OBLIGATIONAL CONSTRUCTIONS IN NEW INDO-ARYAN LANGUAGES OF WESTERN INDIA

Liudmila V. Khokhlova

Abstract: Liudmila V. Khokhlova. *Obligational Constructions in New Indo-Aryan Languages of Western India*. Lingua Posnaniensis, vol. LV (2)/2013. The Poznań Society for the Advancement of the Arts and Sciences. PL ISSN 0079-4740, ISBN 978-83-7654-274-4, pp. 91–107.

The paper describes historical roots as well as syntactic and semantic properties of the three main obligational constructions in modern Hindi-Urdu, Punjabi, Rajasthani[1] and Gujarati.[2] These constructions differ from one another by the degree and by the type of obligation. The main syntactic properties of obligational constructions discussed in the paper are Agent marking and long distance agreement rules. It will be demonstrated that the increasing frequency of the Dative instead of the Instrumental Agent marking in constructions of obligation was part of the gradual destruction of the 'passive syntax' typical for the climactic stage of ergative development.

Key words: obligational construction, Rajasthani, Punjabi, Gujarati, Instrumental Agent marking, Dative Agent marking, long distance agreement

Liudmila V. Khokhlova, Department of Indian Philology, Institute of Asian and African Studies, Moscow State University, khokhl@iaas.msu.ru

1. OBLIGATIONAL CONSTRUCTIONS IN MODERN WESTERN NIA

1.1. The strongest type of obligation is expressed by constructions with the verb 'to fall', preceded by the infinitive of the main verb. The subject (obligor agent)[3] is

---

[1] Rajasthani means here dialects grouped together according to G. Grierson (1918) on the basis of common phonetic, morphological and syntactic features. Most written texts exist in Marwari and Mewari, though the native speakers of other dialects also participate in the literary process. I am using this term here as the texts written in various Rajasthani dialects show similar tendencies of typological development.

[2] Examples used in this paper have largely been taken from information provided by native speakers and from literary sources. Fabricated examples have been checked and cross-checked with native speakers. References to literary sources are given in bibliography.

[3] The thematic role of the subject in obligational construction is described as Experiencer by Masica (1991: 351–352), as Goal by M. Butt (2006: 86), Agent by Cardona (1965: 96). It is usually defined as Agent in gerundival constructions – OIA and MIA antecedents of modern obligational constructions (Hock 1986: 15–26), (Bubenik 1998). This thematic role is really ambiguous as the subject has more volitional properties in constructions denoting planned action and moral obligation, less – in constructions denoting compulsion. Understanding inaccuracy of any general term used for subject in obligational construction, I will use the term Agent in order to show historical link with the Agent of gerundival constructions in OIA and MIA. The term 'obligor agent' has been suggested by Prof. H. Hock.

marked by Dative in Hindi-Urdu (1), Punjabi (2) and Rajasthani (3) and by Instrumental in Gujarati (4):

(1)　　　(H-U.)
　　　　dhobī　　ko　ye　　sāre　　kapṛe　　　dhone　　　paṛeⁿge
　　　　washerman　DAT　these.PL　all.M.PL　clothes.M.PL　wash.INF.M.PL　fall.FUT.3M.PL
　　　　'The washerman will have to wash all these clothes.'

(2)　　　(P.)
　　　　us-nūⁿ　　eh　　kamm　　karnā　　　pawegā
　　　　he.OBL-DAT　this　work.M.SG　do.INF.M.SG　fall.FUT.3M.SG
　　　　'He will have to do this work.'

(3)　　　(R.)
　　　　mha-nai　tau　　marṇau　　ī　　paṛsī
　　　　I.OBL-DAT　emph.　die.INF.M.SG　emph　fall.FUT.3SG
　　　　'As for me, I shall have to die.'

(4)　　　(G.)
　　　　teṇe　　ā　　copḍī　　wāⁿcwī　　paḍśe
　　　　he.INS　this　book.F　read.INF.F　fall.FUT.3SG
　　　　'He will have to read this book.'

1.2. Constructions denoting m o r a l   o b l i g a t i o n , f o l l o w i n g   s o m e b o d y ' s   r u l e s   a n d p r e s c r i p t i o n s imply an Agent that has comparatively free choice to perform or not to perform the action. The predicate is formed by an adverb (Hindi-Urdu, Rajasthani, Gujarati) or verbal adjective (Punjabi), preceded by the infinitive and followed by copula. Adverbs in Hindi-Urdu, Rajasthani and Punjabi are derived from √*cāh* 'want': H-U. *cāhiye*, R. *cāhījai*, historically they are the finite forms of Present Passive; P. *cāhīdā* historically is the Present Passive Participle; the adverb *joīe* of Gujarati is derived from √ *jo* 'to see', historically the finite form of Present Passive.[4]

The A g e n t is marked by D a t i v e in H-U. (5), R. (6) and P. (7):

(5)　　　(H-U.)
　　　　baccoⁿ　　　ko　baRoⁿ　　　ke sāmne　kuch　　　nahīⁿ　bolnā　cāhiye
　　　　child.PL.OBL　DAT　elder. PL.OBL　in front of　something　NEG　say　necessary
　　　　'Children should not oppose grown-ups' words.'

(6)　　　(R.)
　　　　ma-nai　e　　roṭī　jīmṇī　　cāhījai
　　　　I.OBL-DAT　this　roti.F　eat.INF.F　necessary
　　　　'I should eat this roti.'

(7)　　　(P.)
　　　　beṭe,　　tai-nūⁿ　　ih　　sārīāⁿ　kitābāⁿ　paṛhnīāⁿ　　cāhīdīāⁿ
　　　　son.VOC　you.OBL-DAT　these　all.F.PL　book.F.PL　read.INF.F.PL　necessary.F.PL

---

[4] Interestingly, the adverbs in the described obligational constructions are etymologically derived from Sanskrit verbs meaning 'to see', the metaphorical development here must have been 'see > want'. Compare with Marathi adverb pāhije derived from root with the same meaning (KATENINA 1963: 70).

han
are.PRES.3PL
'Son, you should read all these books.'

In Gujarati the Agent is marked by Dative freely varying with Instrumental (8), (9). There is great variation with regard to the preferred Agent marker in Gujarati both regionally and individually (Cardona 1965: 96; Lambert 1971: 60–61, 108–109; Masica 1991: 351–352). The native speakers I worked with preferred the Instrumental case marking of Agent in sentences signifying moral obligation.

(8)   (G.)
teṇe/tene   mitrā-ne   patra   lakhvo   joīe
he.INS/he.DAT   friend.OBL-DAT   letter.M.SG   write.INF.**M**.SG   necessary
'He should write a letter to (his) friend.'

(9*)*   (G.)
e   maṇas-e/maṇas-ne   ghar   jāwuⁿ   joīe
this   man.INS/man.DAT   home   go.INF.N   necessary
'This man should go home.'

Compare similar Agent marking in Gujarati ergative construction (10):

(10)   (G.)
e   maṇas-e   1942-nī   rāṣṭrīy caḷvaḷ-māⁿ   ame   sāthe   kām
this   man.INS   1942-of   national movement-in   me   with   work.N.SG
kareluⁿ
did.PAST.N.SG
'This man together with me participated in 1942 national movement.'

The 1st and 2nd pers. pronouns in Instrumental case may be replaced by possessive pronouns having the same case. They vary freely with personal pronouns in Dative (11):

(11)   (G.)
mare/mane   amāre/amne   tamāre/tamne   ghar   jāwuⁿ   joīe
my.INS/me.DAT   our.INS/us.DAT   your.INS/you.DAT   home   go.INF.N   necessary
'I/we/you should go home.'

1.3. The constructions of the third type denote the action planned by the Agent himself or planned for the Agent by someone else. Similar to the Agent in constructions denoting moral obligation, the Agent in this type of constructions is not compelled to perform the action, but has free choice to follow his own or somebody's plans or prescriptions. The predicate is formed by the infinitive + copula. The Agent is marked by Dative in standard H-U. (12), R. (13) and G. (14), by Ergative in P. (15) and sub-standard H-U. (16):

(12)   (H-U.)
hamāre   baccoⁿ   ko   jūn   meⁿ   imtihān   dene
our.M.PL.OBL   children.PL.OBL   DAT   June   in   exam   give.INF.M.PL
haiⁿ
are.PRES.3PL
'Our children are to sit at the exams in June.'

(13)   (R.)
         ma-nai   kām   karṇo   hai
         I.OBL-DAT   work.M.SG   do.INF.M.SG   is.PRES.3.SG
         'I am to do the work.'

(14)   (G.)
         āj   sā^{n}je   maheś-ne   gām   jāwu^n che
         today   in the evening   Mahesh-DAT   village   go.INF.N.   is.PRES.3SG
         'Today in the evening Mahesh is to go to the village.'

(15)   (P.)
         jasbīr   ne   tere   bāp   nāl   gallā^n karnīā^n han
         Jasbir   ERG   your   father   with   word.F.PL   do.INF.F.PL   are.PRES.3PL
         'Jasbir is to talk to your father.'

(16)   (sub-standard H-U.)
         rām   ne   śādī   karnī   hai
         Ram   ERG   marriage.F.SG   do.INF.F.SG   is
         'Ram is to marry.'

According to M. BUTT (2006: 86), the Dative-Ergative case alternation in Urdu is supposed to express a certain semantic contrast. In her examples (17) and (18) below the Agent marked by Dative is semantically neutral. It may be interpreted as Goal, i.e. 'receiving the zoo going event'. Dative can also be interpreted on the control dimention, so (17) may have two readings: 'plus control' (= Nadya wants to go to the zoo) and 'minus control' (= Nadya has to go to the zoo). As for Ergative in (18), it expresses the marked situation, showing a very high degree of control and results in a reading whereby the participant wants the event to take place: Nadya wants to go to the zoo.

(17)   (H-U.)
         nādyā   ko   zoo   jānā   hai
         Nadya.F.SG   DAT   zoo   go.INF.M.SG   be.PRES.3SG
         'Nadya has/wants to go to the zoo.'

(18)   (H-U.)
         nādyā   ne   zoo   jānā   hai
         Nadya.F.SG   ERG   zoo   go.INF.M.SG   be.PRES.3SG
         'Nadya wants to go to the zoo.'

The suggested type of analysis raises doubts as the case alternation does not take place in one and the same idiolect and due to this cannot be used for expressing different meanings. The choice of particular marking depends on age, background, education, contacts and the surroundings.[5] Marking with the Ergative has been borrowed from Punjabi. It is spread-

_____

[5]   M. BUTT (2006) ascribed similar 'volitional vs. involitional' opposition to possible case alternations in constructions with intransitive verbs like 'cough', 'sneeze', 'laugh' etc.

(a)   **ram**   *khã̄s-a*
        Ram.M.SG.NOM.   coughed.PERF.M.SG
        'Ram coughed.' (he is sick)

ing in Pakistani Urdu (about half of the Pakistan population are native speakers of Punjabi) and in Hindi of Delhi (MASICA 1991: 352). One and the same person uses always the same – either Dative or Ergative – case irrespective of the fact that the Agent wants the event to take place or obeys the law, rules etc. Compare, e.g., (18) above, where the Agent wants and (19) below, where the Agent does not want the event to take place, but is compelled to perform the action planned for him/her by somebody else. Other speakers would use Dative in both the cases:

(19)   (H-U.)
          nādyā   ne   tīn   din meⁿ pāⁿc imtihān   dene   haiⁿ
          Nadya.F.SG ERG three days in   five exams.M.PL give.INF.M.PL be.PRES.3PL
          'Nadya has (*wants) to sit in five exams during three days.'

Irrespective of Dative/Ergative marking, the Agent in constructions denoting planned action occupies the highest position in the volitionality hierarchy. Constructions denoting compulsion naturally imply the obligor Agent and constructions expressing moral obligation occupy the intermediate position.

The table below shows the Agent marking in all the types of obligational construction.

Language	Type of obligation		
	compulsion	moral obligation	planned action
Hindi-Urdu	DAT	DAT	DAT/ERG
Rajasthani	DAT	DAT	DAT
Punjabi	DAT	DAT	ERG
Gujarati	INS =ERG	INS =ERG/DAT	INS=ERG/DAT

Standard Hindi-Urdu and Rajasthani have similar Agent marking (by Dative) in all the constructions denoting obligation. In Punjabi and sub-standard Hindi-Urdu the Agent obeying moral rules is combined with the Agent compelled to perform the action (both are marked by Dative); they are opposed to the Ergative marked Agent that follows its own or somebody's (including God's) plans in life.

In Gujarati the Agent in the constructions, denoting moral obligation and planned action may be marked either by Instrumental or by Dative. In case of the compelled action the only possible Agent marking is by Instrumental-Ergative inflection. This means that in the semantic map of Gujarati the Agent that has more chance to act according to its free will, i.e. to display its Agentive properties, is opposed to the Agent compelled to perform the action. Interestingly, in Gujarati the Instrumental-Ergative case serves to mark the most involitional Agent, forced to perform the action. That means that Gujarati data contradicts M. Butt's hypothesis saying that Ergative shows a very high degree of control while Dative

(b)   ***ram-ne***   *khãs-a*
         Ram.M.SG.ERG   coughed.PERF.M.SG
         'Ram coughed **(purposefully)**.'

Similar to the obligational constructions with alternative Agent marking, these constructions also are not used in one and the same idiolect, and because of that they cannot differentiate meanings.

is preferred in constructions where the Agent is endowed with the less amount of free will in performing the action.

Being grouped with 'compulsion' in Punjabi and with 'planned action' in Gujarati, the constructions with 'moral obligation' reading have a peculiar syntactic feature, not shared with the other obligation constructions. Agents in all obligational constructions have such subject properties as binding the subject oriented reflexive or being a controlled PRO subject (20):

(20)   (H-U.)
         *hame^n (i)   bacco^n (j)   ko   [**PRO** (i)   apne (i*j)   kamre   me^n biṭhānā]*
         we.DAT   children   DAT   self's   room   in   make sit
         hai/cāhiye/paṛegā
         is/necessary/will fall.FUT.3M.SG
         'We are/should/shall have to make the children sit in their room.'

But only the Agent in constructions denoting 'moral obligation' allows the grammatical functions to reverse, compare (21) and (22) with reversible predicates:

(21)   (H-U.)
         *pati (i)   ko   apnī (i/*j)   bīvī   pasa^{n}d   ānī   cāhiye*
         husband   DAT   self's   wife   liking   come.INF.F   necessary
         *hai   *paṛegī
         *is   *will fall.FUT.3F.SG
         'The husband should like his wife.'

(22)   (H-U.)
         *bīvī (i)   apne (i/*j)   pati   ko   pasa^{n}d   ānī   cāhiye*
         wife   self's   husband   DAT   liking   come.INF.F   necessary
         'The wife should be liked by her husband.'

One more specific property of the constructions denoting 'moral obligation' is that only these constructions may have no Agent in their argument structure, compare H-U. (23):

(23)   (H-U.)
         bīvī   gharelū   honī   cāhiye   *hai   *paṛegī
         wife   domestic   be.INF.F   necessary   *is   *will fall.FUT.3F.SG
         'Wife should be domestic.'

The obligational constructions in the described languages demonstrate the case of Long Distance Agreement (LDA) when the matrix predicate agrees with the argument which is not its own. In Punjabi (24) the participle *cāhīdīā^n* and copula *han* agree with the argument *kitābā^n* that is not their own.[6]

(24)   (P.)
         beṭe,   tai-nū^n [ih   sārīā^n kitābā^n paṛhnīā^n]   cāhīdīā^n
         son.VOC   you.OBL-DAT   these   all.F.PL   book.F.PL   read.INF.F.PL   necessary.F.PL
         han
         are.PRES.3.PL
         'Son, you should read all these books.'

---

[6] Compare the description of LDA in Hindi-Urdu by Rajesh Bhat (2005: 757–807).

In Rajasthani (25) the predicate *paṛī* agrees with an argument *parṇiyoṛī* that is not its own:

(25)   (R.)
phagat garībī rai   kāraṇ thā^n-nai [sāt pherā^n rī
only   poverty GEN.M.OBL reason you-DAT seven circle.F.PL.OBL Gen.F

parṇiyoṛī   choṛnī]   paṛī
married.F.SG leave.INF.F fall.PRES.P.F

 'Only because of poverty you will have to leave [your wife] married according to Hindu law.'[7]   (BAHAL 1989: 119).

In Hindi-Urdu the agreement in obligational constructions is optional,[8] though preferable in literary standard:

(26)   (H-U.)
rām   ko   [kitābe^n paṛhnī]   paṛe^{n}gī/   paṛhnā   paṛegā
Ram   DAT   books.F.PL.   read.INF.F.   fall.FUT.F.PL/   read.INF.M.SG   fall.FUT.M.SG
'Ram will have to read the books.'

Being a part of present tense predicate, Hindi-Urdu *cāhiye* sometimes (rather rarely) agrees with the plural form of infinitive's direct object:

(27)   (H-U.)
bacco^n ko   [baṛo^n kī   bāte^n mānnī]   cāhiye^n
children   DAT   grown up.OBL.PL.   G.F   words.F.PL   respect.INF.F   necessary.PL
'The children should listen to grown-ups.'

In H-U. the infinitival agreement takes place only in case of LDA, while in other languages it is compulsory within simple clause. Compare standard H-U. (28), P. (29) G. (30) and R. (31):

(28)   (H-U.)
zarūrat se   zyādā   kitābe^n paṛhnā   tabīyat   ke liye   acchā nahī^n
necessity ABL   more   books.F.PL   read.INF.M.SG   health   for   good   NEG

hai
is

'Reading more books than necessary is not good for health.'

(29)   (P.)
caran   nū^n rūsī   sikk$^{h.}$ṇī   ca^{n}gī   lagdī   hai
Charan   DAT   Russian.F.SG   learn.INF.F.SG   good. F.SG   seem.PRES.P.F.SG   is
'Charan likes to learn Russian.'

(30)   (G.)
ā   co^{n}pḍī   wā^{n}cwī   muśkel   che
this   book.F.SG   read.INF.F   difficult   is
'It is difficult to read this book.'

---

[7]   The main part of marriage ritual are seven circles around the sacred fire.
[8]   For optional LDA in Hindi-Urdu see HOOK 1979, DAVISON 1988, MAHAJAN 1989, BUTT 1995, BHAT 2005.

In Gujarati and Rajasthani, but not in Punjabi, Accusative postposition does not block the infinitival agreement (31):

(31)   (R.)
       rājasthān-meⁿ   kaṭhaiī -kaṭhaiī   śabd-rā   aⁿt- meⁿ   'y'   śruti
       Rajasthan-LOC   somewhere   word-GEN.M.PL   end-in   'y'   sound.F.SG
       suṇījai,   likhaṇ-meⁿ uṇ-nai   nahīⁿ darsāwaṇī
       heard.PRES.PASS.3   writing-in   it.OBL.SG-ACC   NEG   show.INF.F
       'At some places in Rajasthan the sound 'y' is heard at the end of the words, it
       should not be shown in writing.'

Long distance agreement rules in Punjabi contradict Rajesh Bhatt's statement that LDA can only take place if the matrix verb has no non-overtly case-marked arguments of its own. In Punjabi the Agent expressed by the 1-st or 2-nd person pronouns in constructions of the planned action has no case marking, compare P. (32):

(32)   (P.)
       mai/tūⁿ/asīⁿ/tusīⁿ   paⁿjābī   sīkhṇī   hovegī
       I/thou/we/you   Punjabi .F.SG   learn.INF.F.SG   will be.FUT.3F.SG
       'I/thou/we/you may plan to learn Punjabi.'

2. THE HISTORICAL ROOTS
OF MODERN OBLIGATIONAL CONSTRUCTIONS

2.1. According to Butt (2006: 86), in the construction with the copula and a non-finite main verb the use of Dative historically precedes the use of Ergative. M. Butt referred to E. Bashir's study of Modern Urdu syntax (Bashir 1999). According to Bashir, in modern Urdu the Ergative is slowly encroaching on the domain of the Dative. Not contesting this conclusion, it is much easier to explain the phenomenon by the Punjabi influence. The Punjabi-speaking community constitutes 44.15% of the total population of Pakistan and 47.56% of its urban population. Together with speakers of Saraiki (10.53%) which is treated by some linguists as a southern dialect of Punjabi (Nadiem 2005), the bearers of the Punjabi language represent the majority of the population of Pakistan.

2.2. As for diachronic data, they demonstrate a different type of development. The Rajasthani/Gujarati infinitive may be derived from Skr. gerundives (potential participles) with suffixes *-tavya/-itavya*: Skr. *-(i)tavya-* > Pkt. *-(i)avva-* > OG *-(i)va-* extended by suffix *-uⁿ* declined for number and gender (Dave 1935: 64).[9] Hindi-Urdu, Punjabi and modern Rajasthani infinitives are most probably connected with OIA deverbative action nouns with suffix *-ana-*[10] – like *darś-ana* 'sight' (√*dṛś*) (Bubenik 1996: 126). However, the Sanskrit gerundives in *-(ī)ya-*, *-(i)tavya-*, *-ya*, *-anīya-* expressing 'obligation' or necessity, may have played a significant role in the formation of the obligational constructions in Hindi-Urdu and Punjabi (Masica 1991: 352). Bubenik has pointed to the fact that unlike Greek and Latin where the gerundives were used predominantly in statements of deontic modality, their IA counterparts could denote both the necessity and the possibility (Bubenik 1998: 190).

---

[9] *-au* for M.SG, *ā-* for M.PL, *-ī* for F/SG=PL.
[10] In Western Apabhramsha *-aṇa/u-* (Bubenik 1996: 126).

Changing the Agent marking in OIA-MIA-NIA obligational constructions sheds light on the typological development of Western NIA languages.

2.3. In early Vedic Agent in constructions with gerundives could be marked by Dative (33), Genitive (34) and Instrumental (35):

(33)   *sákhā   sákhibhya   íḍyaḥ*
       friend.NOM.SG   friend.DAT.PL   invoked.GER.M.NOM.SG
       'A friend to be invoked by friends.' (Hock 1986: 20); or 'A friend [is] to be praised by friends.' (Bubenik 1998: 190); or 'A friend to be invoked for friends.'
                                                    (Elizarenkova 1999: 55) (RV 9.66.1).[11]

(34)   *yá   éka   id-dháv-ya-ś-   caṛṣaṇīnām*
       that.NOM.SG   one.M.NOM.SG   EMPH.invoke.GER.M.N.SG   ploughman.GEN.PL
       'That (only) one should be called by the people (lit. by ploughmen).'
                                                    (Elizarenkova 1995: 117) (RV 6.22.1)

(35)   *tvám̐ nṛbhir   hávyo   viśvádhā   asi*
       thou   man.M.INS.PL   invoked.GER.M.SG   always   art.PRES.2SG
       'You should always be invoked by men.'   (Elizarenkova 1995: 201),
       'You are always to be invoked by men.'   (Bubenik 1998: 190) (RV 7. 22. 7)

The Instrumental marking did not correspond to any particular thematic role: the Instrumental case could be used both for Agent (35 above) and for Experiencer (36 below):

(36)   *asmābhir   ū   nú   praticákṣyā   abhūt*
       we.INS   PRT[12]   now   visible.GER   became.AOR.3SG
       'She became visible to us.' (lit. 'possible to be seen by us')
                                                    (Bubenik 1998: 191) (RV 1. 113.11)

2.4. By the time of Classical Sanskrit the gerundive has lost its Dative Agent marking, and the Genitive Agents have become rare (Hock 1986: 20), the Instrumental Agents were predominating in all the P-oriented constructions – in constructions with *-ta-* participles, the antecedents of future ergative constructions (37), in constructions with passives (38) and in those with gerundives (39):

(37)   *devadattena   kaṭaḥ   kṛtaḥ*
       Devadatta.INS.SG   mat.NOM.SG.   made.NOM.SG
       'Devadatta has made a mat.' = 'A mat has been made by Devadatta.'

(38)   *devadattena   kaṭaḥ   kriyate*
       Devadatta.INS.SG   mat.NOM.SG.   is made.PRES.PASS.3SG
       'A mat has been made by Devadatta.'

(39)   *devadattena   kaṭaḥ   kartavyaḥ*
       Devadatta.INS/SG   mat.NOM.SG   is to be made
       'A mat is to be made by Devadatta.'   (Hock 1986: 15)

In early Vedic gerundives were usually formed from the transitive stems. The gerundives from intransitives were very rare and confined just to roots √*jan* 'be born' and √*bhū*

---

[11]   Different translations show that Dative marking was ambiguous, meaning that the argument might have thematic roles either of the Agent or of the Beneficiary.
[12]   Particle.

'be'. By the time of Vedic prose there have appeared the Agent-demoting gerundives from intransitives (Hоск 1986: 19). The Agent-demotion has become obligatory for the most productive sub-type of gerundives, that is for those in *-tavya-,* the antecedent of the obligational constructions in Old Gujarati and Rajasthani.

(40)   *paśúvratena   bhavitavyam*
          cattle-like.INS.SG   should be.GER.N.SG
          'One should be cattle-like.'   (Hоск 1986: 20) (MS 1.8.7)

According to Hock, impersonal constructions of the type illustrated in (40) were much more commonly attested for gerundives than for passives (Hоск 1986: 20). This means that gerundives provided the starting point for the innovation that was a very important feature of ergative development. Following Comrie's definition of ergativity as 'passive' morphology and/or syntax without the existence of a corresponding and more basic 'active counterpart' (Comrie 1978), the *-tavya-* gerundives in Vedic prose could be considered more ergative than the *-ta-* participles, as they did not suppose any 'active – passive' opposition and were obligatorily 'passive' even in case of intransitives, while the *-ta-* participles were obligatorily passive only in case of transitives. As for passive constructions, in Classical Sanskrit they implied the corresponding 'active' counterparts (Hоск 1986: 19).

2.5. In the climactic point of ergativity development, namely in late MIA, the active-passive opposition has stopped to exist: the A-demotional passive has been preserved only in non-ergative domain, while the *-ta-* participle (41) and the gerundival (42) constructions have not entered into the 'active – passive' opposition and have retained the Instrumental Agent marking:

(41)   *tā   keumaieṃ   hauṃ   gharaho   nīya*
          then   Ketumati.INS   I.NOM   house.GEN.DAT   taken.PP
          'Then Ketumati brought me home." = 'Then I was brought home by Ketumati.'
                                                  (Bubenik 1986: 148) (Kc 6.12.1)

(42)   *ṇavara   ekku   vau   maiṃ   pālevau   jiṇu   mellevi*
          only   one   vow   by me.INS observed.GER   Jina   abandoned.GER
          aṇṇu   ṇa   ṇamevau
          another   not   worshipped.GER
          'I want to observe only one vow (=only one vow should be observed by me) that with the exception of Jina I will not worship another [deity] (=another deity will not be worshipped by me)'   (Bubenik 1986: 194–195) (Pc 26.3.2)

2.6. Old Gujarati and Rajasthani have inherited the 'passive' syntax from MIA, including the Instrumental marking of *-ta-* participial (43, 45) and of gerundival Agents (44, 46):

(43)   (Old Gujarati: 16 cent.)
          saṃyama   nā   saghalā   vyāpāra   mūṃkyā   chaiṃ
          self-control GEN.M.PL   all.M.PL   activities.M.PL   left.PP.M.PL   are.PRES.3.PL
          jīṇaiṃ
          by whom.INS.SG
          '…who has left all the attempts at self-control' = 'by whom all the attempts at self-control have been left'   (Dave 1935: 50) (Suri: 526)

(44)　　　(Old Gujarati: 16 cent.)
　　　śiṣyiiṃ　　te　　kārya　　tatkāla　　ācarivauṃ　　　　ji
　　　pupil.INS　　that　work.N.SG　immediately　should be done.GER.N.SG　HON
　　　'The pupil should immediately do that work.' = 'The work should be done by
　　　the pupil.'　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(DAVE 1935: 65) (Suri: 78)

(45)　　　(Old Rajasthani: 16 cent.)
　　　phal　　　　　vesyāi　　　　　līdhau
　　　fruit.M.SG.NOM　courtesan.INS.SG　taken.PP.M.SG.NOM
　　　'The courtesan took the fruit.' = 'The fruit was taken by the courtesan.'
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(RG: 35)

(46)　　　*im　anere...　　vidyā　　　lete　　　vinay　　　　karivu*
　　　so　others.INS　knowledge　grasping　humility.N.SG　should be done.GER.N.SG
　　　'So grasping knowledge others should also show humility.'　　　(RG: 16)

　　The Agent has retained the Instrumental marking in constructions with gerundives from intransitives:

(47)　　　(Old Rajasthani: 16 cent.)
　　　je　pākhtī　bi　vṛkś chai　te　taḷhārī tai^n　　na jā-iv-u^n
　　　which　nearby　two　trees are　them　under　you.INS　not should be gone.GER.N.SG
　　　'Do not go under two nearby trees [lit. should not be gone by you]'.　(RG: 37)

　　The impersonal gerundival constructions from transitives (48) as well as from intransitives (49) have continued to be used widely:

(48)　　　(Old Rajasthani: 15 cent.)
　　　tiṇi　　kāraṇi　buddhi karī　　　eu　vi-pratār-iv-au
　　　this.INS　reason.INS　brain　having made.ABS　he　should be deceived.GER.N.SG
　　　'Because of this, using brains he should be deceived.' = 'I should think how to
　　　deceive him.'　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(RG: 8)

(49)　　　(Old Gujarati: 16 cent.)
　　　rāga　dveṣa　nai　　vasi　　　　na　　āv-iv-auṃ
　　　love　hatred　of.LOC.SG　domination.LOC.SG　not　should come.GER.N.SG
　　　'One should not come under the domination of love and hatred.'
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(DAVE 1935: 69) (Suri: 125)

　　2.7. Starting approximately from the 16th century on, the consistent ergative pattern in MIA noun declension has gradually split into two main case marking systems: the accusative S=A≠O and A≠O and the tripartite S≠A≠O one. This evolution from ergative towards nominative syntax in nominal paradigms has resulted in restructuring the whole syntactic system of the late Western NIA, first of all – in deviation from the 'passive pattern' typical for the late OIA and MIA periods. The remains of the Sanskrit *-ta-* participle construction have been included into the 'active – passive' opposition and the passive construction has developed its non-demotional variety. Only Gujarati has preserved the essential feature of 'passive' syntax, inherited from the late OIA stage: the identical Agent marking by Instrumental in ergative and in inherited gerundival constructions (see examples 4, 8, 9, 10 above),

though in the two types of gerundival construction the Agent marking by Instrumental has been varying with the Dative. For more details see (Khokhlova 2001).

2.8. Only Modern Gujarati has inherited from Sanskrit the -tavya- gerundive used in all the obligational constructions, see (4, 8, 9, 11, 14) above. After Gujarati-Rajasthani split that has taken place in approximately 16th century (Tessitori 1914–1916), the obligational constructions have started being formed not only from the inherited -tavya- gerundives but also from the OIA deverbative action nouns with the suffix -ana-.[13] Both forms could be used in one and the same sentence. The Instrumental Agent marker typical for OIA and MIA 'passive syntax' has been replaced by the Dative.

(50)   (Rajasthani: 18 cent.)
   au   dhanuṣ   mo-nū^n cāṛhṇo   sītā   parṇawī
   this   bow.M.SG   me-DAT   draw.INF.M.SG Sita.F   marry.GER.F
   'I am to draw this bow and marry Sita.'   (RG 97)

Gradually the former gerundives have become obsolete, and the new constructions with the adverb *cāhījai* 'necessary' and the infinitives of the new type with the suffix -n- have been formed:

(51)   (Rajasthani: 18 cent.)
   vikramādit-udaisingh   thārā   lohṛā   bhāī   chai,   tinā^n nū^n ek
   Vikramadit-Udaisingh   your   younger   brothers   are   them   DAT   one
   pag-ṭhoṛ   dīnī   cāhījai
   foot-place.F   give.INF.F   necessary
   'Vikramadit and Udaysingh are your younger brothers. They should be given
   some place (to stay).'   (RG: 48)

Unlike Rajasthani where the prose texts are dated back to the 14th century, the historical development of Kauravi – the basic dialect of modern Hindi-Urdu – has not been represented in chronologically ordered texts belonging to different centuries. The general trend of Hindi-Urdu syntactic development may be analyzed through studying the history of a Hindi dialect that has a literary tradition, namely Braj. Similar to Old Rajasthani, Old Braj possessed two infinitives: one with the suffix -(i)v- and the second with the suffix -n-. They were used partially in free variation, partially in complementary distribution (Miltner 1962: 501). The obligational constructions of Old Braj were formed with the infinitive having suffix -n-, the Agent in them was marked by Dative:

(52)   (Old Braj: 17 cent.)
   vaiṣṇav   kū^n vaisī   hī   kr̥tī   karnī   cāhiye
   Vaishnav   DAT   such   EMPH   deed.F   do.INF.F   necessary
   'Vaishnav should perform exactly this type of deeds.'   (vārtā: 107; 58)

(53)   *...jinke līye   śrī nāth-jī   kū^n masāl   lenī   paḍī*
   …whom for   HON.Nath-HON   DAT   lantern.F   take.INF.**F**   fell.Pst.**F**
   'For whom Krishnaji had to take lantern.'   (vārtā: 121; 65,1)

---

[13] The forms derived from OIA deverbative action nouns with suffix -ana- are usually defined as 'infinitives' in various descriptions of Modern NIA. Most authors describe both verbal and adjectival properties of these forms: Ashant 1994; Bahal 1989; Bhatia 1993; Bhayani 1969; Cardona 1965; Gaeffke 1967; Gill & Gleason 1963; Gusain 2004; Kachru 1966; Masica 1991; Puar 1990; Smirnov 1976; Swami 1960; Trivedi 1954 etc.

Constructions with the adverbs R. *cāhījai*, G. *joīe*, H-U. *cāhiye*, Old P. *loṛīe* (see below) and with Modern Punjabi adjective *cāhīdā* 'necessary' acquired the meaning of moral or ethic necessity which previously had been expressed by gerundives (compare example 48 above). Constructions with the verb √*paḍ* 'to fall' (53) added the new meaning of strong obligation, not quite typical for Sanskrit gerundives. According to my preliminary analysis these constructions have first appeared in Braj and only later in Gujarati, Punjabi and Rajasthani.

In Old Braj and Old Punjabi the constructions with the adjective/adverb 'necessary' and the verb 'to fall' might be formed not only with the infinitives, but also with the perfective participles:

(54)   (Old Braj: 17 cent.)

āp   ko   kachu   gāyo   cāhiye
you   DAT   something   sang.PP.M.SG   necessary
'You should sing something.'   (vārtā: 3; 1,2)

(55)   (Old Braj: 17 cent.)

paraⁿtu   sevā-to   karī   cāhiye
but   service.F-EMPH   done.PP.F   necessary
'But service should be done.'   (vārtā: 45; 7,8)

(56)   (Old Braj: 17 cent.)

itno   kām   karyo   paḍyo
so much   work   done.PP.M.SG   fell.PP.M.SG
'So much work had to be done.'   (vārtā: III; 60)

(57)   (Old Punjabi: 17-18? cent.)

mūrakh   nūⁿ   bhāvaiⁿ   thoṛā   bhāvaiⁿ   bahutā   kujh
fool   DAT   let (it be)   little   let (it be)   much   something
paṛhiyā   cāhīe
read.PP. M.SG   necessary
'A fool should read something, let it be little or much.'   (PPV: 77)

In Punjabi the adverb *cāhīe* was used in free variation with its synonym *loṛīe*,[14] both were usually preceded by the perfective participle:

(58)   (Old Punjabi: 17–18? cent.)

jis   ih   baiⁿt   ākhiā hai tis-dā   dīdār   kītā
who.REL.OBL.SG   this   couplet   pronounced   his   sight.M.   done.PP.M.SG
loṛīe
necessary
'It is necessary to have a sight of a person who pronounced this couplet.'
(PPV: 38)

The Agent in constructions with *loṛīe* was usually in the 'Direct' case:

(59)   (Old Punjabi)

asī   ḍūⁿm…   piⁿn   khādhā   loṛīe
we   dum…   dumpling   eaten.PP.M.SG   necessary
'For us, Dums (cast name) … it is necessary to eat dumplings'

(PPV: 38)

[14] Historically present passive from √*loṛ* 'to need'.

(60)   *asī*   *dīdār*   *kītā*   *loṛīe*
          we.NOM   sight.M   do.PP.M.   necessary
          'We should see (him)'   (PPV: 38)

The obligational constructions formed from infinitives with the suffix *-n-* were used in Old Punjabi with and without copula. Constructions with copula denoted plan or desire to perform the action (61), constructions without copula signified moral obligation (62):

(61)   (Old Punjabi: 17–18? cent.)
          e nānakā   ik   dui   galā^n asā^n tere   nāli   karṇīā   haini
          O Nanak.VOC one two words.F.PL we.OBL. you with do.INF.F.PL are.PRES.3PL
          'O Nanak, we are to tell you one-two words.'   (JSP: 167)

(62)   (Old Punjabi: 17–18? cent.)
          tusā^n bhī   sabadu   bāṇī   dī   prīt   karnī
          you.OBL   also   word   voice   GEN   love.F.SG   do.INF.F.SG
          'You also should love the Word (of God) and the Voice (of God).'
                                                                                (P.P.V. 1973: 73)

The meaning of 'moral obligation' could be easily combined with the sense of the imperative – compare in this respect (62) above and (63) below. In sentences with the infinitive without copula there might sometimes be no agreement with the Direct Object (63):

(63)   (Old Punjabi: 17–18? cent.):
          tusī^n[15]   bhī   braham   nū^n bia^{n}t   jāṇke   sabh kise   de nāl
          you.DIR   also   Brahma   ACC   eternal   having known.ABS   everybody   with
          bhāu   bhagati   karnā
          attachment.M.   love.F.SG   do.INF.M.SG
          'Knowing that God is eternal you should love everybody.'   (PPV: 75)

The Agent in the infinitival obligation constructions was usually marked by the 'Oblique Case', similarly to the ergative Agent – compare (64) and (65) below:

(64)   *tusā^n bhī   paramesar   kā   bhajan karnā   te   sādh*
          you.OBL   also   Supreme Ruler GEN.M.SG prayer do.INF.M.SG and   holy
          sa^{n}gati   kī   sarani   rahṇā
          gathering   GEN.F.SG   shelter.F.LOC   stay.INF.M.SG
          'You should also pray God and stay in the shelter of holy gathering.' (PPV: 77)

(65)   *asā^n mahārāj   dī   ārtī[16]F.SG   kītī   hai   ar tusā^n kiu^n*
          we.OBL   spiritual teacher GEN.F.SG   arti[16]F.SG   did.F.SG   is.3.SG and you.OBL. why
          nahī^n kītī
          not   did.F.SG
          'We have performed aarti in praise of maharaj, why didn't you do so?'
                                                                                        (PPV: 58)

---

[15] Agent in (63) is in the 'Direct Case'. It demonstrates the new tendency in personal pronouns' case marking: in modern standard Punjabi the 1st and 2nd person pronouns are used in 'Direct Case' being both the ergative Agents and the Agents of the obligational constructions denoting 'planned action':
          main^n/asī^n/tusī^n punjābī   sīkhṇī   hai 'We are to learn Punjabi.'
          main^n/asī^n/tusī^n punjābī   sīkhī   hai 'We have learned Punjabi.'
[16] Religious ritual of worship. It involves the circulating of an 'Aarti plate' or 'Aarti lamp' around a person or deity and is generally accompanied by the singing of songs in praise of that deva or person.

The analysis given above shows a great degree of variability of Agent marking and predicate structures in Old Punjabi prose texts. Modern standard Punjabi has preserved obligational constructions with the infinitive and copula (61) denoting the 'planned action', the constructions with the adverb *cāhīe* denoting the 'moral rules'[17] and has developed the new construction with the verb 'to fall' implying the sense of 'strong obligation'. Only the first type of constructions may have the inconsistent ergative Agent marking, in the other two constructions the Agent is consistently marked by the Dative.

CONCLUSION

It has been demonstrated that the increasing frequency of the Agent marking by Dative and not by Instrumental in constructions of obligation was a part of a gradual destruction of the 'passive syntax' typical for the climactic stage of ergative development. Similar historical development, i.e marking of the Agent of obligational constructions by the Instrumental/Ergative case later replaced by Dative, has been described by K. Stroński for Pahari.[18]

The Standard Hindi-Urdu and Literary Rajasthani have similar Dative Agent marking in all the constructions denoting obligation. In Punjabi and sub-standard Hindi-Urdu the Agent obeying 'moral rules' is combined with the Agent that is compelled to perform the action (both are marked by Dative); they are opposed to the (Ergative) Agent that follows its own or somebody's (including God's) plans.

In Gujarati, the Agent in constructions denoting moral obligation and planned action may be marked by both the Instrumental and Dative. In case of the compelled action the only possible Agent marking is by Instrumental-Ergative inflection. This means that in the Gujarati semantic map the Agent that has more chance to act according to its free will, i.e. to display its Agentive properties, is opposed to the Agent compelled to perform the action. In Gujarati the Instrumental-Ergative case serves to mark the most involitional Agent, forced to perform the action. That means that Gujarati data contradicts M. Butt's hypothesis saying that Ergative shows a very high degree of control while Dative is preferred in constructions where the Agent is endowed with less amount of free will in performing the action.

Agents in all obligational constructions have subject properties such as binding a subject oriented reflexive or being a controlled PRO subject, but only the Agent in the constructions denoting 'moral obligation' allows the grammatical functions to reverse, and only these constructions may have no Agent in their argument structure.

The obligational constructions of the described languages demonstrate the case of Long Distance Agreement when the matrix predicate agrees with the argument that is not its own.

In Hindi-Urdu agreement in obligational constructions is optional, though preferable in literary language, in other languages it is compulsory. In H-U infinitival agreement takes place only in case of LDA, while in other languages it is compulsory in all cases.

---

[17] The adverb *cāhīe* has been replaced by the adjective *cāhīdā*.
[18] P.c.

REFERENCES

ASHANT B.L. Malee 1994. *Rajasthani bhasha aur vyakaran* (Rajasthani Grammar). Jaipur: Rajasthani bhasha bal sahitya prakashan trust (in Hindi).

BAHAL Kali Charan K. 1989. *Adhunik Rajasthani ka sanrachnatmak vyakaran* (Generative Grammar of Modern Rajasthani). Jodhpur: Rajasthani Sahitya sansthan (in Hindi).

BASHIR Elena. 1999. "The Urdu and Hindi Ergative Postposition ne: Its Changing Role in the Grammar." In: SINGH 1999: 11–36.

BHAT Rajesh. 2005. "Long Distance Agreement in Hindi-Urdu." *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 23, 757–807.

BHATIA Tej. 1993. *Punjabi: A Cognitive-descriptive Grammar*. London: Routledge.

BHAYANI Harivallabh. 1969. *Thorok vyakaran vicar* (Concise grammatical commentary). Ahmadabad: Vora & Company (in Gujarati).

BONAMI O., CABREDO HOFHERR P. (eds.). 2006. *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics 6*: 69–92.

BUBENIK Vit. 1996. *The Structure and Development of Middle Indo-Aryan Dialects*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

BUBENIK Vit. 1998. *A Historical Syntax of Late Middle Indo-Aryan (Apabhramsha)*. Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

BUTT Miriam. 1995. *The Structure of Complex Predicates in Urdu*. Stanford, California: Center for the Study of Language and Information.

BUTT Miriam. 2001. "A Reexamination of the Accusative to Ergative Shift in Indo-Aryan." In: BUTT & KING 2001: 105–141.

BUTT Miriam. 2006. "The Dative-Ergative Connection." In: BONAMI & CABREDO HOFHERR 2006: 69–92.

BUTT Miriam, DEO Ashwini. "Ergativity in Indo-Aryan", http://ling.unikonstanz.de/pages/home/butt/main/papers/ia-erg.html.

BUTT Miriam, KING T.H. 2001. *Time over Matter: Diachronic Perspectives on Morphosyntax*. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications.

CARDONA George. 1965. *A Gujarati Reference Grammar*. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press.

COMRIE Bernard. 1978. "Ergativity." In: LEHMANN 1978: 323–393.

DAVE Trimbaklal. 1935. *A Study of the Gujarati Language in the 16-th Century (V.S.)*. London: The Royal Asiatic Society.

DAVISON Alice. 1988. "Constituent Structure and the Realisation of Agreement Features." In: MACLEOD et al. 1988: 41–53.

ELIZARENKOVA Tatyana. 1995. "Translation of Rigveda Mandals 5–8." Moscow: Nauka.

ELIZARENKOVA Tatyana. 1999. "Translation of Rigveda Mandals 9–10." Moscow: Nauka.

GAEFFKE Hans Peter Theodor. 1967. *Untersuchungen zur Syntax des Hindi*. The Hague–Paris: Mouton.

GILL Harjeet Singh, GLEASON Jr. Henry A. 1963. *A Reference Grammar of Punjabi*. Hartford, Connecticut: Hartford Seminary Foundation.

GRIERSON George A. 1918. *Linguistic Survey of India* (Vol. VIII, Part II). Calcutta: Government of India Press.

GUSAIN Lakhan. 2004. *Marwari*. Muenchen: Lincom Europa academic publications.

HOCK Hans Henrich. 1986. "P-Oriented Constructions in Sanskrit." In: KRISHNAMURTY 1986: 15–26.

HOOK Peter Edwin. 1979. *Hindi Structures: Intermediate Level*. Ann Arbor: Center for South and South-East Asian Studies, University of Michigan.

KACHRU Yamuna. 1966. *An Introduction to Hindi Syntax*. Urbana: Department of Linguistics, University of Illinois.

KATENINA Tatyana. 1963. *Jazyk Marathi* (Marathi Language). Moscow: Oriental literature publication.

KHOKHLOVA Liudmila. 2001. "Ergativity Attrition in the History of Western New Indo-Aryan Languages (Hindi/Urdu, Punjabi, Gujarati and Rajasthani)." *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics*. Tokyo Symposium on South Asian Languages. Contact, Convergence and Typology. New Delhi–London: Sage Publications.

KRISHNAMURTY B.H. (ed.). 1986. *South Asian Languages. Structure, Convergence and Diglossia*. Vol. 3. Delhi etc.: Motilal Banarsidass.

LAKA I., MAHAJAN A.K. (eds.). 1989. *Functional Heads and Clause Structure*. Cambridge: MITWPL.

LAMBERT H.M. 1971. *Gujarati Language Course*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

LEHMANN W.P. (ed.). 1978. *Syntactic Typology*. Austin: University of Texas.

Macleod L., Larson G., Brentari D. (eds.). 1988. *Papers from the 24-th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Mahajan Anoop K. 1989. "Agreement and Agreement Phrases." In: Laka & Mahajan 1989: 217–252.

Masica Colin. 1991. *The Indo-Aryan Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Miltner Vladimir 1962. "Braj Morphology in the Bihari-Satsai." *Archive Orientalni* 30, 494–504.

Miltner Vladimir. 1964. "Old Gurjar, Middle Gujarati and Middle Rajasthani Sentence structure compared." *Bharatiya Vidya* 24, 9–31.

Nadiem Ihsan N. 2005. *Punjab: Land, History, People*. Lahore: al-Faisal Nashran.

Puar Jogindar Singh. 1990. *The Panjabi Verb. Form and Function*. Patiala: Panjab University Publication Bureau.

Singh Rajendra (ed.). 1999. *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Smirnov Yuriy. A. 1976. *Grammatika jazika Pandżabi*. Moscow: Nauka, 335–351.

Swami Narottamdas. 1960. *Rajasthani vyakaran* (in Rajasthani). Bikaner: Sadul Rajasthani Research Society.

Tessitori Luigi Pio. 1914–1916. "Notes on the Grammar of Old Western Rajasthani with Special Reference to Apabhramsha and Gujarati and Marwari. Indian Antiquary." Hindi translation by Namvar Singh, Nagaripracharini Sabha, Kashi, 1955.

Trivedi A.K. 1954. *Gujarati Bhasha nun brihad vyakaran* (Gujarati Grammar). Surat, The popular publishing house (in Gujarati).

ABBREVIATIONS

JSP – Janam Sākhī Paramparā, sampādak Kirpāl Singh Nārang, Paṭiālā, Punjābī University, 1969.

Kc – Kanakāmara's Karakaṇḍacariu (from Bubenik 1998).

Pc – Svayaṃbhūdeva's Paüma-cariu (ed.) H.C. Bhayani. Bombay, 1953-60 (from Bubenik 1996).

PPV – Purātan Panjābī Vartak. Surindar Singh Kohlī (ed). Chandigarh: Publication Bureau, 1973.

RG – Rājasthānī Gadya: Vikās aur Prakāś. Narendra Bhanāvat (ed). Agrā: Śrīrām Mehtā and Company, 1969.

RV – Ṛgvedā (from Bubenik 1998; Elizarenkova 1995, 1999; Hock 1986).

Suri – *Suri*, Upadeśamālā (from Dave 1935).

Vārtā – Do sau bāvan vaiṣṇāvāⁿ kī vārtā (śuddh saⁿśodhit saṇskaran) sampādak Niranjan dev Śarma, Prakāśak – Śrī Govarddhan granthmālā kāryālay, Mathurā, saṃvat 2022/1965.