Introducing the interpretation
of medieval Hindī texts into the Hindī curriculum:
An alternative approach

Jaroslav Strnad

Oriental Institute of the Czech Academy of Sciences

Abstract. The author has been trying, for several years now, to apply and further expand the method of detailed morphological analysis of Old Hindī texts first developed by the Czech Indologist Vladimir Miltner in his *Old Hindī Reader* and to test it in the courses given at the Institute of Indology at Charles University, Prague. This paper demonstrates the possibilities this still little used descriptive approach offers to students who have basic knowledge of Modern Standard Hindī and wish to gain an insight into the grammatical structure of Old Hindī literary dialects. Careful use of this method helps highlight, among other things, the high degree of homonymy of grammatical morphemes and the consequent frequent ambiguity of meaning. A continuous text segmented into basic morphological units can be processed by a concordancing software and further analysed with the help of methods developed in the field of corpus linguistics. An appendix to the paper shows the method as applied to the analysis of one short *pad* (poem) of a medieval Hindī poet, Sant Kabīr.

The use of this method in classes helps the students read and interpret a greater quantity of texts in a relatively short time. This can serve as an incentive on the one hand to work with the literary material in the source language and on the other to pay closer attention to distinctive features of written and oral traditions in their wider social contexts.

Most scholars engaged in teaching courses of modern Indo-Aryan languages at the university level are familiar with one specific problem that invariably turns up after students finish the basic course of a modern written and spoken language and are encouraged to turn their attention toward wider cultural contexts and deeper historical perspectives behind modern literary works. Students certainly know that the literary tradition of, e.g., Hindī does not begin in the first decades of the 19th century and may be curious about its older phases. After all, it is difficult to imagine studying English as a subject at the university level without being able to read and analyse texts of Chaucer or Shakespeare. Therefore, it should be only natural for a student of Hindī to read and enjoy texts written by or ascribed to Tulsīdas, Gorakhnāth, Kabīr or Mīrā.

Many scholars and teachers of Hindī would perhaps agree with another proposition, namely, that introducing students to the language (or languages) of the aforementioned Hindī poets is more difficult than encouraging them to interpret Shakespeare's sonnets. Basically, teachers of Hindī can choose between two different approaches:

those more philologically oriented would explain basic grammatical features of the main Hindī literary dialects, Avadhī, Braj and possibly Diṅgal, and then students would proceed to read specimens of selected works and authors. The advantage of this approach lies in the firm grammatical framework mastered by students well in advance, which makes them aware of the position of these dialects in the broad historical development of the New Indo-Aryan languages. The disadvantage is that this preparatory stage, undoubtedly worth the effort in itself, is relatively time-consuming and in the general plan of a curriculum often leaves relatively little time for reading larger sections of texts. Specimens read in class may be selected primarily with the intention to illustrate grammatical phenomena rather than to show literary creations in their own right as works of art and of intellectual or spiritual depth. Moreover, this systematic approach based primarily on acquaintance with the standard grammars of literary dialects (Braj or Avadhī) does not work well with texts ascribed, e.g., to Gorakhnāth, Nāmdev or Kabīr, which show many irregularities and aberrations from standard forms found in grammars.

The other approach, perhaps more direct and intuitive, is best represented by readers working with texts in the original language and their parallel translations-an excellent example is Rupert Snell's *The Hindī Classical Tradition: A Braj Bhāṣā Reader*, published by SOAS, London (1991), and used in several university courses across Europe and in the USA. Here, grammatical explanations, which form the first chapter of the book, are kept to a minimum and the student is invited to delve quickly into the texts themselves and to look for additional information in copious and informative notes accompanying the text. The text itself is arranged as a mirror: the left page contains the Hindī original in Devanāgarī, and the right its close translation in English, accompanied by copious explanatory notes. Students thus can proceed more quickly, acquaint themselves, in a limited amount of time, with greater quantity and variety of texts, and therefore get a better chance to appreciate them as works of art. A slight disadvantage of this method is that it may encourage a somewhat superficial attitude towards the purely grammatical, morphological and syntactical aspects of these texts: once a correct meaning, sometimes perhaps arrived at by looking at the English translation, is established, one ceases to worry about this or that grammatical peculiarity or irregular feature. Students using this particular reader get a good introduction into a literary tradition and a literary dialect, but their ability to analyse grammatical forms correctly will be exposed to a hard test, especially when they encounter texts composed not in standard dialects. Here problems arising from frequent homonymy, especially of grammatical morphs, which can sometimes lead to different interpretations of meaning, are aggravated by occasional incidence of forms that can be described either as archaisms or as borrowings from some other dialect. Kabīr's

language, for example, has been often characterized by modern Hindī scholars as *khicaṛī bhāṣā*, a mixture of forms coming from various dialects of western and eastern parts of the Hindī area.[1]

The purpose of this paper is to offer still another approach to the study of Old Hindī literary dialects and texts, a method developed during the 60s and 70s of the last century by an eminent Czech Indologist, the late Dr Vladimír Miltner. Miltner looked at the language from the point of view of descriptive linguistics and subjected selected texts to detailed and rigorous analysis of their morphological and syntactical structure. He demonstrated his method of morphological analysis of an Old Hindī text for the first time in the 1960s in his short study called *Early Hindī Morphology and Syntax* (Miltner 1966) and developed it further in his *Old Hindī Reader*, which was ready for publication in the 1970s. Due to the adversity of those times, however, it could be published only as late as 1998 (Miltner 1998).

In this latter work, Miltner takes specimens of texts written by or ascribed to thirteen Hindī authors of the pre-modern era (Roḍā, Joindu, Dāmodar, Gorakhnāth, Cand, Kabīr, Vidyāpati, Jāyasi, Sūr, Tulsī, Mīrā, Gokulnāth and Biharī Lāl). He analyses each word into its constituent morphs, lexical and grammatical, orders them into an alphabetical sequence and thus obtains a detailed index of all morphological elements occurring in the texts in question. The alphabetical ordering shows a great degree of homonymy, a feature encountered frequently, particularly in the case of grammatical morphs: all homonyms are marked by index numbers. Further, as elements of a system, the occurrence of all morphs is co-determined by their immediate context, i.e., by other morphs that precede and morphs that follow the morph in question. For example, the grammatical morph *-i* can mean three different things when found at the end of a verbal base (as in *kah-i:* 3rd pers. sg. pres., 2nd pers. sg. imper., and absolutive) and has still other possible meanings when found at the end of a nominal base (dir. sg. f., as in *khabar-i*, 'report'; obl. sg. m., as in *ghar-i*, 'house'; or obl. sg. f., as in *dis-i*, 'side', 'direction'). Each morph entered into the index is therefore furnished with information about all other morphs, lexical as well as grammatical, that immediately precede and follow it in the texts that were excerpted and included in the reader.

In the introduction to his book, Miltner assures his readers that the 'process of interpretation is very simple and requires minimal brainwork'. Practical experience in

---

[1]   Probably an extreme example of interpenetration of one medieval dialect or language by another can be found in the corpus of Hindī *pads* of the medieval mystical poet Nāmdev originating in Mahārāṣṭra. W.M. Callewaert and M. Lath, in their edition of Nāmdev's songs, give a good specimen of this phenomenon when they draw attention to song no. 165 of Nāmdev's Hindī corpus. The song is composed largely in Marāṭhī. 'To a Rājasthānī audience the song would have made sense-to whatever extent it did make sense—only with "Rājasthānī meanings". This implies that phrases with a particular meaning in Marāṭhī, probably meant something totally different in Rājasthānī' (Callewaert, Lath 1989, 401–2 [commentary], 352–3 [the song]).

Old Hindī courses has convinced me that this assessment is more or less realistic. Of course, students have to master the grammatical terminology used for the description of Indo-Aryan languages, but, at this more advanced level of training, meeting this requirement poses no particular problem.

An important part of the task of preparing such a reader is the correct decision concerning the quantity and variety of texts selected for inclusion. Processing just one or two short poems may suffice for the purposes of basic instruction but leaves the student with little scope for his or her own interpretation: as each morphological element turns up only once or twice, the interpreter is left with the very simple task of reassembling the jigsaw-puzzle of the segmented text to its original form. The student scarcely meets any real ambiguity, e.g., a case when he or she would have to ponder whether the correct form to select in a particular case is the 2nd pers. sg. imperative or 3rd pers. sg. of the indicative: there is a relatively high probability that in a morphemicon based on too little morphologically segmented material, the verbal base in question will appear in combination with only one of these two homonymous morphs. The larger the corpus of analysed texts is, the greater the probability that the verbal base will be found to coexist with the other morph too. In such a case, an interpreter will be faced with the dilemma of which morph to select; and the very awareness of this possibility of choice will induce him or her to look at the wider context of the word and the sentence. In some cases, the student may come to the conclusion that there is a real ambiguity, implying the possibility of two different readings and meanings of one piece of text. Thus, at the very beginning of the course, the student is, so to speak, thrown into the water and made to swim. It is, of course, advisable for him or her to consult some grammatical overview where the main outlines of the dialect in question are presented in a more systematic form (students may get such materials at the beginning of the course), but the main point of this method is that the student starts with genuine texts and is able to see them in their complexity—with all their ambiguities, morphological irregularities and other peculiar features which are brought into sharp relief in the process of morphological analysis.

An important aspect that merits attention and that has been hinted at above is the language variability of the selected texts. As is obvious from the list of authors chosen by Miltner for his *Old Hindī Reader*, Avadhī of Tulsī and Jāyasī is presented side by side with the purely Braj works of Bihārī Lāl and Gokulnāth and with the language of Madhyadeśa, represented by Gorakhnāth and Kabīr, which is often closely related to but not identical with Braj. The Morphological Key or Morphemicon, as Miltner prefers to call it, therefore includes a wide variety of morphological forms that occur in Eastern as well as in Western Hindī; such a key cannot be used as a catalogue of forms belonging to one particular dialect or author. However, as the occurrence of

eastern forms in western dialects and vice versa is not an uncommon feature with many authors (or, to be more exact, with their texts as extant in existing manuscripts, printed editions, or oral traditions), this is not necessarily a drawback.

However, the minimal amount of brainwork promised by Miltner to the student has to be more than compensated by hard intellectual labour on the part of the compiler of the Morphemicon. The morphological segmentation of words found in texts that cover a time span of more than half a millennium and area as wide as Western Europe is certainly a very difficult task, the more so, as Miltner tries to conform to a Pāṇinian ideal of maximum consistency and economy of description. An interesting problem that must have occupied him at that stage of analysis was how to solve one particular dilemma turning up time and again in the process of building up the repertoire of morphemes: when constituting a particular morph, should precedence be given to historical considerations or should the primary requirement be systemic clarity and economy of description? There is probably no clear-cut answer to this question; in my opinion, Miltner succeeded admirably in striking the middle course—most grammatical morphs constituted by him and found in the texts can be discussed as results of historical development, even if some cases are debatable.[2]

With Miltner's Morphemicon at hand and with its usefulness for the practical task of analysing and translating Old Hindī texts tested in university courses, it was possible to apply his method to a larger corpus of texts ascribed to one particular author. After some deliberation, I decided to analyse a greater number of *pads* of the medieval Hindī poet and mystic Kabīr. Several reasons have led me to this decision. Probably the most important one was a recently published edition of the pads of Kabīr based on several relatively old manuscripts, the oldest dating back to A.D. 1614 (Callewaert 2000). The editor, Belgian scholar Winand M. Callewaert, selected ten manuscripts containing Kabīr's pads (short poems sung to a particular rāga) and organized his edition in such a way that one and the same pad (or what can still be counted as a version of one and the same pad) is presented in all its manuscript variants on the same page (or following pages). This synoptic presentation admirably shows the vari-

---

[2] A case in point is Miltner's treatment of the perfective participle, to which he assigns a 'meaningful zero' (-0_2-) even in those forms that retain the characteristic suffix *-y-* (as e.g. in *bolyau*, *milyā*, etc.). The semivowel *-y-* is treated by Miltner as a mere 'inserted consonant' (and included in the Morphemicon as $-y_2-$), although from a purely historical point of view it is a final product of the regular process of phonological attrition typical of the MIA period (*-ita > -iya > -ia*) and, therefore, should be understood as representing part of the morpheme of the perfective participle. From a systemic point of view, however, the zero makes very good sense: in feminine forms, the semivowel disappears entirely (as e.g. in *bolī*, *milī*, etc.), and zero as a marker of perfectivity would be required, anyway. The problem of describing perfective markers in NIA languages has recently been discussed by Masica 1991, 269–70. For the concept of zero as a descriptive marker, Miltner refers to Gleason 1955.

ability inherent in the oral performance at the time when it gradually became fixed
in written form and began to undergo further changes and corruptions characteristic
to the transmission of the written word. For the purposes of morphological analysis,
the great advantage of this type of presentation lies in the fact that one can work with
and analyse one particular document, one single manuscript produced by one copyist
at one time and possibly one place. Thus, the language subject to analysis has greater
internal coherence than, e.g., the so-called critical editions that attempt to present
the text in an⸺as far as possible⸺'original form' and are full of various emenda-
tions.[3] A morphemicon based on the analysis of a single manuscript—in this case,
the Jaipur manuscript from the Sanjay Sharma Sangrahālaya dated 1614 (the old-
est *Pañc-vāṇī* manuscript found and published by Callewaert in his edition)⸺may
then reveal a specific language variant whose features can be subsequently quantified
(processed by a concordancer) and, if found statistically significant in comparison
with other manuscripts, can form a basis for further studies of oral as well as textual
transmission of a given work.[4] In this one respect, the attitude of the present author
differs from Miltner's: whereas his wide selection of texts yields a very rich harvest of
morphs and morphological variants, concentration on a single manuscript should help
sort out regular features and exceptions or linguistic borrowings from other dialects.

    Another consideration which led to my decision to concentrate on Kabīr was my
feeling that this poet and thinker has so far been relatively neglected in modern stud-
ies that focus on medieval Hindī literary traditions. Great and certainly deserved
attention has been paid especially to the Vaishnava authors—as a glance into bibli-
ographies clearly shows. On the other hand, traditions of the so-called *nirguṇī* branch
of Hindī poetry⸺with the significant exception of the Sikh tradition⸺have so far
received relatively less attention. Moreover, Kabīr's words and ideas have been, in
modern times, used so often for various ideological purposes that they can scarcely
escape the process of simplification or even misinterpretation.[5]

    With these considerations in mind, I set about analysing some of Kabīr's pads
closely following Miltner's method of morphological segmentation. The result has

---

    [3] The admirable work of Pārasanātha Tivārī, *Kabīra Granthāvalī* (Prayāga, 1961) can serve as
an excellent example of this type of edition The result of his painstaking collation of a number of
manuscripts of different age and origin and of several printed editions was a new version of 200 of
Kabīr's pads that claimed to stand as close as possible to the original poems othat might have been
composed and sung by Kabīr himself.

    [4] A close acquaintance with the text of Callewaert's edition showed the necessity of consulting
the manuscript itself. A good photocopy of the manuscript was generously made available to me
courtesy of the library of the Südasien Institut in Heidelberg, the present owner of the microfilm.

    [5] A doctoral dissertation by David C. Swain, *Images of Kabīr: A Study of Transformations in the
Identity of a Sant* (Department of South Asian Languages and Civilisations, The University of Chi-
cago, Chicago, IL, December 1994) is a good overview of these interpretations, re-interpretations,
and various uses of Kabīr's poetry or his name.

been, so far, a corpus of about one hundred pads, edited provisionally with foot-notes, supplemented occasionally with modern Hindī commentaries, and followed by a morphemicon that can be used as a key for their translation and interpretation. Constant referral to Miltner's Morphemicon as presented in his *Old Hindī Reader* and application of the morphological units he collected to new textual material convinced me of the viability of the majority of his decisions. Very few minor changes were necessary in the structure of the Morphemicon itself: one thing which seemed desirable for better understanding of the texts was the inclusion of fixed phrases or idiomatic expressions—collocations of words with special meanings, which necessarily lie beyond the process of morphological segmentation (expressions such as *pīḍ par-* 'to chase', 'to go after'; *pā̃nī birol-* lit. 'to churn water', fig. 'to engage in useless activity', etc.).

However, there was still another concern that gradually pressed itself in the fore-ground with growing urgency as a clear desideratum: in order to make the morpho-logical analysis of the grammatically often complex forms *more* comprehensible and the process of segmentation itself *more* transparent, a kind of grammatically and historically grounded justification for establishing a particular segment as a morph was felt necessary. Such a morphological commentary should explain the reason that a particular segment was deemed a morphological unit, discuss possible alternative solutions, and give a short exposition of the historical background. (Vladimír Miltner gave a short outline of this grammatical explanation in his *Early Hindī Morphology and Syntax*, but omitted it altogether in his *Old Hindī Reader*.) Properly researched and cross-referenced, such grammatical explanations will constitute a kind of histori-cal grammar, a 'Text-grammatik' based on the language of one particular manuscript. As such, it could serve not only as a grammatical supplement to a proposed Kabīr reader, but also as a useful tool for future comparative studies of Old Hindī dialects.

The purpose of the appendix that follows this paper, taking one of Kabīr's pads as an example, is to present the following informationshow the basic structure of the work discussed in preceding paragraphs:

1. The original text of the pad is presented provideswith footnotes pointing out possible ambiguities of grammar and meaning. Alternative readings found in other manuscripts edited by Callewaert in his *Millenium Kabīr Vāṇī* are in-cluded for comparison. The basic text that has been subject to further morpho-logical analysis has been taken directly from athe Jaipur manuscript.

2. Morphs that have been arrived at by the process of segmentation are pre-sented of in the form of an appropriate, alphabetically arranged morphemicon (the indexing of morphs included in the list has been taken from the general Morphemicon which was compiled on the basis of much more extensive ma-terial and which therefore contains a greater number of homonymous mor-

phological units; that is why several morphs are marked with higher index numbers).

3. Historical and functional explanation of selected grammatical morphs are provided; in the Morphemicon, cross-references to these explanations are included in square brackets following the morph (in our examples, V designates the section that deals with verbs and the following digit marks the subsection devoted to a particular type of suffix or ending).

4. The text of the pad is morphologically segmented and presented in a form suitable for inclusion into an electronic corpus; such a corpus of a morphologically structured text can be further analysed with the help of appropriate concordancing software (in this particular case, I have used WordSmith Tools, version 2.0, developed by Mike Scott at the University of Liverpool). As some software concordancers may have problems showing letters with diacritics correctly, the text has been converted into ASCII codes. In most cases, I hope, the ASCII equivalents of letters with diacritics will be self-evident.

5. An example of a concordance showingan the occurrence of the sigmatic future in the present corpus: sentences which form the immediate natural context of such forms can be used at later stages of the research as illustrative material for paragraphed grammatical treatment of the language in question.

APPENDIX **Analysis of one of Kabir's pads**

1. The pad with notes

॥ राग सोरठा ॥

काग्रा मंजिसि⁶ कौंन गुंनां । जे घट भीतरि हैं⁷ मलनां⁸ ॥टेक॥

तूंबी अठसठि तीरथ न्हाई । करवापण तउ न जाई ॥ १ ॥

जे रिदे सूध मन ग्यांनी ॥ तौ तूं कहा बिरोलै पांनी ॥ २ ॥

कहै कबीर बिचारी । भौ सागर तारि⁹ मुरारी ॥३॥२८॥

(MS Jaipur 1614, fol. 223b–224a: 'Rāga soraṭha', pad 28; Callewaert 2000, 443, No. 338 / S264; Siṃha and Siṃha 1981, 101, No. 79; Gupta 1969, 312, No. 16, Tivārī 1961, 99, No. 171)

---

⁶   S264 and Gop13;29 *mājisi*, A284, J171 and Raj97;9 *mājasi*, C110 *mājaśi*, AG656;8 *mājasi*.

⁷   Nasalized *haĩ* solely in MS 1614/S264. A284 has *hē*; C110, Gop13;29, Raj97;9 and AG656;8 read *hai*. Could the nasalization in our MS be due to meticulous recording of nasal pronunciation of the diphthong before nasal consonant? Plural is clearly not in place here: even if the following *malanã* is understood to be a noun, such a noun could be hardly interpreted as countable.

⁸   *Malanã* can be read either as an adjective—see, e.g., Caturvedī and Mahendra 1973, 324 (*apavitra*, *asvaccha*), with the quotation of this locus, and also Śyāmasundaradāsa 1965–75, 8: 3814 (*dūṣita*, *burā*)—or as a noun. So Gupta 1969, 312 translates: *ghaṭa śarīra ke bhītara malinatā hai*. Similarly, Siṃha and Siṃha 1981, 101, for whom *malanã* = *gandagī*.

⁹   All other MSS included in Callewaert 2000 have *tāri* without nasalization. Closer inspection of the locus in MS 1614 reveals the dot as a mirror imprint of an anusvāra on the opposite page.

2. Morphemicon for MS Jaipur 1614, fol. 223b–224a, pad 28
($\underline{P}$ = preceding morph; $\underline{F}$= following morph)

-0_3 *dir. sg. m.* $\underline{P}$ gyã̄nī-, pã̄nī-, murārī-

-0_4 *dir. sg. f.* $\underline{P}$ kāyā-

-0_7 *obl. sg. m.* $\underline{P}$ bhau-

-0_{11} *obl.* $\underline{P}$ aṭhasaṭhi-

-a_4 *dir. sg. m.* $\underline{P}$ kabīr-, ghaṭ$_1$-, -paṇ-, sāgar-, sūdh-

-a_8 *obl. sg. m.* $\underline{P}$ man-

-a_{10} *obl. pl. m.* $\underline{P}$ tīrath-

-a_{20} *conjunction* $\underline{P}$ t$_2$-

aṭhasaṭhi- *sixty-eight, fig. many* $\underline{F}$ -0_{11}

-ahā *dir. sg. of pronouns* $\underline{P}$ k$_1$-

-$\bar{a}_{18}$- *nominal thematic vowel* $\underline{P}$ karav- $\underline{F}$ -paṇ-

-$\tilde{\bar{a}}_2$ *obl. sg. m.* $\underline{P}$ gun-

-$\tilde{\bar{a}}_6$ *dir. sg. m.* $\underline{P}$ malan-

-i_3- *connecting vowel* [V1] $\underline{P}$ mãj- $\underline{F}$ -s$_3$-

-i_{10} *2nd pers. sg. imper.* $\underline{P}$ tār-

-i_{15} *2nd pers. sg. fut.* $\underline{P}$ -s$_3$-

-$\bar{\imath}_2$ *dir. sg. f.* $\underline{P}$ tũb-

-$\bar{\imath}_9$ *3rd pers. sg.* $\underline{P}$ jā$_1$-, nhā-

-$\bar{\imath}_{11}$ *absolutive* $\underline{P}$ bicār$_1$-

-u_{10} *inclusive emphatic particle* $\underline{P}$ -a$_{20}$

-$\tilde{u}_1$ *dir.* $\underline{P}$ t$_1$-

-e_{11} *conjunction* $\underline{P}$ j$_1$-

-ai_4 *loc./instr./erg. sg. m.*

-ai_8 *3rd pers. sg.* $\underline{P}$ kah-, h$_1$-

-ai_{12} *2nd pers. sg.* $\underline{P}$ birol-

-au_9 *conjunction* $\underline{P}$ t$_2$-

-$auna_2$ *obl. sg. of pronouns* $\underline{P}$ k$_1$-

k$_1$- *indefinitive / interrogative* $\underline{F}$ -ahā, -auna$_2$

kabīr- *Kabīr* $\underline{F}$ -a$_4$

karav- *bitter* $\underline{F}$ -$\bar{a}_{18}$-

kah- *to say* $\underline{F}$ -ai$_8$

kāyā- *body* $\underline{F}$ -0_4

gun$_1$- *benefit, profit* $\underline{F}$ -$\tilde{\bar{a}}_2$

gyã̄nī- *learned, wise* $\underline{F}$ -0_3

ghaṭ$_1$- *jug; fig. body, mind, heart* $\underline{F}$ -a$_4$

j$_1$- *relative* $\underline{F}$ -e$_{11}$

jā$_1$- *to disappear* $\underline{F}$ -$\bar{\imath}_9$

t$_1$- *pronoun of the 2nd pers. sg.* $\underline{F}$ -$\tilde{u}_1$

t$_2$- *far demonstrative/correlative* $\underline{F}$ -a$_{20}$, -au$_9$

tār- *to transport across/to the other shore* $\underline{F}$ -i$_{10}$

tīrath- *place of pilgrimage* $\underline{F}$ -a$_{10}$

tũb- *bitter bottle gourd* Lagenaria siceraria $\underline{F}$ -$\bar{\imath}_2$

na$_1$ *negative particle*

nhā- *to bathe* $\underline{F}$ -ī$_9$

-paṇ- *deriver of abstract nouns* $\underline{P}$ -ā$_{18}$- $\underline{F}$ -a$_4$

pã̄nī- *water* $\underline{F}$ -0$_3$

bicār$_1$- *to think, to contemplate* $\underline{F}$ -ī$_{11}$

birol- *to churn* $\underline{F}$ -ai$_{12}$

pã̄nī birol- *to engage in useless activity*

bhītari$_1$ *in, within, inside*

bhau- *world, saṃsāra* $\underline{F}$ -0$_7$

man- *mind* $\underline{F}$ -a$_8$

malan- *unclean, dirty* $\underline{F}$ -ã̄$_6$

mãj- *to bathe, to cleanse* $\underline{F}$ -i$_3$-

murārī- *Kṛṣṇa* $\underline{F}$ -0$_3$

rid- *heart* $\underline{F}$ -ai$_4$

-s$_3$- *future* [V2] $\underline{P}$ -i$_3$- $\underline{F}$ -i$_{15}$

sāgar- *ocean* $\underline{F}$ -a$_4$

sūdh- *pure, clean* $\underline{F}$ -a$_4$

h$_1$- *to be* $\underline{F}$ -ai$_8$

3. Explanatory grammatical notes

Section V1: -*i*$_3$- connecting (auxiliary) vowel

A. Origin and function

In Miltner's *Old Hindī Reader*, we find -*i*$_3$- described as a 'verbal thematic vowel' occurring before the morphs of the perfective participle (-*0*$_2$-), verbal substantive (-*b*$_1$- and -*v*$_2$-) and verbal adjective (-*k*$_3$- in *choḍika:u* in the text of Rāur-vel by Roḍā). The same designation, 'verbal thematic vowel', is also given to the morph -*a*$_3$- (followed by a greater number of different morphs, i.e.inter alia by -*b*$_2$-, a verbal adjective in the texts of Vidyāpati, Gorakh and Tulsī), to the morph -*u*$_2$- (followed by -*b*$_2$- in Tulsī), and to the morph -*o*$_2$- (again followed by -*b*$_2$- in the text of Vidyāpati). It is obvious that under one common designation we have here a group of morphs which share similar (not always identical) functions but are of different origin.

The contexts in which the morph -*i*$_3$- occurs in Kabīr's pads from Rājasthān allows us to devise a more specific name for it: in all quotable instances it appears to be a descendant of the OIA connecting vowel (Bindevokal) used in the formation of, e.g., past participles and gerundives of the so-called *seṭ*-verbal roots (for a list of forms in which this Bindevokal is used in Sanskrit, see, e.g., Morgenroth 1989, 125, §167. Of course, the use of the term 'connecting vowel' for both the OIA -*i*- and NIA -*i*$_3$- does not imply that the rules of its occurrence with particular verbal roots are identical. What we should see as significant is the origin of this NIA -*i*$_3$-, which is traceable to the OIA Bindevokal -*i*-, and a common function of both these suffixes in the formation of the future tense and participles. This is perhaps enough to justify the change in the designation of this morph in the context of the language of Kabir's pads, from "'verbal thematic vowel' to the more specific 'connecting vowel', a term used by Western grammarians to describe its Sanskrit predecessor (see, e.g. Burrow 1973, 331; but in ibid., 369)

uses also the term 'auxiliary vowel', following perhaps the usage of W.D. Whitney). Thiel-Horstmann 1983, 42, appears to see the intermediate *-i-* in the perfect participles merely as a matter of alternative spelling: 'After root-final consonants *-y-* is often inserted. The writing may also be *-iy-* in such cases, thus, *dekhiyā*'. Kellogg 1965, 295, §497a notes the insertion of *-i-* before the perfect participle termination in the dialects of Rājpūtāna, 'often inserted in the "Plays"', quoting as examples *sūraja ugīyā* 'the sun has risen', *rāja tākiyā* '(I) have forsaken (my) kingdom' and *kāgada le hū̃ āviyo* 'I have brought a paper (i.e., a letter)'. Tessitori 1914–1916, §126 gives several examples of this intermediate *-i-* with roots ending in consonants from Old Mārvārī texts (*kar-iu*, *kah-iu*, *ūḍ-iu*, *āp-iu*; and the less frequent strong form *-ia:u* in *jaṇ-ia:u* and *pūj-ia:u*). Narottamadāsa Svāmī in his *Saṃkṣipta Rājasthānī-vyākaraṇa* 1960, 83, introduces the *-i-* forms as regular alternatives of the *sāmānya bhūta*: both *phiriyo* and *phiryo* in the sg. and *phiriyā* as well as *phiryā* in the plural. *-i₃-* in perfect participles in the analysed Kabir's pads therefore appears to be due to the influence of western dialects. The same can be said about the sigmatic future joined to the root by the same connecting *-i₃-*: apart from Rājasthānī dialects, it appears also in Old Gujarātī and Old Marāṭhī.

B. Examples of *-i₃-* connecting vowel

2nd pers. sg. of -s₃- future (< OIA -i-ṣya-):
338.0 *kāyā m̲ā̲j̲i̲s̲i̲ kaūna gunã* 'why will you rub [your] body'

1st pers. sg. of the -h₂- future (< OIA -i-ṣya-):
257.3 *kahai kabīra mai sala raci m̲a̲r̲i̲h̲ũ̲* 'says Kabīr: having built a funeral pyre I shall die'

-0₂- perfective participle (< OIA -i-ta-):
188.2 *ākāse phala phaliyā* 'in the sky the fruit has ripened'

-b₁- verbal substantive (< OIA -i-tavya-):
315.0 *iba mohi n̲ā̲c̲i̲b̲a̲u̲ na āvai* lit. 'now, dancing does not come to me (i.e., I do not feel like dancing)'

-b₂- verbal adjective (< OIA -i-tavya-):
113.0 *jau pai rasanā rāma na k̲a̲h̲i̲b̲a̲u̲, tau upajata binasata bhrāmata r̲a̲h̲i̲b̲a̲u̲* lit.: 'if one will not pronounce the name of Rām (lit.: "if the name of Rām is not to be pronounced ...") with one's tongue, then one has to keep being born, perishing, wandering around' (or: 'one will have to be born, to perish, to wander around again and again')

Section V2: -*s₃*- future
A. Origin and function

The origin of the sigmatic suffix used in the formation of the future tense in several NIA languages and dialects can be traced back to the OIA sigmatic future suffix *-sya-/-i-ṣya-* added to a strengthened verbal root. In the MIA stage (Śauraseni, Māgadhī), the suffix *-ssa-/-i-ssa-* is added predominantly to the present stem; the ending of the 1st pers. sg. is that of the secondary conjugation (*-m* instead of *-mi*) (Pischel 1900 *GPS*, 362, §520). In Apabhraṃśa, this final *-m* was together with the preceding *-a-* of the stem transformed into *-u*: skt. *kariṣyāmi* > pkt. *karissaṃ* > apa. *karīsu* (with the reduction of the double consonant and compensatory

lengthening of the preceding vowel). The known Apabhraṃśa terminations coincide with the corresponding forms in Old Mārvāṛī —or Old Western Rājasthānī, as L.P. Tessitori preferred to call it. The forms he selected as illustrative examples match closely those found in our text. He gives: 1ˢᵗ sg. *jāisu, bolisu, karisi, dharisiū, thuṇasyū, kahīsa*; 2ⁿᵈ sg. *jāisi, huisii*; and 3ʳᵈ sg. *kahisii, desii, milisya:i, karisa:i, lahasii, jāṇisī*. He points out that this type of sigmatic future survives in Jaipurī, for which he gives the following terminations: 1. sg. *-asyū*, 2. sg. *-asī*, 3. sg. *-asī*; 1. pl. *-asyā̃*, 2. pl. *-asyo*, 3. pl. *-asī* (Tessitori 1914–1916, 80–81, §121). Similarly Kellogg 1965, 297–8, §502, brings further examples of use and adds that 'in Bundá, Kotah, along the river Chambal, and northward to Jaipúr, the future in सय्ं, etc., is the usual colloquial form'. In Kabīr's pads, occurrences of this type of future are not numerous; in the three forms of the 2ⁿᵈ pers. sg., we see the suffix of the future tense connected with the root by the connecting vowel *-i₃-*, and in the single instance of the 3ʳᵈ pers. sg. the suffix is connected by the vowel *-a₃-*. In 138.0 we meet the form *cīnhyasi*, the affix *-ya-* being probably a graphic representation of weakened pronunciation of the connecting vowel *-i₃-* (cf. McGregor 1968, 114, §2.9).

Since the sigmatic forms in the analysed pads of Kabīr are probably due to some influence of western dialects, still another possibility of their interpretation should be taken into account. Tessitori, 1914–1916, §117, mentions as alternative ending of the 2ⁿᵈ pers. pres. the form *-si*, although this is, according to him, very rare and limited to certain works written by Jainas, possibly due to the influence of Prākrit used by them. He notes that before this *--si*, 'thematic *a* is optionally substituted by *i* or *e*' and quotes as examples *sah-a-si, anubhav-i-si, kar-e-si, lah-e-si, rāc-e-si*'. Some forms in the pads of Kabīr could be perhaps be interpreted in this way: e.g., *mājisi* in 338.0, for which several other Rājasthānī MSS have athe variant reading *mājasi*. Finally, still another possibility is to see in the form *mājisi*, and according to M.P. Gupta and V. Sīha also in *cīnhyasi* (in the verse 138.0), 2ⁿᵈ or 3ʳᵈ pers. sg. of the Avadhī past tense: for a discussion of this possibility, see, in the present work, the section devoted to inflected perfect.

On the basis of the few examples given below, it is impossible to make a comprehensive statement about the uses of the *s*-future. The future action is either understood as certain (*deṣisi, binasasī*) or it is put in an interrogative sentence. Metzger's observation about the use of the *s*-future in the letters of *vakīls* of 18ᵗʰ century Rājasthān may be pertinent to our texts too: 'Allerdings scheint es so zu sein, dass das Futur 1 [i.e., *s*-future] ausschliesslich zur Bezeichnung von Sachverhalten eingesetzt wird, die definitiv eintreten werden (oder besser, von Sachverhalten von denen das erwartet wird...), während das Futur 2 [i.e., *l*-future] oft eher eine Möglichkeit oder Wahrscheinlichkeit auszudrücken scheint' (Metzger 2003, 105).

B. Examples of *-s₃-* future

2ⁿᵈ pers. sg.:

138.0   *kā nāgaū kā bā̃ā̃dhai cā̃ā̃ma, jau nahī̃x⁰* **cīnhyasi** *ātamarā̃ā̃ma* 'what [is the use] of [going around] naked, what [is the use] of binding animal skin (around your body); when you will not recognize God in / as the Self? (or: " ... when you have not recognized the God in the Self?")'

338.0 *kāyā* **mājisi** *kaūna gunā̃; je ghaṭa bhītari hai malanā̃* 'why (lit.: "for what benefit / profit') will / do you rub [your] body, when the pot is dirty inside?" (or: "... have you rubbed [your] body, ...")

367.2 *kahā̃ vai loga kahā̃ pura paṭāṇa; bahuri na **deṣisi** āi* 'where are those people, where is the quarter, the city [you lived in]? You will not see [them] again having come [back]'

408.3a *aba nahī̃ **bhajisi bhajisi** kaba bhāī; āvaigā āta bhajyau nahī jāī* 'if you will not worship now, when will you worship? [When] the end comes, it will be impossible to worship'

3rd pers. sg.:

92.2 *je upajyā so **binasasī*** 'what[ever] has been born will perish'

4. Entry for the corpus (processed by concordancer built in the WordSmith 2.0. program for linguistic analysis.)

[338.0] kaayaa- + -04; maMj- + -i3- + -s3- + -i15; k1- + -auMna2; gun1- + -aaM2; j1- + -e11; ghaT1- + -a4; bhiitari1; h1- + -ai8 *; malan- + -aaM6;

[338.1] tuuMb- + -ii2; aThasaThi- + -011; tiirath- + -a10; nhaa- + -ii9; karav- + -aa18- + -paN- + -a4; t2- + -a20; -u10; na1; jaa1- + -ii9;

[338.2] j1- + -e11; ridai- + -07; suudh- + -a4; man- + -a8; gyaaMnii- + -03; t2- + -au9; t1- + -uuM1; k1- + -ahaa; birol- + -ai12; paaMnii- + -03;

[338.3] kah- + -ai8; kabiir- + -a4; bicaar1- + -ii11; bhau- + -07; saagar- + -a4; taar- + -i10; muraarii- + -03.

5. Concordance—the sigmatic future

N Concordance

1 hh- + -aa7; maag- + -02- + -y2- + -aa7; t2- + -aba; k1- + -y2- + -aa11; kah- + -a3- + **-s3-** + -i15; mukaMd- + -aa7; [249.1] t1- + -uuM1; baaMbhaN- + -a4; m- + -aiM3; k

2 a1; rah- + -aa5- + -i9; j1- + -e6; upaj- + -02- + -y2- + -aa7; s1- + -o4; binas- + -a3- + **-s3-** + -ii9; t2- + -aa12- + -taiM; dushh- + -a4; kar1- + -i11; mar- + -ai8; balaai- + -04

3 ; log- + -a6; k1- + -ahaaM; pur2- + -a4; paTaMN- + -a4; bahuri; na1; deshh- + -i3- + **-s3-** + -i15; aa2- + -i11; kah- + -ai8; kabiir- + -a4; raaMm- + -a8; naaMm- + -a8; bha

4 -i10; man- + -a8; saaragapraaMNii- + -03; [408.3] 01- + -aba; nahiiM; bhaj- + -i3- + **-s3-** + -i15; bhaj- + -i3- + -s3- + -i15; k1- + -aba; bhaaii- + -03; aa2- + -v4- + -ai8- + -

5 praaMNii- + -03; [408.3] 01- + -aba; nahiiM; bhaj- + -i3- + -s3- + -i15; bhaj- + -i3- + **-s3-** + -i15; k1- + -aba; bhaaii- + -03; aa2- + -v4- + -ai8- + -g2- + -aa20; aMt- + -a4;

6 j- + -aiM2; ho1- + -i9; s1- + -u6; ho1- + -ii9; [338.0] kaayaa- + -04; maMj- + -i3- + **-s3-** + -i15; k1- + -auMna2; gun1- + -aaM2; j1- + -e11; ghaT1- + -a4; bhiitari1; h1- +

List of abbreviations

OIA = Old Indo-Aryan

MIA = Middle Indo-Aryan

MSS = manuscripts

NIA = New Indo-Aryan

R e f e r e n c e s

Burrow, Thomas. *The Sanskrit Language*, 3rd ed., London: Faber and Faber, 1973.

Callewaert, Winand M., Mukund Lath. *The Hindī Padavalī of Nāmdev. A critical edition of Nāmdev's Hindī songs with translation and annotation*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1989.

——— (in collaboration with Swapna Sharma and Dieter Taillieu). *The Millennium Kabīr Vāṇī*, Delhi: Manohar, 2000.

Caturvedī, Paraśurāma and Mahendra. *Kabīra-kośa*, Ilāhābāda: Smṛti prakāśana, 1973.

Gleason, Henry A. *An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1955.

Gupta, Mātā Prasāda. *Kabīra-granthāvalī*, Āgrā: Prāmāṇika prakāśana, 1969.

Kellogg, Samuel H. *A Grammar of the Hindi Language*, 3rd repr. ed., London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965.

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

Metzger, Mathias. *Die Sprache der Vakīl-Briefe aus Rājasthān*, Würzburg: Ergon Verlag, 2003.

Miltner, Vladimír. *Early Hindi Morphology and Syntax, being a key to the analysis of the morphologic and syntactic structure of Ukti-vyakti-prakaraṇa*, Dissertationes Orientales 6, Prague: Oriental Institute, 1966.

———. *Old Hindī Reader*, Praha: Karolinum, Charles University Press, 1998.

Morgenroth, Wolfgang. *Lehrbuch des Sanskrit: Grammatik, Lektionen, Glossar*, 6th ed., Leipzig: Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1989.

Narottamadāsa Svāmī. *Saṃkṣipta Rājasthānī-vyākaraṇa*, Bīkānera: Sādūla Rājasthānī Risarca Iṃsṭīṭyūṭa, c. 1960.

Pischel, Richard. *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*, Straßburg: Trübner, 1900.

Siṃha, Jayadeva, Viśvanātha Siṃha. *Sabada. Bhāvārthabodhinī vyākhyā sahita*, Kabīra vāṅmaya 2, Vārāṇasī: Viśvavidyālaya prakāśana, 1981.

Snell, Rupert. *The Hindī Classical Tradition: A Braj Bhāṣā Reader*, London: SOAS, 1991.

Swain, David C. 'Images of Kabīr: A Study of Transformations in the Identity', Doctoral dissertation submitted at the Department of South Asian Languages and Civilisations, The University of Chicago, Chicago, 1994.

Śyāmasundaradāsa (ed.). *Hindī Śabdasāgara*, 11 vols, Vārāṇasī: Nāgarī Pracāriṇī Sabhā, 1965–75.

Tessitori, Luigi Pio. 'Notes on the Grammar of the Old Western Rajasthani with Special Reference to Apabhramśa and to Gujarati and Marwari', *The Indian Antiquary* (Feb. 1914–June 1916).

Thiel-Horstmann, Monika. *Crossing the Ocean of Existence: Braj Bhāṣā Religious Poetry from Rājasthān. A Reader*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1983.

Tivārī, Pārasanātha. *Kabīra-granthāvalī*, Prayāga: Hindī pariṣad, Prayāga viśvavidyālaya, 1961.

Whitney, William Dwight. *Sanskrit Grammar*, 9th issue of the 2nd ed., Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960 (1st ed. 1889).

Jaroslav STRNAD, Ph.D. (strnad@orient.cas.cz), research fellow and head of the Department of South Asia of the Oriental Institute, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic; part-time teacher at the Faculty of Arts, Charles University, Prague

✉: Orientální ústav Akademie věd ČR, Pod vodárenskou věží 4, 182 08 Praha 8, Czech Republic