

THE  
JOURNAL  
OF THE  
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY  
OF  
GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

NEW SERIES.



VOLUME THE THIRD.

LONDON:  
TRÜBNER AND CO., 60, PATERNOSTER ROW.

. MDCCLXVIII.

ART. XIV.—*Notes on the Bhojpuri Dialect of Hindí, spoken in Western Behar.* By JOHN BEAMES, Esq., B.C.S., Magistrate of Chumparun.

[Read February 17, 1867.]

THE Bhojpuri dialect is spoken in the British districts of Chumparun, Sarun, Shahabad, Ghazipoor, Azingurh, and Goruckpore, by a population which probably amounts to five millions. It is not, of course, the same in all these districts; but through all its variations it preserves the same general features, such as the use of the substantive verb *bhá* or *bá*, the perfect in *il*, and other points of difference from the classical or literary type of Hindí. It is largely used as a written medium of communication by native merchants, and in all the transactions of the rural population, such as village accounts, leases, receipts, and so forth. The character is a variation of the Devanágari, formed by omitting the horizontal top line, and is strikingly similar to the Gujarátí character, so much so that a work printed in that language can be read by a native of Chumparun. In the following remarks, however, I shall use the Devanágari character as more generally understood in Europe.

It is expected of one who writes on the modern Indian dialects that he should trace the origin of the forms from Sanskrit through the Prakrit, and I shall endeavour as far as I can to do this; but it must be remembered that the subject of Prakrit is involved in much obscurity, and that in India the difficulty of procuring books is very considerable. The greater part of the literary treasures of India is now in London and other European capitals; and we are constantly, in our search for manuscripts and copies of celebrated works, told by natives that they are not now to be procured. As an instance of this, I lately endeavoured to obtain a copy of the whole or part of the Prithi Raja Rasa of Chand. After vainly inquiring in Calcutta, Benares, and other large

cities, I found that only *one* manuscript was known to be in existence in the whole of the Bengal Presidency, and that was in the Library of St. John's College at Agra. Whereas, therefore, we in India possess an advantage over scholars in Europe, in being able to hear the various dialects in the mouths of the people, and thus have a great command of facts, we are far behind them in the matter of *apparatus criticus*. The learned researches of German scholars seldom reach us, except by accident,—we are, necessarily, ignorant of the progress of philological science, and it is therefore safer for us to establish a division of labour, and to confine ourselves to supplying facts for the information of our more fortunate fellow-labourers in Europe. Certain salient points, however, exist which may be noted with advantage, and to these I shall confine myself.

The name Bhojpuri, usually applied to this dialect, is derived from the ancient town of Bhojpur, in the district of Shahabad, situated a few miles south of the Ganges, and about sixty miles west of Patna. It is now a mere village, but was formerly a place of great importance, as the headquarters of the large and powerful clan of Rajpoots, whose head is the present Maharaja of Doomraon, and who rallied round the standard of the grand old chief Kunwar Singh in the mutiny of 1857. Readers of the entertaining "Sair-ul Mutakherin" will remember how often the Mahomedan Soubas of Azimabad (Patna) found it necessary to chastise the turbulent Zemindars of Bhojpur, and how little the latter seemed to profit by the lesson. It is remarkable that throughout the area of the Bhojpuri language a spirit of bigoted devotion to the old Hindu faith still exists, and that the proportion of Mahomedans to Hindus is very small. Rajpoots everywhere predominate, together with a caste called Bábhans (बाबन) or Bhuinhárs (भूईहार=landleute), who appear to be a sort of bastard Brahmins, and concerning whose origin many curious legends are told. The Maharaja of Bettiah in the Chumparun district is of this caste, though he is pleased to call himself a Brahmin.

I consider that the purest form of the Bhojpuri is to be

found in Chumparun and Eastern Goruckpore. The Sarun people clip their words, and the Shahabad folk have been exposed to constant contact with other people, so that they have in many respects assimilated their speech to that of the townsmen and educated classes. Chumparun, lying far from the great highways of India, has remained in comparative obscurity. The valour of the Rajpoots has protected their country from Musulman invasion, and as its name (Chumparun चम्पकारख = "the forest of the Champak tree"), implies, it was probably for many years a vast tract of almost impenetrable forest. Indeed, even in the present day, there are dense jungles in many parts of the district. From these causes the ancient speech has preserved its purity more in Chumparun than elsewhere; and the remarks I shall make will have reference chiefly to this district, though I shall also note any peculiarities in the dialects of other districts which may be known here, or seem deserving of mention.

The use of the compound consonants is unknown, and in writing the words of the language I shall therefore insert a *virāma* wherever there is any risk of obscurity, but in general the rules observed in Hindí may be applied, remembering that in some cases, *e.g.* the second person singular future, the final inherent vowel is distinctly heard (*karba* or *kōrbō*), while in the first person of the same tense it is mute (*karab*). In such cases as these the *virāma* will be used.

I may also call attention to the fact that the proper name for the vernacular of the valley of the Ganges when unmixed with Persian words is not Hindví, nor Hindúí, nor Hindoui, nor Hindavi, but plain and simple Hindi हिन्दी, and that all the distinctions drawn by some writers between the words Hindí and Hindúí are purely imaginary. Both words mean the same thing, but those forms which contain the *v* are more used by the illiterate and by Mahomedans.

#### I.

The sounds are in general the same as those in Sanskrit, and are expressed by the same letters, the vowels अ and आ, however, are unknown, and the compound or Gupa vowels ए and ओ are preferentially written अह and अर; so also the Vṛiddhi vowels ऐ and औ are

expressed by **खर** or **खार** and **खळ** or **खाळ**; but generally very little difference is observed between these two classes of sounds. This habit of writing the compound vowels by their elements is probably attributable to the fact that they are, as in Prakrit, derived by the elision of a consonant, and that a half-observed memory of their origin tends to retain for them a separate existence in writing, and to a certain extent in speaking. It is not uncommon, for instance, to hear the word *kaisan* (Hindi *kaisā*) pronounced *ka-isan*, and it is generally written **कइसन**.

With regard to the consonants, it is noticeable that their regular elision in the middle of a word, leaving a hiatus, is one of those characteristics of the Mahārāshṭrī and Saurasēnī Prakrits, especially of the former, which seems to militate against the supposition that the Marāṭhī and Hindī were derived from Sanskrit through them. For instance, the mutilated form **निओओ** *ni-o-o* for the Sanskrit **नियोगो** *niyogo*, can never be the parent of the Hindī **निजोग** *nijog*. A fact observable in Bhojpurī, however, seems to me to throw some light on this point; it is this, that many words are written with their full complement of consonants, but in speaking only a few can be heard. Thus the word *indāra*, "a well," sounds *in'āra*; and even the few Persian words in use have not escaped, **بندشوار** *bandishwār*, "an opium contractor," sounds regularly *ban'swār*. So also in the infinitive *dho'e wāṣṭe*, **देखे जाते**, are heard for *dhone ke wāṣṭe*, **देखने को जाते**; **सड़क** *sarak*, "a road," and many others. We conclude, then, that the Prakrit of the plays is written more according to sound than etymology, and that the letters so frequently dropped represent the blurred inarticulate pronunciation of the peasantry, half-contemptuously mimicked by the Sanskrit playwrights. In Pali we do not find these numerous hiatus and droppings of consonants; and in the Māgadhī, from which it is derived, even the Prakrit grammarians notice that the elision of consonants is less frequent than in the principal dialect. Owing to religious influences, the modern Marāṭhī has in so many instances borrowed the old pure Sanskrit words again that we cannot reason upon the Mahārāshṭrī Prakrit from it.

Another peculiarity in Bhojpurī is its tendency to substitute medials for tenues. Thus we hear **भोगना** for the Hindī **फेंकना** "to throw," **भिराना** for **फिराना** "to return," **गुगा** "a parrot," for **गुका**, etc.

**र** is constantly substituted for **ख**. Thus **करिख** "black," for **काखा**; **हर** "a plough," for **हख**; **बरद** "a bull," for **बखद**; **हरदी**

“turmeric,” for हलदी; केरा “a plantain,” for केला; परवर “a small sort of gourd,” for पल्लव; मुररि “a radish,” for मूली; अंगुरी “finger,” for अंगुली; and very many others. A dissyllabic word containing two open long syllables, like the word कासा quoted above, generally takes an incrementary syllable,—रच or उच (more frequently the latter), which increment has the effect of shortening the first syllable, as we have just seen in करिच. Thus they say अमुआ “a mango tree,” for Hindí आम, बेटुआ for बेटा, घरआ for घर, खेतुआ for खेत, चसुआ for चास, etc. In the first and third of these words the *e* is pronounced short, as in English, reminding one of Lassen’s discovery that *e* and *o* are short as well as long in Prakrit. There is an unchecked license in this respect which gives a singular type to the language. Some men always add the *ud*, others rarely. In Shahabad it sounds *id* more than *ud*; but so confirmed is this habit that even *marduá*, for the Persian *mard*, “a man,” is heard; and the English “box” becomes बकुसुआ *baksud*. This habit is evidently of great antiquity, as it is seen in names of towns and villages; thus Rámpúr becomes in Chumparun Rámpúrwa; Tirkúla (Sanskrit त्रिकूलः) Tirkúliá and Tirkuluá, and even Mahuá is called Mahúwuwa, a word almost unpronounceable, and yet I know five or six villages of this name.

*Sh* is invariably pronounced *s* both in Hindí and Persian words. This agrees with Vararuchi xi. 2 (Lassen, p. 391), as far as ष goes, and would be a Mágadhí type. I am unwilling, however, to admit the connection of Bhojpurí with Mágadhí—1st. Because there exists another dialect called Magadh or Magarh (ख) spoken in Gya and Patna which differs from Bhojpurí, and has the best claim to the title. 2nd. Because I think there is evidence of great changes having taken place in the localities of certain tribes and classes since the days of Prakrit. Roughly speaking, Maháráshṭrī should be the parent of the modern Maráthī, Saurasenī that of Hindí proper, Mágadhí of Magadh, Paisáchī of Nepalese, Apabhraṅśī of Sindhí; but in taking up any dialect now spoken in India it is impossible to avoid being struck by the mixture of types from all the Prakrit dialects that meets the eye. It would take me too far from the limits of this sketch to work out this point thoroughly, nor have I the machinery nor the ability for the task; but I mention it as a fact patent to the most cursory observer.

The above are the chief points of note in the pronunciation of this dialect. I proceed to the various parts of speech.

The noun is declined precisely as in Hindí, with the usual affixes *ka*,

*ke, kī, ko, etc.*; but there is a tendency to confusion of forms. Thus we hear *ke* used where the accusative or dative is evidently intended, and occasionally *ko* for *kā* of the genitive.<sup>1</sup> In ordinary conversation in Bhojpuri, and often in other dialects of Hindī, the distinction between *kā, ke, and kī* is lost sight of, all three forms being merged in an obscure *ki*. For *से se* *सौ son* is commonly used, as also *सौँ thā*; and for *पर* often *परि pari*. The plural is preferentially expressed by adding *सौन्* or *सब* to the singular; and in all nouns except those ending in *आ* nom. and *ए* oblique, there is generally no distinction of form between the two numbers. In the oblique cases of the plural, however, we occasionally find the termination *सन्* corresponding to the *सौँ* of Hindī, thus *सौनन् का* "of people;" also, when with more emphasis, *सौगनीका*. This is similar to the old Hindī form.

The pronoun affords, on the contrary, great varieties of form, and it is in it that some of the most striking peculiarities of this dialect are exhibited. I give the personal pronouns in full.

## FIRST PERSON.

SINGULAR.		PLURAL.	
I,	हम्	We,	हमनी
Of me,	हमर् हमरा हमरे हमरो	Of us,	हमार (also हमनी का).
To me,	} हमरा के	To us,	} हमनी के, हमरा के
me,		us,	
From,	} हमरा सौँ, में, etc.	From,	} हमनी सौँ, etc. हमरा सौँ
on, etc.		etc., us,	
me.			
	(Shahabad मोह सौँ)		
	<i>moñh son.</i>		

## SECOND PERSON.

Thou,	तुह, तें	Ye,	तोहनी, तुहनी
Of thee,	तुहर तुहरा तुहरे	Of you,	तुहार, तुहनी का
To thee,	} तुहरा के	To you,	} तुहरा के तुहनी के
thee		you,	
From thee,	तुहरा सौँ	From you,	तुहरा सौँ-तुहनी सौँ etc.

In the first person the true singular (में of the Hindī) does not exist. The form *हम्* is used for both singular and plural, and the plural form

<sup>1</sup> Analogous to this is the use of the affix *ko* for the usual *ke* or *karke* in the Maithil dialect (Tirhāt), where they say *देखकारको, देखको*, for the ordinary *दखके* and *देखके*, "having seen."

given above is only used when the notion of plurality requires to be distinctly enforced, and even then the forms **हम सब**, **हम लोग** (or frequently **हमरे लोग**), are commonly heard. The only true plural form is that of the genitive, which, together with its analogue **तुहार**, exhibits a near approach to classical Hindî. The ablative form **मोह से** is the only one which recalls the Hindî singular, but I cannot say I have ever heard it in Chumparun. In the second person the singular is used in a familiar or half-contemptuous way. The respectful method of address corresponding to the Hindî **आप** is **रउरा** or **रीरा**, *raurá*, with a plural **रउरन्ह**, *rauranh*, which is declined regularly as a noun. The oblique cases of the second person may also be written **तीरा**, **तोहरा**, etc. Of course, in a language which is so seldom committed to writing in a serious way (for in writing accounts and the like every one seems to follow his own ideas), much diversity of spelling must exist; and as I am recording the forms of this dialect only from what I hear around me every day, I must confess to being very much in doubt about the correct spelling of many words.

The form **रवाँ** *rawán* is also heard for **रउरा**, and suggests a possible connection with the Sanskrit **भवाँ**, perhaps with an incorporation of the particle **रे** or **अरे** in some way. This is a mere conjecture, however, and I can offer no certain clue to the origin of the word.

The pronoun of the third person is of two kinds,—the proximate **ई**, **ए**, or **हे**; the remote **ऊ**, **ओ**, or **हो**: here the old rule of the palatal sounds expressing nearness, and the labials, distance, comes out clearly as in the Hindî **यह** and **वह**, and so many other languages. The declension is as follows:—

Singular, ए this (he).		ओ that (he).	
N. ए or हे (raro ई),	this.	ओ or हो (raro ऊ),	that.
G. एकर (Shah. इकरा),	of this.	उकर (Shah. ओकरा),	of that.
Acc. इकरा के and एके,	this.	उकरा के and ओके,	that.
Ab. ए सेँ,	from this.	ओ सेँ,	from that.
etc. etc.		etc. etc.	
Plural.			
N. इहे,	these.	उहे,	those.
G. इनकर ०रा ०रे,	of these.	उनकर ०रा ०रे,	of those.
Acc. इनकरा के, इनके,	these.	उनकरा के, उनके,	those.
Ab. इनकरा सेँ इन सेँ,	from these.	उनकरा सेँ उन सेँ,	from those.
etc. etc.		etc. etc.	



It will be observed that the post-positions can be added either to the direct base, *i.e.* nominative, or to the secondary, *i.e.* inflected base; in the former case, being mere signs of inflection; in the latter, true post-positions, as in Latin or Greek. The latter form is more used when emphasis is required. The Hindī dialects are in an unsettled and transitional condition in respect of these particles. Thus we find that in the singular the particles are always appended to the direct base, while in the plural they are attached to an inflected base. Thus we say *का* *बैल* *को*, *बैल* *को*, etc., in the singular, but *को* *बैलों*, etc., in the plural. In nouns ending in *d*, we have, even in the singular, an inflected base for the post-position; thus from *गहोरा* *ghorā* we have *का* *गहोरे* *ghore kā*. Thus, at least, the grammarians tell us, though *का* *गहोरा* is a not uncommon vulgarism.

The several series of pronouns and pronominal adverbs are not quite so perfect as in Hindī. They are as follows:—

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. Place— <i>कहाँ</i> where?                       | 2. Time— <i>के बेर</i> when?           |
| <i>इहाँ</i> here.                                  | <i>ए बेर</i> now.                      |
| <i>उहाँ</i> there.                                 | — then.                                |
| <i>कहाँ</i> wherever.                              | <i>के बेर</i> whenever.                |
| <i>तहाँ</i> there.                                 | <i>ते बेर</i> then.                    |
| 3. Quantity—                                       | 4. Quality—                            |
| <i>कतेक</i> or <i>कितेक</i> how much?              | <i>कैसन</i> ( <i>कासन</i> ) what like? |
| <i>अतेक</i> this much.                             | <i>ऐसन</i> like this.                  |
| <i>उतेक</i> that much.                             | <i>वैसन</i> like that.                 |
| <i>जतेक</i> however much.                          | <i>कैसन</i> whatever like.             |
| — so much.   | <i>तैसन</i> such like.                 |
| 5. Direction— <i>केन्हर</i> , <i>केने</i> whither? |  |
| <i>एन्हर</i> , <i>एने</i> hither.                  |  |
| <i>उन्हर</i> , <i>उने</i> thither.                 |  |
| <i>केन्हर</i> , <i>केने</i> whithersoever.         |  |
| <i>तेन्हर</i> , <i>तेने</i> thither.               |  |

The series of place may also be expressed by *केठाई*, *केठा*, etc., and that of direction by *के ओर*, etc.

The other pronouns may be given in comparison with the Hindī, thus—

*कौन* *के*, gen. *केकर*, *Shah*. *किकारा*, etc.

*कोय* *केह* *kehū*, gen. *केह का*, etc.

کچھ **बिड़ु**, **बौनो**, the former means "nothing," as **बिड़ु ना जानत बारी**, "we know nothing;" the latter is an adjective, meaning "none," "no," as **बौनो उपाय नहीं**, "there is no remedy."

کیوں **काहे**.

کیا **का**.

कभी **कभीउ**.

कहिन **कगही**.

جو **जे** **جو کوئی** **जे** **केइ**.

II.

The verb in all its forms is best exhibited in comparison with the Hindi verb, as the arrangement of tenses is the same in both.

Infinitive, **जानना**, to know, knowing (the act of).  
**जाने का**, of knowing.

Present participle, **जानत**, knowing. H. **जानता**.

**जानता**. (This form is rarely used.)

Plural, **जानत**.

**जानते**. H. **जानते**.

Past participle, **जानल**, **जानिल**, **जानिला** } H. **जाना**, known, having  
Oblique case, **जानिले पर**, **सों**, etc. } known.

Future participle, **जानिहार**, knower, or about to know. H. **जानेवाला**.  
(Agent.)

PRESENT TENSE.

Sing. **हम**, **तुई**, **उह** **जानत बा**, I am knowing, etc. H. **जानता हूँ**, etc.  
Pl. **Id**. H. **जानते हैं**.

PAST TENSE. (H. **मैं जाना** - **हम जाने**, etc.)

SINGULAR.

1. **हम जानिली**, I knew.
2. **तुह जानिल**, thou knewest.
3. **उह जानिल**, he knew.

(Variant of 3rd pers. **जानिलस**.)

PLURAL.

1. **हमनी जानिली**, we knew.
2. **तोहनी जानिलह**, ye knew.
3. **उहने जानिलन**, they knew.

(Variant of 3rd pers. **जानिला**.)

FUTURE TENSE. (H. **जानूंगा**, etc.)

1. **जानव**, I shall know.
2. **जानव**, thou shalt know.
3. **जानि**, he shall know.

1. } Same as singular.
2. }
3. **जानिही**, they shall know.

IMPERATIVE. (H. **जान**, **जानो**.)

**जान**, know thou.

**जानो**, know ye.

The compound tenses in Hindi are, as is well known, nine, and may be thus classified.

A. Present participle +	{	Present, verb subst. जानता है	1.
		Past „ „ जानता था	2.
		Future „ „ जानता होगा	3.
B. Past participle +	{	Present „ „ जाना है	4.
		Past „ „ जाना था	5.
		Future „ „ जाना होगा	6.
C. Future participle + (Agent.)	{	Present „ „ जानिवासा है	7.
		Past „ „ जानिवासा था	8.
		Future „ „ जानिवासा होगा	9.

The same array of forms may be produced in Bhojpurī by a combination of the three participles A. जानत, B. जानल, C. जानिहार, with the following. For the present, the verb substantive जा, for the past, रहल, and for the future, हरी. In an uncultivated dialect like this, however, refinement of speech cannot be looked for, and consequently the Bhojpurī peasant as a rule confines himself to the three simple tenses given in the paradigm above. The use of जा, however, is very frequent, and its variations very great. First we have जा (in Shahabad भा), then बटे or बाटे, बाह and बाह्या; and, lastly, a declinable form (the others being indeclinable), which, though the same for both singular and plural, varies for the persons, thus—

1st person,	हम देखत बारी,	I am,	we are looking.
2nd „	तुह देखत बार (bāra),	thou art,	ye are looking.
3rd „	उह देखत बारन,	he is,	they are looking.

I generally hear this form used in asking questions and in replying to them; in narrative the other indeclinable forms are used.

For the Hindi जा, which is unknown, the past tense of the verb रहना, “to stay,” is in use; and the future exhibits हरी, the regular future of होना, “to be,” the conjugation of which will be given hereafter.

There are also some fragmentary forms in use. The dialect being an expressive one, in its rude way, indulges much in enclitics (*thegd*, ठेगा, as they call them, Anglice, *tags*). Thus we hear कहितारि, “I say,” probably a corruption of कहत बारी, as I do not remember to have heard this particular tag used with any other verb.<sup>1</sup> Another

<sup>1</sup> Since writing the above I have heard the words जाइतारी, “I am going,” and बान्तारी, (*ban'tarin*) for बाधितारी, “I am tying,” so that probably the phrase is a common one.

favourite is **जुं**, which is added to the end of a sentence, however long, and gives a certain accent of conviction or energy, as we should say, "Don't you see?" Take for example the following sentence: **तोहनी के दुई रूपीआ महीना मिसल बानुं**, which means, "*Well, but you get two rupees a month you know, recollect that.*" The words in italics are all expressed by **जुं**, accompanied by a certain turn of the voice and gesture with the hands and shoulders, which must be seen to be appreciated. **ह** (pronounced ha! or ho!) is also added to commands, as **जाह जाह!** "go! go! Others are **ही** (Sansk. हि), **हीं** (id.), **नी** and **नों**, etc.

It is expedient to exhibit the conjugation of a verb whose root ends in **आ**, as such verbs deviate in some points from others. I take the verb **पराना**, to fly (Hindi भावना).

Present participle, **पराहत**, flying.

**पराता** (rare) id.

Past participle, **पराहस**, fled.

Future participle, **परानिहार**, about to fly.

#### PRESENT TENSE.

Sing. all three persons, **पराहत बा**, I am flying.

Plural " " " "

#### PAST TENSE.

##### SINGULAR.

**हम पराहसी** I fled.

**तुह पराहस** thou fledst.

**उह पराहस** he fled.

Var. **पराहस**.

##### PLURAL.

**हमनी पराहसीं** we fled.

**तोहनी पराहसह** ye fled.

**उहे पराहसन्** they fled.

#### FUTURE TENSE.

1. **हम पराहव** I will fly.

2. **तुह पराहव** thou wilt fly.

3. **उह पराहव** (or **वे**) he will fly.

1. } Same as singular.

2. }

3. **उहे पराहवीं** they will fly.

Imperative, **पराव** (*paráva* or *-vo*), fly ye.

The Passive is expressed by the following form:

Present, **हम पकड़ाहत बा** I am seized, or **पकड़ाहस जात बा**.

Past, **उह पकड़ाहस गेस** he has been seized.

Future, **उह पकड़ाह** he will be seized, or **पकड़ाहस जाद**.

The form, usually appropriated in classical Hindí to the causal verb, being thus used for the passive, recourse is had to the other available

semi-vowel **व** to form the causal, which sounds therefore **दिखावना** or **दिखीना**, "to shew."

Present, **दिखाउत बारी**.

Past, **दिखाउली** or **दिखउली** or **दिखीली**, etc.

Future, **दिखाव**, **दिखाउव**, etc., also **दिखाएव**, etc.

The verbs which, in Hindi, form their preterites in a manner peculiar to themselves, have the same special forms in Bhojpuri. Thus—

**करना** to do.

Pret. **कीली** or **करिली**.

**जाना** to go.

**गेली**.

**मरना** to die.

**मूहली** and **मूखली**.

(Also **मूखना**).

The indefinite participle, which in Hindí ends in **कर** or **के**, is rarely used; in its stead the oblique form of the past participle is commonly heard, as **जानिके पर - गेले सो**, "on knowing," "on going." In some sentences, however, the participle in *ke* is used, as **समझ बुझके**, "having thoroughly understood." I suspect such phrases are recent importations from Hindí.

I have left till the last the aorist, because I almost doubt of its existence. In Urdú this tense is generally used as a vague present, in contrast to the definite present in *tá*:—**wah kahán jáe**, "where is he going?" but **abhi játá hai**, "he is going at once." Such a delicate distinction is beyond the comprehension of our simple peasantry. The only time I am sensible of the existence of a sort of aorist is when a man says, "May I take leave?" = **ab hum jáín**, **अब हम जाईं**, which is literally, "now I go," said with a questioning tone. If there be any such tense it differs only from the Hindí in sounding **ईं** for **एँ** in the first and third persons of the plural; and here, again, I half suspect copying from the Hindí.

The prohibitive particle **मत** of the Hindí imperative is not in use; **न** is used.

It must further be noted that the utmost confusion exists in the application of the above rules, so that you hear, e.g. **पीटार** as the future of **पीटना**, "to beat," **कउचावत रहख**, as the imperfect of **कौचाना**, "to steal," and the like. I have endeavoured, however, with the aid of the best-informed natives, to select and exhibit the most accurate and widely used forms.

In this place should be noticed the form of a verbal noun in **वे** or **वे**. Examples of this form are **सुन्वे न केसन** **sunbe na kailan**, "they would not give me a hearing," **आवे न करिख** **ábe na karila**, "you would not

(even) come," होवे करि ऐसन *hove kari aisān*, "it will probably be so," "it may be expected to be so." On comparing this form with Bengálí expressions, such as करिबार् जञ्ज *kōribār jōnyō*, "for the sake of doing," and the Gujarátí infinitive which ends in जुं as करुं लेवुं *karuṅ levuṅ*, etc.; and again with the two infinitives in Maráthí, one of which ends in उं as करुं *karuṅ*, the other in ये, as कर्ये *karṇe*; and taking further into consideration the old Braj infinitive in वी, as जलवी *jalvāu*, we are forced to regard this form also as a true infinitive, or perhaps a gerund, with a substantive power, similar to that of the inflected infinitive in ने; and its preservation in the local dialects, after it has been lost from the classical tongue, supplies an additional link between the Hindí and other neo-Aryan dialects. Further, the form of the Bengálí future, as करिब *kōribō*, etc., and the same tense in Bhojpurí, as करव, etc., gives us in connection with the Latin forms *amabo*, *amabis*, etc., a clue to its origin in the substantive verb भू "to be," which has lost its aspirate equally in the neo-Aryans and in the Latin. The peculiar value of this and similar formations in the local dialects consists in this, that Urdú has in many respects alienated itself from the sister languages owing to foreign influences, and the existence of such forms as these helps us to restore and establish the fundamental unity of the whole class, even though on a surface view many links might seem to have been lost.

The substantive verb होना, "to be," though in many respects quite regular, possesses, however, some forms of a peculiar nature. The chief noticeable point is the presence of ख *kh*. Thus we have—

Bhojpurí.		Hindí.	
होखत्	for	होता	being.
होखस	„	हए	they have been.
होखव	„	मैं हंगा	I shall be.
होखबह	„	तू होगा	thou shalt be.
होखीहै (ही)	„	वुह होगा	he shall be.
होखी	„	होखीये	be thou (respectful).

These forms arise from the incorporation of the substantive verb खे. This verb, except in the combinations given above, is not declinable, though the single form खे with its negative नाखे is common. As we go further east into Tirhut the form है is universally employed for "is;" quite superseding बा. है is heard as far east as the Hindí language goes, viz., as far as 87° 45', where it merges into the Bengálí आदेह *áche*. Inasmuch as this last word is clearly a corruption of the

Sanskrit अस्ति, we have a chain of forms whose relative geographical position is analogous to their philological. Beginning in Bengal, the region, *par excellence*, of well-preserved Sanskrit forms, and going steadily westwards, we pass in order through the following forms:— आट्ठ *áchhe*, छे *chhe*, खे *khe*, and है *hai*. I am disposed, however, to place है between छे and खे, and to regard the latter as sprung from a hardening of the aspirate, something similar to what takes place regularly in the termination *ṣ h* of Persian words, which spring from a Sanskrit *visarga*, and become in Armenian *h g*, as प्रेतस् *pretas*, فرشته *frishta*, հրեշմուղ *hrieshdag*.

The word वा is pronounced in Shahabad भा *bhá*; and that this is the more correct pronunciation is shown by the form of the past tense, which is in Chumparun भेल् *bhel*, in Shahabad भैल् or भोरल्. It is also evidently derived from the Sanskrit भू. The form भा is found in old Hindí, but in a past sense (Garcin de Tassy, Gram. Hind. p. 37); the most usual form is भयी, and भया is common in modern Hindí for हया all over India.

The form in स् of the perfect is of frequent use, and in some constantly recurring words, as रहना, it loses its स् and sounds रहस्, as in the phrase तेवेर् उह रहस् कि ना, "was he there at the time or not?" This clipping is a characteristic of the Sarun district.

I now proceed to make a few remarks on the origin and general relations of the forms of the Bhojpuri verb.

The infinitive retains the *anuswára*, which appears originally to have existed in the Hindí. I may mention that even in Urdú at the present day I have met many educated natives who always write کرنا, هونان *honán*, *karnán*, etc., for کرنا, هونا *honá*, *karná*.

The presence of this *anuswára* leads me to the conclusion that the infinitive is derived from the neuter form of the verbal substantive in Sanskrit, and not from the masculine as suggested by Professor Bopp (Comp. Gram. vol. iii. p. 1233, Eng. ed.) Taking the forms in order of antiquity, we have first the Sanskrit in *am*, e.g. ज्वलनं or ज्वलनम्. (This use of the *anuswára* is merely a *compendium scripturae* and not a pure nasal as in दण्डः or the like.) Next we find the न् resolved into its two elements, the labial and the nasal. The former element in its vowel form amalgamates with the inherent short vowel of the preceding न and forms नो; the latter becomes a pure *anuswára* with nasal intonation, and the weakening of the न् into these two feebler exhibitions of each of its component elements is compensated for in the ever sensitive

Hindí by lengthening the **ओ** to **औ**; thus we get the Braj form **अखनी**. The next stage is the Bhojpurí **अखनां** which follows the rule by which all words in Braj ending in **नी** change this vowel into **आ**; lastly, we get the Hindí and Urdú form **अखना**. In support of this view I may allege—Firstly, that in the cognate languages the infinitive has always a neuter form, that is to say, the Gerundial or Noun-infinitive. Thus the Maráthí has **होणे, लेणे**, which is shown to be a neuter form by the neuters of the participles and adjectives, as **असते**, etc.; also the pronouns **हैं, तै**, etc. Similarly the Gujarátí exhibits **जुं** as **करवुं karvun**, “to do,” **लेवुं levun**, “to take,” etc., in comparison with the neuters of participles in **ऊ** and the possessive pronouns **अमारे amáruñ**, **तमारे tamáruñ**. So also the Bengálí gives **देखन dekhan**, “to see,” **बसन basan**, “to sit,” etc., true neuters. The Sindhí inf. similarly ends in **जुं** and the Uriyá in **न**. Secondly, the dissolution of final **म्** into its elements, and the working up of the dissolved elements, as in the infinitive, is exemplified in such words as **माथें** from **ग्राम**, **माथी** from **नाम**, **साई** from **स्वामि**; in the last instance, however, the palatal vowel has overcome the labial left by the **म्**.

The form of the present in **त** is a truer present than the ordinary Hindí in **ता**, which is really the agent of the Sanskrit. The Braj form **जातु** leads us to the Sanskrit agent base in **तु** rather than to the form of the nominative in **ता**, and the feminine form **जाती** points to the Sanskrit feminine in **ती**. It is, however, possible to imagine that the Hindí forms in **ता** and **ती** arose also out of the present participle in Sanskrit in this way. The Prakrit form of this participle ends in **जन्त**, from which we get the Sindhí form in **ईदी** as **मारीदी**; a closely allied form is that in use in the southern parts of the Punjab and as far north as the boundary of the Barr, **मारैदी mairéido** or **मारैदा mareñdá**, “beating.” A step further brings us to the Panjábí proper, which has two forms; that which is used with a verb ending in a vowel retains the nasal, as **जाउंदा jáundá**, “going,” but in a verb which ends in a consonant the nasal is of necessity dropped, and we hear **करै करदँ kardá**, “doing,” **अखदँ aghaldá**, “sending,” etc. This latter form brings us naturally to the Hindí **कर्ता**. If this supposition be the true one, the Bhojpurí would seem to have kept itself outside of the whole of this process, and to have retained the simple and original Sanskrit form in **जत्** unchanged. I am not yet in a position to give an opinion as to which of the two suppositions is the more correct. The solution of the question depends on the relative antiquity of the



various dialects, and we have yet to settle whether it is likely or possible for the Hindi to have borrowed from so obscure a source as Panjábí. In fact there is much that requires clearing up in the relation between the Sauraseni, Braj, and the modern Hindi dialects, and until we know more of the colloquial forms of early Prakrit, the mist cannot be dispelled. The Prakrit of the poets is clearly *not* a dialect that was ever spoken. How far it represents the characteristics of any spoken dialect is a question. It is, however, clear that each dialect of Hindi has had an independent existence for centuries, and I think an independent origin. It cannot be supposed that the Bhojpuri ever arose out of classical Hindi, or Hindi out of it. The next form that we have to notice is of itself sufficient to refute any such supposition. I allude to the past tense with its characteristic क्. The generally received theory concerning this widely-spread form, which is found in Bengálí, Maráthí, Gujarátí, and in one at least of the Hindi dialects, is that it is derived from the Sanskrit past participle in त् by a change of त् into द्, thence through ड् and र् to क्. This theory has received the support of the highest authorities, including Bopp and Lassen. My objections to it are these. In the first place, though the possibility of such a change cannot be denied, yet the probability is slight. So great a change must have been gradual and must have left some landmarks. Yet we find the form in क् existent in Prakrit at the same time as forms in द् and ड् (*vide* Lassen, *Inst. Prak.* p. 363), and in the modern languages no traces of the two latter forms exist. Again, the dialects which use the form in क् have no examples of the form in त् except in such Sanskrit words as they have resuscitated in their old dress in comparatively modern times. The argument insisted upon by both Bopp and Lassen of the existence of a parallel form in the Slavonic languages militates against their theory, for the Slavonic people separated themselves from the general stock at a period when Sanskrit, as we know it, was hardly formed, and could have taken away with them nothing more than the common family wordstems, and the general birth-need, or inherent tendency to form their language according to the common Indo-Germanic canons. The existence among them, therefore, of such a form, seems to shew that it must have a higher antiquity than is secured for it by supposing it to be a mere later Prakrit corruption, and I am therefore inclined to suppose it to be an original and independent form for past time as ancient as that in त्, and existing side by side with it, but one which for reasons we cannot

yet fathom has not asserted itself in written Sanskrit, unless it be there represented by the participle in क or क्, a supposition supported by the known convertibility of the two letters क and क् as exhibited in the modern Bengálí pronunciation, as also in the form of the Armenian infinitive in *l* as in *սիրել sirel*, *բերիլ bieril*, and other words. Besides, it may be urged that though the transit of र into क् is a fact supported by some good examples, yet as far as the Bhojpuri is concerned the tendency is quite the opposite; क् migrates into र freely and frequently, but I cannot adduce any instances of र changing into क्.

I would here further observe that the written Sanskrit has unfortunately attracted the attention of scholars too exclusively. No one who lives long in India can escape having the conviction forced on him that the written language is quite inadequate to account for many forms and facts observable in the modern dialects. These dialects assert for themselves a high antiquity, and are derived, one cannot doubt, from an ancient Aryan speech, which is as imperfectly represented in Sanskrit as the speech of the Italian peasantry of their day was represented by Cicero or Virgil. The process of selection which led the polished Roman to use only stately and euphonious words—a process which is abundantly exemplified in the pages of modern English writers—was doubtless at work among the ancient Brahmins; and the fact that the cognate Indo-Germanic languages preserve words not found in Sanskrit, but which can be matched from the stores of humble and obscure Hindi or Bengálí dialects, is another proof of this fact. The line taken by Professor Lassen, in his valuable Prakrit Grammar, of treating all Prakrit words as necessarily modifications of Sanskrit words, is one which he has borrowed whole from Vararuchi and Hemachandra, and however excusable in those ancient commentators, seems unworthy of an age of critical research. The elaborate torturing of a Sanskrit word to make it serve as the etymon of a Prakrit word is a false and strained proceeding. If we approached the Prakrit from the side of the modern vernaculars we should, I think, arrive at a truer view of its position. But I am wandering from the subject of the present notice into a very wide field indeed.

The future appears to be formed of remains of two separate systems; the first and second persons belonging to one, and the third person to another. That of the first and second persons is clearly a combination of the stem with the substantive verb क्, which recalls the Latin future

in *bo, bis*, etc.; also the prefixed  $\text{ب}$  of the Persian and the  $\text{ব}$  of the Bengálí. The reason why the first person is pronounced in two syllables while the second person has three, is to be found, I believe, in the original existence of an  $\text{स}$  in the latter ( $\text{भवसि}$ ), which modulated into  $\text{o}$  and thence into a short  $\text{á}$ . The third person resembles some of the forms of the present given in Lassen's paradigms of the Maháráshtrí Prakrit, and points to the existence of two futures,—one compounded with the root  $\text{भू}$ , the other with  $\text{अस्}$ ; the two first persons are remnants of the first verb as the third person is of the second. The reason for this it is difficult to discover; but I may mention that the respectful form of the imperative, which sounds in classical Hindí *jáiyé*, is often pronounced, even beyond Bhojpurí limits, *jáihín*  $\text{आहँी}$ , which is identical in form with the third person plural of the future; and as the plural is used in most Aryan languages as a mark of politeness and respect, it is not improbable that the respectful form of the imperative arose from the same sentiment, and the final  $\text{ही}$  of the plural may be nothing more than the emphatic particle. Beyond this I cannot at present offer any safe conjecture. The formation of futures, as a rule, in modern Aryan languages proceeds upon analytical principles, the inflectional characteristic being more readily lost in this than in other tenses. Just as we have in the Romance languages a future formed by the auxiliary "to have," so in the modern Indo-Aryans we see that recourse is had, in the absence of a possessive verb, to the verbs "to be," "to go," and the like. Thus in the Hindí the forms *gá, gí, gé, gín*, of the future are recognizable as connected with some now lost relative of the Sanskrit  $\text{गम्}$ ; probably there existed a form  $\text{गा}$ ,<sup>1</sup> which would be intermediate between the existing roots  $\text{गम्}$  and  $\text{या}$ , and thus we should have a series of roots meaning "to go," gradually modulating from the guttural into the palatal varga; thus  $\text{गम्}$ ,  $\text{गा}$ ,  $\text{या}$ ,  $\text{इ}$ , of which  $\text{गा}$  has left no trace in classical writings. My suggestion that the third person of the Bhojpurí future points to the verb  $\text{अस्}$  rests upon the Hindí form  $\text{है}$ , which in ordinary conversation is apt to sound little more than  $\text{इ}$ , especially in Eastern Hindustání.

In the pronouns the most remarkable feature is the formation of the cases. Here, again, we find scholars trying to recall the forms in use in the modern dialects to some connection with the Sanskrit, and I fear with very bad success. I hazard with much diffidence some remarks which point in a fresh direction. In the first place it is noticeable that

<sup>1</sup> Westergaard gives  $\text{गा}$ , but only as a Vedic word. Rad. Sanscr. p. 2.

we have in the majority of these languages the same *system* of genitive formation with a different class of consonants.

Hindí, का की के  
 Panjábí, दा दी दे दीआ  
 Maráthí, चा ची चे चाआ चे, etc.

The effect of these particles, as has been observed from the first, is to make the governed substantive into an adjective agreeing in its accidents with the governing substantive, so that instead of saying *patris equus* we say virtually *paternus equus*, and so forth.

In the next place, the क of the Hindí might, by known laws, modulate into the च of the Maráthí, if we could safely assign to Hindí, *as Hindí*, a higher antiquity than to Maráthí. This is a question which must be investigated quite apart from any considerations as to the relative position of the Maháráshtrí and Saurasení Prakrits, because the locale of the plays being chiefly at Ujjayin, Maháráshtrí probably acquired undue prominence. It is not possible, I think, to suppose upon known laws any phonetic connection between the द of the Panjábí and the क of Hindí. The Panjábí द, however, can be legitimately connected with the र of the pronouns of all the languages, and we may here throw in the र or ৱ of the Bengálí. Thus we have two groups. The Hindí and Maráthí noun, on the one hand, and the Panjábí and Bengálí noun, with all the pronouns, on the other. A third element occurs in the Gujarátí जो, which again is found as an accusative in the Panjábí जु, while the क of the Hindí re-appears in the accusative of the Bengálí কে *ke*. The Nepalese genitive sign is जो, which is identical in form with the sign for the Hindí accusative; but, in origin, is doubtless a relic of the old Hindí form कौ, which has in modern Hindí been softened still further into का. The Sindhí ज system is a still further softening of the Maráthí च.

With the द of the Panjábí agrees the prefixed *o d* of the Pushtu, and perhaps the *rz* of the Armenian accusative. It is further noticeable that at one period of its history Hindí possessed both the क and the द system, as the latter is found in the poems of the early Hindí bards generally, and a series with र is shewn in a quatrain given by M. Garcin de Tassy in a note to his valuable "Grammaire de la langue Hindoui." That distinguished scholar attributes the presence of these forms to Panjábí influence, and his view is doubtless correct. In the Márwarí dialect of Hindí the genitive is regularly formed by रो and रे *m.* री *fem.* This र type also occasionally occurs in the Prithví

rāja, Rása of Chand, which is written in the Bhaṭṭī dialect of Hansi and Sirsa. The facts may be thus summed up:—

1. The machinery for expressing the genitive is identical in nature in the majority of the languages.
2. The said machinery differs by the employment of separate characteristics in each language.
3. These characteristics may be reduced into two groups—a linguo-dental and a gutturo-palatal.
4. In the first group are found Panjábí, Bengálí, and the pronouns of the two first persons in all the Neo-Aryan languages, and those of all three persons in Bhojpurí. In the second, Hindí, Maráṭhí, and Sindhí.
5. The characteristics of the genitive in some languages re-appear as characteristics of other cases in other languages.

The modern languages of the Indo-Germanic family reject as a rule the inflectional construction, and adopt an analytical construction by means of pre- or affixed particles. In the European languages these particles are words which in the inflectional period were prepositions—*de, ad, per, super, of, out, to*, etc. For the genitive relation the preposition which in the former period expressed “separation” and “derivation from,” is *de, of, von*.<sup>1</sup> Another method of expressing genitive relation is by the use of relative pronouns. This is one of the Semitic methods (כִּי for instance, also  $\text{כִּי?}$  and  $\text{?}$ ). On this principle we should expect a system of palatals from the Sanskrit यः;<sup>2</sup> and although it is in Hindí a common vulgarism to use  $\text{किसा}$  for  $\text{किसा}$  and so forth, yet we are not prepared to take the interrogative कः for यः though by this means the क system would receive an appropriate solution. Nothing, however, among the relative pronouns of Sanskrit furnishes an origin for the linguo-dental system. सः might, it is true, be adduced; but the real radical of the सः series of pronouns is त, and if we took this we should have to work backwards through the Panjábí  $\text{द}$  and an imaginary  $\text{द}$  to the pronouns in र, which would hardly be consistent with the universally higher antiquity of pronouns, or account for their unanimous use of the र in languages which use the क system in their nouns.

<sup>1</sup> Von has a genitive relation, though a dative construction; *aus* and *of* have got sundered.

<sup>2</sup> Such as we probably have in the Persian *izafa*. There is a good Essay, by Garnett, on the subject of genitives: it is published in the collected volume of his Essays, which I have not at hand while I write.

Dr. Trumpp's<sup>1</sup> suggestion of कृते for the क system, and Bábú Rájendra Lál Mittra's of the affirmative क of Sanskrit nouns, both fail to meet the necessities of the case, as they do not embrace the whole group of languages, and the uniformity of the machinery leads us to look for one general explanation which will satisfy all the members of the class.

There remains only the method adopted by the European languages, that of using prepositions as signs of case, and this is manifestly inapplicable to the genitive, whatever may be said of other cases. None of the Sanskrit prepositions can have furnished the elements of the क system, or of the र system.<sup>2</sup>

It is here that the Bhojpuri throws a new light on the problem. In the forms क्वर, क्वरा, etc., we find both the क and the र element combined, and the supposition immediately occurs that this is the oldest and most genuine form. There is a known tendency in languages of the Aryan family to sunder compound consonants, so that while one language preserves one of them a second will preserve only the other. May not this tendency have been at work in the present instance? If we assume that the original affix of personality was कृ kr, we have in the older and more widespread र system a rejection of the क, and in the more recent क system on the other hand a rejection of the र, which latter would be in consonance with the Pali and Prakrit rule of assimilating an र when it is the second member of a compound to the first member, e.g. क्व for क्वर. As to the origin and meaning of this affix कृ kr, I cannot here dilate, but its existence is hinted at by Greek forms like *ἡμετερός*, etc. If it could be asserted that the root क्वर् (क्व) were in any way connected with this affix, Dr. Trumpp's theory would not be altogether out of harmony with mine; but I am far from being prepared to admit this point at present.

### III.

To return to the Bhojpuri dialect. The vocabulary is in the main identical with Hindi, but there are many words which are not to be found in ordinary dictionaries, and which I have never heard beyond the Bhojpuri area. I give here a list of those which I have been able to record. I have not attempted to classify them.

<sup>1</sup> Journal Royal Asiatic Society, vol. xix. p. 392, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Though Dr. Trumpp's suggestion of क्वनु for the Panjábí क्वु is undoubtedly correct.

Father,	बप्पू Hindi बाप	Grandfather,	आबा
Mother,	मतारी, महतारी	Grandmother,	आबी
Pillow,	चोटखना <i>oñthakhnd</i>	Uncle,	पितिता } paternal
To peep,	झांकना <i>jhānkna</i>	Aunt,	पितितानी } nal
Good,	नीमन् <i>nīman</i>	Uncle,	मज्जा } maternal
A present,	झोघात <sup>1</sup> <i>ḥoghāt</i>	Aunt,	मज्जायी }
A son's wife, पुतोह <i>putoh</i>		Nephew,	भगोना } sister's
Younger brother's wife,	भहो to be distinguished from बौह, H. बह, which means a married woman in general.	Niece,	भनीनी } children.
Branch of a tree,	डोंची		
A hut in the jungles } used by graziers, }	बघान, also चरार (Goruckpore)		
A cow-shed,	घारी, शार्घर		
Feeding cattle at night,	मैलान, पशर (especially buffaloes, which in the hot weather feed best at night).		
To run after,	पीछवाना		
To collect cattle,	मैलावना		
To quarrel,	टंटा कर्षी, बजनी क°, झोझ क°, झवर क°, probably from Ar. جبر <i>jabr</i> .		
To search for,	गहश् क°, उदेस क°		
To plough,	चास क°. They say एक चास भैल् it has been ploughed once, etc.		
An acquaintance,	परचे, चीन्हा परचे		
To sow,	बाउग, बावग क°		
To transplant,	रोपना		
To pull up,	कवारना, चीतना		
To eat,	खिना, पचना		
Quickly,	तुरन्, हासदे		
To look at,	तखना, कन् खिखवना, घुरना		
To pass,	बीतना (said of passing time)		
To stand,	डा रहना		
To stink (neut.)	पशाना		
To smell (act.)	मुंहकना		
To sleep,	सुतना		
Poor,	ताधरान		

<sup>1</sup> The श् in these words is not distinguishable in pronunciation from स, though in writing it is the more frequently used of the two, probably because it is easier to write. A similar confusion between these two letters exists in Marāṭhī, and to a still greater extent in Bengālī.

Pice,	डेवुआ (generally applied to the small black pice or lumps of unstamped copper imported from Nepaul which are current in Cham-parun, and preferred to the Government pice, as the value of them rises and falls like the price of goods. They are reckoned by "gaṇḍas" or clusters of four. From 25 gaṇḍas and upwards go to the seer.
A broom,	बड़नी
A basket,	दउरा हैंटी
A water-pot,	गगरी
A platter,	घरोआ (H. घासी)
A small water-pot,	जुभा (H. कटोरा), other sorts of pots are तउआ, a large earthenware vessel, the Hindī हाडी, and पत्की a smaller sort.
Shoes,	पगहीं
A walking stick or staff,	गोबी, डेगा, परैगा
A rope,	रसरी; अउर <i>jausr.</i>
A beam,	सरही; परैरू <i>parenr.</i>
A post,	घुनी
Thatch,	छानी
Meat,	सगउती
Vegetables,	तीअन्
Near,	नेर
Far,	झांट
Clothes,	जूगा
Wind,	बीआर
Sunshine,	घाम
Morning,	बिन्खार (var. भी०)
Hot,	तातल्
Cold,	शेराइख
Man,	मर्दुआ (Pers. مرد)
Woman,	मिहुराहू <i>mihurá</i>
Slave,	बेरुआ
The gnava,	एगो
The brinjal,	भेटा
Ginger,	आदी



Torai,	घीऊरा <i>ghíúrá</i> or घ्यूरा (a small sort of cucumber much used as a condiment).
Spinach,	भावी; Hindi साग or पासकसाग
Plantain,	किरा
Pepper,	मरीचा
Gourd,	खउका
A plough,	हर
Ploughshare,	फासा, फार
Sickle,	हुसुआ
Axe,	टांगी, टंगारी (small)
Pot for husking rice,	ऊखर
Rice-beater,	मुसर
Wolf,	ऊंरार, ऊंड़ार
Fox,	खीखीर्
Cat,	बीखार
Squirrel,	खखी (from खख a tree)
Fish,	माखर्
Pigeon,	परैवा
Rat,	मुंग
Fly,	माखी
Snake,	सरप
Calf,	खेख <i>loru</i>
Heifer,	उग्रर
Milch cow,	दोहान
Buffalo heifer,	पस्
Buffalo,	म्हीस <i>mhains</i>
Wife and family,	बिकत् (S. व्यक्ति). This word is used in a general sense, a man will say, "I have five bikats," meaning that his family consists of five persons; when only the wife is alluded to she is called बिकती.
Head,	मुर, कपार (Hindi)
Forehead,	माथा, माष्
Neck,	घेंट
Goutre,	खेधा a very common disease in Chumparan.
Waist,	डार
Back,	डीडा

Hand,  
Foot,

बाउन्ह probably from Hindí बाँह "arm"  
बौर

This short vocabulary is taken chiefly from notes made at the time I heard the words. It, and in fact the whole of this article, would have been more complete had I not been appointed to another district in quite a different part of the country, and thus obliged to leave Chumparun before I had completed my researches. I trust, however, that, slight as they are, these remarks may suffice to show how much valuable information, and what an amount of new light on doubtful subjects, may be expected from a fuller investigation of the rural dialects of Hindí. In the Bhojpurí we have a dialect spoken by a numerous population in one of the most fertile and accessible parts of India, one which counts more speakers than any other dialect of Hindí, and which yet has remained entirely uncultivated and uninvestigated. The Braj having attracted the attention of the Musulman invaders, and having been adopted by them and made to serve as a basis for their copious, beautiful, and all-pervading Urdú, has usurped the honors due to its sister dialects, and is in return deprived of the light which they might throw on its otherwise obscure formations.

If at a future time I should have further opportunities of investigating the Bhojpurí, I shall endeavour to collect ballads and old songs, sunnuds and title deeds, in the hope that the older forms of the dialect may thus be brought to light. I do not, however, think much is likely to be done in this way, as I observe that the wording of ballads is apt to get modernized, when they are not reduced to writing, and from the fact that Chumparun was so long a jungle, there are not likely to be many old title deeds in existence. It is, however, pre-eminently a district for archæologists. There is a large Buddhist tope at Kesarea (called by the people Raja Bhím's house); two Asoka pillars at places named after them *Louria* (*लौर* = *φαιλλός*); the vast ruins of the ancient city of Simraon;<sup>1</sup> and many old temples. Mud forts exist in the northern part of the district, and in one place there is a re-

<sup>1</sup> In 1835 the remains of walls, a large reservoir, ditches, a brick causeway, palace, citadel, and temple of richly carved stone, were still standing. Simraon was founded by Manyupa Deva in A.D. 1097, his sixth successor, Hari Singha Deva, was defeated by Toghlok Shah in 1322, and fled to Kathmándo, where he established his throne. Simraon has been in ruins since that time. The kingdom when at its height extended from the Kosi to the Gandak, and from the foot of the hills to the Ganges. See *Journal Asiatic Society, Bengal, March, 1835*. The ruins have been much diminished since that date; a few fine sculptures still remain, and the mounds marking the old line of walls enclose an immense area.

markable collection of them, called *Báwan Garhí* or the Fifty-two forts. In all these places, as well as in the strange tower-like mounds which exist here and there, there might be found old copper plates of grants of land and so forth. In short, there is much to be done in the way both of linguistic and archaeological enquiry and discovery in this interesting district; it is to be hoped that some one will one day or other take up the task. It is also to be hoped that we shall soon cease to hear the modern languages of India sneered at as rude and unworthy of attention. This way of talking was originated by the Orientalist school of English in India forty years ago, who enchanted with the discoveries which were being made at that time in Sanskrit, and not yet emancipated from the frigid classicality of the last century, could spare no time for the examination of the living vernaculars. It is now considered ridiculous to speak of Italian and French as miserable modern jargons; and consistency demands that we should not treat Hindi or Maráthí with contempt either, or consider that time as wasted which is spent in investigations into the arcana of their structure and origin.

---