1. Introduction

In the third chapter we tried to show how English grammar remained heavily under the influence of the classical tradition for centuries, and how the grammarians of English had to struggle hard to clarify their criteria for determining formal categories like mood. Many traditional grammarians went on mixing different kinds of criteria, formal, semantic, logical etc., till at last structuralists strongly objected to this practice, and emphasized the importance of following formal criteria uniformly for determining formal categories of grammar. Some of them like Fries even discarded the traditional nomenclature. Most English grammarians now do not object to the use of the traditional terms, but they use them in a different sense, and they do not normally mix different kinds of criteria in grammatical analysis. As a result of this, the picture of mood in English has undergone a radical change, so much so that some grammarians like Palmer have now completely rejected the category called 'mood' in English. This situation is not unique to English. If we look over the past of Hindi grammar, although it does not go as far back as English grammar, we find a similar situation. Like many grammars of English, Hindi grammars are
also not all written by native speakers of Hindi. Many foreigners like Yates (1827), Adam (1827), Ethrington (1873), Platts (1967), Kellogg (1955), Greaves (1896), etc. have written grammars of Hindi, or of what some of them call Hindustani. As most of them were perhaps familiar with the western classical tradition, it was natural for them to be influenced by it. Even later, many of the grammars written by Indian grammarians could not escape this influence. One can clearly see the influence of Kellogg's grammar on many of them, for example, those by Guru, Dunichand, Sharma etc. Their thinking on modality and mood follows more or less the same line. They use some of the same categories as indicative, imperative etc. and mix formal and notional criteria like many traditional English grammarians. We shall now present a brief account of the work of some prominent grammarians of Hindi to substantiate the above point, and then give our criticism at the end.

2. Hindi Grammars: Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries

S.M. Kellogg (1965): Kellogg discusses the Hindi verb as affected by the distinctions of voice, mood, tense, gender, number and person. About mood he says: "The moods, properly speaking, are four only. Indicative, Subjunctive, Imperative, and Infinitive. The Infinitive simply expresses
the abstract and unrestricted verbal idea; it is, indeed strictly speaking, a Gerund or Verbal Noun" (1965:221).

While explaining the characteristics of the above four moods, Kellogg mixes mood with tense by regarding the Imperative as a variety of the Future, and by listing it as one of the tenses in Group 1. He distinguishes 15 tenses and groups them in 3 distinct groups. About the tenses in Group I he says: "In Group I all these tenses represent the action as not begun, i.e., as future. The Absolute Future represents the futuration as a reality; the Contingent Future and Imperative represent it as a possibility." (1965:228) About the markers of the imperative he says that they are identical with those of the contingent future, except in the 2nd person singular in which no affix is added to the root. The markers of the contingent future are said to be the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I Person</th>
<th>II Person</th>
<th>III Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sing.</td>
<td>1. ù</td>
<td>2. e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plur.</td>
<td>2. ë</td>
<td>2. o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After this, the terminations of the Respectful, or Precative Imperative are given as follows: 2nd plural: 'iyo'; 3rd plural: 'iye', or more rarely, 'iyega'; and 'iye' or 'iyega' with the Honorific Pronoun 'aːp'. One only wonders how one can use 'iye' and 'iyega;' with the 3rd person plural: *ve jaːiye/iyega: (They may go.)
Of the four moods mentioned, Kellogg talks only about the imperative and the infinitive. There is hardly anything said about the indicative and the subjunctive. The fact is that while there is extensive discussion of the categories of tense and aspect in Kellogg's grammar, there is not much discussion of the category of mood. This may be because Kellogg has mixed the categories of mood and tense in his large scheme of 15 tenses.

John T. Platts (1967): Platts says that there are three moods in Hindi, namely, the indicative, the imperative and the subjunctive or the conditional, which is also the optative. (1967:135) The indicative and the subjunctive are said to have a number of tense forms in them. The second person singular of the imperative is the root-form of the verb, as in 'tuj ja:' (thou go), but the second person plural is formed by adding to the singular g, as in 'tum ja:o' (you go). The second person plural is said to be identical with the second person plural of the aorist from which tense other persons of the imperative are also taken. The aorist is the only tense that is said to be formed by means of the person-number inflectional terminations, such as ɦi, e, e, o etc.

The imperative is said to have a precative form also which is commonly used in polite speech. It is what some grammarians call honorific. It is formed by adding to the
verbal root the termination 'iye' for the singular, and 'iyo' for the plural. Platts says that both the forms are used now in the singular as well as the plural, the only difference being that the form ending in 'iye', is always used with 'pronomen reverentiae' 'a:p', and usually refers to present time, whereas the ending in 'iyo' is used with the pronouns 'tu:' and 'tum', and is generally a future imperative. The form ending in 'iyo' is also used in benedictions and imprecations. If 'qa:' is added to the precative ending in 'iye', it gives it a future signification.

Platts has treated tense and mood together. Tenses have been distributed in two groups according to the mood they belong to. The tenses of the indicative are the aorist, the indefinite future, the present, the past imperfect, the past indefinite, the present perfect and the past perfect; and those of the subjunctive are the aorist, the present potential, the past potential and the past conditional. It makes it difficult indeed to separate the markers of any mood as such, as the category is not distinguished as a separate one, except in the case of the imperative. This is thought to be one which always occurs in conjunction with one or the other tense. This may be called tense-mode/mood. It is this sort of scheme that some later grammarians follow. Guru distinguishes 16 tenses by including even the imperative. Aspectual distinctions like perfective, imperfective etc., are not distinguished separately, but are combined, like mood, with tense. Tense is
thus taken to be a comprehensive verbal category that includes other categories like aspect and mood in it. The typical markers of the subjunctive mood are shown under tense forms here.

Kamata Prasad Guru (1952): Guru defines mood as the form of the verb that indicates the mode of predication. He prefers the term 'artha' for it, as other grammarians like Padhye (Bhasha-Tatwa Deopika) and Kale (English-Sanskrit Grammar) have also used it. On the basis of the form of the verb he divides mood into five distinct classes:
(1) nishcaya:ṛtha, (2) sandeḥa:ṛtha, (3) sambha:va:ṇa:ṛtha,
(4) a:gya:ṛtha, and (5) sanketa:ṛtha.

Guru thinks that the above classes of moods have a temporal function too. In some cases the modal and temporal functions are so intimately connected that it is difficult to separate them; for example, 'vahā: na ja:ma: (Don't go there) has 'a:gya:ṛtha' in it, but it also has a reference to future time. It may be difficult, Guru says, to determine exactly whether 'ja:na:' (go) is a form of mood or tense. It is for this reason, he believes, that some grammarians treat tense and mood together and classify verb forms accordingly.

Tense in this scheme indicates not only the time of action, but also its complete and incomplete states, and even its doubtful nature. But in spite of making the function of tense so comprehensive, moods like a:gya:ṛtha (command,
request etc.), 'sambhaivanairtha' (possibility) and 'sanketairtha' (condition) are left out. So Guru decides to classify at one place all those verbs forms that have meanings related to the time of the action, its complete and incomplete states, and to the different types of modality. Such verb forms are said to be of five kinds corresponding to the five moods, as we shall see a little later in the table presented by Guru.

'Nishcayairtha' is defined as a mood that indicates factuality. This is an unmarked mood like the indicative mood, and as such has no distinct form of its own. Having defined 'nishcayairtha' by means of the notion of factuality, Guru takes up the question-forms. He says that since the verb in questions remains in the same form as in statements, it should be considered to be in the 'nishcayaairtha', although while asking a question the speaker is not in a position to assert any fact, but is in a state of uncertainty regarding facts. Guru, however, tries to justify it by saying that since the response to a question is bound to be a statement of fact, the question itself ought to be in the factive mood. 'Nishcayaairtha' is said to occur with six tenses, 'sambhaivanairtha' with three, 'sandehairsthha' with two, 'agyairsthha' with two, and 'sanketairsthha' with three. We give Guru's table below showing the distribution of different tenses under different moods (1952:266):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Simple Present</td>
<td>vah cala: he: (He walks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Present Perfect</td>
<td>vah cala: he: (He has walked)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Simple Past</td>
<td>vah cala: (He walked)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Past Imperfect</td>
<td>vah cala: tha: (He used to walk)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Past Perfect</td>
<td>vah cala:tha: (He had walked)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Simple Future</td>
<td>vah calega: (He will walk)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sambha:vya</td>
<td>Present: vah cala: ho (He may be walking)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sambha:vya</td>
<td>Past: vah cala: ho (He may have walked)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sambha:vya</td>
<td>Future: vah cale (He may walk)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sandigdh</td>
<td>Present: vah cala: hoga: (He must be walking)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sandigdh</td>
<td>Past: vah cala: hoga: (He must have walked)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Pratyaksha</td>
<td>vidhi tu: cal (thou walk)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Simple Sanketartha</td>
<td>vah cala: he: (He would have walked)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Imperfect Sanketartha</td>
<td>vah cala: hota: (He would have been walking)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Perfect Sanketartha</td>
<td>vah cala: hota: (He would have walked)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guru, thus, distinguishes 16 tenses. In the above scheme categories like aspect and mood have been combined with tenses proper, i.e. present, past and future, which have a purely temporal function. At one place he acknowledges that the Hindi verb has mainly three tenses, present, past and future. It shows that while on the one hand, the term 'tense' has been used to refer to the category whose basic function is temporal reference, on the other, it has been used to refer to a category that includes proper tenses, aspects and moods in it. When the perfective and imperfective aspects are added to the three tenses the number goes up to seven, as the following table shows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Simple</th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>vah calata: he:</td>
<td>vah cal rahaa: he:</td>
<td>vah cala: he:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(He walks)</td>
<td>(He is walking)</td>
<td>(He has walked)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>vah cala:</td>
<td>vah cal raha:</td>
<td>vah cala:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(He walked)</td>
<td>tha: (He was walking)</td>
<td>tha:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(He had walked)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>vah calega:</td>
<td>[Blank]</td>
<td>[Blank]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(He will walk)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the earlier table of what we may call tense-moods we can see that while nishcaya: rtha has no formal marker,
other moods seem to have some. Their formal markers may be stated as follows:

(1) Sambhāvārtha
   (a) Present - Present participle + 'ho'
   (b) Past    - Past participle + 'ho'
   (c) Future  - Root + Person-Number.

(2) Sandehārtha
   (a) Present - Present participle + hoga
   (b) Past    - Past participle + hoga

(3) aigya:rtha
   (a) Pratyaksha vidhi - Root (with the second person singular)
       Root + o (with the second person plural)
   (b) Prakosha vidhi - Root + na (with the second person singular and plural)

(4) Sanketa:rtha
   (a) Simple - Present participle form.
   (b) Imperfective - Present participle + hota
   (c) Perfective - Past participle + hota

H.C. Scholberg (1962): The trend of treating tense and mood together perhaps caught on so much that later some grammarians dropped the term 'mood' altogether. Scholberg
does not distinguish mood as a verbal category. All the
distinctions treated under 'mood' by other grammarians are
treated under 'tense' by him. He is unlike Guru in this
respect. Although Guru treats all the modal distinctions
under 'tense', he at least mentions five moods separately and
classifies the tenses according to them. On the contrary,
Scholberg says: "strictly speaking, there is no mood in
Hindi. What might be called such is covered by different
tenses". (1962:76) The basis of the tenses are said to be
the three participles, namely, the conjunctive, the imperfect
and the perfect. The tenses thus formed are said to be the
imperative, the contingent future, the absolute future, the
indefinite imperfect, the present imperfect, the past imper-
flect, the contingent imperfect, the presumptive imperfect, the
past contingent imperfect, the indefinite perfect, the present
perfect, the past perfect, the contingent perfect, the
presumptive perfect and the past contingent perfect. Guru
has also followed a similar scheme. He has only added the
future imperfective (paroksha vidhi) to it, thus making it
a scheme of 16 tenses.

A.H. Harley (1946) : Harley distinguishes some modal
forms in Hindi. Discussing the forms of 'hona:' (to be) he
first lists the indicative forms like 'me hu:' (I am),
'ham he:' (we are) etc., and then the subjunctive-forms like
'me hū' (I may be), 'ham hū' (we may be) etc. He also talks about the imperative form and says that it is identical in this verb (hona) with the present subjunctive form. What is called 'sandehārtha' by some grammarians Harley calls future perfect; for example, 'mē: gaya: hū:ga:' (I may have gone). He does not distinguish any category corresponding to sanketa:ṛtha', but distinguishes two kinds of conditional sentences, expressing real and unreal conditions. The real condition is said to be represented by the use of the indicative in the conditional clause, while the unreal by the use of the present participle in both the clauses. Optative sentences are also discussed along with the conditional ones, in spite of the fact that a category called subjunctive has already been recognized. Although Harley discusses the use of several verbs like 'sak', 'cuk' etc., he does not consider them to be a separate set of modal auxiliaries.

Duni Chand (1950): Duni Chand distinguishes five moods in Hindi, namely, 'niscaya:ṛtha', 'sambhāvāna:ṛtha', 'sandehārtha', 'ā:gya:ṛtha' and 'sanketa:ṛtha'. He claims there is a formal basis for making these distinctions. He illustrates them as below:

1. Raṃ Delhi gaya: (niscaya:ṛtha).
   (Ram went to Delhi.)
2. Parameshwar tumhare: kalaya: kare (sambhavaranirtha)
   (God bless you!)

3. vah cala: gaya: hoga: (sandehartha)
   (He must have gone.)

4. ja:to, pa:nla: la:o (agya: rtha)
   (Go, bring water.)

5. yadi samay par varsha: ho ja:ti: to akail
   na parata: (sanketartha)
   (If it had rained in time, there would have been
    no famine.)

The above are the forms mostly recognized by those who
distinguish the above five moods in Hindi. But like many
other grammarians, Duni Chand also couples mood with tense and
presents a large scheme of complex tenses (mishraka: l) which
include modal and aspectual distinctions in them besides
the temporal ones. The tenses in this scheme are:

| cale + ga: | 1. sa:ma:nyya bhavishyat | vah calega: |
|           | (Present)                | (He will walk) |
|           | (Participle of 'ca:ma:'-walk) |          |
| cal:ta: + | 2. apur: Na bhurt       | vah calata: tha: |
|           | (He used to walk)       | (He walks)    |
|           | 3. sambhaviva vartama:in| vah calata: ho |
|           | (He may be walking)     | (He walks)    |
|           | 4. sandigdha vartama:in | vah calata: hoga |
|           | (He might have been     | (He might have been |
|           | walking)                | walking)      |
|           | 5. apur: Na sanketartha | vah calata: hota: |
|           | (He would have been     | (He would have been |
|           | walking)                | walking)      |
(Past Participle form of 'calana:' (walk))

|   | 1. aisanna bhu:it | vah cala: he: (He has walked.) |
|   | 2. purNa bhu:it | vah cala:tha: (He had walked) |
|   | 3. sambha:vya bhu:it | vah cala: ho (He may have walked) |
|   | 4. sandigdha bhu:it | vah cala: hoga: (He must have walked.) |
|   | 5. purNa sanketa:rtha | vah cala: hota: (He would have walked.) |

|   | 1. aisanna vidhya:rthak | calana: he: (We have to walk) |
|   | 2. purNa vidhya:rthaka | calana: tha: (We had to walk) |
|   | 3. sambha:vya vidhya:rthak | calana: ho (We may have to walk) |
|   | 4. sandigdha vidhya:rthak | calana: hoga: (We will have to walk) |
|   | 5. vidhya:rthak sanketa:rtha | calana: hota: (We would have had to walk) |

To the above tenses the honorific imperative may also be added. We can very well see from this that the markers of different moods are not separate, although Duni Chand seems to believe them to be so.

Kishori Das Vajpeyi (1959): Vajpeyi does not distinguish any moods in Hindi. Instead, he draws a distinction between
'Tingant' and 'Kridant'. Tingant forms are called 'saídhyá', and 'Kridant' forms 'siddha'. The notional difference between them is that while the former express a state of doubt and uncertainty, the latter the speaker's feeling of certainty and commitment. Formally, the tingant forms are marked only for number-person, while the 'kridant' forms are marked only for number-gender. So, what other grammarians call 'sambhá-vyārtha', Vajpeyi treats as the tingant form of the verb which expresses possibility, wish, invitation, entreaty etc., for example, 'shaíyad raím aíye' (Ram may come), 'bhaqwán tumhái sukhií rakhe' (God may bless you!), aíp kal mere yaháí padháíre (would you please come to my house tomorrow?) Forms with 'ga' are treated as 'kridant'. That is why future-forms are regarded as 'kridant'. Vajpeyi claims that they are so not only because they are marked for number-gender like other 'kridant' forms, but also because they express certainty. The speaker is certain of what will take place in future. This may be somewhat true in cases of pure futurity like 'sabhaíshyáím ko hogí:' (the meeting will take place in the evening). This is a case of prediction where the speaker is sure of what will take place in future, but Vajpeyi is forced by his distinction to treat even cases like 'vah jáï: hogá:' (He may have gone), 'vah járáhá: hogá:' (He may be going) as instances of kridant, although they are only conjectures on the part of the speaker, not firm predictions. They involve some
uncertainty about the action. These are the forms that are
treated under 'sandhaśrtha' in other grammars. Vajpeyi
tries to justify them as 'kridant' by saying that even if they
express possibility, this possibility is stronger than that
of the 'tingant' form, and is surely inclined towards certainty.

What is called 'sanketaśrtha' (unreal condition) by others
Vajpeyi treats under 'hetuhetumad bhuit'; for example,
'sa:vyadha:ni: se calte, to Thokar na lagti:' (If you had
walked carefully you wouldn't have stumbled.) Similarly,
what are called direct and indirect imperatives by some
grammarians are treated as forms with the suffixes 'i:' and
'na'. The latter is said to indicate future command.
Thus, we see that Vajpeyi shows absolute independence
from the past tradition of Hindi grammar. In his Hindi
Shabdanushasan we find neither a scheme of moods, nor such
a comprehensive scheme of tense-moods as we do in the grammars
of Kamata Prasad Guru and others.

Aryendra Sharma (1972): Sharma defines mood as "the form
of a verb indicating the 'manner' of the action (whether it
just happens, or is ordered to be done, or is dependent upon
a condition etc.)." According to him Hindi has three moods:
indicative, imperative and subjunctive. His definitions of
these moods are as follows:

(1) The indicative mood is a form of verb which represents
the action as a fact, or makes a query about it; for
example,
vah gaya: (He went)
kya: vah ja:ega: (Will he go?)
laRaka: khel raha: he: (The boy is playing.)

(2) The imperative mood is a form of verb, expressing an action as a command, a request, a warning, prohibition etc. The subject is frequently omitted, but can be easily guessed from both the context and the form of the verb; for example:

(tu) ja: ((thou) go.)
(tum) vaha: na ja:na: (Don't (you) go there.)
(aip) a:iye (you) please come.)

(3) The subjunctive mood is a form of verb which represents the action as a desire, a hope, a possibility, a probability, a condition, a presumption etc. It has four varieties:

(i) optative, expressing desire, demand, entreaty, requirement; for example, 'u:se ca:hiye ki vah ghar ja:e' (He ought to go home.), 'me: ca:hta: hu:n ki vah ja:e' (I want him to go.).

(ii) potential, expressing possibility; for example, 'sambhav he:, vah a:ya: ho' (It is possible he has come.), 'ho sakta: he:ki kahi: varsha: hui: ho' (It is possible it has rained somewhere.)
(iii) contingent, expressing a contrary-to-fact condition; for example, 'yadi mera: bhai: yaha: hota:, to tum e:sa: na kahate!' (If my brother had been here, you would not have said so (but unfortunately he is not here).)

(iv) presumptive, expressing a presumed certainty or probability; for example, 'vah ja:ta: hoqar' (He must be going).

(Talking of the imperative mood, Sharma says that it may have present and future forms. He admits that all imperative forms refer specifically to future, but he makes the above distinction on a formal basis. There is a notional distinction also. While one refers to near future, the other refers to distant future; for example, 'tu: ja:' ((thou) go), and 'tu: ja:na:' ((thou) go (in distant future)).

About the imperative forms of the present Sharma says that with the second person singular the bare root is used; for example, 'parh' (read (thou)); with the second person plural 'o' is appended to the root; for example, (tum)'parho' ((you) Read); with the second person honorific pronoun 'aip' 'iye' is appended to the root; for example, (aip)'a:iye' (Please come).
About the future forms of the imperative he says they are identical with the infinitive forms; for example, 'tu vahā: na jaːnāː' (thou should not go there), 'tum shaːm ko na jaːnāː' (You should not go in the evening). The polite future imperative is said to be made by adding 'qaː:' to the honorific forms; for example, 'aːp kal jaːiegaː' (kindly go tomorrow). There is an exceptional (exclamatory) imperative, denoting emergency, danger, warning etc., which is said to be formed by adding 'iyo' to the root; for example, 'doRiyol aːg laqiː' (Run, fire has broken out!). Such a form is said to be used mainly in calling for help, and is addressed to all persons within hearing, but it is also said to be archaic or dialectal.

Besides the above imperative forms to be used with the second person, Sharma also refers to the forms to be used with the first and third persons. He says that these so-called imperative forms are really subjunctive (optative).

The indicative mood does not seem to have any distinct form. Whatever forms the verbal group takes in this mood are the forms of other categories like tense, number, person, gender etc. This is evident from the following statement: "The indicative forms of a verb either represent the action etc., as a fact or make a query about it. These forms can be of any of the six tenses, and of any number, person and gender." (1972:87) It is these categories that are discussed under the indicative.
As with other moods, Sharma first talks about the function of the subjunctive mood, and then of its form. He says: "The subjunctive mood is a form of verb which represents the action not as a reality, but as a wish, hope, command, requirement, possibility, probability, presumption, condition etc. It represents, in short, the action or state as a conception of the mind rather than a reality. (Curme)" (1972:101).

Sharma believes that the subjunctive has eight forms in Hindi which can be divided into three groups, representing three tenses: present, past and future. It is said of the tenses of this mood that they do not define the time (of the occurrence of an action) as clearly as do the tenses of the indicative. But the eight forms can also be divided into the following four groups:

(i) Those expressing (mainly) wish, desire, requirement,

(ii) Those expressing possibility,

(iii) Those expressing probability or presumed certainty,

(iv) Those referring to a condition which is contrary to fact.

The meanings of the above groups are said to be not mutually exclusive, but often overlapping. The above groups are obviously notional. The eight forms referred to above are given below. For the sake of illustration they are the forms of the verb 'a,' (come):
The groups according to the tenses:

(i) Present - aita: ho, aita: hoga:, aita:, aita: hota:
(ii) Past - a:ya: ho, a:ya: hoga:, a:ya: hota:
(iii) Future - a:e

The above forms are now shown in the four groups, referred to above:

(i) wish, requirement etc. - a:e (optative)
(ii) possibility - a:ta: ho, a:ya: ho (potential)
(iii) probability - a:ta: hoga:, a:ya: hoga: (presumptive)
(iv) condition - a:ta:, a:ta: hota:, a:ya: hota:
   (contingent, contrary to fact)

(1972:101-102)

Sharma rejects what some grammarians treat as first and third person imperatives, as they are said to be identical in form with the subjunctive. But he forgets that the second person plural imperative is also so; for example, 'jaio' (go), 'shayad tum jaio' (You may go), 'ka:sh tum jaio' (I wish you would go) etc. Here Sharma seeks the help of meaning to distinguish the imperative from the subjunctive. He says that there is a clear difference between the meaning of the imperative 'khaio' (eat), and that of the optative, 'achhe ho jai:o' (I wish you would get well). But the same kind of distinction is not made between the Honorific imperative and the optative. One could distinguish on the same lines between
the imperative 'aip vahā: na jaie' ((you) don't go there) on
the one hand, and the subjunctive 'shayad aip vahā: na jaie' (You may not go there), and 'kaish aip vahā: na jaie' (I wish
you would not go there), on the other.

The potential forms are said to be made by combining the
present and the past participles of the main verb with the
forms of 'ho', as 'me: a:ta: hoū:', 'ham a:te hō', 'vah
a:ya: ho' etc.

Sharma says that in most of the grammars the optative
form has been treated as the future form of the potential and
the optative mood has been completely ignored. Its function
has been assigned to the imperative. He does not approve of
such a treatment.

The presumptive forms are said to be made by combining the
present or the past participle forms of the main verb with the
future forms of 'ho'; for example, 'mē: a:ta: hoū:ga:' (I may be
coming), 'mē: a:ya: hoū:ga:' etc. (I may have come.)

Even the simple future is said to be used as the future
presumptive sometimes. 'vah ja:ega:' (He will go), if pronounced
with a slight emphasis or/2, may denote 'he is sure to go',
or 'he must go'. It is treated in this case as a presumptive.
The simple future forms of the root 'ho' are also treated as
the present presumptive; for example, 'vah baRa: vidwa:n hoga:'
(He may be a great scholar.)
Finally, what is called 'contingent' is said to be formed by the present participle and also by combining the present and the past participles of the main verb with the present participle of 'ho'; for example, 'yadi vah a:ta:, to mē; usakah:ta:' (Had he come, I would have told him), 'yadi tum pāṛhāte hote, to pā: ho ja:te' (If you had been studying, you would have passed) etc.

Acharya Ranachandra Verma (1965): Since Verma's grammar is mainly a pedagogical one, he follows the tradition in respect of mood, and distinguishes five moods in Hindi like others. Defining mood as the speaker's attitude (vṛitti), he says that it may be of different kinds as certainty, doubt, possibility, etc. The moods he distinguishes are 'sambhāvārtha', 'sandehārtha', 'āgyārtha', 'sanketārtha' and 'nishcayārtha' (p.120). The markers of these moods are the same as given in Kamata Prasad Guru, except that he mixes future with 'sanketārtha' in a sentence like 'yadi parishram karoge to pa: ho ja:oge' (If you work hard, you will pass.), Verma treats it as an instance of 'sanketārtha', as 'sanketārtha' for him is conditional, including both real and unreal conditions. Some grammarians like Guru treat 'ga' as a future-tense marker. In this case Verma's criteria are not clear. He seems to follow notional criteria more than formal ones.
that Hindi has the following four moods: (1) 'nishcayairtha prakair', (2) aigyairstha prakair, (3) sambhavaistanairtha prakair and (4) sanketairstha prakair.

'nishcayairtha prakair' is said to have no overt form. It has only different tense forms. It is mainly used for statements of fact. It thus seems to be the indicative mood which other grammarians have also acknowledged. It is generally treated as formally unmarked.

'aigyairstha prakair' is said to indicate command, request, warning, advice, permission etc., and to be related to the second person singular or plural, as the action is to be performed by him. It, therefore, has only second person forms. The imperatives with the first person and third person are said to be identical with 'sambhavaistanathak prakair'. The second person singular form is said to be identical with the root of the verb; for example, 'tu ja:' (thou go), but the second person singular (honorific) and the second person plural forms are said to be identical with the person-number markers; for example, 'tuml ja:c (you go), 'aip ja:iye' (you go), 'aip ja:iyega' (you go).

+Hon.

Diemshitz makes a factual mistake when he says that the roots with 'o' at the end; for example, 'bo', 'dho', 'ho', etc., have identical forms with the second person singular and plural, and that the regular rule of adding 'o' to the root with the
second person plural is not followed in these cases. We are sure 'tum bo', 'tum dho' etc., are not acceptable as (+pl) correct forms in Modern Hindi. In fact even here it is necessary to add 'o' as we can see from the acceptable instances, such as, 'tum, yahā: a:lu: boo' (You, sew potato here), 'tum, yah kamiːz dhoo' (You, wash this shirt.)

Similarly, forms like 'aːiyo', 'jaːiyo', 'likhiyo' etc., are also not quite acceptable with the second person honorific, as Diemshitz seems to think. He thinks that 'iyo' is used to indicate command, request or desire to be carried out in future; for example, 'betaː, khush rahiyo' (so, be happy). This dialectal form is still there in modern Hindi, but more regular forms are 'betaː khush rahō', or 'betaː khush rahanaː'. Other examples given by Diemshitz in this respect, such as '*tum, aːj mere yahāː aːiyo' (You, come to my place today.); *jaː, lekin jaldiː aːiyo' (go, but come soon); *bhaːgavān tumko swastha rakhīyo' (God may keep you healthy!) etc., are all unacceptable. In fact 'iyo' with the final vowel nasalized is prevalent only in some dialects of Hindi, such as Braj, but modern Hindi has replaced this form with naː form for distant future command, request etc. Instead of 'tum ː vahāː jaːiyo' a Hindi speaker today will say 'tum ː vahāː jaːnaː'. 'naːs jāːp'
forms are surely less polite with the second person honorific, but that is not their primary function. They are used primarily for commands or requests to be carried out in distant future. That is why some Hindi grammarians treat them as forms of the future or indirect imperative.

'Sambhavanairtha prakāśa' is said to be of four kinds: 'saṁmaṁya', 'apuśna jaTil', 'purNa jaTil', and 'saśatya bodhak'. The forms of 'saṁmaṁya prakāśa' are made by adding number-person suffixes to the root of the verb, such as 'mē: parhū', 'ham parhē', 'tum parho' etc. The number-person markers are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First person</td>
<td>u;</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second person</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third person</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ē</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 'apuśNa jaTil prakāśa' is formed by adding the 'saṁmaṁya prakāśa' forms of the verb 'hona:' (to be) to the present participle form of any verb; for example, 'mē: paṁhēta: hōū' (I may be reading); 'ham paṁhētē hōē' (We may be reading); 'tum paṁhētē hōo' (You may be reading) etc.

The 'purNa jaTil prakāśa' is alternatively formed by adding the 'saṁmaṁya prakāśa' forms of the verb 'hona:' to the past participle form of the verb; for example, 'mē: paṁhē: hōū'.
(I may have read); 'ham paRhe hoo' (We may have read); 'tum paRhe hoo' (You may have read) etc.

The sa:titya boohak is formed by adding the 'sa:mainya prakair' forms of the verb 'hona:' to the honorific progressive of the verb; for example, 'me: paRh raha: hou:' (I may be reading.); 'ham paRh rahe hoo' (We may be reading.); 'tum paRh rahe hoo (You may be reading.), etc.

Lastly, 'sanketa:rttha prakair' is also said to be of four kinds: 'sama:nya', 'apu:na jaTil', 'pu:na jaTil', and 'sa:titya bodhak'. The 'sama:nya prakair' is identical with the present participle form of the verb; for example, 'me: paRhata:' (I would have read), 'ham paRhata' (We would have read), 'tum paRhata' (You would have read). The 'apu:na jaTil prakair' is formed by adding the 'sama:nya prakair' forms of 'hona:' to the present participle form of the verb; for example, 'me: paRhata: hota:' (I would have been reading), 'ham paRhata: hota' (We would have been reading), 'tum paRhata: hota' (You would have been reading). The 'pu:na jaTil prakair' is formed by adding the 'sama:nya prakair' forms of 'hona:' to the past participle form of the verb; for example, 'me:ne paRha: hota:' (I would have read), 'hamne paRha: hota:' (We would have read), 'tumne paRha: hota:' (You would have read).

The 'sa:titya bodhak prakair' is formed by adding the 'sama:nya prakair' forms of 'hona:' to the non-finite progressive form of
the verb; for example, 'mē: pāṛh raha: hota:' (I would have been reading), 'ham pāṛh hahe hote' (We would have been reading), 'tum pāṛh rahe hote' (You would have been reading).

Forms with 'ga:' and 'hoga:', which some grammarians treat as the forms of a distinct mood, called 'sandehaśrthā', Diemshitz treats as the forms of the future tense. Like moods, he divides the future tense also into four classes: 'pratham bhavishyat' (the first future), 'dwiṭīya bhavishyat' (the second future), 'tritiṭya bhavishyat' (the third future), and 'saśātṣṭya bodhak bhavishyat' (the future progressive).

The first future is formed by adding 'ga:' to the different person-number forms of the verb; for example, 'mē: pāṛhūga:' (I shall read), 'ham pāṛhege' (We shall read), 'tum pāṛhoqe' (You will read) etc. But the first future forms of the verb 'hōna:' are said to have some peculiar features. They are used not only to refer to future time, but also to indicate possibility, doubt, conjecture, uncertainty etc.; for example, 'usakī: umrā biṣ saisāl ki: hōgi:' (He may be twenty); 'vah aśpmka: beta: hoga:' (He may be your son) etc.

Like moods, the second, third and progressive forms of the future tense are said to be formed by adding 'hoga:' to the present participle, past participle, and progressive forms of the verb respectively; for example, 'mē: pāṛhata: hūga:' (the
Yamuna Kachru (1966): Kachru distinguishes three aspects and five tenses in Hindi. There is no mention of any moods, but she mentions two modals: 'sak' and 'cuk'. Nevertheless, the tenses distinguished by her look like tense-moods, as they include modal categories like presumptive, contingent etc., in them. They are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Contingent</th>
<th>Past Contingent</th>
<th>Presumptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>= he;</td>
<td>= tha;</td>
<td>= ho</td>
<td>= hota;</td>
<td>= hoga;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The aspects recognized are imperfective (-ta:), perfective (-ya:) and durative (-raha:).

Kachru has dropped her earlier scheme of tense-mood in a book of Hindi grammar that she is shortly bringing out. The manuscript of the book, which we have read, shows that she now distinguishes three tenses in Hindi, namely present, past and future. She has rejected 'cuk' as a modal, and has included 'par', 'ca:hiiye', etc., along with 'sak' among modal elements. About 'ca:hiiye' she thinks it may be an independent lexical verb, as in a sentence like 'tumhē ca:hiiye kī tum apne mā:i-bā:p
ki: seva: karō' (You should serve your parents). *She thinks* that traditional classes of moods like 'nishcayairtha', 'agyairtha', 'sambhavairtha', 'sandehairtha' and 'sanketairtha' may still be relevant to the structure of the Hindi verbal group. One cannot obviously go into more details at this stage when the book is not yet out of the press.

**Kalicharan Bahl (1967):** Discussing the classes of the finite verb in Hindi, Bahl presents the following list of 22 tense forms of the finite verbs. They are based on the root 'ja:'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>gaya: hota:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>gaya: hoga:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>gaya: ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>gaya: tha:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>gaya: he:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>gaya:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>ja:ta: hota:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>ja:ta: hoga:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>ja:ta: ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>ja:ta: tha:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>ja:ta: he:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>ja:ta:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>ja:na: hota:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>ja:na: hoga:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>ja:na: ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>ja:na: tha:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>ja:na: he:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>ja:na:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>ja:iega:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>ja:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>ja:iega:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>ja:e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bahl believes that the primary opposition in the system is of *aspect* versus non-aspect. He also adds a set of six infinitive tenses (13 to 18) to the set of 16 tense forms.
presented by Guru. As aspect versus non-aspect is the primary dimension, he treats 1 to 12 as aspectual and (19) to (22) as non-aspectual tenses. (1) to (6) are based on +perfective, while (7) to (12) on -perfective. (19) to (22) are said to be purely modal tenses, and (13) to (18) neither aspectual nor modal, but indicative tenses, as they indicate likelihood of the happening of an event without any commitment as to whether the event has taken place or not. (1) and (7) are further identified as tenses indicating status. Bahl defines status as follows: "The category of status represents an event as a counter-factual statement in the form of a condition or as a consequence of a condition." (1967:249)

In the rules relating to verbal categories, he gives the following rules that explicitly relate to mood:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{[-status]} & \text{[+mood]} \\
&\text{[+Mood]} & \text{[+presumptive]} \\
&\text{[-Mood]} & \text{[+Tense]} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Later, he also says that the categories that are -Indicative are all +Mood only, and that all +Mood categories indicate the speaker's viewpoint about the narrative event and its participants. The rules relating to -Indicative are as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{[-Indicative]} & \text{[+Injunctive]} \\
&\text{[+Injunctive]} & \text{[+Hortative]} \\
&\text{[-Injunctive]} & \text{[+Presumptive]} \\
\end{align*}
\]
+Presumptive indicates the participation of the subject-noun in the narrated event as an assumed certainty versus - Presumptive that indicates that the participation of the subject-noun is an assumption without any element of certainty.

+Injunctive indicates that the narrated event is imposed on the performer by the speaker. +Hortative indicates that the imposition of an event is an appeal or request, while -Hortative indicates command. We are confining ourselves here strictly to the categories and features that have bearing on mood.

Bahl rejects the traditional future tense. He says: "The dimension of time (or tense) is limited to distinguishing between past versus non-past as a significant feature, and the future is not such a category in the system". (1967:245) The main argument that he gives is that there is no particular tense-ending which contains reference to future time exclusively. The so-called future ending can indicate a past or a present event, as in 'tum jua: kheloge, charas pi:øge', 'gāiye ki; dam laqaiøge, magar a:ye kisake ghar se'. (You would gamble, smoke charas and marijuana but from where should all this money come?), 'banaøege cinema ke poster, e:xr ba:tē karēngē studio ki:' (You would make cinema posters and talk of studio). The so-called contingent future may have a reference to past time. Bahl treats them as modal categories. (22) is also treated as a modal category, as whatever reference to time it has, is purely accidental. Temporal reference is believed
to be accidental to the category of mood. But (1) and (7) are not regarded as modal tenses, even though they are said to represent an event which is contrary to what is expressed, and the reference to past or non-past time is said to be an accidental feature of the environment. The reason given is the following: "The fulfilment or non-fulfilment of a condition or a consequence of a condition should be distinguished from the speaker's opinion about the relationship between an event and its performer (i.e., the category of mood). In other words, the use of the tenses (1) and (7) is limited to counterfactual statements which are quite different opinions expressed by the speaker of a sentence." (1967:248) They are treated as cases of the category of status which is said "to represent an event as a counterfactual statement in the form of a condition or as a consequence of a condition". (1967:249).

Bahl believes that the whole system of the grammatical categories of the finite verb is based on four primitives, namely, the speech event versus narrated event, and the participant of the speech event versus the participant of the narrated event. Mood categories are said to indicate the speaker's viewpoint about the narrated event and its participants.

About the contrast +presumptive versus -presumptive Bahl says that besides differing in the degree of certainty involved
in the assumption about the happening of a narrated event, it also implies a certain reference to the time of its happening in *perfective aspect*. For example, 'kal rast me patte footpath se ur kar si:Rhiyā par a: Thahre hōge' (The leaves must have flown away and settled down on the steps last night). 'Mā:la: ki: mi:Thi: bā:t se lag raha: thais jaise hama:re apāne hi: halke ka: koi: bētakalluf dost kuch dino ke liye hama:re yahā: a: Thahre: ho oCr usāki: ba:ri: si: ga:ri: hama:re darvaze ke sa:īmne kha:ri: ho! (From Mala's sweet words it appeared as if an intimate friend from our own area had come and stayed with us for a few days and his big car had been standing in front of our gate).

Both 'a: Thahre hōge' and 'a: Thahre: hō' in the above sentences are said to imply non-termination of the event, but differ from each other in terms of the taking place of the event in the remote past versus in the proximate past. (p.262)

Bahl distinguishes mood from tense by saying that the former is compatible with *aspect tenses*, but the latter is limited to *aspect* and *indicative* tenses only. He does not consider the expression of an opinion by means of mood and the statement of a fact by means of tense to be two mutually contradictory oppositions. In his view mood versus tense represents a simple continuous dimension with two extremes in the *aspect* and *indicative* tenses.
Chaturbhuj Sahay (1968): Sahay mentions the forms of the Hindi verb that indicate 'vrtti' i.e., the speaker's attitude, but he does not distinguish moods as such in Hindi. According to vrtti he divides verbs into the following classes: 'vidhi', 'sambhavana', 'shart' and 'sanket'. These correspond only partly to the traditional moods. 'Vidhi' looks like 'asya:rytha', including both direct and indirect imperatives, but forms with 'ca:hiye' are also treated as instances of 'vidhi'. 'Sambhavana' includes instances of both 'sambha:vyartha' and 'sandehartha'. Shart does not neatly correspond to 'sanketa:rytha', which includes only cases of unreal condition. 'Shart' has also cases of real condition. Lastly, 'sanket' has numerous kinds of verb forms in it, such as 'khelata: rahe', 'sunata hota:', 'ja:na: pa:Rata:', 'cali:' etc. It does not seem to correspond to what is generally called 'sanketa:rytha'. Sahay also mentions what suffixes each 'vrtti' takes, but we do not find distinct markers for each 'vrtti' in it. While 'e' is said to be the marker of both 'vidhi', and 'sanket', 'ui' is said to be the marker of both 'shart' and 'sanket'. There are some other cases of such overlap also.

Murlidhar Srivastava (1969): Srivastava follows tradition in the matter of tense and mood. Referring to Kellogg he says that in all 15 tenses are formed in Hindi. They can be arranged in three groups on the basis of their
construction and special features. Of these 15 tenses three are formed by the root and the remaining twelve by participles, combined in all the tenses but two with an auxiliary verb. He further says that Hindi has 3 tenses - present, past and future, but these three are of several varieties. He uses the term 'tense' in a general sense. The tenses include the moods also. The scheme of the tenses is exactly the same as presented in Kellogg. In spite of his detailed scheme of tenses Kellogg distinguishes four moods, but Srivastava does not distinguish any moods as separate from tenses.

Herman Hendrik Van Olphen (1970): Van Olphen also treats tense-mood as one category like many other Hindi grammarians, but his classification of verbal categories is different. He distinguishes five tense-moods, namely present, past, presumptive, subjunctive and conditional. In this scheme presumptive, subjunctive and conditional seem to correspond to 'sandha:rtha', 'sambha:vana:rtha' and 'sanketa:rtha'. The other two: 'nishcaya:rtha' and 'a:gya:rtha' are, of course, not there, but 'a:gya:rtha' is treated separately as the imperative having four classes, namely familiar, neutral, polite and extra-polite. Their markers are given below:

**Imperatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) familiar</td>
<td>( V_oo )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) neutral</td>
<td>( V_nea )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The tense-moods are said to follow the aspectual markers which are said to be five in number. The Hindi verbal is analysed as follows:

(a) Verbal $\rightarrow$ MV + Aux

The element Aux consists of modals and other auxiliaries.

(b) MV $\rightarrow$ V + ATM

The ATM element contains those elements of the verb which determine its aspect, mood, and tense.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATM</th>
<th>P (q GN)</th>
<th>Future (Subjunctive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td>Imperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rah</td>
<td>y GN + kart</td>
<td>Progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iterative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) TM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(tense/mood: hoo marker)</th>
<th>p q GN</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>GN</td>
<td>Presumptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conditional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GN = Gender-Number
P = Person.
Besides the tense-moods shown above Van Olphen distinguishes three modals in Hindi, namely 'sakna:' (be able to), 'pa nå: (manage to) and 'cukna:' (finish). He treats them as auxiliaries. He believes that like other auxiliaries they cannot occur without the main verb, not even with a verbal ellipsis (1970:215).

Some restrictions regarding the co-occurrence of aspect and tense-mood are also indicated. For instance, it is said that 'the tense-mood is obligatorily deleted in the imperfect conditional' (1970:4) Van Olphen thinks that '(agar) a:dmii: roTi: kha:ta: ...' (If the man had eaten bread ...) is acceptable, and '(agar) a:dmii: roTi: kha:ta: hota:' (if the man had been eating bread) is not. But that is not true. Both the sentences make good sense and are quite acceptable. So the restriction he imposes does not seem to be there. Similarly, he does not put the conditional tense-mood form with the iterative aspect, as in '(agar) a:dmii: roTi: kha:ya: karata: ...' (if the man had been eating bread) thinking that the same restriction exists here. But in this case also no such restriction exists, as '(agar) a:dmii: roTi kha:ya: karata: hota:' (if the man had been eating bread) is a perfectly good sentence.

Besides the above aspect and tense-mood categories Van Olphen also distinguishes 'future' as a separate category with two classes: 'future' and 'future subjunctive'. The future
seems to be marked with 'ga' as in 'a:dami: roTi: kha:ega:'; (the man will eat bread) but the future subjunctive seems to have no explicit markers. Here the root of the verb takes the person-number marker as in '(sha:yad) a:dami: roTi kha:e' (Perhaps) the man will eat bread.) This future subjunctive is also listed as one of the aspects as we have shown above.

Sudha Kalra (1971): Sudha Kalra does not deviate from the tradition in treating tense and mood together. Modal distinctions like 'sambhālvan:artha', 'sandeha:ārtha', 'agārtha' etc. figure in her table of tenses. What others call 'nischaya:ārtha' she calls 'vidhā:nartha'. The classes are the following:

1. bhūt vidhā:nartha
   
   vah cala: hO
   (He may have walked.)

2. bhūt sambhālva:na:ṣṭara
   
   vah cala: ho
   (He may have walked.)

3. bhūt sandeha:ārtha
   
   vah cala: hoga:
   (He must have walked.)

4. bhūt sanketa:ṣṭara
   
   vah cala: hota:
   (He would have been walking.)

5. vartama:ṇ vidhā:nartha
   
   vah cala: he:
   (He walks.)
vah cala: he:
(He has walked.)

(6) vartama: sambha:vana:thra vah cala: ha
(He may be walking.)

(7) vartama: sandeha:thra
vah cala: hoga:
(He may be walking.)

(8) vartama: sanketa:thra
vah cala:
(He would have walked.)

(9) vartama: a:gya:thra
tu cal
((thou) walk.)

tum calo
((you) walk.)

ve/aip calē
((He/you) walk.)
thon.

(10) vartama: anumatya:thi:
me: calū:
(I may walk.)

(11) bhavishya vidha:narthi:
me: calū:ga:
(I shall walk.)

(12) bhavishya sambha:vana:thi:
(shayad) me: calū:
(I may go.)

(13) bhavishya a:gya:thi:
tu calma:
((thou) walk.)

tum calma:
((you) walk.)

(14) bhavishya a:gya:thi:
aip caliye ga:
((you) please walk.)
Kalra does not say whether this classification is notional or formal. Although various categories remain distinct, some like 'vartama:n anumatyārthi' and 'bhavishya sambha:vanaːrthi' overlap.

**Mc Gregor (1972):** Discussing verb structure and concord, McGregor says that certain modal suffixes appear in subjunctive and imperative forms. He adds that forms of the verb 'hona:' are used with participles as auxiliaries of tense and mood. He distinguishes three tenses: present, past and future. Future forms of 'hona:' are said to be used often to express presumptions. Subjunctive forms are said to characterize actions as possible, desired or desirable, hypothetical, subject to some doubt, etc., rather than as objectively realized or envisaged. They are said to be represented by the following suffixes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sing.</th>
<th>Pl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First person</td>
<td>Ṛ</td>
<td>ḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second person</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third person</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ē</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

McGregor does not present an explicit system of moods. Even subjunctive and imperative that are distinguished as moods by other grammarians are presented by him as different kinds of forms. But he regard these forms (i.e. suffixes) as realizations of different moods. Different kinds of imperative
forms are discussed, for example, the suffix 'o' occurs with 'tum', 'iye' with 'a:pi', 'na:' with 'tum' for expressing sudden or urgent command, and 'iyega:' with 'a:pi' for requests or commands that do not require immediate compliance, but relate to future time. He does not distinguish any mood for accounting for unreal conditions in sentences like 'agar tum samay par pahūc jaite to tumhē ga:Ri: mil ja:ti:' (If you had reached on time you would have caught the train.) The suffix 'ta:' here is treated only as a suffix of the imperative participle.

Since McGregor has written a teaching grammar meant for foreign learners of Hindi he has not bothered much about the theoretical problem of identifying and classifying moods in Hindi. Nevertheless, he seems to be quite aware of the modal function of certain forms.

N.V. Rajagopalan (1973): In his Transformational Generative Grammar of Hindi, Rajagopalan distinguishes three main elements that affect the form of the verb. They are 'kāl' (tense), 'vritti' (mood), and 'paksha' or 'prakāsa' (aspect). By 'vritti' he means the speaker's attitude towards what is said. Assertion, doubt, questioning, denying, wishing, guessing, commanding, requesting etc., are said to be different vrittis. Some vrittis are represented by verbal forms, while others by non-verbal means.
The following are said to be the vrittis of Hindi:

(1) nishcaya vritti (lack of doubt) - a:ya: tha:, a:ta: he:, a:yega:, a:ne vaila: he:

(2) a:gya: or vidhi - a:o, a:iye, a:e, a:na:

(3) icha: - a:e, a:ui, a:o

(4) anugya: -do-

(5) anunaya -do-

(6) sambhavana: -do-

(7) hetumadvritti - a:te, a:ta:

It is said that (3), (4), (5) and (6) are realized by the same form. Even (2) is said to be realized by the same form, except in the case of 'a:iye' and 'a:na:'. Forms like 'a:iye' is sometimes used like (3) as in Urdu 'kya: ki:jije' would mean 'kya: karē' (What shall we do?)

Rajagopalan then looks closely at the 'nishcaya vritti' and finds that except 'a:ya:' form it is formed by putting two 'vrittis' together; for example,

a:ta: he: - hetumadvritti: 'a:ta:' + ichchadi: he:

a:yega: - ichha:di vritti: 'a:e' + 'ga:'

He then discusses the structure of the auxiliary. It is presented as follows:
prakār suṣṭak ruṣp + vṛtti suṣṭak = kail suṣṭak ruṣp

(a)  (aspectual form)   

ruṣp

(modal form)

(tense form)

a:ta: + | he: | = a:ta: he:
| |  
| | thā: | a:ta: thā: 
|  
| ho | a:ta: ho

a:ya: 

| he: | = a:ya: he: 
|  
| thā: | a:ya: thā: 
|  
| ho | a:ya: ho

(b)  vṛtti suṣṭak + prakār suṣṭak = kail suṣṭak

ruṣp

(modal form)

ruṣp

(aspectual form)

ruṣp

(tense form)

a:u: + ga: a:u:ga:

a:e + ge a:e ge

It should be noticed that Rajgopalan treats 'qa' as an aspectual, not a tense marker.

A critique

We have so far only presented the views of some prominent grammarians of Hindi on modality and mood in Hindi. If we now look at them for a critical review we can easily abstract from them the following three main positions:
(1) There are a number of moods in Hindi based on the form of the verb, such as 'nishcayārtha', 'sandehārtha', 'sanbhaivanārtha', 'aigyaārtha' and 'sanketaārtha'. Some grammarians use the English nomenclature for them, such as, indicative, subjunctive, conditional, presumptive, imperative etc. The number of moods distinguished by different grammarians, of course, vary.

(2) The category of mood is not independent. It occurs in conjunction with tense. The category thus appropriately called is tense-mood. Hindi has a number of tense-moods.

(3) Hindi has no moods whatsoever. It has only a system of modal verbs.

Let us look at the first position and see whether there is any case for the moods that are proposed for Hindi. To begin with 'nishcayārtha', we may say that it is like the indicative mood of English grammar which is supposed to be unmarked in opposition to other marked moods within the system. Like the indicative, 'nishcayārtha' could also be called the neutral mood. But its existence obviously depends on the moods with which it is supposed to be in opposition. Let us therefore first look at those moods and see if they are there. There are said to be 'sambhaivanārtha', 'sandehārtha', 'sanketaārtha' and 'aigyaārtha'.
These are the moods, put forward by Guru and supported by several other grammarians of Hindi.

Guru treats the following as the cases of 'sambhavananartha': 'vah calata: ho' (He may be walking), 'vah cala: ho' (He may have walked) and 'vah cale: ' (He may have walk ), but does not clearly indicate what the marker of the above mood is in all these constructions. If we look at the verbal endings we find the root 'ho' in the first two without any marking, and the root 'cal' (walk) marked for number-person with 'e' in 'cale'. The verbal groups in the first two sentences are complex, each having 'ho' and an aspectual form (perfective/imperfective) of the verb 'cal', while that in the third sentence is simple having only 'cal' (walk) with the person-number marker. Such verbal groups have been identified by Diemshitz as different kinds of 'sambhavananartha prakār' (Diemshitz uses 'prakār' for 'artha'). They are 'sa:mainya', 'apūrNa jaTil', 'purNa jaTil' and 'sa:tatya bodhak'. The sentences cited above are the examples of 'apūrNa jaTil', 'purNa jaTil' and 'sa:mainya' respectively. The examples of 'sa:tatya bodhak' is 'vah cal raha: ho' (He may be walking), 'purNa', 'apūrNa' and 'sa:tatya' are in fact different kinds of aspect that figure in the verbal group. Where there is no aspect marker, the verbal group is treated as the case of 'sa:mainya'. But it must be clear that 'purNa', 'apūrNa' and 'sa:tatya' are not kinds of 'sambhavananartha' but of the category called 'aspect'. They only occur in
conjunction with 'sambha:vana:rtha'. 'Sambha:vana:rtha' thus cannot be present in forms like 'calata:', 'calas:' and 'cal rahas:' as in all of them the root 'cal' has different aspect markers. So, one may have to look for it in 'ho' and 'cale' which are the terminal entities in the verbal groups. But there is an obvious discrepancy between them, as while 'cale' is marked for number-person, 'ho' is the bare root of the verb 'hona:'. Besides, 'ho' is treated by some grammarians as a mere auxiliary and 'cal' with 'e' as a lexical verb. Let us see whether such a discrepancy really exists.

Look at the following table:

(1) vah cal ta: ho
(2) vah cal a: ho
(3) vah cal raha: ho
(4) vah cal e

For the moment we shall treat 'ta:', 'a:', and 'raha:' as aspect markers, as many grammarians have done. The question now is that if 'ho' is an auxiliary representing 'sambha:vana:rtha', we cannot account for 'cale', which is also supposed to be in the same mood, as 'cale' does not have 'ho' with it. That makes the position of 'ho' as a mood marker a bit doubtful. Another question is whether 'ho' does not take any suffix when it is supposed to mark 'sambha:vana:rtha'. It is not altogether true that it never takes any. If we replace
the third person with the first person subject 'me:', the suffix becomes obligatory, as in the following sentences:

(5) mē: cal ta: ho ū;
(6) mē: cal a: ho ū;
(7) mē: cal raha: ho ū;
(8) mē: cal ū;

(5) to (8) show absolute regularity in respect of the suffix which is missing in (1) to (4). Such discrepancy is there only in modern Hindi where the person-number suffix with 'ho' is obligatory only in case the first person is the subject. With other persons the usage varies in this respect. While some may use even in standard Hindi expressions like 'vah cala: ho(v)e', 'ham cala: ho(v)e', 've cala: ho(v)e' etc., others may use only bare 'ho' in all these sentences. That is to say, even when the subjects are second and third persons, the person-number suffix may be added to it 'ho' optionally. But it is worth noticing that 'is throughout obligatory in Braj, one of the major dialects of Hindi, for example:

u1/vo cala: ho
u1/vo cala: ho
u1/vo cal rahyo ho

We can thus see that person-number markers are present with all verbs, including 'ho', in the above context of
'sambha:vanartha'. They are deleted only in certain situations in 'KhaRī: bolī', or Standard Hindi, especially when the second and third person subjects occur with 'ho'. One can now clearly see that it is this person-number marker that marks the so-called 'sambha:vanartha', not 'ho', as is mistakenly supposed by some grammarians.

Our next question is what exactly is the status of 'ho' in (1) to (3). It seems to be a stative verb that belongs to the matrix sentence. 'calata: ho', 'cala: ho' and 'cal raha: ho' are thus not simple but complex verb phrases resulting from the verbal groups of two independent sentences. Diemshitz rightly treats them as 'jaTīl' (complex) verb phrases, but he does not show the genesis of them. Underlying the surface structures of (1) to (3) may be the following deep structures:

(1) S
   /   
  NP   VP
   /     
  N   S   V
  /     
 yah  vah calatā: he:/tha: hoe

(2) S
   /   
  NP   VP
   /     
  N   S   V
  /     
 yah  vah cala: he:/tha: hoe

(3) S
   /   
  NP   VP
   /     
  N   S   V
  /     
 yah  vah cal raha: hoe
  he:/tha:
Notice, the complement S in any of the above cases can take either the present or the past tense. It depends on the preceding context in the discourse. If A went to see B and even got no response when he knocked hard at his door, A might account for the lack of response in the following ways: (i) It may be the case that B was not in the room, or (ii) It may be the case that B was sleeping fast. In Hindi one might say (i) "(sha:yad) yah ho(e) ki vah kamære me nahi: tha:' or '(sha:yad) yah ho(e) ki vah gahari: niid mē so raha: tha:'.

The above statements each of which is constituted of two distinct sentences (or, one may say, clauses) may also be presented in the following form. (iii) '(sha:yad) vah kamære mē nahi: ho(e)' (He may not be in his room), and (iv) '(sha:yad) vah gahari: niid mē so raha: ho(e)' (He may be fast asleep).

If, on the other hand, the preceding context is of the present time the same sentences i.e. (1) 'vah kamære mē nahi: ho(e)' and (2) 'vah gahari: niid me so raha: ho(e)' will have a different sense. That will depend on the underlying sentences having the non-past tense in the complement S; for example, if A goes to see B and gets no response from him even when he knocks hard at the door, he may account for it by saying: (v) '(sha:yad) yah ho(e) ki vah kamære mē nahi: he:' (It may be the case that he is not in his room), or (vi) '(sha:yad) yah ho(e) ki vah gahari: niid mē so raha: he:' (It may be the case that he is sleeping fast.)
The above analysis is applicable to every case of the so-called 'sambha\textsuperscript{Vana}rtha' where 'ho' occurs as a terminal element in the verb phrase. It shows two things: (1) 'ho' is an independent verb, not an auxiliary here, and (2) the cases with 'ho' and without 'ho' such as 'calata: ho(e)' and 'cale' are absolutely identical in the deep structure as far the person-number marking is concerned. The status of 'ho' as an independent verb is also proved by the following set of sentences:

vah gussa: ho; kya: e:sa: nahi: ho sakta:?
(He may be angry; can't it be so?)

vah mar gaya: ho; kya: e:sa: nahi: ho sakta:?
(He may be dead; can't it be so?)

vah mar raha: ho; kya: e:sa: nahi: ho sakta:?
(He may be dying; can't it be so?)

Each of the above sentences has two propositions, the inner which puts forward something as a fact, and the outer which qualifies or modalizes it. This is clear from the tag question 'kya: e:sa: nahi: ho sakta:' where the complement 'e:sa:' is pro S standing for the inner proposition in every case, and the question relates to the outer proposition whose main verb is 'ho'. In fact in the first sentence it looks independent even at the surface as no other verb precedes it, as happens in the
other two cases. Such cases are also functionally identical as they both denote possibility which is a certain kind of modality. But now the crucial question is what the exact formal marker of this modality is. It turns out to be only the person-number marker where there is a concord between the subject and the verb, or the neutralized kind of third person singular number suffix where there is no concord, as in 'use bukha:r ho(e)' (He may have fever), 'mujhe bukha:r ho(e)' (I may have fever). There is no concord between the subject and the verb in Hindi if the subject is in an oblique case form. In that case all person-number markers get neutralized to the third-person singular marker.

There is thus really no case for distinguishing a separate formal category called 'sambha:vana:rtha' simply because certain verbal groups denote the sense of possibility. It seems to be based on purely notional criteria which we cannot follow in distinguishing formal categories. Instead of distinguishing a separate mood and calling it 'sambha:vana:rtha' we may say that when the root of the verb is marked for number-person in respect of concord or neutralization it denotes the modal meanings of possibility, wish etc. That is to say, when the speaker wants to express the above modal meanings he does not look for a mood in Hindi to represent such meanings, but simply uses the root with different person-
number markers that are normally used for concord or otherwise. If we follow this line of thinking we shall find that even the optative and potential moods that Aryendra Sharma proposes as kinds of the subjunctive mood are purely notional, as their only markers are person-number markers. Sharma imitates the categories of English grammar, but does not pay sufficient attention to formal criteria. This also invalidates the contingent tense, distinguished by Yamuna Kachru (Kachru perhaps no longer treats contingent as a tense category) and part of Bahl's analysis in which a paradigm of 22 tenses has been presented. That paradigm mixes complex verbal groups like 'gaya:ho', 'ja:ta: ho', 'ja:na ho' with the simple one like 'ja:se' and treats them as different tenses. We shall say more about Bahl's analysis later.

Another mood besides 'sambhaparvane:rrtha' which is proposed by Guru is 'sanketa:rrtha'. This is said to be present in the following sentences:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{vah} & \quad \text{calta:} & \quad \text{hota:} \\
\text{vah} & \quad \text{cala:} & \quad \text{hota:} \\
\text{vah} & \quad \text{calta:} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Here also 'calta: hota:' and 'cala: hota:' are clearly complex verbal groups with 'hota:' belonging to the matrix sentence in the deep structure, and 'calta:' in the last sentence a simple verbal group. But 'hota:' and 'calta:',
besides being formally alike, are also functionally alike as they both denote unreal condition. The suffix that is added to the roots 'ho' and 'cal' here is 'ta:'. We may, therefore, treat 'ta:' as the formal marker of 'sanketa:ṛtha'. In that case we shall have to distinguish this 'ta:' which is supposed to be the marker of 'sanketa:ṛtha', from the 'ta:' which is said to be the marker of the imperfective aspect. What can be the motivation for doing so? It seems to be that in the former case the meaning associated with 'ta:', especially in conditional sentences, is that of unreal condition, while in the latter it may be of habitual action, for example, 'agar tum kal a:te to mé; avashya tumha:re sa:th cal:ta:' (If you had come yesterday, I would surely have accompanied you), and 'mé; roz do mi:l cal:ta: hū:' (I walk two miles every day). Another difference that one may notice is that in the case of unreal condition 'ta:' cannot be followed by any tense, while in the case of habitual activity it can. The reason is obvious. Unreal condition does not require any time reference other than that of the past time which is implicit in that, just because unreal condition is unfulfilled condition. We can say that something did not take place on account of the non-existence of a certain condition only with reference to the past. But a habitual activity can have a full contrast between present and past time reference, and thus allow specific tenses with it.

Now the question is whether such differences are enough motivation for distinguishing modal 'ta:' from aspectual 'ta:'
formally. Can we not uniformly treat 'ta:' as an aspect marker and distinguish its habitual from non-habitual function which may include the modal function of unreal condition also. This situation may not be unique to Hindi, as English also expresses unreal condition by means of past tense and perfective aspect; for example, in the sentence, 'If you had reached on time you wouldn't have missed the train' there is obviously no mood corresponding to the so-called 'sanketa:ṛtha' to express the modal meaning of unreal condition. Why should we then unnecessarily distinguish 'sanketa:ṛtha' in Hindi when it does not have any distinct marker? The easier solution, I think, is to treat 'ta:' as a marker of the imperfective aspect everywhere, and to account for its different functions in different contexts. Moreover, it is also not the case that the 'ta:' which is not followed by tense represents only the modal meaning of unreal condition. It can be used for a past characteristic activity as in 'vah a:ta: o:ṛ ghantō yahā: be:Tha: rahata:' (He would come and sit here for hours.), or for expressing unwillingness to do something, as in 'mē: ab nahi: jā:ta:' (I am not willing to go now), or for expressing inability to do something, as in 'mē: yah kā:m nahi: kar sakata:' (I can't do this thing). Shall we call all these also instances of 'sanketa:ṛtha'? No Hindi grammarian who subscribes to 'sanketa:ṛtha' would perhaps be ready for this. Does the use of 'ta:' in the unreal condition alone thus
entitle it to being called the marker of 'sanketañrtha'? This is surely applying notional criteria to determine a formal category. Even the syntactic environment of a conditional sentence cannot justify the distinction of a separate mood when its marker is the same as that of the imperfective aspect in every other environment. As we have already suggested, the better solution is to extend the aspectual 'ta:' even to conditional sentences to yield the meaning of unreal condition and to dispense with 'sanketañrtha' altogether. We will thus only widen the function of the imperfective aspect and reduce one category. This will surely make the grammar of Hindi simpler.

Let us now look at 'aśgyartha' which is divided into 'pratyaksha' and 'paroksha vidhi' by Guru, the former referring to command or request to be carried out now or in/near future, while the latter referring to one to be carried out in distant future. These 'vidhis' obviously occur in imperative sentences, but the question again is what their formal markers are. The marker of 'pratyaksha vidhi' with the second person singular subject 'tu:' is said to be zero, as it is the root form of the verb which is used with that, for example, 'tu cal' (thou go). This is not unique to Hindi. In English as well the root form of the verb is used in imperative sentences, although the second person subject is often left out there. But Hindi has certain peculiar features in some other respects. It makes a
systematic distinction between the verb forms to be used with
the second person singular and the second person plural
subjects; for example, 'tu: cal' (thou go) and 'tum calo' (you
go). 'tum' is also used as a polite form of the second person
singular subject. What we see with 'tum' is that the verb takes
the person-number marker 'o'. So, in fact, the contrast between
'tu:' and 'tum' works out to be this: with 'tu:' in the so
called 'a:ga:jrtha' the verb is in its bare root form, but with
'tum' it takes the person-number suffix 'o'. Other person-
number suffixes appear, if we extend the imperative to the first
and third person subjects also. Look at the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Person-Number Suffix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ab</td>
<td>tu:</td>
<td>ja:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(now)</td>
<td>(thou)</td>
<td>(go)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>tum</td>
<td>ja:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(you)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(go)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>me:</td>
<td>ja:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(go)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>ham</td>
<td>ja:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(we)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(go)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>vah</td>
<td>ja:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(he)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(go)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>ve</td>
<td>ja:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(they)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(go)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hindi has a regular paradigm of imperative sentences
wherein persons other than the second person can also occur
as subjects. The above paradigm shows that, except with 'tu:',

the person-number suffix is regularly used with the root of
the verb along with other subjects to denote command, request
etc. Even with 'tu:' Braj, a major dialect of Hindi, allows
the person-number suffix 'e' in negative sentences; for
example, 'tu: mat ja: e' (thou, don't go). Standard Hindi
does not use it. So, in fact, the bare root-form is restricted
only to affirmative commands, with 'tu:' as the subject, if
we take the overall structure of Hindi into account. In that
case the best solution would be to recognize the person-
number marker uniformly with all the three persons somewhere
in the underlying structure of imperative sentences, and
delete it in the surface structure of only those sentences
which have 'tu:' as their subject. That will solve another
problem too. Aryendra Sharma will then not have to reject
the first and third person imperatives just because they are
identical in form with his subjunctive mood, which others
call 'sambhavanartha'. With the second person imperatives
also being identical with that the identity will thus be total.
This will invalidate 'a:gya: rtha' in the same way as it has done
'sambhavanartha'. We will then not find any specific markers
of 'a:gya: rtha', as far as 'pratyaksha vidhi' is concerned. They
will be only person-number markers that we find in the verbal
groups that are supposed to have 'sambhavanartha'. If there
are still differences between sentences expressing possibility,
wish etc., on the one hand, and command, on the other, they
can be attributed to other syntactic factors, not to the difference
of mood in the verbal group. We therefore do not see any justification for distinguishing 'a:gya:rttha' ('pratyaksha vidhi') as a distinct formal category. Treating the same person-number markers as 'a:gya:rttha' just because they occur in certain verbal groups to express command will be conceding again to notional criteria. Even if we do not recognize a person-number marker with the verb used with 'tu:' in the underlying structure, its unmarked form does not support the case for distinguishing any mood other than the indicative ('nishcaya:rttha') which alone is supposed to be the neutral or unmarked mood. These facts go against distinguishing 'a:gya:rttha' as a distinct mood.

Besides the above person-number markers we also sometimes find 'iye' attached to the root when the subject is 'a:p'. This is the case of the honorific 'a:p' which is used for making offers, requests etc. The same feature is copied in the verb and is realized by 'iye'. It seems that both number-person and honorific are jointly realized by that, as in a sentence like 'a:p ja:iye' (You please go). This can be used for both 'pratyaksha' and 'paroksha vidhi', as by saying 'a:p yah pustak paRhiye' (Please read this book), the speaker may request the reader to read the book now, in near or distant future. 'Paroksha vidhi' (i.e. request for distant future) is better expressed by 'iyeqa:' with the honorific 'a:p'; for example, 'a:p yah pustak avashya paRhiyeqa:' (Please do read this book-
whenever you have the time.), 'agar mēi ghar par na milūi: to thōri: der intaza:r ki:jī:yeqa:ī' (If I am not at home, please wait for a little while).

Let us now have a brief look at the so-called 'paroksha vidhi'. It is said to be present in the verbal groups of sentences like 'tum vahāi ja:na:ī' (You go there) 'tu: apāna: kām karana:ī' (thou, do your work). One thing to be noticed here is that the distinction between 'pratyaksha' and 'paroksha vidhi' is related only to those imperative sentences which have the second person subjects. 'Paroksha vidhi' is regularly represented by 'na:ī' with the root. Now the question is: Is 'na:ī' really a mood marker? We think it is not so. It can more suitably be incorporated in the aspectual system of Hindi. Parallel to 'ja:ta:ī' and 'ja:ta: he:/tha:ī' we can have forms like 'ja:na:ī' and 'ja:ma: he:/tha:ī'. We have proposed this analysis towards the end of this critique. If 'na:ī' is recognized as an aspect marker we can easily account for all the forms of 'paroksha vidhi' which have 'na:ī' by saying that they take the aspect marker for future commands. In any case we will require some such analysis for relating 'na:ī' without tense to 'na:ī' with tense, as we will in the case of 'ta:ī'. Is there any need then of distinguishing even 'paroksha vidhi' as a separate mood or sub-mood?
'iyega:', which is used for requests with the honorific 'arp', is sometimes in free variation with 'iye', and sometimes not. But leaving that aside, we will have to admit that this is the marker of both number-person and honorific like 'iye'. That settles the issue of even 'paroksha vidhi' which we cannot accept as a distinct formal category.

Having rejected 'sambha:vrtha', 'sanketa:vrtha', and 'a:gra:vrtha', we shall now examine the status of the last non-neutral mood, i.e., 'sandeha:vrtha' which is said to be present in sentences like 'vah calat:a: hoga:' (He may be walking) and 'vah cala: hoga:' (He may have walked). Again, we shall ask the same question: What is the marker of this particular mood? Is it 'hoga:' or just 'ga:'? While in the discussion of 'sanketa:vrtha' we have treated 'hota:' on a par with other aspectual forms like 'calata:' and 'cama:', as 'ta:' is coupled with the root in every case. But here 'calata: hoga' and 'cala: hoga:' will have to be distinguished from 'calega:', which is treated by Guru and some others as a case of future tense. Thus, we can easily conclude that 'hoga:', not ga:, is regarded as the marker of 'sandeha:vrtha'. But it raises two questions: (1) Is 'ga:' with other lexical verbs basically different from 'ga:' in 'hoga:' and (2) Is 'hoga:' as a whole some sort of mood marker?

Some grammarians treat 'ga:' as a future tense marker mainly because it refers to future time; for example, 'vah ja:ega:'. 
(He will go), but they forget that 'hoga:' also can occur in the cases of future time reference. Look at the following sentences:

1. vah kal Bombay ja:egaa:
   (He will go to Bombay tomorrow.)

2. vah kal Bombay ja: raha: hoga:
   (He will be going to Bombay tomorrow.)

3. vah kal Bombay ja: cuka: hoga:
   (He will have left for Bombay tomorrow.)

   (If he is to go to Bombay tomorrow, I'll also go with him.)

But now the question is whether the 'ga:' which is coupled with 'ho' is different from that which is coupled with other verbs. We have pointed out in connection with 'hota:' that verb phrases like 'ja:ta: hota:' and 'gaya: hota:' are complex verb phrases in which 'hota:' belongs to the matrix sentence and 'gaya:' and 'ja:ta:' to the embedded sentences. We may now say that the verb phrases with 'hoga:' also, such as 'ja:raha: hoga:', 'ja:ta: hoga:', 'ja: cuka: hoga:' etc., are complex with 'hoga:' belonging to the matrix sentence and 'ja:' with the
aspect marker belonging to the embedded sentences. The sentences (2) to (4) cited above may be analysed as below:

(2)
```
S
 /\     /
NP   VP
 /\   /\    /
N  S  Adv.  V
   \   \   \    
yah vah Bombay ja: raha: kal hoga:
   \    he:
```

(3)
```
S
 /\     /
NP   VP
 /\   /\    /
N  S  Adv.  V
   \   \   \    
yah vah Bombay ja: chuka: kal hoga:
   \    he:
```

(4)
```
Adv
 S
 /\     /
NP   VP
 /\   /\    /
N  S  Adv.  V
   \   \   \    
yah vah Bombay ja:ta: he: kal hoga:
   \    he:
In the (4) we have analysed only the subordinate clause as that alone is relevant.

This shows that 'qa:' with 'ho' here is no different from 'ga:' with other lexical verbs. It refers to future time in every case. It is probably for this reason that Diemshitz treats both as instances of future tense. Those who treat 'hoga:' as a case of presumptive and 'ga:' as that of future probably overlook the fact of qa: having uniformly the same temporal reference in both the cases. The difference between them remains purely of a modal nature. When 'ga:' is coupled with 'ho' it marks the modality of presumption, but when it is coupled with other lexical verbs it marks the modality of prediction. They are only different types of epistemic modality.

But even following the notional line of future time reference let us now ask if it is the case that 'qa:' with 'ho' and also with other verbs always refers to future time. That does not seem to be true. Look at the following sentences:

(1) vah kal Bombay gaya: hoga:
    (He must have left for Bombay yesterday.)

(2) vah kal Bombay ja:raha: hoga:
    (He must have been leaving for Bombay yesterday.)
(3) 'din bhar ya:r dostō ke saith qhumate phiroge
to pais ke:se hoge?' (ab rone se kya: hota: he:)

(How could you pass, if you would spend the whole
day with friends?)(What use is crying now?)

(4) mē: to ca:hū:ga: ki aśp abhi: kuch din ośr
yahā: rukē.

(I would like you to stay here for a few days more.)

In none of the above sentences does 'qai:' refer to future,
irrespective of its occurrence with 'ho' or other verbs. It
refers either to past, or present, or is timeless. That seems
to be the reason why Bahl rejects the traditional future tense.
We have already presented Bahl's arguments in this matter.
There is thus no motivation for treating 'hoqai:' and 'qai:'
separately as markers of the presumptive and the future
respectively. We can now see that they are used for marking
both futurity and non-futurity. (1) and (2) further show that
the verbal groups in them are complex. The reason why 'qai:' in
(1) cannot refer to future is that if it does so it will clash
with the past time reference of the complement S 'vah kal
Bombay gaya:' and the reason why 'qai:' in (2) is ambiguous
between future and past time reference is that the complement S
can admit both future and past time reference there as in
'vah kal Bombay ja:raha: tha:' (He was going to Bombay yesterday)
and 'vah kal Bombay ja:raha: he:' (He is going to Bombay tomorrow)
The discussion that we have so far had about the function of 'ga:' has probably created the impression that its function is purely temporal. That is not the case. The main function of 'ga:' in fact, is modal, as it is used to indicate the speaker's prediction, supposition, presumption etc., about a certain event or state of affairs. Temporal reference of futurity is so closely knit with the modality of prediction or supposition that it cannot be separated from it. This makes one suspect sometime that future time reference is merely a consequence of the above type of modality. As Bahl suggests that the dimension of time (or tense) is limited to distinguishing between past versus non-past as a significant feature, and that the future is not such a category in the verbal system of Hindi, we find that 'ga:' even formally does not belong to the system of Hindi tenses which are periphrastic in nature. They are carried by the auxiliary 'ho'. Look at the following paradigm:

(i) vah ja:ta: he:/tha:
(ii) vah ja:raha: he:/tha:
(iii) vah qaya: he:/tha:
(iv) vah ja:eqa:

From (i) to (iii) we find a clear contrast between the present and the past tense. They can both be preceded by the different aspectual forms 'ta:', 'raha:' etc., and are carried by the auxiliary 'ho'. With 'ga:' neither of the conditions exist. It can neither be preceded by the same aspectual forms,
nor can be carried by the auxiliary 'ho'. 'ga:', therefore, does not seem to be a tense marker.

We shall, therefore, treat 'ga:' as a modal verb along with other modal verbs like 'sak' and 'ca:hiye' and discuss its syntactic and semantic behaviour in the next chapter. For the present it is necessary to say that as 'ga:' does not represent future tense in Hindi, 'hoga:' also does not represent a mood like 'sandehartha'. 'ga:' not 'hoga:', is surely a modal element. We would like to treat it as a modal auxiliary, not the marker of any mood. We shall advance some arguments in support of this position in the next chapter.

We have so far discussed Guru's system of moods which several grammarians of Hindi follow directly or indirectly, and have found that there is hardly any motivation for accepting it as necessary for describing the structure of Hindi. The facts of the language do not support it. But we still have some other grammarians who use different labels for the same forms. For example, Aryendra Sharma calls 'nishcaya:rtha' the indicative mood, 'agya:rtha' the imperative mood, 'sambha:vanartha' the subjunctive (optative and potential) mood, 'sanketa:rtha' the subjunctive (contingent) mood, and 'sandehartha' the subjunctive (presumptive) mood. Kellogg and Platts also use the same labels. . . . Rajgopalam calls them 'vrittis'. Our arguments apply to them in the same way.
as they do to the system proposed by Guru, Diemshitz and others.

Having rejected moods, we shall now have a brief look at the tense-moods proposed by some grammarians. What is a tense-mood? How different is it from mood as such. These are some of the questions that need to be answered first.

A tense-mood is treated in two different ways by the grammarians of Hindi. One is the way of grammarians like Kellogg, Platts, Guru, Dunichand, Diemshitz, Sudha Kalra, Bahl, etc., who draw a large scheme of tenses that include different moods also in it, even though tenses and moods are separately distinguished in the grammar. Another is the way of persons like Van Olphen, Yamuna Kachru etc., who treat tense-mood as a unitary category. Olphen distinguishes five tense-moods like present, past, presumptive, subjunctive and conditional. Although Kachru calls them tenses, we suspect her tenses, present, past, contingent, past contingent and presumptive are only tense-moods.

As far as using tense-mood as a convenient label for a comprehensive system of verb forms in which tenses and moods are separately distinguished is concerned, we do not have to say more than what we have already said. We accept the tense contrast of past and non-past, but reject the moods proposed for the reasons given above. We cannot therefore, accept the
kind of rules Bahl has proposed in which \( ^{+}\text{Mood} \) \( \rightarrow \) \( ^{+}\text{Presumptive} \), as verb forms like 'ja:ta: hoga:', 'gaya: hoga:' represent neither mood nor presumptive, as we have tried to show. They have the modal auxiliary 'ga:' associated with them. Similarly, tenses like (19) 'ja:iega:' (20) 'ja:' (21) 'ja:ega:' and (22) 'ja:e' which Bahl regards as modal tenses are in fact not so. Forms like 'ja:' and 'ja:ega:' may have the sense of injunctive and hortative, but this fact alone cannot make them markers of mood. We have explained the position of these forms in our discussion of the so-called 'gaya:artha'. Forms like 'ja:e' and 'ja:ega:' have also been accounted for. While the former has the root coupled with person-number, the latter has the modal verb 'ga:' associated with it. Bahl's notion of modal tenses is indeed a little strange. He does not treat forms like (1)'qaya: hota:' and (7) 'ja:ta: hota:', which other grammarians treat as instances of 'sanketa:artha', as modal tenses even though they represent unreal condition. The reason given is unconvincing. He thinks that the fulfilment or non-fulfilment of a condition or a consequence of a condition should be distinguished from the speaker's opinion about the relationship between an event and its performer (i.e. the category of mood). He believes that the use of tenses (1) and (7) is limited to counterfactual statements which are quite different opinions expressed by the speaker of the sentences. One does not know how counterfactual statements cannot be the
speaker's opinion about the relationship between an event and its performer, and thus cannot be called modal propositions. It is not at all clear how they are opinions of a non-modal nature. Truly speaking, all opinions expressed by the speaker that in any way qualify the factual status of the proposition are in essence modal. But even if we accept for the moment that (1) and (7) are different kinds of speaker's opinion the distinction still remains purely notional. One may still ask how (1) and (7) are formally different from forms like (2) 'gaya: hoga:' and (8) 'ja:ta: hoga:' which Van Olphen and Yamuna Kachru regard as belonging to the same system. The term that Bahl uses for (1) and (7), i.e., 'status', is also rather unusual. This is not a normally-used term for counter-factual statements. It seems to us quite unwarranted.

In the kinds of comprehensive schemes of tense-moods that we have just discussed we find that tense is used in a different sense. It is perhaps used as a cover term for all kinds of verb forms that can be neatly arranged under different moods, as in Guru's table. There is no need to call all the different forms tenses when they are supposed to have different verbal categories like tense, aspect, mood etc., in them. Besides, if certain tenses have modal functions there is no need to call them tense-moods. They can still be called tenses which, besides having temporal functions, also have modal functions. For example, in 'If you had worked hard you
would surely have passed', the past tense associated with 'had' and 'would' has a modal function. Similarly calling certain forms like 'ja:', 'ja:iega:', 'ja:ega', 'ja:e' etc., modal tenses is pointless. If one believes that these forms have mood markers in them one could characterize them accordingly without using the term tense ambiguously in that connection. In fact, some of the so called tenses in Guru's scheme like 'pratyaksha vidhi', 'paroksha vidhi', simple 'sanketa-rtha', etc., have no tense markers (i.e. of the present or past) associated with them.

Let us now look at the other view of tense-mood where it is treated as a complex category, and not as a convenient label. Val Olphen puts generally accepted tense categories like present and past along with modal categories like presumptive, conditional and subjunctive. He thinks that they all take the auxiliary 'ho' and belong to the same system. Since some of them, like present and past, have temporal reference and others have modality as their basic function he has perhaps chosen to call them tense-moods. His modal categories, i.e., presumptive, conditional and subjunctive are not new. They are close to 'sandeha-rtha', 'sanketartha' and 'sambha:vanartha' which we have already discussed. We have already explained how 'hoga:', 'hota:' and 'hout' cannot belong to the system to which past and non-past tenses do. One basic difference between the verbal groups having past and
non-past tenses and those having terminal elements like 'ho', 'hota:', and 'hoga:' is that the former are simple, while the latter are complex verb phrases. This difference has been overlooked by Van Olphen and Yamuna Kachru who have put forward a scheme of five tenses or of five tense-mood mixing proper tense forms with 'ho', 'hota:' and 'hoga:' which represent neither tenses nor tense moods. In fact the surface distributional similarity among jasta: he:, jasta: tha:, jasta: ho:, jasta: hota: and jasta: hoga: is deceptive, as our analysis shows. Even the status of 'ho' is different in the last three cases from that in the tenses. While it is the main verb of the matrix sentence in the last three, it is only an auxiliary in the case of the tenses which need it to carry them.

To repeat our conclusion regarding 'ga:' we will say that with 'ho' and other verbs it occurs as a modal auxiliary, not as a tense marker. Similarly, 'ta:' occurs with 'ho' and other verbs as the imperfective aspect marker which may have some modal functions. But person-number markers occur with 'ho' and other verbs for certain modal functions. They are only person-number markers, not markers of any mood or tense.

We shall, therefore, keep the tense system consisting of past and non-past separate from other categories and will not have any tense mood or modal tenses even though we fully
acknowledge certain modal functions of the tenses. We have clear tense categories in Hindi with their explicit markers, and the so-called moods are nowhere there. What we have are conceptual distinctions of modality which English also has, but those distinctions do not necessarily have to be represented by moods in every language. They may be represented by other categories like modal auxiliaries, adjectives, adverbs and so on.

We therefore reach the conclusion that Hindi has no moods. Among traditional grammarians Kishore Das Vajpeyi is perhaps the only one who does not specifically mention any moods in his grammar of Hindi. Instead, he distinguishes 'tingant' from 'kridant' forms. He does not argue against the past tradition of moods, but only presents a different analysis that accounts for some of the modal distinctions. More recently some grammarians like Yamuna Kachru, Amar Bahadur Singh etc., have put forward a set of modal auxiliaries. They have not emphasized traditional moods very much, but have accounted for most of their functions either in their system of tenses or elsewhere. Olphen also proposes a set of modal auxiliaries. Although Hindi has no distinct system of moods, it has a set of modal auxiliaries. Whether these are auxiliaries or main verbs is an issue that we shall discuss in the next chapter.
Finally, we would like to spell out rather tentatively the categorial structure of the Hindi verbal group to make our position regarding moods still clearer. It is bound to be tentative, as we cannot at the moment verify whether such a proposal is valid in respect of all the categories put forward. We believe that Hindi has two tenses, past and non-past, and a number of aspects. Generally, three aspects are distinguished for Hindi, such as perfective, imperfective and durative/progressive. Their markers are said to be 'a:', 'ta:' and 'raha:' respectively. If one looks closely one finds that the perfective aspect in fact has no distinct marker in Hindi. All the forms said to have this aspect are composed of the root of the verb and gender-number marker, wherever there is concord, and the neutralized gender-number form 'a:' where there is none. For example, 'Ram laRa:' (Ram fought), 'Sita laRi:' (Sita fought), 've laRe' (They fought), and 'Sita ne khaːmaː nahiː khaːyaː:' (Sita didn't have her meal.) The verb forms 'laRa:', 'laRi:' and 'khaːyaː:' are obviously different. One way of accounting for them is to distinguish 'а:' as a perfective marker everywhere, and then change it to 'iː', 'e' etc., according to the concord of gender-number by means of some phonological rules; another is to distinguish the perfective as an
unmarked aspect which can take either gender-number or person-number markers depending on its specific function. That will also accommodate forms like 'laRū', 'laRe', 'laRo' etc., in which the root takes person-number markers. We can thus distinguish the perfective as a neutral or unmarked aspect that has different functions with gender-number and person-number markers associated with it. Other aspects like imperfective, durative etc., are to be taken as marked aspects. If this analysis is accepted we may treat aspect as an obligatory category in the Hindi verbal group, as tense is in English. This will also give suitable place to forms that are now given ad hoc labels, like optative (Yamuna Kachru, 1966). Now that we have rejected moods in Hindi we shall have to account for such forms as have been treated as the cases of 'sambhaːvanaːrtha' in the system of Hindi verbal group. They cannot be called optative on the basis of particular meaning, as they have several other meanings as well.

Another proposal that we may put forward is regarding 'naː' forms that are regarded as the non-finite infinite forms outside the finite verbal group. We can distinguish one more aspect to account for forms like 'laRnaː heː/θaː', 'khaːnaː heː/θaː' etc., which seem to fit into the aspectual system, at least distributionally. Look at the following table:
The aspectual system could thus be presented, as in the following diagram:

```
     Perfective
       \   /  Imperfective - ta:
       /   \
 Aspect - Non-perfective - Durative - raha:
      \     /  Determinative - na:

GN = gender-number   PN = person-number
```

The inclusion of 'na:' as an aspect marker will integrate all those six verbal forms in the system of aspect which Bahl treats under a new category, called 'Indicative'. This will also make it possible to provide an exhaustive analysis of the different kinds of finite verbal groups in the central systems of aspect and tense. As we have already said, these proposals regarding the categories of tense and aspect are highly tentative at this stage. We cannot advance any further arguments in support of them. Since we are chiefly concerned in this dissertation with moods and modal verbs, we shall now move on to a discussion of the modal verbs in Hindi.