NMML
OCCASIONAL PAPER

HISTORY AND SOCIETY
New Series
43

Imagining Hindi: The politics of language before and after partition

Rohit Wanchoo

Nehru Memorial Museum and Library
2014

Published by

Nehru Memorial Museum and Library
Teen Murti House
New Delhi-110011

e-mail : ddnehrumemorial@gmail.com

ISBN : 978-93-83650-09-5

Price Rs. 100/-; US $ 10

Page setting & Printed by : A.D. Print Studio, 1749 B/6, Govind Puri Extn. Kalkaji, New Delhi - 110019. E-mail : studio.adprint@gmail.com

Imagining Hindi: The politics of language before and after Partition*

Rohit Wanchoo

The debate on Hindi, Urdu or Hindustani has been one of the most emotive issues in India for a long time. It is clear that this controversy has been shaped by several forces — the features of the language or languages in question; the attitude of the colonial state; the contribution of key players like linguists, creative writers, journalists, and political leaders; and finally the link established over time between language and national and religious identity. The specific impact of these factors has been shaped by the relative importance of these influences at different points of time. In the literature on the subject today there are some well defined positions and lines of argument.

One is an older nationalist account, largely based on a Gandhian or progressive understanding of the controversy over language. Gandhi was a supporter of Hindi as a national language but he wanted it to be Hindustani with the use of both the Devanagri and the Arabic script. The Congress leadership too broadly supported the idea of Hindustani — a single language with two scripts — although there were many who disagreed strongly with this formulation. The Progressive Writers' movement during the 1930s also endorsed the idea of Hindustani, although some supporters felt that the language had yet to flower and was more an ideal solution to the language disputes, rather than a living reality. In short, Hindustani could be a solution to the Hindi–Urdu divide but it had to be consciously

*This paper is based on research done as a Fellow, NMML (2009–11).

created and nurtured by its supporters. Since the Hindi–Urdu divide was seen as an outcome of a Hindu–Muslim divide, widening during the late colonial period, the choice of Hindustani was also seen as an attempt to ensure communal harmony.

There were others who felt that the choice of Hindustani as the national language was not justified. There were those who favoured Hindi as the language most suited to be India's national language on merit rather than communal preferences. These proponents of Hindi believed that it was a language which was most likely to be accepted by the non-Hindi/Hindustani speakers in India who were far more closely linked to the Sanskrit tradition than to that of Arabic or Persian. Non-native speakers would find it easier to accept a national language which drew upon the rich tradition of Sanskrit which had also shaped their own regional languages. Others argued that as languages developed they would need to expand their vocabularies and would naturally turn to the classical languages they felt close to. The effort to make Hindi and Urdu fit for modern societies and suitable for law, administration, education and science and technology would inevitably widen the gulf between the two forms of the spoken Hindustani.

There were also spokesmen for Hindi and Urdu who felt that Hindustani was adequate for purposes of communication — as a link language — but not to articulate the cultural and religious sensibilities of Hindus and Muslims. There was a mild view which emphasized the need to develop two languages and there was a more virulent perspective which was intolerant of the other language and did not support the idea of Hindustani or any compromise with the other's conception of the national language. Hindu and Muslim nationalists and communalists were ardent supporters of Hindi and Urdu and wanted to see their own language in positions of power and prestige. As Indian freedom approached, the antagonism based on language intensified. The movement for Pakistan, or the assertion of Muslim identity, did shape the language debate as it influenced the cultural politics of both the Hindus and the Muslims. The Partition of India in 1947 had serious consequences for the evolution of Hindi and Hindustani in postcolonial India.

The debate about the 'evolution' of Hindi was not only about its relationship with Arabic and Persian or the Muslim perception of a lingua franca or national language. It was also about the relationship of Hindi — Khari Boli — with the 'dialects' or 'bolis' in different parts of north India — which had accepted Hindi as the literary or national language. There were those who argued that the controversy between Hindi and Urdu would either greatly diminish or even disappear if the regional dialects, numbering at least thirty according to the scholar Rahul Sanskrityayan, were accepted as the medium of education at the regional level. The support for dialects like Braj, Bhojpuri, Maithili, Awadhi would greatly facilitate the spread of education and make the Hindi–Urdu dispute a minor issue.

The debate during the 1930s was influenced by the awareness that the country would be able to achieve independence in the foreseeable future and had to choose the language of administration and education. It was about the future, about the evolution of a national language or about the future of Hindi-Urdu-Hindustani. The disputes regarding the nature of Hindustani were important during the last two decades of British rule but the real issue was about the future. The controversies surrounding this issue did accentuate the differences based on religious affiliations but it was the Partition of India that decisively shaped the direction that language policies would take after 1947. The marginalization of Urdu, the decline in support for Hindustani and the steady rise of 'pure' Hindi were a consequence of the division of the country on religious lines. If the country had not been divided the outcomes would have been different. It is likely that both Hindi and Urdu would have flourished and Hindustani too would have attracted a sizeable following among both Hindus and Muslims.

The Nationalist View

There were those who argued that the national language should be based on the language used by the common people of north India which included simple words from Sanskrit, Persian and Arabic. Mahatma Gandhi argued that Hindustani ought to be the national language and words should be accepted on the basis of popular use

and not their indigenous or foreign origin. Although he thought that Devanagari was the script most suitable for Hindustani — since it was closer to the script of regional languages in India which Muslims in those regions were also comfortable or familiar with — he wanted both Devanagari and the Urdu script to be accepted till such time as the Muslims wanted the Urdu script[1]. In the mid-1940s the Mahatma wanted to bring out the *Harijan* in Urdu as well. His approach was based on pragmatically handling Muslim anxieties and maintaining communal harmony. He thought that the regional or local context would determine the choice of words: in areas where Urdu words were more commonly understood as in Punjab they ought to be used, and in areas where more Sanskrit words were familiar as in Bengal and South India they would be favoured. Gandhiji felt that Madan Mohan Malaviya, Babu Bhagwandas and Mohammad Ali were men who were equally at ease when addressing Urdu and Hindi-speaking audiences.

The nationalists had different explanations about the reasons for the growing chasm between Hindi and Urdu, but many felt that Hindustani had to be promoted. Political leaders, aware of the implications of mass awakening, felt that as the language of the common people was Hindustani it would be able to achieve acceptability eventually. However, in the absence of literary production in Hindustani it was, to use a familiar term, a language in the making. The nationalist Muslim Z.A. Ahmad observed that while everybody thought that Hindi-Urdu-Hindustani was most suitable as the national language, "differences, however, arise when we begin to consider the question as to how and in what direction this language of the North is to be developed in order to suit national purposes".[2] Harish Trivedi has argued that the project of Hindustani was anti-communalist and nationalist but it was linguistically unviable. A limited vocabulary of Hindustani words could not be the basis for a national language and that Gandhi's support for Hindi or Hindustani in the meeting at Nagpur of the Bharatiya Sahitya Parishad in April 1936 doomed the project for Hindustani. Many Muslims felt thereafter that Gandhi had begun to favour Hindi. "The bluff of 'Hindustani' had been called, on both sides, and there was nothing left to salvage", comments Trivedi. "Perhaps there had never

been any real common ground".[3] This seems to be too severe an indictment of the project of Hindustani and in 1936 it would certainly be premature to call it a "dead horse".[4]

The difference between the Hindi and Urdu versions of an extract from Premchand's story that Trivedi has highlighted may indicate the chasm between Hindi and Urdu but the question of national language is not only about the literary form of such a language. In many countries the language of the educated elite and the masses is not similar. The spoken language of the common people, Hindus as well as Muslims, was not as sharply different as the literary language favoured by the educated elite. The well-meaning were trying to minimize the growing differences by trying to agree on a shared vocabulary of Hindustani to which both Sanskritized Hindi and Persianised Urdu could contribute. Not only Gandhi and Nehru, but many nationalists supported the idea of Hindustani. Rajendra Prasad and Subhas Bose too supported the idea of Hindustani in different forms.[5] Rajendra Prasad declared, "We should deliberately include in Hindustani all those Persian and Arabic words which are used by good Hindi writers and all those Sanskrit words which are used by good Urdu writers." He thought it was not important to figure out where a word came from but whether it was able to achieve "popular currency". Words should be borrowed from other languages, without compromising on the purity of grammar, "if they are likely to be easily understood and adopted by the people".[6] There was a clear justification for using "apt rustic words and expressions" instead of drawing on Sanskrit or Persian.

Multilingual 'Nations'

The future of Hindustani was being debated during the 1940s quite seriously among the nationalists and it depended not only on the choices made by native speakers but also by speakers of other Indian languages. The formulation of Benedict Anderson regarding national language is not particularly relevant to the experience of those countries which were trying to forge national unity in the context of many indigenous languages. By adopting his formulation one would have to accept the importance of one language for the

'nation'.[7] In India the problem was that many regional languages were negotiating their relationship with Hindi as the lingua franca and the national language. The experience of other multilingual nation-states like Indonesia, Philippines and the Soviet Union is more relevant for analyzing the language problem in India.

The distinguished linguist, Suniti Kumar Chatterjee, was not in agreement with the language policy advocated by Mahatma Gandhi. In an essay entitled 'Rashtrabhasha Ka Prashna' reproduced in *Rithambhara*, he argued that there was a strong case for the adoption of Hindi with the Devanagari script because it was closer to the scripts of most north Indian languages. The influence of Sanskrit was felt in most Indian languages, even those in south India. According to Chatterjee there was lopsidedness in the attitude of Hindi and Urdu speakers: while Hindi had accepted thousands of Arabic and Persian words, Urdu had not allowed even a few Sanskrit words into the language.[8] In his view it was surprising that in the name of Hindustani the language used by All India Radio was in fact Persianised Urdu. Eighty per cent Indians would be in a position to understand Sanskritized Hindi, but not words drawn mainly from Arabic and Persian.

Chatterjee was not denying the valuable contribution that Arabic and Persian had made to the development of Hindi. In fact he believed that the medieval Muslim rulers had helped to extend the geographical appeal of the early forms of Hindi.[8A] Therefore, he was not rejecting the medieval impact but trying to limit further inputs from Persian and Arabic as far as Hindi as a national language was concerned. This was not intended to thwart the development of Urdu, but to make a more Sanskritized Hindi the national language of India. He felt that if Hindi and Urdu had to be used to develop a new national language then it could not be the language of the Muslim community. He argued for three points: as far as possible new words be created using pure Hindi '*dhatu, pratyaya aur shabd*'; in matters of religion and culture the words should be drawn from Arabic and Persian as the Muslims preferred; and if required words should be drawn sparingly from other languages, although this restriction was not to apply to Sanskrit.[9]

The acceptability of Hindi as the national language in India was because of two factors: the use of the Devanagari script and the presence of Sanskrit words. The popularity of Hindustani in the non-Hindi speaking regions would diminish without these features. In the non-Hindi speaking regions people were afraid of the difficult Urdu script and the even more difficult words derived from Arabic and Persian. The acceptability of Hindi was being challenged by the Muslims of India, an attitude they did not always have. Although Chatterjee may not be regarded as a Hindu nationalist, a nationalist he certainly was.[10] He argued that Muslims had not adopted such an intolerant attitude towards Hindi words in the past. The Muslims had used words like *Kartar*, *Sai* and *Gusain* instead of Khuda and Allah in earlier times. In the villages this was still the case.

With the spread of education Indian Muslims would change their attitude towards the use of Sanskrit words and the religious ideas of their Hindu, Jain and Buddhist ancestors. This attitude was strengthened by Chatterjee's knowledge of the rise of nationalism among the Turks and the Iranians. Both had started eliminating the influence of Arabic language on Turkish and Farsi, the Turks trying to get rid of Persian influence as well.[10A] The call to prayer in Turkey could only be made in Turkish by licensed mullahs. In future Indian Muslims were bound to follow the example of the Iranian and Turkish nationalists and so in the intervening period there was no need to oppose or restrict the use of Sanskrit in the national language of India.[11]

Suniti Chatterjee believed in the idea of a single nation, not a "confederacy". Therefore, he felt there was a need for a national language and that Hindi — descending from Lokik Sanskrit, Shaurseni Prakrit, Pali, Shaurseni Apabhransha, Braj and Khari Boli — had a history of serving as a language of inter-regional communication for over two thousand and five hundred years.[12] His nationalism and concern for the popularization of Hindi in the non-Hindi speaking states led him to favour one rather than both scripts for the national language. The conflict between Devanagari and Urdu script was frightening the people in the non-Hindi-speaking states. Although Devanagari on patriotic, historical and scientific grounds

was most suitable as the script for the national language, the Muslims were unlikely to accept this. The support for using the Roman script itself arose because of this controversy. Netaji Subhas had advocated the use of the Roman script for Hindustani at the Haripura Congress session, but this would be difficult to achieve without the acquiescence of the educated classes. Therefore, for pragmatic reasons the use of both scripts, according to circumstances, as advocated by the Congress, was the best option that was available.[13]

I
The Importance of Bolis and Janapadas

The question of forging a national language of India was not just confined to the relative suitability of Hindustani or Hindi or Urdu. The problem of creating a national language was not only about Hindi vis-à-vis non-Hindi languages like Bengali, Punjabi, Marathi or Tamil, but also vis-à-vis Hindi dialects like Maithili, Bhojpuri, Braj, Marwari and Awadhi. The evolution of language in north India was such that there were many who advocated the use of some, if not all of the regional dialects, as separate languages. Among those who lent support to the development of these "languages", alongside the development of Hindi, were scholars like Rahul Sankrityayan, Amar Nath Jha and S.K. Chatterjee. The most vocal support for the use of some of, but not all, the regional Bolis or languages came from Banarsi Das Chaturvedi, who as an editor of *Madhukar*, promoted by the ruler of Tikamgarh near Jhansi in Central India, became a leading figure in this movement for recognising and promoting regional dialects in the country.

Banarsi Das Chaturvedi was also one of the leading spokesmen for the idea of 'decentralization' or *Vikendriyakaran* in the Hindi speaking world. He argued that the popularization and promotion of Hindi could not be managed from a single centre, no matter how committed or diligent the leading figures at such a centre might be. At its Haridwar session the Akhil Bharatiya Hindi Sahitya Sammelan passed a resolution stating that Indian 'sanskriti' or culture lives in its regions or "Janapadas". It proposed that there should be a committee that would study the language, literature, folk songs, flora

and fauna, local scientific knowledge and produce of the different regions or Janapadas of India. The members, appointed to this committee, were Vasudev Sharan Aggarwal (Lucknow), Banarsidas Chaturvedi (Tikamgarh), Rahul Sankrityayan (Bihar), Chandrabali Pandey (Kashi), Amarnath Jha (Prayag), Jainendra Kumar (Delhi), and Satyendra (Mathura). This committee was empowered to co-opt members whenever it deemed fit and could also include as members up to four people from each of the Janapadas in which it worked.[14] The proposal for emphasis on the cultural and linguistic importance of Janapadas led to some opposition at the Haridwar session itself. The antipathy to the very word Janapada, based on its negative consequences for the development of Hindi, became an important issue thereafter.

The demand for decentralization or the Janapada movement had philosophical roots and a practical programme. In one account, the response to this Janapada movement was partly shaped by the fact that two of the members of the committee had taken up other causes earlier. The scholar Rahul Sankrityayan had proposed that the language of the different regions ought to be used as the medium of instruction. Banarsidas Chaturvedi had started a movement for the organization of Hindi literary organizations on regional or Mandal lines. The proposal for the Janapada movement initially came from Dr. Vasudev Sharan Aggarwal in a letter to B.D. Chaturvedi in January 1941. He had proposed that such Janapada work should begin in Bundelkhand and the proposal was published in *Madhukar* soon after.

Until such time as decentralization was accepted, the proposal for the Janapada movement by Dr. V.S. Aggarwal and Kshiti Mohan Sen, designated the Aggarwal programme, was taken up at the Haridwar Sammelan. The proposal, roughly along the lines indicated in the letter of 11 January, 1941, was moved by Bhadant Anand Kaushalyayayan and supported by Dr. Amarnath Jha and Shrimati Kamlabai Kibay. In the open session the proposal was opposed by Avanindra Kumar Vidyalankar and Shrinath Singh. In the opinion of Vidyalankar Indian culture no longer lived in its regions since the Janapadas had ceased to exist long ago. Although the villages

were still there, they were no longer the repositories of Indian culture. Any effort to turn to the Janapadas would waste resources and create divisions. Shrinath Singh feared that since Rahul Sankrityayan was a member of the Committee and it had accepted Janapadas as cultural entities he would be in a position to work against the interests of Hindi and the unity of the country. At a time when there was a demand for Pakistan, any legitimacy given to the Janapadas would create a divisive atmosphere.

The proposals were passed by the majority after two amendments in May 1943. Subsequently Chandrabali Pandey, the Secretary of the Sammelan, changed his position. From accepting that the Aggarwal programme would be implemented keeping in mind the resources of the organization in September 1943 he moved to the position that this program had no direct relationship with the work of the Sammelan. The programme was an issue that concerned only the U.P. and Madhya Bharat organizations.[15] He wanted the whole of India to speak in one voice and Hindi, infused with patriotic fervour, to spread far and wide.[16] In an interview published in *Hindustan* Makhan Lal Chaturvedi, the Chairman of the Sammelan, declared that although the programme had not been chalked out the Janapada programme could be set aside by the forthcoming Sammelan at Jaipur. These pronouncements indicated the effort to dampen the spirits of those who supported this movement.[17] On 14 November, 1943, B.D. Chaturvedi resigned from the Janapada committee in order to remove any apprehensions and to facilitate the adoption of the programme favoured by V.S. Aggarwal.

In the world of Hindi scholars many fears surfaced, based on the assumption, that B.D. Chaturvedi's programme for decentralization or *Vikendriyakaran* was closely associated with the Janapada programme. Makhanlal Chaturvedi, Swami Bhawani Dayal Sanyasi and Satyendra were critical of the Janapada programme precisely because they perceived them as quite similar. The anxiety among the scholars also arose because B.D. Chaturvedi had endorsed the three separate strands in the debate on language at the same point in time. He had supported the Janapada, decentralization and Rahul Sankrityayan programmes and thereby contributed to the

misunderstanding. According to the scholar and socialist, Dr. Sampurnanand, this had added to the confusion. Even those who were opposed to the idea of education in regional dialects, advocated by Sankrityayan or the idea of decentralization advocated by Chaturvedi since 1934, were in favour of recording the folk tales and songs of the various regions of the country in order to enrich the Hindi language. Among those in favour of the third strand were Avanindra Kumar Vidyalankar, Dr. Dhirendra Verma, Bhawani Dayal Sanyasi and Dr. Sampurnanand.

Decentralization and Local Literary Patriotism

In February 1934, B.D. Chaturvedi wrote in *Vishal Bharat* that the establishment of regional Sammelans would strengthen the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan and promote the cause of Hindi. At a time when there were few people of calibre available for the promotion of Hindi a central organization could have played a key role. That was not the case ten years later. Kashi, Prayag, Kanpur and Lucknow were all capable of serving as vibrant centres of literary production. People who were not full time workers, based in Prayag, could no longer play any serious role in promoting or even coping with the diverse trends in the Hindi-speaking world. The Hindi Sahitya Sammelan, according to B.D. Chaturvedi, had become "a temple without a priest". The Virendra-Keshav-Sahitya Parishad in Bundelkhand could be made the nodal centre for the recovery and promotion of the language and culture of the region. Not only was the language of Bundelkhand as sweet as that of the Braj region, in the opinion of the eminent poet Maithili Sharan Gupt, it was even sweeter.[18]

B.D. Chaturvedi espoused the cause of "local literary patriotism" in his March 1934 article in *Vishal Bharat*. This confidence in local talent and initiative sprang from his knowledge of the tremendous work done by the Madhya Bharat Hindi Sahitya Samiti which had played a key role in the propagation of Hindi in south India and in Indore itself under the guidance of Sardar Madhavrao Vinayak Kibay and Dr. Sarju Prasad. In Delhi, the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan accepted in 1934 the significance of regional dialects for the first time and proposed the establishment of Mandal Sabhas. Nevertheless, even

ten years down the line, such regional or mandal sabhas had not been set up. The reluctance of the central body to back up this proposal for dialect and region-based literary bodies may have played a role but the Braj Sahitya Mandal and the Bundelkhand Sahitya Mandal, based on local initiatives, also did not survive for very long.

It would appear that while the desirability of promoting regional dialects was felt among literary circles the local talent was either lacking in resources or organizational skills to sustain initiatives. These proposals depended for their success on local talent and sponsors and both were in short supply during the late 1930s for a variety of reasons. The national, peasant and socialist movements and various other popular movements competed for local talent. Purely literary figures could not attract enough people for their own projects about Hindi. The fact, that there was some anxiety about the divisive consequences of two of these strands in the literary world, added to the difficulty. The spokesmen had to declare that they were not trying to break up the country into small segments, like Mr. Jinnah was trying to do.

B.D. Chaturvedi started the journal *Madhukar* from Tikamgarh in October 1940. Shri Satyendra argued that before he went to Tikamgarh, Chaturvedi's programme was beneficial for Hindi; after he moved there it was vitiated by the ulterior motive of trying to carve out a separate state of Bundelkhand by highlighting its distinctive characteristics. When the movement for decentralization began in 1940 it had the endorsement of Satyendra who thought it was in keeping with the democratic spirit of the times. Later, he argued that the very word Janapada was controversial and divisive: it was advisable to work at the level of individual villages, rather than particular dialects or cultural regions.

As late as June 1941, Satyendra had accepted the idea of decentralization in the journal *Sadhana*. At this time he also accepted the use of the regional dialects of Hindi to reach out to the people in the villages. Although Bundelkhandi stories were being published in Khari Boli in *Madhukar*, stories in *Braj-Bharti* were being printed in the Braj language itself. The Braj Sahitya Mandal, of which Satyendra was a leading figure, also proposed the setting up of a

Braj-Bhasha University. Satyendra, the mentor of Jagdish Chaturvedi, had since resiled from his position and had begun to see it as divisive because it was associated with the demand for education in the regional dialects. In the specific case of Bundelkhand it was also associated with the demand for a separate state that had emerged from Tikamgarh in 1942.[19]

The support for local patriotism was espoused by Banarsidas Chaturvedi in *Madhukar* in June 1941 when he published an abbreviated version of an article in the *Modern Review* which had come out over seventeen years ago. Dr. Sudheendra Bose, an academic at the University of Iowa for almost three decades, wrote an article entitled, 'Let Us Be Provincials'. The History Council of Iowa University was not only producing works for scholars but was also engaged in the dissemination of knowledge among ordinary citizens. The Council had published 170 volumes for the general public. The article cited American scholars in support of the ideal of constructive provincialism. Dr. Shambough argued that the knowledge produced by local history councils would produce true patriotism and a practical approach to serving the nation. A Harvard philosopher, Joshua Royce, argued that nations in the future would have to respect the healthy spirit of provincialism.[20]

Therefore, B.D. Chaturvedi believed that if the histories of regions like Braj, Awadh, Bundelkhand and Rajasthan were meticulously explored it would help in writing a comprehensive history of our motherland. He supported the ideal of local patriotism or *prant-prem* but not small-minded provincialism. He was definitely against the idea of producing books for schools in the regional dialects: an unbridled provincialism would be a threat to Indian nationalism. The ideal he upheld was the development of local or provincial literary resources and talent in order to support the wider and greater conception of the motherland. The idea of a separate Bundelkhand could only be supported on the basis of this relationship between the region and the nation.[21]

The Janapada programme

The Janapada programme was interpreted in diverse ways, but there was a key point of discussion: was it desirable to develop the Bolis and to impart education through them? There were those who felt that the Janapada programme was desirable and those who felt it might hinder the progress of Hindi. Makhanlal Chaturvedi, the Chairman of the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan at Haridwar, wanted to protect and preserve the rich literature in the dialects but was not willing to accept the publication of school textbooks in these languages. The idea of producing several centres for the promotion of Hindi also did not strike him as a development that could rightfully be called decentralization. He argued that if we got to a stage when speakers of Maithili and Marwari failed to understand each other it would be a tragedy for the conception of a common Hindi language. The inflammation of provincial pride and support for education in the dialects would be the surest way of strengthening the position of English in the Hindi belt.

If education was encouraged in the dialects he felt that it would enable English to become the language of convenience, of High School and College education and inter-provincial communication in the Hindi world. He was all for the fullest recognition to the literary contributions of writers in the dialects but accessed through the medium of Hindi. Those who could understand the originals in Marwari or Maithili were welcome to do so but for the rest the same work would be available in the standard Hindi in current use. The fear that English would become the language that would be preferred by pragmatic people who spoke different dialects was uppermost on his mind.[22] The fear might not be misplaced because even after the dialects were not made the medium of instruction in the Hindi-speaking world after independence the sway of English only increased over time.

There were many who felt that Hindi could be regarded as the national language but not the mother-tongue. Scholars like Amar Nath Jha and political figures like Vyohar Singh were supporters of literary Hindi as the national language but were committed to their mother-tongues, the dialects. In the opinion of A.N. Jha the speakers

of Hindi ought to feel proud of the fact that the speakers of the dialects felt it their duty to accept Hindi as the national language. If the speakers of these dialects were to feel that their mother-tongues were being treated with scant respect it would lead to a reaction against Hindi and weaken its appeal. Jha was emphatic that a bazaar language like Hindustani could never become a literary language. Hindi was our mother-tongue, not Hindustani because it was a *dogali* or double-faced and unworthy language. As President of the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan, he toured various places and argued that Hindi would prosper only if the Janapada dialects prospered.[23]

In response to the principle of decentralization and the Aggarwal programme, one scholar, with the Soviet Union as an example before him, argued that he did not think that the Janapada programme was desirable. Devendra Satyarthi argued that in Russia, where the different spoken languages and dialects had been developed into literary languages, it was Russian that had become the language of the Soviet Union. The language policy of the Soviets had in fact promoted centralization by making it the language of the USSR. He was attracted by this policy and therefore could not accept the ideal of decentralization endorsed by V.S. Aggarwal. He also quoted with approval Chandrabali Pandey who stated unequivocally at one point that he was an opponent of decentralization and favoured centralization.[24]

Languages like Maithili, Rajasthani spoken by large numbers of people, would help to enrich Hindi as the various languages in the USSR were enriching Russian. This might be a misreading of what was happening in Russia but it indicated that Satyarthi thought there was no essential conflict between Hindi and the development of some dialects into literary languages. He did not think that the development of literary languages based on dialects of Hindi would undermine Hindi. Satyarthi believed that the position of Hindi had to be as strong as that of Russian in the Soviet Union. He was influenced by the Soviet doctrine on the self-determination of nations as propounded in 1922 and endorsed by Stalin later. This policy would enable larger political units to be formed on the basis of popular support and national unity would be more stable and enduring.

Language, Dialect and Province

The link between language and province was established by the Congress in 1920 and the Provincial Congress Committees were organized on the basis of linguistic principles or regions. The issue as far as the Hindi-speaking states were concerned was whether the dialects spoken in the region ought to be the basis for reorganizing states. The newspaper *Jagriti* from Calcutta criticized Chaturvedi for raising his voice in support of organizing provinces on the basis of dialects. He denied that he had developed a desire to become a political leader and asserted that his sole concern was the well-being of the ordinary people of Bundelkhand and not its propertied or educated elite. Vyohar Rajendrasinghji, a prominent Congress leader of Madhya Prant, believed that there was a clear need to bring the Bundelkhandi-speaking people scattered in United Provinces, Madhya Prant and numerous small princely states into one single province.

Vyohar Singh, M.L.A., was a prominent member of a Committee that had steered the movement for the division of the Hindi-speaking province in 1928. Dwarka Prasad Mishra, a leading Congressman, had advocated the creation of a Hindi-speaking province in 1927. Although a movement for a separate state was not new, the demand for a separate Bundelkhand was now sought, according to Chaturvedi, only in order to serve a united India more efficiently. This proposal was the best way to destroy the communal virus and tackle the demand for Pakistan. The rivers of the region — Betwa, Dhasan, Kane and Jamner — were equally the mothers of all the people of the region and they had nothing to do with the conflicts arising out of religious differences.[25] This was a notion of separate statehood that placed the interests of the common people above all others.

As Chairman of the Bundelkhand Parishad, Vyohar Singh wrote an article in *Madhukar* clarifying his position on the demand for a separate state. If all the Hindi-speaking people could be clubbed together in one large state he would not have any objection to it. Since such a state would be too large and unwieldy he felt that the

division of the region into different provinces should be on the basis of the dialects or Bolis. The proposed Bundelkhand province would also include regions where people spoke Braj, Chhatisgarhi, Nimadi and Gondi. This proposal had been supported by *Vishvabandhu* in its issue of 15th December, 1943. From the viewpoint of language, literature and culture it seemed desirable to create provinces based on Bolis or dialects in the Hindi-speaking region. Politically, the opposition of the princely states had to be overcome. Economic difficulties would arise in the early stages but with some central government grants Bundelkhand too could become self-reliant like Orissa and Sindh. If these two provinces could have their way and Andhra and Karnataka were adamant about getting separate statehood then the Bundelkhandis also could, and should, resolutely demand a unified state for the Bundeli-speaking people.[26]

Justifying the demand for a separate state, Deendayalu Shrivastava made the case on geographical considerations. There were three or four districts in the United Provinces that were actually Bundelkhandi. The U.P. region had flat plains that were fertile and Bundelkhand was a rocky terrain with large uncultivable tracts. Just as the states of Rajasthan, which had similar geographical characteristics, could not be merged with neighbouring states like Punjab, Bombay or the United Provinces, the districts of Bundelkhand also could not be justifiably merged with the United Provinces. The disparities in the level of development of the Bundelkhand and U.P. regions, in terms of transport facilities and educational development, meant that the less developed were being asked to compete with the developed. The students of grade one could not be asked to compete with those of grade four. Although the Bundeli language was definitely insufficiently developed, Shrivastava was not averse to its use in education if the people of the region so desired.[27]

The demand for a separate state had repercussions in distant places as well. Krishna Chandra Aggarwal, the son of the newspaper owner and journalist Mool Chandra Aggarwal, argued for a sporting event in Bundelkhand to unite the people of the region. Although he was based in Calcutta, his father belonged to the region and was

born there. The annual sporting event to be called Bundelkhand Olympics would showcase the talent of the region, which had produced internationally famous hockey players like Dhyan Chand and Roop Singh. It would also unite all the people and overcome religious, caste and other differences. The days when provinces were divided had gone: the objective should be to develop the region rather than to create a new province. Had the people forgotten the infamous partition of Bengal?[28] The ideal was to unite Thakur and Harijan, Hindu and Muslim by participation in an annual sporting event and improve the lot of people of the region. Development and uplift were posited as alternatives to the creation of a separate state.

In the opinion of one writer there was little evidence to believe that Bundelkhandi was a language very different from Braj. The Braj and Bundelkhandi Bolis were both derived from Shaurseni Prakrit and were governed by the same grammar rules. The two Bolis used similar verbs, adjectives, common nouns and even their vocabularies and stories *(kathnikayein)* were similar. No other dialect or Boli was as close to Braj as Bundelkhandi was. Madan Lal Chaturvedi went on to argue that Braj was not only the most important language to emerge from Shaurseni but that it influenced other Prakrit languages as well. Some of the early Gujarati literature was in fact in Braj; the Marwari poets and even Guru Nanak and Guru Govind Singh used Braj; and the work of Malik Muhammad Jayasi of Awadh was a mixture of Awadhi and Braj. Vidyapati in Bihar wrote in Braj and so did the 14th century Bengali poet Chandidas. The language of these two poets was referred to as Brajbuli in Bengal. After the decline of Sanskrit it was Braj which became the literary and national language.[28A] By denying that Bundelkhandi was a distinct language from Braj the case for a separate identity and statehood for Bundelkhand was being rejected.[29]

Although there was a difference between the Braj and Bundelkhandi regions, in terms of the martial traditions of the latter region, the language in use was substantially similar in both. It was arguable that the difference between Braj and Bundelkhandi was greater when it came to writing stories. Madan Lal Chaturvedi was willing to concede this point in his argument with a Bundelkhandi

critic but insisted that only the pure form of the two dialects ought to be compared. This reflected an attitude of linguistic purism as well as social and elitist prejudice. Chaturvedi insisted that Bundelkhandi should not include words used by Kols, Bhils and Anaryas or non-Aryans. The Sadhu Bhasha used by Keshav, Chattrasal, Raghuraj, Isuri and Biharilal, author of the *Satsai*, alone would be considered as standard Bundelkhandi. The same standards would apply in the case of Braj and would exclude words that were used by Jats and Gujars and borrowed from other local dialects or *deshaj bolis*.[30] The debates during this period were not only about the standard form of Hindi but also of its various dialects. The arguments might be framed primarily in terms of language and literature, but were used to deny political claims. In this case, Madan Lal Chaturvedi was making a case for the rejection of the distinctiveness of the language of Bundelkhand and its demand for a separate state.

There is considerable scope for controversy about the relation between language and dialect. In classical Greece there was no single Greek language but written dialects that were used for specific purposes — Ionic for history, Attic for tragedy and Doric for choral lyric. The post-classical period saw the development of a single Greek language called Koine which was based on the dialect of Athens and was the product of convergence of the various Greek written dialects of different regions. Nevertheless, these written dialects had their origin in spoken dialects which had diverged from an old common Greek language. Therefore, an American scholar has argued that the dialect may be regarded as a set of norms under the rubric of language which could historically be the product of both convergence and divergence.[31] In France the French revolutionaries regarded the regional dialects as feudal remnants. The French did not record the speakers of Breton in the census even after World War II and were reluctant to acknowledge the claims of those who spoke Provencal.[32] Different standard forms of written language declined in France after French became the national language.

In Italy too the Piedmontese language declined progressively after the adoption of Tuscan as the standard form of the Italian

language. Eric Hobsbawm has argued that at the time of the French revolution barely 12–13 per cent of the French population spoke French 'correctly' and 50 per cent did not speak it at all. In northern and southern France hardly anybody talked in French. Only 2½ per cent spoke standard Italian 'for everyday purposes' when the unification of Italy took place in 1860.[33] Therefore, the steady rise of the national language was a product of state patronage and neglect of the dialects. Nationalist pressures, the advantages of learning a dominant language or the weaknesses of the dialects or the dialect speakers themselves could ensure the ascendancy of the language chosen as the national language.[34] To some extent, these factors have helped Hindi to gain ascendancy at the expense of its regional dialects.

II
Education in Hindi Dialects

Not to recognize the vital importance of Hindi as the language of communication or *sammilit bhasha* or *sammilit sajhay ki bhasha,* according to Rahul Sankrityayan, would be unacceptable. All he wanted people to accept was that those who did not live in the Meerut Commissionary, which constituted less than four districts, also had mother-tongues that deserved attention. Mother-tongue was that language which the uneducated and even children could speak without any grammatical mistakes. Even a child of five in the Braj region, unlettered and untaught, would be able to laugh at incorrect use of Braj by someone who had picked it up as a second language. The child acquired the language literally with his mother's milk. Therefore, it was vital to recognize the importance of Braj (Saursheni), Panchali (Ruhelakhandi), Bundelkhandi (Dashararni), Kashika (Banarsi), Mallika (Bhojpuri), Vatsi (Dakshin Awadhi) and Baghelkhandi (Chedika).

The huge expansion in the knowledge available to mankind made it vitally important for the masses to acquire education. In order to promote education, and reduce the labour involved in its acquisition, it would have to be provided in the mother-tongue. If those who spoke Awadhi, Kashika or Mallika were compelled to learn Hindi

for eight years before they were permitted entry into the "temples of learning", i.e in high schools and colleges, the task of learning would certainly become more difficult. The scholar, who had visited the Soviet Union, was advocating the policy on language that had been adopted by the country he came to admire. Rahul Sankrityayan lauded the policy of providing education to the people of Central Asia in their mother-tongues, languages that the Soviet Union actually helped substantially to develop.[35]

Unlike the government of the Tsars, which was not interested in the education of the common man, the Socialist government took enormous pains to ensure that the common people were educated and that too in their own mother-tongues. The Turkmen, Uzbek, Kirghiz and Kazakh languages did "not have any script of their own, or any written literature" at the time when the Bolsheviks came to power in these regions. The enlightened government thought it would be better to educate the people in their own languages, by translating from the more developed languages like Russian and Turkish, rather than to compel them to learn these two developed languages. This enlightened policy transformed the entire region in a quarter century. In Uzbekistan where there had not been a single published book in the Uzbek language there was by the mid-1940s a university at Tashkent where numerous subjects were taught in the Uzbek language in different colleges.

It was the solicitude for the common people and the spoken languages of the common people that led Rahul Sankrityayan to argue that the different dialects of the broadly Hindi-speaking world should be developed as the vehicles for the spread of education. If the policy of a post-independence state was only to maintain the superior position of the elite, based on the illiteracy and ignorance of the masses, then there was no need to educate in the mother-tongue. But such elites ought to keep in mind that those who worked in factories needed adequate education in order to handle the new technology and machines. Soldiers required some education too if they had to use modern weapons. Widespread education was essential for the smooth functioning of a modern economy and society.

Rahul Sankrityayan was upset not by the contemporary concern for the preservation of local literature and songs, but the underlying assumption that these had to be recorded before they disappeared forever. It appeared to him as though a death warrant for these languages had been issued. He was horrified at this attempt to put languages like Bhojpuri, Bundeli and Bagheli in a museum. The latter two regions had populations as large as those in Czechoslovakia and Belgium. The languages spoken by crores of people, the languages of Surdas, Tulsidas and Vidyapati, could not be swept aside. If these languages — Bolis — had not become extinct till now, they were not going to disappear in the near future. He did not want these languages to become like crippled cows counting the last few moments of their lives. He wanted these languages to be used in the regional assemblies (janpad parliaments), in the courts, in the schools and colleges and even the universities. He observed, "Only when the language of the people becomes master in its own region will the people become the master of their own house".[36]

The objections to the use of regional dialects as a basis for education could not be set aside on practical grounds that were typically mentioned. The preparation of textbooks in languages which could count on innumerable students was a relatively simple task. If there was no problem in accepting the principle that education should be provided in the mother-tongue the preparation of suitable texts was not really a serious problem. Many of the writers in Hindi actually were speakers of regional dialects and preparation of texts for education up to the matriculation level would not take more than a year or two.[37] As for 'paribhashik' words the dialects had to confront the issue in much the same way as Hindi had to; and they had the same access to Sanskrit as Hindi had. Like German, the dialects would invent or coin words on their own (like *panvgaadi* for bicycle and *aganboat* for steamer) and accept words current internationally.

The division of regions in the past had been on the basis of the interests of the rulers; in future the convenience (subhita) of the people would determine policies. The creation of thirty provinces would not antagonize the British, if they continued to rule over India, since it would offer career opportunities for more ICS officers by

creating more posts of Governors. The unity of India would not be undermined by the creation of so many regions based on language. He wrote, "If you cannot prepare Bengali, Oriya, Gujarati and Marathi to commit suicide — or accept self-effacement — then what crime have poor Brajbhasha, Bundeli, Mallika and Maithili committed" to be condemned to extinction? The plan he had outlined was actually one of centralization rather than of decentralization because he had proposed that the Bhojpuri speaking people, found in both the United Provinces and Bihar, should be put in one province based on language.

In the opinion of Rahul Sankrityayan the Soviet Union had been able to impart education in the language of the people of the national republics of the USSR. This development of national languages was a result of the policies pursued during the quarter century after the Russian revolution. Although Mahapandit Rahul had become a Buddhist in his early years he was attracted to the ideology of Marxism and visited the Soviet Union. He was on good terms with the Soviets and was even appointed to a professorship in the USSR for two short spells. His opinion is broadly valid but he does not consider the suppression of the 'bourgeois' and 'reactionary' elements in the national republics which somewhat diminishes the claim about respecting the will of the people. Further, recent scholars have argued that Soviet policy was neo-traditionalist because it reinforced traditional national identities rather than vigorously promoting class consciousness. It is also clear that Russian served as the medium for higher technical education and positions in the upper echelons of the republics were controlled by Russians or Russian-speaking indigenous elites.[38]

The liberal attitude towards imparting education in most of the dialects or Bolis is reminiscent of the policies pursued in the period of the New Economic Policy during the 1920s in the USSR. Every effort was made to reach linguistic and national minorities through their own language. Official documents had to be printed in the languages used by the different linguistic groups in any region. This policy was later abandoned because it proved too cumbersome and expensive. The process of collectivization and industrialization

transformed many regions and the national minorities were compelled to fall in line. The language of the Kazakhs was developed, but they lost the bulk of their cattle herds during collectivization and their opinion was not sought with regard to the policies of modernization of society or with regard to the script to be used for their national language. It was a case of enlightened despotism practised by a modernizing socialist state.[38A]

Also, the Soviets introduced a system of dual nationalities, where citizens were formally recognized as both Kazakh and Soviet in official passports, whereby the Kazakhs were regarded as one of the 'nationalities' within a multi-national socialist state. The speakers of Bhojpuri or Awadhi were unlikely to claim the status of nationalities based on language and the proponents of Hindi were unlikely to endorse such a move. The Soviet Union was dominated by the more developed Russians and they had inherited the Central Asian regions from the imperialist Tsarist state. They were keen not to be seen as perpetuators of Russian hegemony and Russification policies of the 19th century. This was not the case in India, where Hindi's claim as a national language had emerged only in the 19th century, battling continuously against the influence of the dominant Urdu language. The Hindi*wallahs* were demanding the right to use Hindi as the second official language in the United Provinces, a demand that was conceded as late as 1900. Therefore, the position of Hindi in north India vis-à-vis the Bolis was far from comparable to that of Russian among the linguistic groups in Central Asia.[39]

It is also unclear whether the comparison can be made with the development of languages in Central Asia since the connection between Russian and these Turkic languages was almost negligible compared to that between the regional Bolis and Hindi in northern India. In fact it can be argued that if the broadly Turkic-speaking groups had been a part of the Turkish rather than the Russian empire then they would have been modernized along lines determined by Turkish rather than Russian decision-makers.[39A] However, the modernizing Turkish state under Kamal Ataturk and the Soviet Union under Stalin introduced policies during the 1920s and 1930s which share certain similarities. The two states tried to develop languages

on modern lines and introduced the Roman script to make learning easier.[40]

The similarities between Khari Boli and Braj and Awadhi were greater than between any of the Central Asian languages and Russian. Dr. Sampurnand said that it was wrong to argue that the connection between Russian and Kazakh or Uzbek was comparable to the relation between Hindi and Banarsi or Ghazipuri. The students who came from Benares, Allahabad or Jabalpur faced no problem in acquiring education in Khari Boli and their energies were not wasted by adopting Hindi as the medium of instruction. While the advocates of Hindi did not want to impose it on the regional languages it was clear that Russian was the language of education in the entire Russian Federation. Even in England, a much smaller country, despite the variations in dialects of different regions and counties, the position of English as the literary language was unquestioned. The burden of imposing thirty languages as medium of education in schools and universities, as recommended by Rahulji, would impose an intolerable financial burden on this poor country.[41]

It has recently been argued that the attitude of socialists and radical politicians often fell far short of the principles of secularism.[42] Sampurnanand believed that the future development of Hindi could not be imagined in terms of its current features. Hindi was being assailed from all directions and was living through a period of war or a *yudhkaal*. Under such conditions centralization was essential. Once this stage came to an end the centralized institutions would collapse on their own. To argue for decentralization during the *yudhkaa*l of Hindi was to diminish the influence of Hindi and to increase that of Urdu. It was like becoming an enemy, a *shatrunandan*, literally the son of the enemy. Sampurnanand was completely opposed to the ideas of Sankrityayan because, although he spoke Kashika, he had never come across anyone who wanted to use it as a medium of instruction. Except for those who spoke Maithili, Sindhi or Punjabi he did not think that the speakers of dialects were in favour of using them as a medium of instruction. He feared that it would be impossible to stop the flood tide if the dialects were introduced as mediums of instruction at the level of

primary education. The consequence of such a policy would be to weaken the country by creating 'nations' or *rashtras* based on language which would only create anarchy. Who said that people who spoke dialects were desperate to get education in their own dialects? This was an artificially produced demand for mother-tongues that would wreck the country as once the small and weak states of India had succumbed to foreign invasion.[43]

Therefore, the argument for the development of the Bolis would have to be primarily in order to facilitate education at the lower levels in north India. Rahul Sankrityayan's main argument was about learning in the mother-tongue, but Soviet policies depended on factors that were not relevant in the north Indian case. Even Sankrityayan did not make a case for Bolis based on the principle of nationalities or that of a federation of national republics as in the case of the USSR. The idea of decentralization he endorsed did not rest on the notion of nationality, based partly on ethnic and religious differences, that the atheist Russian communists were faced with in the Muslim Turkic-speaking Central Asian republics. The 'imperialism' (*samrajyavad*) of Hindi in the area dominated by the Bolis was not comparable to that of the Russians in Central Asia.

Rahul Sankrityayan's proposals favouring education in the dialects of Hindi were unacceptable to supporters of Sanskritized Hindi and Persianized Urdu. If the proportion of words to be drawn from Sanskrit was to be very high then Pandit Rahul's scheme would tend to bring about greater similarities at the level of higher education in the regional dialects and Hindi than at the elementary levels. Therefore, the scheme he proposed was likely to facilitate early learning rather than the development of the regional dialects as separate languages, like Marathi or Bengali. Even more, if the Bolis were to be the medium of instruction up to the matriculation level then the Urdu-speakers would be keen to wean away the Muslims who spoke the Bolis at the local level. If the communal divide was not bridged at the political level the chances of Muslim political leaders calling upon Muslims to switch to Urdu was enormously high. The use of thirty Bolis as a medium of instruction at the regional

level might facilitate education, but it was unlikely to be entirely effective against the communitarian or communal identification of Muslims with Urdu. His views were too radical since he made the acceptance of Hindi as the inter-regional language dependent on the will of the people of the different regions.[44]

The proponents of the Bolis were making a case for the recognition of their language for a variety of reasons. Whether the development of Bhojpuri led to the resolution of the Hindi versus Urdu dispute was not very important for many Bhojpuri speakers. They simply loved their language and wanted to promote it. The support for early education in the dialects was endorsed by others who did not share either Mahapandit Rahul's ideological fascination with Soviet policy or even personally identify with the regional dialects. Jagdish Chaturvedi supported the use of regional dialects as a medium of instruction because he felt the slow growth of literacy in the Hindi-belt was partly because the speakers of the regional dialects found it difficult to cope with learning in Hindi which was not their mother-tongue. In the non-Hindi-speaking states, since the mother-tongue was the medium of instruction, the spread of literacy was faster.[44A] Therefore, the use of regional dialects to spread literacy and education was defensible, even if it tended to weaken the unity and broad appeal of Hindi.[45]

The Janapada Programme

There was a clear division between those who were in favour of developing Hindi as a language that represented the best of the local traditions in the regional dialects and Bolis and those for whom the development of these dialects as languages of education and culture was of central importance. The most extreme proponent of the latter idea was Rahul Sankrityayan but there were other supporters as well. There were also scholars like V.S. Aggarwal who were deeply concerned about the development of knowledge embedded in the regional dialects and the need to enrich Hindi by drawing upon the vocabulary and the wisdom, about local life and conditions, built up in these dialects over the centuries. In his fascination for the knowledge contained in the dialects and the beauty of their songs

and local skills, Aggarwal was treading a path familiar to most nationalists. Typically, studies of local music, the language of the common people and the distinctive features of local society were made by intellectuals associated with the rise of nationalism.[46] It may be argued that the concern for the natural beauty of their localities was also typical of many nations in the making but the concern for the economic features of a given region or locality and the desire to emulate the Dictionary of Economic Products that the British produced does reveal the unmistakable imprint of colonial knowledge.[47] The proposal for studying the Bundelkhand region seems to be to produce a humungous work that would be the indigenous variant of the District Gazetteers and Settlement Reports and Linguistic and Zoological Surveys all rolled into one.

Aggarwal believed that Hindi could never progress without drawing upon the resources of the dialects. He claimed in 1940 that he had been trying for the past five years to get the literary men of the Braj region to accept this position.[48] The scholar claimed to have introduced words like *fagunhata*, the local name for a strong breeze that blew in *Ahicchetr*a, into his published articles. The word *panchayatn*i was used to refer to those four temples for minor deities, placed at the four corners of the temple for the major deity, in order to create harmony.[49] The attitude was eclectic: Aggarwal believed that th*e samarajya* or dominance of Hindi was necessary when it came to scientific and *paribhashik* words; but for the creative development of literature there was a need for *vairajya*. The *dvairajya* or the predominance of two forces would remain in so far as both Hindi and Urdu and Hindi and other provincial languages would continue to exert their influence in their respective spheres.[49A] In mutual interest different literary groups would exercise influence in diverse ways; *bhaujya shasan* would also remain.[50]

From the correspondence between Banarsidas Chaturvedi and Vasudev Aggarwal it is quite evident that the two men thought they were engaged in a great task of developing the Hindi language. Chaturvedi had declared "the Principal aim of my life is interpretation of what is best among other people". In Vedic terms from half of Brahma was born '*vishva-bhuvan*' and from the other half it's

'*prateek*' according to Aggarwal. Our objective is to be concerned about both — other people as well as the traditions of our own people. All that was best in the world was known to our people.[51] The Janapada and *paur-kshetras* were as valuable as the eternal truths of the Vedas. Although the collection of folk songs, the programmes for village uplift and the love of Khadi were seemingly different they were the product of the same philosophical perspective. Vasudev Sharan declared that he was a staunch supporter of the man-centred view of the universe. Without a focus on man, as the sage Vyas had recommended, the whole project for the study of local culture and knowledge would not be of any importance.

Vasudev Sharan was not only flexible enough to speak of different spheres of influence for Hindi and Urdu but he was also not identifying entirely with the virtues of village life and society. He was open to influences from abroad but believed that only those who had developed the capacity to understand their own society and culture would have the necessary strength to absorb knowledge from outside. What is noteworthy is that Aggarwal believed that the towns and the Janapadas both needed each other. He earnestly hoped that the close contact or *gaadh parichay* of the towns and Janapadas would be the hallmark of the future and the harbinger of change for the betterment of both.[52] In the Lakhamandal he met a carpenter who used the word *ukare* for *nakkashi* or carving, a word derived from the Sanskrit *Utkirn*. In one hour the carpenter was able to give them nearly fifty *paribhashik* words. He admired the villagers for preserving the literary inheritance of the Gupta period because the carpenter used the expression *surujanrayan ka phoo*l for a variety of the lotus flower. In so far as Aggarwal recognized some virtues of the city he cannot be perceived as an uncritical advocate of the superiority of village society. Nevertheless, his programme did aim to rejuvenate society and culture using the immense treasures buried in the Janapadas. He argued that the next fifty years could be devoted to a study of the Janapadas.

The primary concern of Vasudev Aggarwal was to enrich and promote Hindi and therefore he was reluctant to identify with Chaturvedi's programme of *Vikendriyakaran*. He feared that the

negative perception of the term would weaken the Janapada programme. Satyarthi and Aggarwal wrote to Chaturvedi urging him not to use the term for one year. The Janapada Kalyaniya programme would have become stronger but for the stand taken by *Madhukar.* In any case the larger cause of the Janapada would be unaffected even if the Hardwar proposals were dropped at the Jaipur session.[53] In an essay 'Hindi Sahitya Ke Samagra Roop', Vasudev Sharan had argued that the approach called Janapada Kalyaniya and *Setubandh* were both essential for the progress of Hindi literature. The first approach entailed the discovery of what was best in indigenous society; the second meant the acceptance of the best from outside. Satyendra, Chaturvedi and Vasudev Sharan were merely the humble instruments to promote the progress of Hindi since the gods had already determined its path of development. He was willing to accept the sin of *brahmhatya* if his views were deemed detrimental to the cause of Hindi.[54]

Only after developing a keen eye for the immense beauty of the forest would scholars be able to develop the capacity to understand the *lok* or people. The rising nation would have to pay its tribute to nature. By turning to nature we would be able to enrich our literature and turn away from foreign influences. The artificial distinction between the town and the country or village would have to be removed. At least the traditions that went back to the Gupta period of Indian history could be recovered by literary men with a keen sense of observation.[55]

Although Aggarwal was drawing on largely Hindu cultural traditions it is not possible to find negative remarks about the Muslim period or the Persian and Arabic influences.[56] The Vedas had referred to earth as *mahimata* or the Great Mother and it was essential that Hindi literature re-establish its links with nature. Thousands of words were awaiting discovery by scholars devoted to the progress of Hindi. This can be partly attributed to the fact that the Janapadas were perceived as individual democracies of which the literary scholars studying them were citizens.[57] There is little evidence of linguistic chauvinism either. Hindi had come to the *swayamvar* for choosing the national language and it had to have a broad outlook. Hindi had

to develop a substantial interest in the rich vocabulary and literature of languages like Punjabi, Gujarati and Bangla. Hindi had to be prominent among equals as the sun among the planets.[58]

III
Laukik or *Chalu* Hindi

The problem of developing a national language in a country where there were many developed languages was quite a major issue. Many speakers of other languages were convinced that the use of Hindi or Hindustani could serve such a function. The debate was not only about the choice of the national language but also how it could be made acceptable to those who were not native speakers of the language or of any of its numerous dialects. In the non-Hindi speaking states there were scholars and politicians who felt that a simplified language was best suited to be the common language for the common people. C. Rajagopalachari voiced some concerns about the dispute between Hindi and Urdu, which he felt could impede the progress of the national language in south India. There were local rumblings against the use of Hindi or Hindustani and the dispute about the nature of the national language was not to be left entirely to the good sense of the native speakers of the language in the opinion of men like Suniti Chatterjee.

In his writings, particularly in an essay entitled 'Chalu Hindi', he argued for a need to simplify the language. *Shudh* Hindi or *Sadhu* Hindi was the literary and pure form of Hindi. On the other hand *laukik* or *chalu* Hindi was spoken by those who did not understand pure Hindi or Urdu and were speakers of regional languages or dialects. Even educated people whose mother-tongue was Punjabi, Lahndi or Hindki, Maithili, Bhojpuri, Garhwali or Chhatisgarhi spoke in simple *laukik* Hindi with each other or people from their own region. This argument was different from that of Rahul Sankrityayan in two ways. One, Suniti Chatterjee was not stating that education be provided in regional dialects of Hindi or that all these dialects had an equal right to be languages used for education. He was only arguing for a modification of the rules of Hindi grammar in order to help the non-native speakers in accepting Hindi as a means of

communication. Secondly, he wanted simplified Hindi to be used for ordinary speech and even for newspapers.[59]

Unlike some others, Chatterjee had a definite set of criteria by which the claims of regional dialects as separate languages were to be accepted. There had to be first of all substantial differences between its grammar and that of Hindi. Secondly, the speakers of the dialect were expected to show great pride and attachment for their language. Thirdly, they had to show that they faced considerable difficulty in coping with Hindi. Finally, the dialect claiming the status of a language had to have a substantial body of literature of high quality. These principles were to be used to judge the suitability of a dialect for use as a medium of instruction and to acquire the status of a language that was distinct from Hindi. Therefore while Chatterjee did not oppose decentralization he set some stiff standards for accepting the claims of the dialects as languages.[60] In the opinion of the learned linguist, only Maithili qualified unequivocally. Although the medieval literature in Marwari was substantial the speakers of Jaipuri and Malaviya were unlikely to accept it as literary Rajasthani. If Marwari were to develop into a modern literary language it would occupy a status similar to that of Punjabi in Punjab. While in western Punjab the literary language was Urdu, in eastern Punjab it was Punjabi, in which the Sikh attachment to Punjabi in the Gurmukhi script had played an important role. Therefore, from the point of view of the current known as decentralization or *Vikendriyakaran,* Chatterjee was willing to accept the claims of Punjabi together with those of Maithili, Bhojpuri and Marwari/ Rajasthani.

Identifying the problems of people from eastern Bihar and Bengal, he argued that they found it exceedingly difficult to speak *sadhu* Hindi. There was an acute problem that Bengali speakers faced with regard to gender in Hindi. In this respect Hindi was like French. There was not only the argument that the common mistakes made by speakers of other languages should be acceptable in the real world of commerce and day-to-day life but that it should go beyond that. The grammar of Hindi ought to be simplified such that the problem

of gender was done away with. In the essay on 'Chalu Hindi' the distinguished scholar, who could write Hindi very well himself, actually advocated that the *chalu* Hindi ought to be used for journalistic writings and broadcasts as well. This he thought would make the Hindi language more popular among Bengalis. In other ways too he sought to make the language more scientific and more acceptable to non-native speakers of Hindi.

The idea of a simple language which involved the systematic reform of Hindi grammar provoked some strong reactions among the advocates of Hindi. Dhirendra Varma was so appalled by the idea that "Hindi should give up all grammatical modifications in adjectives and verbs due to gender" that he was in favour of retaining its purity as the provincial language of ten crores of Indians. "Torturing and disfiguring" Hindi in a thousand ways just to make it acceptable to twenty-five crores of Indians as an inter-provincial language was too high a price to pay.[61] The reaction was strong on Varma's part because he believed that Hindi-speaking people, who were not perplexed by gender difficulties, were being asked "to speak *hathi jaati hai* and *Lomdi bola"*. Even though the French had a similar 'grammatical gender' as Hindi they were not being pressurized into modifying their language. Nobody had asked the English to have a more rational system of spelling or grammar. The difficulties that the Bengalis faced were different from those faced by the Punjabis or the Tamils. If Hindi was to be modified "according to the convenience of a dozen languages of India" it would be "anything but Hindi".[62]

Objections were raised by other proponents of Hindi against the proposal to modify the grammar of Hindi. The Buddhist Bhadant Anand Kaushalyayan was critical of this proposal in his introduction to the addresses to the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan published in 1986. If Dr. Suniti Chatterjee had been alive he would have asked him how many of the numerous languages that he had studied had simplified their grammar for his convenience. For the benefit of the numerous students of Sanskrit in universities in India and abroad what efforts had been made to make Sanskrit grammar easy to comprehend? In what way has the grammar of Bengali, the mother-tongue of Dr. Chatterjee, been modified to facilitate learning by non-

Bengalis? Commented Kaushalyayan, "To cut off the ears and nose of a language, in order to make it easier to learn", was like cutting off the nose and ears of Surpnakha, the sister of Ravana, which led to dire consequences.[63]

Why was Suniti babu, who favoured the Roman script because the votaries of Urdu refused to accept Devanagari, not recommending the virtues of the Roman script to speakers of Bengali? Was defenceless Hindi alone to be subjected to projects of improvement?[64] It is interesting that Humayun Kabir was advocating the adoption of the Roman script for all the Indian languages. This would not only solve the problem of Urdu versus Nagari scripts but also encourage people from the north and the south to learn the languages of their regions. Kabir observed, "The task of the pupils would be rendered easier by the tendency of the largely common vocabulary of today to become even more markedly so and the adoption of the mother-tongue would not in consequence endanger the chances of developing an all India speech". He also argued that the difference between the vocabulary used by the Muslims and Hindus in Bengal did not lead to the creation of two distinct languages because of a common script. Hindustani would develop more substantially as a common language if the Roman script was adopted to make the language more acceptable to both Hindus and Muslims.[65]

What is Hindustani?

There was considerable confusion about what was signified by the word Hindustani. There were those who argued that Hindi had developed as a reaction to the predominance of Urdu. The unity of the Urdu-speaking elite was broken by the Hindu revivalist effort to promote a more Sanskritized form of Hindi in the 19th century.[66] In the second account Urdu was the language of a microscopic minority of urban literate groups since the unity of the Urdu-speaking elite was confined to the urban and muffasil elites who were concerned with civil, judicial and revenue matters. Its literary treasures, although considerable, were restricted to a few themes and a small circle of elite Muslims together with 'Kayasthas, Kashmiris and Khattris'.[67] Amar Nath Jha blamed Sir Sayyed Ahmad Khan for insisting that

the language of the elite Muslims was the language of the province and that Hindi was trying to undermine it. There were others who argued that only 5 per cent of the population in the United Provinces spoke and understood Urdu. The majority of people spoke the dialects like Braj, Awadhi and Bhojpuri, even if they were Muslims. Urdu was not a language of the Muslims alone, but the majority of Muslims did not speak it even in the United Provinces.

There are a few positions that have emerged in the literature: those who thought that Urdu was being challenged by protagonists of Hindi and Hindu communalists; those who believed that Urdu represented an alien or elitist trend in India; those who thought it did not matter when the divide between Hindi and Urdu developed as long as there was broad agreement about the language policy for the region. Of those who sought a solution for the problem of Hindi versus Urdu there were those who favoured Hindustani and those who thought that a simplified or modified Hindi would be suitable for the Hindus. The Muslims favoured Urdu or a Hindustani with large inputs from Arabic and Persian. The nationalist minded Muslims and the Congressmen favoured Hindustani but the precise nature of the Hindustani was indeterminate because the pull of the Sanskrit and Perso-Arabic traditions respectively was felt by the Hindus and Muslims within this broad group.

There was one scholar who argued that Khari Boli had three separate forms — High Hindi, Urdu and Hindustani. Barannnikov was able to argue that Hindustani was a variant of Khari Boli.[68] The spoken form of Khari Boli had been around much before the emergence of Urdu. He disputed the tendency, of those whom he called 'Hindu' scholars, to deny that Urdu had contributed to the development of Hindi. In his view a spoken language cannot achieve lexical and grammatical stability until it develops a literary language or is related to it. It was the development of Urdu as a literary language that allowed Khari Boli, which was a spoken language, to get the stability required to develop subsequently into a separate language. The inability to develop prose in Khari Boli and Braj was related to the upper caste background of the literary figures, men who could use Sanskrit as the language of prose. It was this option

of using Sanskrit, a developed and stable language for prose composition in fairly widespread use, which prevented the development of Hindi.[69]

The English brought to India the idea of a spoken language that was close to the literary language and Hindustani, which emerged partly after British intervention, became the literary language most suited to unite both Hindus and Muslims. Baburam Saksena was one of the scholars who supported the use of Hindustani for this very reason. The British role in the setting up of Fort William College is well known. What Barannikov was arguing was that with the emergence of a bourgeois class in India there was a need felt to develop a literary language close to the spoken language. Further, the British provided the means for the propagation of such a language through the press. It was Hindustani which could bring the Hindus and Muslims together. In the opinion of this scholar the use of Arabic and Persian by Muslims was as legitimate as the use of Sanskrit was for the Hindus. Therefore, Hindustani was the best choice as the literary language for the two communities. Many protagonists of Hindi had argued that the introduction of Sanskrit words was essential to make Hindi acceptable to people of other regions of India. They did not consider the fact that Hindustani, before their intervention, had flourished without the profusion of Sanskrit *tatsama* words.[70]

The historian Dr. Tarachand argued that although Khari Boli had developed after the tenth century A.D. and had begun to absorb loan words introduced by the Muslim rulers, it faced competition from Rajasthani as the literary language in northern India in the 13th century. Later the Bhakti movement popularized Braj and Awadhi and only Kabir and Nanak popularized Khari Boli or Hindustani. The literary language was Persianized Hindustani up to the 18th century for both Hindus and Muslims. Modern Sanskritized Hindi did not develop as a result of the British support for Indian scholars at Fort William but as a result of the literary efforts of Bharatendu Harish Chandra and Raja Shiv Prasad after the revolt of 1857.[71] According to Dr. Tarachand, "Khadi boli or Hindustani has two literary forms. The earlier form called Hindi by its users, and now

known as Urdu, has a continuous history from the 14th century to the present day. The second form, known as Modern Hindi, came into literary use at the beginning of the 19th century and has made rapid progress since the Mutiny."[72]

Dr. Tarachand was the author of an influential work entitled *Influence of Islam on Indian Culture* and was a strong believer in the confluence of cultures and the elements of synthesis that could be found in Indian culture.[73] He believed that Hindus had learnt to express their religious and cultural interests in the Urdu language and there was no reason to fear the inclusion of Arabic and Persian loan words. In a dictionary, the *Farhang-i-Asafia*, compiled by Sayyid Ahmad Dehlavi there were 7,584 words from Arabic, 6,041 from Persian, 554 from Sanskrit and 500 from English out of a total of about 50,000 words. In the Hindi *Sabda Sagar* put together by the Nagari Pracharini Sabha "we find that almost every one of these 7,584 Arabic and 6,041 Persian words is included in it".[74] This was for Dr. Tarachand evidence of a shared vocabulary and for many advocates of Hindi, proof of the domination by an alien culture. The objections to the use of such loan words were cultural, aesthetic or religious, but the net result was the rejection of any synthesis. Tarachand believed that Hindustani was no artificial creation and had existed as a separate language for a thousand years. Obviously, this depended on what one chooses to call Hindustani, but Hindustani was not just another British invention.

Tarachand firmly believed that the only way to consolidate the nation was by "the fusion of communities". Bazaar Hindustani could not serve as the language for administration and education and so Hindustani would have to be "an elevated and dignified speech, rich in words and phrases and flexible to a degree". The elevated Hindustani would have to borrow from many languages but the borrowing must be in conformity with the phonetic system and grammatical rules of Hindustani.[75] He argued, "Although Hindi and Urdu are mainly borrowing languages, there is no reason why Hindustani should not develop the capacity to form words and derivatives from its original words or from borrowed words." The development of Hindustani must be based on the "phonetic genius

of the dialect" and ought to be a "composite speech" drawing on the speech of the Hindu and Muslim communities.[76]

Unfortunately, Hindi and Urdu were moving apart, making their derivatives based on the rules of Sanskrit and Arabic rather than their own genius. The phonetic system of Khari Boli and its grammatical and morphological rules are different from that of Sanskrit and there is no point in trying to modify the "sound structure of the dialect which is the basis of both Hindi and Urdu''. There are seven forms of the declension of nouns of which six constitute the cases of Sanskrit, but Hindi and Urdu have both lost all these forms. They do not have more than three true cases. The difference between Modern Hindi and Urdu was, therefore, not fundamental. On the other hand, both these languages differ from the Sanskrit and Persian systems "materially". Modern Hindi, Hindustani and Urdu are all Aryan languages and therefore the effort to create artificial languages like Sanskritized Hindi and Persianized Urdu should be arrested in order to create a vibrant lingua franca like Hindustani.[77]

Who Created the Hindi–Urdu Divide?

The debate on language has also been influenced by the historical reasons for the divide between Hindi and Urdu. Among the nationalists, primarily close to the Congress, there was a view that the reasons for the divide were unimportant and that there was an urgent need to promote Hindustani as the lingua franca. The support for Basic Hindustani was based on the need to reduce the growing linguistic and communal divide. Jawaharlal Nehru advocated the idea of Basic Hindustani, along the lines of Basic English, which merely required knowledge of about a thousand words. The idea was to make Hindustani a language for communication suitable for all Indians. It was merely trying to make the spoken form of Hindustani the medium for inter-provincial communication. He did not want to impede the development of either Hindi or Urdu as literary languages but regarded their growing divide as a political problem that had to be tackled.[78] In this he was sincere, as were Dr. Rajendra Prasad and Subhas Bose. Although these leaders represented different ideological shades within the Congress, it did not affect their

substantive position on the need for Hindustani as the preferred form of the future national language of India.

There were nationalists and communalists who argued that the divide was created because Urdu deliberately chose to cut itself off from the spoken languages of the people of north India, from the 18th century onwards. The Mughal Empire had adopted Persian as the language of administration and culture.[79] Even after its collapse it was a court language in many states that cropped up in the 18th century. The Muslim elite chose to develop Hindustani/ Khari Boli as a literary language drawing on Persian words, metaphors and literary styles which involved the use of complex compound or *samasik* words. In an address to the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan it was asserted that Urdu scholars went out of their way to imitate the Persian style; instead of references to Indian flora and fauna they chose Persian names. It is with considerable exasperation that Hindu nationalists and Hindi advocates refer to the alienating impact of this choice made by the Muslim elite.

Another line of argument against Hindi is that it tried to undermine the stranglehold that Urdu allegedly had over the elite and therefore crafted a language that was heavily laden with Sanskrit vocabulary.[80] There are scholars who disagreed with this view and some of them were European experts.[81] In the opinion of Grierson, writing in 1887, the importance of Bharatendu Harishchandra's essay 'Hindi Bhakha', was that it spelled out the different dialects of Hindi that he was familiar with. He identified six types of Hindi prose: the first in which Sanskrit words predominated; the second in which there were some Sanskrit words; the third in which there were no Sanskrit but only pure Prakrit words; the fourth in which foreign words were admitted; the fifth which was full of Persian words; and finally the sixth in which English words were used. Grierson points out that Harishchandra considered prose which had Persian words as Hindi, although he preferred the second and third type of Hindi. He thought that as far as the 'natives' were concerned the difference between Hindi and Urdu did not depend on the vocabulary but idioms and the order of words.[82]

The difference between Urdu and Hindi was not very clear cut during the early 19th century. Although the missionary William Carey, who translated the *Bible* into Hindustani, used the term indiscriminately he did believe that there had to be two translations of the *Bible*. In his First Memoirs, published in 1808 and cited in Graham Bailey, Carey wrote that a Hindustani with a great number of Persian words would not be understood by a Pandit born and brought up in north India who was accustomed to a large number of Sanskrit words.[83] In a letter by Reverend David Brown of 1806 there is a mention of two specimens of writing he had received from Serampore — one 'Shanscrit Hindoostanee' and the other 'Delhi Hindoostanee'. In fact the language that Carey used for translating the *Bible* was Urduized Hindi, although the words would have been familiar to those who spoke Hindi. William Hunter's version was in pure Urdu with the help of Mirza Fitrut. It is an indication of the missionary concern about reaching out to people that a Hindi version was published soon after and this was based on the translation by the Baptist missionary, John Chamberlain.[84]

In the opinion of a Hindi scholar, who had a Marxist understanding of the problem, the Urdu language developed as a result of the cultural inclinations of a narrow circle of people in a feudal atmosphere where they were cut off from the mass of people in north India. The argument, that Urdu was a language that emerged as a result of the commingling of the Muslims with the Hindus, has been challenged by Ram Vilas Sharma. He cites Sayyad Ehtisham Hussain, the historian of Urdu literature, thus until the end of the 18th century the word Urdu was not used to refer to a language. The small group of Hindus and Muslims, who used Persian as the official language, tried to study and understand the language through Hindi. Besides, the common Hindus and the Muslims spoke the regional dialects.

Until the time of the poet Mir the Urdu poets did not fight shy of calling their language Hindi. The language of the Muslims who were writing in Braj and Awadhi was not very different from the language that was being used by those Muslims who were writing in Khari Boli. The vocabulary or *shabd bhandar* that was produced

by Jayasi, Rahim, and Raskhan in Braj and Awadhi was not very different from that used by writers in the Deccan. Although the Hindus and Muslims had been living together for over five centuries an independent language had not developed. Urdu had not developed independently of Hindi until the 18th century.[85]

The adoption of Persian as the official or state language by the Mughals had two distinct consequences. On the one hand it enabled the direct and indirect expansion of the influence and popularity of Hindi. On the other hand it prevented the development of Khari Boli as a language of the broad masses or the *jatiya bhasha*. Although the rulers of the Deccan, in Bijapur and Golconda, gave the status of an official language to Hindi this privilege was denied to Khari Boli Hindi in Delhi, its place of birth. The fascination of the declining Muslim feudal elite with the Persian language led to the steady incorporation of loan words through Persian into Khari Boli; this also accounts for their inability to accept the more liberal tradition of early Dakhini Hindi.[86] The narrow elite, both Hindu and Muslim, who were cut off from the dialects like Braj and Awadhi, were unable to forge a language that could evolve as a common national language of the Hindustani *jati* or people.[87] Therefore, the British were able to exploit a cleavage in Indian society by creating a difference between Hindi and Urdu.[88]

Debating Hindustani: Hindu and Muslim Views

There was considerable optimism among many writers and scholars about the viability of Hindustani. In the early years of the twentieth century, before the communal violence and polarization of the 1920s, a Muslim scholar wrote approvingly of Hindustani and the common linguistic and cultural inheritance of Hindus and Muslims in India. Yusuf wrote that the language of Kabir, Tulsidas, Malik Mohammad and Nazir would find some way of articulating the common aspirations of the Hindus and Muslims of India.[89] Ali delivered this lecture in March 1917 in which he stated that Hindi and Urdu were 'structurally' the same language. The Hindustani language was 'flexible' and 'catholic' in its approach and accepted words from outside although it had a well developed literary tradition

of its own. The literature that he included in Hindustani included works with religious themes, folk songs and poetry, essays, history writing and literary works of both the Hindus and the Muslims.

Ali was concerned with the conflict between Hindi and Urdu but felt the problem could be handled. When he spoke of the creation of an 'academy' for Hindustani he expected that it would produce a standard form of literary Urdu, if nothing else. Despite the differences between Hindi and Urdu the proceedings of the All India Urdu Press Conference held a short while earlier showed the way forward. He argued that Urdu was a language that had been created by the Hindus to communicate with the Muslims who spoke and wrote in Persian. This was an observation of Sir Charles Lyall which he quoted approvingly. He wanted to systematise the use of Urdu and to make it capable enough to serve as a means of education in the future. While the classification of literature was catholic the future of Hindustani or Urdu was not clearly delineated.[90] The author was against the 'pedantic tendencies' of people out of touch with the world but that did not tackle the issue of Hindustani versus Urdu or Hindi head on.

A strong argument that had been advanced in Padma Singh Sharma's book, published in 1932 by the Hindustani Academy of Allahabad, was that the vocabulary of Urdu and Hindi was not as dissimilar as the spokesmen for the former claimed. The systematic import of Arabic and Persian words ought to be stopped to keep the common language called Hindustani alive. The authors in Urdu not only adopted words from Arabic and Persian but also *vyakaran* and *pingal* were distorted under that influence. The artificial difference between Hindi and Urdu was exaggerated and the divide between Hindi and Urdu widened because of communal feelings and religious sensibilities. This was probably unheard of anywhere else in the world.[91] Maulana Altaf Hussein Hali wrote in a review of the *Farhang-e-Asfiya* by Sayyad Ahmad Dehlavi in 1887 that an Urdu dictionary should be written only by someone who spoke chaste Urdu and was also a cultured Muslim from Delhi. As a consequence the President of the Second Hindi Sahitya Sammelan, Pandit Govind Narain Misra, was compelled to declare that Hindi and Urdu could

not be considered as the same language. Janab Ahsan Marharvi, who is cited, argued that the Hindus were, therefore, compelled to follow the Muslim example. The gap between Hindi and Urdu thus began to widen.

Raja Shiv Prasad *Sitare-Hind* was appalled by the fact that instead of a common grammar for Urdu and Hindi the gap between the two languages was widening. The Pandits and the Maulvis were pulling in different directions, denying the slow evolution of a common language. There was one set of books for Muslims and Kayasthas and another one for Brahmins and Banias. In an assessment of Urdu Maulvi Sayyad Wahiduddin 'Salim' Panipati, a professor of Osmania College, argued that the words drawn from the Aryan languages outnumbered the Semitic ones in the ratio of six is to one. Of the 54,009 words included in the *Farhang-i-Asafiya* the words that were drawn from Hindi and Punjabi and eastern dialects numbered 21,644 and the words that were formed by the combination of Hindi with other languages were 17,505. From Arabic and Persian respectively 7,584 and 6,041 words were included. Even the words from Hindi were three times the number of words from Arabic. The author of *Wazzeh Istallahat* argued that the attitude of contempt towards words from Hindi, as those that were used by people in the bazaar or by the uncultured, was an indefensible attitude. Why was there an antipathy to the use of Hindi words in common use in Urdu when it came to producing standard works?[92]

IV
The Perception of Punjabi

There is among some of the earlier colonial scholars a favourable view not only of the sturdy Punjabis but also their language. In the Punjab the colonial administrators and scholars saw hard working peasants, trustworthy and brave soldiers and men who respected strong leaders rather than rule-based bureaucracy. One scholar went so far as to argue that not only was Punjabi a substantial language it had the ability to express fine distinctions better than Urdu. Grahame Bailey argued in a review of the Linguistic Survey by Grierson that although the Punjabi language was not as well

developed as Urdu it was in a better position to absorb words from different sources. It could draw upon Persian, Arabic and Urdu as well as Sanskrit and Hindi for literary or scientific words. The genius of the language allowed it to do so easily.

The absence of a strong literary tradition has enabled Punjabi to remain more natural and true to its soil. As a language of conversation it was far superior to Urdu because it was spoken in the homes of people. When it came to expressing thoughts for every word in Urdu there were three in Punjabi. In Bailey's view there were not many Europeans who would not prefer Punjabi to Urdu if they were proficient in both languages. In the western part of Punjab which was predominantly Muslim the Persian script was in use while in the eastern part Gurmukhi was popular. The difference was not confined to the script alone. For the western part of the Punjab the translation of the *Bible* used words like *Khuda* for god and *gunah* for sin; in the eastern part *Parmeshwar* and *pap* were used instead.[93]

The connection between Western Hindi and Punjabi was also noted by scholars. While the language of Nanak, which was close to Western Hindi, was gradually transformed into Punjabi during the period of the later Gurus, the writing of the tenth Guru in the Dasam Granth was very close to Western Hindi. The fact that a lot of poetry that could be considered Hindi was written in Gurmukhi had led many scholars to underestimate the influence of Hindi on the Punjabi language. The Hindi and semi-Hindi of the Sikh scriptures had had an impact on Punjabi Sikh literature and had influenced forms of speech in Punjabi. The prose hagiographies of Lal Singh and Atma Singh were more Hindi than Punjabi in style. It was after independence that the Punjabi language flourished with contributions from notable writers including women writers like Amrita Pritam.[94]

In the Punjab the educated elite were familiar with and fond of Urdu. It flourished because it was adopted as the official language by the British after they annexed the Punjab. Even the Hindus were adept at Urdu and it was regarded as the language of culture. The literary men of the Hindi heartland were not aware of the extent of the popularity of Hindi in the Punjab. At the time of the Hindi Sahitya

Sammelan, the Chairman observed that they were under the impression that Hindi was not very popular in the Punjab. The schools established by the Arya Samaj played a very important role in the propagation of the Hindi language. The work done by this organization brought out the fact that the Punjab was not averse to Hindi.[95] In the absence of a dictionary of common and spoken Hindi words there was great difficulty in imparting education. The linguist Dr. Siddheshwar Varma from Jammu, who commended the Janapadiya programme, also pointed out that Hindi examinations, particularly in the Punjab, were nothing but an exercise in rote learning. Neither the students nor the teachers could understand the Hindi words that they used.[96]

The Arya Samaj was an advocate of Hindi and Lala Lajpat Rai in fact became convinced that "political solidarity demanded the spread of Hindi and Devanagari" even though he did not know the Hindi alphabet when he made this decision.[97] The Hindu Mahasabha in one pamphlet promoted the idea of Hindi as the language of the Punjab as Bengali was that of Bengal. The influence of Hindi in the Punjab was not negligible although the main task of the Arya Samaj, the Hindu Mahasabha and proponents of Hindi was to oppose the dominance of Urdu in the Punjab.[98] Urdu was the language of the courts and administration in the Punjab but communication with the people depended on Punjabi. Although it flourished as a colloquial language, Punjabi did not do so by overt resistance to colonial rule. It was "resilience" which enabled Punjabi to constitute a "broader vernacular culture".[99]

It was the colonial administrators who assumed that there was a clear connection between the Gurmukhi script and the Punjabi language. In reality, each script was used for multiple languages. A quarterly return for books in 1877 recorded entries such as Hindi in Gurmukhi character and Urdu in Nagri character. While the standardization of Urdu and Hindi took place during the 19th century it did not happen in the case of Punjabi. Despite a vibrant print culture in Punjabi there was no standardization of the language. Mir argues that this shows that states play a critical role in the standardization of languages. Print culture "did not bring about an ethnolinguistic

nationalism based on Punjabi in the way vernacularization processes in Europe did. Nor did it operate in the ways that Benedict Anderson suggested in *Imagined Communities*, where he describes how print cultures in vernacular languages produce nationalist sentiment".[100] Although Mir's work has also shown the elements of shared piety in Punjab and the robustness of the Punjabi literary formation this was being challenged by the rival communalisms which flourished in the three decades before partition, if not earlier.[101] As she herself observes the Punjabi language never managed to create a sense of linguistic nationalism in the Punjab before partition.

In some ways it was the Partition of India that allowed Punjabi to flourish in India, largely owing to the determined support for Punjabi in the Gurmukhi script by the Sikhs. The Hindi–Punjabi dispute that developed after independence was the product of Hindu and Sikh identity politics. The creation of a Punjabi-speaking province ultimately led to the assuaging of the sentiments of those Sikhs who were fearful of losing their identity in Punjab and not only the rest of India. The fate of Hindi in the Punjab was therefore determined by the interaction of three communities, Hindu, Muslim and Sikh. While the Hindus and Muslims spoke Punjabi but advocated the use of Hindi and Urdu as their literary languages the Sikhs were the most determined advocates of Punjabi because their religious and cultural identity was tied up with the Punjabi language.

Although the development of Punjabi as a literary language has been slower than that of Urdu and Hindi the vibrancy of the language has not been in doubt. Even though Punjabis have been attached to their language, Punjabi has not been very closely linked to state power in both India and Pakistan. That may account for the dominance of Urdu in Pakistani Punjab even after partition and the support for Hindi declared by many Hindus in Indian Punjab during the census of 1961.[102] Whether Punjabi was one of the developed dialects of Western Hindi may be a debating point for linguists, but cultural politics ensured that eventually many accepted Hindi as their literary language with the creation of the state of Haryana.[103]

State, Market and Popular Culture

It is important to keep in mind that the development of languages depends on many factors. The state and the patronage it provides have an impact on the development of languages as has been discussed with regard to the rise of the vernaculars in pre-modern India.[104] The regional kingdoms of India played an important role in the rise of languages like Kannada, Telugu, Marathi and Gujarati; the patronage of the Mughals helped spread Persian words into Indian languages. The rise of the vernaculars was uneven and many genres and performative practices shaped language at the elite and popular level. It has been argued that the English language spread across the world because of the role that Britain and America have played in the world economy and the growth of modern means of communication. The language has been absorbed in various ways in different parts of the world. As far as its acceptability as a means of communication is concerned that is not dependent on the knowledge of the classics of English or King's English. In many ways Hindustani and Hindi also spread in India without any substantial official patronage before independence.

The debate about language was at different levels: that of the literary language, of science and education and of inter-provincial communication. While the question of high culture would tend to pull Hindi and Urdu apart the need for everyday communication would make an amalgam like Hindustani more acceptable. The rise of print culture in India has similarities with that of Europe, at least in terms of the number of books that were published in the second half of the 19th century.[105] In Bengal the language that was used in folk songs or performances by folk artistes was very different from the Sanskritized Bengali that was being promoted by the literary figures in 19th century. The rise of printed books had an impact on the Bengali language only over a period of time and varied according to different genres.[106] Sanskritized Hindi arose in the late 19th century but was briefly challenged by those who believed in local literary patriotism and the Janapada movement.

The difference in terms of the language actually used by different social classes was also the subject of discussion. Rao Sahib Kibay

argued that he had observed in England that the speech of the common people differed from that of those who were educated or upper-class. This difference was bound to exist in Hindi as well.[107] So to some extent we need to separate the language appropriate for literary, scientific and educational purposes and that meant for communication among various Hindi-speaking people of different social classes or between Hindi and non-Hindi-speaking people. There was also a tendency among authors in the past to use Hindustani or Urdu words for Muslim characters in their works.[108] The variations in spoken language and the relatively limited vocabulary required for communication were factors which were not seriously considered by the protagonists of Hindi and Urdu. Also, the regional responses to Hindi could vary. G.R. Vaishampayan, addressing the Abohar session of the Sahitya Sammelan noted that in non-Hindi speaking regions — like Maharashtra — when someone had to be scolded it was preferable to do that in Hindi rather than in Marathi.[109] Hindi expressed anger or annoyance more forcefully or with more *josh*. Whether this makes Hindi a 'language of command' for some Marathis may not be clear but it certainly shows the regional variations in the response to Hindustani.

The spread of Persian and Arabic words into Hindvi, Rekhta, Dakhini or many other languages was because of the power and prestige of those who spoke the languages. The language of the ruling elites was bound to influence the speech of the people who had to deal with them. Ordinary people also accepted words that were used in the courts, revenue records and official pronouncements. Whether or not it was voluntarily accepted, the influence of the language patronized by the state was bound to increase.[110] In a short interview published by the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan, Sheikh Abdullah commented that just as Hindus had learnt Persian and Arabic during the medieval period to get ahead in life, the Muslims too would have to learn Hindi in India.[111] This Conference was held and the volume was published during the Emergency period when the power of the state must have appeared even greater than in earlier times. The flaw in the mercurial Sheikh Abdullah's argument was that the propagation of language in medieval India by the ruling elite cannot be bracketed with the policy of a regime based on democracy and pluralism. Secondly, the spread of Hindi was far easier because it was the

language of the majority of the people. Finally, the ruling elite had to deal with language riots and agitations, particularly in 1968, and had good reasons to be mindful of linguistic sentiments unlike the medieval rulers.[112]

Shankar Dayal Singh, a Member of Parliament and a member of the Congress Parliamentary Board, reported that a Tamil friend, who met him after twenty-two years, argued that Hindi was being introduced in a 'half-hearted' way. If the state announced that henceforth all work would be done in Hindi from the very next day, as Kamal Ataturk had done in Turkey, everything would fall into place. Undoubtedly, there would be rumbles of protest but things would eventually settle down.[113] This was a bit too optimistic about the power of the Indian state and the appeal of unitary nationalism even during the period of Emergency in India.[113A] The linguistic diversity of Turkey was less than that in India and the regime of the modernizing Ataturk was not based on electoral democracy. Also the task of nation-building in post independence India could not command the allegiance of the people in the same way as it could during the freedom struggle.[113B]

Some of the Indian nationalists were aware that the early stirrings of nationalism and the feeling of belonging to one nation was based on the fact that they spoke the same language — English.[114] Although the ultimate goal of nationalism would be to displace English, the contribution it made to nationalism could not be denied. The language had bound together patriots from different linguistic groups in the country. The popularity of English after independence has been attributed to various reasons: the brown sahib mentality of the elite who secured power; the reluctance of the elite to educate the masses in order to maintain their economic and social advantages; the reluctance of the southern states to learn Hindi; and finally the reluctance of people in the Hindi speaking states to learn another Indian language or accept the three language formula. The popularity of English was also based on the perception of advantages that knowledge of the language provided to its speakers.

The demand for the English educated in the country helped to provide a major impetus to English after independence. It was the

language of science and higher education and remains so largely till today. The English Indians speak may have been made fun of but the language spread although it was spoken with many different accents and styles.[115] Hinglish and Pinglish flourished; so did 'conventia' Hindi, a Hindustani language with English words and accents in post-independence India.[116] The popularity of Hindi among Indians is also based on the development of *Bambayya* Hindi and *Madrasi* Hindi; although these styles of speaking are made fun of in Bollywood movies, they represent the spread of Hindi by market forces rather than state power. The protagonists of Hindi may lament the loss of lyrics and meaning in Hindi songs but they are the carriers of the national language. This is how major languages achieve wider currency and popularity and the purists must not obstruct this process.

The rise of newspaper publishing in regional languages was greatly facilitated by the development of capitalism and market forces. The rise in literacy, the development of printing technology, the rise in rural incomes and literacy has led to an increase in advertising in regional language newspapers by private businessmen. This has provided much needed financial support for regional language newspapers. With these changes coming during the 1980s there has been a tremendous increase in the publication of newspapers in languages like Hindi, Tamil and Telugu. These trends have been insufficient to help languages like Urdu according to Robin Jeffrey.[117] However, the private television channels that have proliferated, have also played a dynamic role in the spread of Hindi and Bhojpuri and Urdu, apart from regional languages. As the consumer culture spreads and languages lose their intensely emotional appeal for many people the language conflicts have subsided in terms of political importance. As far as the position of Hindi is concerned it is rapidly becoming more popular, although it is not the only language to become so. As the number of languages shrink around the world and also decline, in India, the ability of Hindi to reach out to a wider population, is growing.

The collection of local poems, folk tales and proverbs was an important factor in the case for enriching Hindi with the vocabulary of the localities and the dialects. While Hindi tried to link up with

the localities and there was the rise of the *aanchalik upanayas* or the novel with focus on regional culture in Hindi, this was not necessarily based on the use of the regional dialect. Although Phanishwar Renu wrote novels with a focus on regional culture he used a language familiar to those who spoke relatively Sanskritized Hindi. Although he was born in Purnia he did not use the language of that region. There was a great use of *ardh-tatsams* that would have been more familiar to speakers of Braj a few centuries earlier. Therefore, the idea of using the uniqueness of the language of particular localities, did not work out as the protagonists of the Janapada movement had imagined. The willingness to ignore or bend the rules of grammar and the use of spoken speech in the novels of Renu has some features that Suniti Chatterjee had favoured in his essay on *Chalu* Hindi. In any case the language Renu sometimes used was close to that of people who spoke Bengali and eastern Hindi without due importance given to gender or grammar. [118]

V
The Question of Science and Technology

The divide between Hindi and Urdu may have begun with the 18th century turn to Arabic and Persian words by those who wanted to preserve their culture and identity, but by the late 19th century the effort to create a Sanskritized Hindi was also gaining momentum. The themes of the writers of Hindi and Urdu were rather limited in the period up to the early twentieth century, because the range of interest of the scholars and writers as well as the readers in these languages was not too extensive. The idea of a modern language, suitable for a developed society, was becoming a vital issue for scholars and patriots of many different hues during the second quarter of the 20th century. While Urdu culture was criticized for its lack of social concern and interest in modern science Hindi was regarded as a language that was deficient in the field of science as well as sophisticated culture. There was a substantial amount of legal and administrative vocabulary in Urdu and those well versed in it resisted the rise of Hindi as a language of education and administration, especially in the politically important United Provinces. In the field of science some fields were not underserved in Urdu. It has been

pointed out that the British encouraged a lot of translations of medical texts into Urdu in the early 19th century and that this played an important role in the rise of the Unani system of medicine practiced by the Muslim hakims.[119] The role of British scholars like Ballantyne in producing translations of scientific terms and works into Hindi has recently been highlighted.[120] The effort petered out after some time and seems not to have had an impact on subsequent discussions about translations of scientific terms.

In an article about the creation of scientific terms Krishnanand Gupt, writing in *Madhukar* in 1942, felt that it would be impossible to invent or create scientific terms on the basis of words in common use without the use of Sanskrit. Some of the writer's friends believed that it was possible to write on scientific subjects without the use of either Sanskrit or Arabic and Persian. They argued that if water was called *pani* instead of *jal*, air was called *hawa* instead of *vayu* and electricity was called *bijli* instead of *vidyut,* the conflict between, Hindi and Urdu would come to an end. Gupt argued that when it came to science the use of words based on the classical languages would be better and more precise than terms that were drawn from *desi* or commonplace words. Even in English the words used by professional scientists were not to be found in everyday speech and conversation. The choice before the others was either to accept these terms as internationally valid or to invent new ones in their own language. Without precise scientific terms it was impossible to write about science. The reason why there was less opposition to the invention of words in the English language was because more than half of them were in common use. Frequently used scientific words had gained popular acceptance. This could happen in the case of Hindi too. The Urdu writers recognized this problem and used the term *vark* instead of *bijli* for electricity.[121]

The option before Indians was either to accept the scientific terms in vogue in English or to create a new terminology on their own. Since for the majority the English words were as difficult or unfamiliar as the ones based on Sanskrit would it not be better to use indigenous words? Writers on science in Hindi could either accept words derived from Arabic or Persian by Urdu writers or

invent words based on Sanskrit. The choice before us was to use the words they had produced or to invent words based on Sanskrit. Over thirty years ago during the Bangiya Parishad meeting this issue had been discussed. Both the Nagari Pracharini Sabha and the Science Council or Vigyan Parishad had been in favour of using Sanskrit dhatus for creating scientific terms.[122] In matters of science precision was paramount; simplicity ought not to be at the expense of clarity and precision. One should not ignore the rich literature and substantial terminology available in Sanskrit in fields like mathematics, astrology and Ayurveda. There was also the possibility of inventing words based on Sanskrit that could be common to many Indian languages like Bengali, Marathi, Gujarati and Hindi. There was a clear need to decide about the way in which classical or standard works in science would be produced.[123]

The development of terms for the sciences based on coining words using Sanskrit or Arabic roots had its limitations. In the opinion of Dr. Tarachand, "Sanskrit words have phonetic values unsuited to Hindi, Urdu or Hindustani speech. Arabic suffers from the additional defect that it has little capacity to form compounds. Neither of them can provide enough terms for all sciences and some dependence upon European languages is therefore inevitable." He advocated the grouping of the sciences according to their requirements. The mathematical sciences required exact and extensive terminologies but not many general words; for disciplines like Chemistry, Physics, Anatomy or Geology although exact terms were important there was a greater need for description; and finally for the sciences relating to man such as Anthropology, Economics, Philosophy or Psychology the general vocabulary needed was much larger than for the first two categories.[123A] The adoption of English terminology was the "most practical solution" for these two categories provided some clearly defined rules were formulated to modify English terms in accordance with the "linguistic peculiarities of Hindustani".[124]

Dodson has shown that scholars like Dalmia have not taken note of the role of colonial educators and traditional Indian scholars whose works could have created some basis for the construction of Hindu

identity and conceptions of Hindi during the late nineteenth century. He has drawn attention to the fact that "the essentially European orientalist preconceptions which underpinned translation into Hindi during the 1850s and 1860s under Ballantyne and Hall in Benares College, and the formation of a 'pure' and 'classical' Hindi by reference to Sanskrit, have largely been elided from discussions of, for example, Bharatendu Haris'candra's formulation of Hindi as India's 'national language' (*desbhasa*), or his notion that the linguistic improvement of Hindi must necessarily precede north Indian social evolution". Nevertheless, the Sanskrit oriented scientific vocabulary scholars like Ballantyne produced, did not find much favour later, and the scientific lexicon produced by the Nagari Pracharini Sabha in 1906 preferred utilization of English transliterations in the absence of suitable Hindi equivalents.[125] In a sense the preference for scientific terminology based on Sanskrit during the late colonial period was a return to an earlier failed initiative. In the post independence period the project did achieve considerable success in terms of creating a new scientific vocabulary, but not in achieving popularity or acceptance within the educational system.

VI
Some Comparisons

The significance of the national language for creating a sense of nationalism has been identified by Benedict Anderson. He has argued that the rise of print culture promotes the national language. A scholar, who has done empirical work on Indonesia like Anderson, has argued that the national language of Indonesia does not claim exclusivity and deep origins. Comments Webb Keane, "On the contrary, Indonesian, like perhaps Swahili or Filipino, and in contrast to many national, ethnic and religiously freighted languages such as French, Gaelic, Hebrew, or Tamil, is not normally depicted as a language of ancient lineage or as a closely guarded cultural property." The national language of Indonesia, Bahasa Indonesia, is a variant of Malay; it is self-consciously modern and is regarded as potentially "a superordinate and cosmopolitan language".[126] The national language of Indonesia was a second language for all the linguistic groups in the country. Even those who spoke Low Malay would have

to make considerable effort to learn the standardized national language.

The choice of Indonesian as the national language was made in 1928 after the Youth Oath. Although the leaders of the national movement were accustomed to Dutch they committed themselves to the idea of a national language — Bahasa Indonesia – even before the creation of the independent state of Indonesia. At this time only 4.9% of the population of the East Indies spoke Malay, compared to 47.8% who spoke Javanese and 14.5 % who spoke Sundanese. In 1990, 15.5 % of the population declared that Indonesian was their first language and over 70% said that it was their second language. Those who claimed to be Javanese speakers declined to 38.8%. Malay, the language of a small group, was able to develop as the national language despite the presence of "several numerically and culturally dominant groups".

This success of Indonesian has been contrasted by Keane with that of Hindi in India. There were several reasons for the success of Bahasa Indonesia; most importantly the fact that it was not identified with the colonizer or any privileged ethnic group. Although Malay had developed as the lingua franca of the region between the Moluccas and the Philippines, before the Dutch had established their rule, 'standard' Malay did not emerge until the end of the 19th century. Standard Malay was developed along the lines of the literary forms which had emerged in the Riau sultanate although this was different from what most Malay speakers were familiar with. Therefore, the difference between Malay speakers and those who spoke other languages, when it came to learning Indonesian, was only one of degree.

The Indonesian language is supposed to lack two features: "a clear social-geographical 'centre' or exemplary 'best speakers.'" According to Keane an easy language to learn has the disadvantage that it lacks depth and subtlety. This weakness probably afflicts Swahili and Hindi as well. Those who shaped modern Indonesian, like Sutan Takdir Alisjahbana, wrote in 1948 that the task was to build a new culture in keeping with the times. Indonesian was

conceived as a modernist project which would produce an egalitarian speech that would avoid, for instance, the "lexical choices among the vocabulary sets of 'high', 'middle', and 'low' Javanese".[127] The modernist project with regard to Indonesian may have been sustained by an authoritarian regime, but also succeeded because of the lack of linguistic movements against it.

What could be the possible implications of this experience for India? First, it was clear that in India the lingua franca was Hindustani, as far as the spoken language was concerned, and it was also in contention for becoming the national language of India. The problem was disagreement about the developed form of the national language—whether Urdu or Hindi or both — should be accepted. The preferences in India were based on religious and cultural considerations unlike the modernist nationalism that was invoked in favour of Indonesian.[127A] Secondly, the use of common Sanskrit words in most Indian languages, except in Urdu, made Hindi closer to Sanskrit a choice which could be justified on both linguistic and religious grounds. Secular as well as communal Hindus could often come to the same conclusion on the question of Hindi and therefore, the Hindi–Urdu divide grew.

As the Muslim elite regarded Urdu as the language of high culture and the devout saw it as the bearer of Muslim religious traditions it tended to bring both secular and communal Muslims on a common platform. Therefore, in India the creation of an altogether 'new' language was ruled out. Even if we stretch a point and argue that a modernized Hindustani could be regarded as the 'modern' national language the situation would not be comparable to that of Indonesian. The problem was not only about the desire to create a new language like 'Hindustani', but also from where it would borrow to make it a language suitable for education, science and governance. One is not aware of the sources from which Indonesian has drawn its vocabulary, but clearly rival religious traditions and classical languages have not been contending for dominance over Bahasa Indonesia.

In the case of the Philippines about 85% of the population spoke eight major languages of the Filipino-Austronesian family, although

there were about eighty major and minor languages. The vernaculars were suppressed by the American colonizers, who had promoted the use of English. The Philippines after independence decided to adopt Filipino as the national language– a modified form of Tagalog that was used in Manila. The Cebuano language, the mother-tongue of a quarter of the population according to the 1960 census, was more popular than Tagalog. It was spoken in the Visyas region and served as a lingua franca for this region. Tagalog, however, was known to the largest number of Filipinos as the second language and as the language of culture. On the basis of census data of 1970 the Tagalog speakers outnumbered those who used Cebuano as the first language or the language spoken at home. The Ilocano speakers of the northern part of the country, who were prominent in the economic sphere, were also very attached to their language. By 1990 those who spoke Tagalog rose to 27.9 % of the population while those who spoke Cebuano had declined to 24.3%.[128]

The authors praise the Indian language policy which gives due recognition to the rights of regional languages while promoting Hindi as the national language. Even Spain has adopted this policy by recognizing linguistic diversity while promoting Castillian Spanish. Unfortunately, in the Philippines the state has adopted a policy of ignoring the indigenous languages. These languages are not used as a medium of education and the students are expected to get their education through English or Filipino as mediums of instruction. The indigenous languages are used for spoken communication, and are popular, but they are not accepted as the medium of instruction in schools and colleges. The real tussle has emerged between Filipino and English; the national language is in conflict with the international language. The state, therefore, actively began promoting Filipino to counter the influence of English by adopting a Bilingual policy in education in 1973. In the 1970 census, 48% of the population claimed that it was able to speak English while that number rose to 64.5% of the population above six years in 1980. The government announced that it would try and make the nation competent in both English and Filipino in the country and that both languages would be used as the medium of instruction in the schools from Grade1. This was a policy accepted by the constitutions of 1973 and 1986.[129]

The experience of the Philippines differs from that of India in two ways although the authors have indentified only one. The Philippines is a country in which the spread of English has been greater than that in any ex-colonial country. In no non-white colony has the ex-colonial language achieved such a remarkable success. In India the use of English has been a source of hostility and resentment among many supporters of Hindi in the northern states but there has been fairly strong support for the retention of English as the language of administration and education in the southern states. No matter what people understand by the term national language the attitude towards English and Hindi in India has to do with the implications for jobs and power and not only linguistic pride or chauvinism.

Secondly, the use of the regional languages as the medium of instruction in schools and colleges has been quite successful in India. Policy-makers in India have been more supportive of regional languages than those in the Philippines. The languages in India are probably more developed than all but three of the languages in the Philippines but the advocates of Indian regional languages have also been more vocal in supporting their mother-tongues. This is in spite of the fact that most of the Indian languages have a link with Sanskrit and the Philipino dialects and languages do not have such a classical language to bind them together.

VII
The Impact of Partition

The national movement failed to achieve independence with unity. The inability to resolve the relationship between Hindi and Urdu or the 'rightful' place of Urdu in the country also contributed to the developments which led to the Partition of the subcontinent. The division of the country on the basis of religion led to a considerable reaction in India alhough the country remained wedded broadly to the ideas of democracy and secularism. Nevertheless, there was a backlash of sorts; if that word seems too strong then we can say that the political realities changed substantially. There was no longer the need to come to a settlement with the advocates of

Persianized Urdu to preserve the unity of India.[130] Secondly, the decline in the number of Muslims in the polity meant that they did not pose as serious a political challenge to Hindu nationalists as they had earlier. Therefore, as long as the country accepted a more Sanskritized Hindi as the national language, the Muslims could develop Urdu along lines they thought best for themselves. The debates on language in the Constituent Assembly indicate the changes that Partition had brought about.

The advocates of Hindi as a national language became more assertive after independence and Partition. The problem was that there was a decline of the strong nationalist fervour that had led to the acceptance of Hindi as the national language of India. The development of incipient linguistic nationalism or of interest groups organized on lines of language led to the demands for new linguistic states. The opposition to the use of Hindi in administration led to the demand for retaining English as the link language. This conflict reached its peak in the mid-1960s; there were pro-Hindi and anti-Hindi agitations during the years 1967–68.[131] This indicates that nationalist attitudes of the 1930s and 1940s were no longer present.[132] Not only had the times changed, the rise in democratic participation and the development of regional languages had made the formulations of the earlier period less popular. Hindi continued to grow in influence but at a slower pace than earlier nationalists had hoped for, without any substantial links with its dialects. Therefore, it became even more dependent on wholesale translation of English words.[133]

The debate about the nature of Hindi was not only about the relationship with Urdu but also with the regional dialects and Bolis. Although languages like Maithili and Bhojpuri remained popular, the education that was provided in post-independence India was in standard Hindi. In fact, the elites who shaped the policies with regard to Hindi and its use as a medium of instruction were not by and large supportive of policies favouring dialects.[134] The rise of Sanskrit-based Hindi was not the outcome of partition alone; it was also because the regional dialects were less assertive about their claims. Nation-building demanded a standard language for education and

governance and the Bolis were not encouraged to make the task more difficult. Most of them accepted their relegation to the status of a spoken language. Writers abandoned their mother-tongues and switched to standard Khari Boli both because of patriotic impulses and the desire to reach out to a wider public.[135] Several nationalists feared that the support for dialects that were dormant would tend to create divisions and weaken the nation.[136]

The need to coin words that could be used to translate works of science and technology into Hindi was arduous enough and there seemed little point in encouraging the Bolis as mediums of education as recommended by advocates in the 1940s. The task was complicated by the fact that only one of the Bolis or dialects could be used as a language for education and administration in any province or any synthesis of the dialects spoken there. To many it seemed more pragmatic and patriotic to accept standard Hindi than to promote competition between the various dialects of any province in order to create a regional language. The attempt to create a Rajasthani language, it was argued, would create fears about the dominance of Marwari, the most widely spoken language. The competition between dialects — between Mewari, Dhundhari, Bagri, Haroti and Mewati — would obstruct the process of integration of people into Rajasthani society. Further, since 60 per cent of the words in the dialects were from Hindi, it was becoming increasingly acceptable to people in Rajasthan. Doshi and Purohit, writing in 1968, identified and welcomed this development because it would have been pointless to create a new Rajasthani language based on the synthesis of more than twenty dialects.[137] Such an attempt would have created friction and disrupted the integration of Rajasthan with Indian society. It is interesting that even before independence there were people who were opposed to creating a distinct Rajasthani language and using it as a medium of instruction in educational institutions. [138]

VIII
Summing Up

There were clear signs that Hindi and Urdu were moving apart as two standardized versions of the same language in late colonial India. The rise of communalism and the cultural preferences for different classical languages for loan words was driving the two languages apart and the effort at creating a common Hindustani ran into serious difficulties.[139] The Partition of the country in 1947 led to a tremendous setback to the idea of Hindustani in the subcontinent. India eventually opted for Hindi with a tilt in favour of Sanskritized Hindi as the national language. The opponents of the Janapada programme like Chandrabali Pandey and Makhan Lal Chaturvedi during the 1940s were joined by many others in the post-independence period.[140] In Pakistan, Urdu became the national language despite, or because of, the fact that it was the mother-tongue of very few people in that country. Hindi was progressively Sanskritized after the Partition of India because it reduced the moral and political compulsions to evolve a common Hindustani language.[141] Urdu became more and more identified with Indian Muslims and became a 'minority' rather than a 'national' issue.

Although the idea of Hindustani that was debated in the two decades before independence lost its political salience the idea has not died. Even in the 1990s there have been arguments in favour of Hindustani and in favour of a more vibrant and simplified Hindi. There are people who believe that Hindustani, including both Hindi and Urdu, is capable of becoming the lingua franca or link language of the whole of South Asia.[142] Some others believe that Hindustani is not merely simple Hindi and Urdu. Hindustani has had its own identity and traditions from the time of Khusro and Kabir to Premchand and Manto down to modern day writers. While Dushyant and Shamsher Singh are writing ghazals in Hindi even today Nida Fazili and Bekal Utsahi are producing songs and *dohas* in Hindi.[143]

In the modern age because of the growth in the audio-visual forms of communication the preservation of linguistic diversity has become easier. According to Bhalachandra Nemade there has been

a hierarchy among languages in India from the earliest times. The supralanguages like Sanskrit, Prakrit, Persian and English have played a pivotal role in India's cultural life and geopolitical unity or *bhurajkiya rashtriyata*.[144] In future too Hindi would be able to become a national language but not the mother-tongue of the majority of people. Just below the level of the supralanguage regional languages have flourished. Then, there are the dialects — the *upbhashas* and Bolis. In the Marathi speaking region these are Khandeshi, Vahadi, Konkani and nearly a hundred Bolis. Finally, there are link languages or *jodbhashas*.

The *jodhbhashas* serve as a medium of communication where the more literary supralanguages do not hold sway. In north Karnataka, Goa, southern Madhya Pradesh, the Indore–Malwa–Raipur region, Marathi serves as the link language. Urdu serves as a link language throughout the country and unless Hindi gives up its excessive use of Sanskrit words it will find it difficult to become a national language. Nemade has asserted that only that language is likely to become a national language that has the capacity to replace English. Without taking the help of Urdu and other link languages like Marathi it would be difficult for Hindi to succeed in displacing English which is an international language. Only by securing for Hindi and its supportive link languages the advantages that English enjoys can we move towards strengthening Hindi as a national language. Our language policy should promote all the Indian link languages while simultaneously promoting Hindi at the international level.[145]

In the opinion of Krishna Kumar, the tragedy of Hindi as a language is that what has been promoted by the state through education and the media does not evoke any feelings among the Hindi speakers. The kind of Hindi that could arouse the people is in dire need of support. Hindi has become a language fed on translations, a language that has lost touch with tradition and literary sensibility. The narrow focus of those who were confined to literary themes has emasculated the language and prevented it from playing a role in the intellectual life of the people. Very few original works in fields like economics and science or environment are being written.[146] The

criticism may be exaggerated but draws attention to the limited use to which Hindi is put and the triumph of an official language. In any case, the idea of a People's Hindi, which would be able to reflect many dialects and regions, did not make headway in the postcolonial period.[147]

The men who were debating the Janapada and *Vikendriyakaran* movement during the closing years of colonial rule were those who wanted to bring the Hindi language close to the hearths and hearts of the common people. They were not in favour of a lifeless literary language. They sought inspiration from the past, from local knowledge and from nature but they were trying to create a lively and vibrant language.[148] The evolution of society makes their vision seem far too preoccupied with the rural idyll or local literary patriotism than is acceptable today. Besides, even those who sympathised with some of their aspirations, like Vyohar Rajendra Singh, did not want to weaken the credibility of Hindi as a national language.[149] Although scholars today might find their sources for literary inspiration and linguistic development somewhat restrictive or dated, they represented a trend that offered alternatives to the rapid 'manufacture' of the language under the umbrella of Sanskrit.[150] Even the broad vision of Banarsidas Chaturvedi or V.S. Aggarwal appears insufficiently exciting or attractive today. What is difficult to deny is that they represented a trend within the Hindi public sphere and literary universe which could have thwarted the process of creating a heavily subsidised official language with limited public appeal.

The men who were able to claim that the language of education should be the mother-tongue of people and not literary Khari Boli in the Hindi-speaking world, like Rahul Sankrityayan, were slowly swept away after independence. The rising tide of standardized Hindi was supported by the state, by the compulsions of nation-building and the conflict between different dialects vying for recognition and support within new political boundaries.[151] The approach of Chaturvedi and Aggarwal was to make Hindi a language fit to be the national language, although their knowledge of the literary achievements of other Indian languages was not very extensive. They were not sufficiently multicultural and modern themselves, but they

wanted Hindi language and literature to have a broad-minded and catholic attitude towards the languages of the common people, whether they spoke dialects of Hindi or regional languages and dialects. Nevertheless, the two of them were believers in the need to promote Hindi as the national language and did not endorse the viewpoint of Rahul Sankrityayan.[152] The postcolonial state created a vast apparatus to protect the linguistic and cultural heritage of India but within the Hindi literary circles there was probably a less catholic view that slowly gained ascendancy.[153] This narrowness of perspective affected not only the relation of Hindi with Urdu but with other Indian languages as well.

Krishna Kumar argues that the fact that Hindi was declared the national language of India created an arrogance or smugness among Hindi speakers who regarded other Indian languages as regional and therefore inferior to Hindi. The development of literary and intellectual activity in Hindi was severely restricted by the slow development of literacy in the Hindi-speaking states owing to limited expenditures on literacy, caste prejudices and class differences. Only by breaking these barriers would Hindi be able to progress.[154] In a sense the postcolonial state has been unable to build on the more capacious vision of Hindi that developed in the 1930s and 1940s among a few literary people. That some of these broad and people-oriented proposals fell by the wayside may also have to do with their association with parochialism on the one hand and radicalism on the other.

Chaturvedi's concern for the creation of Bundelkhand was probably perceived as narrow-minded and parochial and Sankrityayan's appeal to Soviet nationality policies might have disturbed both the supporters of nationalism and conservatism.[155] Not very long after India gained independence advocates of Hindi also developed notions of the superiority of Hindi vis-à-vis India's regional languages. This was a departure from the more earnest attempt of the pre-independence period when spokesmen of Hindi sought to make it rich enough and catholic enough to be acceptable to other Indian language groups.[156] There was also anxiety about the ability of Hindi to hold its own vis-à-vis the regional languages, both

in terms of numbers of speakers and literary influence.[157] On the other hand the decline of Urdu after independence was a product of growing official and market support for Hindi, inadequate increase in literacy in the Hindi belt and the identification of Urdu with Muslims and Islam.[158]

The main argument advanced in this article is that we need to take a serious look at a brief period in India's cultural history when there were lively debates among literary figures of considerable importance about the future path of development of Hindi language and literature. These were not the men who decided the fate of Hindi after India got independence but had their views been given due importance the rise of 'official' Hindi would have been less swift and smooth. Whether the views of these scholars could have promoted the development of Hindustani as a literary language is far from clear, but it could have kept Hindi closer to the dialects. More importantly, some thought that the survival of Urdu itself depended on how close it wanted to come to the dialects.[159] The development of Hindi as a language fit for science and administration would have compelled some degree of Sanskritization, or modification of English terms, as recommended by Dr. Tarachand, but bulk manufacture of scientific and administrative vocabulary would have been contested and resisted.

The argument advanced here is not about the inherent superiority of the viewpoint of these scholars of the 1930s and 1940s,[160] but about the relative broad-mindedness of their views and their earnest desire to create a vibrant language closely linked to the life of the common people.[161] The men who shaped Hindi in the post-independence period were able to create a language with a large vocabulary but a relatively lifeless one. Hindi has, nevertheless, evolved because of market forces and the media and as a medium of communication or lingua franca it is as vibrant as ever. The official crust of Hindi may not be able to keep the dynamic language spoken by diverse groups in South Asia under its baleful influence for long. When the language of the common people will be accorded respectability and recognition, the men whose hearts throbbed at the mention of the Janapada programme and the principle of *Vikendriyakaran,* will rejoice and find peace.[162]

Hindi was faced with many challenges before independence and Partition. There was competition with the dialects of Hindi, rivalry with Urdu, conflict with English and anxiety about the relationship with the regional languages. After independence the position of Urdu and the regional dialects weakened vis-à-vis Hindi both in terms of state support and popularity as a language of communication at the pan-India level. The limited availability of intellectual and financial resources required to develop languages also contributed to the decline of the dialects and the sluggish growth of Urdu as a modern language.[163]

While the state determined the language of the courts and of education it was the market which influenced the language used by the newspapers, the television channels and the makers of cinema. The language of the former is more Sanskritic and the language of the latter more syncretic or eclectic. The forms of spoken Hindi are far more responsive to the needs of various kinds of speakers than the written and literary language. This is true of most substantial languages and also of a global language like English. Nevertheless, the development of Hindi as a language of science and higher education is still inadequate. Hindi has forged ahead of the dialects and Urdu in India but it has not overcome resistance to its role as a national language by the regional languages. It is trailing behind English in the fields of higher education and science and technology.[164] Languages evolve all the time and Hindi still has a long way to go. The debates about the future of Hindi during the 1930s and 1940s might not influence or enthuse those who wish to shape language today, but they reveal the complexity of the arguments on the eve of independence and a great concern for connecting with everyday life and ordinary people.[165] The need for an equally free and wide-ranging debate about imagining Hindi is only too apparent today.

Notes

[1] Z.A. Ahmad (ed.), *National Language for India*: *A Symposium*, Kitabistan, Allahabad 1941. Mahatma Gandhi said, "Hindustani of the Congress conception has yet to be crystallized into shape. It will not be so long as Congress proceedings are not conducted exclusively in Hindustani. The Congress will have to prescribe the dictionaries for use by Congressmen and a department will have to supply new words outside the dictionaries... For the purposes of crystallizing Hindustani, Hindi and Urdu may be regarded as feeders. A Congressman must therefore wish well to both and keep in touch with both in so far as he can". Quotes pg 36.

[2] Z.A. Ahmad (ed.), *National Language for India*, Allahabad 1941. Preface, quote pg 7. Ahmad observed, "The difficulty at present, however, is that Hindustani still represents only a tendency in literature. Unless this tendency is rapidly and vigorously concretised, it would not be an easy matter to stop the pull of literary Hindi in one direction and that of literary Urdu in the other. Besides when we come to actual writing, we find a good deal of difference even among the supporters of Hindustani. This obviously is due to the fact that the conception of Hindustani has not yet taken a definite literary form". Ibid pg 10.

[3] Harish Trivedi, 'The Progress of Hindi, Part 2: Hindi and the Nation', in Sheldon Pollock (ed.), *Literary Cultures in History: Reconstructions from South Asia*, Oxford University Press, 2003, pp 958–1022, spl pp 975–980. Quote pg 977.

[4] Tara Chand, 'The Problem of a Common Language for India', The Twentieth Century, Allahabad, 1944. pp. 251–263. Dr. Tarachand observed that while the Indian National Congress at its Karachi session in 1925 had decided that Hindustani would be the lingua franca of India this position was revised at Nagpur in favour of Hindi-Hindustani by the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan. Tarachand does not hold Gandhiji responsible for this decision but recognized that it had negative consequences as pointed out by Harish Trivedi. The nationalist-minded Muslims were disappointed by this decision and the Muslim League demanded that Urdu should be considered the lingua franca. However he points out that Mahatmaji in May 1942 created the Hindustani Prachar Sabha to promote Hindustani and also outlines the way in which Hindustani could be promoted in future. pg 251.

[5] Sampurnanand and Dr. Zakir Husain also spoke up for Hindustani. Sampurnanand argued that if the Hindus accepted Persian vocabulary and the Muslims Sanskrit vocabulary to some extent many difficulties could be tackled. The Congress believed in not interfering with the language problem

and the Muslim League and the Hindu Mahasabha should do likewise otherwise the language controversy would become more intractable. He repeated Rajendra Prasad by stating that having both Sanskrit and Persian words would add to the richness of the language. Ahmad, *National Language for India*, Allahabad, 1941, pp. 122–130. Zakir Husain argued that new words should be taken from the speech of villagers, from that of craftsmen and workers and even from foreign languages. Zakir Husain observed, "Our scientific terms we shall have to take over in large numbers from foreign languages, and it will be a great advantage if Urdu and Hindi speakers agree upon adopting the same terms, otherwise the scientific literature of the one will be of little use to the other. We shall have still to borrow many words from both Arabic and Sanskrit". Ibid pp. 97–106. Quote pp. 103–104.

[6] Rajendra Prasad was in favour of drawing upon Sanskrit, Arabic, Persian and even English because new words had to be coined under "the stimulus of new ideas". Prasad stated, "If we do so we shall be enriching Hindustani by incorporating in it many words from different languages which will serve as synonyms in the beginning but which, with the growing replenishment of the treasury of words and expressions, will be eventually distinguished from each other by finer shades of thought". Ahmad, *National Language*, 1941, pp 75–81. Quotes pg 76 and pg 77. Dr. Prasad argued that although the commonly used words like *roti* had come from Turkish and *aag* and *paani* had come from Sanskrit they had to be governed by the rules of Hindi and Urdu. Many words which derived from Sanskrit and which were not modified according to gender were now being unnecessarily differentiated. Moreover, what was important in a national language was that it was widely acceptable, not that it had the greatest vocabulary. Address by Rajendra Prasad, 28th Kashi Session in A. Kaushalyayan (ed.), *Rashtra Bhasha Ki Samasyaein,* Hindi Sahitya Sammelan, Prayag, Allahabad 1986, pp 19–27. Our policy ought to be to include all those who were willing to join; words which had become acceptable were not to be excluded regardless of their origins. Those who sought to expand the influence of Hindi had to be large-hearted. Ibid pg 27.

[7] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism,* Verso 1982.

[8] Suniti Kumar Chatterjee, 'Rashtrabhasha Ka Prashna', in *Rithambhara*, Sahitya Bhawan Private Limited, Hindi Sahitya Press, Allahabad. Second revised edition 1958, pp. 50–91. He stated that most Indian languages 'borrowed' words because they were incapable of 'building' or creating them. From the very beginning Hindi borrowed from its grandmother

Sanskrit. It adopted thousands of Arabic and Persian words and later accepted many from English and other European languages. But "how can we give up the link between Sanskrit and Indian culture which has existed for over three thousand years?" Quote pg 67.

[8A] For a discussion of Braj at the Mughal court and its role in creating a composite culture see Allison Busch, 'Hidden in Plain View: Brajbhasha Poets at the Mughal Court', *Modern Asian Studies,* Volume 44, 2, March 2010, pp. 267–309. Busch argues that Braj was "more suited to a Mughal politics of pluralism than either Sanskrit or Persian with their more limited constituencies." Quote pg 204.

[9] Suniti Kumar Chatterjee, 'Rashtrabhasha Ka Prashna', in *Rithambhara,* Sahitya Bhawan Private Limited, Hindi Sahitya Press, Allahabad. Second revised, edition 1958, pp. 50–91. Reference, pg 68.

[10] According to S.K.Chatterjee the use of Arabic and Persian words first arose in Dakhani during the 16th century. The influence of Dakhini on the Khari-Boli of Delhi led to the rise of Urdu during the early 18th century under the influence of Wali Aurangabadi. Urdu provided "mental and spiritual compensation" to the Muslim elite who were affected by the decline of the Mughal Empire and the rise of British power in India. Muslim courtiers of foreign origin contributed to the rise of Urdu although many traditional and indigenous Indian Muslims, like the 18th century Muslim poet with the *nom de plume* 'Garib', wrote in Hindi. It was the Muslim elite that created Urdu, based on heavy borrowing from Arabic and Persian, as a language for Muslims. Chatterjee cites the work of Chandrabali Pandey to whom he gives the credit for removing misconceptions about Hindi and Urdu. He does not believe that Urdu is older than Hindi or that Urdu developed with the enthusiastic cooperation of the Hindus. If this interpretation of the development of the Hindi–Urdu divide is erroneous or biased then we might regard Chatterjee's views as dated or based on contemporary notions of nationalism. An interpretation that differs is provided by Faruqi in the Pollock volume cited earlier. Shamsur Rahman Faruqi, 'A Long History of Urdu Literary Culture, Part I: Naming and Placing a Literary Culture', in Pollock (ed.), *Literary Cultures*, 2003, pp. 805–863.

[10A] Suniti Chatterjee would have been quite perturbed if language reform had produced the negative consequences discussed in Nergis Erturk, 'Phonocentrism and Literary Modernity in Turkey', *Boundary* 2, summer 2010, pp. 155–185. She argues that Turkish linguistic nationalism was a "form of self-surgery" primarily concerned with the "suppression of internal difference". Erturk asserts, "The creation of a transparent, abstract phonetic writing system for the modern Turkish of the new republic could be presented

as an efficient guarantee of the unitary self-identity of an otherwise hybrid, multireligious, and multiethnic population". Quotes pp. 156–157. The Turkish language reforms under Ataturk did not bring the language of the elite and the masses close to each other, abandoned the emphasis on simplification of the earlier period and produced an artificial language. Citing the sociologist Meltem Ahiska she asserts the reforms led to "bifurcation of the Republican everyday into two orders of things: one comprising the formal authority of a pure Turkish society of external appearances, the other, the interiorized illegitimacy of the disavowed 'Ottoman', along with the republic's peasants, fundamentalists, criminals, communists, and ethnolinguistic others, the remainders of the Kemalist revolution". Quote pg 182. If this view is accepted then the failure to follow the example of Ataturk in India may not be a cause for regret.

[11] Chatterjee, Allahabad, 1958, pg 72. It is important that the argument about the rise of nationalism among Turks and Iranians was emphasized by scholars who were less concerned about the linguistic rights of Urdu speakers in India than its links with Arabic and Persian. At the 31st Haridwar session of the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan Chandrabali Pandey observed that Arabic had even less links with Indian languages than English. In his view Persian was welcome but not Arabic. If Urdu was regarded as the language of the Prophet — *Nabi ki zaban* — then its claims could not be accepted since the Prophet believed in the primacy of the national language. *Nabi deshbhasha ke pujari they, kuch videshbhasha ke nahin*. A. Kaushalyayan (ed.), *Rashtra Bhasha Ki Samasyaein*, Hindi Sahitya Sammelan, Prayag, Allahabad 1986, pp 35–60. Quote pg 39. In Turkey the people have turned to Turkish; Arabic may be the sacred language but cannot become the national language. To think of Urdu or even Farsi and Arabic as national language is sacrilege. *Mazhab nahin kufr hai*, *Islam nahin upadrav hai*. Ibid. Quote pg 40. Pandey believed that Urdu had emerged as an un-Indian or *abharatiya* language. In order to become Indian it would have to return to its Nagari *rashtrabhumi* roots. He argued that the Sufis had used Hindi and other Indian languages for the spread of Islam more than Urdu. Those who wanted to end the Hindi–Urdu dispute would have to change the outlook of Urdu — *Urdu ki pravritti mein parivartan karna hi hoga.* Ibid. pg 55.

[12] Chatterjee, Allahabad, 1958, Quote pg 54 and pp. 60–61.

[13] Chatterjee, Allahabad, 1958 pp. 74–76.

[14] *Madhukar*, 1944. Article entitled 'Janpad Aandolan' written in Kundeshwar in *Tikamgarh* by Jagdish Prasad Chaturvedi. pp. 1–16.

[15] Pandey argued that there was no point in making an issue about the mother

tongue— *matrabhasha ke poot naam par adhik bitanda ki aavashyakta nahin.* The mother also gives up her language for the language of her husband. Chandrabali Pandey to B.D. Chaturvedi dated 5th November, 1943, *Madhuka*r, 1944, pp. 82–83. Pandey gave convoluted arguments to justify why he had supported the Janapada programme at Haridwar although he was basically an opponent of *Vikendriyakaran*.The reason why he favoured the idea of Vikendriyakaran was that he found the language 'why' after 'reason' currently in use lifeless. Not just the Urdu Janapada but the firangi Janapada ought to be the subject of study. We should learn from both the Deshgat and Videshi Janapadas. He wanted the language of the nation to be strong and substantial in which every element in the country was represented — *kan- kan ki boli.* This is what he meant by centralization. He was opposed to the idea that the Urdu Janapada was the maker or founder, Vidhata, of the Hindi Rashtra. Besides, when there was no centre where was the need for decentralization? Chandrabali Pandey, Nagari Pracharini Sabha, Kashi to B.D. Chaturvedi dated 24th August, 1943, *Madhukar*, 1944, pp. 79–80.

[16] Letter from C. Pandey to B.D. Chaturvedi circulated in the Hindi literary world. The Sammelan needed to understand India and its people and this would help the Janapadas to flower under the stimulus of Indian nationalism. Both of them needed to come up with their own schemes for Hindi and eventually produce one which would enable the whole country to speak in one voice. *Madhukar*, 1944, pp. 81–82.

[17] *Madhukar*, 1944. Article entitled 'Janpada Aandolan' by Jagdish Prasad Chaturvedi, pp 5–6.

[18] *Madhukar*, 1944. Article entitled 'Janpada Aandolan' by Jagdish Prasad Chaturvedi. Quote pg 7. In March 1934 B.D. Chaturvedi wrote in *Vishal Bharat* that it would be far better to produce dedicated scholars like P.D. Tandon and Babu Shyam Sunder Das than to criticize them for their shortcomings. pg 8.

[19] *Madhukar*, 1944. Article entitled 'Janpada Aandolan' by Jagdish Prasad Chaturvedi. pp 10–11.

[20] Dr. Sudheendra Bose, M.A., Ph.D., 'Prant Prem Jagrat Keejiye', *Madhukar,* 15 June, 1941, pp. 26–28.

[21] Editorial comment by B.D. Chaturvedi on the article by Dr. Sudheendra Bose, M.A., Ph.D., 'Prant Prem Jagrat Keejiye', *Madhukar,* 15 June, 1941, pg 26.

[22] Makhan Lal Chaturvedi's comments in excerpts from scholars of the

Hindi world in 'Janpadiya Karyakrama tatha Vikendriyakaran', *Madhukar*, 1944, pp 34–35. The awareness of the overwhelming power of English on Indian knowledge systems was reflected in an observation of Hazari Prasad Dwivedi in this collection of excerpts. He noted that even information about our flora and fauna, our mountains and forests and right down to the insects was gathered together in English language texts. Excerpt from the address given to the Hindi Sahitya Parishad, Monghyr, in 1941. Ibid pg 39.

[23] Amar Nath Jha, 'Janpadiya Bhashaon ka Sawal', *Madhukar*, 1944, pg 119. Although A.N. Jha favoured elementary education in the mother-tongue—or the dialects of Hindi — he recommended that the rashtrabhasha, Hindi, should be used for secondary education. He asserted that Hindustani was just "bad Urdu", but he wanted both Hindi and Urdu to be used as the medium of instruction in the United Provinces. He wanted Urdu to flourish but thought its influence was restricted to U.P. and Punjab. He did not think there was much point in adopting the Roman script. Amarnath Jha, 'Hindi —The Rashtrabhasha in India', *The Twentieth Century,* 1946, pp. 200–204.

[24] Letter to B.D. Chaturvedi from Devendra Satyarthi, Janta-janta, Sant Nagar, Lahore dated 28 September, 1943, *Madhukar*, pp. 85–88.

[25] Banarsi Das Chaturvedi's editorial 'Prant Nirman', *Madhukar*, 1 October, 1942, pp. 29–33.

[26] Vyohar Rajendra Singh, Jabalpur, 'Vindhyaprant Nirman Samasya', in *Madhukar*, March 1944, pp. 577–578.

[27] Deendayalu Shrivastava, 'Prant Nirman Kis Liye?' *Madhukar*, March 1944, pp. 599–602. Shrivastava envied those who lived in Jabalpur and could deal with the government and the courts in Hindi unlike those Bundelkhandis in the UP districts who had to cope with Urdu. As a layman Shrivastava was not pronouncing any judgements on the language question but felt that there could be the use of the dialect for education if the people wanted it.

[28] Krishna Chandra Aggarwal, B.A., Vishvamitra Office, Calcutta, 'Mera Bundelkhand Ek Kaise Ho?' *Madhukar,* June, 1943, pp. 387–390.

[28A] Busch has cited Chandrabali Pandey's work as an example of those literary historians who saw "a Hindi couplet flowing from every emperor's tongue". Speaking more generally she writes, "This type of scholar seems to find solace in highlighting features of a more linguistically pluralistic past, with Hindi-using Muslim poets and patrons revered as tolerant advocates of national unity *avant la lettre"*. Her own articles, however, present a nuanced account of the patronage of Braj by Mughal emperors

from Akbar to Aurangzeb and by a section of the Indo-Muslim literati and elite. Allison Busch, 'Hidden in Plain View: Brajbhasha Poets at the Mughal Court', *Modern Asian Studies,* volume 44, 02, March 2010, pp. 267–309. Quotes pg 270. As for Chandrabali Pandey, some of his stong pronouncements against Urdu make his partriotism look narrow-minded. See footnote 11.

[29] Pandit Madanlal Chaturvedi, 'Brajbhasha aur Bundelkhandi', *Madhukar*, 16 November, 1942, pp. 112–115.

[30] Pandit Madanlal Chaturvedi, 'Brajbhasha aur Bundelkhandi', *Madhukar,* 16 November, 1942. Chaturvedi argued that he was proud of the Braj language of Bundelkhand because it was a part of the literature in the *Braj* language. pg 115.

[31] Einar Haugen, 'Dialect, Language, Nation', *American Anthropologist*, New series, Vol. 68, No. 4, August 1966 pp. 922–935. spl pg 923.

[32] It is worth noting that Suniti Chatterjee believed that the recognition of any dialect as a language was based on differences in grammar, on the extent of attachment to the dialect, the difficulty faced by dialect speakers in acquiring education through the literary language in use in their region and the possibility of developing the dialect as a literary language. The Provencal of southern France, a variant of Catalan of northern Spain, and once a rival of French, had over time been abandoned by Provencal speakers in favour of French. On the other hand Catalan had evolved as a new literary language. As far as India was concerned Chatterjee argued that there was a greater sense of unity or *milankami pravritti* which had enabled Sanskrit, Apbhransha and then Hindi-Hindustani to dominate in north India. While the trend recently seemed to be in favor of *Vikendriyakaran* the matter would be settled only in the future. Eventually 'mahakal' would decide. Dr. S.K. Chatterjee, 'Hindi aur Janapadiya Bhashayein', *Madhukar*, 1944, pp. 113–115.

[33] Eric Hobsbawm, Nations and Nationalism Since 1780, Cambridge, 1990, pp. 59–62. This evidence is cited to support the argument of Anderson about "proto-national cohesion". Quote pg 59.

[34] Haugen argued that the Irish language movement had not had great success because of the tremendous importance of English as a language of international contact. In the case of the New Norwegian movement the influence of Danish had been difficult to shake off because of the pre-eminence it had achieved over four centuries during the union between Norway and Denmark. Progress had only been possible because Danish was not such a great international language. Einar Haugen, 'Dialect,

Language, Nation', *American Anthropologist*, New series, Vol 68, No. 4, August 1966 pp. 922–935. spl pg 928. Although the Finns had an unwritten vernacular and the Israelis an unspoken standard both were able to develop a modern and substantial language as a result of conscious effort. Therefore languages could be created and developed in modern times. Ibid, pg 929.

[35] Rahul Sankrityayan, 'Matrabhashaon Ka Prashna', *Madhukar,* 1944, pp. 24–30. Quote pg 25.

[36] Ibid., Quote pg 26.

[37] Ibid., Sankrityayan argued that the textbooks for the use of students in the regional dialects could be produced easily because there was no dearth of talent in the dialects. Sumitranandan Pant, Ilachandra and Hemchandra Joshi were speakers of eastern Pahari; Banarsidas Chaturvedi, Harishankar Sharma, Kishorilal Goswami spoke Braj; Maithili Sharan Gupt spoke Bundeli; Nirala, Devidutt Shukla spoke Kausali or eastern Awadhi; Jagannath Prasad Mishra and Amaranth Jha spoke Maithili; Chandrabali Pandey, Ayodhya Singh Upadhyayay spoke Kashika or Benaresi and Udaynarain Tiwari and Shivpujan Sahay spoke Mallika or Bhojpuri. Therefore the preparation of texts would not take very long to prepare. Talent and market forces were both supportive of education in the mother-tongue. pp. 26–27.

[38] Terry Martin, 'Modernization or neo-traditionalism? Ascribed nationality and Soviet primordialism', in Sheila Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Stalinism: New Directions,* Routledge, London and New York, 2000, pp. 348–367. Also see Ronald Grigor Suny, 'Constructing Primordialism: Old Histories for New Nations', *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol 73, No 4, December 2001, pp. 862–896.

[38A] The Turks were promoting secular nationalism but not socialism as in Soviet Central Asia. There was a less accommodating conception of Turkishness which particularly hurt the interests of the Kurds. But modernization was also buttressed by pseudo-scientific theories. Ilker Ayturk, 'Turkish Linguists against the West: The Origins of Linguistic Nationalism in Atatürk's Turkey', *Middle Eastern Studies,* Vol. 40, No. 6 (Nov., 2004), pp. 1–25. Amateur linguists, most of them members of the Turkish Language Institute, concocted a theory that asserted that civilization first emerged in Turkery and after it declined because of drought and climate change the Turks "started to emigrate in all directions, transmitting their Neolithic civilization to other peoples of the world. Naturally, it was assumed, the ancient form of the Turkish that these conquering emigrants spoke was also carried with them and contributed to every primitive language

the most important concepts necessary for abstract thought as loanwords. Hence, the Sun-Language Theory had provided a pseudo-scientific explanation for a presumed linguistic transplantation and complemented the equally half-backed Turkish History Thesis". Although this theory gained state support in 1936 it had emerged earlier in 1922. Quote pp. 16–17.

[39] In fact Amar Nath Jha argued that after Persian was replaced in 1837 by the provincial languages in the law courts, the Muslims as the former rulers "could not reconcile themselves to the position of equality to which all languages were reduced". While Muslims of Bengal, Madras and Bombay were "free to contribute to the languages of their province" this was opposed in Bihar, UP and Punjab. There was "violent opposition" to the cause of Hindi among the Muslims. Ahmad (ed.) *National Language,* 1941, pp 184-200. Quotes pg 186.

[39A] A scholar has concluded that alphabet reform "appears as a site where the demands of the population for opportunities to learn to read and write converged with the interests of a modernist state. Alphabet change becomes, at least in part, the state's response to social needs and demands, rather than a top–down reform instituted against the wishes of the pupulation". Cited in Hale Yilmaz, 'Learning to Read (Again): The Social Experiences of Turkey's 1928 Alphabet Reform', *International Journal of Middle East Studies,* Vol. 43, 2011, pp. 677–697. Quote pg 686. The new Turkish alphabet had to be accepted in the fields of education, law, government and publications within two years at most. In practice the Ottoman script persisted for many years afterwards. Yilmaz argues, "Individual reactions to reforms, and in particular the alphabet transition, had much to do with cultural and habitual change at a very personal level and did not necessarily fit the categories of ideologically oriented resistance or opposition. The transformation to the new alphabet was more gradual and the government policy toward noncompliance more accommodating than has often been assumed in the literature". Ibid. Quote pg 694. Many Hindi scholars who cited the changes brought about by Turkish linguistic nationalism understimated the enormous difficulties involved in the process of transition.

[40] Adeeb Khalid, 'Backwardness and the Quest for Civilization: Early Soviet Central Asia in Comparative Perspective', *Slavic Review*, Vol. 65, No. 2, summer 2006, pp. 231–251.

[41] Sampurnanand, 'Janapada Aandolan Ki Dharaein', *Madhukar*, 1944, pp. 116–118. Sampurnanand considered the proposal of Chaturvedi as misleading and unreasonable. There was a pointless argument being made about dictatorship and *Arajakvad* or anarchy. In any case the autonomy of the different parts of the body could not be used as a pretext for dismembering

the body. — "Avyavon ki swatantra ke shrutimadhur naam par prani ka angchhed to nahin kiya jaa sakta". Ibid., Quote pg 116.

[42] William Gould, 'Congress Radicals and Hindu Militancy: Sampurnanand and Purushottam Das Tandon in the Politics of the United Provinces, 1930–1947', *Modern Asian Studies,* Vol. 36, No. 3, July 2002, pp. 619–655.

[43] Sampurnanand, 'Janpada Aandolan Ki Dharaein', *Madhukar*, 1944, pp. 116–118.

[44] *Madhukar*, 1944. Pandit Rahul Sankrityayan argued that after primary school the students who were getting educated in their dialects should study Hindi for two to three hours a week. Although he thought there might be no opposition to making Hindi a compulsory second language in the thirty Janapadas he had identified (broadly based on the list prepared by Grierson), since this policy affected the entire country in Bengal, Andhra, Dravid and Kerala regions people might have an objection to making Hindi a compulsory second language. Therefore, he argued, "whether to make it compulsory or not ought to be left to the Janapadas to decide on their own". Hindi would become more popular with time, but students should have the freedom to appear for examinations in their mother-tongue. Clearly this was not the idea of the modular nation-state that was spreading after the French Revolution, although it owed a lot to the Russian revolution. Article by Rahul Sankrityayan, 'Matrabhashaon Ka Prashna', pp. 24–30 and 28–29. Quote pg 29.

[44A] Chaturvedi — and more importantly Sankrityayan — were willing to use the regional dialects to promote literacy; the Turks changed their alphabet partly for this reason. The "expansion of literacy was a genuine goal of the proponents of alphabet reform. A related argument for reform had to do with the unsuitablity of the existing alphabet for printing presses, necessitating... more than 400 pieces of type", according to Yilmaz. "A more functional and simpler alphabet would make printing more convenient and less expensive, thus contributing to increased literacy and readership". After intense propaganda, led by Kemal Ataturk and his party, the Turkish Parliament passed the Alphabet Law on 1st November, 1928. Hale Yilmaz, 'Learning to Read (Again): the Social Experiences of Turkey's 1928 Alphabet Reform', *International Journal of Middle East Studies,* Vol. 43, 2011, pp. 677–697. Quote pg 679. As a result of the literacy campaign the level of literacy rose from 8.16 per cent in 1927 to 20.4 per cent in 1935 and 32.2 per cent in 1945. Ibid pg 681.

[45] *Madhukar*, 1944. Jagdish Chaturvedi observed, "Education has a big role to play in the rejuvenation of the nation. The welfare of the people is

paramount and we must work for it even if it hurts our sentiments. Today the leaders of the nation are even willing to give up the unity of the country for freedom. If by abandoning our commitment to the unity of Hindi we are able to facilitate the spread of education among the masses we should do so". Article entitled 'Janpada Aandolan' by Jagdish Prasad Chaturvedi, pp. 15–16 Quote pg 16.

[46] See Orlando Figes, *Natasha's Dance: A Cultural History of Russia,* Penguin Books, London, 2003, chapters 4 & 5; also see E.J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*, Cambridge, 1990.

[47] Letter from Vasudev Sharan, Provincial Museum, Lucknow to Chaturvediji dated 11th January, 1941. *Madhukar* 1944, pp. 52–53. In this letter he outlined a five-year programme in order to better understand the life of the country and its people. The impact of Orientalist scholarship is apparent in the open admiration for the masterly Bihar Peasant Life produced by Grierson. He wanted that there should be eight committees to study the Bundeli language and the collection of *dhatu-path*; the geographical features and local rivers of the region; the local names for the different animal and plants ; the record of local products as carried out by *Watts' Dictionary of Economic Products*; the folk songs and proverbs of Bundelkhand; the anthropological study of the customs and practices of the people of the region including the aboriginal people; the local culture and civilization; and finally, the study of the geological and agricultural conditions in order to facilitate material prosperity.

[48] Letter from Vasudev Sharan, Provincial Museum, Lucknow, to Chaturvediji dated 25th July, 1940. Published in *Madhukar*, 1944. pp. 51–52. He admired the masterly dictionaries produced by Turner and Grierson for Nepali and Kashmiri respectively and felt deeply upset by the fact that there was no such work for Braj and Awadhi. This was galling because the literary treasures in these languages were bound to result in more voluminous works.

[49] Letter from Vasudev Sharan, Lucknow, to Chaturvediji dated Vaishakh Purnima 2000. *Madhukar*, 1944, pp. 54–56.

[49A] Urdu, based on "the reformed Muslim schools and tireless printing presses of colonial India", even influenced Afghan modernism. "After the decline of Persian in India from the mid-1800s, and before the Afghan governmental investment in teaching and printing in Pashto from the 1930s", Nile Green states, "the emergence of a trans-regional 'Urdusphere' connected Muslim intellectuals as far apart as Kabul and Madras, not to mention readers in such maritime Urdu outposts as Durban, Istanbul, and Cairo". Nile Green,

'The Trans-Border Traffic of Afghan Modernism: Afghanistan and the Indian "Urdusphere"', *Comparative Studies in Society and History,* Vol. 53, No. 3, 2011, pp. 479–508, quotes pp. 485-486. The influence of Urdu in the subcontinent, although substantial, had to cope with challenges.

[50] In a postscript dated 18th May, 1943 in the letter to Chaturvediji the author argued that although the domain of Hindi was one and indivisible the work in this field would be based on *"samarajya, swarajya, vairajya, dvairrajya and bhaujya"* and would continue to be so influenced. Letter from Vasudev Sharan, Lucknow, to Chaturvediji, pg 56. *Madhukar*, 1944.

[51] Letter from Vasudev Sharan to Chaturvediji dated 8th June, 1943, Aggarwal was absolutely clear that there should be no link between the Janapada programme and the movement for the creation of separate provinces. Letter to Chaturvediji dated 11th June, 1943. *Madhukar*, 1944. pp. 57–58.

[52] Letter from Vasudev Sharan to Chaturvediji from Kalsi dated 18th November, 1943. He said the brighter aspects of urban life and the natural sense of belonging and fellow-feeling of the rural people were admirable. The villages also had preserved a part of the earlier culture of India. These two aspects of urban and janapada life should be valued and synthesized. This was the combination of the tea available in the towns and the *meva* in the Janapadas that Satyendraji had recommended. *Madhukar* 1944, pp. 65–66.

[53] Vasudev Sharan to Chaturvediji dated 22nd November, 1943. This letter was written after Chaturvedi had resigned from the Janapada committee set up after the Haridwar session. *Madhukar*, 1944, pg 67.

[54] Vasudev Sharan to Chaturvediji, dated 24 November, 1943, *Madhukar*, 1944, pp. 68–69.

[55] Vasudev Sharan to Chaturvediji dated 10 March, 1944, *Madhukar*, 1944, pp. 71–72.

[56] Before embarking on a study of Indian history and culture Aggarwal believed it was necessary to study and collectively memorize the sixty-three *mantras* of the *Prithvi Sukta*. The fact that he regarded this as a pre-requisite for national programmes indicates his Hindu beliefs and sensibilities. Religious sentiments were not excluded from national programmes as the secularists would have insisted. Even the essay on Hindi begins with a reference to the *Prithvi Sukta* of t*he Atharva Veda*. V.S. Aggarwal, 'Hindi Sahitya Ka Samagra Roop', *Madhukar*, 1944, pp. 109–112.

[57] Vasudev Sharan to Devendra Satyarthi, Lahore, dated 22nd August, 1943, *Madhukar*, 1944, pp. 73–75. Aggarwal felt that the literary men had to be taught how to come close to nature like the *prithviputras* of earlier times.

[58] Vasudev Sharan to Dr. Siddheshwar Varma, Kashmir, dated 24th October, 1943. *Madhukar*, 1944, pp. 75–77. The attitude was one of learning from others and rediscovering the lost treasures buried in the Janapadas. The ideal path of development was without any religious or linguistic chauvinism. Yet there was undoubted inspiration from Hindu religious traditions and indubitable love for Hindi language and literature.

[59] Suniti Chatterjee, 'Chalu Hindi', in *Rithambhara,* Allahabad, 1958 edition, pp. 24–38.

[60] In the essay on national language Chatterjee had argued that one had to consider the following four points: differences in grammar, pride in the regional dialect, the difficulty in coping with Hindi and the existence of a substantial literature in the dialect. Only Maithili had all four points in its favour and could be considered as a separate language. In the case of Magahi there was the absence of pride in the language and a substantial literature in the dialect. Nor did Chatterjee think there was a case for decentralization or 'vikendriyakaran' in the case of Bhojpuri although Rahul Sankrityayan had tried to contribute to the growth of the language. There was a definite lack of a substantial literature in Bhojpuri although the other three conditions were met. 'Rashtrabhasha Ka Prashna', *Rithambhara*, 1958, pp. 79–83.

[61] Pattabhi Sitaramayya, the Andhra Congressman, wrote, "The employment of the past participle and gerundial infinitive used adjectivally is very common in Telugu while it is almost absent in Hindi-Hindustani. … The two bugbears to us in the South in respect of Hindi or Hindustani are the use of the letter *ne* with the subject and the distinction of gender for words…. When we people of the South however have to learn Hindi or Hindustani we must be exempt from the tyranny of *ne* as well as of gender…. It would also be of advantage to abbreviate expression by using freely the gerund and gerundial infinitive in an adjectival sense". Ahmad, *National Language*, 1941, pp. 250–257 Quotes pp. 251–252.

[62] Dhirendra Varma argued that the problem was that even Hindi speakers were being asked to accept changes in their language to be acceptable to non-native speakers. But there was some confusion about the role of Hindi as a literary and administrative language and one that was to serve as a link language or lingua franca. D. Varma in Ahmad, *National Language,* Allahabad, 1941 pp. 258–276, spl pp. 269–271. Quote pg 270. The spread of English was essentially because it allowed different people in the world

to use it in different ways. The emphasis on Queen's English did not prevent the dissemination of English in different forms with different grammatical mistakes and multiple pronunciations. The Scots, Welsh and Irish did not speak English in the same way as people in southern England. Therefore the toleration of multiple accents and many variants did a lot to make English a national and an international language.

[63] The modification of grammar was unlikely to have a benign impact according to Kaushalyayan. See, A. Kaushalyayan (ed.), *Rashtrabhasha Ki Samasyaen*, Hindi Sahitya Sammelan, Prayag, Allahabad 1986, pp. 1–17. Quote pg 9. Although the Bata shoe company may modify its shoes to suit different foot sizes, no one would modify his foot to fit a shoe produced by that company, he wrote caustically.

[64] Kaushalyayan used a proverb in Hindi which says that it is the poor man's wife who becomes the sister-in law of all and sundry, i.e. the poor have no choice in dealing with others. Ibid pg 9.

[65] Humayun Kabir asserted that the difference in the vocabulary of East and West Bengal, based on the greater preponderance of Muslims and Hindus in the two regions, did not lead to the creation of two distinct Bengali languages. He observed, "The difference in script has led to division in the case of Hindustani, while the unity of script has saved Bengali from a similar fate". Humayun Kabir in Ahmad, *National Language*, Allahabad, 1941, pp. 277–296. Quote pg 287.

[66] Francis Robinson, *Separatism among Indian Muslims: The Politics of the United Provinces' Muslims*, *1860–1923,* Cambridge 1974. Also see Francesca Orsini, *The Hindi Public Sphere 1920–1940: Language and Literature in the Age of Nationalism,* New Delhi, Oxford 2002. Orsini has argued that the success of constitutional politics after 1937 buttressed the normative view of Hindi and steadily reduced the influence of critical voices and popular culture in Hindi. Therefore, Hindi failed to become the unifying language that could produce a "more popular and inclusive understanding of the public". Francesca Orsini, 'What Did they Mean by "Public"? Language, Literature and the Politics of Nationalism', *Economic and Political Weekly,* Vol. 34, No. 7, Feb. 13–19, 1999, pp. 409–416. Quote pg 415.

[67] See Harish Trivedi in Pollock, *Literary Cultures,* 2003 and Amarnath Jha in Ahmad, *National Language*, 1941.

[68] A. Barannikov, 'Modern Literary Hindi', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, University of London, Vol 8, No. 2/3, 1936, pp. 373–390.

[69] Ibid, pg 382 and pg 376.

[70] Ibid, pp. 389–390.

[71] This has been partially questioned by McGregor. See R.S. McGregor, 'A Hindi Writer's View of Social, Political and Language Issues of His Time: Attitudes of Harishchandra, of Banaras (1850–1885)', *Modern Asian Studies*, Vol. 25, No. 1 (Feb., 1991), pp. 91–100. McGregor has also argued, "The pre-19th-century prose texts which have been preserved in Braj Bhasa, Khari Boli, and Rajasthani dialects have a collective importance for our subject as antecedents of the Sanskritized style of standard Hindi, based on Khari Boli, which emerged in the 19th century". R. S. McGregor, 'The Rise of Standard Hindi and Early Hindi Prose Fiction', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland,* No. 3/4 (Oct., 1967), pp. 114–132. Quote pg 114. McGregor observes that Devanagari during the 19th century was "able to subsume the potentialities of all the dialects of the Hindi language area as vehicles for literary expression". Ibid, Quote pg 131. Padma Singh Sharma writes that Bharatendu Harishchandra in 'Aggrawalon Ki Uttapatti' stated that the Aggarwals spoke Khari Boli, i.e., Urdu. This showed that he did not think there was any difference between spoken Hindi and Urdu and that he used Khari Boli as a "synonym for Hindustani". Padma Singh Sharma, *Hindi, Urdu aur Hindustani*, Allahabad, 1931 pp. 32–35, Quote pg 33.

[72] Dr. Tarachand argued that there were scholars who were trying to curb the growing divide between Hindi and Urdu but they were not very successful. Against the Sanskritization of Hindi Balkrishna Bhat, Pandit Giridhar Sharma and Ayodhya Singh Upadhyay had spoken out; Syed Ali Bilgrami, Maulvi Wahidud Din Salim and Maulvi Abdul Haq had tried to curb the zealous Arabicists. Ahmad, *National Language*, 1941 pp 131–157. Quote pg 144.

[73] Dr. Tara Chand, *Influence of Islam on Indian Culture*, The Indian Press, Allahabad, 1946.

[74] Dr. Tarachand therefore argued that the difference between Urdu and Hindi as regards loan words was not so great. He observed, "So far as compounds and derivatives are concerned, the methods of combination and the use of vocables (affixes) in forming derivatives are to a considerable extent common". Ahmad, *National Language*, 1941. Quote pg 148.

[75] Abdul Haq also lamented the fact that so-called Hindustani was "only useful for conversational and ordinary business needs…. No organized and united attempt has been made to make Hindustani an adequate vehicle for expressing literary and scientific ideas". A dictionary, and a few newspapers

and periodicals in Hindustani would go a long way in popularizing it. Ahmad, *National Language*, 1941, pp. 82–92. Quote pg 90.

[76] Dr. Tara Chand, 'The Problem of a Common Language for India', *The Twentieth Century*, Allahabad, 1944, pp. 251–263. Quotes pg 261. Germans developed new words from old words while the English borrowed from other languages. Modern Hindi and Urdu are like English. He observed, "Hindi writers eschew words containing sounds which are common to Khariboli and Perso-Arabic, Urdu writers hesitate to use sounds which do not occur in the Perso-Arabic phonetic system. Both forget that it is now too late in the day to modify the sound structure of the dialect which is the basis of both Hindi and Urdu". Quote pp. 256–257.

[77] Ibid, quote pg 257. Khari Boli has lost a number of Sanskrit vowels and acquired new vowels. Tarachand argues, "Its consonantal sounds too have become different by losses and gains. A number of nasals and one of the sibilants have disappeared: some rolled lateral and flapped sounds have entered from non-Aryan Indian tongues, others like an uvular plosive and fricatives have come from Perso-Arabic languages. It has developed certain peculiarities of pronunciation: for example, it drops the ultimate short vowels like a, i, u, it tends to break up compound consonants, and does not tolerate them at the beginning of words: while Sanskrit words end mostly in vowels, Khari Boli words end in consonants". Ibid pp. 255–256.

[78] Jawaharlal Nehru wrote that Basic Hindustani "with a little effort from the state... will spread with extreme rapidity all over the country and will help in bringing about that national unity which we all desire. It will bring Hindi and Urdu closer together and will also help in developing an all-India linguistic unity". Ahmad, *National Language*, Allahabad, 1941, pp. 45–74. Quote pg 64.

[79] Muzaffar Alam, 'The Culture and Politics of Persian in Precolonial Hindustan', in Sheldon Pollock (ed.), *Literary Cultures in History*: *Reconstructions from South Asia*, Oxford University Press, 2003, pp. 131–198. Alam observes, "Persian..... literary culture had a certain logical connection with the Mughal political ideology. It helped generate and legitimate the Mughal policy of creating out of heterogeneous social and religious groups a class of allies. Like the emperor and his nobility in general, this class also cherished universalist human values and visions". Quote pg 171. Alam cites Mirza Khan, an author of Aurangzeb's time, who argued that Sanskrit was a language of the gods. Observes Alam, "No barbarian (*mleccha*) would have been allowed to pollute it by choosing it as a symbol and vehicle of his power. No *mleccha* could have used it to create the world of his vision. Prakrit, by contrast, which was *patal bani*, the language

of the underworld, of the snakes, the Mughals considered too low to appropriate for lofty ideals. Braj, or Bhakha, the language of this world, was only a regional dialect. Furthermore, Bhakha, in the Mughal view, was suitable only for music and love poetry". Also Siraj al-Din Ali Khan Arzu wrote in the 18th century that Hindvi had not evolved a uniform idiom in northern India. Ibid, Quote pg 168.

[80] Vasudha Dalmia, *The Nationalization of Hindu Traditions: Bharatendu Harishchandra and Nineteenth Century Banaras,* OUP Delhi, 1997.

[81] Amrit Rai has argued that Urdu broke away from Hindi during the 18th century and that the British merely exploited an existing division. Amrit Rai, *A House Divided: The Origin and Development of Hindi/Hindavi,* Delhi: OUP 1984. Christopher King finds Rai's argument convincing but according to Trivedi "attempts to deflect Rai's main thrust by arguing that about a century after Urdu had caused the divide, Hindi reacted by causing 'the other side of the divide'— as if a divide did not have two sides to begin with". Trivedi in Pollock (ed.) *Literary Cultures,* pg 970. See also review by Peggy Mohan, 'A Language Divided — A House Divided: The Origin and Development of Hindi/Hindavi by Amrit Rai', *Economic and Political Weekly,* Vol. 20, No. 44 (Nov. 2, 1985), pp. 1867–1868. Peggy Mohan points out that Rai criticized deliberate Persianization after the decline of the Mughal Empire when Muslim power was replaced by emphasis on Muslim identity; but he also opposed "deliberate Sanskritization" which robbed Hindi of its "natural genius". She argues that Rai's book might have reached its natural audience better if it had been written in Hindi or Urdu since it constitutes a "protest" against the decline in the vitality of Hindi/Hindavi.

[82] G.A. Grierson, 'Hints to Oriental Students: No 1. Some Useful Hindi Books', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland,* New Series Vol 19, No 1, (January, 1887), pp. 138–144. Spl pp. 140–141. The difference between Hindi and Urdu was also highlighted with reference to *Kahani Theth Hindi Mein.* The text had hardly any Persian words and the vocabulary was that of Prakrit, but the construction of sentences was in the Urdu style. The verbs in Hindi come at the end but in this text they often came in the middle. Although the vocabulary was pure Hindi the text was regarded by scholars at that time as Urdu rather than Hindi. Ibid pg 142.

[83] T. Grahame Bailey, 'Judge H.T. Colebrooke's Supposed Translation of the Gospels into Hindi, 1806', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, No 3, July 1936, pp. 491–499. Spl pg 492.

[84] Ibid, Spl pg 498.

[85] Ram Vilas Sharma, *Bhasha aur Samaj*, Peoples Publishing House, New Delhi, 1961. Chapter12, 'Jatiya Bhashaon Ka Vikas aur Urdu', pp. 291–325. Spl pg 303.

[86] Dr. Tarachand noted that the Hindustani that developed in the Deccan was dominated by *tadbhava* vocabulary and had a sprinkling of Persian and Arabic words. The borrowed elements were well digested. As the Mughal emperors had patronized Braj it was only after their power waned that Urdu emerged. In a passage that does not differ from the assessment offered by Ram Vilas Sharma the historian comments, "The practitioners of Hindustani at Delhi were men whose ears were familiar with Persian sounds and whose tongues were habituated to utter them. The phonetics of the Deccani Hindustani were a strain upon them. To utter the cerebrals, plosives and palatal affricatives, or the alveolar flapped or rolled consonants was a task too difficult for their tongues. They naturally started a purification of the language which robbed it of a considerable part of its inheritance". Thus Hindustani was transformed into Urdu. Tara Chand, 'The Problem of a Common Language for India', *The Twentieth Century*, Allahabad, 1944, pp. 251–263. Quote pp. 258–259.

[87] Ram Vilas Sharma, *Bhasha aur Samaj*, Peoples Publishing House, New Delhi, 1961. Chapter12, 'Jatiya Bhashaon Ka Vikas aur Urdu', pp. 291–325. Spl pg 313. Sharma argued that "the central question was whether the words employed by poets such as Sur, Tulsi, Jayasi and the treasure trove of words embedded in the Bolis of the Janapadas would be incorporated by Urdu or not. If it accepted them it would attract the majority of Hindustani people and by linking up with the older literary traditions it would be able to represent the unity of the Hindustani *jati* and promote its cultural development". Quote pg 313.

[88] Padma Singh Sharma disagrees with this view since the East India Company in 1803 appointed scholars under the supervision of John Gilchrist to prepare a common language — *sarvasadharana ki bhasha* — which would neither be too Sanskritic nor too Persianized. pg 30. He wrote that Raja Shivprasad Sitare-Hind blamed the Maulvis and the Pandits and not Grierson for creating two grammars instead of creating one for a common language. But he was convinced about the superiority of the Hindi script. He cites the author of *Tamaddune-Hind*, Shamsul-ulema Janab Maulvi Sayyad Ali Sahab Bilgrami, to prove how *Arya bhasha* was easier to learn than Semitic *bhasha.* Without knowledge of Arabic grammar and vocabulary it was not possible to read texts in that language. This was not true of Devanagari. In fact he cites Justice Sharfuddin of the Calcutta High Court who said that Indian Muslims should even publish the Quran Sharif in

Devanagari. Prof Badrinath Verma believed that the slow progress of education among Muslim pupils was because of the difficulty of learning the Urdu script. The number of educated Muslims was greater in those regions like Sindh, Gujarat and Bengal where they used Arya alphabets or Arya *akshara*. This indicates that some advocates of Hindustani, who thought they were non-communal scholars, were convinced that the Devanagari script was better than the Urdu script. Pandit Padma Singh Sharma, *Hindi, Urdu aur Hindustani,* Hindustani Academy, Allahabad, U.P., 1932, pp .70–83.

[89] Yusuf Ali wrote, "Who shall say that what Kabir, Tulsidas, Malik Mohammed and Nazir had accomplished in the past no product of the blended civilization of Britain, Islam and India will be able to achieve in the future?" A. Yusuf Ali, L.L.M., a lecturer in Hindustani and Hindi, made these remarks towards the end of his lecture at the School of Oriental Studies in London. Yusuf Ali, 'The Importance of Hindustani', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, University of London, Vol. 1, No. I, 1917, pp. 109–111.

[90] Ali referred to the need for education in the vernaculars, citing Lord Chelmsford, but he specifically referred to the need for national education and character-building in Upper India based on the use of Urdu. Yusuf Ali, 'The Importance of Hindustani', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies,* University of London, Vol. 1, No. I, 1917, pp. 109–111.

[91] Pandit Padma Singh Sharma, *Hindi, Urdu aur Hindustani*, Hindustani Academy, Allahabad, U.P., 1932 spl section 'Bhinnta ke Karan', pp. 40–50. The author says that the similies and metaphors were also drawn from Persia. The birds referred to were bulbuls, the flowers nargis, the heroes were called Rustam, the just Nowsherwan Adil and the generous Hatimtai. But the division between Urdu and Hindi was noticed even earlier in 1854, by the French scholar Garcien de Tassy, based on religion observes the author citing the *Urdu* of October, 1923.

[92] Raja Shivprasad wrote that textbooks were created for "Muslims and Kayasths" on the one hand and "Brahmins and Banias" on the other by the Pandits and Maulvis. Maulana Abdul Haq observed that Urdu was a '*khalis hindi zabaan*' and directly related to the Aryan rather than the Semitic language family. P.S. Sharma, *Hindi, Urdu aur Hindustani*, Allahabad, 1931, pp. 50–63. Quotes pp. 52 and 53. For the statistics see pp. 55–56. The author of *Wazzeh Istallahat* wrote that it was wrong to oppose words from Hindi on the ground that they were uncouth and unworthy. However, it is unclear whether the author of *Wazzeh Istallahat* would agree with the subsequent paragraph where Sharma argued that words from Sanskrit instead

of Arabic and Persian should be adopted to bring Urdu and Hindi closer to each other and indeed to other Indian languages like Bangla and Marathi as well. Jis bhasha aur jis reeti se Hindi mein paribhasaon ka nirman hua hai, vahi reeti Urdu mein bhi grahya honi chahiye. Quote pg 63. Ibid pp. 62–63.

[93] Grahame Bailey, 'Linguistic Survey of India Vol IX, Part I: Western Hindi and Punjabi by George Grierson', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland,* 1918 July, pp. 605–614. The author argued that he had discovered about eight to ten years ago that Punjabi was a tone language like Chinese. Northern Punjabi and Lahnda have four tones — level, high falling, low rising and low rising plus high falling. About 75 per cent of the words have the level tone. Not many words have the double tone. Ibid, pg 614.

[94] L.D. Barnett, 'Some Notes on Hindi Poetry in the Panjab', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies,* University of London, Vol 20, No1/3, Essays in Honour of Sir Ralph Turner, 1957, pp. 73–75.

[95] Speech by Chairman Hindi Sahitya Sammelan G.R. Vaishampayan delivered at 30th Abohar Session cited in A. Kaushalyayan (ed.), *Rashtrabhasha Ki Samasyaen*, Hindi Sahitya Sammelan, Prayag, Allahabad 1986, pp. 29–34. He praised the work of Swami Keshavanand who had created the Sahitya Sadan and popularized Hindi in Punjab. Even Amarnath Kak of Kashmir was using Sanskrit-*nishta* Hindi at this conference. Ibid pg 34.

[96] Dr. Siddheshwar observed that V.S. Aggarwal was the first person to emphasize the study of the Janapada Bolis but the study of non-Hindi languages would also have to be taken up. The Deshaj words in Hindi would have to be included in the dictionaries like in English. Letter to Dr. V.S. Aggarwal by Dr. Siddheshwar Varma, Kud Dwara, Jammu, dated 22nd September, 1943, 'Hindi Jagat Ki Pratham Aavshayakta: Boliyon Ka Anusandhan', *Madhukar*, 1944, pp. 89–90.

[97] Lajpat Rai, 'The Story of My Life', in *The Collected Works of Lala Lajpat Rai*, Vol 5, B.R. Nanda, (ed.) New Delhi: Manohar, 2004, pg 332 cited in Bob van der Linden, *Moral Languages from Colonial Punjab: The Singh Sabha, Arya Samaj and Ahmadiyas*, Manohar: New Delhi 2008, Chapter 4, pp. 142–179, Quote pg 144.

[98] Bob van der Linden, *Moral Languages from Colonial Punjab: The Singh Sabha, Arya Samaj and Ahmadiyas,* Manohar: New Delhi, 2008, Chapter 2, pp. 67–98, Spl pp. 76–83. Publication of books in Hindi in Punjab was more popular than publications of Hindi newspapers. However, many newspapers were merely "advertising sheets". In 1911, 80 were published

in Hindi, 450 in Punjabi and 600 in Urdu. In 1903 while there were 31 newspapers in English, 164 in Urdu there were only 6 in Hindi and 7 in Punjabi. pg 80.

[99] Farina Mir, *The Social Space of Language: Vernacular Culture in British Colonial Punjab*, Permanent Black, New Delhi 2010, Chapter 1, pp. 27–61. Spl pp. 58–61. Quote pg 61. Of the 413 periodicals published in Punjab between 1880 and 1901, 82% were in Urdu. Publication of books in Urdu was far greater than in Punjabi and Hindi during the late 19th century. Ibid pp. 33–34.

[100] Ibid, Chapter 2, pp. 62–90. Spl pp. 64–70, Quote pg 69.

[101] For the complex ways in which religious symbols and institutions were used to create social distinctions and instruments of control see David Gilmartin, *Empire and Islam*, OUP Delhi, 1989. For the competing basis of identity formation in Punjab based on religion and language see Ayesha Jalal, *Self and Sovereignty*, OUP Delhi, 2001.

[102] Mir argues, "We are compelled to read Punjabi's failure to serve as a ground for a religiously plural linguistic identity in postcolonial India or as a linguistic identity of any political impact in Pakistan as an absence of its affective power". This is erroneous, as the history of the Punjabi literary formation during the colonial period shows, because "affective ties to language and state-centric politics need not be linked". Mir, *The Social Space of Language*, 2010, Conclusion, pp.183–194. Quote pp. 185–186.

[103] The attitude towards language was shaped by communal controversies generated by the fear of conversions, the struggle for jobs and political representation in elected bodies. Linden reports how the Punjabi Hindus and Sikhs were attracted to the Arya Samaj in the late 19th century. The Brahmo Samaj with its more tolerant attitude "gave little comfort to Hindus surrounded by proselytizing traditions and fearful of Christian conversions". They found the Arya Samaj more acceptable because of its "quest for both female education and the propagation of Hindi". Bob van der Linden, *Moral Languages from Colonial Punjab*: *The Singh Sabha, Arya Samaj and Ahmadiyas*, Manohar: New Delhi, 2008, Chapter 2, pp. 67–98, pp. 83–92 Spl pg 88.

[104] Sheldon Pollock, "India in the Vernacular Millennium: Literary Culture and Polity, 1000-1500", *Daedalus*, 127, 3. 1998, pp. 1–34.

[105] Robert Darnton, 'Book Production in British India, 1850–1900', *Book History*, Vol 5, 2002. pp. 239–262.

[106] For a discussion of the non-derivative character of Bengali prose and literary production before the mid 19th century see Hans Herder, 'The Modern Babu and the Metropolis', in Stuart Blackburn and Vasudha Dalmia (eds.), *India's Literary History: Essays on the Nineteenth Century*, Permanent Black Delhi 2004. And Anindita Ghosh, 'An Uncertain "Coming of the Book": Early Print Cultures in Colonial India', *Book History,* Vol 6, 2003, pp. 23–55.

[107] Sardar Madhav Rao Vinayak Kibay, Rai Bahadur, Indore, *Madhukar,* 1944, pp. 47–48. He felt that at least those dialects of Hindi which did not have any substantial written literature ought to accept the main form of the language or *mukhya bhasha*. Those that were better developed could be part of the Hindi language family or *antargat bhasha*. Despite many accents of people from different backgrounds in Britain the literary and written form of the language was the same for everyone. Unless there was deliberate fostering of the dialects this would also be true for Hindi.

[108] Chandradhar Sharma Guleri wrote that Hindu poets would use the dialects for Hindu characters and Khari Boli for the Muslim ones. Padma Singh Sharma, *Hindi, Urdu aur Hindustani*, Allahabad, 1932, pp. 34–35.

[109] A. Kaushalyayan (ed.), Rashtrabhasha Ki Samasyaen, Hindi Sahitya Sammelan, Prayag, Allahabad 1986. G.R. Vaishampayan, Address to the 30th Abohar Session, pp. 29–34. Spl pg 34.

[110] Kanhaiyalal Maniklal Munshi argued that after English was adopted as the medium of instruction the natural process by which Persian words were absorbed into Indian languages came to an end. He cited the statistics put together by Vyankatesh Narayan Tiwari about the decline in the popularity of Persianised Hindi, i.e., Urdu between the 1890s and 1930s in terms of books, newspaper readership and students enrolled in vernacular schools. K.M. Munshi's address to the Thirty Second Jaipur Session, Kaushalyayan (ed.), *Rashtrabhasha,* 1986, pp. 61–69. Spl pg 64. He proposed that a more Sanskritized Hindi be adopted by Hindus for inter-provincial communication and Muslims in different parts of India learn Urdu for the same purpose. Only after the two communities had learnt to live with each other and overcome separatism would a synthesis between Hindi and Urdu become possible. This *sanshleshan* could come only in the second phase after both Hindus and Muslims had developed Hindi and Urdu as languages of inter-provincial communication for the two communities in the first phase. Ibid pp. 68–69.

[111] Interview of Sheikh Abdullah, 'Bhasha ka Prashna', in Hindi Sahitya Sammelan, Prayag Special Session (Visheshadhiveshan), Prayag, 1975,

pp. 177–179. This *smarika* was edited by Prabhat Shastri and Dr. Ratnakar Pandey based on speeches and messages by delegates at Prayag on 6th, 7th and 8th December, 1974.

[112] While the sensitivity towards language of the ruling elite was greater in post-1947 India compared to the medieval period, Urdu did decline because of a variety of factors. See Mushirul Hasan, *Legacy of A Divided Nation: India's Muslims Since Independence*, Delhi, OUP, 1997. However, both 'market' forces and anti-Urdu sentiment played a role in the decline of Urdu. The real dispute is about the relative importance of these two broad factors. Aijaz Ahmad has argued that the number of Hindustani speakers which was 50 per cent more than those who spoke Urdu in 1951— and three times more than Urdu in the rural areas — had virtually disappeared by 1961. The communal identification of Urdu actually became greater fourteen years after partition than immediately after. In India 62% Muslims and in Pakistan 93% of the population did not identify much with Urdu four years after partition. Ahmad, 'In the Mirrors of Urdu: Recompositions of Nation and Community, 1947–65', in Ahmad, *Lineages of the Present: Political Essays,* Tulika, Delhi, 1996, pp. 191–220. Also cited in Papiya Ghosh, 'Writing Ganga-Jamni: In the 1940s and After', *Social Scientist*, Vol. 34, No. 11/12 (Nov. – Dec., 2006), Spl. pp. i – xx. pg ii. And footnote 4, pg xiv.

[113] Note by Shankar Dayal Singh in Hindi Sahitya Sammelan, Prayag Special Session (Visheshadhiveshan), Prayag, 1975, pp. 21–23.

[113A] In the post-independence period Hindu nationalists frequently expressed admiration for the Israelis just as they had in the pre-independence period admired the Turks. However, they underestimated the uniqueness of the Jewish predicament which had created the conditions for the revival of Hebrew. According to Nahir, "The shift from Yiddish to Hebrew during the Revival period may thus be regarded as having resulted from an aggregate of small, individual and seemingly insignificant micro-language planning (MLP) activities, the language planning 'goal' being that of language revival (see Nahir 1977a, 1984). As I have shown here, these activities were carried out mostly by school teachers and principals, but also by various other activists — parents, school superintendents, local leaders etc. — all'MLP agents, operating in 'MLP cells'. Seen in this light, it may even be possible to discern in their activities a pattern comprising Haugen's four language planning "processes" (1966, 1983). Many individuals in the settlements, the MLP agents, made decisions, or SELECTIONS, involving a shift to Hebrew; and they either participated in or used the results of other agents' activities that led toward the CODIFICATION of Hebrew. They then worked

toward their **implementation**, and finally **elaboration**". Nahir concludes, "the case of the Hebrew Revival shows that it is not impossible for a community to shift from one language into another; yet it will take a long chain of highly unlikely, probably unfortunate historical twists before such a sociolinguistic experiment can again be successfully accomplished". Moshe Nahir, 'Micro Language Planning and the Revival of Hebrew: A Schematic Framework', *Language in Society,* Vol. 27, No. 3, Sept 1998, pp. 335–357. Quotes pg 352–353.

[113B] In a letter to Walter Benjamin in 1937, cited by Erturk, the literary figure Erich Auerbach, who taught at Istanbul University from 1936 to 1947, observed, "No one under 25 can any longer understand any sort of religious, literary, or philosophical text more than ten years old and ... the specific properties of the language are rapidly decaying'. This does not mean, however, that the Republican construction of nationalized pure Turkish subjects was an unqualified success. We might say that the Republican attempt to reconstitute an ontology of immediacy and self-presence, through the reform of writing, produced a kind of 'spectral' reality — what Derrida, in another context, has called 'hauntology'. Nergis Erturk, 'Phonocentrism and Literary Modernity in Turkey', *Boundary* 2, summer 2010, pp. 155–185 Quote pg 181. While in India the dialects declined — or failed to develop as languages after independence — no one can argue that this constituted a case of "amnesia" of the ruling elite. The intellectual and political elite in India were not even promoting Sanskritized Hindi as the sole expression of Indian nationalism. Erturk bemoans the fact that "an immensely heterogeneous, active cultural idiom was uprooted from its particularity, converted to dictionary form, and lexicalized in abstract equivalence for the Arabic or Persian language element (itself part of that active cultural idiom). To take just one example of the heterogeneity of actually existing language at the time, in all its linguistic "confusion", the *Tarama Dergisi* listed twenty-two possible Turkish substitutes for the Arabic loanword *hikâye* (story), and seventy-seven for *hediye* (gift)". Ibid., quote pg 176. If we consider the rise of Sanskritized Hindi in the post independence period this might appear similar, but the relationship of Hindi with the dialects and with Urdu reminds us of the dissimilarities.

[114] Amar Nath Jha wrote, "While it is no longer the ambition of any Indian that he will achieve eminence as a writer of English, yet our debt to it is incalculable in its contribution to the development of our sense of nationhood". Further, "In the use, or misuse, of English all Indians are at an equal advantage or disadvantage. No Madrasi need be in danger of being ridiculed by the natives of Delhi and Lucknow; no Bengali need fear his ignorance of the gender". Ahmad, *National Language*, 1941, pp. 184–200,

Quotes pg 199 and 200.

[115] Even in the late 19th century Grierson observed that educated Hindus in Hindustan spoke Hindi with lots of English words. They used English words like the French did when they used words like 'jockey' and 'a shake-hands'. G.A. Grierson, 'Hints to Oriental Students: No 1. Some Useful Hindi Books', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, New Series Vol. 19, No. 1, (January, 1887), pg 141.

[116] Anoop Chandra Chandola, 'Some Linguistic Influences of English on Hindi', *Anthropological Linguistics*, Vol. 5, No. 2, Feb 1963 pp. 9–13. Chandola deals with the pattern of Anglicized Hindi or AH, an issue taken up by Grierson briefly in his article published in 1887. The educated use a new style of Hindustani with numerous loan words from English. Unlike the impact of Persian and Arabic which led to the rise of Urdu this new Hindustani does not have a name. This Anglicized Hindi has some loan words that have been absorbed and naturalized. These Chandola has called AL and the loan words that are found only in the speech of the educated and are only superficially absorbed are designated SL. Hindi without SL is pure Hindi. The SL come through 'Hindi English' or HE which is one of several varieties of Indian English spoken in the country. Thousands of English words are being absorbed by Hindi in an effort to make it a language suitable for education and administration. Chandola observed, "The practical importance of AH is very great, especially as a medium of higher instruction. College students from non-Hindi areas can speak or understand AH more easily than any other style of Hindi. A policy of retaining English terms could ease the burden of students throughout India and save the time, money and energy which are being spent in translating English terms into the 14 constitutional languages of India. This policy allows an easy switch-over from English to Hindi or from Hindi to English and permits an easy access to that knowledge which is expressed through English in the world. AH can be a compromise between lovers of Hindi and English on the one hand and lovers of any other regional language of India on the other". Quote pg 13.

[117] Robin Jeffrey, 'Advertising and Indian-Language Newspapers: How Capitalism Supports (Certain) Cultures and (Some), States, 1947–1996', *Pacific Affairs*, Vol. 70, Number 1, Spring 1997, pp. 57–84.

[118] Kathryn Hansen, 'Renu's Regionalism: Language and Form', *The Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 2, Feb 1981, pp. 273–294. Hansen argues that Renu's language can be considered similar to the bazaar Hindustani used by the unschooled masses of north India identified by S.K. Chatterjee as Basic Hindi. Ibid., pg 278.

[119] Seema Alvi, *Islam and Healing: Loss and Recovery of an Indo-Muslim Medical Tradition, 1600–1900*, Permanent Black, Delhi and Palgrave, Macmillan, London, 2007.

[120] Michael S. Dodson, 'Translating Science, Translating Empire: The Power of Language in Colonial North India', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 47, No. 4 (Oct., 2005), pp. 809–835. In the 1840s Felix Boutros of Delhi College had tried to translate western scientific terms into Urdu. He sanctioned the inclusion of Greek prefixes such as "mono", "di", "proto", "hypo", or "peri", in the composition of compound Urdu words, though he gave no examples of how this might be affected. pg 821. Later, on this basis, James Ballantyne outlined a comprehensive chemical nomenclature in Sanskrit. He favoured the use of words like *gandhaka* and *loha* for "sulfur" and "iron" which had appeared in the *Amarakosa*, a revered text. Terms such as *suvarna* for "gold" and *amgara* for "carbon" were also well known. Otherwise, writes Dodson, "the nomenclature created anew was entirely descriptive, and "self-interpreting". For example, "hydrogen" was rendered *jalakara*, "the maker of water"; "nitrogen" became *jivantaka*, "that which puts an end to life"; while "chlorine" was translated as *harita*, "greenish-coloured". Reflecting the evolving nature of his endeavour, Ballantyne had originally translated "oxygen" as *amlakara*, "one which forms an acid", but later changed this to *pranaprada*, "that which gives breath", lest the former term "preserve the exploded theory that there is no generator of acids besides oxygen". Ibid pg 829. Dodson explains, "Ballantyne noted the similarity of terminations such as "-ic", "-ate" and "-ous" in Latin and Greek to those in Sanskrit (*-ika, -ayita and -ya*) was sufficient to provide the basic model. "Sulphuric acid", therefore, became *gandhakikamla* (where *amla* denotes "acid"), while "sulfate" was rendered as *gandhakayita*. Moreover, the use of the Sanskrit suffix *ja*, indicative of the use of the verbal root *jan* "to be born", in an *upapada tatpurusa* compound, resulted in the coining of such terms as *pranapradaja,* "that which is born from oxygen", or an "oxide". While Ballantyne's translational scheme was relatively straight forward, it could also produce rather lengthy compounds that, in effect, served to express the process by which a material was produced rather than simply the material itself. Ibid. pg 829.

[121] Krishnanand Gupt, 'Hindi Mein Vaigyanik Shabdon Ki Rachna', *Madhukar*, 1st April, 1942, pp. 12–17.

[122] A substantial number of Hindi textbooks were published under the auspices of Benares College during the 1850s which incorporated highly Sanskritized vocabularies, including Hindi versions of Ballantyne's *A Synopsis of Science*. Several of the Pandits employed at Benares College

also published vernacular textbooks on Ballantyne's model. Bapu Deva Sastri, Veni Samkara Vyasa and Mathura Prasad Misra translated scientific texts into Hindi. Dodson writes, "The highly Sanskritized vocabulary utilized in all of these texts was further consolidated by the publication of a series of Hindi dictionaries prepared by pandits employed in Benares College during the 1860s, including the 1865 English–Urdu–Hindi dictionary of Mathura Prasad Misra, and a 1870 Hindi translation of H.H. Wilson's Sanskrit dictionary by Ram Jasan". Dodson, 2005, Spl pp. 823–832, Quote pg 830.

[123] Krishnanand Gupt, 'Hindi Mein Vaigyanik Shabdon Ki Rachna', *Madhukar*, 1st April, 1942, pp. 12–17. Gupt argued that words like hydrogen could be translated as *udjan* and oxygen as *oshjan*. It was better to use words like *lauh* for iron instead of the easier term *loha* because it would be better to develop words for items made from iron or things which produce iron as *lauh-nirmit* and *lauh-dayak*. As a lover of science who wanted to produce books on science that young students could easily understand Gupt wanted to use words in common use. Yet, he felt it was more appropriate to use the word *gurutvakarshan* instead of the more easily available word *khichav* for the earth's gravity. While the word *bhap* for vapour was quite viable the term for vapourisation would be difficult to create; therefore it was preferable to use the terms *vashp* and *vashpikaran*. For chemical terms there was a clear need to develop a terminology that was precise because in any language people who read such specialized works were expected to have a basic familiarity with the scientific terms.

[123A] The Turks were trying to purify their language while the pragmatic Dr. Tarachand favoured a synthesis represented by Hindustani. The Turkish language was to be purified by eliminating 1,400 Arabic and Persian words. As a nationwide survey could not come up with suitable equivalents 130,000 words from "ordinary and past usage" were accepted. In place of 7,000 Arabic and Persian loan words a 'dictionary' produced in 1934 suggested 30,000 pure Turkish words. The purist attitude which reached its apogee during 1933–35 became less strident during 1935–36. This was reflected in the Pocket Dictionary produced in September 1935. Ataturk himself began using the Arabic *millet* instead of the pure Turkish *ulus* for nation in his speeches after 1935. While there was a preference for new terms re-invented from Turikish roots, by means of Turkish word formation, "increasingly Arabic terms were being replaced by European ones, especially French, and being directly applied when a Turkish equivalent did not exist". Yilmaz Colak, 'Language Policy and Official Ideology in Early Republican Turkey', *Middle Eastern Studies,* Vo. 40, No. 6, Nov 2004, pp. 67–91. Quote pg 84. Some of the foreign words that were accepted were "benzin, makina

(machine), fizik (physics), psikoloji (pscyhology), kimya (chemistry), telefon (telephone), elektrik (electricity), radyo (radio), gazete (gazette, newspaper), kongre (congress), parti (party), demokrasi (democracy), and so on". Ibid quote pg 91.

[124] Dr. Tara Chand, 'The Problem of a Common Language for India', *The Twentieth Century*, Allahabad 1944, pp. 251–263. Quotes pp. 262 and 263. This article was based on the address to the Journalists' Association at Allahabad. For the third category Tarachand felt it would be possible to borrow from Sanskrit, Arabic and the *tadbhava* elements in the kindred languages. As far as subjects like history and biography were concerned the resources of Hindustani should be supplemented by borrowings from Indian classics and modern languages. For the fifth and final category of creative literature there were to be no regulations or prescriptions. Once communal passions subsided the writers would find the various ways of expressing themselves and reaching out to the people. Ibid.

[125] Michael S. Dodson, 'Translating Science, Translating Empire: The Power of Language in Colonial North India', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 47, No. 4 (Oct., 2005), pp. 809–835. Spl pp. 832–835. Quote pg 834.

[126] Webb Keane, 'Public Speaking: On Indonesian as the Language of the Nation', *Public Culture* 15(3), 2003: 503–530. Quotes pg 504.

[127] Argues Webb Keane, "In the egalitarian aspirations of early Indonesian nationalists and many speakers today as well, the move into Indonesian is meant to avoid the overt display of status differences. In practice, this means a language supposedly abstractable from interactive contexts and the cultural presuppositions they invoke. Such abstraction denies the indexical, performative, and poetic dimensions of language in favour of reference and semantics — an emphasis that seems to be endemic to ideologies of the public". Keane, 'Public Speaking: On Indonesian as the Language of the Nation', *Public Culture* 15(3) 2003: 503–530. Quote pg 519.

[127A] See Yilmaz Colak, 'Language Policy and Official Ideology in Early Republican Turkey', *Middle Eastern Studies,* Vol. 40, No. 6, Nov 2004, pp. 67–91, Turkish language reform was based on ideas of modernism and secularism and not just nationalism. Advocates of Hindi who admired Ataturk for weeding out Arabic and Persian words from Turkish did not highlight this aspect of Kemalism. Mustafa Kemal declared, "So long as Turkish was written from right to left, it could never properly express the ideals of European civilization. The pictureseque involutions and intricacies of Arabic script afforded a psychological background to the Oriental mentality which

stood as the real enemy of the Republic". Quote pg 73.

[128] Jerzy Smolicz and Illuminado Nical, 'Exporting the European Idea of a National Language: Some Educational Implications of the Use of English and Indigenous Languages in the Philipines', *International Review of Education*, Vol 43, Nos 5/6, *Tradition, Modernity and Postmodernity in Comparative Education*, 1997, pp. 507–526. Spl pp. 511–512.

[129] Ibid., Spl pp. 512–514. Although the number of people who can speak Tagalog has risen steadily after the Philippines became independent in 1946, rising to 77% by 1980 from 25.4 % in 1937, it has remained the first language of a minority. In the Indian case Hindi is neither as commonly understood as Filipino is throughout the country nor is it the first language of as small a minority of people in India as Tagalog is in the Philippines. If we include watching Hindi movies as the standard for knowing Hindi then of course the situation might be even better than that in the Philippines.

[130] Shripad Damodar Satvalekar observed in his address to the 35th session of the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan at Bombay that Hindustani was the product of a political sin or *rajkiya paap*. The promotion of Urdu and Hindi would have led to the revival and assertion of Muslim and Hindu culture and pride respectively and this would not have been in British interest. Therefore they promoted Hindustani which has remained a language used by cooks or *bawarchis*. After British rule had come to an end there was no need to use the *paapjanya sankarjanya* Hindustani — the language which was the product of sin and distortion. After the creation of Pakistan as a separate nation for the Muslims and the acceptance of Urdu as the language of Pakistan it was only proper that pure Hindi be accepted by Indian leaders. After the failure to achieve Hindu–Muslim unity based on the acceptance of Hindustani — after partition and swaraj — what was the need to go begging for words from other languages? Apart from obstinacy — *hath* and *duragraha* — what could be the reason for the support for Hindustani? Kaushalyayan (ed.), *Rashtrabhasha Ki Samasyaein,* 1986, pp. 110–139. Spl pp. 112–117. Rhetorically he asked that if Hindu Muslim unity was to be achieved on the basis of a language taking words equally from Hindi and Urdu would the need to come to an agreement with the Christians result in the acceptance of one-third each from Hindi, Urdu and English? Ibid pp. 115–116.

[131] Duncan Forrester, 'The Madras Anti-Hindi Agitation, 1965: Political Protest and Effects on Language Policy in India', *Pacific Affairs*, Vol 39, No 1/2, spring- summer 1966, pp. 19–36.

[132] For a somewhat less enthusiastic support for the very idea of a national

language of India and the suitability of Hindi for such a role see P. Seshadri, 'The Problem of a Common Language for India', *The Twentieth Century*, 1944, pp. 463–471. The author asserted that the question of "a lingua franca should wait for an exhibition of literary superiority by Hindustani". Seshadri argued, "The bulk of the people in the non-Hindustani speaking provinces will hardly have any occasion to use the language in conversation and much less in writing, like many of our England-returned men in India compelled to go through a course in Latin or French in their University days". English already serves as the medium for inter-provincial communication. "The average citizen of a distant province in India has hardly any occasion to use Hindustani", observed Seshadri. "The humorous remark that you can travel through the whole of India if you know three Hindustani words, *jaldi*, *asthe* and *khabardar* has a considerable measure of truth in it". Quote pg 470.

[133] Sushil Srivastava, 'The Farce That is Hindi', *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 35, No. 43/44 (Oct. 21 – Nov. 3, 2000), pp. 3898–3899. Srivastava calls Hindi "the Sanskritized version of the English language". Pg 3899.

[134] Swami Bhawanidayal Sannyasi of Ajmer did not favour the idea of education, administrative work, and publication of newspapers in various dialects of Hindi. He was not convinced that it would be beneficial to develop even languages like Rajasthani, Bundelkhandi, Awadhi or Bhojpuri. He asserted that the difference between Marwari and Mewari was similar to that between Magadhi and Awadhi. Hiralal Shastri, a well-known leader, discovered that songs composed in the dialect of the southern tracts of Jaipur state were not understood in the Shekhawati region of the northern and Hindon region of the eastern part of the Jaipur state. Under such circumstances a Rajasthani language was not viable. If the Rajasthani language was constructed on the basis of incorporating words from the different dialects in proportion to the numbers of speakers of the dialects there would be hardly anyone who would understand that artificial and concocted language. Sannyasi was trying to use the example of Hindustani which was regarded as a language based on the acceptance of 50 per cent words from both Hindi and Urdu. The reason why he endorsed the idea of *Vikendriyakaran* was because he thought there were those who wanted to use the power of the central government to impose Urdu or Hindustani on the people of the regions. If Bihar and United Provinces were left free to formulate their own policies they would not allow the small number of Urdu speakers to dictate language policy. Men like Sir Tej Bhahadur Sapru who wanted to make Urdu the national language could only be thwarted by accepting decentralization. Swami Bhawani Dayal Sannyasi, Ajmer, 'Janpada Andolan ka Vastavik Swaroop', *Madhuka*r, 1944, pp. 120–121.

[135] In the opinion of Dr. Dhirendra Verma, M.A., D.Litt. there had developed a fashion for accepting the Soviet Union as an ideal. Soon after the Soviet Union announced official recognition of the sixteen languages of the republics of the USSR a demand for similar rights for the languages of the sixteen Janapadas of the Hindi-speaking region was made. This revealed the complete absence of any reflection about the past, present and future of the region and the attitude itself was a consequence of 800 years of political slavery. Verma conceded that the literary standard of Sumitra Nandan Pant would have been higher if he had written in his mother tongue instead of Hindi. It would be equally true to state that if a future Pant were to write in Kumaoni instead of Hindi the reach of such an author would shrink from ten crores to ten lakhs. The creation of a single literary language for the whole Hindi-speaking zone made sense because it gave access to a wider readership and a greater literary field for writers from all the dialects. Dhirendra Verma, Hindi Vibhag, Vishwavidyalaya, Prayag, 'Madhya-desh Ki Sahityik Bhasha', *Madhukar*, 1944, pp. 122–129. Spl pp. 127–128.

[136] Although the nationalist-minded were aware of the dangers posed by encouragement of the dialects and the Sankrityayan proposals they could not have had more than a glimmering of what was actually happening in the Soviet Union during the 1940s. For the effects of Soviet nationality policies see Yuri Slezkine, 'The USSR as a Communal Apartment, Or How a Socialist State Promoted Ethnic Particularism', in Sheila Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Stalinism: New Directions,* London & New York, 2000, pp. 313–347. On the other hand some found what they knew about the Soviets quite acceptable. See Rao Bahadur Sardar Madhavrao Vinayak Kibay, 'Janpadiya Karyakram', *Madhukar*, 1944 pp. 130–131. Kibay felt that looking at the Soviet experience the awakening based on the Aggarwal and Sankrityayan proposals would be beneficial — Soviet Rus ka anubhav dhyan mein liya to yeh jagriti kalyankar hi hai. The fundamental unity of India would not be undermined by these proposals.

[137] S.L. Doshi and D.S. Purohit, 'Social Aspects of Language: Rajasthan's Multilingual Situation', *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol 3, No 38, September 21, 1968, pp. 1441 and 1443–1444. On the basis of a survey in Udaipur of students and parents the authors conclude that the speakers of the dialects feel inferior if they have to use their mother-tongue for official purposes and prefer to get education in Hindi or English. This natural and 'logical' development, based on the use of 60 per cent Hindi words in the Rajasthani dialects, leads the authors to the conclusion that this process should be accepted and encouraged. The dialects are not being suppressed; people find it more convenient to shift to Hindi for communication between different dialect groups.

[138] Shri Durgashankar Durgavat, Sthanapan Mantri, Rajasthan Hindi Sahitya Sammelan, Udaipur, *Madhukar*, 1944 pp. 158–159. Durgavat felt that Rahulji's endorsement of dialects based on the Russian example was an extreme proposal. It would be harmful to both Hindi and India. Those who were aware of the differences between Hindi and Urdu should realize the dangers of promoting the different dialects of Hindi. In Jaipur alone there were fourteen dialects and a Rajasthani language would be difficult to create. The development of language on the basis of popular support was also difficult because of the influence of many princely states in Rajasthan.

[139] As the divide grew during the late colonial period secular nationalists tried to promote Hindustani. Narayan Sadashiv Bapat observed that it was important to expose both Hindu and Muslim communalism which both Mahatma Gandhi and the radical M.N. Roy had failed to do. He noted, "We must not condemn only one communalism to fondle another communalism. … The ideals of Pakistan and Pan-Islamism surpass in impossibility and foolishness the ideals of Hindu-Pad-Padshahi or Hindu Raj". Hindu–Muslim unity would have to be achieved by cooperation based on common self-interest of the two communities. Chapter IV, Section 2, *The Future of the Communalist Movements*, pp. 87–90. Quotes pg 89. Bapat declared, "We want neither Sanskrit-Nishta Hindi nor Urdu to be ever our national language. We can please neither the Hindu fanatics nor the Muslim fanatics. We can only condemn and pity them.... Not to accept Hindustani is to accept either some provincial, alien, Sanskrit Nistha Hindi or Urdu as our national language which is an undemocratic, uncivilized and a barbarous action". He believed that the charge that Hindustani has no literature was fallacious. He observed, "In fact, Hindustani has literature and if the fact is otherwise, Hindustani shall have literature". N.S. Bapat, *A National Challenge to the Communalists — Nationalism versus Communalism: An Essay on Hindu–Muslim Unity*, Third edition, Poona, August 1943 (first edition 1938), Chapter III, Section 4, 'Controversy Concerning the National Language of India', pp. 69–79. Quotes pp. 76–78.

[140] Chandrabali Pandey gave a rather convoluted argument to justify his opposition to the idea of promoting the Bolis and dialects of Hindi. He pointed out that even the mother did not use her own language or mother-tongue after she got married. Thereafter, she uses the language of her husband and his family. The mother is bilingual. Therefore those who were attached to the idea of mother-tongue should also give importance to the idea of *pitrabhasha* or the language of the husband or father. He was essentially trying to justify giving due importance to the national language and not just the mother-tongue as far as the Bolis in the Hindi-speaking world were concerned. Languages are not simply inherited, they are acquired after some

effort. Besides, children easily pick up languages spoken in their homes and neighbourhood so Hindi could be easily acquired by those who might have a dialect of Hindi as a mother-tongue. As he observed crisply, "Janambhasha se nikal kar Karmabhasha mein dhasna he hoga". Anyone who did not regard Hindi as a *karmabhasha* in this perilous period— *pralayankari yug* — was being fooled to the top of his bent — *Brahma dwara thaga gaya hai*. In any case there was no need for the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan to support movements for placing other languages in competition with Hindi. This would only weaken Aryavarta. Chandrabali Pandey, Lanka, Benares, 'Matrabhasha ki Uljhan', *Madhukar*, 1944, pp. 148–149.

[141] Sripad Damodar Satvalekar argued that in the non-Hindi-speaking provinces people had come to believe that Hindustani was the national language. They had even come to believe that only when there was an admixture of Hindi and Urdu that the language could be called Hindustani. He did not advocate the elimination of English, Urdu or Persian and Arabic words that had been accepted by Hindi but a ban on the entry of new words from these languages. Satvalekar emphasized the need for certain rules for the absorption of new words into Hindi. He argued that if there were words which featured in eight or more dictionaries of the fourteen or sixteen regional languages of India then they were to be accepted in the national language. In the dictionary of the national language the word should be entered with the names of the languages in which that word was used. If a word occurred in less than five regional languages then that word was not to be included in the dictionary of the national language. Those foreign words that were in use in more than half of the regional languages were to be accepted; otherwise they were to be rejected. The creation of a dictionary for the national language based on these rules would help in determining the nature of the national language. Satvalekar in Kaushalyayan, *Rashtrabhasha Ki Samasyaein*, 1986, pp. 121–123.

[142] Rakshat Puri, ' Dakshini Asia Ki Hindustani', in Muhammad Hasan (ed.), *Hindustani Boli*, Ghalib Academy, New Delhi 1993, pp. 17–21. Puri argued that spoken words used in films, plays and advertisements would be able to gain admittance in the literary form of languages in South Asia. Words from Hindustani would be able to enter languages of South Asia and words from these languages into Hindustani. With its flexible grammar and openness to words from other languages Hindustani would be able to develop as a lingua franca in the subcontinent.

[143] Muhammad Hasan, 'Kaumi Ekta aur Tehzibi Milap mein Hindustani Zaban', in M. Hasan (ed.), *Hindustani Boli*, Ghalib Academy, New Delhi, 1993, pp. 9–16. Professor Muhammad Hasan, the Director of the Hindustani

Project of the Ghalib Academy, put together essays presented on the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Hindustani Prachar Sabha by Gandhiji in Mumbai in 1942. He advocated the adoption of the *tadbhav* instead of *tatsam* words and the open-hearted acceptance of words without concern for purity and pollution. Hasan also spoke of the relevance of 'theth Hindustani adab and sahitya'. Quote pg 14.

[144] Bhalachandra Nemade, 'Rashtriya Ekta aur Rashtrabhasha Ki Samasya', in M. Hasan, (ed.), *Hindustani Boli*, Ghalib Academy, New Delhi 1993, pp. 45–53.

[145] Ibid, Spl pp. 50–53.

[146] Krishna Kumar, 'Hindi ki Giraftari', in K. Kumar, *School Ki Hindi: Shiksha aur Sanskriti Vishayak Nibandh Chayan*, Rajkamal Prakashan, New Delhi, 2001, pp. 66–71.

[147] Alok Rai, *Hindi Nationalism*, Orient Longman, Delhi, 2000. Although a more vibrant language may be eminently desirable the problem of Hindi as a language is not only about representing Muslims, Dalits and women in literature and the media. The problem of medium of education and the development of a people's language suitable for science, law and administration is not addressed by Rai. Vasudha Dalmia also blames Hindi belt *savarnas* and their nationalism for the creation of Sanskritized Hindi. The only way forward is for the English and Hindi elites to collaborate with each other. Review by Vasudha Dalmia, 'The Locations of Hindi: Hindi Nationalism by Alok Rai', *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 38, No. 14 (Apr. 5–11, 2003), pp. 1377–1384.

[148] N.C. Zamindar has argued "from 1942 to 1947, Hindi literature was tossed from leftist progressivism to nationalism and from nationalism to bitter Hindu–Muslim revivals. There were terrible tensions but very few works reflect them". He has also argued that the conflict between the views of the Marxists and the nationalists, particularly because of the role of the Indian communists during the Quit India movement, was not reflected in literary works. N.C. Zamindar, 'The Modern Hindi Literary Scene', *Books Abroad*, Vol. 39, No. 4 (Autumn, 1965), pp. 414–415. The discussion in *Madhukar,* however, shows that contemporary literary men did spend considerable time in responding to the views of Rahul Sankrityayan although many found them unacceptable.

[149] Vyohar Rajendra Singh argued that economic and political factors were destroying the isolation and independent existence of the Janapadas and the country was being transformed by the power of nationalism. The scheme for thirty languages based on thirty Janapadas with their thirty capitals was

destined to remain a scheme confined purely to the literary field. It was necessary to have more than just a *sammilit bhasha* that Rahulji spoke of. It was undesirable to develop Bolis into languages as rivals and competitors of Hindi. The difference between the various Bolis of Hindi could not be compared with the different languages in Russia. The development of the Bolis would create a permanent division between them and Hindi. This would weaken Hindi and its claims to being the national language of India. He was in favour of developing the Bolis and preserving their literature but unlike Sankrityayan he did not want them to be used in local parliaments and the courts, schools and universities of the Hindi-speaking region. Vyohar Rajendra Singh, M.L.A., Sathiya Kua, Jabalpur, 'Vikendriyakaran, Janapadiya Karyakram aur Matrabhashayein', *Madhukar*, 1944, pp. 150–151.

[150] Avanindra Kumar Vidyalankar argued that in every country there were tendencies favouring or opposing decentralization. There was a need to maintain a balance between centrifugal and centripetal forces though it was difficult to determine what the proper balance ought to be. He wanted India to be like Britain and America, countries which were the product of many races and languages. In order to get the support of the USA even Russia had to sacrifice the Third international. He regarded this sacrifice as significant because the Soviets had presented the world with a new ideal. If India wanted to live like a free nation then it had to become one nation with a strong centre. Vidyalankar, New Delhi, 'Kya Peechay Lautein?' *Madhukar*, 1944, pp. 131–138, Spl pg 133. In India there was much sentiment in favour of decentralization and not centralization. The transformation of dialects into literary languages would be harmful to the country. Even the Soviet Union was able to stand tall in the world on the basis of its strong centralized government. The question before us was whether we wanted to go forward or return to the path taken by our ancestors. Ibid pp. 134–135.

[151] In a letter to several literary figures and journalists Chaturvedi clarified his position on the Janapada programme. He mailed the three crucial essays- *Janapdiya Karyakrama*, *Vikendriyakaran* and *Matrabhashaon Ka Prashna*- to help others understand his position on the issues mentioned therein. He stated that V.S. Aggarwal's programme was entirely apolitical and concerned only with literary issues. Rahul Sankrityayan's programme was clearly political and he was inspired by the Soviet Union where in fact there was centralization of power. There was one party dominance, even one-man rule. As far as he was concerned he favoured the encouragement of some Bolis as languages but not all. He did not favour the development of readers for education in Braj but was in favour of letting Rajasthani and Maithili experiment along these lines. There was no reason to accept the viewpoint

of the foreign rulers who believed that the development of Bolis as languages would lead to the demand for new provinces. The development of Hindi would be aided if it allowed its Bolis to develop. These Bolis were not its rivals, but its mother or sisters. See Letter dated 19th July, 1944 by Banarsidas Chaturvedi, Tikamgarh, "Janpadiya Karyakram-Meri Sthithi", *Madhukar*, 1944, pp. 91–93.

[152] In his short note 'Janpada Kalyaneeyam' Dr. Vasudev Sharan Aggarwal argued that the edifice of Hindi could not be constructed on the ruins of the Bolis of the Janapadas. All the languages and bolis were invited to contribute to Hindi. *Madhukar*, 1944, pp. 107–108. In the accompanying essay, 'Hindi Sahitya Ka Samagra Roop', Aggarwal emphasized the idea of Janapada Jan as mentioned by Mauryan emperor Ashoka who used the language of the common people to reach out to them. *Madhukar* 1944, pp. 109–112.

[153] Kamal K. Sridhar, 'Language in Education: Minorities and Multilingualism in India', *International Review of Education*, Vol. 42, No. 4, The Education of Minorities (1996), pp. 327–347. Observes Sridhar, "Thus, language movements against Hindi illustrate the conflict on the following levels: (a) as a language of national communication, it comes into conflict with English, which is recognized as the associate official language of the Union; (b) as a developed (inter-) regional language at the state level it comes into conflict with Tamil, Bengali, etc.; (c) as a lingua franca for its own dialects, it comes into conflict with Maithili, Bhojpuri, etc.; (d) as an alternate literary variant it comes into conflict with Urdu; and (e) as an interethnic link language, it comes into conflict with Santhali, Khasi, etc. (Srivastava 1984b: 109). Several minority and tribal languages are agitating at one or more of these levels currently, which adds another dimension of complexity to an already complex situation". Quote pp. 343–344. Nevertheless, the Indian educational policies are considered fairly supportive of linguistic rights of people since 75% of the population does get education through the mother tongue. Comments Sridhar, "This still leaves out a huge block of linguistic minorities (of various types), whose size nearly equals the entire population of the US. Given the large number of Indian languages, and the fact that not all of them have scripts, and some that have scripts lack any kind of literary tradition, how feasible and practical is this population?" Ibid pg 335. The bulk of the Universities however retained English as the medium of education as late as the end of the 20th century even in the Hindi belt, particularly in the science departments. Ibid. pg 338.

[154] Krishna Kumar, 'Dayra aur Dambh', in K. Kumar, *School Ki Hindi: Shiksha aur Sanskriti Vishayak Nibandh Chayan*, New Delhi, 2001, pp. 82–85.

[155] Professor Satyendra argued against the Janapada programme forcefully. He found that Banarsidas Chaturvedi's programme had become more concerned with the creation of a state of Bundelkhand rather than the revival of local culture and folk traditions. Rahul Sankrityayan was primarily concerned with weakening the influence of Gandhian ideas inspired as he was by the Soviet Union. A change of leadership was the aim of his policy recommendation. Satyendra felt that the effort to transform the Bolis into distinct languages was bound to weaken the sense of unity among the Hindi-speaking people. The claim of Hindi to be the national language was based on the strength of its numbers. The emphasis on the Bolis would weaken the claims of Hindi to become the national language. Besides Vasudev Sharan's programme was idealistic and had a romantic view of the past. The programme did not pay attention to the forces which shaped the modern world and the fact that these Janapadas in the past had been involved in conflict with each other on the flimsiest of reasons. See Shri Satyendra, M.A., Poddar Inter College, Tawalgarh, Jaipur rajya, 'Janpadiya Andolan Ka Doosra Paksh', *Madhukar*, 1944, pp. 94–106.

[156] In an article about Rabindranath Tagore and Hindi Banarsidas Chaturvedi admitted that although he did not get an opportunity to learn Bengali he had once written a letter to Gurudev in simple Bengali. He approvingly quoted the observation of Tagore, "Do not rest contented with the accidental advantage of your numbers. Attract people by creating great creative literature". He also admitted that he had failed to bring the shy Premchand to visit Gurudev at Shantiniketan. In fact, Chaturvedi felt it was regrettable that when the Congress government in Madras was sending opponents of Hindi to jail north Indians had not opposed this policy. Only by ensuring the comprehensive development of Hindi literature and by substantially cooperating with the other Indian languages could Hindi become popular and acceptable. Supporters of Hindi had to follow the path recommended by Rabindranath Tagore. B. Chaturvedi, 'Gurudev aur Hindi', *Madhukar*, 16th November, 1941, pp. 28–32.

[157] Dhirendra Verma argued that if the Hindi belt was broken up into sixteen political units based on the development of dialects, then the bigger provinces like Bengal, Punjab and Maharashtra would be able to ride roughshod over the representatives of these scattered and divided units in representative bodies — *tash ke patton ki tarah anek prakar se kat aur fant kar tarah tarah se nach nachate rahein to aascharya nahin.* The people of the Hindi-speaking region would become as helpless as the smaller states of Europe and the Balkan states. This does indicate Verma's anxiety about the Balkanization of the Hindi-speaking people. In any case the development of the Janapadas would be easier and more effective through the medium of

a universally accepted language like Hindi — a *sarva-sammat bhasha*. Dhirendra Verma, 'Madhya-desh Ki Sahityik Bhasha', *Madhukar*, 1944, pp. 122–129. Quotes pg 128. Although Verma had sound cultural and political reasons for advocating unity among the Hindi-speaking people he was not in favour of denying any dialect the right to create its own literary language if it seriously wanted to do so. Invoking the language of the joint family Verma said that the unity of the Hindi-speaking people was founded on love and sacrifice and not self-interest and obstinacy. Ibid pg 129.

[158] Aijaz Ahmad has remarked that Hindu and Muslim communalisms agreed that Urdu is the language of Muslims and that "there is a direct link between Islam, Urdu and Pakistan". A. Ahmad, 'In the Mirror of Urdu: Recompositions of Nation and Community, 1947–65', in Ahmad, *Lineages of the Present*, Tulika, Delhi, 1996, pp. 191–220, Quote pg 203. While in the communal imagination such a connection was made most of the advocates of Hindi we have discussed so far asserted that Urdu was not the language of all the Muslims of India. It was not the language of Bengali and Marathi Muslims. Some argued that in the Hindi-speaking zone the rural Muslims typically spoke the dialects of Hindi rather than Hindi or Urdu. Therefore the politics of language cannot be understood in terms of the census figures of 1951 and 1961 in India as Ahmad has himself pointed out. The fact that "incidence of bilinguality was much higher among Urdu speakers" than any other language in India, including Hindi, on the other hand shows that many Muslims regarded it as a language of culture or an inter-provincial language of communication for Indian Muslims. Ibid quote pg 217.

[159] Brindavan Lal Verma, advocate and writer based in Jhansi, stated that he had got a note from the Hindustani Academy which declared that the language spoken in Lucknow and Delhi should be regarded as Hindustani. Verma asked rhetorically : then what should we call the language spoken in the villages? To create a vibrant language Hindi would have to turn to the villages, the cultural life blood of India. If Urdu had to survive and strengthen itself it could only do so by drawing on the words and proverbs from the villages of India. He was opposed to the *mulamma* or artificiality or sugar coating in Urdu, whether that sugar coating was done in Lucknow or Delhi. He did not think too highly of what was broadcast by All India Radio at that time. He recommended that the literature of the villages should be used as a resource, but with a sense of judgement and discrimination — *vivek ke sath upyog kiya javega.* Verma was quite clear that reason or wisdom would dictate the manner in which the collection of literature from the villages would be utilized. B.L.Verma, *'*Hamari Sanskriti ke Meru-Dand*', Madhukar,* 1944, pp. 138–139.

[160] The programmes associated with Janapadas and the dialects were not in the long-term interests of the country according to Vidyalankar. Without industrialization we cannot combat poverty, illiteracy and unemployment. Industrialization would lead to greater urbanization and the dialects of the Janapadas would not be a suitable medium for education even for the workers in the new towns. It was vital to choose that language which would be useful to the people in the future. It would not be wise to use the dialects instead of Hindi. Besides, as the elections to the municipalities had shown caste and racial pride in India was greater than national sentiment. When we are aware that even a nationalist party like the Congress drops a Brahmin candidate in favour of a Jat in an electoral contest with a Jat candidate it did not make sense to promote greater parochialism based on dialects and identities of the Janapadas. Would it be sensible for us to reach out to Greater India on the basis of the Bundeli, Bhojpuri or Bagheli languages and cultures? Education in the dialects and emphasis on the villages would create impediments in the path of India's development. It was also highly unlikely that the Muslims would accept the dialects as their language instead of Urdu. As long as they used religion as a basis for achieving political power they were unlikely to abandon Urdu in favour of the dialects. Avanindra Kumar Vidyalankar, New Delhi, 'Kya Peechay Lautein?' *Madhukar*, 1944, pp. 131–138.

[161] Ram Iqbal Singh 'Rakesh' writing from Bhadai in Muzaffarpur district of Bihar argued that there was a need to develop the dialects in order to strengthen the position of Hindi. The words in our mother-tongues — the dialects — were pointed and appropriate but in Hindi they were flat and dull. Interestingly, he believed that the Hindi language was artificial because it was influenced by foreign culture and by an unnaturally developed educational system shaped by lawyers, professors and the well-to-do. Hindi abandoned its links with the mother-tongues and hung on to the coat tails of Urdu and English. This view represents one of the two positions for revitalizing Hindi — of accepting words from other languages or turning to the dialects. In the opinion of Rakesh it was ludicrous to claim that the encouragement of Bolis could undermine Hindi. R.I. Singh, 'Janpadiya Kendriyakaran Ki Samasya', *Madhukar*, 1944, pp. 144–147. He wanted Hindi to profit from cooperating with the dialects — *apni sahodar bahinon-matrabhashaon kay sahyog se bharpur labh utha sake*. Ibid. Quote pg 147.

[162] There were critics like Thakur Shrinath Singh who asserted that Vasudev Sharan's programme was the pipedream of an opium addict. Although he liked Chaturvedi's programme he did not think that it was possible to inspire people by establishing thousands of centres. Inspiration had to emerge spontaneously, not by pressure from outside — like the explosive energy of

a volcano — prerna aur sfoorti to janta mein se svayam footni chahiye jaise prithvi se jwalamukhi futthaa hai. Thakur Shrinath Singh, former editor of Hal and Bal-Sakha, Prayag, *Madhukar*, 1944 pg 157.

[163] Professor Lalita Prasad Sukul argued in a contribution to *Vishal Bharat* that the expenditure of money and intellectual energy required to develop the various dialects was bound to be very substantial and, in view of the availability of Hindi, quite wasteful. L.P. Sukul, M.A., Calcutta, 'Hindi hi Kyoon?' *Madhukar*, 1944, pp. 139–144. He was also upset by the fact that Amarnath Jha almost implied that Hindi was being promoted as the national language not on the basis of its utility and quality but as a favor or out of pity for the language — *pakshpat aur daya*. The charge that Hindi was humiliating or obstructing the development of the Bolis or mother-tongues was wrong and uncalled for. No dialect or language was dependent on literary works for its existence as a spoken language: *koi bhi boli apne jeevan ke liye sahitya ki mohtaj nahin*. The fear that without literary works the Bolis would not achieve a stable and standardized form — *roop mein sthiratha* — was mistaken because the basic characteristic of any language was continuous change or *nirantar parivartan.* Ibid Quote pg 141. Although Sukul was free to advocate the use of Hindi he was definitely underestimating the consequences of the neglect of the dialects as literary languages. His views indicate both preference for Hindi and denial of the crowding out effect on the dialects.

[164] Hans R. Dua, 'The National Language and the Ex-Colonial Language as Rivals: The Case of India', *International Political Science Review,* Vol.14, No. 3, *The Emergent World Language System* (Jul., 1993), pp 293-308. Dua observes, 'The awakening of linguistic consciousness at the regional level seems to be accompanied by the erosion of a national consensus for Hindi'. Ibid pg 295. Also, writes Dua "Since the linguistic capital controlled by the dominant social group is primarily constituted by control of the ex-colonial language, the educational system not only supports the preponderant choice of English by the socially dominating groups but also sets the standards and tendencies which strengthen the use of English by other groups for social and ideological reasons…. Finally, the market economy tends to develop into a single uniform market through competition and the elevation of academic qualifications in terms of social power, status, and mobility. The high academic qualifications associated with the mastery and control of the ex-colonial language are rated superior to comparable qualifications attained through the national or other Indian languages. Moreover, higher academic qualifications associated with English seem to be "symbolically consecrated", in the words of Bourdieu, as they mark the distinction of international and intellectual life". Ibid. pg 303.

[165] Even Chandrabali Pandey and Vyohar Rajendra Singh who opposed the idea of developing the Bolis in ways that could undermine the position of Hindi as a literary and national language were keen to support the movement to incorporate the literature embedded in the dialects and vocabulary of the villages. This was not just the pressure of public opinion or the desire to be seen as democratic regardless of conviction. It also represented the triumph of the idea of the village or *gram* and the dialect or the Boli associated with it. The villages and the dialects were perceived as vital for the future of Hindi and of Indian culture. This reveals the hegemonic power of both nationalism and democracy in late colonial India. For the views of a Bundelkhandi writer see Vrindavanlal Verma, 'Hamari Sanskriti Ke Aadhar', *Madhukar*, 1 October, 1940, pg 2.