NMML
OCCASIONAL PAPER

PERSPECTIVES IN
INDIAN DEVELOPMENT

New Series
47

Questions in and of Language

Rita Kothari

Humanities and Social Sciences Department,
Indian Institute of Technology, Gandhinagar, Gujarat

Nehru Memorial Museum and Library
2015

NMML Occasional Paper

Published by

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

e-mail : ddnehrumemorial@gmail.com

ISBN : 978-93-83650-63-7

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

Questions in and of Language*

Rita Kothari

Sorathgada sun utri
Janjhar re jankaar
Dhroojegadaanrakangra
Haan re hamedhooje to gad girnaar re…
(K. Kothari, 1973: 53)

As Sorath stepped out of the fort
Not only the hill in the neighbourhood
But the walls of Girnar fort trembled
By the sweet twinkle of her toe-bells…

The verse quoted above is one from the vast repertoire of narrative traditions of the musician community of Langhas. The story and its various versions and recitations have elements from Sindhi, Marwari, Gujarati and dialectical inflections from all three, pointing to its mobility in Saurashtra, Kutch, Sindh, and parts of Rajasthan—regions that show, with varying intensities, many threads of continuity. If the story of King Diyach and his infatuation for Sorath has traveled, so have the Langhas, and other tribes who carried the story with them. It is possible that the story also traveled with the tribe of the Sammas,[1] to which King Diyach belonged, and through its dissemination recreated the King's

* Public lecture delivered at the Nehru Memorial Museum and Library, New Delhi, 11 April 2014.

[1] *Tuhfatu-L Kiram*, an Arab source from the fourteenth century reminds us, 'Be it observed that the Sammas are the owners of the land throughout Sind, as far as Guzerat, including the greater part of Rajputana, and they form the majority of the population of Sind' (in Elliot and Dawson, 1866–77: 339).

glorious sacrifice. Also, Shah Abdul Latif, the famous sixteenth century Sufi of Sindh, had traveled the entire western part of the subcontinent, and his popularization of these folk tales has contributed immensely to the sustenance of narrative traditions. On one hand, the verse consists of multiple inflections and languages; on the other hand, the verse *and* its translation are both recorded in Rajasthan. For a translator working in present times, the 'source', i.e. (the 'original' verse), would be Rajasthani, and given the dominant nature of translation studies as a discipline his/her discussion would veer around the global target language of 'English'. However both the regional language and its attendant source, Rajasthani, have come to be constructed historically through a set of language and region-making processes (see Merrill, 2009; Kothari, forthcoming). Also, conventional notions of a 'source' text 'carried across' to another locale or target imply a certain displacement from one point to another. But when the source itself consists of translations, circularities of this nature dislodge the notion of a fixed and traceable 'source' and thereby of language itself. In other words, the notion of a given and traceable 'source' is built upon the assumption that languages are 'fixed', 'fully-formed', well defined, historically continuous and discrete entities, an assumption which erroneously informs a range of contemporary discourses on nationalism, identity, textual practices and discussions of translation. The edifice of language is more often than not invisible—a background that on occasions gets foregrounded in intense and violent ways. The way that language gets codified has implications not just for translation but also for larger issues like nationalism and linguistic identity.

The specificity of questions that are asked here come from a simultaneous engagement with ethnography and translation, or rather ethnography-as-translation. Practices of language and meaning-making in everyday India, especially in overtly performative contexts, but more so, in unselfconscious contexts take place in ways that have not been theorized and studies on how multilingualism operates on the ground are yet to be written. Languages comprehensible to each other get politically divided and sometimes incomprehensible ones get clubbed as one

language. Hegemonic languages shrink multilinguality while minor ones stretch themselves, sometimes to the point of relinquishing the places they come from. Complicating these criss-crossing relations that are both temporally and spatially, horizontally and vertically determined, is the presence of English, a subject that demands its own treatment, and yet, never, as the case tends to be, without its relationship with other Indian languages.

In the course of fieldwork and close observations of linguistic practices carried out in the western region over the years, it was found increasingly bewildering to think of texts (and this is used in an expansive manner) as binaries of 'sources' and 'target'. Sources are protean, many-faced, formed through many languages, translation constituting them rather than they being antecedents to that process. While we may recognize this, this knowledge seldom informs scholarship. Uncovering assumptions that go into the making of a language reveal anxieties and desires of history and identity in particular directions. With a lack of mutual engagement by historians, linguists, translation studies scholars with these aspects, there appears a schism in the histories we record and the cultural encounters that have transpired so that the historical significance of identities shaped through language remains undocumented. For instance, it would be to state the obvious that communities such as the Dalits and the Muslims are not homogenous or monolithic. However, an examination of how language contributes to that heterogeneity and shapes identities in specific and non-summarizable ways is seldom undertaken in social science scholarship. A recent novel in Gujarati (Mehta, 2011) shows an Uttar Pradesh Muslim speaking in Urdu, while the one from Gujarat speaks Gujarati. A neutral fact by itself, except that the Muslim from Uttar Pradesh runs a terror project and indoctrinates the Gujarati speaking, 'gullible' Muslim from Gujarat who switches over to *Ammi* and *Abba* from *Ba* and *Baapu* as he gets close to the Muslim from UP. The externalization of Urdu and its synonymy with a specific group creates an erroneous sociology because it assumes that identities are monolingually formed, or that the correspondence between language and identity

is linear and consistent. This monolingual understanding of the source informs the act of translation both at the stage of its making and its appearance as a target text. Such experiences of translation of texts, both physical and intangible, lead me to ask what is Gujarati, the language I work with and one that is assumed as a 'given' in the state I come from. These questions form a part of ongoing concern with multilingualism, translation and identity, and in this working paper they address only a few significant moments in the biography of one particular language—Gujarati. This paper is but a tiny fragment of a complex biography, and some of its episodes have been put in place by preceding scholars such as Riho Isaka (2002) and Samira Sheikh (2010). The intention here is to further provoke the discussion, by providing three moments of the twentieth century and thereby extending the discussion of Gujarati that generally tends to focus on standardization in the nineteenth century. Moreover, the instability of language that unfolds in the subsequent discussion aims to point to the instability of 'source', a phenomenon untheorized in translation studies.

Questions in and of Gujarati

So what exactly is Gujarati, apart from being the official language of Gujarat since it became a linguistic state in 1960, and the supposed nucleus of what appears in all popular imagination as a given Gujarati identity? How does it become the political boundary and a source of social and cultural power? What are its origins? When did 'Gujarati' become concrete, its rough edges smoothed, its certitudes formed of representing one and all in the territory of Gujarat, its confidence of being inclusive taken for granted? For instance, in the summer of 2013, when the Lok Sabha resonated with cries of opposition to protest the scrapping of regional languages in the UPSC examination, there appeared for once a surprising unanimity over not just the reason for such a move but for the need to oppose it. The order annoyed state representatives from Tamil Nadu, Odisha, Maharashtra, West Bengal and Punjab who found Hindi hegemonic, whereas representatives from the Hindi heartland were annoyed at the

hegemony of English. The then Gujarat Chief Minister Narendra Modi sought to reverse the changes by terming the issue as a 'language bias' ('Modi Alleges "language bias" against Gujarati, writes to PM.' *The Indian Express* 15 March 2013). Modi made a particular mention of tribal communities which would stand to lose the most because of the new rules. It may be useful to ask why those tribal communities would be studying in the Gujarati medium, and whether this isn't really another form of colonization within Gujarat (as may be the case elsewhere) which marginalizes tribal languages and presumes them to be Gujarati-speaking and studying? To whom does Gujarati belong, asks Manishi Jani, in an editorial that invites Dalits, Muslims, Christians, and linguistic minorities to reflect if their languages find expression, legitimacy and representation in Gujarat, or to put it differently, if Gujarati is inclusive (see Jani, 2012). The results are telling, as every response, arguably representative, shows a 'Gujarati' different from the one propagated through state functions.[2] The responses also help interrogate the monolingual assumptions of a linguistic state such as Gujarat, a disjunct that may well exist in other parts of India as well. Such instances help understand that both diachronically and synchronically 'Gujarati' is not the same and therefore its 'givenness' needs to be questioned.

A recent overview of the Gujarati language, taken as an indicative instance rather than as a specific one, points to the indeterminability of tracing a language and at the same time posits that what we now see as Gujarati may have been *Apabhramsa* of the 12th century. Jayant Kothari, in his account of the evolution of the language mentions that to look for the origin of a language

[2] For instance, Jitendra Vasava, mentions how distant he and other tribals felt from the Gujarati textbooks. 'We learnt the pledge in Gujarati which said, 'Hun Maara desh ne chaanhu chhu ane tena samrudh ane vaividhyapurna vaarsano mane garvchhe' [I love my country and feel proud of its rich and diverse heritage]. But come to think of it, for us tribals, land, language, and culture is our samruddhvaarso. But the textbooks make no mention of our heritage. On the contrary, the teachers muffled our language and cultivated disgust for our "vaividhyapur navaarso" so that we couldn't wait to give it up'. (Jani, 2012: 5). Also see in this context, Dalit response in Kothari, 2013b.

is like asking where a river originated. Yet according to him, the emergence of Gujarati can be put down to a period between the 10th and 12th century (2011: 82–92). This is odd, considering that poets writing prior to Bhalan (1434–1514) and Premanand (1649–1714) referred to their own language as Prakrit. Scholars such as Samira Sheikh and Sitanshu Yashashchandra (who are referred to later) allude to the shift from transregional languages of medieval Gujarat, prior to the 'givenness' assumed of 'Gujarati'. Sheikh in particular builds a strong case for us to see how 'Gujarati' today has been stripped bare, notionally, of the many cultural encounters it has had through the centuries. Gujarat was a destination for Arab traders and Muslim preachers much before its thirteenth century A.D. conquest by Allaudin Khilji. The sea ports such as Ghogha and Cambay, and later Bharuch and Sanjan drew itinerants of all kinds who entered into the trade of goods and words that created the Gujarati of the future. It is this unimaginably mobile space that Sheikh draws attention to and argues that it was through this that an Indo-vernacular polity was forged.[3] Gujarat Sultanate created some of the most enduring institutions that reflect how linguistic equations in the region varied with political power, economic transactions, and varying composition of a cultural elite. The liberal patronage of Ahmad Shah drew many eminent scholars from other lands to Gujarat. Books were translated from Arabic into Persian through a bureau of translation established by Mahmud Begada.

Sunil Sharma, the acclaimed scholar of Indo-Persian studies, notes how any serious scholar of Urdu, Persian, or Arabic in South Asia would gravitate to Hazrat Pir Muhammad Shah Library in the old part of the city of Ahmedabad. Built in the eighteenth century, Hazrat Pir Muhammad Shah library is a monumental

[3] From A.D. 1296 to 1407 Gujarat remained a province of the empire of Delhi and Patan remained the seat of the provincial government. This long period of more than a century preceded the establishment of the independent Sultanate of Gujarat by Muzaffar Khan, a provincial governor who established himself as an independent Sultan and took the title of Shah at Virpur in 1407. From then to the death of Bahadur Shah in 1537, Gujarat remained under the domination of the Gujarat Sultanate.

evidence of how Arabic and Persian scholarship thrived and formed a public sphere for at least three centuries. While such scholarship is lamentably scarce in any part of the world, the 'Gujarati' literary establishment is oblivious of such parallel linguistic-literary narratives in the same city and state. Yagnik and Sheth mention that

> evolved during the Chalukaya era on the foundation of Sanskrit, Prakrit and Apabransh, *Gujarati acquired its distinct character in the Sultante era* (emphasis mine). During the Mughal era it was further cultivated by saint poets on the one hand and merchants on the other. As the court language of both the Gujarati Sultanate and the Mughals was Persian and because merchant communities had extensive linkages with Arabic speaking West Asia, the influence of Persian and Arabic is immense (2005: 15).

However, Gujarati's historical relation with West Asia has remnants in words from not only Persian and Arabic, but also from Turkish and Sindhi. In fact, the fifteenth century witnessed the emergence of Gujari which had elements of all these languages. Pre-colonial Gujarat was a complex region in linguistic terms, with medieval Gujarati, Prakrit, Persian, Arabic, and Gujari playing simultaneous roles in a region that that could not be made synonymous with any one particular language (see Naik,1954, 1955; Madani, 1981; Sheikh 2010).

The remnants of this period are accidentally available today, unknown very often to the ones whose language reveals them. For instance when the newsreader mentions on Gujarati news that that there is legal action (*kanooni karyavaahi*) against a criminal, she may not be aware of how *kanooni* (legal) is a Persian word, fusing into Gujarati through a long history. Or upper-caste Hindus today with last names such as Gharekhan are not likely to know that they owe this lineage to Persian, whose knowledge provided specific jobs for them in Muslim courts. However, the newsreader mentioned earlier invokes Sanskritic Gujarati for a self-conscious reference to cultural heritage, 'Sanskritic Vaarso'. Even Gujari, a language emerging out of marketplace of religion and trade

(discussed at length in Sheikh 2010) has remnants in Gujarati spoken by Shia Muslims in the region in and around Ahmedabad.[4] This would form a continuity with the famous Wali Gujarati (1667–1707) for instance, considered to be an important Gujari as well 'Urdu' writer, depending upon how language and history is defined. However neither users of 'Gujari', nor Gujarati nor Urdu take these continuities into account. So really speaking, these elements exist as vestiges of a time prior to a fixed understanding of Gujarati. They are both significant and not, in that they exist as signs without signification, but also reflect persisting presence of words that defy formal processes and institutionalization, of the kind that took place in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In rich detail, Riho Isaka points to how the process of codification was effectuated through language debates in late-nineteenth century Gujarat. The Gujarati elite perceived a cultural need to construct a regional identity even as the vernacular itself increasingly became a vehicle for colonial resistance. However, the standardization that was sought by the Gujarati literati was based on concepts of purity in language and also reflected the internalization of Western approaches to language through works such Taylor's Gujarati grammar book in 1867 and the *Narmakosh* in 1873. The role of the Gujarat Vernacular society in mobilizing Gujarati as a medium of the people and as the only suitable language for social reform along with the rise of the modern script of Gujarati further foregrounded the need for the standardization of Gujarati (Isaka 2002).[5]

[4] A group of Shia Muslims, colloquially called Chelias, have a community magazine called *Jaffrey Awaaz* that includes writings by Saiyed Pir Mashaikh Chishti credited with Gujari works such *Noornama, Maktulnama*, among others. During the days of Moharram, teaching from Shia *pir*s rendered in Gujari are recited for at least three weeks. Whether Gujari is living or dead would simplify the complex question of how languages persist or shrink in purposes, go into exile, become hegemonic and sometimes morph into more dominant narratives.

[5] As far as spoken Gujarati was concerned there was significant regional variation as highlighted in the well-known phrase 'Bar gaue boli badlay' (The dialect is changed every twelve leagues.) Furthermore, Isaka also points to the influence of the language varieties used by merchant communities for keeping their accounts; Vaniai (from shopkeeper), Sarafi (from banker) etc.

The discussion above delineates in broad brush-strokes the difficulty of determining the origins of Gujarati language considering that its roots go back to transregional languages that operated in the region; as also its contestable inclusion of the many non-standard varieties of languages which were made illegitimate through processes of codification, of the kind shown by Riho Isaka. After the nineteenth century language debates, which to the cultural elite may have appeared 'settled', the twentieth-century discussions on Gujarati proceeds on the basis of the assumption that Gujarati is 'settled'. The next section provides three such important and mutually supportive moments in the twentieth century that created common sense about Gujarati and contributed to further the myth that Gujarati is sedentary, and an already established phenomenon. Of particular significance is the fact that language is employed to both create and maintain boundaries, words become both an ally and target for separating one's 'own' from 'others', and rhetoric strategies are employed in the service of language, territory and nation-making.

Twentieth Century: Three Moments: History, Language, Linguistic State

In the discussion that follows, let us examine the three significant events or historical moments that *simply assumed* 'Gujarati' existed in an incontrovertible and continuous state of being; and its 'mixtures' could be explained away as manageable digressions in an otherwise seamless narrative. Some of the myth-making is traceable and the discussion below maps this in three stages of history-making, language-making, and region-making.

---

which also posed challenges to the elitist notion of 'pure' Gujarati in the context of standardization. Dilip Chavan (2013) discusses how the dominant caste and sanskritization played a major role in the codification of Marathi in the nineteenth century. Analogies of this nature are possible to find in other Indian languages also, where debates around sadhu and chalit bhasha (register of the educated/elite and colloquial speech) took different forms but showed a decisive privileging of certain sections and what they considered as 'standard'.

The three stages are the cultural nationalism of K.M. Munshi (1887–1971) which established through his diverse writings an influential narrative of Gujarat and Gujarati. Among the many aids it used was also G.A. Grierson's Linguistic Survey of India (1927) which in turn was also based upon a view that Gujarati simply unfolded through the centuries, its discursive and heterogeneous nature notwithstanding. The third stage is when Gujarat's cultural and political elite mobilize resources for a linguistic state of their own and break away from the bilingual Bombay state. The three moments are only partly chronological, in that, Grierson ought to have preceded Munshi in the discussion. However this is being done to avoid a simplistic teleological narrative, substituting coherence of one kind to question another. Moreover, Grierson's Linguistic Survey (as is discussed elsewhere; Kothari, forthcoming) acquired significance as an authoritative text in times of linguistic disputes, not as a fount of knowledge and popular imagination that Munshi's oeuvre has in Gujarat. The instrumentality of Grierson's Survey is positionally communicated between the two discussions on K.M. Munshi and the linguistic state.

a. Origin, Indigeneity, Exclusion: Questioning Munshi's claim

Gujarat like the rest of India is brooding. The language is shaping itself.

(Gandhi, 1935)

At a time when K.M. Munshi, one of the most influential nationalist figures from Gujarat, documented a history of Gujarati literature, it is odd for Gandhi to mention in a Foreword to such a history that the language was shaping itself. Histories of literature are written upon the certainties of language. Why would Gandhi do that? From Gandhi's point of view, the first dictionary of Gujarati language, *Saarth Jodnikosh*, was in the process of taking shape under his leadership at the Gujarat Vidyapith. Gandhi also noticed the absence of Muslims and Parsis as partakers of Gujarati literature in Munshi's history, a fact he gently pointed

out in the Foreword.[6] The writers Munshi included were also from the upper-class, what Gandhi called 'commercially minded'. He lamented the chasm between 'us' the middle class and those whose language we do not even follow. It is clear then that the unsettled nature of Gujarati made Gandhi say in the Foreword to 'Gujarati and its Literature' that the language was shaping itself. Gandhi's Foreword betrays an unfortunate and uneasy relation with Munshi's text, a matter strangely undiscussed in circles of Gujarati literature.[7] The valorization of Munshi and non-serious engagement with Gandhi may have something to do with it, but that is perhaps a digression.

The paper has not belaboured the obvious point that Munshi is a very central figure to the history of Gujarat. A close associate of Mahatma Gandhi, Munshi was a member of the Indian National Congress in pre-independence India. By then he was also an established lawyer, and a highly successful writer of Gujarati prose and fiction. In post-independence India, Munshi continued to enjoy several prestigious positions including membership of the Rajya Sabha and Governorship of Uttar Pradesh. For our purposes it is important to remember that Munshi also popularized the term Gujarat nee Asmita (the identity of Gujarat), a phrase associated with regional pride of Gujarat (bordering, oftentimes, on chauvinism). Munshi's historical trilogy, an important development in the history of Gujarati language and literature, was interestingly set in the so-called 'Hindu' period of the Chalukyas (A.D. 942–1299) before it lost its glory to Muslims (see Vyas, 2013). This incidentally is also the period when, according to Munshi, language flowered, a claim we return to later. Although the interconnections between Munshi's fictional, prose writings and the myriad roles he played as a nationalist

[6] Although Gandhi had less patience with divergent modes of spelling, and believed in standardization (see B. Sebastian: 2009), the site of Gujarati language and literature as a shared history of different communities was something that he was sentient to.

[7] Also see: M.K. Gandhi, 'Gujarati Bhasha Vishe Kaink Vichaar', ed. Veerchand Dharamshi. *Navneet Samarpan,* October 2005, 49–52.

figure are fascinating and relevant, we need to return, keeping this background in mind, to the issue of language.

The lack of pluralism that Gandhi noted in Munshi's history of Gujarati literature and language is consistent with a fundamental difference between the two men, and a common thread running across Munshi's writings. Munshi's views on Gujarati and Gujarat sculpt the definition of a national history evident in statements such as the Gujarati people possess a 'common stock of tradition and values' and the Gujarati language is 'a seamless continuity from Sanskrit to Gujarati. It is useful quoting him at length from the History to which Gandhi wrote the Foreword:

> Like other units of India distinguished by the dominance of a single individual, Gujarat had an independent social and cultural entity from the earliest times. Each of such provinces possesses a common stock of traditions and values and social outlook which was set working by the early Aryans in India and which developed during the course of history peculiar to itself. All of them have employed and do employ now the structure, wealth and tradition of Sanskrit for their fuller literary expression. They all throb with common ideals and cherish a common will. (xxvi).

This aphoristic announcement appears like a smooth translation of a highly jagged region/text, cleverly managed by an implicit collapsing of Gujarati's distinct regional history as an ongoing and incontrovertible feature of a nation and its many parts. What did Gujarat's 'independent' entity rest upon, considering boundaries and idea of Gujarat as well as Gujarati have not been the same in any two centuries.

The Gurjars, a pastoralist group that supposedly lent its name to the region, have inhabited at different times Punjab, Rajputana, and Madhya Pradesh. Even when Sidhraj Jaysingh consolidated his reign, it included Gujarat, Rajputana, and Malwa. Language therefore was created between Dwarka and Mathura. It included Marwari, Mewati, Jaipuri, Mewadi, and Malwi. What we consider

as Old Gujarati would perhaps also be Old Rajasthani. It is also known as western Rajasthani, although Umashankar Joshi calls its 'Maru Gurjar' and K.K. Shastri calls it 'Gurjar Bhasha' (1949). What we do know for certain is that something got created out of the mercantile, migrant Jain merchants and monks, pastoralists and traders, between Rajasthan and Gujarat. It would be fallacious of Gujarat, as of any other region, to imagine an indigeneity of origins and a history of the language.

Moreover the Chalukya dynasty did not extend up to Kutch, a province with a cultural distinctness and a political autonomy of its own, at least most of the time. In fact, even in the twentieth century when Munshi was writing various histories, Kutch was a princely state with a distinct language, history, and sovereignty of its own. Its connection with Gujarat did exist, but it was equally, if not more, connected with Sindh. Munshi's brisk dismissal is worth noting:

'Kaccha, for culture and literary purposes has always been regarded as part of Gujarat'. (xx).

Who is the elliptical subject here? Regarded by whom? It is these missing subjects that tell us that it is not for Kutch to determine whether it considers itself a part of Gujarat, but rather a prerogative of what is positioned by Munshi as the including and obliging party. (For more detailed discussion on this see Kothari, 2013a.)

Munshi further summarizes:

> North of Umbergaon Gujarati is spoken by all classes. The people understand Marathi and use a good many Marathi words, but the bulk of the vocabulary and the grammar is Gujarati. […] south as far as Vaitarna between the coast and the railway the language of almost all classes except Marath Brahmans and other late immigrants, is also Gujarati rather than Marathi and along the Dahanu coast where Gujarati is taught in the Government schools, the Gujarat element is so strong as to make ordinary speech unintelligible to anyone who knows Marathi only. (xx).

What was Munshi's basis for saying the above? Would the Maharashtra side of history say the same thing, or construct another narrative? These positions have not found an internal critique in Gujarat. However, Munshi's broader positions have come to be challenged in recent times in Indian scholarship in English. Its ramifications are yet to be felt in the literary circles of Gujarat. Yashaschandra notes that terms such as Gujarat, Gujarati, Gujarati literature are 'employed as entirely stable signifiers in every existing historical account of Gujarati and its literature' (569). He proceeds to say that 'an eager search to discover a primeval Gujarati identity has led to uncritical assumptions on the part of even some of the most distinguished cultural historians' (ibid). Munshi's belief in a distinct region and distinct language has no historical evidence, but advanced in the service of the socio-political needs of Munshi's day. A systematic interrogation of Munshi is advanced by Samira Sheikh in her book *Forging a Region: Sultans, Traders, and Pilgrims in Gujarat, 1200–1500.* Sheikh examines three claims made by Munshi,

> to justify the existence of the modern state of Gujarat: a modern linguistic area, a clearly delimited topographical area bounded by natural features such as rivers and mountains, and, as the clinching argument, the assertion that the political and cultural unity of Gujarat was wrought about eight hundred years ago by the Chalukyas (2010: 2).

By demonstrating how an indo-vernacular polity in which Gujarati, Gujari, Arabic, Persian, Sanskrit interacted in a marketplace of kings, and pirs, sovereigns and slaves was forged, Sheikh's Gujarat is more a melting pot than a smoothly translated nation of one-people-one-language that Munshi suggests. Meanwhile, since some of Munshi's philological observations (and that of later successors) draw from Grierson, it is towards him that we turn.

b. Grierson and the Codification of 'Gujarati'

By itself, G.A. Grierson's Linguistic Survey of India (1927) would have been a fairly insubstantial text, despite an enormous

ethnographic richness of language variation recorded by Grierson. Grierson made use of translation (in a literal sense) to record similarities and differences. However his own approach towards the linguistic landscape he encountered was also an act of translation of assumptions that one-space-one-language-one-person constituted a norm (Kothari, forthcoming). Sarangi remarks that 'Grierson's appreciation for people's languages and tongue was Herderian in spirit, which looked for an isomorphic relationship between languages and cultures' (2009a: 22). Also hierarchies of language and dialect introduced in the Survey were foreign to processes of language thinking in India.[8] However Grierson was invoked by influential figures in Gujarat, as may have been the case elsewhere also. As far as Gujarati is concerned, Grierson's observation that 'The old Vedic language can be traced through Prakrit down to Apabhramsa, and we can trace the development of Apabhramsa from the verses of Hemchandra down to the language of a Parsi newspaper. The continuity of language is complete and absolute for nearly four thousand years' (1908: 327) and is the bulwark of a specific nationalist history. This also sits strangely with his observation of 'the curious mixture of races which now inhabits Gujarat. Even the name of the country is derived from a foreign tribe which invaded it from the north and east—the Gurjaras (1908: 327).

Grierson's assertion based on location and indigeneity gets further undermined, in my view, when he describes the mixed origin of the population of Gujarat and enumerates a list of the groups that came by sea: 'the Yadavas (1500–500 BC); contingents of Yavanas (300 BC–A.D. 100) including the Greeks, Bactrians, Parthians, and Scythians; the pursued Parsis and the pursuing Arabs' (A.D. 600–800); … the Portuguese and the rival

[8] Incidentally T.C. Hope, a colonial official who was given the responsibility of updating textbooks for students in the mid-nineteenth century, made early attempts at the standardization of Gujarati by creating what came to be known as 'Hope Vachanmala' in 1860. Hope insisted the text be written in Gujarati instead of translating the content from English or Marathi as translations were known to be ridden with errors (Rajani, 2014).

Turks (A.D.1500–1600)' (1908: 324) and so on, ending with the French, the Dutch, and the British (A.D. 1750 and thereafter). On the other hand, the peoples that came by land included the Gurjaras (A.D. 400–600), the early Jadejas and the Kathis (A.D. 750–900), a host of Muslims from the north and Marathas from the east. He concludes this by saying: 'It will thus be seen what heterogenous elements go to form the Gujarat population' (ibid). The contradiction between heterogenous elements and an unbroken homogenized view of language escapes Grierson.

It is only on the issue of language at the territorial boundary that Grierson shows a degree of hesitation and reveals the historical fault lines in the process of codification. For instance, he mentions that 'to the North, Gujarati extends almost to the Northern frontier of the Palanpur state beyond which lie Sirohi and Marwar, of which the language is Marwari' (ibid). Governed by the experiences of a monolingual world, Grierson interpreted languages as either one or the other. Grierson's survey shows that languages were created, assimilated, written off, subsumed and differentiated. For instance, Thari, spoken in Rajasthan (a territorial name invented by Colonel Tod), became part of 'Rajasthani', a language 'invented for the purposes' of the Survey. In Gierson's own words: 'Natives do not employ any general name for the language, but content themselves with referring to various dialects, Marwari, Jaipuri, Malvi, and so forth'. (1908: 1). After creating an institution that did not exist a piori, Grierson suggests that Marwari is Rajasthani's most important dialect. He even admits that the natives employ the term Marwari for a large number of variation and spread. Rajasthani, a label created by Grierson, now evokes a sense of nationalism (associated with the state of Rajasthan) and its advocates deploy an array of strategies to assert its identity: 'the political battles being waged over the recognition of the Rajasthani language' are in 'stark, life and death terms' (Merill, 2009: 44).

If Grierson was separating with considerable effort, Gujarati from Marwari in the north, he was also presenting an unconvincingly bounded view of Gujarati and Marathi in the

south. For instance, he says that Gujarat 'extends as far South as the southern border of the district of Surat, where it meets the Marathi of Daman. On both sides of the border line, the country is bilingual. The two nationalities (the Gujaratis and Marathis) are mixed, and each preserves its own tongue' (1908: 324).

How did Gujarati and Marathi come to be considered as two separate nationalities, and how did they not permeate into each other? We shall see later in our discussion on the linguistic state how this separation was rhetorically formed to determine territorial boundaries.

While there is enormous work, some of his dismissals have unintentionally contributed to this singularity to the Gujarati language narrative. For instance, note Grierson's summary dismissal of a range of Gujaratis spoken by the Muslims of Gujarat.[9]

If Gujarati and Gujarat existed as stable signifiers for Grierson, it must still be noted that Grierson's 'area' did not include Kutch, a region with a linguistic legacy closer to Sindhi than to Gujarati. However in the years to come, specially during the formation of the linguistic state Grierson was read selectively enough for this fact to be ignored.

Grierson employed translation both as a textual process as well as a means to crossover from one kind of linguistic landscape into another. Gujarati, as we discussed, is likely to have a history

[9] 'Most of the Musulmans of Gujarat speak Hindustani, not Gujarati and specimens of their language will be found in the section devoted to western Hindi. Some tribes, however, who are by origin descended from converted Hindus, speak Gujarati. The educated members of this class speak ordinary Gujarati, with a free admission of Hindustani (and through it of Arabic and Persian) words, and specimens of this form of speech are not necessary. The uneducated Gujarati-speaking Musulmans usually employ the dialect of their uneducated neighbours' (1908: 436–437). The unimaginable error in generalizing the languages spoken by all Muslims is in glaring contrast to the rich versions of Gujarati spoken for centuries by different Muslims communities in Gujarat. Unfortunately no serious research has been carried out in this area.

which cannot be separated from what came to be called 'Rajasthani' at the northern front and also faced similar challenges at the southern border. Where do languages begin and end, and how does one determine their boundaries? To what extent do identities of people and of nations draw from languages? These are relevant questions that undermine the process of language codificaton especially in the border areas of a geographical region. Sudipta Kaviraj alerts us to the dangers of treating languages as fully-formed discrete entities and he says, 'it is a world, to put it dramatically, of transitions rather than of boundaries' (2010: 142), a sense of indeterminability echoed by Gierson. And yet Grierson is invoked to codify Gujarati, because he has been read to classify rather than to question (Sarangi, 2009a: 25). He has also been read selectively so that his classification of Kutchi as a dialect of Sindhi remained peripheral in the eternal story of Gujarati. The most recent challenge to Grierson, not only in the context of Gujarat but of many other Indian languages, has come from the Peoples Linguistic Survey of India that does not sift away Bhilli from Gujarati or Ahirani from Konkani and attempts to confer legitimacy upon each speaker by recognizing his or her language.

The Gujarati volume of the *Linguistic Survey of India* is an influential text used by K.M. Munshi, and K.K. Shastri among others. In fact K.K. Shastri translated the volume into Gujarati and in the discussion on the linguistic state, Grierson was invoked especially with respect to Dangi. The committees looking after boundary issues in Gujarat drew heavily, but rather selectively on Grierson. The historical records of the Mahagujarat movement, which mobilized the formation of the linguistic state, demonstrate region-making and language-making as inseparable processes. It is the linguistic state, a third milestone in the making of 'Gujarati' that we now turn.

c. Linguistic State

In his discussion on the linguistic state, Ambedkar argued for 'one-state one-language' and viewed the linguistic state as a possibility towards 'socially homogenous and politically

democratic space' (Sarangi, 2006: 151–157). The premise of one-state one-language assumes the homogeneity and immobility of language. Moreover, it is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss whether the formation of linguistic states has helped or hindered the growth and legitimacy of Indian languages. Perhaps the question is a wrong one as it frames the issue in a polarized manner, and chances are that while the growth of the dominant language is fueled, the minority languages may have to struggle. Or that minority languages may benefit from tokenism but become emptied of real purposes of survival, as the case with Sindhi is noted to be. Minority languages may be supported and strongly experienced as sites of identity, and yet the relations with the linguistic state turn hostile as power equations shift. As far the linguistic state of Gujarat is concerned, the dominant and dominating role of a 'standard' and 'codified' Gujarati is evident in recent exchanges between Urdu schools and State government, for instance.[10]

When Gujarat became a linguistic state in 1960 after bitter and protracted dispute with Maharashtra, it marked a very important moment of linguistic nationalism. In the years preceding this event, codifying Gujarati and both sealing as well as extending its boundaries constituted an important step towards territorial claims. Kutch, despite being linguistically and politically distinct was subsumed under Gujarat. This homogenization of region and language has a mirror image in the southern part of the stage where Dangi had to be 'separated' from Marathi. The Seema Parishad meeting held in 1952 laid out the Gujarati-speaking landscape, and emphasized the linguistic cohesion of the state, its uneasy borders with Marathi, the heated

[10] In its response to a public litigation challenging the state government's decision to change the language of the board exams from Tamil, Urdu, Marathi to Gujarati, Hindi, English, the Gujarat Secondary and Higher Secondary Education Board said 'so far as the paper setters/translators are concerned, it would be difficult to find a teacher, on whom the board can rely on the aspect of confidentiality; and if such translators/teachers can leak the paper the future of lakhs of students will be at stake'. See Shamshad Pathan vs State of Gujarat, PIL No. 167 of 2011.

debates about 'Dangi' in the south when elements of 'Gujarati' and 'Marathi' were rhetorically constructed as separate, mutually exclusive entities, Marwari and the distinct nature of Kutchi notwithstanding. Note this for instance:

'…certain integral parts of Gujarat were severed from it piece by piece by the alien conquerors or their officers and placed at different intervals of time under political divisions wherein the non Gujarat languages were both the media of education and administration' (Report, Formation of Mahagujarat, 1954). It is in this context that the committee rallying around the linguistic state explains how Marathi words entered (through Marathi rule over a Gujarati land) in the Dangs, Khandesh District and the Coastal talukas of the Thana District of the Bombay state. 'However, the Gujarati dialects spoken in these areas have retained their fundamental character until our own days. The influence of the non-Gujarati languages on them is regarded as being quite superficial by the competent authorities on philology and the Gujarati language' (ibid). The contentious subject of Dangs and Bombay city between the Mahagujarat and Samyukut Maharashtra Samiti dealt with 'words' and 'sentences' and whether Gujarati words had come into Marathi sentences or if it was the other way around. Words such as 'basically' Gujarati or 'basically' Marathi continued with the project of one-language-one-person-one-region and reductive discourses about language were created to achieve non-linguistic aims. The rhetoric of such discussions and its complexities escaped the authorities in charge and influenced their understanding of language.

Remembering, Forgetting: The formation of the linguistic state, along with Grierson's classification, and Munshi's nationalism consolidated the edifice of Gujarati. Words came in handy for both boundary creation and boundary maintenance of language, which in turn, got mobilized to demarcate territories and regional identity. A scholar such as Asha Sarangi has drawn attention, in ways that political scientists seldom do, to the larger centrality of languages in shaping territories (2009a: 197–227). Her critique of enumeration technologies and their role in shaping

ethno-linguistic identities is important. However, attention also needs to paid to the rhetorical strategies that obtain state functions and create commonsense about language as well as nation. For instance, in Munshi's account Gujarat appears as a nation that is natural and objective, 'organic' in the way Johann Gottfried von Herder and Johanna Gottlier Firchte Herder propagated. Grierson's summary of Gujarati spoken by the uneducated, Hindustani (and not Gujarati) spoken by Muslims of Gujarat and so on normalize a phenomenon that falsifies the bewildering distinctness of Gujarati spoken by Bohras, Khojas, and other Muslim communities in India and Pakistan. How did something so obvious escape Grierson? If the answer is manifest in sites of languages, the question may well be outside discussion of language, in domains of what Grierson and some other saw as legimitate history of India. The linguistic state on the other hand employed one kind of rhetoric to merge the Dangs, and another to separate itself from the bilingual state of Bombay. The irony of claiming proximity to and distance from language sometimes requires a shift in emphasis of vocabulary such as 'basically' Gujarati, or 'influenced by' or 'borrowed from' depending upon whether purities or mixtures need to be explained.

So our larger questions that go beyond the present discussion would be: How does language become both an argument and its ally in service of state, territory, nation, and citizenship? How does its construct genealogies to erase historical encounters and cultural memories? How does language get deployed to mark out differences, and also to homogenize them? What rhetoric is employed in such situations, and how do we examine language as the thing itself, as well as a metaphor? These questions need to be answered with interdisciplinary approaches that are sensitive to language both as cultural memory and also as practice rather than as a disembodied object or as an instrument of policy and politics. How do we examine, along with notions of religion, caste and community, the idea of language to get a fuller understanding of regions, nations, and citizenship? How are communities imagined through language? Scholars such as Sumathi Ramaswamy (1993), Lisa Mitchell (2009), Farina Mir (2010),

Veena Naregal (2001), Chitralekha Zutschi (2003), and others discuss this with respect to specific languages. This paper has attempted to uncover some more soil underneath this complex biography, cultural histories and lived reality of language. Meanwhile language-making and unmaking involves both, remembering and forgetting. The following instance from a famous Gujarati novel is telling:

In a classic of Gujarati literature titled *Bhadrambhadra* (1953) *(*which still awaits a translator) written in the early twentieth century by Ramanbhai Neelkanth, the protagonist Daulatshankar travels from Ahmedabad to Mumbai. Exasperated and enraged by the *sudhaarak*s, social reformers, bent upon 'reforming' the time-tested Sanatana Dharma, Daulatshankar has resolved to defeat them in a debate to be held in Mumbai—a significant centre of social reform in the Bombay Presidency in the nineteenth and early twentieth century. Daulatshankar buys two tickets for himself and his companion at the railway station and utters words that are indelibly marked among readers of Gujarati literature. He says, 'Moha-nagarimaate be mulyapatrika…' (Give me two tickets to go to Mumbai). Obviously, he is not understood. The Parsi at the ticket speaks a variety of Gujarati which is vastly different from Daulatshankar's. 'Shubakechh?' exclaims the Parsi clerk (1953: 9). Daulatshankar has no patience with such a corruption of language by 'impure humanity'. He is the Don Quixote of his time in search of a purer world that simply needs reclaiming. Eventually, he boards the train and falls asleep to the rocking motion but ends up having a frightening dream. Lord Shiva appears before him and rebukes him for using his name 'Shankar' along with a *yavni*, foreign word 'daulat'. A chastized Daulatshankar renames himself and is now Bhadrambhadra, an immortal entity in Gujarati literature, amusing and parodic, but with lessons important for all times.

Although Ramanbhai Neelkanth's objects of parody were the Brahmin scholars of his time (such as Manilal Dwivedi and Mansukhram Tripathi), the novel is an important comment on all willful erasures of histories and cultural encounters. It is not

pertinent at this stage to demonstrate how Bhadrambhadra's agenda of purifying, language, history, culture, the past and the present remain implausible. But what Bhadrambhadra does tell us is that not only are such purification rites comic, but that the fashioning of identity begins with language even though it is never entirely about language. The complete neglect of Arabic-Persian and Gujari in Munshi as well as Grierson, the reduction of the encounter with the Arab world into a dismissive sentence or two helped create an idea of Gujarati as a language of the Hindus, starting with Narsinsh Mehta to Munshi himself in the twentieth century. This 'forgetting', as Ernest Renan calls it, is like the yavni word in Bhadrambhadra. It was never entirely about language, but about the neglect of a particular period, people, and language in history. Renan mentions that the 'essence of a nation is that all individuals have many things in common and also that they have forgotten many things' (1990:11). The forgotten or neglected episode of Arabic-Persian and/or Gujari, point to the presence of a schism in the midst of pluralism and demand a revision of some positions on Gujarat. In an example of how language is used both as an apparatus of separation as well as of its justification, the sustained and profuse presence of Arabic and Persian in Gujarati is systematically erased and reduced to clinical notions of 'borrowing' and 'loan words'. At a linguistic level, this is done through a separation of syntax and vocabulary, but in terms of cultural history, such a separation, by reducing rich, lived cultural encounters to mere additives, ignores the fact that they are constitutive contexts shaping history and identity. The discussion above delineated moments of making Gujarati a seamless narrative of the Gujarati people, a process formed through exclusion of other histories. It has not been possible to show in detail what has been excluded from the story of the Gujarati language. However, at the very least, one hopes the conception of 'source' in translation studies, that has hitherto been seen as an already established and evident entity, got dislodged from its habitual environs.

It may be useful at this point to understand what meanings 'source' and 'target' generate in translation practices, and what

implications an instability of 'source' for the discipline and its practices entail. While the act of re-telling is one of the most primal and primary need in humankind, and that would make translation as old as creation, the label 'translation' has come under much scrutiny of what are seen as its misplaced universal claims (see Kothari, 2013c). However in the many divergent understandings of translation and its relation with close allies of such adaptation, the fact that there is a concrete and stable text in a particular language out of movement takes place towards another particular text in another language has remained a cardinal truth. The contestations around unequal relations between texts, languages and cultures, or a greater attention to the role of the translator and what happens in the in-between space s/he occupies also take the monolingual 'source' and its sedentary nature for granted. By pointing out the instability of language, its historical and ongoing construction, and also highlighting the mixture of many inflections that later come to be constructed as languages, this paper has hoped to highlight how the discipline of translation studies rests upon the shaky grounds of language. Now the question is what does that do to translators and to the discipline at large, and although this may not be the space for a detailed discussion, it is tempting to hazard a few guesses. For instance, translators may need to revise their self-definition as being Sindhi, Marathi, or Gujarati translators, but also be sentient to the languages of the western region that go into making Gujarati, Marathi so as not to miss their multilingual realities even in what appear as single-language forms. The example from Ila Arab Mehta's novel provided at the beginning of the essay provides an instance of how the assumption that a Muslim person's Gujarati would have no Sanskrit, or Hindu's Persian is faulty; so is the assumption that all those who speak Urdu live outside Gujarat. Translators can not afford to be concerned only with the physical texts, but must also take cognizance of the multilingual, however implicit that is, worlds that texts inhabit or at least hail from. This recognition of the 'mixed' source enables translation strategies that can at least attempt to create a target text that is not monolingual. Thus a wide range of institutions and disciplines can be cautious about perpetuating a view of language as discrete,

defined, frozen entity and speak with forms of the so-called 'regional' pride and emotive or even chauvinistic charge that the idea of language carries, especially in times of globalization. The leap from a protean source to the fragile foundation of a regional language/original source (sometimes posited as one) may seem far-fetched. Or perhaps not.

Meanwhile, forms of linguistic plurality in quotidian contexts may have a set of configurations that the paper has not taken account of. An evolving linguistic sphere in which an increasing use of Urdu by Muslims, Sanskritized Gujarati by Hindus represent extreme polarities of one kind; while the Gujaratification of Kutchi, the abdication of Sindhi, and other tribal languages may represent different points of the spectrum. Resisting the coherent narrative of language and history are also Gujaratis that continue to be spoken and used, serving as indices of self-expression as well as identification. Live practices of language show the multiple Gujaratis that continue to both obtain and disappear in the dominant narrative, but giving away every now and then, vestiges of cultural encounters through Arabic, Persian, and Gujari references, unbeknowst to the speakers themselves. Yet a dynamism characterizes this terrain so that certain linguistic identities are steadfastly held; some identities are morphed if not replaced and some steer clear by aspiring for an allegedly neutral language like English (Kothari, 2013b). Given the complex nature of this terrain, and its demand of a different set of methodology, it has not been possible to include such instances in the present paper.

Acknowledgements

I wish to place on record my gratitude to Krupa Shah, Dinesh Bhatt, Suguna Ramanathan, Mona Mehta, Srinivas Reddy, Abhijit Kothari, Achyut Yagnik and Ganesh Devy for various discussions and suggestions helpful to the paper.

References

Eley, Geoff and Roger Grigor Suny (1996) ed. *Becoming National: A Reader*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Elliot, Henry Miers and John Dowson (1866–67). *The History of India: As told by its own Historians.* Vol. 1. Trübner and Company, 1866–67.

Gandhi, M.K. 1967. 'Foreword'. Munshi, K.M. *Gujarat and its Literature: From Early Times to 1852.* Mumbai: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, pp. v–vi.

Grierson, G.A. (1927). *Linguistic Survey of India*. Vol. 1 (Part 1). Delhi: Low Price Publication.

——. (1908) *Linguistic Survey of India*. Vol. IX. Part II. Delhi: Low Price Publications.

Isaka, Riho (2002) 'Language and dominance: The debates over the Gujarati language in the late nineteenth century', *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies*, 25: 1, 1–19.

Jani, Manishi (2012) ed. 'Koni Koni Chhe Gujarati?' *Lekhakane Lekhan*, 51, October Ahmedabad.

Jhaveri, K.M. (1945). *Farsi Grantho*. Ahmedabad: Gujarati Vernacular Society.

Kaviraj, Sudipta (2010). *The Imaginary Institution of India.* New Delhi: Permanent Black.

Kothari, Jayant (2011). *Bhashaparichay Ane Gujarati Bhashanun Swarup.* Ahmedabad: Gurjar Granthratna Karyalaya.

Kothari, Komal (1973). *Monograph on Langas: A Folk Musician Caste of Rajasthan.* Jodhpur: Rupayan Sansthan.

Kothari, Rita (2013a). *Memories and Movements: Borders and Communities in Banni, Kutch.* New Delhi: Orient Blackswan.

––. (2013b). 'Caste in a Casteless language: English as a language of "Dalit" expression', *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLVIII (39).

—— (2013c). 'Response', *Translation Studies,* September, Routledge Journal, U.K.

—— (forthcoming) 'Names are for other people's languages', in Ahmed Ankit and Said Faiq (eds), *Revisiting Language and Translation in India*, Cambridge: Scholars Publishing.

Madani, Saiyed Zaheeruddeen (1981). *Sukanvraan-e-Gujarat: Poets of Gujarat.* New Delhi: Directorate Urdu Bureau.

Mehta, Ila Arab. *Vaad (Fence*). Gurjar Granthratna Karyalaya. 2011, trans. Rita Kothari (Zubaan, forthcoming).

Merrill, Christi (2009) *Riddles of Belonging: India in Translation and Other Tales of Possession.* Fordham Publishing.

Mir, Farina (2010). *The Social Space of Language:Vernacular Culture in British Colonial Punjab*. University of California Press.

Mitchell, Lisa (2009). *Language, Emotion, and Politics in South India: The Making of a Mother Tongue*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Munshi, K.M. (1967). 'Introduction'. *Gujarat and its Literature: From Early Times to 1852*. Mumbai: Bharatiya Vidya Bhawan. pp. xi–xxix.

Naregal, Veena. (2001). *Language Politics, Elites, and the Public Sphere.* Orient Blackswan.

Naik, Chhotubhai. 'Gujari Bhasha'. *Svadhyaya* IV. (3): 268–285.

——, (1954, 1955), 'Gujarati par Arabi-Farsi nee Asar', Part I and II, Gujarat Viday Sabha, Amdavad.

Neelkanth, Ramabhai (1953). *Bhadrambhadra*. Ahmedabad: Gurjar Granthratna Karyalaya,.

Ramaswamy, Sumathi (1993). 'En/gendering Language: The Politics of Tamil Identity'. *Comparative Studies in Society and History,* 35 (4) : 683–725.

Rajani, Vyas (2014). 'Peheli Gujarati Vachanmala Angreje Taiyar Karavi Hati'. *Navgujarati Samay*. 16 June 2014.

Renan, Ernest (1990). 'What is a Nation?' *Nation and Narration*. Ed. Homi K. Bhabha. London: Routledge, pp. 8–22.

Sarangi, Asha (2006). 'Ambedkar and the Linguistic States: A Case for Maharashtra', *Economic and Political Weekly* 41 (No. 2), January. 151–157.

—— (2009a). 'Enumeration and the Linguistic Identity Formation in Colonial India'. *Studies in History,* 25(2): 197–227.

——. (2009b). *Language and Politics in India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Sebastian B. (2009). 'Gandhi and the Standardisation of Gujarati', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 44(31), August, 94–101.

Shamshad Pathan vs State of Gujarat. No. 167. Supreme Court. 2011.

Sharma, Sunil (2005). 'Urdu and Persian Scholarly Publishing in Contemporary Gujarat', *The Annual of Urdu Studies*, pp. 296–300.

Shastri, K.K. (1949). *Gujarati Bhasha.* Trans. K.K. Shastri. Mumbai: Forbes Gujarati Sabha.

Sheikh, Samira (2010). *Forging a Region: Sultans, Traders, and Pilgrims in Gujarat 1200–1500*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Vyas, Shvetal (2013). 'Writing Fiction, Living History: Kanhaiyalal Munshi's Historical Trilogy', *Modern Asian Studies,* July, pp. 1–21.

Yagnik, Achyut and Suchitra Sheth (2005). *The Shaping of Modern Gujarat: Plurality, Hindutva, and Beyond*. India: Penguin Books.

Yashaschandra, Sitanshu (2003). 'From Hemacandra to Hind Svaraj', in Pollock Sheldon. *Literary Cultures in History: Reconstructions from South Asia*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 567–611.

Zutschi, Chitralekha (2003). *Languages of Belonging: Islam, Regional Identity and the Making of Kashmir,* Permanent Black.