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Chapter 2

The Hindi and Urdu Controversy:
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2.0 Introduction

The present chapter deals with the Hindi and Urdu controversy that has survived in India for a good deal of time. The Hindi and Urdu controversy existed in India during freedom struggle. It suggests that Hindi and Urdu have a long history of conflict on many levels. Therefore, the chapter deals with the various sides of the issue up to some detail and end with a reading that helps relating the issue to the problem of attitudinal perception. The chapter also analyzes its impact on the attitudinal shift.

Both Urdu and Hindi are the two major languages of India. They are listed in the 8th schedule of Indian Constitution. Both these languages occupy prominent positions in the census report of 2001. The two languages are closely related to each other. The linguistic relatedness of the two languages has always been a matter of concern for linguists. Although Urdu is influenced by the Arabic and Persian languages, however, Urdu has originated and developed in the Indian subcontinent. Both these languages share the same Indic base. At the phonological and grammatical level, they are so close that they appear to be one language, but at the lexical level Urdu has borrowed extensively from Persian Arabic sources. This distinction is most marked at the orthographical level, where Hindi uses Devanagari, and Urdu uses the Perso-Arabic script indigenously modified to suit the requirements of an Indo-Aryan speech. According to a general estimate, Urdu and Hindi taken together form the third largest speech community in the world today.

Urdu gained popularity among masses from the very beginning. In India it is one of the twenty two scheduled languages of India. It has been declared as the national
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language of Pakistan. On the other hand Hindi enjoys the status of official language of India. Urdu has also been declared second official language in some of the states of India. According to the census report of 1991 the total number of Hindi speakers is 40.2% and total number of Urdu speakers is 51,536,111 which accounts to 5.01% of the total population of India. To fully understand the heterogeneity of Indian Languages and Cultures we must understand the area and the population size of the country, and therefore a detail account of Indian population size has been provided in the present study. The figure 2.1 given below presents the factual position of the total number of the speakers of different Indian languages. It is based on the details of the census report of 1991.

Fig 2.1 Distributions of language Families in India according to census 1991

http://www.sciencenews.org/pictures/101009/bb_india_map_zoom.jpg
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As shown in the figure 2.1, Urdu numerically ranks 6th among the eighth scheduled languages of India. It comes next to Hindi, Bengali, Telugu, Marathi and Tamil. Due to geopolitical discontinuity the speakers of Urdu language are spread in almost all the States and Union Territories of India. The maximum number of Urdu speakers (to be exact 13,272,080) live in Uttar Pradesh and the minimum number of Urdu speakers are in Lakshadweep. (Fatihi 2001: Urdu in Multilingual India)

Urdu is also spoken in countries surrounding India and Pakistan, such as Afghanistan, Bangladesh and Nepal. Practically, Urdu has become the cultural language and lingua franca of the South Asian Muslim Diasporas outside the sub-continent, especially in the Gulf and the Middle East, Western Europe, Scandinavia, U.S.A. and Canada.

2.1 Understanding the name “Urdu”

The name ‘Urdu’ seems to have begun its life as Zaban-e-Dehli, Zaban-e-Hindostan, Zabăn-e-Urdu-e-Mu’allah, the ‘Exalted Language of the Camp’ (i.e. Delhi). With the passage of time Urdu-e-Mu’allah, was shortened to Zaban-e-Urdu and later it became only Urdu. Masood Husain Khan (1988) in his book ‘Urduu Zubaan: Taariikh Tashkiil, Taqdiir’, has mentioned the changing phenomenon. He is of the opinion that the source of the spoken language is the Prakrit languages i.e. sub language of the Indo-Aryan. Mirza Khalil A. Beg (1988) in his ‘Urdu Grammar’ has given the same naming pattern to the development of the term ‘Urdu.’ He followed the argument of Masud Husain Khan. Shamsur Rehman Faruqi (2001) in his ‘Early Urdu Literary Culture and History’ also quoted the same expression. The word ‘Urdu’ (originally Turkish) literally means camp, or the royal camp. It also refers to the city of Delhi, which was the seat of the Mug’hal’s for centuries.

According to Fallon (First published in 1879 and reprint in 1989) the word Urdu is used for “an army, a camp, a market, Urdu-e-Muallah, (the royal camp or army) generally means the city of Delhi or Shahjahanabad; and Urdu-e-Muallah, ki zaban, refers to the court language. The term is very commonly applied to the Hindustani Language as spoken by the Muslim population of India proper.” (Fallon, 1989: 28)
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Platts (1884) defined Urdu as, "Army, camp; market of a camp; s.f. (=Urdu zaban), the Hindustani language as spoken by Hindus, who have intercourse with them and who holds appointments in the government courts. (It is composed of Hindi, Persian and Arabic, Hindi constituting the backbone, so to speak): Urdu-e-Mu'allah, the royal camp or army, generally means the city of Delhi or Shahjahanabad; the court language (Urdu-e-mualla ki zaban); the Hindustani language as spoken in Delhi." (Platts, 1884: 40)

Historically, Urdu has developed in the post-12th century period. Its first folk poet is the great Persian master, Amir Khusrau (1253-1325), who is known for composing dohas (couplets) and riddles in the newly-formed speech language, called "Rekhta/Hindavi." Throughout the whole medieval period, this mixed speech (i.e. Rekhta) was called by various speech sub-groups in various ways. Shamsur Rehman Faruqi (2001) has mentioned the following order of the development of the name of the language which presently known as Urdu i.e. "... 'Hindavi', 'Zaban-e-Hind', 'Hindi', 'Zaban-e-Dehli', 'Rekhta', 'Gujari', 'Zaban-e- Urdu-e-Mu'allah', 'Zaban-e-Urdu', and at the end it just remains as 'Urdu'..." (Faruqi, 2001: 22). Faruqi claims, that the order of the development of the language is more or less similar to the above given pattern.

In a paper published in 1926, Hafiz Muhammad Kakorvi quoted the following verse of Mushahafi, which has been also quoted by Nayyar Kakorvi in his dictionary published in 1924,

/ May God Preserve them, I have heard the speech of Mir and Mirza,

How can I truthfully, oh Mushahafi, says, my language is Urdu/

(Sherani, Maqalat-e Sherani, vol.1, p.41)

In this couplet, the term 'Mirza' refers to Mirza Sauda, who died in 1781 and as a result of this it can be said that this couplet is dated in middle of the 18th century. Around 1772 Mushahafi went to Lucknow to meet Sauda (who died in June 1781) and later on he went to Delhi in 1773. In Delhi he had the first meeting with Mir. Mushahafi composed this material before the death of the Sauda (i.e. 1781). Sherani
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in his “Maqalat-e Shirani” quoted this couplet to reveal that the term Urdu was in use from the mid of the 18th century.

Hobson and Jobson (as cited in Yule Brunel, p.164) cited a references from materials written in 1560, in support of ‘Urdu bazaar’ (i.e. Camp-market). They also claimed that the word ‘Urdu’ came to India with Babur (1526), and then his camp was called *Urđū-e-Mu’allah* (the exalted camp or court), and the language that grew up around the court/ camp was called zaban-e- *Urđū-e-Mu’allah*. Babur never had an extended stay in Delhi.

Edwar Terry, who was a companion of Thomas Roe in Jahangir’s court described the language in his ‘A Voyage to East India,’ London (1655) as ‘Indostan’, saying that “it was a powerful language which could say much in few words, had a high content of Arabic and Persian, but was written differently from Arabic and Persian”. (Edward Terry, 1655: 300)

These are evidences to establish that the name ‘Hindustani’ used in the late 11th century, which later became synonymous with Urdu. However, major Urdu writers kept referring to their speech as ‘Hindavi’ till as late as the beginning of the 19th century. Following couplets cited from Mir and Mushafi:

/najane log kehte hain kis ko surUr-e-qalb
  aya nahn ye lafs to Hindi zaban ke blc/

*Mir Taqi Mir (d. 1810)*

/Mushafi farsi ko taq pe rakh
  Ab hai ashAr- e-Hindavi ka rivaj/

*Mushafi (d.1824)*

(Link: http://urducouncil.nic.in/pers_pp/index.htm \National Council for Promotion of Urdu Language.mht)

The couplet of Mushafi suggests that by the 19th century the tradition of Persian was totally rejected and the preferences was given to the *Hindavi* language (It was earlier
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called Rekhta. It was the language used by Amir Khusrau (1253-1325 CE), the eminent poet of his time.

Tara Chand, (1944) in his book ‘The Problem of Hindustani’, mentioned that throughout these centuries, Hindi (Persianised Hindustani) and not modern Hindi (Sanskritised Hindustani) was the lingua franca of India and the speech of the polite society, whether Hindu or Musalman’ (Tara Chand, 1944: 86).

It emerges that the two terms ‘Rekhta’ and ‘Hindvi’ which existed at that time did not refer to the two different languages, rather both of these terms ‘Rekhta’(i.e. amalgamation of languages) and ‘Hindvi’(The language of ‘Hind’) were popular as two different names for the same language something around the 18th century in north India. Shamsur Rehman Faruqi supports this view and says:

“The name ‘Hindi’ was used, in preference to ‘Rekhta’, from about the mid 19th century. The spoken language was almost always referred to as ‘Hindi’. It was unknown, in fact, even in the early 20th century, for the name ‘Hindvi’ to be used to mean ‘Urdu’. ‘Hindvi’ was in use until about the end of the eighteenth century.” (Shamsur Rehman Farooqi, 2001: 22-23)

By the 18th century, if not sooner, the word Urdu meant ‘the city of Delhi’. It continued to retain this sense until at least early 19th century. Insha and Qatil say in Dariya-e latafat (Ocean of Subtleties, 1807), that 'the residents of Murshidabad and Azimabad (Patna), in their own estimation, were competent Urdu speakers and regard their own city as the Urdu; Insha means that they are really local and not true citizens of Shahjahanabad.” (ibid: 26)

Bhartendu Harishchandra (1850-1885), father of the modern Hindi (here Hindi refers here to the language with Nagri Script), began his career as an Urdu writer. Though he belonged to Benares (now Varanasi), he was not fully aware of the cultural language and the language of folk of the Benares area of his time. In 1871 Bhartendu Harishchandra wrote that his language and the language of women of his community was “Urdu”.
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Amrit Rai, (son of the Premchand, 1880-1936), a well known Hindi scholar, claimed that Hindavi or Hindi became Urdu when the Muslims of India decided to move away from Hindi and as a result they started code mixing and followed the heavy Persianized style which soon become the identity of the Muslims. In his thesis, entitled as ‘A House Devided’ he presented his view elaborately.

In view of these facts it can be said that earlier there was the existence of ‘Rekhta’ and later on it started to be called as ‘Hindavi’ because it was the language of the people of different speech community of India. During the Mug’hal period the term ‘Hindavi’ or ‘Hindi’ became more popular. It is to be noted here that both the terms ‘Hindvi/Hindi’ was used for the language which was developed from ‘Rekhta’ a language used by Amir Khusrau. It suggests that the term ‘Hindi’ in Mug’hal period did not refer to the Devenagri Hindi (i.e. Sanskritized Hindi) rather it was used to refer to the Persianized Urdu.

2.2. Views of Different Scholars

By taking the views of different scholars about the development of Urdu and Hindi, it will be easy to understand linguistic and socio-historical developments of that time, chronologically. We find very convincing evidences from the writings of Prof. Irfan Habib (2009), Prof. M.K.A.Beg (1988), Prof. Masood Husain Khan (1988), Shamsur Rehman Faruqi (2001) and other scholars. In one of his papers entitled “India and Its Languages as Seen in Medieval Persian Text” Irfan Habib says:

“...Ashokan Prakrit which is found in Ashokan inscriptions of 3rd century BC, from the border of Afghanistan to Karnataka, is a first all Indian Languages that has come to us in written forms, for the next five hundred years or so (in fact from around 260BC to about 300AD). What is known to historians as a successor to increasingly influence by local dialects? Thereafter, classical Sanskrit took over the linguistic scene of that time. The difficulty in describing the linguistic situation of that period is that, in classical Sanskrit some of the Prakrit words were re-converted into Sanskrit forms and thereafter, what the spoken language was at that time is not historically represented to us, because even the prakrit conversation in Sanskrit texts
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become formalized, and it is here that Persian text become very important begining with the ‘Chachnama’, whose materials go back to around 700AD.

Now first of all, there is the problem of nomenclature. Prof. Masud Husain Khan’s due attention to the form ‘Hindavi’ is pertinent and relevant. The form ‘Hindvi’ for anything Indian, including language, is more common in earlier texts beginning with the ‘Chachnama’, which is the very literal Persian translation of an Arabic text. When the Arabs conquered Sind they did not realize that ‘Sind’ and ‘Hind’ had etymologically the same origin, so they distinguished between Sind (lower Indus Basin) and the rest of India to which the name Hindi was confined. This distinction was possibly aided by corruption of the title of the astronomical tracts Siddhantas as Sind – Hind. The distinction persisted still in Isami’s Ode to Indostan in 1350, where ‘Sind’ is named among foreign lands, along with ‘the two Iraqs (Iran and Iraq) and Arabic. Since Sind remained under Arab rule up to the late 1020s when the Gahnavids took over the distinction seemed to have taken a religious color and so Hindus (as the people of Hindi) became synonymous with non-Muslim Indians. This usage has its classical place in Alberuni, who takes the Brahmans to be the spokesmen of distinction between ‘Hindus’ as ‘non-Muslim Indians’ and ‘Hindian’ or ‘Hindis’ as Indians comprising both Hindus and Muslims e.g. Isami Futuhu’s Salatin (1350) speaks of the ‘Hindi’ cavalrmen of the army of Hindostan.

As for Hindostan it was sometimes like Hind when distinguished from Sind applied to land under Hindu rules. As this land tended to recede eastwards with the Ghorian conquest tended to be used for the contrary east of Delhi or rather between Delhi and Bengal as in the tabaqat-I Nasir of Mihaj Siraj (1260). Such territorial limitation of the name Hindostan is analogous to Mughal official when the name could be used in contradiction with the Deccan for northern India alone.

It suggests that the word ‘Hind’ in Arabic comes from the Iranian word ‘Hindu’ which has the short vowel at the end. In both old Iranian and Sasanian Iranian this word is ‘Hindu’ which is of course parallel to the Sanskrit work ‘Sindhu’ as /S/ changing into /H/ another further addition of /-stan/ which in Sasanian became common suffix for all territorial lands. So, ‘Hindu’ naturally became ‘Hindustan’
and therefore, the ‘Hindustan’ is written with the short vowel /vao/. So ‘Hindvi’ actually is the Persian form of ‘Hindu’ with the short vowel at the end, which disappeared, in Arabic writing. But which re-appears in the form of ‘Hindustan’, which is simply ‘Hindu’ as territorial name. It is true that in some cases the short vowel is not used with the suffix /Stan/, as in ‘Uzbekistan’, ‘Afghanistan’ and so on… But with ‘Hindu’ it must necessarily become ‘Hindustan’. There is nonsense about it being the country of ‘Hindus’. There is no Sanskrit word until the 20th century for /-stan/ I think /-than/ is the only Indo Aryan expression for /-stan/ but it was never written at all as suffix in Sanskrit.” (Irfan Habib, 2009: 116-117)

“In the 1719 A.D. Abdul Jalil Bigrami from Delhi, a medium officers, writes that the “bhakshul Mumalik” Abdul Hasan Khan, the one of the two famous Sayed Brothers is very keen to get the “Kabit of Alam” the Hindi poem verses of Alam, and Sayed Brothers is very keen to get the “Kabit of Alam” the Hindi poem verses of Alam, and you kindly get it in Bilgram from these people Harbans Misr or Devakar or Ghaseti sons. These are the three ends: they are all non-muslims or anyone else and get it in the “Kabit-e-Hindi” in Devanagri, not in Farasi, script, because in Farsi the word cannot be correctly read. So please get it in Hindi. Correct Hindi obviously to be presented to the “Bakhshul Mumalik”. It suggests that a considerable knowledge of Hindi as well as Devnagari was essential at that time. As a result of this arose what is called ‘Rekhta’ and I think this nomenclature although it was used later for Urdu. But it is not in fact Urdu. It is actually a real mixture of Persian and Urdu and Hindi expressions of Indian people”. (ibid: 124-125)

This is what we called ‘Rekhta’ and although there have been many discussions in Mahmood Sheerani, and he comes to the same conclusion that the Persian and Hindi expressions are mixed.

“Take Chand Bahar, in “Bahare Ajam” in fact described “Rekhta” as ‘a mixture languages “Makhloot” and therefore, with this standard definition even in 1739, there need not to be any particular discussion on what the “Rekhta” signify. It was
not Hindi; it was not any form of Hindi written in Urdu script. It was a direct mixture of Hindi and Persian”. (ibid: 125)

During the 16th or the 17th centuries Agra became the capital and it may be possible that the Hindi /Hindavi/ Hindustani most often meant the Braj dialect (early specimens of which semi officials documents survive from the 16th of centaury in Vrindavan collections).

The information which Irfan Habib provided in his paper about the ‘Chachnama’ (700AD) shows that ‘Urdu’ has emerged from ‘Rekhta.’ He highlighted the language development issues by citing the example of the suffix /-stan/, which is not used in Sanskrit and not even found in any single Sanskrit word. In ‘Chachnama’ (which is the literal translation of the Arabic text), Amir Khusrau used the word ‘Hindavi’ to designate the language which were spoken in ‘Sindh’ at the time of Arab conquest which was written around 700AD. He listed out the similar kind of words used in ‘Chachnama.’ For example, the word ‘buddha’ has been used having the meaning as ‘Idol’ whereas in Indian context ‘buddha’ is the name of ‘God’ or the ‘Idol of the God’. Some other examples which he found in Chachnama are ‘khar (i.e. Soil), Buddha (i.e. Idol or Idol of god), Raja (i.e. Title for ruler), Rajaputra. It shows that Irfan Habib (2009), very interestingly explained the concept of Urdu, Hindi and Hindustani by extracting the solid examples of Persian and Sanskrit texts in order to provide information about the historical development of Urdu. The examples cited in his paper suggest that the language which was in use at that time was carrying the features of both Persian and Sanskrit. The most important point that has been highlighted here is that the terms ‘Hindvi/Hindi’ did not refer to the present modern ‘Hindi’ rather it was the language which emerged out of intermixing of Persian and the local languages.

Professor Khalil A. Beg (2004-2005) says, “Urdu, indeed, is a Khadi Boli based language. It developed out of the Khadi Boli by the end of the 12th century AD. Khadi Boli is the dialect of North-East Delhi comprising the areas of Western Uttar Pradesh. It is the descendent of the Saurseni Apabhramsa. When Saurseni Apabhramsa died out in 1000AD, a number of dialects emerged from it in the same
regional, especially in and around Delhi. Khadi Boli is one of them. It became prominent when the Muslims comprising the Turks, Iranians and Afghans and also the Muslims from the Punjab settled in and around Delhi after a new political order was established in North India as a result of the conquest of Delhi by Shahabuddin Mohammad Gauri in 1193 AD.

...The first literary development of Khadi boli was also made by the Muslims with the admixture of Persian compounds, phrases and clauses into it. Such form of poetic expression was called “Rekhta”...Amir Khusrau (1253-1325) is the first poet who wrote poetry in the form of ‘Rekhta’. The language which was built up by taking Khadi Boli as the base, and which was known as “Hindi”, “Hindavi”, and “Rekhta” is the earlier form of the same language we call today “Urdu”. These names, therefore, refer to Old Urdu.”(Miraza Khalil A. Beg, 2004-05: 5-6).

Professor Beg (2004) rightly observes that Urdu has emerged out of Khadi Boli, when saurseni Apabhramsa died around 100AD during the 12th century. Khadi boli was also made by the Muslim with the mixing of Persian, which later on popular as Rekhta. Amir Khusrau (1253-1325) was the first Persian poet who first wrote the poetry in Rekhta and out of it Urdu emerges. He also claimed that Hindi, Hindavi and Rekhta are the older name of Urdu. Therefore, it seems that Urdu takes birth first then after Devnagri Hindi or Modern Hindi emerged.

Masud Husain Khan, (1988) also claimed that the Urdu language has been developed out of Haryanvi and Khari Boli. He said that when Delhi became the capital of the Mughal Empire Khari Boli began to exercise its influence more on the ‘Rekhta’ the mixed Hindi-Persian language out of which literary Urdu/ Hindustani arose.

2.3 The Relationship between Urdu and Hindi

As we have seen in the previous sections (i.e. section 2.1 and 2.2) Hindi and Urdu has a strange relationship. Despite the fact that Hindi and Urdu had a close structural association, the two languages always had a strained relationship. For further
clarification, the relationship of Urdu and Hindi can be analyzed at two levels i.e. structural and historical.

At the structural level both the languages have structural similarities in many ways. This is only because, linguistically, both the languages are based on Khari boli of Delhi. It is evident from '-a' ending structure of both the languages. However, the dialectal base of old Hindi is Brajbhasha, Kanauji and Bundeli (As evident from '-au' or '-o' structures). When, the Muslims came to Delhi and Agra. It was the '-a' ending dialect which was gaining prominence in the speech communication system of the people of the north. The Urdu vocalic system is similar to Hindi with slight variations in the short vowel allophones. Urdu also retains a complete set of aspirated stops, a characteristic of Indo-Aryan, as well as the retroflex consonantal set except the retroflex 'n' (in Krishn). Urdu does not retain the complete range of Perso Arabic, consonants. The largest number of loan consonants retained being among the aspirants, i.e., 'f', 'z', 'zh', 'x', 'gh' and only one sound among the stops, i.e., uvular 'q'. It suggests that at the phonological level both the languages have certain idiosyncrasies. However, there is a lot of similarity at syntactic level.

Historically, the relationship between Hindi and Urdu is also very interesting. There are lots of controversies regarding these two languages. Earlier the terms Hindavi, Rekhta and Urdu were used interchangeably even by Urdu poets like Mir and Mirza Ghalib of the early 19th century (the term Hindi was used later). By 1850, the terms Hindi and Urdu were no longer used for the same language. Before the Partition of India Delhi, Lucknow, Aligarh and Hyderabad were used to be the four literary centers of Urdu.

These two standardized registers of Hindustani have become as entrenched as separate languages that many extreme-nationalists, both Hindus and Muslims, claim that Hindi and Urdu have always been separate languages. During the British Raj the tension between the two languages and the Hindi and Urdu controversy reached its peak in 1867, especially in the United Provinces. However, there are unifying forces as well which tried to merge both the languages as in a single language with two scripts. For example, Indian Bollywood films get language certificate in 'Hindi', but
the language used in most of these movies is ‘Urdu’. This may bring the two languages together.

2.4 The Urdu and Hindi Controversy

There has always been a controversy regarding these two languages i.e. Hindi and Urdu. After independence, during the formation of states of India the Hindi and Urdu relationship further strained. Both the communities of that time were taking the language as the major factor of their identity. As the situation of that time was very critical and before and after independence this controversy further enhanced. As we know both the languages have the same source of development and have lots of similarity at different structural levels with some non-negotiable distinctions. Different scholars made different statements about the historical development of Hindi and Urdu language. Some scholars said that both these languages are the same language of two different styles. Others believe that Hindi has emerged out of Urdu, and some conclude that Urdu emerges out of Hindi. When we look at the colloquial language spoken by the people of Delhi, we find that the two styles are indistinguishable, whether it is called Hindi or Urdu by its speakers. The main important distinction at this level is the script: if written in the Perso-Arabic script, the language is generally considered to be Urdu, and if written in Devanagari it is generally considered to be Hindi. Besides the script there are also some other differences at the level of phonology and morphology.

However, since independence the formal registers used in education and the media have become increasingly divergent in their vocabulary. Where there is no colloquial word for a concept, Standard Urdu uses Perso-Arabic vocabulary, while Standard Hindi uses Sanskrit vocabulary. This results in the differentiation of the two languages. One being heavily Sanskritized and other being Persianized.

Before independence, most of the India was a British colony, and before the British the most dominant Empire of north India was the Mug’hal Empire, who arrived in India during the 12th century AD. The official language of the Mug’hal courts was Persian. The Mug’hals, like other residents who lived to the west of the Indian subcontinent named India as ‘Hind’ or ‘Hindustan’, after the river Indus which flows in
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the present day Pakistan (earlier known as Sind Baluchistan). The language spoken in ‘Hind’ was called by them Hindi or Hindustani.

The controversy arose by the time only when this ‘Hindi’ or ‘Hindustani’ has been taken into consideration because one group claimed that this is the language having Nagri script and other group claimed that this is the language, having Persian features and follows the Persian style of writing. This is the point where the whole controversy of Hindi and Urdu was centred and the linguistic situation was not easy to tackle.

It should be noted here that the term ‘Hindi’ does not refer to the present Hindi but it refers to that language which existed during the invasion of the Mug’hals in India. As we discussed earlier, in the section 2.1.1, that they do not have the distinction between /s/ and /h/. In view of this phonological rule the Muslim rulers called it Hind (like as Sind), Hindi and finally Hindustani. But as we know the term ‘Hindi’ does not refer to the present Modern Hindi, rather it refers to the language which has the Persian script.

Naturally, with different names associated with different forms and styles of the language, the controversy gained further. The term Hindustani was an attempt to bring the two languages together. It has developed a wider connotation. It embraces all forms of the language spoken in Northern India. It includes Hindi as well as Urdu and even more than that it includes each and every shade of the spoken language of the North. It covers all the forms of the languages spoken in North India which includes both Hindi and Urdu.

(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hindustani_language(Hindustani Language from Wikipedia))

In the light of the above discussion it’s not easy to explain that which language emerged first and which language came later. Some scholars believe that Urdu came first and some says that Hindi emerged first and later on Urdu developed. Some says Urdu was earlier known as Hindvi/Hindi later it is introduced as ‘Urdu’. Out of that Hindi or Hindavi, Urdu or Devenagari Hindi emerged. Because of this linguistic rivalry, both Hindi and Urdu speakers claimed their language to be the oldest. Both
groups were in favor of their own language. Only after going through the different substantiation, facts, documentaries and evidences regarding these two languages and the researcher finally concluded that earlier it was only single languages called ‘Rekhta’ which means ‘amalgamation of language’. Rekhta had the flavor of all the existing languages that existed at that time. Later on these two languages come in contact with the Sanskrit and Persian & Arabic as a result of which ‘Sanskritized Hindvi’ emerged and ‘Arabo-persianized Hindavi’ developed. Attempts were made to cover both these languages under the term Hindustani but it could not succeed.

2.4.1. Hindi and Urdu movements

In 1837, the British East India Company replaced Persian with local vernacular in various provinces as the official and court language. However, in North India, Urdu in Persian script instead of Hindi in Devanagari script was chosen to replace Persian. The most immediate reason for the controversy is believed to be the contradictory language policy in North India in 1860s. While the government encouraged both Hindi and Urdu as a medium of education in school, it discouraged Hindi or Nagari script for official purposes. This policy gave rise to conflict between students educated in Hindi or Urdu for the competition of government jobs, which eventually took on a communal form.

In 1867, some Hindus in the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh during the British Raj in India began to demand that Hindi should be made an official language in place of Urdu. Babu Shiva Prasad of Banaras was one of the early proponents of the Nagari script. In a Memorandum on court characters written in 1868, he accused the early Muslim rulers of India for forcing them to learn Persian. In 1897, Madan Mohan Malaviya (1897) published a collection of documents and statements titled “Court character and primary education in North Western Provinces and Oudh”, in which, he made a compelling case for Hindi.

Several Hindi movements were formed in the late 19th and early 20th century, notable among them were Nagri Pracharni Sabha formed in Banaras in 1893, Hindi Sahitya Sammelan in Allahabad in 1910, Dakshina Bharat Hindi Prachar Sabha in 1918 and Rashtra Basha Prachar Samiti in 1926. The movement was
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encouraged in 1881 when Hindi in Devanagari script replaced Urdu in Persian script as the official language in neighboring Bihar. They submitted 118 memorials signed by 67,000 people to the Education Commission in several cities. The proponents of Hindi argued that the majority of people speak Hindi, and therefore introduction of Nagari script would provide better education and improve prospects for holding Government positions. They also argued that Urdu script made court documents illegible, encouraged forgery and promoted the use of complex Arabic and Persian words.

Organizations such as Anjuman Taraqqi-e-Urdu (1903) were formed by Maulvi Abdul Haq for the advocacy of Urdu. Advocates of Urdu argued that Hindi scripts could not be written faster, and lacked standardization and vocabulary. They also argued that the Urdu language originated in India, asserted that Urdu could also be spoken fluently by most of the people and disputed the assertion that official status of language and script is essential for the spread of education. Communal violence broke out as the issue was taken up by firebrands. Sir Syed Ahmed Khan had once stated,

"I look to both Hindus and Muslims with the same eyes & consider them as two eyes of a bride. By the word nation I only mean Hindus and Muslims and nothing else. We Hindus and Muslims live together under the same soil under the same government. Our interest and problems are common and therefore I consider the two factions as one nation."

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hindi%E2%80%93Urdu_controversy

Speaking to Mr. Shakespeare, the governor of Banaras, after the language controversy heated up, he said

"I am now convinced that the Hindus and Muslims could never become one nation as their religion and way of life was quite distinct from one another."(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki)

In the last three decades of 19th century the controversy flared up several times in North-Western provinces and Oudh. The Hunter commission, appointed by the
Government of India to review the progress of education, was used by the advocates of both Hindi and Urdu for their respective causes.

Sir Sayed Ahmad Khan was very farsighted person and very truly realized the consequences of the demand for a separate Hindi for the Hindus that would be very harmful for both Hindus and Muslims. His seriousness about this problem reflects in his one letter which he wrote to his friend Muhsin-ul-Mulk, on April 29, 1870. He wrote:

“I have received a piece of news which made me extremely sad and anxious, it is egged by the suggestions of Babu Shiv Prashad Sahib, there is the general favor of effacing from the world, the Urdu language and the Persian script, which are the memorials of the Muslims....This proposal and a device on which there will in no way be agreement and unity among the Hindus and the Muslims. Muslims will never agree on Hindi...and the consequence will be that Hindus and Muslims become separate. There isn’t much to fear in this, thus far....Rather, the Muslims will be the gainers and Hindus will be in loss. And yet I am concerned here about just two things here: First... I desire well for all Indians... Second, they [the Muslims] will never become capable of doing anything for their own good.”(Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan, 1976: 463-464)

It seems here that Sir Sayyid was in support of both the languages, i.e., Hindi and Urdu and would like to see both of them flourished.

2.4.2. The British Language Policy

The differences between these two languages were formalized by the British language policy. In 1801, Fort Williams College was established in Calcutta and two distinct styles of Khadi Boli prose were encouraged to develop. Later in the early 20th century, this division was accentuated by the Hindu-Muslim strife in the national polity leading to two separate language movements-- Nagari Prcharini Sabha (NPS) and Anjuman-e-taraqqi-e-Urdu (ATU). The political battles between Indian National Congress and Muslim League propelled both of these language
movements to cause further alienation of Hindi and Urdu. NPS began Sanskritising while ATU was advocating Persianising of Khariboli. This controversy reached its climax at the time of India's partition. Nevertheless, the tension between the communities and the process of alienation has continued, perhaps, even more forcefully. The separation of Hindi-Urdu became most pronounced at the governmental level and at the All India Radio level.

It simply suggests that Britishers after getting proper settlement in India wanted to proceed further. For that reason they designed different policies in order to rule India. In their attempt to rule India they attempted to destroy the unity of the Indians during the colonial period. They observed that Indians are very religious and culturally very strong. Under this policy they wanted to bring Bundelkhand under their control, for that reason they took Jhansi from Bazirao Peshwa, and handed it over to Maharaja Gangadhar Rao. They did it because they knew that Gangadhar Rao decided not to marry again. Similar kind of policies were followed everywhere. Nothing was more central to British colonial ideology than arguments and policies that justified their rule on the grounds that India was not a nation but mosaic of separate peoples infinitely divided by language, caste, region, and above all religion. In a pervasive theme in arguments of colonial legitimacy, British colonialist saw themselves alone as providing the umbrella under which these groups could flourish. Their policies, whether in *quotas* in the army and schools, in the theory of “marital races,” or, above all, in the creation of separate systems of personal law, helped to create the very divisions they took as natural.

Consequently, division between Urdu and Hindi occurred under the colonial impact with the growing cultural consciousness as part of the processes of political modernization. A beginning, in fact, was affected at the Fort William College, Calcutta (established 1800), under John Gilchrist (1789-1841). There is enough evidence to show that the British rulers tied down the question of the varieties of 'Hindavi', first to the cultural heritage and social hierarchy, and later to religion and political power play. Thus, it was at the Fort William College that the two distinct trends in literary prose writing came to the fore. On the one hand, we had Mir Amman's *Bagh-o-Bahar* (1800-1802) and, Hyder Bakhsh Hyderi's *Aaraish-e-Mehfil*
(1802-1804) as Urdu prose, and, on the other, Lallu Lal's Premsagar and Sadal Mishra's Nasiketopakhyan as Hindi prose.

### 2.4.3. Establishment of Fort William College during British Rule

The main purpose of the establishment of the Fort William College was to translate the text into their priority language. Both academic and moral training were necessary to face the challenge of colonial administration. As a result Wellesley during beginning of the 18th century decided to establish a college where administrators can be trained. The aim of the British Planners was to make them strong to rule over India. Fort William College was established with the following purposes:

1. Fort William College an orientalist training centre set up by Governor General Lord Wellesley in 1800 within the Fort William complex.
2. Its object was to effect moral and intellectual improvement of the newly recruited European civil servants.
3. Envisioned ruling British India efficiently with the help of an enlightened bureaucracy.
4. For both academic and moral training.

Wellesley (1800) visualized ruling British India efficiently with the help of an enlightened bureaucracy. Under the existing system the young civilians, who were mostly between fifteen and seventeen years of age, were posted to districts without giving them any institutional training in local history, languages and the art of administration. He felt that both academic and moral training were necessary to make the new arrivals capable of facing the challenge of colonial administration. He set up the College of Fort William, Calcutta. Like the Calcutta Madrasa of Warren Hastings and the Benaras Hindu College of Jonathan Duncan, Wellesley's college was not, in fact, a fully government institution.

Its expenses were designed to have been met by a contribution from all the civilians in India and an uncertain allocation that was to come from the operation of the Government Printing Press.
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A Department was established for each major language and culture of India. For each Department there was one Professor and a couple of Assistant teachers.

1. **Persian**, which was still used as the court language of India, had a Department headed by Neile B. Edmonstone, then a Persian translator to the Government. His Assistant teacher was John H. Harington, a Judge of Sadar Diwani Adalat and Francis Gladwin, a soldier diplomat.
2. For **Arabic** studies, Wellesley engaged Lt. John Baillie, who was considered to be the best Arabist after William Jones.
3. The **Hindustani Language** Department was entrusted to John B Gilchrist, an Indologist of great repute. H.T. Colebrooke, the famous orientalist, was selected to head the Sanskrit Department.
4. William Cary, a non-civilian missionary and a specialist in many Indian languages including **Bangla**, was selected to head the Department of Vernacular Languages.

All the Departments had a number of **Pundits** and **Munshi** who made up the native element of the College staff. In all, twelve Faculties were established by 1805. They were required to receive linguistic and administrative training for two consecutive years before posting. Wellesley, himself a classical scholar, had a dream that his College would be so productive in the cultivation of arts and sciences that someday it should flower into the 'Oxford of the East', as he put it metaphorically.

"The teachers and alumni of the college have been instrumental in reforming and modernizing almost all the languages of India including Bangla. Among the most celebrated Bengali staff members of the College were Ramram Basu, Tarinicharan Mitra and Mrittunjoy Bidyalankar. With the help of these Pundits the Professors of the College successfully experimented with standardizing Bangla language and fashioning its prose. It was with the encouragement and co-operation of the College of Fort William that the technology of printing and publishing vernacular books was begun and collaborative learned institutions established…

Out of practical considerations the College of Fort William was, however, allowed to function as an institution for instruction in vernaculars. The civilians who
graduated Haileybury College were given the option of taking further linguistic training at the Fort William College. Curiously, many did opt for further training in vernaculars and in spite of financial difficulties the members of the College staff, native and European had been working for the development of vernacular languages and literature.

Lord William Bentinck, Governor General, was committed to abandon the path of orientalism in education and administration. He refused to fund the projects sponsored by the College for writing and publishing books in vernacular languages.

Bentinck announced his educational policy of public instruction in English in 1830. In the same year, he abolished the professorships of the College and in 1831 he abolished the College Council. Bentinck, curiously, retained the signboard of the College and some native Pundits who were allowed to work officially as private tutors of civilians. The Dalhousie administration formally dissolved the phantom College of Fort William in 1854.” [Sirajul Islam cited from: http://banglapedia.search.com.bd/HT/F_0170.htm]

2.4.4. Swarsiti

In its issue on November 1902, Swarsiti, a monthly Hindi journal, printed photographs of two Indian women; one of a Muslim prostitute decked in all the finery of her profession and the other of a Hindu woman modestly clothed with a simple sari. The verses printed under respective photographs expressed that the modest Hindu woman and Muslim prostitute personifies Hindi and Urdu respectively. Hindi supporters generally alleged Urdu as a promoter of fraud, deceit, and several other social vices, whereas Hindi is a source of enhancement of truth, honesty and other virtues. Urdu is a product of Indo-Persian linguistic synthesis. There is another explanation of Hindi-Urdu controversy that in 1837 East India company replaced Persian by Urdu as the counted language of lower counts while English introduced in government offices. At the same time the language policy adopted by the government in 1860 made an appreciable contribution to strengthen the controversy. On the one hand in government schools, there were both Hindi and Urdu as mediums of instruction, and on the other hand, only Urdu was recognized as
medium for official purposes. Those who adopted Hindi as medium in schools faced difficulties in seeking government jobs and those already in service feel difficulty in handling official work. The clash of interest was inevitable and unfortunately took a communal form. In 1868, Babu Shiv Parshad, a prominent advocate of Hindi, accused the Muslim rulers of north India of forcing Hindus to learn Persian. He also denounced British policy to turn Hindus into semi-Muslims and to destroy the Hindu culture. He asked the government to replace Urdu by Hindi as court language. In the next three decades, Hindi-Urdu controversy in North India flared up and died down several times. Hunter commission was set up to review only the progress of education. Nevertheless Hindi and Urdu supporters approached the commission to promote their respective causes. The main issue was to select the language and script for courts and government offices. Hindi supporters argued that since majority of people understand Hindi; therefore adoption of Hindi in Devnagri script would make government work easy. While opposing Urdu they argued that Urdu script is of foreign origin and is replete with Arabic and Persian words which makes it un-understandable by common people. On the other hand protagonists of Urdu maintained that Urdu can be written faster than Hindi also. Hindi has improvised vocabulary especially for scientific and technical terms. Hindi-Urdu controversy reached new heights when government issued a proclamation in April 1900 to grant sanction of use to both Devnagri and Urdu scripts. Urdu supporters took out rallies and held protest meetings throughout north India. Hindi supporters flooded the Hindu press in support of Hindi. So tense did feelings become that language figures for 1901 census were vitiated. In actual practice Urdu remained dominant in most parts of North India till independence in 1947. The researcher found the similar situation among different scholars. The reason behind the entire clash is that nobody wants to claim his/ her language and also no body accepted the non-honorophic things towards their own languages and of these two reasons people don’t want to see the insulting way towards their own language. Presently the situation is similar towards the consciousness of their own languages but the change that has been took place, is that people respects are not only towards their own languages but also towards the other languages. Because of this reason in the present world most of the people considered the other languages also as prestigious as their mother tongue.
they do not hatred and hesitated with other languages, it shows the positive sign of the peoples’ attitude.

As here in the above paragraphs Jagjit Singh Jabewal mentioned the earlier controversies issues/reasons. It is just because of the reason that people were thinking earlier in different ways but in present world its totally positive thought. (Jagjit Singh Jabewal, 1902)

2.4.5. Nagari Pracharini Sabha

The Nagari Pracharini Sabha was an organization founded in 1893 at the Queen's College, Varanasi for the promotion of the Devanagari script. Dictionaries are among the many scholarly publications by the Sabha. The Hiriki-śabdasāgara by Syāmasundara Dāsa was first published in 1916-1928, with a new edition published in 1965-1975 (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nagari_Pracharini_Sabha).

National awareness was growing rapidly day by day in Dholpur. In the year 1934, with the efforts of Arya Samaj workers Nagari Prachami Sabha was established in Dholpur. This Sabha was instrumental in making Hindi popular in the state. During that period Urdu was the court language. People of Dholpur objected, the use of Urdu language. After great deliberations the ruler agreed to use Hindi and made it a court language.

Nagari Pracharini Sabha, in Varanasi is an institution of national status. In more than a century of its existence, students and scholars from India and across the world have turned to it as a major resource for their work.

The aim of the establishment of the Nagari Pracharni Sabha was to encourage Hindi Writers of non-Hindi speaking areas engaged in creative writing through intensive orientation and by acquainting them with the latest trends in literature. Not only the Hindi scholars but even those students of Hindi who are prosecuting their studies in Hindi in the non-Hindi speaking areas are also provided opportunities to visit Hindi speaking areas to improve conversation in Hindi as well as acquiring the proper accent and pronunciation of Hindi words.
Later, with the rise of India's freedom struggle, Mahatma Gandhi sensed the communalization of the language issue and the political twist given to it by the British rulers. He, therefore, supported the composite concept of Hindustani as a common variant of the colloquial usage written in both the scripts as the national language of the country. It is interesting to note that much before Mahatma Gandhi's proposal of Hindustani as a language of composite Indian culture, Raja Shiva Prasad (1875) in his book of grammar, reiterated that Hindi and Urdu have no difference on the level of communication. He wrote:

"The absurdity began with the Maulvis and Pundits of Dr. Gilchrist's time, who being commissioned to make a grammar of the common speech of Upper India made two grammars...

The evil consequence is that instead of having a school grammar of the vernacular as such... we have two diverse and discrepant class books, one for the Mohammedan and Kayastha boys and the other for the Brahmins and Banias." (cf Srivastava, A Historical Perspective of Urdu: p.30)

The idea of Hindustani becomes fade after the partition because of the linguistic partition. Though there were no official takers of the idea of Hindustani, it is this common core speech that rules the roost and functions as the vehicle of communication at the level of mass culture, and is widely used in movies and all forms of entertainment. The British policy was to promote the Devanagri script and they become successful after the establishment of the Fort William College. British, finally, become successful in their Purpose they gifted a special kind of faith to the Indians in terms of ‘Hindi/ Hindu Identity’ and generated very strong emotions of Indians through their divisive scheme.

In the meantime the Nationalist Movement under the leadership of the Indian National Congress had travelled a long distance. In the previous century Dayanand Saraswati had made Hindi the vehicle for his reform movement. Now Gandhiji upgraded it as "Rashtrabhasha" along with the political plank of the nationalist movement. At the advice of his friends and followers he attached himself with the Hindi Sahitya Sammelan. He presided over the Sammelan convention in the year
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1917. Actually, he made a lot through the Sammelan and Rashtrabasha Prachar Samitis in the south and elsewhere, and gave a national stature to Hindi in the real sense of the term. Undoubtedly, he was the sole leader of the Congress who was in command in twenties and onwards. A big team of Hindi zealots were incorporated in his team. None of the Hindi leaders could dare to defy him. But everything was not going to be smooth and all right. The communal passion of the previous century, going slow up till now, erupted with vehemence and the politics of the Muslim League, was very much there making a parallel space in the nationalist movement.

The onset of the Hindi and Urdu controversy of 1867 saw the emergence of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan as a political leader of the Muslim community. He became a leading Muslim voice opposing the adoption of Hindi as a second official language of the United Provinces (now Uttar Pradesh). Sir Syed perceived Urdu as the lingua franca of Muslims. Having been developed by Muslim rulers of India, Urdu was used as a secondary language to Persian, the official language of the Mughal court. Since the decline of the Mughal dynasty, Sir Syed promoted the use of Urdu through his own writings. Under Sir Syed, the Scientific Society translated Western works only into Urdu.

The schools established by Sir Syed imparted education in the Urdu medium. The demand for Hindi, led largely by Hindus, was to Sir Syed an erosion of the centuries-old Muslim cultural domination of India. Testifying before the British-appointed education commission, Sir Syed controversially exclaimed that "Urdu was the language of gentry and Hindi that of the vulgar." His remarks provoked a hostile response from Hindu leaders, who unified across the nation to demand the recognition of Hindi.

The success of the Hindi movement led Sir Syed to further advocate Urdu as the symbol of Muslim heritage and as the language of all Indian Muslims. His educational and political work grew increasingly centered around and exclusively for Muslim interests. He also sought to persuade the British to give Urdu extensive official use and patronage. His colleagues and protégés such as Mohsin-ul-Mulk and Maulvi Abdul Haq developed organizations such as the Urdu Defence Association.
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and the Anjuman Taraqqi-i-Urdu, committed to the perpetuation of Urdu. Sir Syed's protégé Shibli Nomani led efforts that resulted in the adoption of Urdu as the official language of the Hyderabad State and as the medium of instruction in the Osmania University. To Muslims in northern and western India, Urdu had become an integral part of political and cultural identity.

2.4.6. Congress Policy

No doubt, greater sections of the Muslim community had a whole-hearted adherence to the Congress and Gandhiji, but the elitist leaders like Jinnah, who joined the Muslim League very late, indulged openly in the power play. Being throughout his career a modern secularist politician, he ultimately stood by the communalist politics and used it as an instrument to establish himself as 'the sole spokesman' of the Muslims of India. He was nothing to do with Islam and perhaps did not know Urdu well, which had acquired a communal color till then Gandhiji was puzzled. He tried his best to check the communal divide. But the Hindu card players in the Congress had been bold enough to defy Gandhiji shamelessly. The secular combine of Gandhi-Azad-Nehru could not make and maintain the balance, and there was a more cunning tug-of-war between the Congress and the League. Gandhi, with his strong ethical appeal, continued his compromise drive throughout his life, but failed, as his compromise formula on language plane could not do. A strong propagator of Rashtrabhasha Hindi, Gandhi took a peculiar turn and coined 'Hindustani' as a common language for both Hindus and Muslims neither Hindi nor Urdu, but Hindustani. Gandhiji was not a linguist, nor a literary figure who could deal with the delicate intricacies of the domain. Still a literary stalwart like Prem Chand stood by him and a number of historians, jurists, and men of other disciplines were in favor of his compromise coinage 'Hindustani'. But the leaders of the sammelan like Purshotam Das Tandan out rightly rejected Hindustani and thereby Gandhiji had to disassociate himself from the sammelan. The battle was ultimately fought on the constitutional plane, the constituent assembly debates making a documental landmark of the whole episode. The Hindustani Academy of Allahabad stands still today as a historic symbol of Gandhiji's vision of Hindustani and the goodwill behind it. A trio of Gandhiji's followers - Pt. Sunder Lal, B.N. Pandey and Mahmud
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Ahmed Huner - also launched a Hindustani magazine 'The Naya Hindustan' which was printed in both Nagri and Urdu script side by side. The silent academic workers in the tradition of Saraswati and Mahabir Prasad Dwivedi remained almost aloof, but made a nationality oriented structure of Hindi language. Rahul Sankrityayan and Dhirendra Verma were two such personalities, the former being rather a mobile propagator as well. Rahul's contribution is in researching and discovering the historicity of the language, whereas, Verma made a spatial and geographical outline of 'Madhyadesh', the area which the Hindi speaking people belong to. This very Madhyadesh was developed later on as 'Hindi Pradesh' by Ram Bilas Sharma, though the thesis being very controversial today. The present research is sticking on the controversy and trying to unfold the unscientific, rather 'imagined' formulations behind it. (Unfolding the "Hindi Pradesh" Controversy. Cited from: http://osdir.com/ml/culture.india.sarai.reader/2005-04/msg00170.html)

2.4.7. Hindi and Urdu in Post-Independent India

The post-independent period in India is treated as most important period from linguistic point of view. After independence the states were re-organized on the basis of linguistic variation and regional distribution. It suggests that the linguistic distribution was one of the major factors for the re-establishment of the different sates of India.

During the 1947-1950 periods, the territories of the princely states were politically integrated into the Indian Union. Most were merged into the existing provinces; others were organized into new provinces, like Rajputana, Himachal Pradesh, Madhya Bharat, and Vindhya Pradesh made up of multiple princely states; a few, including Mysore, Hyderabad, Bhopal, and Bilaspur, became separate provinces. The Government of India Act 1935 remained the constitutional law of India pending adoption of a new Constitution. The Constitution of India, which went into effect on January 26, 1950, made India a sovereign, democratic republic, and a union of states (replacing provinces) and territories. The states would have extensive autonomy and complete democracy in the Union, while the Union territories would be administered
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by the Government of India. The constitution of 1950 distinguished between three types of states.

Part A states, which were the former governors' provinces of British India, were ruled by an elected governor and state legislature. The nine Part A states were Assam, West Bengal, Bihar, Bombay, Madhya Pradesh (formerly Central Provinces and Berar), Madras, Orissa, Punjab, and Uttar Pradesh (formerly United Provinces).

The eight Part B states were former princely states or groups of princely states, governed by a rajpramukh, who was often a former prince, along with an elected legislature. The rajpramukh was appointed by the President of India. The Part B states were Hyderabad, Saurashtra, Mysore, Travancore-Cochin, Madhya Bharat, Vindhya Pradesh, Patiala and East Punjab States Union (PEPSU), and Rajasthan.

The ten Part C states included both the former chief commissioners' provinces and princely states, and were governed by a chief commissioner. The chief commissioner was appointed by the President of India. The Part C states included Delhi, Kutch, Himachal Pradesh, Bilaspur, Coorg, Bhopal, Manipur, Ajmer-Merwara, and Tripura.

Jammu and Kashmir had special status until 1957. The Andaman and Nicobar Islands was established as a union territory, ruled by a lieutenant governor appointed by the central government.

Political movements for the creation of new, linguistic-based states developed around India in the years after independence. The movement to create a Telugu-speaking state out of the northern portion of Madras State gathered strength in the years after independence, and in 1953 the 16 northern Telugu-speaking districts of Madras State became the new State of Andhra.

Other small changes were made to state boundaries during the 1950-1956 periods. The small state of Bilaspur was merged with Himachal Pradesh on July 1, 1954, and
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Chandernagore, a former enclave of French India, was incorporated into West Bengal in 1955.

In December 1953, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru appointed the States Reorganisation Commission to prepare for the creation of states on linguistic lines. This was headed by Justice Fazal Ali and the commission itself was also known as the Fazal Ali Commission. The efforts of this commission were overseen by Govind Ballabh Pant, who served as Home Minister from December 1954. The commission created a report in 1955 recommending the reorganization of India's states.

The States Reorganization Act of 1956, which went into effect on November 1, eliminated the distinction between parts A, B, and C states. It also reorganized the state boundaries and created or dissolved states and union territories.

On November 1, 1956, India was divided into the following states and union territories:

States

"Andhra Pradesh: Andhra was renamed Andhra Pradesh, and enlarged by the addition of the Telangana region of erstwhile Hyderabad State; Assam; Bihar; Bombay State: the state was enlarged by the addition of Saurashtra and Kutch, the Marathi-speaking districts of Nagpur Division of Madhya Pradesh, and the Marathwada region of Hyderabad. The southernmost districts of Bombay were transferred to Mysore State. (In 1960, the state was split into the modern states of Maharashtra and Gujarat); Jammu and Kashmir; Kerala: formed by the merger of Travancore-Cochin state with the Malabar District of Madras State and adding southern part of Travancore (kanyakumari) to Madras state; Madhya Pradesh: Madhya Bharat, Vindhya Pradesh, and Bhopal were merged into Madhya Pradesh, and the Marathi-speaking districts of Nagpur Division were transferred to Bombay State; Madras State: the state was reduced to its present boundaries by the transfer of Malabar District to the new state of Kerala. The southern part of Travancore (kanyakumari district) was added to the state. (The state was renamed Tamil Nadu
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in 1969); **Mysore State:** enlarged by the addition of Coorg state and the **Kannada** speaking districts from southern Bombay state and western **Hyderabad state.** (The state was renamed **Karnataka** in 1973); **Orissa:** enlarged by the addition of 28 princely states including two princely states of Saraikela and Kharsawan, but later these two states merged with Bihar; **Punjab:** the Patiala and East Punjab States Union (PEPSU) was merged into Punjab; **Rajasthan:** Rajputana was renamed Rajasthan; **Uttar Pradesh; West Bengal.**

**Union territories**

Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Delhi, Himachal Pradesh, Lakshadweep, Pondicherry, Tripura and Manipur.

In 1953, the movement that led to the creation of the state of Andhra Pradesh. This act was consistent with Gandhi's wishes and with established Congress policy. After Andhra, the Government of India set up a States Reorganization Committee (SRC). Its report, submitted in 1955, pretty much conceded that India would be reorganized according to linguistic provinces. But some ticklish questions remained. The most serious was the future of India's most prosperous city, Bombay. Would it go to Maharashtra, since it had more Marathi speakers than speakers of other languages, and since the areas contiguous to it would anyway form part of the state? Or would it go to Gujarat, since the Gujaratis had invested so heavily in its development? Or, since there were many other linguistic groups in Bombay, would it be constituted as some kind of autonomous, multicultural city-state? The question of Bombay's future came up for discussion in the Lok Sabha on November 15, 1955. Strongly pushing the city-state alternative was the Marathi-speaking M.P. from Bombay, S.K. Patil. His city, said Patil, had a "cosmopolitan population in every respect; it had been built upon the labor of everybody." It was, he continued, cosmopolitan in theory as well as in practice: here "everybody thinks in terms of common citizenship." This is what Patil said in Parliament, and he later expanded on the theme in a newspaper interview. The prospective city-state of Bombay, he told the paper, would "be a miniature India run on international standards ... (A) melting pot which will evolve a glorious new civilization ... And it is an extraordinary coincidence that the
population of the city should be exactly one per cent of the population of the whole
country. This one per cent drawn from all parts of the country will set the pace for
other states in the practice of secularism and mutual understanding." Patil asked the
Maharashtrians to give up their claim on Bombay in the spirit of compromise. The
plea was rejected in ringing tones by the M.P. from Pune, N.V. Gadgil. Speaking
immediately after Patil in the Lok Sabha, Gadgil insisted that while he was in favor
of compromise, "there is a limit. That limit is, nobody can compromise one's self-
respect, no woman can compromise her chastity and no country its freedom." The
reports of protest meetings should make it clear "that anything short of Samyukta
Maharashtra with the city of Bombay as capital will not be acceptable." If these
sentiments went unheeded, warned Gadgil, then the future of Bombay would be
decided on the streets of Bombay. The Maharashtrians were being urged to accept
the loss of Bombay in the name of national unity. Gadgil protested against this
unsubtle attempt at blackmail. The last 150 years, he said, had seen Maharashtrians
contributing selflessly to the growth of national feeling. Marathi speakers founded
the first schools and universities, and helped found the Indian National Congress.
The Mahrattas were "the pioneers of violent action" against the British. Later, in the
early 20th Century, when the Congress party languished, "who was it that brought in
new life? Who propounded the new tenets and new philosophy? It was Lokmanya
Tilak. In the Home Rule movement he led and in the 1920 movement we were
behind none and ahead of many provinces ... I will merely quote the certificate given
to us by no less a person than Mahatma Gandhi that Maharashtra is the beehive of
(national) workers". Even now, in independent India, it was a Maharashtrian,
Vinoba Bhave, who was "carrying the flag of Gandhian philosophy and spreading
his message from place to place".

Other States - Assam

In the case of Andhra Pradesh, the minority consists of Urdu speakers centered in
the state's capital, Hyderabad, where nearly 40 percent (some 1.7 million people in
1991) of the population speak that language. Linguistic affinity did not form a firm
basis for unity between the two regions from which the state had been formed
because they were separated by cultural and economic differences. Although there
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were riots in the late 1960s and early 1970s in support of the formation of two separate states, the separation did not occur.

The violence that broke out in the state of Assam in the early 1980s reflected the complexities of linguistic and ethnic politics in India. The state has a significant number of Bengali-speaking Muslims -- immigrants and their descendants who began settling the region in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The Muslims came in response to a British-initiated colonization plan to bring under cultivation land left fallow by the Assamese. By the 1931 census, the Assamese not only had lost a hefty portion of their land but also had become a disadvantaged minority in their traditional homeland. They represented less than 33 percent of the total population of Assam, and the Muslim immigrants (who accounted for roughly 25 percent of the population) dominated commerce and the government bureaucracy.

Assamese-Bengali rioting started in 1950, and in the 1951 census many Bengalis listed Assamese as their native tongue in an effort to placate the Assamese. Further immigration of Bengali speakers after the formation of Bangladesh in 1971 and a resurgence of pro-Bengali feeling among earlier immigrants and their descendants reawakened Assamese fears of being outnumbered. Renewed violence in the early and mid-1980s was sufficiently serious for the central government to avoid holding general elections in Assam during December 1984.

Punjab

In the compound of Amritsar's Golden Temple, holy of holies to India's 6,000,000 Sikhs, long lines of tall, bearded and turbaned Sikh men and slender Sikh women passed slowly by a small wooden hut.

When they reached the hut, each Sikh dropped a coin or a bill in an offering box, and then peered through a tiny glass window. Inside, on a hard mattress, laid Sant Fateh Singh, 50-year-old Sikh holy man. While doctors and disciples stood anxious watch, Sant Fateh Singh was carrying on a hunger strike. Its aim: to compel the
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Indian government to create a separate linguistic state in the Punjab, traditional home of the Sikhs.

In May, 1960 the Indian government arrested the Sikhs' wily political leader, Master Tara Singh, for advocating a Sikh march on New Delhi to demand statehood. Before disappearing behind prison walls, Tara Singh designated Sant Fateh Singh as his successor. For weeks stretching into months, young Sikhs, shouting "Punjabi Suba Zindabad" (Long live Punjabi state), had poured out of the Golden Temple at Amritsar and the Sikh temple at New Delhi—into the waiting arms of tough Indian police, who hustled them off to prison. At one time India's overburdened detention camps held 20,000 Sikhs. About the last week of December, 1960 Sant Fateh Singh decided that even more effort was required to force a grant of separate statehood. A husky 260-pounder, he announced that he was embarking on a "fast unto death," would take water but no food of any kind until New Delhi gave in. By last week the holy man was down to 243 lbs., and daily health bulletins, issued with Jim Hagerty-like detail, were emphasizing the presence of ketones in the urine, indicating imminent uremic poisoning.

For India's Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, keeping in anxious touch with developments while making a tour of Uttar Pradesh, the fast—and the whole Sikh effort—presented a number of galling ironies. In the first place, fasting as a political weapon was developed by Nehru's nationalist mentor, Mahatma Gandhi, but is now regarded by New Delhi as in bad taste. Secondly, to justify keeping Master Tara Singh in jail without proof of crime, Nehru a month ago had to insist on a further extension of the same Preventive-Detention Act passed originally under British rule to allow the imprisonment of Gandhi, Nehru himself and other Indian freedom fighters. After, the bill was rammed through by a 165-10-33 vote, loud cries of "Shame! Shame!" reverberated in the Lower House chamber.

Finally, the Sikh demand for a separate state is an embarrassing end result of Nehru's own mistakes. After the Prime Minister backed down spring and allowed the division of Bombay State between the Marathi and Gujarati language groups, the Punjabi-speaking Sikhs became the only one of India's 14 major constitutionally
The intensity of anti-Hindi protests created concern among the Congress leaders. On 31 January 1965, a group of leaders including S. Nijalingappa, Chief minister of Mysore, Atulya Ghosh, Bengal Congress leader, Sanjeeva Reddy, Union Minister and K. Kamaraj, the Congress president met in Bangalore and issued an appeal not to force Hindi on non-Hindi speaking areas as they believed it might endanger the unity of the country.

Congress leader Morarji Desai said that by learning Hindi, Tamil people will increase their influence in India. He regretted that Hindi was not made official before the anti-Hindi protests crystallized. He said Congress leaders in Madras should convince people there and no regional sentiments should come in the move to forge the integration of the country.

On 11 February 1965, after the resignation of two Union ministers from madras, Lal Bahadur Shastri announced in All India Radio that he would fully honor Nehru's assurances that English would be used as long as people wanted. He also gave the following assurances regarding the languages. Some of them are: (1) every state will have completed and unfettered freedom to continue to transact its own business in the language of its own choice, which may be the regional language or English. (2) Communications between one States to another will either be in English or will be accompanied by authentic English translation. (3) The non-Hindi states will be free to correspond with the Central Government in English and no change will be made in this arrangement without the consent of the non-Hindi States. (4) In the transaction of business at the Central level, English will continue to be used. (5) All India Civil Services examination would continue to be conducted in English rather than in Hindi alone.
2.5. Conclusion

Any language of the world can be used for many purposes. Although language are not empty vessels— they carry a lot of baggage in the form of cultural literary heritage, concept, collective memories, etc., they may nevertheless be put to the most contradictory use by their speakers and writers.

In the backdrop of Hindi-Urdu controversy, the present research attempts to find out the changing linguistic attitude of both of these communities. In the Labovian sociolinguistic paradigm, there is the notion of covert prestige of certain linguistic forms, which explains why certain Urdu expressions persist despite attempts to eradicate, stigmatize, or extirpate them. With regard to certain forms, e.g. Urdu (q) forms all subjects positively evaluate this pronunciation, even those who do not use it themselves, had its supportive theories. The attitudinal results of the present study will be presented in the following chapters.