From Hindi to Urdu
A Social and Political History

From Hindi to Urdu
A Social and Political History

TARIQ RAHMAN

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

DEDICATED TO
Wife, companion and friend of thirty years
HANA
And children
Son-in-law Atif, daughter Tania and son Fahad

لوگوں کوں جب کھول بتاویں

ہندی میں کہہ کر سمجھاویں

Lōgõ kõ jab khōl batāvẽ

Hindī mẽ kaēh kar samjhavẽ

(When they explain clearly to the people

It is in Hindi that they speak to make them understand)

Tarīkh-ē-Gharībī, 1170 Hijri/1756–57

وہ اردو کیا ہے یہ ہندی زباں ہے

کہ جس کا قائل اب سارا جہاں ہے

Vo Urdū kyā haē yē Hindī zubã haē

Ke jis ka qā'el ab sarā jahã haē

(What that 'Urdu'? It is the Hindi language

Which now the whole world acknowledges)

Pir Murad Shah 1203/1788–89

Contents

Preface and Acknowledgements

This book has taken me to some of the major cities of Pakistan including Karachi and Lahore and four countries: England, France, Germany, and India. It made me learn the Devanagari script on my own and Persian from the Khana-e-Farhang in Rawalpindi at the age of fifty-eight. It made me study sources in Urdu, Persian, Pashto, and Hindi and even get works in Chaghtai Turkish, French and German translated for myself. In short, in about five years of fairly intensive and extensive study, it took me to hitherto uncharted intellectual regions making me almost give up in despair and regret that I had bitten more than I could chew. Indeed, I had no idea of what kind of work this book would entail otherwise I might never have started it in the first place.

The book began in September 2005 although I had started thinking about it during my stay at the University of California, Berkeley as the first incumbent of the Pakistan Chair in 2004–05. This was a period of growth in the universities of Pakistan and the Higher Education Commission (HEC), presided over by Dr Atta ur Rahman, was flush with money and encouraged academics to submit research proposals. As I had never received any funding before, except airfare once in 1993 from the University Grants Commission, I had no hopes of getting funding for the project of writing a social history of Urdu. However, I applied. And, in two years, I did get funding for which I am most grateful to the HEC. But the story of how this funding came through, is instructive, if for no other reason than to make donors change their ways. Briefly, my experience was excellent as far as the top leadership of the HEC is concerned but very painful as far as the middle-ranking bureaucracy is concerned. Let me elaborate.

Firstly, the middle-level officials of the HEC regretted that they had no allocations for books. Projects—yes; books—no! Upon this, I resubmitted the proposal as a project. Secondly, I applied for something more than Rs 700,000 and got Rs 400,000. As it happened, the expenditure, not counting the money I got for fellowships at Oxford and Heidelberg, came to something close to Rs 750,000 so that all the expenditure, over and above the money from the HEC, came out of the family savings. Thirdly, and most importantly, it took two years for the funds to be released. Even this delay could be endured because of bureaucratic red-tapism but the strange demands upon me, which are described below, were unendurable. For instance, one referee declared that I was working like Don Quixote and that such a history should be written in collaboration with such institutions as the National Language Authority. Moreover, said the same sage, there was no need for me to go to India or England. The material was all available in Pakistan. From this I guessed that the writer of the report was a scholar of Urdu literature who had no idea that most of the reports, private papers of British officers and other sources necessary for writing a sociolinguistic and political history of Urdu were scattered over Indian and British archives. Later, of course, I discovered that they were also in other European countries.

The referee also insisted that the 'project' be finished in one year or a maximum of two and the HEC officials added that the product should be published by them. I had to turn down both conditions. The book would take five or six years I told them and, as HEC could not distribute the books as well as an academic press, nor did it command prestige as a publisher, I would try my luck with a prestigious academic press once it was over. I did, of course, agree that they could stop their funding after two years or whenever they wished but the book would go on. After several such acerbic exchanges, possibly because of my complaints about delay and no response to letters, the HEC told

me that the project could not be funded. It was now that I made a personal appeal to Dr Sohail Naqvi and I thank him most sincerely for having intervened and got the funds released—though, regrettably, after a reduction of nearly Rs300,000.

Anyway, during the two years of wrangling with the HEC, I kept collecting research material and reading. The National Documentation Centre in the Cabinet Division in Islamabad had some very useful material as did the Punjab University Library and the Anjuman Taraqqi-e-Urdu in Karachi. However, I had to see the material in the British Library in London. As personal savings were not adequate the only option was to stay with friends—Dr Rashid and Dr Ghazala Bhatti—in Oxford and travel daily on the Oxford Tube (the name of a long-distance bus which they call a 'coach' in England) to London. So this is what I decided to do and, as a gamble, requested the Oxford University Press for the return ticket to England. Much to my surprise—since I had made clear I might never write the book after all—Mrs Ameena Saiyid sent me money for the ticket. Even more surprisingly, the price of the ticket came down (yes, they do sometimes) and when I offered to return the leftover money she very graciously told me to use it for research.

But, of course, the money for travelling, photocopying and occasional meals etc., came from the family savings. The understanding was that when these Rs 100,000 (about £700) come to an end I would return to Pakistan. Well, they came to an end just when I had figured out what to look for in the Oriental and India Office Collections of the British Library in London. At the Bodleian I spent only a week and barely touched the surface so to speak.

Then came the trip to India in January 2008. By then the money from the HEC had come in so, for once, the trip was comfortable and I am grateful to the donors for it. I am also grateful to the Indian embassy which gave me a non-police reporting visa of six cities. I found excellent research material

at the Nehru Memorial Library in Delhi, the Aligarh Muslim University Library, the Rampur Raza Library, and above all, the Andhra Pradesh Archives in Hyderabad. I cannot find words to thank Tanmoy Roychoudhary and Ketaki Bose of the Orient Blackswan Press, my publishers in India, for their warm hospitality and logistic support. I also thank Professor Ravinder Gargesh, then in charge of the Delhi University Guest House, for having made our stay (my wife Rehana and daughter, Tania accompanied me) a real pleasure. So I returned from India with loads of research material and very warm memories.

The HEC funding, inadequate as it was, came to an end by 2008 but luckily a great breakthrough occurred. I was given a fellowship at the Oxford Centre for Islamic Studies for the Trinity Term (18 January to 15 March 2010). This was the first time I really discovered the riches of the Bodleian Library. Indeed, there was such an abundance of research material that I did not undertake the daily journey to London on the Oxford Tube which had exhausted me so much in July 2006. But for this stay at Oxford, this book would be inadequate and weak. I, therefore, thank the Director of the Centre, Dr Farhan Nizami, and the committee which awarded me this fellowship for this significant contribution to my research. I also thank Mrs Nighat Malik and my friend Dr Iftikhar Malik for being such good neighbours and entertaining friends during our stay at Oxford. Indeed, if Mrs Malik had not given us a flat belonging to Worcester College my wife and I would have been on the streets. At Oxford, I must thank Dr Adeel Malik and Dr Talib who put in a lot of colour in that unusually chilly Oxford winter. Of course, my old friend Chandramohan, as usual, stands out for having given us the warm hospitality of his house and very pleasant company at Oxford, Canterbury and London. Our other friends of my student days—Riaz, Laiqa, Dave, and Billy—also met us and made us feel wonderful. And, above all, our daughter Tania and her husband Atif visited us and we visited them. Indeed, I thank Atif and his

family for providing us a second home in England. In short, there was much fun being in England with my wife as in the old days when we had set up our first house after marriage in 1982.

After Oxford the book had taken shape but I knew Germany had some manuscripts of Urdu I had not seen. So I applied for and got a research fellowship from DAAD tenable at the University of Heidelberg. The fellowships are for longer periods but I had requested them to reduce it to a month because I was in a hurry to finish the book and I thought Germany would not have much material beyond the manuscripts. But Lo and Behold! The South Asia Centre at Heidelberg had material which amazed me. So, instead of looking leisurely at a few manuscripts, I worked hard for a month and so the book—despite its inadequacies—finally came to an end in August 2010, i.e. five years after it began.

I take this opportunity to thank people who either helped me find research material or let me use their libraries. First, our extremely competent librarian at the National Institute of Pakistan Studies, Mr Tahir Naqvi, who miraculously procured almost every rare book I asked for; then Dr Shahid Kamal for sending me some rare books from Karachi and helping me find material in the library of the University of Karachi; Dr Saleem Mazhar, Director of the Centre for South Asian Studies at the Punjab University, gave me his own work in Persian on Khan-e-Arzu and helped me find very useful material from the Shirani Collection of the Punjab University, Lahore; Dr Hanif Khalil, Assistant Professor of Pashto at NIPS, who found some rare Pashto works for me. Professor Fateh Mohammad Malik and Iftikhar Arif who generously gave me material on Urdu from the National Language Authority and allowed me to use the library.

I now come to translators: my greatest debt is to Dr Jawad Hamadani who actually spent hours teaching me some of the relevant Persian classics and then checked my translations for

correctness; Dr Hanif Khalil who translated some lines from Pashto and checked my translations of other lines; Mr Harun Koken who checked lines from the autobiography of Babar in Chaghtai Turkish; Dr Vaishna Narang who transliterated lines from Old Hindi, Dr Anand Mishra who translated them for me and Gautam Liu who wrote them for me in the Devanagari script in Heidelberg. I also thank my colleague, Dr Azam Chaudhary, for translating background material for me from German to English. But for these translators the book would not have been completed.

The book was word-processed by Mr Yousaf Khan, my part-time secretary, who has worked loyally with me for the past ten years. I owe him a debt of gratitude for his hard work and patience as the book took shape over the last five years. I also thank the Oxford University Press, especially Mrs Ameena Saiyid, its Managing Director, who published the book and especially for permitting Orient Blackswan for publishing it in India. I especially thank Miss Manal Shakir for her efficient editing of the book. I am also grateful to all the unknown and silent workers in the press who brought the book into being.

In the end I would like to thank my family for their cooperation and appreciation of my work. Tania for having made me addicted to India soap operas which enabled me to write about their language. Fahad for encouraging me in various ways, including his insistence that I actually enjoyed studying and writing and that this could hardly be normal. And above all, my wife Hana, but for whom the book could never have been completed. For it was not only the extra money which she never grudged me for this hobby but the emotional support and the constant reassurance that I could finish it and that I need not give up.

After the painful experience with funding this time I intend not to rely on donors. I used to write as a hobby with my savings and this is what I intend to do again. Of course, ones' savings are never enough for a big project but I am at the fag end of my

research career and I do not intend to compromise my self-respect by submitting a proposal unless the donor is one who can give funding with respect and without inordinate delay. Obviously that is not the way to create a research culture in the country but that is something academic managers and donors should bother about.

FUNDING FOR THE BOOK

Head of Expenditure	Donor	Amount
Air ticket (July 2006) to the UK and back	Oxford University Press	Rs67,000
Trip to India and research Pakistan (2 years)	Higher Education Commission	Rs430,043
One-term stay at Oxford	Oxford Centre for Islamic Studies University of Oxford.	£4,000
One-month stay at the University of Heidelberg	DAAD	€2,820
NB: Expenses out of personal income, such as the first stay in England in July 2006, the ticket for the trip to Oxford in 2010, photocopying, secretarial assistance for five years etc has not been calculated but comes roughly to Rs 350,000. At this time Rs 85 is equivalent to 1 USD.		

Abbreviations

A	Arabic (derived ultimately from the Arabic language)
AA	Andhra Archives, Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh, India
AH	Al-Hijra (Islamic calendar). Where there are two dates the one which comes before the slashes is this whereas that after the slash is the Common Era date, i.e. AH/CE
AU	*Akhbar-e-Urdu*, Islamabad: National Language Authority
AUS	*Annual of Urdu Studies*
Bod	Bodleian Library, University of Oxford
c.	Circa
F	Farsi (derived from the Persian language)
H	Hindi (derived from Sanskrit or one of the varieties of the greater Hindi language)
Hdl	Library of the University of Heidelberg, Germany
IOR	India Office Records (dates, numbers of documents, etc., are parenthetically embedded in the text)
KP	Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (new name for former North West Frontier Province)
LAD-B	Legislative Assembly Debates of East Bengal (the exact references are given parenthetically in the text)
n.d.	No date
NDC	National Documentation Centre, Cabinet Division, Islamabad
NLA	National Language Authority (*Muqtadrā Qaumī Zubān*)
n.pag.	No pagination
OIOC	Oriental and India Office Collections, the British Library, London
PO	*Pakistan Observer* [English daily from Dhaka]
Punj	Punjabi language (derived from or found now in Punjabi)

PBUH   'Peace Be Upon Him)—used by Muslims for respect towards Prophet Muhammad
RRL   Rampur Raza Library, Rampur, UP, India

Translation and Transliteration

Translations from several languages—Turkish, Sanskritized Hindi, Arabic, and Pashto—were made by translators. The passages from Persian, Punjabi, Siraiki, spoken Hindi in the Devanagari script, and Urdu were translated by the author unless otherwise indicated. Most, except Urdu, were shown for verification to people competent in these languages and scripts.

The pronunciation of Persian and Arabic texts is that of Urdu speakers and not that of Iranians or Arabs. As the primary readership of this book is of scholars of South Asia, familiar words and names of persons and places have been transliterated using ordinary Roman letters unless the pronunciation is considered ambiguous or unfamiliar. Titles of books and quotations have, however, been transliterated using the symbols given below.

Symbols commonly used for Urdu, Hindi and Persian sounds. The Urdu pronunciation is used even if the letters (graphemes) are borrowed from Arabic or Persian.

Ā   as in ask (nasalized as ã).
Ē   as in Urdu/pet/=stomach (half high front vowel)
       (ē̃ nasalized).
Ī   as in s<u>ea</u>t (ĩ nasalized).
Ō   as in Urdu/log/=people (half high back vowel)
       (õ nasalized).
Ū   as in b<u>oo</u>t (ũ nasalized).
<u>Kh</u>   as in Scottish lo<u>ch</u>/lox/(خ)
<u>gh</u>   as in Af<u>gh</u>anistan (velar fricative/ɣ/or غ)

z	ض	ز	ذ	ظ	(/z/voiced alveolar fricative)
s	ث	ص	س		(/s/unvoiced alveolar fricative)
q	ق				(/q/unvoiced uvular stop)
t	ت	ط			(/ṱ/unvoiced dental stop)

Symbols used for retroflex sounds in South Asian Languages

ڑ	ṛ	ڑھ	r̲h̲
ڈ	ḍ	ڈھ	d̲h̲
ٹ	ṭ	ٹھ	t̲h̲

Symbols used for Arabic Sounds

و   As a Persian/Urdu conjunction is transliterated as (-o) whereas as an Arabic conjunction و is transliterated as (wa).

‘   as in Arabic pronunciation of ‘Ali (glottal stop). This is used to show orthography

’   *hamza* ء (in Arabic it represents the glottal stop and is used for the pause between two vowels. Its use varies according to its position, i.e. initial, medial and final. For South Asian speakers of Urdu and other languages it functions like a vowel i.e. schwa or/ə/). This is not used except in quotations.

Usage of Oriental Words in this book

Words commonly used in contemporary writings in English are written without the use of the orthographical symbols given in this chart unless they are in a quotation or part of a title.

Examples are:

Word	Usage in this book
ʿālim	alim
ʿulemā	ulema
Bhāshā	Bhasha
g̱hazal	ghazal
Hadīth	Hadis
Hindī	Hindi
Jihād	jihad
Kharī Bōlī	Khari Boli
madrassā	madrassa
Maōlvī	Maulvi
Maulānā	Maulana
Munshī	Munshi
Qurʾān	Quran
Rēkhtā	Rekhta
Sāhib	Sahib
Sūfī	Sufi
Urdū	Urdu

1

Introduction

From the thirteenth till the end of the eighteenth century the name of the language we now call Urdu was mostly Hindi. Other names were also used (see Chapter 2) but this was the name which most people used for this language. But then it was not *this* language. Firstly, because languages change naturally. And, secondly, because the language mostly called Hindi for about five hundred years was the ancestor of two languages: modern Urdu and Hindi. Modern Urdu was created not only by natural change but also human agency as, indeed, was modern Hindi. This book narrates the story of how this happened. And this narrative unfolds by tracing out the use of Urdu in social domains: education, courts, administration, entertainment, media, religion, and so on. That is why it is a social history and, since all these uses feed into politics, it is also a political history of Urdu.

At present Urdu is the national language of Pakistan, a symbol of Muslim identity in (north) India and a widely spoken language among the South Asian diaspora spread all over the world. In its spoken form it is so similar to spoken Hindi that, in fact, it has far more second-language users than the numbers of its mother-tongue speakers would suggest. Here is what the *Ethnologue* tells us:

Speakers of Conversational Urdu/Hindi		
	Mother Tongue Speakers	**Second Language Speakers**
Hindi	366,000,000	487,000,000
Urdu	60,290,000	104,000,000
Total	426,290,000	591,000,000
Grand Total: Mother tongue + second language speakers of Urdu-Hindi = 1,017,290,000. Source: Gordon 2005: see under 'Pakistan' and 'India' entries.		

Mother tongue speakers of Urdu are about 7.4 per cent of the total population of Pakistan (Census-P 2001) while mother tongue speakers of Hindi are 41.03 per cent and those of Urdu 5.01 per cent of the population of India (Census-I 2001: Statement-4, p. 13).

The spoken form, which is popularized by Bollywood and Indian and Pakistani TV plays and songs, can be heard on the streets of Delhi, Karachi, Lahore, and even Dubai. And Hindi films are available in Afghanistan, UK, USA, Zambia, Botswana, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, and Fiji. It is also taught, both in the Urdu and the Hindi varieties, in major universities of the world. And coming down to the level of the common people, it is the most preferred language of inscriptions in Pakistan. About 75 per cent of the inscriptions on Pakistani trucks, plying day and night all over the roads of Pakistan, from Karachi to Kabul, Quetta to Lahore and Gilgit to the Neelam Valley, are in Urdu. Even Pashto, the language of most of the drivers of these trucks, is used only on 14 per cent of them while Punjabi, otherwise the language of 44.15 per cent of Pakistanis, is used only on 10 per cent of trucks; Sindhi, with 14.10 per cent mother-tongue speakers, has a paltry share of 1 per cent as far as inscriptions on trucks are concerned. Balochi and Brahvi are found with great effort and percentages cannot be calculated (Rahman 2010: 277). In short, if the choice of language to write inscriptions is an

indicator of the dissemination of Urdu, then it is certainly the most widespread language of Pakistan among ordinary people connected with business activities especially in the transportation sector.

And, while much more widespread because of the modern means of communications than ever before, some variety of this language has been a lingua franca over much of the subcontinent, longer than any other language. For instance, a Marathi document informs us that the runners and news-gatherers (*harkārās*) in eighteenth century Maratha kingdoms were supposed to know five languages, one of which was 'Avidhi'—one of the dialects of 'Hindi' and possibly the name given to the commonly used variety of the languages of the Hindi belt used in Maharashtra (Quoted from Bayly 1996: 64). And, earlier literature from Gujarat, the Deccan, and even from the Punjab and what is now northern Pakistan, bear witness to the wide area over which unstandardised, mutually intelligible varieties of a language, which can be called 'Hindi-Urdu', were spread out unevenly even before the British spread the standardized varieties systematically.

At present the names of this ancient language are Urdu and Hindi. However, the term 'Hindustani'—used mostly by the British for this language—is still used for the spoken language of the popular, urban culture of North India and Pakistan. George Grierson, the pioneer of the modern scientific study of the languages of South Asia, defines these terms as follows:

> Hindōstānī is primarily the language of the Upper Gangetic Doab, and is also the *lingua franca* of India, capable of being written in both Persian and Dēvanāgarī characters, and without purism, avoiding alike the excessive use of either Persian or Sanskrit words when employed for literature. The name 'Urdu' can then be confined to that special variety of Hindōstānī in which Persian words are of frequent occurrence, and which hence can only be written in the Persian character, and, similarly, 'Hindi' can be confined to the form

of Hindōstānī in which Sanskrit words abound, and which hence can
only be written in the Dēvanāgarī character (Grierson Vol. 3: 47).

These definitions, coming from the British period, are as valid
today as they were in the early twentieth century. However, the
term Hindustani is not used much in either India or Pakistan.
That was the middle ground which has been lost, and what has
replaced it are the names for the opposite ends of the continuum:
Hindi and Urdu. These standardized varieties, Sanskritized Hindi
and Perso-Arabicised Urdu, diverge so much from each other at
the higher, more learned, levels that they are almost unintelligible
for the speakers of the other variety. That is why modern Urdu
and Hindi are considered different languages even by linguistic
historians (Rai 1984: 288; Jain 2005: 259) who describe their
common ancestry.

   Both the standardized varieties, like all other big languages,
are actually made up of area-bound (dialects) or class-bound
(sociolects) varieties as well as styles and registers. Thus the
term Hindi is also used for the sum total of its varieties which
are fifty, excluding the term 'Hindi' itself, in the Census of 2001.
Out of these the major dialects are: Bhojpuri (33,099,497
speakers); Chattisgarhi (13,260,186); Magadhi (13,978,565);
Rajasthani (18,355,613); Mewari (5,091,697); Bundeli (3,072,147);
Awadhi (2,529,308); Marwari (7,936,183); and Khortha (4,725,927)
(Census-I 2001: Statement-1, part-A, p. 3). And Urdu has Dakhini,
Lakhnawi Urdu, Dehlavi, Bambayya Urdu, Pakistani Urdu, and
several sub-varieties of the language (some described in Grierson
Vol. 3). Thus, what one means when one uses the words Urdu or
Hindi, varies from context to context and speaker to speaker.

   In this book the term Urdu will be used for that variety of
Hindustani (in Grierson's meaning of the word) which is written
in the Perso-Arabic script and the learned and formal registers
of which borrow terms from Persian and Arabic. The terms
Hindi-Urdu (or Urdu-Hindi) will be used for the ancestor of

modern Hindi and Urdu which went by several names, which will be mentioned later. It is also used for the language shared between urban Pakistan and North India—indeed, all major cities of South Asia—which goes by the name of 'Hindi' in the Bollywood films but used to be called 'Hindustani' before 1947. In my view, because it eschews difficult words from Persian, Arabic and Sanskrit, it is closer to the real, living speech of urban people in North India and Pakistan. It does, of course, have words of Sanskritic and Perso-Arabic origin but these have been nativized and assimilated in the language for centuries. A list of 5,500 such words, based on the existing dictionaries of Urdu, Hindi and Hindustani is available thanks to the scholarly work of Agnieszka kuczkiewicz-Fras (2008), which illustrates how deeply these words have penetrated the ancestor of our languages and how indispensable they have become. Indeed, they are part of the common language of North Indian and Pakistani cities. It is the language we hear in the soap operas of India and Pakistan and the lilting strains of music South Asians love, whether in the semi-desert expanses of Rajasthan and Bahawalpur or the marriage halls of Houston, Bradford and London.

This book is a social history of Urdu including Urdu-Hindi in both its meanings. Despite Shamsur Rahman Faruqi's warning that the term 'Old Urdu' is linguistically and historically incorrect (Faruqi 1999: 11), it is a convenient term to use for the variety of language which evolved into modern Urdu and Hindi. Of course it was called Hindvi and Hindi and by other names but this term (Old Urdu) will be used sometimes if it helps us in understanding certain developments.

But, first things first, 'what is a social history'? Is it the description of the reflection of society in literary works? If so, the poetic genre called *shahr ashōb* in Urdu would be an excellent way of writing such a history. These poems record the devastation and decline of cities and the civilization which was associated with them (Aqil 2008: 72–73). One could also record the political

response to the events of 1857—called the mutiny till nationalist historiography started calling it 'the war of independence', sometime from 1910 onwards. See Rahman 2009—or the effect of nationalism or the freedom movement on Urdu literature. This kind of work has already been done by Moinuddin Aqil in *Taēhrīk-ē -Azādī Mẽ Urdū kā Hissā* (2008). But the present work is not a history of Urdu literature; it is a social and political history of the language. By social history I mean a historical reconstruction of the events and processes which preceded and led to the use of Urdu in such social domains as governance, judiciary, education, media, and entertainment. But mere chronological recording of events and processes is only one aspect of this undertaking. More importantly I will attempt to understand the effects of the use of Urdu in the domains mentioned above. All such uses had important effects upon the construction and perception of identity, political mobilization and the distribution of goods and services. In short, the historical narrative is not a mere record of facts and perceptions. It is meant to be a nuanced analysis of what happens when a language is used in certain social domains. The reality which emerges is so complex as to defy any neat categorization or analysis in terms of relationships between variables. What one can hope for is to find tentative answers to the following questions.

What ideological and political purposes do theories about the origin and age of the language serve? What is its identity? Is it a Muslim language or the product of the composite culture of the Hindus and Muslims of North India? Is it the language of romantic love and eroticism? Or is it the language of Islam and right-wing political ideologues? How did it replace Persian as the official language of the princely states of India? How was it used in the domains of education, media and film?

There are many scholars who have attempted to answer questions about the origins (Shirani 1930; Malik et al., 2006), names (Faruqi 1999: 11–38 and 2003: 805–812; Shirani 1926 in

1965: 1–9;) and linguistic reform of Urdu (Bilgrami 1884) and the association of the language with Islam and erotica. But this book is not so much interested in answering these questions for themselves. Rather, these questions will be answered with reference to social and political factors: the construction of identity, especially Muslim identity, and its political repercussions. For instance, the antiquity and origin of Urdu relate to its identity (essence) as a composite legacy of the Hindu and Muslim civilization of North India or, alternatively, as a Muslim preserve. Standardization also relates to the same perceptions about the identity of the language. The identity of the language, in turn, feeds into notions about the identity of its users. They may be seen as being Muslim', 'Pakistani nationalist' or 'urban' at different periods of history. Whether the amorous and erotic associations of Urdu are suppressed or not depends upon which identity perception of its users is favoured. Similarly, the use of Urdu in social domains mentioned above is closely related to the formation of Hindu and Muslim communal identities and their struggle for supremacy during the British period.

This study is not limited to any specific period but the focus being the use of Urdu in social domains, especially when modernity impinged upon the subcontinent, there is more emphasis upon British India than upon medieval or post-partition South Asia. This is especially useful because the relationship of Urdu with identity-formation and its political repercussions developed during this period and we are still experiencing the effects.

While the field of social history is a familiar one—there being classical studies of the social history of England (Trevelyan 1942), the formation of the British working class (Thompson 1963) and the whole subaltern school of Indian history (Guha 1981–9)—the present author has come across only a few books purporting to be social histories of language in the sense that they focus on the use of language in social domains. Burke and Porter's edited book

with that title, *The Social History of Language* (1987), is meant to fill the 'gap between linguistics, sociology (including social anthropology) and history, a gap which can and should be filled by the social historian of language' (Burke and Porter 1987: 1). But the main contributions to this book are on the use of language in society such as insults, etc. Other social or cultural histories of languages are also concerned with the interests of sociolinguists: standardization, the deployment of prestigious features in conversation (pronunciation), varieties of language, social class, and language, etc. In a cultural history of English, Knowles raises such 'issues as languages in contact, the development of literacy and new text types, and the relationship between standard language and dialects' (Knowles 1979: 1). In another cultural history of English, Bailey traces out the history of the standardization of the language and such things as 'myths about its correct use' (Bailey 1992). One book purporting itself to be the social history of American English is a study of the development of the varieties of American English. While it refers to the influence of immigration, transportation (railroads) and the rough living of the frontier (gambling, drinking, etc.), the focus remains the lexicon or other linguistic features. There is little reference to the social processes and institutions which use language and how other non-linguistic features like identity, ideology and economy, etc., are related to it (Dillard 1985). However, another book entitled *A Social History of English* (Leith 1983), is indeed a history of the changing patterns of the use of the language, its imposition and spread and its standardization and role in the world. These are some of the grounds the present study covers but, since it is also a political study, it tilts towards the political repercussions of such phenomena. Even more than Dick Leith, Knowles covers ground which is intended to be covered in this book. He looks at the role of printing and the role of English as a language of opposition to church and state in the

fourteenth century (Knowles 1979: 63–65). These are concerns which inform this book.

Of course the number of studies on the use of a language in one or more domains of a society are legion. An exemplar is Nicholas Ostler's *Empires of the Word* (2005). The author traces out languages which spread over vast areas and influenced a large number of people. The approach is that of macro-history though the author does not use that term. Speaking about the analytical category of language he says:

> The language point of view on history can be contrasted with the genetic approach to human history, which is currently revolutionising our view of our distant past. Like membership in a biological species and a matrilineal lineage if its mother is in that lineage. Likewise, at the most basic level, you are a member of a language community if you can use its language (Ostler 2005: 8).

In his other book, *A Biography of Latin* (2007), Ostler traces out a history, including its social dimension, of Latin. In a very crucial passage he says:

> Languages create worlds to live in, not just in the minds of their speakers, but in their lives, and their descendants' lives, where those ideas become real. The world that Latin created is today called Europe. And as Latin formed Europe, it also inspired the Americas. Latin has in fact been the constant in the cultural history of the West, extending over two millennia. In a way, it has been too central to be noticed: like the air Europe breathed, it has pervaded everything (Ostler 2007: 20).

The history of the promotion of Hebrew in Israel is another case in point (Rabin 1973; Fellman 1974). Indeed, such studies are available for many languages: the death of Irish for economic reasons 'which have promoted the modernization' of the Irish-speaking parts of Ireland (Hindley 1990: 248); the standardization of French and its increased use in domains of power (Lodge

1993); the relationship of language with social experience and historiography (Corfield 1991), and so on. However, it is generally only a few aspects of the use of a language in some domain which are investigated. This book, on the other hand, intends to extend the scope of the historical investigation to the use of Urdu in more social domains than has been done so far at least as far as South Asia is concerned.

This is not to say that scholars of South Asia have not attempted social histories involving language. One example is Farina Mir's doctoral dissertation on Punjabi popular narrative in British India which is a social history in the sense that it focuses on literary narratives like Hīr Rānjhā, the Punjabi equivalent of Juliet and Romeo, to understand the 'shared cultural sphere' of religious communities in the Punjab (Mir 2002: 344). Another good example of the kind of history I have in mind is Ulrike Stark's history of book publishing in India. Aptly entitled *An Empire of Books*, this is a study of the Naval Kishore Press (Stark 2008). In this study we find out how modernity affected the diffusion of the printed word in India; what social, economic and political conditions made such a wide scale diffusion possible and how it affected education, religious consciousness and, more relevant to our concerns, the construction of Hindu and Muslim identities in India. Another study relevant for our purposes is Christopher King's excellent analysis of the construction of the Hindu identity through the linguistic activities of the Nagari Pracharini Sabha (King 1974). Subtitled as 'A Study in the Social and Political History of the Hindi Language', this study focuses on the construction of the Hindu identity through language planning activities and its expression through linguistic symbols of which the Devanagari script and Sanskritic vocabulary are the most notable.

Yet another paradigmatic (meaning a pattern or prototype in one of the meanings given by Thomas Kuhn [1962: 175]) study is Francesca Orsini's *The Hindi Public Sphere 1920–40* (2002). This

study looks at the creation of discursive spaces in the Hindi-using public which allow us 'to draw a picture of the Hindi literary sphere in all its variety of traditions, tastes, audiences, and modes of transmission' (Orsini 2002: 7) in order to understand literary productivity during the twenty years the book focuses upon. And what emerges out of this investigation is an understanding of ideas and discourses about history and politics in the public sphere. Another study of the 'information order' of the British empire in the Hindi-speaking areas, by C.A. Bayly, uses the term 'ecumene' for the 'cultural and political debate' in this area in which Urdu as well as Hindi, both in their high forms and as the common spoken language, play so important a role (Bayly 1996: 182). Indeed, this language (especially its Urdu form) took 'on the character of the public tongue of the ecumene' (Bayly 1996: 193) though the Devanagari character was used for some kinds of works in some areas since the boundary markings we are now familiar with were not so rigidly applied till the end of the nineteenth century. Our study draws upon these works and, in fact, expands their investigation into the way the use of Urdu in social domains helps us understand vital aspects of the social and political lives of the Muslims of Pakistan and North India.

As mentioned above, an important aspect of this study is to find out how the Hindu and Muslim identities were constructed as a result of modernity which was a consequence of colonial rule in India. This may not have taken the same turn without the British intervention in South Asia. Indeed, the idea that numbers are politically significant—for quotas in jobs, admissions in educational institutions, government patronage—was created by the British who introduced modern concepts like representation of the people, equality before a secular legal system and the creation of an ubiquitous public service all over India. When the Indians experienced the census, they found that the category 'Mahomedan' (Muslim) could be disempowered or empowered, impoverished or enriched, deprived or benefited, depending on

a number of factors out of which the only ones they understood were numbers and loyalty to the rulers. This game of numbers created the perception of a monolithic Muslim community—suppressing sectarian (Shia, Sunni, Aga Khani, Bohra, etc.); class and linguistic or ethnic divisions—which was held together by Islam and Urdu. The mirror image of this was the construction of the Hindu 'Other' held together by Hindutva and Hindi (King 1994; Dalmia 1997). Besides investing political and economic significance in the categories of 'Muslim' and 'Hindu', modernity also made it possible to disseminate language much more widely than ever before. The printing press, the schooling system, the textbooks, the political speeches and pamphlets, and later radio, television and the cinema all spread out standardized versions of languages—mostly Hindi and Urdu in North India and the areas now comprising Pakistan—which created communities (Muslims and Hindus) much as 'print capitalism' created nationalistic identities in modern Europe in a process described by Benedict Anderson (1983).

Almost a century—from the middle of the nineteenth century till the creation of Pakistan—of the Hindi-Urdu controversy, makes us realize how potent the symbolic value of language was in the creation of the politicized modern Muslim and Hindu identities.

Narrowing the focus to Urdu-Hindi, while no complete social history exists, there are numerous studies of the use of both languages in social domains. There is, for instance, Vasuda Dalmia's chapter on the way Hindi became a symbol of Hindu identity in the nineteenth century (Dalmia 1997: 146–221). And Christopher King's more detailed work on the Hindi movement and its contribution to the development of the Hindu identity in the nineteenth century (King 1994). And, indeed, all histories of the Hindi-Urdu controversy—and there are many to choose from such as Gupta 1970; Brass 1974: 119–181; Dittmer 1972; Fatehpuri 1977; and Rai 2001 besides the works mentioned earlier—deal

with identity formation when the two languages are used in schools, courts of law, journalism, and the lower bureaucracy.

However, this macro-analysis of the indexicality of Urdu and Hindi along religious lines does not always correspond to facts on the ground. Rizwan Ahmad, a socio-linguistic researcher on Urdu, after his research in Old Delhi points out that the 'ideologies about the indexicality of Urdu changed significantly in post–1947 language discourse' in India (Ahmad 2007: 195). First, while both Muslims and Hindus claimed to speak Urdu in the pre-partition era, those born after 1947 associate with it if they are Muslims but not if they are Hindus. This has already been pointed out by many scholars including—perhaps most clearly—by Christopher King (1994), but what is new is that in the third generation, at least in the ghettoized population of Old Delhi, Muslims do not pronounce the distinctive phonemes of Urdu replacing them with the Hindi ones (Ahmad 2007: 197). They consider Urdu 'the language of their parents' and do not have functional literacy in the distinctive Perso-Arabic script of Urdu (Ahmad 2007: 200). This kind of work points to another direction of research on the social identity of Urdu, i.e. through language ideology and indexicality.

Language ideology is defined as 'sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization of justification of perceived language structure and use' (Silverstein 1979: 193). And it is part of ideology to see language as indexing a certain group identity. There are social differentiations—socio-economic class, religious affiliation, ethnic identity—which may or may not be correlated with linguistic differentiations. In the US, for instance, Black English or Ebonics is related to African Americans. In Britain, the Received Pronunciation (RP) is related to the educated middle and upper classes, and in Pakistan Pashto is related with the Pashtun identity. But these indexical relationships function within a society and are invested with significance by the ideology of that social order. This ideology creates the sets

of beliefs we operate through while making sense of the world and living in it, and language ideology is a sub-set of this ideology of life. But ideology, including language ideology, and the indexicality contingent upon it is socially situated. This means that as external and internal factors change, language ideology and indexicality both change (Irvine and Gal 2000; Silverstein 1998; Woolard 1998; Wassink and Dyer 2004). This explains why the social reality of Urdu has changed over time and space and why it remains in flux. One purpose of the book is to understand how our language ideologies are constructed and how they help us index Urdu with a certain identity in pre-partition India as well as in modern India and Pakistan.

This language ideology is part of a certain consensus among cultural authority figures about certain prescriptive norms of the 'standard' language. Pre-modern languages have a lot of variation—spellings, words, aspects of grammar and pro-nunciation—and this is precisely what prescriptive authorities eliminate. Jim Milroy, an authority on prescriptivism in language, distinguishes between the 'language-internal' and 'language-external' aspects of the ideology which informs prescriptivism. The uniformity of grammar, spellings, diction, etc., are the 'language-internal' factors, while the selection of one variety of the language and then diffusing it through writing and teaching is the 'language-external' one (Milroy 2002: 8). The standardization of Urdu, as we shall see, followed the same process.

At this point it may be useful to give a synoptic outline of the book. This introduction is followed by three chapters entitled 'Names', 'Age', 'Origins and Historiography'. In a sense all of them relate to the crucial Chapter 5 on the identity of the language we now call Urdu. It has had several names—Hindvi, Hindi, Hindustani for instance—which have a bearing on its identity in the past as well as today. Its age also has political and social implications so crucial for its identity. For, if it is an Indian language then it belongs to Hindus as well as Muslims, but if it

is a product of the military camps of the Mughals—as many Pakistani school textbooks claim it to be—then it started off as a symbol of military conquest and remains a Muslim preserve. As for the debate on the origins—Sindh, Punjab, Delhi, Maharashtra—it too has implications for identity: regional, national and communal. The chapter on 'identity' describes the standardization of Urdu from the eighteenth century onwards. It is argued that it was this process of standardization which associated the language with the Muslim identity in North India. That is why it is sub-titled 'the Islamization of Urdu'. Chapters 6 and 7 are on the association of Urdu with two contradictory themes: religion and the amorous and erotic. It was roughly from the late eighteenth century onwards that Urdu became the major vehicle of Islam in South Asia. But at the same time, at least till the twentieth century, Urdu literature was also associated with the ghazal, the refinement of the courtesan's speech and the decadent aristocracy of Lucknow—all of which, in turn, associated Urdu with love and beauty, the romantic and the aesthetic, the amorous and the erotic. In this context, too, the suppression of the amorous and the erotic associations in favour of the religious ones has political reasons and implications for the construction of the Muslim identity in South Asia.

Chapter 8 is about the learning of Hindustani by the British. This is important because the British role in promoting Urdu has not been fully documented. It is also important because British understandings of the language led to classificatory categories (such as the ones in the census) which then constructed and reinforced ethno-linguistic identities. Chapter 9 looks at the processes which led to the introduction of Urdu as the official language of two major princely states: Kashmir and Hyderabad, and a few smaller ones too. The political reasons for such a change and its implications have been traced out in some detail. The last five chapters are on the use of Urdu in the service of the state and the private sector. While Chapter 10 focuses on

employment in the lower levels of the judiciary and the administration in North India, the subsequent four chapters focus more exclusively on such crucial domains as education, print, radio, films, and the television, i.e. the media and entertainment. Once again this is not a straightforward historical narrative but one which is informed by insights into identity politics and the play of (communal) ideological narratives in these domains. The conclusion sums up the insights gained by the study with some comments on the future of the language.

The sources of this book are mostly historical but information about contemporary policies and practices is obtained through interviews, unstructured conversations, observation, and internet sources. Among the historical sources are the *tazkarās* (hagiographies, narratives, anecdotes, and biographical information) of mystics or Sufi saints and their conversations (*malfūzāt*). The former genre is mostly hyperbolic and not objective, being written by those who had blind faith in the saint. They are mostly near-contemporary as the writing appeared after the demise of the saint. The *malfūzāt* are contemporary but even these are not always correct as Khwaja Banda Nawaz Gesu Daraz (1312–1421) himself pointed out in 802/1400 (Hussaini 1401: 244–245). However, his own *malfūzāt*, written by his son Syed Mohammad Akbar Hussaini, was authenticated by him in own lifetime (Hussaini 1401: 587). The Sheikh also pronounced the *malfūzāt* of Sheikh Nizamudin Auliya (1238–1325) entitled *Fawāid ul Fawād*, collected by Amir Hasan Sanjri from 28 January 1308 to 5 September 1322, as authentic (Hussaini 1401: 244). These sources relied upon written language and to use it as evidence for the existence of the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi is problematic. As Ursula Schaefer points out in her 'Introduction' to the beginning of standardization in medieval Europe:

> As we have no choice but to deal with what has come down to us—more or less by chance—*in writing*, the data are, for one thing "bad" because they are selective in number and diverse in quality. They

are also "bad" because they give—at best—a 'mediated' picture (!) of what might have been the language actually spoken. This has, for a long time, been the 'big lie' of historical linguistics as scholars have tacitly glossed over the materiality of their evidences (Schaefer 2006: 8).

This weakness is acknowledged but the only other option, in the absence of the spoken word in this case, is not to venture any opinion about the past of any language. I believe, therefore, in using the written sources with caution and being tentative in my conclusions rather than not doing linguistic history at all.

Doing linguistic history, therefore, requires the mastery of different archives and different methods of research. Being a history, the historical method of research is, of course, dominant, but knowledge about modern policies, regarding the use of Urdu in different, contemporary, social domains, requires interviewing and other techniques. Document analysis, especially those pertaining to language policies, is also a major technique of research. In short, the book combines all feasible research methods and techniques in order to obtain data which is analysed in the light of the constructionist theories of identity-construction and their mobilization into the political arena. That is why the book is an attempt to understand the use of Urdu in the social domains as well as the political implications of such use. In short, the book is of as much interest to a social historian as it is to a sociolinguist and a political scientist.

2

Names

The name Urdu—first used only 'around 1780' by the poet
Ghulam Hamadani Mushafi (1750–1824) (Faruqi 2003: 806)—itself
biases the user/hearer into assumptions about its identity, which
are implicitly, and in the final analysis, political. The word is
from Turkish and refers to camp, a military cantonment or a
place of the residence of the elite (*Urdū-ē-Muallā*). It is associated
with the theory that the language was born in the Mughal
military camps because military life necessitated the interaction
of Muslim and Hindus. Such associations tend to disown at least
four hundred years of the history of the language when it was
called, according to Shamsur Rahman Faruqi, (roughly in that
order): Hindvi, Hindi, Dihlavi, Gujri, Dakani and Rekhtah (Faruqi
2003: 806). Amir Khusrau (1253–1325) in his *Masnavī Nuh Sipihr*
(718/1318) says that each province of the India of his day had a
distinctive language which is not derived or borrowed from any
other and then mentions the following languages:

> *Sindī ō Lāhorī ō Kashmirī ō kabar*
> *Dhōr Samandrī ō talangī ō Gujar*
> *Ma 'abarī ō Gorī ō Bangāl ō Awad*
> *Dehli ō pīrāminash andar hamā had*
> *ī hamā Hindvīst kē za ayyām-ē-kuhan*
> *'āma bakār ast bahar gūna sukhan* (Khusrau 1318: 179–180)[1]

The last three lines mean:
(Delhi and in its environs/it is Hindi since ancient times/which is
used ordinarily for all kinds of conversation).

Grierson gives the modern names of these languages as follows: Sindhi, Panjabi, Kashmiri, Dogra of Jammu, Kanarese of Mysore, Telugu, Tamil of the Coromandel coast, Northern Bengali, Bengali, Eastern Hindi, and Western Hindi (Grierson Vol. 1: 1). Writing in 1590, about three hundred years later, the Mughal man of letters, Abul Fazl, wrote in the *Āīn-ē-Akbarī*, 'that India has many languages and these forms of speech are not mutually intelligible'. He then gives the following list of languages:

> *Dēhlī Bangālā Multān Marwār Gujrāt Tilangānā Marhat Karnātik Sind Afghan Shāl (kē miān Sind ō Kābul ō qandhār ast) Balōjistan Kashmīr* (Fazl Vol. 3, 1590: 45).[2]
> The words in the brackets mean: 'is between Sind and Kabul and Qandhar'.

Grierson gives the following names for these languages: Western Hindi, Bengali, Lahnda, Western Rajasthani, Gujarati, Telugu, Marathi, Kanarese, Sindhi, Pashto, Balochi, and Kashmiri (Grierson, Vol. 1).

These lists tell us about the linguistic classification of the authors, living as they did so many centuries apart, and of George Grierson who supplied the British names of the languages as used in *The Linguistic Survey of India.* What is interesting is that all of these classifications help us understand the identity of Urdu only partially.

If we take the myth of Urdu's birth as a language created in military camps in order to facilitate interaction between Muslims and Hindus, then we would be calling Urdu a pidgin language. The definition of a pidgin is that it 'is a reduced language that results from extended contact between groups of people with no language in common' (Holm 1988: 4–5). But Urdu, or its ancestor, is not a reduced language in any sense of that term. Its grammatical structure and other features qualify it for a full language and not an *ad hoc* tool of communication. It is not a creole either because, although creolization is 'a process of

expansion rather than reduction' and creoles, unlike pidgins, have native speakers. But creoles are said to have a pidgin or jargon—'a variety that has been radically reduced (Holm 1988: 8)—in their ancestry. There is no evidence that the ancestor of Urdu was such a variety. Nor have linguists ever included Urdu and Hindi in their studies of pidgin and creole languages. In a classic study of pidgins and creoles the linguist Gumperz reports how the Urdu of Kupwar, a village on the border of Maharashtra and Dravidian-languages speaking area, stands in relation to Standard Urdu, as Haitian Creole stands in relation to Standard French. Kupwar Urdu differs from Creole in that 'its starting point was not a pidgin' (Gumperz & Wilson 1971: 166). In other words, like English and French, Urdu too may be pidginized and creolized but it never started off as a pidgin.

The theory which is most credible is that there was a base language, call it Hindi for convenience, spoken in pre-Muslim India which was a fully developed language in its own right. This language came in contact with other languages—Persian and Arabic mostly—and absorbed words, morphemes and even phonemes from them at various levels. If the emphasis is on the mixing of Persian, Arabic and Turkish words to the exclusion of the base itself (the language in which these words were mixed in the first place), there is a definitional problem; a problem of linguistic identity. Mixing takes place in many languages but it is not given the political significance which it receives in Urdu and modern Hindi. Modern English, for instance, derives much of its technical and learned vocabulary from Norman French, Latin and Greek but it is called a Germanic language and refers to a Germanic tribe, the Angles, who lived in England before the Norman conquest in 1066 rather than the Norman French or the Romans, etc.

That Urdu contains hybrid words does not make it a pidgin or creole. Hybrids are very much part of English and French as both languages borrowed much of their formal vocabulary from Latin

and Greek. In a study of 929 hybrids of Urdu we learn that 'Hybrid words created by means of native, Hindi affixes make up only 28% of the whole amount, and adequately, a group of hybrids formed by Perso-Arabic formatives comprises 72% of it' (Kuczkiewicz-Fraś 2003: 103; also see her 2008 dictionary mentioned earlier). This is understandable if one looks at the words which are not hybrids as most of these words are the basic means for daily living (body parts, food items, relationships, etc.). Thus the theory that the hybrids 'were oral in nature, i.e. created at the very first level of inter-language contact between Indians and Muslims' (Ibid., 108), misses the point that in a hybrid like '*bin-bāp*' (without father) the operative word is the Hindi word *bāp* and not the Persian affix *bin* or *bē*. So, while they may well have been oral in nature, it is the base language which is important and which is doing the borrowing and not the languages from which the borrowing is being done.

In short what is wrong with the theory that Urdu is a pidgin is that it takes away the status of Urdu as a fully formed language before the arrival of the Muslims. The association with camps, as the name Urdu implies, makes the language contingent upon conquest whereas languages borrow words from other languages in all kinds of situations and not only in military camps. Indeed, all names of Urdu and its ancestor are implicitly political as they have associations given below.

Name	Period of use	Associations	Ideological Bias
Hindi	13th–19th century	India, Hindus	Indianness. Is now used for Modern Hindi in India.
Dēhlavī	*c.* 13th–14th century	Delhi	Regional particularism. No longer in use.

Name	Period of use	Associations	Ideological Bias
Hindvī/ Hinduī	13th–19th century	India, Hindus	Indianness. Hindu identity. No longer used.
Gujrī	15th century	Gujarat; Gojri language	Regional particularism. No longer in use.
Dakkanī or Dakhni	15th–18th century	Deccan	Regional particularism. No longer in use.
Indostan	*c.* 17th–18th centuries	India	Indianness. Used only by a few English travellers.
Moors	18th century	Muslims of Spain	Muslim identity. Was used only by a few Europeans but never gained currency.
Hindus-tānī	18th–20th century	India, especially North India (Hindustan)	Includes all Indians of all religions but excludes Pakistan.
Rēkhtā	18th–19th centuries	Mixed Persian and Urdu; sub-standard	Assumes that Persian is the standard language implying the inferiority of India's local languages.
Urdū	18th century	Muslims; Mughal military camps; mixture of Muslim languages with local Indian ones.	Muslim identity; Pakistani identity.

HINDI, HINDVI OR HINDUI

This label has been used by outsiders, especially Muslims, for the languages of India (Hind). Thus it is not always clear exactly which language and in which script, is meant by 'Hindi'. Even as late as the nineteenth century, the term Hindi was sometimes used for Gujarati in addition to what we now call Hindi and Urdu. One instance of such usage is in the story of Baba Ali Sher, a saint of Indian Gujarat (Khetch) who flourished during the time of Sheikh Farid-u'd-din Ganj-i-Shakar (1175–1265), also called Baba Farid of Ajodhan, in what is now Pakistani Punjab. Once Baba Sher Ali was sitting naked when Baba Farid arrived to meet him and he (Ali Sher) said: 'bring clothes for the guardian of the Islamic law arrives'. The words of the Persian chronicler, although writing in the late nineteenth century are: *'bazubān-ē-Hindi farmūdand lōgrõ lāō sar sharā' nakōt avē chē'*. Some of these words are clearly in Gujarati but the author uses the label Hindi for them (Khan 1889 Vol. 3: 60).

Sometimes, the usage is so ambiguous that one cannot make out which language is meant. For instance, a famous saint of the Deccan, according to Khwaja Banda Nawaz Gesu Daraz in 802/1399–1400 Sheikh Ali Khatri, an illiterate saint, was shown words written in Persian, Hindi and Arabic. In between there were a few verses from the Quran. The Sheikh recognized them as, according to him, they were radiant. Here it is not clear whether Hindi is a variant of the ancestor of Hindi-Urdu or some South Indian language. However, it does seem probable that these words of 'Hindi' too were in some derivative of the Arabic script (Hussaini 1401: 200).

However, sometimes the chronicler is aware of the local language being different from the one he calls Hindvi or Hindi and makes this clear. In *Siyār ul Auliyā*, a *tazkarā* of Sheikh Nizamuddin Auliya, by Syed Mubarak Kirmani also called Mir Khurd (d. 770/1368–69), there is another story about Sheikh Farid. Sheikh Farid looked at Sheikh Isa, a Sufi disciple who

served him, because he was standing aghast as Sheikh Farid's
prayer mat had been occupied by Sheikh Alauddin who was then
a child. He smiled and said: '_mubukh tē baē bazubān-ē-ā diyār_' ('sit
on the _mubukh_ in the language of that area') (Kirmani _c._ 14th,
century: 204). Here the language, which is recognizably Punjabi-
Siraiki, is not called Hindvi or Hindi.

Hindi, Hindvi and Hindui are all used as variants of each other
and they are used mostly for the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi.
Although the most commonly used word in the earlier sources
is Hindvi, all these terms occur in medieval sources inter-
changeably. Amir Khusrau, always interested in language, used
both 'Hindvi' and 'Hindi' in two meanings: for the language of
India (Hind); and for the language of the region around Delhi.
Khusrau has been credited with being the father of modern Urdu
and Hindi (Sharma 2006: 81). Songs, riddles and anecdotes in
verse attributed to him are quoted in innumerable books and
even sung in South Asia. However, it is not clear that he actually
wrote all or even any of them, though it is clear that he did write
in a language he called 'Hindi' or 'Hindvi' since he 'gave some
samples of Hindi verse to friends as gifts'. (_Juzvē chand nazm-ē-
hindvī nēz nazrē dōstã kardā shudā ast_) (Khusrau 1293: 63). He was
aware that this language changed after every hundred miles, as
the varieties or dialects of all unstandardized languages do, while
Persian was uniform all over India (_Zubān-ē-Hindvī har sad karōhē
har gurōhē rā istilāhē dīgar ast ammā Pārsī dar ĩ chahār hazār ō and
farsang yekē ast_) (1293: 29).

The term Hindi kept being used even when Urdu was already
in use. For instance, in _Nasīhat ul Muslimīn_ (1822), Khurram Ali
states that he wanted to refute heresy for those who did not
understand Arabic by translating the verses of the Quran 'in the
Hindi language clearly' (_Hindī zubānmẽ sāf sāf_) (Ali 1822: 2).
Another book on the rituals of Islam, written nearly at the same
time, is called _Masāil-ē-Hindi_ (Anon 1818). Maulvi Ikram Uddin,
in his exegesis of a Quranic verse says: 'if the benefits of the Sūrā'

Fatehā are explained in the Hindi language' all Muslims will enjoy their prayers (Uddin 1308/1890–91: 2). A copy of the Quran, translated by Syed Waliullah in Arabic, Persian and 'Hindi'—also called 'Hindoostanee' by the Englishman, William Wright, for whom it was written—is preserved in the library of the University of Heidelberg. It begins 'with the name of God' (*sāth nānō khudaī kē*) and is a complete translation in beautifully written handwriting in 512 pages. The fourth column, which says '*angrēzī*' (English), is left blank (Waliullah 1837). But even at this time a versified commentary in the Quran in Punjabi, mixed with Urdu, is said to be in 'Hindvi' (Mohammad n.d.: 2). However, in most cases Hindi was the name of Urdu till almost the end of the nineteenth century when it came to be reserved for Sanskritized Hindi and the dialects of the Hindi belt.

Dehlavi

Amir Khusrau in his work *Nuh Sipihr*, written in 1318, mentions the language of 'Delhi and its environs' (*Dehlī ō pirāmanash andar hamā had*) (Khusrau 1318: 180). Sheikh Bajan (d. 912/1506–07), writing in Gujarat, calls his language both Hindvi and Dehlavi. One of his poems begins with the Persian words: '*sift-ē-duniyā ba zubān-ē-Dehlavī guftā*' (I describe the world in the language of Delhi) (quoted from Shirani 1930–31 in 1965: 168). The poem which follows is in the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi and is quite intelligible to modern readers:

> *Yē fitnī kyā kisē miltī haē*
> *Jab miltī hāē tab chaltī hāē*
> (where and how does one find this evil one)?
> And when one does she [the world] seduces one)
> (Shirani 1965: 168).

At times the language of the same poem is called both Hindvi and Dehlavi (Shirani 1965: 168).

The term was used till the eighteenth century when it was replaced by others.

Gujri, Gojri and Gujarati

These mutually interchangeable terms for specimens of sequences of words, clearly recognizable as closer to Hindi-Urdu than the languages which now go by these names, are found in the works of medieval writers. Most of them were in Gujarat but some were also in the Deccan. Sheikh Burhanuddin Janum wrote his *kalmāt ul Haqāēq* in 990/1582 in the Deccan (Bijapur) but he used this name for the language of the book.

> *Sab yō zubān gujrī, nām ĩ kitāb*
> (All give Gujri language-the name of this book).

The language is mixed with Persian but sequences like: *isdil kī* (of this heart) and *dhartā haē* (puts) are easily recognizable as Hindi-Urdu (for detailed discussion see Jain in Jafer and Jain Vol. 2, 1998: 357–362).

Shirani gives further details about Gujri or 'Gujarati Urdu' in the 10th/15th–16th centuries. He mentions Sheikh Bahauddin Bajan (d. 912/1506–07), Shah Ali Mohammad Jeo Gam Dhani (d. 973/1565–66) and others writers of Indian Gujarat who call the language by various names including Hindi, Hindvi and Dehlavi. It appears that the writers of Urdu-Hindi in the Deccan kept using the term Gujri in order to indicate the relationship of their language with that used in Gujarat (Shirani 1930 and 1931 in 1965: 183–184). The language is also called Gujarati as in the works of Khub Mohammad Chishti who also shows his awareness of deliberately using Perso-Arabic diction in the 'Gujarati' base. For instance he says: 'I wrote every couplet in my own language Gujarati which has Persian and Arabic words' (*har yak shē'r bazubān-ē-khud tasnīf kardā and ō mīkunand ō man bazubān-ē-gujratī kē alfāz 'ajamī ō 'arabi ast*) (Shirani 1930 and 1931 in 1965: 191). In

short, Gujri was that special style of the Urdu-Hindi language which had assimilated Persian and Arabic words.

Dakhni

The terms Dakhni, Dekani, Dakhini, and Deccani are used interchangeably for the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi, as used in the Deccan from the fifteenth century onwards. Specimens in the language, both verse and prose, with the names Dakhni or Hindi, are given in Naseeruddin Hashmi's *Dakan mẽ Urdū* (Hashmi 1923: 13–15). Besides the *Masnavī Kadam Rāō Padam Rāō* (1421–1435), probably the earliest specimen of verse of some length in the language, there are other samples written in the language identified as Dakhni by their authors. Abdul Haq searched out a number of manuscripts in this language which he sometimes called 'Old Urdu' (*Urdū-ē-Qadīm*) and published them (Haq 1961). While his claim that Khwaja Banda Nawaz Gesu Daraz's *Mērāj ul Āshiqīn*, supposedly written sometime in the beginning of the fifteenth century, has now been refuted (Jain in Jafer and Jain Vol. 2, 1998: 293), we are still left with *Sab Ras* (1045/1635–36) and the poetry (*kulliyāt*) of Quli Qutab Shah (1580–1611) which was published by Mohiuddin Qadri Zor in 1940. The *kulliyāt* was edited in 1025/1611 by the King's nephew, Muhammad Qutab Shah, and is recognized as the first 'non-religious Urdu verse we possess' (Matthews 1991: 39)—a claim which makes sense only by excluding *Kadam Rāō* which is indeed, much more far removed linguistically from modern Urdu than this work.

Indostan and Moors

One of the first names for what came to be called 'Hindustani' used by the British in India was 'Indostan'. Edward Terry, the English traveller who began his voyage on 3 February 1615, wrote as follows:

For the language of this Empire, I meane the vulgar, it is called
Indostan, a smooth tongue, and easie to be pronounced, which they
write as wee to the right hand. The Learned Tongues are Persian and
Arabian, which they write backward, as the Hebrewes to the left
(Purchas 1905: 31).

The innumerable words of this language used by the early
Englishmen in their documents leave us in no doubt that this was
the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi.

Yet another name used by early Englishmen is Moors. The
term is explained in *Hobson-Jobson* as follows:

The term *Moors* is probably now entirely obsolete, but down to 1830,
at least, some old officers of the Royal army and some old Madras
civilians would occasionally use the term as synonymous with what
the former would also call 'the black language'. [Moors for Urdū was
certainly in use among the old European pensioners at Chunār as
late as 1892.] (Yule and Burnell 1903: 584).

The authors cite thirteen examples from the Anglo-Indian
literature, of the period starting from 1752 till 1804, of the use
of this term for the language which later came to be called
Hindustani (Ibid., 584–585). The most well-known usage is that
of George Hadley (d. 1798), who wrote a grammar of it in 1772,
in his book which is entitled, *Grammatical Remarks on the Practical
and Vulgar Dialect of the Indostan Language Commonly called Moors
with a Vocabulary English and Moors...* (Hadley 1772). The book was
reprinted several times and the 1784 edition has a 'Moorish
vocabulary' (Hadley 1784: iii). But 'Moors' was 'spoken in its
purity between Europeans and their native servants in Calcutta
and Bombay' (Arnot and Forbes 1828: 16) and was more of a
pidgin language than the language which came to be called
Hindustani later.

However, since this was the current term in use, even John
Borthwick Gilchrist (1759–1841), the father of modern Urdu and

Hindi prose, who was later to call the language Hindustani, wrote in the beginning of his career that upon his arrival in Bombay in 1782, he 'sat resolutely down to acquire what was then termed as the Moors...' (Siddiqi 1963: 21). But both these names were transitory and were given up by the British for Hindustani as well as Urdu and Hindi in due course.

Rekhta

In his excellent article entitled '*Rēkhta*', Mahmud Shirani discusses how the term has been understood by writers of Urdu (Shirani 1926 in 1965: 1–9). There is not much which one can add to this scholarly exposition. However, turning to the contemporary editions of the well-known dictionaries called *Fīrōz ul Lughāt*, both Farsi and Urdu, the word is defined in Persian as (1) fallen, (2) spread out, and (3) fashioned metal. In Urdu it is defined as (1) fallen, (2) spread out, (3) confused, (4) mixture language, (5) Urdu which is made of many languages, (6) The couplets of Urdu, (7) material required for making a house, and (8) concrete building.

Mohammad Hussain Azad, one of the most important early historians of Urdu, says that Urdu has been made by the words of many languages just as a house is made of bricks, lime and clay (Azad *c*. 19th century: 21–22). The different meanings given in the dictionary and reproduced above are used by earlier writers (Shirani 1926 in 1965: 1). Initially rekhta meant music created by the fusion of Indian and Persian music. Later, a verse with half a line or one line in Persian and the other in Hindi was called by this name. Still later, probably in the eighteenth century, the name came to be used for Urdu. This name overlapped with Hindi in the beginning of the century and with Urdu by the end of it. The poet Mushafi (b. 1141 to 1156/1728–29 to 1743) who is credited with having used the word Urdu for this language for the first time used Hindi and rekhta as synonyms. In his *Tazkarā-ē-Hindi* (1236/1860–61) he wrote: '*Rēkhtā fī*

zamānana pa pāyā ā'lā fārsī rasīdā (balkē az ū bēhtar gardīdā)'
(Rekhta in this period has reached the level of Persian [indeed it
has become even better than it]) (Mushafi 1861: hē).

Qaim Chandpuri (1135/1722—208/1793–94), in his *Makhzan-ē-
Nikāt* (1168/1754–55), also uses this term. He begins by
erroneously attributing (Chandpuri 1754–55: 6) 'one or two
couplets' of this language (*yak dō baēt rēkhtā*) to the Persian poet
Sa'adi but, as later research has proved, this was another poet of
the same name (Sprenger 1852: 513–519). Qaim also claims that
he is the first to write brief biographical notes along with
specimens from their verse of 'rekhta' poets. Incidentally, Mir
Taqi Mir, in his *Tazkarā Nikāt ul Shu'arā*, written sometime before
1168/1754–55 in Delhi, had claimed that 'it is not unknown that
in the art of rekhta the couplets of which are like those of
Persian in the language of the Exalted City of Shahjahanabad
Dehli no book before this one had been written' (*pōshīda namãnd
kē dar fan-ē-rēkhtā ke shē'r īst bataōr shē'r fārsī bazubān urdu-ē-
mu'allā Shāhjahānābād Dēhlī kitābē tā hāl tasnīf nashudā*) (Mir
1755: 9). But Mir also uses the terms Rekhta for code switching
in Old Urdu-Hindi and Persian. For instance, the first hemistich
is in Persian and the other in Hindi; half the hemistich is in
Persian and the rest in Hindi and in the third type particles and
verbs are in Persian. Mir only condemns the last as ugly (*qabīh*)
but the rest are approved of (Mir 1755: 161).

The term rekhta kept being used, along with Urdu, by all the
great poets of Urdu including Ghalib.

> *Rēkhtā kē tum hī ustād nahĩ hō Ghālib*
> *Suntē haẽ aglē zamānē mẽ kōyī mīr bhī thā*
> (You are not the only master of Rekhta O! Ghalib!
> One hears that in times gone by there was one Mir).

It appears that contemporaries differentiated between Hindi and
Rekhta. Shirani quotes from the translation of the Quran by Shah
Abdul Qadir (1205/1790–91) in which it is stated that Hindi, not

Rekhta, is used, so that the translation is intelligible to ordinary people (Shirani 1926 in 1965: 9). Prince Azfari, while referring to his language as Hindi and Hindustani elsewhere, uses the term Rekhta for his Urdu verse (Azfari 1806: 127). This implies that Rekhta referred to the Persianized diction of high culture, and especially, the ghazal. It is to be noted that this period, the end of the eighteenth century, is the time when Persianized Urdu was being created and it was deviating from ordinary Hindi used by the common people. Javed Majeed, studying the boundaries of Rekhta, uses the concept of 'leaky diglossia', i.e. the 'High' (H) variety of a language in which the 'Low' (L) one has intruded. According to him, 'The term *rekhta* is evocative of the tension that arises between an intermediate form and the 'High' language it has tied itself to'. In this case the L-variety is not of the same language but of another one—hence Fasold's concept of diglossia (1984) is more relevant rather than that of Ferguson (1959)—but, Majeed suggests that it (L) 'while simultaneously trying to enhance its prestige, is struggling to establish itself as a corpus of verse in its own right' (Majeed 1995: 193). But Rekhta was an intermediate name and fell out of use by the end of the nineteenth century.

HINDUSTANI

This is the language which I have called Urdu-Hindi and ordinary Urdu and Hindi at different places in this book. Being the common heritage of South Asians—both Hindus and Muslims—it is a very important language and, therefore, the term Hindustani will be examined in great detail. George Grierson says that 'the word "Hindostani" was coined under European influence, and means the language of Hindostan' (Grierson, Vol. 3: 43). Indeed, he adds that 'it appears to be Gilchrist who about 1787 first coined the word "Hindōstanī" or, as he spelt it, "Hindoostanee"' (Ibid., 43). However, the terms Hindustani or 'Hindustani language' exist in a few sources of pre-British times. For instance,

Zahiruddin Babar (1483–1530), the founder of the Mughal empire, says in his autobiography that: 'I said to someone who knew Hindustani, "tell him these words one by one and make him understand..."' (Babar 1528: 318).[3] The person to whom Babar wanted to convey how much he owed to him was Dawlat Khan, a Lodhi Chief who had fastened two swords to his body in order to fight him. Babar meant the 'language of Hindustan' and not necessarily a language with this name, nor is it certain that this North Indian language was the ancestor of modern Urdu and Hindi. However, it is clear that a foreigner coming to Hindustan, as North India was called, found it natural to refer to the language he associated with it, as Hindustani. Mulla Wajhi, the author of *Sab Ras* describes the language of his book as '*zubān* Hindustan' (Wajhi 1635: 16). The term Hindustani occurs in the *Tārīkh-ē-Farishtā* about Ibrahim Adil Shah, a ruler of the Deccan (1580–1595–96), as one of the languages he was proficient in. The exact words are that the King, 'thus became an expert in Persian and like this he spoke Persian very well. And till he did not speak in Hindustani nobody could understand that he knew any language except Persian' (*Fārsī khuān gar dahīd ō banō'ī fārsī rā khūb mī guft ke tā bahundstānī mutakallam namī shud hīchkas namī tavānist fahmīd ke ghair az farsī bazubān-ē-dīgar ashnāi dārad*) (Farishta, Vol. 2, *c.* 1612: 80). Mulla Abdul Hameed Lahori, the author of *Badshah Nama*, i.e. a history of Shahjahan (r. 1628–58), written sometime before the 1640s, uses the words '*Hindustānī zubān*' twice in a passage in which he describes music, songs and literature. At one place, while describing a famous musician, Lal Khan, he calls him the doyen of the 'singers of the Hindustani language' (*naghmā sarāyān-ē-Hindustānī zubān*). A little further in the same passage he mentions 'writings demonstrated in the Hindustani language' (*tasnīfī ast ke bahindustāni zubān barguzardah*) (Lahori *c.* 1640s: 5). As to which language is meant is not clear. But it was probably some dialect of Hindi-Urdu. This becomes clear when Lahori goes on to tell the reader that a certain Raja

of Gwalior knew all the subtleties of the musical and literary tradition of 'Hindustan' and that he brought out a new style in the language of Gwalior (Lahori, 6). This language, as we know from other sources, was considered the best form of 'Hindi' and was probably Braj Bhasha, i.e. one of the dialects of greater Hindi. Moreover, Khial Bukhari, a scholar of Pashto, claims in his introduction to the poetic collection of Ma'āz ullāh Mōhmand (fl. 1085/1674–75—1167/1715) that this Pashto poet had also written some Urdu verse and that in his 'handwritten manuscript he had not used the name "Urdu" for this language but had called it "Hindustani" (*qalmī nuskhē kē daghē jabē da pārā da 'Urdu' nōm na dē raoṛē-balkē da vartā 'Hindustānī' vaēlē dī*) (Bukhari 1958: 39). As this was at least seventy-two years before Gilchrist, and at a time when British usages had not gained currency in India, especially in the Pashto-speaking areas where Mohmand lived, it is likely that among the several names for Hindi-Urdu in India, Hindustani was one. The Mughal prince, Mirza Ali Bakht Zahiruddin Azfari (1173/1759–60—1243/1867–68), was brought up in captivity in a palace where he is not likely to have been influenced by British linguistic habits. And in his memoir *Wāqiāt-ē-Azfarī*, written between 1211/1796 and 1221/1806, he calls his language 'Hindi' (Azfari 1806: 74) and also 'Hindustani'. After quoting the Urdu couplets of a Nawab he says that 'in his Hindustani poetry his language is that of the gentlemen of Delhi' (*ō dar nazm Hindustānī siāq kalām bataōr mīrzāiyān Shāhjahānābād dāsht*) (Azfari 1806: 151). The earliest European travellers, such as Edward Terry (1616–1619), used the term 'Indostan' and 'Indostan tongue' for some widely spoken language of North India. Terry tells us that Thomas Coryat (1612–1617) learned the Persian 'and Indostan tongues' in Agra (Foster 1921: 284). While one cannot be certain which language or languages these foreigners called 'Indostan', there are clearly intelligible words of Urdu-Hindi in the fragments which are available in sources.

The British, like Babar, also associated the lingua franca of North India with the country called Hindustan. But they were modern rulers with efficient ways of spreading neologisms and so the term found greater currency, at least temporarily, than ever before. Let us now look at the various definitions of 'Hindustani' or 'Hindoostaneeh', etc., by the British before Grierson's monumental work, which has been referred to earlier.

William Carey (1761–1834), the pioneer of the Serampore mission which translated the Bible and published other religious material in the languages of India, learned Sanskrit and 'translated the *entire* Bible into Bengali, Oriya, Marathi, Hindi, Assamese, and Sanskrit' (Drewery 1979: 156). This implies that he was exposed to much more Sanskrit than Persian or Arabic. But perhaps other people in the mission did have knowledge of these languages too. Thus, we are told that the missionaries published their books in two languages which they thought were Muslim Hindustani and Hindu Hindustani. The first was full of Perso-Arabic diction, while the second with Sanskrit words. John Chamberlain, a missionary who arrived in Serampore in 1803, wrote a letter to Dr Ryland, principal of Bristol Academy, that 'the language called by Europeans "Hindoost'hanee" and the language of the Hindus are diverse' and then recommends:

> I suspect that if we would do good to the major part of the Hindoos, we must have scriptures in their own vernacular language, and must preach to them in that language too (Chamberlain in *Periodical Accounts No. xxiii*, p. 422 Quoted from Vedalankar 1969: 94).

This is perhaps what Alok Rai means when he says that these 'linguistic-religious communities had no existence except in the proselytizing designs of the missionaries' (Rai 2001: 25). However, religion is a subject which necessitates borrowing from the etymological roots it comes from, so Hindu texts did contain more Sanskritic words while Muslim ones (such as *Karbal Kathā*)

had more Perso-Arabic ones than songs, sayings, riddles, and ordinary conversation. Thus, what the missionaries did was to give impetus to an incipient trend for imagining linguistic identities in relation to the etymological roots of ones' diction. In time this became more and more pronounced and the boundary-marking became more and more stringent.

But even before Grierson stabilized the meanings of linguistic terms in India the British considered Hindustani the lingua franca of India, H.T. Colebrook, an officer-scholar with much influence in India, commends the work of Gilchrist on the language:

> which is used in every part of Hindustán and the Dekhin; which is the common vehicle of colloquial intercourse among all well-educated natives, and among the illiterate also in many provinces of India, and which is almost everywhere intelligible to some among the inhabitants of every village (Colebrook 1808: 223).

However, although considered an all-India language in a country where the majority of the population was Hindu, it is associated with Muslims and is often called 'Urdu'. Monier Williams writes in his grammar.

> Urdú or Hindústaní is the mixed and composite dialect which has resulted from the fusion of Hindí, the idiom of the Hindús, with the Persian and Arabic of the Musalmán invaders. It is not only the regular spoken language of Delhi, Lucknow and at least fifty millions of persons in Central India, the North West Provinces and the Punjáb, but is also the common medium of communication between Musalmans throughout all India (Williams 1871: 1).

J.B. Gilchrist, the pioneer of Hindustani studies among the British in India, differentiates it from 'Hinduwee' as follows in his grammar.

> The proper Hinduwee is, like European languages, the reverse of
> Persian, being written and read from left to right, in a character
> called *Naguree* .... Before the Moosulmans established themselves,
> their letters and religion, with fire and sword in this country, the
> *Naguree* was to India, what the Roman alphabet is now to Europe
> (Gilchrist 1796: 4).

The British generally wrote in both the Perso-Arabic and the
Devanagari scripts. However, as mentioned with reference to
both the missionaries and the officials, they had a mental
distinction between Hindi and Hindustani. The former was
associated with the Hindus; the latter with the Muslims. For the
latter, the terms Urdu and Rekhta are also used. The normal
understanding of this dialect is summed up by a British writer
as follows:

> There are two main dialects, that of the Hindus called *Hindi,*
> abounding in Sanskrit words, and that of the Musalmans called Urdu,
> abounding in words and phrases from the Arabic and Persian (Green
> 1895 Vol. 1: 3).

Green uses the Urdu script for Meer Amman's *Bāgh-ō-Bahār*, a
text in Urdu taught to the British, but there are verses in the
Devanagari script (Ibid., 203) and words now associated with
Hindi are used: *turant* (immediately), *mānas* (person), *jal* (water),
sundar (beautiful), *pūt* (son), and *kaniyā* (girl/daughter). There are
exercises in the Devanagari script but most of the work is in the
Urdu one (Ibid., 'Appendix', p. 1).

   Because it was associated with the Muslims, the British wrote
it in the Perso-Arabic (Urdu) script. Apart from the *Bāgh-ō-Bahār*
which has been mentioned above, the British taught it through
other texts produced by the Indian Muslim civilization. Platts for
instance, draws upon other texts of Muslim cultural origin:
Fasānā-ē-Ajāib, The Shōlā-ē-Tūr of Kanpur, the *Aligarh Institute
Gazette* and the *Urdū Reader* (Platts 1920: ix). Gilchrist himself

mostly uses the Urdu script and the frontispiece of his grammar has the following couplet in the same script:

> *Maĩ Hazrat-ē-Saudā kō sunā bōltē yārō*
> *Allāh hī Allāh kē kyā nazm ō bayān haē*
> (I heard the honourable Sauda speaking
> O God! What poetry; what eloquence there was!) (Gilchrist 1796: 1)

Although the passages in the Devanagari script are very few, it was taught and is used in the books on grammar.

Likewise, Shaikh Imam Baksh Sahbai prepared an anthology of twelve Urdu poets called *Intikhāb-ē-Davāvīn* for use in Delhi College in which both the words, 'Hindoustany Poets', as well as 'Hindi verse' have been used (Naim 2006: 179). All the poems in it are in Urdu written in the Perso-Arabic script. Yet, as was the linguistic fashion of the times, they could be called Hindi, Hindustani, Rekhta, and Urdu.

By the time Grierson was carrying out his monumental linguistic survey of India, associations of language with religion were accepted by those who ruled India. Accordingly he made two recordings of 'The Prodigal Son': the Urdu form (of Hindustani) read out by a Muslim called Baqir Ali; the Hindi form read out by Babu Gauri Shankar Gupta (Grierson 1885–1933). In short, the British perceptions of the distinct identities of Hindus and Muslims helped to associate language with religion weakening the perception that a composite language could be shared between the two communities.

By the early twentieth century, both the India-wide character of Hindustani and its division into two varieties, a Muslim and Hindu one, were articles of linguistic faith. Thus Chapman, writing a textbook on Urdu for examinations, writes:

> Hindustani, the *lingua franca* of India, is a composite language, derived from Sanskrit, Arabic and Persian. It has several recognized

varieties of which the principal are Urdu and Hindi (Chapman 1907: 1).

R.P. De, writing at about the same time, calls it the 'lingua franca of India', and while recognizing the Muslim and Hindu varieties, says that both commonly go 'under the name of Hindustani' (De 1904: 1). John T. Platt, in his grammar, calls it Urdu:

> Urdu, or Hindustani, though a composite language is derived mainly from the Hindi. The Persian and Arabic languages have contributed largely, but Hindi is the chief source (Platts 1920: 1).

In short, the British considered Hindustani the lingua franca of the whole of India and not just North India and such centres of Urdu literature as Hyderabad (Deccan). It is arguable, however, that the number of people who understood the language outside the urban centres of North India and the Deccan, was probably far fewer in 1757, the beginning of British rule, than in 1947, its end. The British perception became reality because they used it in the army, in the schools and courts of North India and brought in modernity with its improved and new means of communications: trains, cars, buses, and later planes. The printing press, the radio and later film also spread in Hindustani. It spread more because of British rule than it ever had before. Even in far off West Punjab, now part of Pakistan, the term Hindustani was used in 1346/1927–28—at a time when the term Urdu too was widespread—for the language used by a Sufi who is otherwise Punjabi-speaking: '*bāz auqāt bazubān-ē-Hindustānī nēz natq mīnamūdand*' (sometimes spoke in the Hindustani language [in addition to the Punjabi of Maharan] because his sufi mentor used Hindustani and he himself 'spent a lot of time in India' [*basiār muddat dar Hindustān aqāmat kardā and*]) (Ruknuddin 1928: 47). And it was here that the famous mystic and poet of Siraiki, Khwaja Ghulam Farid (1845–1901), produced an Urdu *divān* with '95 ghazals and a few minor poems' (Shackle in Shackle 1991: 79).

In short, the British first thought it was the common language of India and then actually made it almost that.

Their other perception, that it was closer to Urdu than Sanskritized Hindi, fed into the Hindi-Urdu controversy of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This, however, is a subject requiring such exclusive treatment that it has been left out here (see Rai 1984; King 1994). Suffice it to say that it was partly because of this association that identity-conscious Hindus did not adopt it as the language of the independent Indian Union opting for (Sanskritized) Hindi instead.

The British used Hindustani and Urdu interchangeably but Hindustani seemed to push out Hindi and inclined towards the Urdu end of the linguistic scale. Indeed that is why Sulaiman Nadvi, who wanted peaceful coexistence among Hindus and Muslims, advised Muslims to abandon the name Urdu in favour of Hindustani. He considered the common language of both Muslims and Hindus as deserving of that name—symbolic as it was of Indian nationalism and Hindu–Muslim unity—because Urdu, after all, was only a recent name for the language (Nadvi 1939: 74 and 101–104). But precisely because it invoked 'Hindi', the more politically conscious Muslims did not like it either. Z.A. Bukhari, an important official and pioneer of radio in India, says that one could have used the language if it had 'a dictionary or if it had literature in it. Then one could have said, all right let us accept this language. But how can we use this hypothetical language which has no literature, no lexicon, no father nor any mother...' (Bukhari 1966: 120). Such identity-conscious Muslims obviously could not accept 'Hindi-Hindustani' for the language but they also rejected the term 'Hindustani' during the Urdu-Hindi controversy. In any case, precisely because it symbolized a common Indian nationality—something which ceased to exist in 1947—it did not survive the partition of British India.

HINDUSTANI AFTER THE PARTITION

After 1947 Hindustani was ousted from both India and Pakistan. The former chose the name Hindi and the latter Urdu. In both countries this compromise appellation was seen as an artificial construction and, at best, a compromise among the would-be unifiers of the Hindi-Urdu controversy period.

The debate on using the name Hindustani or Hindi started on 12 September 1949, in the Constituent Assembly of India, and instead of the Gandhian compromise formula of accepting the name Hindustani and allowing it to be written in both the Perso-Arabic and the Devanagari scripts, the following resolution was tabled:

> The official language of the Union shall be Hindi in the Devanagari script and the form of numbers to be used for official purposes of the Union shall be the international form of Indian numerals (LAD: I IX; 32; 1949: 1321)

The debate was long and bitter. Hindu and Muslim members of the house stood in the opposite camps of Hindi and Urdu. Qazi Syed Karimuddin said that this could be a reaction to Pakistan's adoption of Urdu as its national language (Ibid., p. 1367). Abul Kalam Azad supported the compromise of Hindustani (Ibid., 1456). Even the members from South India supported this compromise term but they were overruled by people like Seth Govind Das, R.V. Dhulekar and Purushottam Das Tandon, all fanatical about Sanskritized Hindi and suspicious that Urdu would sneak in under the cover of Hindustani, and on 15 September 1949 the resolution was adopted.

While in India Muslims struggle to keep the word Urdu alive so that it would not be subsumed under Hindi as one of the styles or varieties of that language; in Pakistan some nationalists have suggested that the language be called 'Pakistani'. Linguists, wishing to emphasize the similarities between ordinary Urdu and

Hindi, as used at present in South Asia, call it Urdu-Hindi. A Hindi movie, fully understood in Pakistan, is nevertheless said to be in Hindi. Likewise, Pakistani dramas are said to be in Urdu in Pakistan even though speakers of Hindi comprehend them easily.

Sanskritized Hindi

The name used for the language of modern India roughly from about 1802 by excluding words of Arabic and Persian from Khari Boli Hindi is called just Hindi nowadays. However, in order to distinguish it from the earlier language of this name—also from the varieties of the collectivity called Hindi as used in the Hindi belt of India—some scholars call it Sanskritized Hindi, Modern Hindi and 'Hindi' (Rai 2001: 15). Its creation has been described by Vasudha Dalmia (1997), King (1994) and Alok Rai (2001: 79–92). The consensus among scholars is that Khari Boli was purged of words of Perso-Arabic origin and written in the Devanagari script in *Prēm Sāgar* by Lallu Ji Lal as a pioneering work of what later became Modern or Sanskritized Hindi (Jalili 2002). Others such as Sadal Misra in his *Batiyāl Pachīsī* also created the first paradigmatic texts of this language. Of course Insha Allah Khan Insha (1756–1818), who also wrote *Rānī Kētakī Kī Kahānī* (Insha *c.* 1803) in just such a language is not counted because he did it to show off his linguistic skill and was not serious about eliminating the Perso-Arabic diction which was symbolic of Muslim conquest and cultural hegemony for Hindu language activists. But the Hindus were not the only ones to Sanskritize Khari Boli Hindi. The British did it too. For instance, J.T. Thompson published his *A Dictionary in Hindee and English Compiled from Approved Authorities* (1846) and replaced a large number of Perso-Arabic words with Sanskrit equivalents. Even earlier (1785) William Kirkpatrick, the Persian Secretary to the Commander-in-Chief, had given the idea of preparing a Hindi dictionary but nothing had come out of it (Steadman-Jones 2007: 75; Bayly 1996:

296). For the lexicographers, the Sanskrit words were an index of their scholarship and the fact that there was a linguistic category called Hindi in the Devanagari script, of which they were producing a reference dictionary, made them hunt with the zeal of the purist for Sanskrit words. Their assumption was that their job was to restore words which the Muslim languages had driven out. But the words they substituted for these familiar ones were not intelligible.

The charge that this new language is not intelligible without specialized training is well-known. The language, or rather the style, is not meant to be intelligible, however. It is an identity symbol and its function is iconic—to evoke Hindu nationalism, help imagine a united land (Bharat) and a monolithic people united through the emotive symbols of land, language and creed. That is why it was pushed through the legislative assembly of India in 1949 with enthusiasm bordering on fanaticism as described earlier.

This language has created a diglossic situation in North India because it is nobody's mother-tongue. Instead, like Classical Arabic and Greek, it has to be learned in school. And, indeed, it is a difficult language to acquire as Alok Rai observes:

> there is the universal dread of 'school Hindi', in school and out of it. The large numbers of students who fail in Hindi in the Hindi belt itself are grim testimony to the fact that 'Hindi' has robbed them of their mother tongue. From being native users, free to invent and be creative, they have been 'second-languaged', disabled, rendered alien (Rai 2001: 105).

The real problem, however, is that the name Hindi, appropriated by this politically constructed language, makes it difficult to claim the shared past of both modern Urdu and Hindi, which remains unknown and unacknowledged in both Pakistan and India. Moreover, the unintelligible Sanskritic words make it difficult for ordinary people to believe that linguists claiming

that Urdu and Hindi are the same language could be right. So, in the last analysis, the divisive forces of the establishments on both sides stand to gain, as the message which emerges is that Hindi and Urdu, and thus Hindu and Muslim civilizations, are so alienated from each other as to warrant the official narratives of 'two nations', alien *malicchas* and strangers sharing common space or borders. Names like Hindustani would have given hope of emphasizing commonalities and the historical memories attached to that name are not antagonistic or bitter. But, then, the logic of a century and a half of the mobilization of linguistic identities in North India dictated otherwise. We reaped what we sowed.

Names and the Census

The politics of language is facilitated by discursive practices which include naming, classification and categorization, and of course, the use of these categories in the domains of power. Benedict Anderson, while describing the rise of nationalist ideology in the colonies of the Western powers, wrote that the three institutions which played a major role in constructing or 'imagining' the new 'nation' were, 'the census, the map and the museum: together, they profoundly shaped the way the colonial state imagined its dominion' (Anderson 1983: 163–64). The identities created, or at least made salient by the census, became the new political realities of the day in South East Asia which is Anderson's focus.

In India the census played an important role by creating the categories of Urdu, Hindi and Hindustani and enumerating the numbers of people who gave the corresponding label to their mother-tongue. This created assumed bodies of speakers out of those who might not have given their mother-tongue any name at all, as according to the census authorities, the 'average native rarely knows the name of his own dialect' (Census-I 1903: 250).

The first census report, that of 1871–72, elaborates upon religious categories as they were the most prominent part of the British classificatory discourse but language is also mentioned. Thus we are told that the area reported upon has a population of 190,563,048 people out of which the Hindus are the majority (139,248,568), followed by Muslims (40,882,537), after whom are Sikhs (1,174,436), and then the followers of minority religions (Census-I 1875: 16 and Table 17 of Appendix). The languages are reported to be 'Hindustani' in Bihar in both the Perso-Arabic and the Kaithi scripts and Hindi in the Chota Nagpur area in the Devanagari script (Census-I 1875: 69). At this time the British did not rule the Hindi-Urdu heartland—present-day UP—so Urdu does not even figure in this report.

The next census, that of 1881–1882, does not give figures for Urdu either, but does give figures for Hindi (517,989) and Hindustani (82,497,168). The census does, however, make it clear that Urdu is included under the category of 'Hindustani'. It says 'the language which is returned as numbering most speakers is Hindustani or Urdu' (Census-I 1883: 196). Further, the report asserts that Hindi speakers have been included among the Hindustani ones because although it 'is a distinctly separate language from Hindustani', it has not been distinguished from it in 'the North Western Provinces and Oudh' (43,221,705 speakers of Hindustani) (Census-I 1883: 196). This region, as we know it, is now called the home of Hindi, but it is also the centre of Urdu literature and high culture and the urban people here still speak a language which could be called popular Hindi-Urdu.

The 1891 census gives the number of Urdu-speakers as 140 per 10,000 of the population while the corresponding figures for Hindi are 3,269. The census also says that 'the language of the plains [NWP and Oudh] is officially "Hindustani", so it is not likely that any attempt would be made through the medium of the census to contravene this authoritative decision' (Census-I 1893: 138). This 'Hindustani', it is further explained, has 'a few

conventional terminations to the local vocabulary, with the introduction of some Persian words' (Census-I 1893: 134)—which, in fact, is ordinary, spoken Urdu also. By the 1901–1902 Census the Urdu-Hindi controversy had entered the consciousness of the census officials as well as the people. This report, for instance, associates Urdu explicitly with Islam as follows:

> Islam has carried Urdu far and wide, and even in Bengal and Orissa we find Mussalman natives of the country whose vernacular is not that of their compatriots but is an attempt (often a bad one) to reproduce the idiom of Delhi and Lucknow (Census-I 1903: 249).

Urdu is included in Western Hindi (40,714, 925 speakers) which is described as being spoken between 'Sirhind in the Punjab and Allahabad in the United Provinces. On the north it extends to the foot of Himalayas, but on the South it does not reach much beyond the valley of the Jamna, except towards the east, where it covers Bundelkhand and a portion of the Central Provinces' (Census-I 1903: 328). The census report goes on to name the dialects of this language: 'Hindustani, Braj Bhāshā, Kanaujī, and Bundīlī, to which we may add the Bangarū of the South-Eastern Punjab' (Ibid., 328).

The numbers of the speakers for each of these dialects is as listed:

Vernacular Hindostani	7,072,745
Dakhni	6,292,628
Other Hindostani including unclassed dialects	5,921,384
Braj Bhasha	8,380,724
Kanauji	5,082,006
Bundeli	5,460,280
Bangaru	2,505,158
Western Hindi	40,714,925
Source: Census-I 1903: 328.	

...

After independence the census of 1951 says that, in contrast to the past 'the pendulum now swings the other way and speakers of Urdu have declined from 699,523 in 1941 to 131,600 in 1951 whereas over the same period the speakers of Hindi have increased from 67,988 to 652,722' (Census-MP 1954: 74). The same phenomenon was evident in Madhya Pradesh and Bhopal, the former Urdu-speaking areas, where the 'vast majority of speakers of various dialects of Hindi and Rajasthani...returned Hindi' (Census MP 1954: 73).

Basically, the neutral term Hindustani declined as Hindu and Muslim identities became rigid and focused upon language—Hindi and Urdu respectively—in addition to religion. The rising period for Hindustani was between 1911 and 1921 when speakers of Urdu and Hindi reverted back to being speakers of Hindustani. Between 1921–31 and 1931–1951, Hindi gained at the expense of Hindustani. After 1949 as we have noted, Hindustani speakers decreased very rapidly. During 1951–1961, however, 'Hindustani's loss became Urdu's gain'. However, the census report was unsure 'whether Urdu was slightly inflated either on its own or at the expense of some other tongue in 1961 (Census-I 1964: vi–vii).

However, Hindustani declined till it was not even recorded after 1961 and Urdu was relegated to the status of a minority language. The following figures given in percentages illustrate this:

Urdu in Present-day India (1971–2001)		
Year	Urdu	Hindi
1971	5.22	36.99
1981	5.25	38.74
1991	5.18	39.29
2001	5.01	41.03
Source: Census-I 2001: Statement-5, p. 14.		

In UP, once the home of Urdu, 7.99 per cent of people claim it as
a mother-tongue, while 91.32 claim Hindi to be their mother-
tongue (Ibid., Statement 9, pp. 20–37). The strength of Urdu
versus Hindi in other areas of India is as follows:

Distribution of 10,000 Persons by Language		
	Urdu	Hindi
Bihar	1,141	7,312
Uttar Pradesh	799	9,133
Delhi	632	8,100
Uttaranchal	586	8,803
Madhya Pradesh	197	8,732
India (whole)	502	4,110
Source: Census-I 2001. Statement-3, p. 12.		

In keeping with the official discourse of secularism, the tendency
to link language with religion is discouraged. During the 1991
census, for example, the enumerators were told: 'You should also
not try to establish any relationship between religion and mother
tongue' (Census-UP 1996: 2). However, the classificatory labels
used by the census authorities and as they are understood in
India and Pakistan do tend to associate languages with religious
communities. For instance, even in the census of 1961 in India,
the meaning of Urdu is restricted to what may be called
'Persianized' or 'High' Urdu. It is differentiated from the spoken
language of urban India in the Census of 1961 as follows:

    (a) Literary Hindostani was the vernacular of Musalmans and
the form of polite speech of India generally (it may be
renamed 'Hindustani' only) (article b).

    (b) Urdu was that special variety of literary Hindostani which
had excessive use of Persian words and was written in
Persian character (article c).

In other words, it is by not recognizing the speech of ordinary urban people as 'Urdu', not even Muslims who are otherwise said to speak Urdu, that this language is restricted to a small, elitist Muslim preserve. An alternative view, and one which is favoured by the present author is that the language defined as 'Hindi' could equally be called 'Urdu' and vice versa. This definition is as follows:

(a) Vernacular Hindostani was the speech in Northern Doab and the contiguous areas by the inhabitants as their vernacular. (To avoid confusion this could be better known as "Hindi") (Census-I 1964: Article a, ccxi).

If this is the language of the streets of North India then it is quite intelligible to the speakers of Urdu (both as a first and a second language) in the cities of Pakistan. The sum total of these varieties may be seen as forming a continuum which may be given any name—Urdu, Hindi, Hindustani, or Urdu-Hindi—but it is basically the same language.

URDU

As mentioned earlier, this name was used for the language for the first time by the poet Mushafi in 1780 or so (Fauqi 2003: 806). However, some scholars, notably Syed Abdullah, claim that it was used first by Sirajuddin Ali Khan Arzu 1099–1169/1688—1756–57 in his book *Navādir ul Alfāz*, finished in 1165/1751 (Abdullah 1951: 28–29). Some even claimed that Mir Mohammad Husain Ata Khan Taehsin's book called *Naō Tarz-ē-Murass'ā*, written around 1193/1779, may be the first instance of such use in print. However, Taehsin's book, a translation from Persian of the tale of the four mendicants (*chahār dervish*), in 'colourful and embellished Hindi language' ('*ibārat rangīn zubān-ē-Hindī*) is meant to teach 'the language of the exalted city' (*zubān-ē-Urdū-ē-mu'allā*) (Taehsin 1775: 54). So, even if the writing of the book

predates the usage of the term by Mushafi, it cannot be said with certainty that Taehsin used the term Urdu for the language. Most probably he adhered to the conventional use of the term for the city of Delhi.

The claim about Arzu is, however, more serious. This theory was first advanced, although only in passing, by Hafiz Mahmud Shirani (Shirani 1941 in 1965: 51). It was reasserted but without reference to Shirani by Syed Abdullah, who advanced it in the preface to the *Navādir ul Alfāz* by giving examples of Arzu's explanations, or actually corrections of Mir Wase Hanswi's meanings in his <u>*Gh*</u>*araib-ul Lughāt*, of the words: '*rajwāṛā*', '*gazak*', '*nakhtōṛ ā*' and '*haraphnā*' (Abdullah 1951: 28–29). While in the first three the interpretations of the word Urdu is most likely not used in the meaning of language (see Arzu's explanation in Persian in Chapter 5 of this book), in the last case the Persian lines read: '*haraphnā... zubān-ē-Urdū ō aehlē shaherhā nīst ...*' (Arzu 1751: 441–442) translates as 'the language of Urdu and the inhabitants of the cities is not'. The word Urdu, which is normally used for city during this period, at least in writing, is probably still being used for Delhi. However, Abdullah takes it as referring to the language. While the usage here is ambiguous the actual date matters less than the fact that the word Urdu came to replace earlier terms for the language, sometime by the end of the eighteenth century.

As the word itself is Turkish and means camp or military cantonment, the most commonly believed theory in South Asia is that the language was born in military camps. This is only partly true because the language has an ancestor which existed in India even before the Muslims arrived. Moreover, even more than the camps, the market place, the <u>kh</u>ānqāhs of the Sufis and, indeed, the exigencies of daily life, made people borrow words from Persian and Arabic, the languages of Muslims, into the ancestor of both Hindi and Urdu. It is, however, true that cantonments do establish the power and, hence, the culture and

artefacts of the conquering power. As such, the act of borrowing the idiom associated with such places may have been faster than the rural areas of India.

While there is no clear example of the language of the military camps of pre- and even Mughal India, there are examples of the British cantonments where English entered the Indian languages. For instance, in Kanpur, a military camp established by the British, several such terms are found. The word camp itself becomes '*kampū*' and '*kanp*', etc. (Ansarullah 1988: 147). The words '*bārak*' (barrack), '*agan bōṭ*' (steam boat), appeal, appellant, etc., among others, are described in Persian by Mir Ali Ausat Rashk in his dictionary called *Nafs ul Lughā* (Ansarullah 1988: 147–152). Pencil is defined in Persian as '*qalm-ē-surmā bashad kē angrēzã badã navīsand ō lughat-ē-angrēzī ast*' (a pen of kohl which the British use for writing and it is an English word) (Ibid., 152). Later everybody knew the meaning so well that such explanations were no longer required. Is this how Persian and Arabic words entered the ancestor of our languages? Probably—but the exact process is yet to be described fully.

But the connotation of the name Urdu—military, Muslim conquests—cast a sombre shadow over Hindu-Muslim relations in British India. That is why those Muslims who emphasized peaceful coexistence with Hindus in a United India pointed out these associations (military domination and Muslim rule) and wanted the name to be abandoned (Nadvi 1939: 103). The logic which is advanced in support of this is that the word Urdu means 'camp' in Turkish. However, Shamsur Rahman Faruqi has given an excellent refutation of this. He first refers to 'a surreptitious feeling of guilt generated by the Urdu literary community's almost universal belief that Urdu was a "military language" after all' (Faruqi 2003: 818). He claims emphatically that 'there is no recorded instance of this word [Urdu] ever being used in the Urdu-Hindi-Rekhtah-Gujri-Dakhni language to denote "army"' (Faruqi 2003: 818). But the fact that the oldest name for Urdu was

Hindi is not acceptable to many Pakistani users of Urdu because they want to wipe out the Indian past of their language in favour of an exclusively Muslim (and military) past. In India it is the other way round. The name Hindi is now reserved for Sanskritized Hindi created in the nineteenth century so that Urdu appears to be an exclusively Muslim, hence foreign, cultural artefact. This weakens Urdu's position in India while associating it with Pakistan. But this is politics and not linguistic history—something which we will see very often in the case of Urdu.

COMPARATIVE TABLE FOR NUMBERS OF HINDI, HINDUSTANI AND URDU SPEAKERS 1911–1981

UP					
	1911	1921	1931	1951	1961
Hindi	43,769,569	-	-	50,454,217	62,442,721
Hindus-tani	-	49,384,073	49,456,327	6,742,938	10,530
Urdu	4,095,728	-	-	4,300,425	7,891,710
MP					
Hindi	8,203,278	7,651,334	2,868,538	19,875,774	21,686,140
Hindus-tani	79,291	28,907	4,990,345	59,381	1,084
Urdu	308,590	374,424	751,775	368,233	740,098
Punjab					
Hindi	1,670,023	1,641,267	-	-	11,297,838
Urdu	322,495	1,221,886	In 1931 Hindi includes Urdu so separate figures are not available	In 1951 the classificatory labels were Hindi, Urdu, Punjabi and Pahari.	255,660
Delhi					
Hindi	84,200	46,410	586,967	1,646,476	2,057,213
Urdu	90,345	309,000	-	-	153,247
Source: Census-I 1964, Statement–1.					

NB: The figures which are missing are not given in the source.

NOTES

1. The lines from Amir Khusrau's *Nuh Sipihr* are as follows:

سندی و لاہوری و کشمیری و کبر

دھور سمندری و تلنگی و گجر

معبری و گوری و بنگال و اود

دھلی و پیرا منشن اندر ھمہ حد

این ھمہ ھندویست کہ ز ایام کہن

عامہ بکار است بہر گونہ سخن

<div align="right">(Khusrau 1318: 179–180)</div>

Shamsur Rahman Faruqi does not accept Grierson's list of names of
languages giving his own interpretation of them (Faruqi 1999: 63–64).
However, his argument has no bearing on the points being made in this
work.

2. The words of Abul Fazl are as follows:

درفر اخنای ھندوستان بفراوان زبان سخن سرایند۔ آن اختلاف کہ از فہمیدگی یکدیگر بازندارد

از شمارہ بیرون۔ وانچہ نیارند دریافت دھلی بنگالہ ملتان ماڑواڑ گجرات تلنگانہ مرہٹ کرناتک

سند افغان شال (کہ میان سند و کابل و قندھاراست) بلوچستان کشمیر

<div align="right">(Abul Fazl Vol. 3, 1590: 45).</div>

3. Babar's words in the original Turkish are as follows:

غوزوب بیر ھندوستانی بیلور کیشیکا بو یو ر دوم کیم بوسوز لارنی

بیرار بیرارالکا خاطر نشان

<div align="right">(Babar 1528: 415).</div>

3

Age

How old is the ancestor of Hindi-Urdu? This question is difficult to answer because the surviving documents have only a few words which are recognizable but nothing is known about how they were spoken and whether the missing words, the ones which we do not understand, were in such a great majority that the descendants are too far removed from the ancestors to be classified under the same head.

Meer Amman, who is often quoted in defence of the idea that Urdu is a pidgin born during the middle Mughal period, traced the language back to the time of Akbar. His theory is that speakers of different languages came together in Akbar's capital (which was Agra, situated in the Braj Bhasha speaking area) and during buying and selling and trade (*lēn dēn saudā sulaf*) a language (Urdu) was created (Amman 1851: 11). This is the classical description of the creation of a pidgin language but even pidgins have a certain base language which this theory ignores. Thus every serious researcher, most notably Shirani (1965), have traced back the ancestor of Urdu to a spoken language at least as far back as the fourteenth century.

Amrit Rai, however, has quoted words and lines from the Nath-Panthi literature compiled in *Gorakh bānī* by Pitambar Datta Barthval (1942) which would shift the date back by about three centuries, i.e. from the fourteenth to the eleventh century, if it was authentic. However, it should be noted that the verses recorded as being of the Nath Panthis are from oral literature. The dates of the writing of manuscripts, which Barthval gives in

the introduction of his book, are from the sixteenth century onwards. In the case of Punjabi literature they are called 'a kind of folk translation'. Thus, while 'the verse line and the phrase remain more or less in their original forms, while older and archaic words are unintentionally changed into more familiar current idiom' (Rahul Sankrityayan quoted from Sekhon and Duggal 1992: 3) this is true for the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi also. Thus, the specimens accepted as being authentic by Amrit Rai (1984: 64–72) are to be taken as being approximations of an ancient form of Urdu-Hindi.

These texts are claimed by historians of Hindi alone though they belong to the common ancestor of both Hindi and Urdu. The following lines come from *Gorakh Bānī* have been transliterated and translated into English as follows.

Bastī na sunyē sunyē na bastī agam agōchar aēsā
(The Fullness is not zero; zero is not Fullness
He is such which cannot be known; nor perceived by the senses)

gagan si khar mahī bālak bolāē tākā nãv dharugē kaēsē
(From above the summit of the sky speaks the Absolute pure like a child—how will you name it?).

adēkhī dēkhibā dēkhī bechāribā adistī rākhiba chiyā
(The Unseen should be seen; the seen should be contemplated; And the Unseen should be kept in the consciousness)

pātāl kī gangā brahmand chaṛ ḫaibā tahā bimal bimal jal piyā
(Raise the [river] Ganga from the lowest level up to the highest, there to drink the clearest water).

ihã hī āchē ihã hī alōp ihã hī rachilaē tīnī trilōk
(Here is the Undestroyable, here is the mystically hidden and here the originally created three worlds)

āchaē sangaē rahaē juvā ta kāranṛ anant siddhā jēgēsrar huvā
(One who remains in companionship with the Absolute so because of it attains the endless perfection of the yogi).

vēd katēb nakhā ̣r ī bā ̣r ī sab dhankī talī ā ̣r ī
(Neither the Vedas nor other religious books nor the Word
originating from its [four] sources reach the Absolute—all bring it
under a cover).

gagni sikhar mahī sabd prakāsyā thā būjhaē alakh binā ̣r ī
(The Word brings itself to light at the highest peak of the sky
[Brahmand] and at that level one should realize the Unseen and the
Unknown) (Barthwal 1942: 1–2).[1]

The following twenty-three words out of a total number of sixty-
seven words (not counting repetitions) are intelligible to
speakers of modern Urdu: *bastī* (as habitation not fullness); *aēsā*
(of this kind); *gagan* (sky); *bōlē* (speaks); *nām* (name); *dhar* (to
keep); *gē* (will as in *dharō gē* = will keep); *kaēsā* (of what kind);
dēkhī (seen); *rakkhī* (kept); *kī* (of); *cha ̣r h* (mount); *jal* (water); *piyā*
(drank); *hī* (it is); *rachnā* (to be decorated; in visible splendour);
tīn (three); *kitāb* (book); *na* (no); *sab* (all); *sang* (with); *huā*
(happened); and *bujhē* (put off). The words *bichār* (think) *sabd*
(word) and *kāran* (reason) are also intelligible to Urdu-speakers
educated in the classics of India or those who are exposed to
Bollywood movies and Indian TV. This leaves forty-one words
which are known to specialists in Sanskrit. But, since this is a
religious work, it probably has more words of Sanskrit—the
language of religious and philosophical thought—than ordinary
speech would.

Even better than the text quoted above is the following
specimen of a deed of gift in one of the royal courts of
Rajasthan.

*Ō janānā mẽ thārī vansrā ̣t āl ō dūjō jāvēgā nahĩ ōr thārī baēthak dalī mẽ
hī jī pramā ̣nō pardhan barōbar kara ̣n dēvēgā.*
(And in the harem you and your descendants can enter and no other.
And your room will be near our secretary's (Pardhan's) office.[2]

This was written by Dube Pancholi Janaki Das in Anand Sam 1139 or 1172 CE. As one can see, words of Muslim languages have been used but what is more interesting is that the 'verbal forms are of a type, identical with those of Kharī Bolī viz. 'Javegā', 'Devegā' etc' (Vedalankar 1969: 4)

If this specimen is, indeed, of the twelfth century, then it indicates—far better than the lines from the *Gorakh Bānī* quoted earlier—that the ancestor of modern Hindi-Urdu was present before the Turks and the Afghans established their rule in North India.

The specimens provided earlier would not be intelligible to a non-specialist in Sanskrit and the Prakrits of India in the medieval age, but the same is true for old English texts from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries which are not intelligible to modern speakers of English.

It appears almost certain then that the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi was present in the eleventh century when the Persian-speaking Turkish and Persian invaders, merchants, mendicants, and holy men arrived in India. This ancestor (Proto Urdu-Hindi) was not a standardized language so it was spoken with major differences of vocabulary, pronunciation and other usages from around Peshawar to the end of Bihar. But it was probably in the area around Delhi that the language got most mixed up with Perso-Arabic diction, resulting in code-switching and then the stabilized forms we encounter in medieval documents. Code switching—changing from one language to another by speakers who are fluent in both—is a worldwide phenomenon and is evident in linguistic history. For instance, Richard Kyngston, dean of Windsor, wrote a letter to King Henry IV on 13 September 1403 in Norman French in which he switches to English as he probably did in conversation:

> Please a vostre tresgraciouse Seignourie entendre que a-jourduy après noone....Warfore, for goddesake, thinketh on ʒour beste frende...

This is translated in the footnote (no. 4) as follows: 'May it please your most gracious Lordship to understand that today after noon... Wherefore, for God's sake think of your best friend'...(quoted from Knowles 1979: 55).

But, besides actually switching back and forth in two languages, bilinguals also borrow words in their languages. For instance, in the above example the word 'noone' became the English 'noon' and so on. Nor was this all as a large number of collocations and expressions were borrowed from French into English. Some such process must have gone on into the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi. Examples of Urdu-Hindi in the making are illustrated in the letters of representatives of Hindu rulers in Mughal courts, 'in the form of *arzdasht* written in *Hindvi* incorporating the Rajasthani and Persian dialects' (Sharma 1987: 1). One such document from Vakil Pansholi Megharaj to Maharaja Bishan Singh dating from 6 January 1692 in the Devanagari script reads:

> *Mahārāj salāmat. Yāmae jū khātir mubārak mẽpasand āvē su arjdāst karaēlā. Fārsī arjdāst sitābī kē sabab nahī karī he. Jū navāb salāmat Khān Jī naē pharmāyā jū jald joṛ ī chalē jū. Jald smacharõ kī arjdāst karī hẽ* (Sharma 1987: 44).[3]
>
> (Great Ruler May you live long. If it pleases you I am sending this petition. I have not written the petition in Persian because of the hurry. Whatever Nawab Salamat Khan Ji has said that I have quickly conveyed to you. Quickly I have conveyed the news in this petition to you).

These documents suggest that the representatives of the Rajput rulers wrote normally in the Devanagari script but they could also write in the Persian script upon formal occasions though it took them longer to compose a letter in that script. Being in a Muslim court they had to use the vocabulary (salutations, courteous expressions, formal words in Persian for documents, etc.) of that court so that their language is very much like the

kind of hybrid English one finds in the English Factory documents mentioned elsewhere. It is this process of intermingling in many domains—business, diplomacy, bureaucracy, military, and religious—which produced the common ancestor of Hindi and Urdu in the medieval age in India.

There is evidence also that the ancestor of Hindi-Urdu, was used informally by people. As mentioned earlier, this evidence comes from the *malfūzāt* (for a synoptic survey of twenty-nine books of this genre see Aslam 1995), *tazkarās,* histories and other contemporary documents in Persian. Examples from this kind of literature as well as other historical documents in Persian have been quoted by Ghani (1929, 1930), Hafiz Mahmud Shirani (1965: 132–158), Syed Sulaiman Nadvi (1939: 19–75), Jamil Jalibi (1975: 21–50), Aslam (1995: 339–340), Askari (1995); and Jafer and Jain (1998), as well as others who do not, however, seem to have used the original Persian sources. These researchers concur that a language called 'Hindi' or 'Hindvi' or in Gujarat 'Gojri' and also 'Gujarati' was used in informal conversation or spontaneously— as when someone is hurt or surprised or is talking to people who are not conversant with the formal Persian. It is also used in songs (*samā'a*).

Unfortunately none of these researchers have commented upon the relative credibility of the sources they have used to reproduce the lines in what is often called 'Hindvi' and 'Hindi'. Thus *tazkarās*, written in the nineteenth century, are used without comment when reporting the words of a medieval saint as are contemporary *malfūzāt*. The examples given here fall under three main headings: those which mention a language without, however, giving the actual words; those which are not from contemporary sources and are, therefore, of doubtful credibility; and finally, those from contemporary or near-contemporary sources which give the actual words in the language. First, however, let us mention the words of Hindi-Urdu in the Persian documents.

WORDS

The presence of Urdu-Hindi words in the Persian documents of the medieval age are recorded very carefully and extensively by Hafiz Mahmud Shirani (1965: 54–101). It is not possible to add to this list. Suffice it to say that even the word *badhnī*, water pot, which is the nickname of Sheikh Badhni who lived in the thirteenth century, is because, according to the legend, he used to give water to prisoners. Thus 'he got the nickname of *badhnī* which in the 'Hindvi' language means a pot of water' ('*Shekh Sufi rā badhnī [laqab uftād] kē bazubān-ē-Hindī kūza murād ast*') (Dehlavi 1862: 74).

SENTENCES IN A LANGUAGE CALLED 'HINDVI' OR 'HINDI'

As for the recording of utterances by previous researchers such as Ghani (1929 and 1930), Shirani (1930 in 1965: 132–158), Nadvi (1939: 19–75) and Jalibi (1975: 21–42), they do not differentiate between contemporary or near-contemporary and latter sources when recording the Hindi utterances attributed to medieval speakers. Some sources mention that so-and-so said something in the 'Hindvi' or 'Hindi' language but the words themselves are not actually quoted. For instance, the *Khair ul Majālis*, which is the *malfūzāt* of Sheikh Nasir Uddin Chiragh Dehli (1276–77–1356) (the manuscripts of 1649 have been used to prepare the book used here but the conversations actually took place and were written by Hamid Qalandar in the early fourteenth century) mentions Sheikh Badhni (mentioned above) who lived during the lifetime of Sheikh Farid (Assembly 48, Qalandar *c*. 14th century: 159). When he was told that he would not have to say his prayers in paradise he said that he had no use for such a paradise and 'said a word in the Hindvi language which it is not appropriate to repeat' (*lafzī guft bazubān-ē-Hindvī kē natawān guft*' (Ibid., 159). This is also repeated in a *tazkarā, Akhbār ul Akhiār*, written at a later date (Dehlavi 1862: 73).

Yet another example is that Khwaja Usman Harooni goes into
a fire with a Hindu child who later says 'in the Hindvi language:
'I was sitting in the middle of a flower garden' (*bazubān-ē-Hindvī
guft kē man darmiān bāgh nashistā būdam*) (Assembly 11, Qalandar
c. 14th century: 54).

Quoting from *Latāif-ē-Quddūsī*, the *malfūzāt* of Sheikh Abdul
Quddus Gangohi (860–945/1455–1538), written by his son Sheikh
Ruknuddin, between 1537 and 1538, Aslam says that he spoke
'Hindi' and listened to songs in that language (Aslam 1995: 339).
However, the actual words are not given.

Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya narrates the story of Sheikh Ahmad
Nahravani who was a disciple of a certain Faqir Madhu—a name
suggesting Hindu origin—who is said to be the leader of prayers
at a mosque in Ajmer. This Madhu told Nahravani, whom he
heard reciting Hindvi poetry, that he had a beautiful voice and
he should not waste it on singing Hindvi songs (*darēgh bāshad kē
surūd-ē-Hindī kharch kunī*) (Sijzi 1322: 764). Instead, the mentor
advised him to recite the Quran. Again, Shirani (1965: 137) and
other researchers assume that this was the ancestor of Urdu but
it is not clear exactly which language is meant by 'Hindvi'.
However, it is reasonable to assume that it would be a variety of
Urdu-Hindi used in Ajmer.

Similarly, Sheikh Rizqullah Mushtaqi (1495–6–1581–2), the
author of *Waqiāt-ē-Mushtāqi* (1572), tells us that Sher Shah Suri
(r. 1540–45) had appointed separate clerks to write in Persian as
well as 'Hindvi' (Mushtaqi 1572: 185). And, of course, we know
from the *Āin-ē-Akbarī* (1590) that it was Raja Todar Mal, appointed
minister (*Vakīl*) by Akbar in 990/1582, who changed the language
of the accounts from Hindvi to Persian (Blochmann 1873: 377).

Unfortunately, the 'Hindvi' or 'Hindi' words are not reproduced
in all the cases cited above. Thus, it cannot be said with certainty
as to whether this was the ancestor of Urdu and Hindi which
Shirani (1965: 54–131), as well as other researchers, assert it was.

Reasoning from the examples given below it probably was but one cannot be sure.

Sentences of Hindi in Sources of a Latter Date

According to the legend Sheikh Ahmad Nahravani, a weaver, was visited by Sheikh Hameed Uddin Nagori (590–673/1193–1274), his mentor. He was weaving and the Sheikh said 'Ahmad! How long will you remain bound to this profession' and left. Sheikh Ahmad stood up to fasten a loose nail, slipped, fell and broke his arm. The Persian words are: '*Sheikh Ahmad bazubān-ē-Hindvī guft yenī Qāzī Hameed Uddīn Nāgōrī dast-ē-man bashakist*' ('in the Hindvi language said Qazi Hameed Uddin Nagori broke my arm') (Assembly 99 in Qalandar *c*. 14th century: 276).

Another story quoted by both Ghani (1929: 72) and Shirani (1930 in 1965: 150) is of Syed Burhanuddin Abu Mohammad Abdullah Bukhari (d. 857/1453), who is famous for having uttered words in Hindi spontaneously when he struck a piece of wood one night after getting up for prayers. The Persian chronicler says*: 'bar zubān-ē-mubārak guzasht kē 'kyā haē lōhā haē kē lakṛ ī haē kē patthar haē*' (from the blessed tongue burst forth 'what is it? Is it iron or wood or stone?' (Khan Vol. 3, 1889: 17).[4] But while this hagiography mentions a saint who died in the fifteenth century, it was actually published in 1306/1888–89. Thus it is not certain whether the words in Hindi were exactly these or not.

Sheikh Hameed Uddin Nagori, disciple of Sheikh Moinuddin Chishti (1141–1230), is said to have spoken 'Hindi' at home (Aslam 1995: 339). However, only a few words purported to be spoken by him survive (Shirani 1965: 136).

According to Khwaja Ghulam Farid (1845–1901), Nizamuddin Auliya was very fond of Hindi songs. Once a woman was singing inside the house and her voice reached the saint. The rest of the story is best told in the words of the writer of the *malfūzāt*. '*ĩ shē'rī guft: "lagan bin raen nā jāgē kōī" pas bar ĩ shē'r nēz āhazrat rā zauq rasīd ō bavajd āmadand*' (Ruknuddin 1928: 167) (sang this

[Hindi] couplet: '<u>without love nobody keeps awake the whole</u>
<u>night</u>' so on hearing this couplet he reached ecstasy and fell into
a state of exalted consciousness). But this conversation is
recorded in the twentieth century so the actual words of the
couplet may have been changed during the long history of its
narration.

A saint whose name is Sheikh Mohammad but who is known
as Mian Alulak got this title through an utterance in Hindvi
attributed to Hazrat Shah Alam, a saint of Gujarat mentioned, in
the third volume of the *Mirā 'at-ē-Ahmadī*, who died in 857/1453.
The Persian chronicler says that Sheikh Mohammad was sitting
outside his home when Shah Alam arrived. However, since he
wanted him [Alam] to give him a title he did not respond to the
visitor thrice when called by name. After the third time Shah
Alam 'smiled and said: "O Mian Alulak why don't you speak?"
('*tabassum kanã farmūdand "<u>arē Miã Alūlak bōltē kyũ nahĩ</u>*"') (Khan
1889 Vol. 3: 81). This sentence in Urdu-Hindi is perfectly
intelligible but it is found in a work of the nineteenth century
though it purports to refer to medieval Gujarat.

Another source is a hagiography (*tazkarā*) called the *Jawāhir-*
ē-Farīdī finished by Asghar Ali Chishti on the 3rd of Shawwal
1033/1623. Out of its 399 pages 272 are devoted mostly to the life
of Sheikh Farid with anecdotes about other Chishti saints. It
reproduces certain 'Hindi' utterances of the saint which have
been quoted by all researchers as if they represented the
language of the saint himself. However, because of the passage
of nearly 175 years to the saint's death, all that we can be sure
of is that these may be examples of early seventeenth century
Urdu-Hindi in North India. The examples are:

> '*dōhrā: Farīdā dhar sūli sar pinjrā taliã thukan kāg/Rab rajīvē bā hōrī tū*
> *dhan hamārē bhāg*' (Chishti 1623: 187).[5]
> (Couplet: O Farid! Place the crucifix on the head of the cage and the
> dregs will be spit out by the crows. God fulfils others and that is our
> good luck).

While this couplet has not been used by most researchers, the conversation which all the researchers mentioned above, and many others have quoted uncritically, is from the same source. The story of Sheikh Farid, then a disciple of Sheikh Qutbuddin Bakhtiar Kaki (1173–1235), whose search for fire to heat the water for ablutions for his mentor leads him to the house of a beautiful prostitute who invites him to sleep with her. He refuses and she asks for his eye which he plucks out and gives her taking the fire in exchange. He then ties a cloth on the eye and attends to his mentor who asks him why he has tied his eye. The young Farid says 'in the Hindi language: "*ā̃kh āyī haē*"'. All these words are perfectly intelligible today and the expression literally means the 'eye has come' but also means 'the eye is inflamed or painful' even now. The Sheikh replies as follows: '*agar āyī haē ĩ rā chirā bastā aēd*' (if it has come why have you tied it up?). Thereupon Farid removes the cloth and the eye is fine. Part of the Sheikh's reply is also in Hindi and he too uses the punning word '*āyī*' (come) for being physically present as well as infected (Ibid., 208). Sheikh Farid is to have also said in the 'Hindi language: *Sarsā kabhī sarsā kabhī narsā*' (Sarsa [a sub-district in Bihar] sometimes populated sometimes not) (Chishti 1623: 275). Similarly he counts in Hindi-Urdu in response to a woman's question as to how many sons she would have. His words are: '*ēk, dō tīn chār panj haft*' (one, two, three, four, seven) (Chishti 1623: 360). Out of these words only the last one is in Persian.

In addition to the words in many sources mentioned above a number of Hindi-Urdu words such as '*bābā*' (father, old man) and '*bāp*' (father) are attributed to thirteenth century saints (Ibid., 360). While describing a marriage custom the word '*ghaṛ aōlī*' is mentioned (Ibid., 232) and the names of dry fruit are in this language: '*chilghōzā ō akhrōt ō narjīl ō pistā ō alāchī*' (pine nuts and walnuts and coconuts and pistachio and cardamom) (Chishti 1623: 273).

A source which has not been used by any of the researchers cited above is the *Waqiāt-ē-Mushtāqī* (1572) mentioned before in another context. Mushtaqi quotes a couplet by Sheikh Farid which has words we recognize as Hindi-Urdu and Punjabi:

> *Jit ghar zamīn nā pāē mabiā maban<u>dh</u>ī tat*
> *Chitu pardēsī pāhnā haē ō nahāē jat* (Mushtaqi 1572: 216).[6]
> (When one does not find habitation or a piece of the earth—or reality. Where does the foolish alien bathe?).

This is the language of the sixteenth, not the fourteenth century, since we find them in a source written during Akbar's reign.

However, even with this imperfect evidence it seems probable to assume that certain words of the local languages, especially Hindi-Urdu, had entered ordinary Persian discourse in India so much that they were used freely even in formal writing just as words of Urdu are used in Pakistani English nowadays.

Amir Khusrau (1253–1324)

Most of the researchers on Khusrau's work have concluded that the writings in Hindvi/Hindi attributed to him are not authentically his (Narang 1987; Sharma 2006:78). However, others credit him with so many writings that he is also called the father of Hindi as well as Urdu poetry (Sharma 2006: 81–83). Unfortunately no authentic manuscript source of a contemporary date is available to judge these claims.

Recently Gopi Chand Narang has referred to the Sprenger collection in Berlin which comprises the Hindi writings of Khusrau. The riddles certainly do contain words we now associate with Hindi—*Purkh* (men), *charnõ* (feet), *nār* (women), *ashnān* (bath), *bhōjan* (meal), etc.,—as do other works up to the eighteenth century, but the date (1763) on the manuscript is not the date of the writing. It is the date when Sprenger put it together from the library of the rulers of Awadh. As such, Narang's assertion

that there are no reasonable grounds for not accepting any of these works as originally Khusrau's is not viable (Narang 1987: 142). The problem is that the copyists introduced linguistic changes according to the fashion of the period in which they were copying the manuscripts. So, even if Khusrau did write some of the original lines, what we are reading now is the language of the eighteenth century. That Khusrau did write in Hindi cannot be denied in the face of his claim that he had distributed these writings among his friends quoted earlier.

He also boasted that he had a collection of verse in Hindui in addition to Persian. His words are:

> *Pēsh az ĩ az pādshāhān-ē-su<u>kh</u>an kisē rā saē dīvān nabūd magar ma rā kē <u>Kh</u>usrau-e-Mamālik kalāmam. Mas'ud Sā 'ad Salmān ra agarchē hast ammā ĩ saē dīvān dar saē 'ibārat ast 'Arabī ō Pārsī ō Hinduī-dar Pārsī-ē-mujarrad kisē su<u>kh</u>an rā bar saē qism nakard juz man kē dar ĩ kār qassām-ē-'adilam'.* (Before this among the kings of poetry nobody had three collections of verse except I who is the exalted one of the realm of letters. Masood Saad Salman did, however, have three collections of verse in Arabic, Persian and Hindui. In Persian itself nobody has written verse in three styles except me and I am the judge of this kind of work) (Khusrau 1293: 63–64).

Khusrau made it clear that he was proficient in Hindi and proud to be an Indian Turk—his mother was Indian and he was brought up in his maternal grandfather's Indian household—as he says:

> *Turk-ē-Hindustāniam man Hinduī gōēm javāb*
> *Shakkar-ē-Misrī nadāram kaz 'Arab gōēm su<u>kh</u>an*
> (I am an Indian Turk and give reply in Hindi/the sugar of Egypt I do not have to speak in Arabic) (Khusrau 1293: 63).

Yet another couplet is:

> *Chū man tōtī-ē-Hindēm rāst pursī*
> *Zē man Hinduī purs tā na<u>ghz</u> gōēm*

(Because I am a parrot of India if you ask me correctly/ask me in Hindui so that I give sweet answers) (Khusrau 1293: 63).

SENTENCES OF HINDI NEAR-CONTEMPORARY SOURCES

Now we come to near-contemporary sources with Hindi words or sentences. The following story is given in *Siyār ul Aulayā* by Kirmani (d. 1368–1369). The quotations given below have been taken to mean that Sheikh Farid could speak in the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi to people who were not fluent in Persian. However, what is more reasonable is to assume that during the fourteenth century, more than a century after the saint had died, this kind of language was spoken.

Sheikh Jamaluddin Hansvi (583/1177–78—659/1262) had a small son, Burhanuddin, who came to Sheikh Farid, after his father's death, with a maid servant, Madar-ē-Mominã. The Sheikh gave him all symbols of mentorship and *ijāzā*. Madar-e-Momina said in the Hindi language: '*Khōjā Burhanuddin bālā haē*' (Khoja Burhanuddin is a child). The Sheikh replied in the same language: '*ponõ kā chānd bhī bālā hōtā haē*' (the moon of the fourteenth night was also once small) (Kirmani *c*. 14th century: 193). This story is repeated in the latter work *Jawāhir-ē-Farīdī* with minor changes (Chishti 1623: 303).

In the same book a *dōhrā* is attributed to Sheikh Farid in a local Indian language which is probably the ancestor of Punjabi and Urdu-Hindi. It is: *kantā nahō hītan* (or *haetan*) *karu rī tākān hata manāē/bas kandlē madhan gar hōrī luhd khā* (Kirmani *c*. 14th century: 377).[7]

Sheikh Nizamuddin Auliya (1244–1325), the disciple of Sheikh Farid, understood Hindvi very well because the *Siyār ul Auliyā* mentions that he entered into a state of ecstasy when the heard a *Jikrī* whose words are given as follows: '*baenā bin bahājī aesā sukh saēn bāsūn*'.[8] These words in Hindvi, the author tells us in Persian, 'had an effect upon him' ('*ĩ Hindvī asar kard*' (Kirmani *c*. 14th century: 522). He also held a conversation with two sufis

who had come from Uchch in Sindh and 'they did not know Persian' (*īshān Pārsī namīdānand*) (Ibid., 584). His biographer, on the authority of manuscripts he had seen, has said that he preferred and loved 'Purbi songs' having passed his childhood and early youth in Badaon (Nizami 2007: 141 and 16–25).

The Actual Words

Now we come to examples of the actual words of the language which exist in some sources. One of these is what the <u>Khair ul Majālis</u> calls 'Hindvi'. Firstly, a slave girl asks a merchant whether she should bring him food as follows:

> shall I bring *nihārī*? He said wait a little. This he said in the Hindvi language and used the word "*raēh, raēh*" (*nihārī biāram? Guftī barī sabar kun, ĩ sukhan bazubān-ē-Hindvī farmūdand kē guftī kalmā "raēh, raēh*") (Assembly 27 Qalandar *c.* 14th century: 93).

The word *'raēh'* is used even now in Urdu and Hindi for 'stay', 'live', 'stay put', 'wait' and so on. At another place the Sheikh narrates the story of an idol worshipper who contracts high fever. So, placing his head on the feet of the idol, he begs him in 'Hindi'. '*Tū merā gusāĩ tū mērā kartār muj is tāp thĩ chadā*' (You are my Lord You are the one who does everything, save me from this fever'). The Persian source makes it clear that this was said in Hindi and was written as such (*ĩ alfāz bazubān-ē-Hindi farmūdand hamchunã navishtā shud*). The story continues that, upon receiving no response from the idol, he says, again in the same language: 'You are not the Omnipotent' (*tū kartār nāhĩ*). The story was understood and the hearers were so affected that they wept (Assembly 36, Qalandar *c.* 14th century: 123).

Yet another instance of the words of 'Hindvi' given in the <u>Khair ul Majālis</u> is the incident of Ali Maula who says about the young Nizamuddin in Badaun to another person in 'Hindvi': 'O

Maulana he will become old' (*arē Maulana! Yē budā hōsī*). Then he goes on to say: 'I have seen two things in him. One is as they say in the Hindvi language: "he who wears the turban he falls at somebody's feet" (*man dar ū dō chīzī mī bīnam-yakī ãst kē bazubān-ē-Hindvī guftand: "jō mundāsā bāndhē sō pāẽ pasrē"*') (Assembly 56. Qalandar *c.* 14th century: 191).

These lines are easily intelligible as mentioned above. However, that a man in Badaun in the Hindi belt should use the word '*hōsī*', used even now in Punjabi for 'will become', may be difficult to explain unless one assumes that the varieties of a large unstandardised language was spoken from Peshawar to the end of Bihar and this was the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi as well as Punjabi and other related languages.

The problem with these small sentences is that one cannot be sure whether they have not been modified later by the copyists (*kātibs*) since they are far too close to our present-day Urdu and Hindi than what we should expect. However, even discounting the sources which are not contemporary or near-contemporary there is enough evidence to suggest that the ancestor of Urdu and Hindi, whatever it was called, was actually used in many parts of North India including the Indian Guajarat and the Deccan, before Babar entered India in 1526. And, indeed, our example of an actual text of 'Hindi' in the Perso-Arabic script is from the Deccan.

This is the *Masnavī Kadam Rāō Padam Rāō* of Fakhar Din Nizami written between 1430 and 1435 and it is far less intelligible for the modern reader than the isolated utterances and phrases quoted above. It would suggest that either the literary idiom was more Sanskritized than ordinary speech or that Deccan used a more Sanskritized variety of the language than the north. The diction of this book is not only Sanskritic but is also obsolete so that it is only through Jamil Jalibi's glossary that one may understand the book. This book was written in the Deccan, so that may be the reason for its alienation from the North Indian

reader who appears to have borrowed and built upon a North Indian linguistic tradition rather than the Dakhni one. One reason for asserting this is that Bayazid Ansari's (1526–1574) book _Khairul Bayān_ (1560), written in what is now the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province of Pakistan, is much more intelligible than the _Masnavī_. True that there are about 140 years between the two texts but still the diction of this book is remarkably intelligible. Examples from both these texts are given in the chapter on the identity of Urdu and need not detain us here. It is to be noted, however, that probably the first specimen of ancient Urdu-Hindi writing available, are the legal documents in the Devanagari script from the Rajput courts—assuming that they do go back to the twelfth century as claimed by scholars (Vedalankar 1969: 4) quoted earlier. In Perso-Arabic script the _Khair-ul-Bayān_ is probably the first specimen of Urdu-Hindi prose extant since it is almost certain that Sheikh Gesu Daraz left no authentic work in any variety of this language (Jain in Jafer and Jain Vol. 2, 1998: 282–325) and that Burhanuddin Janum's _Kalmatul Haqāeq_ was written in 990/1582 (Ibid., 357–362).

In this context it is instructive to look at the works of Kabir Das (1440–1518). He was brought up in a weaver's house in Benares and it is not clear whether he was a Hindu or a Muslim. Unfortunately, he did not leave behind authentic manuscripts of his verse, so that what is now attributed to him is from the oral tradition.

Kabir composed verses in old Avadhi, Dingal (old Rajasthani), Braj Bhasha, and like the Muslim Sufis, 'the old Hindui dialect, mixed with Panjabi and Arabic-Persian vocabulary' (Vaudeville 1993: 113). However, the local language around Benares and its neighbourhood is Bhojpuri which is spoken from Eastern UP to West Bihar and up to the Himalayas. However, Kabir's language— or at least that which is attributed to him—is a hybrid—an eclectic language with a wider intelligibility than a regional variety could have. Indeed, according to Vaudeville, 'the language

of the aristocratic Khusrau, like that of the poor Julāhā Kabīr, must have been basically the same: good old Hindui, the language of the bazaar, though the language of the heart may still have been Avadhi' (Vaudeville 1993: 124)

The verses now available to us are as follows:

Sāhīb mērā ēk haē dūjā kahā na jāē
Dūjā sahib jō kahū sahib kharā rasāē
(I have one Master; another I cannot own
If I acknowledge another one, the real one will be displeased) (Avadh 2006: 25).

Another one is:

Khush khānā haē khīchrī mũ par atak nūn
Mānas parāyā khāē kē garā katāvē kaōn
(I enjoy eating rice-and-lentil with a bit of salt)
Who would eat other people's meat and get his neck cut off) (Avadh 2006: 152).

Another book, and this time in Khari Boli which was standardized into both modern Urdu and Hindi is Gang Kavi's (1518–1617) *Chand Chhandrōnan ki Mahmā* (1603). The author is said to be a friend of Abdul Rahim Khan-e-Khanan (Jain in Jafer and Jain Vol. 2, 1998: 270; Snatak 1999: 213). Yet another book, called the *Ajē Chand Nāmā* by Aje Chand Bhatnāgar, written in 960/1553 in the Khari Boli of Sikandarabad in the Buland Shehr area near Delhi, has the following verse. '*Khāliq jin jag paēdā kiyā rāziq, sab kõ bhojan diyā* (The Creator who created the world; the Giver of sustenance, who gave food to everybody) (Quoted from Jain in Jafer and Jain Vol. 1, 1998: 440).

Although there are words referring to Hindu mythology, culture and religious concepts, these are also to be found in the *Masnavī Kadam Rāō Padam Rāō.* Indeed, the very fact that the language is so intelligible, makes one suspect that it is not the

language of the early fifteenth but that of the early sixteenth century.

Sur Das (1478 or 79–1581 or 84), whose work is reproduced as part of Hindi renaissance in 1881 by Munshi Natthu Ram, writes in a much more intelligible language.

> *Āpē purkh āpē nārī....āp pitā āpē hī*
> *Mātā...āpē pandit āp giānī... āpē*
> *Rājā āpē rānī...āpē dhartī āp akāsā...*
> (himself man himself woman; himself father himself mother; himself learned man himself student; himself king himself queen; himself earth himself sky) (Das n.d.: 52).

This text is perfectly intelligible though most of the words now belong to the register of Hindi rather than Urdu. On the other hand, the Sanskritized Hindi of the author (Natthu Ram) is not intelligible to a speaker of Urdu (Ibid., 202) because, unlike the above words which were shared for centuries, the Sanskritic ones were borrowed only recently.

It is not clear to what extent this language had penetrated different sections and strata of society up to the Mughals. Babar (1483–1530) did not know the language he calls 'Hindustani' in 1526 because he got his Persian translated into the language for a Lodhi chief as has been mentioned in another context earlier (Babar 1528: 459). However, he must have picked up some of its vocabulary later because the manuscript of his Turkish *Dīvān* in the Rampur Raza library has the following couplet by him:

> *Mujkā na huā kuj havis mānk ō mōtī*
> *Fuqara halighā bas lolghū sedur bānī ō rōtī* (Babar n.d.).
> (I have never had lust for jewels and pearls
> The mendicants only require water and bread)

The first line is almost all in the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi and the second also has words like '*bānī*= water' and '*rūtī*=bread' which are used even now but the other words are in Turkish.

Humayun (r. 1530–1556), Babar's son, does not seem to have known the language because when he heard a parrot repeating the lines: 'read Rumi Khan is a villain read Rumi Khan is a villain' (*paṛh Rūmikhān harāmkhōr paṛh Rūmīkhān harāmkhōr*), the Persian chronicler says that 'the King learned the meaning of this phrase through a translator' ('*Jannat Ashiānī* [Humayun] *chun ma 'āni ĩ 'ibārat rā az tarjumān mā 'alūm kardand*'). But the source of this story is the *Mirāt-ē-Sikandarī* written in 1308/1890 (Manjhu 1890: 247–248). While this may not be the language of Humayun's court, such words do exist in other sources from this period.

Akbar (r. 1556–1605) lived all his life in India and probably did use the language in private life. At least the use of a Hindi-Urdu obscenity in extreme rage would suggest this. This happened when Akbar was about to kill Adham Khan who had rebelled against him. In the words of Bayazid, in his book *Bahār-ē-Ajam*: '*Hazrat ba zubān Hindustānī farmūdand kē ayē kāndū*' (His Majesty in the language of Hindustani said 'O you catamite!') (Fazl Vol. 2, 1595: f.n. 3, p. 271). Some people (e.g. Chatterji and Masud Hasan Khan) have even attributed couplets in Braj to Akbar, but like Gian Chand Jain, one can only be sceptical about them (Jain in Jafer and Jain Vol. 1, 1998: 441–443).

The language was used in poetry as we have seen. It was also used in works of art which only very rich and powerful patrons could buy or commission. Evidence to this effect is provided by the existence of stories in verse with beautiful paintings. Such unpublished manuscripts of paintings with verses in Hindi-Urdu also exist in the British Museum. In one painting (Add. 16880), about the romance of Ratan Sen, Raja of Chitor with the Princess of Ceylon, there are verses 'composed in an archaic form of Deccani Urdu, with a large admixture of Arabic and Persian words' by a certain Hasan Manjhu Khilji, written about 1582

(Pinder-Wilson 1969: 143–145). Another such story with paintings and verse (BM. Or. 86) is a 'translation of the story [of Saif ul Muluk and Badi al-Jamal] into Deccani verse by Gawasi' in 1616–17 (Ibid., 177–178). In short, the elite probably knew enough Hindi-Urdu, at least in some parts of India such as the Deccan, to enjoy writings in it.

Indeed, if one looks at all the instances of the reported use of the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi it appears as if the language of the elite was the local language for those members of it who had spent a lot of time in India and who interacted much with the local people. Saints fell into that category as did Indian-born courtiers like Amir Khusrau. At the highest level, however, it was not necessary that people should know the language–barring a few words of it—because either they did not spend their whole lives in India or were isolated in Persian-speaking court circles. However, with the introduction of Rajput ladies in the harems of the Mughals, it is certain the later Mughals, from Akbar onwards, spoke the same language in private. In the Deccan and Gujarat, the elite seems to have known the language, even in pre-Mughal times. While the use of the sources of a later period, for a person who existed earlier, is obviously untrustworthy, the sources which are contemporaneous do suggest that the language was used spontaneously or with people who did not understand Persian. Sources from the seventeenth century use Urdu-Hindi words even where Persian equivalents exist, (*pān* rather than *barg-ē-tambōl* in Chishti 1623: 303) as if these were naturally accepted in the society just as English words are used both in Urdu and English writings in South Asia today. And, while doubting the exact words used by the speakers of an earlier age, these latter sources do help us understand that their writers thought that Hindi words attributed to revered personalities should be reported as such.

To sum up, the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi was considered so important that Bayazid Ansari uses it in Waziristan, a remote

part of present-day Pakistan. Kabir and Kabir *panthis* sang songs in it in present-day UP; saints kept using its words and whole sentences all the way from Gujarat to the Deccan, and there are even written works in it in remote parts of India.

So what is the implication of these facts for Urdu today? Taking the work of Shirani, who is probably the best researcher on the ancestry and origin of Urdu, this has certain ideological implications. For, if Urdu is traced back to an ancient time, it becomes endowed with more prestige than a mere newcomer, a mongrel language, would warrant. One is not claiming that this ancestry is wrong; it is certainly correct. But it does serve the political interest of the Muslim elite which could claim that it contributed to the refining and improvement of a language which may have existed in the land of their adoption when they arrived even in the eleventh century (see Jalibi 1975: 265)

However, if the language was present when the Muslims arrived, then the thesis that it is a Muslim language cannot be wholly true. This indeed is something which Muslims who lived before the partition in undivided India, or live in present-day India rather than Pakistan, keep claiming. It is, of course, true that the mixing of some Persian, quite a few Arabic and a few Turkish words changed the existing language to the extent that the pre-Muslim language—even if we were sure that we have discovered an authentic sample of it—is no longer intelligible, even then that original base cannot be dismissed or discounted. If English is a Germanic language because of its Anglo-Saxon (Germanic) base, despite the mixing of Latin and Greek through French and otherwise, then Urdu is also an Indic language despite the mixing of words from other languages. The denial of this original identity and the corresponding emphasis upon the mixing of words—as if this were true only of Urdu—reinforces the identification of Urdu with Muslims. Though the myth that Urdu was born in Mughal military camps is only to be found in school textbooks, the ancestry and Indic base of the language is not given the recognition it deserves by the historians of the

language. But, then, are questions of the historiography of Urdu politicized? To this we turn now.

NOTES

1. I thank Professor Vaishna Narang for having first transliterated these lines at the Jawaharlal Nehru University in May 2010 and sent them to me by e-mail. My transliteration is based upon her original specimen. I also thank Mr Anand Mishra from the South Asia Institute of the University of Heidelberg who translated these lines for me in English in June 2010 at Heidelberg. I also thank Dr Gautam Liu of the Institute of South Asian Studies, University of Heidelberg, for having transcribed the following lines in the Devanagari script from *Gorakh Bani*.

बसती न सुन्यं सुन्यं न बसती अगम अगोचर ऐसा।
गगन-सिषर महि बालक बोलै ताका नांव धरहुगे कैसा॥१॥
अदेषि देषिबा देषि बिचारिबा अदिसिटि राषिबा चीथा।
पाताल की गंगा ब्रह्मांड चढाइबा तहां बिमल बिमल जल पीया॥२॥
इहां ही आछै इहां ही अलोप इहां ही रचिलै तीनि त्रिलोक।
आछै संगै रहै ज वा ता कारणि अनंत सिधा जोगेस्वर हूवा॥३॥
वेद कतेब न षाणीं बाणीं। सब ढंकी तलि आंणीं॥
गगनि सिषर महि सबद प्रकास्या। तहं बूझै अलष बिनांणीं॥४॥

2. The text given in transliteration is reproduced in the Devanagari script below:

ओ जनाना में थारा वंसरा टाल ओ दुजो जावेगा नहीं ओर थारी बैठक
दली में ही जी प्रमाणे परधान बरोबर कारण देवेगा

3. महारज सलामत, यामै जु खातिर मुबारिक में पसंद अबे सु अरजदासत करैला, फारसी अरजदासत सीताबी के सवब नही करी ह| जु नवाब सलामत खां जी नै फरमाया जु नै फरमाया जु जलद जोड़ी चले जु| जलद समाचारों की अरजदासत करी है (राजपुताना 1692)

4. *Mirā'at-e-Ahmadī* has been published in two different editions. The one used here is a text in Persian with three volumes in one cover but each volume is numbered separately. The names of two people whose 'endeavour and administration' (*ba sai ō ēhtēmām*) given on the first page are Qazi Abdul Kareem and Qazi Rahmatullah and the date of publication is 1306/1888–89. The author is originally Ali Mohammad Khan. This is referred to in the bibliography as Khan (1889). The other one is a work in two volumes by Ali Mohammad Khan whose nom de plume, Mirza Mohammad Hasan, is also mentioned on the first page. This is mentioned in the bibliography as Khan (1928). Quotations from the saints of Gujarat in the text are from the 1889 publication.

5. دوهرہ: فرید ادہر سولی سر پنجرہ تلیاں تہوکن کاگ

رب رجیوں با ہوری تو دہن ہمارے بہاگ

6. جت گھر زمین نہ پای میا مبندھی تت

چتو پردیسی پاھنا ھی او نھائی جت

The meaning of *mabiā mabandhī* could not be found in any dictionary consulted by the author.

7. کنٹ نہوہیٹن کارُری تا کان ہٹ مَنائی

بس کندلے مدہن گرہورں لُہد کہا

Some of the words of this couplet are given in the glossary. However, the meaning of the whole is not clear to this author.

8. بَینَا بِن بَھاجی اَیسا شکھ سَین باسُون

Most of the individual words of this hemistich are given in the glossary. The last four words mean 'found so much profound peace and tranquillity'. However, the meaning of the whole is not clear to this author.

4

Origins and Historiography

The theories about the origins of Urdu revolve around two questions: where was it born? And what language(s) did it descend from? The first question is geographical; the second genealogical. And both are addressed in the historiography of the language—ideologically, politically, and sometimes, emotionally and polemically. This chapter does not attempt to provide the correct answers to these questions. Rather, it aims to study the major theories about them so as to determine in what ways historiography is related to ideology—especially those aspects of it which contribute to the politics of identity among the speakers of Urdu and Hindi in South Asia. Some of these questions are treated in a book entitled *Literature and Nationalist Ideology*, which provides, among other things, a framework for examining the relationship between Indian nationalism(s) and literary and linguistic histories (Harder 2010).

As questions of place of birth and parentage lead to perceptions of belonging or ownership, we shall take into account the historiography of possession. Specifically, is Urdu a joint product of the interaction between Muslims and Hindus and is, therefore, a shared possession? Or is it the possession and monopoly of the Muslims of a certain area of the subcontinent? Or all Muslims? The answers to these questions are, of course, deeply political in significance. That is why the purely linguistic answers to questions of origin are insufficient for our purposes. More relevant are the ideological forces and inspiration behind these answers.

To begin, then, the theories themselves are easy to summarize—as they have already been by Ayub Sabir (1993) to a degree—but our purposes require us to analyze them in terms of the ideological orientation, or if that is difficult to determine, the group-identity of the linguistic historians who are most prominently associated with them.

The most obvious classifications about the geographical and the genealogical questions are (a) the theories of Indian origin and (b) the theories of Pakistani origin.

The most common theories, and ones which contemporary scholars agree with, is that 'the speech of the areas around Delhi, known as *Khari Boli* [*Kárī bolī*], was adopted by the Afghans, Persians, and Turks as a common language of interaction with the local population. In time, it developed a variety called Urdu' (Kachru 2008: 82). There are variant forms of it, such as Muhammad Hussain Azad's (d. 1910) assertion in *Āb-ē-Hayāt* (*c.* 19th century) that 'everybody knows this much that our language Urdu is born out of Braj Bhasha and that Braj Bhasha is a purely Indian language' (Azad *c.* 19th century: 10). But, on the whole, Western Hindi is the most likely candidate for the parent of both modern Urdu and Hindi.

In this context the views of Suniti Kumar Chatterji are instructive. In his book on the development of Bengali he succinctly says: 'Hindōstāni is in its origin based on the Western Hindi dialects spoken in and around Delhi, dialects which were strongly influenced by the contiguous Panjābī and Rājisthānī; and as the speech of the capital, it gradually came to be adopted by the Turki, Persian and Pastō speaking nobility of the Moslem court' (Chatterji 1926: 11–12). In his other book *Indo-Aryan and Hindi*, he explains this history in detail in several chapters (Chatterji 1942: 150–188). Among other things he conjectures that groups of Punjabi Muslims moved from their homeland in the West from 1206 onwards (the date of the establishment of the Turkish Sultanate in Delhi) to Delhi, and their language

influenced the language already prevalent here (Chatterji 1942: 187–188). George Grierson, of the *Linguistic Survey of India* fame, gave the following answers to both questions about the origins of Urdu-Hindi:

> The dialect of Western Hindī spoken in Western Rohilkhand, in the Upper Gangetic Doab, and in the Panjab district of Ambala is what I call Vernacular Hindōstānī, that is to say, it is the form of speech on which literary Hindōstānī that took its rise in Delhi is based (Grierson Vol. 3: 63).

Examples can be multiplied but it is pointless to make a list of authors agreeing with each other.

What is more interesting is that historians of Urdu emphasize the role of the Muslim heritage languages almost to the exclusion of the Indian element. Let us now turn to the views of two of these scholars of Urdu: Jamil Jalibi and Hafiz Mahmud Shirani, on the subject of the historiography of the language.

Jamil Jalibi believes that Urdu has a distinctive Muslim character. He does not deny the Indic base of Urdu but he calls the Islamization of literary themes and the Persianization of the language as improvements (see Chapter 5). In *Tārīkh-ē- Adab-ē- Urdū* (1975) Jamil Jalibi says:

> *Ibtidā mẽ is nē-Gujrāt mẽ bhī aōr shimāl ō Dakan mẽ bhī-Khālis Hindavī asrāt kō qubūl kiā-lēkin jab āgē baṛhnē kā rāstā nazar na ā rahā hō aōr takhlīqī zahen apnē izhār mẽ rukāwat maēhsūs kar rahā hō tō zāhir haē kē vō us taraf baṛhē gā jis taraf usē rāstā nazar ā rahā hō* (Jalibi: Vol. 1, 1975: 193).
>
> (In the beginning both in Gujarat and the Deccan it [Urdu] accepted pure Hindvi effects but when the way for advancement is not visible and the creative mind finds impediments in its expression, then it is obvious it would advance towards that side on which it sees the way).

He says this Persianization of Urdu was a natural act (*fitrī amal*) and that any other course of action was impossible. In his view the poetry of the poets of Bijapur is alien for us in contrast to those of Golconda because of the Persianization of the latter. Thus the poetry of Nusrati is not known and that of Vali is. As proof, he offers the words of a poet called Shafiq, who wrote his *Chamanistān-ē-Shu'arā* in 1761 in which he said about Nusrati '*alfāzish batāur Dakhniã bar Zubānahā girã mī āed*' (His words are felt to be heavy on the tongue like those of the Deccanites).

Let us now take up the views of Shirani who has been mentioned earlier. Shirani tells us that up to the seventeenth century, Hindi rhythm was used. However, after Quli Qutab Shah (988/1580–1020/1611–12) there is evidence of Persian influence. At one place he says:

> *fi zamānanā is taehrīk kī mukhālfat mẽ bāz halqõ sē āvāz buland huī haē aōr is kō ghaēr mulkī aōr nā'āqbat andēshānā kahā gayā haē-lēkin hamārā khiāl haē kē buzurgõ kī yē jiddat pasandī jahã tak kē is kē natāej dēkhē jātē haē-nehāet mufīd aōr sūdmand sābit huī haē* (Shirani 1930 and 31 in 1965: 200).
>
> (In these days there is opposition from some circles to this trend [Persianization]. It is attacked as being foreign and short sighted. But we think that our elders in their search for novelty were right as the results we see are greatly useful and profitable).

Moreover, Shirani presents the thesis that Urdu should have 'Muslim emotions'. He feels that the language called Urdu is distinctive and separate from other languages because it has (a) *Musalmānī Jazbāt ō Khiālāt*, i.e. the emotions and ideas of Muslims (b) *Arabī ō Fārsī alfāz*, i.e. diction from Arabic and Persian, and (c) its grammatical rules follow a certain order (Shirani 1930 and 31 in 1965: 174).

The last point however, has not been explained. Moreover, Shirani has left out one point—that the script should be Perso-

Arabic. All the examples he provides in his book are in this script.

The same is also true about Jamil Jalibi mentioned earlier, though he is one of the few historians who has mentioned Nam Dev (1270–1350), Kabir (1399–1518) and Guru Nanak (1469–1538) in nine pages (out of 711). Abdul Jamil Khan has mentioned all these as well as Hem Chandra (*c.* 12th century), Chand Bardai (*c.* 1190s) and a few others in two pages (2006: 159–164). Abdul Haq (1870–1961), called Baba-i-Urdu (the Father of Urdu), does not even mention anything written by a Hindu in the Devanagari script in a book entitled *Qadim Urdū* [Old Urdu] (1961). Muhammad Sadiq's *A History of Urdū Literature* (1964), does not mention anyone but Muslims and writings in the Perso-Arabic script, and Ali Jawad Zaidi, though writing in post-partition India, mentions Kabir in less than a page (Zaidi 1993: 31–32). Even Hindu historians, when writing the history of Urdu, ignore writings in the Devanagari script. For instance, in the paradigmatic work of Ram Babu Saksena, *A History of Urdū Literature* (1927), Kabir and Tulsi Das (1550–1624) get only passing mention in one line (Saksena 1927: 11). In short, while historians of Urdu admit to the Indic base of Urdu, they do not include it in the canon of Urdu. And this is not simply because of lack of space. Shamsur Rahman Faruqi, one of the foremost contemporary scholars of Urdu, in his book on the initial age of Urdu (*Urdū kā Ibtidāi Zamānā*), points out that the language which later came to be known as 'Khari Boli' existed at the time of Muslim arrival in India, and the Muslims acted as 'chemical agents' in order to make it an established language (Faruqi 1999: 36). But he gives no attention to the literature in the Devanagari script before the creation of modern Persianized Urdu and Sanskritized Hindi in the nineteenth century. And this, despite the fact that he points out that Azad's *Āb-ē-Hayāt* ignores the contribution of Hindus to Urdu literature (Faruqi 1999: 43–44). Yet, it is not merely a question of the inclusion of poets writing in the Perso-Arabic

script, which Azad ignores. The point being made here is the ideology which goes into the construction of the history of Urdu. Azad had to imagine a mother for Urdu which is 'simple, sweet, natural, and entirely Indian' (Pritchett and Faruqi 2001: 12). The British were defining the cultural world of their Indian colony and simplicity and naturalness were at a premium. These were to be found in English and Braj Bhasha which formed the 'storage trunks' of Urdu. According to Pritchett and Faruqi Azad's views show 'the widespread defensive reaction of the colonized to the colonial critique' (Ibid., 17). In short, Azad's literary and linguistic ideologies had to perform a balancing act: finding Indian ancestry for Urdu but also Muslim ownership; finding British literary criteria but also preserving indigenous ideals.

But there is an ideology at work in the construction of the history of Hindi also. For instance, the historians of Hindi ignore the contribution of Muslims to a common literature. Acharya Ramchandra Shukla's *Hindī Sahityā kā Itihās* (1929), even ignores the canonical poets of Urdu. Hans Harder, writing on the ideological uses of literary historiography, comments on this as follows:

> In a way, the long-standing issue of the relationship between Hindi and Urdu also belongs to this complex, leading to the linguistically unwarranted, but politically successful and by now almost un-questioned decision on Ramchandra Shukla's and apparently some of his predecessor's part, to include rather 'deviant' varieties, in relation to modern standard Khari Boli Hindi, such as Braj and Avadhi, in the history of Hindi literature, but to mostly exclude the linguistically closer, if not identical, Urdu from the repertoire (Harder 2010: 18).

Since Shukla's book was used as a textbook in colleges, it had tremendous influence over the perception of students of several generations. That is why, describing it as a paradigmatic text in five pages, Krishna Kumar claims that it 'contributed to the

crystallization of the educated Hindi speaker's identity' (Kumar 1991: 131). Also like the historians of Urdu, they too seek Hindi's birthplace. And, of course, it is in 'Hindustan'. Rahul Sankrityayan mentions 'all the languages which emerged after the eighth century AD in "Suba Hindustan"' (Quoted from Rai 2001: 12). Others point to the fluidity of the unstandardized languages of the period such as the kind the Nath Panthi Sadhus used to speak during the tenth and eleventh centuries. This language was called *pachmēlā*—five-in-one—which we now call Braj Bhasha, Khari Boli, Avadhi, Bhojpuri and Bundeli (Jindal 1955: 9)—and, indeed, it went beyond these five to include Punjabi and Rajasthani dialects.

But the mention of Gorakh Nath Panthis brings us to another ideological imperative—but a completely necessary one—which inspired the historians of Hindi. This was the search for an indigenous parent going back to pre-Islamic times. As mentioned earlier, this was found by Pitambar Datta Barthwal who found the *Gorakh Bānī*. Another milestone of this kind is Hazari Prasad Dwivedi's *Nāth Siddhõ kī Bāniã* (1957). This literature is the centerpiece of works like Amrit Rai's *A House Divided* (1984) and Gian Chand Jain's *Ēk Bhasha: Dō Likhāvat, Dō Adab* (2005), which are considered an attack on the tradition of Urdu historiography. The quest for a link with the pre-Islamic tradition, initiated by Rahul Sankrityayan, had already taken Hindi back to pre-Islamic times when he, in collaboration with Jayaswal, discovered Siddha literature (Jindal 1955: 5–6). The Siddhas are said to have 'mixed the standard forms of Western apabhranshas with the current forms of the adjacent western districts' (Jindal 1955: 5). The samples of Siddha poetry transliterated into Hindi by Rahul Sankrityayan have words which are not fully intelligible but yield meaning with some effort. For instance the first line of Sarhapa (Nālanda): '*gurū ban amyā ras*' in the Siddha language is transliterated in Hindi as '*gurū kē vachan amiyā ras*' (the words of the teacher are like the sweet nectar of mangoes).

Most academic histories, however, caution us against accepting the Panthi language as being authentically of the tenth or even the twelfth centuries as claimed. McGregor, for instance, asserts that it 'can hardly predate the mid–14th century in its present linguistic form' (McGregor 1984: 22). Shardadvi Vedalankar claims that there are no manuscripts of Hindi prose 'produced between the 10th and 12th centuries AD' (she does not include deeds of gifts and inscriptions among prose writings) (Vendalankar 1969: 3) but some, like Vijendra Snātak, admit that, while some are doubtful, others are authentic (Snatak 1999: 30).

With this genealogy established in ideologically motivated writings, the historiography of Hindi appropriated the vast literature in all the varieties, which together add up to Greater Hindi. However, when Khari Boli came to be accepted as *the* language which was the base for Hindi, the other varieties—including the poetic Braj Bhasha—were excluded from the Hindi canon. Ayodhya Prasad Khattri in his *Kharī Bōlī ka Padyā*, in his desire to monopolize Khari Boli as the desiderated parent for Hindi, agreed that 'Urdu is but another form of Hindi' (Quoted from Rai 2001: 86). Chandradhar Sharma Guleri, the author of *Purānī Hindi*, also says that Urdu is the same as Hindi and that Modern Hindi was created by replacing Perso-Arabic diction with Sanskritic words (Quoted from Rai 2001: 14).

But this relationship with Urdu promoted the urge to invent difference, not to acknowledge or promote closeness. Thus, diction was Sanskritized, the preferred idiom diverged from that of Modern Urdu (i.e. the Urdu constructed in the late eighteenth century) and the pronunciation of some sounds and words was different from native Urdu-speakers. As for literature in the Perso-Arabic script, it was either accepted as being 'Hindi'—as in the case of Amir Khusrau's work—if it was of sufficient antiquity and symbolic value or played down, marginalized and ignored.

In short, questions of the origin of Urdu, which are also questions of the origin of Hindi, bring us close and then take us apart as the same geographical location and genealogy are, nevertheless, wrenched apart by the uses to which the historiography of both languages lends itself to. But now let us see what happens when the geography and the genealogy are different. When, for example, they are located in present-day Pakistan.

The theories of Pakistani origin claim that Urdu was born in the areas now in Pakistan as a result of Perso-Arabicization of the languages spoken here. The pioneer of such theories was Hafiz Mahmud Shirani, some of whose works and views have been mentioned before. Normally a painstaking and careful researcher of Urdu and Persian, Shirani turned his attention from Persian to Urdu when Abdullah Yusuf Ali (1872–1953), then principal of Islamia College, asked him to write something on the origins and age of Urdu. As Shirani was a lecturer in this college between 1921 and 1928, his initial endeavours came to light during these years. Almost the whole corpus of his writings on linguistic history—for that is how his work would be classified now—addresses these questions directly or indirectly. Of course, while working on these issues he encounters other areas of interest out of which many of his literary and other works are born, but basically these are the mainsprings of his enormous output.

Shirani's magnum opus is *Punjāb Mẽ Urdū* (1928). The central thesis of this work is that Urdu was created in the Punjab and the Muslims took it with them to Delhi when they spread from the western part of India eastwards. A variant of this thesis is that it was the Multani variety of Punjabi (Siraiki as it is called now) which was the basis of Urdu (Mughal 1990: 11–20). A corollary of this hypothesis is that Punjabi/Siraiki and Urdu are very similar even now—Shirani claims that the two languages share a large part of the basic vocabulary (Shirani 1928: 130–131). And that words used in old Urdu (Shirani's term) are still used

in Punjabi. However, there are certain distinctive features (morphological [*kā, kī*] and others) which separate Urdu from Braj Bhasha as well as Punjabi/Siraiki (which he calls Multani).

Among other things, Shirani points to the presence of words still used in Punjabi in old Urdu (especially Dakhni) as well as such words in modern Urdu. In the latter case they have no separate meaning but are used as idiomatic usages to supplement and strengthen the meaning. Examples are as follows:

Din dehāṛē	The word '*din*' means day in Urdu. '*Dehāṛē*' means day in Punjabi even now. In Urdu the latter word is not used in isolation but is used in this idiomatic phrase.
Māngā Tāngā	'*Māngā*' is to take as a loan; to beg in Urdu. '*Tāngā*' means the same in Punjabi but has no meaning on its own in modern Urdu (Shirani 1928: 126–129).

Similarly the possessive marker '*kā*, '*kī*' in Urdu is '*dā*' and '*dī*' in Punjabi nowadays but there are a number of places in the Punjab with endings on '*kē*' and '*kā*' such as Muridkē, Sadhukē, etc.

From this evidence Shirani concludes that Urdu is a 'developed'—his term—form of Punjabi. An alternative hypothesis, which Shirani does not even consider, is that Urdu, Hindi, Punjabi, Siraiki, Hindko, etc., could simply be descendants of a language spread over the huge area from Peshawar to Benares. That the varieties of such a language would have some vocabulary in common but would also grow and change along different lines is only natural. But Shirani's book is not really a thesis from beginning to end because he also makes it a history of the writers of varieties of what he calls 'Old Urdu'. This has only an indirect relationship with the main theme but takes most of the space in the book (Shirani 1928: 180–486).

On the whole, Shirani, whose research on the ancient names, origin and usage of Urdu is so impressive, is on a weak footing in this book. His mistakes and false reasoning have been

demonstrated notably by Masood Husain Khan who argues that Shirani ignores the differences between Dakhni and Punjabi as well as other evidence which suggest that Urdu has descended from Khari Boli rather than Punjabi (Khan 1966: 156–180). Shaukat Sabzwari uses similar arguments to refute Shirani's claims (Sabzwari n.d.: 66–112) and to assert that the apabhranshas of the Delhi and Meerut Doab region (Madhiya Desh) of the eleventh century is the ancestor of Urdu (Ibid., 101).

Why were the weaknesses of his reasoning not evident to Shirani himself? After all, he was normally a careful researcher. The reason can only be conjectured. In my view, Shirani was not only a pioneer of certain trends in Urdu's linguistic history, but also a pioneer of Muslim nationalism in South Asia. He lived at the time of the rise of Muslim nationalism which, as we know, was expressed through the symbols of Islam and Urdu. He witnessed the Urdu-Hindi controversy and was as much concerned with claiming Urdu as part of the Muslim heritage in India as Abdul Haq or other Muslim nationalists. This ideological imperative closed his mind to other hypotheses about the birth of Urdu. His emotional and ideological interests were best served if he associated Urdu with the Muslims and that too of the Punjab, a major Muslim-majority province of India and one where he had spent almost all his adult life. It is because of this that modern Pakistani nationalists have appropriated Shirani's work—witness Fateh Mohammad Malik's foreword to its publication, which refers to a pre-partition controversy about making Punjabi rather than Urdu the medium of instruction in the Punjab, and is entitled 'Urdu is the mother-tongue of the Punjab' (Malik 2006 in Malik et al., Vol. 4: 1–5).

A theory similar to that of Shirani was also advanced by Grahame Bailey, a British man of letters, in a book completed in 1929 but published in 1932. He too claimed that Urdu began in Lahore after the Ghaznavide conquest in 1027. Like Shirani he too conjectured that it moved to Delhi about 166 years later

where it was 'overlaid by old Khari' which was 'not very different from old Punjabi'. It also kept absorbing words from Persian and Arabic and so Urdu was born (Bailey 1932: 7).

In 1933 another theory claiming the birth of Urdu in the areas where the Muslims arrived first was propounded. The man who advocated it was Syed Sulaiman Nadvi (1884–1953) whose stature as a scholar and a leader of the Muslims of North India is well-known. Nadvi argued that the first place of the arrival of the Muslims was Sindh and, therefore, it was this place which could be the birthplace of Urdu. The ancestor in this case would be Sindhi (Nadvi 1939: 31–35).

Unfortunately, Nadvi did not explain why Sindhi remained so distinct from Urdu. And also how was it that Urdu actually assimilated more Persian than Arabic words. And, indeed, the Arabic words which did enter Urdu came via Persian. Even more to the point is the fact that the Arabs came into contact with Dravidian languages in the Malabar. Though this did bring Arabic words into these languages, it did not create anything like Urdu. The Sindhi hypothesis is much weaker than that of Punjabi, on the grounds that there is no similarity between the fragments of old Sindhi and those of Hindi-Urdu now available to us. There are, however, similarities between some forms of Hindi-Urdu— such as Dakhni—and Punjabi. However, there are many more similarities with the varieties of Hindi found in India. In any case, if Punjabi is also accepted as a variety of Greater Hindi—a hypothetical language spread out from the plains of Peshawar to the end of Bihar—the similarities can be explained.

Other theories claim Hindko, Gujri and Pahari—all mutually intelligible varieties of what may be called 'Greater Punjabi'—as the ancestor of Urdu. All the arguments advanced in order to put forward the candidature of Punjabi as the ancestor of Urdu, apply with equal force here. But the point is not whether some words—such as *rājā* (ruler), *putrā* (son), *ātma* (soul), *likhia* (wrote)—found in a kharoshthi tablet in the Hindko-speaking

area, make Hindko the ancestor of Hindi-Urdu as Ghaznavi (2003: 130–131) argues. Such words are found in Nath Panthi literature also. The point is to analyse why such finds, which can be used to support the candidature of many languages in many parts of the subcontinent, are used to support any one particular language.

Theory of Non-Sanskritic Origin

While all the theories we have considered so far trace Urdu back to Sanskritic roots (the Indic branch of the Indo-Aryan language family) there are a few attempts at discarding this genealogy altogether. There is, for instance, Ain ul Haq Faridkoti who traces Urdu back to the Munda and Dravidian languages spoken in the subcontinent before the Aryan incursions. More precisely, it is a descendant of the ancient language of the Indus valley and its immediate ancestor is Punjabi. Later in the book the author uses the adjective 'Pakistani' for colonies from the Indus valley in Central Asia till present-day Pakistan (Faridkoti 1972: 264–266). In short, the author disconnects Urdu from both the Gangetic valley and the Sanskrit language and appropriates it for the areas now called Pakistan.

Another book with somewhat similar arguments from archaeology and linguistics is Rashid Akhtar Nadvi's (1913–1992) book entitled *Pakistān Kā Qadīm Rasmul Khat aōr Zubān* (1995). The main argument is that the Aryans started using the language of Mohenjo Daro and even Sanskrit was born out of this mixture. This Sindhi ancestor of Urdu, he says, was the real queen who ruled from Peshawar to Bihar and not Sanskrit, which lived a life of concealment like a mistress in the cells of Pandits (Nadvi 1995: 303). In this way, like Faridkoti, Nadvi too appropriates Urdu for Pakistan

Yet another book on these lines is Abdul Jamil Khan's *The Politics of Language Urdū/Hindi: An Artificial Divide* (2006). Here too the main argument is that 'two foreign languages Munda and

Dravidian' laid the foundations of Urdu (Khan 2006: 108). However, the author does not reserve Urdu for Pakistan. Despite his search for Urdu's 'African heritage' and 'Mesopotamian roots' he argues that not only Urdu but all Indian languages descend from these common roots. Moreover, his major focus is that Hindi and Urdu are the same language. However, part of his argument is that the further 'evolution of old Urdu involves infusion of Arabic and Persian from the oldest source, Mesopotamia' (Khan 2006: 132). In other words, he provides a continuous line of influence from Iraq—a Muslim country—on Urdu, rather than in India. Of course the Arabic, Persian and Turkish element in Urdu are acknowledged by all scholars, but taking it back to the very root of the language while discounting the centrality of an Indic base language and Sanskrit, dilutes the Indian identity of the language. He does the same for the scripts arguing that the Nagari-Hindi script, like the Perso-Arabic one, is 'rooted in the West Asian and Phoenician-Armaic system' (Ibid., 361).

Narratives of Ownership

Whatever the scholarly status of these theories, what is more significant is the use to which they are put as far as our analysis of historiography is concerned. We have seen that there are two narratives about the ownership of Urdu. First, that it is the common language of the Hindus and Muslims of North India; the fruit of centuries of coexistence which was mostly peaceful, and hence, a cultural product of the Jumna-Gangetic civilization (Ganga-Jamna *Taēhzīb*). And second, that it is a Muslim language, a Muslim cultural preserve and, therefore, just as alien to the Hindus as Hindi is to the Muslims.

For the British, there was always a Muslim Hindustani and a Hindu one. They did not sometimes mention the kaesth class of Hindus or a number of other urban people who used and owned Urdu. As Christopher King argues, it took a long time for the

equation Urdu=Muslim+Hindu to change to Urdu=Muslim and Hindi=Hindu. Indeed, even 'throughout the history of the Hindi movement before independence the equation Hindi=Hindu was never true' because rural people kept using regional standards (such as *kaithi*) and some Hindus remained 'wedded to Urdu' (King 1994: 177).

Each one of the major theories outlined above has political implications: the Indian origin theory gives the ownership of Urdu to India; the Pakistani origin ones to Pakistan; and the theories dismissing Sanskrit as the mother of most Indian languages or locating the ancestor of Urdu in present-day Pakistan detach Urdu from India. They also substitute a non-Indian ancestry for Urdu in place of an Indian one. But more importantly, these narratives of ownership are politically significant when they come from Muslim intellectuals and leaders. In this context let us first take the works of Abdul Haq who wrote grammars, dictionaries and other works on Urdu.

In all these works Haq's style is historical rather than linguistic. Basically his focal point is vocabulary. It is with reference to this, rather than phonology or syntax, that he supports his major theses which are that (1) Urdu is an ancient language which developed in Gujarat and Deccan, earlier than it did in North India where it was born (Haq 1961); and (2) Persian influenced the languages of North India, mainly the ancestor of Urdu but also other languages such as Marathi (Haq 1933), and is, therefore, now a natural part of the linguistic heritage of North India.

These theses had political implications during the period leading up to the partition of India. These were, after all, the Urdu-Hindi controversy days and Abdul Haq wished to promote the idea that Urdu was the common heritage language of the Muslim and Hindu civilizations of India. Therefore, he argued, that Urdu—which could be called Hindustani—should be promoted in all the domains of power in India. The other

candidate for this role was modern or Sanskritized Hindi which Abdul Haq opposed as an artificially constructed and partly incomprehensible language (AIR 1939: 31).

After partition Abdul Haq migrated to Pakistan where he reversed his earlier position of calling Urdu the joint heritage of Hindus and Muslims. Now he emphasized the Muslim ownership of Urdu. Indeed, he said:

> Urdū zubān hī Pākistān kī binā kā bā 'as huī- yē zubān hamārī zindagī kā juz aōr tāēhzīb ō qaōmiat kī buniyād haē
>
> (The Urdu language is the basis for the creation of Pakistan. This language is the element of our life and the basis of our civilization and nationality) (Haq n.d. b: 20).

He also said that it was Urdu which had disseminated the propaganda of the Muslim League so that it had reached 'in every street and every house' (Haq n.d. b: Bē).

Syed Sulaiman Nadvi was another intellectual who took the same position as Abdul Haq before the partition. He began by arguing that Urdu is not the language of any particular nation (qaōm) and that it had 'no special association with the Muslims' (Musalmānõ kē sāth kōi khās khusūsiat nahî) (Nadvi 1939: 6), and then he comes to his most important recommendation—that the name 'Urdu', which was only one hundred and fifty years old, should be abandoned in favour of Hindustani (Nadvi 1939: 74). But, while giving such conciliatory suggestions, Nadvi also says that wherever there are Muslims in the whole 'length and breadth of India', they speak and understand Urdu, no matter what their mother-tongue may be (Ibid., 67).

In 1950, however, Nadvi came to live in Pakistan, though probably for private reasons, where he took an active role in Islamizing the constitution and supporting Pakistani nationalism of which Urdu was an important symbolic component. Indeed, he opposed the major challenge to Urdu from Bengali when he declared during the Third Historical Conference in February 1953

in Dhaka, that Bengali was saturated with Hindu influences and needed to be Islamized (Abdullah 1976: 35; Nadvi, M. 1986: 582). This was a far cry from his acceptance of the Hindu linguistic heritage of Urdu-Hindi for which he was famous in his pre-partition days (Siddiqui 1986: 131–169).

It is this strategic use of competing narratives about the ownership of Urdu which Gian Chand Jain finds so infuriating (Jain 2005: 265–269). But it could also be interpreted as the adoption of an extremist position after efforts at conciliation and accommodation fail. This is exactly what happened in the political field, after all, as Ayesha Jalal (1985), Ajeet Jawed (1998) and Jaswant Singh (2009) have brought out.

After partition, political imperatives continue to influence the scholars' choice of narratives of ownership. In Pakistan, Urdu is celebrated as a language of Muslims and its ownership is not shared with the Hindus. From children's textbooks to scholarly works it is called the national language of Pakistan—though this is contested by ethnic nationalists (Rahman 1996)—and the most important part of Pakistan's Islamic heritage. However, here Urdu is in service of the ideology of nationalism as, indeed, is Islam itself.

One example of this use of linguistic history is the recent publication of the National Language Authority Islamabad in five volumes—each dedicated to a region of Pakistan—which celebrates Urdu as a Pakistani language. The pattern followed in each book is to give pride of place to articles arguing that Urdu was born in that region (Sindh, Punjab, NWFP, Balochistan) followed by writings on its use, especially by creative writers, in it (Malik et al. 2006: Vols. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5). In the volume on Kashmir (Vol. 5), however, the emphasis is on the use of Urdu in the former princely state which still remains disputed between Pakistan and India. Here too the 'Gujri' language of the Gujar tribe, some of whom live in parts of the former state, is celebrated

as the mother of Urdu, and 'Pahari', another language of this area, is compared with Urdu (Karnahi 2007).

This nationalistic claim over Urdu is nothing new. Jamil Jalibi, who has been referred to earlier, dedicates a chapter to Urdu in the areas of Pakistan in his two-volume *Tārīkh-ē-Adab-ē-Urdū* (1975: 593–712). And another author, who, at the time of writing was a colonel in the Pakistan Army, clearly states that the theories that Urdu was born in the regions now in Pakistan is a source of joy because these are the areas which are witnessing its youth. Moreover, he also expresses gratification that Urdu was born in military cantonments and that his purpose— spreading the use of Urdu in the army—is thereby facilitated (Khan 1989: 11–12). In India the question of identity politics is even more vexing for Muslims than it is in Pakistan. The major narrative of Indian Muslims is that Urdu is a symbol of the composite culture of the Hindus and Muslims of North India. Indeed, Muslim leaders are at pains to prove that Urdu is an Indian language (both geographically and genealogically), and that it is a shared cultural product of all North Indians. Salman Khurshid, an important Muslim politician, wrote in the preface of a book on the politics of Urdu in India:

> Urdu has always been projected as the language of the Muslim invaders, and later on was deemed responsible for the partition of India and the formation of Pakistan. In other words, it lost its primacy relevance as a language of common Indian civic space (Farouqui 2006: ix).

The question of ownership is a key issue in India. If it is only a Muslim preserve, then it is a minority language. This, exactly, is what has been happening and the Gujral Committee Report (1975) assumes that this is so. But if it is the common language of North India and major Indian cities—as its spoken form arguably is—then it has the same legal standing as Hindi written

in the Devanagari script (for an explanation of this position see Pemberton 2006: 142–144).

In short the narratives of ownership of Urdu are constrained by the political realities of one's country of residence, the religious community one happens to be born into and such other non-linguistic factors.

To sum up, the historiography of Urdu has been under the domination of identity politics and other aspects of ideology. The debate about the origins of Urdu is influenced by identity politics because the geographical location and genealogy of the language facilitate its appropriation as a cultural product by Indians and Pakistanis, Muslims and Hindus and, indeed, by both under certain circumstances. Pakistani nationalists have appropriated the debate about Urdu's roots to the nationalist enterprise. Claims about Punjabi, Sindhi, Hindko, and Siraiki being the ancestors of Urdu are also flattering for the speakers of these languages because Urdu is the national language and the symbol of Muslim identity in South Asia. Thus, besides feeding into the imperatives of nationalism, the debate also feeds into ethnic and linguistic pride. Indian, and specifically identity-conscious Hindus, have also moved from locating Hindi in India and tracing its ancestry to an Indian language to owning it after moving it as far from Urdu as possible. Thus, the debates on Urdu, as well as Hindi, have shifted from linguistic identity to nationalistic identity. But is modern Urdu the ancestor of the language which was called Hindi for most of its history? Or is it a recently constructed product like Sanskritized Hindi? What is its identity and how has it been created? These are questions which we will try to answer in the next chapter.

5

Identity: The Islamization of Urdu

The Islamization of Urdu is my term for the use of excessive Persian and Arabic words as well as the overall references to Indian Islamic culture in the ancestor of modern Urdu and Hindi between the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries. Sometime later—from the early nineteenth century onwards—Hindi was Hinduized also. Both languages were given communal identities during the colonial period. The standardization of Modern Urdu and Hindi is the process by which they were given these polarized identities. This chapter will look at this process only for Urdu but not for Hindi, which is outside the purview of this book. However, it should be mentioned at the outset that in both languages this was done by indexing linguistic symbols—scripts, allusions, idiom, rhetorical devices, and formulaic expressions—with a civilizational or cultural identity. Such devices associated this single language with different religious and ethnic identities in the minds of their own users as well as others.

This is not to say that languages are never associated with identities. Classical Arabic, though used by Arab Muslims as well as Christians for formal functions, is mostly associated with Islam. Hebrew is associated with the Israeli as well as the Jewish identity (Spolsky and Shohamy 1999: 65–73). Latin is associated with the Roman Catholic Church (Ostler 2007: 313) and Sanskrit, though its 'cosmopolitanism never carried particularistic religious notions' in the past (Pollock 2006: 572), became a marker of the Hindu nationalist identity during the colonial period when identity took shape.

The Muslim elites ruling India since the thirteenth century used Persian as the court language. However, when the British rulers of India replaced Persian with the vernacular languages of India—of which Urdu, albeit called Hindustani by the British, was one—in 1834, the Muslim elite had already adopted a deliberately Persianized form of the language which functioned as an identity symbol for this elite (Rai 1984: 248–250). The nineteenth and early twentieth centuries saw Urdu getting more closely associated with Islam as religious literature proliferated and the Pakistan Movement made it a symbol of Muslim identity. In the same way Hindi was separated from Urdu and identified 'as the language of the Hindus' during the same period (Dalmia 1997: 147–148).

The separation of Urdu from Hindi, which has been described by Amrit Rai (1984: 226–284) is contingent upon the script (Devanagari for Hindi; Perso-Arabic for Urdu); lexicon (borrowings from Sanskrit for Hindi; Arabic and Persian for Urdu); and cultural references (Hindu history and beliefs for Hindi; Islamic history and ideology for Urdu). These language-planning processes led to the splitting of a language (Hindi-Urdu) into modern Persianized and Arabicized Urdu at one extreme and modern Sanskritized Hindi at the other. Between the two ends is a continuum which veers towards one end or the other according to the speaker, the occasion and the environment. This chapter looks at how the process of standardization, carried out primarily by Muslim intellectuals associated modern Urdu with Islamic culture in South Asia in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in greater detail than earlier attempts in this direction. The same processes continued for both Urdu and Hindi in the twentieth century but they have not been considered in this chapter.

The Sanskritic-vernacular Phase of the Ancestor of Urdu

For most of its history Hindi-Urdu been full of words now
associated with Sanskritic and vernacular roots. Let us look at
the most ancient texts now available. First, there are words in
use at present in both Hindi and Urdu which are traceable to
Sanskrit. Out of these forty-three words of daily use are given by
Amrit Rai (1984: 59–63). Among these are:

āj	today
ṭo	so
thā	was
tū	you
bāṯ	words; saying
pūch	ask
yēh	this
hāth	hand

These basic words of the language in their historical forms
(*Apabhranshā*) are given in texts claimed to be dating back before
the Turkish armies entered India. The document from Rajput
courts of the twelfth century, mentioned in an earlier context,
have the words *Pardhan* and *karan* in a sample of only twenty-two
words (see Note 2 of Chapter 4). However, as these dates are
uncertain, since the actual texts which are available now were
probably transcribed by copiers from oral narratives, let us,
therefore, look at a text written by a Muslim in the Perso-Arabic
script about six hundred years ago.

   This is *Masnavī Kadam Rāō Padam Rāō* by Fakhar Din Nizami
from the fifteenth century which has been mentioned earlier in
another context (Jalibi 1973). In contrast to the few statements
scattered in Persian texts referred to earlier, this is a lengthy
text with 1,032 couplets. The language of this work is not
Persianized or Arabicized. According to Jamil Jalibi: 'Nearly
twelve thousand words have been used and out of them only
about one hundred and twenty five are of Arabic and Persian'

(Jalibi 1973: 36). The rest of the diction belongs to what Jalibi calls the Hindu tradition (Hindvi *ravāet*) (Ibid., p. 37). However, the basic syntax of the language and part of the diction is still part of both Urdu and Hindi. Nevertheless, it is closer to the Hindi end of the spectrum and, therefore, may be less intelligible to non-specialist speakers of Urdu than those of Hindi. The following words are still used in Modern Hindi:

Āshtī	Ease
Utāval	Quick, one who wants results quickly.
Uttar	answer
Akkhar	word
Bintī	request
Patr	Paper
Prīt	love
Purs	man
Nār	woman
Pūt	son
Turat	immediate
Jag	world
Chamatkār	miracle
Sabd	word
Giān	wisdom
Lāb	profit
Mās	month, meat
Mūrakh	fool, ignorant
Nark	hell

The first few lines are as follows:

Gusaĩ tuhĩ ēk duna jag adār
Barōbar duna jag tuhĩ dēnāhār
Ākās ūchā pātāl dhartī tuhĩ
Jahã kuch nakoī tahã haē tuhĩ
O lord! You are the only support of both worlds

Correctly speaking you are the one who gives sustenance to both
worlds
You are the heaven and the lower part of the world
Where there is nobody; there you exist (Jalibi 1973: 65).

Out of these twenty-two words, six are not intelligible to non-
specialist speakers of Urdu. Hindi speakers may, however,
understand *ākās* (sky) as well as *pātāl* (lower part of the world).
The verb *dēnā* (giving) in *dēnāhār* (one who gives) is intelligible
to both Urdu-and Hindi-speakers but the suffix-*hār* is not used
in modern Urdu in this meaning.

This sample of the language of Deccan, during the early part
of the fifteenth century (1421–1435), as evidenced by *Kadam Rāō*,
is far less intelligible and far more Sanskritized than the
sentences of Urdu attributed to the saints in their *malfūzāt* and
tazkarās mentioned earlier. Thus, while it is not clear how people
actually spoke it, it can be said with confidence that Urdu-Hindi
was a far more Indian (Sanskritized) language from the fifteenth
till the eighteenth centuries than it is now.

While *Masnavī Kadam Rāō Padam Rāō* was written in Deccan and
the setting was Hindu, we have another text written in the
extreme north west of the subcontinent and here the setting was
Muslim. Indeed, it was intended to be a religious text by its
author. This is *Khairul Bayān* written by Bayazid Ansari
(931/1526–27—980 or 989/1572–1581) between 1560–1570, and it
also has words now associated with Hindi (Ansari 1570) (see
annexures A/5 and B/5 for the actual words). The manuscript of
the book from which the published version used here has been
printed is in Germany and is dated 1061/1650–51.[1] However, as
Akhund Darweeza (d. 1048/1638–9) has denounced Bayazid's
work for heresy in his own book, *Makhzan ul Islām*, which was
written sometime in the late sixteenth century, and finally
revised by his son Abdul Karim in its present form in 1024/1615
(Blumhardt 1905:2), it is certain that *Khairul Bayān* was in

circulation and was taken seriously enough to cause much anxiety among the ulema of the period.

The present version of _Khairul Bayān_ has only sixteen lines in the language called 'Hindi' by the author, some consisting of only two words. This is probably the first Urdu writing in the Pashto-speaking area now in Pakistan (Rahman 2008 c). These 'Hindi' words are found only in the first four pages. These pages have Arabic, Persian and Pashto in equal portions. The Persian portion, however, gets reduced later while the Arabic and Pashto remain till the end. However, the Pashto version is longer than the Arabic one so that it is not an exact translation. In short, the book as it stands today, can hardly be called a book in four languages. But that is precisely what the author and his critics call it.

Bayazid himself writes in the end of the book in Pashto:

Gorā har chē lavalī khairul Bayān ū pa chār jaba ka var ba ō khēm ō dā
vatā salōr jabē khabar ba yē kaṛ am dā kaṛa na kaṛa la charē da har muqām
(Qasmi 1967: 296–297)
(Anyone who reads _Khairul Bayān_. I will teach him four languages, and I will give him knowledge in four languages about how to behave in all fields of life).

The first four lines which begin the book are in Arabic followed by Persian, Pashto and then 'Hindi'. The 'Hindi' words are as follows:

Rē Bāyazīd: likh kitāb kē āghāz kē bayān jin kē sārē
akkhar sahen bismillāh, tamām! maẽ na guvāũ gā
mazdūrī unhã kī jē likhẽ paṛan bigāṛan akkhar
kē tamkani paṛan likhẽ is kāran jē sahī hōē bayān! (Qasmi 1967: 1).
(O Bayazid: write in the beginning words all with the name of God. I will not waste the wages of those who write words without distorting them. But only if they write that which expresses the meaning correctly)

Words like *akkhar* (word), used in this book, are now associated with Hindi but they were in use in this specimen of the ancestor of Urdu in the North Western regions of Pakistan.

If we remember that 438 years have passed to the writing of *Khairul Bayān* it is amazing that it is still intelligible to those of us who know Urdu, Hindi, Punjabi, Siraiki, etc. Moreover, Bayazid must have chosen it because it must have been an important language outside the Pashto-speaking world he was living in. As Jamil Jalibi has opined, he must have wanted to influence people in the plains of India (Jalibi 1975: 58), and this could only make sense on the assumption that this must have been the language most commonly understood there as, indeed, its descendants Urdu, Hindi and Punjabi, are even now. It appears as if Bayazid's followers also followed his fashion of writing in more than one language. A poet called Arzani, who was 'intelligent' and a master of correct language (*fasīh zubān būd*), also wrote poetry in 'Afghani, Farsi, Hindi, and Arabi' like Bayazid Ansari (Darweeza 1613: 149).

Besides these lines in the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi in *Khairul Bayān*, at least one couplet in the same language is attributed to Bayazid by Ali Muhammad Mukhlis (1610–11—1664–65) who is said to be one of his followers. This occurs in Mukhlis's own collection of Pashto verse. He introduces it in Persian as a 'couplet of Bayazid in the Hindvi language':

> *Sachchā bōl Bāyazīd kā jō banīave kōī*
> *Chū marnē paher paehlē vī par nā marē sōī*
> (Mukhlis *c*. 17th century: 581)
> (The true saying of Bayazid he who recites
> At the time of death he does not go on the path of annihilation)

Mukhlis's work—at least this poetic collection—is only in Pashto but he lived in India for the latter part of his life and possibly that is why words like '*anand*' (pleasure, joy, happiness)—used even now in modern Hindi—are found in his Pashto. All the

samples of the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi given are intelligible for the modern reader.

As mentioned earlier, words like *akkhar*, *kāran*, *jīb* (tongue), are still used in some varieties of Hindi and Punjabi. Most of the other words are easily intelligible to present-day speakers of Urdu and Hindi as well as Punjabi.

About sixty-five years after *Khairul Bayān*, a book in Urdu-Hindi prose entitled *Sab Ras* (1045/1635–36) was written by Mulla Wajhi in the Deccan. Like *Khairul Bayān,* it is quite intelligible for the contemporary reader. And, in common with the works of that period, it has words of Sanskritic origin as well as some which are now obsolete. Among those which are used in Hindi even now are:

Jāpnā	to remember, to count
Chitarnā	to make pictures
Chīntā	worry
Chandan	tactics
Sarjanhār	Creator

An idea of its intelligibility can be formed by reading the following lines:

Ēk shaher thā us shaher kā naõ Sīstān is Sīstān kē bādshāh kī nāõ Aqal-dīn ō duniyā kā tamām kām us tē chaltā-us kē hukm bāj zara kĩ naĩ hiltā (Wajhi 1635: 16).
(There was a city. Its name was Sistan. The name of its king was 'Aqal. All activities spiritual and secular were carried out under his orders. Without his orders not a thing moved).

Another book by Mulla Wajhi entitled *Qutub Mushtarī*, written in 1610, has a number of Sanskrit words given by Amrit Rai (1984: 215).

All the words mentioned by Rai are also associated with Punjabi. The variety of Urdu-Hindi used in the Deccan also has

Punjabi words and certain grammatical usages (such as pluralization). Examples are:

Ākhē	said
Ānnā	to bring
Aōsī	will come
Angul	finger
Tattā	hot
Thã	place
Chiṛī	bird
Chōṛsī	will leave
Diṭhā	saw
Disē	were seen
Dūjā	Second; the other
Dīvā	lamp
(Source: Jalibi 1973: 242–265)	

The pluralization is ã as in Punjabi (*Phatrã*) and even the verbs are pluralized (*hōr aehmaqã kē batã kon kyā ētbār* = and what is the trustworthiness of the words of fools). In Urdu /õ/ is used instead of /ã/.

Coming now to *Karbal Kathā* by Syed Fazal Ali Fazli (b. 1710–1711) written in during Mohammad Shah's reign (1719–1748) 1145/1732–33 and revised in 1161/1748 in North India, one finds some change from the texts we have been considering so far. The book is a translation of Husain Wa'iz Kashifi's (d. 910/1504–05 Persian work called *Rōzatul Shuhadā*. It was translated because it was read out during the meetings (*majālis*) of Muharram to lament the trials and tribulations of the martyrs of the Battle of Karbala (680 CE)[2] but, being in Persian, 'its meanings were not understood by women' (Fazli 1748: 37). Therefore, Fazli undertook this translation because, according to him, 'before this nobody had undertaken this innovation and up to now the translation of Persian to Hindi has not happened' (*ō lehzā pēsh az*

ĩ koī is san'at kā nahī huā mukhtarā'-aōr ab tak tarjumā' fārsī ba ibārat hindī nahī huē mustamā') (Fazli 1748: 23).

The book is a religious work and, therefore, abounds in words of Arabic as well as Persian. Yet, its author tries to use 'easy to understand Hindi' (Ibid., 38) and some words now confined to Punjabi, and even varieties of Hindi are found in it. Yet, the change is that there are more Perso-Arabic words and the linguistic style is different. As Malik Ram says: 'it is the very first sample of the language of Delhi', i.e. the new Urdu which came to be used in Delhi during this period (Malik Ram in Fazli 1748: 24).

In the Deccan San'ati's *Qissā Bēnazīr*, written in 1055/1645 makes two things clear: that while the scholars prided themselves upon their competence in Persian, the common people found it easier to understand Dakhni; and, that Sanskrit words were removed, at least partly because of their difficulty. Thus the author says:

> *Usē fārsī bōlnā zaōq thā*
> *Valē kē azīzā kō yũ zaōq thā*
> *Kē Dakhnī zubān sũ usē bōlnā*
> *Jo seepī tē mōtī naman rōlnā*
> (He was fond of speaking in Persian/but his loved ones had taste for Dakhni so now he is to speak in the Dakhni language/and is to roll out shells as if they were pearls) (Sanati 1645: 26).

Further, the poet tells us that he used less Sanskrit words so that by having less Persian and Sanskrit diction, his work was accessible to people who knew only Dakhni well (Ibid., 26). However, there are preambles in Arabic and, since the story is ostensibly about Tameem Ansari, a personage from early Muslim history, there are words relating to Islam, and hence, of Arabic origin. Even so, words of Hindi like '*gagan*' (sky) are also used.

Another early writer of Urdu, this time from the north, called Mohammad Afzal Gopal (d. 1035/1625), wrote a love story called

Bakat Kahānī. As it is in the Indian tradition, it is in the voice of
a woman (Jain in Jafer and Jain Vol. 3, 1998: 10–34). His *Tērāh
Māsā Qutbī*, copied in 1143/1730–31—the date given on the Punjab
University manuscript used by the present author—is in
Persianized Urdu but does have words declared obsolete later.

> *Achānak tōp kī chun rā ‘ad garjā*
> *Kaṛ ak uskī jō sun kar jeu larjā*
> (Suddenly like the cannon the cloud roared/listening to its thunder
> the heart trembled) (Gopal 1731: n. page).

In this, while *rā‘ad* is used in Persian for cloud and is originally
from Arabic, '*larjā*' is the Hindi pronunciation of the Persian
'*larzā*' used even now in Urdu. In short, despite the trend of
Persianization of diction from the seventeenth century onwards
in Dakhni and North Indian Hindi, as used by Muslim writers,
words and pronunciation patterns of ordinary Hindi had not
become taboo as they did later. Even more importantly the local
tradition of using a woman's voice, as well as allusions to the
seasons of India, is maintained. These, as we know, were also
tabooed later. However, because of the Persianization of diction,
Jamil Jalibi praises it as being more refined than its contemporary
Muqimi's *Chandar Badan ō Mahiār* or Ghawasi's *Saif ul Mulūk Badī’
ul Jamāl* (1625) (Jalibi Vol. 1, 1975: 67).

Yet another example from the same period is the *Masnavī
Wafātnāmā Hazrat Fātimā* of Ismail Amrohvi written in 1105/1693–
1694. It is notable because it is by a Muslim and is a religious
text. Here too there is more Perso-Arabic diction than in other
writings of the period but Hindi words like *sansār* (world) *mukh*
(mouth, face), *ānand* (happiness), *ant* (end), *bichār* (thought),
narās (disappointed; hopeless), and *thār* (varied), etc., also exist
(Amrohvi 1694: 103). At least some of the poets of Urdu-Hindi in
this early period, both Muslims and Hindus, knew Sanskrit and
the local Indian languages. For instance, among others, Ahmad
Gujrati who is called a '*Sha’ir-ē-Hindi*', is an expert on Sanskrit

and Bhasha (local language) (*dar 'ilm Sanskrit ō Bhākā yād tulā dāsht'*) (Chandpuri 1755: 18). Sanskrit and the local languages were not tabooed as they came to be later. In short, although Perso-Arabic diction seems to have increased in works written in the Perso-Arabic script in Hindi-Urdu by the late seventeenth century, even religious texts—which have to borrow from Perso-Arabic word stock in use for religious themes—do not eschew diction now associated with Hindi. The process of weeding out words of Sanskritic origin and the local languages of India came to happen as described below in the movement for the standardization of Urdu which I call Islamization.

THE PROCESS OF ISLAMIZATION

In short, the ancestor of Urdu and Hindi does pass through two distinct phases of identity. Jamil Jalibi calls the use of Sanskritic words and allusions to indigenous (Hindu) culture the 'Hindui tradition' (Jalibi 1975: 529). The opposing trend may, therefore, be called the 'Muslim tradition' or linguistic 'Islamization'.

The movement made the following changes in the identity of the language:

1. Sanskritic words were purged out.
2. Words of local dialects were also purged out.
3. In place of the above, words of Persian and Arabic were added.
4. Literary and cultural allusions, metaphors and symbols would be predominantly to Iranian and Islamic cultures.
5. Allusions to Indian landscape were replaced by references to an idealized and conventionalized Iranian landscape.
6. The amorous conventions of Indian poetry—such as the woman expressing love for the man—were replaced by Iranian ones (i.e. a man expressing love for a beloved of indeterminate gender).

It is this new Muslimized language which became an identity symbol of the elite (*ashrāf*) community of North India.

During the process of Islamization, the excellence of literary practitioners was measured with reference to the presence of Persian and Arabic diction in their work; deviation from actual local pronunciation in orthography was taboo; and the use of Persian literary allusions, similes, metaphors, and idiomatic phrases—the rose and the nightingale of Islamic, elitist culture—rather than Hindu, mass culture were imperative.

This communalization of literary evaluation has created the illusion that Urdu was always associated with Islamic South Asian culture. This is not true as we have seen. However, there is a slow transition from the Hindu (Sanskritic) tradition to the Muslim (Perso-Arabic) one. This started in the seventeenth century during the rule of Ibrahim Adil Shah in Deccan (d. 1627) (Jalibi 1975: 252–279) and achieved momentum during the late eighteenth century.

Aspects of this process of standardization seems to be inspired or patronized by Nawab Amir Khan, the minister of the Mughal King Mohammad Shah in Delhi. A contemporary account, the *Siyār-ul-Muta'ākhirīn* describes the nobleman as follows:

> He composed with great elegance and much facility, both in Persian and Hindostany poetry, often uttering extempore verses; but no man ever equalled him in the talent of saying bon mots, and in rejoining by a repartee. He possessed the art of narration in such a high degree, that people charmed with his story, kept it hanging at their ears as a fragrant flower, whose perfume they wished to enjoy for ever (Khan 1789, Vol. 3: 279).

This Amir Khan is said to have delighted in the company of learned people and patronized poets of Urdu thus contributing to its refinement. Moreover, he had created a private society which discussed words, idioms and sent the standardized version to the whole of India (Khiyal 1916: 76).

The author of *Karbal kathā*, Fazli, is also said to be part of this group and his language is much influenced by Arabic and Persian. Others, whose attempts at standardizing the Persianized style of Urdu-Hindi, in effect separating the literary and official styles of both languages, are available. They are Sirajuddin Ali Khan Arzu 1099–1169/1688—1756–57 Sheikh Zahuruddin Hatim (1699–1786), Sheikh Imam Baksh Nasikh (d. 1838) and Insha Ullah Khan Insha (1752–1818).

One of the major figures of the movement for the Islamization of Urdu is Shah Hatim who was also one of the protégés of Nawab Amir Khan. The following lines illustrate this:

> *Mumtāz kyũ na hōvē vō apnē hamsarõ mẽ*
> *Hātim ka qadardān ab Nawāb Amīr K͟hān haē*
> (Why should he not be distinguished among his peers
> Hatim's patron is now Nawab Amir Khan)

His book *Dīvān Zādāh* was completed in 1169/1756. In its preface (*dībāchā*) written in Persian he gives an account of his own linguistic practices as follows:

> *Lisān 'Ārabi ō zubān-ē-Fārsī kē qarībul fahem ō kasīr ul istē'māl bāshad ō rōz marrā'-e-Dehlī kē mīrzāyān-ē-Hind ō fasīhān-ē-rind dar mahāvra dārand manzūr dāshtā-zubān-e-har diyār tā ba Hindvī kē ã rā bhāka gōend mauqūf kardā- mahez rōzmarrā' kē 'ām fahem ō k͟hās pasand būd ik͟htiār namūdā* (Hatim 1756: 40).
> ([words out of] the Arabic and Persian languages which are intelligible and commonly used [he has used]. And the daily usage of Delhi which the gentlemen of India and the correct users of language and their idiom is acceptable. And the language of various localities and also Hindi which is called *bhākā* [the common language] has been stopped. And he has adopted that language which is used in daily life and is popularly liked and also liked by the connoisseurs of language.

The spellings prescribed by Hatim do not correspond to the pronunciation of these words in India. Rather, the orthography has to correspond to the original Arabic or Persian orthography.

مثلاً تسبیح راتسبی و صحیح راصحی و بیگانہ را بگانہ

و دیوانہ را دوانہ و مانند آں بطور عامہ

(Hatim 1756: 40)

In short, Hatim wanted the restoration of the original spellings of Arabic and Persian words.

He also specifically mentioned words of Hindi which were to be eschewed.

> *Yā alfāz-ē-Hindi kē naēn ō jag ō nit ō basar*
> *vaghaērā ānchē bāshad Yā lafz 'mār' ō 'muā' ō*
> *az ī qabīl kē bar khud qabāhat lāzim āēd.* (Hatim 1756: 40)
> Or words of Hindi like '*naēn*' (eye) or '*jag*' (world) or '*nit*' (always) and '*basar*' (to forget) etc., or like them. And words like '*mār*' (hit) and '*muā*' (dead) and words of this type should be considered contemptible.

Urdu poetry progressed through poetry meetings (*mushairās*) and teacher-pupil (*Ustādī-Shagirdī*) networks (Faruqi 1999: 144–145). In *Tabāqāt ul Shu'arā* (1188/1774–75) Qudrat Ullah Shauq writes that the poet Vali, who used to write in Dakhni was advised by Shah Gulshan when he came to Delhi that 'you should leave Dakhni and write Rekhta like the exalted language of Delhi' (*shumā zubān-ē-dakhnī rā guzāshtā rēkhtā rā muāfiq-ē-urdū-ē-mu'allā shāhjahānābād maozū bakunaed*') (Quoted from Jafer and Jain 1998 Vol. 1: 63). However, Faruqi's argument that Shah Hatim may not be solely responsible for removing Sanskrit words (Faruqi 1999: 154) is correct, as such movements are contributed to by many people, some of whom will be mentioned below. His other argument is that the classical poets, including Hatim himself,

have used many of the words they advised others to purge from the language (Faruqi 1999: 152–153). From this fact he infers that their advice was not meant seriously or that it was meant to draw a line between the language of Delhi and that of Deccan; or to make the language more inclusive. The point, however, is that the movement for purification led to exclusion, elitism and what I call Islamization of the language. On this point Amrit Rai is correct. In any case, correctness was a fad or obsession and a marker of identity (Faruqi 1999: 147). But are there any theories in the linguistic tradition of the Indian Muslims which could provide a rationale for these new linguistic trends? To answer this question we first turn to Amir Khusrau.

Amir Khusrau's Linguistic Theories

Amir Khusrau gave some of his linguistic theories in the preface to the *Dīvān Ghurrat ul Kamāl* written in the thirteenth century. Khusrau exalts the Arabic script and literature above all others but only for religious reasons. However, from the strictly poetic point of view, he considers Persian poetry superior (Khusrau 1293: 24–25). This view belongs to the medieval language ideology among Indian Muslims which categorises reality hierarchically: the language of cities is superior to that of rural areas; written language is superior to the spoken one; the language of certain elites is superior to that of ordinary people, etc. But Khusrau also adds that those brought up in India, especially in Delhi, can speak any language and even contribute to its literature while those of other places cannot (*bē ãkē mamārasat ĩ tāifā yābid tawānad kē bar tarq-ē-har kē begoend sukhanē begoed ō shunvad ō tasrafē dar nazm-ō-nasr nēz bekunad*) (Khusrau 1293: 28).

This view is heard even now among Urdu-speakers who claim that they can speak any language correctly while speakers of other languages cannot speak theirs with the same correctness of pronunciation. And a corollary of this is the excessive

significance which Urdu-speakers gave to pronunciation, idiom
and diction in Urdu. The idea of this being cultural capital was
taken to such absurd lengths that it was used as a weapon to
humiliate those who did not conform to these prescriptive norms
of correctness. The number of 'correct' speakers was reduced to
some families (see Insha's views) and some exemplars were
elevated above all others. Mir Mustahsan Khaleeq, a poet of
Urdu, was praised by Sheikh Nasikh, one of the experts on good
Urdu, as a person whose family spoke the most 'correct' Urdu
(Azad *c.* 19th century: 314). The relevance of these linguistic
views is that they formed part of the language ideology which
informed Muslim linguists, who transferred these ideas to Urdu
when it was standardized, as an icon of Muslim identity, as we
shall see. One of these views might have been the linguistic
superiority of Delhi which we will encounter later in the book.

Arzu's Contribution

Sirajuddin Ali Khan Arzu [1099–1169/1687–88–1755–56], known
for his linguistic work on Persian and Urdu, was one of the
pioneers of the reform movement which created modern
Persianized Urdu. Arzu wrote a treatise on Persian linguistics
called *Muthmir*. In this he emphasizes the existing linguistic
ideology that the variety of Persian spoken in the cities is more
correct (*fasīh*) than that of the rural areas. The relevant passage
is as follows:

> *Pas ba taēhqīq pēvast kē afsāh zubānhā zubān-ē- Urdū ast*
> *ō Fārsī hamĩ jā mu'atbar ast*
> Therefore research shows that the most authentic or sophisticated
> among all languages is the language of the city and the Persian of
> this place is the most authentic... (Arzu *c.* 18th century: 13).

He also points out that all the classical poets were associated
with a certain city and spoke the language of that city (*ba hamã*

zubān-ē-muqarrar harf zadand ō ã nīst magar zubān-ē-Urdū illā māshā allāh kamā sabaq) (Ibid., 13).

Arzu's views about correctness in language are found, in addition to his *Muthmir*, in his dictionary, *Navādir ul Alfāz*, finished in 1165/1751. This book was written to improve and correct an existing 'Hindi' dictionary called *Gharāib ul Lughāt* by Abdul Wāse' Hānsvī. In short, taking both the *Gharāib* and the *Navādir*, we get a peep into Urdu-Hindi before it was standardized into Urdu and Hindi.

The point which strikes a reader is that Arzu calls the language of Gwalior the most correct Hindi of all. Two sources of the middle of seventeenth century, both histories of Shahjahan, also praise Gwalior as a centre of cultivation and one explicitly considers its language the best variety of Hindi. The *Bādshāh Nāmā* of Lahori mentions a certain Raja of Gwalior who knew much about the songs and literary works of Hindustan and 'created new meanings in the language of Gwalior' (*ma 'ānī tāzā bazubān-e-Gwāliar guzārish dādāh*) (Lahori *c.* 1640s: 6). Kanboh's *Shāh Jahān Nāmā*, goes further and states categorically that 'Gwalior the language of which is the authority in Hind and Sind...' (*gavāliar kē lughat ã jā dar tamām hind ō sind sanad ast...*). In the context of Gwalior being a centre of art and literature, Arzu's high praise for the language of this region can be understood (Kanboh 1070/1659–60: 45). However, he also refers to the language of the cities of Delhi (Shāhjahānābād) and Agra (Akbarābād) as places with a desirable standard. Let us take the two claims one by one.

The assertion that the 'Hindi' of Gwalior is the best is repeated several times for instance:

(i)   While explaining *Jēli* (hoe to separate grain from chaff) he says:

'Ō ba Hindi muta'ārif Gwāliar kē afsāh ul Lisanā Hindi ast'
(Arzu 1751: 187) (And in Hindi used in Gwalior which is
the best Hindi).

(ii) While explaining the meaning of *kandal* (circle; also a
game in which the players sit in a circle) he says:
*'Lēkin zubān-ē-Gwāliar kē Hindi afsāh ast badĩ ma'ānī chīl
jhapattā khuānand'* (Arzu 1751: 348) (But in the language of
Gwalior which is the most correct variety of Hindi this is
called *chīl jhapattā*).

(iii) Explaining *gāndar* (grass to make sweeps) he says:
*'Lēkin gāndar ānchē zubān zad mardam Gwāliar ō Akbarābād
kē afsāh ul Lisanā' Hindi ast Kāhē bāshad'* (Arzu 1751: 362)
(But *gāndar* in the language of the people of Gwalior and
Akbarabad, which is the most correct out of the varieties
of Hindi, is called grass).

(iv) Explaining the meaning of *īvārā* (pen to enclose animals)
he says: '*ō bazubān-ē-braj ō Gwaliar kē afsāh ast ã rā kharak
guvaēnd*' (Ibid., 48) (and in the language of Braj and
Gwalior which are the most correct it is called *kharak*.

The language of Gwalior as well as that of Agra, which Arzu
praises, is Braj Bhasha. This is the language of 'the Central Dōāb
and the country immediately to its South from near Delhi to, say,
Etawah, its headquarters being round the town of Mathura
[Muttra]' (Grierson Vol. 1, n.d.: 162). On the map of UP, the
following districts fall into Braj areas (Gautam Buddha Nagar,
Bulandshahar, Aligarh, Mahamaya Nagar, Mathura, Agra,
Ferozabad, Etah, Mainpuri, Badaun, Bareilly, and Tarai parganas
of Nainital). It is also spoken in Gurgaon, in Bharatpur and
Karauli, and in Madhya Pradesh in Gwalior and surrounding
areas. In Rajasthan, however, it slowly merges into Rajasthani
(Grierson Vol. ix: Part–1 n.d.: 69). This language had much oral
literature and a high reputation before Khari Boli, which was
standardized as Hindustani later, became ascendant.

Arzu's praise for Braj Bhasha probably owes to the fact that
was born in Agra (Akbarabad) and brought up in Gwalior. His
mother's family came from Gwalior and his teacher was Mir
Ghulam Ali Ahsani Gwaliari. It was only in the beginning of the
reign of Farrukh Siyar (r. 1713–19) that he went to Delhi (Qasmi
and Mazhar 2001: 70).

But, apart from the dialect of Gwalior, which is repeatedly
called the best or 'most correct' form of 'Hindi', Arzu also refers
to the language of certain exalted parts of Muslim urban centres
of power (Urdu) as standards. The examples are as follows:

(a) While explaining '*Chanaēl*' (woman who oggles at men
    surreptitiously) he says: '*Lēkin chanaēl mā'lūm nīst kē
    lughat-ē- kujā ast mā mardam kē az aēhlē hindēm ō dar urdūē
    mu'allā mī bāshēm nāshanīdā ēm*' (But one does not know
    where the word *Chanael* comes from for we, who are
    Indians and the inhabitants of the Exalted city, have not
    heard it) (Arzu 1751: 214).

(b) While explaining *dibā* (flesh which the camel takes out of
    his mouth during the rutting season) he says: '*lēkin lafz-ē-
    mazkūr muta'ārif Urdūē bādshāhī ō zubān-ē-Akbarābād ō
    Shāhjahānābād nīst...*' (but the word in question is not
    known in the city of the King and the languages of Agra
    and Delhi) (Ibid., 248–249).

(c) While explaining the connotative meaning of *rajwārā*—
    otherwise the place of the residence of the ruler—as a
    brothel he says: '*lēkin rajwārā badĩ ma'ānī istilāh- ē-
    Shāhjahānābād ast balkē aēhlē Urdū ast...*' (Ibid., 261). (But
    the word *rajwārā* in this meaning is the idiom of Delhi,
    indeed of the inhabitants of the exalted quarter of the
    City).

(d) While explaining the meaning of *gazak* (a sweetmeat) he
    says: '*lēkin gazak bā istilāh-e-aēhl-ē-Urdū...*' (Ibid., 371) (But
    gazak in the idiom of the inhabitants of the city...).

(e) While explaining *nakhtōṛā* (nostril) he says: '*lēkin nakhtōṛ ā dar 'urf-i-Urdū va ghaērā...*' (Ibid., 430). (But *nakhtōṛā* in the usage of the city, etc...)

(f) While explaining *haṛaphnā* (putting in one's mouth inelegantly) he says: '*lēkin haṛaphnā zubān-ē-Urdū ō aehlē shaherhā nīst-shāēd zubān-ē-qariāt ō muvāzē' bāshad...*' (Ibid., 441–442). (But *haṛ aphnā* is not the language of the city and the people of the city. Maybe it is the language of the towns and rural pockets)

In all these examples there is a language—meaning a variety of the 'Hindi' language—of the exalted city (Urdu-e-Mualla)—which is held up as a model of excellence. This is specifically associated with Delhi and Agra and with rule (*Bādshahī*). The speakers of this language are called '*aēhlē Shaher*' (the inhabitants of the city) or '*aēhl-ē-Urdū*', which probably means the inhabitants of Delhi. This is the city where the Muslim gentry, aristocracy and workmen associated with royalty, used to live. Insha Allah Khan Insha, as we will see, described this in detail. It is the Muslimized idiom of the *ashrāf* which Arzu calls the 'language of Urdu'. By Urdu he means 'city' and not a language—which is called Hindi—though Syed Abdullah claims that he is the first writer who does use the term Urdu for a language as has been mentioned earlier (Abdullah 1951: 28–29). The point is that Arzu does have a standard in mind and it is the language of an elitist Muslim minority living in Delhi and other imperial cities.

Let us now take Arzu's condemnation of the ordinary peoples' language which is termed as being 'wrong' or 'ignorant' or 'vulgar'—in the sense of belonging to the common people—or being from a rural backwater. Examples abound but a few will be sufficient:

1. While explaining *harval* (leading) he says: '*lēkin harval ghalat-ē-awām ō dahāqīn-ē-Hindustān ast*' (Arzu 1751: 441)

(But *harval* is the mistake of the common people and the peasants of India).

2. While explaining *mutakkā* (pillow) he says: '*nēz mutkā guvaēnd ō ī ghalat-ē-aēhlē Hind ast...*' (Ibid., 403). (Moreover, it is called *mutkā* and this is one of the mistakes of the people of India).

3. While explaining *kalābā* (carrier of water) he says: '*lēkin kalābā bakāf-ē-Tāzī zubān-ē-juhalā-ō-avām-ē-Hindustān ast*' (Ibid., 338). (But *kalābā* is the language of the ignorant and the common people of India).

He also explains that the people of India cannot pronounce qāf/q/(ق) (Ibid., 356); or *jīm*/dʒ/(ج) (Ibid., 174); or several other phonemes borrowed from Arabic and Persian.

If we connect this purist attitude of Arzu with his general praise for the language of the cities, and especially the centres of royal power, it becomes clear that he aspires for linguistic purity and this, in practice, means taking the Muslimized idiom of imperial Mughal cities as the new standard. The Hindi of Gwalior, while being the best variety of Hindi, is not the model which Arzu will follow. Instead, he will adopt the minority language of an elitist group, which happens to be Muslim, as the elite language which will function as the identity symbol of *ashrāf* Muslims like Arzu who will switch over from Persian to Persianized Urdu in the near future.

Insha's Contribution

Another linguist whose work must have influenced the Islamization movement is Insha Allah Khan Insha, whom we have encountered several times before in other contexts. Known mostly as a poet, Insha was the pioneering sociolinguistic historian of Urdu. His pioneering work is a book in Persian entitled *Daryā-ē-Latāfat* (1802).

Insha built his whole linguistic theory around the notion of 'correctness' (*fasāhat*). This notion is based upon a hierarchical, medieval (and colonial) world-view mentioned as being part of language ideology earlier. The assumption is that the phenomenal world is a fixed and given entity with an essential nature or quality. Thus values and hierarchies within things, including languages, are an immutable given and intrinsic to their nature. Thus some languages—like some people, some religions, some races, etc.—are inferior or superior to others. The upper classes are superior to the lower ones and men are superior to women. While notions of class are found everywhere in the book, the idea of the superiority of women is given in passing as follows: 'the women of Shahjahanabad [Delhi] are the most linguistically correct women in India except men' (*zanān-ē-Shahjahānābād afsāh zanān-ē-Hindustān and sivāē mardā*' (Insha 1802: 98). The idea that human beings, or rather groups, give value and determine hierarchies which are, therefore, neither unchangeable, nor objective nor intrinsic, was not known to Insha and his contemporaries. Indeed, his British contemporaries too did not countenance such a constructionist and relativist view. They would, of course, have argued for the superiority of Europe and of English, while Insha argued for the superiority of Urdu over the other languages of India. But both parties would have agreed with the basic assumption that value (superiority or inferiority) resides in the essential nature of a thing and is not given to it by observers.

Insha developed his notion of *fasāhat* on this basic assumption—that there are superior forms of language. He then argues that the standard of correctness lies in the practice of some families of Delhi. Although he begins the book by stating that the language of the capital is the best as a general rule, he comes to a more complete definition of 'correctness' later:

> The language of Shahjahanabad is that which people attached to the royal court, courtiers themselves, beautiful women, Muslim handicraftsmen, the functionaries of rich and fashionable people—even their very sweepers—speak. Wherever these people go their children are called Dilli *wālās* and their *mohallā* is known as the *mohallā* of the Delhites (Translated from Insha 1802: 71).

Insha has been saying much the same thing from the beginning but he builds the grounds for this definition by exclusion. For instance, he excluded the Hindus arguing that it is well-known to refined people that the Hindus learned 'the art of behaviour and conversation and the etiquette of partaking food and wearing clothes from the Muslims' (*pōshidā nīst kē Hinduān salīqā dar raftār-ō guftār ō khurāk ō pōshāk az Musalmānān yad griftā and*' (Ibid., 9). Then he goes on to eliminate the working classes of Delhi and such localities as that of Mughalpura and the Syeds of Barah. The working classes, he says, speak Urdu mixed with other languages.

Some localities, such as Mughalpura, are rejected because their Urdu is mixed up with Punjabi (Insha 1802: 36). Even the Syeds of Barah, who belonged to a powerful family, are excluded on the grounds that they came from outside Delhi and were too proud to learn the correct Urdu language (Ibid., 36). After this, Insha eliminates all outsiders settled in Delhi, be they from Kashmir, Punjab or the small towns of UP. The Punjabis come in for summary rejection because of their pronunciation. In the end he is left with a few families with courtly connections and gentlemanly status (*ashrāf*). In short, correctness in Urdu is based upon the membership of an exclusive club which was Muslim, not of working-class status, and belonging to Delhi. This has been explained by Javed Majeed with reference to Insha's concern 'to define for Urdu a geographical region of its own, while at the same time ensuring that it is not tied to any one locality exclusively' (Majeed 1995: 196). However, my hypothesis is that Insha's reason is that his patron, Nawab Sa'adat Yar Khan, the

ruler of Awadh, and he himself lived in Lucknow and not in Delhi.

This was Insha's difficulty. And he overcame it by praising the correctness of the Urdu of Lucknow in the same rhetorical language as he earlier praised the language of Delhi. Thus he explains that one does not have to be born in Delhi to be correct in Urdu. Indeed, the best Urdu-speakers (*fusahā*) of that city have migrated to Lucknow. Since the ruler (his patron) encouraged knowledge and the arts, it was in Lucknow that the best form of Urdu flourished (Insha 1802: 67–71). With this stratagem he achieves what he started out with—that correctness resides in the language of the *ashrāf* of Delhi—but also avoids hurting egos of the Luckhnavis and especially the Nawab. However, to be fair, it should be added that this was also the view of other literary figures such as Rusva, as he explains in his preface of 1887 to his *Muraqqā-ē-Lailā Majnũ* (Rusva 1928: footnote 1: 6–8).

Insha's linguistic theory is related to power. First, the hierarchical and value-laden evaluation of languages or linguistic practices in itself confirms the differentiation in society initially created by the powerful. Secondly, Insha clearly states that figures with temporal authority can create linguistic innovations. For instance, the word '*rangtarā*' for '*sangtarā*', by Mohammad Shah, is such a neologism. Insha believes that whatever form of language is acceptable to rulers is ipso facto 'correct' (Insha 1802: 37–38). Indeed, Delhi's language is correct precisely because it was the capital of the Mughal empire for so long. But then, fulsome praise is given to the language of the Nawab of Lucknow when it is claimed that every utterance reminds the author of the *Maqāmāt-ē-Harīrī*, the model of eloquence in Arabic (*dar har fiqrā yad az muqāmāt-ē-Harīrī mīdahad*' (Insha 1802: 37). Obviously, Insha was trying to locate the quality of 'correctness' in the Muslim of Delhi but pragmatism made him include the elite of Lucknow in this charmed circle also.

Given such views about correctness Insha also believes in purging the language of course or inharmonious words. Not all these words are from Hindi though some, *sarijan, pī,* and *pītam* are. Indeed, some words are considered unreasonable (*nā māqūl*) simply because they belong to a bygone age (*mānē* for '*maẽ*'=me; *dasā* for 'seen' or 'that which was seen'; *satī* for '*sẽ*'=from, to), etc. Insha is also in favour of abandoning all words coming from the peripheral areas where Braj Bhasha or (in Lucknow) Avadhi, is spoken (Insha 1802: 33–37). He condemns such words as being unsuitable for Urdu.

Although some of Insha's ideas do not conform to traditional purist views about Urdu—for instance he argues that foreign words should be pronounced according to the phonological rules of Urdu rather than the language they are borrowed from (1802: 241)—his influence as an upholder of elitist language affected Urdu writers in the nineteenth century. And the major thrust of his elevation of the language of the Muslim elite of Delhi and Lucknow as the standard of correctness and elegance contributed to the Islamization of Urdu.

OTHER LINGUISTIC REFORMERS

The other major figure who is referred to in this process of the Islamization of Urdu is the poet Mirza Mazhar Jan-e-Janan (1701–1780). Mazhar was a poet of Persian and was also reputed to be a mystic (Sufi). According to Anwar Sadeed, who has written on the literary movements in Urdu, Mirza Mazhar carried out the linguistic reforms in the language as a religious and political duty (Sadeed 1985: 203). For him it was a religious and political necessity to have the same linguistic tradition operating in both Persian and Urdu (Ibid., 203). He was, of course, familiar with both Persian and Arabic and was a master of the Muslim mystical religious tradition. In his hands Urdu poetry developed some of the features which are associated with

the ghazal. He uses Persianized diction, Iranian literary allusions and Islamic cultural symbols.

Mirza Rafi Sauda, another classical poet, is credited by Azad for having introduced Persian idiomatic language in the local language (*bhāshā*) and, thus, having 'purified' it (Azad *c.* 19th century: 133). Another figure of this movement, Sheikh Imam Baksh Nasikh (d. 1838), spent his childhood in Faizabad and his manhood in Lucknow during a period when the Urdu-based Lucknow Shia Muslim civilization was rising. His role in standardizing Urdu has been appreciated by Ghalib. According to Safīr Bilgrami, the poet said:

> *Miã agar mujh sē pūchtē hō tō zubān kō*
> *Zubān kar dikhāyā tō Lucknow nē aōr Lucknow mẽ Nāsikh nē*
> (He said: 'Sir, if you ask me then it is Lucknow which made utterance into elegant language and in Lucknow it was Nasikh who did it)
> (quoted from Javed 1987: 42–43)

Imdad Imam Asar also says in *Kāshif ul Haqāeq*:

> *Sheikh nē Urdū kō tarāsh kharāsh kar aēsā kar*
> *diyā kē ab us kī latāfat aōr safāi Fārsī sē kutch kam nahĩ mā'lūm hōtī*
> (Quoted from Javed 1987: 43). (Sheikh [Nasikh] refined Urdu in such a way that its sweetness and refinement does not seem to be any less than that of Persian)

Indeed, Nasikh and his pupils—Mir Ali Rashk, Baher, Barq, Abad—are all known for giving precedence to language over meaning. According to Mohammad Hussain Azad, Nasikh had 'studied books of Persian from Hafiz Waris Ali Lakhnavi and had also studied textbooks from the ulema of Firangi Mahal. Although he did not have a scholarly command of Arabic but according to the requirements of traditional knowledge and the company of his peers he had full understanding of the requirements of poetry' (Translated from Urdu from Azad *c.* 19th century: 282).

Azad also says that he was rightly called *nāsikh* (one who cancels out something) because he cancelled out, or brought to an end, the ancient style of poetry (*tarz-ē-qadīm*) (Azad *c.* 19th century: 289). Anwar Sadeed goes to the extent of considering Nasikh responsible for the trend of purging out even well-known words of the local languages (*prākrits*) and substituting them with difficult and erudite words of Persian and Arabic (Sadeed 1985: 211). However, Rashid Hasan Khan, in his 'Introduction' to the selection of Nasikh's verse, while agreeing that Nasikh did use difficult Arabic words, attributes this trend to the lack of depth in his work which verbosity is intended to conceal (Khan 1996: 34–69). Moreover he claims that the students of Nasikh and not the poet himself carried out most of the linguistic purges which are attributed to him. However, Nasikh did make Lucknow a centre of the ongoing standardization of Urdu (Ibid., 70–109).

One of the sources describing the linguistic reform movement is *Jalwā-ē-Khizr* (1884). Its author, Farzand Ahmad Safeer Bilgrami, aspires to write a history of Urdu poetry like Azad's *Āb-ē-Hayāt*, and for this purpose he chose the extended metaphor of committees. The focus is the refinement of Urdu diction and there are eight committees for this purpose. The first was by Shah Hatim, the second by Mir Taqi Mir, the third by Jurat, the fourth by Mushafi, the fifth by Insha, the sixth by Mir Hasan (1736–7—1786), the seventh by Shah Naseer (1756–1839), and the eighth by Ibrahim Zauq (1789–1854) and Momin Khan Momin (1800–1851). There were also sub-committees by the students of the last two and Ghalib (Bilgrami 1884: 273). Of course there were no formal committees of this kind but the metaphor is useful for categorizing the major figures who participated in what was seen as the refinement of the language. A number of lists are given which suggest that the major change was of fashion, i.e. the old-fashioned word or expression was substituted by a new one. In many cases only the grammatical gender was changed (in *tāsīr kiyā* [affected] the last word which refers to the gender of the

verb 'did' became *kī*, i.e. feminine). However, well-known words of Hindi origin, which are still used in modern Hindi and especially in popular songs, were declared obsolete. Among these are: *naēn* (eyes), *darshan* (vision), *sajan* (friend), *jag* (world), *mōhan* (darling)*, dārū* (medicine/alcohol), *sansār* (world), *piyā* (beloved), *sarījan* (deity), *pītam* (beloved)*, mukh* (mouth), *prēm* (love), etc. (Bilgrami 1884: 73–74). However, Mir Dard, Mirza and Sauda, etc., did throw out some 'typical words of Hindi' (*thēth Hindi alfāz*) from their poetic work (Ibid., 91).

Even so, it should be clarified here that this movement for purging the existing 'Hindi' language of words was not seen as Islamization at that time nor is it called that by historians of Urdu. As mentioned earlier, if one examines the lists of words rendered obsolete by this movement of linguistic purification one finds that most words were discarded simply because they were old fashioned, rustic or grammatically mixed (one morpheme from Arabic another from Hindi or Persian or some such combination). Thus Khalid Hasan Qadri's glossary of 4,000 obsolete words has items which are not of Sanskritic origin but fell from grace for other reasons (Qadri 2004). Other lists of obsolete words are provided by Shauq Neemvi, Abra Hasni and Khurshid Lakhnavi, among others (Baloch 2008: 219–225). Most of the words and expressions in these lists are not of Sanskritic or local language (*bhasha*) origin but are simply old fashioned (*āē haē* (comes), *jāē haē* (goes), *lījō* (take), *dījō* (give), or of the wrong Persian construction (*khandā jabīn* is obsolete and in its place *khandāh jabīn* is allowed, i.e. the *hē* < ح > is to replace the *alif* < ا >) (Baloch 2008: 121). The fact that speakers of Urdu actually use the *alif* is of no account for the purists. The practitioners of the movement considered it linguistic reform and that is how the historians of Urdu describe it even now. Even a recent work, Imtiaz Hasnain's thesis, is entitled 'standardization and modernization of languages', and he describes the same movement (Hasnain 1985). In contemporary India, 20.51 per cent

people still consider the Urdu of Lucknow and Delhi as the standard (Ibid., 122). But this discussion of the 'standard' conceals the Islamization of the language which created Modern Urdu out of Hindi-Urdu.

It is obvious to any discriminating researcher, however, that the major role of the movement was that of a class marker. The language ideology of the time valued Persian over the local languages so, if a local language had to be used, it had to be embellished with Persianate vocabulary and constructions in order to gain acceptance among elitist circles. Thus, when Mir Mohammad Hussain Taehsin wrote his *Naō Tarz-ē-Murass'ā*', the tale upon which Meer Amman's *Bāgh-ō-Bahār* is based, he said he would write it in 'colourful Hindi'. As this tale was written, according to Nurul Hasan Hashmi, in 1775 (Hashmi 1958: 31) the word Urdu was not used—or, at least, was not commonly used—for the language. Thus, Taehsin uses the word Hindi but makes it clear that he was using an experimental form which 'in the past nobody had invented' and the novelty lay in embellishing ordinary Hindi with ornamental Persian and thus making it fit to be accepted as an offering to a ruler (Nawab Shuja ud Daulah of Lucknow) (Taehsin 1775: 54). This was a time of insecurity for the Muslim elite which had earlier prided itself on the foreign Persian. Now that they had to adopt an indigenous language, a language of India, it had to take as many non-Indian and non-rustic elements as possible to make it appropriate. Rusticity (*ganwārpan or ganwārū*) was something to be shunned both by the creators of modern Urdu and later Modern Sanskritized Hindi. One reason why Braj Bhasha was discarded and Khari Boli preferred for creating Hindi, as an editorial put it, was 'Braj Bhasha is used mainly by illiterate rustics, but Khari Hindi is used by well-educated both for speaking and writing' (*Hindusthan* 3 April 1888). Rahul Sankrityayan, one of the most accomplished historians of Hindi, tells us that the devaluation of the local for fear of rusticity facilitated the entry of words of Sanskrit, (quoted

from Rai 2001: 81). Another reason for the hunt for Sanskritic diction was, of course, that Khari Boli was the base for Urdu too. As Alok Rai puts it: 'the relationship with Urdu is embarrassingly manifest, that with Sanskrit is largely mythical' (Rai 2001: 82). And in both cases the reform movements followed the same trajectory; they moved away consciously from rusticity, locality and to an idealised construction corresponding to new identities which were in the process of construction. But to admit to having political aims, or even being conscious of identity politics, is not the perception of writers, poets and linguists. Hence the insistence that the movements for the Islamization and Hinduization of Khari Boli are not political acts but are merely linguistic reform movements.

THE INSTITUTION OF POETIC APPRENTICESHIP

As mentioned earlier, among the institutions which Islamized Urdu, was poetic apprenticeship or mentorship (*shāgirdī ustādī*). Poets became disciples or students of established practitioners or teachers (*usātizā* sing. *ustād*) who corrected their poems according to the established criteria of correctness and eloquence (*fasāhat ō balāghat*) (Baloch 2008: 57–77). These poets acted as the 'language guardians' whose attitude 'to the use of vocabulary is an important aspect of prescriptivism' (Gustafsson 2008: 85). By prescribing what diction to use they cultivated a language ideology which was disseminated to the young aspiring poets, their hearers and all those who professed to possess literary taste. Deviation from these prescribed norms was punished by social obloquy and stigmatized as lack of taste, philistinism and ignorance. The *mushā'irā* (poetry recitation meeting) was a site of such sanctions. According to C.M. Naim 'Every master poet had his loyal disciples (šāgird) and their numbers and names were matters of prestige. These disciples attended musha'iras in the company of their masters, and were quick to rectify, verbally or otherwise, any loss of face' (Naim 1991: 168). And one of the

things which never went uncorrected was any deviation from the standard language. That is why the hold of the standard language, the new Islamized Urdu carefully cultivated by the Urdu poets, was so strong and correction was its driving force.

Prosody was one aspect of this correction but the focus was always diction. Obsolete words and expressions had to be eschewed and one had to be careful about the accepted idiom among ones' seniors. As the novice poet had to recite his poems in a *mushāirā* which is an assembly of other poets—all potential or actual rivals—words acquired a meaning which they could not in cultures in which poetry was a private matter. It was because the performance was public and so completely dominated by Muslim *usātizā* that the cultural references of Persian and Indian Muslim culture saturated Urdu poetry after this movement and the space for using local and Hindu references disappeared in all genres except the *dōhā*. Thus, the movement for linguistic reform which was not consciously meant to communalize Urdu actually ended up doing just that.

Discursive Pattern and Identity

As mentioned above, what changed the identity of Urdu from a composite language of Hindus and Muslims to a language of urban Muslims was not only the expurgation of certain words. Much more significant was the fact that the overall discourse became oriented to elitist Indian Muslim culture. Thus the themes, cultural references, formulaic utterances, salutations, religious allusions, and the overall atmosphere came from Islam as practiced in North India. This is something which made it difficult for Hindus—at least those who wanted their literary products to function in an overall Hindu and Indian oeuvre—to keep writing in Urdu. This fact is not usually acknowledged by Muslim scholars—something which Gian Chand Jain complains about (Jain 2005: 200–215)—but judging from the praise, some of the greatest modern day scholars of Urdu have lavished on the

Islamization of discourse, it was and still is considered a welcome development. Indeed, writing at present, Moinuddin Aqil says that Mirza Mazhar Jan-e-Janan's achievement was to prevent the domination of the influences of Hindi (*Hindi asrāt kō Urdū adab mẽ ghālib ānē sē rōknā thā*) and that the movement brought Urdu closer to Persian and Muslim cultural values (Aqil 2008: 58).

Examples can be multiplied but the point is clear that some of the twentieth century paradigmatic scholars of Urdu believe that the discursive elements of Urdu should belong to the urban, middle class culture of North Indian Islam. All their talk of Muslim 'emotions', 'values' and cultural references alluded to in the previous chapter, created a certain literary culture in which it was not possible for a writer to choose a non-Muslim cultural style to express himself or herself. This explains why Mohammad Hussain Azad's famous history of Urdu literature *Āb-ē-Hayāt*, ignores both Hindu poets and women—the dice was loaded against them as Urdu had been standardized from the eighteenth century onwards to become an identity symbol of North Indian Muslim males of the *ashrāf* class.

There were attempts to reverse the trend of Islamization during the Urdu-Hindi controversy period by those who wanted Muslim-Hindu unity. Waheeduddin Saleem, a minor literary and academic figure in Hyderabad, was one of these people and, among other things, he said that Hindi words, allusions to Hindu mythology and culture and references to India rather than Persia, should be added to Urdu in order not to alienate our 'Hindu brethren' (Saleem *c*. 20th century: 6–8). More famously, Sir Syed, one of the pioneers of the anti-Hindi reaction during the Hindi-Urdu controversy, deplored the tendency of using the idiom and diction of Persian. He said these two things made 'the Urdu-ness disappear' (*unsē Urdūpan nahĩ raēhtā*) (Khan 1847: 427). Syed Sulaiman Nadvi also pointed out that there were hundreds of 'beautiful' words of Hindi in Urdu poetry before Ghalib and Momin but they had been declared unidiomatic. He suggests

making a dictionary of pure (*thēt*) Hindustani words (Nadvi 1939: 75 and 91–92). However, as linguistic symbols feed into narratives of identity, this Islamization continued with the result that Urdu is now seen as solely a Muslim language. Indeed, the opposite trend which produced glossaries of purely Persian and Arabic words such as the *Farhang-ē-'Amirā* in 1937, continues even now so that the National Language Authority has not only reprinted this dictionary in 1989 and again in 2007 (Khaveshgi 1937) but continues to create technical terms (neologism) in mostly incomprehensible Perso-Arabic vocabulary.

Social Implications of Islamization

One major tradition of Urdu linguistics is: preoccupation with 'correctness' (*fasāhat*) and this is seen through the criterion of what I call Islamization. This trend has ideological associations and implications for identity, self-definition, and ultimately, politics. The notion of correctness makes it possible to create a certain aristocracy of the 'owners of language' (*ahl-ē-zubān*). This serves the purpose of making the language an exclusive preserve of an elitist group distinguished from others by its birth, upbringing and education in the norms of the 'correct' language. By the same token it is a device which excludes non-native speakers of Urdu; the less than perfect speakers; the 'Others'. These 'others' can, of course, learn Urdu but they will always fall short of the perfection of the *ahl-ē-zubān*. As to who were the *ahl-ē-zubān* is contested and that is exactly what Insha tries to do; he demarcates them from the 'others'. In short, the notion of 'correctness' imbues Urdu with the kind of value which makes it a rare and valued commodity. This is best explained with reference to Bourdieu's concept of 'linguistic capital'"

> The constitution of a linguistic market creates the conditions for an objective competition in and through which the legitimate competence can function as linguistic capital, producing a *profit of*

distinction on the occasion of each social exchange [emphasis in the
book] (Bourdieu 1982: 55).

This capital is 'capital' only as long as its value is recognized in
the society in which it operates. In this case it was so recognized
and, lacking political power, the *ahl-ē-zubān* jealously guarded
the purity of their usages so as to keep the value of this capital
intact. There are many anecdotal incidents, especially of the poet
Josh Malihabadi, of rebuking people who did not speak Urdu,
according to the usages he considered correct. But, as identities
are in a state of flux and are always being constructed, the notion
of linguistic capital keeps changing. When Hindu-Muslim politics
necessitated an emphasis on unity rather than separation, both
groups adjusted their linguistic performances. For instance, Syed
Sulaiman Nadvi points out that between 1919 and 1925, at the
height of the Khilafat Movement, Muslim speakers used typically
Hindi words in their speeches and vice versa (Nadvi 1939: 93).

To conclude, the standardization of Urdu in the late eighteenth
century made modern Urdu highly Persianized and Arabicized.
There were two aspects of this standardization: the removal of
certain words of colloquial, indigenous or Indic origin and
substituting them with the words of Persian and Arabic. This was
called the linguistic reform movement but it did not purge away
only Indic words. Indeed, it removed many more words used in
the composite language of the time, which were merely old-
fashioned or considered unrefined, even if they were originally
borrowed from Persian and Arabic and then naturalized into
Urdu-Hindi. The movement probably had more to do with class
than with religion to begin with. This point is generally ignored—
Amrit Rai, for instance, ignores it—though it has been mentioned
by Krishna Kumar who notes that, as a result of purification,
Urdu became a '"class dialect" of a nervous aristocracy' (Kumar
1991: 136). It so happened that this 'nervous aristocracy' was
either Muslim or culturally steeped in Muslim traditions. Thus,

the overall effect of the linguistic reform movement was to create a discourse which favoured the Muslim ways of thinking, feeling and describing reality. These discursive imperatives drew upon Muslim cultural values and used Islamic cultural references in such a manner that they became literary imperatives which the tradition of poetic apprenticeship imposed upon all literary practitioners. Later on, other imperatives, such as the necessity of aligning oneself to the antagonistic and hegemonic Muslim or Hindu identities during the freedom movement of the later nineteenth and twentieth centuries, took over. Krishna Kumar could be right when he claims that the 'reaction to this identification [of Urdu with Islam] took the only available form of associating Hindi and the Nagri script with Hinduism, and of its "purification" by the removal of words of Arabic-Persian lineage' (Kumar 1991: 136). However, it should not be forgotten that the first movement (Persianization) was a class movement to begin with while the second (Sanskritization), even if a reaction, was a political and communal one. Thus, Urdu and Hindi kept drawing apart till now their formal, high literary registers are mutually unintelligible. Yet, the common peoples' language in the streets of Delhi and Karachi are mutually intelligible.

NOTES

1. The author visited the University of Tuebingen in June 2010 and was told that the manuscript had been sent to Berlin. The record of the library indicates that the Mss was of 167 pages and was written by Faqir Bahar Tavi.
2. The battle of Karbala (in present-day Iraq) took place on 9 or 10 October 680 CE between Husain (son of Ali) and Yazid I (son of Muawiya), the Umayyad Caliph. Husain was killed and his martyrdom is commemorated every year in Muharram especially by the Shia sect of Islam.

Extract in Urdu-Hindi

Annexure-A/5

The lines as given in the edited version of the manuscript of *Khairul Bayān* are as follows:

رے بایزید! لکھ کتاب کے آغاز کے بیان جن کے سارے اکھر سہن بسم اللہ، تمام؛ میں نہ گنوانو نگا
مزدوری انہن کی ہے لکھیں پرن بگارن اکھر کہ تمکنی پرن لکھیں اس کا رن ہے سہی ہوئے بیاناں....

...

رے بایزید! لکھ وہ اکھر ہے سب جیب سہن جڑ تھمیں؛ اس کارن ہے نفع پاؤن ادمیان؛ توں سبحان
ہے کچ کا میں ناہیں جانتا بن قراان کے اکھر رے سبحان!

رے بایزید! لکھنا اکھر کا تجھ سی ہے، دکھلاونا اور سکھلاونا مجھ سی ہے، لکھ میرے فرمان سہن جیوں اکھر
قراان کی پہن کی پہن، لکھ کوئی اکھر اور پر تمکنا کہ جزم کہ وہ اور نشان ہے وہ اکھر پیچجا نہن ادمیان؛ لکھ
کوئی اکھر چار چار عیان درہاں سکھنے ہے پڑھین تو سانس نکالہن کوئی دویں بچا اکھر سہن ادمیان!

(The meanings are as follows):

O Bayazid: Write in the beginning of the book all words correctly in the Name of God. I will not let the wages of those be lost who read without spoiling or making mistakes even a word for this reason that the narrative be authentic.

O Bayazid: Write those words which fit the tongue for this purpose that you find benefit, O Men!
You are the Pure and Elevated One. I know not anything but words of the Qur'an O Pure One!

O Bayazid: Writing of the words is from You, to show and to teach is from Me. Write my sayings words wearing the forms of the writing of the Qur'an, Write some words and put on them diacritical marks so that the readers recognize words, O Men! Write some words in four forms clearly in them. So that they learn quickly and intone with breath. Some two words out of them O Men!?

The question mark (?) indicates that the meaning is not clear to this author.

(Ansari 1570 in Qasmi 1967: 3)

Separate Lines In Urdu-Hindi

Annexure-B/5

The following phrases and words are dispersed on pages 3 and 4 of _Khairul Bayān._

Alif is One	الف ایک ہے
This is the narrative	ہے بیان
Read O! Men!	پڑھن آدمیان!
If you recognize then understand	پہچانیں تو جان
The truth is manifest	سچ ہے عیان
Read what is on the tongue	پڑھو جیب پہن از زبان
It is understood by blessed men.	اسے سمجھیں سبحان آدمیان
All of them learn [it].	سکھن تمام

(Ansari 1570 in Qasmi 1967: 1–4).

There is no Hindi after p. 4 of the printed version available to this author.

6

Urdu as an Islamic Language

We have seen how the standardization of Urdu is associated with the Muslim identity. This chapter shows how the language came to be associated with Islam itself in South Asia. Relevant for these purposes is the use of Urdu in Islamic writings, teaching in the Islamic seminaries (madrassa*s*) and, of course, the use of the language as a symbol during the freedom movement which resulted in the creation of Pakistan.

Unlike Arabic, Urdu is not considered sacrosanct in itself though it is written in the script of Persian (*nastālīq*) which, in turn, is based on the Arabic one (*naskh*). However, Khurshid Ahmad, an ideologue of the Jamā'at-i Islāmī in Pakistan, begins his seminal essay on Islamic literature in Urdu in the *Tarīkh-ē-Adabiāt*, with the claim that 'after Arabic the biggest treasure of religious Islamic literature is in Urdu' and that from the middle of the nineteenth century onwards, Muslim thought in the subcontinent has been in this language (Ahmad 1972: 261). Khurshid Ahmad's claims are substantially true and this chapter looks at the religious texts written during this period which weakened the association of Urdu with other factors, especially the amorous and the erotic, and associated it with Islam and Muslim identity in the subcontinent.

THE ASSOCIATION OF URDU WITH ISLAM
IN PRE-PARTITION INDIA

Urdu was not initially associated with Indian Islam though it was used for preaching to those who were illiterate in Persian since the sixteenth century at least. Although there was a debate in Islam about whether any language but Arabic could be used for worship or other sacred purposes, other languages were used for quasi-religious purposes as soon as non-Arabs converted to Islam. Persian was part of the Islamic culture and Muslim identity in India because it was the language of the dominant elite. When this elite lost its political power in the wake of British colonialism, it consolidated its cultural power through Persianized Urdu. However, Urdu-Hindi had been in use by Islamic preachers, Sufis and holy men since the medieval age. Let us turn to this aspect of the language now.

EARLY INDIAN SUFI WRITING IN URDU

The Sufis had started using the ancestor of Urdu-Hindi in informal conversation and occasional verses, as attested by the *malfūzāt* and the *tazkarās* cited earlier in other contexts. Some of them were said to recite verses in Hindi. For instance, Sheikh Rizqullah (897/1491–92—997/1588–89), is said to have recited couplets in Hindi and written a treatise (*risālā*) in that language 'and its name in Hindi is Rajan and in Persian Mushtaqi' (*va nām-ē- īshān dar Hindi rājan ast ō dar fārsī mushtāqī'*) (Dehlavi 1862: 163–64). Sheikh Burhan Kalpi was famous for his Hindi *dōhrās* (a poetic genre) (Ibid., 267), while Sheikh Abdullah Abdal Dehlavi, who was a *majzūb*, 'used to dance in the market-place and recite couplets in simple Hindi relevant to the situation' (*dar bāzār raqs kunan ō dōhrāhē hindi sadā māfiq-ē-hāl guftī'* (Ibid., 272). For a recent (nineteenth century) example of the way they used the local languages, it is instructive to read the *malfūzāt* of Khwaja Ghulam Farid (1845–1901), who lived in the present Siraiki-

speaking area. Mohammad Ruknuddin, the compiler of the *malfūzāt*, gives many instances of his mentor's own Siraiki verses recited during poetry and musical sessions (*mehfil-ē-samā'a*). Moreover, songs in 'Hindi' were also sung. For instance, a certain sufi called Sayyid Turab Ali, during the *maghrib* prayers, started singing the following *'thumrī'*: *'nēki lagat mohē apnē sayyā kī ānkh rasīlī lāj bharī rē'* (beautiful appears to me my lover's eye filled with nectar and bashfulness) (Ruknuddin 1926–27: 23). As there is mention of similar musical sessions and the singing of 'Hindi' songs it is evident that the Sufis patronized, or at least encouraged, singing in the local languages.

Khwaja Banda Nawaz Gesu Daraz is said to have given sermons in Dakhni Urdu since people were less knowledgeable in Persian and Arabic and several works in Hindvi are attributed to him (Shareef 2004: 59). According to Jamil Jalibi, however, Gesu Daraz could not be the author of these works (Jalibi 1975: 159–160). However, whether these particular writings are by Gesu Daraz or not, he did know the languages of India. This is suggested by the conversation of 28 Sha'bān 802/1400, when the Saint make it clear that he conversed with Brahmins and knew the religious books of the Hindus and the Sanskrit language very well (Hussaini 1401: 218–219). He also discussed 'Hindi' songs on the first of Ramzān 802/1400, but it is not clear whether this refers to Dakhni or some South Indian Dravidian or other language (Hussaini 1401: 238).

However, even if Indian languages, including the ancestor of Urdu and Hindi, were used by the saints in their conversation, they were not considered appropriate for religious writing. Thus Shah Miran Ji (d. 1496) writes in a didactic poem in Hindvi that this language was like a diamond one discovered in a dung heap. He makes it clear that the poem is intended for those who neither knew Arabic nor Persian. Then, in easy Hindvi verse, which contemporary Urdu readers can understand with some effort, the author explains mysticism in questions and answers

(Haq 1939: 48–50). His son, Shah Burhanuddin Janum, wrote a Hindvi poem in 1582. He too apologizes for writing in Hindvi but argues that one should look at the meaning, the essence, rather than the outward form (Ibid., 62–63). In short, the Sufis used the local languages for the dissemination of their message just as the medieval friars used the European vernacular languages in Europe. As Kehnel puts it:

> One seems to agree that in England as in the rest of late medieval Europe, preachers made regular use of the vernacular when actually delivering their sermons. They did however—at least in writing—develop a specific bilingual jargon, a style generally referred to as Macaronic, which functioned somewhere in between the written Latin text and the spoken vernacular word (Kehnel 2006: 94)

In the case of medieval India, for the Muslim Sufis, a similar process was at work and the couplets in Rekhta—meaning that half a line or a full line is in Persian and the other in Hindvi—attributed to many of them, are a parallel development.

Yet another practice which disseminated the local languages in addition to Persian which was normally in use in formal domains—was music or *sama'ā*, which has been mentioned in other contexts several times already. The sufis held musical evenings (*mefil-ē-sama'ā*) in which 'Hindi' songs were heard. The conversation of 7 Ramzan 802/1400 of Sheikh Geru Daraz records that a certain Hasan Mehmandi said '*sohla mai sohla*' in Hindi in such a musical evening. The meaning given in the book is: 'o my mother! Happiness and music are His' (Hussaini 1401: 270). Khawaja Naseeruddin Chiragh Delhvi is reported to have reached ecstasy upon hearing both Hindi and Persian couplets on 10 Muharram 803/1400 (Hussaini 1401: 532). Khwaja Gesu Daraz's father told him on 21 Safar 803/1401 about a sufi who was older than him—this takes us back to the early fourteenth century—who got in such ecstasy upon singing the Hindi song *ohnū sa maddiā khan shrā mākar huā* that a needle penetrated his foot

causing such excessive bleeding that he died (Hussaini 1401: 553).[1]

The attitudes of these fifteenth and sixteenth century mystics is similar to that of the Mahdavis—pioneers of a new religious sect—who followed the teachings of Syed Muhammad Mehdi of Jaunpur (1443–1505), which were considered heretical at that time. In a poem written between 1712 and 1756 in Hindvi, the Mahdavis say that one should not look down upon Hindi as it is the commonly used language for explanation (Shirani 1940 in 1987: 207). That this language was considered useful for religious preaching is evidenced by Bayazid Ansari's use of it in his book *Khairul Bayān*, written by the end of the sixteenth century. As this book and its author have been discussed in detail earlier they need not detain us here. Suffice it to say that the language was used in the extreme North West of the subcontinent by a man who fancied he was giving a new interpretation of Islam. There were also a large number of versified stories on what may be called folk Islam or popular Islam in 'Hindvi' in circulation: these were on the Prophet of Islam's [PBUH] radiance or spiritual essence (*Nūr Nāmās*) or his passing away (*Wafāt nāmās*); on the battle of Karbala (*Jang Nāmās*, *Karbālā Nāmās*); life after death (*Lahad nāmās*) and holy personages (such as *Bībī Fatimā*). They proliferated in the Deccan during the seventeenth century. Jamil Jalibi tells us that they were read out and people believed that such recitations would make their wishes come true (Jalibi 1975: 493–496). The other favourite theme referred to previously, was the *Pand Nāmā*, a book which explained the rituals and rudimentary principles of Islam. These can be called the *Sharia'h* guide books and can be seen in the catalogues of the British Library (Blumhardt 1926; and Quraishi and Sims-Williams 1978).

The medieval Sufis, once again like the friars of medieval Europe, were members of a universal, international order which tied them to the Muslim world especially the Persianate one. But