



RESEARCH PAPER

The Role of Hindi and Urdu as Sister Languages in the Formation of Civilization in the Subcontinent

Muhammad Yasir*¹ Dr. Aurang Zaib² Bismillah Khan³

1. Lecturer, Department of Arts & Humanities, BUIITEMS, Quetta, Balochistan, Pakistan,
2. Assistant Professor, Department of Arts & Humanities, BUIITEMS, Quetta, Balochistan, Pakistan
3. Lecturer, Department of Arts & Humanities, BUIITEMS, Quetta, Balochistan, Pakistan

DOI

[http://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2021\(5-II-sep\)1.11](http://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2021(5-II-sep)1.11)

PAPER INFO

ABSTRACT

Received:

July 31, 2021

Accepted:

September 10, 2021

Online:

September 25, 2021

Keywords:

Britishers,
Hindi,
Hindus,
Hindustani,
Muslims,
Urdu

***Corresponding Author**

Yasir.nasar786@gmail.com

This paper is a study of the terminologies of Hindi and Urdu that have been a subject of debate and interpretation. Some scholars argue that Hindi has a rightful claim in the literary history of the region, including Urdu, until at least the 17th century. Linguistic and sociopolitical factors led to distinct identities for Hindi and Urdu, with Hindi adopting Indo-Aryan words and Urdu poetry using Indo-Aryan words. The use of Hindi declined in the 19th century, and the British abandoned the term "Hindustani" due to its association with Muslims. Muslims, either due to British psychological or political pressures, began to exclude Hindus from Urdu literature. The English policy of exclusion of Hindus from Urdu literature was discussed, but the belief that Hindi was the language of Hindus and Urdu was the language of Muslims changed in the 1930s. Historiographical research is undertaken to analyze the critical role of Hindi and Urdu in the reconstruction and formation of civilization anew. After undertaking a qualitative study, the findings are that the Hindi movement in the 1880s and 1890s aimed to eliminate Arabic and Persian elements from the Urdu language, leading to the introduction of Roman script for Hindustani military forces. Modern Hindi, a branch of Urdu, is not a separate language, but its emergence and temporal coincidence with Urdu are not accurate.

Introduction

Two standardized registers of the Hindustani language, which originated in the Indian subcontinent, are Hindi and Urdu. Despite having the same language base and a high degree of mutual understanding, they have developed into separate written and formal standards as a result of various historical, social, and political causes.

The early Prakrits of North India and the ancient Indo-Aryan languages are where Hindi's roots may be found. During the Middle Ages, it progressively changed

from these local dialects to become Apabhramsha. During the Bhakti movement (from the 15th to the 17th century), (Faruqi, 2003) Hindi started to receive recognition as a separate language. Famous medieval poets who wrote in their tongues, such as Kabir, Surdas, Tulsidas, and others, made a vital contribution to the growth and acceptance of Hindi.

Hindi's development was significantly influenced by the British East India Company's presence in India during the British colonial era and their emphasis on administration and education. Hindi was encouraged in schools by the British as a literary language. During this time, there was also encouragement for the development of the Devanagari script, which is used to write Hindi.

The issue of the official language emerged in 1947, the year India attained independence. The Indian Constitution declared Hindi written in the Devanagari script to be the nation's official language in 1950. (Rahman, 2012) However, it also permitted the use of English for official purposes until a later time, acknowledging the linguistic plurality of the nation. As a result, "Standard Hindi," a standardized form of Hindi, was developed.

The Central Asian countries that speak Persian are where Urdu first emerged. During the Delhi Sultanate (13th–16th century), interactions between Persian-speaking immigrants and the native Indo-Aryan people in North India gave rise to it. Urdu was originally a Persian-influenced language with substantial Arabic, Turkish, and regional Indian dialect borrowings. It was mostly employed in administrative and intellectual circles.

Persian served as the court tongue throughout the Mughal Empire (16th–18th centuries), but Urdu continued to flourish as a language of poetry, culture, and government. Its linguistic diversity increased throughout this time as more Persian terminology was introduced.

The evolution of Urdu was significantly influenced by the British colonial era. As British influence grew, Urdu replaced English as the official language of communication between the British government and the local populace. The Indian independence movement had a large number of Urdu-speaking thinkers and authors who were instrumental in advancing the language's use.

Many scholars argue that the language referred to as "Hindi" today had a rightful claim in the literary history of the entire region (at least until the 17th century), which we now call "Urdu." At that time, it was considered a dialect of the "Hindavi" language and was also known as "Hindvi Deccani Rekhta."

Over time, linguistic and sociopolitical factors led to the emergence of distinct identities for Hindi and Urdu. While they have a shared linguistic heritage and remain mutually intelligible, they acquired different scripts (Devanagari for Hindi and Nastaliq for Urdu) and developed distinct vocabulary due to influences from Sanskrit and Persian/Arabic, respectively.

However, the text suggests that many scholars hold the view that the language currently known as "Hindi" has a historical claim to the literary heritage of the entire region, including what is now referred to as "Urdu" until at least the 17th century. It also suggests that the term "Hindavi Deccani Rekhta" was used to explain the language, which later evolved into modern Hindi and Urdu. (Shareef, 2004)

Literature Review

There is good literature that emphasizes the Linguistic and sociopolitical factors that led to distinct identities for Hindi and Urdu, with Hindi adopting Indo-Aryan words and Urdu poetry using Indo-Aryan words. The use of Hindi declined in the 19th century, and the British abandoned the term "Hindustani" due to its association with Muslims. Muslims, either due to British psychological or political pressures, began to exclude Hindus from Urdu literature. Ananda's *The Oxford Companion to Indian Theatre*, Ansarullah's *Urdu Nasr per Hindu Mazhab ka Asr*, Azad's *AAB-E-HAYAT* and Bailey, T. G. *Studies in North Indian Languages*. All the authors provided insightful discussions of the Hindu/Urdu association and movements related to them. The Writings like Shams ur Rehman Faruqi's *URDU KA IBTEDAI ZAMANA*, Chand's *Sahitya ka Uddeshya* by Munshi Premchand, Chand's *THE PROBLEM OF HINDUSTAN* and Dalmia's *The Nationalization of Hindu Traditions: Bhāratendu Hariśhchandra and Nineteenth-century Banaras* go into detail Hindi and "Urdu" terminologies, their historical development, They offer helpful information.

"As far as the question of regional languages like Braj Bhasha, Awadhi, and other modern North Indian languages is concerned, speakers of modern Hindi started incorporating their history as part of their history from the early days of the partition of India. (Rahman, 2012) And regarding the history of Urdu, these claims by the Hindi speakers to be part of the same historical heritage began after the partition of the country. Now, no discussion about the history of Hindi/Urdu can overlook the fact that both of these claims, being the custodians of the same literary and linguistic tradition, stand in contrast on our horizon. Another important point is that these claims are not based on scholarly evidence but rather on vested interests and assumptions about the Indian Hindu person."

Jules Bloch says that after 1857, Hindi gradually took the form of Hinduism's resurgence. The criterion also accepts that Fauji Lal changed everything in his famous book "Prem Sagar" under the influence of Christ. According to Bloch, his prose is generally Urdu, but instead of Persian words, Indo-Aryan words were used. (Faruqi, 2003) It is also acknowledged by many Hindi scholars. They have presented an excerpt from an article by Chandra Dhar Sharma Negari, a famous Hindi poet from 1921, as evidence for their claim. (Faruqi, 2003)

The impact of making Hindi dominant over Urdu had far-reaching consequences for Urdu literary culture. However, only a few such instances are formally documented or recorded consistently. Detailed study and analysis of these instances are still needed. When modern Hindi was being developed and

standardized in the literary and linguistic landscape through efforts to centralize it in the "*Lisani aur Adabi Manzar Nama*," there was also a sub-current running parallel. The objective of this sub-current was to undermine Urdu on moral and religious grounds. For example, Bharatendu Harishchandra (1850 to 1885) can be cited as an example. He was hailed as the patriarch of modern, standard Hindi. Towards the end of the 19th century, he was moving towards Hindi, and not just that he was abandoning Urdu; he was also writing extremely provocative and sarcastic writings about the death of Urdu Begum. In Urdu Begum's funeral processions, the following languages were used: Arabic, Persian, Pashto, and Punjabi. The reason was that the script of all four languages was non-Indian. In his words:

The use of the Nagari script will cause harm to them (Muslims) as the opportunity to deceive and exploit people will slip from their hands. At this time, they write one thing and read another, and their writings also distort the meanings. The use of Persian script in offices is not only unjust to Hindus but also a source of inconvenience and dissatisfaction for the majority of loyal subjects of Queen Victoria. (Gupta, 1989)

In those days, there were voices opposing Urdu, and these voices were louder in Benares. However, even among them, Bharatendu's taunts are quite prominent, as he is a person who began his literary life as an Urdu poet and still holds a significant position in Urdu literature.

To fully understand Bharatendu's changed stance, it is essential to remember that just eleven years before the above statement (in 1871), he had already declared that his and his nation's language is Urdu. If he had any knowledge of the local language of Benares, let alone the vernacular language of the Western branch (the Western Vals), he probably had no idea about the local dialect of Benares, and even if he had observed the Eastern branch (the Eastern Vals) from a condescending perspective, he would not have raised any questions about their language. (Mushafi, 1861) Moreover, he must have considered the act of composing poetry in this modern Hindi difficult because, in his view, expressing poetry in this language is challenging compared to expressing it in Brij Bhasha. Perhaps this is because the principles of Mangal's poetry are not compatible with the standing spoken dialect. (Anand, 2004)

We call it Urdu, but the use of the term "Hindi" started to decrease gradually in the ninth decade of the 19th century (1881-1890). And when the term "Urdu" became prevalent as the name of the language, the British also abandoned the term "Hindustani." This change was advantageous for them as the term "Urdu" was more associated with Muslims than the term "Hindustani," and the British desired to identify Urdu as the language of Muslims. (Platts, 1884)

Despite the emergence of new Urdu writers among Hindus, Muslims adopted a new approach. Either due to the psychological and political pressures of the British or perhaps because of the increasing complexity of the Urdu-Hindi debate, Muslims began to exclude Hindus from the canon of Urdu literature. (A similar approach was adopted with Persian as well, but that's a separate story.) In his book

"Aab-e-Hayat" (first published in 1880), Muhammad Hussain Azad (1849-1910) mentioned only one Hindu poet, Diya Shankar Nasim (1811-1832), and he also wrote about him not in the proper chronological order but together with Mir Hasan (1727-1786). Therefore, even if someone wanted to find Nasim's statement, it would not be easy. (Faruqi, 2001)

It should be noted that the subtitle of "Aab-e-Hayat" claimed to present the biographies of famous Urdu poets. Hence, the reader, especially in the context of modern Urdu, where no such history or canon existed before, might have got the impression that those outside this book were not deserving of being called famous Urdu poets. This led to everyone suffering, even Gujarati Urdu writers (whose names were also not in the book) and Deccani Urdu writers (who were considered not worthy of appreciation in the book).

"Here, Dakkan also refers to present-day Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, and Maharashtra. Women, Hindus, Punjabis, and writers from the eastern region suffered even more loss because, with time, some gradual fairness was shown with Gujarati and Dakkani. However, even now, women, Hindus, Punjabis, and writers from the eastern region have not received their rightful place.

No doubt, here the discussion was about the policy of the English or its influence, that the Hindus were excluded from the literary canon of Urdu. Abe Hayat played an important role in this matter. Azad completely ignored the well-established Urdu-speaking Hindu poets and, even more so, the well-established Persian-speaking Hindu poets in his book, as if hundreds of Hindus had never done anything for Urdu.

Maulana Mohammad Hussain Azad has been recognized like any renowned poet, such as Daagh Dehlvi. Some of his disciples, like Jaafar Ali Hasrat and Haider Ali Haera'n, are mentioned. Ajay Chand Bhatnagar (1550 AD), who wrote "Mithal Khaaliq Bari," Azad remembered him in the context of Amir Khusro, but it seems he did not know anything about it, so he did not mention Taj Chand Bahar (died 1766 AD), even though Bahar's Persian dictionary "*Bahar-e-Ajam*" introduced thousands of new ideas and techniques to Urdu poets. Bahar also wrote little in Rekhta. His name is mentioned in most of the references of that time."

Then, Budh Sannah Qalandar (around 770 AD to 780 AD), Tika Ram Tisli (around 1780 AD), Kanji Mal Saba (around the same period), Jaswant Singh Parwane (1757 AD to 1813 AD), Bandra Bin Khushku (died 1756 AD), Raja Ram Narayan Musawon (around 1762 AD), Raja Kalyan Singh Aashiq (752 AD to 1821 AD), Raja Raj Kishan Das (1781 to 1823 AD), and many other exceptional poets did not catch the attention of Maulana Azad.

When the 19th century came, Azad showed Diya Trim Na'im Ghanshyam Al Aasi (1798 to 1838 AD) as merely a footnote. Both Zauq and Shah Naseer were Ghanshyam's mentors, but Azad not only recognized Ghanshyam's mentorship but also presented all of Zauq's poetry in Abe Hayat, expanding it. It is said that Nafs ki

Teeliyan by Akhss ki Teeliyan Ma'arikay Mein. (Faruqi, 2009)

Despite Ghanshyam's allegiance to Zauq, his ghazal was better than Zauq's at the time. (Manmohan, 1939)

Mohandas Lal Mathur, Ghanshyam's adopted son, stated that Azad had asked for information about Ghanshyam to include in "Abe Hayat," but he did not use the information. Azad only mentioned Ghanshyam in one reference. Even then, he attributed Ghanshyam's poetry to Shah Naseer's son, Wajihuddin Khair, and then wrote a reference stating that he heard from some elders that this verse was read by Lala Ghanshyam Vass and that he was a disciple of Shah Naseer. He was a young boy during those days. (Azad, 1944)

There remains a flaw that Azad did not write Ghanshyam Lal correctly and instead wrote Ghulam Nazeem Waas. Ghanshyam's status in some way is no less than the poets of the 19th century, such as Mustafa Khan Shefta, whose recognition is mentioned in Ab-e Hayat. Maulana Hali (1837 to 1912 AD) published his famous work "Shahr-e-Afāq" in 1893 AD. After "Ab-e Hayat," "Shahr-e-Afāq" is the most effective and popular account of 19th-century Urdu prose. The ideas expressed in it are highly respected and influential. In "Shahr-e-Afāq," verses and references from the 18th and 19th-century Urdu poets are found scattered throughout. But if they are not found, then the verses of Hindu poets are not found either. The name of Daya Shankar Naseem is mentioned four times, twice in a derogatory manner and each time with displeasure. One verse attributed to Mir, who is a student of Meer Dard, is found, but it is attributed to Meer. (Hali, 1977)

Maulvi Syed Ahmad Dehlavi's "Firhang-e-Āṣafiya," Volume 1 (published in 1190 AH) was commented upon before publication by Hali, who wrote that there are two necessary conditions for being eligible to write the Urdu dictionary. Firstly, the writer must be from Delhi. The second condition is that the dictionary writer should be a respectable Muslim because, even in Delhi, only Muslim people are considered to have a refined understanding of Urdu. The social status of Hindus does not allow them to claim Urdu as their mother tongue. (Hali, 1960)

It is not surprising that they were working towards excluding the entire Hindu community from the realm of respectable Urdu and expressing mysteries and horrifying statements about the social status of Hindus. They were, in a way (consciously or unconsciously), echoing the views of their Western rulers. Otherwise, Hali was an extremely human-friendly person, and he had no prejudice or narrow-mindedness. In labeling Hindus as incompetent in their native language Urdu, he was like his contemporary European scholars who held the belief, with complete sympathy and humanitarianism, that the backward black race is inferior to the white races by birth.

Shibli openly acknowledged that Hindus have natural talent in learning refined Urdu. He also accepted that among Hindus, many enlightened thinkers are eager to promote the development of the Urdu language. In a letter to Maslak-i-

Guzasht, written on October 19, 1912, Shibli said,

"It is said that Hindus are eliminating our national language, Urdu, but why? Aren't they producing excellent Urdu magazines and literary journals, and promoting Urdu authors to create many new writings? Aren't capable Hindu writers competing side by side with Muslim writers in producing outstanding literature for the United Nations?"

"I have repeatedly seen Hindu writers with envy in the pages of Zamana," continued Shibli, "turning their pages over and over again." (Naumani, 1964)

Shibli's words are accurate and correct, but let's focus on his first statement. They are using the phrase "our (meaning Muslims') national language Urdu" to describe Urdu. While Hindus may be experts in it, the language belongs to Muslims. This is the reason why Shibli did not hesitate or feel any discomfort in praising Prem Chand, who was known for writing in a style that even the great writers and intellectuals from Delhi and Lucknow admired. Shibli's innocent and delicate superiority is illustrated in a humorous incident involving his friend Qazi Khursheed Ahmed (1864 to 1920) from Mairth in Muzaffarnagar.

According to Josh Malihabadi, on one occasion, Qazi Khursheed Ahmed was present at Maharaja Shadad's place, and he was continuously saying things that could be considered against the etiquette of the gathering. Josh Sahib writes,

"Though I was drowning in embarrassment due to Qazi's actions, I managed to compose myself and recited two ghazals of Maharaja. He tapped his hat on the table and said, 'Mian Josh, you are very fortunate. Maharaja is neither from Delhi nor Lucknow, yet he composes excellent poetry, and that too being a Hindu. Being a Hindu...'"

This story reveals the intriguing personality of Premchand, who was a prominent figure in the first half of the 20th century, a wise, knowledgeable, and well-meaning reformer. He wrote several influential works in Urdu but also believed that the Hindi-speaking world is our religious need and that no other language can fulfill it. In his magazine "Narmand" from July 1910, he wrote,

"Though I was drowning in embarrassment due to Qazi's actions, I managed to compose myself and recited two ghazals of Maharaja. He tapped his hat on the table and said, 'Mian Josh, you are very fortunate. Maharaja is neither from Delhi nor Lucknow, yet he composes excellent poetry, and that too being a Hindu. Being a Hindu...'" (Malihabadi, 1970)

Daata Dial Mehrishi Shyavart Lal Darman (1820 to 1930), belonging to the first half of the 19th century, were enlightened, knowledgeable, and reformist individuals. They composed many remarkable works in Urdu, but they also asserted that besides Hindi, no other language could fulfill our religious needs. In their essay "Arand," Lahore, July 1910, they wrote, "We also write everything in Urdu, but at the

same time, we must pay attention to the welfare of Hindi. Those who have a passion for Urdu writing can pave the way for Hindi through their writings. They can bring Hindi words in abundance. These Urdu authors will undoubtedly be helpful assistants for other linguistic communities."(Ansarullah, 1972)

Professor Dial Shyavart Lal's guidance that only Hindi can fulfill the religious needs of Hindus is a clear indication that language is also a matter of religious identity, particularly for Urdu, which is the language of Islam. In the early years of the 20th century, it had become a common belief among both Hindus and Muslims that Hindi is the language of Hindus, and Urdu is the language of Muslims. This perception began to change in the 1930s when Urdu speakers realized that if Hindi is the language of Hindus, then it cannot be Urdu, and there would be no place for Urdu under Hindu dominance in India. Now, Urdu speakers, regardless of being Hindus or Muslims, started saying that Urdu is not just the language of Muslims and equating Urdu with Muslims is a false and ignorant statement. However, the notion persisted that Muslims have more affinity for Urdu. In response to an essay titled "An Open Letter" published in August 1945, Firaq Sahib wrote:

To gain even more prominence among Urdu-speaking Muslims, Hindus don't need to abandon their faith or convert to Islam. Instead, what is essential is for them to embrace the inner essence of the language, just as Meer, Daagh, Sauda, Ghalib, Insha, and Aatish did, by bringing Urdu and Hindi closer together. After reading the poetry of Muslim Urdu poets, a broad-minded and intelligent Hindu can become a greater Urdu poet than Meer and Iqbal. (Gorakpuri, 1996)

The institution of "Stadiya Shaagirdi" (Teacher-Student relationship) began in Delhi in the 18th century and quickly gained extraordinary popularity. The significance of this institution was so great that one measure of a poet's excellence was to whom they were a student. Initially, there was no shame for Muslims to become students of Hindus. Prominent figures like Surya Kant Tripathi 'Nirala,' Jafar Ali Hasrat, and Hyder Ali Hyder were known to have been students of Sahitya. In the 19th century, with the rise of the notion that Hindus are associated with Hindi, and Muslims with Urdu, the number of Hindu students decreased or became almost absent. Hindu poets also began to showcase their work to Hindu teachers to a certain extent.

In the 19th century, in Northern India, a large population of Hindus, who should have learned Urdu, started inclining towards Hindi. Several institutions emerged that promoted Hindi in the Devanagari script and aggressively pushed for its advancement. However, Urdu literature continued to thrive among Hindus, and this fact truly commends the Hindu-Urdu minds to the pages of history.

In the 19th century, many Hindu poets are associated with Urdu Nazm (poetry) or had the potential to be connected with it. Renowned poets like Ratnath Sarshar (1846-1903), Turbon Nath Hijr (1853-1938?), Durga Sahai Surur (1873-1910), Jawala Parshad Barq (1863-1911), Bishan Narain Abroo (1896-1916), Naik Parshad Talib (1848-1922), Burj Narain Chakbast (1882-1926), Shankar Dial Farhat (1843-

1902), Suraj Narain Mehr (1850-1931), and Lala Sri Ram (1875-1930) are names that our history should not forget.

Among them are some poets like Burj Mohan Dayatariya Kafee (1866-1953), who remained actively involved in literary work even in the 20th century and made significant contributions to Urdu linguistics and syntax. Regarding literary theories, these poets also embraced the influence of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan and Azad, just like their Muslim counterparts. Both had shared reformist goals and programs, wrote and spoke the same literary language, and shared cultural assumptions.

All of this is true, but the poison sown by the British had begun to bear fruit. It is a fact that in the 19th century, even fair-minded English historians like R.W. Frazer were not averse to stating the truth. Frazer wrote:

"The scholars and educated men among the Hindus and Muslims had almost a common language. Their literature and civilization were also very much alike."

"When (Urdu) was used for literary purposes by Muslims, a significant portion of its vocabulary was derived from Persian or Arabic. And when it was used for the common people speaking various dialects of India, it often contained redundant words from the market. Literary Hindi, on the other hand, is just a written language that was adopted under the influence of the British. They encouraged native authors to write in a form of Hindustani that excluded Arabic and Persian words and included Sanskrit words". (Frazer, 1907)

This book was first published in 1898. Fraser should have said that both Hindus and Muslims used this language... but it was probably not acceptable to the British colonial authorities.

Modern Indian historian Dr. Tara Chand exposed the hidden politics behind the Urdu-Hindi controversy. In 1939, All India Radio, Delhi, broadcast six talks under the title "What is Hindustani?" The speakers were as follows: Dr. Tara Chand, Maulvi Abdul Haq, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, Dr. Zakir Hussain, Pandit Kafee, and Asif Ali. Those times and those subjects were full of excitement and emotions. Regarding the Urdu issue, Pandit Kafee and Maulvi Abdul Haq presented the most potent and logical arguments. Dr. Tara Chand provided historical background and analysis, and compared to others, he presented more details and clarifications.

These speeches were given in the above-mentioned sequence from 20th February 1939 to 25th February 1938 and were broadcast from All India Radio Delhi. After some time, Maktaba Jamia printed them in book form under the title "Hindustani." Tara Chand sang: "For India's literature, its history, its culture, and its progress, Hindustani is not only a gift of God but a natural necessity."

Hindus like Lala Lajpat Rai, Bedil Masroor, Biny Narain, etc. (from Aligarh Muslim University), it was ordered to write books on "Nasr-e-Gadh" (prose style). They faced many difficulties. Although literature or Saqafiya was Urdu, it was

mainly used for "Gadh" or prose. But they chose the path of adopting the languages of Meer Aman, Afsos, etc., and removed Persian and Arabic words, replacing them with Sanskrit and Hindi (= Brij and other dialects) words. In this way, within less than ten years, dozens of Urdu speakers from their original abode were separated by the signs of Vedic gods and ended up struggling on the diasporas of Ban Savor, Rang Mini. Both looked similar because they were daughters of the same mother. They had no difference in their adornments, clothes, and jewelry. But both were stubbornly turned away from each other. This little dislike turned the country into turmoil. And since that day, till now, we have been wandering on different paths. (Hindustani, 1939)

In his radio speech, Tara Chand indicated that English politics were behind the Urdu-Hindi issue. Five years later, in his concise book "The Problem of Hindustani," he held some professors of Fort William College responsible for the wrong trends and agitation. Still, he concluded that it was the result of the professors' actions.

A new type of Urdu emerged (came into existence) in which Sanskrit words were used in place of Urdu-Persian. This was done with the view that it could be given as a separate language to Hindus. But the consequences of this step went far, and even today, India is suffering due to the artificial division of languages. (Chand, 1944)

After thirty years, the prominent linguist of modern India, Suniti Kumar Chatterji, mentioned the slogans of the advocates of "Hindi" in one of his dissertations. Chaturvedi referred to them as obscurantist slogans. Some of the slogans he quoted are as follows:

"Hind, Hindu, Hindi. These three are one for us. On this point, Chatterji writes, it is partially similar to the concept of nationalist Swami Vivekananda that the children or true Indian nations and sects are those who follow the Hindu religion. Further elaboration is unnecessary."

"Urdu is only a Muslim language, not a separate language. Remove the Persian/Arabic script from Urdu, and Urdu will attain its true form... It will obtain Hindi's grace (advantages). Dr. Yatar Hee's detailed expression on this point is worthy of quoting."

From a linguistic perspective, it is entirely correct to say that Hindi and Urdu are one language, the Western Hindi spoken or the pure dialect of Walis's "Hindustani." However, historically, Urdu was not a modified "Muslimized" form as it is known today as Hindi (i.e., Sanskritized written dialect). On the contrary, the situation is the opposite. The Persian-influenced Hindustani, which flourished in the Mughal court in the 18th century and is still spoken in Deccan, was adopted by Hindus... (Then) they adopted Desi Nagari and started using the robust Sanskrit-influenced vocabulary... and thus they formed the basis of today's literary Hindi. This work was done around 1800 AD, especially in Kolkata. (Chatterji, 1973)

Continuing further, Suniti Kumar Chatterji ji says that although his perspective on this matter was different earlier, now he agrees with Tara Chand's theory that Hindi, influenced by Sanskrit, was created as a model for Persian-influenced Urdu. The truth is that poor Suniti Kumar Chatterji if he had accepted Tara Chand's theory earlier, should not be accused of anything now. Interestingly, even today many experts on Urdu cannot conclude that Urdu came first, and modern Hindi came later. I have never seen or heard any linguistic expert of Urdu saying clearly in words that modern Hindi is nothing but a style (variant) of Urdu. It is evident that the term "style" is often used by scholars of Hindi to describe the relationship between Urdu and Hindi. Their general opinion is that Urdu is nothing, it is merely a variant of Hindi. However, now let's refer back to Suniti Kumar Chatterji.

"Darr aur Seena, Shivoseena jaisi ek Hindi seene banao, taake Hindi ke liye learn" (Create a Hindi chest like that of Shivsena to fight for Hindi). Suniti Kumar Chatterji did not object to it, perhaps because his watering place remained limited in the depths of Natak Serai. (Robinson, 2007)

However, Suniti Kumar Chatterji and Tara Chand, both wise and unbiased historians, were not successful in debunking the conspiracy theories and doubts, especially because his water-scarce theory and biased nationalist beliefs were behind it.

In the Urdu-Hindi issue, the Hindus maintained the same view and majority theory that was expressed by Raja Jay Kishan Das and Shiva Prasad in the late 19th century. Francis Robinson says that by the late 19th century, due to various reasons, the dominance of the aristocratic Urdu-speaking class gradually declined, and most of these reasons were due to British colonial rule. (Robinson, 2007) The English policy at that time aimed to create the belief among Hindus, especially in Northern India, that their identity required a separate language for expression.

Raja Jay Kishan Das Sarasid was among his closest friends. He started supporting the cause of Hindi and Nagari script in every possible way. He made efforts to abolish Urdu from government offices... When the Hindi flag was raised with pride, many aristocrats who spoke Urdu joined under this flag.

Francis Robinson concludes that during the 1880s and 1890s, an important new development in the Hindi movement was that it adopted a sectarian crusade against the Urdu language. (Robinson, 2007) We have seen the accusations Babu Tendu made about the Urdu script before this Commission. Now, consider the testimony of Shiva Prasad before the Commission. Babu Shiva Prasad, Star of India, held high positions in the Education Department of Uttar Pradesh. He had abandoned Urdu and became associated with his loyal Hindi. Before the Commission, he stated:

In the view of Hindus, Hindi referred to the language from which all Arabic and Persian elements were removed. This elimination of elements reminded Hindus

of the dominance of Muslims over them. However, despite this, Muslims considered Hindi as an inferior thing and found it extremely difficult to learn. In the second half of the 19th century, Urdu and its Persian script had become a symbol of Muslim power and influence. (Robinson, 2005)

Sir Syed had realized that the establishment of a separate Hindi language would be essential for both Hindus and Muslims, although the reasons for this necessity would differ. On April 29, 1870, he wrote to Muhsin-ul-Mulk from England.

"I have received news that has caused me immense grief and concern. The movement of Babu Shiv Prasad Shad, which has stirred the hearts of Hindus, calls for the removal of the Urdu language and Persian script, which are symbols of Muslims... This is such a great discord that Hindus and Muslims can never agree on it. Muslims will never agree on Hindi, and if Hindus become adamant and insist on Hindi, Muslims will not agree on Urdu. As a result, Hindus and Muslims will become separate. I am not concerned about this, rather, I understand that if Muslims and Hindus engage in their businesses separately, Muslims will benefit more, and Hindus will suffer losses. However, I have only two concerns. First, due to my nature, I wish well for all Indians, whether Hindus or Muslims. Second, I have great concern for Muslims. They are faced with extreme adversity and oppression... Not everyone is capable of doing something for their well-being."(Khan S.S, 1985)

The Hindi-Anaagri movement had cultural consequences for Urdu-speaking people as well. They started feeling guilty and inferior to both Urdu script and Arabic script. I have mentioned before that Bhartendu Harishchandra had included in his criticism against Urdu, the fact that its script was non-indigenous, and it could create ambiguity in pronunciation, leading people towards deceit. The supporters of Nagari argued that it was intrinsically better than the Urdu script. Garsan Datasi informs us about an article written by Rajendra Lal Mitra in favor of Nagari. (Fatehpuri, 1977) In it, Mitra stated that Urdu script was inferior to Nagari. (Dalmia, 1999) However, it is worth mentioning that these opinions are born out of biased and prejudiced views.

He once suggested that many eastern languages, including Sanskrit, Arabic, and Hindustani, should be written in the Roman script. (Siddiqui, 1963)

With time, the anti-Urdu voices gained strength, and eventually, many native Urdu speakers became convinced that these voices were speaking the truth. The British had already introduced the Roman script for the Hindustani military forces. The Roman script is inadequate in representing many Urdu sounds, but the military needs were not particularly sensitive to this issue. Apart from Roman Urdu editions of the New Testament, which were of no use in missionary schools, very few people outside the Indian military had prior exposure to Roman Urdu. (Fatehpuri, 1977)

However, it does not mean that the proposal to convert Urdu script to Roman was not seriously considered. Garcia da Orta tells us that Urdu punctuators, who are blind with prejudice, keep criticizing its script. He believed that if this continued, the British might decide to write Urdu in Roman script. He writes that it would be a great

tragedy if the British did so. Even now, the demand for reform in Urdu spelling and script persists, not only from Urdu opponents but also from within the Urdu-speaking community. (Fatehpuri, 1977) The literary and linguistic society of Urdu, which is almost a unique society in the world, feels somewhat uneasy and even guilty about almost every aspect of its spelling and script. In this context, there is an awareness of the crime that Urdu is not truly a military and martial language.

I believe that those modern historians who have written or arranged our histories after 1880 are responsible for this last point. Even for a moment, it did not occur to them that if the word "Urdu" was used as the name of the language from the late seventeenth century, then the existence of any military connection or background behind this name is impossible. The late Allama Hafiz Mahmud Sherani had written this point that the name of the language "Urdu" is not very ancient, but he did not delve into its implications. Nor did I have the opportunity to say it concisely. (Sheerani & Mazhar, 1966) Sir Graham Bailey is the only historian of literature who felt this contradiction and he also offered a solution to this issue. Unfortunately, in the meantime, he made many statements that can be seriously criticized. Perhaps, that is why no one has further pursued the spread of this issue. Bailey wrote:

Urdu's birth is in 1027 AH. Its birthplace is Lahore and the ancient Khari Boli is its foster mother. There is no direct relationship with any sign of the zodiac. The name of the language "Urdu" came into existence seven hundred years after its emergence. (Rahman, 2012)

Despite the discussions about the birth, birthplace, and foster mother of Urdu by Bailey, there are still three important questions that need to be answered:

Why did it take centuries to give the name "Urdu" to the language?

If a new name was to be given in the eighteenth century, why was a word chosen that had already been used with the meaning of "army" or "Lashkar" in a contemporary and modern context?

If during Babur's time (1526), the term "Urdu" was not used for the army, why was this name given to a language that had been in existence for at least five hundred years before that? (Faruqi, 2001)

Bailey's questions were indeed pertinent, but he stated that it was easy to state the problem but difficult to solve it. The solution he presented was very weak. He suggested that perhaps the term "Urdu" or some similar name or phrase might have been in use by the people at the time when it was used for the army. And gradually, very slowly, after many centuries, it found its way into books. And from the time we have its usage, it seems that it was in circulation even before that. The word "Urdu" came into use much later. (Faruqi, 2001)

The above statement is not accurate in any aspect, neither historically nor logically. However, Billi (the author) should be commended for realizing that the

term "Urdu" was in use at that time and for acknowledging that there is some ambiguity regarding the origin of the name "Urdu." If Urdu scholars did not make efforts to find the answer to this question, then it was indeed their shortcoming.

Billi points to an interesting suggestion by Jules Bloch that "Urdu" is a term given by European people. However, Bloch himself admits that it is merely a subjective notion and requires further evidence. (Faruqi, 2003)

This suggests that the term "Urdu" may not have been proposed by the English, as Billi correctly notes. But Billi overlooks the fact that the name "Urdu" does not mean "army" or "military," as it is a misconception in poetry. (Faruqi, 2001)

In any language, there is no example of the word "Urdu" meaning "army" or "military." The most popular meaning of this word in our region was "Shahjahanabad," as we have seen, and as evident from the works of Fellon and Platts, who were Englishmen and used the term during their time. (Faruqi, 2001)

Similarly, the blame for this matter should also be attributed to Urdu scholars for not addressing the emergence of modern Hindi and its temporal coincidence with Urdu. When the proponents of Hindi claimed that Urdu is nothing, just a style, Urdu scholars should have responded by saying that today's Hindi is a branch of Urdu, and the ancient name for the language now known as Urdu is Hindi.

Premchand may not have been a historian, but his views on this matter were clearer than those of Urdu historians, although eventually, even he got influenced by the prevailing sentiments, as we saw at the beginning of Chapter One. Prem Chand recommended the adoption of Hindustani and meant by it the simplified Urdu-Hindi. However, he also accepted that modern Hindi is not a separate language. He delivered a sermon at the Bombay meeting in 1932, saying, "In my opinion, Hindi and Urdu are the same language. When there is no distinction between 'Karya' (verb) and 'Karta' (subject), verb and subject, then there should be no doubt about their unity. (Raees, 1980) Interestingly, until fifty years ago, what is now called Urdu was also called Hindi by Muslims." (Raees, 1980)

However, the words and statements of Premchand and others like him were mere reminiscences of radio broadcasts, not based on theory. Therefore, legends about the military roles of Urdu in the Muslim community persisted and continue to be popular to a significant extent. Otherwise, why would Tara Chand overlook the fact that in past centuries, neither Hindus nor Muslims, but the language of cultured society and the lingua franca of the entire country was Fransika, "Hindi, i.e., Persian-influenced Hindustani (Khari Boli)," and not the modern Hindi, which is Sanskrit-influenced Hindustani (Khari Boli)?

Conclusion

The birthplace and foster mother of Urdu raises three important questions: why it took centuries to give the name "Urdu" to the language, why a new name was

chosen in the eighteenth century, and why the term "Urdu" was not used for the army during Babur's time (1526). Billi acknowledges the vagueness regarding the origin of the name "Urdu" and points to Jules Bloch's suggestion that "Urdu" is a term given by European people. However, Bloch acknowledges that it is a subjective notion and requires further evidence.

The most popular meaning of the word "Urdu" in the region was "Shahjahanabad," as seen in the works of Fellon and Platts, who were Englishmen and used the term during their time. Urdu scholars should have addressed the emergence of modern Hindi and its temporal coincidence with Urdu. Premchand, a prominent Urdu historian, recommended the adoption of Hindustani, which meant the simplified Urdu-Hindi language. He also accepted that modern Hindi is not a separate language.

However, the words and statements of Premchand and others were mere reminiscences of radio broadcasts, not based on theory. Legends about the military roles of Urdu in the Muslim community persisted and continue to be popular.

Hindi and Urdu are two standardized registers of the Hindustani language, they have developed into separate written and formal standards due to historical, social, and political causes while having the same linguistic base. The Bhakti movement contributed to the literary development of Hindi, which was popularised by British colonial rule and adopted the Devanagari script to become the national language of India. On the other hand, during the Delhi Sultanate, Urdu developed as a result of contact between Persian-speaking immigrants and the indigenous Indo-Aryan people, and it has considerable vocabulary from Persian, Arabic, and Turkish. During British colonial control, it was used in the Mughal court and developed into an administrative language. Hindi and Urdu are still significant languages with cultural and regional significance today, adding to the Indian subcontinent's vast linguistic variety. Despite their disparities, speakers of the two languages frequently comprehend one another, establishing a sense of mutual understanding and shared ancestry.

References

- Rahman, T. (2012). *From Hindi to Urdu: A Social and Political History 1st Edition*. Oxford University Press.
- Azad, M. H. (1969). *AAB-E-HAYAT*. Lahore: Matba Kareemi Press.
- Chand, T. (1944). *THE PROBLEM OF HINDUSTAN*. Allahabad: Indian Periodicals Ltd,
- Chatterji, S. K. (1973). *India, a Polyglot Nation, and Its Linguistic Problems Vis-a-vis National Integration*. Mumbai: Mahatma Gandhi Memorial Research Centre, Hindustani Prachar Sabha.
- Faruqi, S. R (2003). *A Long History of Urdu Literary Culture, Part 1: Naming and Placing a Literary Culture*. Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press
- Faruqi, S. R. (2001). *Constructing a Literary History, a Canon, and a Theory of Poetry*. Chicago: The Digital South Asia Library.
- Faruqi, S. R. (2009). *URDU KA IBTIDAI ZAMANA*. Karachi: Aaj Ki Kitaben Press.
- Fatehpuri, F. (1977). *URDU IMLA AUR RASMUL KHAT*. Karachi: Niaz Ahmed.
- Fatehpuri, F. (1977). *Urdū-Hindī Tanāzā'*, Islamabad: Qaumi Committee Barae Sadsala Taqribat Paidaesh-e-Quaid-e-Azam.
- Frazer, R. W. (1907). *A literary history of India*. London: London T.F. Unwin.
- Gorakhpuri, F. (1996). *Aik khet Ka jawab*. Delhi: Firaq Gorakpuri Foundation.
- Gupta, S. S. (1989). *Krsna, The Cruel Beloved, Harishechandra on Urdu*. Madison: University of Wisconsin,
- Hali, A. H. (1960). *KULLIYAT-E- Nasr HALI*. Delhi: Jadeed Kitab Ghar.
- Hali, A. H. (1977). *MUQADDAMA-E-SHER-O-SHAIRI*. Aligarh: Educational Book House, Aligarh.
- Hindustani. (1939). Delhi: Matbua'a, maktaba-e-Jamia.
- Khan, S. S. (1985). *MAKTUBAT-E-SIR SYED*. Lahore: Majlis Taraqi Adab.
- King, C. R. (1994). *ONE LANGUAGE, TWO SCRIPTS*. New Delhi: Oxford University.
- Malihabadi, J. (1970). *YADON KI BARAT*. Karachi: Josh Academy.
- Manmohan, L. M. (1939). *KALAM-E-AASI*. Delhi: Dayal Printing Press.

- Mushafi, G. H. (1861). *Tazkarā-ē-Hindī*. (Ed, 1933). Abdul Haq. Delhi: Jamia Barqi Press,
- Nomani, S. (1987). *Maqalaat-e-Shibli (Vol. 6)*. Lucknow: Aasi Press.
- Platts, J. T. (1884). *A dictionary of Urdu, classical Hindi, and English*. London: W. H. Allen & Co.,
- Raes, Q. (1980). *PREM CHAND FIKR-O-FUN* . Delhi: Publications Division
- Robinson, F. (2007). *Separatism Among Indian Muslims: The Politics of the United Provinces' Muslims, 1860-1923* (Cambridge South Asian Studies, Series Number 16) 1st Edition. Cambridge: University Press.
- Saksena, D. B. (1945). *Dakkhani Hindi*. Urdu Publishers. Allahabad.
- Shareef, M. J. (2004). *Dakan Mē Urdū Sha'iri Vali Sē Paehlē*. Hyderabad, India: Idara Adabiat Urdu.
- Sheerani, H. M., & Mazhar, M. S. (1966). *Maqalat-E-Hafiz Mahmood Shirani*. Lahore: Imtiyaz Ali Taj.
- Siddiqi, M. A. (1963). *Origins Of Modern Hindustani Literature*. Aligarh: Naya Kitab Ghar.