



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Modern Literary Hindī

Author(s): A. Barannikov

Source: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, University of London*, Vol. 8, No. 2/3, Indian and Iranian Studies: Presented to George Abraham Grierson on His Eighty-Fifth Birthday, 7th January, 1936 (1936), pp. 373-390

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#) on behalf of the [School of Oriental and African Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/608047>

Accessed: 03-03-2016 09:46 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



School of Oriental and African Studies and Cambridge University Press are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, University of London*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Modern Literary Hindī

By A. BARANNIKOV

THERE was a prevailing opinion in English linguistic literature that the modern prose Hindī, High Hindī, or Khari bolī, was invented by the English.

This point of view was maintained some time ago by such a highly authoritative scholar as Sir G. A. Grierson. Thus, in the preface to his work on the history of Hindī literature he says¹: “The first half of the nineteenth century . . . was the period of the birth of the Hindī language, invented by the English, and first used as a vehicle of literary prose composition in 1803 under Gilchrist’s tuition, by Lallū Ji Lāl, the author of the Prem Sāgar.”

In another place of the above-mentioned work Sir G. A. Grierson explains in what sense the term “invention” he uses should be understood. He says²: “In 1803, under Gilchrist’s tuition, Lallū Ji Lāl wrote the Prem Sāgar in the mixed Urdū language . . . with this peculiarity that he used only nouns and particles of Indian, instead of those of Arabic or Persian origin. The result was practically a newly invented speech; for though the grammar was the same as that of the prototype, the vocabulary was almost entirely changed. This new language, called by the Europeans Hindī, has been adopted all over Hindustan as the *lingua franca* of Hindūs, for a want existed which it fulfilled. It has become the recognized medium of literary prose throughout Northern India.”

Further investigations into the domains of the history of Indian languages, investigations in which Sir G. A. Grierson himself has taken such an eminent part, have shown that the history of the Hindi and Urdū languages is much more complicated than it was supposed even at the end of the last century. In conformity with the results obtained by these investigations, Sir G. A. Grierson to a great extent modifies his point of view with regard to the formation of the High Hindī. In his article “Indo-Aryan Vernaculars”, he says³: “The

¹ *The Modern Vernacular Literature of Hindustan*, Calcutta, 1889, Introduction, p. xxii.

² Op. cit., chapter x, p. 107.

³ “Indo-Aryan Vernaculars,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, 1918, vol. i, pt. 2, p. 52.

present form of literary Hindī or High Hindī, is a reversion to the type of the non-Persianized vernacular of the Upper Doab, brought into use by the teachers at the College of Fort William in Calcutta in the early years of the nineteenth century. It was desired to create a Hindustānī for the use of Hindūs and this was recreated by taking Urdū, the only form then known, as the basis. . . . Owing to the popularity of the Prem Sāgar of Lallū Jī Lāl, one of the first books written in this newly devised speech, and also owing to its supplying the need for a *lingua franca* which could be used by the strictest Hindūs . . . etc.”

A whole number of European authors recur to the version of the English having invented a new language. However, after the appearance of the above-mentioned article of Sir G. A. Grierson it is generally said with reference to the invention of this language that it was not invented by the English themselves, but by the teachers at the College of Fort William, under the direction of the English. In the *Encyclopædia Britannica* we read : “ the Hindī form of Hindustānī was invented simultaneously with Urdū prose by the teachers of Fort William . . . ” etc.

This European point of view up to recent times was popular in India not only among Mussulmans, but among Hindūs as well.

As an illustration one may bring forward the views of the brothers Miśra upon this question and suggested by them in their history of literature of the Hindī. The brothers Miśra say ¹: *Varttamān gadya ke janmadātā Sadal Miśra aur Lallūjī Lāl māne jāte hāi* “ The parents of modern prose are considered to be Sadal Miśra and Lallū Jī Lāl.” Of course the brothers Miśra are not considered to be the best authorities in the domain of linguistic problems but we quote their opinion because these words reflect the point of view widely spread in India itself.

However, after the war, when national and confessional relations and contradictions became strained, this conception regarding the origin of modern literary Hindī underwent a revisal on behalf of the Hindū scholars.

It should be said that this criticism was not altogether fruitless, as owing to it, it was possible to ascertain a series of historical facts, which were heretofore unknown to science.

On the other hand one must acknowledge the fact that criticism

¹ *Miśrabandhuvinod athavā Hindī sāhitya kā itihās*, dvitīya bār, dvitīya bhāg, Lakhnaū, sam^o 1984, p. 852.

was and is carried on in a mode quite different to an unprejudiced study of historical facts. Very often a series of circumstances are based not upon a thorough study of historical facts, but merely upon personal impressions and emotions evoked by an upheaved national and confessional proper pride.

It is impossible to fully envisage the question of the origin of the modern literary Hindī in the frames of a small note, therefore I shall only stay for the chief statements of Bābū Śyām Sundar Dās, one of the most eminent connoisseurs of Hindī, the chief editor of the large Hindī dictionary, *Hindī Śabdāsāgar*, author of the first course of general linguistics (*bhāṣā-vijñān*) in Hindī and other important scientific works; and also upon the views of the collaborator of Śyām Sundar Dās in reference to the mentioned dictionary, Rāmcandra Śukla, expressed by him in a short essay on the history of Hindī literature supplemented to the above-mentioned dictionary, and Śrī Jagannāth Prasād Śarmā—author of an essay regarding the development of Hindī. All the three authors quite agree as to the question of the origin of prose Hindī.

Their chief objections with regard to this question are as follows :—

In the history of the Hindī language neither prose nor the dialect Kharī bolī upon which the modern prose literary language is based are considered to be new phenomena. Hindī prose existed even before the nineteenth century. As to the Kharī bolī dialect, its history is ancient and has been known since the thirteenth century. Kharī bolī was not invented by the Mussulmans, but it is a colloquial language of the educated Hindū merchants, scholars, etc.; the Mussulmans merit the wide spreading of the language only. The literary language of the Mussulmans, the Urdū, based upon the Kharī bolī, is only a dialect of the Hindī language. The Urdū is merely an artificial language and therefore cannot be considered as a basis of literary Hindī. The honour of “invention” or introducing and spreading the prose Hindī does not belong only to Lallū Jī Lāl and to Sadal Mīra who acted under the guidance of the English, but much more so to the authors that worked independently of them and whose language, by the way, was much better than the language of Lallū Jī Lāl, for which reason this latter cannot be considered the inventor of the modern prose literary language.

The above-mentioned Hindū scholars, as well as a number of others who have written before and after them, point out that prose in the Hindī language, carrying its incessant tradition since the nineteenth

century, is not considered to be an absolutely new appearance in the Hindi literature.

It is true, that the works written in the literary dialects of Braj and Avadhī in their majority are composed in verse; but equally with these, prose works are also known. Thus Śrī Jagannāth Prasād Śarmā after the historians of Hindi literature, points out¹ that one of the works attributed to Gorakhnāth, an author of the fourteenth century, although, probably, it was written by one of his followers, represents the earliest sample of Braj prose. In the middle of the sixteenth century, in the same prose language were written the Vartās of Viṭṭhalnāth as well as comments of some of his followers.² However Jagannāth Prasād Śarmā himself points out that this prose in Braj did not continue any further. The prose of a few commentators—Viṭṭhalnāth's followers—is to such an extent formless and helpless that it rather obscures the sense of the original than serves to explain it. The helplessness and uncertainty of this prose was one of the causes why the Braj prose tradition was soon smothered, not to be renewed in future.

Still less successful was the attempt to create prose in the Kharī bolī, i.e. the dialect which served as a basis later on (in the nineteenth century) to the development of the modern literary Hindi. The poet Gang, who belonged to the court of the emperor Akbar, wrote a little story in prose Kharī bolī. This attempt of Gang's was not upheld by the following authors and remained a solitary instance.

For this reason Śyām Sundar Dās is quite correct in his remark,³ when he says the prose which existed in Kharī bolī before the nineteenth century was but nominal (*nām mātra*).

The cause of the failure of these attempts to create a prose language in Braj and Kharī bolī are quite natural: authors of the Hindi literature of that period belonged in their majority to the high castes, whose prose language was the Sanskrit, therefore there was no necessity of creating another prose language which neither possessed such a standard form nor the possibilities of being as widely spread as Sanskrit.

With regard to the question of prose the Hindū scholars themselves come to the conclusion that single sporadic attempts of writing in

¹ *Hindī kī gadya śailī kā vikās*: Nāgarīpracāriṇī Patrikā, navin saṃskaraṇ, bhāg 11, aṅk 2, Saṃ^o 1987, p. 187.

² See also F. Y. Keay, *A History of Hindī Literature*, pp. 30, 100, etc.

³ *Ādhunik Hindī gadya ke ādi ācārya*, Nāgarīpracāriṇī Patrikā, navin saṃskaraṇ, bhāg 6, aṅk 1, p. 13.

Hindī prose, being of an interest by themselves and from the point of view of the history of this literary language, were of no practical consequence and could, in no manner, influence the future formation of quite a new literary language, new in principle to the Hindī literature.

The circumstances of the Kharī bolī dialect are much more complicated. The Hindūs declare the question of its development to be involved with many delusions, and its history is generally represented erroneously. Such a point of view is expressed by Śyām Sundar Dās.¹ This idea is repeated in a series of his works, in particular in an essay on the history of the language attached to the large Hindī dictionary *Hindī-Śabdāsāgar*.² The same idea is repeated by other scholars, for instance Rāmacandra Śukla in his essay on the history of Hindī literature, supplementing the same dictionary.

One must acknowledge that in reference to the question of the rise of Kharī bolī the Hindūs are quite correct in many points.

Firstly, among the Indian Muslims, up to very recent times, an opinion was widely spread that the Urdū had risen from the mixing up of different languages and dialects, the speakers of which thronged the court of the Mogul emperors. This point of view upon the Urdū, mentioned in a well-known work of Mir Ammān, was accepted by several European scientists as well, part of whom up to the present consider the Urdū to be an artificial language—originating from the mixture of various dialects and languages.

Secondly, with regard to the formation of the Kharī bolī the representatives of this opinion declare the literary Hindī to have originated from the Urdū by the way of a mechanical exclusion of Persian and Arabic words and by replacing them with Sanskrit, pure tatsamas or tadbhavas.

Thirdly, up to very recent times a view was widely spread among the Hindūs themselves to the effect that the modern Hindī originated from the Braj and was reformed under the influence of the Mussulmans. Rāmacandra Śukla points out that such opinions were expressed not so long ago (in 1928) by the President of the Society Hindī Sāhitya Sammelan.

In order to show the error of these ideas, the Hindū scholars quite justly point out that Kharī bolī was not a new language. In

¹ *Bhāṣā-vijñān*, Kāśī, saṁ° 1982, p. 342.

² *Hindī bhāṣā kā vikāś*, p. 38.

particular Śyām Sundar Dās says ¹: “Kharī bolī has existed from the same time as Avadhī and Braj. The only distinction between them is that the literary production both in Braj-bhaṣa and Avadhī began to develop a long time ago, whereas that in the Kharī bolī has begun quite recently.”

Śyām Sundar Dās himself as well as Rāmacandra Śukla and Jagannāth Prasād Śarmā point out that, besides being used as a spoken language, the Kharī bolī crept into literature from ancient times.

Thus, Amir Khusro (1256–1325), known more as a Persian poet, has written a series of small productions, riddles, etc., in the Kharī bolī. And not only historians of the Hindī language and literature, but also historians of the Urdū literature consider Amir Khusro’s verses nearer to the Hindī than to the Urdū. Bābūrām Saksena ² in particular says: “These verses though they employ Hindī words are scanned according to Sanskrit prosody and can scarcely be regarded as Urdū verses, though Persian words are found there and here.”

After Amir Khusro the traces of Kharī bolī are partly observed in the works of Kabīr, Nānak, Dādū, in Bhūṣaṅ’s “Śīva Bhāvanī”, in one of Lalit Kiśorī’s verses, in the verses of Sītal Kavi, in one of the already mentioned prose works of Gang—who belonged to the court of emperor Akbar—also in Jatmal’s (about 1624) “Gorā bādāl kī kathā” etc., and in other poetical works.

The above-mentioned authors give short extracts from the works of the enumerated poets. These extracts, in a most convincing manner, certify to the existence and development of Kharī bolī from the thirteenth century; thus, we may speak of the Kharī bolī as one of the dialects of Hindī literature which was used in the latter to a very limited extent and only in single cases as we may observe it in Amir Khusro and in the works of the poet Gang—it was used as an independent dialect and not as a special stylistic means as it appears in Bhūṣaṅ’s works and in those of a few other Hindū authors.

The fact of using Kharī bolī in the Hindī and Urdū literature undoubtedly testifies to the Kharī bolī being employed also as a spoken language.

In this manner we may consider the antiquity of Kharī bolī as

¹ *Bhāṣā-vijñān*, p. 342.

² *A History of Urdū Literature*, Allahabad, 1927, p. 10.

proved. Therefore the idea of the Kharī bolī being a language which has risen from the intermingling of different dialects, or having been founded on the Braj, completely falls away.

The Kharī bolī is an independent idiom, having risen on the basis of one of the local dialects. But whether it is founded on one of the dialects used near Delhi, Agra, or Meerut, as is presumed by the Hindū scholars, or whether upon the basis of one of the Panjabī dialects, as is presumed by Grahame Bailey,¹ does not enter the scope of the present note.

However, the Hindū scholars, when looking into the correlation between Kharī bolī, the modern literary Hindī, Urdū, and Hindustānī, come to conclusions with which one may undoubtedly disagree.

For instance, Śyām Sundar Dās, on the one hand, says ²: “There are three forms of Kharī bolī: (1) the pure Hindī, which is the literary language of the Hindūs; (2) Urdū, which is used specially among Mussulmans and is their literary language as well as the spoken language outside their homes, the language of educated Muslims and several Hindūs; and (3) Hindustānī, in which are used, without any difference, words of both Hindī and Urdū languages and which is used by all as a spoken language.”

In the above cited quotation Śyām Sundar Dās considers Kharī bolī as a more general conception and in the literary Hindī, Urdū, Hindustānī, he observes different aspects and different forms of the language based upon the Kharī bolī.

Whereas, a little further on, in the same work ³ Śyām Sundar Dās, following Paṇḍit Candra-Gulerī, states: *Urdū koī bhāṣā nahī hai, Hindī kī vibhāṣā hai* “Urdu is not a language, but a dialect of the Hindī language”.

Evidently Śyām Sundar Dās put a mark of equality between Kharī bolī and Hindī as, if he had understood the term “Hindī” as the whole of all dialects (from Bihar to the Panjab), he would have had to acknowledge this dialect to be not only Urdū but the literary Hindī and the Kharī bolī itself.

How to reconcile these contradictory statements is not clear.

Exactly from this point of view Urdū is represented by the scholars mentioned as a purely artificial dialect (*kr̥tr̥im vibhāṣā*).

Hindū scholars declare the merit of spreading Kharī bolī

¹ “Urdu, The Name and the Language,” *JRAS.*, 1930, April, pp. 391-400.

² *Bhāṣā-vijñān*, p. 342.

³ *Bhāṣā-vijñān*, pp. 346-7.

all over Northern India and over the Deccan to belong to the Muslims as well as the fact of the Muslims being the first to use *Kharī boli* as a literary form. According to their opinion, however, *Kharī boli* in the hands of the Muslims obtained an artificial form ; owing to the introduction of a large number of foreign, Persian, and Arabic elements, the *Urdū* lost its national Indian character, all the more so because the *Urdū* had taken up some of the elements of Persian grammar.

One cannot deny the fact that the *Urdū* in the hands of the Muslims underwent many changes, greatly removing it from the spoken language. Nevertheless, these changes were quite natural, in so far as this literary form began to be used for expressing ideas of another Muslim culture, the scope of conceptions of which differ from the notions peculiar to Hinduism. Besides this the *Kharī boli* dialect, modified by the Muslims and changed into *Urdū*, appears to be no more artificial than the very same *Kharī boli* in the hands of some *Hindū* writers, who sometimes exclude the elements of *tadbhavas*, replacing them by elements of Sanskrit *tatsamas* and by heaping up most complicated compound nouns, some of which are composed of ten or even more components. Both the overloading with Muslim elements as well as with Sanskrit elements, especially with compounds not properly pertaining to the spirit of *Kharī boli*, attributes to it an artificial form. The *Hindūs* are justified by the Sanskrit elements being national elements, but for the Muslims, educated on Arabic and Persian culture, borrowing from Arabic and Persian languages it also seems natural to have “the national elements” presented.

Hindū scholars insist upon the artificial, hybrid character of the *Urdū*, especially so because very many authors interpret the expression of *Lallū Jī Lāl* : *Yāvanī bhāṣā chor . . . kharī bolī mē kah* “excluding Muslim elements and narrating in a pure language”, in such a manner, that the modern literary *Hindī* is created by *Lallū Jī Lāl* from *Urdū* through excluding from it Muslim elements.

Trying to refute this statement, the *Hindū* scholars attempt to prove first of all that the *Kharī boli* existed separately, independently of the Muslims and their “artificial” literary language ; secondly—that *Lallū Jī Lāl*, who was employed by the English, was not the creator of the modern literary *Hindī*.

It is quite natural and absolutely comprehensible why the *Hindūs* objected to a simplified, purely mechanical, understanding of the formation of a modern literary *Hindī*, as though

it were formed exclusively by the substitution of some lexical elements to others.

Even Lallū Jī Lāl personally, when creating his work, does not mention the fact of his departing from the Urdū, he says he writes in a "pure Delhi and Agra language", i.e. his point of departure was that of the spoken language of these cities.

The Hindū scholars, however, try to prove that this pure Kharī bolī language was mainly cultivated amidst purely Hindū surroundings; this language being used by Hindū paṇḍits, sādhus, merchants, etc.

These statements, of course, surmised in the ardour of Hindū patriotism, lead the Hindū scholars to contradict themselves, as they are obliged to acknowledge that the most ancient samples of Kharī bolī are to be found either in the works of Muslim authors (Amir Khusro, Kabīr) or in those parts of the works of the Hindū authors, where Muslims are represented.

Thus Śyām Sundar Dās writes¹: *Hindū kaviyō ne bhī apnī kavītā mē is kharī bolī kā prayog kiyā hai. Prāyah Musalmānō kī bātcī we kharī bolī mē likhte the* "Hindī poets also used the Kharī bolī in their poetry. In general they used to render the conversation of Muslims in Kharī bolī".

Rāmcandra Śukla as well, in the above-mentioned essay on the development of literary Hindī,² says that from the point of view of Hindū poets the Kharī bolī is understood to be specially a Muslim language. *Is se Bhūṣaṇ, Sūdan ādi kaviyō ne Musalmānī darbārō ke prasaṅg mē yā Musalmān pātrō ke bhāṣaṇ mē is bolī kā vyavahār kiyā hai* "For this reason Bhūṣaṇ, Sūdan, and other poets when representing Muslim durbars or depicting the language of Muslim personages used to employ this language".

It is quite evident the Hindū poets considered the Kharī bolī as a special spoken language of the Indian Muslims. Undoubtedly the Kharī bolī was the language of educated Hindūs, but in the midst of the Hindūs it was a spoken language used by them (as is mentioned by paṇḍit Gulerī and other authors), outside the home, for the spoken home language was more or less coloured by local dialectical peculiarities varying in different provinces.

Although the Kharī bolī has for long been used by Muslims not only as a spoken language, but also in Muslim poetry, where it

¹ *Bhāṣā-vijñān*, p. 343.

² *Hindī sāhitya kā vikās*, p. 207.

appeared mostly in a form saturated with Persian and Arabic elements, the Hindūs absolutely ignore the use of Kharī bolī elements in the Urdū literature, although elements of Sanskrit tadbhava occupy quite an eminent place with several authors of the Urdū literature.

Completely ignoring the use of Kharī bolī elements in the Indo-Muslim literature, the Hindūs speak of its existence only in the form of a spoken language.

However, from the history of no matter whatever language, we know if it lacks a literary language its spoken form is void of stabilization both from a lexical point as well as in respect of grammar, which in no case may be asserted with regard to the Kharī bolī, for it comes forward in quite a uniform style with various Hindū poets who sporadically use it in their poems written in the Braj. Besides, having no uniformity in the spoken language, Kharī bolī could not appear in such an analogous literary form at the beginning of the nineteenth century with authors who wrote in different parts of the country, as did Lallū Jī Lāl, Lāl Sadāsukh, and Inshā Allā Khān.

Up to the nineteenth century the only form of a literary language which to a certain extent directed the free development of colloquial Kharī bolī and communicated a certain steadiness and stability to the latter, was the literary language of the Indian Muslims—the Urdū. That is its historical merit which the Hindū scholars cannot efface.

Our acknowledging the exclusive role of the Urdū as a literary language, which has, during several centuries, influenced the Kharī bolī spoken language and added to it a certain stability, preventing it from splitting up into a number of dialects, does not mean to assert the literary Hindī to be considered as having risen from the Urdū. Both the Urdū and the literary Hindī are grounded upon the spoken Kharī bolī. The difference is merely that the Urdū began to develop much earlier, therefore it was able to exercise a strong influence on the development of spoken Kharī bolī, attributing a certain steadiness to it.

The undoubted influence of Urdū upon the formation of literary Hindī is also proved by the fact that Lallū Jī Lāl, Munshī Sadal Mīśra, Sadāsukh and Inshā Allā Khān all had a perfect knowledge of the Urdū ; the priority in that respect belonging naturally to Inshā Allā Khān and Sadāsukh, the former being one of the most eminent poets of the Urdū literature, the second the author of several books in the Urdū and Persian languages.

It is quite comprehensible, therefore, that the Urdū did not

immediately affect the literary Hindī, but through the medium of a spoken language which, in the hands of the above-mentioned authors, was moulded into a completeness of form only owing to their perfect knowledge of the Urdū.

The patriotism of the Hindū scholars is manifested not only in their inclination to deny an obvious fact of the effects of Muslim Urdū upon the formation of literary Hindī, but also in that they try to disparage the role of Sadal Miśra and especially Lallū Jī Lāl—the authors who worked over the creation of a literary Hindī under the direction of the English, chiefly under John Gilchrist.

In the introduction to “Prem Sāgar” of Lallū Jī Lāl (edition issued by Nāgarī Pracāriṇī Sabhā) the editor says that Lallū Jī Lāl is considered to be the first author of the Hindī prose as well as the first writer in the Hindī in its modern form,”¹ Śyām Sundar Dās and other authors repeatedly deny this role of Lallū Jī Lāl. In this manner Śyām Sundar Dās, in his course of general linguistics,² says : *Lallūjī Lāl Hindī gadya ke janmadātā māne jāte haī. Vāstav mē unhō ne Hindī gadya ko ādhunik rūp nahī diyā* “Lallū Jī Lāl is considered to be the parent of prose Hindī. In reality it is not he who gave the prose Hindī its modern form.” The same is repeated by Śyām Sundar Dās in an essay treating of the development of the Hindī, supplement to the dictionary *Hindī-Śabdasaṅgar*,³ and after him a number of authors, in particular Śrī Jagannāth Prasād Śarmā.⁴

The most essential of all their arguments is firstly that Lallū Jī Lāl did not act independently, but by the direction of the Administration of Fort William College ; secondly, his weak knowledge of Sanskrit and insufficient preparedness for such an important business as the creation of a literary Hindī.

The Hindū scholars point out that besides Lallū Jī Lāl and Sadal Miśra the creators of literary Hindī are to be considered Munshi Sadāsukh Lāl and Syed Inshā Allāh Khān, whose activity in that line is all the more important as they both acted on their own behalf and initiative, and not upon the directions of the administration of Fort William College. According to their assertions this fact is principally of great importance, as it is a proof that Indian society realized the

¹ Compare also : Śyām Sundar Dās : *Hindī gadya ke ādi ācārya. Nā° pra° Pa°*, navin saṁskaraṇ, bhāg 6, aṅk 1, 1982, p. 19.

² *Bhāṣā-vijñān*, pp. 348-9.

³ *Hindī bhāṣā kā vikās*, p. 41.

⁴ *Hindī kī gadya śailī kā vikās*, pp. 197-8.

necessity of having a prose literary language ; attempts were made, independently of the English, to satisfy this need.

Munshī Sadāsukh Lāl was a native of Delhi. He was born in Sam. 1803. For a long period he was an employee of the East India Company. He knew the Urdū and Persian languages perfectly and wrote several works in those languages. He made a translation in prose of the Bhāgavat and gave it the name of Sukhsāgar. Besides that, Sadāsukh wrote ¹ several articles of which one was even printed.

Rāmcandra Śukla emphasizes that Sadāsukh wrote in prose language not according to the directions of some or other English official and not according to some kind of given standard, but according to his own initiative. As follows from the above, Sadāsukh wrote in the spoken language of educated Hindūs.

One may doubt the proximity of Sadāsukh's language to the spoken language, anyway as far as his lexicology is concerned, because of his using Sanskrit tatsamas to a great extent. It is certain, however, that he followed the same way as most of the workers of the modern Hindī literature, who also use Sanskrit tatsamas to a large extent.

As Sadāsukh began to write a little before the other workers of the beginning period of the Hindī prose literature, his activity in this respect was considered to be of great import.²

Syed Inshā Allā Khān (died in 1817) was the most eminent poet of the Urdū literature. He was a poet at the court of Delhi and afterwards of Lucknow and finally he was in Murshidabad at the court of the Nawab of Bengal. Wishing to prove to his friends it was possible to write in a pure spoken language, Inshā Allā Khān wrote a story called “ Rānī Ketkī kī Kahānī ”, in which he used only the vocabulary and terms of style of the spoken language of the educated circles of his time, avoiding both vulgarity and pretentious expressions typical of literary Urdū of his epoch. Inshā Allā Khān's independence of topic, the simplicity, refinement, picturesqueness and vividness of style, imbued with expressions of everyday life, force the historians of literature to acknowledge Inshā Allā Khān's pre-eminence in the way of masterly use of the new prose style of literary Hindī, although historians generally point out the influence of Urdū in his lexicology and syntax.

The third creator of the modern literary Hindī the Hindū scholars consider to be Paṇḍit Sadal Miśra. As well as Lallū Jī Lāl, he served

¹ Śyām Sundar Dās : *Ādhunīk Hindī gadya ke ādi ācārya*, p. 18.

² Rāmcandra Śukla : *Hindī sāhitya kā vikās*, pp. 210-211.

in the East India Company in the capacity of teacher at Fort William College. In the year 1803 he translated into Hindī the tale “Nāsiketopākhyān”. Although, according to the opinion of Hindū scholars, the language of Paṇḍit Sadal Miśra is much better than that of Lallū Jī Lāl, it nevertheless has some deficiencies, of which the most important are : The using of the Eastern Hindī forms such as *phūlanh*, *cahūdis*, *sunī*, etc. ; placing auxiliaries before participles of the verb, for instance, *uttam gati ko hāi pahūcte*, etc. ; the dropping out of the copula, for example, *kanyā sab gāṭī* ; instability of orthography, such as *kad hī* and *kadhī* and several other defects. Notwithstanding these trifling deficiencies, the language of Paṇḍit Sadal Miśra is considered to be better than the language of Lallū Jī Lāl.

Especially Lallū Jī Lāl and his language are subjected to harsh criticism.

Jagannāth Prasād Śarmā¹ points out that the work of Lallū Jī Lāl is much inferior to the mentioned works of Sadāsukh and Inshā Allā Khān, because Lallū Jī Lāl acted not upon his own initiative but according to the directions of others, being in the capacity of teacher at Fort William College. Besides all that, his “Prem Sāgar” written in 1803 at the same time as “Nāsiketopākhyān” of Sadal Miśra and “Rānī Ketkī kī Kahānī” of Inshā Allā Khān is not considered to be an original production. The language of Lallū Jī Lāl, according to the opinion of the mentioned author, is subjected to many deficiencies, of which the chief are : there is no steadiness in grammar, Sanskrit tatsamas are used to a great extent, but their spelling differs from the standards of orthography. The orthography of tadbhava is also not strictly kept to. Lallū Jī Lāl has quite excluded Arabic and Persian elements from his vocabulary, whereas these elements have been without doubt substantially introduced into the Hindī and, on the contrary, he often uses Braj and introduces into “Prem Sāgar” a large quantity of verses in that dialect. In other parts of his works besides poetry in the Braj language he sometimes makes use of rhymes.

Based upon the above deficiencies, Lallū Jī Lāl’s language, which, according to the opinion of the Hindū scholars is not void of some positive traits, cannot be considered as an example of literary Hindī. For that reason Lallū Jī Lāl cannot be considered to be the founder of that language.

¹ *Hindī kī gadya śailī kā vikās*, p. 197.

Of the four authors who wrote at the beginning of the nineteenth century in prose Hindī, according to the opinion of Rāmcandra Śukla,¹ the best should be considered to be the language of Sadāsukh Lāl, and for this reason he must be considered to be the creator of the modern literary language. Śrī Jagannāth Prasād Śarmā is of the same opinion in this respect as Rāmacandra Śukla.²

From the point of view of purity and correctness of the literary language Śyām Sundar Dās ranks the three authors as follows : “ The first place is to be occupied by Inshā Ullā Khān, the second by Sadal Mīra, and the third by Lallū Jī Lāl.”³

In this way Lallū Jī Lāl, who in the European literature is considered to be the inventor of modern prose Hindī, from the point of view of Hindū scholars occupies the last place, or is even completely excluded from the ranks of parents of the Hindī prose.

In order to estimate the cause of such varying conclusions both on the part of European authors and Hindūs, it is necessary to dwell upon the arguments used by Hindū scholars and their criterion of a model literary language.

Hindū scholars consider the deficiency of Lallū Jī Lāl to be in the following : his grammar is not stable and has no standard ; for instance, he uses several variations for the same form ; in order to express the Conjunctive Participle he uses such forms as : *kari*, *karke*, *bulāy*, *bulāykari*, *bulāykar*, *bulāykarike*. Further, in Lallū Jī Lāl's works we come across Braj dialect, such as : *bhaī*, *soī*, *nirakh*, *lījai*, and others.

Diversions from the standard modern language are to be found in the works of all four authors. In Sadāsukh Lāl we come across such forms as : *āvtā*, *jāvtā*, etc., *ko* instead of *koī*, etc. ; Inshā Allā Khān uses such forms as *āviyā*, *jāviyā*, etc. ; Sadal Mīra employs forms already noted like *phūlanh*, etc. Thus this deficiency is observed in the works of all the mentioned authors. It is doubtful whether one should reckon these deviations as a deficiency, for most probably the spoken language of the latter period of the eighteenth century possessed a greater number of forms than the modern literary language, and different authors introduced variations of these forms into their works. Only the subsequent development of the literary language actuates a certain standardization.

¹ *Hindī sāhitya kā vikās*, p. 214.

² *Hindī kī gadya śailī kā vikās*, p. 195.

³ *Ādhunik Hindī gadya ke ādi ācārya*, p. 33.

Secondly, even at the present time, the literary Hindī is not standardized to a great extent among different authors, not mentioning noticeable discrepancies both from a lexical and grammatical side. As an example we may take the forms of the Conjunctive Participle, for which any grammar provides several variations, for example *bol*, *bolkar*, *bolke*, *bolkarke*, or the Conjunctive form *jāe*, *jāye*, *jāy*, *jāve*, or the form of the Past Participle such as *diye*, *die*, etc.

There is no doubt, of course, that some of these variations will gradually drop off with the further development of the literary Hindī.

The fact of Lallū Jī Lāl employing verse in the Braj dialect can by no means be considered as a deficiency of his language. The adoption of verse in the Braj should be looked upon as a peculiar method of composition practised by Lallū Jī Lāl in his "Prem Sāgar". Epic narration is carried out by him in prose language, moments of high lyrical tension are reproduced in a lyrical language, which the Braj dialect was ages ago considered to be. Neither of these dialects are mixed up with each other. Only single forms of Braj are sometimes used in prose, which can evidently be explained by the fact of their being in affinity to the spoken language of the end of the eighteenth century.

Hindū scholars consider Lallū Jī Lāl's language to be greatly deficient by his using Sanskrit tatsamas differing from the orthography generally used.

Evidently Lallū Jī Lāl, attempting to write in a language the nearest possible to the spoken, without doubt wrote Sanskrit tatsamas in such a way as they were pronounced at that time. It is a defect of orthography, but not a defect of the language.

Orthographical questions are very complicated ones, and Lallū Jī Lāl, creating a new literary form, solved the difficulties as he considered to be more correct. Secondly the orthography of the literary Hindī is its weakest point, and is to be further improved.

The Indian Press has recently discussed various projects of reforming the devanāgarī. In case one of these projects should be accepted, naturally the orthography of many modern authors will become obsolete, but this does not mean that their language will become obsolete as well.

Because of the digressions from the Sanskrit tatsama orthography many authors state that Lallū Jī Lāl had quite a low knowledge of the

Sanskrit or even did not know it at all.¹ I doubt whether such a conclusion will be correct after a minute survey of the language of “Prem Sāgar”. Such conclusions should not be drawn from this fact, all the more so as Lallū Jī Lāl was not prepared for such a role as the creator of a new literary language.² Śyām Sundar Dās who also considers Lallū Jī Lāl hardly prepared enough for his role, still brings forward the opinion of other scholars; “some say if he lived at the present times he would never have attained such fame. But this may be said about Newton and other world famous scientists.”³

Besides, the role in history of this one or another promoter is not determined by the degree of his erudition. Most probably at the end of the eighteenth and at the beginning of the nineteenth century there were many scholars who knew the Sanskrit and most likely the Hindī much better than Lallū Jī Lāl, but, nevertheless, they did not participate in this great undertaking as Lallū Jī Lāl did.

Hindū scholars, basing their views upon abstract facts of purity and correctness of language, find it impossible to consider Lallū Jī Lāl the founder of the modern literary Hindī, and they consider that such a role should be attributed to Munshī Sadāsukh and Syed Inshā Allā Khān and to a certain extent to Sadal Miśra.

One may come to such a conclusion only in that case if one is to forget historical facts announced by these scholars. It is well known that the story of Sadal Miśra, “Nāsiketopākhyān”, was soon forgotten and was not republished. Śyām Sundar Dās himself says⁴ the collection of Sadāsukh’s articles was not even published, and the story of Syed Inshā Allāh Khān⁵ was published for the first time by Rājā Śiv Prasād. Whereas “Prem Sāgar” by Lallū Jī Lāl was published many times and its popularity grew stronger and stronger. It is quite comprehensible that the formation of a literary language should be affected only by such works as are propagated and widely read and not the ones which lie in manuscripts or which are forgotten immediately after their appearance.

For this reason from all the mentioned works of the four authors considered by the Hindū scholars to be the founders of modern literary Hindī, the “Prem Sāgar” of Lallū Jī Lāl is the most noted work to play an honourable part; owing to it the idea of a prose literary

¹ Rāmendra Śukla : *Hindī sāhitya kā vikās*, pp. 212–13.

² Śyām Sundar Dās : *Adhunik Hindī gadya ke ādi ācārya*.

³ Op. cit., p. 30.

⁴ Op. cit., p. 18.

⁵ Op. cit., p. 32.

language became popular, many authors of the following stages of the development of literary Hindī studied prose language by it.

Hindū scholars attempt to diminish the significance of Lallū Jī Lāl and Sadal Miśra by pointing out their serving at Fort William College and their acting upon the initiative and directions of the administration of the College, whereas Paṇḍit Sadāsukh Lāl and Inshā Allāh Khān were never employed at that College and therefore acted independently and upon their own initiative. But, first of all, Paṇḍit Sadāsukh also served in the East India Company, although not at the College; secondly, the fact that both the mentioned authors started to work upon a prose language only when Lallū Jī Lāl and Sadal Miśra were solving the same problem, and this undoubtedly is a sign they began their work also under the influence of Europeans.

The influence of Europeans upon the development of a prose language is not only to be seen in that they brought to India an idea new to this country of a literary language resembling that of a spoken language, but also as Śrī Jagannāth Prasād Śarmā¹ justly remarks, with the advent of the English and under their influence great changes have taken place in the economic, social, and religious life of India. A new bourgeois class is formed which is in need of a literary language close to that of the spoken, and, with the assistance of the English, this class creates and spreads it by technical means (such as the press, etc.) adopted from Europe.

Out of three literary forms set up on the basis of Kharī bolī, viz. High Hindī, Urdū, and Hindustānī, this latter the Hindū scholars consider to be purely artificial, originated by the English "for political reasons".² These scholars imagine the affair to have been enacted in the following way: the English selected out of the Urdū and Hindī words common to both languages, kept the Hindī grammar and in this way invented a new language. Such a mode of explaining the formation of the idiom which the Hindūs themselves call Hindustānī is quite mechanical and contradicts their own words, as the Hindū scholars declare that the Hindustānī is just the form of language *jise sab log bolcāl mē kām mē lāte hāi*³ "which is used by all in conversation".

From the point of view of proximity to the living spoken speech the Hindustānī is the most perfect form of a literary language which can

¹ *Hindī kī gadya śailī kā vikās*, pp. 189-190.

² Śyām Sundar Dās: *Bhāṣā-vijñān*, pp. 342-5.

³ Śyām Sundar Dās: *Bhāṣā-vijñān*, p. 342, 1.

unite the Hindūs and Muslims. This is recognized by several Hindū scholars, for example by Bābūrām Saksenā.¹

Most of the Indian scholars have another point of view upon the matter and find that the literary language must differ from the spoken language, even of the educated class²; in accordance with this, these scholars see the only way of forming a literary Hindī on the basis of a spoken language by satiating it with as many pure Sanskrit tatsamas³ as possible.

The satiation of literary Hindī with Sanskrit tatsamas is not only done out of "purely theoretical" considerations, but with the purpose of rendering the Hindī comprehensible in other provinces, as in the literary languages of these provinces a great number of Sanskrit tatsamas is also found.

It is omitted in this reasoning that the spoken Hindī or rather the Hindustānī did not need Sanskrit tatsamas in order to be widely spread.

Although a sound judgment is raised in objection to excess of Sanskritizing the Hindī, for example by Rām Dās Gauṛ⁴ and others, also several modern authors of literary Hindī Sanskritize their language to such an extent that tadbhava elements occupy quite an insignificant part in their vocabulary. For instance, in Viyogī Hari⁵ we read :
jab māi . . . srotasvatī-sarīt-taṭ-taru-śākhā-viharit-kalkaṅṭhī-kokil-kuhuk-dhvani suntā hū, prabhāt-ausakaṅ-jhalkit-harīt-tṛṇācchādit-prakṛti-parīṣkṛt-bahu-vanaspati-sugandhit-sukhad-bhūmī par lettā hū . . .

From the above specimen we may draw the conclusion that a digression from the principle of connecting together spoken and literary language leads, practically speaking, to the restoration of Sanskrit.

¹ *Bhāratvarṣ kī ādhuṅik Ārya bhāṣāē, Nā° Pra° Pa°, navin saṃskaraṅ, bhāg 11, aṅk 2, pp. 121-162.*

² Śyām Sundar Dās : *Bhāṣā-vijñān*, p. 353.

³ Mahāmahopādhyāya Śrī Giridhar Śarmā Caturvedī : *Varttamān Hindī mē Saṃskṛt śabdō kā grahaṅ, Nā° Pra° Pa°, navin saṃskaraṅ, bhāg 10, aṅk 1-2, 1986, pp. 195-231.*

⁴ *Śrīrāmarīmānas kī bhūmikā*, Dehlī aur Kāśī, 1982, p. 8.

⁵ Śrī Jagannāth Prasād Śarmā : *Hindī kī gadya śailī kā vikās*, p. 334.