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The Mulayam Singh Yadav Government of Uttar Pradesh had brought the Urdu University Ordinance (August 2004) to set up an Urdu-Persian University at Rampur. The Urban Development Minister of UP, Mohammad Azam Khan, had been appointed its permanent custodian and he promptly declared that the syllabus (of the proposed university) would be “copied” from the Al-Ahzar Arabic University of Cairo, Egypt. [Hasan 2004] Azam Khan’s statement reminds us of the extra-territorial mooring of Urdu. But it wasn’t always so. It was transformed into an artificial Arabised-Persianised language with extra-territorial mooring in the latter part of the Moghul era. More about it later. The Urdu University Ordinance had caused a deep division in the Council of Ministers, headed by Mulayam Singh Yadav, and became extremely controversial. The Governor, T.V. Rajeswar, had referred the draft ordinance to the President of India and the matter had been pending. On November 30, 2004, the Uttar Pradesh Assembly passed the Maulana Mohammad Ali Jauhar Urdu University Bill to replace the proposed Ordinance, but the Governor again referred it to the President who took time to consider and finally returned it saying that the Governor should seek legal opinion and take appropriate decision. On March 5, 2005, the Mulayam Singh Yadav Government took a decision to set up the Urdu University in the private sector. [Hindustan Times 2005] In the last 50 years the Muslims of Uttar Pradesh have shown a welcome sign of cultural integration; they have learned Hindi and started to read the same newspapers, magazines and books as their next-door Hindu neighbours. Setting up of the proposed Urdu University will likely disrupt this process and launch the Muslim community on a path of linguistic, and by extension, cultural separation once again. This would adversely impact socio-political developments in Uttar Pradesh in the near future and this merits close attention.

Urdu is the official language of Pakistan, which is not the land of its birth, whereas Yiddish is the language of the Jews of East Europe, which again is not the land of its birth. Why is Urdu the official language of Pakistan, not only in the Central Federal Government but also in the provinces, while there are four provincial vernacular languages? Why did the Jews of Slovakia, Russia, Poland, Lithuania, Hungary and Ukraine etc. speak Yiddish, where the other inhabitants spoke their respective native tongues? There are lessons for us Indians in the answers to these questions. We, the present authors, are both residents of Uttar Pradesh and speak the local language fluently and Urdu is supposed to be the language of Uttar Pradesh. Yet none of us can understand much of Urdu news (Khabar) broadcast from the Lucknow Doordarshan, so loaded with Arabic-Persian words and phrases it is. Why is it so? Similarly, Germans find it difficult to understand Yiddish, although it was born in South Western Germany, and has the same verbs, pronouns and syntax.

A debate is going on in the journal, Mainstream, on the history of Urdu. Shahabuddin (2004a) claims that over the centuries North India had evolved a composite culture and Urdu was its language and cultural expression... Yet Hindi was promoted as an alternative to Urdu by communal elements on purely religious grounds.

Vasudha Dhagamwar (2004) says that Urdu was the language of administration of the Moghuls. Shahabuddin (2004b) refutes this and claims that Urdu was the unchallenged lingua franca of the educated elite of the UP and that it was the imposition of Hindi in the nineteenth century that stopped the evolution of a common language and culture in North India. In summary, he makes two points:

1. Urdu represented the composite culture of North India, and
2. Hindi was promoted as an alternative to Urdu. This implies that Hindi came on to the scene much later than Urdu and it was imposed as late as in the nineteenth century.

Nothing can be farther from truth. Shahabuddin denies Hindi its rightful place in history. The question of what was the lingua franca is being raked up again. In order to discuss what the lingua franca was, it is necessary to go into the genesis of Urdu and its evolution. In this article we would like to explore the history of Hindi, Urdu and Yiddish and study the socio-linguistic aspects of Urdu and Yiddish to bring out certain historical similarities.

This article is in two parts: (a) the first part refuses
the false claims made by Shahabuddin about Hindi and deals with Urdu and its role in the growth of the Two-Nation Theory and creation of Pakistan; (b) the second part deals with Yiddish and its role in the growth of Zionism (in Europe) and creation of Israel. The second part also deals briefly with several other similar religio-linguistic-political phenomena in different parts of the world.

Antiquity of Hindi and its Literature

MEDIEVAL dialects of Hindi descended from Apabhramsa that predates even the early Muslim invaders, like Mahmud Ghaznavi. [Ref: Shukla 1940, Dinkar 1956 and Khan 1987] We shall have to refer to these authors again and again and therefore not give the year of publication in the text, but give the page number wherever appropriate. Dinkar's magnum opus, Sanskriti ke Char Adhyayana, is a work of immense scholarship with a foreword written by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and received the Sahitya Academy Award. Unfortunately we, the present authors, had not known about this work until about two years ago.] Right from late ancient and early medieval days both Hindus and Muslims had been writing poetry in various dialects of North India—Khadi Boli, Braja and Awadhí. [Shukla, Dinkar, and Khan] These dialects are often collectively called proto-Hindi or medieval Hindi and were written in Nagari script. Abdullah Iraqi translated the Quran into Hindi in 892 AD. [Dinkar, p. 390] The earliest written speciments of Khadi Boli poetry are found in the writings of Amir Khusrau (1253-1325 AD). A scholar of Persian [Shukla, p. 34] he wrote extensively also in Braja. [Shukla, pp. 2, 36, 111, 284 and Dinkar, pp. 380-381] An example of Sufi-spiritual verse composed by Khusrau is given here:

कहरहै लौट मिला जाय भी के संग तब मेरे मन बीत को, धरे मे यह एक रस.

[Khusrau spends the night of union wakeful with the beloved / The body belongs to me but the mind to my love, the two merging in a monochrome.] The earliest specimen of Braja prose has been dated to mid-fourteenth century AD. [Shukla, p. 278 and Dinkar, p. 392] Similarly, the earliest specimen of Khadi Boli prose has been dated to the Mughul King Akbar’s reign. Ganga Kavi, a poet and courtier of Akbar [Shukla, p. 137], wrote a prose work called Chanda Chhanda Ramayanski Mahima. [Shukla, p. 282 and Dinkar, p. 393] However, the first mature work of prose in Khadi Boli appeared in 1741 AD when Rama Prasad Niranjan, in the court of Patiala, wrote Birsna Yoga Vashish-tha. [Shukla, p. 282 and Dinkar, p. 393]

Certain coins of Mahmud of Ghazni carry Sanskrit-Nagari inscriptions and Hindu motifs. [Zakaria 2002, p. 89] Dr Nupam Mahajan’s web-page (please see References under Mahajan) for Indian coins has an image of one such coin, a silver dhiram. Mohammad Ghori also struck coins carrying Nagari inscriptions. [Khan 1987] Dr Mahajan’s web page has an image of one such coin, a gold stater minted at Delhi that carries Nagari inscription on the reverse. Similarly, some coins issued by Sher Shah Suri carried Nagari inscription. [Dinkar, p. 287] Akbar issued many interesting coins. One of his most important coins dispaly Rama, the hero of Hindu epic Ramayana and his wife Sita on obverse while a word Ramayana, in Nagari script, is on reverse. [Refer to Dr Mahajan’s web page]

Until Akbar’s accession, government records were maintained in medieval Hindi. [Dinkar, pp. 403, 391] Most of the Muslim kings used to have a Persian and a Hindi Navis (Secretary). [Dinkar, p. 391 and Shukla, p. 298] Use of Hindi in the administration during the medieval era was not a mere political expediency. The rulers assiduously cultivated Hindi. Dinkar (ibid.) has quoted Hindi verses composed by Akbar, Shah Jahan (p. 291) and Jебunisa, Aurangzeb’s daughter (p. 292), and a popular couplet of the time invoked by Aurangzeb. (p. 391) Akbar’s friend, Raja Birbal, used to give away to the poor his entire year’s earnings on every birthday. On his death a grieving Akbar uttered a poem:

दीन जानी रस दीन, एक न दीनों सुरह दूला।
सो मैं झुकक अब दीन, ककू र स र ती दीववल। [The poor knew (him) well, he never hurt anyone, / The poor tell me that Birbal did not keep anything (wealth) for himself.] Some Mughal princes had two names. Shah Jahan gave Aurangzeb two names, one was Aurangzeb and the other Navarang Bihara. This name appears in the works of contemporaries of Aurangzeb, like Bhushan, the court poet of Shivaji. [Dinkar, p. 627] Unable to bear imprisonment in the hands of Aurangzeb, Shah Jahan lamented in a verse:

जन्मजय दिखाय दान दियों आर नाम सदला नातारा हिही।
बालको हो अह्मदमल दियो अर देय गुप्तकर दियो देहते।
सो सर घे भुजी मन मे घर हाम दियो वैशाल मे इती, / शहदी बिने हेरो सो वैहिन सवाल राजवधन राजह मही। [When he was born I gave lakhs of gifts and named him Navrang Bihara, brought him up with care and made him satrap of a territory with a large army. This son nurtured enmity in mind and put my hands in chains, / Shahjahan submits to God saying, “O Almighty! all that happens is your will.”]

The use of the Persian word “हिही” is notable. More notable is the usage of the Sanskrit words “हेरो” and “रथवधन” for God or Allah, although the latter, meaning lotus-eyed, is an epithet for Vishnu in Hindu scrip-
tures. The vocabulary of this language included all words that there in popular usage. No words, Persian (Farsi) or Sanskrit, were deliberately kept out.

Famous linguist Dr Suniti Kumar Chatterji has written that according to “Mayasire-Alamgiri”, while Aurangzeb was in the Deccan (a region south of Narmada river and north of Godavari river) in 1690, a Muslim from Bengal met him and wished to be his disciple. Aurangzeb quoted a popular couplet of that region to deride him [Dinkar, p. 391]:

\[ \text{[You want to give up long hair and wear the cap of a Fakir], Oh shameless man! Your house is being eaten by rats and you talk of erecting a new roof.]} \]

Aurangzeb’s daughter, Zibunnisa, wrote a work called Naina Vilnas. When his son, Mohammad Azam Shah, sent certain varieties of mangoes and asked him to name them, Aurangzeb named them Sudharaasa and Rasnaa Vilnas. [Dinkar, p. 391] Aurangzeb was born and brought up in a liberal atmosphere like his brother Dara Shikoh, who translated sections of Upanishads into Persian under the title Upnikhat. However, later in his life he (Aurangzeb) accepted Sheikh Saiufuddin Sirhindhi as his spiritual guru. [Dinkar, p. 627] Sheikh Saiufuddin was the grandson of Sheikh Ahmed Sirhindhi (1562-1624 AD), of the Naqshbandiyya order of Sufis, who waged a bitter struggle against the secular and liberal policies of Akbar. This order traditionally preached sectarian hatred, unlike the more popular orders, Chishtiyya of the north and Qadriyya of the Deccan.

It is clear that the Moghul royals, within a generation of coming into India, became comfortable speakers of medieval Hindi. Originally they were Turkish speakers who were bilingual in Persian, the latter being the court language. After settling down in India, they gave up Turkish and adopted Hindi with alacrity but retained Persian as the court language. They had to perforce use Hindi (and Nagari script) as the language of lower administration and business transaction, since even the bulk of their Muslim subjects and the entire Hindu populace did not speak any Persian. So in this bilingual state the elite knew Persian but the lingua franca was medieval Hindi.

Origin of Urdu

It would be pertinent to explore the origin of Dakhkini-Urdu (Dakhkini is a Sanskritic word meaning “Southern”). The descendants of the Muslim invaders who settled around Delhi acquired the lingua franca of the region, Khadi Boli, to which they added some of their own vocabulary. Khadi Boli had reached the Deccan even earlier through trade, Sufi-Bhakti saints, and invading Muslim armies from North India. But the decision of Mohammad Bin Tughlaq to shift his capital to Daulatabad in Deccan (1327 AD) led to a substantial shift of population from Delhi region to Deccan and brought Khadi Boli (also known as Hindavi) to the Deccan in a very big way. Ramdhari Singh Dinkar (ibid.), among others, like Suniti Kumar Chatterji and R.S. McGregor, holds that it was Hindavi of the North that started being written in the Arabic Nastaliq script in the Deccan and at that moment Dakhkini-Urdu was born. Earlier in the seventh century this script had been imposed on Persian when Islam conquered Persia and banned the original Avestan script. In the Indian Deccan the Arabic script was not imposed by force of arms, but just adopted by the Muslim rulers who systematically developed the language and its literature. These liberal rulers left other scripts and languages of the region, Marathi and Telugu, free. Yet the inescapable question arises—why did the liberal Sultans give patronage to the Arabic script, when a script much more suitable for an Indian language was available at hand? The inescapable answer is—they did so because the Arabic script was the one that was used in their religious books. Khan (1987) writes:

The Hindavi of the north… became the language of administration and transaction in the Bahmani kingdom. From this evolved the Dakhani language or the Urdu of Deccan.

Then it is not surprising that all the works that are considered as early specimens of Urdu were written in the Deccan. Dinkar notes that the writers of Dakhkini-Urdu used Persian meters. However, Persian and Arabic words were sparingly used and the themes were rooted in the local culture. He has reproduced some fine specimens of these early works. [Dinkar, p. 385] Both Dinkar and Khan have rightly attributed the origin of Dakhkini-Urdu to the syncretic culture of Hindus and Muslims flourishing in the Bahamani kingdom.

The earliest work of poetry in Dakhkini-Urdu has been attributed to Ibrahim Adil Shah (1571-1626 AD) followed by other Deccan rulers—Mohammad Kuli Kutub Shah, Sultan Mohammad Kutub Shah, Sultan Abdul Kutub Shah and Abul Hasan Tana Shah. Wali Dakhni (1668-1744 AD) of Aurangabad is widely regarded as the first poet of Dakhkini-Urdu who brought his poetry to Aurangzeb’s court. [Dinkar, p. 383] These writers successfully adapted Persian metres to Dakhkini-Urdu. Ibrahim Adil Shah wrote the following invocation to his Nauras Nama which is a commentary on nine Rasas or moods of Natya Shastra, a treatise on dramatics written in Sanskrit:

\[ \text{[Saraswati and Ganesh are (like) mother and father/you] } \]
are like transparent crystals.]

Here the title Nauras Nama is a mixture of Sanskrit and Persian, and the poetry is rich in Sanskrit words. The language reflects the composite culture of the Adil Shahi times. To begin with, poet Wali Dakhini wrote in Dakhkini-Urdu. [Dinkar, p. 385]

But another event as important as Tughlaq’s decision to shift the capital southwards happened during Wali’s lifetime: In 1686 AD Aurangzeb decided to establish in Aurangabad (in present Maharashtra) his centre for the long-drawn Deccan wars. Now the Northern establishment came in prolonged contact with Dakhkini-Urdu. Wali himself visited Delhi twice (1690 AD and 1724 AD), where he impressed the Mughul court with his poetry. It is now necessary to trace the evolution of the atmosphere of the Mughul court since Akbar’s liberal times. Iqbal Khan (1987) says:

As a result of Mongol (Mughul) invasion of Central Asia, large numbers of the Ulims (priests, theologians) migrated to India. They were followers of the Sunni faith and in matters of Figh held extremist views. On arriving here they compelled the Sultans of Delhi not to treat Hindus as Zimmis, because that treatment is permissible only towards the people of the Book (Koran).

There was a long-drawn tussle between the liberal and the orthodox elements in the Mughul court. Naqshbandiya Sufi order of Sirhind opposed Akbar’s liberal policies. Abul Fazal, Akbar’s court historian, author of Ain-I-Akbari and translator of Bhagavad Geeta, was murdered. The struggle continued through the reign of Jahangir and Shah Jahan. The orthodoxy opposed Dara Shikoh’s claim to the throne and backed Aurangzeb. Later he became a murid (disciple) of Sheikh Safiuddin Sirhindi of Naqshbandiya order. In Iqbal Khan’s (1987) words,

The orthodox elements’ final triumph came with the ascension of Aurangzeb to the throne... Islamic fundamentalism and reaction now reigned supreme. It was in this atmosphere that Urdu...arrived in Delhi in the person of poet Wali Dakhini. Urdu was literally usurped by the ruling classes and reshaped... All that was genuinely Indian in its make up was suppressed... It now emerged as the language of the Muslim...

The orthodoxy looked down upon the Indian vernacular as the language of the infidel and was pro-Persian in language style. At the same time they realised that Persian can never become a popular language in India. They took interest in Wali Dakhini’s works because they saw in it the successful adaptation of a local language that would lend itself to Persianisation and can be a vehicle of orthodox thoughts. [Dinkar, p. 386] There Shah Gulshan, an elderly and respectable poet of Persian, advised Wali to use Persian words in his works. Wali followed the advice and started excluding vernacular words and replacing them with Persian ones. But he was not completely successful as shown by Dinkar, who has quoted a verse written by Wali, after his transformation. There was a similar attempt by Faiz, one of the earliest Urdu poets of the North and a contemporary of Wali, to Persianise the vernacular but he too could not write consistently in that artificial medium. [Dinkar, p. 386]

Hence the pronouns, verbs, the syntax and grammar of the vernacular had to be retained in good measure. The nouns, adjectives, idioms and metaphors of Indian origin were sought to be expelled as far as possible. Dinkar calls this policy “Matrikaat ya Bahishkaar ki Niti”. [Dinkar, p. 385] It should be noted that Persian of the Moghul era had already been thoroughly Arabised in the prior six centuries of its post-Islamic phase. So in effect the process of Persianisation resulted in Perso-Arabisation of Urdu. Dakhkini-Urdu acquired some Telugu, Marathi and Gujarati influences. All these were systematically purged along with the Sanskrit ones. Thus emerged the Northern Urdu, which is the present form of Urdu, from the womb of Dakhkini-Urdu.

Some exceptions like Noor Mohammad, the last prominent Sufi-style writer of Hindi and the court poet of Mohammad Shah, resisted this change. [Shukla, pp. 73-76] A scholar of Persian he was equally at ease with the traditions of Hindi literature. He used a very mature language with many words directly from Sanskrit. His major contributions include Indrawati and Anurang Bamsuri: the former was considered by Shukla to be the last great work in Sufi-style. It seems that he was often condemned for writing in Hindi despite being Muslim by birth! But instead of withdrawing he consistently defended his choice of themes and medium of expression in his works. In one place he writes:

जानते हैं वह सिरजन हारा। जो खिचू है मनहुँमसा। शिंधू मन पर पव ह न होलें। का जो भूती हिंदी भालें।

[He (the Creator) alone knows what is there in my mind.
I have not stepped on the Hindi threshold.
What if I have written in Hindi.]

But his was a fight for a lost cause. But this did not deter him from expressing himself freely in the medium of his choice. What else can one expect from one who drew inspiration from the grand syncretic Sufi masters of yore? It has been the misfortune of Urdu and North India that an eminent poet like Nazir Akbarabadi was ostracised because he used a lot of native words and themes. [Ref: Dinkar, p. 388] Jameel, a popular twentieth century Urdu poet, has expressed his anguish over the Persianisation of Urdu, an Indian language, in the following verse:

Kije na Jameel Urdu ka singaar, iram mene talmeedoone se pelmgii
bideshi geti kyon ye beti Bharat Matii ki?

[Ref: Dinkar, p. 624]
Sectarian Nationalism and Linguistic Exclusion Principle

Ghosh (1984) surveyed European and Indian history to see if there is a pattern in various religious conflicts from the time of the Crusades and found a strong interplay between religion and nationalism in certain cultures. He defined a new generic category called ‘Sectarian Nationalism’ as a brand of nationalism which in the initial phase is forged around the communal identity of a religious sect. Later in a more mature phase it spreads to individuals, groups and organisations which are secular and even atheist. In this connection he defined the Linguistic Exclusion Principle as follows:

Loyalty to a language and its script is often an important ingredient of nationalism. Therefore a sectarian nationalist seeks to restrict language and literature artificially so as to serve the narrow purpose of his sect. At the same time he attempts to exclude other people who are adherents of other religions but inhabit the same geographical area or land; this is a kind of Linguistic Exclusion Principle applied in the sphere of religion. This will be denoted in abbreviation by LEP hereafter.

The Two-Nation Theory, that led to the partition of India in 1947, posits a kind of nationalism for Indian Muslims which belongs to the category of Sectarian Nationalism. Zionism of the European Jews also falls in this category. And both have much to do with LEP. The process by which LEP led to Sectarian Nationalism in Indian Muslims will be dealt with in Part One of this article. Zionism will be discussed in Part Two.

The Process

To start with, there is a religious community which has a tendency to impose the script of its scripture on a language unrelated to the scripture. Then the process starts and develops in three phases. In the first phase, the fundamentalist clergy (Ulema) and the sectarian Sufi (such as Naqshbandiyya) provide inspiration for the separate sectarian identity to the “people of the Book” (Zimmi). A pitched battle starts between the sectarians and the liberals within the religious community. Sectarians are better organised and scatter the liberals easily. Political formations take shape which reflect the victory of the sectarians, and the attitude towards the people of other faiths hardens.

This leads, in the second phase, to the creation of an artificial language, such as the post-Aurangzeb form of Urdu. For example, poet Mirza Ghalib employs eight metaphors to describe something so typically Indian as a roasted betel nut ande yet seven out of eight metaphors are foreign. [Khan 1987] Sanskritic/Dravidian nouns, adjectives and phrases are replaced by Arbi/Farsi ones. In Khan’s (1987) words, “…All that was genuinely Indian in its make up….was suppressed and purged from it (Urdu).” Here we see the Linguistic Exclusion Principle in full flow. Hindus are sought to be excluded from the language and its literature, and Urdu emerges as the language of the Muslim. This phase of creation of an artificial language and a sectarian culture spans centuries.

In the third phase, the LEP, which remains quietly at work in a subterranean fashion, succeeds in creating a sectarian identity which now infects even those members of the community who are modern and reformist (and also those who are religious and non-believers at times). There is a gap of centuries between the initial inspiration provided by the fundamentalists and the modernist intellectuals falling prey to a sectarian culture. At that point in time they are not aware of the historical process that has shaped their attitude. They oppose fundamentalism in the name of modernism but glorify Sectarian Nationalism all the same. Thus religious fundamentalism gives birth to Sectarian Nationalism in which the LEP plays the role of a midwife.

It is not Islamic fundamentalism but the Sectarian Nationalism embedded in the Two-Nation Theory that created Pakistan. Mohammad Ali Jinnah, the supreme leader of the Muslim League and known as the Father of the Pakistani Nation, was a modern and religious man. He opposed religious fundamentalism in his speeches and writings. But he firmly believed that the Muslims of India were a separate nation and linked that nationhood to Urdu [Gandhi 2000]; otherwise why would he desperately try to impose Urdu on the Bengali Muslims of East Pakistan? And when he failed in this, he even tried to impose the Arabic script on the Bengali language. However, the West Pakistani people accepted Urdu as the national language precisely for the same reason, that is, they believed their nationhood to be inseparably linked to Urdu. (Noorani 2004) They do
not have, for instance, Punjabi as the official language of the Punjab province, because Punjabi is not exclusively for the Muslims; it belongs to Hindus and Sikhs as well, whereas Urdu belongs solely to the Muslims. That is the dominant perception anyhow, whether or not some Sikhs used to learn Urdu. The poet laureate of Urdu, Mohammad Iqbal, who was the first to propound the Two-Nation Theory, was a modernist individual opposed to religious fundamentalism. He was an ardent social reformer. In his ‘Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam’, he wrote:

The claim of the present generation of Muslim liberals to reinterpret the foundational legal principles, in the light of their own experience and the altered conditions of modern life is, in my opinion, perfectly justified.

It should now be clear why it is necessary to distinguish between religious fundamentalism and Sectarian Nationalism.

Conclusion

To conclude, we can say that the claim that Urdu was the language of composite culture in North India is both historically and linguistically erroneous. In fact it became the vehicle of Muslim sectarian culture in its post-Aurangzeb incarnation. As shown above, the present (Northern) version of Urdu was created by deliberately expelling words, idioms and phrases of Indian origin and imposing Persio-Arabic vocabulary on Dakhini-Urdu on religious grounds. So, it was Urdu that was imposed on people on communal grounds and not Hindi. Medieval Hindi is the mother of both Urdu and Hindi. Moghul emperors and their kith and kin were fluent speakers of medieval Hindi and wrote poetry in it. They were bilingual in Persian and Hindi and so was their administration. Urdu arrived in the Moghul court in Aurangzeb’s time and triggered the bifurcation of language and culture of Hindus and Muslims. Urdu prose first appeared in a crude form in 1732 in the Dakh Majlis of Fazli, and matured in the early nineteenth century. [Dinkar, pp. 392, 395] Hindi developed the prose form very early (fourteenth to sixteenth century) and continued her own journey without any break. She grew to maturity with the prose of Niranjan in 1741, as mentioned before. [Dinkar, pp. 392-393] Modern Hindi descended from medieval Hindi through natural evolution. It was not developed as an alternative to Urdu in the nineteenth century, contrary to the claim of Shahabuddin. (2004b)

Khan (1987) attributes Partition of India to the religious fundamentalism of Muslims. He does not explain the fact that the leading lights of the Pakistan movement, M.A. Jinnah, M. Iqbal and Liaqat Ali Khan, were all modernists and against fundamentalism. The category of Sectarian Nationalism, defined by Ghosh (1994), solves this paradox. However, Khan (1987) correctly and explicitly links Urdu to Partition. Dinkar (1956, p. 396) too asserted that Urdu had become a vehicle of thoughts of the Muslim community alone; this implied that the language issue had become as divisive as the religion between Hindus and Muslims. It is Urdu, and the Linguistic Exclusion Principle embedded in it, that gave rise to Sectarian Nationalism among Indian Muslims, and hence Urdu should be held responsible for contributing much to the many-faceted and complex phenomenon called Partition of India. The Urdu University Bill, just passed by the Assembly of Uttar Pradesh, has been referred to the Governor, as per the rule. In the light of the discussion above, the Governor should ponder over the political fall-out of the Bill and seek opinions of scholars of the history of Indian languages before giving his assent.
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FOOTNOTES

1. Is it mere coincidence that the spiritual guru of poet Iqbal, who long before Jinnah raised the demand for Pakistan in his presidential address at the 1930 Lahore session of Muslim League, also belonged to the tradition of Sheikh Ahmed Sirhindi of Naqshbandiyya order? [Ref: Dinkar, pp. 335, 605] In late twentieth and early twenty-first century this order is active in Afghanistan and Central Asia and collaborates with the Taliban Wahhabis.

2. The word Brahami is derived from Sanskrit Brahmana. Jafar Khan, who founded the Brahami kingdom in 1347, prefixed Gangu Braham to his name to show his reverence for his Brahman colleague, Gangu. [Ref: Dinkar, p. 384] Brahaman, Braham etc. are colloquial forms of Brahman still in vogue in many parts of the country.