

REVIEW ARTICLE

CHRISTOPHER R. KING. *One Language, Two Scripts: The Hindi Movement in Nineteenth Century North India*. Bombay: Oxford University Press, 1994. 232 pp. Rs. 375.

SEVERAL RECENT STUDIES have questioned the hitherto prevalent opinion regarding different aspects of nationalism in South Asia.¹ They have also sought to reevaluate the historiography of the national movement in India. Christopher King's book would appear to be very much a part of this new wave of scholarship, as it suggests an alternative to the received opinion on nationalism and communalism in colonial India.

King differs from the "mainstream" view in that he does not believe the partition of British India to be the work of the "villainous" partisans of the Urdu language. Instead, he proposes the Hindi movement itself as the motivating force behind Hindu communal consciousness in pre-independence India. He emphasizes that the movement "not only expressed but reinforced" a communal awareness which culminated in the creation of Pakistan in 1947. King thus challenges the positions that authors Suniti Kumar Chatterji and Amrit Rai have taken in regard to Urdu.¹ He does not find it necessary to look for elements of divisiveness

¹The more notable among them include: Stanley Wolpert, *Jinnah of Pakistan* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), Ayesha Jalal, *The Sole Spokesman: Jinnah, the Muslim League, and the Demand for Pakistan* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), Sudhir Chandra, *The Oppressive Present: Literature and Social Consciousness in Colonial India* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1992) and Amiya P. Sen, *Hindu Revivalism in Bengal, 1872-1905: Some Essays in Interpretation* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1993). These authors suggest important departures from our established thinking on the national movement in India. While Wolpert and Jalal challenge the orthodox opinions on the politics of partition of India, Chandra and Sen offer a different interpretation of the role of ideas in the development of nationalism and communalism in colonial India.

¹Both Chatterji, in his *Indo-Aryan and Hindi* (Ahmedabad: Gujarat Vernacular Society, 1942), and Rai, in his *A House Divided: The Origin and Development of Hindi/Hindavi*, (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1984), consider

in eighteenth-century Indian society, religions, or languages.² On the contrary, he asserts that the Hindi movement in the nineteenth century consciously distinguished people in terms of religion and language and determined a language on the basis of its script and vocabulary, rather than such linguistic characteristics as grammar or syntax.

King seems to be a little puzzled by the modern Indian nation where extraordinary cultural and linguistic diversity continues to exist within a single political system. However, he observes that events like the creation of Pakistan in 1947, the inauguration of linguistic states in 1955, the anti-Hindi agitations in south India in 1965, the emergence of a Punjabi province in 1966, and the birth of Bangladesh in 1971 all confirm the view that religion and language have had, and continue to have, enormous influence on developments in South Asia. Like Paul Brass, he too therefore applies the somewhat obsolete and clearly inadequate theory of Karl

Urdu a significant deviation in the Indian language tradition. They see it as marked by religion and a predominantly Persio-Arabic vocabulary, and think the very nature of Urdu led to the rise of separatist tendencies among its speakers. However, Chatterji later (1962) revised his opinion and observed that Urdu was not responsible for the creation of Pakistan because it was not a language natural to the people of South Asia. It was unnatural even to the people of Pakistan, for in East Pakistan the natural language was Bengali, and in West Pakistan people were more at ease with Punjabi, Hindko, Sindhi, Pashtu, Balochi, and Brahui. However, he did grant that literary Urdu was essential for the development of Hindi, because it served as a guide and model for present-day literary Hindi. (See his *Languages and Literatures of Modern India* [Calcutta: Bengal Publishers, 1963], pp. 154–55.)

²Chatterji and Rai see a “cultural divide” growing in Indian society in the eighteenth century largely because of Urdu. Both are true followers in the tradition of European scholars and therefore both applied historical linguistics in order to understand the development of languages in India. They consider languages natural, organic systems whose synchronic and diachronic developments are to be understood according to scientific principles. The development and change in a language is to be observed in terms of its component sub-systems: phonology, morphology, syntax, lexicon, and script. They rely on literary texts, particularly *bhakti* poetry, as the data for their historical reconstructions. They see in *bhakti* and *ṣūfi* poetry a unity and continuity with the past. This tradition continues without a break into modern times (Rai calls this unified language tradition “Hindi”) until it is seriously disrupted in the eighteenth century with the development of Urdu. What we have here is the application of an unabashed double-standard by Chatterji and Rai to understand the development of the two languages—Urdu and Hindi. And they allow distortions of history to dominate their analyses and understanding.

Deutsch to nationalism in India,³ thus producing an argument which can be viewed as reductionist. Nevertheless, King's application of Deutsch's theory to the South Asia experience compels attention. The incontrovertible historical facts and evidence that King has packed into his study should be of great use in reconstructing certain aspects of nationalism and communalism in north India.

King's study begins with an account of the conscious attempt made at the College of Fort William in the early nineteenth century to differentiate languages in terms of script and vocabulary.⁴ The college was established to provide instruction in Indian affairs to British civil servants. Its courses included, among others, instruction in "classical" Indian languages and the "vernaculars," such as Tamil, Telugu, Marathi, Bengali, and "Hindustani." Since no suitable textual materials existed for the "vernaculars," the college decided to develop its own textbooks. Although "Hindustani" ("Khari Boli") had a vibrant prose tradition, this prose was essentially literary and often suffistic in nature; hence, it was quite unsuitable for the instruction of bureaucrats. Four *munshis* (authors) were therefore engaged to write books in "Hindustani." Two different scripts—Perso-Arabic and Nagari—were used. The texts compiled under this scheme replaced more formal Perso-Arabic words with either Sanskrit synonyms, or Sanskrit-based local, less formal words and phrases. King states that there was also a parallel move to introduce words of Perso-Arabic or Sanskrit origin into "Hindustani," and supports his statement with a quote from Gilchrist, the famous compiler of the *Hindustani-English Dictionary* (1798). While there can be little doubt that the attempt was made at this time to divide a single language—"Hindustani"—into the two categories of Urdu and "Hindi" on the basis of script and vocabulary, the British certainly made no attempt to extend this distinction to

³Karl Deutsch's theory, however, has been shown to be both insignificant and inadequate by E.J. Hobsbawm, who observes that the formation of a nation is a complex phenomenon and simply cannot be limited to the means of communication only. See his *Nation and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), p. 3.

⁴Rai, however, thinks differently. According to him (*op. cit.*, p. 285), a clear divide in the language of north India started developing a hundred years before the establishment of the College of Fort William. Rai here adopts the ways and means of a propagandist to show that Urdu as a language was divisive and parochial. The weaknesses in his theory are analyzed by David Lelyveld in his "Zubān-e-Urdū-e Mu'alla and the Idol of Linguistic Origins," in *The Annual of Urdu Studies*, 9 (1994): 107–17.

religion or to the social implications of text production in “Hindi.”

However, King does not apply methods of historical linguistics to demonstrate conscious deviations which the British had introduced in the extant traditions of the “Hindustani” language.⁵ He records bare facts to support his analyses and arguments, but quite fails to tell us how the language of north India (i.e., Urdu) came to be called “Hindustani.” G.A. Grierson reports that the Europeans described the language spoken in India as “Indostani” or “Hindustani,”⁶ and Robert N. Cust informs us that the early Europeans in India found that “Hindustani” was spoken all over the Indian subcontinent.⁷ However, their identification of a spoken language of India notwithstanding, the problem of the script of this spoken language continued to puzzle the early Europeans. They had the hardest time believing that both the Hindus and Muslims wrote the language in a script that was similar to, or even derived from, the Perso-Arabic script. They were convinced, as per their perception of Indian society in general, that the Hindus must have a separate and distinct script. Their search for a script other than Perso-Arabic led them nowhere. This is precisely the reason why the Serampore missionaries opted for the Roman script in their early discourses aimed at preaching Christianity among the Indian peoples.⁸

It is thus that Modern “Hindi”—the new variant of “Hindustani”—lacked a distinct past, which led its spokesmen to look for, and ultimately to claim, a consistent and continuous past for it in the traditions of Khari Boli.⁹ King points out that the champions of this

⁵King substantiates his arguments with facts and evidence. He does not create or support myths to arrive at tendentious conclusions. Here he is supported by several linguists, the most noteworthy among them being John Beames, for whose position on the subject, see his *A Comparative Grammar of the Modern Aryan Languages of India*, (London: Trubner & Co., 1872–79; reprint, Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1966), pp. 31–34.

⁶Cf. his *Linguistic Survey of India*, Vol. I, Part I (Calcutta: Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing, 1927), p. 4.

⁷See his *A Sketch of the Modern Languages of the East Indies* (London: Trubner & Co., 1878), p. 47.

⁸The Nagari script was used for writing Sanskrit and therefore its use must have been restricted to a particular caste of the Hindus. See Grierson, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, Part I, Intro., and Vol. VIII, Part I; see also Cust, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

⁹This intention is clearly discernible in the writings of all those who sought to provide a well-known tradition for the “new” Hindi. See, for instance,

“new” Hindi aspired to set it up as a rival of the Urdu language, which led them to appropriate for it the linguistic traditions of Urdu itself. Modern “Hindi,” a language without any roots, thus came to claim for its antecedents the traditions of Khari Boli.

There is, however, another reason for all this appropriation: the anxiety of the inventors of this variant of “Hindustani” not only to displace Urdu as the language of “Hindustan” but also to establish the hegemony of this “new” language-form over the other new Indo-Aryan (henceforward, NIA) languages.¹⁰ This is evident in the following comment of A.N. Ghatage:

On the whole the impression is provided that the best way to understand the interrelation of phonologies of the NIA languages is to imagine them as having a centre in the central region from which radiations in all directions have followed; with innovations and individualities increasing along with the distance from the centre.¹¹

Conscious of the need to claim the supremacy of this language-form over the other NIA languages, the advocates of the “new” Hindi quite naturally related it directly with an area-dialect that was central to the subcontinent. Thus, they conveniently appropriated the Khari Boli tradi-

Dhirendra Varmā, *Hindībhāṣā kā Itihāsa* (Ilāhābād: Hindustānī Academy, 1933), and for a recent exposition of this trend, Rai, *op cit.*

¹⁰The partisans of “new” Hindi wanted to locate the alleged traditions of this new language in the geographical area which had been prominent in Indian history through the ages. This was the *madhyadeśa*, and the dialect spoken there was, according to them, Khari Boli. This idea is evident in the writings of Suniti Kumar Chatterji (an echo of which can also be heard in Amrit Rai), who, for instance, writes :

The basis of Hindu (i.e., mixed Austric-Mongoloid-Dravidian-Aryan) culture was laid in the tract known as the *Madhya-desa* (i.e. the Midland) early in the first millennium B.C., and this tract comprised the present East Punjab and Western U.P., and it formed the centre or heart of Aryandom as well. The speech of this area quite early became the vehicle of Hindu culture. Being the language of the Midland, it appears to have been more easily understood by Aryan speakers of the outlying tracts. In successive ages, this speech obtained a wide currency, both as a culture language and as a communication speech. (*Op cit.*, p. 119)

¹¹*Historical Linguistics and Indo-Aryan Languages* (Bombay: University of Bombay, 1962), p. 148.

tion which was central to the Indian subcontinent in terms of its history, geography, and cultural production.

After constructing an imagined past for the “new” Hindi, its advocates launched a campaign proclaiming that literature can only be written in the “Khari Boli” or “new” Hindi. This they did in two stages. In the first stage, they sought to establish the view whereby prose could only be written in “new” Hindi. This view gradually gained currency between 1824 and 1885 (Bhartendu Harishchandra died in 1885¹²). During these years, several “new” Hindi texts came into circulation and received wide acceptance. In the course of the first stage, the advocates of “new” Hindi not only claimed its superiority for prose writing, but also sought to demonstrate the Indian origin and character of the language by distinguishing it from Urdu, which they described as a language of foreign origin.

This development entered into its second stage in the last decade of the nineteenth century. Appeals were now made for people to write even poetry in the “new” Hindi. The protagonists of this “Hindi” labored to devalue, and ultimately rejected, poetry in Braj Bhasha and its sister dialects. It was claimed that poetry of the best sort could only be written in “Khari Boli” or “new” Hindi. Mahavir Prasad Dwivedi, for example, asserted the supremacy of “Khari Boli” as the medium of poetry in vigorous terms, so that “[b]y 1914,” writes King in the work under review, “the Hindi literary world had accepted Khari Boli as the most important, though not the only, vehicle of Hindi poetry, and the opposition to the new medium had become united. With the beginning of *Chayavad* (“Romantic”) movement in Hindi literature, a series of highly talented poets established Khari Boli as the medium of Hindi poetry once and for all...” (p. 36).

King cites three reasons for the eventual triumph of “Khari Boli” Hindi as the medium of Hindi poetry. First, “Khari Boli” Hindi had by this time accumulated an extensive literature in prose. North Indian Hindu nationalists did not therefore hesitate in accepting “Khari Boli” Hindi as the most appropriate candidate for a national language. Second, “Khari Boli” Hindi had no tradition of religious or erotic poetry (or even prose, for that matter), so it was considered a convenient vehicle for ex-

¹²On Harishchandra and his efforts on behalf of the fledgling “new” Hindi, see Sagaree Sengupta, “Kṛṣṇa the Cruel Beloved: Hariścandra and Urdu,” in *The Annual of Urdu Studies*, 9 (1994): 133–52. [—Eds.]

pressing “secular” themes. Lastly, after Dwivedi’s successful attempt at Sanskritizing “Khari Boli” Hindi, no one could seriously oppose the new literary medium on the ground that it threatened to become Urdu.

King somehow fails to adduce another extremely significant explanation for this phenomenon. It is to be found in two kinds of crises generated in the Indian literary environment by the impact of the British. The colonial experience had become entrenched in the consciousness of the Indians by the second half of the nineteenth century. Most of them, like their colonial masters, felt that their social, economic, and cultural backwardness was the result of their humiliating past. As such, two very different kinds of efforts came into play. Some tried to deny or underplay the past; others attempted to glorify the ancient past at the cost of the immediate past. These reactions were expressed within the two distinct literary mediums of “Hindustani.” While the Urdu literary establishment disdained its past,¹³ the advocates of the “new” Hindi freely propagated myths to construct a glorious past situated far back in time.¹⁴ The ideas put into circulation by the “new” Hindi movement were more conducive to the purposes of both colonialists and nationalists. The colonial government was pleased to find support from a group of people willing to thrash their immediate past and welcome the present. The nationalist leaders were happy because the “new” Hindi movement gave them a reason not to feel humiliated about their present. The “Khari Boli” Hindi movement was therefore bound to succeed in north India from the outset.

King observes that Sanskritized “Khari Boli” Hindi went through a process of assimilation and differentiation to establish its supremacy among the languages of India. It particularly distinguished and distanced itself from Urdu, and gradually arrived at the point where it could set itself up as the “national language” of India. This form of “Hindi” not only undermined the position of Braj Bhasha as the literary medium, but also proceeded to claim other languages then in circulation in north India as

¹³S.R. Faruqi has discussed the attitudes of the nineteenth-century Urdu theorists, mainly Hali and Azad, in his numerous Urdu writings. Also see his paper “Constructing a Literary History, a Canon, and a Theory of Poetry: *Ab-e Hayat* (1880) by Muhammad Hasan Azad (1831–1910),” forthcoming in *Social Scientist*.

¹⁴This spirit is evident in most of the writings of the supporters of “new” Hindi, for which see Sudhir Chandra, *op. cit.*, Chapter III; and Chatterji, *op. cit.*, p. 135–41.

its “dialects.” That a tendency towards this is evident in the report of Grierson¹⁵ is proof enough of the colonialist nature of the process of “Hindification” of India. However, in tracing the details of this development, King does not note the efforts of Allahabad University to establish a “genuine past” for Sanskritized “Khari Boli” Hindi and to construct the case that all other north Indian languages were somehow dialects of this “Hindi.”¹⁶ The ideas purveyed by the Hindi and Sanskrit departments of Allahabad University colored the thinking of successive generations of students and scholars alike in favor of the “new” Hindi. Bundelkhandi, Avadhi, Bhojpuri, and Magadhi lost their identity early in this game, but were allowed, somewhat grudgingly and late in the day, a regional and subservient character.

The “new” form of Hindi quickly made use of the benefits of modern technology, particularly the printing press, and thus extended its appeal and claims far and wide. After 1868, the number of publications in Sanskritized Hindi began to rise, so that by 1925 books, journals, and periodicals in the Nagari script far exceeded those in the Perso-Arabic script. However, this trend is not evident in the circulation of newspapers. Urdu newspapers continued to dominate the scene, which clearly indicates Urdu’s popularity among the general literate population of Uttar Pradesh (henceforward, U.P.), and points to the artificial character of “Khari Boli” Hindi.

The struggle for the supremacy of Sanskritized “Khari Boli” Hindi received full support from the British government. By 1900 it had received recognition as a language for official use along with Urdu in U.P. It continued to gain in strength because of the support of the government as well as the efforts of such institutions as the Nāgarī Pracāriṇī Sabhā and the Hindī Sāhitya Sammelan, neither of which made any bones about identifying Hindi with Hindus. Chapters 3 and 4 of Christopher King’s book delineate the thinking and role of the British government towards evolving a language policy that was ultimately sympathetic to Hindi, and Chapter 5 describes the efforts of non-government institutions and people in setting up Hindi as the national language of India.

¹⁵Vol. I, Part I.

¹⁶To name just a few of such efforts by Allahabad University scholars: Dharendra Varmā, *op cit.*; Baburam Saksena, *Evolution of Awadhi (A Branch of Hindi)* (Allahabad: The Indian Press, Ltd., 1937); and Shardadevi Vedalkar, *The Development of Hindi Prose Literature in the Early Nineteenth Century, 1800–1856 A.D.* (Allahabad: Lokharti Publications, 1969).

Towards the second quarter of the nineteenth century, the British government suddenly became conscious of the need to make itself more relevant to the people. It therefore decided to replace Persian with Urdu as the official language so that the people could freely approach the government with their petitions. This situation continued till 1870, when government officials again became concerned about the common language of the people. In the 1880s, the governments of Bihar and the Central Provinces decided to allow official work to be conducted in Hindi written in the Nagari script. The Devanagari script was allowed to replace the two scripts—Perso-Arabic and Kaithi (which King calls a variant of Nagari¹⁷)—then extensively in use. It was also introduced in the schools throughout these provinces, but no one wanted it, because it was of no practical use to anyone. Instead, people continued to use the Kaithi script. Attendance in schools using the Devanagari script for instruction continued to be low and the government was forced to reconsider the issue of the scripts. At this time, criticism of the Kaithi script gained momentum. Supporters of the Nagari script aggressively pointed out that Kaithi was not just hard to read but was also phonetically inad-

¹⁷King considers Kaithi to be a variant of the Devanagari script because of stylistic similarities. In fact, there have been several scripts in circulation in India at different periods, and although there might exist some similarities in these different scripts, it is difficult to agree that these scripts have a single origin. It is difficult to find evidence to say that the Kaithi or Mahajani scripts are variants of Devanagari. What is certain is that Sanskrit was written in the Devanagari script from an early time, but as Indian society was hierarchical by nature, this script probably distinguished a caste. Some modern-day commentators have associated scripts with particular castes or occupational groups. Grierson thinks that Kaithi was used by the Kayasthas and therefore it was also called “kayasthi.” Kuar Lachman Singh writes that the Devanagari script was brought into use by the Nagar Brahmins of Gujarat. He adds that the Kayasthas cannot be treated on a par with the other higher castes because they were forbidden to use the Nagari script. The Kayasthas, according to him, should be treated as Sudras because they wrote in the Kaithi script (see his *Historical and Statistical Memoir of Zila Bulandshahar* [Allahabad: North-Western Provinces’ Government Press, 1874], p. 150 [for Nagar Brahmins] and pp. 178–79 [for the Kayasthas]). However, it is a fact that Kaithi was a popular script in rural north India up to the nineteenth century. It was because of this that Sher Shah Suri accompanied all his Persian declarations with translations in local languages of the areas written out in the Kaithi script. Kaithi was apparently used in matters related to the villages. Literature, however, was composed in the Persio-Arabic script. Most of the manuscripts that were put together by the Search Committee set up by the Nāgarī Pracāriṇī Sabhā were found to have been written in the Persio-Arabic script.

quate. In the wake of these criticisms, the government decided to improve the Kaithi script. In some areas, particularly in Avadh, significant improvements were introduced. Consequently, Kaithi became a more functional script. However, the efforts to improve the Kaithi script did not go far in either effect or duration, as the government policy suddenly veered in favor of Nagari-script Hindi as the official language of U.P. By 1900, “Khari Boli” Hindi written in the Nagari script had received official recognition in Bihar, the Central Provinces, and the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh. The supremacy of the Devanagari script over the other prevalent scripts was sealed by government fiat.

The government argued that it had accorded official recognition to “Khari Boli” Hindi because it wished to identify itself closely with the perceptions of people. This is unconvincing. In fact, by doing so the British government rather sought to effect a total break with the preceding Mughal (=Muslim) government. It appointed commissions to “rationalize” its educational and language policy; however, none of its efforts in this direction proved at all advantageous for the people. The fact of the matter is, all such moves led to further antagonism and conflict between Hindus (=Hindi) and Muslims (=Urdu).

The motivation underlying the British efforts to erect an alternative language-form and script is very clear from an instance quoted by King. In 1847, Dr. J.R. Ballantyne, then Principal of the English Department, Benaras College, was keen to develop a sensitivity for “Hindi” among his students. He introduced “Hindi” as a subject. This puzzled the students, who also felt quite resentful, and remarked:

“We do not clearly understand what you Europeans mean by the term Hindi, for there are hundreds of dialects, all in our opinion entitled to the name, and there is here no standard as there is in Sanskrit. ... If the purity of Hindi is to consist in its exclusion of Mussulman [i.e., Muslim] words, we shall require to study Persian and Arabic in order to ascertain which of the words we are in the habit of issuing everyday, is Arabic and Persian, and which is Hindi.”

Despite this clear signal from the people about the non-existence of “Hindi,” the British government continued in its efforts to establish it anyway, and to set up commissions to find ways to popularize the new-fangled language called “Hindi.” Although the findings of these commissions unequivocally indicated a lack of enthusiasm in the use of “Hindi,”

they still advocated its introduction in teaching institutions.

The efforts of the British government to popularize “Khari Boli” Hindi were strengthened by the Nagari-Hindi movement which had started in the late 1860s. This movement organized groups and individuals to demand political action for the recognition of “Hindi.” The movement transformed the question of the script into a cultural issue and tried to project “Nagari-Hindi” as the script and language of the Hindus. Voluble efforts were made to decry those Hindus who continued to use the Perso-Arabic script. It is interesting to note that until 1900, the “Hindi-Nagari” movement had, however, failed to draw a sizable number of Hindus away from the use of Urdu, but after “Hindi” received recognition as the official language of U.P., more and more Hindus started using the Nagari script. The nexus here between government patronage and language use is too evident to need any comment.

The Nāgarī Pracāriṇī Sabhā (1893) of Benaras spearheaded a movement to recognize “Nagari-Hindi” as the official language of the country. The Sabhā claimed that “Nagari-Hindi” had a long tradition and it was the mother-language of all modern Indian languages that had evolved from the Midland Apabhraṃśa. As such, it was *the* language and *the* script of the Hindus. After receiving government recognition for the use of Hindi as U.P.’s official language, the Sabhā next proceeded to fix its foundations in tradition. A committee was specially formed to search for and locate old manuscripts written in “Khari Boli” Hindi or its variants. As a result, most manuscripts originally written in the Perso-Arabic script were also claimed as part of the “Nagari-Hindi” heritage. The work of the Nāgarī Pracāriṇī Sabhā was extended by the Hindī Sāhitya Sammelan, established in 1910 in Allahabad. The Sammelan, going the Sabhā one better, demanded the recognition of “Hindi” at the national level. The fact that a large number of nationalist leaders were supporters or promoters of the Sammelan strengthened the case for “Nagari-Hindi” as the national language. Some individuals, particularly those associated with Hindu organizations, also pleaded the cause of “Nagari-Hindi.” Madan Mohan Malaviya took it upon himself to show the inadequacies of the Urdu script and alleged that it created more confusion than clarity.¹⁸

¹⁸Malaviya’s ideas on language are contained in his book *Court Characters and Primary Education in N.W.P. and Oudh* (Allahabad, 1897). Malaviya’s biases become clear from his conversations with Harcourt Butler, then governor of the

The “Nagari-Hindi” movement successfully related a language to a religion and worked up the ideal of “Hindi, Hindu, Hindustan.” Hindu movements launched in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries found good use for this ideal. The society was thus split up on the basis of language and religion, thanks to the success of the “Nagari-Hindi” movement. This movement also facilitated the birth of a culture that challenged the traditional, composite, culture of India. King rightly sees the movement as generating social and political divisions in Indian society. King must be commended for his insight that though the split was more for the sake of script, it made it easier for the Hindi-Hindu activists to add further distinctions based on religion. Thus, it is clear that “Hindi” created a loosely unified nation, not a coherent nation. It failed to symbolize for its speakers a real or imagined fortress of intellectual, literary, or cultural power.

—SUSHIL SRIVASTAVA
Allahabad University

United Provinces of Agra and Oudh. In 1918, Butler reported that Malaviya came to visit him and suggested that the Muslims might attempt to reconquer India from the British. He warned Butler that he must safeguard the territories of British India from the Afghans. See *Butler Papers* (microfilm) (New Delhi: Nehru Memorial Museum and Library).