**Western Hindi.**

The home of Western Hindi closely agrees with the Madhyadésa, or Midland, of ancient Sanskrit geographers. The Madhyadésa was the country between the Saraswati on the west and what is now Allahabad on the east. Its northern boundary was the Himalaya Range, and its southern the Narbada River. Between these limits lay, according to tradition, the holy land of Brahmanism. It was the centre of Hindú civilisation, and the abode on earth of its deities. Western Hindi does not extend so far east as Allahabad—its eastern limit is about Cawnpore,—but in other respects the area in which it is spoken is almost exactly the same as the Madhyadésa. It is spoken as a vernacular over the western portion of the United Provinces, in the eastern districts of the Panjab, in Eastern Rajputana, in Gwalior and Bundelkhand, and in the north-western districts of the Central Provinces. Moreover, its most important dialect, Hindostáni, is spoken and understood, and is even amongst some classes of the population a vernacular, over the whole of the Indian Peninsula.

Western Hindi has five dialects,—Hindostáni, Bángarü, Braj Bhákhá, Kanaúji, and Bundéli. Hindostáni, as a local vernacular, is spoken in Western Rohilkhand, the Upper Gangetic Dóáb, and the Panjab District of Ambala. It has also been carried over the whole of India by Musal-mán conquerors, and has received considerable literary culture. Under these conditions it has three main varieties, Literary Hindostáni proper, employed by both Musalmáns and Hindús for literary purposes and as a lingua franca; Urdú, employed chiefly by Musalmáns and by Hindús who have adopted the Musalmán system of education, and a modern development, called Hindi, employed only by Hindús who have been educated on a Hindú system. Urdú, itself, has two varieties, the standard literary form of Delhi and Lucknow, and the Dakhini, spoken, and used as a literary medium, by Musalmáns of Southern India.

Bángarü is the dialect of Western Hindi which is spoken in the Eastern Panjab. It is also called Jaṭú and Hariáni. It is much influenced by the neighbouring Rájastháni and Pañjábi.

Braj Bhákhá is the dialect of the west central Dóáb and the country to its north and to its south.

Kanaúji is really a form of Braj Bhákhá and is only given separate consideration in deference to popular opinion. It is spoken in the east central Dóáb and the country to its north.

Bundéli is spoken in Gwalior and Bundelkhand. It is also spoken in the adjoining districts of the Central Provinces.

All these dialects are described with considerable detail on the following pages, and it will suffice to give here the total estimated number of speakers of each—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hindiśáni</th>
<th>5,282,733</th>
<th>7,696,364</th>
<th>3,654,172</th>
<th>16,633,169</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Vernacular</td>
<td>5,282,733</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary Hindostáni (including Urdú and Hindi)</td>
<td>7,696,364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakhini</td>
<td>3,654,172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VOL. IX, PART I.**
This is about the same as the population of the United Kingdom in 1891 (38,104,975), and two-thirds of a million less than that of France at the present time (38,641,333). I roughly estimate the area in which it is spoken at about 200,000 square miles, with which we may compare the area of the German Empire (200,000), and that of France (204,000).

As explained in the Introductory Note, Western Hindi is the purest representative of that Group. It is directly derived from the Apabhramśa dialect corresponding to Śaurāṣṭrī, the most Sanskritic of all the Prakrits; it is spoken in the area which was the centre from which Aryan civilization was diffused over Hindostan; and the head-quarters of its principal dialect—Braj Bhākhā—is Mathurā,—the Madhavā ṣtōv στων of the Greeks, and in ancient times one of the most sacred cities of India.

Of the four languages which form the Central Group of Indo-Aryan vernaculars, Western Hindi is the one which is the most typical of the group. In fact, it would be more accurate, though more complicated, to describe it as being the only member of the group, the other three, Panjābī, Rājasthānī, and Gujarātī, being intermediate between it and the adjoining languages, Lahnda, Sindhi, and Marāthī, which belong to what I call the Outer Circle. These languages, Panjābī, Rājasthānī, and Gujarātī, lie to the west and south of Western Hindi. It is also to be remembered that to its east we have Eastern Hindi, another language which is intermediate between Western Hindi and the speeches of the Outer Circle. But these two sets of intermediate languages possess sharply opposed characteristics. Their respective bases are quite different. As has been explained in the introduction to Vol. VI of this Survey, pp. 3 and ff., Eastern Hindi is a language of the Outer Circle affected by the characteristics of the Central Group, while Panjābī, Rājasthānī, and Gujarātī are in all their chief characteristics members of the Central Group, and only show traces, which are more and more evident as we go westwards, of the influence of the Outer Circle. It would be most correct to class them as a distinct intermediate group of languages, but it is more convenient to consider them all together, with Western Hindi, as members of one group—the Central,—remembering that they do not possess all the true characteristics of that group in its purity.

The linguistic boundaries of Western Hindi are as follows:—On its north-west it is bounded by Panjābī, to its south-west and south lies Rājasthānī, to its south-east, Marāthī, and to its east, Eastern Hindi. On the north it is bounded by the Indo-Aryan dialects, Jaunsārī, Garhwāli, and Kumauni, of the lower southern slope of the Himalaya. It gradually shades off into Panjābī, Rājasthānī, and Eastern Hindi, but there is no intermediate dialect between it and Marāthī. Marāthī nowhere merges into the languages of the Central Group, but is separated from them by a sharp distinct line.
There are, it is true, a few tribal dialects which possess the characteristics of both Western Hindi and Marathi, but these are mere mechanical mixtures—broken jargons,—which are not true intermediate forms of speech. We may consider Marathi as being fully established in the Nagpur plain at the foot of the Satpura Range. The northern hill dialects are described in Part IV of this volume, and are closely connected with Rājasthāni.

Two characters are employed for writing Western Hindi,—the Persian for some forms of Hindōstānī, and the Devānāgarī (with its current hands the Kaithī and Mahājani) for the other dialects. Neither of them need be described here. In writing the dialects in the Devānāgarī character, an important irregularity is observed in the employment of the letter र ra. When this is followed, in Tadbhava words, by the letter यu or य wa, it does not take the form रा. Such compounds are written य रा and य रा, respectively. Thus (Braj Bhākhā) माखी māryañ, struck ; Bundelī रुपा rvābō (Hindōstānī rōṇā), to weep.

The familiar Hindōstānī grammar may be taken as the standard of the grammars of all the Western Hindi dialects. Each is fully described in the proper place, and I here content myself with pointing out one characteristic in which Western Hindi is pre-eminently typical of the Central Group of language. This is the analytic method of its construction, which will be dealt with at some length in the first volume of this Survey, and is only referred to here. Of all the languages of the group, Western Hindi is that which carries analysis to its furthest extreme. Its standard dialect has only one true tense (the present subjunctive) for its verb, and has only one true case (the so-called oblique form) for its nouns. Nearly all the other accidents of time and relation are expressed by the aid of participles, auxiliary verbs, or postpositions.

The earliest date which Yule gives of the use of the word ‘Hindōstānī’ is 1616 when Terry speaks of Tom Coryate being proficient in ‘the Indostan, or more vulgar language.’ We may also note that Terry, in his A Voyage to East India (1655), gives a brief description of the vulgar tongue of the country of Indostan, which will be found quoted below under J. Ogilby. So Fryer (1673) (quoted by Yule) says: ‘The Language at Court is Persian, that commonly spoken is Indostan (for which they have no proper character, the written Language being called Banyan).’ It is evident, therefore, that early in the 17th century it was known in England that the Lingua Franca of India was this form of speech. On the other hand, another set of authorities stated that the Lingua Franca of India was Malay. So Ogilby in the passages quoted below. Again, David Wilkins, in the preface to Chamberlayne’s collection of versions of the Lord’s Prayer (published 1715), explains that he could not get a version in the Bengali language, as that form of speech was dying out, and was being superseded by Malay. He therefore, for Bengali, gave a Malay version, written in the Bengali character.

It is possible that Ogilby had less excuse than appears for his mistake, for Mr. Quaritch, in his Oriental Catalogue published in 1887, mentions a MS. Dictionary then

---

1 See, for this and other quotations, Hobson-Jobson, s. v. Hindostance and Moors. It is hardly necessary to remind the reader that in the 16th century Hindōstānī was commonly called ‘Moors.’
in his possession (No. 34,724 in the Catalogue)\(^1\) which he doubtfully dates as 'Surat, about 1630.' This is a Dictionary of Persian, Hindostani, English, and Portuguese, and he describes it as 'a great curiosity as being the first work of its kind. It was probably compiled for the use of the English factory at Surat. The Persian is given in Native and in Roman letters, the Hindostani in Gujarati and Roman letters.' It is a small folio manuscript on Oriental tinted paper.

The celebrated traveller Pietro Della Valle arrived at Surat early in 1623, and remained in India till November 1624, his head-quarters being Surat and Goa. His Indian Travels were published in 1663,\(^2\) and he has the honour of being the first to mention the Nagari, or, as he calls it, Naghër, alphabet in Europe. He also mentioned a language which was current all over India, like Latin in Europe, and which was written in that character.\(^3\) This is, however, probably Sanskrit, not Hindostani.

A Jesuits' College was founded at Agra in the year 1620, and to it, in 1653, came Father Heinrich Roth.\(^4\) Here he studied Sanskrit, and wrote a grammar of that language. He visited Rome in 1664, and afterwards returned to Agra, where he died in 1668. While in Rome he met Kircher, who was then in that city getting the primatur for his China Illustrata, and gave him information regarding the Nagari alphabet which he incorporated in that work. It was published at Amsterdam in 1667, and its full title was Athanasii Kircheri e Soc. Jesu China Monumentis qua sacris qua profanis, nec non variis Naturaee et Artis Spectaculis, aliarumque Rerum memorabilium Argumentis Illustrata. Roth's contributions (besides verbal information) consisted of a set of illustrations, of the ten Avatâras of Vishnu (nine of which have titles in both Roman and Nagari characters), and five plates, four of which describe the Nagari alphabet (Elementa Linguae Hanscrl), while the fifth gives the Pater Noster and the Ave Maria in Latin, but written (incorrectly enough) in the Nagari character. The Pater Noster begins as follows,—यानि (sic) नैस्तिक की एस दन ब्रेलिस.\(^5\)

In 1673 John Ogilby, Cosmographer, published in London—Asia, the first Part. Being an Accurate Description of Persia, and the Several Provinces thereof. The Vast Empire of the Great Mogol, and other Parts of India; and their several Kingdoms and Regions: With the Denominations and Descriptions of the Cities, Towns, and Places of Remark therein contained. The various Customs, Habits, Religion, and Languages of the Inhabitants. Their Political Governments, and Way of Commerce. Also the Plants and Animals peculiar to each Country. Collected and translated from the most authentick Authors, and augmented with later Observations, illustrated with notes and adorned with peculiar Maps, and proper Sculptures. On pp. 59, 60, he deals with the Persian language and its three dialects, Xirazy, Rostazy, and Harmazy. On p. 129 he takes up the subject of the Malay language. He says, 'as to what concerns the Language of the Indians, it only differs in general from the Moors and the Mahometans, but they have also several different Dialects amongst themselves. Amongst all

---

\(^1\) It has since been sold, and I have failed to trace it.
\(^3\) See Professor Zachariae, in the Vicuna Oriental Journal, XVI. pp. 206 and ff.
\(^4\) See Professor Zachariae, F. O. J., XV. pp. 313 and ff.
\(^5\) All this is taken from Professor Zachariae's article above referred to. The representation of coedus by शिल्लस (shîllis) is interesting. The Italian pronunciation of the word is represented by शिल्लस (shîlîs) in Beligatti's work mentioned below.
their Languages, there is none which spreads itself more than the Malayan.' He then proceeds to give a vocabulary of Malayan. He next rather wavers on this point, for (p. 134) he first quotes Pietro Della Valle to show that the same speech is used everywhere, but the written characters differ. Next, he explains on Kircher's (not Pietro Della Valle's) authority that the word 'Nagher' is used as the name both of a language and of a character. He then goes on, 'According to Mr. Edward Terry [see above] the Vulgar Tongue of Indostan hath great affinity with the Persian and Arabic Tongues: but is pleasanter and easier to pronounce. It is a very fluent language, expressing many things in few Words. They write and read like Us, viz. from the Left to the Right Hand.' (This last remark shows that some alphabet akin to Nagari, and not the Persian one, is referred to.) The language of the Nobility and Courts, and of all public businesses and Writings, is Persian, but 'Vulgar Mahumetans speak Turkish, but not so elocuently as the natural born Turks. Learned Persons, and Mahumetan Priests, speak the Arabic. But no Language extends further, and is of greater Use than the Malayan.

The Netherlands East India Company have lately printed a Dictionary of the Common Discourse in that Tongue, as also the new Testament and other Books in the same Language. Moreover, the Holland Ministers in their several Factories in India, teach the Malayan Tongue, not only in their Churches, but Schools also."

In the same year we have Fryer's much more accurate statement about Indian languages already quoted.

In 1678 there appeared at Amsterdam the first volume of Henricus van Rheede tot Drakestein's Hortus Indicus Malabaricus adornatus per H. v. R. t. D. The introduction contains eleven lines of Sanskrit, dated, in the Nagari character. The date corresponds to 1675 A.D.

In Berlin in the year 1680, Andreas Müller, under the pseudonym of Thomas Ludeken, produced a collection of versions of the Lord's Prayer under the title of Oratio Orationum. S. s. Orationis dominicae Versiones praeter authenticam fere centum, eaque longe emendatius quam antehac, et e probatisimis Autoribus potius quam prioribus Collectionibus, jamque singulari genuinis Linguis sua Characteribus, adeoque magnam Partem ex Aere ad Editionem a Barnimo Hagio traditae editaeque a Thoma Ludekenio, Solq. March. Berolina, ex Officina Rungiana, Anno 1680. The Barnimus Hagiis mentioned herein as the engraver is also a pseudonym for Müller himself. In this collection Roth's Pater Noster was reprinted as being actually Sanskrit, and not a mere transliteration of the Latin original.

In 1694 there appeared a work on Chess by Thomas Hyde, entitled Historia Saculudii. On pp. 132-137 he gives twelve different Sanskrit words for 'elephant' engraved in Nagari characters.
So far we have dealt only with general notices or with the accounts of the characters in which Hindostani is written. With the commencement of the 18th century, we find the first attempts at giving serious accounts of the language itself. According to Amaduzzi in his preface to Beligatti's *Alphabetum Bramhanticum* (see below), a Capuchin monk named Franciscus M. Turonensis completed at Surat, in the year 1704, a manuscript *Lexicon Linguae Indostanicae*, in two parts, of between four and five hundred double-columned pages each. In Amaduzzi's time it was still preserved in the library of the Propaganda in Rome, but when I searched for it there in the year 1890 it could not be found.

We now come to the first Hindostani grammar. John Joshua Ketelaer (also written Kötelär, Kessler, or Kettler) was a Lutheran by religion, born at Elbingen in Prussia. He was accredited to *Shāh ʿĀlam Bahādūr Shāh* (1708-1712) and Jahāndār Shāh (1712) as Dutch envoy. In 1711 he was the Dutch East India Company's Director of Trade at Surat. He passed through Agra both going to and coming from Lahore (civ Delhi), but there does not seem to be any evidence available that he ever lived there, though the Dutch Company had a Factory in that city subordinate to Surat. The mission arrived near Lahore on the 10th December 1711, returned to Delhi with Jahāndār Shāh, and finally started from that place on the 14th October 1712, reaching Agra on the 20th October. From Agra they returned to Surat. In 1716 Ketelaer had been three years Director for the Dutch Company at Surat. He was then appointed their envoy to Persia, and left Batavia in July 1716, having been thirty years in the Dutch Service or in the East Indies. He died of fever at Gambroon on the Persian Gulf on his return from Isfahan, after having been two days under arrest, because he would not order a Dutch ship to act under the Persian Governor's orders against some Arab invaders.\(^1\) He wrote a grammar and a vocabulary of the 'Lingua hindostanica,' which were published by David Mill, in 1743, in his *Miscellanea Orientalia* (see below). We may assume that they were composed about the year 1715.

In the same year there appeared another collection of versions of the Lord's Prayer. Its author was John Chamberlayne. It was published at Amsterdam, and had a preface by David Wilkins, who also contributed many of the specimens. Its full title was *Oratio dominica in diversas omnium fere Gentium Lingus versa et propriis cujusque Linguae Characteribus expressa, una cum Dissertationibus nonnullis de Linguarum Origine, variisque ipsarum Permutationibus. Editore Joa. Chamberlanio Anglo-Britanno, Regiae Societatis Londinensis Socio. Amstelodami, typis Guil. et David. Goerei, 1715*. For our present purpose, it is sufficient to remark, with reference to this celebrated work, that it reproduces Roth's *Pater Noster*, but without making Müller's error of imagining it to be Sanskrit.

Maturin Veyssière LaCroze was born at Nantes in 1661. In 1697 he became librarian to the Elector at Berlin and died in that city in 1739. As librarian he kept up a voluminous correspondence on linguistic subjects with the learned men of his time, including David Wilkins, John Chamberlayne, Ziegenbalg, and T. S. Bayer. This was published after his death under the title of *Thesauri Epistolici LaCroziiani Ex Bibliotheca Iordaniana editit Io. Lodovicus Vhilis. Lipsiae, 1742*. In this we find him helping Wilkins and Chamberlayne in the compilation of the *Oratio Dominica* just mentioned. For our present purpose, the most important letters are those to and

---

from Theophilus Siegfried Bayer, one of the brilliant band of scholars who founded the Imperial Academy at St. Peters burg. In one of Bayer’s letters (dated June 1, 1726) we find what are I believe the first words of what is intended for Hindostani ever published in Europe. These are the first four numerals as used by the ‘Mogulenses Indi’ (1 = ki<cu ; 2 = guu ; 3 = tray ; 4 = tzahr), which are contained in a comparative statement of the numerals in eight languages. These numerals are, however, not really Hindostani. Gnu is an evident misprint. The others are Lahnda or Sindhi, (1 = Lahnda, hik ; Sindhi, hiku ; 3 = Lahnda, trai ; Sindhi, tê ; 4 = Lahnda, çahr ; Sindhi, châr). Two years subsequently, in the third and fourth volumes of the Transactions of the Imperial Academy (for the years 1728 and 1729, published in 1732 and 1735 respectively) we find Bayer busily deciphering the Nagari alphabet, first through means of a trilingual syllabary printed in China, which gave the Tibetan form of Nagari (Lântshâ), current Tibetan, and Manchu alphabets, and afterwards with the help of the missionary Schultz to be shortly mentioned. Finally, in November 1731 LaCroze writes to Bayer that the character used for writing by the Marathâs is called ‘Balabande,’ which, however, he adds, hardly differs from that used by the ‘Bramans’ which is called ‘Nagara’ or ‘Dewanagara.’ He then proceeds to show how, in his opinion, the ‘Balabande’ alphabet is derived from Hebrew, basing his contention on the forms of the letters in Roth’s Pater Noster as reproduced in Chamberlayne’s work.

Our next stage is Mill’s Dissertationes Selectae. Its full title is Davidis Millii Theologiae D. ejusdemque, nec non Antiquitatum sacrarum, & Linguarum orientalium in Academia Trajectina, Professoris ordinariae, Dissertationes selectae, varia s. Litterar urn et Antiquitatis orientalis Capita exponentes et illustrantes. Curis secundis, novisque Dissertationibus, Orationibus, et Miscellaneis Orientalibus auctae. Lugduni Batavorum, 1743. To us its principal interest consists in the fact that, in the Miscellanea Orientalia, he prints Ketelaer’s Hindostani Grammar and Vocabulary, which, as we have seen, was written about the year 1715. He also gives some plates illustrating Indian alphabets. Two illustrate the Nagari character, and I am not certain from where he got them. The third is taken from Bayer’s essay in the Transactions of the Imperial Academy of St. Petersburg, and shows the Lântshâ, ordinary Tibetan, and Manchu characters. The fourth illustrates the Bengali alphabet. The Miscellanea Orientalia are on pp. 455-622 of the work. Caput, I., De Lingua Hindustanica (pp. 455-488). Latin, Hindostani, and Persian Vocabulary (pp. 504-509). Etymologicum Orientale harmonicum (a comparative vocabulary of Latin, Hindostani, Persian, and Arabic) (pp. 510-598). Except for the plates of characters, all the Hindostani is in the Roman character, the body of the work being written in Latin. The spelling of the Hindostâni words is based on the Dutch system of pronunciation. Thus, me kiâ, feci ; me kartajoekâ (maï kar chukâ), feci ; misjâ (mujhê), mihi. The use of the Perso-Arabic alphabet for writing Hindostâni is explained. In the two test points of the accuracy of all these old grammars (the distinguishing of the singular and of the

1 Bayer gives the numbers more correctly on pp. 113 and ff. of his Historia Regni Græcorum Bactriâni. Petropolli, 1788. Here he gives the first ten numerals both in the Devanâgar character, and in transliteration. The latter runs, 1, heku ; 2, dihá ; 3, tray ; 4, tsiar ; 5, pangoj ; 6, tache ; 7, tsatte ; 8, addaj ; 9, naro ; 10, ndga. He tells us that he got them from a native of Multan. I have to thank Professor Kuhn for drawing my attention to this work.

2 Regarding LaCroze and Bayer, see further particulars in G. A. Grierson, J. A. S. B., Vol. LXII. (1893), pt. I., pp. 42 and ff.
plural of the personal pronouns, and the use of *nē in the agent case). Ketelaer is right in the first and wrong in the second. He recognises *maī (which he spells *me) and *tu (toe) as singulars, and *ham (*ham) and *tum (*tom) as plurals. He has no idea of the use of *ne. On the other hand, he teaches the Gujarāṭī use of *āp to mean 'we.'

Ketelaer's Grammar includes not only the Hindōstānī declensions and conjugations, but also versions of the Ten Commandments, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer in that language. His translation of the last may be given as a specimen of the earliest known translation of any European Language into Hindōstānī. It runs as follows:

Hammare baab—Ke who asmaanmehe—Paak hoē teere naom—Anne hamko moluk teera—Hoē resja teera—Sjon asmaan ton sjimienne—Roolie hammarch neti hamkon aasde—Oor maafrica taxier apne hamko—Sjon mafkaric apre karresdaar onkon—Nedaal hamko is was wasjeme—Belk hamko ghaskar is boerayse. Teerae he patajai, soorauri alemgiere heametme. Ammen.

In the year following the publication of Ketelaer's Grammar appeared that of the celebrated missionary Schultze, whose name has been already mentioned more than once. The full title is *Viri plur. Reverend Benjamin Schultzei Missionarii Evangelici Grammatica Hindostanica collectis in diurna infer Hindostanos Commoratione in justum Ordinem redactis ac larga Exemperum (sic) Luce perfusis Regulis constans et Missionarium Usui consecrata. Edidit et de suscipienda barbararum Linguarum Cultura prefatus est D. Jo. Henr. Callenberg. Halae Saxonom, 1744 (some copies are dated 1745). Schultze was aware of the existence of Ketelaer's Grammar, and mentioned it in his preface. Schultze's Grammar is in Latin. Hindōstānī words are given in the Perso-Arabic character with transliteration. The Nāgārī character (*Deva-nāga-ricae) is also explained. He ignores the sound of the cerebral letters and (in his transliteration) of all aspirated ones. He is aware of the singular and plural forms of the personal pronouns, but is ignorant of the use of *ne with the past tenses of transitive verbs.

Four years afterwards Johann Friedrich Fritz published the *Sprachmeister with a preface by Schultze. Its title runs *Orientalisch-und Occidentalischer Sprachmeister, welcher nicht allein hundert Alphabete nebst ihrer Aussprache, So bey denen meisten Europäisch-Asiatisch-Africaniund Americaischen Völckern und Nationen gebrächlich sind, Auch einigen Tabulis polyglottis verschiedener Sprachen und Zahlen vor Augen leget, Sondern auch das Gebet des Herrn, in 200 Sprachen und Mund-Arten mit dererselben Characteren und Lesung, nach einer Geographischen Ordnung mitthei-let. Aus gunstwürdigen Auctoribus zusammen getragen, und mit darzu nöthigen Kugjern versehen. Leipzig, Zufinden bey Christian Friedrich Gessner. 1748. Fritz's book is a long way ahead of its predecessor Chamberlayne's. Part I. (pp. 1-219) gives tables of the alphabets of over a hundred different languages, with accounts of the mode of use of each. On pp. 120-122 we find described the use of the Perso-Arabic alphabet as applied to Hindōstānī. It may be noticed that all mention of the cerebral letters is omitted. On p. 128 we have the 'Devanagaram,' on p. 124 the 'Balabandu,' and on pp. 125-131 the 'Akar Nagari,' which are all rightly classed together as various forms of the same alphabet, but the transliteration is often curiously incorrect. For instance,
under ‘Akar Nagari,’ ज is transliterated $dhgja$, and it is explained that an स is always sounded before it and that the ज is clearly pronounced as in the Arabic ज. It will be seen that here the existence of cerebral letters is indicated. Except in the case of ‘Akar Nagari,’ no attempt is made to distinguish between aspirated and unaspirated letters. On p. 204 are given the Hindoostani numerals from 1—9, and 10, 20, 30, etc., up to 90. They commence, जेक, दो, तीन, चाहार, पांचह, छेत्र, सात, आठ, नौ, दस. Part II (pp. 1-128) contains the versions of the Lord’s Prayer. On pp. 81 and 82 is given Schultze’s ‘Hindoostanica seu Mourica seu Mogulisch’ version in the Perso-Arabic character with transliteration. The latter begins, $Asman-po$ रहात-सो हमारा बप, तुमारा नाम। $pak$ तर्के होने देर, तुमा $Pada$ शक्ति अने देर, etc. The versions in the Nâgâri character are Roth’s transliterated version, Sanskrit in ‘Dewa-nagara s. Hanscrot,’ and Bhôjpuri in ‘Akhar-Nagarka’ (the last two by Schultze). Finally, there are comparative statements of the words for ‘father,’ ‘heaven,’ ‘earth,’ and ‘bread’ in all the languages quoted, and some other appendixes. The Hindostani forms of these four words are given as $Bab$, $Asmán$, $Humnía$, and $Rosí$ (sic), respectively.

Our next authority is Travels from St. Petersburg in Russia to diverse Parts of Asia. By John Bell. *Glasgow, 1763. (New Edition, Edinburgh, 1806.) In Chapter 12 of this work are given the Numerals of Indostan.

Of much more importance is the Alphabetum Brammhanicum seu Indostanum Universitatis Kast. Romae, 1761. Typis Sac. Congregationis de Propag. Fide. It is by a Capuchin Missionary named Cassiano Beligatti, and is furnished with a preface by Johannes Christophorus Amadutius (Amaduzzi). In this preface there is a very complete account of the then existing knowledge regarding Indian languages. It describes Sanskrit (संस्कृत) correctly as the language of the learned, and next refers to the बखरा बोल्ते or ‘Beka Boli’ or common tongue which is found in the University of Kasi or Benarès. It then goes on to enumerate the other principal alphabets of India which (except ‘Nagri, Nagri Saratensis, or Balabandâ’) do not immediately concern us. Of more particular interest is his mention of a Lexicon Linguæ Indostanicae which was composed by a Capuchin Missionary of Surat named Franciscus M. Turonensis, in the year 1704, the manuscript of which was then in the Propaganda Library in Rome, and which Amaduzzi describes at considerable length. He also mentions a manuscript dialogue († in Hindostanı) between a Christian and a Native of India regarding the truth of religion, which was dedicated to the Râjâ of Betia, in the present district of Champaran, by Josephus M. Gargnanensis and Beligatti, the author of the work we are now describing. The Alphabetum Brammhanicum is of importance as being the first book (so far as I am aware) in which the vernacular words are printed in their own character in moveable types. But not only are the Dèvanâgari letters represented by types, but even the Kaithi ones receive the same honour. Beligatti calls the Dèvanâgari character the ‘Alphabetum expressum in litteris Universitatis Kast,’ and after covering over a hundred pages with a minute description of its use (including the compound consonants), he goes on, on page 110, to deal with the ‘Alphabetum popolare Indostanorum vulgo Nagri.’ This is, he says, used by all the natives for familiar letters and ordinary books, and for all subjects, whether religious or profane, which can be

1 This postposition ‘po’ (पो) belongs to Dakhini Hindostanı.
written in the ‘भाषा वैदिक bhakī boli or vulgar tongue.’ He then gives a good description of the Kaiti̇ alphabet, using moveable types also here. The book concludes with an account of the numerals and with reading exercises. These last are transliterations of the Latin Pater Noster and Ave Maria into Déva-nāgari, followed by translations of the Invocation of the Trinity, the Lord’s Prayer, the Ave Maria, and the Apostles’ Creed into Hindōstānī, in the same character. Taking it altogether, the Alphabetum Bramhānicum is, for its time, a wonderfully good piece of work.

With the Alphabetum Bramhānicum the first stage of Hindōstānī Bibliography may be considered to be completed. Hadley’s Grammar appeared in 1772, and was quickly followed by a number of other and better ones, such as the Portuguese Grammatica Indostam (1778: far in advance of Hadley), Gilchrist’s numerous works (commenc ing 1787), and Lebedeff’s Grammar (1801). These will all be found below, each described in its proper place. Lebedeff’s work deserves more than a mere entry on account of the extraordinary adventures of its author. This remarkable man gives an account of his life in the preface of his book, from which we gather that he began his Indian career (apparently as a bandmaster) in the year 1785 at Madras. After a stay there of two years he migrated to Calcutta, where he met with a Pandit who taught him Sanskrit, Bengali, and Hindōstānī (or, as he called it, the Indian mixed dialect). His next attempt was to translate two English plays into Bengali, and one of these was performed publicly with great applause (according to its author) in 1795 and again in the following year. According to Adelung, he then became theatrical manager to the Great Mogul, and finally returned to England after a stay of more than twenty years in the East. In London he published his grammar, and made the acquaintance of Woronzow, the Russian Ambassador, who sent him to Russia. He was employed in the Russian Foreign Office and was given a large subvention towards founding a Sanskrit press. I have no knowledge of any other works from his pen. It is to be hoped, for the sake of his patrons, that his knowledge of Sanskrit and Bengali was greater than that of Hindōstānī which he displays in his grammar. Not only is its system of transliteration (kon haw hooa = who is there) detestably incorrect, but so is the whole account of the grammatical structure of the language. The concluding words of his preface show that he was not conscious of its imperfections, and at the same time throw a curious light on the morality of Europeans in India at his time. ‘The Indian words in this work are . . . . so well ascertained as to leave no doubt, but the European learner, with a little assistance of a Pandit or Moonshie, nay, even of a Bebee-sahib, cannot fail in a short time to obtain a knowledge of their [the natives’] idioms, and to master the Indian dialects with incredible facility.’

Finally we may briefly refer to a few belated works of the early period of inquiries into Indian languages, which appeared after Hindōstānī had begun to be seriously studied

---

1 Beligatti’s representation of this expression is more accurate than Amaduzzi’s, but even his transliteration here breaks down. Count de Gubernatis (Bollettino Italiano degli Studii Orientali, Firenze, 1876-77, pp. 44, 45) mentions a Grammatica Mora (suel dire Hindostanī adoperato i caratteri devanagari). Segue un percorso Dictionarium indostamum de Nominibus ut plurimum obsitus in Historia Indica, by the Paulinus a S. Bartholomeo mentioned in the next page as the author of the preface to the Alphabeta Indiae. The work mentioned by Count de Gubernatis is apparently in MS. and should belong to the latter half of the 18th century. I owe this reference to the kindness of Professor Zachariae.

2 Mitridates, I. 185. According to the same authority he was by birth an Ukraine peasant, and, on account of his musical talents, was taken up by Prince Razumovsky, who carried him to Italy, where he became proficient on the violoncello. He then wandered to Paris and London, where he took service under a Lord who went to India as Governor.
in Calcutta. In 1782 Iwarus Abel published in Copenhagen Symphonia Symphonia, sive undecim Linguarum Orientalium Discors exhibita Concordia Tamuticae videlicet, Granthamicæ, Telugicæ, Sanscruòtamicæ, Marathicae, Balabanicae, Canáricae, Hindostanicae, Cunancicae, Gutzartaticæ et Peguanicae non characteristicae, quibus ut explicativo-Harmonica adiecta est Latine. It is a comparative vocabulary of fifty-three words in these eleven languages. The words include parts of the body, heaven, sun, etc., certain animals, house, water, sea, tree, the personal pronouns and numerals.

In 1791 there was published in Rome an anonymous work, with a preface by Paulinus a S. Bartholomæo, entitled Alphabeta Indica, id est Granthamicum seu Sanscromico-Malabaricum, Indostanum sive Vanarensce, Nagarcim vulgare, et Talenganicum. It is a collection of these four alphabets, all in moveable types.

Johann Christoph Adelung's Mithridates oder allgemeine Sprachenkunde mit dem Vater Unser als Sprachprobe in bey nahe fünfhundert Sprachen und Mundarten may be taken as the link between the old philology and the new. A philologist so eminent as this great writer could not fail to adorn whatever linguistic subject he touched, and, for its time, this work is a marvel of erudition and masterly arrangement. So far as Indian languages go, it sums up all (little it must be confessed) that was known about them at the end of the 18th century. In it 'Mongolisch-Indostanisch oder Mohrisch' (i.e., Urdu) (Vol. I, pp. 183 and ff.) and 'Rein oder Hoch-Indostanisch, Dewa Nagara' (pp. 190 and ff.) are jointly described as 'Allgemeine Sprachen in Indostan.' By 'Rein oder Hoch-Indostanisch' are meant the various 'Hindi' dialects spoken between Mathura and Patna, but as an example is given the Lord's Prayer in badly spelt Sanskrit. It is contributed by Schultz, whose nationality apparently prevented him from distinguishing between bh and p. For instance, he spells bhūjanam 'podsanam.'

Vol. IV of the work consists of additions and corrections, and of a supplement by J. S. Vater. Further information regarding Hindostani will be found on pp. 58-63, 83 (relationship of Hindostani to Roman). and 486 of that volume.

**SUMMARY OF IMPORTANT EARLY DATES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.D.</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1660</td>
<td>Emperor Akbar reigning. English East India Company incorporated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1662</td>
<td>Dutch East India Company founded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1665</td>
<td>Emperor Jahāngir comes to the throne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1667</td>
<td>Embassy of Sir T. Roe. English factory established at Surat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1668</td>
<td>Earliest recorded mention of the Indostan language (spoken by Tom Coryate).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1670</td>
<td>Jesuits' College founded at Agra. English establish an Agency there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674-75</td>
<td>Pietro della Valle in India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1677</td>
<td>Emperor Shāh Jahan comes to the throne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td>English factory established at Hugli.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1683</td>
<td>Heinrich Roth joins Jesuit College at Agra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1685</td>
<td>Terry's Voyage to East India published. Terry accompanied Sir T. Roe (1616).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1688</td>
<td>Emperor Aurangzeb comes to the throne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691</td>
<td>Bombay transferred to the English crown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1693</td>
<td>Pietro della Valle's Indian Travels published.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1694</td>
<td>Heinrich Roth visits Rome and meets Kircher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1697</td>
<td>Kircher's China Illustrata. LaCroz appointed Librarian at Berlin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td>J. Fryer's Travels in East India and Persia commenced and continued to 1681. Published 1698.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1673</td>
<td>O. Dapper's Asia published in Dutch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1674</td>
<td>J. Ogilby's Asia.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A.D. 1678. Henricus van Rheeoe tot Drakestein's Hortus Indicus Malabaricus commenced to issue.
1680. Andreas Muller's Oratio Oratio Lationum.
1681. O. Dapper's Asia (German Translation) published at Nurnberg.
1694. Thomas Hyde's Historia Shahshidi:
1696. Charnock founds Fort William in Calcutta.
1704. Francisca M. Taronensi completes his Lexicon Linguæ Indostanicae.
1708. Emperor Bahadur Shah comes to the throne.
1711. Ketelser's embassy.
1712. Emperor Jahandar Shah comes to the throne.
1713. Emperor Farruh-Siah comes to the throne.
1719. Emperor Muhammad Shah comes to the throne.
1744. Schultze's Grammatica Hindostanica.
1745-58. Schultze's Bible translations.
1754. Emperor Alamgir II. becomes the throne.
1757. Battle of Plassey.
1759. Emperor Shah Alam II. comes to the throne.
1773. Ferguson's Hindostani Dictionary published.
1778. Gramatica Indostana published at Lisbon.
1782. Iwarus Abel's Symphona Symphona.
1786. Marquis of Cornwallis, Governor General.
1787. Gilchrist begins publishing.
1788. The Indian Vocabulary published in London.
1791. Alphabeta Indica published at Rome.
1798. Lord Mornington (Marquis of Wellesley), Governor General.
1800. Robert's Indian Glossary.
1807. Earl of Minto, Governor General.
1810. Henry Martyn's Urdu translation of New Testament, the basis of all subsequent versions, completed in manuscript with the aid of Muhammad Fitrat.
1813. Earl of Moira (Marquis of Hastings), Governor General. Carey publishes the Pentateuch in Hindi.

Of the dialects of Western Hindi, Braj Bhakha and Hindostani are those which have received most literary culture. Kanauji is so like Braj Bhakha, that it hardly deserves separate mention. I only refer to it as its separate existence is popularly recognised. Some few works have
been written in Bundeli, but none of them have been critically edited. Indeed, this important dialect has been almost entirely ignored by students. Even Dr. Kellogg does not describe it in his Grammar. Kanauji and Bundeli are therefore hardly mentioned in this bibliography. Nearly all the entries refer either to Braj Bhakhá or to one or other of the various forms of Hindostani.
HINDOÈSTANI.

It is sheer pedantry—nay, a misconception of the laws which govern language as a living organism—to despise pithy and apt colloquialisms, and even slang. In order to remain healthy and vigorous, a literary language must be rooted in the soil of a copious vernacular, from which it can extract and assimilate, by a chemistry peculiar to itself, whatever nourishment it requires. It must keep in touch with life in the broadest acceptation of the word; and life at certain levels, obeying a psychological law which must simply be accepted as one of the conditions of the problem, will always express itself in dialect, provincialism, slang.'—W. Archer in the Pall Mall Magazine for October 1899.

As a dialect of Western Hindi, Hindostani presents itself under several forms. These may first of all be considered under two heads, viz. Vernacular Hindostani, and the Literary Hindostani founded thereon. Vernacular Hindostani is the language of the Upper Gangetic Doab and of Western Rohilkhand. Literary Hindostani is the polite speech of India generally, and may be taken as the vernacular of educated Musalmans throughout northern India, and of all Musalmans south of the Narbada. Being derived from, and still having its roots in, vernacular Hindostani, it would be more logical to treat the latter first, but considerations of convenience lead us to reverse the process. Literary Hindostani is so widely known, and of such importance, that it must necessarily be taken as the standard dialect of Western Hindi. Its grammar and its various standards of literary style are fixed, and present a suitable form with which to compare the different vernaculars on which it is based, or to which it is related. I therefore commence by describing Literary Hindostani.

The following is the approximate number of speakers of the two main divisions of Hindostani,—the vernacular, and the literary form of speech—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vernacular Hindostani</th>
<th>Literary Hindostani</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,382,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,350,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,633,169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The name is 'Hindostani,' not 'Hindustani' as commonly written. All the early European writers spelt it correctly with o, not u. The word rhymes in Persian and Urdu poetry with dosto and bosto and the vowel of the second syllable is consequently o, not u; even the word now more generally pronounced Hindū should correctly be Hindo and is too often heard so pronounced in India (where the distinction between o and u, lost in Erin, still survives) by accurate reciters of Persian poetry. Hindo represents an earlier Hindau, being the modern Persian for the ancient Hindu, i.e., a dweller in the country of the hapta hinda (Sankrit, sapt ̣a sindhu) or 'seven rivers' now called, with the omission of two (probably the Saraswati and Drishadwati or Ghaggar), the 'Punjab.' See Lyall, Sketch of the Hindustani Language, p. 1. Sir Charles Lyall has drawn my attention to the following verse by Sa'di, Bostān (ed. Graf, Muqaddimah 127):—

كل آرند سعدی سری بستا
به خی گل گنج بندیت

'Sa'di has shamelessly brought a rose to the garden and pepper to India,' i.e., he has brought coals to Newcastle.
ancient Madhyadēśa or Midland of Sanskrit geography, but extends far beyond it to the
east.\(^1\)

The word 'Hindōstān' was coined under European influence, and means the
language of Hindōstān. It thus connotes much more than it literally signifies, for,
besides Hindōstān, three other languages, Bihārī, Eastern Hindi, and Rājasthānī, are
spoken in Hindōstān, a tract inhabited by about ninety millions of people, and as large
as Germany, France, and Spain combined. Even in the tract in which Western Hindi
is a vernacular, and of which Hindōstān may be considered as the standard literary
dialect, it is only spoken as a general vernacular in a comparatively small area in the
north-western corner.

The earliest writers on India (such as Terry and Fryer) called the current language
of India 'Indostan.' In the early part of the eighteenth
century writers alluded in Latin to the Lingua Indostanica,
Hindustanica, or Hindostanica. The earliest English writers in India called the
language 'Moors,' and it appears to be Gilchrist who about 1787 first coined the word
'Hindōstān' or, as he spelt it, 'Hindoostance.'\(^2\)

Literary Hindōstān, as distinct from vernacular Hindōstān, is current, in various
forms, as the language of polite society, and as a lingua
franca over the whole of India proper. It is also a language
of literature, both poetical and prose.

As most of those who possess the power of speaking it use it as a second language,
in addition to their own vernaculars, it is impossible to
give more than an approximate number of the speakers
amongst whom it is current. It is true that, especially in the larger cities, the
Urdu form of Hindōstān is the only vernacular of educated Musalmāns, but no figures
are available for distinguishing these from the large number of people who are bi-
lingual. Only for the Dakhini form of Hindōstān are approximately correct figures
available.

The following table shows, province by province, the best estimate which I can put
together of the number of people who speak Literary Hindōstān, in some form, or
other, by preference. I exclude from it the speakers of Vernacular Hindōstān who
inhabit the Upper Doab and West Rohilkhand, and also all speakers of other dialects of
Western Hindi such as Bundālī, Kanauji, Braj, or Bāngarū. The figures for Dakhini
are given as a total, the details being given later on, province by province, when we
come to consider that form of speech more particularly. The figures for Assam, Bengal,
the United Provinces, Rajputana, Central India, Ajmere-Merwara and Kashmir, are
estimates based on returns supplied for the Survey. The others are based on the Census
figures for 1891, after making the necessary adjustments.

In Bombay, I have taken the Hindōstān of Gujarat and Sindh as Literary Hindō-
stān, and that of the rest of the presidency as Dakhini.

---

\(^1\) The eastern limit of the Madhyadēśa was what is now Allahabad.

\(^2\) Ferguson in 1773 published a Dictionary of the Hindostan Language. For further particulars on this subject see the
Bibliography, ante.
Table showing the estimated number of speakers of Literary Hindōstāni in the various Provinces of India.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Estimated number of speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assam</td>
<td>32,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>1,828,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berar</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujarat</td>
<td>101,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindh</td>
<td>18,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>119,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Provinces</td>
<td>80,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panjab</td>
<td>1,329,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Provinces</td>
<td>3,859,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baroda</td>
<td>11,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mysore</td>
<td>25,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajputana, Central India, and Ajmere-Merwara</td>
<td>322,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashmir</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add figures for Dakhini</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,850,436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As already stated, Literary Hindōstāni is based on the vernacular Hindōstāni spoken in the Upper Doab and in Western Rohilkhand. It grew up as a *lingua franca* in the polyglot bazaar attached to the Delhi court, and was carried everywhere in India by the lieutenants of the Mughul Empire. Since then its seat has been secure. It has been adopted as the language which every follower of Islam (the religion of the Emperors) speaks if he can, and its simple grammar and enormous vocabulary have rendered it able to fill the need which has always been felt in such a polyglot tract as India for a *lingua franca*. It has also received, in at least two of its forms, considerable literary cultivation.

It has several recognised varieties, amongst which may be mentioned Urdu, Rēkhta, Dakhini, and Hindi. Urdu is that form of Hindōstāni which is written in the Persian character, and which makes

---

1 Most of these are probably speakers of Dakhini, but no certain information is available.
2 It will be noticed that this account of Hindōstāni and its origin differs widely from that which has been given hitherto by most authors (including the present writer), which was based on Mir Amman’s preface to the ‘Bāgh o Bahār.’ According to him Urdu was a mongrel mixture of the languages of the various tribes who flocked to the Delhi bazaar. The explanation given above was first put forward by Sir Charles Lyall in the year 1880, and the Linguistic Survey has shown the entire correctness of his view. Hindōstāni is simply the vernacular of the Upper Doab and Western Rohilkhand, on which a certain amount of literary polish has been bestowed, and from which a few rustic idiom has been excluded.
a free use of Persian (including Arabic) words in its vocabulary. The name is said to be derived from the Urdu-e mualla or royal military bazaar outside the Delhi palace. It is spoken chiefly in the towns of Western Hindostan, by Musalmans and by Hindus who have fallen under the influence of Persian culture. Persian vocabularies are, it is true, employed in every form of Hindostani. Such have been admitted to full citizenship even in the rustic dialects, or in the elegant Hindi of modern writers like Harischandra of Benares. To object to their use would be affected purism, just as would be the avoidance of the use of all words of Latin derivation in English. But in what is known as High Urdu the use of Persian words is carried to almost incredible extremes. In writings of this class we find whole sentences in which the only Indian thing is the grammar, and with nothing but Persian words from beginning to end. It is curious, however, that this extreme Persianisation of Hindostani is not, as Sir Charles Lyall rightly points out, the work of conquerors ignorant of the tongue of the people. On the contrary, the Urdu language took its rise in the efforts of the ever pliable Hindu to assimilate the language of his rulers. Its authors were Kayasths and Khatri employed in the administration and acquainted with Persian, not Persians or Persianised Turks, who for many centuries used only their own language for literary purposes. To these is due the idea of employing the Persian character for their vernacular speech, and the consequent preference for words to which that character is native. 'Persian is now no foreign idiom in India, and though its excessive use is repugnant to good taste, it would be a foolish purism and a political mistake to attempt (as some have attempted) to eliminate it from the Hindu literature of the day.' I have made this quotation from Sir Charles Lyall's work, in order to show what an accomplished scholar has to say on one side of a much debated question. That the general principle which he has enunciated is correct one I think no one will dispute. Once a word has become domesticated in Hindostani no one has any right to object to its use whatever its origin may be, and opinions will only differ as to what words have received the right of citizenship and what have not. This, after all, is a question of style, and in Hindostani, as in English, there are styles and styles. For myself, I far prefer the Hindostani from which words whose citizenship is in any way doubtful are excluded, but that, I freely admit, is a matter of taste.

Rekhta (i.e. 'scattered' or 'crumbled') is the form which Urdu takes when used for poetry. The name is derived from the manner in which Persian words are 'scattered' through it. When poems are written in the special dialect used by women, which has a vocabulary of its own, it is known as Rekhti. Dakhini is the form of Hindostani used by Musalmans in the Deccan. Like Urdu it is written in the Persian character, but is much more free from Persianisation. It uses grammatical forms (such as

1 English is being introduced into Bengali in the same way by English-knowing Babus. When these gentlemen talk amongst themselves in Bengali, sometimes every second word is English. Once in Monghyr I overheard one Babu say to another 'A deger climate constitution janya ati healthy.' A native horse-doctor once told me about a dog licking his wound, 'Kutta-ka-salwa bahut antiseptic hai,' and Mr. Graham Bailey has heard one Panjabi dentist say to another 'continually excavate na karo.'

2 It is hardly necessary to point out that much of the preceding account of Urdu is based on Sir Charles Lyall's 'Sketch of the Hindustani Language.' Dakhini is separately described on pp. 58 and 7.
mērē-kō for mujh-kō) which are common in rustic parts of Northern India, but which are not found in the literary dialect, and in the Southern Deccan it does not use the agent case with ṇē before transitive verbs in the past tense, which is a characteristic feature of all the dialects of Western Hindostan.

The word 'Hindi' is used in several different meanings. It is a Persian, not an Indian word, and properly signifies a native of India, as distinguished from a 'Hindū' or non-Musalmān Indian. Thus Amir Khusraw says, 'whatever live Hindū fell into the King's hands was pounded to death under the feet of elephants. The Musalmāns who were Hindū had their lives spared.' In this sense (and in this way it is still used by natives) Bengali and Marāṭhi are as much Hindi as the language of the Doab. On the other hand, Europeans use the word in two mutually contradictory senses, viz. sometimes to indicate the Sanskritised, or at least the non-Persianised, form of Hindīstānī, which is employed as a literary form of speech by Hindūs, and which is usually written in the Nāgari character: and sometimes, loosely, to indicate all the rural dialects spoken between Bengal proper and the Panjab. In the present pages, I use it only in the former sense. This Hindi, therefore, or, as it is sometimes called, 'High Hindi', is the prose literary language of those Hindūs of Upper India who do not employ Urdū. It is of modern origin, having been introduced under English influence at the commencement of the last century. Up till then, when a Hindū wrote prose and did not use Urdū, he wrote in his own local dialect, Awadhl, Bundėli, Braj Bhākhā, or what not. Lallū Lāl, under the inspiration of Dr. Gilchrist, changed all this by writing the well-known Prēm Sāgar, a work which was, so far as the prose portions went, practically written in Urdū, with Indo-Aryan words substituted wherever a writer in that form of speech would use Persian ones. It was thus an automatic reversion to the actual vernacular of the Upper Doab. The course of this novel experiment was successful from the start. The subject of the first book written in it attracted the attention of all good Hindūs, and the author's style, musical and rhythmical as the Arabic saj', pleased their ears. Then, the language fulfilled a want. It gave a lingua franca to the Hindūs. It enabled men of widely different provinces to converse with each other without having recourse to the (to them) unclean words of the Musalmāns. It was easily intelligible everywhere, for its grammar was that of the language which every Hindū had to use in his business relations with Government officials, and its vocabulary was the common property of all the Sanskritic languages of Northern India. Moreover, very little prose, excepting commentaries and the like, had been written in any modern Indian vernacular before. Literature had almost entirely confined itself to verse. Hence the language of the Prēm Sāgar became, naturally enough, the standard of Hindū prose all over Hindostan, from Bengal to the Panjab, and has held its place as such to the present day. Now-a-days no Hindū of Upper India dreams of writing in any language but Hindi or Urdū when he is writing prose; but when he takes to verse, he at once adopts one of the old national dialects, such as the Awadhi of Tulsi Dāś or the Braj Bhākhā of the blind bard of Agra. Only of very late years have attempts been made to write poems in Hindi, with, in the opinion of the present writer, but moderate success. Since Lallū Lāl's time Hindi has developed for itself certain rules of style which differentiate it from Urdū, the principal ones relating to the order of words, which is much less free than in that form of Hindīstānī. It has also, of late
years, fallen under the fatal spell of Sanskrit, and is showing signs of becoming in the hands of Pandits and under the encouragement of some European writers who have learned Hindi through Sanskrit, as debased as literary Bengali, without the same excuse. Hindi has so copious a vocabulary of its own, a vocabulary rooted in the very beings of the sturdy peasantry upon whose language it is based, that nine-tenths of the Sanskrit words which one meets in most modern Hindi books are useless and unintelligible excrescences. The employment of Sanskrit words is supposed to add dignity to the style. One might as well say that a graceful girl of eighteen gained in dignity by masquerading in the furbelows of her great-grandmother. Some enlightened native scholars are struggling hard, without displaying an affected purism, against this too easily acquired infection, and we may hope that their efforts will meet with the encouragement which they deserve.

We may now define the three main varieties of Hindostani as follows:—Hindostani is primarily the language of the Upper Gangetic Doab, and is also the lingua franca of India, capable of being written in both Persian and Devanagari characters, and without purism, avoiding alike the excessive use of either Persian or Sanskrit words when employed for literature. The name ‘Urdū’ can then be confined to that special variety of Hindostani in which Persian words are of frequent occurrence, and which hence can only be written in the Persian character, and, similarly, ‘Hindi’ can be confined to the form of Hindostani in which Sanskrit words abound, and which hence can only be written in the Devanagari character. These are the definitions which were proposed by the late Mr. Growse, and they have the advantage of being intelligible, while at the same time they do not overlap. Hitherto, all the three words have been very loosely employed. Finally, I use ‘Eastern Hindi’ to connote the group of intermediate dialects of which Awadhī is the chief, and ‘Western Hindi’ to connote the group of dialects of which Braj Bhākhā and Hindostani (in its different phases) are the best known.

As a literary language, the earliest specimens of Hindostani are in Urdū, or rather Rākhī, for they were poetical works. Its cultivation began in the Deccan at the end of the 16th century, and it received a definite standard of form a hundred years later, principally at the hand of Wali of Aurangabad, commonly called ‘the Father of Rākhī.’ The example of Wali was quickly followed at Delhi, where a school of poets took its rise, of which the most brilliant members were Saudā (d. 1780, the author of the famous satires) and Mir Taqi (d. 1810). Another school (almost equally celebrated) arose in Lucknow during the troubled time at Delhi in the middle of the 18th century. The great difference between the poetry of Urdu and that written in the various dialects of Eastern or Western Hindi lies in the system of prosody. In the former the prosody is that of the Persian language, while in the latter it is the altogether opposed indigenous system of India. Moreover, the former is entirely based on Persian models of composition, which are quite different from the older works from which the native literature took its origin. Urdu prose came into existence, as a literary medium, at the beginning of the last century in Calcutta. Like Hindi prose it was due to English influence, and to the need of text-books in both forms of Hindostani for the College of Fort William. The Bāgh o Bahār of Mir Amman
and the Khirad Afrőz of Ḥafizū’-d-dīn Aḥmad are familiar examples of the earlier of these works in Urdu, as the already mentioned Prēm Sāgar written by Lallū Lāl is an example of those in Hindi. Since then both Urdu and Hindi prose have had a prosperous course, and it is unnecessary to dwell upon the copious literature which has poured from the press during the past century. The late Sir Sayyid Ahmad Bahādur is probably the most eminent among deceased writers of Urdu prose, while in Hindi the late Harishchandra of Benares, by universal consent, holds the first place. Hindi, of course, has no poetical literature. Urdu poetry continues to flourish.

Urdu and Hindi, as representing, each, one of the two great religious systems of India, have their headquarters wide apart. Two rival cities claim to be the true headquarters of Urdu, viz. Delhi and Lucknow. The styles of the writers of these two cities, and of their respective followers, show considerable points of difference. Putting a few matters of idiom, such as the use of the Infinitive as a Gerundive, or of certain verbs as transitive or intransitive, to one side, the main point of difference is that Lucknow Urdu is much more Persianised than the Urdu of Delhi. Lucknow writers delight in concocting sentences which, except for an auxiliary verb at the end, are throughout Persian in construction and vocabulary. Delhi Urdu, on the other hand, is more genuinely Indian. Writers are not afraid to employ a word because it is of home growth. This avoidance of pedantry had been strongly advocated by the new school of Delhi writers which has come to the front in the last twenty years of the nineteenth century, and of whom, Naqīr Aḥmad, the author of several excellent novels, is the most illustrious example. The Urdu of his earlier works is remarkably clear and simple, and his writings exhibit both sturdy common-sense and a fine appreciation of humour. Other authors of this school who may be mentioned are Ḥāli, Muḥammad Ḥusain Āzād (said by some to compose the purest Urdu prose that ever was written), Ratan Naṭh Sarṣhār, and 'Abdu’l-Ḥalim Sharār. All these writers, whether in prose or verse, are apostles of naturalness as opposed to the artificial thought and diction of the Lucknow school.

Hindi, also, has two schools of writers—that of Agra, and that of Benares. The Hindi prose of Benares is as artificial as literary Bengali. It stands as a literary parallel to Lucknow Urdu, in avoiding the use of simple language as much as possible and in confining its vocabulary almost entirely to words borrowed directly from Sanskrit. Native Indian words are eschewed as strictly as those of Persian origin. The school of Agra, on the other hand, is not only much more free from Sanskritisms, but admits with comparative liberality foreign words which have achieved citizenship in the general vocabulary of India.

In connexion with this, it may here again be mentioned that Literary Hindoostāni is not only founded on a vernacular dialect of Western Hindi, but is still in living connexion with it. Different writers have not hesitated to employ in their works idioms borrowed from their own vernaculars, and many of these have won their way into what is the standard form of speech. Hence the literary Hindoostāni of the time ofGilchrist is very different from that employed at the present day. Idioms have fallen into disuse, and new idioms have been introduced, so that works like the Tōtā Kāhāṇī or the Bhag ḷ Bahār are very
unsafe guides as to what is elegant modern Urdu. Many European writers have fought against this change, and have not hesitated to condemn new idioms as 'ungrammatical' or as solecisms. They forget that the works which they consider to be classics were really first attempts at writing Hindostani prose, and that a hundred years of practice, with an inexhaustible well of racy native idiom at hand from which to draw at will, has greatly improved a form of speech originally possessed of great capabilities. Mr. Platts was, I believe, the first to attack this too conservative method of teaching a language,—not as it is, but as the teacher thinks it ought to be. He rightly insisted that grammars written by Europeans, however scholarly, cannot be considered as the ultimate court of appeal. The *jus et norma loquendi* of the best writers of the time is the only criterion. The language cannot be made to fit the grammars, but the grammars must be made to fit the language. It is a false purism which condemns the use of an apt expression because, although born of the soil, it has not been used by former writers.

The particular alphabet in which Hindostani is written is usually a matter of religion. Musalmans commonly employ the Persian alphabet with a few additional signs, and most Hindus the Devanagari or the Khaithi. Simple Hindostani which is neither highly Persianised nor highly Sanskritised cannot be, and often is, written in both alphabets. It is quite common to find a book which appeals to a large circle of readers issued in two editions, one in the Persian character for Musalmans, and one in the Devanagari character for Hindus. In this respect it should be noted that many educated Hindus, and especially Kayasths, are equally familiar with both alphabets.

When Hindostani is highly Persianised, and takes the form of Urdû, the words are often so foreign in sound that they cannot be conveniently represented in the Devanagari character. Hence Urdû is always written in the Persian character. Similarly highly Sanskritised Hindi does not lend itself to the Persian character and always appears in Devanagari. Amongst fanatics who ought to know better, but do not wish to do so, this question of characters has unfortunately become a sort of religious shibboleth. True Hindostani can be written with ease in either character, and Musalmans find it easiest to read it in the Persian and most Hindus in the Devanagari. But, owing to the fact that the extreme varieties of Hindostani on each side can only each be written in one character, these fanatics have confused alphabet with language. They say, because a thing is written in Devanagari therefore it is Hindi, the language of Hindus, and because a thing is written in the Persian character therefore it is Urdu, the language of Musalmans. Nothing could be further from the truth. The written character does not make a language. If it did, when we write Hindostani in English characters, we should have to say it was the English language, and not Hindostani; but not even

---

1. As examples of this borrowing from the vernacular dialects, I may cite the use of *Un-nâ* instead of *Un-nd* to mean 'by him.' Several grammarians have exercised their ingenuity over it, and some have condemned it as wrong. It is simply the very common vernacular *and* or *uni*, which is still retained in Dakhini. In the literary language the *n* has been doubled under the influence of false analogy. Another example is the employment of *kâ* in the sense of the dative instead of *kâ*. All over northern India *kâ* is frequently used for the dative, and quite properly so. As we go east it is the rule, and we never hear *kâ*. All grammarians except Mr. Platts have tried to explain this *kâ* as an oblique form of *kâ*. In phrases like *us-â bâ-kâ jôh lâgi hâi*, it is, as Mr. Platts points out, a dative pure and simple.

2. Compare the remarks of W. Archer quoted at the head of this section.
our fanatics would go so far as that, although that is where their arguments would logically lead them. It is necessary to mention this because the policy regarding the alphabets which are officially recognised by some of the Indian Governments has been much misrepresented. When orders were issued enjoining or permitting in certain cases the use of the Dēva-nāgari character for official documents, a cry was raised, which misled many well-meaning Muhammadans, that the Hindi language was being introduced into our courts. Government was quite aware that Sanskritised Hindi was just as unintelligible to the masses as Persianised Urdu, and took no steps towards introducing either. All that it directed was that, without changing the language, official documents should be written in characters which would be most decipherable to those who had to read them.¹

It is unnecessary to describe the Dēva-nāgari and Kaithi alphabets. A full account of them will be found on pp. 7 and ff. of Vol. V, Pt. II of this Survey. Nor is it required to describe the Persian Alphabet. The student will find all that he needs on this point in any Hindōstāni grammar. Suffice it to say that the signs employed for sounds peculiar to Indian languages, and not found in Persian, are $\text{स}; \text{त}; \text{र}; \text{ल}; \text{प}; \text{ह}; \text{द}; \text{र}; \text{व}; \text{ण}; \text{त}; \text{न}; \text{म}$.

Hindōstāni Grammar.

Hindōstāni, like every Aryan language of India, is derived from an ancient Indian dialect not unlike the old Sanskrit which we meet in the Vedic hymns. This ancient dialect became changed in the course of centuries, and we have specimens of it in various stages from about 250 B.C. down to, say, 1000 A.D. The modern vernaculars may be said to have become established on their present basis at about the latter date.

We may take Sanskrit grammar as illustrating in its main features the grammar of the ancient Indian dialect from which Hindōstāni is sprung. When we examine this grammar we find that the verb is supplied with a very complete and somewhat complicated array of tenses. The present and one form of the future tense were fairly simple. They have survived, in an abraded form, down to the present day, although the representative of the future is now-a-days excluded from literary Hindōstāni. With the past tenses it was different. Besides an Imperfect the ancient Indian dialect had three tenses which expressed past time, a perfect, and two aorists. It had also a past parti-

¹ The average native makes a business of deciphering any written document. He has first to read it,—that is the first stage,—and then he has to grasp its meaning,—that is the second, and subsequent stage. The two stages are, with the uneducated, seldom concurrent. This is illustrated by the oft repeated phrase, ‘when he had read and understood’ such and such a communication. Similarly the word for reading a letter to oneself is not parākhā, but parākh-līna, to read and take. It may be added that in some parts of India, the local character is employed for writing Urdu. For instance the Musalmāns of Orissa use the Oriya character for it.
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ciple, which was always intransitive, that is to say, in the case of transitive verbs, it took a passive meaning. Thus, the past participle of the intransitive verb 'to go' was 'gone,' but that of the transitive verb 'kill,' was not 'having killed,' but was, passively, 'killed.' In the old Indian dialect, as in Sanskrit, this past participle was often used as a past tense, without employing any auxiliary verb. When its speakers wished to say 'he went,' they often said 'he gone,' and when they wished to say 'I killed him,' they often said 'he killed by me,' in which it will be seen that the participle still retains its passive sense. But there is another way of using the past participle of a neuter verb,—i.e., impersonally. When a speaker of the old Indian dialect wished to say 'he went,' he as often as not (instead of saying 'he gone') said 'it (is) gone by him.'

Now the true past tenses of the ancient Indian dialect had a very complicated conjugation. There were two ways of forming the perfect, and regarding the more commonly used form, even Sanskrit grammarians were not agreed as to its rules. The two aorists were still more difficult to conjugate correctly. The formation of the past participle is on the other hand simple enough. As the language developed from the ancient Indian dialect it, according to a well-known law, proceeded along the line of least resistance, and gradually abandoned the whole complicated array of past tenses and adhered solely to the employment of the past participle to express the idea connoted by a past tense. In doing so it retained all the methods of employing the past participle which existed in the old Indian vernacular, and also extended them by adding one of its own. When Hindostani, therefore, wishes to express the idea of 'he went,' it says either,—

1. (Actively) 'he gone,' voh chalā (Sanskrit, sa chālitaḥ)

or

2. (Impersonally) 'by him it (is) gone,' us-nē chalā

(Sanskrit, tēna chālītam)

Similarly, if it wishes to express the idea of 'I killed him,' it says either,—

3. (Passively). 'by me he (was) killed,' mañ-nē voh māra

(Sanskrit, mayā sa mārītaḥ).

or

4. (Impersonally) 'by me with reference to him it was killed (or killing was done),' mañ-nē us-kō māra. (The Sanskrit would be mayā tasya-krīte mārītam, but the impersonal construction with transitive verbs was not employed in Sanskrit).

The fourth is apparently a development of the modern vernacular, based on the analogy of the second—at least there is no evidence that it existed in the ancient Indian vernacular from which Hindostani is descended.

We thus see that there are three methods of employment of the past participle to express the past tense. Of these, one, the active one, is confined in Hindostani to intransitive verbs, one, the passive one, is confined to transitive verbs, and one, the impersonal one, is employed with both intransitive and transitive verbs, although literary Hindostani prohibits its employment with the former.

1 It will be remembered that intransitive verbs in Latin can also be similarly employed in two ways. For 'I play,' we may say either, actively, ludō, I play, or, impersonally, luditur a me, it is played by me.

2 This second impersonal form of a neuter verb is excluded from literary Hindostani, but it occurs in vernacular dialects.

3 I do not pretend that this particular sentence is idiomatic Hindostani, but it illustrates what I want to say, and the construction would, in certain circumstances, be correct.
These three constructions (or prayōgas) are named as follows by Indian grammarians—

1. The active construction is called the Kartari prayōga.
2. The passive "" "" Karmāni "
3. The impersonal "" "" Bāvē "

One word more. The past participle is an adjective, and is therefore liable to change for gender.

In the Active construction it naturally agrees with the subject. If a man is gone, we say mard chalū, but if a woman is gone, we say 'aurat chali.

In the Passive construction the participle must agree in gender with what would be, in English, the object. For instance, the phrase 'the woman struck a horse' must be expressed passively by 'by the woman a horse (was) struck,' in which it is evident that the participle 'struck' must agree with 'horse,' and not with 'the woman,' — thus 'aurat-nē ghōrī mārā. But, 'the woman struck a mare' would be 'aurat-nē ghōrī mārā, in which mārā, struck, is put in the feminine to agree with 'mare.'

In the impersonal construction, the participle should, properly speaking, be in the neuter, but that distinction of gender no longer exists in literary Hindīstāni, the masculine being at the present day always substituted for it. Hence the participle is always in the masculine. Thus 'the woman struck the horse' is 'by the woman with reference to the horse it was struck (or striking was done),' 'aurat-nē ghōrē-kō mārā; and 'the woman struck the mare' is 'by the woman with reference to the mare striking was done,' 'aurat-nē ghōrē-kō mārā.

It is of great importance that this system of construction should be thoroughly mastered. Otherwise it will not be easy to understand the interlinear translations of the specimens which follow, in which all three constructions are literally translated whenever they occur.

There is no difference of importance between the declensions and conjugations used in Urdu and Hindi, respectively. Urdu often borrows Persian constructions, such as the izāfat, but these are borrowings and nothing more. Besides the difference of vocabulary, there is, however, an important point of difference in the idiom of the two forms of Hindīstāni. This consists in the order of words. In Hindī prose, which follows the almost universal rule of all Indo-Aryan dialects, the order of words is fixed, and can only be altered for the sake of emphasis. Except when the order is deliberately changed to lay stress on any particular word, it is invariably,—first, the introductory words of the sentence, such as conjunctions and the like; next, the subject; next, the indirect object with its appurtenances; then, the direct object with its appurtenances; and, last of all, the verb. Adjectives and genitives precede the words they qualify. For instance, the sentence which in English would run,—'I give John's good book to you' would run in Hindī prose,—'I you-to John's good book give.' In Urdu, on the contrary, the influence of Persian and of Semitic languages has greatly relaxed this rule. The Persian rule of order, or even the Semitic one (in which the verb precedes the subject), is often followed, and, especially, the verb is frequently moved from the end to the middle of the sentence. So important is this point of the order of words in a sentence that Hindī scholars make it a test as to whether the language of a book is Hindī or Urdu, and in one notable case—the
Kukāni thēth Hindi-mē, a work written by Inshā (see p. 35) in the last century—a book which does not contain a single Persian word from cover to cover is classed as Urdu because the writer ordered his sentences in the Persian fashion. He was a Musalmān, and could not release himself from the habit of using idioms which had been taught him by Maulavis in his school-days.

Hindūstāni Vocabulary. The Vocabulary of Hindūstāni falls under four heads, viz.:

1. pure Hindūstāni words;
2. words borrowed from Sanskrit;
3. words borrowed from Persian (including Arabic); and
4. words borrowed from other sources.

The last group may be dismissed without notice, such words exist in every language. As regards the Persian (and Arabic) borrowings, they do not come from the old Persian language of pre-Musalmān times (though that has also contributed a small quota), but from the Arabicised Persian of the Mughul conquerors. Thus, through Persian, the Indo-Aryan vernaculars have also received an important contribution of Arabic, and even some few Turki, words. The influence of the Musalmān religion has opened another door for the entry of Arabic, and a few words have also been imported on the west coast from Arab traders. In the main, however, the Arabic element in all the Indian vernaculars, whether Aryan or not, came in with Persian, and as a part of that language. The pronunciation of the Persian words so imported is that of the Mughul times, and not the effeminate articulation of the land of the Lion and the Sun at the present day. The extent to which Persian has been assimilated varies greatly according to locality and to the religion of the speakers. Everywhere there are some few Persian words which have achieved full citizenship and are used by the most ignorant rustic, and we find every variation between this and the Urdu of a highly educated Muhammadan writer of Lucknow, who uses scarcely a single Indo-Aryan word except the verb at the end of his sentence. In all circumstances, however, it is the vocabulary and but rarely the syntax which is affected. Only in the Urdu of the Musalmāns do we find the Persian order of words in a sentence. There has been no other introduction of Persian construction, nor are the Arabic words inflected (except by purists) according to their own rules, but they have to conform to the grammatical system of their host.

The words borrowed from Sanskrit take two forms, according to whether they are lifted straight out of the Sanskrit dictionary, spelling and all, or whether they are more or less mispronounced, and spelt according to the mispronunciation. Words of both classes are named Tatsamas or 'the same as "that"' (i.e., Sanskrit), and European scholars have named the corrupted Tatsamas of the second class semi-Tatsamas. This borrowing has been going on for centuries, but has been carried to excess during the last hundred years.

The pure Hindūstāni words form the backbone of the language. They are derived from the ancient Indian dialect which I have already mentioned as akin to classical Sanskrit. This ancient language passed through various stages and ultimately became Hindūstāni, just as Latin passed through various stages and became Italian, French, etc. After the ancient Indian dialect had lost its pristine form, and before it finally became Hindūstāni, it passed
through what is known as the Prakrit stage. If we borrow the terms of blood relationship, we may say that the ancient Indian dialect and classical Sanskrit were brothers; that Prakrit was the son of the ancient Indian dialect, and the nephew of Sanskrit; and that Hindostani is the grandson of the ancient Indian dialect, and the grand-nephew of Sanskrit. Words borrowed by Hindostani direct from Sanskrit are therefore grand-uncles of the genuine Hindostani words, descended through Prakrit from the ancient Indian dialect, although we often meet them side by side in the same sentence. Nay, we sometimes find a grand-uncle and his own grand-nephew on the same page.¹ These genuine Hindostani words are called, by native scholars, *tadbhavas* or *Having “that”* (i.e., Sanskrit, or, rather, its brother the ancient Indian dialect) for their origin. We thus find that the Indian element of the vocabulary of Hindostani is made up of *tadbhavas* with a mixture, varying in amount, of *tatsamas*.

To take examples, the modern vernacular word अजुः, a command, is a Tatsama loan-word borrowed direct from classical Sanskrit. Its semi-Tatsama form, which we meet in some languages, is ṣajya, and one of its Tadbhava forms is the Hindī ᵐइन, derived immediately from the Prakrit अव. So also, राजा, a king, is a Tatsama, but रूय or रूष is a Tadbhava. Of course complete triplets or pairs of every word are not in use. Frequently only a Tatsama or a Tadbhava occurs by itself. Sometimes we even find the Tatsama and the Tadbhava forms of a word both in use, but each with a different meaning. Thus, there is a classical Sanskrit word कम्या, which means both ‘family’ and ‘bamboo,’ and connected with it we find in Hindi the semi-Tatsama बन्ध, meaning ‘family,’ and the Tadbhava बांध, meaning ‘a bamboo.’”

We thus see that for many hundred years classical Sanskrit has been exercising, and is still exercising, a potent influence on the vocabularies of Hindostani. It is only upon the vocabulary that its influence has been directly felt. The grammar shows little (if any) traces of it. This has continued stendily in the course of its development since the earliest times. The influence of Sanskrit may have retarded this development, and probably did so in some cases, but it never stopped it, and not one single Sanskrit grammatical form has been added to the living grammar of Hindostani in the way that Sanskrit words have been added to its vocabulary. Nay, more, all these borrowed Tatsamas are treated by Hindostani exactly as other borrowed foreign words are treated, and very rarely change their forms in the processes of grammatical accidence. For instance, गौरा, a horse, has an oblique form गौरेश, because it is a Tadbhava, but राजा, a king, never changes in the oblique cases, because, and only because, it is a Tatsama. Now in all the modern Indo-Aryan vernaculars the verb must change its form in the processes of conjugation, while nouns are not necessarily changed in the course of declension. Hence Tatsamas are as a rule never treated as verbs. If it is found necessary to do so, it must be done with the help of another Tadbhava verb. For instance, the word दागुण, seeing, is a Tatsama, and if we wish to use it in the phrase ‘he sees,’

¹ In Bengali, in which the state of affairs is exactly similar, I have seen in the narrative part of a novel the *tatsama* word दीक्षा-दीक्षा, and in the very next line, in which one of the characters uses colloquial language, the corresponding *tadbhava*, दीक्षा-साल्य, a match.

² Tatsamas and Tadbhavas occur also in European languages. Thus, ‘lapis’ in ‘lapis calm’ is a Tatsama, and ‘lapse’ is a semi-Tatsama, both meaning ‘a falling,’ while ‘lap’ is the Tadbhava form of the word, with the different meaning of ‘the hanging part of a garment.’ Similarly ‘fragile’ and ‘redemption’ are semi-Tatsamas, while ‘frail’ and ‘ransom’ are the corresponding Tadbhavas.
we cannot say darbuné, but must employ the periphrasis darbán karré, he does seeing.
On the other hand, in all the modern vernaculars nouns need not be declined synthetically. Borrowed nouns can always be declined analytically. Hence Tatsama nouns (which are necessarily declined analytically) are common, and, in the high literary styles of all the vernaculars, very common. Thus, although there are sporadic exceptions to the broad rule, it may be laid down as a universal law that Indo-Aryan vernacular nouns may be either Tatsamas (including semi-Tatsamas) or Tadbhavas, but that Indo-Aryan vernacular verbs must be Tadbhavas.

During the last century, the introduction of printing and the spread of education has, in the case of some modern Indo-Aryan languages, introduced a fashion of using Tatsamas in comparison with which the wildest Johnsonese may almost be considered to be a specimen of pure Saxon English. It has been proved, for instance, by actual counting that in a modern Bengali work 88 per cent. of the words used were pure Sanskrit, every one of which was unnecessary and could have been represented by a vocable of true home growth. In such cases the result has been most lamentable. The vernacular has been split into two sections—the tongue which is understood of the people, and the literary dialect, known only through the press, and not intelligible to those who do not know Sanskrit. Literature has thus been divorced from the great mass of the population, and to the literary classes this is a matter of small moment, for 'this people, who knoweth not the law, are cursed.'

Although Bengali displays the greatest weakness in this respect, and has lost all power of ever developing a vigorous literature, racy of the soil, until some great genius rises and sweeps away the enchantment under which it labours, other Indian vernaculars, especially Hindi, show signs of falling under the same malignant spell. The centre of Hindi literature is naturally Benares, and Benares is in the hands of the Sanskritists. There is no necessity, as may have existed in the case of Bengali, for Hindi to have recourse to the classical tongue. In themselves, without any extraneous help whatever, the dialects from which it is sprung are, and for five hundred years have been, capable of expressing with crystal clearness any idea which the mind of man can conceive. It has an enormous native vocabulary, and a complete apparatus for the expression of abstract terms. Its old literature contains some of the highest flights of poetry and some of the most eloquent expressions of religious devotion which have found their birth in Asia. Treatises on philosophy and on rhetoric are found in it, in which the subject is handled with all the subtlety of the great Sanskrit writers, and this with hardly the use of a Sanskrit word. Yet in spite of Hindi possessing such a vocabulary and a power of expression scarcely inferior to that of English, it has become the fashion of late years to write books, not to be read by the millions of Upper India, but to display the author's learning to a comparatively small circle of Sanskrit-knowing scholars. Unfortunately, the most powerful English influence has during this period been on the side of the Sanskritists. This Sanskritised Hindi has been largely used by missionaries, and the translations of the Bible have been made into it. The few native writers who

---

1 The newly appointed minister to a Scotch parish had made a round of visits to his people. "He's a rale fine educated man, the new minister," said an enthusiastic wife. "Ay, he's a'that," returned the husband. "Ye dinna ken the meaning o' the hauf o' the words he uses."—St. James's Gazette.
have stood up for the use of Hindi undefiled have had small success in the face of so potent an example of misguided efforts. Arguments may be brought forward in favour of using classical Sanskrit words for expressing technical terms in science and art, and I am willing to admit their truth. I am not one of those who (to quote a well-known example) prefer 'the unthroughforcefulness of stuff' to 'the impenetrability of matter,' but there the borrowing from the parent language should stop. There is still time to save Hindi from the fate of Bengali, if only a lead is taken by writers of acknowledged repute, and much can be done in this direction by the use of a wise discretion on the part of the educational authorities of the provinces immediately concerned.

Very similar remarks apply, mutatis mutandis, to that form of Urdu which is overloaded with Persian words. The Hindostani of Musalmans will always differ in its vocabulary from that of Hindus, but this is no reason for overloading a naturally facile and elegant form of speech with hundreds of exotic expressions which are unintelligible to nine-tenths of the author's co-religionists. Urdu can be simple and Urdu can be pedantic. The simple belongs to India, the pedantic is an imitation of the language of a foreign country. There should be no hesitation in the choice made by a patriotic Indian Musalman.

After the foregoing general remarks it will suffice to give the annexed brief summary of the main heads of Hindostani grammar. It will be remarked that, in Urdu, the so-called imperfect*, which has been carefully recorded in all the vernacular specimens in the Devanagari character, is omitted. This is the usual method of writing Urdu. For instance, the word meaning 'to see' would be देखना dēkhna in Hindi, but دیکھنا dēkhna in Urdu. This principle is followed in all the specimens of literary Hindostani. The imperfect letter is also omitted in the skeleton grammar.