

COMMUNITIES AND LANGUAGE IDENTIFICATION IN NWP AND AWADH

- Dr.Himanshu K.Chaturvedi

INTRODUCTION

Disintegration of Soviet Union brought forth the issues of nationalism and ethnicity in the prime of academic debate, leading to post-Marxist interpretations in the above light. Central focus of this debate is around the identification of a community or a ethnic group, based on broad features, which is supposed to be strong enough in its form to challenge the edifice of modern nation system which evolved in centuries after French and American Revolutions . This has certainly given strength to the new idea that Nations and Nationalism are not static identities and will change with the time.¹ While interpreting the issue of ethnicity, modern scholars like De vos have defined Ethnicity as a sense of Ethnic identity as consisting of the 'subjective, symbolic or emblematic use by a group of people... of any aspect of culture, in order to differentiate themselves from other groups'.² Nations may be created by the transformation of an ethnic group in a multiethnic state into a self conscious political entity or by the amalgamation of diverse groups and the formation of an inter-ethnic, composite or homogeneous national culture through the agency of modern state. In India's context evolution of such modern state into some kind of national identity started in later half of the nineteenth century. However, the process of nationality formation may or may not be pursued to the point where political structures are made congruent with nationality by creating an autonomous or independent self governing entity. Similarly, the process of nation - building by state authorities may or may not succeed in creating relatively homogeneous national groups congruent with the territorial boundaries of the state. Although the process of forming nationalities out of ethnic groups and of building national cultures to conform with state boundaries are similar in many respects. Basically there are two stages in the development of a nationality in modern state system where ethnic identity collaborates with political identity. The first is the movement from ethnic category to community. Depending on the context, this stage may involve such changes as the creation of a self conscious language community out of a group of speakers.³ Language becomes not merely a means of communication but a priceless heritage of group culture. This may be reflected in Irredentism when the leaders of the movement tend to create a language community, may at the same time stake a claim to dominance of that language in a particular territory; the supporters of the demands for religious community may also seek protection for the language or script in which their religious texts are written and may promote the identification of language with the religion and encourage and protect it to fulfill the needs of culture as well as its usage in modern state. The second stage in the transformation of ethnic group involves the articulation and acquisition of social, economic, and political rights for the member of the groups or for the group as a whole.

In early modernizing colonial and ex-colonial societies, government employment and the use of language in other new professions, erstwhile absent in a state, are often the critical factor in the growth of ethnic rivalries because it provides the authorities with a means to both reward the sons of the collaborationist aristocracy and to create new collaborationist groups by distributing opportunities unevenly, whether intentionally or unintentionally. During the initial course of modernization a new class always emerges in such societies. In India's context this was the most debatable middle class, hard to define on European scale, but certainly a new class with ambitions for its own niche or for group as a whole. This may be interpreted in new elite rivalries, quite different from older aristocracy in the representative mobilization form where political ambitions get intermixed with economic and social issues. Although elite conflict and job competition are common in modernizing societies, they do not always impel distinctive cultural groups towards ethnic differentiation. The process of modernization may produce so great an imbalance between one group and another that many ethnic groups may become assimilated to another language and culture.⁴ This can happen only when the state policy works positively and leaders of the new elite control the forces of mobilization in unifying terms. However, both failed considerably in the course of Indian colonial modernization. It is in this light, that the present case study of community identification in the region of NWP & Avadh has been attempted where language issue played as catalyst to redefine the ethnic issue in the face of the initial modernization in colonial society thus, defining the force, challenges and issues of

change in the building of modern India.

I

The Communalization of Hindu/Urdu controversy cannot be simply traced back to divisive politics of colonial rulers. It should also be looked upon as a crisis of new elite that emerged in India in the later half of the nineteenth century. The source of the deeper controversy shall be traced out from the complicated working of the elite politics and caste and communal rivalries. The anxieties and ambitions of the North Indian Brahmin elite, tormented by the entrenched power of the Muslim upper classes and jealous of the Kayastha monopoly over the service sector, sustained the energies of the Nagari/Hindi movement. Devanagari was opposed not only to the Persian script, but also to Kaithi, a variant of the Nagari script that was popular amongst Muslims and Kayasthas. To displace a community it was necessary to repress the assumed markers of its identity and cultural basis of its power. The hostility towards the Persian script, coalesced with the attack against the syncretic culture associated with the hegemonic Awadh Muslim elite, fusing the issue of language as a basis of religious division for future. On the contrary its also a fact that one has to understand that English did not ruled India on the power of guns but on the basis of ideology which in the 19th century was a mixture of English thought of colonial governance of civilizing India with clear design of crippling and dividing the basic features of the civilization itself for its own existence. Macaulay's policy if civilizing India ended the era of Orientals and process of modernizing Indian communities began. In the course of such modernization issues related to the system of education in India got directly linked to two vital factors. Firstly what shall be the idea of educating the Indians and secondly the medium of instruction. The structural changes which started in the 19th century, later half undoubtedly effected the traditional moulds the old society (pre 1857) were vanquished in their final attempt at rehabilitating their former power and status in 1857. They were too exhausted and weakened to embark upon a fresh enterprise in future. Thus, the policy of colonizers regarding India underwent a metamorphosis after 1857. Its former orientation towards support of the new progressive forces within the Indian society was replaced by a growing gravitation and support to the conservative forces of that society. Such conservative forces provide catalyst in national awakening undoubtedly, but on issues of greater consequences (to avoid divide) they couldn't check the forces unleashed by British Government in which they were a part consciously or unconsciously.

The issue of use of Court language, new government jobs, political seats and medium of instruction in education set the pace for the structural change in Indian society. Of these issues Language and state affairs were prior importance to the governed, as well as to the governing. The government had a clear thought of these issues. However, prior to 1857 language displacement in the official policy was adopted but it did not made any impact, communally. But post 1857 the language issue was the first underlying current which brought two major language groups of U. P. to debate upon their cultural identities culminating to the breaking of the spirit of 1857 which had witnessed the Hindus and Muslims shouldering the common cause.

The political situation in India changed considerably after the failure of Indian uprising of 1857. The resulting political configuration gave rise to a series of problems concerning the adaptation of the politically conscious Indians to the new system. In their attempt to come to terms with the altered political situation, the politically conscious Indians could not offer a common response. They mostly differed sharply among themselves in their interpretation of the situation as well as evaluation of their own roles.⁵

II

Prior to 1857, there had been few noteworthy changes on the issue of language. In 1830 the court of Directors of the EIC advised the government in India to introduce English as the language of public business in all its departments. But they asked the court of law to be excluded from the operation of this instruction. Their argument for the exclusion of courts was "It is highly important that justice should be administered in language familiar to the litigant parties and to the people at large."⁶ In 1836 the government of NWP, circulated an order in Hindi stating that on account of Persian being the language of the courts the people were put to inconvenience and difficulty, that hence forth they would be free to submit their petitions to the Sadar Board in Hindi written either in Persian or Nagari character, and that the Board and replies would be in the script of the petition. It is evident that though the scripts suggested

were two, the language chosen was Hindi. A year later (1837) regional languages in different provinces were substituted for Persian, but in NWP Bihar and CP the choice went in favour of Urdu in Persian script and the Nagari character was shut out.⁷ However, this did not made any serious impact on communities and largely it was only a governmental affair to decide upon. One most assume that prior 1857 language was a subject only related to official circles with no political bearings of any magnitude on communities.

The perception that Persianized language could not fulfill social needs was strengthened by the founders of the Fort William College. Since, then emphasis was put more on Hindustani.⁸ Though, outside U. P. (then, it was in 1825 that the British granted Urdu the status of court language) its opposition assumed social colour as revival of Sanskrit was started in Poona and Culcutta. It was the first reactionary sort of lingua movement in the 19th century, urging upon the use of Devnagari script. Its main purpose seemed to rely upon superiority of language and hence on momentum gathered steadily to announce Arabic and Persian as alien languages and attempt started to free the indigenous languages from foreign influence. Resultantly the British welcomed this new development as an opportunity to further divide the two major communities to pitch them against each other.

While emphasizing upon the fact of communal disharmony based upon linguistics, one has to understand the importance of the same in the modern time. Though till 19th century language was (and now also) the chief source of cultural identification but the structural changes which started shaping new India transformed language, along with cultural identification, into commercial identification. Vernacular medium and employment got so intermixed after Wood's dispatch that in the later half of the 19th century the issue became eco-cultural. It is a truth that, of all the forms of social interaction, the language people speak is the most compelling and enduring source of cultural identity. Cultural identities and differences tend to follow linguistic lines. Major differences in customs, values, attitudes and rituals tend to be accompanied by differences in language and similarity in language tend to reinforce similarities in social behaviour.⁹

Analyzing the Indian situation since ancient times one finds interesting that scholarly interest in language in India is reflected in ancient literary and philosophical writings. Many such works have been credited with detailed linguistic observation. However, none of these works throw any light on the social consequences of the linguistic diversity in India. This is to state that lingua difference didn't have any political bearings.¹⁰

III

From the above discussion, two conclusions can be drawn regarding language and identity. Firstly, language was not a political question before 1857, though changes were sought by the government in that era and secondly, the cultural and economic questions were not vital issues in context to language. The sense common enmity towards British among the Hindus and Muslims in the uprising of 1857 is suggestive enough of the fact that time was no animosity between two communities on such issues. It would be more interesting if one analyze the role of language during the uprising of 1857 in the form of slogans for mobilization. A prefect blend of unity can then be witnessed. This can be traced from the files of vernacular press, specially Urdu histories written in Persian and Urdu soon after the suppression of the rebellion and a number of Proclamations issued by the rebels during 1857 - 58. The Proclamation indicates simultaneously "ruin of religious classes specially pandits, faquirs and other learned men."¹¹ Apart from this the appeal to unity and protection of deen aur dharam is made in almost all Proclamations issued by Nana Saheb, Khan Bahadur Khan and others. From the linguistic point of view the Proclamation indicate that rebels used a very simple language which one may term Hidustani (already defined in reference), they are bilingual in nature, printed in Nagari and Urdu scripts and languages targeted for commoners. Use of word like mans, paji, chohar, bairi, be-dharma, chatur, and dhar, are commonly found.

Use of simple language was not confined to the Proclamations of Awadh. Reference may be made to Khan Bahadur Khan's Bareilly Proclamation. This is addressed to the local chieftains "ap sab raja log bade dharam aur khoobiyon wale sakhi data, bardasht karne wale bahadur ho aur samhalne wale apne dharam aur auro ke dharam ke ho."¹² In this proclamation words like "Sarir" (Body), "Reet" (Customs), "Rand" (Widow), "Dharam Sati, Raj Dharam" (Duty Of The State) "Desh" (Country) have been used. It

denotes that till 1857, there existed no linguistic dispute between two communities and Urdu, Awadhi and Braj (Brij) phraseology are used extensively.¹³

As the Proclamations are in mixed language, the thrust is also upon Hindu - Muslim unity, as in most cases the emphasis is laid to protect Hinduism and Islam and it is the duty of Indians as a whole. This can be witnessed as in the form of address these Proclamations made such as "Hindu and Musalman brothers". The author of Zafarnama, waqya - i - gadar, refers to the rebels slogans in Awadh: "Deen tu Duee Den, Hindu ka Dharam Musalman ka Iman". Furthermore, rebels assume Hindu and Musalman as descendent from one father "Ek Pita Ke Duee Putra, Ek Hindu Ek

Turk inka choli daman ka saath".¹⁴ Durga Das Bandhopadhyay, a British employee posted at Bareilly refers to rebels slogans: "Hindu Musalman Ek, Ram Rahim Ek, Shri Krishna Allah Ek".¹⁵ Thus, language as a mode of communication and mobilization in 1857 - 58 bears enough testimony that there was no politico- cultural difference between Hindu and Muslims, at least on linguistic front.

IV

Within fifty years after 1857 India witnessed the process of change which was unprecedented in its earlier history. The economic policies of the Imperial government along with the spread of western education and administrative changes (chiefly introduction of the local self government and modern courts) produced a new middle class which became the carrier of nationalism and modernism but could not prevent the wedge among the major communities. Perhaps this was the biggest failure. Few among the new middle class became catalyst factor in this drama of friction between Hindu and Muslims, specially in Northern India and U. P. played a leading role in this crisis which started on the issue of language. It was this question of the authenticity of the identity of the languages that led to major cleavage in the language politics of Northern India. Broadly speaking, the linguistic controversy, rather requirement of the age (post 1857) was now divided into two sections, firstly, What should be the medium of education and secondly, what should be the language of public offices? Both issues clearly were related to the emerging middle class.

In NWP while protest began to assert against the Persian laden Urdu within a few years of linguistic change of 1837. The advocacy for Hindi produced some results and in 1854, the government of NWP instructed the district authorities that the village revenue of official papers should be maintained in Hindi and Devnagari script. In 1856, another order was sent out calling upon junior officer of the Revenue Department to learn the Nagari character and telling them that if they did not carry out the order, their services would be dispensed with.¹⁶

In NWP, the case of Hindi was taken up by certain individuals of whom one Raja Shiv Prasad was more prominent. As an Inspector of Schools he was a government official also representing the new middle class. He presented the first serious demand diplomatically. He set aside the Hindu - Urdu controversy and merely proposed that the Nagari script should be substituted for that of Urdu. All that Raja Shiv Prasad's proposal meant to secure was the script should be Nagari and the language should continue to be Persian laden Urdu. Both, the protagonists of Hindi and Urdu did not react favourably. The protagonists of Hindi were critical of this and Urdu supporters would not agree to a script which was not suitable for Persian words.¹⁷ Government reply to same was ambiguous. The reaction to the Raja Shiv Prasad's petition can be found in the letter of Sir Sayyed Ahmad Khan (then in London) written to one of his friends, "I have received a news of concern that Hindus are excited on a petition given by Babu Shiv Prasad and they are contemplating to get rid of Persian and Urdu which is so symbolic of Muslims".¹⁸ One must understand that both Raja Shiv Prasad and Sir Sayyed Ahmed Khan were representing the new middle class intelligentsia of U. P. and pro British in their attitudes, which was in transition. The following excerpts from a statement given by the Raja to the education commission gives an idea of the controversy. "It was in 1868 that I wrote a memorandum on court character in the Upper Provinces. My object was to speak only about the character".¹⁹

Although in 1870s Hindi was adopted as the language of the lower courts, first in Bihar and then in the Central Provinces. British officials in the Upper Provinces resisted the demand, partly on the ground that Urdu was the vernacular at least in Awadh and partly because they did not wish to cause Muslim dissatisfaction.²⁰ Moreover, recent research has suggested that, as a subject of study in the schools in North-West Provinces and Awadh, Urdu had gained ground relative to Hindi. In 1860-61, 11490 boys were studying Urdu in govt. schools and in 1873, 48229, a percentage

increase over 219. The equivalent figures for Hindi were 69134 and 85820, a percentage increase of 24.21. Curiously before 1857 there was an institution in Benares opened by a Hindu Philanthropist named Jai Narayan Ghosh which taught English, Persian, Hindi and Bengali. Muslim students freely entered it.²²

By 1870 the new education policy and the administrative and judicial jobs (closely related to professionals) became a matter of prime importance in NWP and Awadh in which language was a crucial factor, specially in judiciary. In NWP and Awadh Muslims held 44.8 and 45.9 percent respectively of the executive and judicial appointments, in relation to an overall population proportion of 13.4 percent. This was incidentally the highest proportion, if compared to Bengal, Madras and Punjab in respect to population verses jobs.²³ Other than this government's new policy of administrative changes brought district boards and municipalities which started the idea of political identification of community in which again language and identity and mobilization were crucial factors.²⁴ This made the issue of court language a very important factor for the two communities.

The Provincial Report for 1873 -74, specifically stated that 71 percent of the boys spontaneously chose to be taught in Hindi in preference to Urdu. The Hindi-Urdu controversy was carried to the Education Commission in bitter stains. The Muslim educationist and reformer Sir Sayyid Ahmed Khan told the commission for Urdu that Hindi was read only by the people of lower ranks, engaged in petty trades. On the contrary the advocates of Hindi condemned the Persian script as worthless and liable to mislead law court clients. Hindi case was put forward by Bhartendu Harishchandra, the foremost figure in Hindi literary world. He examined in 50 pages statement the various aspects of Hindi and Urdu and said: "In all civilized countries the language spoken by the people and the character written by them are also used in courts. This is the only country where the court language is neither the mother tongue of the ruler nor the subject."²⁵ Further in 1895 - 96 it was found that in Provincial schools the number of student offering Hindi had declined in contrast to Urdu. This fall was again an incentive for Hindi leaders. They pleaded with the government that its policy was proving inimical to Hindus and Hindi.

In late 1890's the agitation for introduction of Hindi in law courts was stepped up. In 1898 a deputation under Pt. Madan Mohan Malviya led the delegation to Lt. Governor on the issue. Decision to the same was taken in 1900, the decision to the above is as follows:

1. All persons may present their petition or complains either in Nagari or in the Persian character, as they shall desire.

2. All summons, proclamation and the like in vernacular issuing to the public from the courts or from the revenue officials shall be in the Persian and Nagari characters and the portion in the latter shall invariably be filled up as well as in the former.

3. No person shall be appointed, except in a purely English office, to any ministerial appointment hence forward unless he can read and write both the Nagari and Persian character.²⁶

Hindi Speakers were not satisfied with this order and took it as the mercy rather than justice and Urdu supporters took it as wrong done to Urdu. They held public meetings and condemned the decision as an attack on Urdu and urged the government to withdraw the orders. Thus, the gulf, which was not political, created in 1837 by the substitution of Urdu for Persian, had no impact upon 1857, but with the turn of the century the two linguistic groups were certainly drifting apart falling into the trap of counterpoise.²⁷

The Provincial newspapers, by then a popular mode of carrying and creating the opinion, did not left out of the controversy. Bhartendu an annual paper, from Mathura, wrote on 20th July 1883- "Why Hindi is not used in municipal departments....., why the municipal acts are not written in Hindi--- as use of Urdu is hampering its right progress". On 16th September 1883 same paper wrote, "The government is following the policies of regional languages in different vernacular regions but Hindi is still tied and put in a well".²⁸ Another paper 'Pradeep' from Allahabad (Bal Krishna Bhatt, ed.) laid emphasis on the problems of Persians and Urdu scripts and made mockery of its style. The Urdu press also did not left any stone unturned and on 17th May, 1900 an interesting poetry entitled "Urdu ki apeel" (The address of urdu) was published in 'Avadhpanch', in this address Nagari Hindi was pronounced as greatest enemy of Urdu.²⁹

One has to understand, that often scholars tend to argue upon the facts of

differentiation between Hindus and Muslims as a by-product of religious differences only, along with the political ambition of newly modernizing India which (modernization) of course was duly based upon colonial ideology of divide and rule in the garb of modernization. One finds it interesting that of the two most powerful aspects of Culture- Language and Religion it was language divide policy of the White Men that led to socio- political and religious differences between Hindus and Muslims in U.P. Another interesting fact that comes in a sensitive mind is simple, that is to say - who were the native gentlemen playing a catalyst role in organizing this controversy in their own communities and consciously or unconsciously became a tool in the hands of alien Government's policy of divide and rule. Interestingly one finds that the bearers of the controversy were the representatives of the new middle class, which emerged with the ideals and interests of its own in NWP and Awadh in the later half of nineteenth century. Lets take up two examples. Raja Shiv Prasad was a Government employ, well versed in English and who took up the case of Nagri script as a trusted torch bearer of English masters without giving a second thought for the consequences. Then one may find Sir Sayyed Ahmad Khan reacting to formers proposal and urged upon the need to protect Urdu. But on the contrary he was a champion of English and Western education and his fellowmen shall thrive only by studying the same. Both were in close proximities of Colonial Government and both belonged to the new bhadrakok (immaterial to argue - organic or inorganic bhadrakok) of NWP and Awadh. The subsequent developments are well recorded in the History of modern India, but unfortunately it was not Mandir-Masjid controversy but language only which broke the spirit of 1857.

Notes and References:

Basically this paper was first presented in National Seminar at B.H.U .in the year 2007 and later published entitled as "Language :Breaking the Spirit of 1857.A Case Study of U.P.(1857-1900" in A.K .Sinha (ed.)"Approaches to History, Culture, Art and Archaeology "Anamika : New Delhi.(2009). On the basis of comments and feedbacks same has been presented here with an added introduction to make the issue more logical for interpretaton..

1. For details on post Marxist theories of Nations and Nationalism see, Hobsbawn, Eric J. "Nations and Nationalism Since 1780 : Programme , Myth, Reality. Cambridge : Cambridge University Pres (1990) Also see, Anderson, Benedict "Imagined Communities : Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism": London: Verso (1990) Note: This work first appeared in 1983 and since then it has become one of the most standard text on the topics of nations and nationalism.The following definition is one of the most commonly used by scholars in the field "In an anthropological spirit, I propose the following definition of the nation: it is an imagined political community-and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign".
2. Goerge de Vos, "Ethnic Pluralism" in George de Vos and Cola Romanucci Ross (eds.) "Ethnic Identity : Cultural Continuities and Change" Calif: Mayfield Pub.(1975) p.16
3. Karl W. Deutsch "The Trend of European Nationalism- The Language Aspect" Hague : Mouton (1968) pp599-601. Also see Gellener, Ernest, "Thought and Change" Chicago: Chicago Univ.Press (1964). Gellener has based his argument on the basis that predominant European tradition has been to distinguish the terms of 'nationality' and 'nation' using the former term for language groups and the latter to define the attachment of the people of one or more language groups to a single state.
4. Paul R. Brass, "Ethnicity and Nationalism : Theory and Comparison" ,New Delhi : Sage (1991) pp.24-28.
5. For an account of the problems of this period and responses of different quarters see, C.H.Philips (ed.) (1962): "The Evolution of India and Pakistan (1858-1947)" vol. iv: London : Oxford University Press. Also see, S.N.Sen: "Eighteen Fifty Seven" Delhi : Publications Division.
6. Ram Gopal:(1966): "Linguistic Affairs in India": Bombay : Asia Publishing House. p.162
7. Notes on Indian Affairs, vol.i, 1836, p.30
8. Encyclopedia Britannica states that the Englishmen have called the basic Indo-Aryan language spoken in the plains of Ganges in Northern India as Hindustani. Mir Amanan in the foreword of Bagh-o-Bahar which was written in Fort William College, while explaining peculiarity of this language said "John Gillchrist asked me to translate this tale into Hindustani which is used by the people of Urdu". The implication of this sentence of Gillchrist, as understood by certain Researchers is that in that age there was a difference between Hindustani and Urdu. For more details see, S.Sanghasen (ed.)(1997) : "Language problem in India" New Delhi : Public Institute of Political Science.(sp.S.A.Bari : Urdu : A Victim of Language Fascism)
9. H.C.Lindgren (1972) : "An Introduction to Social Psychology" New Delhi : Willey Eastern Private Limited. p.314. Chomsky and the newer group of linguistic approach tends to study language in terms of transformational generative grammar in which they claim that children learn the language of their culture merely by imitation. This makes language so crucial for cultures either to survive in civilization or due to the pressures from economic culture. For details see, Noam Chomsky : (2002): "On Nature and Language".U.K.: Cambridge University Press. (Chomsky's argument rests on the idea that language faculty is not new, it had its roots in the classical rationalist perspective of studying language as a mirror of the mind.)
10. For linguistic approach, see A.L.Basham (1963) : "A Wonder that was India". New York : New Thorne Books (rev.ed.) For perspective comment on the limited field of communication in which the traditional literati of India performed their function in ancient times, see, Max Weber: (1960) : "The Religion of India". (trans. H.H.Gerth and D.Martiandale) Glencell : Free Press. pp.101-140.
11. For details see, Brijji's iQuadir Proclamation of 17, August, 1857. FPP, 30th Dec.1857, NAI, New Delhi, No.193.

12. Khan Bahadur Khan's Proclamation, text reproduced in Nawab-i-Azadi: Abdul Razzaq (ed.) cf. Iqbal Hussain : 'Remembering 1857',in, SNR Rizvi (ed.) "Proceedings of the U.P. History Congress"(Gorakhpur Session) p.37.
13. 1bi;; p.37
14. ibid; p. 38
15. ibid; p.38
16. Ram Gopal; op. cit; p.169
17. ibid; p.170
18. Pamphlet of Hindi Sahitya Sammelan, 18 April.2000 "Uttar Pradesh Mein Hindi Ka Pahla Shangharsh" p.2.
19. Ram Gopal; op. cit p.170
20. Nandalal Chatterjee: (1955) "The Government's Attitude to Hindi-Urdu-Hindustani in the Post Mutiny Period" : Journal of the Uttar Pradesh Historical Society,III.I, p.18
21. Paul.R.Brass : Muslim Separatism in U.P.: EPW (Bombay) Annual No.Jan 1970, p.181
22. Report of the Education Commission, 1882 (North Western Provinces) p.8
23. Report of the Public Service Commission, 1886-87 (Calcutta, 1888) p.38
24. For details on the impact of British administrative Changes on communal situation in U.P., see, Francis Robinson: "Municipal Government and Muslim Separatism in the United Provinces, 1883-1916" , in John Gallagher, Gordon Johnson and Anil Seal (eds.)(1973) : "Locality Province and Nationalism" , Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
25. Ram Gopal; op; cit.p.172.
26. ibid.p.173
27. Language and Linguistic Problem (Oxford Pamphlets on Indian Affairs) pp.20-21
28. Ram Gopal :(1900):"Swatantra Poorva Hindi Ke Shangharsh ke Itihaas". Prayag: Hindi Sahitya Sammelan.p110
29. For details of the controversy in the vernacular press, see Ram Gopal: op;cit.