

# Shuddhalekhan

## Orthography, Community and the Marathi Public Sphere

PRACHI DESHPANDE

This paper examines a long-running debate over Marathi *shuddhalekhan*, or orthography. Efforts to standardise spelling conventions for Marathi words began in the colonial period and continued through the 1950s. In 1962, the new state of Maharashtra authorised a set of rules for public use. Critics of these revised rules persist, keeping the debate perennial in the public sphere. This paper locates these orthographic debates within colonial-era transformations in Marathi print culture and grammar, and examines the idea of the social and the popular within grammar discourse to examine how and why orthography became a persistent, and controversial issue within Marathi language reform. It explores how seemingly trivial questions at first glance of vowel signs and dots gradually emerge as part of larger ones about literacy, historicity, community and the public sphere.

Recent years have witnessed a growing clamour, led by prominent scholars and politicians, for the central government to officially declare Marathi a “classical language” with a deep history from pre-Vedic times to the present. This claim also asserts the language’s autonomy and recognisability as Marathi from these antique times, marking it off from other older languages such as Sanskrit (Pathare et al 2013). At the same time, the Marathi public sphere has reflected a persistent concern about the language’s contemporary status and future in the face of the overwhelming presence of English. While urban, middle-class Maharashtrians overwhelmingly opt for English-medium education, Marathi-medium schools are swelling with new learners and teachers from different caste backgrounds. Educationists have sharply critiqued the Marathi standard language and its ability to represent all the varied speech forms that coalesce under its label. In order to respond to these varied challenges, the Maharashtra government’s language advisory committee published a draft action plan for the next 25 years in 2014 (Kottapalle et al 2014). Its call to increase the public presence of Marathi in diverse public settings echoes many such writings that have regularly featured in the Marathi press over the last decade or more.

One of the favourite areas targeted for reform in this discourse of language publicity and presence has been script and orthography. *Shuddhalekhan* (literally correct writing, but used to designate the correct spelling of Marathi words), in particular, has been a perennial subject of debate. This debate regarding proper spelling conventions for Marathi words using the Balbodh (Devanagari) script began at the turn of the 20th century, and continued through the 1950s. In 1962, the new state of Maharashtra authorised a set of rules for official, public use. But critics of these rules have persisted. The inclusion of particular Devanagari graphemes and the correct arrangement of consonant clusters in an authorised Marathi *varnamala* (alphabet) has a similarly long colonial history. Apart from various individual reform efforts, the Maharashtra government has revised this *varnamala* for use in government textbooks twice since 1960. My effort in this paper is to locate these discussions of orthography<sup>1</sup> within wider colonial-era transformations in Marathi print culture and grammar, and the configuration of the social and the popular within linguistic discourse. This historicisation, I believe, is critical to understand the persistence of certain orthographic debates, and how seemingly trivial issues of signs and dots gradually emerge as part of larger ones about literacy, historicity, community and the public sphere.

I would like to acknowledge Rahul Sarwate’s critical feedback in thinking through the ideas expressed in this paper. Errors are mine alone.

Prachi Deshpande ([prarochana@gmail.com](mailto:prarochana@gmail.com)) teaches history at the Centre for the Study of Social Sciences, Calcutta.

Orthographic controversies have figured in languages the world over as part of modern nation-building processes and they have been extensively analysed (Schieffelin and Doucet 1994; Jaffe 1996, 2000; Gundersen 1977; Bermel 2007). Establishing particular orthographies for languages has also been critical to mass literacy. If literacy is central to the two principal institutions of the modern democratic nation state—the school and the bureaucracy—orthography is key to successful literacy practice. Many spelling debates have taken place in the course of the printing of textbooks, grammars and dictionaries, with pedagogical concerns about comprehension and ease informing periodic orthographic reforms. These, in turn, have not taken place in a social vacuum, but have been imbued with ideas about class, caste or gender (Cook-Gumperz 2006). Overall, recent ideological approaches to literacy and language underline that far from being a simple, technical matter of rendering spoken language into arbitrary written signs, orthography is an important point where “issues of language as a formal object and of language as a social and cultural phenomenon intersect” (Sebba 2007: 26). In the Indian subcontinent, Orientalist philology produced Indian languages, old and new, as distinct objects of study, with pasts and possible futures. This approach compelled a wide variety of debates over the colonial period about how the history and identity of these languages would be adequately represented (Mantena 2005; Mitchell 2009; Kar 2008). One mode of representation was *narrative*, that is through the writing of a language’s literary or regional history. The other was *visual*, through an appropriate choice of script, and particular word-arrangement conventions. Clarifying the relationship of modern Indian languages with high languages such as Sanskrit or Persian on the one hand, and with contemporary communities of speakers on the other has been a major issue in both these modes. The most well-known example in this regard is that of Hindustani, eventually resulting in the two distinct languages Hindi and Urdu in Devanagari and Persian script, as markers of polarised Hindu and Muslim communities respectively (King 1994; Ahmad 2008). However, the Sanskrit legacy has also prompted vexed orthographic issues in apparently less polarised languages, such as Marathi or Gujarati, and regional sociolinguistic contexts have shaped the particular engagements within these languages with this legacy (Sebastian 2009; Upadhyaya 2010). The orthography of Sanskrit words current in Marathi has been one such vexed issue, while the other has to do with a series of *anunasiks* (silent nasal markers on specific letters in words) established by long convention. Connoting as much a history of Brahminical privilege as a hoary literary past, the appropriateness of Sanskrit-derived conventions for Marathi as a language of the masses has therefore been a bone of contention.

This is not a paper on Marathi linguistics or a survey of Marathi grammar, but an exercise in cultural history. My purpose is not to recommend the “right” orthography for the language based on its “objective” linguistic features. Drawing on critical perspectives on literacy that emphasise its inseparability from wider structures of power, institutions and identity, I attempt to provide a historical, discursive background for current orthographic debates in order to sketch the sociocultural

contexts that have shaped them.<sup>2</sup> I hope to tease out contradictions in language and grammar discourse through which orthography emerged not only as a continued and favoured means of Marathi language and social improvement, but also as a persistent site of regional social conflict.

### The Grooming Touch of Grammar

The adoption of Balbodh, the regional Devanagari script for Marathi writing over the medieval period had brought Sanskrit orthographic conventions into Marathi manuscript culture. Medieval bureaucratic writing and correspondence also deployed the cursive Modi script. Norms for *shuddha* writing did exist, and orthographic practices did cohere within specific textual communities in manuscript culture. But there remained considerable variations in orthography, which was nowhere explicitly regulated by grammar.<sup>3</sup> The emphasis was instead on legibility and readability; these qualities were themselves premised neither on neatly separated letters or words, nor an absolute correspondence between text and recitation, but on a distinct culture of reading.<sup>4</sup> Words were placed indistinguishably together, without punctuation, across several lines of text. Individual readers had to recognise their pronunciation and meaning *in spite of their possible visual variation*, to render the writing meaningful as a whole. This relation between reader and text allowed spellings in manuscript texts to vary without much concern. In other words, phonology (the study of sounds in a particular language) and orthography (the appropriate sequence of graphemes, or written signs) were distinct domains in premodern Marathi literate culture.

In the 19th century, British colonial efforts to “cultivate” Indian languages generated what Thomas Trautmann has described as “an explosion in the grammar factory” (Trautmann 2006: 1–41). The Bombay government’s education policy from the 1820s generated a battery of grammars, dictionaries and textbooks. Most of the early texts were the joint efforts of British scholars and missionaries working with native Pandits. As with many other Indian languages, Sanskrit *vyakarana* and English grammar were the two major influences (Arjunwadkar 1991). The influential Major Thomas Candy, Oriental Translator to the Bombay government, cemented this specific manner in which English and Sanskrit were to give shape to the new Marathi standard. Candy closely monitored the language in government-approved textbooks and the emergent periodical press. He openly admitted that this oversight was necessary for protecting both the colonial state’s authority as well as the inherent rules of the language. The new Western-educated, largely Brahmin, middle class agreed with Candy on the need to regulate public expression in Marathi, even as a few editors and writers began to resent his pedantic interference outside the sphere of government textbooks (Kulkarni 1956; Chavan 2013a, b). Grammar emerged as the ideal instrument to regulate the kind of language that emerged in print, and drew orthography into its ambit.

Dadoba Pandurang’s 1836 text *Maharashtra Bhasheche Vyakaran*, the primary reference text for schools over the 19th century, argued that grammar not only made it possible to differentiate *shuddha* (correct) from *ashuddha* (incorrect), but

also enabled one to systematically point this out to others. Grammar, in other words, was not only about learning correct language; it was also explicitly conceived early on, within a social context, as the ideal instrument of *correcting language*. Dadoba's eager use of grooming metaphors underlined the importance of his task:

My chief objective, to the best of my ability, is to regulate that language which, to this day, nobody sought to bring under regulation, due to which a tangle of writers was created, whom nobody thought to groom with the comb of grammar and to grasp the knots of that Marathi language that has long been literary, to loosen its folds and attempt some disentanglement (1850 [1836], np).

While acknowledging that language changed every few miles in the region, he took Puneri Brahmin speech, that of the precolonial Peshwa elite, as his benchmark for his prescriptive grammar.<sup>5</sup>

Dadoba's section on *varnavichar* comprised a discussion of vowels and consonants via Sanskrit phonology, of the designation of individual Balbodh graphemes for distinct phonemes current in Marathi. *Shabdavichar* contained a categorisation of words and a wide-ranging analysis of different parts of speech and case markers, while *vakyarachana* considered questions of tense, voice, etc. In an important report on Dadoba's text that served as the basis for his significantly revised, second edition, Candy translated these three vyakarana categories as orthography, etymology, and syntax respectively, yoking them to concepts within English grammar.<sup>6</sup> Rendered as orthography, with its qualitative emphasis on the correct arrangement of letters within words, *varnavichar* now braided together previously disparate domains of phonology and writing, and placed the script and graphemes appropriate to the language's sounds upfront at the start of grammar. Regulating the relationship between the pronunciation of words and the way they were written down, thus emerged as something for a discourse of rules such as grammar to determine.<sup>7</sup> My hunch is that *shuddhalekhan*, which gradually became the term of choice to designate correct writing in the early 20th century, was a derivative of the English word orthography.

Three critical shifts within grammar discourse over the 19th century produced orthography as a central issue within Marathi language debate. The first was the elaboration, within the general ambit of grammar, of new script and reading practices as written text transitioned from manuscript culture to print in the 1840s and 1850s. The second was the growing importance from the 1860s of historical grammar and etymology. The third was the arrival by the 1870s of the notion of the popular within grammar discourse, and the calls for descriptive grammar. Let us detail these shifts, as they help us better situate the orthographic policy debates that began at the turn of the 20th century.

### Grammar, Script and New Reading Practices

Within *varnavichar*, Dadoba followed the English practice of placing the letters of the script into a *varnamala* at the start of grammar. He also grammatically categorised a variety of existing writing and pronunciation conventions, that is to say, he divided them into groups of words based on vowel or consonant

endings, or derivations from Sanskrit, Persian and Arabic, in order to frame patterns that could be laid down as rules (Pandurang 1850: 5–7, 109). One combination of letters and sounds was especially vexing in this context: depending on the word in question, the same letters च, ज and झ were pronounced palatally or dento-palatally. Although he felt that the “people of Maharashtra” did not need visual markers to distinguish between these pronunciations, Dadoba initially endorsed the innovation introduced by some Pandits in the service of the Company to add a small dot before the horizontal line on top of these letters to indicate their dento-palatal pronunciation (ं च, ं ज, ं झ).<sup>8</sup> Bal Shastri Jambhekar deemed this innovation consistent with the “spirit of the Balbodh script,” of having a distinct symbol for every separate sound.<sup>9</sup> Candy, however, thought these additional dots unnecessary and confusing, especially apt to be compounded by printer error.<sup>10</sup> From the 1850s, the practice of dots to distinguish these separate sounds fell out of practice, but they figured repeatedly in phonemic improvements recommended by later script reformers. The exact list of properly Marathi phonemes within the Balbodh script, to be placed and learned at the start of grammar, however, would become a matter of linguistic identity, as well as pedagogical importance.<sup>11</sup> The turn of the 20th century, for instance, witnessed new efforts at visual pedagogy, which introduced literacy by mixing up the *varnamala*'s phonological order, and clustering together similarly shaped graphemes, such as “ग म भ न,” “र स त न,” etc, instead. B G Tilak denounced this new pedagogy as a “murder of our alphabet.”<sup>12</sup>

In his revised 1850 edition, Dadoba also took stock of the expansion of Marathi prose through two new chapters on correct writing and reading practices. In contrast to the continuous blocks of text in premodern manuscript culture, Dadoba's rules emphasised the importance of retaining the visual integrity of individual words in printed text. Words had to be properly separated, except when joined in a compound. He carefully backed his recommendation of firmly attaching suffixes to words through a grammatical discussion of cases. He also suggested that important words in a sentence be highlighted through size or density, with punctuation to specify pauses and accents to ensure that the writer's intended meaning reached the reader (Pandurang 1850: 313–21). These guidelines foregrounded visual cues within written text, especially prose, to stabilise meaning within text, and a greater correspondence between the written text and its reading. This material shift from manuscript to print culture gradually produced a new culture of reading founded on the idea of a visually complete, or more accurate written text (Priolkar 1974: 133–55). Along with the increased interest in matching phonemes to graphemes across the script, it was an important factor in making the spelling of individual words a matter for linguistic debate and regulation in the first place.

### Historical Grammar and Etymology

In 1863, the Dakshina Prize Committee, officially formed for the patronage of Marathi works, announced a prize for a new grammar that would “elegantly and plausibly demonstrate, by

elaborating rules of derivation and syntax, how the current Marathi language developed from the original Sanskrit, through Prakrit” (Kulkarni 1956: 104). Krishnashastry Chiplunkar, head of the committee, had written extensively in previous years on Marathi grammar in the journal *Shalapatrak* (1923). Along with the committee’s authority in the fledgling print sphere, Chiplunkar’s essays inaugurated a new historicist turn in Marathi grammar. The prize-winning book in response to this call by Krishnashastry Godbole, *A New Grammar of the Marathi Language...Showing Its Affinity to Sanskrit and Prakrit* was published in 1867.

Chiplunkar drew heavily on the historicist approach of Orientalist philology, which as Trautmann has shown, resulted from the fusion of a historicist European, and a structuralist Sanskrit approach to language. The historicist perspective drew on Biblical equations between languages and nations, and the idea of their genealogical dispersal from a primary source. The structuralist one (which included grammars of Prakrit) was based on differentiating the extent of difference between Sanskrit and the Prakrits. The analysis of vocabulary or *vyutpatti*, in this latter scheme was thus based on categories that clarified this variation of various Prakrits from Sanskrit, and its discussion of word-origins was qualitative, for identifying suitability in literary usage: *tatsama* (Sanskrit words as is); *tadbhava* (Sanskrit words modified); *deshya* (localised); *gramya* (local, but also vulgarisms); *antardesya* (exotic); and *mleccha* (foreign). While this method did not preclude an understanding of chronology, historical evolution was not its defining element (Trautmann 2006: 56–58).

The early Marathi grammars, including Dadoba’s, employed a similarly structural approach to vocabulary. Words had natural (*prakruti*) and modified (*vikruti*) states; the natural state in turn could be either *siddha* (fully formed and indivisible into further meaningful units), or *saadhit* (derived from earlier words or roots) (Pandurang 1850: 20–21). Here, *prakruti*, a category we will return to below, applied to the nature or disposition of individual words. Nouns were classified under *akarant*, *aakarant*, *ikarant*, *ukarant*, and *ekarant* headings, that is on the basis of terminal vowels /a/, /aa/, /i/, /u/, and /e/ respectively. Specific modifications to the penultimate and terminal vowels of these nouns caused by gender and number declensions and case markers were listed within these headings. Through these lists emerged broader patterns in language usage: for example, *deshi* Marathi *aakaranta* nouns such as सोटा, गोटा, भाला were mostly masculine, but *ikarant* nouns such as नदी, अर्ई, भाकरी, tended to be feminised. Penultimate vowels of occupational names usually shifted from long to short vowels when feminised. परीट became परिटीण, बुड became बुडोण, फडणोस became फडणोशीण (Pandurang 1850: 30–36).

Chiplunkar’s evolutionary model, however, deployed *vyutpatti* as the overarching means to track the *chronological* distance between languages, and therefore the crucial link that yoked Marathi to Prakrit and Sanskrit. On the argument that patterns of inflection changed over time, he identified the transformation of words as the key to this clarification of boundaries between languages (1923: 10–23). As etymology, thus, word

analysis became an important entry into history by the late 19th century. The lure of etymology for excavating deep links to the past was widespread in this period. Its power and attraction was not simply for the history of language per se, but also for actual historical transformations over large swathes of time. Indeed, far from being tolerated as one, possibly unreliable trace of human history in the absence of other historical or material artefacts, this foregrounding of etymology bolstered the idea of a deep, primal link between language and community, and their necessarily conjoint historical evolution. Word-journeys, depicted through lists and tables of similar-sounding words in different, chronologically arranged languages, now came to metonymically stand in for actual lived histories of communities across eras (Trautmann 1997; Bryant 2001).

### Tripartite Lists

Tripartite lists showing transformations of words from Sanskrit and Prakrit abounded in Marathi grammar and histories from the late 19th century onwards. These lists were the principal, and often only “sources” for this historical linkage of languages, and plausibility based on similar sounds or meanings the overriding etymological method. Yet etymology became a powerful tool of turning Marathi into an archive of the Maratha past. Debates in Marathi historiography at this time over the origins of the category “Maratha” were deeply political, overwhelmingly informed by divergent positions on caste and social hierarchy and claims to regional political and social authority (Deshpande 2007). As the history of language became intimately enmeshed with a social history, the etymological method firmly linked the historical evolution of Marathi with foundational questions of who the Marathas were and how they came to be. Conservative Brahmin historians like V K Rajwade built an overarching narrative of the early history of Maharashtra and the migration of upper-caste groups into the region on the basis of Sanskrit- and Prakrit-derived etymologies of local place names and caste names.<sup>13</sup> This equation between Sanskrit, Aryan origins and Brahminism and the etymology of place names and deities was deployed by the radical thinker Jotirao Phule too, but to invoke an ancient, indigenous people and language of Maharashtra, where Brahmins were interlopers.<sup>14</sup>

The narrower linguistic debate about the precise relationship of Marathi to Sanskrit and Prakrit was thus interpellated with a wider ideological split in regional political discourse, and contemporary debates over caste and Brahmin dominance in regional society. Some scholars argued for a linear evolution of Marathi from Sanskrit via Maharashtri Prakrit (Godbole 1895: 30–64). Another position argued for Sanskrit as the coterminous, refined form of the everyday Prakrit, and insisted that Marathi’s roots had to be traced to this everyday Prakrit rather than the refined Sanskrit (Bhagwat 1887; Joshi 1910, 1919). Elaborating this debate in all its complexity is out of the scope of this paper.<sup>15</sup> Suffice it to note that for all the differences over the precise origins of Marathi, historical grammar continued to deploy the basic structure of organising vocabulary analysis around Sanskrit words, into *tatsama*, *tadbhava*, and *deshya* categories. The question of the Sanskrit (and by extension northern)

legacy within Marathi language and culture predominated, both for its celebrators and detractors. Southern influences of Kannada and Tamil, or later Perso–Arabic influences, emerged as comparatively superficial in this process, restricted to the domain of loan-words deployed in specific contexts.<sup>16</sup>

Early critics of historical grammar and etymology asked why it was not enough to simply accept a word current in Marathi usage as a Marathi word, and leave the question of its etymology to the dictionary (Chiplunkar 1923: 248–52). Recent scholars of language echo this question (Arjunwadkar 1991). Such critiques, however, then as now, beg basic, persistent questions about the difficulties of establishing the historical integrity and identity of a language: when does one language end and another begin? How exactly does one differentiate a loan-word from one properly admitted within a language? It is necessary to visually mark this differentiation through orthography? Should this difference be determined via rules of grammar or evolving usage such as current pronunciation? These questions were, and remain, at the core of the orthographic debates, and their imbrication with a deeply contested social history of the language’s speakers is a clue to their public resonance and persistence.

As we have seen, Dadoba had used vowel endings as a means of listing existing patterns of nouns and their modifications, and specify correct usage in different contexts. In 1869, in arguably the first orthography guide produced for Marathi, the philologist R B Gunjekar also focused on the importance of recognising the correct vowel endings of tatsama, tadbhava and deshi words. In his view, a failure to do so was one of the principal reasons for common mistakes in Marathi writing (Gunjekar 1942 [1869]: 423–38). To this extent, vowel endings remained at best a matter of variety, and worst, confusion, to master within the language. As historical grammar took root, however, these vowel endings and modifications became critical to fleshing out an overarching pattern of Marathi linguistic practice. They became the prime site of determining Marathi distinctiveness across the board from Prakrit and Sanskrit. In effect, *deerghata*, or the long-vowel tendency of nouns with penultimate and terminal vowels emerged as the overarching distinctive feature of Marathi (Godbole 1895: 30–64; Joshi 1910: 1–27, 1919: 108–12). If the knowledge of vowel differentiation in tatsama, tadbhava or deshi categories of words was key to specifying shuddha or correct language practice in the old Sanskrit grammar, in historical grammar this knowledge became critical for establishing linguistic difference as a whole. Prakruti, the disposition of individual words in the structuralist approach, was now expanded to represent the essential disposition of the entire language. Marathi’s prakruti, in other words, tended to long terminal vowels.

### Descriptive Grammar, or *Marathichi Prakruti*

This consolidation of linguistic distinctiveness—also invoked as *swabhaava* or *swaruupa*—and its deep enmeshing with the collective identity of its speakers witnessed growing demands by the late 19th century for Marathi grammar to be more representative of actual usage. Grammar emerged not only an

impartial recorder of the language’s inner logic, but also a virtual parliament of sounds and speech conventions of actual people. Against Dadoba’s enthusiastic prescriptivism, calls grew for Marathi grammar to take on such a mirror-like, descriptive role. Terms like *ruudhi* (tradition) or *prachaar* (practice) invoked the idea of the popular as actual spoken language, freer and accrued through convention, rather than preset technical rules of derivation. The tendency towards *deergha* pronunciations of terminal vowels exemplified this convention. Although first clarified with respect to deshi and tadbhava words, orthography reformers would argue that this overarching convention of deergha pronunciations extended to Sanskrit tatsama words as well, and ought to be reflected accordingly in Marathi writing.

Ramchandra Bhikaji Gunjekar’s essays in the *Vividh Dnyan Vistaar* exemplify these shifts in grammar discourse. As part of a series of recommendations to shore up Marathi’s public presence in print and education policy vis-à-vis Sanskrit and English, Gunjekar argued for a grammar faithful to current Marathi usage thus: “When painting a portrait of someone with a crooked nose, the painter must retain the crooked nose. He should not straighten it because it is unsightly” (1942 [1889]: 194). Descriptive grammar’s promise of objectively capturing “the popular,” however, was a chimera. It invoked an abstract collective through terms like *lokavyavahaar*, but its practical inability to equitably represent all speech forms of the language led it to necessarily privilege particular forms and render others either invisible or wrong. This contradiction bolstered grammar’s social-pedagogical role, as Marathi educated elites welded its abstract ability to represent “popular usage” with its duty to nurture “cultured language.” As Krishnashastry Chiplunkar (1923: 25–26) put it,

A Marathi grammar ought to include all its different varieties. But grammars of no language represent all its different forms; instead, the language, especially the written form used by those who have authority over others due to knowledge, power and prestige is the variety that grammars describe.

Chiplunkar’s matter-of-fact tone would echo in the general pragmatism that other elite writers advocated regarding language standardisation. Even as he lamented the lowly public position of Marathi, Gunjekar asked speakers of various “sub-languages” of Maharashtra to give up their pride in local forms and submit to the now-stable standard Marathi as a pragmatic means of social mobility.<sup>17</sup> For all the invocation of “popular usage,” therefore, Puneri Brahmin speech remained the touchstone as the *sarvamanya* (unanimously accepted), or in Pierre Bourdieu’s terms, “normalised” language (1991: 43–65). For all the valorisation of the spoken language, moreover, written language in print remained the main target of standardisation. Examples of regional variations that did figure in these discussions were drawn largely from differences between various Brahmin groups on the coast and the hinterland, focusing inordinately on nasalised pronunciations, or the lack thereof (Gunjekar 1942 [1890]: 306–13). The vast variety of non-elite Marathi forms either did not find any expression within grammar discourse, or entered it primarily as lesser

expressions to be eventually smoothed out. To what extent this overarching character of *deerghata* was indeed a popular practice across Marathi speakers of various regions and backgrounds, thus, was not a question descriptive grammar addressed.

### Rules and Institutional Arenas

Experiments with literary idiom from the 1860s and 1870s also explored the terrain of popular spoken usage, such as the informal language in Moreshwar Mahadev Kunte's epic poem *Raja Shivaji* (1869) or Gunjekar's pioneering historical novel, *Mochangad* (serialised in *Vistaar* from 1867), and Jotirao Phule's powerful peasant idiom in all his polemical writings.<sup>18</sup> Vishnushastri Chiplunkar's criticism of these efforts in his landmark *Nibandhamala* essays over the 1870s, especially his casteist dismissal of Phule's use of language, suggests that while attractive in the abstract, spoken idiom was perhaps too slippery and potentially unstable a site for constructing a disciplined, linguistic social (1991 [1874]: 441–57). It was also notoriously difficult to define, much less enforce, through rules of grammar, which 19th century language discourse in the sub-continent equated with uniformity and regulation, prestige and advancement. Whether through Dadoba's prescriptive metaphor of a comb or Gunjekar's descriptive reference to a mirror, grammar emerged as a discourse of rules to showcase the modern *deshbhasha*'s uniqueness, keep it well-groomed and regulate its growth.

The visual singularity of words in the new reading and writing practices made the individual word, rather than sentence structure or literary idiom, the preferred site for this process. The growing importance within historical grammar on word-categorisation via terminal and penultimate vowels ensured that no matter how many other distinctive pronunciation patterns existed among Marathi speakers, it was the deergha pronunciation of terminal vowels of words that became a sign of Marathi linguistic difference. Pronunciation (even if largely that of Brahmin groups of central, western Maharashtra), invoked the domain of spoken language, and through it, the social-popular, and compelled a fresh look at the gaps between spoken and written words. This was a concern within wider script reform in this period as well, with efforts to find ways of separately representing a variety of accents and pronunciations currently not distinct in the script (Naik 1971: 483–85). It was the anunasiks and variations in vowel endings, however, that became central to orthographic policy efforts.

Let us now survey the events over the first half of the 20th century that led to the establishment of such a new orthographic policy in 1962. In 1898, Kashinath Narayan Sane, Shankar Ramchandra Hatavale and Ramchandra Parashuram Godbole, all employees in the education department, circulated a series of pamphlets proposing a thoroughgoing phonemic orthography (collected in 1900 into a book titled *Marathi Bhashechi Lekhanpaddhati*).<sup>19</sup> The trio proposed a series of changes, of which two became controversial, and which are addressed here.

The first was to write all words with /i/ and /u/ terminal vowels, including those in Sanskrit tatsama words, as long

vowels. They also dismissed all etymological and grammatical reasons for the anunasiks, and retained only those that distinguished meaning between identically written words (नाव-name/ नाव-boat). The sweeping long vowel rule was simple and uniform, they argued, in keeping with the language's overall disposition, and reflected current pronunciation. Most anunasiks were tedious and too often based on dubious etymologies; phonemic reforms were in the interests of the majority (*bahujansamuha*). Alongside the privileging of pronunciation, therefore, Sane et al invoked the popular by citing the need for simplicity and convenience in orthography. The textbook committee argued, "The reasons for these reforms are the need to smoothen the path of the writer, and ensure that schoolchildren and others unfamiliar with Sanskrit are not inconvenienced" (Banhatti 1932: 33).

In 1903, the Bombay education department decided to revise the decades-old Marathi school primers prepared in Candy's days. Sane's appointment to this committee, and the possibility that the new primers might adopt his proposed spelling reforms propelled grammar discourse into an important institutional arena. Considerable discussion ensued in the Marathi periodical press both for and against Sane et al's recommendations, from the point of view of etymology, grammatical cases, the variety of phonemic representation, and convenience (Banhatti 1932; Chiplunkar 1904; Gunjekar 1942 [1898]: 341–65). Established older newspapers like the *Induprakash* and *Dnyanprakash* gave the old guard a platform. B G Tilak's *Kesari*, while taking care to not alienate this old guard, weighed in on the reformist side (Tilak 1976 [1904]: 577–95). The textbooks committee convened a meeting of scholars and litterateurs in Pune in September 1904 to discuss the matter. A vote on the proposals produced strong support in favour, and the textbooks committee announced its decision to go ahead with a reformed orthography. In early 1905, however, a group of scholars led by the veteran 19th-century textbook author V K Oke, successfully lobbied the Governor Lamington to prevent these changes on the grounds that they were tantamount to colonial interference in native religion and culture. Thus ended the first orthography controversy in early 1905, only to reappear in a couple of decades (Banhatti 1932: 5–12).

Across the country, the early 20th century witnessed the emergence of middle-class-led literary associations, which sought to promote regional literary spheres and consciously formed an alternative to colonial state initiatives in language and literature in the previous century. Although quite restricted in the social context from which they drew their members, as well as in the actual number of members, many of these *sahitya sabhas*, *mandals* and *parishads* deployed the democratic vocabulary of annual congresses, elected chairs and representation and came to serve as the platforms for new regional political imaginaries and linguistic states by the mid-20th century. They enthusiastically took over the baton of linguistic standardisation and arbitration from the colonial forebears in the education department for everything from literary prizes to orthographic rules. The Marathi Sahitya Parishad (MSॢ), formed in 1906, was the premier such organisation in the

Bombay Presidency, and the Vidarbha Sahitya Sangh its parallel in eastern Maharashtra. In 1927, the parishad adopted a resolution to form a committee to look into orthographic matters, after N C Kelkar, the famous litterateur and editor of *Kesari*, published two volumes of his autobiography without any grammatical or conventional anunasiks and set off a fresh storm of spelling discussions. Henceforth, this literary-institutional arena would be the primary site for determining language-wide orthographic rules.

At its annual literary meet in Goa in 1930, the parishad issued a statement emphasising the importance of tradition, contemporary usage, etymology, grammar and utility alongside pronunciation in determining orthographic practice, and adopted a broad set of new rules. This rather sweeping set of considerations hints at the *sammelan's* inability to agree on any one premise for its rules. The rules themselves retained *rhasva* terminal vowels for Sanskrit tatsama words, and retained only those anunasiks that had a grammatical or etymological function. Those deemed merely conventional were removed. Another committee appointed by the *sammelan* to look into making the Balbodh script more print-friendly and suitable to linear typesetting, also recommended reforms to particular graphemes, and provisions for distinguishing dento-palatal phonemes as well as long and short accents on particular words (Naik 1971: 579–81).

The next decade witnessed increasing confusion among students about how to spell words in their examination scripts. To curb this confusion, Bombay University adopted its own set of rules in 1947. These, remarkably, allowed both *rhasva* and deergha spellings for tatsama words, and allowed some, but not all, conventional anunasiks. The general note of accommodation struck by this document suggests that it was a way for the university to somehow deal with the wide variety of spellings that were actually in existence, without penalising anybody for them (Bombay University 1947). Matters were made worse when the new Secondary School Certificate Board established in 1948 went with the Bombay University rules, whereas Pune and Nagpur universities went with the parishad's 1930 document (Walimbe 1968: 8–9). Depending on what school or college she went to, a student could encounter one, two or three sets of spelling rules throughout her education.

In the 1950s the regional organisations moved afresh to quell this “anarchy” and standardise spelling across the board. In 1957 and 1958, the MSP convened two meetings of the Marathi Shuddhalekhan Mandal in Pune, comprising leading academics, litterateurs, editors and university representatives. After considerable back and forth, it adopted a new set of rules that both tweaked and retained parts of its 1930 document. A year later, the Vidarbha Sahitya Sangh adopted a virtually identical list, endorsed by Nagpur University. In May 1960, the Marathi areas of Bombay Presidency, Central Provinces and Marathwada were merged into the new linguistic state of Maharashtra. Accordingly, in 1961, these regional literary associations merged into an umbrella literary organisation called the Marathi Sahitya Mahamandal (MSM). One of the first tasks before the MSM was making a final list of orthographic

rules out of all the different regional documents, which the state administration endorsed in 1962. Four clarificatory clauses were added in 1972, but to this day, these are the orthographic rules that have official sanction across the state (Walimbe 1968: 26–29).

### Mobilisation for Linguistic States

The late colonial and early postcolonial era was the time of hectic mobilisation for linguistic states. The *sammelan*, from its very early years, was at the forefront of the demand for Samyukta Maharashtra. The quest for a unified state of Marathi speakers and the quest for a unified orthography for all Marathi writing were part of the same nationalist discourse of standardisation. Both movements invoked language as the ultimate index of the popular. The promise of a common regional language for a democratic and developmentalist future called both for its enshrinement, as well as its regulation, in multiple sites ranging from mass textbooks to government forms and newspapers. It is no coincidence, therefore, that the regional literary associations in Bombay, Vidarbha and Marathwada and their orthographic rules merged into one umbrella unit at the same time that these actual regions themselves did into one linguistic state. It is also fitting that these successive orthographic documents culminated in a set of phonemic spelling rules. Resting on claims of convenience, accessibility and ease, they publicly visualised the culmination of linguistic nationalism in 1960 and its promise of literally giving voice to people's concerns.

Yet, all these efforts simultaneously delimited this definition of the linguistic popular. The 1930 MSP document tempered its own nod to the importance of pronunciation by citing grammar and tradition. The 1947 Bombay University's rules upheld the logic of phonemic orthography, but took care to clarify that this pronunciation was that of cultured elites in non-colloquial settings, such as public speeches, etc. The Shuddhalekhan Mandal endorsed this very definition of the popular spoken voice in 1957, and the final 1962 rules did away with all etymological, grammatical and conventional anunasiks. Citing the swabhaava of Marathi, these rules finally switched to deergha terminal /i/ and /u/ vowels, including Sanskrit tatsama words. Yet, these phonemic rules too retained several etymological caveats in the case of certain compound words, case suffixes. For example, when in a compound, a tatsama word got its terminal short vowel back. (कवी, but कविमन, गुरु but गुरुकुल). Moreover, original tatsama spellings were to be retained in dictionaries. These etymological remainders for tatsama words continue to generate critique today.

A palpable mood of optimism pervaded different aspects of language practice immediately after unification. Even as official workshops for teachers were held across the state to familiarise them with the new orthography, a new *sathottari* (post-1960) generation of writers from different political perspectives—Dalit Panthers, *deshivaadis* and leftists—consciously broke with past traditions and inaugurated a decade of creativity and experimentation in Marathi literature. An era of little magazines, this was also a time of experimentation in typography and printing, of exploring new creative relationships between the visual and the text (Nerlekar forthcoming).

Yet, for all this, “the people” remained differentiated, and disenfranchised. A vast scholarship has elaborated the growing disenchantment of the bulk of the regional population in subsequent decades, as unification strengthened only a small upper-caste elite in urban and rural areas. Growing disaffection with the state and its public institutions, not surprisingly, has also generated critiques of standard Marathi and its orthography. Neither, it appears, has lived up to its promise of convenience, accessibility or representativeness.

The writings of V B Kolte, the Vidarbha-based scholar of Marathi literature, give us an idea of the inclusionary hopes pinned on the linguistic state, as well as their gradual dissipation in subsequent decades (1992). Kolte came from a Satyashodhak background and his life was spent in researching the literature of the heterodox Mahanubhava sect. He was a strong supporter of Samyukta Maharashtra, and had been part of the Vidarbha Sahitya Sangh Committee that approved the new orthographic rules in 1960. Kolte’s reformist position imagined a more genuinely representative standard language in service of the developmentalist state. At the Bhopal Sahitya Sammelan in 1962, he called broadly for such an inclusive standard that actively included regional vocabulary in literature, and regional variations in grammar. His specific suggestions, however, zeroed in on the remaining etymological caveats in the orthography of tatsama words. Comparing tatsama words in Marathi to women after marriage, he argued that like women they must follow the rules of their marital, not natal, homes and therefore change their spellings when they came into Marathi. Citing Marathi’s deergha character again, he recommended that the short vowel sign be abandoned altogether in the Balbodh script, along with graphemes like ऋ and ॠ that represented sounds that were not distinctly pronounced in Marathi (Kolte 1992: 37–46). These Sanskrit orthographic traces, in Kolte’s argument, stymied Marathi’s full democratic potential.

This democratic potential, for Kolte, lay primarily in Marathi’s viability as a language of regular use in the new linguistic state bureaucracy. Anxious about ensuring the smooth use of the language at all levels of the state administration, he was keen to underline its ability to adapt to the needs of speedy writing and overall efficiency and convenience. Its prestige attached, in his arguments, to this modern flexibility rather than a hoary heritage, thus compelling a further simplification of script and orthography. In order to increase Marathi usage in the administration, the new state government passed the Language Act in 1965 and established a language advisory panel, of which Kolte himself was a long-time member, and chairman from 1977–80 (Kolte 1992: 54). This body prepared a wide variety of *paribhasha kosha* (vocabulary banks) to use in different contexts, and undertook to distribute bureaucratic materials such as letterheads, notebooks, ledgers, inward-outward registers in Marathi to all departments. Most importantly, following a central government initiative regarding the national standardisation of the Devanagari script, the Maharashtra government approved new Balbodh ligatures (*jodaksharas*, or joint consonants) to bring them in line with a “national” Devanagari

script, and to suit the linear typesetting needs of modern typewriters (Naik 1971: 579–97). Yet, for all this effort, Kolte’s own essays written over the 1980s bemoan the overall failure of this project in the upper levels of the state administration in favour of English. He blamed an Anglicised national civil service, as well as the inertia of Anglicised Marathi bureaucrats. While he maintained his demand for a radically simplified script and orthography, in later years he affirmed above all the need to enforce established rules to shore up the language’s public prestige (Kolte 1992: 52–67).

More recent critiques of the existing Marathi standard have come from the sphere of education. Linguists have highlighted the sheer diversity of regional speech forms that cohere under the umbrella category Marathi. Educationists, for their part, have raised doubts about the efficacy of mass education in the “vernacular” when its textbook form is so distant from local speech forms. The move to English-medium education in recent years, in these arguments, is propelled as much by the exclusionary Marathi standard as by the opportunities an English education promises.<sup>20</sup>

These challenges have refocused attention on Marathi script and orthography. Some educationists point out that rules regarding tatsama words are confusing in a pedagogical environment where neither students nor teachers, especially new learners from non-elite backgrounds who now people the Marathi schools, have any independent way of knowing which words are tatsama in the first place (Phadke 2008). Kolte’s call to do away with short vowels has found more recent echoes in calls to bring back the Modi script, which has single vowel signs, and remove Balbodh/Devanagari altogether in the hopes of further simplifying Marathi orthography (Gangal 2008). Others have vehemently called for a return to the old etymological spelling and a firm Sanskrit grammatical base to meet the English juggernaut. In this view, it is surface simplification, in ignorance of historical depth that has damaged Marathi’s public prestige (Parab 2012; Samant 2008; Mohoni 2011). The term *shuddhalekhan*, with its emphasis on purity, is now being replaced with more neutral terms like *pramaanalekhan* (standard spelling), or *lekhaniyam* (writing rules) instead.<sup>21</sup> Remarkably, in 2009, the state government once again made changes to the Balbodh script in the interests of tradition, bringing back the old vertical ligatures that had been difficult to render by typewriters, but are now easily rendered as single glyphs by computer software.<sup>22</sup>

### Orthography Reforms for Whom?

A discourse of rules, with the stabilising and regulatory authority of grammar at its core, and a commonsensical acceptance of uniform language as convenient, necessary and patriotic, has shaped the process of Marathi standardisation, and within it, the debates on orthography. As a guarantor of prestige and bulwarks against fears of instability in the face of English as well as the growing clamour of local dialects, the clarification of rules (of alphabet, orthography, syntax, cases, etc), rather than the messiness of everyday practice, remains attractive to regional language discourse and policy, including the state



government's recent 25-year draft plan (Pande and Ozharkar 2015; Datar 2015). It allows for a neat division of the language into a strict textbook standard and various dialects, the former ensconced in primers and public institutions, and the latter in literature, at once disciplined and celebrated.

This paper has attempted to historicise this discourse by tracking shifts in approaches to grammar, and their imbrication with ideas of history and the deep social formation of a community of Marathi speakers. If in the early 19th century, prestige accrued through the association with Sanskrit grammar, by the early 20th century, it was enhanced through a selective distancing from Sanskrit, in favour of an appropriately delimited modern vernacular as the language of the popular. Today, in the early 21st century, this prestige for this beleaguered vernacular is sought in a "classical" tag (and, crucially, central government funds), on the grounds that it is as old, if not older than Sanskrit. This preoccupation with prestige is a bottleneck. It precludes the exploration of alternative ways of linking grammar, orthography and pedagogy in school textbooks and beyond, and the imagination of flexible grammars that harness the rich diversity of the language's speech forms to enrich the standard rather than narrow it down (Horner et al 2011).

In conclusion, it is worth contrasting this identitarian approach with the "practice-oriented approach" of critical literacy studies to signal towards some other concerns relevant to orthography, and pedagogy and language usage more generally. This practice-oriented approach parses out the different components of literacy into reading, writing and pedagogy. It contrasts the conflicting needs and priorities of each of these practices, and the practical and ideological frameworks that undergird them (Street 1995, 2003; Sato et al 2014). When thinking about a suitable orthography, for instance, most literacy advocates have beginning or remedial readers in mind, and argue that a phonemic (or transparent) writing system, being closer to spoken language, is easier on the new learner. Etymological (or opaque) orthographies, on the other hand, are deemed to be beneficial for advanced readers, enabling them to deepen their vocabulary and understanding of the language and its history. But when writing, rather than reading is the concern, speed and minimalism rather than ease of reading take centre-stage; here too, the concerns of typing or electronic writing are often at odds with those of hand writing (Sebba 2007: 19–25).

The concerns of schoolchildren from different social backgrounds, the smooth deployment of a rich and complex vocabulary in literature, and the ease of rendering graphemes into handwritten, printed or electronic text, therefore, all impinge on orthography, but in different ways. To take just one

example, removing the etymological markers that peppered the old Marathi orthography made writing faster, and students less liable to be penalised in examinations for a missed, superfluous dot. However, many of these markers, while tedious to write, clarified meaning between similar-sounding words and parts of speech, making it easier for readers to comprehend the overall sentence or text. Removed in the name of phonemic, and therefore more transparent, orthography, their disappearance simultaneously made written text opaque in other ways, leaving the reader to determine meaning of a word from its context. Successive sets of rules, including the current ones, moreover, restricted themselves to these phonemic issues. Others, such as the accents and variable phonemes represented above, have remained indistinct both within the script as well as orthographic debates. We know little about how these diverse orthographic practices enable or hinder reading and comprehension at different levels and varied sociolinguistic contexts.

Ease, convenience and transparency, it turns out, are themselves contradictory, and just as ideologically salient as the different literacy practices they gloss. Writing in 1904 against the reformist moves, N D Banhatti (1932: 35) declared that the concerns of schoolchildren were not as important as grammar and tradition in determining Marathi orthography. Yet, the convenience of children, or an infantilised "ordinary Marathi speaker" has been ideologically harnessed by advocates of both phonemic and etymological orthography. If Sane et al were the earliest to invoke schoolchildren as the target of their phonemic reforms in 1900, a century later, Sattvasheela Samant, an indefatigable campaigner for bringing back all the grammatical and etymological *anunasiks*, repeatedly invoked the *samanya manus*, a common and somewhat dim Marathi speaker, easily liable to be misled and frustrated by their absence in the reformed orthography (Samant 2008).

This "ordinary speaker" has to be fleshed out based on the specific, practice-based needs of readers and writers, children and adults, or beginning and advanced readers of public texts as diverse as primers, novels, billboards, government regulations or forms. Only then can the debate about a genuinely useful and representative Marathi orthography, and by extension the Marathi standard and its *prakruti* (which also means health) in the public sphere, be meaningful. Historicising the diverse literacy practices of reading, writing and pedagogy, as well as their linguistic and communitarian contexts, is also critical for exploring a more textured social history of the Marathi language, rather than the deep, ahistorical antiquity that the "classical language" label and the preoccupation with prestige seeks to confer on it.

## NOTES

1 The story of Devanagari script reform and typography is a long and complicated one involving printers, linguists, historians and policymakers across Maharashtra and North India from the early days of print into the postcolonial period. For a survey of this complex domain, see Naik (1971). For reasons of space, this paper only references those issues regarding script that have figured within Marathi debates on grammar and orthography.

2 While Michel Foucault's formulation of the school as a central site of modern discipline is an important theoretical foundation for this body of scholarship, it also draws heavily from Pierre Bourdieu's analysis of how the discursive linkage of standardised language and social mobility in nationalist discourse contributes to the reproduction of existing, unequal social relations (Foucault 1975; Bourdieu and Passeron 1977).

3 The few grammatical treatises in Marathi produced over the medieval era were modelled on

Sanskrit, focused on explicating vocabulary in particular literary corpuses (Mone 1927: 69–118).

4 The 17th-century poet saint Ramdas's detailed discussions of writing and reading practice in the *Dasbodh* provide a good glimpse into this premodern culture of literacy (Deshpande, in progress).

5 Dadoba, who belonged to the urban Pathare Prabhu community of Bombay, was an instructor at the Elphinstone Institute, and later superintendent of schools in the education

- department. Active in religious and social reform, he established the Manavadharma Sabha, and was a moving force behind the radical Paramahansa Mandali in Bombay (Priolkar 1993[1947]).
- 6 *Maharashtra State Archives* (henceforth MSA) Mumbai, General Department, Vol No 23/540, 1840, pp 1–5.
  - 7 Writing practices, in terms of aesthetics, legibility and speed on the one hand, and different genres such as letters, petitions, etc, on the other, now constituted a separate sphere of discussion from grammar and orthography. This sphere also generated several efforts at easier, speedier handwriting, adequate to changing needs and contexts ranging from offices to examinations. The medieval Modi script, abandoned for print due to its inability to correctly render Marathi orthography, continued to form an important basis for these discussions, but also competed with new “speed-scripts” developed for Marathi shorthand (Deshpande, in progress).
  - 8 Dadoba also considered varying pronunciations represented by the consonants  $\text{ॐ}$  and  $\text{ॐ}$ . Instead of different signs for them, however, he attempted to grammatically determine what the correct pronunciation in different situations would be, based on the placement of letters at the beginning, middle or end of words (7–8).
  - 9 Balshastri Jambhekar to Boyd, 11 November 1838, MSA, General Department, Vol No 23/540, 1840, 318–21.
  - 10 Candy to W J Boyd, Acting Secy to Govt, 15 March 1838, 311–14.
  - 11 Incidentally, some early Marathi grammars designated Modi as the proper Marathi script in their grammars, and it remains an interesting counterfactual to imagine what the course of Marathi modernisation and print culture would have been, had this practice endured. Other than the difficulty of casting the cursive signs into printed type, Modi’s inability to render all the vowels sounds, and its habit of using the same graphemes for multiple phonemes, was also a cause for its gradual disuse in print.
  - 12 Tilak 1976 [1904]: 596–600. This new pedagogy, however, endured over the 20th century. Today *gamabhana* is shorthand for the basics of literacy, and also an excellent Indic language software program.
  - 13 Rajwade takes the prominence of Maharashtra in Sanskrit plays as the elite Prakrit of choice literally, and uses that as fact to argue for the elite caste status of people who migrated to Dandakaranya to escape Buddhism from the north, and were Maharashtrikas–Maharattas. Apart from prefaces to various texts and document collections, he presented etymologies for hundreds of words through short pieces in the *Bharat Itihasa Samshodhak Mandal Quarterly* throughout the early 20th century.
  - 14 In his 1873 text *Gulamgiri* (Slavery), Phule derived the names of local deities such as Khandoba (official of a *khand* or province), Malhari (from *malla*, or warrior), *mhasoba* (from official of a mahasuba, or large province), mahar (from maha-ari, or great warrior), etc, firmly rooting them in local society and institutions (Phule 1991: 158–65).
  - 15 For an excellent, recent discussion of the centrality of etymology in Marathi historiography and these perspectives on Prakrit and Sanskrit, see More (2013).
  - 16 Recent scholarship has re-evaluated this relationship between Marathi and Dravidian languages (Khaire 1979).
  - 17 (Gunjekar 1942: 194–97) Elaborating the knotty construction and subordination of these “sub-languages” within the history of Marathi is outside the scope of the present paper, but suffice to say that the imperialist impulse of designating particular speech forms as “lesser” sub-languages or dialects of a central, more prestigious form, as Oriya and Assamese were in the case of Bengali, or Konkani in the case of Marathi, was an integral part of the crystallisation of many dominant regional languages.
  - 18 Although he did not write directly about orthography, Phule did write his own name phonemically as Jotirao, rather than etymologically as Jyotirao.
  - 19 Sane, who was the senior-most, was also a pioneering historical researcher and editor who had brought many Marathi *bakhars* into print from the 1870s onwards.
  - 20 Various perspectives on this debate are articulated in the special issue of the parenting journal *Palakneeti* (Diwali Ank 2012).
  - 21 See Parab (2012). In the highly communalised environment of the early 20th century, Hindu nationalist groups such as the Arya Samaj organised the *shuddhi* (purification) movement to reconvert Hindus who had converted to Islam back into the Hindu fold. In Maharashtra, VD Savarkar extended this shuddhi movement to language, seeking to “purify” the Marathi language altogether of Persian and Arabic loan words, and replace them with Sanskritic vocabulary. These caste and communal vociferances of the term *shuddhata* have also produced calls to redesignate orthography with a more neutral term.
  - 22 The circular stating the new rules are available in *Bhasha ani Jeevan*, Vol 28, No 1, Winter 2010: 69–80.

## REFERENCES

- Ahmad, Rizwan (2008): “Scripting a New Identity: The Battle for Devanagari in Nineteenth Century India,” *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol 40, No 7, pp 1163–83, available at <http://www.science-direct.com/science/article/pii/S0378216607001051>.
- Arjunwadkar, K S (1991): *Marathi Vyakaranacha Itihasa (History of Marathi Grammar)*, Bombay: Bombay University Press.
- Banhatti, Narayan Daso (1932): *Marathi Bhashechi Lekhanpaddhati: Isavi San 1904–1929 Saali Shuddhalekhanavishayi Zhalelya Vaadant Lihilelya Lekhanacha Sangraha* (The Writing System of the Marathi Language: Essays Written during the Orthography Debates between 1904–1929 CE), Nagpur: Navabharat Granthamala Karyalaya.
- Bermel, Neil (2007): *Linguistic Authority, Language Ideology, and Metaphor: The Czech Orthography Wars*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Bhagwat, Rajaramshastri (1979 [1887]): *Marhatyansambandhane Char Udgar* (a few words about the Marathas), Pune: Varada Books.
- Bombay University (1947): *Rules of Orthography*, Bombay: Government Central Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Jean-Claude Passeron (1977): *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*, London: Sage Publications.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1991): *Language and Symbolic Power*, trans Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson, New York: Polity Press.
- Bryant, Edwin (2001): *The Quest for the Origins of Vedic Culture: The Indo-Aryan Migration Debate*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cook-Gumperz, Jenny (2006): *The Social Construction of Literacy*, Cambridgeshire: Cambridge University Press.
- Chavan, Dilip (2013a): *Language Politics under Colonialism: Caste, Class and Language Pedagogy in Western India*, Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- (2013b): “Adivasi Bhasha: Avhane and Pudhil Disha” (Tribal Languages: Challenges and

Futures), *Parivartanacha Watsaru*, 1 April, pp 25–30.

- Chiplunkar, Krishnashastri (1923): *Marathi Vyakaravaril Nibandha, Maji Shalapatrakat Prasiddha Zhalele* (Essays on Marathi Grammar, previously published in the Shalapatrak), 3rd ed, Pune: Chitrashala Press.
- Chiplunkar, Vishnu Govind (1904): *Marathi Bhashechi Lekhanpaddhati: Prastutchya Lekhanpaddhatit Textbook Cometine Yojilelya Pherphaaraance Ashastriyatva va Anishta Parinam* (The Writing System of the Marathi Language: The Unscientific Changes Proposed by the Textbook Committee and Its Undesirable Consequences), Baroda (publisher not available).
- Chiplunkar Vishnushastri (1991): *Nibandhamala, 2 Vols (Garland of Essays)*, Pune: Varada Prakashan.
- Darak, Kishore (2013): “Bhashecha Sattakaran ani Bhashajanya Shoshan” (The Politics of Language and Linguistic Exploitation), *Parivartanacha Watsaru*, 1 April, pp 19–24.
- Datar, Abhay (2015): “Marathi Bhasha Dhoran—Kahi Shanka, Kahi Prashna,” *Sakal*, 12 February, <http://www.esakal.com/Tiny.aspx?K=IEM2c>.
- Deshpande, Prachi (2007): *Creative Pasts: Historical Memory and Identity in Western India, 1700–1960*, Delhi: Permanent Black.
- (in progress): “Between Monk and Scribe: Literacy Practices in Early Modern Maharashtra” (manuscript).
- Foucault, Michel (1975): *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, London: Vintage Books.
- Gangal, Shubhanan (2008): “Shuddhalekhan Niyamachi Dashat,” *Manogat*, <http://www.manogat.com/node/14156>.
- Godbole, Krishnashastri (1895): *A New Grammar of the Marathi Language, Containing Accidence, Syntax and Prosody, and Showing Its Affinity to Sanskrit and Prakrit*, 3rd revised ed, Bombay: Subodha Prakash Press.
- Gundersen, Dag (1977): “Successes and Failures in the Reformation of Norwegian Orthography,” *Advances in the Creation and Revision of Writing Systems*, Fishman J A (ed), The Hague: Mouton, pp 247–65.
- Gunjekar, R B (1942): “Ramchandra Bhikaji Gunjekar Yanche Sankalit Lekh,” *Pratham Khand Pahila*, A K Priolkar (ed), Mumbai: Marathi Grant-halaya.
- Horner, Bruce, Min-Zhan Lu, Jacqueline Jones Royster and John Trimbur (2011): “Language Difference in Writing: Toward a Translingual Approach,” *College English*, Vol 73, No 3, pp 303–21.
- Jaffe, Alexandra (1996): “The Second Annual Corsican Spelling Contest: Orthography and Ideology,” *American Ethnologist*, Vol 23, No 4, pp 816–35.
- (2000): “Introduction: Non-standard Orthography and Non-standard Speech,” *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, Vol 4, No 4, pp 497–513.
- Joshi, R B (1889): *Praudhabodh Vyakaran* (Advanced Grammar), Pune: Chitrashala Press.
- (1910): *Shabdassiddhi Nibandha* (Essay on Word Derivation), Pune: Chitrashala Steam Press.
- (1919): *Marathi Bhashechi Ghatana* (Formation of the Marathi language), Pune: Balwant Ganesh Dabholkar.
- Kar, Bodhisattva (2008): “‘Tongue Has No Bone’: Fixing the Assamese Language, c 1800–c 1930,” *Studies in History*, Vol 24, No 1, pp 27–76.
- Khaire, Vishwanath (1979): *Marathi Bhasheche Mool* (The Roots of Marathi), Pune: Sammat
- King, Christopher (1994): *One Language, Two Scripts: The Hindi Movement in Nineteenth Century North India*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Kolte, V B (1992): *Marathichya Asmiticha Shodh* (In Search of Marathi Identity), Pune: Sridvidya Prakashan.

- Kottapalle, N et al (2014): *Marathi Bhashavishayak Dhoran* (Marathi Language Policy), <https://www.maharashtra.gov.in/Site/upload/WhatsNew/मराठीभाषाविषयकधोरण2014-मसुदा.pdf>.
- Kulkarni, K P (1956): *Adhunika Marathi Gadyachi Utkranti* (Evolution of Modern Marathi Prose), Thane: Marathi Samshodhan Mandal.
- Kunte, Mahadev Moreshwar (1992 [1869]): *Raja Shivaji, S S Bhosale* (ed), Aurangabad: Sahitya Seva Prakashan.
- Mantena, Rama Sundari (2005): "Vernacular Futures Colonial Philology and the Idea of History in Nineteenth-century South India," *Indian Economic & Social History Review*, Vol 42, No 4, pp 513-34.
- Mitchell, Lisa (2009): *Language, Emotion and Politics in South India: The Making of a Mother Tongue*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Mohoni, Divakar (2011): *Marathi Pramanabhasechya Lekhanavishayici Majhi Samkalpana* (My Thoughts about the Marathi Written Standard), *Bhasha ani Jeevan*, 29 (Winter).
- Mone, M S (1927): *Marathiche Vyakaranankar ani Vyakaran-prabandhakar* (Marathi's Grammars), Pune: Shrimant Holkar Sarkar Granthamala.
- More, Sadanand (2013): *Garja Maharashtra*, Pune: Sakal Prakashan.
- Naik, Bapurao S (1971): *Typography of Devanagari*, 3 Vols, Bombay: Directorate of Languages.
- Nerlekar, Anjali (forthcoming): *Bombay Modern*, Chicago: Northwestern University Press.
- Palakneeti (2012): *Special Issue on Medium of Education*, Diwali issue, <http://palakneeti.org/मासिक/शिक्षणमासिक/म-विशेषांक-दिवाळी-२०१२>.
- Pande, Avinash and Renuka Ozarkar (2015): "Marathicha Vikas, pan Konachi Marathi?" (Marathi's Progress, but Whose Marathi?), *Parivartanacha Watsaru*, Vol 14, No 21, March, pp 1-15.
- Pandurang, Dadoba (1850), *Maharashtra Bhasheche Vyakaran* (A Grammar of the Marathi Language), 2nd revised edition, Bombay: American Mission Press.
- Parab, Prakash (2012): *Marathi Bhasha ani Marathi Shuddhalekhan* (Marathi Language and Orthography), 22 March, <https://prakashparab.wordpress.com/2012/11/09/मराठीभाषा-आणि-मराठी-शुद्ध/>.
- Pathare, Rangnath et al (2013): *Submission for Classical Status of Marathi Language to Ministry of Culture, Government of India by Department of Marathi Language*, Mumbai: Government of Maharashtra.
- Phadke, Arun (2008): "Marathi Shuddhalekhanache Niyama Marathichya Prakrutipramaech Havet" (Marathi Orthography Should Be Based on Marathi's Character), *Manogat*, 23 March, <http://www.manogat.com/diwali/2008/node/73.html>.
- Phule, Jotirao (1991): *Mahatma Phule Samagra Vangmaya* (Collected Works of Mahatma Phule), Y D Phadke (ed), Mumbai: Maharashtra Rajya Sahitya ani Samskruti Mandal.
- Priolkar, A K (ed) 1993[1947]: *Raobahadur Dadoba Pandurang: Atmcharitra* (Autobiography of Raobahadur Dadoba Pandurang), Mumbai: Anubhav Publications.
- (1974): *Hindustanche Don Darvaze* (The Two Gates of Hindustan), Mumbai: The Goa Hindu Association.
- Samant, Sattvasheela (2008): *Vyakaranshuddha Lekhanapranali*, 3rd ed (Grammatically Correct Writing Practice), Pune: Diamond Prakashan.
- Sato, Shinji et al (ed) (2014): *Rethinking Language and Culture in Japanese Education: Beyond the Standard*, Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Schieffelin, Bambi B and Rachele Charlier Doucet (1994): "The 'Real' Haitian Creole: Ideology, Metalinguistics, and Orthographic Choice," *American Ethnologist*, Vol 21, No 1, pp 176-200.
- Sebastian, V (2009): "Gandhi and the Standardisation of Gujarati," *Economic & Political Weekly*, Vol 44, No 31, pp 94-101.
- Sebba, Mark (2007): *Spelling and Society: The Culture and Politics of Orthography around the World*, Cambridgeshire: Cambridge University Press.
- Street Brian (1995): *Social Literacies: Critical Approaches to Literacy in Development, Ethnography and Education*, London: Longman Publishing Group.
- (2003): "What's 'New' in New Literacy Studies? Critical Approaches to Literacy in Theory and Practice," *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, Vol 5, No 2, pp 77-91.
- Tilak, B G (1976): *Samagra Lokamanya Tilak, Vol 5: Samaj wa Samskruti* (Collected Writings of Lokamanya Tilak, Vol 5: Society and Culture), Pune: Kesari Prakashan.
- Trautmann, Thomas (1997): *The Aryans and British India*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- (2006): *Languages and Nations: The Dravidian Proof in Colonial Madras*, New Delhi: Yoda Press.
- Upadhyaya, Himanshu (2010): "Gandhi, Gujarati Spelling and the Ideology of Standardisation," *Economic & Political Weekly*, Vol 45, No 24, 12 June, pp 26-33, accessed on 15 January 2016, <http://www.epw.in/journal/2010/24/commentary/gandhi-gujarati-spelling-and-ideology-standardisation.html>.
- Walimbe, M R (1968): *Marathi Shuddhalekhan Pradeep* (A Light on Marathi Orthography), Pune: Nitin Prakashan.

# EPWRF India Time Series

An online database on Indian economy developed by EPW Research Foundation, Mumbai.



## Salient Features

### Time Series Data

- Comprising major sectors with various periodicities
- Availability of data in time series format
- Timely updation of data

### User-friendly Interactive System

- Ease in identifying variables
- Versatility of data variables/series selection
- Easy to download and export to Excel files

### Enhancing Research

- Saves time spent on data compilation
- Plotting of data variables/series
- Availability of 'Meta data' at a click

## SUBSCRIPTION

- Attractive annual subscription rates are available for institutions and individuals.
- 'Pay-per-use' facility also available for downloading data from different modules as per specific requirements.

To subscribe, visit : [www.epwrfits.in](http://www.epwrfits.in)

EPW Research Foundation

C-212, Akurli Industrial Estate, Akurli Road, Kandivli (E), Mumbai - 400101 | Tel: 022-2885 4995/96 | Email: [its@epwrf.in](mailto:its@epwrf.in) | Web: [www.epwrf.in](http://www.epwrf.in)