

Power Languages in India: The Making of Hindi as a Power Language

Sovna Khati

Department of Political Science, University of North Bengal, West Bengal, INDIA. 734013

Abstract

Politics of language in India is evident not only in the standardisation and hierarchical ordering of languages, it is also expressed in attempts at getting into power languages through demands for linguistic recognitions as pedagogic tool, or entry into job-market and more instrumentally, in autonomy movements and demands for separate states. In this paper we attempt to see the issue of national languages and politics of language in India in general and Hindi in particular by situating them in our historical experiences. One of the important modern developments which brought the imagined community of nation into a homogenous connected reality was the development of print capitalism. The homogenous nation and its culture had to be sustained through centralised socialization or national education, through the common medium of language and this universal unified culture constitutes the natural repositories of political legitimacy and (re)production of the nation. Rooted in colonial history in India and in tandem with absorption of modular forms of western nationalism, the case of emergence of new Hindi with Devnagari script and marginalisation of script neutral Hindustani in India as well communal separation of Hindi and Urdu testify to how the subliminal category of language get politicised within the framework of nation. The paper concludes that coexistence of two official languages and a list of scheduled languages are all parts of standardisation of national languages and are all power languages relevant to emotional integration and business communication.

Keywords: nation-state, system, language, Hindi, education

Introduction

How does one understand the coexistence of ‘Official Language’ (Hindi in Devanagari Script) with ‘Associated Official Language (English) (Official Languages Act, 1963, 2026) and the Scheduled Languages in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution of India, containing an expanding list of multiple national languages? One may find some clearer explanations in the, in the intersectionality of language and politics within the ambit of a nation-state. The category of language is more prominently understood in the contexts of tribes and castes, which have become more of political than sociological categories. Politics of language is evident not only in standardisation and hierarchical ordering of languages, it is also expressed in attempts at

*Corresponding Author Email: sovnakhati@nbu.ac.in

Published: 18 May 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.70558/IJSSR.2026.v3.i3.301095>

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s). This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).

(re)constructing themselves as power languages through demands for linguistic recognitions as pedagogic languages, demands for linguistic recognition for competitive examinations, demands for recognitions of vernaculars by the state governments and also instrumentally in autonomy movements and demands for separate states. This paper attempts to see the case of national language(s) and politics of language in India in general and Hindi as the Official language of Indian Union in particular by situating them in their historical experiences. However, before that some kind of theoretical understanding of nation and language is in order.

Nation and Language

Language is not merely an instrumental category, encoding and describing the objective world that surrounds us, it also conditions the human world by constructing new meanings and values in perceiving and responding to the extra-linguistic or material world. As rational beings, unlike other animals, human beings do not use the language (sounds, words, signs) simply for the purpose of responding to the external stimulus. Innately we create/ construct meanings whenever we apply/ engage ourselves with the external world. This reflective (rational) exercise of creating meanings as a part of rationalizing the world we live in and surrounded by, takes place in and through the semantic dimension. The semantic dimension is a linguistic dimension, as there is no language without semantic dimension and no semantic dimension without language (Taylor, 2006, p. 24).

The modern nation, is representative of the modern Geist of universality unlike the cosmological representation of the pre-modern polity. The development of science and technology physically connected the otherwise unrecognised spaces which helped the vast expanses of territories to come under stable political units of modern nations. The connection of the physical spaces was also paralleled by the expansion of the normative frontiers, the conceiving the territories as a continuous, connected spaces of diverse communities into common (national) history, common reality. The nations could be imagined as a continuous, connected reality of anonymous but united community, moving together in a homogenous empty time. The new Geist, “everything is connected”, provided the universalist framework led to the construction of a homogenous time reality, unlike in the pre-modern social world, with multiplicity of inward looking, self-contained, relatively unconscious cosmologies, with their own idiom and logic, own meaning system, not properly united and hierarchically sub-related world (Gellner, 1983 Reprint 1993, pp. 21-22). The modern world is an ever-growing, ever-progressive and hectically mobile society where customs has not time to hallow anything (Gellner, 1983 Reprint 1993, p. 25). The national homogeneity brought in by the universal spirit also opened up spaces for egalitarianism in the mobile society of free and equal rational individuals.

One of the important modern developments which brought the imagined community of nation into a homogenous connected reality was the development of print capitalism. The growth of print changed the oral structure of traditional societies into literal spheres which led to the transformation of oral speeches and vernaculars into literal languages. The fixity of the written texts transformed the idea of simultaneousness unlike before, connecting the discreet events into a continuous logical reality, creating the construct of homogenous empty time, measured

by universal clock and calendar, moving solid communities together up or down in time (Anderson, 1983, Reprint 2016, pp. 24-26).

In the premodern world the expansion of the literal sphere moved around the spheres of sacred/truth language(s) to the court languages. The premodern oral world was imagined through the religious truths contained in the sacred languages (Sanskrit, Latin, Arabic) where the literal sphere was small and restricted to the sacred/truth languages (Anderson, 2016, pp. 13-19). In the modern period however, the expansion of the literal sphere and the growth of vernaculars into literal languages was significant in constructing the homogeneity of the nation. This national homogeneity of the nation was cemented by the construction of national language(s). The development of print capital and the expansion of literary sphere brought in the premise of communication over the vast territory amongst the citizens of the nation system, creating the possibility and the need for standardised medium of communication and common patterns of meanings. The homogenous nation and its culture had to be sustained through centralised socialization or national education, through the common medium of language and this universal unified culture constitutes the natural repositories of political legitimacy and (re)production of the nation (Gellner, 1993, pp. 55-57).

The civilizational progress of the modern societies has led to the increasing gap between the capacities of young and the concern of the adults. Direct learning (as a part of socialization) in advanced societies in the pursuits of mature life becomes difficult as the society gets differentiated and complex and the occupations also gets specialized. Therefore, in order to transmit all the resources and achievements of a modern society, the standardisation of explicit educational materials and the establishment of network of formal intentional schools and other educational institutions became necessary for growth of an individual and of the society. As the societies becomes more complex in structure and resources the need of formal education had increased (Dewey, 1916 Reprint 1968, pp. 7-8). However, in practice, the onset of modern liberal democracies created a fetish of instrumental rationality and science and led to the crisis of individual's intersubjective existence leading to anomie, alienation and dehumanisation. The schools which became the sites of the whole development of an individual in the liberal period, moving beyond the narrow intellectual scholastic aim of the conservative abstract elite schools, in practice also became the sites of inculcation fulfilling the social aim of conservation and the ideological function of legitimation of the dominant hierarchy and power relations (Passeron, 1977 Reprint 1990, p. 102). Languages as pedagogic tools reproduce power relations in complex ways through hierarchical educational institutions in a nation state.

Power Languages

The modern ideas of a universal man and humanism found its home in the political units of nation-states. Development of human society with modernisation led to accelerated process of social differentiation. The society as a lifeworld/ social totality gets differentiated into society of systems (complexes of social world). Lifeworld and systems are two ontological concepts given by Habermas, in understanding the ontogenesis and development of the communicatively structured human/social world. Lifeworld is an intersubjective horizon, a horizon of communion, where the use of language and the communicative actions are geared towards the achievement of mutual understanding through understanding and not individual success

(Habermas, 1987, p. 121). With the establishment of modern period, the dominance of objective scientific rationality as the true reasoning, the languages of the lifeworld get delinguistified (Habermas, 1987, p. 154). In the systems world, political and economic systems where power and wealth creations represent respective unifying principles, together organise power languages in the process of delinguistification, what is true becomes essentially purposive, guided by scientific instrumental reality, what is social becomes systematic arranged, where systems stand in complete independence from each other and the individuals (intersubjective) becomes abstract and atomised individuals, stabilised by the legal structure and systems of value neutral objective formal rules and procedures. In the modern period the system is stabilised and steered within the political unit of nation-state. Within the nation this is cemented by the national language(s). The homogenous nation and its culture had to be sustained through centralised socialization or national education, through the common medium of language and this universal unified culture constitutes the natural repositories of political legitimacy and (re)production of the nation. Power languages are basically system languages of power and wealth as well as represent pedagogic tools of emotional integration within multilingual nation. Officially put at higher pedestal across the nations or widely accepted as business languages. Below the national level they encourage emulative standardisation of regional languages sometimes working as tools of political mobilisation resisting dominant languages or become vehicles of state autonomy movements. The one constant feature is one language one script leading to some form of discrete multilinguality distinguished from pre-modern syncretic multilingualism. In every modern nation-state and more apparently in multilingual nations power languages dominate public spheres and vernaculars of minority and marginal groups get suppressed. The oral traditions eventually become extinct as the future generations enter the semantic fields of power languages.

The Case of Hindi Nationalism

The development of Hindi in India is understood as a construction of a modern (literal) category of Hindi (new Hindi which is Sanskritised than old Hindi/Hindustani which was a syncretic language) into a power language in the regional the province of United Province (now Uttar Pradesh) to the position of Official language of Independent India. The issue of Hindi marks an upward journey in the linguistic hierarchy, starting off in a dialectical growth with its counterpart, Urdu, as a part of standardisation process of indigenous language(s) that began in colonial India. So, the focus would be on intermeshing of language situation in UP and all India position of leaders within Indian National Congress. and the eventual positioning of Hindi in the Constituent Assembly and its post-independence development.

Urdu and Hindi languages have their roots in the Indo-Aryan family of languages. All the modern vernaculars in India, have been developed from the Apabhramshas, a form of Prakrits. The Aryan speech came from the north-western region of the world, which gradually spread over to Afghanistan, Punjab, Sindh and the Gangetic valley and eventually embracing the whole of north-east parts, western parts and as far as Maharashtra in the south, of India. Aryan speech of earliest kind is found in the Vedic hymns. Around 500 BC, from the Vedic Sanskrit developed the Classical Sanskrit. The Classical Sanskrit was the literary language in ancient times and occupied the position of a (high) language/*bhasa*.

The dialects spoken then, were called Prakrits. They were the common tongues and considered low/corrupt versions of the high Sanskrit language. The Prakrits is believed to have evolved into generally three versions: primary, secondary and tertiary Prakrits. The earliest form of local tongues was categorised as the primary Prakrits. With the gradual process of standardisation of the Prakrits which were the common tongues then, the secondary Prakrits developed. The Ashokan inscription dated around 250 BC is considered as a form of the Secondary Prakrit. Another popularly known form of secondary Prakriti was Pali, which is found in the Buddhist texts. From the secondary Prakrits developed the Tertiary Prakrits or the Apabhramshas. The word Apabhramsa's literally means corrupt. With the spread of the tertiary form of vernaculars, they gradually developed their literary styles called as Nagar Apabhramsa's (Superintendent Government of India, 2022, p. 9). The major variants of Apabhramsa from which the modern vernaculars developed were: Saurseni, Maharashtri, Magdha, Vrachada and Kekaya. From Sauriseni developed Western Hindi, Rajasthani, Punjabi and Gujarati, the language spoken in the Sursen kingdom in the middle Gangetic Doab and the neighbouring regions. The Eastern Prakrit was called Magadhi which was spoken in the Magadh region i.e. the present-day Bihar, from which developed Bengali, Assamese and Oriya. Between the Sursen and Magadh kingdom developed the middle language called Ardha-Magadhi which was mostly used by the Jain preachers and is recorded as the Jain scriptures. From Vrachada the modern vernacular, Sindhi. Close to Western Prakrit was the southern Prakrit or Maharashtri from which developed modern Marathi. (Superintendent Government of India, 2022, pp. 9-10).

Development of a language with two scripts- Hindustani

During the 8th century in areas around Delhi, the development of a common dialect was necessitated and facilitated with the coming in of the people of different races and linguistic backgrounds, Afghans, Iranis and Turks in the region. Urdu as a common vernacular developed in this context and developed particularly in the armies and the courts (Superintendent Government of India, 2022, p. 12). The local dialect around Delhi, at that time was a form of Apabhramsa of the Western Prakrit kind, which became the base for the emerging composite language, popularly denoted as the Khari Boli. This common dialect developed borrowing words from Persian, Arabic and Turkish origin, along with Sanskrit roots serving the goal of common means of communication. This board language was popularly called Hindustani, a *bazar* language.

The new Urdu is one of the forms of the Hindustani or Khari Boli. The word Urdu has a Turkish origin. Urdu in Turkish language means tent or camp or encampment of a chief. The tents of Mongol princes were also their courts, the word designated to refer to the camps or the courts was Yurt or Ordu. Later the word changed to Urdu, to suit the Persian and Indian speech forms, which has long vowels (Superintendent Government of India, 2022, p. 13).

This common spoken language later got standardised as a literal language for the purpose of administration (Brass, 1974, p. 128). The practice of writing the language however did not follow one language one script rationality (monolingual logic) of modern times. It was standardised into Persian as well as the Nagari scripts. The word Hindi was derived from Persian word Sindh/Hind, which denoted the people living beyond the Sindhu River. (Superintendent Government of India, 2022, p. 14). The cultural and religious meanings were

later constructed, in the colonial period, when the community consciousness started to grow as necessary developments in the modern context brought in by the colonial power. Emerging out of the common tongue Hindustani, Hindi and Urdu when spoken did not thus differ materially. The difference between the two languages was set by their respective scripts- Urdu written in Perso-Arabic script called Nastaliq and Hindi in Devanagari script. The development of the modern vernaculars of Hindi and Urdu started taking place since the 19th century, under the influence of colonially mediated modern rationality. With the advent of the colonial rule in India, one of the important problems faced by the colonialists was that of the language definition. The complex (mostly oral) multicultural and multilingual society of the then India, did not fit into the clearly defined modern rational colonial structures and idea of a (literal) language and was a complex reality to grapple with. Therefore, the colonial linguists like J.B. Gilchrist and others in order to understand the complex linguistic situation in India reconstructed the identity of the languages prevalent. One of the logics used in reconstituting the languages was the ordering of the category of a language with a script. With the official authority of the colonial officials, their process of categorisation of different languages led to the process of standardisation of the indigenous vernaculars into modern literal languages. The institution of Fort William College was among the earliest institutions which started this process of standardising the vernaculars. The process of reconstruction of modern vernaculars also entailed the process of creation of a linguistic and literary histories of the indigenous vernaculars, which was marked with appropriation, neglect and exclusions (Orsini, 2010, pp. 1-3). The crystallisation of the communities around language took the form of one language and one script and one community. The period of definition of communities around languages and religions was enabled with the development of print technology in colonial India. The print technology brought in paradigmatic changes in the nature and shape of the languages and influenced the language definition process. The presence of the variety of lingual and literary traditions in the 19th century for example, courtly, devotional, popular, manuscript, oral and mixed, with complex diglossia which represented the complex composite lingual heterogeneity was changed into a unified linguistic and literary field by the formation of discreet languages and literary traditions mutually distinct from each other by the 20th century, with the impact of the print capitalism in colonial India. The process of language polarisation/ communalisation of language and marginalisation of oral and script neutral languages started out of the conditions of structuration of social structures in modern times. India's colonially mediated modernity has produced the now (re) configured the linguistic imagination, India.

The Hindi movement grew in the North West Province and Oudh region (Brass, 1974, p. 130). It was fierce here because of the social structure of the society. The majority of the population were Hindu by religion and lived dominantly in the rural areas while the urban educated population were the people from the Muslim community. The making of the modern Hindi was the working of the elite politics and caste and regional rivalries. The ambitions and concerns of the North Indian Brahmins against the dominance of the Muslim upper class and that of the monopoly of the Kayasthas in the service sector led to a vigorous movement for (New) Hindi in Devanagari Script. It was in the nineteenth century that the idea of two-ness of Hindi and Urdu from the broad North India dialect of Hindustani started taking shape. It was in Fort William, Calcutta who started the modernist project of standardizing the two different registers

into two different languages. John Borthwick Gilchrist, a surgeon and itinerant linguistic in the late 19th century North India conceived the project of setting up a “seminar” in which the newly appointed officers of the East India Company would be taught Hindustani. This projected ‘seminar’ was soon overtaken by the establishment under official aegis of the Fort William College in 1800, in which Gilchrist was appointed the Professor of Hindustani (Gupta, 1970, p. 52). The staff of Indian scholars and translators invented the linguistic duality: two ways of doing Hindustani (Rai, 2001, Edition 2018, p. 22). One was the Sanskritised version known as Hindi and the other was Perso- Arabianized version of Hindustani.

Another important colonial actor in the history of linguistic division were the Christian missionaries. They started disseminating modern education in Serampore and spread to the rest of the country. They also established the Book Societies all over north India (Stark, 1916, pp. 7-8) With the introduction of modern education, there were technical and existential imperatives which led to the standardization of the language and the script. The need for the creation of text books in vernaculars for the spread of education brought the standardization of the grammar and orthography. It was conceived as the “natural’ or the “normal” imperative built into the new printing technologies. The codification process creates the categorical boxes for ordering the knowledge and here the different religious groups and not yet a community as of, depending upon their classical languages for their theological spiritual heritage had to be linguistically indexed and thus differentiated.

The most important cause for the Hindi movement was the goal of replacement of Urdu as the court language with the local vernaculars. In Bihar and the Central Province (now Madhya Pradesh) Urdu in the Persian script began to be replaced by Hindi in Nagari script in 1870s and 1880s (Gupta, 1970, p. 70). The struggle over the languages issue was intense with profound consequences in the North West Province and Oudh region. As a result of the standardization of Persian language as a court language, the knowledge of the Urdu was highly recommended as an important requirement in the service sector. Due to this the study of Urdu and Persian script increased as one moves up in the education ladder while the study of Hindi declined.

After the revolt of 1857 the agitation of Hindi in Nagari script caught up momentum. In 1868 Babu Prasad, later Raja Shiva Prasad a prominent official in the education department submitted the memorandum to the government and proposed the official language, specifically against the Persian Urdu. In 1863, a memorandum in favour of de- Persianized Hindi/ Hindustani was submitted to the then Lt. Governor, Sir William Muir. The memorandum presented the case of sanskritised Hindi as a Democratic agenda as the number of Hindi speakers was more than the elites who used the Persianized Hindi. In 1882, 76 memorials were submitted to the Hunter commission, in favour of the Nagari/ Hindi (Brass, 1974, pp. 130-31). Sir Syed Ahmed Khan who was the member of the Viceroy Legislative Council then, persuaded the Commission that the matter of the Nagari/ Hindi/ Urdu is not an educational but in fact a grave political matter (Gupta, 1970, p. 104)

The momentous event in the movement of Hindi was the appointment of Lt. Governor, Sir Anthony Mac Donnel in 1895. The Governor was quite hero in the Hindi circle as he was associated with the introduction of Nagari character in the administration of Bihar. Delegations of 17 people under the leadership of Madan Mohan Malaviya submitted the memorandum

called the “Court Character & Primary Education in NWP&O” in 1897 to Sir Donnel (Rai, (2001, Edition 2018, pp. 42-43). Malaviya reformulated the controversy in a masterly way. It formulated the language matter into the condition of the primary education in the State, which was in a dismal state. It turned the language focus on the education of the poor masses. Due to the lack of the spread of education, the region was undeniably backward. And this backwardness contributed to the region’s proneness to crime, superstition and fanaticism.

The language issue was cloaked into the education of the masses, which in turn made it a democratic concern of the State. The majority of the people of the region claimed by the Hindi protagonists were Hindi in origin, though they were acquainted with the Persianized Hindustani. On 18th April 1900, Mac Donnel initiated the order allowing the use of the Nagari characters in the Courts of North West Province and Oudh, citing the case of Bihar and CP. It was not an exclusive use of Hindi, Urdu was retained as one of the court languages along with Hindi. The unadvertised Clause 3 of the original order recommended that “no person shall be appointed except in a purely English office, to any ministerial appointment henceforward unless he can read both the Nagari and Persian characters fluently. But when the order was officially promulgated by the Government on 26th June 1900, it said “the Hindi and Urdu language.” instead of Nagari and Persian characters. This mistake at that time was described as “inadvertent” and “a mistake” in the press. This is how the modern Hindi got recognised as a standard regional language of the of North West Province and Oudh (Rai, 2018, pp. 45-48). With time the Hindi associations and the Urdu associations were established that furthered the two-ness of the same linguistic continuum. The Hindi protagonists were successful in making the Hindi a regional language of the United Provinces to the Official language of Independent India.

The issue of National Language, given the linguistic diversity in the sub-continent of India has been a complex issue and increasingly so with the modernization of the indigenous vernacular communities during the National Movement against colonialism. Linguistically, the leaders of National Movement in colonial India were united through and in opposition to the language of the colonial domination, English. The development of Hindi into a common composite tongue in colonial India which could be written in the scripts of Devanagari as well as Nastaliq made the position of Hindi linguistically stronger in relation to the other indigenous vernaculars. The Indian National Congress as early as 1920s recognised Hindi as its official language replacing English. Gandhi advocated and provided support for the development of this composite language, Hindi/Hindustani as the common tongue. In this spirit of inclusive development of Hindi language, he became the first President of the organization Hindi Pracharini Sabha which worked for the development and spread of Hindi across India.

However, the development of the vernacular languages resorted to the classicization and established into an ethno-language. The development of Hindi took a communal turn and the extreme groups developed an exclusive sanskritised version of Hindi. In the Constituent Assembly debates Hindi group supported the claim of sanskritised Hindi as the language fit to be the National language of the would be newly independent nation-state of India.

Constituent Assembly Debates and Independent India

The standardization of any issue including language in a framework of nation- state needs the political legitimacy and what better way of gaining it than been written in the supreme law of the land i.e. the Constitution. The language issue has been one of the most complex and unresolving that has been discussed by the Constitution Assembly. With regard to language the issue of National Language was highly contentious. Following the trajectory of the European model of development, India also envisioned one nation with one culture (national culture) and one language (national language).

The language positions can be categorised into four main groups: i) Hindi sanskritised/ New Hindi) by the Hindi extremists ii) Hindustani by the Orientalists iii) English by the Anglicists and iv) Regional languages by the vernacularists. In the early days of the debates on language there were two positions on Hindi/ Hindustani. One was the extremist camp who is called as the Hindiwallahs by Granville Austin. People like Purshottam Das Tandon Seth Govind, Jai Narayan Vyas, Ghanashyam Singh Gupta, Kirshorimohan Tripathi, Algu Rai Shastri, Purshottam Das Tandon, Madanmohan Malaviya and others were in the group (Austin, (1972, Reprint 2019, pp. 332-333). They wanted the Hindi in Devanagari script to be the national language for the independent country. On the other hand, were the moderates, comprising of Mahatma Gandhi, Nehru and others who wanted the liberal, inclusive form i.e. Hindustani to be the national language of the country. English was ruled out of the matrix of national language by the virtue of it being not an indigenous language. It was also symbolic of language of India`s colonialism and of foreign origin. To Gandhi, true Swaraj could only be achieved by a language which is on Indian origin as the national language was essential for the dissemination of political knowledge and education among the indigenous people and for the unity for freedom struggle. Gandhi advocated for Hindustani as the common language of the whole India. Hindustani should be neither purely Sanskritised Hindi nor Persianized Urdu but a happy combination of both. This language would truly bridge the widening gap between the Hindus and the Muslims. It would be a true marker of cultural synthesis.

The Indian National Congress in 1936 proclaimed Hindustani as the language of all Congress proceedings. However, one important development that took place during the independence was the division of the country and creation of a separate nation- state of Pakistan. Under the shadows of partition, the meetings witnessed amendments that substituted Hindustani with Hindi firstly in the provincial legislature and the Hindiwallahs also moved the union constitutional legislature to change the Hindustani as the language of Parliament by Hindi. They supported the view that Hindi should be the national language. Finally, the partition of the country killed the Hindustani language as a consequence against the Muslim community. "Hindustani became a bad word after the Partition and the party leaders were reluctant to divide the party over it." (Austin, 2019, p. 347)

The Draft Constitution of February 1948 established that the Union language was Hindi and not Hindustani. The Hindiwallahs moved many amendments to make Hindi in Devanagari script. The people from the South Constituencies opposed the Hindi imperialism and others members of the Constituent Assembly also supported the claims of Hindustani in both the scripts. In the end of the language debates a compromise formula was drawn called the Munshi-

Ayyanger Formula, on the basis of which the part XVII of the Constitution on languages was formed. The formula provided that the Official language of the Union was to be Hindi in Devanagari Script while retaining the International numerical. English would be used for the Union affairs for the period of 15 years and the Parliament could extend the period if found necessary. It also included the lists of major Regional Languages known as the Officially Recognised Languages which in the Constitutions is referred to as the 8th Schedule, which originally comprised of 14 languages and now contains 22 languages. (Constitution of India, Volume 9, 1949) The linguistic identity of Indian nation debated in the Constituent Assembly came into effect since 1950.

The constructed multilingual identity of independent India was top heavy with three power languages: the official language of the nation-state, Hindi, the regional principal language or the official language of state and English. After the establishment the linguistic identity of India dominantly as a Hindi speaking nation with some (non-Hindi) principal languages and the irrevocable existence of English, was supported by the process of institutionalisation of the official languages in the fields of administration, courts and education by the Indian state.

The method of officialisation/ standardisation of a language group into a principal (literal) language was the technique used to achieve in integration of diverse ethno-lingual communities into distinct discreet lingual communities thereby leading to assimilation of the small ethno-linguistic groups into mainstream communities or the differentiation and marginalisation of the peripheral language communities which has led to the slow death of many such dialects and language groups in independent India. At the regional level there are second official languages recognised on small pocket areas; however, they rank lower than the dominant state language in the linguistic hierarchy (e.g. Nepali or Santali in West Bengal.) The integrative ideology of the linguistic and culturally homogenous political units (federal states) into the organism of the Indian nationhood, led to the creation of the political units of the Indian states as linguistic states thereby making the category of language as a political, legal-rational category. The linguistic state reorganisation (1956) politically strengthened position of the principal languages in relation to the several minority languages and dialects spoken across India by politically establishing the linguistically territorialised states thereby making them power languages. The linguistic reorganisation of the states was instrumental in streamlining the process of institutionalisation of the Official/ Principal languages in the institutions of administration, courts and education.

Institutionalisation of Power languages

The project of integrating and building the Indian nation therefore was under taken on the logic of Hindi axis. By the position of the Official Language of the Union, Hindi language was understood/ signified the language representative of the common cultural inheritance of the nation-state. Article 351 of the Constitution stipulates that Hindi would develop to be "...a medium of expression for all the elements of the composite culture of India." (Report of Official Language Commission, 1957, p.208) The Official Language Commission in 1955 advocated comprehensively the use of Official languages of the Indian union in the institutions of administration, courts and education, for the purpose of the progressive used of Hindi and development of the language as the common link language for all the purposes of the Union

and inter-state matters across the nation. Hindi was to replace the colonial power language, English and the integrative ideology of the nation strengthened the claims of Hindi as an indigenous dominant language spoken by majority of the people (42% in the census of 1951). The role of Hindi as the common linguistic medium was necessary for not only the administrative purposes, also for the maintenance of the country's political unity and integrity (Report of Official Language Commission, 1957, p.208).

Among the institutions of the state, education has been regarded as one of the most important agencies of the state for the progressive use and dissemination of the knowledge via and of the power languages across the country. The languages in the school curriculum across the levels of educations was also conceived around the logic of the Hindi axis, meaning the education system would be one of the vital institutions of the state that would materialize the claim and vision of Hindi as eventually being the lingua franca and the composite language representative of the common culture of India. Accordingly the Mudaliar Commission, the first education commission in independent India formed to look into primarily the matter of secondary education in India, considering the languages to be institutionalized within the school curriculum, divided the regions into three kinds: i) regions where Hindi is the Mother Tongue (MT) and the Regional language, ii) regions where Hindi is not the MT but is the Regional Language, and iii) where Hindi is neither the MT nor the Regional Language, categorized upon the axis of Hindi (Mudaliar Report,1953, p 47). The Commission stressed the removal of English by Mother Tongue/ Regional language as the medium of education, where English in the colonial India until 1937, was the medium of instruction. The Committee recommended the learning of Hindi, the lingua-franca of the nation, in-making as a compulsory second language to be introduced in the schools, especially in the non-Hindi states, while the Commission felt no compulsion to be introduced to learn a non-Hindi language in the Hindi states where Hindi would be he natural medium of expression and education ((Mudaliar Report,1953, pp. 57-58). English could be introduced in the middle school level on an optional basis, however not in the same year where Hind is introduced. The Official Language Commission (1955), in consistency with the previous two Education Commissions recommends the institutionalisation of the three power languages (MT/ Regional Language, Hindi and English) as the languages of education in India.

The precursors of Three Language Formula thus had laid down the matrix of three (power) languages to be institutionalized in the education system as the languages of education i.e. of Hindi, Regional Language and English following the dictates of Constituent Assembly debates surmised in the Munshi-Ayyanger Formula. It created a hierarchical system of linguistic framework, based/guided by the monolingual logic and a literal signification of language category, created in the milieu of modern colonial India intricately linking the modern languages to the larger normative idea of a nation-state. It was in the decade of 1960s that the institutionalisation of languages in independent India took concrete shape with the recommendations of the Kothari Commission which unified the otherwise diversified/ provincialised colonial educational experiments and developments into a unified national educational pattern.

The process of national integration continued in the decades of the sixties. After the political unification of the Indian nation-state during the decade of the fifties, the state in the sixties moved towards the process of emotional integration which was significant as the nation building (cultural) project after the achievement of the independence. The particular institution identified by the Emotional Integration Committee (Report, 1962) appointed by the government of India, for the nation-cultural (emotional integration) project was the system of education. Besides the socio-economic purpose of the education, the education system was guided by the political purpose of emotional integration of the nation. The institutions of education were important institution of the state which would disseminate, inculcate and promote national values and spirit and in creating the children into citizens of the Indian nation-state. The national goal of integration through the system of education guided the development of a common pattern of education throughout the country was laid down by the Kothari Commission in 1964-66 and implemented with the endorsement of the first National Policy of Education in 1968 bringing in unity in educational pattern and system throughout the nation-state. This unity in the education structure was supplemented by the unity in curriculum and pedagogy. This pedagogical unification/ integration would be brought in through the languages used in education, thereby leading to the devising of a pan-Indian linguistic strategy to be implemented in the education system across the country. This strategy led to the framework of languages to be used in education called the Three Language Formula, a formula significant for the emotional (socio-cultural) integration of the nation. It is in this context of nation building followed after the political independence of India that the Three Language Formula, as a pan-Indian linguistic strategy, building a psychological cultural base for nationhood of the political unified administrative (linguist) states, was formulated. Hindi became a power language by becoming the language of the system in a complete sense. The same happened to state level official languages below national level but in a lexical priority.

Summing up

Rooted in colonial history in India and in tandem with absorption of modular forms of western nationalism the case of emergence of new Hindi with Devnagari script and marginalisation of script neutral Hindustani in India as well as communal separation of Hindi and Urdu testify to how subliminal category of language got politicised within the framework of nation. The coexistence of two official languages emerging out from North-South debate to debates between Hindi-speaking areas and non-Hindi speaking area and a list of scheduled (Regional) languages are all parts of standardisation of national language(s) and are power languages within layers of linguistics hierarchy within the system of Indian nation-state, relevant for the emotional integration and system's communication. These power languages are languages with standard grammars and scripts and literary sphere(s). This script-language association is a double-edged sword marginalising the minority vernaculars and the boils without scripts on the one hand and encouraging on the other multilinguality of power languages depending on political significance of large territorially concentrated linguistic groups in democratic political process. The tensions between languages of life and languages of power/system or between different power languages form an important stuff of democratic politics in India today.

Bibliography

- Anderson, B. ((1983)2016). *IMAGINED COMMUNITIES: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Austin, G. ((1972)2019). *THE INDIAN CONSTITUTION: Cornerstone of a Nation*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Brass, P. R. (1974). *LANGUAGE, RELIGION AND POLITICS IN NORTH INDIA*. Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.
- Constitution of India*. (Volume 9, 1949, September 14). Retrieved from <https://www.constitutionofindia.net/debates/14-sep-1949/>
- Dewey, J. ((1916)1968). *DEMOCRACY AND EDUCATION: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. Toronto, Ontario: COLLIER-MACMILLAN LIMITED.
- Gellner, E. ((1983), 1993). *NATIONS AND NATIONALISM*. UK: Blackwell Publishers.
- Gupta, J. D. (1970). *Language Conflict and National Development: GROUP POLITICS AND NATIONAL LANGUAGE POLICY IN INDIA*. Berkely: University of California Press.
- Habermas, J. (1987). *THE THEORY OF COMMUNICATIVE ACTION (VOLUME TWO) Lifeworld and Systems: A Critique of Functionalist Reason*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Official Languages Act, 1963*. (2026, May 14th May). Retrieved from Government of India: https://rajbhasa_act_1963e.pdf
- Orsini, F. ((2010)2016). Introduction. In Orsini, F. (eds.), *Before the Divide: Hindi and Urdu Literary Culture* (pp. 1-20). New Delhi: Orient Blackswan Private Limited.
- Passeron, P. B.-C. ((1977)1990). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage Publications.
- Rai, A. ((2001)2018). *HINDI NATIONALISM*. Telangana: Orient Black swan Private Limited.
- Report of the Committee on Emotional Integration (1962)*, Ministry of Education, Government of India, New Delhi: The Vishva Bharati Press.
- Report of the Education Commission, 1964-66, Education and National Development (1970)* New Delhi: National Council of Educational Research and Training
- Report of the Secondary Education Commission, Mudaliar Commission Report, October 1952-June 1953*, Delhi: Ministry of Education, Government of India
- Report on the Official Language Commission, 1956, (1957) Delhi* : The General Manager, Government of India Press.
- Stark, H. A. (1916). *Vernacular Education in Bengal from 1813-1912*. Calcutta: THE CALCUTTA GENERAL PRINTING CO. LTD. .
- Superintendent Government of India, D. R. (2022, April 16)*, Superintendent Government of India, Delhi, Report of the Uttar Pradesh Language Committee, 1962, Retrieved from



Indian culture.gov.in: <https://indianculture.gov.in/reports-proceedings/report-uttar-pradesh-language-committee-1962>

Taylor, C. (2006). An issue about language. In C. J. Tuite, *LANGUAGE, CULTURE, AND SOCIETY: KEY TOPICS IN LINGUISTIC ANTHROPOLOGY* (pp. 16-48). New York: Cambridge University Press.