HISTORIOGRAPHY OF PUNJABI LANGUAGE: A CRITICAL STUDY

Varinder Khurana[*]

ABSTRACT

A dormant debate on Indian languages' historiography is densely shadowed by Orientalism. At least in India, no one looks into this field. The propositions are not allowing linguistics to expand beyond language structure. The purpose of this paper is to discuss the doctrines on which language historiography is based, in general, and with reference to Punjabi, in particular. As proto-languages are not the last resort to end all debates on language history, this paper made a step forward in analysing the offspring-origin theory. Neither of these doctrines is scientific, but biblical in interpretation. Language development is distorted by these considerations in linguistics, on which objective historiography should be based. Why was India only an import centre? Why couldn't Indian languages come from the subcontinent? In this paper, we will examine alternative trends in language history.

Keywords: Language Historiography, Orientalism, Offspring-Doctrine, Proto Language, Mosaic Ethnology, Colonialism

1. Introduction

Historiography of Indian languages has been dormant for a long time. In this field of study, we don't see any new theoretical discoveries; all the studies are based on orientalist propositions. Theoretically, these types of suggestions are biased and based on 'Mosaic Ethnology', which is a subjective interpretation. It is easy to relate this discourse to theological propagation. Language history was studied with a colonial mindset, making Indian languages destitute.

It is very problematic to interpret the historical development of languages based on biblical origin when Mosaic Ethnology doctrines are questionable. Unfortunately, most Indian research doesn't want to shed its colonial cloak. Following the path shown in the prior-mentioned outlook, they continued interpreting Indian languages.

In contrast, we can find alternative views on the historical development of languages; some scholars have firmly criticized colonialism. For instance, Ram Vilas Sharma (शर्मा1980), Bhagwan Singh (सिंह1973)and Abhay Kumar Dubey (दुबे2020)offer an initial

---

[*] Department of Punjabi, Punjabi University, Patiala, India

glimpse into some of these alternative trends, contrasted with the popular but reactionary beaten path mentioned above.

Punjabi's historiography is no different from other Indian languages, especially Indo-Aryans; there is a doctrine claiming that contemporary languages are descendants of Sanskrit and ultimately, they are proto-Indo-European in origin.

In an alternative view, Indian languages originated on the subcontinent, and should be studied in a context of coexistence. There are two recent publications by Manzur Ejaz that discuss Punjabi's roots in the prehistoric era (Ejaz 2020, 2021). There are many writings by Ainul Haq Faridkoti, but his most famous work is a monograph titled Pre-Aryan Origin of Pakistani languages (Faridkoti 1992). It discusses the origins of Pakistani and north Indian languages - Urdu, Hindi, Sindhi, Punjabi. He considered these languages to be continuations of the Dravidian language family. Punjabi is seen as the continuation of Munda languages by Ejaz. To support his doctrine, he developed a 380-page comparative dictionary of Punjabi and Austroasiatic languages (Ejaz 2019).

According to Rama Shankar Tripathi, Punjab is the native place of the Dravidian population, and Punjabi is related to all regional languages, including Vedic, Sanskrit, and Prakrit (Tripathi 1942). According to Witzel an amount of attention was paid to Vedic and Davidian in the attempts to decode the seals of the Indus Valley, which overshadowed the other possibilities (Witzel 2008). He suggested that none other than Austroasiatic and Para-Munda be used to relate these under discussion languages. Nevertheless, he suggested leaving this debate open until a better and firmer study could be conducted (Witzel 2019).

This paper examines some alternative trends in the historiography of Indian languages by analysing the offspring doctrine, although Punjabi remains our focus. This paper will attempt to revive dormant debates about Indian languages' history.

1.1 Historiography of Languages: A General Discussion

Language is the practical consciousness (Marx & Engels 2015 [1846]); it is the creative aspect of human consciousness. Humans are social, consciousness is social, and language is social. Every human society (regardless of its size) has developed its own language. During inter-clan contact (social contact), these languages developed shared features of living along with other languages. Feature exchange occurs regularly between languages. Social and linguistic advancements were made by developing a contact language. As a result, various societies and languages are integrated.

The investigation of language origins and historiography of language are fields where distorted doctrines are imposed in a way that makes finding the true theory difficult. Actuality was blurred by these doctrines; they don't correspond objective reality.

It is essential to establish this objective correspondence for a proposed doctrine. Doctrines cannot be validated without this, they remain subjective propositions only (Khurana 2021).

A hypothesis is always determined by philosophy, i.e., the outcome (doctrine) of outlook and philosophy. Therefore, the idealist philosophy works behind the offspring doctrine; Known as the Genealogical Classification of Languages.

Historiography of this type considers pre-established languages and language families. The proto-languages established all their features before interacting with other languages. This first language was divine, and their descendant languages were cursed or polluted. The formation of languages through relative contact is ignored. The proponents of this theory see transformation as distortion, not as development. We can also find attempts to create a higher, macrolanguage that would be the mother of all known language families, the Nostratic language family (Bomhard 1984).

2. Analysis of the Genealogical Approach

The establishment of the genealogical approach and off-spring hypotheses denies the process of language development through mutual contact. They are contradictory, both can't stand true at the same time. Off-spring doctrine establishes the perception of the descendants of many languages from one single ancient and perfect language. These languages are projected to be dependent on the mother language for all their features and it is being preached that these languages borrowed their terminology from that ancient mother language, because it is rather pure, so the speakers should go back to the history and have to respect their divine language. But there is always a long-standing question in front of this approach, i.e. *Why the process of language development could not happen another way, the opposite of this?* The answer we get to this question is always; *silence.*

We have to address this question, *what if the so-called genealogical hypothesis was not right?* As it is not got proven yet, it comes with a speculative disclaimer. In the case of Aryan languages, it is widely accepted that the modern Indo-Aryan languages are the offsprings of Sanskrit; this doctrine comes to the scene with the orientalists, especially with William Jones, Friedrich Max Müller, Robert Caldwell etc. and many more.

We are justified in accepting so far, the native opinion that Sanskrit is the parent of the whole family (Beames 1872: 2).

In the lifetime of Max Müller, there was no excavation of Harrapan Valley taking place; it was started later in 1920, i.e., many years after Max Müller, Caldwell and Jones. The point here is that they did not have any practical idea of the presence of any ancient civilization in India. They had some propositions, on which they built a doctrine of Aryan invasion, and the perception of language families, whose validity was never tested, and, after that, all the pieces of

evidence were used isolated to prove their validity, indeed, only usable pieces of evidence were kept and others were ignored. Logically it is not possible to interpret a historical event without knowing, what is preceding it. Then how we got to know without this knowledge, that the event we are studying is an alien event to the preceding or just a continued succession.

The archaeologist cannot identify the language of a culture if there is no writing or if the writing cannot be read. Therefore, the archaeologist cannot identify an archaeological culture as 'Aryan'. We have to wait until the Harrapa script is read before the proposed the identification of Harappans with Aryans can be considered (Thapar 2008: 20).

So, it is up to us that we want to interpret history on orientalists' racial insights or there is any possibility of reinvestigate the history on actual terms.

This interpretation of language history also faced criticism in its initial interpretations. In Max Müller, the Indo-European language family was known as the Aryan language family at first. This was the point of contradiction between the European scholars, though both sides were following a genealogical approach but from opposite sources; according to the first, the source is the Indian sub-continent and the latter considers the source in Europe, it is essential to mention Crawfurd here; he was contemporary to Max Müller and firm critique. In one of his papers, he commented on the question of antiquity and the parent land of Sanskrit as follows;

…Now of this strange history the Sanskrit language, although containing abundant ancient written records, tells us nothing. The very word Sanskrit itself is a fictitious one, and not, as in almost every other case, whether with Oriental or European nations, ancient as well as modern, derived from the name of the people who spoke it, or of the country in which it was spoken. It simply signifies "adorned, completed, perfect," a definition obviously showing that the word is the more recent creation of grammarians. Its writings make no reference to the parent country of the people of whom it was the living tongue. On the contrary, the names of heroes, gods, and places are confined to Hindustan, and more especially to the north-western portion of it (Crawfurd 1861: 268-69).

In this paper, Crawfurd criticized the Sanskrit supremacy claimed by Max Müller, Bopp and other orientalists. He also criticized the efforts to claim one macro language family, imposition of general rules for the comparative study of these languages, etc. But the essence of this paper was the anti-Indian origin of the Indo-European languages, and it has nothing in counter to the notions of language families and offspring-doctrine, which indicates that the debate of that time had the intra-notion contradictions. At the initial stage of the colonial rule, India was viewed as an image of that ancient culture which was propagated in Europe as the glory of the past, and a match with this culture was

being proposed in Europe, but this view faced criticism and the notion of one race was eroded and European dominance over Indians was maintained.Orientalists' interpretation of Indian languages is usually known to be associated or started with Jones, but it was started many years before that so-called historical event of 1786. But Italian merchant Filippo Sassetti (16th century) was to suggest the link between Sanskrit and some European languages (Thapar 2008). Roberto de Nobili was an Italian missionary, who arrived in India in 1606, learned Telegu, Tamil and Sanskrit, and started living impersonating a pundit, as he declared himself a Brahmin and even started following untouchability.

Père Coeurdoux (1691-1779) was a Jesuit priest in Puducherry who wrote a letter to Paris back in 1766 almost twenty years before the *discovery* of Jones. He pointed the cognates between Sanskrit, Latin, and Greek and according to him there could not be any other reason for these similarities, except their common origin; i.e., '*une commune origin'.*

In his concern to maintain harmony with the literal statements of the Bible in the Book of Genesis, Coeurdoux postulated one primitive "language" before Babel, which after the miracle became different but related "languages," including Latin, Greek and Sanskrit, growing further apart with time(Godfrey 1967: 59).

We can see, in these examples, a clear tendency to relate the origin of languages with the 'story of tower of babel'. On which the whole 'science of orientalist' was based.

India is a geographical point for them instead of a country, they try to construct the whole of the universe on the coast of the Mediterranean Sea.It is difficult but not impossible to comprehend to what extent they remain inspired by the story of Tower of Babel and Eve and Adam while doing so (सिंह1973: 45).

Nathaniel Brassey Halhed was also before Jones, who wrote Grammar of the Bengali language and noted similarity of Sanskrit, Persian and Arabic words (Max Müller 1855). He conceptualized that these similarities can be framed to have happened right after the dawn of civilization.

These comparative studies are older than the lecture of William Jones, hence he can't be credited as the first and foremost.

a. These studies fall under a trend of related Indian languages to the Tower of Babel story.

b. In fact, these are not mere studies, but a part of a much larger propaganda to distort historical interpretations under presupposed mythical thought to deepen the roots of colonialization.

We can see Goldstücker's critique of the efforts of orientalists in distorting the interpretation of Vedas and literature, in his work he states firmly that the orientalists deliberately misinterpreted Indian literature, which is the only source of reference in the whole knowledge for the

world about ancient India. (Goldstücker 1861). Their misconceptions turned into suppurating sore for Indian history. Their comparative method was biased, cognates in various languages could also be the result of their co-existence rather than being sister, daughter, and mother languages. They used these similarities to take advantage to forward their propaganda.

Their Comparative analysis focuses on singularity; scholars usually compare one desired form with several of the same meaning with the other most desired available forms of other languages. Their tracing of words was limited to form not meaning. Although the sound correspondence itself is not limited, that means it is not only an intra-family phenomenon. Similarities are the result of inter-language, inter-family contact in co-existing. Indeed, similarities are lesser in quantity than dissimilarities among the languages. For instance;

It is reasonably to be objected to the words selected by the advocates of the Aryan theory,that they consist often of a single synonyme out of the many which exist in Sanskrit. Thus, heli is one word out of a score, for the sun, and from this is supposed to come the Latin sol and the Gothic suil, the German, the English, and the Erse having no term in the least resembling it. The far more frequent words for the sun in Sanskrit, surya and rawi, are unnoticed. For the moon they give the word masa, which signifies also a month, and from this is supposed to come the Latin mensis, and the Erse mios, the far more frequent Sanskrit words, chandra and soma, being taken no notice of, The Erse word in this case usually pronounced mis, I have no doubt comes direct from the Latin mensis, but I have just as little doubt that the latter does not come from the Sanskrit masa (Crawfurd 1861: 282).

Commenting in this Context Bhagwan Singh noted:

As far as the question of logic-skill is concerned, we can conclude from the examples of the arguments given in this debate that even a lie can be proved true and has been done so far. Not only this, a lie presented with full skill appears to be truer, while the truth in front of them remains a ridiculous thing (सिंह1973).

By these comparative studies, Sanskrit was claimed as the mother of Indo-Aryan languages and also a source of many words in Dravidian languages, and the offspring hypothesis tends to be proven. Several burdened adjectival phrases were being attached to Sanskrit; *'the perfect language', richer than others, the mother language'* etc. and this practice are still alive, but Suniti Kumar Chatterji states;

Sanskrit was not exactly the home language of any part of the country: - only in the centuries B.C. the dialects of the Panjab and the 'Midland' (i.e., Western United Provinces of the present day) appear to have given to Sanskrit its basic form(Chatterji 1942: 159).

However, Chatterji is a firm supporter of Sanskrit offspring-doctrine, this statement could be an instinctive statement responding to the objective reality, but most of the time we distort studies, discrediting

the simple logical things. We know the study in the genealogical approach is not an area of universal certainties, hence, rather considering the research problem in its context and studying it as a whole, we isolate it and consider some preconditions essential to study the history of language. This situation raises some questions, i.e., *What are these preconditions? Why are they so needed? And how do they affect our results? Are they the sources of biases?* But indeed, these preconditions are neither essential nor true in the studies. They never take us to the correct conclusions but distort the studies and also the mind which, unfortunately, results in biased studies. Let's see the following statement in this context;

Languages of this type are not produced with a social testament by adapting all languages within them. However, a language that is more important from a political, economic, or religious standpoint tends to become dominant over others. They influence and are influenced by other languages of their dominant region. They get polished by intellectuals while acquiring a general form arising from their regional forms. In the process, they enrich themselves by adapting the features of other languages and by sowing a large part of their vocabulary in them by diminishing the distinctions of other regional languages, and thus a common culture and language develops over a very large region; in a nation-society made up of many nationalities, in a land made up of many customs and beliefs. By inverting this entire sequence, scholars corrupt their interpretations and results (सिंह1973: 20).

This statement is concluded with an endnote mentioning Sanskrit, Greek, Latin and Russian, French, German, Hindi etc. as these types of languages, which have been discussed above in the previous paragraph. According to our doctrine, as a result of presupposed and speculative studies based on genealogical approaches, there has been little contribution to the analysis of the actual development of languages, rather, their propagation has resulted in the worst for them. For instance, the orientalists' hypothesis of Indian languages influenced Grierson while conducting the Linguistics survey of India. His survey is a reference text for Indian language historiographers. If we leave the rest of the survey aside and look at the Punjabi section only, it ruined every possibility to study Punjabi as a language of the land of Punjab and the continuation of languages being spoken there. Contrary to this, he separated Punjabi in Lahnda - Western Punjabi and Punjabi – Eastern Punjabi (Grierson 1903) based on their source of origin of which they are the descendants according to him. It is as a result of their misconceptions about the development of Indian languages being imposed in such a way that they appear to be true and all alternative doctrines are tossed aside without any discussion, in fact, as a joke.

These philological readings coincided with and were instrumental in the European reconstruction of the past and present. By the late nineteenth century Social Darwinism – the adaptation of Darwinism to social history – was linked to what was emerging as 'race-science'. History was seen as involving the inter-action of races. This view

became a further reason justifying high imperialism when the upper classes were said to be the superior from German Romanticism and culminated in Ariosophy and the Nazi ideology. This was also a view that undermined orthodox Christian theology. But by the middle of twentieth century the fallacies of racial theories had become apparent and the theories were generally discarded by biologists and cultural historians. But they remained popular in India and continue to be (Thapar 2008: 11).

In this way, the genealogical doctrine of the development of languages is still popular and has the big support of linguists and historians. This approach, as a whole, is the distortion of reality. It does not interpret the actual process of the development of languages. Hence, this approach in the historiography of languages needs a critical analysis, and all the doctrines related to this should be kept under the eye of scientific outlook to reinvestigate. Because language is a social phenomenon and, at the same time, a social product, the history of language or literature is always influenced by the historical form and transformation of society. That is a major missing in the genealogical approach. While dealing with the history of language and literature, it is necessary to discuss the fact, as to what is a form of social organization, society had at that time. Without having knowledge of that human society, and living in what stage of social development, it is not possible to interpret the history of language and literature (शर्मा 1986). So, we need a scientific theory in the historiographical studies of language.

2.1 Historiography of Indian Languages

It is an established perception that all the language families residing in India are not native to Indian soil; they all came from various foreign lands; We are all well aware of the yet-stated historical timeline of the Indo-Aryan Languages. The relationship of Dravidian with Scythian languages was also proposed in the studies of the 19th century (Caldwell 1856). But later in the 20th century the relation of Dravidian Languages, particularly with Finno-Ugric languages was proposed (Burrow 1944), yet another foreign language family. We can see more on the proposed relations of Dravidian languages in a work *The Dravidian Languages* (Krishnamurti 2003). Similar to these, Austro-Asiatic and Tibeto-Burman language families are also non-native to India according to the hitherto available studies. Although we can also find many other different opinions about nativeness or non-nativeness, the names given to these language groups suggest the above-given connection. Indian sub-continent is only an import-colony of language and culture, for orientalists.

All of these doctrines, in one and another form, believe that all language forms in the world developed from very few or even one language, i.e., all modern languages are the descendants of few ancient languages and these few ancient languages are further descendants of one single language.

But this classification of Indian languages, notwithstanding its wide acceptance among linguists, did also face criticism for its problematic and theological propositions. Those who accept this can never have in mind that language families being spoken in India could also have an Indian origin. When you go to deal with this problem with the prior hypothesis that all the languages of India come from foreign sources, then you can't see the internal inter-language connections and keep your focus only to find the source to interpret every phenomenon in your imaginary doctrine.

All the writers agree that Aryans invaded India from the northwest, defeated Dravidians, occupied their land, and expelled them in the south of Vindhyachal. They consider Mosaic Ethnology as the basis of language family can never contradict the origin of language by a divine power ideologically. They are contrastive to scientific reality. In general vision it can be accepted without any issue, but in critical analysis, we have three situations basically; i.e.

i. If Aryans were not native and invaded from the north-eastern side of India, then there are two possibilities;

   a. They forced and exiled Dravidians, occupied their land and then imposed their foreign culture and language, or

   b. They didn't force Dravidians to migrate and constructed a joint culture and language together.

ii. If Aryans were native Indigenous; they didn't come from any other place and no Dravidian migration happened, hence we will have the following possible outcomes;

   a. We will have to give off the notionof foreign/alien races for them both.

   b. And we have to consider their expansion due to the increase in their population, and the expansion for ages increased the visible differences.

iii. In the third situation, if we consider that all ancient clans were nomads, and none of them was originally native to any piece of land, then;

   a. The need for better living conditions forced them to migrate from one place to another until their knowledge of the process of cultivation. Those who adopted agriculture early got settled early and started (continuously) developing towards the next possible stage according to their objective conditions.

   b. All these primitive societies had developed their languages, capable of their communicational function. The common visible features between languages got developed by their inter-clan contact in co-existence. This validates the phenomenon of regular exchange of features between languages.

Romila Thapar discussed the so-called migration of Aryans and the history of the term *'Arya'* in '*The Aryan: Recasting Construct*(Thapar 2008). These migration stories are deliberately attached to the Biblical interpretation, and also to the mythological interpretation of *Puranas*.

Though, Language is a human fabrication, which they are weaving eternally, even without knowing that they are doing it. It is a fact that without getting the right process intellectually or lack of the development of natural sciences, there could be an idealist interpretation of this process. But in the contemporary world, when we have all the knowledge of this process, the preachers of pseudo-science in linguistics not letting us get rid of these unscientific notions. The following comment is essential to note in this context.

"To impose the radiating logic of segmentation upon language history or ethnological classifications one has to remove or ignore or deal in other ways with the phenomena produced by the convergence of languages and peoples in the formation of new languages and new peoples. Specifically, the segmentary logic of the family tree of languages or nations prevents and disallows the idea of the mixture as a creative principle" (Trautmann 1997: 11).

It can be noted in the trends of hitherto historiography of Indian languages that came into the discussion so far. For every language family, there is an imagined hypothetical proto-language, and all other possibilities are darkly shadowed under this. The actual process of language development turns upside down by this interpretation. By following this path Indian languages are racially classified in presently known language families, which deliberately divided the Indian population, and excluded all the possibilities to study Indian languages as the independently-relative languages, developed by remaining in contact for epochs.

2.2 Three Theses in the Historiography of Punjabi Language

According to the yet popular historiography of the Punjabi language, it is not the continuation of the languages of the Punjab region and doesn't correspond to its socio-historic development. Considering this it originated in the 10th-11th century as the descendant of Sanskrit along with other Modern Indo-Aryan languages. According to the established historical studies, Punjabi is just a language, which always imports sounds, words, syntactical expressions, etc. from other languages and accepts their socio-political effects, but never does anything contrasting to this holy process. They tend to prove that Punjabi is just another recipient language, as they consider many other languages, and leave them for the sake of Sanskrit or European languages. That is a firm racist conception.

All the pre-supposed and speculative studies hardly contributed to analyzing the actual development of languages, rather their propagations resulted in the worst for them. For instance, Grierson

while conducting the Linguistics survey of India, was so influenced by the orientalists' hypothesis of the Indian languages. His survey has been a reference text till now, for Indian language historiographers. But it was not conducted by professional and experienced surveyors; the presented data were collected by the patwaris without having any training and experience. If we leave the rest of the survey aside and have a look at the Punjabi section only, it ruined every possibility to study Punjabi as a language of the land of Punjab and the continuation of languages being spoken there. Contrary to this, he separated Punjabi in Lahnda - Western Punjabi and Punjabi – Eastern Punjabi (Grierson 1903), which on a big aftereffect played a role in the partition of Punjab.

There is a mixed response of agreement and disagreement in this context among the linguists who wrote on the history of Punjabi. But almost all of them couldn't see beyond the offspring hypothesis. We can also see its detailed analysis in the works of Javed Majeed (Majeed 2019).

When we see the historiography of Punjabi, we can see three different theses as follows.

a. In the Indo-European line, there is the same offspring-doctrine, in which the contemporary languages are the descendants of Sanskrit and ultimately, they come from the so-called Proto Indo-European. In Aryan languages, there is the kinship of descendants from Proto-Indo-European to Indo-Iranian, then a split into two branches Indo-Iranian to Iranian and Indo-Aryan or Indic, then Vedic Sanskrit → Classic Sanskrit → Pali → Prakrits → Apabhramsha → Modern Indo-Aryan languages.

b. Then we have another type of suggestion to find its roots in the so-called prehistoric era; there are two recent publications discussing this in detail by Manzur Ejaz. There are several writings of Ainul Haq Faridkoti also. Ainul Haq & Rama Shankar Tripathi consider Punjabi a Dravidian language. Faridkoti discussed the origin and development of Punjabi along with Urdu, Hindi, and Sindhi, as the continuation of the Dravidian language family. According to Rama Shankar Tripathi, Punjab was the native place of the Dravidian population, and not only Punjabi but all the regional languages, even Vedic, Sanskrit, and Prakrits are related to the Dravidian language family.

Manzur Ejaz and Michael Witzel suggest the origin of Punjabi in Austroasiatic and Para-Munda. According to Witzel there should be another means to decode the seals of the Indus valley, by leaving the Dravidian outlook aside, although, in one of his later works, he suggested leaving this debate open, until a better and firm study, is conducted. Whereas Ejaz suggests renaming the Punjabi language with 'Meluha' (a name with the Indus Valley people were known to Mesopotamians), which, according to him, was an Austroasiatic Language, and the present Punjabi is its continuation. But these Doctrines contrasting with the Indo-Aryan origin of the Punjabi

language are also revolving in the whirlwind. They also isolate the languages from their region and relate them with either of the language families monistically, instead of watching it as dialectically developed. They repeated the same offspring hypothesis varying only with the family name.

c. But according to a different outlook, Indian languages originated from the soil of the subcontinent, and suggest studying these languages in the context of co-existence. There, we see some scholars who firmly criticized the colonial offspring doctrine for languages. We can see the works of Ram Vilas Sharma and Abhay Kumar Dubeyto have an initial look at some of these alternative trends.

Every language is made up of various varieties, and the existence of a contact language among them is the fact, so they all exist dialectically, e.g., Punjabi can be Pothohari or Puwadhi or Majhi or can be any other so-called dialect (of Punjabi) and vice-versa at the same time. The known Punjabi to us is just a contact language between the speakers of hitherto known dialects of Punjabi. So, the fact to be noted is that Punjabi is a language group; a group of the languages of the Punjab region. Hence, Punjabi is the group of Punjabi Languages. This understanding is missing in the historiography of Indian languages

2.3 The Conflict

A fundamental conflict in the historiography of Indian languages is their origin and development. It is generally considered that the Aryan invasions were from the northwest, through Punjab. Aryan invasions started happening in this region, leading to Dravidians migrating southward, gradually. Several hundred years of invasions and migrations followed. As a result, a doctrine is built that the so-called lower caste people of North India are the remaining Dravidian slaves captured by Aryans. This Aryan invasion doctrine is politically beneficial and gave India a gulf of separation based on racism.

People who believe in Aryan invasion will also believe in language replacement, and will also consider the offspring hypothesis, i.e., that Indian languages originate from Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Dravidian. In their doctrine of development, Indian languages develop from already developed languages. As a result of this kinship mechanism, all other languages are considered to descend from this proto-language. As a result, advocates of this doctrine cannot accept relative language development.

There are phonological tendencies in every region that determine how words evolve. Importing words from other languages and transforming them accordingly. This process is not one-sided; as is being propagated in Punjabi and other Indo-Aryan languages that they import words from Sanskrit or dialects import their words from standard languages, and the words of these languages are only the transformation of these so-called higher forms of languages, and one-sided implies it is only being done from Sanskrit to other languages. It

initiates a notion of pure and polluted words. A language exchanges its properties with another. To understand the horizons of language development, we must keep this notion in our minds.

However, the above-mentioned discussion never considers contact as an empowering condition, rather, they regard it as a later phenomenon. Language contact and the import and export of various categories may have been restricted until a language family had fully developed.

3. The Alternative Notion (In Lieu of Conclusions)

Language groups don't exist in isolation. By identifying common features in many languages, the interpreters fabricated the hypothetical notion of a language family. This area of study considers the commonalities between various languages, while ignoring the differences.

It is therefore a firm need to overturn the notion of language families and linguistic interpretations based on Mosaic Ethnology, in order to reinterpret the history of Indian languages, and not just Indian languages.

References

Beames, John. (1872). *A Comparative Grammar of the Modern Aryan Languages of India*. Vol. I. Trübner and Company.

Bomhard, Allan R. (1984). *Toward Proto-Nostratic: A New Approach to the Comparison of Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Afroasiatic*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Burrow, T. (1944). Dravidian Studies IV. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies,* 11(2): 328-356.

Caldwell, Robert. (1856*). A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian or South-Indian Family of Languages*. Trübner and Company.

Chatterji, Suniti Kumar. (1942*). Indo-Aryan & Hindi*. Gujarat Vernacular Society.

Crawfurd, John. (1861). On the Aryan or Indo-Germanic Theory. *Transactions of the Ethnological Society of London,* 1: 268.

Ejaz, Manzur. (2019). *A Comparative Dictionary of Indian Austroasiatic Languages: Santhali, Munda, Khasi, Romani and Punjabi*. Wichaar Publications.

Ejaz, Manzur. (2020). *People's History of Punjab*. Wichaar Publications.

Faridkoti, Ainul Haq. (1992). *Pre-Aryan Origins of the Pakistani Languages*. Orient Research Centre.

Godfrey, John J. (1967). Sir William Jones and Père Coeurdoux: A Philological Footnote. *Journal of the American Oriental Society,* 87(1): 57.

Goldstücker, Theodor. (1861). *Panini: His place in Sanskrit Literature: An Investigation of Some Literary and Chronological Questions which may be Settled by a Study of his Work*. N. Trübner.

Grierson, George Abraham. (1903*). Linguistic Survey of India*. XI vol. Superintendent of Government Printing.

Khurana, Varinder. (2023). *Materialism, Doctrine and the Origin of Language*. Motilal Banarsidas International.

Krishnamurti, Bhadriraju. (2003). *The Dravidian Languages*. Cambridge University Press.

Majeed, Javed. (2019). *Colonialism and Knowledge in Grierson's Linguistic Survey of India*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Marx, Karl, & Friedrich Engels. (2015). *The German Ideology (1846).* People's Publishing House.

Max Müller, Friedrich. (1855). In August Petermann. Williams and Norgate (eds.), *The Languages of the Seat of War in the East: With a Survey of the Three Families of Language, Semitic, Arian and Turanian.*

Stalin, Joseph. (1950). *Marxism and Problems of Linguistics*. Foreign Languages Publishing House.

Thapar, Romila. (2008). *The Aryan: Recasting Constructs*. Three Essays Collective.

Trautmann, Thomas. (1997). *Aryans and British India*. University of California Press.

Tripathi, Rama Shankar. (1942). *History of Ancient India*. Moti Lal Banarsi Das.

Witzel, Michael. (2008*). Aryan and Non-Aryan Names in Vedic India: Data for the Linguistic Situation, C. 1900-500 B.C.*

Witzel, Michael. (2019). Early 'Aryans' and their Neighbors Outside and Inside India. In *Journal of Biosciences* 44 (3).

दुबे, अभयकु र्मर. (2020). भमषमपररवमरऔर भ्यतमकमनस्लीस द्विंत [Racial Doctrine of Language Families and Culture]. In प्रसतर्मन 15 (1): 86-133.

शर्मा, रमर्सवलम . (1980). भमरतके प्रमचीनभमषमपररवरऔरसहन्दी *[Ancient Language Families of India and Hindi]. 3 vols*. रमजकर्लप्रकमशन.

शर्मा, रमर्सवलम . (1986). भमरतीय मसहत्यके इसतहम की स्यमिए *[Problems of the History of Indian Literature.* Vaani Prakashan.

स ि॒ंह, भगवमन. (1973). आया-द्रसवड़भमषमओंकीर्॒लभूतएकतम *(Fundamental Unity of Arya-Dravid Languages).* Lippi Prakashan.