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1 Politics of religion

Hindi Christian politics

On a Sunday morning 225 years ago, William Carey walked into a local market in Bengal and started speaking to a congregation of Muslims. It was the winter of 1794 and Manicktullo Bāzār was busy. Carey had just arrived in India – in November 1793, to be precise. At the market that day, the Baptist missionary was accompanied by his local assistant (munṣī). Local clerks played an important role in the work of missionaries in India. Carey’s Journal is replete with references to his ‘Munshi.’ The munshi helped him learn the vernacular, translate scripture, preach to locals, teach in school, and run the press. Carey could not speak proper Bengali and was unable to preach for months after he reached Bengal. The munshi translated and spoke for him most days. As it turned out, Carey would be glad his ‘Munshi’ was with him.

Carey was happy with the turnout that day. “Our Congregation,” he wrote, “consisted principally of Mahometans, and has increased every Lord’s Day; they are very inquisitive; and we have addressed them upon the subject of the Gospel with the greatest freedom.” It is unclear whether “congregation” referred to a group of Christian converts or interested Muslims or some combination thereof. At the very least, the Journal makes it clear that Carey had found an eager audience that was growing every Sunday in the bāzār. Various topics were discussed but none generated more interest than two: Which was better, the Quran or the Gospels? Who was greater: Mohammed or Jesus? The debate on the first topic was vigorous. Each side spoke freely. Carey argued most Muslims could not read Arabic. If you could not read Arabic, he asked, how could you follow the Quran? Also, if you could not read it, how could you know if it was true? The ‘Mahomedans’ countered by claiming they had learned Quranic instructions and one of them had even read it in Arabic. Then, in their turn, the Muslims pressed. “The Quran was sent to confirm the Words of Scripture” because “Jews, and Christians had corrupted the Bible, which was the reason why God made the revelation by Mahomet.” The Quran was clearly an improvement on the Bible. So why settle for second best?
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The conversation on who was better was equally lively. Carey posed the question: Who was better, Mohammed or Jesus? The Muslims replied, Carey notes, “Mahomet was the Friend of God, but Esau, by whom they mean Jesus, was the Spirit of God.” A friend was more important than a spirit. One could relate to a friend, spend time with a friend, have a personal relationship with a friend. What could the spirit do? Carey fell silent, it seems, for his clerk piped up. But who is higher, Munshi countered, your friend or your soul or spirit? Carey thought Munshi was clever—“shrewd,” he writes—but the Muslims were not impressed. Carey does not record the Muslims’ response to Munshi but Carey’s notes suggest the Muslims left unconvinced of the superiority of Christianity. “All this [back and forth] they bore with good temper; but What effect it may have time must determine.” The interplay between listeners and preachers was complicated. Christians preached and the Muslims talked back. The Muslims countered and the Christians talked back. Carey records numerous such encounters in his journals. The encounters were open-ended—at least, Carey logs them that way. Discourses on religious conversions in contemporary India portray a different interplay of voices. The next story from 1993 illustrates the difference. Two centuries after Carey’s encounter, Indian Christians find themselves in a situation where states and governments have found it necessary to curb the perceived threat of Christian evangelism to social order in India. Carey’s encounter with Muslims does not represent the standard encounter between missionaries and others. In some cases, the encounter was fruitful—in others, hostile. I have employed the Muslims-Carey chat-in-the-market (bāzār bātcīt) to contrast it with public perceptions of Christian evangelism in contemporary India.

On March 12, 1993, two hundred years after the bāzār bātcīt, a group of Christian leaders walked into a meeting with the governor of Andhra Pradesh. Governor Krishan Kant had called the meeting. Bishop Franklin Jonathan was in attendance and recorded the exchange. The Christians met Kant for more than an hour, and Jonathan was impressed. Kant was “a good scholar, top-class politician and a political leader desirous of national unity and communal harmony.”4 Kant had something specific on his mind. He wanted to talk about evangelism. He wanted to and proceeded to criticize Christian mission. He doubted Christian motives and questioned their actions. Kant praised Christians as learned and enlightened but was adamant in alleging that evangelism was a social problem. For Kant, propagating religion was not an invitation to a conversation but a slippery slope to discord. It needed to stop. The Christian community and Christian leaders are “most enlightened,” Kant felt, but it was the governor’s “request” (āgrah) that all forms of evangelization “be voluntarily stopped for at least fifty years.”5

Kant made a request. It was not a demand. Jonathan took pains to note this. Kant was a state official in secular India and could hardly demand that Christians in India voluntarily self-curtail their constitutional right to
profess and propagate religion. Kant did not say his ask was a request. Jonathan described it as such. One wonders whether Jonathan was being diplomatic in print. Noticeably, Jonathan does not print the Christians' response. Did they talk back? Did they refuse the 'request'? Did they agree to consider it? Did they offer any response, then or later, to the governor? It is clear that Kant's request did generate some reflection on Jonathan's part. “What is the meaning,” Jonathan wrote, “of evangelism? Is it to share the love of God with others?”6 “Have we,” Jonathan wondered, “sent the wrong signal to those who are outside the church?”7 Jonathan was sympathetic to Kant. Yet his response to Kant is absent from his public report. It is unclear whether the Christian leaders did much after the meeting or whether Christian communities paid any heed to Kant's ask.

Comparing the encounters is revelatory. Contemporary perceptions of Christian activities have focused on evangelistic practices by Christians. While the social footprint of Christian churches in India – through their many hospitals, schools, colleges, orphanages, and charities – garners little public attention, conversions and evangelistic practices have come to occupy a primary place in public perceptions of Indian Christians. State governments and lawmakers have felt increasingly motivated to intervene in such practices in order to 'protect' easily-swayed 'Hindus' from converting. Studies have traced the relevance of caste context behind such motivations.8 Nevertheless, in contemporary narratives of Christian evangelism the agency to refuse Christian claims seems to have disappeared. According to accounts of Hindu nationalists, ‘naive and easily-swayed Hindus’ need to be protected from the aggression of Christian evangelists. Underlining the opposition to Christian conversions in India is the perception that one cannot be both a loyal Christian and an Indian. This perception is being fostered by a pair of complementary forces in contemporary India: Hindu nationalism and Hindi nationalism.

Hindu nationalism and Hindi nationalism are complementary ideas. A Hindu is original to India and India is Hindu. A Christian or Muslim is a foreigner and not Indian. Allegiance to one group (India) cannot overlap with allegiance to another group (Christianity, Islam). Aligning with both identities can only divide an Indian's loyalty. Hindu nationalism argues that pitting one identity against the other is the outcome of confusion on what it means to be 'Indian.' A central feature of Hindutva has been portrayals of Muslims as a “community outside the ‘national mainstream’” and intent on undermining “Indian/Hindu culture and civilization.”9 A ‘true Indian’ is anyone who recognizes India, the land of Hindus, as her geographic fatherland and cultural motherland. ‘Indian’ and ‘Hindu’ are synonymous, and for Hindu nationalists, as Richard G. Fox puts it, a bharatiya (‘of India’) is a ‘Hindian.’ As such, attributes like Hindu, Christian, Muslim, Sikh, Tamil, and Dravidian are sectarian identities that should never be confused with and empowered over an Indian’s essential identity, which is Hindian.10 The third attribute of an Indian is loyalty to Hindi. This is the central claim of
Hindi nationalists. Hence, advocates for the national primacy of Hindi in India made claims regarding the foreignness of Urdu and Muslims that echoed the claims made by Hindu nationalists.

Both movements – Hindu nationalism and Hindi nationalism – matured around the same time, the quarter century preceding 1947. Both movements had similar demographic attributes. Hindu nationalism drew support from Hindu, urban, young, lower-middle class, and ‘forward caste’ groups like Brahmans, Kayasths, Khatris and Baniyas (medium- and small-scale merchants).11 Hindi nationalists drew support from Hindus, urban, middle class, educated, forward castes like Brahmans, Kayasths, Bhumihars (land-holders), Rajputs, and Baniya groups like Agarwals and Vaishyas.12 Both movements complemented each other. “Hindi, Hindu, Hindustan,” or “Hindi, Hindu, India,” the slogan went.13 The movement to Hinduize India had a willing and enthusiastic partner in the movement to Hinduize Hindi and Hindi-ize India.14 Finally, both movements had their geographic center in north India, further cementing the fusion of language and religion as a central attribute of the national identity under construction by the religious group dominant in the corridors of political power in independent India.

In contemporary India, religions have languages. This idea has been expressed in certain ways. Hindi is the language of Hindus, Urdu is the language of Muslims, and Christians have associated most frequently with English, the language of the ‘West.’ In public imaginations, English remains the language of India’s colonizers (more on this later). In contemporary India, English is ascendant due to its status as the primary language of global advantage.15 Yet English remains a ‘foreign’ language. As Christopher King has noted, Hindi has become synonymous with Hindu, and Urdu has become synonymous with Islam (more on this later). However, to the fusion of language and religion another type of claim is linked. These arguments are related to autochthonicity. And the lingo-religious argument described earlier morphs into a linguistic-religious-geographic moniker. Hindi is not merely the language of Hindus in India but rather is the language of the autochthonous Hindus of India. Urdu is the language not merely of Muslims of India but rather of Islamic invaders of India. Similarly, the argument goes, English is the language Christians in India have received and adopted from their Western and colonizing predecessors. When Urdu and English are portrayed as foreign and intruders, the religions linked with them are portrayed as foreign and intruders as well. Hindi and Hindu nationalists are not the only agents of such conflations. The linguistic organization of pre- and post-independence India strengthened the connection of ethnicity and religion with language and political power. The movement for Indian independence promoted Hindustani as the national language and from the process Hindi in the Devanagari script emerged as the national language. The emergence of Hindi in the nation’s story, though controversial, continues to shape ideas regarding nationality and Indianness in terms of Hindi idioms.
Shaped by a sense of the Hindu-Hindi-ness of the nation, Christian writers in India have promoted Hindi as the proper language of Indian Christians in order to promote Christians as Indian, deśī, and rooted in the linguistic world of Hindi. Hindi Christian works counter the politics of religion and language prevalent in independent India. In light of the widespread perception of Christians as aggressive evangelists, followers of a foreign faith, and culturally not Indian, Hindi Christian works present a religion that is linguistically Hindi, culturally Indian, and theologically open to Hindu and Muslim ideas. Works of Hindi Christian prose and poetry convey a certain type of religious identity that is intentionally Hindi, Indian, and political. In this book, I explain why and how this identity has taken shape and manifests itself today. Hindi Christian works are political in nature, aim to sway public perceptions, promote particular forms of citizenship, and do all this in the context of fostering the use of Hindi. This attention to language takes different forms. It is shaped by the foundational idea that religion and language are intertwined in India. It is essential to recognize the place of languages in India’s story and the relation of languages to ethno-religious identities in India in order to grasp the impulses surging through Hindi Christian arguments. As the book proceeds, I add details to the story of languages and religions in India.

India’s religious history is a story of languages. English, Hindi, Sanskrit, Tamil, and Urdu have influenced the politics of religion in India. Dravidians used Tamil and other languages to develop distinct religious ideas. Sanskrit was deployed to manage the political power of certain social groups. Hindi and Urdu were shaped by relations between Muslims and Hindus in classical India and continue to do so in India today. Linguistic cultures influenced each other too. Tamil influenced Sanskrit and Sanskrit influenced Tamil. Urdu influenced Hindi and Hindi influenced Urdu. English influenced Hindi, and English has been influenced by many other Indian languages. Further, India’s religious history is a story of multilingualism. In Vedic horse sacrifices, for instance, different groups speak different languages and the four priests are supposed to call the sacrificial horse with four different names. Emperor Ashoka had the empire’s values inscribed in Pali and other languages spoken throughout the empire. Sanskrit and Urdu encountered each other in Mughal courts. Hindi and Urdu were co-languages of Muslim and Hindu literature till the politics of the nineteenth century intervened.

The politics of religion and of language have shaped each other. Christian deployments of Hindi fit this pattern. But a lacuna haunts our understanding of religion and language in contemporary India. Hindi Christian sources are not the subject of the academic study of religion. A few scholars study these sources. Hindi sources are part of literary history. Hindi literature is part of scholarship beyond South Asia in studies of devotionals, poems, and novels. Indian Christians use many languages in addition to Hindi. Recently published sources of Indian Christian literature would reveal sources mostly from southern India (for instance, in Malayalam and
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Tamil) and in English. Recent research has examined vernacular Christianity in Marathi. However, Hindi Christian sources are not the subject of current studies of language and religion in India. I correct this lacuna and present a study of Christian materials in ‘modern standard Hindi.’ These materials cover hymns, poems, guidebooks, theology-ethics, stories, and translation choices. Or, in the vocabulary of Hindi Christian materials, I examine gīt-sangīt (songs), bhajan (hymns), kathā (stories, or narratives), kavitā (poetry), dharmavijñān (theology), nītiśāstr (ethics), ārādhanā (worship), gāid or sandarśikā (guidebooks), tīkā-ṭīppanī (scriptural commentary), darśan (philosophy), and itihās (history). Hindi Christian sources are attuned to the politics of language and religion in India. I show why this is the case, describe the forms in which this attention is manifested, examine the nature of Christian attention to Hindi, and explain the political claims embedded in Hindi Christian ideas.

Attention to the politics of language and religion is evident in three distinct, overlapping, and ongoing debates in Hindi Christian works. These debates are the subjects of chapters 3–5. Should Christians in India use Hindi, and if they should, how should they use Hindi in ways distinct from Hindu ideas and Western ideas? This debate, which is the focus of chapter 3, has played out in discussions on translation choices when trying to express Christian ideas in Hindi. A parallel debate has played out over media representations of Indian Christians. This is the focus of chapter 4. The question of representation emerged as a topic of discussion particularly after state television (Doordarshan) started airing religious programs in the 1980s. The third debate, which is the focus of chapter 5, is concerned with the ways in which Christians must act in a multifaith society such as is found in India. Commentaries on the subject of national participation explore proper Christian notions on citizenship, relation with people of other faiths, discipleship, and identity in India. By ‘Hindi Christian sources’ I mean a corpus of materials in post-1940 central and north India written and published in modern standard Hindi. As a language of religious communities, Hindi is not exclusively Christian in purpose. However, the book studies Protestant Hindi Christian materials available in India through both ‘mainline’ and independent publishers.

What is Hindi Christian?

I deal with Hindi Christian works. Such a claim raises certain questions. First, what is ‘Hindi,’ as I use the term? Second, is ‘Hindi Christian’ a justifiable descriptor? Finally, what does it mean to call a Christian work a Hindi Christian work? What makes a Christian work particularly Hindi? The rest of this section answers the first question. The next section answers the second question. The second chapter answers the third question, but I can preview the second chapter here with brief comments. It is the essential attribute of a Hindi Christian work that it does not use Hindi merely
because that happens to be the local language or the popular language in the region. Rather, a Hindi Christian work includes reflections on why Hindi should be used. It comments on the effect of using Hindi on the content of the work. It chooses to use Hindi specifically to serve an unserved audience and draws discriminatingly from the world of Hindi idioms. In each aspect of its work, it asks how Hindi influences the Christian idea under examination. In doing so, it grounds Christian ideas in Hindi rather than simply expressing Christian ideas in Hindi. As such, theology, ethics, poetry, liturgy, and other aspects of Christian life are given new terms and a network of ideas at home in the religious worldviews of Hindi-speaking India. I will say more on this in the second and third chapters. But for now, I return to the first question. What do I mean by ‘Hindi’ in the term ‘Hindi Christian’?

By ‘Hindi,’ I mean ‘modern, standard Hindi.’ The emergence of modern, standard Hindi can be traced to Middle Indo-Aryan language forms. What is ‘standard’ about ‘modern, standard Hindi’ is its geographic use and standardized form (at least its written form, though variations in pronunciation exist). It has a geographic reach. It is spoken by the people in particular regions and has the loyalty of its speakers. It is easy to use and is a popular medium in which local people communicate. In this sense, Hindi is a regional language of India. As a matter of practice, all Indian languages are regional since no language is the primary language used by all Indians. Uday Narayan Tiwari, an influential biographer of Hindi, has explained the historic status of Hindi: a ‘regional language’ is the name for peoples’ language and “the language that occupied this position in a particular time and place was known by this designation.” From 600–1200 ce, developed forms of Middle Indo-Aryan language occupied this position. By the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, Modern Aryan languages had become the local or regional languages. Among Indian languages, Hindi was the language of the middle part of the country, and modern forms of literary Hindi and Urdu can be traced to the Kharı Bolī (“standing speech” or “stand[ard] speech”) form of western Hindi spoken near Meerat and Bijnor in modern-day Uttar Pradesh. Spoken together, Hindi-Urdu was called Hindustani. As a descriptive term, ‘Hindustani’ itself was the invention of John Gilchrist, a colonial linguist, who coined the term in eighteenth century to ‘unify’ distinct languages spoken in north India. Hindustani, in Gilchrist’s construction, was a single language with three dialects differentiated by the extent to which they used Sanskrit, Persian, and Arabic. This ‘Hindustani’ was eventually conflated with Urdu and given status as the language of official business during the Raj in large parts of northern India.

Hindi-Urdu share a “virtually identical” grammar and core vocabulary with differences in usage and terminology so minor that it is not possible to clearly tell whether someone is speaking ‘Hindi’ or ‘Urdu.’ Suniti Chatterji’s influential history of Indo-Aryan languages divides the development of Indian languages into three periods: Old Indo-Aryan (or Vedic Sanskrit) from 1500 BCE to 500 BCE; Middle Indo-Aryan (or Prākrit) from 500 BCE
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to 1000 CE; and New Indo-Aryan from 1000 CE onward. Colin Masica adapts Chatterji’s history and proposes slightly different time-periods: 1500 BCE–600 BCE for Old Indo-Aryan; 600 BCE–1000 CE for Middle Indo-Aryan; and 1000 CE onward for New Indo-Aryan. Hindi-Urdu belong to the New Indo-Aryan family of languages.

Hindi or Hindustani appeared at the tail end of a long history and it took 11 centuries, roughly from 1100 CE to 1800 CE, to develop. For the linguistic genealogy of Hindi, Chatterji’s *Indo-Aryan and Hindi*, published 76 years ago, is still the standard account. The story of Hindi begins “somewhere in Europe” where a Primitive Indo-European language was spoken in its undivided state by a group of people philologists have called Wiros, the Primitive Indo-European word for ‘man.’ The Wiros did not develop a material culture of any high order. What they did leave behind was a language and a well-organized society. Their society was patriarchal and made up of a collection of clan groups. They showed respect for women and developed a religion where the unseen forces of nature (viewed as God or Gods) were characterized as beneficial rather than harmful. God or Gods lived in heaven above, as distinct from humans, who lived on earth. Gods were not anthropomorphic beings. Conjectures about this people and their society have, as a result, been the province of linguistic paleontology rather than of archeology. Half-nomadic and half-settled, the Wiros travelled and took their language and social organization with them. One group of Wiros left the homeland to travel south. These Indo-Iranians or Aryans reached northern Mesopotamia by 2000 BCE.

Indo-Iranian or Aryan culture and religion were the predecessors of both Vedic Indians and pre-Zoroastrian Iranians. Once they arrived in India after 1500 BCE, the Aryans encountered non-Aryan cultures in the Indus Valley and Dravidian peoples. The Aryans were not indigenous to India. Indus Valley artifacts do not include Aryan motifs. As an instance, horses, popular in Aryan culture, are absent in Valley seals, pottery, and other leftovers. Aryans slowly migrated from Eastern Iran into Punjab in Western India. Archeological and linguistic evidence suggests the arrival of the Aryans was not in the form of a sudden invasion but rather in the form of a slow migration, which eventually led to the development of culture that mixed Aryan and Dravidian elements. There is evidence that the Indus Valley script was not a proto-Aryan script but belongs to the Dravidian group of languages. The encounter between the Aryans and non-Aryan people profoundly changed the Aryans and their language. Aryan or Indo-Iranian language changed into Indo-Aryan, represented in its developed form in the Rig Veda. The Indian Aryans laid the foundation of the Vedic culture. The language of the Indo-Aryans took two forms: a spoken form, Prākrit, and a cultured, written form, Sanskrit.

From 1000 BCE onward, Sanskrit became the language of religion and higher intellectual life in upper India and the forebearer of Hindu culture. By 600 BCE, Prākrit and Sanskrit had begun to spread south into the Deccan
and mingled with well-established groups of Dravidian speakers, whose native speech was too fixed to adopt Aryan elements. Yet, by this point the Aryan language had superseded India’s non-Aryan languages and was dominant from Afghan to Bengal. The grammar of Sanskrit was fixed by Pāṇini around the fifth century BCE. By 500 BCE, Vedic culture and Sanskrit had fully incorporated (upper) Indian culture. Prākrit developed unimpeded along with Sanskrit, and where Sanskrit was standardized more or less from the fifth century BCE, Prākrit (the spoken dialects of Aryan India) differed considerably. One such Prākrit to gain prominence in northern India was Western Apabhraṃśa, which had established itself as the lingua franca in upper India by the tenth century CE.

Western Apabhraṃśa is the immediate predecessor of both Braj-bhāṣā (a modified form of Western Apabhraṃśa) and Hindustani. When the Turks and Iranians (with their Persian language) conquered north India in the tenth and eleventh centuries CE, Western Apabhraṃśa and its local dialects were dominant in the region. It is in the history of Turkish and Iranian rulers of India that the first reference to ‘Hindi’ appears as a language distinct from Prākrit and Sanskrit. The *Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī* of 1022 CE reports a poem by the Rajput king of Kalanjar “in the Hindū tongue.” This tongue’s first name was simply Hindī or Hindū (Hindawī), which meant the language of Hind or India or ‘of the Hindus’ (the ‘Hindus’ being a geographic designation, and not a religious one, for the people who lived beyond the Indus river). As Chatterji notes, however, this early ‘Hindī’ was most likely not Braj-bhāṣā or later Hindustani. We have no Hindi or Hindustani before the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries CE. However, after the Muslim ruling house had been established at Delhi in the sixteenth century, the common language of the masses in northern India at the time, Braj-bhāṣā, started to gain prominence. Braj-bhāṣā was written in the Devanagari script. Even as the language became the medium of courts and of culture and poetry, it remained a specialized literary dialect rather than a popular, colloquial one. That role was assumed by the language popular in the markets of Delhi, a dialect of Western Hindi. This vernacular was called Hindi. Its other name—that arose later in the seventeenth century—was Zabān-e-Urdū, or ‘language of the camp.’ ‘Urdū’ is a Persianized spelling of a Turkish word that means tent, dwelling, or encampment and identified the spoken language popular in the Delhi camps of the Muslim rulers. Urdu developed a Perso-Arabic vocabulary and an Arabic script. This form of Hindi—with its Perso-Arabic vocabulary and Arabic script—had become the language of Muslim nobility and religious men in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Two forms of Hindi or Hindustani were developing in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: the Hindustani of Delhi, and a Deccan dialect of Hindustani popular among north Indian Muslims settled in the Deccan. It was the north Indian Muslims in the Deccan who set the stage for the literary separation between Hindustani or proper Hindi and Braj-bhāṣā. Trying to assimilate among their Hindu neighbors, Deccan North Indian
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Muslims adopted the Delhi language they brought with them and started writing it in the Persian script, which was still the language of the Muslim power centers in Delhi. North Indian Hindi speakers adopted this Deccan practice and started using Delhi Hindi in its Persianized form. By the beginning of the eighteenth century, this Persianized Delhi Hindi acquired a new name: *Hindōstānī*. By 1970, the name was accepted by north Indians and Indianized by the Hindus as *Hindūsthānī*. However, north Indian Hindus of the Eastern Provinces continued their attention to Delhi Hindi in its Braj-bhāṣā form.

Toward the end of the eighteenth century, Braj-bhāṣā Hindi came to acquire the name *Khaṇī Bolī* (or “standing language”) as distinct from dialects like Braj-bhāṣā and Awadhī proper, which were designated ‘fallen languages’ or *Pari Bolī*. Hindustani or Hindi therefore emerged in the eighteenth century in two forms: High Hindi (*Khaṇī Bolī* Hindi in the Devanagari script) and Urdu (Persianized Hindi in the Arabic script). This modern Hindi was common to both Hindus and Muslims. Two forms of the same language, Nagarai Hindi and Persianized Hindi (Urdu) had identical grammar, shared common words and roots, and employed different scripts. This common Hindi became the lingua franca of upper India after the eighteenth century. In the course of the nineteenth century, Hindi, written in the Devanagari script, developed a more standard style in competition with better-established languages like Urdu and growing languages like English. Hindi prose literature and novels in the nineteenth century are partly responsible for the development of modern standard Hindi.33

Chatterji has identified five forms of Hindi or Hindustani.34 (1) The Urdu language, as spoken with a combination of Persian, Arabic, and Hindi words. It is written in Perso-Arabic, which is the Arabic script for the Persian language. Its vocabulary is highly Persianized and its literary use did not emerge before the end of the seventeenth century. In its highly Persianized form, High Urdu is a language of Muslim culture and poetry in India. (2) High Hindi or Devanagari Hindi, which has a grammar identical to Urdu but employs the Devanagari script. It uses many words from the regional Hindi (Prākrit) and dips deep into Sanskrit for words of higher culture. Perso-Arabic Urdu and Sanskritized Hindi share a common element or form; this common element is *Khaṇī Bolī*. ‘Sanskritized Hindi’ was not invented during the nineteenth-century. It can be traced not to debates on Hindi-Urdu or to the Hindi movement of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries but to the older ‘literary tradition of Hindi.’ A fifteenth-century poet in Gwalior may have been the first to incorporate Sanskritic themes (from the Mahabharat and the Ramayan) into Braj-bhāṣā poetry. Awadhi in the Devanagari script and Sanskritic lexical style can be found in Sufi poems from the middle of the twelfth century. Sanskrit loan words appear in Hindi spoken around Delhi in the sixteenth century and seventeenth-century dictionaries of Hindustani vocabulary record Sanskritic loan words.35 It was a Brahman anthropologist who coined the term ‘Sanskritization’ to refer
to the spread of Brahmans over India and the influence of their ideas and practices on the other groups of people they encountered on the subcontinent; for the most part, Sanskritization was a form of Hinduization, to the extent that Brahman communities tried to convert the people they encountered to Hinduism.36 (3) Hindustani, which is the name for the common Khaṛī Bolī that maintains in its vocabulary a balance between Perso-Arabic Urdu and Sanskritized Hindi. Chatterji has described it as “just Hindi not highly Sanskritised.” It is the combination of and median between Urdu and High Hindi and as such was promoted strongly by the Indian National Congress as the only national language of post-independence India (more on this in later sections). (4) Then there is ‘vernacular Hindustani,’ a collective reference to regional dialects and forms of Hindi. These vernacular forms provided the grammar and vocabulary for Hindustani. As such, High Urdu and High Hindi can be considered refinements of vernacular Hindustani. (5) Finally, Bāzār Hindi or ‘market Hindi’ is a simplified form of types (1) and (2) and the language of the masses in India. It is the most used language in India and the language that is mentioned as the mother tongue by nearly 500 million speakers today. In this book, I use Hindi to mean High Hindi and quotidian, ‘market’ Hindi spoken with a preponderance of Sanskrit words, and written in the Devanagari script.

While the spoken history of modern Hindi can be traced to the New Indo-Aryan period, written forms of Hindi are more recent. Tiwari has argued that the use of Khaṛī Bolī for literary construction is not older than the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries.37 However, the use of a ‘Nagari’ or ‘Devanagari’ script dates from the seventh-eighth centuries. The meaning of ‘nagari’ remains unclear. However, since the script used to write Khaṛī Bolī was the script used to write Sanskrit, which is considered a heavenly language,38 the script came to be known as ‘Devanagari.’ ‘Dev’ means ‘heavenly’ or ‘god’ while ‘nagari’ means ‘belonging to a city or town’ or ‘civil.’ Devanagari, or literally ‘divine city writing,’ acquired its name from the belief that it probably originated in a city.39 By the eleventh century, the Devanagari script was fully developed and quite popular in middle and north India. Palm-leaf inscriptions in Devanagari from Gujarat, Rajasthan, and Maharashtra are available.40 The Hindi script has developed differently from the Urdu script. These differences loom larger in formal and literary levels, where Hindi borrows its lexicon more from Sanskrit while Urdu borrows its lexicon more from Arabic and Persian.41

At least three applications of the term ‘Hindi’ are possible. ‘Hindi’ refers to a spoken language of recent provenance that in the modern era is distinguished from spoken Urdu. ‘Standard Hindi’ denotes a language written in the Devanagari script in a relatively standardized form. Its pronunciation and spoken forms are less standardized. Standard Hindi is in general use in most of central and north India. It gained currency in the period leading up to the 1860s as a “medium of education and instruction” and by the 1900s Hindi had become a “well established vehicle for journalism and
belles letters” in central and north India. Hindi is probably the third-most used language in the world. Due to its growing popularity in the Indian subcontinent and beyond, “Hindi in the Devanagari script” was recognized as an official language of India in 1947. Hindi’s popularity must be understood in the context of the nineteenth-century movement to promote Hindi as the language of Hindus and Indians (more on this later). Hindi and Urdu were together for most of Hindi’s history. Hindi’s forerunner, Hindustani, was an amalgam of Hindu and Urdu, both languages spoken similarly but written with different scripts. Nationalism is partly responsible for their split. So is Indian politics.

As a macroterm, ‘Hindi’ can also refer to an assembly of cognates. In this sense, Hindi is a collection of 49 cognates like Awadhī, Banjārī, Bhojpuri, Bundeli/Bundelkhandi, Chhattisgarhi, Haryānvī, Kharī Boli, Lodhī, Magadhī/Magahī, Mārwārī, Nāgpuriā, Pahārī, Rājasthānī, and Sargujī. Historically, languages like Awadhī and Braj-bhāsa should be correctly understood as cognates of Hindi. Stuart McGregor notes, “[i]t is historically and linguistically inappropriate to speak of early Braj-bhasha and Avadhi as dialects of Hindi, which they long preceded as literary languages.” From the perspective of literary studies in the twenty-first century, however, they can be considered “as falling within a composite ‘literary tradition of Hindi’.” The languages listed along with Hindi in India’s census can be understood as part of the ‘Hindi family.’

According to the 2001 census reports, 422 million Indians named Hindi as their mother tongue. Around 258 million Indians, or 25.09 percent of Indians named standard Hindi as their mother tongue. In this book, ‘Hindi’ always refers to modern, standard Hindi. Recently released data from India’s decennial census of 2011 adds depth to our understanding of Hindi’s position in India. In 2011, there were 528 million speakers of Hindi in India. Uttar Pradesh (U.P.) had the most Hindi speakers (188 million), followed by Bihar (81 million), Madhya Pradesh (64 million), and Rajasthan (61 million). The number of people who listed Hindi as their mother tongue has grown at a steady pace over the past 40 years, from 203 million in 1971 to 528 million in 2011. Decade over decade, Hindi users grew by 27 percent over 1971–1981, 28 percent over 1981–1991, 28 percent over 1991–2001, and 25 percent over 2001–2011. Hindi was not the fastest growing language during the last 40 years. That distinction belongs to Sanskrit, which grew by 176 percent over 1971–1981, a whopping 715 percent over 1981–1991, lost 72 percent users over 1991–2001, yet rebounded and gained 76 percent over 2001–2011! In real terms, however, the number of persons who listed Sanskrit as their mother tongue peaked at 49,736 in 1991 and stood at a meagre 24,821 in 2011 – well, meagre in Indian terms.

Hindi is by far the largest language in India. Over the past 40 years, the strength of Hindi users as a proportion of the total population has steadily increased. In 1971, Hindi users accounted for 37 percent of the total
population, 38 percent of the population in 1981, 39 percent in 1991, 41 percent in 2001, and 44 percent in 2011.\textsuperscript{53} Analysis of data on internet language trends adds further depth to our understanding of Hindi’s reach in the modern world. According to a 2017 report by KPMG, the consulting firm, there are 521 million speakers of Hindi in India. Of them, 254 million are Indian language literates who use Hindi (over English) as their primary language to read, write, and converse.\textsuperscript{54} Hindi users will soon surpass English users in the digital age. Hindi Internet users are expected to surpass English Internet users by 2021.\textsuperscript{55}

Finally, ‘Hindi’ also marks a cultural state of affairs, referring to a geographic area – India’s ‘Hindi area,’ so to speak – that is shaped by Hindi’s history and its widespread use. While Hindi is used throughout India and around the world, the sources studied in this book are part and parcel of the life in India’s Hindi area.\textsuperscript{56} The borders of Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, and Jharkhand constitute the southern and south-eastern boundaries of this area. The eastern border of Rajasthan and the northern border of Gujarat makes up its western limit. Bihar and Uttar Pradesh respectively mark the eastern and north-eastern limits of this Hindi area. Haryana, the Union Territory of Delhi, Himachal Pradesh, and Uttarakhand make up its northern limit.\textsuperscript{57} Users of modern standard Hindi in its spoken and written forms can certainly be found outside this territorial map and beyond India, but the ‘Hindi area’ denotes the limits of the linguistic geography of this book. A few more notes on the scope of this book are helpful at this point.

The book deals primarily with mainline Protestant materials in the Hindi area. The Hindi Christian sources I have studied are the handiwork of Anglican, Baptist, Congregationalist, Lutheran, and Methodist groups and institutions in the region. These materials are mostly from the Hindi Theological Literature Committee, Lucknow Publishing House, and the Indian Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge. Based, respectively, in Jabalpur (Madhya Pradesh), Lucknow (Uttar Pradesh), and Delhi, these publishers produce most of the Hindi-language Christian materials in the Hindi area.\textsuperscript{58} Among these publishers, the Hindi Theological Literature Committee deserves special mention. Founded in 1954, the Committee has been the most prominent producer and promoter of Christian works in Hindi.\textsuperscript{59} Publications by Roman Catholic institutions enrich the body of works published by mainline Protestant Christians in the Hindi area. The same can be said of the social footprint of Roman Catholic institutions in areas like health care, education, and charity. There is a rich history of Roman Catholic Hindi literature in the region. The Hindi area is home also to Syrian Catholic, St. Thomas, Orthodox, evangelical, and Pentecostal Christians.\textsuperscript{60} I pay limited attention to this diversity when examining Hindi Christian claims regarding the politics of language and religion in India. My sources are limited to mainline, Protestant Christian sources in Hindi.

In this book, I examine Hindi Christian works in independent India. The output of the Hindi Theological Literature Committee has been instrumental
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to this study. Yet the Committee’s work must be understood in the context of the much-longer history of Hindi Christian publications in India. An early example of Hindi Christian literature comes from 1877 in the form of a published account of a person’s conversion. In pamphlet form, such accounts were quite in line with the type of publications popular at the time among missionaries who were trying to promote conversions. “Bhayahān Dās,” the convert, seems to have been illiterate. His conversion account is, as a result, written by one Rāmsimh, who attested to the account’s veracity by “signing” the pamphlet. The slim pamphlet was titled Kaise Pāyā Muktidātā, arthāt Bhayahānādās kā Itihās subtitled “How I Found the Saviour, or The Shepherd Convert of Monghyr” in English, and widely circulated. It was published by The Rev. Thomas Evans, a Baptist missionary at Monghyr (or Munger) on the banks of the Ganges river in Bihar, and printed at the Medical Hall Press in Benaras. The Welsh Baptists were also known for such publications as Rām Parīkṣā (“A Character Examination of Ram,” in two editions), Shiv Parīkṣā (“A Character Examination of Shiva,” in two editions), and Sat Gurū kī Bulāhat (“The Teacher’s Call,” in two editions).

Many features of the pamphlet reflect strategic choices by its publisher. It was written in Kaithi, a popular local dialect of Hindi, for widespread appeal. The decision to use Kaithi over Hindustani suggests an interest in local and mass appeal rather than an appeal to the Hindu elite, the officers of the Raj, or an upper-caste audience. The account is polemic in nature and spends a considerable number of pages on the protagonist’s first-person account of why he wanted to leave Hinduism, the religion of his birth. For Bhayahān Dās, Hinduism was corrupt, dominated by greedy learned men who shamed people into guilt and therefore into supporting them, and was spreading its corruption from town to town. Dās does not dismiss Hinduism as polytheist or erroneous. Rather, the argument is aimed at the irreversible corruption of an admirable religion. The message to Hindus seems to be as follows: even if you think Hinduism is intrinsically acceptable, it is beyond redemption these days. This should motivate you to look elsewhere and you will see that Christianity provides a great alternative. It offers salvation and mukti without ritualism and priests. The Protestant tinge of the argument is evident. So is the strategic nature of the choice of location where the pamphlet was published. Benaras is one of Hinduism’s holiest sites, the city of Shiva and the Ganges, and as Diana Eck has described it, the city of all India, good life, and of death and liberation.

Banaras remains a site of Hindu pride. The city has long been venerated as one of the seven cities of pilgrimage in Hinduism and is said to contain within itself all seven cities. The earliest Purāṇās (c. fourth-sixth cen. CE) speak of Siva’s arrival in the city. The city’s rulers promoted the Hindu tradition, supported schools of Sanskrit, and sponsored the education of Brahmans. Its rulers, merchants, Brahmans, and pilgrims jointly fostered the story of Kāśi (Banaras) as the sacred space with its divine links, ancient
heritage, and power to heal and liberate. Colonial Christians reached Banaras at the tail end of the eighteenth century. Never more than a few hundred in number at a time, the Britishers regarded their time in Banaras as a “kind of moral exile” and Indians an “inferior race.” Europeans lived on the outskirts of the city, following the colonial practice of segregation. They built a school and a Christian Missionary Society in Banaras. After the First War of Independence or Mutiny of 1857, the Raj emerged when the Government of India Act of 1858 transferred India’s governance from the East India Company to the British Crown through the Secretary of State.

Indo-British relations in Banaras did not change under the Raj. Despite some debate, the link between missionaries and the government continued unabated. Pamphleteering was part of empire-endorsed Christian activity. In the nineteenth century, Banaras would become the site from which Hindi was promoted as the language of the Hindus – Sanskrit remained a language of the Brahmins. Given the place of Banaras in the Hindu imagination, the place of Sanskrit and schools of Hindu learning, and the Christo-colonial history in the city, the publication of the conversion account in Banaras in the local vernacular sought to achieve multiple aims through a single medium. It criticized Hinduism without denigrating the city, it took a swipe at holy and learned Hindus (Brahmans), it offered Christianity as a better religious alternative, and it spoke with the voice of an insider to a Hindu-heavy audience. The pamphlet’s impact remains unknown. It was well-circulated but it did not lead to any mass conversions. Some may have converted after being influenced by this pamphlet or others of its ilk, but most probably the pamphlet suffered the same failure as the Christian enterprise in Banaras – which was largely unsuccessful when it came to conversions.

Banaras was not the only site of Hindi Christian literary activity. Hindi translations of the gospels and Hindi Christian materials were a large part of the output of the Baptist missionaries in Serampore, with the first translation of Hindi gospels around 1818. An 1875 account of (Protestant) Christian vernacular publications mentions Benjamin Schultze’s 1743 Summa Doctrinae Christianae as the “first Christian book printed in Hindustani.” The book was published by the Orphan House in Halle. By 1917, a comprehensive list of Christian literature prepared by the missionary council in central and north India catalogued 490 books in Hindi (this list is discussed later). For the purpose of this book, I commissioned an update of the 1917 list with materials published up till 2010. This updated 2010 catalogue of Hindi Christian works is the main source of published works for this book. The 1917 list is available online for public access. The 2010 catalogue is also available online for public access. The 1917 and 2010 catalogues of Hindi Christian works are discussed in chapter 2. The neglect of Hindi Christian works recurs in publications on Christianity in India. The India section of Asian Christian Theologies is a case in point.

Asian Christian Theologies, published in 2002, is an unparalleled collection of Christian sources in Asia. It catalogues works by 103 writers in
17 languages: Bengali, Danish, English, French, German, Hindi, Kannada, Khasi, Malayalam, Marathi, Mizo, Naga, Oriya, Punjabi, Sanskrit, Tamil, and Telugu. Despite its scope, it omits the vast majority of Hindi Christian authors and publications. Two Hindi Christian texts are cited among the nearly 1130 books in the India section of *Asian Christian Theologies*. James Massey’s *Masīhī Dalit: Ik Itihāsik Parīkshā* ("Christian Dalits: A Historical Analysis"), published in 1993, and Vandana Mataji’s 2-volume *Śabd, Śakti, Sangam* ("Word, Power, Union"), published in 1995, make an appearance. The collection includes indirect references to other Hindi Christian works: Vandana Mataji, whose English-language works are referenced in *Asian Christian Theologies*, wrote hymns in Hindi; Viman Tilak’s poetry crossed over Marathi and Hindi; and James Massey does much work in Hindi. The absence of most works in Hindi can be partly explained by the book’s focus on English-language sources. *Asian Christian Theologies*, the editors explain, offers “a survey of the writings in English.” Yet the editors also tip their hand toward a broader goal when they write that they will survey English writings while “drawing on the writings in many languages of the region.” Given this appeal to other languages, the severe paucity of Hindi entries is conspicuous. The paucity is even more glaring in a multi-volume compendium that makes the claim that “[e]xtensive research has been undertaken to ensure that a wide range of vernacular materials are included and outlined.”

**Language and religion**

In *Constructing Indian Christianities*, Bauman and Young raise an important question: Who is an Indian Christian? The query is complicated. What is the defining marker? Is it religion – *Christianity*? Is it a nation – *India*? Or, is it culture – a certain *Indian-ness*? Is it all these things, none of which can be packed into a neat definitional box? Is it none of them? They question whether a term like ‘Indian Christian’ ‘impose[s]’ an “alien taxonomy on phenomena that in the final analysis remain fluid and stubbornly unreifiable.” Similar questions can be raised of a book that studies Hindi Christians. What is ‘Hindi Christian’? What is a ‘Hindi Christian’ source or material or publication? Is it defined by its ‘Hindi-ness’? Or, by its ‘Christian-ness’? The danger of reification remains, but taxonomy is problematic, more so when it makes exclusive and permanent claims. The titular plural in *Constructing Indian Christianities* responds to the danger in naming through a counterclaim to conventional studies of Christianity in India. It hints at the state of permanent diversity that characterizes Christianity in India. Further, it claims that Christianity in India is a process, maybe not uniquely so but a process, nevertheless. Indian Christianities are always under construction. ‘Hindi Christian’ is a useful, if relatively unknown, descriptor. As a descriptive term, ‘Hindi Christian’ has a history. It has been in use at least since 1970. The term appears in a preface by C. W. David to a popular
book on Christian discipleship. David was the editor of the Hindi Theological Literature Committee at the time and was trying to use his influential perch to promote Hindi Christian works. He writes: “[i]t is the misfortune of Hindi Christian literature that it has very few readers. . . . Hindi speakers are requested to awaken and, by reading good books, to remove their shame and be enlightened.” David’s appeal did not fall on deaf ears. By the middle part of the twentieth century, Hindi was a Christian language and had mass appeal through the many hymns and devotional songs (bhajan) in Hindi.

Congregations in central and northern India share Hindi. This shared heritage has fostered many of the Hindi Christian works still in widespread use. The movement in the twentieth century toward ecumenical relations catalyzed joint efforts among Hindi-using congregations and institutions. One such prominent collaboration is the production of Ārādhānā ke Gīt. It is the primary hymnbook of mainline Hindi-speaking churches in central India. The Madhya Pradesh Christian Council and the Methodist Church in India have been publishing Ārādhānā ke Gīt together for the last 45 years. Regular updates to Ārādhānā ke Gīt have kept the hymnbook up to date and have made it popular in Hindi-speaking congregations in Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, and Bihar.

Ārādhānā ke Gīt was commissioned by the Madhya Pradesh Christian Council as a revision of the Hindi hymnal, Masīhī Gīt Sangrah, in which “the paucity of contemporary Indian compositions, the dominance of difficult Western compositions, and the absence of easy, clear, and currently popular language was starting to be painfully felt.” It was produced “so that one book might be printed which would be suitable for both Hindi and Urdu speaking areas in M.P., U.P. and Bihar.” A Hymn Book Revision Committee began its work in the first week of March 1967 after conducting a survey of Hindi-speaking congregations to solicit views on which hymns and bhajans to include or exclude. The Methodist hymnbook was also undergoing a revision at the time, and in 1970, the Methodist Revision Committee joined the Christian Council’s committee. Ārādhānā ke Gīt includes traditional and contemporary bhajans (devotionals). It includes well-known songs and anonymous compositions. Provenance, however, was not a major concern of the publishers. “We have made every effort,” they explain, “to discover and acknowledge the authors and composers of the Indian songs and bhajans but still [we] are uncertain about many.” The main criteria for inclusions in the book has been a song’s popularity. Most of the songs included in the book enjoy mass appeal and are in regular use. As such, the songs are recognizable and bridge the liturgies of congregations across a swath of India’s Hindi area.

In addition to worship, theological education also unites Hindi-speaking congregations. Mainline denominations run joint seminaries dedicated to instruction in Hindi. Hindi, along with English, is the language of instruction in many seminaries in north India, some of which, like Leonard
Theological College in Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh, focus on preparing pastors and church leaders for Hindi-speaking congregations. Joint publication houses have also enriched shared theological education in Hindi. The Hindi Theological Literature Committee was set up as one such joint venture by a variety of denominations that use Hindi. The Committee has served as the primary patron of Hindi Christian publications in India. It distributes its output in India through a partnership with the Indian Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. The Society has book shops across the country and promotes Hindi Christian literature beyond the Hindi area.

Hindi-speaking churches have established joint ventures in literature, liturgy, and theological education. Their use of Hindi has brought them together. This collective focus on Hindi has gained depth and patronage over the years. “The Principals of theological colleges, church bishops, pastors, publication houses, distributors of our books, boards, and missionary organizations from the Hindi regions are giving [us] their full support” to Hindi Christian ventures. This support represents a sea change in denominational attitudes toward Hindi Christian literature. Across a span of geographies, denominations, and contexts, Christians in India’s Hindi-speaking region belie uniformity. Yet they have fostered ecumenical collaborations, common institutions of learning, standardized hymnbooks, common liturgies, and shared literature.

The intellectual history of religious studies in South Asia helps shed more light on the intelligibility, function, and usefulness of lingo-religious descriptors like ‘Hindi Christian’ in studying Christianity in India. Such descriptors allude to the role of language and religion in the formation of faith and identity. They point to a family of influences. The late Selva J. Raj wrote an ethnography of the ritual life of ‘Santal Catholics’ that shed light on the ways in which Santali tribal and Roman Catholic elements are combined in religious life. In its attention to the role of language, this book goes beyond Raj’s work on Santal Catholics. The interface of multiple strands, Raj explains, enabled this community to “construct a distinct identity for itself that is authentically tribal, fully Indian, and genuinely Christian.” Kerry P.C. San Chirico writes of the Khrist Bhaktas of the Hindi belt who worship Christ in personal and communal devotion, yet remain unbaptized and Hindu according to the religious taxonomy of the Constitution of India and its Census Bureau. They have adapted Catholic beliefs and Hindu temple practices to a bhakti mode of religious life.

Like Raj and San Chirico, Vasudha Narayanan draws attention to Hindus and Christians who are “multiritual” and “polytheological” in their religious expressions. Practices based on the view that religious lines are blurry permeate the religious landscape of India. As an instance, khrist bhaktas are part of the north Indian religious landscape. Rajasthan has pilgrimage sites shared by Muslims and Hindus. Hindus and Christians worship at The Church of the Infant Jesus in Bangalore. Hindu, Muslim, and Christian venerate Sister Alphonsa in Kottayam as a healer. Satya Sai Baba claims
that he does not speak for any sect or doctrine but preaches respect, unity, and the glory of God. In similar vein, Hindus argue that that multiple paths lead to God. Forms of God are prolific, and gods can exist as partial and particular manifestation of the ‘one’ God. Angelika Malinar argues that the theology of the Bhagavad Gita, one of Hinduism’s most sacred and influential scripture, can be called ‘cosmological monotheism’ because the Gita presents Krishna as the “highest and only god of liberation and creation” while acknowledging other gods as “partial manifestations” of Krishna.

Similarly, Islam teaches that God sends different prophets to different peoples. Chapter 16, verse 36 of the Koran is an ideal example of this sentiment: “We indeed sent a messenger unto every community, ‘Worship God, and shun false deities!’ Then among them were those whom God guided; and among them were those who were deserving of error.” Other verses affirm the idea that every community has its own messenger (10:47), its own book (45:28), and is called to worship God (21:25). God has revealed many ways and many religions and many creeds and many rites and many legal codes. As such, “variegated religious forms do not contravene the validity and efficacy of one another” but are part of the repeated calling back of humans to God. Raj and Dempsey say of Christianity in India that it is “neither homogenous nor uniform but essentially plural and diverse.”

“Christianity” in India is a congeries of beliefs and practices inspired by faith traditions and social histories whose constituents are never too far from change.

David Mosse has critiqued “short-time-frame ethnographies” that unearth cultural adaptations with a bias toward disjunctions between culture and Christianity and that pay inadequate attention to the stability in beliefs and practices embedded in centuries-long traditions like Orthodox and Catholic Christianity in India. As a “source of distinctive forms of thought, action, and modes of signification” he writes, studies of “profoundly localized” Christianity that eschew presenting the relation between “culture” and “Christianity” as continuity or rupture offer a necessary corrective to studies of Indian Christianity. The Tamil Catholicism of the pseudonymous Alapuram in his work charts a rich terrain with features that have gradually emerged from the “complex intercultural space” between Catholicism and Tamil cultural forms.

Drawing on Mosse’s corrective in The Saint in the Banyan Tree, I explore the space created by Hindi Christian materials between Hindi “culture,” Hindu-Christian relations, and the politicization of language and religion in India. I interrogate the many ways in which Hindi Christians have created credible and recognizable linguistic features that seek to function in a religious milieu that is affected by Hindu practices and Hindi cultural forms. I study the particular ways in which Hindi and Christianity continue to function in India. This is partly in response to Mosse’s critique that most scholarship on Indian Christianity has sought to either find a gap between ‘local’ culture and Christian claims or to suggest they are undistinguishable.
Mosse’s research on Tamil Catholics did not support this division; and, he therefore invites scholars of Indian Christianity to take a deeper look at these relations. This book accepts Mosse’s invitation. It looks at the relation between a language and certain religious ideas. In line with Mosse’s findings, Hindi Christian materials reveal neither a continuity with existing claims nor a complete rejection of available resources. Rather, a middle ground emerges that is clearly marked to insist Christianity is culturally Indian, idiomatically Hindi, and home grown.

The milieu

In *Religions in Practice*, John R. Bowen describes a private *pūjā* (worship) in a village in Madhya Pradesh. A father gathers his family, lights a cow-dung cake, sprinkles water around the fire, and offers portions of prepared food to the fire. The fire purifies the food. The food is now blessed. Portions of food are offered because purified parts can cleanse the whole. Blessing all the food by sacrificing parts of it also allows the blessed food to be shared. The remaining food – now blessed food (*prasād*) – is then shared in a family meal. Family rites and public festivals permeate the religious landscape of India. Accompanied by chants and prayers, *bhajans* and *pujā* resound through the many villages, towns, and cities in the region. Growing up in a small town in Madhya Pradesh, I woke up most days to sound of temple-bells and *bhajans* coming from the Hindu temple down the road. Once in a while an *azān* would break through from the mosque across town. Festival plays, street theaters, religious holidays color the landscape with a religious hue. *Bhakti* shapes north India. Hawley’s observation 30 years ago is apt even today: “north India [is] a place where bhakti is spoken.” Ganesh, Hanuman, Krishna, Lakshman, Lakshmi, Ram, Saraswati, and Sita adorn temples, books, factory floors, shops, schools, hospitals, government offices, calendars, posters, clothes, and bodies. The image of God, in Diana Eck’s apt phrase, is “visible everywhere in India.” *Bhakti* (devotion), *śraddhā* (veneration), and *pūjā* are the means of reaching out to God.

*Bhakti* is a religious language and a way of being. One is a devotee of, and in relationship with, God. These relations are complementary, and in most cases reciprocal. Devotees worship, bring gifts, and go on pilgrimages. The deities protect, grant wishes, and help manage the ups and downs of life. I use *bhakti* in this broader sense to refer to the general relationship formed between a devotee and the divine. The relationship between a *bhakt* and her god(s) is personal, reciprocal, continual, and special. A devotee may have a special relationship with one main god while engaging other minor gods as needed. Hindu devotees shift among different main gods at different occasions or elevate more than one god above other gods or may assign different religious meaning to one god elevated above others. Within *bhakti* traditions, however, the tendency is to elevate one god above others and to foster life-long loyalty to one god over other gods.
The word ‘bhakti’ emerged around 2500 years ago. It appears in the Svetasvatara Upanishad and the Bhagavad Gītā, by far the most influential Hindu scripture on bhakti. Bhakti denotes love or devotion directed to a deity or God. At the root of the word ‘bhakti’ is the Sanskrit verb bhaj. In the Rig Veda (c. 1700–1500 BCE), bhaj meant to divide, distribute, allot, or apportion. The verb later developed to mean to obtain as one’s share, to partake, to receive, or to enjoy. It has a noun form, bhakta, which denotes a worshipper or votary. By the time the Mahabharata was composed during 300 BCE to 300 CE, bhaj acquired a vassalic form; it meant to declare for, prefer, choose (e.g., as a servant) or to serve, honor, revere, love, or adore. Bhakta acquired commensurate connotations in the Mahabharat, where it meant to be engaged in, occupied with, attached to or devoted to, loyal, faithful, honoring, worshipping, and serving.

Since its origin, bhakti has existed as one path to liberation among other paths – like those of jñāna (knowledge), karma (action), and other types of disciplines. In the Bhagavad Gītā, as an instance, the bhakti path to liberation is mentioned in conjunction with the path of knowledge and that of proper action. Around 1200 year ago in Tamil Nadu, however, a new form of bhakti emerged that understood loving devotion to God as the only path to liberation. The great eleventh-century teacher, Rāmānuja, exemplified one interpretation of this type of devotion-based liberation. Rāmānuja draws a distinction between two types of bhakti, a lower bhakti and a higher bhakti. Lower bhakti is a discipline of knowledge in which a devotee seeks a better understanding of Brahmā (God). This discipline of knowledge is a form of indirect knowledge of God and is based on the scriptures. Through jñāna-yoga, which is the systematic exploration of scripture under the guidance of a teacher, a devotee comes to know God. The discipline of knowledge complements a discipline of proper actions (karma-yoga), which consists of doing what is obligatory and permissible without attachment to the fruits of those actions. The discipline of indirect knowledge is then a discipline of knowledge-and-work. When done with the intention of the love of God, this combination discipline constitutes a discipline of devotion (bhakti-yoga). Rāmānuja suggests that too much of one’s ego still survives in love for God. Hence, this form of bhakti constitutes a lower form of bhakti. While lower, this type of discipline helps a devotee walk on the path toward the higher form of bhakti.

Higher bhakti is a form of direct knowledge of God. It occurs in the form of an epiphany of the divine, an “ever-deepening relationship of intimacy,” with the divine. It is still cognitive in nature and a form of knowledge, even if an ineffable intimate knowledge of God. Even as Rāmānuja locates knowledge of God in devotion of God, bhakti for him is still grounded in “the context of necessary social and religious obligations.” Bhakti did not remain in Tamil Nadu but spread outward, reaching the west, then the north and eventually reaching the eastern parts of India. As the personal-devotional form of bhakti spread from southern India, many of the main
features set during its time in Tamil Nadu spread with it. As bhakti spread throughout India, it acquired certain features. Some features separated it from the ‘intellectual’ bhakti of Rāmānuja. Yet, as Schelling notes, many of its main features were set in its Tamil Nadu days. These features include a devotion that is substantially personal, expressively emotional, scornful of doctrines, suspicious of religious authorities, defiant of orthodoxy, physically immersive, intentionally disruptive, grounded in communities, egalitarian in outlook and distinctively open in its symbols and songs. Further, bhakti is mostly in the form of oral poetry and songs and not in the form of literature.104

Bhakti in north India is characterized by a few features. It constitutes a deep and personal relationship between a devotee and her God. Further, it is reciprocal: the devotee offers praise, worship, and gifts and receives blessings. It is also continual: a devotee may not visit a temple or pray ritually every day, but the relationship is a constant presence in the thoughts and acts of the devotee. She expects that the divine sees the devotee whenever the divine is called upon. Finally, bhakti tends to be broadly exclusive. A devotee may pray to different saints or holy people at different times, but bhakti is usually layered, with one supreme deity the focus of devotion and a range of secondary ‘saints’ available as needed. While a bhakt can be in relationship with multiple divinities for particular purposes – as an instance, Sister Alphonsa for health, Ganesh for good luck, Lakshmi for wealth, Saraswati for wisdom, and Hanuman for protection – a specific divinity primarily occupies the devotee’s devotion. It is in the context of this larger, four-fold sense that Hindi Christian sources express bhakti. Bhakti as found in Hindi Christian sources reflects a combination of ‘southern’ bhakti – with its fusion of personal devotion and proper actions – and pan-Indian bhakti, with its passionate, unorthodox, egalitarian form. Hindi Christian notions of devotion and love of God do not scoff at rituals or doctrines. Yet at their core lies a commitment to the liberation of the body and soul in this world and the world to come.

Bhakti and Christianity share motifs and vocabulary in India. A comparison by Sabapathy Kulandran in 1957 listed the following shared features.105 In their essence, both modes of religious expressions describe the human response to the divine. Both religious traditions embody a whole-hearted trust and commitment to another. They characterize God as the ‘other’ in whom one places complete trust. The power of trust can be found in the love poems of Mirabai, the seventeenth-century bhakti saint. Mirabai sings:

He’s bound my heart with the powers he owns, Mother –
    He with the lotus eyes.

Arrows like spears: this body is pierced,
    And Mother, he’s gone away.
When did it happen, Mother? I don’t know
But now it’s too much to bear.
Talismans, spells, medicines –
I’ve tried, but the pain won’t go.
Is there someone who can bring relief?
Mother, the hurt is cruel.
Here I am, near, and you’re not far:
Hurry to me, to meet.
Mira’s Mountain-Lifter Lord, have mercy,
Cool this body’s fire!
Lotus-Eyes, with the powers you own, Mother,
With those powers you’ve bound.106

One moment Krishna is far. The other moment he is near and ready to meet. God may be the ‘other’ to whom a bhakt relates, but God/Krishna is not completely removed from the devotee. Bhakti, Kulandran continues, rises above legalism and ritualism. As such, bhakti traditions undermine caste claims and caste-based distinctions. Important differences remain. The most important difference, Kulandran argues, concerns the nature of God and the sources of salvation. Unlike Christianity, which posits a God distinct from creation and Jesus Christ as the only source of salvation, bhakti tends toward monism and offers itself to Hindus as one among many paths to liberation.

David Scott has also characterized Christianity and bhakti as responses to the sacred. He goes as far as to conflate the two phenomenon and jointly call it “Hindu and Christian Bhakti.” In Scott’s construction, Christianity and Hindu have a “common” human response to the divine in the “personalist tradition of religious devotion of bhakti” that both Christianity and Hinduism share.107 Given the overlaps between Christianity and Hinduism, Scott proposes that bhakti can be used as the gateway to a fuller Indian understanding of Christianity. Bhakti is the bridge that links the Christian faith to the Hindu faith. Hindu and Christian bhakti, Scott explains, is characterized by love of God, personal devotion to God, the experience of grace, utter self-surrender to God, and the power of God’s love. In Scott’s construction of religion, bhakti provides the proper orientation for “outward” religious acts like worship and devotion and “inward” religious acts like faith and love.108

Bhakti and Christianity further share a concern for social relations. Poems of the bhakti tradition, Schelling writes, started to take shape during the eighth and ninth centuries, drew inspiration from excluded sections of society, challenged social hierarchies, and spread revolutions across kingdoms. Bhakti has led to uncontainable movements for spiritual freedom and fostered persistent demands for social and economic equality. It has nurtured the human yearning to connect with something greater and served as a way to experience the transcendent. “At the root of bhakti,” Schelling observes, “coils the formidable old hunger for human freedom, a sense of
the world’s inexplicable mystery, and the conviction that each of us forms some personal relationship to that mystery.”

Not all comparisons between Christian devotion and bhakti were appreciative or positive. Some comparisons sought to present bhakti as the antidote to Christian colonialism in India. As Dipesh Chakrabarty and Tapan Raychauduri have noted, bhakti as loving devotion became a source of political unity among nationalist authors in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Comparativist scholars during the British Raj were wary of certain forms of bhakti. George Abraham Grierson (1851–1941), the leading ethno-linguist, found much to admire about the bhakti-focused writings of Indian religious leaders like Sitaramsharan Bhagwan Prasad (1840–1932). Grierson would go so far as to trace the origin of Hindu bhakti to early Nestorian Christianity via the theology of the great eleventh-century Hindu theologian, Rāmānuja. He retreated from that claim later. Despite his retreat, Grierson found many parallels with Christian motifs in Hindu bhakti: God’s unwavering love for humanity, God’s grace, self-surrender, abandoning the world for God, cleaving away from sin, being ‘reborn’ as a bhakta. Yet not every form of bhakti earned a positive review. Grierson was critical of Krishna-bhakti, which he considered was based on the love of a man for a woman and corrupted by an extreme form of bhakti veering on the edge of lust. Contrary to Krishna-bhakti was Ram-bhakti, which was based on the love between a father and a son, lacked any hint of sensual licentiousness, and was a good approximation of the Christian motif of God’s love for humans.

Arun Jones draws a distinction between certain versions of Christianity and bhakti traditions, which he designates ‘local religion.’ He argues that nineteenth-century evangelical Christianity found its place in the religious milieu shaped and nourished by bhakti. In the motifs and practices of bhakti groups, evangelical Christianity unwittingly found substantial echoes. Jones identifies five areas of resemblance. In theology, both religious groups looked to a divine savior for liberation. Devotees sought a personal, intimate relationship with their savior. Both groups further shared a form of religious expression that emphasized personal experience of the divine rather than rituals and doctrines. This form of religious expression fostered vernacular expressions. In terms of social outlook, bhakti and evangelical Christianity shared a reformist impulse that provided counterpoints to formal religion, orthodoxies, and religious hierarchies. Both religious traditions further stressed on communal formation as the main means to religious devotion. Worshipping communities were the primary locus of bhaktas and evangelical Christians in North India. (Jones writes of evangelical Christians in Hindi North India but has very little to say about the Hindi-ness of Christianity in North India.) Finally, both groups shared a demography, drawing members primarily from groups on the periphery of society.

Despite the sharing of motifs and practices, Jones notes, bhakti and Christianity could not be (con)fused in nineteenth-century north India.
Important differences remained. As an instance, where bhakti was henotheistic in outlook, evangelical Christianity had a different sense of divine self-expression. Similarly, where bhakti groups challenged social hierarchies in their motifs and form of organization, evangelical Christianity emphasized the development of personal holiness, though Jones seems to suggest that evangelical Christianity had high(er) degree of social activism than bhakti traditions in North India. Jones’s general thesis is on point: nineteenth-century evangelical Christianity in India found hospitable spaces in the religious milieu shaped by north Indian bhakti traditions. His observation that this hospitality was “coincidental” and “unwitting,” however, needs to be qualified. On the matter of the relationship between motifs in bhakti traditions and motifs in the evangelical Christianity of Hindi north India in the nineteenth-century, Jones may be right. But as I discuss in following sections, the devotional hymns of mainline, Protestant Hindi Christians in the twentieth-century show an affinity with and explicit adoption of the motifs and language of bhakti. In the Hindi area, connections between Hindi Christianity and bhakti appear weak at first glance. While the practice of bhakti populates the Hindi area, I have not found direct references in Hindi Christian sources to the works of the bhakti saints like Ravidas, Kabir, Nanak, Surdas, Mirabai, and Tulsidas. Yet Hindi Christian books and hymns demonstrate a robust affinity to the ideas and terms of bhakti. While a Hindi Christian may not describe Christianity as a bhakti religion, thematic analogies between the world of bhakti and Hindi Christian expressions are evident. Hindi Christian devotionals provide the most fertile ground to examine this evidence.

Hindi Christian hymns include direct references to bhakti and bhakts. Noticeably, ‘official’ collections of Hindi Christian hymns present Christian ārādhānā as bhakti. Ārādhānā ke Gīt has a special place in Hindi Christian liturgy given its role as a primary source of devotional songs and other bhajans. It has also led to standardization of Hindi Christian devotionals. Ārādhānā ke Gīt has wide acceptance among mainline Protestant Christian congregations that use Hindi. The hymnbook is also noteworthy for its reliance on the motifs and vocabulary of bhakti. The topical index of Ārādhānā ke Gīt lists songs for ‘Worship and Adoration’ under the category ‘Ārādhānā.’ In this popular hymnbook, ārādhānā is synonymous with bhakti. The publishers of the hymnbook categorize all songs related to the adoration and worship of God as “Ārādhānā (Bhakti).” In their construction, Christian worship is bhakti. A few examples follow (emphases mine). The first hymn in the hymnbook describes Christian devotion as bhakti. In a Hindi rendering of ‘How Great Thou Art,’ its fourth verse reads:

\[
\text{Āegā khris tāḥ baḍi mahimā ke,} \\
\text{Sāth usāke hogā ek ānand mahān,} \\
\text{Tab bhakti-bhāv aur dīnātā se mainīn jhukkar,} \\
\text{Christ will come in great glory,} \\
\text{With him shall be great joy,} \\
\text{Then bowing with humble devotion,}
\]
Politics of religion

(Number 1; translated by R. M. Clark)

The third hymn uses bhakti for devotion:

Ab āe tere pās  
Ārādhnā karne ko,  
Praśamsā bhakti se karem,  
Aur prārthānā saccī ho.  

Now we come close to you,  
So that we may worship you,  
May our praise be devoted to you,  
And our prayers be true.

(Number 3; anonymous composer)

So does Hymn 29:

Duniyām kā racne vālā vahī,  
Bhaktomī ke dil kā ujālā vahī,  
Pāpin kāraṇ jannā vahī,  
Śūli par caṛbhne vālā vahī.  

He is the one who creates the world,  
He enlightens the heart of devotees,  
He is the one born to fix sin,  
He is the one to climb the cross.

(Number 29; composed by Ahsan)

And Hymn 403:

Bhakti se, stuti se,  
Is din ko pavitr māneṁ.  
Khrisṭī yisū ke dvārā mere,  
Pāpomī ko kṣamā kar tu de,  
Bhakti se, stuti se,  
Is din ko pavitr māneṁ.  
Ānand se āem tere ghar,  
Ārādhnā ho saccāī se;  
Hamārī bhakti aesī ho  
Ki bhāe vah svarg mem tuje.  

With devotion, with praise,  
Consider this day holy.  
Through Christ Jesus,  
You forgive my sins.  
With devotion, with praise,  
Consider this day holy.  
May we enter your house with joy,  
May our worship be true;  
May our devotion be such  
That it pleases you in heaven.

(Number 403; “O Happy Day,” translated by Phillip Doddridge)

Evangelical Christians in north India in the twentieth century have also described their devotion as bhakti. Jīvan Saṅgīt (“Life Music”) was published in 1994 and is a popular publication among evangelical Christians in Madhya Pradesh. It is the primary hymnbook of churches affiliated with Mid-India Christian Services, a well-established evangelical Christian organization based in Damoh, Madhya Pradesh. Hymn 2 of Jīvan Saṅgīt is the popular Hindi Christian hymn “Terī Ārādhānā Karūm.” Its second verse reads:

Srṣṭī ke har ek kaṇ kaṇ mem  
Chāyā hai terī bi mahimā kā rāj  
Paksī biṁ karte hain terī praśamsā  

In every kernel of the universe  
Your glory reigns  
Even the birds sing your praise
Politics of religion

Har pal sunāte haim ānand kā rāg
Merī bhī bhakti tujhe grahan bo
Hṛday se prārthānā karūm.

Sounding your joy always
May my worship be acceptable to you
This is my heartfelt prayer.
(Number 2; anonymous composer)

Then there is “Śaran meṁ āe haim hum,” Hymn 329 in Jīvan Saṅgīt, which has a counterpart in a Hindu devotional song of the same name. Between the two songs, only some words are different. Among these slight changes, yīśu (Jesus) in the Christian version is bhagvan (Lord) in the Hindu version. The third and fifth verses of the hymn respectively read:

Na hum meṁ bal hai
Na hum meṁ shakti,
Na hum meṁ sādhan
Na hum meṁ bhakti.
Tumbhāre dar ke hum haim bhikāri,
Dayā karo he dayālu yīśu.

We lack strength,
We lack power,
We lack the means
We lack devotion.
We are beggars at your doorstep,
Show us mercy, merciful Jesus.

Pradhān kar do mahān bhakti,
Bharo hamāre meṁ jnān shakti.
Narak nāśak ho krūs dhārī,
Dayā karo he dayālu yīśu.

Grant us great devotion,
Fill us with powerful wisdom.
You are the hell-destroyer, the cross-bearer
Show us mercy, merciful Jesus.
(Number 329; anonymous composer)

Hindi Christian bhajans, like their bhakti counterparts, use vernaculars and mix and match terms from a variety of linguistic contexts. Consider Hymn 511 in Ārādhānā ke Gīt:

Terī nazar ke pyāse haim hum,
Tujhse duā yah karte haim hum.

We thirst for your gaze,
That you look upon us, we beseech you.

Tū hai hāmī, tū hai svāmī,
Tū hai prem apār.

You are our advocate, you are our master,
You are love unbound.

Tū hī dān, tū hī mān,
Tū hai jag kā ādhār.

You are the gift, you are the honor,
You are the foundation of the world.

Tū hai śakti, tū hai bhakti,
Tū hai tāranāhār.

You are power, you are devotion,
You are savior.
(Number 511; lyrics and tune by D. M. Daniel)

The song is listed as hymn of ārādhānā (bhakti) and exemplifies the linguistic mixing of languages and concepts that occurs when bhakti traditions and
Christian worship come together. *Nazar* is an Urdu word via Arabic. *Hāmī* is Arabic in origin and *Svāmī* and *Apār* are Sanskritic in origin. *Hāmī* is an Arabic loan-word that means ‘supporter’ or ‘advocate.’ It is sometimes also conflated with the Arabic *ḥāmī*, which means ‘to confirm’ something, as in *ḥāmī bharānā* (to agree with, to assent to). In the next verse, *mān* and *ādhār* are borrowed from Sanskrit. Finally, Sanskrit provides *śakti*, *bhakti*, and *tāranābār*, which respectively mean power, devotion, and one who enables a crossing over. The combination of *nazar*, *hāmī*, *svāmī*, *bhakti*, and *tāranābār* in the Hindi hymnal asks a singer of the hymn to perform a type of multilingualism where understanding the full meaning of the hymn depends on facility with a range of linguistic terms in Urdu, Hindi, Arabic, and Sanskrit. Hindi Christian hymns share other ideas with *bhakti* traditions. A recurring theme in popular Hindi Christian hymns, for instance, recalls sacrifice and surrender. A devotee brings herself to Christ, surrenders, seeks, shelter, and receives freedom or *mukti* from time and death. Consider these examples:

I.

*Dil merā le le, pyāre yiśu,*

*tūne ise banāyā hai,*

*ismem tu apnā ghar banā le,*

*jiske liye hī yah banāyā hai.*

Take my heart, O dear Jesus,

You are the one who has made it,

Make in it [now] your own house,

For this only it was made.

*Pavitr ātmā kā yeh ho bhavan,*

*agni ke baptismā se,*

*har jagah, har samay dūmā gavāhī,*

*jaisā yeh usne sikhāyā hai.*

May the Holy Spirit live here,

By the baptism of fire,

Everywhere, always, may I witness,

Just as He has taught this.

(Number 311; anonymous composer)

II.

*Yīśu tu ne kiyā nihāl, jab main śaran mem terī āyā.*

Jesus, you freed me, when I came under your refuge.

*Yīśu ākar tere dwār, barkat pāī beśumār,*

*kripā terī huī apār, mere dil kā mail mitāyā.*

Jesus, having reached your door, countless blessings I received,

Your mercy was unbound, as it cleaned my dirty heart.

. . .

*Jo terī śaran mem āe, vah pāpoṁ se bac jāye,*

*man mem pāvan ātmā āe, isko mainme hai ājmāyā.*
He who comes to your refuge, from his sins he is saved, 
He receives the Holy Spirit, in this witness I have shared.

Hai dās terā viśvāsi, kāṭī tūne kāl kī phānsī, 
dhan-dhan amar lok ke vāsi, darśan mainme terā pāyā.

Your believer is a servant, you have cut the noose of time, 
Blessed-blessed those in heaven, your vision I have received.
(Number 282; lyrics and tune by Premdas)

In the context of *bhakti* and of Hindu religious vocabulary, *pāp* refers to sin, evil, wickedness, or a wrong. In *bhakti*, one turns to God to seek liberation from the effects of sin, which are generally understood as forms of self-attachment, mistaken desires, or evil acts. The effects of such evil and sin can keep one bound to life and the cycle of rebirths. As a describer of sin and evil, the word *pāp* – along with its antonym *puny* (meritorious, auspicious) – functions in both Christian and Hindu circles. It is common in Hindi hymns to beseech Christ for safety and a personal relationship:

*Prem tere kī yahī rīt:* 
*Man mem bhar de terī prīt,* 
*tīre prem ke gāyem ġīt.*

Tis’ the nature of your love: 
Fills one’s heart with your love, 
We sing songs of your love.

*Khidmat apnī le mujh se,* 
is mandir mem tū hi base, 
*jag me terā nām phaile.*

Take from me your service [Lord] 
In this temple may you stay, 
May the world hear your name.
(Number 47; anonymous composer)

With *bhakti* literature, Christian hymns further share an erotic terminology. Mirabai is well-known for her love-filled songs directed at Krishna, her playmate and lover. Christian hymns recall the lover’s relationship that exists between Christ and his *bhakt* in comparable terms and suggest a two-way relationship in which a devotee surrenders to Christ and is at the receiving end of Christ’s love. Consider this Hindi translation of a German Lutheran hymn:

*Main prem āpar ko nit sarāhītā* 
*jo yiśu tujh se prakat hai,* 
*aur apne ko samarpit kartā* 
*tujh ko jo merā premī hai.*

I always praise the love unbound 
That appears from you, O Lord, 
And I surrender myself 
To you who’s my lover [Lord].
The lovers’ relationship described in Hymn 7 does not exist in a vacuum. It complements communal forms of worship. The relationship of bhakt communities to the singer saints of India is complicated. Nirguna bhakti, Hawley and Juergensmeyer note, is not readily hospitable to institutions, temples, priests, and structures. The resistance of nirguna poets to organized religion typified in the poetry of Kabir was particularly attractive to those seeking to escape structures of caste and creed. Kabir’s critique of Hinduism and Islam on one hand and his relationship with a community of listeners and yogis who rejected Hindu hierarchies on the other, however, reflects the very concrete ways in which society and politics impact religious practices.

Christian devotion is imprinted with the Christological core embedded in Hindi hymns. As one consequence of this imprint, Christian Hindi hymns are clearly not devotionally ‘layered’ with primary and secondary deities as can be found in bhakti bhajans. While local healers and saints do figure in devotional schemes, Hindi Christian sources are distinct from bhakti devotionals in their exclusive devotion to Jesus. The Christological core has also led to the dominance of saguna forms of devotion rather than nirguna forms of devotion in the body of Hindi devotionals. Key features of nirguna and saguna devotions like longing, community, refuge, love, and surrender are nevertheless part of some of the most well-known Hindi Christian hymns.

Bhakti traditions pay attention to the relationship between teacher and disciples. In concrete terms, the values and practices of a worshipping community are passed down from teacher to teacher. Such teachers depend on their community of disciples to manifest the teachings and devotion to God. The worshipping community is the site of religious expressions, growth, and transmission. The Kabir panth has valued the transmission of faith and worship from gurus to disciples. Mira’s songs are best experienced in “the company of other worshippers.” Or, in the words of a famous Hindi Christian hymn:

Dhanyavād sadā prabhu
khrist tuhe
tere sanmukh śīś navāte haim,
hum terī Ārādhānā karne ko
mandir meṁ tere āte haim.

We give thanks to you always Jesus Christ,
We bow our heads before you,
To worship you [and sing your praise]
We gather in your temple.
Hindi Christian hymns and *bhakti* devotionals echo a variety of themes. These themes include a strong personal bond between God and devotee, a two-way relationship with mutual obligations, personal devotion in the context of and as part of larger communities of worship, and a certain exclusivity in a devotee’s focus on a supreme deity who meets her need for love and salvation. The cultural milieu of Hindi Christian works has been shaped by ideas other than the motifs found in *bhakti* traditions.

The Indian subcontinent has a long history of Christian scholarship and this history can be traced to India’s earliest Christian communities in the first century CE. Early trade routes and later colonial expansions brought converts in contact with Christian communities outside the subcontinent. Hindi Christian literature exists as part of this Christian milieu in the subcontinent. However, it seems that Indian Christian scholarship has minimally interacted with Hindi Christian materials. While the influence of Western authors on Hindi Christian writers is evident, Hindi Christian writers have for the most part ignored Indian Christian scholarship in other languages. Hindi Christian writers may have engaged their Western predecessors but a study of Hindi Christian materials reveals that Indian Christian scholarship in other languages has not been an influential partner of Hindi Christian writing in the way Western scholarship has. Let us look at two examples.

The bibliography of Dayal’s popular Hindi-language textbook on Christianity (published in 2005) presents a list of 74 books. Eleven of the 74 are by Indian authors. Western sources dominate the list, led by the works of D. M. Baillie, Karl Barth, Emil Brunner, Mircea Eliade, David Ford, John Hick, John McQuarrie, Reinhold Niebuhr, Karl Rahner, and Paul Tillich. Only five of the 11 Indian-authored books are in Hindi. In a widely-used Hindi-language textbook, then, only 6.7 percent sources are in Hindi. Other Hindi-language textbooks do not fare any better. The 23-book bibliography of Masih and Peter’s *Prabhu Yeśu kī Jīvanī aur Sevākāry* (2007) lists only one Indian author – the rest are from the West. All its sources are in English. The 30-book bibliography of Khan’s Christian ethics, *Khristīy Nītiśāstr* (2009), lists only two books by Indian authors (one by H.H. Titus, another by Joseph Vadakumcherry). Again, all its sources are also in English. What explains this state of affairs? Are Hindi Christian writers generally unaware of Indian Christian sources in English or other languages? Do Hindi Christian authors have limited access to translated editions of non-Hindi sources?
(assuming they are restricted to the use of Hindi)? Are non-Hindi sources from India unhelpful and hence underutilized on purpose?

An analysis of the interactions between Indian Christian theology and Hindi Christian scholarship sheds light on these questions. Missionary theologians like Robin Boyd, William Barclay, and John Webster were aware of local theological works and found in Indian Christian theology a familiarity with their personal ideas and vocabulary. A sense of familiarity created the impression that Indian Christian theologies were vernacular expressions of their Western concepts. Boyd laments this perceived state of affairs in his 1969 dissertation on Indian Christian theology. The question of whether Boyd and his compatriots had understood Indian theology on its own terms was yet to emerge as a necessary query. Rather, the conventional wisdom of the day understood Indian Christianity as an echo of missionary expressions. Capturing the popular point of view, Boyd writes:

There is no doubt that to an outside observer the Church in India seems to be dominated by Western attitudes and modes of thought. In church architecture, church organization, church services, church music and church publications, Western forms and attitudes still seem to predominate. . . . Again, the teaching given in theological colleges throughout India has been, and still is, dominated by Western theology, as a glance at any syllabus will show. The result is that the preaching of the average Indian minister or evangelist reflects the Western theological categories in which he has been trained.127

Western categories did not influence Indian Christianity exclusively. Sanskrit motifs and upper-caste Hinduism also shaped Indian Christian works in English. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, many of the pioneers of Indian Christian thoughts were upper-caste Hindu converts or Hindu reformers like Krishna Mohan Banerjee (1813–1885), Pandita Ramabai (1858–1922), Brahmabandhab Upadhyay (1861–1907), Keshub Chandra Sen (1838–1884), and A. J. Appasamy (1848–1926). Their influence led to what Arvind Nirmal has called a Brahmanic turn in Indian Christian theology. Nirmal explains:

Broadly speaking, Indian Christian theology in the past has tried to work out its theological systems in terms of either *advaita Vedanta* or *vishishta advaita*. Most of the contributions of Indian Christian theology in the past came from caste converts to Christianity. The result has been that Indian Christian theology has perpetuated within itself what I prefer to call the ‘Brahmanic’ tradition. . . . To speak in terms of traditional Indian categories, Indian Christian theology, following the Brahmanic tradition, has trodden the *jnana marga*, the *bhakti marga* and the *karma marga*. In Brahma Bandhav Upadhyay, we have a brilliant theologian who attempted a synthesis of Sankara’s *Advaita Vedanta* with
Christian theology. In Bishop A.J. Appasamy, we have a bhakti marga theologian who tried to synthesize Ramanuja’s Vashishtha Advaita with Christian Theology. In M.M. Thomas we have a theologian who has contributed to theological anthropology at the international level and who laid the foundation for a more active theological involvement in India – the karma marga. In Chenchiah we find an attempt to synthesize Christian theology with Sri Aurobindo’s ‘Integral Yoga’.128

Banerjee, who joined the Church of England post-conversion and was an ordained minister and professor at Bishop’s College in Calcutta, interpreted Christ as the true prajāpati (Lord and Creator) and the true purus (both human and divine).129 Ramabai came from a Maratha Brahmin family and post-conversion tried to combine her Hindu upbringing with her experience of the Holy Spirit.130 The influence of Sanskrit and the Vedas was not new to nineteenth and twentieth century Indian Christian thought. Roberto de Nobili (1577–1656) learned Tamil and Sanskrit, adopted the life of a sanyāsi, tried to establish a seminary with Sanskrit as the medium of instruction, and experimented with Sanskrit as a liturgical language in the church.131 Other followed in his enculturated footsteps. Evaluations of Indian Christian thought by Hindi authors have faulted it in both its Westernized and Sanskritic content.132

Hindi Christian literature is neither Brahmanic in construct nor Vedantic in content. It reflects a general distaste for Sanskritic ideas and idioms. It embraces a commitment to economic development, social mobility, and the abolition of caste- and gender-based discriminations. The demography of Hindi Christianity – made up mostly by Dalits, tribal, and rural converts133 – partly explains this outcome. Hindu reformers of the nineteenth century wanted to identify ideas like love, equality, and grace as shared motifs with Hinduism in their quest to reform caste practices and gender relations. M. M. Thomas, V. S. Azariah, and Paul D. Devanandan spoke for many Christians in newly-Independent India when they invited church communities to dedicate themselves to nation building, interfaith harmony, and close alliances with civil society. S. J. Samarth (1920–2001), George M. Soares Prabhu (1929–1995), Dhyanchand Carr (1938–), Renthy Keitzar (1936–2000), Aruna Gnanadason (1949–), Monica Jyotsna Melanchthon (1962–), and James Massey (1943–), among others, have produced works that address the needs of church and society, tribal issues, inter-religious dialogue, gender empowerment, ecumenism, Dalit rights, and ecological care.134 Hindi Christian authors have been cautious in their engagement of Brahmanic and upper-case ideas.

Debates over the religious meaning of ‘Hindi’ have shaped the development of Hindi Christian ideas in the context of Hinduism and India. The term’s reference to a language was not an issue. Rather, the controversy centered on whether ‘Hindi’ meant ‘Hindu’ or ‘Indian’ when used by Christian authors writing in Hindi. The question played out in the editorial decision
over the Hindi title of a translated book. The story unfolds in C.W. David’s introduction to Boyd’s _An Introduction to Indian Christian Theology_ in 1976 and his subsequent introduction to Benjamin Khan’s _Bīsvīṁ Satābdī ke Pramukh Dharmavijñānī_ (“Major Christian Theologians of the Twentieth Century”) in 1990. In the 1970s, David was the editor-in-chief of the Hindi Theological Literature Committee, Khan a prominent Hindi Christian author, and Boyd a well-respected scholar of Christianity in India. David sparked the conversation when he decided to change the title of the Hindi version of Boyd’s book to “Christian Theology in India” instead of maintaining Boyd’s original “An Introduction to Indian Christian theology.” Explaining his decision, David wrote: “There can be no such thing as Indian Christian theology” because “Christ is universal, beyond every nation.” That Christ was universal, however, was not the only argument against describing Boyd’s book as a study of Indian Christian theology rather than as a study of Christian theology in India. David preferred a particular feature of Boyd’s work and wanted to promote that feature as the core “Indian” aspect of Indian Christian thought.

Two strands dominate Boyd’s account of Indian Christianity. One strand focuses on Hindu contributions to the development of Christian thought in India. Boyd draws upon a number of Hindu reformers to explain the content of Indian Christianity and his study is colored by interactions between upper-caste Hindu converts and reformers and emerging Indian Christian scholarship. Boyd’s reliance on Hindu-Christian encounters to introduce Indian Christianity gave the impression that Indian Christian thought was, generally speaking, Hindu Christian thought. To balance a reliance on Hindu modes of thinking, Boyd explained Indian Christian thought as the “search for truth” intrinsic to India’s religiosity and not specific to any one religious tradition. To tangle with truth was at the heart of “true religious enquiry.” In the artful Hindi translation of Boyd’s argument, what made Indian Christianity Indian was a Christian’s “saty ke sāth ulajhnā” (“struggling with truth”), where the truth is Christ. Boyd reminded his readers that the idea of struggling with or searching for truth was a domestic idea, with a rich history, and transcended religions. “To tangle with truth, which is the demand of true religious enquiry, is not a foreign idea for the Indian tradition.”

Indian Christian thought is made Indian by its search for truth. Locating the search for truth at the heart of Christian thought made it truly Indian. Such a Christianity would embrace ethics, engage philosophy, avoid repeating Hindu thoughts, and save Indian Christian thought from merely parroting Western works. “In India today,” Boyd explained,

there is the need for a conduct-based, witness-giving theology. . . . It seems that before becoming the congregation’s systematic theology or Indian doctrines it is important to tangle with the Christian revelation
David sought to promote the struggle for truth in Boyd’s account of Indian Christianity and wanted to minimize Boyd’s dependence on Hindu thought. To this end, David renames Boyd’s work as ‘Christian theology in India.’ “The author,” David explains, “has provided a ‘definition of Indian Christian theology’ in the thirteenth chapter of the book. We accept ‘Indian Christian theology’ in that sense.”

Other Hindi Christian authors picked up on David’s discomfort with characterizing Boyd’s work as an accurate depiction of Indian Christian thinking. Benjamin Khan uses theologies in English by Western authors of the twentieth century to introduce Western Christian thoughts to Hindi readers. Khan’s methodology stands in contrast with Boyd’s. Boyd used theologies in English influenced by Hindu-Christian debates to characterize Indian Christian thought. Khan’s book is aimed at a broad Hindi Christian audience: seminarians, pastors, educators, authors, and general readers. He was motivated by a lack of good Christian sources available in Hindi. Khan explained,

Many readers who go to seminary to study religion are maybe not competent enough in English to fully understand those books on Christian literature that are written in English. In the same way, an average Christian also remains ignorant about schools of thought in Christian literature beyond the Bible because he does not have available in the mother tongue any book whose study allows him to learn about the primary schools of thought in Christian theology. I have been feeling this void for a very long time.

Khan clarifies his intention to introduce Hindi readers to Western Christian thought in simple terms accessible to a general reader. “As far as language in concerned,” he further writes, “I have tried to present the thoughts in very simple language.” Clarity regarding his task and sources allows David to encourage his readers to find new ways to present Christian theology in terms of India’s context. He invites his readers to “think anew in the cultural context of India and to present Christian theology in terms of the religion and ethics here [in India’s context].”

“In Indian theology” – a term Khan uses in Bīsvīṁ Śatābdī ke Pramukh Dharmaviñāṇī in 1990 – should introduce the incarnated, risen Christ in ways that makes sense to the developing world. “Jesus Christ,” Khan argues, is this Word of God who incarnated, who united humans with God in his life, death, and resurrection. Such a presentation of this Christ is necessary that can be acceptable to today’s human, who wants to be
self-reliant on the basis of her intelligence and advances in science and who has attained maturity.\textsuperscript{142}

Khan finds Boyd’s work lacking in its presentation of Indian (Christian) theology. He explains:

We have studied Boyd’s ‘Indian Christian theology.’ At the same time, some works and a book have also been published on Dalit theology. It is our humble belief that writing Indian Christian theology in English can only lead to the false use of Indian categories of thought. It is our hope that in the near future Indian scholars and thinkers will emerge who will write systematic theologies that could be truly called Christian theologies.\textsuperscript{143}

Khan’s review of Boyd is harsh. It claims a schism between the English language and Indian thought that is rather hard to defend. Nevertheless, Khan’s comments clarify the debate on the meaning of ‘Christian’ in Hindu Christian sources. The Hindu tinge of Boyd’s Indian Christianity can be explained as a function of the paucity of Indian Christian sources that avoid Hindu categories. It is less a function of Boyd’s methodology. Boyd’s selection of Indian Christian sources takes him to the Hindu worldview. David and Khan find Boyd’s portrayal of ‘Indian Christian’ thought problematic for different but overlapping reasons. Their discomfort is symbolic of the general suspicion with which Hindi Christian authors approach Indian Christian scholarship. The desire to Indianize and Hindify Christian claims without Hinduizing them is driving this suspicion.
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Uttar bhārat kā mahisī samāj bhāṣā kī driṣṭī se triśanku hai: kadācit hindī filmōṁ kā koī īsāī pātr jō bhāṣā bāltā hai, usse hum is tathy ko samajh sakte haimāi. Hamāre videśī bhāiyōn ne hamein sikhāyā kī hindī hinduom kī bhāṣā hai, aur urdi musalāmaṁōn kī. Aur īsāī anigreō . . . Īsāī dharmaguru kesak pahanne vāla keval roman kaitholik ēdār bhi bo saktā hai.

Hindi bābil jo āpke hāth mein hai uskā anuvād san 1905 mein ilāhābād ke presbītēri miśnarī dē rē es. ec. kailāg ne kiyā thā. Sau varō pūrv hindī keval ek bōlī thī jo uttar pradeś ke kuchh jōlē hūmāi thote merē śrotā, darśak, pātē hak, gair mahisī, viśeśakar mere Payosī hindū bote hai. . . .

Schüssler Fiorenza, Jesus and the Politics of Interpretation.

Schüssler Fiorenza, Jesus and the Politics of Interpretation.


James, Mahilā Dharmavijñān, 227: “[S]hamāj mein rahnevalāi bahanom se aur any sadasyoṁ se prem ke sāth vyavahār kar sake . . . dukhbharī kahānīyāṁ sun saktī hai aur dukhīt bhāsā hai – sampark bhāsā hai aur ākāśvān ākar ābhyukt karne ke liye nae-nae bhāvāṁ ko abhivyakt karne ke liye nae-nae śabd hindī bhāsā mein ā gae haimāi.

‘Mukti kā śubh samācār’ ghosīt karte samay yadi sampresāk us bhāsā kā pragy nahi karta jo sandeś śabdan karne vāla samajhtā hai to śubh sandeś aśubh sandeś bo jāta hai, arth kē anarth bo jāta hai.”

James, Mahilā Dharmavijñān, 228: Pati ke samast dāyitv mein uskā saprem sāth de.

James, Mahilā Dharmavijñān, 231–232: Kalīsiyā ke jīvan aur pracār kāry memāि striyomāि kā bhārī hāth rahā hai. Hamāre prabhu ne ārambh hī stri ko anugrah aur sevā memāि purusā barāva māna hai (dekhie yūhannā 4:7 kramik pad; markus 5:23 se āge; lūkā 10”38–42). Yah māna ki striyomāि ko celomāि ke samān āścaryakarne kī sāmarth sahit prabh ne bhejā, parantu celomāि ke samudāy memāि sevā, sahāyatā aur ātithy satkār memāि unkā viśeś bhāg rahā (lūkā 8:2; markus 15:40 se āge). Unmemāि se kucch striyāṁ āgake punurutthit khrist kī satrāpratham gavāh thīṁ (markus 16:1). Yiśu ke drīṣtāntōṁ mem striyōṁ ko mahatvāpurṇ sthān hai. Preritōṁ kē kāṁ aur patrītiōṁ mem ānek striyōṁ kā ullekh bhai jo susamācār pracār mem sahāyak thīṁ (preritōṁ kē kāṁ 1:14; 12:12; 16:13 se āge; rōmiyōṁ 16:1, 3; 1 kūrinthiyuṁ 1:11; kulūsiyōṁ 4:15; 2 timuthiyuṁ 1:5; filemon 4:2–3). Kalīsiyā mem striyāṁ ānek prakār kē jīmedāryāṁ sambhāltī thīṁ. Udāhāranā ki īye, ōbe kriiruvrayā kē manḍli mem ākāśvān tāṁ (rōmiyōṁ 16:1); priskillā ne apullos kā prāśikṣān kiyā (pre. 18:24–26); titūs 2:3–5 mem presbītār mahilāom kā ullekh hai; vidhvāem parhit prārthanāṁ kē sevā mem ālārī rāthī thī (1 tim. 5:5). Āisā pratīt bhāi hai kē prārthambhīh kalīsiyā mem nabyāṁ bhi thī (pre. 21:9). Sant pāluṁ striyōṁ ko ‘mere sahakarmī’ kahā thī (ro. 16:3). Yah māna jā saktā hai ki hamāre prabhū yiśu khrist ke dvārā aur striyōṁ kē prati prārthambhīh kalīsiyā kē abhivyaktī ki kārān mānav samāj mem striyōṁ kē śār uṁcā huā hai.
Is paramparā ke anurūp āj mabhālem kalisiyā men anek prakār se svā kar raḥi hain, yahāin tak ki kuchh kalisiyāom men unko pādrī yā presbitar bhī banāyā gayā hai. Striyom ko kalisiyā men matdān kā adhikār hain; ve mandalī men anek rūpom men svā kartī hai, bāibil viṃmen pracrā kāry kartī hain, mabhālem ko skūlon men śikṣā detī hain, āspatāloī men kāry kartī hain, mśnari hain, sahāyāk pādrī hain, ādi.

Mabhālem ko kalisiyāi, antar-kalisiyāi aur antarāsū tārīy sabhāi aur sangatē hai. Yah bade srey ki bāt hai ki ve hostel, skūl, āspatāl aur samsthāein jo mabhālem ko āth hain kā bātom men śresṭh hain.”

39 Schüssler Fiorenza, Discipleship of Equals, 159–161.
40 Schüssler Fiorenza, Discipleship of Equals, 157.
42 Paul, Striyom kē Parameśvar ke Sāth Cālah, 217: “Ādhunik striyām anek prakār se yogī boṭi hain. Vah kā tārab ke kāryom ke li ye uct raḥī hain . . . Vah kalisiyā kē sammātioīn pār salāhakārī ke vīhārī menī, ātmā jīte kē upcārīkā kē rūpī menī, prabhubhoj tāyār karne ke lie, baccom kē susamūcār ke bāre menī batāne ke liye, prārthanā mandaśiyom kē kalāne ke lie, yuva kē āgūtī karne ke dvārā, sande skūl menī kāry karke, striyom kē sangati ko kalākār, kalisiyā kē bimārōmī kē pā jākār, vidhavāom evam anāthom kē dekhhāl karke, ṭāṅkan kāry (tāīping) karke, ān kē ṭāktī karke, āgantuk satkārī hokar, aur in sabhe āpar muskurā kar, kalisiyā kē sevā kār saktī hai.”
43 Paul, Striyom kē Parameśvar ke Sāth Cālah, 116: “Masīh kē drīṣṭī menī strīyāmīn acührī nahīm bhī.”
44 Cf. Schüssler Fiorenza, Discipleship of Equals, 152, note 2.
45 Paul, Striyom kē Parameśvar ke Sāth Cālah, 15.
46 Paul, Striyom kē Parameśvar ke Sāth Cālah, 32: “Uskā yah bhi adhikār hai kē manusy kē apekṣā paramesvarā kē āgyā pālān kare.”
47 Paul, Striyom kē Parameśvar ke Sāth Cālah, 31: “Svarg menī kōi strīling athavā purling nahīm hai. Lingu bhed keval is dhārī par bi hai, svarg menī kōi ling bhed nahīm hai.”
48 Paul, Striyom kē Parameśvar ke Sāth Cālah, 31: “Ek strī kē apne pati, bacce evam ghar ke āpar adhikār hotā hai.”
49 Paul, Striyom kē Parameśvar ke Sāth Cālah, 132: “Striyom kē purushom kē āpar adhikār nahīn ājmanā caḥīre.”
50 David in James, Mahilā Dharmaviñān, xii: “Kalisiyā aur bhūrāt bhūmī kē kalyān kē nimitt pustak kē lekbhāom aur sakānakārī kē sāth bhūm bhī apne āraḥdhy prabhū yīśu khrisṭ ke carnūmī menī ise samarpit karte hain.”
51 James, Mahilā Dharmaviñān, 103: “Khrisṭīy jīvān duhrah jīvān hai. Īsmeī ādhyātmik aur naitikātā donom kē gābrā sambandh hai.”
52 James, Mahilā Dharmaviñān, 102: “Pratye k khrisṭīy jan kē liye yah avāsyak hai kē vah apne ācaṛān banānevāle siddhāntoīn kē jāne aur unke sambandh menī use nīścay ho.”
53 James, Mahilā Dharmaviñān, 108: “Parvā r ke prati kartavy; samaj aur samudāy ke any logom ke prati kartavy; des ke prati kartavy.”
James, Mahilā Dharma vijñān, 107–108: “Adhikār jinke pās haim unkā yah nātik dāyitv hai ki ve sab ke kalyān ke liye uskā upayog karem... jivan ke prati ādar; ātmā-raksā; svāsthy raksā; ātm hatyā na karnā aur na disroim kī batyā karnā... dhān ko śaḍbhy rūp menī nahiṁ daran disroim kī bhalāi ke śādhān ke rūp menī arjni karnā cāhiye. Dusroim kī sampatti kā ādar karnā cāhiye... buddhi, gyan, kauśal ādi kā viṅkā [karnā]... saty bohnā, apni ichhāoṁ, abhiśrūttiyoon aur vāsānōṁ par samyam rakhnā... atm-ngrab aur atm-samān rakhnā, caritr aur sāmājiṅk vyavasthā kā samān karnā; gati tathā imāndāri se kathor śrām karnā.”


Dayal, Vyaktīgat Manan-Cintan, 10: “Var de ki maim ne jo pahle pratigyāyem kī haim, unhe na todū aur jo galtiyāyem kī haim, unko binā sudhāre na chodū. Var de ki yadi maim kisī humrāhī ko sankat mem dekhūm to katrā kar na calā jāūm. Var de ki maim kartavy ko pūrā kiy bagair na chodū aur na kisī buri ādat ko käyam rahne diūṁ. Jahām merā ko kāry sansār ko pūrā kiy yādūm, jahām merā vacan kisī nirāś man ko protsāhan de saktā hai yā kamjor icchā-saktivāle ko dridh kar sakta hai, jahām meri prārthanā muktidātā prabhū yeśu ke rājy kā hissā banā saktā hai.”


Patlia, Pāstarī Viddhyā, 49–50: “Sambhav hai ki vah bahusankhyak samudāy ke hathkanām ke kārnoṁ apne adhikārom ko prāpt karne ke liye saktī kar sakta hai, vahām meri prārthanā muktidātā prabhū yeśu ke rājy kā hissā banā saktā hai.”

David's preface in Sinha, Masīhī Ācaranāṁ, i (k): “Masīhī ācaranāṁ kī prāpti evam pragati ke liye avīśyātā padne par sānti aur prem kā asā sanghār kā saktā hai ki mahan se mahān śaktiyām bhī jhuk jāēṁ, uttam sākṣi utpān ho aur paraṁśvar kā rājy pragatīśil ho sake.”

Patlia, Pāstarī Viddhyā, 50.

Patlia, Pāstarī Viddhyā, 49: “Jahāṁ gantantrātmak svatantratā kā adhikār hai, vahāṁ ek samāj ko, cāhe alpsankhyak ki kyom na ho, apne nāgrīk adhikārōṁ ko prāpt karne kā rāmillion ki pūrī svatantratā hai.”

Sinha, Masīhī Ācaranāṁ, 1: “Ve log bhī, jo masīhī nahīṁ hain, is bāt se paricit hain kī masīhtiyōṁ ko masīh ke samān honā hai. Sansār menī bahut log, jo masīhī nahīṁ hain, prabhū yīsu ke caritr ko bhaliṃbhāntī jānte hain. Unhe is bāt kā gyan hai ki prabhū yīsu nyāyapriy, namr aur śuddh ācaranāṁ kārner valā tathā satybhāṣī jan thā.”

Patlia, Pāstarī Viddhyā, 50.
David’s preface in Sinha, *Masīhī Ācaran˙*, i (k): “Is pustak mein masīhī ācaran kā ādarś, masīhī sadgun, tathā is ādarś evam in sadgunōnī ko apnāne ke sāmarth srot kā atyant sundar aur rocak vivecan kiyā gayā hai.”


Rajagopal, *Politics after Television*, 84, 326.


Mankekar, *Screening Culture*, 5.

See also Mankekar, *Screening Culture*, 255.

Rajagopal, *Politics after Television*, 76ff.

Mankekar, “Epic Contests,” 143.

Rajagopal, *Politics after Television*, 73.

King, *Nehru and the Language Politics of India*, 78.

Gill, “Why Ramayan on Doordarshan.”

Scharf, *Rāmopākhyāna*.

Mankekar, “Epic Contests,” 143.

Rajagopal, *Politics after Television*, 327.

Engineer, *Babri-Masjid*, 1ff.


Khan, *The Great Partition*, 129.


Khan, *The Great Partition*, 156.


Varshney, “Contested Meanings,” 249.

Rajagopal, *Politics after Television*, 81ff.

Rajagopal, *Politics after Television*, 83.

Mankekar, “Epic Contests,” 145.

Rajagopal, *Politics after Television*, 84, 117–118.

Also see, Rajagopal, “Ram Janmbhoomi,” 1661.


Mankekar, “Epic Contests,” 140.


Pollock, “Ramayan,” 289.

Thapar, “The Ramayan Syndrome.”


Anand spelled the Hindi (“Bāibil kī kahāniyām”) differently than Doordarshan did (“Bāibil kī Kahāniyām”) – with no difference in meaning.

The original Hindi pronoun (unbone) is gender non-specific.


Mukti kā jīvit śubh sandeś jīvit bhāsā ke mādhyam se māi karodhonā logom ne sār dān se sampresiṁ honā cāhie. Aur iske lie āvaśyak hai bhārat ki bhāsāom ki pūrnāgīyān. Yadi maim hindi bhāsā kā nivāsi hīn, merā kāry kseṁ hindi bhāsā kseṁ hīn thī to muhe hindi bhāsā kā gyān honā cāhīy. Uskā vidhivat adhyayan kārnā cāhīy.”

112 Dayal, Uttar Bhārat aur Pākistān, 201.
116 Anand’s preface in Khan, Samvād, I: “Paramēśvar ne hum-masīhiyom ko ek viśes sthiti meṁ rakhā hai: hamāre Parāsī hindū, musalmān, jain, bauddh ādi haim. Inkā dharm, viśvās, bhāsā tathā sanskriti bhī bhimn hai. Vāstav meṁ hum babudharm tathā bahusankriti ke pariveś meṁ rāb rāb haim. Dūsrī or alp-sankhyāk dharmāvlambī samāj hone ke kāran hum kis prakār āpne Parāsī ko prabhu yiśu kā antim ādeś sunaṁ sakthe haim?”

1 McGregor, The Oxford Hindi-English Dictionary, 606, lists the following as translations of paricay: acquaintance (with); knowledge, experience (of); information, data; to introduce (one to); to acquaint (with); to make known (to); or, to demonstrate.
2 Biographical details are from Khan’s Khristīy Nītiśāstr (1981: viii) and Bisāvīm Śatābdī ke Pramukh Dharmavijñānī (1990; v–vi).
3 Khan’s doctoral dissertation was published in English as The Concept of Dharma in Vālmīki Ramayana by Munshi Ram Manohar Lal press (Delhi) in 1965.
4 Both Khristīy Nītiśāstr (viii) and Islām: Ek Paricay (“Islam: An Introduction”; vi) were first and original books in Hindi Christian literature on their subjects. Both books have been quite popular: due to continued demand, Khristīy Nītiśāstr was republished in 2009. Islām went through a new edition in 1987 and was republished in 2004.
5 Bhajan and Khan, Islām, viii.
6 Khan, Khristīy Nītiśāstr, v: “Mere śodh prabandh ‘vālmīki rāmāyan meṁ dharm kā svarūp’ ke prakāśan uparānt merī yah hardik abhilāṣā raḥī ki main hindi meṁ khristīy nītiśāstr par bhi pustak likhūṁ aur us samay se hi main mās is visay kā viśes adhyayan kartā raḥā hūṁ.”
7 Scharf, Rāmopākhyāna, 8–15.
8 Scharf, Rāmopākhyāna, 424–437.
9 Flood, Hinduism, 66.

12 Bhajan and Khan, Islām, vi: “[Yah] pustak sirāmpur sinet dī. tīec. evam bī. dī. ke chātron ki āvāyakatāom ki pūrti betu bhi likhi gai hai.”

13 Bhajan and Khan, Islām, vi: “Hamārā viśvās hai ki samast hindi bhāṣi pāthakom tathā saty ke anveṣakom ke lye hamārā vinamr prayās mālyavān aur milstambh bogā.”

14 David, in Bhajan and Khan, Islām, viii: “Yah saty ke anveṣakom ko preranā pradān karegī, aur paraspar samvād evam des ki ekatā ko baḍhāne men sahāyak hogī.”

15 Khan, The Concept of Dharma, 40.

16 Khan, The Concept of Dharma, 135.


[Masīhiyatā men] pāpī manusys kā paramēśvar se mel-mlāp pramukh siddhānt hai aur yah khrist ke balidān ko sivkār karne mein sambhav hai. Manusys kī sakci dharmkātū uske apne prayās, apni dhāritā, apne dharmavijyā par nirbhār nāhīn varan is anubhav par ādhārit hai ki paramēśvar se uskā mel-mlāp (Reconciliation) huā hai atbū nāhīn. Manusys apni śakti aur prayās dvārā dhārmik nāhīn banh saktā. Yah to usmen abham paiddā kartā hai. Ģīvar ke samaks pāpī samarpan kar, Ģīvar se śakti prāpt kar naitik-kāry kar saktā hai. Isi anubhav se manusys ke jīvan, uske kāry aur uske sambandhboṇi mein ek nayā mod ātā hai aur vah naitik jīvan vyātīt karne lagtā hai. Ģīvar ke samaks samās drājātā kar, Ģīvar se milāp kar naitik jīvan vyātīt karne ki śakti prāpt karte hai. Isi pūrvdhāranā ko samaks rākkhār māṁi khristīy nītisāstr par ek pustak likhne kā ek atūt sambandh hai.

18 Khan, The Concept of Dharma, v: “Vah vṛtti yā ācaranō ki lok yā samāj ki sthitī ke lie āvāyak hai; vah ācār jiske dvārā samāj kī rāksā tathā sukh-sāntī kī vṛttī ho aur parlok mein bhi uttam gati prāpt bo.”

The feminine possessive is my addition; the original possessive (uskā) is gender non-specific.

19 Khan, Khristīy Nītisāstr, 18: “Dharm īśvar ko sat cit ānand kahtā hai. Kucch vidvān satyam-sivam-sundaram kahte hain. Yadi yah paribhāsa saty hai to nītisāstr aur dharm mein atūt sambandh pramānīt hotā hai, kyoṅkī jis subh (sivam, Good) kā naitik śāstr adhyayan kartā hai, vah dharm ke īśvar kā gun karte hai. Fir hum yah bhi jānte hain ki hum naitik prāśnoṅi kā us vakt tak koi sāhib uttar nāhīn de saktē jah tab hum is bāt ko niscīt na kar len ki manusys ki prakṛti kyā hai, brahmānd mein uskā kyā sāthā hai, aur brahmānd kā kyā svarūp hai. Atah hum is niskars par pahumte hai ki tārīkī evam vyāvahārik rūp se dharm aur nītisāstr mein ghanisṭh sambandh hai.”

20 Khan, Khristīy Nītisāstr, 30: “Nītisāstr manusys ke vyavahār mein subh aur āsūbh ke adhyayan kā sāmany viṣṇīnīn hai. Iske adhyayan se humem manāvī mālyavī śivam kā gāyān hotā hai aur hum yah bhi jānte hain ki vyāpār mein, cikitsā mein, āpsī sambandhboṇi mein kaun sā vyavahār ucit hai aur kaunsā anucit hai; kyā āsūbh aur kyā āsūbh hai.”

21 Bhajan and Khan, Islām, v: “Āj kal masīhiyōn mein bhi ek nayā āndolan cal rabā hai jis kā lakṣy sansār ke vibhīnm dharmoṁ ke mānne vāloṁ ki madhy prem kā sambandh sāthīt kārnā hai. Āvāyakatā is bāt kā hai ki vibhīnm dharmoṁ ke mānne vāle āpasī prem pempūrvāk baṅth kar ek ādīrse kā bāt sunem aur mil jul kar paramsāty ki khoj kareṁ. Aisā saty jo hrdyān mein us śānti ko bhar
de jis se ek nav-mānav kā uday ho aur jo prem aur āśā se paripūrnā ho. Is naye āndolan kā nām samvād (Dialogue) hai. Is kā matlab yah nahi ki hum ek diśre par kicchāhēni, varan yah hai ki hum premamay vātāvaran mein bairi kar dhairy aur sānti se ek diśre ki bāt sahānubhūtī se sunem aur samjhem, ek diśre se sikhēni aur jāhēn tak ban pade jāntā ki bhalāi ke liye ek diśre ki sahāytā karemos. Is āndolan ko safal banāne ke liye yah avāsya hai ki hum diśre dharmom ke visvāsom aur rīti rivājom se bhāmi bhānī paricay prāpt karemos. Is lie aisē āvakom, jo vibhīn dharmom ke visvāsom, rasmi-rivājom, naitikatā ādi ki ucit āṅg se prastut karemos, avāsy hi samay ki ek bādī āvaśyakata ko pūrā karemosī.”

24 Robinson, Christians Meeting Hindus, 4–5.
26 Robinson, Christians Meeting Hindus, 32–34.
27 Robinson, Christians Meeting Hindus, 60–77.
28 Balagangadharana, Reconceptualizing India Studies.
29 Balagangadharana, Reconceptualizing India Studies, 159.
30 Balagangadharana, Reconceptualizing India Studies, 164.
31 Robinson, Christians Meeting Hindus, 77.
35 Bonhoeffer, Letters and Papers, 359.
36 Bonhoeffer, Letters and Papers, 346.
37 Bonhoeffer, Letters and Papers, 326.
38 Bonhoeffer, Letters and Papers, 361.
39 Bonhoeffer, Ethics, 132 (emphasis added).
40 Bonhoeffer, Ethics, 130–132.
41 Metaxas, Bonhoeffer, 155.
42 Bonhoeffer, Ethics, 193ff.
43 In Bonhoeffer’s words: “Ethical thinking in terms of spheres, then, is invalidated by faith in the revelation of the ultimate reality in Jesus Christ, and this means there is no real possibility of being a Christian outside the reality of the world and that there is no real worldly existence outside the reality of Jesus Christ. There is no place to which the Christian can withdraw from the world, whether it be outwardly or in the sphere of the inner life.” (Bonhoeffer, Ethics, 198)
44 Khan, Khristīy Nītiśāstr, 161–162: “Bāṁmhāṛur apni āvaśyak ‘ethiks’ men lūṭhar kī us alocanā ko jo lūṭhar ne dvaitavād (Thinking in Terms of Two Spheres) ke viruddh kī thi, svikār kartā huā manus ky prākrētik evam aprākrētik starom kī ghor alocanā kartā hai. . . . Is dvaitavād ke anusār naitītāt kē bhi do star māne jāne lage . . . niyam, un āvaśy kē liye ki prākrētik star par rahte hain aur ādhyātmik pūrnāt un logoṁ kē lie jo dharmī āvaśy, jinhaṁme masīhi jīvaṁ vyatīt karne kā niścay kar liyā hai. . . .

Bāṁmhāṛur is dvaitavād ko avāstavīc kahtā huā likhtā hai: “Ek masīhi, masīhi ko svikār karne ke paścāt kīś antārdvānd kē kṣetr naṁiṁ ban jātā parantu jis prakār masīhi ek hai vah bhi antārdvānd se mukti pē ek avibhājīt ikāi ban jātā hai aur vah do starom pār naṁiṁ raṁtī, sadaiv ek star pār raṁtī hai.” . . . Bāṁmhāṛur likhtā hai ki is prākrētik jīvaṁ ko hum yah na mān baiṁshī ki yah masīhi ko svikār karne se pahle kā jīvaṁ hai parantu yah jīvaṁ to vah hai joi masīhi yīśu dvārā māṇyātā prāttī prāttī.

Sārāṁ kē kāh sakte hain ki bāṁmhāṛur ne upāntim par jor dekar is dumiyāyī jīvaṁ ko nayā arth prādān kīya aur nai maḥātvaṭā dī. Iśi prakār do starom athaṁ āvaśyad kē ḍhaṁ kar yah pramāṁnī kīyaṁ ki yah jagat masīhi kē is dumiyā kē prabhū māṁme kē mavan avaroṁdti utpānī naṁiṁ kartā varan sahāyātā ādi.
hai. Ek masīhī ko yah jānnā cāhie ki ek masīhī manus hai aur vahī manusy, manusy hai jsne ki debadhāri masīh ko svīkār kiya hai.”

45 McGregor, The Oxford Hindi-English Dictionary, 44.

46 Bonhoeffer, Ethics, 196.


48 Bonhoeffer, Ethics, 198.

49 Khan, Khristīy Nītiśāstr, 162: “Masīh mānav jīvan ke lie ek udāharan hai. Usne kyā kiyā, kaise rahā, kyā uskā jīvan thā; vah manusyō me rahtā thā, unke sāth khātā-pītā thā, unki bhānti sotā-UTHT thā aur unme ek nāi mānavatā ko jograt kartā thā. Yahī ek masīhī kā naitik jīvan hona cāhie. Jagat se dūr nahīṃ varan jagat ke mādhy aur yahi carc kā kāry bhi hona cāhie.”

50 Khan, Khristīy Nītiśāstr, 162: “Carc kā is jagat me ek sthit hai. Carc is jagat kā ek tukdā hai. Carc kā is jagat ke prati ek uttārdāyītva hai, islie carc ek vah samāj hai jiskā uttārdāyītva jagat ke prati hai. Use is sansār mein kūd jānā hai, jo īśvar ko nahīṃ māntā. Vah usse dūr rahkar koi kāry nahīṃ kar saktā.”

51 Bonhoeffer, Ethics, 199-200.

52 Bonhoeffer, Ethics, 72.

53 Khan, Bīsavīm Śatābdī ke Pramukh Dharmavijñānī, 146: “[Ādarśom, kāryakr.mat, antarātmā, kartavy, uttārdāyītva aur sadgund dvārā hum sattā kā na to sāmnā kar sakte bāṁ aur na hi us par vijay pā sakte bāṁ. Yah kāry hum īśvar se prem ke prem duvārā, aise prem ke prem duvārā, jo ek sāmnā pratyay nahīṃ parantu sampūrnā prem hai, kar sakte bāṁ.”

54 Khan, Bīsavīm Śatābdī ke Pramukh Dharmavijñānī, 146: “[Is prem ko bāṁnahāūfar masīh mei īśvar se prem ki sāgyā detā hai, aur use vah ‘īśvar se prem mei jīnā’ kahtā hai.”


56 Khan, Bīsavīm Śatābdī ke Pramukh Dharmavijñānī, 147: “Bāṁnahāūfar... hamen batātā hai ki hamen is sansār ko bāḍi sanjīdagī se lenā cāhiye. Isē pyār kārnā cāhiye, isī mei rahnā cāhiye aur yadi jārūri bo to iske liye me bhī maīṃ bhi cāhiye. Hamārā susamācār kisi palāyānāvādī dharām se dhātāna nahīṃ kartā.”

57 Khan, Bīsavīm Śatābdī ke Pramukh Dharmavijñānī, 162: “[Dharmanirpeksavādī] dharmanirpeksavādī dharmavijñān ne carc ko niscit rūp se ek nayā pāth padhāyā. Vah yah hai ki carc manusyom kī sansārik kāthīnāyīnī aur sāmsāyaom mei pūrā sakriy yogdān de. Jis prakār purānā niyan kā īśvar isārel kaum ke ādhyātmik, sāmājik aur bhautik pahalovā ko barābar chītā hai use prakār āj aise īśvar ki, jo is sansār mei samast mānav-jātī ki ādhyātmik aur bhautik sahāyatā kare, āvaśyakatā hai.”

58 A ’crore’ equals ten million.

59 A ‘lakh’ equals hundred thousand.

60 Bulcke, Angrezī-Hindi Koš, 744.

61 Bhajan and Khan, Islām, vii: “Islām sansār ke pramukh dharman mei se ek hai. Vartāmān bhārat mei islām ke anuyāyiyom kā sansār bhāsā ka saha bhāsā bhautik hindī dharmavalambiyom ke bād hi hai. Inmei se adhikānś hindī bhāsā kṣetret mei rānta hai. 1971 ki jāngānā mei anusār bhārat mei 45.3 karod hindū, 6.1 karod muslim, 1.4 karod khristi, 1 karod sikkh, 38 lākh bauddh aur 20 lākh jain dharmon ke pālān karne vāle hai. Ye anik yahān rāṣṭr ki prīhukatā ke liye nahīṃ, varan is tathī ke mahātu ko samajhane ke liye die gae hai kii hamāre des mei dharmon-vasāsom evam dharmanītīyom mei antar hai aur ki hum ek
दुस्रे के धर्म का अध्ययन करें और यह जानें कि सभी धर्म समान नहीं हैं। हमें दूसरे की भावना का अदार करें।

इस्लाम के परिचय पुस्तक के तैयार करने में है। हमें दूसरे की भावना का अदार करें।

इन पुस्तक के तीन उद्देश्य हैं, जिन में से दो का केंद्र तथा सहायता की आवश्यकता के लिए भावना है। इनकी भावना के दृष्टिकोण आया मात्र यह होगा। क्या साध्यता यह माननीय नहीं है?

कहते हैं: "मसीह के प्रेम का दूसरा पक्ष परसी भोजन प्रेम करना है। परसी कोई अमृत प्रत्यय नहीं है, वरन हर सच्चा है। मसीह ने कहा कि तुम मानवता या मनुष्यता के लिए प्रेम कर। इसके विषय में प्रेम के सबसे अध्ययन किया है। हमारा परिचय एक अच्छी परिचय रहता है, ताकि हम दूसरे के नाम पर भी नये की धर्म के समानता का होने का हमें भी मानना अहसास करें।"

62 खान, ख्रिस्टीय नितिशास्त्र, 71: "मसीह के प्रेम नियम का दूसरा पक्ष परसी भोजन प्रेम करना है। परसी कोई अमृत प्रत्यय नहीं है, वरन हर सच्चा है। मसीह ने कहा कि तुम मानवता या मनुष्यता के लिए प्रेम कर। इसके विषय में प्रेम के सबसे अध्ययन किया है। हमारा परिचय एक अच्छी परिचय रहता है, ताकि हम दूसरे के नाम पर भी नये की धर्म के समानता का होने का हमें भी मानना अहसास करें।"

63 खान, ख्रिस्टीय नितिशास्त्र, 73–74: "कुछ लोग अपने ग्यान, पुन्नी, साधिक सन्दर्भ, वर्ग जैसे उदाहरण के लिए उड़े करते हैं और यह उड़े के दीवार का उड़ा कर देते हैं। यह हमें अपने परसी के अवश्यकता की दीवार नहीं देते। भारत वर्ग-उड़े के उदाहरण हैं। ख्रिस्ट एक और उड़े के दीवार का अध्ययन करते हैं जो उस काल के नैतिक और धार्मिक अवस्था को दीवार की भांति जाकर रहा। यह धार्मिक उड़े का बहुत है, जब उसके साथ त्योहार और उसके साथ संदभूत है। यह दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि हमें एक आयाम का प्रयास करना ही है।"

64 खान, ख्रिस्टीय नितिशास्त्र, 214–215: "हम मसीही हैं जो भारत में हैं। यह भारतवर्ष का अर्थ अधिक नहीं है। प्रत्येक व्यक्ति के अपने अपने धर्म के प्राप्ति और विस्तार के स्वतंत्रता है और दूसरे के धर्म के लिए अदार का अदश्न है।"
hai. Vah iskā doṣ dūsrom pār na lagāe, vah svayam bhi doṣi hai kyomki vah masiḥī prabhāv kō prabhāvākāri karne mein asaṭal rahā hai.

tīṣrā, use is vicār ko chod˙ dēnā cāhie ki rājanīti mem ˙ kisī prakār kī svacchatā hoti hai, aur kī rājanīti śaitānī kī ām tā hai. Rājanīti svacchatā aur śaitānī kā mīrān hai aur masiḥī kā yah kartavy hai ki vah rājanīti mein sakriy bhāg lekar śubh sakti kō prabal kare.

cauthā, masiḥī kisī pārt˙ kā mohrā hī na ban kar rahe parantu ek āisā vyakti jo apne adhikār aur maṭ ko masiḥī kī śikṣāoṁi ko anusār vyakt kartā hai.

use sadā yah nabīṁ sochnā cāhie ki uskā drṣṭikōṁ sarvaśresth hai. Use apnā prabhāv vināmr rūp se dālnā cāhie.

chaṭhvāṁ, masiḥī kō yah nabīṁ sochnā cāhie ki ek ē kī samasāyā ke hul ho jāne se ċē ki pratyek samasāyā hul ho jāgē. Udāharan ke lie nasbandī, juāvarjan ityādi. Use jankalyāṁ, nyāy, svaśtantrātā aur surakṣā kī bhāvanā kā sadā prayatnśīl rahnā cāhie.
jātā hai. Antardhārmik samvād kā cauthā mukhy śatru rūdāv (Fundamentalism) hai. Hindi, hindii, hindustān! Islām khatre mem ˙  hai! Hindī, hindū, hindustān! Lekhakom ˙ , cintakom ˙ , dārśnikom ˙  ko dharm, śarīyat ke nām par deś-nikālā denā, maut kā fatvā jārī karnā, yah dhārmik katārvaḥ, rūdāv kā udāharan hai. Inke nāre din prati-
din vāyuman,dāl ko garmā rahe haim ˙ . Udhar masīhi dharm, sikkhdharm, buddh dharm, jain dharm ityādi bhī rūdāv ke śikār hote jā rahe haim ˙ . Bhārat


Anand’s “brief introduction of the author,” in Dayal, Uttar Bhārat, iv.

For an introduction to the experiment, see Bonhoeffer, Life Together, 10–11 and Metaxas, Bonhoefffer, 262–277.


Which he described in Life Together (orig. German 1938). For an introduction to the experiment, see Bonhoeffer, Life Together, 10–11 and Metaxas, Bonhoeffer, 262–277.

ye bātein masībī viśvāsīyom ke lie bahut hī mahatvapūrn mānyatāem hain. Kintu ye keval masīhīyom ke lie mahatvapūrn hain.


83 Howell was ordained by the Evangelical Church of India. From 1990–1996 he served as the Principal of Allahabad Bible Seminary and from 1996–1997 as the Associate General Secretary of E.F.I. He was elected General Secretary of E.F.I. in May 1997. He has also served as the Secretary of the Evangelical Fellowship of Asia, Member of the Continuation Committee of the Global Christian Forum, and Vice-Chairperson of the International Council of the World Evangelical Alliance. Howell’s works include Free to Choose and Transformation at Work (both in English) and Mission (in Hindi). He also serves as the chief editor of Aim, the monthly newsletter of E.F.I. (Biographic details from Howell, Parivartan)

84 Howell, Parivartan, 7: “Bāibil hamem prameśvar ki kahānī batātī hai. Ye prameśvar kī aur uski khoī srṣṭī evam sannāt karte hain ki kahānī hain.”

85 Howell, Parivartan, 10: “Islie bāibal kā ārambh isī vicār ke sāth hotā hai ki prameśvar ek srot ke rūp mēn, sambandh ek prāthamikatā ke rūp mēn aur prameśvar ek adhikārī ke rūp mēn hai.”


87 Howell, Parivartan, 18: “Bāibil ki is pūrī kahānī mem hamare jīvan kā ucit sthān kyā hain, aur prameśvar is sānsār mēn kyā kucch kar rahā hain iē bāt kā hamem jiān prāpt karnā hain. Hamem apne sangharṣom se āge bārhnā hain aur prameśvar ke us vrhad aur bādī yojānā mēn hamārā sthān evam bhūmikā kyā hain isko jānnā hain. Prameśvar se kahie ki ve āpkī jīvan kī in viṣayom ki jāme aur dekhne mēn āpki madad kaiṁ.”

88 Howell, Parivartan, 15:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameśvar</th>
<th>Manusy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parameśvar srot hai</td>
<td>Hum paramēśvar par nirbhār haiṁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameśvar racayitā hai</td>
<td>Hum racaṁ hai aur uske binā vidvān nahin rahi sakte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameśvar ke pās samsār kā adhikār hai aur vah us par niyantar kartā hai</td>
<td>Hum svayam-kendrit haei arthāt apne ko niyantar kar sakte haiṁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameśvar jindagiyom kā nyāy karne vāla hai</td>
<td>Hum jīvan kā anubhav karte hain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameśvar ne manusy kī ractā kaur uske liy niyam banāeṁ</td>
<td>Hum paramēśvar dvārā batae niyamom kā apnī jindagiyom mem pālan karte hain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

89 Howell, Parivartan, 252: “Bhāratī prajātāntre naī cunautiyom kā, sāmudāyik sanghars, ātānkar se larnā, yuvā sāmaṁ kī vicārdhārāṁ ko sāth caṁāṁ, in sakhā sāmna kartā hai. Bhārat ko apnī pādāthā ko behtar banāne ki ávāsyakatā hai. Īskā arth prajātāntre ko nīrnav lenevalā, prabhāvī, samvṛthaṁ ātānkar स्वतंत्रतावाद ko prajātāntre ke yavahār men jōrā, tuṭū aur bikhari huiy rājanītik samājāthā kā purṇīṁmāṁ karnā aur sabse baadhkar sārkarī samsthāom kā sattādhārāḥyom ko apnī jīmāṁveī samajhnā kaur aur nībhungā atyant āvāsyak hai. Īnhē keval kānīṁ nahin paraṁt parantu naitik bātoṁ kā uḍhārān logom kā sāmne rakhā cāhīe aur uskā svayam pālan karnā cāhīe. Īske bagair prajātāntr kōbhlā bān jēga, keval ākāṁ kī nahīṁ paṁantu khatarnāk bhi, īske sāth svatāntātra vād naṁ ho jēga, svatāntātra kā upayog atyācār kē lie kīya jēga au sāmān yam jīvaṁ naṁ ho jēga.”

90 Howell, Parivartan, 252–253: “Masīhiyom kā rājanīti ke kṣetṛ se hāt jāne kā arth hai kī galat rīti se vartamān mem sīṁth sāmājik-rājanītik drṣṭikom ko svīkār karnā. Kuchh viśisṭ yojanāom kaur anyāvy ātē viruddh yādī dhārnīk pratirodh nahin kīya gayā to vāstab mem hum unko sambatī dete hain. Des kē rājanītik kāryom mem sābhbāḏ denā yah masīhiyom kā kartvāy hain, tākī ve āpne drṣṭikom ko sāmne rakh sakēṁ. Bhārat mem masīhiyom ko sārkarī yojanāōrin se lagatār ātē ātānkar leni pād rahi hai. Īskā ēk chōta uḍhārān hain, cār rājyom mem dhārn sambandhā biṁ kī manjūrī pradān karnā. To ēr ab bāṁre sāmne kīya mārg hain, rājanītī mem masīhiyom kā adhik sabhyog yā fir rājanītī se pūrṇ rūp se dūr rahnā?


92 Howell, Parivartan, 254: “Masīhi log, nāgarik hone ke nāte āpne Parosī kē tathā rāsṛ kē cīntā karnē kē dvārā paramēśvar kē rājy kē seva karte hain. Parivartan lāṁ vāla mīsān vāstāv mem sāmājik baruṁ baṭāne tathā sāmaṁ mem parameśvar kē rājy ke mūlyom kō lāne ke lie pavitr sāstrē kē drṣṭikom kē upayog kartā hain.”
Howell, Parivartan, 271: “Jab carcā kā visay mānavīy jimmedārī kī or jātā hai tab log aksar becain ho jāte hai. Pavitr šastrī dūsrom ke adhikārom ke lie sanghārṣ karne ke visay men babut kuchh kahtā hai, parantu apne adhikārom ke lie sanghārṣ karne ke visay men babut thodhā batāyā gayā hai. Dūsri or jab vah hamāre visay men kahtā hai to hamen apne adhikārom ke visay men nabhim parantu jimmedārīyon ke visay men batātā hai. Hamenī paramēsvār tathā apne Parōṣī se preṃ karne ke lie kahā gayā hai. Pavitr šastrī is bāt par jor detā hai ki dūsre vyaktī ke adhikārom kī rakṣā kārnā hamārī jimmedārī hai; aur aisā karne ke lie hamenī adhikār bhī chorne ke lie t.aiyār rahāna cāhie.

Hamenī is bāt ko svikār kārnā cāhie ki dūsre logon ke adhikār hamārī jimmedārī hai. Sthānīy kalīsiyā kā jivan paramēsvār ke rāj kī pрагat kār karne ke lie hai. Kalīsiyā kō sōmār menī ek samudāy ke rūp men rahāna cāhie jahāṁ mānav sammān aur samānātā ko sadaiv sthanīyā diyā jātā hai, aur logonī ki ek dūsre ke prati jimmedārī ko svikār kīyā jātā hai jismenī koī bhedbhāv nāhinī, paksāt nāhinī, jahāṁ gārib aur kamjorom ke lie sanghārṣ kīyā jātā hai aur mānav ko mānav bankār rahne kā adhikār hai, thik usī prakār īj prakār paramēsvār ne unhem bānāyā aur cāhie ki ve usī prakār rahēṁ.”

Howell, Parivartan, 272: “Paramēsvār ne jin logon ko cunā aur bulāyā hai unke any logon ke sāth sambandh mein masīhī samudāy kā bhīmī carit va svabhāv dikhāi detā hai. Kalīsiyā paramēsvār ke log hain, yah masīh kā šarīr aur dulhan hai aur pavitrī atmā kā mandir hai. Jāgarūk kalīsiyā sampūrnā rīti se ek parivār hai aur jaise humne pahle hī carcā kī hai masīh ke samudāy ko bhīmī sanskrītī ko pрагat kārnā cāhie. Paramēsvār ke bulāe hue log hone ke nāte kalīsiyā kī ek jimmedārī hai – cīnī honā, aur paramēsvār ke rāj kā kādhan bannā. Iskā artī yah huā kī yah samudāy paramēsvār ke āne vāle rāj kī or īśārā kartā hai. Pavitrī atmā se paripūrnā samudāy hone ke nāte, kalīsiyā ko apne sāmānī jivan ke dvārā bhī paramēsvār ke āne vāle rāj kī pрагat kārnā cāhie. Masīh kā samudāy hone ke nāte kalīsiyā ko us āne vāle rāj kī or sāmānī vāstavīk rūp mein pradarśit kārnā cāhie, kyomīki vah rāj vyaktī jīvan ki pīrātā aur samāj kā lie nyāy aur sampūrnā sṛṣṭī ke lie ārogyatā pradarśit kartā hai.”

Howell, Parivartan, 171. “Hum bāhārat ke bāhar sthit kalīsiyāom se kahā cāhie ki ve is bāt ke visay menī sacet rahēṁ ki miśan kī ayogy bhāsā ke prayog ke kārān ve yahāṁ anya vīṣvās ke logonī kā bhīvānāom kō bi kēval thēs nabhim pahumīcāte parantu masīhiyomī kē lie bhī bābdā kā kārān baṅ jāte haim.”

Khan, Khrīṣṭī Nītiśāstr, 214.

Or, the rule of one party, person, or institution. See Bahri, Rājpāl Hindi Šabda-kōś, 128.

Khan, Khrīṣṭī Nītiśāstr, 214: “Vah rājī jo paramēsvārī kē ājnāmī kē ahuvalēnā kāre, uskā vīrodb kārnā masīhī naitekātā hai, aur jo rājānītī ekadhikārī kī or ludhak rahi ho uskō sidhe mārg par lānā masīhiyomī kā uttārāyitv haim.”

Dayal, Māsīhī Dharm Vijnān, 30.

Howell, Parivartan, 271.

1 Manorama, “Dalit Women: The Thrice Alienated.” Manorama has studied the exceptional impact of discrimination on the women of backward communities and has described such women as the “Dalits among the Dalits.”

2 Melanchthon, “A Dalit Reading of Genesis 10–11:9.” Melanchthon is currently an associate professor of Old Testament at the University of Divinity in Australia. She formerly taught at Gurukul Lutheran Theological College and Research Institute, Chennai, and was a member of the Senate of Serampore College, Serampore. She has written extensively on the intersection of Dalit studies, gender, and biblical interpretation.
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