I

This paper states a problem, but it makes no attempt to present a solution. It is rather like a bad detective story where the questions, Who did it? and how? and why? are left unanswered. Perhaps the interest of this paper should lie in the fact that the question that it asks has never before been asked, or its existence even hinted at. Why the question should never have occurred to anyone so far is itself an interesting question, and an attempt to answer it is likely to tell us something about the way the minds of our historians have worked over the last century-and-a-quarter. I will, however, make no attempt to address this latter question, for my main problem is thorny enough as it is.

Simply stated, the problem is: Why is it that sometime in the early nineteenth century, users of (Indian) Persian, and Urdu, lost their self-confidence and began to privilege all Indo-Iranian Persian writers against the other two, and all kinds of Persian and Arabic against Urdu? The linguistic totem pole that this situation created can be described as follows:

TOP: Iranian Persian, that is, Persian as written by Iranians who never came to India.

UPPER MIDDLE: Indo-Iranian Persian, that is, Persian written by Iranian-born writers who lived most or all of their creative life in India.

LOWER MIDDLE: Indian Persian, that is, Persian written by Indians,
or close descendants of Iranians settled in India.

JUST ABOVE BOTTOM: Urdu, provided its Arabic/Persian component conformed to Arabic/Persian rules/idiom/semantics/pronunciation. For the definition of Persian, go to the Top and Upper Middle sections of the Pole. Arabic means the work of Arabic lexicographers, and Arabic as absorbed into Persian.

THE BOTTOM: Urdu, whose Arabic and Persian component did not conform to Arabic/Persian norms and format. (For the definitions of Arabic and Persian, see above.)

All this sounds unbelievable, and most modern Urdu scholars and speakers will indignantly deny its truth. That the order of privilege as described by me is in accord with true facts of history will become clear as this paper progresses. I’ll begin by providing some examples.

1. A few months ago I gave a public lecture in Allahabad, where I live. It was in Urdu, and was about Urdu literature, and its audience consisted of modern Urdu-educated men and women. After the lecture, a grave-looking gentleman of about sixty approached me and said, mildly accusing, “You used the word deh≥t to mean ‘village.’ But deh is Persian, and itself means ‘village,’ and the suffix -≥t is a plural marker, and that too in Arabic. How could you conjoin an Arabic plural marker to a Persian word, and worse, how could you use it as singular?” I had no answer, except to repeat feebly that deh≥t in the meaning of “village” in the singular was perfectly good Urdu. For my friend, this was begging the question, and he wasn’t persuaded.

2. A controversy raged for many months recently in Hamārī Zabān the official organ of Anjuman Taraqqi Urdu (Hind), issued weekly from New Delhi. The details of the point at issue are too boring to recount here. Briefly, the dispute was about the word istifādā an Arabic verbal noun which in Arabic means “deriving or obtaining benefit.” Urdu “purists” argued that it was wrong to say istifādā hāšil karnā to derive istifādā in Urdu because the Arabic word itself contained the sense of “to derive, to gain, to secure,” so forth. “Correct” Urdu, therefore, was to say istifādā karnā to do the act of istifādā. My plea—that Urdu should be treated as a language in its own right, and should be allowed to impose its own meanings and usages on loan words—was brushed aside, in spite of my producing a quote from Ḥālī (1837–1914), an authoritative source, using istifādā hāšil karnā and citing the great scholar Saiyid Sulaimān
Nadvī (1884–1953) on the principle described by me above.¹

3. Amīr Khusrav (1253–1325) is universally recognized as the greatest Persian poet born in India, and one of the greatest Persian poets ever. Even Ghālib (1797–1869; about whom more later) said, “None among Indians, except Khusrau of Delhi, is of proven incontrovertibility. Even master Fa’īz fumbles once in a while.”² I read this many years ago, as a young student, and was saddened. (No Indian, not even Fa’īz, whom Emperor Akbar made his poet laureate in preference to many Iranians of great merit?) Now imagine my sense of devastation when I read Shiblī Nu’mān’s *She’rū ‘l-Ajam*, Urdu’s greatest work on Persian poetry, a work read and venerated alike by Iranians, Indians, and Westerners. Shiblī (1857–1914) admired Khusrav greatly. Still, he wrote, “The Amīr has even used many idioms and phrases which don’t occur in the poetry of any competent native speaker (*ahl-e zabān*).³ […] This has given occasion to ill thinkers to say that Khusrav lapses into ‘Indianisms’ because of his sojourn in India. Maybe it is so. But since I don’t have confidence that my research on this point has been fully diligent and inductive, I can’t share the mistrust of the ill thinkers.”⁴ Such half-hearted defense, and such poverty of ratiocinative power, from one of my heroes in regard to another of my heroes, deeply shook my hope that Indians could ever write impeccable Persian.

4. A dispute that arose in learned circles in the later part of the nineteenth century is an interesting example of the confusions, prejudices, and absurd reasoning that prevailed in most discussions involving Iranian Persian/Indo-Persian/Urdu usages. The dispute was whether the Persian word *nam*, which commonly means “wetness,” is also used in the sense of “wet.” Orthodox opinion held that the latter sense was incorrect, so phrases like *čāshm-e nam*, *dida-e nam* (both mean wet eyes) which are prevalent in Urdu are incorrect. Ḥakīm Mahdī Kamāl, the son of a

¹For full details, see *Hamārī Zabān*. Issues of the following dates are relevant: 15 March, 22 March, 15 May, 6 June, 15 June, 1 July, 8 July, 8 August, 15 August, 9 September, and 22 September 1996.


³An untranslatable compound, it means something like “a competent, reliable, and educated native speaker, preferably of good upbringing.”

Lucknow ustād, and a prominent poet himself, rules, “To use čashm-e nam, dida-e nam […] and to use nam in the sense of ‘wet’ is in no way correct. […] For nam means ‘wetness’, and not ‘wet.’” That is, the Persian meaning should prevail in Urdu too. Later, some person quoted Sirjū d-Dīn ‘Ali Khān-e Ārzū (1687–1756), the great Indian lexicographer, linguist and poet, to the effect that in his dictionary Čirāgh-e Hidīyat (1745), Khān-e Ārzū was of the view that nam also meant “wet,” and had cited a she’r from the Iranian poet and nobleman, Muḥsin Tāṣīr, where nam was used in the sense of “wet.” Saiyid ‘Alī Ḥaider Naẓm Ṭabāṭaba’ī (1852–1933), relying on the authority of abl-e zabān with whom he was personally acquainted, asserted, “Persian is not a dead language. Thousands of its native speakers are still found in India. None among them uses nam in the sense of namnāk (full of wetness). […] It is imperative that we regard the text of the she’r quoted in Čirāgh-e Hidīyat as corrupted due to calligrapher error. […] In short, there is no doubt of any kind that čashm-e nam is incorrect, or, rather, is Persian coined by Indians.”

5. Ṭabāṭaba’ī also held that it is not permissible to use the words designed by Urdu speakers on the pattern of Arabic. For example, words like tamāzat (from the Persian tamūz), žībānat (from the Arabic žīhm), shamāliyat (from the Arabic šamūḏ), are not Arabic, though they sound like Arabic words, and have been constructed on the analogy of Arabic. Such words are impermissible in Urdu.

6. In the same strain, a poet wrote to me recently that one shouldn’t say khairiyat because the original Arabic word is khairiyat. A few months earlier, there were objections from some quarters to saying haṣṣiyat because the original Arabic is haṣṣiyat. In both cases I replied that even the conservative dictionary Nāru ‘l-Lughāt permits such Urdu usages. This, I grant, wasn’t a reply based on any linguistic principle. My reply should

---

6 See his “Laf’t Nam’ ki Taḥqīq,” in Urdū-e Mu’allā (Aligarh; May–June 1913); reproduced in Ashraf Rafī’, ed. Maqālāt-e Ṭabāṭaba’ī (published by the ed. with aid from H.E.H. The Nizam’s Trust, Hyderabad, 1984), p. 231. Ṭabāṭaba’ī expressed the same opinion in another paper of 1912. He said, “Those who are masters of the art [of poetry] will not accept the view that Bēdil or Fażī cannot be incorrect. They were imitators and followers. The native speaker never says ‘čashm-e nam’” (Ibid., p. 207).
7 Ibid., p. 207.
have been: (a) these pronunciations are used in Urdu by all and sundry, and therefore have the sanction of currency; and (b) these are now Urdu words and their use in Urdu cannot attract the rules of Arabic. Yet my reply was the best under the circumstances, because the two elementary axioms I have enumerated above don’t much cut ice with Urdu-language speakers today, while most dictionaries, and Nuru 'l-Lughat in particular, are regarded as right minded, and prescriptive.

7. The funny (or sad) aspect of the conduct of our opinion-makers’ pronouncements is that the Iranian Persian speaker was regarded by them as privileged not only in Persian, but also in Arabic. Zähid Sahāranpūrī, a pupil of the famous poet and lexicographer Amīr Minā’ī (1828–1900), once used the Arabic word quds as qudus. When Amīr Minā’ī questioned it, Zähid quoted a minor eighteenth-century Urdu poet in support of his usage. Amīr Minā’ī wrote back, “The poetry of Khvāja Nāṣir won’t suffice as authority. Had it been competent masters of Iran who wrote thus, then there would be no room for doubt or objection.”

8. In fact, the Persian of Indians came to be held in such low esteem by the middle of the nineteenth century that Ghālib felt uncomfortable with the very idea of Iranians using words coined by Indians. In a letter, written probably before 1847, he wrote, “The word be-pir is a coinage of Indian born Turks. […] Mirzā Jalāl-e Asir—God’s blessing upon him—is plenipotent, and his usage is authoritative. How can I say that a word used by him is wrong? But it’s a surprise, again, it’s a surprise, that an Iranian nobleman should use such a word.”

9. The great modern scholar Niyāz Fatehpūrī (1886–1966) wrote for many years in his magazine Niqār (then published from Lucknow) a column called “Mā Lahu wa Mā ‘Alaihi” (that which is by him, and that which is for him). The columns were collected in book form and published under the same title. Here are some noble pronouncements from that book:

(i) “Zimma is an Arabic word; it means ‘covenant,’ ‘security,’ and ‘conscience.’ […] No one writes zimmadārin Persian. […] In Urdu, this word [i.e., zimmadār] is used in the sense of ‘answerable, respon-

---

9Khaliq Anjum, op. cit., vol 1, p. 234.
sible.’ This sense is incorrect, and not in accord with the original meaning of žimma.

(ii) “Raviya, to rhyme with sabiya, is Arabic, and means ‘deep thought.’ Even the Persians didn’t use it to mean ‘conduct, attitude.’ In Urdu, of course, only the illiterate, and plebeians, use it in this sense.”

I’d like to make it clear that žimmadâr/žimmedâr in the sense of “answerable, responsible,” and ravaiya, not raviya, in the sense of “attitude, conduct,” are standard Urdu. Both are found in reliable (in fact rather conservative) dictionaries like John T. Platts (1884) and Nâru ‘l-Lughât (1924–34).

10. Let me now cite a few outrages committed by the poet, lexicographer, and Islamist Shauq Nimvî (1863–1904) whose influence is still quite substantial.

(i) Khud-rafa, in the sense of “lost to oneself, therefore utterly distracted,” has been used by Urdu poets since at least the early eighteenth century. Its validity was questioned in the late nineteenth century on the grounds of its not being found in Persian, where the phrase is az khud rafta. Shauq Nimvî says, “Plain khud-rafa, without az, is not found in the poetry of Persian masters. Someone may have used it, God knows all. And this writer doesn’t like using az khud rafta in Urdu, and since khud-rafa is avoided by knowledgeable masters, he doesn’t use that either, and says vârafa instead.”

(ii) Some people were, and in fact even now are, of the view that since ‘âdîn in Arabic means “deed or thing of which one is habituated,” therefore its use in Urdu to mean “one who is habituated (of something)” is incorrect. Shauq Nimvî graciously concedes that he doesn’t mind the use in Urdu of ‘âdîn in the sense of “habituated,” provided the word occurs in the stand-alone mode, and not as part of a

10See his Mâ Labu wa Mâ ‘Alaibi (Lucknow, Nigâr Office, 1948), p. 60 and 70.

Persianate compound.\(^{12}\) We have seen Ghālib (vide 3 above) declare that no Indian except Khusrau is authoritative. Beginning in the thirteenth century, Indians, however, wrote almost all the major dictionaries of Persian through the nineteenth century. Some of the greatest among them were second or third generation Indians, that is, Iranians or Central Asians whose forebears had settled in India. Some, like Ṭek Čand Bahār (1687/8–1766/7), and Vārasta Siyālkōī (d. 1766) were Hindu. Some, like Khān-e Ārzū and Muḥammad Bāḏshāh (fl. 1880s) were from Muslim families so long settled in India that they had lost all trace of their native lands. Ghālib was a third-generation Indian, but he rejected all lexicographers who didn’t actually write their dictionaries in Iran, or were not actual, practicing, Iranian poets. He wrote to his disciple Har Gāpāl Tafta, “Lexicographers rely on analogy and opinion. Each one wrote what he thought correct. Were there a dictionary compiled by Niẓāmī or Sa’dī, it would be binding on us. How and why can one regard Indians to be of proven incontrovertibility?”\(^{13}\)

About the same time that he wrote to Tafta, Ghālib wrote in a pamphlet called Nāma-e Ghālib (Ghālib’s Letter) addressed to one Mirzā Rāḥim Bēg, as follows: “There are many among the poets of India who write well, and who find [new and attractive] themes. But what fool would say that it behooves them to claim competent knowledge of the language? Now as regards the lexicographers, may God free us from their snares. They put the verses of the ancients before them, and marched along the path of analogy and opinion. On top of it all, they traveled the path alone, with no guide or companion, or rather, entirely lost and undone. Were there a guide, he’d teach them the right way, were there a teacher, he’d expound to them the meaning of the verse. […] Keep on removing the veils from the face of the lexicographers, you’ll see only raiment, the real person doesn’t exist. Keep turning the pages of the dic-

\(^{12}\)Ibid., p. 15. This opinion became so influential that I can’t recall any occurrence of ‘ādī in the sense of “one who is habituated” in modern Urdu, as a part of a Persianate compound. Nūrū l-Lughāt maintains that ‘ādī is not even Arabic; it is a word coined by Indian Persian speakers, and should be used only with karnā, būnā (that is, not in a Persianate compound). Cf. vol. 3 (Facsimile ed. Lahore, 1988), p. 532.

\(^{13}\)In a letter to Tafta, dated 14 May 1865, see Khaliq Anjum, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 352.
tionaries, you’ll find mere pages. The meanings are imaginary.”¹⁴

12. Both in the above epistle to Mirzâ Rahîm Bêg and the letter to Taftâ, Ghalîb used almost identical words for himself, to the effect that competent knowledge of Persian was his native capability, a special gift from God; also, he had an intuitive grasp of the subtleties of Persian. He thus stood above all Indian writers of Persian. It is an irony of fate that Ghalîb’s contempt for non-Iranian Persian writers rebounded on himself. His own self-regard notwithstanding, Ghalîb’s Persian failed to win the respect of “purists” like Shibli and Tabâtabâ’î. Shibli once wrote that he wouldn’t accept Ghalîb’s usage of andâz (a very ordinary Persian word) because Ghalîb was not abl-e zabân.¹⁵

II

This privileging of Iranian Persian over Indian Persian, and free acknowledgment of the Iranian’s right to take creative license with Arabic, while denying the same right to the Urdu writer in regard to Persian and Arabic, and the insistence on enforcing Arabic/Persian rules on the Arabic/Persian component of Urdu, has not been with us for very long. But it is so widely spread in the Urdu milieu, and has had such unquestioning acceptance almost everywhere, that most of us tend to believe that this state of affairs is as ancient as the Urdu language itself. Even those who chafe under the enervating constraints imposed or implied by such privileging, most often toe the line for fear of being branded as ignorant. To be sure, poets have occasionally questioned specific cases, but only half-heartedly, and sparingly. Linguists and scholars like Saiyid Sulaimân Nadvi and ‘Abdu ’s-Sattâr Siddiqi (1885–1972) protested strongly and wrote papers against the practice of denying to Urdu the rights and privileges due to any language worth the name.¹⁶

Writers like Nadvi and Siddiqi have had only a small effect on some practices, and no effect on many. And they didn’t touch some of the most

¹⁴Ibid., op. cit., vol. 4, p. 1447.
¹⁵As quoted by Shu’âib A’zamî in his “Shibli, Munkir-e Ghalîb,” in Ghalîb Number of Jâmi’a (New Delhi) 59:2–3 (February–March 1969), p. 166.
glaring and endemic cases. To give a simple example: Urdu has a number of high-use Arabic and Persian words which consist of three letters and two syllables. The first syllable, consisting of two letters, is long. The second, consisting of one letter, is short. The “correct” pronunciation of such words involves a brief stop after the first syllable, thus: shah-r (Persian, city), jam-’ (Arabic, gathered, total, etc.), naq-l (Arabic, imitation, story, etc.). Now words like these are often spoken in Urdu as short-long: sha-har, ja-ma’, na-qal. But everybody insists that in poetry at least, such words should conform to their original Arabic/Persian pronunciation. That is how it is in poetic practice today, and that’s how it had been since “times immemorial” in the modern Urdu speaker’s memory.

Actually, it is nothing like “since times immemorial” that these prejudices and deleterious practices have been with us as Urdu speakers. It has been, in fact, somewhat less than 200 years. Yet their presence has been so strong, and so all-pervasive, that it has seemed natural for us to believe that our Persian is by definition, and of necessity, inferior; that the creative license open to the Iranian is not available to the Indian; that Urdu, in order to be “literary” and “sophisticated,” must always treat Arabic and Persian as sacrosanct and inviolate.

This situation could surely not be pristine. Surely this was a case of loss of self-confidence, or a surge of self-hatred. But when did this happen? Who made it happen, and why did it happen? These questions have never been raised in Urdu literary or linguistic historiography. No one seems to have felt that our attitude to our own language needed to be defined and analyzed, because it was a problematic of major proportions and ramifications all over the place. It impinged on our literary culture’s self-image, canon formation, the lines on which literary or “sophisticated” Urdu had been forced to develop, and of course our own views about the nature and history of language itself.

There seems to have been a mental block somewhere. Small wonder that our academic and literary establishment—often they are one and the same—had so much difficulty in even beginning to recognize that Gujri (old Urdu as practiced in Gujarat from the fourteenth century) and Dakani (old Urdu as practiced in the Deccan from the fifteenth century) are not different languages, or even “dialects” of Urdu, but Urdu plain and simple. Since in both Gujri and Dakani, writers took liberties with Arabic and Persian routinely, and adhered to the popular usage or their own creative bent, it was impossible to pretend that they had the same “healthy respect” for Arabic and Persian as became the norm for mainline Urdu writers from the end of the eighteenth century. It was easier to
claim that Gujri and Dakani were not standard, mainline Urdu, than to have to accept that through most of the language’s early history, its expert users didn’t valorize Arabic and Persian above all else.

Similar is the case of the fiction about the nature and origin of Urdu. The belief that Urdu originated in Muslim army camps and cantonment bazaars helped generate and sustain two myths: Urdu was the language of the Muslims, and being originally the language of camp and cantonment, it stood in natural need of being refined and gentrified, and this process was initiated by the master poets of Delhi in the second half of the eighteenth century.

Small wonder, then, that the name “Urdu,” which didn’t come into use for the language before the 1780s, is invariably invoked by our historians to “prove” that since “Urdu” means “army, army camp, or the market of a camp,” the Urdu language was born as a result of “foreign” Muslims and local “Hindus” interacting with each other for petty trade and commerce. None stopped to consider that the only foreign armies in India during and from the 1780s were British (and some French). There were no Arabic- or Persian- or Turkish-speaking armies in India from the 1780s, and the language of Urdu had by then been in existence for several centuries.17 Thus the name “Urdu” which first came into use apparently in the 1780’s could not have been given to the language because of the putative army connection.

The word “Urdu” as a language name does not appear in old Persian dictionaries though they were all compiled in India and very often do enter or mention some words as “Hindi.” Let’s take a look at some of the specifically Urdu-English dictionaries. They were mostly compiled in the nineteenth century, and almost always by the British. Duncan Forbes (1866) defines “Urdu” as follows:

An army, a camp; a market, urdu, i mu’alla, the royal camp or army (generally means the city of Dihli or Shahjahanabad; and urdu i mu’alla ki zaban, the court language). This term is very commonly applied to the Hindustani language as spoken by the Musalman pop-

---

17Urdu’s earliest and most popular name was “Hindi” or “Hindvi.” Khusrau uses both. Much before Khusrau (1253–1325), Mas’ūd Sa’d Salmān (1046–1121) is reported to have compiled a divān in Hindvi. See Jamil Jalbi, Tārikh-e Adab-e Urdu, (4 vols. Delhi: Educational Publishing House, 1977–84), vol. 1, p. 23.
ulation of India proper.¹⁸

And this is Fallon (1873):

Originally, a camp,
1. An army; a bazar attached to the camp [...] 
2. The Hindustani language as spoken by the Mohamedans of India, and by the Hindus who have learnt of them or have intercourse with them [...] Urdu-i mualla 1. The court language. 2. The Delhi idiom.¹⁹

Here is Platts, who came after the above two:

Army; camp; market of a camp; s.f. (= urdū zabān), The Hindūstānī language as spoken by the Muhammadans of India, and by Hindūs who have intercourse with them [...]—urdū-i-mu’allā The royal camp or army (generally means the city of Delhi or Shāhjahānābād); the court language (= urdū-i-mu’allā ki zabān); the Hindūstānī language as spoken in Delhi.²⁰

I don’t need to point out the political underpinnings which have, perhaps unconsciously, let colonialistic biases creep into these definitions. Those will become clear when I quote John Gilchrist who wrote when colonialistic thought was just being crystallized in the British mind. Suffice it to say at present that even these comparatively late arrivals on the Urdu linguistic scene were not able to suggest that the language name had anything directly to do with the Army, Muslim or any other. They have, of course, suppressed the major fact that the language was also, and more commonly, and even at the time of their writing, known as Hindi, or Rekhta.

The earliest traceable use of “Urdu” as language name is in a she’r of

Muṣḥaf (1750–1824), in his first *divān*, compiled around 1782–85. It must have contained poems from earlier dates too, but not much earlier, because his actual first *divān* was stolen in Delhi. He said in a later *divān*, “My *divān* was stolen in Delhi too.” The *she'r*, suggesting that “Urdu” is a language name, is as follows:

Muṣḥaf has, most surely, claim
of superiority in Rekhta,
That is to say, he has
Expert knowledge of the
language of Urdu.

Since Urdu has no definite article, the word “Urdu” in the *she'r* could theoretically refer to Delhi, but we will assume that “Urdu” is used here as a language name. Yet another *she'r* of Muṣḥaf’s has been cited in *Nūr al-Lughāt* under the entry “Urdu” as a language name. It has also been cited by Maḥmūd Shērānī.

May God preserve them, I have
heard the speech of Mir and Mirzā,
How can I truthfully claim, oh Muṣḥaf
that my language is Urdu?

I have been unable to trace this *she'r* in eight *divāns* of Muṣḥaf, and neither *Nūr al-Lughāt* nor Shērānī cites the source. However, if the *she'ris* by Muṣḥaf, it should push back the date of the first use of “Urdu” as a language name by a few years, for the reference to Mirzā (Saudā) suggests that Saudā may have been alive at the time. Saudā died in 1781. It must be said, though, that the phrase “khudā rakkāb (“may God preserve”) could well refer to the language, and thus need not necessarily be of a date prior to 1781. Even if the *she'r* dates from before 1781, it won’t push back the history of the word “Urdu” by very many years.

---

22Ibid., vol. 1, p. 67.
Khān-e Ārzū composed his Urdu dictionary *Navādiru l-Alfāz* around 1747. In this work, he doesn’t use the word “Urdu” in such a way as to indicate that it is a language name. He speaks of “people of [the] Urdu,” “popular speech of [the] Urdu,” “language of [the] Urdu,” and so on. It is not before Gilchrist (1796) that we have a linguist’s—or even a poet’s, for that matter—unambiguous reference to “Urdu” as language name.

Gilchrist clearly defined “Urdu” to mean “the polished language of the court.” In 1796, he wrote his *Grammar of the Hindoostanee Language*. In this book, we find Gilchrist saying that poets have composed “their several works in that mixed Dialect, also called Oordoo [...] or the polished language of the Court.”

25 By the 1800s, however, British colonial imperatives were creating another source for Urdu’s origin. Seizing upon the etymology of the word “Urdu,” and taking advantage of the fact that it also meant “camp, or market of a camp” (though never “army”) in Urdu, they proposed that Urdu was born in Army camp markets. The earliest printed source for this fiction seems to be Mir Amman’s *Bāgh-o-Bahār*, produced at the College of Fort William in 1803. Mir Amman said:

Finally, Amir Taimūr (with whose House the rule still remains, though only in name) conquered India. Due to his coming, and staying here, the bazaar of the army entered the city. And that’s why the market place of the city came to be called “Urdu.” [...] When King Akbar ascended the throne, people of all communities, hearing of the appreciation and free flow of generosity as practiced by that peerless House, came from the lands of the four sides and gathered in his presence. But each had his distinctive talk and speech. By virtue of their coming together for give and take, trade and commerce, question and answer, a [new] language of the camp-market came to be established.


This theory of the “lowly” origins of Urdu, perpetrated by the British for their own purposes, may have given strength and support to the Urdu establishment’s view that Urdu needed to be refined and raised to a higher level by making it conform to Arabic/Persian as much as possible, and by placing a higher value on its Arabic/Persian content. But it was no part of the British agenda, at least not a conscious part, to dispossess Indian or Iranian Persian from their place in the culture, or to develop Indian Persian, and make Urdu a petty appendage of Persian/Arabic. In fact, the British didn’t apparently make the distinction between Iranian Persian and Indian Persian, and were quite unaware of, or uninterested in, the repercussions on Urdu wrought by the privileging of Iranian Persian above other linguistic practices.

It will not be useful here to theorize, after Michel Foucault, that the decline of Persian and Urdu was inevitable after the site of power shifted from Delhi to Calcutta. There are many things wrong with this argument. First and foremost, it was the Indians themselves, and not the British, who knocked down Indian Persian and Urdu from the pedestal of cultural value, and they did not put English, but Iranian Persian, in the space vacated by Indian Persian and Urdu. Iranians had no political power in India in the eighteenth century. They may have enjoyed cultural prestige in small areas, but they had no kind of power. Second, Persian, and Urdu continued to be languages of high culture in India for a long time, until late in the nineteenth century. Urdu in fact began to gather, rather than lose, prestige and power after Shāh ‘Alam II began to use it for courtly conversation. (Hence the apppellative, zabān-e ʿurdū-e muʿāllā Urdu for short, which came into common use around that time—we have Gilchrist’s testimony to confirm this.) Third, Persian, and by extension Urdu, continued to be languages of power throughout the eighteenth and part of the nineteenth century over large parts of India. Even though Delhi’s power disintegrated after Shāh ‘Alam II’s second restoration at the hands of the Maratha in 1788, Persian continued to be the official language of administration practically throughout the country.

MādHAV Rāʾō Sindhiyā (d. 1794) ruled the better part of India in the name of the Emperor, as well as his own Peshwa. His administrative language was Persian. He himself was fluent in Persian and Urdu. More important, according to Col. W. Malleson, “the great dream of Madha ji Sindhia’s life was to unite all the native powers of India in one great
confederacy against the British.” Naturally, he couldn’t hope to do this without enlisting Persian to his aid. Persian was the official language of Tippu Sultan and Nizāmu ’l-Mulk in the south, and of the Indian/British administration in Bengal, Bihar, and Orissa. The Navābs/kings of Avadh had Urdu-Persian as their court language until the very end, which came in 1856.

Thus there’s no way to pretend that because the Mughals went out of power, Persian too lost its power, and Indians began to regard Indian Persian as lowly, and Urdu as even more despicable. The entire proposition is false, and its second part is a non sequitur anyway. In fact, Indian self-confidence in Persian reached its peak in the eighteenth century. Consider the following cases.

Shāikh ʿAlī Ḥazīn (1692–1766) was an Iranian poet of noble birth. Circumstances, and the desire to win worldly success and recognition, forced him to leave Iran for India, where he arrived around 1734. He was patronized here by Mughal nobles and even by the Emperor. However, his dislike for India and his sour disposition ensured that there was no love lost between him and his Indian counterparts. He wrote a savage satire against India, and went about criticizing Indian Persian poets as incompetent, and their language as substandard. Khān-e Ārzū, in retaliation, composed a scathing critique of Ḥazīn’s poetry, pointing out its defects and flaws. Completed in 1750–51, Ārzū called it Tanbūḥu ’l-Ghafīl (Admonition to the Heedless). Āzād Bilgrāmī (1704/5–86), another seminal figure of the eighteenth century, found some of Khān-e Ārzū’s points well taken; some he judged to be not so well founded. He called it Rajmu ’sh-Shayġūn (Stoning the Devils), giving it a Qur’anic flavor. He proved to his satisfaction that all of Khān-e Ārzū’s objections were invalid and puerile.

Mūnir Lāhūrī (d. 1644), a scholar, poet, and civil servant whom Khān-e Ārzū regarded as next to Faiqī (1547–95) among Mughal poets, wrote a critique of four major poets of the sixteenth century: Ṯūrī, Ṭālib, Zulālī,

---

and Zahurri; all of them were Iranian. Khân-e Ārzū wrote a rebuttal of Munir, calling it *Siraj-e Munir* (Brilliant Lamp; or A Lamp for Munir). The work was completed before 1748.30

The great Urdu poet Sauda (1706–81) wrote a short book in Persian, naming it, clearly after Khân-e Ārzū, *‘Ibratu ’l-Ghâfîlin* (Lesson for the Unheeding). The time was the years between 1774 and 1781, and the place, Lucknow.31 As regards the occasion for this “Lesson,” let’s hear about it from Sauda himself:

Ashraf ’Ali Khân, a senior person of distinguished family, and an old acquaintance of mine, having labored for fifteen years, and having consulted a number of old and new anthologies, compiled an anthology comprising nearly a hundred thousand she’rs. He took it to Mirzâ Fâkhir Makîn, May God, the giver of gifts, preserve him.32 He humbly pleaded with him to correct its [textual] errors. Mirzâ Sâhib observed, “I have no inclination or patience for this kind of work. I’ll do it for your sake on the condition that I’ll strike off all the *she’rs* of all Indian poets like Faiq, Ghanî, Nisbatî, Nâsîr ‘Ali, Bêdîl, Siraju ’d-Dîn ‘Ali Khân-e Ārzū, and Mir Shamsu ’d-Dîn Faqîr, but I’ll do corrections on and make selection from the poets of Iran.” Upon hearing this absurd talk, the Khân took away the anthology, rejecting the conditions of Mirzâ Fâkhir Makîn.

As events turned out, the poor anthologist was obliged to eat crow and resubmit his text to Mirzâ Fâkhir Makîn, who struck down a number of *she’rs* from even Khusrav, Sa’di, Rûmî, and Jâmi, as poor, or devoid of meaning. As for the Indians like Vâqîf, Qubûl, Nâsîr ‘Ali, Āyatu ’l-Lâh Şanû and even some *she’rs* of great Iranians like Rûmî and ‘Ali Ḥâziûn, he


32Mirzâ Fâkhir Makîn (d. 1815) was a fourth-generation Indian from a distinguished family of Samarqand. He was for some time ustâd to Shâh ’Ālam II. He migrated to Lucknow in the 1760s. See Navâb Siddiq Hasan Khân, *Sham’-e Anjuman* (Bhopal: Maṭba’ Ra’isul ‘l-Maṭâbî Shâhjâhînî, 1875–76), p. 416.
made corrections on many of their she’rs.

Saddened and outraged, Ashraf ‘Ali Khān brought the molested pages to Saudā and requested a rejoinder and just decision on the criticisms made by Makīn. Saudā refused, pleading that he didn’t know enough Persian and suggested other names. “In short, despite my exhortations, he forcibly placed before this humble person the pages wounded by the pen [of Makīn], and went away home, unhappy and sad.” Saudā had thus no choice but to study the handiwork of Makīn and write a rejoinder in which he also criticized some of Makīn’s own verses.33

There are other instances of this kind, but these should suffice to make the point, which is that the opposing players in this game are both Indian, and the issue in contention is the worth of Iranian and Indo-Persian poets. Munir Lāḥōrī, an Indian, criticizes four major Iranians. A century later, Khān-e Ārzū, another Iranian, defends them. Yet he comes down heavily on ‘Ali Ḥażīn, another Iranian, who is then defended by Vārasta Sīyālḵōrī, an Indian, and a Hindu to boot. Vārasta’s closest friends are Muslim, his ustād was a Muslim. He held Khān-e Ārzū in the greatest esteem, yet he opposed him strongly, and supported an Iranian. It’s not that Vārasta is against Indians. His fame rests mainly on Muṣṭaliḥāt-e Shu’ārā; a dictionary which he says took fifteen years to compile and was completed only a few years before his death in 1766. In it, he cites many Indians’ verses and statements as authoritative.34 Fākhir Makīn, an Indian, and a minor Persian poet at best, has the chutzpah to strike down dozens of she’rs from great Iranian masters, refuses to acknowledge Indian Persian poets as poets at all, and presumes to make corrections on the verses of sundry other Iranian and Indian poets. The answer to Makīn comes not from an Iranian, or even a major Indian Persian poet, but from Saudā, who, though a major Urdu poet, is a good occasional Persian poet at best. His answer is so strong that it silences Makīn on the literary front and shames him into trying to perpetrate violence on Saudā through his

34For example, see p. 76 (Munir Lāḥōrī), p. 86 (Ṭāhir Ghānī Kāshmīrī), p. 88 (Sāqī Kashmīrī), etc., Muṣṭaliḥāt-e Shu’ārā’ (Lucknow: Naval Kishore Press, 1898).
ruffianly pupils.35

I say, there can be no better indicator of Indian self-confidence in Persian language and literature than these episodes: Indians consider themselves not only expert Persian researchers, scholars, and lexicographers. They have also critical sense, and are major poets in their own right. They regard competent Indians as having equal right with Iranians to take creative license with the Persian language. Ḥazīnī is the only Iranian who seems to be critical of Indian Persian, and even he is not on record as saying that all Indian poets are incompetent. And Khān-e Ārzu’s criticism of Ḥazīnī’s own she’rs had force; Vārasta’s reply didn’t convince everyone. Imām Bakhsh Šahbā’ī (1806–57) felt obliged, nearly a century later, to write another refutation of Khān-e Ārzu.36 Šahbā’ī too was an Indian, but his case is not parallel to that of Vārasta. By the time Šahbā’ī wrote, there was little doubt left in the minds of Indians that they were by definition inferior to Iranians. Had the spirit of the 1750s been abroad in the nineteenth century too, Šahbā’ī would have written a rebuttal of Vārasta.

As regards Urdu, its literary prestige and popularity grew apace. Centers of literary and linguistic excellence flourished, as could be expected, in Delhi and Hyderabad. New ones at Aurangabad—due to Āzād Bilgrāmī, Sirāj Auranğābādī (1714–45), Lachmi Narayan Shaftiq (1745–1808)—and Madras—due to ‘Abdu ’l-’Ali Bahīru ’l-’Ulūm (1729–1810), Bāqar Āğāh (1745–1806), and the patronage of the Navābs of Carnatac—came into prominence. In the east, Murshidabad and Azimabād (Patna) became so important that Inshā’ Allāh Khān Inshā, writing in 1807, was obliged to make a snide comment about them. He said, “Although the residents of Murshidabad and Azimabād, in their own estimation, are competent Urdu speakers and regard their own city as the urdū, […]” they are mostly locals, and not true native speakers from Shahjahanabad.37

Inshā may have looked down upon the Murshidabadis and Azimabadis as local yokels, but in regard to Urdu usage we rarely hear a voice in the eighteenth century reprimanding Urdu poets for not con-

35The full story is narrated by Saudā in a long poem, for which see Abdu ’l-Bārī Āsī, op. cit., vol. 2, pp. 358–65.
36Qaul-e Faiḍal (Decisive Pronouncement), composed around 1846.
37Inshā’ Allāh Khān Inshā, Daryā-e Latāfāt (Murshidabad: Māṭba’ Āftāb-e ‘Ālam-tāb, 1850). The word urdū here means Shahjahanabad.
forming to Persian poets’ practice in idiom, grammar, or compound-making. Urdu poets freely composed in accordance with current Urdu usage, idiom, and pronunciation, and took license with Persian, Arabic, English, and other languages without fear of excommunication or reprisal at the hands of Persian/Arabic scholars, or Persian ahl-e zabān.38 Once Ātash (1777–1847) had the word begam rhyme with hamdam, in accordance with the Urdu practice. When someone pointed out respectfully that the original Turkish word is bagum (to rhyme with the English “room”), and the rules of Persian also required this pronunciation, Ātash retorted, “I’ll say begam when I go to Turkey. Right now I am speaking Urdu.”39 Against this, we have Amir Mināʾī less than a century later, demanding an Iranian’s certificate before he could permit changing the pronunciation of the Arabic word quds to qudus.

IV

How did the change come about? And why? Can it be said that Indian self-confidence in Persian reached its apogee by the late eighteenth century and then began to decline of its own, by way of a kind of deceleration after full acceleration was achieved? But do things happen that way in the realm of art and culture? Fashions may change, a particular author or manner may go out of favor, or come back into reckoning. But does a whole culture establish and perpetuate a cult of self-hatred and self-denigration without outside stimulus? (If stimulus is the word I want; should I say evil encouragement?)

It has long been fashionable for Urdu historians to characterize the eighteenth century as one of loss, decay, and chaos. While this picture is not quite on all fours with the actual political reality, there is anyway the

38For a glimpse of the kind of thing that, for instance, Mīr (1722–1810) did with Urdu all his life, see my She’r-e Shahr-Angāz, (4 vols., Delhi: Bureau for the Promotion of Urdu, Government of India, 1990–94), vol. 1, pp. 62–109. No one criticized Mīr in the eighteenth century for his language. No one chastised him for his “impurities” or what people today might call “vulgarisms.” In fact, he was rather uniformly praised in his time for writing a language that was mānūs (idiomatic, familiar, and devoid of high literary words).

fact of the empire’s disintegration. And this is enough for our historians to paint hair-raising scenes of moral and political strife in the eighteenth century. (This conveniently provides an implicit justification for British intervention and ascendancy in India.) Yet there is no way that the Persian and Urdu literary scene in that century can be described as decadent and effete. And even if it was decadent and effete, there is no indication at all that its players also believed this to be the case. So there is no apparent reason for this sudden access of self-hatred, if that is what it was.

It is true that Shaikh ‘Ali Ḥaḍīth sowed a tiny seed of doubt toward the middle of the century. Fākhir Makīn’s refusal in the middle 1770s to grant the status of poet to Indian Persian writers should perhaps suggest that the seed fell on fertile ground, and gradually flourished into a strong sapling. But the fact is that the Ashraf ‘Ali Khān/Fākhir Makīn/Saudā episode would be practically unknown today but for Saudā’s short Persian treatise and long Urdu poem about it. It is very difficult to say that Ḥaḍīth or Makīn played the role of opinion maker in their time. Yet one can perceive a distinct feeling becoming prevalent in India toward the end of the century that Indian Persian is suspect, and Urdu too; that in order to escape odium, it should clean up its act as far as its Arabic/Persian component is concerned.

Perhaps Inshā’ Allāh Khān Inshā (1753–1817), poet, linguist, courtier, polemicist, and man about town, sensed this feeling, and, in spite of his own prejudices and reservations, knew it to be pernicious. He issued a warning in Daryā-e Latīfīyat he declared, “Let it be clearly understood that every word that becomes current in Urdu is an Urdu word, regardless of whether it is Arabic, or Persian, or Turkish, or Syriac, or Panjabi; and regardless of whether it conforms to its original usage, or not, it is correct Urdu. The correctness or incorrectness of its use is determined by the way it is accepted in current Urdu. Whatever is against Urdu usage is incorrect, and whatever is in accord with Urdu usage is correct, even if it shouldn’t be according to its original source. Although this fact has already been hinted at in this work, a fuller explanation is offered at this point.”40 This comes at the very end of the book, as if the author wished to make his point linger in the reader’s memory. He followed up the statement of principle with a number of examples. He didn’t however go to the extent of permitting Persian/Arabic-Indic compounds, which were common in the eighteenth century, and which are to be found in his

40Pp. 470–1.
poetry too.\textsuperscript{41} His prohibition may have strengthened the growing prejudice against such “license,” but whatever he did permit was forward-looking enough, and it seems to have fallen on deaf ears.

Sa’di said, “The foundation of inequity on earth was small; everyone who came later added to it.”\textsuperscript{42} Inshā’s prohibition of Arabic/Persian-Indic compounds was not a small inequity, and was self-contradictory in light of his own rule about loan words quoted above. Those who came after him practiced every kind of inequity and placed every kind of constraint on Urdu. That this implied denial of the status of an independent language to Urdu, doesn’t seem to have occurred to anyone. Privileging Iranian Persian above all others seemed to be what mattered most.

Initially though, the disputes and constrains were small in practice. The first controversy about how to use Arabic/Persian words in Urdu seems to have involved Inshā himself, with Muḥaffīz, a major Urdu poet who also wrote prose and verse in Persian. Inshā and Muḥaffīz were friends, but fell out for apparently trivial reasons. A large number of ghazals and satires were exchanged between the two, and also between their disciples. Some of the words/usages in Inshā and Muḥaffīz’s poems that drew objections and sneers during this controversy are as follows:

\textit{Saqanqūr} (a kind of pangolin, called \textit{rēg māhi} [sand fish]) in Persian should not be used alone; the correct thing to say is \textit{māhi-e saqanqūr}. (The disputants seemed to believe that \textit{saqanqūr} is Arabic. Some dictionaries describe it as Turkish. However, even Turkish was privileged, as we know from the Ātash incident.)

In Persian/Arabic compounds where the first word has a final “\textit{i}” (\textit{ydh}), the “\textit{i}” should be kept short, and not lengthened to suit the scansion. For example, say \textit{māhi-e saqanqūr} Don’t say \textit{māhi-e saqanqūr}.

\textit{Maskūt} (Arabic) in the sense of one who is \textit{sākī} (dazed) is not correct.

\textsuperscript{41}Examples are given from the middle of p. 471 to p. 475. On p. 475 is also the prohibition against hybrid compounds. It is worth noting that Bāqar Āgāh, writing in the south, and perhaps before Inshā, discouraged hybrid compounds. See his preface to the Urdu \textit{dīvān} in ‘Alim Ṣabā Navēdī, \textit{Maulānā Bāqar Āgāh kē Adabī Navādīr} (Madras: Tamil Nadu Urdu Publications, 1974), p. 65.

\textsuperscript{42}Sa’di, \textit{Gulistān} (Kanpur: Maḥbā’-e Majidi, 1909), Chap. 1, p. 45
Halqa (Arabic) means “circle” or “ring,” but not in the sense of the finger ornament.

Billär (Persian, cut glass) is incorrect. It should be bilār.43

The dispute soon took an ugly turn, and ended only at the intervention of Aṣīfu ‘d-Daula in 1797. The Navāb died shortly thereafter, but apparently both Muṣḥafi and Inshā had had enough.44

Another Muṣḥafi incident, recorded in Khush Ma’rika-e Zebā is to the effect that Muṣḥafi composed a chronogram on the death of one Muftī Ghulām Ḥaḍrat. The word muftī (Arabic) occurred in the poem so as to scan long-short, and not long-long, as the Arabic pronunciation requires. This was considered a lapse, because word-final yā alif, and sa’d in Arabic and Persian words are required to be invariably long. Muṣḥafi replied in true eighteenth century fashion, “I have depressed the word-final yā of my own name Muṣḥafi (in Arabic Muṣḥa-fi) in hundreds of places. So who has the patience to correct them all?”45 Later, of course, the “impropriety” of depressing such vowels to suit the scansion became a credo of poetic praxis in Urdu. It is largely prevalent even to this day.

These were just straws in the wind. The wind became a storm by 1827–28. The young Ghālib, ardent admirer of the great Indian Persian poet Bēdil (1644–1720), was in Calcutta. Some people objected to a couple of his Persian usages on the authority of Qatīl (1747/8–1818), another Indian Persian poet and linguist. Ghālib flatly refused to accept Qatīl, or any other Indian for that matter, as arbiter in questions of Persian poetry and language. Even in his Persian apologia in verse, composed immediately to appease Qatīl’s supporters, he wrote:

---

43 For further details, see Shamīm Inhōnvi, ed. Khush Ma’rika-e Zebā, by Sa’ādat Khān Nāṣir (Lucknow: Nasim Book Depot, 1971), pp. 278–87. This was the first printing of the work which was composed in 1846.


45 Sa’ādat Khān Nāṣir, op. cit., p. 273.
God forbid, I am not a bad-mouther,  
And whatever I say, I don’t say on my own;  
But those who are expert knowers of Persian  
Are all of this view and belief  
That Qat̂l was by no means from the native speakers,  
He certainly wasn’t from Iṣfahān.  
Doubtless, he’s not worthy of reliance,  
His utterances are not suitable as authority.

* *

How can I release myself from the hands  
of Ṭālib, and Naẓīrī, and ‘Urfī?

* *

One who has traveled to such destinations  
Of what account would he hold such as Qat̂l, and Vāqīf?46

In this poem, Ghālib spared Bēdil, his childhood hero. Later in life, he denounced even Bēdil. He wrote to 'Abdu 'l-Ghafūr Surūr in March–April 1859, “Nāṣīr 'Ali, and Bēdil, and Ghanīmat, of what worth is their Persian? Examine the poetry of each of them with the eye of justice; to see the bracelet on your arm needs no looking glass.”47

Ghālib used even worse language later for the hapless Indians. But it is clear that barely a century after Khān-e Ārzū, Āzād Bilgrāmī, and others, the tables have been turned firmly on Indian writers. In his Khażāna-e 'Āmira, Āzād Bilgrāmī thought nothing of commenting adversely on ‘Urfī and Ḥāzīn and others.48 Khān-e Ārzū and his friends regarded the Iranians as human, and liable to error. Ghālib regarded all Iranians, and ‘Urfī in particular, as little short of God. He said, “Whatever drops from ‘Urfī’s lips is authoritative. For us all, his utterance is firm as law. ‘Urfī is to be obeyed; we are his followers and adherents.”49 If Ghālib intended to

---

48 Pp. 195ff. and 318ff. for Ḥāzīn and ‘Urfī, respectively.
49 Khaliq Anjum, op. cit., vol. 4, p. 1542.
secure for himself the respect and adherence of Indians and Iranians, he couldn’t have chosen a worse strategy. His claims that he had a “natural affinity” with Persian, and he had learnt the finer points of the language from an Iranian convinced no one, and certainly not his detractors.50

The star of Ghālib and of other Indians as mainline Persian poets continued to sink low, and disappears below the horizon with the five volumes of Shibl’s She’ru ʾl-ʾAjam (1909–1918). Himself an Indian, Shibl barely mentions Ghālib or Bēdil in his 1250 pages, ignores scores of other eminent Indians and blacks out most of the Iranians who wrote in the “Indian style.”

At the beginning of this paper, I cited some examples of the deleterious effect, caused by the change in Indian Persian’s fortunes, on the literary status of Indian Persian writers, and on the linguistic growth and flexibility of Urdu. Historically the effect on Persian studies in India was an apologetic marginalizing of Indian Persian writers. Hardly any who were not discussed in She’ru ʾl-ʾAjam made the canon in universities. Bar- ring a handful of scholars, no one today knows the names—not to mention the work—of major Persian writers from India except Khusrau, Ḥasan, Faġī, Ghālib, and Bēdil. The latter’s fame rests on his name being linked with Ghālib and Iqṭāl; his works, however, are unavailable.

The effect on Urdu was a hardening of Urdu’s arteries, a narrowing of its linguistic reach, and a valorizing of petty pedantry over creativity in literary Urdu. Hundreds, if not thousands, of words and phrases were banished as “illegal” or improper. Even if many of them continued in common use, the doors of literary Urdu were closed on them. Hundreds of others which could have been coined or introduced into the language could not see the light of day. Even now, lists continue to be published, prohibiting this or that pronunciation as not in conformity with the original Arabic or Persian, or seeking to ban or excise from the language this or that phrase for not being grammatical, or idiomatic, according to Persian or Arabic. If nothing else, they provide ammunition to fire at opponents.51

50 For “natural affinity” and “Iranian master,” see ibid., pp. 1447; vol. 2, p. 744, and vol. 3, p. 1202, respectively.

51 See, for example, a list published by Nashtar Jalandhārī, in Humayūn (Lahore; March, 1932); reprinted in Abr (Badaon; July–December, 1995), pp. 72–7; see also Mājiduʾl-Bāqi’s list in Ṣarrīr (Karachi; annual number, 1995), pp. 171–82.
We have indeed come a long way from the early Urdu when our writers cheerfully took liberties with words of all languages: creativity, currency, and good taste were more in demand than grammarians. In the eighteenth century, the language of poetry began to become somewhat restricted. Shāh Haitim (1699/1700–83) declared that Urdu poets should write in the idiom of the people of Delhi. One requirement was to preserve, to the extent possible, the original pronunciation of Arabic/Persian words. Equally important, no deviation from the current usage, and the norms of standard, educated speech, was permissible. In other words, practice was superior to the book.52

This was not as good as old Urdu, but in practice, turned out to be a more laid back attitude than could be possible by the middle of the next century. Persian fared even worse. It was plain blind imitativeness all the way. In his Nāma-e Ghālib (1865), Ghālib narrated an anecdote, as follows:

There was a discussion about Persian words and compounds. Maulānā Jālālu ’d-Dīn ‘Urāfī, God’s blessing be upon him, said, “Ever since I reached the age of sensibility, and became familiar with speech, I have heard these very Persian words and compounds from the old ladies of our households.” Fāzī said, “Whatever you have learnt from the old ladies of the house, we learnt and extracted from Kháqānī and Anvari.” Ḥaẓrat ’Urāfī commanded, “Pardon me, but the source of Kháqānī and Anvari are none else but the old ladies of the house.”

Ghālib says that this conversation took place in the presence of Abu ’l-Faḍl.53 I have so far been unable to trace an earlier-than-Ghālib account of this incident. Ghālib clearly believed (or pretended) that ‘Urāfī had delivered a crushing reply to Fāzī and, vicariously, to all Indian Persian writers. Let me make it clear, though, that ‘Urāfī’s reply had by no means the effect of pulling down Fāzī’s status and reputation as a Persian poet. ’Abdul ’l-Qādir Badā’oni, sworn and mortal enemy of Fāzī, writing in 1615, long after the deaths of both ‘Urāfī and Fāzī, says of the latter’s magnavī Nal’ Daman, “God’s truth, there would have hardly been a

Some version of the story narrated by Ghâlib must have been known to Khân-e Ārüzû, who discussed and dismissed ‘Urfi’s point effectively in his Muṣmin, a seminal work on Persian usage and applied grammar, written on the pattern of as-Suyûtî’s Arabic work Muzhir. Ārûzû said:

Since compounds have a special position and particular uses in the language, and the common people have no knowledge of their subtleties and finer points, some learned men of India told an Iranian poet that his [the Iranian’s] teachers learnt the language from their old men and women, and they [the Indians], from the Iranian masters of standard and acceptable speech like Khâqânî and Anvari. Those learned Indians meant, by this, those very compounds which occur at different places, and in great variety. Common people do not have any knowledge of their mysteries. Thus a person trained and educated by the élite of a language is superior to one trained and educated by its common users.55

Khân-e Ārûzû’s point is well taken. Persian abounds in metaphorical and associative compounds. No person not well versed in literary Persian can begin to understand most of them, far less decide which or any such compound is appropriate at a particular place. Opening Ţêk Čand Bahûr’s Bahûr-e ’Âjam at random, (vol. II, p. 456), I found fifteen compounds, phrasal verbs, and idioms on that one page alone. Bahûr has quoted she’rs in support of each usage and definition. The poets whom he has quoted are: Šâ’îb, Muḥsin Tâṣîr, Mullâ Ṭuḥhrâ, Ashraf Maẓandarânî, Shifâ’î Iṣṭahâni, ‘Ali Quli Kurâshâni, Dânish Mashhâdî, Fauqî Yazâdî, Zulâlî Khvânsâri, Ţâlib Âmulî, and Muḥammad Quli Salîm. I’d defy any educated native speaker of Persian to know a fifth of these compounds, and a tenth of the works of the poets quoted by Bahûr. (Among the poets

54I have translated from the original Persian quoted by Shibîlî in She’ru ’l-’Âjam, vol. 3 (Azamgarh: Ma‘ârif Press, 1956), p. 56. Lowe’s translation reads, “And verily it is a masnawi the like of which for the last 300 years since Mir Khursu no poet has composed.” See Muntakhabat Tawarikh, vol. 2 (Delhi, 1986 [1884]), p. 411.

quoted are courtiers, poets-laureate, specialist writers, teachers, a šāfi‘i, and a pornographer.) And when I say educated native speaker of Persian, I mean one of Ghâlib’s times, not of today.

Ghâlib was well aware of the difference, especially in Persian, between everyday idiomatic speech and highly metaphorical, complex literary speech. He used this, with characteristic inconsistency, to debunk Qatîl who was reported to have been much in the company of Afghans and Iranians who visited Lucknow during the time of Sa‘dât ‘Ali Khân (ruled 1798–1814). Ghâlib wrote to Surûr in March 1859 to the effect that most of these visitors were “Kashmiri, or Kabuli, or Qandahari,” and by chance, “even if there was among them an Iranian commoner, speech may be something, but writing is something else again.”

Ghâlib’s inconsistencies never seem to have been effectively challenged at any time. Nor was heed given to Khân-e Ārzû’s argument in Mũṣmir that since Iranians have practiced creative license on numerous Arabic and Indian words, why should not “creative license in Persian be permissible for Indians who have command over Persian?”

Toward the end of his life, Ghâlib was embroiled in a bitter controversy over Burhân-e Qâṣî‘, a dictionary of Persian composed in 1652 by Muḥammad Ḥusain Tabrîzî Burhân in the Deccan. Ghâlib didn’t exactly cover himself with glory in this controversy; the most powerful and convincing rebuttal of Ghâlib’s views of the Burhân came from one Maulvi Ṣulṭân ‘Ali, who wrote his Mu‘āyīyid-e Burhân in 1866. The burden of Ghâlib’s argument was, expectedly, that the author of the Burhân was no Iranian, and therefore had no credentials as a lexicographer. In reply to Ṣulṭân ‘Ali’s book of more than 400 pages, Ghâlib wrote a barely sixty page pamphlet, Tâgh-e Tâz (Delhi, 1867), in which he presented the opinions of his own friend Ṣhâfta, and pupil Ḥâlî as juridical pronouncements in support of his own positions. Ṣulṭân ‘Ali’s book is full of authoritative quotes and citations; it is not a hodgepodge of home grown opinions. Ṣulṭân ‘Ali’s reply to Ghâlib’s pamphlet, which he called Shamsīr-e Tâz-tar came out in 1869, though after Ghâlib’s death. Both of Ṣulṭân ‘Ali’s books remain practically unknown, and in any case they failed to reestablish the credibility of Indian Persian writers.

---

57 As quoted in Iqīl Anṣârî, op. cit., p. 117.
58 A full examination of the whole matter is to be found in Naẓîr Aḥmad, Naqd-e Qâṣî‘-e Burhân, Ma‘āz Šāmā‘îm (Delhi: Ghâlib Institute, 1986).
Ghâlib, in denigrating Indian writers of Persian, did harm to himself as well. For history saw him tarred with the same brush. Shibli’s Persian poetry, though more in accord with the Iranian manner, was still criticized for Indianisms and infelicities. Shibl’s reputation however, is more that of an arbiter of good taste in Persian, rather than that of a Persian poet. It was Ghâlib who boasted in a Persian ghazal of his:

Go look at my Persian, so that you may find Paintings of many hues and colors; Pass over my Urdu collection, for it’s only An initial drawing, devoid of color.

Ghâlib was, without a doubt, a truly great Persian poet, and one of the greatest poets ever, but in taking the tar brush to his compatriots, he painted on enough to blacken all of his own tribe, himself included. Shibli polished and teflonized the tar. Or to go back to our original metaphor, Khân-e Ārzû had hacked at the sapling of doubt sown by ‘Alî Ḥaziân. Unfortunately, it was tended and nurtured by their successors, and its deadly shade stunted and skewed the growth of Urdu too.

VI

I have suggested an answer to the question When? The answer to the question How? is, I think, fairly circumstantial. The mystery of Why? remains—at least for me. □

60Ghâlib, Kulliyât, op. cit., p. 13.
It is interesting that the word "Urdu" in the original coinage mentioned by Faruqi meant not the language itself but the place it was purposefully attached to. It denoted the area in the royal city of Delhi which housed the Red Fort and the abodes of the nobility associated with the royalty in one form or another. It was unlike the trajectory of Persian which was undeniably of a non-Indian origin but which had grown into a local language of intellectual and cultural expression and discourse and still kept its genealogy intact during the centuries-long rule of the dynasties of Muslim invaders from the north-west. One, it changed the way the history of Urdu was to be conceived and presented since the 19th century.