



ḲĀN-E ĀREZU, SERĀJ-AL-DIN 'ALI (ARTICLE 2)

ḲĀN-E ĀREZU, Serāj-al-din 'Ali (1688-1756), a Persian-language philologist, lexicographer, literary critic and poet from North India. In defending a Persian *gāzal* stylistics that originated in the 1500s called “Speaking Anew” (*tāza-guy'i*) against detractors, he sought to demonstrate that the trans-temporal and trans-spatial concept and criterion of “linguistic purity” (*faṣāḥat*) had always had local content specific to pedagogically trained peoples within a period and across periods. His legacy has been fundamental to Urdu literature.

It is important to note at the outset that the term *Sabk-e hendi* or “the Indian style” by which the poetic tradition here in question has been known since Moḥammad Taqī Bahār first used this term in the early twentieth century in his book *Sabk-šenāsi* (Bahār, 1942), has been discredited in recent scholarship (Faruqī; Kinra), because Bahār’s usage of this term bears culturalist and essentialist premises that projected 19th- and 20th-century national, territorial, and ethnic identities into the 16th-, 17th-, and 18th-century Persian literary tradition designated by this term. This tradition, in fact, called itself *tāza-guy'i*, a term here translated as “Speaking Anew” to capture the primarily stylistic sense it possessed for its practitioners and its recursive temporal relation to the earlier heritage of Persian poetry.

LIFE



He was born in Akbarābād (Agra) to Sheikh Ḥosām-al-din, who was employed in the emperor Awrangzēb's army and introduced Kān-e Ārezu to “hundred to two hundred distiches” of the Persian poetry of “the recent masters,” this introduction becoming what Ārezu later called his “poetic capital” (Koşgu, p. 313). Though Kān-e Ārezu did not compose poetry in Braj Bhasha and Urdu, he was clearly intimately familiar with these vernacular traditions that were flourishing in his milieu in courtly and non-courtly settings. Among the ample evidence for this is that he explained the copious quantities of verse attributed to Rudaki (d. 945) by comparing him to the similar case of the 16th-century Braj poet Sur Dās, explicating the genre in which Sur wrote (Koşgu, Staatsbibliothek, p. 11). And in 1880, he was remembered by the Urdu litterateur Moḥammad Ḥosayn Āzād thus: “As long as all logicians will be called the descendants of Aristotle, all Urdu-speakers will continue to be called the descendants of Kān-e Ārezu” (Āzād, p. 115). If Kān-e Ārezu's references to “Hendi of the books” or “scholarly Hendi” (*hendi-e ketābi*) are to what the modern historian Mozaffar Alam identifies as Sanskrit (Alam, p. 168), we may assume that his familiarity with this language and its literary traditions was, as in the case of most North Indian Muslim intellectuals, mediated by his knowledge of Braj Bhasha literature (whose aesthetics was a vernacular adaptation of Sanskrit literary aesthetics) rather than being direct.

In his entry on himself in his biographical dictionary (*tadkera*) of Persian language poets, the *Majma' al-nafāyes*, composed in 1750-51, Kān-e Ārezu took pride in his father's descent from the Sufi poet saint Naşir-al-din Maḥmud Ćerāġ-e Dehli (d. 1356) and from his mother's side from the 16th-century Şaţţāri Sufi Sheikh Moḥammad Ġawţ Gwāliyāri, and, further back, from the great mystical Persian poet Farid-al-din 'Aţţār (d. 1221), adding “In any event poetry came to me by inheritance” (Kān-e Ārezu, 2006, pp. 23). This pride in lineage was one of several means by which he, like many of his contemporaries, bolstered his claims to literary authority in a context where Mughal courtly power was dispersing into provincial fiefdoms and competition had increased with Iranian and Central Asian immigrants for what patronage remained for Persian litterateurs (Chandra, pp. 278-92). Of his own education, Kān-e Ārezu says that until the age of five or six he had read no books in Persian apart from Sa'di's *Golestān*, *Bustān*, and *Pand-nāma* and, until he was fourteen, studied “the Arabic sciences” (Koşgu, p. 313).

After his father's death in 1703, Kān-e Ārezu moved from Akbarābād to Gwalior, then returned to Akbarābād, and finally moved to Delhi in search of



employment, joining the retinue of the Prince Moḥammad A'zam, whose father, the emperor Awrangzēb, was then marching on the Deccan, a campaign in which Moḥammad A'zam and therefore Kān-e Ārezu joined him. Kān-e Ārezu had spent nine months in the imperial army when the emperor died in 1707. He went to Gwalior, where he spent a while at his mother's request before returning to Akbarābād, where he studied the Islamic rational and transmitted sciences under Mawlānā 'Emād-al-din or Darviš Moḥammad. He had composed his earliest poetry at the age of fourteen during a visit to Mathura and had much of his early verse checked in Gwalior by Mir 'Abd-al-Šamad Soḳan, Mir Ğolām 'Ali Aḥsani, and, during his five years in Akbarābād, by such renowned poets of the time as Sa'dollāh Golšan, Mirzā Hātam Beg Hātam, 'Ażamatollāh Kāmel, Moḥammad Moqim Āzād, Nāşer 'Ali Serhendi, and others (Aşġar, p. 31). Kān-e Ārezu returned to Delhi around 1714, when, after a bloody succession dispute over the Mughal throne, Farroḳ Siar became emperor. Kān-e Ārezu then spent six years on imperial appointment in Gwalior, composing poetry and other texts. When Farroḳ Siar was murdered, Kān-e Ārezu returned to Delhi and, during the short-lived reigns of the subsequent three emperors, found employment for a year in Gwalior. In 1719, Kān-e Ārezu returned to Delhi during the reign of the emperor Moḥammad Šāh Rangile, staying there thirty-three years continuously except for a year spent in 1731 in a Mughal court of the Deccan (Ķoşġu, p. 319). While in Delhi, he entered into literary disputes with the famous Iranian émigré scholar Ḥazin-e Lāhiji (d. 1766), whose disparagements of Mughal India, its Persian literary culture and the ethical dispositions of its people (Ḥazin, 1954, pp. 92-95; 1998, pp. 228-31), were crucial provocations for some of Kān-e Ārezu's most significant works of criticism and philology. He was also tutored in his poetry by the prodigious mystical poet 'Abd-al-Qāder Bidel (d. 1720), in whose memory he later annually organized a poetic assembly in the city (Dargāh, pp. 44-45). It was during this stay in Delhi, too, that Kān-e Ārezu befriended the Hindu Persian-language poet and scholar Ānand Rām Moḳleş (d. 1750), who, in his capacity as personal representative at court (*vakil*) to Eşhāq Kān Şuštari, who was the overseer (*kān-sāmān*) of the emperor Moḥammad Šāh's domestic affairs, procured Kān-e Ārezu the rights to collect the revenues from a region near Akbarābād, a house opposite his own in Delhi, and a title (Aşġar, pp. 39-40). Among his long-time students in poetry was Bindrāban Dās Ķoşġu, whose first-hand account of Kān-e Ārezu in his biographical dictionary *Safīnaye koşġu*, to which Kān-e Ārezu himself added marginalia and a preface around 1745, remains the most reliable biographical account of his life.



Ḳān-e Ārezu served under Eshāq Ḳān and then under both his sons. The younger son took Ḳān-e Ārezu to Lucknow after Nāder Shah of Iran invaded North India in 1739, finding him employment under Navāb Šojā'-al-Dawla. Ḳān-e Ārezu died in Lucknow on 27 January 1756, having willed his body to be buried in Delhi, to which city his remains were transferred months later.

WORKS

Ḳān-e Ārezu composed in most of the major Persian prose and verse genres of his milieu. In keeping with his various defenses of the Speaking Anew stylistics of the Persian *ḡazal*, his works bespeak his sense of literary solidarity with those who, since the early 1500s, had practiced this stylistics. He attempted to marshal such solidarity by honoring his fellow practitioners of the Speaking Anew *ḡazal* by his competitive responses (*javāb*) to their poetry on the one hand, while, on the other, authorizing this solidarity by his scholarly display and maintenance in various expository genres of hermeneutic familiarity with the works of “the old masters” whose literary precedents even his detractors considered exemplary.

Verse. Ḳān-e Ārezu authored seven *Divāns*, mostly comprising *ḡazals*, and five *matnavis*. Only one of these *Divāns* has been published. His first two *Divāns* contain poetry he wrote between when he was fourteen years old and forty and between forty and the end of his life, respectively. The third *Divān* is a competitive response to that of Moḡammad Qoli Salim-e Ṭehrāni (d. 1647), a Speaking Anew poet. The fourth *Divān* was a competitive response to that of Šafi'ā Aṭar (d. 1702), a Speaking Anew poet who never left Iran but whose *Divān* was immensely popular in India. This is the only *Divān* to have been published, as mentioned above. Its *ḡazal* distiches re-elaborate with denser metaphorical use of words from the same semantic fields (*morā'āt al-naẓir*) and frequent paronomasia (*ihām*) the tropes (*maẓmun*, pl. *maẓāmin*) deployed by Aṭar and the Persian *ḡazal* tradition. The fifth *Divān* is a competitive response to that of Bābā Faḡāni (d. 1519), conventionally regarded within classical Persian literature as the progenitor of Speaking Anew. The sixth *Divān* comprises alphabetically organized *ḡazals* only until the end-refrain corresponding to the letter *dāl* in competitive response to the *Divān* of Kamāl Ḳojandi (d. 1400). Ḳān-e Ārezu's seventh *Divān* was a *ḡazal-by-ḡazal* competitive response to that of Aṭar-e Širāzi (date unknown), whose *ḡazals*, too, were widely popular in India of the period (Ašḡar, pp. 52-54). In his entry on himself in his *Majma' al-nafāyes*, Ḳān-e Ārezu mentions later compiling the third, fourth, and fifth *Divāns* into a single *Divān* (Naqavi, p. 336), further



signaling his ambition to consolidate a trans-regional Indo-Iranian community of Speaking Anew poets.

A survey of his five *maṭnavis*, none so far published, also reveals his ambition to either elucidate the old masters or compete with Speaking Anew poets of the previous century:

1. A *maṭnavi*, begun between 1741 and 1748, in the same meter as that of the Ḥadiqat al-ḥaqiqa wa šari'at al-ṭariqa of Sanā'i (d. circa 1130). That this work is incomplete, like Ḳān-e Ārezu's *Divān* in competitive response to that of Kamāl Ḳojandi, suggests that he invested the greater part of his attention to the "old masters" in commentaries on them rather than in competition with them (Ḳān-e Ārezu, 2004-06, p. 22).

2. *Juš o ḳoruš* (Upwelling and uproar) is a competitive response to *Suz o godāz* (Burning and melting) by Mollā Moḥammad Reza Now'i Ḳabušani (d. 1679-80), a prominent Speaking Anew poet (Ḳān-e Ārezu, 2002-3, p. 50).

3. *Suz o sāz* (Burning and bearing) is a competitive response to *Maḥmud o Ayāz* by Zolāli Ḳvānsāri (Ḳān-e Ārezu, 2002-03, p. 50), relating the popular amorous plot of the Ghaznavid Sultan Maḥmud's love for his slave Abu'l-Najm Ayāz. This text may also have been entitled *Suz-e 'ešq* (Love's burning) (Raḥimpur, 2007, p. 342).

4. *'Ālam-e āb* (A world of water), which he dedicated to the ruler of Ahmadnagar in the Deccan, Neẓām Šāh Borhān II, and composed in the sub-genre of the *Sāqi-nāma* (address to the cup-bearer) in competitive response to Zohuri-e Toršizi's (fl. 1600s) *Sāqi-nāma*, is the most famous and much-imitated instance of this sub-genre (Ḳān-e Ārezu, 2002-03, p. 50).

5. *Ĝeyrat-e fasāna* (The Envy of Stories), which he wrote between 1734 and 1753, is a competitive response to *Qazā o qadar* by Moḥammad Qoli Salim Tehrāni (Ḳān-e Ārezu, 2002-03, pp. 50).

Correspondence. Ḳān-e Ārezu compiled a collection of his letters in response to those of nobles, calling it *Payām-e šawq*. This has not been published.

Miscellaneous prose. Ḳān-e Ārezu composed two prose descriptions, one of the Indian festival of Holi called *Golzār-e ḳiyal* (Ḳān-e Ārezu, 2002-03, pp. 50) and the other of ponds, fountains and fruits entitled *Ābru-ye soḳan* (Ḳān-e Ārezu, 2002-03, pp. 50). He also authored a prose treatise on the rules of love called



Resāla-ye adab-e 'ešq (Ḳān-e Ārezu, 2002-3, pp. 50). Some of Ḳān-e Ārezu's prefaces and letters may be found in Vārasteh Siyālkoti's anthology of prose pieces, *Şefāt-e kā'enāt* (The attributes of creation; Siyālkoti, 1878). With the exception of the last mentioned text, none of these prose texts have been published.

Commentaries.

1. *Ḳiābān šarḥ-e golestān-e sa'di* (The road: a commentary on Sa'di's *Golestān*): in his childhood Ḳān-e Ārezu began, but only resumed and completed thirty years later, a commentary called *Ḳiābān* on Sa'di's famous prosimetric work on ethical topics, *Golestān* (1258). In it he supplemented and emended two earlier commentaries from India on the same work by Mollā Nurollāh Aḥrāri and Mollā Sa'id Ṭattawi (Ḳān-e Ārezu, 1996). This commentary also gave him contexts in which to implicitly legitimize Speaking Anew localizations of "linguistic purity" by analogous demonstrations that Sa'di, too, had construed this originally Arabic trans-temporal and trans-spatial concept and criterion in ways local to Persian. An example of this may be found in Ārezu's gloss of the word *ḳodā* (God) as an abbreviation of *ḳod-āyanda* (the Self-Originating), the Persian translation of the Arabic philosophical term *wājeb al-wojud* (the Necessary Existent) associated with Muslim Peripatetic philosophy (Ḳān-e Ārezu, 1996, p. 4).

2. *Serāj-e vahhāj* (The brilliant lamp): a commentary and account of a disputation on the difficulties of a distich by Hafez (d.1398) whose second hemistich is *bāšad ke bāz binim yārān-e āšnā rā* (Ḳān-e Ārezu, 2004-06, p. 22). That Ḳān-e Ārezu chose to devote a separate, albeit brief, text to this topic signals, like the afore-listed commentary, the commentarial rather than competitive attention directed at poets regarded as "old masters." This text remains unpublished.

3. *Šarḥ-e qaşāyed-e 'Orfi* (A commentary on the panegyrics of 'Orfi Širāzi [d. 1591]): the verses of this early Speaking Anew poet had become the topic of stylistic attack and defense since the seventeenth century. This commentary has not been published.

4. *Šarḥ-e gol-e košti-e Mir Nejāt* (A commentary on the *Gol-e košti* of Mir Nejāt): a commentary on a famous *maṭnavi* expounding wrestling techniques by a Safavid poet called Mir Nejāt-e Esfehāni. Towards the end of Ḳān-e Ārezu's life, a Persian-language poet who grew renowned in the next generation, Mirzā



Moḥammad Ḥoseyn Qatil (d. 1817), claimed that it was Vārasteh Siālkuti (d. 1756) who had in fact authored this commentary and that Kān-e Ārezu had had it copied and claimed its authorship for himself in his *Majma' al-nafāyes*. The modern scholar Seyyed Moḥammad Aṣḡar argues against this claim by noting that Nejāt completed his *maṭnavi* in 1751 after Kān-e Ārezu had completed his *Majma'*, and that Kān-e Ārezu only composed his commentary on it between 1753 and 1754. Aṣḡar then infers that it was possibly Qatil's loyalty towards Ḥazin-e Lāhiji's end of the stylistic dispute with Kān-e Ārezu that led him to invent this charge of literary theft. This was also why, he notes, Qatil wrote a rebuttal of Kān-e Ārezu's attack on Ḥazin's distiches (Aṣḡar, pp. 58-60). If this imputation is accurate, then it is further evidence that the stylistic dispute between Kān-e Ārezu and Ḥazin continued to encode in pre-nationalist ways rival conceptions of literary community and their relations with ethnicity at least up to 1845, when Sheikh Emām Baḡš Şahbā'i composed his criticisms of Kān-e Ārezu's criticisms of Ḥazin's distiches, calling it *Qawl-e Feṣṣal* (The decisive word).

5. *Şarḥ-e zolaykā* (commentary on *Zoleykā*): neither a copy of the commentary nor the work has been traced (Āzād, 1913, p. 224).

6. *Şarḥ-e moḡtaşar al-mā'āni* (Commentary on 'Gist of semantics'): a commentary on Sa'd-al-din Mas'ud b. 'Omar b. 'Abdallāh al-Taftāzāni's Arabic textbook by this name, standard in the curricula of the period, on the sub-discipline of semantics. No copy of the commentary has been found (Naqavi, p. 333).

7. *Şegufa-zār* (Field of buds): a commentary on the first part of the famous and much-imitated *maṭnavi Eskandarnāma* ('Alexander-book') by Neẓāmi Ganjavi (d. 1209).

8. *Şarḥ-e Eskandarnāma* (commentary on the Alexander-book): a commentary on the second part of the above-mentioned *Eskandarnāma*. Here, too, as in his *Kiābān*, Kān-e Ārezu takes issue with points in earlier commentaries on the same text and often refers the reader to his dictionaries and treatises, signaling how coherent in motivation and inter-textual references he conceived his works to be even across decades. This and the aforementioned commentary were published as marginal notes to the 1878 edition of Neẓāmi's text.

Criticism.



1. *Tanbih al-ġāfelin* (Censure to the complacent): a criticism of each distich from a selection of four hundred by Ḥāzin. Mostly, Ḳān-e Ārezu criticizes Ḥāzin for formulations without authoritative precedent in Persian poetic history, defending his own prescriptions with exempla from the “the old masters” whose poetic authority was beyond dispute (Ḳān-e Ārezu, 1981).

2. *Eḥqāq al-ḥaq* (Administering justice): a distich-by-distich criticism of four hundred of Ḥāzin’s distiches. No freestanding copy of this work seems to have survived, though extracts of it may be found quoted in Sheikh Emām Baḳš Şahbā’i’s *Eḷā’ al-ḥaq* (Upholding the truth, composed in the mid-19th century), and Faṭḥ ‘Ali Ḳān Gardizi’s *Ebṭāl al-bāṭel* (A refutation of errors, composed around 1755); both texts were composed in refutation of Ḳān-e Ārezu’s (Raḥimpur, 2007, p. 345; Aşġar, 1990, p. 63).

3. *Dād-e sokan* (The equitable judgement of poetry, composed between 1741 and 1750). Mollā Şeydā Faṭḥpuri (d. 1632-33) had written a criticism in verse of Moḥammad Jān Qodsi Maşhadi’s (d. 1646) panegyric to Imam Reżā, Qodsi having been a noted Speaking Anew poet. Abu’l-Barakāt Monir-e Lāhuri (d. 1644), who declared his preference for the style of the “old masters” rather than the “recent ones,” had in turn evaluated and analyzed these criticisms in his rival verse. Ḳān-e Ārezu responded by evaluating the faults and merits of all three, defending the innovations of Speaking Anew. He wrote a preface, three introductions, and a conclusion to this work. The first of these introductions argues that competency in everyday, spoken Persian does not ensure freedom from error in poetic or literary Persian. The second argues that “authoritative innovation” (*taşarrof*) in the use of Persian words by trained poets from India was as acceptable as equivalent innovations in the use of Arabic words had been by trained poets from Iran. In his third introduction he elucidates seven interpretive attitudes towards a poetic text based on seven groups of readers, the last and least defective group being poets. Interpretation of poetry that was “in keeping with the temperament of poets” was ideal but was often defective because of ignorance of authoritative poetic precedent. Thus the ideal reader of poetry needed such knowledge of literary history as Ḳān-e Ārezu himself furnished in his dictionaries and commentaries. This introduction thus offers a window onto the hermeneutics and cultural history of reading in his milieu (Ḳān-e Ārezu, 1974, pp. 9-14). These introductions also constitute the most condensed of his arguments in favor of pedagogy rather than ethnicity being the necessary qualification for poetic innovation. They also let us infer the increasing appearance from the



mid-17th century onward of ethnicity as a criterion of literary community.

4. *Serāj-e monir* (A brilliant lamp/A lamp for Monir): a rebuttal of the aforementioned Monir-e Lāhūrī's criticisms in his *Kārnāma* (Chronicle) of the allegedly unprecedented poetic innovations of four early Speaking Anew poets, referring to exemplary precedents by old masters like Hafez, Neẓāmī, and Sa'dī in their defense. The four poets in question were 'Orfi Širāzi (d. 1590), Ṭāleb-e Āmoli (d. 1626-27), Zolālī-e Kāvānsārī (1600s) and Zohūrī-e Toršizi (d.1600s). This work also contains a revealing defense of "semantic derivation" (*akḍ*) in poetry provided it was "based on creative emulation" (*min ḥayṭ al-javāb*) rather than "based on weakness and literary theft" (*min ḥayṭ al-'ajz wa'l-serqa*) (Kān-e Ārezu, 1977, pp. 35-36).

5. *Naqd bar divān-e Ḥākem-e Lāhūrī* (Criticisms of the *Divān* of Ḥākem-e Lāhūrī): this work, apparently no longer extant in a freestanding copy and probably originally known by a title other than this one if any, comprises Kān-e Ārezu's criticisms of Ḥākem-e Lāhūrī's *Divān* of poems, which the latter had lent him to evaluate (Raḥimpur, 2008, pp. 289-318). As in the aforementioned work, what remains as extracts from this work quoted in Vārasteh Siālkuṭī's *Javāb-e šāfi* (The Decisive Answer, cited in Raḥimpur, 2008, p. 304) and Ġolām 'Ali Āzād Belgrāmi's defense of Ḥākem-e Lāhūrī in his entry on him in his biographical dictionary, *Kazāna-ye 'āmera* (The Burgeoning treasury, 1762-63, pp. 201-3) gives us a detailed sense of the logic and quality of poetic innovation Ārezu defended.

Lexicography.

1. *Serāj al-loḡāt* (Lamp for Words): a dictionary, composed in 1734-35, as a guide to the vocabulary of the earliest Persian poets until 'Abd-al-Raḥmān Jāmi (d. 1492). It contains some forty thousand Perso-Arabic words. Aiming to correct perceived errors in *Farhang-e rašīdī* (1654) and *Borhān-e qāṭe'* (1651), two major Persian dictionaries of the previous century, it also culls many of their entries as well as those of other dictionaries. With Kān-e Ārezu's commentaries on the works of "the old masters" like Sa'dī and Neẓāmī, it is an expression of the awareness in this period that the works of the old masters had grown estranged over time and needed commentarial and lexicographic supplements to remain intelligible.

2. *Ĉerāḡ-e hedāyat* (Guiding Lamp): a dictionary, forming the second part of the previous dictionary, of some five thousand poetic phrases Kān-e Ārezu did not



find in the major dictionaries of his time and that were peculiar to the poetry of “the recent masters” or the poets of what he considered his age. Complementing its first part, this dictionary bespeaks the sense of historical newness that Ḳān-e Ārezu and some of his contemporaries shared. This dictionary has been published.

3. *Navāder al-alfāz* (Rare words, 1750): a dictionary Ḳān-e Ārezu authored by emending what he considered the erroneous entries in 'Abd-al-Vāse' Hānsavi's late 17th-century dictionary *Ġarāyeb al-logāt* (Strange words) that provided thus far unknown Perso-Arabic glosses of some five thousand words shared by a group of languages (Haryānvi, Braj Bhasha, Urdu, Hindi, Khadiboli) spoken in the region of Delhi, words Ḳān-e Ārezu called “Hindi words” (*logāt-e hendiya*), using “Hendi” here as it was used in Mughal Persian texts to refer to any local Indian language (Ḳān-e Ārezu, 2006, p. 24; Ḳān-e Ārezu, 1951). This work and *Ĉerāg-e hedāyat* both contain passing reflections on the concordance between some Persian and “Hendi words,” suggesting that something of the historical newness Speaking Anew formulated in Persian may have been related to a sense of the burgeoning poetic possibilities in the vernacular languages.

4. *Zavāyed al-favāyed* (An addition to benefits): a dictionary of Persian infinitives that Ḳān-e Ārezu considered relatively unfamiliar. He modeled this work on 'Abd-al-Vāse' Hānsavi's second and eponymous dictionary *Zavāyed al-favāyed* (Supplement to Benefits) (Asḡar, 1990, p. 71; Raḥimpur, 2007, pp. 344-45). This work, too, attests to Ḳān-e Ārezu's sense of temporal depth with respect to the Persian of the old masters that seemed to him and some of his contemporaries to have grown estranged over time, necessitating such lexicographic updates. This text has not been published.

Linguistic and literary theory.

1. *Moṭmer* (Fruition): this is Ḳān-e Ārezu's most conceptually articulated and lengthy exposition of his views on “the principles of the Persian language” (Ḳān-e Ārezu, 1991, p. 1). As such, it formulates the theoretical core of his various other particular engagements with the poetry of others. Ḳān-e Ārezu explicitly modeled this work on *al-Mozher* (The Flowering) by the philologist of Mamluk Cairo, Jalāl-al-din al-Soyuṭi (d.1505), a study of roughly equivalent topics with respect to the Arabic language. Ārezu divides his work into thirty-eight chapters on such topics as “An Exposition of the Words 'Fārs' and 'Fārsi',” “Unfamiliar Words That Have Been Established by the Utterances of



Master Poets,” “Authoritative Innovations made by Persian-speakers in Arabic and Hindi,” “On the Outlandish and Strange,” and so forth. The burden of this work is to demonstrate the pedagogically attained equality of ideal speaking subjects of poetic Persian. To this end, he demonstrates that the contents of the trans-temporal and trans-spatial criteria of Persian linguistic purity had always varied across pedagogically trained speakers in each period and from period to period.

In this sense, his works written across decades, notwithstanding their more short-term motivations, complement each other as literary theory, its evidentiary base in literary history and poetry emboldened by both. *Moṭmer* and *Mawhebat-e 'oẓmā* constitute Ḳān-e Ārezu's explicitly conceptual and historicizing analyses of linguistic purity.

2. *'Aṭiya-ye kobrā* (The great gift): this comprises the first exposition in the Persian language, as Ḳān-e Ārezu proudly notes, of “the science of metaphors” (*'elm al-bayān*), one of the three standard sub-disciplines in Arabic of the discipline of “linguistic efficiency” (*balāḡat*) and devoted to an analysis of linguistic reference through varieties of metaphor (Ḳān-e Ārezu, 2002-03, p. 51).

3. *Mowhebat-e 'oẓmā* (The great gift): this comprises the first exposition in Persian, as Ḳān-e Ārezu again notes, of “the science of semantics” (*'elm al-ma'āni*) (Ḳān-e Ārezu, 2002-03, p. 186). This and the previous work exemplify at the level of literary theory the temporality of Ḳān-e Ārezu's relations with literary history, since they are based, like *Moṭmer*, on long-authoritative medieval Arabic textbooks on their topics which, in being explicitly invoked here as models, allow Ḳān-e Ārezu to authorize the innovations of Speaking Anew as retrievals from medieval Arabic. They also conceptualize what Speaking Anew poetry reveals at a stylistic level, namely that poetic innovation in this period consisted more in the invention of new metaphors and complex syntactical forms rather than in new figures of speech as in the past.

4. *Me'yār al-afkār* (The touchstone of thought): apparently a study of Persian syntax and grammar (Ḳān-e Ārezu, 2002-03, p. 50). No copy of this work appears to have survived.

Biographical dictionary.



Majma' al-nafāyes (Gathering of souls, 1750-51): Kān-e Ārezu's only biographical dictionary (*taḍkera*). It comprises alphabetically arranged entries on 1,735 poets, old, middle and recent. Kān-e Ārezu says that he intended this text primarily as an anthology of his favorite poetry and so expended relatively little effort on gathering biographical information on the poets he includes entries on (Kān-e Ārezu, 2004-06, p. 38). This text explicitly defines his ideal of literary community by its inclusions and exclusions, revealing that, despite the several Hindu men he counted as his students in poetry and philology and his laudatory entries on some of them in this text, this vision of his ideal community mostly comprised Muslim men, whether Indian, Iranian, or Central Asian, of noble descent.

Kān-e Ārezu's legacy. Kān-e Ārezu died only a year before what popular Indian historiography considers the formal beginning of British colonialism, the Battle of Plassey of 1757. This date also marks one possible beginning of the end of the governmental life of Persian in India, as it came to be displaced over the next century by Urdu and then English. Kān-e Ārezu's historicization of the conceptual constituents of literary purity and his defenses of Speaking Anew were remembered in Urdu not so much as formal lessons in literary theory as authoritative, scholarly validations, from Persian's trans-local perspective, of the aesthetic locality of Speaking Anew stylistics in the Urdu *gāzal*. Ironically, Kān-e Ārezu's defense of such locality in Speaking Anew Persian poetry was followed by what the modern scholar Shamsur Rahman Faruqi has characterized as a loss of confidence among Indians with respect to Persian from the early 19th century onward (Faruqi, pp. 3-30), leading to a privileging of Persian phonemic traits in Urdu and thus to the marginalization from this date onward in Urdu literary culture of Braj-inflected Dakkani or South Indian Urdu literature because of its preponderance of retroflex and other non-Persianate phonemes. Among Kān-e Ārezu's legatees in Urdu was his estranged step-nephew Mir Taqi-e Mir (d. 1810), canonized as one of the two greatest poets of classical Urdu. In Iran, the early 20th-century consolidation of a national literary canon rendered Kān-e Ārezu's oeuvre "homeless" (Tavakoli-Targhi, pp. 1-15), though dictionaries authored by his students under his supervision such as Ānand Rām Mokles's *Merā't al-eṣṭelāḥ* (Mirror of Terms) came to be cited in nationalist lexicographical projects like 'Ali Akbar Dehḳodā's *Loḡatnāma*. That Kān-e Ārezu's own poetry remains mostly unpublished is a sign of the scholarly, rather than literary, nature of his reception. However, this, like any hermeneutic state of affairs, could change. As more of his unpublished or long out-of-print works and works by his



respondents come to be edited and published in Iran, Pakistan, and India, they are likely to refine our understanding of Persianate literary culture of the 18th century and his place therein.

See also ARZU, SERĀJ-AL-DIN.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources.

S. A. K. Ḳān-e Ārezu, *Šarḥ-e qaṣāyed-e ‘Orfi*, MS Catalogue No. 1763, Salarjung Museum and Library, Hyderabad; Mohammad Ashraf, ed., *A Concise Descriptive Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the Salar Jung Museum and Library*, Salarjung Museum and Library, Hyderabad, India, 1966.

Idem, *Sekandarnāma*, Kanpur, 1878.

Idem, *Navāder al-alfāz*, ed. S. ‘Abdollah, Karachi, 1951.

Idem, *Farhang-e čerāg-e hedāyat*, ed. M. Dabir-Siāqi, Tehran, 1958.

Idem, *Dād-e soḳan*, ed. M. A. Ekrām, Ravalpindi, 1974.

Idem, *Serāj-e monir*, ed. M. A. Ekrām, Islamabad, 1977.

Idem, *Tanbih al-ḡāfilin*, ed. M. A. Ekrām, Lahore, 1981.

Idem, *Moṭmer*, ed. R. Ḳātun, Karachi, 1991.

Idem, *Majma‘ al-nafāyes: baḳš-e mu‘ašerān*, ed., M. H. Moḥaddes, Tehran, 2006; 2nd edition, ed. Z. A. Ḳān, M. N. M. Ḳān, Islamabad, 2004-06.

Idem, *Ḳiābān: šarḥ-e Golestān-e Sa‘di*, ed. M. N. M. Ḳān, Islamabad, 1996.

Idem, *‘Aṭiya-ye kobrā va mawhebat-e ‘oẓmā*, ed. S. Šamisā, Tehran, 2002-03.

Idem, *Divān-e Ārezu*, ed. S. M. Ašḡar, Aligarh, 2011.

S. M. Ašḡar, “Divān-e Ārezu, tadvin bā moqadamma,” Ph.D. diss., Aligarh



Muslim University, 1990.

Moḥammad Ḥoseyn Āzād, *Āb-e ḥayāt: ya'ni mašāhir-e šo'arā-ye ordu ke savāneh 'omri aur maḍkur ki 'ahd ba 'ahd ki taraqqiyon aur islāḥon kā bayān*, Lahore, 1907.

Ġolām 'Ali Belgrāmi, *Ķazāna-ye 'āmera*, Kanpur, 1900.

Moḥammad 'Ali Ḥazin-e Lāḥiji, *Taḍkerat al-mo'āšerin*, Tehran, 1954.

Idem, "Resāla-e vāqe'āt-e Iran va hend," in *Rasā'el-e Ḥazin-e Lāḥiji*, Tehran, 1998.

Dargāh Qoli Kān Do'l-Qadr, *Moraqqa'-e Dehli*, Hyderabad, n.d.; ed. and tr. into Urdu by Kāliq Anjum, New Delhi, 1993.

Bindraban Das Košgu, *Safina-ye košgu*, ed. S. S. M. Aatur Rahman, Patna, 1959; ed. S. K. Ašgar, 3 vols., Tehran, 2012.

Bindraban Das Košgu, *Safina-ye košgu*, Sprenger MS 330, Staatsbibliothek, Berlin.

Ānānd Rām Mokleş, *Mer'āt al-eṣṭelāḥ*, ed. T. Ahmad, New Delhi, 1993.

Abu'l-Barakāt Monir-e Lāhuri, *Kārnāma*, ed. M. A. Ekrām, Islamabad, 1977.

S. I. B. Sehbāi, *Qawl-e feyşal*, Kanpur, 1862.

M. Vārasteh Siālkuti, *Şefāt-e kā'enāt*, Lucknow, 1878.

Idem, *Javāb-e šāfi*, ed. S. Šamisā, Tehran, 2004.

Studies.

M. Alam, "The Culture and Politics of Persian in Pre-Colonial Hindustan," in Sheldon Pollock, ed., *Literary Cultures in History: Reconstructions from South Asia*, Los Angeles, 2003.

S. Chandra, *Parties and Politics at the Mughal Court: 1707–1740*, New Delhi, 2002.



Faruqi, S., "Unprivileged Power: the Strange Case of Persian (and Urdu) in Nineteenth Century India," *Annual of Urdu Studies*, 13, 1998, pp. 3-30.

S. R. Faruqi, "The Need for a New and Comprehensive Persian Literary Theory," at http://www.columbia.edu/itc/mealac/pritchett/00fwp/srf/srf_persianlittheory_2009.pdf

(last accessed on 4 March 2012).

R. Ḳātun, *Aḥvāl o āsār-e Serāj-al-din 'Ali Ḳān-e Ārezu*, New Delhi, 1987.

R. Kinra, "Make it Fresh: Time, Tradition, and Indo-Persian Literary Modernity," in *Time, History, and the Religious Imaginary in South Asia*, ed. Anne C. Murphy, New York, 2011, pp. 12-39.

A. R. Naqavi, *Tadkera-nevisi-e fārsi dar hend va pākestān*, Tehran, 1964.

M. Raḥimpur, "Aṭiya-ye kobrā va mawhebat-e oẓmā," *Āyina-e mirās*, 5/4, 2007, pp. 334-50.

Idem, "Seyri dar aḥvāl o āsār-e Serāj-al-din Ḳān-e Ārezu-ye Akbarābādi," *Āyina-ye mirāt*, 6/1, 2008, pp. 289-318.

M. Tavakoli-Targhi, *Refashioning Iran: Orientalism, Occidentalism and Historiography*, New York, 2001.