# Refashioning Iran

## Orientalism, Occidentalism and Historiography

Mohamad Tavakoli-Targhi
*Associate Professor of Historiography and Middle Eastern History*
*Illinois State University*
*Normal, Illinois*

palgrave



First published 2001 by
PALGRAVE
Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS and
175 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10010
Companies and representatives throughout the world

PALGRAVE is the new global academic imprint of
St. Martin's Press LLC Scholarly and Reference Division and
Palgrave Publishers Ltd (formerly Macmillan Press Ltd).

ISBN 0–333–94922–6

This book is printed on paper suitable for recycling and made from fully managed and sustained forest sources.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Tavakoli-Targhi, Mohamad, 1957–
Refashioning Iran : Orientalism, Occidentalism, and historiography / Mohamad Tavakoli-Targhi.
p. cm. — (St. Antony's series)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0–333–94922–6 (cloth)
1. Iran—Historiography. 2. Orientalism—Iran. 3. Nationalism—Iran. 4. Historiography—Iran. 5. Historiography—India. I. Title. II. St. Antony's series (Palgrave (Firm))
DS271.5 .T38 2001
955'.007'2—dc21

2001035430

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
10 09 08 07 06 05 04 03 02 01

Printed and bound in Great Britain by
Antony Rowe Ltd, Chippenham, Wiltshire

# Contents

# 2
# Orientalism's Genesis Amnesia

## A genealogy of Orientalism

The formation of Orientalism as an area of European academic inquiry was grounded on a "genesis amnesia"[1] that systematically obliterated the dialogic conditions of its emergence and the production of its linguistic and textual tools. By turning "the Orient" into an object of analysis and gaze, Orientalism as a European institution of learning anathematized the Asian pedagogues of its practitioners. Embedded in an active process of forgetting, histories of Orientalism have attributed to the "pioneers" of the field the heroic tasks of entering "this virgin territory," breaking into "the walled languages of Asia," unlocking "innumerable unsuspected scriptures," and making "many linguistic discoveries."[2] This modulated account of the history of Orientalism appropriates as its own the agency, authorality, and creativity of its Other. As a hegemonic and totalizing discourse, Orientalism celebrates its own perspectival account as scientific and objective while forgetting the histories and perspectives informing its origins.

The sedimentation and institutionalization of Orientalism authorized the history of its other. In recent years the growth of Orientalism as a field of critical inquiry has further contributed to the underdevelopment of that history. A few exemplary statements by Bernard Lewis, a renowned Orientalist scholar, and Edward Said, a leading critic of Orientalism, display the unequal development of Orientalism and its nemesis, Europology (Europe + logy). In direct contrast to "the Oriental renaissance" and "Europe's rediscovery of India and the East," Bernard Lewis asserts that "there was a complete lack of interest and curiosity among Muslim scholars about what went on beyond the Muslim frontiers in Europe." Lewis observes that, by the end of the eighteenth century,

there was a "total lack of any such literature in Persian or – with the exception of Moroccan embassy reports – in Arabic." The more advanced Ottoman writings on Europe "had not yet amounted to anything very substantial." Evaluating the "Muslim scholarship about the West," he postulates that "the awakening of Muslim interest in the West came much later, and was the result of an overwhelming Western presence."[3] Lewis suggests that Asians lacked the curiosity of Europeans in the study of languages and religions:

> Europeans at one time or another have studied virtually all the languages and all the histories of Asia. Asia did not study Europe. They did not even study each other, unless the way for such study was prepared by either conquest or conversion or both. The kind of intellectual curiosity that leads to the study of a language, the decipherment of ancient texts, without any such preparation or motivation is still peculiar to western Europe, and to the inheritors and emulators of the European scholarly tradition in countries such as the United States and Japan.[4]

Discussing how the "fear of the West has proven itself a spur to humanistic studies" and "scientific knowledge of the West," G. E. Von Grunebaum similarly observed, "The urge to acquaint oneself with cultural phenomena outside one's own civilization is, broadly speaking, a peculiarity of the post-Renaissance West." Having assumed that interest in other cultures represents a peculiarly European style of thinking, Von Grunebaum takes a 1948 Iranian call to establish a field of Europology (*Farangshinasi*) as a symptom of acculturation:

> Somewhat surprisingly to our [Western] point of view, the Muslim East has never developed anything comparable to Western "Orientalism"; thus it seems an important innovation and, if you wish, a significant symptom of acculturation when an Iranian scholar-politician like Dr. Fakhr al-Din Shadman (who in 1948 published a book with the characteristic title *The Subjection of Western Civilization* [*Taskhir-i tamaddun-i firangi*]) calls for *firang-shinasi*, that is, for a study of Western civilization in all its aspects.[5]

While critical of such historically inaccurate accounts, Edward Said grounded his pioneering work on the assumption that Orientalism "had no corresponding equivalent in the Orient." Viewing Orientalism as a "one way exchange," Said argues that it would be unlikely "to imagine

a field symmetrical to it called Occidentalism." Likewise, he observes that "the number of travelers from the Islamic East to Europe between 1800 and 1900 is minuscule when compared with the number in the other direction."[6] Oddly enough, both Said and Lewis agreed on the absence of Occidentalism or Europology. Criticizing Said's Foucaultian analysis of power/knowledge, Bernard Lewis wrote,

> The "knowledge is power" argument is no doubt emotionally satisfying, to some extent even intellectually satisfying, and it serves a double purpose: on the one hand, to condemn the Orientalism of the West; on the other, to make a virtue of the absence of any corresponding Occidentalism in the East.[7]

These exemplary observations were based on the binary assumption of "Oriental silence" and "Western writing" and were products of Orientalism's genesis amnesia. The assumed silence and lack of scientific curiosity among the Orientals were strategic choices for authorizing the "disciplinization" of Orientalism and legitimating its claim to objective knowledge. Without these assumptions the perspectival nature of Orientalist knowledge, which has been skillfully elucidated by Edward Said, would have been obvious from the outset. By retrieving the dialogic conditions of the emergence of modern Orientalism, this chapter retraces the contributions of Persianate scholars to the education of "pioneering" Orientalists and the production of their texts. In retracing the dialogic relations between European and Persianate scholars I hope to retrieve an unexplored history of Indian and Iranian *vernacular modernity*, a common history elided by the nationalist historiography.

## The Columbus of Oriental studies

The modular histories of Orientalism grounded exclusively in a European context the intellectual contributions of Anquetil-Duperron (1731–1805), Sir William Jones (1746–94), and other "pioneering" Orientalists. This historiographical selection played a strategic role in constituting "the West" as the site of innovation and "the Orient" as the locus of tradition. The fully differentiated East and West were the historical products of these paradigmatic selections and deletions.

But in its formative phase Orientalism was a product of cultural and intellectual hybridization. Its development into "a style of thought based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction between 'the Orient' and (most of the time) 'the Occident'"[8] was a later development.

Orientalism's transformation into a discourse on Western domination was ultimately connected to colonization and obliteration of all traces of "Oriental" agency, subjectivity, voice, writing, and creativity. This chapter offers an account of the conjoined process of the silencing of "the Orientals" and the authorizing of Western writers. More particularly, I will elucidate the Persianate scholarly and textual culture that authorized Anquetil-Duperron and William Jones as "pioneers" of Orientalism.

Viewed by Max Müller (d. 1900) as "the discoverer of Zend-Avesta,"[9] Anquetil-Duperron was in essence "a disciple of Indian Sages."[10] During his residence in India between 1755 and 1761,[11] Anquetil-Duperron was trained to read and decipher Pahlavi texts by Zoroastrian scholars Dastur Darab bin Suhrab, also known as Ustad Kumana Dada-Daru of Surat (1698–1772), Dastur Kavus bin Faraydun (d. 1778), and Manuchihrji Seth.[12] The study of Avestan and Pahlavi texts had been an important component of Parsi intellectual life in India well before Anquetil-Duperron translated and published his *Zend-Avesta* (1771). Yet, according to Raymond Schwab, Anquetil-Duperron for "the first time... succeeded in breaking into one of the walled languages of Asia."[13] But the breakthroughs in comparative religion and linguistics, which were the high marks of "the Oriental Renaissance"[14] in Europe, were in reality built upon the intellectual achievements of Mughal India.

Aspiring to create a harmonious multi-confessional society, Emperor Akbar (r. 1556–1605) sponsored debates among scholars of different religions and encouraged the translation of Sanskrit, Turkish, and Arabic texts into Persian.[15] Persian translations of Sanskrit texts included *Ramayana, Mahabharata, Bhagavad-gita, Bhagavat-purana, Nalopakhyana, Harvamsa, Atharva-veda,* and *Jug-bashasht,* among many others.[16] In the introduction to the Persian translation of *Mahabharata,* Abu al-Fazl 'Allami (1551–1602) described Akbar's motivation for sponsoring these translations:

> Having observed the fanatical hatred between the Hindus and the Muslims and being convinced that it arose only from mutual ignorance, that enlightened monarch wished to dispel the same by rendering the books of the former accessible to the latter. He selected, in the first instance the *Mahabharata* as the most comprehensive and that which enjoyed the highest authority, and ordered it to be translated by competent and impartial men of both nations.[17]

These efforts helped to make Persian the *lingua franca* of India. Furthermore, Akbar encouraged the expansion of the lexical repository of the

Persian language by commissioning the compilation of a dictionary "containing all of the old Persian words and phrases" that had become obsolete "since the time that Arabs gained domination over the Persian land [*bilad-i 'Ajam*]."[18] To facilitate the learning of Persian by Sanskrit pundits who were increasingly employed in translation projects, Vihâri-Srî-Krishna-dâsa-Misra wrote a book on Persian grammar in Sanskrit, *Parasi-prakasa* (1717), dedicated to Emperor Akbar.[19] In addition Mirza Jan Ibn Fakhr al-Din Muhammad wrote his *Tuhfat al-Hind*, an original study of Sanskrit and Indian prosody, poetics, and music.[20] Upon the request of the lexicographer Mir Jamal al-Din Inju (d. *c.*1626), who was commissioned to compile a comprehensive Persian dictionary, Akbar invited Dastur Ardshir Nawshirvan of Kirman to the court in 1597 to assist Inju with the compilation of the "Zand and Pazand" component of *Farhang-i Jahangiri*.[21] This dictionary functioned as an essential tool for Siraj al-Din Khan Arzu, who ascertained the affinity of Persian and Sanskrit, a significant event in historical linguistics, a few decades before Sir William Jones. It also provided the semantic resources for the nineteenth-century nationalist attempts to purify Persian of Arabic terms and concepts.

The cultural and intellectual environment in India provided a pertinent context for the Oriental Renaissance in Europe. Contrary to Eurocentric historical accounts, the compiling and collating of Avestan and Pahlavi manuscripts were not methods invented by Orientalists. The late sixteenth-century neo-Zoroastrian *dasatiri* movement, which is discussed in Chapter 5, prompted an interest in pre-Islamic textual traditions. A religious controversy among the Zoroastrians of India in the early eighteenth century likewise motivated the development of textual criticism.[22] In response to this controversy the Zoroastrian scholar Dastur Jamasb Vilayati was invited from Kirman for advice. He visited Surat in 1720, bringing a collection of manuscripts, and offered Avestan and Pahlavi lessons to young *dasturs* Darab Kumana of Surat, Jamasp Asa of Navsari (d. 1751), and Dastur Kamdin of Broach.[23] Among the rank of Dastur Jamasb's students were the "Indian sages" who later educated Anquetil-Duperron during his residence in India from 1755 to 1761. The translation and the publication of *Zend-Avesta* (1771) by Anquetil was made possible by Dastur Darab, Dastur Kavus, and other Parsi scholars who taught him Pahlavi language and manuscript collation.[24]

Neither was the comparative studies of religions a uniquely European phenomenon. Prince Dara Shikuh's (1615–59) interest in comparative understanding of Hinduism and Islam prompted him to seek assistance from the pundits of Banaris with a Persian translation of the *Upanishads*.

Completed in 1657 as *Sirr-i Akbar* (The Great Secret) or *Sirr-i Asrar*,[25] this text was retranslated into English by Nathaniel Halhed (1751–1830)[26] and into French and Latin by Anquetil-Duperron and published in 1801–2.[27] As Schwab remarked, "the pandet of Dara Shikoh... was the famous translator who provided the Persian version of the *Upanishads* which Bernier was to bring back to Paris and which Anquetil was to translate." Francois Bernier, who rendered "India familiar and desirable to educated society in the seventeenth century" Europe,[28] had served as a physician and translator for Danishmand Khan Shafi'a Yazdi (d. 1081 H/1670), a Persian–Indian courtier and scholar. This enabled Bernier to interact with Hindu pundits:

> My Aqah [master], Danechmend-khan, partly from my solicitation and partly to gratify his own curiosity, took into his service one of the most celebrated Pendets in all the Indies, who had formerly belonged to the household of Dara, the eldest son of the King Chah-Jehan [r. 1628–58]; and not only was this man my constant companion during a period of three years, but also introduced me to the society of other learned Pendets, whom he attracted to the house.[29]

In its formative phase, Orientalism was not a discourse of domination but a reciprocal relation between European and Indian scholars. However, with European hegemony and the rise of a heroic model of science in the eighteenth century, Orientalists increasingly marginalized and deemed non-objective the contribution of non-Europeans. This marginalization and denial of agency of the Other provided the foundation for the Orientalists' claim of creativity and authorality. Most histories of Orientalism, from Raymond Schwab to Edward Said, fail to take into account the intellectual contribution of native scholars to the formation of Oriental studies. In a typical example, Anquetil-Duperron was portrayed as the Columbus of Oriental studies by the suppression of the contributions of indigenous scholars in "his discovery" of *Zend-Avesta*.

## Jones and the affinity of languages

Sir William Jones (1746–94), who is viewed as the founder of British Orientalism as well as "one of the leading figures in the history of modern linguistics,"[30] also relied heavily on the intellectual labor of numerous Persianate scholars. He was supported by an extensive network of scholars whom he labeled as "my private establishment of readers and writers."[31] This network of "readers and writers" included Tafazzul Husayn Khan

(d. 1801),[32] Mir Muhammad Husayn Isfahani,[33] Bahman Yazdi,[34] Mir 'Abd al-Latif Shushtari,[35] 'Ali Ibrahim Khan Bahadur,[36] Muhammad Ghaus,[37] Ghulam Husayn Khan Tabataba'i (1727–1814?),[38] Yusuf Amin (1726–1809), Mulla Firuz, Mahtab Rai, Haji Abdullah, Sabur Tiwari, Siraj al-Haqq, and Muhammad Kazim.[39] In addition, Jones was assisted by many pundits, including Radhacant Sarman.[40] In one letter he specified that, "My pendits must be *nik-khu, zaban-dan, bid-khwan, Farsi-gu* [well-tempered, linguist, Vedantist/Sanskrit-reader, and Persophone]."[41] As the manager of an extensive scholarly enterprise, William Jones appropriated as his own the finished works that were the products of the intellectual capital and labor of Indian scholars.

Jones's connection to Persianate scholars predated his 1783 arrival in India. Mirza I'tisam al-Din, an Indian who traveled to England between 1766 and 1769, reported that during his journey to Europe he helped to translate the introductory section of the Persian dictionary *Farhang-i Jahangiri*, which was made available to Jones when he composed his academic bestseller *A Grammar of the Persian Language* (1771). As Munshi I'tisam al-Din recounted:

> Formerly, on ship-board, Captain S[winton] read with me the whole of the Kuleelaah and Dumnah [*Kalilah va Dimnah*], and had translated the twelve rules of the Furhung Jehangeree [*Farhang-i Jahangiri*], which comprise the grammar of the Persian language. Mr. Jones having seen that translation, with the approbation of Captain S[winton], compiled his Grammar, and having printed it, sold it and made a good deal of money by it. This Grammar is a very celebrated one.[42]

While at Oxford, Munshi I'tisam al-Din met William Jones and "went to the libraries" with him.[43] In the preface to the *Grammar of the Persian Language*, Jones acknowledged the assistance of an unidentified "foreign nobleman," who was later identified as Baron Charles Reviczky by the editor of his collected works.[44] As Jones acknowledged:

> I take a singular pleasure in confessing that I am indebted to a foreign nobleman for the little knowledge which I have happened to acquire of the Persian language; and that my zeal for the poetry and philology of the Asiaticks [*sic*] was owing to his conversation, and to the agreeable correspondence with which he still honours me."[45]

In light of Munshi I'tisam al-Din's remark in his travelogue, one may doubt the editor's assertion that Jones had intended to thank Reviczky,

whom he had met in 1768.[46] By leaving the "foreign nobleman" unidentified, Jones may have intended to use this ambiguity to simultaneously account for different individuals who assisted him with his Persian, including Mirza, his "Syrian teacher."[47] It is significant that in the preface to *A Grammar of the Persian Language*, Jones distinguished his work from that of others:

> I have carefully compared my work with every composition of the same nature that has fallen into my hands; and though on so general a subject I must have made several observations which are common to all, yet I flatter that my own remarks, the disposition of the whole book, and the passages quoted in it, will sufficiently distinguish it as an original production.[48]

Demonstrating the extent of Jones's originality in *A Grammar of the Persian Language* is beyond the scope of this study.[49] But it should be noted that the text bore a Persian title, *Kitab-i Shikaristan dar Nahv-y Zaban-i Parsi tasnif-i Yunis-i Oxfordi*, where Jones or "*Yunis-i Oxfordi*" (Yunis of Oxford or Oxonian Jones) is identified as the compiler of the work.

Publication of Jones's *A Grammar of the Persian Language* (1771) coincided with that of Anquetil-Duperron's *Zend-Avesta*. Jones, who had claimed in the "Preface" to be working on "a history of the Persian language from the time of Xenophon to our days,"[50] seemed unaware of the Avestan and Pahlavi languages from which Anquetil had translated his work. To protect his own reputation, Jones attacked the authenticity of the texts that Anquetil had translated.[51] Relying upon the authority of John Chardin (1643–1713), Jones argued that the "old Persian is a language entirely lost; in which no books are extant . . . ".[52] Jones argued that the translation of "the rosy-cheeked Frenchman," ascribed to Zoroaster, was in fact "the gibberish of those swarthy vagabonds, whom we often see brooding over a miserable fire under the hedges."[53] John Richardson (1741–1811), a leading Persian lexicographer and the compiler of *A Dictionary: Persian, Arabic, and English* (1777–80), joined Jones in his attack against Anquetil, arguing that the two languages of Zend and Pahlavi were mere fabrications. Having evaluated the work of Anquetil, Richardson, like Jones, concluded: "Upon the whole, M. Anquetil has made no discovery which can stamp his publication with the least authority. He brings evidence of no antiquity; and we are only disgusted with the frivolous superstition and never-ending ceremonies of the modern Worshippers of Fire."[54] Richardon, offering a philological reason, maintained that inauthenticity of Zend and Pahlavi was evident

from numerous Arabic words found in both.[55] This conjecture fueled the imagination of Jones who later entertained the thesis that Pahlavi was related to Arabic and Hebrew.[56]

Jones, who had grown more erudite and informed by 1789, revisited the controversy with Anquetil-Duperron in his "The Sixth Discourse: On the Persians." His observation that "Zend was at least a dialect of the Sanscrit"[57] earned him recognition as "the creator of comparative grammar."[58] In Max Müller's estimation, however, "[t]his conclusion that Zend is a Sanscrit dialect, was incorrect, the connection assumed being too close; but it was a great thing that the near relationship of the two languages should have been brought to light."[59] While Jones continues to be lionized for his remarks concerning the affinity of languages,[60] the Persian–Indian scholars and texts that informed Jones's work have remained unknown.

A few decades prior to Jones, the Persian lexicographer and linguist Sirāj al-Dīn Khān Arzū (*c.*1689–1756) wrote a comprehensive study of the Persian language, *Muthmir* (Fruition), discerning its affinity with Sanskrit.[61] Textual evidence indicates that Jones might have been familiar with this work and so might have used it in writing the lecture that gained him recognition as "the creator of the comparative grammar of Sanskrit and Zend."[62] In his study of phonetic and semantic similarities and differences of Persian, Arabic, and Sanskrit, and the interconnected processes of Arabization (*ta'rīb*), Sanskritization/Hindization (*tahmīd*), and Persianization (*tafrīs*) in Iran and India, Arzū was fully aware of the originality of his own discernment on the affinity of Sanskrit and Persian. He wrote, "Amongst so many Persian and Hindi [Sanskrit] lexicographers and researchers of this science [*fann*], no one except *faqīr* Arzū has discerned the affinity [*tavāfuq*][63] of Hindi and Persian languages." Arzū was amazed that lexicographers such as 'Abd al-Rashīd Tattavī (d. *c.*1658), the compiler of *Farhang-i Rashīdī* (1064/1653) who had lived in India, had failed to observe "so much affinity between these two languages."[64] The exact date of the completion of Arzū's *Muthmir* has not been ascertained. But it is clear that Arzū had used the technical term "*tavāfuq al-lisānayn*" (the affinity/concordance of languages) in his *Chirāgh-i Hidāyat* (1160/1747), a dictionary of rare Persian and Persianized concepts and phrases.[65] In this dictionary he offered examples of words common to both Persian and Hindī (Sanskrit).[66] Since Arzū died in 1756, *Muthmir* must have been written prior to that date. Arzū's works on the affinity of Sanskrit and Persian certainly predated the 1767 paper by Father Coeurdoux, who had inquired about the affinity of Sanskrit and Latin.[67]

Based on a set of Zand and Pazand terms, *Lughat-i Zand va Pazand* (technically known as *Huzvarish*[68] and appearing in an appendix to *Farhang-i Jahangiri*), Arzu also conjectured the "affinity of Pahlavi and Arabic languages"*(tavafuq-i lisanayn-i Pahlavi va 'Arabi*). What Arzu failed to recognize was that in Pahlavi Aramaic words were occasionally used as ideograms for conveying their Persian equivalents. These words were written in Aramaic but were read as Persian equivalents. Arzu's mistake was similarly repeated by Jones who a few decades later asserted that "the Zend bore a strong resemblance to Sanscrit, and Pahlavi to Arabick [*sic*]."[69] More consistently historical in his thinking than Jones, Arzu argued that the change from Pahlavi to Dari and contemporary Persian was due to diachronic linguistic changes.[70] He likewise attributed the differences between the Zoroastrian texts *Avesta*, *Zand*, and *Pazand* to a historical transformation of the Persian language.[71]

Arzu's study of the transformation of Persian language was motivated by the intensified linguistic conflict among the Persian poets of Indian and Iranian descent. His essays, *Dad-i Sukhan*, *Siraj-i Munir*, and *Tanbih al-Ghafilin*, all focused on these tensions. In search of courtly patronage in India, poets from Iran sought to advance their lot by questioning the linguistic competence of the poets of Indian descent. For example, Shayda Fatihpuri (d. 1042/1632), whose poem was analyzed in Arzu's *Dad-i Sukhan*, complained that Iranians dismissed him because of his Indian lineage.[72] Unlike his Iranian nemesis, Shayda argued that "being Indian or Iranian can not become an evidence of excellence" (*Irani va Hindi budan fakhr ra sanad nagardad*).[73] Abu al-Barakat Munir Lahuri (d. 1054/1644), another poet whose work was evaluated in Arzu's *Siraj-i Munir* and *Dad-i Sukhan* had also responded to the same ethnic–professional tension that inspired Shayda to criticize the work of the Iranian Malik al-Shu'ara [King of Poets] Muhammad Jan Qudsi (d. 1056/1646). Like Shayda, Munir Lahuri complained that Iranian lineage (*nasab-i Iran*) – in addition to old age (*piri*), wealth (*tavangari*), and fame (*bulund avazigi*) – was unfairly viewed as a criterion for the recognition of one's mastery of language. He observed, "if a Persian makes one-hundred mistakes in Persian, his language will not be questioned. But if an Indian, like an Indian blade [*tiq-i Hindi*], reveals the original essence [of Persian], no one will applaud him."[74] He complaind that despite his achivements in the Persian language, "if the infidel I [Munir Lahuri] tell the truth and reveal that the land of India is my place of descendence [*nizhadgah-i man-i kafir*], these villains of the earth will equate me with the black soil."[75] Munir Lahuri elaborated his views in his *Kamamah*, an outstanding text challenging the Iranian poets' self-congratulatory definition of linguistic competence.

These productive tensions inspired Arzu to undertake a pioneering historical study of the Persian language and the processes of lexical Arabization (*ta'rib*), Persianization (*tafris*), and Sanskritization (*tahmid*). His discernment of the affinity of Persian and Sanskrit bolstered his argument that Indians were authorized to resignify Persian words and phrases and use Hindi concepts in their writings. Pursuing such a historically informed path, students of Arzu initiated a process of vernacularization and cultivation of literary Urdu, *Urdu-yi mu'alla*.[76] It was for this reason that Muhammad Husayn Azad (*c.*1834–1910) argued that Arzu "has done for Urdu what Aristotle did for logic. As long as all logicians are called the descendants of Aristotle, all Urdu scholars will also be called the descendents of Khan-e Arzu."[77] In other words, vernacularization was a result of poetic and literary contestation among Indian and Iranian poets and was well under way prior to the British colonization of India.

Like Arzu, Jones's speculation concerning the historical relation of Sanskrit, Persian, and Arabic was informed by the historical imagination of *Dabistan-i Mazahib*, which had been introduced to him by Mir Muhammad Husayn Isfahani.[78] *Dabistan* and other "dasatiri texts" provided a mythistorical narrative inaugurated by the pre-Adamite Mahabad, who was supposed to have initiated the great cycle of human existence well before Adam. Compiled, composed, or "translated" by Azar Kayvan (1529–1614) and his disciples, these texts fashioned a new historical framework that challenged the hegemonic biblical/Islamic imagination in which human history begins with the creation of Adam.[79] This proto-nationalist historical imagination provided Jones with necessary "evidence" for establishing the origins of languages and nations. Writing about his "discovery" of *Dabistan*, Jones explained: "A fortunate discovery, for which I was first indebted to Mir Muhammed Husain, one of the most intelligent Muslims in India, has at once dissipated the cloud and cast a gleam of light on the primeval history of Iran and the human race, of which I had long despaired, and which could hardly have dawned from any other quarter."[80] The historical narrative of *Dabistan*, by extending the history of Iran to pre-Adamite eras of Abadiyan, Jayan, Sha'iyan, and Yasa'yan, offered a new origin for languages and races:

> If we can rely on this evidence, which to me appears unexceptionable, the Iranian monarchy must have been the oldest in the world; but it remains dubious, to which of the three stocks, Hindu, Arabian, or Tartar, the first King of Iran belonged, or whether they sprang

> from a fourth race distinct from any of the others; and these are questions, which we shall be able, I imagine, to answer precisely, when we have carefully inquired into the languages and letters, religion and philosophy, and incidentally into the arts and sciences, of the ancient Persians.[81]

The theoretical possibility of "a fourth race distinct from any of the others" inspired Max Müller (1823–1900) to map the Aryan race and family of languages.[82] Based on the historical imagination of *Dabistan* and *Dasatir*, Jones argued that Kayumars, a progenitor of humankind in Zoroastrian cosmology, "was most probably of a different race from Mahabadians, who preceded him."[83] By assuming a racial difference between Kayumars and Mahabad, responding to the dispute with Anquetil-Duperron, Jones was "firmly convinced, that the doctrines of the *Zend* were distinct from those of the *Véda*, as I [Jones] am that the religion of the Brahmans, with whom we converse every day, prevailed in Persia before the accession of Cayumers [Kayumars], whom the *Parsis*, from respect to his memory, consider as the first of men, although they believe in a universal deluge before his reign."[84] Speculating further on the basis of *Dabistan*, Jones conjectured "that the language of the first Persian empire was the mother of the Sanscrit, and consequently of the Zend, and Parsi, as well as of Greek, Latin, and Gothick; that the language of Assyrians was the parent of Chaldaick and Pahlavi, and that the primary Tartarian language also had been current in the same empire: although, as Tartars had no books or even letters, we cannot with certainty trace their unpolished and variable idioms."[85] The historical narrative of *Dabistan*, in other words, enabled Jones, as it had inspired Khan Arzu, to imagine both linguistic and racial diversification of human societies.

In his significant lecture "On the Persians," which earned him a permanent place in the history of comparative linguistics, Jones solicited recognition for his originality: "In the new and important remarks, which I am going to offer, on the ancient *languages* and *characters* of *Iran*, I am sensible that you must give me credit for many assertions, which on this occasion it is important to prove; for I should ill deserve your indulgent attention, if I were to abuse it by repeating a dry list of detached words, and presenting you with a vocabulary instead of a dissertation[.]"[86] Describing his reliance on evidence, Jones noted:

> since I have habituated myself to form opinions of men and things from *evidence*, which is the only solid basis of *civil*, as *experiment* is of

> *natural*, knowledge; and since I have maturely considered the question which I mean to discuss, you will not, I am persuaded suspect my testimony, or think that I go too far, when I assure you, that I will assert nothing positively, which I am not able to satisfactorily demonstrate.

Yet after these introductory remarks Jones went on to explain the affinity of Persian and Sanskrit without offering any examples: "I can assure you with confidence, that hundreds of Parsi [Persian] nouns are pure Sanscrit, with no other change than such as may be observed in numerous *bhasha*'s, or vernacular dialects, of India; that very many Persian imperatives are the roots of Sanscrit verbs." As Richardson had noted earlier in his criticism of Anquetil-Duperron's translation of *Zend-Avesta*, Jones asserted that "in pure Persian I find no trace of any Arabian tongue, except what proceeded from the known intercourse between Persians and Arabs, especially in the time of Bahram."[87] With the assistance of Bahman Yazdi, a Zoroastrian scholar who had fled Iran,[88] Jones was able to articulate the theses that established him as "the creator of comparative grammar of Sanskrit and Zend:"[89]

> I often conversed on them with my friend Bahman, and both of us were convinced after full consideration, that the *Zend* bore a strong resemblance to *Sanscrit*, and the *Pahlavi* to *Arabick*. He had at my request translated into *Pahlavi* the fine inscription, exhibited in the *Gulistan*, on the diadem of Cyrus; and I had the patience to read the list of words from *Pazand* in the appendix to the *Farhangi Jehangiri*: this examination gave me perfect conviction that the Pahlavi was a dialect of the Chaldiack; and of this curious fact I will exhibit short proof.

In support of the thesis that Pahlavi was a Chaldiack dialect, Jones offered the following evidence: "By the nature of the Chaldean tongue most words ended in the first long vowel like *shemia*, heaven; and that very word, unaltered in a single letter, we find in the Pazand, together with *lailia*, night, *meya*, water, *nira*, fire, *matra*, rain, and a multitude of others, all Arabick or Hebrew with Chaldean termination . . . " This list of common terms in Chaldiack and Pahlavi offered by Jones–*shemia* (heaven), *lailia* (night), *meya* (water), *nira* (fire), *matra* (rain)[90] – were among the first few words that appeared in a list of over 40 terms analyzed by Arzu under the heading "On Lexical Affinity" (*dar tavafuq-i alfaz*).[91]

Given the evidences cited, it is apparent that Persianate scholars such as Arzu and Bahman Yazdi and texts such as *Muthmir*, *Dabistan*, and *Farhang-i Jahangiri* figured prominently in the shaping of William Jones and his contributions to comparative linguistics and Oriental studies. Clearly Orientalists such as Anquetil-Duperron and Jones had entered into the fields of "Oriental" languages, religions, and history as novices. Their intellectual developments and contributions would not have been possible without the expertise and the cultural capital of the native scholars whom they had employed. The European nativist accounts of Orientalism have erased these pertinent non-Western contexts informing the intellectual development of the field.

## Intertextuality and postcolonial historiography

Similar to the capitalist process of commodification and reification,[92] histories of Orientalism have concealed the traces of creativity and agency of the intellectual laborers who produced the works that bear the signature of "pioneering" Orientalists. The archives of unpublished Persian texts commissioned by eighteenth- and nineteenth-century British Orientalists reveal this underside of Orientalism. Having examined the works of the British who commissioned these unpublished works, it appears to me that they had "authored" books that closely resemble their commissioned Persian works. For instance, Charles Hamilton's *Historical Relation of the Origin, Progress, and Final dissolution of the Rohilla Afghans* (1787) corresponds closely to Shiv Parshad's *Tarikh-i Fayz Bakhsh* (1776).[93] Similarly W. Francklin's *History of the Reign of Shah-Aulum, the Present Emperor of Hindustan* (1798) is comparable in content and form to Ghulam 'Ali Khan's *Ayi'in 'Alamshahi*.[94] Likewise, a large set of Persian language reports on Tibet provided the textual and factual foundations for Captain Samuel Turner's *An Account of an Embassy to the Court of the Teshoo Lama in Tibet Containing a Narrative of a Journey Through Bootan, and Part of Tibet* (1800).[95] The most fascinating of these textual concordances is William Moorcroft's *Travels in the Himalayan Provinces of Hindustan and Panjab*.[96] Moorcroft is recognized as "one of the most important pioneers of modern scientific veterinary medicine" and is also viewed as "a pioneering innovator in almost everything he touched." In 1812 Moorcroft commissioned Mir 'Izzat Allah to journey from Calcutta to the Central Asian city of Bukhara. Along the way, Mir 'Izzat Allah collected invaluable historical and anthropological information which he recorded in his "Ahval-i Safar-i Bukhara."[97] Mir 'Izzat Allah's findings, similarly, provided the factual foundations for the "pioneering" *Travels*

of Moorcroft. A preliminary inquiry indicates that Moorcroft may not have personally made the recounted journey that is praised for its "accuracy of historiographical and political observations."

Based on these and other collated texts, it seems that in its formative phase European students of the Orient, rather than initiating "original" and "scientific" studies, had relied heavily on research findings of native scholars. By rendering these works into English, the colonial officers in India fabricated scholarly credentials for themselves, and by publishing these works under their own names gained prominence as Oriental scholars back home.[98] The process of translation and publication enabled the Europeans to obliterate the traces of the native producers of these works and thus divest them of authorality and originality, attributes which came to be recognized as the distinguishing marks of European "scholars" of the Orient. In many of these cases, European scholars differentiated their works by adding the scholarly apparatuses of footnotes and references, citations that were already available in the body of the commissioned texts.

In some other cases, scholarly competition helped to preserve the name of the original authors. For instance, Mirza Salih Shirazi served as a guide for the delegation led by Sir Gore Ouseley (1770–1844), the British Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, who visited Iran between 1811 and 1812.[99] Mirza Salih accompanied and kept records of the journey of this delegation, which included leading Orientalists William Ouseley (1767–1842), William Price, and James Morier (1780–1849).[100]

Mirza Salih composed a set of dialogues in Persian which were published in William Price's *A Grammar of the Three Principal Oriental Languages*.[101] According to Price, "While we were at Shiraz, I became acquainted with Mirza Saulih, well known for his literary acquirements: he entered our train and remained with the Embassy a considerable time, during which, I prevailed upon him to compose a set of dialogues in his native tongue, the pure dialect of Shiraz."[102] In his *Travels* of thirteen years earlier William Ouseley had cited an "extract from some familiar Dialogues, written at my request by a man of letters at Shiraz..."[103] The extract offered by Ouseley was the opening of the "Persian Dialogues" written by Mirza Salih.[104] Both Ouseley and Price claimed that the "Dialogue" was written at their request.[105] These competing claims may account for the preservation of the name of Mirza Salih as its author. In the introduction to the "Dialogue," Price humbly noted, "having myself no motive but that of contributing to the funds of Oriental literature, and of rendering the attainment of the Persian

language to students; I have given the Dialogues verbatim, with an English [*sic*] translation as literal as possible."[106] Mirza Salih also assisted Price in the research for his *Dissertation*.[107] William Ouseley likewise credited Mirza Salih for providing him with a "concise description and highly economiastick [*sic*]" narrative on historical and archaeological sites used in his *Travels in Various Countries of the East, More Particularly Persia*.[108] Having relied on Mirza Salih's contribution, Ouseley viewed part of the work as "the result of our joint research...."[109] Oddly enough, Mirza Salih is only remembered as a member of the first group of Iranian students sent to England in 1815 who were supposedly in need of "instruction in reading and writing their own language."[110]

The obliteration of the intellectual contributions of Persianate scholars to the formation of Orientalism coincided with the late eighteenth-century emergence of authorship as a principle of textual attribution and creditation in Europe. The increased significance of authorship is attributed to the Romantic revolution and its articulation of the author "as the productive origin of the text, as the subjective source that, in bringing its unique position to expression, constitutes a 'work' ineluctably its own."[111] With the increased cultural significance of innovation (*inventio*), European interlocutors constituted themselves as the repositories of originality and authorship. It was precisely at this historical conjuncture that contemporary works of non-European scholars began to be devalued and depicted as *traditio*. This rhetorical strategy authorized the marginalization of Persianate scholarship at a time when the existing systems of scholarly patronage in Iran and India were dislocated. Without stable institutional and material resources that authorized the Persianate scholars, Orientalists were able to appropriate their intellectual works. The institutionalization of Orientalism as a field of academic inquiry, and its authorization of "original sources," enabled European scholars to effectively appropriate the works of their non-Western contemporaries, who were denied agency and creativity.

The challenge of postcolonial historiography is to re-historicize the processes that have been concealed and ossified by the Eurocentric accounts of modernity. This challenge also involves uncovering the underside of "Occidental rationality." Such a project must go beyond a Saidian critique of Orientalism as "a systematic discourse by which Europe was able to manage – even produce – the Orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically, and imaginatively." Said's *Orientalism* provided the foundation for immensely productive scholarly works on European colonial agency but these works rarely explore the agency and imagination of Europe's Other, who are depicted as passive

and traditional. This denial of agency and *coevality* to the "Rest" provided the ground for the exceptionality of the "West." By reconstituting the intertextual relations between Western texts and their repressed "Oriental" master-texts, the postcolonial historiography can reenact the dialogical relations between the West and the Rest, a relationship that was essential to the formation of the ethos of modernity. The reinscription of the "homeless texts" into historical accounts of modernity is essential to this historiographical project.