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ABSTRACT

This study deals with Siraj-ud- Ali Khan Arzu’s *Muthmir* which is one of the most advanced theoretical studies of language. In *Muthmir*, Arzu undertakes the long tradition of literary criticism in Persian and Arabic. He combines ideas by various thinkers for a new analysis which is based on research and an extensive theoretical understanding about language from both **DIACHRONIC** (historical) point of view and from **SYNCHRONIC** (a given point of time) perspective. The work is divided into forty-one sections, called Asl (اّصل) some of which are further divided, into Tadiil (تذیل), Tadnib (تذینب) Faida (فیدا), Bishnau (بیشناو) and so forth. Some of the sections are quite short, while the others are pretty long. So far as the date of the completion of *Muthmir* is concerned least can be ascertained but the discussion of his other works by Arzu into it testifies that *Muthmir* was compiled by him towards the end of his life and the year of Arzu’s death is 1756.

It is remarkable that besides the sheer volume and range of his scholarly and creative works, his colleagues and students were among the most important Persian scholars and Urdu poets of their generations. Arzu was a devoted, careful viewer of language, culture and society who aspired to correct cultural misconceptions if those held by Indians or non-Indians and to record regional usages authentically although he found them ineloquent or inappropriate for his literary work.

Khan-i-Arzu has a wide range of scholarship from Persian to Sanskrit and this acclaimed orientalist has a profound impact on numerous subjects such as Persian Poetry, Lexicography and Phonetics and in many more domains of language which makes him eligible to be celebrated as a scholar of Linguistics rather than only a Laureate. He has composed mathnawis, in lexicography the preeminence of Khan-i-Arzu is simply unchallengeable, as a
commentator, Khan-i-Arzu stands quite high, his commentaries on Persian texts have a marked originality and therefore are valuable and instructive, in criticism the supremacy of Khan-i-Arzu was generally accepted. The contributions of Khan-i-Arzu to poetics and stylistics were in the nature of prototypes.

Arzu’s *Muthmir* is self-evidently an important work but its place in the intellectual tradition of Indo-Persian has not been settled. This treatise on language by Khan-i-Arzu which he calls an account of *ilm-i usuul-i lughat* (*the science of the elements of language*) that is quite synonymous with the modern science of language, called Linguistics *has* barely received a complete treatment by the experts of language in any language to the best of our feeble knowledge except that of the published edition of *Muthmir* by a teacher of Persian language who is also former Head of the Department of Persian, University of Delhi and is the author of *Encyclopaedia of Persian Language and Literature* from Pakistan: University of Karachi with an introduction in English.

This study aims at portraying contribution of Khan-i-Arzu as a scholar in general and also as a whistle blower in the field of developing Linguistics in particular with a special reference to concept of language relationship, different levels and elements in a language, language variation and the philosophical foundation of linguistic thought that his monumental work *Muthmir* treasures for the linguists. The fundamental nature of this work has been discussed on the very onset whereas the second chapter lays emphasis on the philosophy of language and linguistics which observes the nature of human language and of linguistic inquiry. It briefly talks about ‘epistemology’, the branch of philosophy which deals with the nature of knowledge – in case of linguistic knowledge. While conceptualizing, understanding and regurgitating, the material knowledge is being processed to get the structured thought. Knowledge is the net result of the processing of the perceived ideas in the mind through thinking or when mind perceives conceptualizes and understands through thinking and finally
regurgitates a well structured thought, then this well structured thought is referred as knowledge. Then ‘ontology’, the branch of metaphysics which deals with the existence of reality, nature of reality, sustainability of reality and properties of reality and the likes. Thereafter it throws light on ‘logical positivism’, ‘mentalist’ and other schools of philosophy which view several aspects of language and the philosophical relevance of *Muthmir* which in the first place was the first coherent description of the linguistic thought process. *Muthmir* gained its special place in the history of Perso-Arabic linguistic tradition. In his search for a Perso-Arabic linguistic tradition Professor Abdul Azim projected Khan-i-Arzu’s *Muthmir* as a milestone in the Perso-Arabic linguistic thought process. He quotes Khan-i-Arzu and says that he bases his claim of concord between Sanskrit and Persian on correct linguistic observations. In principle the language belonged to a well-defined group of people. This means that it may be regarded as an introduction to his linguistic thought process. He further says that Khan-i Arzu is referring to the feature of voicing.

Chapter three expounds what can be considered the seed of Historical Linguistics that Arzu sowed in *Muthmir* which burgeoned at least three decades before what qualifies Sir William Jones as founding father of Historical and Comparative Linguistics after his famous lecture in which he proclaims the historical tie between Sanskrit, Latin and Greek as well as with “the Gothic and the Celtic, and the old Persian,” in the Third Anniversary Discourse to the Asiatic Society of Bengal as death claimed Arzu in year 1756 and it but obvious that this treatise on Language would have come before it.

Sir William Jones who in 1783 sailed for Calcutta as judge of the Supreme Court during the colonial rule in India and in 1784 founded the Asiatic Society of Bengal. There in his 1786 presidential discourse, he postulated the ‘common ancestry of Sanskrit, Latin, and Greek’. This very finding began to be believed as the one which provides the induction for the
advancement of Historical and Comparative Linguistics. The following lines of Sir William Jones are believed to be stepping stone for the discipline called Historical Linguistics:

_The Sanscrit language, whatever be its antiquity, is of a wonderful structure; more perfect than the Greek, more copious than the Latin, and more exquisitely refined than either, yet bearing to both of them a stronger affinity, both in the roots of verbs and the forms of grammar, than could possibly have been produced by accident; so strong indeed, that no philologer could examine them all three, without believing them to have sprung from some common source, which, perhaps, no longer exists; there is a similar reason, though not quite so forcible, for supposing that both the Gothic and the Celtic, though blended with a very different idiom, had the same origin with the Sanscrit; and the old Persian might be added to the same family._

Which can well be disillusioned if one goes through the works of Arzu who left the world in 1756 and in particular with this very attestation is more than enough to suggest us that he was the vanguard in the field of linguistics and in particular the Historical Linguistics:

_up to this day no one has conceived of the tawafuq (concord/agreement/relationship) between Hindi and Persian except this fakir Arzu in spite of the fact that there were a number of dictionary makers and other scholars of this guiding science. And whoever_
should be the disciple and the follower of this humble (Arzu), he should establish the fundamental principal and should base the correction of some Persian words on it as I have written my own books such as Sirajul Lughah and Chirag-i-Hidayat, etc. And it is amazing that Rashidi and other were in India, yet they failed to observe that there is concord in these two languages.

Here Arzu laments that scholars of Persian in India have failed to appreciate how much similarity exists between the two languages that is, Sanskrit (or Indian Language which he calls Hindi) and Persian. To substantiate it he further cites examples from words of definitely Indian orgin used freely by Persian poets.

Chapter four which is entitled *Muthmir: Fashioning New Trends in Linguistics* is just the obverse of the previous chapter in the sense of this work, which is *Towards the Development of Historical Linguistics: Revisiting Khan-i- Arzu’s Muthmir* principally if we go by the now current terms of Synchronic versus Diachronic Approach in Linguistics which are terminological inventions of Ferdinand de Saussure.

This Swiss linguist and semiotician came along and dubbed the field of linguistics in the start of the twentieth century as a **synchronic** approach which is a descriptive look at language at a certain point in time as opposed to **diachronic approach** which considers the development, change and evolution of a language through history and that is why also referred to as **Historical Linguistics** and was the common business for the linguists throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth century.

We attempted to sightsee magnitude of contributions made by Siraj uddin Ali Khan Arzu in the domain of language studies which might cover different compartment of Modern Linguistics. *Muthmir* which is one of the instances of his great enterprise explicates Arzu’s insight on the language that cropped at that time in the east and could only be seen at least a
The descriptive study in the chapter four aims at portraying contribution of Khan-i-Arzu in Modern Linguistics. This descriptive study aims at portraying contribution of Khan-i-Arzu as a scholar in general and also as an avant-garde in the field of developing Linguistics in particular with a special reference to concept of language relationship, different levels and elements in a language, language variation and the philosophical foundation of linguistic thought that his monumental work *Muthmir* treasures for the linguists. The efforts have been to minimize all the limitations that might creep in course of the research of this nature, it is but obvious that certain constraints within which the research was completed. There have been many topics like orthography, lexicology, lexicography and a few more which could not be dealt with at length under separate headings besides there would be some instances in which it might appear a point overlaps although the attempts have been made to organize it most systematically, comprehensively and unequivocally.

With this approach Khan-i-Arzu sets up a model for the structuring of linguistic argumentation. He was certainly not alone in this respect: all grammarians of this period used similar arguments. But as he himself boasts in the introduction to his Muthmir it is true that he was the first to present a formal theory of linguistic argumentation. Strangely enough, later grammarians do not seem to have developed this theory any further. We do not find any elaboration of this scheme until Prof. Abdul Azim dealt with the criteria of knowledge as they
were applied in the second and third-level arguments. Khan-i-Arzu proposed formal conditions for the application of linguistic analogy in order to avoid the kind of free-for-all that threatened the basis of linguistic reasoning. Grammarians felt free to set up all kinds of analogy to explain linguistic phenomena and Khan-i-Arzu felt it to be his duty to restrict the application of this instrument. In his treatise he discusses the relative value of linguistic criteria, the two most important of which are analogy (qiyaas) and the transmission of linguistic data from reliable sources. He concludes that conclusive evidence for the correctness of a linguistic phenomenon can consist only in the testimony from an authority. The use of analogy by linguists can serve only as additional explanation or support in the selection of alternatives and must be carried out under strict conditions. It may be added that in his discussion of linguistic methods Khan-i-Arzu borrowed almost the entire line of reasoning from a neighbouring discipline, that of legal science. Khan-i-Arzu himself remained chiefly known for his dictionaries rather than for his theory of linguistic argumentation. Ironically, he believed himself to have been an innovator in the discipline of linguistic thought.

The present study suggests that Khan-i-Arzu’s linguistic observations presented in *Muthmir* will be regarded for centuries as the best way to study the language issues.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION TO THE WORK

This study deals with Siraj-ud- Ali Khan Arzu’s Muthmir which is one of the most advanced theoretical studies of language. In Muthmir, Arzu undertakes the long tradition of literary criticism in Persian and Arabic. He combines ideas by various thinkers for a new analysis which is based on research and an extensive theoretical understanding about language from both DIACHRONIC (historical) point of view and from SYNCHRONIC (a given point of time) perspective. The work is divided into forty-one sections, called Asl (اُصَل) some of which are further divided, into Tadiil (تَذْيِل), Tadniib (تَذْنِيب), Faida (فَيدَة), Bishnau (بِيِشُنَاو) and so forth. Some of the sections are quite short, while the others are pretty long. So far as the date of the completion of Muthmir is concerned least can be ascertained but the discussion of his other works by Arzu into it testifies that Muthmir was compiled by him towards the end of his life and the year of Arzu’s death is 1756.

Arzu had collected and studied almost all the available works which had relevance with this monograph. A range of poetic and prose works of savants has been utilized by him. Muthmir is inspired extensively from Imam Jalaluddin Al- Suyuti’s Al-Muzhir fii uluum al-lughah wa anwaaihaa (The Luminous Work on the Sciences of Language and its Subfields) model. The fundamental questions concerning what we would call in Modern Linguistics as semiotics, phonetics and morphology are mostly engagements with Al-Muzhir but Khan-i-Arzu has added many topics peculiar to Persian. A comparison of the chapters of Muzhir and Muthmir goes in tandem in order to establish that despite Khan-i-Arzu’s indebtedness to Siyuti, Arzu has been an original scholar. He has discussed the relations between the Arabic and the
Persian on one hand and on the other between Sanskrit and Persian. Muthmir is the result of a great measure of intelligent labour put in by Arzu which befittingly qualifies him as a scholar of Linguistics rather than only a Laureate who deserves to be reckoned as the first scholar in both the east and the west who introduced the theory of similarities of two languages, meaning that Sanskrit or Indian Languages which he calls Hindi (would be found written so in the present text here on) and Persian are sister languages alongwith several other contributions which he made in the domain of language studies which might cover different compartment of Modern Linguistics. Muthmir which is one of the instances of his great enterprise explicates Arzu’s insight on the language that cropped at that time in the east and could only be seen at least a century later in the west. We can evaluate Khan-i-Aruz’s works on the basis of range of topics he has covered under Phonetics, Phonology, Morphology, Semantics, Sociolinguistics, Stylistics, Orthography and many more and its modern interpretation. In this detailed work ranging from phonetics to pragmatics as well as sociolinguistics and stylistics we can witness a wide range of study which may have a profound impact on the subject-matter of language science.

Besides frequent reference to *Al Muzhir*, some of the other equally important sources for Arzu in preparing this treatise are the three famous Persian lexicons namely Farhang-i-Jahangiri, Farhang-i-Rashidi and Burhan-i-Qati. These works have also been abundantly and variously quoted in Muthmir. Moreover, Khan-i-Aruz has made use of some of the other works of his own such as Sirajul Lughat, Chiragh-i-Hidayat, Majma’un Nafaais, Khiyaaban, Zawedul Fawaaid and Diwaan too.

It is evident that Arzu chose Al-Muzhir as the model because of the broad scope of it which allowed him to make distinguished composition. Besides this, *Muthmir* is heavily invested in a very long tradition of language studies that extends back to a millennium and broadens the of this tradition to the extent that most probably led the birth of the discipline called
linguistics which can be evident through the following chapters of the present study the aims to draw the main arguments in *Muthmir* and to bring these into discourse for the days to come as monumental work was superseded by the Western discipline of linguistics and tends to be forgotten.

1.1 **KHAN-I-ARZU: A BRIEF INTRODUCTION**

Siraj-ud-din Ali *nom de plume* Khan-i-Aruz was without a doubt one of the world’s great intellectuals in the eighteenth century. He settled in Delhi early during Muhammad Shah’s reign (probably in early 1720) and had a successful career for just over thirty years in the capital before taking up a post in Lucknow and dying there soon after. He was survived by two generations of students and his works which included poetic manuals, commentaries, a body of Persian poetry, three dictionaries, a tazkirah and most importantly, the subject of this study, a treatise on language namely *Muthmir* which literally means ‘fruitful’. It is remarkable that besides the sheer volume and range of his scholarly and creative works, his colleagues and students were among the most important Persian scholars and Urdu poets of their generations. He is regarded as one of the first intellectuals to take Urdu literature seriously but was also arguably the greatest Indian Persianist of his day. He was referred to as a ‘marja’ meaning *a refuge or point of reference* and as ‘siraj al-muhaqqiqin’ meaning *Lamp of the Researchers* and was at the center of most of the famous literary debates of his time. As a scholar, he drew upon an extraordinarily broad range of research materials and correspondingly employed an encyclopedic critical approach that compared numerous sources. He drew deeply from the resources of the Arabic tradition, for example basing his *Muthmir* on Al-Muzhir fi uluum al-lughah wa anwaiha (The Luminous Work Concerning the Sciences of Language and its Subfields) by the fifteenth-century Egyptian savant Jalal al-Din al-Suyuti besides having easy access to indigenous Indic traditions. Arzu was a keen, scrupulous observer of language, culture and society who aspired to correct cultural
misconceptions if those held by Indians or non-Indians and to record regional usages faithfully although he found them ineloquent or inappropriate for his literary work. However, his ethnography was based on his interest in language which in turn was focused on the practice of poetry. Therefore, it is better to understand him as a linguist much before the arrival of the western school of linguists.

Brief biographical notices appear alongside definitions of certain words and expressions in Anand Ram Mukhlis’s dictionary Mirat al istilah (The Mirror of Expressions, 1745–1746). He maintains:

Arzu has the meaning hope and desire, and also is the pen-name of Khan sahib Siraj al-Din Ali Khan (May God bless him!) whom the author knew intimately (lit. ‘whom this wretch served without any blame of the hypocrisy of pseudo-friendship’) for thirty years, more than the limits of present discourse which his illustrious name advances from the pen’s tongue; the boldness of the manners of affection demands that I be satisfied with a few lines in the settlement of writing and in the plan of the example of his excellent qualities I sift (them) as decoration for these pages: “His conditions completely like a rose in color and smell / Siraj al-Din Ali Khan Arzu” The specifics of his praised rank are a decoration to the folios of night and day and the ornament of the page of time. ... He is a master in the science (ilm) of Arabic, lexicography, and prosody, and the art (fann) of history, music and hindi.

Mukhlis’s deep respect for Arzu is pretty obvious although a great deal of his metaphorical language is lost on us, both as a matter of interpretation and aesthetic taste. He states that he has been Arzu’s close friend for thirty years besides a list of a number of Arzu’s special qualities, such as: knowledge of Arabic, lexicography, prosody, history, music and hindi. The range is impressive, and suggests that the set of skills that are brought to bear on poetic
composition and criticism is larger than we might expect. History and hindi may seem like outliers, but, as we see in the following chapters, they were valued by Arzu and his circle as philological tools. Mukhlis’s account is filled with complex imagery of a lush garden, an extended tribute to Arzu’s talent as a poet and claim that his talent has received divine sanction. Mukhlis’s remarks are a good place to start in assessing Arzu.

1.2 WORKS OF SIRAJ UDDIN ALI KHAN ARZU

Khan-i-Arzu has a wide range of scholarship from Persian to Sanskrit and this acclaimed orientalist has a profound impact on numerous subjects such as Persian Poetry, Lexicography and Phonetics and in many more domains of language which makes him eligible to be acclaimed as a scholar of Linguistics rather than only a Laureate. His great insight on the problem of language which was cropped at that time both in the literary and non-literary discourse find solutions in his detailed works ranging from Poetry, Criticism, Commentaries, Biographies to Lexicography and finally to Linguistics at large and his MUTHMIR is one of the instances of that great enterprise. His list of scholarship may be witnessed in composite form in Atiya-i-Kubra and Majma’un Nafais.

LIST OF KHAN-i-ARZU’S WORKS

A. POETRY

The sources suggest that Arzu started composing poems at the age of fifteen and approached Mir Abdus Samad Sukhan for to get the verses corrected and obtain guidance from him in the poetical art. However, it is said Arzu could not profit from the Mir's masterly suggestions as he left Gwalior shortly afterwards.

In poetry the style of Khan-i-Arzu was naturally as synthetic as could be expected in view of his all embracing genius. The main features of the artistic concepts and expressions of his model poets combined with his own individual peculiarities, imparted to the whole technique the appearance of a wonderfully congruous blend. He considered the expression
of novel ideas in elegant language to be the beautiful poetry. He commanded uniform mastery over ghazal, qasidah, mathnawi and the likes and represented all the aspects of poetical psychology of his age. So far as the astounding range and volume of his poetry is concerned, even a dozen contemporary Persian writing Indian poets put together could not ' bear comparison with him. With regard to his parallelism it can safely be said that if production of hi wans in imitation of different standard poets were to be considered a fact, then no poet since the dawn of Persian poetry in India up till its total extinction could be able to claim equality with this great master.

1. **A bulky Kulliyat**

   According to the remarks of Arzu in his Majmuaaun Nafais, this Kulliyat contained thirty thousand lines both in prose and verse.

2. **The Diwaan**

   In imitation of the Divan of Shafia-i Athar of Shiraz which was very popular in India at that time.

3. **The Diwaan**

   The Diwan, in imitation of the Divan of Salim of Tehran.

4. **The Diwan**

   Modelled on the Diwan of Baba Fughani of Shiraz.

5. **The Diwan**

   In imitation of the Divan of Kamal of Khujand.

6. **Qasaid-wa-Rubaaiyaat**

   **B. MATHNAVI**

   The following mathnawis have been composed by Arzu.

   1. **Josh-wa-Kharush** on the model of Mulla Naui's Suz-u Gudaz
2. Shur-i -ishq, or Suzu Saz, a mathnawi in imitation of Zulali’s Mahmud-u Ayaz
3. Aiam-i-Ab, a poem in imitation of Zuhuri’s Saqinama, composed for Burhan Nizamshah II of Ahmad Nagar
4. Mehr-wa-Mah in a metre not generally used for mathnawi poems.
5. Ibrat Fasana an incomplete poem in imitation of Ali Quli Salim’s Qada-wa-Qadr.

C. LEXICONS

In lexicography the preeminence of Khan-i-Arzu is simply unchallengeable. The compilers of earlier lexicographical works who spent the whole of their lives in examining, correcting and bringing updated ancient lexicons, pale into insignificance before him, because as a poet, critic and polyglot he had immense advantage over them. His original researches accurate interpretation of illustrations and thorough criticism of words and expression led scholars to believe that it was a sheer waste of time to turn to his predecessors for authentic information.

1. Sirajul Lughah

A bulky lexicography based on drawn out original research. It is a work of rare value. It fascinated Tek Chand Bahar so much that he incorporated it in his lexicon, entitled the Bahar-i-Ajam. It is an indispensable reference work for those who are interested in the study of ancient poets of Persia. The chief importance of it lies in its comments on and criticism of, the Burhan-i Qati and the Farhang-i-Rashiidi and it also reveals a close affinity between Sanskrit and Persian. In compiling this lexicon of his, it was the primary aim of Arzu to correct the mistakes of both the Rashiidi and Burhan. The Sirajul-Lughah was completed in 1147A.H. on the basis of the two above named
lexicons, as well as the Majma ul Furs, the Farhang-i Jahangiri, the Kashful Lugah, the Farhang-i-Qusi, the Moedul Fudala, the Durar-i Gharar, the Farhang-i-Munisi and some commentaries on the Gullistan etc. It is arranged alphabetically in European fashion, the first letter constituting the bab, the second the Fasl.

2. Chiragh-e-Hidayat

The second volume of the Siraj ul Lughah, containing such words and expressions as had been used by Persian poets coming after Jami and were not found in the Farhang-i-Jahangirl, the Majmuaul-Fars-i-Sururi and the Burhan-i Qati.

3. Nawadirul-Alfaz, Tashih-i-Gharaaebul Lughah

A corrected edition of Abdul Waase of Hansi’s Gharaaebul Lughah which is a glossary of the Urdu words with their equivalents in Persian Arabic, and Turkish.

4. Zawaadul Fawaaid

A dictionary of Persian verbs and the abstract nouns derived from them, presumably related in some way to the Zawaaedul Fawaaid, a work on the same subject by Abdul Waase of Hansi.

D. LINGUISTICS

Muthmir

It is on a subject which was quite new and original, not touched by any scholar before him. His works on Persian lexicography like, Siraj ul-lughah and Chiragh-i-Hidayat have opened a new vista for a critical study of the art of Persian lexicography. As it is generally known, Khan-i Arzu was an original and creative scholar and therefore he did not confine himself to imitating the earlier masters of the field. He audaciously and competently pointed out the merits and demerits of the lexicons of the two outstanding lexicographers like, Jamalud-Din Husain Inju and Abdur Rashid. He forcefully
defended Jamalud-Din in Cases where the latter had been unduly ridiculed by Abdur Rashidiid and Arzu’s arguments show that in most cases Husain Inju’s findings are correct and that Inju was more original than Abdur Rahhiid.

He is the first person to write systematically and scientifically on the subject of which fascinated the scholars across the globe and across generation and present research is one out of them. Muthmir written on the pattern of Imam Suyuti’s Muzhir deals with the principles of the Persian language in particular but more importantly, linguistics in general.

E. COMMENTARIES

As a commentator, Khan-i-Arzu stands quite high. His commentaries on Persian texts have a marked originality and therefore are valuable and instructive. Scholars in both the east and the west are of the consensus that Khan-i-Arzu was the best commentator that India had produced. We evaluate briefly some of the common commentaries of Arzu:

1. Khiyaaban

A commentary on Saadi’s Gulistan, determining the actual meanings of the difficult words and expressions occurring in the text as well as a thorough criticism of the earlier commentaries such as those by Mir Nurullah Ahraari, Mulla Saad and the likes.

2. Shigufa-i-Zaar

It is commentary on Nizaami’s first part of the Sikandar Nama with detailed criticism of the expositions of the work.

3. Sharh-i Qasaed-i –Urfii

In this commentary most of the objections raised by Mulla Muniir and others have been refuted and interpolations in the text of qasaed have been competently determined.
4. It is a commentary on Mir Nijaat’s famous but rather difficult mathnawi dealing with the art of wrestling.

5. Siraj-i-Wahhaaj

This is a discursive commentary on Hafiz’s verses.

F. CRITICISMS OF DIFFERENT WORKS

In criticism the supremacy of Khan-i-Aruz was generally accepted. In fact, he was referred to as critic of critics. His highly developed aesthetic sense, combined with his logical reasoning went to make him a critic excellence. Of course, he sometimes became over critical but it must be admitted that by doing so he uplifted the status of literary criticism which till then was stereotyped and hence not every luminary and useful.

1. Tanbihul Ghafilin

When Shaikh Muhammad Ali Hazin, the leading Persian poet and scholar satirized India and the Indians Khan-i-Aruz rose up to pay Hazin in his own coins. Arzu collected numerous wrongly constructed verses of Hazin and criticised them at length in the work entitled Tanbihul Ghafilin. The publication of this work went a long way to damage the literary reputation of Hazin.

2. Ihqaaqul Haq

It is another tract dealing with Hazin. No copy of this work seems to have been made.

3. Siraj-i-Muniir

A refutation of Mulla Munir's critical work, entitled Karnama in which Mulla has taken objection to certain verses by Urfi, Talib, Zulali and Zuhuri.

4. Dad-i-Sukhan

A short treatise on various questions relating to style, versification and the likes. The author states that he undertook an analysis of a qasida by Abul Barakat Munir (d. 1054 A.H.) and tried to be as impartial as possible. He refers also to Muhammad Jan Qudsii (d. 1056 A.H.)
and others presumably; this work is concerned with the qasida of Shaida in which the latter enumerates at length the defects found in each and every couplet of a qasidah by Qudsii a contemporary of his.

G. GRAMMAR AND POETICS

The contributions of Khan-i-Aruz to poetics and stylistics were in the nature of prototypes. These added feathers to the author's cap. Being a master poet, he was decidedly in a much better position than the most of the grammarians to deal with these subjects.

1. Atiiya-i-Kubra

It is on the subject of Bayaan It is a dissertation on literary styles, claimed to be the first work- on the subject.

2. Mahabbat-i-Uzma

It is a treatise on rhetorics and literary style.

3. Meyaarul-Afkar

This is a treatise on grammar.

H. BIOGRAPHICAL WORKS

1. Majmua un-Nafaais:

In his capacity as the compiler of the Majmua un-Nafaais, Arzu has played the role of an encyclopedist and as such he occupies an unique position among Persian anthologists and biographers. The work in addition to biographical notices of 1735 poets and copious selections from their poems abounds in critical remarks, discussions of controversial points, personal opinion on various questions relating to the Persian language and literature and it is also more bulky than all the other similar works. The work was completed in 1164 A.H. and is arranged alphabetically.
I. OTHER WORKS

As a writer of sketches, descriptions and letters, Arzu has a pronounced individualism and therefore ranks high in this respect, as well. His sketches, descriptions and letters being largely in the form of tropical prose and poems produce an exhilarating effect on the mind of the readers.

1. Payaam-i-Shauq
   It is a collection of letters.

2. Adab-i-Ishq
   It is a brochure on the matters of love.

3. Gulzar-i-Khayal
   It is description of the spring and the Holi festivals.

4. Abru-i-Sukhan
   It is a description of a tank, fountain and vine yard.

5. Ruqaat-i-Arzu
   A collection of Arzu’s letters which he had written to his friends, relatives and contemporaries.

1.3 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The present researcher consulted quite a few available literatures relevant to the study concerning Khan-i-Arzu and his contribution. As a matter of fact, for quite sometime there has been a propensity to cite another scholar’s opinion that the contribution of Khan-i-Arzu in general his Muthmir in particular is historically significant rather than subjectively engaging with the ideas Arzu as well as Muthmir, a text which concerns the present study. However, there have been a few significant work done which have benefitted this study besides the help the present researcher got from some useful Encyclopedia. They are Aab-e hayat, a
commentary on Urdu poetry by Muhammad Husain Azad written in 1880, Language in South Asia published in March 2008 edited by Braj B. Kachru, Yamuna Kachru and S. N. Sridhar which linguistically sightsees South Asia, a rich and fascinating linguistic area, its many hundreds of languages from four major language families representing the distinctions of caste, strata, occupation, faith, and region, Refashioning Iran by Mohamad Tavakoli-Targhi which offers a corrective to current studies on Orientalism that focuses only on European scholarly productions with no exploration of the significance of native intellectuals and vernacular research to the creation of Oriental studies, The Pursuit of Persian: Language in Mughal Politics, an article written by Muzaffar Alam in Volume 32 of Modern Asian Studies by Cambrige University Press in May 1998 and Delhi: Pages From a Forgotten History Book by Arthur Dale Dudney published in 2015 which aims to explores the history and development of literary culture during the Medieval India. The reviews have been presented chronologically hereunder which followed by brief discussion towards the end of the discussion.

Ab e Hayat (The Water of Life) of Muhammad Husain Azad which was published in 1880 and is considered to be the first comprehensive history of Urdu poetry. It is a Janus-faced work that looks back nostalgically and reverently towards the poetic tradition of Urdu while also trying hard to be a ‘modern’ literary history that could help Urdu poetry transcend its supposedly decadent and immoral past. It is stuffed with well-worn anecdotes about each of the poets like a traditional Persian tazkirah but systematically demonstrates civilizational development over time like a contemporary Western historical text. Azad was at the first person to have been able to write such a book no one before would have felt the need while at the same time being one of the last to be able to access the living tradition that had been swept away by the wholesale cultural reorientation in the wake of the 1857 uprising. Aab-e ḥayat’s influence cannot be overstated, its fluid style and wealth of stories have been so
beguiling that people have frequently overlooked the fancifulness of many of Azad’s historical claims. For instance, he puts forward an absurd declaration about the historical origin of Urdu with the phrase ‘everyone knows this much’.

This is not a metaphysical point but a practical one. Before we start to read texts historically, we should understand that historical study is necessarily a conversation with a text in which the ways that we as the interpreters pose the questions condition our understanding of the replies we receive.

At first glance, this appears a willfully obfuscatory position why we just cannot read a historical text and extract information from it? Furthermore, doesn’t this view presuppose that only emic analyses (that is, ones based on the tradition’s own assumptions) are legitimate? It is obvious that the purpose of the study of history is gathering some kind of knowledge about the past but intellectual history, the goal of this project, is not just a matter of collecting names and dates but of sustained interpretation. We must situate ourselves vis-à-vis the text and the ‘variety of voices in which the echo of the past is heard that constitute the tradition we are studying for historically-conscious interpretation. Tradition is a web of relationships between texts, the strands of thought and rhetoric that interpreters follow from one text to another. A tradition is not simply a Great Books curriculum and in no way stands outside of history traditions and are made and re-made, traditions die or in some cases are deliberately killed. Thanks to tradition we cannot approach any text, even one entirely foreign to us, with a blank slate. Thus we must be conscious of our predisposition to reach certain conclusions (what the hermeneutical tradition call ‘prejudices’) that shapes and sometimes deforms our understanding of history. On reflection it is obvious that a scholar must be able to research a tradition without necessarily using its categories because a purely emic interpretative project would have no resonance outside the society to which the particular tradition in question belongs and thus we would only be able to study ourselves and our
recent forebears. However, we must recognize that when our study crosses not only boundaries of time but of culture our ability to think historically is constrained not by the traditional boundaries of traditions but by our individual horizons as scholars. When one has access to the tradition concerned by means of a university education rather than by growing up with it, this attention to one’s own position in history is especially important. Cultural distance can be a beneficial as it allows us to listen closely to voices in a text that the mainstream of a tradition tends to sink.

No one internal or external to a tradition can claim a neutral vantage point because history itself conditions the questions that motivate one’s inquiry into the past.

Skinner beware us against applying external principles of rationality on historical texts because such an approach makes us dependent on the degree of ‘cognitive discomfort’ we feel to direct ourself whether to read something figuratively or literally. However, in the Indo-Persian and Urdu tradition, there is a deep structural problem in our current prospects for approaching the past. For reasons having to do with the epistemic trauma of colonialism and the nationalist response to it, scholars have been generally unwilling or perhaps unable to attempt anything like a Skinnerian reconstruction of the intellectual structure of the Delhi literary scene in the time just prior to colonialism. That is to say that the questions are not posed to consider what the authors of the texts might have intended and what that tells us but rather to ask how the texts themselves reveal momentum towards allow either colonial rule or national awareness. The historiographical argument that the present study will advance is that many of the historical questions that have been framed about eighteenth-century Indo-Persian (and by extension Urdu) literary culture by later scholars would have had little or no relevance for those living in the period under discussion. Now, the eighteenth century has been thoroughly studied and obviously many answers have been provided to historical questions, but there has been to some degree been a failure to engage with eighteenth century
writers on their own terms, hence many of the answers we have are well-formed but are nonetheless responses to badly framed questions. A well-formed answer to a badly constructed question is obviously a problem, as we have seen in our discussion of Ab-e Ḣayat. It is also dismaying that recent edited volumes focusing on the eighteenth century in South Asia also focus on economic and political history while excluding questions of cultural and intellectual history.

We are obliged to remember that historical subjects have a limited horizon and are not necessarily particularly invested in having the world turn out the way that we know it did after their deaths. Thus, we should renounce any goal of showing what Arzu got ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ by measuring his insights against modern linguistics which in any case would require the implicit assumption that our approach to analyzing language is right and any other approach is primitive or wrong.

Our thinking about how to understand language in the abstract is nonetheless informed by modern linguistics, as well as by the history of the relationship between Latin and the vernacular languages in Europe. The present work will not pursue a full comparative analysis of either but they inevitably inform our study and will be raised when apt. This is a more productive and intellectually honest approach than forcing history to hew to a trajectory determined in advance by the historian which is unfortunately how much of the social history of Urdu and Indo-Persian literature has been written.

Aab-e hayat makes much the same case as the present study in that it argues that Arzu’s career is a critical historical juncture. However, Azad’s conclusions are far from the last word on the subject because his subject is the growth of Urdu literary culture so he ignores Arzu’s Persianate intellectual life. He offers the striking formulation that Arzu is to Urdu poetry as Aristotle is to logic (Ab-e Ḣayat 1907: 115). Earlier tazkirahs had similar hyperbole too.
Literary histories of Urdu like Azad’s frame Arzu’s career in terms of his foundational role in Urdu literature but except in passing they do not connect it with his Persian scholarship which forms the vast bulk of what he wrote and significantly is what earned him the respect of his peers. This omission is not surprising given the precipitous decline in Persian’s prestige in South Asia, but it does mean that Urdu literary historians’ assessments of Arzu are incomplete. This is not to say that they get their facts wrong, as judged from a philosophically-suspect viewpoint but rather that they cannot fully answer the questions we wish to pose. However, their own interpretations shape our understanding of the tradition and indeed their interpretations comprise much of the tradition. Arzu has not received his due in the annals of South Asian intellectual history, we can understand because he was a Persian scholar first and then a hindi poet.

If we look more closely at Azad’s analysis of Arzu then we see that it suffers from a problem common to much of his scholarship, namely the need to slot writers into a narrative of the development of Urdu literature that the evidence cannot really sustain. According to Aab-e hayat, Arzu was one of the poets who took poetry that was founded on wordplay and ambiguity and pulled it into the Persian style and manner of expression. This kind of statement fallaciously implies that there was no wordplay in poetry of Persian. When Persian influenced Urdu poetry, it supposedly stripped away the indigenous tendency to engage in wordplay. This is, simply put, nonsense. Throughout his work, Azad focuses on indeed, it is fair to say that he is obsessed with a literary device called iham or punning. Iham has a long history in Persian poetics and a critical analysis of it first appeared seven hundred years before Azad in the work of Rashid al-Din Watw Furthermore, Amir Khusrau, the savant of thirteenth and fourteenth-century Delhi, boasted of having invented a new style of iham. Great classical poets, including Hafiz, mastered iham and it was an important tool in courtly discourse since it often provided an opportunity for a clever turn of phrase at the right
moment. The device clearly has an impeccable pedigree in Persian and yet Azad flatly claims that iham which in its Indic variant, jugat is a fault Urdu that inherited from Hindi and even more improbably, that the process of Persianization of Urdu poetry was mostly about scrubbing the iham out of it. There was an eighteenth-century conversation about iham, but it came later and was far less central than Azad has made it.

The reason Azad should frame all of Urdu literary history as a campaign against wordplay is obvious when we consider that he spent much of his life working for the colonial state: Nineteenth-century Britons had imbibed Romanticism so deeply that in general the only kind of contemporary poetry they valued was that of poets such as Wordsworth with their descriptions of apparently spontaneous emotional reactions to natural scenery. Thus there was no room for the perceived artificiality of iham and similar devices. Especially after Azad’s full-throated denunciation of it, this humble rhetorical device has been considered a pernicious evil that stifles genuine emotion.

The tendency to address Arzu achievements in the two languages separately means that we have not appreciated the fact that his theories on language and aesthetics, ostensibly about Persian only, are actually more general than that and encompass hindi as well. Without his engagement with the vernacular, his philosophy of language in Persian would not have been as rich and without his standing in Persian he would not have been in a position to influence vernacular poetry. There is also a practical problem: It is difficult for us to know how to split up Arzu’s lifeworld between the vernacular and Persian. Azad states with a brazen certainty that Khan-e Arzu was not an Urdu poet and nor did people of that time consider Urdu poetry to be an accomplishment (Aab-e hayat 1907: 116). Despite his critical acumen, he is at a disadvantage because has never been inside a theatre and he has never seen a play. We have so little information about social aspects of the intellectual lives of eighteenth-century Indians that we are groping for answers. For example, we can be certain that rekhtah and Indo-
Persian literary culture in the eighteenth century valued orality, and can assume that its focus was the poetic gathering, or mushaairah, but the fact is that the most authoritative scholarly account of mushaairahs cannot help but be completely speculative when discussing pre-twentieth-century gatherings as it is a common consensus among scholars.

*Language in South Asia* is a collected works of twenty-six articles distributed randomly among the following ten sections:

- language, history, families, and typology
- languages and their functions
- language, history, families, and typology
- languages and their functions
- Sanskrit and traditions of language study
- multilingualism, contact, and convergence
- orality, literacy, and writing systems
- language conflicts
- language and modernization
- language and discourse
- language and identity
- languages in diaspora

Each article is of uniformly very high quality and the volume attains a marked degree of comprehensiveness, a remarkable achievement given the breadth of South Asian languages. We learn from this collection about some 320 different languages in four dominant families, the depth of India’s linguistic history much of which has oral and not written. Therefore, this book presents its own unique problems and the complex sociolinguistic interactions which include issues like polite and familiar forms of address bilingualism and so forth
which has been a subject matter of the fourth chapter of this work as well. This work is successfully covers a wide range of well-known characteristics of the South-Asian Subcontinent.

The studies incorporated range from highly technical discussions regarding elements of language and linguistic structures which includes syntax, vocabulary, morphology, end even of systems writing. These can be referred in Yamuna Kachru’s *Hindi–Urdu–Hindustani*; Karu- muri V. Subbarao’s *Typological Characteristics of South Asian Languages*; Ian Smith’s *Pidgins, Creoles, and Bazaar Hindi*; Peter T. Daniels’s *Writing Systems of Major and Minor Languages*; S. N. Sridhar’s *Language Modernization in Kannada*. It attempts to present broad but comprehensive representations of census details of languages spoken which can be witnessed in R. E. Asher’s *Language in Historical Context*; Tej K. Bhatia’s *Major Regional Languages*; Anvita Abbi’s *Tribal Languages*; E. Annamalai’s *Contexts of Multilingualism*, to a number of carefully considered and planned and cautiously designed and presented analyses of the social dimensions of South Asia languages. We may see Madhav M. Deshpande’s *Sanskrit in the South Asian Sociolinguistic Context*; Ashok Aklujkar’s *Traditions of Language Study in South Asia*; S. N. Sridhar’s *Language Contact and Convergence in South Asia*. In continuation is the last group of studies is a selection of articles that investigate language in the different spheres of advertising in chapter nineteen, cinema in chapter twenty, religion in chapter twenty-one, gender in chapter twenty-two and among the nonmainstream groups of Dalits, Indian youth, and the South Asian diaspora from chapters from chapter twenty-three to twenty-six.

The sum and substance is that in this volume there is something for everybody interested in language in South Asia. If there is a central theme, it is most probably language that anchors culture in South Asia, whether expressed, as Ashok Aklujkar reiterates, in the belief that the Indian grammatical tradition underlies the growth of systematic thought in South Asia or as
S. N. Sridhar specifies in the role of bilingualism in Indian modernization. In the same fashion, several essays discuss how features were used and persistently stand as agents of political and social hegemony in South Asia such as Sanskritization, Persianization, Englishization which have been discussed by Braj B. Kachru in the introduction of this volume.

However, the objective behind a few of the section titles is not always clear and as a result the collection seems a bit unbalanced. Though there are separate articles discussing Persian, Sanskrit, Hindi-Urdu, and Kannada, many of the other South Asian languages appear only in the context of broad discussions like- *Major Regional Languages; Minority Languages* and their Status though again, the breadth of the subject matter must be taken into consideration here and without any doubt not every facet of linguistically diverse area like South Asia can be discussed in a single volume even in hefty one like this.

*Refashioning Iran Orientalism, Occidentalism and Historiography* by Mohamad Tavakoli-Targhi is a book which aims to explore modernity, Orientalism, nationalism, and the writings of history. It is a text which reflects the authors intensified curiosity about the formation of Orientalism and Oriental studies in India and this very interest inquiry into the works of early Orientalists, conversely, seem to have stirred his interest in Persianate scholars who had informed and educated these some pioneers which furthermore seem to have prompted his study of Persian travelogues on Europe and so forth which forms the subject of his work.

This detailed study on the subject is not a traditional historical monograph. Each of the chapter of this monograph stands on its own but it does share the overarching concerns of the others also. Refashioning Iran is an historiographical work that seems to challenge the conventional national histories of Iran which often depict modernity as a historical epoch started by Westernizing and state-centralizing reforms as it views modernity as a global
process that engendered various strategies of self-refashioning which is also the objective the present study which seeks to break away from the dehistoricizing implications of Westernization of European and non-European societies.

The first four chapters this remarkable and pacesetter book are dedicated to explore the interrelations of modernity, Orientalism, and Europeology, that is, a body of knowledge about Europe. The rest of the three chapters illuminate the emergence of an Iran-centered historiography and a constitutionalist discourse.

Informed by recent scholarship, Chapter one evaluates the conventional accounts of modernity as a by-product of Occidental rationalism and tells about an alternative approach for the exploration of Persianate modernity.

*Orientalism’s Genesis Amnesia* which is Chapter two of this work by Mohamad Tavakoli-Targhi attempts to explore the institutional extermination of the efforts of Persianate scholars who contributed to the making of Orientalism as an area of academic inquiry. Reassessing the intellectual career of Europeans greats of colonial period like Sir William Jones who also frames a section of the present study, this interrogates an intellectual exchange that authorized European scholars but marginalized their oriental associates. It also explores the intertextuality of European printed texts with forgotten Persian manuscripts like Muthmir the subject of the present research, the chapter seeks to rectify a current critical tendency that focuses solely on European scholarly productions without inquiring into the contribution of native scholars in the making of Oriental studies.

Chapter three which is *Persianate Europology* of this book analyzes late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century Persian accounts of Europe. Familiarity with Europe and European modes of life the argument by the author facilitates the development of a double consciousness
whereby Persianate ethical standards were used to evaluate European cultural practices and European perspectives were deployed for the censuring of Indian and Iranian societies.

Chapter four surveys the late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century Persian travelers’ impressions of the European women. Positive account of women of Europe informed the nationalist call for unveiling and educating women in Iran. Negative accounts, on the contrary, prompted the formation of a Europhobic discourse that warned against the Europeanization of Iranian women and chapter five entitled as “Contested Memories,” studies the allegorical meanings of Iran’s pre-Islamic history, a point of debate between Islamist and secular-nationalist visions of Iran. It attempts to explain the meanings of pre-Islamic Iran are found in the narratives that terminate in the Muslim conquest. Whereas Patriotic and Matriotic Nationalism, which is the seventh and last chapter studies two competing styles of national imagination. It explains how as a mother symbolically eliminated the father-Shah as the guardian of the nation in the engendering of the national body besides exploring how this contributed to the emergence of popular sovereignty that is, the participation of the nation’s children in determining the future of the mother-land.

The diverse range of issues dealt with in this book inexorably raises a barrage of questions.

This book raises some fundamental questions on account of Indo-Iranian modernity which also includes and comprises of some significant contribution and position of Khan-i-Arzu.

*The Pursuit of Persian: Language in Mughal Politics* is an article written by Muzaffar Alam in Volume 32 of Modern Asian Studies by Cambridge University Press in May 1998 which has attempted to highlight some points with reference to the contribution of Khan-i-Arzu. It says that as late as the eighteenth century, Hindavi did not evolve a uniform idiom even in northern India.
Sirajuddin Ali Khan Arzu (d. 1756), a noted eighteenth-century poet, writer and lexicographer, mentions Gwaliori, Braj, Rajputi, Haryanvi, Hindi and Punjabi as diverse besides the dialects of Shahjahanabad-Delhi and Akbarabad Agra. Sanskrit or Hindi-ye kitab (Hindi of Book) as Arzu calls it could have been a choice in place of Persian as a language of the empire.

The article further states that if the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was the period of sublime and the best poetry produced in India then the eighteenth century was the richest in terms of the number and varieties of prose and poetic works in Persian which has been instatiated as well. Seventy-seven of the Persian poets who lived during the earlier half of the century found the place of honour in the tazkira, titled as Majma’-un-Nafa’is of Siraj-ud-Din Ali Khan Arza who was the best and the most revered scholar, poet and critic of the period the article attests.

Thereafter principal Persian philological works of the period have also been discussed which includes the recognition of Siraj-ul-Lughat of Arzu, Miraat-ul-Istilahaat of Anand Mustalahaat-ush-Shu’ara of Siyalkoti Mal Warasta and Bahaar-i-Ajam of Munshi Tek Chand ‘Bahar’ were all oriented to in the light of the current usages in Iran.

It furthermore says that there were some attempts for Indian Persian autonomous position, but these were feeble and exceptional. Arzu, for instance, defends the tasarruf of masters like Mirza Bedil. It identifies endeavour to legitimize the use of the Indian words in Persian and says that he earned the distinction of being the first to discover the correspondence (tawafuq) between Persian and Sanskrit. Siraj-ul-Lughat and Chiraagh-i Hidayat, he discusses this at length in Muthmir to show how these two languages are identical. He is conscious of his achievement. It quotes Arzu:
To date no one, excepting this humble Arzu and his followers, has discovered the tawafuq (lit. agreement, concord) between Hindi and Persian, even though there have been numerous lexicographers and other researchers in both these languages. I have based on this principle in assessing the correctness of some of the Persian words, which I have illustrated in my books like Siraj-ul-Lughat and Chiragh-i Hidayat.

It is strange that even the author of Farhang-i Rashidi and those who lived in India have neglected the tawaafuq between these two languages.

However, it questions Arzu's practice of this idea. According to the article Arzu's own writings are largely free from this tasarruf, implying perhaps that the ideal Persian was the unalloyed one. Even if it may not sound very much relevant here, pride in his Hindavi is noteworthy.

The Author of this article suspects the possibility of eighteenth-century social and political conditions that had a bearing on Arzu's position which it tends to call ambiguous. It further maintains:

On the one hand, there was pressure from the high Mughal culture which was more in support of an unmixed Iranized idiom, on the other, as a reaction to this influence, the newly risen Indian 'upstarts' threatened, sometimes, to dislodge the established elite. Arzu attempted a kind of a compromise. He discovered Hindi's affinity with Persian, which incidentally was not a mere political ploy, and thus satisfied the urge of the upcoming elite. But in practice he maintained a position close to the one favoured by the established elite.

It also talks about Arzu’s literary debate against the eminent Iranian poet, Shaikh Ali Hazin who came and settled in India in the period and who was generally dismissive about the
Indian Persian poetry just because in his assessment it did not come up to the contemporary Iranian linguistic standards. It talks about Arzu’s ventures to correct Hazin in the light of the old established Persian usages, or he simply pointed out the illogicality of some of the expressions in Hazin’s verses. At any rate, Hazin had many followers among the Indians. Some were unhappy with Arzu’s criticism and wrote rejoinders in support of Hazin.

The article says that in the face of the asserting regional forces in the eighteenth century the Mughals accorded a respectable position to Hindavi by admitting it in their sarkars but many of them also saw to it that it was heavily Persianized. In the first place, even as Mirza Khan prepared a manual for the Mughal elites to learn Hindi script, Hindavi, if it was to be a language of this class, was to be written only in Persian script. Secondly, it would thenceforth be given the name of the language of the imperial camp (zubaan-i Urdu-i mu’alla, zuban-i Urdu-i Shahi). In other words, it was the language that evolved at the Mughal camp and not the language of the region, which the Mughals recognized and appropriated.

It stresses that both these positions have been argued out fairly cogently in the writings of Arzu, which represented best the Mughal stand during the period. He prepared his own Hindi-Persian dictionary, Nawadir-ul-Alfaz, and even if he based it on Mir Abd-ul-Wasi’s Gharai, he dismissed many words used by him as the ones belonging to ‘the tongue of the illiterates (zubaan-I juhhaal)’. While Abd-ul-Wasi characterized as correct and lucid or fasih in Hindavi many of the Indianized or rather locally corrupt spellings and pronunciations of the Persian words, Arzu insisted on their original Persian forms. It talks about a discussion on Persian, Pahlavi and Dari, Arzu says that the most accurate and elegant form of a language is the one spoken at a royal camp. For, it is the language of the camp which the king and his nobles speak and which is distinctly different from the language of villagers and the people of petty towns. Prose and poetry of high are written only in this language.
By Persianizing Hindavi, the Mughals intended to purify the language and thus raise it to a level commensurate with their culture and life style. The article sees Arzu as the one who refused to incorporate in his ‘language of the royal camp’ the Hindavized Persian words and says that Arzu’s position deserves special notice. It says that in the matter of Persian he defended, even if with a reservation, tasarruf-i Hind or Mughal Indian Persian in the face of the onslaught against it by the Iranians and their Indian ‘cup-lickers’ and thus asserted the sovereignty of the Mughals. In the matter of Hindavi, he took a position of reconciliation and having done assiduous research on tawafuq and thus legitimating his stand, adjusted to the demands of the rising regions. Nonetheless, he firmly declined to compromise on the supremacy of the culture of the Mughal court according to the article.

The author maintains that Arzu found strong support for this in Shah Hatim a notable Mughal writer and poet of that period. It says that in 1755, Hatim laid down principles to replace the local words by Perso-Arabic ones with their original spellings. Arzu and Hatim's positions echoed the deliberations of the meetings which used to take place at the haveli of Amir Khan where a number of nobles and notables assembled to listen to Persian poetry and consider ‘reforms’ of Hindavi poetry and prose.

Delhi: Pages from a Forgotten History is a book of commitment and ebullience rarely matched in the present-day academic writing. That is how in fact it should have been, if one undertakes to write on a subject like this. Dudney presents here a detailed account of the influence, influx, accomplishment and role of Sirajuddin Ali Khan, Khan-i-Arzu and the magnitude of gigantic Persian lexicographers who were active in the eighteenth century. Tek Chand Bahar and Anand Ram Mukhlis whose dictionaries Bahaar-i Ajam and Miraat al-Isttilaah are some of the greatest of Persian dictionaries of all time, were in a good bond with Khan-i-Arzu, or vice-versa. Here he comes somewhat at par with Mohammad Hussain Azad who says in Aab-i -hayaat (1880: 115), “As long as all logicians will be called the
descendants of Aristotle, all Urdu-speakers will continue to be called the descendants of Khan-i-Arzu”.

The writer also rightly observes Khan-i-Arzu’s distinction between the literary language and day to day language and notes his proposition that literary language can only be imbibed through reading and study. He maintains that there are numerous constructions in Persian which are used only in poetry which a ‘native’ speaker could scarcely claim familiarity with.

It seems that among Dudney’s many advantages is his first-hand knowledge of the subcontinent, his sufficient knowledge of Persian, Urdu and spoken Hindi and his familiarity with many classical and modern European languages made this piece more efficacious.

In this, almost the first and rare published account in English of Khan-i-Arzu’s notion, Dudney cautions us that it is wrong to apply the term native speaker in the medieval context of Indo-Iran. What was more important was competence. Khan-i-Arzu observed that if native speakers of Hindi/Rekhtah could commit mistakes of language or idiom in their Hindi/Rekhtah poems, then why we should not imagine that the Iranians may also commit mistakes in their Persian poetry.

In a nut shell, this work conscientiously and commendably discusses about Arzu who in the words of Prashant Keshavmurthy (2013:28) is “Among the most copious authors of critical discourses related to Speaking Anew and among the most useful to help us better understand the recursive temporality of this kind of literary newness...” The author deserves an umpteen credit for the care and thoughtfulness that have undergone into preparing this significant reference work.

Nonetheless, in English as well as other languages like Urdu and Persian almost all the writings on Arzu and his works including Muthmir have been discussed in historical context like a few of the above plus a couple more by Arthur Dale Dudney and language which was prime concern of Arzu is secondary for the majority of scholars.
Arzu’s *Muthmir* is self-evidently an important work but its place in the intellectual tradition of Indo-Persian has not been settled. In the last couple of decades, scholars have shown interest in the text which is the subject of the present research. However, almost all of them exclusively see this with relation to the concept *tawaafuq al-lisaanain* which has been a sort of scholarly trend although *tawaafuq* is addressed in only a small part of *Muthmir*. Whereas, there is considerably a lot more to explore in *Muthmir* than this particular idea. This treatise on language by Khan-i-Arzu which he calls an account of *ilm-i usuul-i lughat* (*the science of the elements of language*) that is quite synonymous with the modern science of language, called Linguistics *has* barely received a complete treatment by the experts of language in any language to the best of our feeble knowledge except that of the published edition of *Muthmir* in Persian by a teacher of Persian language who is also former Head of the Department of Persian, University of Delhi and is the author of *Encyclopaedia of Persian Language and Literature* from Pakistan: University of Karachi with an introduction in English. The publication of Rehana Khatoon’s work in 1991 came before computer typesetting was present in Pakistan which is aimed to provide opportunities to scholars to further undertake research on the subject. However, it cannot fit the criteria of research of linguistic orientation as it lacks suitable approach, style and appropriate terminology employed in the modern day linguistics. The publisher did not engage a professional scribe to prepare a fair-copy either. The material of manuscript that came to light towards the end of preparing the edition was simply appended that too in a very poor quality xeroxed form. This does not entail the belittlement of this work as she has painstakingly tried to trace many of the references in the text which includes passages taken directly from all the other relevant sources, namely *Al-Muzhir, Farhang-i-Jahaangiri* and so on and has written out the text in her own handwriting.
1.4 **SCOPE OF THE STUDY**

The relevance of the study lies in the fact that until no or little attention has been made to examine Arzu critically for his contribution to literary as well as in linguistic scholarship. The present study will pave the way for better understanding of Arzu’s work and his wide contribution to linguistic scholarship which will open up a window for further exploration and establishment of Arzu as a laureate at par and Linguist of all time genius. It attempts to evaluate Khan-i-Arzu’s works on the basis of his varied contribution in Diachronic as well as Synchronic Linguistics besides the other Interdisciplinary fields of Linguistics like Sociolinguistics, Stylistics and the likes.

1.5 **METHODOLOGY**

The setting up of the research is in such a way as to derive systematic and logically sound conclusion. Its purpose is to provide conclusive answers to the problem posed as well as to customize the research. The design of proposed study is both explorative and descriptive in nature. The exploratory studies are used to provide a beginning familiarity with the proposed topic. The descriptive studies aim at portraying contribution of Khan-i-Arzu as a scholar in general and also as a whistle blower in the field of developing Linguistics in particular with a special reference to concept of language relationship, different levels and elements in a language, language variation and the philosophical foundation of linguistic thought that his monumental work Muthmir treasures for the linguists.

1.6 **LIMITATION OF THE STUDY**

In spite of best of the efforts to minimise all the limitations that might creep in course of the research of this nature, it is but obvious that certain constraints within which the research was completed. There have been many topics like orthography, lexicology, lexicography
and a few more which could not be dealt with at length under separate headings besides there would be some instances in which it might appear that a point overlaps although the attempts have been made to organize it most systematically, comprehensively and unequivocally.
Chapter 2

PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATION OF LINGUISTIC THOUGHT

2.0. GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The Chapter two of the present study introduces the major issues and themes that have moulded and fashioned the expansion and growth of Philosophical thinking about language, meaning and communication. The philosophy of language and linguistics concerns itself with the nature of human language and of linguistic inquiry. The central issues concern epistemology and ontology.

- ‘Epistemology’ is the branch of philosophy dealing with the nature of knowledge – in this case linguistic knowledge. While talking about knowing something what really this means, the question arises:

  ⇒ What is ‘knowing’?
  ⇒ What to be known?
  ⇒ How to be known?

The art of conceiving, understanding and reproducing the concept is referred to as knowing. When a general idea from the set of circumstances is picked and chosen and conceptualizes, understands and regurgitate, it is the process of knowing. In other words knowing can be said to possess knowledge and understanding. Amidst knowing, it is essential to discuss that what to be known. While conceptualizing, understanding and regurgitating, the material knowledge is being processed to get the structured thought. Here it is worth discussing the connotation of knowledge. Knowledge is the net result of the processing of the perceived
ideas in the mind through thinking or when mind perceives, conceptualizes and understands through thinking and finally regurgitate a well structured thought, then this well structured thought is referred as knowledge. After that the matter of concern is ‘how to know’. This ‘how to know’ is the conscious as well as subconscious mental process which operates in the mind where thinking pick and choose nodes to form thought. This very process from perceiving, conceiving, understanding and reproducing the ideas into thought is the answer for ‘how to know’.

This ‘what is knowing’, ‘what to know’ and ‘how to know’ forms a subsection of philosophy called as epistemology. Epistemology as a terminology of philosophy was first introduced by Scottish philosopher James F. Ferrier in 1854 in his work Institutes of metaphysic. The word epistemology is the philosophical theory of knowledge which means the study of knowledge as a discipline.

Epistemology as a process can be described as the human accumulates knowledge through senses, then verified by reasoning in understanding and translating it into knowledge, after that logic works as an agent in sustaining the knowledge. The knowledge turns to concept which acts as a mental plane for the abstract details of the realities. The sustained knowledge then relates themselves to the real world through objectivity means to say that objective of the knowledge is to use it practically in the real world.

- ‘Ontology’ is that field of philosophy which deals with reality, with what exists (is there only one kind of reality, or should we speak of a pluralism of realities?). Ontology is the branch of metaphysics which deals with the existence of reality, nature of reality, sustainability of reality and properties of reality and the likes. The word ontology is made up of two Greek words ontos which means ‘reality’ and logos meaning ‘study’. Furthermore, ontology is the study of being and existing, classification of entities like, material structure or mental structure, its properties and change of kind. While defining
ontology it is necessary to tackle these two questions, what is being? And what is existence? According to Merriam-Webster Dictionary ‘being’ means a living thing, state of existence and the most important or basic part of the person’s mind or self. Furthermore, ontology can be defined as something that actually exists in the given universe, the state or reality of existing, something that can be conceived as existing, the entirety of existence and the conscious existence. According to Merriam-Webster Dictionary ‘existence’ means reality as opposed to appearance, reality as presented in experience, the totality of existent things and a particular being. So that existence can be defined as the reality that can be presented in experience or the whole of existence of the universe.

In the philosophy of linguistic thought, the main ontological question is whether we can reasonably claim if there are linguistic realities, or a single linguistic reality, as distinct from other kinds of reality. Epistemology and ontology are closely intertwined, especially if we assume that there are linguistic realities, and that they constitute a kind of knowledge. The last few decades have seen at least two fundamental changes: towards philosophy of language for its own sake, and towards the scientific study of ordinary talk. To understand these changes, it is vital to appreciate two corresponding background features of the philosophical landscape. First, for much of the twentieth century philosophy of language was regarded as the core field of philosophy in the sense that other fields were to be approached through its prism. In a weaker form, this is an old idea. But two schools in the twentieth century took this ‘linguistic turn’ to a new level. This leads to the second background feature, namely the long-standing clash between ‘scientific’ versus ‘actual usage’ camps in the philosophy of language.
In other words, the philosophy of linguistic thought is closely connected with issues in the philosophy of science which concerns itself with questions such as:

⇒ Is there such a thing as scientific knowledge distinct in kind from other sorts of knowledge?
⇒ Is it possible to distinguish scientific theories from other sorts of theory?
⇒ If so, how?
⇒ Is there such a thing as a scientific method?
⇒ If so, how do we characterize it?
⇒ What makes it different from other methods?

Clearly, we cannot say whether, or to what extent, linguistic inquiry might be scientific unless we have some understanding of what we mean by ‘science.’ Furthermore, given that philosophers of science disagree on the answers to the questions just raised, linguists must adopt a particular philosophy of science if they are to argue that linguistic investigation is scientific in nature. To set out the range of positions that have been proposed in the philosophy of linguistic thought, let us begin with a difference made within the philosophy of science literature and then relate it to positions adopted within linguistics. Some philosophers of science, notably Feyerabend (1975), argued that there is no valid distinction to be drawn between scientific and nonscientific knowledge, that the idea of ‘scientific method’ is an illusion. Those who have denied this include Popper (1959), who argued that there is such a thing as scientific method, and thus scientific knowledge, distinct from non-scientific knowledge. But he disagreed with the views of the members of the Vienna Circle, a group of scientists and philosophers working in the Vienna in the mid-20th century, who embraced a position known as ‘logical positivism.’
2.1 **LOGICAL POSITIVISM**

Rudolph Carnap (1891–1970) and fellow logical positivists regarded ordinary language as hopelessly inadequate to the needs of science, and so initiated the development of a new and better suited artificial language. Each sentence in this new language would be tied, definitionally, to the conditions under which it could be confirmed or refuted empirically. Anything not expressible in this improved language would then be dismissed as so much metaphysical nonsense. This revisionist project had been largely discredited by the 1960s, but it has cast a long and often unacknowledged shadow across the whole of philosophy. The logical positivists (e.g., Moritz Schlick) argued that scientific knowledge is firmly and exclusively based on observation, and that, because of this, scientific theories, unlike nonscientific theories, can be proven, yielding knowledge that was certain (indubitable). They argued that statements that are not scientific (on their understanding of the term) are literally meaningless. Their position is often referred to as ‘verificationism’ since they believed that scientific theories could be verified (proven) via observation of the physical world. Although Popper believed, like the logical positivists, that there was such a thing as a scientific method, and thus scientific knowledge, he disagreed with the idea that science yields certain knowledge via verification. Instead, he argued for ‘fallibilism,’ the idea that our scientific hypotheses are always fallible, and that we can never have knowledge that is absolutely certain. Popper rejected verificationism and adopted, in its place, ‘falsificationism’: he believed that the hallmark of scientific hypotheses was falsifiability: if a claim about the world was framed in such a way that it admitted of counterevidence, then it was falsifiable and thus scientific. There is a connection between this idea and the idea of the content of a hypothesis: the more a hypothesis excludes (the more states of affairs it rules out), the more it is claiming about the world. Popper believed that scientific inquiry rested on a process of hypothesis formation, deduction of the consequences of our hypotheses, and testing of those
consequences. This is known as the ‘hypothetico-deductive method.’ If a falsifiable hypothesis is tested and falsified, then we may retain it until a better hypothesis emerges, abandon it, or modify it. For Popper, this was what allowed us to make scientific progress. But even if a testable hypothesis has not been falsified, that does not warrant the conclusion that it is true: for Popper, our scientific knowledge was always open to the possibility of being falsified and abandoned. Popper also rejected the view that nonscientific claims were meaningless. In its place, he argued that a given idea may begin by being nonscientific (unfalsifiable) but nonetheless meaningful, to being falsifiable, and thus scientific. An example he gave of this was the idea that the earth revolved around the sun, an idea that has its roots in Greek mythology but that eventually became scientific. Popper’s views on the scientific method were combined with another central plank in his philosophy of science: ‘scientific realism.’ By this he meant the idea that there are aspects of reality that are amenable to scientific inquiry but are not themselves directly observable. Examples of these are gravitational force and electromagnetic forces: we cannot, in principle, observe these, but we can observe their effects. For Popper, it was thus valid for scientists to postulate unobservable aspects of reality and to make testable claims about them. This clearly flew in the face of the positivist claim that scientific knowledge concerns only that which is observable. Opponents of scientific realism adopted a position referred to by Popper as ‘instrumentalism’ they argued that theoretical constructs in science were no more than that: they were instruments for systematizing and making predictions about observable phenomena.

Nick Moore observes that a positivist approach depends on the assumption that there is a distinction between objective and subjective perspectives; that there is an explanation of the world that is the correct one and it exists without people. The modern version of this position derives from Descartes. The Cartesian principle *cogito ergo sum*, or “I think therefore I am,”
privileges reason over emotion. It provided the philosophical foundation for the expansion of scientific understanding in the modern era, and influenced a wide range of scholars from Newton to Chomsky.

The aim of a positivist experiment is to measure the world ‘out there’ with instruments that operate independently of the operator. The result, in a positivist paradigm, is a measurement of reality that can be expressed independently of an observer. As the dominant ideology in the early twentieth century, positivism was a requirement for any new discipline wishing to promote itself as a science.

2.1.1 Instrumentalism:

Under an instrumentalist approach, we are not warranted in saying that our constructs correspond to theory external objects and events in the world. The term ‘phenomenalism’ is also used for this position. Thus, all talk of unobservable ‘forces’ is nothing more than a way of talking about observable phenomena: the instrumentalist withholds any ontological commitment of the sort that claims that various forces actually exist. The distinction between positivism, with its instrumentalist, antirealist outlook, and scientific realism had an effect on modern linguistics. During the mid-20th century, many linguists (notably, the ‘post-Bloomfieldians’) working in the United States argued for an instrumentalist interpretation of linguistic constructs, such as ‘the phoneme’ and ‘the morpheme.’ It is arguable that they had been influenced by the logical positivists, either directly or indirectly. In insisting that linguistics, to be scientific, had to concern itself only with that which was observable, they were committed to a position that was anti-mentalistic, since mental states and processes are, by definition, unobservable. This outlook was combined with a positivistic conception of psychology, often referred to as ‘behaviorism,’ the view that a properly scientific psychology should concern itself only with observable behavior and not with unobservables. It is
arguable that much of Noam Chomsky’s thinking (1965, 1993, 2002 and elsewhere) about the nature of linguistic inquiry is in line with Popper’s thinking about science. Like his immediate predecessors in the United States, Chomsky believed that the kinds of linguistic inquiry he was engaged in (generative linguistics) were scientific in nature. But, unlike them, Chomsky adopted scientific realism: he argued that science is not limited to observables. It is Chomsky’s scientific realism that allowed him to embrace mentalism in the study of language: freed from the insistence that science concerns itself only with that which is observable.

2.2. MENTALESE

Some theorists of mind have claimed that thought takes place in a language-like medium. They have called this language ‘Mentalese.’ Mentalese has a syntax, a semantics, and a morphology, though discovering these properties of the language of thought will likely require extensive empirical investigation of the mind. Obviously, mentalese does not have a phonology. It is therefore more like written public language than overt speech. And whereas public languages require a pragmatics – a theory of how the language is used by speakers – mentalese, like the machine languages of computers, does not call for one. Gilbert Harman (1973) offered the following argument for the existence of mentalese: logical relations hold among mental states and these relations are essential to their role in psychological prediction and explanation. If the belief that snow is white and grass is green is true, then the belief that snow is white is true. In general, if the belief that p&q is true, then the belief that p is true. Generalizations of this sort presuppose that beliefs have sentential structure. Some beliefs are conjunctions, others disjunctions, and so on. Beliefs (as well as desires, fears, and the other propositional attitudes) are part of a language like system. Harman’s argument fails to establish that mental states themselves have logical or sentential structure. The argument trades on the fact that belief ascriptions have sentential structure. We ascribe certain beliefs to
subjects using sentences that are conjunctive or disjunctive, but it does not follow that the mental states so ascribed are themselves conjunctions or disjunctions, or that the relations that hold among these mental states are of the sort that hold among sentences (or propositions), that is, that they are logical relations. To assume that they are is just to assume what is at issue – that thoughts have a language-like structure. In general, one must guard against attributing to thoughts themselves properties of the representational scheme that we use to talk about them. The hypothesis that thought occurs in a language like medium is understood as the claim that not only beliefs but also desires and the other propositional attitudes are properly construed as relations to sentences in the inner language. The difference between the believing-relation and the fear-relation is construed as a difference in the processing that the sentence token undergoes in the brain, in other words, as a difference in its functional role. The belief is likely to cause, in certain circumstances, sincere assertions of a public language sentence meaning the conflict in the Middle East will not be resolved. The fear is more likely to give rise to appropriate emotional states.

Chomsky could allow that there are linguistic realities that are mental in nature, in stark contrast to the anti-mentalistic stance of his immediate predecessors. He went further than this: he insisted that linguistic realities are exclusively mental. More specifically, they are mental states, not processes, and they are strictly internal to individuals. Thus, linguistic inquiry was a branch of individual psychology for Chomsky. This clearly flies in the face of any social conception of the object of linguistic inquiry, which Chomsky labeled ‘E-language,’ where the ‘E’ means ‘external to individual minds.’ In contrast, he insisted that the object of inquiry in linguistics is ‘I-language,’ where the ‘I’ stands for both ‘Individual’ and ‘Internal’ (to the mind). This is Chomsky’s ‘internalism.’ Connected with this is Chomsky’s insistence that language is not designed for use. This is not intended to mean that language is not, in fact, used for communication (no one could deny that it is); rather, communicative use
is not what language is for. This is Chomskys’ ‘antifunctionalism’: in his view, language is not driven by communicative function. Rather, language is for thinking: language and thought are intimately connected, for Chomsky. Connected with this is the long-standing distinction between ‘competence’ and ‘performance’: for Chomsky, the object of inquiry is not observable utterance phenomena (performance), or acts of online mental processing of utterances (which also falls within performance), but the knowledge (competence) that allows performance (use of that knowledge) to take place. The choice of terminology was unfortunate, since in everyday parlance, ‘competence’ denotes the ability to perform in some domain, as in John’s competence as a manager is unquestionable. But Chomsky long since insisted that his conception of linguistic knowledge was not to be interpreted as knowing how to do something; nor was it to be interpreted as knowing that something is the case. Rather, linguistic knowledge was an unconscious mental state that grew in the mind of the child. This notion of growth is a biological one: according to Chomsky, language ‘acquisition’ (the term is inappropriate in discussing Chomsky’s views, since, for Chomsky, language is not acquired – it is innate) was not something that a child did: it was something that happened to the child. In this view, ‘language acquisition’ is a process of biological growth. This constitutes Chomsky’s ‘naturalism’: the view that language belongs to the natural world and not to culture, a view that is controversial. A central component of Chomsky’s naturalism was his claim that human beings are born with linguistic knowledge, that there is innate cognitive content that is specifically linguistic. This is often referred to as the ‘innateness hypothesis,’ although Chomsky disliked the term on the grounds that everyone agreed that there are innate cognitive capacities: the question is what they might be. In arguing for innate linguistic knowledge, Chomsky adopted a version of ‘rationalism,’ often referred to as ‘nativism.’
2.3. **RATIONALISM**

In the history of philosophy, rationalism is most frequently associated with the work of Rene´ Descartes, who argued that not all human knowledge is acquired through interaction with the mind-external world. Rather, he argued that there is innate cognitive content, often referred to as the ‘Cartesian doctrine of innate ideas.’ Chomsky explicitly associated himself with the Cartesian tradition and has elaborated a specifically linguistic version of rationalism. The Chomskyan version of the doctrine of innate ideas is that we are born with a universal set of semantic primitives, out of which specific word meanings are constructed. Although the terms ‘nativism’ and ‘rationalism’ tend to be used interchangeably, some definitions of nativism claim only that it amounts to allowing that there are innate cognitive capacities, a view that is consistent with ‘empiricism,’ a doctrine that has various versions, but that emphasizes the role of our experience with the mind-external world in acquiring knowledge. Empiricists need not deny that we are born with innate cognitive capacities of various sorts (such as the capacity for forming inductive and analogical generalizations); where empiricists in linguistics disagree with Chomsky is in denying that innate, specifically linguistic, knowledge exists. Another central plank in Chomsky’s philosophy of linguistics is his adoption of ‘modularism,’ the view that at least some aspects of the mind are modular in nature. By ‘module’ he meant a distinct component of mind devoted to a specific cognitive domain (such as language, or recognition of familiar faces, or the visual system as a whole). The notion of modularity of mind is associated with the work of Fodor (1983), who suggested a set of defining properties of mental modules, including the property of being ‘encapsulated.’ The idea behind encapsulation is that the internal workings of a mental module are unavailable to other aspects of the mind. However, the output of a module is available to other aspects of the mind. For instance, we cannot access the inner workings of the module of mind that compels us to suffer optical illusions, but we do access the output of
that module. Like Fodor, Chomsky never believed that the mind is entirely modular, but he
did consistently espouse linguistic modularity: he believed that the mind contains an innately
endowed language module. He also followed Fodor in believing that the mind contains a
central processor that is nonmodular and that is used in, among other things, the fixation of
beliefs. Our experience of optical illusions provides us with an example of the distinction
between the modular visual system and the central processor: while the central processor can
arrive at the belief that a given picture constitutes an optical illusion, it cannot override the
output of the visual system. Knowing that a picture is illusory does not allow us to escape
from experiencing the illusion. Fodor claimed that the central processor contains a ‘Language
of Thought’ (LoT), which is said to be innate. The LoT is said to be a universal set of
semantic primitives that has a syntax of its own, allowing for the construction of complex
concepts out of a set of semantic primitives. One of the arguments in favor of the LoT is the
claim that language acquisition involves entertaining hypotheses about the structure of the
language to be acquired: such hypotheses cannot be formulated unless there is an innate LoT
for them to be formulated in. One important difference between Chomsky and Fodor is that,
when Fodor spoke of language as a mental module, he conceived of it as an input/output
module that receives certain kinds of output from the mind-external world, processes it, and
creates an output. For Chomsky, input/output modules were distinct in kind from the
innermost cognitive system, which constitutes language. An alternative recent approach to
modularity can be found in the work of Karmiloff-Smith (2001), who argued that, rather than
postulating innate mental modules, we should postulate, in addition to general cognitive
capacities, innate biases in certain domains, which then evolve into a modular organization.
This notion of emergent modularity is part of Karmiloff Smith’s ‘constructivism,’ according
to which a child actively constructs a mental grammar, revising his or her own internal
representations during the course of development. This stands in contrast to Chomsky’s
passive conception of language acquisition. The work of Karmiloff-Smith occupies a midway position between rationalism and empiricism. A more overtly empiricist approach to linguistic knowledge was adopted by the linguist Geoffrey Sampson (1997), who opposed linguistic rationalism for several decades. Sampson claimed that the arguments given in support of nativism do not hold up to close scrutiny. Instead, he argued that the child starts with a blank slate, but with the capacity to learn via the hypothetico-deductive method. On this view, language acquisition is learning, a view entirely at odds with the Chomskyan view.

Others have objected to the ontological status of linguistic objects proposed by Chomsky. Among these are Katz (1981), who argued for Platonism in linguistics. Arguing against Chomsky’s psychologism (the view that linguistics is a branch of psychology), Katz’s view, which is a version of realism, was that there are linguistic realities but they are ‘abstract,’ in the sense of being Platonic in nature: they are not spatiotemporal (they do not exist in space and time). Katz was a semanticist who argued, among other things, that the existence of necessary truths in language leads us inexorably to Platonism, since necessary truths are timeless: they predate human psychological states. Katz also argued that, since the notion ‘knowledge of’ is a two-place predicate, the notion ‘knowledge of language’ presupposes linguistic objects of which we have mind-internal knowledge. Knowledge of the structure of a sentence, Katz argued, is distinct from the structure of the sentence per se. Engaging in acts of intuitive grammaticality judgment entailed, Katz claimed, our gaining direct access to abstract Platonic objects, rather than gaining access to mind-internal states, as Chomsky argued. Note that Chomsky’s use of the term ‘knowledge’ did not, in fact, appeal to a two-place predicate: linguistic knowledge was not knowledge of something, for Chomsky. Katz argued not only that linguistic objects such as sentences were Platonic objects, but that specific languages such as French and Spanish also had this status. For Katz, linguistics was on a par with mathematics, as one of the ‘sciences of the intuition’: just as mathematical
objects are (according to Katz) mind-external Platonic objects to which we can gain intuitive access, so are sentences. A less radical version of antipsychologism was the view, first proposed by Roger Lass (1976), that linguistic objects are intersubjective in nature, specifically that they belong to the ontological category referred to by Popper (1972) as ‘world three.’ Popper argued for ‘ontological pluralism,’ the view that the world is open-ended and that new sorts of reality can emerge. For Popper, ‘world one’ was the world of inanimate physical objects and events. ‘World two’ was the world of mental states, which emerged with the emergence of life forms, particularly those with minds. ‘World three’ was where Popper believed scientific knowledge belonged: he regarded scientific theories as objective knowledge, inter-subjective in nature. His principal argument was that our scientific theories may contain logical consequences that might, at a given stage in scientific history, remain unnoticed, later to be discovered. Popper believed that such consequences are real, even before being discovered, and that they therefore must be said to exist independently of our subjective mental states. Carr (1990) later elaborated on Lass’s idea, arguing that linguistic knowledge is objective knowledge in the Popperian sense, while also arguing that generative linguistics is scientific in the Popperian sense. A distinct version of linguistic knowledge as mutual knowledge can be found in the work of Itkonen (1978), who argued that the central notion in language is the notion of socially constituted rules or norms. Itkonen distinguished spatiotemporal events such as rocks rolling down hills, from our actions, which necessarily contain a component of intentionality. It is social actions that are central to Itkonen’s thinking: he argued that socially constituted norms (rules) formed the basis for linguistic behavior. These norms (conventions) are the object of grammatical inquiry for Itkonen, and since they are social in nature, the object of grammatical inquiry is social, not mind-internal. A more recent approach to the question of the respective roles of nature and social conventions can be found in the work of Noel Burton-Roberts (see Burton-Roberts and
Carr, 1999). Burton-Roberts adopted a version of naturalism; he advocated ‘radical internalism,’ the view that the only coherent conception of Chomskyan internalism is one under which the contents of innate linguistic knowledge are not in any sense internalized. ‘Internalization’ implies setting up mind-internal representations of events or objects that are mind-external. This, Burton-Roberts argued, is not what Chomsky intends when he advocated internalism. He agreed with Chomsky that radically internal language is ‘austere’ in the sense that it has no access to other aspects of mind that contain internalization of properties of the mind-external world, such as linearity (sequentiality), derived from the linear sequencing of the speech signal. Knowledge of the conventions regarding the sequences of phonemes, morphemes, and words in a specific language is ‘internalized knowledge’ for Burton-Roberts. The place of phonology was a central concern for Burton-Roberts (see Burton-Roberts 2000), since sequencing is a defining feature of phonology. The relationship between phonology and semantics was equally important for Burton-Roberts, since that relationship was both arbitrary and conventional. He argued that if one allows, as Chomsky did, that phonological knowledge is part of radically internal linguistic knowledge, then one compromises radical internalism by incorporating that which is conventional into that which is natural. The distinction between that which is radically mind-internal and that which is internalized is crucial here. That which is radically internal to the mind has not been internalized from the mind-external world. That which is internalized, such as the mental image of a familiar face, is not radically internal: it results from internalizing aspects of the mind-external world. Burton-Roberts distinguished a generic conception of language from the Chomskyan naturalistic conception of language. The former appealed to a notion of the universality of the notion ‘language’ by generalizing over all human languages: ‘language’ here is the generic term for the set of all languages. In this view, a specific language is an ‘instantiation,’ or ‘token,’ of the type ‘language.’ The generic conception of language lends itself to an
instrumentalist interpretation: the notion ‘language’ can be seen as a construct that has no reality beyond the specific languages which it ranges over. The naturalistic conception of language appeals to a notion of ‘language’ as something quite independent of particular languages: the reality of language, in this view, does not reside in particular languages. Rather, ‘language’ is the innate linguistic knowledge shared by all members of the species. The naturalistic conception of language lends itself to a realist interpretation: ‘language’ as a biological reality. The generic conception of ‘language’ embodies a methodological claim: that the way to understand the notion ‘language’ is to investigate particular languages. In this view, strong universals are properties attested in every human language that one will ever encounter, whereas weak universals are tendencies within the world’s languages. The naturalistic conception, on the other hand, embodies an ontological claim: that the notion ‘language’ denotes an object in the biological world. Universals here are the properties of that object. Burton-Roberts argued that Chomsky’s conception of I-language is inconsistent in that it vacillates between the generic and the naturalistic conceptions of language. This is so because Chomsky takes phonology, and thus linearity, to constitute part of naturalistic I-language. For Burton-Roberts, linearity and conventionality necessarily lay outside of language conceived of in naturalistic terms (since conventions are social in nature: they belong to culture, not nature; conventions are not given by biology). Crucially, Burton-Roberts argued that Chomsky was mistaken in regarding the relationship between ‘language’ (understood in the naturalistic sense) and particular languages as one of instantiation, since this amounted to incorporating an aspect of the generic conception into the naturalistic conception. Burton-Roberts argued that, if we are to sustain the naturalistic conception, we must replace the relation of instantiation with one of ‘physical representation’: specific utterance phenomena are mind-external physical representations of the contents of the language module. Burton-Roberts was at pains to point out that physical representation is
entirely distinct from instantiation: that which is a physical representation of something is not thereby an instantiation of it, just as Magritte’s painting of a pipe is not itself an instance of a pipe. For Burton-Roberts, particular languages are acquired, phonologically constituted, conventional systems for physically representing a single, natural, innate language. Burton Roberts’s main epistemological point was that knowledge of the representational conventions of a specific language is quite distinct from innate linguistic knowledge: it is acquired, internalized from the mind-external world. It is conventional, not natural, in character. Burton-Roberts was thus able to accommodate many aspects of empiricism (such as implicit and explicit learning, analogical and inductive generalization) into his conception of the acquisition of a language, while retaining Chomskyan rationalism. Interestingly, Burton-Roberts’s position raises the question of whether there is any distinction to be made between the idea of an LoT and the idea of an innate language module: both have been said to contain a universal set of semantic primitives and a recursive combinatorial syntax, yielding linguistic expressions that have hierarchical structure. If no distinction is to be drawn between the two, then innate language is simply the innate LoT, which is nonmodular in nature. One then ends up with a version of naturalism that denies that there is a language module, while allowing that our knowledge of conventions of physical representation may become modular in the course of development. Another recent approach to the language-versus culture debate surrounding the nature of linguistic knowledge is that adopted by Levinson (2001, 2003a, 2003b). Levinson and colleagues resuscitated a version of the Sapir–Whorf Hypothesis, according to which the categories of the language one has acquired shape, to some extent, cognitive content and mental activity. Levinson claimed that, on the basis of a wide sample of languages, it is possible to conclude that there are three main kinds of Frame of Reference (henceforth FoR) for expressing the spatial location of an object relative to other objects on a horizontal plane. First, there is an ‘egocentric’ (viewpoint-dependent) or ‘relative’ FoR (what
counts as left or right is relative to one’s location: turn around 180 degrees and right becomes left), as in The ball is to the left of the tree. Second, there is a ‘geocentric’ or ‘absolute’ FoR (what counts as north or south is not relative to one’s location), as in The ball is to the north of the tree. Third, there is an ‘object-centered’ or ‘intrinsic’ FoR. This latter kind of FoR involves locating an object A with reference to the partitioning of another object B into parts and the projection of an axis from the centre of object B through one of its parts, as in The ball is at the front of the truck (Levinson, 2003a: 8), where object A is the ball, object B is the truck, and the relevant part of object B is the front of the truck. Levinson claimed that it has been assumed by nativists that concepts such as ‘left’ and ‘right’ are universal, since they are necessarily innate in the nativist view. Crucial to Levinson’s argument is the claim that not all languages possess all three systems, but that any given language will possess at least one. Note that the conception of universalism appealed to here is the generic conception, not the naturalistic one: Levinson’s argument here does not necessarily undermine a consistently naturalistic conception of the notion ‘language.’ Importantly for Levinson, some languages (e.g., Oxchuc Tzeltal, an American Indian language spoken in Mexico) have no ‘relative’ spatial expressions at all. In such languages, one cannot say The ball is to the left of the tree; rather, one has to express the spatial location by means of absolute terms, such as The ball is north of the tree, Please pass the plate to your east, or Take the first turning to the south (but not Take the first turning on the right). Equally, in work with Majid et al. (2003), Levinson and colleagues argued that speakers of the Australian language Guguyimidjir entirely lack both relative and intrinsic FoRs and use only absolute FoRs, so that even the description of the location of an object on a body part is described, and conceived of, in absolute terms, as in There’s an ant on your south leg. Levinson argued that the conceptual representations we use in nonlinguistic thinking vary depending on the language we have acquired, a strikingly Whorfian claim that has incited opposition among broadly Chomskyan linguists such as Li
and Gleitman (2002). Levinson and colleagues carried out experiments in which a set of languages were classified as absolute, relative, or mixed and required speakers of those languages to carry out nonlinguistic tasks involving the spatial location of objects. In one such task, reported in Levinson (2001: 578–579), subjects were shown three different toy animals in a row on a table and asked to memorize the order in which they appeared. The subjects were then turned around by 180 degrees, taken to another table, and asked to place the objects in the same order they had seen them in. When he compared speakers of Tzeltal, who have a language with an absolute FoR to describe objects in a row, he found that they placed the objects in the opposite order from the way they were placed by speakers of Dutch, which uses a relative FoR: the subjects seemed to be memorizing the rows of objects in a way that was consistent with the FoR given by their native language. The claims made by Levinson are clearly of considerable importance in debates about the nature of language, since they rest on the claim that both nature and culture play a role in linguistic knowledge. For Levinson, there is coevolution of language, nature, and culture, and cultural variation subsumes linguistic variation, which results in variation in ‘cognitive style.’ Levinson’s work offers new empirical observations on the relative roles played by nature and culture in human language.

The opposing camp held that there was nothing wrong with ordinary language. Rather, philosophical problems arise when, to use Ludwig Wittgenstein’s phrase, ‘language goes on holiday’. Many followers of Wittgenstein (1889–1951), in common with the verificationists he and they opposed, regarded careful reflection on language as a route to overcoming philosophical confusion. The revisionist/scientific versus ordinary-usage dispute is represented in this volume. So too is the languagecentric philosophical methodology advocated by both parties to that dispute. However, the ideas and methods of the two camps
have gradually lost currency, and the relationship between philosophy of language and linguistics has undergone a quiet revolution as a result.

Previous interpreters of Descartes’s observations on language have rarely attempted to determine their status and function1 within the framework of his entire philosophy. Any endeavor to show that Descartes’s theoretical views of language depend upon his doctrine of innate ideas and a universal “raison” must remain fragmentary if one does not also consider his dualistic system and the arguments that had already surrounded that system during Descartes’s lifetime. The fact that Descartes and his followers explicitly advanced linguistic theories in order to argue for the dualism of spirit and matter has hardly been considered before. Nor has it been recognized that linguistic theories were likewise proposed by his opponents, although they proceeded from a sensualistic conception of thought and human nature as a whole. The relevance of an interpretation of language for such a major philosophical problem as the determination of the relationship between the physical and intellectual elements in human nature must be included in any consideration of the various problems relating to language that were discussed in France during the seventeenth century. By examining this controversy and its ramifications for the thinkers who came after Descartes, we may be able to classify more precisely in historical terms the debate that occurred in the following century. For it was during this period that the confrontation between a sensualistic and a rationalistic view of humanity took place primarily in the form of theoretical arguments about the nature of language itself. By way of introduction, I will sketch here a few of the philosophical and scientific presuppositions that informed linguistic discourse in the seventeenth century. In so doing, I will consider the much-discussed concepts of “raison,” “imagination,” and “passion,” which were important concepts not only in theories of language; they also underline the connection between linguistics and reflections on anthropology, epistemology, and aesthetics. When, in 1671, attacks against Descartes’s
philosophy reached their highest pitch in France, and the Sorbonne sought measures to have it. A burlesque text circulated in Paris that parodied these efforts to forbid the entrance of “raison” into the sciences. Yet the text does not cite the Cartesians as being first among the advocates of a new conception of science. It lists, rather, the Gassendists as the prime “offenders,” and the Jansenists were placed on a level equivalent to both. In doing so, the pamphlet identified the three main schools that played crucial roles in the philosophical debates that took place during the second half of the seventeenth century. All three shared a sense of opposition to the official universities, at the head of which stood the Sorbonne. The university was the undisputed center of power within the scholastic tradition. As the guardian of true faith and highly conscious of its mission to preserve the well-being of the state, it assiduously resisted all innovations within science, philosophy, and religion it considered dangerous. The most powerful impetus for a new orientation in philosophical and scientific thought in France during the seventeenth century unquestionably came from Descartes, but not from him alone. The Jansenists, whose nonconformist stance in religious as well as political matters aroused the displeasure of the ruling powers, had combined a dependence upon Descartes with a declaration of allegiance to the teachings of Augustine. The center of Jansenism was the Parisian cloister of Port-Royal, where Jansenist authors edited the Grammar and Logic which are usually cited in connection with that name. The most significant representatives of Jansenism were Blaise Pascal, who died at a very early age, and the contentious Antoine Arnauld, who wrote numerous philosophical and religious tracts. Above all, Arnauld was able to give currency to his interests in the philosophy of language through his advisory role to Claude Lancelot, the editor of the Port-Royal Grammar, and even more so as the governing author of the Port-Royal Logic, which includes a substantially larger number of questions pertaining to the philosophy of language than does the Grammar. Those Gassendists who, in the burlesque pamphlet, were the
principal representatives of “raison” and the new science, even before the aforesaid Cartesians and Jansenists, were emphatically rejected by Descartes and his followers, together with the Jansenists. Gassendi’s sensualism stood in marked opposition not only to Descartes’s rationalism, but also to the religious attitudes of the Jansenists by virtue of their debt to Cartesianism and Augustinianism. These conflicts point to the distinctiveness and complexity of the forms in which a new scientific thinking manifested itself as an expression of the emerging bourgeois “Weltanschauung.” It is perhaps of no small interest that the author of the burlesque pamphlet against the Sorbonne was none other than Boileau, who soon thereafter summarized the canon of classical French literature in his Art poétique (1674).2 Racine, who like Boileau was involved in Jansenism, was probably a co-author of the pamphlet, as was Bernier, who was a follower and propagator of Gassendi’s philosophy.3 At the same time, Molière was busy editing a comedy that parodied the Sorbonne’s resistance to the new conception of science and its implications. And La Fontaine’s fables, which contain direct references to the antagonism between the Gassendists and the Cartesians, provide literary testimony to his decided sympathy toward Gassendi’s sensualism.4 It is clear from Boileau’s position against the Sorbonne’s plan to ban Cartesian philosophy that the concept of “raison,” which was held to be in opposition to the scholastic scientific tradition, applied equally to the Jansenists, Cartesians and Gassendists, and that it therefore could not be strictly viewed as a concept stemming solely from Cartesian rationalism. It was, rather, a “raison” that was conceived as being part of a general, healthy “common sense,” a “raison” whose advocates in classical French literature could proclaim their allegiance to any one of these three philosophical camps. In seventeenth-century France, the appeal to reflect upon the powers of human understanding, which was an expression of growing bourgeois selfconfidence that was being carried out in the name of “raison,” had, to be sure, found its most representative formulation in the writings of Descartes, but it was not reserved for the
Cartesians alone. In the debate concerning linguistic questions, too, the catchword of “raison” came into the foreground. The polarity between “raison” and “imagination” or, in another realm of debate the opposition between “raison” and “imagination” (or “passion”), illustrates ideas that led to an interest in language that was supported by sociological and philosophical concerns. A different concept of “raison,” however, comes into play in each case. The effort to determine the relationship between “raison” and “usage” within language touched closely upon the problem of the socially exemplary norms of the French language. When, in the sixteenth century, the nationally conscious humanistic scholar Henri Estienne criticized the language of French courtiers as being overburdened and alienated by Italianisms, he demanded that one ought to measure their ostensibly exemplary “usage” by the criteria of “raison,” of which positive traces could be found in the linguistic usage of other levels of society. And when, in the seventeenth century, Vaugelas proclaimed the language spoken by both the court elite and by writers to be the normative “good speech” (“bon usage”), he lent an even more strongly pronounced sociological component to the relevance which, ever since the sixteenth century, linguistic consciousness in France had increasingly acquired with regard to the national consciousness (Remarques sur la langue française, 1647). If the most esteemed writers were placed alongside the members of the court as the representatives of exemplary linguistic usage, then this was as such a confirmation of the bourgeoisie as a culturally formative force. Yet the literature of French classicism, which was after all produced by representatives of the bourgeoisie, nevertheless remained beholden to the standard of the court, just as absolutism generally represented a form of compromise between the still ruling feudal class and the emerging bourgeoisie. Bringing both social forces together under the rubric of “la Cour et la 6 Interpretations of language Ville,” or of Versailles and Paris, was an attempt to reveal the cultural standards common to both. But the growing self-confidence of the bourgeoisie also put the dominance of Versailles into question with respect
to the “bon usage.” The Port-Royal Grammar itself bears witness to this claim in that, in comparison to Vaugelas, it presents a completely different conception of linguistic usage and places it in another relation to “raison” long before Antoine Arnauld openly, and in polemical opposition to Vaugelas, demanded the equality of Parisian linguistic norms with those of the court.6 In this constellation of social forces, the traditional opposition between “usage” and “raison” received, in relation to the problem of a linguistic norm, a philosophical component that was dependent upon the sociologicalone. To be sure, for Vaugelas and even in the Port-Royal Grammar, “raison,” in its opposition to “usage,” usually meant hardly more than the observance of the rules of logic or linguistic analogy.7 Yet precisely because of this fact, an approach was made to that general concept of “raison” which, as an appeal to the powers of human understanding, was attributed in the debate sketched above just as much to the Gassendists and the Jansenists as it was to the Cartesians. There is further evidence that a general concept of “raison” played an important role as a form of expression for the emerging social forces in the seventeenth century in that the terminology with which Vaugelas presented the “bon usage” exhibits unmistakable parallels to feudalistic common law.8 The “bon usage” was legitimated as the dominant linguistic usage owing to the simple fact that it represented the language of the rulers, and it therefore required no justification through “raison”—“‘usage’ does many things through reason, many without reason, and many counter to reason” (“l’usage fait beaucoup de choses par raison, beaucoup sans raison, et beaucoup contre raison.”)9 The normative character of the “bon usage” resulted directly from its opposition to the “poor speech” (“mauvais usage”), which was understood as characterizing the speech of the people. And it is precisely for this reason that the claim for the sovereignty of the “bon usage” was just as unlimited as the social claims of its speakers. Vaugelas thus very emphatically rejected the assertion that the people were the speakers of language and “usage.” In the opinion of Vaugelas, the etymological appeal to Latin to support
the claim that “the entire jurisdiction” of linguistic usage belonged to the people overlooked
the fundamental difference of meaning between “populus” and “people,” for the latter
corresponds merely to the Latin “plebs.” The language of the common people, however, can
only be the “mauvais usage,” a judgment Vaugelas emphasized by large print:
“ACCORDING TO US,

2.4 THE PHILOSOPHICAL RELEVANCE OF MUTHMIR

In spite of the reputation of the Muthmir we know surprisingly little about Khan-i-Arzu’s life.
The few facts that are reported by the biographers can be displayed. If we go by the
quotations in the text of Muthmir of which there are hundreds, we would have to say that
Muthmir has contributed considerably to linguistic thought process. The phrasing of some of
these quotations implies that Muthmir has determined the development of Philosophical
thinking about language, meaning and communication. The book Muthmir left to later
generations was unique in several respects. In the first place it was the first coherent
description of the linguistic thought process. In the second place it was one of the first real
research work in Perso Arabic linguistic tradition. The period of Khan –i – Arzu was not an
exclusively oral, since most scholars used to record their thoughts in writing. Khan –i – Arzu
nevertheless, made his description of linguistic thought into a book, with a beginning and an
end, and with cross-references, so that it could be read from cover to cover. Its uniqueness in
this respect is borne out by the “title” it received, Muthmir “The fruit”, In spite of its unique
features Muthmir was not an immediate success. It was not until it came to play a role in the
establishment of the linguistic thought. The book Muthmir gained its special place in the
history of Perso Arabic linguistic tradition. In the process of reception of the Muthmir a later
linguist, Abdul Azim, played a central role. He was involved in establishing and interpreting
the text of Muthmir. In his search for a Perso Arabic linguistic tradition Professor Abdul
Azim projected Khan-e-Arzu’s *Muthmir* as a milestone in the Perso Arabic linguistic thought process.

For example Khan –i- Arzu claimed that lexicology was a separate discipline (‘ilm al-lughah); most grammarians also received a lexicographical training, and most lexicographers also studied grammar, but it was perfectly well possible to say of a scholar that he was excellent in grammar, but lagged behind in lexicography, which shows that the two disciplines were really regarded as separate domains. In *Muthmir*, he explains the role of Lexicography by making a claim that:

Therefore, I wrote treatise for this skill which is known by the name of Siraj ul Lughat. This might help the authors in bettering their skills and correctitude. As some people say uptil now in Persian Lexicography, book of this standard has not been seen. I pointed out thousands of mistakes books of that time like Qateh Burhan and mentioned in Siraj ul Lughat. Out of all these slips or mistakes one big one is the word /čaka:k/ which has been written with *Persian jiim* and comes in the meaning of *cup* or *deed writer (scribe)* or in the sense of *person who studs gems* and this is astonishing. Because forehead is called /čaka:d/, which is written with *daal* and this is a Persian word as it can be witnessed in the general dictionaries of Persian. And in Persian /Saka:k/ is there as the equivalent of ‘scribe’ and that is written with *dotless saad* and comes on the metre with /hadaad/. Similarly, gem studder is called /haka:k/. /haka:k/ is written with *dotless he* and comes on the metre with the former. Both these are well-known Arabic and Arabicised words.

The quotation from one of the sections of the *Muthmir* presented above deals with the elementary notions of lexicography. It has been surmised that in this part of the book Khan-i-Arzu introduced those innovations which he himself had brought to the discipline. It is,
indeed, remarkable that in this section he quotes no other grammarians, whereas in the rest of the Muthmir grammarians are quoted on every page.

Professor Abdul Azim’s paper published in “Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft” served as a simpler version of the Muthmir, more accessible to the later scholars than the Khan-i-Arzu’s Muthmir. He also took it upon himself to interpret the linguistic thoughts of Khan-i-Arzu.

Although he knew very little about Sanskrit and nothing about old Iranian languages, he was able to discover that Sanskrit is related to Persian. In his still unpublished Muthmir, said to be learned work on grammar and linguistics, Arzu speaks of his discovery in unambiguous terms.

To elaborate his point further he quotes Khan-i-Arzu:

Up to this day no one has conceived of the tawāfuq (concord/agreement/relationship) between Hindi and Persian except this fakir Arzu in spite of the fact that there were a number of dictionary makers and other scholars of this guiding science. And whoever should be the disciple and the follower of this humble (Arzu), he should establish the fundamental principal and should base the correction of some Persian words on it as I have written my own books such as Sirajul Lungha and Chirag-i-Hidayat, etc. And it is amazing that Rashidi and other were in India, yet they failed to observe that there is concord in these two languages.

He further elaborates:

Khan-i-Arzu bases his claim of concord between Sanskrit and Persian on correct linguistic observations. In his Navadirul Alfaz, he comments on the phonetic, morphological, and semantic features of many cognate words. In as much as these words are very close both in sound and in meaning, they are considered by him as proof of linguistic proximity between
the two languages. A few items from this dictionary are quoted below. As it will be worthwhile to see how the cognates given by Arzu are viewed today, references to modern works are given for each item. Before presenting these items, it must also be noted that Khan-i-Arzu is not able to find cognates at all for many words in his dictionary, and that some of his etymologies are not correct.

Henceforth, Khan-i-Aru’s authority was uncontested; one hardly ever finds explicit criticisms of his teachings in later grammatical literature. The linguistic experiences of Khan-i-Arzu as a lexicographer prompted him to write about the structure of speech in an innovative way.

In principle the language belonged to a well-defined group of people. But through a process of idealization, not uncommon in a speech community in which there is observable social class, this language is also regarded as the mother tongue of all members of the community who have received an education and make an effort to speak correctly. Thus, on the one hand, the corpus used by the grammarians was closed, being limited to the written text, but, on the other hand, the grammarians upheld the fiction of native speakers whose judgment could be trusted. Since by definition the speakers of Persian could not make mistakes, the purpose of linguistics was not a prescriptive one. Later grammarians, especially in the Islamic West, sometimes wrote treatises about the mistakes people made when they tried to write standard language, but in technical grammar this aspect of linguistics was hardly ever mentioned. There are no references to common mistakes in the books of the grammarians, nor is there any awareness of the changes the language had undergone. Khan-i-Arzu believes that Perso-Arabic linguistics was, however, not purely descriptive either: for grammarians it was not enough simply to describe the language as it was used or spoken. Their aim was much more ambitious: since language is part of God’s creation, it was bound to be a perfect language without deviations or exceptions. Every single part of the language must exhibit this
perfection and it was the self appointed task of the grammarian to show in the tiniest detail of the linguistic structure that this was indeed a system in which every element was in its place, in which every phenomenon was explicable.

At the stage of grammar at which Khan-i-Arzu wrote, explanations could be crude and ad hoc: it sufficed to point at a superficial resemblance to explain a connection or a similar linguistic behaviour of two elements. For instance, in the quotation above Khan-i-Arzu points out that there is a construction in which one category of verbs may be used with the same meaning as a noun (participle), and explains the fact that the resembling verbs have the same endings as the noun by this shared construction. At a later stage of the discipline much more complicated and theoretical explanations were needed. It is not easy to describe the contents of the _Muthmir_. Its arrangement differs from that of grammars in the Latin school tradition. After the general introduction from which we have quoted extensively above, Khan-i-Arzu first deals with syntactic questions, then there is a large section on all kinds of processes that have to do with derivational morphology; finally, phonological processes are treated that determine the actual surface form of the word. The terms used traditionally in the Perso-Arabic tradition to denote these sections need some explanation. The general term for grammar is _nahw_; but this term also indicates the section of grammar dealing with the relations between constituents in the sentence, i.e., syntax including the treatment of the declensional endings. Morphology is called _sarf_; this includes derivational morphology and morphonology, i.e., those changes in words that are not connected with syntactic relations. These two terms divide grammar into two large parts, dealt with together in the Khan-i-Arzu’s _Muthmir_, but later also treated separately. Phonology was regarded as ancillary to morphology: those phonological processes that were relevant to morphology, such as the 'imaala (fronting of /a/ in certain environments), changes involving glides, and assimilation, were added as an appendix to the grammatical treatises. Phonetics, i.e., changes in words that
were completely independent of morphology, was dealt with briefly (Khan-i-Arzu has a section in which he mentions the places of articulation of the consonants), but only because without a minimal knowledge of phonetic terminology and classification it is impossible to deal with morphological questions. Phonetics as the science of the correct realization of linguistic sounds was dealt with in other disciplines, for instance in treatises on recitation. Acoustics and the science of sound were completely excluded from linguistics.

The contents of the Muthmir suggest that Khan-i-Arzu deliberately stepped away from the existing tradition. This means that it may be regarded as an introduction to his own linguistic thought process. The most essential innovation Khan-i-Arzu introduced appears to have been the systematization of the sound change.

1. It means āb (water) in Persian and mā in Arabic. This too is due to linguistic agreement for there is not much difference between these words as mentioned earlier. Here Khan-i Arzu is referring to the feature of voicing. He explains the voicing in some Middle Iranian and most New Iranian languages of intervocalic voiceless stops.

2. Also the research indicates that (the Persian word) gulu with first vowel as a (i.e., in the form of galu) as some people pronounce it, is more probable and the reason is that in Hindi they call it gala with a and –a and –u are interchangeable. Thus it is form the agreement of languages. And this is the main reason according to Fakir Arzu even through others are not convinced. It is to be noted that Arzu is now using the evidence of Indian to fix the pronunciation of Persian. Given the fact that Persian has two variants galu and gulu the one that agrees with the Hindi form is to be gala.

Apparently Khan-i-Arzu rejected the old method of calling all vowels by the same terms, whether they were declensional or not, which is why he made a careful distinction between those endings that were produced by the action of another word in the sentence, a governor
(`âmil), and those words in which the ending was invariable. The status of the declension is thus directly connected with the important principle of `amal, governance.

Such examples show that from the perspective of the grammarians the linguistic system was a formal system, conditioned by formal properties of the elements involved, by their resemblances to each other. This is reflected in the terms they assign to many linguistic categories: the imperfect verb, for instance, is not called after its semantic properties but because of its resemblance to another syntactic category it is called “resembling verb” (fi’l mu `âri’). The comparison between the status of various elements within the system is called by the grammarians qiyâs, from the verb qâsa “to measure”, usually translated in English by “analogy”. Yet, the qiyâs of the Arabic grammarians represents a totally different concept: it is a method to explain apparent deviations from the rules in certain phenomena by referring to their resemblance to other phenomena. The result is an increased regularity because the rules are applied to as many phenomena as possible. This kind of analogical reasoning is different from the concept of “analogy” in Western linguistics, which serves as an instrument to explain irregularities by showing how they developed by interference from other phenomena. In Perso-Arabic philosophical terminology the same term qiyâs translated the concept of the Aristotelian syllogism, but the grammatical qiyâs has nothing to do with this logical method, either. Since linguistic analogy (qiyâs) is a post-factum explanation of linguistic phenomena, it does not operate as a method to produce linguistic forms.
TOWARDS THE DEVELOPMENT OF HISTORICAL LINGUISTICS: REVISITING KHAN-I- ARZU’S MUTHMIR

3.0 GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The present chapter is an endeavor to expound what can be considered the seed of Historical and Linguistics that Arzu sowed in his monumental work Muthmir which is an Arabic word and means ‘fruitful’. This burgeoned at least three decades before what qualifies Sir William Jones as founding father of Historical and Comparative Linguistics after his famous lecture in which he proclaims the historical tie between Sanskrit, Latin and Greek, as well as with “the Gothic and the Celtic, and the old Persian,” in the Third Anniversary Discourse to the Asiatic Society of Bengal as death claimed Arzu in year 1756 and it but obvious that this treatise on Language would have come before it.

Jones in his lecture delivered on 2 February 1786 and published in 1788 postulates…

The Sanscrit language, whatever be its antiquity, is of a wonderful structure; more perfect than the Greek, more copious than the Latin, and more exquisitely refined than either, yet bearing to both of them a stronger affinity, both in the roots of verbs and the forms of grammar, than could possibly have been produced by accident; so strong indeed, that no philologer could examine them all three, without believing them to have sprung from some common source, which, perhaps, no longer exists; there is a similar reason, though not quite so forcible, for supposing that both the Gothic and the Celtic, though blended with a very different idiom, had the same origin with the Sanscrit; and the old Persian might be added to the same family.
This common source later began to be termed as Proto-Indo European and subsequently, almost all the textbooks on Historical Linguistics and Linguistic publications began to credit Sir William Jones for the methods for Comparative Linguistics and discovering Indo European Language Family. We can witness statements such as Bengtson and Ruhlen’s (1997: 3) that Sir William Jones “discovered the method of comparative linguistics—and with it the Indo-European family”. Murray (1998: 3) reports that Jones “had founded comparative philology, or historical linguistics”. Cannon (1990: 246) maintains that Jones’ “was the first known printed statement of the fundamental postulate of Indo-European comparative grammar; more than that, of comparative linguistics as a whole” and on and on.

Furthermore, in the overview of historical growth of Historical and Comparative Linguistics the scholars across the world believe that Grammarians of Greek and Latin were least interested in the systematic comparison of Languages. It was only in late Middle Ages that Dante Alighieri (1265-1321) set off to work on the European Vernaculars of the then period which can be evident from his work *Vulgari Eloquentia* ‘On the Vernacular Speech’. While Dante used the word *yes* to classify European Languages and classified Greek on the one hand and the Slavic, Germanic and Romance Languages on the other, Giuseppe Scaligero (1540-1609) employed the word *God* in order to classify European Languages and classified them into *deus-languages* (Latin and Romance Languages) and *gott –languages* (the Germanic group) *boge-languages* (the Slavic group) and Greek in which the word for God is *theos*. However, he concluded that there is no relationship between the languages of these groups which he called *matrices*. Scholars believe that Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646-1716) went very close to recognize the fundamental relationship in (Indo-European) Languages of Europe which he termed as *Celto-Schytian*. During Renaissance and throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth century the quest was on to establishing the original language of humankind and some went on to conclude that Hebrew could be the first
language while in view of Gropius, 1569 was Dutch and Webb, 1669 believed that Chinese could be the first language.

In the eighteenth century the information about Sanskrit the cultural language of India could reach the European learned circle. It was chiefly because of the Christian Missionaries to India which included French Pierre Coeurdoux, Austrian Filip Vesdin and the likes who published the first European Grammar of Sanskrit. While the European Scholars thought that the affinity in major European Languages could be explained as the outcome of language contact, it required a different explanation for Sanskrit as it had some words which sounded and meant very similar to the classical languages of Europe like Latin. To mention a few are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>English Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pitar</td>
<td>Pater</td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma:tar</td>
<td>mater</td>
<td>mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhra:ter</td>
<td>Frater</td>
<td>brother</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thereafter, Sir William Jones who in 1783 sailed for Calcutta as judge of the Supreme Court during the colonial rule in India and in 1784 founded the Asiatic Society of Bengal. There in his 1786 presidential discourse, he postulated the ‘common ancestry of Sanskrit, Latin, and Greek’. This very finding began to be believed as the one which provides the induction for the advancement of Historical and Comparative Linguistics.

Later on it was also emphasized that the similarity between Sanskrit and Classical Languages is not only restricted till lexical level but to the level of grammar as well. German Linguist, Franz Bopp in 1816 came up with a study on verbal system in Sanskrit, Greek, Latin and many other Indo-European Languages to the relationship. Then Jacob Ludwig Carl Grimm in 1819, another German scholar known for Grimm’s Law found sound correspondence
between the consonant in the old Indo-European Languages, Low Saxon Languages and High German languages. The overview of Grimm’s Law:

The law comprises of three parts which form successive phases in the sense of a chain shift. The phases are generally constructed in the following ways:

1. Proto-Indo-European voiceless PLOSIVES change into voiceless fricatives.

2. Proto-Indo-European voiced PLOSIVES become voiceless PLOSIVES.

3. Proto-Indo-European voiced aspirated PLOSIVES become voiced PLOSIVES or fricatives (as allophones).

This chain shift can be conceptually represented as:

- \( b^h > b > p > \phi \)
- \( d^h > d > t > \theta \)
- \( g^h > g > k > x \)
- \( g^w > g^w > k^w > x^w \)

Over here each sound moves a place to the right to take on its new sound value. We can note that within Proto-Germanic, the sounds represented by ⟨b⟩, ⟨d⟩, ⟨g⟩ and ⟨gw⟩ were PLOSIVES in some position and fricatives in others, so \( b^h > b \) should be construed here as \( b^h > b/\beta \), and likewise for the others. The voiceless fricatives are normally spelled ⟨f⟩, ⟨p⟩, ⟨h⟩ and ⟨hw⟩ in the Germanic Language.

He substantiates it with an example of Latin *dece*m and Greek *deka* meaning ten which exactly matches Gothic *taihum* and all of them have been believed to be derived from *dek’m* of Proto-Indo European.
Influenced by evolutionary biology, in 1860s August Schleicher introduced genealogical tree-diagram into Comparative Linguistics. In this very model, genetically connected languages are represented as nodes on genealogical tree and in the root is Proto Language of that family. By applying Comparative Method, he also attempted to reconstruct Proto-Indo European Language.

The development of Comparative Linguistics got major breakthrough in the 1870s, when a group of young German Scholars gathered at Leipzig University and began their systematic researches on the history of Indo-European languages and the reconstruction of Proto-Indo European. The name Junggrammatiker or Neogrammarians was somewhat mockingly given by the elder colleagues of these scholars but these scholars accepted it. Some of the prolific one among them were:

- Adolf Noreen
- August Leskien
- Berthold Delbrück
- Eduard Sievers
- Karl Brugmann
- Hermann Osthoff
- Hermann Paul
- Otto Behaghel
- Wilhelm Braune

Major contributions of these scholars to linguistics are:
• The Neogrammarians’ was the first hypothesis of sound change to endeavor to follow the principle of falsifiability according to scientific method.

• The objective of linguistic enquiry is not the language system, but the idiolect, viz: language as it is localized in the individual, and hence is directly observable.

• Autonomy of the phonetic or sound level- being the most observable characteristic of language, the sound level is perceived as the most significant level of description, and absolute autonomy of the phonetic or sound level from the syntax and semantics is understood.

• Historicism- the main objective of linguistic enquiry is the description of the historical change of a language.

• Analogy- in case the premise of the inviolability of sound laws fails, analogy may be applied as an explanation if plausible. Thus, the exceptions are understood to be a normal adaptation to a related form.

The works of a German Scholar August Wilhelm Schlegel initiated a new discipline in Linguistics called Language Typology. This divided the languages of the world into the following types:

⇒ Isolating Languages such as Chinese

The Isolating Languages are those languages in which words do not change or take affixes.

⇒ Agglutinating Languages such as Turkish

The Agglutinating Languages are those languages in which a word contains a number of affixes and each of those affixes have a grammatical function.
Inflectional Languages such as *Latin*

The Inflectional Languages are those languages in which a word has affixes which can express several grammatical functions.

This Morphological Typology was further refined by Wilhelm Humbolt. Humbolt is also credited for also his observation that the structure of our language is shaped up by our world-view Weltanschaung besides the addition of the fourth type to taxonomy of Schlegel which he terms as *incorporating languages*. The example of it is *Inuit* (Eskimo). In these languages, the distinction between a clause and a word is blurry as the direct object is incorporated into the verb itself. The typology of languages was thoroughly revised by Edward Sapir in twentieth century and has still been being reviewed.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century Hugo Schuchardt, one of the most prominent linguists of the Germanic tradition gave a crucial impetus to the advancement of areal comparison of languages.

The Primary Concerns of Historical Linguistics include:

1. The description with a detailed account for observed changes in a particular language
2. The reconstruction of the pre-history of languages and the determination of their relatedness, grouping them into language families which is the domain of comparative linguistics
3. The development of general theories about how and why a particular language changes
4. The description of the history of speech communities
5. The study of the history of words, that is, Etymology
It can be construed from the discussion that the practice of Historical Linguistics bases on the following subfields and Muthmir has several chapters devoted to them. They would be briefly explained in generally first and thereafter we would revisit Khan-i- Arzu’s Muthmir which sprang many of these concepts of Historical Linguistics.

3.1 COMPARATIVE LINGUISTICS: REVISITING KHAN-I- ARZU’S MUTHMIR

Comparative Linguistics which was earlier referred to as comparative philology is that branch of Historical Linguistics which is dedicated to comparing languages (as the very name suggests) in order to establish their historical affinity. Languages can be related by convergence through borrowing or by genealogical descent, thus languages may change overtime and also are able to cross-relate.

Genetic relatedness means a common origin or proto-language. Comparative Linguistics has the aim of constructing language families, reconstructing proto-languages, and detail the changes that the documented languages have undergone. To maintain an obvious difference between the attested language and reconstructed forms, comparative linguists put an asterisk to any form that is not traced in surviving texts.

Section thirty of Muthmir is devoted to the commonness (埈/tawa:fuq/) of words and by commonness is meant the simultaneous existence of a word in two or more languages exactly in the same form or in a slightly modified. He refers to Persian and Arabic, or to Persian and Hindi or in all the three languages. Arzu puts forward the instance of the words /dalu:/ (the Arabicised form of डॉल/ and /dalu:/ and proves his point that both the words of which the former belongs to Hindi and the latter to Persian and Arabic, mean a bucket.

With regard to the variations in the forms of the common words, Arzu’s opinion is that the
difference of dotted and undotted (letters) and specificity of a letter to a language, does not constitute an inherent (i.e. structural) difference. In substantiation of the said view Arzu has cited the word دست /dast/ (which with the undotted س /s/ is Arabic, and with the dotted one (i.e. ش /š/) is Persian and in both the cases means a desert). Then he goes on to say that if the words in question are approximate to each other in pronunciation, even their varied structures, does not constitute a difference. For example متر /matra/ (which is a Pahlawi word and means rain) and متر /matra/ (which is Arabic and also means rain). Similarly،،/miya:/ (a Pahlawi word meaning water) and ما/ma:/ (the Arabic counterpart of the preceding word).

Besides this, in the section thirty-two, Khan-i-Arzu has concerned himself with the elucidation of the commonness of some words with slight modification, between Arabic and Persian, Persian and Hindi, and between all the said three languages.

He laments that scholars of Persian in India have failed to appreciate how much similarity exists between the two languages and cites examples from words of definitely Indian origin used freely by Persian poets.

After putting forward the genesis of the bilinguality and multilinguality of the concerning
words and citing in substantiation of his contention some of the words common among
Arabic and Persian in section thirty five of Muthmir Khan- i- Arzu, dwells on the sameness
of the Persian and Hindi words. And he also gives out the causes of this similarity.

According to him *the first of these causes is the chance concurrence, arising from the very
origin of the said words. That is to say that some were coined independently of each other
in Persian but they just came to be possessed of similar meaning.* The examples of such
sort of similarity are the words ֚/kula:l/ and ݘ/kuppi/ which in both the languages
that is, Persian and Hindi mean potter and monkey, respectively. Sometimes, this kind of
similarity is obtained through a slight change and alteration as in the case of the words
֚/dah/ and ٗ/das/. The former is Persian and the latter is Hindi and both of them mean
**number ten.** While still sometimes the similarity is through a slight differentiate constituent
letters. For example ֚ /tišnah/ which is a Persian word and means **thirsty** and ٵ/tišna:/
which is a Hindi word and means **thirst**.

*The second cause of the similarity is mere coincidence,* maintains Arzu. The word ۪/jaru:/
which in both the languages that is, Persian and Hindi means a **broomstick,** is an instance of
the said sort of congruity. However, in Hindi, the exact word is ۪/jha:ru:/ while in Persian,
the actual word is ۪/ja:ru:b/ and ۪/jaru:/ is its shortened form.

The third cause is the Persianisation of the words and that consists in the modification of the
essence of a word for the change in pronunciation or for some other purpose.

The assumption in this connection, says Arzu, is that the words thus modified and taken into
Persian had originally belonged to Hindi, except that they existed separately also in the said
two languages before being subjected to the process of Persianisation. For example, ۪
/angušt/ and /uštur/ which exist separately in Persian and Hindi in the form of /angušt/ and /uštur/ and /uštur/.
And the reason for the Persianisation, in most of the cases, of the Hindi words, for their adoption in Persian, is the non-existence in Persian of some of the Hindi alphabetical letters. These letters are ट/ʈ and ड/ɖ and ढ/ɽ.

3.2 ETYMOLOGY: REVISITING KHAN-I- ARZU’S MUTHMIR

The word Etymology is made up of two Greek elements. First is etymon which means ‘true sense’ and is a neuter of etymos meaning ‘true, real, actual’ and is related to eteos ‘true’ which perhaps is cognate with the Sanskrit satyah, the Gothic sunjis and the Old English sođ ‘true’. The second element is ology (also logy) which stands for science or branch of study. Therefore it is the study of:

⇒ the history of words
⇒ when they entered a language
⇒ from what source
⇒ how their form and meaning have changed over time

A word can come in a language as a loan or borrowed word, through derivational morphology by combining with the pre-existing elements in that language, by a hybrid of both the two processes which is referred to as phono-semantic matching, or in several other minor ways.

In the languages with a long and detailed history, etymology utilizes philology which is the study of how words change from culture to culture overtime. Etymologists also employ the
methods of Comparative Linguistics to reconstruct information about languages that are so old that any direct information like writing cannot be known. By using comparative method which is a tool for analyzing related languages, linguists can draw inferences, about the parent language and its vocabulary. In that way, word roots that can be found all the way back to the origin of, for example, the Indo-European Language Family have been established.

As a matter of fact, the very first asal that is section of Muthmir is dedicated to Etymology. Arzu has started with the definition of the word ‘fars’ and ‘farsi’ which are the Arabicised forms of the original ‘pars’ and ‘parsi’, both occurring in Persian works. As the Arabic phonetic system did not include a bilabial stop /p/, it was replaced by /f/. This is one of the phonetic changes occurring in such borrowings between two languages in contact. Another change which is not because of any phonetic limitation, is caused by the pattern of word formation. Arzu maintains that the original Persian had /pars/ with a two-consonant cluster at the end in the form of CVCC, a pattern not permissible in Arabic as a result that form has been broken into a two-syllable word Faras /fa:ras/ with an internal addition of a vowel - CV CVC. The technical term used by classical grammarians including Arzu is jama' sakainain that is, combining two sounds without an intermediary vowel or a short vowel.

3.3 DIALECTOLOGY: REVISITING KHAN-I- ARZU’S MUTHMIR

Dialectology as the name suggests is the scientific study of linguistic dialect, that is, the varieties of a language that are characteristic of particular groups, based mainly on geographical distribution and their related features. This is in contrast to variations that is on the basis of social factors, which is the subject matter of sociolinguistics, or variations based on time, which falls under the domain of Historical Linguistics.

Dialectology treats topics such as divergence of two regional dialects from a common ancestor and synchronic variation.
Dialectologists focus on grammatical features that correspond to regional areas. Therefore, they usually deal with populations living in specific locales for several generations without moving, but also with immigrant groups coming along with their languages to new settlements.

Section two of Muthmir deals with the Persian language where Arzu refers to seven dialects of Persian out of which the four mentioned below had fallen into disuse:

1. Harawii
2. Sagzii
3. Zawuli
4. Sughadii

The following three were still prevalent:

1. Persian
2. Darii
3. Pahlawi

The first among these three languages (i.e. Persian) is the written and scientific language of the people of Shiraz, Qazwiin, Gilaan and Khuraasaaan, and even India although the spoken languages of these regions are different. The second one that is, Darii has no particular region, nor is it well defined and regulated. According to some, it is the language in which the original forms of words are retained that is to say that they have not been abridged. For instance:

| /iškam/ | \(\text{س} \) | /iškam/ | \(\text{ز} \) |
| /abr/ | \(\text{س} \) | /bar/ | \(\text{ز} \) |
While some others say that it is the language spoken in some cities, like- Balkh, Marv-i-Shahjahan, Bukhara etc.

Moreover, there are still some others who say that it is the pure language spoken in the passes of the mountains (having its derivation from (dārah) not mixed with other languages.

The third language of this series is Pahlawi, which has three different derivations:

- It has been attributed to Pahlaw, the father of Pars, the alleged originator of the Pahlawi language.
- Pahla is the collective name of three cities, viz, Ray, Isfahaan and Diinawar and hence the language spoken in the three cities just mentioned, came to be known as Pahlawi.
- Pahlawi is the language of the cities in general, because Pahlaw is synonymous with 'city' as such.

Arzu provides a distinction between the rural and urban idiom of language asserting that a study of Dari and Pahlavi seems to reveal that Dari is the idiom of mountains and passes and Pahlavi that of the city. He furthermore believes that Dari and Pahlavi are same in meaning, the one being the language of the kings and lords and the other of the common camp.

He also concludes that a poet's association with a particular area is not significant. Khaqani from Sherwan, Nizami from Ganj, Sunai from Ghaznin, Khusro from Delhi spoke in the same idiom - and it was nothing but the language of the Camp (/urdu/) or in other words, the idiom commonly accepted.

Arzu has dealt with rotten (raddi/) and detestable (mazmu:m/) words in section seventeen of Muthmir. The observation in question is borrowed wholly from Muzhir, wherein the pronunciations of Arabic words by different Arab tribes are given. For example, the tribes of Qais (Joe) and Tamim (Joe) interchange the initial Hamza (a) with Ain (a)
and hence, pronounce the word (لام/alam/) meaning *grief* as (لام/لام/) meaning *flag*.

The tribe of Tamiim add the *ka:f* (ك) of address for the females (کافْتغلبْموده) and pronounce *bak* (باك) as *bakush* (باكش). Similarly, the tribes of Rabia and Madr change *ka:f* (ك) into *shi:n* (شن) and pronounce the word (منک/mink/) and (لام/لام/) as (منش/minš/) and (لام/لام/). It is fascinating to note that the people of the Tamim tribe pronounce the letter *ka:f* (ك) in a sound resembling that of *ga:f* (گ). Arzu, after giving the said information, states that the sound in question is certainly that of *ga:f* (گام/ka:f-i-farasi:/) as the Tamimian people clearly pronounce *qa:l* /qa:l/ as *گل* /ga:l /. To support his statement, Arzu draws analogies from Persian and says that such changes in dialects can be found in abundance in the latter language as well. For example, the people of Iraq, and also of Shiraz change the letter, 'ghain (غين)' with *qa:f* (قاف) and pronounce the word *یلات* /yalat/ as *یلات* /qalat/ but in writing the said words remain as they actually are.

### 3.5. Sound Change and Cognates: Revisiting Khan-I- Arzu’s Muthmir

A great deal is known about general method and historical details of changes at all levels of linguistic analysis. However, a commendable and noticeable success has been attained in modeling changes in phonological systems which was traditionally referred to as *sound*
change. Advancement in techniques in such cases allowed us to reconstruct the sound system and the vocabulary of unattested parent language from information about daughter languages. Sound changes work to change the real phonetic form of the given word in the two or more languages, but we can still recognize them as originating from a common source on the basis of the regularities within each language.

The dimension along which we may observe sound change is by classifying changes according to the particular process. This may be viewed under the umbrella term Processes of Sound Change.

Assimilation is the influence of one sound on the adjacent sound and is perhaps the most pervasive process. This processes changed Latin /k/ when followed by /i/ or /y/, first to /ky/, then to ‘ch’, and thereafter to /s/ and Latin *faciat* /fakiat/ ‘would make’ became *fasse* /fas/ in Modern French (the subjunctive of the verb *faire* ‘to make’). A kind of assimilation is Palatalization.

On the other hand, Dissimilation, Metathesis, and Haplology tend to take place infrequently. Dissimilation involves an alteration in one of two ‘same’ sounds that are adjacent or are almost adjacent in a particular word as if they are no longer the same. Thus the first "l" in English *colonel* changes to an ‘r’, and the word is pronounced like ‘kernel’.

Metathesis involves the change in order of two adjacent sounds and for an instance we can look at the Modern English *bird* which in Old English was *brid*. Haplology is similar to dissimilation, as it involves getting rid of similar neighbouring sounds but here one sound is simply dropped rather than being altered to another sound and a suitable example is the pronunciation of Urdu *Saahab* as *Sa'ab*.

Merger, Split, Loss, Syncope, Apocope, Prothesis, and Epenthesis are some other Process of Sound Change. Merger and split can be called the mirror image of each other. Where
Merger is a kind of sound change whereby two or more contrastive sound units are replaced by a single and as a consequence, phonemic distinctions are lost for example the words borrowed in Urdu from Arabic would be pronounced with simple z sound although in the source language distinction is quite perceptible; there Split is a process in which from a single unit there emerges two distinct sound units as in the case of /f/ and /v/ in English where /v/ having previously been an alternate of /f/ when /f/ occurred in an intervocalic position.

Loss means the loss of a sound from a language, as for example the loss of /ɣ/ of Middle English and a as result change in the pronunciation of the word night, now.

\[
\text{ME/niɣt/} > \text{NE/naɪt/}
\]

The loss of medial and final sounds is referred to as Syncope and Apocope, respectively. Middle English 'tame' in the past tense was /temede/ and it lost both its medial and final vowels and became /teymd/ in Modern English.

Prothesis and epenthesis are the addition of sounds, initially and medially respectively. The addition of /e/ that made Latin words like scola 'school' into Portuguese escola is a suitable example of prothesis. As far as epenthesis is concerned a good example be the insertion of /d/ into ME thunrian to give the Modern English thunder. Paragogue refers to the addition of a sound and a syllable in the end of the word and a good example can be of amongst.

Now a question arises is what helps the Historical and Comparative Linguists most in attesting that two or more languages are genetically related?

So the is answer is, Historical and Comparative Linguists work on the principle that from the same word in the ancestral language words in two or more daughter languages are derived and this is are referred to as cognates.
The following words of the Persian language hint that Persian is a descendent of Indo-European Language family as other languages also have words sounding and meaning very similar of the words from the former.

1. **ab, ap, ava, aua** *(water)* = Lat. *aqua*; Sp. *agua*; Grk *apopatos* (water closet); PIE *ab*

2. **æbru** *(eyebrow)* = Eng. *brow/eyebrow*; Grk *ophrus*; PIE *bhruh*

3. **æst, est** *(to be, is)* = English *is*; German *ist*; Spanish *esta, es*; Latin *est*; etc.

4. **æz, ze, z** *(from)* = Grm *aus*; Rus. *iz*; Pol. *Z*

5. **atæsh, azær, azer** *(fire)* = Latin *ater, ignis*; PIE *āt(e)r*

6. **bæd** *(bad)* = Eng. *bad*

7. **bæradaer, bradær** *(brother)* = Eng. *brother*; Du. *broeder*; Grm. *Bruder*; Phrygian *brater*; Latvian *bralis*; Armenian *eghbayr*; Hindi *bhrata*; PIE *bhratar*


9. **chane** *(chin)* = Eng. *Chin*


13. **dær** *(door)* = Eng. *door*; PIE *dhwors-

14. **derækht** *(tree)* = Lat. *drus*; Ru. *derevo*; Pol *drzewo*; PIE *dero, doru, dru*

15. **dokhtær** *(daughter, girl)* = Eng. *daughter*; Du. *dochter*; Grm. *Tochter*; Lithuanian *dukte, dukterine*; PIE *dugheter*

16. **domb** *(tail)* = PIE *dumb*
17. **gærm** (warm) = Phryg./Illyrian *germe*; Hin. *garma*; Arm. *jerm*; Grk. *thermos*

   PIE *gwher*

18. **gav, gau** (cow) = Eng. *cow*; PIE *gwous*

19. **gush** (ear) = Grk. *ous*; PIE *hous*


21. **kerm** (worm) = Sanskrit *krmi*; PIE *krmis*

22. **khers** (bear) = Grk *ursus*; PIE *hrtkos,bher*; PIE *k̑ er*(s)- (bristle, stiff hair)


24. **kul, kule** (back, something to put on back) = Lat. *culus* (back); PIE *kuhlos* (back)

25. **læb** (lip) = Eng. *lip*; PIE *lē̆b*, *lō̆b*, *lāb*, *leb*


27. **mæn** (i, me, mine) = Eng. *me, mine*; Lith./Latv. *man*; Grm *meine*; Sp. *me*; etc.

28. **mah** (moon) = Eng. *moon*; PIE *meh'not/mens*

29. **meydan** (city/park square or center) = Engl. *middle*; Sp. *medio* (middle); PIE *medhi-, medhjo-* (middle)

30. **morde** (dead, death) = It. *morte,morto*; Sp. *muerte*; Fr. *mort*; Lat. *mortuus*;

   Pol. *martwy*; Rus. *mertvy*; Hin. *Mrita*

31. **murcheh** (ant) = Grk. *murmos*; PIE *mouro*

32. **mush** (mouse) = Eng. *mouse*, PIE *mus*


34. **naf** (navel) = Eng. *navel*; Skt. *nabhi-*; PIE *h'nobh*


   PIE *h'nomn*

36. **ne-/næ-** (prefix to make verb negative) = Lith. *ne-* (prefix to make verb negative)
Thus, cognates are the words in two or more languages which have a common origin. It is because of the developmental relationship between the languages through history /maːdɑr/ of Persian and /mʌðə(r)/ of English are perfect examples of true cognates as they both mean the female parent. They share some sort of formal and/or semantic correspondence. As they have similar meanings, true cognate words can facilitate the foreign language learning
process as well. That is to say that, despite the passage of time these words have maintained their similarities in pronunciation and meaning.

However, at times there are word pairs from different languages that in spite of their *formal similarities* may have different meanings cross-linguistically. To paraphrase, they resemble each other in form but express different meanings in each of the two languages. These may be termed *false cognates* and example the can be Persian /kΛrm/ which means *magnificence* and Sanskrit /kΛrm/ which refers to *deeds* and these can be very misleading.

In the section twenty-one, Khan-i- Arzu discusses the mode of difference in the pronunciation of letters in Persian, when they form words.

Such a difference is of the following two types:

1. **Singling of the double letters** (آفrier[^1]) occurring consecutively in the same word, to soften the pronunciation of the word concerned.

2. **Doubling of the single letter** or the germination of a sound which is also referred to as *doubled consonant*.

Arzu first of all discusses various forms of assimilation of two identical letters occurring consecutively (آد[^2]/dya:m/) such as:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>/ni:man/</td>
<td>نم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>/šaprah/</td>
<td>شر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>/dam/</td>
<td>دم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>/kam/</td>
<td>کم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>/sum/</td>
<td>سم</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In such cases (تاشد[^3]/tashdi:d/), *gemination* does not result from the process of assimilation, as far as Persian is concerned but in Arabic this leads to (تاشد[^4]/tashdi:d/), *gemination* as in:
Section twenty-two deals with the problems of the deletion (which is now is termed as *Aphresis*, if initial segment is deleted; *Syncope*, if medial segment is deleted and *Apocope*, if final segment is deleted) of letters or sound in particular cases. Arzu believes that after the deletion of one or two letters, some words have the same authenticity as their original forms and so they means the diluted forms of the words are as effective and acceptable as their original forms were. Some of such words mentioned in Muthmir are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>01</th>
<th>/gu:zan/</th>
<th>/gu: z/</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>/kanu:n/</td>
<td>/nu:n/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>/hanu:z/</td>
<td>/nu:z/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>/čašm/</td>
<td>/čaš/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>/zaxm/</td>
<td>/zax/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>/farwardi:n/</td>
<td>/farwadi:n, fawardi:n, fardi:n /</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>/ču:n o čara:/</td>
<td>/ču:n o čar/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even in some cases words of foreign origin have undergone the said process of dilution such as:
In the section twenty-three of Muthmir, Arzu discusses the problem of the addition at the end of some letters to words which is now termed as as **paragoge** which is an obverse of the foregoing problem of deletion (هَزْف/hazf/) termed as **apocope**. He has substantiated it with the following examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>/astarla:b/</td>
<td>/satarla:b, sala:b/</td>
<td>/asstarla:b/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>/abu: jahal/</td>
<td>/abu: jahal/</td>
<td>/abu: jahal/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>/aju:bah/</td>
<td>/aju:bah/</td>
<td>/aju:bah/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>/abu:lalab/</td>
<td>/bu:lalab/</td>
<td>/abu:lalab/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>/asi:r/</td>
<td>/si:r/</td>
<td>/asi:r/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>/kibriya:/</td>
<td>/kibriya:i/</td>
<td>/kibriya:i/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>/yu:š/</td>
<td>/yu:šak/</td>
<td>/yu:šak/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>/kis/</td>
<td>/kist/</td>
<td>/kis/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>/sana:/</td>
<td>/sana:/</td>
<td>/sana:/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>/du:ta:/</td>
<td>/du:ta:/</td>
<td>/du:ta:/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>/fara:š/</td>
<td>/fara:št/</td>
<td>/fara:št/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the section twenty-three of Muthmir, Arzu discusses the problem of the addition at the end of some letters to words which is now termed as as **paragoge** which is an obverse of the foregoing problem of deletion (هَزْف/hazf/) termed as **apocope**. He has substantiated it with the following examples:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>/astarla:b/</td>
<td>/satarla:b, sala:b/</td>
<td>/asstarla:b/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>/abu: jahal/</td>
<td>/abu: jahal/</td>
<td>/abu: jahal/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>/aju:bah/</td>
<td>/aju:bah/</td>
<td>/aju:bah/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>/abu:lalab/</td>
<td>/bu:lalab/</td>
<td>/abu:lalab/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>/asi:r/</td>
<td>/si:r/</td>
<td>/asi:r/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>/kibriya:/</td>
<td>/kibriya:i/</td>
<td>/kibriya:i/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>/yu:š/</td>
<td>/yu:šak/</td>
<td>/yu:šak/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>/kis/</td>
<td>/kist/</td>
<td>/kis/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>/sana:/</td>
<td>/sana:/</td>
<td>/sana:/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>/du:ta:/</td>
<td>/du:ta:/</td>
<td>/du:ta:/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>/fara:š/</td>
<td>/fara:št/</td>
<td>/fara:št/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The section twenty-four of Khan-i-Arzu’s Muthmir deals with the problem of the transposition of letters in the same word, to give that word a different and perhaps better form, such as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>/dri:wzah/</th>
<th>دروژه</th>
<th>/darw i:zah/</th>
<th>دروژه</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>/laha:šam/</td>
<td>پام</td>
<td>/hala:šam/</td>
<td>پام</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>/dast fa:l/</td>
<td>دستغل</td>
<td>/dast la:f/</td>
<td>دستلاف</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>/a:bšaxu:r/</td>
<td>دروا</td>
<td>/yu:šak/</td>
<td>دروا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>/hušya:r/</td>
<td>بوری</td>
<td>/kist/</td>
<td>بوری</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>/bu:špa:s/</td>
<td>پشک</td>
<td>/sana:/</td>
<td>پشک</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>/maya:n/</td>
<td>هن</td>
<td>/du:ta:/</td>
<td>هن</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>/pala:rik/</td>
<td>پارک</td>
<td>/fara:št/</td>
<td>پارک</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>/bira:man/</td>
<td>بارک</td>
<td>/ba:lišt/</td>
<td>بارک</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>/balyu:r/</td>
<td>در</td>
<td>/pa:da:št/</td>
<td>در</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>/balyu:r/</td>
<td>در</td>
<td>/baryu:l/</td>
<td>در</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>/mar ţu:zan/</td>
<td>مرزن</td>
<td>/murz ţan/</td>
<td>مرزن</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>/časpidan/</td>
<td>/čapsidan/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>/bi:lak/</td>
<td>/bli:k/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>/čaraga:h/</td>
<td>/ča:rga:h/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>/ya:wašu:/</td>
<td>نارس</td>
<td>/ya:wuš/</td>
<td>نارس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>/gastah/</td>
<td>/sagistah/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the section twenty-five Arzu has discussed the problem of the substitution (/abda:l/), that is the substitution of one letter by another. Khan-i-Arzu states that this change is of two kinds:

a. Change of a letter in a word once only as /sape:d/ and /safe:d/ etc.

b. Change of letters more than once and this is termed as the substitution of the substitute (/badl ul badl/).

He substantiates it with some such words:
In section twenty-nine, Khan-i-Arzu has thrown light on borrowing. He puts forward that Persian writers and poets have made certain changes in Hindi words so as to suit their purposes. He further classifies them into the following two kinds:

1. Substitution of a letter or letters in the same word such as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Instead of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/zaːl/</td>
<td>/zaː:l/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/sagaːl/</td>
<td>/sagaː:l/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/zaː:l/</td>
<td>/zaː:l/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Transposition of letters or letter within the same word and deletion of some letter or letters such as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Instead of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/jasar miːr/</td>
<td>/jeːsalmeːr/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/maturah/</td>
<td>/mathuraː/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/diwaːli/</td>
<td>/diwaːliː/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Khan-i-Arzu also has throw light on derivations from Persian originals to simplified forms and the changes made in the process of Persianization of words of Arabic origin specially in forming base or (مسادر/ masa:dir/). The ending in Persian base is normally in the letter ن /nu:n/ which in Arabic base loans is دال /dal and نون /nu:n/. Examples are رضویان /ta:libid, raqsi:dan/ and so forth. The discussion emphasizes the role of Adaption in case of borrowing which depends upon the nature of the two languages which belong to different structural pattern of language families. Some interesting examples of derivations are سند /sandal/ which is the arabasised form of سندان /candan/ a word of Indian origin, لیل /li:l/ to نیل /ni:l/. The change of ن /nu:n/ for ل /la:m/ is one Arab form which has been accepted in ایران و تران /ʔi:ra:n wa tu:ra:n/ نژین /na:zni:n/ a compound of نژک /na:zuk/ and نیل /ni:n/. This sometimes involves a modification in pronunciation as well.

3.6. CONCLUSION

Therefore in the present chapter we witness that in Muthmir, the work of great acumen how depth was the understanding of Siraj uddin Ali Khan-Arzu. It can be evident that he was aware and he aptly used all the major concepts which are employed in the Historical Linguistics. The discussion above shows that the major concepts like- Linguistic Affinity (تالابات/tawa:fuq-i-zaba:n), Cognate (ممخرب/mushtarak), Borrowing (سروب/iqtaba:s) as well as Etymology (یستاقا/ištaqa:q/) and may more useful terms and methods for meticulous and
comprehensive observation of languages had already been existing in the work of the oriental linguists like Arzu before the brands of Western scholars grandstood. In his monumental work Muthmir, Khan-i-Arzu may be reckoned as the first scholar in both the east and the west who introduced the theory of similarities of two languages, meaning that Sanskrit and Persian are sister languages.

Historian Professor Irfan Habib recognizes Khan-i-Arzu as “one lexicographer who took great interest in the relationship between HINDWI / HINDI (both spelling used) and Persian was Sirajuddin Khan Arzu”, (Language Vitality in South Asia: India and Its Languages as Seen in Medieval Persian Texts).

His great insight on the problem of language which was cropped at that time both in the literary and non-literary discourse find solutions in Arzu’s detailed works ranging from Poetry, Criticism, Commentaries, Biographies to Lexicography and finally to Linguistics at large. MUTHMIR is one of the instances of the greatest of enterprise.
Chapter-4

MUTHMIR: FASHIONING NEW TRENDS IN LINGUISTICS

4.0 GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The present chapter entitled *Muthmir: Fashioning New Trends in Linguistics* is just the obverse of the previous chapter in the sense of this work, which is *Towards the Development of Historical Linguistics: Revisiting Khan-i- Arzu’s Muthmir* principally if we go by the now current terms of Synchronic versus Diachronic Approach in Linguistics which are terminological inventions of Ferdinand de Saussure. This Swiss linguist and semiotician came along and dubbed the field of linguistics in the start of the twentieth century as a *synchronic* approach which is a descriptive look at language at a certain point in time as opposed to *diachronic approach* which considers the development, change and evolution of a language through history and that is why also referred to as *Historical Linguistics* and was the common business for the linguists throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth century. This has been dealt with at some length in tandem with the insight of Khan-i-Arzu in the previous chapter.

The dichotomy of synchrony and diachrony is often explained by the metaphor of time slices. If you were to cut time into slices, with each slice being a certain moment in time, then a synchronic approach would look only at a single slice, whereas a diachronic one would look at several slices and compare them to each other. Scholars often explain dichotomy of synchrony and diachrony by the metaphor of time slices. Whereas Saussure's explains it through the analogy of game of chess and maintains that the chessboard is constantly changing during the game, as each player makes his moves. But if someone walks into the room at any moment during the game, he can understand the state of the game by looking at the positions occupied by the pieces. It does not matter how many moves or what kind of
moves have been made before arriving at that stage in the game, the game can be described without reference to the earlier moves. In the same way, he says, as the respective value of the pieces depends on their position on the chessboard, each linguistic term derives its significance from its opposition to all the other terms. The rules that are agreed upon before the game begins continue to operate with each move. Similar rules exist in language too. To pass from one stage to the next, only one piece needs to be moved at a time. Thus in language, change affects only isolated elements, not the whole language. Of course, these changes eventually do result in changing the language, just as a succession of moves can change the outcome of the game. However, at each point in the game all the pieces exist relative to each other and we cannot say what their ultimate fate will be at that point. Therefore, it can be deduced that he endeavours to keep the two approaches apart as language is a pretty complex system of values and one might confuse synchrony (syn = one + chromos= time) as the study of language at a given point of time with diachrony (dia = throughout+ chronos= time) as the study of language across time or throughout.

This very conception of Saussure in connection with language has been seen as revolutionary because it appears to answer an ancient question about how language is to be seen in a novel way at a given point in time. Saussure's idea provides the foundation of a view that has affected all modern linguists as his work which came to the world through the book published posthumously 1916 by the name of *Cours de linguistique générale* or Course in General Linguistics by two his students Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye on the basis of the notes from lectures given by Ferdinand de Saussure at the University of Geneva between 1906 and 1911 paved a new way to look into the system of language and that is which qualifies him to be called as the father of Modern Linguistics.
As discussed above, Synchronic or Modern Linguistics attempts to describe a language entirely and precisely as it exists at a given point in time and therefore this is also referred to as Descriptive Linguistics.

4.1 DIFFERENT LINGUISTIC LEVELS AND INSIGHTS OF ARZU

In order to analyse the language systematically, a hierarchy of structure is made on the basis of the fact that a language is made up of units which are themselves made up of smaller units which are made up of units which are made of still smaller units till we the smallest invisible unit. To put it other way round, a single sound or phoneme is combined together to make larger units of sounds which further combine into a bigger meaningful unit called a morpheme, morphemes combine to form larger units which is called word which combine sentence and so forth.

This has been presented through the following diagram in a highly structured way in Major levels of linguistic structure for which the source is National Visualization and Analytics Center: Illuminating the Path: The Research and Development Agenda for Visual Analyticsp.110., 2005 AuthorJames J. Thomas and Kristin A. Cook(Ed.)
Each level of Linguistic analysis corresponding to their structural level can be broadly seem to be operative at the following three components, that are:

i. Speech Sounds

ii. Words

iii. Meaning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Linguistic Analysis</th>
<th>Structural Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phonetics</td>
<td><em>Speech Sounds in a General</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonology</td>
<td><em>Speech Sounds in a Given Language</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphology</td>
<td><em>Internal Structure of Words/ Word Formation</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These components are all inter-related and have been set up so for linguistic analysis. The comprehensive survey of a particular language at a given point of time is possible going through all these levels which are also referred to as **Linguistic Levels** (Crystal, David: A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics, Sixth Edition).

Language system is composed of an inventory of elements where SPEECH SOUNDS for which is the domain of Phonetics occupies the bottom and MEANING which is the subject matter of **Semantics** assumes the top. All these linguistic levels can be discussed under the following three heads succinctly and would be followed by the insights of Arzu in the said sphere.

4.1.1  **Phonetics and Phonology: Arzu’s Insights**

“Phonetics gathers the raw material, while Phonology cooks it.”

-Kenneth Lee Pike

**Phonetics** studies language at the level of sounds in general, that is to say that it studies human speech sounds from the following three points of view:

- How human speech sounds are produced
- How human speech sound is transmitted
- How human speech sound is perceived

It is dedicated to describing how human speech sounds are *articulated* by the human speech mechanism, how spoken utterances which is considered as *physical signals are transmitted*
through the air and how they are received by the auditory mechanism and therefore Phonetics is further subdivided into:

i. Articulatory Phonetics

ii. Acoustic Phonetics

iii. Auditory Phonetics

Human speech apparatus can produce a large number of speech sounds and they all are the subject matter of Phonetics.

However, a particular language at a given point of time makes use of only limited number of speech sounds for instance the Phonological System of English has forty-four unique sounds (also known as phonemes), Modern Persian has twenty-nine phonemes, thirty eight phonemes in Urdu, Sanskrit has 48 sounds, Arabic has 34 sounds and so on.

Phonology is that linguistic level which is dedicated to study the inventory of sounds(both segmental and suprasegmental) in a given language, how a unit of sound contrasts with the other , how different sounds units combine for the formation of syllables and which further come together to form larger units and so forth. To paraphrase, phonology is the study where we deal with the sound system of a given language and how they are used in a particular language.

Therefore, it is possible to study the phonetics of all languages without phonology, but one cannot study phonology without phonetics as it could be also Fig: 4.1- Levels of Linguistic Structure outline.

The section twenty of Khan-i-Arzu’s Muthmir which is quite long deals with the difference of meanings of the structurally identical words, caused by the difference in vowel points. After mentioning the reasons for the difference in the meanings of the structurally identical
words, Arzu has gone on to provide a long list of the said kinds of words and has discussed in detail the reasons for the difference in their meanings. Some of the words of this sort are as follows:

1. Those differing in vowel points:
   i. /čira:k/ چراک with ‘zer’ ز and /čara:k/ چاراک with ‘zabar’ ز
   ii. /ufta:d/ یرت with ‘peš’ پész and /afta:d/ ارت with ‘zabar’ ز
   iii. /ništar/ نیشتار with with ‘zer’ ز and /naštar/ ناشتار with ‘zabar’ ز
   iv. /bištar/ بیشتار with with ‘zer’ ز and /baštar/ باشتار with ‘zabar’ ز
   v. /suxan/ سخان with ‘zabar’ ز and /suxun/ سخان with ‘peš’ پész and so on

The same is evident in some of the Arabic words used in Persian and vice versa.

2. Those pronounced with variation in pronunciation:

   Difference of diacritical mark مکت into Absence of Vowel مکن such as:
   i. /gursinah/ گرسيناه =/gursnah/ گرسن
   ii. /pahan/ پهن =/pahn/ پن
   iii. /keyomars/ كيومارس =/kyomars/ كیومارس

The same is the case with the Arabic words as well.

For instance:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>/nasar/</td>
<td>نشر</td>
<td>/nasr/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>/kafan/</td>
<td>كافن</td>
<td>/kafn/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>/bu:qalamu:n/</td>
<td>بقلمون</td>
<td>/bu:qalmu:n/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>/harakat/</td>
<td>مکت</td>
<td>/harkat/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>/qaran/</td>
<td>مکرن</td>
<td>/qarn/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The section thirty seven of Khan-i- Arzu’s Muthmir is dedicated to the study of diacritical points (اًءرث/ārth:). Dealing with the problem of pronunciation Arzu observes that pronunciation of letters is not possible without vowel points (اًءرث/ārth/) because of the emission of sound that lies dormant in the interior of the belly of a person. So, if that sound, that is, the one that issues forth from the interior of the belly reaches the organ of excretion and exceeds it. It is termed as vowel point.

But if that sound goes up a little and does not pass beyond the organ of excretion appreciably, so that it becomes long. It is known as quiescence (ناکین/nakīn). So, the vowel points of both the accented and quiescent letters are inflected without which pronunciation is not possible. It is possible that two letters might be governed by one diacritical mark only, like- the silent waw (واو/wa:w) and the preceding ‘kha’ (خ/xā) in the words غرب/xwa:b/ and غرب/xwa:st/. According to Arzu, such a possibility is not only confined only to the silent waw (واو/wa:w) preceded by ‘kha’ (خ/xā). The said ‘waw’ (واو/wa:w) is merged in pronunciation. With the preceding letter that is both are governed by one diacritical mark even if the latter is not ‘kha’ (خ/xā) or some other letter or sound.

For instance, the word چوپا:ن/čowpa:n/ meaning a shepherd in which the ‘silent waw’ is preceded by the ‘Persian kaaf (گا:ل/ga:l)’ and even then the two letters are governed by one diacritical mark and the sound of the ‘waw (واو/wa:w)’ is merged into that of the preceding
‘Persian kaaf ٍ(گ/ga:f)’. Arzu goes on to state that the case in point is not confined to the ‘silent waw’ whether it is preceded by ‘kha ٍ(خ/xa/) or by some other letter only, other letters also might be bracketed together for the purpose of pronunciation by one diacritical mark with their preceding letters in the beginning of a word. As an instance of this, he cites the word (ٍ(گ/gya:n/) meaning learning and intelligence) in which the letter concerned is ‘yaa’ (ٍ(ی/ya/) and not ‘waw’ ٍ(واو/waw/). But the word cited here by Arzu (ٍ(گ/gya:n/) is a Hindi word which has not been borrowed into Persian.

He in one of the sections describes this process in detail discussing replacement with reference to Arabic and Persian. Arzu says: it is the replacing or substituting a letter (phoneme) by another which may be closer in point of articulation. Actually two factors are involved in articulation - the articulator and the point of articulation. It is not only a shift from one phoneme to another by a shift of articulator or the point of articulation or both. Actually each language has its own system of phonemes, and the limitation or absence of certain sounds in one case does not depend upon any articulatory disability but upon the ‘Selective’ tendency of the individual language. Arzu recognises four typical phonemes of Persian which occur only in Persian, i.e. /p/, /č/, /g/ and /ž/which are difficult for the Arabs to pronounce as they do not occur in their phonological system.

An example of the same is ُگر (meaning white).

Section thirty-one which is one of the longest sections of the Muthmir deals with the problem of the Arbianization of the Persian words ٍ(ت/taːɾːi:b/) and is mainly based on Imam Siyuti’s Muzhir. Khan-i-Arzu, however has critically examined the words referred to by
Siyuti in his said work and has given out his own findings with regard to the nature of the usage of these words in Persian and Arabic. For instance, with regard to the word (ز/ku:z/) he says that it is used in both Arabic and Persian in exactly the same sense.

4.1.2 *Morphology and Syntax: Arzu’s Insights*

“…syntax deals with the distribution of words (i.e. word forms) and morphology with their internal grammatical structure…”

*John Lyons*

*Morphology* is dedicated to study the patterns of word formation by the combination of sounds into minimum distinctive units of meaning, known as *morpheme*. Words can be made up of a single morpheme or number of them. Let us have some example from English:

- Hope
- Hopeful
- Hopeless
- Unhopeful
- Hopelessness
- Hopelessly
- Hoped
- Hoping
- Hopes

It is evident that ‘hope’ is a morpheme which can stand on its own and thus is referred to as *free morpheme* where as there were a number of morphemes which can be affixed to it and they are called *bound morphemes*. The addition of any bound morpheme which is also called *affixes* technically which are of four kinds on the basis of the position they placed:

- **Prefix**, if it is added before the free form
- **Infix**, if it is inserted within the free form
- **Circumfix(also confix)**, if it is placed in two parts, one placed before the free form and the other either in the middle or at the end of it
- **Suffix**, it is suffused after the free form
Furthermore, we can also observe above that the affixes or the bound morphemes play two types of role as *-ful, -less, un-, -ness, -ly* are helping us derive new words out of a given word which serves as tool for increasing the lexicon of the given language and that is why termed as **Derivational Affixes** and on the other hand the affixes for instance: *-ing, -ed, -s* and the likes are termed as **Inflectional Affixes** because they express a grammatical distinction that is required for its stem word’s class in certain given grammatical context. Some common instances of grammatical categories that inflectional affixes express are **Aspect, Case, Modality, Number, Person, Tense, Voice and so on**.

Therefore, at this level the internal structure of word is dealt with and the next level is **syntax** which is also concerned with words but unlike morphology deals with how the words are combined together to make or form larger units.

**Syntax** analyses how the words are arranged to make phrases, phrases to create clauses and how a well-formed sentence in a language is constructed. It is the set of rules, principles, and processes that govern the formation of sentences in a particular language, specially the word order.

The section twenty-six which is a short one, is on ٓ /imala/ which means the substitution of ْ /alif/ by ی /yaa/ as in ٖ /a:zə:t/ from ٖ /a:za:t/ and ٌ /a:be:d/ from ٖ /a:ba:d/ ٖ /haje:b/ from چیب / haja:b/. Arzu further substantiates it by citing the following which he has often done throughout Muthmir.

| دارم دوست ندارم بست | در جهان نه چه این که قریب لب هزار
|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| نفرت آهو غیر شرست | در نگرفت چه این که چرین لب دیس
| مفید کردن که به بیار آبی | یا مش که نمی زن
| در خود‌دارم دوست ندارم بست | تماشا کردن که می نگر در خور‌م دارد |
Besides this, in section twenty-eight of Muthmir Khan-i-Arzu discusses the problem of effecting changes in the Arabic and Hindi words when used in Persian and he terms this sort of effectuations as گملاپ ثرفس /‭‌‬/صمل-پ ثرفس, the process of the Persianization of borrowed words. The process of گملاپ ثرفس /‭‌‬/صمل-پ ثرفس takes place in both simple (مفردا /mufrad/) and (مرکب /murakkab/) words.

A. Simple (مفردان /mufrada:)/:

a. Infinitives: These are not retained in the case of their use in Persian in their entirety and changed into Persian infinitives by suffixing (یاپا/daːl nuːn/) to the original infinitives. Such as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{نابود/taːlibiːdan/} & \text{ from } نابود /taːlib/ \\
\text{نابود/raqsiːdan/} & \text{ from } نابود /raqs/ \\
\text{نابود/فهم/} & \text{ from } نابود /faham/ \\
\end{align*}
\]

The examples provided by Arzu here are limited to the Persianization by means of the just mentioned method of the Arabic infinitives, more correctly verbal nouns only.

b. Nouns: The procedure adopted for bringing about change for the sake of Persianization in the nouns of source languages has not been mentioned by Arzu he has only given examples of such change. The few of them are:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{نابود/یاراپ/} & \text{ from } نابود /یاراپ/ \\
\text{نابود/یادد/} & \text{ from } نابود /یادد/ \\
\end{align*}
\]

B. In Compound Words, the changes done in the Arabic compound words and phrases. For instance:
He furthermore substantiates it by giving a long list of compounds which includes the following words:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Instead of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/zu:l xurši:d/</td>
<td>ذوالفقارهیر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/nahanţul jar/</td>
<td>نہانقلب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/palańul jabl/</td>
<td>پالانقلب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/anal ya:r/</td>
<td>انالیاب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/andal xurši:d/</td>
<td>اندرعفاظ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/bismil/</td>
<td>بسمل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/taharmiz/</td>
<td>تحریم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/naz:kat/</td>
<td>نازک</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/fala:kat/</td>
<td>فلاتک</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/pa:dša:hat/</td>
<td>پدشاہ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The section thirty-six of Muthmir indulges in treating with the paired words (عیش/ittaba:ق/) means the combinations of meaningful and meaningless words that have gained currency in Persian and other languages on account of their free use by all the classes of the society.

According to Arzu, meaningless words have been joined to meaningful ones to form this kind of combinations for sake of emphasis. Some of the examples he cited are:
In Muthmir, Khan-i-Arzu also takes up the issue of Word Order. Dealing with the nature of the ‘word’ /lafz/, Arzu puts forward the distinction between Simple Words (mufrad) and Compound Words (murakkab).

What he actually means is that words occur as separate units with a form like /a:b/ or water and /xar/ or ass and so on and as compound which is a combinations of two words. He gives two examples where the word order is not significant e.g. Khawaja Ali and Ali Khawaja but in the other case the word order is significant and cannot be changed. For instance:

/aspe Zaid/ if changed to /Zaid e asp/

It would lead to meaninglessness.

Towards the end Khan-i-Arzu in his Muthmir deals with affixes. Here, he particularly throws light on the prefixes which is a ‘bound morphemes’. Its role is adding to or defining the meaning of a free morpheme. A 'word' which has a prefix a ‘bound morpheme' prefixed to it either gives a new word or its new form expresses a grammatical distinction that is required for its stems word’s class in
certain given syntactic context. Arzu instantiates it with the example of یاد /a:yad/ in case of derived verb form continuous, or order like from یاد /a:madan/ ‘coming’ یاد /a:yad/ and یاد /bia:yad/. As usual Arzu points out that the base is near in pronunciation to the Hindi (meaning Indian Language or old form of Urdu) which would be only یاد /a:/ and may appear similar to Persian and such coincidence may be found in some other forms, but the laws governing the two different languages have to be observed.

The Negative Prefix (م) and (ن)

The next discussion is about the negative prefix (م /miim/) and (ن /nu:n/) like

ناغفت /naguf/ (did not say), نکارد /nakard/ (did not do) which according to some of the scholars who were before Arzu may be replaced by /miim/ like مانند /mama:nand/ and میاد /maba:yad/. Arzu does not subscribe it and considers it as absolutely wrong. He has discussed such other observations and has quoted authorities.

4.1.3 Semantics and Pragmatics : Arzu’s Insights

“Pragmatics involves how speakers use language in contextualized social interactions, how they do things with words. Semantics invites a focus on meaning and truth conditions without regard to communication and context.”

-Geoffrey Neil Leech

Semantics is that level of linguistic investigation. Its central concern is on the relationship between signifier per say- words, phrases and sentences and signified, that is, what they stand for. In other words, it is the study of the meaning of linguistic expressions.
On the hand, *Pragmatics* is that linguistic level that studies the ways in which context contributes to meaning. That is to say that its subject matter is conversational implicature. It deals with what a speaker implies and a listener infers. As a matter of fact a word does not necessarily always stand for its defined meaning and there pragmatics comes to play role. Its prime concern is how words can be interpreted different ways depending on the situation or context.

In section thirteen of Muthmir, Khan-i-Arzu has dealt with the methodology of the affirmation of the meanings of words. What he has to say in this connection is that the only means of the determination of meaning of the words of any language is their oral transmission from one generation to another and that such transmission is either continuous or intermittent. However, as stated by Imam Fakhr-i-Razi in his Mahsul both of these method for the determination of the meanings of words are infested with difficulties which has further elaborated.

However on the contrary, in the section six of Muthmir Arzu discusses the problem introduced by Qadi Iddud-din Aiji in his Mavaaqif to the effect that sometimes words are used for a person as he is, and sometimes they are related to specifications in respect of common qualities available in common between persons and things.

Arzu also indulgdes and talks about about kinds of meaning a word may have. Section thirty-three of Arzu’s Muthmir deals with what he calls the real (haqi:qi/) and the metaphorical (mija:zi/) meanings of words. Agreeing with the concept put forward by Siyuti in his Muzhir, Arzu here maintains that he too is of the opinion that by reality in this context is meant the use of a word in its original sense, whereas metaphor (mija:z/) means the employment of that very word in a sense different from the sense for the expression of which it was originally coined.
Arzu discusses the problem introduced by Qazi Iddud-Dini Aiji in his Mavaaqif to the effect that sometimes words are used for a person as he is, and sometimes they are related to specifications in respect of common qualities available in common between persons and things.

In the subsequent section that is section thirty-four of Muthmir Khan-i-Arzu has also taken up the problem of synonymity (/mutra:dif/) and contradictioriness (/taza:d/) meaning found in the same word of a language. He further elaborates it in the following way:

A. When there are different names for the same thing they are called Synonyms such as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Its Synonym</th>
<th>Meaning/ English Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/te:γ/</td>
<td>گک</td>
<td>شمشیر Sword</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ne:zah/</td>
<td>چک</td>
<td>شاخدگ Lance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the scholars have made the distinction of generality (/umu:m/) and particularity (/xusu:s/) of meaning with regard to the said two examples of the synonyms. However, according to Arzu this kind of distinction can be held valid only in relation to the origin of the words concerned but not in respect of their use.

B. There is a sort of commonness called opposition (/zid/), and that applies to the two opposite senses of a word which in no way are similar to one another. According to Arzu, some of the Arabic scholars do not subscribe to such sort of commonness, such as Ibn-i- Darsuwaih but most of the Arabic scholars accept it.
Arzu says that in Persian this sort of commonness exists but is limited to a few words only and wherever it takes place, metaphorical sense of a particular word is the cause of contradictoriness in the two senses of a word. He substantiates with the example of the word (٦٤/ sapu:xtan/) which means both bringing in and bringing up forcibly. As for bringing up a thing, bringing in is essential. Arzu further argues that it is likely that the interdependence of the two said actions motivated the coiner or coiners of this very word (i.e.- ٦٤/ sapu:xtan/) to the said contradictory meanings to it.

In Muthmir there is also a discussion about the correspondence between some Arabic and Persian words having the same meaning but entirely different words. ﻣ ﻣ/nama:z/ is a Persian word meaning ‘Praise’ which is used by Muslims in Persian and Urdu in place of Arabic ﺎ ﺲ/ sala:h/. This is mainly significant as words of Arabic origin have reached Urdu through the stage in Persian and have mainly the form as in Persian which may even not be considered as ‘correct’ in the original.

4.2 DIFFERENT INTERDISCIPLINARY FIELDS OF LINGUISTICS AND INSIGHTS OF ARZU

The growth of core linguistic studies at different levels of language led to the growth of interdisciplinary fields related to it as language is relevant to many other areas of human activity and knowledge and vice-versa. David Crystal (1987) in his encyclopaedia, The Cambridge Encyclopaedia of Language has categorized some of them under different interdisciplinary fields of linguistics. As described above, linguistics describes the systems of language that is at the level of sound, grammar and meaning. It acquires the central position and is technically called Descriptive or Theorotical Branch. On one side it relates to man’s outer world such as, the social cultural, educational and literary aspects of language use in the
world, on the other side to man’s inner world such as psychological and mental process and activities, thought logic. As John Lyons (1981:35) states, “Briefly, theoretical linguistics studies language and languages with a view to constructing a theory of their structure and functions and without regard to any practical applications that the investigation of language and languages might have, whereas applied linguistics has as its concerns the applications of the concepts and findings of linguistics to a variety of practical tasks, including language-teaching.”

Therefore, the formal study of language has also ushered the developments of disciplines like psycholinguistics, which studies the representation and function of language in the human mind, neurolinguistics which researches language processing in the brain and language acquisition, which looks into as to how children and adults acquire and/or learn any language.

Linguistics includes non-formal approaches to the study of other aspects of human language, viz: social, cultural, historical, political and the likes. The study of cultural discourses and dialects comes under the domain of sociolinguistics, which explores the relation between linguistic variation and social structures besides that of discourse analysis, which studies the structure of texts and conversations.

Exploration on language through historical and evolutionary linguistics focuses on how languages change and on the origin and development of languages across time.

Corpus linguistics takes naturally occurring texts and investigates the variation of grammatical and other features based on such corpora. Stylistics engages in the study of patterns of style: within written, signed, or spoken discourse. Language documentation comprises anthropological investigation with linguistic inquiry to describe languages and their grammars. Lexicography is dedicated to the study and construction of dictionaries. Computational linguistics applies information technology to deal with questions
in theoretical linguistics and to create applications for use in parsing, data retrieval, machine translation and so forth. We can apply actual knowledge of a language in translation and interpreting too.

Furthermore, policy makers work with governments to frame and execute new plans in education and teaching which are based on linguistic research. Some other areas of study related to linguistics include semiotics which is the study of signs.

Fig: 4.2- Levels of Linguistic Structure

Some of these interdisciplinary fields of linguistics can be viewed in the above elucidated chart. The interdisciplinary fields on which the insights from Arzu’s Muthmir are available can be viewed hereunder:
4.2.1 Sociolinguistics and Arzu

One of the most powerful emblems of social behaviour is our language. In the process of our communication through language, we use language to send crucial social messages such as:

⇒ Who we are?
⇒ Where we come from?
⇒ With whom we are associated?

It is an amazing fact that we may extensively judge an individual's background, character, and intentions simply on the basis of his/ her language, dialect in some cases, even the choice of a single word. Thus, in the view of social role of language, it became somewhat indispensable to dedicate a domain of linguistics to study the role of language in society.

The scope of sociolinguistics:

a. The use of language symbolically represents fundamental dimensions of social behaviour and human communication. The notion is quite simple but the ways in which language reflects behaviour is usually complex and subtle. Moreover, the interface between language and society affects a range of encounters: from broadly based international associations to closely defined interpersonal relations. For say, sociolinguists might investigate language attitudes of populations on a national level, such as those exhibited in Sri Lanka with respect to the Tamil-only amendment-the legislative proposal to make Tamil the ‘official’ language. In the same way, they might study the status of Hindi and Chattisgarhi in Chattisgarh of India or the status of national and vernacular languages in the developing countries of the world as symbols of basic social relations among cultures and nationalities.

b. A somewhat different concern of Sociolinguists is to focus closely on the effect of particular kinds of social situations on language structure. For instance, language contact studies explicate the origin and the linguistic composition of pidgin and creole
languages, the special language varieties evolve when speakers from mutually not at all intelligible language groups require a common language for communication. There are many socio-historical situations throughout the world that have resulted in these particular language situations. While examining the language contact situations, it is also essential to examine both the details of a particular language and the social and linguistic details that demonstrate how bilingual speakers use each language and keep switching between them.

c. Sociolinguistics also focuses on the situations and uses of language as an activity in its own. The study of language in its social context reveals quite a bit about how human beings organize social relationships. Addressing somebody as ‘Mrs.’, ‘Ms.’, or by his/her first name is not actually about simple vocabulary choice rather the relationship and social position of the speaker. The use of sentence alternatives such as:

- Pass the salt.
- Would you mind passing the salt.
- I think this food could use a little salt

It is not merely a matter of simple sentence structure. Here, the choice involves socio cultural values and norms of politeness, respect, and rank or status. It is possible to lay emphasis on discovering the specific patterns or social rules for conducting conversation and discourse. For example, we can describe the rules for opening and closing a conversation, how to take turns in conversational, or how to narrate a story or crack joke and so on. It is also possible to examine how people deal with their language in relation to their cultural background and the objective of interaction.

d. Sociolinguists may also investigate:
o How mixed-gender conversations differ from that of single-gender conversations?
o How differential power relations manifest themselves in language forms?
o How caregivers let children know the ways in which language should be used?
o How language change occurs and spreads to communities?

To address these questions pertaining to language as social activity, sociolinguists make use of ethnographic methods; they attempt to get an understanding of the values and perspective of a community in order to explain the behaviours and attitude of its member of that speech community.

Therefore in a nut shell, the scope of Sociolinguistics is to answer who says what to whom, when, where, how and why. How does one speak to his/ her friends in private and why does one speak differently to his/her boss or parents. Through the Scope of Sociolinguistics, we can determine an individual’s social status, educational, background, setting, sex, age, and the likes. The scope of Sociolinguistics is very wide but has a vast impact on language and its different varieties. Arzu’s Muthmir covers some such points which may be observed here on. In section nine of Muthmir, Arzu has spoken of the liability of commitment of mistakes by the speech community (ز܉ن /ahl e zuba:n/) in respect of the usage of the words of that language and substantiates his view by providing examples from the compositions of Sa'di and Hafiz.

In the section fourteen of Muthmir, Arzu has put forward the criticism after his observation of Imam Tha'alibi (ضیافت) with regard to the preference by the Persian - speaking people of the popular Arabic words over the obsolete Persian words. Khan-i-Arzu maintains that Tha'alibi’s observations with regard to the words quoted by Tha'alibi in his Fighul Lughat
are not tenable. Arzu has further quoted some of the popular Arabic words prevalent among the Persian-speaking people whose Persian forms do not seem to be strange in the Persian language.

Furthermore, according to Arzu it is obvious that the language or idiom of cities and specially capitals becomes saturated with heterogeneous elements due to the influx of persons from every part of the country and belonging to every walk of life and therefore it may be concluded that the purest form of a language may be observed in sequestered regions viz: remote villages rather than in big cities. Arzu observes that from this point of view Dari, the form of Persian from Darra e Koh that is the pass in the mountain, may be considered as having a form purer than in any capital city.

In support of his argument, Arzu has cited the case of Arabic saying that the standard and reliable (moḥṭbar) Arabic as one that is unadulterated with other languages.

It was for this reason that the idiom of the Arab tribes on the frontier of Syria where Nasara (Christian) were in majority or that of the Yemenites with its adulteration by the words of language of Hind was not considered reliable.

Commenting upon this point of view Arzu is of the opinion that standard and reliable Persian is:

/zabaːn e moḥṭbar e faːrsiː zabaːn e orduyi paːdšaːhiː ast /

Which Fatihi A. R.: Khan-i-Aruz: A Linguist of 18th Century observes in the following way:

It appears that Arzu’s use of the term “established language” is closer to that of the modern term “institutionalized language”. He does not want to associate the Urdu language with any local dialect.
Furthermore, on the basis of Professor Irfan Habib’s observation it can be said that Arzu was the first in propagating standardization of language or the Zaban-i- muqarrar” i.e. the established or prescribed language. His ideas about standard usage can be summarized as follows:

i. The “established language” should be based on:

(a) The city language as opposed to the vulgar village language.

(b) The language of the court and that of its appendage.

ii. The “established language,” when used in poetry and composition, becomes the “Standard language”.

Besides this, Arzu has also debated on whether it is permissible or not to use those words in Persian which are not of Persian origin. Arzu sees no harm in the use of Persian and Turkish words and goes further to include Hindi also.

4.2.2 **Stylistics and Arzu**

*Stylistics* is that Interdisciplinary Field of Linguistics which is concerned with the study of style in texts, especially but not exclusively in literary works. It involves examination of sound, lexis, grammar, meaning and discursive devices in a given work. As a matter of fact, Stylistics acts as a middle ground and connective means between linguistics and literary criticism to reveal how the linguistic elements act significantly in a text to convey the message.

The prime concern of *Stylistics* is:

⇒ What is being said?

⇒ How is it being said?

The objective of stylistics is to determine the connections between the *form* and *effects*
within a variety of language. Therefore, it tends to look at what is ‘going on’ within the language; what the linguistic relations are that the style of language reveals.

Khan-i-Arzu in section sixteen of Muthmir endeavors to elucidate eloquence (/fasa:hat e kala:m/) basing the discussion given in Imam Siyuti’s Muzhir on eloquence. The case of the said discussion is that the term ‘eloquent’ is applicable to a word or phrase which is not unfamiliar (/yari:b/) and hence it is acceptable and attractive. The term unfamiliarity (/yari:b/) is applied only to a word not in use since a long time. Whereas aversion (/tana:fur/) to a word, is borne out of defective and inappropriate construction. Arzu has elaborated this point by citing apposite Persian verses. It is also said by him that change of diacritical marks of a word in order to fit it in the structure of a certain rhyme and meter adversely affects eloquence.

Arzu furthermore discusses the use of Hindi words in Persian. He has taken a liberal view on this and says that although the use of the Arabic, Turkish and Aramaic words in Persian is fully permissible the employment in Persian of the Hindi words too is not prohibited. To prove his point by, he cites the master writers and savants of Persian who employed Hindi words, one such is Sanai a couplet of whom has been supplemented by Khan-i-Arzu goes like this:

=/na dar a:n ma:zdah xud rah dami:dah nah dar a:n didah qatra yi pa:ni/

Section nineteen of Muthmir on the hand is devoted to uneloquent (/wafši:/) and unfamiliar (/yari:b/) words.
Defining and illustrating the kinds of words, Arzu says that the words that are difficult and their meanings are known to the highly educated persons only, are termed as uneloquent (\(\text{\textit{wa\text{"h\text{"s\text{"i}:}}}}\)).

To substantiate it, Arzu has cited the Tarikh-i Wassaf which contains many uneloquent and unfamiliar words imported into Persian from Arabic and Turkish.

4.3. **CONCLUSION**

Arzu’s *Muthmir* is apparently an important work but its place in the intellectual tradition of Indo-Persian has not been justly settled. In recent past, the scholars have become interested in it but almost exclusively with regard to its explication of *tawaf\text{\textit{uq al-lis:nain}}*. However, it is addressed in only some part of the text. There is significantly a lot more in Muthmir than this idea. There are sections that address and are relevant to other semantic, literary and social questions and are worth considering if we are to have a complete picture of this contribution of this oriental scholarly monument. As a matter of fact, *Muthmir* has never received a comprehensive treatment in general and scholars have written about it in Urdu and Persian, though not comprehensively to the feeble knowledge of the present researcher. There has been a tendency to cite another scholar’s opinion that *Muthmir* is historically significant rather than delving into the ideas in the text.

For instance, Arzu puts forward a linguistic question on the nature of word and its relation to a definite meaning. The question raised by Arzu is in a different context:

He asks whether, for every meaning, a fixed word is essential or not. Quoting Imam ‘ Fakhr Razi and others, he asserts that it is not essential. Conception which is the function of a word is unlimited for a given language. Arzu supports the argument and cites some examples like *hammam*, a bath house is a word requiring no such concept in Hindi (by which he means any
language of India or Hind) as the Indian people unlike the Persians go out and bathe in rivers in the open even when it is cold. He puts forward some other cases of this sort. This kind of observation gives a basis for the language affected by local environment.

Thus, in the present chapter we attempted to sightsee magnitude of contributions made by Siraj uddin Ali Khan Arzu in the domain of language studies which might cover different compartment of Modern Linguistics. MUTHMIR which is one of the instances of his great enterprise explicates Arzu’s insight on the language that cropped at that time in the east and could only be seen at least a century later in the west. We can evaluate Khan-i-Arzu’s works on the basis of range of topics he has covered under Phonetics, Phonology, Morphology, Semantics, Sociolinguistics, Stylistics, Orthography and many more and its modern interpretation. In this detailed work ranging from phonetics to pragmatics as well as sociolinguistics and stylistics we can witness a wide range of study which may have a profound impact on the subject-matter of language science which befittingly qualifies him as a scholar of Linguistics who deserves to be reckoned as the first scholar in both the east and the west.

The descriptive study in the present chapter aims at portraying contribution of Khan-i-Arzu in Modern Linguistics besides being a whistle blower in the field of Historical Linguistics in particular with a special reference to concept of tawa:fuq that is language relationship, language variation and many more which is outlined in the previous chapter.
Chapter-5

SUMMARY & CONCLUSION

5.0 GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The present chapter is the sum and substance of the present study which at first summarizes the all the previous chapters and then conclusion has been presented towards the end.

5.1 SUMMARY

*Muthmir* which is inspired extensively from Imam Jalaluddin Al-Suyuti’s *Al-Muzhir fī al-ulūm al-lughah wa anwāaihaa* (The Luminous Work on the Sciences of Language and its Subfields) model. The fundamental questions concerning semiotics, phonetics and morphology are mostly engagements with Al-Muzhir but Khan-i-Arzu has added many topics peculiar to Persian and Indian languages. A comparison of the chapters of Muzhir and Muthmir goes in tandem in order to establish that despite Khan-i-Arzu’s indebtedness to Siyuti, Arzu has been an original scholar. He has discussed the relations between the Arabic and the Persian on one hand and on the other between Sanskrit and Persian.

It is remarkable that besides the sheer volume and range of his scholarly and creative works, his colleagues and students were among the most important Persian scholars and Urdu poets of their generations. Arzu was a devoted, careful viewer of language, culture and society who aspired to correct cultural misconceptions if those held by Indians or non-Indians and to record regional usages authentically although he found them ineloquent or inappropriate for his literary work.

Khan-i-Arzu has a wide range of scholarship from Persian to Sanskrit and this acclaimed orientalist has a profound impact on numerous subjects such as Persian Poetry, Lexicography
and Phonetics and in many more domains of language which makes him eligible to be celebrated as a scholar of Linguistics rather than only a Laureate. He has composed mathnawis, in lexicography the preeminence of Khan-i-Arzu is simply unchallengeable, as a commentator, Khan-i-Arzu stands quite high, his commentaries on Persian texts have a marked originality and therefore are valuable and instructive, in criticism the supremacy of Khan-i-Arzu was generally accepted. The contributions of Khan-i-Arzu to poetics and stylistics were in the nature of prototypes.

The work in addition to biographical notices of 1735 poets and copious selections from their poems abounds in critical remarks, discussions of controversial points, personal opinion on various questions relating to the Persian language and literature and it is also more bulky than all the other similar works.

Arzu’s *Muthmir* is self-evidently an important work but its place in the intellectual tradition of Indo-Persian has not been settled. This treatise on language by Khan-i-Arzu which he calls an account of *ilm-i usuul-i lughat* (*the science of the elements of language*) that is quite synonymous with the modern science of language, called Linguistics *has* barely received a complete treatment by the experts of language in any language to the best of our feeble knowledge except that of the published edition of *Muthmir* in Persian by a teacher of Persian language who is also former Head of the Department of Persian, University of Delhi and is the author of *Encyclopaedia of Persian Language and Literature* from Pakistan: University of Karachi with an introduction in English.

This study aims at portraying contribution of Khan-i-Arzu as a scholar in general and also as a whistle blower in the field of developing Linguistics in particular with a special reference to concept of language relationship, different levels and elements in a language, language variation and the philosophical foundation of linguistic thought that his monumental work
Muthmir treasures for the linguists. The fundamental nature of this work has been discussed on the very onset whereas the second chapter lays emphasis on the philosophy of language and linguistics which is dedicated observes the nature of human language and of linguistic inquiry. It briefly talks about ‘epistemology’, the branch of philosophy which deals with the nature of knowledge – in case of linguistic knowledge. While conceptualizing, understanding and regurgitating, the material knowledge is being processed to get the structured thought. Knowledge is the net result of the processing of the perceived ideas in the mind through thinking or when mind perceives conceptualizes and understands through thinking and finally regurgitates a well structured thought, then this well structured thought is referred as knowledge. Then ‘ontology’, the branch of metaphysics which deals with the existence of reality, nature of reality, sustainability of reality and properties of reality and the likes. There after it throws light on ‘logical positivism’, ‘mentalist’ and other schools of philosophy which view several aspects of language and the philosophical relevance of Muthmir which in the first place was the first coherent description of the linguistic thought process. Muthmir gained its special place in the history of Perso-Arabic linguistic tradition. In his search for a Perso Arabic linguistic tradition Professor Abdul Azim projected Khan-i-Arzu’s Muthmir as a milestone in the Perso Arabic linguistic thought process. He quotes Khan-i-Arzu and says that he bases his claim of concord between Sanskrit and Persian on correct linguistic observations. In principle the language belonged to a well-defined group of people. This means that it may be regarded as an introduction to his linguistic thought process. He further says that Khan-i Arzu is referring to the feature of voicing.

Chapter three expounds what can be considered the seed of Historical and Linguistics that Arzu sowed in Muthmir which is an Arabic that burgeoned at least three decades before what qualifies Sir William Jones as founding father of Historical and Comparative Linguistics after his famous lecture in which he proclaims the historical tie between Sanskrit, Latin and Greek,
as well as with “the Gothic and the Celtic, and the old Persian,” in the Third Anniversary Discourse to the Asiatic Society of Bengal as death claimed Arzu in year 1756 and it but obvious that this treatise on Language would have come before it.

Sir William Jones who in 1783 sailed for Calcutta as judge of the Supreme Court during the colonial rule in India and in 1784 founded the Asiatic Society of Bengal. There in his 1786 presidential discourse, he postulated the ‘common ancestry of Sanskrit, Latin, and Greek’. This very finding began to be believed as the one which provides the induction for the advancement of Historical and Comparative Linguistics. The following lines of are believed to be stepping stone for the discipline called Historical Linguistics:

*The Sanscrit language, whatever be its antiquity, is of a wonderful structure; more perfect than the Greek, more copious than the Latin, and more exquisitely refined than either, yet bearing to both of them a stronger affinity, both in the roots of verbs and the forms of grammar, than could possibly have been produced by accident; so strong indeed, that no philologer could examine them all three, without believing them to have sprung from some common source, which, perhaps, no longer exists; there is a similar reason, though not quite so forcible, for supposing that both the Gothic and the Celtic, though blended with a very different idiom, had the same origin with the Sanscrit; and the old Persian might be added to the same family.*

Which can well be disillusion if one goes through the works of Arzu who left the world in 1756 and in particular with this very attestation is more than enough to suggest us that he was the whistle-blower in the field of linguistics and in particular the Historical Linguistics:
Up to this day no one has conceived of the tawāfuq (concord/agreement/relationship) between Hindi and Persian except this fakir Arzu in spite of the fact that there were a number of dictionary makers and other scholars of this guiding science. And whoever should be the disciple and the follower of this humble (Arzu), he should establish the fundamental principal and should base the correction of some Persian words on it as I have written my own books such as Sirajul Lughah and Chirag-i-Hidayat, etc. And it is amazing that Rashidi and other were in India, yet they failed to observe that there is concord in these two languages.

Here Arzu laments that scholars of Persian in India have failed to appreciate how much similarity exists between the two languages that is, Sanskrit (or Indian Language which he calls Hindi) and Persian. To substantiate, he also cites examples from words of definitely Indian origin used freely by Persian poets.

Chapter four which is entitled *Muthmir: Fashioning New Trends in Linguistics* is just the obverse of the previous chapter in the sense of this work, which is *Towards the Development of Historical Linguistics: Revisiting Khan-i- Arzu’s Muthmir* principally if we go by the now current terms of Synchronic versus Diachronic Approach in Linguistics which are terminological inventions of Ferdinand de Saussure.

This Swiss linguist and semiotician came along and dubbed the field of linguistics in the start of the twentieth century as a *synchronic* approach which is a descriptive look at language at a
certain point in time as opposed to *diachronic approach* which considers the development, change and evolution of a language through history and that is why also referred to as *Historical Linguistics* and was the common business for the linguists throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth century. This has been dealt with at some length in tandem with the insight of Khan-i-Arzu in the previous chapter.

we attempted to sightsee magnitude of contributions made by Siraj uddin Ali Khan Arzu in the domain of language studies which might cover different compartment of Modern Linguistics. MUTHMIR which is one of the instances of his great enterprise explicates Arzu’s insight on the language that cropped at that time in the east and could only be seen at least a century later in the west. We can evaluate Khan-i-Arzu’s works on the basis of range of topics he has covered under Phonetics, Phonology, Morphology, Semantics, Sociolinguistics, Stylistics, Orthography and many more and its modern interpretation. In this detailed work ranging from phonetics to pragmatics as well as sociolinguistics and stylistics we can witness a wide range of study which may have a profound impact on the subject-matter of language science which befittingly qualifies him as a scholar of Linguistics who deserves to be reckoned as the first scholar in both the east and the west.

The descriptive study in the chapter four aims at portraying contribution of Khan-i-Arzu in Modern Linguistics besides being a whistle blower in the field of Historical Linguistics in particular with a special reference to concept of *tawa:fuq* that is language relationship, language variation and many more which is outlined in the previous chapter. The descriptive studies aim at portraying contribution of Khan-i-Arzu as a scholar in general and also as a whistle blower in the field of developing Linguistics in particular with a special reference to concept of language relationship, different levels and elements in a language, language variation and the philosophical foundation of linguistic thought that his monumental work Muthmir treasures for the linguists. The efforts have been to minimize all the limitations that
might creep in course of the research of this nature, it is but obvious that certain constraints within which the research was completed. There have been many topics like orthography, lexicology, lexicography and a few more which could not be dealt with at length under separate headings besides there would be some instances in which it might appear a point overlaps although the attempts have been made to organize it most systematically, comprehensively and unequivocally.

5.2 CONCLUSION

A systematic and exhaustive scrutiny of Muthmir suggests that Khan-i-Arzu attempts to make his study of language logical because logic investigates those objectives that can be understood and those meanings that can be seized, by observing the impulses of the mind and the motions of the soul. In the intelligible things all people are alike. Khan-i-Arzu is of the opinion that logic is the base of knowledge and wisdom because it investigates the meaning, and grammar investigates the expression. If the logician comes across the expression, it is by accident, and if the grammarian stumbles upon the meaning, that too is by accident. Meaning is nobler than expression and expression is humbler than meaning. The only difference between expression and meaning is that the expression is natural, whereas the meaning is rational. This is why the expression disappears with time, since time effaces the traces of nature and replaces them with other traces. This is also why the meaning is permanent in time, because the receptacle of meaning is the mind, and the mind is divine: the matter of the expression is earthly, and all earthly things wither away. Khan-i-Arzu claims that the meanings occur by reason, investigation and reflection; the only thing that remains to learn are the rules of the language. The simple scheme of Khan-i-Arzu, as reproduced in the text of the debate, was that expressions belong to the level of speech and are accidental, whereas the meanings belong to a higher level. They are universal for all nations, only the
languages of the nations differ in their surface rules for the expression of the meanings. ‘Meanings’ (ma‘ânî) in this context refers to the logical operations of the mind and may be equated with ‘concepts’ as far as the simple meanings are concerned, and with ‘propositions’ as far as the compound meanings are concerned. For the grammarians, however, ‘meaning’ referred to an inherently linguistic entity, the semantic aspect of a phonetic expression. According to Khan-i-Arzu meaning in this sense is not universal at all: each language has its own meanings. In this use of the word ‘meaning’ Khan-i-Arzu is simply following the current linguistic usage of this term. Most grammarians use ma‘nâ in one of the three meanings: the lexical meaning of words (as discussed by the lexicographers); the intention of the speaker (as discussed by the exegetes); and the meaning or function of a word, which is what the grammarians are concerned with. Seen from this perspective, it is obvious that Khan-i-Arzu could never accept the traditional notion of meaning.

A close analyses of Muthmir further suggests that at times, Khan-i-Arzu provides insufficient definitions of the basic notions of linguistics. For example in Muthmir Khan-i-Arzu ‘defines’ the noun by giving two examples of nouns, and the verb by providing an ambiguous description that could be applied to physical actions as well as to grammatical verbs (both are called fi‘l).

With respect to the noun, Khan-i-Arzu did not give a definition to set it apart from other words and to distinguish it from the verb and the particle, but simply said ‘The noun’ is any word whose form signifies a meaning that is not connected with an accidental time is a noun. The commentators like Professor Abdul Azim attempt to explain why Khan-i-Arzu had neglected this important aspect of scholarly discourse; one of the reasons given by him was that he regarded the definitions as self-evident and therefore omitted them.

The discipline of logic, on the other hand, deals with the subject of signifying expressions rather than with expressions per se, and only with those expressions that signify universal
matters rather than particular matters. Its aim is to combine these expressions in such a way that they correspond to the truth (or to reality). The aim of grammar is then to provide these true expressions with the correct vowel endings according to the rules of the language. As we can see from this conclusion, in spite of his moderate formulation substantially Khan-i-Arzu draws the same lines between the two disciplines as the traditional grammarians did. Khan-i-Arzu demonstrates his intimate acquaintance with logical definitions, while carefully differentiating between the aims of the two disciplines of logic and grammar.

With this approach Khan-i-Arzu sets up a model for the structuring of linguistic argumentation. He was certainly not alone in this respect: all grammarians of this period used similar arguments. But as he himself boasts in the introduction to his *Muthmir* it is true that he was the first to present a formal theory of linguistic argumentation. Strangely enough, later grammarians do not seem to have developed this theory any further. We do not find any elaboration of this scheme until Prof. Abdul Azim dealt with the criteria of knowledge as they were applied in the second and third-level arguments. Khan-i-Arzu proposed formal conditions for the application of linguistic analogy in order to avoid the kind of free-for-all that threatened the basis of linguistic reasoning. Grammarians felt free to set up all kinds of analogy to explain linguistic phenomena and Khan-i-Arzu felt it to be his duty to restrict the application of this instrument. In his treatise he discusses the relative value of linguistic criteria, the two most important of which are analogy (qiyyās) and the transmission of linguistic data from reliable sources. He concludes that conclusive evidence for the correctness of a linguistic phenomenon can consist only in the testimony from an authority.

The use of analogy by linguists can serve only as additional explanation or support in the selection of alternatives and must be carried out under strict conditions. It may be added that in his discussion of linguistic methods Khan-i-Arzu borrowed almost the entire line of reasoning from a neighbouring discipline, that of legal science. Khan-i-Arzu himself
remained chiefly known for his dictionaries rather than for his theory of linguistic argumentation. Ironically, he believed himself to have been an innovator in the discipline of linguistic thought.

The present study suggests that Khan-i-Arzū’s linguistic observations presented in *Muthmir* will be regarded for centuries as the best way to study the language issues.
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