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This article examines the story of a city (Lahore) and an intellectual (Muhammad Hussain Azad) that both developed new identities following the political and social turmoil of the Great Revolt of 1857. After 1857, Lahore became an intellectual and cultural center for northwest India, where Indian intellectuals from Delhi and surrounding areas could recreate and transform their lives. One of the most significant Indian intellectuals who migrated to Lahore was Muhammad Hussain Azad. Once in Lahore, Azad worked with British officials and publicly advocated the development of Urdu as a modern literary language - a language of a new cultural framework associated with colonial rule. Yet privately, Azad was a conflicted individual who realized his efforts facilitated the loss of an older Muslim educational and literary heritage associated with his family in Delhi. This conflict resulted in his intellectual and cultural displacement, illustrating the impact of British rule on the city as well as individuals central to Lahore's emerging literary and educational life at the time.

After the Great Revolt of 1857, and the subsequent physical and emotive destruction of Delhi as a political and cultural capital for north India, Lahore developed into a new intellectual and cultural center for northwest India. Lahore provided opportunities for a variety of individuals, both British and Indian. Perhaps most importantly, it was location for Indian intellectuals to recreate and transform their lives after the loss of Delhi as a viable intellectual center.

One of the most significant Indian intellectuals who migrated to Lahore after 1857 was Muhammad Hussain Azad. Although there have been studies of Azad's poetical achievements and monumental work *Ab-e Hayat*, there has been little focus on his early career in Lahore. Yet, his writings and work in Lahore help to elucidate the impact of British rule on the city as well as individuals central to the intellectual life of Lahore. Therefore, instead of viewing his work in Lahore as the work of a loyal subject eager to please his British patrons, this paper will use his writings and ideas from early career to examine a more complex and forlorn Azad. Indeed, it is vital to evaluate Azad’s early career in Lahore in order to examine him as an active intellectual who wrestled with the meanings and implications of his work (supported by the British), he was not simply as a servant of the British. By doing this, we will have a clearer view of his concerns and the changing fabric of Azad’s life and Lahore in the 1860s and 1870s.

Azad came from an important literary family from Delhi that was part of a Perso-Islamic cultural milieu that existed throughout north India. Therefore, he held connections to the people, cultures, and systems of power when he moved
to Lahore. Yet, if we evaluate Azad through a more complex multifocal lens that also examines his work in Lahore, we can view him as a ‘member’ of the larger Perso-Islamic cultural milieu of his Delhi childhood as well as ‘outsider’ to his community in his new city of Lahore. Indeed, as an outsider, Azad never quite fit within the larger social and cultural world around him.

This status as an outsider was not only due to the fact that he was an Urdu speaker living in the capital of Punjab, where many people mainly spoke Punjabi. This paper analyzes his status as a part of a physical, intellectual and personal displacement. I use the term ‘displacement’ somewhat cautiously. The term often is associated with migrants and immigrants, especially with the growth of Diaspora studies in Europe and the US. When linked to Diaspora studies, writings often discuss the displacement of individuals from Asia who migrate to Europe or North America and undergo cultural, religious, social, and personal transformations. Although such analysis has proven valuable academically, these studies can contain problematic constructs such as the construction of an East-West divide. I do not wish to build such a divide between Delhi and Lahore. What I seek to do, however, is to apply the notion of displacement historically, to evaluate how historical experiences and events can result in similar forms of displacement. To state it another way, we will not simply concentrate on physical distance as a form of displacement; we also will examine intellectual and emotional displacement as a result of cultural transformation associated with the development of Lahore as a colonial city in the later nineteenth century.

To develop this point, it is important to first examine the historical background of Azad and Lahore.

Azad, Lahore, and Educational Reform

Muhammad Hussain Azad was born into an important literary family in Delhi around 1830. His father, Moulvi Muhammad Baqir, was educated at Oriental College, Delhi, and worked for the British colonial government before running the *Delhi Urdu Akhbar* press. The press published ‘Oriental’ books and translations of English books for Delhi College and other colonial schools. Baqir also founded the *Delhi Urdu Akhbar*, the first Urdu newspaper published from Delhi, in the 1840s after he separated the press from direct affiliation with Delhi College. He served as the editor of the newspaper in the later 1840s.

Azad was well-trained in the Persian and Urdu cultural milieu of mid-nineteenth century Delhi. He attended Delhi College after receiving some education in religious matters at home. At Delhi College, he was exposed to the educational reforms, including the development of Urdu, as he was a student in the “Oriental” section. He devoted himself to his studies, and he won awards for his essays in Urdu. After his studies, Azad assisted his father with the printing press, eventually serving as printer and publisher.

Unfortunately for Azad, 1857 interrupted his life and changed it forever. His father aligned with the Mughal emperor, Bahadur Shah, against British rule, publishing articles that were critical of the British in the *Delhi Urdu Akhbar*. 
Azad personally wrote a poem that attacked British arrogance in May of 1857, reveling in their losses. In the poem, Azad viewed the Revolt as a religious conflict, and referred to the British simply as Christians. Once the British retook Delhi, they were quick and ruthless in their quest to reassert control. Blame rested upon the Muslim elite, especially those who had supported the last Mughal emperor. The entire social fabric of the city was completely changed. While the circumstances about how Azad left Delhi are not fully clear, and he rarely discussed this episode, he did briefly mention the horror of the situation in Ab-e Hayat (1880). He stated how, “the soldiers of the victorious army suddenly entered the house. They flourished their rifles: ‘Leave here at once!’ The world turned black before my eyes.” As the British executed his father, Azad and his family were forced to flee from the city.

Azad eventually made his way to Lahore, a city full of promise and opportunities, in the early 1860s. This was a Lahore that was on the cusp of radical change as the British only recently asserted direct political control over the region. In addition, Azad was part of the movement of intellectuals that left Delhi and found sanctuary in Lahore, helping to advance Lahore as a new center for learning and culture. Although Azad’s family was from Delhi, the literary and intellectual background of his family helped him greatly in his new city. Azad’s background and abilities were unique, and British officials quickly realized that they needed Azad’s talents and knowledge. In 1861, Azad found employment in the Post Office, and he soon entered into correspondence with the Director of Public Instruction, Captain A.R. Fuller. Fuller, recognized Azad’s abilities, and Azad eventually found employment in the colonial educational system of Punjab in 1864.

At that time, Azad quickly entered the emerging debates about educational and social reform; Lahore became a center for advocacy and development of “vernacular” (Indian-language) education. As an employee of the colonial state, he soon worked with many officials including the colorful G.W. Leitner – the first principal of Government College, Lahore as well as the founder and President of the Anjuman-e Punjab. The Anjuman was an association that included British officials (including the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab from 1865-1870, Sir Donald Mcleod) as well by many important members of the Punjabi elite drawn from the three major religious communities of the Punjab -- Muslim, Hindu, and Sikh. With this diverse membership, the Anjuman became a center for debates about educational and social reform at the time.

Leitner and many British officials, including Captain Fuller, sought to develop a new colonial educational system that drew from both European and Indian educational systems. The goal was to establish colonial schools and universities modeled after Europe; yet Leitner sought to utilize the official “vernacular” (ie Indian) language of the Punjab – Urdu – to communicate to students. Education reform was central to Leitner’s movement to “revive” the language, literature, and culture of elite society. His goals became intertwined with the Anjuman’s basic objectives: the “revival of ancient Oriental learning,” and the “diffusion of useful knowledge...through the medium of the vernacular.” “Useful knowledge” in the context of colonial education was
another term for European knowledge associated with secondary and higher education in England. European knowledge came to represent ideas of "modernity," progress, and the promotion of "western" values. This knowledge was privileged above indigenous knowledge, as European science and technology was associated with the "advances" of European powers, helping to justify and facilitate imperial expansion in Asia and Africa. Therefore, educational reformers (and increasingly the Indian literati) argued that European knowledge was necessary for the development of education.

In order to conduct this large-scale reform, Leitner needed Indian intellectuals to help him reach his objectives of reviving learning. Leitner quickly developed a close relationship with Azad, and he became central to Leitner’s efforts.

### Azad’s Displacement

Although Azad quickly found employment in his new city, he was an outsider to Lahore; the Lahore that Azad arrived in the early 1860s was not at all like Delhi. Azad was part of a Persian and emerging Urdu cultural milieu in Delhi prior to 1850, supported by both Mughal and British patronage. Although such developments did have some influence beyond Delhi, colonial reforms and debates had not fully permeated Lahori society by the early 1860s as the British only took direct control of the city in 1849. Indeed, this is why Azad found employment quickly, as the British valued his knowledge and experience. Yet for Azad, Lahore was a city of landed local elites and privilege - with the remaining vestiges of Maharaja Ranjit Singh’s state. He was not a member an elite Lahori family, and he also was a minority Shi’a Muslim who lived in a Shi’a area of the city. In addition, it was a Lahore were Punjabi played an important role in cultural life, for all religious communities. Although Azad certainly was welcome into this society, as an Urdu speaker, he never quite fit within it. His public persona, and his public addresses all were in Urdu, and he often spoke about a larger heritage that centered in Delhi -- not Lahore, as we shall examine shortly. Moreover, his colleagues and acquaintances were either British or Punjabi as well.

This status as an outsider was not only due to the fact that he was an Urdu speaker living in the capital of Punjab, it was part of his physical, intellectual and personal displacement. Azad faced physical displacement similar to people we would now name refugees. Although his situation cannot be fully compared to one of the world’s longest refugee crisis -- the Palestinians, their documented experiences can help us to evaluate Azad’s life. After 1948, the large numbers of Palestinian refugees that were forcibly removed from their homes and relocated in Gaza have sought to regain some of their lost lives. Although these refugees live relatively close to the area where they once lived prior to 1948, they could never return to their homes in what became Israel, or reclaim them. Instead, it is their memory of these lost places that has served to reinforce displacement, loss, and anger.
Although Azad was still in north India, his forced migration out of Delhi (the physical displacement) after political upheaval and the murder of his father, coupled with the inability to return to a Delhi that existed prior to 1857, reinforced displacement and loss. Although he could visit Delhi, there were little opportunities for him and the city was radically altered. This dislocation provided Azad with a desire to actively participate in educational and social reform in Lahore, although he did long for Delhi in his writing.

Azad’s dislocation is best illustrated by a paper he wrote in 1864, aptly named, “Delhi.” In the paper, Azad clearly shows his love and longing for a city that had been forever altered by the events of 1857. He purposefully began the paper with a specific reference to his physical dislocation when he refers to the “dreadful destruction of the life of Delhi” in 1857 and states with poetical allusion how “building upon building fell and from grave to grave everywhere there was desolation.” He even marks the physical space that was destroyed when he states that a 3 mile wide area from Shahjahanabad south to the Qutb Minar was “all ruins.” Additionally this loss was not only Mughal Delhi, especially Shahjahanabad, but the remains of older empires were, “in ruins, and you cannot tell where they existed.” In fact, much of his concern was the loss of history, especially the historical buildings and remains that came to define the city at that time. He also showed concern about the destruction of the physical space of Muslim and pre-Muslim rulers.

However, the majority of his paper did not poetically mourn the loss of Delhi, it served to help memorialize his love of the city and its history. He sought to replace the physical evidence with a written description of the city. To support his paper with additional evidence, he used the travel writings of people who visited Delhi centuries earlier to help recreate and perhaps re-imagine the city. For example, he refers to the Arab traveler Ibn Battuta who arrived in Delhi in the 1300s in order serve as a magistrate. In addition, he used the writings of the English traveler William Finch, who visited Delhi in 1611. The paper served as a memorial to heritage of Delhi, and the role it has played for succeeding empires.

This longing for a Delhi that he saw as a “paradise” was always part of his memory of a place that no longer existed. Indeed, much later in his life, he briefly discussed his forced migration from Delhi in Ab-e Hayat. He indicated that, as he left Delhi in 1857, “the words fell from my lips, ‘Hazrat Adam left Paradise; Delhi is a paradise too. I’m his descendant--why shouldn’t I leave Delhi?’” Whether he commemorated Delhi and its history in 1864, or he discussed this Delhi of his childhood as “paradise” in 1880, this was a Delhi that clearly was at the forefront of his tragic personal memory.

In addition to his longing for Delhi, Azad’s displacement was also intellectual and very personal. Azad was a complex individual who cannot be classified easily. Partly because he fled Delhi and relied on patronage in Lahore from Leitner and the Punjab Education Department, Azad was not closely affiliated with important contemporary movements of Muslim intellectuals, such as the Aligarh Society of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan (located outside of Delhi). Still, Azad maintained contacts with Sir Syed contemporaries. For
example, while Azad was in Calcutta in 1866, he became interested in Nawab Abdul Latif’s Muhammadan Literary Society. Moreover, Azad worked with fellow Delhi intellectual Altaf Hussain Hali in the early 1870s in Lahore, before Hali returned to Delhi and became an important associate of Sir Syed. Sir Syed valued and defended Azad’s efforts to reform Urdu poetry in the 1870s, when Azad’s poems were harshly criticized. Although Azad was not directly part of additional north Indian movements, he held connections with several leading Muslim intellectuals and he identified with their concerns.

Instead, Azad became closely associated with the Orientalist scholar G.W. Leitner shortly after Leitner arrived in Lahore. Azad began to work with Leitner on the Anjuman’s Education Committee in 1865. At this time, a partnership was fostered early in their careers in Lahore, as Leitner recognized Azad’s potential. Their close relationship helped Azad to prosper under the Anjuman and reclaim his status following 1857, as he was appointed secretary to the organization in 1867. Azad also became a prominent paid lecturer for the Anjuman at that time, an appointment that Leitner was eager to fill since 1865. Azad used the lecture series as well as lectures to meetings of the Anjuman to discuss many aspects of reform for the Anjuman. His lectures were published in the *Akhbar-e Anjuman-e Punjab* as well as the *Risala-e Anjuman-e Punjab* (Magazine of the Anjuman-e Punjab).

It was through this role that we can see Azad’s intellectual and personal displacement began to take shape. Soon after he joined Leitner and the Anjuman, Azad gave speeches that articulated the key aspects of the Anjuman’s program for reform. His early speeches illustrated how his views of the British had radically shifted (at least publicly), from his critiques of British rule and his support of the last Mughal ruler in 1857 to accepting and supporting the social reforms sponsored by the British in north India. For example, in October 1865, he wrote an essay delivered to a meeting of the Anjuman in praise of British rule. In the essay, he believed that British rule brought with it notions of progress and opportunities for Indians to prosper. Thus, he stated that the objective of government was to help its “loving subjects” obtain “civilization” and “good character.” He also justified government institutions and reforms, including prisons and the land revenue reforms. He concluded that, “it is a matter of pride that our rulers…are thinking of our progress.”

This radical shift from criticism (in 1857) to optimistic praise of British rule (in 1865) is important for understanding Azad. Although it is difficult to ascertain the reasons for his overt British support, Lahore was a sanctuary for him after 1857 – Lahore provided safety and patronage. Indeed, the Anjuman provided an important source of patronage for Azad, where he served as a speaker for the organization. In other words, his support of the British was very practical; he was an employee of the government and received government patronage. In addition, as we shall see, Azad had a genuine interest in the promotion of language and education reform and the development of his fellow Indians. Certainly, such a positive view about British rule facilitated his association in Leitner’s project to develop Urdu as an educational vernacular.
As Azad developed his partnership with Leitner, Azad also began to serve as an agent for British geo-political concerns. When Azad accompanied Leitner on a political mission to Central Asia in 1865, Azad assisted Leitner in promoting British interests in the region. This was the time where the region became central to the “Great Game,” as Britain sought to extend its sphere of influence against any Russian expansion. Although Leitner also was researching the languages and people of the Himalayan areas (later published as part of Leitner’s work on Hunza and Gilgit), the political objectives of the mission were clear, further illustrating Azad’s fundamental shift from criticism of British rule in 1857 to support of British rule by the 1860s.

Leitner valued Azad’s talents and abilities during his travels up north, and he continued to rely upon Azad in Lahore throughout the 1860s. Azad became a spokesperson for Leitner in Lahore, advocating the use and reform of Urdu in the region to the Punjabi elite. For example, Azad began to promote the use of Urdu as a scholarly language in a series of lectures in Lahore in 1865, published under the title “Zaban Urdu.” In the lectures, he argued that languages had two basic purposes. First, a language had to provide a clear articulation of knowledge, especially facts and ideas. Information had to be clearly expressed in texts, whether they originally were written in Urdu or translated into Urdu. Secondly, a language’s grammar should allow writers to express ideas in novel ways. While Urdu had these capabilities, Azad stated that they had not been fully realized because the British only recently sought to develop it as a “national language.” In addition, Urdu newspapers only began to form in the 1830s (a reference to his father), and scholarly books began to be translated into Urdu in the 1840s. Otherwise, he viewed Urdu mainly as a poetic language, while Urdu stories often contained many grammatical errors.

Advocating the use of Urdu was hardly radical for Azad, although it may have alienated him from some of the Punjabi elite and further contributed to his role as an ‘outsider.’ What was more radical was his call for reform. In this lecture, he supported Leitner by arguing that authors could not simply utilize the historical connections between Urdu, Arabic and Persian. Although Persian and Arabic terminology and grammar were a central part of Urdu, Azad associated European knowledge with English language terms, techniques, and ideas. He argued English words and phrases could express contemporary concepts and terminology, especially technological innovations associated with colonial rule such as the railways. Thus, he believed English provided an important model to reform Urdu. He also sought to use English to reform the grammar of Urdu -- especially the Persian poetical heritage and similes that influenced Urdu -- in order for Urdu to “blossom.” He even advocated using “translations of idioms and similes” from English. For example, he explained how English authors utilized notions of time, anger, and love, and beauty. Thus, he hoped that this would help to revive the age of great Persian-Urdu poets, such as Mir and Sauda, and bring the “spirit of Shakespeare” to India. Lastly, he emphasized that English was “methodological,” an ideal characteristic of an educational language.
The belief that English was an appropriate model for the development of Urdu was influenced by his work with Leitner and the Anjuman-e Punjab. However, Azad’s arguments were developed alongside Leitner, and they predated Leitner’s more formulated ideas expressed in Sinin-e Islam (discussed below). For example, Azad analyzed the ideas of logic and knowledge, and the use of reason to develop an opinion on a particular topic in an essay given as a lecture to the Anjuman in 1867.43 This essay, “Ilm-e Mantaq par Not” (A Note on Logic), was a significant step in the development of Azad’s beliefs about the purpose of language reform, illustrating his role in the developing theories to reform Urdu and establishing him as an important intellectual in the Anjuman.

Azad used “Ilm-e Mantaq par Not” to demonstrate the importance of supporting and debating ideas. In the essay, he wrote that people had a right to express their opinion during discussions. However, he believed that it was incorrect to forcibly argue one position, as people often became angry, exchanged words, or quarreled.44 In these cases, people did not consider alternative opinions, and they were not familiar with the opposing arguments. To provide a proper debate of ideas, Azad wrote that the use of logic allowed a writer to justify and explain his arguments as well as to understand counter arguments. Intelligence and knowledge were vital to providing a logical argument. This essay also could be viewed as a subtle critique of Punjabi, a language the British considered ‘vulgar’.45

As Azad helped to formulate a philosophy on how to reform Urdu, he began to develop a history of the language in the form of lectures for the Anjuman. These lectures detailed his understandings about Urdu that predated the publication of his monumental work, Ab-e Hayat, in 1880. They began in 1867 and became popular amongst Anjuman members. One important lecture in April 1867, entitled “Zaban-e Urdu,” discussed the early history of Urdu.46 He used the lecture to argue that Urdu was the “language of Hindustan,” shared by Muslims and Hindus. In order to support this claim, he provided a brief historical timeline, stating that Urdu originated in the eleventh century when Muslims and Hindus began to live together in India. He termed the language rekhta (mixed language), and argued that it became more prominent during the rule of the Mughal emperor Akbar, when Hindus began to enter government service in large numbers.47 This understanding was significant, as Urdu was the language of administration and education in the Punjab under British rule. Thus, he used his lecture to promote Urdu as an inclusive language, important to Muslims, Hindus, and Sikhs, whereas he described Persian and Arabic historically as the “language of the rulers.” Although Azad accepted that Persian language and culture were part of Mughal rule, he sought to justify the use of Urdu to a diverse audience of Anjuman members who were considering proposals for an Oriental university at that time.

These lectures on the history of Urdu were one of the early attempts to offer a linear history of the language, influenced by European notions about the historical growth and change of languages and cultures as well as European literary analysis. Indeed, well before the publication of Ab-e Hayat in 1880, a work that provides a historical background and analysis of Urdu poetry,48 these
early lectures about Urdu begin to provide similar historical and literary analysis. In addition, they demonstrate Azad’s wider conceptions of an Urdu literature that could be used for educational purposes and his thoughts about the British. This is partially because Azad accepted Urdu as a language of reform and the successor to Persian. He believed that British rule provided the opportunity to develop Urdu and move beyond the influence of Persian, transforming Urdu from a poetic language to a language for scientific inquiry, debate and education. Urdu poetry also was to replace the highly poetic and abstruse terms associated with Persian verse. As a result, he wrote in a well-organized and logical Urdu, with a prose style that is still admired today. His ideas may appear to be straightforward, but they were written in a prose that suited the tastes of a wider audience as Azad sought to easily explain ideas that were somewhat revolutionary.

Azad was soon at the center of the development of Urdu, and the reform of Urdu poetry was one of his significant contributions to educational and language reform. In May 1874, a musha’ira (poetry recitation series) was organized in Lahore by the Anjuman in conjunction with the Department of Public Instruction, Punjab. Azad was one of the key speakers for the first event, and his speech was published in Urdu newspapers and other journals soon afterwards, providing wider distribution of his ideas. It was one of Azad’s most significant statements on the reform of Urdu poetry. He began with a brief history of Urdu poetry and detailed the influence of other languages on it. He stated that Persian provided Urdu with “colorful thoughts” and influenced Urdu grammar; Urdu developed “beautiful” similes, metaphors, and ideas due to its Persian heritage. Yet, he also thought that Urdu writers should utilize other sources, reflecting the circumstances of colonial rule; “if we open our eyes and see wisdom,…the languages of European books are full of powerful thoughts.” His goal, and the objective of the meeting, was to advocate the ‘advancement’ of Urdu poetry by examining and learning from European poetry (especially English poetry). He believed Urdu poetry should communicate ideas and emotions, and not only rely on the embellishments of its Persian heritage. At the time, Azad’s ideas offered a somewhat radical departure from a traditional musha’ira series, but his work proved influential for later generations.

Azad’s early writings in Lahore had a lasting influence upon his career. They illustrate his eagerness to support a wide range of reforms to elite society, including his efforts to promote Urdu language instruction. The Anjuman provided Azad with important opportunities to participate in reforms associated with the new cultural world brought by colonial rule. However, these efforts contributed to his intellectual and personal dislocation as they were a fundamental challenge to his way of life and dependency on a pre-colonial order. Indeed, this was a period of extensive challenges, as his cultural and educational background in Delhi was radically questioned and adapted with the formation of societies such as the Anjuman, Urdu language colonial schools, and the rejection of the pre-1857 cultural heritage of Delhi.
Although Azad supported and worked with Leitner, another significant part of Azad’s personal dislocation was the eventual strained relationship between these two intellectuals. Azad relied upon Leitner for employment, patronage, and legitimacy. They worked closely together in the Anjuman and as educational officials. Azad also was appointed a professor of Arabic at Government College, Lahore in 1869, a position he gained through the support of G.W. Leitner. The close relationship between Azad and Leitner in the later 1860s was illustrated in a speech about education where Azad praised his patron. Azad’s tribute was overly complimentary of Leitner’s “enthusiastic” efforts and “wise suggestions.” Comparing London in the 1860s to ancient Greece, Azad also drew parallels between Leitner and Aristotle. Thus, Azad asked the Anjuman members to put their faith and trust in Leitner, and support educational and social reform. This was a friendship that Azad valued and needed personally.

However, Azad’s long-term experiences with Leitner as a patron consolidated his intellectual and personal dislocation. Although they collaborated on several projects, one project caused their partnership irreparable harm – the publication of the history text *Sinin-e Islam*, in 1870. *Sinin-e Islam* was written in Urdu, specifically for the “use of Maulvis,” because Leitner argued that although, “some of the Maulwis were profound in matters of verbal and grammatical details, …all were, more or less, ignorant of some of the most prominent facts of Arabic history and literature.” *Sinin-e Islam* taught these moulvis European Orientalist scholarship with an Arab-centric view on Islam. Thus, Leitner hoped that his work would teach moulvis, “the sequence of their history,” and teach that this history, “is connected with the history of other cultures.”

Leitner sought to use the text as an example of educational reform. He believed that utilizing Urdu for educational texts such as *Sinin-e Islam* meant more than adopting terms and ideas from the European scientific and humanities disciplines. Leitner argued that there was a need to ‘adapt’ European knowledge in order to develop ‘oriental’ learning. Thus, he developed a new notion of translation in *Sinin-e Islam*, where he argued that, “books on scientific and literary subjects, written in any of the European languages, should not be translated, but “adapted” into Urdu,” as European writers were “abstract and impersonal,” while “Oriental” writers were “personal, particular, concrete, and dramatic.” For Leitner, the “difficulties” of translating into “Oriental languages” required that European books should be “re-written” for “oriental” languages, to better adapt them to an ‘Oriental’ audience. Instead of relying on a dictionary and a “docile Munshi,” he believed that translators needed to examine and compare “thoughts” and “associations” between languages, and if necessary, they needed to narrate these associations in translations. It is clear that Leitner sought to control the interpretation and application of this knowledge by explicitly detailing the meanings of this knowledge. Yet, he also sought to make translations relevant to the student reader rather than forcing students to memorize materials they did not completely comprehend.
Similar to many British Orientalist scholars, Leitner did not adequately credit his intellectual partner (and Urdu writer), Muhammad Hussain Azad. Yet, the texts illustrated the close relationship between Leitner and Azad. Leitner relied on Azad to draft the text in Urdu. Although Leitner only expressed his gratitude for Azad’s “assistance” in the introduction, the literary style of the book suggests that Azad played a significant part in crafting its prose. It is probable that Azad served as a translator and stylist in order to adapt (to use Leitner’s term) a manuscript that Leitner had originally written in English. This would help to explain why Azad later defended the format of the text from criticisms of the books “faulty style” by arguing that it provided a basic history of Islam. It was this criticism that ultimately ended their partnership, causing Azad further personal and intellectual dislocation. After receiving several harsh critiques, Leitner was willing to acknowledge the role of Azad in crafting the text. Indeed, Leitner sought to blame Azad for the problems. Although Azad sought to salvage their relationship that had benefited both men, writing a defense of *Sinin-e Islam* in a statement to Leitner, Leitner essentially distanced himself from Azad. For example, Leitner’s reflected on Azad’s efforts to reform Urdu and hold *musha’iras* in the 1870s rather negatively, stating that problems of the *musha’iras* were that the, “irritable genus of poets did not want to be told by any one that they had hitherto debased their genius by celebrating love and they declined dictation in poetic inspiration.” Azad certainly was distraught by their disputes, and it affected him in his later years.

**Conclusion**

By 1890, Azad was certified to be mentally ill, a process that is documented at least from 1885 if not earlier. He was known to wander the streets of Lahore alone by that time. The causes of this mental illness were undoubtedly complex and many. Personally, this was an individual who suffered many tragedies. After his father was murdered in 1857, most of his children died in his lifetime. This includes his beloved daughter Amat us-Sakinah, who died in 1885, and who he said, “was more precious than seven sons, when I was writing she was my right hand; her death has shattered my heart.” Such tragedy would cause anguish to any parent.

In addition to his anguish over losing many family members tragically during his lifetime, there is little doubt that his physical, intellectual, and personal displacement caused him irreparable mental health problems. Indeed, by reviewing his earlier works in Lahore, we learn more about Azad and can begin to piece together the causes of his madness. The events of 1857 and the loss of his cultural world in Delhi were never fully reconciled in or replaced by Lahore. His work “Delhi” clearly illustrates a man who held a tragic love for the city and its history, a Delhi he also referred to as a “paradise.” Yet, we also see an individual who relied on the patronage and goodwill of the people (the British) who murdered his father. Perhaps this is why his public comments
radically shifted from critiquing the British in 1857 to praising them in 1865. Azad clearly was a man who illustrated seemingly contradictory ideas in his lifetime, and he never openly discussed these contradictions.

Azad’s contradictions and dislocation were not only about loyalty, they also were a central part of his work in Lahore for Leitner and the British. One can locate a love for his Persian-Urdu heritage in his writing. This is the subject of many of his writings and his most celebrated (even if biased) work, *Ab-e Hayat*. Moreover, he illustrated this devotion to his Persian-Urdu heritage by stating that when he fled the British in 1857, he chose to bring with him copies of the ghazals of the Urdu poet Zauq; “If God is gracious, and you live, then everything can be restored; but where will this very Ustad come from, who can compose these ghazals again?” Yet, as he stated in his writings about Urdu beginning in 1865 and onwards, he continued to advocate for the reform of Urdu literature, prose and poetry.

The reasons for seeking to reform Urdu and what that meant may be less clear. Indeed, on one level, it can be difficult to understand why Azad rejected and ardently sought to reform the Persian heritage of Delhi in his writings, as he was a product of this heritage. He may have sought to be a faithful servant for British interests, and his ideas certainly echoed Leitner and the larger colonial debates about language and education. Yet, there are several problems with such an analysis. Indeed, by examining his early writings in Lahore, we can see a connection between these writings and his later works. In 1865 he wrote about the need to reform and remodel Urdu and Urdu poetry, transforming Urdu from a poetic language to a scientific language that relied less on Persian literary and poetic devices. He again echoed these comments when he launched the Mushairas of 1874, and communicated similar ideas as he wrote *Ab-e Hayat*. If he only needed to please the British, he would not necessarily have to restate similar ideas over the course of two decades. Instead, he could have served as a professor and translator, writing textbooks for the Education Department and living a quiet life in Lahore. Moreover, if he was concerned about appearing loyal to the British, he would not have mentioned 1857 and his rush to retain the ghazals of Zauq (even if it was brief) in *Ab-e Hayat*. This could have reminded any British official, who would have read this work (and read that far in the text), about the role of Azad’s family’s in 1857; consequently this could raise questions about Azad’s loyalty, questions that would not be answered by any of his pro-British writings.

It is doubtful, therefore, that he simply served British interests, and this contradiction helps to explain his final intellectual dislocation. It is likely he did not have a simple or straightforward answer himself to fully support his efforts to reform Urdu or about how to reform Urdu. Indeed, it has been argued that Azad may not have fully accepted the reforms brought with colonial rule, and that he longed for the cultural world of his Delhi childhood. Azad’s pre-1857 experiences certainly were important, and the devotion to the Delhi of his youth was clear, but we also need to examine his larger concerns and experiences as well. He spent his career seeking to overcome his physical, intellectual, and emotional displacement from, and his heartrending memory of, a Delhi that no
longer existed. He sought to preserve this Delhi and its cultural heritage beginning in 1857, when he fled with copies of Zauq’s ghazals. Yet, he realized retaining copies of poetry was not enough, and his call for reform was a recognition that Indians needed to adapt to changing times under British rule. It was not only the British ability to use violence (such as in 1857), it was their ability to use knowledge for control and power in India. Therefore, Azad believed that Indians could learn from the British, as he stated in 1874, “if we open our eyes and see wisdom,…the languages of European books are full of powerful thoughts.” Similar to his contemporary, Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, Azad sought to be a ‘modernizer’ who could develop his heritage to reflect the realities of colonial Lahore and colonial India in the later nineteenth century – after the fall of the Mughal Empire. In other words, Azad sought to preserve this heritage through reforming it in order to make it relevant to life under colonial rule. Although Azad rarely directly articulated his predicament, it was a very real concern for many intellectuals, and one that is seen clearer in the writings of Altaf Hussain Hali.

The unanswered questions in his writings continue to plague those who study Azad. Yet, by evaluating Azad’s earlier writings in Lahore, we can piece together a more complete picture of an individual who seemingly defies a straightforward answer. *Ab-e Hayat* became a monumental work, not least because it was one of the earliest attempts to delineate the history of Urdu literature. It is this delineation of history and culture (and his identity), through his writing, that he valued. Even prior to *Ab-e Hayat*, Azad utilized notions of historical change and the progress of societies and languages in his writing. In fact, his early historical lectures on Delhi already use this pattern, a pattern that continues to the study of language with his 1860s lectures about Urdu and in later writings. Thus, these efforts were lifelong pursuits that celebrated his heritage and relocated him physically as well as intellectually and personally in the colonial realm of Lahore. At the same time, his writings, especially on language, advocated reform to retain this heritage. In essence, Azad symbolical represented his own heritage and the challenged posed to it by British rule - he was a memorial to this heritage and he worked tirelessly to document as well as reform it. Unfortunately for Azad, his writings were part of many attempts to reconcile his dislocated identity between his narratives of reform and displacement, and judging from his madness he did not fully succeed in his efforts.
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Notes

1. This is a view some critics have held. See, Shamsur Rahman Faruqi. "Constructing a Literary History, a Canon, and a Theory of Poetry: Ab-e Ḥayāt (1880) by Muhammad Ḥusain Āzād (1830-1910).” Social Scientist, Vol. 23, No. 10/12, pp. 90-91.


5. Moulvi Muhammad Hussain took the pen name “Azad” (free), and is now known as Muhammad Hussain Azad. Thus, he is referred to as Azad in this examination. Background on his life is from, Muhammad Sadiq. Muhammad Hussain Azad: His Life and Works. Lahore: West-Pak Publishing Co., 1965, especially pp. 1-18; According to different sources, Azad’s birthday is said to be both in 1827 and 1830.

6. For a background to Delhi College, see Margrit Pernau, ed. Delhi College: Traditional Elites, the Colonial State and Education before 1857. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2006.


8. Azad held this role from about 1850 until 1857. See Khan, A History of Urdu Journalism, p. 71.


Muhammad Hussain Azad. (Francis Pritchett and Shamsur Rahman Faruqi, translators). *Ab-e Ḥayāt.* Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2001, 450, p. 367. This was the only direct reference to his experience in 1857 that I have located, perhaps not surprising as he did not wish to relive the experience.


The British often referred to Indian languages as “vernacular” languages in the Punjab region at this time. This paper uses the word “vernacular” as it is the term utilized in colonial debates.


Urdu was the official ‘vernacular’ of chosen for the Punjab by the 1860s. Punjabi was viewed by the British as ‘vulgar,’ and debates about Hindi and Urdu did not emerge in the region until the later nineteenth century (debate that have resonated through the national projects of India and Pakistan). Indeed, Urdu was used by the elite of all religious communities who worked with the British at the time. See, Diamond, “A ‘Vernacular’ for a ‘New Generation’?”

Report of the Anjuman-I-Panjab...For the Year 1865, p. 1.


This landed elite were central to early colonial policy in the region as well, and was the subject of colonial interest. For example, see Griffin’s work on Punjabi elite families, printed for British officials, Sir Lepel Griffin. *The Punjab Chiefs.* Lahore: Chronicle Press, 1865.

For a discussion about language usage and policy in early colonial Lahore, see, Diamond, “A ‘Vernacular’ for a ‘New Generation’?”


Azad was a member of the Committee since 1865, and begun to work with Leitner from that time. *Report of the Anjuman-I-Panjab...For the Year 1865*, pp. 4-6, 20.


Leitner published many works on this area he called Dardistan (the present day Gilgit region of Pakistan), over his career, including, G.W. Leitner. Dardistan in 1866, 1886, and 1893. Woking: Oriental University Institute, 1893.


Azad, “’Ilm-e Mantaq par Not,” pp. 157-159.

Azad did not participate in debates about Punjabi, and he is less clear of his view of that language. For an examination of these debates, see, Diamond, “A ‘Vernacular’ for a ‘New Generation’?”


For a discussion about Urdu as rekhta (mixed language) in early nineteenth century Delhi, see, Javed Majeed. ”’The Jargon of Indostan’: An Exploration of Jargon in Urdu and East India Company English” in Peter Burke and Roy Porter, eds. Languages and Jargons: Contributions to a Social History of Language. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press, 1995, pp. 191-196.

Indeed, Ralph Russell believed that Ab-e Ḥayāt, “for the first time…presents Urdu poetry against some sort of historical background and gives critical assessments of the poets in something approaching a modern style.” Russell, The Pursuit of Urdu Literature, p. 121.

Many of his essays were read in meetings of the Anjuman, and he sought to appeal to a wide audience to promote his ideas. James Ballantyne also sought to convey his ideas in a manner that were “least likely to provoke cavil”

50 Akhbar-e Anjuman-e Punjab, 14 May 1874, pp. 1-6.
51 Akhbar-e Anjuman-e Punjab, 14 May 1874, p. 2.
52 For a discussion about the general atmosphere of Urdu poetry during this time with reference to Azad and his critics, see, Pritchett, Nets of Awareness.
56 Leitner stated this in a letter to the Sec. GOP about the initial “chronological sketch” he wrote before the publication of the full text in 1871. OIOC, PEP, A, November 1870, No. 3.
58 This idea has been proposed at least since Urdu literary critic Muhammad Sadiq discussed Azad’s important contribution to Sinin-e Islam. See Muhammad Sadiq, Muhammad Hussain Azad, Appendix IV, pp. 131-135. Leitner would not have been the first colonial official to understated the influence that indigenous translators and editors served in ‘preparing’ their works.


Akhbar-e Anjuman-e Punjab, 14 May 1874, p. 2.

Hali and Syed Ahmed also shared a similar predicament. Seeking to reform a cultural world that they “carried…within themselves.” See, Majeed, “Nature, Hyperbole and the Colonial State,” p. 33.