www.gsrjournal.com
GSR
Global Sociological Review

ISSN-P : 2708-209
ISSN-E : 2708-35861

VOL. XI ISSUE I, WINTER (MARCH-2026)

GLOBAL SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW (GSR)

GSR

GLOBAL SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

HEC-RECOGNIZED CATEGORY-Y

HumanityPublications
sharing research
www.humapub.com
US | UK | Pakistan

DOI (Journal): 10.31703/gsr
DOI (Volume): 10.31703/gsr.2026(XI)
DOI (Issue): 10.31703/gsr.2026(XI-I)

Double-blind Peer-review Research Journal
www.gsrjournal.com

Humanity Publications (HumaPub)
www.humapub.com
Doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.31703

Title: Tragicomedy and Ambivalence: Dogs as a Lens on Muslim Society in Mushtaq Ahmad Yusufi's Works

Abstract

This paper examines the representation of dogs in the literary corpus of Mushtaq Ahmad Yusufi, one of the foremost humor writers in the Urdu literary tradition. Drawing on Yusufi's four major books, Charagh Talay, Khakam Badahan, Zar Guzasht, and Aab-e-Gum, the study traces the multifaceted role of dogs in his fiction, situating it within the broader context of Islamic attitudes toward dogs and the impact of British colonialism on Muslim sensibilities in the Indian subcontinent. The paper argues that Yusufi employs dogs not merely as comic devices but as complex cultural signifiers that illuminate colonial mimicry, class aspiration, and the tension between Islamic jurisprudential attitudes toward dogs and the Westernized sensibility of the educated Muslim elite. The analysis also places Yusufi's corpus within the growing field of human-animal studies and Muslim literary traditions.

Keywords: Mushtaq Ahmad Yusufi, Dogs, Urdu Literature, Human-animal Studies, Colonialism, Islam

Authors:

Hafiz Abid Masood: (Corresponding Author)
Assistant Professor, Department of English, International Islamic University Islamabad, Pakistan.
(Email: abid.masood@iiu.edu.pk)

Pages: 82-92
DOI:10.31703/gsr.2026(XI-I).08
DOI link: https://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gsr.2026(XI-I).08
Article link: https://gsrjournal.com/article/tragicomedy-and-ambivalence-dogs-as-a-lens-on-muslim-society-in-mushtaq-ahmad-yusufis-works
Full-text Link: https://gsrjournal.com/article/tragicomedy-and-ambivalence-dogs-as-a-lens-on-muslim-society-in-mushtaq-ahmad-yusufis-works
Pdf link: https://www.gssrjournal.com/jadmin/Auther/31rvIolA2.pdf

Global Sociological Review

p-ISSN: 2708-2091 **e-ISSN:** 2708-3586
DOI(journal):10.31703/gsr
Volume: XI (2026)
DOI (volume):10.31703/gsr.2026(XI)
Issue: I Winter (March-2026)
DOI(Issue):10.31703/gsr.2026(XI-I)

Home Page
www.gsrjournal.com
Volume: XI (2026)
https://www.gsrjournal.com/Current-issue
Issue: I-Winter (March 2026)
https://www.gsrjournal.com/issue/11/1/2026
Scope
https://www.gsrjournal.com/about-us/scope
Submission
https://humaglobe.com/index.php/gsr/submissions
Scan the QR to visit us

Humanity Publications (HumaPub)
www.humapub.com
Doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.31703

Citing this Article

Article Serial	08
Article Title	Tragicomedy and Ambivalence: Dogs as a Lens on Muslim Society in Mushtaq Ahmad Yusufi's Works
Authors	Hafiz Abid Masood
DOI	10.31703/gsr.2026(XI-I).08
Pages	82-92
Year	2026
Volume	XI
Issue	I

Referencing & Citing Styles

APA	Masood, H. A. (2026). Tragicomedy and Ambivalence: Dogs as a Lens on Muslim Society in Mushtaq Ahmad Yusufi's Works. *Global Sociological Review*, *XI*(I), 82-92. https://doi.org/10.31703/gsr.2026(XI-I).08
CHICAGO	Masood, Hafiz Abid. 2026. "Tragicomedy and Ambivalence: Dogs as a Lens on Muslim Society in Mushtaq Ahmad Yusufi's Works." *Global Sociological Review* XI (I):82-92. doi: 10.31703/gsr.2026(XI-I).08.
HARVARD	MASOOD, H. A. 2026. Tragicomedy and Ambivalence: Dogs as a Lens on Muslim Society in Mushtaq Ahmad Yusufi's Works. *Global Sociological Review,* XI**,** 82-92.
MHRA	Masood, Hafiz Abid. 2026. 'Tragicomedy and Ambivalence: Dogs as a Lens on Muslim Society in Mushtaq Ahmad Yusufi's Works', *Global Sociological Review*, XI: 82-92.
MLA	Masood, Hafiz Abid. "Tragicomedy and Ambivalence: Dogs as a Lens on Muslim Society in Mushtaq Ahmad Yusufi's Works." *Global Sociological Review* XI.I (2026): 82-92. Print.
OXFORD	Masood, Hafiz Abid (2026), 'Tragicomedy and Ambivalence: Dogs as a Lens on Muslim Society in Mushtaq Ahmad Yusufi's Works', *Global Sociological Review,* XI (I), 82-92.
TURABIAN	Masood, Hafiz Abid. "Tragicomedy and Ambivalence: Dogs as a Lens on Muslim Society in Mushtaq Ahmad Yusufi's Works." *Global Sociological Review* XI, no. I (2026): 82-92. https://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gsr.2026(XI-I).08.

Global Sociological Review
ISSN-P : 2708-2091 | DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gsr.2026(XI-I).08 | ISSN-E : 2708-3586
www.gsrjournal.com

Tragicomedy and Ambivalence: Dogs as a Lens on Muslim Society in Mushtaq Ahmad Yusufi's Works

Hafiz Abid Masood (Corresponding Author)[1]

[1] Assistant Professor, Department of English, International Islamic University Islamabad, Pakistan.
(Email: abid.masood@iiu.edu.pk)

Abstract

This paper examines the representation of dogs in the literary corpus of Mushtaq Ahmad Yusufi, one of the foremost humor writers in the Urdu literary tradition. Drawing on Yusufi's four major books Charagh Talay, Khakam Badahan, Zar Guzasht, and Aab-e-Gum, the study traces the multifaceted role of dogs in his fiction, situating it within the broader context of Islamic attitudes toward dogs and the impact of British colonialism on Muslim sensibilities in the Indian subcontinent. The paper argues that Yusufi employs dogs not merely as comic devices but as complex cultural signifiers that illuminate colonial mimicry, class aspiration, and the tension between Islamic jurisprudential attitudes toward dogs and the Westernized sensibility of the educated Muslim elite. The analysis also places Yusufi's corpus within the growing field of human-animal studies and Muslim literary traditions.

Keywords: *Mushtaq Ahmad Yusufi, dogs, Urdu literature, human-animal studies, colonialism, Islam*

Introduction

Human-animal relations go back in the annals of history to times unknown. Human beings have benefited from animals in the early phases of their civilizational history and continue to benefit from them in this postmodern age. Animals such as horses, camels, donkeys, and even wolves have been used for transportation purposes for centuries, but technology is rapidly making many species redundant. Many types of animals have been used to fulfill humanity's food needs since time immemorial. The dog is a unique animal that has served human beings as a guardian of their belongings, and its loyalty to its master is proverbial. This paper examines the representation of dogs in Mushtaq Ahmad Yusufi's corpus. Yusufi deserves to be included in the canon of world literature, though he has not been duly recognized so far. The translation of one of his books, *Aab-e-Gum*, as *The Mirages of the Mind* by Matt Reeck and Aftab Ahmad is expected to introduce Yusufi to a wider audience.

Since the 1980s, there has been an upsurge in studies dealing with human interaction with animals. Jennifer McDonell, in her article "Literary Studies, the Animal Turn, and the Academy," has catalogued the theoretical perspectives, secondary sources in the form of monographs, and special issues of journals and dedicated journals on human-animal studies in a very effective manner (6). McDonell highlights the role of various academic and commercial presses in producing material related to animals. For example, Reaktion Books launched a series on individual animals that has so far published 93 volumes from Albatross to Zebra. In the field of animals and literature, Palgrave has a series titled *Palgrave Studies in Literature and Animals*, which has published 20 volumes six of them on the representation of animals in literature in 2019 alone. These developments demonstrate that human-animal studies generally and animals in literature specifically are fields that have attracted considerable attention in recent years (McDonell, 2013).

The breadth of this scholarship is evident from the range of canonical authors it now covers. Chaucer has attracted dedicated volumes (Van Dyke; Rudd, 2019) as well as substantial journal studies (Oerlemans, 2013). Shakespeare has been the subject of two monographs (Boehrer; 2002 & 2011), a full-length handbook (Raber

& Dugan, 2020), and even a dictionary devoted entirely to his animal references (Raber & Edwards, 2022). Milton (Silverman, 2017), the eighteenth century (Cole, 2019) Jane Austen (Seeber, 2013), and Samuel Beckett (Bryden, 2013) have all received dedicated treatment. Schiesari (2012) *Polymorphous Domesticities* extends this inquiry to four modern writers. Clearly, no period of literary history has been left untouched by this critical wave, and no canonical writer is considered too grand or too minor to be examined through the lens of the animal turn.

Slowly but steadily, these studies have had their impact on scholars who specialize in the Muslim world. Richard Foltz 2006 took the lead with his monograph *Animals in the Islamic Tradition and Muslim Cultures*. Tlili (2012) *Animals in the Qur'an*, published by Cambridge University Press, is another example in this regard. Shehada (2012) *Mamluks and Animals* can also be regarded as an important contribution toward the Muslim tradition of veterinary medicine during the Mamluk period. Alan Mikhail's *The Animal in Ottoman Egypt* is also a welcome addition to the secondary sources discussing the place of animals in the Muslim world (Mikhail, 2017). Ludwig Maximilian University's European Research Council-funded project titled "Animals in the Philosophy of the Islamic World" is set to further enhance our understanding of how Muslim thinkers and philosophers have engaged with animals. Extending this recent development, this paper investigates the ways in which dogs are represented in the writings of a writer who wields great influence as a humor writer in the Urdu-speaking world.

Dogs are considered notorious animals in the Muslim world. They are more acceptable among the rural population, but in urban areas, dogs have been a subject of debate and discussion. Muslims living in the West are faced with the challenge of reconciling their conventional ideas about dogs with their practical interactions at the physical level. Many Muslims, as they are not exposed to dogs, are afraid of them. A google search for "dogs in Islam" helps one understand the kind of controversy that dogs cause; virtually thousands of threads can be found in cyberspace dealing with the status of dogs in Islam

Dogs in Charagh Talay

The dog is the most prominent animal that appears in Yusufi's corpus. Dogs are used by Yusufi in a complex manner, and references to dogs appear throughout his work. In the preface to his first book, *Charagh Talay*, he presents his biographical sketch in a humorous way. About his name, he asks the reader to refer to the title page of the book. While talking about his hobbies, he says that he loves dogs as pets. He says that he kept his first dog to safeguard his home, but that dog was stolen. Now he keeps a dog as a formality, since the dog is man's best friend (Yusufi, *Charagh* 13). Yusufi also points out that some narrow-minded people object that Muslims are irritated by dogs without a valid reason. He says that there is a very logical reason for Muslim dislike of dogs. "Muslims," according to him, "have always been a practical nation. They never keep an animal that they could not sacrifice later and eat" (Yusufi, *Charagh* 13). This is the only reference to dogs in this book, but it sets the agenda for the remaining books.

Caesar and Mata Hari in Khakam Badahan

In his second book, *Khakam Badahan*, there is a story titled "Caesar, Mata Hari and Mirza." The eponymous Caesar is a dog gifted to the writer as a souvenir by his English boss. One of the physical features of the dog was that it was a huge animal, just like a baby elephant, and secondly, it was very clever. "But the biggest benefit of this dog was that his earlier owner was an English man, and we all know that even our illiterate folks give their dogs English names and try to communicate with their dogs in English. This will help our children to learn English" (Yusufi, *Khakam* 27). There are many characters who are connected with dogs and who knew full well the pedigree of their pets. We have S.K. Din (Sheikh Khairuddin, MA, Oxon) who had a greyhound. There is a subtle irony in the way Khairuddin's name's acronym is used, which shows the impact of English education. A large number of Muslims who were educated in British educational institutions in India or England would Anglicize their names as they wanted to distance themselves from their local peers.

"Caesar, Mata Hari, and Mirza" is a narration about an Alsatian dog (also known as a German Shepherd) that the narrator receives from his boss, who is returning to his homeland after completing his job tenure. The story is full of irony, humor, satire, and eventually empathy. Apart from this, we have a digression about a female dog called Mata Hari, owned by Mr. Khilji, and a greyhound owned by Mr. S.K. Din. Two fictional

characters created by Yusufi, Professor Qazi Abdul Quddus and Mirza Abdul Wadood, also figure prominently in the story. The views about dogs held by these characters represent the variety of opinions held about dogs in Muslim society. The narrator's interest in dogs is evident from the fact that he mentions a number of breeds, such as the cocker spaniel and the Pomeranian, apart from the other breeds mentioned above. He even became a member of the kennel club to learn the skills of keeping a dog.

Mirza, who hated dogs, always dissuaded the narrator from having a dog. According to the narrator, Mirza lacked all sense about animals in general, but he was specifically biased about dogs. The characters that own dogs the writer who owns Caesar, S.K. Din who owns a greyhound, and Mr. Khilji who owns Mata Hari are aligned on the pro-dog side. The anti-dog characters include Mirza, Khawja Shamsuddin (Importer and Exporter), and Mr. Khilji's nameless maternal grandfather. Through these characters, Yusufi is able to present the various views prevalent in Muslim society about dogs.

To illustrate his biased approach, the narrator quotes a dialogue between them. One day Mirza said:

> *"A house that has a dog in it not only keeps thieves away, but also the angels."*
>
> *"I can understand the thieves, but what are the angels afraid of?"*
>
> *"That's because dogs are unclean."*
>
> *"But you can keep the dogs clean. Look at the Brits. They give bath to their dogs every morning and evening."*
>
> *"If you washed the dung with soap every morning and evening, would it be clean?"*
>
> *"But the question is why the dog is considered unclean?"*
>
> *"Some should learn illogic from you! My grandmother used to say that dogs have swine's saliva in their mouths."*
>
> *"You've found a unique reason for unclean!"*
>
> *"My brother, I'll tell you the clear recognition of a clean animal. Remember, all those animals that Muslims can eat are clean."*
>
> *"Considering that, goats have suffered a great deal in Muslim countries for being clean."*
>
> *"Let them say whatever they want to. People have always called dogs, dogs, and have not addressed them with big peoples' names."*
>
> *"What do you mean by big peoples' names. Haven't you heard that all dogs were once wolves; living with people their wolf-ness went away, but people on the other hand"* (Anonymous, trans.; Yusufi, Khakam 35)

Typical of Yusufi, the dialogue is serious and humorous simultaneously. While Mirza is serious in his critique of dogs, the narrator, who is the other interlocutor, always replies in a humorous manner and does not take Mirza's criticism seriously. Starting with a hadith of Prophet Muhammad (without identifying it as such), moving through the total uncleanliness of dogs to the partial uncleanliness of their saliva, he ends with the complaint that Muslims have never used the names of great personalities to name their dogs a reference to the English practice of naming their dogs "Tipoo," which will be discussed later in this essay.

Keeping dogs is highlighted as an impact of colonization. The narrator tells his wife that a dog earlier owned by an English family can facilitate the children in improving their English language skills (Yusufi, *Khakam* 27). After mentioning this, the narrator is reminded of an incident around twenty years ago when he saw a beautiful "blond" Memsahib in a park strolling with her cute Pomeranian (28). Yusufi conflates the features of the English lady and her Pomeranian in an effort to remove the boundaries between the human and the animal. His narrator says that when he saw "beauty at both ends of the chain" (28), he decided that, after the exit of the British from India, he would keep a "blond" dog, clearly conflating the blond Memsahib and the dog. The names of the dogs Caesar and Mata Hari are allegorical in nature. In the case of the former, it is possible to say that while the British left India, they left their culture behind, which is represented by Caesar. Mata Hari represents the hybridity that was introduced in the colonies by the colonizers, and the physical representation of this hybridity is found in the character of Mr. Khilji's Anglo-Indian wife.

The dogs are shown to be the most important part of their keeper's lives, though with a touch of irony. For example, we are told that Mr. S.K. Din never gave a damn about his own pedigree, but he knew the pedigree of his dog up to the fifteenth generation and could recite it quite easily without forgetting. He would express pride in his dog's earlier generations as if they were his own forefathers (Yusufi, *Khakam* 28). He would tell people that his greyhound's grandfather was killed in Pondicherry on June 15, 1941, fighting local dogs (28). All this detail about Mr. Din's dog is replete with irony and shows that the Indian Muslims who kept dogs were suffering from an inferiority complex and preferred things English over all things local, even their own forefathers. The mention of the killing of the greyhound's grandfather at the hands of local dogs is a clear symbol of Indian resistance against British occupation.

A similar ironic account is found in the section on Mata Hari. Mata Hari, a female dog, was owned by Barrister Mr. Khilji. Mr. Khilji inherited a few dogs from his father, and Mata Hari was one of them. He would proudly inform his visitors that Mata Hari's maternal grandmother, Josephine, had had an affair with Rasputin, who was an imported "Great Dane," and that he had a duly certified letter from the Shimla Civil and Military Kennel Club regarding this relationship, which he had framed and hung in his bedroom (Yusufi, *Khakam* 30). The element of irony cannot be overruled in this description; Yusufi is showing that Anglicized Muslims, in order to prove their loyalty to the British rulers, kept dogs and learned their pedigrees to impress their peers, and this facilitated their upward rise in the corridors of power. An incident from Mr. Khilji's life further strengthens this impression when we are told about his visit to Murree in his personal car. While he wanted to take Mata Hari along, his maternal grandfather seriously objected to her presence in the car, calling her "Najis Kutti," meaning "unclean bitch" (31). Rather than abandoning Mata Hari, Mr. Khilji requests the narrator to host his grandfather for the duration of their stay in Murree. This speaks volumes about Mr. Khilji's attachment to Mata Hari and his disregard for human relations. Here a dog is preferred over a grandfather, which symbolizes the new sensibility of English-speaking, English-loving colonized Indian Muslims.

Mata Hari is represented as a lousy and wanton character like her real namesake. She is said to have eloped with the dog of a butcher on the occasion of Eid ul-Azha—a time when butchers are very busy and when she returned, there were around a dozen dogs following her (Yusufi, *Khakam* 31). She could guard anything except her honor (31). A similar character reappears in Yusufi's last book, where the narrator is advising the main character Basharat Ali Farooqi to abstain from purchasing a mare. The narrator says that he had developed a recent interest in dogs and that this respect had reached such levels that he would not call a bitch a bitch but a "female dog." He told Basharat not to purchase a "female horse," as he had a terrible story about a "female dog" (Yusufi, *Aab* 99). According to the story, a man had a female dog at his house. Someone had told him that if a person has a dog at his house, angels, old people, and thieves do not enter but never told him that only dogs would then come to his house. The whole city's adult dogs had besieged Mr. Dastgir's house; the female dog's motto was the same as the Boy Scouts': Be Prepared (99). Mr. Dastgir was very upset with the situation. What worried him most was that his dog was of high pedigree and that stray dogs posed a serious threat to this pedigree. The narrator advises him to keep an ordinary bitch to divert the stray dogs' attention and says that he was the first person to shoulder the responsibility of the dogs' moral character (Yusufi, *Aab* 100). From a feminist perspective, Yusufi's discourse is very patriarchal, and males are represented as the guardians of females. There is also a perception that women in Yusufi are not assigned any significant role, and there are no major female characters.

"Caesar, Mata Hari, and Mirza" is a tragicomic story that displays an ambivalent attitude toward dogs in Muslim society. While dog-keeping represents the new sensibility among the English-educated Muslim elite, the tradition of disliking dogs is also shown through the figures of Mirza and Mr. Khilji's grandfather. Professor Qazi Abdul Quddus, however, takes a middle position on dogs, though not sincerely. As a friend of the narrator, who owns Caesar, the Professor favors dogs just to irritate Mirza, who is never convinced by dog-keeping, as is evident from the dialogue quoted above. One day, while the Professor was trying to convince Mirza of the importance and benefits of dogs, Caesar attacked him and bit him on the leg (Yusufi, *Khakam* 35). Mirza poked fun at the Professor to such an extent that the latter got annoyed with the former, and it took many cups of coffee for their relationship to return to normal. The Professor continued his old habit of admiring dogs in order to irritate Mirza.

Most of the story has ironic underpinnings and is narrated in a comic tone to highlight the impact of colonization on educated Muslims in the Indo-Pak subcontinent. But the last part of the story that deals with

Caesar's final days is devoid of any irony, comedy, or humor. Yusufi humanizes Caesar, who, in the latter part of his life, became immensely friendly toward the children and was regarded as an old member of the narrator's family. "This meant that nobody would notice him," the narrator says. "By and by, a feeling of companionship, travelling together, sharing of pain and destiny developed in the heart as we both had seen each other growing old. We both surrendered ourselves at the altar of time simultaneously" (Yusufi, *Khakam* 38). Some parts of the description of Caesar's old age can be read as an allegory of the life of old people.

The most tragic part is the description of his death due to an accident with a car. Despite being very old, Caesar would never refuse to entertain children. It would never happen that a child threw a ball and Caesar did not chase it. He would always run after the ball and bring it back to the child. One day, while he was relaxing under his favorite bougainvillea, a girl with a blue ribbon threw her ping-pong ball in front of Caesar, and while he jumped after it, the ball went onto the main road. Caesar chased the ball, and a car hit the rear half of his body and crushed it. Here is the description of his last moments:

> *Everyone helped pick him up and laid him by the gate under the Bougainvillea. The blood was still coming out. It seemed as if his life was leaving with each of his heartbeats: drip-by-drip, moment-by-moment. Everyone was touching him with fingers to feel his heartbeat; every beat that was followed by a new beat, a new life. I had no heart to say that his time was up, that he was leaving us. He was leaving us with such dignity, such courage, such peace, and such patience that only animals are fortunate to have. He did not cry, did not express hurt, did not make a sound. He just kept looking at us with listless eyes. Turn by turn, everyone patted him. When we put our hand on his head, he would lower his eyes. Our eyes were full of tears. This was the first time that, when patted, he could not wag his silky tail. The strange smell of blood was getting into his nose. Within half an hour, the crows started to gather, slowly started to descend, started to sit on the wall, and became noisy. Caesar looked at them briefly, snarled slightly, then lowered his eyes. Hurt, we could not see this. We took his collar off and poured a bottle of sleeping pills down his blood-filled mouth. He kept looking at the fading-out faces of his loved ones and fell asleep forever.*
>
> (Anonymous, trans.; Yusufi, Khakam 40)

This description is a testimony to the fact that the narrator (probably Yusufi himself) had developed a feeling of love and respect for his dog. The ambivalence is gone, and Caesar's death is lamented as a genuine loss. The dog, from being a butt of jokes and irony, emerges as an important part of the narrator's life.

Dogs in Zar Guzasht: Tony and Radcliffe

In *Zar Guzasht*, Yusufi's third book and his autobiography, there are a number of references to dogs. The first dog is Mr. Anderson's, who licks Yusufi's cheeks during the interview and is dubbed "very friendly" by Anderson (Yusufi, *Zar* 23). Anderson's dog is later mentioned in the book, and we learn that he is called "Tony Sahib" (232). One day, while Yusufi was busy in his office, the peon entered and asked for a few pennies for Tony Sahib's milk. Yusufi thought that the milk for his guest was out of stock, but a little while later the peon brought Tony Sahib for an introduction. After diligently describing his physical features, Yusufi tells us that all the bank staff were full of respect for the dog and that nobody even called him "dog." Everyone addressed him by his name, "Tony Sahib," except Yasub ul Hasan, who called him "Tony Mian" out of love. Everybody tried to appease the dog either by gently rubbing his head or his tail. Some would offer him food. The Chief Accountant of the bank wanted to bring her own bitch, Sheba, into this "Najib-ut-Tarfain" [thoroughbred] dog's social orbit. Calling a dog Najib-ut-Tarfain reminds us of "Caesar, Mata Hari, and Mirza," where the owners of dogs proudly memorize the pedigrees of their dogs. Yasub ul Hasan Ghauri is said to have had the dog lick his palm and would show everybody the palm licked by "Tony Mian" (232). This shows the culture of flattery in the workplace; the employees make every effort to send positive signals to the boss and can go to any extent to please him, even in a culture where dogs have traditionally been conceived in a negative manner.

Tony further appears in the book when Yusufi narrates the story of his boss Mr. Anderson's drinking habits. His source is Bundu Khan, one of the attendants of Anderson. "Keeping his hand on Tony's head," Bundu Khan solemnly declares, "By Tony's head, Big Boss remains so drunk that he is unable to differentiate between a hen and a peacock. Except if the bastard peacock starts dancing." An oath in the name of a dog shows the significance of the dog in the narrative. Bundu Khan further reveals that the big boss and Tony sleep in the same bed. He informs Yusufi that Tony is a very loving dog. "All night, he sleeps embracing the boss,"

says Bundu. He further reveals that Tony also drinks, and here he calls him "Harami Pilla," meaning "Bastard Puppy." Yusufi asks him whether he had seen him drinking with his own eyes, to which Bundu replies that "He drinks like Muslims—in a hidden manner." Bundu Khan mentions some signs of Tony when he is drunk: he starts dancing with his forelegs up; he runs towards Clifton and tries to be friendly with a female camel; and when he is fully drunk, he refuses to go to Pir Gulambar Shah's shrine even if you threaten to cut him into pieces (Yusufi, *Zar* 237–38). References to Muslims and Pir Gulambar Shah's shrine allude to the prevalence of a hidden drinking culture in Muslim societies. The fact that the dog never goes to Pir Gulambar Shah's shrine when he is drunk shows that in that state, he has no need of visiting such a place.

One of the Pashtun characters in *Zar Guzasht* is named Khan Saif ul Mulook Khan. When Yusufi visited him for the first time, he was performing a minor surgery on his dog, whose name was Radcliffe. Khan was cutting his dog's ears, and when Yusufi enquired about it, he replied, "I am converting this bastard pup into a hunting dog" (Yusufi, *Zar* 97). A little while later, he calls Radcliffe "Takhmir," a short form of Tukhm-e-Khinzir (progeny of pig) (97). After performing the surgery, Khan used hubble-bubble water to disinfect the dog. He was of the view that once a dog's ears are cut, it becomes more loyal. Yusufi felt bad for the dog and informed Khan Saif ul Mulook Khan that it amounts to cruelty and that he might receive a fine if someone from an animal welfare authority saw him. Khan was not stirred by this and informed Yusufi that once he had met a bird watcher from New Zealand who exercised even more cruelty toward animals (98).

Khan and Yusufi later go on a hunting trip, during which Yusufi becomes friendly with Radcliffe. Yusufi, riding a bicycle, was following Radcliffe as they went hunting. One of the benefits of Radcliffe was that the street boys did not throw stones at the bicycle but targeted Radcliffe instead. On their way, they stopped to relax under a tree, and Yusufi started touching Radcliffe's tail, as that was the farthest part from his jaws (Yusufi, *Zar* 112). Radcliffe also had itchy skin, as Khan had had the same condition a month ago. Prior to leaving for the hunt, Khan had washed Radcliffe with soap (112). On this, Yusufi expresses his opinion about the impurity of dogs, saying that a wet dog is many times more impure than a dry dog (112). Khan, while enjoying Yusufi's friendly behavior toward his dog, tells him that barking is a dog's right and tail-wagging is a dog's primary obligation (112).

At another point in the same book, Yusufi invokes a Persian proverb that speaks of the better status of a dog than a younger brother. Yusufi says that in Urdu there are two types of dogs, the second type being that of a younger brother (Yusufi, *Zar* 186). In *Aab-e-Gum* too, Yusufi discusses the same Persian proverb. According to him, human beings keep pets for their benefit or self-interest. For example, those poor souls who cannot afford a companion or servant keep a dog. Some of them keep a dog erroneously thinking that it might have a younger brother's characteristics (Yusufi, *Aab* 274).

Tipu vs. Wellesley in Aab-e-Gum

The last story in *Aab-e-Gum* is titled "Dhiraj Ganj ka Pehla Yadgar Mushaira" (The First Memorable Poetry Festival of Dhiraj Ganj). Basharat travels to Dhiraj Ganj to be interviewed for the post of a teacher at an orphanage. When he reached Dhiraj Ganj early in the morning, he was feeling hungry. He went to a sweetshop and decided to have jalebi for breakfast. As soon as he got the jalebis, a dog moved toward him and started licking his calf, as he was wearing loose trousers. Basharat fed the dog as he fed himself. Once he finished his breakfast, he wanted to leave, but he realized that the dog had started following him. On his way to his destination, a number of other dogs emerged and tried to attack Basharat and his dog. His dog fought bravely against all odds. The neighborhood children also started throwing stones at the dogs, many of which hit Basharat. As the dog proved to be a shield against other dogs, Basharat felt a surge of sympathy and love for the dog and began thinking about giving him a nice name (Yusufi, *Aab* 308).

While thinking about his name, he came to know that the dog already had a name: Tipu. This is how Basharat describes his feelings on knowing this:

> *It upset Basharat that the sweetshop owner and the village boys called the dog 'Tipu'. After the British martyred Tipu Sultan in the bloody battle of Seringapatam, they began calling their dogs by this name. There was even a time throughout north India when this name was so common that everyone referred to any stray dog as Tipu 'Scram, Tipu!' without even knowing why stray dogs were called this. Other than Napoleon and Tipu, the British treated none of their enemies so badly, and this was because none made their hearts fill with such awful dread. A hundred years have passed in South Asia with the name of the martyred sultan*

> *on every one's lips! 'Get lost, Tipu!' 'Take that, Tipu!' The trials and tribulations the sanctifying sorrows and great sacrifices of only a few select martyrs are not forgotten after they die. These are the few that God Almighty blesses with eternal martyrdom!*
>
> (Yusufi, Mirages 412)

The above passage demonstrates acute awareness on the part of Basharat Ali Farooqi of the losses that Muslims have suffered since the fall of the Mughal Empire specifically, how Muslim heroes are mistreated by the victors, and how this results in serious demoralization of Muslim masses. He has found a way to glorify the insult meted out to Sultan Tipu: his name has been kept alive, and he haunts his enemies long after his death. Basharat calls this "eternal martyrdom."

The tradition of naming dogs "Tipu" has no other purpose than demeaning and insulting a worthy enemy. This tradition also took root among some Hindu writers from the British period, and even some Muslims had no qualms calling their dogs Tipu. Calling a dog Radcliffe, as we see in *Zar Guzasht*, might be taken as a rejoinder to the English practice of calling their dogs Tipu or Tipoo.

A number of creative writers in the late twentieth century have criticized or perpetuated this trend. For example, Qurratulain Hyder's *Aakhir-Shab kay Humsafar* has references to the English habit of naming their dogs Tipoo because they hated Tipu (Hyder, 2010, 66, 72, 164). Muzaffar Abbas, in his book *Textbook Development in Pakistan and United Kingdom* (Abbas, 993), mentions a story in one of the textbooks that features a dog named Tipu (36). In Iqbal Masud's memoirs of the partition, a woman is quoted as saying: "Your grandfather never went to the British Inspector General's House because he had a dog called Tipu" (Masud, 1997). Geeta Menon's collection of stories titled *Kidnapped and Other Stories* has a dog character named Tipu (Menon,1993). Similarly, one of Manohar Malgonkar's stories features a dog named Tipu (*Four Graves*). A dog named Tipu owned by the Muslim singer Abdul Karim Khan is mentioned in *The Lost World of Hindustani Music* by Mukherjee (2006) (Malgonkar,1990, 269–70). Alok Bhalla's multivolume collection of partition stories has a similar reference to a Tipu-named dog, but what is interesting is that a character suggests renaming the dog "Wellesley" (Bhalla, 1994).

Basharat reached the venue where his interview was fixed and started waiting for his turn. All the applicants were waiting under a neem tree. Basharat sat on a stone, and the dog sat at his feet, wagging his tail. Basharat liked his style and felt a sense of strength because of his presence. Meanwhile, when he was called to appear before the interview board, the dog also entered the room. After a successful interview and securing the job offer, he went along with the dog to the sweetshop and bought puri and rabri for the dog. He was convinced that the dog had a certain karma, and his success in securing the job had something to do with that dog (Yusufi, *Aab* 318).

It was time for him to leave for Kanpur, but the dog was not ready to let him go. In Yusufi's words:

> *When it was time to board the pickup back to Kanpur, the dog leapt into the truck, and all the passengers there shrank back in fear. The driver's assistant picked up the engine crank and raised it to hit the dog. Basharat lunged forward and grabbed his wrist. The dog rode on the roof of the truck all the way. At this point, calling such a loyal dog just a dog made him feel guilty; he started calling him Lord Wellesley after the general who had turned Tipu Sultan into a martyr.*
>
> (Yusufi, *Mirages* 426)

Conclusion

The strategy of calling dogs by great people's names has been criticized by Yusufi through Mirza in "Caesar, Mata Hari, and Mirza." In *Zar Guzasht*, we find a dog named Radcliffe, and a number of times he is called "Harami" and "Takhmir." No commentary is provided in the book as to why Khan Saiful Mulook Khan chose to call his dog Radcliffe. The theme reaches its culmination with a dog called Tipu in Dhiraj Ganj, and Basharat changes his name to Lord Wellesley the general who defeated Tipu. This shows that Yusufi employs dogs in his writings with various motives. He is aware that despite Europeans' love for dogs, they knew that giving real historical figures' names to dogs can be insulting and degrading. Through Mirza, he expresses the opinion that Muslims have not generally resorted to this practice of insulting their enemies by giving their names to their dogs. Nevertheless, two of his characters respond to the British in their own idiom by calling their dogs Radcliffe and Lord Wellesley. In the case of Radcliffe, as no rationale is given, in all probability the name is a

pure coincidence. The second case, however, is a deliberate attempt to insult Lord Wellesley. Keeping in view the status of Muslims in pre-partition India, one can understand how a large number of Muslims felt about the colonial masters.

References

Abbas, M. (1993). *Textbook development in Pakistan and United Kingdom*. Sang-e-Meel Publications.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Anonymous (Trans.). (n.d.). Caesar, Mata Hari and Mirza. *Ravi Magazine*. Retrieved April 28, 2023, from https://www.ravimagazine.com/caesar-mata-hari-and-mirza-story-by-mushtaq-ahmad-yusufi/
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Armstrong, P. (2008). *What animals mean in the fiction of modernity*. Routledge.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Bhalla, A. (Ed.). (1994). *Stories about the partition of India* (Vol. 3). Indus.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Boehrer, B. (2002). *Shakespeare among the animals: Nature and society in the drama of early modern England*. Palgrave.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Boehrer, B. (2011). *Animal characters: Nonhuman beings in early modern literature*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Brown, L. (2010). *Homeless dogs and melancholy apes: Humans and other animals in modern literary imagination*. Cornell University Press.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Bryden, M. (Ed.). (2013). *Beckett and animals*. Cambridge University Press.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Cole, L. (2019). Animal studies and the eighteenth century: The nature of the beast. *Literature Compass*, *16*(6), Article e12536.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Donovan, J. (2009). Tolstoy's animals. *Society and Animals*, *17*(1), 38–52.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

El Fadl, K. A. (2004). Dogs in the Islamic tradition and nature. In B. Taylor (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of religion and nature*. Continuum.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

European Research Council. (n.d.). *Animals in the philosophy of the Islamic world*. CORDIS. Retrieved April 28, 2023, from https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/786762
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Flegel, M. (2015). *Pets and domesticity in Victorian literature and culture: Animality, queer relations, and the Victorian family*. Routledge.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Foltz, R. C. (2006). *Animals in Islamic tradition and Muslim cultures*. Oneworld.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Hofele, A. (2011). *Stage, stake, and scaffold: Humans and animals in Shakespeare's theatre*. Oxford University Press.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Huggan, G., & Tiffin, H. (2015). *Postcolonial ecocriticism: Literature, animals, environment*. Routledge.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Hyder, Q. (2010). *Fireflies in the mist [Aakhir-Shab kay humsafar]*. New Directions.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Kenyon-Jones, C. (2017). *Kindred brutes: Animals in Romantic period writing*. Routledge.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Malgonkar, M. (1990). *Four graves and other stories*. Penguin Books.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Masud, I. (1997). *Dream merchants, politicians, and partition: Memoirs of an Indian Muslim*. HarperCollins India.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

McDonell, J. (2013). Literary studies, the animal turn, and the academy. *The Social Alternative*, *32*(4), 6–14.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Menache, S. (1997). Dogs: God's worst enemies. *Society and Animals*, *5*(1), 23–44.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Menon, G. (1993). *Kidnapped and other stories*. Children's Book Trust.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Mikhail, A. (2017). *The animal in Ottoman Egypt*. Oxford University Press.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Mukherjee, K. P. (2006). *The lost world of Hindustani music*. Penguin Books.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Newman, A. R. (1987). Images of the bear in children's literature. *Children's Literature in Education*, *18*(3), 131–138.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Oerlemans, O. (2013). The animal in allegory: From Chaucer to Gray. *ISLE: Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment*, *20*(2), 296–317.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Palmeri, F. (2006). *Humans and other animals in eighteenth-century British culture: Representation, hybridity, ethics*. Ashgate.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Payne, M. (2010). *The animal part: Human and other animals in the poetic imagination*. University of Chicago Press.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Pick, A. (2011). *Creaturely poetics: Animality and vulnerability in literature and film*. Columbia University Press.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Raber, K., & Dugan, H. (2020). *The Routledge handbook of Shakespeare and animals*. Routledge.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Raber, K., & Edwards, K. (2022). *Shakespeare and animals: A dictionary*. Bloomsbury.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Rudd, G. (2019). Animal in Chaucer. In I. Johnson (Ed.), *Geoffrey Chaucer in context* (pp. 209–216). Cambridge University Press.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Salisbury, J. (2012). *The beast within: Animals in the Middle Ages*. Routledge.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Salter, D. (2001). *Holy and noble beasts: Encounters with animals in medieval literature*. Boydell & Brewer.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Schiesari, J. (2012). *Polymorphous domesticities: Pets, bodies, and desire in four modern writers*. University of California Press.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Seeber, B. (2013). *Jane Austen and animals*. Ashgate.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Shehada, H. A. (2012). *Mamluks and animals: Veterinary medicine in medieval Islam*. Brill.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Silverman, W. J., Jr. (2017). Milton's Satan and early modern treatment of animals. *South Atlantic Review*, *82*(2).

Tlili, S. (2012). *Animals in the Qur'an*. Cambridge University Press.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Van Dyke, C. (Ed.). (2012). *Rethinking Chaucerian beasts*. Palgrave.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Waldau, P., & Patton, K. (2006). *A communion of subjects: Animals in religion, science, and ethics*. Columbia University Press.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Yusufi, M. A. (2010). *Majmu'a (Collected works)*. Jahangir Books.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext

Yusufi, M. A. (2014). *Mirages of the mind* (M. Reeck & A. Ahmad, Trans.). Random House India.
Google Scholar Worldcat Fulltext