

The Transformation of the Persian Ghazal: From Amatory Mood to Fixed Form

Franklin Lewis

The traditional classification of Persian poetry recognizes eleven discrete categories on the basis of both prosodic features and topic or mood: *ghazal*, *kaṣīda*, *tashbīb*, *kiṭā*, *rubāī*, *fard*, *mathnawī*, *tardjī-band*, *tarkīb-band*, *mustazzād*, *musammaṭ*. As Browne argued, this classification “is neither clear nor satisfactory”¹. He proposed instead to divide the corpus of Persian poetry into three major prosodical classes or “verse-forms”²: 25):

- 1) the “one-rhymed,” including the *kaṣīda*, the *kiṭā*, the *ghazal*, the *tardjī* – and *tarkīb*-band and the *rubāī*;
- 2) “the many-rhymed” consisting of the *mathnawī* or “couplet-poem;” and,
- 3) “multiple poems” including the *musammaṭ* and its various permutations.

When, however, Browne proceeds to discuss the particular forms subsumed under these general headings, the *ghazal*, which he calls “ode,” begins to emerge as a separate genre, differentiated from the *kaṣīda*, or “elegy,” by subject, length, and at least one formal feature:

...the former is generally erotic and mystical, and seldom exceeds ten or a dozen *bayts*; the latter may be a panegyric or a satire, or it may be didactic, philosophical or religious. In later days (but not, I think, before the Mongol Invasion) it became customary for the poet to introduce his *takhalluṣ*, *nom de guerre*, or “pen-name,” in the last *bayt*, or *maqṭā* of the *ghazal*, which is not done in the *qasīda*.³

This is an accurate definition, so far as it goes, of the formal features of the *ghazal* from the 7th/13th century forward, though his dating of the introduction of the *takhalluṣ* is at least a century belated and he apparently excludes the possibility of panegyrical *ghazals*.⁴ These quibbles aside, a more fundamental problem arises from Browne’s classifications: he blurs the distinction between form, on the one hand, and content or mood on the other. For example, Browne identifies the *rubāī* as a native Persian verse form, denies an independent status to the *kiṭā*,⁵ and

¹ Browne 1906: 23.

² Browne 1906: 25.

³ Browne 1906: 27.

⁴ Ghanī 1321 Sh./1942 was the first to point out the panegyrical intent of many of the *ghazals* of Hāfiẓ, a point insisted upon shortly thereafter by Lescot 1944. Oddly, this now rather self-evident fact had previously gone unremarked; one can only surmise that the opposition posited by medieval Persian rhetoric between *madh* and *ghazal* (see below) must have predisposed critics to conceive of these categories as mutually exclusive.

⁵ Browne 1906: 23 describes the *kiṭā* in the same breath with the *bayt* (stich), which is more properly a prosodic unit than a poetic form or genre, and with the *fard*, which usually refers,

claims that the *ghazal* is a “form” (as opposed to a mood or theme) borrowed from the Arabs and later modified⁶.

Alessandro Bausani proposes a somewhat more nuanced scheme for classification, distinguishing the motifs (*i motivi*), forms (*le forme*) and genres (*i generi letterari*) of Persian poetry. Bausani posits four genres: 1) lyrical-panegyric poetry, consisting of the *kasīda* and *ghazal* (the one differentiated from the other by length and subject matter); 2) the *rubāī*; 3) the *mathnawī*, whether on epic, romantic, mystical or didactic themes; and 4) prose⁷. Elsewhere, he includes the *kiṭā* as a further genre and speaks of the strophic poems (*tardī*-band, *tarkīb*-band, *murabba'*, etc.) as forms⁸.

These categories also prove somewhat fuzzy, mixing as they do prosodic and thematic considerations. The *rubāī*, for example, is a metrical form, which though prominently associated with the mood and *topoi* of Khayyamesque epicureanism, is often used as a vehicle for other theatics, including encomium, elegy, and the epigram. Likewise, the *mathnawī* is a prosodic form, but the epic “genre” (as typified by Firdawsi’s *Shāh-nāma*) cannot meaningfully be grouped on thematic grounds with, for example, the mystical *Mathnawī-yi ma'nawī* of *Djalāl al-Dīn Rūmī* or the romances of *Nizāmī*.

This imprecision may account for Bausani’s conclusion⁹ that the concept of genre applies only up to a certain point for Persian literature, and calls our attention to the problems with genre theory that have been enunciated by modern literary critics. Ernst Robert Curtius points out that the classical concept of genre was based on an amalgam of prevailing moods (epic, comedy, tragedy) as well as principles of versification (iambus, elegy, etc.), all of them categories inherited from the Greeks¹⁰. Divorced from their native milieu, however, the meaning of such terms began to wander, as the mis-translation into Arabic of Aristotle’s “comedy” and “tragedy” as *hidjā'* and *madīh* nicely illustrates.¹¹

in the context of a prose work interspersed with verse, to a poem of a single line composed specifically for that setting. The *kiṭā* is generally associated with occasional poems, though less frequently with the formal ceremonial occasions commemorated in the *kasīda*. It is also distinguished formally, either by virtue of the fact that it is less than twenty lines, considered the minimum length for the *kasīda*, or because it lacks the *maṭla'* (i.e., the opening hemistich does not rhyme with the rest of the *bayts*). Browne seems determined, despite the contrary evidence he compiles, to understand the *kiṭā* as “merely a piece of a *qaṣīda*, though it may be that no more of the *qaṣīda* was ever written, and, indeed, the productions of some few poets, notably Ibn Yāmīn (died A.D. 1344-5), consist entirely of such ‘fragments.’” (Browne 1906: 23). It has also been denied that the Arabic *kiṭā* is independent in status, though the early critics, such as Ibn Ḥutayba, and al-Ḍīḥīz (who called it *al-kasīda al-kaṣīra*), recognized it as a separate form. See Jones 1992: 6.

⁶ Browne 1906: 18.

⁷ Bausani 1968a: 181.

⁸ Bausani 1968b: 39-40.

⁹ Bausani 1968a: 179.

¹⁰ Curtius 1979: 248.

¹¹ For a discussion of this infelicity, see Heinrichs 1969: 108ff.

Hegel, however, reduced and refined the classical genres to three – lyric, epic and drama – categories which remain with us today,¹² particularly in the modifications given by Claudio Guillén, who sees these three as universal modes of experience, in contradistinction to genres proper, such as the sonnet or the tragedy.¹³ Karl Viëtor has pointed out the confusion that arises from applying “genre” to both essential categories or modes (i.e., epic, drama, lyric) and to historical kinds (e.g., tragedy and comedy).¹⁴ Francis Cairns, while recognizing that “genre” is used as a formal classification, applies the term to a meticulous adumbration of the topical or content-based conventions of Greek and Roman literature.¹⁵ Indeed, French and German critics tended to speak of genres either in terms of the triad of lyric/epic/dramatic modes or as thematic categories, in contradistinction to “fixed forms,”¹⁶ which are determined by stanza, form and meter. Others prefer to conceive of genre in terms of a combination of both the prosodic outer form and the inner form or “attitude, tone, purpose – more crudely, subject and audience”¹⁷ of a poem.

Genres, or “literary kinds,” are then, “institutions,” or “aesthetic conventions” which shape the character of a literary work.¹⁸ Genres are not, of course, hermetic or pure categories, and there is considerable bleeding, or intertextuality between them, both in terms of form and content. Naturally, authors utilize genre expectations to both fulfill and to disappoint audience/reader expectations, and they combine elements of various genres, often thereby producing new genres.¹⁹ Nevertheless, whether viewed in terms of rhetorical orientations, or in more formal and prosodic terms, as in the sonnet, genre remains a useful concept, not so much to classify as to clarify shared “traditions and affinities” that might otherwise go unremarked.²⁰

¹² Hegel’s categories are widely assumed and have been borrowed by scholars to characterize non-European poetries as well, such as Șafă, 1363 *Sh.*/1984: 2-4.

¹³ For an excellent *précis* and bibliography on the historical debate over genres, see Preminger and Brogan 1993: 456-9, s.v. “Genre.” I have also profited from Cohen, 1991: 85-113, and from Chapter 1 “Categories and Definitions” in Lindley 1985.

¹⁴ See the discussion of Viëtor in Wellek and Warren 1956: 227.

¹⁵ Cairns 1972: 6. Meisami 1981: 208 briefly suggests Cairns’ approach as a solution to the problem of “disunity” in the Persian *ghazal*.

¹⁶ The “*ghazal*” and “*haiku*” are defined as a “fixed forms” in Myers and Simms 1989: s.v. “*ghazal*” and “fixed forms.”

¹⁷ Wellek and Warren 1956: 231.

¹⁸ Wellek and Warren 1956: 226. The metaphor of genres as “institutional imperatives which both coerce and are in turn coerced by the writer” derives from N. H. Pearson.

¹⁹ See Hirsch 1993: 137 for a discussion of the “mixed-genre lieder” of Schubert, whose “fusion of genres”, including elements of dramatic (almost operatic) scenes, dramatic ballads, and traditional strophic *Volkslieder* themes (*Frühlingslied*, *Ständchen*, *Wiegenlied*), represents his “most important legacy to nineteenth-century song composition.”

²⁰ Frye 1957: 247-8. Contrast the skeptical view of Perkins 1992: 73, 81, who tends to see the hermeneutic circularity of analysis by genres or other literary taxonomies as self-fulfilling prophesies. Gunther Müller already in 1928 noted that “the dilemma of all genre history is that we apparently cannot decide what belongs to a genre without knowing what is *gattungshaft*, and we cannot know what is *gattungshaft* without knowing that this or that belongs to a genre” (Müller, Gunther 1928: Bemerkungen zur Gattungs poetik. *Philosophischer Anzeiger*

Insofar as a tradition – authors, auditors, readers, and critics – clearly identifies or imagines certain genres or types in its own literary corpus, as is certainly the case for the Persian *ghazal*, approaching these genres as historical constructs ought to prove critically productive.

Bausani does treat the historical and stylistic evolution of the “genres” he identifies, but nevertheless tends to reify the categories, as, for example, when he claims that the concept of genre applies only up to a point for Persian literature and that the genres of Persian poetry are born, “Minerva-like,” almost perfectly formed, showing little development over nine hundred years, such that a *ghazal* of Dakīkī (d. c. 366/976) is difficult, for the European eye, to distinguish from a *ghazal* of Kā’ānī (d. 1270/1853).²¹

Most scholars have continued to speak of the *ghazal* and other Persian prosodic conventions in approximately similar terms to the “forms” and “genres” of Browne and Bausani,²² with the *kaṣīda* and *ghazal* usually grouped together as forms of lyrical poetry. Heshmat Moayyad, however, makes a helpful distinction between fixed form and genre, describing Persian lyrical poetry as a genre that can be found in any number of different prosodic forms and structures (*kiṭ‘a*, *rubā‘ī*, and *taghazzul*, or the amatory introit of certain *kaṣīdas*), but which came to be identified pre-eminently with the *ghazal* (Moayyad 1988: 121).

The classical Persian *ghazal* as a prosodic form is more closely associated with specific *topoi* and motifs and with a certain rhetoric of presentation than any other Persian form, and therefore has a more sharply delimited horizon of expectations than perhaps any other Persian poetic convention. Whether, therefore, we classify the *ghazal* as primarily a rhetorical (lyric), a thematic (amatory), a prosodic (“fixed form”), or a performance convention, it does not require an over-elastic imagination

III, 1928: 136, as quoted in E. D. Hirsch). Hirsch 1967: 107ff. approvingly quotes this observation and, while rejecting essentialist, *a priori* genre concepts, argues on behalf of historical and culture-bound studies of genres.

²¹ Bausani 1968a: 179-80. Although the 13th/19th century Persian *ghazal* preserves much of the *topoi* or iconology of 4th/10th century amatory poetry, the *ghazal* shows considerable formal, semantic and philosophical development, as one might naturally expect, over a millennium.

²² The lengthiest and most intricate discussion of genre in Persian is given by Mu’taman 1339 *Sh.*/1960: 7ff., 52ff., 63ff., 70ff., who speaks of the *akṣām* (categories) and *kawālib* (forms), by which he intends primarily the fixed forms (i.e., *kaṣīda*, *ghazal*, *tardīrāt*, *kiṭ‘a*, *rubā‘ī*, *mathnawi*), and views the *ghazal* primarily as a lyric mode on the love theme, and only secondarily as a fixed form. His earlier study on this subject (Mu’taman 1332 *Sh.*/1953) is also quite useful. Compare this with Bahār 1333 *Sh.*/1954: 73-77. In western languages, see Mirzoev 1958: 7, 40, 42, who speaks of genres, forms and generic forms, “[zhanrovoi formi gazieli” and “zhanrova (rodov) klassicheskoi persidsko-Tadzhikskoi poezii”]. Aryanpur 1973: 61-3 calls the *ghazal* and other forms “metric and stanzaic conventions.” Elwell-Sutton 1976: 243-60 observing Browne’s three categories, describes them as “verse forms.” Yarshater 1988: 20 refers to poetic “genres” and Clinton 1988: 88 refers to “forms.” Meisami 1987: 236, 239 quite pointedly calls the *ghazal* a “poetic genre” whereas Schimmel speaks of “meter and genres” in the chapter title, but in the text refers to the *ghazal* as a “form” (Schimmel 1992: 22).

to view the 7th/13th century Persian *ghazal* as a lyrical genre *sui generis*, analogous to the *carmina*, *canso* or sonnet, in contradistinction to other Persian genres.²³ At the same time, the Persian *ghazal* stands apart from the Arabic *ghazal*, insofar as it need not be amatory in mood, and furthermore because it is subject to several additional constraints, including the formal features of length (five to fourteen lines), and the appearance of the poet's *takhallus*, usually in the final or penultimate, or less often, in the first line of the poem.

How and when did the Persian *ghazal* come to be defined and understood as a generic classification based on a formal verse structure, as opposed to primarily thematic features? In what follows, I propose to trace the development of the Persian *ghazal* from a thematic genre into a fixed form and its changing position within the system of medieval Persian genres by a close examination of Persian poets' and rhetoricians' use of the word *ghazal* and related terminology.²⁴

In Search of the Historical Persian Ghazal

In the surviving examples of the Persian poetry of the 4th/10th century Persian poetry, the love theme predominates in a number of poems in various forms (*kit'a*, *rubā'i*, *taghazzul*), all ostensibly independent of the *kasīda*.²⁵ Most of the surviving neo-Persian poetry of this period is panegyrical; amatory lyrics certainly circulated in a popular musical performance environment but, not being associated with a court or ruler, the incentive to record them or even to see them as poetry, as distinct from song, was lacking.²⁶ In addition to literate Persian poets consciously borrowing motifs from the Arabic *ghazal* and forms and imagery from the *bādī* poets, neo-Persian poetry also has roots in the poetic tradition of the Sasanian period and before, probably by

²³ These various other genres need not be precisely defined for our purposes, but might include: narrative poetry, including the genres of the *mathnawī* romance and heroic epic; didactic poetry, including polemical or catechismal orientations to religious, philosophical and mystical themes, appearing in any prosodic form; orational poetry, including panegyre, anthems, celebratory odes, occasional poems, or satire and invective, occurring primarily in the *kasīda* and *kit'a*. In the past two decades, a number of Iranian scholars have begun writing histories of the genres or fixed forms of Persian poetry, e.g., Shamīsā 1362 *Sh.*/1983 and 1363 *Sh.*/1984; Zafarī 1364 *Sh.*/1985; A'zamī-rād 1366 *Sh.*/1987; Imāmī 1369 *Sh.*/1990. Note also the important earlier approaches to genre studies, viz., Ṣafā 1321 *Sh.*/1942 and Gulčin-i Ma'ānī 1346 *Sh.*/1967. A few western studies have also treated the development of Persian genres, such as Anwari-Alhosseyni 1986 and de Fouchécour 1986.

²⁴ This paper derives from my dissertation (Lewis 1995), which attempts to trace the origins of the *ghazal* with specific reference to the poetry of Sanā'i. In addition to the changing significance of the term *ghazal* (which is summarized in the present paper), this work also considers the performance occasions of the Persian *ghazal* (see Lewis 1995: 69-96), the patronage networks and the social nexus which shaped the emergence of the form (Lewis 1995: Chapter 2), and the categorization of the thematic sub-genres or *topoi* appearing in the fixed form *ghazal* (Lewis 1995: Chapters 4 and 5).

²⁵ See Moayyad 1988: 121, and Mu'taman 1339 *Sh.*/1960: 202.

²⁶ Mu'taman 1339 *Sh.*/1960: 199-201.

way of the sub-literate performance tradition of the minstrels.²⁷ Indeed, though Persian poetry draws heavily on the imagery, *topoi* and genres of Arabic poetry, it was distinguished from the outset by unique prosodic, structural and even thematic features.²⁸ It is worth noting that pre-Islamic Iran appears to have known a love lyric tradition²⁹ which remained a vital and primary mood in folk poems such as the *fahlawiyyāt*, characterized by non-quantitative meters, until at least the 7th/13th century.³⁰ It must also be pointed out that poetry on the theme of love was often linked with the *radīf* or refrain, a native Persian feature of prosody, and with the *rubāī* form, a native Persian verse form.³¹

None of this is meant to deny the obvious influence of the terminology, theme and mood of the Arabic *ghazal* on the Persian. Undoubtedly, the motifs and tropes of the Arabic *ghazal* were borrowed by Persian poets. However, even obvious borrowings from the Arabic *ghazal* tradition, such as the *Madjnūn-Laylī* cycle, received the greatest attention in Persian letters in the *mathnawī* form, or couplet, again a native Persian prosodic tradition (like the *mutakārib* meter),³² and not in the *ghazal*. The Arabic *ghazal* poets in the second century of Islam also composed the majority of their poems in meters rarely or never used by Persian *ghazal*

²⁷ Boyce 1957: 21 notes that there is no native word in neo- or Middle Persian to denote a poet as distinct from a musician, and this is probably why, though several terms relating to minstrels exist, Persian borrowed “*shā’ir*” from Arabic to distinguish a respectable, literate lyricist from a mere minstrel (*khunyāgar*; *rāmishgar*; these Persian words were gradually replaced by the Arabic *mutrib* during the 5th/11th and 6th/12th centuries). See also the important study of Khaleghī-Motlagh 1978: 3-27, which discusses the musical performance tradition of certain short pieces of the epic material; the social status of the *lūriyān*, the *gōsān*, and the musicians at the Sasanian court; as well as the development of the separate professions of the poet and that of the minstrel/musician in the Islamic period. It is interesting to note that the other major formal innovation in the Arabic literary world, the *muwashshaha*, likewise took place in a bilingual atmosphere, probably under Arabo-Romance musical influences, as the form is structurally and melodically similar to the Romance rondeau (Monroe 1974: 30-31). Cf. Jones 1992: 5 who argues that the *muwashshaha* was a popular form, probably sung, and that several generations of such poems were lost before they were thought worthy of recording. This situation is analogous to the oral poetry that was evidently being produced in Iran prior to the 4th/10th century.

²⁸ Reinert 1973: 76-81 attempts to draw some distinctions between the poetry written in eastern Iran and that written in the west of Iran, but insists on the individual character of Persian poetry with respect to form and theme from the outset (71-76).

²⁹ Elwell-Sutton 1976: 169-171, 246 argues that the *suriūd* (MP *srōd* [Elwell-Sutton gives it as “*sarud*”]) was a royal or hieratic hymn, the *čakāmak* (MP *čegāmag*) or *čāmak* a love lyric or romance, and the *tarānak* a drinking or feasting song. Cf. Klima 1968: 49ff.

³⁰ See Khānlarī 1345 *Sh.*/1956: 38-77. For the *fahlawiyyāt* and other forms of Persian folk poetry, see Wahidiyān-Kāmyār 1357 *Sh.*/1978. Elwell-Sutton 1976: 168-185 gives a sound account of the genesis of neo-Persian meters.

³¹ Shafī’i-Kadkāni 1368 *Sh.*/1989: 119-130 on *radīf* and 176-7 for *rubāī*.

³² For the Persian origins of the *mutakārib* meter, see Grunebaum 1961: 179-80. For the Persian influence on the development of the Arabic *mathnawī* or *muzdawidj* (couplet) see Grunebaum 1944: 9-13. Ullmann 1966: 48ff., raises some objections, but the *mathnawī* is without question a native form in neo-Persian, dating perhaps to Parthian times.

poets.³³ Furthermore, the Persian poets, when making mention of famous Arab predecessors in the poetic craft, usually speak of *Djarīr*, al-Farazdaq, al-Mutanabbi and al-Buhturī rather than the *ghazal* poets, *Djamil*, al-‘Abbās ibn al-‘Ahnaf, Muslim ibn al-Walīd or ‘Umar ibn Abī Rabī‘a, who, I believe are rarely spoken of by Persian poets. The homoerotic ethos suffusing Persian *ghazal* poetry is also of non-Arab origin.³⁴ The influence of music and performance styles in particular does not respect linguistic borders, and there certainly was some interchange of literary styles among Byzantine, Jewish, Persian and Arab musicians in Syria and Iraq in late antiquity.³⁵ One can even point to Persian influences in the Arabic poetry of the Abbasid period, as in the case of Abū Nuwās, who composed macaronic verses using Persian and toyed with formal innovations, such as the *musammat*, perhaps suggested to him by Iranian strophic poetry.

In general one may say that the Arabic *ghazal*, though distinct from the *kaṣīda*, was defined more by its theatics than by its form, whereas the Persian *ghazal* came to denote a poem of between seven and fourteen lines³⁶ with a *maṭla‘*, or opening line rhyming in both hemistichs; and with a *takhallus*, or signature, in the last line (*maṭla‘*). The *ghazal* had largely displaced the *kaṣīda* as the preferred vehicle of poetic expression in Persian by the end of the 7th/13th century.³⁷ In Arabic, by contrast, the *ghazal* never did crystallize into a normative form or achieve preeminence, as J. Stetkevych explains:

³³ See the chart in Bakkār 1971: 359. Compare the statistical survey of the meters of a number of Persian poets in Elwell-Sutton 1976: 145-167.

³⁴ Bakkār 1971: 195-207 provides several medieval Arabic sources in support of the view that the Arabs prior to and in the first century after Islam (with the possible exception of an unnamed tribe or two) inclined only to women, or at least confined the object of their *tashbib* (the amatory introit to the *kaṣīda*) to women, and that desire for *ghilmān* (slaves or pages) arose among the armies in Khurasan only out of necessity.

³⁵ The suggestion of the influence of Greek and Persian singers on the development of the *ghazal* is made by Gibb 1974: 44.

³⁶ Bahār 1954: 80 reckons seven or nine lines to be normative, while eleven should be the upper limit. He differentiates this from the Persian *kaṣīda* in terms of length (claiming that anything between eleven and 1000 lines is a *kaṣīda*) and subject matter, the *ghazal* being originally on themes of love and the poet's plight in that state, and later edging into philosophical and mystical themes. For a medieval definition from the 7th century A.H., see *Shams-i Kays Rāzī*: 201, for whom a poem is a *kaṣīda* if it is more than fifteen lines and begins with a line rhymed in both hemistichs (*bayt-i maṭla‘ muṣarrā*). If less than fifteen lines, or in the event that it does not begin with a double-rhyme, it is a *kiṭ‘a*, unless the subject matter is the “arts of love”, in which case it is a *ghazal*. This view, probably following an Arabic manual of poetics, implies that both latter forms are derived from the *kaṣīda*.

³⁷ See Bausani EI² (s.v. “*Ghazal*, ii”, 1033-36), who traces five periods in the development of the Persian *ghazal*: the non-formulaic love poems of the 3rd-4th/9th-10th century; the introduction of mysticism in the 4th-7th/10th-13th c.; the classical period (7th-10th/13th-16th c.), during which the formal aspects crystallize (which ignores Sanā‘ī’s role in the process); the abstract expressionism of the Indian style; and, finally, the neo-classical and modernist adoption of non-traditional themes.

The alternative to the *qaṣīdah*, or at least to the structured *nasīb*, which Ibn Abī Rabī‘ah's *ghazal* seems to offer, did in the long run lead to the legitimization of a formal fragmenting of the complex ode structure. By independently developing only one aspect of the *nasīb*, however, it could not aspire to being an all-encompassing alternative to the traditional “great” form. Formally at least, it was bound to remain an unfinished, if charming, development, like every other formal development in Arabic poetry that was not the *qaṣīdah*.³⁸

While the modernist poets (*muhdathūn*) of the Abbasid period are credited with the introduction of “various new and independent genres such as *khamriyyāt*, *tardiyāt*, *zuhdiyyāt*, *mudjūniyyāt* and others”, Heinrichs argues that the themes of such “genres” can be found in the pre-Islamic *kaṣīda*, which, in any case, “never ceased to exist in its original form”³⁹.

Why, then, and how did the Persian *ghazal* develop into a fixed form genre? Modern scholars have proposed, in addition to the theory of Arabic origin (*Şiblī Nu‘mānī*, Y.E. Bertels), that the Persian *ghazal* derives from Chinese models (Bausani 1971), that it is a development from Persian folk poetry (I.S. Braginskiy), or, a combination of the folk tradition and Arabic models (A. Mirzoev).⁴⁰ Though Rypka denies the existence of the *ghazal* in the Samanid period, some of the amatory poems in the 4th/10th century corpus do almost appear to be *ghazals* in the later formal sense, while many others consist of only one or two lines, and we cannot be sure whether they are independent poems or the opening *taghazzul* sections of *kaṣīdas* which gained currency outside the courts after discarding the panegyrical sections. However, it is quite possible, in view of the fact that several of the 4th/10th century poets are known to have been musicians, that such poems were recited in musical contexts and might never have consisted of more than a line or two. We find references to songs, *surūd* or *čakāma* in the 4th/10th and 5th/11th century, and though the association with musical performance is clear, it is unclear to what extent these are associated in the minds of the poets who use such words with the forms bearing the same name in the Sasanian period.⁴¹ Though it seems to me that the amatory verses of the 4th/10th century poets are not simply detached fragments, the Persian critics, following the Arabic theorists, conceived of the prototypical *kaṣīda* as beginning with an amatory exordium to catch the

³⁸ Stetkevych, J. 1993: 57

³⁹ Heinrichs 1973: 25.

⁴⁰ A survey of the various views is given by Bausani in EI² (s.v. “*Ghazal*, ii”), who tends to side with Mirzoev's argument about the simultaneous existence of a technical and a folk *ghazal* tradition, which gradually merge. Meisami 1987: 237-8n1, argues that these theories cannot be correct because they misconstrue the early meaning of the word *ghazal*. While this is generally correct, the fact that the word *ghazal* denoted a “content based genre” and not yet a “formal genre”, does not mean that a love lyric form did not exist under another name (e.g., *shīr* in *Waqrah wa Gulshāh*, as discussed below) or with no technical term at all.

⁴¹ Rāzānī 1340 *Sh.*/1961: 22-26 offers a description of the Sasanian forms *surūd/sarwād/surūd-i khusruwānī*, *čakāmak*, and *tarānak*, their syllabic prosody, their subject matters and their performance occasions. Cf. Bahār 1333 *Sh.*/1954: 73-77 and Khaleghī-Motlagh 1978: 3-27.

audience's attention (though in Persian praxis, such poems typically begin with a description of spring rather than of the beloved). This section, the *nasīb* of the classical Arabic *kaṣīda*, was variously called *ghazal*, *taghazzul*, *tashbīb* and *nasīb* throughout the medieval period by Persian critics with little practical difference in meaning, long after the *ghazal* as we know it had been recognized as a formal genre.⁴²

Very frequently, these short amatory poems employ the *radīf*, or refrain, a Persian invention. Indeed, in 'Ayyūkī's romance *Warqah wa Gulshāh*, most likely written within a generation of Firdawsī, and therefore attributable to about the early or middle 5th/11th century, we find a story of love and adventure, adapted from an Arabic source, set in a *mutakārib* meter in the *mathnawī* form (both characteristic and perhaps native to neo-Persian prosody). A number of embedded lyrical poems, each four to eight lines long, announced as poems (*shi'r*) and recited (*guft*, *yād kard*) by one or the other protagonist of the story, punctuate the text of 'Ayyūkī's poem. These inlaid poems observe the same meter as the rest of the *mathnawī*, and while dropping the couplet form's rhyme from the first hemistich, observe the supplementary prosodic artifice of the *radīf*. Unlike the rest of the lines, these interludes do not forward the narrative, but are lyrical in mood and in orientation – a love suit, a lament for love lost, a love plaint, lament for the dead, etc. – all emotions moving the character to an I-thou dialogue, often as an apostrophe to the absent thou, and hence are songs of soliloquy. These inlaid poems, lacking only the *takhallus* (though one of the poems observes this, as well), look for all the world like formal *ghazals*,⁴³ though 'Ayyūkī describes them in each instance as "*shi'r*,"⁴⁴ meaning simply an individual poem. In the middle of the 5th/11th century, then, we have clear evidence of the existence of self-contained lyrical poems observing highly determined prosodic features, derived neither from the *kaṣīda* nor from narrative poetry.

The Persian poets of the 4th/10th century, some writing perhaps as much as one hundred years before 'Ayyūkī, also usually refer to poems as "*shi'r*", and also "*bayt*" or "*du-bayti*". They refer to themselves as "*shā'ir*" and to the craft of poetry as "*shā'iri*". The poems, "*ash'ār*", they compose constitute *nazm*, or versified speech, as distinct from prose (*nathr*). A word meaning meter, *wazn*, also occurs as a hapax legomenon in the Persian verse that has survived from the 4th/10th

⁴² See, e.g., *Shams-i Ḳays*: 413 and *Tādj al-Halāwī*: 84-5.

⁴³ In fact, Rypka, who has denied the existence of such a form for the 10th century, calls these inlaid poems "love songs in the form of *ghazals*" (Rypka 1968: 177).

⁴⁴ 'Ayyūkī: 13, 15, 20, 27, 39, 60, 75, 81-2, 108, 110, 112. Dankoff 1984 argues that the inclusion of such poems within the body of a *mathnawī* must be seen as the origin of the later verse form, *dah-nāma* or '*ushshāk-nāma*', made popular by 'Irākī and others in the 7th/13th century.

century.⁴⁵ All these words, and those for the categories of poetic genres or moods that follow, are derived from Arabic, the learned language, which distinguishes between poet and musician in a way Middle Persian apparently did not⁴⁶.

As for the categories, genres or moods of poetry in the preserved verses of the 4th/10th century Persian poets, the following terms exist:

Madh: meaning panegyric, as the intent or theme of a poem.⁴⁷ The existence of a *maṣṭūl* form, *mamduḥ*, meaning the person praised, or patron, used commonly in Arabic and also in Persian (Kaykāwūs b. Washmīr: 139), suggests that *madh* is viewed as a poet's rhetorical orientation to the addressee, and not as a form.

Madīh: same as *madh*, but somewhat more concrete (i.e., an instance or product noun), in that a poet can speak of *madīh-ī*, a panegyrical poem.⁴⁸

Midhat: same as above.⁴⁹

Fakhr: Self-praise, or praise of the patron.⁵⁰

Hazl: a hapax legomenon, only understandable from this instance in a general way, and from later usage, but the meaning is generally the same as *hidjā*, satire or invective.⁵¹

Hidjā: satire, invective.⁵² Occasionally *hidjā* is associated with the Arab poets Djarīr and al-Farazdaq by Ghaznavid poets of the 5th/11th century.

Kaṣd: used once in a *kaṣīda* to explain the purpose of that particular poem (*sukhan*).⁵³

Ghazal, the word that most directly concerns us here, occurs twice in the poems of Rūdakī, the earliest occurrences of the word in neo-Persian, which apparently refer to

⁴⁵ The above conclusions are based on a thorough search through Lazard 1341 Sh./1962 and the poems of Rūdakī, as collected by Nafīsī 1342 Sh./1963. For details of which poets use the terms and in what contexts, see Lewis 1995: 49–50.

⁴⁶ See Boyce 1957: 21, 32–45.

⁴⁷ See Lazard 1962: 25:15, from Shahīd-i Balkhī who contrasts *madh* with *hidjā*, which can describe the same utterance, depending on the context, as he makes clear; and 141:2 (doubtfully ascribed to Daḳīkī). Rūdakī also uses the term in Nafīsī 1962: 497:154, 508:438, 509:476, 512:540, and 497:155 for *maddāḥ*).

⁴⁸ See Lazard 1962, where Daḳīkī dresses a panegyric in fine clothes (150:67), contemplates writing one panegyric for a certain patron (153:99), compares the superiority of Rūdakī's *madīh* to his own (156:139–40), and makes a similar comparison in a lament for Shahīd (161:175).

⁴⁹ Daḳīkī uses the word in “O Amir, in praise (*midhat*) of you my life is made short” as follows (Lazard 1962: 141:3). Rūdakī says all expressions of praise ever spoken are owed to the addressee of his poem (Nafīsī 1341 Sh./1963: 512:550).

⁵⁰ Rūdakī glories in his love for the two little dark eyes of the beloved (Nafīsī 1341 Sh./1962: 495:101–2).

⁵¹ From Muhammad b. Wasīf in Lazard 1962: 15:22.

⁵² From Shahīd-i Balkhī, in Lazard 1962: 25:15.

⁵³ Gurgānī in Lazard 1962: 62:78.

the lyrical subject matter or rhetorical orientation of the poem, as contrasted with the panegyrical orientation of *madh*:

*khudār-yā bi-sutūdam ki kirdigār-i man-ast
zabān-am az ghazal u madh-i bandagān-sh na-sūd*⁵⁴

I gave praise unto God, who is my creator,
my tongue was not worn away by lyrics (*ghazal*)
and panegyrics (*madh*) for his servants.

*darīgh midhat-i čun durr u ābdār ghazal
ki čābukī-sh nay-āyad hamī bi lafz padid*⁵⁵

Alas for pearly praises (*midhat*) and juicy lyrics (*ghazal*)
which trip not lightly off of every tongue

Dakīkī, though not actually using these terms, draws the same thematic division between panegyrical and amatory themes, the one being addressed to kings, the other to beloveds⁵⁶.

The vocabulary of terms reconstructed from the poems of the 4th/10th to 6th/12th century shows that the poets continued to conceive of their poems primarily in terms of mood and topoi rather than formal structure. *Ghazal* continues to occur mostly in apposition to the word *madh* (sometimes also to *thanā*), or sometimes in contradistinction to other themes/moods, such as *hazl*. We may infer from various comments that a *ghazal* or *taghazzul* can occur within a panegyric, for example, as the amatory introit to a *kaṣīda*. In most of these examples it is clear that the word *ghazal*, like *taghazzul* and *tashbīb*, designates a lyrical passage usually amatory in mood or *topos*. This topical dichotomy of love/lyric on the one hand, and panegyric/epideictic on the other, is also clearly reflected in the 5th-6th/11th-12th century rhetorical manuals and prose works about poetry.

The earliest surviving critical discussion of Persian poetry and prosody occurs in the 5th/11th century *Ķābūs-nāma* (w. 475/1082) of Kaykāwūs b. Washmgīr, who includes a chapter on poetry (*dar rasm-i shā’irī*). Here the word *ghazal* (love lyric) is distinguished from other topical genres: *madh* (panegyre), *hidjār* (satire), *marthiyat* (lament) and *zuhd* (asceticism). These terms designate the theme or content of a poem, while two specific fixed forms, the *tarāna* (most probably meaning the *du baytī* or *rubā’ī*) and *kaṣīda*, are also mentioned (Kaykāwūs b. Washmgīr 1366 Sh./1987: 137-40). However, *ghazal* is not so unambiguously just a thematic category here, because Kaykāwūs sees the *ghazal* and *tarāna*, in contrast to *madh*, as forms of poetry which should be based on light, popular meters and rhymes, devoid of difficult language, and appealing equally to the elite and the common folk (Kaykāwūs b. Washmgīr 1366 Sh./1987: 138:2-5). Because of the juxtaposition with *tarāna*, probably denoting the specific form and meter of

⁵⁴ Nafīsī 1341 Sh./1962: 498:184.

⁵⁵ Nafīsī 1341 Sh./1962: 500:242. The line could also be understood to mean that the poet is unable to express the patron’s agility – so great it is – in verse.

⁵⁶ Lazard 1962: 153:95-6.

a quatrain (either the *rubā’ī* or even the non-quantitative *fahlawī*), one is tempted to understand *ghazal* here as a distinct form, like the inlaid poems (*shīr*) found in *Warqah wa Gulshāh*. We should understand *madh* not as a form of its own, but as an attitude or rhetorical aim of poetry, like *hidjā’* (satire). Both of these terms are mentioned in connection with the *kasīda* form. Indeed, Kaykāwūs apparently distinguishes the modes of lyric from those of the epideictic oration in a passage directing that *ghazal* and *marthiyat* should be composed/recited in one manner, with *hidjā’* and *madh* in another (*ammā ghazal wa marthiyat az yik tarīk gūy wa hidjā’ wa madh az yik tarīk*), since the two elements of each pair are the inverse emotional poles of a particular rhetorical orientation to the subject of the poem. He apparently sees the subject matter or the images (*ma’nī, lafz*) of the rhetorical modes – *hidjā’* and *madh* – as interchangeable, and likewise the themes or images of the lyric modes – *ghazal* and *marthiyat* –, but he gives no indication that the rhetorical themes can be mixed with the lyric ones (Kaykāwūs b. Washmgīr 1366 Sh./1987: 139-140). In the *Kābūs-nāma*’s chapter on minstrelsy (*andar ādāb-i khunyāgarī*), *ghazal* poetry is particularly associated with a popular and musical milieu: *ghazal* is to be memorized, along with *shīr*, and one must avoid composing meterless (*bī-wazn*) *ghazal* and *tarāna* (Kaykāwūs b. Washmgīr 1366 Sh./1987: 142), perhaps indicating that *ghazal* lyrics were commonly composed in non-quantitative popular meters to be sung.

In Rashīd al-Dīn Waṭwāt’s *Hadā’ik al-sihr* (c. 550/1155), the *takhallus*, which will later become a technical term for the last line of the *ghazal* but here clearly refers to the *gurīz-gāh* (literally ‘path of escape’, a Persian calque on the Arabic *makhlas*, whence *takhallus*, meaning ‘escape’ ‘extrication’) of the *kasīda*, is described as the segue from the *tashbīb* (which in Arabic has the same meaning Waṭwāt is ascribing to *ghazal*) or introit of the poem, to the praise of the king, which should ideally sum up what has been said and relate it somehow to the patron. Waṭwāt chooses a few lines from al-Mutanabbi, ‘Unṣūrī and Kamālī to illustrate how to do this well, and explains the art of *takhallus* as follows:

This art is when the poet moves in the most pleasing and praiseworthy manner from an amatory mood (*ghazal*), or from some other theme which he has chosen for the introit (*tashbīb*) of the poem, to praise for the patron. (Waṭwāt 1308 Sh./1930: 31-2)⁵⁷

⁵⁷ Waṭwāt: 31-2. Other passages make it clear that Watwāt sees the *kitā’ā* as an independent form (28, 55, 57, 60, 64, 79), along with *kasīda* (30, and *kasāyid*, 60). The two forms are put side by side (57) as possible forms for a dual-rhyme. *Musammat* is seen as a *kasīda* with the added rhetorical artifice of dividing the line into four parts (*kism*), the first three observing *sadjā’*, and the last a rhyme. But after saying that the *musammat* has five or six parts, he then calls them rhyming hemistichs (*mīṣrā’*, 61-3). Towards the end, in an addendum, he groups *madh/madīh, hajw/hidjā’* and a number of other terms which do not apparently deserve separate treatment (85-7), including *tashbīb*, also known as *nasīb* or *ghazal*, which he glosses as talk about the qualities of the beloved and the poet’s love for her. Waṭwāt makes it clear he is speaking of the opening section of the *kasīda*, which he says is commonly called *tashbīb*, regardless of the subject matter, if it contains anything other than praise of the patron (85). He

By the time of 'Awfi's anthology *Lubāb al-albāb* (c. 618/1221), poems are usually introduced by the title *bayt*, *nazm*, *shi'r*, *kiṭ'a*, *kaṣīda* or "*ghazal*." The latter three seem to be used as technical terms, applied to the forms we recognize today, though it is clear from 'Awfi's titling of two lines of panegyric as *ghazal* ('Awfi 1906: 2: 49), and his description of a *kaṣīda* containing a *taghazzul* and *madh* section as consisting of lines (*bayt*) of *ghazal* and *madh* ('Awfi: 2: 119), that the word "*ghazal*" could still connote the thematic, as well as the formal, features of a poem.

Shams-i Ḳays Rāzī, in the work on prosody and poetics which he began about 617/1220 but did not complete (due to the Mongol invasions) until about 630/1232, does explicitly distinguish the *kaṣīda* and its two derivative forms, *kiṭ'a*, and *ghazal*:

...any cut-off poem on the subject of the arts of love, like the description of tresses and beauty marks and stories about union and separation and longing for florid and aromatic fragrances and rains and the description of the ruins of encampments, is called a "*ghazal*" (Shams-i Ḳays: 201)

By the second quarter of the 7th/13th century, therefore, the *ghazal* had been consciously recognized by critics and poets as an independent form, though at this time the word could still be applied to the generic love theme found also in the *nasīb* or *tashbīb* or *taghazzul* section of a *kaṣīda* (Shams-i Ḳays: 413).

Tādj al-Ḥalāwī, writing probably in the 8th/14th century, and heavily indebted to Watwāṭ's manual, titles the poetic examples he gives either by the name of the poet, by fixed form terms such as *kiṭ'a*, *rubā'ī*, or by broader prosodic terms like *nazm*, *shi'r*, or *bayt* (which can also be a numerator, meaning that just one verse is quoted). He also describes some poems by content – *hazl* or *madh* (Tādj al-Ḥalāwī 1962: 34, 40 and 54, 61, respectively). Elsewhere he speaks of "the types of poetry and the kinds of verse" (*adjnās-i shi'r wa anwā'i nazm*), without, however, specifying what he means by this (Tādj al-Ḥalāwī 1962: 81).

Regarding the *ghazal*, he explains that etymologically it meant the entertaining talk of girls or tales about the beloved, but in the vocabulary of the rhetoricians (*sukhan shināsān*), *ghazal* is:

a pleasing and refreshing diversion, through the evocation (*dhikr*) of the beloved and description of his/her tresses and beauty mark, including tales of union and separation (*hikāyat-i wasl wa hidjir*), which is built out of a pleasant meter, an attractive form (*tarkīb*) and profound meaning (*ma'nī-yi 'arīk*), devoid of recondite expressions, like the poems of Shaykh Sa'dī (Tādj al-Ḥalāwī 1962: 86).

This passage borrows a few phrases from Shams-i Ḳays, but gives a fuller, more precise definition, on the basis now not only of theme and diction, but also of

also recognizes the existence of two forms of *rubā'ī*, the 3- and 4-rhymed. Here he treats *tardjīr* (called *naghmat*, melody) as a separate genre, and explains the strophic divisions.

meter, form and meaning. And the poems, or “*ash‘ār*”⁵⁸ of Sa‘dī (d. 691/1292?) are offered as paradigmatic of the *ghazal*, though by the time Ḥalāwī wrote, the mystical *ghazal* would already be eclipsing the profane variety.

The *ghazal* is clearly now a formal concept, distinguished from the introduction (*mukaddima*) of the *kaṣīda*, which though formerly called *ghazal* or *aghzāl* (a highly unusual occurrence of the word in an Arabic plural) when amatory in theme, is now known by the term *nasīb*, a term which Tādj al-Ḥalāwī 1962: 84-5 feels he must explain. If the introductory section of the *kaṣīda*, which is designed to attract the attention of the patron and predispose him to grant the desired aim of the poet, involves either the poet’s plaint over his lot in life, a description of nature or the traces of the abandoned encampment, it is then known as *tashbīb*. The *nasīb* and *tashbīb* are contrasted to the *mamdud* or *muktadab*, which is a *kaṣīda* that lacks either the *ghazal* or *tashbīb* introit, instead starting *in medias res*. This last passage, where *ghazal* is used in the sense he has just attributed to *nasīb*, probably reflects the older usage found in his sources on prosody and poetics and the dichotomy frequently mentioned by earlier poets between *ghazal* and *madh*. His terminological equation of *nasīb* and *aghzāl* probably reflects his inclination to reserve the word “*ghazal*” for the formal genre of Sa‘dī. It is worth noting, however, that *takhallus* continues with its old meaning, the progression from some other theme to the *madh* portion of a poem⁵⁹.

Finally, Ridā Kulī Khān Hidāyat (1215-1288/1809-1871) in his *Madāridj al-balāgha*, which for the most part follows Rashīd-al-Dīn and al-Ḥalāwī, describes *al-tardjīr* and *al-tarkīb-band* under separate entries as separate styles or forms (*siyāk, tarz*) of poem, formerly devoted to royal panegyric but latterly used mostly for didactic, philosophical, mystical and love verse⁶⁰. He, of course, sees the *ghazal* as an independent form⁶¹, and finds it necessary to explain at length the earlier usage of the term *ghazal* in the passage on *takhallus*:

This artifice is when the poet moves in a nice, pleasing, smooth fashion from the *ghazal*, meaning the *taghazzul* of the *kaṣīda* or some other theme (*ma‘nī*) with which he has opened the poem (*tashbīb karda*), to the praise of the patron. Let it be known that what is in this age called *taghazzul*, the masters of old called *ghazal*, and that which in these days is called *gurīz* was called by those who went before *takhallus*, while in this day *takhallus* is the closing lines of ghazals (*makāti‘-i ghazaliyyāt*).⁶²

⁵⁸ A term suggestive of shorter poems, it probably does not mean to encompass Sa‘dī’s *mathnawi*, the *Būstān*, but perhaps does not exclude his *kaṣīdas*.

⁵⁹ Tādj al-Ḥalāwī 1962: 82.

⁶⁰ Hidāyat 2535/1976: 96-7.

⁶¹ Hidāyat 2535/1976: 105-6.

⁶² Hidāyat 2535/1976: 125-6.

Ghazal as a Formal Term

Khākānī (c. 520-582/c. 1126-1186, or possibly as late as 595/1199), who is concerned with poetic style and innovation, and considers himself in some respects a follower of Sanā'ī, frequently speaks of his poems having a new style (*shīwa-yi tāza* or *shīr-i bādī*).⁶³ In a poem with the *radīf* “Unṣūrī,” Khākānī compares his new special style to the old style of the earlier poet, who died more than a century and a half before. In this poem, he discusses the various styles of poetry, pointing out that ‘Unṣūrī only tried his hand at *madh* and *ghazal* (*djuz az ṭarz-i madh u ṭarāz-i ghazal / na-kardī zi ṭab’ imtiḥān ‘Unṣūrī*), and that in *madh* *u ghazal*, Khākānī is considered superior to ‘Unṣūrī by the cognoscenti (*shīnāsand afādīl ki čun man na-būd / bi madh u ghazal dur-fishān ‘Unṣūrī*). Not only that, Khākānī goes on to note that he has adorned the body of poetry with various styles (*shīwa*) of poetry, including *wa’z* and *zuhd*, of which ‘Unṣūrī was ignorant. In this usage, the terms *madh* and *ghazal* evidently still refer primarily to content-related genres, and not formal features of the poem.

With Zahīr-i Fāryābī (d. 598/1202), a contemporary of Khākānī, however, we find an allusion which suggests he recognized the *ghazal* as a separate form with a separate performance occasion. In this passage, he hints at knowing how to compose various kinds of poetry and complains that people do not properly acknowledge his due in this regard. Finally, he says that the best genre (*djins*) of poetry is the *ghazal*, though one cannot make money with it:

*kamīna pāya-yi man shā’irī-st khud bi-ngar
ki čand gūna kishīdam zi dast-i ū bīdād
bi pīsh-i har ki az-ū yād mī-kunam harf-ī
nimī-kunad pas az ān tā tavānad az man yād
zi shīr *djins-i ghazal* bihtar ast u ān-ham nīst
bađā’atī ki tavān sākhtan az ān bunyād*⁶⁴

My most insignificant support is the craft of poetry;
See for yourself the many injustices I’ve suffered at its hands!
Not one of those I stand before and memorialize with a few words
ever tries afterwards, when it is in his power, to remember me!
Of poetry, the best form is the ghazal, though even on that basis
one cannot make any money!

Zahīr was a practitioner of court poetry in western Iran and composed a number of what we view in hindsight as very fine *ghazals*. Zahīr recognizes several kinds (*gūna*) of poetic practice (*shā’irī*), specifically mentioning only one form (*djins*) of poetry (*shīr*) by name, the *ghazal*. Though the older thematic contrast between panegyric (*madh*) and *ghazal* is not far from mind, Zahīr is probably also complaining about

⁶³ Cited in Mahdjūb 1967: 20, quoting from Khākānī’s *Dīwān*, ‘Abd al-Rasūlī (ed.): 199, 213, 263, 345.

⁶⁴ Cited in Muṣaffā 1335 Sh./1956: 100.

performance occasions here; the money one can receive from a *kawwāl* for a *ghazal* does not compare with what one can get for a *kaṣīda* at the court⁶⁵.

Dh. Ṣafā points out that the great bulk of poetry being written by the Safavid period was *ghazals* in the formal sense, no longer predominantly on love themes, but treating the themes of mysticism and practical ethics, as well.⁶⁶ Though some poets had been using the *ghazal* format for mystical and religious themes for at least two centuries, Ṣafā is of the opinion that in the 8th-10th/14th-16th centuries, only poets who really knew their trade were including such topics, whereas the amateur poets were all practicing the amatory *ghazal*, making the lover become ever more ill and wretched than before⁶⁷. In the 7th/13th century Ṣafā sees the *ghazal* developing in two different directions: the love *ghazal* exemplified by Sa‘dī, in the tradition of Rūdakī, Zāhīr, Mudjīr and Kamāl Ismā‘īl; and the mystical *ghazal*, following ‘Aṭṭār, and exemplified by ‘Irākī, Djalāl al-Dīn Rūmī and Sayf al-Dīn Farghānī⁶⁸. He sees both forms eventually mingling somewhat, especially in Khājū-yi Kirmānī, Kamāl-i Khudjandī, ‘Imād, Amīr Khusraw and Ḥāfiẓ.

Thus, beginning with the formal characteristic of including one's signature, or *takhalluṣ*, in shorter poems on a variety of themes, such as those found in the *Dīwān* of Sana‘ī, poets separate out the various themes and topoi – the mystical, the religious, the amatory – and develop them in different directions, until finally, in Ḥāfiẓ and his contemporaries, these disparate strains began to harmonize once again. By this time the evolution has come full-circle; *ghazal* has lost its original meaning – an amatory, as opposed to a panegyrical (*madh*) mode or theme – and is now considered a fixed form of its own that can treat of a range of themes in various modes. Whatever inspiration the Persian *ghazal* initially drew from the Arabic, it developed in particular directions of its own, becoming recognized by the time of the Mongol invasions as a fixed-form genre with a pre-determined limit as to length, but with little restriction as to theme.

Bibliography

Anwari-Alhosseyni, Shams 1986: *Logaz und Mo‘amma: eine Quellenstudie zur Kunstform des persischen Rätsels*. Berlin.

Aryanpur, A. 1973: *A History of Persian Literature*. Tehran.

‘Awfi, Muḥammad: *Lubāb al-albāb*. Qazvini, Mirza Muhammad and Browne, E. G. (eds.). 2 vols. 1903 and 1906. London.

‘Ayyūkī 1343 Sh./1964: *Warkah wa Gulshāh-i ‘Ayyūkī*. Ṣafā, Dhabīh Allāh (ed.). Tehran.

⁶⁵ See Lewis 1995: Chapter 2.

⁶⁶ Ṣafā 1366 Sh./1987: v 5/1: 603-4, where he cites poems of Kalīm-i Kāshānī, Ṣā’ib and Ḡanī.

⁶⁷ Ṣafā 1366 Sh./1987: v. 4: 188-9.

⁶⁸ Ṣafā 1366 Sh./1987: v. 3/1: 320-23.

A‘zamī-rād, Gunbad-Durdī 1366 Sh./1987: *Musammaṭ dar shi‘r-i fārsī*. Tehran.

Bahār, Muhammad Taķī 1333 Sh./1954: *Shi‘r dar Īrān*. Tehran.

Bakkār, Y.H. 1971: *Ittidjāhāt al-ghazal fī al-ķarn al-thānī al-hidjri*. Cairo.

Bausani, Alessandro 1968a: *La letteratura Persiana*. Milan.

Bausani, Alessandro 1968b: *Le letterature del Pakistan e dell’Afghanistan*. Milan.

Bausani, Alessandro 1971: Considerazione sull’origine del ghazal. *Quaderno dell’Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei* CLX, 1971. 195-208.

Boyce, Mary 1957: The Parthian Gōsān and Iranian Minstrel Tradition. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* XVIII (1957): 10-45.

Browne, Edward G. 1906: *A Literary History of Persia from Ferdowsi to Sa‘di*, v. 2. New York.

Cairns, Francis 1972: *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*. Edinburgh.

Clinton, Jerome 1988: Court Poetry at the Beginning, In: Yarshater, Ehsan (ed.) 1988: *Persian Literature*. New York: 75-95.

Cohen, Ralph 1991: Genre Theory, Literary History and Historical Change. In: Perkins, David 1991 (ed.): *Theoretical Issues in Literary History*. Cambridge, Mass.: 85-113.

Curtius, Ernst Robert 1979: *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. Trask, Willard (tr.). London.

Dankoff, Robert 1984: The Lyric in the Romance: The Use of Ghazals in Persian and Turkish *Masnavīs*. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* XLIII: I, 1984. 9-25.

Elwell-Sutton, L.P. 1976: *The Persian Meters*. Cambridge.

EI²: *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. 2nd ed. Leiden.

Fouchécour, Charles-Henri de 1986: *Moralia: les notions morales dans la littérature persane du 3e/9e au 7e/13e siècle*. Paris.

Frye, Northrop 1957: *The Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton.

Ghanī, Kāsim, 1321 Sh./1942: *Tārīkh-i ‘aṣr-i Ḥāfiẓ*. Tehran.

Gibb, Hamilton A. R. 1974: *Arabic Literature: An introduction*, 2nd ed. Oxford.

Grunebaum, G.E. von 1944: Early Development of Muzdawij Poetry. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* III, 1944. 9-13.

Grunebaum, G.E. von 1961: Firdausi’s Concept of History, In Grunebaum, G.E. von (ed.) 1961: *Islam: Essays in the Nature and Growth of a Cultural Tradition*. New York. 168-184.

Gulčin-i Ma‘ānī, Ahmād 1346 Sh./1967: *Shahr-āshūb dar shi‘r-i fārsī*. Tehran.

Heinrichs, Wolfhart 1969: *Arabische Dichtung und Griechische Poetik*. Beirut. (Beiruter Texte und Studien; 8)

Heinrichs, Wolfgang 1973: Literary Theory: The Problem of Its Efficiency. In Grunebaum, G.E. von (ed.) 1973: *Arabic Poetry: Theory and Development*. Wiesbaden: 19-69.

Hidāyat, Ridā Қulī Khān: *Madāridj al-balāgha dar ‘ilm-i bādī*. Ma‘rifat, Ḫusayn (ed.): 2535/1976. Shiraz.

Hirsch, E.D. 1967: *Validity in Interpretation*. New Haven.

Hirsch, Marjorie 1993: *Schubert’s Dramatic Lieder*. Cambridge.

Imāmī, Naṣr Allāh 1369 Sh./1990: *Marthiya-sarā’ī dar adabiyyāt-i fārsī-yi īrān*. Ahvaz.

Jones, Alan 1992: *Early Arabic Poetry*. V. 1 (Board of the Faculty of Oriental Studies, University of Oxford). Reading.

Kaykāwūs b. Washmgīr, ‘Unṣur al-Ma‘ālī: *Kābūs-nāma*. Nafīsī, Sa‘īd (ed.). 6th ed. 1366 Sh./1987. Tehran.

Khālegī-Motlagh, Djalal 1978: Hamāsa-sarā-yi bāstān. *Sīmurgh* (Nashriyya-yi Bunyād-i Shāh-nāma-yi Firdawsī) V, Summer 2537/1357 Sh.. 3-27.

Khānlarī, Parwīz Nātil, 1345 Sh./1976: *Wazn-i shī‘r-i fārsī*. Tehran.

Klima, Otakar 1968: Avesta, Ancient Persian and Middle Persian. In Rypka, Jan (ed.) 1968: *History of Iranian Literature*. Dordrecht.

Lazard, Gilbert (ed.) 1962: *Ash‘ar-i parākanda-yi қadīmtarīn shu‘arā-yi fārsī-zabān*. *Les Premiers poètes persanes*. Vol. 2. Tehran (Département d’Iranologie de l’Institut Franco-Iranien).

Lescot, Roger 1944: Essai d’une chronologie de l’œuvre de Hafiz. *Bulletin d’Etudes Orientales* (Beirut: Institut Français de Damas) X, 1944. 57-100.

Lewis, Franklin 1995: *Reading, Writing and Recitation: Sanā’ī and the Origins of the Persian Ghazal* (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago).

Lindley, David 1985: *Lyric*. London.

Mahdjūb, Sayyid Muḥammad Dja‘far, 1967: *Sabk-i Khurāsānī*. Tehran.

Meisami, Julie 1981: Norms and Conventions of the Classical Persian Lyric: A Comparative Approach to the Ghazal, In: Kostantinovic, Z. (ed.) 1981: *Classical Models in Literature* (Proceedings of the IXth Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association). Innsbruck.

Meisami, Julie 1987: *Medieval Persian Court Poetry*. Princeton.

Mirzoev, ‘Abd al-Ghanī 1958: *Rudaki i razvitiye gazeli*. Stalinabad.

Moayyad, Heshmat 1988: Lyric Poetry. In: Yarshater, Ehsan (ed.) 1988: *Persian Literature*. New York. 120-146.

Monroe, James 1974: *Hispano-Arabic Poetry: A Student Anthology*. Berkeley.

Muṣaffā, Mażāhir 1335 Sh./1956: *Pāsdārān-i sukhān*: čakāma sarāyān. Vol. 1. Tehran.

Mu’taman, Zayn al-‘Ābidīn 1332 Sh./1953: *Shī‘r wa adab-i fārsī*. Tehran.

Mu’taman, Zayn al-‘Ābidīn 1339 Sh./1960: *Tahawwul-i shī‘r-i fārsī*. N.p.

Myers, Jack and Simms, Michael (eds.) 1989: *The Longman Dictionary of Poetic Terms*. New York.

Nafīsī, Sa‘īd 1341 Sh./1963: *Muhiṭ-i zindīgī wa ahwāl wa ash‘ar-i Rūdakī*. 2nd ed. [1st ed. in 3 vol: 1309-1319 Sh./1931-40]. Tehran.

Perkins, David 1992: *Is Literary History Possible?* Baltimore.

Preminger, Alex and Brogan, T.V.F. (eds.) 1993: *The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetics*. Princeton.

Rāzānī, Abū Turāb 1340 Sh./1961. *Shi‘r wa mūsīkī wa sāz wa āwāz dar adabiyāt-i fārsī*. N.p.

Reinert, Benedikt 1973: Probleme der vormongolischen arabisch-persischen Poesiegemeinschaft, In: von Grunebaum, G.E. (ed.) 1973: *Arabic Poetry: Theory and Development*. Wiesbaden. 72-105.

Rypka, Jan (ed.) 1968: *History of Iranian Literature*. Dordrecht.

Şafā, Dhabīh Allāh 1363 Sh./1984: *Hamāsa-sarā’ī dar īrān*. 4th ed. [1st ed. 1321 Sh./1942)]. Tehran.

Şafā, Dhabīh Allāh 1366 Sh./1987: *Tārīkh-i adabiyāt da īrān*. Vol. 5, 1. Tehran.

Schimmel, Annemarie 1992: *A Two-Colored Brocade*. Chapel Hill.

Shafī‘ī-Kadkanī, Muhammad-Riḍā 1368 Sh./1989: *Mūsīkī-yi shi‘r*. Paris.

Shamīsā, Sīrūs 1362 Sh./1983: *Sayr-i ghazal dar shi‘r-i fārsī*. Tehran.

Shamīsā, Sīrūs 1363 Sh./1984: *Sayr-i rubā’ī dar shi‘r-i fārsī*. Tehran.

Shams-i Kays Rāzī n.d.: *al-Mu‘djam fī ma‘ayir ash‘ār al-‘adjam*. Mudarris-i Raḍawī, M.T. (ed.). Tehran.

Stetkevych, Jaroslav 1993: *The Zephyrs of Najd*. Chicago.

Tādj al-Ḥalāwī: *Dakāyik al-shi‘r*. Kāzīm-īmām, Sayyid Muhammad (ed.) 1962. Tehran.

Ullmann, Manfred 1966: *Untersuchungen zur Ragazpoesie*. Wiesbaden.

Waḥīdiyān-Kāmyār, Takī 1357 Sh./1978: *Bar-rasī-yi wazn-i shi‘r-i ‘āmmiyāna-yi fārsī*. Tehran.

Waṭwāṭ, Rašīd al-Dīn: *Hadā’iķ al-siḥr*. ‘Abbās Iqbāl (ed.). 1308 Sh./1930. Tehran.

Wellek, René and Warren, Austin 1956: *Theory of Literature*. 3rd ed. New York.

Yarshater, Ehsan 1988: The Development of Iranian Literatures. In: Yarshater, Ehsan (ed.) 1988: *Persian Literature*. New York: 3-37.

Zafarī, Walī Allāh, 1364 Sh./1985: *Habsiyya dar adab-i fārsī*. Tehran.

