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*, *ḳaṣīda*, *tashbīb*, *ḳiṭ'a*, *rubā'ī*, *fard*, *mathnawī*, *tardjī'-band*, *tarkīb-band*, *mustazād*, *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 ḳaṣīda, the ḳiṭ'a, the ghazal, the tardjī' – and tarkīb-band and the rubā'ī;
> 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 *ḳaṣīda*, 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 *bayt*s; 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 *maqṭa'* of the *ghazal*, which is not done in the *qaṣīda*.[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 *rubā'ī* as a native Persian verse form, denies an independent status to the *ḳiṭ'a*,[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 Ḥāfiẓ, 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 *madḥ* and *ghazal* (see below) must have predisposed critics to conceive of these categories as mutually exclusive.
5   Browne 1906: 23 describes the *ḳiṭ'a* 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 modified[6].

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 *ḳaṣīda* and *ghazal* (the one differentiated from the other by length and subject matter); 2) the *rubāʿī;* 3) the *mathnawī*, whether on epic, romantic, mystical or didactic themes; and 4) prose[7]. Elsewhere, he includes the *ḳiṭʿa* as a further genre and speaks of the strophic poems (*tardjīʿ-band*, *tarkīb-band*, *murabbaʿ*, etc.) as forms[8].

These categories also prove somewhat fuzzy, mixing as they do prosodic and thematic considerations. The *rubāʿī*, 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 thematics, including encomium, elegy, and the epigram. Likewise, the *mathnawī* is a prosodic form, but the epic "genre" (as typified by Firdawsī's *Shāh-nāma*) cannot meaningfully be grouped on thematic grounds with, for example, the mystical *Mathnawī-yi maʿnawī* of Djalāl al-Dīn Rūmī or the romances of Niẓāmī.

This imprecision may account for Bausani's conclusion[9] 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 Greeks[10]. 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 *hidjāʾ* and *madīḥ* 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 *ḳiṭʿa* is generally associated with occasional poems, though less frequently with the formal ceremonial occasions commemorated in the *ḳaṣīda*. It is also distinguished formally, either by virtue of the fact that it is less than twenty lines, considered the minimum length for the *ḳaṣīda*, or because it lacks the *maṭlaʿ* (i.e., the opening hemistich does not rhyme with the rest of the *bayt*s). Browne seems determined, despite the contrary evidence he compiles, to understand the *ḳiṭʿa* 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 Yamīn (died A.D. 1344-5), consist entirely of such 'fragments.' " (Browne 1906: 23). It has also been denied that the Arabic *ḳiṭʿa* is independent in status, though the early critics, such as Ibn Ḳutayba, and al-Djāhiz (who called it *al-ḳaṣīda al-ḳaṣīra*), 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 Ṣafā, 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 Gattungspoetik. *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 Daḳīḳī (d. c. 366/976) is difficult, for the European eye, to distinguish from a *ghazal* of Ḳāʾānī (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 *ḳaṣīda* 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 (*ḳiṭʿa*, *rubāʿī*, and *taghazzul*, or the amatory introit of certain *ḳaṣīda*s), 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 Muʾtaman 1339 Sh./1960: 7ff., 52ff., 63ff., 70ff., who speaks of the *aḳsām* (categories) and *ḳawālib* (forms), by which he intends primarily the fixed forms (i.e., *ḳaṣīda*, *ghazal*, *tardjīʿāt*, *ḳiṭʿa*, *rubāʿī*, *mathnawī*), 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 (Muʾtaman 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 gazeli" 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 *takhalluṣ,* 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 (*ḳiṭʿa, rubāʿī, taghazzul*), all ostensibly independent of the *ḳaṣīda.*[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 *badīʿ* 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 *ḳaṣīda* and *ḳiṭʿa*. 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., <u>Sh</u>amīsā 1362 <u>Sh</u>./1983 and 1363 <u>Sh</u>./1984; Ẓafarī 1364 <u>Sh</u>./1985; Aʿẓamī-rād 1366 <u>Sh</u>./1987; Imāmī 1369 Sh./1990. Note also the important earlier approaches to genre studies, viz., Ṣafā 1321 Sh./1942 and Gulčīn-i Maʿānī 1346 <u>Sh</u>./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 Sanāʾī. 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 Muʾtaman 1339 <u>Sh</u>./1960: 202.

[26] Muʾtaman 1339 <u>Sh</u>./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 tradition[29] 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 *rubāʿī* 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 *mutaḳārib* 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 "*shāʿir*" from Arabic to distinguish a respectable, literate lyricist from a mere minstrel (*khunyāgar, rāmishgar*; these Persian words were gradually replaced by the Arabic *muṭrib* 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 *muwashshaḥa*, 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 *muwashshaḥa* 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 *surūd* (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 Waḥīdiyān-Kāmyār 1357 Sh./1978. Elwell-Sutton 1976: 168-185 gives a sound account of the genesis of neo-Persian meters.

[31] Shafīʿī-Kadkanī 1368 Sh./1989: 119-130 on *radīf* and 176-7 for *rubāʿī*.

[32] For the Persian origins of the *mutaḳārib* 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 D̲j̲arīr, al-Farazdaḳ, al-Mutanabbī and al-Buḥturī rather than the *g̲h̲azal* poets, D̲j̲amīl, al-ʿAbbās ibn al-Aḥnaf, Muslim ibn al-Walīd or ʿUmar ibn Abī Rabīʿa, who, I believe are rarely spoken of by Persian poets. The homoerotic ethos suffusing Persian *g̲h̲azal* 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 *musammaṭ*, perhaps suggested to him by Iranian strophic poetry.

In general one may say that the Arabic *g̲h̲azal*, though distinct from the *ḳaṣīda*, was defined more by its thematics than by its form, whereas the Persian *g̲h̲azal* came to denote a poem of between seven and fourteen lines[36] with a *maṭlaʿ*, or opening line rhyming in both hemistichs; and with a *tak̲h̲alluṣ*, or signature, in the last line (*maḳṭaʿ*). The *g̲h̲azal* had largely displaced the *ḳaṣīda* as the preferred vehicle of poetic expression in Persian by the end of the 7th/13th century.[37] In Arabic, by contrast, the *g̲h̲azal* 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 un-named tribe or two) inclined only to women, or at least confined the object of their *tas̲h̲bīb*s (the amatory introit to the *ḳaṣīda*) to women, and that desire for *g̲h̲ilmān* (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 *g̲h̲azal* is made by Gibb 1974: 44.

[36] Bahār 1954: 80 reckons seven or nine lines to be normative, while eleven should be the up-per limit. He differentiates this from the Persian *ḳaṣīda* in terms of length (claiming that any-thing between eleven and 1000 lines is a *ḳaṣīda*) and subject matter, the *g̲h̲azal* being origi-nally 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 S̲h̲ams-i Ḳays Rāzī: 201, for whom a poem is a *ḳaṣīda* if it is more than fifteen lines and begins with a line rhymed in both hemistichs (*bayt-i maṭlaʿ muṣarraʿ*). If less than fifteen lines, or in the event that it does not begin with a double-rhyme, it is a *ḳiṭʿa*, unless the subject matter is the "arts of love", in which case it is a *g̲h̲azal*. This view, probably following an Arabic manual of po-etics, implies that both latter forms are derived from the *ḳaṣīda*.

[37] See Bausani EI² (s.v. "G̲h̲azal, ii", 1033-36), who traces five periods in the development of the Persian *g̲h̲azal*: the non-formulaic love poems of the 3rd-4th/9th-10th century; the intro-duction 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 Sanāʾī's role in the process); the abstract expressionism of the Indian style; and, finally, the neo-classical and modernist adop-tion of non-traditional themes.

The alternative to the *qaṣīdah*, or at least to the structured *nasīb*, which Ibn Abī Rabīʿah'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 (*muḥdathūn*) of the Abbasid period are credited with the introduction of "various new and independent genres such as *khamriyyāt, ṭardiyyāt, zuhdiyyāt, mudjūniyyāt* and others", Heinrichs argues that the themes of such "genres" can be found in the pre-Islamic *ḳaṣīda*, 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 (Shiblī Nuʿmānī, 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 *ḳaṣīdas* 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 *ḳaṣīda* 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., *shiʿr* in *Warqah 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 *taranak*, 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 *ḳaṣīda*, 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 ʿAyyūḳī'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 *mutaḳārib* 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 (*shiʿr*) and recited *(guft, yād kard)* by one or the other protagonist of the story, punctuate the text of ʿAyyūḳī'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 *takhalluṣ* (though one of the poems observes this, as well), look for all the world like formal *ghazal*s,[43] though ʿAyyūḳī describes them in each instance as "*shiʿr*,"[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 *ḳaṣīda* nor from narrative poetry.

The Persian poets of the 4th/10th century, some writing perhaps as much as one hundred years before ʿAyyūḳī, also usually refer to poems as "*shiʿr*", and also "*bayt*" or "*du-baytī*". They refer to themselves as "*shāʿir*" and to the craft of poetry as "*shāʿirī*". The poems, "*ashʿār*", they compose constitute *naẓm*, 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-Ḥalāwī: 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 *ghazal*s" (Rypka 1968: 177).

[44] ʿAyyūḳī: 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 *ʿushshāḳ-nāma*, made popular by ʿIrāḳī 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 not[46].

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

Madḥ: meaning panegyric, as the intent or theme of a poem.[47] The existence of a _mafʿūl_ form, _mamdūḥ_, meaning the person praised, or patron, used commonly in Arabic and also in Persian (Kaykāwūs b. Washmgīr: 139), suggests that _madḥ_ is viewed as a poet's rhetorical orientation to the addressee, and not as a form.

Madīḥ: same as _madḥ_, but somewhat more concrete (i.e., an instance or product noun), in that a poet can speak of _madīḥ-ī_, a panegyrical poem.[48]

Midḥat: 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-Farazdaḳ by Ghaznavid poets of the 5th/11th century.

Ḳaṣd: used once in a _ḳaṣīda_ 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 _madḥ_ with _hidjā'_, which can describe the same utterance, depending on the context, as he makes clear; and 141:2 (doubt-fully ascribed to Daḳīḳī). 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 Daḳīḳī dresses a panegyric in fine clothes (150:67), contemplates writing one panegyric for a certain patron (153:99), compares the superiority of Rūdakī's _madīḥ_ to his own (156:139-40), and makes a similar comparison in a lament for Shahīd (161:175).

[49] Daḳīḳī uses the word in "O Amir, in praise (_midḥat_) 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 Muḥammad b. Waṣīf 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 *madḥ*:

> *khudār-yā bi-sutūdam ki kirdigār-i man-ast*
> *zabān-am az **ghazal** u **madḥ**-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 (*madḥ*) for his servants.

> *darīgh **midḥat**-i čun durr u ābdār **ghazal***
> *ki čābukī-sh nay-āyad hamī bi lafẓ padīd*[55]
> Alas for pearly praises (*midḥat*) and juicy lyrics (*ghazal*)
> which trip not lightly off of every tongue

Daḳīḳī, 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 beloveds [56].

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 *madḥ* (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 *ḳaṣīda*. 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 *Ḳābūs-nāma* (w. 475/1082) of Kaykāwūs b. Washmgīr, who includes a chapter on poetry (*dar rasm-i shāʿirī*). Here the word *ghazal* (love lyric) is distinguished from other topical genres: *madḥ* (panegyre), *hidjāʾ* (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 *rubāʿī*) and *ḳaṣīda*, 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 *madḥ*, 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 *rubāʿī* or even the non-quantitative *fahlawī*), one is tempted to understand *ghazal* here as a distinct form, like the inlaid poems (*shiʿr*) found in *Warqah wa Gulshāh*. We should understand *madḥ* not as a form of its own, but as an attitude or rhetorical aim of poetry, like *hidjāʾ* (satire). Both of these terms are mentioned in connection with the *kaṣīda* 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 *hidjāʾ* and *madḥ* in another (*ammā ghazal wa marthiyat az yik ṭarīk gūy wa hidjā wa madḥ az yik ṭarīk*), 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 (*maʿnī, lafẓ*) of the rhetorical modes – *hidjāʾ* and *madḥ* – 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. Waṣhmgīr 1366 Sh./1987: 139-140). In the *Ḳābūs-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 *shiʿr*, and one must avoid composing meterless (*bī-wazn) ghazal* and *tarāna* (Kaykāwūs b. Waṣhmgīr 1366 Sh./1987: 142), perhaps indicating that *ghazal* lyrics were commonly composed in non-quantitative popular meters to be sung.

In Raṣhīd al-Dīn Waṭwāṭ's *Ḥadāʾiḳ al-siḥr* (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 *makhlaṣ*, whence *takhallus*, meaning 'escape' 'extrication') of the *kaṣīda*, is described as the segue from the *taṣhbīb* (which in Arabic has the same meaning Waṭwāṭ 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. Waṭwāṭ chooses a few lines from al-Mutanabbī, ʿUnṣurī 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 (*taṣhbīb*) of the poem, to praise for the patron. (Waṭwāṭ 1308 Sh./1930: 31-2)[57]

---

[57] Waṭwāṭ: 31-2. Other passages make it clear that Waṭwāṭ sees the *kiṭʿa* as an independent form (28, 55, 57, 60, 64, 79), along with *kaṣīda* (30, and *kaṣāyid*, 60). The two forms are put side by side (57) as possible forms for a dual-rhyme. *Musammaṭ* is seen as a *kaṣīda* with the added rhetorical artifice of dividing the line into four parts (*ḳism*), the first three observing *sadjʿ*, and the last a rhyme. But after saying that the *musammaṭ* has five or six parts, he then calls them rhyming hemistichs (*miṣrāʿ*, 61-3). Towards the end, in an addendum, he groups *madḥ/madīḥ, hajw/hidjāʾ* and a number of other terms which do not apparently deserve sepa-rate treatment (85-7), including *taṣhbīb*, also known as *nasīb* or *ghazal*, which he glosses as talk about the qualities of the beloved and the poet's love for her. Waṭwāṭ makes it clear he is speaking of the opening section of the *kaṣīda*, which he says is commonly called *taṣhbīb*, re-gardless of the subject matter, if it contains anything other than praise of the patron (85). He

By the time of ʿAwfī's anthology *Lubāb al-albāb* (c. 618/1221), poems are usually introduced by the title *bayt, naẓm, shiʿr, ḳiṭʿa, ḳaṣīda* or "*ghazal*." The latter three seem to be used as technical terms, applied to the forms we recognize today, though it is clear from ʿAwfī's titling of two lines of panegyric as *ghazal* (ʿAwfī 1906: 2: 49), and his description of a *ḳaṣīda* containing a *taghazzul* and *madḥ* section as consisting of lines (*bayt*) of *ghazal* and *madḥ* (ʿAwfī: 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 *ḳaṣīda* and its two derivative forms, *ḳiṭʿa,* 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 *ḳaṣīda* (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 *ḳiṭʿa, rubāʿī*, or by broader prosodic terms like *naẓm*, *shiʿr*, or *bayt* (which can also be a numerator, meaning that just one verse is quoted). He also describes some poems by content – *hazl* or *madḥ* (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 shiʿr wa anwāʿ-i naẓm*), 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 (*ḥikāyat-i waṣl wa hidjr*), which is built out of a pleasant meter, an attractive form (*tarkīb*) and profound meaning (*maʿnī-yi ʿarīḳ*), devoid of recondite expressions, like the poems of Shaykh Saʿdī (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 *rubāʿī*, the 3- and 4-rhymed. Here he treats *tardjīʿ* (called *naghmat*, melody) as a separate genre, and explains the strophic divisions.

meter, form and meaning. And the poems, or "*ashʿār*"[58] of Saʿdī (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 (*muḳaddima*) of the *ḳaṣīda*, 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 *ḳaṣīda*, 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 *mamdūd* or *muḳtaḍab*, which is a *ḳaṣīda* 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 *madḥ*. His terminological equation of *nasīb* and *aghzāl* probably reflects his inclination to reserve the word "*ghazal*" for the formal genre of Saʿdī. It is worth noting, however, that *takhalluṣ* continues with its old meaning, the progression from some other theme to the *madḥ* portion of a poem[59].

Finally, Riḍā Ḳulī 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-tardjīʿ* and *al-tarkīb-band* under separate entries as separate styles or forms (*siyāḳ, ṭarz*) of poem, formerly devoted to royal panegyric but latterly used mostly for didactic, philosophical, mystical and love verse[60]. He, of course, sees the *ghazal* as an independent form[61], and finds it necessary to explain at length the earlier usage of the term *ghazal* in the passage on *takhalluṣ*:

> This artifice is when the poet moves in a nice, pleasing, smooth fashion from the *ghazal*, meaning the *taghazzul* of the *ḳaṣīda* or some other theme (*maʿnī*) 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 *takhalluṣ*, while in this day *takhalluṣ* is the closing lines of ghazals (*maḳāṭiʿ-i ghazaliyyāt*).[62]

---

58 A term suggestive of shorter poems, it probably does not mean to encompass Saʿdī's *mathnawī,* the *Būstān*, but perhaps does not exclude his *ḳaṣīda*s.
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

Khāḳānī (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 Sanāʾī, frequently speaks of his poems having a new style (*shīwa-yi tāza* or *shiʿr-i badīʿ*).[63] In a poem with the *radīf* "ʿUnṣurī," Khāḳānī 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 ʿUnṣurī only tried his hand at *madḥ* and *ghazal* (*djuz az ṭarz-i madḥ u ṭarāz-i ghazal / na-kardī zi ṭabʿ imtiḥān ʿUnṣurī*), and that in *madḥ u ghazal*, Khāḳānī is considered superior to ʿUnṣurī by the cognoscenti (*shināsand afāḍil ki čun man na-būd / bi madḥ u ghazal dur-fishān ʿUnṣurī*). Not only that, Khāḳānī goes on to note that he has adorned the body of poetry with various styles (*shīwa*) of poetry, including *waʿẓ* and *zuhd*, of which ʿUnṣurī was ignorant. In this usage, the terms *madḥ* and *ghazal* evidently still refer primarily to content-related genres, and not formal features of the poem.

With Ẓahīr-i Fāryābī (d. 598/1202), a contemporary of Khāḳānī, 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 shāʿirī-st khud bi-ngar*
> *ki čand gūna kishīdam zi dast-i ū bīdād*
> *bi pīsh-i har ki az-ū yād mī-kunam ḥarf-ī*
> *nimī-kunad pas az ān tā tavānad az man yād*
> *zi shiʿr djins-i **ghazal** bihtar ast u ān-ham nīst*
> *baḍāʿatī 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!

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

---

[63] Cited in Maḥdjūb 1967: 20, quoting from Khāḳānī's *Dīwān*, ʿAbd 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 *ḳawwāl* for a *ghazal* does not compare with what one can get for a *ḳaṣīda* at the court[65].

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 before[67]. In the 7th/13th century Ṣafā sees the *ghazal* developing in two different directions: the love *ghazal* exemplified by Saʿdī, in the tradition of Rūdakī, Ẓahīr, Mudjīr and Kamāl Ismāʿīl; and the mystical *ghazal*, following ʿAṭṭār, and exemplified by ʿIrāḳī, Djalāl al-Dīn Rūmī and Sayf al-Dīn Farghānī[68]. He sees both forms eventually mingling somewhat, especially in Khᵛājū-yi Kirmānī, Kamāl-i Khudjandī, ʿImād, 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 Sanāʾī, 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 (*madḥ*) 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 Moʿamma: eine Quellenstudie zur Kunstform des persischen Rätsels*. Berlin.

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

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

ʿAyyūḳī 1343 Sh./1964: *Warḳah wa Gulshāh-i ʿAyyūḳī*. Ṣafā, Dhabīḥ 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, Ṣāʾib and Ghanī.
67 Ṣafā 1366 Sh./1987: v. 4: 188-9.
68 Ṣafā 1366 Sh./1987: v. 3/1: 320-23.

Aʿẓamī-rād, Gunbad-Durdī 1366 Sh./1987: *Musammaṭ dar shiʿr-i fārsī*. Tehran.

Bahār, Muḥammad Taḳī 1333 Sh./1954: *Shiʿr dar Īrān*. Tehran.

Bakkār, Y.H. 1971: *Ittidjāhāt al-ghazal fī al-ḳarn al-thānī al-hidjrī*. 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 Saʿdi*, 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 Maṣnavīs. *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, Ḳāsim, 1321 Sh./1942: *Tārīkh-i ʿaṣr-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.

Gulčīn-i Maʿānī, Aḥmad 1346 Sh./1967: *Shahr-āshūb dar shiʿr-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, Riḍā Ḳulī Khān: *Madāridj al-balāgha dar ʿilm-i badīʿ*. Maʿrifat, Ḥusayn (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-sarāʾī 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, ʿUnṣur al-Maʿālī: *Ḳābūs-nāma*. Nafīsī, Saʿīd (ed.). 6th ed. 1366 Sh./1987. Tehran.

Khāleghī-Motlagh, Djalal 1978: Ḥamāsa-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 shiʿr-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: *Ashʿār-i parākanda-yi ḳadīmtarīn shuʿarā-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: Sanāʾī and the Origins of the Persian Ghazal* (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago).

Lindley, David 1985: *Lyric*. London.

Maḥdjūb, Sayyid Muḥammad Djaʿfar, 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, ʿAbd 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, Maẓāhir 1335 Sh./1956: *Pāsdārān-i sukhan: čakāma sarāyān.* Vol. 1. Tehran.

Muʾtaman, Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn 1332 Sh./1953: *Shiʿr wa adab-i fārsī*. Tehran.

Muʾtaman, Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn 1339 Sh./1960: *Taḥawwul-i shiʿr-i fārsī*. N.p.

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

Nafīsī, Saʿīd 1341 Sh./1963: *Muḥīṭ-i zindigī wa aḥwāl wa ashʿār-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. *Shiʿr wa mūsīḳī wa sāz wa āwāz dar adabiyyāt-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.

Ṣafā, Dhabīḥ Allāh 1363 Sh./1984: *Ḥamāsa-sarāʾī dar īrān.* 4th ed. [1st ed. 1321 Sh./1942)]. Tehran.

Ṣafā, Dhabīḥ Allāh 1366 Sh./1987: *Tārīkh-i adabbiyāt da Īrān*. Vol. 5, 1. Tehran.

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

Shafīʿī-Kadkanī, Muḥammad-Riḍā 1368 Sh./1989: *Mūsīḳī-yi shiʿr*. Paris.

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

Shamīsā, Sīrūs 1363 Sh./1984: *Sayr-i rubāʿī dar shiʿr-i fārsī*. Tehran.

Shams-i Ḳays Rāzī n.d.: *al-Muʿdjam fī maʿāyīr ashʿār al-ʿadjam*. Mudarris-i Raḍawī, M.T. (ed.). Tehran.

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

Tādj al-Ḥalāwī: *Daḳāyiḳ al-shiʿr*. Kāẓim-Īmām, Sayyid Muḥammad (ed.) 1962. Tehran.

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

Waḥīdiyān-Kāmyār, Taḳī 1357 Sh./1978: *Bar-rasī-yi wazn-i shiʿr-i ʿāmmiyāna-yi fārsī*. Tehran.

Watwāṭ, Rashīd al-Dīn: *Ḥadāʾiḳ al-siḥr*. ʿAbbās 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.

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