



## DĪVĀN III. COLLECTED WORKS OF A POET

---

### iii. COLLECTED WORKS OF A POET.

The word *dīvān* is widely used both in Arabic and Persian to designate the collected poems of a particular author, generally without his or her long poems (*maṭnawīs*). The Arabic philologists of the Abbasid period (many of them of Persian origin) assembled the works of the pre-Islamic Arab poets, which had until then survived only through oral transmission, into collections which they called *dīvāns*, evidently by analogy to the registers or archives in which financial documents were preserved. Then the literate Arabic poets of the Abbasid period often collected their own poems in a *dīvān*, but in some cases their *dīvāns* were put together by others after their death, evidently because they had no time to do so themselves; this is the case, for example, with Motanabbī.

Many of the surviving *dīvāns* of pre-Mongol Persian poets are known only from manuscripts copied in the last two or at most three centuries and evidently represent collections assembled by literati of the Safavid period such as Taqī Kāšī (e.g., the *dīvāns* of Farroḳī, Lāme'ī, Manūčehrī, and 'Onṣorī). In the absence of old manuscripts it is difficult to say whether the Safavid prototypes of these *dīvāns* were based on earlier, lost, copies, or whether they were assembled ad hoc from the stray poems quoted in anthologies. Other published *dīvāns* were put together by their 20th-century editors. On the other



hand, some early *dīvāns*, such as those of Azraqī or Sanā'ī, survive in good 13th-century manuscripts. In any case, Persian *dīvāns* did certainly exist at a very early date. Thus Nāṣer-e Ḳosrow writes that in the year 438/1046 the poet Qaṭrān “came to me and brought the *dīvān* of Monjik and the *dīvān* of Daqīqī” (now both lost) and the same author speaks in his poems of his own ‘two *dīvāns*’ in Arabic and Persian. Neẓāmī Ganjavī indicates that he collected his own *dīvān* before 584/1188 (very early in his career) and his contemporary Farīdal-Dīn ‘Aṭṭār also assembled his own *dīvān*, as he tells us in the introductions to two of his other works (*Moḳtār-nāma* and *Ḳosrow-nāma*). On the other hand the *dīvān* of Ẓahīr Fāryābī was assembled after the author’s death by the poet Shams-al-Dīn Sojāsī, who wrote a preface to it in prose.

In the post-Mongol period it is commonplace for poets to publish their own *dīvāns*. Amīr Ḳosrow collected his own poems at various stages in his life in five different *dīvāns*, for each of which he composed a prose introduction. His example was followed in the three *dīvāns* of Jāmī. By contrast, Sa’dī’s shorter poems are not assembled in a *dīvān* but rather are contained, together with his longer poems and his prose writings in the ‘complete works’ (*kollīyāt*) put together after his death by ‘Alī b. Aḥmad b. Abī Bakr b. Bīsotūn.

In most manuscripts (and modern editions) the poems in a given *dīvān* are grouped by genre (usually with *qaṣīdas* first, then strophic poems, *ḡazals*, *qeṭ‘as*, and *robā‘īs* last) and then within each section the poems are arranged alphabetically by the last letter. However, in early manuscripts the poems are generally not arranged alphabetically, and often not separated by genre either, but often grouped by subject, or by their dedicatee. Both alphabetical and non-alphabetical ordering can be observed in early copies of Arabic *dīvāns* as well; it is thus likely that both systems were used for Persian *dīvāns* from an early date.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

Nāṣer-e Ḳosrow, *Dīvān*, ed. M. Mīnovī and M. Moḥaqqueq, Tehran 1353 Š./1974, *qaṣīda* 64 v. 46; *qaṣīda* 177 v. 51.

Idem, *Safar-nāma*, ed. M. T. Dabīrsīāqī, Tehran 1354 Š./1976, p. 9.



Nezāmī Ganjavī, *Laylī o Majnūn*, ed. A. A. Aleskerzade and F. Babayev, Moscow 1965, p. 39.

Storey/de Blois, V (for the manuscripts of Persian *dīvāns*). Zāhīr Fāryābī, *Dīvān*, ed. T. Bīneš, Mašhad, 1337 Š./1959, pp. 2-9.