Published: December 15, 2010
Last Updated: May 14, 2018

ḴĀQĀNI ŠERVĀNI II. WORKS

ḴĀQĀNI ŠERVĀNI

ii. Works

Qaṣidas and tarjiʿāt. Ḵāqāni's fame rests on his qaṣidas, of which, in Żiāʾ-al-Din Sajjādi's edition, there are one hundred and thirty-two (*Divān*, pp. 1-444). One should add to these his sixteen *tarjiʿāt* (pp. 446-546). The *tarjiʿband* was, at the time, considered as a specific kind of qaṣida (Šams-e Qays, [ed. 1981], pp. 400-401[= ed. 1956, pp. 393-94]). None of the tarjiʿāt of Ḵāqāni has an identically repeated refrain. More than a quarter of his qaṣidas have a strophic character as well, through the use of the stylistic figure *taṣriʿ*, which means that new themes are introduced by a line in which both hemistiches rhyme (*tajdid-e maṭlaʿ*, a new beginning; on the device, Reinert, 1964-65, passim; 1990b, pp. 246 and 255, n. 32).

Of these qaṣidas and tarjiʿāt, nearly two-thirds are panegyrics. Most of them are profane, but some are in praise of the Prophet (*naʿtiyas*). These naʿtiyas in particular, but many of his other panegyrics as well, more specifically those dedicated to mystical and religious figures, have an ethical and pious content (*zohdiyas*).

A substantial number (around a quarter) of the qaṣidas lack a panegyric section; these are either zohdiyas (e.g., qaṣida pp. 171-73), complaint poems (*šakwāʾiyas*, e.g., the qaṣida of pp. 62-68), lamenting the fickleness of fate, or poems rebuking inimical poets and others at court, mingled with self-praise

(*faḵr*), boasting of his own superiority in poetry (e.g., qaṣida pp. 17-19). Conspicuous among these are five long qaṣidas concerning the ḥajj, although one of them incorporates some lines of praise for the above-mentioned Jamāl-al-Din Mawṣeli and the caliph al-Moqtafi (*Divān*, pp. 215-21). Some of these non-panegyric qaṣidas are among Ḵāqāni's best-known poems. An example is his qaṣida known as *Merʾāt al-ṣafā*, beginning *Ma-rā del pir-e taʿlim ast o man ṭefl-e zabān-dān-aš* (pp. 209-15), which opens many manuscripts of his divan and can be considered as a kind of manifesto. In this complex poem Ḵāqāni expresses, among other things, his ambiguous attitude towards his life as a court poet: his high aspiration (*hemmat*) would logically require the severance of ties with this material world, but this is something which he cannot afford (Beelaert, 2000, pp. 108-9; de Bruijn, 1997, pp. 45-47). This poem was later the object of a number of responses (*jawāb*s) or emulations (*naẓira*s); among the poets who tried their hand were Amir Ḵosrow, Jāmi, Fożuli, and ʿOrfi (Sajjādi, Introduction to the *Divān*, pp. lx-lxii). In another famous non-panegyric ode, the contemplation of the ruins of the Sasanid palace at Madāʾen, beginning *Hān ey del-e ʿebrat-bin az dida ʿabar kon hān/ayvān-e madāʾen rā āyina-ye ʿebrat dān*, elicits a warning about the transience of royal courts (*Divān*, pp. 358-60; Meisami, 1996a; tr. in 1996b).

Over twenty long poems (qaṣidas and tarjiʿāt) are elegies (marṯias), among them some poignant ones for his son Rašid-al-Din, who died of epilepsy in his youth.

Most of Ḵāqāni's courtly qaṣidas and tarjiʿāt were written to celebrate the festivals of the New Year (*Nowruz*) or of the end of the month of fasting, Ramadan (*ʿid-e feṭr*). Other occasions which called for qaṣidas were local events, such as the completion of an important dam on the river Kor at Bāqelāni (*band-e Bāqelāni*; see on one of these, *Divān*, pp. 45-49, below, Beelaert, forthcoming). The qaṣidas on the occasion of the *ʿid* in particular are very elaborate, and all but one have more than one maṭlaʿ, introducing different aspects of the feast, such as the dawn of the first day of the festivities, the new moon, the season in which the celebration takes place, and an amorous theme (see on one of these, *Divān*, pp. 388-92; Beelaert, forthcoming).

A characteristic feature of Ḵāqāni's qaṣidas is the use of radif after the rhyme (*qāfiya*). More than half of his qaṣidas are with radif (*moraddaf*), and these can vary from a single word (a substantive, e.g., *ḵāk* in the qaṣida pp. 237-39; or, more often, a verbal form, e.g., *afšānda-and* in the qaṣida pp. 105-11; or a complete sentence, e.g., *bar natābad biš az-in*, qaṣida pp. 337-40). In contrast to

other poets of the period who use a substantive as radif just to show their virtuosity, he chooses the radif in relation to the qaṣida's subject (the above-mentioned qaṣida with radif *ḵāk* is an elegy; Reinert, 1972, pp. 40-41).

Shorter verse-forms. The *Divān* as edited by Sajjādi contains both a section of short qaṣidas (*qaṣāʾed-e kučak*, pp. 744-810) and a section of *qeṭaʿāt* (lit. 'fragments,' i.e., relatively short occasional or topical poems, pp. 810-937), reflecting a tradition in a number of manuscripts (e.g., in a ms. at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, suppl. persan 1816). In the edition of Mir Jalāl-al-Din Kazzāzi these "short" qaṣidas are merged into one section with the lyrical poems (*ḡazals*, II, pp. 768-1082). These poems vary greatly in length and are similar in subject matter to the qeṭaʿāt, except for having an initial line (maṭlaʿ) with rhyming hemistiches. They have been written for a variety of occasions and contain, for example, panegyric pieces (e.g., p. 773, vv. 8-17), elegies (e.g., p. 902), excuses (e.g., p. 844, vv. 15-16), faḵriyas (e.g., p. 881, vv. 5-7), šakwāʾiyas (e.g., p. 784), ascetic poems (zohdiyas; e.g., pp. 782-83) and a small number of satirical pieces (e.g., p. 903, and, against women, pp. 876-77; Zipoli, 2002). Some are to be found in Ḵāqāni's letters as well (e.g., p. 839, ll. 8-10; in *Monšaʾāt*, p. 145). Even if many of them may have been composed extempore, his mastery is always evident.

Ḵāqāni wrote more than three hundred ghazals (pp. 548-700; see ḠAZAL), mostly profane love poems, and many featuring the traditional wayward beloved and the rejected lover. Here, as in his qaṣidas, Ḵāqāni frequently uses a radif—mostly verbal forms, but also unexpected phrases (e.g., p. 554, *zir-e āb*; and p. 575, *sag-e kuy-at*), resulting in a tightly-knit poem. (One thousand verses from the ghazals were incorporated in Meneghini, *Lirica Persica Hypertext*.)

Of the approximately three hundred *robāʿi*s in Sajjādi's edition of his *Divān*, some have been ascribed to different authors in other sources (e.g., *Divān*, p. 724, vv. 13-14: cited by Rāvandi [p. 369] as composed by the Saljuq Toḡrel III; *Divān*, p. 734, v. 14-p. 735, v. 1: attributed in the anthology *Nozhat al-majāles* [p. 212, no. 791] to ʿĀyeša Samarqandi). Their subject matter is varied: they include amorous and panegyric poems and šakwāʾiyas.

Toḥfat al-ʿErāqayn. Ḵāqāni wrote only one mathnawi, known under the title of *Toḥfat al-ʿErāqayn*. (Its original title, *Ḵatm al-ḡarāʾeb* is found in its oldest ms. in Vienna; see the facsimile edition by Afšār, 2006 and Beelaert, 1995, 2007-08; about another mathnawi with this title ascribed to Ḵāqāni, see below.) The *Toḥfat al-ʿErāqayn* is an unusual mathnawi. Although it has certain affinities

with some earlier mathnawis (such as Sanāʾi's *Kār-nāma-ye Balḵ*; see Beelaert, 2000, pp. 45-46, 130), in its form it is even more similar to Ḵāqāni's own qaṣidas with multiple maṭlaʿs. In this case the poem is punctuated by renewed lyrical addresses to the Sun—it is the addressee of three quarters of its well over three thousand verses—in terms which reflect the topics of the poem. The Sun thus becomes a complex and vital symbol of the issues raised in it (Beelaert, 2000, pp. 29-113). It is the Sun to whom Ḵāqāni complains about his plight, and it is the Sun who is asked to perform the ḥajj he claims to be unable to perform himself because he cannot leave Šervān. Ḵāqāni maps the route for the Sun, describes and praises the places and people the Sun will see, and asks him to deliver two long panegyrics of the Kaʿba and the Prophet at Mecca and Medina. In the last part of the poem there is a shift of addressee from the Sun to Jamāl-al-Din Mawṣeli, the vizier of the Zangids, who spent a fortune in embellishing the Holy Places (see above). In this part Ḵāqāni also praises a number of family members and friends. A topic throughout the poem is an ethical dilemma: how can one be a poet and at the same time avoid wasting one's talent on a secular patron? The solution to this dilemma could be praising the Prophet only, but in this poem the solution consists in praising an ideal worldly patron, "someone who has Moḥammad's goodness" (*Moḥammad-eḥsān*), namely Jamāl-al-Din Mawṣeli (Beelaert, 2000, p. 84).

Monšaʾāt. Ḵāqāni expressed more than once his pride in being highly gifted in both poetry and prose (*naẓm o naṯr*; e.g., *Divān*, p. 873, v. 5), and there is proof that he was indeed appreciated as a prose-writer from early on (Varāvini, p. 16); the only prose he seems to have written (except for the prose introduction to the *Toḥfat al-ʿErāqayn*) are letters, a highly appreciated literary genre at the time. A small number of manuscripts (see bibliography) provide us with some sixty letters; unsurprisingly, no autographs. It is clear that these are only a small portion of those he must have written, and it is to be expected that more letters may be discovered in hitherto not fully examined miscellanies. Although one has to be on one's guard for apocrypha (as in the case of Sanāʾi; see *EI*[2], s.v.), the literary quality of most of the letters leaves little room for doubt. They contain numerous verses (not always found in his *Divān*). The letters are not dated, but include both letters presumably written before 1160, during the reign of the Ḵāqān Manučehr, and later ones, written during his life in Tabriz. They have been used for biographical purposes by Kandli (see bibliography) and Beelaert (2000, passim).

A short mathnawi, also entitled *Ḵatm al-ḡarāʾeb*, was found under the name of

Ḵāqāni as appendix to a manuscript of the *Toḥfat al-ʿErāqayn* from the end of 18th-19th century (Sepahsālār, no. 272; ed. Sajjādi, *FIZ*, 1965, pp. 155-87). It has become clear that this poem, of which there is also another manuscript, is a *naẓira*—a poem modeled on the *Toḥfat*—and not a work by Ḵāqāni himself (Beelaert, 1995; 2007-08).

Ḵāqāni's style and imagery. Ḵāqāni must certainly be considered as a 'mannerist' poet; however, it is necessary to define this term within the context of classical Persian poetry. To some extent, all classical Persian poetry may be considered mannerist, in the sense that each poem reflects earlier poems rather than 'reality'—poems it tries to emulate—and extensively makes use of rhetorical figures. Therefore a dichotomy between 'classical' and 'mannerist' poetry, in the same way as in Western poetry, cannot be applied (Heinrichs, 1974, pp. 118-28). Nevertheless, even within a Persian context, one can distinguish between poets according to the degree in which they foreground language itself. This gives us, on one side of the spectrum, poets using a more 'natural' and flowing diction (an example of such a poet would be Saʿdi) and, on the other side of the spectrum, those whose language is, on the contrary, characterized by being more highly rhetorically crafted and ornate, as well as showing a vast array of surprising images. Ḵāqāni clearly belongs to the latter category. Ḵāqāni's mannerism appears, moreover, from his great love for paradox, as the paradox has been postulated as the quintessential principle of mannerism (see references in Beelaert, 2000, p. 3, n. 4). Indeed, in his works, paradox not only molds single verses or whole passages, but even the whole of his only mathnawi, *Toḥfat al-ʿErāqayn* (see below and Beelaert, 2000, pp. 93-94 and passim).

In his thought-provoking *Ḫāqānī als Dichter* (1972) Benedikt Reinert has attempted to describe Ḵāqāni's intricate rhetoric through the formalism of mathematical set theory.

Throughout his works, in his *Divān* and in his *Toḥfat al-ʿErāqayn*, as well as in his letters, there are a number of recurring topics. Such as, first of all, descriptions of dawn or daybreak and the sun, and (though this only in the *Divān*), the wine drunk at dawn (*ṣabuḥ*). Examples of his descriptions of dawn—some thirty of which feature in his qaṣidas and strophic poems—may serve here to show some characteristics of his style. We find in them metaphors taken from a great number of semantic spheres. All these semantic spheres may have been used previously in this context by poets, Arabic and Persian alike, but in his hands they offer more than ever before. Many of the

metaphors he created became stock metaphors after him and, eventually, lexical items, so that one can easily forget that he was the first to use them. Dawns were traditionally described in, for instance, amorous or martial terms. In these descriptions, images, both sweet, as of costly perfumes (in evoking dawn's freshness) and of costly clothes (in evoking its colorfulness), and cruel, as of bloody battles or medical treatments and diseases, were already a given in Ḵāqāni's time. However, the sheer richness in his interpretations of these basic features and the staccato succession of the images in any of his poems were without precedence.

Dawns described in terms of 'unveiling,' in which the 'veil' discarded is the darkness of the night, and sartorial imagery in general in this context, combined with a personification of the different elements composing the scene, can already be found in the qaṣidas of Ghaznavid poets (e.g., Farroḵi, qaṣida 5, v. 1: "At daybreak, when the air tore the veil (*parda*) of the night/the day, with a linen cloak, rose above the mountains"). But, typically, in his qaṣida beginning with *Rokhsār-e ṣobḥ parda ba-ʿamdā bar-afkanad/rāz-e del-e zamāna ba-ṣaḥrā bar-afkanad* (pp. 133-40; see above), Ḵāqāni composes a dawn scene in which sartorial imagery is maintained for several consecutive lines; such a drawing of terms from one semantic field is, in terms of Arabic and Persian stylistics, a *tanāsob* ('congruity'), but with earlier poets this stylistic figure usually shapes a single line, not a whole passage. This prolonged drawing from the same semantic field leads to a great lexical richness, and this is also one of the characteristics of Ḵāqāni's style: the use of the 'precise' word, instead of the more 'common' one. Also his well-known use of precise 'scientific' terminology, because of which he is considered a difficult poet, is an example of this same pursuit. This qaṣida's first line, "The face of dawn deliberately threw down its veil/threw down the secret of the heart of time (i.e., the sun) onto the plain," begins with the well-known image of daybreak tearing down the veil of night. But then it goes on with a flood of other sartorial images, including a hood worn over a turban (*ṭaylasān*, v. 2), a *borqaʿ* (v. 4), the yellow piece of cloth (*zard-pāra*) Jews had to wear to distinguish themselves (v. 5), a piece of brocade cloth (*qawāra-ye dibā*) visible from the opening in front of a garment (*jayb*, v. 6), and, finally, a piece of cloth (*roqʿa*) on which games are played (v. 7).

Another dazzling, complex, and tightly knit dawn qaṣida is the one beginning *Jobhat-e zarrin namud ṭorra-ye ṣobḥ az neqāb* (pp. 45-49), written for the occasion of the *band-e Bāqelāni* (see above; discussed in detail in Beelaert,

forthcoming). It describes the advent of spring and has also an ethical theme, made explicit by an evocation of an encounter with the prophet Ḵeżr (q.v.). It is a qaṣida in which the idea of 'dawn' itself shapes not only the lyrical introduction, but the whole poem, by way of the repetition of the very word (*ṣobḥ*) in every line, used both in a literal and figurative sense—a brilliant example of the stylistic figure *eltezām*. Moreover, the rhyme-syllable *–āb*, as a separate word, has a literal and a figurative meaning, namely 'water' and 'honor.' 'Water' links up with the 'water theme' of the building of the dam and the (according to the Galenic system) 'water' signs of the Zodiac, Aquarius and Pisces, of the last two months of winter, which the advent of spring leaves behind. 'Honor' links up with the ethical theme; the 'dawn' of the poem, namely, is also the 'dawn of reason' (v. 21: *sobḥ-e ḵerad*), and it is indicated that wine should be forsaken for water. As in the qaṣida with the radif *bar–afkanad*, sartorial imagery is used in the first hemistich, with the expected 'veil' (here: *neqāb*), but then is continued by describing the colors involved by use of a series of animals known for their fur: the panther (*palang*, v. 3), the mink (*fanak*), and the beaver (*qondoz*, v. 5). Further unity in the first *nasib* is conferred by the semantic sphere of 'symptoms' or 'facial expressions,' physically or psychologically motivated: 'sneezing' (v. 1), 'laughing' (vv. 1 and 2), 'winking,' 'crying' (v. 2), and 'vomiting' (v. 4).

This last example also shows that we should be wary of putting the divide between 'beautiful' and 'ugly' in an anachronistic way. For example, images taken from (symptoms) of disease are quite common in his poetry, and these were sometimes considered as offensive in later periods, both in the West and in Iran (Beelaert, 2000, pp. 61-65, 87-93 and 161-79).

In his *Toḥfat al-ʿErāqayn* Ḵāqāni fully exploits the symbolic potential of a single image, in this case the Sun. He uses this heavenly body's connotations to make it an analogue of himself, the Prophet, and his mamduḥ, Jamāl-al-Din Mawṣeli, and a symbol of both the single vice as well as, paradoxically, the two virtues at stake. These are his own greed, Jamāl-al-Din's generosity, and the *hemmat* ('high aspiration') of both of them (see Beelaert, 2000, pp. 29-113).

The style of Ḵāqāni's letters has to be evaluated within the context of *enšāʾ*. Contemporary treatises, such as Moḥammad al-Meyhani's *Dastur-e dabiri* (from 1180), show how it was advised that all naturalness be avoided in favor of a high degree of ornateness. This makes medieval Persian letters not always enjoyable for modern readers. Ḵāqāni's letters, however, distinguish themselves favorably within this context. Indeed, circumlocution and the use

of metaphors, descriptions, and comparisons were recommended (see, among others, Meyhani, pp. 36-38). But in Ḵāqāni's case we see real poetic inspiration, and his letters are a genuine goldmine of original metaphors and impressive descriptions. Some of the letters stand out by their poetic power, for instance, letter 13 (pp. 85-92), which has a 'solar' construction analogous to that of the *Toḥfat al-ʿErāqayn* and begins with a three-page long description of the sun (see Beelaert, 2000, p. 101, n. 297).

Influence and reception of Ḵāqāni. Ḵāqāni's literary background consisted both of classical Arabic poetry (e.g., in the autobiographical passage in the *Toḥfat al-ʿErāqayn* [p. 219] already referred to, he mentions al-Maʿarri's [973-1058] *Saqṭ al-zand*) and the great Ghazanavid poets (especially ʿOnṣori, Masʿud-e Saʿd-e Salmān, and Sanāʾi). His own poetry, in particular his daring imagery, was to have a momentous influence, first of all on his younger fellow countryman Neẓāmi Ganjavi, and through the latter on Persian poetry in general. His qaṣidas influenced both those of poets of the late 12th and early 13th century, such as Šams-al-Din Ṭabasi (Introduction, pp. xxxii-xxxiii) and Sayf-al-Din Esfarangi (Introduction, pp. 46-47) and later on, in the 16th century, with the new flowering of the qaṣida in Indo-Persian poetry, those of poets such as Fayżi and ʿOrfi. This influence appears, among others, in the qaṣidas many of these poets wrote in response (*jawāb*) to his poems (see also above). Moreover, the inclusion of many of Ḵāqāni's qaṣidas in a large number of anthologies from the centuries after his death proves that they were still read, although, as we may gather from the number of qaṣidas included, he was not as popular as his contemporary Anwari (q.v.; d. not long after 1164-65) who also excelled in this verse form. Given their rich vocabulary and ingenuous images, Ḵāqāni's poems proved, from early on, a challenge to their readers, and hence required commentaries for their elucidation (see bibliography).

Although some Iranian scholars in modern times have expressed an unbounded admiration for him (Ṣafā, 1977, pp. 782-84), his 'difficulty,' as well as his ways of combining the 'beautiful' with the 'ugly,' has often been an obstacle to a full appreciation. A case in point is ʿAli Dašti (1894-1982; q.v.), who, in 1961 published his essayistic work under the telltale title *Ḵāqāni, šāʿer-e dir-ašnā* ('Ḵāqāni, the inaccessible poet'). In this work, which also includes a substantial and thematically ordered anthology, he contrasts Ḵāqāni with Saʿdi, about whom he had written a study some years before. To him, as to many others, Saʿdi's poetry, showing 'fluency and simplicity,' is the opposite of Ḵāqāni's. Although he admits to Ḵāqāni's great talent, he also expresses regret

for the 'strangeness' (*ḡarābat*) and 'unpleasantness' (*nāḵoši*) of some of his images. Foruzānfar too, in his subtle and positive evaluation of the poet, deplores that sometimes he appears to be 'unbalanced' (*birun az eʿtedāl*; 1990, p. 618). Such a difficulty in coming to terms with Ḵāqāni's unexpected imagery can be seen even in the criticism of recent specialists (e.g., Kazzāzi, 1989, pp. 365-66). Not everybody is attuned to the splendors Ḵāqāni offers, but those who are, are richly rewarded.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Earlier bibliographies, only partly repeated here, are found in Rypka, *Hist. Iran. Lit.* (up to 1968; particularly detailed concerning Russian publications); Ḡaffār Kandli, tr. Mir Hedāyat Ḥeṣāri, *Ḵāqāni-e Šervāni, ḥayāt, zabān o mohiṭ-e u*, pp. 650-67 (up to 1972; includes references to all his own articles from 1967 to 1974); Iraj Afšār, *Fehrest-e maqālāt-e fārsi/Index Iranicus*, vols. 1-5 (up to 1991); ʿAbd-al-Rasul Ḵayyāmpur (Tāhbāz-zāda), *Farhang-e soḵanvarān*, rev. ed., 2 vols., 1990-94, I, pp. 292-94; Storey/de Blois, *Persian Literature* V/2, pp. 398-99 (up to 1994); 2nd rev. edition, with extra references, as François de Blois, *Persian Literature, a Bio-bibliographical Survey*, vol. V*: Poetry of the Pre-Mongol Period,* London and New York, pp. 332-33. For an annotated survey of studies up to 1998, see Beelaert, 2000, pp. 4-10.

Manuscripts and editions. The *Divān* has been preserved in a great number of manuscripts, both separately (Monzawi, *Nosḵahā* III, pp. 2308-313) and as part of the *Kolliyāt* (ibid., pp. 1856-57). The oldest dated ms. is a *Divān* in the British Library in London (Or. 7942). There is little doubt that this ms. is indeed of 2 (or 8) Šawwāl 664/July 7 (or 13) 1266 (according to its colophon). An older date of 594/1197-98, found on a gilded medallion on fol. 223a, is not to be trusted: this folio from another ms. had apparently been added later by forgers, in order to give the ms. a yet more ancient aspect (see *EIr*. X, s.v. "FORGERIES iv. OF ISLAMIC MANUSCRIPTS," p. 97b: quoting Mojtabā Minovi [1957]). The ms. did not contain that particular folio when it was still part of the library of Farhād Mirzā Moʿtamed-al-Dawla (q.v.).

The only critical edition of the *Divān*, by Żiāʾ-al-Din Sajjādi, Tehran, 1959 (repr. 1978), is based on this ms. and three undated ones written between the end of the 6th/12th and beginning of the 9th/15th centuries in libraries in Tehran and Paris (Sajjādi, pp. lxvii-lxx). The more recent edition of Mir Jalāl-al-Din Kazzāzi, 2 vols., Tehran, 1996 does not have a critical apparatus. It is mainly based on Sajjādi's edition, although some mss. were consulted (vol. I, p. iii). Kazzāzi published a commentary on the *Divān* in a separate volume, *Gozāreš-e došvārihā-ye divān-e Ḵāqāni*, Tehran, 1999. Earlier, both the *Divān* and the *Toḥfat al-ʿErāqayn* had been lithographed several times in India during the 19th and early 20th centuries (Mošār, *Fehrest* I, pp. 805 and 1523). First printed edition of the *Divān* in Iran by ʿAli ʿAbd-al-Rasuli, Tehran, 1937 (includes some commentaries in the footnotes); ed. Moḥammad ʿAbbāsi, Tehran, 1957 (includes a number of subject indexes by Ḥosayn Naḵaʾi).

The *Toḥfat al-ʿErāqayn* is included in mss. of the *Kolliyāt* (see Monzawi, above), but some old mss. give it as a separate text (Monzawi, op. cit., IV, pp. 2714-18). Most notably, bearing the original title *Ḵatm al-ḡarāʾeb*, in an only recently catalogued ms. in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, dated 12 Jomāda I 593/2 April 1197, no. Mixt 845, discovered by Iraj Afšār (ed. by him in facsimile with a long introduction (pp. ix-xxix, first published as an article in *Maʿāref* 16/2; see below) and a German foreword by Bert Fragner and Noṣrat-Allāh Rastegār, Vienna and Tehran, 2006; detailed review by Beelaert in *Nāmeh-ye Bahārestān* (see below); see also Beelaert, 2000, pp. ix-x, and 199-203). Another important ms., dated *Rabiʿ* II 791/April 1389, is located in the library of the Aya Sofya in Istanbul (no. 1762/2; Ateş, *Istanbul kütüphanelerinde*, no. 83; Beelaert, 2000, pp. 23-25). Neither were used by Yaḥyā Qarib in his critical, but not entirely reliable edition, Tehran, 1954 (Introduction, pp. *nun–za–nun–ṭā*Toḥfat al-ʿErāqayn was first printed by Moḥammad Yusof Kukan, with the 18th-century commentary by Mir Moḥammad Esmāʿil Khan Abjadi, in *Kolliyāt-e Abjadi* IV, 2nd ed., Madras, 1954, pp. 1-288.

The oldest ms. which contains letters of Ḵāqāni is in Istanbul (Lālā Ismaʿil no. 600), undated but not later than the 7th/13th century (Rowšan, introduction to the *Monšaʾāt*, pp. *dāl–hā*). It contains thirty letters (Ateş, who describes the contents of this ms. in "Recueil de lettres de Xāqānī-i Şirwānī," mentions only twenty-seven letters, but overlooked three very short ones). More mss. have surfaced in the course of time, and the edition of Żiāʾ-al-Din Sajjādi (*Majmuʿa-ye nāmahā-ye Ḵāqāni-e Šervāni*, Tehran, 1967) is based on two more mss. containing a smaller number of letters (pp. iv-v). Moḥammad Rowšan, for his

edition (*Monšaʾāt-e Ḵāqāni*, Tehran, 1970, 2nd edition, with addenda, 1983) used another ms. in Istanbul (Šahid ʿAli Paša no. 2796, a *majmuʿa*) from the 9th/15th century, which contains forty-eight letters, and only twenty in common with Lālā Ismaʿil (introduction, pp. *dāl–yā–za*). At least one other ms. exists, which has not yet been used for an edition (Bodleian, Oxford, Fraser 61).

Commentaries. Ḵāqāni was considered a difficult poet, and from at least the 15th century on, commentaries on his works were written, both in Iran and India. For commentaries on the *Divān*, see: Minorsky, "Khāqāni and Andronicos Comnenos," pp. 150-51; Sajjādi. *Ḥawāši*, pp. 153-65; Monzawi, *Nosḵahā* V, pp. 3464-67, 3488, 3513, 3448-49; Storey/de Blois V/2, pp. 391-93; Beelaert, 2000, pp. 26-27. For commentaries on the *Toḥfat* see: Monzawi, *Nosḵahā* V, pp. 3457-58; Storey/de Blois, V/2, p. 397; Beelaert, 2000, pp. 25-26.

Sources and Studies. Iraj Afšār, "*Ḵatm al-ḡarāʾeb = Toḥfat al- ʿErāqayn.* Nosḵa-ye mowarraḵ-e 593 (Viyan)," *Maʿāref* 16/2, November 1999, pp. 3-38.

Idem, *Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the Austrian National Library and the Austrian State Archives in Vienna/Fehrest-e dastnevishā-ye fārsi dar ketābḵāna-ye melli-e otriš va āršiv-e dawlati-e otriš dar Viyan*, Vienna and Tehran 2003, pp. 84-87.

Aṯir-al-Din Aḵsikati, *Divān*, ed. Rokn-al-Din Homāyun-Farroḵ, Tehran, 1958.

Jamšid ʿAlizāda, *Sāḡeri dar miān-e sangestān*, Tehran, 1999; 2nd ed., 2003.

Ḥosayn Āmuzgār, *Moqaddama-ye Toḥfat al-ḵawāṭer wa zobdat al-nawāẓer* (sic) *yā Toḥfat al- ʿErāqayn-e Ḵāqāni*, Tehran, 1954.

Sayyed ʿAli Ardalān Javān, *Tajalli-e šāʿerāna-ye asāṭir va revāyāt-e tāʿriḵi o maḏhabi dar ašʿār-e Ḵāqāni*, Tehran, 1989.

Idem, *Taṣwirhā-ye zibā dar ašʿār-e Ḵāqāni*, Tehran, 1995.

Ahmed Ateş, "Recueil de lettres de Xāqānī-i Şirwānī (*Munşaʾāt-e Xāqānī*)," in *Trudi XXV mezhdunarodnogo kongressa vostokovedov* II, Moscow 1963, pp. 356-62.

Idem, *Istanbul kütüphanelerinde farsça manzum eserler*, Istanbul 1968.

Moḥammad-Reżā Barzegar Ḵāleqi, *Šarḥ-e Divān-e Ḵāqāni*, vol. 1, Tehran, 2008.

Alessandro Bausani, “La letteratura neopersiana,” in Antonino Pagliaro and Alessandro Bausani, *Storia della letteratura persiana*, Milan, 1960, pp. 398-405 and 634-40.

Anna Livia Beelaert, “La qaṣide en honneur d’Ispahan de Xāqāni et la recherche du Xatm al-ḡarāʾeb,” in Christophe Balaÿ, Claire Kappler, and Živa Vesel, eds., *Pand-o sokhan. Mélanges offerts à Charles-Henri de Fouchécour*, Paris, 1995, pp. 53-63.

Idem, *A Cure for the Grieving. Studies on the Poetry of the 12th-Century Persian Court Poet Khāqānī Širwānī*, Leiden, 2000 (includes also a number of articles published before).

Idem, “The *Saugand-nāma* (or *Qasamīya*), a Genre in Classical Persian Poetry,” in Maria Szuppe, ed., *Iran. Questions et Connaissances*, Vol. 2, *Périodes médiévale et moderne*, Paris, 2002, pp. 55-73.

Idem, “The Khatm al-Ġarāʾeb Manuscript of AH 593 (AD 1197),” *Nāmeh-ye Bahārestān*, 8-9 in one/ser.no. 13-14, 2007-08, pp. 5-18.

Idem, “Panegyric Poetry from the Seljuqs to the Delhi Sultanate,” in François de Blois, ed., *Studies in Persian Literature*, forthcoming.

J. T. P. de Bruijn, *Persian Sufi Poetry. An Introduction to the Mystical Use of Persian Poems*, Richmond, 1997.

Jerome W. Clinton, “The *Madāen Qaṣida* of Xāqāni Sharvāni I,” *Edebiyât* 1/2, 1976, pp. 153-70.

Idem, “The *Madāen Qaṣida* of Xāqāni Sharvāni, II: Xāqāni and al-Buhturī,” *Edebiyât* 2/1, 1977, pp. 191-206.

ʿAli Dašti, *Ḵāqāni, šāʿer-e dir-āšnā*, Tehran, 1961.

Jamāl-al-Din Moḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Razzāq Eṣfahāni, *Divān*, ed. Waḥid Dastgerdi, Tehran, 1941.

Sayf-al-Din Esfarangi, *Divān*, ed. Z. Ṣeddiqi, Multan, 1979.

Moḥammad Esteʿlāmi, *Naqd o šarḥ-e qasāʾed-e Ḵāqāni bar asās-e taqrirāt-e ostād Foruzānfar*, 2 vols., Tehran, 2008.

Hermann Ethé, “Neupersische Litteratur,” in W. Geiger and E. Kuhn, *Grundriss der iranischen Philologie* II, Strassburg, 1904, pp. 263-65.

Farroḵi Sistāni, *Divān*, ed. Moḥammad Dabir Siāqi, 2nd ed. Tehran, 1970.

Badiʿ-al-Zamān Foruzānfar, *Soḵan wa soḵanvarān*, 4th ed., Tehran, 1990, pp. 612-84.

Hādī Ḥasan, *Falakī-i Shirwānī: His Times, Life and Works*, London, 1929.

Wolfhart Heinrichs, “‘Manierismus’ in der arabischen Literatur,” in Richard Gramlich, ed., *Islamwissenschaftliche Abhandlungen: Fritz Meier zum sechzigsten Geburtstag*, Wiesbaden, 1974, pp. 118-28.

Jamāl Ḵalil-e Šervāni, *Nozhat al-majāles*, ed. Moḥammad Amin Riāḥi, Tehran, 1987.

Ḡaffār Kandli (also known, or referred to, as Kandli-Harisči, Kanadali, Kendli; in Rypka, *Hist. Iran. Lit.*, erroneously, as Kandī), “Nāma ba Waḥid-al-Din ʿOṯmān, Ḵāqāni va Najm-al-Din Aḥmad Simgar,” *NDAT* 21, 1969, pp. 235-51.

Idem, “Vā-bastagi-e Ḵāqāni ba Ganja,” *NDAT* 21, 1969, pp. 319-44, and 22, 1970, pp. 42-64.

Idem, “Ḵāqāni va ārzu-ye Ḵorāsān,” *MDAM* 6/4, 1970, pp. 802-36.

Idem, “Šams-al-Din Maḥmud b. ʿAli va Ḵāqāni-e Šervāni,” *NDAT* 23, 1971, pp. 145-87.

Idem, *Khagani Shirvani, haiaty, dovru va muhiti*, Baku, 1972, tr. Mir Hedāyat Ḥeṣāri as *Ḵāqāni-e Šervāni, ḥayāt, zamān o mohiṭ-e u*, Tehran, 1995.

Mir Jalāl-al-Din Kazzāzi, *Roḵsār-e ṣobḥ, gozāreš-e čāma-i az Afżal al-Din Badil Ḵāqāni-e Šervāni*, Tehran, 1989.

Idem, *Sarāča-ye Āvā o rang. Ḵāqāni-šenāsi*, Tehran, 1997.

Idem, *Suzan-e ʿIsā, gozāreš-e čāma-ye tarsāʾi-e Ḵāqāni*, 2nd ed., Tabriz, 2007.

Fateme Keshavarz, *A Descriptive and Analytical Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the Library of the Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine*, London, 1986, pp. 29-35.

N. de Khanikof, “Mémoire sur Khâcâni, poëte persan du XIIe siècle,” *Journal Asiatique* 6/4, 1864, pp. 137-200, 6/5, pp. 296-367; pub. as monograph, Paris, 1865.

Dickran K. Kouymjian, “A Unique Coin of the Shirvānshāh Minūchihr II, dated A.H. 555/1160 A.D.,” in Dickran K. Kouymjian, ed., *Near Eastern Numismatics, Iconography, Epigraphy and History. Studies in Honor of George C. Miles*, Beirut, 1974, pp. 339-46.

Maʿṣuma Maʿdan-kan, *Bazm-e dirina-ʿarus, šarḥ-e pānzdah qaṣida az divān-e Ḵāqāni*, Tehran, 1993.

Idem, *Negāhi ba donyā-ye Ḵāqāni*, 3 vols., Tehran, 1996-99.

Idem, *Besāṭ-e qalandar, bar-gozida va šarḥ-e ḡazalhā-ye Ḵāqāni*, Tabriz, 2005.

Idem, *Jām-e ʿarus-e ḵāvari, šarḥ-e šeš qaṣida az divān-e Ḵāqāni*, Tehran, 2008. ʿAliqoli Maḥmudi Baḵtiāri, *Ḵāqāni dar eyvān-e Madāʾen*, Tehran, 1996.

ʿAbbās Māhyār, *Gozida-ye ašʿār-e Ḵāqāni, enteḵāb o šarḥ*, Tehran, 1993.

Julie Scott Meisami, “Poetic Microcosms: The Persian Qaṣida to the End of the Twelfth Century,” in Stefan Sperl and Christopher Shackle, eds., *Qaṣida Poetry in Islamic Asia and Africa* I. *Classical Traditions and Modern Meanings*, Leiden, New York, and Köln, 1996a, pp. 173-82.

Idem, “Khāqānī, Elegy on Madā’in,” in Stefan Sperl and Christopher Shackle, eds., *Qaṣida Poetry in Islamic Asia and Africa* II. *Eulogy’s Bounty, Meaning’s Abundance. An Anthology*, Leiden, New York, and Köln, 1996b, pp. 162-69.

Idem, “Imagery as an Argument: Khāqānī’s *Qaṣīda* to the Sharvānshāh on the Occasion of ‘Īd al-Fiṭr,” *Edebiyât* 9, 1998, pp. 35-59.

Idem, *Structure and Meaning in Medieval Arabic and Persian Poetry*, *Orient Pearls*, London, 2003.

Daniela Meneghini, *Lirica Persica Hypertext. Browse and Search 20.000 Lines of Persian Ghazals*, CD-ROM, Venice, 2000. Moḥammad al-Meyhani, *Dastur-e dabiri*, ed. A. S. Erzi, Ankara, 1962.

Vladimir Minorsky, “Khāqānī and Andronicos Comnenos,” *BSOAS* 11, 1945, pp. 550-78; repr. in *Iranica. Twenty Articles*, Tehran, 1964, pp. 120-50.

Mojtabā Minovi, "Kāpus-nāma-ye Ferāy, Tamrini dar fann-e tazvir-šenāsi," *Yaḡmā* 9/10, 1957, pp. 449-65.

Saʿid Qarabaglu, "Taʾammoli dar Divān-e Ḵāqāni," *MDAM* 26, 3-4, 1993-94, pp. 781-808.

Moḥammad b. ʿAli al-Rāvandi, *Rāḥat al-ṣodur*, ed. M. Iqbál (Eqbāl), London, 1921.

Benedikt Reinert, "Tajdid-e maṭlaʿ dar qaṣāʾed-e Ḵāqāni," *MDAT* 12, 1964-65, pp. 126-49.

Idem, *Ḫāqāni als Dichter, Poetische Logik und Phantasie*, Berlin and New York, 1972.

Idem, "Khāḳāni," in *EI*[2] IV, 1978, pp. 915-16.

Idem, "Der Concetto-Stil in den islamischen Literaturen," in Wolfhart Heinrichs, ed., *Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft, Band 5, Orientalisches Mittelalter*, Wiesbaden, 1990a, pp. 366-408.

Idem, "Die persische Qaṣīde," in Wolfhart Heinrichs, ed., *Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft, Band 5, Orientalisches Mittelalter*, Wiesbaden, 1990b, pp. 242-57.

Marina Reisner, "The Life of the Text and the Fate of Tradition. VI: Birds in Mystical-Symbolic *Qaṣīda*s by Sanā'ī and Khāqānī (12th Century) (To the Problem of Formation of the Symbolic Language in the Classical Persian *Qaṣīda*)," *Manuscripta Orientalia* 11/2, 2005, pp. 21-29.

Francis Richard, "FORGERIES iv. OF ISLAMIC MANUSCRIPTS," in *EIr*. X/1, 1999, pp. 97-100.

Idem, *Le livre persan*, Paris, 2003. Jan Rypka, "Ḫāqānīs Madā'in-Qaṣīde rhetorisch beleuchtet," *Archiv Orientální* 27, 1959, pp. 199-205.

Idem, "Poets and Prose Writers of the late Saljuq and Mongol Periods," in *Camb. Hist. Iran* V, 1968, pp. 568-75. Idem et al., *History of Iranian Literature*, Dordrecht, 1968, pp. 202-8.

Ḏabiḥ-Allāh Ṣafā, *Tāriḵ-e adabiyāt dar Irān* II, Tehran, 1977, pp. 776-94.

Moḥammad-Reżā Šafiʿi-Kadkani, "Ḵāqāni va moḥiṭ-e adabi-e Tabriz bar asās-e *Safina-ye Tabriz*," *Nāmeh-ye Bahārestān* 4/1-2, *daftar-e* 7-8, Spring-Winter 2003-04, pp. 159-64.

Idem, "Noktahā-ye nau-yāfta dar-bāra-ye Ḵāqāni," *NDATabriz* 45/n.185, 2004, pp. 1-6.

Żiāʾ-al-Din Sajjādi, "*Ḵatm al-ḡarāʾeb*, maṯnawi-e mansub ba Ḵāqāni," *FIZ* 13, 1965, pp. 155-87.

Idem, *Gozida-ye ašʿār-e Ḵāqāni-e Šervāni, be moqaddama o šarḥ-e loḡāt o tarkibāt o maʿni-e abyāt*, Tehran, 1972.

Idem, *Kuy-e Sorḵāb-e Tabriz o maqbarat al-šoʿarāʾ*, Tehran, 1977.

Idem, ed., *Ḥawāši-e doktor Moḥammad Moʿin bar ašʿār-e Ḵāqāni-e Šervāni*, Tehran, 1979 (includes also, pp. 113-65, two articles by Sajjādi himself and one by Moḥammad Moʿin).

Idem, *Farhang-e loḡāt o taʿbirāt bā šarḥ-e aʿlām o moškelāt-e divān-e Ḵāqāni-e Šervāni*, 2 vols, Tehran, 1995.

Monira Aḥmad Solṭāni, *Qaṣida-ye fanni va taṣwir-āferini-e Ḵāqāni-e Šervāni*, Tehran, 1991.

Storey/de Blois, *Persian Literature* V/2, pp. 382-99 and V/3, pp. 631-32; 2nd rev. ed. François de Blois as *Persian Literature, a Bio-bibliographical Survey* V*: Poetry of the Pre-Mongol Period,* London and New York, 2004, pp. 319-33.

Šams-al-Din Ṭabasi, *Divān*, ed. Taqi Bineš, Mashad, 1964.

Saʿd-al-Din Varāvini, *Marzbān-nāma*, ed. Ḵ. Ḵatib Rahbar, 2nd ed., Tehran, 1987.

O. L. Vil'chevskiĭ, "Chakani. Nekotorye cherti tvorchestva i mirovozzreniya poeta," *SV* 1/4, 1957, pp. 63-76.

Idem, tr. Jerome W. Clinton, "The Chronograms of Khaqani," *Iranian Studies* 2, 1969, pp. 97-105 (originally published in Russian in *Epigrafika Vostoka*, 1960).

Wali-Allāh Ẓafari, *Ḥabsiya dar adab-e fārsi, az āḡāz-e šeʿr-e fārsi tā pāyān-e zandiya*, Tehran, 1985.

Riccardo Zipoli, “Il Khāqāni polemico,” in Giovanna Pagani-Cesa and Ol’ga Obuchova, eds., *Studi e scritti in memoria di Marzio Marzaduri*, Venice, 2002, pp. 457-82.