

Licit Magic – GlobalLit Working Papers

No. 17

**PERSIAN LITERARY CRITICISM IN INDIA:
KHĀN-I ĀRZŪ'S CRITIQUE OF ḤAZĪN'S POETRY**



Nasrin Askari

Birmingham 2023
University of Birmingham

Global Literary Theory

Licit Magic – GlobalLit Working Papers

No. 17

Rebecca Ruth Gould, *Editor-in-Chief*

Nasrin Askari, Kristof D’hulster, Hadel Jarada, Bakir Mohammad, Michelle Quay, Kayvan

Tahmasebian, *Consulting Editors*

Licit Magic – GlobalLit Working Papers comprises translations of and commentaries on key works of poetics, rhetoric, literary theory, and related areas of inquiry from the literatures of the Islamic world. Together with its website (<https://globallit.hcommons.org>), online publication (<https://medium.com/global-literary-theory>), newsletter (<https://medium.com/global-literary-theory/newsletters/licit-magic-global-literary-theory-newsletter>), and twitter feed (@balaghas), the Working Papers are one of five venues of interim science communication of GlobalLit. Global Literary Theory is an ERC-funded project directed by Rebecca Ruth Gould and based at the University of Birmingham since 2018, that brings into comparison the literary traditions of the Islamic world, including Arabic, Persian, and Turkic traditions.



All working papers are downloadable on <https://globallit.hcommons.org/licit-magic-working-papers/>.

This series is part of a project that has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Grant agreement No. 759346).

Cover image: © Excerpts from Sa’ dī’s *Gulistān*. 17th-18th centuries. Probably from an albums produced in Mughal India. Library of Congress African and Middle Eastern Division Washington, D.C. 20540 USA.

Persian Literary Criticism in India: Khān-i Ārzū's Critique of Ḥazīn's Poetry*

Sirāj al-Dīn 'Alī Khān, poetically styled as "Ārzū" (lit., desire, wish) and usually referred to as Khān-i Ārzū is a well-known Persian-speaking Indian litterateur, philologist, lexicographer, and poet, who was born in Akbarābād (Agra) in 1687–8. He died in 1756 in Lucknow and was buried in Delhi. His father, a high-ranking military officer at the court of Aurangzib (r. 1658–1707), was a poet too and versified the Indian popular tale of Kamrup and Kamelta. Ārzū boasts of being a descendent of the great Persian poet 'Aṭṭār (d. 1221) through his maternal lineage, asserting that his mother's ancestors were called the 'Aṭṭārīs. He was highly respected by the literati and rewarded by the royalty on account of his knowledge and eloquence.

Besides composing poetry in Persian (and Urdu too), Ārzū wrote numerous scholarly works on a vast range of topics related to literature, including literary criticism, linguistics, and commentaries on the works of classical Persian poets, such as Niẓāmī Ganjavī (d. 1209) and Sa'dī (d. 1291 or 1292). Modern scholars of Persian literature recognize him as "the most learned scholar of Persian literary styles" because of his analyses of the constituting elements of Persian literary styles and their historical development.¹ It has also been argued that he played a fundamental role in the development of Urdu language and literature.²

In his *Dād-i Sukhan* (Justice to Speech, written ca. 1741–43), where he critiques a poem and two other scholars' critiques of the same poem, Ārzū discusses seven modes (*vajh*) of perception (*fahm*, *daryāft*, *idrāk*) of poetry. Since his discussion focuses on the reader's perception and evaluation of poetry, it has been argued that his ideas in this work compare to the modern-day theories of reception, which focus on the reader's perspective.³ In this work, Ārzū describes seven different modes of perception of poetry in relation to the knowledge of seven groups of audiences. The first mode of perception, according to Ārzū, relates to all speakers of the language (*'amma-yi ahl-i zabān*). He explains that this mode of perception is the same for everyone, as it relates to the well-known, simple and compound terms that speakers of the language have heard from their elders and learned to appreciate according to their education. He

* I am grateful to Rebecca Ruth Gould and Kayvan Tahmasebian for their valuable comments on the earlier drafts of this paper.

¹ Shafī'ī Kadkanī, "Masā'il-i sabk-shināsī," 1–16.

² Dudney, "The Wonders of Words;" Dudney, *India in the Persian World of Letters*.

³ Raḥīm-pūr. *Bar Khvān-i Ārizū*, 193–211; Raḥīm-pūr, "Naẓariya-i daryāft," 90–109.

further comments that those who have learned the language from the elite (*khavāṣṣ*) are more knowledgeable and eloquent than those who have been trained by the common people (*‘avāmm*).

Ārzū then introduces six modes of perception of poetry by six groups of people, each concerned with a particular area of the aesthetics of poetry. Thus, the second mode of perception of poetry is that of teachers (*mullāyān*), whose perception, according to Ārzū, is different from that of the speakers of everyday language (*ahl-i rūzmarra*). The example that Ārzū provides for the perception of this group indicates that they focus on grammatical points in their appreciation of poetry. The third mode of perception of poetry is that of the masters of semantics (*arbāb-i ma ‘ānī*), who focus on the techniques of pre-posing and post-posing (*taqaddum va ta ‘khīr*) as well as conjoining and disjoining of the sentence elements (*faṣl va vaṣl*), and on the techniques of brevity and prolixity (*ījāz va iṭnāb*) in their understanding and evaluation of the poem. Ārzū comments that this group does not know of the secrets (*asrār*) of synecdoche (*majāz-i mursal*), simile (*tashbīh*), and metaphor (*isti ‘āra*), which form the basis of poetic speech. The fourth group, the masters of clear speech (*arbāb-i bayān*), knows the intricacies of simile and the likes of it, but knows nothing of literary embellishments (*muḥassanāt-i badī ‘ī*). The fifth group, the people of literary devices (*badī ‘iyān*), perceive the perfection of speech (*kamāl-i sukhan*) in relation to the use of literary devices (*nukāt-i badī ‘a*). In Ārzū’s opinion, this group is obsessed with literary ornamentations and ignores the perspicuity (*faṣāḥat*) and eloquence (*balāghat*) of the poem.

The sixth mode of perception is that of school teachers (*mullāyān-i maktabī*), who, according to Ārzū, are called *nāẓim* (lit., regulator, composer of verses,) in India. The perception of this group has nothing to do with perspicuity (*faṣāḥat*) and eloquence (*balāghat*) of a poem, as they are concerned with meanings that agree with their own presumptions and opinions. The seventh mode of perception is that which agrees to the taste of poets and is dependent upon one’s knowledge of composition of apposite word arrangements in conformity with one’s own everyday language (*rūzmarra-yi zabān-i khud*) as well as the poet’s language, and the observance of the poet’s intended method of expression, for example, through imagination, symbol, allegory, etc.⁴ So, in Ārzū’s opinion, people’s perception and evaluation of poetry

⁴ Ārzū, *Dād-i Sukhan*, 20–21, as quoted in Raḥīm-pūr, *Bar Khvān-i Ārizū*, 200–201. See also Keshavmurthy, “Local Universality” 35–37; and Dudley, *India in the Persian World of Letters*, 116–24.

differs depending on their level of mastery of the language, their knowledge of and personal interest in specific literary techniques, and their own biases.

Ārzū's *Tanbīh al-ghāfilīn fī al-i'tirāz 'alā ash'ār al-Ḥazīn* (Admonishing the negligent: Criticism of Ḥazīn's poetry, ca. 1744), excerpts of which are presented here in English translation, is a critique of some 300 verses of poetry by Muḥammad 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib Ḥazīn Lāhījī (1692–1766), a Persian polymath and poet at the Safavid royal court, who immigrated to India in 1734, fleeing the political and economic turmoil following the Afghan invasion of Iran. Ḥazīn's remarkably simple and clear style of writing was in sharp contrast to the extremely ornate and ambiguous new style of poetry, which he deplored and ridiculed in his writing.⁵ Ārzū's critique of Ḥazīn mostly concerns language usage, meanings of the words, and sometimes he accuses Ḥazīn of employing the themes that have appeared in the works of others.

In his introduction to his *Tanbīh al-ghāfilīn*, Ārzū states that he happened to study Ḥazīn's collection of poetry, the reputation of which “had filled the ears of everyone,” and comments that he was unable to make sense of some of his verses. Thus, states Ārzū, he slightly modified them to make them meaningful. He further comments that his critiques of Ḥazīn's poetry should not be understood as criticism of a great poet; rather, he intends to provide historical precedents (*sanad*) for what is considered to be the fault of speech (*laghzish-i sukhan*) in the works of poets in India.⁶

Ārzū's critique of Ḥazīn's poetry was later critiqued by other poets and writers. Excerpts from the works of two critics of Ārzū's critique are also provided here to demonstrate how they judged on Ḥazīn's poetry and Ārzū's critique of it. Since the works of these three critics are not easily available, the source of the present translation is a work by the Iranian litterateur and poet Muḥammad-Rizā Shafī'ī Kadkanī, entitled *Shā'irī dar hujūm-i muntaqidān: Naqd-i adabī dar*

⁵ Since the characteristic features of that extremely ornate and ambiguous style are most prominent in the works of Persian-speaking poets of Mughal India, it is often referred to as the “Indian Style” (*sabk-i hindī*), but poets in other places, especially in Safavid Iran, wrote in that style too, and therefore the terms “Safavid” or “Isfahani” style have been proposed to be used instead. However, to be more accurate and avoid restricting this style to a particular region or period, recent scholarship has suggested that the term *tāza-gū'ī* (lit., fresh-speaking), which was used by the proponents of the new style, be used. See for example, Yarshater “*The Indian or Safavid Style*,” Kinra, “Make it Fresh.” Ḥazīn is known as a poet of the new style too, although his contemporaries considered his poetry to belong to the styles of both the Ancients and Moderns. See Kadkanī, *Shā'irī dar hujūm-i muntaqidān*, 108–111.

⁶ Kadkanī, *Shā'irī dar hujūm-i muntaqidān*, 124.

sabk-i hindī; Pīrāmūn-i shi‘r-i Ḥazīn-i Lāhījī (A poet invaded by critics: Literary criticism in the Indian School; On Ḥazīn Lāhījī’s poetry), a chapter of which contains excerpts from the three works, that is, Ārzū’s critique of Ḥazīn’s poetry, a treatise by Ārzū’s contemporary Imām Qulī Ṣahbā’ī, who wrote a response to Ārzū’s critique primarily in defence of Ḥazīn’s poetry, and a treatise by the modern Afghan poet ‘Abdullāh Qārī (d. 1982), who tried to be a fair judge of Ḥazīn, Ārzū, and Ṣahbā’ī. To illustrate the criteria used by the three critics in their assessment of Ḥazīn’s verses, where all three critics have commented on a verse by Ḥazīn, Kadkanī provides them all together. But, since Ṣahbā’ī and Qārī did not comment on every verse that Ārzū critiqued, some of Ārzū’s critiques are not followed by Ṣahbā’ī’s and Qārī’s commentaries. Also, since Ṣahbā’ī and Qārī sometimes diverge from the main point and go into lengthy discussions on unrelated matters, Kadkanī included their main points and omitted their irrelevant discussions. The works of Ṣahbā’ī and Qārī, which were used by Kadkanī, are listed in the bibliography provided below. Page numbers in square brackets refer to Kadkanī’s work.

Sources

- Ārzū, Sirāj al-Dīn ‘Alī Khān. *Dād-i sukhan* [Justice to speech]. Rawalpindi: Markaz-i taḥqīqāt-i fārsi-i Īrān va Pākistān, 1973.
- . *Tanbīh al-ghāfilīn fī al-i ‘tirāz ‘alā ash ‘ār al-Ḥazīn* [Admonishing the negligent: Criticism of Ḥazīn’s poetry]. Edited by Sayyid Muḥammad Akram Ikrām. Lahore: Punjab University, 1981.
- Dudney, Arthur. *India in the Persian World of Letters: Ḳhān-i Ārzū among the Eighteenth-Century Philologists*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022.
- . “The Wonders of Words, or the Role of Khān-i Ārzū’s *Navādir al-Alfāz* in the Development of Urdu.” In *An Informal Festschrift in Honor of the Manifold Lifetime Achievements of Shamsur Rahman Faruqi*, edited by Satyanarayana Hegde. 2010. www.columbia.edu/itc/mealac/pritchett/00urduhindilinks/srffest.
- Kadkanī, Muḥammad-Rizā Shafī‘ī. “Masā’ il-i sabk-shināsī az nigāh-i Ārzū.” [Matters of style from Ārzū’s perspective] *Dānishkada-yi adabiyāt va ‘ulūm-i insānī-i dānishgāh-i Firdawsī-i Mashhad* 141 (1382): 1–16.
- . *Shā ‘irī dar hujūm-i muntaqidān: Naqd-i adabī dar sabk-i hindī; Pīrāmūn-i shi ‘r-i Ḥazīn-i Lāhījī* [A poet invaded by critics: Literary criticism in the Indian School; On Ḥazīn Lāhījī’s poetry]. 2nd ed. Tehran: Āgah, 1375/1996. [First published 1963.]
- Keshavmurthy, Prashant. “The Local Universality of Poetic Pleasure: Sirājuddin ‘Alī Khān Ārzu and the Speaking Subject.” *The Indian Economic and Social History Review* 50, no. 1 (2013): 27–45. DOI: <10.1177/0019464612474168>.
- Kinra, Rajeev. “Make it Fresh: Time, Tradition, and Indo-Persian Literary Modernity.” In *Time, History, and the Religious Imaginary in South Asia*, edited by Anne C. Murphy, 12–39. New York, 2011.
- Nawshāhī, ‘Ārif. *Fihrist-i nuskha-hā-yi khaṭṭī-i fārsī-i Pākistān (Fihrist-i 8000 nuskha-yi khaṭṭī-i kitābkhāna-hā-yi shakhshī va dawlatī)*. Vol. 3, *Adabiyāt, Jughrāfiyā, Safarnāma, Tārīkh, ‘Ulūm-i gharība, Afzūda-hā*. Tehran: Mīrās-i Maktūb, 1396/2017.
- Nizāmī, Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad Ilyās b. Yūsuf. *Khamsa-yi Nizāmī*. Edited by Vahīd Dastgirdī. Edited by Sāmiya Baṣīr Muzhdihī. Reviewed by Bahā’ al-Dīn Khurramshāhī. Tehran: Dūstān, 1383/2004.

- Qārī ‘Abdullāh. *Kulliyāt-i Qārī*. Kabul, n.d. [Includes his poetry, correspondences, and the treatise “Judgement between Khān-i Ārzū and Şahbā’ī” (*Muḥākama dar bayn-i Khān-i Ārzū va Şahbā’ī*)].
- Raḥīm-pūr, Maḥdī. *Bar Khvān-i Ārzū: Guftārḥāyī dar zamīna-yi nazariya-hā-yi adabī va zabānshinākhtī-i Sirāj al-Dīn ‘Alī* [On the table of Ārzū/desire: Discussions about Ārzū’s literary and linguistic theories]. Qom: Majma‘-i zakhā’ir-i islāmī, 1391/2012.
- . “Nazariya-i daryāft: Az Sirāj al-Dīn ‘Alī Khān-i Ārzū-yi Akbarābādī tā Hans Robert Jauss-i ālmānī” [Perception theory: From Sirāj al-Dīn ‘Alī Khān-i Ārzū of Akbarābād to Hans Robert Jauss of Germany]. *Āyina-yi Mīrās* 7, no. 1 (2009): 90–109.
- Şahbā’ī (Imām Bakhsh Dihlavī). *Qawl-i fayşal* [The decree]. Nawal Kishawr Publications, n.d.
- Yarshater, Ehsan. “The Indian or Safavid Style: Progress or Decline?” In *Persian Literature*, edited by Ehsan Yarshater, 249–88. Albany, N.Y.: Bibliotheca Persica, 1987.

Further Reading

- Keshavmurthy, Prashant. “Kān-e Ārezu, Serāj-al-din ‘Ali (Article 2).” *Encyclopædia Iranica*. www.iranicaonline.org/articles/kan-e-arezu.
- Khudābakhsh, Asadullāhī and Maḥdī Raḥīm-pūr. “Sirāj al-Dīn ‘Alī Khān-i Ārzū az pīshgāmān-i naqd-i adabī dar shibh-i qārā” [Sirāj al-Dīn ‘Alī Khān-i Ārzū: A pioneer of literary criticism in the Subcontinent]. *Nāma-yi farhangistān*, Special issue, *Shibh-i qārā* [Subcontinent] 8 (1397): 13–47.
- Kia, Mana. *Persianate Selves: Memories of Place and Origin Before Nationalism*. Redwood City: Stanford University Press, 2020.
- Kinra, Rajeev. “Make it Fresh: Time, Tradition and Indo-Persian Literary Modernity.” In *Time, History, and the Religious Imaginary in South Asia*, ed. Anne Murphy, 12–39. New York: Routledge, 2011.

Keywords: Khān-i Ārzū, Ḥazīn, Persian literary criticism, Persian literature in India, Indo-Persian literature

Translation

[p. 124] **Ḥazīn:**

Without you, my heart is like a broken decanter
wailing (*hāy-hā*) in tears.

Dil bī tu chu shīsha-yi shikasta

Dar girya-yi hāy-hāst mā rā

Khān-i Ārzū: *Hāy-hā* is most likely not the plural of *hāy*.⁷ If it is *hāy-hāy* [p. 125] with the “y” omitted, this [form] is unprecedented. It [should be] *hāy-hāy* or *hāy-ā-hāy*. *Hāy-hā* has never been heard or seen. **Anyone who claims [to have seen or heard it], should provide evidence.**⁸ (*Tanbīh al-ghāfilīn*, 2)

Ṣahbā’ī: I say, firstly, in view of the established general rule of the Persians (*fārsiyān*), a final “y” is added to the words ending with *alif* (ā). For example, *khudāy* (God), *namāy* (show), *āshnāy* (familiar), and *humāy* (a mythical bird). As Sa’ dī has said:

Humāy is the noblest of [all] birds

because it eats bones and does not harm any birds.

Humāy bar sar-i murghān az ān sharaf dārad

ki ustukhvān khurad u ṭāyirī nayāzārad

And, sometime the “y”, which is originally a part of the word, is dropped, as in *jāy* (place) and *nāy* (flute), which are employed as *jā* and *nā*. And *tang-nā* (tight place, difficulty) is the most well-known of such words. The omission of “y” from *hāy-hā* does not require precedent (*sanad*), but if the request for evidence cannot be withdrawn, the usage of the eloquent notables provides an amazing evidence, which would quiet the deniers. Mīrzā Mu’ min Astarābādī has said:

Tonight, the shout of joy reaches the ears of consciousness.

O you companion, excuse the tears [that accompany our] profuse wailing (*hāy-hā*)

Hāy-hū-yī mīrasad imshab bi gūsh-i hūsh bāz.

⁷ *Hā* in Persian is a suffix added to a singular noun to make it plural (T.). All notes that I have added to the text are marked by “T.” (Translator’s note).

⁸ Sentences translated from Arabic are boldfaced throughout this paper (T.).

Hamnishīn az girya-yi pur hāhy-hā ma 'zūr dār.

And, in a *qaṣīda* in praise of the Commander of the Faithful, the final letter of the rhyming word of which is *ā*, Sanjar Kāshī says:

In a shoreless rough sea

I am a mortal bubble like Noah's Ark

Dar mawj-khīz dāman-i man kash kināra nīst

hamchun ḥubāb-i kashī-i nūh ast bī baqā

If Salmān saw me like this on a plain of millet

He would cry and wail (*hāy-hā*) for my state

Salmān bi dasht-i arzan agar dīdīm chunīn

bigrīstī bi ḥālatam āngah bi hāy-hā

The truth is that in this term (*hāy-hā*), *hāy* is repeated, and, it has been used both with and without the “y.” Firstly, it is obvious, and secondly, it embellishes this poem by Jalāl-i Asīr⁹:

Wherever there is a tumult with wailing [*hā-hū*] from the heart,

You can sense the scent of a heart [in love].

Har kujā shūrī bi-hā-hū-yi dilast

tā nafas bar-mīkīshī būy-i dil ast

When the “y” is repeated, it becomes *hāy-hāy* or *hāy-ā-hāy*. When the “y” is omitted, it becomes *hā-hā*. And when the two forms are combined, it becomes *hāy-hā*. All three forms are in use.

The first one is obvious and accepted by the high-ranking Khān. And, it is not a long time since the third form has removed veil from its beauty and entered this era. As for the second form, [an example] from the table of the eloquence of Ni‘mat Khān ‘Ālī¹⁰ would serve as a taster for the palate of those whose eyes are hungry for the fruits of meaning:

[p. 126] He became occupied with his own wailing (*hā-hā*)

The small food that was prepared remained in place.

Gasht ū mashghūl bar hā-hā-yi khud

Mā-ḥāzar nīz ānchunān bar jāy-i khud

⁹ Mīrzā Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Mu‘min Shahrīstānī Iṣfahānī, poetically styled as Asīr (prisoner/captive), was a great poet of the first half of the 17th century, and the son-in-law of Shah Abbas II. His poetry was more popular in India, even though he had never been there. (T.)

¹⁰ Mīrzā Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad, known as ‘Ālī-i Shīrāzī, Ni‘mat Khān, and Dānishmand Khān, was a Persian-speaking poet of eighteenth-century India. (T.)

(*Qawl-i fayṣal*, 10)

Ḥazīn:

O Ḥazīn, I lament a sorrowful glance from the eyes,

As I have let go the soil of Isfahan from the embrace of my eyelashes.

Ḥazīn az dīda mīnālam nigāh-i ḥasrat-ālūdī

ki az āghūsh-i muzhgān dāda-am khāk-i ṣifāhān rā

Khān-i Ārzū: In the composition of the first hemistich, *mīnālam* (I lament) is apparently [written] with “n,”¹¹ but *nālīdan* (to lament) is intransitive, so “a sorrowful glance” cannot be its object, unless it is said that the preposition *bā* (with) is omitted [from the phrase], that is, “I lament with a sorrowful glance,” as in the following verse, where “with” is omitted from *sar-birahna* (bare head):

The mystic way-fares [with a] bare head, because

it is hot in the realm of Humā’s wings.¹²

Sar-birahna az ān sayr mīkunad ‘ārif

ki dar qalamraw-i bāl-i humā havā garm ast

However, [the omission of the required “with”] is not seen anywhere else other than in “bare head” and “bare feet,” which refer to a bare-headed or bare-footed person.¹³ Thus, the omission of *bā* [in this verse by Ḥazīn] requires a precedent (*sanad*).

We could also say that the object of the verb *mīnālam* has been replaced by its modifier, as in “the beloved laughs sugar” (*ma ‘shūq shikar mīkhandad*) or “the lover cries blood” (*‘āshiq*

¹¹ Since dots are usually not placed properly above or below the letters by copyists of the manuscripts, ambiguity arises when the number and placements of the dots could change the meaning of a word. As explained by Ārzū, the verb could be read as *mīnālam* (می نالم) or *mīpālam* (می پالم). (T.)

¹² Humā is a mythical bird of good omen, usually represented by the sun; hence the reference to the heat. And, it was believed that if Humā’s shadow fell on someone’s head, that person would be crowned; hence the reference to the bare head. Thus, the verse means: Flying in the sky of the soul bare-headedly, the mystic tolerates the heat of the sun (Love) in the hope of receiving the crown [of union with the Beloved]. (T.)

¹³ *Sar-birahna*, contracted form of *sar-i birahna* “bare head,” is an adjective or adverb, meaning “bare-headed” or “bare-headedly.” When used in its uncontracted form in a sentence, the verb requires the proposition “with” (with a bare head). (T.)

khūn mīgiryad), while “laughing” and “crying” are intransitive verbs. But, precedent is still required [for the verb *mīnālam*] if that is the case.

It is also possible that the verb is *mīpālam* from [the infinitives] *pālīdan* and *pālūdan*. If it is from *pālīdan*, it means “to search,” as noted by masters of vocabulary, and that is irrelevant here. And if it is from *pālūdan*, its correctness is uncertain, as it has not been seen in the works of masters.

Moreover, it is *pālāyam* [not *pālam*]. Research shows that it is a general rule of the Persians to replace the fully pronounced *ū* (*vāv-i ma ‘rūf*) with *ā*, in the infinitives ending in *ūdan*, to form the future tense, as in *farmūdan* (to order) and *farmāyad*, *āsūdan* (to rest) and *āsāyad*, *farsūdan* (to exhaust) and *farsāyad*, *nimūdan* (to show) and *nimāyad*, *gushūdan* (to open) and *gushāyad*, and *zudūdan* (to remove) and *zudāyad*. But, in [the case of] *shinūdan* (to hear), which sounds odd [to say *shināyad*], *ū* is not one of the main letters of the word; rather, it is a replacement for *ī* in *shinīdan*. And the *ū* in *durūdan* (to reap) [which is not changed to *ā* to make *dirāyad*] is actually a partially pronounced *ū* (*vāv-i majhūl*), as is well known by [the term] *dirugar* (reaper). The pronunciation of the present-day Iranians (*Īrāniyān*) cannot be taken as evidence here, as they do not partially pronounce the partially pronounced *ū*’s and *ī*’s (*vāv va yā-yi majhūl*), even though these sounds do exist in the language of other [Persian speakers], and the scholars of [the science of] rhyme have confirmed that partially pronounced letters do exist in Persian.

To do justice to research, [p. 127] the aorist formed from an infinitive that ends in *ūdan* takes two forms: One is that *ū* changes to *ā*, as in *farmūdan* and *farmāyad*, and the other is that *ū* changes to *va*, as in *ghunūdan* and *ghunavad*, *būdan* and *buvad*, *shinūdan* and *shinavad*. This is an established rule, and the correct [form] is this; although, [the aorist of] *ghunūdan* is very uncommon. One can also say that the *ū* is either replaced by *āy*, as in the previous examples, or by *va*, as in *shinavad* (from *shinūdan*) and *ghunavad* (from *ghunūdan*). There is no need to restrict the *ū* to the fully pronounced (*ma ‘rūf*) *ū*. And, for certain infinitives, both [forms] are used, as in *būdan*, from which, both *buvad* and *bāyad* are formed, and **this is correct**.

In short, in addition to all of the above-mentioned problems, [the imagery of] “a sorrowful glance for the separation from the soil of Isfahan” is not nice. Thus, it is better for the first hemistich to read like this:

My glance, o Ḥazīn, has become a sorrowful sigh.

Nigāh-i man Ḥazīn gardāda āh-i ḥasrat-ālūdī

(*Tanbīh al-ghāfilīn*, 3-5)

Şahbā'ī: Neither *nālam* (I lament) is [used as a] transitive [verb], nor [the verb] is *pālam*, and nor “with” is omitted from “a sorrowful glance” as in “bare head.” Rather, it is the intransitive *nālam* with “n,” and the preposition *az* in *az dāda mīnālam* means “for”—I lament *for* my eyes. So, one must suppose that “a sorrowful glance” is followed by [an implied] “should be taken.” The reason for this supposition is the final *ī* [in *nigāh-i ḥasrat-ālūdī* (a sorrowful glance)], which is a marker for an indefinite noun. Naẓīrī says:

Some mercy [should be shown], as it is going to be lost.

It is cruel to ignore someone who is being drowned.

Rahmī, ki zi dast mīravād kār

Bar gharqa jafā buvad taghāful

A resurrection [should take place] to turn the firmament upside down.

For how long should my fortune depend on the Sky and Pisces?

Rastkhīzī ki shavad zīr u zibar vaẓ '-i falak

Chand rakhtam bi samā bāshad u bakhtam bi samak?

Jalāl Asīr has said:

I have been burned by [my beloved's] ignorance, a glance [from the beloved I desire].

I have lost my life in bitterness, a sweet smile [from the beloved I desire].

Taghāful-sūz gardādam nigāhī

Bi talkhī jān sipurdam nūshkhandī

O friends, it is spring! [We need] some treatment, some drunkenness
some vine, a musician, a beautiful [company], a corner of a garden.

Bahārast yārān, 'alājī, dimāghī

Mayī, mutribī, gulrukhī, kunj-i bāghī

[p. 128] I am a prisoner, speechless, heartless, impatient, intoxicated.

A glance, a laughter, a conversation, a happy tiding, a sign, a hint [I desire].

Asīram, bīzabānam, bīdilam, bīṭāqatam, mastam
Nigāhī, khanda`ī, harfī, navīdī, ramzī, imā`ī

On the path of impatience, my dust became collyrium for rumours.¹⁴

You did not rejoice, o truth-less you! [A glance from] the corner of [your] eye [I desire].

Ghubāram surma-yi āvāz shud dar rāh-i bītābī
Dilat khālī nashud ay bī haqīqat gūsha-yi chashmī

‘Urfī has said:

Although [the beloved] tells the truth,

A silent [lover befits] this [beloved] whose oppression is ever-increasing.

Harchand ki rāst gūyad ammā
Khāmūshī īn sitam-fazā rā.

The implied words [that complete the meaning of] the above-mentioned verses are not concealed to contemplators. Thus, the meaning of Ḥazīn’s verse is “O Ḥazīn, I lament for my deprived eyes; they need to be glanced upon, that is, they should be asked about. The reason for my lament for my eyes is that I have let go the soil of Isfahan—which was [like] medicine and collyrium for my eyes—from the embrace of my eyelashes. In this state, how would my eyes feel?”

The verse cannot be interpreted this way either: “O Ḥazīn, I lament for my own eyes. Take a sorrowful glance at me and see what wrong I have committed that I have lost the soil of Isfahan from the embrace of my eyelashes.” Given the learned Khān’s scrupulousness, I wonder why he went through so much trouble [to interpret the verse].

And, perhaps the meaning of *az dīda mīnālam* is “I lament because of the eyes” (*az dast-i dīda mīnālam*), and “because of” (*az dast-i*) is omitted because the second hemistich begins with the subordinating conjunction *ki* [which introduces the clause with the reason for the lament]—similar to when one complains about a long journey and says “I lament because of the revolving

¹⁴ The “dust” is that of someone who has travelled for a long time and is thus covered in dust. The “dust becoming collyrium for rumours,” means that the traveller’s dusty appearance added flavour to the rumours about the traveler being in love and on the path to reunite with the beloved. (T.)

firmament” (*az dast-i gardish-i falak mīnālam*)—that is, because the firmament has taken me so far away from home. So, the verse means, “O Ḥazīn, I lament because of my eyes, which have let the soil of Isfahan go away from the embrace of my eyelashes.” The intended meaning is that since he is no longer in Isfahan, the dust of Isfahan no longer goes into his eyes. So, that soil is not near him. Making the eyes responsible for not being on the soil of Isfahan is for the purpose of ridding himself of the responsibility; otherwise, he himself is the agent of the action and the eyes have nothing to do with it.

If the interpretation that I have offered here had not occurred to Ḥazīn, he would have said “they (my eyes) lament” instead of “I lament” and made “glance” (*nigāh*) the object [of the verb], that is, the sorrowful glance would have been of the lamenting and complaining eyes. A smart person knows that with my interpretations there is no need for such tasteless modifications [by Khān-i Ārzū].

And, [Ārzū’s] examples regarding the [change of] *ū* to *va* are debatable, because *shinūdan* (to hear) is an artificial infinitive (*maṣdar-i ja’lī*) constructed from *shinuftan*, and, according to the rules, [p. 129] the “f” in the infinitive is sometimes changed to *vāv* (pronounced *ū* or *va*). For example, *ravad* is made from *raftan* (to go), *gūyad* is made from *guftan* (to say), and *shinūd* is made from *shinuftan* (to hear). And, *shinu* (hear) is made from *shinūdan*, in the same way that *jah* is made from *jahīdan* (to jump) and *sūz* is made from *sūzīdan* (to burn) and *rūy* from *rūyīdan* and the likes of these. And, contraction is made in two ways: 1) by dropping the *vāv*, 2) by dropping the *ī*. Thus, *shinīdan* (شنیدن) is made by dropping the *vāv* (و) [from شنویدن], and *shinūdan* is made by dropping the *ī* (ی) [from شنویدن]. And *durūdan* is made from *diravīdan* (درویدن → درودن, by dropping the *ī*), as *dirīdan* is the contracted form of *diravīdan* by dropping the *vāv* (درویدن → دریدن). So, the original infinitive forms of these two verbs have been different. (*Qawl-i fayṣal*, 11–13)

Qārī: According to Mawlānā’s (Ṣahbā’ī’s) interpretation, many pre- and post-positions (*taqdīm va ta’khīr*) and omissions have had to take place in the verse. That is, first, between “O Ḥazīn,” which is a vocative expression, and “a sorrowful glance,” which is its address, the sentence “I lament” is inserted. And then, between this sentence and the second hemistich—which Mawlānā considers to be the reason for it—the address has come. And the omission is clear, as explained by Mawlānā.

However, if he (Ḥazīn) has lost the soil of Isfahan from the embrace of the eyelashes, as the second hemistich indicates, why should the addressee—which is himself—take a sorrowful glance at the Sheikh (Ḥazīn)? If read carefully, [one notes that] “I have lost from the embrace of the eyelashes” is a metaphor violating the rules of the language, because one would not say that I have lost the beloved, or whatever, from the embrace of someone else. Yes, if something is forcefully pulled away from someone’s embrace, they say “[it] was pulled away from the embrace of so and so.” With this explanation, it becomes clear that in such situations, “to pull away” (*kishīdan*) is used, not “to give [away]” (*dādan*). If the wording of the verse is modified, there will be no need for Mawlānā’s justification, and the objection to the phrase “from the embrace of the eyelashes” will be resolved too. For example:

O Ḥazīn, I pour sorrowful tears from my eyes,
for my eyelashes have unjustly lost the soil of Isfahan.

Ḥazīn az dāda mībāram sirishk-i ḥasrat-ālūdī
ki bījā dāda muzhgānam zi kaf khāk-i šifāhān rā.

This way, “I pour from the eyes” becomes the address, and the second hemistich becomes the reason, without any pre- and post-position. (*Kulliyāt-i Qārī*, 488)

Ḥazīn:

So long as the curls (*chīn*) of your locks have spread [their] snare,
The nests have fallen into ruins.

Tā dām gushāda chīn-i zulfat
Uftāda kharāb āshiyānhā

Khān-i Ārzū: “Nests” (*āshiyānhā*) belongs to birds, and, for two reasons, it is “deer” that is in harmony [with the phrase] “the curls of your locks” (*chīn-i zulfat*): 1) the word *chīn* (curls/China), 2) fragrance, which is associated with musk.¹⁵ As such, [p. 130] the rhyming word needs to be changed, and the hemistich should read like this:

¹⁵ Hair was usually scented with musk, and the best musk was made from a substance taken from the belly of a type of deer that inhabited the plains of China, hence the harmony among the words deer, China, curls, fragrance, and musk. (T.)

All plains (*ṣaḥrā*) have fallen into ruins.

Uftāda kharāb jumla ṣaḥrā.

Another possibility is to remove *chīn* (curls/China) from the first hemistich and correct the metre this way:

So long as your hairs have spread [their] snare

Tā dām gushāda ast zulfat

If they say that the exaggeration is stronger in the spreading of snare with the “curls” (*chīn*) of the hair because each curl is one snare, and that here *chīn* means curls of the hair not China for “deer” to be required, I would say that this lowly person’s (i.e., my) point is that it is a convention in poetry to observe [the employment of the] required (i.e., harmonious) words, not that *chīn* means China [here]. And, if “all plains” is used, it is all-inclusive, so all beasts and birds would be caught. The restriction to “nests,” would exclude the beasts. Nonetheless, the freshness (*tāzīgī*) of the theme of the poem and its elegance is evident. (*Tanbīh al-ghāfilīn*, 6)

Ṣahbā’ī: People of [good] taste know that to restrict oneself to such things—that is, anywhere *chīn* (curls/China) is mentioned, a deer too is caught in the trap of the mind, and musk is placed in the pomander of thought—is to make the unnecessary necessary (*luzūm-i mā lā yalzam*). Have you not seen that they compare the beloved, or parts of the beloved’s [body], or other things to certain things and do not see it necessary to mention that which is harmonious among those things? Sa’dī says:

O my world-inflaming moon, why are you vexed at me?

O my night-illuminating candle, why are you vexed at me?

Ay māh-i ‘ālam-sūz-i man az man chirā ranjīda-ī

Vay sham ‘-i shab-afrūz-i man az man chirā ranjīda-ī

‘Urfī:

It is on account of the miracle of your beauty that the pen of pre-destination was not burned

when it drew the green down above your fiery ruby¹⁶

Zi i jāz-i ḥusn-i tust ki kilk-i qazā nasūkht

¹⁶ The poet has compared the first appearance of moustache and beard on the beautiful face of a young man to “green down”, and his lips to red ruby. (T.)

bar la 'l-i ātashīn-khat-i sabzat chu zad raqam.

[In the above-mentioned verses], the [words] that are harmonious with “moon” and “ruby” are not mentioned. Jalāl-i Asīr says:

Hail to the good fortune [when], to hunt Asīr,

I see your saddle becoming the place of sunrise

Ay khushā bakht-i bulandī kaz pay-i şayd-i Asīr

Mashriq-i khurshīd bīnam khāna-yi zīn-i turā

What is meant by the “saddle becoming the place of sunrise” is that the beloved has mounted the horse (i.e., rises and shines on the saddle like the rising sun). There is no word in the first hemistich that is harmonious with the words in the second hemistich. Rather, the harmony is in the meaning, because it is in the interpretation [of the second hemistich] that the harmony with the term “hunt” in the first hemistich [is revealed]—mounting [the horse] is for the intention of hunting, and “being the place of sunrise” has nothing to do with “hunt.” If the observance of [harmony of words] is not necessary [in this verse], why is it necessary to observe it when it can be perceived through commonalities? To say that “deer” should be mentioned for harmony [with *chīn*, curls/China]—as the objector has commented—is a sort of critique that belongs to the world of hypercorrection. (*Qawl-i fayşal*, 13–14)

[p. 131] **Ḥazīn:**

Do whatever you want, but do not speak of [being] far from the sight.

Do not turn a desolate mind into the abode of fear.

Harchi khvāhī bikun az dūrī-i dīdār magū

Vaḥshat-ābād makun khāṭir-i vīrānī rā

Khān-i Ārzū: Turning a desolate mind into the abode of fear is not so [difficult] to prohibit it.¹⁷ In this case, “cultivated mind” (*khāṭir-i ābād*) or “collected mind” (*khāṭir-i jam*) should be used, and the collectedness of the lover’s mind—in the company of and in conversation with the beloved—is not unlikely. (*Tanbīh al-ghāfilīn*, 7)

¹⁷ Şahbā’ī’s *Qawl-i fayşal*, p. 14, reads: *chandān muzā`īqa nadārad* (does not involve so much difficulty).

Ṣahbā'ī: “Desolate mind” refers to the past not present [state of the lover], just like when a poor person becomes wealthy with the help of a great person and, to praise the kindness of that generous person, the poor one would say, “All that I have is thanks to the magnanimity of so and so; otherwise, how could I, an impoverished beggar, have gained such wealth?” Clearly, that person is not impoverished and poor at the time [of speaking]. This is some kind of synecdoche (*majāz-i mursal*). [Ḥazīn] probably said so, because the wealth of the collected mind acquired through union with the beloved **is insignificant**, as the beloved’s attention [to the lover] is not reliable, and the beloved’s speaking of being out of sight does not help. So, it is as though the same desolateness [that existed prior to the union with the beloved] still exists and has not left the mind. However, since at the moment [of his union with the beloved], he has gained [some] collectedness of the mind, he says do not turn my desolate mind into the abode of fear by speaking of leaving and separation, as he would lose the slight assurance that he has momentarily gained through his union with the beloved.

That is the interpretation of the verse if “desolate” is taken as an adjective for “mind,” but it may also be a noun (*muḏāfun ilayh*) [forming a possessive case with “mind”], that is, “the mind of someone desolate”, referring to himself [as a desolate person], and this is [a technique] from the category of “placing the manifest in the position of the concealed” (*vāz ‘-i maẓhar fī mawẓi ‘-i muẓmar*). It also constitutes [the technique of] focal shift (*iltifāt*), as defined by Sakkākī, for, according to him, it is not required to refer to something in [just] one of the three ways (i.e., from the point of view of the speaker, addressee, or the third person) after it has been referenced in one of these ways, and any of the three points of views can be used (i.e., the author can freely shift the point of view). When a focal shift takes place, the conveyed meaning remains the same, as in this verse by Imra’ al-Qays, addressing himself: “Your night was prolonged at a place called Athmud.” The apparent context [of the verse] requires “my night,” [not “your night”].

At any rate , the point of [Ḥazīn’s verse] remains the same in either interpretation, as the reason for the desolateness of the person and the mind is the same. (*Qawl-i fayṣal*, 14–15)

[p. 132] **Ḥazīn:**

Illuminate the lover’s house of darkness with your face.

For how long should I bring to the day the darkness of the nights?

Zulmatkada-yi 'āshiq az chihra muvavvar kun.

Tā chand bi rūz āram tārīkī-i shab-hā rā?

Khān-i Ārzū: It is the night, not darkness, that is brought to the day. If the “dark nights” (*shabhā-yi tārīk*) fit the meter, one could count it [as a good verse]. (*Tanbīh al-ghāfilīn*, 7)

Şahbā'ī: The author of the *Muḥākama*¹⁸ has cited a verse from Mawlavī Jāmī as a precedent (*sanad*):

In the end, my heart turned from the [beloved's] hair toward the [beloved's] face

It brought to the day the darkness of the night

Dilam ākhir zi zulfash sū-yi rukh raft

bi rūz āvard tārīkī-i shab rā

Truly, he (the author of the *Muḥākama*) has done a great job; we tried hard and could not find any [precedent].

A great person related that someone went to the Sheikh (Ḥazīn) and told him that he should have used the first-person pronoun, I, instead of “lover” (*'āshiq*) [in the first hemistich of the above-mentioned verse], so that the two hemistichs would be paralleled (*muṭābaqa*). The Sheikh ignored him. The author of these words (Şahbā'ī) says that there is a focal shift (*iltifāt*) in the second hemistich to clarify that the “lover” is just the speaker [and no one else]. If that dull-natured person did not get the point, it is not the Sheikh's fault. (*Qawl-i fayşal*, 15)

¹⁸ The complete title of the work is *Muḥākamat al-shu'arā* (The Poets Tribunal). It was written in 1180/1766–67 in response to Ārzū's critique of Ḥazīn and in defence of Ḥazīn. In it, the author refers to Ḥazīn as “the Sheikh,” to Ārzū as “the Doubtful” (*mushakkak*) and “the Scholar” (*muḥaqqiq*), and to his own opinion as “the Judgement” (*muḥākama*). It has been suggested that the author might be Ārzū's great grandson, Mīr Muḥammad Muḥsin Akbarābādī, who wrote a work of the same title in the same year, but the contents of the two works are not exactly the same. A manuscript of this work, which contains Şahbā'ī's quotations from it, is available in Karachi, Pakistan, but unfortunately, it does not contain the author's name. For the description of both manuscripts, see Nawshāhī, *Fihrist*, 1592–95. See also Dudley, *India in the Persian World of Letters*, 127–28. (T.)

Qārī: Whether or not the face [of the beloved] illuminates the lover’s house of darkness, the darkness of the night turns into the daylight. Therefore, the verse by Mawlānā Jāmī cannot prove the correctness of the Sheikh’s verse, as in Jāmī’s verse, day and night refer to the beloved’s face and hair mentioned in the first hemistich respectively. Surly, when the heart turns from the hair toward the face, the darkness of the “night of the hair” turns into the “day of the face.” But, in the Sheikh’s hemistich, the darkness of the night and the day are [used] in their true meanings, and when he “brings to the day the darkness of the night,” that is, when the night ends, surely it becomes day[time], even if the dark house [of the lover] is not illuminated with the face [of the beloved]—as mentioned by the Sheikh: “For how long should I bring it to the day.” It seems that an error has occurred in the verse—a word like “candle” or “lamp” or something similar should have been mentioned [as well]. For example:

Illuminate the lover’s house of darkness with your face.

For how long should I bring to the day the darkness of the nights without a candle?

Zulmatkada-yi ‘āshiq az chihra munavvar kun.

Tārīkī-i shab bī sham ‘ tā chand bi rūz āram?

In this case, the irrelevant plural sign (*hā*), which is added to the “night” (*shab*), would be removed too.

I am amazed that these two learned scholars have discussed whether or not one can “bring the darkness of the nights to the day,” but have not noticed the main problem. Surprisingly, Mawlānā Ṣahbā’ī approves of the Sheikh’s hemistich, as he considers it to be like Jāmī’s hemistich in the *Muḥākama*. But, with some deliberation, it becomes clear that “to bring to the day” in this hemistich constitutes a detestable redundancy (*hashv-i qabīḥ*)¹⁹ and the claim (*mudda ‘ā*) [in the first hemistich] requires [p. 133] something like these words: “For how long should I spend the nights in darkness.” (*Kulliyāt-i Qārī*, 462)

Ḥazīn:

My frail body would not be more persistent than the dew

If the heat of the sun of the beloved’s [furious] face [were to] cast upon me.

¹⁹ *Hashv* (redundancy) is of several types, some of which are considered to beautify the speech. (T.)

Girān-jān-tar zi shabnam nīst jism-i nātavān-i man
Agar mībūd bā man rūy garmī āftābash rā

Khān-i Ārzū: The relation between the condition (*shart*) and its consequence (*jazā*) does not sound proper, unless it is said that the consequence is omitted and replaced by its cause (*illat*), as in this verse by Sa‘dī:

If you do not know what lies in their heart,
What is the [morality] police doing in [their] house?

Gar nadānī ki dar dil-i ū chīst
Muhtasib rā darūn-i khāna chi kār?

But this is the style of the Ancients and not devoid of obscurity for the Moderns. Besides, the theme of the verse is borrowed (*mubtazal*).²⁰ Mīrzā Ṣā‘ib says:

With the slightest heat on the rose’s face, the dew turns its back on the rose,
Why should one be so disloyal in friendship?

Bi andak rūy garmī pusht bar gul mīkunad shabnam.
Chirā dar āshnā’ī īn qadar kas bī-vaḡā bāshad.

(*Tanbīh al-ghāfilīn*, 8)

Ṣahbā’ī: His (Ārzū’s) words, “I wonder about the relation between the condition (*shart*) and the consequence (*jazā*),” indicates that he has taken the first hemistich as the consequence of the condition, while it is not. The consequence is known, and the first hemistich is the reason for the consequence. That means, if the beloved’s sun (face) shone upon me, I would annihilate myself due to extreme sadness, as I am not more persistent than the dew, who, with the slightest heat from the sunlight, annihilates itself and completely disappears.

One may also say if the beloved’s sun cast heat upon me, that is, if the beloved showed any sign of anger and fury, I would depart so that my presence would not disturb the beloved so much; the dew departs when it receives heat from the sun, and I am not more persistent than it to stay on and burden the beloved when [I am] unwanted, because it is inappropriate to burden someone to that extent.

²⁰ *Mubtazal* means “cliché,” but the critics in India used it in reference to a theme (*mazmūn*) that was taken from someone else’s work. See Kadkanī, *Shā‘irī dar hujūm-i muntaqidān*, 50. (T.)

The author of the *Muḥākama* has interpreted the verse this way: “When the dew with such a low status and persistence reaches out to the sun, if my sun cast heat upon me, I would do the same, because my frail body is not more persistent than the dew. So, [Ḥazīn] has omitted the sentence “I too would reach out to the sun,” which is the consequence of the condition, and the first hemistich provides the corresponding the reason for it.”

At any rate, the question of the relation between the condition and the consequence in this verse is out of place.

As for the accusation of the borrowed theme, it is the result of [p. 134] [Ārzū’s] inattentiveness. The theme of the verse by Ṣā’ib is disloyalty, whereas here, according to my first interpretation, [the theme] is self-annihilation in the presence of the beloved, which is the [result of] extreme love and perfect loyalty. According to my second interpretation, [the theme] is proper conduct (*adab*), and proper conduct does not negate loyalty; rather, it is the essence of loyalty. And, according to the third interpretation (by the author the *Muḥākama*), [the theme] is to express one’s degree of aptitude and desire. So, [Ḥazīn] has changed the meaning of the theme [used in Ṣā’ib’s verse], and change (*taṣarruf*) eliminates [the sense of] borrowing (*ibtizāl*) and grants unfamiliarity to the borrowed theme. As mentioned in the *Muṭavval*, “**when a clichéd simile is altered by something that makes it unfamiliar, the cliché is removed.**”²¹

[*Muṭavval*’s author] then provides an example from Abū Ṭayyib [al- Mutannabī], where he has changed the [clichéd] simile of comparing a beautiful face to the sun by using a prophetic saying (*ḥadīṣ*) about shame (*ḥayā`*), thereby turning a familiar [simile] into an unfamiliar one.²²

What is more interesting is that he (Ārzū) has discussed this matter in his *Aṭīyya-yi kubrā* (Greater Gift) and has made a mistake here. Yes, what afflictions that are not aroused by jealousy! If you say that the distinguished Khān has also written in that same work that “the truth is that a strange simile (*tashbīh-i gharīb*) is more eloquent than an altered borrowed simile,” we would say **the truth is more deserving to be followed**. We, too, would say that borrowed is

²¹ I have used “cliché” in the translation of *mubtazal* here because it is used in reference to trite similes. (T.)

²² For the cited sentence, see Mas‘ūd b. ‘Umar al-Taftāzānī, *Muṭavval* (Istanbul: Dār al-ṭibā‘at al-‘āmirā, 1260/1844), 315. The verse by Abū al-Ṭayyib Mutannabī reads: “The sun would not appear before this face, unless it has no shame (*Lam yalqi hadhā al-vajha shamsu nahārinā//illā bi-vajhin laysa fīhi ḥayā`u*.)” By changing the trite simile of “a beautiful face like the sun,” the poet has removed its clichéd meaning and refreshed it (i.e., the beloved’s face is more beautiful than the sun).

borrowed, even when turned into something strange through alteration. But we are not concerned with the blamer [here]; rather, our point is just that borrowing is eliminated [in Ḥazīn verse], and that [point] is made. (*Qawl-i fayṣal*, 15–17)

Ḥazīn:

If we are depressed, what is happening to zephyr?

The scent of no rose has ever lost its way to our nose.

Mā gar fisurda-īm ṣabā rā chi mīshavad?

Rah gum nakarda bū-yi gulī tā damāgh-i mā

Khān-i Ārzū: For the meaning of this verse to be correct, “did not come” is required, that is, “the scent of no rose lost its way, [and thus the scent] did not come to our nose.” Also, in the first hemistich, he has mentioned “what is happening to zephyr,” while, in the second hemistich, he has connected “not losing the way” to the scent of the rose. It is more fitting²³ [p. 135] to say “it did not go the wrong way” instead of “it did not lose the way.”

The truth of the matter is that the point of this verse is that if we are depressed and do not strive to seek the beloved, what happened to zephyr, who went the wrong way,²⁴ and therefore, did not bring the scent of the rose, which is the beloved, to our nose. It takes much effort to arrive at this meaning with the wording [of the verse]. (*Tanbīh al-ghāfilīn*, 8)

Ṣahbā’ī: Based on his (Ārzū’s) prescription of the requirement of “did not come” and the change of “losing the way” to “going the wrong way,” it is clear that he understood the meaning of the verse to be a complaint against zephyr’s not coming and the scent of the rose not reaching [him], that is, “if we are depressed, what happened to zephyr, who did not come, and [so,] the

²³ The term Ārzū uses for “more fitting” is *ūlā* (اولی), which is a technical term used in the discussions about structure and form in literary criticism. According to Ārzū, the criteria for evaluating poetry is the fittingness (*awlaviyyat*) not correctness (*ṣiḥḥat*) of its constituting forms. For more on this topic and some examples, see Kadkanī, *Shā’irī dar hujūm-i muntaqidān*, 28–31. (T.)

²⁴ Unless an error was made by the scribe or the editor, in the previous paragraph, Ārzū suggests that it is better to say “it did not go the wrong way.” (T.)

scent of the rose did not lose its way to our nose, or did not reach us by some mistake.” But that is not the [intended] meaning. Rather, the meaning is “if we are depressed and cannot go to the garden, nothing [wrong] has happened to zephyr, that is, zephyr is not depressed, because the scent of the rose has not lost its way to our nose and keeps reaching us every moment.” In this reading, it is clear that zephyr is not depressed, because, if zephyr was depressed, how could the scent of the rose reach [the lover]?

And, the reason he (Ḥazīn) has connected “not losing the way” to the scent of the rose is that he has made zephyr the leader and carrier of the scent of the rose—without a leader, the wayfarer would surely get lost. Obviously, the scent of the rose cannot reach [the lover] without zephyr, so, it is [the scent of the rose that] would lose the way.

With this interpretation, the criticism of connecting the “losing of the way” to the scent of the rose, and the suggestion that “going the wrong way” is more fitting, are addressed. (*Qawl-i fayṣal*, 17)

Qārī: Mawlānā’s interpretation does not agree with the wording of the verse and [therefore] does not resolve the criticism. If the Sheikh’s intention was what Ṣahbā’ī says, he should have said it like this:

If we are depressed, zephyr nourishes our soul.

It cheers us up with the fresh scent of the rose.

Mā gū fisurda-īm ṣabā rūḥ-parvar ast

Sāzad zi bū-yi tāza-yi gul tar dimāgh-i mā

(*Kulliyāt-i Qārī*, 489)

Ḥazīn:

Our captivated heart made the beloved arrogant.

Our heart is a mirror for the beloved’s self-admiration.

Dil burdan-i mā bā ‘iṣ-i maghrūrī-i ū shud.

Ā’īna-yi khudbīnī-i yār ast dil-i mā.

Khān-i Ārzū: The first hemistich has two sides, one of which is not suitable for [speaking of] the taste of love. (*Tanbīh al-ghāfilīn*, 9)

[p. 136] **Hāzīn:**

We wish to go astray, where is a temple for love,
the bells of which would replace our “O Eternal” chant?

Sar-i kāfir shudan dārīm kū butkhāna-yi ‘ishqī
Ki nāqūsash bi-jāy-i naghma-yi yā hayy shavad mā rā

Khān-i Ārzū: It is not concealed to those who understand eloquent speech that bells cannot replace the chant of O Eternal. It should rather be the “sound of the bells.” (*Tanbīh al-ghāfilīn*, 9)

Şahbā’ī: Apparently, he (Ārzū) has never thought of synecdoche (*majāz*); otherwise, who does not know that the sound of the bells is intended by the bells, as in this verse by Nizāmī, where “Venus’s song” is intended by “Venus”:

I tied the silk [strings] of his instrument so [well]
that its song became more pleasant than Venus[’s].

Chinān bastam abrīsham-i sāz-i ū
Ki az zuhra khushtar shud āvāz-i ū

It means that the instrument’s sound became more pleasant than Venus’s. (*Qawl-i fayṣal*, 17)

Hāzīn:

Even if I may be fallen on the dust of your path for a hundred years because of my selflessness,

If you asked about [my] sojourn, I would passionately say that I stayed [only] one day.

Agar chi ṣad sāl zi bīkhudīhā bi khāk-i rāhat fitāda bāsham
Chu bāzpurīsī ḥadīs-i manzil, zi shawq gūyam labiṣtu yawman

Hail to love, which liberated me from the shackles of existence and idol worshipping.

No passion for any work, no burden, no suffering for today, no fear of tomorrow.

Khushā muḥabbat ki fāriḡham kard zi qayd-i hasī u but-parasī

Na zāwq-i kāri na zīr-i bārī na ranj-i imrūz na bīm-i fardā

Khān-i Ārzū: There are three lapses (*sikta*) in [the meter of] these two verses. Although some experts of prosody consider it permissible, it weighs heavily on a sound nature. With a slight modification, the first hemistich could read: *Agar chi ṣad sāl dar rah-i tu zi bīkḡudīhā fitāda bāsham* (Even if I may be fallen on your path for a hundred years because of my selflessness). The two lapses in the second verse, too, can be removed with slight modifications, but I do not have the [presence of] mind at the moment.

Although the hemistich that this lowly person (Ārzū) has composed contains a lapse too, mine is that of short vowels (*ḡarakatī*), whereas the Sheikh’s are of consonants and long vowels (*ḡarfī*), which should be removed to correct the meter. Lapses of short vowels abound in Abū Ṭālib Kalīm’s collection of poetry.²⁵ If it is said that this type of poetry is found in abundance in the works of Khāqānī and other masters, we would say that the point of removing the lapses is to eliminate what is unpleasant to the ear and can be treated with slight modifications; otherwise, there is no doubt about the correctness of this kind of lapse and even worse than this. Rizā Kāshī says:

O you who arrive from that abode, how is the heart and soul [of mine]?

How is my heart, how is my soul, how is the sweetheart?

Ay ki zān kū rasī aḡvāl-i dil u jān chūn ast?

Dil-i man chūn ast, jān chūn ast, jānān chūn ast?

[p. 137] Since some masters of speech were not sure about the correctness of the metre of this verse (Rizā Kāshī’s), they consulted Mawlānā Muḡtasham, who composed a verse in response to and in agreement with [Rizā Kāshī’s verse]:

The debate about the hemistich is not warranted, as [it] is not off-metered.²⁶

²⁵ Kalīm-i Kāshānī (born in Hamadān) was a great poet of the 17th century, who moved to Kāshān and then to Shīrāz, and finally immigrated to India during the reign of Jahāngīr and received the title of *Malik al-Shu‘arā* (King of Poets) from Shāh Jahān. (T.)

²⁶ If *rizā* in the second hemistich is read as a proper noun (Rizā), referring to the poet, it would form a possessive case with *miṣrā‘* (*miṣrā‘-i rizā* “Rizā’s hemistich”). In this case, the hemistich would mean: The question is not about Rizā’s hemistich not being metred.

Its style is balanced, and it is metred, but [its] metre has no name.

Baḥṣ-i miṣrā ‘ rizā nīst ki nā-mawzūn nīst

Ṭarz mawzūn ast u mawzūn ast u nām-i vazn nīst

This topic is discussed by Mawlānā Majd al-Dīn ‘Ali Qawsī Shustarī in his *Risāla-yi sikta* (Treatise on lapses).²⁷ But, to be fair, with the hemistich that this lowly person (Ārzū) has composed, keeping the Sheikh’s verse [as is] would be an extreme offense to the ears of the sound-natured people. (*Tanbīh al-ghāfilīn*, 10–11)

Şahbā’ī: I would say that the Sheikh should not be blamed so much. If he should, then who can be safe [from such blames]? What did a poet like Firdawsī, whose eloquence is firmly accepted, do in the *Shāhnāma*? If Mr. Critic read it, he would easily disgrace the honour of poetry (i.e., Firdawsī). (*Qawl-i fayṣal*, 18)

²⁷ It is not known if this work has survived or not. If it has, it should contain important information for the study of prosody and stylistics. See Kadkanī, *Shā’irī dar hujūm-i muntaqidān*, 49.