

The function of the *mamdūḥs* in the 7th *maqāla* of the *Tuḥfat al-ʿIrāqain* by Khāqānī Širwānī by A.L.F.A. Beelaert

1

There are several classical Persian texts in which we encounter a number of *mamdūḥs* instead of the usual single one i.e. the *mamdūḥ* in the strict sense of the word: the person who has given the commission — in the case of our dealing with a commissioned work — and who will give the remuneration. There is no clear-cut explanation for such a multiplicity of praised persons; obviously various historical situations and literary conventions are at its root.

In some of the cases the increase in *mamdūḥs* can only be interpreted as the result of rededication. In these cases, several consecutive versions have come to stand next to each other in the text as we have it now. Whereas it was never the author's intention to have those panegyric sections follow one after the other. Such a situation occurs in the second part of Nizāmī's *Iskandar-nāma*, the *Iqbāl-nāma*. The history of the text has not yet been satisfactorily resolved, but in all probability it was first dedicated to Nuṣrat al-Dīn, the Ildeñizide, and after his death in 607/1210 to the Zangid ʿIzz al-Dīn Masʿūd, who reigned in Mosul. In the manuscripts (none older than 763/1362), and even in the editions, the two versions are mixed up. In the critical edition¹ it is the Zangide king who is praised for the rebuilding of Ganḡa after an earthquake, and as Ganḡa is a territory over which he never ruled, the passage is obviously about Nuṣrat al-Dīn. In the edition of Waḥīd Dastgirdī² on the other hand, it is Nuṣrat al-Dīn who is called *ṭarafdār-i Mauṣil* 'possessor of Mosul'. The problem of rededicated texts is often not recognised, as one always seems to be searching for the 'real' *mamdūḥ* of a text³. Unjustly, alternative or extra names which occur are only mentioned in the critical apparatus of a text and are thus by tradition not incorporated in the index⁴.

One should, nevertheless, bear in mind that such cases are not extremely numerous, since rededication was something which was done by necessity, but was avoided in principle. One should consider a two-stage model for the whole ritual of offering a work (in particular larger works, i.e. other than *qaṣīdas*): a poet offers a work in progress, a would-be maecenas approves of the idea of presenting the finished work to him, and then the work is completed and provided

with the appropriate panegyrics. One source for such a situation is a letter of introduction from the 6th/12th century⁵, written on behalf of a certain Qādī al-Biṣṭāmī, who tried to present his work when only half completed. It is important in this context to think of the topos of the 'virginal work', *bikr*, as it is called in the prose introduction of the *Tuḥfat al-ʿIrāqain*⁶, i.e. a work not yet dedicated to anyone. This situation of 'virginity' was prolonged until the ideal 'husband' for the work was found⁷.

Another form of rededication should also be considered: after the original purpose of a work was fulfilled, some copies could be given to other dignitaries or friends, with a personal dedication in verse. These dedications could later, by an editor or by the author himself, be inserted in the text. A case in point is the *Ḥadiqat al-Ḥaqīqat* of Sanāʿī⁸.

In several other cases, however, the author intentionally praises several persons at once. In Nizāmī's *Khusraw u Šīrīn* both the Seljuqide Sultan Tuḡrīl b. Arslan and the Ildeñizides Muḥammad Šams al-Dīn Ġahān-Pahlavān and Qizil Arslan are praised. Although Ġahān-Pahlavān died in 581/1186 and an elegy on him is included in the epilogue, he is presented as alive in the prologue, and his praise, with that of the two others, is part of a compositional whole; from this prologue we can conclude that the first version was indeed dedicated to all three of them. Nizāmī addresses himself to Sultan Tuḡrīl, whom he asks to act as an intercessor and to persuade the Ildeñizid Ġahān-Pahlavān to reward him. In the end the poet turns to Qizil Arslan who at that moment is 'posted in the west', apparently subordinate to his brother. By way of an anecdote in which a lover considers the happiness of his beloved as his own, Nizāmī asks Qizil Arslan to consider the gift for his brother as also his own⁹. In this prologue, an important role is that of the intercessor, the person who opens the way to the ultimate maecenas.

Another kind of text where several *mamdūḥs* are presented is that where the personages of one town or one court are pictured, as in Sanāʿī's *Kārnāma-yi Balkh*¹⁰ or a small *maṭnawī* of Masʿūd-i Saʿd-i Sal-mān¹¹. These texts could be viewed as an elaborate form of town panegyrics.

2

The *Tuhfat al-'Irāqain* of Khāqānī (a Persian poet who lived from 521/1127 to 595/1199 mostly in Širwān, in the Caucasus, but for the latter years of his life in Tabriz) is a *matnawī* of some three thousand verses long, written around the time of the first *ḥaḡḡ* of the author, and presumed to have some connection with it. Its final version dates from 552/1157-58¹². In this poem thirty-two persons are invoked by name and then praised, blamed or mourned. When we see how much of the text is used for this¹³, and realize that the rest of the text is also set in what we could call 'the praising mode' (with as object cities, the sun, the Ka'ba and the Prophet) the epithet panegyric *matnawī* would not be unbecoming.

What sort of situation do we have here? Is there any analogy with the aforementioned cases?

To begin with I would like to summarize the *Tuhfat al-'Irāqain*¹⁴. In the edition it is divided into seven *maqālāt*¹⁵. In the first two, Khāqānī describes a short trip of his to 'Qūhistān', where he has a conversation with an unspecified *Khawāga-yi buzurg*, who does not allow him to speak to an unspecified *Pādšāh*. The titles in the text identify these two persons as Ğamāl al-Dīn Mauṣilī and the Seljuq king Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd, but these titles are obviously additions of copyists, for nothing in the text itself justifies this identification. A conversation with the Širwānšāh (called *Khāqān-i buzurg* in the text) and with Khidr, and a *mi'rāḡ* of the Prophet follow. These two *maqālāt* together have a *récit visionnaire*-like quality, part of which can be compared with Avicenna's *Ḥayy b. Yaqzān*. In both cases a *pīr* (in the *Tuhfat al-'Irāqain* Khidr) answers questions of an encyclopaedic and philosophical nature and at the end leads the protagonist to a king (in the *Tuhfat al-'Irāqain* the Prophet Muḥammad). In *maqāla* III-VI the poet addresses the sun and says that he cannot leave Širwān to make the *ḥaḡḡ*. The moving Ka'ba (the sun) has to visit the fixed Ka'ba. There follows a description of the road the sun has to take, and of some of the personages it will meet, with panegyrics for some of them, along with the advice to the sun to recite these praises at the intended places. Eventually, after Hamadān, Bagdad, Kūfa, Mecca and Medina, the sun will arrive in Mosul, where, as the poet says, it has to describe the journey to Ğamāl al-Dīn Mauṣilī, and praise him.

Then, abruptly, in *maqāla* VII the long maintained *conchetto* of the travelling sun is broken off, and the poem continues without this linking motif. Ğamāl al-Dīn Mauṣilī is addressed directly, praised and exhorted to do the pilgrimage himself through the sky, in the shape of the star Sirius. After Ğamāl al-Dīn comes a series of other panegyrics, and after them the work is concluded with another eulogy of Ğamāl al-Dīn.

The panegyrics which follow the praising of Hamadān and Bagdad do not present many difficulties. Their

function could be compared with the panegyrics in the above-mentioned *Kār-nāma-yi Balkh* and the small *matnawī* of Mas'ūd-i Sa'd.

The persons mentioned in the panegyrics cannot all be identified by way of other sources (a *Who's Who* of pre-Ikhanid Iran and Iraq would be an excellent project), but those who can be traced all belong to the expected category of men of consequence in the town concerned. For Hamadān there are the Seljuq king and the *ra'īs* of the town with his sons, for Bagdad the Khalif, and for both cities Šāfi'ite lawyers, theologians and *šaikhs*. The problems begin with the panegyrics of *maqāla* VII. In the first instance it is not clear what the different praised persons have in common. At any rate, they are not all inhabitants of Mosul. Moreover, in contrast with the panegyric portions of Hamadān and Bagdad, the panegyrics of *maqāla* VII are not transmitted integrally and in the same order in the edition and in the manuscripts used.

3

These manuscripts are the following. Only two of them were extensively used:

— The oldest dated extant manuscript of the *Tuhfat al-'Irāqain* (not used for the edition) Aya Sofya 1762/2, in the Süleymaniye Library of Istanbul, dated Rabī II 791/April 1389¹⁶.

— A manuscript of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris¹⁷, undated but from the 9th/15th century. Y. Qarīb used it for the edition, without, however, noting important differences between it and the text as he edited it.

In addition I perused four more manuscripts of the Bodleian library in Oxford; three of the *Tuhfat al-'Irāqain* itself, and one of a commentary.

— MS Fraser 62, undated but presumably 9th/15th century¹⁸.

— MS Fraser 61, dated 1015/1606¹⁹.

— MS Elliot 384, dated 1209/1794²⁰.

— MS Ouseley 61, an extensive commentary by Ğulām Muḥammad in a manuscript dated 1124/1712. The commentary itself was probably written a century earlier²¹.

The differences concerning the panegyric sections which one notices in these manuscripts raise the question whether we have here a situation like that found in the *Iqbāl-nāma* (rededication), in the *Ḥadīqat al-Ḥaqīqat* (dedications to friends, afterwards incorporated) or in the *Khusraw u Širīn* (multiple dedication, with the presence of an intercessor). The relative obscurity of the various personalities mentioned does not make the choice any easier.

4

Here follow in the order of the edition, some data on their personalities:

The main *mamdūh*, as has already been said, is Ġamāl al-Dīn Mauṣilī, a native from Iṣfahān, vizir of the Zangids in Mosul. He is one of the very important people of the 6th/12th century; famous for his generosity, he is therefore well-known under the name al-Ġawād²². Khāqānī calls him *šāh-i sakhā* several times, and calls himself *šāh-i sukhan* in contrast. This generosity was in large part dedicated to Mecca and Medina. Ibn Ġubair, who made the *ḥaġġ* thirty years after the *Tuḥfa* was written, alludes several times to the embellishments and the facilities he sees there, which were financed by Ġamāl al-Dīn. We may say that he was the ideal man to whom one could dedicate a work like the *Tuḥfa*.

There follows an extensive eulogy of 'Umar Diyā' al-Dīn al-Nisā'ī. From the eulogy Khāqānī bestows on him, we can see that he was a *šaiḫ* from Mosul. He is praised as a 'builder of the Ka'ba' (*'āmīr-i Ka'ba*): as the text makes clear, this refers to the fact that he was sent by Ġamāl al-Dīn Mauṣilī to Mecca and Medina to deliver his gifts²³. Khāqānī expresses his devotion to him and gives a long excursus on the renunciation of the world.

Then comes Raḍī al-Dīn Khuzā'ī, praised as a learned and eloquent man, and one skilful with the pen. There are no specifications concerning his function or place of residence²⁴. An identification with the *mamdūh* of a *qaṣīda* of Khāqānī²⁵, a certain Raḍī al-Dīn, who is the vizir of the Širwānšāh, is possible. The latter is also extensively praised for his penmanship. More interesting is the fact that the *qaṣīda* in question has as subject matter the request for the intercession of the vizir in relation to the Širwānšāh, since ill-disposed people seem to have spread the news that Khāqānī wants to withdraw from the service of the Šāh. Khāqānī takes an oath by everything he cares for (it is a *saugand-nāma*, an 'oath-poem'), that this is not the case, but that he only went from the *khāna* to the *khāngāh* (from the house to the monastery) as a child goes from his father to his mother. This situation, as we shall see further on, can be read between the lines of the *Tuḥfa*. (Raḍī al-Dīn is missing from the manuscript of Paris²⁶.)

Khāqānī then first praises himself and his poetry, and, in what are perhaps among the most beautiful passages of the *Tuḥfat al-'Irāqain*, describes his poetical creation in terms of the occupations of his grandfather, father and mother, respectively weaving, carpentry and cooking. Subsequently he praises his father and his mother and mourns his uncle Kāfī al-Dīn.

These are followed by Sayyid Šaraf al-Dīn Muḥammad Muṭahhir al-'Alawī, whom we can identify with certainty from at least five letters of Khāqānī²⁷. In two of them he is praised as one of the *autād* of a *ṭarīqa*²⁸. In a letter written early after his first *ḥaġġ*, Khāqānī expresses the hope of meeting Šaraf al-Dīn in Madīnat al-Salām (i.e. Bagdad) after having been unable to meet at the Ka'ba²⁹. From the panegyric in the *Tuḥfat*

al-'Irāqain we can deduce that they have met (no hint is given where this has taken place), and that Šaraf al-Dīn, after having been away from Herat, has returned to his home town³⁰.

Then we have Waḥīd al-Dīn 'Uṭmān, the son of Khāqānī's uncle Kāfī al-Dīn. In the Paris manuscript his eulogy comes indeed directly after that of the poet's uncle. This must have been the original order, because a relic of this former situation is still to be found. In the edition, the last line of the eulogy on Šaraf al-Dīn and the first line of the eulogy on Waḥīd mourn the death of an *imām*³¹. This is clearly meant for his uncle, and the verses are the transition between the passages devoted to uncle and cousin in the Paris manuscript³². They are affixed to the *martīya* on Kāfī in the Istanbul manuscript³³, where neither Waḥīd nor Šaraf is represented³⁴.

In the edition Naġm al-Dīn Aḥmad b. 'Alī Sīmgār³⁵ follows Waḥīd. He is praised for the spiritual help he gave to Khāqānī. He is also known to us from the *Dīwān*³⁶ as well as from the letters³⁷ as a *šaiḫ* in Darband, to whose *khāngāh* Khāqānī retired from time to time to escape the obligations of the court. The presence of this person is an extra argument for the identification of the aforementioned Raḍī al-Dīn as the vizir of the Širwānšāh.

There immediately follows a *martīya* on 'Imād al-Dīn Abharī, a 'pure young man' who died in his thirty-third year ('like Iskandar'). We know him also from a letter, written by Khāqānī, presumably during a stay at the *khāngāh* of Naġm al-Dīn³⁸. There he tells another *šaiḫ* about the death of this man, who is mourned in several *qiṭ'as* in the *Dīwān*³⁹.

The elegy on 'Imād al-Dīn (whose death seems to have been caused by someone's negligence) elicits an invective against 'enemies', which crystallizes eventually into a satire on Abū'l 'Alā' Gaṅgavī, a poet at the court of Širwān who is said to be Khāqānī's father-in-law⁴⁰.

After those *nā-tamāmān*, 'imperfect persons', as he calls them, Khāqānī returns to 'a second Muḥammad', Muḥammad Šadr al-Dīn, and his brother Ġamāl al-Dīn, two important men (to whom he also refers in his *Dīwān*) and members of the famous Iṣfahān family of the Khuġandīs, a family which held the function of *ra'īs* of the Šāfi'ite *madhab* in that town during the whole of the 6th/12th century⁴¹. Šadr al-Dīn was the *ra'īs* at the time of the composition of the *Tuḥfat al-'Irāqain*. The fact that they come from Iṣfahān does not necessarily mean that Khāqānī became acquainted with them there⁴², since Šadr al-Dīn also taught at the Niẓāmīya in Bagdad, and both brothers had connections with Mosul, as we shall see later⁴³.

Then comes 'Izz al-Dīn Muḥammad Qaṣṣār, whom we cannot identify with anyone from the *Dīwān* or the letters. He is praised as a pure man, and Khāqānī puns on his *laqab* Qaṣṣār, 'fuller', 'cleaner of clothes'. He is thanked for the fact that he talked to Khāqānī about

šaiḫ 'Umar, who must be the earlier mentioned šaiḫ 'Umar al-Nisā'i from Mosul.

By way of a smooth transitional passage we reach Taġ al-Dīn 'Alī Šaibānī, an eloquent *wā'iz*, not connected explicitly with any place, and unknown to us in any other way⁴⁴.

Before another panegyric on Ġamāl al-Dīn Mauṣilī begins, there are three verses for a certain Rašīd al-Dīn Abū Bakr, someone from the stock of Abū Sa'id b. Abī 'l-Khair according to Khāqānī. This can be interpreted as proof of his Khurasan origin. However there exists a tomb of another Abū Sa'id b. Abī 'l-Khair in Baku, thus this Rašīd could well be someone from Širwān⁴⁵. (These verses are not included in the manuscript of Paris.)

Summing up the preceding, the residences of the personages are as follows:

Ġamāl al-Dīn Mauṣilī	}	Mosul
'Umar Dīyā' al-Dīn al-Nisā'i		
Raḍī al-Dīn Khuzā'i		presumably Širwān
Family (5 persons)		Širwān
Šaraf al-Dīn Harawī		Herat / (Bagdad?)
Naġm al-Dīn ibn Simgar		Darband
'Imād al-Dīn Abharī		i.a. Darband
Šadr and Ġamāl Khuġandī		Išfahān / Bagdad / (Mosul)
'Izz al-Dīn	}	residence not clear
Tāġ al-Dīn		
Rašīd al-Dīn		presumably Širwān

5

The best approach to the history of a text as the *Tuhfat al-'Irāqain* is not a purely philological one (apart from the fact that I have not seen enough manuscripts to afford such an approach), but a close look at the problematic passages.

Looking at Table I one sees differences in these manuscripts concerning the inclusion or non-inclusion of some personalities. What could be the reason for this? A hypothesis of rededication, in the sense that one of the persons excluded was once intended as the main *mamdūh*, can be ruled out when we see who the persons concerned are. Neither his cousin Waḥīd al-Dīn, or Rašīd al-Dīn, who receives three lines of friendly praise, are appropriate. Raḍī al-Dīn could have been one, but against this speaks the fact that the only manuscript which lacks him, the Paris manuscript, incorporates most of his panegyric into the section about Naġm al-Dīn (where it is obviously not in the right place⁴⁶). The elimination is likely to be due to a copyist. That leaves the case of Šaraf al-Dīn who is missing in the oldest manuscript (the Istanbul manuscript), where the last verse of his panegyric is incorporated into the panegyric on Naġm al-Dīn⁴⁷, but one - impersonal — verse is too little of an argument for a solution as in the case of Raḍī al-Dīn. As a Šāfi'ite lawyer and *šaiḫ*, however, he was most probably not a person of large enough financial means to have been thought of by Khāqānī as the main *mamdūh* of his most ambitious work. There remains the possibi-

TABLE I

Panegyrics of *maqāla* 7 of the *Tuhfat al-'Irāqain*.

Edition	Ms. Istanbul (791/1389)	Ms. Paris (9/15th C.)	Fraser 62 (9/15th C.)	Fraser 61 (1015/1606)	Ouseley 61 (1124/1712) (commentary)	Elliot 384 (1209/1794)
Ġamāl al-Dīn Mauṣilī	Ġamāl M.	Ġamāl M.	Ġamāl M.	Ġamāl M.	Ġamāl M.	Ġamāl M.
Dīyā' al-Dīn Nisā'i	Dīyā'	Dīyā'	Dīyā'	Dīyā'	Dīyā'	Dīyā'
Raḍī al-Dīn Khuzā'i	Raḍī		Raḍī	Raḍī	Raḍī	Raḍī
Khāqānī	Khāqānī	Khāqānī	Khāqānī	Khāqānī	Khāqānī	Khāqānī
Father	father	father	father	father	father	father
Mother	mother	mother	mother	mother	mother	mother
Kāfī al-Dīn (uncle)	Kāfī	Kāfī	Kāfī	Kāfī	Kāfī	Kāfī
Šaraf al-Dīn Harawī		Waḥīd	Šaraf	Waḥīd	Šaraf	Šaraf
Waḥīd al-Dīn (cousin)		Naġm	(Waḥīd)	Naġm	Waḥīd	Naġm
Naġm al-Dīn b. Simgar	Naġm	Šaraf	Naġm	Šaraf	Naġm	Waḥīd
'Imād al-Dīn Abharī	'Imād	'Izz	'Izz	'Izz	'Izz	'Izz
Abū'l-'Alā' Ganġawī	Abū'l-'Alā'	Tāġ	Tāġ	Tāġ	Tāġ	Tāġ
Šadr al-Dīn Khuġandī	Šadr	'Imād	Rašīd		Rašīd	Rašīd
Ġamāl al-Dīn Khuġandī	Ġamāl	Abū'l-'Alā'	'Imād	'Imād	'Imād	'Imād
'Izz al-Dīn Qaṣṣār	'Izz	Šadr	Abū'l-'Ala'	Abū'l-'Ala'	Abū'l-'Ala'	Abū'l-'Ala'
Tāġ al-Dīn Šaibānī	Tāġ	Ġamāl	Šadr	Šadr	Šadr	Šadr
Rašīd al-Dīn	Rašīd		Ġamāl	Ġamāl	Ġamāl	Ġamāl
Ġamāl al-Dīn Mauṣilī	Ġamāl M.	Ġamāl M.	Ġamāl M.	Ġamāl M.	Ġamāl M.	Ġamāl M.
	(Šaraf and Waḥīd are missing)	(Raḍī and Rašīd are mis- sing)	(Waḥīd has been added in the margin in another hand)	(Order as in ms. Paris but only Rašīd is missing)		

lity that he was a person to whom a separate dedicated copy was sent and whose panegyric was afterwards inserted.

Useful information can perhaps be gleaned from the order of the panegyrics. In the various manuscripts the following sequences are fixed: 'Izz/Tāğ/Rašīd (whenever it is complete) and 'Imād/enemies/ Abū'l-'Alā' Ganğavī/the Khuğandīs. Concerning their respective order, however, there are two traditions. Either the first sequence (as in the edition or the Istanbul manuscript) or the second (as in the other manuscripts used) precedes the final praising of Ğamāl al-Dīn Maušilī. It can be argued that preference is to be given to the second option. First of all, there is a connection between the Khuğandīs and Ğamāl al-Dīn Maušilī. As we already know, Ğamāl al-Dīn Maušilī also came from Işfahān, and this alone could make us think that there was contact between them. But in fact we know even more. 'Imād Kātīb in his *Nuṣrat al-fatra* tells us how Şadr al-Dīn and Ğamāl al-Dīn fled to Ğamāl al-Dīn Maušilī, in Mosul, in 543/1148-49, when there arose difficulties in Işfahān⁴⁸. It is even tempting to suggest — but I concede this is pure speculation — that they played a role as intercessor between Khāqānī and Ğamāl al-Dīn Maušilī. We know that the son of this Şadr al-Dīn (with the same *laqab*, but with the *ism* 'Abd al-Laṭīf) did this for another writer: In the above-mentioned letter from the 6th/12th century, (see above, par. 1) it is 'Abd al-Laṭīf who writes to Ğamāl al-Dīn Maušilī to present a work of an otherwise unknown Qāḍī al-Biṣṭāmī. As we have seen in the introduction of the *Khusraw u Şīrīn*, the name of an intercessor is something we can expect.

A second and perhaps more important argument is that the praising of 'Izz al-Dīn begins with the following verse:

z'ān 'ālī mağlis-i muqaddas
*'Izz al-Dīn yādgār-i man bas*⁴⁹.

Even if the term *mağlis-i muqaddas* could be used for the milieu of the Šāfi'ite lawyers and preachers of the Khuğandīs, who precede in the edition, Khāqānī uses it in his letters mostly for the milieu of a *šaiḫ*⁵⁰. This would leave open the possibility of both Şaraf al-Dīn and Nağm al-Dīn, who alternatively precede 'Izz al-Dīn in some manuscripts. The facts are somewhat in favour of Nağm al-Dīn. Şaraf al-Dīn, as it happens, does not explicitly figure as a *šaiḫ* in the *Tuḥfat al-'Irāqain* itself; Nağm al-Dīn, however, is presented as such. Moreover, we can doubt whether Şaraf al-Dīn is part of the original series: we have seen already that he is missing in the Istanbul manuscript and that in the edition (and some other manuscripts) he is obviously misplaced between Kāfī al-Dīn, Khāqānī's uncle, and Waḥīd al-Dīn, his cousin (see above, par 4). A last argument for 'Izz al-Dīn belonging to Nağm al-Dīn's circle and not Şaraf al-Dīn's is that he is not known to us otherwise: this is a very common situation as far as

people from Azerbaijan are concerned, but much less for Khurasan, about which we are better documented. But for the time being the question has to be left open.

6

Summing up the preceding, what is the impression we get from the 7th *maqāla*, and the persons praised there? We see that the people can be divided into those living in Azerbaijan and other personal friends on the one hand, and those related to the vizir of Mosul on the other hand. In several of these panegyrics there is an emphasis on the role they played in the spiritual evolution of the poet, and in a sense these panegyrics can be seen as an extension of the *fakhr*, 'self-praise', the classical form of which Khāqānī also uses in the 7th *maqāla*, or indeed in his whole work. In the order in which they are presented in the Paris manuscript, it is a fairly closely-knit series, with the possible exception of the section on Şaraf al-Dīn. A passage earlier in this *matnawī* can be seen as a preparation of such a series: in a panegyric on the Prophet Muḥammad⁵¹ Khāqānī takes an oath that he will never praise anyone but the Prophet himself, except the 'leaders of your religion' (*nuqabā-yi ummat-i tu*), 'dignitaries' (*aşhāb*), parents (*wālidīn*) and loved ones (*aḥbāb*). This could be taken as a statement concerning his poetry in general, but because of the inclusion of his parents, and the fact that no panegyric of his mother other than that in the *Tuḥfat al-'Irāqain* is known, the passage is best interpreted to refer to the *Tuḥfat al-'Irāqain* itself.

It is very probable that all these persons, (except perhaps Şaraf al-Dīn Harawī), figured in the copy presented to Ğamāl al-Dīn Maušilī. In relation to this *mamdūh* it must have had the function of a *curriculum vitae*, reflecting the poet's personal background and the spiritual values he cherished.

7

What is the relation with the texts mentioned at the beginning of our exposition? There is no trace in the text of another possible main *mamdūh*, so the kind of rededication as we find it in the *Iqbāl-nāma* is not seen here (although this seems to have been suggested formerly by Ḥ. Āmūzgār⁵²) but we can contemplate in the case of Şaraf al-Dīn (and possibly also Rašīd al-Dīn) — an analogy with the *Hadīqat al-Ḥaḳīqat*. If our hypothesis about the Khuğandīs is right, there is an affinity with the *Khusraw u Şīrīn*. The main relationship, however, is with a text as the *Kār-nāma-yi Balkh*. We have in both instances a long series of persons intended as such. The important difference, however, is that in Sanā'ī's work these persons are all but one citizens of one town (Ghazna), and are not particularly described in their relationship with the poet himself. The use made of a series of panegyrics by Khāqānī in his *Tuḥfat al-'Irāqain* is fairly unique in Persian literature up to the 6th/12th century.

NOTES

- ¹ F. Babayev, Baku 1947, pp. 19-20.
- ² 2nd ed., Tehran 1335, pp. 26-33
- ³ Nevertheless, the possibility of rededication has been recognized. V. Minorsky, in his article 'Khāqānī and Andronicos Comnenos' (in *BSOAS*, XI, 1945, p. 562), gives an example in connection with a *qaṣīda* (although he prefers eventually the solution of the dedication to two persons). For the situation in Arabic literature see J. Bencheikh, *Poétique arabe, essai sur les voies d'une création*. Paris 1975, p. 78.
- ⁴ There are some examples in Khāqānī's *Dīwān*, e.g. ed. D. Saḡḡādī, 2nd edition, Tehran 1357, *qaṣīda* No. 39, pp.133-144, dedicated to Nuṣrat al-Dīn Abū 'l-Muzaffar Iṣfahbad Liyaluāšīr. From the apparatus it appears that the verses with the name of this *mamdūh* are not found in the oldest manuscript dated 664/1266 (British Museum MS Or. 7942, G.M. Meredith-Owens, *Handlist of Persian Manuscripts 1895-1966*, London 1968, p. 53), and are sometimes replaced by verses with 'Akhsitān' or 'Khāqān-i akbar', (*ibid.* p. 135, n.1, p. 137, n.2).
- ⁵ In a collection of letters from the 5th/11th-6th/12th century, *Al-mukhtārāt min al-rasā'il*, edited in facsimile by I. Afšār (Tehran 2535) p. 84.
- ⁶ *Tuhfat al-'Irāqain*, ed. Y. Qarīb, Tehran 1333, p. 9.
- ⁷ Heuristically it may help to think of the manner of working of Renaissance artists, e.g. as told by the 16th-century etcher, goldsmith and sculptor Benvenuto Cellini in his autobiography (translated by G. Bull, Harmondsworth 1956). He tells how he made a wax model of a salt-cellar on demand of the cardinal of Ferrara. When the model was finished, the cardinal did not accept it. Afterwards Cellini was invited to the court of François I in France, where he made several objects. When the King wanted to have an accompanying salt-cellar for two jugs, Cellini displayed the once rejected wax model he had taken with him. The King approved of it and Cellini made the golden work which is now in Vienna (*op.cit.* pp. 238-240, 261-2, 290-1). The wax model is the intermediate version of a work, and can be compared with the unfinished and undedicated copy of the work of a Persian author.
- ⁸ See J.T.P. de Bruijn, *Of Piety and Poetry. The Interaction of Religion and Literature in the Life and Works of Ḥakīm Sanā'ī of Ghazna*. Leiden 1983, p. 85.
- ⁹ Ed. L.A. Khetagurov, Baku 1960, pp. 27-55. On p. 31 this edition has the reading *ṣafīqī* instead of *ṣafī'ī* (as in the edition of Waḥīd Dastgirdī, 2nd ed. Tehran 1333, p. 17); erroneously this *ṣafī'ī* is not mentioned in the apparatus, although it could be considered as a possible reading. But even with the reading *ṣafīqī*, the role Sultan Tuḡrīl plays in the prologue is unmistakably the role of an intercessor.
- ¹⁰ *maṭnawīhā-yi Ḥakīm Sanā'ī*, ed. M.T. Mudarris-i Raḍāvī, Tehran 1348, pp. 142-178. The work is treated by J.T.P. de Bruijn, *op.cit.* pp. 194-200.
- ¹¹ Ed. R. Yāsīmī, 2nd ed. Tehran 1362, pp. 562-579. The title there is *Madḥ dar wasf-i darbāriyān wa 'amala-yi khalwat wa arbāb-i tarab*.
- ¹² The exact connection of the *Tuhfat al-'Irāqain* with Khāqānī's first *ḥaḡḡ* is the subject of a still unresolved controversy, in which a.o. B. Furūzanfar, H. Āmūzgār, D. Saḡḡādī, B. Reinert, and most recently Ğ. Kanadilī participated, sometimes ignoring each other's arguments. 552 A.H. is based on a verse (p. 140, verse 1) which mentions the well-known conjunction of planets in 582 as being another thirty years away. A verse on the last page of the text (p. 250, verse 3) could in my view be interpreted as a chronogram which also yields the same date 552. (*In tuhfā kurāsa-īst muḥdīṭ*, i.e. the value of the letters of the word *muḥdīṭ*.) How long it took Khāqānī to compose the whole work will possibly never receive but hypothetical answers, but this date can safely be seen as the date of its completion. (More details will be given in a monograph on the *Tuhfat al-'Irāqain* which I intend to publish before long.)
- ¹³ More or less a third of the text is devoted to it.
- ¹⁴ This *maṭnawī* has usually been incorrectly summarized. To my knowledge only H. Āmūzgār's summary in his *Muqaddama-yi Tuhfat al-'Irāqain*, Tehran 1333, is for the most part correct.
- ¹⁵ In nearly all the manuscripts I have seen it is divided in six *maqālāt* (with the exception of the MS Fraser 61 in the Bodleian Library in Oxford which has five *maqālāt*). But this division is not so important, as it is most probably an invention of copyists and not of Khāqānī himself.
- ¹⁶ A. Ateş, *Istanbul Kütüphanelerindi Farsça Manzum Eserler*, Istanbul 1968, No. 83.
- ¹⁷ *Kulliyāt*, Suppl. persan 1816, E. Blochet, *Catalogue des manuscrits persans de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris 1905-1934, tome 3, No. 1232.
- ¹⁸ *Tuhfat al-'Irāqain*, H. Ethé, *Catalogue of the Persian (...) MSS in the Bodleian Library*, Oxford 1889, No. 576.
- ¹⁹ *Kulliyāt*, Cat. H. Ethé, No. 560.
- ²⁰ *Tuhfat al-'Irāqain*, Cat. H. Ethé, No. 579.
- ²¹ Cat. H. Ethé, No. 580.
- ²² This is also the name under which he is listed in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., Leiden/London, 1954-*(EI²)*, s.v. al-Djawād al-Iṣfahānī.
- ²³ He does not appear in the rest of Khāqānī's work. The identification by H. Āmūzgār (*op. cit.*, p. 80) of this Diyā' al-Dīn with the Diyā' al-Dīn Abū'l-Naḡīb, praised by Khāqānī among the people of Bagdad, cannot be sustained. In *maqāla* VII our Diyā' al-Dīn is explicitly connected with Mosul (p. 196 v.10).
- ²⁴ H. Āmūzgār places him among the people of Mosul without any motivation (*ibid.* pp. 92-93)
- ²⁵ *Qaṣīda* 15, ed. D. Saḡḡādī, pp. 49-56.
- ²⁶ H. Āmūzgār (*op. cit.* pp. 92-93) mentions other manuscripts from which his name is missing.
- ²⁷ *Munša'āt-i Khāqānī*, ed. M. Raušan, Tehran 1349, Nos. 6, 21, 32, 55 and 56.
- ²⁸ *Ibid.*, letter No. 6, p. 37 and No. 56, p. 327.
- ²⁹ In letter No. 32, p. 218, written from the *khāngāh* of a *Šaiḫ* 'Uṭmān to Šaraf al-Dīn.
- ³⁰ From other sources we know that Šaraf al-Dīn was also a Šāfi'ite lawyer in Qazwin (cf. *Dīwān* of Qiwāmī Rāzī, ed. Ğ. Muḥaddīṭ, Tehran 1334, *ta'līqāt*, p. 207, where the unedited work by Rāfi'ī Šāfi'ī (d. 623/1226-27) *Tadwīn fī ḍikr ahl al-'ilm bi-Qazwīn* is cited, cf. C. Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur* (2nd ed. Leiden 1943-48), I, p. 393.) In the period that the other four letters were written this seems to have been the case: he is called there *ṣadr-i Khurasān* and *qadwat-i 'Irāq*, but nothing in the *Tuhfat al-'Irāqain* or in letter No. 32 points in that direction. Two of Khāqānī's letters (Nos. 55 and 56, written by Khāqānī from Širwān to Akhsitān who is in Abkhāz, where he was victorious in battle) give also greetings from Šaraf al-Dīn and indicate that in a later period he also lived for some time in Širwān.

³¹ *Tuḥfat al-'Irāqain*, p. 224, verses 9-10.

³² Fol. 30a.

³³ Fol. 136a.

³⁴ The fact that some lines were not clearly part of this or that section of the text is to be imputed to the manner in which manuscripts were sometimes written, namely in four columns, with titles placed in such a way that they do not form a clear caesura, as e.g. in the manuscript of Istanbul.

³⁵ Some aspects of his connections with Khāqānī have been studied by: Ğ. Kanadilī in his article 'Nāma ba Waḥīd al-Dīn 'Uṭmān, Khāqānī wa Nağm al-Dīn Sīngar' (*Naşrīya-yi Dānişkada-yi Adabīyāt-i Tabrīz (NDAT)*, 21, 1348, pp. 235-251).

³⁶ *Qaşıda* No. 96, pp. 324-328.

³⁷ Letters Nos. 17, 46 and 51.

³⁸ Letter No. 46.

³⁹ *Dīwān*, pp. 845, 902 and 964.

⁴⁰ The oldest explicit source for this is Daulatšāh's *Tadki-rat al-šu'arā'* (ed. E.G. Browne, London/Leiden 1901, p. 70), a work completed around 892/1487, although Daulatšāh himself refers to Mustaufī's *Tārīkh-i guzīda* (of 730/1329-30), in which we find only one verse of Abū 'l-'Alā' which could be thus interpreted. In the whole of Khāqānī's oeuvre the question is not referred to. In any case Abū 'l-'Alā' lived in Širwān (*Tuḥfat al-'Irāqain*, p. 237, verse 7).

⁴¹ Curiously enough, none of them has earned an article in the *EI*². About their importance see H. Halm, *Die Ausbreitung der Šafī'itischen Rechtsschulen*, Wiesbaden 1974, pp. 146-47.

⁴² It is generally accepted that Khāqānī passed through that city in returning home from his pilgrimage (Cf. D. Sağğādī in the introduction to the *Dīwān*, p. 17), but there are no really strong arguments for this.

⁴³ According to a title in the edition, two brothers are ascribed to Šadr al-Dīn, but this is based on a faulty interpretation of one verse, p. 241, verse 1.

⁴⁴ H. Āmūzgār, *op. cit.* pp. 101-102, mentions both 'Izz al-Dīn and Tāğ al-Dīn among the people of Širwān, without any motivation.

⁴⁵ Cf. Ğ. Kanadilī, 'Šams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. 'Alī wa Khāqānī Širwānī' (*NDAT*, 23, 1350, p. 169-171). Following the inscription on the tomb the man buried in Baku is

himself a descendant of his well-known namesake (But even if in the *Tuḥfat al-'Irāqain* the great Abū Sa'īd is meant, this does not prove that Rašīd al-Dīn himself originated from Khurasan). This man is possibly the same as the addressee of the short letter No. 4, *khwāğa-yi ḥakīm-i fāḍil Rašīd al-Dīn, mağd al-ḥukamā', šaraf al-Širwān, Maḥmūd al-ṭabīb*, although this is not considered by Ğ. Kanadilī.

⁴⁶ On fol. 31a we see in the section on Nağm al-Dīn the following verses from the panegyric of Raḍī al-Dīn: edition p. 203, verse 6, up to p. 204, verse 2, and the second *mişrā'*s of p. 203, verses 3-5, attached to other first *mişrā'*s. Thus from the entire panegyric of Raḍī al-Dīn only p. 203, verse 2 (with his name) is not to be found at all in this manuscript.

⁴⁷ Edition p. 224, verse 8 on fol. 136b.

⁴⁸ *Histoire des Seldjucides de l'Iraq par al-Bondarī, d'après 'Imād al-Dīn al-Kātib al-Isfahānī*, ed. M.Th. Houtsma (Leiden 1889) vol. 2, pp. 219-221, as cited by Y. Qarīb in his notes in the edition of the *Tuḥfat al-'Irāqain* (*op. cit.* pp. 415-416):

⁴⁹ P. 242, verse 1.

⁵⁰ E.g. letter No. 8, p. 50: *mağlis-i muqaddas (...)* Ğamāl al-Dīn, *sulṭān al-ṭarīqa*, letter No. 56, p. 327: *mağlis-i muqaddas (...)* Šaraf al-Dīn (Harawī) (...), *awwal-i autād al-ṭarīqa*. But perhaps not exclusively: letter No. 33, p. 220: *mağlis-i muqaddas (...)* Zahr al-Dīn (...), *šaikh al-islām, 'allāmat al-'ulamā'* and letter No. 24b, pp. 178-179: *mağlis-i muqaddas (...)* Quṭb al-Dīn (...), *ra'īs al-aşḥāb, muftī-yi 'Irāq*. In this last case, however, one of the two manuscripts in which this letter was preserved has the reading *muqtadā* instead of *muqaddas*.

⁵¹ *Tuḥfat al-'Irāqain* p. 170, verses 10-11.

⁵² *Op. cit.* pp. 22-24. He does not say so explicitly; he considers, however, e.g. Šaraf al-Dīn Harawī as one of the people of Khurasan to whom Khāqānī could have sent his *Tuḥfat al-'Irāqain* before presenting it to Ğamāl al-Dīn Mauşilī. The fact that Khāqānī sent the *Tuḥfat al-'Irāqain* first to Khurasan is deduced from the prose introduction (edition, p. 9). The passage in question can indeed be interpreted as a search for the right *mamdūḥ* in Iraq and Khurasan before finding Ğamāl al-Dīn, but, as we have seen, Šaraf al-Dīn is no likely candidate; also, the search for another *mamdūḥ* does not necessarily result in a *madḥ*.