

# The transmission of early Persian ghazals (with special reference to the *Dīvān* of Sanā'ī) by J.T.P. de Bruijn

1

It is still difficult to say exactly when the Persian ghazal came into being. There can be no doubt that, from the very beginning, love poetry was an important element of the Persian tradition. The term 'ghazal' itself, a borrowing from Arabic poetry, was in use as early as the Samanid period, though it is not quite clear whether it denoted a specific type of poetry or merely the erotic genre in general. Rūdakī, the great minstrel poet of the 4th/10th century, was regarded as a specialist of the ghazal<sup>1</sup>. The *dīvāns* of some of the poets at the Ghaznavid court in the early 5th/11th century, contain examples of fine love poetry incorporated in *qaṣīdas*; there are also a few short pieces of a similar nature which, however, are suspected of being actually fragments of *qaṣīdas*, the panegyrical sections of which have not been preserved<sup>2</sup>.

In spite of these early references to the ghazal, the number of specimens preserved as independent poems from the earliest period (i.e. up to about 1100 A.D.) remains very small indeed. When the evident popularity of love poetry at the courts of both the Samanids and the Ghaznavids is taken into consideration, the virtual absence of ghazals from the recorded literature seems hard to explain. It is true, of course, that the works of the early poets have not been handed down to us in full. The remnants of Samanid poetry which were reassembled by modern scholarship are too few to allow any certain conclusions as far as the ghazal poetry of the 4th/10th century is concerned. Even the *dīvāns* of early Ghaznavid poets such as 'Unṣurī, Farruxī and Manūčīhrī are known to us only in comparatively late and probably recast forms, no older than the 10th/16th or the 11th/17th century<sup>3</sup>. However, these unfortunate philological circumstances do not provide a sufficient explanation for the fact that we do have a fair number of *qaṣīdas*, stanzaic poems and *matnavīs* from this period, but hardly any ghazals.

If the available documents do not provide a direct answer to the question how the earliest ghazals were actually transmitted, it might be worthwhile to try an indirect approach. The period under discussion is still very close to the origin of classical Persian poetry. This event involved in many ways a decisive break with the

literary past of Iran, not least because it introduced the written transmission of poetry, which the Arabic philologists had evolved during the previous centuries. The *dīvān*, as a 'register' of a poet's collected work, was an essential element of this innovation. Primarily it served to save, for a wider circulation, poems which would have been forgotten quite soon after they were produced under the conditions prevailing in pre-Islamic Iran where the songs of the minstrels were not committed to writing.

We might, therefore, raise the question whether the absence of ghazals from the earliest Persian *dīvāns* might not have been caused by the nature of these poems rather than by the hazards of textual transmission. Ghazals are only seldom panegyrical poems. From the point of view of the main social function court poetry had to fulfil — namely, spreading the name of the patron mentioned in the poems — there was, therefore, little reason to include them into the *dīvāns*. Very likely, they were still mainly regarded as a kind of oral poetry which belonged to the repertoire of the minstrels. Their appearance in the *dīvāns* of Persian poets, on an equal footing with other forms of poetry, should thus be seen as an indication of the rise of the ghazals to the level of 'serious' literature, to that of poetry which was worthy to be recorded in writing.

2

The first poet to leave a collection of ghazals large enough to become the subject of a philological inquiry was the religious poet Sanā'ī, who died at Ghazna in 525/1131. The number of ghazals in his *Dīvān* not only exceeds by far anything to be found in the *dīvāns* of predecessors or contemporaries, such as Mas'ūd-i Sa'd-i Salmān<sup>4</sup> and Sayyid Ḥasan-i Ġaznavī Ašraf<sup>5</sup>, but it is even greater than the number of ghazals contained in the *Dīvān* of Ḥāfiz<sup>6</sup>.

In a discussion of this ancient collection from the point of view of its textual tradition, the presentation of Sanā'ī's poems, both in the medieval manuscripts and in the printed texts of his *Dīvān*, should be taken into consideration. It appears that the neat alphabetical order of the poems in the modern editions is a

comparatively recent innovation in the transmission of the text. All existing copies of the *Dīvān* older than the late 16th century are arranged in a non-alphabetical order. The alternative principle of arrangement is, in some cases, a thematic one, explicitly marked by rubric titles; in other cases no guiding principle can be noticed at first sight, although it is possible that thematic considerations did play a role in determining the order of the poems<sup>7</sup>.

For our purpose it is even more important to note that the early manuscripts of the *Dīvān* differ from each other to a degree which makes it unlikely that they all go back to a single codification of Sanā'ī's lyrical poetry, either compiled by himself or by someone else who lived close to the time of Sanā'ī's life. If it is not possible to reconstruct an original version of the *Dīvān* from the extant copies by means of standard philological procedure, one is led to question the philological status of the *Dīvān* as such: is it still possible, in this case, to speak of a 'book' in the ordinary sense of the term? Are we really dealing with an identifiable unit of literature which remains basically the same, in spite of all the changes it underwent in the course of its existence, either through the process of copying or as a result of the work of editors, and one which, conceivably, could be reduced to an original 'author's version'? To my mind, Sanā'ī's *Dīvān* does not conform to this definition. In fact, the title is nothing more than a collective name referring to a group of texts which, in one configuration or another, contain a collection of the poet's lyrical poems. Although some of them are evidently more related to each other than others, their great variety in content as well as in the order of their arrangement, reflects the vicissitudes of a textual history, but does not reveal the traces of an original, authoritative collection.

Combining the conclusions of these preliminary observations, the following model for the transmission of these ghazals can be constructed as a working hypothesis:

(1) At the basis of our model is merely a set of separate poems. Each ghazal was composed at a specific time and place, and must have been intended for a specific occasion. In most cases nothing about the origin is known to us, but it is essential for our understanding of the individuality of each poem that we postulate such circumstances at the starting point of its literary life. As Sanā'ī's career as a writer of ghazals was very close to the oral period in the history of the Persian ghazal, it may be assumed that the idiosyncrasies of oral poetry still exerted some influence. It is possible that, at this early stage, the form of these ghazals was not quite fixed but still open to modifications or even adaptations, made either by the poet himself or by others who were involved in the oral transmission of the ghazals. We must, therefore, take into account that a number of the most ancient variant readings belong to an ancient layer of author-

ized variations, or that they represent an alternative form reflecting the early use of the ghazal in oral presentations.

(2) It is conceivable that the first recordings of Sanā'ī's ghazals, made in order to preserve them as part of his literary heritage, were albums containing small sets of poems which were produced in the same period of the poet's life and in the same surroundings. We know that the poet lived both in Ghazna and in several cities of Khurasan, and that he produced parts of his poetry at various times and places. Separate strains of transmission may very well have begun from each of these places<sup>8</sup>. The early manuscripts contain evidence that such locally differentiated collections did actually exist. The clearest example is a number of ghazals which all contain panegyric references to Sultan Bahrāmshāh of Ghazna, a patron of the poet in Ghazna during the final years of his life<sup>9</sup>. Albums of this kind could easily have circulated separately and may have played a major role in the spread of Sanā'ī's reputation in the course of the 6th/12th century.

(3) At the third stage of this model appear the medieval copies of the *Dīvān*. They show that, at least from the early 7th/13th century onwards, attempts were made to assemble as much as possible of the poems of Sanā'ī into comprehensive collections. In the extant copies older than the earliest alphabetical collections which can be dated, no less than six separate strains of transmission can be discerned on the basis of an inventory of the contents of these manuscripts and the order of the poems in each of them.

(4) The most decisive moment in the later development of the *Dīvān* was the change-over to an alphabetical order of the poems; in the case of Sanā'ī, this is not earlier attested to than about 1600 A.D.<sup>10</sup> The printed texts, which were produced since the middle of the last century, are mainly based on these alphabetically arranged versions, although increasingly older manuscripts have been taken into account in the most recent editions.

The validity of this model can, of course, only be tested through a recension of the available sources. The prerequisite of such an undertaking, i.e. the registration of all the variants to be found in the medieval manuscripts, is still far from being fulfilled. We do not even have a full inventory of the ghazals ascribed to Sanā'ī<sup>11</sup>. A survey of the ancient manuscripts of the *Dīvān* accessible to me has shown that quite a few ghazals which do occur in the modern editions cannot be found in any of the older manuscripts. The possibility that genuine material was handed down in ways the earliest traces of which are — only by chance — not represented in the copies which survived, cannot be excluded. A judgment on the authenticity of individual poems is, therefore, only justified when other arguments can be found to substantiate or counter a judgment based solely on their absence from the early manuscripts.

3

These general remarks on the transmission of Sanā'ī's ghazals can be illustrated by an example of such a *recensio* based on a single poem. The following table contains a comparison based on (a) the text as it reads in the modern editions<sup>12</sup>; (b) three early MSS of the *dīvān*, only one of which is explicitly dated; and (c) an indirect source, namely, a quotation of two lines from the poem which can be found in the famous collection of 'paradoxes of the Šūfīs' (*šathīyāt*) by Rūzbihān-i Baqlī<sup>13</sup>.

The poem is classified as a *qaṣīda* in some of the printed *Dīvāns*, but both its form and content indicate that it should properly be regarded as a ghazal. The absence of the poet's pen-name at the end does not contradict this conclusion because this feature of the classical Persian ghazal is still very often missing in the ghazals of this poet. In the final line the name of one of the poet's patrons is mentioned, i.e. the Ḥanafī judge Muḥammad-i Maṣū' of Sarakhs, who played an important role in Sanā'ī's career as a religious poet<sup>14</sup>. This 'panegyric' ghazal is comparable to the series of poems which were written a few years later for the Ghaznavid Sultan Bahrāmšāh. The present poem celebrates the *majlis* of the judge by means of a phantasy: Sanā'ī and the other people who come to the *majlis* to listen to the preaching of the judge are presented as 'lovers' making their way to a party (*sūr*) of their beloved friend (*yār*, *dilbar* or *but*). When the poet is admitted to the presence of his friend he sees him holding a book containing in a short phrase the essence of the judge's teachings.

#### The transmission of one of Sanā'ī's ghazals

##### Sources:

MR<sub>2</sub>: *Dīvān-i Sanā'ī*, 2nd ed. by M.T. Mudarris-i Raḍavī, Tehran 1341/1962, p. 164.

VEL: MS Velieddin No.2627, Istanbul (dated 684/1285), fol. 229a-b.

KAB: MS Kabul, Kitābxāna-yi 'amma = Facsimile edition, Kabul 1356/1977 (not dated; 7th/13th cent.?), p. 393.

BOD: MS Bodleian Library, Elliot No.108, Oxford (not dated; 9th/15th cent. ?), fol. 85a-b.

Baqlī: Rūzbihān-i Baqlī, *Šarḥ-i šathīyāt*, ed. by Henry Corbin, Tehran-Paris 1966, p. 402.

#### A. Concordance of the lines in the ed. MR<sub>2</sub>:

MR <sub>2</sub>	VEL	KAB	BOD	Baqlī
1	1	1	1	—
2	2	2	2	—
3	3	3	4	—
4	4	4	3	—
5	—	—	5	—
6	—	—	6	—
7	7	7	7	—
8	5	5	8	—
9	—	—	9	—

10	8	8	10	p.402,2-3
11	9	9	11	p.402,4-5
12	6	6	—	—
13	10	10	12	—
14	11	11	—	—
15	12	12	13	—
16	13	13	14	—

#### B. Concordance of the lines in VEL/KAB:

VEL/KAB	BOD	MR <sub>2</sub>	Baqlī
1	1	1	—
2	2	2	—
3	4	3	—
4	3	4	—
5	8	8	—
6	—	12	—
7	7	7	—
8	10	10	p. 402,2-3
9	11	11	p. 402,4-5
10	12	13	—
11	—	14	—
12	15	15	—
13	14	16	—

VEL/KAB om. MR<sub>2</sub> 5,6,9.

BOD om. MR<sub>2</sub> 12,14 = VEL/KAB 6,11

#### C. Survey of variant readings<sup>15</sup>:

- 1a VEL *ay / Sanā'ī / dūš / dar sar yār-i mā-rā / sūz(!) / būd*  
 KAB ----- | *andar sarāy-i yār-i mā / sūr(+)* | ----  
 BOD -- | *rafiqān / bāz mā-rā dūš dar sar / sūr* | ----  
 MR<sub>2</sub> -- | ..... | -- | *mā-rā dar sarā'ī / sūr* | ----  
 (+) with *sukūn* on the *rā'* in KAB
- 1b VEL *raftam ānjā garči / rāh-u šab dirāz-u dūr / būd*  
 KAB ----- | *rāh-i dūr šab daijūr* | ----  
 BOD ----- | *rāhī sa'b-u* | ..... | ----  
 MR<sub>2</sub> ----- | ..... | ..... | ----
- 2a VEL *dīdam / ānjā bar dar-u / dargāh-i ān šāh-i butān*  
 KAB ----- | *andar rāh / bar* | -----  
 BOD ----- | ..... | <-i> *man* | -----  
 MR<sub>2</sub> ----- | ..... | *zī* | -----
- 2b VEL *harči andar kull-i 'ālam / 'āsiqī / mastūr būd*  
 KAB ----- | *'āsiq-i* | -----  
 BOD -----  
 MR<sub>2</sub> -----
- 3a VEL *az čirāg-u šam' kas-rā yād / nāmad / z-ān sabab*  
 KAB -----  
 BOD ----- | *nāyad* | -----  
 MR<sub>2</sub> -----
- 3b VEL *k-az jamāl-i xūb-rūyān nūr / andar / nūr būd*  
 KAB -----  
 BOD ----- | *-hā dar* | -----  
 MR<sub>2</sub> -----
- 4a VEL *kas niṭārī kard natvānist andar x'ard-i ū*  
 KAB -----  
 BOD -----  
 MR<sub>2</sub> -----
- 4b VEL *z-ānki ašk-i 'āsiqān-aš lu'lu'-i mantūr<sup>16</sup> būd*  
 KAB -----  
 BOD -----  
 MR<sub>2</sub> -----

5a	VEL	<i>ay basā madkūr-i 'alam   kas   bad-ū   dar   nangirist</i>
	KAB	-----   <i>nangarīd</i>
	BOD	-----   <i>k-ū   būy-i   ----   nangirist</i>
	MR <sub>2</sub>	-----   .....   -----   .....
5b	VEL	<i>  vay   basā   mahjūr-i xāmūsān   ki ū   madkūr   būd</i>
	KAB	<i>  ay   -----   madkūr-i dīl z-išān   -----</i>
	BOD	<i>  ...   -----   darvīš-i dīl rīšā   -----   ranjūr   ----</i>
	MR <sub>2</sub>	<i>  ...   -----   .....</i>
6a	VEL	<i>  az   havāy-i   'āšiqān   -u   hāy-u   hūy-i   šābirān</i>
	KAB	<i>  ---   hūy-hūy[-i]   -----   hāy-hāy-i   -----</i>
	MR <sub>2</sub>	<i>  hāy-hāy-i   -----   bā<sup>17</sup> hūy-hūy-i   šādiqān</i>
6b	VEL	<i>kas   namī dānist k-ān   mātām   būd aš   yā sūr būd</i>
	KAB	<i>---   nadānist ān ki   -----   būd   -----</i>
	MR <sub>2</sub>	<i>---   nadānistī ki   -----   ....   ān   -----</i>
7a	VEL	<i>jūybār-aš-rā ba-   jāy-i   āb   may   dīdam   ravān</i>
	KAB	-----
	BOD	-----   <i>mīdīdam</i>   -----
	MR <sub>2</sub>	-----   .....   <i>šarāb</i>
7b	VEL	<i>zūr-i har šāx   -aš   hazārān   'āšiq-i maxmūr būd</i>
	KAB	-----   -ī   -----
	BOD	-----   ...   <i>farāvān</i>   -----
	MR <sub>2</sub>	-----   ...   -----
8a	VEL	<i>šad hazārān hamcū Mūsā   (* )bīš   būd andar   rah-aš</i>
	KAB	-----
	BOD	-----   <i>xīra</i>   -----
	MR <sub>2</sub>	-----   .....   -----
	Baqī	-----   <i>būda dar</i>   -----
		(*) <i>bā'</i> without dot in VEL and KAB
8b	VEL	<i>z-ānki har sangī dar-ān rah bar miṭāl-i Ṭūr būd</i>
	KAB	-----
	BOD	-----
	MR <sub>2</sub>	-----
	Baqī	-----
9a	VEL	<i>harki-rā   manšūr   dādand az   kamāl   -u az jalāl</i>
	KAB	-----
	BOD	-----   <i>tauqī'</i>   -----
	MR <sub>2</sub>	-----   .....   -----   <i>jamāl</i>   -----
	Baqī	-----   .....   -----   <i>jamālī</i>   <i>bar kamāl</i>
9b	VEL	<i>lan tarānī   bar sar-i   tauqī'-i ān   manšūr būd</i>
	KAB	-----   <i>dar bar-i</i>   -----
	BOD	-----
	MR <sub>2</sub>	-----
	Baqī	-----   <i>tauqī'hā</i>   -----
10a	VEL	<i>  gar   ma-rā rah dād darbān dīgarān-rā man' kard</i>
	KAB	<i>  mar   -----</i>
	BOD	<i>  .....   -----</i>
	MR <sub>2</sub>	<i>  .....   -----</i>
10b	VEL	<i>z-ānki nām-i man rahī dar   šahrhā   mašhūr būd</i>
	KAB	-----
	BOD	-----   <i>'āšiqī</i>   -----
	MR <sub>2</sub>	-----   .....   -----
11a	VEL	<i>čūn dar-ān   rah 'aql-u   rūh-am   andar   -ān ḥadrat rasīd</i>
	KAB	-----   <i>šab šaxs-i</i>   -----
	MR <sub>2</sub>	-----   .....   -----   <i>nazd-i</i>   -----
11b	VEL	<i>šūrat-i hastī   {bi na}dīdam   'aql-i   man maqhūr būd</i>
	KAB	-----   <i>bidīdam</i>   <i>naqš-i</i>   -----
	MR <sub>2</sub>	-----   <i>nadīdam</i>   .....   -----
12a	VEL	<i>mašhafī dīdam   girifta   dilbar-am dar   dast-i rāsī</i>
	KAB	-----   <i>ān but andar</i>   -----
	BOD	-----   <i>girift</i>   .....   -----
	MR <sub>2</sub>	-----   .....   -----
12b	VEL	<i>xaṭṭ-i   ū   az   bāb-i hast-u   nafy-u   lā   mastūr   būd</i>
	KAB	-----   <i>ḥaft bāb-i</i>   <i>nafy-i</i>   -----
	BOD	-----   <i>ān</i>   ---   <i>nīst-i mā dar</i>   .....   --   <i>mastūr</i>   ----
	MR <sub>2</sub>	-----   ...   ---   <i>hast-i mā v-az</i>   .....   --   .....   ....
13a	VEL	<i>čūn   dar ān mašhaf   nigah   kardam   sarāsar xaṭṭ-i   ū</i>
	KAB	-----
	BOD	-----   <i>nigah kardam dar-ān mašhaf</i>   -----
	MR <sub>2</sub>	-----   <i>naẓar</i>   -----   <i>ān</i>

13b	VEL	<i>ramz   -i majlishā- &lt;yi&gt;   qādī   Ahmād-i   Manšūr būd</i>
	KAB	-----   <i>Mahmād-i</i>   -----
	BOD	-----   <i>-hā-yi majlis-i Muḥammad</i>   <-i>   -----
	MR <sub>2</sub>	-----   .....   <i>Mahmād<sup>18</sup>   ibn-i</i>   -----

D. Lines in the versions BOD/MR<sub>2</sub> omitted from the version VEL/KAB:

I-II (BOD 5-6, MR<sub>2</sub> 5-6)

*būy-i x'āš nāmad ba-kār andar sarāsar kūy-i ū*

*z-ānki xāk-i kūy-i ū az 'ambar-u kāfur būd*

BOD *farš-i maydān-aš zi-ruxsār-u lab-i | rūḥāniyān<sup>19</sup>:*

MR<sub>2</sub> ----- | *may-x'ārāgān*

*takya-gāh-i 'āšiqān-aš dīdahā-yi ḥūr būd*

III (BOD 9, MR<sub>2</sub> 9)

BOD *har ki az vay būd tarsān | dūr būd-u | nazdīk būd*

MR<sub>2</sub> ----- | *ū bad-ū* | -----

*v-ānki az gustāxiy-aš nazdīktar ū dūr būd*

The tables A and B show the presence of the lines and their arrangement in the five sources. The first table takes the printed text MR<sub>2</sub> as its point of reference (left column). If we look at the length of the ghazal it can be noted that the poem of 16 lines occurring in the printed texts corresponds to two shorter forms: (1) VEL/KAB with 13 *bayts*, (2) BOD with 14 *bayts*. The omitted lines are different in each form. The two sources containing the shortest form of the ghazal are alike, also as far as the order of the lines is concerned; the deviations from the printed text all occur in the middle section of the ghazal. The BOD version, on the other hand, shows differences from MR<sub>2</sub> only in the first and the last sections.

Table B presents the conclusions to be drawn from this: there are clearly two early versions of the poem preserved in our sources which cannot be reduced to each other (resp. version VEL/KAB and version BOD). The text in the editions evidently represents an amalgamation of these authentic versions into a sixteen-line ghazal. The Baqlī-quotation could, as far as the order of its two lines is concerned, have been derived from each of the latter versions.

The survey of the variant readings (Table C) can be used to check the validity of this distinction of versions and to consider its consequences. Even a superficial look at the facts (no more is possible within the limits of this paper) can learn us something if we seek answers to the following questions:

(1) Where does the division of the variants confirm the distinctions based on the preceding tables ?

(2) Where does it contradict them?

(3) Where is it inconclusive ?

\* Answer to question 1: the opening words of the poem (*ay Sanāī dūš || ay rafīqān bāz*) provide a particularly strong confirmation by their prominence in the structure of the poem; further positive indications can be derived from the lines 3a (*nāmad || nāyad*), 3b (*andar || -hā dar*), 5a (*kas bad-ū || k-ū būy-i*), 7a (*may dīdam || mīdīdam?*), 7b (*hazārān || farāvān*),

8a (*bīš // xīra*), 10b (*šahrhā // āšiqī*) and 13a (*darān maṣḥaf nigah kardam // nigah kardam dar-ān maṣḥaf*). Baqlī allows a positive conclusion only in one place (9a *manṣūr // tauqī*) where it confirms the reading of BOD, suggesting that at least one of BOD's variants might be as ancient as the late 6th/12th century.

\* Answer to question 2: contrary evidence is given by 1b (*dirāz-u dūr // šab daijūr*), 2a (*ānjā bar // andar rāh*), 5b (*vay // ay*), 7b (*šāx aš // šāx-ī*), and 12a (*dilbar-am dar // ān but andar*), where KAB takes sides with BOD. Possible explanations are: (a) these are deviations from the text, as it was common to both versions, which are characteristic only of VEL; or (b) they are the results of a contamination, in KAB, of separate strains in the textual transmission. A comparison of several other poems is needed before any decision on this issue can be made.

\* Answer to question 3: inconclusive are, in the first place, the lines 6 and 11 which are not represented in BOD, and the lines which are identical in both versions. There are places in the poem where the confusion is too great to allow a clear-cut decision; conspicuous among them are a number of places which are particularly important to the meaning of the poem as a whole: (1a) the characterization of the scene evoked in the poem, (5b) the qualification of those admitted to the presence of the friend, (12b) the

contents of the *maṣḥaf*, and (13b) the first name of the patron, to wit, Aḥmad/ Maḥmad/ Muḥammad (in this case the problem seems to have been how to fit the name into the metre *ramal*). It is most likely that the variant readings of this type have their origin in editorial changes made in either one of the two versions at some stage of the textual history.

## 4

The significant position of Sanā'ī's collection of ghazals in the development of this poetical form makes it imperative that sufficient weight be given to all the evidence which can be derived from the ancient manuscripts of his *Dīvān*. Such inquiries should not be aimed at the reconstruction of the 'original' text of the *Dīvān* as a whole, for it is doubtful that an authoritative comprehensive collection of the poet's lyrical poetry really stood at the beginning of its textual history<sup>20</sup>. If, in this case, there is any sense in seeking to establish a stemma, it can only be the stemma of each individual poem. Even so, however, it remains unlikely that all of the variations which the sources contain can be satisfactorily arranged on the assumption of the gradual change of a single original. The survival of traces of early adaptations, even authorized ones, can never be absolutely excluded.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Cf. 'Aufī, *Lubāb al-albāb*, ed. London-Leiden, 1903-06, 616, where 'Unṣurī compares his own ghazals with the superior specimens in Rūdakī's poetry.

<sup>2</sup> See on the early history of the Persian ghazals: A. Ateş, s.v. GAZEL in *Islam ansiklopedisi*; A. Bausani, s.v. GHAZAL ii, in *Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition*. Neither writer took Sanā'ī's collection into account.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Munzāvī, *Fihrist-i nusxahā-yi xatīrī-yi fārsī*, III, Tehran 1350/1971, pp. 2451 ff. ('Unṣurī), 2462 ff. (Farruxī), 2547 ff. (Manūcihrī), and the introduction by M. Dabīr Siyāqī to his edition of *Dīvān-i ḥakīm Farruxī-yi Sīstānī*, Tehran 1349/1970, p. *haḍdah* (an album dated 1067 A.H. contains the oldest collections of poems by Farruxī and Manūcihrī known to exist).

<sup>4</sup> *Dīvān*, ed. by R. Yāsīmī, Tehran 1339/1960 (reprint), pp.670-79: 21 poems.

<sup>5</sup> *Dīvān*, ed. by M.T. Mudarris-i Raḍavī, Tehran, 1328/1949, pp. 262-305: 83 poems.

<sup>6</sup> The collection *ḡazaliyāt* in the second edition by Mudarris-i Raḍavī contains 408 poems; to this number a least one hundred poems in the collection of *qaṣīdas* should be added; this brings the total of Sanā'ī's ghazals well above five hundred. The edition of the *Dīvān* of Ḥāfiẓ by P.N. Xānlari (Teheran, 1362/1983<sup>2</sup>) contains 486 ghazals.

<sup>7</sup> See the discussion of the textual history of Sanā'ī's *Dīvān* in the present writer's *Of Piety and Poetry*, Leiden 1983, pp. 91-112.

<sup>8</sup> Headings attached to individual poems in the early MSS of the *Dīvān* sometimes refer to Balkh, Sarakhs or Nishapur as places where the poems were written.

<sup>9</sup> In the MS *Kitābxāna-yi Millī*, No. 2353, p. 70, the epitheton '*xallada'llāhu mulkahu wa-sulṭānahu*' is added to the Sultan's name at the beginning of a group of ghazals

addressed to him; this does not prove that the MS itself (which is not dated) was copied during the reign of Bahrām-šāh, but the formula may have been copied from a small collection of poems made at that early date.

<sup>10</sup> *Of Piety and Poetry*, p. 110.

<sup>11</sup> N. Ahmad, *Indo-iranica* xvi/2 (1963), pp. 48-65, showed that some of the later Sanā'ī MSS contain quite a few poems which are not incorporated in the printed collections.

<sup>12</sup> The text of the poem in the ed. MR(2) has been compared with: ed. lith. Tehran, 1274/1858, p.177; ed. lith. Bombay, 1328/1910, II, p.40; ed. Mazāhir-i Muṣaffā, Tehran, 1336/1957, p.99. These printed editions all present the same version of the ghazal as ed. MR(2), with only minor variations.

<sup>13</sup> This mystical writer frequently quotes Sanā'ī in his works (cf. *Of Piety and Poetry*, pp. 11, 172, 233). The early dates of Baqlī's lifetime (1128-1209) add a philological relevance to these citations.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. *Of Piety and Poetry*, pp. 64-68.

<sup>15</sup> In this table --- means: = VEL; ... means: = one of the other sources.

<sup>16</sup> Edd. lith. Tehran and Bombay: *manṣūr*.

<sup>17</sup> Ed. Bombay: *yā*.

<sup>18</sup> Edd. lith. Tehran and Bombay, ed. Muṣaffā: *Maḥmūd*.

<sup>19</sup> Also in edd. lith. Tehran and Bombay.

<sup>20</sup> A comparison with the textual histories of other collections of ghazals would be worthwhile, but cannot be attempted in the present article; see especially the account of the problems encountered in the editing of the poems of Ḥāfiẓ by P.N. Xānlari, in his '*Guzāriš-i kār*', *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ*, II, pp. 1117 ff.