ACTA UNIVERSITATIS UPSALIENSIS
Studia Iranica Upsaliensia
43

Cover image: Hadi Ziaoddini

We Drank the Wine from His Hand

Studies on the time, life and poetry of the Kurdish Sufi poet Malā-yē Jazīrī

Farhad Shakely

Also available online:
http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:uu:diva-536508

Dissertation presented at Uppsala University to be publicly examined in Ihresalen, Engelska parken, Thunbergsvägen 3, Uppsala, Friday, 4 October 2024 at 13:15 for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The examination will be conducted in English. Faculty examiner: Stefan Sperl (SOAS, London).

Abstract
Shakely, F. 2024. We Drank the Wine from His Hand. Studies on the time, life and poetry of the Kurdish Sufi poet Malā-yē Jazīrī. *Studia Iranica Upsaliensia* 43. 329 pp. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. ISBN 978-91-513-2204-9.

This study is about the Kurdish Sufi poet Malā-yē Jazīrī (1570–1640), whose poems are considered to mark the beginning of classical Kurdish poetry.

To understand the poet's time and poetry, the political, religious and cultural background is presented, which represents an important phase of Kurdistan's history. Jazīrī lived in a period when several semi-independent Kurdish principalities were established and flourished as a result of the rivalry between the Safavids and the Ottomans. He lived in the city of Jazīra, the capital of Botan principality, and was close to the princely family of Azīzān, especially Prince Šaraf-Xān III, for whom he composed two panegyrics.

Two important philosophical and Sufi schools of thought were present and active during Jazīrī's lifetime, and they had a great impact on his thought and poetry. These were the Naqšbandī order and Ibn ʿArabī's doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*.

Manuscripts and printed editions of Malā-yē Jazīrī's *Dīwān* are presented, and formal and linguistic aspects of Jazīrī's poetry are studied, particularly how he applied the Arabic prosodic system to Kurdish poetry. Various aspects of Jazīrī's poetry are also examined with a focus on his Sufi ideas and the aesthetic expression of his philosophical and spiritual experience.

Keywords: Malā-yē Jazīrī, Kurdish poetry, Dīwān, Sufism, Naqšbandī, Waḥdat al-wujūd, prosody

Farhad Shakely, Department of Linguistics and Philology, Box 635, Uppsala University, SE-75126 Uppsala, Sweden.

ISSN 1100-326X
ISBN 978-91-513-2204-9
URN urn:nbn:se:uu:diva-536508 (http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:uu:diva-536508)

To Ziryan Shakely

the greatest pain in my life, the deepest wound in my soul

His silence speaks of sadness
better than a thousand and one books
and more fluently than all flutes I have ever heard

Contents

Acknowledgements

The writing of this dissertation has taken many years. I began the work in the early 1990s, but many obstacles – social, political and personal – prevented me from proceeding as I had wished. In the meantime, I thought it would be better to expand and update another essay I wrote in the late 1980s called *The Modern Kurdish Short Story.* I submitted a new and revised version of the essay for a Lic. Phil. degree in 2002. It was subsequently published as a book in 2106.

My supervisor was Professor Bo Utas, who constantly encouraged me not to abandon my work on the dissertation about Malā-yē Jazīrī. Sufism and poetry are a common interest of ours, and Jazīrī was a great Sufi and a great poet. Professor Utas' knowledge in both fields is extraordinary. I wish to express my gratitude for his help, patience and scholarly guidance. Unfortunately, I disappointed you, Bo, when I was unable to finalize my thesis under your supervision, although I had written two semi-chapters.

My friend, colleague, and supervisor Professor Carina Jahani resumed the efforts of Professor Utas and revived my hope, morale, and willingness to continue the task. She persuaded me to keep going and not give up. She shared her optimism with me, and the result is the present book. I thank you with all my heart, Carina, my fifth sister.

This is also the right opportunity to thank my assistant supervisor, Professor Ali-Asghar Seyed-Gohrab, Utrecht University, who spared no effort in guiding my research and discussing the contents of the chapters of this work in detail.

To spend such a Azlong and challenging time writing about a great poet like Jazīrī requires not only knowledge of his poetry, his life, his times, his ideas, and a variety of other topics and subjects, but also finding the right answers to the many questions one is regularly confronted with. In this regard, I have been fortunate enough to receive indispensable help and advice from many friends and colleagues to whom I am very grateful. Among them I must mention Professors Abdulaziz Lodhi and László Károly, Uppsala University, Professor Martin van Bruinessen, Utrecht University, Mr Abd al-Raqib Yousif, Mr Muhammad Hama-Salih Tawfiq and Mr Ismaʿil Badi, Kurdistan, Mr Anwar Soltani, London, Mr Nawzad Hirori, Stockholm, and Mr Fanar Rozhbayani, Germany.

I would also like to thank a number of Swedish associations, institutes, and foundations for their generous assistance in the form of financial support or free accommodation in hotels or guest houses, and especially Svenska Institutet, Sveriges Författarförbund, Sveriges Författarfond and Sigtunastiftelsen. I also received a four-year doctoral position at the Department of Linguistics and Philology, Uppsala University. I am grateful to the staff of the Uppsala University Library, especially the Karin Boye Library, from which I borrowed hundreds of books that I needed for my work. Moreover, they were always willing to purchase the titles I suggested.

Finally, but most importantly, I would like to thank my wife Gelas and our lovely daughter Choman who always created a home environment where I could forget the fatigue and strain of the work.

Abbreviations and explanations

AH: Anno Hijra
BCE: Before Christian Era
CE: Christian Era
EBr: Encylcopedia Britannica
EIs-I: The Encyclopedia of Islam, first edition
EIs-II: The Encyclopedia of Islam, second edition
EIs-III: The Encyclopedia of Islam, new edition
EIr: Encyclopaedia Iranica
n.d.: no date
n.p.: no place
Q1: Jazīrī's first panegyric which begins with "Lord of Lords"
Q2: Jazīrī's second panegyric which begins with " glorious King of Kings"
R: Rumī, Ottoman Turkish Calendar
r.: reign
Š: Šamsī, Iranian Calendar
ZdJ: Malā-yē Jazīrī's *Dīwān*, Zivingī's edition

All English translations of verses from the *Qurʾān* are quoted from Arberry (1964).

All quotations of Malā-yē Jazīrī's poems are from Zivingī's edition (1978), if not stated otherwise.

Ibn ʿArabī is given as the name of the Sufi thinker, but if his name is given as Ibn al-ʿArabī in a specific source, that form is preserved.

Transliteration System

The following table represents the writing system used mainly by classical Kurdish poets and writers, based upon Arabic-Persian alphabet. Attempts to conduct a reform in the alphabet to suit the Kurdish sound system were started towards the end of the 19th century and continued until the 1970s.

Consonants

Kurdish	Arabic	Persian	Transliteration
ئـ، ء	ئـ، ء	ئـ، ء	ʾ
ب	ب	ب	B
پ	–	پ	P
ت	ت	ت	T
ث	ث	ث	T̲
ج	ج	ج	J
چ	–	چ	Č
ح	ح	ح	Ḥ
خ	خ	خ	X
د	د	د	D
ذ	ذ	ذ	D̲
ر	ر	ر	R
ڕ	–	–	Ṛ
ز	ز	ز	Z
ژ	–	ژ	Ž
س	س	س	S
ش	ش	ش	Š
ص	ص	ص	Ṣ
ض	ض	ض	Ḍ
ط	ط	ط	Ṭ
ظ	ظ	ظ	Ẓ
ع	ع	ع	ʿ
غ	غ	غ	Ġ
ف	ف	ف	F

Kurdish	Arabic	Persian	Transliteration
ڤ	–	و	V
ق	ق	ق	Q
ک	ک	ک	K
گ	–	گ	G
ل	ل	ل	L
ڵ	–	–	Ļ
م	م	م	M
ن	ن	ن	N
و	و	–	W
ھ	ھ	ھ	H
ی	ی	ی	Y

Vowels

Kurdish	Arabic	Persian	Transliteration
ا	ا	ا	Ā
ـە، ه	ـَ	ـَ	A
وو	و	و	Ū
ۆ	–	–	O
و	ـُ	ـُ	U
وێ	–	–	Ö
ی	ی	ی	Ī
unwritten	ـِ	ـِ	I
ێ	–	–	Ē

Introduction

When I first started writing poetry, Malā-yē Jazīrī was not one of the Kurdish poets I admired, tried to imitate, or wanted to write like, simply because I had never heard of him or his poetry. I was twelve years old at the time, and it was not until more than twelve years later that I became acquainted with Jazīrī's poems.

After settling in Sweden in the late 1970s, I began to approach classical Kurdish poetry. Some of the first poets I read carefully were Nālī, Maḥwī and Aḥmad-ē Xānī. In his epic *Mam ū Zīn*, Xānī records with great admiration the names of three Kurdish poets who preceded him, with Jazīrī at the head of the list. I devoted almost two years to studying Xānī's *Mam ū Zīn*, and the outcome was a study entitled "Kurdish Nationalism in *Mam ū Zīn* of Xānī", which was my BA paper in Iranian Languages at Uppsala University, submitted in 1983.

One of my next projects was to study Jazīrī's poetry. A first reading of his *Dīwān* made me realize that Jazīrī's poetry is not easy. This was the beginning of my deep interest in studying and writing about his work, though I soon found that there was not enough material about his life, his times, his poetry and his thought. At that time, in the early 1980s, I had access to only four editions of Jazīrī's *Dīwān*, two of which consisted of the poems without any commentary or analysis. The other two were annotated editions with introductions containing some superficial information about the poet's life and times. Moreover, there were two studies in Kurdish about different aspects of Jazīrī's life and poetry. These were sections of books devoted to the history of Kurdish literature, but neither of them contained reliable information on which serious research could be based.

Attempting to study Jazīrī and his poetry was not easy. He is the first classical Kurdish poet, but the linguistic, aesthetic and thematic value of his poems reaches such a level of magnificence and grandeur that one can imagine that he relied on a great historical heritage of poetry.

Unlike most classical Kurdish poets, almost all of Jazīrī's poetry deals with a single theme, namely Sufism, Islamic mysticism. The only exceptions are two panegyrics, which have their own history and will be discussed in the appropriate part of this dissertation.

I postponed my work on Jazīrī's poetry several times while waiting to obtain more data that could dispel the uncertainty surrounding my questions about various aspects of his poetry, life and thought. Each time I read the

Dīwān, or parts of it, my questions increased in perceptibly. In the meanwhile, I continued to read the *Dīwān*, seeking new facts or even hypotheses that might give a clearer picture of Jazīrī, his poetry, and his times.

Writing about Jazīrī and his poetry requires knowledge in fields other than poetry, with its basic structural elements such as rhyme and metre, and various branches of rhetoric. The aim of this study is to present, as far as possible, a comprehensive account of the various dimensions of Jazīrī's poetry, life and thought, with a special emphasis on his use of language, which is an important basis of his style. In order to achieve this objective, several questions need to be discussed and answered. These are addressed in a number of chapters that constitute the framework of the study, as outlined in the following.

The first chapter is devoted to describing various aspects of 16th-century Kurdish society, in order to provide a background to the environment in which Jazīrī lived and worked. At the beginning of the 16th century, the Safavid Empire was established as a rival power to the Ottomans. The tensions and conflicts between the two states culminated in the Battle of Čāldīrān (1514), in which the Kurds fought on the Ottoman side and the Safavids were defeated. The historical and political situation that dominated in Ottoman Kurdistan as a result of the battle and the long-standing enmity between the Ottomans and the Safavids shaped a new period in the history of the region.

An important outcome of the new situation for the Kurds was the establishment of a number of semi-independent Kurdish principalities, some of which became significant political, military and cultural entities and centres in Kurdistan. The principality of Botan, with Jazīra as its capital, was one of these centres, and Jazīrī's poetry was a product of the flourishing cultural era in the principality. Among other things, the chapter aims to present a comprehensive picture of the cultural, political and religious features of the period that produced the poet Jazīrī and other notable scholars, Sufis and thinkers.

Although several editions of Jazīrī's *Dīwān* and studies of his life and his poetry have been published over the past thirty years, we still find that several important questions about the poet's life remain unanswered. One of these concerns the identity of the prince for whom the poet wrote his panegyrics. This is another issue that will be discussed in the first chapter.

Chapter 2 is devoted to Jazīrī's life and his *Dīwān*. Writing about the poet's life forces one to survey numerous divergent sources and opinions, rejecting some and accepting others. In both cases, it is important to present reasonable arguments.

Reviewing Jazīrī's *Dīwān* is not a troublesome issue, since this study does not aim to prepare a new edition of his poetry. In the chapter, a number of manuscripts and printed editions are presented, and a number of articles, studies and book chapters dealing with Jazīrī's life and poetry are listed and briefly reviewed.

Chapters 3 and 4 are concerned with "technical" aspects of Jazīrī's poetry. Chapter 3 examines different forms and structures of the poems. Poetic forms,

rhyme words, metaphors and prosody are presented along with illustrative statistics and figures. Chapter 4 deals with Jazīrī's language and the way he handled Kurdish words. It is interesting to note that Jazīrī used verb forms and vocabulary items that are not found in the poetry of his contemporaries or even in that of later generations.

Jazīrī is already known to have been a Sufi poet. This can be understood by reading his poems, which are almost entirely devoted to Sufi ideas. At the same time, it is essential to know which Sufi order (*ṭarīqa*) he belonged to. In his poetry, Jazīrī shows aspects of his system of Sufi thought that coincide with the principles of the Naqšbandī order. This will be examined in the context of the history of the Naqšbandī order, its development and its geographical expansion toward Ottoman Kurdistan.

In the context of Jazīrī's Sufi and philosophical thought, it is also worth noting that there are indications in his poetry that he had a tendency to favour the ideas of the great Sufi and thinker Ibn ʿArabī (1165–1240 CE) and especially his doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* (The Unity of Being).

In studies of classical Kurdish poets, we often read that various poets were Sufi poets and were inspired by Ibn ʿArabī's doctrine. Such estimations are usually based on a few simple words or expressions describing human love between two people, or general ideas about life, death or the universe, embellished with some mystical dimensions or flavours.

However, in order to truly establish that a poet was a follower of Ibn ʿArabī's doctrine, it is not enough to find in his or her poems some words or expressions that remind us of Ibn ʿArabī' writings. The doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* is a philosophical system of thought that has its own principles, language and concepts. It can be approached in two main ways: firstly, by discussing the ideas that form the basis of the doctrine, either to support, develop and extend it or to dispute it; and secondly, by using poetic metaphors to illustrate the doctrine's various ideas about God, being, creation, eternity, the One and the many, and so on. This is what most of the Sufi poets, especially those who were inclined towards Ibn ʿArabī's thought, including Jazīrī, have done. It is the aim of this study to outline Jazīrī's Sufi ideas and their congruence with the principles of the Naqšbandī order on the one hand, and with the foundations of Ibn ʿArabī's doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*, on the other.

At the same time it is of great importance to study the issue in its historical context, and to view the Naqšbandī order and Ibn ʿArabī's philosophical ideas as components of the religious and cultural background of Kurdish society in the 16th and 17th centuries.

In Chapter 5, Jazīrī's Sufi ideas are discussed in detail, with particular attention to the historical frameworks within which Ibn ʿArabī's ideas and the Naqšbandī order spread to Kurdistan. The contact between the Naqšbandī leaders and Ibn ʿArabī's doctrine is known to have begun already in the time of Xwāja Bahāʾ al-Dīn Naqšband (d. 791/1389), the eponym of the Naqšbandī order. Algar (1991, 2) asserts that "one of Khwaja Baha' ad-Din's principal

disciples and successors, Xwāja Muhammad Pārsā (d. 822/1419) (…) was an enthusiastic and celebrated devotee of Ibn ʿArabī."

A central and unavoidable issue that nevertheless is missing in the available studies of Jazīrī's poetry and in the editions of his *Dīwān* is the application of an aesthetic point of view to the reading and evaluation of the texts. In most studies, the authors have contented themselves with explaining the poems in order to help the reader to understand them. This is not satisfying for one who is interested in probing the depths of the poems to understand the artistic and linguistic relationships between the ideas, language, construction of metaphors, and structure and forms of a poem – especially a *qaṣīda* – as an artistic unity.

Some editors and researchers have written about Jazīrī's greatness as a poet and the loftiness and beauty of his poetry. I perceived this only as an impression given by the experience of reading, but was unable to explain how and why this poetry was so excellent and beautiful. I was unable to accept this, because I thought that the aesthetic content of a poem should be explained so that even a reader who does not command the original language can understand it. This should be shown by a clear analysis of the structure. I found this sort of analysis in the writings of five scholars who have worked with classical (and partly Sufi) Arabic and Persian poetry. These five scholars were Julie Scott Meisami, Suzanne Pinckney Stetkevych, Stefan Sperl, Kamal Abu-Deeb and Thomas Emil Homerin.

Jazīrī left behind a legacy of poetry that encapsulates the deepest and most subtle thoughts of Sufism within the confines of classical poetry, subject to the hard rules of prosody, rhyme and rhetoric.

The existence of God has always been one of the most difficult and complicated questions for believers, non-believers, philosophers and ordinary people. While philosophers have tried to delve into the depths of the question and have presented logical and rational arguments to prove or deny His existence, most Sufis have not bothered with logic or philosophical arguments. The starting point for them is what they call "*ḏauq*" (taste or heart-savour) and what their hearts tell them. Jazīrī, in a poem about recognizing God, compares his Ṣūfī experience with the rational knowledge found in books:

> *Ma ži sarčašm-yi ḥaywān, qadaḥak ṣāfī vexwar*
> *Nāgihī laḏḏat u ḏawq-ā ma bi sad jild-i kitāb* (ZdJ: 60).
>
> We drank from the fountain of life, a pure goblet.
> You cannot arrive at the rapture and taste (we have experienced)
> Even with a hundred volumes of books.

When I was first planning to write about Jazīrī's poetry, I thought it would be necessary to approach and study the poems from a theoretical point of view. This was and is a tradition that many researchers and scholars follow. With this idea in mind, I devoted a few months of my year-long stay in London in

1991–1992 to acquiring knowledge of various literary theories. My immediate impression was that the literary theories were mostly derived from the prevailing ethical and aesthetic values in the literature produced in the West, America and Europe. I felt that they could not be taken as reliable measures for explaining or understanding texts that represent a different culture and civilization.

A text can bear an aesthetic and a communicative message. These two aspects of the text are in an interactive relationship with each other. Among the literary theories, structuralism is the one that seems able, to some extent, to be used as an artistic measure to evaluate the great, deep and wide literature produced by the Sufi poets.

Jazīrī is the product of a specific historical, political, religious and cultural period. It is of great importance to study that period to obtain the necessary knowledge of the environment that was his material, spiritual and artistic background. Information about Jazīrī's life is mainly scattered among various biographical sources. There is also philological and factual evidence in his poetry that can help to shed light on different periods and aspects of his life.

Despite the abundance of sources, it is striking that the Kurdish people are largely marginalized, despite their significant participation in the events. Fortunately, we have access to two sources that offer a glimpse, albeit insufficient, into Kurdish history in Jazīrī's times. These are the *Šarafnāma* of Bidlīsī and the *Siyāḥatnāma* by Awliyā Čalabī.

Bidlīsī writes in detail about almost all the principalities and rulers in the different regions of Kurdistan up to his time. In some cases, he describes the cultural conditions and the educational system, and mentions notable Kurdish personalities, scholars, poets and Sufis. When visiting various regions in Kurdistan, Čalabī.pays most attention to the everyday life of the people, but he also describes the wider economic, cultural and religious conditions.

As far as Jazīrī as a poet and a Sufi is concerned, I am mainly interested in three topics: his relations with the rulers of the Kurdish principality of Botan, the Sufi order to which he belonged, and the impact of Ibn ʿArabī's doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* on his system of thought and his poetry. There are also minor questions that should be studied, such as Jazīrī's use of language and the structural features of his poetry. The practical and spiritual principles of the Naqšbandī order are also evident in his poetry.

As for the poet's relations with the princes of Jazīra, Jazīrī's panegyrics are important documents for understanding this issue. I would like to emphasize once again that this *qaṣīda* is not a traditional and conventional panegyric *qaṣīda* of the kind that a poet was expected to compose for a king or a prince. This is obviously due to the fact that Jazīrī was not a court poet. He followed the traditional pattern of a panegyric *qaṣīda* only in that the *qaṣīda* is a long poem using monorhyme. Nevertheless, when it comes to the various sections of a conventional *qaṣīda*, or the use of hyperbolic encomium to praise the patron, the poet is free to such an extent he can hardly be called a conventional poet.

In addition to studying Jazīrī's poetry from a variety of perspectives, the dissertation aims to establish a profound knowledge of the Kurdish poet with whom the classical period of Kurdish literature, especially poetry, began. The task is fraught with some difficulty because of its two-fold nature. On the one hand, much of the information that is available about Jazīrī's life and career is closer to mythology than to historical fact. This applies not only to the dates of his birth and his death, but also to his studies and travels. It is necessary to refute such inaccurate statements. On the other hand, the main purpose of this study is to establish facts about different aspects of the poet's life and times, which is no easy task. In light of these issues, it is clear that this will not only be a literary study, but will also provide a new reading of different periods and characteristics of the Kurdish people and their country, Kurdistan. This study thus deals with many aspects of the life, times, thought and poetry of Jazīrī.

Chapter 1: The Political, Religious and Cultural Background of Jazīrī's Poetry

1.1. Preliminary Remarks

The emergence of the Ṣafavīd dynasty at the beginning of the 16th century and its long-standing conflict and enmity with the Ottoman Empire shaped the history of the Kurds politically and culturally for the coming centuries. This was because of the geographical location of Kurdistan between the two empires, but also due to the fact that most of the Kurds were adherents of the Sunnite belief and were allied with the Ottomans.

The immediate result of the military and political confrontations between the two empires was the division of Kurdistan between them for the first time, which was subsequently legalized by official agreements from 1555 to 1914, the most important of which were the Treaty of Amasya in 1555 and the Treaty of Zohab in 1639. Elucidating the results of the Treaty of Amasya, Ateş (2019: 401–402) writes:

> The Shiʾi Safavids and Sunni Ottomans started to negotiate terms of an uneasy coexistence, while initiating a period of the territorialization of sovereignty that would take a long period of time to finalize. […] Dividing Georgia between them, the negotiations granted the Ottomans Iraq, most of Kurdistan, and western Armenia, while Iran kept parts of Kurdistan, Azerbaijan, Yerevan, and Nakhchevan. At the time it was signed, Erzurum, Diyarbekr, Zulkadriyye, Baghdad, and Shahrizur were also securely in Ottoman hands, with the local Kurdish principalities in Erzurum, Van, and Shahrizur provinces serving as a buffer between the Iran and the Ottomans, and preventing Safavid expansion into Anatolia, where the masses were more sympathetic to the Safavids.

The division of Kurdistan between the two rival states and the establishment of a number of semi-independent Kurdish emirates had a significant impact on Kurdish society in general. Xaznadār (2002: 247–248), maintains that the beginning of Kurdish national consciousness and the emergence of classical Kurdish poetry for which the principality of Jazīra was one of the main centres, were among the important results.

In order to understand various aspects of Jazīrī's poetry, it is essential to place it in its historical context and take into account the political, cultural and religious dimensions of his time. Questions of particular interest are the poet's relationship with the rulers of Jazīra, the ʿAzīzān dynasty, and the Sufi order to which he probably belonged. In addition, there are issues of Kurdish culture and language that deserve investigation. These issues are directly connected with the history of the Botān principality, but also with the situation in Kurdistan in general.

1.2. Ottomans and Ṣafavīds, and the Kurds between them

The Ottomans were originally one of many tribal and nomadic Turkmen groups of Oghuz (or Ġuzz) ancestry living mainly in western and northwestern Anatolia. The Ottoman state was presumably founded around 1299, and "was one among several other Turkish states (…) that were established between the former Saljūq state and the Byzantine Empire" (Kramers, 1995: 192). Although ʿOthman I Ghazi is regarded as the founder of the empire, it was his grandson, Murād I, who first held the title of Sulṭān (ibid: 193), a title that continued to be used until the Empire's demise in the early 20th century.

For much of the first two centuries of the empire's history, the main objective of the sultans was to defeat the Byzantine Empire, conquer its territories, and occupy the Balkan Peninsula. These goals were nearly realized by Meḥemmed II Fātiḥ ("the Conqueror"), whose victories culminate in the capture of Constantinople on 29 May 1453. Despite their nomadic and tribal origin, the Ottomans created a centralized government, a standing army, a large and efficient bureaucracy and strong Sunni institutions (McDowall, 1996: 25).

Unlike the Ottomans, the Ṣafavīd dynasty did not have tribal or nomadic roots, but originated from a mystical order centred in the town of Ardabīl in northwestern Iran, where the order's founder, Sheikh Ṣafī al-Dīn (1252–1334) was buried (Matthee, Safavid Dynasty, EIr). They are also believed to have been of Kurdish ancestry (ibid), although Iskandar Beg Monšī, in his *Tārīx-i ʿālam ārā-yi ʿAbbāsī* (Monšī 1377 Š/1998–1999: 13), the most comprehensive history of the Ṣafavīds up to Shah ʿAbbas I, traces their origins to the Prophet Muḥammad and his cousin ʿAlī. The order, and the dynasty, were mainly followed and supported by various Turkmen tribal groups called the Qizilbāš, "redheads", scattered throughout parts of Anatolia, Azerbaijan and Persia.

It was under the influence of these tribes, that the order adopted Twelver Šīʿism as its religious faith, under Xvāja ʿAlī (d. 1427). In 1501, Ismāʿīl I, then barely 15 years old, established the Ṣafavīd political rule, proclaimed himself Shah after defeating the Šīrvānšāhs in 1499 and the Āq-Qoyunlu in 1501, and captured Tabrīz. This was the start of an empire and a dynasty that ruled Iran from 1501 to 1722 and shaped the future Iran to this day. Under the rule of Shah Ismāʿīl I, "Iran took shape as a Šīʿite state in religion and a Persian state linguistically and culturally" (Eppel, 2016: 27).

Shah Ismāʿīl I, who was crowned in Tabriz in 906–7/1501, consolidated his power through two major factors: religion and the history of Persian dynasties. He "encouraged his disciples to consider him a divine incarnation" (Savory and Karamustafa, Esmaʿīl I Ṣafawī, EIr). When he came to power, Persia had not been a separate entity for more than eight centuries. The Ṣafavīds "rested their authority inter alia on the divine right of kings traditionally claimed by Persian monarchs" (ibid).

From the very beginning, the Ṣafavīd Empire emerged as a serious rival to the Ottoman state. Sultan Bāyazīd II (r. 1481–1512), who was old and ill, was aware of the danger posed by the Ṣafavīds, but seemingly wanted to avoid direct military confrontation. Prince Salīm, the youngest son of Bāyazīd II, favoured a more decisive attitude. Having seized the throne in 1512 with the help of the Janissaries in 1512, he was crowned Sultan. He immediately prepared a war against Shah Ismāʿīl I.

1.2.1. The Battle of Čāldīrān

After suppressing uprisings of the Qizilbāš tribes in central and western Anatolia and executing 40,000 of them, Sultan Salīm I, moved eastwards to fight the Ṣafavīds. In March 1514, at the head of an army of about 140,000 troops, he launched the campaign to invade Persia and confront the Qizilbāš on their own soil. The Kurdish chieftains sided with the Ottoman Sultan. The Ottoman army reached Čāldīrān, between Erzinjan and Tabriz, towards the end of August, and the two armies stood face to face. Being equipped with firearms and cannons, the Ottomans defeated the greatly outnumbered Qizilbāš badly and captured and plundered their capital Tabriz.

The battle of Čāldīrān was Shah Ismāʿīl I's greatest spiritual and military defeat, destroying "his belief in his own invincibility and divine status. It also fundamentally altered the relationship between the *murshid-e kāmil* and his *murīds*" (McCaffrey, Čalderān, EIr). Sultan Salīm I and his army remained only a short time. They then returned to the Ottoman lands to deal with the problems of the post-war situation, the most important of which may have been how to secure and fortify the eastern borders of the empire.

1.2.2. Idrīs Bidlīsī: Kurdish Statesman and Scholar

Along with Sultan Salīm I, the victors in this battle were the Kurdish chieftains, who had now obtained a new significance as the real power in the territories between the two empires.

The man behind the idea of strengthening the existing Kurdish principalities and fiefdoms and establishing new ones was the Kurdish statesman and scholar Idrīs Bidlīsī, who "was given a free hand in organising the Kurdish territories" (Ménage, Bidlisi, Idris, EIr: 1207).

Mawlānā Ḥakīm al-Dīn Idrīs Bidlīsī (1457–1520), scholar, historian, poet and statesman, was originally from Bidlīs, son of Ḥusām al-Dīn ʿAlī Bidlīsī, a distinguished scholar and Sufi who had written treatises about Sufism in Arabic and Persian. Idrīs Bidlīsī was a bureaucrat at the court of the Aq-Qoyunlu Sultan Ya'qub for many years. After the destruction of the Aq Qoyunlu state in 1501/02, he entered the service of the Ottoman Sultans (Sönmez, 2012: 17). Sultan Bāyazīd II commissioned him to compose in Persian a history of the Ottoman sultans from the beginning to his time. Bidlīsī completed the work, *Hašt Behešt* (Eight Paradises), in 912/1506.

He left Istanbul to live in Mecca for a year, until Sultan Salīm I invited him back to the court. He accompanied Salīm on his 920/1514 campaign against the Ṣafavīd Shah Ismāʿīl I (Fleischer, Bedlīsī, Ḥakīm-al-Dīn Edrīs, EIr). Sönmez (2012: 17) writes that, as a diplomat, "he sought and succeeded at establishing an alliance between the Ottoman state and Kurdish notables". His role in Ottoman history in this regard is greatly revered. Bayrakdar (1991: 76) holds that: "if one of the two architects of the Ottoman state is Yavuz (i.e. Salīm I), no doubt the second is Idrīs Bidlīsī".

1.2.3. Kurdish Emirates

Idrīs Bidlīsī's role stemmed from his extensive knowledge of Kurdish society and his abundant relations with most of the notables in Ottoman Kurdistan. He was the indispensable figure who, after the Čāldīrān campaign, "rendered invaluable service to the Ottomans by winning over the Sunnī Kurdish princes to their side" (Ménage, Bidlisi, Idris, EIr: 1208). He visited most of the ruling lords of the existing emirates and persuaded them to join forces against the Qizilbāš. Idrīs Bidlīsī's mission was considered so vital for the Ottomans that Sultan Salīm I wrote a letter to Bidlīsī in November 1515, informing him that he has sent "a number of empty documents that bore the imperial signature, which should be filled out by Idrīs in accordance with the proper titles of the emirs to whom they are bestowed" (Tezcan, 2000: 546).

In mid-September 1515, Diyarbakir was recaptured and an Ottoman governor, Biyiqli Muḥammad Pasha, was appointed there. The immediate consequence of the Kurdish alliance with the Ottomans was the establishment of the

ayālat of Diyarbakir, which included all Kurdish chiefdoms of some importance (van Bruinessen & Boeschoten, 1988: 16). These principalities acted "as a bulwark along the Ottoman Empire's frontiers with Persia [and were] recognized as practically independent but acknowledging the nominal sovereignty of the Ottoman Government" (Anonymous, 1949: 249).

The number of the Kurdish emirs persuaded by Bidlīsī to support the Ottomans is estimated to be eighteen (Eppel, 2016: 28), or seventeen (van Bruinessen, 1988: 17). The rulers of these emirates enjoyed a high degree of independence, and some of them were even exempted from paying taxes. Seventeen emirates, seven major and 10 minor, were governed indirectly and formed an administration called the *Vilayet-i Kurdistan* (ibid). The most important emirates that left significant traces in the history of Kurdistan, politically, socially or culturally, were Bidlīs, Jazīra (Bohtān or Botān), Āmēdī (ʿImādiya), Bābān and Sorān in the Ottoman Kurdistan and Ardalān in Iranian Kurdistan.

1.3. Sources

Although they were a part of the Ottoman Empire, our information about the Kurdish principalities is scarce. The most comprehensive sources that can provide some, though not sufficient, knowledge about them from different perspectives, are three; the *Šarafnāma* by Šaraf-Xān Bidlīsī (1543–1599), the *Siyāḥatnāma* by Awliyā Čalabī (1611–1682), (in modern Turkish, written as Evliya Çelebi), and *Mam ū Zīn* by Aḥmad-ē Xānī (1651–1707). Of these, only *Mam ū Zīn* deals directly, with the principality of Botān albeit in the framework of a romance and has the city of Jazīra as its setting.

The *Šarafnāma* is a chronological and descriptive history of the Kurdish emirates up to 1597. It deals mostly with the events surrounding the rulers; their ascent to power, their wars and campaigns, and their deeds. In some cases, the author also briefly mentions information about scholars and poets.

The *Siyāḥatnāma:* The part of the *Siyāḥatnāma* that deals mainly with Kurdistan is the fourth volume. However there are narratives of travels to some areas in Kurdistan, mostly in the periphery, in vol. II and vol. III. Van Bruinessen (2000a: 2) writes that Awliyā Čalabī, "made three major travels through Kurdistan", in 1646, 1649–1650 and 1655–1656. He describes almost everything in the places he visited and the book is therefore an invaluable source for understanding the approximate time of Jazīrī. Čalabī visited most parts of both Ottoman and Iranian Kurdistan, (including Jazīra) during his last trip in 1655–1656. Although, he records the names of some scholars and poets when writing about Jazīra, Malā-yē Jazīrī is not included.

Aḥmad-ē Xānī, on the other hand, in the introductory parts of his epic *Mam u Zīn*, mentions Malā-yē Jazīrī as a great poet whom he venerates together with two other poets. Additionally, we find in *Mam u Zīn* many important details about various features of the society, material, spiritual and intellectual.

In addition to the above-mentioned sources, one can mention *Tārīx-i ʿĀlamārā-ye ʿAbbāsī* by Iskandar Beg Monšī (ca. 968–1042 AH/1560–1632 CE), which contains a detailed history of the Ṣafavīd dynasty up to Shāh ʿAbbās I. In his description of the Čāldīrān battle, the Kurds are not mentioned. It is in vol. 2 of the book that we find records of Kurdish tribes and Kurdish emirates, e.g. the Bradost, in regions under Ṣafavīd rule.

1.4. Jazīra: Capital of the Kurdish Principality of Botān

Most of the historical sources about Jazīra agree that the city is quite ancient and that it has been known by various names. It was called Gazartā of Kardū in Aramaic (Minorsky, Kurds, Kurdistān: EIs-II,), and has been identified with the ancient Bāzabdā, where Alexander the Great crossed the Tigris (Elisséeff, 1971: 960). The location of the city, in a place where a branch of the Tigris flows around it, is the reason why it was called Jazīra, the Arabic word for island. The city was taken by the Islamic army led by ʿAyyāḍ bin Ġanam at the time of the second caliph ʿUmar bin al-Xaṭṭāb in 17/638. Apparently, the name, Jazīrat Ibn ʿUmar, was imposed in the Islamic era, after a certain Ibn ʿUmar, about whom there are many suggestions. The Kurdish sources, on the other hand, have always simply called it Jazīra or Jazīr-ā Botān.

The Jazīra region is more commonly known, especially among the Kurds, as Botān or Buhtān. The name appears to derive from the ancient Buxtī, which is identified with the Kardukhi (or Carduchi) mentioned in *The Persian Expedition* by Xenophon (1984: mainly in book III, ch. 5, book IV, ch. 1 & 3). Moreover, Minorsky (Kurds, Kurdistān: EIs-II) notes that "the land of the ancient Karduchoi is at the present day one of the principle centres of the Kurds."

1.4.1. Rulers of Jazīra: The ʿAzīzān Dynasty

Several dynasties and powers succeeded one another in ruling Jazīra and the surrounding areas. The most important of these dynasties was the Kurdish ʿAzīzān dynasty, which lasted for some six centuries, until the Badir-Xān revolt was defeated and the principality was completely annexed to the Ottoman Empire in the mid-nineteenth century. Their rule was, however, interrupted in a few periods by the Saljūqs, the Ṣafavīds and the indirect rule of the Ottomans.

There are several theories about the origins of the family. One of these theories, put forward by the chiefs of the dynasty themselves, traces their descent back to the famous Islamic general Xālid bin al-Walīd (Anonymous, 1949: 249). This idea is also repeated by Aḥmad-ē Xānī when, at the beginning of his epic, he traces the origins of the Amīr of his epic to Xālid (Xānī, 1962: 44). This claim obviously has no historical basis, for it is established that all the descendants of Xālid b. al-Walīd had died out by the early period of Islam (Zakî, 1986: 364).

The *Šarafnāma* relates concise accounts of the ʿAzīzān princes of Jazīra from the establishment of the dynasty until 1005/1597 when the author finished his book. According to Bidlīsī (1860: 115), Sulaymān bin Xālid was the first prince to take power in Jazīra. This was in the second half of the 7th/ the 13th century. He was succeeded in 680 AH/1281–2 CE by his son Mīr ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, from whom the name ʿAzīzān is said to derive. Prince Kamurān Badirxān, himself a descendant of the ʿAzīzān family, links the name to a small village called Arzīzān near Jazīra. He believes that his ancestors "changed their name taken from the village to ʿAzīzān in order to claim some connection with the companions of the Prophet, as was fashionable in those days" (Anonymous, 1949: 249). To this, it should also be added that they are believed to have been Yazīdīs, and that they only later, probably after consolidating their power as rulers of the principality, "followed the straight path of Islam" (Bidlīsī, 1860, 115), i.e. they converted to Islam.

Studying the history of the principality, as well as that of other principalities, one gets the immediate impression that the rivalries within the ruling family increased conspicuously after the contact with the Ottomans. This is understandable given the background that the Ottomans were not satisfied with these Kurdish entities and were planning to get rid of the principalities in due time. The *Šarafnāma* contains brief information about the ʿAzīzān princes from the beginning of the foundation of the principality. Princes succeeded one another in ruling the country without serious conflicts, while from the mid-16th century, the Ottomans began to aggravate the disagreements between members of the princely family. When Šāh ʿAlī Bag died in 950/1543–4, his son Badir Bag succeeded him. The vizier, Rustam Pāšā, soon began to incite the latter's brother, Mīr Nāṣir, to demand the rule of Jazīra, and sent him to Sulṭān Sulaymān, who appointed him ruler of Jazīra. Two years later, the deposed Badir Bag obtained a Royal decree from the same Sulṭān, and was once again the ruler of Jazīra (Bidlīsī, 1860: 127).

Another important example is the tragic fate of Amīr Nāṣir, the son of ʿAbdāl Xān. After the death of his ten-year-old cousin Sulṭān Muḥammad, he claimed the rule of Jazīra, which was granted to him by Farhād Pāšā-yi Vazīr Sardār. On the same day, his uncle Amīr ʿAzīz was introduced to the Pasha. ʿAzīz petitioned the Pāšā for the post and promised that if he got it, he would give one hundred thousand florins of the dead Sulṭān's treasure and twelve thousand florins of his own treasure to the Pāšā's treasury. The next day Amīr Nāṣir was to kiss the Pāšā's hand in the ceremony of ascension, but the Pāšā had changed his mind. When the notables of Jazīra requested and insisted that Amīr Nāṣir should be the ruler of Jazīra, the Pāšā became angry, called the executioner, and had Amīr Nāṣir put to death. This happened, according to the *Šarafnāma* (Bidlīsī, 1860:136), on Thursday, the 29th of Ramaḍān, 991 AH/16th October, 1583 CE. The years that followed were full of examples of interference in and violation of the internal affairs of the Jazīra principality.

1.5. Jazīrī's Patron

In the history of Jazīra, until 1005 AH/1597 CE, we find three princes named Šaraf, Mīr Šaraf or Šaraf-Xān. This question has apparently caused some confusion among writers on the history of Kurdish literature and biographers of Malā-yē Jazīrī as to which of the three was a contemporary of Jazīrī, to whom the poet dedicated two panegyrics. Another important question in this context is the Red School, which was also built by a Mīr Šaraf.

After the death of Mīr Šaraf I, in 860/1457, his brother Amīr Badir succeeded him, and when he died in 875/ 1470 he was succeeded by his brother Kak Muḥammad. At the time of Kak Muḥammad, in 1475, the Āq-Qoyunlu occupied Jazīra; the prince and Mīr Muḥammad and Šāh ʿAlī Bēg, sons of his brother Amīr Badir, were taken as prisoners. The third brother, Mīr Šaraf II, was safe and lived underground for thirty years (Bidlīsī, 1860: 124).

When the Ṣafavīds invaded major parts of Kurdistan and defeated the Āq-Qoyunlu in the first decade of the sixteenth century, Mīr Šaraf II mobilized his troops and Jazīra was relieved. The Qizilbāš, who now occupied the whole region, marched towards Jazīra, but Mīr Šaraf's army defended the emirate. The *Šarafnāma* relates (ibid) that in one battle, 1,700 Qizilbāsh soldiers were killed and a large squadron was taken captive. When the Ṣafavīds established their power in the region, Xān Muḥammad Ustājlu, the *Mīr-i Mīrān* of Diyārbakir, and his brother Qara Xān attacked Jazīra, but they were defeated. The third time, the Ṣafavīds brought Yakān Bēg-i Takalu-yi Qurčī-bāšī from Hamadan, along with his warlike army, but again the Kurdish fighters of Jazīra defeated them. The Qizilbāš never again approached Jazīra.

It is said that when Mīr Šaraf II was on his way to capture Jazīra, after spending long time in exile, he prayed to God and promised to build a mosque on the spot where he entered the city, and thus the Red School (in Kurdish, *Madras-ā Sor*), together with a mosque, was built in 1508 (Yaşin, 1983: 46). Almost all the sources agree that Malā-yē Jazīrī was buried in the basement of the school, which is a part of the cemetery belonging to the mosque. This is recorded to emphasize that Jazīrī enjoyed a high status and was much appreciated by the ruling family.

Abdullah Yaşin, himself a native of Jazīra, presents new evidence in his book on Jazīra that can be of great importance in understanding Jazīrī's time. Apparently, thanks to his religious education, he had access to many historical documents. He saw and read the inscriptions on the gravestones in the abovementioned cemetery of the princely family, next to the mosque and the Red School. According to Yaşin, there are seven graves in the cemetery.

The cemetery was restored in 1936, and when the gravestones were taken back to the graves, the work obviously was done in such a careless way that head and feet stones of the same grave now do not match (ibid: 46–50). For example, the deceased is female, but the Arabic verb for passed away, is masculine: *intaqala* instead of *intaqalat*. There are four readable names on these

gravestones, three princes and the daughter of one of them. One of the gravestones belongs to Amīr ʿImād al-Dīn ibn al-Amīr Šaraf al-Bohtī, which confirms the view that a prince with that name did exist, and it is believed that he was the prince with whom Jazīrī had a poetic correspondence (see Chapter 2).

There are also five dates of death on the gravestones, the earliest being from Rajab 914/October 1508 and the latest from 936/1529. From this, we infer that two of these seven graves are those of Mīr ʿImād al-Dīn and Malā-yē Jazīrī, and that the dates of their deaths are on the five preserved gravestones, which are much older. This in turn means that the prince of Jazīra, Mīr Šaraf-Xān III, who is said to have been the ruler for whom Jazīrī wrote his two panegyrics, was not buried in the same cemetery. We can also infer that the school and the mosque, or at least parts of them, were built no later than 914/1508, which agrees with what the *Šarafnāma* tells us (Bidlīsī, 1860: 124), namely that Mīr Šaraf II spent thirty years in exile before liberating Jazīra.

The relationship between Malā-yē Jazīrī and the princely family of Botān, the ʿAzīzān dynasty, is not recorded except in the poetry of Jazīrī himself and in a large number of anecdotes about his life, most of which are completely unsubstantiated. The essence of this relationship and the reason why Jazīrī held such a high position in this family may be based on the fact that Jazīrī was a Ṣūfī and a poet. In the *Dīwān* of Jazīrī, as has already been mentioned, we find no more than two panegyrics to the Kurdish prince, along with another poem whose addressee is so mysteriously described that it seems fruitless to speculate anything about it.

1.5.1. Two Panegyric Poems

In the *Dīwān* of Jazīrī, there are only two panegyrics to the Kurdish prince Šaraf-Xān. One of these is addressed to *Xān-i Xānān*, roughly translated as Lord of Lords, while the other is addressed to *Šahinšāh-i Muʿaẓẓam*, the glorious King of Kings. In order not to confuse the two poems, the first will be called "Lord of Lords" and the second "King of Kings". The two poems, and especially the question of their addressees, have been the focus of discussion by most of Jazīrī's biographers and the editors of his *Dīwān*. Zakī (1947: 205–206) assumes that "King of Kings" was dedicated to ʿImād al-Dīn Zangī (1085–1146), who was the ruler of Mosul in 1127–8, and "Lord of Lords" to a certain *Xān-i Xānān*, who was the ruler of Tabrīz, without specifying who he was and in what period he ruled Tabrīz. Sajjādī in his *History of Kurdish Literature* (1971: 183–184) does not agree with Zakī's conclusion and suggests that "King of Kings" was written for the Tīmurīd Sultan Ḥusayn Bāyqara (1438–1506), and "Lord of Lords" either for the Ottoman Sultan Muḥammad Fātiḥ or his son Bāyazīd II.

Zivingī, is more confident, when he argues that both poems were addressed to Šaraf-Xān, or Xān-Šaraf, son of ʿAbdāl-Xān, who, according to Bidlīsī (1860:

144), was in power at the end of *Rajab* 1005/mid-March 1597, when he finalized his book. All three authors have attempted to find historical evidence to support their views about the period in which they believe the poet lived.

Apparently, Zivingī's opinion on this was more acceptable to the editors of most of the editors of Jazīrī's *Dīwān* that were published after Zivingī's edition, such as Hažār (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1982: 23) and Doskī (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 2004: 479; Malā-yē Jazīrī, 2018, IV: 294). As we shall see, all the indications suggest that the poet wrote and dedicated the two poems to prince Šaraf-Xān III, who came to power in 999/1590 and was a contemporary of Jazīrī.

Jazīrī's two panegyric *qaṣīda*s in praise of Mīr Šaraf-Xān III are quite similar in many respects. The striking similarities between these two poems make it seem certain that they were written within a very short period of time. These similarities include metaphors, the manner in which the prince is addressed, and the rhythm, and both are almost the same length: 22 distiches in "King of Kings" and 23 distiches in "Lord of Lords". Both *qaṣīda*s are composed in the same metre; *ramal-i muṯamman-i maḥḏūf,* the pattern of which is as follows:

fāʿilātun/ fāʿilātun/ fāʿilātun/ fāʿilun
– v – –/ – v – –/ – v – –/ – v –

It is worth pointing out that most of the scholars who wrote about and discussed the life and times of Jazīrī, in addition to some historical evidence, used a metaphor in a *ġazal* in Jazīrī's *Dīwān* to support their position. The *bayt* that describes the arrows shot at the heart as "the arrows of Xān Šaraf" is as follows:

Ṣaf ṣaf ma dīn Hindī u Zang, Jangīz-i hāt, *Taymūr-i Lang*
Xafʿwān rašāndin dil xadang, tašbīh-i tīrēn Xān-Šaraf

We saw Indians and Black people coming in rows,
We saw Changiz and Timur Lenk,
They secretly aimed their arrows, which resembled
The arrows of Xān-Šaraf, at our hearts. (ZdJ: 352)

The only fact that can be concluded from this verse is that the poet mentions the name of a certain Xān-Šaraf, who may have been a brave leader. In the history of the Botan principality, there are three rulers whose names were Šaraf or Šaraf-Xān, but the above-mentioned *bayt* does not tell us when the Šaraf who is being praised lived.

Better evidence can be found in Jazīrī's two panegyrics, in which he not only mentions Xān-Šaraf, but also associates his name with the city of Jazīra and its landmarks, traits and peculiarities. He records that the wall of the city was decorated by verses from the *Qurʾān*, that it was the capital city of the Botan principality, and prince Šaraf-Xān, reigned in a country called Kurdistan. Moreover, he mentions the tower, which he calls *Burj-ā Šaraf*, Tower of Šaraf, built by Šaraf-Xān III in 1596.

Another important piece of information that settles the argument is that the two panegyrics consist mainly of wishes for the prince to be happy, successful and victorious in conquering other cities and lands. Such hopes are usually expressed for rulers who are still alive and in power. The significance of Jazīrī's two panegyrics lies not only in their aesthetic value, but also in the fact that they prove conclusive evidence for understanding his life and time.

Taking into consideration the conventional divisions of a "standard" *qaṣīda*, one does not find all the expected components in Jazīrī's two panegyrics. The overwhelming impression and obvious purpose of "King of Kings" is to express Jazīrī's good wishes for the prince, e.g. that he may always be victorious and extend his realm to the seven climes. It is only in the last distich (22) that the poet simply expresses his desire, as no more than a gesture of courtesy and friendship, to be at the prince's service and in his sight. The two poems can therefore confidently be classified as monothematic *qaṣīda*s, consisting almost entirely of *madīh*. The following is an English translation of the *qaṣīda*, "King of Kings":

O, glorious King of Kings! May God be your protector,
The *Sūra* of *Innā Fataḥnā* be around you! (1)

To whichever side you turn the reins of zeal,
May Venus be your courier and Saturn your groom! (2)

May the House of honour always be the station of your feast,
A fortunate horoscope and good luck be your friends! (3)

May the bewildering seven planets and nine skies,
With such astonishing revolution, be in your service! (4)

May the moonlight of power be a single ray of your candle,
The sun of eminence a single flash of your light! (5)

May the brightness of eternal victory illuminate your crown,
The star of eternal prosperity be one of your planets! (6)

The Divine lightning that illuminates hundreds of souls,
And reveals hearts, may it be a sign of your secrets! (7)

The conquest banner of your victory has always been unfurled,
May the knight of divine radiance be your standard bearer! (8)

May not only Tabrīz and Kurdistan be under your rule,
But also hundreds like the Shāh of Xurāsān be in your guesthouse! (9)

Though you ascended the throne of the sultanate in the fourth clime,
May the kings of the seven climes salute you! (10)

May the Sultan's meadow be a single tulip in your orchard,
The Khāqān's rose bed be a thorn in your flower garden! (11)

Whoever disobeys your revered command, may he be like a candle,
Before your sword and your hair-splitting [edge]! (12)

However high the royal falcon soars, coming and going,
It will still fall into your net and be the prey of your eagle! (13)

A king [who] has great awe, but is beyond his share,
May he suddenly appear and be bent under your burden! (14)

Whoever is prosperous should be in your chains,
Anyone who is intelligent must put himself in your service! (15)

Anyone who wants to be free should expect your kindness,
May whoever considers himself independent be in need of your favour and grace. (16)

Whoever has a wish in his heart should seek your court,
He who has a request in mind should be your supplicant! (17)

Anyone, who is not a well-wisher of [your] Excellency
from the bottom of his heart,
May he, like the damned, be under your subjection and punishment! (18)

May you live in joy, pleasure and happiness,
For as long as a year can renew and relieve you! (19)

Anyone who does not praise and pray for you wholeheartedly,
May he be a captive in your chains and a target for your arrow! (20)

To the heart's perceptive knowledge, a hint of your attributes came,
Otherwise, who could be aware of your worth and power! (21)

The intention and desire of *Malā* from the bottom
of the soul and heart is always this:
To be in the chains of your service, in your sight! (22)

There are many reasons to believe that Jazīrī wrote these two panegyrics to praise a Kurdish ruler or prince, and that the city of Jazīra was the capital of that ruler. The two poems contain many peculiarities that can only be associated with the city of Jazīra, and thus with its rulers, the ʿAzizan dynasty. If Jazīrī had written his poems to praise Zangī, the ruler of Mosul, or a Xān in Tabriz, or an Ottoman sultan, he would have written them in a language other than Kurdish, a language that they could understand and that was in use as a literary vehicle at the time, Arabic, Persian or Ottoman Turkish, which he commanded. The use of Kurdish as a literary language was very limited in those days, at least in Ottoman Kurdistan.

One of the important remnants that can be seen in the modern city of Jazīra, apart from the Red School, is the piebald tower, *Burj-ā Balak*, built on the bank of the Tigris. Yaşin, a Kurdish historian and resident of Jazīra, states in his book on the city that the tower was built in 1596 by Mīr Šaraf III. The name *balak*, piebald, derived from the Arabic *ablaq*, is used because the tower is built of black basalt rock and gypsum (Yaşin, 1983: 34). It is believed that basalt was first used to build mosques and castles in Diyārbakir in the 16th century (Botānī, 1988: 139).

The tower, *burj*, is present in both poems, once as the House of honour, *Burj-ā Šaraf*, in "King of Kings" and the other time in "Lord of Lords" as your tower, *burj-ā ta*. Line 3 in "King of Kings" reads as follows:

> *Dāʾimā manzilgah-ā sūr-ā ta bit burj-ā Šaraf*
> *Ṭāliʿ-ē farxunda (w)ū baxt-ē saʿīd yār-ē ta bī* (ZdJ: 653)
>
> May the House of honour always be the station of your feast,
> A fortunate horoscope and good luck be your friends!

In line 2, "Lord of Lords", we read:

> *Kawkab-ā saʿd-ā šaraf ṭāliʿ di nēv burj-ā ta bit*
> *Dā tinē ž čarx-ē balā šubhē mahē manẓūr bī* (ZdJ: 661)
>
> May the star of blessed fortune and honour shine
> in your Zodiac sign (or tower)
> So that you will be safe of the celestial sphere, and be seen as a moon.

The word *šaraf* and its derivations, *šarīf* and *tašrīf*, are used in both poems, which clearly demonstrates that the poet is referring to the prince Šaraf-Xān (distich 3 in "King of Kings" and distiches 2, 3, 4 and 18 in "Lord of Lords").

Kurdistan, as a region, and Jazīra as its capital are also mentioned in "King of Kings" and "Lord of Lords" respectively, which leaves no doubt that the ruler who is being praised is a Kurdish prince and that Jazīra was the capital of his region. In line 9 of "King of Kings" we read:

> *Nay tinē Tabrīz u Kurdistān libar ḥukmē ta bin*
> *Ṣad wekī Šāh-ē Xurāsānē di farwār-ē ta bī* (ZdJ: 654)
>
> May not only Tabrīz and Kurdistan be under your rule,
> But also hundreds like the Šāh of Xurāsān be in your guest house!

Jazīra is mentioned in line 10, "Lord of Lords", and the poet wishes it to be the centre of all the seven climes:

> *Mā Jizīrē šubh-ē dār-ē taxt-i haft ʾiqlīm bit*
> *Ham bi ḥukm u salṭanat Askandar u Faġfūr bī* (ZdJ: 663).
>
> May Jazīra be the capital for the royal throne(s) of the seven climes,
> And by your command and power, you will be Alexander and the Chinese Emperor (*Faġfūr*).

The town of Jazīra, which the poet wishes will be the centre of the seven climes, is more clearly defined in "King of Kings" as the prince's capital and as being located in the fourth clime:

> *Garči dar ʾiqlīm-i rābiʿ hatī taxt-ē salṭanat*
> *Pādišāh-ē haft-i ʾiqlīmān salām-kār-ē te bī* (ZdJ: 655).
> Though you ascended the throne of sultanate in the fourth clime,
> May the kings of the seven climes salute you!

The habitable world, according to medieval geographers, was divided into seven zones/climes, which were called ʾaqālīm (Arabic plural for ʾiqlīm). In this geographical system the city of Jazīra belonged to the fourth ʾiqlīm (Ibn Khaldûn, 1958: 145).

We do not know on what occasion Jazīrī's two panegyrics were composed, but the context of the poems and the surroundings they describe clearly show that they were not intended to celebrate the prince's accession to power. They may have been composed long after the event.

Reading the *Šarafnāma* one understands that Prince Šaraf III, also known as Xān-Šaraf, spent most of his life in battle against troops sent by the Ottomans to occupy the principality, as well as dissidents within his own family who did not respect his power.

Indeed, two parallel dimensions interact throughout the poem, from the very first distich until the penultimate one. These are the local dimension, reflecting the true condition of the principality, and the external dimension, extending to the horizons of the poet's dreams. On the one hand, reference is made to various features of the city of Jazīra, the capital of the principality of Botān, while on the other hand Kings, Sultans, Shahs and Khaqans from all over the known world are paraded by the poet to show their loyalty to the prince. The sole link between the two worlds is the prince himself. Through the poet's wishes, the prince is made into the centre of a circle covering the seven climes (see the verses above).

Similar ideas and expressions to those found in lines 2, 8, 10, 15 and 19 of "King of Kings", are also found in "Lord of Lords". The general atmosphere in both *qaṣīda*s is also the same; the good wishes that the poet hopes will be fulfilled continue in both of them until, finally, Jazīrī ends them with a *duʿāʾ*, a supplication to be in the presence of the prince and to be seen by him. The last *bayt* in "King of Kings" reads:

> *Qast u dāxwāz-ā Malē dāʾim ži jān u dil ava*
> *Har di band-ā xizmatē, pēšdast-ē dīdār-ē ta bī* (ZdJ: 660).
>
> The intention and desire of *Malā* from the bottom of his soul and heart is always this:
> To be in the chain of your service, in your sight!

Regarding the use of the House of Honour, *Burj-ā Šaraf*, in line 3 in "King of Kings", Schimmel (1996: 480) wrote that "in the Kurdish Qasida there is a mention of the *burj-i sharaf*, the 'high tower', which is of course an astrological term describing the zodiacal sign in which the exaltation of a star takes place". It is similarly used to refer both to the name of the prince and his palace and to "the highest dignity and prosperity" (Steingass, 1947: 170).

This term is the key to all the parallel metaphors that follow. It is represented as the centre of the universe, around which all things, terrestrial and celestial, revolve. In many of the following verses, the two dimensions are presented in different ways, each time juxtaposing a local aspect of the principality with wider dimensions. Although these two parallel dimensions seem, at first glance, to be opposites, the poet's strategy is based upon integrating the greater into the smaller, the peripheral into the centre, e.g.:

Bayt	Universal dimension	Local dimension
1-a	God (*Ḥaqq*)	Your protector
1-b	*Sūra* of *Innā Fataḥnā*	Around you
2-b	Venus	Your courier
2-b	Saturn	Your groom
4	Seven planets, nine skies	In your service
5-a	Moonlight of power	A single ray of your candle
5-b	Sun of eminence	A single flash of your light
6-a	Brightness of eternal victory	Illuminating your crown
6-b	The star of eternal prosperity	Be one of your planets
7	Divine lightning	Be a sign of your secrets
8-b	Knight of divine radiance	Be your standard bearer
9	Hundreds like the Šāh of Xurāsān	Be in your guest house
10	Kings of the seven climes	Salute you
11	Sultan's meadow	A tulip in your orchard
11-b	*Xāqān*'s rose bed	A thorn your rose garden
13	Royal falcon	Will fall into your net
13	Royal falcon	The prey of your eagle
14	Awe-inspiring king	Bent under your burden

The list could be made longer by including many other elements mentioned in the *qaṣīda*. It is clear that by juxtaposing small and local elements with large and global ones, the poet provides artistic and psychological compensation for the limited power and importance of the principality of Botan.

1.6. The Naqšbandī Order in Ottoman Kurdistan

The following two sections deal with the Naqšbandī order in Kurdistan and Ibn ʿArabī's doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* (The unity of being). These two topics are relevant to the history of the cultural and intellectual life in Kurdistan in the last several centuries and to the poetry of Jazīrī. In this chapter, these topics will be treated as important constituents of the superstructure in Kurdistan at the time of Jazīrī. In chapter five, where I return to these two subjects, the focus will mainly be on Jazīrī's system of thought and how these topics were reflected and presented in his poetry.

The Naqšbandī order was founded by Xwāja Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Bahāʾ al-Dīn, also known as Šāh-i Naqšband (718–91/1318–89). The order is considered to be historically and spiritually linked to the Xwājagān series of Central Asian masters of Sufism, initiated by Abū Yūsuf Hamadānī (d. 534/1140). Bahāʾ al-Dīn left no writings and even discouraged his disciples from recording his sayings. To the eight principles of spiritual conduct (*kalimāt-i*

qudsiyya, lit. 'Holy Words') originally promulgated by ʿAbd al-Xāliq Ġijduwānī (d. 617/1220), Bahāʾ al-Dīn added three further principles. Although the order had flourished under the guidance of Bahāʾ al-Dīn's predecessors mainly among the Persian-speaking people of Transoxiana, a few generations later it had spread to almost every region of the Turkish world (Algar, 1993a: 933).

A prominent and important successor of Bahāʾ al-Dīn was Xwāja ʿUbayd Allāh Aḥrār (d. 896/1490) "under whose auspices the Naqšbandīyya both established its supremacy in Central Asia and began its expansion in the wider Muslim world" (ibid: 934). Mollā ʿAbdullāh Ilāhī of Sīmāw (d. 1490) was the person who established the Naqšbandī order in the Ottoman lands. He was initiated by Aḥrār in Samarqand and, after completing his training, he became a deputy of Aḥrār. The order was further spread in many parts of the Ottoman Empire, as far north as Sarajevo, by Ilāhī's successors and disciples, with the most important centres being in Istanbul and Bursa. There are no indications however that Ilāhī or his successors had established the order in Kurdistan, for, as van Bruinessen (1990: 358) surmises, "no contact could be discovered, in this early period, between the Naqšbandīs of Kurdistan and the branches of the order established in and around Istanbul." The roots of the Naqšbandī order in Ottoman Kurdistan should therefore, be sought elsewhere.

At the beginning of the 16th century, Šayx Sunʿ Allāh Kūzakunānī (d. 929/1522–3) from Azerbaijan, supposedly initiated into the Naqšbandī order by either Xwāja ʿUbayd Allāh Aḥrār or ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Maktabdār, spent several years in Kurdistan. This happened when the Ṣafavīd Šāh Ismaʿīl conquered Tabriz. The shaikh later returned to Azerbaijan. His son Abū Saʿīd (b. 1514) also left Azerbaijan in 1548 on the occasion of Sulṭan Suleymān's Azerbaijan campaign. He first lived in Diyarbakir and then moved to Aleppo and Istanbul. Apparently, during their stay in Kurdistan, they neither established a branch of the order nor appointed deputies (van Bruinessen, 1990: 354).

The most influential and charismatic Naqšbandī shaykh in Kurdistan in the early 17th century was Šayx Maḥmūd, commonly known as Rūmiya Šayxi, "the Sheikh from Urumiya", or *Ḥaḍrat-i ʿAzīz*, the "Precious Presence", or simply the Saint, who moved to Diyarbakir presumably in 1603 (ibid: 340). He apparently chose Diyarbakir as the main centre of his *ṭarīqa*, because the city was then an important administrative and military centre and was connected by good roads to all parts of Kurdistan, Azerbaijan, Anatolia and Syria. He was the head of a branch of the Naqšbandī order called the Urmawī branch. He had left Urumiya when the Ṣafavīd Šāh ʿAbbās reconquered the city and settled in Diyarbakir until he was executed by Sulṭan Murād IV in 1639. He was succeeded by his son Ismāʿīl Čalabī, whom the Ottoman traveller Awliya Čalabī met when he visited the city in 1655.

Writing about Šayx Maḥmūd, Awliyā Čalabī refers to his branch of the order as the ṭarīq-i Xwājagān or ṭarīq-i Xwājagān-i Naqšbandī, while other branches are referred to simply as Naqšbandī. Šayx Maḥmūd's ancestors, according to Awliyā, were also great sheikhs, and the tombs of two of them,

Qočāġā Sulṭān and Šorī, or Šawrī, Sulṭān, were in Urumia. As far as the spiritual lineage of the family is concerned, they are believed to be descended either from one of ʿUbayd Allāh Aḥrār's xalīfas in Azerbaijan or from another *silsila* that can be traced directly back to Bahāʾ al-Dīn. There is still some obscurity about the spiritual lineage of the branch, and its connection with the Transoxiana origins is not certain.

Šayx Maḥmūd's influence in the region was enormous. People from all districts of Kurdistan visited his *takiya*, paid tribute to him and "flocked to his feet" (van Bruinessen & Boeschoten, 1988: 51). It is estimated that he had no fewer than 40,000 followers. These were not only common people, but also military commanders, pashas and members of the elite. In addition to the main *takiya* in Diayarbakir, he had *takiya*s in Van and in Urumiya and the surrounding area.

There was great interest in poetry in the *takiya*, but also in the city, where there were hundreds of proficient and eloquent poets of accomplishment. Ismāʿīl Čalabī, the son and successor of Šayx Maḥmūd, was well versed in Islamic sciences and wrote poetry. He was also renowned as a musician and composer, but it is not confirmed whether music accompanied the *ḏikr* ceremonies in his *takiya*, since it was completely unknown among the Naqšbandīs. Ismāʿīl's son and successor, Aḥmad, was one of the best known composers of his time. On an intellectual level, the Shaykh is believed to have been an adherent of Ibn ʿArabī's doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* which was widely embraced by the Naqšbandīs in the Ottoman lands. In his *madrasa* in Diyarbakir, *taṣawwuf* and *tawḥīd* were taught.

Šayx Maḥmūd's influence in Kurdistan was abundantly clear. In addition to his main *takiya* in Diyarbakir, he had *takiya*s in Urmiya and Van. Generals, provincial governors, great merchants and aristocrats visited him. However, he enjoyed even greater support among the lower classes of society. When Sulṭan Murād IV was at the head of a campaign to Baghdad in 1639, the Shaykh led a delegation of Diyarbakir notables to welcome him on the banks of the Euphrates, in the vicinity of Diyarbakir, according to Čalabī, or in Aleppo, according to another Turkish historian (van Bruinessen, 1990: 344). He presented to the Sulṭan the peasants' complaints about the tax burden and asked him to reduce them.

It is also said that on several occasions the enemies of the Shaykh reported to the Sulṭan that "the Shaykh was preparing a rebellion, and was likely to set himself up as the *Mahdī*", according to van Bruinessen (1990: 344). Moreover, he was accused by the slanderers of having knowledge of alchemy, which enabled him to change copper into silver and gold. Whatever the reason, it seems that the Sulṭan was biding his time to get rid of the Shaykh, whom he came to see as a potential element of disturbance and unrest in Kurdistan. Šayx Maḥmūd was executed in 1639 when the Sulṭan passed through Diyarbakir on his way back from his campaign to Baghdad. Considering the great influence and prestige the Shaykh enjoyed, his execution was recorded by most of the

historians as one of the major events of the year. People heard and talked about it even in regions as far away as Hungary (van Bruinessen, ibid: 341).

Understandably, the Naqšbandī order did not decline in Kurdistan after the execution of Šayx Maḥmūd. His son, who was the head of the Urmawi branch and held the same position as his father when Awliyā Čalabī visited Diyarbakir in 1655, had succeeded him. A few decades later, at the beginning of the 18th century, a new branch of the Naqšbandī order was established in the Ottoman territories; the Mujaddidī branch, which originated from the Indian subcontinent. Šayx Muḥammad Murād Buxārī (d. 1141/1729) was initiated into the *tarīqa* by Xwāja Muḥammad Maʿsūm, Sirhindī's son and successor. He spent about five years in the Ottoman capital towards the end of the 11th/17th century and the next thirty years mainly in Damascus. In 1141/1729 he returned to Istanbul, where he died shortly afterwards. He established the Mujaddidī branch in Istanbul, and his disciples spread it further in Anatolia and the Balkans (Algar, 1993: 936b; 1996: 52).

The most important wave of the Naqšbandīyya-Mujaddidiyya was led by Mawlānā Xālid Kurdī Šahrazūrī (d. 1827), who was initiated into the order by Šayx Ġulām ʿAlī Dehlavī. Mawlānā Xālid's disciples spread the order to all parts of Kurdistan, Syria, Anatolia, Rumelia, Southast Asia, the Caucasus and Crimea. The movement initiated by Mawlānā Xālid is so important that it is considered an independent branch named after him, as the Xālidiyya. The impact of the Xālidiyya branch on the political situation in Kurdistan and other regions of the Middle East is obvious. It also created a rich intellectual and cultural heritage, the presence of which is still deeply rooted in Kurdish society (Shakely, 1999: 99–100). Within a few decades Xālidiyya became the most powerful branch of the Naqšbandī order, and it "displaced most of the existing lines of affiliation. [....] After Mawlānā Xālid, in fact, the Xālidiyya is virtually synonymous with the Naqšbandīyya in all of Western Asia" (Algar, 1993b: 936).

1.7. Muḥyī al-Dīn Ibn ʿArabī and his Doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*

Ibn ʿArabī, Muḥyī al-Dīn Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. ʿAlī b. Muḥammad al-Ḥatimī al-Ṭāʾī (560–638/1165–1240), also known as *al-Šayx al-Akbar* (The Supreme Master), is one of the most important and influential thinkers and Sufis in the history of Islam. He was born in Andalusia and travelled widely in various Islamic countries. He spent the last years of his life in Damascus, where he died, and was buried on the slopes of Mount Qāsiyūn. It is estimated that he wrote more than two hundred books and treatises, almost all of which deal with various issues and aspects of Sufism (Ibn ʿArabi, n.d.: 6).

Ibn ʿArabī is best known as the founder of the doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* (The Unity of Being, also translated as The Oneness of Being), the gist of

which he expounded especially in *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam* (The Bezels of Wisdom), but also in *Al-Futuḥat al-Makkiyya* (The Meccan Illuminations) and other writings. The doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* has been elucidated and discussed more than any other theory in Islamic philosophy, despite the fact that "the theories set forth in the *Fuṣūṣ* are difficult to understand and even more difficult to explain" (Nicholson, 1989: 149). There are, however, more than one hundred explanations and commentaries on the *Fuṣūṣ*.

The ideas of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* as presented in *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam*, were known among the Sufis even before Ibn ʿArabī, although they were not formulated as theoretical and philosophical doctrines. Rather, they were expressed in a way that made them closer to *Šaṭḥiyāt* (theopathic utterances). Bāyazīd Bisṭāmī (d. 261/874), for instance, had uttered expressions that were interpreted as ecstatic, but also as heretical; e.g. *Subḥānī Subḥānī mā aʿẓama šaʾnī* (Glory be to me! Glory be to me! How great is my state!). Ḥusayn bin Manṣūr al-Ḥallāj (244–309/857–922) is also widely known for his expression *Anā al-Ḥaqq* (I am the Truth, or God), often used by Sufi poets as a symbol of union with, or annihilation in, God. Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār (540–618/1145–1220) is generally considered a *wujūdī* poet and a Sufi, since many of his poems contain references to notions similar to those of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* and the terms of Ibn ʿArabī (Paymard, 1374: 48).

However, it is important to note that all these ideas, which are present in the works and deeds of most of the Sufis who lived before Ibn ʿArabī, do not constitute a developed and organized doctrine, as was established by the Supreme Master (*Al-muʿallim al-akbar*, *Al-Šayx al-akbar*). Explaining this issue, ʿAfīfī (Ibn ʿArabi, n.d.: 25) states that:

> The school of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* in Islam had not existed in its perfect form before Ibn ʿArabī. He is the real architect of the pillars of this school and its founder. He analyses in detail its meanings and purposes. He draws for it a definitive image which has been used by every Muslim, after him, who talks about this school.

The doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* is therefore understandably linked to the name of Ibn ʿArabī, although he never used the term in his writings.

Many Sufis and scholars after Ibn ʿArabī have devoted their works to the further study and development of the doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*. Among the most important of them, one can mention ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Jīlī (767–811/1365–1408), ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī (d. 898/1492), ʿAbd al-Ġanī al-Nabulusī (1050–1143/1641–1731) and Awḥad al-Dīn al-Balyānī, who lived in the seventh/thirteenth century. There are, apparently, many others who were more or less involved in commenting on and elucidating the ideas and works of Ibn ʿArabī, especially his *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam*. Moreover, there are, literally, hundreds

of poets in whose works the ideas of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* are reflected in the various languages of Islam.

1.7.1. The Naqšbandīs and the Doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*

A clear sign of the inclination of a Naqšbandī leader towards Ibn ʿArabī's doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* is found first in the writings of Xwāja ʿUbayd Allāh Aḥrār (d. 896/1490), one of the main successors and disciples of Xwāja Muḥammad Bahāʾ al-Dīn, the eponym of the Naqšbandī order (Algar, 1991: 9). However, there is evidence that Xwāja Muḥammad Pārsā (d. 822/1419) and Xwāja ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār (d. 802/1400) were interested in and revered Ibn ʿArabī and his works.

Abd al-Raḥmān Jāmī (d. 898/1492) is another great Naqšbandī scholar whose devotion to Ibn ʿArabī and his doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* was inspired by the writings of Xwāja Muḥammad Pārsā and Xwāja ʿUbayd Allāh Aḥrār. Jāmī's works consist of both prose and poetry, and his influence extended beyond Iran to Central Asia, India and Ottoman lands, including Kurdistan.

Mullā ʿAbd Allāh Ilāhī (d. 896/1491) was initiated into the Naqšbandī order by Xwāja ʿUbayd Allāh Aḥrār in Samarqand. On his way back to the Ottoman lands, he also visited ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī in Herat sometime in the early second half of the fifteenth century. It is believed that he learned about the concepts of Ibn ʿArabī from these two men. Beside his role in spreadning the Naqšbandī order in the Ottoman lands, Ilāhī also spread the teachings of Ibn ʿArabī, especially *Waḥdat al-wujūd*, in his writings and poems, to which he devoted the last years of his life (Lubis, 1994: 238–239). Amīr Buxarī (d. 922/1516), the principal successor of Mollā ʿAbd Allāh Ilāhī, is also known as an enthusiastic adherent of Ibn ʿArabī's teachings. The poet Lāmiʿī Čalabī (d. 938/1532), one of Buxārī's many successors, was a celebrated poet who, along with other poets and Sufis, "did much to propagate further the teachings of Ibn ʿArabī in the Turkish-speaking lands" (Algar, 1991: 18).

Although the teachings of Ibn ʿArabī were confronted by a new system of ideas established by Šayx Aḥmad Sirhindī (971–1033/1563–1624), *Waḥdat al-Šuhūd* (the unity of witnessing), they remained dominant in the Ottoman lands and several other regions. Many decades after Sirhindī's death, the Mujaddidi branch of the Naqšbandī order reached the Ottoman lands. Nevertheless, the doctrine of *Waḥdat al-Šuhūd*, did not constitute a serious rival to the teachings of Ibn ʿArabī. Even in areas where the Mujaddid's thought had the strongest position, such as in the Indian subcontinent, there were still many Sufīs who adhered to the doctrine of Ibn ʿArabī.

The Urmawī branch of the Naqšbandī order, headed by Šayx Maḥmūd (executed in 1639), was the most influential Sufi order in the eastern provinces of the Ottoman Empire and Azerbaijan in the first half of the seventeenth century. According to several indications recorded by the Ottoman traveller Awliyā Čalabī in his *Siyāḥatnāma*, Šayx ʿAzīz Maḥmūd was a follower of the

doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*. It is even believed that the teachings of Ibn ʿArabī were taught in the *madrasa* that belonged to the Diyarbakir branch (van Bruinessen, 1990: 347). Awliyā Čalabī records the existence of five Naqšbandī *takiya*s in the Kurdish provinces he visited. Of these five *takiya*s, three belonged to the Urmawi branch of Šayx Maḥmūd, namely those in Diyarbakir, Van and Urmiya. The *takiya*s in Jazīra and Bidlīs belonged to branches of the Naqšbandī order other than the Urmawī.

The capital of the powerful Kurdish principality of Bidlīs was the city of Bidlīs. Prince Šaraf-Xān, who wrote his *Šarafnāma* in 1597, records the names of many notable and distinguished poets, scholars and Sufis from his native city. Among these were Sheikh ʿAmmār b. Yāsir who was a disciple of Sheikh Abū Najīb al-Dīn Suhrawardī and the preceptor of Shaikh Najm al-Dīn Kubrā, and Sheikh Abū Ṭāhir al-Kurdī, of whom "our Lord, the light of the nation and the religion, Mawlānā ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī has made mention in *Nafaḥat*" (Bidlīsī, 1860: 344). This veneration of Jāmī indicates a strong affiliation with the Naqšbandī order and familiarity with Jāmī as a Sufi and scholar. Moreover, Bidlīsī ends his *Šarafnāma* with a few words about his own son, who was effectively the ruler of the principality, and quotes a long passage from the *Xiradnāmah* of Mawlānā Jāmī to give him words of advice.

In the summer of 1065/1655, Awliyā Čalabī accompanied his patron Malak Aḥmad Pāšā when he mobilised a large army to invade the Kurdish principality of Bidlīs. The Kurdish ruler, ʿAbdāl Xān, was defeated, and the Ottoman army conquered the city. The possessions of the Prince were confiscated in the presence of Awliyā Čalabī. He records a long list of precious books in the library of ʿAbdāl Xān, which were "the fine books and important texts and reliable chronicles that emerged from the seven camel-boxes with the Khan's own seal" (Dankoff, 1990: 290). These books included *Al-Futūḥāt al-Makkiyya* and *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam*, and several commentaries on these works. This indicates that "there was apparently a serious interest in these works among the educated Kurds" (van Bruinessen, 1990: 346).

1.8. Other Intellectual Trends in Kurdish Society

We do not have access to many reliable sources to trace the various philosophical schools in the Kurdish society of the mid-16th to the mid-17th century, the approximate time when Malā-yē Jazīrī lived. Of the three books mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, only *Mam u Zīn* of Xānī gives us a glimpse of the ideas that were familiar in his time. It is true that the Kurdish society was a part of the Islamic world and also of the Ottoman and Iranian societies. This means, consequently, that there were great and wide areas of similarity and common ground in these societies, but also divergences that could not be ignored.

The long-standing enmity between the Ottoman and Safavid empires, had created a large rift in the common religion, and the differences were politically

institutionalized. Probably the only aspect of Islam that was not seriously damaged was Sufism, which spread very quick in Kurdistan, especially Ottoman Kurdistan.

The Safavīds cracked down on Sufism, the Sunnī profession and Kurdish identity, which led to the emigration of most of the Sufis and Sufi orders to Kurdistan. Algar (1991: 16–17) asserts that "with the rise of the Safavids and the persecution of all Sunnī orders, Naqshbandī activity in Western Iran was brought to an almost complete end, and several Naqshbandī shaykhs were put to death, including Maulana Sayyid ʻAlī Kurdī and the spiritual descendants of Kuzakunanī."

The reason why most of the Sufis and orders fled to Kurdistan could be sought in its social and political conditions. There were many semi-independent emirates in Kurdistan, but no central authority, and the Ottomans were unable to control them because they needed Kurdish support against the Safavīds.

This explains to some extent why most of the poets, scholars and saints in Kurdish society were Sufis, or at least interested in Sufism. The Sufi orders (*tarīqa*s) fleeing the Safavid persecution were established in Kurdistan, and thousands of people followed them. These Sufi orders brought with them various philosophical ideas that stimulated the intellectual life of Kurdish society. Malā-yē Jazīrī, Aḥmad-i Xānī and other contemporary poets were distinguished examples of poets associated with this process.

Ottoman Kurdistan was a multi-religious, multi-ethnic and multi-cultural society. This is a topic that is often mentioned in the *Siyāḥatnāma* of Awliyā Čalabī, which reports from various cities and regions in Kurdistan. There were ethnic groups in Kurdistan other than the Kurds, such as Armenians, Nestorians, Turkmens and Arabs, and there were other religions than Islam, such as Christianity, Yezidism, Judaism and heterodoxy. The exchange of ideas in such societies, especially among the educated people, is the rule rather than an unusual phenomenon.

One should not expect to find detailed reporting about the intellectual life of a society in the poetic texts of a poet. However, the impact of different thoughts and philosophies on the way a poet thinks and on the contents of the poems is significant.

Malā-yē Jazīrī's poetry contains a wealth of ideas that clearly show that he was familiar with numerous philosophies and idea of his time, and that he was actively involved in intellectual reasoning within his own mind, and with his surroundings.

1.8.1. Poets, Saints and Scholars

Writers on the history of Kurdish literature agree that the classical poetry in the northern dialect of the Kurdish language began with three poets, Malā-yē Jazīrī, ʿAlī Ḥarīrī and Faqī-yē Ṭayrān. Concerning the dates of their births and deaths, the information varies greatly, but it is almost certain that they were

contemporaries. The first time they were mentioned as great Kurdish poets was in the *Mam u Zīn* of Aḥmad-ī Xānī, composed in 1105 AH/1693 CE They are at the top of a list of eight poets recorded by Jaba (1860: 13–14).

There is a great difference between the poetry of Jazīrī and that of the other two poets. The poetry of Ḥarīrī and Faqī-yē Ṭayrān is mainly characterized by folkloric form and content, whereas Jazīrī's poems are distinguished as sophisticated classical texts with high aesthetic standards in both form and content. Moreover, the Sufi thought that dominates in Jazīrī's poetry has given it a depth that has made it popular in Sufi circles, the traditional schools and in the courts of the princes and rulers in Kurdistan. He is "the first Kurdish poet who transmitted the system of *ʿarūḍ* and the unified classical Arabic rhyme into Kurdish literature, and acquired the experience of Persian and Ottoman Turkish literatures" (Xaznadār, 2002: 246).

Nevertheless, we should not think that Jazīrī emerged from an empty field in Kurdish literature, or that he was the only poet of his time. The *Dīwān* of Jazīrī contains the names of at least five Kurdish poets, in addition to the names of, or references to, various Arab and Persian poets. The Kurdish poets mentioned in Jazīrī's *Dīwān* are Mīr ʿImād al-Dīn Jazīrī, Faqī-yē Ṭayrān, Lāġar, Sheikh Ramaḍān and Malā Xamsa-ʿašar, whose real name was Malā Dāw(ū)d Finikī. The first two poets each conducted a long poetic conversation (called *mukālama* in all manuscripts of the *Dīwān*) with Jazīrī. These poetic conversations contain various Sufi and philosophical topics, as well as phrases of praise and friendliness.

As for Mīr ʿImād al-Dīn Jazīrī, we do not have enough information about his life or even his poetry. His poetic conversation with Jazīrī, consisting of eighteen couplets, is included in almost all the manuscripts of Jazīrī's *Dīwān*, but we do not have access to any other texts by him. According to Zivingī (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1987: 895), he may have been a brother of the prince Šaraf-Xān III, ruler of the Botan principality and a contemporary of Jazīrī. Yaşin (1983: 46), in his book about the city Jazīra states that in the small cemetery beside the Red School (*Madras-ā Sor*), there is a grave, and the gravestone indicates that it is the grave of prince ʿImād al-Dīn son of the Prince Šaraf al-Buhtī. This can be interpreted as indicating that Mīr ʿImād al-Dīn was not the brother of Prince Šaraf-Xān, but his son.

In his second edition of Jazīrī's *Dīwān*, Doskī (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 2018: 354–355) maintains that the poet with whom Jazīrī exchanged poetic messages was a prince from the Kurdish Hakkarī principality named Mīr ʿImād al-Dīn Hakkarī. Moreover, Doskī indicates that the prince was a poet, that his pen name was Ṣabūrī, and that he has access to four poems by the poet in question. Although Doskī discusses the question persistently, his arguments are not persuasive. Concerning Faqī-yē Ṭayrān, a great number of his poems and epics have been preserved and published.

The poet Lāġar has written a stanzaic poem based upon a poem by Jazīrī that he made "five-fold" (*taxmīs*). Sheikh Ramaḍān also wrote a six-fold

(*tasdīs*) poem, based on one of Jazīrī's poems. In *taxmīs*, a poet takes a poem by another poet and to each distich he adds three hemistiches of his own. In *tasdīs* four hemistiches are added to each distich of the original poem. The three or four extra hemstitches must have the same rhythm as the base poem, and must have the same rhyme as the first hemistich of each *bayt* in the original poem, but the new poem retains the general rhyme of the adapted original poem throughout the new text. If the first two *bayt*s of the original poem are rhymed as follows:

– – – – – – – – – A
– – – – – – – – – A
– – – – – – – – – B
– – – – – – – – – A

The poet who makes them five-fold or six-fold adds three or four hemstitches of his own as follows:

– – – – – – – – – A
– – – – – – – – – A
– – – – – – – – – A
– – – – – – – – – A
– – – – – – – – – A
– – – – – – – – – A

The hemstitches added to the second *bayt* are arranged as follows:

– – – – – – – – – B
– – – – – – – – – B
– – – – – – – – – B
– – – – – – – – – B
– – – – – – – – – B
– – – – – – – – – A

The pattern continues in the same way in the other stanzas, and the rhymes C, D, E, F…etc. are employed in the same way.

In the case of Lāġar, the original poem of Jazīrī on which he based his five-fold poem is not found in the *Dīwān*, while the original poem, which made is six-fold by Ramaḍān, is included in almost all the manuscripts and the printed editions of Jazīrī's *Dīwān*. Both poets use their pen names at the end of their poems. Lāġar appears to receive less attention from those who write about classical Kurdish poetry, probably because no other poems by him have been found, and his six-fold poem based on Jazīrī's poem remains the only poem attributed to him.

The poet Ramaḍān uses his pen name only in the form of Ramaḍān, although Zivingī (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1987: 717, 925) calls him Sheikh Ramaḍān. In recent decades, poems by Ramaḍān and articles, information and a book about him have appeared. Ismāʿīl Bādī's book "Ramazān-ē Jizīrī in another following and research", published in 2011, is the most comprehensive among them. Concerning the poet's life and time, Bādī does not present any specific information. Nnevertheless, in his book he published six poems by Ramaḍān Jazīrī, one of which is the six-fold poem mentioned above. Bādī (pp. 42–52) obtained all six poems from different manuscripts in the possession of private individuals. Obviously the poems were already published by other writers and researchers during the 1980s and 1990s.

The fifth poet is the person whom Jazīrī calls Malā *Xamsa-ʿašar*, which means Malā fifteen, an allegorical way of insulting him by evaluating him as 15, which is a small number compared with other names that have higher values counted with the *abjad* pattern. His name was Malā Dāwd Finikī. Fifteen is the value of his first name according to the *abjad* pattern as explained here:

(د: ٤) + (ا: ١) + (و: ٦) + (د: ٤) = داود: ١٥
D-د: 4 + A-ا: 1 + W-و: 6 + D-د: 4 = Dawd: 15

Jazīrī accuses him of plagiarism and of "stealing" his poems, but we do not have access to any poems by this Malā Dāwud, whether he composed them himself or plagiarized them.

In the MS. Hs. Or. 13958, preserved in the Staatsbibliothek Zu Berlin, Preusischer Kulturbesitz, in addition to the five-fold by Lāġar five-folding and the six-fold by Ramaḍān of Jazīrī's poems, there is another poem by Ramaḍān (fol. 51a and b) which consists of 15 *bayt*s and the poet uses his pen-name Ramaḍān in the last distich. The MS, mainly devoted to Jazīrī's *Dīwān*, contains poems in Persian and Kurdish by other poets. In addition to Lāġar's and Ramaḍān's poems, there are Kurdish poems by Malā ʿIsā, Bātayī and Sayfī (also called Mīr Sayf al-Dīn and Sēvaddīn in the same MS.). There are other Kurdish poets whose poems are in Persian in this MS. Since the MS does not contain any information about the scribe or the date when it was completed, it is difficult to estimate when these poets lived.

There is, however, mention of a certain poet in the *Siyāḥatnāma* of Awliyā Čalabī, called *Mullā* (Čalabī uses the word as *Munlā*) Ramaḍān-i ʿAbbasiyān, from ʿImādiyya (Çelebī, 2010: 712). A poem by this poet is also quoted in Čalabī's text, but his association with the poet (Sheikh) Ramaḍān is controversial. He is mentioned in different sources as Sheihk, *Āġā* and *Malā*, and his surname is recorded as Botī and Jazīrī, since it is thought that he also came from the city of Jazīra. In Čalabī's book, his name is followed by the surname ʿAbbāsiyān.

If we assume that the poet whose poem was quoted by Čalabī is the same Ramaḍān who made a six-fold of one of Jazīrī's poems, it can be concluded

that the quoted poem must have been written not later than 1066 AH/1656 CE, the year in which Čalabī visited ʿImādiyya (ibid), and the poet was either alive then or died before that year.

The *Šarafnāma,* which relates the history of various Kurdish principalities, also sheds light on the cultural situation in some of them, recording the names of poets, saints and scholars, and significant schools and teachers. The author, Šaraf-Xān Bidlīsī, especially praises the scholars of the ʿAmādiya region, for their thorough knowledge of many sciences and their writing of books on some topics (Bidlīsī, 1860: 15). Writing about the principality of Bidlīs, of which he himself was the ruler, Šaraf-Xān (341–345) provides a more detailed account of the cultural life there. He documents the names of the celebrities and notables of Bidlīs, those who lived in the past or who were his contemporaries, like the scholars Mawlānā ʿAbd al-Raḥīm Bidlīsī, Mawlānā Muḥammad Barqalʿī, Ḥakīm Idrīs Bidlīsī and his son Abu al-Faḍl Afandī, the Sufis Sheikh ʿAmmār Yāsir and Sheikh Abu Ṭāhir al-Kurdī, and the poet Šukrī. The two Sufi masters from Bidlīs are found in Jāmī's book *Nafaḥāt al-Uns* (Breaths of Fellowship), which is a biography of the Sufi saints (Jāmī, 1386Š/2007: 371, 421). Bidlīsī (1860: 347) also indicates that during his time as the ruler of Bidlīs, he has built five schools "full of students" and appointed great scholars as teachers there.

Writing about the Kurdish principality of Zarqī (also called Darzīnī) and its rulers, Bidlīsī (ibid: 240) states that Prince Yaʿqūb Bēg bin Muḥammad Bēg was appointed by the Ottoman Sultan Sulaimān as the ruler of Zarqī in 949 AH/1542 CE. Bidlīsī, describing the prince, ascribes to him great qualities and high appreciation. Among other things, he records (ibid) that Yaʿqūb Bēg was a Sufi and a poet and that "most of his poems are in the Kurdish language and he has a *dīwān* in that art". Moreover, Bidlīsī recounts that after ruling the principality for 25 years, Yaʿqūb Bēg abdicated, left power to his son Dūmān Bēg, and died three years later (ibid: 241).

Based on what Bidlīsī relates, it can be concluded that Yaʿqūb Bēg was a Kurdish poet who wrote most of his poems in the Kurdish language, and that he died in approximately the same year as when Malā-yē Jazīrī was born. Accordingly, one can also conclude that there were Kurdish poems and Kurdish poets before Jazīrī, although Bidlīsī does not quote any poems by that poet.

Awliyā Čalabī, in his *Siyāḥatnāma*, is more keen to describe the cultural situation in the Kurdish emirates and regions he visited. His accounts of Diārbakir, Bidlīs, ʿImādiyya and Jazīra are lively and detailed. He writes that ʿImādiyya had a large number of schools with proper facilities. The library of the Amīr-Ḥāj School, for example, contained 10,000 books, and at the Murād-Xāniyya school, the students were paid money for their room-fee, meat and candles (Çelebī, 2010: 704). He describes another school as housing 300–400 students in winter and summer, and that all the sciences were read there, including the works of Aristotle and Avicenna (ibid: 706). The most impressive school for him is the Kobhan School, of which he writes (706) "In short, I

have been travelling in these Kurdish lands for eleven years now, but I have not seen a school as unique as this Kobhan School."

Čalabī praises the Kurdish dialects of Jazīra and Šīrwān as being the most eloquent among the versions of the Kurdish language, but he thinks that the Kurdish language of the Bahdīnānī Kurds of ʿImādiya is even more eloquent and elegant than those (ibid: 711). He relates that the scholars of ʿImādiya were very proud of their Kurdish language and thought that it was the language of the people of the Paradise, along with Arabic and Persian. He records a Kurdish poem by a certain Mullā Ramaḍān-i ʿAbbāsiyān, as was already mentioned. The poem consists of nine distiches and contains some simple Sufi metaphors. The first distich reads as follows:

Rāyē li Āṣaf dikan, vāliḥ u ḥayrān-ı ʿışq
Dars-i Arasto didan, serxoş-ı sakrān-ı ʿışq

They give sincere advice to Āṣaf, those who are madly in love and the bewildered,
They instruct Aristotle, those who are intoxicated by love

The metre is *basīṭ-i muṯamman-i sālim (-i muzāl)*, as follows:

mustafʿilun/fāʿilun/mustafʿilun/fāʿilun
– – v – / – v – / – – v – / – v – /

Čalabī quotes the poem under the heading *Imâdiye Kürdü kavminin diliyle şiir, Molla Ramazan-i ʿAbbasî'nin sözleriyle* (a poem in the language of the Kurdish people of ʿImādiya, the words of Molla Ramazān-i ʿAbbāsī).

Čalabī's description of Jazīra is very detailed and takes up several pages. He begins with a long history of the city in different periods of history, beginning with the prophet Noah, whose son Sām, according to Čalabī, was the founder of the city, and continuing until his time. He records various aspects of the city and provides information about the number of the mosques, more than 240, and reports that there was a school in each mosque "because there are too many Kurdish scholars in the city of Jazīra" (Čalabī, 1898: 729).

Among the scholars and sheikhs, he mentions Mulla Muḥyī al-Dīn, Mulla Sayyid Afandī and his elder brother Sayyid ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Afandī. As for the poets, the transcribed edition published in 2010 does not include any names baceause, as the editors claim, many lines in different places in the manuscript were either blank or illegible. The most important shrines he describes are those of Sheikh Muḥammad al-Ġawṯ, Imām ʿAlī Mašhadī, and Sheikh Muḥammad ibn al-Jazarī al-Šāfiʿī. This sheikh Šāfiʿī had written a book on the science of *Tajwīd*, the art of reciting the *Qurʾān*, which has become a major source in its field, although it was a small book containing only

109 *bayt*s (distiches). Čalabī also records three song texts in Kurdish, which are a few lines of folkloric poetry each.

Awliyā Čalabī visited Bidlīs principality three times and met Emīr ʿAbdāl-Xān. The impression one gets from reading Čalabī's account of the prince is that he was a great intellectual and scholar of his time. The list of the books in ʿAbdāl-Xān's library, looted by the Ottoman Malak Aḥmad Pāšā's army after the defeat of ʿAbdāl-Xān and estimated at seven camel-boxes (Dankoff, 1990: 289), includes hundreds of significant books, albums, dictionaries, maps and atlases. Among them were 76 books in Persian, Arabic and Turkish, and 105 essays, mostly in Persian, written by the Xān himself (ibid: 293). Čalabī's account of the Xān's character shows that he was extremely impressed by him and his talents in most fields of science and art.

If we attentively consider the whole picture of the poet Malā-yē Jazīrī in the framework of the political, religious and cultural circumstances of his time, we get the impression that he was a great intellectual who was involved in and influenced by several aspects of life in his society. His spiritual and intellectual relations with the newly established Naqšbandī order in Kurdistan and the philosophical ideas of Ibn ʿArabī reveal a curious person who devoted his life to the religious and cultural currents in the Kurdish society of the late 16th and early 17th centuries.

Jazīrī is regarded as the first poet who made Kurdish poetry a vital part of Oriental poetry by borrowing artistic standards of form, style and composition from Arabic and Persian poetry. What is remarkable in this regard is that, despite being at the head of a renewal movement, that had no precedent in the Kurdish language, he was a powerful and distinguished poet.

Chapter 2: Malā-yē Jazīrī: His Life and His *Dīwān*

2.1. The Life of Malā-yē Jazīrī

Writing about the Kurdish poets of the past has always involved discussions about the dates of their births and deaths. This has led to some uncertainty about the period when the Kurdish language was first put to use as a literary vehicle, and about the beginning of written Kurdish literature. The few academic studies of classical Kurdish literature that have been published to date, do not cover periods earlier than the mid-sixteenth century. One obvious reason for this state of obscurity is the lack of data that can provide a basis for thorough research.

The life of Malā-yē Jazīrī has been a matter of dispute among the biographers and historiographers of Kurdish literary history from the mid-19th century until today. The difference between the earliest and the latest dates given for the poet's birth and death is as much as four and a half centuries.

It seems that in 1005/1595–6, when Šaraf-Xān Bidlīsī (949–1012 AH/1543–1603–4 CE) wrote the first detailed and comprehensive history of the Kurds, the *Šarafnāma*, he was unaware of any Kurdish poet, or at least of any important one, to include in his history. Bidlīsī points out that there were many scholars and learned people (*ʿulamā va fuḍalā bisyār ast*) in Kurdistan, but "in poetry and composition and calligraphy and ways of social intercourse that bring about access to rulers and sultans and lead to the obtaining of high positions from righteous kings, they are not so much talented" (Bidlīsī, 1860: 15).

The first ever mention of Jazīrī was made exactly a century later by another Kurdish poet, Aḥmad-ē Xānī (1061–1119 AH/1651–1706–7 CE). In the introductory parts of the epic *Mam u Zīn*, completed in 1105 AH/1693–4 CE, Xānī mentions the names of three Kurdish poets. They are Malā-yē Jazīrī, ʿAlī Ḥarīrī and Faqī-yē Ṭayrān. Describing the miserable conditions of his people, Xānī wishes that they had a king who appreciated knowledge, art and poetry, for, then he could play his part in developing the culture and reviving the heritage of his people, and would:

Min dē ʿalam-ā kalām-ē mawzūn
ʿĀlī bikirā li bān-e gardūn
Bīnava ruḥē Malē Jazīrī
Pē ḥay bikirā ʿAlī Ḥarīrī
Kayfak wah bidā Faqī-yē Ṭayrān
Ḥattā bi abad bimāya ḥayrān. (Xānī, 1962: 36).

I would have exalted the banner of metrical speech (poetry)
Over the top roof of the universe.
Revive Malā-yē Jazīrī
Resurrect ʿAlī Ḥarīrī
Give Faqī-yē Ṭayrān such a delight,
That he might remain bewildered forever.
(Translated by ʿAzīz Gardī, in: Khani, 2009: 46)

Although Xānī did not write a biography of Jazīrī and his fellow poets, this statement in his epic is a significant biographical element for further discussion of the span of Jazīrī's lifetime. For the first time in the history of Kurdish literature, a Kurdish poet reminds his contemporaries of three poets, and considers them predecessors of himself, as a poet, and of the literature he writes.

Information about Jazīrī's life is mainly scattered among various biographical sources. There is also philological and factual evidence in his poetry that highlights different periods and aspects of his life. Examining the available sources thoroughly, one distinguishes three principal viewpoints, each with several subdivisions, issuing from a certain informant or biographer, as shown below:

1. Malā Maḥmūd Bāyazīdī

Malā Maḥmūd Bāyazīdī (1797–1858), also known in some sources as Maḥmūd Efendī Bāyazīdlī, a Kurdish scholar of the 19th century, was the informant and teacher of M. Alexandre Jaba, the Russian consul in Erzurum from 1836 to 1869. Bāyazīdī wrote an anthology of essays and anecdotes, which he delivered to Jaba, alon with among many other writings and manuscripts. This anthology was published together with a translation into French by Jaba in St. Petersbourg in 1860, with the title *Recueil de Notices et Recits Kourdes*. In the fourth chapter, which deals with Kurdish poets and authors, eight poets are briefly presented. The data given by Bāyazīdī on the life of Malā-yē Jazīrī, the second in the sequence, is confusing, not to say incorrect. He states that Jazīrī appeared/was born (*paydā būya*) in Jazīra in 540 AH/1145 CE and died in 556 AH/1160 CE (Jaba, 1860: 13–14; p. 8 of the French text).

Bāyazīdī, writing about the third poet, Faqī-yē Ṭayrān, uses the same expression, *paydā būya*, which Jaba has translated on the first occasion as "he made himself known (*se fit connaître*)," whereas on the second occasion he has translated it as "he was born (*il est né*)." (ibid: 8–9).

Furthermore, Bāyazīdī states that the ruler of Jazīra at that time was Prince (*Mīr*) ʿImād al-Dīn, who had a sister with whom Šēx Aḥmad (i.e. Jazīrī) was in love (ibid:13–14). The rest of that love story has been retold, extended, embellished and exaggerated by almost all those who have written about Jazīrī, as will be shown later in this work.

This dating has been accepted and repeated by Hartmann (1904: VI), Soane (1913: 21), and Šērkuh (1986: 65). Muḥammad Amīn Zakī (1880–1948), a well-known Kurdish historian, states in his book on the history of the Kurds and Kurdistan that Jazīrī lived in the second half of the sixth century AH, which corresponds to the second half of the 12th century CE (Zakī 1939: 336). It seems that Zakī came to new conclusions a few years later. In his book on the notables of the Kurds and Kurdistan (Zakī 1947: 205), he suggests that "Šayx Aḥmad was born after Jāmī" (ibid: 206), for he had mentioned Jāmī (d. 898/1492) in his *Dīwān* (ibid). In a footnote, Muḥammad ʿAlī ʿAwnī (1897–1952), who has translated into Arabic, edited and annotated Zakī's books, emphasizes Bāyazīdī's and Jaba's, and hence Hartmann's, opinion that Jazīrī died in 556/1160–61. Accordingly he concludes that the poems in which Jazīrī mentions Saʿdī, Jāmī and Ḥāfiẓ were "not proven, but made and added by scribes" (Zakī, 1947: 205, footnote).

It seems that a major concern for many of those who wrote about Jazīrī's life and accepted Bāyazīdī's information as reliable, was to find, in the history of the Kurds, a ruler or a prince with the name ʿImād al-Dīn and to make Malāyē Jazīrī his contemporary. This would make it possible to prove the authenticity of a poetic correspondence between Jazīrī and a certain Mīr ʿImād al-Dīn. This correspondence is included in all the editions of Jazīrī's *Dīwān*. Both Hartmann and M. A. Zakī assume that Jazīrī's Mīr ʿImād al-Dīn may have been the Atābakī ʿImād al-Dīn Zangī who captured Jazīra in 512/1127 and was killed in 541/1146 (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1904: VII; Zakī, ibid: 206).

2. ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Sajjādī

A new attempt to establish facts about the life of Jazīrī was made by ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Sajjādī in his *History of Kurdish Literature* in 1952. Sajjādī's starting point is different from that of Jaba, Hartmann and Zakī. He bases his argument mainly on internal evidence from Jazīrī's poems. Sajjādī definitely rejects the idea that Jazīrī lived before Ḥāfiẓ. He quotes a distich by Jazīrī in which he refers to Ḥāfiẓ.

Furthermore, Sajjādī argues that if anyone with literary taste compares the poems that are said to be wrongly attributed to Jazīrī because he mentioned Ḥāfiẓ in them with his other poems, he/she will find out that they actually are Jazīrī's (Sajjādī, 1971: 185). on the other hand, he assumes that Jazīrī was a contemporary of Jāmī, and even older than he was. To prove this he cites a distich by Jāmī, which he supposes is a reference to Jazīrī (ibid: 182).

Sajjādī thus also dismisses the idea that Jazīrī was a contemporary of ʿImād al-Dīn Zangī. Regarding the two panegyric poems in Jazīrī's *Dīwān*, he suggests that one was written for the Tīmurid sulṭān Ḥusayn Bāyqarā, and the other for one of the Ottoman sulṭāns Muḥammad Fātiḥ or Bāyazīd II (ibid:184–185). Sajjādī's conclusion is that Malā-yē Jazīrī lived between approximately 811 AH/1408–9 CE and 886 AH/1481–2 CE (ibid: 184). These dates suggested by Sajjādī were, and to some extent still are, considered reliable by some authors who have written about Jazīrī, for example Anwar Māʾī in his introduction to Jazīrī's *Dīwān*, which was edited and published by Gīw Mukrianī (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1964: 1–15).

3. Aḥmad b. al-Mullā Muḥammad al-Buhtī al-Zivingī

The Muftī of Qāmišlī, Aḥmad b. al-Mullā Muḥammad al-Buhtī al-Zivingī (1893–1971), published a new edition of Jazīrī's *Dīwān* in 1959, along with an Arabic translation and commentaries (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1959 and 1982). In his introduction, Zivingī discusses Jazīrī's life and times at length. He completely rejects all previous opinions concerning the dates of Jazīrī's birth and death and establishes new facts in the field. His evidence is both internal and external, literary and historical.

To refute the idea that Jazīrī lived before Ḥāfiẓ, he quotes examples of the former's poetry, in which Ḥāfiẓ is mentioned. Moreover, Zivingī provides distiches that contain the names of Chingīz Xān (d. 624/1226), Tamerlane (in Kurdish Taymūr-i Lang) (d. 807/1404), and Jāmī, and accordingly rejects the view that Jazīrī lived before them (ibid: Ṭāʾ). Zivingī points out that there is a *qaṣīda* in Arabic in Jazīrī's *Dīwān* which is very similar to another *qaṣīda* composed by Aḥmad Pāšā Ibn al-Mawlā Waliy al-Dīn al-Ḥusaynī (d. 902/1496), which suggests this Jazīrī lived even later than that poet (ibid: *Yāʾ*, 841).

Additionally, Zivingī examines the question further in the light of different kinds of literary and historical evidence. The most important conclusions he draws can be summed up as follows:

A. The two panegyrics in Jazīrī's *Dīwān* were written for a prince who had the city of Jazīra as his capital. There are details in both of them that confirm this idea; the surrounding wall is described as being embellished with *Qurʾān*ic inscriptions, and the city as being located in the fourth *Iqlīm*, which is the case with Jazīra, as was seen in the first chapter, let alone that the name Jazīra is mentioned clearly in one of the poems.

B. In one of his poems, Jazīrī describes the arrows shot at the heart as "the arrows of Xān Šaraf". This Xān Šaraf, or Šaraf Xān, is the same Amīr Šaraf b. Xān ʿAbdāl who was the prince of Jazīra in 1005/1596–7 when Šaraf-Xān Bidlīsī completed his book Šarafnāma. Bidlīsī (1860: 144) praises him highly as generous and courageous.

C. During his time as the ruler of Jazīra, Šaraf-Xān built "the Red School" in the western part of the city, with its own mosque and several other facilities. Malā-yē Jazīrī is buried in a vault in the mosque that belonged to that school.

D. In Jazīrī's *Dīwān* there is a poetic correspondence between him and Mīr ʿImād al-Dīn al-Jazīrī. Reading the Šarafnāma, which is the history of the Kurdish emirates until 1005 AH/1596–7 CE, one does not find a prince of this name among the princes who ruled Jazīra. He might therefore have been one of Šaraf-Xān's sons, brothers or cousins.

E. Jazīrī has another poetic correspondence with the Kurdish poet Faqī-yē Ṭayrān, which suggests that they were contemporaries. The latter gives the date of one of his own poems as 1041 AH/1631–2 CE.

Considering these indications, Zivingī concludes that Jazīrī was born at the end of the 10th century AH, and probably lived until 1050 AH or perhaps even later (ibid: *Yāʾ*). These statements by Zivingī obviously had a strong influence on later biographers and editors, for they have been used and repeated ever since the publication of Zivingī's edition of Jazīrī's *Dīwān* as facts or bases for elaborate discussions of Jazīrī's life.

In an article published in 1969, D. N. MacKenzie discusses the question in the light of the evidence already available. Reviewing the previous opinions, he focuses in particular on the conclusions drawn by Zivingī, and attempts to make them more precise. The only new element in MacKenzie's arguments is a "scrap of verse by Faqī Ṭayrān" (MacKenzie, 1969: 128), supposedly a part of an elegy for Jazīrī, quoted in an article on classical Kurdish poets published by Jalādat Badir-Xān in 1941. The two lines recalled by Badir-Xān include an *Abjad* pattern indicating the date of Jazīrī's death. The pattern can be interpreted in a number of ways. According to MacKenzie's interpretation, Jazīrī must have died in 1050 AH/1640 CE, and he postulates the year 980 AH/1570 CE as the date of his birth (ibid: 129).

In 1975 and 1976, the Kurdish writer Ṣādiq Bahāʾ al-Dīn Āmēdī (1918–1982) published a long study, in three parts, in the Journal of the Kurdish Academy, about Malā-yē Jazīrī's life and poetry (Āmēdī, 1975; 1976; 1976). Āmēdī republished this study together with several other articles in his book *Hozānvānēt Kurd* (Kurdish Poets) in 1980. His study is quite comprehensive and deals with Jazīrī's life in detail. Although he examines almost all available sources on Jazīrī, he leaves the question of Jazīrī's dates of birth and death without a precise answer. Āmēdī concludes that it is impossible to determine the date of Jazīrī's birth, yet he proposes that his death occurred some time after 1031 AH/1620 CE (Āmēdī, 1980: 82–83).

In 1977, Āmēdī also published a new edition of Jazīrī's *Dīwān*. In the introduction, he briefly discusses Jazīrī's life and suggests that the poet may have lived sometime in the second half of the 10th and the first half of the 11th

century AH (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1977: 49), which is in consistent with the conclusion already reached by Zivingī.

Two other editions of Jazīrī's *Dīwān* appeared in 1982 (1361Š) and 1987, in Tehran and Stockholm respectively. The Kurdish poet ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Šarafkandī, mostly known as Hažār (1920–1991) who edited and annotated the Tehran edition provides no new evidence concerning the life of Jazīrī. He only underlines Zivingī's conclusions (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1982: XXIII).

Taḥsīn Ibrāhīm Doskī published three versions of Jazīrī's *Dīwān* two of which he edited and annotated (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 2000 and 2018). The other edition was that of Mullā ʿAbd al-Salām al-Jazarī, the manuscript of which was given to Doskī, who published it in 2004. His contribution to this edition is an introduction about Jazīrī's and the editor's lives. In all three editions, Doskī's conclusion about the dates of Jazīrī's birth and death is almost the same as that of Zivingī. In addition to the sources already mentioned, fragments of information about Jazīrī are scattered in several minor works.

Obviously, most biographers of Jazīrī have encountered various difficulties in presenting a convincing portrait of the poet's life. The various conclusions that have been drawn in this connection are flawed in one way or another. Although almost all those who have dealt with the question have made great efforts to make use of both internal and external evidence, the problem has remained unsolved. The available material on Jazīrī's life, especially the external evidence, is too complicated and obscure, and therefore provides a little scope for interpretation and assessments. The difficulties admittedly arise from the fact that in Jazīrī's poetry we do not find the slightest mention of the date of his birth or discussion of his own life as a whole. It is even difficult to find in his poetry any clear indication of the exact time when he lived.

There are, as was already mentioned, three theories concerning the poet's life. The first, that Jazīrī lived in the twelfth century CE, is easily dismissed by the fact that Jazīrī refers to Saʿdī, Ḥāfiẓ and Jāmī in his poems. Moreover, a close study of Jazīrī's poetry closely reveals that he was influenced by the style, poetry and philosophy of all three. This is especially emphasized by Sajjādī and Zivingī.

The second theory, first developed by ʿA. Sajjādī, has been widely accepted since its publication in the 1950s. It derives its strength from a line of verse attributed to Jāmī, which refers to "an old man from Jazīr", who, according to Sajjādī, may have been Malā-yē Jazīrī. The distich, however, had been quoted earlier for the same purpose by the Kurdish poet Ḥājī Qādir-ī Koyī (1817–1897) in one of his poems, in which he dated Kurdish poets of old and his contemporaries (Koyī, 1986: 221). The line of verse attributed to Jāmī reads as follows:

Pīrmardī bidīdaʾam zi Jazīr
Nīkmardī bidīdaʾam zi Ḥarīr

I saw (met) an old man from Jazīr,
I saw (met) a good man from Ḥarīr.

This distich, however, is not found in the main works of Jāmī (MacKenzie, 1969: 130, footnote 5; Rasūl, 1990: 23).

The third approach, taken by Zivingī, seems more reasonable since its main starting point is evidence derived from the poetry of Jazīrī himself and the circumstances of Botān principality. Apparently, Zivingī's viewpoint was made the basis for further research aimed at elaborating and strengthening it.

An important element in the discussion of Jazīrī's life is the distich attributed to the poet Faqī-yē Ṭayrān in an article on classical Kurdish poets by Jalādat Badir-Xān, under the pseudonym of Herekol Azīzān (Azīzān 1941: 6–14). The distich reads as follows:

Ḥaft ʿAyn u Lām ži hav būn judā
Šīn u girī dīsā tēda

Seven ʿAyn (ع) and Lām (ل) were separated from each other,
Lamentation and weeping in it, moreover.
(Translation by D. N. MacKenzie)

MacKenzie, employing the *abjad* notation, interprets the distich in this way:

(7 x ع) – ل = 490 – 30 = 460
ش + ی + ن + گ + ر + ی = 300+10+50+20+200+10 = 590
460 + 590 = 1050

The year 1050 AH corresponds to 1640 CE, which is the year that was surmised to be the date of Jazīrī's death, and that was also accepted by MacKenzie (1969: 129).

Azīzān (1941: 8) states that the distich is the only verse he remembers from an elegy composed by Faqī-yē Ṭayrān on the death of Jazīrī. Although this statement was made in the early of the 1940s, and many studies of the life and poetry of Faqī-yē Ṭayrān have appeared since then, and his *Dīwān* has also been published, the alleged elegy has never come to light. Ṣādiq Bahāʾ al-Dīn Āmēdī, who has published a few lines of that poem suggests that it was composed by Ṭayrān to lament the passing of his beloved (Āmēdī, 1980: 75). The *Abjad* notation in the poem, moreover, can be read and interpreted in different ways, which makes the distich of uncertain importance for determining the date of Jazīrī's death and, consequently, makes the opinions built upon it, unreliable. It is noteworthy that Zivingī, who published Jazīrī's *Dīwān* nearly two decades after Badir-Xān published his article, does not take this distich into account, although it could provide additional support for his arguments.

Another poem by Faqī-yē Ṭayrān, on the other hand, sheds light on the time in which Jazīrī lived, namely the poetic correspondence between Jazīrī and Faqī-yē Ṭayrān. This poem, usually called *mukālama*, contains a date at the end, which a common feature of Faqī-yē Ṭayrān's poems. In the versions published by Hartmann and Zivingī, many parts are missing, and they do not contain the date, which could also be an important piece of evidence for Zivingī's point of view. The complete text of the poem, consisting of 25 triplets by each of the poets, was first published in 1971 by ʿAbd al-Raqīb Yūsif (Yūsif, 1971: 29–42), who had at his disposal a manuscript from 1181 AH/1766–7 CE containing poems by various Kurdish poets. The last triplet by Faqī runs as follows:

Birīndārē ʿishqē-ma, dūrim ži sihā bihān
Dizānin maddāḥē kē-ma di hazār u yak u sihān
Ţanā-xwānē Malē-ma li hamū ard u jihān.

Wounded by love, I am deprived of the shadow of quince [trees].
Do you know whose panegyrist I am in one thousand one and thirty?
I am a eulogist of Malā in every place and everywhere.

The conclusion that can be drawn from the date in the poem is that Jazīrī must have been alive in 1031 AH (or one thousand one and thirty, as expressed by Faqī-yē Ṭayrān in the poem), which corresponds to 1620–1 CE.

Many of the biographies of Jazīrī and studies of his life and poetry give detailed pictures of the poet's life, based mainly on oral stories and anecdotal evidence. These details have in the course of time become a basic part of all sources dealing with Jazīrī. Evidently, only a very small part of the available knowledge can be traced in his poems. In almost all the sources, Jazīrī is portrayed as a poet and a Ṣūfī, although the two images are not entirely distinct.

A recurring and essential theme in these stories is his love for the sister or daughter of the prince of Botān. This was first recorded in the book by Jaba who in turn, was informed by the Kurdish scholar Malā Maḥmūd Bāyazīdī. The princess is called Salmā in most of the later sources. This is because the story is associated with a number of Jazīrī's poems in which the name Salmā is mentioned, although not necessarily to indicate a human lover. In a few sources, Jazīrī's beloved is the daughter of the prince of Ḥasankayf.

Attempts to compose a biography of Jazīrī have mainly concentrated on a few aspects of his life, leaving essential questions unanswered concerning his studies, his path in Ṣūfism, and the cultural, spiritual and social milieu in which his poetry developed. Although conclusions about his life are generally inferred from elements in his poetry and from the evidence of his time, it is likely that there are internal and external indications that have not yet been exhausted. Investigation of these clues may lead to new knowledge about Jazīrī's time and poetry.

In reviewing the main theories and viewpoints on the life of Jazīrī, it seems relevant to ask whether it is possible to establish a chronology of the poet's life based on the scattered pieces of information in his poetry and biographies. Generally speaking, the traditional pattern of life followed by many Oriental classical poets can be used as a stereotype. This includes attending the traditional education system, studying the *Qurʾān* and many other sciences, travelling widely to acquire knowledge, and serving as a preacher in a mosque or as a poet in a court. To this is sometimes added an unsuccessful love story or the poet's affiliation with a Ṣūfī *ṭarīqa*, both of which become a source of inspiration for the poet's poems.

Apparently, many of those who have written about Jazīrī have followed this same method in their approaches. It is not my intention to follow this path in dealing with the life and poetry of Malā-yē Jazīrī. Studying the formal, aesthetic and philosophical values in his poetry can provide us with a comprehensive picture of the rational and intellectual dimensions of his life.

2.2. Malā-yē Jazīrī's Name and Pen Name

Jazīrī's name was Aḥmad, but he is usually referred to as Šēx, or Šeix/Šayx, Aḥmad-ē Jazīrī or Malā-yē Jazīrī. The surname Jazīrī appears to be derived from the name of the city of Jazīra in northern Kurdistan, which appears in historical sources as Jazīrat Ibn ʿUmar (see Chapter 1 of this work). Various forms of the surname have been used in the sources dealing with the poet, such as Jizrī, Jizīrī, Jazarī, and Jazīrī. Moreover, those who wrote about him in Arabic used the surname preceded by the Arabic particle *al*, denoting the definite form. In this study, only the form Jazīrī will be used.

Jazīrī's father's name was Malā Muḥammad or, according to some sources, Šēx Muḥammad. It is not known where he was born, but it is believed that his family belonged to the Buxtī, or Bohtī, tribe, who lived in the region of Jazīra. There are many details concerning his father being a great *qāḍī* (judge), and even being appointed by Sulṭān Bāyazīd I as chief of the *qāḍis* in Damascus and later in Istanbul. These details seem to be constructed to fit into the overall picture of Jazīrī as a contemporary of Sulṭān Muhammad II and Sulṭān Bāyazīd II, and consequently to prove that he wrote his two panegyrics to praise one of them.

The pen names that Jazīrī uses are *Malā* and *Malē*. The latter is the colloquial form indicating the *izāfa* construction for masculine nouns in the northern (Kurmānjī) dialect of Kurdish. The Kurdish word *Malā* is thought to have its roots in the Persian word *Mollā*, which in turn is derived from the Arabic *Mawlā* (see Calmard, *Mollā,* EIs-II). Jazīrī also uses *Nišānī* as his pen name in a number of poems, or together with or in the same poem. It is thought that he adopted Nišānī to indicate that he was the target, *nišān*, of the arrows of divine love, or as a reference to the mole on the face of the beloved (ZdJ:

wāw). It is worth noting that Jazīrī derives this name from the Persian form of the word, the first vowel of which is short, whereas the Kurdish form of the word has a long vowel instead. Jazīrī was Obviously aware of this, for he often uses both words in the same verse, and even in the same distich, as a pun:

Wara nīšān-i Nišānī da x(w)a bē parda saḥar
Lē ži xūnē bika parhīz ku šahīdān či ḥisāb. (ZdJ: 65)

v v – – / v v – – / v v – – / v v –
– v – – / v v – – / v v – – / v v –

Come (and) show yourself to Nišānī without veil in the dawn,
But beware of blood, as the martyrs are countless.

As the metre in this poem is *ramal-i muṯamman-i maxbūn-i maḥḏūf*, the first vowel in *nīšān* is necessarily long, whereas it is short in *Nišānī*. This combination of the two words occurs in four poems (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1987: 65, 329–339, 614, 741).

It is not clear which of these two pen names, *Malā* and *Nišānī*, he used first and when he began to use the other one, but it is conceivable that *Nišānī* was the name he used as a young poet.

The title *Malā*, especially in the Kurdish language, denotes a person who is a graduate of the traditional, religious system of education and is qualified in several sciences. It is rarely obtained at an early age. Hence, it seems probable that Jazīrī adopted this title as his pen name when he was recognized as an outstanding scholar in society and identified more with the title than with his own name. Jazīrī uses both of the pen names, *Nišānī* and *Malā* or *Malē*, in fourteen poems. These poems were probably written in a transitional period, in which he gradually abandoned *Nišānī* and began to use *Malā* or *Malē*. It is not easy to confirm such an idea and it remains a hypothesis. Nonetheless, one can assume, that Jazīrī used only the pen name *Malā*/*Malē* in the poems that deal extensively with philosophical and Ṣūfī ideas.

The poet may have composed those poems in his old age, when he was deeply involved in the sciences of mysticism and philosophy. To this category belong his poems *Tu saḥargah bi tamāšā wara bāzār-i ḥudūṯ* (Come at dawn to the market of temporality/newness for viewing), *Muḥbatē miḥnat di zorin* (Love has many adversities) and *Allāh, saḥargāh-ā azal, yalmūm-ē ʿišqē šuʿla dā* (God has lit the lamp of love at the dawn of eternity). In addition to the names mentioned above Jazīrī also uses Aḥmad as a pen name in five poems, especially in his Arabic poems, but also in a couple of Kurdish poems. In his *musammaṭ* poems, however, he uses Malā/Malē in the Kurdish distiches and Aḥmad in the Arabic distiches.

With the publication of the Arabic translation of *Der West-östlicher Divan* by the German poet Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749–1832), a discussion

arose among writers and intellectuals in Kurdistan concerning Jazīrī and his pen name *Nišānī*. It has been suggested that in writing his poem *Lesebuch*, Goethe was inspired by a Turkish poet whose pen name also was *Nišānī*. A few Kurdish writers thought that Goethe's *Nišānī* was Jazīrī, and so they claimed that Goethe was inspired by Jazīrī's poetry (Mizūrī, 1984: 91–93).

Goethe's translator into Arabic, the well-known Egyptian philosopher ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Badawī (1917–2002), who also presents a translation of *Nišānī*'s poem to compare it with Goethe's poem, correctly points out in his commentaries that Goethe was inspired by *Nišānī*'s poem, although he erroneously calls the poet Niẓāmī instead of *Nišānī* (Jīta, 1980: 121). A closer examination of the question shows that Badawī was right, and that *Nišānī* (d. 975 AH/1567 CE) was a poet, a historian and a cipher-writer (*nišānji* and *nišānī* in Ottoman Turkish) to Sulṭān Sulaymān I (Gibb, 1882: 70, 198–199).

Martin Tegen, who has translated Goethe's *Der West-östlicher Divan* into Swedish, emphasizes the issue pointing out that Goethe was inspired, when writing his poem *Lesebuch*, by the Turkish poet Nischani, but he confused him with the Persian poet Nisami (Niẓamī) (Goethe, 2004: 326–327). According to Tegen, Goethe read Nischani's poem in [Heinrich Friedrich] von Diez's book *Denkwürdigkeiten von Asien* (Memorabilia of Asia).

There are many stories and anecdotes about the life of Jazīrī, in the biographies and editions of his *Dīwān*. These stories constitute a part of the traditional view of the poet's life. A great number of them are similar to legends. They probably illustrate aspects of his life in terms of how his different ages and periods of life are depicted in them. Nevertheless, these stories and anecdotes do not add any significant facts to our knowledge about Jazīrī and his poetry. The most important conclusion one can draw from them is that Jazīrī was an outstanding and celebrated poet and Ṣūfī.

2.3. Jazīrī's *Dīwān*

The poetry of Malā-yē Jazīrī is one of the most popular collection of literary work in Kurdistan. It can be compared to the epic *Mam u Zīn* by Aḥmad-ē Xānī. Jazīrī's *Dīwān* has always been one of the main subjects in the traditional education system. It has been regarded as a standard model of good poetry and has therefore been imitated by many generations of poets. The fact that Jazīrī was closely related to the princes of Botān was probably one of the reasons why his poetry was easily accepted and integrated into the system of education. Another reason is that he belonged to the Naqšbandī order of Sufism, which was one of the most widespread orders in Kurdistan. Still, it remains a fact that it is primarily the aesthetic and spiritual values in Jazīrī's poetry that have made it a long-lived body of work.

Apparently, the poet himself was aware of the high quality of his poetry and his own position as a leading poet. In one of his poems, Jazīrī praises himself, comparing his poetry with that of Ḥāfiẓ:

> *Gar luʾluʾē manṯûr ži naẓmē tu dixwazī*
> *War šiʿrē Malē bīn, ta bi Šīrāzē/ī či ḥājat* (ZdJ: 129).
>
> If you want strewn pearls of verse,
> Come (and) see Malā's poetry, what need do you have
> of (the one from) Shiraz?

The central word in this distich, written in the old Kurdish orthography, can be read as either *Šīrāzē* or *Šīrāzī*. The first refers to the city of Shiraz, and the second to a person from Shiraz, who is certainly the poet Ḥāfiẓ, with whom he compares himself and his poetry. Such poetic self-praise is found in other poems in Jazīrī's *Dīwān*.

There is also a reference in his *Dīwān* to a case of plagiarism and falsification of his poems:

> *Qawī mašhūra ku nāvē ta Malā xamsa ʿašar*
> *Tu bi šiʿr-ā na ta gotī, xwa dikī qand u šakar*. (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1982, 560).
>
> It is widely known that your name is Malā fifteen!
> With poems you have not composed, you make yourself (as sweet as) candy and sugar.

"Malā fifteen" was Malā Dāw(ū)d of Finik, as is widely known in Kurdish literary circles, and fifteen is the value of his first name according to the *abjad* pattern. According to Zivingī, Finik was a village north of city of Jazīra (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1987: 888).

The word *dīwān* (or *dīvān*) in Arabic, Kurdish, Persian and Turkish denotes the collected poems of a poet, excluding long poems, *maṯnawī*s. The term is also used in the same sense in other (Islamic) oriental cultures. The poems in a *dīwān* are usually "grouped by genre (usually with *qaṣīda*s first, then strophic poems, *ġazal*s, *qitʿa*s, and *rubāʿī*s last) and then within each section the poems are arranged alphabetically by the last letter." (de Blois, *Dīvān,* EIr).

Apparently, there was no Kurdish *dīwān* before Jazīrī, but educated people in Kurdish society were acquainted with *dīwān* and poetry in other languages, especially Persian and Arabic. Jazīrī's *Dīwān* is only arranged alphabetically, without regard to the genres or themes of the poems. It is not known as of yet whether the poet arranged the poems himself or if they were arranged as a *Dīwān* after his death. Moreover, we do not have access to any manuscript of the *Dīwān* that could have been written by Jazīrī himself.

In the Stockholm edition of Jazīrī's *Dīwān*, the editors make the assumption that the poet decided to "complete" his *Dīwān* and to cease writing poems ten

years before he died. This assumption is based on the calculation, according to the *abjad*-pattern, of a distich in which the poet mentions something about letters (*ḥarf*) and the beginning of the year (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1987: 22–23). This pattern is so ambiguous that it can be interpreted in many different ways to create dates or figures that are more imaginary than real. Moreover, the distich is too vague to indicate the purpose for which the poet mentions letters and years.

To refute the assumption there is no need to discuss the figures. It is completely against the nature of a poet, and especially a great and genuine poet like Jazīrī, to think about such a decision. It is quite possible and conceivable for an author to finish a novel or a book on history, geography or any other non-fiction subject, or even a *maṯnawī*, but it is unthinkable and very illogical that a poet could decide to stop writing poems. If this assumption were true, then we would now have access to a complete *Dīwān* of Jazīrī, which would be approved by the poet himself.

The *Dīwān* is the only literary work attributed to Malā-yē Jazīrī. We do not know at present of any other work, in verse or prose, that could have been composed by him. It seems that efforts were made at a relatively early stage to collect the poems of Jazīrī and arrange them in a *Dīwān*. However, there is no evidence that the poet himself undertook such a task. One of the sources on Jazīrī's life suggests that he had sent his *Dīwān* as a gift to a certain *Xān-i Xānān* in Tabrīz (Zakī 1947: 206). This is no more than an anecdote about the poet's life, which, like dozens of others, lacks any reliable support. Nor do we have any indication that such an attempt to collect his poems in a book was made by anyone else during the poet's lifetime.

A careful study the manuscripts and editions of Jazīrī's *Dīwān* leads to the conclusion that almost all the manuscripts may have emerged from one pattern of origin. This conclusion is based on two observations:

1. The order in which the poems are arranged is quite similar in most of the manuscripts and the printed editions, which, in turn, are based on different manuscripts.

2. There are two poems that do not belong to Jazīrī directly, but are still included in most of the manuscripts. The first of these two poems is a *taxmīs* (fivefold version) of a poem of Jazīrī, made by a poet called Lāġar. It is noteworthy that Jazīrī's poem on which the *taxmīs* is based does not exist in any of the manuscripts. The second is a *Tasdīs* (sixfold version) of a poem of Jazīrī made by a certain Šēx Ramaḍān.

It is noteworthy that the poet has utilized all the letters of the Arabic alphabet except *Ḏāl* (ذ), *ʿAyn* (ع) and Ġ*ayn* (غ), in rhyming his poems. He has also used some of the Kurdish letters, that are not found in the Arabic alphabet as rhymes, like *pē* (پ), *vē* (ڤ) and *gāf* (گ), but not Č (چ) and Ž (ژ).

The *Dīwān* was first printed in 1904 in Berlin by Martin Hartmann. This edition was no more than a lithographic copy of a MS. The first true printed *Dīwān* of Jazīrī was published by Muḥammad Šafīq al-ʾArwāsī, in Istanbul, in 1338 Rūmī/1340 AH/1922 CE. At present there are some twelve editions of the *Dīwān*. The following section consists of a description of a number of Jazīrī's *Dīwān*: five manuscripts and nine printed editions.

2.3.1. Manuscripts

Bodleian Library, University of Oxford, Ms. Asiat. Misc. d.2.

Apparently, the MS used to bear the signum Ms. Kurd. d.1. which was later replaced by the present one.

The MS consists of 65 folios, with writing on both sides. The folios were not originally numbered. In the upper left corner of 1a is written "Bt (1.3.09) from g.g. Naaman". The MS begins with a *basmala*, which is immediately followed by Jazīrī's poems with no indication or heading. The poems are alphabetically arranged by the last letter of the rhyme. The MS contains 119 poems, including a *taxmīs* by Lāġar and a *tasdīs* by (Šēx) Ramaḍān, although nothing is said about these two poems. The foll. 2a and 65b are ornamented in gold, blue and black. Three important poems are not included, namely, Jazīrī's poetic correspondences with Mīr ʿImād al-dīn and Faqī-yē Ṭayrān, and his longest poem on the whole "*Allāh, saḥargāh-ā azal…*". Nor are the *rubāʿī*s of Jazīrī included. On the other hand, there are a few poems that do not appear elsewhere in the printed editions.

Foll. 2b–8a are in three columns, foll.1a and 8b–65a are in two columns, and Fol. 65b is in one column. All the pages have frames. The scribe/collator makes marginal notes. At the bottom of each right-hand page, outside the frame, the word with which the next page begins is written. This is traditionally called a catchword, and it is especially important when collating the order of the folios, since they are not numbered. As for the orthography, the Kurdish characters p, č, ž and v (پ، چ، ژ، ڤ) are correctly used, whereas g (گ) is always replaced with k (ک).

The colophon, fol. 65b, clearly indicates that this copy of the *Dīwān* was prepared "in compliance with the Order of the Great Prince, the crown of the princes and the sultans, by whom I mean Mūsā Bēg, the son of the late Ismāʿīl Pāšā, with the fingers of the least ʿUṯmān who belongs toʿAqra, originally and in his surname." This is followed by the date, in Arabic, which reads:

> *bi taʾrīx-i salax-i šahr-i Jumādā al-awwal fī sanat-i arbaʿat-in wa ṯalaṯīn wa miʾa(tin/tayn) baʿd al-alf li al-hijra al-nabawiyya ʿalayhi al-ṣalāt wa al-salām fī kulli yawm-in alf-u marrat-in*

> On the last day of the month of *Jumādā*, the first, in the year thirty-four and one/two hundred after a thousand of the migration of the Prophet, peace be upon Him, a thousand times a day.

The word *miʾa* (one hundred) or *miʾatayn* (two hundred) is slightly obscured by what appears to be the trace of a stamp, but is still partly legible, although it can be read as either *miʾatin* (one hundred) or *miʾatayn* (two hundred). This slight ambiguity makes a difference of as much as one hundred years. At the bottom of the same page, below the colophon, the following two lines of poetry in Persian are written, which complete the information given in the colophon:

> *Be rūz-e panj šanba haštom-e māh*
> *Šuda taṣḥīḥ-e in dīvān-e del-xwāh*
> *Mubārak bād bar Ṣāhib Ilāhī*
> *Muzayyan az vujūd-ash pādišāhī*
>
> On Thursday, the eighth day of the month
> This dearly loved *Dīwān* was corrected.
> May it be glorious for His Highness (owner), I beg you God!
> Ornamented with his existence is the kingdom.

It is not certain whether it is the same scribe, ʿUṯmān al-ʿAqrāwī, who corrected the *Dīwān* and wrote the two lines of poetry. The first line, which gives the date of the correction/collation of the *Dīwān* as the eighth of the month, does not clarify in what month and year this was done.

Reading the history of Kurdistan in the 18th and 19th centuries, we know that Ismāʿīl Pāšā was the ruler of the Kurdish principality of Āmēdī during the years 1182–1212 AH/1768–1797 CE. Since the manuscript, as mentioned above, was prepared for "Mūsā Bēg, the son of the late Ismāʿīl Pāšā", it must have been done after the death of Ismāʿīl Pāšā, that was on the 18th of Ṣafar 1212 AH, which corresponds to 12 August 1797 CE (Al-Māʾī, 1960: 159).

Taking these dates into consideration, the mystery of the one hundred or two hundred years in the colophon is also solved. The date in the colophon clearly refers to the last day of *Jumādā al-awwal* in 1234 AH, which corresponds to 27 March 1819, as the date on which the writing of the *Dīwān* was completed.

MS or. quart. 1131. SB Marburg / Berlin

This manuscript consists of 74 folios of two pages each, except fol. 74 which is only one page. The end of the MS is missing. 1a-b is a letter in Ottoman Turkish dated 11th *Šawwāl* (12)89, which corresponds to 12 December 1872 CE. Kamal Fuʾād, who has already described this MS in his PhD thesis, considers this date to be a *terminus ante quem* (Fuad 1970: 116), although there

is no indication that the letter originally belonged to the MS. On 2a some additional calculations are made, which do not appear to be relevant to the *Dīwān*. In the left margin of fol. 38b, it is indicated that Muḥammad al-Asmar al-Xošābī is the scribe, but no place or date is given.

The poems are in alphabetical order. The text has been collated and the corrections have been made between the lines or in the margins. In many poems, difficult words are translated into Kurdish or explained by simple synonyms or phrases. A few lines of verse by Ḥāfiẓ and Fuḍūlī or unidentified poets are written in blank spaces on many pages. In the margins of foll. 39b–40b a long poem is written by a certain ʿAbd al-Qadīr, in praise of a Saydā (master), which obviously refers to Malā-yē Jazīrī. The MS contains 98 *qaṣīda*s *and ġazal*s, 2 poetic *mukālama*s, 17 *rubāʿī*s, and one *musaddas* that is the last poem of the MS, and the last parts of which are missing. There are slight differences between this text and other texts of Jazīrī's *Dīwān*.

Almost all Kurdish characters are represented correctly, except for the letter g (گ), which is replaced by k (ک). It is noteworthy that the scribe was aware of the existence of the phoneme ē (ێ) in Kurdish and used a special sign, something similar to an apostrophe, under the letter ī/y (ی) to indicate that sound. This is of great importance to reading and correctly understanding the poems.

A quite new piece of information in this MS is something concerning the first *ġazal* in the *dīvān* of Ḥāfiẓ which is a fourfold poem, according to all MSS and printed editions, composed by Jazīrī. In the present MS, foll. 72a–73a, it is stated that the four fold (*tarbīʿ*) version of Ḥāfiẓ *ġazal* was made jointly by Jazīrī and Faqī-yē Ṭayrān.

***Der Kurdische Dīwān Des Schēch Aḥmed von Gezīret Ibn 'Omar Genannt Mäla'i Gizri*, Fotolithografie Einer Handschrift Mit Einer Einführung von Martin Hartmann, S. Calvary & Co., Berlin 1904, XI + 222 pp.**

Although this source is often referred to as a book, it is not in the form of a book. It consists of lithographic copies of the original MS, preceded by an introduction by Martin Hartmann that reflects his great interest in the Kurdish language and literature. The pages are not bound into a book, but are gathered in a box or a packet.

This first edition was very limited, because, as stated on page IV, it was "gedruckt in einhundert numerierten Exemplare". It seems that it was mainly the Orientalists who were interested in and used the edition, and there is no information that can confirm that copies have reached Kurdistan.

Hartmann's work is based on a MS that containing seven different works in Kurdish, which he obtained in March 1896 with the help of Dr Hermann Gies, who was working at the German embassy in Istanbul at the time (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1904: V). Hartmann published the first two parts of the MS that are attributed to Malā-yē Jazīrī, as shown below:

First, there is a *qaṣīda,* which is Jazīrī's longest poem. The heading reads: *Hāḏā qaṣīdat Šēx Aḥmad al-Jizrīyy almusammā bi Malā* (This is a *qaṣīdat* by Šēx Aḥmad al-Jizrīyy who is called Malā). The scribe calls the text "The *qaṣīdat*", but he probably meant "a *qaṣīdat*". It is worth notinig is that the Arabic demonstrative pronoun used at the beginning of the heading is incorrect, since *qaṣīda* is a feminine word in Arabic, whereas the demonstrative pronoun *Hāḏā* is used for masculine singular words. The demonstrative pronoun *Hāḏihi* should have been used instead.

This is followed by a *basmala*. The first page, which corresponds to p. 2 in this edition, and the last page, which corresponds to page 20, contain four and 5 *baits* respectively, whereas the remaining 17 pages contain seven *baits* each. At the bottom of p. 12, we find the catchword *lafẓī*, which, according to a tradition followed in Oriental manuscripts indicates that the next page begins with the same word, although this is not the case here. Bearing in mind that in almost all editions the poem consists of 142 *baits*, it is clear that two folios of the original MS, with a total of fourteen *baits*, are missing. It is quite astonishing that Hartmann neither discovered nor mentioned the lack of these two pages in his introduction to the manuscript. Not even anyone who has written about this edition since its publication in 1904 and up to now, has noticed or mentioned this deficiency.

The second part is Jazīrī's *Dīwān*, pp. 21–222, the heading of which reads: *Hāḏā dīwān raʾīs al-šuʿarāʾ Šēx Aḥmad al-Jizrīyy, raḥimahu Allāh* (This is the *Dīwān* of Šēx Aḥmad al-Jizrīyy, the leader of the poets, may Allah bless him).

This part contains 89 poems, *ġazal* and *qaṣīda*, two poetic *mukālama*s and 17 *rubāʿī*s. One of the *rubāʿī*s is wrongly indicated by the scribe as two separate *fard*s. At the bottom of every other page, a catchword indicates the first word of the next page. Various headings are used, mostly *wa lahu* (also by him), but also *Šēx Aḥmad* and *Šēx Aḥmad al-Jizrīyy*. The heading of the poetic *mukālama* between Jazīrī and Mīr ʿImād al-dīn is given only as "*Suʾāl-i Malā*" for the first couplet and "*Jawāb-i Mīr*" for the second, and simply as Malā and Mīr in the continuation.

The heading of the second *mukālama* reads "*Mukālāma-ye Faqah-i Ṭayrān wa Šēx Aḥmad al-Jizrīyy*" with alternation of Faqah and Malā in each couplet. Marginal notes are made by different hands. The colophon, p. 222, is *Qad tamma dīwān Malā Aḥmad al-Jizrīyy fi yad al-ʿabd li al-sayyid* (The *Dīwān* of Malā Aḥmad al-Jizrīyy was completed by the slave for the lord). With this, the scribe closes off any possibility of knowing who he and his lord were. Moreover, the MS has no date, which is usually given in the colophon of MSS.

It should be noted that wherever this edition is quoted in the Kurdish or Arabic sources, the editor is given as Von Martin Hartmann or Martin Von Hartmann. This seems to have happened, because of the German preposition "von", used in the title before the editor's name, as seen above. Another such error is what most sources have always repeated without checking, namely that there was a portrait of Jazīrī on the cover of this edition (see, e.g. Sajjādī

1952: 180; Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1987,: h; Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1982: 15, Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1964: 2). The picture in question is in fact nothing more than the emblem of the publisher, or of the printing house, S. Calvary & Co. Berlin.

Dīwān Aḥmad al-Jizrī, *Istanbul Dār al-funūn, Adabiyyāt madrasasi kutubhānasi* (The Istanbul Department of Arts, Library of the School of Literature), Tartīb numrosi 51–7420.

The name of the MS is "Dīwān Aḥmad al-Jizrī", which was most likely given by someone on the library staff, since the handwriting differs from that of the MS scribe. Moreover, it is unthinkable that a scribe would give the name of the poet as Aḥmad al-Jizrī, without a title like sheikh or *malā*. The MS is referred to as Fārsī (Persian), apparently to avoid calling it Kurdī (Kurdish).

Below those words is a great stamp, the first two lines of which read *Istanbul Dar al-funūn, Adabiyyāt madrasasi kutubhānasi* (The Istanbul Department of Arts, Library of the School of Literature). Then there is a sort of serial or catalogue number called *Tartīb numrosi* (51–7420). Next to the large stamp there is a smaller circular stamp consisting of two circles. Inside the larger one we read "*Adabiyyāt madrasasi kutubhānasi*" and two dating systems are used, 1336 and 1920, which indicate the Ottoman *mālī*, or *Rūmī*, and the CE dating systems respectively. Inside the small circle, we can read *Dar al-funūn-i ʿUṯmānī* (The Ottoman Department of Arts). This circular stamp is also used on pages 3, 36, 63, 94 and 154 of the MS. It should be added in this regard that these titles and stamps are written in the Ottoman Turkish alphabet based on Arabic characters.

This is the manuscript often referred to as 'The Jazīra Copy', written/copied by Malā ʿAbd al-Salām Nājī bin Murād bin ʿAbd al-Salām al-Najjār (1295–1372 AH/1878–1952 CE), also called Malā ʿAbd al-Salām al-Jazīrī (or al-Jizrī). It is considered to be the most accurate and reliable copy of Jazīrī's *Dīwān*.

It appears that ʿAbd al-Salām wrote several copies of the *Dīwān*, and the present copy is only one of them. Āmēdī (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1977: 10) writes of three copies of the *Dīwān* that Malā ʿAbd al-Salām sent as gifts to his friends. The present copy is certainly one of the oldest copies (probably the oldest copy) prepared by ʿAbd al-Salām, since he left his city of Jazīra and settled in Syrian Kurdistan in the early 1930s (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 2004: 16). The copy was written in 1906, when he was 28 years old and worked as a teacher in the 'Red School', the same school where Malā-yē Jazīrī lived, taught and was buried. The stamp on the cover page of the MS shows that it was already being kept at the Library of the School of Literature belonging to the Istanbul (or Ottoman) Department of Arts in 1920, when the Ottoman Empire still existed.

The MS consists of 77 folios, and all its 154 pages, except for the first and the last pages, were originally numbered by the scribe. Every page, except for page 1, is divided into two columns, and all pages, except the first and the last, have frames. The first hemistich of each distich in each poem is written in the

right-hand column, and the second hemistich in the left-hand column. The last *bayt* (distich) of each poem is written vertically in the centre of the page, leaving two small square spaces, each about 2x2 centimetres, on either side of this last distich. These spaces were used by the scribe to write the heading of the next poem. In the right-hand square he wrote *wa lahu ayaḍan* (also by him) and the seqvential number of the poem, and in the left-hand square he wrote *quddisa sirruhu* (may his secret be sanctified).

The *Dīwān* begins on page 2 of the MS with the words '*Hāḏā dīwān al-Šayx Aḥmad al-Jizrī qaddasa Allāhu asrārahu*' (This is the *Dīwān* of al-Šayx Aḥmad al-Jizrī, may God sanctify his secrets), followed by a *basmala* and the sentence '*wa bihi nastaʿīn*' (and from Him we seek help). The headings of all but a few of the poems follow the same pattern 'also by him, may his secret be sanctified'.

All the poems are written in black ink, while the headings and the vocalizations of the poems are written in red ink. The vocalization is sporadic, appearing only on some pages or in isolated hemstitches or words. At the end of every even-numbered page, outside the frame and at the bottom of the left-hand column there is a catchword, the word with which the next page begins. As far as orthography is concerned, the Kurdish characters p, č, ž and v (پ، چ، ژ، ڤ) are correctly used; but when writing g (گ), the letter k (ک) with three dots above it (ک), is used.

The colophon on the penultimate page, 153, indicates that this copy of the *Dīwān* was prepared and written by ʿAbd al-Salām Nājī bin Murād bin ʿAbd al-Salām al-Najjār. The scribe begins the colophon with long sentences in praise of the poet Jazīrī, followed by a few sentences describing himself in words of humility and modesty. The date of completion of the work is accurately stated. Following is the basic information concerning the scribe and the date:

> *Qad waqaʿa al-farāġ min taḥrīr dīwān […] al-Šayx Aḥmad al-Jizrī, qaddasa Allāhu asrārahu […] ʿala yad adʿaf al-ʿibād […] ʿAbd al-Salām Nājī bin Murād bin ʿAbd al-Salām al-Najjār, fī yawm al-xamīs, qabl al-ẓuhr, fi al-yawm al-ṯāliṯ wa al-ʿišrīn min šahr Šaʿbān al-šarīf, fī baldat al-Jazīra, fī ḥujrat al-Madrasa al-Ḥamrāʾ […], fī sanat qad xalat min al-hijra al-nabawiyya 1324 sanat […].*
>
> The writing of the *Dīwān* of […] al-Šayx Aḥmad al-Jizrī, may God sanctify his secrets […] was completed at the hands of the weakest of God's servants […] ʿAbd al-Salām Nājī bin Murād bin ʿAbd al-Salām al-Najjār, on Thursday, before noon, on the 23rd day of the honoured *Šaʿbān* month, in the city of al-Jazīra, in the classroom of the Red School […], in the year 1324, after the Prophetic migration […].

The date 23rd of *Šaʿbān*, 1324 AH, corresponds to 12 December 1906 CE. In the first half of the page, beside the left-hand column, but in a vertical line, he adds the following words '*wa qad katabtuhu fī ḥujrat al-Madrasa al-Ḥamrāʾ al-latī dufina fīhā al-nāẓim raḥimahu Allāhu taʿālā*' meaning 'and I wrote it in the classroom of the Red School where the poet was buried, may God, be He exalted, have mercy upon him'.

The poems are arranged alphabetically according to the rhyming letters of the poems. Each new rhyme section begins with the name of the letter, written outside the frame, such as '*ḥarf al-alif*' or '*ḥarf al-sīn*' (the letter *alif* or the letter *sīn*). The poems rhyming in the Kurdish letters p (پ) and g (گ) are not placed in seperate sections, but are integrated into the sections for the letters b (ب) and k (ک) respectively, since there are similarities in form between them. It is noteworthy that the scribe devotes a special section to the letter 'Lā' (لا) between the sections w (و) and y/ī (ي), whereas there is no such letter in the Arabic alphabet.

All the poems are numbered according to their order in the MS, and the total number of poems is 115. Three important poems are not included in the MS, namely Jazīrī's poetic correspondences with Mīr ʿImād al-Dīn and Faqīyē Ṭayrān and his longest poem "*Allāh saḥargāh-ā azal…*". The *rubaʿī*s of Jazīrī are not included either. Nevertheless, Lāġar's *taxmīs* (five-fold) and Ramaḍān's *tasdīs* (six-fold) version of Jazīrī's poems are included.

HS. Or. 13958, in Preussicher Kulturbesitz, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin.

The MS consists of 115 originally unnumbered folios. Only the first page of each folio is numbered, making a total of 230 pages. The MS is bound as a book, but there is no title or information on the cover. Each page is divided into two main columns with a narrow column between them. It is noteworthy that neither the name of the scribe nor the date of completion of the work is recorded in the MS. Most likely the information was recorded in the original MS, but since the last text, a *maṯnawī*, is unfinished, some pages at the end of the MS, where the name of the scribe and the date of completion are usually recorded, may have been torn or lost.

The greater part of the MS, 1a–84b, consists of Jazīrī's poems. The remaining sixty pages, 84b–115b, contain several poems in Persian and Kurdish. The headings of Jazīrī's poems are '*Šayx Aḥmad*, *Šayx Aḥmad farmayad* and *wa lahu ayaḍa*' (Šayx Aḥmad, Šayx Aḥmad says and also by him). Nowhere in the MS is the surname Jazīrī used. The Kurdish characters p, č, ž and v (پ، چ، ژ، ڤ) are used correctly, but to write g (گ) the letter k (ک) is used.

In the 168 pages devoted to Jazīrī's *Dīwān*, we also find poems by other Kurdish and Persian poets sporadically inserted on different pages among Jazīrī's poems. The poets are Sheikh Ramaḍān (also called Ramaḍān), Sayfī (also called Mīr Sayf al-Dīn and Mīr Sēvdīn), Lāġar, Bātayī, Qubād Bēg, Āṣafī, Qāsim, Malā ʿĪsā and Hāfiẓ. The first four poets are Kurds, and some

of their Kurdish and Persian poems are included here. As to the other five poets, only Hāfiẓ is known as a great Persian poet.

The MS contains 115 poems by Jazīrī, which are identical with his poems in most of the MSS and editions of his *Dīwān*. However there are two poems in this MS that are found only in Doskī's edition (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 2018: III, 243 and IV, 335). Moreover, there are six hemstitches that the scribe calls '*fard*' but they have common rhyme and rhythm. A *fard* usually consists of two hemstitches, like a *bayt*, but it is independent, not a part of a *ġazal* or a *qaṣīda*.

The second part of the MS, beginning with 84b, is a kind of anthology, containing poems by the following poets: Ibn Ḥisām, Mawlānā Rūmī, Ismāʿīl, Šayx-i ʿAṭṭār, Sarāʾī, Tāj al-Dīn Rāzī, Sayyid, Najmī, Āzād, ʿIṣmat, Ṣafāʾī, ʿĀṣī, Ḥisāmī, Xvājū, Bātayī, Ahlī, Qubād Bēg and Sayfī (Mīr Sayf al-Dīn). The poems are mostly in Persian, but there are also few poems in Arabic and Kurdish. The Kurdish poems in this section are by Bātayī and Sayfī. One of the two poems by Jazīrī mentioned above is included in this part, rather than with his other poems in the *Dīwān*.

The last twenty pages of the MS contain longer poems which may be part of a *maṯnawī*, but nowhere is the name of the poet mentioned. On page 102a, a new text begins with the title *ʾĀġāz-i kitāb-i Ḥālnāma*. It is obviously also a *maṯnawī*.

2.3.2. Printed Editions

Dīwān-ā Jizīrī, Muʾallif-i Šēx Aḥmad al-Jizīrī, edited by Muḥammad Šafīq al-ʾArwāsī, Šāhzāda Bāši, Awqāf-i Islāmiyya Maṭbaʿasi, 1338 Rūmī–1340 AH (1922 CE), 96 pp.

The collection is preceded by a brief introduction by the editor in which he compares Jazīrī with Ibn ul-Fāriḍ and Ḥāfiẓ. There are 115 poems in this edition. Amēdī (18–25) and Rasūl (44), give the number of the poems in this edition as 120, because, for no apparent reason, they count the six parts of the last *Tarjīʿ-band* as independent poems. The order is alphabetical. The two poetic *mukālama*s, the *rubāʿī*s and the long poem *Allāh saḥargāh-ā azal...* are not included. Immediately before the colophon, the date of printing is given as 1337 according to the Rūmī, or *Mālī*, calendar, which corresponds to the years (1339–1340) AH. At the beginning of the colophon, it is stated that the printing of the book was finished in 1338, in April and Šaʿbān, but the AH year is not given. The Rūmī date corresponds to Šaʿbān of 1340 AH and April of 1922 CE. The two dates, Rūmī and AH, are given on the cover of the book.

It is also noteworthy that although the name of the editor, Muḥammad Šafīq al-Arwāsī, is given on the front cover of the book, there are two other names in the colophon. The first one, Š. Q. (ش ق), indicates that the book was printed in April 1338, which is followed by a few sentences of supplication, whereas the second one, ʿAbd al-Raḥīm Raḥmī of the Hakkārī family (*ži mālā Hakkāriyā*), concludes the book with five lines of verse in which he highly praises Jazīrī and

the Kurdish language. He considers Malā more skilful as a poet than Ḥāfiẓ and Ferdousī. Moreover, he compares him, now as a Ṣūfī, with Al-Ḥallāj. It is assumed that the person who signed his name as Š. Q. (ش ق) in the colophon may have been Šēx ʿAbd al-Qādir Nahrī, or Šamzīnī, who was one of the leading Kurdish political and cultural personalities in Istanbul in those years, before he was executed in Diyarbakir in June 1925 (van Bruinessen, 2000b: 205).

In the first two pages following the cover, pp. 3–4, the letter g (گ) is missing and is replaced by the letter k (ک), while starting from page 5, the letter g (گ) is used correctly and consistently.

Al-ʿiqd al-jawharī fī šarḥ dīwān al-Šayx al-Jizrī, 2 volumes, edited, translated, annotated and commented on by Aḥmad bin al-Mullā Muḥammad [al-Buhtī] al-Zivingī, Muftī al-Qāmišlī, 1st edition, Maṭbaʿat al-Rāfidayn, Qāmišlī 1959, 17(alif-ġayn)+ 947 pp., 2nd edition, Maṭbaʿat al-Ṣabāḥ, n.p., 1407/1987. A preface of six unnumbered pages is added to the second edition, written by Ḍiyāʾ al-Dīn Mullā Muḥammad, Zivingī's nephew.

Jazīrī's poems are in Kurdish, but the explanations are in Arabic. Zivingī's edition of Jazīrī's *Dīwān* is definitely one of the two best annotated editions to now. In his introduction at the beginning of the *Dīwān*, Zivingī discusses in detail the life of Jazīrī and relevant aspects of his poetry. He first reviews the opinions of previous writers and then explains his own views, relying on internal and external evidence. Much of the introduction is devoted to his reasoning about the dates of the poet's birth and death. His conclusions in this regard are of the utmost importance and have become the basis for almost everything written about Jazīrī since.

In an epilogue, the editor briefly describes the nature of his work, but not the method he used in editing the *Dīwān*. He states that most of the manuscripts at his disposal were of no use, because of the errors and deficiencies they contained. Here he does not say anything about other copies, while on pp. 843 and 846 he gives the impression that the edition, except for the last seven poems, pp. 847–937, was heavily dependent on a manuscript that he calls "The copy of Jazīrat Ibn ʿUmar". He does not explain how the texts of this edition were established.

The edition comprises 120 poems and 3 *rubāʿī*s, arranged alphabetically according to the final letters of the rhymes, regardless of the form; i.e. the *qaṣīda*s and the *ġazal*s are not separated. The text is accurately vocalized, even taking into account the prosodic scanning of the poems. The headings are either *Wa lahu ayaḍan quddisa sirruhu* (Also by him, may his secret be sanctified) or *Wa qāla ayaḍan quddisa sirruhu* (He also said, may his secret be sanctified). As for the poems whose authenticity the editor was dubious about, he has placed them at the end of the book. This part contains seven poems, including Jazīrī's longest *qaṣīda* and the two poetic *mukālama*s. He separated

these seven poems because they are not included in The copy of Jazīrat Ibn ʿUmar, which he used as the basis for his work.

The edition is remarkable for its explanations and commentaries in Arabic. Every *bait* of a *qaṣīda* or a *ġazal* is dealt with separately. Firstly, the words are translated or explained, and secondly, a word-for-word translation into Arabic is given, followed by a more detailed explanation that, in relevant cases, highlights rhetorical and philosophical, but less aesthetic, aspects. Notably, this pattern is followed throughout the first volume, whereas in the second volume the word-for-word translation is abandoned. Wherever a similarity is found between Jazīrī's poetry and the poetry of great Persian or Arabic poets, e.g. Saʿdī, Ḥāfiẓ, Jāmī or Ibn al-Fāriḍ, it is noted.

Concerning the Sufi ideas in Jazīrī's poems, Zivingī focuses mainly on the principles of the Naqšbandī order, to which both Jazīrī and Zivingī himself adhered, and in a few cases, on the doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*, although he does not mention the name of Ibn ʿArabī. In these cases, he limits himself to giving the name of the doctrine, but does not give any information about its principles. In his annotation, Zivingī does not deal with the aesthetic or structural aspects of the poems. The verse meters are not recorded, even though the vocalization of the poems confirms that he was aware of the prosodic system and its application in the poems.

Dīwān-ī Šēx Aḥmad-ī Jizīrī, edited by Gīw-ī Mukryānī, Čāpxāna-y Hawlēr, Hawlēr 2576 (Kurdish era, *sic.*)/1964, 167 pp.

The text is preceded by an introduction, pp. 1–16, originally written in Arabic by Anwar Māʾī (1331–1386 AH/1913–1965 CE) and translated into Kurdish by the editor of the *Dīwān,* Gīw-ī Mukryānī. There are some additional remarks by Mukryānī himself at the end of the introduction, but neither part provides anything new about Jazīrī beyond what was already known. In his remarks, the editor refers to Hartmann's (Berlin 1904) and Arwāsī's (Istanbul 1922) editions, as well as two other editions from Yerevan and Aleppo, which are now known never to have existed. On the other hand, he does not mention Zivingī's edition (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1959), published five years earlier.

The collection includes 116 poems, arranged alphabetically according to the final letters of the rhymes. Mukryānī employs a kind of orthography that is a combination of the traditional orthography, which uses the Arabic (and Persian) vocalization system, and the new system that had been partly in use in Southern Kurdistan since the mid-1950s. The edition contains many misprints. Moreover, the editor seems to have changed, a large number of words, as he is generally known to do, and the edition is therefore not very reliable.

Dīwān-ā Malā-yē Jizīrī, edited by Ṣādiq Bahāʾ al-Dīn Āmēdī, Čāpxāna-y Koṛ-ī Zānyārī-y Kurd, Baghdad 1977, 640 pp.

In his introduction to this collection, Āmēdī confirms that the principles and the methodology of editing a text critically are followed in the work. Āmēdī states that he had access to four printed editions of Jazīrī's *Dīwān*, namely those of Hartmann, Arwāsī, Zivingī and Mukryānī, and five manuscripts, the oldest of which dates from 1231AH/1815–1816, in addition to a number of poems published in various publications and periodicals (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1977: 8–14). He describes the printed editions and manuscripts in detail. Explaining the method he used to establish the text, Āmēdī states that he has used Zivingī's edition as a basis and compared it with the other texts, showing the differences in the *apparatus criticus*.

A close examination of the text reveals that it was not prepared with sufficient accuracy. In several cases, words in the text have been changed without any notice and in complete contradiction to what is said to be the method employed in the edition. The volume is also provided with a list comparing the number of the poems in the different editions and manuscripts. Even here, inaccuracies are apparent.

The edition contains 128 poems and 17 *rubāʿīs*. Obviously, in addition to the poems that are common to the different editions and manuscripts, the editor has included all those poems that are found in one or more of the sources, but not in all of them. Āmēdī uses, though not consistently, the orthographic system adopted by the Kurdish Academy in Baghdad in the early 1970s.

Dīwān-ī ʿĀrif-ī Rabbanī Šēx Aḥmad-ī Jizīrī Mašhūr ba Malā-y Jizīrī, edited, explained, annotated and commented on by Hažār, Surūš, Teheran 1361Š (1982 CE), XXVIII + 626 pp.

In the introduction, Hažār reviews in detail the different opinions on the life of Jazīrī and explains his own point of view, which is the same as that of Zivingī. Noticeably, he makes no mention of the manner in which the text was established or of the editions and manuscripts that were available to him.

The explanations of the poems are largely similar to the pattern used by Zivingī in his edition, except that here they are in Kurdish, whereas Zivingī's are in Arabic. Each verse is treated separately. First, the words are elucidated in simple and modern (central) Kurdish, and secondly, the content is explained in detail, with emphasis on the rhetorical and philosophical aspects.

Whenever relevant, comparisons are made with similar verses in Persian, Arabic or Kurdish. In this context, Hažār's commentaries are more comprehensive than those of Zivingī. Approximately from the second half of the book, the system of explanation becomes different; groups of three, four or even more verses are treated together and the commentaries are therefore briefer than in the first half. This is exactly what is found in Zivingī's edition, which strengthens the belief that he was very much dependent on Zivingī's edition.

Hažār almost entirely avoids commenting on the Sufi ideas of Jazīrī or the aesthetic and structural aspects of his poetry. When explaining the poems devoted to Sufism, he uses general expressions such as the divine love that encompasses the whole universe, or that the earthly love is a step on the staircase that leads to Divine love. These expressions can of course be said of many other Sufi poets besides Jazīrī. Nowhere in this work do we read that Jazīrī was a Naqšbandī Sufi or a follower of Ibn ʿArabī's philosophy.

Regarding the metaphors in the poems, Hažār demonstrates his appreciation and admiration for Jazīrī only in general terms, without providing any examination of the elements or structures that can be associated with the poet's language and style.

The total number of poems in this edition is 117, *ġazal*s and *qaṣīda*s, and 3 *rubāʿī*s. The last part of the volume contains 10 poems, about which the editor expresses doubts and, consequently does not attribute them to Jazīrī, but nevertheless includes them in his book.

Mela-yê Jiziri: *Dîwān*, transcribed into Latin characters by: Zeynalabidîn Kaya and M. Emîn Narozî, Roja Nû, Stockholm 1987, 327+11+233+4 pp.

The edition includes Jazīrī's poems in the original alphabet and their transcription into Latin characters. The text is mainly based on Zivingī's edition, but the editions of Āmēdī and Hažār are also consulted. The edition includes 122 poems and 3 *rubāʿī*s. Since many sounds existing in the Kurdish language and in the Arabic or Persian words used in Jazīrī's poetry are not represented in the Latin alphabet used to transcribe the poems, the text is a deformed representation of Jazīrī's poems. Moreover, the text contains numerous errors, due to the editors' misreading of Arabic and Persian words, and lack of command of prosody (*ʿarūz*). The edition duly, is therefore unreliable and of no value for research on Jazīrī's poetry.

An earlier attempt to Latinize the *Dīwān* of Malā-yē Jazīrī was made by Qadrī Jamīl Pāšā in the 1940s. Jamīl published 43 poems in the Kurdish magazine *Hawar*, nrs. 35–57, in the years 1941–1943. The assessment made of the preceding edition applies here too.

Dīwān-ā Malā-yē Jizīrī, edited by Taḥsīn ʾIbrāhīm Doskī, Ministry of Culture, the Regional Government in Iraqi Kurdistan, Duhok 2000, 443 pp.

Doskī begins the book with an introduction in which he mostly gives the general information that has already been available about Jazīrī and his life. He even discusses the dates of Jazīrī's birth and death, and a date suggesting that Jazīrī "finished" his *Dīwān* and ceased writing poetry.

All the conclusions he presents have already been published by Kaya and Narozi (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1987: 21–23). This edition contains 125 poems, pp. 23–357, and a word list, pp. 359–433, explaining many of the words and terms used in the poems. The list was prepared by ʾIsmāʿīl Tāhā Šāhīn.

Šarḥ Dīwān al-Šayx al-Jazarī, li al-Mullā ʿAbd al-Salām al-Jazarī, edited and annotated by Taḥsīn ʾIbrāhīm al-Doskī, two volumes, Spīrēz Press & Publisher, Duhok 2004, vol. 1: 564 pp., vol. 2: 584 pp. (Jizīrī's poems are in Kurdish and the explanation is in Arabic).

In the printed editions of Jazīrī's *Dīwān* and in writings about him, reference is often made to a manuscript called "The Jazīra Manuscript" or "The Jazīra Copy", which is supposed to be a standard and reliable copy of his *Dīwān*. This Jazīra copy is also generally associated with the name of Malā ʿAbd al-Salām Nājī al-Jizīrī (whose name is written in different ways). In his edition of the *Dīwān*, Zivingī (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1959: 843) mentions this manuscript and indicates that he relied on it.

Āmēdī also relates in his edition that Malā ʿAbd al-Salām had sent a copy of the manuscript to Jalādat Badir-Xān, that was transliterated and partially published in the Damascus-based *Hawar* magazine. Another copy, according to Āmēdī, was sent to Muḥammad ʿAlī ʿAwnī in Egypt. Āmēdī, in turn, indicates that he relied on a copy made by ʿAwnī in addition to other editions and manuscripts, and to the poems that were published in *Hawar* and Zivingī's edition. Both Hažār and Kaya were also largely dependent, on Zivingī's edition.

Malā ʿAbd al-Salām Nājī al-Jizrī was an eminent scholar and poet from Jazīra, where he was the *imām* and teacher of the Red School, where also the poet Malā-yē Jazīrī was also a teacher, according to all the sources on his life, and where also was buried. Malā ʿAbd al-Salām emigrated to Syria in 1933 and spent the last ten years of his life as an *imām* and teacher at the main mosque in Qāmišlī.

ʿAbd al-Salām was an authority on Jazīrī's poetry and made fourfold (*tarbīʿ*) and fivefold (*taxmīs*) versions of several of Jazīrī's poems (Yaşin, 1983: 147–148), although none of these have yet been published. Malā ʿAbd al-Salām al-Jazarī (1878–1952) was an avant-gardist in translating and explaining the poems of Jazīrī, but his book did not see the light of day until more than half a century after it was written and after his death.

Already in 1959, when Zivingī's edition was published, there was information to the effect that he was not the author of the book, and that he had published the manuscript that he had borrowed from Mullā ʿAbd al-Salām. He was accused of plagiarism and the question was brought up and publicized in 1973 by Malā Hamdī ʿAbd al-Majīd in an article about the life of Malā ʿAbd al-Salām. The writer relates in detail how Zivingī published ʿAbd as-Salām's manuscript and, undeservedly, attributed it to himself (ʿAbd al-Majīd 1973: 50–54.). The same is confirmed by Hažār (23, in letters), and ʿAbd al-Salām Nuʿmān (1990: 72–83.). The latter even publishes copies of two pages from Malā ʿAbd al-Salām's manuscript and compares them with corresponding pages from Zivingī's edition as evidence of plagiarism.

Indeed, Zivingī states in his edition that he at the beginning of his work on the *Dīwān* he received help from Malā ʿAbd al-Salām Nājī al-Jizrī. This hesitant acknowledgement is made in the prologue of the book and it limits ʿAbd al-Salām's assistance to sharing his knowledge of the Kurdish dialect of Jazīra, in which, according to Zivingī (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1959: 941), Malā-yē Jazīrī wrote his poems.

Now that the *Dīwān* that was prepared and annotated by Malā ʿAbd al-Salām Nājī al-Jizrī has been published, the question should be reconsidered for the benefit of Zivingī, and it should be declared that he is the genuine editor of this edition of Jazīrī's *Dīwān*, ZdJ, and the issue of plagiarism is, and has been, baseless.

Taḥsīn Ibrāhīm Doskī (edited and annotated): *Šarḥ-ā Dīwān-ā Malā-yē Jizīrī*, 4 volumes, 1629 pages, by, Komalga-y Farhangī-y Aḥmad-ē Xānī, Soran, 2018.

This is the most comprehensive annotated edition of Jazīrī's *Dīwān*. It begins with a very short introduction, two pages, about Jazīrī's life. In this introduction, Doskī informs us that the prince ʿImād al-Dīn, who had a poetic conversation with Jazīrī, was not a member of the ʿAzīzān princely family that ruled Botān principality, but a prince from Hakkārī principality, and his pen name was Ṣabūrī. Doskī does not present any evidence to support his argument, so the matter is open to question.

The introduction is followed by an article on Jazīrī's life and poetry, in which new information is presented about attempts made to edit, annotate and comment on parts of Jazīrī's poetry. The first attempt, according to Doskī, was made by Malā Jarjīs Arbīlī (d. 1206 AH/1791 CE), who wrote a book, *Risāla-ye Fatḥiyya*, for the governor of Ākrē Fatḥullāh Pāsā in 1185 AH/1771 CE. The book was in Persian and was devoted to explaining a poem by Jazīrī that deals with questions of *qidam* (eternity before creation) and *ḥudūṯ* (new creation, i.e., the created world).

What makes Doskī's edition so detailed and comprehensive is that, in addition to his own explanation of the poems, he refers to other previous editions and how they read or explained Jazīrī's poems. An obvious shortcoming of this edition is that the author explains the poems literally and tries to avoid the Sufi aspects in Jazīrī's poetry. When dealing with poems that openly present Jazīrī's ideas as an adherent of Ibn ʿArabī's doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*, Doskī does not conceal his unfriendly attitude towards the doctrine and its founder. He describes the ideas as pagan and anti-Islamic. He approaches the poet's thought from a *Qurʾān*ic and Islamic theological perspective. Moreover, the aesthetic and structural characteristics of the poems are not dealt with. The prosody of each poem is clearly presented and, accordingly, the rules of Kurdish orthography are generally observed.

2.3.3. Fragments

In addition to the poems in the manuscripts and the printed editions of Jazīrī's *Dīwān*, there are a few poems scattered in manuscripts that contain poems by other Kurdish poets than Jazīrī. There are also copies of poems attributed to Jazīrī that were circulated among teachers and students of the traditional schools in Kurdistan. The following is a brief description of some of these poems:

MS: GLB, Kurd 36, Saltikov-Šedrīn Library, St Petersburg (formerly Leningrad):

The title on the cover fol. in Kurdish reads: *Majmaʿā ġazaliyyātēd šuʿarāyēd Kurmanjāna* (The Anthology of the *ġazal*s of Kurdish Poets) and it is translated into French as: *Recueil de poesies Kurdes*. The MS is one of many manuscripts prepared by Malā Maḥmūd Bāyazīdī and brought to Russia by A. Jaba. It contains poems by nine Kurdish poets. Jazīrī's poem, foll. 57–58, consists of 17 distiches. The heading is *Malā Aḥmad-i Jizrī farmāyad* (Malā Aḥmad-i Jizrī says). The pen name used in the last distich is Malā. It is noteworthy that the rhyme of the poem is (*-av*), which would make it unique if it can be proved that it belongs to Jazīrī, since this would be the only poem by Jazīrī that has the Kurdish character *v* (ڤ) as its rhyme.

A couple of poems in a hand-written anthology of poetry circulated in Kurdistan are also attributed to Jazīrī. It is stated that these are poems not included in the *Dīwān*. The first consists of 10 distiches and the second of 15 distiches. The pen names are Aḥmad and Malē respectively. These two poems were first published by ʿAbd al-Raqīb Yūsif in his book *Dīwān-ā Kirmānjī* (16–20) and were later adopted by Āmēdī (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1977: 602–603, 605–607).

2.3.4. Translations

ʿAbd al-Wahhāb al-Karmī: *Naqd wa tarjamat li muxtārāt min dīwān al-Mullā al-Jazrī* (Criticism and translation of a selection of the *Dīwān* of al-Mullā al-Jazrī), Maṭbaʿat al-Kātib al-ʿArabī, Damascus 1992, 158 pp.

The book contains 21 poems by Jazīrī translated into Arabic. In many cases the translation is done *verbatim*, but in those poems where Ṣūfī thoughts are presented, al-Karmī intends to elaborate on his comments. The translation is followed by a critical reading of the poems, in which aesthetic and linguistic aspects are evaluated.

The same pattern is used throughout the book. Each poem is first translated into Arabic, distich by distich. This is followed by a text called "criticism and comments", in which a critical reading of the poem is presented. In many cases, the author points out the prosody of the poems. In this part, al-Karmī presents ideas about the poems and explains some of the symbols and metaphors according to his understanding of the poems. Al-Karmī treats aesthetic

aspects of some of the poems, emphasizing the significance of the language used by Jazīrī and his ingenuity in constructing the metaphors.

Although the title of the book gives the impression that the texts are studied from a critical point of view, the overwhelming feeling throughout is that the poems, without exception, are highly appreciated and overestimated by Al-Karmī. Regarding Jazīrī's Sufi ideas, he describes them in general terms, and nothing is mentioned about the influence of the doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* or the Naqšbandī order.

Dīvān Gazelei Malā-yē Jezīrī (The *Dīwān* of the *Ġazal*s of Malā-yē Jazīrī), translation from the Kurdish into the Russian, introduction and comments by: Karīm Ayyūbī, edited by I. A. Smirnovā, Nauk, St Petersburg 1994, 286 pp.

The comprehensive introduction of the book (pp. 5–38), written by Ayyūbī, takes up various aspects of Jazīrī's life and poetry. The author presents an overview of the editions of the *Dīwān* that were at his disposal. He also discusses Jazīrī's life, taking into account the opinions suggested previously by the editors of the poet's *Dīwān*. He seems to be inclined to accept the conclusion drawn by Zivingī concerning the approximate dates of Jazīrī's birth and death. Aesthetic, linguistic and structural aspects of Jazīrī's poetry are also discussed. All the poems of Jazīrī's Dīwān are translated (pp. 39–271), followed by a few pages of commentary and notes.

Three poems of Malā-yē Jazīrī (By Mistake, In Praise of Mīr Šaraf-Xān and Your Holy Beauty) were translated into English by the present author and published in *The International Journal of Kurdish Studies*, Volume 18, Nos. 1 & 2 (2004), pp. 196–200.

Jazīrī's *Dīwān* was translated into Arabic by Tawfīq al-Ḥusaynī and published in Damascus in 1989. The *Dīwān* was also translated into Turkish by Osman Tunç and printed in Istanbul in 2009. These two translations were not at my disposal and are therefore not found in the bibliography.

2.4. Previous Research about Jazīrī's poetry

2.4.1. Books

Rasūl, Dr ʿIzz al-Dīn Mistafā (1990), *Malā-y Jizīrī, šitēk darbāra-y žiyān u barham-ī* (Malā-y Jizīrī, something about his life and his work), Hawlēr, 231 pp. (The book is in Kurdish).

This is the only book in the Kurdish language devoted entirely to the study of Jazīrī's life and poetry. The book consists of fourteen chapters, mainly dealing with Jazīrī's life, philosophy and poetry. The author begins his book with a

chapter on Jazīrī's life, in which he reviews all the opinions previously expressed on this subject. Although he does not provide a definite time or period for the poet's life, he seems more inclined to accept what Zivingī presents in his edition of Jazīrī's *Dīwān*.

One of the main chapters of the book is devoted to Jazīrī's long poem *Allāh saḥargāh-ā azal...* Jazīrī's Ṣūfī ideas are traced in the stanzas of the poem and explained in detail. Besides the Ṣūfī ideas, other less-discussed aspects of Jazīrī's poetry are highlighted, such as chess, *ġurbat* (absence from the homeland or exile), being a *malā* and astrology.

In his discussion of Jazīrī's philosophy, the author rightly points out that Jazīrī was a follower of the doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*, but he avoids writing about the principles of this doctrine, and nowhere does he quote or refer to any of Ibn ʿArabī's writings.

Consequently, the reader is left without any clear answers to his/her questions about the construction of a philosophy that forms the main source for Jazīrī's Sufi ideas and Sufi poetry. Like many other writers, Rasūl is of the opinion that Jazīrī belonged to the Naqšbandī order. He bases this idea on the conclusion reached by Zivingī in his edition of Jazīrī's *Dīwān*, and he cites the same distiches used by Zivingī as evidence for his argument that Jazīrī belonged to that order.

Although the author devotes two chapters to "metaphor in the poetry and some aspects of Sufism" and "notes about the form", we do not find in them any considered analysis or development of the two concepts of metaphor or form in Jazīrī's poetry. With regard to the metaphors, he merely explains the meanings of the distiches and compares them with similar expressions used by other poets. As for form, he limits himself to referring to some *Qurʾān*ic verses or stories that he believes inspired the poet in writing the poem. Only in a few cases does he take up special words and try to explain why they are used in this or that way. Prosody is not discussed at all in the book, and the construction of the poems is not analysed from an aesthetic point of view.

Doskī, Muḥammad Amīn: *Falsafat al-ʿišq al-Ilāhī fī šiʿr al-Jazīrī*, (Philosophy of Divine Love in the Poetry of al-Jazīrī), Ḥukūmat Iqlīm Kurdistan al-ʿIrāq, wazārat al-ṯaqāfa, Duhok 2000, 205 pp. (The book is in Arabic.)

Unlike other studies about Jazīrī, the author does not concern himself with the poet's life or time, but goes straight to the main topic. The book consists of nineteen, mostly short chapters, each devoted to a philosophical or a Sufi concept found in Jazīrī's poetry, such as *al-ʿišq* (passionate love), al-*maḥabba* (love), *al-jamāl wa al-jalāl* (divine beauty and divine majesty), *al-sama'* (mystical concert and dance), *al-zuhd* (asceticism, renunciation), etc. The writer chooses various Sufi terms and ideas and traces them in the poetry of Jazīrī, quoting distiches of a poem or whole poems that allude to those ideas. He explains them in detail, from a historical perspective and within a Sufi

context. In some cases a number of terms are so similar that one can hardly see the boundary between them, e.g. *hiyām* (passionate love), *ḥubb* (love, attachment), *maḥabba* (affection) and *ʿišq* (ardour of love).

Although Ibn ʿArabī is mentioned in a few cases, his theory of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* is not referenced and Jazīrī is not presented as an adherent of that doctrine. Doskī simply refrains from writing about Jazīrī's relationship to the doctrine, and he does not discuss the aesthetic aspects of Jazīrī's poetry either.

Mīkāīl, Nāyif Ṭāhir: *al- Šayx al-Jizrī; Naḥjuhu wa ʿAqīdatuhu min Xilāl-i Diwānihi al-Šiʿariyy* (al- Šayx al-Jizrī; His path and his Faith, through his poetry), Spīrēz Press & Publisher, Duhok 2005, 368 pp.

The book was originally a dissertation submitted to the Department of Islamic Studies at the University of Duhok, Kurdistan, in 2002, for the degree of Master of Arts. Although the book is in Arabic, the quotations of distiches from Jazīrī's poems are in Kurdish, with translations into Arabic. The first chapter, which deals with the life of the poet, is almost an exact repetition of materials available in previous studies of Jazīrī and in the various editions of his *Dīwān*.

Although the author's starting point is that the poet was a Sufi, he deviates noticeably from his initial intention of highlighting the questions of Islamic theology and the canonical laws of Islam in Jazīrī's poetry. He reviews most of the schools of Islamic *Šarīʿa* and philosophy and shows how Jazīrī expressed these thoughts in his poetry. In a few cases, the author imposes other, mostly theological, interpretations on Jazīrī's poetic and Sufi expressions. Concepts like *qidam* (primordiality, eternity) and *ḥudūṯ* (temporality, newness) are fundamental to Sufi philosophy, especially in the doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*, whereas here they are presented as theological concepts. The two main characteristics of Jazīrī's Sufism are almost entirely disregarded, namely his being a Naqšbandī Sufi and his obvious adherence to Ibn ʿArabī's doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*. The book does not deal with aesthetic or linguistic aspects of Jazīrī's poetry.

2.4.2. Chapters in Books

'Risālayaka di Baḫṯ-ā Šāʿir u Muṣannifēd Kurdistānē ku bi Zimān-ē Kurmānjiya Jih u ktēb u Šiʿr u Ḥikāya u Qiṣṣayēd wān Bayān dika' (An essay about poets and authors of Kurdistan, in Kurdish language, explaining their places and books and poems and stories), in: Jaba, M. Alexandre: *Recueil de Notices et Recits Kourdes*, St Petersburg, 1860, pp.13–16.

The author of the article appears to be Malā Maḥmūd Bāyazīdī, who was Jaba's informant. There is brief information about eight Kurdish poets. Most of the dates given for the births and deaths of the poets are now known to be incorrect. The last sentence about the life of the eighth and last poet, Murād-Xān Bāyazīdī, is interesting. It reads, "He died in the year 1199 and was buried

in Bāyazīd, and no Kurdish poet has appeared after him until now." The year 1199 AH corresponds to 1784–5 CE, and the article was written down around 1856. Jazīrī is the second poet in the list.

Sajjādī, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn: Malā-y Jizīrī, 1407–1481, in: Sajjādī, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn (1952, 1390 AH/1971 CE), *Mēžū-y Adab-ī Kurdī* (History of Kurdish Literature), Baghdad, pp. 179–204. (The book is in Kurdish.)

In the chapter devoted to Jazīrī, Sajjādī concentrates on three subjects, which he deals with in detail: the dates of the poet's birth and death, his travels and studies in various places in Kurdistan, and his Sufism. Sajjādī describes, the ordinary life of the poet, outlining many details about him, including his physical appearance, which are not based on any reliable source. Moreover, he quotes only three poems and some sporadic distiches, which he explains in simple language, but he does not discuss any aesthetic or structural features of them.

Sajjādī devotes a large part of the study to discussing Jazīrī's life and time. He bases many of his arguments on historical facts, but also on internal evidence from Jazīrī's poems, to conclude that the poet lived in the years 1407–1481. To find a connection between the historical facts and indications in the poems, he interprets these indications in a way that does not seem persuasive. In addition, the poet's Sufi ideas are presented together with excerpts from the poems.

Āmēdī, Ṣādiq Bahāʾ al-Dīn: Malā-yē Jizīrī, in: Bahāʾ al-Dīn: *Hozānvānet Kurd* (Kurdish Poets), Koṛ-ī Zanyārī-y ʿĒrāq, Dasta-y Kurd, Baghdad 1980, pp. 25–175. (The book is in Kurdish.)

This study was originally published in three parts in the Journal of the Kurdish Academy in Iraq in 1975–1976. It was republished together with several other studies in a book titled *Hozānvānet Kurd* (Kurdish Poets) in 1980. It is one of the most thorough studies of Jazīrī and his time. The author has exhausted, in 150 pages, almost all the sources that were available for him, but without reaching a definite conclusion about the dates of Jazīrī's birth and death. He only assumes that Jazīrī may have died sometime after the year 1030 AH/1620 CE (Āmēdī, 1980: 82–83). Sufism and Sufi ideas as the central theme of Jazīrī's poetry is not sufficiently addressed in this study.

Āmēdī quotes many verses from Jazīrī's poems, but he employs them only as evidence of the validity of his arguments about the poet's life. Nothing is said in the chapter about the aesthetic values of Jazīrī's poems.

Shakely, Farhad (1996), 'The Kurdish Qasida', in: Sperl, Stefan & Christopher Shackle, *Qaṣīda Poetry in Islamic Asia and Africa*, 1. Classical Traditions & Modern Meanings, E.J. Brill, Leiden, pp. 327–338.

The article deals mainly with the *qaṣīda* in the poetry of Jazīrī, but also more generally in Kurdish poetry. In addition to examples of Jazīrī's use of internal

rhyme, it is pointed out that "in the *qaṣīda*s, where every half-hemistich has internal rhyme, the last syllable of the rhyming foot almost always coincides with a word boundary."

Jazīrī's *qaṣīda* in praise of Šaraf-Xān, the prince of Botān, is analysed in more detail, showing that, through the wishes of the poet, the prince is made into the pivot of a circle covering the seven climes. The last part of the study is devoted to "the later Kurdish *qaṣīda*" up to the mid-1930s.

Xaznadār, Mārif: Malā-y Jizīrī, 1567–1640, in: Xaznadār: *Mēžū-y Adab-ī Kurdī* (History of Kurdish Literature), vol.: 2, Aras Press and Publisher, Kurdistan–Erbil 2002, pp. 243–303.

The author does not discuss the details of the poet's life, being content with what other researchers have concluded before him. He deals with various aspects of Jazīrī's poetry, but mainly emphasizes the Sufi ideas. He believes that Jazīrī was not affiliated with any of the Sufi *ṭarīqat*s (orders) that existed in Kurdistan at that time. According to Xaznadār, Jazīrī was inspired by Arabic and Persian Sufi literature, especially the poetry of Mawlānā Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī. Xaznadār (2002: 246–247) also suggests that Jazīrī was the founder of classical Kurdish poetry, since it was he who introduced poetic forms such as *ġazal* and *qaṣīda*, as well as prosody and the unity of *qāfiya* (rhyme), into Kurdish literature.

2.4.3. Essays and Articles

Herekol Azīzān (pseudonym of Jalādat Badirxān): Klasîkên Me (Our Classics), *Hawar*, 33(1941), pp. 6–14.

The article introduces, 25 classical Kurdish poets and writers, eight of whom are already known from Jaba's book. Three of the poets are discussed in some detail, namely Malā-yē Jazīrī, Faqī-yē Ṭeyrān and Aḥmad-ē Xānī. He does not write anything about Jazīrī's life, as he believes that the poet is well known to the Kurds and therefore does not need to be described further.

He claims that an edition of Jazīrī's *Dīwān* had been published in St. Petersburg before 1919, and that he himself saw a copy of that edition in the quarter of the Kurds in Damascus (Azīzān, 1941: 7). Although Azīzān's article was published in October 1941, it seems that what he wrote about an edition of Jazīrī's *Dīwān* from 1919 was baseless, because nobody else has seen a copy of it.

Writing about the poet Ḥājī Qādir-ī Koyī (d. 1897), the author tells us that he himself saw the poet when he was a small child, and that he saw a handwritten copy of his *Dīwān* consisting of about 800 pages.

Mutābčī, Dr Amīn ʿAlī (1994), 'Malā-y Jizīrī ustād-ī ġazal-ī Kurdī la šēwa-y Kirmānjī Šimālī-da' (Malā-y Jizīrī, the master of Kurdish ġazal in the Northern Kirmānjī dialect), *The Journal of the Iraqi Academy, Kurdish Corporation*, Volume 25–26, pp. 3–29.

At the beginning of his study, the author presents the peculiarities of classical Persian poetry and how they were adopted by Kurdish poets. *Ġazal* was one of the forms of poetry that soon became popular in the Kurdish language, along with other forms such as *qaṣīda*, *rubāʿī*, *maṯnawī* etc. Mutābčī rightly points out that Jazīrī was the Kurdish poet who established this art in Kurdish poetry and thus became both a great master of *ġazal* and the founder of classical Kurdish poetry.

The number of the *bayt*s (distiches) in a *ġazal* is usually between five and 19. Nevertheless, it happens that a poet writes a *ġazal* with more than 19 *bayt*s and up to 70 *bayt*s. Mutābčī estimates that the *ġazal*s of Jazīrī with 5–19 *bayt*s are 90 in number, and those that exceed 19 *bayt*s are 15 in number.

There are undoubtedly many other articles and studies that deal wholly or in part with the life and poetry of Malā-yē Jazīrī. The reason why I have not included them here is either that I did not have access to them or that I consider them of less importance to this study.

2.5 Final Remarks on Jazīrī's *Dīwān*

Jazīrī's *Dīwān* has been published and republished several times since the beginning of the last century. Among all the *dīwān*s of Kurdish poets, it is the one that is most often edited. Nevertheless, no critical edition based on philological study and historical research of the text has yet been produced. When it comes to the authenticity of the pronunciation of words and the correct readings of verses according to the prosody, Zivingī's edition stands as the most reliable of the nine editions to which I presently have access. Moreover, it is now obvious that most of the later editions were largely dependent on Zivingī's edition. Accordingly, Zivingī's edition will be the main one used in this study, and the other editions will be consulted only for the purpose of comparison and collation.

The most important part of the *Dīwān*, and thus the largest number of the *ġazal*s and *qaṣīda*s, is common to all the manuscripts and editions. This part contains approximately to 90–95% of Jazīrī's poems. In addition, the two *mukālama* poems and the long poem "*Allāh Saḥargāh-ā Azal*…" are included in most editions. The latter is apparently a didactic *qaṣīda*, which was composed as an independent work, for educational or practical use in Sufi circles.

It is a tradition, especially in Persian literature, for a poet to begin a *dīwān* with a series of poems, praising God (*munājāt*) and the Prophet Muḥammad

(*naʿt*). It seems that Jazīrī did not want to follow this tradition, although there are several poems in the *Dīwān* that approach the divine love in Sufi terms.

The structural aspects of a classical (Oriental) *dīwān* are of the utmost importance when studying a poet's works. Mapping the prosody of a *dīwān* is essential to understanding the formal framework into which the content is "poured". Furthermore, an Oriental poet is not only appreciated for his/her linguistic or metaphorical use of words, but also for his/her skill in the use of poetic meters and rhyme.

The *Dīwān* of Malā-yē Jazīrī has been published several times, as described in this chapter. There are also many studies of Jazīrī's poetry in which various aspects of his work are discussed. It is nevertheless remarkable that until recently there has not been a single study of the prosodic forms of Jazīrī's poems. A significant work in this regard, though not confined to Jazīrī's *Dīwān*, is an encyclopaedic book by Dr ʿAzīz Gardī (1948–2022) in which he mapped the poetic products of 82 classical Kurdish poets whose poems have been published in books (*dīwān*s) from the beginning and until the present day (Gardī, 2003). In this study, it is my ambition to convey an impression of the prosodic form of Jazīrī's poems and to study the thoughts, metaphors and fantastic features they contain.

I will not address such questions as the number of the poems in different editions of Jazīrī's *Dīwān*, or the absence of a particular text in one edition or another. I am not preparing a new edition of Jazīrī's *Dīwān*, but it is my hope that I can present the aesthetic values of the poems a comprehensive study of the poet's Sufi ideas and the artistic expressions and forms in which those ideas are presented.

Chapter 3: Structural Aspects of Jazīrī's Poetry

3.1 The *Dīwān*

The word *dīwān* is a loan word in Arabic, Turkish and some other languages, and has its roots in the Iranian languages, but it is believed that the word was borrowed into Iranian languages from Akkadian and ultimately from Sumerian (de Blois, 2011: 432). The earlier and current usage of the word is "associated with words, letters, records, and a particular kind of seat associated with high rank, contemplation, conversation, and leisure culture" (Shamel, 2012: 371).

In the field of Oriental-Islamic literature, the word denotes the collected poems of a particular poet, except for his or her epic poems (*Maṯnawī*s). The poems in a *dīwān* are arranged in most manuscripts and modern editions according to poetic form (with *qaṣīda*s first, then *ġazal*s, *qiṭ ʿa*s, and finally *rubā ʿī*s). The poems within a section are arranged alphabetically. The last letter of the rhyming lines nearly always determines the place of a poem in the section.

The *Dīwān* of Malā-yē Jazīrī is the first book of poetry written by a Kurdish poet in the Kurdish language, that contains the main poetic forms such as *qaṣīda*, *ġazal*, *rubā ʿī*, *tarkīb-band*, etc., which are composed in various metres of the Arabo-Persian *ʿarūḍ* system. It has been read, studied and circulated in educated circles, especially among the clerics, Sufis and members of the ruling families in Kurdistan since the time of the poet. At the beginning and until the first decade of the 20th century, it existed in manuscript form. A very limited edition of Jazīrī's poems, only one hundred copies, was published by Martin Hartmann in Berlin in 1904. There is no information to confirm that any copies have reached Kurdistan.

Jazīrī uses the word *dīwān* eight times in his poetry; four times to denote state council, three times to denote the *dīwān* style used in calligraphy, and only once to denote a collection of poems, referring to his own *Dīwān*:

> *Hēž sahw-ā xāmayē bū, warna min*
> *Av ġalaṭ nākir di dīwānē ġalaṭ* (ZdJ: 335)
>
> This was, after all, an error of the pen, otherwise,
> I would not have inadvertently made this mistake in the *Dīwān*.

Many years later we find the word *dīwān,* referring to Jazīrī's poetry in *Mam u Zīn* by Aḥmad-ē Xānī (1962: 35), where he refers to three Kurdish poets, of

whom only Jazīrī was known for having a *Dīwān*. Alexandre Jaba, in his book, published in the mid-19th century, also emphasizes the importance of Jazīrī's *Dīwān* and that it was of an elegant style and very popular among the Kurds. (Jaba, 1860: 14).

The poems in Jazīrī's *Dīwān* are not arranged in exactly the traditional way used in Oriental *dīwān*s. The *qaṣīda*s and the *ġazal*s are not separated into different sections, but are grouped together and arranged alphabetically according to the last letter of the rhyme, with minor differences in arrangement in the different editions. These are followed by *tarjīʿ-band* and *tarkīb-band* poems, and then the *mukālamāt*, followed by *rubāʿī*s, which are very few in number. Headings to the poems are generally lacking both in the manuscripts and in the printed editions.

There is a great similarity between the manuscripts and the printed editions of Jazīrī's *Dīwān* in the way the poems are arranged. This suggests that the number of original manuscripts that were the main sources for later copied manuscripts and printed editions may have been very limited. The differences between the manuscripts mainly lie in the number of the poems included and in some cases the number of distiches, while the similarity between the texts is striking. In a few cases, the differences are so insignificant that they concern the dotting of characters or the use of diacritical marks.

The following is a table that shows the number of poems and distiches in four manuscripts and six printed editions of Jazīrī's *Dīwān.*

MSS + editions	No. of poems	No. of distiches
Oxford-Bodleian	119	1964
Hartmann (Ms.)	96	1565
Jazīra copy	115	1781
The anthology	118	1870
Arwāsī	137	2189
Zivingī	129	2052
Hažār	108 + 10	1974
Āmēdī	128	2109
Doskī, TI-1	122	2140
Doskī, MA	125	2127

The statistical information in this table should be regarded as approximate, since the calculation is not completely accurate. This is due to the fact that Jazīrī uses various poetic forms, some of which have different principles than those followed in writing ġazal *or qaṣīda*, such as *tarjīʿ-band* and *tarkīb-band*. *Taxmīs* and *tasdīs* are partly based on poems by other poets. The two *mukālama*s consist of couplets each of three distiches, by which Jazīrī and the poet with whom he corresponds, successively address each other.

The longest poem in Jazīrī's *Dīwān*, *Allāh Saḥargāh-ā azal yalmūm-ē ʿišqē šuʿla dā* (At the dawn of eternity, Allāh kindled the torch of love), which consists of 142 distiches, is treated in Hartmann's manuscript edition (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1904: 2–20) and some other printed editions as an independent text rather than as part of the *Dīwān*. Even Hažār, in his edition (1982: 585), considers only the 108 poems published on pages 3–584 as undoubtedly belonging to Malā-yē Jazīrī. He therefore excludes 10 other poems, published separately on pp. 586–626, and justifies his retention of them (ibid: 585) on the grounds that they are "Kurdish poems and a part of national heritage that should not be lost."

Jazīrī's literary production seems very small when compared with that of poets like Sanāʾī (d. 1131) Saʿdī (1210–1291), Ḥāfiẓ (1315–1390 CE), or Jāmī (1414–1492). He lived for some seventy years, which is a relatively long life for a person who devotes his life only to writing and practising Sufi rituals. What we have inherited from Jazīrī is only a book of poems consisting of some 2,000–2,500 distiches. Judging from what we have at our disposal at present, it is believed that he did not write any *maṯnawī*s or any prose texts.

3.2. Poetic Forms in Jazīrī's *Dīwān*

There are obviously great similarities in the forms of classical poetry among the different languages and literatures of the Muslim peoples. This is because these forms are mostly borrowed from the same source, namely Arabic poetry and language. Even the names of the poetic forms, such as *ġazal*, *qaṣīda*, *rubāʿī*, etc, are almost completely preserved in these languages. Nevertheless, it is also clear that the poets of these languages and literatures developed and modified these forms in their own ways to make them appropriate to their languages and cultures.

Persian poets were in the forefront of all others in coming into contact with Arabic poetry and borrowing poetic forms and themes, which they adapted and made suitable for their language. These poetic forms spread from Persian to many other peoples and languages, from the Balkans to Bengal. Despite the similarities, it is also true that the definition of these poetic forms varies among different critics and researchers. The following is a short review of the definitions of only the two main poetic forms, *ġazal* and *qaṣīda*, in terms of the structure or body of the text and the theme:

3.2.1. *Ġazal*

According to Gibb (1900: 80), a *ġazal* is a short poem of not fewer than four and not more than fifteen couplets, with five to ten being the average number. The limits of a *ġazal* are more flexible in another definition, which assumes that the average number is between five and twelve and sometimes up to fifteen and sixteen distiches, but rarely up to nineteen *bayt*s (Humāyī, 1992:

124). Thiesen (1982: 79) holds that a *ġazal* is rarely longer than fifteen *abyat*. Andrews (1976: 136), writing about Ottoman poetry, estimates that "a very high percentage of *ġazal*s are either 5 or 7 *beyt*s in length". He bases his conclusions on an informal survey of several published *divans* indicating that "more than 80% of *ġazal*s in the *divans* examined are of these two lengths". Gardī (1999: 257) is of the opinion that the number of the distiches of a *ġazal*, at least in Kurdish, should be odd (5, 7, 9, 11, 13, and 15). Obviously, this is not the case, whether in Kurdish or in any other language.

The conventional structure of a *ġazal* implies that it begins with a rhymed distich called *maṭlaʿ*, in which the two hemistiches are *muṣarraʿ*, i. e. rhyme together. The following couplets are not *muṣarraʿ*, but all their second hemistiches have the same rhyme as in the first couplet, the *maṭlaʿ*, while their first lines do not rhyme at all. A *ġazal* is thus a monorhyming poem. The order of the couplets, in terms of rhyme, is as follows: AA, BA, CA, DA, EA, etc. The last couplet in a *ġazal* is called *maqṭaʿ*, in which the poet uses his pen name, "though the pen name at times occurs in the penultimate *bayt* as well". The second *bayt* in a *ġazal*, the one immediately follows the *maṭlaʿ*, is called *ḥusn-i maṭlaʿ* (beauty of the *maṭlaʿ*), and the couplet immediately preceding the *maqṭaʿ* is called *ḥusn-i maqṭaʿ* (beauty of the *maqṭaʿ*). Almost all sources (e.g. Šamīsā, 2007: 286; Gardī, 1999: 255) agree that the *ġazal* was the introductory part of the *qaṣīda*, but eventually it became an independent genre, which is why a *ġazal* is shorter than a *qaṣīda*.

As to the themes of the *ġazal*, Gibb (1900: 81), emphasizing mainly the Ottoman *ġazal*, writes that "love in all its manifold phases – the charms of the beloved, the rapture caused by her presence, the anguish born of her absence or her harshness – this forms the true and proper subject of the Ghazel." This idea is also stressed in relation to the Persian *ġazal*; "the *ġazal* has been the form of love poetry. This is to say that *ġazal* is essentially the language of love. As we mentioned earlier, mystical themes are also often expressed in a love contexture" (Šamīsā, 1991: 250). The author extends this statement to compare human love and mystical love in the *ġazal* when he writes (ibid: 279): "The most important types of *ġazal* are love and mystical *ġazal*s. In the lyrical *ġazal*, the human being and nature are the essence and in the mystical *ġazal* the human being and the metaphysics are the essence."

Another important feature of the *ġazal* is that "the several couplets stand in no direct relationship to one another or […] might be arranged in any order without affecting the general sense of the poem" (Gibb, 1900: 82).

3.2.2. *Qaṣīda*

Gibb (1900: 83) indicates that a *qaṣīda* theoretically contains not less than thirty and not more than ninety-nine couplets. Humāyī (1992: 102) specifies the limits of an average *qaṣīda* as being between twenty and seventy or eighty *bayt*s, and sometimes up to one hundred and fifty. Moreover, he points out

that poems with even less than twenty and up to the limits of fifteen and sixteen *bayt*s are also called *qaṣīda*. He later adds (ibid: 104) that the lowest limit can be twenty *bayt*s, or just over fifteen and sixteen *bayt*s. Thiesen (1982: 80) describes a *qaṣīda* as "rarely less than twenty *abyat* and it may extend to as many *abyāt* as the ingenuity of the poet allows, sometimes more than a hundred and fifty."

The *qaṣīda* is similar in form to the *ġazal*, but is much longer. The traditional *qaṣīda*, especially in Arabic, begins with a lyrical section that is similar to a *ġazal* and is therefore called *taġazzul* or *nasīb*. The order of the verses of the introductory part of the *qaṣīda*, contrary to the *ġazal*, cannot be changed, for this would affect the sense. The *qaṣīda*, according to Thiesen's definition (ibid), "may have any subject matter, mystical, didactic, epic, etc". Scott-Meisami's description of the subjects of a *qaṣīda* is stricter. She writes (Scott-Meisami 1987: 48): "Although numerous examples exist of *qaṣīdahs* containing only encomium, equally numerous are those constructed on the polythematic model of *nasib*, *raḥīl* (often eliminated by Persian poets), and *madīḥ*, as well as the concluding *duʿā* or prayer for the well-being of the patron." Gardī's (1999: 257) conclusion in this regard seems realistic when he states that "the *ġazal* is mostly devoted to the inner feelings of the poet who addresses his own soul, whereas the *qaṣīda* is devoted to the external world, and the poet addresses either a person, whom he praises or the nature, which he describes."

In the absence of any firm evidence, it seems likely the view that Kurdish *qaṣīda*s existed before the time of Malā-yē Jazīrī will remain impossible to prove. Whatever the truth of such views, the quality of Jazīrī's poetry has earned him such a dominant position in Kurdish literature that it seems unlikely that there were earlier poets who could be compared to him. On the other hand, the very excellence of Jazīrī's poetry raises questions about the sources of his art. Was his path as a poet paved by his considerable knowledge of Sufism and of the Arabic, Persian and Turkish poetic traditions? Did he start any writing in one of these languages? And if so, why did he switch to Kurdish? Even more interestingly, what was involved in the process of "Kurdifying" classical Arabic and Persian poetry? The task of finding answers to these questions is one of the main challenges facing students of Kurdish literature, and is likely to remain so for some time.

Indeed it is not easy to distinguish between the *qaṣīda*s and the *ġazal*s of Jazīrī, unless one uses the number of distiches as a measure, which cannot always provide a correct assessment. A rough count indicates that the *Dīwān* contains about 120 poems. There are about 21 "real" *qaṣīda*s, i.e. poems of more than 18 verses (*bayt*), the longest consisting of 142 verses. There are also about 25 poems of between 15 and 18 verses. It is difficult to decide whether the poems of this group should be classified as *qaṣīda*s or as *ġazal*s. The difficulty arises not only regarding the form, but also in terms of themes and organization, since the traditional divisions and fixed order of the classical *qaṣīda* do not seem to apply to a large number of Jazīrī's *qaṣīda*s.

Among those who have written about Jazīrī, Amīn ʿAlī Mutabčī is evidently the most determined regarding the forms of Jazīrī's poems. He states (Mutabčī, 1994: 15) that "Jazīrī's *ġazal*s are between 5 and 19 *bayt*s. Although he deviated from the rules and wrote *ġazal*s consisting of 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 49 and 58 *bayt*s, if we reckon the number of *bayt*s as evidence, then these poems are *qaṣīda*s, whereas the themes, the contents and the purposes are those of the *ġazal*, and therefore we consider them to be *ġazal*s". He concludes that apart from the verse forms other than *qaṣīda* and *ġazal*, the only poem in Jazīrī's *Dīwān* that could be considered a *qaṣīda* rather than a *ġazal*, is his longest poem, which consists of 142 *bayt*s. This conclusion is undoubtedly incorrect, for we find in Jazīrī's *Dīwān* at least two panegyrics, of 22 and 23 *bayt*s respectively, the theme of which is praise to a Kurdish ruler. There are also few other poems that deal mostly with mystical or philosophical subjects and could be regarded as *qaṣīda*s. Moreover, it seems very unconventional to consider a poem with 28, 42, 45, 51 or 58 distiches as a *ġazal*, whatever the theme may be.

Jazīrī himself usually uses the word *šiʿr* when describing his poems, as in the following verse:

> *Sikka-yē šiʿr-ā ma bi nāv-ē ta hāt*
> *Law bi ʿiyārē di jahān dā rawāj* (ZdJ: 175).
>
> Our poetry is stamped with your name
> Therefore, with its standard, it circulates in the world

In one of his poems, which consists of fifteen *bayt*s, he calls the poem a *ġazal*, as if he wants to assure readers that it is a *ġazal* and not a *qaṣīda*:

> *Wara bē parda Malā, vē ġazalē bēna maqām!*
> *Har damā bēna samā daf bi daf u* čang *bi* čang (ZdJ: 394).
>
> Come, Malā, without barrier (curtain), and bring this *ġazal* to the assembly.
> For every time the tambourines and harps begin to dance side by side (hearing your poetry).

Moreover, he also uses the word *naẓm*, 'verse/strung words' (literally 'order'), when referring to and praising his own poetry:

> *Naqšēn falakān guh didirin vē naẓmē*
> *Tanhā na bašar har dikirin taḥsinē* (ZdJ: 761)
>
> The ornaments of the skies (the stars) listen to this verse,
> It is not only human beings who admire this poetry.

The rest of the *Dīwān* consists of *ġazal*s, plus a few each of other genres (*musammaṭ, rubāʿī, tarkīb-band* and *tarjīʿ-band*). Reading the poems written in these poetic forms, one sometimes gets the impression that Jazīrī wrote them assuming it was his artistic duty to include them in his *Dīwān*, thus fulfilling the requirements of a good poet. It is not known whether Jazīrī ever wrote a *maṯnawī*.

3.2.3. *Rubāʿī*

Traditionally, a *rubāʿī* consists of two distiches, in which the first, second and fourth hemstitches rhyme with each other, while the third hemistich does not. The structure is:

1. - - - -a
2. - - - -a
3. - - - -x
4. - - - -a

In different editions of Jazīrī's *Dīwān* we find different numbers of *rubāʿī*s (*rubāʿīyyāt* in the plural), quatrains. The oldest edition (by Hartmann) contains 16 *rubāʿī*s, but at the same time the scribe includes two separate verses, with the same rhyme and rhythm, which he considers to be two *fard* verses (one single distich each), without any explanation. These two distiches are indeed connected and form a *rubāʿī*, which makes the number of the *rubāʿī*s in that edition 17, not 16.

The immediately following edition (by Arwāsī) does not include any *rubāʿī*s. In the editions by Zivingī and Hažār we find three *rubāʿī*s each, the texts of which are identical with each other. Āmēdī's edition contains16 *rubāʿī*s. Like the scribe of Hartmann's manuscript, he also includes two couplets, which he considers to be two separate *fard* verses, whereas they form one *rubāʿī*.

In all of Jazīrī's *rubāʿī*s, the four hemstitches rhyme with each other. The rhyme scheme is thus:

1. - - - -a
2. - - - -a
3. - - - -a
4. - - - -a

This type of *rubāʿī* is called a *rubāʿī-ye muṣarraʿ* (Rhymed Quatrain).

3.2.4. *Mustazād*

A *mustazād* "is formed by adding to each *miṣrāʿ* or hemistich in a piece of verse a short line called the *ziyāde*" (Gibb, 1900: 87). The original poem to which a short line is added must be written in the *hazaj* metre, Gibb (1900: 88) asserts and the *miṣrāʿ* must scan:

(– – v / v – – v / v – – v / v – –)

And the *ziyāde* must scan:

mafʿūlu / faʿūlun: – – v / v – –

Jazīrī has only one *mustazād* poem in his *Dīwān*. He based his *mustazād* on an Arabic poem and followed the rules of the *mustazād* literally. Zivingī (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1987: 841) suspects that the poem is not Jazīrī's, but borrowed from another contemporary poet, a contemporary named Aḥmad Pāshā ibn al-Mawlā Waliy al-Dīn al-Ḥusainī (d. 902 AH/ 1496 CE), and that Jazīrī added just a few lines that may be his.

Moreover he believes that even Aḥmad Pāshā, in turn, borrowed his poem from another poet called al-Mawlā Xidir Bag bin Jalāl al-Dīn (d. 863 AH/ 1458 CE). He published the poems of both Aḥmad Pāshā and Mawlā Xidir. Apparently, Jazīrī added just two verses of his own to Aḥmad Pāshā's poem. The other five verses are identical with those of the Pāshā.

3.2.5. Stanza Forms: *Tarjīʿ-band* and *Tarkīb-band*

Tarjīʿ-band and *tarkīb-band* are poems consisting of a series of stanzas called *tarjīʿ-xāna* and *tarkīb-xāna* respectively. These are composed in the same metre, but with different rhymes, although each stanza has monorhyme. The number of couplets in each stanza is the same, and is never less than five and rarely more than ten. The stanzas are separated by a couplet, "which has the same metre as the rest of the poem, and may or may not rhyme with the opening stanza. This rhyming couplet is called the *wāsiṭa* or link" (Gibb, 1900: 90). The only difference between a *tarjīʿ-band* and a *tarkīb-band* is the couplet, which is unvarying in a *tarjīʿ-band*, but varies in a *tarkīb-band*.

The most notable, but at the same time the most confusing, forms in Jazīrī's *Dīwān* are the stanza forms *tarjīʿ-band* and *tarkīb-band*. The number of the poems in Jazīrī's *Dīwān* that can be classified as *tarjīʿ-band* or *tarkīb-band* or both of them at the same time is five. This uncertainty in the designation is due to the fact that the poet does not strictly adhere to the rules that poets regarding these forms in classical poetry are supposed to follow. He exercises a sort of creative freedom and experimentalism by changing the forms. Even

the editors of Jazīrī's *Dīwān* appear to have been undecided about the classification of those five poems. Zivingī (p. 821), Hažār (p. 520) and Āmēdī (p. 507) use the term *tarjīʿ-band* for only one of the poems.

It is generally believed that "the *tarjīʿ-band* and *tarkīb-band* are much used for elegies; they are also employed for mystical, philosophical and contemplative poetry in general" (Gibb, 1900: 91). Jazīrī employs the two forms for philosophical and contemplative themes, but not for elegies.

It should also be noted that these stanzaic poems occupy a large space in Jazīrī's *Dīwān*. The total number of verses in these five poems is about 300, which is more than an eighth of the entire Dīwān.

What follows is a survey of the five poems meant to illustrate how the poet deviated from the classical definitions of tarjīʿ-band and tarkīb-band. The poems are labelled "TB" followed by a number from 1 to 5, and the first verse of each poem is given in transcription, scanning and translation:

TB-1

Ṣabāḥ ul-xayr-i Xān-ē min
Šah-ē šīrīnzabān-ē min (ZdJ: 769).

(v – – –/ v – – –)
hazaj-i murabbaʿ-i sālim

Good morning my Prince,
My sweet-spoken king.

This poem consists of nine stanzas, and each stanza contains four verses, to which two verses are added as the wāsiṭa (link) that separates the stanzas from each other. Every two verses in the stanzas rhyme with each other in all four hemstitches. As for the wāsiṭa, the second verse is unvarying throughout the poem. This is also true of the second hemistich of the first verse of the wāsiṭa, but only the words of the first hemistich vary in each wāsiṭa, and it always rhymes with the second hemistich. The two hemstitches of the second verse of the wāsiṭa do not rhyme with each other or with any verse in the stanzas throughout the poem. The scheme of every stanza in the poem is as follows:

1: - - - -A - - - -A
2: - - - -A - - - -A
3: - - - -B - - - -B
4: - - - -B - - - -B

The *wāsiṭa* verses, on the other hand, are arranged in the following way:

1: - - - -C - - - -C
2: - - - -D - - - -E

What changes in each stanza is that the rhymes of the four verses become FFFF and GGGG and so on, whereas the rhyme in the two *wāsiṭa* verses are not changed; only the words of the first hemistich in the first verse vary.

If one examines this poem against the conventional background formed by the generally accepted definitions, as mentioned above, one sees that it deviates from most of the rules. In the following comparison, four criteria are given, against which the stanzaic poems of Jazīrī are examined:

a) Every stanza is monorhyming: in this poem, none of the stanzas is monorhyming, but every two verses are monorhyming.
b) The number of couplets in each stanza is never less than five: here the number of couplets in each stanza is four.
c) The stanzas are separated by a couplet: the stanzas in this poem are separated by two couplets.
d) Regarding the couplet called *wāsiṭa*, and whether it is varying or unvarying, it depends on how we interpret the term. If it is means that the rhyme of the couplet is varying or unvarying, then the rhyme is unvarying in both couplets, and the poem could be called a *tarkīb-band*. However, since the first hemistich of the first verse of the *wāsiṭa* varies in its words every time it is repeated after each of the nine stanzas, the poem could be called a *tarjīʿ-band*.

TB-2

Ṣanam-ā sur ži Ṣamad, šawq-i ži Ḥaq dāya wujūdē
Gar ʿAzāzīl-i bidītā nadibir ġayr-i sujūdē, (ZdJ: 779)

(– v – – / v v – – / v v – – / v v – –)
Ramal-i muṯamman-i maxbūn

If *ʿAzazīl* (Satan) had noticed how the venerable idol, by the will of the Lord,
Beamed upon existence,
He would do nothing but prostrate himself (before Adam).

This poem comprises five stanzas, the first of which has six verses, whereas the other four have five verses. The stanzas do not rhyme with each other, but the verses in each stanza are monorhyming, not only in the second half of their verses, but also in both halves throughout the whole poem. Each stanza is followed by a couplet that is repeated, unvaryingly, throughout the poem. The first stanza begins and ends with this couplet, which explains why it consists of six verses. The second half of the last verse of each stanza rhymes with the following *wāsiṭa* couplet. The poem has all the qualities required to be called a *tarjīʿ-band*.

TB-3

Ṣanam-ā sur ži Ṣamad, nay-šakar-ā lab ži nabāt
Aḥsana Allāhu tabārak ži sur-ā wē ṣanamē (ZdJ: 790)

(– v – – / v v – – / v v – – / v v –)
Ramal-i muṯamman-i maxbun

The venerable idol, whose beauty is from the Lord,
is like a sugar cane, and his/her lips are like rock candy
God be blessed, how venerable (attractive) is that idol.

This poem is similar to the previous poem in many ways. It comprises five stanzas, first of which has seven couplets and the rest six couplets each. The stanzas have different rhymes, but each stanza has monorhyme, not only in the second half of the verses, but also in both halves throughout the poem. It is striking that two stanzas in each of the poems have a number of similar rhyming words: *-st* (five times) and *-arī* (six times).

Unlike the previous poems, the *wāsiṭa* here, consists of three lines (hemstichs) that make one and a half couplet. The three hemstitches rhyme with each other throughout the poem, but the first hemistich varies in its vocabulary after every stanza. The same uncertainty expressed about TB-1, as to whether it is a *tarjīʿ-band* or a *tarkīb-band*, also applies here.

TB-4

Īro mi dī waqt-ē saḥar
Aw dilbar-ā sundus di bar (ZdJ: 804)

(– – v – / – – v –)
rajaz-i murabbaʿ-i sālim

Today, at dawn, I saw
That beloved who was donned with silk brocade.

This poem (TB-4) has 12 stanzas and each stanza consists of seven couplets followed by the *wāsiṭa*, a couplet which is repeated throughout the poem. The stanzas have different rhymes, but every stanza is monorhyming, not only in the second half of their verses, but also in both halves throughout the poem. The second hemistich of the *wāsiṭa* does not vary in rhyme, but the first hemistich rhymes with the preceding verses of the stanza. In most editions the number of stanzas is twelve, but in Hažār's edition (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1982: 608–613) the number of the stanzas is ten. This poem is a *tarkīb-band*.

TB-5

Ma bi dil nērgiziyēn xāṣṣa divēn
Saman u yāsaman-ē tāza divēn (ZdJ: 821)

(v v – – / v v – – / vv –)
ramal-i musaddas-i maxbūn-i maḥḏūf

With all our hearts we want narcissus of the best quality,
We want new and succulent clover and jasmine.

In most editions, this poem consists of six stanzas with the first four stanzas comprising eleven verses, and the last two stanzas thirteen verses each. In Hažārs edition (ibid: 534–539) the number of the stanzas is five and each is made up of eleven verses. The stanzas are followed by a *wāsiṭa* consisting of three hemstitches, i.e. one and a half couplets. In two editions (Zivingī and Amēdī), the *wāsiṭa* after the last stanza consists of the last two hemstitches of the *wāsiṭa* that follows the other five stanzas.

For some unexplained reason, a hemistich is apparently lacking in the last verse of the last stanza, and the first hemistich of the *wāsiṭa* is inserted there, reducing the number of hemstitches of the *wāsiṭa* to two. The stanzas do not rhyme with each other, but each stanza has monorhyme in both hemstitches of each couplet. The three hemstitches of the *wāsiṭa* also rhyme with each other, but not with the stanzas, and the first one varies its words each time it follows a stanza.

Gardī (1999: 280) thinks that this poem is a kind of combination of three verse forms, namely *musammaṭ*, *tarjīʿ-band* and *tarkīb-band*. Mutābčī (1994: 14) describes the form as an artistic creation that should be attributed to Malā-yē Jazīrī.

3.2.6. *Murabbaʿ* and *Tarbīʿ*

The *murabbaʿ* "foursome" is a form of poetry "consisting of a succession of four-line stanzas called Bend or 'Tie'" (Gibb, 1900: 91). The fourth line of the first stanza and the way in which it is used in the following stanzas, is essential for distinguishing two types of *murabbaʿ*:

a. If the fourth line of the first stanza is repeated in its entirety as the fourth line of each following stanza, the poem is called a *murabbaʿ-i mutakarrir* (repeating foursome). The scheme of this form, according to Andrews (1976: 160) is aaaR/ bbbR/ cccR/ etc (R: refrain, repeated line).
b. If the fourth lines rhyme together, but vary in each stanza, the poem is called *murabbaʿ-i muzdawij* (pairing foursome), the scheme of which (ibid) is: aaaa/ bbba/ ccca/ etc.

The fourth line of the first stanza, as Gibb (ibid) indicates, "may or may not rhyme with the other three which must all rhyme together. But whatever be the rhyme of the fourth line of the first stanza, that rhyme must be repeated in the fourth line of every succeeding stanza, while the first three lines of each of these must take a new rhyme."

Jazīrī has a poem that consists of eight stanzas and is constructed as a *murabbaʿ-i muzdawij* (pairing foursome), although he deviates greatly from the rules and principles mentioned above. The second stanza is as follows:

Wardān gulāv girtin xunāv, lē min di tāv, sohtin hināv
Min dî bi čāv zulfēn balāv, lē bûna dāv, band kir bi nāv
Nûr-ā baṣar, guft u xabar qand u šakar zulfān ži sar
Xālēn di qar bāvē saḥar dā bēta dar ṣubḥ-ā bi ḥaq (ZdJ: 362)

(– – v – / – – v – / – – v – / – – v –)
Rajaz-i muṯamman-i sālim

The roses caught dewdrops as rosewater,
but I, in the heat, my insides were burnt,
I saw with my own eyes the tresses were spread out.
turned into snares (and nets), for the cheeks,
You, the light of eyes, whose speech is as candy and sugar,
Remove the tresses
From the black mole at dawn,
That the true dawn may appear.

The scheme of the strophes follows this order: AA-XB, CC-XB, DD-XB, etc., which means that the first three lines do not rhyme together. The exceptions are the first and the fourth stanzas. In the first stanza, the second and the fourth lines rhyme, and the same rhyme is repeated in the fourth lines of all the stanzas. The scheme of the first stanza is: AB-XB. The first three lines of the fourth stanza rhyme with each other, making it the only stanza in the poem that follows the rules of constructing a *murabbaʿ*. In the other stanzas, it is only the first two lines that rhyme together, while the third line is free, but the rhyme of the fourth line in the first stanza is repeated in the fourth line of each subsequent stanza.

Even in this poem, Jazīrī uses internal rhyme, not only in every half hemistich, but also in every foot of the hemistich. The first strophe of the poem is structured as follows:

1. - - - -A - - - -A - - - -A - - - -A
2. - - - -A - - - -A - - - -A - - - -B
3. - - - -C - - - -C - - - -C - - - -C
4. - - - -C - - - -C - - - -C - - - -B

In the following strophes, except for the fourth, the structure becomes stricter, since all four feet of the second lines of the first distich are also bound to the same rhyme of the first line:

1. - - - -D - - - -D - - - -D - - - -D
2. - - - -D - - - -D - - - -D - - - -D
3. - - - -E - - - -E - - - -E - - - -E
4. - - - -E - - - -E - - - -E - - - -B

The fourth strophe is the strictest one in terms of internal rhyme, where all four feet of each line of the first distich, the four feet of the first line of the second distich, and the first three feet of the second line of the second distich rhyme with one another. Only the fourth foot of the second line of the second distich has the main rhyme of the poem. This means that of the sixteen feet of the strophe, fifteen of them have the same rhyme. The scheme is as follows:

1. - - - -F - - - -F - - -F- - - -F
2. - - - -F - - - -F - - -F- - - -F
3. - - - -F - - - -F - - -F- - - -F
4. - - - -F - - - -F - - -F- - - -B

Tarbīʿ, an Arabic loan word found in Persian, Kurdish and Turkish, denotes the process of building a *murabbaʿ*, or turning a poetic text into a *murabbaʿ*. It is a stanzaic form of poetry consisting of four hemstitches, the first two of which, (i.e. the first couplet, which is called the *ḍamīma* or "addendum",) belong to the poet, whereas the last two hemstichs, (i.e. the second couplet,) belong to another poet, on whose poem, usually a *ġazal*, the *murabbaʿ* (the foursome) is built. In some cases, the new poet chooses only one hemstitch, usually the second line of a couplet, called the *ʿajz*, of another poet's *ġazal*, to which he adds three hemstitches of his own. This form is, indeed, a deviation from the standard form of *tarbīʿ*. The added hemstitches, be they two or three, must be in the same metre as the poem on which they are built.

As for the rhyme words of a *tarbīʿ*, the first two hemstichs rhyme with each other. If the poet adds two lines, these two must rhyme in the first stanza with the *maṭlaʿ* of the *ġazal* he is working on, but in the following stanzas, the two lines must rhyme with the first hemistich of each distich of the *ġazal* taken as a basis. If the poet adds three lines, the same rule applies, but the third line may or may not rhyme with the second line of the other poet's distich, which is the rhyme word of the whole poem.

The difficulty in the *tarbīʿ*, Gibb indicates (ibid: 92), is "to make the *Ḍamīma* blend naturally and gracefully with the lines to which it is prefixed; it should so harmonise with these both in feeling and in language that the whole poem appears to be the work of one and the same writer."

Jazīrī bases one of his poems, a *murabbaʿ*, on one of the best known *ġazal*s of Ḥāfiẓ, namely *Alā yā ayyuhā al-sāqī*. The structure of Jazīrī's poem is unique in many respects. Ḥāfiẓ's *ġazal* consists of seven couplets, but Jazīrī's poem has eight stanzas, each comprising four hemstitches, three of which are added by Jazīrī and the fourth is taken from Ḥāfiẓ's *ġazal*. In the first and second stanzas, Jazīrī adds three lines to each of the two hemstitches of the *maṭlaʿ* of Ḥāfiẓ's *ġazal*, whereas in the rest of the poem, he chooses only the last hemistich, the *ʿajz*, of each couplet of Ḥāfiẓ's *ġazal*. The first stanza is as follows:

Nawā-yā muṭrib u čangē, fiġān āvēta xarčangē
Wara sāqī ḥatā kangē našoyīn dil ži vē žangē?
Ḥayāt-ā dil, may-ā bāqī, binošīn dā bi muštāqī
Alā yā ayyuhā al-sāqī adir kaʾsan wa nāwilhā (ZdJ: 2).

(v – – – / v – – – / v – – – / v – – –)
Hazaj-i muṯamman-i sālim

The voice of the singer and the sound of the harp,
have brought a clamour to the sign of Cancer,
Come, cupbearer! How long shall we not wash
this rust from our hearts?
Let us eagerly drink the life of the heart, the remaining wine!
O wine-bearer, bring forth the cup and hand it to me!

The two lines of the first couplet in every stanza rhyme, but the third line does not rhyme, at least in external appearance, with either the preceding lines or the next line. The rhyme word of the fourth line is the rhyme word of Ḥāfiẓ's *ġazal* and thus the main rhyme word at the end of every stanza throughout Jazīrī's poem. The scheme of the stanzas is thus AA-XB, CC-XB, DD-XB, etc. Examining the poem more closely, one deduces that Jazīrī uses internal rhyme in each half line in all the first three lines. The four half lines of the first couplet rhyme with each other, while the two half lines of the third hemistich also rhyme with each other, but at the same time also rhyme with the first half line in Ḥāfiẓ's hemistich. The scheme of the four lines in every stanza, in terms of internal rhyme words, is as follows:

The first stanza:
1. - - - -A - - - -A
2. - - - -A - - - -A
3. - - - -B - - - -B
4. - - - -B - - - -C

The second stanza:
1. - - - -D - - - -D

2. - - - -D - - - -D
3. - - - -E - - - -E
4. - - - -E - - - -C

An artistic and linguistic invention in Jazīrī's *tarbīʿ* is the use of three languages in the poem, Kurdish, Persian and Arabic. The fourth lines of all the eight stanzas are those of Ḥāfiẓ, and therefore the fourth lines of the first and the last (the eighth) stanzas, are in Arabic, since Ḥāfiẓ originally wrote them in Arabic. Indeed, it is believed that he borrowed the first line of his *ġazal* from a poem composed by Yazīd ibn Muʿāwiya (26–64 AH/647–683 CE). The other six stanzas end with the Persian lines of Ḥāfiẓ.

The three lines added by Jazīrī in every stanza begin with two lines in Kurdish, while the third lines alternate between the three languages. The third lines in the first, second, sixth and seventh stanzas are in Kurdish. In the third, fourth and fifth stanzas they are in Persian, and the third line of the eighth stanza is in Arabic. The scheme of the poem regarding the use of languages (A: Arabic, K: Kurdish, P: Persian) is as follows: 1. KKKA, 2. KKKP, 3. KKPP, 4.KKPP, 5. KKPP, 6. KKKP, 7. KKKP, 8. KKAA.

The two forms *murabbaʿ* and *tarbīʿ* are indeed similar in many respects; since both of them consist of units of four hemstitches each. The principal difference is that in one of them, *murabbaʿ*, the poet composes the whole poem himself, whereas in the other one, *tarbīʿ*, the poet chooses a *ġazal* by another poet on which to base his poem. An easy way to distinguish between these two forms is to look at the number of pen names at the end of the poem. If the poem ends with one pen name, then the poet has written the whole poem, but if there are two pen names, it means that he has based his poem on a *ġazal* by another poet.

A *murabbaʿ*, be it independent or based on another poem, differs from the widely known verse form *rubāʿī* (quatrain). A *murabbaʿ* is a sequence of several four-line units (stanzas), but a *rubāʿī* is an independent unit. There are also other structural differences between them, regarding the order of the rhyme words in the four lines.

3.2.7. *Mukālama* (Poetic Correspondence)

The word *mukālama* is an Arabic word meaning to talk with someone, conversation and discussion (Wehr, 1971: 838). Even in Persian, it has almost the same meaning (Steingass, 1947: 1298). As a literary term, we do not find any definition of it in sources about Persian, Ottoman or Kurdish literature. However, there is, a literary form in the Arabic and Persian literatures called *ixwāniyyāt* referring, according to Šamīsā, (2007: 252), to "Poetic letters exchanged between poets, composed in the same rhythm and rhyme, in which they often complain about luck and time, and praise each other."

The examples cited in Šamīsā's book (ibid: 252–254) specify that in many cases, a poet would send a poem, which could be a long text, to a poet-friend, and he too would reply with a long poem, but they would not continue by writing further to each other.

Jazīrī's *Dīwān* includes two long texts the contents of which are poetic conversations or correspondences. The first is with a Kurdish prince, called Mīr ʿAmādīn (ʿImād al-Dīn), who probably was a brother or a son of Jazīrī's patron, Prince Šaraf-Xān III (see Chapters 1 and 2). The second conversation is with the poet Faqī-yē Ṭayrān, who was a contemporary of Jazīrī (see Chapter 2).

Jazīrī's *mukālamas*, unlike the Persian *ixwāniyyāt*, are short poems, but the large number of such texts suggests that the correspondence continued over a long period, especially considering that Faqīh-yē Ṭayrān lived in the Hakkārī region, very far from the city of Jazīra, where Jazīrī lived.

The conversations are called *mukālama* in most of the new editions, but in Hartman's edition there is no title. In the first conversation, the first two stanzas, belonging to Jazīrī and the prince respectively, have the headings "*suʾāl-i Malā*", Malā's question, and "*jawāb-i Mīr*", the Prince's reply. The remaining stanzas of the conversation have only the headings "Malā" and "Mīr".

In the Berlin manuscript: MS. or. quart. 1131, the stanzas have the headings "*inšāʾ-i Malā*", the composition or treatise of Malā, and "*Jawāb-i Amīr*", the Prince's reply. The Bodleian manuscript does not include these conversations. The number of stanzas in all editions of the *Dīwān* are 19 by Jazīrī and 19 by the Prince, and each stanza consists of three verses, composed in the *hazaj* metre. The correspondence with the Prince begins with three verses by Jazīrī and ends with three verses by the Prince. The *mukālama* between Jazīrī and Faqīh-ē Ṭayrān, on the other hand, begins with three verses by Ṭayrān, but ends differently in different editions. The first three hemstitches of each verse rhyme with each other, and the second three hemstitches also rhyme. The stanzas, do not, however, rhyme with each other. Jazīrī begins his poem by sending his regards to the Prince:

Salām-ā min ṯanā-xwānī
Saḥargāh gawhar-afšān bit
Bi ṣūrat amr-ē Subḥānī
Sar alqāb-ē zar-afšān bit
Bi xidmat ʿard-ē sulṭānī
ʿAbīr u ʿanbar-afšān bit (ZdJ: 895).

(v – – – / v – – –)
Hazaj-i murabbaʿ-i sālim

My greetings, I who praise (the Prince)
May scatter gem at dawn.
May it be in the form of a Divine order,

To scatter gold on the titles of honour,
To be presented as a royal service,
And scatter scent and ambergris.

The conversation does not contain any questions or answers. Both Jazīrī and the Prince present short ideas on philosophical and Sufi topics and comment on each other's statements. Both use several Sufi terms, symbols, even historical, geographical, musical, and theological concepts, and names like Adam, Moses, Jesus, Solomon, Mānī, Egypt, Qazvīn, harp, etc. In the last two stanzas, both Jazīrī and the Prince praise and address each other modestly. Jazīrī ends his poem by calling himself "a slave of Prince ʿAmādīn" (*Ġulām-ē Mīr ʿAmādīn-im*), and the Prince declares that "Šēx Aḥmad is our master" (*Ku Šēx Aḥmad ma ustāda*).

The second poetic conversation, that between Jazīrī and the poet Faqī-yē Ṭayrān, varies in length in different editions. In Hartmann's edition (1904: 208–215) the total number of stanzas is 43, of which 22 belong to Ṭayrān and 21 to Jazīrī. In Zivingī's edition (pp. 914–924) the poem is shorter; 12 stanzas by Ṭayrān and 11 by Jazīrī. The longest version of the poem is that included in both Hažār's (pp. 574–584) and Āmēdī's (pp. 565–594) editions, which consists of 25 stanzas by each of the poets.

In Hartmann's edition, the poem has a heading that reads *Mukālama-ye Faqīh-ē Ṭayrān wa Šayx Aḥmad al-Jazari*, the conversation between Faqīh-ē Ṭayrān and Šayx Aḥmad al-Jazarī. In the Berlin manuscript, the stanzas have either Faqīh or Malā, as heads. The stanzas of this poem also consist of three distiches each; the first three hemstitches rhyme with each other and the second three hemstitches also rhyme, but the stanzas do not rhyme with each other.

It is almost impossible to scan Faqīh-ē Ṭayrān's verses in the second conversation according to the prosodic patterns of classical poetry. As far as Faqīh-ē Ṭayrān is concerned, he is known for writing most of his poems according to Kurdish Folk rhythms. However, Jazīrī is a strict follower of the prosodic rules of classical poetry.

Both poems contain many Sufi ideas and symbols. The poets also employ several *Qurʾān*ic terms and expressions and allude to some stories related in the *Qurʾān*. At the end of the poem, the two poets praise each other with modest and friendly words. In the last stanza, Ṭayrān dates his poem by stating that he praises Jazīrī in 1031 AH, which corresponds to the years 1621–2 CE.

3.2.8. *Mulammaʿ* Poems

In a poem that is in stanzaic form, but is not a *tarkīb-band* or *tarjīʿ-band*, Jazīrī uses the languages Kurdish, Persian and Arabic in turn, though not consistently (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1987: 446–450). The poem comprises five stanzas, each consisting of five hemstitches. In the first, second, fourth and fifth stanzas, the first three hemstitches are in Kurdish, the fourth in Persian and the fifth in

Arabic. The third stanza differs, in that the first and third hemstitches are in Kurdish, but the other three are in Arabic.

The first stanza has monorhyme, whereas in the other four stanzas, the first four hemstitches rhyme with each other, but not with the other stanzas, while the fifth hemstitch has the same rhyme as in the first stanza. Structurally, this poem is a *musammaṭ*, but since it is composed in three languages, it can be called a combination of *musammaṭ* and *mulammaʿ*. A poem in which two or three languages are used is called a *mulammaʿ* (pied) (Gibb, 1900: 124).

With regard to the use of three languages, the scheme of the poem is as follows (K: Kurdish, P: Persian, A: Arabic): 1. KKKPA, 2. KKKPA, 3. KAKAA, 4. KKKPA, 5. KKKKA.

Jazīrī has another poem that can also be called a mulammaʿ. It consists of ten couplets, the first hemistich of which is in Kurdish and the second in Arabic, but he deviates from this rule in two couplets. The fifth couplet is entirely in Kurdish and the ninth couplet, the penultimate, is entirely in Arabic (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1987: 182–185).

In another poem (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1987: 194–197), which consists of 12 distiches, the first distich is entirely in Kurdish, the ninth entirely in Arabic, but in the other ten distiches, the first hemstitches are in Kurdish and the second ones in Arabic. Altogether, there are eleven poems in Jazīrī's Dīwān that can be called mulammaʿ or half-mulammaʿ.

3.2.9. *Istiqbāl* (*Naẓīra*)

Jazīrī wrote a poem in Persian as an *istiqbāl* poem to honour and creatively imitate a poem by the Sufi poet ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī (Mutābčī, 1994: 15). It is also called *naẓīra* (parallel). This is a poetic form used to show respect and admiration for another poet. The poem is written "in emulation of one by another writer.

The *naẓīra* must be in the same metre and have the same rhyme and the same *redif* (if there be one) as the poem emulated; it should moreover be conceived in a similar spirit" (Gibb, 1900: 99). But the *naẓīra*s were not written only to emulate contemporary poets' verses or immediate predecessors' verses, "the poets composed them to honour the works of men long dead, whose style they admired and whose verses they were fain to rival" (Gibb, 1900: 100), which is, apparently, the case with Jazīrī's poem.

Jāmī's poem consists of seven couplets, but Jazīrī welcomes his poem with ten couplets. The similarity between Jazīrī and Jāmī's poems is striking. In most of the distiches, what Jazīrī has done is no more than to rearrange Jāmī's poem or replace some of its words with other words. Both Zivingī (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1987: 429–434) and Hažār (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1982: 594–596) were aware of this similarity and pointed it out. Zivingī published it as one of Jazīrī's poems, whereas Hažār placed it among the poems he doubted belonged to Jazīrī.

3.3. The Repetition of Rhyme Words (*qāfia*)

The use of different rhyme words, *qāfia*, in a poem appears to be one of the arts that demonstrates the ingenuity of the classical poets, in terms of the richness of their vocabulary. What is emphasized in this regard is the use of new rhyme words in every couplet, which can be realized in a *ġazal*, because of its limited length and the small number of its couplets. In a *qaṣīda*, the task is not that easy, especially when it contains a large number of couplets. Gibb (1900: 85) finds that:

> It is allowable in a *Qaṣīda* to repeat the same rhyme word with the same meaning, provided that at least seven couplets intervene, but it is always better to dispense when possible with this license.

Jazīrī, who is known as the most skilled Kurdish poet in the use of word rhyme (Gardī, 1999: 207), is no exception in repeating *qāfia* in the same poem, be it a *ġazal* or a *qaṣīda*. Beginning with his longest poem, which has 142 couplets, he employs 143 rhyme words ending in (*-a*) followed by (*-dā*) as *radīf*. The scheme of the frequency of the rhyme words is as follows:

RW	F	B	i-7
šuʿla	3	1, 87, 113	
xwa	7	2, 6, 11, 33, 38, 63, 126	3
na	4	3, 42, 114, 124	
wa	5	6, 17, 82, 86, 135	1
va	4	7, 55, 90, 110	
ma	2	10, 78	
jilwa	3	12, 22, 89	
sāda	2	18, 51	
xanda	2	23, 118	
naġma	2	30, 103	
rašḥa	2	68, 99	
tisʿa	2	94, 111	
panja	2	104, 127	

Codes used in the table: RW: rhyme words repeated in Jazīrī's longest *qaṣīda*; F: the frequency of the RW; B: the *bayt*s in which the RW are used; i-7: how often is the interval lesser than seven *bayt*s?

Of these 143 *qāfia*s, 13 words are repeated with this frequency in various places in the poem: *šuʿla* 3, *xwa* 7, *na* 4, *wa* 5, *va* 4, *ma* 2, *jilwa* 3, *sāda* 2, *xanda* 2, *naġma* 2, *rašḥa* 2, *tisʿa* 2, *panja* 2. Altogether, the 13 rhyme words are repeated 40 times. This can also be interpreted as indicating that the poet

used the remaining 103 rhyme words only once in his poem, which in turn means that he repeated only one-eighth of the rhyme words. The interval between the repeated words is less than seven couplets in four cases, three times with the word (*xwa*) and once with (*wa*).

In another poem, the second longest in the *Dīwān* and consisting of 58 couplets, Jazīrī uses a total of 59 rhyme words. Almost all the words used as *qāfia* end with a long vowel (*-ā*), followed by the copula verb (*=a*) for third person singular, preceded by the hiatus filling semi-vowel (*y*). Only in three cases are the rhyme words verbs in the past perfect form, which is also built with the help of the copula verb (*=a*). The number of repeated rhyme words is seven, which makes up one eighth of the total rhyme words used in the poem, and the frequency is as follows: *mifā* 2, *dawā* 2, *rawā* 3, *dāya* (verb) 4, *bā* 2, *tabā* 2, *vadāya* (verb) 2. Altogether, the seven repeated words are used 17 times, while the other 41 words are used only once each. The interval between the repeated words is less than seven couplets in two cases, once with the word *dāya* and once with the word *bā.* The following table provides more details:

RW	F	B	i-7
mifā	2	2, 53	
dawā	2	3, 30	
rawā	3	6, 14, 50	
dāya	4	7, 11, 44, 58	1
bā	2	18, 19	1
tabā	2	24, 42	
vadāya	2	26, 45	

It should be noted, however, that the poet may repeat a rhyme word even in a short poem. In a *ġazal* consisting of nine verses (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1987: 146–149), the *qāfia* word *dilbar* is used in the first and the third distiches, which means that the interval between them is only one couplet. Reviewing the poems of Jazīrī, one finds that in most of them rhyme words are not repeated at all, or the repetition is quite rare.

3.4. *Radd al-ṣadr ilā al-ʿajz*:

The use of this poetic art concerns the repetition of the last word of a distich at the beginning of the next distich. This definition seems to be somewhat inadequate compared with what Gardī (1999: 318–319) suggests. He points out that it can be used in two ways, first by repeating the rhyme word(s), or any word(s) from the second section of the second hemistich of the preceding

distich at the beginning of the next one, provided that the *bayt*s in each hemistich have four feet. The second way is to repeat the meaning or the metaphor at the end of the preceding distich at the beginning of the next distich.

In a poem comprising 20 *bayt*s, Jazīrī uses both types of repetition of word(s) or metaphors from the last hemistich at the beginning of the next *bayt*. An example of the first is:

> *Miḥnat-Kašīn rūz u šabē, dar firqat-ā šīrīn-labē*
> *Ẓulm-ā ži bar dast-ē ta bē, awʿadla, em pur pē xwašīn*
> *Ẓulm-ā tu kī pur pē xwašim, sohtī-dilē hijrān-kašim*
> *Miṯlē parang-ē ātašim, rūḥak mujarrad bē lašīn* (ZdJ: 468–469)
>
> (– – v – / – – v – / – – v – / – – v –)
> *rajaz-i muṯamman-i muzāl*
>
> We are tormented, day and night, for separating from that sweet-lipped
> The oppression that comes from you is a justice, we are very happy with it.
> I am very satisfied to be oppressed by you,
> I am burned in my heart and suffer from being abandoned,
> I am like an ember of a fire, we are a mere soul without a body.

Here we see that the poet repeats the phrase in the second hemistich, *Ẓulm-ā ži bar dast-ē ta bē, awʿadla, em pur pe xwašīn* 'being happy and content with the injustice and oppression that comes from the beloved', in the first hemistich of the next distich.

In the same poem, Jazīrī repeats a metaphor without using the same words as in the previous distich. He replaces the Kurdish word *gulāv* (rosewater) and the verb *rašīn* (to spatter, to sprinkle) with the word *māwar*, which is a Kurdified form of the Arabic word *māʾ-al-ward*, which also means rosewater, and the verb *ka*, an imperative form from the infinitive *kirin* (to do/to use):

Zulf-ā siyāh ʿanbar bika, xamlē ži zērē ***zar*** *bika!*
Zar*-bāf u dībā bar bika, misk u* ***gulāvē*** *lē* ***rašīn****!*
Māwar ka *ṭarḥ u biškuwān!, jīrān-ē barg u luʾluʾān*
Awʿarʿar u salw-ā juwān, šatrī bi mastī lē xušīn (ZdJ: 466).

Scent the black ringlet with ambergris;
Make the fringes (of your garment) of yellow gold!
Dress it in gold brocade and silk; sprinkle them with musk
and rosewater!
Perfume the (newly grown) forelock and rosebuds,
Near the jewellery and pearls, with rosewater!
The jewellery rustles, intoxicated,
On the young juniper and cypress.

Examples of the use of *radd al-ṣadr ilā al-ʿajz*, can be found in at least five poems in Jazīrī's *Dīwān* (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1987: 230–234, 462–469, 497–508, 522–551, and 688–698).

3.5. The Multiple Use of Metaphors

Reading the *Dīwān* of Jazīrī, one encounters hundreds of metaphors that form the essential basis for the richness of his language and the eloquence that pervades his style. The easiest way to understand the roots of the metaphors in Jazīrī's poetry would be to examine the Islamic literary and philosophical heritage, especially Sufism, in the languages he commanded; Kurdish, Persian, Arabic and Ottoman Turkish. This assessment will be undertaken in other parts of this work.

It is noteworthy that the poet uses some of the metaphors employed in one of his poems in other poems as well. This can be interpreted either as an artistic shortcoming or simply as a way of using them to show his appreciation. The most repeated metaphor is the one in which the lover is compared to a dog staying on the threshold of the beloved's house. It is widely known, in almost all cultures and civilizations, that a dog is the most faithful animal to a human being. The metaphor of a faithful dog at the threshold comes originally from the *Qurʾān*, where the story of "the companions of the cave" (*aṣḥāb al-kahf*) is related. The dog is described in that verse only as a faithful animal. The young men slept in the cave for 300 years "and their dog stretched [out] its paws on the threshold" (XVIII: 18).

When Jazīrī uses this metaphor in his poems, he uses three different words: *sag* (dog in Kurdish and Persian), *kalb* (dog in Arabic) and *tūla*. The latter is now used nowadays in Kurdish to mean a puppy or a small dog, whereas in classical Persian it means puppy, but also a hound used for hunting. Jazīrī uses

tūla in the Persian sense of the word. It was probably also used in the same sense in Kurdistan at the time of Jazīrī. In most cases, the metaphor is loaded with other aspects of powerlessness or dependence on the owner for food or just a sign of kindness.

> *Xāk-i pāyēn ta, di rēz-ā sag u tūlān xwa dināsīn*
> *Ma na sūj u ne gunāh u na xaṭā, av či ʿitāba?* (ZdJ: 515)
>
> With a soil under your feet, we know ourselves to be
> in the line of the dogs and hounds
> We have not committed any fault, any sin, any mistake,
> Why, then, this blame (from you)?

In another poem, he uses the same image again, but the sentence is in Arabic. Not only does it remind the reader of the *Qurʾān*ic verse, but all four words of the verse are used:

> *Dargah-ē lutf-ā ta Xānim, mā li maḥrumān vabī*
> *Inna kalban bāsiṭan dahran ḏirāʿan bi'l-waṣīd* (ZdJ: 224)
>
> The port of your kindness, my lord, may it be open for the deprived,
> A dog with outstretched forelegs, a lifetime, is at the threshold.

The only word that does not appear in the *Qurʾān*ic verse but is used in Jazīrī's sentence is *dahr* which indicates a long time and an epoch, and this is consistent with the story of the companions of the cave.

The metaphor is used twice in two consecutive verses in one of the poems, and the word *tūla* is repeated three times:

> *Min divē sar l'āstānē har wekī tūlān nihim*
> *Balki jārak kayl bipirsit av či maḥrūm tūlaya?*
> *Gar bi nāv-ē tūlayān jārak vaxūnit bandayī*
> *Bā Malē xwaštir ži māl u gawhar u ganjīnaya* (ZdJ: 507)
>
> I want to put my head on the threshold like dogs.
> The Lord, perhaps, asks once which deprived dog is this?
> If he summons this slave once with the name of the dogs,
> It is, more amusing for Malā than wealth, gem and treasures.

Another metaphor that is repeated in Jazīrī's poems is that of the fly that insists on alighting on sweet substances and does not leave them even if it is driven away. The fly is the poet himself, and the sweet substance is the beloved. Jazīrī writes in a poem:

Ṣad jawr u jafā dī bi ma nāčīn ži dar-ē ta,
Yaksar tu nabātī u li ṭabʿ-ē magasim az (ZdJ: 254)

Even if you subject us to hundreds of tyrannies and oppressions
We will not go away from your door
You are entirely fine sugar and my nature is like that of the fly.

The metaphor is used three times in the *Dīwān* with almost the same structure. In one case, a subtle change is made, when the beloved calls him a fly:

Min go ma bi tiġān vadī nākin ži dar-ē ta
Go am ži nabatīn u li tabʿ-ē magasī tu (ZdJ: 628)

I said we cannot be driven from your door even by swords
He/she said we are (made of) fine sugar and your nature is that of a fly.

It is important to note that the metaphor is used in three poems the rhyme words of which end with *-as*. These three poems even have many other rhyme words in common. Examining the metaphor closely it is born in the mind that the poet used it, and the other words, all of them ending with *-as* under the pressure of the rhyme word of the poems.

Other important metaphors that can be mentioned in this regard are as follows:

a. Maḥmūd and Ayāz: usually used by Sufi poets as a symbol of Divine love between Sulṭān Maḥmūd Gaznavī (971–1030 CE) and Ayāz, who was originally a slave from Georgia, but rose to a high rank in the Sultan's army.
b. *Rūḥ u qafaṣ* (soul and cage): the beloved is the essence of the lover's existence; otherwise, he is merely an empty cage.
c. Farhād and Parwīz: the best known version of this love story is the *Maṯnawī* Xosrow and Šīrīn by Nizamī-ye Ganjavī (1141–1209 CE). The Sasanian king Xosrow is called Parwīz in Jazīrī's poems.

The two panegyrics written by Jazīrī for the Kurdish Prince Šaraf-Xān III are striking for the similarity of the metaphors used in them (see Chapter 1).

3.6. Jazīrī's Pen Names

Jazīrī uses his pen name in a variety of way which do not entirely follow the rules that many other classical poets commonly follow. He uses six forms of his pen name in different places in the poems. It is believed that the last couplet of a *ġazal* "usually includes the pen name (*mahlas*) of the poet, although the pen names at times occur in the penultimate *beyt* as well, or not at all" (Andrews, 1976: 137). The table below shows the different forms of pen names used by the poet in the last or penultimate couplets of his poems, or in places other than these two.

As is shown in the table, Jazīrī uses six different pen names in his *Dīwān*. Aḥmad is his own name, which he has used eight times; four times as a single name and four times in combination with other names in the same poems. The most frequently used names are *Malā* and *Malē* (64 and 32 times respectively) when used alone. The first is the title used in addressing him, and the second is the everyday and popular form, which deviates from the grammatical form *Malā-yē*, when used as an *izāfa* or before his surname Jazīrī, to indicate the *Malā* of/from Jazīra. The original *izāfa* form, *Malā-yē*, is used only twice. *Malāyī* is the oblique form of *Malā*, especially when it is used as a direct or indirect object and when preceded by a preposition, as it is a masculine name.

Of the six forms, Jazīrī uses five, each in combination with one or two other forms in the same poem. In some cases, he uses the same form twice in the same poem, or even twice in the same hemistich. In one poem (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1987: 634–641), which consists of 16 distiches, he uses the pen name *Malā* 17 times, since it is the addressee of the poem, but also its *radīf*, twice in the first distich and once in the second hemistich of each of the other 15 distiches.

The total number of poems in which only one pen name is used once is 90, whereas the number of poems in which more than one pen name (two or three) are used is 28. The poem in which the pen name *Malā* is used 17 times is an exception. Regarding the two poetic conversations, he uses *Malā* in the first stanza of his poem to Faqī-yē Ṭayrān, who in turn addresses Jazīrī as *Malē* once. In his conversation with Prince ʿImād al-Dīn, he does not use any pen name, whereas the Prince addresses him once as *Malā* and once as *Šayx/Šēx Aḥmad*. It is noteworthy is that Jazīrī never uses the title *Šayx* or its Kurdish form *Šēx* as a pen name in his poetry, although most of the sources on his life refer to him as *Šayx* (or *Šēx*) *Aḥmad* or *Šayx/Šēx Aḥmad-ē Jazīrī*. The stanza forms *tarjīʿ-band* and *tarkīb-band* are not included in this table.

Pen name	L	P	Other	B
Aḥmad	4			
Malā	46	1		
Malā	1		1-15	16
Malāyī	5			
Malā-yē	1			18
Malā-yē			10	12
Malē	30	1	13	16
Nišānī	1			7
Aḥmad + Malā			7 + L	10
Aḥmad + Malē			P + L	8
Malā + Malā			1 + L	8
Malā + Malā			1-a + L	7
Malā + Malā			20 + L	22
Malā + Malē			1 + L	8
Malā + Malē			15 + L	19
Malā + Malē			L + L	22
Malā + Malē + Malē			13 + 34 + L	58
Malā + Nišānī			9 + L	12
Malā + Nišānī			11 + P	13
Malā + Nišānī			L-a + L-b	5
Malā + Nišānī			1 + P	15
Malāyī + Aḥmad			P + L	15
Malāyī + Aḥmad			L-a + L-b	15
Malāyī + Malā			P + L	51
Malāyī + Malā			L-a + L-b	9
Malē + Malā			L-a + L-b	11
Malē + Malā			P + L	23
Malē + Malāyī			7 + L	11
Malē + Malē			L-a + L-a	11
Malē + Malē			P + L	28
Malē + Nišānī			P + L	15
Nišānī + Malā			8 + P	10
Nišānī + Malā + Malē			P + L-b + L-b	27
Nišānī + Malāyī			8-a + 8-a	10
Nišānī + Malā + Nišānī			5 + 12 + L	15
Nišānī + Malē + Nišānī			5 + L-a + L-b	25

Codes used in the table: L: the last couplet, L-a: the first hemistich in the last couplet of a poem, L-b: the second hemistich in the last couplet of a poem, P: the penultimate couplet, other: other places in the poem(s) where the pen name is used, B: the number of the couplets (*bayt*s) in the poem.

Regarding the use of pen names in stanza forms, Gibb (1900: 91) indicates that a poet who is writing a *tarkīb-band* or a *tarjīʿ-band* uses his pen name "towards the close of the last stanza, but not in the *wāsiṭa*". Jazīrī's use of his pen names in the *tarkīb-band* and *tarjīʿ-band* poems is mostly unconventional. He uses the pen name in different places in the stanzas, as briefly shown here:

TB-1: the pen names *Malā-yē* (an *iḍāfa* form) and *Malā* respectively are used in the first and second hemstitches of the last couplet in the ninth and last stanza. This is considered a conventional usage.

TB-2: the pen name *Malē* is used in the first hemistich of the first distich in the last stanza.

TB-3: the pen name *Malā* is used in the first hemistich of the first distich in the last stanza.

TB-4: the pen name *Malē* is used in the second hemistich of the first couplet in the last stanza.

TB-5: Jazīrī uses pen names three times in this poem as follows:

a. the pen name *Malā* is used in the first hemistich of the penultimate couplet of the fourth stanza,
b. the pen name *Malāyī* is used in the first hemistich of the penultimate couplet of the fifth stanza.
c. the pen name *Malāyī* is used in the second hemistich of the tenth couplet of the last stanza.

The use of the pen name in the poems TB-2, TB-3, TB-4 and TB-5 is unconventional.

3.7. Internal Rhyme or *Tašṭīr*

The most common forms used by classical Kurdish poets in their poetry were *qaṣīda*, *ġazal* and *maṯnawī*, although they also tried other minor forms such as *rubāʿī*, *qiṭʿa*, *tarjīʿ-band* and *tarkīb-band* etc. A *qaṣīda* or a *ġazal* usually begins with a verse the two lines of which rhyme. In the succeeding verses, the second lines rhyme with the main rhyme word of the poem, and the structure continues in this way: aa, ba, ca, da and so on.

Among the classical Kurdish poets, Malā-yē Jazīrī is the one who most of all experiments with various forms of using rhyme words. In addition to the form mentioned above, he uses other forms whose purpose is to increase the number of rhyme words even within each line of the verses. The use of more than two rhyme words in a verse gives it extra musical harmony and a melodic flavour. This is done within a poetic art called *tašṭīr*, which is also in agreement with another poetic art called *tasmīṭ*.

The word *tašṭīr* means to divide something into two parts, and as a literary term it means that the poet divides each line of a verse (each hemstitch of a distich) into two parts. The result is that the verse is divided into four parts, the first three of which, and sometimes all four, rhyme with each other. Jazīrī takes this a step further by dividing each hemistich into four parts, so that the distich is divided into eight parts. A *tašṭīr* is implemented in poems composed in the *sālim* variety of the metre, especially when it is *muṯamman-i sālim*, which means that each hemistich consists of four similar feet (Gardī, 1999: 320).

The following is an overview of the different patterns in which internal rhymes are used in Jazīrī's poetry. It should be emphasized in this context that Jazīrī follows a slightly different pattern in the first verse than in the rest of the poem, in order to establish the rhyme, which becomes the main rhyme word throughout the poem.

The poet divides each line of a verse (each hemstitch of a distich) into two parts. The result is that the distich is divided into four parts.

Here, the two first halves of the distich rhyme with each other and the two second halves also rhyme with one another. It also gives the reader the idea that the main rhyme word throughout the poem will be (- - - -b).

- - - -a - - - -b
- - - -a - - - -b

Dīsā ži nū bēḥāla dil, sāqî warîn jām-ā zujāj
Muštāq-ē xamr-ā āla dil, lē xošī anī bit mizāj (ZdJ: 176)

(– – v – / – – v – / – – v – / – – v –)
Rajaz-i muṯamman-i sālim

The heart, once again, is ill-circumstanced, bring the glassy goblet, cupbearer!
My heart is yearning for the red wine, (so that) my temperament may become merry and glad instantly.

All the other verses of the same poem are structured in this way:

- - - -c - - - -c
- - - -c - - - -b

Ḥattā bi nūr-ā bādayē, rangīn nakī sajjādayē
Dūrī ži wē Šahzādayē, durdāna-yā gardin ži ʿāj (ZdJ: 178).

(– – v – / – – v – / – – v – / – – v –)
Rajaz-i muṯamman-i sālim

As long as you do not colour the prayer rug with the light of wine,
You are far from that princess, the unique pearl, whose neck is of ivory.

In another poem, all the four parts of the first distich of a poem are monorhyming, and the rhyme word remains the main rhyme throughout the poem:

- - - -a - - - -a
- - - -a - - - -a

Čīn čīn kirin zulfēn siyā, kask aṭlas-ā dībā qabā
Īdī nišān nābin xuyā, tēkil kirin lāzim ṣabā (ZdJ: 26)

(– – v – / – – v – / – – v – / – – v –)
Rajaz-i muṯamman-i sālim

She gathered her black hair into curling locks,
Wearing a green (garment), (and) a silky tunic.
The moles on her face are no longer seen,
Since the east wind mingled the curling locks.

In all the other verses that follow, the two halves of the first *miṣrāʿ* and the first half of the second *miṣrāʿ* are monorhyming, while the second half of the second *miṣrāʿ* rhymes with the main *qāfia* throughout the poem.

- - - -b - - - -b
- - - -b - - - -a

Min dilbarak wak duṛ haya, maḥbûb-ē šīrīn sur haya
Ḥusn u jamalāk puṛ haya, Balqīs ṣifat, maskan Sabā (ZdJ: 27).

(– – v – / – – v – / – – v – / – – v –)
Rajaz-i muṯamman-i sālim

I have a sweetheart who is like a pearl.
I have a beloved who is sweetly attractive
She is of great beauty and prettiness,
Resembling Balqīs, who dwells in Sheba

In a number of poems, the two parts of the first *miṣrāʿ* are monorhyming, the first part of the second *miṣrāʿ* is free, not rhyming with the preceding or the next rhyme, and the second part has the main rhyme throughout the poem:

- - - -a - - - -a
- - - -x - - - -b

Zulfān tu bas čīn čīn bika, biskēn muqābil dīn bika
Pēškēš-i yak zulfak ta bin, mulk-ē Xutan, taxt-ē Xatā (ZdJ: 33)

(– – v – / – – v – / – – v – / – – v –)
Rajaz-i muṯamman-i sālim

Don't curl your tresses in locks anymore,
And don't drive the side-tresses mad.
May it be a gift to a single curl of yours
The country of Tartary, the throne of Xatā (Scythia)

The poet divides each line of a couplet (each hemstitch of a distich) into four parts, so that the verse is divided into eight parts. In many other poems, the internal rhyme is further extended to each foot (*rukn*), so that all four feet of the first hemistich rhyme with each other, and in the second hemistich the first three feet of the hemistich rhyme with each other, while at the end of the hemistich another rhyme is used for the main rhyme of the *qaṣīda*:

- - - -a/ - - - -a/ - - - -a/ - - - -a/
- - - -b/ - - - -b/ - - - -b/ - - - -c/

May bar ***kafē****, mašhā* ***ṣafē****, soz-ā* ***dafē****, dā qar****qafē***
Ḥusn-ā li ***dēm****, waṣfān ni****šēm****, harčī di****bēm****, žē* ***dūr bū*** (ZdJ: 598)

(– – v – / – – v – / – – v – / – – v –)
Rajaz-i muṯamman-i sālim

Wine in hand, he went to the dancing rows, the tambourine's heat,
Penetrated the wine;
The beauty of his face, I cannot describe, whatever I say, falls far short.

In a *murabbaʿ* poem that consists of eight stanzas, the eight feet of the first couplet rhyme with one another, while in the second couplet the four feet of the first *miṣrāʿ* and the first three feet of the second *miṣrāʿ* (seven feet in all) rhyme together, and the fourth foot of the second *miṣrāʿ* has the main rhyme throughout the poem:

- - - -a/ - - - -a/ - - - -a/ - - - -a/
- - - -a/ - - - -a/ - - - -a/ - - - -a/
- - - -b/ - - - -b/ - - - -b/ - - - -b/
- - - -b/ - - - -b/ - - - -b/ - - - -c

*Yār hāt u **mast**, ṣubḥā **Alast**, min dast bi **dast**, dī jām di **dast***
*Kākul di**bast**, tāyak va**rast**, vērā ši**kast**, nīšāna **qast***
*Aw lab-**šakar**, wā hāta **dar**, rābū ži **bar** tāyēn **dibar***
*Xālēn **diqar**, zulf čūna **sar** aṣlān **saḥar** lē būn **faraq*** (ZdJ: 368)

(– – v – / – – v – / – – v – / – – v –)
Rajaz-i muṯamman-i sālim

The beloved came, in the morning of eternity,
I was near to her, she had a goblet in her hand.
She was tying a ringlet, a wisp (of hair) was set free,
It hung down, headed for the mole.
That sweet-spoken, thus, came out and stood up
Behind the golden chain that covered the black mole,
The tresses were strewn over the eyes that morning.

The poem consists of 16 couplets, and each couplet is divided into eight parts. Of the 128 feet of the poem, 127 are bound to the scheme shown above. The only exception, which is an artistic necessity, is the fourth foot in the second hemistich of the first stanza, which has the main rhyme repeated in the last foot of the fourth distich in each stanza.

Another pattern that is used in a poem in where each distich is divided into eight parts, is as follows:

- - - -a/ - - - -a/ - - - -b/ - - - -c/
- - - -x/ - - - -a/ - - - -b/ - - - -c/
*Šox u **šangē**, Zuhra-**rangē**, dil ži min **bir**, dil ži **min***
*Āwirēn **hay**bat pi**langē**, dil ži min **bir**, dil ži **min*** (ZdJ: 481)

(– v – – / – v – – / – v – – / – v –)
Ramal-i muṯamman-i maḥḏūf

The graceful one, who is like (the planet) Venus
Took away my heart, my heart.
Her gazes, dreadful like the gazes of a tiger,
Took away my heart, my heart.

The arrangement of the other couplets in the 15-verse poem is slightly altered:

- - - -d/ - - - -d/ - - - -x/ - - - -d/
- - - -x/ - - - -d/ - - - -b/ - - - -c/

*Zulf u **xālān**, nūn u **dālān**, wān ži min **dil** bir bi **tālān***
*Goša-yē **qaw**s-ē **hilālān** dil ži min **bir**, dil ži **min*** (ZdJ: 482)

(– v – – / – v – – / – v – – / – v –)
Ramal-i muṯamman-i maḥḏūf

Tresses and mole, '*Nūn*'s and '*Dāl*'s (eyebrows and forelock),
They took away and looted my heart
The bows and crescents took away my heart, my heart.

In a poem consisting of ten distiches, each hemistich of which is divided into four parts, the first three parts of the first line rhyme, and the first three parts of the second line rhyme, and the fourth parts in both the first and the second lines rhyme. This rhyme word continues to be the main rhyme word throughout the poem. The scheme is as follows:

- - - -a/ - - - -a/ - - - -a/ - - - -b/
- - - -c/ - - - -c/ - - - -c/ - - - -b/

Yār-ē ma ***puṛ*** *nīšān u* ***suṛ****, sīmā ži* ***duṛ****, dīm kaw****kaba***
*Aw lab-****šakar****, nāzik* ***bašar****, jabhat* ***saḥar****, kakul* ***šaba*** (ZdJ: 586)

(– – v – / – – v – / – – v – / – – v –)
Rajaz-i muṯamman-i sālim
Our beloved, who has a mole, is graceful,
Her face is like a pearl, shining like as a star.
That sweet-lipped one, whose skin is elegant,
Her forehead is (like) the dawn, her hair is (as black as) the night.

The repeatition of the rhyme in the fourth part of both hemistiches of the first distich seems to indicate that it will continue as the main rhyme throughout the poem. In the rest of the poem, the fourth part of the first hemistich rhymes with the other three preceding parts, while the fourth part of the second line continues to be (- - - -b), which is the main rhyme of the poem.

In this poem, wose metre is *rajaz-i muṯamman-i sālim* (four times *mustafʿilun*: – – v –), the last syllable of a rhyming foot does not necessarily coincide with a word-boundary. Out of 80 metrical feet, there are five that do not coincide with a word boundary. The following is an example:

Xāl u ***xaṭē****, šox* ***qāmatē****, ma ž'vē kitē****b ū dastxaṭē***
Hardam ži ***naw****, dil fayḍa* ***aw****, av ʿišq u saw****dā mawhaba*** (ZdJ: 588)

You, with facial beauty and charming stature,
Seeing this book and its handwritten lines
Our hearts always and anew receive an emanation,
This love and madness are gifts (from God).

In the first line, the last two feet must be read as (*ma ž'vē kitē*) + (*b ū dastxatē*), where the word *kitēb* is split into two parts, the last letter of which must be read with the next syllable, which is the first syllable of the next foot. The same thing happens in the second line, when the last two feet must be read as (*av ʿišq u saw*) + (*dā mawhaba*). The word *sawdā* is split into two parts, *saw* and *dā*.

In most of the other poems, in which every couplet is divided into eight parts and composed with internal rhyme, almost every last syllable of the rhyming foot coincides with a word-boundary. The poem *May bar kafē etc* quoted above consists of 19 verses, meaning that it contains a total of 152 feet (*arkān*). It is striking that in 150 cases the last syllable of the foot coincides with the last syllable of a word. This is true even of Jazīrī's longest *qaṣīda*, with 142 distiches, where the coincidence of boundaries is complete in all 568 cases.

3.8. Style (*Sabk*)

Writers and researchers of the history of classical Persian poetry usually systemize the history of this poetry into different periods. Although writers and poets of earlier centuries were aware of the concept of style *sabk*, they did not always use the term in the same sense as it is used in modern times (Šamīsā, 2007: 193). Apparently, it is only "since the early 20th century that the history of Persian poetry has been loosely divided into four broad period styles or *sabk*." (Losensky, 2012: 1022).

Muḥammad-Taqī Bahār (1884–1951), also known as *Malik- al-šuʿarā Bahār*, is considered the first scholar to establish the research on the history of Persian literature by dividing it into various period styles. His book *Sabk-šenāsī* is highly regarded as the work that "established 'style' (*sabk*) – at once a thematic and methodological element – as an indispensable term and concept in the Persian literary critical lexicon." (Ahmadi, 2004: 142). Nevertheless, Šamīsā (2007: 202) holds that Bahār's work was mostly about Persian prose and that "he did not find the opportunity to publish his views on poetry stylistics."

It should be clear that the term *sabk* in this context is different from the style used by an individual poet. In the context of literary history, it refers to the main poetic styles and trends used by different poets over a period of time that may span several centuries. Šamīsā (2004: 88–105) distinguishes between three terms in this regard: *sabk-e dawra* (period style), *sabk-e šaxṣī yā fardī* (private/individual style) and *sabk-e adabī* (literary style).

The most important period styles *sabk* were the *Xurāsānī*, the *ʿIrāqī* and the *Hindī*. There were also other poetic schools or styles of minor importance, such as the *Azerbāijānī* and the *Bāzgašt*. Each of these schools of poetry had its own characteristics, principles, and measures regarding the content, form and language of the poetry written by the poets of those periods.

Kurdish literary history is usually classified according to the historical periods in which the poets lived and created their texts. Mala-yē Jazīrī is mentioned not only as a classical poet, but also as the founder of classical Kurdish poetry (Xaznadār, 2002: 246–247; Gardī, 1999: 254–255; Adak, 2019: 39). He is sometimes compared with great Persian and Arab poets, but is never labelled as belonging to any Persian or Arabic literary tradition or style. It is important in this context to take into account the following components that construct his life and authorship:

a. Jazīrī wrote almost all his poems only in the Kurdish language. It is true that in some of his poems, he included lines of poetry in Persian and/or Arabic, but this was a tradition that already existed in Persian literature. This is one of the reasons why Kurdish literary history has treated him only as a Kurdish poet who belonged to the Kurdish literary tradition, and he was not associated with any non-Kurdish style or literary school.
b. Jazīrī lived in a Kurdish principality that was almost an independent state, the Botān principality, which only nominally belonged to the Ottoman Empire. Unsurprisingly the prevailing cultural atmosphere was Kurdish, which also explains the foundation of a Kurdish literary tradition in this part of Kurdistan, which produced a number of poets, the best known of whom were Malā-yē Jazīrī, Faqī-yē Ṭayrān and Aḥmad-ē Xānī.

On the other hand, if we want to trace the influence of any literature or any literary style in his poetry, we must look first to Persian and then to Arabic literatures. Before Jazīrī, as far as we now know, there were no other Kurdish poets who used the classical prosodic Persian style, so we cannot assume that he followed the style of any of them. It is true that his *Dīwān* preserved the name of some Kurdish poets, but they were all his contemporaries.

It does not seem relevant to attribute Jazīrī's poetry to any Persian literary school, but there appears to be indications in his poetry, both stylistic and thematic, that he was influenced by the great Persian poets and that he was thoroughly familiar with Persian literature.

Jazīrī's relationship to Persian literature and Persian literary styles could be interpreted in another way. Reading his poetry, it seems quite clear that three poets who wrote in Persian, namely Saʿdī, Rūmī and Ḥāfiẓ, influenced him, and traces of this influence are perceptible. Moreover, he mentions the names or works of poets like Jāmī, Niẓāmī and Šabistarī etc. in his poetry.

If we study the history of Persian literature in terms of period styles, it is evident that each style has its own characteristics that distinguish it from the other styles. With this idea in mind, it is clear that there are elements in the *Sabk-e ʿIrāqī* that are essential constituents of Jazīrī's poetry. The two main

peculiarities of this *sabk*, according to Šamīsā (2009: 188, 201), are the promotion of *ʿIrfān* (Sufism) and the prevalence of *ġazal*. Other characteristics of the *Sabk-e ʿIrāqī* are the raising of the position of the beloved (*maʿšūq*) to such a degree that it can be confused with that of the worshipped (*maʿbūd*), and the presence of themes like *Waḥdat al-wujūd*, the supremacy of love (*ʿišq*) over reason (*ʿaql*) and the tendency towards the Divine tradition *kuntu kanzan maxfiyyan*… (I was a hidden treasure…), etc. These aspects are widely represented in the poetry of Jazīrī.

3.9. The Use of Prosody (*ʿarūḍ*):

When the Kurds, the Persians, and other peoples of the Middle East embraced Islam as their religion, many great changes took place in their societies, affecting almost all areas of their existence. In the sphere of culture, the first great change was the adoption of the Arabic alphabet in the writing system. This was later followed by the use of Arabic prosody (*ʿarūḍ*) by poets. It is noteworthy that within a relatively short period after the introduction of the Arabic alphabet, the cultural and educated elite came to the conclusion that the Arabic alphabetical signs were not adequate for writing in those languages. There were characters that represented sounds that did not exist in Persian, but there were also sounds that existed in Persian were not represented by any sign in the Arabic characters.

A similar process, in the handling of both the alphabet and the prosody, can also be observed in the Kurdish language when working with Kurdish manuscripts. In addition to borrowing Persian letters that represent phonemes also found in the Kurdish language, namely (p, č, ž, g: پ، چ، ژ، گ), Kurdish scribes and writers designed new letters to represent sounds that existed in Kurdish but not in Arabic and Persian. The MSS of Jazīrī's or other classical Kurdish poets' *dīwān*s also contain indications that the scribes were well aware of the need to use special diacritical signs to represent the Kurdish sounds in the texts.

The new signs were created either by adding dots to Arabic or Persian letters (e.g. v: ڤ) or by placing diacritical signs beneath or above Arabic and Persian letters. For the following phonemes new signs were created as follows:

Phoneme	Letter
V	ڤ
Ṛ	ڕ
Ḷ	ڵ
O	ۆ
Ö	وێ
Ē	ێ

These and some other attempts are found in MSS from the mid-19th century and later, and in a Kurdish-Arabic dictionary published in the last decade of the 19th century (al-Xalidī–al-Maqdisī, 1310 AH/1893 CE). This process was partly established at the end of the 1920s, when newspapers and magazines were published in Kurdish, and the Kurdish language was officially used in education in some regions of Iraqi Kurdistan.

In using the Arabic prosody, the poets found that the Arabic prosody, did not suit the Persian language and the Persian words in many respects. Xānlarī (1988: 106) points out that "this kind of divergence between Persian and Arabic poetry has been widely debated by Iranians since the very beginning of the arrival of *ʿarūḍ* in Iran, and Iranian scholars have sought to establish specific rules appropriate to Farsi and Persian-language tastes."

Kurdish poets, according to Gardī (2003: 5) beginning with Bābā Ṭāhir Hamadānī, borrowed the modified prosody system from Persian poets. It was widely used by most classical Kurdish poets, starting with Jazīrī, and was developed by other poets, until the beginning of the 20th century, when it was gradually abandoned (ibid).

The following table shows the metres and their different versions used by Jazīrī, and the number of poems composed in these metres and versions. The table is a slightly revised version of a scheme arranged and published by Gardī (2003: 196).

Codes used in the table are B: baḥr (meter), PB: the total number of poems composed in the metre, VB: the variants of the metre, PV: the total number of poems composed in a certain variety.

It is noteworthy that the greater part of Jazīrī's poems, about one hundred, are composed in variations of only three metres, namely *hazaj*, *rajaz* and *ramal*. The rest of the poems, less than ten, are composed in one variety of each of the meters *sarīʿ*, *muḍāriʿ*, *basīṭ* and *xafīf.*

No	B	PB	VB	PV
1	*Ramal*	49		
			Ramal muṯamman maqṣūr	8
			Ramal muṯamman maḥḏūf	10
			Ramal muṯamman maxbūn maḥḏūf	8
			Ramal muṯamman maxbūn maqṣūr	8
			Ramal muṯamman maxbūn	3
			Ramal musaddas maḥḏūf	3
			Ramal musaddas maxbūn maqṣūr	2
			Ramal musaddas maxbūn aṯlam	2
			Ramal muṯamman sālim	1
			Ramal muṯamman maškūl	1
			Ramal musaddas maxbūn maḥḏūf	2
			Ramal muṯamman maxbūn aṯlam	1
2	*Hazaj*	29		
			Hazaj muṯamman axrab makfūf maḥḏūf	9
			Hazaj muṯamman sālim	8
			Hazaj muṯamman axrab abtar	3
			Hazaj musaddas axrab mawbūz maqṣūr	2
			Hazaj murabbaʿ sālim	2
			Hazaj musaddas maqṣūr	1
			Hazaj muṯamman axrab makfūf maqṣūr	1
			Hazaj axrab majbūb	1
			Hazaj musaddas maḥḏūf	1
			Hazaj muṯamman musabba'	1
3	*Rajaz*	22		
			Rajaz muṯamman sālim	13
			Rajaz muṯamman muzzāl	4
			Rajaz muṯamman maṯwī maxbūn	2
			Rajaz murabbaʿ muraffal	1
			Rajaz muṯamman maṯwī maxbūn muzzāl	1
			Rajaz murabbaʿ sālim	1
4	*Sarīʿ*	3		
			Sarīʿ musaddas maṯwī mawqūf	3
5	*Muḍāriʿ*	2		
			Muḍāriʿ muṯamman axrab	2
6	*Basīṭ*	2		
			Basīṭ muṯamman maṯwī	2
7	*Xafīf*	1		
			Xafīf musddads maxbūn aṯlam	1

Chapter 4: Linguistic Aspects of the Poetry of Malā-yē Jazīrī

4.1. The Kurdish Language at the Time of Malā-yē Jazīrī

The language used by the poet Malā-yē Jazīrī in his poems, represents a specific period in the process of the development and formation of the Kurdish written language. It was, clearly, preceded by other experiences of using the language as an artistic means to create written poetry, but also to write prose texts. It was also followed by even deeper and more sophisticated achievements in later periods of the Kurdish literary history. The aim of this chapter is first to demonstrate the situation of the Kurdish language in the latter half of the 16th century and the first half of the 17th century and, secondly, to show the characteristics of the language as it was employed by Jazīrī.

Sources about this period are quite limited and mostly deal with other aspects of Kurdistan's history than the linguistic one. Still, one can find small indications about the Kurdish language and its use in writing in two of these sources, namely the *Šarafnāma* by Šaraf-Xān Bidlīsī and the *Siyāḥatnāma by* Awliyā Čalabī. Moreover, the publication in 1971 of a manuscript about Arabic grammar, composed by ʿAlī Taramāxī, provided a prose text that represents a specimen of the Kurdish language in the 17th or 18th century.

4.1.1. The *Šarafnāma*

Šaraf-Xān Bidlīsī, in his *Šarafnāma*, which is the first book on the history of the Kurds and Kurdistan, provides important information on the cultural situation in various Kurdish principalities and regions. *Šarafnāma* is written in Persian, although it deals with the history of the Kurds and Kurdistan. In addition to abundant information about Kurdish principalities and Kurdish rulers, Šaraf-Xān provides many important details about himself and his book. He records the date of his birth, which is the 20th of Ḏī'lqaʿda 949 AH (25 February 1543 CE), and the day he finished writing his book, which is the 30th of Ḏī'lhijja 1005 AH (13 August 1597 CE).

Although Bidlīsī grew up in the royal palace of the Ṣafavīd Shah Tahmasp I who reigned 930–984/1524–1576, and although he wrote his book and his poems in Persian, he apparently had a command of the Kurdish language. In

some cases, he explains what various Kurdish words mean and how some Kurdish names are derived.

Defining the Kurds at the beginning of the book, Bidlīsī divides the Kurdish *ṭāʾifa* into four groups (*čahār qism*), the Kurmānj, the Lur, the Kalhur and the Goran, and states that their language and traditions (*zabān va ādāb*) are different from each other (Bidlīsī, 1860: 13). In the 1870 French translation of the *Šarafnāma*, "the Kurdish *ṭāʾifa*" is translated as "la nation kourde" and "*zabān va ādāb*" as "la langue et les moeurs" (Bidlīsī, 1870: 27). In the 2005 English translation, the former is translated as "the Kurdish nation" and the latter as "tongue and customs" (Bitlîsî, 2005: 32).

A few paragraphs later, Bidlīsī mentions with appreciation that in Kurdistan, and especially in the ʿAmmādiyya region, there are many scholars and learned people (*ʿulamā va fuḍalā bisyār ast*) who have even written books on various scientific subjects, without specifying the language they used. Writing about other Kurdish principalities, for example Botan, he uses almost the same words and terms in praising the scholars and learned people, and he records the names of many of these scholars, although again he does not mention the language in which their books were written.

The only exception is the case of Yaʿqūb Beg bin Muḥammad Beg, the ruler of the Zarqī principality. The prince is described as Sufi, wise, pious and a poet, who wrote most of his poetry in the Kurdish language and had a poetry book, a *dīwān* in that art (Bidlīsī, 1860: 240). He ruled the principality for 25 years, from 949/1542 to 974/1566, leaving power in the hands of his son Dūmān Beg. He is believed to have died in 987/1578. He is not mentioned in any sources other than the *Šarafnāma*, and none of his poetry is extant. Considering the period of his life, he obviously lived before Malā-yē Jazīrī.

Another poet mentioned by Bidlīsī is Šukrī (d. 937 AH /1531 CE), whom he calls Šukrī the poet (*Šukrī-ye šāʿir*), probably because he was known as such and had achieved great fame as a poet. He was close to Bidlīsī, the grandfather of the Kurdish prince, and historian Šaraf-Xān Bidlīsī, the author of *Šarafnāma*. He later, joined the Ottoman sultan Salim (who reigned 1512–1520) and wrote a history book about him in Turkish verse called the *Salīmnāma*, which he presented to Sulaymān the Magnificent (Bidlīsī, 1860: 345; 1364: 451–452). Speaking about himself in the last section of the *Salīmnāma*, Šukrī declares that he is of Kurdish origin and writes, "I am a Turk while being with a Turk and a Kurd while being with a Kurd" (Tezcan, 2000: 549). Whether he wrote any poems in Kurdish is uncertain.

Laṭīfī Rūmī, or ʿAbdullaṭīf Xatīb-zāde (896–990 AH/1491–1582 CE), who wrote *Tazkirat al-šuʿarāʾ*, "his most important work, generally as the second finest biographical work (after ʿĀšik Čelebī's) in Ottoman literature" (Četin, Laṭīfī, EIs-II), records his name as Şükrî Kürdistanli to distinguish him from another poet who is also called Šukrī (Levend, 1984: 265).

4.1.2. Taramāxī's Text

An interesting text in this context, first published in 1971, is a short grammar of the Arabic language in Kurdish by ʿAlī Taramāxī. The manuscript of this work is among the Kurdish materials collected by Alexander Jaba in the mid-19th century with the help of Malā Maḥmūd Bāyazīdī. At that time Jaba was the consul of the Russian Empire in Erzurum in the Ottoman Empire. In a letter dated 17 June 1858 to Bernhard Dorn (1805–1881), who was an adjunct at the Russian Academy of Sciences and attained the level of academician in 1852, Jaba informed him about the manuscript that belonged to an old Kurdish *Malā* from Hakārī. According to Jaba's letter, the *Malā*, refused to donate it to him, but allowed him to copy it (Taramāxī, 1971: 9). Apparently, the one who copied the manuscript was Malā Maḥmūd Bāyazīdī, who also wrote a short but quite informative introduction to it, in which he described the contents of the text and its importance, and gave a short account of the life of Taramāxī and a brief report on the traditional education system in Kurdistan.

Bāyazīdī did not give a date for the birth or death of Taramāxī. He only mentioned, although the wording is not that clear, that Taramāxī wrote his book after the year 1000 AH (Jaba, 1860: 17), which corresponds to 1591/1592 CE. Apparently, this note became a source on which many estimates were based regarding the dates of Taramāxī's birth and death, and even when he wrote his grammar.

The Russian Imperial Academy of Sciences decided in 1859 not to publish Taramāxī's text (Jaba, ibid: vii). It remained, along with many other Kurdish manuscripts, in the bookcases of the library of the Department of Orientalism, subordinated to the Russian Imperial Academy of Sciences, which was renamed the Soviet Academy of Sciences during the communist era, in Leningrad (formerly St Petersburg) (Xaznadār, 1971, 10). Bāyazīdī's introduction to the manuscript was included in a book published by Jaba in 1860. This was the first time that information about Taramāxī and his grammar was made public. Xaznadār first published the text in 1971, with an introduction and a glossary.

Concerning Taramāxī's time and life, there are various estimates ranging from the late 16th (Xaznadār, 1971: 6) to the early 18th (Leezenberg, 2014: 716, 720) century. Different interpretations have been proposed, starting from the statement of Bāyazīdī that Taramāxī wrote his grammar after the year 1000 AH. Two remarks are relevant in this regard:

1. The date suggested by Bāyazīdī is not reliable, since some of what he wrote about the dates of birth or death of other poet in another article published in the same book turned out later to be incorrect (see for example the discussion of Jazīrī's life in Chapter 2).
2. The passage about Taramāxī and his book is long and difficult; or rather, it is formulated in uncertain terms. It can be interpreted in a way to mean that Taramāxī was born after the year 1000 AH, and that he

> travelled for a long time in different regions, and that he later settled in his village and wrote his grammar book. Bāyazīdī, introducing Taramāxī's text, writes, "*Di tarīx-ā ḥazārī bi-šūnva, ži qaḍāyēd Hakāriyān, di qaḍā Mukṯēdā, gundak haya Taramāx dibēžin, ži wī gundī nāvē ʿAlī mirovakī xwayī ḏihn u idrāk u ṣāḥib ḥiss u faṭānat paydā būya*" (Jaba, 1860: 17). The English of these lines is, roughly, as follows: "After the year (one) thousand, in the Muks district, a district in the Hakārī region, there is a village called Taramāx, from that village was born a person by the name ʿAlī, who had intellect and understanding and possessed knowledge and sagacity". What makes the reading suggested above more likely is the use of the words "*bi šūnva*" (after) and "*paydā būya*" (was born/has been born). The latter expression is repeatedly used by Bāyazīdī to denote the date of the birth of seven of the eight poets recorded in another article in Jaba's book, which deals with the lives and works of Kurdish poets and authors (Jaba, 1860: 13–16).

In the absence of conclusive evidence, all the arguments should be seen as tentative and open to confirmation or refutation. Taramāxī and his work are not mentioned in the *Šarafnāma* and there is no indication that Jazīrī knew of his text.

The text's significance can be considered from two points of view. First, it is one of the oldest, non-fiction prose texts in Kurdish; secondly, it is a link in a process of the vernacularization, the use of the Kurdish language in the traditional religious schools in Kurdistan (Leezenberg, 2014: 732). The text appears to be a linguistic attempt to use Kurdish terms to explain grammar, but without further success, since almost all the grammatical terms used are Arabic.

The main aim of the text is to explain Arabic grammar in Kurdish in order to facilitate the process of learning Arabic for Kurdish students. In a few cases, Taramāxī compares the grammatical rules with those of the Kurdish and Persian languages. This attempt by Taramāxī is evidently a part of a process aimed at using the Kurdish language in the traditional education system in Northern Kurdistan and included works by other Kurdish authors, the most outstanding of which being *Nūbār-ā bičūkān* (First-fruit for children) by Aḥmad-ē Xānī.

Nūbār-ā bičūkān is an Arabic-Kurdish wordlist written in verse, completed by Xānī in 1094 AH (1683 CE). It consists of 14 sections written in various poetic rhymes and rhythms. Obviously, it is the first dictionary in the history of the Kurdish language. It contains 954 Arabic words with their meanings in Kurdish (Le Coq, 1903:1–33; Al-Xālidī-Al-Maqdisī, 1893: 279–292).

A similar attempt was also made in Central Kurdish at the end of the 18th century. It included, among other things, an Arabic-Kurdish glossary by Sheikh Maʿrūf Nodayī (1166–1254 AH/1752–1838 CE) and a profession of faith by Mawlānā Xālid Šahrazūrī Naqšbandī (1193–1242 AH/1779–1827 CE).

Taramāxī's text, as an early attempt to employ the Kurdish language to explain the grammatical rules of Arabic, and partly of Persian and Kurdish, has deservedly been appreciated and studied by many scholars, both Kurdish and European. This should not be a reason to overlook the shortcomings that are obvious to anyone who commands the grammar of these languages. As instances of such erroneous explanations, with regard to the Arabic language, one can mention the examples he gives for transitive and intransitive verbs, or when he describes the inflection of a verb for 2nd person dual. When he describes Persian and Kurdish grammar, the errors are even more numerous. When explaining the imperative in both Persian and Kurdish, which has only two forms, he presents six forms, because he does not distinguish between imperative and present subjunctive. His explanation of personal pronouns, demonstrative pronouns and genitive in Kurdish, and transitive and intransitive verbs in Persian, are also instances of such inaccurate descriptions.

4.1.3. The *Siyāḥatnāma*

Awliyā Čalabī's travel book *Siyāḥatnāma* is a remarkable and indispensable source for studying different aspects of the Kurdish society in the 16th and 17th centuries. Awliyā Čalabī (1020–1095 AH/1611–1684 CE) was a Turkish traveller who recorded the details of his numerous travels in a book called the *Siyāḥatnāma* (Book of Travels), which comprises ten thick volumes that "constitute a unique work almost unparalleled in the travel literature" (van Bruinessen, 2000: 1). The book is written in Ottoman Turkish, but Čalabī's language is overloaded with Persian and Arabic words and expressions. The book is printed in both Ottoman and modern Turkish, but neither is entirely reliable, since they are politically censored, particularly the parts that deal with his trips to Kurdistan.

The *Siyāḥatnāma* can in some ways be seen as a complement to Bidlīsī's *Šarafnāma*. While Bidlīsī's book is mainly concerned with the history of the Kurdish emirates, and records almost nothing about the lives of the ordinary people of his time, Awliyā Čalabī's book reflects a traveller's observations about almost everything in the daily life of the inhabitants of the places he visited.

It is clear that Awliyā Čalabī "made three major travels through Kurdistan" (ibid: 2), in 1646, 1649–50 and 1655–56. The book is, therefore, an invaluable source for understanding the approximate time of Jazīrī. Čalabī visited most parts of both Iranian and Ottoman Kurdistan, including Jazīra, which he visited on his last trip in 1655–56. Although he records the names of some scholars and poets when writing about Jazīra, remarkably, Jazīrī is not included.

Awliyā Čalabī evidently commanded the Ottoman Turkish, Arabic and Persian languages, but not Kurdish. This did not prevent him from writing about the Kurdish language and its dialects, and even presenting a theory of its origin. According to Čalabī, who quotes a certain Armenian historian called

Maqdisī, the Kurdish language was created by a person whose name was Malik, or Malak, Kurdum, who belonged to the Prophet Noah's people. After the Flood, Kurdum, who lived for 600 years, built the town of Jūdī. Coming to Miyāfārqīn, he settled there, because he liked the climate and invented the new language, which was not Hebrew, Arabic, Persian or Dari.

Confirming the theory of the origin of the Kurdish language, Čalabī writes, "Now it is called the Kurdish language and it is used in these regions. The Kurdish language consists of twelve varieties, the words and pronunciation of which do not resemble each other, and they even need interpreters to understand each other's words" (Čalabī, 1898: 74–75). Counting the Kurdish varieties, Čalabī records the following: Zāza, Lolo, Hakārī, ʿAwnikī, Maḥmūdī-Šīrwānī, Jazīrawī, Pasānī, Sinjārī, Ḥarīrī-Ardalānī, Sorānī, Xālitī, Čakwānī-ʿImādī and Rožakī (ibid: 75). Čalabī justifies these differences by the fact that Kurdistan consists of mountains, vast plains and rocks that separate different regions and populations.

Čalabī's information about Kurdish is, understandably, not the result of an adequate investigation, but the impression a traveller gets while moving from one region to another. When describing different Kurdish dialects, he usually emphasizes two aspects: that there are many varieties and that the speakers of these dialects do not understand each other.

The samples of Kurdish dialects, what he believed to be Kurdish dialects, that Čalabī recorded during his travels consist of the following items:

1. A glossary of words and simple sentences from a dialect spoken in Mayāfārqīn (now called Silvan in Turkish and Farqîn in Kurdish), which he calls Sorānī (Çelebī, 2010: 111–113). The vocabulary is, according to our knowledge of the Kurdish language of today, a mixture of words from both Central and Northern Kurdish.
2. Two distiches of poetry attributed to Kurdish poets in praise of mount Alwand in Hamadān (Čalabī, 1898: 350; Çelebī, 2010: 470). Although, according to Čalabī the poets were Kurds and wrote in Kurdish, the distiches are actually in Persian.
3. A folk song from Jazīra consisting of three sections (ibid: 732–33).
4. A poem by ʿAbdāl-Xān of Bitlīs (Čalabī, 1898: 97–98; Dankoff, 1990: 84–88), presented as a Kurdish text in the Rožakī dialect "which appears in fact to be Turkish grammatically, with a high proportion of Armenian words" (van Bruinessen, 2000a: 6–7).
5. A sentence in the Ardalānī dialect (Çelebī, 2010: 711).
6. A poem in the dialect of ʿImādiya (Āmēdī in Kurdish) written by the poet Mullā Ramaḍān-i ʿAbbāsiyyān (ibid: 712–13), who was almost unknown until recently, and about whom we have no reliable information. He may be same poet who has a *tasdīs* (six-fold) based on a poem of Jazīrī. He is mentioned in the various editions of Jazīrī's

Dīwān and other sources, although his name is recorded in different ways.

Of these seven samples, only ʿAbbāsiyyān's poem should be considered a written and literary Kurdish text. The poem consists of nine distiches and contains some simple Sufi metaphors. The first distich reads as follows:

Rāyē li-Āṣaf dikan, wāliḥ u ḥayrān-i ʿišq
Dars-i Arasṭo didan, sarxwaš-ē sakrān-ē ʿišq

They give sincere advice to Āṣaf, those who are madly in love and the bewildered,
They instruct Aristoteles, those who are intoxicated by love.

The metre is *basīṭ-i muṯamman-i maṭwī* and *sālim (-i muzāl)*, as shown here:

mufta ʿilun/fā ʿilun/ mufta ʿilun/fā ʿilun
– v v –/ – v –/ – v v –/ – v –

Čalabī quotes the poem under the heading "a poem in the language of the Kurdish people of ʿImādiya, in the words of Monlā Ramaḍān-i ʿAbbāsiyyān". At the end of the poem he adds a kind of footnote indicating that there are many such poems and *qaṣīda*s (in the city of ʿImādiya or in the Kurdish language of ʿImādiya).

In quoting this poem, Čalabī records a text that may have been written by a poet who was alive when he visited the city of ʿImādiya (in 1066 AH/1656 CE), or perhaps was a contemporary of Malā-yē Jazīrī, or even lived earlier. At the same time, he leaves some uncertainties about the poet who composed the poem. Firstly, he does not mention whether the poem was given to him by the poet himself or by someone else, which raises the question of whether the poet was alive at the time or not. Secondly, Čalabī records the name of the poet as "Monlā-ye *ʿālim* Ramaḍān-i ʿAbbāsiyyān" (the scholar *mullā* Ramaḍān-i ʿAbbāsiyyān), whereas the poet himself uses the pen name Ramaḍān, followed by a word that can be read as "Kurdikī or Kurdakī", and which cannot be interpreted as a part of the pen name, but only as an independent word. The last distich that contains the poet's pen name could be read as follows:

Fāšī maka zār-ē xwa, ay Ramaḍān Kurdikī (or *Kurdakī*)
Šubh-ē nasīmē dibī, tāzī u ʿuryān-ē ʿišq

Do not reveal your lamentation, Oh, Ramaḍān Kurdikī /Kurdakī (you are a Kurd)
You will be like a breeze, naked and undressed (because) of love.

Martin Van Bruinessen (2000: 1–11) reads the word as part of the poet's pen name and therefore calls him Mullā Ramaḍān Kürdikī. This reading does not correspond to the pattern usually used in classical Kurdish (but also Persian) poetry. The names of classical poets can consist of two or more parts, such as Malā-yē Jazīrī, Ḥāfiẓ-i Šīrāzī, Niẓāmī-ye Ganjavī etc., but the pen names (*tax-alluṣ*) used by the poets in their poems always consist of one word, such as Malā, Ḥāfiẓ, Jāmī, and so on. Moreover, it does not agree with the metrical scanning of the distich. Accordingly, the poet's own name may have been Mullā Ramaḍān-ē ʿAbbāsiyyān, and his pen name only Ramaḍān. In that case, the word following his name should not be read as *Kurdakī*, which means "you are a Kurd", but in a different way.

Although the word in Čalabī's MS is so obscure that one can only guess how it should be read, I think the correct reading should be *gar dikī*, meaning 'if you do / doing that etc.' which is more relevant in the context of the distich.

It seems relevant to think that the poet Mullā Ramaḍān-ē ʿAbbāsiyyān, also described by Čalabī as *ʿālim* (scholar), is the same Ramaḍān who wrote a poem in six-line stanzas based on a poem by Jazīrī and using the process called *tasdīs* (sixfold). Zivingī calls the poet sheikh Ramaḍān (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1987: 717, 925, 937), and Amēdī (1977: 529) calls him Sheikh Ramaḍān Botī, but they give no further information about him. Nāyif Ṭāhir Mikāīl, who wrote his MA thesis on Jazīrī in 2002, suggests that the poet who made a sixfold version of Jazīrī's poem is Ramaḍān Jazīrī, and that he may have been one of Jazīrī's students. He also notes that in a manuscript of Jazīrī's *Dīwān* that he used in his research, the poet is called Ramaḍān Āġā-yē Jazīrī (Mikāīl, 2005: 58). Accordingly, one should not exclude the possibility that Čalabī's Ramaḍān is the same Ramaḍān whose sixfold poem is found in the *Dīwān* of Jazīrī.

4.1.4. Mullā Ramaḍān-ē ʿAbbāsiyyān's Poem

It is almost impossible to assert that any text in Northern Kurdish (Kurmānjī) existed (long) before the years in which Jazīrī lived and wrote the poems that make up his *Dīwān*. The Kurdish texts that are available to scholars of Kurdish literature are overwhelmingly written by poets who were his contemporaries, as was mentioned in chapter one. The two texts referred to in this chapter, namely Taramāxī's Arabic grammar in Kurdish and Mullā Ramaḍān-ē ʿAbbāsiyyān's poem, remained unknown to the majority of the Kurdish readers and researchers for a long time, and only recently were brought to light. The first text was published in 1971 and the second in 2000.

Reading the poem of ʿAbbāsiyyān as recorded by Čalabī, one notices several orthographical errors that are the result of Čalabī's unfamiliarity with the Kurdish language, as well as the editors' lack of regard for the *Siyāḥatnāma*. What follows is a transcription of the poem and an attempt at an English translation.

Rāyē li-Āṣaf dikan, wālih u ḥayrān-i ʿišq
Dars-ē Arasṭo didan, sarxwaš-i sakrān-i ʿišq

They give sincere advice to Āṣaf, those who are madly in love and the bewildered,
They instruct Aristotle, those who are intoxicated by love

ʿAql-ē kul ar bēta nēv maktab-i ʿišqē damak
Dē bibitin maḍḥak-ē ṭifl-ē hawasxwan-ē ʿišq

If the perfect intellect comes to the school of love for a while
It will become a laughing-stock for the self-indulgent child of love

Dafʿ-i ḥarārat dikat mā ži dil-ē Zamharīr
Lāyazal-ā garmiyā ātaš-ē sūzān-ē ʿišq

Can intense cold (*Zamharīr*) drive out heat from the heart?
(and) the eternal warmth of the burning fire of love?

Dē bisužit ʿālamē āh-i šararbār-i dil
Gar habitin gavakē māniʿ-ē ṭūfān-ē ʿišq

The sigh of the heart that rains sparks will burn the world
If there will be an obstacle, for a moment, to the flood of love

Man ḥasada kufri bū, dāġē li īmāni, law
Sargar u pēxwās dičūm dāman-i ruhbān-i ʿišq

Anyone who envied, became an infidel, a brand of the faith
Intoxicated and barefoot I go to (seize) the skirt of love's monks

Dāġ-ē nihānī ma law aškara ẓāhir kirin
Amr-ē čirāgāni kir Xusraw-i xūbān-i ʿišq

We revealed the secret heart-sores and manifested them
The king of the graceful people of love ordered (to start) the illumination

Gah ži zamīrē bi xwa xūn ku taraššuḥ dikat
Dīda dibit maʿdanē laʿl-ē badaxšān-ē ʿišq

When, someday, the blood exuding from the heart
The eye will turn into a mine of love ruby of Badaxšān

Ġunča-yi bustān agar bandē niqābī vakat
Lāli dibit bēgumān murġ-ē gulistān-i ʿišq

If the Rose-bud in the garden opens the tie of the veil
The bird in the Rose-garden of love will become dumb/mute

Fāšī maka zār-ē xwa, ay Ramaḍān gar dikī
Šubh-ē nasīmē dibī, tāzī u ʿuryān-i ʿišq

Do not reveal your lamentation, O, Ramaḍān, for doing that
You will be like a breeze, naked and unclothed (because) of love.

The language of the poem is the Kurdish dialect spoken in Bahdīnān and called Bahdīnānī. It is a subdialect, pertaining to the Northern Kurdish dialect (Kurmānjī). The poets of the region have used it as a literary medium since the time of the ʿImādiya (Āmēdī) principality. Although it is similar to other Kurmānjī subdialects in most respects, it also has some peculiarities, especially in *iḍāfa* structure and verb conjugation. There are already small differences between the language of ʿAbbāsiyyān and Jazīrī . Differences between the dialects spoken in Bahdīnān and Jazīra may have increased in later periods, when Kurdistan was divided between several countries in the Middle East at the beginning of the 20th century.

It should be emphasized here that the similarities between the language of this poem and that of the poems of Malā-yē Jazīrī are striking. The only forms in ʿAbbāsiyyān's poem that deviate from the language of Jazīrī are two present stems. The present stems of the infinitives *kirin* (to do) and *dān* (to give) are *ki* and *di* in Jazīrī's poems, whereas they are *ka* and *da* in ʿAbbāsiyyān's poem. This difference becomes clear in comparison with Čalabī, since he vocalized the roots *ka* and *da* by placing a *fatḥa* (the short vowel point *a* in the Arabic alphabet) on each of them, although he does not do this consistently.

As mentioned, there are plentiful similarities between the two subdialects. One interesting case in this context is the negated imperative. The negation verbal suffix common to both is (*ma-*), as in the first line of the last distich, *fāšī maka* (do not reveal), which is used by both poets. The use of (*ma-*) as a negation verbal suffix later disappeared in most subdialects of Northern Kurdish and was replaced by (*na-*), but it is still used in the Bahdīnānī subdialect.

Apparently, there were no significant differences between the subdialects of Jazīra and ʿImādiya when Čalabī visited the region. This was probably due to the geographical proximity of the two regions and the flourishing cultural relations between the Kurdish emirates, not only those within the Ottoman Empire, but also with those within the borders of Iran. An important and decisive reason for this is that the education system in Kurdistan was quite similar and uniform, and that the prevailing tradition allowed students to wander in different regions of Kurdistan in search of outstanding teachers and schools

that offered better accommodation and food. There is also no doubt that almost all the poets, writers and scholars in Kurdistan until the beginning of the twentieth century were trained by and through this traditional system of education.

4.2. The Kurdish Language of Jazīrī and Xānī

The poets Malā-yē Jazīrī (1570–1640) and Aḥmad-ē Xānī (1651–1707) are undoubtedly two of the most outstanding poets in the history of Kurdish literature. The influence of their works has been enormous and profound over the past three centuries.

Jazīrī's poems are collected in a *Dīwān* that has been printed and reprinted several times since the beginning of the twentieth century (see the details in Chapter 2). Xānī's most renowned book is *Mam u Zīn* (Mam and Zīn), which is an epic written in 1105 AH (1693–1694 CE). He also wrote in 1094 AH (1683 CE), *Nūbār-ā bičūkān* (First-fruits for children), which is an Arabic-Kurdish dictionary composed in verse, and *ʿAqīd-ā Īmān* (Profession of faith), which consists of 73 distiches in which he explains the principles of Islam. He also wrote a number of other poems, but they are not numerous enough to be collected as a *Dīwān*.

It is not certain whether Jazīrī was acquainted with any texts in (Northern) Kurdish written by Kurdish poets before his time, whereas Xānī proudly mentions the names of three poets who preceded him, namely Malā-yē Jazīrī, ʿAlī Ḥarīrī and Faqī-yē Ṭayrān (Xānī, 1962: 35–36). It can clearly be concluded that Jazīrī was among the very first poets to employ the Kurdish language as an artistic instrument. This also means that he did not follow any prototype or style when writing poems in Kurdish. He undoubtedly had access to Persian and Arabic, and perhaps Ottoman, poetry to use as models. Accordingly, he had to adapt the Kurdish language to the poetic structures and poetic techniques used in Persian and Arabic poetry, or rather to Kurdify these structures and techniques. This situation can be clearly seen and felt in many of Jazīrī's poems.

In contrast to Jazīrī, at least three Kurdish poets seem to have preceded Xānī. He also mentions the poets Jāmī (1414–1492 CE) and Niẓāmī (1141–1209 CE) who wrote in Persian. When reading *Mam u Zīn*, it is easy to see that he was influenced by Niẓāmī's *maṯnawī*s and that he took them as his model.

Xānī was born 11 years after Jazīrī's death, but this does not mean that they belonged to the same literary generation, since the span of time between their birth dates is about 80 years.

In order to understand the Kurdish language as used by Jazīrī and Xānī and to establish the similarities and differences, one can compare a few grammatical aspects that show how they approached the language (see also the next section):

1. The genus (gender) of the substantive is decisive in the formation of the oblique case in Northern Kurdish, especially with regard to the *iḍāfa* (genitive) construction. Jazīrī often deviates from this rule and forms the *iḍāfa* without using the suffixes *-(y)ā* for feminine and *-(y)ē* for masculine. This obviously depends on the fact that he was still in the process of transitioning from following the Persian grammatical constructions to which he was accustomed, and where there are no gender differences, to employing the Kurdish gender-sensitive *iḍāfa*. Xānī is more consistent in this regard, although in a few cases he also deviates from the Northern Kurdish gender-sensitive *iḍāfa*.
2. The present indicative and present subjunctive are built according to the pattern verbal prefix *di-/bi-* + present stem + present personal ending. The present personal ending for the 3rd person singular in the texts of both Jazīrī and Xānī is mainly *-it/-at*, but in some cases also *–itin/ -atin*. In the version of Northern Kurdish currently used in northern and western parts of Kurdistan, the present personal ending for the 3rd person singular is replaced by *-a*, whereas in the Bahdīnānī subdialect the endings *-it/-at* and *-itin/-atin* are still used.
3. The vocabulary in Jazīrī's poems is often a mixture of Kurdish, Arabic and Persian words, but Xānī takes more care to use purely Kurdish vocabulary. In many cases, he even uses words that are not used in the northern parts of Kurdistan.

The similarities between the languages of the two poets are quite numerous. The differences, lie in their styles and the way they express ideas, which is an aesthetic issue.

4.3. Specific Features of Jazīrī's Language

The following parts of this chapter deal with specific linguistic aspects of the poetry of Jazīrī, including phonological, morphosyntactic and lexical features. It is, indeed, impossible to determine whether the poet followed a written standard for the language that was accepted and followed by other poets of his generation or before him. This is because the number of poets who were his contemporaries or who preceded him was very small, as has already been mentioned. It is also true that Jazīrī, as a poet, was greater than they were, and was an ideal example for them to imitate, but also for generations to come. Jazīrī, one can assume, was driven in his linguistic creativity by two guidelines: his discernment and aesthetic sense of the language, and his understanding of Persian and Arabic poetry, especially the Sufi literature in these two languages.

As a Sufi poet, he had Persian and Arabic Sufi poets as his source of inspiration when it comes to both terminology and vocabulary, and Sufi ideas and

thoughts. Nevertheless, he devoted many of his poems to his own experiences in which he was confronted with an aesthetic obligation to use his own language. Despite his experimental attitude towards the use of the language, he was apparently limited and constrained by the strict rules of poetry, namely rhyme and rhythm. Moreover, he often had to deal with poetic structures, metaphors and similes in a way that made them seem appropriate within the framework of the Kurdish language, rather than Arabic and/or Persian.

Many of the questions discussed below are interesting not only from a linguistic point of view, but also from a historical one. The shift between the Persian and the Kurdish languages in the use of the *iḍāfa*, which corresponds to the genitive, is an important historical issue. It has to do with the beginning of the use of the Kurdish language, in this case the northern dialect as a literary instrument. In other Kurdish dialects that were used as a literary language, this question was not relevant, since the gender of the noun does not determine the form of the *iḍāfa*. In Northern Kurdish (Kurmānjī), on the other hand, the gender of the word is decisive in that regard, and apart from Jazīrī the rules are strictly followed. Jazīrī was apparently aware of the grammatical rules of his own language, but he did not apply them consistently.

Another interesting point is Jazīrī's use of the personal pronouns. The rules for using personal pronouns and distinguishing between those used in oblique case(s) and those used in nominative/direct case are entirely clear. Jazīrī deviates from the rule on two occasions, and alternates between the two pronouns used for the first person singular.

As for the use of verbs, there are several interesting cases. Some of the forms used by Jazīrī do not exist in modern Kurdish. These, and many other similar issues, will be discussed in the following sections.

4.3.1. Phonological Features

1. The invention of a new letter to represent the voiced labiodental fricative /v/

The voiced labiodental fricative /v/ is a rare phoneme in Central and Southern Kurdish, but it is very common in Northern Kurdish. The letter that Jazīrī used for this phoneme is not present in the Arabic or Persian writing systems. It is therefore likely that Malā-yē Jazīrī himself or another contemporary writer invented the letter. It uses the same form as the letter for the phoneme /f/ ف in Arabic and Persian, but has three dots on top of the letter instead of the one for /f/. Thus, the phoneme /v/ is represented by the letter ڤ. This letter was also used by Faqī-yē Ṭayrān and Mīr ʿImād al-Dīn, who were contemporaries of Jazīrī, and it was quickly incorporated into the script and used by later authors such as Malā-yē Bātayī and Aḥmad-ē Xānī. An example of the use of the letter is the following distich:

ئەز گهام ئاڤا حەیاتێ خەف ژ دل
خضری ڤاژی چوویە حەیوانێ غەلەط

Az gihām āv-ā ḥayātē xaf ži dil
Xuḍr-i vāžī čūya ḥaywānē ġalaṭ (ZdJ: 329)

I reached the water of life secretly in the heart,
Conversely, Xiḍr came to the water of immortality by mistake.

It seems that Yūsuf Ḍiyāʾ al-Dīn Pāšā al-Xālidī al-Maqdisī (1842–1906 CE) was the first to point out to this phenomenon, and he wrote about it in his Kurdish-Arabic dictionary *Al-Hadiyya al-Ḥamīdiyya fī al-luġa al-Kurdiyya*, published in 1893. Al-Xālidī al-Maqdisī (1893: 5) writes, "it should be known that there are in the structure of this language what does not exist in the Arabic language, which are five letters, p, č, ž, v and g. They distinguish these letters from those that are alike by putting three dots." In the chapter that deals with the letter /f/ in alphabetical order, he includes the words that begin with both /f/ and /v/, but uses the correct letters to distinguish between them. At the beginning of that chapter (ibid: 178), he calls it "the section of Arabic f and Kurdish f". Of the five letters mentioned by al-Xālidī al-Maqdisī, only /v/ was new. The other four letters were already in use in the Persian and Ottoman Turkish writing systems.

2. Adaptation of the pronunciation of the Arabic pharyngealized fricative /ṣ/ and interdental fricative /ṯ/ to the Kurdish sound system, where they are pronounced identically to the alveolar fricative /s/

This can be seen in the rhyme patterns, where words with the three letters ص (for /ṣ/), ث (for /ṯ/) and س (for /s/) are used as rhyme words in the same rhyme in a poem. This usage can also be seen in the writings of other contemporary and later poets, such as Aḥmad-ē Xānī. In a poem whose rhyme word is "*-asim az*" and which consists of ten distiches, he uses eight words, Kurdish and Arabic, that end with /s/س, but in three cases he uses words that do not end with /s/س. Two of these words end with /ṣ/ص, namely *qafaṣ* (cage) and *miqaṣ* (scissors), and one ends with /ṯ/ث, namely *ʿabaṯ* (absurd, vain). Below are examples of the use of rhyme words ending with both letters:

مثلێ مەهی نەو گەر تە دڤێتن مە ببینی
مێزە بکە جامێ تو دزانی چ کەسم ئەز

Miṯl-ē mah-i naw gar ta divētin ma bibīnī
Mēza bika jāmē, tu dizānī či kasim az (ZdJ: 252)

If you want to see us as the new moon
Look in the cup, [then] you will know who I am

یەغما ژ مە جان کر، کو تەجەللایێ ل دل دا
من ڕووحێ د قالب تویی، تەنها قەفەسم ئەز

Yaġmā ži ma jān kir ku tajallāyē li dil dā
Min rūḥē di qālib tuyi, tanhā qafaṣim az

He plundered our soul when His manifestation appeared in the heart
The soul in my body is you; I am a mere cage.

And

جانا تویی من جان، گولی بێ خار گەرەم بی
مننەت کو نە وەک بولبولی میحنەت عەبەثم ئەز

Jānā tuyi min jān, guli bē xār-i garam bī
Minnat ku na wak bulbul-i miḥnat ʿabaṯim az (ZdJ: 254)

My beloved, you are my soul, if you were for me a rose without a thorn
Thank you that I am not like the nightingale whose toil is in vain

4.3.2. Morphosyntactic Features

1. Plurals of Plurals

An interesting phenomenon in the language of Jazīrī and other classical Kurdish poets such as Aḥmad-ē Xānī and Malā-yē Bātayī is that they form Kurdish plurals from Kurdish or Arabic plurals. This grammatical form, plural of plural, originally comes from Arabic and is also used in Persian. Classical Kurdish poets probably borrowed the form from Persian or Arabic, but it does not exist in modern Kurdish. Jazīrī uses the form three times in his poems. In one of them, he forms a plural from the word *juwānān*, which is originally a plural of the word *juwān* (youth), and uses the word as an *iḍāfa*. The formation process is as follows:

juwān (youth, sg.) → *juwānān* (pl.) → *juwānānēn* (pl. of pl. in *iḍāfa* position)

War dilo dā čīn tamāsā-yā ***juwānānēn*** *čaman*
Wē hilānī sar bi nāz ū sāyabān dāyē niyāz (ZdJ: 267)
Come, my heart, let us go and see the youth(s) in the orchard!
They raise their heads in coquetry, and the parasol does their bidding.

The other two words are *ḥurūfēn* and *suṭūrēn*, which are the plurals of *ḥurūf* and *suṭūr*, and these two are the plurals of *ḥarf* (letter) and *saṭr* (line). Here, the words are turned into plural of plural in this way:
ḥarf (letter, sg.) → *ḥurūf* (pl.) → *ḥurūfēn* (pl. of pl. in *iḍāfa* position),
saṭr (line, sg.) → *suṭūr* (pl.) → *suṭūrēn* → (pl. of pl. in *iḍāfa* position).

> *Fayḍ-ā* ***ḥurūfēn*** *ʿāliyāt, baḥṯ-ā* ***suṭūrēn*** *sāfilāt*
> *Āyāt u waṣfēn muḥkamāt tartīb-i ʿušr ū sūra dā* (ZdJ: 861).
>
> The Divine bounty in the sublime letters, the arguments in the lower lines
> The firm (*Qurʾān*ic) verses and descriptions put in order the decades
> and the *Sūra*s (of the *Qurʾān*).

Xānī also uses the plural of plural in the epic of *Mam u Zīn*. The words *ḥāḍir* (attendant) and *nāẓir* (onlooker), both singular, are turned into Arabic plural and then into Kurdish plural as follows:

ḥāḍir (sg.) → *ḥāḍirīn* (Arabic pl.) → *ḥāḍirīnān* (Kurdish pl.)
nāẓir (sg.) → *nāẓirīn* (Arabic pl.) → *nāẓirīnān* (Kurdish pl.)

> *Afġān ži jān-ē* ***ḥāḍirīnān***
> *Faryād ži nihād-ē* ***nāẓirīnān***
> *Sē rož u šavān ži farš-ē ġabrā*
> *Paywasta dičūna ʿarš-i aʿlā* (Xānī, 1962: 178).
>
> The lamentation rising from the spirit of those present
> The shout coming up from the hearts of the onlookers,
> Would, ceaselessly, for days and nights
> Ascend from the roan mattress (earth) to the higher throne
> (Khani, 2009: 287).

The Arabic word *muʾminat* means a female believer and is singular. The plural is *muʾmināt*, which is the Arabic feminine plural of the word, and *muʾminātān* is the Kurdish plural of the Arabic plural of the word.
muʾminat (Arabic fem. sg.) → *muʾmināt* (Arabic fem. pl.) → *muʾminātān* (Kurdish pl. of the Arabic pl.).

Bātayī, in his *Mawlūdnāma*, uses the Kurdish plural of the Arabic plural as follows:

> *Ma bibaxšī tu bi ġufrān-ā ḏunūb*
> *Ham li dā wu bāb u hindī muslimīn*
> *Ham li hindī* ***muʾminātān*** *ajmaʿīn* (Le Coq, 1903: 89).

May you forgive us, pardoning our sins
Also, parents of all the (male) Muslims
Moreover, all the (female) believers.

2. Pronouns

In northern Kurdish dialects, there is a distinction between the nominative (direct) and the oblique form of the personal pronouns. On two occasions Jazīrī deviates from the expected use of the nominative and oblique forms of the first person singular pronoun, once by using the nominative (direct) form *az* 'I' instead of the oblique form *min*, and once by using the oblique form *min* instead of the nominative (direct) form *az*. The first deviation is found in a distich where he writes *az* after the preposition *li* 'on', where the form *min* is expected:

Paywasta du abrū li ma maḥbūbē kišāndin
Ṣad gazma payāpay li ***az-ē*** *xasta rašāndin* (ZdJ: 477)

The beloved drew her eyebrows (like two bows) continually against us
She repeatedly shot one hundred arrowheads at me (lit. I), the ill one.

The second deviation is found in the following distich where the form *min* is used as the subject of the copula *am* 'am', where *az* is expected.

Ay šah-ē ʿālījanāb pur ʿājiz ū parkanda-am
Āh ži dast jawr-ā avīnē čibkirim (či bikirim) ***min*** *banda-am* (ZdJ: 447)

O, Your Majesty, the King, I am quite powerless and feeble
Ah! Before the tyranny of love, what can I do? I am a slave

If we want to absolve the poet of deviating from the rules of Kurdish grammar, we can read the last sentence in the second hemistich of the second example as a Persian sentence in this way, "*man banda-am"*, which has the same meaning as the Kurdish sentence.

The use of the enclitic pronoun is also a deviation from the grammar of Northern Kurdish, since this category of pronouns does not exist in northern Kurdish, although it does exist in Central Kurdish and Persian. When an enclitic pronoun is used as a possessor in an *iḍāfa* construction, the enclitic pronoun is attached directly to the possessed word. In two cases, Jazīrī uses this form. The following is one example:

Qalb ū jagar min būna xwīn, lawrā ku nū dar būn birīn
Ay jān wara ***ḥālim*** *bibīn, war rūḥ ži qālib bēta dar* (ZdJ: 245)

My heart and my liver have turned to blood,
for the wounds have opened again
My soul (dear one) come to see my condition!
Even if the soul departs the body.

The word *ḥālim* (my condition) consists of *ḥāl* which is directly attached to the enclitic pronoun *-im* (sg. 1). In northern Kurdish, it should be constructed as *ḥāl*+ *ē* (*iḍāfa* suffix for masc. sg.) + *min* (personal pronoun, sg. 1), since enclitic pronouns are not used in that dialect.

3. *Iḍāfa*:

This shifting between the Persian and the Kurdish *iḍāfa*, as has already been mentioned, is especially common in the poems of Jazīrī. In Persian, there is only one gender-neutral form of the *iḍāfa* (*-i*), whereas in Northern Kurdish the *iḍāfa* is number and gender sensitive. After a masculine singular noun, the form of the *iḍāfa* is *-(y)ē*; attached to a feminine singular noun its form is *-(y)ā.* After a plural noun of either gender, the form of the *iḍāfa* is *-(y)ēn*. Jazīrī maintains the correct form of the *iḍāfa* for plural nouns, but often replaces the *iḍāfa -(y)ā* after a feminine singular noun either with the Persian *iḍāfa -i*, which is written with a *kasra* in different editions of Jazīrī's *Dīwān*, or with *-(y)ē* which indicates that the noun is treated as masculine. It seems that the prosodic metre of the poem decides which form is used. It is impossible to know how this was represented in Jazīrī's own manuscript.

The relations between the two words that make up the construction of the *iḍāfa* in northern Kurdish (the possessed and the possessor) can be summarized as in the table below:

Possessed	*iḍāfa*	Possessor	Case marking
(m)	*-(y)ē*	(m)	*-(y)ī*
(m)	*-(y)ē*	(f)	*-(y)ē*
(f)	*-(y)ā*	(m)	*-(y)ī*
(f)	*-(y)ā*	(f)	*-(y)ē*

An interesting word is *yār* which is constantly used by Sufi poets to indicate 'friend, lover, beloved, and mistress' but also to indicate 'God'. In both cases, the poet amorously expresses his feelings for her/Him, although it is often not easy to be sure who the addressee is. Jazīrī uses the word frequently in his poems, but never with a feminine form of the *iḍāfa*, namely *yār-ā*, which would indicate that a feminine beloved is meant. In the following distich, the metaphor is constructed to be more appropriate to describe a feminine beloved, but the *iḍāfa* form is that of a masculine noun:

*Dil-i **yār-ē** ma nabū narm-i bi sad āb-i girī*
Aṯarē dē či bikit ābi bi sad qaṭra li sang (ZdJ: 389)

The heart of our beloved did not become tender/soft with
a hundred (drops of) water of weeping (tears)
What effect would the water have, with a hundred drops, on a stone?

The masculine *iḍāfa* form is used in most of the poems in Jazīrī's *Dīwān*. The word *yār* is also used as the possessor in the *iḍāfa* construction, as either a masculine or a feminine word, where traditional orthography makes no distinction between the oblique case ending in *-ī* (m) and *-ē* (f). New editions of Jazīrī's *Dīwān* normally prefer to mark the oblique case ending as feminine *-ē*, which is possible in modern Kurdish orthography.

Yak sajda tinē farḍa di dīn-ē ʿišqē
*Bin bar qad-i **yārē/yarī** di majāl-ē dīnē* (ZdJ: 761)

In the religion of love, only one prostration is obligatory
This should be done before the lover /beloved's stature,
when she/he is seen.

Another rule in this regard is that when the subject of a transitive verb in the past tense feminine, the suffix *-(y)ē* is attached to the word. This is a feature of the grammatical construction called ergative, which has strict rules in Northern Kurdish. However, speakers and writers do not always follow these rules. Jazīrī often deviates from using the feminine form of the *iḍāfa* in the third and fourth formulas, as presented in the table above, while following the rule of adding the oblique case suffix to a feminine subject in the past, as can be seen in the following distich:

*Awwal ku **yārē** dā ma yak ḏarrayak ʿināyat*
Qismat ma xamr u jāma di daftar-ā hidāyat (ZdJ: 136)

When the beloved, at the beginning, gave us an atom of concern/care
Our lot/fortune was wine and a goblet, in the book of guidance.

The use of *yārē* in the previous distich is grammatically correct, but since the poet is using a metaphor in which the beloved is usually God, he should have used the form *yārī* rather than *yārē*.

While it is possible to interpret *yār* as a masculine or feminine lover/beloved and thereby determine its gender, the word *may* (wine) is always a feminine noun in Kurdish. Jazīrī often conjugated this word as a feminine noun. In some cases, however, he treats it as a masculine noun. In the following distich, *may* is treated as a feminine noun:

Ḥayāt-a dil, ***may-ā*** *bāqī, binošīn dā bi muštāqī*
Alā yā ayyuhā al-sāqī adir kaʾsan wa nāwilhā (ZdJ: 2).

Let us drink desirously the life of the heart, the remaining wine!
O winebearer, bring forth the cup and hand it to me!

An example of using the word as a masculine noun is as follows:

Bi ***may-ē*** *ṣāfī bidīn xarqa-yi zarq*
Bi xarābāt-i muġān ar birasīn (ZdJ: 474)

We will sell the blue garment for pure wine
If we arrive at the ruins (tavern) of the Magi (tavern keeper).

Other examples can be found in some other poems (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1987: 57, 311, and 632). The words *šiʿr* (poetry), *ḥusn* (beauty) and *jām* (cup, goblet) are feminine, but they are used as both feminine and masculine words in Jazīrī's poetry (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1987: 176, 326, 375, 450, 760, 873, and 874). An interesting case in this context is the name Zulayxā, which is undoubtedly a woman name, but it is used in an *iḍāfa* construction without the feminine particle. In some editions, it is read with a masculine *iḍāfa*, but the poetic metre does not permit such a reading. It must only be read as a Persian *iḍāfa*.

ʿĀlamak šahdayi-yā ḥusn u jamāl-ā ta didit
Tū ***Zulayxā-yi*** *zamānī wa či ḥājat madaḥī* (ZdJ: 713)

– v – – / v v – – / v v – – / v v –
Ramal-i muṯamman-i maxbūn-i maḥḏūf

A whole world testifies to your beauty and prettiness
You are the Zulayxā of the (present) time, why should you be praised?

The second foot of both hemstitches is *faʿilātun* (v v – –) which unavoidably must have two short syllables at the beginning of the foot (*rukn*). Had the poet used the Kurdish *iḍāfa*, be it masculine (*yē*) or feminine (*yā*), the foot would begin with a long syllable, which would not agree with the rules of prosody. Aware of this, Jazīrī used the Persian *iḍāfa* form, which is in accordance with the prosody rules.

Another case of *iḍāfa* that is not related to the gender of the word is when the poet uses a form that does not belong to the grammar of northern Kurdish, but to central Kurdish. The word *mubtalā* (to be afflicted) ends in a vowel *-ā*, which necessitates following it with either the *iḍāfa -(y)ē* or *-(y)ā*. In central

Kurdish, words ending with a vowel take the *-y* form of the *iḍāfa*, and this is what Jazīrī occasionally used:

> *Har kasī muḥbat ži rūḥa,* ***mubtalā-y*** *nūr-ā ṣubūḥa*
> *Wī di dil-dā sad jurūḥa, jaḏba wū larzīn u tāya* (ZdJ: 533)
>
> He whose love is from the soul, (he) is afflicted by the pure light,
> There are a hundred wounds in his heart (and) passion, trembling and fever.

4. Verb Conjugation:

In the negated past continuous form of the verb, Jazīrī occasionally uses a contracted form that does not belong to Northern Kurdish. To construct the past continuous in northern Kurdish, and also for at least some 50 years in central Kurdish, it is formed by means of the prefixes *di-* and *da-* respectively, which attach to the verb stem. The prefix *a-*, occasionally used by Jazīrī, is commonly employed in central Kurdish.

In Jazīrī's poetry we encounter forms like *nākat* 'he/she/they was/were not falling: wandering about in the context' (< *na-a-kat*), or *nākir* 'he/she/they was/were not doing' (< *na-a-kir*) or *nādā* 'he/she/they was/were not giving' (< na-a-da), instead of the more common form in Northern Kurdish, *nadikat*, *nadikir* and *nadidā*. In all three forms, *nākat, nākir* and *nādā* the two short *a* vowels are assimilated and turned into a long *ā* vowel. The following are examples of the above-mentioned three verbs, which are found in one and the same poem:

> *Saṭwat-ā Laylē yaqīn Majnūn tapānd*
> *Warna Qays* ***nākat*** *biyābānē ġalaṭ* (ZdJ: 328)
>
> It was certainly Laylā's power that made the madman [Majnūn] collapse,
> Otherwise, Qays would not wander about in the desert by mistake.
>
> *Hēži sahw-ā xāmayē bū, warna min*
> *Av ġalaṭ* ***nākir*** *di dīwānē ġalaṭ* (ZdJ: 335)
>
> This was, after all, an error of the pen, otherwise,
> I would not have made this error in the *dîwân* by mistake.
>
> *Wē lisar bažn-ā ta av saywān vadā*
> *Warna* ***nādā*** *roži saywānī ġalaṭ* (ZdJ: 335)
>
> The sun opened this shade over your stature,
> Otherwise, it would not open a shade by mistake.

This form of conjugation was used not only by Jazīrī, but also by at least one other poet. Mīr (Prince) ʿImād al-Dīn, who was a contemporary of Jazīrī and had a poetic conversation or correspondence with him, used it in a poem:

> *Ma dībū šakl-e Šīrīnē*
> *Tu ustādān wa* ***nākēšā*** (ZdJ: 898)
>
> We had seen the form (appearance) of Šīrīn
> None of the masters painted her thus.

The 3rd person singular non-past suffix *-(i)t*, which in modern Northern Kurdish is normally dropped in word-final position and replaced by the suffix *-a*, is always present in Malā-yē Jazīrī's poems, as well as in the writings of his contemporaries. They also sometimes use the form *-(i)tin*. Even today in modern northern Kurdish, the suffix *-(i)t* appears when the verb form is followed by the preposition *-a*, which attaches enclitically to the preceding word. This shows that the suffix must have been dropped in northern Kurdish after the time of Jazīrī, or even after the time of Aḥmad-ē Xānī and Malā-yē Bātayī (1675–1760), who also use it consistently. Today the *-(i)t/-(i)tin* suffixes are still present in variants of Northern Kurdish spoken in Bahdīnān, and also in some varieties of Central Kurdish.

Examples of the use of *-(i)t* and *-(i)tin* by Jazīrī:

> *Mast-i šahkās-i may-ā jāḏibayīn rūḥ didīn*
> *Rūḥ dizān****it*** *ku žibar laḏḏat-i ʿišq māma labālab* (ZdJ: 67)
>
> We are intoxicated by the royal bowl of the attractive wine, (and) we sacrifice our souls,
> The soul knows that it is because of the enjoyment of love that I am still full to the brim.
>
> *Jawr-i Hindē dē kišīn****it*** *har kasī ṭāwūs divē****t***
> *Gawhar ū duṛṛ-ā yatīm bē tark-i sar tē****tin*** *ṭalab?* (ZdJ: 76)
>
> Whoever wishes to obtain a peacock, must suffer the hardship of (going to) India,
> Is it possible to request (to have) a jewel and a unique pearl without giving up one's head?

Examples of the use of *-(i)t* and *-(i)tin* by Aḥmad-ē Xānī in his works, *Mam u Zīn* and *Nūbār-ā bičūkān*:

*Ḥusn-ā nabi**tin** ču ḥadd u ġāyat*
*Nāb**it** ži xwaʿāšiqān nihāyat* (Xānī, 1962: 49)

The beauty that has no limits or ends
Its lovers are also endless (Khani, 2009: 68)

*Dar-ē ḏihnē vabi**tin***
*Harčī dixūnin zaḥmat nabi**tin*** (Le Coq, 1903: 2).

May the doors of the brains (of those angel-natured ones) be open,
So that they may find what they study easy.

Malā Ḥusayn Bātayī in his *Mawlūdnāma* also uses both forms:

*Dā bičī**tin** ṭalba ka**t** kānī kiya*
Xoš dibēžin vē nawā-yēʿāliya (Le Coq, 1903: 89).

So that she goes and inquires who are those
Who sing this melody so beautifully.

Maqdisī, who published his Kurdish-Arabic dictionary in 1893, uses only the suffix *-a* at the end of the verb for the 3rd person singular non-past: *di-* + present stem + *-a* (al-Xalidī al-Maqdisī, 1893: 13–14).

The first newspaper in Kurdish history, called Kurdistan, was published in 1898 by Miqdād Midḥat Badir-Xān, a member of the Badir-Xān dynasty that ruled the Jazīra principality for several centuries. His form of Kurdish is the same as that of Jazīrī and Xānī, who lived in the city of Jazīra and also wrote their works in the same Kurdish variant. In his articles in that newspaper he uses all three forms of the suffix, *-(i)t, -(i)tin* and *-a*. These three forms are also used in articles written by others in the same newspaper.

Miqdād Midḥat Badir-Xān was first the editor-in-chief of the paper and he published five issues in Cairo between 21 April and 16 June 1898. During this period, the three suffixes are used in the newspaper as described above. When his brother ʿAbd al-Raḥmān resumed the publication of the paper a few months later, there were some changes in the language and ideology of the paper. Among the changes in the language, one can observe that the use of the suffix *-(i)tin* disappears completely, while the other two suffixes continue to be used.

The newspaper *Žīn* (Life) was published in Istanbul between 7 November 1918 and 2 February 1919, in 25 issues. Again, the suffix *-(i)tin* is not used in this newspaper, but the other two are.

The negation of the imperative form in classical Kurdish, and still in central Kurdish and variants of northern Kurdish spoken in Bahdīnān, is *ma-*, while in other variants of modern northern Kurdish, the negation *na-* has also spread

to the imperative verb forms. Jazīrī and his contemporaries consistently use the negation *ma-* in imperative forms.

Example of the use of *ma-* from Jazīrī's poetry:

> *Bi ḥabābē **ma**ba maġrūr waha sargašta Malā*
> *Bā vibar kaftiya wē bēhūda sargašta ḥabāb* (ZdJ: 63)
>
> Don't be astonished, or bewildered, Malā, by (seeing) the bubbles
> They contain air and are wandering in vain.

Xānī uses the same form in *Mam u Zīn*:

> *Zinhār tu **ma**ba li malē ḥāriṯ*
> *Lawrā ku dibin ži dast ta wāriṯ* (Xānī, 1962: 132)
>
> Take care of it! Do not be attached to possessions,
> For the heirs will take them away from you (Khani, 2009: 209).

Bātayī uses the same form:

> *Ṣaḥibān az dītim ū pursīn dirēž*
> *Lēki tanbīh bū li min bo kas **ma**bēž* (Le Coq, 1903: 78).
>
> The friends saw me and inquired in detail,
> But I was warned: don't tell anyone!

The 1st person plural non-past suffix *-(y)īn*, which in modern Northern Kurdish has changed to *-(y)in* and merged with the suffix *-(y)in* of the 2nd and 3rd person plural, is always present in Jazīrī's poems, as well as in the writings of his contemporaries. This suffix is still present in variants of Northern Kurdish spoken in Bahdīnān, and in central Kurdish. The same applies to the 1st person plural form of the non-past copula, which is *-(y)īn* in Jazīrī's poems and the writings of his contemporaries, as well as in central Kurdish and Bahdīnānī, but is *-(y)in* for all three persons in the plural in modern northern Kurdish.

Present subjunctive, 1st person plural:

> *Waya hudhud ži Sabā bēt u bizān**īn** čiya ḥāl*
> *Ku li ḥālē ma ġarībān na suʾāl u na jawāb* (ZdJ: 64)
>
> The hoopoe may come from Sabaʾ (Sheba), and then we know what the condition is
> But as for us, strangers, there are no questions and no answers.

Copula, 1st person plural:

> *Miḥnat-Kaš**īn** rūz u šabē, dar firqat-ā šīrīn-labē*
> *Ẓulm-ā ži bar dast-ē ta bē, awʿadla, em pur pē xwaš**īn*** (ZdJ: 468)
>
> We are tormented, day and night, for separating from that sweet-lipped one,
> The oppression that comes from you, is justice, we are very happy with it.

Xānī writes in *Mam u Zīn*:

> *Gurzān bihaž**īn**, rimān bibāz**īn***
> *Av ranga Mamī ži mīr bixwāz**īn*** (Xānī, 1962: 146)
>
> Let us swing clubs and lance spears
> And thus ask the prince to release Mam (Khani, 2009: 235).

An example of the use of *-(y)in* as a non-past suffix in modern literary northern Kurdish is as follows:

> "*Em di jimareya 23'an da ragîhanek dibîn**in***" (Bozarslan, 1985: 13)
> In the issue number 23, we see an announcement.

As an example of the use of the copula for 1st person plural, Qadrījān (1911–1972) writes in a poem:

> *Belê… em xizanê mal **in**,*
> *Lê zengînê Kemal **in*** (Aras, 2020: 11).
>
> Yes… we are poor in wealth,
> But we are rich in perfection/integrity.

Special Verb Forms

The verb *kirin* 'to do' has the non-past stem *ki* in modern northern Kurdish, except in Bahdīnānī, and *ka* in Bahdīnānī and central Kurdish. Malā-yē Jazīrī uses both the stem *ki* and another stem, *kir*, with about equal frequency. To my knowledge, there is no modern Kurdish dialect that uses the non-past stem *kir*, nor do any other classical or modern Kurdish writers use the non-past stem *kir.* The forms with this stem are found in all persons and non-past verb forms, except the imperative form. The following forms are attested:

Present indicative, 1st person singular: *dikirim*
Present indicative, 2nd person singular: *dikirī*
Present indicative, 3rd person singular: *dikirit*
Present indicative, 1st person plural: *dikirīn*
Present indicative, 2nd and 3rd person plural: *dikirin*.
Present subjunctive, 1st person singular: *bikirim*
Present subjunctive, 2nd person singular: *bikirī*
Present subjunctive, 3rd person singular: *(bi)kirit*
Present subjunctive, 1st person plural: *bikirīn*
Negated present subjunctive, 2nd person singular: *nakirī*
Negated present indicative, 1st person plural: *nākirīn*
Negated present indicative, 3rd person plural: *nākirin*

Jazīrī conjugates the verb *kirin* (doing) with the non-past stem *ki* in this way:

> *Āwurēn aswad-ʿuyūnān ʿāqilān sawdā* ***dikin***
> *Gazma-yā ʿāšiq vadil kaftī ži čahvēn šahla bū* (ZdJ: 620).
>
> The looks of the black eyes drive the intelligent insane
> The arrows that hit the lover's heart were (shot) from the bluish-black eyes.

He conjugates the same verb in the same tense, using the non-past stem *kir*, as follows:

> *Naqšēn falakān guh didirin vē naẓmē*
> *Tanhā na bašar har* ***dikirin*** *taḥsīnē* (ZdJ: 761).
>
> The ornaments of the celestial spheres (stars) listen to this verse,
> Not only human beings do constantly commend it.

The verb *xwārin* 'to eat' has the non-past stem *xo/xu* in modern Northern Kurdish, Bahdīnānī and Central Kurdish. Jazīrī uses both the stem *xo/xu* and occasionally another stem, *xur*. In the following distich he uses *xu* as the non-past stem in a verb in the present subjunctive form:

> *ʿĀšiq divē dil-sāda bit, xāk-ā rī-yā yār-ē xwa bi*
> *Ṣad dāġ di dil wak lāla bit, xūnē bixut, rang-ġunča bit* (Zdj: 815)
>
> The lover must be simple-hearted, (and) be
> The earth of the road of his beloved,
> (and) to be cauterized in the heart, one hundred times like tulips,
> (and) eat blood to be like a rosebud.

To my knowledge, no modern Kurdish dialect uses the non-past stem *xur/xwar* (with a retained *r*, as in the Persian non-past and past stems and the Kurdish past stem). No other classical or modern Kurdish writer uses the non-past stem *xur*. In these examples Jazīrī uses the verb in combination with the nouns *sond* and *qasam* (oath, swear) to mean 'to take oath/to swear'. In Kurdish and Persian, one "eats/consumes" oath, the expression for taking an oath or swearing.

Qiblatī wajhuka fī kulli ṣabāḥin wa masāʾ
Bi du abrūyi ta jānā, ***dixurim*** *az qasamē* (ZdJ: 686).

Beloved, I swear by both your eyebrows!
Your face is my *Qibla* in every morning and evening

Az bi wē qāmat u bažnē li ta sondē ***dixurim***
Bas ka ay padišahā min li asīrān ġadarē (ZdJ: 721).

I put you on oath by that stature of yours
To stop, my emperor, treachery towards the captives.

In most dialects of Kurdish, there is no possession verb 'to have'. Possession is constructed with the verb *habūn* 'to be/to exist'. In Persian, however, and in the southernmost dialects of Kurdish (Lurī for example), the verb *dāštan*, originally meaning 'to keep, to hold', has developed the meaning of 'to have'. Probably due to Persian or Luri Kurdish, influence, Jazīrī occasionally uses a form similar to the Persian verb *dāštan* to denote possession. It is noteworthy, however, that he does not use the Persian non-past stem *dār*. Instead, he uses a non-past stem *dīr* as in the following two distiches:

Ḥusn ū jamāl-i jānān ***nādīritin*** *tu pāyān*
Harčī nabit bidāyat, aṣlan nahin nihāyat (ZdJ: 137)

The beauty of the souls (or sweetheart) has no end
Whatever that has no beginning, never has a termination.

Lāt-i ḥusnī (w)u šah-ē xūbānī, bi xwa ham xānī (w)u ham xāqānī
Yūsuf-ē ṯāniyī tu īro xānim, ku bi ḥusn-ā xwa ***nadīrī*** *ṯānī* (ZdJ: 738)

You are the idol of beauty and the king of the beautiful,
you are both a lord and an emperor
Today you are the second Joseph, my Lord,
and in your beauty you have no second.

This form of the verb, *dīr*, as the non-past stem of the infinitive *dāštan*, is found in the quatrains of Baba Tahir 'Uryan.

Jazīrī also uses the normal Northern and Central Kurdish possessive construction with *habūn*, as in this distich:

> *Min dilbarak wak duṛ* ***haya****, maḥbūbi šīrīn-sur* ***haya***
> *Ḥusn ū jamālak puṛ* ***haya****, Balqīs-ṣifat, maskan Sabā* (ZdJ: 27).
>
> I have a heart-ravishing (sweetheart) who is like a pearl,
> I have a beloved of sweet charm
> She has great (plenty of) beauty, a Balqīs, who dwells in Sabā (Sheba).

The verb *dāyin/dān* 'to give' has the non-past stem *di/da* in all modern Kurdish dialects. Jazīrī uses both the stem *di/da* and occasionally another stem, *dir*. As far as I know, there is no modern Kurdish dialect that uses the non-past stem *dir*, and no other classical Kurdish writers use it. There is no *r* in either of the two stems of this verb in Persian either. The verb *nādim* (I do not give) in the following verse is based on the non-past stem *di*:

> *Šarbat-ā (L)ām u (B)iyān az bi ḥayātē* ***nādim***
> *Bāda-yā laʿl-ē bi āv-ā ẓulumātē* ***nādim*** (ZdJ: 413)
>
> I do not give (change) the juice of L and B (lips) with the water of life
> I do not change the ruby-like wine with the water of the Darkness.

In the following distiches, Jazīrī uses the non-past stem *dir*:

> *Qahwa-yā talxi digal zahr-i halāhil* ***bidirī***
> *Ma ži dast-ē ta mubarak šakar-amēza gulāb* (ZdJ: 61).
>
> If you give us, bitter coffee (mixed) with deadly poison
> We (take it) from your sacred hand (as) rose water mixed with sugar.
>
> *Naẓarak wē bašar-ē lab-šakar-ē ḥūrī-sirištē*
> ***Nādirim*** *az bi may u kawṯar u ḥūrēn di bihištē* (ZdJ: 782).
>
> I do not give a look from that sugar-lipped, *houri*-natured human being
> For the wine, *Kawṯar* and the *ḥouri*s of paradise.

5. Postpositions

The two postpositions *dā* 'in' preceded by the preposition *di*, denoting locative, and *rā*, often combined with the prepositions *ži* or *bi* to form a circumposition 'for, to, with' denoting an indirect participant such as recipient, benefactor or addressee, are represented in the modern orthography as *de* and *re*. Jazīrī and his contemporaries use *dā* and *rā*.

*Ism-ē taya maktūbi di dīwān-i qidam-**dā***
Ḥarfak qalam-ē ʿilm-i bi taqwīm-i raqam dā (ZdJ: 11).

It is your name that is written in the record of eternity
The pen of (divine) knowledge correctly wrote a letter.

Jazīrī uses the other postposition *rā* in this distich:

*Bi tūlēn āstānē-**rā** vaxwāndim Mīr bi dargāhē*
Bi vī čāvī ḥabīb dītim šukur av šafqa Mawlē dā (ZdJ: 48)

The Prince (ruler) called me together with the dogs of the threshold,
I saw the beloved with my own eyes, thanks that this kindness was granted by God almighty.

Adak (2019: 23), a modern Kurdish writer, uses the postposition ***de***, as we see in the following lines:

"*Hêvî ew e ku her teşeyeke nezmê ku **di** vê berhemê **de** cih digire, **di** paşerojê **de** bibe mijara nameyeke akademîk, yan jî lêkolîneke serbixwe*" which means 'It is my hope that the poetic forms contained in this work will be the subject of an academic thesis or an independent essay in the future'.

Ulugana (2018: 44), another modern Kurdish writer, uses both ***de*** and ***re*** as postpositions in the following text:

"***Di** salên 1640î **de** êdî giliyên Evdal Xan bi rêya nameyan ji siltanê Osmaniyan re dihatin kirin. Yanî **di** van salan **de** rêvebiriya Osmanî li Kurdistanê, newêribûn ku bi wî re raterast şer bikirina*." The text means 'In the 1640s, Evdal Xan (ʿAbdāl Xān) used to send his complaints by letters to the Ottoman sultan. This meant that the Ottoman authorities in Kurdistan did not dare to fight him directly'.

6. Lexicon

A. Coinage of Words and Expressions:

Jazīrī sometimes coins new words and expressions based on already existing words and expressions. One such expression is *guh-li-rē* 'ear-to-road' in the sense of "waiting to hear from you" coined on the pattern of *čāv-li-rē* 'eye-to-road' in the sense of "waiting for you, expecting you to come".

Hudhud-ē riḍwān-i ġaybē, sad xabar šīrīn ži jaybē
Dā dil-ē min murda ḥay bē, ***guh li rē*** *min wak ṣabāya*
Čahvanērim, ***guh li rēma****, lē ṣabā rēdāya bēma*
ʿarḍiḥāl-ā muḥbatē ma, bandayak ṣādiq Malāya (ZdJ: 527–528).

The hoopoe, a messenger, the gardener of paradise,
Has a hundred lovely messages in his pocket
To revive my dead heart. My ears are to the road, to meet the east wind.
My eyes are to the road (expectant); my ears are to the road, the zephyr, I think, is on its way
The message (petition) of our love (is that) Mala is a truthful slave.

A new word coined by Jazīrī and not found in any Kurdish text before or even after him is *fiṛā*, with the meaning of 'being very fast in flying'. The word is based on the pattern of *zānā* (scientist, scholar), *twānā* (strong, powerful, capable) and *bīnā* (clear-sighted, able to see), which give a sense of exaggeration and superiority in knowing, doing or seeing something. In coining the word *fiṛā*, Jazīrī follows the same rules applied in constructing the other three words, namely the non-past stem of the verb + *ā* (the present stem of the infinitive *fiṛīn* 'to fly' is *fiṛ*). The word is used only once in Jazīrī's *Dīwān*.

Ma w nasīm xwaš panja tēkrā, wē dičin wak tayr-i vēkrā
Baḫṯ-i zulf-ā yār-i pēkrā, bor-i ʿišqē puṛ ***fiṛāya*** (ZdJ: 541).

The breeze and we, hand in hand, went together like birds,
Talking about the ringlet of the beloved, the horse of love flies very fast.

B. Use of Synonyms:

Jazīrī often uses two synonyms for one concept. This is rather common in Kurdish for abstract concepts, but Jazīrī also uses it for concrete material things. It is worth noting that in all cases; the poet uses the two words together, combining them with the word *u/ū* 'and'. Some examples are *čatr u saywān* 'umbrella' (87), *barg u waraq* 'leaf' (95), *rūḥ u rawān* 'soul' (769), *qand u nabāt* 'sugar/candy' (769), *maqsūd u qast* 'purpose' (770), *kilk u xāma* 'pen' (867), *govand u raqṣ* (dance) (874). Below are two distiches by Jazīrī that contain such synonyms:

Waṣf ū kamālātēn subūḥ, ḥarfēn kitāb-ā ʿaql u rūḥ
Ismak divē lē bin wuḍūḥ, law lawḥ u ***kilk ū xāma*** *dā* (ZdJ: 867)

The pure qualities and perfections, the letters in the book of the intellect and the soul,
Need a name that explicates (explains) them, and thus He created the tablet (board) and the pen.

Sāqī ži dang-ē bulbula, āvēta čarxē ġulġula
Rūḥān li dorē silsila, ***govand u raqṣ*** *ū ḥalqa dā* (ZdJ: 874)

The cupbearer caused a tumult in the firmament with the spout of the jug,
The souls began dancing in circles and forming rings.

C. Foreign Words:

Jazīrī uses two foreign words that belong to languages not commonly known in the Middle East at his time. One of these is *astuqus* from the Greek *stoicheion* (στοιχεῖον), which is used in the same sense as in Greek, namely for 'element' in philosophical discussion. It can be noted that Jazīrī adds a fifth element to the four Greek ones, namely love. The other word is *pincers* (he uses the word as *pans*), which is used together with its Arabic counterpart *kulab* (*kullaba* in standard Arabic) to denote the instrument called 'pincers' or 'forceps' in English. If the first word may have been known in philosophical circles, the second is highly unexpected in 16th-century Kurdistan.

Jawhar-ē ʿāliya ʿunsur ma Malā
Bil-ḥaqīqat na ži xwār astuqusīn (ZdJ: 477)

Our origin and existence is of high quality, *Malā*!
We are, indeed, not of an inferior element.

Ži jigar Malā pilingān bi kulāb u pans-i kar kir
Asadān ži panja vērān dil u sīna harišāndin (ZdJ: 453)

The tigers tore Mala's liver with forceps and pincers,
The lions also tore the heart and the breast with their claws.

D. Causative Formation

In all modern Kurdish dialects, the verb *ānīn/hānīn/īnān/hēnān* means 'to bring'. Jazīrī uses this verb in the form of *īnān* (twice) and *ānīn* (twelve times), but he also constructs another form, *warīn,* for the 2nd person singular imperative form of 'to bring'. To my knowledge, this form is not attested in any other Kurdish text or spoken dialect. It could possibly be explained as a caus-

ative formation based on *wara* 'come', which is the 2nd person singular imperative (irregular) form of *hātin* 'to come'. Northern Kurdish forms causatives with the suffix *-īn* and in some cases *-ēn*.
In the following two distiches, the form *warīn* is used:

Dīsā ži nū bēḥāla dil, sāqī ***warīn*** *jām-ā zuǰāj*
Muštāq-i xamr-ā āla dil, lē xoš-i ānībit mizāj (ZdJ: 176)

My heart, once again, is ill-circumstanced, bring the glassy goblet, cupbearer!
My heart is yearning for the red wine, (so that) my temperament may become merry and glad instantly.

D'ānī zuhūr, dīm-ē bi nūr, xālēn dihūr, jām-ā ṭahūr
Sāqī ***warīn*** *jām-ā zarīn, aw sur-širīn, jām-mašraba* (ZdJ: 587)

She was showing her bright face, the small birthmarks and the goblet containing the pure wine,
Cupbearer, bring the golden goblet, that attractive beauty, enjoys drinking (wine).

Chapter 5: Malā-yē Jazīrī: A *Wujūdī-Ṣūfī* Poet

5.1. Introduction

The poetry of Malā-yē Jazīrī has always been treated as one of the most authentic and magnificent examples of Kurdish Ṣūfī poetry. This assessment is not only the result of admiration for Jazīrī as one of the poets who founded Classical Kurdish poetry, but also because his poetry is regarded as masterly, great and deep Ṣūfī poetry.

The Dīwān of Jazīrī contains rich evidence that poets who were his contemporaries venerated him as a Ṣūfī poet and spiritual leader. Prince ʿImād al-Dīn, who wrote a long poetic conversation with Jazīrī, uses dozens of expressions of reverence for Jazīrī and his work in his poem, ending it by describing him as "our master" (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1987: 913). Fivefold versions of Jazīrī's poems were made (taxmīs) by other poets while he was still alive (see Chapter 1) and therefore these fivefold poems are found together with Jazīrī's poems in the manuscripts and are included in all the editions of Jazīrī's Dīwān.

The same attitude of reverence for Jazīrī is present in the poems of Faqī-yē Ṭayrān and in *Mam u Zīn* by Aḥmad-ē Xānī, who lived later. It is also common knowledge that the poet had good relations with the ʿAzīzān princely family who ruled the principality of Botān. Apparently, they also held him in high esteem as a poet and a Ṣūfī, since we know that Jazīrī is the only person who is not a member of the princely family but is buried in their family cemeterey.

Apart from the above-mentioned evidence of the high position Jazīrī enjoyed among the educated and higher circles of society, we read in his biographies many stories and anecdotes that illustrate how highly he was regarded by simple and ordinary people (Sajjadi, 1971: 189; Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1959: س). These people were probably unaware of Jazīrī's poetry, but they adored him as a Ṣūfī and regarded him as a holy man, a saint. In a number of these anecdotes and stories, some talents are attributed to Jazīrī that place him outside the sphere of ordinary human beings and give him a tinge of sanctity.

In his History of Kurdish Literature, Sajjādī (1971: 189) recounts a story about Jazīrī to the effect that, in his young years, while attending a party arranged in Ḥasnkīf for a theology student who was to recieve certification, Jazīrī fell in love with Salmā, the daughter of Malik Kāmil, the ruler of the city. Jazīrī wrote many poems for her, and thus the story of their love was revealed to the public. People blamed the ruler for not not accepting that his reputation was being damaged by Jazīrī's poems about his sister. At first he

put the poet in prison, but later, he had him released. The ruler had wanted to test whether the poet's love was genuine or not. It was arranged that Jazīrī would meet Salmā somewhere outside the city, without being notified in advance, and the ruler and some members of his staff would watch them secretly from a distance. Salmā came out of her hiding place and approached the poet, saying that she was the Salmā to whom he had written his love poems. Jazīrī, in a state of ecstasy, told her that she was not the Salmā he loved and for whom he had composed his poems. A shrieking sound was heard from him and he went up in flames. When they came closer to him, they saw that he had turned into a heap of ashes, and Salmā was burned too.

This story, which contains many contradictions, is no more than a myth, but it illustrates popular beliefs and ideas about a poet, a Ṣūfī, and Divine love. It is clear that Jazīrī's death was not the result of being burned. Moreover, it is almost certain that he died when he was a relatively old man, contrary to what the story suggests. An essential aspect here is the coincidence between the popular imagination and understanding of love and a poetic metaphor often used by poets in various cultures. Love, be it earthly or divine, is supposed to have a physical energy that can burn the lovers. Jazīrī uses this metaphor in several poems. The following is an example:

> *Wah či ʿišq u či salāmat, hardu dūrin ži yakī*
> *Kullu man yasluku ḥubban, subul al-nāri salak* (ZdJ: 382)
>
> Oh, that love and safety, they are far from one another
> Whoever follows (the way of) love, he has taken the roads of fire.

The concept of a love that burns the lovers is present in the traditional tales and epics of various peoples and cultures. A well-known love story of this kind is that of Asli and Karam, originating from Azerbaijan and eastern Anatolia (Khosroshahi and Negahban, Aṣli and Karam, EIs-III).

What is of interest about Jazīrī in the context of this study is not this aspect of his life, but the way he expressed his feelings and the spiritual and mystical states he experienced as a Ṣūfī. In other words, it is important to highlight the artistic output of a Ṣūfī who also was a poet. This, in turn, implies that there are aspects of Jazīrī's poetry that are common to the poetry of other Ṣūfī poets. These include, in addition to the formal and structural characteristics, the ideas and thoughts he held, verbalized, and transmitted by means of words. On the other hand, there are attributes of his poetry that characterize his poems and his style, giving them discernible features that can be described as the constituents that construct Jazīrī's poetry. Among these, one can count the words and expressions he chose, as well as the metaphors and similes he employed in his poems.

This chapter is an attempt to present Jazīrī as a Ṣūfī poet within the confines of a historical and, in part, a theoretical context that constitutes the spiritual

and philosophical background that shaped the contents of his poetry. The same postulate is also suggested for other Kurdish Ṣūfī poets who succeeded him. Taking this background as a starting point for studying the Ṣūfī aspects of Jazīrī's poetry entails writing about two important affiliations that form the structure of Jazīrī's thought and poetic creation. The two affiliations are, first, his membership in the Naqšbandī Order (*Ṭarīqa*), which was, and still is, one of the most dominant and popular Ṣūfī orders in Kurdistan, and, secondly, his association with the doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* (the unity of being or pantheism) of Ibn ʿArabī.

Although there are many similarities between the Ṣūfī orders, there are also features that make some of them unique. Over the centuries of its history, the Naqšbandī order has undergone changes and developments in its system of thought and the structure of its teachings and practice. These special aspects are sometimes reflected in the texts of the writers and poets associated with the order.

The doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* is one of the main ideas and doctrines known among the leaders and the intellectual circles of the Naqšbandī order, as well as in almost all other Ṣūfī orders. In addition to tracts that dealt in whole or in part with the philosophy of Ibn ʿArabī, promoted by the *ʿulamā*, many Naqšbandī poets devoted extensive space to the expression of their spiritual experience, influenced by Ibn ʿArabī's thoughts, especially his theory of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*.

In the *Dīwān* of Malā-yē Jazīrī, both of these affiliations are present. A large number of Jazīrī's poems are dedicated to the questions of existence, the creation of the universe and the relationship of human beings to God. These are important principles of Ibn ʿArabī's philosophy, especially his theory of *Waḥdat al-wujūd,* although the poets did not treat them in philosophical language, but in a mystical one, employing allegories, symbols and Ṣūfī terminology.

5.2. Ṣūfīsm and Poetry: The Beginnings of Ṣūfīsm

Defining a starting point for Islamic mysticism (Ṣūfīsm) is obviously a controversial question, depending on the point of view from which one approaches the issue. The primordial convenant between God and humanity, to which the *Qurʾān* refers (VII: 172) is the most impressive idea for many Muslims, especially the Ṣūfīs. The *Qurʾān*ic verse in question reads "And when thy Lord took from the children of Adam, from their loins, their seed, and made them testify touching themselves, 'Am I not your Lord?' They said: "Yes, We testify". Schimmel (1975: 24), describing the day of the primordial convenant, points out that "here is the starting point for their understanding of free will and predestination, of election and acceptance, of God's eternal power and man's loving response and promise".

The day of that primordial convenant is called in the Ṣūfī heritage the "day of *alastu*" or the "tavern of *alastu*", referring to the Arabic question "Am I not your Lord?" (*alastu bi-rabbikum?*). Almost all Ṣūfī poets allude to it in their poetry. The metaphor of the tavern implies the idea that God gave the human being a goblet of wine as a sign of Divine love.

Another idea in this regard is to trace Ṣūfīsm back to the Prophet Muḥammad. Knysh (2010: 61) writes: "Normative Ṣūfī literature routinely portrays the Prophet and some of his ascetically minded Companions as 'Sūfis'". Among these, are Abū Ḏar al-Ġifārī (d. 32AH/652 CE), Salmān al-Fārisī (d. 14 AH/635 CE), and Bilāl al-Ḥabašī (d. 19 AH/640 CE). Schimmel (1975: 27) develops the idea further, and asserts that:

> Muhammad is the first link in the spiritual chain of Ṣūfīsm, and his ascension through the heavens into the divine presence, to which the first lines of *Sūra* 17 allude, became the prototype of the mystic's spiritual ascension into the intimate presence of God.

The wearing of woollen (*ṣūf* in Arabic) clothing seems to have been the main reason why many pious people became known as *Ṣūfis* by the end of the second/eighth century. Other theories suggest the words *ṣafā* (purity), *ṣuffa* (bench) and *ṣaff* (rank) as roots of the term Ṣufism (*taṣawwuf* in Arabic), which seem less relevant (Knysh, 2000: 7; Schimmel, 1975: 14). Al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (21–110 AH/642–728 CE) was one of the first mystics to preach this kind of ascetic, anti-government thought to various people in society, and he had many followers.

5.2.1. Arabic Ṣūfī poetry

Adherence to Ṣūfīsm produced rituals, forms of expression and utterances that gradually became the main characteristics of some Ṣufis, especially those who were educated and acquainted with literature. Ṣūfī poetry was a product of this development. Among the most prominent Ṣūfīs who composed poetry in Arabic are Rābiʿa al-ʿAdawiya (d. 185/801), Ḏu al-Nūn al-Miṣrī (d. Giza, in 245/859 or 248/862), Junaid al-Baġdādī (215–298 AH/830–910 CE), Al-Ḥallāj (d. 858–922), Ibn al-Fāriḍ (576–632 AH/1181–1235 CE), and Ibn ʿArabī (d. 1165–1240 CE). As an example of the first Ṣūfī poems in Arabic, here are a few lines by Rābiʿa al-ʿAdawiya, which, in my opinion, were undeservedly described by Schimmel (1982: 18) as a "little artless poem":

ʾUḥibbuka ḥubbayni, ḥubb al-hawā
Wa ḥubban li-annaka ahlun li-ḏāk
Fa-ammā al-laḏī huwa ḥubb al-hawā
Fa-šuġlī bi-ḏikrika ʿamman siwāk
Wa-amma al-laḏī anta ahlun lahu
Fa-lastu arā al-kawna ḥattā arāk
Fa-lā al-ḥamdu fī ḏā wa-lā ḏāka lī
Wa-lākin laka al-ḥamdu fī ḏā wa ḏāk. (Badawī: 1962, p. 64)

Nicholson (1962: 234) translates the piece as follows:

Two ways I love Thee: selfishly,
And next, as worthy is of Thee.
'Tis selfish love that I do naught
Save think on Thee with every thought.
'Tis purest love when thou dost raise
The veil to my adoring gaze.
Not mine the praise in that or this,
Thine is the praise in both, I wis.

The earlier mystical poets employed simple and short poetic forms, but longer forms, especially *qaṣīda*, were later also used, for example by Ibn al-Fāriḍ, whose *tāʾiyya* (a poem rhyming in the letter t: ت) consists of 761 distiches.

In terms of the content, language and metaphors of the poems, the Ṣūfī poets used almost the same patterns as earlier Arab poets who described their passion for the beloved, and their experience of the different stages of love, such as separation, longing, weeping and shedding tears, being burnt by the fire of love, or joy and intoxication. These and many other similar features of Ṣūfī poetry could later also be found in Persian, Turkish, Kurdish and Indian Ṣūfī poetry.

Ibn al-Fāriḍ uses the following metaphor in one of his poems:

Šaribnā ʿlā ḏikri al-ḥabībi mudāmatan
Sakirnā bihā min qabli an yuxlaq al-karmu

In memory of the Beloved, we quaffed a vintage
That made us drunk before the creation of the vine
(Nicholson, 1989: 184)

Nicholson (ibid) further interprets the verse, pointing to the mystical allegory through which the poet conveyed his message "the soul was intoxicated with the wine of Divine Love (i.e. was rapt in contemplation of God) during its pre-existence in the eternal knowledge of God before the body was created". It is

noteworthy that Nicholson, not only translates the verse, but also finds it necessary to explain it, in order to shed light on the mystical symbols and to decipher the obscure meanings hidden behind the metaphorical Ṣūfī language.

The idea, no doubt, is the same "day of *alastu*" or "tavern of *alastu*" that refers to the *Qurʾān*ic verse 7: 172 quoted above. It can be found in the poetry of almost all Ṣūfī poets and in different languages. Such similarities are quite common in mystical poetry.

Šaṭḥiyāt, also called *šaṭaḥāt*, (theopathic locutions or ecstatic utterances of "drunken" Ṣūfīs), were also an artistic verbal expression attributed to some of the Ṣūfīs. *Šaṭḥiyāt* differ from Ṣūfī poetry in that they are not necessarily produced by Ṣūfī poets. They could be uttered by Ṣūfīs who were not known as poets, like al-Niffarī (d. ca. 965 CE) and al-Xarqānī (351–425 AH/963–1033 CE). Moreover, the *šaṭaḥāt* are usually prose texts, and in many cases they are not written down, but recited by a Ṣūfī and then passed on by some of his listeners or his followers, friends and disciples.

Among the Ṣūfīs who are known for having uttered words of *Šaṭḥiyāt*, reference should be made to Bāyazīd al-Bisṭamī (d. 874), Al-Ḥallāj (d. 922), Abu Bakr al-Šiblī (d. 945), and Abu al-Ḥasan al-Xarqānī. *Šaṭḥiyāt* words and statements are also attributed to Ibn ʿArabī, because of what he relates in many of his writings about his revelations, his meetings with the Prophets Ibrāhīm and ʿIsā (Jesus), or that he saw the Prophet Muḥammad in a dream giving him a book and telling him to take it to the people (Ibn al ʿArabi, 1980: 45). The book was *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam* (The Bezels of Wisdom), which is Ibn ʿArabī's most celebrated book.

All the aspects mentioned here are also present, as will be seen, in the poetry of Malā-yē Jazīrī. It should be added that the mystical poets, who wrote their poems in various languages, generation after generation, were not confined to these forms and themes, but innovated in their artistic and linguistic means and introduced countless features to the treasure of Ṣūfī literature.

5.2.2. Persian Ṣūfī Poetry

Although Persian Ṣūfī poetry began later than Arabic Ṣūfī poetry, there are similarities between them, at least in the choice of simple poetic forms by the early mystical poets. "The most cherished poetic form in the early period was the quatrain," writes Seyed-Gohrab (2021: 187). He develops the idea, pointing out that:

> Due to its compact form and pithy formulation, the quatrain became a favourite poetic form for Ṣūfī masters at their preaching sessions, and especially during the ritual of musical audition (*samāʿ*). (ibid).

Abu Saʿīd ibn Abi'l-Xayr (967–1049 CE), from Xurāsān, is one of the great early mystics and poets, and his quatrains are among the most popular Ṣūfī texts in Persian. Nonetheless, De Bruijn (1997: 17), doubts the authenticity of his quatrains, stating that "it is by no means certain that Abu Saʿīd composed any quatrains at all". Schimmel (1982: 51) also holds that "it is a fact that mystical literature in Persian developed first in the Eastern lands of the Caliphate, namely in Herat and northwest India", and suggests ʿAbdullāh-i Anṣārī (1006–1088) and Ḥakīm Sanāʾī of Ġazna (1080–1131) as the poets who initiated a Ṣūfī literature in Persian. Sanāʾī was the first poet to introduce Ṣūfī themes and topics in long maṯnawī (rhyming couplets) poems. He is also credited with *ġazal*s treating the themes of love, wine and antinomianism. Later generations of Ṣūfī poets also used qaṣīda and ġazal forms, in addition to quatrains and maṯnawī.

Compared to the Arabic Ṣūfī literature, the contents of Persian Ṣūfī literature are more varied and the number of mystical poets is much greater. Among the great Persian poets who enriched not only the Persian Ṣūfī literature, but also the treasure of Ṣūfīsm as a whole, one can mention Sanāʾī (479–545 AH/1080–1131 CE), Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār (540–618 AH/1145– 1221 CE), the summit of Ṣūfī poets and poetry Maulānā Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī (603–672 AH/1207–1273 CE), Saʿdī Šīrazī (1210–1292), Faxr al-Dīn ʿIrāqī (610–688 AH/1213–1289 CE), Maḥmūd Šabistarī (687–740 AH/1288–1340 CE), Šāh Niʿmatullāh Walī (1331–1431), Nūr al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī (817–898 AH/1414–1492 CE), Niẓāmī Ganjavī (535–605 AH /1141–1209 CE).

When discussing Ṣūfī poetry in the Persian language, it is of the utmost importance, to emphasize the fact that Persian Ṣūfī literature is not limited to the political or territorial borders of Iran. There are many poets, even great poets, whose mother tongue was not Persian and who were not from Iran, but who contributed master pieces in the Persian language that are highly appreciated wherever and whenever they are read. ʿAbd al-Qādir Bēdil (1642–1720), Ġālib (1797–1869) and Muḥammad Iqbāl (1877–1938), all from the Indian subcontinent, are shining examples.

5.2.3. Kurdish Ṣūfī Poetry

Kurdish literary historiography usually considers that the beginning of Kurdish poetry and Kurdish Ṣūfī poetry to be Bābā Ṭāhir ʿUryān (meaning the Naked), also known as Hamadānī, especially among the Kurds (Sajjādī, 1971: 171–172; Xaznadār, 2002: 184). Most of the sources about his life regard his dates dates a matter of dispute and find it difficult to place him chronologically (Rypka, 1968: 234; Elwell-Sutton, Baba Tahir Oryan, EIr). Sajjādī (1971: 171–172) suggests 935–1010 CE as the dates of his birth and death, but it is generally accepted that he lived in the early 11th century. Bābā Ṭāhir used the quatrain form in composing his poems, but his quatrains are usually called *du-*

baytī ‘double distiches’ because “he does not make use of the customary *rubāʿī* metre but employs the *hazaj*” (Rypka, 1968: 234). They are also called *tarāna* ‘song’, sung by the *Yāresān*, accompanied by melodies of on the *tambūr* (a stringed musical instrument) (Xaznadār, 200w, 191). Other researchers call these quatrains *fahlaviyyāt* and the poets who composed them *fahlavī-gūyān* (Šamīsā, 2008: 277).

Bābā Ṭāhir is considered one of the great saints of the *Yāresān* (*Kākayī*), also called *Ahl-i Haqq* (the People of Truth), who regard his quatrains as a part of the sacred texts of their religion (Kākayī, 1991: 84; Minorsky, 1943: 95). The sacred book of the *Yāresān*, called *Sar-anjām*, consists of various poetic texts, mainly composed by Suḷtān Sahāk (Isḥāq), but also poems by other *Yāresān* poets. In addition to *Sar-anjām*, the *Yāresān* circulate many other texts, among which the quatrains of Bābā Ṭāhir are of great importance.

The quatrains are written in a language that is a mixture of the Kurdish dialects Lakī and Gorānī, but also Lurī, which is the subject of varying and confusing information regarding its classification as a Kurdish dialect or an independent Iranian language (Qamandar, 2014: 56–72). Regarding the poet and his quatrains, Vahman (1999–2000: 289) writes:

> The Kurds, e.g. claim that Baba Taher was a Kurd; he occupies one of the first places in the alleged list of the Kurdish poets in the literary production of Kurdish nationalistic authors. The Lurs and Bakhtiaris also consider him as their compatriot. Baba Taher became even one of the revered Saints of the Ahl-i haqq sect: he is the Fourth Angel of the Shah-Khoshin era, incarnation of the Deity.

The Laks are Kurds (Bidlīsī, 1860: 323) and are regarded as “the most southern group of Kurd tribes in Persia.” (Minorsky, Lak, EIs-II). They speak a Kurdish subdialect called Lakī, which is a part of the southern dialect of the Kurdish language (Mann, 1910: XXVII; Paul, Kurdish language i., EIr). Edmonds (1922: 340) also thinks that “Lakkī has much in common with modern Kurdish”. Lakī is spoken in a large region stretching from central Luristan and to the south and southeast of Kermanshah (Qamandār, ibid: 73–80). Bidlīsī (1860: 323) counts the Lurs as Kurds.

Moreover, Qamandār (2014: 60) records that “Muslim historians like al-Ṭabarī, al-Masʿūdī, Abu al-Fidā, al-Yaʿqūbī, al-Maqdisī and Yāqūt consider all the Lurs to be Kurds”.

Bābā Ṭāhir’s texts have been subjected to great changes; so much so that they have retained very few of their original characteristics. Regarding the language of the *du-baytī*s, Utas (2008: 119–120) writes:

> These *fahlaviyāt*, which are written in a more or less Persianized north-western dialect, survive in the still very popular *dobeytis* that are passed on in the name of the nebulous figure Baba Taher Oryan, who is believed to have lived in the mountains of Luristan near Hamadan.

Obviously, the Kurdish language belongs to the northwestern group of Iranian languages, while Persian is a southwestern Iranian language.

Concerning the change in the language of the quatrains, Šamīsā (2008: 280) states, "The poems of Bābā Ṭāhir have changed in the course of time and came closer to the Darī dialect", (*aš'ār-e Bābā Ṭāhir be morūr-e zamān taġyīrātī kard va be lahja-yi Darī nazdīk šod*). In fact, almost all the sources on Bābā Ṭāhir claim that the quatrains have been altered in more recent editions and made closer to Persian. Zarrīnkūb, in his book '*Just-jū dar Taṣavvuf-i Irān*' (Searching in Iranian Sufism) concentrates upon two issues: that Bābā Ṭāhir was one of the saints of *Ahl-i Haqq*, and that his *dobaytī*s were changed to be understandable by Persian-speaking people. Zarīnkūb (1984: 188) argues that there are *falaviyyāt* texts in '*Al-Mu'jam fī ma'āyīr aš'ār al-'Ajam*' that are quite different in language and rhythm from those of Bābā Ṭāhir. Šamīsā (ibid) concludes that:

> this point shows that after the ninth century, when the *dobaytī*s of Bābā Ṭāhir were published, they were introduced in a new rhythm and language – different than how they were in the seventh century – in order that they could be understood by the Persian-speaking majority.

The reason why Bābā Ṭāhir is associated with Luristan and, consequently, the language of his poetry is considered as Lurī, seems to have to do with the existence of the two semi-independent principalities of Great-Lur (*Lor-e bozorg*) and Small-Lur (*Lor-e kūčik*) around 300AH (Bidlisi, 1860: 24). The territories of the two principalities encompassed the regions now known as Lorestan and Ilam, and parts of Kermanshah. Since the majority of the population were Laks "the territory occupied by the Lak, and including northern and north-western Luristan is sometimes called Lakistan." (Minorsky, Lak, EIs-II).

Reading a printed edition of Bābā Ṭāhir's quatrains (e.g. that of 1363Š), one comes across many vocabulary items that are genuinely Kurdish, and even the editor has provided the book with a glossary in which the Kurdish words are explained in Persian (Bābā Ṭāhir, 1984: 94–95). Taking into account the linguistic features called isoglosses, to show the sound change in the northwestern (e.g. Kurdish) and southwestern (e.g. Persian) Iranian languages (Korn, 2003: 52–59), it is clear that many of the vocabulary items in the list are Kurdish. Among these Kurdish words and verb stems, we read, *rož*, *rēž*,

gēž u wēž, *zūnī*, *sūža*, *maka*, *šaw*, *dīr*, in addition to some verbs that are conjugated according to Kurdish grammar. The Kurdish words contain the sounds ž and z, which correspond to the Persian sounds z and d respectively.

Heron-Allen, who published a number of Bābā Ṭāhir's quatrains in English translation in 1902, gives a detailed account of his efforts to obtain information about the poet's life and the dialect of his poems. Among other things he records an anecdote about Bābā Ṭāhir, to the effect that:

> It is stated that Ṭāhir-i-ʿUryān was an illiterate person and was a wood-cutter. During the day, he was wont to go to the Madrasa (academy) and listen whilst the students would read their lessons, but the students used to make fun of him. One day he remarked to one of the inmates of the institution, "I wonder what these students do in order that they may understand the instructions of the Professors." The student replied jokingly, "At midnight they get into this pond and plunge their heads under the water forty times; after undergoing this process, they understand the instructions." Ṭāhir believed this account and did the same himself, though the weather was intensely cold. Just then, a flash of light appeared and entered his mouth (?). Next day he came to the Madrasa and commenced a philosophical discussion with the students to which they were unable to respond. When they asked him the reason of this sudden change, he related his story to them, saying, "I passed the night as a Kurd and opened with the morning as an Arab." (Heron-Allen, 1902: XV)

This sentence of Bābā Ṭāhir is widely known in the Ṣūfī literature, especially in its Arabic version, which reads "*Amsaytu Kurdiyyan wa aṣbaḥtu ʿArabiyyan*". It is remarkable, however, that the statement is attributed not only to Bābā Ṭāhir, but also to other Ṣūfīs as evidence of their being great Ṣūfīs whose knowledge is a divinely inspired (*ʿIlm ladunī*). It is at the same time an affirmation that the Ṣūfīs to whom this statement was attributed were Kurds, and their becoming Arabs is only a symbolic allusion to their becaming acquainted with Islamic sciences, which were overwhelmingly in Arabic. Among the Ṣūfīs to whom the statement and the story are attributed, with slight differences, we find Abū ʿAbdullāh (Bābūyī) from Širāz (Jāmī, 2007: 325) and one of the ancestors of Ḥusām al-Dīn Čalabī, who became the second spiritual guide of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī after the death, or disappearance, of Šams-e Tabrīzī (Al-Rūmī, 1978: unnumbered page).

Apparently, the tradition of writing Ṣūfī poetry in Gorānī Kurdish, begun by Bābā Ṭāhir, was continued and further promoted by many other poets. This Kurdish dialect was the literary language of the Ardalan Principality, the capital of which was Sina (now officially Sanandaj), and continued to be used as a literary language until the beginning of the 18th century, when Central Kurdish, the literary language of the Bābān Principality, replaced it in many regions of Central Kurdistan. Even thereafter, some poets in the domains of Ardalān and Bābān principalities continued to use it when writing poetry until the second decade of the 20th century.

After Bābā Ṭāhir there are many other poets who wrote in Gorānī Kurdish. They fall into two distinct categories of poets; the first includes those who were mostly religious leaders of the Yāresān (Ahl-i Ḥaqq). The ideas expressed in the poetry of these poets are rather similar to those of the Muslim Sufi poets, although they were not Muslims. In some cases, there are ideas that seem to have been borrowed from Christianity, as in the story of 'danka-hanār' (the pomegranate seed). A maidservant of Suḷtān Sahāk finds a pomegranate seed in the place of worship and eats it. She becomes pregnant and gives birth, from her mouth, to a boy. Important poets of this generation are Pīr Šālyār (1006–1098), Šā Xošīn (1015–1074), Bābā Nāwus-ī Jāf (1084–1161), Suḷtān Sahāk (Isḥāq) (1272–1388), ʿĀbidīn-ī Jāf (1320–1394), Šā Ibrāhīm Ayūt (1324–1407), Bābā Yādgār (1359–1480), Šāways Qulī Qirmizī (1407–1514) and ʿĀlī Qalandar (1434–1484).

When it comes to the structural aspects of poetry, it is noteworthy that all the poems of the generation just mentioned have only two metres, which are not derived from the Arabic prosody (ʿarūḍ). They have the same rhythm as Kurdish folk poetry, which has been composed and learned by heart for centuries. The first metre consists of ten syllables in each hemistich, regardless of the length of the vowels, with a caesura between the first and the second five syllables. The two hemistiches in every distich rhyme, like a maṯnawī. Here are two distiches by Suḷtān Sahāk:

Yādgār ja tanūr, wurēzā aw pā
Wa lafzī šīrīn, salām dā wa Šā
Barg-ī xud-rangī, kard wa xaḷātaš
Tamām Kurdistān, kard wa barātaš
(Xaznadār, 2002: 262).

Yadgar rose up from the bottom of the baking oven
He saluted the King with sweet words
He rewarded him with beautiful dress,
Gave him the whole of Kurdistan as a gift.

This metre was quite popular and was often used even by the classical poets who wrote in Central Kurdish. It was also revived by the modernist Kurdish poet Goran (1904–1962) and other poets of his generation, and is used by some poets of our time.

The second metre has eight syllables, regardless of the length of the vowels, in each hemistich, separated by a caesura between the first and second groups of four syllables. Seemingly, this metre was not quite in favour, and was therefore rarely used. ʿĀbidīn-ī Jāf writes:

Az ka wēḷ būm, la jē w šārim
Baḷadmī kird Šā-y šāswārim
Min ʿĀbidīn-ī Kākayīm
Axir ba yār-ī xom gayīm (ibid: 264)

When I strayed from my place and my city
My cavalier King made me acquainted (with the path)
I am the *Kākayī* ʿĀbidīn
Finally, I reached my Beloved.

This metre was also revived and widely used by the poet Goran and his contemporaries. Even the poets of the Post-Goran generation often use it.

Among the second group of poets who wrote in Goranī Kurdish one can mention Malā Parēšān-ī Dīnawarī (1356–1421), ʿĒl Bag-ī Jāf (1492–1553), Bēsārānī (1643–1701), Aḷmās Xān-ī Kandūlayī (1702–1776), Xānā-y Qubādī (1704–1778), Walī Dēwāna (1745–1801), Ranjūrī (1750–1809), Aḥmad Bag-ī Komāsī (1796–1877) and Mawlawī (1806–1882). The only difference that distinguishes the two categories is that the poets of the second group are Muslims, and consequently the contents of their poetry, especially that of the Ṣūfī poets, reflects their Islamic faith. As to the form of their poetry, they used the same two metres mentioned above. Malā Parēšān-ī Dīnawarī, Ranjūrī and Mawlawī are outstanding Ṣūfī poets, the first being a Shiite Muslim and a follower of the Ḥurūfī order, the second a follower of the Qādirī order, and the third a follower of the Naqšbandī order.

There is no evidence to suggest that Malā-yē Jazīrī was familiar with the literature that existed in that part of Kurdistan and in that Kurdish dialect, let alone that he was inspired by the Ṣūfī poets mentioned above, although many of them lived before Jazīrī or were his contemporaries. Nevertheless, it is worth noting here that Jazīrī uses a verb form that is found in the quatrains of Bābā Ṭāhir ʿUryān and some other poets, and more generally in the texts of Kurdish poets who wrote in varieties of southern or Goranī Kurdish dialects, namely "*dīr*", as the present stem of the verb 'to have' (see Chapter 4).

5.3. Jazīrī: A Naqšbandī Ṣūfī

The search for the roots of the thought system of the Naqšbandī order and its reflections in the poetry of Malā-yē Jazīrī requires, on the one hand investigating the Sufi aspects in his poetry and, on the other hand, examining the history of the order, especially from the time of its introduction in Kurdistan.

Jazīrī presents many Ṣūfī ideas in his poetry, but since it is not didactic, he gives these ideas with spaces, the space that a Ṣūfī poem allows without damaging the aesthetic or linguistic dimensions of the text. This is a balance that is not easily achieved, unless the poet is really talented and has mastery over his/her artistic tools; otherwise he/she is forced to sacrifice, and lose, one of the two sides. This is true of poetry and poets, whether in the past or in our era. Remarkably, Jazīrī, like all genuine poets in history, left behind a legacy of poetry, which contains the deepest and most subtle thoughts of Sufism, within the confines of a classical poetry, which is subject to the hard rules of prosody, rhyme and rhetoric.

The Sufi thoughts in Jazīrī's poetry are of two kinds: thoughts common to a large number of Ṣūfī poets, and thoughts representative of the followers of the Naqšbandī order. Ibn ʿArabī's doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* is indeed the link between the two, since most of the Ṣūfī orders, including the Naqšbandī, are familiar with and embrace that doctrine. The influence of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* on Jazīrī's poetry will be discussed separately, in a special section of this chapter.

In his poetry, Jazīrī does not use the name of the Naqšbandī order, nor does he refer to his affiliation with it or any other order, although he does allude to the names of some of the most celebrated Ṣūfīs, particularly the early Ṣūfīs of Baghdad, as will be seen later. In order to elucidate this aspect of his life and his poetry, we have to bring into focus the terms, concepts and expressions that originate from the teachings of the Naqšbandī order, which constitute the basic principles of the order.

Taking into consideration the period in which Jazīrī lived, two important conclusions can be drawn from the indications in his poetry, by which his Naqšbandī affiliation can be affirmed and his Ṣūfī thought specified. The first conclusion is that the silent remembrance (*ḏikr-i xafī*) was the only form of remembrance practised by all the Naqšbandīs at the time of Jazīrī. Before Bahāʾ al-Dīn there were periods when the Naqšbandīs practised vocal remembrance (*ḏikr-i jahr*) in addition to silent remembrance, but Bahāʾ al-Dīn cancelled this tradition and recommended silent remembrance as the only form of remembrance for the Naqšbandīs (Buxārāʾī, 1975: 59).

The second conclusion concerns the doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*. Although Jazīrī was a contemporary of Sirhindī, it is, out of question to believe that he or other Naqšbandī Ṣūfīs in Kurdistan or in other Ottoman regions were aware of Sirhindī's doctrine of *Waḥdat al-šuhūd* (unity of vision). The Mujaddidī branch

of the Naqšbandī order that was established by Sirhindī in the Indian subcontinent was not introduced into the Ottoman lands until at the end of the 17th century, by Šayx Muḥammad Murād Buxārī (d. 1141 AH/1729 CE).

It seems quite unexceptional that Jazīrī, a poet and a learned person, a scholar, joined the Naqšbandī order. Writing about the introduction of the Naqšbandīya into the Ottoman lands in the fifteenth century, Algar (1976: 140) describes the order as follows: "it was above all the order of the ulama: countless members of the learned institution gave it their allegiance". This does not necessarily mean that people from lower classes did not belong to the order, as Algar (ibid) continues, "men from all classes and professions have been affiliated to it, and its influence has extended beyond the major cities into provincial towns and villages as well." Even before its introduction into the Ottoman lands, the order was known for having great poets such as Jāmī and Navāʾī in its ranks, and "the order may be described not only as a one of ulama, but also, to a lesser degree, as one of poets – a combination which implies much concerning its character" (ibid: 141).

Reviewing the poems and the biographies of many great poets, one gets the impression that they became poets after being initiated into Ṣūfīsm or after joining a Ṣūfī order, and that their talents as poets flowered because of their adherence to Ṣūfīsm, which cannot be true of all Ṣūfī poets. This could be the case with Maulānā Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, for whom Ṣūfīsm was the start of one of the greatest poetic talents in history, since "from the moment Love carried away Maulānā's heart "as a falcon carries away a small bird," he, like so many other mystics, had no choice" (Schimmel, 2001: 34). In thinking about Jazīrī and many other poets, the question that arises is whether they wrote any poems before being initiated into Ṣūfīsm. Jazīrī's *Dīwān* is only the artistic expression of a Ṣūfī lover, and to interpret any of his poems as love poetry for a human being, a woman, is to expose them to a great non-aesthetic and non-linguistic pressure.

The life of Jazīrī, as already mentioned, is quite difficult to map in order to illustrate various social, cognitive and spiritual periods of his life. Nonetheless, there are indications in his poetry that can be of considerable help in understanding and construing fragments of some of these periods. Jazīrī's relation to Ṣūfīsm, and especially to the Naqšbandī order, is understandably at the forefront of the issues concerning the poet and the details of his era. It is therefore of great importance to read the spiritual experiences of the poet in close comparison with the teachings of the order and its presence in Kurdistan.

The history of the Naqšbandī order, according to Algar (1976: 126) "is essentially identical with its initiatic chain, its *silsila*, reaching back to the Prophet Muhammad". Traditionally, the various Naqšbandī branches trace their chain back to the Prophet Muhammad through two lines that end with two successors of the Prophet, namely Abu Bakr al-Ṣiddīq and ʿAlī bin Abī-Ṭālib. The line that goes back to ʿAlī is called the Golden Chain (*silsilat al-ḏahab*). Different periods in the history of the order, from the beginning to the

present day, are usually designated by the masters' names or epithets. The periods are as follows:

1. Ṣiddīqiyya, from Abu Bakr al-Ṣiddīq to Bāyazīd Bisṭāmī.
2. Ṭayfuriyya, from Bisṭāmī to Xvāja Yūsūf Hamadānī.
3. Xvājagāniyya, from Hamadānī to Muḥammad bin Bahāʾ al-Dīn Naqšband.
4. Naqšbandīyya, from Bahāʾ al-Dīn to ʿUbayd Allāh Aḥrār.
5. Naqšbandīyya-Ahrāriyya, from Ahrār to al-Imām al-Rabbānī Ahmad Fāruq al-Sirhindī, nicknamed "Mujaddid al-Alf al-Ṯānī" (renewer of the second millennium).
6. Naqšbandīyya-Mujaddidiyya, from al-Sirhindī to Šams al-Dīn Ḥabīb-Allāh Jān-e Jānān Maẓhar.
7. Naqšbandīyya-Mujaddidiyya-Maẓhariyya, from Maẓhar to Mawlāna Xālid al-Kurdī al-Šāhrazūrī.
8. Naqšbandīyya-Mujaddidiyya-Xālidiyya, from Mawlāna Xālid to the present.

It is worth mentioning that Malā-yē Jazīrī's life coincided with the last decades of the period called Naqšbandīyya-Aḥrāriyya. He was a contemporary of Sirhindī, but he did not belong to the lineage that began on the Indian Peninsula and in Afghanistan, and included great mystical leaders and poets like Sirhindī and Jāmī.

The preceptors (*Sheikh* or *Muršid*) of the Naqšbandī order attach great importance to the spiritual training and the exercises that their disciples practise under their guidance. The most important of these is the "Silent Remembrance" (*ḏikr-i xafī*). These Ṣūfī practices are governed by a set of principles that are called the "Sacred Words" (*Kalimāt-i qudsiyya*), the number of which is eleven. Eight of these words were originally fixed by Xwāja ʿAbd al-Xāliq Gujduwānī (d. 1220), and three more were added by Bahāʾ al-Dīn Naqšband (d. 1389).

The eight sacred words that descended from Gujduwānī are as follows:

1. *Hūš dar dam* (awareness while breathing)
2. *Naẓar bar qadam* (watching the footsteps)
3. *Safar dar waṭan* (journeying within the homeland)
4. *Xalwat dar anjuman* (solitude within society)
5. *Yād-kard* (remembrance)
6. *Bāz-gašt* (restraint)
7. *Nigāh-dāšt* (watchfulness)
8. *Yād-dāšt* (recollection).

Bahāʾ al-Dīn Naqšband added the following three words:

9. *Wuqūf-i zamānī* (temporal pause)
10. *Wuqūf-i ʿadadī* (enumerated pause)
11. *Wuqūf-i qalbī* (the awareness of the heart)

Gujduwānī was not a Naqšbandī himself, as he died nearly a century before Bahāʾ al-Dīn Naqšband was born. He was a follower of the Xwajagāniya order. Bahāʾ al-Dīn's connection with Gujduwānī, according to the Naqšbandī tradition, was spiritual. Algar (1991: 11), describing this relationship, writes that "the list of Bahā al-Dīn's preceptors is not exhausted with Bābā Muḥammad Sammāsī, Amīr Kulāl and Khalīl Ātā. More significant than the training these three imparted to him was his encounter with the spirit – *rūḥāniyat* – of ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghujduvānī, who instructed him in the method of silent *dhikr*".

The Silent Remembrance (*ḏikr-i xafī*) consists of two types, *ḏikr-i munfarid* (solitary remembrance) and *ḏikr-i tawḥīd* (remembrance to declare that God is One). This remembrance is also called *ḏikr-i nafy wa iṯbāt* (remembrance of negation and affirmation). In the first case, the Divine name *Allāh* is repeated in the heart, and in the second case, the formula "*Lā ilāha illā Allāh*" (there is no god but *Allāh*) is recited in the heart. Algar (1992: 219) is of the view that: "Silent dhikr is said to have been inherited from the Prophet, upon whom be peace, by way of Abu Bakr, whom Sunni belief commonly identifies as the best of all men after the prophets."

In silent *ḏikr*, the disciple presses his tongue against the roof of his mouth, and firmly closes his lips and his jaws, so that the tongue does not move and the remembrance is done only in the heart. The goal of this method is to concentrate on thinking of God in the heart without being interrupted or bringing the mind brought back to the movements of the tongue and lips. Indicating the significance of silent remembrance, Jazīrī says:

> *Fahm-ē rāz ar bikirī war bibahī mužda-yi sāz*
> *Čangē bē parda dibēžit, na nay u nāyē bi dang* (ZdJ: 387)
>
> If you understand secrets and if you listen to the glad tidings of the *sāz*
> The harp tells it without any tone, not the flute in a (loud) voice.

The most important element in the metaphor is the harp (*čang*), which with its silence, not having a tone, can tell secrets that the flute, despite its loud voice, cannot tell. The harp is here a symbol of heart, and the recipient is the novice, who is expected to be seeking to understand the secrets and to be able to hear what the various musical instruments are telling.

The silent remembrance (*ḏikr-i xafī*) consists of seven phases, in each of which the novice concentrates on one of the seven *laṭāʾif* (subtle centres of perception) in his body, by directing the *ḏikr* to the point where the *laṭīfa* on

which he is training is imagined to be. The aim of each phase is to instil the *ḏikr* into the *laṭīfa* in question, until the part begins to repeat the *ḏikr* by itself. The seven *laṭāʾif* are also of two kinds; five of them belong to *ʿālam al-ʾamr* (the world of Divine command) and the other two belong to *ʿālam al-xalq* (the world of creation). The first five are *qalb* (heart), *rūḥ* (spirit), *sirr* (secret), *xafī* (innermost secret) and *axfā* (the most concealed), whereas the other two are *nafs* (lower soul) and *qālib* (body). The training thus begins with the heart and ends with the whole body, the heart being the most important phase in the process of arriving at the stages of *kašf* (revelation) and *mušāhada* (vision) (Naqšbandī, 1985: 426).

> *Ism u nāv-ē ta-y šarīf ḥay kir li min qalb-ē mirī*
> *Law di madḥ-ē ta w sanāyē būyima čang ū naya* (ZdJ: 506)
>
> Your glorified name, revived my dead heart
> To praise and extol You, I have become a harp and a flute.

A main principle of the Naqšbandī order is "*Darj,* or *Idrāj, al-nihāyat fī al-bidāyat*" (the inclusion of the end in the beginning), which is the basis upon which the training of the disciple is built, when initiated to the path. According to the Naqšbandī tradition, the disciple must begin his/her Ṣūfī exercises with purification of the heart, which is a central concept in the order. The heart, as a Ṣūfī term, has a metaphorical meaning and is regarded as the centre of all the thoughts, feelings, intentions, sentiments and beliefs of the human being. The first step in being able to receive the Divine light is to purify the heart, which the novice can achieve by practising the silent remembrance (*ḏikr-i xafī).*

Algar (1992: 219), explaining the significance of this remembrance, writes "whereas vocal dhikr begins with the tongue and has as its aim the graduate inculcation of the dhikr to the heart, the silent method situates it there immediately; hence the Naqshbandīs' claim that the beginning of their path is the end of other paths". Sirhindī (1992: 143; 1994: 89), in a letter to the sons of his preceptor Muḥammad Bāqī Bi'llāh (d. 1603), whom he calls *pīr* (spiritual guide, literally: old man) and *maxdūm* (the served), mentions that he acquired from him the power/dominion of including the end in the beginning (*daulat-e idrāj al-nihāyat fī al-bidāyat bi barakat-e īšān ḥāṣil karda).* In another letter, Sirhindī (1992: 222; 164) assures reads that

> the esteem of the ambitions of the grandees of this sublime order is very high, and it is therefore that "the termination of the others is included in their beginning and the beginner in their order has the authority of the learned in other orders."

Apparently, Jazīrī, as a Naqšbandī Ṣūfī, was familiar with this principle and had practised it:

> *Ku nūr-ē ʿišqē lāmiʿ dat, li Ṭūr-ē qalbē jāmiʿ dat*
> *Di sayr-ā barzax ul-asmāʾ, nihāyātu bidāyātī* (ZdJ: 700)
>
> When the light of love shines upon the Sinai Mountain of the heart,
> That contains knowledge,
> The ends become to beginnings in my path and my graduating
> In the isthmus of the divine names.

The existence of God has always been one of the most difficult and complicated question for believers, non-believers, philosophers and ordinary people. Whereas the philosophers have tried to delve into the depths of the question and have presented logical and rational evidence to prove or deny His existence, most Sufis have not cared about logic or philosophical arguments. The starting point for them is what they call "*ḏauq*" (taste or heart-savour) and what their hearts tell them. Jazīrī, in a poem about recognizing God, compares his Ṣūfī experience with the rational knowledge found in books:

> *Ma ži sarčašm-yi ḥaywān, qadaḥak ṣāfī vexwar*
> *Nāgihī laḏḏat u ḏawq-ā ma bi sad jild-i kitāb* (ZdJ: 60).
>
> We drank from the fountain of life, a pure goblet.
> You cannot arrive at the rapture and taste (we have experienced)
> Even by a hundred volumes of books.

Reading the above distich gives the impression that the poet's main concern in writing it was not so much to present a logical argument as to emphasize an experience that seems to be limited to the Ṣūfīs. The scene behind the statement, presented in a metaphorical form, is the argument between a philosopher and a Ṣūfī. As readers, we are not expected to incline toward what the poet prefers, since there is no way of comparing the two sides of the equation: reading a hundred volumes of books and drinking a pure goblet of water or wine. Understandably, the simile of drinking a pure goblet of water or wine, from the Divine fountain, must be interpreted as a way of arriving at the absolute truth, which is also the intention and goal of the reader of a hundred volumes of books.

In another poem, dealing mainly with some Ṣūfī concepts such as *aḥadiyyat* (oneness), Jazīrī develops the idea that it is impossible to know God by means of intellect or wisdom. He devotes the last three distiches of the poem to emphasizing the incapacity of the human intellect to comprehend the essence of the intuitive knowledge of God (*maʿrifat*). Jazīrī writes:

Sar bi ʿijzē didirit quwwat-i darrāka-yi mā
Rajaʿa ʾlʿaqlu kalīlan wa matā qāma qaʿad

Ḥīrat u ʿijza Saranjāmē di bāb-ē naẓarē
Kay bi Xāliq naẓar-i qāṣir-i maxlūq-ī rasad

Guft u go-yī maʿriſat čandī Malā paydā bikī
Gawhar-ā maʿrifatē nāgihatē kas bi xirad (ZdJ: 221–222).

Our power of conception ends in weakness,
The intellect terminates in exhaustion
And whenever it tries to stand up, it kneels down

Perplexity and deficiency are the conclusion of pondering,
How can the inadequate contemplation of the created attain the Creator?

However much talk and words of Gnosis you invent and find, Malā,
No one comprehends the essence of recognizing (God) by reason.

There is a saying among the Naqšbandī Ṣūfīs that captures the essence of the question from a Ṣūfī, or rather a Naqšbandī Ṣūfī, point of view. The statement, which is attributed to Bahāʾ al-Dīn Naqšband (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1987: 741–742; 2004: 471), is "I acknowledge God without any proof" (*man Xudā bī dalīl mīšināsam*). The statement should not be limited to Bahāʾ al-Dīn Naqšband or the Naqšbandī Ṣūfīs alone, as a similar saying is also attributed to Dhu'l Nūn al-Miṣrī (796–862 CE). "When Dhu'1-Nún was asked how he knew God he replied, 'I know Him by Himself'", (Nicholson, 1906: 310). For many Naqšbandī Ṣūfīs, this statement is an axiom that does not need to be discussed. Jazīrī uses this logic twice in one of his poems:

Garči pur xāl u nišānī, ammā
Bi Nišānī ku tu bē nīšānī (ZdJ: 741).

Although you have many signs and marks
For Nišānī, you are without signs.

Či ḥadd-i ʿaqla qiyās-i ta kirit
Ava burhān ku tu bē burhānī (ZdJ: 742).

How can the intellect make an analogy of You?
This is a proof that You are without proof.

In the first distich, Jazīrī uses his pen name *Nišānī* together with two forms of the word for target, mark or sign, the Persian *nišān* and the Kurdish *nīšān*, as a pun. Presumably, one can also deduce that the poem was written during what has been described as a transitional period in the poet's life (see Chapter 2).

Obviously, this idea can be traced back to Ibn ʿArabī who expresses the idea in these words (Ibn alʿArabi, 1980: 93, translated by Austin):

> It is true that a primordial eternal essence can be known, but it cannot be known as a divinity unless knowledge of that to which it can be related is assumed, for it is the dependent who confirm the independence of the Independent.
> However, a further spiritual intuition will reveal that that which was necessary to affirm His Divinity is none other than the Reality Himself, and that the Cosmos [of created beings] is nothing more than His Self-revelation [to Himself] in the forms [determined] by their eternally unmanifest essences, which could not possibly exist without Him. It will reveal also that He manifests Himself variously and formally according to the [inherent] realities and states of the essence, all of which is understood together with the knowledge that, in relation to us, He is the Divinity.

There are several poems in Jazīrī's *Dīwān* that deal, wholly or in part, with the question of the existence of God. In his argumentation, he occasionally resorts to the logic of Muslim theologians who, besides various *Qurʾān*ic doctrines, build their disputation on a method that consists of the following three steps:

1. The world (here the universe) is new (*ḥādiṯ*) which also means, "created in time".
2. Everything new, created, inevitably has a creator (*muḥdiṯ*).
3. Conclusion: since the world/universe is new and created, there is, inevitably, a creator who created it, who is God.

Jazīrī, utilizing that logic, writes:

> *Fāʿilak lāzima dā fiʿl u aṯar paydā bit*
> *Gar tu ḥaddādi nabit kūrayi ḥaddādi či kit* (ZdJ: 131)
>
> A maker is necessary for an action and a result to appear
> If there is no smith, what can a furnace do?

Another argument presented by Jazīrī invokes the precision and subtlety with which the universe is made and how it functions:

Allāh, Allāh! Čarx u dolāb-ē dinē
Nuqṭa qaṭ nākit di dawrānē ġalaṭ (ZdJ: 330)

Oh God, Oh God, how wonderful! The wheel of the rotating mill
(The celestial sphere) of the world,
Does not make a mistake in its revolution by a dot.

5.3.1. Who was the Preceptor (*muršid*) of Jazīrī?

Nowhere in the writings about Jazīrī's life or in the editions of his *Dīwān* do we find any information about Jazīrī's *šayx* or his preceptor (*muršid*). Zivingī, who annotated and published the most reliable edition of the poet's work, corroborates his affiliation with the Naqšbandī order, but he says nothing about who his preceptor was. (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1987: 506, 621, 700, 742). Nevertheless, it is possible to obtain enough indications, however slight, in the poetry of Jazīrī to make a rough estimate in that regard. What will be presented in this section of the chapter is a hypothesis that hopefully will be the subject of further research.

The word *Pīr* is used in the Kurdish and Persian languages to denote an old person, especially an old man. In a Ṣūfī context, the preceptor is usually referred to as *Pīr*, which is a translation of the Arabic word *Šayx* (Sheikh), although it has pre-Islamic roots.

Jazīrī uses the term in several contexts, but in two cases, he refers to his own *Pīr*, which clearly denotes his spiritual leader, his Ṣūfī preceptor. He writes:

Ṣad naql u riwāyat di may-ā ṣāf-i mūyak
Īro ku ži Pīr-ē xwa bi fatwāyam az (ZdJ: 260)

A hundred quotations and narratives about
the pure wine are worth a single hair
When, today, I have a legal counsel (*fatwā*)
from my preceptor.

In another poem, evidently recounting his mystical experience, he says:

Dil yak-a, dē ʿišq-i yak bit, ʿāšiqān yak yār-i bas
Qibla dē yak bit, qulūbān dilbarak dildār-i bas.

Min di band-ā zulfakī dil dā bi dast-ē Pīr-i ʿišq
Law diʿišqēda ma bast iḥrām u yak zunnār-i bas (ZdJ: 286)

The heart is one, (and) love must be one,
For lovers, one beloved is enough.
The *qibla* (prayer niche) must be one,
For hearts, one heart-ravishing beloved is enough.
Bound in a ringlet, I handed my heart to the master of love,
Thus, I tied the garb of a pilgrim of love, and only one belt (*zunnār*).

In these couplets, Jazīrī refers to the *Qurʾān*ic verse that says, "God has not assigned to any man two hearts within his breast." (XXXIII– 4). He uses this idea to construct a new thought, that a human being should have only one love, and lovers should have only one beloved. Moreover, he asserts that anyone who worships God must have only one *qibla*, towards which he stands to perform his prayers, and thus hearts should have only one heart-ravishing beloved.

The poet seemingly wants us to understand that he already practises the principle he has just explained in the preceding verse. His heart is bound in a single ringlet and he hands it over to the master of love, who is his preceptor, and he tied on the garb of the pilgrim of love and only one belt.

By referring to a preceptor, his own preceptor, Jazīrī provides evidence that must be treated as a fact and as a link between different periods of his life, although it should be supported by information from his own life and the period of Kurdistan's history in which he lived, particularly in relation to the presence of the Naqšbandī order in Kurdistan. There are, in fact, elements of Jazīrī's life that can be of great importance in constructing a form of life that could be taken as a model for a Ṣūfī poet and scholar.

Among the scholars and editors who have written about Jazīrī's life, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Sajjādī provides the most comprehensive and informative account. He states that he obtained basic information about Jazīrī's life from a manuscript of Jazīrī's *Dīwān* copied by a certain ʿAbd al-Qādir ʿAlī ʿAmmādī in 1338 AH/1919–1920 CE (Sajjādī, 1971: 186). Sajjādī, citing the manuscript, indicates that as a student Jazīrī went to many regions in Kurdistan, such as Jazīra, Hakārī, Diyārbakir and Āmēdī, which is a basic part of the pattern followed by most students in the traditional educational system in Kurdistan. The excerpt that contains the essence of the topic reads as follows:

> Finally, at the age of 33, he took his scientific certification from a certain *Malā* Ṭāhā, in the village of Sitrbās near Diyārbakir and he served as a *Malā* for some years in the village of Sarbā, also in Diyārbakir. Afterwards he visited Ḥasnkīf and stayed there a while. During the time when he was in Diyārbakir, he taught widely and gave many scientific certifications (to students). Then, a state of love led him to Ṣūfīsm, which rendered him unable to teach, and he returned to Jazīra. (ibid: 187)

This information sheds light on an important period in the poet's life, and gives a rough idea of the changes that took place and their consequences for his life and future. We can possibly rearrange the context to depict the period in question, taking into account a fictional timetable that may be consistent with the details of the social life of the time:

a. According to the tradition followed by the students, Jazīrī travelled to various regions of Kurdistan, including Hakārī, Āmēdī and Diyārbakir. Presumably, he stayed in Āmēdī for a long time, probably a few years. This can be inferred from the fact that Jazīrī uses in his poems some forms of verb conjugation that may have been, and still are, in use in the Bahdīnān region (see chapter 4). The city of Āmēdī, was widely known in Kurdistan for its advanced educational system, its important schools, and its great scholars and poets.
b. After studying in different regions and cities, he establishes himself in Sitrbās, a village near Diyārbakir, and continues his studies until he finishes them and receives the final certification at the age of thirty-three under the supervision of *Malā* Ṭāhā.
c. As a teacher and scholar, he settles in Sarbā, another village near Diyārbakir, and teaches there for several years. He supervises many students and gives scientific certifications to many students. This period can be estimated at seven to ten years.
d. In Diyārbakir, he is initiated into Ṣūfīsm and writes poems that deal mainly with divine love, but it is genrally believed that he is in love with a woman and is writing his poems for her. His commitment to Ṣūfīsm makes it impossiblr for him to continue teaching. People assume he has gone insane.
e. He leaves for Ḥasnkīf and stays there for a short time. Rumours circulate that the poet was in love with Salmā, the daughter of Malik Kāmil, the ruler of the city. The story is told at the beginning of this chapter.
f. At the age of 40-43 years, he returns to his native Jazīra and spends the rest of his life there as a Ṣūfī and scholar. It is generally accepted that he never married.

The paradigm presented above seems like a quite realistic depiction of the life of a Kurdish poet who acquires knowledge in most of the sciences available within the educational system of his society and comes into contact with Ṣūfīsm. This pattern, with some minor changes in the details, could be used to describe the lives and careers of several Kurdish poets until the end of the 19th century.

The present account of Jazīrī's life could be interpreted in terms of dates derived from his biography. It is generally agreed that Jazīrī was born around 1570 CE. Based on that date, we can assume that he completed his studies in 1603, served as a teacher in Diyārbakir between 1603 and 1610–1613, and returned to Jazīra sometime between 1610 and 1613, where he died in 1640. The missing links in the account are his initiation into the Naqšbandī order and the sheikh who was his preceptor (*muršid*), whom he calls *pīr* in at least two poems.

The Naqšbandī order was introduced into the Ottoman lands by Mollā ʿAbdullāh Ilāhī (d. 1490) and his successors, with the most important centres being in Istanbul and Bursa. There are no indications that Ilāhī or his successors

established the order in Kurdistan. The presence of the order in Kurdistan, van Bruinessen (1990: 358) writes "is attested from at least the beginning of the 17th century on." The most important branch of the order was the *Urmawī*, which was established in Kurdistan "sometime in the years 1605–07" (ibid: 341) by Sheikh Maḥmūd, commonly known as *Rūmiye Šeyhi* "the Sheikh from Urūmiya" or as *Ḥaḍrat-i ʿAzīz*. He was even called Sheikh ʿAzīz Maḥmūd.

The sheikh was executed in 1639 by Sulṭān Murād IV and was succeeded by his son Ismāʿīl Čalabī, whom the Ottoman traveller Awliyā Čalabī met when he visited Diyārbakir in 1655.

The main centre and *takiya* (*tekke*) of Sheikh Maḥmūd and his branch of the Naqšbandī order was in Diyārbakir, but he established two other *takiya*s in Van and Urūmiya. In the first half of the 17th century there were six Naqšbandī *takiya*s in Kurdistan, three of which belonged to the *Urmawī* branch headed by Sheikh ʿAzīz Maḥmūd. The fourth *takiya* was located in Jazīra and housed Indian, Özbek, Čagatay and Kumuk people (Çelebī, 2010: 729). The other two *takiyas* were in Malatya and Bitlīs.

According to Sajjādī, Jazīrī stayed in Diyārbakir for a long time, both as a student and as a teacher. It was during these years that the Naqšbandī order was established in Diyārbakir under the leadership of the charismatic, popular and influential Sheikh Maḥmūd. From this, it is reasonable to conclude that Jazīrī was initiated into the Naqšbandī order by Sheikh Maḥmūd, and that the Sheikh was his preceptor (*muršid*) and his *Pīr*.

In addition, there are a few other pieces of evidence that may be of interest to support this position, among which we can mention the following:

1. Poetry was an important part of the ceremonies performed in the Naqšbandī *takiya* in Diyārbakir. The relationship between Ṣūfīsm and poetry is attested by all the sources that deal with both. We do not know whether Jazīrī wrote poetry before he was initiated into the path, but it is quite understandable that his participation in the rituals of the *takiya* and his contact with his preceptor and other Ṣūfīs inspired him to become a Ṣūfī poet.
2. Describing the peculiarities of the Naqšbandī *takiya* in Diyārbakir, van Bruinessen & Boeschoten (1988, 52) write "In Şeyh Mahmud's branch of the Naqshbandi order, music apparently played an important part". Ismaʿīl Čalabī, the son and successor of the Sheikh, "was not only well-versed in the Islamic sciences but also wrote poetry, composed music, and was an accomplished performing musician as well" (ibid: 50). Evidently, Jazīrī was familiar with the ceremonies held in the *takiya* and acquired knowledge about the instruments played and their tones. This impression is strongly present in many of Jazīrī's poems (al-Sindī, 1983: 116–122).
3. The doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* was one of the basic subjects studied and discussed in the *takiya* and the schools belonging to the order.

The Urmawī branch of the Naqšbandī order, represented by Sheikh ʿAzīz Maḥmūd and his immediate successors "adhered to the metaphysical system of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* " (van Bruinessen, 1990: 347). Reading Jazīrī's poems one can assume that he was an enthusiastic follower of Ibn ʿArabī's doctrine, which will be discussed in the next section of this chapter.

4. Another noteworthy piece of evidence is that Jazīrī mentions three times in two poems that he was a prisoner or a "captive" for thirty years. If the poet was initiated into the order sometime in the early 17th century, when he was a teacher in Diyārbakir, then he may have written these poems thirty years later in Jazīra, during the last few years of his life.

Sīh sāla ži dard ū ži balāyē ta hilākīn
Ḥattā bi falak har diratin āh u ah-ē min (ZdJ: 455)

(Now) it is thirty years that we have suffered your pain and calamity,
My groans go up to heaven.

Hēž nizānim Mīr di bīrīn, zānit am sī sāl asīrīn
Čahvinēr pursak Amīrīn, law bi raḥm ū šafqaya (ZdJ: 553)

I still do not know if the prince recalls us
Or if he knows that we have been prisoners for thirty years,
We are waiting for the prince to inquire about us, once,
Because he is compassionate and kind.

Ar nakī raḥmē tu Mīro, dē či bit ḥāl-ē ma īro
Qat nabī jārak asīro, girtī-yē sī sālaya (ZdJ: 567)

If you do not show mercy, O Prince!
What will be our condition today?
Say, at least, once, that this captive
Has been in prison for thirty years.

Sheikh Maḥmūd was executed by Sulṭān Murād IV in 1639 and Jazīrī died a year later, in 1640. We do not find in Jazīrī's *Dīwān* any poem that could be interpreted as an eulogy by the Ṣūfī poet for his master and preceptor.

5.4. Ibn ʿArabī and his Doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*

Ibn ʿArabī (560–638 AH/1165–1240 CE) is the most widely known Islamic thinker, the most influential thinker in the sphere of Ṣūfīsm and philosophy in

the Islamic world, but also the absolutely most controversial Islamic thinker up to the present. This fact is described by Izutsu (1984: 2) in the following words "Ibn ʿArabī has evoked so much discussions and controversy, unprecedented in the history of Islamic thought". He also describes Ibn ʿArabī as "this extraordinary man" (ibid) and "the great Master who has been considered by many people one of the profoundest, but at the same time, obscurest Islam has ever produced" (ibid: 4).

Chittick (2005: 1) describes Ibn ʿArabī as "at once the most influential and the most controversial Muslim thinker to appear over the past nine hundred years". Affifi (1979: xiv) indicates, "There has never been such a diversity of opinion on the orthodoxy of a man before. He has been regarded by some people as one of the greatest saints of Islam, and by others as a heretic of the worst type." He is known throughout the Islamic world as *al-šayx al-akbar* (The greatest master or Doctor Maximus).

In the present chapter, great emphasis will be placed on two of Ibn ʿArabī's books that constitute the theoretical basis of his doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*. Moreover, the basic terms and concepts that are relevant in the context of his doctrine are briefly presented. Examples of Jazīrī's poems are quoted to show the influence of Ibn ʿArabī's doctrine in his poetry, and how these thoughts were reflected in the framework of a poetry that possesses a high aesthetic and linguistic standards. Ibn ʿArabī's life is dealt with in the second chapter.

5.4.1. Ibn ʿArabī's Writings

Ibn ʿArabī is the most productive writer in the history of Islam. Chittick (2011: 664) describes him as "an extraordinarily prolific author". Ateş (1971: Ibn al-ʿArabī, EIs-II, 708) states that he "was certainly the most prolific of all Sufi writers". He records various estimates of the number of his writings made by numerous scholars, varying between 239 and 864. He states that "Ibn al-ʿArabī himself did not know how many works he had written" and concludes that "altogether there seems little doubt that Ibn al-ʿArabī is the author of some 400 works" (ibid).

Ibn ʿArabī's writings cover a very wide range of Islamic sciences and knowledge. Landau (2008: 16) writes of his books that "these comprise theology, mysticism, biography, philosophy, Quranic commentaries, and poetry".

Almost all those who write about Ibn ʿArabī's writings and thought, emphasize the difficulty of his language and style. Hirtenstein and Tiernan (2005: 4256) state in this regard:

> The complexity of his writings make him one of the most demanding of authors, and difficult to comprehend, leading some Islamic scholars to oppose and even reject his position.

Chittick (2005: 1) echoes the above impression of him as a writer

> Ibn ʻArabi has always been considered one of the most difficult of authors. This is due to many factors, not least extraordinary erudition, consistently high level of discourse, constantly shifting perspectives, and diversity of styles.

Although Ibn ʿArabī's works are extremely numerous, two of his books in particular have received the most attention: *Al-Futūḥāt Al-Makkiyya* (The Meccan Revelations or The Meccan Illuminations) and *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam* (The Bezels of Wisdom, sometimes also translated as Gems of Philosophy). The reason why these two books are more famous than his other writings is that they are the most important sources of his philosophical thought, especially his doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*.

Of his *Ṣūfī* works, the most important are, according to Ateş (Ibn al-ʿArabī, EIs-II), 19 books and treatises, the first two at the head of the list being *Al-Futūḥāt Al-Makkiyya* and *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam*. He also includes, although towards the end of the list, *Tarjumān al-Aśwāq*. Chittick (ibid: 7), however, records only those three titles as "the most famous of his books".

What follows is a brief introduction to Ibn ʿArabī's two most important books as the main sources for his doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*, *Al-Futūḥāt Al-Makkiyya* and *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam.*

Al-Futūḥāt Al-Makkiyya: Ibn ʿArabī began writing this book at the beginning of his stay in Mecca in 598 AH/1201–2 CE and completed the first draft of it in 629/1231 and a second revision of the entire work in 635 AH/1238 CE in Damascus. Al-Tarjumān (2002: 112) affirms, "He finished writing it in 636 A.H. when he lived in Damascus, two years before his death". The book is in four volumes and consists of six divisions (*faṣl*) and 650 chapters (*bāb*). It is considered by most researchers and scholars to be Ibn ʿArabī's *magnum opus*. What remarks about Ibn ʿArabī's way of writing the book is of interest to know his working method.

> The enormous work was not composed in a continuous flow. The beginning of Volume IV was written in 1239, the end of Volume II in 1236, Volume III in the following year. The work took several years to write, and this is explained not only by its length but also by Ibn ʿArabī's method of composition.

Describing the preface of the *Futūḥāt*, Rundgren (1993: 340) indicates that

> These Meccan Revelations were composed in stages, and the preface, the muqaddima, has been completed by an extensive supplement, a tatimma. In addition to this, the

> work is introduced by a khutba, a sermon, a literary genre which in certain circumstances can function as a preface; this sermon, too, is provided with a supplement.

Ibn ʿArabī claims that the *Futūḥāt* was dictated by God through the Angel of Inspiration (Schimmel, 1975: 265), whom he meets in the *Kaʿba*, performing the circumambulation of the House, a youth with no name "who is both speaker and silent, neither alive nor dead, both complex and simple, encompassed and encompassing" (Hirtenstein, 1999: 151).

Although it is generally accepted, that *Al-Futūḥāt Al-Makkiyya* is one of the two main sources of Ibn ʿArabī's theory of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*, it is also true that the book's contents are much broader and more comprehensive. Chittick (2005: 7), describing the topics dealt with in the book, writes: "This is a vast compendium of metaphysics, theology, cosmology, spiritual anthropology, psychology, and jurisprudence".

The interpretation of the *Qurʾān* is an important topic of the *Futūḥāt*, and apparently, "the Greatest Master", writes Abrahamov (2017: 443), "uses not only the system of allusions (*ishārāt*) in his interpretations of the *Qurʾān*, but also other systems based on the plain meaning in order to convey his ideas as effectively as possible". Expanding on his view of Ibn ʿArabī's method of interpretation, Abrahamov (ibid) continues:

> The devices he employs are based on: (1) simple logical arguments; (2) the first meanings of the words; (3) play with the etymology of the words; (4) paraphrasing of the verses; and (5) creating a whole picture through adding verses from other *sūras*. In employing all these systems of interpretation, Ibn ʿArabī succeeds in showing that metaphysics is the true meaning of the Qurʾān.

The book has been published several times, but "the proportion of Ibn ʿArabī's works available to the non-Arabic reader is very small", according to Austin (Ibn alʿArabi, 1980: 12) who himself translated "Sufis of Andalusia" and *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam* (The Bezels of Wisdom) into English. He depicts the situation in this way:

> Translations of small sections of The Meccan Revelations exist as quotations in other works on Ibn ʿArabī. Considering that the A.H. 1329 printing of this work contains over 2,500 pages, a translation of the whole work would indeed be a daunting task.

Chittick (2005: 1) also expresses the same impression about the book and its difficult style and language "Thorough analysis and explication of a single page

of *Futuhat* demands many pages of Arabic text, and the task becomes much more challenging when it is a question of translation into a western language".

Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam: At the beginning of the book (Ibn al ʿArabi, 1980: 45), Ibn ʿArabī establishes two important facts about it when he writes:

> I saw the Apostle of God in a visitation granted to me during the latter part of the month of Muharram in the year 627, in the city of Damascus. He had in his hand a book and he said to me "This is the book of the Bezels of Wisdom; take it and bring it to men that they might benefit from it".

The date given here corresponds approximately to the middle of December 1229. It can be interpreted as the date when he had the dream, not when he began writing the book. At the end of the same paragraph (ibid), he indicates that he is not the author of the book, "for I have not set forth here anything except what was set before me, nor have I written in this book aught but what was revealed to me".

Affifi (1979: xviii) states that Ibn ʿArabī finished the book in 628/1230, ten years before his death, which means that he wrote it in one year. Contrary to many researchers and scholars, Affifi (ibid) considers *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam* (not *Al-Futūḥāt Al-Makkiyya*) to be Ibn ʿArabī's *Opus Magnum*. Ateş (ibid) writes of a manuscript "written by Ṣadr al-Dīn in 630/1232–1233, read to and corrected by the author", which is preserved in Istanbul. This manuscript should therefore be considered the most reliable the various copies of the book, since it was written by Ṣadr al-Dīn Qūnawī, Ibn ʿArabī's disciple, and was read and corrected by Ibn ʿArabī himself. It is quite likely that Ibn ʿArabī may have changed things in the manuscript, making it the latest version of the text. Austin (Ibn al ʿArabi, 1980: 17) used this manuscript when he translating the book into English.

Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam, is a small book compared with *Al-Futūḥāt Al-Makkiyya*. It consists of 27 chapters, which he calls *Fuṣūṣ* (the singular form of which is *Faṣṣ*) 'bezels, gems or ring stones'. Each chapter is devoted to a prophet, beginning with Adam and ending with Muhammad. Hirtenstein (1999: 271) describes the book as follows:

> Considered to be the quintessence of Ibn ʿArabī's spiritual teaching, it comprises twenty-seven chapters, each dedicated to the spiritual meaning and wisdom of a particular prophet. The twenty-seven prophets, beginning with Adam and ending with Muhammad, are like the settings of a ring, holding the jewel-stone of Wisdom, and represent all the different communities of humankind.

All those who have written about Ibn ʿArabī and his book *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam* agree that the book is extremely difficult, highly unintelligible and obscure. Affifi (1979: xviii), who edited and published the book and translated it into English, says, "It is one of the most difficult of his works to understand". Nicholson (1978: 149) expresses the same impression of the book, "The theories set forth in the *Fuṣūṣ* are difficult to understand and even more difficult to explain". He thinks that the book's difficulty lies in the fact that its language is incomprehensible:

> The author's language is so technical, figurative, and involved that a literal reproduction would convey very little. On the other hand, if we reject his terminology, we shall find it impossible to form any precise notion of his ideas.

The reason why Ibn ʿArabī's two books *Al-Futūḥāt Al-Makkiyya* and *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam* are usually mentioned and treated as twins, is that together they form the basic source for Ibn ʿArabī's most well-known and discussed philosophical theory, namely *Waḥdat al-wujūd*. Schimmel (1975: 265) states, "The fifteenth century Naqshbandi mystic Muḥammad Pārsā compared the *Fuṣūṣ* to the soul and the *Futūḥāt* to the heart". Affifi (ibid) also affirms the relationship between the two books, when he writes: "without the *Futūḥāt*, which may be looked upon as a large commentary on the *Fuṣūṣ*, the *Fuṣūṣ* would be, even with such an excellent commentary as that of Qāshānī, most unintelligible and obscure".

Apparently, the difficulty of the *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam* was the main reason why numerous writers and scholars wrote commentaries on it. Chittick (2005:7) records that "over the centuries Ibn ʿArabī's students held this book in highest esteem and wrote well over one hundred commentaries on it". Hirtenstein (2005: 4258) is highly appreciative of the commentaries, writing, "This book has had a perennial appeal, giving rise to at least one hundred commentaries over several centuries and in several languages, and these constitute a whole history of Islamic mystical thought in themselves".

5.4.2. *Waḥdat al-wujūd*: The Influence of Early Sufis

A question that often arises that discussing Ibn ʿArabī's doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* is whether he was influenced or inspired by the thoughts of earlier pantheistic Sufis. Affifi (1979: 183–184) mentions several sources which influenced Ibn ʿArabī's thought, both Islamic and non-Islamic. Among the earlier Sufis, he mostly emphasizes (ibid: 188) the influence of Ḥallāj who "seems to have exerted the greatest influence. Ibnul ʿArabī seems to have been thoroughly acquainted with Ḥallāj's mystical sayings and he is even supposed to have written a commentary on Ḥallāj's terms".

In addition to Ḥallāj, other Sufis influenced Ibn ʿArabī, according to Affifi (ibid: 190), who writes:

> Besides Ḥallāj, Ibnul ʿArabī borrowed ideas from numerous other Sufis and gave them all his usual pantheist colouring. He refers to Bāyazīd in more than a hundred places in his *Futūḥāt* and often quotes Junayd, Shiblī, Tustarī, ʻAbdul Qādir al-Jīlānī and his pupil Abu-Su'ud b. al-Shibl, Muḥammad b. ʻAbdi'l Jabbār an-Niffarī, Ghazālī and scores of others. But his references on the whole, are too short and incidental to throw any light on the doctrines of these Sufis.

Affifi (ibid: 188–189) thinks that "some of the most vital points in Ibnul ʿArabī's system" that seem to be inspired by Ḥallājian ideas are: the question of the One and the Many, the Logos, the nature of esoteric knowledge, transcendence and immanence, essence and attribute, divine love, the difference between *al-mashī'ah* (divine Desire) and *irādah* (the divine will) and the esoteric interpretation of the Qur'ān.

Abrahamov (2014: 370), writing about the influence of Abū Yazīd al-Bisṭāmī on Ibn ʿArabī, points out that in his *Futūḥāt* "Ibn al-ʻArabī mentions Abū Yazīd 143 times in the text, more than any other Sufi (al-Ḥallāj appears only 15 times and al-Junayd 34). This would appear to suggest that Ibn al-ʻArabī ascribes significant importance to his predecessor".

In his article, Abrahamov does not compare any specific aspects of Ibn ʿArabī's doctrine of pantheism with Bisṭāmī's ideas, since we do not have access to any writings by Abū Yazīd. Almost all of his mystical legacy consists of hundreds of anecdotes, stories, and sayings recorded by his contemporaries or by Sufi historiographers of later generations. Even most of these stories and sayings are retold in different accounts, since Bisṭāmī's sayings were expressed when he experienced ecstatic states, and are commonly called *Šaṭḥāt* or *Šaṭḥiyāt* (theosophical locutions).

The topics discussed by Abrahamov mainly concern Ibn ʿArabī's attitude towards, and appraisal of, Sufi states, stations and behaviours, and the attributes attributed to Abū Yazīd. It is also of great significance in this regard to remember that Ibn ʿArabī's *Al-Futūḥāt Al-Makkiyya* is a very comprehensive book that deals with dozens of topics, of which pantheism is only one.

Lubis is strongly inclined to accept the idea that Ibn ʿArabī was influenced by most of the idea presented in al-Ḥallāj's "*Kitāb al-Ṭawāsīn*". He repeats almost all the information introduced by Affifi, as was mentioned above. He mainly emphasizes the concept of the Muḥammadan Light, to give precedence to al-Ḥallāj. Lubis (1994: 14) writes:

> One may also say that al-Ḥallāj (244/857–309/922) was the forerunner of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*, as far as the concept of the Muḥammadan Light (*al-Nūr al-Muḥammadī*) was concerned. In fact, he is the first Sufi who introduced the theory of the Muḥammadan Light.

5.4.3. *Waḥdat al-wujūd*: The Term

The doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* (Oneness of Being) as a philosophical and mystical system of thought is definitely attributed to Ibn ʿArabī. Although it is possible to find similarities in some aspects of Ibn ʿArabī's thought and that of earlier Sufis, Ḥallāj for example, it is clear that in many cases, Ibn ʿArabī modified these ideas to suit his own position. Affifi (1979: 190) says:

> It is true that Ḥallāj belongs to a different class of mystics from that to which Ibnul 'Arabī belongs, but in many of Ḥallāj's sayings Ibnul 'Arabī finds fertile soil to sow the seeds of his pantheist doctrine. He modifies most of Ḥallāj's ideas in such a way as to fit in with his own system. I do not wish to assert that Ibnul 'Arabī was a follower of Ḥallāj or that his system was Ḥallāj's system, for Ḥallāj had no such elaborate system, but rather that Ḥallāj was one of the most influential sources of which Ibnul 'Arabī availed himself.

ʿAfīfī, (Ibn ʿArabi, n.d.: 25) asserts that "The school of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* in Islam had not existed in its perfect form before Ibn ʿArabī. He is the real builder of the pillars of this school and its founder".

Affifi, who wrote the first doctoral dissertation on "*The Mystical Philosophy of Muhyid Din Ibnul Arabi*", under the supervision of Professor R. A. Nicholson, at the University of Cambridge in 1930, presented a work that is still one of the most appreciated and consulted by those who study Ibn ʿArabī and his thought. He also edited and published *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam* in 1946. Affifi did not limit his work to the study of Ibn ʿArabī's most famous doctrine, *Waḥdat al-wujūd*, but also studied the whole of his philosophical and mystical thought.

Despite his great reverence for Ibn ʿArabī and his writings and ideas, Affifi presents numerous critical points of view on various aspects of Ibn ʿArabī's works, especially his two most famous books *Al-Futūḥāt Al-Makkiyya* and *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam*. He ascribes, for example, the "disorder" of *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam* to Ibn ʿArabī's lack of philosophical training. Affifi (1979: xi) writes:

> The *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam*, perhaps, may be said to sum up the maturest form of his pantheistic doctrine; but what an unintelligible and disorderly summary! One has to do so much hunting through other books by ibnul ʻArabī besides the *Fuṣūṣ*, so much analysing and synthesising and gathering relevant points scattered haphazardly amongst masses of trivial or irrelevant details, before one can arrive at anything like a system. He was certainly conscious of a complete pantheistic philosophy, but lacking philosophical training he did not know how to express it. He also may be said to be a consistent thinker, provided we do not attach too much importance to his verbal paradoxes and the way he often tries to reconcile Islamic dogmas with philosophical principles. There is no possible means of reconciling his philosophy with Islam. The orthodox garb with which he so persistently drapes his pantheistic ideas is a sham appearance purposely put there.

As far as the term *Waḥdat al-wujūd*, it seems that it was never used by Ibn ʿArabī himself in his writings (Hirtenstein, 1999: 19; al-Ḥakīm, 1981: 1154). Madkūr (1969: 369–370) supposes that it was first used by Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728 AH), who was known for being against all the Sufis. Obviously, he did not use the term appreciatively, but pejoratively, to give it wide currency outside Sufi circles (Lubis, 1994: 19). According to Lubis (ibid), the term was first used by two of Ibn ʿArabī's disciples: Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī and Saʿīd Farghānī.

5.4.4. *Waḥdat al-wujūd*: Principles and Concepts

Although it is generally thought that *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam* is the main source in which Ibn ʿArabī presented his doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*, it is also clear that in order to understand Ibn ʿArabī's doctrine, one must also consult many of his other writings, including *Al-Futūḥāt Al-Makkiyya*. Ibn ʿArabī did not formulate his theory in a single and limited philosophical framework that can be reviewed to acquire all the dimensions of his doctrine. Affifi (1979: xi) expresses this reality clearly when he writes: "Nowhere in his numerous works can one find his mystical philosophy expressed *as a whole* or with any appreciable degree of coherence or order."

The doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* is based on a number of principles that are expressed in concepts and terms. The terminology used by Ibn ʿArabī in most of his writings does not constitute a single and unified system, and therefore his texts are subject to different interpretations. Takeshita (1983: 87) says that "due partly to the lack of a coherent system and the loose, fluid character of his terminology, it is extremely difficult to define many technical terms peculiar to his metaphysics." This same difficulty is also noted by ʿAfīfī, (Ibn

ʿArabi, n.d.: 19), although he justifies Ibn ʿArabī's use of such language, asserting that "the language of logic is incapable of expressing those tasteful meanings that the Sufi perceives in the conditions of ecstasy; he only has the language of signs and symbols".

The following is a brief presentation of the main principles and concepts that constitute important aspects of Ibn ʿArabī's theory of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*. In this context it is important to bear in mind two points regarding the doctrine and its theoretical composition. First, most of those who have studied Ibn ʿArabī's theory have different views when it comes to defining the principles of this theory, and secondly, the idea of The Perfect or Universal Man (*al-Insān al-Kāmil*) is in some cases regarded as part of the doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*, (Lubis, 1994: 52), whereas it is treated separately by some scholars (al-Hakim, 1981: 158–168).

5.4.5. Existence or Being (*Al-Wujūd*)

This is a key word in Ibn ʿArabī's philosophy, under which many of his main principles and concepts are grouped. The most significant concepts that are deduced from existence or being as an idea and philosophical concept are God and creatures (*al-Ḥaqq wa al-xalq*), the One and the many (*al-Wāḥid wa al-kaṯīr*), the Inner and the Outer (*al-Bāṭin wa al-Ẓāhir*), the First and the Last (*al-Awwal wa al-Āxir*) and the Eternal and the Temporal (*al-Qadīm wa al-Ḥadīṯ*).

The reality of existence (*al-ḥaqīqah al-wujūdiyah*), as maintained by Ibn ʿArabī, is one in its substance (*jawhar*) and Essence (*al-ḏāt*), and many in its attributes (*al-ṣifāt*) and names (*al-asmāʾ*). There is no multiplicity (*taʿaddud*) in it, except by ascription (*al-nisab*) and attribution (*al-iḍāfah*). It is old and eternal and does not change even if the existential imaginations in which it appears are changed. It is the brimful ocean of being that has no shores, and perceptible existence is nothing but the waves of that ocean that are seen on its surface.

In the chapter of his book titled "The Wisdom of Divinity in the Word of Adam" in *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam* (The Bezels of Wisdom) Ibn ʿArabī (1980: 55), explains these ides, as follows:

> There is no doubt that we are, as individuals and types, many, and that, though representatives of a single reality, we know definitely that there is a factor distinguishing one individual from another, but for which, multiplicity would not be [implicit] in the One. In the same way, even if we describe ourselves as He describes Himself, in all possible aspects, there would still remain an inevitable factor of distinction [between Him and us]. This [factor] is our dependence on Him for existence, which, in our case, derives entirely from Him because we are originated while He is free of all dependence whatsoever. Thus is He rightly called the

> One without beginning, the Ancient of Days, contradicting all priority in the sense of existence starting from nonexistence. For, although He is the first, no temporal priority may be attributed to Him. Thus He is also called the Last. Even if He were the First in the sense of being the first-determined existence, He could not be called the Last in this sense, since contingent being has no end, being infinite. He is called the Last only in the sense that all reality, though reality be attributed to us, is His. His Finality is essentially [implicit] in His Priority as His Priority essentially [implicit] in His Finality. Know also that the Reality has described Himself as being the Outer and the Inner [Manifest and Unmanifest].

God and creatures (*al-Ḥaqq wa al-xalq*) and the One and the many (*al-Wāḥid wa al-kaṯīr*) – the latter two terms are indeed synonyms of the former two terms in the context of Ibn ʿArabī's philosophy, and he uses them in the same sence. The view of Oneness (*al-Waḥdah*) and multiplicity (*al-kaṯrah*) is possible when we consider the Real (*Ḥaqq*) as the essence of creatures (*xalq*) and all phenomena as the phenomena manifesting that Essence. The One is the Necessary Being (*Wājib al-wujūd*), and whatever thing that is outside Him derives its existence from Him. Affifi (1979: 9) points out that "by a necessary being is meant a being whose existence is self-necessitated, i.e. it exists *per se*: and this is God alone." Ibn ʿArabī is of the opinion that there is nothing in existence except God, for He is the real existence and the absolute existence. His existence is eternal and everlasting. He is the whole of existence and there is nothing in existence except Him. There is no creature or existence coming from not-being (*ʿAdam*); they are nothing more than Divine over-flowing or emanation (*faiḍ*) and self-disclosures (*tajallī*) of God. The Divine manifestation (*tajallī Ilāhī*) is eternal and everlasting, the most important sign of which is the cognition of the Real when His attributions and names appear in the world of existence. This is an allusion to a well-known extra-Qurʾanic revelation (*ḥadīṯ qudsī*) that says, "I was a hidden treasure, and I wanted to be known, so I created the creatures, and thus they knew me by me."

Affifi (ibid: 8), explaining the existence of things according to Ibn ʿArabī, writes: "with regard to God, […], things have only two 'planes' of being, (a) intelligible and (b) concrete, and things have existence in God's knowledge prior to their existence in the external world. For us, on the other hand, things must have a concrete existence before we form any concepts of them." The Real, God, has a real existence (*wujūd ḥaqīqī*) and an extra existence that is His existence in the contingent essences (*Aʿyān al-mumkināt*).

Upon that argument, he builds his views regarding the two aspects of existence. Affifi (ibid: 10) explains:

> According to Ibnul ‘Arabī there is only One Reality in existence. This Reality we view from two different angles, now calling it *Haqq* (the Real) when we regard it as the Essence of all phenomena; and now *khalq* when we regard it as the phenomena manifesting that Essence. *Haqq* and *khalq*; Reality and Appearance; the One and the Many are only names for two subjective aspects of One Reality; it is a real unity but empirical diversity. This Reality is God.

In order to elucidate the relationship between the One and the many, Ibn ʿArabī often uses metaphors that are not easy to understand. In his books, *Al-Futūḥāt Al-Makkiyya* and *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam*, there are a fair number of such metaphors. The following are brief accounts of two of them as presented by Affifi (1979: 16–17):

> (i) The metaphor of the “mirror” and “images” which is closely allied to that of the object and its shadow. The One is regarded as an object whose image is reflected in different mirrors, the images appearing in different forms and shapes according to the nature of each mirror (locus). The Many (phenomenal world) is the mirror-images, the Shadow of the Real Object beyond. The whole world is like a shadow play. […] (iv) The mathematical metaphors of number “one” and the diacritical point, and the centre of a circle. According to Ibnul ‘Arabī, the One stands to the Many in the same relation as the mathematical one stands to the infinite numbers based on it.

The relationship between the Real and the creatures (God and the world) is like that between the number One (1), and all the other numbers that are derived from it. In the same way, the Real One brought into being the Many existences that are called the World.

The question of The Eternal and the temporal (*al-Ḏadīm wa al-Ḥadīṯ*) is an important aspect of the theory of Ibn ʿArabī. Every being is either temporally originated (*Muḥdaṯ*), by which the Creatures (*al-Xalq*) are meant, or it is not temporally originated, which reffers to The Real (*al- Ḥaqq*) or the Creator (*al-Xāliq*), since He was and He existed and nothing else existed with Him.

Ibn ʿArabī (1980: 54) describes the relationship between the two aspects as follows:

> It is established that the originated is [completely] dependent on that which brings it about, for its possibility. Its existence is [entirely] derived from something other than itself, the connection in this case being one of dependence.

> It is therefore necessary that that which is the support [of originated existence] should be essentially and necessarily by itself, self-sufficient and independent of any other. Thus it is that it bestows existence from its own essential Being on dependent existence, which in this way becomes related to it.
>
> Furthermore, since the former, because of its essence, requires the latter [the independent], the latter has [in a certain sense] necessary being. Also, since its dependence on that from which it was manifested is [implicit in] its own essence, it follows that the originated should conform to all the Names and attributes of the cause [origin], except that of Self-sufficient Being, which does not belong to originated existence, since what necessary being it has derives [entirely] from something other than itself."

God, the Real (*al-Ḥaqq*) or the Creator (*al-Xāliq*) is necessarily existent (*wājib al-wujūd*), self-sufficient and independent, whereas the Creatures (*al-Xalq*) are contingently existent (*mumkin al-wujūd*) and dependent. The contingent being always needs an originator who brings it into being. God, as the necessarily existent, donates existence to those whom He creates, the contingently existent. Every being, except God, whether soul or body, is temporally originated, did not exist, but became existent. All beings, with the exception of God, are originated from non-existence, since the existence of the originated is preceded by non-existence and its being is later than the eternal existence of God.

This statement may give the impression that the contingently existent, the fixed archetypes (*al-aʿyān al-ṯābita*), are also eternal and share eternity with the Real. This contradiction is not accepted in Ibn ʿArabī's philosophy. He asserts that the essences of contingent existence are only created and brought about. He invalidates their being brought about from absolute non-being and maintains that they are only created from an extra or a relative non-being (al-Tarjumān, 2002: 385).

Ibn ʿArabī (1980: 51) distinguishes the human being, the created, from the power that brought him into being, when he says "He is Man, the transitory (in form), the eternal (in essence); he is the perpetual, the everlasting, the (at once) discriminating and unifying Word". He thus combines the eternal and the created in the human being, signifying that Man is created in his external existence and eternal in his existence in the Divine knowledge, since all beings have a former existence in God's knowledge. The eternity of the Real means the negation of a starting time or starting point for Him, and that His existence has no beginning and was not preceded by non-being (*ʿĀdam*). Man is both eternal and created. He is eternal because he existed in the Divine knowledge and he is created because he was not a being in himself, but was dependent and was brought into being.

5.4.6. Transcendence and Immanence (*al-tanzīh wa al-tašbīh*)

Ibn ʿArabī is of the view that the duality of *Haqq* and *xalq* is not a real duality of being, but a duality of what can be called differentiating attributes, which are identified with two terms he calls transcendence and immanence (*al-tanzīh wa al-tašbīh*). These terms are commonly used to describe or not describe God with attributes that are used to describe creatures.

Lubis (1994: 40) explains these two terms literally and theologically:

> *Tanzīh* literally means "keeping something away from anything making impure", and theologically means "proclaiming and contemplating God to be absolutely free from any deficiency." *Tašbīh* literally means "making something equal to something else" or "considering something similar to some other thing," and theologically means "likening God to created things" or "ascribing human or worldly characteristics to God." These two terms theologically run counter to each other and cannot coexist in harmony.

Tašbīh (Immanence) can be explained as the attribution to God of qualities comparable to those of men and other created beings. *Tanzīh* (Transcendence), on the other hand, is to hold that God is above all such qualities. Affifi (1979: 19) maintains that Ibn ʿArabī uses the terms in a different sense. He writes:

> The assertion that God "hears" or "sees" or has "hands," etc., etc., which anthropomorphists make, is not understood by Ibnul ʻArabī to mean that God *possesses* "hearing" or "sight" or "hands", etc., but rather that He is *immanent* in all that hears, sees or has hands. He hears and sees in every being that hears and sees, and this constitutes His immanence (*Tašbīh*). On the other hand, His essence is not limited to one being or a group of beings that hear and see, but is manifested in *all* such beings and in *all* beings whatever. In this sense, God is transcendent because He is above all limitation and individualisation.

There are several verses in the *Qurʾān* that can be interpreted as asserting those two ideas. Izutsu (1984: 56) discusses the issue in detail and quotes Ibn ʿArabī regarding the *Qurʾān*ic verses:

> God Himself "purifies" (i.e. *tanzīh*) by saying: *laysa ka mithli-hi shay'*, and "assimilates" (i.e. *tašbīh*) by saying: *wa-hua al-samī' al-baṣīr*. God "assimilates" or "declares Himself to be dual" by saying: *laysa ka mithli-hi shay'*, while he "purifies" or "declares Himself to be unique" by saying: *wa-hua al-samī' al-baṣīr.*

The two *Qurʾān*ic verses in the quotation above are both from XLII: 11 as "Like Him there is naught; He is the All-hearing, the All-seeing."

Ibn ʿArabī, nevertheless maintains that both transcendence and immanence (*al-tanzīh wa al-tašbīh*) are real attributes. One should not be satisfied with only one of them, because the intellect alone, which provides transcendence, cannot provide enough knowledge to know God, and fancy alone, which provides immanence, does not produce a real image of Him. He writes (Ibn alʿArabī, 1980: 230):

> The intellect, by itself, absorbing knowledge in its own way, knows only according to the transcendental and nothing of the immanent. It is only when God acquaints it with His Self-manifestation that its knowledge of God becomes complete, seeing Him as transcendent when appropriate, and as immanent when appropriate, and perceiving the diffusion of God in natural and elemental forms. Indeed, he sees the Essence of the Reality to be their essence. This is complete gnosis, which the Law, sent down from God, brings, all fancies being determined by this gnosis.

5.4.7. God

The dominant idea of God in Islam is that there is only one God. The first part of the profession of faith (*Šahāda*) is to testify that there is no god but God. In the *Qurʾān* too, many verses emphasize this idea, e.g., "Your God is One God; there is no God but He" (II: 163), or "Say: He is God, One" (CXII: 1). The Sufis, and especially Ibn ʿArabī, apparently tried to elucidate the issue in a way that differs from the way traditional Islamic theology interpreted it. It is generally known that Ibn ʿArabī maintains that "There is nothing but God" (Landau, 2008: 27).

Mysticism has as its end to know God (*maʿrifa*), by which it is meant to know Him as one with the world, as different from it, and as He is in Himself. According to Ansari (1999: 175), who derives his ideas from the writings of Ibn ʿArabī "there are three ways of knowing God: reason, revelation and the *kashf* of the mystic." Examining Ibn ʿArabī's different thoughts in this regard, Ansari (1999: 176–178) summarizes Ibn ʿArabī's views as follows:

a. Rational thought, independent or guided by revelation, cannot have any other idea than the idea of a finite God (*Ilāh muqayyad*); it cannot have an infinite God (*Ilāh muṭlaq*). Reason constructs God according to its own wishes. Instead of a Creator God, it has a God of its own creation (*Ilāh bi'l-jaʿl*), a God fashioned in belief (*al-Ilāh al-makhlūq fi'l-iʿtiqād*). Whoever dares to comprehend Divine realities in rational categories is impertinent.
b. Revelation, as a prophet has it or understands it, confirms the existence of the infinite God, as Ibn ʿArabī affirms. A finite God is the God of theological thought that interprets prophetic revelation, or the God of the common man who accepts it by following (*bi'l-taqlīd*) the theologian. Revelation is entirely in agreement with the truth of the mystic, except in one respect. It does not speak of the Divine Essence as it is in itself. It does not speak of the undifferentiated unity (*aḥadiyyat muṭlaqah*) or the absolute oneness of the Essence (*aḥadiyyat al-dhāt*), but only of the unity of Godhead (*al-aḥadiyyah al-Ilāhiyyah*).
c. The perfect way of knowing God [….] is the *kashf* of the mystic. […] the way to know the infinite God (*al-Ilāh al-muṭlaq*) is not spiritual vision (*mushāhadah*) but unveiling (*mukāshafah*). *Kashf* is an imaginative inference from a mystical vision. The mystic's *Kashf* reveals that God is the subject of all descriptions by which anything is described. Precisely because God is the subject of all predicates and the substance of all forms, His [God's] description is impossible. He fact that *Kashf* reveals the infinite God means that the mystic knows through his *Kashf* that God is infinite, that as such He is unknowable.

5.4.8. Worship

Ibn ʿArabī, as already mentioned, believes that all beings except God are created, brought about, and originated from non-existence, and that their existence is preceded by non-existence. He combines this thought with the Divine command "Be" (*Kun*) and declares that obedience and worship were not created in them, but belong to the contingent essence both in its non-being and in its being, and that is why it accepts the Divine command without holding back. This is recorded in the Divine statement expressed in the *Qurʾān*ic verse "Be! and it becomes" (*Kun fa-yakūn*), which is repeated eight times in the *Qurʾān*. He maintains that the Divine will for the contingent essences to worship is more possible in their state of not-being than in their state of being (al-Tarjumān, 2002: 385).

The theme of worship is one of the controversial questions in Ibn ʿArabī's philosophy. Since his doctrine of "The Unity of Being" asserts that all existing beings are considered to be only one, he believes that All is One and the One

is God. Ibn ʿArabī (1980: 124) says, "All we perceive is nothing other than the being of the Reality in the essences of contingent beings. With reference to the Identity of the Reality, it is Its Being, whereas with reference to the variety of its forms, it is the essences of contingent beings."

Ibn ʿArabī (ibid: 78) bases his view of the worship of God upon that theory when he asserts:

> In every object of worship there is a reflection of the Reality, whether it be recognized or not. In the case of Muhammad's heirs He says, *Your Lord has decreed that you serve only Him*, meaning He has determined it. The one who knows, knows Who is worshiped and in what form He is manifest to be worshiped. He also knows that the distinction and multiplicity [of forms] are merely like pears of a sensible form or the powers of a spiritual image. Indeed, in every object of worship it is [in truth] God Who is worshiped.
>
> The ignorant man imagines the object to be invested with divinity and, were it not for such a notion, neither the stone nor anything similar would be an object of worship. For this reason He says, *Bid them name them*. Had they done so they would have called them stones, trees, or stars. Had they been asked whom they worshiped, they would have said 'a god' and not 'God' or 'the God'.

Idolatry in Islam is viewed as a form of polytheism (*širk*) and is therefore not accepted, because in worship they associate some being with God that they consider to be other than God. Ibn ʿArabī is very careful to be clear about this. That is why he always asserts that there is no being in existence other than God. This is indeed the basic idea of the theme of God and creatures (*al-Ḥaqq wa al-Xalq*) or the One and the Many (*al-Wāḥid wa al-Kaṯīr*). Ansari (1999: 179), interpreting the issue, writes:

> The worship of an object regarded as a manifestation of God, which is the case in reality, is justified. Idolatry is to be condemned in two forms only: one, when the object of worship is a god existing in itself apart from God, and, second, when a particular object is singled out as the exclusive manifestation of God worthy of worship because it involves the belief that other objects are not the manifestation of God.

5.4.9. *Al-Fanāʾ* (annihilation, evanescence, effacement)

The term *fanāʾ* is often used together with, and as the opposite pole of, the term *baqāʾ* (enduring). *Fanāʾ* is "the aim of the Sufis that is realized by the way-farer folk who arrive [at that goal] and is followed, inevitably, by enduring" (Al-Tarjuman, 2002: 418). This *baqāʾ* (enduring) is interpreted by Ibn ʿArabī as the realization of the vanishing of the evanescent images and the enduring [nature] of the Eternal Essence. He also maintains that no human being can arrive at the reality of the Absolute Essence. He writes (Ibn al ʿArabi, 1980: 56) "The Reality can never be known [by cosmic being] in any way, since originated being has no part in that [Self-sufficiency]".

Affifi (1979: 142), after reviewing various definitions given by Sufis before Ibn ʿArabī, summarizes Ibn ʿArabī's view regarding *fanāʾ*, writing:

> The perfect mystic is the one who recognises both Essence and "form" but realises their essential unity and the absolute non-existence of the form. This is the most perfect *fanāʾ* a mystic can attain in this life according to Ibnul ʻArabī: the *real fanāʾ* is attained after death when the form completely disappears. Such a view is quite in harmony with Ibnul ʻArabī's metaphysical theory of Reality. Mysticism is the consummation of the mystic's quest for true knowledge of the Real.

Landau (2008: 54) thinks that for Ibn ʿArabī, the goal of *fanāʾ* is "the attainment of *true* knowledge by the passing away of everything phenomenal, that is, everything other than God. Attainment of such knowledge can be equated with awareness of God. This, however, must not be interpreted as becoming God. Rather is it God's recognizing himself through, and within the medium of man."

5.4.10. Love (*al-ḥubb, al-hawā, al-ʿisq*)

Love is a central essence in Sufi doctrines and encompasses love of man and God. Landau (2008: 63) notes that "love implies reciprocity, and it would be presumptuous of man to assume that his love of God must impel his Maker to love him in return." Ibn ʿArabī interprets the idea of the love relationship between man and God differently, according to Landau (ibid) who summarizes Ibn ʿArabī's viewpoint as follows: "He agrees that the basis of all religions is the worship of God. But could man worship anything without loving the object of his worship? Without love worship is impossible." Ibn ʿArabī (n.d.: 194) expresses the same thought in a verse:

> *Wa ḥaqq'l-hawā inna al-hawā sabab al-hawā*
> *Wa lawlā al-hawā fi al-qalbi ma ʿubid al-hawā*

> By the truth of passion, surely passion begets passion
> And but for passion in the heart it would not be worshiped
> (Translated by Austin, in Ibn alʿArabi, 1980: 246)

Affifi (1979: 173) corroborates and summarizes Ibn ʿArabī's viewpoint regarding love and beauty as follows:

> According to Ibnul 'Arabi love is not an end itself; it has no intrinsic value. The basis and the cause of all love is Beauty. [….] God's Beauty is the source of all types of Beauty. It is the source of all spiritual and intellectual beauty as well as beauty of form, although in itself God's Beauty is above all form and shape. God loves beauty of form because form reflects His own Beauty as it reflects his Being. In abstract beauty as well as in beauty of form, therefore, God ought to be loved and worshipped, and this is how a perfect Gnostic knows Him, loves Him and worships Him.
>
> [….] Love is the cause of creation (or self-manifestation of the One in His infinite forms), but it is also the cause of the return of all the manifestations to the One. 'Does not God say', Ibnul 'Arabi says, 'O David, My yearning for them is greater than their yearning for me?' Love is the working principle in all manifestations of the One, from the highest to the lowest. It reaches its zenith in Man, the Perfect Man, who above all creation experiences all the three kinds of Love. Through Love, the Whole is bound together and through it the object of creation is realised.

Affifi (2018: 178) argues that the perception and the image that the Sufis of the first two centuries of Islam's history had of God was that of an Almighty God who dominates everything and strikes, tortures or forgives whomever He wants. The ascetic Sufis only regarded Him as the Worshipped God (*al-Maʿbūd*). This image was changed from the beginning of the third century, and the Sufis thought of Him as absolute beauty and absolute love. The perception of the Worshipped God was altered to the Loved God (*al-Maḥbūb*).

The culmination of Ibn 'Arabi's thinking about Love can indeed be found in his most famous verses in his book of poetry "*Tarjumān al-aśwāq*" (Ibn al-ʿArabī, 2005: 62), which reads:

Laqad ṣāra qalbī qābilan kulla ṣūratin
Fa marʿa li ġizlānin wa dayrun li ruhbāni
Wa baytun li awṯānin wa Kaʿbatu Ṭāʾifin
Wa alwāḥu tawrātin wa muṣḥafu Qurʾāni
Adīnu bi din al-ḥubbi annā tawajjahat
Rakāʾibuhu fa al-ḥubbu dīnī wa īmānī.

My heart has become capable of every form:
It is a pasture for gazelles and a convent for Christian monks,
And a temple for idols and the pilgrim's Kaʿba
And the tables of Tora and the book of the Koran.
I follow the religion of Love: whatever way
Love's camels take, Love is my religion and my faith.
(Translated by R. A. Nicholson, in: Ibn al-'Arabi, 1978: 67)

5.5. Reflections of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* in Malā-yē Jazīrī's Poetry

The most salient feature of the poetry of Malā-yē Jazīrī is, undoubtedly, Sufism. When one examines the poems of Jazīrī, one encounters a large number of Sufi concepts and terms that are common to the poetry of almost all Sufi poets. However, there are many concepts and terms in Jazīrī's poetry that belong specifically to the philosophical thought of Ibn ʿArabī and his doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*. The presence of these thoughts and concepts in Jazīrī's poetry is clear proof that he was a *Wujūdī* poet. The word *Wujūdī* is often used to describe Sufis, or Sufi poets who believe in Ibn ʿArabī's teachings (Algar, 1991: 11).

It is important to explain in this context that there is a difference between the *Wujūdī* Sufi scholars and the *Wujūdī* Sufi poets in reflecting Ibn ʿArabī's thoughts and expressing them in their work. The Sufi scholars who were connected with the doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* were mostly involved in spreading it among the learned society or writing commentaries on Ibn ʿArabī's book *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam*, which is one of his two main works about his theory of the Unity of Being (*Waḥdat al-wujūd*). No Islamic book, except the *Qurʾān*, has ever been so commented on so extensively. Chittick (2005:7) estimates that "Ibn ʿArabī's students held this book in highest esteem and wrote well over one hundred commentaries on it". Hirtenstein (2005: 4258) appreciates the commentaries highly, writing, "this book has had a perennial appeal, giving rise to at least one hundred commentaries over several centuries and in several languages, and these constitute a whole history of Islamic mystical thought in themselves."

The *Wujūdī* Sufi poets, however, expressed thoughts and views that were a result of the profound impact of Ibn ʿArabī and his teachings in their poetry. Of

course, a poet is not expected to explain or comment on the complicated philosophical and mystical texts of Ibn ʿArabī within the framework of poetry, which is restricted by several formal and linguistic rules. Nevertheless, they did their utmost to adapt the philosophical thoughts within the framework of poetic standards such as rhyme, rhythm, metaphor, rhetoric, consonance, and so on.

Reviewing the poems of Malā-yē Jazīrī, one can trace Ibn ʿArabī's philosophy both in the thoughts presented and in his use of a number of the concepts and terms, most of which are related to the doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*. In the following pages, a number of examples of Jazīrī's affiliation with the doctrine in question will be given from his poems.

The Arabic word *wāḥid* (one) is the source of several important Sufi terms. Many of the terms and concepts used by Ibn ʿArabī are also derived from the same source, such as *tawhid* (divine unity, to declare that God is One) *waḥda* (unity), *waḥdāniyya* (the uniqueness of God), *waḥidiyya*/*aḥadiyya* (Oneness)…etc. Jazīrī uses almost all of these terms, and instead of explaining them in logical and philosophical terms, as Ibn ʿArabī and other thinkers do, he illustrates them poetically with metaphors that speak to the hearts and souls of readers and listeners. He says:

Gota ma durdāna-yī, am ži te wu tu ž ma-yī
Law bi haqīqat yak-īn, masʾala bē šubha mā
Bāda ma nošī ži dast, čūma ži xwa, māma mast
Qaṭra bi baḥr-ē gihā, baḥr bi ʿayn-i xwe mā. (ZdJ: 23–24)

He told us, you are a single pearl,
We are from you and you are from us
Since we are, in reality, united,
The question is then undoubted.
We drank the wine from His hand,
I became unconscious and drunk
The drop reached the sea, the sea was still the same.

These lines are, in fact, a poetic explanation of what Ibn ʿArabī (1860: 623; translation: Affifi, 1979: 11) says when he writes: "Unity has no other meaning than two (or more) things being *actually* identical but *conceptually* distinguishable the one from the other; so in one sense the one *is* the other; in another, *it is not*." In the same poems, we read:

Ḥarf-i ž yak būna faṣl, gar bibirī wān bi aṣl
Ḥarf dibit yak xaṭ-ak, xaṭ ku namā, nuqṭa mā
Waḥdat-i muṭlaq Malā, nūr-a di qalbān jalā
Zor-ē di vē masʾal-ē, ahl-ē dilān šubha mā. (ZdJ: 25)

The letters are separated from each other,
[But] if you return them to their origins

The letter becomes a line,
When a line disappears, a dot does remain.
The Absolute Unity, O, Malā,
Is a light that illuminates the hearts,
Among the people of hearts,
Many are in doubt about this question.

The metaphor in the first couplet is based on the diversity of the letters of the alphabet as symbols of the creatures. The diversity of the letters lies not only in their forms, but also in the different sounds they represent. If we think about the letters, we see that they are nothing more than the reshaping of a line, a streak, and its construction in different forms. When drawing or writing a line, one starts with a dot, a point, which one extends to draw the line. In the Arabic system of writing, a dot resembles the numeral zero.

In the first hemistich of the next couplet, Jazīrī uses the concept of *Waḥdat-i muṭlaq* (the absolute unity), which is a synonym for *Waḥdat al-wujūd*. He maintains that the absolute unity is a light that illuminates the hearts. At the same time he alludes to a *Qurʾān*ic verse (XXIV: 35) that says, "God is the light of the heavens and earth."

The idea of drop, wave and sea, used in the above poem, is also used in another poem:

Yak-a daryā tu bizān qanj či mawj u či ḥabāb
Di aṣil-dā ku hamī āv-a či āv u či jamad (ZdJ: 217)

The sea is one, you should know well, be it wave or bubble
Originally all is water, be it water or ice.

The same idea is employed in another poem, with the difference that the poet asserts his belief by using two verbs that are central in the context:

Ta dizānim, Ta dibīnim, ku Tu-yī nūr-i wujūd
Allāh Allāh ži či nūr-a di sarā-yā ma labālab (ZdJ: 69)

I know You, I see You, that You are the light of existence
O God! Such a light, of which is our palace [world] brimful.

Jazīrī first uses the Kurdish verb *dizānim* from the infinitive *zānīn* 'to know' instead of *nāsīn* 'to know, to be acquainted with'. Most likely he intentionally starts from the Arabic verb *ʿ-r-f* (to know, in both senses) from which the Sufi term *maʿrifah* (Gnosis) is derived, because it makes a better impression on the reader and also on himself. Otherwise, it is clear that in the Kurdish language one says *Ta dināsim* (I know you), not *Ta dizānim*. The second verb, *dibīnim*

(I see), is an expression of the poet's closeness to God, when he claims to see God as the light of all existence.

In the following couplet, he expresses the Sufi concept of *waḥdat* 'unity, to be united' in a language more commonly used in the context of the human lover-beloved relationship, using the words *ʿāšiq* (lover) and *wiṣāl* (union). However he is determined to confirm the Sufi content of the metaphor by alluding to the idea that the purpose of the (re)union is for the soul to be united with "soul".

> *Qast-ē waḥdat dikirit rūḥ bi rūḥ*
> *War-na ʿāšiq ži wiṣāl-ē či ġaraḍ?* (ZdJ: 316)
>
> The soul intends to be united with "soul"
> What purpose, otherwise, does the lover have for (re)union?

According to Landau (2008: 33):

> For Ibn 'Arabi, union with God is not an eventual reaching or meeting Him but rather a becoming aware of a relationship that has always existed. What the individual soul does is merely to awaken to the realization of its unity with God. […] Ibn 'Arabi naturally holds that man never becomes God, as God never becomes man. They are always one, even though we are seldom aware of this fact. Only the true mystic can be aware of it.

Worshipping idols, according to the Islamic *Šarīʿa* (the canonical law of Islam), is treated as blaspheming God and being an infidel. Even most Sufis hold the same opinion and belief. However, those who adhere to Ibn ʿArabī's theory of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* have a different attitude, which they defend by quoting verses from the *Qurʾān* and traditions attributed to the Prophet Muhammad. In addition, they take refuge in Ibn ʿArabī's theories about this. Ibn ʿArabī (1980: 78) confirms his outlook in philosophical but clear language when he writes:

> In every object of worship, there is a reflection of the Reality, whether it be recognized or not. […] The one, who knows, knows Who is worshiped and in what form He is manifest to be worshiped. He also knows that the distinction and multiplicity [of forms] are merely like pears of a sensible form or the powers of a spiritual image. Indeed, in every object of worship it is [in truth] God Who is worshiped.

Obviously, Jazīrī starts from Ibn ʿArabī's texts in this regard, when he says in two of his poems:

> *Na tanē qand u nabāt-ī, maẓhar-ē rūḥ u ḥayāt-ī*
> *Ham but ū ʿUzzāy u Lāt-ī, law ma dil butxāna-ya*
> *Xund-ē Lāt-ē Āzar-ī tū, bē či šīrīn dilbar-ī tū*
> *Har jihē lē bēwirī tū, bē xilāf aw Kaʿba-ya* (ZdJ: 568)
>
> You are not only sugar and candy,
> but [also] the manifestation of soul and life
> You are also an idol, *ʿUzzāy* and *Lāt*,
> our heart is [therefore] an idol temple.
> You are the lord of Āzar's *Lāt*,
> such a sweet beloved one are You
> Whatever place You dwell in is,
> doubtless, the *Kaʿba*.
>
> *Hayā Bīnāhī-yā čahvān, but ū ʿUzzāy u Lāt-ē min*
> *Tu-yī pēšbar sujūd-ā min saḥargāhān di xalwē-dā* (ZdJ: 51)
>
> O, light of the eyes (God), my idol, *ʿUzzāy* and *Lāt*
> You are the *Qiblah* for my prostration in seclusion at the dawn.

In these verses, Jazīrī mentions the names of the idols *ʿUzzāy* and *Lāt* that were placed in Mecca and worshipped before Islam, including those worshipped by Āzar, the father or uncle of Ibrāhīm (Abraham). He knows, like Ibn ʿArabī, that only "ignorant people imagine a divine nature in every object of their worship", but he does not employ such expressions as "the one who knows" or "the lover", since his language is poetic and that of Ibn ʿArabī is philosophical.

Ibn ʿArabī (1980: 78) expands on his viewpoint in this way:

> The ignorant man imagines the object to be invested with divinity and, were it not for such a notion, neither the stone nor anything similar would be an object of worship. For this reason He says, *Bid them, name them* (Qurʾān: XIII: 23). Had they done so they would have called them stones, trees, or stars. Had they been asked whom they worshiped, they would have said "a god" and not "God" or "the God." The man endowed with knowledge does not imagine thus, but knows that the object of worship is the vehicle of divine manifestation, worthy of reverence, while not restricting himself (to the particular object).

As was shown above, Ibn ʿArabī is of the opinion that "in every object of worship, there is a reflection of the Reality, whether it be recognized or not." He bases this statement on the *Qurʾān*ic verse (XVII: 23) that says, "Thy Lord has decreed you shall not serve any but Him" and another verse (ibid: II: 115) that says, "Whithersoever you turn, there is the face of God". Moreover, in *Al-Futūḥāt Al-Makkiyya,* he quotes a prophetic tradition that says, "God is in the prayer's *qibla*" (Hirtenstein, 1999: 7). These ideas are the kernel of Jazīrī's above-mentioned verses, especially the hemistiches that read: "Whatever place You dwell is, doubtless, the *Kaʿba*" and "You are the *qibla* for my prostration in seclusion at the dawn".

In the second hemistich of the first couplet, Jazīrī says, "our heart is an idol temple" which is a literal Kurdish translation of the same metaphor used by Ibn ʿArabī in his famous poem quoted above. Ibn ʿArabī's verse reads:

> My heart has become capable of every form:
> It is a pasture for gazelles and a convent for Christian monks,
> And a temple for idols (*baytun li awṯānin*) and the pilgrim's *Kaʿba*.

As a believer, Jazīrī, to borrow Ibn ʿArabī's words "does not restrict himself to a particular object" to worship. He believes that all those who worship God, regardless of their faith and religion, worship one and the same God, as we read in these couplets:

> *Sajda bin bar ta rawā-ya di hamī maḏhab u dīnān*
> *Kī dibit mušrik u kāfir ži wē širin-ē fam-ē*
> *Gar bibim bar Ta sujūd-ē di dam-ā kašf u šuhūd-ē*
> *Mi li dil dē bidirit partaw-ē nūr-ā qidam-ē* (ZdJ: 685)
> Prostration before You is legal, in all faiths and religions
> Who will become a polytheist or an infidel because of that sweet-mouthed one?
> If I prostrate before You at the time of revelation and contemplation
> The ray of the light of Eternity will radiate in my heart.

In some other poems, he refers to religions other than Islam, which was the religion of the majority of the people in his society. Jazīrī spent many years of his life as a young man in Diyarbakir and the surounding villages. Awliyā Čalabī (1611–1685), who visited Diyarbakir in 1655 (15 years after Jazīrī's death), recorded in his *Siyaḥatnāmeh* (van Bruinessen & Boeschoten, 1988: 31) that there were Christian groups, an insignificant Jewish minority, Yezīdīs and Šamsīs there.

In the same year, Čalabī visited the city of Jazīra, the capital of the Kurdish principality called Botan and Jazīra, where Jazīrī spent the greatest part of his life.

It is also where he died and was buried. Writing about the religious groups in Jazīra, (Çelebi, 2010: 731) states that in Jazīra "there are two churches […], there are a lot of Yazidi subjects and there is one Jewish synagogue. These Jews have been living near their temple, called *Kaništ*, since the time of Ibn ʿUmar".

Obviously, Jazīrī lived in an environment where the adherents of other religions, Christians, Jews and Yezī dīs, were present and had their own places of worship. This situation might have influenced his view of other religions, but his main source of inspiration in this regard was undoubtedly Ibn ʿArabī's thought.

Below are four verses in which Jazīrī mentions different Islamic, Christian, Jewish and Yezidi symbols:

> *Bi zunnār-ā di dērē-dā, li hindāv-ā čalīpā-yē*
> *Bi miḥrāb-ē ma bir sajda, balē ammā xayāl abrū* (ZdJ: 595)
>
> Wearing the belt of unbelief in the church, face to face with the cross,
> We prostrated ourselves in the *miḥrāb*, but the eyebrows were in our minds.
>
> *Hin ži nik dērē-va tēn, qast-ā kaništ-ē hin dikin*
> *Nay ži vān-im, nay ži wān-im, min dar-ē xammār-i bas* (ZdJ: 287)
>
> Some come from the church and some go to the synagogue,
> I do belong to neither these or those; the door of the wine-seller is enough for me.
>
> *Dil-gašta min ži dēr-ē nāčim kaništa-yē qaṭ*
> *Miḥrāb-i wī/wē bi min-rā, war dā bičīna Lālaš* (ZdJ: 293)
>
> My heart returns from the church; I do not go to the synagogue,
> His/her *miḥrāb*-like eyebrows accompany me, come! We go to Lālaš.
>
> *Ṭūr-im bi dil ū payraw-ē Mūsā-yim az*
> *Ātaš-paras ū nūr-i tajallā-yim az* (ZdJ: 256)
>
> My heart is the Sīnai mount and I am a follower of Moses.
> I am a fire-worshipper and the light of manifestation.

In the first couplet, he prostrates in the church, in front of the cross, and in the *miḥrāb* of the mosque, but he always has the image of the beloved in his mind, since he reflects on the same beloved, whether here or there. In the second couplet, he does not want to be identified with any particular faith; he is content to be at the door of the wine-seller, the tavern, which alludes to the wine

of love on the *Alast*-day (Primordial). In the third couplet, goes a step further and wants to go to Lālaš, the most important and sacred place for the Yezīdīs, since that is the location of the shrine of their Saint Sheikh ʿĀdī, or Hādī (c. 1075–1162 CE). Jazīrī's attitude can be better understood when we know that the Yezīdīs were considered 'Devil-worshippers' and were regarded a sort of pariahs in Muslim societies, including the Kurdish society. *Ātaš-paras* (fire-worshipper), used in the fourth couplet, gives the impression that Jazīrī means the Zoroastrians, but that seems far-fetched. The expression is used in a context where Mount Sinai, Moses and the manifestation of the divine light are used. Therfore, it must be interpreted as a reference to a *Qurʾān*ic verse (VII: 143) relating the story of Moses and his request to see God, which says:

> And when Moses came to Our appointed time and his Lord spoke with him, he said, "Oh my Lord, show me, that I may behold Thee!" Said He, "Thou shalt not see Me; but behold the mountain – if it stays fast in its place, then thou shalt see Me." And when his Lord revealed Him to the mountain He made it crumble to dust; and Moses fell down swooning. So when he awoke, he said, "Glory be to thee! I repent to Thee; I am the first of the believers".

The overwhelming sense in the preceding verses is that Jazīrī, despite (or because of) his being a Muslim Sufi, believes that the object of worship in various religions and faiths is the same God. This is very much in line with what Ibn ʿArabī (1980: 247; translated by Austin) says in this regard:

> Every worshiper is under the rule of passion. Then the worshiper begins to see that, among those who worship, the objects of worship are various and that the worshiper of some particular object of worship accuses those who worship anything else of infidelity. Thus, those who have any awareness become confused because of the universality of this passion, indeed, the oneness of passion being the same in every worshiper. […]
>
> The perfect gnostic is one who regards every object of worship as a manifestation of God in which He is worshiped. They call it a god, although its proper name might be stone, wood, animal, man, star, or angel. Although that might be its particular name, Divinity presents a level [of reality] that causes the worshiper to imagine that it is his object of worship. In reality, this level is the Self-manifestation of God to the consciousness of the worship of the object in this particular mode of manifestation.

In one of his *qaṣīda* poems, Jazīrī surprises the reader with a chain of arguments that at first sight, seem to contradict each other, but he justifies them with the logic of his Sufi thought. The story of the Ṣanʿānī Sheikh is one of these arguments. According to a popular tale, the sheikh was in love with a Christian (Armenian) girl. In order to be accepted by the girl's family, he agreed to their conditions: to convert to Christianity, take care of their pigs, and drink wine. Jazīrī justifies the sheikh's conduct, saying that he was not wrong because, like Moses, he had seen God's manifestation. The poem begins with these couplets:

May nanošī Šēx-i Ṣanʿānī ġalaṭ
Aw načū nēv Armanistān-i ġalaṭ
Miṯl-ē Mūsā wī tajallā-yā Ta dī
ʾĒ Tu dī kānī xaṭā, hānī ġalaṭ (ZdJ: 327)

The Ṣanʿānī Sheikh did not drink wine by mistake,
He did not go to Armenia by mistake.
Like Moses, he saw Your manifestation,
What is the sin of the one who saw You, what is his mistake?

In the first hemistich of the following couplet, Jazīrī quotes a *Qurʾān*ic verse, modifying it slightly to fit the rhythm of the poem, by adding the pronoun word *Huwa* (He) to the other three divine attributes, since it is the first one in the original text that has the pronoun. The *Qurʾān*ic verse (LVII: 3) says "He is the First and the Last, the Outward and the Inward; He has knowledge of everything", and Jazīrī's couplet reads:

Huwa al-Awwal, Huwa al-Āxir, Huwa al-Ẓāhir, Huwa al-Bāṭin
Huwa al-Maʿbūd-u wa'l-Mašhūd-u fi kull al-huwiyyāt-i
(ZdJ: 705)

He is the First, He is the Last, He is the Outer, He is the Inner
He is the Worshipped and the Witnessed in all realities.

The four words *Awwal* (first), *Āxir* (last), *Ẓāhir* (outer) and *Bāṭin* (inner) are important concepts in Ibn ʿArabī's system of thought. Ibn ʿArabī (1980: 73, translated by Austin) alludes to the last two attributes, writing, "The truth is that the Reality is manifest in every created being and in every concept, while He is [at the same time] hidden from all understanding, except for one who holds that the Cosmos is His form and His identity. This is the Name, the Manifest, while He is also unmanifested Spirit, the Unmanifest". Lubis (1994: 24), interprets Ibn ʿArabī's word as follows:

> He is hidden from the understanding of people, except a group of men who know that the world is the form and

> manifestation of God's identity, for they witness God in all of His manifestation. The world consists of the divine name outward (*Ẓāhir*), i.e., the world is His Identity and Reality made manifest. And God, with respect to the meaning and reality is also spirit and the inward aspect (*Bāṭin*) of the World. So the outward aspect of the world is the name *ẓāhir* and the inward aspect is the name *bāṭin*. The name *ẓāhir* necessitates the appearance of the world and the name *bāṭin* necessitates the hiddenness or inwardness of its truth in spite of the fact that the one who necessitates is in one respect also the one who is necessitated.

Ibn ʿArabī (1980: 135–136, translated by Austin) explains the first two attributes, saying: "He is also their inner Essence, being also the Unmanifest. He is the First, since He was when they were not, and also the Last, since in their manifestation He is their Essence, the Last is the Manifest and the First is the Unmanifest. Thus, *He knows all things*, as knowing Himself".

Lubis (1994: 36) interprets Ibn ʿArabī's words in a simpler style of writing:

> Here we observe one of the most important elements making up Ibn ʿArabī's doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*: existence in its various degrees is, indeed, One Reality – be it *al-Ḥaqq* (the Reality = God) and *al-Xalq* (the creatures), or al-*Wāḥid* (the One) and *al-Kaṯīr* (the Many), or *al-Ẓāhir* (the Outward) and *al-Bāṭin* (the Inward), or *al-Awwal* (the First) and *al-Āxir* (the Last).

Jazīrī expresses the question of God's eternity (*azal* and *abad*) in many poems. In the following couplet, he refers to the concept of eternity by using other terms, namely *bidāyat* (beginning) and *nihāyat* (end/termination). Since the world is a contingent existence, it is not a self-necessary existence, but a dependent existence. This existence, in the form of creatures and contingent essences, has a beginning and an end, whereas the divine Existence is Eternal, without a beginning or an end.

> *Ḥusn ū jamāl-i jānān nādīritin tu pāyān*
> *Harčī nabit bidāyat aṣlan nahin nihāyat* (ZdJ: 137)
>
> The beauty of the Beloved has no end,
> Whatever has no beginning has no end at all.

In another poem, Jazīrī develops this idea further by placing the question in the context of knowing God as the Necessary Existence that has no time limitation. The poem begins with these lines:

Sirr-i waḥdat ži azal girtiya ḥattā bi abad
Wāḥid ū fard-a bi ḏāt-ē xwa, wi nīnin ču ʿadad
Di qidam-dā azal ū ʿayn-i abad hardu yak-in
*Sarmadiyyat wah dixwāzit na azal bit, na abad (*ZdJ: 216)

The secret of Unity encompasses [everything] from Eternity to Eternity
He is the One and the Singular in His Essence, He has no multitude/variety
In the Preeternity, *azal* and *abad* are the same.
Being Everlasting (*sarmadiyyat*) requires that there should be no *azal* or *abad*.

In a short gazal (seven couplets), Jazīrī presents various Sufi ideas, two of which are relevant in the context of Ibn ʿArabī's thought. Jazīrī writes:

Ži sirr-ā lāmakān wājib tanazzul kir di imkān-ē
Fa ayna alʿilm-u? ayna al-ʿayn? wa ayna al-aynu, iḏ lā ayn? (ZdJ: 443)

From the undetermined Hidden Wisdom,
The Necessary Existence descended to the contingent existence
Where then is, the knowledge? Where is the Essence?
And where is the "where", when there is no "where"?

Here, in the first hemistich, he repeats the idea of "The Necessary Existence" (*Wājib al-wujūd*) and "The Contingent Existence" (*mumkin al-wujūd*), explained earlier in this chapter. Jazīrī's use of language in the second hemistich resembles that of al-Ḥallāj, who is known for his special language. In the chapter, "The garden of Knowledge" (*Ḥadīqat al-maʿrifah*), which is a part of his famous book *Ṭawāsīn*, al-Ḥallāj (1974: 62) writes:

> The external form of gnosis is concealed from the understanding and returns to them. *How* does he know Him, where there is no 'how'? Where did he know Him where there is no 'where'? How did he reach Him where there is no idea of union? How did he separate from Him where there is no separation?

In the next couplet, he emphasizes the divine Unity and the Oneness of God using an argument that is unique. He urges himself (and, certainly, other believers) to see only God, and nothing but God, if he knows only Him. He builds on this with the next idea, that there is nothing but God in the two worlds. This is the idea that we find in many of Ibn ʿArabī's writings. Ibn ʿArabī (translated by Ansari, 1999: 170) states that "for the real gnostic nothing exists exept God, and

our existence, if we exist, depends upon His existence. And he who exists by some thing else is as though non-existent."

Landau (2008: 27), interpreting the thought, declares that "If Ibn ʿArabī is usually described as a pantheist, there is ample justification in his own arguments. For while the *Qurʾān* declares: 'There is but one God', Ibn ʿArabī maintains that 'There is nothing but God'."

> *Malā har Wī bibīn, har Wī, agar har Wī dināsī tū!*
> *Huwa al-maʿbūd, Huwa al-mašhūdu, bal lā ġayru fī al-dārayn* (ZdJ: 445)
>
> Behold only Him, O, Mala, only Him, if you know only Him!
> He is the Worshipped and the Witnessed,
> Nay, there is nobody else in the two houses.

In the chapter on the Prophet Jacob in *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam*, Ibn ʿArabī (1980: 115, translated by Austin) says "the only [true] existence is the existence of the Reality in the forms of the states in which the contingent beings are in themselves and in their [eternally latent] essences."

ʿAbd al-Ġanī al-Nābulsī (1641–1731), the most enthusiastic supporter of Ibn ʿArabī's theory of '*Wājib al-wujūd*', who lived after Jazīrī's death, conveys the idea (Lubis, 1994: 95) in these words "The existence of the universe, existing as it does by God's existence at every moment, is therefore the existence of God. There is no existence other than the existence of God."

The focus of the preceding pages was mainly on the reflections of the theory of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* in the poetry of Jazīrī, although this aspect does not represent the whole of the poet's work. There are other Sufi ideas that Jazīrī dealt with and conveyed artistically in his poems, but which were not included here. In many cases, those Sufi ideas are common to the poetry of other poets, Kurdish or non-Kurdish. The idea of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*, nonetheless, is not present in the poetry of all Sufi poets. Among the Kurdish Sufi poets who lived and wrote after Jazīrī, there are those in whose poetry one finds reflections of Ibn ʿArabī's thought, but it is quite difficult to find, among them, any poet who showed his adherence to the theory of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*, with the same artistic force as in Jazīrī's poetry.

Chapter 6: Aesthetic Aspects of the Poetry of Malā-yē Jazīrī, a Structural and Thematic Analysis

6.1. Introduction

Most of the studies of Jazīrī's poetry are, understandably, interwoven parts of writings that mostly deal with his life and work within the framework of the history of Kurdish literature. There are, however, isolated studies and articles about specific aspects of Jazīrī's authorship. Although his *Dīwān* has been published more than a dozen times, there are only five editions in which the poems are annotated. Even in these cases, the aesthetic or philosophical aspects of the poems are not dealt with to any great extent. It is noteworthy that in two of the editions are the poems scanned or mapped according to the prosodic system of Oriental poetry.

Considering the high standard of Jazīrī's poetry, be it in terms of content or its formal, aesthetic and technical characteristics, it must be admitted that this poetry has not received the attention it deserves. The independent works about the poetry of Jazīrī that I had at my disposal amounted to four books, three in Arabic (6, 7 and 9) and one in Kurdish (5). There are additionally some other writings which constitute chapters of books desl with Kurdish literature. This situation provides a genuine picture of the scarcity of serious studies of Jazīrī's poetry described here.

6.2. Previous Attempts to Analyse Jazīrī's Poetry

The following is a brief description of the main works, either in the form of a book or as a chapter in a book, that are devoted to various features of Jazīrī's poetry, and annotated editions of the *Dīwān* that can give an impression of aesthetic, structural or other aspects of this poetry. (Note that no. 2, 4, 8, 10 are found under Malā-yē Jazīrī in the bibliography.)

1. Sajjādī, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn: *Mēžū-y adab-ī Kurdī* (The history of Kurdish literature, first edition, 1952, second edition, 1971, in Kurdish). In the chapter devoted to Jazīrī, Sajjadī concentrates on three subjects, which

he deals with in detail: the dates of the poet's birth and death, his travels and his studies in various places in Kurdistan, and his being a Sufi. Sajjadī describes the daily life of the poet, and gives many details about him that are not based on any reliable source, including Jazīrī's physical appearance. Moreover, he quotes only three poems and some sporadic distiches, which he explains in a simple language, but without discussing any aesthetic or structural features of them.

2. Al-Zivingī, Aḥmad bin al-Mullā Muḥammad: *Al-ʿiqd al-jawharī fī šarḥ Dīwān al-Šayx al-Jazarī* (The jewelled necklace in the explication of the *Dīwān* of al-Šayx al-Jazarī, first edition, 1959, second edition, 1987; Jazīrī's poems are in Kurdish, but the explanation is in Arabic). Zivingī's edition of Jazīrī's *Dīwān* is definitely the best commentary to date. He devotes the introduction to different aspects of Jazīrī's life, the most important of which is the dates of the poet's birth and death. His conclusions in this regard are of the utmost importance and have become the basis for almost all those who have written about Jazīrī since.

   Zivingī explains almost every distich in detail, and this is done in two steps: first, he provides a translation of the distich into Arabic, and then he explains the metaphors, mapping the constituent elements. In some cases, when he perceives some similarity between the metaphors in Jazīrī's poems and metaphors in the poetry of other poets, especially Persian poets, he notes the resemblance and quotes the Persian distich where the metaphor is employed.

   Regarding the Sufi ideas in Jazīrī's poems, Zivingī focuses mainly on the principles of the Naqšbandī order, to which both Jazīrī and Zivingī himself adhered, and in a few cases, on the doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*, although he does not mention the name of Ibn ʿArabī. In these cases, he limits himself to indicating the name of the doctrine, but does not give any information about its principles.

   In his commentary, Zivingī does not deal with the aesthetic or structural aspects of the poems, and the verse meters are not recorded.

3. Āmēdī, Ṣādiq Bahāʾ al-Dīn (1980): *Hozānvānēt Kurd* (Kurdish poets, in Kurdish). The chapter on Jazīrī is the longest in the book, 150 pages, and in it, Āmēdī discusses the poet's life in detail. He gives an account of most of what has been written about Jazīrī and the dates of his birth and death. It is noticeable that he does not come to any definite conclusion about the years in which the poet lived. He only suggests that Jazīrī may have died sometime after 1030 AH/1620 CE (1980: 82–83). Āmēdī quotes many verses from Jazīrī's poems, but he uses them only

to support the validity of his arguments about the poet's life. The chapter makes no mention of the aesthetic values of Jazīrī's poetry.

4. Hažār: *Dīwān-ī ʿārif-ī rabbānī Šēx Aḥmad-ī Jazīrī, mašhūr ba Malā-y Jizīrī* (The *Dīwān* of the divine mystic *Šayx* Ahmad-ī Jizīrī, known as Malā-y Jizīrī, 1361 Š/1982 CE, the book is in Kurdish). In editing and commenting on Jazīrī's *Dīwān*, Hažār follows to some extent the method used by Zivingī. He explains almost every distich in two steps; first, he translates most of the Arabic words and some of the Kurmanji words into Central Kurdish. Secondly, he elucidates the contents of the distich in detail. Zivingī's commentary is entirely in Arabic, whereas Hažār's is in Kurdish. In cases where he finds some similarity between metaphors in Jazīrī's poems and the poetry of other poets, whether Arabic, Persian or Kurdish, he notes the similarity and compares them. This occurs more often than in Zivingī's edition of Jazīrī's *Dīwān*.

   Hažār almost entirely avoids commenting on Jazīrī's Sufi ideas or the aesthetic and structural aspects of his poetry. In explaining the poems devoted to Sufism, he uses general expressions such as the comprehensive divine love that encompasses the whole universe or the idea that earthly love is a step on the staircase that leads to Divine love. These are things that can be said of many other poets, not only Jazīrī. Nowhere in this work do we read that Jazīrī was a Naqšbandī Sufi or a follower of Ibn ʿArabī's philosophy.

   Regarding the metaphors in the poems, Hažār only expresses his appreciation and admiration for Jazīrī in general terms, without providing any examination of the elements or structures that can be associated with the language and the style of the poet.

5. Rasūl, Izz al-Dīn Muṣṭafā: *Malā-y Jizīrī, šitēk darbāra-y žiyān u barham-ī* (Malā-y Jizīrī, Something about his life and work, 1990, in Kurdish). Rasūl's book is the only book so far in the Kurdish language that deals entirely with Jazīrī's life and poetry. It is a comprehensive work that treats various parts of the poet's life and work. It consists of fourteen chapters, mainly dealing with Jazīrī's life, philosophy and poetry. Other minor topics include love, astrology, chess and separation in Jazīrī's poetry.

   In his discussion of Jazīrī's philosophy, the author rightly points out that Jazīrī was a follower of the doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*, but he avoids writing about the principles of this doctrine and nowhere does he quote or refer to any of Ibn ʿArabī's writings. Consequently, the reader is left without any clear response to his/her curiosity about the construction of a philosophy that is the main source of Jazīrī's Sufi

thought and poetry. Like many other writers, Rasūl believes that Jazīrī belonged to the Naqšbandī order. He bases this idea on the conclusions reached by Zivingī in his edition of Jazīrī's *Dīwān*, and he cites the same distiches used by Zivingī as evidence for his argument that Jazīrī belonged to that order.

Although the author devotes two chapters to "metaphor in the poetry and some aspects of Sufism" and "notes about the form", we do not find in them any deliberate analysis or development of the two concepts of metaphor or form in Jazīrī's poetry. Regarding metaphor, he merely explains the meanings of the distiches and compares them with similar expressions used by other poets. As for form, he limits himself to referring to some *Qurʾān*ic verses or stories that he believes inspired the poet to write the poem. Only in few cases does he take up special words and try to explain why they are used in this or that way. The prosody is not discussed at all in the book, and the construction of the poems is not approached from an aesthetic point of view.

6. Al-Karmī, ʿAbd al-Wahhāb Ḥusayn: *Naqd wa tarjamat li muxtārāt min Dīwān al-Mullā al-Jazrī* (Criticism and translation of a selection of the *Dīwān* of al-Jazrī, 1992, in Arabic). The author has selected twenty-one poems, both *qaṣīda*s and *ġazal*s, which he considers to be "genuine models and true examples that reflect the spirit of the *Dīwān* and the owner of the *Dīwān*" (Al-Karmī, 1992: p. 150). The pattern used throughout the book is the same. Each poem is first translated into Arabic, distich by distich, and this is followed by a text called "criticism and comments". In many cases, the author points out the prosody of the poems. In this part, al-Karmī presents ideas about the poems and explains some of the symbols and metaphors according to his understandng of the poems. Al-Karmī treats aesthetical aspects of some of the poems and emphasizes the significance of the language used by Jazīrī and his ingenuity in constructing the metaphors.

   Although the title of the book gives the impression that the texts are studied from a critical point of view, the overwhelming feeling throughout is that the poems, without exception, are highly appreciated and overrated by al-Karmī. As for Jazīrī's Sufi ideas he describes them in general terms, and nothing is said about the influence of the doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* or the Naqšbandī order.

7. Doskī, Muḥammad Amīn: *Falsafat al-ʿišq al-ʾilāhī fī šiʿr al-Jazīrī* (The philosophy of Divine love in the poetry of Jazīrī, 2000, in Arabic). The book consists of nineteen articles of different length, each of which is devoted to a Sufi or philosophical concept found in Jazīrī's

poetry, such as *al-ʿišq* (passionate love), *al-maḥabba* (love), *al-jamāl wa al-jalāl* (divine beauty and divine majesty), *al-samāʿ* (mystical concert and dance), *al-zuhd* (asceticism, renunciation), etc. The author explains these terms in detail, from a historical perspective and within a Sufi context. He quotes examples from Jazīrī's poems that contain the ideas in question. Although Ibn ʿArabī is mentioned in a few cases, his theory of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* is not discussed and Jazīrī is not considered by Doskī to be a follower of that doctrine. The aesthetic aspects of Jazīrī's poetry are not discussed either.

8. Al-Jizrī, al-Mullā ʿAbd al-Salām bin Murad: *Šarḥ Dīwān al-Šayx al-Jazarī* (The explication of the *Dīwān* of al-Šayx al-Jizrī, 2 volumes, 2004; Jazīrī's poems are in Kurdish and the explanation is in Arabic). This edition of Jazīrī's *Dīwān* is one of the most controversial stories in the history of Kurdish literature, because Zivingī, who published his own edition of Jazīrī's *Dīwān* in 1959, was accused of plagiarism and of having copied his edition from the manuscript of al-Mullā ʿAbd al-Salām Al-Jizrī. The author, ʿAbd al-Salam Al-Jizrī, died in 1952, and his book was published 52 years later, in 2004, by Taḥsīn Ibrāhīm al-Doskī. During the 45 years between the publication of Zivingī's edition and this edition, the accusations against Zivingī were brought up several times. The question is also briefly described in Chapter 2 of this book.

   The pattern employed in this edition is somewhat similar to that of Zivingī; the Kurdish and Persian words in each distich are translated into Arabic, followed by an explanation of the distich in Arabic. Unlike Zivingī's commentary, which is elaborate, al-Jizrī's explanations of the distiches are mostly short. In addition to explaining each distich, Zivingī also provides a literary translation, whereas Al-Jizrī limits his commentary to a general interpretation of the distiches. He does not refer to the Sufi manifestations in the poems, nor does he approach an aesthetic evaluation of the metaphors or the language construction.

9. Mīkāīl, Nāyif Ṭāhir: *Al-Šayx al-Jizrī, nahjuhu waʿaqīdatuhu min xilāl dīwānihi al-šiʿrī* (Al-Šayx al-Jizrī, His way and his belief as shown in his *Dīwān*, 2005, in Arabic). The book was originally a thesis submitted to the Department of Islamic Studies at the University of Duhok in Kurdistan. It is written in Arabic, but the quotations of distiches from Jazīrī's poems are in Kurdish and are translated into Arabic.

   The author deals mainly with Jazīrī's thought as an Islamic scholar and a Sufi. He reviews most of the schools of Islamic *Šarīʿa* (the canonical law of Islam) and philosophy and shows how Jazīrī expressed these ideas in his poetry. Although he devotes a large part of his book

to Jazīrī's Sufi thought, he almost completely ignores the two main features of Jazīrī's Sufism, namely his being a Naqšbandī Sufi and his obvious adherence to Ibn ʿArabī's doctrine of *Waḥdat wujūd*. The book does not deal with the aesthetic or linguistic aspects of Jazīrī's poetry.

10. Doskī, Taḥsīn Ibrāhīm: *Šarḥ-ā Dīwān-ā Malā-yē Jizīrī* (The annotation of Jizīrī's *Dīwān*, 2018, four volumes, 1629 pages, in Kurdish). This is the most comprehensive annotated edition of Jazīrī's *Dīwān*. It starts with a very short introduction, two pages, about Jazīrī's life. In this introduction, Doskī informs us that the Prince ʿImād al-Dīn, who had a poetic conversation with Jazīrī, was not a member of the ʿĀzīzān princely family that ruled Botān principality, but a prince from Hakkārī principality, and that his pen name was Ṣabūrī. Doskī does not present any evidence to support his claim, so the issue is an open question.

    The introduction is followed by an article about Jazīrī's life and poetry, in which new information is given about attempts to edit, annotate and comment on parts of Jazīrī's poetry. The first attempt, according to Doskī, was made by Malā Jarjīs Arbīlī (d. 1206/1791), who in 1185/1771 wrote a book, *Risāla-ye Fatḥiyya*, for the governor of Ākrē Fatḥullāh Pāšā. The book was in Persian and was devoted to explaining a poem by Jazīrī that deals with the questions of *qidam* (eternity before creation) and *ḥudūṯ* (new creation, i.e. the created world).

    What makes Doskī's edition so detailed and comprehensive is that, in addition to his own explication of the poems, he refers to other earlier editions and how they read or explained Jazīrī's poems. An obvious shortcoming of this edition is that the author exolains the poems literally and tries to avoid the Sufi aspects in Jazīrī's poetry. He approaches the poet's thought from a *Qurʾān*ic and Islamic theological perspective. Moreover, the aesthetic and structural features of the poems are not dealt with.

6.3. Aesthetics, Poetry and Sufi Poetry

6.3.1. Definition

The Encyclopaedia Britannica, in its fifteenth edition, begins its article on aesthetics with a brief definition (Munro & Scruton 2024) that reads as follows, "Philosophical study of beauty and taste. It is closely related to the philosophy of art, which is concerned with the nature of art and the concepts in terms of which individual works of art are interpreted and evaluated." The definition

would sound convincing were it not followed by these lines (ibid), which are closer to justification than explanation:

> To provide more than a general definition of the subject matter of aesthetics is immensely difficult. Indeed, it could be said that self-definition has been the major task of modern aesthetics. We are acquainted with an interesting and puzzling realm of experience: the realm of the beautiful, the ugly, the sublime, and the elegant; of taste, criticism, and fine art; and of contemplation, sensuous enjoyment, and charm. In all these phenomena, we believe that similar principles are operative and that similar interests are engaged.

Aesthetics, like many other sciences and areas of thought, has its roots in ancient Greek philosophy. Plato (427 to 347 BCE), in Book 10 of his famous philosophical work *The Republic*, takes up, among many other topics, questions related to art and "its answerability to standards outside itself", according to Cooper (1997: 11), who describes Plato's work as "one which contains the first sustained discussion of art in Western literature and the most abidingly influential". Obviously, Plato's attitude toward many arts and artists was quite negative, but his "most serious allegation against representational poetry" is, indicates Cooper (ibid: 12), its "terrifying capacity for deforming people".

Although most sources affirm that the term aesthetics was coined in the eighteenth century, no one can disregard the fact that beholding, enjoying, appreciating and evaluating art and beauty have been segments of the nature of the human being in the whole history of the humanity.
Kristeller (1998: 416) points out that:

> The term *Art* in the eighteenth century comprises above all the five major arts of painting, sculpture, architecture, music and poetry. These constitute the irreducible nucleus of the modern system of the arts, on which all modern writers and thinkers of aesthetics seem to agree.

Hartman (2014: 1) maintains that "Aesthetics is a kind of knowledge, indeed one with a genuine tendency to become a science." Paterman (1991: 4) provides a very practical and simple verbal sketch of the aesthetic field, which I will try to reproduce below, mainly using, his words and terms. The four successive stages through which a work of art passes, he points out, are:

- Making: an individual creates an expressive symbolic form by engaging with the specific medium of the art in question (clay, musical notes, gestures, words, etc.)
- Presenting (to an active audience):

Drama, dance, mime, music: the work is performed
Visual arts: exhibited or displayed
Written works: published/performed
Film and video: shown

- Responding: the audience responds through its feeling, senses and imagination
- Evaluating: the audience attempts to make a judgement (the intellectual formulation of aesthetic response is required).

Beauty, judgment, taste and imagination are central concepts that are present when we think about arts. It is generally thought that the theory of aesthetics deals only with beauty and art. But this is often opposed by many as a very limited and narrow outlook. Hermerén (NE, 1991: 611) thinks that "the German idealists (Kant, Hegel, Schelling and Schopenhauer) understood aesthetics as the theory of the beautiful. However, that definition is today outdated and too limited".

Hartman (2014: 6) indicates that "no doubt aesthetics has to do with the ugly, among other things. To a certain extent, it indeed belongs with all kinds of beauty. For even to beauty, limits are present everywhere, and the contrast is just as essential here as in other spheres of value." He concludes in this regard (ibid) that "what succeeds as art is not always the beautiful." Moreover he argues (ibid: 3) that:

> There is no genuine consciousness of the laws of beauty. It appears to lie in their nature to remain concealed from consciousness and only to form the secret of the background, while entirely hidden from sight.
>
> That is no doubt the reason why aesthetics can say, as a matter of its principle, what beauty is and even what its kinds and levels are, along with their general preconditions, but cannot teach in the practical sense what is beautiful, or why the particular form of some construction is a beautiful one. Aesthetical reflection is in all cases *post facto*: It can take its ground after the acts of beholding aesthetically and simply indulging in the enjoyment of beauty has taken place.

Since the main topic and purpose of this chapter is to present the artistic and beautiful aspects of Jazīrī's poetry, it seems more realistic to concentrate on definitions of aesthetics that are primarily associated with the realm of poetry. Additionally, in the case of Jazīrī's poetry, we are dealing mainly with Sufi poetry, which certainly has its own peculiarities and its own scheme of aesthetic values.

The first definition of aesthetics provided in an older edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica (Langfeld 1947: 263) reads as follows: "If we examine a poem in order to determine what it is that makes us feel it to be a poem, we at once find two constant and necessary elements: a complex of *images*, and a *feeling* that animates them."

Utas (2008: 203), approaching a definition of aesthetics in relation to poetry, confirms, like many others, that "it is not possible to give a really satisfactory definition of the concept aesthetic." He emphasizes (ibid) the role of the message in the aesthetic experience:

> When it comes to texts, they might in principle be seen as having two modes: an aesthetic mode and a communicative mode. From the point of view of the author/composer/poet, this means conscious and, probably, unconscious uses of various means. These means are concerned with form and meaning, but it cannot be maintained that the aesthetic mode is identical with the form and the communicative mode with the meaning. A piece of art (a painting, drama, poem etc.) certainly carries a mixture of aesthetic and communicative messages in its field of meaning, i.e. meaning often plays a role in the aesthetic experience, too.

Utas distinguishes (2008: 204) these two messages by the ways they are received by the reader or listener:

a. Aesthetic messages seem to be those that primarily appeal to his emotions,
b. Communicative messages are what appeals to his reason.

Consequently, he sums up (ibid) his idea by pointing out that "one could maintain that in most types of early classical poetry the ideal was a communicative message that was maximally amplified by its aesthetic expression."

The subjectivity in evaluating aesthetic experience is an important expression of an attitude of disapproval that should have been considered more seriously in discussions about aesthetics. Definitions that try to generalize the experiences of an audience, a society or a group ignore the particularity of individual recipients' perceptions of the aesthetic values of an artefact.

Eaton (1988: 142) argues that:

> One recurring strain in the history of Western aesthetics has been an emphasis on the subjectivity of aesthetic experience. Aesthetic value arises from a positive response of a person or group toward something. Whether we believe the response is natural or learned, whether we believe that only some responses are correct, or that some are better than others, it is obvious that unless someone *feels* positively inclined toward a thing or event, it cannot be said to have aesthetic value.

The above argument, I think, leaves many fragments of the truth about subjectivity in the dark. Reciting a poem to an audience can leave as many different impressions as the number of people listening to it, and their responses can be just as contradictory.

6.3.2. Sufi Poetry

Sufi poetry is the most popular, picturesque and profound poetry written by Muslim poets in their various languages. Literary critics wrote extensively and comprehensively, about Sufi poetry in different phases. They created abundant resources of judgements, evaluations and assessments. These criteria supposedly belong to later periods in the history of Islam, and more especially to a time when Sufi poetry came to be known and read, since we do not find any written text on the evaluation of poetry in the early periods of Islam, although poetry was a well developed and popular art among the Arabs even before Islam. The only clear reference to poets and poetry in the *Qurʾān* is in a *sūra* called "*al-Šuʿarāʾ*: The Poets" which reads:

> And the poets – the perverse follow them; hast thou not seen how they wander in every valley and how they say that which they do not? Save those that believe, do righteous deeds, and remember God oft, and help themselves after being wronged; and those who do wrong shall surely know by what overturning they will be overturned. (*Qurʾān*, XXVI: 224–227)

Nevertheless, this is obviously an ethical, not an aesthetic evaluation. It blames the wrongdoing poets and praises those who are believers. It can be implicitly understood that the evaluation applies not only to the poets themselves, but also to their poems.

The attitude of the prophet Muḥammad towards a particular poet and his poem is noteworthy in this regard. Kaʿb ibn Zuhayr ibn Abī Sulmā, who died

in 24 AH/622 CE, was against Islam and even composed satirical poems against its prophet. Later he visited the Prophet and read his famous *qaṣīda* known as "*bānat Suʿād*: Suʿad is gone" to him and announced his allegiance and adherence to the new religion. It is interesting to note that "according to some versions of the story, Muḥammad removes his cloak, which was associated with his prophetic inspiration, and presents it to Kaʿb as a mark of protection." (Sells & Sells, 1990: 141). The poem is commonly known as the *burda* poem, since the word means cloak.

The *qaṣīda* consists of three sections; a *nasīb*, also called *ġazal*, a journey section, also called *raḥīl*, and a *madīḥ*, panegyric. The number of the distiches in the poem is sixty. The *nasīb* section is "centered around similes comparing the beloved's wet mouth to a draught of wine" (ibid: 142). It begins with this distich:

Bānat Suʿādu faqalbī ʻlyawma matbūlu
Mutayyamun iṯrahā lam yufad makbūlu

Suʿād is gone, my heart stunned,
Lost in her traces, shackled, unransomed.
(Translated by Michael A. Sells)

The *madīḥ* section in which he praises the Prophet starts with this distich:

ʾUnbiʾtu anna Rasūlaʾllāhi awʿadanī
Waʾlʿfwu ʿinda Rasūliʾllāhi maʾmūlu

They say God's messenger threatens me,
Before the messenger of God one hopes for pardon.

Besides Kaʿb, there were other poets who defended Islam and praised the Prophet Muḥammad, the most prominent of whom was Ḥassān bin Ṯābit, nicknamed *Šāʿir al-Rasūl* (the poet of the Messenger). He was praised by Muḥammad and his successors for his advocacy of Islam, although nothing is said about aesthetic aspects of his poetry. This should not be interpreted as a total absence of aesthetic perceptions and values. Grabar (1998: 535) points out that:

> Arabic poetry and later Persian and the Persianate Turkish and Urdu poetry, whether recited or written down, were judged according to aesthetic criteria. The study and knowledge of this poetry led eventually to written manuals of judgment and interpretation, but there were certainly, long before, unwritten ways of criticism according to rules that were understood but never spelled out. How much these older ways affected the later theories is still unknown.

Nevertheless, between the tenth and twelfth centuries, there were several renowned philosophers and scientists who with their writings in the fields of

physics, mathematics, astronomy, music, poetry, architecture and calligraphy, laid the foundations of what came to be called Islamic aesthetics. Among these, mention should be made of al-Kindī (d. 870), al-Fārābī (d. 950), the Brethren of Purity (*Ixwān al-ṣafā*) who lived in the second half of the tenth century, Ibn Sīnā (d. 1037), Ibn al-Hayṯam (d. 1040), al-Jurjānī (d. 1078 or 1081) and Ibn Rušd (d. 1198). Al-Jurjānī, according to Garbar (ibid: 536), "is one of several writers to develop a theory of literary form in which technical definitions of images and metaphors (*majāz* or *istiʿāra*) acquire a prescriptive quality." A great and outstanding work in this respect is Qays Rāzī's book *al-Muʿjam fī maʿāyīr ašʿār al-ʿajam*, (The Dictionary of Criteria for Persian Poetry) which deals with Persian literary theory.

Jazīrī, in his style of writing and in his views on poetry as an art and on its structure obviously followed the criteria used by poets writing in Persian or in Arabic, both elder generations and contemporaries. These criteria mainly concerned the form of the poem, *qaṣīda*, *ġazal*, *rubāʿī*, etc, and the use of the rhythm (prosody) and rhyme (*ʿarūz* and *qāfia*).

The rules of rhetoric were also among the important basics about which the poets should acquire complete knowledge. These rules were regarded as artistic techniques for writing good and standard poetry. Seyed Gohrab (2012: 3), discussing classical literary theory writes: "the science of rhetoric (*ʿilm al-balāġa*), comprised three branches: semantics (*ʿilm al-maʿānī*); the theory of figurative speech (*ʿilm al-bayān*); and the science of rhetorical embellishment (*ʿilm al-badīʿ*)."

Another artistic component of poetry was metaphor. The poets, I think, had more freedom in this regard, since they were primarily following their own linguistic and aesthetic evaluation, and their judgements were subjective. It is also clear that Jazīrī was well aware that he was writing his poems in the Kurdish language, which was neither Persian nor Arabic. This impression is created in the reader's mind when he/she observes that the poet aimed at "*Kurdifying*" the expressions, metaphors and vocabulary that constituted the basic structure and content of Arabic and Persian poetry. This should not be interpreted as meaning that he wanted to or could abandon the valuable word treasure of Islamic poetry, which was an unlimited resource for all the synthesis that a standard classical poetry needed and should contain. The poetic heritage established in the Persian language was followed by poets in many regions outside the Persian-speaking countries and in languages other than Persian. De Bruijn (1997: 2) notes that "From the sixteenth century onwards Indian and Turkish Muslims participated increasingly in the tradition of Persian poetry, not only by writing in Persian but also by following the examples set by the poets of Persia in their own languages."

There is nothing in Jazīrī's poetry that can tell us anything about the sources from which he drew his aesthetic attitudes and views. It is understandable that poetry is not the proper setting for a poet to bring up such a topic as who inspired him or why he wrote in this way and not that. Nonetheless, we find

in Jazīrī's poetry direct or indirect references to seven poets, namely Ḥāfiz, Saʿdī, Jāmī, Farruxī, Rūmī, Šabistarī, and Niẓāmī. He also referred to five Sufis and scholars who, among other things, also wrote poetry. These were Sheikh Maʿrūf al-Karxī, Al-Ḥallāj, Ibn Sīnā, al-Asfarāīnī and Ibn ʿArabī. The two Kurdish poets present in Jazīrī's poetry, as mentioned in Chapter one, are Faqī-yē Ṭayrān and Prince ʿImād al-Dīn, who were his contemporaries and both of whom regarded Jazīrī as their master.

Schimmel (1975: 291), describing the contents of Sufi poetry written in the major Islamic languages, asserts that:

> Whenever beauty is revealed, there out of necessity love must grow. Beauty and love are interdependent. […] Beauty would be meaningless if there were no love to contemplate it – we may think, once more, of the concept of God as the hidden treasure who wanted to be known: the treasure of beauty (for "God is beautiful and loves beauty") reveals itself in order to kindle love in the human heart.

This definition is undoubtedly a simplification of the concept of Sufi poetry and what Sufi poets express. Beauty and love are obviously the two main sources of inspiration for Sufi poets, as well as for other poets, but the emotions and intuitions created in their minds, are inevitably different. Sufi poets, over time, have created a treasure trove of vocabulary and terms that can be described as the language of the Sufis. On the one hand, these terms are a common and conventional artistic means of expression that we find in the texts of most Sufi poets. On the other hand, it may happen that two Sufi poets use the same term or word in two different ways or to express two different sentiments.

6.4. Six Poems: Thematic and Structural Analysis (Vertical Reading)

In the following pages, six poems of Jazīrī, three *ġazal*s and three *qaṣīda*s, will be analysed in detail, from two viewpoints: one thematic and one structural. The panegyric *qaṣīda* (Lord of Lords, here called Q2), will be employed in the context of a comparison with the *qaṣīda* (Glorious King of Kings, will be called Q1, which also comprises structural and linguistic assessments.

The thematic viewpoint focuses on aesthetic values and basics, artistic creativity, beauty and art, and communicative message that comprises sensuous enjoyment, which altogether appeal to emotions and reason. The structural point of view is concerned with the structure of the poems, the aim of which is to show that a poem, be it a *ġazal* or a *qaṣīda*, is a pattern that has an artistic unity, based on a thematic and structural organization. This is almost the conclusion that Utas (2008: 203–204) points out "One could maintain that in most

types of early classical poetry the ideal was a communicative message that was maximally amplified by its aesthetic expression."

A rough count indicates that Jazīrī's *Dīwān* contains about 120 poems. The *qaṣīda*s and *ġazal*s are not published in separate sections. There are about 21 "real" *qaṣīda*s, i.e. poems of more than 18 verses (*bayt*s), the longest of which consists of 142 verses. There are also about 25 poems of between 15 and 18 verses. It is difficult to decide whether the poems of this group should be classified as *qaṣīda*s or as *ġazal*s. The difficulty arises not only in terms of form, but also in terms of their themes and organization, since the traditional divisions and fixed order of the classical *qaṣīda* do not seem to apply to a large number of Jazīrī's *qaṣīda*s. The rest of the *Dīwān* consists of *ġazal*s, plus a few each of other genres (*musammaṭ, rubāʿī, tarkīb-band, tarjīʿ-band, qiṭʿa*). It is not known whether Jazīrī ever wrote a *maṯnawī*.

In their introduction to the second volume of *Qasida Poetry in Islamic Asia and Africa*, Sperl and Shackle (1996: 2) present a detailed and in-depth survey of the development of the *qaṣīda* from the sixth to the twentieth century. To answer the question "what is a *qaṣīda*?" they write that "a brief description of its formal properties can be readily provided: it is a poem of some length, with verses divided into two hemistichs, a single metre and a monorhyme."

Although the *qaṣīda* was originally an Arabic literary genre, it was adopted and developed in other languages such as Hebrew, Persian, Turkish, Urdu and Hausa. Sperl and Shackle (ibid: 40) indicate that "the only other language that achieved comparable status as a vehicle for qasida composition was Persian, which for many centuries occupied a position of cultural hegemony in the eastern Islamic world."

The extent of the geographical and linguistic territory of the *qaṣīda* was altered a few centuries later when it was transferred to other languages. Sperl and Shackle (ibid: 22) describe this development as follows:

> By the seventeenth century, the status of the Persianate *qasida* as a panegyric medium encouraged its transference into a number of other languages such as Kurdish, Pashto and Urdu. Imagery of the type favoured by ʿUrfī is, for instance, clearly perceptible in a *qaṣīda* from the first fullscale divan in the Kurdish language, that of Malay*ē* Jazīrī (d. 1640). […] Malay*ē* Jazīrī begins his *qaṣīda* in praise of the ruler of a small Kurdish principality with the very note on which ʿUrfī ended his. […] In praising his Kurdish patron in the Kurdish language but with formulae of praise echoing those in use at the Ottoman and Mughal courts, Malay*ē* Jazīrī appears to be expressing a new sense of self-confidence and aspiration to independent statehood among his people.

It is important to note however that the *qaṣīda*, was subject to modification, especially in its thematic units, as it was transferred into other languages. The

traditional pre-Islamic and early Islamic panegyric *qaṣīda* was a tripartite poem that contained *nasīb*, *raḥīl* and *madīḥ*, whereas in later periods the *qaṣīda* could be bipartite or monothematic. Many of Jazīrī's *qaṣīda*s are representative in this regard.

In order to present a comprehensive appreciation of the aesthetic aspects of Jazīrī's poems, they will be read and analysed in two ways. First, six poems, three *ġazal*s and three *qaṣīda*s, will be studied vertically, by which I mean that each of the six poems will be examined in its entirety from beginning to end, as a unified artistic structure. In the second, horizontal, reading, several single verses, *bayt*s, from different poems in the *Dīwān* will be chosen sporadically and reviewed from an aesthetic point of view.

Nonetheless, in the horizontal reading, the structural point of view has little or no function, since the verses are not evaluated within the framework of the whole poem as an artistic and linguistic entity. In some cases, however, the structural beauty of the verse can be concentrated in the choice of vocabulary and its role in constructing the *bayt*, or in its relation to other words, with which it creates the harmony that forms an aesthetic basis. It should be admitted here, that the only standard used in selecting and reading these verses is my own taste for poetry, language and creativity.

To study and investigate the aesthetic aspects of Jazīrī's poetry it is not necessary to confine one's research to a single genre, topic or form. The whole of Jazīrī's poetry offers many opportunities to discover and study the basic elements of representative classical Sufi poetry. These elements are, in fact, harmoniously interwoven with the poet's themes and ideas, creating a high degree of poetic structure. The study of this structure inevitably involves a close reading of the texts to explore the most subtle parts and the intricate relationships between these parts, and to grasp the meanings conveyed by various metaphors and symbols.

One of the most important questions that should be addressed and answered at the beginning of a study of the content of Jazīrī's poetry is whether or not we consider his poetry as an artistic expression of his life and his experiences, material and/or spiritual. A thorough reading of Jazīrī's poetry gives the impression that the topics of Sufism were present and dominant in almost all of his poetic production. This leads us to wonder if there was a time when Jazīrī was a poet, but not yet a Sufi. The logical answer seems to be that his poetic talents burst forth and flourished because of his initiation into the path and his acquaintance with the legacy of Sufi poetry. This issue is partially dealt with in Chapter 5.

The main characteristic of Jazīrī's poetry is that it is almost entirely Sufi poetry. Unlike many other classical Kurdish poets, Jazīrī did not write love poetry that could only be interpreted as love for a human being, or *majāzī* (metaphorical) love poetry, as it is called in the Sufi literature. This aspect of Jazīrī's poetry has been pointed out and thoroughly studied by the editors and researchers of his poetry. Xaznadār (2002: 264), discussing the contents of Jazīrī's poetry writes, "we do not find clear-cut frontiers to divide the poems

according to their contents, since there is no poem the content of which is devoted entirely to love or whatever topic.

Many themes are dealt with in one and the same poem, but it is possible to say that one topic is more dominant than the others." One can find in the poetry of Jazīrī most of the ideas and topics that are dealt with by other Sufi poets. These ideas have also been were discussed in Chapter 5 of this work.

6.4.1. Three *ġazal*s

Ġazal 1

1. *Az nizānim sabab-ē, yār-i čirā dūr-i kirīn*
   Šāh-i šīrīn-dahanān am ži xwa mahjūr kirīn

2. *Miṯl-i go-y bē sar u pā būma libar ḍarb u šakān*
   Law bi čawgān-ē jafā-yā xwa ži dil hūr kirīn

3. *Dā ma ṣad jām-i fīrāq-ē ži xwa ġāʾib nabuyīn*
   Ži wiṣāl-ē qadaḥak dā ma (w)u maxmūr kirīn

4. *Nūr-i čašm-i ma kuʿālam ma bi čašmēn ta didī*
   Bi jamāl-ā xwa ta wak dīda-yi bē-nūr kirīn.

5. *Nafasak bē ta ma nāčī, na dižīn bē ta damak*
   Ži ta hāt amr-i humāyūn, ta wa maʾmūr kirīn.

6. *Ma dizānī ku tu dē ʿāqibatu'l-ʾamr či kī*
   Lab-i laʿl-ē šakarīn, āh ku maġrūr kirīn.

7. *Ḏarrayak būm di hawā-yā ta di wērānayakī*
   Miṯlē rojē bi šuʿāʿ-ā xwa ta mašhūr kirīn

8. *Ži anā'l- Ḥaqq bi labēn laʿlī xabardār buyīn*
   Bi gulāb-ā sar-ē zulf-ā xwa ta Manṣūr kirīn

9. *Munṣarif mā dibuyīn am bi duṣad jāri Malē?*
   Lē bi wē kasr u iḍāfē vi xwa majrūri kirīn. (ZdJ: 458–461)

– v – – / v v – – / v v – – / v v –
Ramal-i muṯamman-i, maxbūn wa maqṣūr)

Segment 1

I do not know the reason why the beloved banished us,
The king of the sweet spoken abandoned us. (1)

I have become like a ball without head and feet, by blows/jolts and kicks,
Heart smashing us with the polo mallet of His oppression. (2)

He gave us a hundred goblets of separation, but we did not faint,
He gave us a cup of meeting that made us intoxicated. (3)

Segment 2

O, the light of our eyes, with Your eyes we were seeing the world,
With Your beauty, You made us as eyes without sight (light). (4)

Without You, we cannot take a breath, we do not live a moment without You,
From You came the Royal command, and thus You made us commissioned. (5)

We knew what You would eventually do,
The sweet ruby lips, alas, made us arrogant. (6)

I was an atom in Your space/love, in a ruin
Like the sun, with Your ray, You made us well-known. (7)
From Your ruby lips, we became conscious of "I am the Real"
With the rose water on the tip of Your ringlet, You made us triumphant.
[With the hook of the tip of Your ringlet, You made us triumphant]. (8)

Segment 3

Would we go away, if two hundred (people) drew us, O Malā?
[Would we go away two hundred times, O Malā?]
[Would we be inflected by two hundred prepositions, O Malā?]
But by breaking and adding, He drew us to Himself.
[But by letting us be governed by a preposition and putting us in the genitive
He drew us to Himself]. (9)

This *ġazal*, consisting of nine *bayt*s, is one of the poet's most difficult poems to translate and explain. This is mainly due to the fact that Jazīrī, here and in some other cases, employs multi-layered metaphors that can be understood in different ways. He uses vocabulary that can be described as homonyms, and

accordingly the metaphor is further extended and provided with additional new dimensions.

From a thematic and structural point of view, the poem can be divided into three segments in the following way:

Segment	*Bayt*s	Theme and/or Message
1	1-3	The addressees are the readers or listeners. The poet describes his miserable situation after being abandoned by his beloved
2	4-8	The addressee is God. Jazīrī describes his deep and intimate love for Him. He does not complain.
3	9	The poet converses with himself and presents a sort of conclusion.

To a large extent, the poem deals with spiritual, mystical states of mind when the Sufi has a feeling of being abandoned or of great joy and ease. These states are called *qabḍ* (compression, constraint) and *basṭ* (expansion), and are experienced by the wayfarer in different stations of the path.

Regarding these two states, Schimmel (1975: 128) writes:

> The stations of fear and hope correspond, in the states, to what is called *basṭ* and *qabḍ*. *Basṭ*, from the root "to get wider and enlarge", means an extension of enthusiastic feeling, a perfect joy and ease that may develop, in some cases, into true "cosmic consciousness", into the feeling of partaking of the life of everything created, into that rapture of which the intoxicated poets of Iran and Turkey have sung so often. […] But whereas *basṭ* is the experience of extension and perhaps intensification of the self, *qabḍ*, "constraint", means the compression of the soul – "to make one's home in a needle's eye" – darkness, the oppressing desert of loneliness in which the mystic spends days and sometimes months of his life. Nevertheless, *qabḍ* has been regarded as superior to *basṭ* by some leading mystics.

In this poem, Jazīrī portrays both states by depicting various situations that he apparently has experienced and that have had a great impact on him. He begins the poem wondering why his beloved banished him. This unknowing and questioning attitude continues throughout the poem, although he does not provide any interpretation. Nevertheless, it gives him the opportunity to present an account of the history of a love, with all its ups and downs.

Although we do not know who the poet's beloved is, reading the first distich we are confronted with a contradiction that is caused by the use of the words *yār* (beloved) and *Šāh-i šīrīn-dahanān* (The king of the sweet spoken). In the first case, 1a, the beloved is feminine, because the word, being the subject of a transitive verb in the past tense, has taken the suffix *–ē*. In the second case, 1b, the word *Šāh* is usually used for the masculine, and if it were used to refer to a feminine royal, it would be followed by the clitic *-ā*, since it is in an *izāfa* construction. Considering this grammatical argument and having a familiarity with Sufi poetry, one easily concludes that the beloved is God, regardless of the grammatical gender of the nouns. This is also true of many other similar poems.

The first two *bayt*s are devoted to telling us, as readers or listeners, that the poet is banished, abandoned and smashed in the heart, which convey his wretchedness and misery. Comparing the three verbs employed at the end of 1a, 1b and 2b with the other seven verbs used at the end of every second hemistich of the following seven *bayt*s, we realize that he used the most effective and strongest verbs in these two *bayt*s. One might think that what he tells us in 4b would be as impressive and strong as the verbs in the first two *bayt*s, but this impression vanishes with the use of the word *wak* (as, like):

> O, the light of our eyes, with Your eyes we were seeing the world,
> With Your beauty, You made us as eyes without sight (light). (4)

He has not turned into eyes without sight, but he is made "as" eyes without sight. The difference is apparently not difficult to perceive.

The third *bayt* is indeed a transitional one, since the poet's sufferings from this *bayt* onwards are quite different. Not only does he cease complaining, but he seems to be proud of what the beloved has done and doing to him. He has already experienced the most painful actions, which he narrated in the first two *bayt*s. With this *bayt* he paves the way to giving a detailed account of what he has suffered and still suffers because of the love that has a long history of separation and meeting:

> He gave us a hundred goblets of separation, but we did not faint. (3a)

Here he sums up everything that happened to him in being separated a hundred times. What the poet tells us here could be considered fatal from a quantitative point of view, but he points out that he did not faint, but evidently survived. Moreover, the beloved also gave him a cup of meeting, by which he was intoxicated, since being together with the beloved (*wiṣāl*), is enough to make a lover not only intoxicated but also enraptured, or even on fire, especially since the beloved here is God.

> He gave us a cup of meeting that made us intoxicated. (3b)

In the following five *bayt*s, which make up the second segment, the poet leaves his audience aside and speaks directly with God, not to blame or complain, but to praise, glorify and extol Him. *Bayt* 4 contains two statements that are important for understanding how the encounter with the beloved affected the poet:

> O, the light of our eyes, with Your eyes we were seeing the world, (4a)
> With Your beauty, You made us as eyes without sight (light). (4b)

The expression at the beginning of the hemistich, "O, the light of our eyes" shows how much the person addressed is dear to and loved by the poet. It is followed by the essential statement that he, the poet, used to see the world through the eyes of the beloved. This, in fact is an allusion to a *ḥadīṯ qudsī*, which Schimmel (1975: 133) translates as follows:

> My servant ceases not to draw nigh unto Me by works of devotion, until I love him, and when I love him I am the eye by which he sees and the ear by which he hears. And when he approaches a span I approach a cubit, and when he comes walking I come running.

The use of the verb in the imperfect form of the past tense *didī* (were seeing) denotes the poet's *qurb* (proximity), which is a stage of love, to the beloved for a long time. The second hemistich consolidates the idea of proximity by mentioning the beauty of God. Most likely, the poet is referring to another stage of love, namely *uns* (intimacy), which, according to Schimmel (ibid: 132), "is connected with the aspects of divine *jamāl*, the manifestation of God's loving and consoling qualities, and as such, it is contrasted with *hayba*, 'reverence, awe,' which awakens in the Sufi's heart at the manifestation of God's grandeur and power."

While the first hemistich, 4a, testifies to the proximity that the poet experienced, the second hemistich, 4b, tells us that God's beauty was so vast, powerful and bright that it dazzled him and deprived him of his sight. The poet does not use the word light when describing the Divine beauty, since he begins the *bayt* with the word *nūr* (light) and the penultimate word is also *nūr*. Moreover, it is obvious that bright light is what dazzles eyes. The describtion of God as light is seemingly borrowed from a *Qurʾān*ic metaphor that suggests: "God is the light of the heavens and the earth." (XXIV: 35).

The next *bayt*, 5, adds nothing of aesthetic significance to the poem, while in the following *bayt*, the poet admits and tells the truth that he knew from the very beginning what would happen to him as a wayfarer. What made him persevere on the path were the sweet words he heard from the ruby lips, which made him

arrogant and determined not to give up. Wayfarers of the Sufi path are apparently conscious of the difficulties they will face in the future, but great hopes and expectations of meeting the beloved make the persistence possible.

The following three *bayt*s have a common feature that is the use of two-fold words, which provides the sentences with a multi-layered structure. The seventh *bayt* is probably one of the most elegant *bayt*s in Jazīrī's *Dīwān*. The metaphor is based on a view of nature, when a bright ray of light enters through a window or an aperture, and thousands of atoms, that are already there, are seen. The poet describes himself as an atom in space or air, among thousands of atoms, in a ruin, when God, like the sun, made him visible and known with His ray. He thinks that he was as small, anonymous and forgotten as an atom in a ruin, but the Divine care turned him to "something" seen, felt and known. The word *hawā*, first interpreted as space or air, also means love, and so the first hemistich can be interpreted as "I was an atom in Your love, in a ruin".

In the second hemistich of the 6th *bayt*, the poet writes that he knew what the Beloved would eventually do to him, but hearing everything from the sweet ruby lips made him so arrogant that he did not care what would happen. In the 8th bayt we understand that the sweet ruby lips had promised that he would be triumphant and told him about *Anā'l-Ḥaqq* (I am the Real), which refers to Al-Ḥallāj (d. 309 AH/922 CE). Jazīrī, in *bayt* 6, does not say what he was told by the sweet ruby lips, and here, in *bayt* 8, he does not mention Al-Ḥallāj's name, but the juxtaposition of the two *bayt*s gives a clearer picture of the idea,

> We knew what You would eventuallu do,
> The sweet ruby lips, alas, made us arrogant. (6)
>
> From Your ruby lips, we became conscious that 'I am the Real'
> With the rose water on the tip of Your ringlet, You made us triumphant.
> [With the hook of the tip of Your ringlet, You made us triumphant.] (8)

The sweet ruby lips, that made him arrogant, also told that 'I am the Real', and with the rose water (*gulāb*) on the tip of the Beloved's ringlet, or with the hook (*kulāb*) of the tip of His ringlet, he was made a Ḥallāj or triumphant one (*Manṣūr* or *manṣūr*). The rose water, with its fragrance, draws the lovers to the ringlet of the Beloved, and the tip of the ringlet is bent at the end like a hook that is used on the gallows. The similarity between the two Kurdish letters G and K has led to different readings of the hemistich, although the metaphor is clear. The word *Manṣūr* means triumphant, but it is also one of the names by which Al-Ḥallāj was known. Reading hemistich 8b carefully, we implicitly understand that to be executed like *Manṣūr* (Al-Ḥallāj) is equivalent to being *manṣūr* (triumphant). Although Jazīrī does not use any word in the poem that can directly denote execution or hanging, symbolically the idea indicates the Sufi station of *Fanā' fī Allāh* (annihilation in God), which is a great goal for a Sufi.

The last *bayt* of the poem can be interpreted in at least two ways, depending on how the basic words are read and perceived. In this segment, consisting of one *bayt*, Jazīrī addresses himself and tries to view what he experienced from a temporal distance. He now knows that it is all over and that the Beloved drove him (or them) away and abandoned him (or them). He wants to give a milder impression, justifying his departure by claiming that the Beloved used both enervating and dominating methods.

Regardless what Jazīrī says, he clearly ends the poem with a play on words, that is structurally tightly woven and characterized by multiple aesthetic dimensions. The following is an outline of the ways in which one can read the *bayt*:

First hemistich (9a)

a. Would we go away from the Beloved, even if two hundred people (*jārr*) tried to pull us? No, but there were other reasons why we did so.
b. Would we leave even if they tried to drive us away two hundred times (*jār*, in Kurdish)?
c. We would not be inflected even by two hundred prepositions (*jār* or *ḥarf jarr*), but the beloved used other means.

Second hemistich (9b)

a. The Beloved drew us to Himself by humiliating/breaking (*kasr*) and adding/accommodating (*ʾiḍāfa*) us.
b. The Beloved placed prepositions in front of our names that governed us (*kasr*); moreover He put us into a genitive construction (*ʾiḍāfa*), which inflects our names and enables the prepositions to govern us by saying "our follower" or "our servant", and thus He drew us to Himself.

The last metaphor is based on a rule of Arabic grammar and its starting point is the name of Jazīrī himself, which is Aḥmad. According to Arabic grammar, proper names constructed in the form of *ʾafʿal* are indeclinable by any preposition unless they are put in a genitive construction. In the nominative case, the noun takes a *ḍamma*, the vowel point of *u*, and grammatically is called (*marfūʿ*). When a noun is in the accusative, the final consonant is pronounced with the vowel *fatḥa* (*a*) and grammatically is called (*manṣūb*). When the same noun is governed by a preposition, its final consonant does not get a *kasra* (the vowel point for *i*) and does not become *majrūr* until it is put in a genitive construction. The word *majrūr* also means drawn/dragged. The resemblance between the two Arabic words for 'drawn' and 'governed by a preposition' (*majrūr*), and the similarity between the Arabic words for 'breaking/fracturing' (*kasr*) and the vowel point for *i* (*kasra*), gave the poet the opportunity to play with the words and create such a grammatical and poetic riddle.

Considering the proper name Aḥmad, it is obvious that it cannot be drawn or governed by a preposition, i.e. be (*majrūr*), until it is put in a genitive construction (*ʾiḍāfa*) and provided with a *kasra* (the short vowel *i* or breaking). The Beloved could draw the poet to Himself by calling him *Aḥmad-u-nā* (Our Aḥmad), thus putting the *kasra* at the end of his name and making him fully inflected and gone (*Munṣarif*).

Personal and reflexive pronouns are frequently and accurately used. The poet seems to consider who the addressee is in different parts of the poem and uses the appropriate pronouns there. When talking about himself, he uses the first person plural pronouns *am* and *ma* (we and us). The only exception is the first sentence in the first *bayt*, *az nizanim* (I do not know). The other person who is frequently mentioned is the Beloved or God, for whom the 2nd singular *tu* and *ta* (you in the direct and oblique forms) are used, while the 3rd person singular is not used at all. This must be intentional, since using 3rd singular as the subject of a transitive verb in the past tense, reveals the gender of the person since it hads to be in the oblique casae. In these cases, he uses the gender-neutral reflexive pronoun *xwa* (himself, herself) and avoids using the personal pronoun.

The use of pronouns in the three segments can be summarized as follows:

segment	addressee	*bayt*	pronouns	reflexive
1	Not clear	1	I, us	+
		2		+
		3	Us, us	+
2	Beloved	4	Us, we, You, You	+
		5	You, we, You, You, You	
		6	We, you	
		7	You, you	+
		8	you	+
3	The poet	9		+

As mentioned above, the *ġazal* deals with Sufi spiritual states that can be experienced in different ways. The verbs used in the poem provide a relatively clear assessment of how Jazīrī lived through the states which seem to have occurred over long periods of time. The number of the most important verbs in the poem, which form the rhymes, is ten. In the first bayt two verbs are used and in the other eight *bayt*s one verb each, at the end of the second hemistich. All these ten verbs are in the simple past tense and are compound verbs composed of an adjective or a noun and the transitive verb *kirin* (made/make), inflected for the first person plural (us), thus meaning, 'You made us such or such'.

In the first bayt two verbs are used and in the other eight *bayt*s one verb each, at the end of the second hemistich.

Comparing the ten verbs, only the first three express complaint: *dūr kirīn* (banished us), *mahjūr kirīn* (abandoned us) and *dil hūr kirīn* (broke our hearts). The other seven main verbs range from milder blame to pride and

gratitude: *maxmūr kirīn* (made us intoxicated), *wak dīda-yi bē-nūr kirīn* (made us like eyes without sight), *maʾmūr kirīn* (made us commissioned), *maġrūr kirīn* (made us arrogant), *mašhūr kirīn* (made us famous), *manṣūr kirīn* (made us triumphant/Ḥallāj), *majrūr kirīn* (made us drawn/inflected).

Ġazal 2

The following is the poem in Kurdish, followed by its translation into English, divided into three segments to facilitate observation of the structural coherence between them, which constitutes the artistic unity of the poem.

1. *Jānā ži jamāl-ā ta muqaddas qabasim az*
   Gar xūb u parīzāda naẓar kī ta basim az

2. *Miṯlē mah-i naw gar ta divētin ma bibīnī*
   Mēza bika jāmē, tu dizānī či kasim az

3. *Yaġmā ži ma jān kir, ku tajallā-yi li dil dā*
   Min rūḥē di qālib tu-yī, tanhā qafasim az

4. *Ḥubb-ā taya min rādihažīnī ku binālim*
   Šab tā bi saḥar nāla ži rangē jarasim az

5. *Min go mah-i naw čāšitiyê abru-yi yār-ī*
   Go min či ḥada, šubhatē naʿlē farasim az

6. *Sāqī ži azal yak du qadaḥ bāda bi min dā*
   Ḥattā bi abad mast u xumār u talasim az

7. *Jānā tu-yī min jān, gul-i bēxāri garam bī*
   Minnat ku na wak bulbul-i miḥnat ʿabasim az

8. *Ṣad jawr u jafā dī bi ma nāčīn ži dar-ē ta*
   Yaksar tu nabātī (y)u li ṭabʿ-ē magasim az

9. *Gar wah ta divētin bibirī sar, bika farmān*
   Dā vē saʿatē sar bibirim, x(w)aš maqasim az

10. *Sar tā bi qadam az bisužim šubh-i Malāyē*
    Parwāna-sifat sohtim u bē ṣawt u ḥisim az (ZdJ: 251–255)

– – v / v– – v / v– – v / v – –
Hazaj muṯamman axrab makfūf maḥḏūf

Segment 1

1	Dear, of your holy beauty I am a firebrand Beautiful and fairy born, if you look [at me], you are enough for me
2	If you want to see us as the new moon Look in the cup, [then] you know who I am
3	He plundered our soul when His manifestation appeared in the heart The soul in my body, is You, I am a mere cage.
4	It is my love (for You) that shakes me [so that] I lament All the night until dawn, my groaning is like that of a bell.

Segment 2

5	I said: New moon, you are like the eyebrow(s) of the beloved! It said: How can I? I resemble a horseshoe.
6	The cupbearer gave me one or two goblets of wine in eternity (*azal*) I am, eternally (*abad*), intoxicated, hung over and threadbare.

Segment 3

7	Dear, you are my soul, if you would be for me a rose without a thorn Thank you that I am not like the nightingale whose toil is in vain
8	Even if you expose/subject us to hundreds of tyrannies and oppressior We shall not go away from your door You are entirely fine sugar and my nature is like that of the fly.
9	If You want, thus, to behead, give the order/command So, at this moment I behead [myself], I am good scissors
10	If I burn from head to heel like *Malā* Then I burn as a moth; I am without voice or sound.

This *ġazal* is an example of a Sufi *ġazal* that contains significant twofold metaphors and similes. The formal and external meaning of this poem suggests that it is a love poem, in which the poet addresses his beloved to describe his love and his grief. This line of thought continues throughout the poem, albeit on different levels. What from the beginning makes the reader aware of the real meaning of the poem – the Sufi ideas of annihilation in and unification with God – is the linguistic vehicle, the vocabulary and metaphors. These elements are employed on such a level that they widen the circle of the poem to comprehend not only earthly love, but also heavenly love.

Jānā ži jamāl-ā ta muqaddas qabasim az
Gar xūb u parīzāda naẓar kī ta basim az

Dear, of your holy beauty I am a firebrand
Beautiful and fairy born, if you look [at me], you are enough for me

The describtion of her/his beauty as *muqaddas*, holy, and of himself as a *qabas*, firebrand or a part of a fire is the key to the dual interpretation. Being a part of a greater whole is the idea that is ambiguously expressed here. The second *bayt* presents the idea of unity in a more deliberate and poetic way:

Miṯlē mah-i naw gar ta divētin ma bibīnī
Mēza bika jāmē, tu dizānī či kasim az

If you want to see us as the new moon
Look in the cup, [then] you know who I am

The image is based on three different allusive and mythical dimensions that are common in Oriental poetry. The new moon, *mah-i naw*, is the symbol of the good news that the month of fasting, *Ramaḍān*, or the festival, i.e. the beginning of *Šawwāl*, has come. Then it is eagerly awaited. On the other hand, it tells of the grief that has made the lover, the poet, so thin that he resembles a new moon. The cup, *jām*, is a reference to Jamšīd's cup, in which he could see the secrets of the world.

The lover and the beloved are physically united to such a degree that she recognizes him in her own image, as seen in the cup. At this stage, illustrated in the first two *bayt*s, the poet emphasizes his being a part of his beloved. The last *miṣrāʿ*, 2b, however, connotes the state of equality between the two poles of the same love. This paves the way for the next stage, in which the beloved becomes a part of the lover.

Yaġmā ži ma jān kir, ku tajallā-yē li dil dā
Min rūḥē di qālib tu-yī, tanhā qafasim az

He plundered our soul when His manifestation appeared in the heart
The soul in my body is you, I am a mere cage.

The cage is a hollow object. The poet feels himself as a hollow cage, for his own soul, *jān*, is plundered and his body is left as a hollow cage. The plundered soul, *jān*, is replaced by His soul, *rūḥ*, a word that is much more appropriate to the question of a divine manifestation and has *Qurʾān*ic connotations.

At this stage, the night, as an image as well as a conception, preoccupies the poet and his poetic moment, and he intensifies the image with a new, internal, dimension by relating his experience of the night:

Ḥubb-ā taya min rādihažīnī ku binālim
Šab tā bi saḥar nāla ži rangē jarasim az

It is my love (for You) that shakes me [so that] I lament
All the night until dawn, my groaning is like that of a bell.

The metaphor in this *bayt* is a kind of eloquence built on three words that carry more than one connotation. The verb "shakes", *rādihažīnī*, from the infinitive *rāhažāndin*, to wave and shake, describes the spiritual condition of the poet who is shaken by his love, *ḥubb*, for Him (literally: it is Your love) so that he laments. But love, Sufi love, can also shake the poet physically when he is obsessed by ecstasy. The relationship between love and the condition of being shaken is merely poetic and fantastic. In order to understand the other aspects of the image we need to reconsider the word *ḥubb* (love). Another word for love is *hawā*, a homonym of *hawāʾ*, air and wind, which is relevant to shaking. The third important word in this context is *nāla*, which means groaning and lamentation. A close word to *nāla* is *nāl*, which means, among other things, reed, hollow reed, pipe, and a small melodious bird. The relationship between *hawāʾ*, air and wind, and *nāl*, meaning hollow reed or pipe, is quite clear.

In 3b the word *qafas*, indicates the state of hollowness, which in turn gives rise to two other words with the same meaning: *nāl*, hollow reed or pipe, and *jaras*, bell. A pipe produces a sound only when it is blown, and a bell makes a sound when it is struck or shaken. In both cases air/wind, *hawāʾ* is essential.

The association of moon and night continues further in the next *bayt*, although here the resemblance is between night and new moon:

Min go mah-i naw čāšitiyê abru-yē yār-ī
Go min či ḥada, šubhatē naʿlē farasim az

I said: New moon, you are like the eyebrow(s) of the beloved!
It said: How can I? I resemble a horseshoe.

To compare the new moon with the eyebrows of the beloved is a traditional allegory in classical Oriental poetry. The resemblance is in the shape, the curved form, not in the colour. In 5b Jazīrī likens the new moon to a horseshoe, for both are also curved. In an allegorical metaphor, the two sides of the resemblance can be on different levels, depending on the meaning and the purpose for which it is used. When a poet wants to present an exaggerated image of his beloved, he usually compares parts of her body to various parts of nature; the eyebrow to new moon, the face to the full moon, the cheeks to a rose… etc.

It also happens that he emphasizes or downplays one side of the resemblance to further strengthen the image. In this *bayt* Jazīrī, has exaggerated the image even more than usual. The new moon is compared to two things in the *bayt*: both to the eyebrows of the beloved and to a horseshoe. In both cases the image

is extremely exaggerated; first to elevate the beloved and secondly to detract from the new moon. A further exaggeration here is that one side of the allegory, the new moon, humbly objects to being compared to the eyebrows of the beloved; *go min či ḥada*, it says how can I? meaning I am not in a position to exceed that boundary. Instead, it affirms that it is like like a horseshoe. The new moon is obviously Jazīrī himself, as was seen in the second *bayt*.
It is easy to see how the poet associates one meaning with another and one word with other words, thus, elaborating, developing and deepening his thoughts with many other dimensions. This association is not necessarily limited to the vocabulary, but occurs freely within the boundaries of the poetic and Sufic moment in which the poem was created. These boundaries include the process of transforming a word into an idea and *vice versa*. Important elements in the context are the similes that connect various parts of the structure. In the second *bayt*, *mah-i naw*, the new moon evokes the night, a dark night, in which the new moon is looked for and can be seen. The new moon, with its brightness, and the night, with its darkness, belong to each other, on the one hand, because the image cannot be completed without them both, and, on the other hand, because they form a paradox.

The image of a new moon appearing in the dark night gives rise to another image that is used in the third *bayt*, namely that of God's manifestation in the heart; He plundered our soul when His manifestation appeared in the heart. The heart is dark until it is illuminated by His manifestation. And its time also begins with this manifestation, just as a new month begins with the appearance of a new moon. The idea of night, a dark night penetrated by light, is further deepened in 4b by adding a new dimension to the image in addition to the light, namely the sound of the bell. The night in which the poet laments is long. This is illustrated by the words *šab tā bi saḥar*, the whole night until dawn. However, it is also a limited night because it ends with the appearance of the dawn, *saḥar*.

The sound of the bell in this *bayt* is similar in its effect to the new moon, 2a, His manifestation in the heart, 3a, and the dawn, 4b. The darkness, the hardness and the length of the night are penetrated/pierced by the new moon, the manifestation, the dawn and the sound of the bell in the three images respectively. The association of words and images continues even in 5a, where the new moon, *mah-i naw*, is used again. To trace the whole idea in *bayt*s 2 to 5, it could be summarized as follows:

2a: The new moon, looked for and seen in a dark night,
3a: His manifestation in the heart; a light in the darkness,
4b: the dawn ends the night,
4b: the poet laments, like a bell, all the night until dawn,
5a: The new moon likened to the eyebrows of the beloved.

The humility expressed in the preceding *bayt* is further explained in the next one. The poet attributes his deteriorating condition to the wine goblets he received in eternity, *azal*, which seems to be a reference to the *alast* tavern:

Sāqī ži azal yak du qadaḥ bāda bi min dā
Ḥattā bi abad mast u xumār u talasim az

The cupbearer gave me one or two goblets of wine in eternity (*azal*)
I am, eternally (*abad*), intoxicated, 'hung over' and threadbare.

The rest of the *ġazal*, does not, in fact, add anything aesthetically essential to the poem as a whole, although there are still a few elements of structural and philological significance. *Bayt*s 7 to 10 contain four metaphors that are a quantitative extension of the preceding six *bayt*s. The relationship between the two sides of the analogies in *bayt*s 7 and 8 is largely traditional: nightingale and rose, moth burned by candle, and fly and fine sugar, *nabāt*:

Jānā tu-yī min jān, gul-i bēxāri garam bī
Minnat ku na wak bulbul-i miḥnat ʿabasim az

Ṣad jawr u jafā dī bi ma nāčīn ži dar-ē ta
Yaksar tu nabātī (y)u li ṭabʿ-ē magasim az

Dear, you are my soul, if you would be for me a rose without a thorn
Thank you that I am not like the nightingale whose toil is in vain.

Even if you expose/subject us to hundreds of tyrannies and oppressions we will not go away from your door.
You are entirely fine sugar, and my nature is like that of the fly.

In *bayt* 9, the humility that was illustrated in *bayt* 5 is developed into total obedience to the beloved. The poet is ready to end his life, with his own hands, if the beloved so desires:

Gar wah ta divētin bibirī sar, bika farmān
Dā vē saʿatē sar bibirim, x(w)aš maqasim az

If You want, thus, to behead, give the order/command,
So, at this moment I will behead [myself], I am good scissors

The last *bayt* is illustrative in its content, for the poet describes himself as a moth that burns and ends its life in silence, and with that, the poem also ends. This is reminiscent of a great number of Mawlānā Jalāl ud-Dīn Rūmī's poems,

which end with the word *Xamūš*, indicating his pen name, but also meaning silent or extinguished, indicating the end of the poem:

> *Sar tā bi qadam az bisužim šubhē Malāyī*
> *Parwāna-ṣifat sohtim u bē ṣawt u ḥisim az*
> If I burn from head to heel like *Malâ*
> Then I burn like a moth, I am without a voice or a sound.

The poem consists of ten *bayt*s. It is structurally divided into three segments, the first comprising *bayt*s 1 to 4, the second *bayt*s 5 and 6, and the third *bayt*s 7 to 10. The first and the third segments are, in many ways, equivalent, symmetrical with each other, but also paradoxical, while the second segment, *bayt*s 5 and 6, are in between. Each of these two segments consists of four *bayt*s and begins with *jānā*, dear. There are contrasting aspects in the two units, regarding both imagery and language. The dominating flavour in the first segment is light (1a, 2a, 3a, 4b) and active movement (2b, 3a, 4a and b), whereas the third segment is dominated by passivity (8a), annihilation (9b, 10a) and silence (10b).

Segments 1 and 3 are parallel designs linked by significant structural and rhythmic motifs and devices that appear to have been worked out to strengthen the poem's arrangement. Scott-Meisami (1985: 49), analysing a poem by the ʻAbbasid poet Baššār ibn Burd (d. 783), calls this pattern of organization "circular structure", and suggests (ibid: footnote 21) that "Ring composition, of which this *qaṣīda* provides an example, is an important aspect of Arabic poetic structure which has as yet received little attention."

The most important *bayt* in the first segment seems to be the fourth *bayt*, in which the poet tells of his lamentation, like a bell, in the night, because his love for Him/her shakes him. The *bayt* is, indeed, full of movement, sound, darkness and light. A counterbalance to this *bayt* is *bayt* 10, the order of which is also the fourth in the third segment. But here, contrary to *bayt* 4, there is no movement, no sound and no light. Even when the poet is burning like a moth, there is no mention of *šamʿ*, candle, or *čirā*, lamp, although they are relevant in the context. It is also noteworthy that the time of the poet's lamentation *Šab tā bi saḥar*, all the night until dawn, 4b, is rhythmically equivalent to *Sar tā bi qadam*, from head to heel, 10a, i.e. the whole of which he wants to burn silently and without complaint. Each of them covers half of the hemistich, which corresponds to – – v / v – (*mafʿulu/ mafā*), and each occurs in the last distich, the fourth and tenth *bayt*s respectively.

The following diagram shows the equivalent, symmetrical and paradoxical aspects in the first and third segments. Segment 2 is only included to show its position in the context of the poem. It is in fact a transitional passage between the first and the last (third) segment.

Bayt indicates the order of the distiches of the poem and the *miṣrāʿ*s, the first (a) and the second (b) hemistichs; Beg, indicates the word with which the

segment begins; Ac.: active movement; P-A-S: passive movement, annihilation or silence; Like: the conjunction used in the similes; Pron: personal pronouns (sg.1: first person singular; sg.2: second person singular; pl.1: first person plural.

Segment 1

Bayt	order	Beg.	light	Ac.	like	Pron.
1a	first	*Jānā*	+			Sg.2, sg.1
1b						Sg.2, sg.1
2a			+		+	Sg.2, pl.1
2b				+		Sg.2, sg.1
3a			+	+		Pl.1
3b						Sg.1, sg.2+1
4a				+		Sg.2, sg.1
4b			+	+	+	Sg.1

Segment 2

Bayt			light	Ac.	like	Pron.
5a			+		+	Sg.1
5b					+	Sg.1, sg.1
6a						Sg.1
6b						Sg.1

Segment 3

bayt	order	Beg.	P-A-S	Like	Pron.
7a	first	*Jānā*			Sg.2, sg.1
7b				+	Sg.1
8a			P		Pl.1, sg.2
8b				+	Sg.2, sg.1
9a					Sg.2
9b			A		Sg.1
10a			A	+	Sg.1
10b			S	+	Sg.1

As for the language of the poem, it can be observed that it contains Persian structures and words, which is a characteristic of Jazīrī's poetry. In 2a and 5a, *mah-i naw* is used for the new moon. The word *mah* is also used in Kurdish, but mostly to indicate the month, not the moon, since there is another word, *hayv/ hīv* that means moon. Besides, the structure of the phrase is Persian, since the *ʾizāfa* (genitive)-structure in Kurdish for a substantive and its attribute is constructed with the affixes *ā* for feminine and *ē* for masculine. *Mah* is feminine in Kurdish, so, the new moon would have been *mah-ā naw*, or *mah-*

ā nû. The same applies to *gul-i bēxār*, a rose without thorn, in 7a, since *gul* is also feminine in Kurdish. This is obviously due to the poet's use of poetic devices commonly used by his Persian forerunners, especially Ḥāfiẓ, as unified and standardized poetic idioms.

The same *miṣrāʿ*, 7a, contains another Persian construction that is quite unusual in Kurdish; *gul-i bēxāri garam bī*, if you would be a rose without a thorn for me. The conjunction *gar*, if, is added directly to the enclitic pronoun *(a)m*, which represents the first person singular.

The most common and usual word for the new crescent moon in classical poetry is *hilāl*, but the poet chooses *mah*, meaning moon in general, which gives a better association with night, whereas *hilāl*, may be seen in the first hours of the night, but not necessarily all night. Jazīrī has used *hilāl*, in another poem when it was relevant in the context:

Gar na tašbīhē du birhēn ta bitin
Ma di ʿīdān bi hilālē či ġaraḍ (ZdJ: 314)

If it is not because it resembles your eyebrows
What purpose do we have with the new moon in the feasts?

In *bayt* 5 the new moon is likened to horseshoes to represent the humility of the new moon, probably alluding to the poet himself, in comparison to the eyebrows of the beloved. The same image is used by Ḥāfiẓ to illustrate the glory and sublimity of his beloved, *Yāram*:

Dar naʿl-e samand-e ū šakl-e mah-e nav paydā
V'az qadd-e boland-e ū bālā-ye ṣanawbar past (Ḥāfiẓ, 1991, 20)

In the horseshoes of her horse, the shape of the new moon is seen
And to her high stature, the stature/height of the fir is low.

In 3b the word *qafas*, cage, is a Kurdification of the Arabic and Persian forms of the word ending with Ṣ (*ṣād*). This is done to qualify the rhyming letter S (*sīn*), and it occurs twice in the poem; *ʿabas*, absurd, vain, 7b, instead of the Arabic and Persian *ʿabaṯ*, and *maqas*, scissors, 9b, instead of *miqaṣṣ*. The poet does indeed write these three words as they are written in Arabic and Persian, but he uses them to qualify the other eight rhyming words ending in S (*sīn*), *qabas*, *bas*, *kas*, *jaras*, *faras*, *talas*, *magas* and *ḥis*. This is because he apparently pronounced them as most Kurds do (see also Chapter 4).

A large number of the constituent units in the poem consist of metaphors and similes. The latter are usually constructed with the help of prepositions and words that connect the two sides of the simile. There are many words in Kurdish that can be used in similes, although some of them are borrowed from Arabic and/or Persian. Jazīrī uses connecting words here eight times; *miṯl*,

like, 2a; *ži rangē*, similar to, literary, the colour of, 4b; *čāšitī*, sort, 5a; *šabhat*, similar, 5b; *wak*, like, 7b; *li tabʿē*, resembling, literary, the nature of, 8b; *šubhē*, similar, 10a; *parwāna ṣifat*, like a moth, 10b.

Another type of constituent units thtat are worth mentioning are the personal pronouns, which are used frequently; thirty one times. This is partly due to the fact that the *radīf* word of the poem is the first singular pronoun *az*, I, in the direct case, which is consequently repeated eleven times in the ten *bayt*s, and once in 10a, but not as a *radīf* word. Of the thirty-one personal pronouns, twenty-eight are in the singular, either the first or the second persons; *az* and *min*, and *tu* and *ta*, marking the direct and oblique cases respectively. Only in three instances is the first plural, *ma* (we), used in the oblique case, instead of the first singular *min*, to indicate the poet himself. We can sum up the use of the pronouns in the poem in the following table:

Pronoun	Person	Case	Frequency
Az (I)	First singular	direct	12
Min (I, me, my)	First singular	oblique	6
Tu (you)	Second singular	direct	4
Ta (you, your)	Second singular	oblique	6
Ma (we, our)	First plural	oblique	3

The only interpretation of the frequent use of the singular form of the personal pronouns instead of the plural, when the poet addresses God (10 times) is the overwhelming sense of intimacy that is portrayed in the poem. Most Sufi poets address God in the first singular form of the pronoun. Schimmel (1982: 16) describes that usage as follows:

> At the beginning of mystical poetry another problem posed itself. The mystic is basically a solitary wayfarer; his goal is to be in the company of God, and in the loving intimacy with the Divine Beloved during nightly vigils he would call Him no longer: "O my Lord!" as he did in the community, but rather, "O my Beloved!" Who could and who would tell what was going on in the blissful solitude of love, in prayer and ecstasy, when the lover does not want anything *from* God but only God Himself?

One final, but important, remark concerns the repetition of most of the metaphors used in this *ġazal* in at least three other poems in Jazīrī's *Dīwān*; (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1987: 470–477, 622–633 and 716. The repetition is not limited to a few words or a part of the metaphors. In most cases, the whole picture is used. The following is a comparative overview of some of the metaphors and analogies used in the present *ġazal* with some similar counterparts in the three poems mentioned above.

a. The idea of being a mere cage that contains His soul in this poem, 3b, is expressed as follows:

3a. He plundered our soul when His manifestation appeared in the heart
3b. The soul in my body, is You, I am a mere cage.

The same image is repeated in ZdJ: 471 and 633 in this way:

471, 5a. Without you, I swear by God, we have not lived, not even for a single moment
471, 5b. You are our soul and we are mere cages.

633, 22a. I said, You are my eyesight and sense (power) of hearing, He said:
633, 22b. We know that we are your soul and you are a mere cage.

b. The hemistich 4b in the present *ġazal* reads:

4a. It is my love (for You) that shakes me [so that] I lament
4b. throughout the night until dawn, my groaning is like that of a bell.

We find the same idea in ZdJ: 472:

6a. The attraction (by God) shakes our heart(s), therefore
6b. In the night our groaning is like that of a bell.

c. Most of the Sufi poets, writing in different languages, use the idea and the metaphor of being offered a goblet of wine, in the eternity (*azal*), as a symbol of the divine love. In ZdJ: 253, *bayt* 6, Jazīrī writes:

6a. The cupbearer gave me one or two goblets of wine in the eternity (*azal*)
6b. I am, eternally (*abad*), intoxicated, hungover and threadbare.

The same metaphor is repeated in three other poems; ZdJ: 475, *bayt* 14, ZdJ: 632, *bayt* 20ab and ZdJ: 716, *bayt* 15ab:

14a. Since old times, we drink pure wine
14b. That is why we are always intoxicated, hungover and threadbare.

20a. I said, since old times I have been drinking the wine of your love,
20b. He said you are not the only one among my lovers, who is threadbare (because of the wine).

15a. In the eternity (azal), the Real (Haqq) gave *Malē* a goblet of love
15b. We are, eternally (abad) intoxicated, ruined by the wine of that goblet.

d. The idea that the beloved is as sweet as fine sugar (*nabāt*) and that the lover(s) is/are fond of that sweetness and cannot be driven away even by force, is expressed in ZdJ: 254, *bayt* 8. The poet wants implicitly to declare, his total love and his willingness to sacrifice his life for the sake of that love:

8a. Even if you expose/subject us to hundreds of tyrannies and oppressions
We shall not go away from your door
8b. You are entirely fine sugar, and my nature is like that of the fly.

In ZdJ: 471, *bayt* 3 and ZdJ: 628, *bayt* 13 the metaphor is repeated:

3a. My Lord, it is obvious, you cannot drive us away from your door by the sword
3b. You are fine sugar and our nature is like that of the fly.

13a. I said, (they) cannot drive us away from your door by the sword,
13b. He said, we are of fine sugar and your nature is like that of the fly.

e. Another idea is that the lover is ready to fulfil whatever the beloved orders him to do, including killing not only the rival, but also himself. In ZdJ: 255, *bayt* 9, Jazīrī says:

9a. So, if You want to behead, give the order/command
9b. So, at this moment, I behead [myself], I am good scissors.

It is also found in ZdJ: 473, *bayt* 11 and ZdJ: 631, *bayt* 18:

11a. If you want to eradicate [me], at this moment,
11b. I behead [myself], with two fingers, we are scissors.

18a. I said do you want me to behead the rival?
18b. He said, I have seen (you), I know you can behead him, you are (a pair of) scissors

f. The relationship between a moth and the candle is often illustrated in classical Oriental poetry as a symbol of love, by most poets, regardless of whether they are Sufi poets or not. Infatuated and in love with light, the moth approaches the flame of the candle, which represents the burning love; although it knows this, it risks being burnt. In ZdJ: 255, *bayt* 10, we read:

a. If I burn from head to heel like *Malā*
b. Then I burn as a moth; I am without voice or sound.

In ZdJ: 632, *bayt* 21ab, the metaphor is employed:

a. I said at night, thus, we burn like candles,
b. As a moth, He /she said, go now! You are without voice or sound.

It is usually said that the classical poets were often forced to use certain words because of the pressure of rhyme, and consequently they chose the idea or metaphor that the rhyming word(s) offered. This is probably one of the reasons why Jazīrī repeated the same metaphors in more than one poem. The rhyming letters in ZdJ: 470–477 are *sīn*, and the rhyming letters in ZdJ: 622–633 are also *sīn*.

Ġazal 3
This *ġazal*, consists of 14 *bayt*s, which means that it is longer than the preceding *ġazal*s 1 and 2. Like those two *ġazal*s, this one is a Sufi poem, but there are essential differences between them in their content and structure, which will be explained when the poem is analysed. Below is the poem in Kurdish, followed by its translation into English:

1. *Sirr-i waḥdat ži azal girtiya ḥattā bi abad*
   Wāḥid ū fard-a bi ḏāt-ē xwa, wī nīnin ču ʿadad

2. *Di qidam-dā azal ū ʿayn-i abad hardu yak-in*
   Sarmadiyyat wah dixwāzit na azal bit, na abad

3. *Farq-a Wāḥid ži Aḥad, lē di maqām-ē ṣamadī*
   Bi Ḥaqīqat ku yak-in hardu či Wāḥid, či Aḥad.

4. *Yak-a daryā tu bizān qanji či mawj u či ḥabāb*
   Di aṣil-dā ku hamī āv-a či āv ū či jamad

5. *Afitāb-i aḥadiyyat di xwa-dā girtiya kawn*
   Naku ʿawrak haya, lē girtiya čahvēn ma ramad

6. *Ḥusn-ē ḏāt-ē but u Lātān ji jamāl-ā ṣamad-a*
   Ži miṯāl-ā ṣanam-ē weh ku tajallā-ya ṣamad

7. *Ġayr-i daryā niya ṣaḥrā bi ḥaqīqat, ammā*
   Ži ruy-ē kayf-a ku av āva-a buyī šubh-i zabad

8. *Kullu yawm-in Huwa fī šaʾn-in nabī ġāfil žē*
   Har payāpay ži šuʾūnān dikirit fayḍ u madad
9. *Gar di Ādam bidiya sirr-ē ʿilim Iblīsī*
   Ḥīnamā abṣarahu, kabbara ḥīnan wa sajad.

10. *Či zamān u či makān u či jihāt u či ḥudūd?*
Či maqādīr u tafāṣīl u ḥisābin, či ʿadad?

11. *Či munāfāt u luzūm-in, či qiyās u či miṯāl?*
Av či tawlīd u či tarkīb-a, či rūḥ-in, či jasad?

12. *Sar bi ʿijzē didirit quwwat-i darrāka-yi mā*
Rajaʿa ʾlʿaqlu kalīlan wa matā qāma qaʿad

13. *Ḥīrat u ʿijza Saranjām-ē di bāb-ē naẓarē*
Kay bi Xāliq naẓar-i qāṣir-i maxlūq-ī rasad

14. *Guft u go-yī maʿrifat čandī Malā paydā bikī*
Gawhar-ā maʿrifatē nāgihatē kas bi xirad. (ZdJ: 216–222)

– v – – / v v – – / v v – – / v v –
Ramal muṯamman al-ṣadr wa maxbūn al-ḥašu (*al-maḥḏūf / al-maqṣūr*)

The secret of Unity encompasses [everything] from Eternity to Eternity
He is the One and the Singular in His Essence, He has no enumeration. (1)

In Pre-eternity, *azal* and *abad* are the same.
The state of eternity (*sarmadiyyat*) requires that there be no *azal* or *abad*. (2)

The One (*Wāḥid*) differs from The Unique (*al-Aḥad*), but
In the state of eternity (al-Ṣamad)
Both The One and The Unique are in reality the same. (3)

The sea is one, you should know well, be it wave or bubble
Originally all is water, be it water or ice. (4)

The sun of oneness (*aḥadiyyat*) comprises the universe in itself,
There is no cloud, but our eyes suffer from disorder. (5)

The beauty of the idols (and the *Lāt*s) is from the beauty
Of The Everlasting (*Ṣamad*),
It is by the way of the images of the idols that the Everlasting manifests Himself. (6)

There is, in reality, no desert, nothing but the sea
But it is a question of quality that this water has become to a foam-like thing. (7)

Do not neglect (the *Qurʾān*ic verse) "Every day He is upon some labour"
He repeatedly sends forth emanations and divine succour, in (different) states. (8)

Had Satan (*Iblīs*) seen the secret of knowledge in Adam,
He would have exalted (God) for a long time and prostrated (before Adam). (9)

What are the times, the places, what are the directions, and borders?
What are (these) measures, details, calculations and numbers? (10)

What are (these) incompatibilities and requirements?
What are (these) measurements and patterns?
What is (this) procreation and construction?
What souls and bodies are these? (11)

Our power of conception ends in weakness,
The intellect terminates in exhaustion
And whenever it tries to stand up, it kneels down. (12)

Perplexity and failure are the conclusion of pondering,
How can the insufficient pondering of the created attain the Creator? (13)

How ever much talk and words of knowledge (of God)
You invent and find *Malā*,
Nobody comprehends the essence of recognizing (God)
By (the help of) wisdom. (14)

Structurally, the poem can be divided into four segments as follows:

Segment	*Bayt*s	Theme and/or Message
1	1-3	Theoretical basic principles: the oneness of God, He is everlasting, *azal* and *abad* are the same.
2	4-7	Proof of the oneness of God from the physical nature, an idea from the *Qurʾān*.
3	8-11	Theological Proof of the oneness of God from the Qur'an, defence of Satan (*Iblīs*). Existential speculations.
4	12-14	Human intellect and wisdom are unable to comprehend the essence of recognizing God.

Since the theme of the poem is philosophical, the poet has quite limited opportunities to use metaphors and similes that are used in love poems or mystical poems devoted to divine love. In segment 1, he presents a theoretical formulation about the oneness of God, which does not leave him much scope for of linguistic or rhetorical action. Furthermore, he asserts that *azal* and *abad*, are the same from the viewpoint of understanding the *qidam* (pre-eternity), since this is what the state of eternity (*sarmadiyyat*) requires; i.e., there should be no *azal* or *abad*.

Seemingly, because of its topic, the poem has, in the past, attracted the attention of the learned and intellectual circles in Kurdistan. Doskī (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 2018, vol: 2: 194) points out:

> Since long time ago, our scholars were interested in writing special tracts about this poem, and one of them was *malā* Ṣāliḥ Jibrāīl Ākrayī, who wrote a tract in 1812 at the time of Āmēdī's ruler Zubayr Pasha, son of Ismail. He supposedly wrote the tract, which was in Persian, at the request of the prince.

The texts in the three *bayt*s of segment 1 are closer to a philosophical text than to poetry. The only poetic elements in these three verses are the rhyme and the prosody. The ten mystical terms in the three distiches are used so densely that it would be impossible to construct any metaphor. At most, this is, due to the poet's deep belief in the thoughts he presents in the segment. This part of the poem is the sort of poetry that in Arabic literature is called educational poetry (*al-šiʿr al-taʿlīmī*), which is usually devoid of aesthetic qualities and poetic beauty.

Segment 1 is followed by two other segments, each consisting of four *bayt*s. The two segments are somehow under the influence of segment 1, and logically constitute supplements to it. Segment 2 with the exception of *bayt* 6, is devoted to evidence from physical nature. The poet is guided by a *Qurʾān*ic

verse (XLI: 53) that says, "We shall show them Our signs in the horizons and in themselves". He proposes evidence from nature and employs important elements such as sea, water, waves, bubbles, sun, foam and desert. In contrast to segment 1, the arguments here are more poetic than philosophical, and are constructed in the form of metaphors.

In *bayt* 5, the poet's starting point is such a firmly established belief that he thinks if we, as people who search for truth, cannot see the reality, then something is wrong with us and it is our power of conception that is not working properly:

> The sun of oneness (*aḥadiyyat*) comprises the universe in itself,
> There is no cloud, but our eyes suffer from disorder.

However, *bayt* 6 does not seem to be entirely relevant in the context of segment 2. It is originally one of the main ideas presented in some of Ibn ʿArabī's writings (see chapter 5 in this book). Jazīrī has also used the same idea in other poems, which will be shown later. After the interruption of the sequence of the physical evidence caused by *bayt* 6, the poet resumes, the argumentation in *bayt* 7 by introducing an idea that interprets, in a way, the theory of creation. Jazīrī writes:

> There is, in reality, no desert, nothing but the sea
> But it is a question of quality, that this water has turned into a foam-like thing.

This is a clear indication that the universe began with the creation of the sea, the foam of which, turned into desert/plain in the course of time. This view of creation is not entirely in agreement with the Islamic doctrine of creation as mentioned in the *Qurʾān*. Several verses indicat that God created the heavens and the earth in six days. However, there are indications that there was also water before the creation of the earth and the heavens, as in the following verse; (XI: 7) "And it is He who created the heavens and the earth in six days, and His Throne was upon the water." In another verse, (XXI: 30), water is regarded as the source of every living thing, "Have not the unbelievers then beheld that the heavens and the earth were a mass all sewn up, and then We unstitched them and of water fashioned every living thing? Will they not believe?"

Clearly, Jazīrī is quite meticulous in the way he arranges his thoughts and evidence in the poem. Segment 3, like segment 2, is dedicated to presenting evidence that can establish the truth of the statements he has already presented in segment 1. If segment 2 was devoted to evidence from physical nature, in segment 3 we read other sorts of ideas, namely theological ideas from the *Qurʾān* and the poet's own reflections in the form of existential questions and doubts. The segment can actually be divided into two parts, the first consisting

of *bayt*s 8–9 and the second consisting of *bayt*s 10–11 with the contents already mentioned. Also in this segment, we find a *bayt* that is not fully relevant in the context of the segment. This is *bayt* 9 about Satan (*Iblīs*), whom the poet justifies for not prostrating before Adam. This theme is repeated in other poems of the poet.

Jazīrī's ideas, in *bayt*s 10–11, can be classified as a part of the discussions among the Sufis about the concept of *qidam* (God's pre-eternity) and *ḥadaṯ* (created in time), which are key ideas in the doctrine of the Unity of Being (*Waḥdat al-wujūd*). According to this theory, everything is created except God. It should also be emphasized that Jazīrī's questions give the impression that his starting point is a kind of existential and sceptical attitude. It is noteworthy that the poet uses 16 terms in these two distiches and distributes them equally between the four hemistiches, four terms in each hemistich.

The last segment of the poem, segment 4, is in many ways symmetrical to segment 1; both consist of three *bayt*s, with two segments of 4 *bayt*s between them. In both segments, Jazīrī expresses deeply held beliefs about two fundamental questions in religion, be it Islam or other religions. In segment 1, he is firmly convinced of the oneness of God, whereas in segment 4, he concludes that it is impossible for a human being to obtain what he calls "the essence of knowledge" (*Gawhar-ā maʿrifatē*) for recognizing God by way of the power of imagination or by using reason or wisdom (*xirad*). This relationship between the two segments is the link that is called "circular structure" or "ring composition."

In three cases, the poet writes the second hemistich (*miṣrāʾ*) of the distich (*bayt*) in languages other than Kurdish; 9b and 12b are in Arabic, and 13b is in Persian. This also happens in some other poems in Jazīrī's *Dīwān*.

Now that three of Jazīrī's *Ġazal*s have been presented and analysed thematically and structurally, it may be interesting to view them together and side by side in order to understand the peculiarities, and also the inconsistencies in each of them.

The three poems, *Ġazal*s 1, 2 and 3, are Sufi poems, but the differences between them, thematically and structurally, are enormous. This probably depends on the poet's point of view, at the time of writing/composing each of them. What follows is an attempt to outline the main features and differences, by comparing some aspects of the three texts:

a. The boudaries between the speaker and the addressee in *Ġazal* 1 are quite clear. The poet himself is the speaker throughout the poem. It is as if he wants us to be aware of this, when the first word in the first hemistich of the first distich is I (*az*), which is the direct form of the first person singular. Only in three cases (*bayt*s 1, 2 and 7) does he employ the singular form for the speaker. In the rest of the cases he uses the

plural forms we (*am*) and us (*ma*). The pronoun representing the addressee, God, is always the second person singular you (*tu* or *te*).

The speaker in *Ġazal* 2 is the poet himself, and the addressee is either God or the Beloved, who is also in Sufi literature a symbol that representing God. Personal pronouns are used thirty-one times, of which only three are the oblique form of the first plural, *ma* (we). The poet, referring to himself, uses this plural form instead of the first singular, whereas when addressing God, he uses only the second singular form.

In *Ġazal* 3, there is no definite and easily identifiable speaker or even addressee, but reading the poem one gets a sense that the poet is addressing a particular group of people, a community. This situation requires limited use of the personal pronouns. Thus, they are reduced to only three; once the second person singular *tu* (you), with which the poet refers to anyone who reads or listens to his poem, and twice the first person plural *ma* (we), which obviously includes the poet himself and the audience to whom he speaks or writes his poem.

b. The third *bayt* of *Ġazal* 1 is a transitional *bayt*, in which the poet talks about God, using the third person singular He, which is understood from the form of the verb, which is simple past tense "He gave us". In the following three *bayt*s, the speaker uses plural forms, our, us and we. The addressee, however, is in the second person singular you and your.

In *Ġazal* 2, the poet is in a situation of suffering, lamenting and groaning because of his divine love, but he does not intend to narrate his pain to an audience or to his readers. The addressee is the Beloved/God, and the poet not only avoids any complaint, but apparently is proud and happy about his condition of suffering. Moreover, he is ready to vanish without the slightest objection. It is with this attitude that he concludes the poem:

> If I burn from head to heel like *Malā*
> Then I burn as a moth, I am without voice or sound.

In contrast to his passive attitude in *Ġazal* 2, in *Ġazal* 3 Jazīrī is in a situation of superiority and self-confidence. He is addressing a community of people who supposedly can understand mystical and philosophical matters. He speaks to them as a teacher or spiritual guide, explaining terms and concepts of the doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* It is noteworthy that the poet does not draw a line between himself and his audience. Only once does he tell them, using the second singular pronoun, to think about the example of the water in its various forms:

The sea is one, you should know well, be it wave or bubble
Originally everything is water, be it water or ice.

In two cases, when he explains the inability of human beings to understand everything in the universe, he includes himself as ignorant in the regard:

The sun of oneness (*Aḥadiyyat*) comprises the universe in itself,
There is no cloud, but our eyes suffer from disorder.

And
Our power of conception ends in weakness,
The intellect terminates in exhaustion
And whenever it tries to stand up, it kneels down

c.

The first segment of *Ġazal* 1 is devoted to the poet's experiences between *fīrāq* (separation) and *wiṣāl* (union, meeting), and the language is traditional and simple. Segment 2 begins with a statement and a metaphor, *bayt* 4, derived from a *ḥadīṯ qudsī*. The metaphor in *Bayt* 7 is one of the most beautiful images in Jazīrī's *Dīwān*, manifesting the relationship between God and the Sufi. The language in the following *bayt* 8 is in twofold form. The most difficult metaphor is in the last *bayt*. It can be called a threefold statement. The poet leaves the reader with an illustration that is similar to a puzzle, without providing any help or guidance.

Since the theme of *Ġazal* 2 is not philosophical, but divine love, which a Sufi cannot learn, but can only experience, the poet uses only three common mystical terms, namely *tajallī* (divine manifestation), *azal* (eternity without beginning) and *abad* (eternity without end). In *Ġazal* 3, however, the theme is exclusively mystical and philosophical, and the argumentation is at a high level. Consequently, the poet uses thirty-eight mystical and philosophical terms and concepts such as *wāḥid* (one), *fard* (singular), *sarmadiyyat* (everlasting), *fayḍ* (emanation) and *maqādīr* (measures), etc. In many cases, some of these terms are used more than once.

6.4.2. Three *qaṣīda*s

Qaṣīda 1: Lord of Lords (Q1)

In Kurdish (transcribed)

1. *Xān-i Xānān lāmiʿ-ē najm-ā ta har pur nūr-i bī*
   Kašti-yā baxt-ē ta az bā-yē muxālif dūr-i bī

2. *Kawkab-ā saʿd-ā šaraf ṭāliʿ di nēv burj-ā ta bit*
   Dā tinē ž čarx-ē balā šubh-ē mah-ē manẓūr-i bī

3. *Anjum-ē čarx-ē muḥaddab har ži ḏāt-ē ta-y šarīf*
   Kasb-i anwār-ē bikin ḥattā ku nafx-ā ṣūr-i bī

4. *Law ziyārat asitān-ē tēta šams-ā dawlatē*
   Dā sahargāhān ži dīdār-ē šarīf pur nūr-i bī

5. *Axtar-ā ta ž parda-yā ġayb-ē agar bētin ẓuhūr*
   Dē bitin niṣf-i-nnahāra war šab-ē dayjūr-i bī

6. *Āyat-ul-kursiy (y)u anʿām haykal-ā tox-ē ta bin*
   Bē nihāyat pur-murād ū bē ʿadad manṣūr-i bī

7. *Har kanārē wargarīnī pēva ʿazm ū himmatē*
   Rāyat-ā fatḥ-ē bi naṣr-ā lam yazal manṣūr-i bī

8. *Xaymat-ā nūr-ē ʿināyat ẓill-i mamdūd-ē ta bit*
   Sūra-yī Umm ul-Kitāb mādār-i ḥaḍrat sūr-i bī

9. *Pāš-i Nawšīrwān dibēm dē ḥākim-ē ʿādil tu-yī*
   Miṯl-i Ḥātim dē bi dān-ē dar jihān mašhūr-i bī

10. *Mā Jazīrē šubhi dār-ē taxt-i ḥaftʾiqlīm-i bit*
    Ham bi ḥukm ū salṭanat Askandar ū Faġfūr-i bī

11. *Miṯl-i Jam jām-ā zarīn xālī nabī ta ž bāda-yē*
    Dā ži xamr-ā šādimānī dāʾimā maxmūr-i bī

12. *Mā di bāġ-ē ʿayš u nošē har bi sāz ū Arġanūn*
    Kāmirān ū kāmibaxš ū dilx^{w}aš ū masrūr-i bī

13. *Čandakī šīrīn pusar darband-i dīwān-ā ta bin*
    Band-i Šāpūr-ē ta bin tā Xusru (w)ū Šāpūr-i bī

14. *Hindakī rož ū šav-in tēkʿīd u Laylu'l-Qadr-i bin*
Jām mudām pur bāda bit, lē na ž may-ā angūr-i bī

15. *Šubhat-ē Rūḥ-ul-Qudus ʿard-ē tu pē lē dāyinī*
Sabza (w)ū rayḥān u nasrīn ū gul-ē manqūr-i bī

16. *Har darē naʿl-ē faras šubhat Burāqē vē kavit*
Čašma-yī ḥaywān ži awʿard-ē mubārak fūr-i bī

17. *Mā taʿumr-ē Xiḍr u Nūḥ ū mulk-i Ḏu'l-Qarnayn bitin*
Gunbud-ā čarx-ē mulammaʿ har bi ta maʿmūr-i bī

18. *Xāṣ-i tašrīf-ē ta bin daryā (w)u Darband-ē ʿAjam*
Dā xalāt-ēn har saḥar ṣad zarkaš ū maxmūr-i bī

19. *Garči dar dīwān-i Ḥaḍrat pur haqīrīn šubh-i mūr*
Čašm-i ta čašm-ē Sulaymān-ī bi ḥāl-ē mūr-i bī

20. *ʾĒ na wak go-y bē sar ū pā bit di band-ā xidmatē*
Mā di čawgān-ā ta har parkanda (w)ū maqhūr-i bī

21. *Mā lisān-ē min duʿāgoyī li darḥaq waṣf-i Xān*
Maẓhar-ē sirr-ā kalāmē wak diraxt-ā Ṭūr-i bī

22. *Har di madḥ-ē ta w ṯanāyē sīna (w)ū qalb-ē Malē*
Bē tafāwut Qulzum-ā pur luʾlu-yē manṯūr-i bī

23. *Ž'āsitan-ē dawlat-ē ġāʾib nabī jārak Malā*
Dā ži farmān-ē mukarram dam bi dam maʾmūr-i bī
(ZdJ: 660–669)

In English translation

Lord of Lords! May your bright star always be radiant and full of light,
(And may) the ship of your fortune be far from a headwind. (1)

May the star of your happiness and dignity shine in your zodiac,
So that in the time of affliction, you alone will be seen as the moon. (2)

May the stars of the celestial orb always receive light
From your Majesty, until the day of the blowing of the Trumpet. (3)

The sun of power visits your threshold, so that at dawn
It becomes luminous by seeing you. (4)

When your lucky star emerges from the veil of the invisible
The time will be the middle of the day; even if it was a dark night. (5)

May the *Āyat al-kursī* and the *sūrat al-Anʿām* be your amulet
May you endlessly reach your goals, and be victorious countless times. (6)

To whichever side you turn (the reins of) zeal and determination,
May the everlasting help raise the banner of victory always. (7)

May the tent of the light of divine care be an extended shadow to you,
(and) the *sura al-Fātiḥa* be a fence around your highness. (8)

You are, I think, the righteous ruler after Anoushirvan,
(and) like Hatam, you will be renowned in the world for your generosity. (9)

May Jazīra be the capital of the seven Climes,
And by your command and your power you will be Alexander and the Chinese Emperor. (10)

May your golden goblet, like that of Jam, not be empty of wine,
So that you may always drunk on the wine of joy. (11)

May you always live fortunately, giving enjoyment, cheer and delight
in the garden of pleasure and luxury, with a *sāz* and an organ. (12)

May there be many lovely boys in the service of your (royal) court,
And may they obey your sons, and you will be like Xusrū and Šāpūr. (13)

May all (your) days and nights be a feast and a Night of Power,
The goblet will continually be full of wine, but not the wine of grapes. (14)

Like the Holy Spirit, the ground on which you set your foot
May plants, basil, wild rose (*Nasrīn*) and flowers grow there. (15)

Wherever the shoes of your horse tread, like *Burāq*,
May the spring of life, gush forth from that sacred earth. (16)
May you have the longevity of Xiḍr and Noah, and the reign (and wealth) of Alexander,
(And) may the lustrous dome of the heavens always be inhabited by you. (17)

May the Persian sea and strait be your special gift of honour,
So that the rewards (you give) at every dawn,
be a hundred gilded and wine-red garments. (18)

Although we are as worthless as an ant, in the royal court of your highness,
May your eye be the eye of Solomon who saw the ant. (19)

The one who is not in your service, like a ball, without head and feet,
May he always be dispersed and vanquished by your polo mallet. (20)

May my tongue, supplicating and wishing well for the prince,
Be the object of the (Divine) secret words, like the tree on Mount Sinai (*Ṭūr*). (21)

To praise and commend you, may the breast and the heart of *Malā*
Always be like a sea, filled with strewn pearls. (22)

You should not be absent from the threshold of the reign, even once, *Malā*
So that you receive a revered command, from time to time. (23)

The *qaṣīda* consists of 23 *bayt*s and is one of two panegyric poems written by Jazīrī in praise of a Kurdish ruler. It can be divided into four segments from a structural and thematic point of view, as shown below. The segments constitute a logical and aesthetic whole, which will be discussed below. The metre of the poem is *Ramal-i muṯamman-i maḥḏūf*, which runs as follows:

– v – – /– v – – /– v – – /– v –
Ramal-i muṯamman-i maḥḏūf

Segment	*Bayt*s	Theme and/or Message
1	1–5	Good wishes for the prince; the metaphors are based on astrological ideas, Celestial bodies are also used.
2	6–8	Supplication and prayer that the prince may be supported by God's will. Chapters and verses of the *Qurʾān* are used.
3	9–18	It is his hope that the prince will be like the great kings and emperors in the history: Iranian, Greek and Chinese. The prayers are of two sorts: material and luxurious life, provided that they are combined with piety and fear of God.
4	19–23	Reflections about himself and his role in the court as a Sufi and a poet. Hopes that everyone will obey the prince. Wishes to be of service by praying and writing poems of praise.

There is nothing in the poetry or biography of Jazīrī to suggest that he was a poet at the court of the princes of Jazīra or that he had a patron during the years he lived in that city. Jazīrī's *Dīwān* contains two panegyrics in which the poet praises the ruler of Jazīra, Prince Šaraf-Xān III. The other panegyric poem was partly discussed in chapter one, but here the two poems will also be compared thematically and linguistically.

It is worth noting that most of the scholars who have written about and discussed the life and time of Jazīrī (see Chapter 2) have used, in addition to some historical evidence, a metaphor in a *ġazal* in Jazīrī's *Dīwān* to strengthen their discourse. The *bayt* that contains that metaphor is as follows:

> *Ṣaf ṣaf ma dīn Hindī u Zang, Jangīz-i hāt Taymūr-i Lang*
> *Xaf wān rašāndin dil xadang, tašbīh-i tīren Xān-Šaraf* (ZdJ: 352).
>
> We saw Indians, black people (*Zang*), coming in rows,
> We saw Changiz and Timur Lenk,
> They secretly aimed their arrows that resembled
> the arrows of Xān-Šaraf, at our hearts.

The only fact that can be concluded from this verse is that the poet mentions the name of a certain Xān-Šaraf, who may have been a brave leader in Jazīra. In the history of the Principality of Botan there are three rulers whose names were Šaraf or Šaraf-Xān, but the above-mentioned *bayt* does not tell us when the praised prince Šaraf lived. Better evidence can be found in Jazīrī's two panegyrics, in which he not only mentions Xān-Šaraf, but also associates his name with the city of Jazīra and its landmarks, features and peculiarities. He records information about the City wall, which is decorated with verses from the *Qurʾān*, that it was the capital of Botan principality, and that the Prince

Šaraf-Xān reigned in a country called Kurdistan. Moreover, he mentions the tower that he calls *Burj-ā Šaraf*, Tower of Šaraf, built by Šaraf-Xān III in 1596.

Another important piece of information in this regard that settles the argument is that the two panegyrics mainly consist of wishs for the prince to be happy, successful and victorious in conquering other cities and lands. Such hopes are normally expressed for rulers who are still alive and in power. The significance of Jazīrī's two panegyrics lies not only in their aesthetic value, but also in the fact that they provide conclusive evidence for understanding his life and time.

Out of 23 *bayt*s, the total number of the *bayt*s of the poem, the eighteen *bayt*s that make up the first three segments are entirely devoted to expressing good wishes and desires. It is only in the last five distiches (segment 4), that the poet thinks about his role as a poet and a Ṣūfī, and reflects on his relationship with the prince. Although the mood of wishing permeates the poem as a whole, there are differences between the poet's wishes in the three segments in terms of vocabulary and metaphors, or the quality and objects of the hopes. In some cases, they concern the Prince's happiness, in others, his success in conquering other regions and countries. The poet consciously classifies his wishes into three different groups according to their contents and the symbols, terms and expressions upon which he bases the metaphors.

In the first segment, *bayt*s 1-5, the poet makes extensive use of nouns and adjectives related to light. He begins the *qaṣīda* by addressing the prince, calling him *Xān-i Xānān*, Lord of Lords, which is followed by six well-wishing sentences, distributed across the five distiches. All the metaphors in the segment, except in 1b, are based upon astrological imagery, constructed mainly of celestial bodies that are intensively used; star (1a, 2a, 3a and 5a), moon (2b) and sun (4a). Light is the common element in all the images. *Bayt* 2 reads:

Kawkab-ā saʿd-ā šaraf ṭāliʿ di nēv burj-ā ta bit
Dā tinē ž' čarx-ē balā šubh-ē mah-ē manẓūr-i bī

May the star of your happiness and dignity shine in your zodiac,
So that in the time of affliction you alone, will be seen as the moon.

The word *nūr* (light) is repeated three times, twice in the singular (1a and 4b), and once in the plural (3b), and one more time, in a metaphorical form, midday, *niṣf al-nahār* (5b), which also denotes light and is used, in the same hemistich, in contrast to a dark night, *šabi-dayjūr*. Bayt 3 reads:

Anjum-ē čarx-ē muḥaddab har ži ḏāt-ē ta-y šarīf
Kasb-ē anwār-ē bikin ḥattā ku nafx-ā ṣūr-i bī

May the stars of the celestial orb always receive light
From your Majesty, until the day of the blowing of the trumpet.

The expression "the day of the blowing of the trumpet" is used in Islamic culture by people and in writings, to mean doomsday, the last day of the world's existence. It is thought that the angel Isrāfīl will blow a trumpet (*ṣūr*) twice; at the first blowing, all the living people on earth and in the heavens will die, and at the second blowing, they will be resurrected. It is also mentioned in the *Qurʾān* (XXXIX: 68): "For the trumpet shall be blown, and whosoever is in the heavens and whosoever is on the earth shall swoon, save whom God wills. Then it shall be blown again, and lo, they shall stand, beholding". Jazīrī's use of this expression is no more than a poetic exaggeration, since he knew that the Prince would not live to see that day.

The only exception in this context is the metaphor employed in 1b, where no word related to astrological images or light is used. The hemistich reads:

Kašti-yā baxt-ē ta az bā-yē muxālif dūr-i bī

May the ship of your fortune be far from a headwind.

Light and astrological imagery are not present in this hemistich, but the metaphor is based instead on a symbol related to physical nature, namely a ship in the sea that may be confronted by a headwind.

In addition to the fact that the poet wishes the prince a light, bright and radiant fortune, time, day, and life, he wants to give special attention to a symbol of the city of Jazīra, namely the piebald tower, *Burj-ā Balak,* built on the bank of the Tigris, and now a ruin. The Kurdish writer Yaşin, himself a resident of Jazīra, states that the tower was built in 1596 by Mīr Šaraf III (Yaşin, 1983: 34). The name *balak*, piebald, derived from the Arabic *ablaq*, is apt because the tower was built of black basalt and gypsum.

By using the word *burj* in both of his panegyric *qaṣīda*s, Jazīrī alludes to two meanings at once: the tower built by the Prince Mīr Šaraf III, and a sign of the zodiac that can influence a person's life and destiny. Moreover, the poet prefers to call the tower *Burj-ā Šaraf*, Tower of Šaraf and House of Honour, instead of *Burj-ā Balak*, giving the name a wider meaning and a higher dignity. It is also possible that the tower was indeed called *Burj-ā Šaraf*, referring to the tower built by Šaraf, at least during the reign of Mīr Šaraf III.

This does not suffice for the poet in venerating the prince; he also uses words derived from the Arabic root *šrf*, which is a clear reference to the name of Šaraf-Xān. The words are *Šaraf* (2a), *Šarīf* (3a and 4b) and *Tašrīf* (18a). Although there are six well-wishing sentences, in the five *bayt*s of the segment, none of them denotes a concrete, material wish. They are imaginary hopes that the prince will enjoy great dignity and high rank. This is also true of the metaphor in 1b, the ship of fortune and the headwind, which, like the other five, is no more than a fanciful and poetic expression.

Segment 2 is the shortest part of the poem, it is devoted to supplications and prayers for the prince to be blessed and supported by the divine will. It sounds as if the poet suddenly remembers that whatever he may wish for the prince, it cannot be realized without the help and blessing of God. He therefore devotes three *bayt*s to praying to God and asking that the prince be saved from misfortune and calamity and be victorious. To strengthen his prayers, he uses verses from the *Qurʾān* that are believed to be effective in saving people from hardship and providing them with victory. The *Sūra*s or verses mentioned in the three *bayt*s and their peculiarities in that regard are as elucidated here:
Āyat al-Kursī (Verse of the Throne, II: 255) is one of the longest verses of the *Qurʾān*. The relevant sentences are "His Throne comprises the heavens and the earth; the preserving of them oppresses Him not; He is the All-high, the All-glorious".

Sūrat al-Anʿām (the Chapter of Cattle, VI) includes, according to Doskī (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 2018: III, 307) "several references to the support given by God to the Prophet against those who showed him enmity".

Fatḥ (victory), *Naṣr* (help), (CX: 1-3): "When comes the help of God, and victory […] then proclaim the praise of thy Lord". Both words are used in the first sentence of the *Qurʾānic* verse, which reads "*Iḏā jāʾa naṣruʾAllāhi waʾl-fatḥu*".

Umm al-Kitāb (mother of the book: I) is usually called *al-Fātiḥa* (opening), since it is the first chapter of the *Qurʾān* according to the traditional arrangement of chapters and verses. It does not belong to the chapters or verses that are thought to provide safety or victory. The only sentence in this chapter that may be relevant in the context of Jazīrī's poem reads, "To Thee alone we pray for succour".

The segment consists of five prayers, four of which are just good wishes that the prince may be supported by God and His words, but do not represent any tangible goal. The only prayer that can be interpreted as the poet's real intention is in 6b. It almost sums up all the good wishes that follow in the rest of the poem and could be seen as the key to most of them. The hemistich says:

Bē nihāyat pur-murād u bē ʿadad manṣūr-i bī

May you endlessly reach at your goals,
And be victorious countless times.

It should also be emphasized that segment 2 is aesthetically the weakest and the most "colourless" part of the poem. This is mainly due to the passive attitude of the poet, who does not present any specific objective. There is, however, evidence of the poet's aesthetic taste in the use of two similar words (almost homonyms) in one hemistich, 8b. The juxtaposition of the words *Sūra* (a chapter of the *Qurʾān*) and *sūr* (wall/fence) is only one of many similar examples found in Jazīrī's poems. The *bayt* says:

Xaymat-ā nūr-ē ʿināyat ẓill-i mamdūd-ē ta bit
Sūra-yi Umm ul-Kitāb mādār-ē ḥaḍrat sūr-i bī

> May the tent of the light of divine care be an extended shadow to you,
> (and) the *sura al-Fātiḥa* be a fence around your highness.

Segment 3, unlike the previous one, is an important and well-grounded part of the poem. It is the longest, consisting of ten *bayt*s, 9–18, which makes it twice as long as the first segment and also twice as long as the last segment. Being in the middle, it constitutes a central and a discrete section of the poem, around which the other sections are arranged to strengthen its position within the structure as a whole. Farrin (2003: 93) emphasizes the role of the central element in the *qaṣīda*, writing, "According to the principles of ring composition, the central element assumes primary importance in the structure; it is the star around which planets orbit".

The first two *bayt*s in the segment, 9 and 10, consist of four sentences, each expressing a good wish. Each hemistich expresses an independent idea, but all four ideas are expressed in a language closer to ordinary everyday speech than to a poetic panegyric. In 9a, the poet thinks that the prince is a righteous successor to Anoushirvan and that, in 9b, he will be known for his generosity, like Ḥātim. Anoushirvan was the 22nd Sāssānid Shah, who ruled between 531–579 CE and was known as *dādgar* (just or righteous) because he was a just king. Ḥātim al-Ṭāʾī (d. 605) was a pre-Islamic Arab tribal chieftain and poet in Arabia, known as the epitome of generosity and munificence.

In 10a, the poet defines his wish more precisely, although what he wishes is an unrealistic and highly exaggerated. He wants Jazīra to be the capital city of the seven climes, in another words, the whole (known) world of his time. Obviously, his wish is that the prince will be an emperor whose rule encompasses the whole world, with Jazīra as his capital. Writing this, he has in mind the images of great leaders and emperors like the Greek Alexander (R. 336–323 BC) and the Chinese emperors, usually called *Faġfūr*. It is interesting to note that Jazīrī borrows his ideals – three rulers and a tribal chieftain known for his generosity– from four different civilizations, namely Sāssānid Iran, pre-Islamic Arabia, ancient Greece, and China. It is also noteworthy that there are no Muslim or Kurdish leaders among them.

The next eight *bayt*s of the segment are devoted to the poet's hopes and wishes for the prince to have power, wealth, luxurious enjoyment, comfort and a happy material life. Nevertheless, his wishes are subject to conditions, since he is concerned to remind the prince that the wine he drinks should not be illicit. Moreover, the symbols he uses are holy symbols, such as *Rūḥ al-Qudus* (The Holy Spirit, usually interpreted as Gabriel or Jesus), *Burāq*, Xiḍr and Noah (Nūḥ).

Bayt 12 reads as follows:

> *Mā di bāġ-ē ʿayš u nošē har bi sāz u arġanūn*
> *Kāmrān u kām-baxš u dilxwaš u masrūr-i bī*

May you always live fortunately, giving enjoyment, cheer and delight
In the garden of pleasure and luxury, with a *sāz* and an organ.

Some of the editors of Jizīrī's *Dīwān*, including Zivingī, read the last word in the first hemistich (12a) as *arġawān*, translating or explaining it as a tree, the fruit and flower of which are of a beautiful red colour, while some others read it as *arġanūn*, meaning the music instrument called the organ. I have chosen to use *arġanūn* instead of *arġawān* and to translate the word as organ for three reasons:

a. It is far from the poetic taste of Jazīrī to use *arġawān* there, when the preceding word is *sāz*, which is also a musical instrument. Moreover, the context requires that the names of musical instruments be used together instead of combining the name of an instrument with a tree. What is expected in the context is that a prince or a king would grant enjoyment, cheer and delight in his garden of pleasure and luxury, when, among many other arrangements, music is played.
b. In two of the manuscripts employed in this study, the word is *arġanūn*. One of the manuscripts (MS. Or. quart. 1131. SB Marburg / Berlin) is estimated to have been written sometime before 1872, and the other one, on which Hartmann (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1904) based his edition of the *Dīwān*, is estimated to have been written before 1900 (see chapter 2).
c. An argument against this opinion is that the musical instrument organ is typically European and is generally used in churches, and therefore it is improbable that Jazīrī, or the surrounding society, knew of this instrument. Apparently, the organ, *arġanūn*, was known and used in the poetry of Persian poets who lived long before Jazīrī.

Rūmī (1978: 455) uses the word many times, as in this *bayt*:

Hīč kas-rā xud zi Ādam tā kunūn
Kay būdast āvāz hamčūn arġanūn?

Nobody, from Adam himself, and until now,
Had such a melody as the organ.

Sheikh Abu-Saʿīd Abu'l-Xayr (967–1049) also used it:

Az sīna ṣadā-ye arġanūn mī-āyad
Va'z dīda bi jāy-i ašk, xūn mī-āyad.

From the breast comes the sound of the organ,
And from the eyes comes blood instead of tears.

The images in the *bayt*s 11–13 are traditional and appropriate for describing a kingly life to which the prince has, or should have, access. A goblet like that of Jamšīd, always full of wine, a garden of pleasure and luxury, musical instruments like the *sāz* and the organ, and lovely boys in service are among the entertainments the poet wishes that the prince will have. The poet places no restrictions or limitations on the imagined situation, which seems familiar in the context.

In the distich that follows, the mood changes. The poet adds a tinge of piety to his discourse, reminding his prince that he may enjoy whatever he desires in the garden of pleasure and luxury, provided that it does not exceed the limits of religious restrictions. *Bayt* 14 consists of two statements as follows:

Hindakī rož u šav-in tēkʿīd u Laylu'l-Qadr-i bin
Jām mudām pur bāda bit, le naž may-ā angūr-i bit

May all (your) days and nights be afeast and a Night of Power,
The goblet will continually be full of wine, but not the wine of grapes.

He wishes (14a) that the prince may be in feast all his life (all days and nights), which should be like the Night of Power (*Laylat al-Qadr*), which is a religious occasion on one of the last nights of the fasting month (*Ramaḍān*) and is celebrated by praying, eating, drinking and listening to religious melodies and hymn until dawn. He also wishes (14b) that the prince's goblet will always be full of wine, provided that the wine is not made of grapes, which is illicit according to Islamic principles. According to Doskī's interpretation, (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 2018, IV: 311) the poet is referring to the wine of love.

This *bayt* is indeed a transitional part between two units of verses, each consisting of three *bayt*s, 11–13 and 15–17. The mood of the unit that precedes this transitional *bayt* is one of pleasure and luxury, as already explained, and no restrictions are mentioned, whereas the mood of the following unit is quite religious and constructed of religious symbols and signs. Jazīrī wishes for the prince to be like the Holy Spirit (*Rūḥ al-qudus*), his horse to be like the *Burāq* **(**which, according to Islamic mythological tradition, is a creature that transported the Prophet Muḥammad to heaven, but is not mentioned in the *Qurʾān*). The poet also wishes that the prince may live eternally like Xiḍr, or at least have a long life like Noah, and rule many parts of the world like Alexander (*Ḏu'l-Qarnayn*).

Alexander the Greek who is also known as *Ḏu'l-Qarnayn*, meaning "Bicorneous", is different from the other symbols in that he is not directly related to any religion. Nevertheless, The *Qurʾān*, devotes 17 verses (XVIII: 83–99) to telling his story. Jazīrī is precise in composing his two different wishes in

one hemistich (17a) and one sentence, and in using an apropos verb that can bring them together:

Mā ta ʿumr-ē Xiḍr u Nūḥ u mulk-ē Ḏu'l-Qarnayn bitin

May you have the longevity of Xiḍr and Noah
And the reign (and wealth) of Alexander.

The verb *bitin* is a present subjunctive derived from the copula verb *būn* (to be), and when used with a personal pronoun, it means "to belong to, to have". In 17a, the poet combines the longevity of Xiḍr and Noah and the power and wealth of Alexander, as things to be possessed by the prince. He also uses the Arabic word *mulk*, which denotes both power/reign and wealth/possession.

At the end of the segment, the poet returns once more to his good wishes and desires that the prince may be victorious in conquering regions and countries. In 18a, he mentions the Persian Sea and Strait. Obviously, what inspired him to express this idea is the mention of Alexander (whom he calls *Ḏu'l-Qarnayn*), whose name is used in the first hemistich, 17a, in the previous *bayt*.

Segment 3, as mentioned above, is the longest and most significant segment in the poem. It consists of five sub-divisions, which are coherent and firmly connected to each other. The following diagram can clarify this structural aspect of the segment:

*Bayt*s	The crux of the wishes	symbols, images & messages
9-10	Power: ruling, conquering, wealth	Anoushīrvān, Ḥātim, Alexander, Faġfūr, justice, generosity
↓↓↓		
11-13	Material life, luxury, pleasure	Jamšīd's goblet, enjoyment, music, making others happy
↓↓↓		
14	transitional	Feast, *Laylat al-Qadr*, licit pleasure, piety
↓↓↓		
15-17	Sacred religious names, long life	The Holy Spirit, *Burāq*, Xiḍr, Noah, but also Alexander
↓↓↓		
18	Power, conquest, wealth	Persian Sea & Strait, give hundreds of rewards

The segment consisting of ten *bayt*s is the largest segment in the poem, and accordingly it is more likely that the poet used the "circular structure" or "ring composition" technique in the segment itself, in addition to using it in the poem as a whole. Thematically, we see resemblance between the first and fifth

units or sub-divisions. In the first unit (*bayt*s 9-10) the objects of the wishes are power, conquest and wealth, which is also the case in the fifth unit (*bayt* 18). Another similarity is between the first and the fourth (*bayt*s 15-17) units. Both mention the Macedonian Greek emperor Alexander (*Ḏu'l-Qarnayn*), who is associated with power, wealth and rule.

The last segment, number four, is the most beautiful and sincere part of the poem from a linguistic and poetic point of view. This applies to the language and the emotional expressions of the genuine feelings with which the poet declares his loyalty and sincerity to the prince. The three preceding segments contain several well-wishing phrases, hopes and wishes that the prince, like the greatest kings and emperors, may conquer the whole (known) world, that his capital city of Jazīra may be the capital of the seven climes, and that he may be wealthy and generous. Segment 4, however, is devoted to the gentle feelings of the poet, his sincere humility, and his tender attitude towards the prince.

The language and the metaphors in the previous segments are of two kinds: One that describes what is expected of or wished for a powerful ruler: to conquer, to be victorious in his wars, and to do what great kings and emperors have done in the past. The other is devoted to describing the luxurious life a king can or should have, but also justice and generosity. That language, ideas, and vocabulary, whether harsh or gentle, deal with and belong to power and those who have power. The metaphors are closer to those of a historical text or sacred book than to poetry. The language in segment 4 is tender, pleasant and modest. It is the language of poets and Sufis.

Jazīrī begins the segment with a metaphor based on a widely known story about Solomon (Sulaymān) and an ant. The story is recorded in the *Qurʾān* (XXVII: 18) and says: "When they came on the Valley of Ants, an ant said, 'Ants, enter your dwelling-places, lest Solomon and his hosts crush you, being unaware!" The poet sees himself as an ant in the court of the prince, small, weak and powerless, but he expects the prince to be kind and tender hearted like Sulaymān. It is expected that just and great kings are those who see not only the great things and persons, but also the small ones.

Being sincere and loyal to the prince, the poet (*bayt* 22) wishes that his breast and heart, symbols of parts of the human body where the feelings are thought to be, will be like a sea full of strewn pearls, a symbol of beautiful words, to praise and commend the prince. Lastly, (*bayt* 23), the poet wants to be always in the service of the prince, so that from time to time he gets a command. The metaphor contains a covert communicative message that must be interpreted by the reader.

Although he does not want to be absent from the princely court at all, the poet expects to receive a command from the prince only occasionally, which is too rarely. Receiving a command from the prince is a great honour for a servant, and it does not happen often. For this reason he does not want to be absent from the princely court at all, lest he miss the chance of being ordered to perform a service for the prince. The reason why his opportunities to get a

command are rare is that he is not the only servant in the court. There are many of them, and he is only one of a large number of servants.

Returning to *bayt* 20, we understand how much importance the poet attaches to being in the prince's service. Jazīrī writes:

> *ʾĒ na wak go-y bē sar ū pā bit di band-ā xidmatē*
> *Mā di čogan-ā ta har parkanda (w)u maqhūr bī*
>
> The one who is not in your service, like a ball, without feet and hands,
> May he always be dispersed and vanquished by your polo mallet. (20)

A real and genuine servant, as Jazīrī sees the question, must be like a ball without feet and hands (*go-y bē sar ū pā*), by which he means that the person must give up his will and surrender himself to the will of the prince. Classical Persian poets used the metaphor in a Sufi context, and Jazīrī seems to have inherited it from them.

In other cases, he simply addresses the prince as you (*tu*: 2nd person singular, direct case, which occurs twice, and *ta*: 2nd person singular, oblique case, which occurs sixteen times). The poet, despite all the veneration he expresses for the prince, does not use the plural form of the pronoun (*hūn* or *wa*), which functions as *pluralis majestatis* in some languages where it is used instead of the second singular "you" and the first singular "I".

In this part of the poem, Jazīrī has a noticable presence. This comes after 18 *bayt*s (segments 1–3) in which the prince is referred to intensively, but the poet is completely absent. He does not even use the pronouns "I, me or mine" to emphasize himself.

In *bayt* 19, he uses the copula verb "*īn*" "we are", apparently to point out that he is one of the servants in the princely court. In *bayt* 21, he employs the first singular pronoun "*min*" "I," which makes him more visible in the picture. In the last two *bayt*s, his presence is strongly confirmed by the use of his pen name *Malā* twice.

There is a similarity in structure, a sort of symmetrical agreement, between segments 1 and 4, in that they consist of five *bayt*s each. Another common feature is that in the first segment, 1a, the poet addresses the prince as Lord of Lords (*Xān-i Xānān*) and in the fourth segment, 21a, he once more calls him Lord (*Xān*), although here he does not address him directly, but mentions him in the context of one of his wishes.

Thematically and linguistically, the two segments 1 and 4 make up a ring composition within the *qaṣīda* as an artistic unity. In segment 1, which consists of five *bayt*s, all the metaphors except the one in 1b are based on astrological concepts and celestial bodies, which are usually considered to be enormous or even unlimited. These phenomena are usually associated with the sky or the heavens and have always been the subject of thousands of mysterious thoughts and questions by humankind.

In segment 4, Jazīrī presents an antithesis in his metaphors, shifting the dimensions of his thoughts from the heavens to the earth and choosing elements that are easily grasped by the reader. In *bayt* 19, the first *bayt* of the segment, he chooses a very small creature as the core of an allegory, namely the ant. The other metaphors are also related to natural and earthly concepts and phenomena. He does not promise anything beyond his own capacity as a poet, nor does he take refuge in other worlds or heavens. The most he wants to do for the sake of the prince is to praise him with the pearls of his words and to be present at the court in order to have the honour of receiving a command from the prince.

Qaṣīda 2: King of Kings (Q2)

In Kurdish (transcribed)

1. *Ay Šahinšāh-ē muʿaẓẓam Ḥaq nigahdār-ē ta bī*
   Sūra-yē Innā fataḥnā dor u mādār-ē ta bī

2. *Har kanārē pēva wargērī ʿinān-ē himmatē*
   Zuhra bī payk-ē ta (w)ū Kaywān rikēbdār-ē ta bī

3. *Dāʾimā manzilgah-ā sūr-ā ta bit burj-ā Šaraf*
   Tāliʿ-ē farxunda (w)ū baxt-ē saʿīd yār-ē ta bī

4. *Sabʿa-yē sayyāra (w)ū nah čarx-i sargardān bi vē*
   Gardiš ū dawr-ē ʿajab dar xidmat u kar-ē ta bī

5. *Māhitāb-ā dawlat-ē yak purtawak šamʿ-ā ta bit*
   Āfitāb-ā rafʿatē barqak ži anwār-ē ta bī

6. *Lāmiʿ-ē fatḥ-ā Azal barqē ži bar tāj-ē ta dit*
   Kawkab-ā saʿd-ā Abad najmak ži sayyār-ē ta bī

7. *Barq-ē subbūḥī ku išrāqē li ṣad jānān didit*
   Aw ku kašf-ā dil dikit ramzak ži asrār-ē ta bī

8. *Rāyat-ā fatḥē ži naṣr-ā ta ku har manšūr-i bū*
   Šahsuwār-ē farr-i subḥānī ʿalamdār-ē ta bī

9. *Nay tinē Tabrīz u Kurdistān libar ḥukm-ē ta bin*
   Ṣad wekī šāh-ē Xurāsānē di farwār-ē ta bī

10. *Garči dar ʾiqlīm-i rābiʿ hāti taxt-ē salṭanat*
    Padišāh-ē ḥaft-i ʾiqlīmān salāmkār-ē ta bī

11. *Čīman-ā sulṭāniyē yak lālayak bāġ-ē ta bit*
Gulšan-ā xāqāniyē xārak ži gulzār-ē ta bī

12. *ʾĒ ži amr-ē ta-y mukarram sarkašī kit šubh-i šamʿ*
Bar sar-ē tīġ-ē ta (w)ū maqtūl-i mūkār-e ta bī

13. *Šāhibāz arčand-i parwāz-ē bi bālā bēt u rat*
Dē di nēv tor-ā ta bīt ū ṣayd-i šunqār-ē ta bī

14. *Šāh-i pur haybat didīrit lē bi sahm-ē zēdayī*
Sāʿat-ā ġaflat xuyā bī kūz di bin bār-ē ta bī

15. *Har sarē dawlat habit dē har di nēv band-ā ta bit*
Har kasē ʿāqil bitin dē har di čokār-ē ta bī

16. *ʾĒ divēt āzāda bit dē čahvinēr luṭf-ā ta bit*
Harči istiġnā di dil bar minnat ū pār-ē ta bī

17. *Har kasē qastak di dil, dē qast-ē dargāh-ē ta kit*
ʾĒ di xātir arju kit dē har rijākār-ē ta bī

18. *ʾĒ na dawlat-x^{w}āh-i hazrat bit ži nēv-ā cān u dil*
Šubhat-ē ahl-ē šaqā bar qahr u āzār-ē ta bī

19. *Mā bi ʿayš ū noš u šāhī aw qadar ʿumr-ē ta bit*
Čandakī sālik mujaddad bīt u bēzār-ē ta bī

20. *Harkasē na ž jān duʿāgoy ū ṯanā-x^{w}ān-ē ta bit*
Girti-yē qayd-ā ta (w)ū āmānj-i nūbār-ē ta bī

21. *Madrak-ē ʿilm-ē ḍamīrī šammayak waṣf-ā ta hāt*
Warna kayʿālim bi šaʾn-ē qadr u miqdār-ē ta bī

22. *Qast u dāx^{w}āz-ā Malē dāʾim ži jān ū dil ava*
Har di band-ā xizmatē, pēšdast-i dīdār-ē ta bī (ZdJ: 652–660)

In English translation:

O, glorious King of Kings! May God be your protector,
The *Sūra* of *Innā Fataḥnā* be around you! (1)

To whichever side you turn the reins of zeal,
May Venus be your courier and Saturn your groom! (2)

May the House of honour always be the station of your feast,
A fortunate horoscope and good luck be your friends! (3)

May the bewildering seven planets and nine skies,
With such astonishing revolution, be in your service! (4)

May the moonlight of power be a single ray of your candle,
The sun of eminence a single flash of your light! (5)

May the brightness of eternal victory illuminate your crown,
The star of eternal prosperity be one of your planets! (6)

The Divine lightning that illuminates hundreds of souls,
And reveals hearts, may it be a sign of your secrets! (7)

The conquest banner of your victory has always been unfurled,
May the knight of divine radiance be your standard bearer! (8)

May not only Tabrīz and Kurdistan be under your rule,
But also hundreds like the Shāh of Xurāsān be in your guesthouse! (9)

Though you ascended the throne of the sultanate in the fourth clime,
May the kings of the seven climes salute you! (10)

May the Sultan's meadow be a single tulip in your orchard,
The Khāqān's rose bed be a thorn in your flower garden! (11)

Whoever disobeys your revered command, may he be like a candle,
Before your sword and your hair-splitting [edge]! (12)

However high the royal falcon soars, coming and going,
It will still fall into your net and be the prey of your eagle! (13)

A king [who] has great awe, but is beyond his share,
May he suddenly appear and be bent under your burden! (14)

Whoever is prosperous should be in your chains,
Anyone who is intelligent must put himself in your service! (15)

Anyone who wants to be free should expect your kindness,
May whoever considers himself independent be in need of your favour and grace. (16)

Whoever has a wish in his heart should seek your court,
He who has a request in mind should be your supplicant! (17)

Anyone, who is not a well-wisher of [your] Excellency
from the bottom of his heart,
May he, like the damned, be under your subjection and punishment! (18)

May you live in joy, pleasure and happiness,
For as long as a year can renew and relieve you! (19)

Anyone who does not praise and pray for you wholeheartedly,
May he be a captive in your chains and a target for your arrow! (20)

To the heart's perceptive knowledge, a hint of your attributes came,
Otherwise, who could be aware of your worth and power! (21)

The intention and desire of *Malā* from the bottom
of the soul and heart is always this:
To be in the chains of your service, in your sight! (22)

This *qaṣīda* (Q2) has already been presented and analysed in detail in Chapter 1, and therefore it will only be presented here in the context of a comparison with the other panegyric *qaṣīda* (Q1).

Jazīrī's Two panegyric Poems: A Brief Comparison

As was mentioned earlier, Jazīrī wrote only two panegyric poems, both dedicated to the Kurdish prince Šaraf-Xān III, who ruled in the city of Jazīra, the capital city of Botan Principality. Reading the two poems, one gets the impression that there are many similarities between them in their structure, theme, language and metaphors.

Taking into account all the similarities in various aspects of the two poems, one inevitably concludes that these two poems were originally one and the same poem, which the poet reworked artistically, and as a result a new poem emerged. I have discussed this issue in part in an article about the Kurdish *qaṣīda* (Shakely, 1996: 334) saying "The striking similarities between these two poems make it seem certain that they were written within a very short time-span. These similarities include metaphors, the manner in which the prince is addressed and the rhythm." What follows is an attempt to expand on the idea and present further evidence that may enrich the discussion.

To facilitate the comparison of the two poems, the *qaṣīda* presented earlier in this chapter, Lord of Lords, will be referred to as Q1 and the other *qaṣīda*, which was presented in chapter one, King of Kings, as Q2.

Presumably, Jazīrī wrote Q1 first, but later changed his mind and wrote Q2, which is mainly based on Q1. He developed and significantly changed Q1, but he also preserved its form and a number of its metaphors and well-wishing

phrases. The reason why he wrote a new poem may have been his dissatisfaction with some of the aesthetic and linguistic aspects of Q1. A genuine poet obviously has the ambition to improve the aesthetic and linguistic elements in his texts and to produce, an ideal poem according to his artistic standards. Below is a comparison between the two poems:

1. Q1 consists of 23 *bayt*s, whereas Q2 consists of 22 *bayt*s. The metre in both poems is *Ramal-i Muṯamman-i Maḥḏūf*, which runs as follows:
   – v – – / – v – – / – v – – /– v –

   and the rhyme in Q1 is – *ūr* followed by the *radīf* "*bī*". In Q2 the rhyme is -*ar-ē ta*, also followed by the *radīf* "*bī*", which is an assimilated form of the present subjunctive form derived from the infinitive *būn*, meaning, "To be, to become".

2. Q1 begins by addressing the prince as Lord of Lords (*Xān-i Xānān*), while Q2 begins by addressing the prince as O, glorious King of Kings! (*Ay Šahinšāh-ē muʿaẓẓam*!). The use of the vocative particle "*ay*" at the beginning of Q2 is a clear sign that Jazīrī wants to use a familiar language of address, with which he has established grounds of equality and familiarity with his prince. In Q1, however, the language used to address the prince is formal.
3. In Q1, 7a, the poet writes:

   Har kanārē wargarīnī pēva ʿazm u himmatē

   To whichever side you turn (the reins of) determination and zeal,

And in Q2: 2a, he uses the same metaphor, saying:

   Har kanarē pēva wargērī ʿinān-ē himmatē

   To whichever side you turn the reins of zeal

The idea behind the metaphor is the same in both cases, and the words are nearly the same, The exception being that the word *ʿazm* (zeal) in Q1: 7a, is omitted in Q2: 2a, and replaced by the word *ʿinān* (rein). By making this change, Jazīrī not only makes the distich more beautiful and eloquent, but he also corrects a poetic and linguistic mistake that a great poet like Jazīrī should not make. In Q1: 7a, he does not use the word *ʿinān* (rein), and a literal translation of the hemistich 7a would be "To whichever side you turn determination and zeal," which is logically incorrect, since both determination and zeal are only abstract nouns. One cannot direct or command abstract nouns to go anywhere. In Q2: 2a, the use of the word *ʿinān* (rein) gives the metaphor a logical

sense. The prince can direct the reins of zeal to whichever side he wants. In the second version, zeal is depicted as a horse that the prince rides and directs.

4. The tower of honour or the house of honour "*burj-ā Šaraf*" is a central term in both poems, and the poet is concerned to highlight it in a way that combines the name of the tower built by the prince with a sign of the zodiac. In Q1: 2a, Jazīrī writes:

   Kawkab-ā saʿd-ā Šaraf ṭāliʿ di nēv burj-ā ta bit

   May the star of your happiness and dignity shine in your zodiac/tower.

"*burj-ā ta*" is your tower, which is obviously not as brilliant as attributing it to the prince and using his name. In Q2: 3a, he modifies the hemistich in this way:

   Daʾimā manzilgah-ā sūr-ā ta bit Burj-ā Šaraf

   May the house of honour/*Šaraf* always be the station of your feast.

5. In Q1, Jazīrī alludes four times to *Qurʾān*ic *Sūra*s and verses, as explained above. In Q2, he reduces them to only two, namely the first verse of the *Sūra* of victory (*Sūrat al-Fatḥ*, XLVIII: 1) which says: "Surely We have given thee a manifest victory". This is mentioned in 1b, in the second *qaṣīda*:

   Sūra-yi (Innā fataḥnā) dor u madar-ē ta bī

   May the *Sūra* of "We have given you victory" surround you

The second time is in 8a, where he alludes to the *Sūra* of help (*Sūrat al-Naṣr*, CX: 1-3):

   Rāyat-ā fatḥē ži naṣr-ā ta ku har manšūr bū

   The conquest banner of your victory has always been unfurled

These verses are also used in Q1: 7b. The metaphor in both hemistiches are almost the same, but in Q1: 7b, he wishes that "the banner of victory may always be raised", whereas, in Q2: 8a, he emphasizes that "the banner has always been unfurled" which has a greater impact in the context of praising the prince.

6. In Q1: 10, Jazīrī wishes that Jazīra, the capital city of the Botān or Jazīra Principality, would be the capital of the seven climes and that the prince would rule like Alexander and the Chinese Emperor:

> *Mā Jazīrē šubhi dār-ē taxt-i haft ʾiqlīm-i bit*
> *Ham bi ḥukm ū salṭanat Askandar ū Faġfūr-i bī*
>
> May Jazīra be the capital of the seven Climes,
> And by your command and power you will be Alexander and the Chinese Emperor.

This wish is obviously no more than a poetic and unrealistic dream, since ruling the seven climes was impossible even for the most powerful kings and emperors of the time. In Q2, Jazīrī develops and modifies the idea. If in Q1: 10, he wishes for his prince to be "like" Alexander and the Chinese emperor, while in Q2: 9–10, his hopes are almost the same, but he expresses them in a more literary and aesthetic language:

> *Nay tinē Tabrīz u Kurdistān libar ḥukm-ē ta bin*
> *Ṣad wekī šāh-ē Xurāsānē di farwār-ē ta bī*
>
> *Garči dar ʾiqlīm-i rābiʿ hātī taxt-ē salṭanat*
> *Padišāh-ē ḥafti ʾiqlīmān salāmkār-ē ta bī*
>
> May not only *Tabrīz* and Kurdistan be under your rule,
> But also hundreds like the Shāh of *Xurāsān* be in your guesthouse!
>
> Though you ascended the throne of the sultanate in the fourth clime,
> May the kings of the seven climes salute you!

7. Jazīrī devotes the last five *bayt*s of the first panegyric, Q1: 19–23, to himself and his position as a poet and a Sufi within the framework or hierarchy of the state, headed by the Prince of Jazīra. Jazīrī is in the court, but he describes himself as being as small as an ant. He devotes the whole segment, five *bayt*s, to declaring his loyalty to the prince.

   In Q2, however, he devotes only one *bayt*, 22, to expressing his desire to be in the service of the prince:

> *Qast u dāx^{w}āz-ā Malē dāʾim ži jān ū dil av-a*
> *Har di band-ā xizmatē, pēšdast-i dīdār-ē ta bī*

The *Malā*'s intention and desire from the bottom of his soul and heart is always
To be in the chains of your service, to be in your sight! (22)

The reduction in the number of *bayt*s devoted to demonstrating his service in Q2, should not be interpreted as a sign of Jazīrī's reduced loyalty towards the prince. Rather it seems to indicate his desire to stress his integrity as a Sufi and a poet. The poet begins his poem by addressing the prince as "*Šahinšāh*", King of Kings:

Ay Šahinsāh-ē muʿaẓẓam Ḥaq nigahdār-ē ta bī

O, glorious King of Kings! May God be your protector.

The only pronoun used throughout the poem to address the prince is *ta* (2nd singular, oblique case), which is used forty times. The reason why this pronoun is used so often is that it constitutes a part of the rhyme (*qāfiya*) of the poem, which is (*-ar-ē ta*). It is therefore used 23 times as a rhyme word and 17 times in other places.

The use of metaphors based upon celestial bodies or *Qurʾān*ic *Sūra*s and verses is also one of the similar aspects in the two poems.

The conclusion one comes to after comparing between Jazīrī's two panegyric poems is that the poet was well aware of the importance of using the proper word or term that would enhance his texts. There may be various reasons why he modified and changed his first text, Q1, but there can be no doubt that the poet's aesthetic, structural, thematic and linguistic standards are at the forefront of these reasons.

Qaṣīda 3: By mistake

In Kurdish (transcribed)

1. *May nanošī Šēx-i Ṣanʿānē ġalaṭ*
   Aw načū nēv Armanistanē ġalaṭ

2. *Miṯl-i Mūsā wī tajallā-yā ta dī*
   ʾĒ tu dī kānē xaṭā, hānē ġalaṭ?

3. *Wī nadī bažn-ā ta (w)ū dāyē qiyās*
   Ḥikmatē law čūya burhānē ġalaṭ

4. *Saṭwat-ā Laylē yaqīn Majnūn tapānd*
   Warna Qays nākat biyābanē ġalaṭ

5. *Wak Nišānī naqš u nīšānak ta dī*
   ʾĒ ku nīšānak ta dī kanē ġalaṭ?

6. *Az gihām āv-ā ḥayātē xaf ži dil*
   Xuḍr-i vājī čūya ḥaywānē ġalaṭ

7. *Šahnišīnēn nāzikān ḍāyiʿ makin*
   Dā nabīnī dil bi vē xānē ġalaṭ

8. *Allah Allāh čarx u dolāb-ē dinē*
   Nuqṭa qaṭ nākit di dawrānē ġalaṭ

9. *Rūz u šab har sayr-ē dīdār-ā ta tēn*
   Nākirin aw dawr u sayrānē ġalaṭ

10. *Hūn nabēn maššāṭayē xaf dāniya*
    Ham-qirān kir xāl u nīšānē ġalaṭ

11. *Dē bi sar jān-ē ma, murwat, dāmaʾēx*
    Biškuwēn band-ā girībānē ġalaṭ

12. *Sar nabī bar kufr-i zulfē, ʿāqibat*
    Az ditirsim lē ži īmānē ġalaṭ

13. *Pahni-yā vē čarx u dolāb-ē dinē*
    Nisbat-ā arbāb-i ʿirfānē ġalaṭ

14. *Nusxa-yē ʿālam hamī ʿinwānaka*
    Nuqṭayak nābit di ʿinwānē ġalaṭ

15. *Qulzum ū bāyēn muxālif tē purin*
    Da nakalšēn dār-i sukkānē ġalaṭ

16. *Dā bizānī pahlawānī, mūyakī*
    Dast nadī lillāhi mīzānē ġalaṭ

17. *Wē di dastē min gul-ā gaš, pur xunāv*
    Ḥayfì bulbul čū gulistānē ġalaṭ

18. *Hēži sahw-ā xāmayē bū, warna min*
    Av ġalaṭ nākir di dīwānē ġalaṭ

19. *Wē lisar bažn-ā ta av saywān vadā*
    Warna nādā rož-i saywānē ġalaṭ

20. *Gah dil ū gah jān dibin Turkēn ta tēn*
Nākirin yaġmā (w)u tālānē ġalaṭ

21. *Mašrab-ē Turkān Furāt ū Nīl-i kir*
Tašna-lab čū ṭarfi ʿUmmānē ġalaṭ

22. *Pīr-i ḥikmat-bīn li wifq-ā mašrabān*
Kas nadī may rēhta finjānē ġalaṭ

23. *Rāsta yak qānūn sarasar nīna tē*
Xwahri (y)ū pēčēn parīšānē ġalaṭ

24. *Pāk-i ṭabʿū quwwatak mawzūn divēt*
Dā nadit ṣanʿat bi idmānē ġalaṭ

25. *Mardumēn čahvēn Malē ʿaks-ā xwa dī*
Wak Nišānī ma li nīšānē ġalaṭ. (ZdJ: 327–339)

fāʿilātun/ fāʿilātun/ fāʿilun
– v – –/ – v – –/– v –
Ramal-i musaddas-i maḥḏūf (*maqṣūr*)

In English translation

A

The Ṣanʿānī Sheikh did not drink wine by mistake,
He did not go to Armenia by mistake; (1)

Like Moses, he saw Your manifestation,
What is the sin of the one who saw You, what is his mistake? (2)

Anyone who has not seen Your stature but uses analogy to understand it
Has lost his wisdom because of this – a proof of his mistake. (3)

It was certainly Laylā's power that caused the *Majnūn* to collapse,
Otherwise, Qays would not have wandered arround in the desert by mistake. (4)

Like *Nišānī*, he saw a picture and a sign of You
Did he who saw a sign of You make a mistake? (5)

I reached the water of life secretly in my heart,
While *Xiḍr* came to the water of immortality by mistake. (6)

B

Do not lose the regal balconies of the elegant
Lest you accidentally find your heart in this caravanserai. (7)

C

O God, how wonderful! The celestial sphere of the world,
Does not make a mistake in its revolving even by a point. (8)

Day and night always, come to behold Your sight
In their revolving and turning, they make no mistake. (9)

D

Do not say that the bride's dresser secretly arranged it,
Associating the mole and the mark by mistake. (10)

Be generous to our souls, do not fasten
The buttons of the collar by mistake. (11)

If you do not at last bow your head before the pagan splendour of the curl,
I fear that your faith is in error and mistaken. (12)

The width of the celestial sphere of the world
According to the masters of gnosis, is a mistake. (13)

All the books in the world have just one title;
There cannot be a single dot in the title by mistake. (14)

The sea and its headwinds are abundant
Take care that the wood of the rudder does not crack by mistake. (15)

You should know that you are a tightrope walker
For God's sake, do not move the balance by a hair's breadth by mistake. (16)

The fresh rose full of dew is in my hand;
What a pity the nightingale went to the rose garden by mistake. (17)

This was, after all, a mistake of the pen, otherwise
I would not have included this 'mistake' in the *dīwān* by mistake. (18)

The sun has opened this shadow over your stature,
For it would not have opened a shadow by mistake. (19)

When the Turks come, sometimes they steal one's heart, sometimes one's soul;
They do not seize spoils or plunder by mistake. (20)

The Euphrates and the Nile were the Turks' drinking places;
The thirsty went towards the Indian Ocean by mistake. (21)

The wise elder, who knows various tastes,
Has not been seen by anyone pouring wine into cups by mistake. (22)

It is true that no all-embracing law exists;
The meanness and disobedience of perplexity is a mistake. (23)

A pure nature and a balanced strength are required,
Lest by addiction the art makes a mistake. (24)

The pupil of *Malā*'s eye saw its own image;
As for the true object of vision, it was, like *Nišānī*, a mistake! (25)

The *qaṣīda* consists of 25 *bayt*s. This is one of Jazīrī's poems that can be described as "theoretical" poems, in the sense that he devotes an entire poem to discussing an issue that is an important part of his system ofthought, which is Sufism. Actually, the poet does not discuss the subject, but he presents proofs and evidence to support a statement that he already treats as a reality in the first hemistich of the first *bayt*. Structurally and thematically, the poem can be divided into four segments as follows:

A (*bayt*s 1–6): The addressee is God. The poet presents a theoretical statement that dominates the whole poem.

B (*bayt* 7): The addressee is the reader or the listener. The start of a series of arguments.

C (*bayt*s 8–9): The addressee is God. A new argument is presented.

D (*bayt*s 10–25): The addressee is the reader or the listener. Several arguments are presented. The poet indirectly refers to his own experience.

Segment A

The poem begins with a statement based on the story of the Sheikh of Ṣanʿān. It is a widely known account in Islamic culture, narrated by ʿAṭṭār in his book *Manṭiq al-Ṭayr* (The language of the birds). The Kurdish poet Faqī-yē Ṭayrān

also devoted a long poem to the same story. Ahmad-ē Xānī refers to the story in his epos *Mam u Zīn*.

The main idea of in the poem is that nothing in human life and nothing in the universe happens by mistake. Everything is planned and already decided by God. There are many phenomena and events for which people have no explanation, and some of them outwardly appear to be contradictory. The idea is repeated in the poem from the beginning to the end, and therefore the main rhyme is *ġalaṭ* (mistake), which is presented to explain or justify the statement to which each *bayt* is devoted. It seems to originate from the *Qurʾān*ic verse (IX: 51): 'Say: Naught shall visit us but what God has prescribed for us; He is our Protector; in God let the believers put all their trust.'

There is another idea in the poem, also familiar to Sufis, namely that *majāzī* (metaphorical or earthly) love is a step towards *Haqīqī* (Real) love. This is not completely dominant, however. It is used in some of the *bayt*s.

The segment consists of six *bayt*s (1–6) and two subdivisions of three *bayt*s (I, 1–3 and II, 4–6) each. In the first *bayt* of each subdivision, a statement is presented; the Ṣanʿānī Sheikh did not drink wine by mistake and Laylā's power caused *Majnūn* to collapse. In both cases the addressee is not identified, but in the *bayt*s that follow, each statement (2 and 5), which also contain a statement, it becomes clear that the addressee is God. The poet points to Him and asserts that the persons in the statements, the Sheikh of Ṣanʿān, Moses, *Majnūn* and Jazīrī himself, were not mistaken, since they saw Your manifestation or a sign of You. The two subdivisions are quite similar in their structure, arrangement, and the words used in them. This can be shown as follows:

Subdivision I
1a: The Sheikh of Ṣanʿān did not drink wine by mistake
1b: He did not go to Armenia by mistake
2a: Like (*miṯl-ē*) Moses, he saw Your manifestation
2b: What is the mistake of the one who saw You?
3a-b: An independent *bayt*

Subdivision II
4a: Laylā's power, caused *Majnūn* to collapse
4b: He did not go to the desert by mistake
5a: Like (*wak*) *Nišānī*, he saw a picture and a sign of You
5b: What is the mistake of one who has seen a sign of You?
6a-b: An independent *bayt*

The similarity between the two subdivisions is striking in many respects, but it is also significant that the poet is quite aware of the peculiarities of the two examples presented in the *bayt*s 1 and 2 of subdivision I and *bayt*s 4 and 5 of subdivision II. In the first *bayt* of Subdivision I, the Ṣanʿāni Sheikh is presented and his mistakes are confirmed; he drank wine and went to Armenia,

which was the starting point of his committing many mistakes. The poet defends the Sheikh and justifies his mistakes by comparing him to (like: *miṯl*) Moses who saw the manifestation of God.

The second subdivision is devoted to *Majnūn* (the madman whose real name was Qays), who collapsed from Layla's power, which was love, and wandered about in the desert. The difference between the Ṣanʿānī Sheikh and *Majnūn* is that *Majnūn* did not make a mistake. The poet compares him to (like: *wak*) *Nišānī*, i.e. the poet Jazīrī himself. He tells us indirectly that he also collapsed from the power of love, when he saw an image and a sign of God. He openly indicates that he reached the reality in the heart that was the result of seeing an image and a sign of God.

Artistically, segment B does not add too much value to the poem. It does not even serve as a transitional *bayt* to prepare the reader for the large number of similar statements that make up the theme of the following eighteen *bayt*s.

Segment C could indeed be a part of segment D and serve as an introduction to it. The only reason why it is regarded as an independent part is that the addressee there is God, according to the first hemistich of the ninth *bayt*, which reads:

> Day and night always, come to behold Your sight

At the beginning of this segment, the central thought of the *qaṣīda* is presented clearly and in a simple language, that does not need any explanation:

> O God, how wonderful! The celestial sphere of the world,
> Does not make a mistake in its revolving even by a point, (8)

In segment D, Jazīrī gathers several statements couched in poetic metaphors that vary greatly in beauty, logical strength and eloquence. The statements are almost identical in defining and affirming the central thought of the *qaṣīda*; things and events are already planned and decided by God and nothing happens by accident, although it sometimes happens that some phenomena seem outwardly inconsistent.

However, there are inequalities and divergences in the illustration and presentation of the statements. As a reader, I think the two most beautiful *bayt*s in segment D are the following:

> All the books in the world have just one title;
> There cannot be a single dot in the title by mistake (14)

> The wise elder, who knows various tastes,
> Has not been seen by anyone pouring wine into cups by mistake. (22)

In the first *bayt*, "book" is a symbol of knowledge and sciences. All branches of science and knowledge in the world are the same thing, have the same title, and bear the same message. It is impossible to find a single point that can be wrong in these sciences. Every science and every piece of knowledge represents the One Reality that is God. This is an expression of the principle of *Waḥda* and *Kaṯra* "The One and the Many", which Affifi (1979: 10) explains as follows:

The Reality we view from two different angles, now calling it *Ḥaqq* (the Real) when we regard it as the Essence of all phenomena; and now *Khalq* when we regard it as the phenomena manifesting that Essence. *Ḥaqq* and *Khalq*: Reality and Appearance; the One and the Many are only names for two subjective aspects of One reality; it is a real unity but empirical diversity.

The wise elder, in the second *bayt*, is "the spiritual guide" who brings up, teaches and instructs his disciples and novices, and the wine he pours in their cups is The Divine Love or the *Maʿrifa* (gnosis) he imparts to them. He knows his disciples very well and is clearly aware of their capacities, capabilities and tastes. He pours different amounts of wine in their cups. Outwardly this seems unfair, but the poet tells us, "The wise elder has not been seen by anyone pouring wine into the cups by mistake."

Given the similarity of most of the metaphors, which derive from a single principle to which the *qaṣīda* is entirely devoted, the poem could be described as monothematic and monostructural.

6.5. A Horizontal Reading of Jazīrī's Poetry (Selected *Bayt*s)

The focus of this part of the chapter will also be on aesthetic aspects of Jazīrī's poetry, although the texts will be read from a horizontal point of view. In the previous pages, six poems, three *ġazal*s and three *qaṣīda*s, were mainly discussed and analysed structurally and thematically, and to some extent linguistically. The reading was from a vertical perspective, by which I mean that each poem was read and analysed from beginning to end. The poem was discussed as a unified structure and as an independent entity. Different aesthetic aspects in the poems were seen as contributing sections that constructed and strengthened the cohesion of the poem. These aesthetic aspects are indispensable parts, without which the artistic unity of the poem would be imperfect and even harmed.

Apparently, many poets in different cultures and languages have used an artistic device called 'ring composition' which manifests the unity of the text, often a poem, by the means of symmetry. The symmetrical aspects, be they similarities in language, structure or theme, can be observed at the beginning and the end of a poem, or even in one of its segments. Jazīrī, as described earlier, was aware of the ring composition as an artistic scheme and used it in most of his poems, whether they were *qaṣīda*s or *ġazal*s.

Reading a selected *bayt* or selected *bayt*s horizontally implies dealing with entities that are separate from, and therefore smaller than, a *ġazal* or a *qaṣīda*. This does not mean that these fragments are less important or devoid of aesthetic qualities. On the contrary, in many cases, the artistic value of a single *bayt* can be better deciphered and perceived when it is taken out of the context of an average poem. It is almost impossible to think that all the verses of a poem are beautiful and possess admirable aesthetic qualities.

It may not be relevant to speak of the scheme of ring composition in a single *bayt* or a few *bayt*s that are detached from a poem, in which the device of ring composition has a great artistic significance. However, the other standards discussed in the context of the vertical reading of the poems will also be used, in this reading.

In addition to the artistic standards used in the analysis of the poems, there is another dimension in these *bayt*s that gives them further beauty and strength, namely the ideas that express the Sufi thought of the poet. There are certainly similar expressions in most of the poems, but what makes the difference is that in many *ġazal*s and *qaṣīda*s, such expressions are spread over more than one single *bayt*, whereas in some of the examples chosen in this part they are concentrated in one *bayt*. A striking example in this regard is the use of paradoxical thoughts in the metaphor. It often happens that the reader expects to read a sentence that is logically consistent with the previous one, but the poet surprises us with an idea that completely contradicts it. This may not be a contradiction, but rather a difference between two systems of thought, each with its own logic and rules.

In Jazīrī's *Dīwān,* there are numerous examples of such *bayt*s that can be included in this category, but only a few of them will be discussed here. In some cases, more than one *bayt* is chosen from the same poem, because it is thought that they are all worth being studied, or because there is an artistic, usually linguistic, combination that links the *bayt*s together.

The following is an attempt to read a number of selected lines and to review the aesthetic aspects in them, according to my perception:

> *Minnat ži Xudā-yī ku bi ʿabd-ē xwa Malā-yī*
> *Iksīr-ē ġam-ē ʿišq-ē, na dīnār u diram dā*. (ZdJ: 14)
>
> Thanks to God, Who gave His slave *Malā*
> The elixir of love's grief, not *Dīnār* and *Dirhem*.

The first hemistich contains a symmetrical case based on the similarity between the two words *Xudā* (God) and *Malā* (the poet's pen name), since each of them consists of two syllables, the first ending with a short vowel (*u* and *a*) and the second with the same long vowel (*ā*). Moreover, the two names are masculine and are preceded by the homophonous prepositions *ži* (to) and *bi* (to, for), which makes it necessary to conjugate the two names in the oblique

case. This conjugation gives the two words another symmetrical aspect, namely addition of the suffix (*-yī*) to each.

The correlation between the words God and slave in the same hemistich is of a special kind. They are neither symmetrical nor paradoxical, but it is obvious that the combination between them, for a believer and a Sufi, is inevitable, which makes the relationship closer to a thematic one.

The significance of the second hemistich only becomes clear when the first hemistich is read again. A slave thanks his God, who has deprived him of a happy material life, but has given him sadness and grief. God granted His slave *Malā* (Jazīrī) love's grief which is worthy as an elixir, and deprived him of money (*Dīnār* and *Dirhem*), the first of gold and the second of silver. The idea in the metaphor, which is not expressed directly, but is tacitly understood, is that the Sufi is ready for hardship in life and does not care about its material values. He longs for the day when he will meet his divine beloved. Homerin (1998: 220) writes:

> "For the mystic, life on earth is not only a moral trial; it is also an excruciating exile from the divine beloved. Thus, the devotee waits for death and the last day, desiring a reunion with God and the beatific vision. But until that time, the mystic must willingly accept the divine will and constantly recollect (*dhikr*) the day of the covenant and God's loving presence within the human heart (*qalb/sirr*)".

This idea is found in other poems of Jazīrī.

> *Ži har bēdāġ u bēdardī mapirsin miḥnata-ā ʿišq-ē*
> *Či zānin bēxabar žān-ā dil-ē dāġ ū kasar tēdā*? (ZdJ: 37)
>
> Ask not those who have not been cauterized (by the branding iron)
> And those without grief, about the affliction of love!
> What do they, the ignorant, know about the pain of a heart
> Full of sorrow and grief?

In a way, this verse is thematically related to the previous one in which the poet mentioned the grief of love. In this verse, he wants us to know that only those who suffer from the affliction of love can understand how serious and painful it is to have such grief in the heart. In this *bayt*, Jazīrī uses six words associated with sorrow, three in each hemistich, namely *dāġ* (sorrow, used twice, once in each hemistich), *dard* (grief), *miḥnat* (affliction), *žān* (pain), and *kasar* (depression). To understand the sorrow and pain that the lovers conceal in their hearts, the poet says, one must have had a similar experience. The poet Al-Ablah al-Baġdādī (d. 597 AH/1183 CE) uses a similar idea in one of his poems:

Lā yaʿrif uš-šawqa illā man yukābiduhu
Wa lā'ṣ-ṣabābata illā man yuʿānīhā

No one knows yearning, except the one who endures it,
And no one knows ardent love, except the one who suffers it.

Xidmat-ā Pīr-ē Muġān dē kit kasē maqṣūda may
Šīša wu jam-ā zujajē ʾē divēt dē rat Ḥalab. (ZdJ: 75)

He, whose intention/target is wine, will serve the tavern keeper.
The one who wants a glass bowl and a goblet will go to Aleppo.

This is one of three *bayt*s in a poem that are almost identical in content. Jazīrī elucidates a Sufi principle accepted by virtually all Sufis, namely that a Sufi wayfarer (*sālik*), whose aim is to enjoy divine love and to arrive at new stations on the path, must experience hard training by a perfect spiritual guide.

Although the metaphor in the first hemistich seems controversial to be used in a Sufi context, this is a tradition followed by all Sufi poets. Wine, tavern and tavern keeper are classic symbols for divine love, a disciple and a spiritual guide. The two important symbols in the second hemistich are the glass, as a substance representing transparency, and the city of Aleppo, as a geographical dimension that was thought to be distant and difficult to reach at the time of the poet.

ʿĀrif ḥatā nanošī, ži dast-ē mayfirošī
Ġāʾib nabū ži hošī, paydā nakir wilāyat. (ZdJ: 138)

Mīrī yu pādišāyī, mūyak li nik Malāyī
Nādim bi mulk-ē ʿālam yak ḏarrayak ʿināyat (ZdJ: 141)

As long as the gnostic did not drink (wine)
From the hands of the wine seller (cupbearer)
He did not lose his consciousness,
Did not earn sainthood.

To be a ruler or an emperor, is
Only worth a single hair to *Malā*
I do not sell one mote of (divine) providence
For the wealth of the world.

ʿĀrif means one who is endowed with intuitive *maʿrifa* (knowledge) of God and denotes a mystic or Sufi. The metaphor is based on the idea that a disciple should be taught and trained by a perfect spiritual guide (*muršid*) in order to attain higher spiritual stations. One of the most important stations is *wilāyat*, sainthood or friendship with God. Once the Sufi tastes the divine love and

loses his human consciousness, he achieves the station of *fanāʾ* (annihilation) and consequently the station of *baqāʾ* (abiding in God).

The idea focuses on a comparison between material life, especially being in power, and divine love, which Jazīrī repeats in many poems. Here he considers that such positions as being a ruler, a prince, or an emperor are as worthless to him as a single hair. Moreover, he is not prepared to exchange even a mote of divine providence for the wealth and treasure of the world.

In many of his poems Jazīrī not only uses rhyming words at the end of every second hemistich, but also provides the two halves of the first hemistich (a) and the first half of the second hemistich (b) with a new rhyme word, and in the second half of the second hemistich the main rhyme word of the whole poem is repeated.

A common structure of a poem is as follows:

– – – – a
– – – – a
– – – – b
– – – – a
– – – – c
– – – – a

Jazīrī uses another technique in some of his *qasidas*. In the first *bayt* he uses a special pattern in this way:

– – s – – a
– – s – – a

This is not repeated in the *bayt*s that follow. Instead, he continues to use the main rhyme of the *qasida* in the fourth foot of the second hemistich, which is the second foot of the second half of the second hemistich, while he uses a new rhyme, an internal rhyme, in the second foot and the fourth foot of the first hemistich and the second foot of the second hemistich

– – b – – b
– – b – – a
– – c – – c
– – c – – a

In the first *bayt*, the rhyming is as follows:

– – *ošī* – – *ošī*
– – *ošī* – – *āyat*

The two feet of the first hemistich in the second *bayt* are also in monorhyme, ending with *-āyī*, and in the second hemistich the general rhyme of the poem is repeated. In addition to an extra musical harmony created by the similarity of the rhymes of three of the four feet, another concord is added by the use of four words beginning with 'm' and two word ending with 'm' as well.

Bi dīnār-ē dinē zinhār, da yār-ē xwe tu nafrošī
Kasē Yūsuf firotī wī di ʿālam-dā xasārat kir. (ZdJ: 242)

Beware! Do not sell your beloved for the money (*dīnar*) of this world
The one who sold Yousuf, he suffered a loss in this world.

Once again, the poet brings up the question of the absurdity of material life and the worthlessness of money compared to the beloved. He refers to the story of Yūsuf (Joseph) and the travellers who sold him in Egypt. The story is narrated in detail in the *Qurʾān*, and the verse to which Jazīrī refers reads as follows (XII: 20), "Then they sold him for a paltry price, a handful of counted dirhams; for they set small store by him".

The words *Dīnār*, *zinhār*, and *yār* in the first hemistich have similar endings, *-ār*. In order not to repeat a word in the two hemistichs, the poet uses the word *dinya* (the world) in the first hemistich and its synonym *ʿālam* in the second.

Dil yak-a, dē ʿišq-i yak bit, ʿāšiqān yak yār-i bas
Qibla dē yak bit, qulūbān dilbarak dildār-i bas. (ZdJ: 286)

The heart is one, (and) love must be one,
For lovers, one beloved is enough.
The *qibla* (prayer niche?) must be one,
For hearts, one heart-ravishing beloved is enough.

In the first hemistich, Jazīrī's starting point is the physical fact that a human being has only one heart. He moves from this principle to another one, which is what he believes to be correct and rational: love must be one. He continues in his argument and derives another idea, which is a logical conclusion from the previous two idea. His advice is that it is enough for a lover to have only one beloved.

Examining Jazīrī's way of discussing the issue, we find that his movement towards expressing his thought consists of three fragments, as seen here:

a. A physical fact that is accepted by almost everyone.
b. A rule in the form of a suggestion based on the previous principle, and
c. A piece of advice that is closer to a recommendation.

The first idea is actually mentioned in the *Qurʾān* (XXXIII: 4) in these words "God has not assigned to any man two hearts within his breast". Obviously, all religions and almost all people believe that the heart is the centre of human feelings. This is even more emphasized with regard to love between men and women. Of course, we still do not know whether the centre of human feelings, especially love, is the heart or the mind.

Jazīrī devotes the second hemistich to his religious and Sufi ideas asserting that one must worship only one God, and consequently, for those who have hearts, that is those who can think, one beloved is enough.

It is of particular interest to note that Jazīrī elucidates in a single verse such an essential philosophical and religious issue as love and worship without resorting to any philosophical or religious texts. His approach to the question is that of a Sufi, whose thoughts are centred on love.

From a linguistic point of view, it can be seen that out of eighteen words, the total number of the words in the verse, eight pertain to the subject of love, four in the first hemistich (*dil, ʿišq, ʿāšiqān* and *yār)* and four in the second (*qibla, qulūbān, dilbarak* and *dildār*). He also uses the word one (*yak*) five times, four times in the form of the number (*yak*) and once using the indefinite singular form (*dilbarak*), meaning 'one heart-ravishing beloved'. The poet is careful not to repeat the words, so in the second hemistich he uses a synonym for three words used in the first hemistich in the following way: *dil:qulūb, ʿāšiq:dildār* and *yār:dilbar*. The word *ʿišq* in the first hemistich corresponds to the word *qibla* in the second. Obviously, these two words do not have common roots, but it cannot be excluded that Jazīrī wants to let us know that for him worship is the same as love, or *vice versa*.

> *Dil Kaʿba-ya, Mawlā-ya lē, nār-ē Kalīm īsā-ya lē*
> *Bāng-ē Anāʾllāh dāya lē, ham Kaʿba wu ham Ṭūr-a dil* (ZdJ: 410)
>
> The heart is *Kaʿba*, the Lord is there,
> Moses' fire is lit there,
> The call of 'I am God' is proclaimed there.
> The Heart is both *Kaʿba* and Mount Sinai.

The heart is a central concept in Sufi literature, and therefore most Sufi orders, for example the Naqšbandī order, assert the importance of habituating the heart to remembering God as one of the first exercises a novice must follow. The verse consists of four sentences, the first three of which indicate Jazīrī's belief that the heart is the centre where God is found and, that God places His truth in the hearts of those who seek to find Him.

A *qudsī* (extra-*Qurʾān*ic) tradition says, "The heart of the believer is the Throne of the All-Merciful". This is what the poet illustrates at the beginning of the verse, but he adds another dimension to what the tradition says, namely that the heart is *Kaʿba* and that it is the house where God is. The second and

third sentences refer to the story of Moses observing a fire on Mount Sinai and God speaking to him. This is mentioned in at least three chapters of the *Qurʾān*. In the *Ant* chapter (XXVII: 9-10) it is said, "Moses, behold, it is I, God the All-mighty, the All-wise". Jazīrī quotes the *Qurʾān*ic text *innahu anā Allāh* (it is I, God). In the last sentence, Jazīrī summarizes his message, "The Heart is both *Kaʿba* and Mount Sinai".

Since the subject of the verse is the heart, it begins and ends with the word heart (*dil*). The second and fourth feet (*rukn*) of the first hemistich and the second foot of the second hemistich are monorhymed and end with *-āya lē*, and the common rhyme of the whole poem is *-ūr-a dil*. This pattern is used throughout the poem.

> *Malā har wī bibīn, har wī, agar har wī dināsī tū*
> [*Huwa ʻl-maʿbūd, Huwa ʻl-mašhūdu, bal lā ġayra fī' d-dārayn*]
> (ZdJ: 445)
>
> Behold only Him, O, *Malā*, only Him, if you know only Him!
> He is the Worshipped and the Witnessed,
> Nay, there is no one else in the two houses.

The theme of this verse, as well as the entire *ġazal* of which it is the last *bayt*, is the essence of Ibn ʿArabī's doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* (The unity of being). Ibn ʿArabī holds that there is nothing in existence except God, for He is the Real Existence and the Absolute Existence. His Existence is eternal and everlasting. He is the whole of existence and there is nothing in existence apart from Him. These thoughts are discussed in detail in chapter 5 of this work.

Affifi (1979: 10) explaining this aspect of Ibn ʿArabī's theory writes:

> According to Ibnul ʻArabī there is only One Reality in existence. This Reality we view from two different angles, now calling it *Haqq* (the Real) when we regard it as the Essence of all phenomena; and now *khalq* when we regard it as the phenomena manifesting that Essence. *Haqq* and *khalq*; Reality and Appearance; the One and the Many are only names for two subjective aspects of One Reality; it is a real unity but empirical diversity. This Reality is God.

Jazīrī, does not discuss any theoretical ideas in this *bayt*, but he is content to present a conclusion in very simple words and with an unquestionable expression that illustrates his contentment.

The poem consists of seven *bayt*s, the first hemistich in four of which (the second, third, fifth and seventh) are in Kurdish and the second hemistich in Arabic. The other three *bayt*s, are entirely in Kurdish.

In addition to the content, the potency of the verse comes from the musical concordance with the poet's view regarding God's being as the only reality and existence, that is repeated in the end of the first three feet of the first hemistich, namely *har wī* (only him), as *-har wī*, *-har wī*, *-har wī, -tu*. In the second hemistich, which is in Arabic, the first two feet are not only monorhymed, but are almost identical, the difference between them being only two letters *Huwa ʻl-maʿbūd, Huwa ʻl-mašhūd*.

> *Ta divē barq u biruskān birašīnī, tu naẓar ka*
> *Ta divē rožē xuyā bit, ži šibāk-ē tu xuyā ba*
> *Ta divē zīr u zabar kī ma, du zulfān bida bar bā*
> *Ta divē qanjē qiyāmat li ma rābit, bi xwa rā ba*
> *Qaṣdi sarčašmayi ḥaywāni ḥaqīqat ka Nišānī*
> *Bi jihān-ē maba maġrūr, ku jihān ʿaynī sarāb-a*. (ZdJ: 519–520–521)
>
> If You want to strike us with lightning and thunder,
> just look at us (in anger)!
> If you want the sun to shine, show yourself from the window!
> If you want to turn us upside down,
> Spread your two ringlets in the air!
> If you want the resurrection to really
> Happen to us, stand up yourself!
> Go to Reality's fountain of life, O *Nišānī*!
> Do not be arrogant towards the world,
> For the world is indeed a mirage.

These three *bayt*s are selected from a long *qaṣīda* consisting of 27 *bayt*s. In that poem, Jazīrī distributes his words and thoughts among three addressees. First, he speaks with God and asks Him to remove the veils and curtains that hide Him and to show Himself to those who love Him. A second addressee consists of the lovers to whom the poet presents his thoughts for consideration, and the third addressee is the poet himself. The boudary between the second and third addressees is not quite clear, since the poet himself is also one of the lovers. In this poem, as in many other Sufi poems, God is addressed as if the poet were speaking to a human being, although the language is somewhat neutral, which does not allow us to decide whether He is represented as a woman or a man. According to some of the editors of Jazīrī's *Dīwān*, especially Zivingī and Doskī, the addressee is a woman. This impression is based on some of the metaphors, in which words such as *lab-i laʿl* (a ruby lip), *Xāl* (mole), and *Zulf* (curl) are employed.

In the first *bayt*, he asks God to show Himself in whatever form or attitude He wants. The lovers know that if God looks at them in anger, then it is like striking them with lightning and thunder, but if He shows Himself in a friendly

form, then it is like a sunshine. In both cases, they are contented. Schimmel (1975: 125) writes that "gratitude is divided into different ranks: gratitude for the gift, gratitude for not giving, and gratitude for the capacity to be grateful. […] the Sufi should give thanks even if his wish is not fulfilled or a hope is withheld". In the second *bayt*, the two alternatives are of the kind that Schimmel calls a wish not fulfilled and a hope that is withheld.

The poet devotes the third *bayt* to advising himself to find the fountain of Reality, which is love, and which can help the lover to understand life. He further advises himself not to be arrogant and deceived by the world, because the world, the material world, is worthless and resembles a mirage. For a thirsty person, a mirage is seen as water from a distance, but when he arrives at it, he finds nothing. This metaphor is borrowed from the *Qurʾān* (XXIV: 39) which says: "And as for the unbelievers, their works are as a mirage in a spacious plain which the man athirst supposes to be water, till, when he comes to it, he finds it is nothing."

Sajda bin bar ta rawā-ya di hamī maḏhab u dīnān
Kī dibit mušrik u kāfir ži wē šīrīn-ē fam-ē?
Gar bibim bar Ta sujūd-ē di dam-ā kašf u šuhūd-ē
Mi li dil dē bidirit partaw-ē nūr-ā qidam-ē
Mūyak-ī az ži ta nādim bi dusad Zīn u Širīnān
Či dibit gar tu ḥisēb kī ma bi Farhād u Mamē. (ZdJ: 685–686)

Prostration before You is legal in all faiths and religions.
Who will become a polytheist or an infidel because of that sweet-mouthed one?
If I prostrate before You at the time of revelation and contemplation
The ray of the light of Eternity will radiate in my heart.
I would not sell a single hair of yours for two hundred Zīn and Šīrīn.
What happens if you regard me (us) as a Farhād or Mam?

In this section of the poem, Jazīrī does not follow the usual pattern of posing a question to his addressee and expecting an answer. He begins with a statement that expresses of a firm belief. In the following hemistich, he asks a question, as if he wants us, but also his addressee, i.e. God, to know that what he said in the preceding hemistich is beyond any doubt.

No one would question the poet's prostration if he had openly referred to God. The use of metaphors based entirely on adjectives describing the beauty of a woman, is the reason why he raises such a question open to suspicion, and it is there that Jazīrī's poetic skill is concealed.

There are two grammatical reasons why most of his metaphors and expressions in this poem are interpreted as having been written for a woman. The genitive (*iḍāfa*) construction in northern Kurdish is entirely dependent on the

gender of the noun. A feminine noun takes the suffix *-ā* when used as a possessor and the suffix *-ē* when used as possessed. The poem begins (1a) with calling the addressee *xudān-ā ḥašamē* (the owner of servants and slaves) in which *xudān* (the owner) takes the suffix *-ā*. The form *šīrīn-dahan* (sweet-mouthed) in the first hemistich of *bayt* 3 also ends with *-ā*, which reads:

Pirsiyār-ē li ma jārak bika šīrīn-dahan-ā min

Ask us once, my sweet-mouthed one!

The second case is that the noun following the demonstrative pronoun for the *singular feminine wē (that) also takes the ending -ē. In the second hemistich of the first bayt of the selection, we read:*

Kī dibit mušrik u kāfir ži wē šīrīn-ē fam-ē?

Who will become a polytheist or an infidel because of that sweet-mouthed one?

These two references are present in this and other poems of Jazīrī.

The selection is preceded by ten *bayt*s, in which most of the signals, whether grammatical or metaphorical, indicate that the addressee is a woman. It is only the tenth *bayt*, which immediately precedes these three selected *bayt*s, that contains a warning to be careful not to walk straight into Jazīrī's poetic trap. The tenth *bayt* reads:

Wē majāl-ē ku jamāl-ā xwa tajallā dikirī
Lāzim-a sajda bibīn bar ta di wē gāv u dam-ē (ZdJ: 685)

The moment You manifest Your beauty
It is a duty that we prostrate before You
At the same time (immediately).

The *bayt* contains two signals, one in each hemistich indicating that we have to rethink the poem in order to identify the addressee. In the first hemistich, the word *tajallā* (manifestation, illumination) is used, which is the proper verb to speak about the Divine beauty and is the most relevant word in a Sufi context. The second signal is that the poet regards it a duty for everyone to prostrate before "You–God". He conjugates the verb of prostration as present subjunctive for the first plural, *sajda bibīn* (we must prostrate). Here we find no indication that the addressee is a woman.

In the *bayt* There is a melodious concord in the first hemistich which adds a further musical beauty to the mood. This is created by using the three words *majāl* (time, moment), *jamāl* (beauty) and *tajallā* (manifestation, illumina-

tion), where the two sounds *J* and *L* are repeated. These two letters are essential parts of the words *jamāl* (divine beauty) and *jalāl* (divine majesty), are also important terms in Sufism.

Reading the tenth *bayt*, which immediately precedes the three selected *bayt*s, prepares the reader or listener to comprehend what Jazīrī means. Indeed it is the only means that can facilitate the deciphering of the three *bayt*s. Prostration before God, says Jazīrī, is accepted and legal in all faiths and religions, and no one is accused of being wrong for listening to the words and thoughts communicated by God. Moreover, the poet says that the light of Eternity radiates in his heart when he prostrates before Him (as an addressee called You). Although Jazīrī uses "*Gar*" (if) at the beginning of the sentence, it seems to mean "when", in this context, giving the impression that he is basing his words on experience.

In the third *bayt*, Jazīrī uses a metaphor found in some of his other poems, namely "not selling a single hair" of somebody one loves. This is a metaphorical expression in the Kurdish language, indicating how much the speaker loves and cherishes the one whom he is talking about. Here he would not sell a single hair of his beloved for two hundred beauties like Zīn and Šīrīn, the two most beautiful and celebrated women in Kurdish mythology. In the next hemistich, he earnestly and desperately implores his beloved to regard him as a Farhād or Mam, symbols of sincere lovers who sacrificed themselves for the sake of Šīrīn and Zīn. Their love stories are widely known as mythological tales and literary romances. In this bayt, Jazīrī again addresses his beloved as a woman when he says:

> *Mūyak-ī az ži ta nādim bi dusad Zīn u Širīnān*
> *Či dibit gar tu ḥisēb kī ma bi Farhād u Mamē*. (ZdJ: 686)
>
> I would not sell a single hair of yours for two hundred Zīn and Šīrīn
> What will happen if you regard me (us) as a Farhād or Mam?

The comparison here is between the beloved and two hundred beauties like Zīn and Šīrīn.

The idea of "not selling a single hair" is also used by other Kurdish and non-Kurdish poets. Ḥāfiẓ says:

> *Agarči Dūst bi čīzī namīxarad mārā*
> *Bi ʿālam-ī nafurūšīm mū-yī az sar-i Dūst*. (Ḥāfiẓ, 1370: 44)
>
> Although the Beloved is not prepared to pay anything for us,
> We would not exchange a single hair of the Beloved's head for a world.
>
> *Masti jawr-ā tama bē bāda wu bang*
> *Bē ta jānā li ma ʿālam būya tang*. (ZdJ: 832)

I am intoxicated by your tyranny, without wine and hemp.
Without You, dear one, the world has become narrow for us.

At first glance, the *bayt* seems to contain a kind of contradiction. The poet is intoxicated, not by wine or hemp, but by His tyranny. One often gets intoxicated of one's own accord. Additionally, one can get intoxicated by wine, hemp, or other similar means, but to be intoxicated by tyranny is unbelievable. What can help us understand this is to know that the addressee is God. No one has forced the poet to love God. He has chosen to do so of his own free will. To speak of the tyranny of the beloved is quite ordinary and typical in love poetry.

Poets, who write about being oppressed, ill-treated and even killed by their beloved are usually satisfied and pleased with this situation. Jazīrī, in describing God's love as tyranny, borrows the metaphor from the dictionary of earthly love. At the same time, he provides the key to understanding what he means to say. He is tremendously happy that he is intoxicated, not by wine and hemp, but by the tyranny of the beloved to which he is subjected.

The second hemistich throws more light on the issue, when it describes the beloved as "*jānā*" (Dear, literally: my soul), which Jazīrī uses in many other poems. The hemistich contains another metaphor that seems to have a contradictory meaning. Normally one feels that a place is narrow when there are more people there than it can hold. But, to feel that a place is narrow because someone is absent indicates that we miss that person. Jazīrī feels that this world is narrow without Him and His love. The *bayt* is built on two contrasts; in the first hemistich the words *mast* (intoxicated) and *jawr* (tyranny), and in the second hemistich the words *bē ta* (Without You) and *tang* (narrow) are contradictory.

Bunmēta ḥusnē rangi-rang, nāy u daf u qānūn u čang
Aw ʿišqa vān tīnit bi dang, law wān bi ḥusnē naġma dā. (ZdJ: 855)
Maḥbūb u xūb u dilbarān, bigrī li wān ḥaftē darān
Dē xwa ž šibāk u panjarān ẓāhir bikin d(h)ar ʿardadā.
Aw lāla-yēn ž gul tāzatar, faṣl-ā buhārē bēta sar
Jih jih bi havrā tēna dar, xwaš xwaš di ʿard-ē xāra-dā. (ZdJ: 857)
Lafẓ u ʿibārat jāmaya, maḥbūbi maʿnā bi xwaya
Lē xamlē ḥusnak zēdaya. Lawrā bi ḥusnē zība dā (ZdJ: 858)

The beauty should be manifested in different ways
Like flute, tambourine, dulcimer and harp.
It is love that induces them to sing, and therefore
They produce melodies to tell of beauty.
The loved, the beautiful and the sweethearts,
If you close seventy doors in their faces,
They show themselves, everywhere, from windows and apertures.

Tulips that are fresher than flowers, when spring (season) arrives to them
They come quickly out of the hard and dry soil, here and there.
Words and phrases are garments,
The Beloved Himself is the real meaning,
But embellishing them gives more beauty,
Therefore, He added adornment to the elegance.

These *bayt*s are quoted from Jazīrī's longest *qaṣīda*, which consists of 142 *bayt*s. They deal mainly with Beauty and Love (*ḥusn* and *ḥubb*), which are among the most significant terms and concepts used by Sufi poets. Jazīrī also uses these two words in mystical and philosophical contexts in many of his poems.

Beauty manifests itself in many ways and is found in different contexts. According to Jazīrī, musical instruments express beauty through melodies. In many of his poems, the poet asserts the conceptual relationship between beauty and love. It is love that motivates and causes musical instruments to express the essence of beauty. The poet almost always associates beauty and love with Eternity, when no creatures existed, and combines them as Divine attributes.

At the beginning of this *qaṣīda*, Jazīrī devotes several *bayt*s to the same topic, presenting it as a mystical and philosophical conceptual question. The *qaṣīda* begins in this way:

Allāh saḥargāh-ā azal, yalmūm-ē ʿišqē šuʿla dā
Nūr-ā jamāl-ā lam yazal ḏāt-ē tajallā-yā xwa dā. (ZdJ: 847)

At the dawn of eternity, God (Allāh) kindled the torch of love,
The light of eternal beauty was revealed, (thus) illuminating the Essence. (1)

After only two *bayt*s, Jazīrī resumes the same theme, deliberately attempting to illustrate a time in pre-eternity when God was known only by Himself. The principles of the discussion and the terminology are largely those of Ibn ʿArabī and constitute an important part of of his thought, especially his doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*. The following are three more *bayt*s that extend the idea, employing metaphors that are standard in Jazīrī's poetry:

The Divine beauty and splendour required love,
they united with each other in one essence,
The ancient light turned into love and passion,
together they showed coquetry and compassion. (4)
The love, coming from the eternal light,
lit up the matchless beauty and splendour
Like a torch and a candle, and became a moth
to move around them. (5)

Beauty and love have always existed,
the Real was a lover of Himself,
He did not need any other beauty,
Thus it is narrated and told. (6)

Since love and beauty have Divine sources, it is impossible to hide them or prevent them from manifesting themselves. The poet asserts that even if love and beauty face seventy closed doors, they can still show and illuminate themselves. In this and other poems, Jazīrī illustrates love and lovers as non-material existences, consisting of light or ether (in its archaic sense). This is also consistent with his belief that love is a Divine quintessence.

The following *bayt* is a kind of extension of the second *bayt*. Love and the beloved can be concealed in the heart, so that they remain unseen, like the seeds of flowers or tulip bulbs, but it is impossible for it to be hidden forever. When the circumstances are right, the seeds and bulbs come out of the hard and dry soil and manifest their beauty, freshness and fragrance everywhere. By using the word *lāla* (tulip) in this *bayt*, Jazīrī combines two or three connotations that provide the *bayt* with other dimensions, since *lāla*, in addition to tulip, also means a passionate lover and the lip of a mistress (Steingass, 1947: 1113).

When love is expressed, whether in poetry, music or whatever art, what initially attracts our attention is the external dimension: words, colours, melodies, etc. Certainly, other more important essences are not seen or discovered by everyone. According to Jazīrī and many other Sufis and poets, the real meaning is the Beloved, in whom both Divine love and beauty are united. Words and phrases are incapable of demonstrating this essence because words, or language, are finite, whereas the real essence and the spiritual world are infinite. Rūmī, in the *Maṯnawī*, has a similar idea when he says:

Lafẓ čūn wakr ast u maʿnā ṭāyir ast
Jism jūy u rūḥ āb-i sāyir ast (Rūmī, 1977, p. 356)

The word is like the nest, and the meaning is the bird
The body is the river-bed, and the spirit is the rolling water.
(Translated by R. A. Nicholson in Rūmī, 1926, p. 392)

For Rūmī, the word is like a nest and the meaning is like a bird. The nest is a form and a framework, but the bird is the essence. In the same way, the body is like a stream, while the soul is the flowing water. Šabistarī devotes a section of his *Gulšan-i Rāz* (Garden of Mystery) to the same question. At the beginning of the book, he writes:

maʿānī hargiz andar ḥarf nāyad
Ki baḥr-i Qulzum andar ẓarf nāyad (Shabistarī,1982: 15)

Mystery cannot be compressed into letters
The Red Sea is not contained in a jug
(Translated by E. H. Whinfield, in Shabistarī, 1880: 5)

In the above-mentioned section of the book, Šabistarī says:

Nadārad ʿālam-i maʿnā nihāyat
Kujā bīnad mar-ūrā lafẓ ġāyat
Har ān maʿnā ki šud az ḏawq paydā
Kujā taʿbīr-i lafẓī yābad ūrā (Shabistarī, 1982: 72)

The spiritual world is infinite
How can finite words attain to it?
How can the mysteries beheld in ecstatic vision
Be interpreted by spoken words?
(Translated by E. H. Whinfield, in Shabistarī 1880: 71)

What Jazīrī expresses in the last *bayt* of the selection is indeed an attempt to elucidate the idea that "embellishing words and phrases supplies more beauty", which is the aim of aesthetics, to make the message of the art more effective and more acceptable.

The rhyming system in Jazīrī's longest *qaṣīda*, from which the selection is taken, is also used in some other poems. He uses internal rhymes in all 142 *bayt*s of the *qaṣīda*. Each hemistich consists of two halves, and each half consists of two feet, since the verse metre is *baḥr-i rajaz-i muṯamman-i sālim*. The pattern is as follows:

– – v – / – – v – / – – v – / – – v –
mustafʿilun / mustafʿilun / mustafʿilun / mustafʿilun

The first and second halves of the first hemistich and the first half of the second hemistich are monorhymed, while the second half of the second hemistich has the main rhyme of the poem, which is *-adā*. The pattern can be shown as follows:

–rang –čang
–dang –a dā

–barān –darān
–jarān –dadā

–zatar –ta sar
–na dar –ra-dā

–maya –xwaya
–daya –ba dā

The importance of the poem depends mainly on the great and profound thoughts that are adapted to fit the framework of a *qaṣīda* that is already burdened by strict artistic and technical principles.

Discussing the aesthetic foundations of Arabic literature, von Grunebaum (1952: 324) assigns that:

> the more encouraging view taken by mysticism of man's ability to rise above himself and to articulate his supreme emotion in his own symbols and images may be in part responsible for the continuance of mystical poetry as a growing form of self-expression.

Jazīrī's poems, as is often pointed out in this book, are overwhelmingly Sufi poems, by which the poet "rose above himself and articulated his supreme emotion" to borrow von Grunebaum's words. This strongly suggests that his aesthetic standards were almost the same as those of other Sufi poets, although he certainly employed them according to the peculiarities of his language, his evaluations, and his artistic and spiritual experience.

Conclusions

The present study is the realization of a desire that was born in my mind about forty years ago and the fulfilment of an intention that has been growing ever since, although it lacked a clear form and outline.

Reading and rereading the various editions of Jazīrī's *Dīwān*, especially those with commentaries and annotations, shed enough light upon Jazīrī's life and poetry for me to understand that the topic I was dealing with, as the subject of a doctoral dissertation, is deserving of serious consideration.

Chapter 1 deals with the political, religious and cultural background of Jazīrī and his poetry. In this context, it was important to address the situation of Kurdistan, which lay between two hostile empires, the Safavid and the Ottoman. One result of the Battle of Čaldīrān (August 1514) was the establishment of a number of semi-independent Kurdish principalities, which played a major role in the development of Kurdish culture. The writing of poetry in the Kurdish language was one of the products of these principalities. The reason is obvious; if a Kurdish ruler, Xān or prince, receives various people from his region in his court, and they all speak Kurdish, it is certain that the poets will also praise the ruler in the language spoken there.

Jazīrī mentions the name Kurdistan in four poems, and he refers to Kurdistan as a country – as the land of the Kurds. This shows that he was highly conscious of his nationality and was aware that his country was Kurdistan. This attitude is clearly expressed in one of his panegyrics, in which he wishes that the Kurdish prince would rule many other countries in the world and that the great kings would obey him. It is a clear testimony to his patriotic views in a basic form.

The two main sources on the Kurdish emirates, the *Šarafnāma* and the *Siyāḥatnāma*, give an interesting account of the cultural situation in some of the emirates, such as Bidlīs, Jazīra and Āmēdī (ʿImādiyya). There were many schools, mosques, libraries, students, scholars and poets. At the Sufi gatherings in Diyarbakir, philosophical issues were discussed, including the views of Ibn ʿArabī, whose books were in the library of the Prince of Bidlīs, ʿAbdāl Xān. The educational system was highly developed and efficient. This explains how Jazīrī could be such a great intellectual, familiar with various branches of knowledge, poetry, philosophy, language, grammar, religion, etc.

Chapter 2 discusses Jazīrī's life. Although there have been at least three different opinions about the dates of Jazīrī's birth and death, the evidence suggests that Zivingī was the first scholar to arrive at the correct answer. Different

MSS and editions of Jazīrī's *Dīwān* are also reviewed and evaluated in the chapter. It was clear from the outset that for many reasons Zivingī's (Malā-yē Jazīrī, 1959, 1987) edition is the most reliable, and all quotations of Jazīrī's poetry are from that edition.

Chapters 3 and 4 are devoted to the study of technical aspects of Jazīrī's poetry. In Chapter 3, various poetic forms are presented and the poems are surveyed according to the prosodic system. This was necessary and unavoidable, because the earlier editions of Jazīrī's *Dīwān* did not deal with this subject. This was not done until 2003, when ʿAzīz Gardī published his *Manual of Classical Kurdish Poetry*, in which he reviewed the poetry of 82 classical Kurdish poets including Jazīrī, who composed their poems according to the rules of Arabic-Persian prosody. In 2018, Taḥsīn Doskī published his second edition of Jazīrī's *Dīwān*, which gives the metres of all the poems.

Chapter 4 deals with linguistic aspects of Jazīrī's poetry. Jazīrī is among the first poets who wrote in northern Kurdish, which means that there was no writing tradition for him to follow. He was an avant-gardist in this regard. He nevertheless uses a strong, beautiful and potent language. It is true that he uses many Persian and Arabic words, but his style is Kurdish, and he "Kurdifies" many expressions borrowed from Persian or Arabic.

Although he mainly uses the Kurdish dialect of Jazīra and was probably also familiar with the dialect of Āmēdī, where he supposedly studied, one can observe that he employs a number of verb forms that are not found in the writings of contemporary poets from these regions. As an example of this, one can mention his conjugation of the verb *kirin* "to do", which differs significantly from its use in various dialects. Other examples are his use of the negated imperative, a special form of the negated past imperfect, and of the verb "to have". These forms, especially the latter two, are unknown in the Kurdish dialects and sub-dialects of Jazīra where he mainly lived, or of Āmēdī, where he supposedly studied. In some cases, Jazīrī deviates from the Kurdish genitive form (*iḍāfa*), which is governed by the gender of the noun, and uses the Persian form, which is not affected by gender. There are many other aspects of the language of Jazīrī's poetry that are worthy of study.

Jazīrī is regarded as one of the greatest Sufi poets in the history of Kurdish literature. His poems clearly support this opinion. What scholars and the editors of his *Dīwān* indicate in this regard is graded into three levels: he was a Sufi; he was a Sufi belonging to the Naqšbandī order; and he was a Sufi, a follower of the Naqšbandī order, and an adherent of Ibn ʿArabī's doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd*. It is only Zivingī and Rasūl who proceed to the third stage.

Chapter 5 begins with an overview of the foundations of Jazīrī's system of thought. Pointing out that he was a Naqšbandī Sufi and a follower of Ibn ʿArabī's *Waḥdat al-wujūd* is not enough to give a complete portrait of the poet. It is of great importance to convey the extent to which the principles and foundations of the Naqšbandī order and Ibn ʿArabī's doctrine are represented and

reflected in Jazīrī's poetry. The aesthetic expression of philosophical and spiritual ideas stands in close relation to the understanding, acceptance and adoption of these ideas. It is obvious that Jazīrī was so deeply involved with his Sufi ideas that he devoted almost all of his poetry to expressing his experience.

Parts of the chapter are devoted to surveying the history of Sufism, the relationship between Sufism and poetry, and Sufi poetry in Arabic, Persian and Kurdish literature. In addition, a brief history of the Naqšbandī order and the sacred words of the order is presented. Ibn ʿArabī's doctrine of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* and its principles and concepts are also introduced.

Chapter 6 deals with the aesthetic aspects of Jazīrī's poetry. In the early parts of the chapter, the relationship between aesthetics, poetry and Sufi poetry are studied. In order to show the beauty and the communicative messages of Jazīrī's poems, it was necessary to analyse the texts from structural and thematic points of view.

In this context, I preferred to study the texts from two different perspectives: vertically and horizontally. Six poems are studied vertically, three *ġazal*s and three *qaṣīda*s. A vertical reading of a text means approaching the poem as a unified and whole entity, from beginning to end. Reading in this way, one can bring to light the artistic and aesthetic strategies that the poet follows in writing his texts. The use of many and varied rhyme words demands great precision in choosing harmonious and concordant words, and avoiding repetition as far as possible. All these fine details must be arranged within the sturdy framework of the prosody and rhetoric.

In a horizontal reading, small units are chosen consisting of only a few distiches each. This way of reading reveals how the poet concentrates on different parts of a poem and prepares them to contribute to the beauty and perfection of the larger whole. In order to accomplish such an essential artistic task, the poet pays more attention to a special part of a poem and makes it the centrepiece, concentrating the most beautiful and highest quality use of language, aesthetics, metaphors and ideas there. This process of creation is the exact opposite of what many classical, but also modern, non-Sufi poets, Kurds and others used to do when they employed the last distich of a poem as the centre. This is what I call a poetic fatal blow, to borrow a term from the language of sport.

In both approaches, the communicative mode is made suitable for combination with the aesthetic mode. The communicative mode in a Sufi poem consists of the philosophical and spiritual ideas and experiences that are sent to the reader, and the poem's structure is constructed for this purpose.

The present work is a contribution to the study of a Kurdish classical Sufi poet from various points of view. It is certainly possible to write much more about Jazīrī's poetry and to highlight other aspects of it that are rarely studied. As an example, one can mention the longest *qaṣīda* in his *Dīwān*, about which I have written only a few brief lines in Chapter 3. Yet it is an outstanding and unparalleled example of the poet's artistic and linguistic skill and his mastery of internal harmony and the use of rhyme.

Bibliography

Note that al-, de, van, von are disregarded in the alphabetic order. The letters ç and č are treated as ch, š as sh, and ö as o.

ʿAbd al-Majīd, Malā Hamdī (1973): 'Hozānvānakī nanyās Malā ʿAbd al-Salām Nājī u čīrok-ā rāvā dīwān-ā Malā-yē Jizīrī', *Nūsar-ī Kurd*, 7, pp. 50–54.

Abrahamov, Binyamin (2014): *Ibn al-ʿArabi and the Sufis*, Oxford: Anqa Publishing.

Abrahamov, Binyamin (2017): 'Ibn al-ʿArabī', in : *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to the Qur'ān,* 2nd edition, Rippin, Andrew, and Jawid Mojaddedi (eds.). Hoboken, New Jersey and Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley & Sons, pp. 442–448.

Adak, Abdurrahman (2019): *Teşeyên Nezmê di edebiyata Kurdî ya klasîk de*, Istanbul: Nûbihar.

Affifi, A.E. (1979): *The Mystical Philosophy of Muhyid-Din Ibnul Arabi*, Lahore: Sh. Muhammad Ashraf Publishers, Booksellers & Exporters.

ʿAfīfī, Abu al-ʿAlāʾ (2009): *Muḥyī al-Dīn bin ʿArabī, Al-falsafa al-Ṣūfiyya ʿinda Muḥyī al-Dīn bin ʿArabī*, translated and introduced by Mustafa Labīb ʿAbd al-Ġanī, Cairo: Al-Markaz al-Qawmī li'l-Tarjuma.

ʿAfīfī, Abu al-ʿAlāʾ (2019): *Al-Taṣawwuf, Al-Ṯawra al-Rūḥiyya fī al-Islam*, Cairo: Afāq Bookshop & Publishing House.

Ahmadī, Walī (2004): 'The Institution of Persian Literature and the Genealogy of Bahar's "Stylistics"', *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 31:2, pp. 141–152.

Algar, Hamid (1976): 'The Naqshbandi order: A preliminary survey of its history and significance', *Studia Islamica*, 44:2, pp. 123–152.

Algar, Hamid (1991): 'Reflections of Ibn ʿArabī in Early Naqshbandi Tradition', *Journal of Islamic Research*, 5:1, pp. 1–20.

Algar, Hamid (1992): 'Devotional practices of the Khalidi Naqshbandi of Ottoman Turkey', in: Lifchez, Raymond (ed.), *The Dervish Lodge, Architecture,*

Art, and Sufism in Ottoman Turkey, Berkeley, Los Angeles and Oxford: University of California Press, pp. 209–227.

Algar, Hamid (1993a): 'Nakshband', *EIs-II.*

Algar, Hamid (1993b): 'Nakshbandiyya', *EIs-II.*

Algar, Hamid (1996): 'The Naqshbandi order in Republican Turkey', *Islamic World Report*, 1:3, pp. 51–67.

Āmēdī, Ṣādiq Bahāʾ al-Dīn (1975a): 'Sarhostā-yē kēš u vahāndinē Malā-yē Jizīrī', *The Journal of Kurdish Academy*, 3:1, pp. 243–302.

Āmēdī, Ṣādiq Bahāʾ al-Dīn (1975b): 'Sarhostā-yē kēš u vahāndinē Malā-yē Jizīrī', *The Journal of Kurdish Academy*, 3:2, pp. 359–416.

Āmēdī, Ṣādiq Bahāʾ al-Dīn (1976): 'Sarhostā-yē kēš u vahāndinē Malā-yē Jizīrī', *The Journal of Kurdish Academy*, 4, pp. 97–154.

Āmēdī, Ṣādiq Bahāʾ al-Dīn (1980): *Hozānvānēt Kurd*, Baghdad: The Iraqī Academy (Kurdish corporation).

Andrews, Walter G. (1976): *An introduction to Ottoman poetry*, Minneapolis and Chicago: Bibliotheca Islamica.

Anonymous (1949): 'The Azizan or the Princes of Bhotan', *Journal of the Royal Central Asian Society*, vol. XXXVI (July-Oct), Part III & IV, pp. 249–251.

Ansari, Abdul Haq (1999): 'Ibn ʿArabī: The Doctrine of *Waḥdat al-Wujūd*' *Islamic Studies*, 38:2, pp. 149–192.

Arberry, Arthur J. (1964): *The Koran interpreted*, Oxford World's Classics paperback, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ateş, A. (1971): 'Ibn al-ʿArabī', *EIs-II.*

Ateş, Sabri (2019): 'Treaty of Zohab, 1639: Foundational Myth or Foundational Document?' *Iranian studies*, 52: 3–4, pp. 397–423.

Austin, R.W.J. (tr.) (1971): *Sufis of Andalusia*, *The* '*Rūḥ al-quds' and* '*al-Durrat al-fākhirah' of Ibn ʿArabī*, London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

Azīzan, Herekol (1941): 'Klasîkên Me' *Hawar*, 33, pp. 6–14.

Bābā Ṭāhir (1363Š/1984CE): *Tarānahā-yi Bābā Ṭāhir, az rū-yi nusxa-yi taṣḥīḥ šoda-yi Wāḥid Dastgirdī*, Tehran: Našr-i Farhang-i Īrān.

Badawī, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (1962): *Šahīdat al-ʿIšq al-Ilāhī*, *Rābiʿa al-ʿAdawiyya*, Cairo: Maktabat al-Nahḍa al-Miṣriyya.

Bayrakdar, Mehmed (1991): *Bitlisi Idris, Ankara, Kültür Bakanligi*. (Translated into Kurdish in 2009 by Shukur Mustafa, Kurdistan-Erbil: Aras Press).

Bidlîsî, Sharaf-Xan (Scheref, Prince De Bidlis) (1860): *Scheref-Nameh ou, Histoire des kourdes,* Tome I, Publiée pour la première fois, traduite et annotée par V. Véliaminof-Zernof, St. Petersburg: Commissionnaires de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences.

Bidlîsî, Chèref-ouddine (1870): *Chèref-nâmeh ou, Fastes de la nation kourde*, par Chèref-ouddine, Prince de Bidlis, dans l'Iialèt d'Arzeroume, Tome I, traduits du persan et commentés par François Bernard Charmoy, St. Petersburg: Commissionnaires de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences.

Bitlîsî, Prince Sharaf al-Dîn (2005): *The Sharafnama or the history of Kurdish nation* –1597 –, Book One, English translation and commentaries by M.R. Izady, Costa Mesa, California: Mazda Publishers Inc.

Blau, Joyce: 'Jaziri,' *EIr*. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/jaziri (accessed on 30 December 2012).

de Blois, François (2011): 'Divan', *EIr.*

Botânî, ʿAbd ul-Fattâḥ ʿAlî Yaḥyâ (1988): 'Burj-ā balak di Jizîr-ā Botân-dā', *Roshinbîr-î Nwê*, 117, pp. 139–145.

Bozarslan, M. Emîn (1985): *Jîn, kovara Kurdî-Tirkî* 1918-1919, cild I, Uppsala: Weşanxana Deng.

de Bruijn, J.T.P. (1997): *Persian Sufi Poetry, an introduction to the mystical use of classical poems*, Richmond, Surrey: Curzon press.

de Bruijn, J.T.P. (2009): *A History of Persian literature*, General Editor Ehsan Yarshater, Volume I, London and New York: I.B.Tauris.

van Bruinessen, Martin and Hendrik Boeschoten (1988): *Evliya Çelebi in Diyarbekir: The relevant section of the Seyahatname, edited with translation, commentary and introduction*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.

van Bruinessen, Martin (1990): 'The Naqshbandi Order in 17th-Century Kurdistan', in: Gaborieau, Marc et al. (eds.): *Naqshbandis, Historical Developments and Present Situation of a Muslim Mystical Order*, Istanbul and Paris: Éditions ISIS, pp. 337–359.

van Bruinessen, Martin (2000a): 'Kurdistan in the 16th and 17th centuries, as reflected in Evliya Celebi's Seyahatname', *The Journal of Kurdish Studies*, 3, pp. 1–11.

van Bruinessen, Martin (2000b): *Mullas, Sufis and Heretics: The role of Religion in Kurdish Society*, Istanbul: Éditions ISIS.

Buxārāʾī, Xvāja Muḥammad bin Muḥammad Pārsā (1354Š/1975CE): *Qudsiyya, Kalimāt-i Bahāʾ al-Dīn Naqšband*, Introduction, annotation and commentaries by Aḥmad Ṭāhirī ʿIrāqī, Tehran: Kitābxāna-yi Ṭahūrī.

Calmard, J. (1993): 'Mollā', *EIs-II.*

Čalabī, Awliyā (1898): *Awliyā Čalabī Siyāḥatnāmasi*, edited by Aḥmad Jawdat, vol. 4, Istanbul: Iqdām Printing House.

Çelebi, Evliya (2010): *Gunumuz Turkcesiyle Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnamesi*, 4. Kitap 2, cilt, edited by Seyit Ali Kahraman and Yucel Dağlı, Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Çetin, Nihad M. (1986): 'Laṭīfī', *EIs-II.*

Chittick, William C. (2005): Ibn al-ʿArabī, Heir to the Prophet, Oxford: Oneworld Publications.

Cooper, David E. (ed.), (1997): *Aesthetics, the Classic readings*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Corbin, Henry (1997): *Alone with the Alone, Creative imagination in the Sufism of Ibn 'Arabī, Princeton*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Dankoff, Robert (1990): *Evliya Çelebi in Bitlis*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Doskī, Muḥammad Amīn (2000): *Falsafat al-ʿišq al-ʾilāhī fī šiʿr al-Jazīrī*, Duhok: Maṭbaʿat Hāwār.

Eaton, Marcia Muelder (1988): *Basic Issues in Aesthetics*, Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Edmonds, C.J. (1922): 'Luristan: Pish-i-Kuh and Bala Gariveh', *Geographical Journal*, 59, pp. 437–453.

Elias, Jamal J. (1988): 'Female and feminine in Islamic mysticism', *The Muslim world*, 78:3–4, pp. 209–224.

Elisséeff, N. (1971): 'Ibn ʿUmar', *EIs-II.*

Elwell-Sutton, L.P.: 'Baba Tahir Oryan', *EIr*.

Encyclopaedia Iranica (1989–) Edited by Ehsan Yarshater, New York: Encyclopedia Iranica Foundation Inc. (Abbreviated EIr)

The Encyclopedia of Islam (1913–1936): Leiden: E.J. Brill. (Abbreviated EIs-I)

The Encyclopedia of Islam, 2nd edition (1954–2009): New York and Leiden: E.J. Brill. (Abbreviated EIs-II)

The Encyclopedia of Islam, new edition (2007–): Edited by Kate Fleet, Gudrun Krämer, Denis Matringe, John Nawas, Devin J. Stewart, Leiden: E.J. Brill. (Abbreviated EIs-III)

Eppel, Michael (2016): *A People Without a State: The Kurds from the Rise of Islam to the Dawn of Nationalism*, Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.

Farrin, Raymond K. (2003): 'The "Nūniyya" of Ibn Zaydūn: A structural and Thematic Analysis', *Journal of Arabic literature*, 34: 1–2, The Arabic Literature of Al-Andalus, pp. 82–106.

Findī, Rašīd (1985): *ʿAlī Taramāxī ēkamīn rēzmān-nivīs u pexšānnivīs-ē Kurda*, Baghdad: Al-amāna al-ʿāmma li'l-ṯaqāfa wa'l-šabāb.

Fleischer, Cornell H.: 'Bedlīsī, Ḥakīm-al-Dīn Edrīs', *EIr.*

Fuad, Kamal (1970): *Kurdische Handschriften*, Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.

Gardī, ʿAzīz (1999): *Sarwā, lēkoḷīnawayak-ī šīkarī-y barāwrda la Šiʿr-ī Kurdī-dā*, Hawlēr: Aras Publishers.

Gardī, ʿAzīz (2003): *Ṛābar-ī Kēš-ī Šiʿr-ī Klāsīk-ī Kurdī*, Silēmanī: Ministry of Culture, Directory of Printing and Publishing.

Gibb, E.J.W. (1882): *Ottoman Poems*, translated into English verse with introduction, biographical notices and notes, London: Trübner & Co.

Gibb, E.J.W., (1900): *A History of Ottoman Poetry*, Volume I, London: Luzac & Co.

von Goethe, J.W. (2004): *Väst-östlig divan*, översättning och inledning av Martin Tegen, Stockholm: Atlantis.

Grabar, Oleg (1998): 'Islamic Aesthetics, historical and Conceptual Overview', in: Kelly, Michael (Editor in Chief), *Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*, Volume 2, Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 535–536.

von Grunebaum, G.E. (1952): 'The aesthetic foundation of Arabic literature', *Comparative Literature*, 1952, 4:4, pp. 323–340.

al-Ġurāb, Maḥmūd Maḥmūd (1983): *Al-Šayx al-Akbar Muḥyī al-Dīn Ibn al-ʿArabī, Tarjumat ḥayātih min kalamih,* n.p.

Ḥāfiẓ-i Šīrāzī (1370Š/1991CE): *Dīvān*, taṣḥīḥ va taḥqīq: Manṣūr Muvaḥḥidzādah, Tehran: Intišārāt-i Pažūhiš.

al-Ḥakīm, Suʿād (1981): *Al-Muʿjam al-Ṣūfī, al-Ḥikma fī Ḥudūd al-Kalima,* Beirut: Dandara li'l-Ṭibāʿa wa al-Našr.

al-Ḥallāj, al-Husayn ibn Manṣūr (1974): *The Tawasin: [the great Sufic text on the unity of reality] of Mansur Ḥallāj*, Berkeley: Diwan Press.

Hartman, Nicolai (2014): *Aesthetics*, translated with an introduction by Eugene Kelly, Boston: De Gruyter.

Hermerén, Göran (1991): 'Estetik' in: *Nationalencyklopedin*, 5, Malmö: Bokförlaget Bra böcker.

Heron-Allen, Edward (1902): *The Lament of Bābā Ṭāhir, being the Ruba'iyat of Bābā Ṭāhir Hamadānī ('Uryān)*, London: Bernard Quaritch.

Hirtenstein, Stephen (1999): *The unlimited Mercifier, The spiritual life and thought of Ibn ʿArabī*, Oxford: Anqā Publishing and Ashland, Oregon: White Cloud Press.

Hirtenstein, Stephen (2005): 'Ibn al-ʿArabī', *Encyclopedia of Religion*, 2nd edition, Detroit: Macmillan Reference, USA.

Humāyī, Jalāl al-Dīn (1371Š/1992CE): *Funūn-i Balāġat va Ṣināʿāt-i Adabī*, Tehran: Muʾassisa-yi Našr-i Humā.

Homerin, Th. Emil (1998): 'In the gardens of al-Zahra: Love echoes in a poem by Ibn Zaydun' in: Waugh, Earle H. and Frederick M. Denny (eds.), *The shaping of an American Islamic discourse*, Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.

Hourani, Albert (1991): *A history of the Arab peoples*, London: Faber & Faber.

Ibn ʿArabī (n.d.): *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam*, I (Text) & II (Commentary), edited by Abu al-ʿAlāʾ ʿAfīfī, Beirut, Dār al-Kitāb al-ʿArabī.

Ibn al-ʿArabī (1978): *The Tarjuman Al-Ashwaq, A collected of mystical odes*, translated by Reynold A. Nicholson, London: Theosophical Publishing House.

Ibn al-ʿArabī (1980): *The Bezels of Wisdom*, translation and introduction by R.W.J. Austin, New Jersey: Paulist Press.

Ibn al-ʿArabī, Muḥyi al-Din bin ʿAli (2005): *Diwān Tarjumān al-Ašwāq*, ed. ʿAbd al-Raḥman al-Mistawī, Beirut: Dar al-Maʿrifa.

Ibn Khaldûn (1958): *The Muqaddimah; An Introduction to History*, Translated from The Arabic by Franz Rosenthal, vol. 1, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Izutsu, Toshihiko (1984): *Sufism and Taoism, A comparative study of key philosophical concepts*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Jaba, M. Alexandre (1860): *Recueil de notices et recits kourdes*, St. Petersburg: Commissionnaires de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences.

Jahāngīrī, Muḥsin (1375Š/1996CE): *Muḥyiddīn Ibn ʿArabī, Čihra-yi barjastayi ʿIrfān-i Islāmī*, Tehran: Intišārāt-i Danišgāh-i Tihrān.

Jāmī, Nūr al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (1386Š/2007CE): *Nafaḥāt al-Uns min ḥaḍarāt al-quds*, Muqaddima, taṣḥīḥ va taʿlīqāt: Dr. Maḥmūd ʿĀbidī, Tehran: Gulrang-i Yaktā.

Jīta (Goethe) (1980): *Al-Dīwān al-Šarqī li al-Muʾallif al-Ġarbī*, translated by ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Badawī, 2nd edition, Beirut: Al-Muʾassasa al-ʿArabiyya li al-dirāsāt wa al-našr.

al-Karmī,ʿAbd al-Wahhāb (1992): *Naqd wa tarjamat li muxtārāt min Dīwān al-Mullā al-Jazrī*, Damascus: Maṭbaʿat al-Kātib al-ʿArabī.

Khani, Ahmad (2009): *Mam u Zīn*, translated into English by ʿAzīz Gardī, Sulaimani: The General Directorate of Journalism and Publications.

Khānlarī, Parvīz Nātil (1367Š/1988CE): *Vazn-i shiʿr-i fārsī*, čāp-i duvvum, Tehran: Tūs.

Khosroshahi and Negahban (2008): 'Aṣli and Karam', *EIs-III*.

Knysh, Alexander (2000): *Islamic mysticism, a short history*, Leiden: Brill.

Knysh, Alexander (2010): 'Sufism', in *The New Cambridge History of Islam*, Volume 4: Islamic Cultures and Societies to the End of the Eighteenth Century, Edited by Robert Irwin, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 60–104.

Korn, Agnes (2003): 'Balochi and the concept of North-Western Iranian' in: Jahani, Carina and Agnes Korn, *The Baloch and Their Neighbours*, Wiesbaden: Reichert, pp. 49–60.

Koyī, Hājī Qādir (1986): *Dīwān-ī Hājī Qādir-ī Koyī*, edited and commented on by S. H. Mīrān and K. M. Šārazā, Arbīl: Amīndārētī-y gištī-y rošinbīrī w lāwān-ī nāwča-y Kurdistān.

Kramers, J. H. (1995): 'ʿOthmanli, 2. The foundation and expansion of the Ottoman Empire', *EIs-II.*

Kristiller, Paul Oskar (1998): 'Origins of Aesthetics, Historical and Conceptual Overview', in: Kelly, Michael (Editor in Chief), *Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*, Volume 3, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 416–428.

Landau, Rom (2008): *The Philosophy of Ibn ʿArabī*, London and New York: Routledge.

Langfeld, Herbert Sidney (1947): 'Aesthetics', *Encyclopedia Britannica,* Chicago, London and Toronto.

Le Coq, A. V. (1903): *Kurdische Texte*, gesammelt und herausgegeben, Erste Teil, Berlin: Gedruckt in der Reichsdruckerei.

Leezenberg, Michiel (2014): ‘Elî Teremaxi and the vernacularization of Medrese Learning in Kurdistan’, *Iranian Studies*, 47:5, pp. 713–733.

Levend, Agâh Sirri (1984): *Türk Edebiyati Tarihi*, I, cilt, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurum Basimevi.

Losensky, P (2012): Persian poetry, in: Greene, Roland (editor in chief), *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, 4th edition, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, pp. 1021-1024.

Lubis, Haji Muhammad Bukhari (1994): *The Ocean of Unity, Waḥdat al-wujūd in Persian, Turkish and Malay Poetry*, Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka Kementerian Pendidikan.

Madkūr, Ibrāhīm Bayyūmī (ed.), (1969): *Al-Kitāb al-tiḏkārī, Muḥyī al-Dīn Bin ʿArabī, fī al-ḏikrā almiʾawiyya alṯāmina li-mīlādihi*, Cairo: Dār al-Kātib al-ʿArabī li’l-ṭibāʿa wa’l-Našr.

Maḥmūd, Nayrūza (2016): ʿAlī Taramāxī wa muʾallafātuhu, *The Journal of Mesopotamian Studies*, V, 1/1, pp. 127–139.

al-Māʾī, Anwar (1960): *Al-Akrād fī Bahdīnān* , Al-Mūṣil: Maṭbaʿat al-Ḥiṣān.

MacKenzie, D.N. (1969): ‘Malā-e Jizrī and Faqī Tayrān’, *Yād-nāma-yi Irānī-yi Minorsky,* Tehran: Tehran University, no. 1241, pp. 125–130.

Malā-yē Jazīrī (1904): *Der Kurdische Dīwān Des Schēch Aḥmed von Gezīret Ibn 'Omar Genannt Mäla'i Gizri*, Fotolithografie Einer Handschrift mit einer Einführung von Martin Hartmann, Berlin: S. Calvary & Co.

Malā-yē Jazīrī (1338R/1340AH/1922CE): *Dīwān-ā Jizīrī, Muʾallif-i Šēx Aḥmad al-Jizīrī*, edited by Muḥammad Šafīq al-ʾArwāsī, Istanbul: Awqāf-i Islāmiyya Matbaʿasi.

Malā-yē Jazīrī (1964): *Dīwān-ī Šēx Aḥmad-ī Jizīrī*, edited by Gīw-ī Mukryānī, Hawlēr: Čāpxāna-y Hawlēr.

Malā-yē Jazīrī (1977): *Dīwān-ā Malā-yē Jizīrī*, edited by Ṣādiq Bahāʾ al-Dīn Āmēdī, Baghdad: Čāpxāna-y Koṛ-ī Zānyārī-y Kurd.

Malā-yē Jazīrī (1361Š/1982CE): *Dīwān-ī ʿārif-ī rabbanī Šēx Aḥmad-ī Jizīrī mašhūr ba Malā-y Jizīrī*, edited and annotated by Hažār, Tehran: Surūš.

Malā-yē Jazīrī (1st ed. 1959, 2nd ed. 1407AH/1987CE): *Al-ʿiqd al-jawharī fī šarḥ Dīwān al-Šayx al-Jazarī*, 2 volumes, edited, translated, annotated by Aḥmad bin al-Mullā Muḥammad [al-Buhtī] al-Zivingī, Muftī al-Qāmišlī, 1st edition, Qāmišlī: Maṭbaʿat al-Rāfidayn, 2nd edition, n.p.: Maṭbaʿat al-Ṣabāḥ, (Abbreviated ZdJ).

Malā-yē Jazīrī (1994): *Dīvān Gazelei Malā-yē Jazīrī*, translation from the Kurdish into the Russian, introduction and commentaries by Karīm Ayyūbī, edited by: I.A. Smirnova, St. Petersburg: Nauk.

Malā-yē Jazīrī (2000): *Dīwān-ā Malā-yē Jizīrī*, edited by Taḥsīn Ibrāhīm Doskī, Duhok: Ministry of Culture, the Regional Government in Iraqi Kurdistan.

Malā-yē Jazīrī (2004): *Šarḥ Dīwān al-Šayx al-Jazarī, li al-Mullā ʿAbd al-Salām al-Jazarī*, edited and annotated by Taḥsīn ʾIbrāhīm al-Doskī, two volumes, Duhok: Spīrēz Press & Publisher.

Malā-yē Jazīrī (2018): *Šarḥ-ā Dīwān-ā Malā-yē Jizīrī*, edited and commented on by Taḥsīn Ibrāhīm Doskī, four volumes, Sorān: Komalga-y farhangī-y Ahmad-ē Xānī.

Mann, Oskar (1910): *Kurdisch-Persische Forschungen, Die Mundartend er Lur-Stämme im Südwestlichen Persien*, Berlin: Druck und Verlag von Georg Reimer.

Matthee, Rudi (2008): 'Safavid Dynasty', *EIr.*

Mela-yê Jiziri (1987): *Dîwan*, transcribed into Latin characters by Zeynalabidîn Kaya and M. Emîn Narozî, Stockholm: Roja Nû.

McCaffrey, Michael J. (1990): 'Čalderān', *EIr.*

McDowall, David (1996): *A Modern History of the Kurds*, London: I.B. Tauris.

Ménage, V.L.: 'Bidlisi, Idris', *EIr.*

Mikāīl, Nāyif Ṭāhir (2005): *Al-Šayx al-Jizrī, nahjuhu wa ʿaqīdatuhu min xilāl diwānihi al- šiʿrī*, Duhok: Spīrēz Press & Publisher.

Minorsky, Vladimir (1943): 'The Gūrān', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 11:1, pp. 75–103.

Minorsky, Vladimir (1986a): 'Lak', *EIr.*

Minorsky, Vladimir (1986b): 'Kurds, Kurdistān, iii History, A. Origins and Pre-Islamic history', *EIr.*

Mizūrī, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (1984): 'Bayna Ġuta wa al-Jazīrī', *Kārwān*, 18, pp. 91–93.

Monšī, Iskandar Beg (1377Š/1998–1999CE): *Tārīx-i ʿālam ārā-yi ʿAbbāsī*, vol. 1, Tehran: Dunyā-yi Kitāb.

Munro, Thomas and Roger Scruton (2024). 'Aesthetics'. Encyclopedia Britannica, 20 May. 2024. https://www.britannica.com/topic/aesthetics. (Accessed 25 May 2024.)

Mutābčī, Dr. Amīn ʿAlī (1994): ‘Malā-y Jizīrī ustād-ī ġazal-ī Kurdī la šēwa-y Kirmānjī Šimālī-da’, *The Journal of Iraqi Academy, Kurdish Corporation*, 25–26, pp. 3–29.

Naqšbandī, Amīn Šēx ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn (1985): *Taṣawwuf čiya*, Baghdad: Dār al-ḥuriyya li al- ṭibāʿa.

Nicholson, Reynold A. (1906): ‘A Historical Enquiry concerning the Origin and Development of Sufism, with a list of Definitions of the terms ‘Ṣúfi’ and ‘Taṣawwuf,’ arranged chronologically’, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 38:2, 303–348.

Nicholson, Reynold A. (1962): *A Literary History of the Arabs*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nicholson, Reynold A. (1989): *Studies in Islamic Mysticism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nuʿmān, ʿAbd al-Salām (1990): ‘ʿAn šarḥ Dīwān al-Jizrī’, *Dirāsāt Ištirākiyya*, Special number, pp. 72–83.

Paterman, Trevor (1991): *Key Concepts, a Guide to Aesthetics, Criticism and the Arts in Education*, London: The Falmer Press.

Paul, Ludwig: ‘Kurdish language i. History of the Kurdish language’, *EIr.*

Paymard, Manṣūr (1374Š/1995CE): ‘Mašrab-i ʿIrfanī-yi ʿAṭṭār; ʿAṭṭār, ʿārif-i waḥdat-i wujūd’, *Rušd-i Āmūziš-i Adab-i Fārsī*, 10:37, p. 48–51.

Qamandār, Ismāʿīl (2014): *Dirāsat al-lahjāt al-Kurdiyya al-Janūbiyya*, Baghdad: Maktabat ʿAdnān lil-ṭibāʿa wa al-našr wa al-tawzīʿ.

Rasūl, Dr. ʿIzz al-Dīn Mistafā (1990): *Malā-y Jizīrī, šitēk darbāra-y žiyān u barham-ī*, Hawler: Čāpxāna-y Dār al-Ḥikma.

Ridgeon, Lloyd (ed.) (2021): *Routledge Handbook on Ṣūfīsm, Routledge*, London and New York: Taylor & Francis.

Rumi, Maulana Jalalu’d-din Muhammad (2008): *The Masnavi i Ma'navi*, Translated by E.H. Whinfield, n.p.: Forgotten Books.

Rūmī, Jalāl al-Dīn (1926): *The Mathnawī*, edited with critical notes, translation and commentary by Reynold A. Nicholson, volume II, London: Luzac & Co.

al-Rūmī, Jalāl al-Dīn (1357Š/1978CE): *Maṯnavī-yi Maʿnavī*, Tehran: Čāpxāna-yi Sipihr.

Rundgren, Frithiof: (1993) ‘The preface of the Futuhat al-Makkiyya’ in: Hirtenstein, Stephen and Michael Tiernan (eds.), *Muhyiddīn Ibn ʿArabī, a commerative volume*, London: Element Books, pp. 340–350.

Rypka, Jan (1968): *History of Iranian literature*, Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Company.

Sajjādī, ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn (1st ed. 1952, 2nd ed.1971): *Mēžū-y adab-ī Kurdī*, Baghdad: Čāpxāna-y Maʿārif.

Savory and Karamustafa, ‘Esmaʿīl I Safawī’, *EIr.*

Schimmel, Annemarie (1975): *Mystical dimensions of Islam*, Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Schimmel, Annemarie (1982): *As Through a Veil, Mystical Poetry in Islam*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Schimmel, Annemarie (1996): ‘Epilogue’, in: Sperl, Stefan and Christopher Shackle (eds.), *Qasida poetry in Islamic Asia and Africa*, vol. 1, Leiden, New York and Köln: E.J. Brill, pp. 475–486.

Schimmel, Annemarie (2001): *Rumi’s World, The Life and Work of the Great Sufi poet*, Boston: Shambhala.

Scott-Meisami, Julie (1985): ‘The Uses of the *Qaṣīda*: Thematic and Structural Patterns in a Poem of Bashshār’, *Journal of Arabic Literature*, 16, pp. 40–60.

Scott-Meisami, Julie (1987): *Medieval Persian Court Poetry*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Sells, Michael A. and M. J. Sells (1990): ‘Bānat Suʿād: Translation and Introduction’, *Journal of Arabic Literature*, 21:2, pp. 140–154.

Seyed-Gohrab, Ali Asghar (2012): *The Great Umar Khayyam: A Global Reception of the Rubáiyat*, Leiden: Leiden University Press.

Seyed-Gohrab, Ali Asghar (2019): ‘The flourishing of Persian quatrains’, in: Yarshater, Ehsan (ed.), *Persian lyric poetry in the classical era, 800-1500, Ghazalas, panegyrics and quatrains*, London: I.B. Tauris.

Seyed-Gohrab, Ali Asghar (2021): ‘Sufism in classical Persian poetry’, in: Ridgeon, Lloyd V.J (ed.), *Routledge Handbook on Sufism,* London: Routledge, pp. 187–200.

Shabistarî, Sa’dudin Maḥmûd b.ʿAbd al-Karîm (1880): *Gulchan i raz: The mystic rose garden*. The Pers. text, with tr. and notes, chiefly from the comm. of Muhammad bin Yahya Lahiji, by E.H. Whinfield, London: Trübner & Co.

Shabistarī, Shaikh Mahmud (1361Š/1982CE): *Gulšan-i rāz*, Tehran: Kitābxāna-yi Ṭahūrī.

Shakely, Farhad (1996): 'The Kurdish Qasida', in: Sperl, Stefan and Christopher Shackle (eds.): *Qasida Poetry in Islamic Asia and Africa*, vol. 1, Leiden, New York and Köln: E.J. Brill, pp. 327–338.

Shakely, Farhad (1999): 'The Naqshbandi Sheikhs of Hawraman and the Heritage of Khalidiyya-Mujaddidiyya in Kurdistan', in: Özdalga, Elizabeth (ed.): *Naqshbandis in Western and Central Asia; Change and Continuity*, Istanbul: Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul.

Shamel, S (2012): 'Divan', in: Roland Greene et al (eds.): *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, 4th edition, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Šamīsā, Sīrūs (1370Š/1991CE): *Sayr-i Ġazal dar Šiʿr-i Fārsī, az Aġāz ta Imrūz*, Tehrān: Intišārāt-i Firdawsī, Čāp-i sivvum.

Šamīsā, Sīrūs (1386Š/2007CE): *Kolliyyāt-i Sabkšināsī*, Tehran: Našr-i Mitrā.

Šamīsā, Sīrūs (1387Š/2008CE): *Sayr-i Rubāʿi*, Tehran: Našr-i ʿIlm.

Šērkuh, Bilač (1930, 1986): *Al-qaḍiyya al-Kurdiyya: Māḍī al-Kurd wa Ḥāḍiruhum*, Beirut, Stockholm.

al-Sindī, Badirxān (1983) '*al-Mūsīqā fī šiʿr al-Jazīrī*' *Kārwān*, 7, pp. 116–122.

Sirhindī, al- Šayx Aḥmad (1992): *Muntaxabāt az maktubāt-i Imām-i Rabbānī*, Istanbul: Ihlas vakfi.

Soane, E. B. (1913): *Grammar of The Kurmanji or Kurdish Language*, London: Luzac & Co.

Sönmez, Ebru (2012): *Idris Bidlisi, Ottoman Kurdistan and Islamic Legitimacy*, Istanbul: Libra Kitap.

Sperl, Stefan and Christopher Shackle (1996): 'Introduction', in: Sperl, Stefan and Christopher Shackle (eds.): *Qasida Poetry in Islamic Asia and Africa*, vol. 1, Leiden, New York and Köln: E.J. Brill, pp. 327–338.

Steingass, Francis J. (1947): *A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary*, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd.

Takeshita, Masataka (1983): 'The theory of the Perfect Man in Ibn 'Arabi's Fusus al-Hikam', *Orient*, 19, pp. 87–102.

Taramāxī, ʿAlī (1971): *Dastūr-ī Zimān-ī ʿArabī ba Kurdī*, Lêkoḷīnawa w lasarnūsīn u āmādakirdin-ī bo cāp Doktor Mārif Xaznadār, Baghdad: Čāpxāna-y Dār al-Zamān.

al-Tarjumān, Suhayla ʿAbd al-Bāʿiṯ (2002): *Naẓariyyat Waḥdat al-wujūd bayna Ibn ʿArabī wa Al-Jīlī, Dirāsa Taḥlīlīyya Naqdīyya Muqārina*, Beirut: Maktabat Al-Xazʿal.

Tezcan, Baki (2000): 'The development of the use of "Kurdistan" as a geographical description and the incorporation of this region into the Ottoman Empire in the 16th century', in: *The Great Ottoman-Turkish Civilization*, editor-in-chief Kemal Çiçek, vol. 3, pp. 540–553, Ankara: Yeni Turkiye.

Thiesen, Finn (1982): *A Manual of Classical Persian Prosody*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Ulugana, Sedat (2018): *Mîrektiya Bitlîsê di êwra Evdal Xan de (1618-1664)*, Istanbul: Nûbihar.

Utas, Bo (2008): 'The Aesthetic Use of New Persian', in: Jahani, Carina and Dariush Kargar (eds.), *Manuscripts, Texts and Literature*, Wiesbaden: Reichert, pp. 203–218.

Vahman, Fereydun (1999–2000): 'Twelve Rubā'is ascribed to Baba Taher in the Bakhtiari Dialect from the Collection of D.L. Lorimer', *Iran and the Caucasus*, 3:4, pp. 289–292.

Wehr, Hans (1971): *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic, third printing*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

al-Xālidī-al-Maqdisī, al-Šayx Yūsuf Ḍiyāʾ al-Dīn Pāšā (1309R/1310AH/1893CE), *Al-Hadiyya al-Ḥamidiyya fī al-Luġa al-Kurdiyya*, Istanbul: Dār-i Saʿādat Širkat Maṭbaʿasi.

Xānlarī, Parvīz-Nātil (1367Š /1988CE): Vazn-i šiʿr-i Fārsī, Intisārat-i Ṭūs.

Xānī, Aḥmad (1962): *Mam u Zīn*, edited, translated into Russian and introduced by M.B. Rudenko, Moscow: Našrxānā Adabiyyetā Rohlātī.

Xaznadār, Dr. Mārif (2002): *Mežū-y adab-ī Kurdī*, Hawlēr: Aras publisher.

Xenophon (1984): *The Persian Expedition*, translated by Rex Warner, Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books.

Yaşin, Abdullah (1983): *Bütün Yönleriyle Cizre*, Cizre: Yücel Matbaasi.

Yūsif, ʿAbd al-Raqīb (1971): *Dīwān-ā Kirmānjī*, Al-Najaf al-Ašraf: Maṭbaʿat al-Ādāb.

Zakī, Muḥammad Amīn (1939): *Mašāhīr al-kurd wa Kurdistān, min aqdam al-ʿusūr al-taʾrīxyya ḥattā al-ʾān*, translated into Arabic and commented on by Muhammad ʿAlī ʿAwnī, vol. 1, Egypt: Maṭbaʿat al-Saʿāda.

Zakī, Muḥammad Amīn (1947): *Mašāhīr al-kurd wa Kurdistān fī al-ʿAhd al-Islāmī*, Egypt: Maṭbaʿat al-Saʿāda.

Zakī, Muḥammad Amīn (1986): *Xulāṣat Taʾrīx al-Kurd wa Kurdistān*, translated into Arabic and commented on by Muhammad ʿAlī ʿAwnī, vol. 2, 2nd edition, London: The Kurdish Students Aid Committee.

Zarīnkūb, ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn (1363Š/1984CE): *Justujū dar taṣavvuf-i Iran*, Tehran, Moʾassisa-yi Intišārāt-i Amīr Kabīr.

Appendix

Kurdish Text

غەزەلی یەکەم

ئەز نزانم سەبەبێ، یارێ چرا دوور کرین
شاهی شیرینده‌هەنان ئەم ژ خوه مەهجوور کرین

میڵلی گۆی بێ سەر و پا بوومه لبەر ضەرب و شەکان
لەو ب چەوگانێ جەفایا خوه ژ دل هوور کرین

دا مه صەد جامی فیراقێ ژ خوه غائیب نەبویین
ژ ویصالێ قەدەحەک دا مه وو مەخموور کرین

نووری چەشمی مه کو عالەم مه ب چەشمێن ته ددی
ب جەمالا خوه ته وەک دیدەیی بێنوور کرین.

نەفەسەک بێ ته مه ناچی، نه دژین بێ ته دەمەک
ژ ته هات ئەمری هومایوون، ته وه مەئموور کرین.

مه دزانی کو تو دێ عاقیبەتولئەمر چ کی
لەبی لەعلێ شەکەرین، ئاهـ کو مەغروور کرین.

ذەرڕەیەک بووم د هەوایا ته د وێرانەیەکی
میڵلی ڕۆژێ ب شوعاعا خوه ته مەشهوور کرین

ژ ئەنەلحەق ب لەبێن لەعلی خەبەردار بویین
ب گولابا سەری زولفا خوه ته مەنصوور کرین

مونصەریف ما دبویین ئەم ب دوصەد جاری مەلێ؟
لێ ب وێ کەسر و ئیضافێ ڤ خوه مەجروور کرین.

غەزەلی دووەم

جانا ژ جەمالا تە موقەددەس قەبەسم ئەز
گەر خووب و پەریزادە نەظەر کی تە بەسم ئەز

میثلێ مەهی نەو گەر تە دڤێتن مە ببینی
مێزە بکە جامێ، تو دزانی چ کەسم ئەز

یەغما ژ مە جان کر، کو تەجەللایێ ل دل دا
من ڕووحێ د قالب تویی، تەنها قەفەصم ئەز

حوببا تەیە من ڕادهەژینی کو بنالم
شەب تا ب سەحەر نالە ژ ڕەنگێ جەرەسم ئەز

من گۆ مەهی نەو چاشتیێ ئەبرویێ یاری
گۆ من چ حەدە، شوبهەتێ نەعلێ فەرەسم ئەز

ساقی ژ ئەزەل یەک دو قەدەح بادە ب من دا
حەتتا ب ئەبەد مەست و خومار و تەلەسم ئەز

جانا تویی من جان، گولی بێخاری گەرەم بی
مننەت کو نە وەک بولبولی میحنەت عەبەثم ئەز

صەد جەور و جەفا دی ب مە ناچین ژ دەرێ تە
یەکسەر تو نەباتی (و)و ل طەبعێ مەگەسم ئەز

گەر وەھـ تە دڤێتن ببڕی سەر، بکە فەرمان
دێ ڤێ سەعەتێ سەر ببڕم، خوەش مەقەصم ئەز

سەر تا ب قەدەم ئەز بسوژم شوبهێ مەلایی
پەروانەسیفەت سۆهتم و بێ صەوت و حسم ئەز.

غەزەلی سێیەم

سڕری وەحدەت ژ ئەزەل گرتییە حەتتا ب ئەبەد
واحد وو فەردە ب ذاتێ خوە، وی نینن چو عەدەد

د قیدەمدا ئەزەل وو عەینی ئەبەد هەردو یەکن
سەرمەدییەت وەهـ دخوازت نە ئەزەل بت، نە ئەبەد

فەرقە واحد ژ ئەحەد، لێ د مەقامێ صەمەدی
ب حەقیقەت کو یەکن هەردو ج واحد، ج ئەحەد.

یەکە دەریا تو بزان قەنجی ج مەوج و ج حەباب
د ئەصلدا کو هەمی ئاقە ج ئاڤ و ج جەمەد

ئافتابی ئەحەدییەت د خوەدا گرتییە کەون
نەکو عەورەک هەیە، لێ گرتییە چاڤێن مە ڕەمەد

حوسنێ ذاتێ بوت و لاتان ژ جەمالا صەمەدە
ژ میثالا صەنەمێ وەهـ کو تەجەللایە صەمەد

غەیری دەریا نییە صەحرا ب حەقیقەت، ئەمما
ژ رویێ کەیفە کو ئەڤ ئاقە بویی شوبهی زەبەد

کوللو یەومین هووە فی شەئنین نەبی غافل ژێ
هەر پەیاپەی ژ شوئوونان دکرت فەیض و مەدەد

گەر د ئادەم بدییا سڕڕێ عیلم ئیبلیسی
حینەما ئەبصەرەهو، کەبەرە حینەن وە سەجەد

ج زەمان و ج مەکان و ج جیهات و ج حودوود؟
ج مەقادیر و تەفاصیل و حیسابن، ج عەدەد؟

ج مونافات و لوزووومن، ج قیاس و ج میثال؟
ئەڤ ج تەولید و ج تەرکیبە، ج ڕووحن، ج جەسەد؟

سەر ب عیجزێ ددرت قووەتی دەڕاکەیی ما
ڕەجەعە-لەقلو کەلیلەن وە مەتا قامە قەعەد

حیرەت و عیجزە سەرەنجامێ د بابێ نەظەرێ
کەی ب خالق نەظەری قاصری مەخلووقی ڕەسەد

گوفتوگۆیی مەعریفەت چەندی مەلا پەیدا بکی
گەوهەرا مەعریفەتێ ناگهەتێ کەس ب خیرەد.

قەسیدەی یەکەم: خانی خانان

خانی خانان لامعێ نەجما تە هەر پوڕ نوور بی
کەشتیێ بەختێ تە ئەز بایێ موخالیف دوور بی

کەوکەبا سەعدا شەرەف طالع د نێف بورجا تە بت
دا تنێ ژ چەرخێ بەلا شوبهێ مەهێ مەنظوور بی

ئەنجومێ چەرخێ موحەددەب هەر ژ ذاتێ تەی شەریف
کەسبی ئەنواڕێ بکن حەتتا کو نەفخا صوور بی

لەو زیارەت ئاستانێ تێتە شەمسا دەولەتێ
دا سەحەرگاهان ژ دیدارێ شەریف پوڕ نوور بی

ئەختەرا تە ژ پەردەیا غەیبێ ئەگەر بێتن ظوهوور
دێ بتن نیصفوننەهارە وەر شەبێ دەیجوور بی

ئایەتولکورسی (یـ)و ئەنعام هەیکەلا تۆخێ تە بن
بێ نیهایەت پوڕمورادووبێ عەدەد مەنصوور بی

هەر کەناری وەرگەڕینی پێڤە عەزم و هیممەتێ
ڕایەتا فەتحێ ب نەصرا لەم یەزەل مەنصوور بی

خەیمەتا نووڕێ عینایەت ظیللێ مەمدوودێ تە بت
سوورەیی ئوموولکیتاب مادارێ حەضرەت سوور بی

پاشی نەوشیروان دبێم دێ حاکمێ عادل تویی
میثلی حاتم دێ ب دانێ دەر جیهان مەشهوور بی

ما جەزیرێ شوبهی دارێ تەختی حەفت ئیقلیم بت
هەم ب حوکم وو سەلطەنەت ئەسکەندەر وو فەغفوور بی

میثلی جەم جاما زەڕین خالی نەبی تە ژ بادەیێ
دا ژ خەمرا شادمانی دائیما مەخموور بی

ما د باغێ عەیش و نۆشێ هەر ب ساز وو ئەرغەنوون
کامران وو کامبەخش وو دلخوەش وو مەسروور بی

چەندەکی شیرین پوسەر دەربەندی دیوانا تە بن
بەندی شاپوورێ تە بن تا خوسرو (و)و شاپوور بی

هندەکی ڕۆژ وو شەڤن تێک عید و لەیلولقەدر بن
جام مودام پوڕ بادە بی، لێ نە ژ مەیا ئەنگوور بی

شوبهەتێ ڕووحولقودوس عەردێ تو پێ لێ داینی
سەبزە (و)وو ڕەیحان و نەسرین وو گولێ مەنقوور بی

هەر دەرێ نەعلێ فەرەس شوبهەت بوراقێ ڤێکەڤت
چەشمەیی حەیوان ژ ئەو عەردێ موبارەک فوور بی

ما تە عومرێ خضر و نووح وو مولکی ذولقەرنەین بتن
گونبودێ چەرخا مولەممەع هەر ب تە مەعموور بی

خاصی تەشریفێ تە بن دەریا (و)و دەربەندێ عەجەم
دا خەلاتێن هەر سەحەر صەد زەرکەش وو مەخموور بی

گەرچی دەر دیوانی حەضرەت پوڕ حەقیرین شوبهی موور
چەشمی تە چەشمێ سولەیمانی ب حالێ موور بی

ئێ نە وەک گۆی بێ سەر وو پا بی د بەندا خدمەتێ
ما د چەوگانا تە هەر پەرکەندە (و)وو مەقهوور بی

ما لسانێ من دوعاگۆیی ل دەرحەق وەصفی خان
مەظهەرا سڕڕا کەلامێ وەک درەختا طوور بی

هەر د مەدحێ تە و ثەنایێ سینە (و)وو قەلبی مەلێ
بێ تەفاووت قولزوما پوڕ لوئلوئێ مەنثوور بی

ژ-استانێ دەولەتێ غائیب نەبی جارەک مەلا
دا ژ فەرمانێ موکەڕڕەم دەم ب دەم مەئموور بی

قەسیدەی دووەم: ئەی شەهنشاهێ موعەظظەم

ئەی شەهنشاهێ موعەظظەم حەق نیگەهدارێ تە بی
سوورەیێ ئینا فەتەحنا دۆر و مادارێ تە بی (١)

هەر کەنارێ پێڤە وەرگێڕی عینانێ هیممەتێ
زوهرە بی پەیکێ تە (و)وو کەیوان ڕکێبدارێ تە بی (٢)

دائیما مەنزلگەها سوورا تە بت بورجا شەرەف
تالعێ فەرخونده (و)وو بەختێ سەعید یارێ تە بی (٣)

سەبعەیی سەییارە (و)وو نەهـ چەرخی سەرگەردان ب ڤی
گەردش وو دەورێ عەجەب دەر خیدمەت و کارێ تە بی

ماهتابا دەولەتێ یەک پورتەوەک شەمعا تە بت
ئافتابا ڕەفعەتێ بەرقەک ژ ئەنوارێ تەبی

لامعێ فەتحا ئەزەل بەرقێ ژ بەر تاجێ تە دت
کەوکەبا سەعدا ئەبەد نەجمەک ژ سەییارێ تە بی

بەرقێ صوببووحی کو ئیشراقێ ل صەد جانان ددت
ئەو کو کەشفا دل دکت ڕەمزەک ژ ئەسرارێ تە بی

ڕایەتا فەتحێ ژ نەصرا تە کو هەر مەنشوور بوو
شەهسووارێ فەڕی سوبحانی عەلەمدارێ تە بی

نەی تنێ تەبریز و کوردستان ل بەر حوکمێ تە بی
صەد وەکی شاهێ خوراسانێ د فەروارێ تە بی

گەرچی دەر ئیقلیمی ڕابیع هاتی تەختێ سەلطەنەت
پادشاهێ حەفت ئیقلیمان سەلامکارێ تە بی

چیمەنا سولطانییێ یەک لالەیەک باغێ تە بت
گولشەنا خاقانییێ خارەک ژ گولزارێ تە بی

ئێ ژ ئەمرێ تەی موکەڕڕەم سەرکەشی کت، شوبهی شەمع
بەر سەرێ تیغێ تە (و) وو مەقتوولێ مووکارێ تە بی

شاهباز ئەرچەندی پەروازێ ب بالا بێت و ڕەت
دێ د نێڤ تۆڕا تە بیت وو صەیدی شونقارێ تە بی

شاهی پوڕ هەیبەت ددیرت لێ ب سەهمێ زێدەیی
ساعەتا غەفلەت خویا بی کووژ د بن بارێ تە بی

هەر سەرێ دەولەت هەبت دێ هەر د نێڤ بەندا تە بت
هەر کەسێ عاقل بتن دێ هەر د چۆکارێ تە بی

ئێ دڤێت ئازادە بت دێ چەهڤنێر لوطفا تە بت
هەرچی ئیستیغنا د دل بەر منەت وو پارێ تە بی

هەر کەسێ قەستەک د دل، دێ قەستێ دەرگاهێ تە کت
ئێ د خاتر ئەرجو کت دێ هەر ڕجاکارێ تە بی

ئێ نە دەولەتخاهی حەضرەت بت ژ نێڤا جان و دل
شوبهەتێ ئەهلێ شەقا بەر قەهر و ئازارێ تە بی

ما ب عەیش و نۆش و شاهی ئەو قەدەر عومرێ تە بت
چەندەکی سالک موجەددەد بیت و بێزارێ تە بی

هەر کەسێ نە ژ جان دوعاگۆی وو ژەناخوانێ تە بت
گرتیێ قەیدا تە (و) وو ئامانجی نووبارێ تە بی

مەدرەکێ عیلمێ ضەمیری شەممەیەک وەصفا تە هات
وەرنە کەی عالم ب شەئنێ قەدر و میقدارێ تە بی

قەست و داخوازا مەلێ دائیم ژ جان و دل ئەڤە
هەر د بەندا خزمەتێ، پێشدەستی دیدارێ تە بی.

قەسیدەی سێیەم: غەلەط

مەی نەنۆشی شێخی صەنعانێ غەلەط
ئەو نەچوو نێڤ ئەرمەنستانێ غەلەط (١)

میثلێ مووسا وی تەجەللایا تە دی
ئێ تو دی کانێ خەتا هانێ غەلەط (٢)

وی نەدی بەژنا تە (و) وو دایێ قیاس
حیکمەتێ لەو چوویە بورهانێ غەلەط (٣)

سەطوەتا لەیلێ یەقین مەجنوون تەپاند
وەرنە قەیس ناکەت بیابانێ غەلەط

وەک نشانی نەقش و نیشانەک تە دی
ئێ کو نیشانەک تە دی کانێ غەلەط؟

ئەز گەهام ئاڤا حەیاتێ خەف ژ دل
خوضری ڤاژی چوویە حەیوانێ غەلەط

شاهنشینێن نازکان ضایع مەکن
دا نەبینی دل ب ڤێ خانێ غەلەط

ئەڵڵەهـ ئەڵڵاهـ چەرخ و دۆلابێ دنێ
نوقتە قەت ناکت د دەورانێ غەلەط

ڕووز و شەب هەر سەیرێ دیدارا تە تێن
ناکرن ئەو دەور و سەیرانێ غەلەط

هوون نەبێن مەششاطەیێ خەف دانییە
هەمقران کر خال و نیشانێ غەلەط

دێ ب سەر جانێ مە، موروەت، دامەئێخ
بشکووێن بەندا گریبانێ غەلەط

سەر نەبی بەر کوفری زولفێ عاقیبەت
ئەز دترسم لێ ژ ئیمانێ غەلەط

پەهنییا ڤێ چەرخ و دۆلابێ دنێ
نیسبەتا ئەربابی عیرفانێ غەلەط

نوسخەیێ عالەم هەمی عینوانەکە
نوقتەیەک نابت د عینوانێ غەلەط

قولزوم و بایێن موخالیف تێ پوڕن
دا نەکەلشێن داری سوککانێ غەلەط

دا بزانی پەهلەوانی، موویەکی
دەست نەدی لیللاهی میزانێ غەلەط

وێ د دەستێ من گولا گەش، پوڕ خوناڤ
حەیفی بولبول چوو گولستانێ غەلەط

هێژ سەهوا خامەیێ بوو، وەرنە من
ئەڤ غەلەط ناکر د دیوانێ غەلەط

وێ لسەر بەژنا تە ئەڤ سەیوان ڤەدا
وەرنە نادا ڕۆژ سەیوانێ غەلەط

گەهـ دل و گەهـ جان دبن تورکێن تە تێن
ناکرن یەغما (و) و تالانێ غەلەط

مەشرەبێ تورکان فورات وو نیل کر
تەشنەلەب چوو طەرفی عومەمانێ غەلەط

پیری حیکمەتبین ل ویفقا مەشرەبان
کەس نەدی مەی ڕێهتە فنجانێ غەلەط

ڕاستە یەک قانوون سەراسەر نینە تێ
خوەهری (یـ) وو پێچێن پەریشانێ غەلەط

پاک طەبع وو قووەتەک مەوزوون دڤێت
دا نەدت صەنعەت ب ئیدمانێ غەلەط

مەردومێن چەهڤێن مەلێ عەکسا خوە دی
وەک نشانی ما ل نیشانێ غەلەط.

ACTA UNIVERSITATIS UPSALIENSIS
Studia Iranica Upsaliensia
Editors: Carina Jahani and Bo Utas

---

1. CARINA JAHANI, Standardization and Orthography in the Balochi Language. 1989.
2. JUDITH JOSEPHSON, The Pahlavi Translation Technique as Illustrated by *Hōm Yašt*. 1997.
3. CARINA JAHANI, Language in Society — Eight Sociolinguistic Essays on Balochi. 2000.
4. SHOKOUFEH TAGHI, The Two Wings of Wisdom. Mysticism and Philosophy in the *Risālat uṭ-ṭair* of Ibn Sina. 2000.
5. ASHK DAHLÉN, Deciphering the meaning of revealed law. The Surūshian paradigm in Shi'i epistemology. 2001.
6. HASHEM AHMADZADEH, Nation and Novel. A Study of Persian and Kurdish Narrative Discourse. 2003.
7. FOROGH HASHABEIKY, Persian Orthography. Modification or Changeover? (1850–2000). 2005.
8. MEHRDAD FALLAHZADEH, Persian Writing on Music. A study of Persian musical literature from 1000 to 1500 A.D. 2005.
9. HELENA BANI-SHORAKA, Language Choice and Code-Switching in the Azerbaijani Community in Tehran. A conversation analytic approach to bilingual practices. 2005.
10. SERGE AXENOV, The Balochi Language of Turkmenistan. A corpus-based grammatical description. 2006.
11. MINOO SHAHIDI, A Sociolinguistic Study of Language Shift in Mazandarani. 2008.
12. JOHN R. ROBERTS, A Study of Persian Discourse Structure. 2009.
13. MARYAM NOURZAEI, CARINA JAHANI, ERIK ANONBY & ABBAS ALI AHANGAR, Koroshi. A Corpus-based Grammatical Description. 2015.
14. DARIUSH KARGAR, Ardāy-Vīrāf Nāma. Iranian Conceptions of the Other World. 2009.
15. BEHROOZ BARJASTEH DELFOROOZ, Discourse Features in Balochi of Sistan (Oral Narratives). 2010.
16. ERIK ANONBY & PAKZAD YOUSEFIAN, Adaptive Multilinguals. A Survey of Language on Larak Island. 2011.
17. ANDERS WIDMARK, Voices at the Borders, Prose on the Margins. Exploring the Contemporary Pashto Short Story in a Context of War and Crisis. 2011.
18. MEHRDAD FALLAHZADEH & MAHMOUD HASSANABADI, Shams al-aṣvāt, The Sun of Songs by Ras Baras. 2012.
19. V.S. RASTORGUEVA et al., The Gilaki Language. 2012.
20. FARIDEH OKATI, The Vowel Systems of Five Iranian Balochi Dialects. 2012.
21. GUITI SHOKRI, CARINA JAHANI & HOSSEIN BARANI, When Tradition Meets Modernity. Five Life Stories from the Galesh Community in Ziarat, Golestan, Iran. 2013.
22. FRANZ WENNBERG, On the Edge. The Concept of Progress in Bukhara during the Rule of the Later Manghits. 2013.
23. ALI MUHADDIS (Ed.), A Historical Poem on the Attack on Iran by the Afghans. Written by Nadīm Mashhadī in 1137 A.H. (1724/5 A.D.). 2014.
24. ERIK ANONBY & ASHRAF ASADI, Bakhtiari Studies. Phonology, Text, Lexicon. 2014.
25. ALI HASSOURI (Ed.), Jām-e Jahān-nemā-ye 'Abbāsi. The Abbasid "Planetarium Cup". On the Benefits of Wine. Written by: Qāẓi ebn Kāšef al-Din Moḥammad. 2014.
26. FOROGH HASHABEIKY (Ed.), International *Shāhnāme* Conference. The Second Millennium. (Conference Volume). 2014.
27. PADIDEH PAKPOUR, Identity Construction. The Case of Young Women in Rasht. 2015.

28. BEHROOZ SHEYDA, Traces of Time. The Image of the Islamic Revolution, the Hero and Martyrdom in Persian Novels Written in Iran and in Exile. 2016.
29. SHOKOUFEH TAGHI, A Typology and Classification of Three Literary Genres. Songs, Folktales, and Initiation Tales in Iranian Oral Literature and their Educational Function. 2016.
30. FARHAD SHAKELY, The Modern Kurdish Short Story. 2016.
31. MARYAM NOURZAEI, Participant Reference in Three Balochi Dialects. Male and Female Narrations of Folktales and Biographical Tales. 2017.
32. JAROSLAVA OBRTELOVÁ, Narrative Structure of Wakhi Oral Stories. 2017.
33. MAHMOUD HASSANABADI, ROUBIK JAHANI & CARINA JAHANI, A Unified Gospel in Persian. An old variant of the Gospels along with exegetical comments. Written by: Yahyā Ibn Ayvaz-e Tabrīzī-ye Armanī. 2018.
34. ERIK ANONBY & ASHRAF ASADI, Bakhtiari Studies II: Orthography. 2018.
35. JAROSLAVA OBRTELOVÁ, From Oral to Written. A Text-linguistic Study of Wakhi Narratives. 2019.
36. CARINA JAHANI, A Grammar of Modern Standard Balochi. 2019.
37. FOROGH HASHABEIKY (red.), Tavlan. En antologi med persiska noveller skrivna efter revolutionen i Iran 1979. 2020.
38. NOZHAT AHMADI (SARRAF) & MOHSEN MOHAMMADI FESHARAKI (Eds.), A Versified History of Shah Abbas the Great [Futūḥāt-i Gītīsitān]. 2021.
39. FOROGH HASHABEIKY, The Missing Link? The New Persian of the 16th–18th Centuries in Three Socio-Political Spheres. 2021.
40. CARINA JAHANI, NAGOMAN BALOCH & TAJ BALOCH (Eds.), Unheard Voices. Twenty-one short stories in Balochi with English translations. 2022.
41. ALEXANDER NILSSON, Evidentiality in Tajik. 2022.
42. MEHRDAD FALLAHZADEH, An Anthology of Indo-Persian Writings on Hindustani Music Theory from the Maghul Period. 2022.
43. FARHAD SHAKELY, We Drank the Wine from His Hand. Studies on the time, life and poetry of the Kurdish Sufi poet Malā-yē Jazīrī 2024.