

FARHANG

*Quarterly Journal of
Humanities and Cultural
Studies*

Issue Topic: Commemoration of Tusi (2)

Vol. 20, Nos. 61 & 62, spring-summer 2007



Institute for Humanities
and
Cultural Studies

فرهنگ

س ۲۰، ش ۶۱-۶۲ بهار و تابستان ۱۳۸۶

ویژه بزرگداشت خواجه نصیرالدین طوسی (۲)



فرهنگ

ویژه بزرگداشت خواجه نصیرالدین طوسی (۲)

سال بیستم، شماره های شصت و یک و شصت و دو
بهار و تابستان ۱۳۸۶



پژوهشگاه علوم انسانی و مطالعات فرهنگی

**A comparison of the theories of *qāfiya*
in Naṣīr al-Dīn-i Ṭūsī and Muḥammad-i Āmulī**

Riccardo Zipoli - Stefano Pellò
Università Ca' Foscari di Venezia

The *Mi'yār al-ash'ār*¹ was composed by Ṭūsī (597-672/1201-1274) in 649/1251.² In addition to dealing widely with Arabic and Persian meter, it contains ten chapters dedicated to the analysis of *qāfiya*: the first chapter is a general introduction (accompanied only by Arabic examples), whereas the following four are dedicated to Arabic *qāfiya* and the last five to Persian *qāfiya*.³

The parallel treatment of *qāfiya* in the two traditions (Arabic and Persian) deserves attention per se, because it provides an opportunity to observe first-hand the relations that a scholar of the caliber of Ṭūsī found between the two contexts.⁴ The analysis he undertakes in the

¹ The contribution of the *Mi'yār al-ash'ār* to the Arabic-Persian theory of *qāfiya* has been the subject of two of our recent works: Zipoli (2003a; 2003b). This paper is a reduced and revised version of Zipoli-Pellò (2004), which includes an extensive bibliography on Arabic and Persian *qāfiya*.

² Shams-i Qays (1959-60: *hā*).

³ On the importance of the *Mi'yār al-ash'ār* for the theory of *qāfiya*, see Fashārakī's observations in Shams-i Qays (1994-5: 8). The *Mi'yār al-ash'ār* has been published – although never satisfactorily – four times: Ṭūsī (1902-3; 1984; 1990; Iqbālī 2000: 159-306); for some remarks on the first edition, see Musul'mankulov (1989: 161), while for the second and third editions, see the respective reviews in Waḥīdiyān Kāmyār (1984-5; 1991); even the fourth edition is not free of lacunae and inaccuracies. In Persia a new edition of the *Mi'yār al-ash'ār*, edited by Muḥammad Fashārakī, is forthcoming; the sections on *qāfiya* in this new edition have already been published (Zipoli 2003b). On the life and works of Ṭūsī, see Mudarris Radawī (1991-2) and Iqbālī (2000); two recent volumes with contributions on Ṭūsī are Ṭūsī (2000, with an exhaustive bibliography) and Ṭūsī (2003).

⁴ Evidence of a widespread interest on the two linguistic fronts is the fact that Shams-i Qays speaks of the need and a project for a 'parallel treatment' in this

two different linguistic universes reveals, however, different degrees of novelty and value.

Ṭūsī's description of Arabic *qāfiya*, albeit with some original observations, basically goes back, in fairly clear and precise terms, over what had previously been theorized on the subject. The chapters in question are thus important not so much from an Arabistic point of view as for the purposes of a closer and more informed interpretation of the section dealing with Persian *qāfiya*, which includes frequent cross references to the corresponding Arabic section.

The analysis of Persian *qāfiya* is much more interesting. This text is more or less contemporary with the analysis of *qāfiya* by Shams-i Qays in *al-Mu'jam fi ma'āyir ash'ār al-'ajam* (Ṭūsī's text is considered to be slightly later) and therefore one of the earliest known Persian treatises on *qāfiya*. From the theoretical point of view, Ṭūsī's exposition varies in several places from the *qāfiya* rules proposed by Shams-i Qays. Evidence of this difference is provided by the fact that Ṭūsī acknowledges Yūsuf-i 'Arūḍī⁵ as the authority and founder of the theory of Persian *qāfiya* while omitting the name of Shams-i Qays, of whose theoretical model he describes (and criticizes) some important elements. Ṭūsī's system, in other words, is a kind of alternative to Shams-i Qays's system,⁶ which came to dominate and relegated Ṭūsī to the background as regards the theory of Persian *qāfiya*.

In this context it is important to mention two counter-current voices who follow the Persian model of *qāfiya* as set out by Ṭūsī. We are referring to Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad-i Āmulī, the mid-8th-/14th-century author of the encyclopedic text entitled *Nafā'is al-funūn fi*

'*arā'is al-'uyūn*, which includes a section on *qāfiya*,⁷ and Yūsuf-i 'Azīzī, who, probably in the first half of the 9th/15th century, dedicated some paragraphs to *qāfiya* in his commentary on Salmān-i Sāwajī's *qaṣīda-yi maṣnū'*. The similarities between the theories of Yūsuf-i 'Azīzī and Ṭūsī have already been identified by Musul'mankulov⁸ who, on the other hand, does not mention the first and more important revisiting of Ṭūsī by Āmulī.

In fact Āmulī's work not only reflects in general the approach of Ṭūsī (also by studying *qāfiya* in both the Arabic and Persian contexts), but in some sections even follows Ṭūsī to the letter, without mentioning, however, the source. The presence of this emulation (like that of Yūsuf-i 'Azīzī), rather than diminishing, seems to confirm Ṭūsī's isolation, demonstrating his theories had a certain influence in later centuries only over marginal theoreticians in the context of Persian *qāfiya*.⁹ Significantly, like Ṭūsī, Āmulī lived at the Ilkhanid court. His interest in the *Mi'yār al-ash'ār* might thus not be due to conscious technical decisions but simple historical circumstances (especially the fame and prestige Ṭūsī and his work enjoyed in those places at that time), or even pure convenience (Ṭūsī's treatise was very probably easily found at court).¹⁰

Given that Āmulī's comments on *qāfiya* is so little known and it is

direction (Shams-i Qays 1959-60: 3, 4), and refers to his analysis of Arabic *qāfiya* (Shams-i Qays 1959-60: 217, 273), which has not come down to us.

⁵ The reflections of Yūsuf-i 'Arūḍī (4th/10th century) on *qāfiya* have not come down to us; for this author and his works, see Mundawī (1969-1974: III, 2153), Šafā (1954-1991: I, 437-438; 1987), and Shams-i Qays (1997: 442). The fact Yūsuf-i 'Arūḍī is mentioned by Ṭūsī in these terms suggests that Ṭūsī's theory of *qāfiya* may well have been first elaborated by Yūsuf-i 'Arūḍī. Interestingly, in a short treatise on Arabic *qāfiya* entitled *Ḥaqīqat al-qawāfi*, the celebrated Persian philosopher Fakhr al-Dīn-i Rāzī (543/1149-606/1209) mentions a book by Yūsuf-i 'Arūḍī describing some features of *qāfiya* as theorized by Ṭūsī (Fakhr al-Dīn-i Rāzī Ms: 3).

⁶ For the differences between Ṭūsī's system compared to that of Shams-i Qays, see Zipoli (2003a; 2003b).

⁷ Āmulī (1958-1960: I, 155-167).

⁸ Musul'mankulov (1989: 106, 114, 163, 190).

⁹ There continued to be references to Ṭūsī's 'heterodox' theories in later periods: see Gladwin (1798: 151, 164-165), Tahānawī (1967: I, 407, 576; II, 1504), Garcin de Tassy (1970: 350), and Blochmann (1970: 81). In this context there are some important commentaries on the *Mi'yār al-ash'ār*; the most authoritative, entitled *Mizān al-ufkūr*, is a 19th-century work by the erudite Indian Muḥammad Sa'd Allāh-i Murādābādī (Murādābādī 1883): the chapters on *qāfiya* from this text have recently been published in a critical edition by Muḥammad Fashārakī with an Italian translation and comment by Stefano Pellò (Pellò 2003).

¹⁰ In another circumstance the popularity of the *Mi'yār al-ash'ār* would seem also to have been favored by marginal factors. We are referring to the famous Persian mathematician and astronomer Ghiyāth al-Dīn Jamshīd-i Kāshānī (m. 823/1429) who, in a letter written from Timurid Samarkand to his father, acknowledges the importance of the *Mi'yār al-ash'ār* for the study of meter (Kāshānī 1996: 47-48): Kāshānī's interest in Ṭūsī may be due to the educational and professional affinities between the two scientists (both were active in an astronomical observatory, Ṭūsī at Marāgha and Kāshānī at Samarkand).

strictly dependent on Ṭūsī's treatise, we thought it would be useful to compare the chapters by Ṭūsī and Āmulī on *qāfiya*.¹¹ The analysis of the two sections on Arabic *qāfiya* is by Stefano Pellò and that of the two sections on Persian *qāfiya* by myself. The conclusions are by Stefano Pellò.

To indicate references to excerpts from Ṭūsī and Āmulī we will use the abbreviations *Mi'yār* and *Nafā'is* followed by the page number of the original text.

Riccardo Zipoli

1. A comparative analysis of the theories of Arabic *qāfiya* in the *Mi'yār al-ash'ār* and the *Nafā'is al-funūn*

It cannot be claimed there is a direct connection between the chapters on Arabic *qāfiya* by Ṭūsī and the equivalent chapters by Āmulī: there are rare common features and many discrepancies in the two texts. Before highlighting the differences between the two works, we will first indicate the few similarities.

The most striking common features are the number of chapters, the description of their content, and the order in which they are arranged in the two texts: There are in fact five chapters in both cases in a corresponding sequence and each with a title indicating the treatment of similar topics. The titles on Arabic *qāfiya* in the *Mi'yār al-ash'ār* are: (1) *Dar ḥadd-i qāfiya wa aqsām-i ān* / "On the length of *qāfiya* and on its types"; (2) *Dar bayān-i ḥurūf wa ḥarakāt-i ki ajzā'-i qāfiya bāshand bar madhhab-i 'arab* / "On the explanation of the *hurūf* and the *ḥarakāt* constituting the parts of *qāfiya* in the Arabic doctrine"; (3)

¹¹ The following observations are based on the critical edition of the chapters on *qāfiya* in the *Mi'yār al-ash'ār* published in Zipoli (2003b) for Ṭūsī, and on the text published in Āmulī (1958-1960: I, 155-167) for Āmulī.

Dar aḥkām-i in ḥurūf wa ḥarakāt / "On the rules of these *hurūf* and *ḥarakāt*"; (4) *Dar anwā'-i qawāfi ba nazdīk-i 'arab* / "On the categories of the *qawāfi* used by the Arabs"; (5) *Dar 'uyūb-i qawāfi ba nazdīk-i 'arab* / "On the faults of the *qawāfi* used by the Arabs". The titles of the chapters on Arabic *qāfiya* in the *Nafā'is al-funūn*, on the other hand, are as follows: (1) *Dar ta'rīf-i qāfiya* / "On the definition of *qāfiya*"; (2) *Dar ḥurūf-i ki dar qāfiya-yi shi'r-i 'arab ri'āyat-i ān kunand* / "On the *hurūf* to be repeated in a *qāfiya* in Arabic verse"; (3) *Dar ḥarakāt-i ki dar qāfiya-yi shi'r-i 'arab ri'āyat-i ān kunand* / "On the *ḥarakāt* to be repeated in a *qāfiya* in Arabic verse"; (4) *Dar bayān-i aqsām-i qāfiya-yi shi'r-i 'arab* / "On the explanation of the types of *qāfiya* in Arabic verse"; (5) *Dar 'uyūb-i qāfiya-yi shi'r-i 'arab* / "On the faults in *qāfiya* in Arabic verse". As we see, the number of chapters, the indication of their content, and the order of the sequence correspond: the authors use practically the same titles for the fourth and fifth chapters, respectively, while the title for the first, second and third chapters have similar indications.¹² Ṭūsī and Āmulī both adopt some typical features of the traditional structure of the Arabic-Persian works on *qāfiya*: in both Arabic and Persian treatises, the first chapters are generally dedicated to a more or less broad definition of *qāfiya*; similarly, the treatment of the faults of *qāfiya* are usually dealt with in the last chapters.

As regards specific theoretical issues (we obviously leave aside the fact that at a general level the two texts basically agree, since they both draw on the classical Arabic theory of *qāfiya*), the only fairly interesting common point is where both authors argue that there is no agreement between Arabic scholars on whether to consider the *wāw* and the *yā* of the diphthongs *aw* and *ay* as a *ridf*: both Ṭūsī and Āmulī quote this dispute between Arabic theoreticians of *qāfiya*. In this case too, however, we cannot speak of a direct connection, since Āmulī quotes as a source for this point al-Tibrīzī's treatise *al-Wāfi fi 'l-'arūd wa-'l-qawāfi* (indicated in Āmulī's text as *Wāfi*), and not Ṭūsī's *Mi'yār al-ash'ār*. The phrases used in Persian are, moreover, very different (Ṭūsī: *wāw wa yā chūn sākin bāshand wa mā-qabl-ishān mutaharrik qawm-i ān-rā ridf shumurand wa qawm-i na*; Āmulī:

¹² Note, however, that the indications in the titles are distributed differently in the second and third chapters.

ṣāhib-i Wāfi āwarda-ast ki dar wāw wa yā'-ī ki mā-qabl-i ishān maftūh buwad hamchūn 'awd wa qayd khilāf kardand wa ba'ḍi guftand ridf wāqi' nashawad wa ba'ḍi gufta-and wāqi' shawad.¹³

From the point of view of quotes and examples, if we continue to consider the similarities, we note that the chapters on Arabic *qāfiya* in the *Mi'yār al-ash'ār* and the *Nafā'is al-funūn* in some cases include the same verse quotes: *qad jabara 'l-dīna 'l-ilāhu fa-jabar* (a hemistich quoted by both authors in the first chapter on the subject of the *qāfiya-yi mutakāwis*¹⁴) and *wa-qātimi 'l-a'māqi khāwi 'l-mukhtaraqin* (a hemistich quoted by both authors in the second chapter on the subject of *ghālī*¹⁵). In addition to these two hemistiches there is a third 'common' hemistich, but in this case the two authors use different versions of it. In fact in his second chapter on the subject of *muta'addī*, Ṭūsī quotes the hemistich *lammā ra'aytu 'l-dahra jamman khaṭaluhu*,¹⁶ whereas this hemistich is mentioned on the same subject by Āmulī with *ḥiyaluhu* instead of *khaṭaluhu*.¹⁷ We must not be misled by the fact these three examples are found in both authors at the same point and on the same topic: they were classical examples used by many Arabic theoreticians in the same context.¹⁸

If we leave aside the obvious use of the same technical terms and the summarizing tendency in both Ṭūsī and Āmulī, there are no other particular technical affinities.

We can thus now turn to the differences in the reflections by the two authors. They are considerable from the following points of view:

¹³ *Mi'yār*: 5; *Nafā'is*: 158. Both authors, however, tend to consider the *wāw* and the *yā* of the diphthongs as the *ridf* (*Mi'yār*: 13; *Nafā'is*: 162).

¹⁴ *Mi'yār*: 3; *Nafā'is*: 155.

¹⁵ *Mi'yār*: 6; *Nafā'is*: 158.

¹⁶ *Mi'yār*: 6.

¹⁷ *Nafā'is*: 159.

¹⁸ As regards the first of the three hemistiches quoted above, see, for example, al-Akhfash (1970: 31), Ibn Kaysān (1859: 50), al-Tibrizī (1970: 218); for the second, see al-Akhfash (1970: 111), Ibn Rashīq (1994: II, 1086), al-Irbilī (1997: 154), al-Sakkākī (1987: 574), and al-Tibrizī (1970: 235); and for the third, al-Akhfash (1970: 113), al-'Arūḍī (1996: 283), and al-Irbilī (1997: 152). Both Ṭūsī and Āmulī quote the third hemistich (*lammā ra'aytu...*) but with a difference compared to the three Arabic treatise we indicated: in the three Arabic texts the last word is always *khabaluhu*, and this suggests a possible error both in the *Mi'yār al-ash'ār* and in the *Nafā'is al-funūn*.

1) content and internal approach in each chapter; 2) theoretical positions and critical ideas; 3) terminology; and 4) quotations and examples.

Let us begin with point number one. In the first chapter, Ṭūsī makes a direct revision of the traditional theory attributed to al-Khalīl, whereas Āmulī brings together various definitions and, with no prior analysis, opts for that of al-Khalīl. In the second chapter, Ṭūsī simply lists the technical terms for the *hurūf* and the *ḥarakāt* of *qāfiya*, keeping his observations to a minimum; Āmulī, on the other hand, only deals with the *hurūf*, and provides explanations for the various cases and exceptions. In the third chapter, Ṭūsī concentrates on a detailed analysis of the features of each *ḥarf* and *ḥarakat* in Arabic *qāfiya*, whereas Āmulī only provides a list of the *ḥarakāt*. The fourth and fifth chapters contain a treatment of the same topics in both texts, but they have a different approach: Ṭūsī is prolix and speculative, while Āmulī is concise with many examples, and completely neglects some of the key reflections found in Ṭūsī, as we will see below.

There are other more significant differences in the theoretical and critical positions of the two authors. Firstly, as further proof of the overall different approach by the two, we note that Ṭūsī immediately includes in the first chapter a programmatic statement revealing that his interest in Arabic *qāfiya* is also related to his desire for a better understanding of Persian *qāfiya*. In fact, after declaring that an understanding of his definition of *qāfiya* requires a knowledge of the individual *hurūf* and *ḥarakāt*, which are constituent elements of *qāfiya*, Ṭūsī goes on to say: "Later, it will be possible to know more precisely the difference between the Arabic doctrine and the Persian doctrine on the subject of *qāfiya*. We will thus begin by expounding the Arabic doctrine on the subject, since the Arabs have precedence in the science of verse, if God the One so wishes".¹⁹ In Āmulī there is no sign of a similar attitude.

If we now consider some more technical questions in his first chapter, Ṭūsī – as we said – quotes the definition of *qāfiya* attributed to al-Khalīl for the purposes of revising it: i.e. to analyze it, highlighting the limits and suggesting an alternative definition. In particular, Ṭūsī reflects on the problems raised by the application of

¹⁹ *Mi'yār*: 4.

this definition of *qāfiya* attributed to al-Khalīl, since in some metric contexts the line endings in the same composition could belong to several types of *qāfiya* simultaneously.²⁰ In Āmulī, who, as we said, accepts al-Khalīl's definition without bothering to analyze it, there is no such discussion. Indeed the author of the *Nafā'is al-funūn* judges all the other definitions of *qāfiya* he is aware of unsatisfactory.²¹ On this subject we note that while Ṭūsī's subsequent analysis will be in keeping with the definition he proposes for *qāfiya*, Āmulī, who indicated al-Khalīl as an absolute model, proceeds to analyze Arabic *qāfiya* according to a different model from that attributed to the Arab theoretician.²²

There are also major differences as regards the characteristics attributed to the individual *hurūf* of *qāfiya*, especially that related to the *rawī*. In line with the classical Arabic theory, Ṭūsī includes the *yā* of the suffixed pronoun of the first person singular in the list of cases in which the weak *hurūf* can be the *rawī*, whereas Āmulī argues that this *harf* cannot exercise the function of the *rawī*.²³ On the subject of the complex discussion on the *hā* of the feminine as the *rawī*, Ṭūsī deals with both the case when it is quiescent (as in *jamīlah*: in this situation it cannot be *rawī*) and the case when it is moving (becoming a *tā* as in *jamīlatī*: in this situation it can be a *rawī*, no matter how unpleasant), whereas Āmulī simply includes the *hā* of the feminine in the list of the *hurūf* that cannot be a *rawī*.²⁴ Moreover, unlike Āmulī, Ṭūsī includes a detailed list of the cases in which the weak *hurūf* and the *hā* can function as a *rawī*.²⁵ Lastly, still on the subject of the *rawī*, Ṭūsī makes a comment not found in Āmulī, when he claims that it is better to use non-weak radical *hurūf* for this function.²⁶

As far as the other *hurūf* of *qāfiya* are concerned, Ṭūsī dwells on the

difficulties encountered in some specific cases over deciding, in terminological terms, between the *riḍf* and the *rawī* or between the *rawī* and the *waṣl*. Ṭūsī considers this difficulty an unsolved problem concerning the limits of traditional terminology for *qāfiya*. Take, for example, the cases of *alāh* and *hajāh*,²⁷ where the *alif* is the last radical and the *hā* a suffixed personal pronoun: if we consider the *alif* as the *rawī* and the *hā* as the *waṣl* we rightly apply the principle, whereby the best *rawī* is the last radical element of the word, but we contravene the traditional theoretical definition, which does not contemplate a *qāfiya-yi muqayyad* with the *waṣl*; if, on the other hand, we consider the *alif* as the *riḍf* and the *hā* as the *rawī*, although not contravening the above traditional theoretical definition, we are forced to consider the last radical element as the *riḍf* and the following non-radical element as the *rawī*. Āmulī never mentions this problem. On the same theme, Ṭūsī raises another issue. Imagining a composition whose first two *qāfiya*-words are *asbābih* and *abwābih*²⁸ (at this point the *qāfiya* would be *ābih*, with *alif* as the *riḍf*, *bā* as the *rawī* and *hā* as the *waṣl*), and, adding, as a third *qāfiya*-word, the term *nābih* (in which the final *hā* is radical), a doubt arises over the value to give to the final *hā*. We have two possible solutions and both are problematic: 1) give *hā* the value of the *waṣl*, but in this case a radical *harf* (the *hā* of *nābih*) would be considered the *waṣl*; 2) give *hā* the value of the *rawī*, but in this eventuality we would have to consider in all three cases *alif* as the *ta'sis* and *bā* as the *dakhīl*, and it should be considered legitimate to include among the *qāfiya*-words a term like *i'lāmiḥ* (*i'lām* in the oblique case with the *hā* of the suffixed masculine personal pronoun), since this term fits the *ta'sis/dakhīl/rawī* structure: this would lead to considering as the *rawī* non-radical elements in three cases out of four (i.e. the *hā* of *asbābih*, *abwābih*, *i'lāmiḥ*) and to deeming as legitimate the use (in a potential continuation of the composition) as a *qāfiya*-word of any word, in the oblique case, of the form *if'āl/af'āl* followed by the suffixed third person masculine singular pronoun (like *anwā'ih*, *atfāliḥ*, etc.). Ṭūsī opts for the first solution, in which the *rawī* (*bā*) is radical in all cases, although in *nābih* it is shifted to the body of the word. Āmulī does not raise the

²⁰ *Mi'yār*: 4.

²¹ *Nafā'is*: 155.

²² The general scheme used by Āmulī to analyze *qāfiya* turns out to be similar to that of Ṭūsī.

²³ *Mi'yār*: 9; *Nafā'is*: 157.

²⁴ *Mi'yār*: 8; *Nafā'is*: 157. In fact Āmulī mentions in a rather involuted way that the *hā* of the feminine can be the *rawī* if preceded by a quiescent *harf*, but this is a special case (see immediately below).

²⁵ *Mi'yār*: 7-8.

²⁶ *Mi'yār*: 9.

²⁷ *Mi'yār*: 9.

²⁸ *Mi'yār*: 10.

problem, but mentions the possibility that the function of the *waṣl* can be exercised by a radical *hā*, without explaining the reason for this contradiction.²⁹ Arguably, Āmulī simply chose to avoid including an element of uncertainty into his treatment.

The chapter with the most significant differences from the point of view of the respective theoretical positions is the fourth. Both authors dedicate this chapter to the types of *qāfiya* in Arabic verse. Ṭūsī speaks of nine types on which scholars agree, and mentions another four ‘new’ types that can occur in Arabic, provided the existence of a quiescent *rawī* followed by a *waṣl* (and possibly by a *khurūj*) is accepted.³⁰ This is one of the most interesting points in Ṭūsī’s treatment of Arabic *qāfiya*, and deserves special attention. The problem raised by Ṭūsī is as follows: since according to al-Khalīl, a *rawī-yi muqayyad* (i.e. quiescent) cannot be followed by other elements, the traditional terminology runs into difficulty when trying to describe the various *hurūf* in a *qāfiya* in special cases like *lam yukhātibhāllam yurāqibhā*, *qāṣihā/dānīhā*, *‘alāhā/nadāhā* in which a last quiescent radical repeated identically (in the three pairs of examples they are the *bā*, the *yā*, and the *alif*, respectively) is followed by other elements. Ṭūsī argues that the classical solution is to consider as a *luzūm mā lā yalzam* or as the *ridf* the radical *hurūf* repeated identically as far as and including the last radical, and to consider as the *rawī* the *ḥarf* immediately after the last radical: in the case of *lam yukhātibhāllam yurāqibhā* we should consider *āqib* and *ātib* as a *luzūm mā lā yalzam*, the *hā* as the *rawī* and the *wāw* as the *waṣl*; in the case of *qāṣihā/dānīhā* we should consider the first *alif* as a *luzūm mā lā yalzam*, the *yā* as the *ridf*, the *hā* as the *rawī*, and the last *alif* as the *waṣl*; lastly, in the case of *‘alāhā/nadāhā* we should consider the first *alif* as the *ridf*, the *hā* as the *rawī* and the last *alif* as the *waṣl*. The limits of this procedure are self-evident: working in this way excludes from the count of the *hurūf* in a *qāfiya* all (as in *lam yukhātibhāllam yurāqibhā*) or some (as in *qāṣihā/dānīhā*) of the repeated radical elements; or (as in *‘alāhā/nadāhā*, the less ‘serious’ case) the only repeated radical element (the *alif*) is considered as the *ridf* instead of the *rawī*. In all these cases, non-radical elements must be considered

as the *rawī*. Ṭūsī’s suggestion for a *qāfiya-yi muqayyad* followed by the *waṣl* (divided as we said into four types) is due to the need to obviate this terminological problem, and most importantly to prevent the exclusion, from the count of the *qāfiya*, of elements which are effectively part of it. The three cases we have quoted as examples are solved by Ṭūsī as follows: 1) *lam yukhātibhāllam yurāqibhā*: *alif* = *ta’sīs*, *qāf* and *tā* = *dakhīl*, *bā* = *rawī*, *hā* = *waṣl*, *wāw* = *khurūj*; 2) *qāṣihā/dānīhā*: *alif* = *ta’sīs*, *ṣād* and *nūn* = *dakhīl*, *yā* = *rawī*, *hā* = *waṣl*, *alif* = *khurūj*; 3) *‘alāhā/nadāhā*: *alif* = *rawī*, *hā* = *waṣl*, *alif* = *khurūj*. In this context we must remember that Ṭūsī highlights (as he also does at the beginning of his analysis) the limits of the definition of *qāfiya* attributed to al-Khalīl:³¹ in a pair like *qāḍih/hāmīh* (*qāfiya-yi muqayyad* with the *ta’sīs* and the *waṣl*, according to Ṭūsī, where the *alif* is the *ta’sīs*, the *dāl* and the *mīm* are the *dakhīl*, the *yā* is the *rawī*, and the *hā* is the *waṣl*), following al-Khalīl’s theory, the *alif* (the *ta’sīs*, according to Ṭūsī) would be excluded from the *qāfiya*, since according to al-Khalīl, the *qāfiya* is included between the last two quiescent *hurūf* of the line (in this case the *yā* of prolongation and the *hā* of the pronoun).

Āmulī only proposes the nine traditional types, and seems unconcerned with the questions just analyzed.³² According to the indication in the second chapter of the *Nafā’is al-funūn*, however, it may be deduced that Āmulī, in line with the tradition, deems a *qāfiya-yi muqayyad* with the *waṣl* to be impossible. Āmulī argues: “Moreover, neither the *hā* of the pronoun when preceded by a moving *ḥarf*, as in *ḍarabahū* and *ḍarabahā*, nor the *hā* of the feminine in the same conditions, as *talhah*, can be considered the *rawī* [...]”.³³ The fact Āmulī specifies that the *hā* of the pronoun and the *hā* of the feminine cannot be the *rawī* when preceded by a moving *ḥarf* suggests that he believed it possible that the *hā* of the pronoun or the *hā* of the feminine, if preceded by a quiescent *ḥarf*, can exercise the function of the *rawī*.³⁴ On the grounds of this hypothesis, therefore, a case like *lam*

²⁹ *Nafā’is*: 157.

³⁰ *Mi’yār*: 10-12.

³¹ *Mi’yār*: 11-12.

³² *Nafā’is*: 160-161.

³³ *Nafā’is*: 157.

³⁴ To support our supposition, it must be said that al-Akhfash explicitly declares that a non-radical *hā*, preceded by a quiescent *ḥarf*, can be the *rawī* (see al-Akhfash 1970: 77-81).

yukhātibhā/lam yurāqibhā (in which the *hā* of the pronoun is preceded by a quiescent *ḥarf*) would probably be considered by Āmulī, in perfect harmony with al-Khalīl's theory, as a *qāfiya-yi muṭlaq* with the *waṣl* (in which the *hā* is the *rawī* and the *wāw* is the *waṣl*), and a case like *ṣalāh/zakāh* (in which the *hā* of the feminine is preceded by a quiescent *ḥarf*) would probably be considered as a *qāfiya-yi muqayyad* with the *ridf* (in which the *alif* is the *ridf* and the *hā* is the *rawī*).

The treatment of the faults in Arabic *qāfiya*, although structured differently in the two authors, has no difference worthy of note from the point of view of their theoretical position. However, in this case, too, Tūsī tends to adopt a more systematic approach. His chapter on the subject is more than twice as long as that of Āmulī (most of Āmulī's chapter deals with examples of verse). On this theme, we would stress how Tūsī, unlike Āmulī, does not deal with the fault called *ramal*, which is metric in nature and therefore outside Tūsī's definition of *qāfiya*.

The two texts also differ at some places from the terminological point of view. Firstly, Āmulī does not include three mnemonic formulas – *sabakraf*,³⁵ *yashuftuj*,³⁶ and *rāḥat-i man*³⁷ – used by Tūsī to indicate the types of *qāfiya* according to al-Khalīl, the *hurūf* in a *qāfiya*, and the *ḥarakāt* in a *qāfiya*, respectively. Secondly, to indicate a *qāfiya* with the *waṣl*, Tūsī uses the term *mawṣūl*, while Āmulī the rarer *mawṣila*.³⁸ Thirdly, again on the subject of the types of *qāfiya*, Āmulī does not use the expression *qāfiya-yi muṭlaq*, even if he uses the 'opposite' definition of *qāfiya-yi muqayyad* (*muqayyada*).³⁹ There is also a slight difference as concerns the *ghālī* and the *muta'addī*: Tūsī (this time less precise than Āmulī) uses the term *ghālī/muta'addī* for the *qawāfī* containing this kind of *hurūf*, and the term *ghuluww/ta'addī* for the *hurūf* themselves, while Āmulī more correctly uses *ghālī/muta'addī* for the *hurūf* in question and *ghuluww/ta'addī* for the *ḥarakāt* preceding them (Tūsī does not mention these *ḥarakāt*).⁴⁰

³⁵ *Mi'yār*: 3.

³⁶ *Mi'yār*: 6.

³⁷ *Mi'yār*: 6.

³⁸ *Mi'yār*: 10-12, *passim*; *Nafā'is*: 160.

³⁹ *Nafā'is*: 160.

⁴⁰ *Mi'yār*: 6; *Nafā'is*: 158-159.

As for the quotations and examples, the two texts are very different in terms of the authors' approaches and intentions.

If we begin with quotations from sources on *qāfiya*, we find Tūsī quotes al-Khalīl (twice⁴¹) and, generically, "others, amongst the most careful scholars of the Arabic language",⁴² without mentioning specific works. Āmulī quotes as many as five Arabic authors: al-Akhfash,⁴³ al-Khalīl,⁴⁴ Quṭrub,⁴⁵ Ibn Kaysān,⁴⁶ and Ibn Jinnī.⁴⁷ Moreover, Āmulī also indicates two texts: the *Mughrib*⁴⁸ (i.e. *al-Mughrib fī sharḥ al-qawāfī* by Ibn Jinnī) and the *Wāfī*⁴⁹ (i.e. *al-Wāfī fī 'l-'arūd wa-'l-qawāfī* by al-Tibrīzī).

The way the system of examples is structured in the two authors is also different: Tūsī's system is mainly based on individual words, while Āmulī's system mainly quotes complete lines. Tūsī adduces almost twice as many examples of individual words than Āmulī (118 in Tūsī, 62 in Āmulī), and, on the other hand, he never quotes a complete line, while Āmulī cites twenty. Both authors quote five hemistiches. In this context we must stress that as regards individual words cited as examples, there is no correspondence between the two works, while as we saw earlier, three of the five hemistiches cited by Tūsī are also found in Āmulī. Lastly, Tūsī never refers to a poet, whereas Āmulī cites the names of four poets: Imru' al-Qays, Ṭarafa, Ḥassān, and 'Abid ibn al-Abras (Āmulī also quotes some of their lines).⁵⁰

On the grounds of the above comparisons, we can stress the different approaches distinguishing the two texts. Tūsī's text is characterized by his critical views as regards the classical Arabic theory on *qāfiya* and by some attempts at a systematic approach. The main features of Āmulī's text, on the other hand, is the lack of any

⁴¹ *Mi'yār*: 3, 12.

⁴² *Mi'yār*: 3.

⁴³ *Nafā'is*: 155, 158, 160.

⁴⁴ *Nafā'is*: 155, 156, 159.

⁴⁵ *Nafā'is*: 155.

⁴⁶ *Nafā'is*: 155.

⁴⁷ *Nafā'is*: 157, 158.

⁴⁸ *Nafā'is*: 157.

⁴⁹ *Nafā'is*: 158.

⁵⁰ *Nafā'is*: 155, 156, 162.

'scientific' observations and a plethora of verse quotations and examples. We can conclude that there is a critical-speculative tendency (preparing the ground to the study of Persian *qāfiya*) in Ṭūsī and a traditional 'compilation' approach in Āmulī.

2. A comparative analysis of the theories of Persian *qāfiya* in the *Mi'yar al-ash'ar* and the *Nafā'is al-funūn*

Unlike his remarks on the subject of Arabic *qāfiya*, Āmulī's text on Persian *qāfiya* seems very closely linked to the corresponding text by Ṭūsī and appears to be a kind of reduced, partially revised version of it. In fact most of the points analyzed by Ṭūsī are taken up by Āmulī but are almost always treated in a summary way (with less explanations and cases), at times patchy and inaccurate, to the detriment of the argumentation. There are also some cases, however, in which Āmulī suggests different solutions from Ṭūsī's model. Here we will try to highlight the common features and major differences between the reflections of the two authors.

As far as the common features are concerned, we can identify three aspects: 1) the approach to the subject and the division into chapters; 2) theoretical positions; 3) phraseology and examples.

In the first aspect we immediately note that Āmulī deals with the same subjects as Ṭūsī both in general and as regards the individual points (apart from some emendations and inaccuracies shown below). We can almost define this convergence as inevitable because it reflects the basic approach, which is often the same in the various treatises on Persian *qāfiya*. It must be noted that Āmulī's sixth chapter embraces the sixth and seventh chapters by Ṭūsī; Āmulī's seventh chapter corresponds to Ṭūsī's eighth, and Āmulī's eighth corresponds to Ṭūsī's tenth (Āmulī has no equivalent to Ṭūsī's ninth chapter dedicated to interpretations of specific questions). The thematic distribution within Āmulī's chapters also basically follows that of Ṭūsī, and the few changes introduced do not affect the content and overall argumentation.

As far as the theoretical positions are concerned, a comparative interpretation highlights how Ṭūsī's heterodox arguments on the number of components (*ḥurūf/ḥarakāt*) in a *qāfiya*, the *rawī-yi muḍā'af*,⁵¹ the *ridf*, and the *waṣl/radif* basically correspond to those found in Āmulī. There are, however, some both minor and major differences.

While according to Ṭūsī there are five *ḥurūf* in a *qāfiya*, Āmulī sets the number at three. But this is not a real reduction since it is only due to a different method of counting the *rawī*: for Āmulī the *rawī*, whether *mufrad* or *muḍā'af*, counts only one unit, whereas in Ṭūsī's system it counts three units (one, for the *mufrad*, plus two for the *muḍā'af*).⁵² The reduction from five to three *ḥarakāt* made by Āmulī, compared to Ṭūsī's model, on the other hand, reflects a substantial, effective change. In fact the two new *ḥarakāt*⁵³ distinguishing Ṭūsī's system from that of Shams-i Qays are missing: Āmulī does not agree they should be included among the components of *qāfiya*.⁵⁴

There is also a difference concerning the *ḥurūf* that can be used as the second *ḥarf* of the *rawī-yi muḍā'af*. We are referring to the presence of *rā* instead of *dāl*.⁵⁵ This change would seem to correspond to a belief held by Āmulī, since he gives two examples (*kār*, *dūr*) to support this possibility. But it is precisely the examples he adduces which highlight the weakness and inconsistency of Āmulī's theory. His very definition confirms, in fact, that the *rawī-yi muḍā'af* is made up of two *ḥurūf* following an *alif*, a *wāw* or a *yā*. But this condition is not respected in the two examples he quotes. Moreover, the examples include also *rānd*, in which the 'removed' *dāl* plays the – this time canonic – functions of the second *ḥarf* of the *rawī-yi muḍā'af*.⁵⁶ The picture is thus confused and Āmulī's position is unclear.

On the subject of the *ridf*, Āmulī never strays significantly from

⁵¹ The *rawī-yi muḍā'af* is made up of two *ḥurūf* following a *ḥarf* of prolongation as in the case of the *sin* and the *tā* in *dūst*.

⁵² *Mi'yar*: 20; *Nafā'is*: 163-164.

⁵³ This is the *ḥarakat-i majhūla* of the first *ḥarf* in the *rawī-yi muḍā'af* and the *ḥarakat* of the second *ḥarf* in the *rawī-yi muḍā'af* or of the *rawī-yi mufrad* when they are followed by a moving *ḥarf*.

⁵⁴ *Mi'yar*: 20; *Nafā'is*: 164.

⁵⁵ *Mi'yar*: 17; *Nafā'is*: 163.

⁵⁶ *Nafā'is*: 163.

Ṭūsī's position.⁵⁷

Coming to the question of the *waṣl* and the *radif*, we discover another contradictory situation. Āmulī basically accepts Ṭūsī's theory whereby the *radif* begins after the *waṣl* or, when it is absent, after the *rawī*. Many of Āmulī's comments on the *radif* effectively closely follow those of Ṭūsī (there is, however, a divergence on the question of the possible length, which Āmulī describes as being shorter).⁵⁸ On the other hand, Āmulī's definition of the *waṣl* is not as detailed as that of Ṭūsī (for example, Āmulī does not mention the fact that the *waṣl* must be quiescent and complete the syntagma to which it is suffixed). But the most serious inconsistency is caused again by his exemplification. The *mīm* of *shinūdām* and *gushūdām* and the *tā* of *dahan-at* and *sukhan-at*, which Āmulī adduces as examples of *radif*,⁵⁹ are in fact, given his definitions (and those of Ṭūsī), simply cases of *waṣl*: this again leaves us puzzling over his real intentions. There is another case of inconsistent exemplification. Like Ṭūsī, Āmulī mentions the possibility that a poet can change the *radif* of a composition after a certain number of lines, provided he mentions and justifies this fact. The example of Kamāl al-Dīn Ismā'īl quoted by Āmulī is the same as that cited by Ṭūsī but we find again some inconsistencies.⁶⁰

Still in the field of theoretical positions, we note that Āmulī reduces the types of *qāfiya* to the eleven cases deemed possible by Ṭūsī (he does not consider the three further cases which his predecessor theorized and described as not used).⁶¹ The general picture offered by the two authors, therefore, basically coincide, although in the list of examples Āmulī's text reveals lacunae and inaccuracies. It is worth noting that, by ignoring the three types not used, Āmulī also avoids the related explanations in metric terms, which in Ṭūsī are often forced

and unconvincing in tone.

Āmulī's notes on the *qāfiya-yi aṣlī* and the *qāfiya-yi ma' mūl*, on the *shāyḡān*, and on the *qāfiya* faults follow Ṭūsī's theory. There are, however, some important differences: 1) the absence in Āmulī's text of the fourth variation of the fault in a *qāfiya* linked to the *rawī*; this variation concerns the *ḥarakāt* he refuses to recognize as elements of *qāfiya*;⁶² 2) the use of the pair *pisar-i/khabar-ē* by Āmulī to provide an example of the fault in the *waṣl*⁶³ and by Ṭūsī to give an example of the fault in the *majrā*, but not vice versa;⁶⁴ 3) Āmulī's inclusion of *īṭā* among the faults of *qāfiya*⁶⁵ (Ṭūsī does not speak directly of *īṭā* among the faults in Persian *qāfiya* but nonetheless alludes to it when referring to the corresponding chapter on Arabic *qāfiya*, in which he does include *īṭā*).⁶⁶

When discussing phraseology, it is easy to note how Āmulī often follows to the letter Ṭūsī's model. The following phrases are cited by both authors (when there are differences we signal Ṭūsī's variation with inverted commas and Āmulī's between brackets): *ba istiqrā' ma' lūm "shuda ast" (shud) ki ḥarf-i "awwal" (awwalī-yi ū) yak-ī az in haft ḥarf bāshad*,⁶⁷ *ba' dī-rā ma' nī bāshad wa ba' dī-rā "nabāshad" (na) ba sabab-i ān ki ba' dī ba infirād lafz-i bāshad wa ba' dī "juzw-i bāshad az lafz-i" (na)*,⁶⁸ *wa tikrār-i radif wājib buwad "magar" (mukarrar: this is a mistake) dar "tarjī' hā" (tarjī' āt) yā ān jā ki shā' ir ba tariq-i bad' at radif bigardānad*,⁶⁹ *"ganj-i shāyḡān" (shāyḡān) ganj-i-rā gūyand ki dar way māl-i bisyār "bāshad" (buwad)*.⁷⁰ Here, lastly, are just some of the various identical examples given: *tuhī*, *pahlū*, *da' wī*, *ma' nī*, *mīnū*, and *mard* in the case of the *rawī-yi mufrad*;⁷¹ *rāst*, *dāsh*t, *sākht*, and *rānd* in the case of the *rawī-yi*

⁵⁷ *Mi' yār*: 16; *Nafā' is*: 164.

⁵⁸ *Mi' yār*: 19; *Nafā' is*: 164.

⁵⁹ *Nafā' is*: 164.

⁶⁰ *Mi' yār*: 21; *Nafā' is*: 165. The second hemistich of the first of the two lines is different in Āmulī compared to that mentioned by Ṭūsī (the edition of Kamāl al-Dīn Ismā'īl's *diwān* corroborates Ṭūsī: the hemistich quoted by Āmulī is part of the same composition but belongs to the previous line; see Kamāl al-Dīn Ismā'īl 1970: 222). Āmulī's quote, moreover, contains an obvious error: with *mīyāyad* instead of *mīyāmad* in the first line the theorized change of the *radif* does not occur.

⁶¹ *Mi' yār*: 21-23; *Nafā' is*: 165-166.

⁶² *Mi' yār*: 27; *Nafā' is*: 167.

⁶³ *Nafā' is*: 167.

⁶⁴ *Mi' yār*: 27.

⁶⁵ *Nafā' is*: 167.

⁶⁶ *Mi' yār*: 26, 15.

⁶⁷ *Mi' yār*: 16-17; *Nafā' is*: 163.

⁶⁸ *Mi' yār*: 19; *Nafā' is*: 164.

⁶⁹ *Mi' yār*: 20; *Nafā' is*: 164.

⁷⁰ *Mi' yār*: 24; *Nafā' is*: 166.

⁷¹ *Mi' yār*: 16; *Nafā' is*: 163.

mudā'af;⁷² *rāstī* in the case of the *rawī-yi mudā'af* followed by *waṣl*,⁷³ *pisar-ī*, *pisar-i man*, *khavar-i man*, *mard-ī*, *mard-i man*, *dard-i man*, *du'ā-t*, *thanā-t*, *rāstī*, *khwāstī*, *rāst-ast*, *khwāst-ast*, and *rāst būd* in the types of *qāfiya*;⁷⁴ *asbān*, *mardān*, *mard-ī*, *gūyad*, *dihad*, *muslimāt*, *mu'mināt*, and *naṣarat* in the examples of *shāyḡān*;⁷⁵ *mard*, *wird*, *dūr*, *shūr*, *akhtar*, *uṣur*, *sabū*, *pisar-ī*, *khavar-ī*, and *basta* in the faults of *qāfiya*.⁷⁶ For the lines of Kamāl al-Dīn Ismā'īl quoted by both authors on the subject of the change of the *radīf*, see above.⁷⁷

This set of remarks highlights how Āmulī's text depends on that of Ṭūsī. This is not only because of the common features. Even the few differences suggested by Āmulī, presuppose referring to Ṭūsī's model text, which in fact Āmulī used for his remarks.

3. Conclusions

In the light of our observations in the foregoing comparisons, we may say that the two texts being examined generally develop in parallel. Both in the *Mi'yār al-ash'ār* and the *Nafā'is al-funūn* the section dedicated to Arabic *qāfiya* is structurally different from that dedicated to Persian *qāfiya* and this difference in structure characterizing the analysis of the two contexts in Ṭūsī's treatise ('classic' for the Arabic and 'innovative' for the Persian) is clearly reflected in Āmulī's text. Despite these similarities, as we have seen, the two authors do have different approaches: Ṭūsī adopts a theoretical and methodic approach while that of Āmulī is a traditional compilatory approach. In the wider context of the logical and prosodic analysis in the *Mi'yār al-ash'ār*, Ṭūsī explicitly uses the part dedicated to Arabic *qāfiya* as the indispensable premise for studying Persian *qāfiya*, whereas Āmulī, who is more interested in presenting

questions about rhyme in a factual way from the encyclopedic point of view of the *Nafā'is al-funūn*, simply describes the 'state of the art' as known to him.

Clear evidence in this sense comes from the discrepancies in the two treatises on a number of controversial points in the theory of Arabic *qāfiya*: as we saw in the comparison, in those cases in which Ṭūsī criticizes the Arabic tradition or clearly departs from it, Āmulī remains faithful to the tradition and never calls it into question in pursuing his encyclopedic aims. Āmulī's closer adherence to classical theory and his compilatory approach are also evidenced in his greater precision in mentioning the technical terminology of the 'science of *qāfiya*': the terms cited by Āmulī on the subject of the phenomena of the *ghālī* and the *muta'addī* are much more in line with the Arabic treatises compared to the terms used by Ṭūsī.⁷⁸ Moreover, unlike Ṭūsī,⁷⁹ Āmulī does not make the mistake of confusing the defect called *iqwā* with that known as *ijāzat*.

We can consider the relative abundance of authorities cited by Āmulī on Arabic *qāfiya* and the almost total absence of such citations in Ṭūsī (who must surely have known them⁸⁰) from the same point of view: as highlighted in our comparison, Āmulī cites five Arabic authors (al-Akhfāsh, al-Khalīl, Quṭrub, Ibn Kaysān, and Ibn Jinnī) and two works (*al-Mughrib fi sharḥ al-qawāfi* di Ibn Jinnī and *al-Wāfi fi 'l-arūḍ wa-'l-qawāfi* by al-Tibrīzī) which he raises to an indisputable prescriptive status, whereas Ṭūsī only mentions al-Khalīl, whom he mainly seems to cite as a founding pillar of the Arabic philological tradition to be referred to in seeking solutions to problems raised by it when applied to the Persian linguistic context.

Moreover, the number of Arabic sources mentioned in the *Nafā'is al-funūn*, and the large number of verse quotations we noted as being a

⁷² *Mi'yār*: 17; *Nafā'is*: 163.

⁷³ *Mi'yār*: 17; *Nafā'is*: 164.

⁷⁴ *Mi'yār*: 21; *Nafā'is*: 165.

⁷⁵ *Mi'yār*: 24; *Nafā'is*: 166-167.

⁷⁶ *Mi'yār*: 26-27; *Nafā'is*: 167.

⁷⁷ See note 60.

⁷⁸ Ṭūsī uses the terms *ghālī* and *muta'addī* to indicate the *qāfiya* containing these *hurūf* and he describes the *hurūf* as *ghuluww* and *ta'addī*, while Āmulī rightly uses the terms *ghālī* and *muta'addī* to indicate the *hurūf* and applies the definition of *ghuluww* and *ta'addī* to the *ḥarakāt* preceding these *hurūf*.

⁷⁹ *Mi'yār*: 14-15.

⁸⁰ This fact is evidenced by various elements in the *Mi'yār al-ash'ār*, including the analysis of the *ghālī* and the *muta'addī*, clearly taken from al-Akhfāsh.

feature of the Arabic section of Āmulī's treatise,⁸¹ but not of the *Mi'yār al-ash'ār*, strongly suggest that Āmulī could rely on several scholarly texts dealing with Arabic meter and *qāfiya*, and that the first section of the *Mi'yār al-ash'ār* was only consulted as a marginal work with no real authority.

The situation changes when it comes to the section dedicated to Persian *qāfiya* in the *Nafā'is al-funūn*: the close dependence of this part of Āmulī's treatise on Tūsī is clearly highlighted in the comparison on the subject. We must stress how in the section of the *Nafā'is al-funūn* dedicated to Persian *qāfiya* no sources are mentioned: judging from the large number of Arabic authorities mentioned, it is highly unlikely that if the encyclopedist Āmulī had had a number of Persian sources available, he would have completely failed to mention them. In all probability, however, Āmulī turned to the *Mi'yār al-ash'ār* as the model for his own description for the theory of Persian *qāfiya* almost as an obligatory choice. As mentioned in the introduction, like Tūsī, Āmulī lived at the Ilkhanid court, where all the works by the Khorasanic scholar (and not only the *Mi'yār al-ash'ār*) enjoyed great prestige. We can thus surmise that Tūsī's analysis of Persian *qāfiya* was the standard reference work at the time and that the other historical authority on the subject, the *al-Mu'jam fi ma'āyir ash'ār al-'ajam* by Shams-i Qays (with theories differing from those of the *Mi'yār al-ash'ār*), was not available for Āmulī, who seems to have been obliged to turn to the only model available.⁸²

In conclusion, despite the general parallels between the two texts, we feel there is no justification in speaking of a definite desire by Āmulī to follow the theories of Tūsī on the subject of *qāfiya*. The structural similarity in the chapters on Arabic *qāfiya* in the two works can be explained by Āmulī's adoption of the classical organizational system also accepted in the *Mi'yār al-ash'ār*. The author of *Nafā'is al-funūn* then makes a number of independent decisions in line with his encyclopedic purposes. On the other hand, the great affinities characterizing the two sections on Persian *qāfiya* are probably due to

the fact Āmulī could not refer to texts other than the *Mi'yār al-ash'ār*, of which the ideas – later to become 'heterodox' – were simply represented for compilatory purposes.

⁸¹ Āmulī cites twenty lines and five hemistiches in Arabic, as opposed to only five hemistiches cited by Tūsī.

⁸² Āmulī was, however, aware of the existence of theories on Persian *qāfiya* in line with that of Shams-i Qays, since Tūsī himself mentions them in some passages of the *Mi'yār al-ash'ār*.

Bibliography

- al-Akhfash, Abū 'l-Ḥasan Sa'īd
1970 *Kitāb al-qawāfi*, edited by 'I. Ḥasan, Dimashq, 1390.
Āmulī, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad
1958-1960 *Nafā'is al-funūn fī 'arā'is al-'uyūn*, edited by M. A. Shi'rānī and I. Miyānājī, 3 vols., Tih-rān, 1377-1379.
- al-'Arūḍī, Abū 'l-Ḥasan Aḥmad
1996 *al-Jāmi' fī 'l-'arūḍ wa-'l-qāfiya*, edited by Z. Ghāzī Zāhid and H. Nājī, Bayrūt, 1416.
- Blochmann, H.
1970 *The Prosody of the Persians according to Saifi, Jami and other writers*, reprint, Amsterdam.
- Fakhr al-Dīn-i Rāzī
Ms. *Ḥaqīqat al-qawāfi*, Aya Sofya 4795/45.
- Garcin de Tassy, J.
1970 *Rhétorique et prosodie des langues de l'orient musulman*, reprint, Amsterdam.
- Gladwin, F.
1798 *Dissertations on the Rhetoric, Prosody and Rhyme of the Persians*, Calcutta.
- Ibn Kaysān, Abū 'l-Ḥasan Muḥammad
1859 *Kitāb talqīb al-qawāfi wa talqīb ḥarakātihā*, in *Opuscula Arabica*, edited by W. Wright, Leyden, pp. 48-74.
- Ibn Rashīq
1994 *al-'Umda*, edited by M. Qarqzān, 2 vols., reprint, Dimashq, 1414.
- Iqbālī, M.
2000 *Shi'r wa shā'irī dar āthār-i khwāja Naṣīr al-Dīn-i Ṭūsī*, 2nd edn., Tih-rān, 1379.
- al-Irbīlī, Abū 'l-Ḥasan 'Alī
1997 *Kitāb al-qawāfi*, edited by 'A. F. al-Qaḥṭānī, n.p., 1417.
- Kamāl al-Dīn Ismā'il
1970 *Diwān*, edited by Ḥ. Baḥr al-'Ulūmī, Tih-rān, 1348.
Kāshānī, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Jamshīd
1996 *Az Samarqand ba Kāshān, nāmahā-yi Ghiyāth al-Dīn Jamshīd-i Kāshānī ba pidar-ash*, edited by M. Bāqirī, Tih-rān, 1375.
Mudarris Raḍawī, M.T.
1991-2 *Aḥwāl wa āthār-i khwāja Naṣīr al-Dīn-i Ṭūsī*, 2nd edn., Tih-rān, 1370.
Mundawī, A.
1969-1974 *Fihrist-i nuskhahā-yi khaṭṭī-yi fārsī*, 6 vols. in 7 parts, Tih-rān, 1348-1353.
Murādābādī, Muḥammad Sa'd Allāh
1883 *Mizān al-afkār*, Lakhtnaw, 1300.
Musul'mankulov, R.
1989 *Persidsko-tadžikskaja klassičeskaja poētika (X-XV vv.)*, Moscow.
Pellò, S. (ed.)
2003 *La teoria della qāfiya nel Mizān al-afkār di Muḥammad Sa'd Allāh-i Murādābādī*, Venice.
- Safā, Dh.
1954-1991 *Tārīkh-i adabiyāt dar Īrān*, 5 vols. in 8 parts, Tih-rān, 1332-1370.
1987 'Arūzī, Yūsof, in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, vol. II, p. 679.
- al-Sakkākī,
1987 *Miftāh al-'ulūm*, edited by N. Zarzūr, 2nd edn., Bayrūt, 1407.
- Shams-i Qays
1959-60 *al-Mu'jam fī ma'āyir ash'ār al-'ajam*, edited by M.'A. Qazwīnī and M.T. Mudarris Raḍawī, 2nd edn., Tih-rān, 1338.
1994-5 *'Arūḍ wa qāfiya (bar girifta az kitāb al-Mu'jam)*, edited by M. Fashārakī, Tih-rān, 1373.
1997 *Svod pravil persidskoj poēzii (al-Mu'jam fī ma'āyir ash'ār al-'ajam), čast II, O nauke rifmy i kritiki poēzii*, edited by N. Čalisova, Moscow.
- Tahānawī, M.A.
1967 *Kitāb kashshāf iṣṭilāḥāt al-funūn*, edited by M. Wajīh, 'Abd al-Ḥaqq and Ghulām Qādir, reprint, 2 vols., Tih-rān.
- al-Tibrizī
1970 *al-Wāfi fī 'l-'arūḍ wa 'l-qawāfi*, edited by 'U. Yaḥyā and

F. Qabāwa, Halab, 1390.

Tūsī

1902-3 *Mi'yār al-ash'ār*, edited by 'A. Najm al-Dawla, Tihirān, 1320 (reprinted in Iqbālī 2000, pp. 307-415).1984 *Mi'yār al-ash'ār*, edited by M. Fashārakī and J. Mazāhirī, Isfahān, 1363.1990 *Mi'yār al-ash'ār*, edited by J. Tajlīl, n.p., 1369.2000 *Naṣīr al-Dīn Tūsī, Philosophe et savant du XIII^e siècle (Dānishmand-i Tūs)*, edited by N. Pourjavady and Ž. Vesel, Tihirān, 1379.2003 *Farhang (wīzha-yi buzurgdāsh-ti khwāja Naṣīr al-Dīn-i Tūsī - I)*, XV-XVI, 44-45 (1381-1382).

Waḥīdiyān Kāmyār, T.

1984-5 "Taṣḥīḥ-i kam-'iyyār-i Mi'yār al-ash'ār", in *Nashr-i dānish*, V, 1 (1363), pp. 33-37.1991 "Taṣḥīḥ-i jadīd az Mi'yār al-ash'ār", in *Nashr-i dānish*, XI, 5 (1370), pp. 51-54.

Zipoli, R.

2003a "On the Theory of *qāfiya* in Naṣīr al-Dīn-i Tūsī and Shams-i Qays", in *Orientalia Suecana*, LI-LII (2002-2003), pp. 479-489.2003b (ed.) *Naṣīr al-Dīn-i Tūsī's Contribution to the Arabic-Persian Theory of Qāfiya*, Venice, 2003.

Zipoli, R. - Pellò, S.

2004 "La teoria della *qāfiya* araba e persiana in Naṣīr al-Dīn-i Tūsī e in Muḥammad-i Āmulī", in *Annali di Ca' Foscari*, XLIII, 3 (2004), forthcoming.***L'étalon des poésies, cet inconnu***

Abolhassan Najafi
 Chercheur à l'Académie
 des Langues et Littérature Persanes
 Traduit du persan par Justine Landau
 Enseignant-Chercheur
 à l'Université Paris III

Au mois de Šahrīvar 1333 paraissait dans la revue *Soxan*, publiée à Téhéran sous la direction de Parviz Nātel Xānlari, un beau poème du poète contemporain Hūšang Ebtehāj (Sāye), intitulé *Tarāne* (chanson), et dont voici les premiers vers :

<i>Tā to bā man-ī zamāne bā man-ast</i>	<i>Baxt-o kān-e jāvedāne bā man-ast</i>
<i>To bahār-e delkaš-iy-o man čō bāg</i>	<i>Šūr-o šowq-e šad javāne bā man-ast</i>
<i>Yād-e delnešīn-at ey omīd-e jān</i>	<i>Har kojā ravam ravāne bā man-ast</i>
<i>Nāz-e nūšxand-e šobḥ agar to-rā-st</i>	<i>Šūr-e gerye-ye šabāne bā man-ast</i>
<i>Barg-e 'eyš-o jān-o čang agar če nīst</i>	<i>Raq̄s-o mast-ī-o tarāne bā man-ast...</i>

(Tant que tu es avec moi, le sort m'accompagne
 La fortune et le désir pour toujours m'accompagnent
 Tu es un printemps ravissant et moi tel un jardin,
 L'ardeur et l'enthousiasme de cent bourgeons m'accompagnent
 Ton tendre souvenir, ô espérance de l'âme,
 Où que j'aïlle, sans cesse m'accompagne
 Si est tienne la douce caresse de l'aurore,
 L'amertume des larmes nocturnes m'accompagne
 Même en l'absence de réjouissances, de coupe ou de harpe,
 La danse, l'ivresse et la chanson m'accompagnent...)