The Poetics of the Sufi Carnival: The Rogue Lyrics (*Qalandariyyāt*) as Heterotopic Countergenre(s)*

Matthew Thomas Miller

Roshan Institute for Persian Studies, University of Maryland, College Park

(mtmiller@umd.edu)

Abstract

*The carnivalesque poetics of the "rogue lyrics" (*qalandariyyāt*) of medieval Sufi poetry have excited the interest of varied audiences since premodern times. This attention is not surprising: these poems' purported celebration of proscribed actions, antinomian figures, and even apostasy shocks readers and demands interpretation. Many Sufi interpreters, followed by a substantial group of contemporary scholars, have read the carnivalesque imagery of such poetry as an esoteric symbolic code that must be explicated through the Sufi hermeneutic tradition. Other scholars, largely approaching these poems from the perspective of the history of Sufism, have sought to understand this poetry's relationship with the historical antinomian groups of the medieval Islamic world. What has been lost in these discussions, however, is an understanding of the* qalandariyyāt*'s poetics and its function within the larger early Persian genre system. This study focuses on elucidating the "poetics of the Sufi carnival" through an exploration of how the* qalandariyyāt *constructs its heterotopic poetics in its parody of ascetic-homiletic (*zuhdiyyāt-mawʿiẓa*) and panegyric (*madḥiyyāt*) poetry. The* qalandariyyāt *operates as a countergenre, but not in the singular. Subsumed under this broad generic umbrella are multiple subgenres—a point that also illustrates the considerable complexity and historical specificity of the early Persian genre system.*

I. Introduction

As early as the eleventh century, Persian poets began producing a new type of poetry that later litterateurs would term the *qalandariyyāt*. These lively lyrics, as their name suggests, focus on the antinomian exploits of the figure of the "rogue" (*qalandar*), his similarly socially disruptive associates (*qallāsh*/rascal, haunter of the winehouse/*kharābātī*, *awbāsh*/ruffian, *rind*/libertine, *ʿayyār*/roguish man of wiles), and the religious and social

* I am grateful to Cameron Lindley Cross, Ahmet T. Karamustafa, Fatemeh Keshavarz, Paul Losensky, John Mullan, Austin O'Malley, Michael Pifer, and Lynne Tatlock for their suggestions and feedback on various versions of the text in this article.

minorities (Zoroastrians, Christians, even infidels) whom they befriend and often fall in love with in their self-imposed exile from mainstream Islamic society. The "revers[ed] world" of the *qalandariyyāt* takes destruction as its starting point.[1] In this sense, the famous comment of the powerful thirteenth-century Sufi master Abū Ḥafṣ ʿUmar al-Suhrawardī (d. 1234) about historical qalandar groups—namely, that their principal characteristic is that they engage in the "destr[uction] of customs and discard[ing] of the protocols of social interaction and engagement"—is equally applicable to the poetic ethos adopted by the *qalandarī* poets.[2] As ʿAṭṭār remarks in one of the *rubāʿī* that he places in the *qalandariyyāt* chapter of his *Mukhtār-nāma*:

> The beloved does not want high position or lordship,
> the beloved wants bewilderment and destruction.
>
> How would I know how to be a mantle-wearing ascetic (*zāhid*)
> when the friend wants me to be a *qalandar*![3]

This impulse to destroy, as ʿAṭṭār confesses here, originates not with the poetic persona of the *qalandar* himself, but with the enigmatic and many-faced figure of the "beloved."[4] Appearing alternatively as an "idol," a young and seductive member of a religious minority,

1. The reference here is to the important book on symbolic inversion and transgression edited by Barbara Babcock and Victor Turner, *The Reversible World: Symbolic Inversion in Art and Society* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978).

2. Abū Ḥafṣ ʿUmar al-Suhrawardī, *ʿAwārif al-maʿārif*, ed. Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Raḥīm Sāyiḥ and Tawfīq ʿAlī Wahba (Cairo: Maktabat al-Thaqāfa al-Dīniyya, 2006), 89. Al-Suhrawardī's account is the touchstone for almost all discussions of *qalandars* and antinomians in the premodern Islamic world. See, for example, Fritz Meier, *Abū Saʿīd-i Abū l-Ḫayr: Wirklichkeit und Legende* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976), 496–97; Ahmet T. Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in the Islamic Later Middle Period, 1200–1550* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1994), 34–36; J. T. P de Bruijn, "The *Qalandariyyāt* in Persian Mystical Poetry, from Sanāʾī Onwards," in *The Legacy of Mediaeval Persian Sufism*, ed. Leonard Lewisohn, 75–86 (New York: Khaniqahi Nimatullah Publications, 1992), 76; idem, *Persian Sufi Poetry: An Introduction to the Mystical Use of Classical Persian Poems* (Richmond: Curzon, 1997), 73–74; Ashk Dahlén, "The Holy Fool in Medieval Islam: The *Qalandarīyāt* of Fakhr al-Dīn ʿArāqī," *Orientalia Suecana* 53 (2004): 64; Muḥammad Riżā Shafīʿī-Kadkanī, *Qalandariyya dar tārīkh: Digardīsī-hā-yi yik īdiʾuluzhī* (Tehran: Sukhan, 1386 [2007–8]), 137–39; Lloyd Ridgeon, "Reading Sufi History through Ādāb: The Perspectives of Sufis, Jawānmardān and Qalandars," in *Ethics and Spirituality in Islam*, ed. Francesco Chiabotti et al., 379–402 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 390–92.

3. Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār, *Mukhtār-nāma: Majmūʿa-yi rubāʿiyyāt-i Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār Nīshābūrī*, ed. Muḥammad Riżā Shafīʿī-Kadkanī, 2nd ed. (Tehran: Sukhan, 1386 [2007–8]), 293. Persian text:

معشوقه نه سر، نه سروری می‌خواهد حیرانی و زیر و زَبَری می‌خواهد
من زاهد فوطه پوش چون دانم بود چون یار مرا قلندری می‌خواهد

4. To be clear, when I speak of the "poet as *qalandar*" or the "*qalandarī* poet," I am referring to the *qalandarī* poetic persona that the poet has adopted in this poem, *not* the historical figure of the poet. On poetic personae in Persian poetry, see Julie Scott Meisami, *Medieval Persian Court Poetry* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987), 261–62; idem, *Structure and Meaning in Medieval Arabic and Persian Poetry: Orient Pearls* (New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003), 29. For a more recent and theoretically rich consideration of the relationship between the "poetic 'I'"/"lyrical I"/"poetic self" and the historical poet, see Domenico Ingenito, *Beholding Beauty: Saʿdi of Shiraz and the Aesthetics of Desire in Medieval Persian Poetry* (Leiden: Brill, 2021), 104–9, 137.

a "cupbearer," or a "friend" (*yār*), this roguish beloved calls the poet to this path of "bewilderment and destruction": a life of revelry aimed at the subversion, inversion, and transgression of all that is celebrated as sacred and respectable in mainstream Islamic society—at times even going as far as praising the "infidelity" (*kufr*) of the winehouse and decrying the highest Islamic principle of "divine unity" (*tawḥīd*) as "infidelity" (*kāfirī*).[5] It is in this sense that the *qalandariyyāt* can be said to constitute an Islamic form of carnivalesque or heterotopic poetics. These poems, each in its own way, imagine a poetic world in which, as Mikhail Bakhtin has famously outlined in his work on the premodern carnivals of Europe, normal social hierarchies are inverted, official high culture (including religion and its rituals) is mocked, and socio-religious rules are suspended.[6] Such intense subversion and parody of the hegemonic symbolic order most frequently occurs in this poetry in the various liminal spaces located at the fringes of medieval Islamic urban centers, such as the "dilapidated winehouse" (*kharābāt*) or Christian monastery (*ṣawmaʿa*). However, the rogue's iconoclastic behavior cannot always be contained in these "counter-sites," to adopt Michel Foucault's terminology from his work on heterotopias. Indeed, one of the most consistent impulses in the *qalandariyyāt* is for its eponymous rogues to burst out of the confines of the various sanctuaries of antinomianism and to assail the pious sensibilities and cherished scared objects of God-fearing Muslims.[7]

The ultimate aim of this Sufi carnival is to shock the average Muslim into a deeper and richer form of Islam that leads to the annihilation of the individual's self—the final "veil" that separates the Sufi aspirant from their divine beloved and the realization of true "divine unity" (*tawḥīd*). But the apparently sacrilegious nature of the *qalandariyyāt*'s thematics has made these lyrics an obvious source of interest and speculation throughout their nearly thousand-year history. Far from being a marginal literary oddity, their carnivalesque poetics have exerted a strong influence on the later development of Persian poetry and

5. Abū al-Majd Majdūd b. Ādam Sanāʾī, *Dīvān-i Ḥakīm Abū al-Majd Majdūd b. Ādam Sanāʾī Ghaznavī*, ed. Muḥammad Taqī Mudarris-i Rażavī (Tehran: Sanāʾī, 1388 [2009–10]), 653–54.

6. In literary-cultural studies, the terms "carnival" and "carnivalesque" are used to refer to real or imagined spaces in which normative social, cultural, political, and even religious values, institutions, and rules are mocked, transgressed, and inverted into a "revers[ed] world." It is a space of symbolic inversion, transgression, "parody," and "profanation" of all that is high and holy. There are, however, some differences between Bakhtin's original conception of these terms and the Sufi "carnival" of the *qalandariyyāt* (e.g., there are no elements of "grotesque realism" in the latter). See Mikhail Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984); Peter Stallybrass and Allon White, *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986), 6–26.

7. Similar in many ways to Bakhtin's notion of the carnival, Foucault's heterotopic "counter-sites" are liminal spaces where carnivalesque and deviant behavior and objects can be exhibited and normal relations are "contested and inverted." See Michel Foucault, "Of Other Spaces," *Diacritics* 16 (1986): 24–26; Daniel Defert, "Foucault, Space, and the Architects," in *Politics/Poetics: Documenta X–The Book*, ed. Catherine David and Jean-Francois Chevrier, 274–83 (Ostfildern-Ruit: Cantz, 1997), 275–76. For a theoretical exploration of transgressive and "subversive" elements in Persian Sufi literature (which brings Foucault into conversation in another way), see Claudia Yaghoobi, *Subjectivity in ʿAṭṭār, Persian Sufism, and European Mysticism* (West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2017).

other Persianate poetic traditions, such as Urdu/Hindi and Ottoman Turkish, in which the figure of the rogue and associated antinomian topoi remained fixtures for centuries, even until the modern era.[8] Yet little poetic analysis has been done on the history and generic development of the *qalandariyyāt*; indeed, several prominent scholars have questioned whether it was ever a coherent genre in the first place.[9] With a few exceptions, most of the work that has engaged *qalandariyyāt* poetry has done so primarily with an eye toward broader historical questions about its relationship to antinomianism in the Islamic world or its place in the Sufi hermeneutic tradition.[10] In different ways, these studies all attempt to answer the question of what role this transgressive poetics historically played in the medieval Islamic world and Sufi piety.

This study will not settle these debates. Rather, it focuses on a foundational aspect of the *qalandariyyāt* that too often has been lost in the discussion over its place in Islamic culture: its poetics.[11] Situating the *qalandariyyāt* within the early Persian poetic system,

8. See, for example, J. C. Bürgel, "The Pious Rogue: A Study in the Meaning of Qalandar and Rend in the Poetry of Muhammad Iqbal," *Edebiyât* 4 (1979): 43–64.

9. On the debate over *qalandariyyāt*'s generic status, see Matthew Thomas Miller, "Genre in Classical Persian Poetry," in *Routledge Handbook of Persian Literature*, ed. Kamran Talattof (New York: Routledge, forthcoming).

10. On historical connections between *qalandariyyāt* poetry and antinomianism in the Islamic world, see Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, 32–33; idem, *Sufism: The Formative Period* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), 155–66; Meier, *Abū Saʿīd-i Abū l-Ḫayr*, 494-516; Shafīʿī-Kadkanī, *Qalandariyya dar tārīkh*; Matthew Thomas Miller, "The Qalandar King: Early Development of the *Qalandariyyāt* and Saljuq Conceptions of Kingship in Amir Moʿezzi's Panegyric for Sharafshāh Jaʿfari," *Iranian Studies* (forthcoming); Bürgel, "Pious Rogue." On the place of *qalandarī* poetry in Sufi theory and the hermeneutic tradition, see Nasrollah Pourjavady, "Rindī-yi Ḥāfiẓ (1)," in *Bū-yi Jān: Maqāla-hā-yi darbāra-yi shiʿr-i ʿirfāni-yi fārsī*, ed. Nasrollah Pourjavady, 214–47 (Tehran: Intishārāt-i Markaz-i Nashr-i Dānishgāhī, 1372 [1993–94]); idem, "Rindī-yi Ḥāfiẓ (2): Zuhd va rindī," in Pourjavady, *Bū-yi Jān*, 248–88; Leonard Lewisohn, "Prolegomenon to the Study of Ḥāfiẓ," in *Hafiz and the Religion of Love in Classical Persian Poetry*, ed. Leonard Lewisohn, 3–73 (New York: I. B. Tauris, 2010); idem, "Sufi Symbolism in the Persian Hermeneutic Tradition: Reconstructing the Pagoda of ʿAṭṭār's Esoteric Poetics," in *ʿAṭṭār and the Persian Sufi Tradition: The Art of Spiritual Flight*, ed. Leonard Lewisohn, 255–308 (New York: I. B. Tauris, 2006); Janis Esots, "The Image of *Qalandar* in the *Dīvān-i Shams*," in *Light upon Light: Essays in Islamic Thought and History in Honor of Gerhard Bowering*, ed. Jamal J. Elias and Bilal Orfali, 239–55 (Leiden: Brill, 2020); Ève Feuillebois-Pierunek, *A la croisée des voies célestes, Faxr al-Dīn ʻErâqi: Poésie mystique et expression poétique en Perse médiévale* (Tehran: Institut français de recherche en Iran, 2002); idem, "Le qalandar: Réalité et fiction en Perse médiévale," in *Etrangeté de l'autre, singularité du moi: Les figures du marginal dans les littératures*, ed. Ève Feuillebois-Pierunek and Z. Ben Lagha, 111–27 (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2015); Dahlén, "Holy Fool"; Cyrus Ali Zargar, *Sufi Aesthetics: Beauty, Love, and the Human Form in the Writings of Ibn ʿArabi and ʿIraqi* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2011).

11. The distinction I want to make here between Sufi hermeneutic or symbolist approaches and my approach is largely the distinction of "hermeneutics" vs. "poetics," as elaborated by Jonathan D. Culler. Culler, in his classic study, argues that poetics is the study of the "devices, conventions and strategies of literature, of the means by which literary works create their effects"—in short, the study of "how works produce the effects they have for readers"—whereas hermeneutics is the "practice of interpretation, whose goal is to discover or determine the meaning of a text." While not mutually exclusive and typically used in tandem, they are two different modes of analysis, and a lack of focus on poetics, in particular, leads to a rather poor understanding of how literary texts produce meaning. See Jonathan D. Culler, *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics and the Study of Literature* (New York: Routledge Classics, 2002), vii–viii.

I will argue that the *qalandariyyāt* needs to be understood first and foremost as a heterotopic countergenre to ascetic-homiletic (*zuhdiyyāt-mawʿiẓa*) and panegyric (*madḥiyyāt*) poetry.[12]

12. There exists considerable ambiguity in both premodern and modern discussions of the generic boundaries of ascetic (*zuhdiyyāt*) and homiletic (*mawʿiẓa*) poetry. These two types of poetry are often treated as the same, or at least closely related in both modern scholarship and the historical tradition, so I have discussed them as one category here. Modern Persian literary critics frequently use these two generic terms in the same studies, sometimes portraying them as nearly identical in meaning and other times qualifying their position somewhat by placing more emphasis on their deep interrelation, though not necessarily their absolute unity. At times the reader can even sense an author oscillate between these two positions within the same text. J. T. P. de Bruijn, in his treatment of "homiletic poetry" and "poems of abstinence," seems to largely equate *zuhdiyyāt* and *mawʿiẓa/vaʿẓ* poetry; see J. T. P. de Bruijn, *Of Piety and Poetry: The Interaction of Religion and Literature in the Life and Works of Ḥakīm Sanāʾī of Ghazna* (Leiden: Brill, 1983), 164–82; idem, *Persian Sufi Poetry*, 29–50. Sīrūs Shamīsā refers to both *zuhdiyyāt* and *vaʿẓ/mawʿiẓa* poetry as "wisdom and ethics" (*ḥikmat va akhlāq*) poetry that is primarily didactic (*taʿlīmī*) in nature; see Sīrūs Shamīsā, *Anvāʿ-i adabī* (Tehran: Nashr-i Mītrā, 1370 [1991–92]), 55. Julie Scott Meisami employs these terms in a way that indicates she sees a difference between them, although she also argues that the origins of the Persian homiletic *qaṣīda* (*mawʿiẓa*) can be found in the *zuhdiyyāt* of the Arabic tradition. See Julie Scott Meisami, "Poetic Microcosms: The Persian Qasida to the End of the Twelfth Century," in *Qasida Poetry in Islamic Asia and Africa*, ed. Stefan Sperl and Christopher Shackle, 1:137–82 (New York: E. J. Brill, 1996), 1:173–74. Leonard Lewisohn avers that "the Sufi poetry composed by Sanāʾī in the *zuhdiyyāt* genre is, in many cases, often indistinguishable in content from Nāṣir-i Khusraw's odes also penned in this genre," but he then goes on to say that "one of the main stylistic factors which Nāṣir-i Khusraw shares with other *qaṣīda* poets of the generation immediately preceding him . . . is an emphasis on preaching and wise instruction (*mawāʿiẓ wa ḥikam*)" before proceeding again to refer to Nāṣir-i Khusraw's poetry as "*zuhdiyyāt*." See Leonard Lewisohn, "Hierocosmic Intellect and Universal Soul in a Qasida by Nāsir-i Khusraw," *Iran* 45 (2007): 194. In a subsequent study, Lewisohn seems to clarify his position on the relationship of *zuhdiyyāt* and *mawʿiẓa* poetry by primarily associating Nāṣir-i Khusraw with "*mawāʿiẓ wa ḥikam*" poetry but saying that "these genres also contain resonances of what J. T. P. de Bruijn calls 'poems of abstinence' (*zuhdiyyāt*)." See Leonard Lewisohn, "Nāṣir-i Khusraw's Ode to the Universal Soul and Intellect," in *Pearls of Persia: The Philosophical Poetry of Nāṣir-i Khusraw*, ed. Alice C. Hunsberger, 53–70 (New York: I. B. Tauris and Institute of Ismaili Studies, 2012), 54–55. The ambiguity between these thematic genres can also be seen in the way in which scholars discuss individual poems. For example, when Muḥammad Riżā Shafīʿī-Kadkanī discusses Sanāʾī's famous "Muslamānān, Muslamānān! Muslamānī, Muslamānī!" *qaṣīda*, he identifies it as a prototypical homiletic (*vaʿẓ*) *qaṣīda* of Sanāʾī, but in MS Kitāb-khāna-yi Millī-yi Malik (MiM) 5468 it is classified as a *zuhdiyyāt* poem; see Muḥammad Riżā Shafīʿī-Kadkanī, *Tāziyāna-hā-yi sulūk: Naqd va taḥlīl-i chand qaṣīda az Ḥakīm Sanāʾī* (Tehran: Āgāh, 1372 [1993–94]), 219. In another case, de Bruijn discusses a poem that he terms a "representative example" of Sanāʾī's homiletic poetry but that the organizer(s) of MS MiM 5468 identify as a *zuhdiyyāt* poem; see de Bruijn, *Of Piety and Poetry*, 170–79. This example is especially interesting because the final line of this poem itself seems to identify it as a poem of "*zuhd va maṣal*" (asceticism and "moral advice"). From a historical perspective, the evidence from the manuscript tradition, poetic manuals, and other early works that discuss poetic genres in early New Persian poetry is similarly ambiguous. Muḥammad b. Badr Jājarmī (fl. early to mid-fourteenth century), in his poetic anthology *Muʾnis al-aḥrār*, includes the categories of "*tawḥīd*, *naʿt-i Muḥammad Mustafā*, *ḥikmat va mawʿiẓa*"; see Ẕabīḥ Allāh Ṣafā, *Tārīkh-i adabiyyāt dar Īrān va dar qalamraw-yi zabān-i Pārsī* (Tehran: Intishārāt-i Firdaws, 1388 [2009–10]), 3/1:320. Kaykāvūs b. Vushmgīr mentions *zuhd* and *tawhīd* poetry together in the *Qābūs-nāma*, but he lists only *zuhd* as one of the five main categories of poetry (*madḥ*, *ghazal*, *hijā*, *marṯiyyat*, and *zuhd*). See ʿUnsur al-Maʿālī Kaykāvūs b. Vushmgīr, *Qābūs-nāma*, ed. Ghulāmḥusayn Yūsifī (Tehran: Shirkat-i Intishārāt-i ʿIlm va Farhang, 1345 [1966–67]), 190–92. Meisami notes that Nāṣir-i Khusraw refers to his poetry only as "*shiʿr-i zuhd*," "*shiʿr-i ḥikmat*," and "*shiʿr-i pand*"; see Julie Scott Meisami, "Nāṣir-i Khusraw: A Poet Lost in Thought?," in Hunsberger, *Pearls of Persia*, 223–55, at 224. This ambiguity around the generic boundaries of *zuhdiyyāt* and *mawʿiẓa* poetry can also be seen in some of the earliest manuscripts of Sanāʾī's *dīvān*. The early MiM 5468 and Kabul Museum 318 (KM) manuscripts contain

Its parodic inversion of these normative genres is a complex intergeneric poetic game in which it adopts and modifies the conventions of other medieval Persian (thematic) genres in the construction of its own distinct carnivalesque poetics. Moreover, the emergence and development of this countergenre, including its ramification into multiple subgenres, illustrates the flexibility, complexity, and historical specificity of the early Persian genre system, as shorter, monothematic poems began to challenge the early dominance of the classical polythematic panegyric *qaṣīda*.[13]

II. The *Qalandariyyāt* in the Persian Poetic System

The Qalandariyyāt *as Heterotopic Countergenre*

Genres—whether formal or thematic—are not born into a vacuum; nor do they enter a literary tradition preformed as a Platonic archetypal form. They develop within specific poetic systems, at particular historical moments, and they gradually create a flexible generic "identity" through a complex process of adopting and modifying the established conventions of their respective literary traditions and their constituent genres. The *qalandariyyāt* is no exception. Poets forged this genre in a poetic dialogue with the other important genres of early Persian poetry—most notably, the royal panegyric and the ascetic-homiletic ode. They assumed the reader would be familiar with the conventions of these other genres and would read the *qalandariyyāt*'s carnivalesque mockery of them as a poetic riposte to these poems as much (or, in some cases, possibly more than) as a statement of antinomianism,

zuhdiyyāt sections in which the medieval editors have placed Sanāʾī's homiletic poetry, poems in praise of the prophet (*naʿt-i rasūl*), and poetry on unity (*tawḥīd*). On the other hand, the table of contents of the oldest dated manuscript of Sanāʾī's *dīvān*, MS Velieddin 2627 (dated 1285 CE), does not use the term *zuhdiyyāt* at all but rather divides these poems into the categories of *mawʿiẓa*, *tawḥīd-i bārī*, and *naʿt-i rasūl*. Other manuscripts use all of these terms in a variety of different combinations: MSS Kitāb-khāna-yi Millī-yi Farhang (MiF) 2353 and British Museum Or. 3302 include the categories of *tawḥīd va ḥikmat va amṯāl* and *ḥikam va maṯal*; MS India Office 2722 uses the terms *tawḥīd*, *naʿt-i payghambar*, and *mawʿiẓa va zuhd va ḥikmat*; and MS India Office 927 arranges Sanāʾī's poems into the categories of *tawḥīd*, *naʿt-i payghambar*, and *andar mawʿiẓa va zuhd va ḥikmat*. (Although these are not explicitly marked within the text of the poems themselves, the divisions can be discerned relatively clearly by examining the poems, as Nizar Ahmad has shown.) I was not able to consult the MiF, British Museum Or. 3302, India Office 2722, and India Office 927 manuscripts personally. I am relying here on de Bruijn's and Ahmad's analyses of these manuscripts: see Nazir Ahmad, "Some Original Prose and Poetical Pieces of Hakim Sana'i," *Indo-Iranica* 16 (1963): 48–65; de Bruijn, *Of Piety and Poetry*, 104. Finally, I will mention that Andras Hamori, Stefan Sperl, and Philip Kennedy also identify close links between homiletic literature and *zuhdiyyāt* poetry in the Arabic tradition: Stefan Sperl, *Mannerism in Arabic Poetry: A Structural Analysis of Selected Texts (3rd Century AH/9th Century AD–5th Century AH/11th Century AD)* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 73, 82; Andras Hamori, "Zuhdiyyāt," in *ʿAbbasid Belles-Lettres*, ed. Julia Ashtiany and T. M. Johnstone, 265–74 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 266, 268–269, 272; Philip F. Kennedy, "Zuhdiyya," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., ed. P. Bearman et al. (Leiden: Brill Online), posted 2012, http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_COM_1392. It is possible that future studies of this vast corpus of poetry may reveal distinctions between these two poetic categories in specific historical contexts, but it is undeniable that they are closely associated with one another in both the Persian and the Arabic tradition and, broadly speaking, contain a similar array of symbols, motifs, and thematic concerns. For this reason, I have decided to discuss these poems here as one poetic tradition: ascetic-homiletic poetry.

13. For more on the early Persian genre system, see Miller, "Genre in Classical Persian Poetry."

an esoteric versification of mystic realities, or a critique of institutionalized Sufi orders. In the parlance of literary studies, they created a countergenre.

The term "countergenre" is of relatively recent provenance. However, the literary dynamic or generic relationship that has come to be called a countergenre is not. Scholars of a number of the world's literary traditions have argued that analogous literary mechanisms of generic inversion have long played a role in the development of new genres, stretching back all the way to Greek literature. As a theoretical concept in literary studies, countergenre has come to denote a genre that consciously seeks to invert another genre's principal characteristics at the symbolic and structural levels (e.g., plot, narrative, scale, poetic persona, formal aspects, dramatis personae, setting, ethos).[14] In the words of Alastair Fowler, it takes an "antithetic" position vis-à-vis the genre it is responding to, parodying its generic expectations, symbolic values, and general modus operandi.[15] Although this process of parodical inversion may have implicit or even explicit political/cultural import, countergenres are first and foremost complex literary games that play out across a literary tradition (synchronically and diachronically) and develop its genre system in new directions.[16] They should not be read, necessarily, as straightforward embodiments of an author's values, nor should an author's decision to invert and mock another genre be construed as entailing any ideological opposition to the values it espouses.[17] In the context of Arabic and Persian poetry, this can clearly be seen in the fact that the same poets who compose poems in popular countergenres such as *khamriyyāt* (wine poetry) and *qalandariyyāt* also often write poems in the very genres that they parody in these countergenres.

In traditional Arabic and Persian poetics, there is no exact equivalent for the contemporary term "countergenre."[18] However, several different notions of poetic antithesis have existed within these poetic traditions from the beginning. At the level of rhetorical devices, both Arabic and Persian poetry manuals typically discuss the important rhetorical figure of "antithesis" (*muṭābaqa/ṭibāq/mutażādd*). Traditional literary critics seem to have conceived of this rhetorical device primarily as operating at the level of the individual line

14. Claudio Guillén first elaborated the term "countergenre" in the early 1970s. On the general theory of "countergenre" or "antigenre" in Euro-American literary criticism, see Claudio Guillén, "Genre and Countergenre: The Discovery of the Picaresque," in *Literature as System: Essays toward the Theory of Literary History*, 135–58 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1971), 146–58; idem, "On the Uses of Literary Genre," in *Literature as System*, 107–34, at 133–34; idem, "Toward a Definition of the Picaresque," in *Literature as System*, 71–106, at 74, 97; idem, "Literature as Historical Contradiction: *El Abencerraje*, the Moorish Novel, and the Eclogue," in *Literature as System*, 159–217, at 179; Heather Dubrow, *Genre* (New York: Methuen, 1982), 24–30, 114–116; Alastair Fowler, *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982), 174–79, 251–55.

15. Fowler, *Kinds of Literature*, 174–79, 251–55.

16. For a treatment of the cultural politics of early *qalandariyyāt* poetry and how its rogue poetics can operate in seemingly counterintuitive ways, see Miller, "Qalandar King."

17. Dubrow, *Genre*, 25.

18. Although there are significant differences between the Persian and Arabic poetic systems, I agree with Meisami that it is "meaningful to speak of these two closely related and interdependent traditions as constituting one larger system" (Meisami, *Structure and Meaning*, xi–xii).

or between sections of a particular poem (e.g., *nasīb* and *madḥ*), but there are indications that some poets and litterateurs extended its logic to the level of genre as well.[19] Kaykāvūs, for example, says to his son in his *Qābūs-nāma* (ca. 1082, the earliest extant discussion of Persian poetry):

> If you want to compose invective and you do not know how, say the opposite of the praise that you would say of that person in a panegyric because whatever is the opposite of panegyric is invective (*hijāʾ*), and love (*ghazal*) and elegy (*marṯiyyat*) are the same [i.e., they, too, have an antithetic relationship, presumably in their contrasting affective aims of merriment and mourning].[20]

Kaykāvūs does not give this generic/thematic category interrelation a specific name, but his remark—which is echoed by other Persian and Arabic litterateurs—indicates at the very least that premodern literary figures were well aware of thematic antitheses and the poetically productive role that thematic inversion could play in crafting poetry.[21]

Although direct discussions of generic interrelationships are rare in premodern Persian and Arabic literary criticism, many scholars of these traditions have clearly shown that poets consciously inverted generic expectations of other genres in their construction of new ones.[22] Much of this scholarship has focused on the process of generic inversion in the context of the explosion of monothematic genres that occurred in *muḥdath*

19. On antithesis (and parallelism) between individual lines and sections of poems, see Meisami, *Structure and Meaning*, 253–64. It is also worth underlining that the lack of explicit or lengthy discussion of a poetic feature (e.g., the "organic unity" of poem) does not necessarily mean that it was not part of poetic practice or was not just assumed to exist (Meisami, *Structure and Meaning*, 9–11).

20. Kaykāvūs b. Vushmgīr, *Qābūs-nāma*, 191. On the complexities of reading early discussions of these thematic categories (i.e., *hijāʾ*, *ghazal*, *marṯiyyat*) as genres or terms for thematic sections within poems, see Franklin D. Lewis, "Reading, Writing and Recitation: Sanāʾi and the Origins of the Persian Ghazal" PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1995), 1–111; idem, "The Transformation of the Persian Ghazal: From Amatory Mood to Fixed Form," in *Ghazal as World Literature*, vol. 2: *From a Literary Genre to a Great Tradition: The Ottoman Gazel in Context*, ed. Angelika Neuwirth et al., 121–39 (Würzburg: Ergon, 2006); Miller, "Genre in Classical Persian Poetry."

21. Echoing the same point, Kāshifī, in his introduction to his poetic treatise *Badāʾiʿ al-afkār*, also remarks that *hajv/hijāʾ* is the opposite (*żidd*) of panegyric (*madḥ*); see Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥusayn Vāʿiẓ Kāshifī Shīrāzī, *Badāʾiʿ al-afkār fī ṣanāʾiʿ al-ashʿār*, ed. Mīr Jalāl al-Dīn Kazzāzī (Tehran: Nashr-i Markaz, 1369 [1990–91]), 82. Riccardo Zipoli extends this discussion of the opposition of *hijāʾ* and *madḥ* to *hazl* and *jidd*, citing many other examples of poets discussing these binaries. See Riccardo Zipoli, *Irreverent Persia: Invective, Satirical and Burlesque Poetry from the Origins to the Timurid Period (10th to 15th Centuries)* (Leiden: Leiden University Press, 2015), 21–28. For an example from the Arabic tradition, see Geert Jan van Gelder, "Some Brave Attempts at Generic Classification in Premodern Arabic Literature," in *Aspects of Genre and Type in Pre-Modern Literary Cultures*, ed. Bert Roest and Herman Vanstiphout, 15–31 (Groningen: Styx, 1999), 20.

22. In addition to the citations on *muḥdath* poetry in the following two footnotes, see Suzanne Pinckney Stetkevych, *The Mute Immortals Speak: Pre-Islamic Poetry and the Poetics of Ritual* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993), 87–157; James T. Monroe, *The Art of Badīʿ az-Zamān al-Hamadhānī as Picaresque Narrative* (Beirut: Center for Arab and Middle Eastern Studies of American University of Beirut, 1983), 20–38, 166–170; idem, "Preliminary Study," in *Al-Maqāmāt al-Luzūmīyah*, ed. James T. Monroe, 1–110 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 2–3, 9.

Arabic poetry. Scholars working on Arabic poetry of this period have shown, for example, how the *khamriyyāt*, *ghazal*, *zuhdiyyāt*, *hazliyyāt*, and *mujūniyyāt/sukhf* operate as parodic countergenres to both the traditional Arabic *qaṣīda* and each other, creating what Meisami refers to as a "well-constructed literary game"[23] in which the topoi, rhetorical figures, and stylistic particularities of each type of poem create an additional layer of intertextual meaning as they play off one another.[24]

A similar dynamic has been observed in Persian poetry, but to date it has received less attention than the parallel phenomenon in the Arabic tradition has. The Iranian scholar Sīrus Shamīsā, for example, mentions in his study of genre theory in Persian literature that the *ghazal* can productively be read as a "countergenre" (*nawʿ-i mukhāsim yā muqābil*) of the classical Persian panegyric *qaṣīda*. However, he offers no explanation or exploration of the topic beyond this remark.[25] Others have pointed to more specific countergenre relationships in Persian poetry, showing in their analyses of ascetic-homiletic, prison (*ḥabsiyyāt*), obscene, and invective/satirical poetry (*hajv/hazl/hazliyyāt*) that these genres can be understood as parodic responses to other thematic genres, such as panegyric, mystical, heroic, and love poetry.[26] But with regard to the *qalandariyyāt* specifically, no studies to date have explored its complex poetic game of generic inversion and parody despite numerous passing comments about the antithesis between the ethos, symbols, and figures celebrated in *qalandarī* and ascetic-homiletic poetry.[27] Instead, existing studies

23. Julie Scott Meisami, "Arabic *Mujūn* Poetry: The Literary Dimension," in *Verse and the Fair Sex: Studies in Arabic Poetry and the Representation of Women in Arabic Literature*, ed. Frederick de Long, 8–30 (Utrecht: M. Th. Houtsma Stichting, 1993), at 17–18.

24. Andras Hamori, *On the Art of Medieval Arabic Literature* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1974), 3–77; M. M. Badawi, "From Primary to Secondary Qasīdas: Thoughts on the Development of Classical Arabic Poetry," *Journal of Arabic Literature* 11 (1980): 26–29; idem, "'Abbasid Poetry and Its Antecedents," in Ashtiany and Johnstone, *ʿAbbasid Belles-Lettres*, 146–66, at 163–64; John Mattock, "Description and Genre in Abū Nuwās," *Quaderni di studi arabi* 5/6 (1987): 531–36; Sperl, *Mannerism in Arabic Poetry*, 82, 93–96, 175–76; Meisami, "Arabic *Mujūn* Poetry"; Philip F. Kennedy, *The Wine Song in Classical Arabic Poetry: Abū Nuwās and the Literary Tradition* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 46, 52, 219–26; Meisami, *Structure and Meaning*, 31–45, 163–89, 219–20; Yaseen Noorani, "Heterotopia and the Wine Poem in Early Islamic Culture," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 36 (2004): 345–66; Zoltan Szombathy, *Mujūn: Libertinism in Medieval Muslim Society and Literature* (Exeter: Gibb Memorial Trust, 2013); Sinan Antoon, *The Poetics of the Obscene in Premodern Arabic Poetry: Ibn al-Hajjāj and Sukhf* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

25. Shamīsā, *Anvāʿ-i adabī*, 286.

26. Meisami, "Poetic Microcosms," 172–73; idem, *Structure and Meaning*, 181–89; Rebecca Gould, "Wearing the Belt of Oppression: Khāqānī's Christian Qasida and the Prison Poetry of Medieval Shirvān," *Journal of Persianate Studies* 9 (2016): 11–34; Paul Sprachman, "Hajv and Profane Persian," in *Persian Lyric Poetry in the Classical Era, 800–1500: Ghazals, Panegyrics and Quatrains*, ed. Ehsan Yarshater, 579–602 (New York: I. B. Tauris, 2019); Zipoli, *Irreverent Persia*, 18; Ingenito, *Beholding Beauty*, 151–203. Daniel Rafinejad advances a related argument in his analysis of one of Nāṣir-i Khusraw's famous poems as an "anti-Ode of Spring," exploring how it flips the generic expectations of the conventional spring ode (*bahāriyya*). In a slightly different way, the poem also showcases the countergenre dynamic that I am concerned with here. See Daniel Rafinejad, "'I Am a Mine of Golden Speech': Poetic Language and Self-Reference in Nāṣir-i Khusraw's *Qaṣida*s," in Hunsberger, *Pearls of Persia*, 39–52.

27. De Bruijn, Shafīʿī-Kadkanī, Ève Feuillebois-Pierunek, Nasrollah Pourjavady, and Franklin Lewis have all commented on the opposition between the values and symbols of *qalandarī* poetry and those of traditional Sufi

have remained primarily focused on the import of this poetry for the development of Sufi thought and symbolism.

In this study, I want to take the discussion of *qalandariyyāt*'s opposition to ascetic-homiletic poetry a step further and analyze how the *qalandariyyāt* constructs its poetics through its parody of not only ascetic-homiletic, but also royal panegyric poetry. Moving from the purely symbolic level of analysis to the poetic is important because the *qalandariyyāt* is not just the product of two opposing modes of piety (*malāmatī* Sufi vs. ascetic/legalistic Islam) or symbolic systems (in the sense of Sufi hermeneutics). Its poetics can be fully appreciated only when we understand that each *qalandarī* poem is, in a sense, an intergeneric and intertextual response to a wide range of other poems and the full range of their poetic particularities.

From Heterotopic Countergenre to Heterotopic Countergenres

One of the crucial inflection points in the development of the premodern Persian genre system is the dramatic rise in importance and quantity of shorter monothematic poems in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Often simply labelled with the broad brush of *ghazal*s in modern scholarship and editorial practice, these poems differ in some important ways from the later formal or technical *ghazal*s.[28] It may be more accurate to think of them as akin to the various types of short monothematic Arabic *qaṣīda*s of the Abbasid period in which the poets selected one of the thematic sections (*aghrāḍ*) of the traditional polythematic *qaṣīda* (e.g., *ghazal*, *khamr*, *zuhd*) and developed it exclusively in a dedicated poem (though always in a unspoken dialogue with the other thematic types).[29] Also similar to these Abbasid period poems is the way in which early Persian *ghazal* poets seem to have conceived of their monothematic poems as belonging to different thematic genres and even, in some cases, to subgenres of these larger thematic categories. The *qalandariyyāt* constitutes one such larger thematic grouping, but there are many others as well—such as love (*ghazaliyyāt*), wine (*khamriyyāt*), and ascetic-homiletic (or "ascetic") (*zuhdiyyāt-mawʿiẓa*) poetry—that appear in early manuscripts, thematically arranged anthologies of poetry, and, less

piety and the "lords of the *sharīʿa*/Islamic law" (to use Shafīʿī-Kadkanī's words), which are celebrated in ascetic-homiletic poetry. See Pourjavady, "Rindī-yi Ḥāfiẓ (2)," 281ff.; Shafīʿī-Kadkanī, *Qalandariyya dar tārīkh*, 34–35, 297; de Bruijn, "*Qalandariyyāt* in Persian Mystical Poetry," 79–81, 85; Lewis, "Reading, Writing and Recitation," 559, 564, 574; de Bruijn, *Persian Sufi Poetry*, 76–77; Feuillebois-Pierunek, *A la croisée des voies célestes*, 240–53, 308; Lewisohn, "Prolegomenon to the Study of Ḥāfiẓ," 31. Lewis's observations in his analysis of five *qalandarī ghazal*s of Sanāʾī come the closest to understanding the relationship between *qalandarī* and ascetic-homiletic poetry as a countergenre phenomenon. He seems to view it that way, but he does not develop this line of thought.

28. See Lewis's studies on the *ghazal*s of Sanāʾī for a discussion of the development of the Persian *ghazal*: "Reading, Writing and Recitation," 1–111; "Transformation of the Persian Ghazal." De Bruijn has also commented on the significant differences between early *ghazal*s and the classical *ghazal*: J. T. P. de Bruijn, "The Ghazal in Medieval Persian Poetry," in Yarshater, *Persian Lyric Poetry*, 315–487, at 363–64 (on the earliest *ghazal*s, see 351–67).

29. See Meisami, *Structure and Meaning*, 30–31, 35, 189.

frequently, manuals on Persian poetry.[30] Lewis, in his pioneering study of the early *ghazal*, argues that there are many such "fluid and not fixed, illustrative and instructive rather than absolute" thematic "genres" or "sub-genres" in the pre-Ḥāfiẓian period of Persian poetry.

> It seems necessary to me, at least in the period up to Hāfeẓ, to deconstruct the notion of the ghazal and to recognize that different topoi with various and perhaps mutually exclusive semiotic horizons should be considered as separate genres and not merely as a static entity, the ghazal. The wine ode, the dying love poem, the love enjoyed theme, the ascetic, the mystical, the *qalandari*, the Sufi initiation, the courtly praise theme, perhaps all should be seen as different genres which only gradually grew to share a common formal structure.[31]

I concur with Lewis on this point, but I would push the argument even further: many of these overarching thematic genres are themselves quite diverse internally and contain other recurring subtypes of poems, some of which may have even risen to the status of subgenres in the minds of poets of this early period.[32] Part of the difficulty in pinning down the number and boundaries of these generic distinctions is that generic development is a dynamic process. As Meisami has argued, "Genres may be combined or included; one genre may become a topic of another, or a topic may be amplified until it takes on the status of a new, independent genre."[33]

The *qalandariyyāt* is an illustrative example of the variegated nature of these early thematic genres.[34] Even setting aside the slightly more complex issue of the polythematic poems classed as *qalandariyyāt* by the editors of early thematically arranged *dīvān* manuscripts, a number of recurring poetic patterns can be seen in the monothematic *qalandarī* poems of this genre's most prolific early practitioners, Sanāʾī (d. 1131), ʿAṭṭār (d. 1221), and ʿIrāqī (d. 1289).[35] I refer to these recurring types or patterns of poems as subgenres only provisionally. Like Lewis, I see them as "fluid and not fixed, illustrative and instructive rather than absolute," and I am more interested in their heuristic value than

30. For a more detailed overview of this argument and its evidence, see Miller, "Genre in Classical Persian Poetry."

31. Lewis, "Reading, Writing and Recitation," 36, 106–7, 438; Lewis, "Transformation of the Persian Ghazal," 136.

32. The identification and study of different thematic types or genres/subgenres within premodern Persian poetry has only just begun. For more on this point, see Charles-Henri de Fouchécour, "Iran VIII: Persian Literature, (2) Classical," in *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, ed. Ehsan Yarshater, 2006, updated 2012, https://iranicaonline.org/articles/iran-viii2-classical-persian-literature; Miller, "Genre in Classical Persian Poetry."

33. Meisami, *Structure and Meaning*, 29.

34. On the case of polythematic *qalandariyyāt*, see Miller, "Qalandar King."

35. De Bruijn recognized this internal diversity in his early (and unfortunately quite brief) study in which he classified *qalandariyyāt* into three categories: (1) poems centered on the *kharābāt*; (2) anecdotal poems focused on *qalandarī* themes; and (3) *andarz* poems with *qalandarī* elements. His observation of the internal diversity of the *qalandariyyāt* is important to build on, but his typology is insufficiently detailed. See de Bruijn, "*Qalandariyyāt* in Persian Mystical Poetry," 79.

in establishing a rigid typology. Below I provide a brief overview of the seven subgenres that I have identified in early monothematic *qalandariyyāt* poetry, and in the final section I present three detailed case studies focused on poems of the rogue boast, rogue figure, and rogue address types by Sanāʾī, ʿAṭṭār, and ʿIrāqī, respectively.

(1) Rogue boasts (spiritual mock fakhr*):*[36] These poems focus on the enumeration of disreputable acts. They are a poetic performance of blame-seeking behavior and read as rogue confessions or manifestos, with the poet proudly listing his litany of misdeeds done in service of the *qalandarī* way.[37] They are one of the most widespread subtypes of *qalandarī* poetry. Many—although not all—are based on an end rhyme of *-am* or *-īm* ("I am" or "We are"), for obvious reasons.

(2) Rogue figure poems (mock panegyrics):[38] These poems are distinguished by their almost exclusive focus on one of the transgressive figures of the *qalandarī* poetic world, such as the Magian youth (*mugh-bacha*),[39] the Christian youth (*tarsā-bacha*),[40] the infidel

36. For examples of poems of this type, see Sanāʾī, *Dīvān-i Sanāʾī*, 73–74 (also type 7, rogue ode), 359–60 ("again" motif, on which see below), 393–94 (also type 7, rogue ode), 401–2; Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār, *Dīvān-i ʿAṭṭār*, ed. Taqī Tafażżulī (Tehran: Shirkat-i Intishārāt-i ʿIlm va Farhang, 1375 [1996–97]), 41, 120 (also type 4, rogue anecdote), 200–201 ("our master" motif, on which see footnote 41), 389–90, 390–91, 391–92, 392–93, 486, 486–87, 491, 491–92 ("again" motif), 499, 506–7, 509–11; Afżal al-Dīn Khāqānī Shirvānī, *Dīvān-i Khāqānī Shirvānī*, ed. Żiyāʾ al-Dīn Sajjādī (Tehran: Intishārāt-i Zavvār, 1388 [2009–10]), 629, 630–31, 643; Fakhr al-Dīn Ibrāhīm b. Buzurgmihr ʿIrāqī, *Kulliyyāt-i Fakhr al-Dīn ʿIrāqī (majmūʿa-yi āṣār-i Fakhr al-Dīn ʿIrāqī)*, ed. Nasrīn Muḥtasham (Khuzāʾī) (Tehran: Intishārāt-i Zavvār, 1382 [2003–4]), 102–3, 103, 105–6 ("again" motif), 106–7, 107–8 (also type 7, rogue ode), 183–84 ("again" motif), 245 ("again" motif), 280–81, 297 ("again" motif). The "again" motif denotes the common motif of the poet, his master, or his beloved "again" engaging in some carnivalesque behavior. Lewis translates and discusses an example of this type by Sanāʾī in "Reading, Writing and Recitation," 364, 560–64.

37. Lewis seems to gesture toward this type as well when he remarks in the introduction to his discussion of a selection of Sanāʾī's *qalandarī ghazal*s that "the genre [*qalandarī* poems] frequently assumes an anthem-like quality, celebrating spiritual virtues of debauchery." See Lewis, "Reading, Writing and Recitation," 560.

38. For examples, see Sanāʾī, *Dīvān-i Sanāʾī*, 25–26, 89 (possibly also type 3, proto-*shahr-āshūb*), 89–90 (also type 4, rogue anecdote) 128–29 (also type 4, rogue anecdote), 135–36, 1008–9; ʿAṭṭār, *Dīvān-i ʿAṭṭār*, 65–66, 158–59, 177–79, 227, 360, 433–35, 435, 435–36, 488, 539–40, 585–86 (also type 5, rogue exhortation), 603–4, 638–39, 643–44, 659–60, 666–67, 693–94, 695–96; ʿIrāqī, *Kulliyyāt-i Fakhr al-Dīn ʿIrāqī*, ed. Muḥtasham, 101–2 (also type 6, rogue address), 237–38, 245–46 (possibly also type 3, proto-*shahr-āshūb*). Lewis translates and discusses an example of this type by Sanāʾī in "Reading, Writing and Recitation," 367, 574–76.

39. The standard doubling of the *ch* is eliminated in these terms for Magian, Christian, and infidel *bachcha*s, rendering the expected *bachcha* into *bacha*. See Lewis's discussion of this phenomenon in the context of *tarsā-bacha* poetry in "Sexual Occidentation: The Politics of Conversion, Christian-Love and Boy-Love in ʿAttâr," *Iranian Studies* 42 (2009): 717. I am grateful to Fatemeh Keshavarz for drawing my attention to this point.

40. Lewis has written an article on this type of poem in ʿAṭṭār's *dīvān*. He argues that ʿAṭṭār's "Christian boy" (*tarsā-bacha*) poems are a "topical sub-genre of [his] *ghazals*," estimating that about 15 of the 872 *ghazal*s (about 2 percent) in Tafażżulī's edition can be placed in this subgenre ("Sexual Occidentation," 717). I would actually put this number a bit higher; see footnote 38. I agree that this should be considered a topical subgenre of ʿAṭṭār's poetry, but it should be understood as a subgenre of the larger *qalandariyyāt* genre of ʿAṭṭār's poetry because the *tarsā-bacha* topos shows up in several of the *rubāʿiyyāt* that ʿAṭṭār places in the *qalandariyyāt* section of his *Mukhtār-nāma*. See three different examples in the opening pages of the *qalandariyyāt* section of ʿAṭṭār's *Mukhtār-nāmah*, 292–93.

youth (*kāfir-bacha*), the *qalandarī* Turk (*turk-i qalandar*), the young man (*pisar*), the mock master/disgraced master (*pīrī*, *pīr-i mā*),[41] the slave (*ghulām*), or even the cupbearer (*sāqī*).[42] They read as mock panegyrics in the sense that they are poems dedicated to antiheroic rogue figures or mock masters, and they revolve around the celebration of these figures' antinomian deeds. These poems sometimes have a narrative element to them as well, although they are not essentially concerned with relating a single anecdote like the rogue poetic anecdotes (discussed below) are.

*(3) City disturber (proto-*shahr-āshūb*) poems*:[43] These poems read as early specimens of "city disturber" (*shahr-āshūb*, *shahr-angīz*) poetry because they elaborate, in different ways, the same basic poetic plot of a beautiful, roguish beloved who comes into town (often specifically to the market) and throws the entire town into a happy chaos because of the love he evokes in all who come into contact with him.[44] He upends the foundations of the entire city and everyone in it: individuals lose their (rational) minds and forsake their religious commitments, entire social spaces (e.g., markets, winehouses) burst into commotion, and true lovers willingly head to the gallows. These poems could, in a sense,

41. The poems referencing "master" or "our master" (*pīrī*, *pīr-i man/mā*) revolve around the figure of the poet's master. Depending on the role of the master in the poem, poems with this figure can be placed in different subgenres.

42. I agree with Afsaneh Najmabadi that we need to think carefully about how to translate the different terms used for the (usually male) figure of the young beloved in premodern Persian sources. As Khaled El-Rouayheb has noted, the terms for these male youths are "somewhat loosely employed in the [premodern Islamicate] sources" (at times applied to youths up to the age of twenty-one), but the bulk of the evidence points to the mid-teen years as the ideal age of male beauty. These figures, at least in the premodern Islamicate conception of the phases of life, are thus not typically prepubescent children but rather are usually best understood as adolescents or even "young men" in the way we use this last term in contemporary English to indicate a male who is not a fully mature adult man but no longer a young child either. I have tried to reflect this more complex notion of the young beloved's age in my translations of the various terms employed in *qalandariyyāt* for the young beloveds rather than opting for strictly literal translations that often obscure the complexity of these terms' use in the premodern context. For more on the age of the figure of the beloved in the Islamic world, see Khaled El-Rouayheb, *Before Homosexuality in the Arab-Islamic World, 1500–1800* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 30–32; Afsaneh Najmabadi, *Women with Mustaches and Men without Beards: Gender and Sexual Anxieties of Iranian Modernity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 15, 24, 60; Ingenito, *Beholding Beauty*, 199–200.

43. Sanāʾī, *Dīvān-i Sanāʾī*, 89 (possibly also type 2, rogue figure), 141; ʿAṭṭār, *Dīvān-i ʿAṭṭār*, 224; ʿIrāqī, *Kulliyyāt-i Fakhr al-Dīn ʿIrāqī*, ed. Muḥtasham, 73–74 (wine), 74–75 (love), 76–77, 151–52, 245–46. In the poems tagged with "wine" and "love," the role of the "city disturber" is played by wine and love, respectively. Lewis translates and discusses an example of city disturber poetry by Sanāʾī and comments that "it eventually developed into a sub-genre of the ghazal all its own," indicating, it appears, that he, too, sees it as a discrete subgenre that poets later developed further. See Lewis, "Reading, Writing and Recitation," 368, 576–78.

44. For more on the *shahr-āshūb* genre, see Aḥmad Gulchīn-Maʿānī, *Shahr-āshūb dar shiʿr-i fārsī* (Tehran: Amīr Kabīr, 1346 [1967–68]); Sunil Sharma, *Persian Poetry at the Indian Frontier: Mas'ûd Sa'd Salmân of Lahore* (Delhi: Permanent Black, 2000), 107–15; idem, "Generic Innovation in Sayfī Buḫārāʾī's *Shahrāshūb Ghazal*s," in Neuwirth et al., *Ghazal as World Literature*, 2:141–49; idem, "Shahrāshūb," in Yarshater, *Persian Lyric Poetry*, 569–78; J. T. P. de Bruijn, "Shahrangīz 1. In Persian," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., posted 2012, http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_COM_1026.

be viewed as a subtype of the rogue figure poem, since they focus primarily on a rogue figure, his transgressive actions, and the disruptive consequences of his presence in an area. Commenting on the rogue figure poem of Sanāʾī that I discuss below, de Bruijn remarks that this poem is "another specimen of the *shahrâshub* motif," which suggests that he sees the poems that I have categorized separately as rogue figure and proto-*shahr-ashūb* poems as part of one larger subtype of *qalandariyyāt*.[45] It seems to me, however, that the poems I have classed here as proto-*shahr-ashūb* constitute a separate and well-developed type (i.e., not just a motif) that becomes increasingly popular over time. Though not identical in all respects with *shahr-āshūb* poetry, they share important affinities and should be considered close relatives.

(4) Rogue poetic anecdotes:[46] The poems of this fairly well-developed class relate a sustained anecdote or an encounter between the poetic persona and other figures, sometimes with lengthy dialogues included.[47] There is an important difference, in my view, between poems of this type, which are generally structured around a single poetic anecdote, and those that contain anecdotal sections amidst others. Most, though not all, of these poems are quite lengthy (some even exceed twenty lines).[48]

(5) Rogue exhortation poems (mock pand*):*[49] These poems are, as their name indicates, characterized by repeated commands or implied exhortations to their imagined audience to take up the carnivalesque *qalandarī* way of life and to reject normative modes of piety and social life. Unsurprisingly, this type of poem frequently—though not always—has an imperative verb form as a part of its end rhyme or poetic refrain (*radīf*). Some are short, playful instructions in verse to a novice "haunter of the winehouse" (*kharābātī*). Others are longer and take a more didactic tone, making them seem more like narrative homilies.

45. De Bruijn, "Ghazal in Medieval Persian Poetry," 382–83.

46. Sanāʾī, *Dīvān-i Sanāʾī*, 89–90 ("master"), 128–29 (possibly also type 2, rogue figure), 163, 666–68; ʿAṭṭār, *Dīvān-i ʿAṭṭār*, 11–12, 120 ("our master"), 193-195 ("our master"), 209 ("our master"), 221–22 ("our master"), 361; ʿIrāqī, *Kulliyyāt-i Fakhr al-Dīn ʿIrāqī*, ed. Muḥtasham, 84–85 ("master"). Also see another example of a rogue poetic anecdote by ʿAṭṭār translated and discussed by Meisami in *Structure and Meaning*, 213–14.

47. There are some similarities between this type of *qalandariyyāt* and some of the anecdote-heavy Arabic *khamriyyāt* (especially those of Abū Nuwās). Meisami points out that the latter "typically contain 'plays within plays': descriptions of, and dialogues with, the companions, the tavern-keeper, the object of Abū Nuwās's affections" (Meisami, *Structure and Meaning*, 100).

48. There are also similarities between these *qalandarī* anecdote poems and the "fable-like" poems of Nāṣir-i Khusraw. See Rafinejad, "'Mine of Golden Speech,'" 48.

49. Sanāʾī, *Dīvān-i Sanāʾī*, 179–80, 295, 311–12, 312, 408, 480–81, 481–82, 482–84, 496, 496–97, 506, 585–86 (also type 2, rogue figure), 627; ʿAṭṭār, *Dīvān-i ʿAṭṭār*, 504–5 (also type 6, rogue address); ʿAlī b. Muḥammad Anvarī, *Dīvān-i Anvarī*, ed. Muḥammad Taqī Mudarris-i Rażavī (Tehran: Intishārāt-i ʿIlmī va Farhangī, 1376 [1997–98]), 859; ʿIrāqī, *Kulliyyāt-i Fakhr al-Dīn ʿIrāqī*, ed. Muḥtasham, 78–80, 80–81. Lewis translates and discusses an example of this type, referring to it as a "sermon" and "homily or catechism," in "Reading, Writing and Recitation," 366, 570–73.

(6) Rogue address poems:[50] These poems are structured around a direct address to a particular figure, usually the beloved or a cupbearer. The address often takes the form of a series of imperative commands (closer in tone to supplications) in which the poet requests wine or the figure's attention. In some poems the address is more didactic in nature, and these poems thus overlap with rogue exhortation poems at times.

(7) Rogue odes and ditties:[51] This final dual grouping of poems is admittedly the most inexact. Rogue odes are typically at least ten lines long and sometimes run into the high teens. Their most defining feature is their more well-developed internal structure and segmentation. They can often be divided into several separate but interrelated sections. Some evince a tripartite structure (strophe, antistrophe, metastrophe) that makes them look like mini-*qaṣīda*s with interchangeable thematic sections of mock *fakhr*, apostrophe/exhortation, anecdote, and/or homily with a short concluding cap of one or two lines.[52] Others exhibit a chiastic/ring design or equal segmentation into sections of (roughly) two to four lines each. Although most of the monothematic *qalandarī* poems that appear in the *qalandariyyāt* sections of Sanāʾī's early manuscripts are longer poems (ten lines or more), there is also a small collection of shorter poems that I have labeled as rogue ditties. This type of poem is less common in comparison to the others, but the shorter length of these poems is likely indicative of other differences in performance context, function, etc.

Some of the foregoing subgenres may come to be rejected or adjusted in subsequent studies of this poetry. Some poems straddle more than one subgenre (as I have indicated in the footnotes), and one could possibly add additional ones, such as the mock *ubi sunt* poem[53] and the winehouse conversion poem,[54] among others. There is also the persistent difficulty of determining when one of these distinguishing patterns should be regarded as just a common motif and when it merits consideration as a genuine subgenre because of its centrality to the structure of a large number of poems. Despite these limitations, however, these categories are useful tools for deepening our understanding of what medieval Persian litterateurs meant when they employed the term *qalandariyyāt*. They help us disaggregate this broad thematic category and see patterns that may not otherwise be apparent, such as Sanāʾī's overrepresentation in the rogue exhortation category, ʿAṭṭār's manifest

50. Sanāʾī, *Dīvān-i Sanāʾī*, 312 (also type 5, rogue exhortation), 586; ʿAṭṭār, *Dīvān-i ʿAṭṭār*, 504–5 (also type 5, rogue exhortation); ʿIrāqī, *Kulliyyāt-i Fakhr al-Dīn ʿIrāqī*, ed. Muḥtasham, 98–99 (mock *ubi sunt*), 101–2 (also type 2, rogue figure), 108–9.

51. Sanāʾī, *Dīvān-i Sanāʾī*, 26, 73–74 (also type 1, rogue boast), 74, 74–75, 75, 75–76, 80–81, 98–99, 128–29, 163, 335–36, 337–38, 358, 393–94 (also type 1, rogue boast), 653–54; ʿAṭṭār, *Dīvān-i ʿAṭṭār*, 33–34, 192–93 ("our master"); Anvarī, *Dīvān-i Anvarī*, 784–85; Khāqānī Shirvānī, *Dīvān-i Khāqānī Shirvānī*, 630–31; ʿIrāqī, *Kulliyyāt-i Fakhr al-Dīn ʿIrāqī*, ed. Muḥtasham, 77–78, 80, 100–101, 107–8 (also type 1, rogue boast), 236–37, 246–47.

52. On reading *ghazal*s as mini-*qaṣīda*s, see Julie Scott Meisami, "A Life in Poetry: Hāfiz's First Ghazal," in *The Necklace of the Pleiades: 24 Essays on Persian Literature, Culture and Religion*, ed. Franklin D. Lewis and Sunil Sharma, 163–81 (Leiden: Leiden University Press, 2010); Meisami, *Structure and Meaning*, 163–66, 183, 186, 205–6.

53. See, for example, ʿIrāqī, *Kulliyyāt-i Fakhr al-Dīn ʿIrāqī*, ed. Muḥtasham, 98–99, 247–48.

54. See, for example, ʿAṭṭār, *Dīvān-i ʿAṭṭār*, 11–12; ʿIrāqī, *Kulliyyāt-i Fakhr al-Dīn ʿIrāqī*, ed. Muḥtasham, 84–85.

predilection for the rogue figure subtype, ʿIrāqī's preference for proto-*shahr-āshūb*-style poems, or Sanāʾī's and ʿAṭṭār's predominance in the production of rogue poetic anecdotes. Further studies on these preliminary observations may show these patterns to be the result of an individual poet's idiosyncrasies, but they may also provide important insights for the broader study of stylistic and generic development in medieval Persian poetry. For example, I suspect that the more concerted use of the longer anecdotal structure in Sanāʾī's and ʿAṭṭār's poetry would fall into this latter camp.

Moreover, analyzing the shifting and imbricated boundaries of these poetic types also reveals something important about the much more complex history of stylistic and generic development in medieval Persian poetry—a history that can only now be obliquely glimpsed in the Persian poetic manual tradition, early manuscripts, and other writings that comment on Persian poetry (e.g., *Qābūs-nāma*, *Chahār maqāla*).[55] These poetic artifacts show that poets were conceptualizing and composing poems in a multidimensional generic space that included a much wider array of variables than most modern discussions of genre in Persian poetry admit. Poetic form and what we might call the poem's "primary thematic category"—e.g., love, ascetic-homiletic, panegyric, or wine—are certainly strong factors in this generic calculus, but so, too, are more nuanced poetic characteristics, such as certain guiding plot scripts, styles of lyrical presentation (e.g., homiletic vs. anecdotal), and recurring internal structural patterns. These features inflect the first-order considerations of each poem's classical formal genre and primary thematic category to such an extent that we cannot just speak about *qalandariyyāt* or *ghazaliyyāt*. We have to be more exact: we have rogue figure or rogue poetic anecdote *qalandariyyāt*, and "dying love" and "love enjoyed" *ghazaliyyāt*, as Lewis says. We thus need to examine the *qalandariyyāt* not as a single genre but as a cluster of heterotopic countergenres if we are to elaborate its full range of intergeneric responses to panegyric and ascetic-homiletic poetry.

III. Setting the (Generic) Scene: Panegyric Poetry and Ascetic-Homiletic Poetry in the Persian Tradition

Before we can dive into a deeper analysis of *qalandariyyāt*, we need a basic picture of the generic features of panegyric and ascetic-homiletic poetry. Both of these genres are complex and dynamic traditions that vary across historical periods and, like the *qalandariyyāt*, are internally diverse.[56] My goal here is not an exhaustive portrayal of all

55. As Lewis argues, we should see these thematic types of poetry as "overlapping sets and sub-sets of thematic, typological and rhetorical strategies" whose "symbols, imagery and thematics . . . are by no means restricted to that particular genre and often bleed into those of a related topos, scene or mood." However, this "fuzziness" of generic borders should not be read as "evidence that the genre categories are artificial, were unperceived as such by the ancient authors or that no poem can ever be assigned to a single genre." See Lewis, "Reading, Writing and Recitation," 438–40, 560 (discussing the *qalandariyyāt* specifically); "Transformation of the Persian Ghazal," 123–24.

56. On diversity and development in panegyric poetry, see, e.g., Muḥammad Riżā Shafīʿī-Kadkanī, *Muflis-i kīmīyā-furūsh: Naqd va taḥlīl-i shiʿr-i Anvarī* (Tehran: Sukhan, 1372 [1993–94]), 85–95; Franklin D. Lewis, "Sincerely Flattering Panegyrics: The Shrinking Ghaznavid Qasida," in Lewis and Sharma, *Necklace of the*

possible permutations of their poetics but a distillation of their principal features so we can better understand the broader generic landscape in which *qalandariyyāt* poems operate. Each poem, of course, will fit this prototype to varying degrees depending on where it falls in the generic spectrum. *Qalandariyyāt*, in any case, do not typically respond to or imitate particular ascetic-homiletic or panegyric poems.[57] Rather, they gesture toward a caricature of these poetic types, parodying, often to absurd levels, their most striking thematic and stylistic elements.

Panegyric Poetry

Panegyric poetry was the genre *par excellence* of the medieval Persian court.[58] Panegyrics in the Persian tradition can be tripartite (*nasīb*/exordium or introit, *raḥīl*/journey, and *madḥ*/praise), bipartite (*nasīb* and *madḥ*), or even monothematic (*madḥ*). A tri- or bipartite panegyric traditionally begins with a garden, nature, desert, or romantic scene in the *nasīb* (and, if tripartite, transitions to another section treating the journey or another descriptive theme) before proceeding to the central panegyric section of the poem, often concluding with a closing prayer/*duʿā*.[59]

Pleiades, 209–50; Gabrielle van den Berg, "The Nasībs in the Dīvān of Farrukhi Sistani: Poetic Speech versus the Reflection of Reality," *Edebiyât* 9 (1998): 17–34.

57. I have not identified any specific example of a *qalandariyyāt* poem responding to or imitating an ascetic-homiletic or panegyric poem in a formal *javāb* or *istiqbāl*, though such poems almost certainly did exist. Paul Sprachman has identified an interesting instance of Sūzanī (d. 1173–74) parodying a "serious" *ghazal* of Sanāʾī in one of his obscene poems. See Sprachman, "Hajv and Profane Persian." On response poems and poetic imitation in Persian poetry, see the classic study of Paul E. Losensky, *Welcoming Fighānī: Imitation and Poetic Individuality in the Safavid-Mughal Ghazal* (Costa Mesa, CA: Mazda, 1998).

58. The general portrait of panegyric poetry in the Persian tradition presented here is a synthesis of the following studies' treatment of this poetry: Shamīsā, *Anvāʿ-i adabī*, 244–47, 273–82; Shafīʿī-Kadkanī, *Muflis-i kīmīyā-furūsh*, 83–106; Ṣafā, *Tārīkh-i adabiyyāt dar Īrān*, 1:367–68, 2:353–54; Jerome W. Clinton, *The Dīvān of Manūchihrī Dāmghānī: A Critical Study* (Minneapolis: Bibliotheca Islamica, 1972), 31–43, 73–96, 126–46; Meisami, *Medieval Persian Court Poetry*, 40–76; Jerome W. Clinton, "Court Poetry at the Beginning of the Classical Period," in *Persian Literature*, ed. Ehsan Yarshater, 75–95 (Albany, NY: Bibliotheca Persica, 1988), 88–95; Julie Scott Meisami, "Ghaznavid Panegyrics: Some Political Implications," *Iran* 28 (1990): 31–44; Michael Glünz, "Poetic Tradition and Social Change: The Persian Qasida in Post-Mongol Iran," in Sperl and Shackle, *Qasida Poetry in Islamic Asia and Africa*, 1:183–203; Meisami, "Poetic Microcosms," 139–164; idem, "The Poet and His Patrons: Two Ghaznavid Panegyrists," *Persica* 17 (2001): 91–105; idem, *Structure and Meaning*, 66–110, 144–55, 235–43, 366–77. Shafīʿī-Kadkanī also touches on various aspects of panegyric poetry in his important study of poetic imagery in the earliest period of New Persian poetry: Muḥammad Riżā Shafīʿī-Kadkanī, *Ṣuvar-i khiyāl dar shiʿr-i fārsī: Taḥqīq-i intiqādī dar ṭatavvur-i īmāzh-hā-yi shiʿr-i pārsī va siyar-i naẓariyya-yi balāghat dar Islām va Īrān* (Tehran: Āgāh, 1350 [1971–72]).

59. In general, early New Persian panegyric *qaṣīda*s are more similar to the Arabic panegyric *qaṣīda*s of the *muḥdath* period in terms of their symbolic world (emphasis on garden and court imagery rather than the desert imagery more typical of the classical Arabic *qaṣīda*) and their structure (more frequently bipartite or even monothematic rather than tripartite and polythematic like the classical Arabic *qaṣīda*). However, there are important differences as well. For more on these issues, see Meisami, *Medieval Persian Court Poetry*, 40–41; idem, "Ghaznavid Panegyrics," 31; idem, "Poetic Microcosms," 140ff. On the Arabic panegyric tradition, see Sperl, *Mannerism in Arabic Poetry*; Andras Hamori, *The Composition of Mutanabbī's Panegyrics to Sayf al-Dawla* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992); Suzanne Stetkevych, *The Poetics of Islamic Legitimacy: Myth, Gender, and Ceremony*

The central figure of the panegyric is the *mamdūḥ*, the object of praise.[60] Regardless of whether he is a king, a court official, or a powerful religious figure, he functions as the poetic axis of the panegyric, and its poetic world revolves around celebration of his power, prowess, and accomplishments of epic proportions in the battlefield, recreational arenas (palatial gardens and hunting or polo grounds), royal feasts, or even spiritual realms. The panegyric is a "poetic microcosm" or poetic "analogue" of the court life that it reflects, as Meisami has argued, and each constituent element in its poetic world is defined in relation to the *mamdūḥ*.[61] If the *mamdūḥ* is a political leader, the poet will typically extol him as an idealized Islamic leader who exudes wisdom, piety (*taqvā*), faith (*īmān*), justice, courage, mercy, and generosity at court and who fights valiantly against any enemy of Islamdom (*kāfir*) as the defender of the faith (*islām*, *dīn*) on foreign and domestic battlefields.[62] The *mamdūḥ*'s power is often portrayed as divinely ordained and his dominion as extending over the whole world (all seven climes). The grandeur of his rule can be seen in the majesty of all his royal accessories, including his court, his throne, his crown, his great armies, and his treasure. Panegyric poetry, in short, is primarily a poetics of power and social order, as Glünz and Bürgel have argued.[63]

Although my focus here is on *qalandarī* poetry as a countergenre to royal panegyric, it is important to note that panegyric poetry in the Persian tradition is not restricted to praise for kings and political elites alone. There is also a rich body of panegyrics dedicated to religious elites of the medieval Islamic world. In general terms, the poet of a religious panegyric will paint his *mamdūḥ* as the undisputed sovereign of the religious and spiritual domains. Although the power, dominion, and accomplishments celebrated in these poems may be of a decidedly more spiritual nature, they are no less grand than those in panegyrics for political leaders, and more importantly, the poetic axis in these religious-spiritual panegyrics continues to be the *mamdūḥ*.[64] The poet will eulogize his piety, religious

in the Classical Arabic Ode (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002); Beatrice Gruendler, *Medieval Arabic Praise Poetry: Ibn al-Rūmī and the Patron's Redemption* (New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003).

60. Praise (*madḥ*) in the panegyric is not just sycophantic adulation. When poets praise the *mamdūḥ*, they celebrate not just an individual but rather an idealized portrait of their patron as the embodiment of the most revered social and spiritual values appropriate to his position in the medieval Islamic sociopolitical system. See Meisami, *Medieval Persian Court Poetry*, 43–48; idem, "Ghaznavid Panegyrics," 32, 34; idem, *Structure and Meaning*, 88–90, 136–38, 147–48; J. C. Bürgel, "Qasida as Discourse on Power and Its Islamization: Some Reflections," in Sperl and Shackle, *Qasida Poetry in Islamic Asia and Africa*, 1:451–74; Glünz, "Poetic Tradition and Social Change," 184, 188, 200; Sperl, *Mannerism in Arabic Poetry*, 9–27.

61. Meisami, "Poetic Microcosms," 144–45, 163–64. See also idem, "The Grand Design: Medieval Persian Poetic Microcosms," in *Proceedings of the XIIth Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association*, 458–63 (Munich: Judicium, 1990).

62. This last point is especially true in the panegyrics for Maḥmud of Ghazna composed by his illustrious court poets Farrukhī and ʿUnsurī. They both wax eloquently about his campaigns against "infidels" (*kuffār*) in which he mercilessly destroyed their "idols" (*but*) and "idol temples" (*but-khāna*) (e.g., Farrukhī's *qaṣīda* 35 on the destruction of the Somnath temple and its idols). See Meisami's discussion of some these *qaṣīda*s in "Poetic Microcosms," 147–48 and *Structure and Meaning*, 235–43.

63. Bürgel, "Qasida as Discourse on Power"; Glünz, "Poetic Tradition and Social Change," 184.

64. I do not mean to suggest any significant separation of the political and religious-spiritual domains here.

knowledge, mystical power, and exalted spiritual state, painting an idealized portrait of the *mamdūḥ* as an embodiment of the virtues and ideals associated with his particular position in the religious-spiritual hierarchy of the medieval Islamic world. Because of a shared concern with certain religious-spiritual values, there is considerable overlap between the respective symbolic/conceptual worlds of religious-spiritual panegyrics and ascetic-homiletic poetry.[65]

Ascetic-Homiletic Poetry

In ascetic-homiletic poetry we may have what constitutes the first countergenre to royal panegyric poetry.[66] The poetic axis of the ascetic-homiletic poet is not the court of the panegyric's *mamdūḥ*, nor is his central concern the enumeration of the *mamdūḥ*'s illustrious deeds and achievements. Rather, the poetic world of the *zuhdiyyāt-mawʿiẓa* revolves around a poetic axis that is firmly anchored in God's court—the eternal court that rules over the entire cosmos and casts the pleasures and achievements of the mundane world in a starkly different light. Even if not set there specifically, the rule, power, and values celebrated in the *zuhdiyyāt-mawʿiẓa* emanate from that celestial court.

The poet of ascetic-homiletic poetry is the preacher of the "arena of religion" (*maydān-i dīn*), as Nāṣir-i Khusraw declares in a famous poem.[67] He is the admonisher (*vāʿiẓ*) of the

My point is only that the poet's focus in the religious panegyric is shifted decidedly toward the panegyrized's religious and spiritual virtues, with only implicit recognition of the political power this exalted religious status may carry.

65. *Qalandarī* themes may even appear in panegyrics for Sufi masters or mystically inclined political rulers. A particularly interesting example of this can be found in Amīr Muʿizzī's panegyric with a *qalandarī nasīb* for Fakhr al-Dīn al-Maʿālī Abū ʿAlī Sharafshāh Jaʿfarī, which is discussed and translated in Miller, "Qalandar King." See also examples in Abū al-Majd Majdūd b. Ādam Sanāʾī, *Kulliyyāt-i ashʿār-i Ḥakīm Sanāʾī Ghaznavī* [facsimile of manuscript], ed. A. A. Bashīr (Kabul: Muʾassasa-yi Intishārāt-i Bayhaqī, 1356 [1977–78]), 516–18; Sanāʾī, *Dīvān-i Sanāʾī*, 388–92, 587–89; Fakhr al-Dīn ʿIrāqī (Hamadānī), *Kulliyyāt-i Shaykh Fakhr al-Dīn Ibrāhīm Hamadānī mutakhallas bih ʿIrāqī*, ed. Saʿīd Nafīsī (Tehran: Kitāb-Khāna-yi Sanāʾī, 1362 [1983–84]), 69–70; ʿIrāqī, *Kulliyyāt-i ʿIrāqī*, ed. Muḥtasham, 311–14.

66. The general portrait of ascetic-homiletic poetry in the Persian tradition presented here is a synthesis of the following studies' treatment of this poetry: Shafīʿī-Kadkanī, *Ṣuvar-i khiyāl dar shiʿr-i fārsī*, 550–63; idem, *Tāziyāna-hā-yi sulūk*, 47–52, 219; Ṣafā, *Tārīkh-i adabiyyāt dar Īrān*, 1:368, 2:356–57, 3/1:332–33; Jerome W. Clinton, "The Madāen Qasida of Xāqāni [Khāqānī] Sharvāni, I," *Edebiyât* 1 (1976): 156–62; idem, "The Madāen Qasida of Xāqāni [Khāqānī] Sharvāni, II: Xāqāni and Buhturī," *Edebiyât* 2 (1977): 200–205; de Bruijn, *Of Piety and Poetry*, 164–82; idem, *Persian Sufi Poetry*, 29–50; Julie Scott Meisami, "Symbolic Structure in a Poem by Nasir-i Khusrau," *Iran* 31 (1993): 103–17; idem, "Poetic Microcosms," 164–81; idem, "Places in the Past: The Poetics/Politics of Nostalgia," *Edebiyât* 8 (1998): 84–89; idem, *Structure and Meaning*, 39–40, 69–71, 172–81, 200–204, 219, 303–4, 375–76; Lewisohn, "Hierocosmic Intellect and Universal Soul," 193–226; Alice C. Hunsberger, "'On the Steed of Speech': A Philosophical Poem by Nāṣir-i Khusraw," in Hunsberger, *Pearls of Persia*, 147–90, 158–80; Lewisohn, "Nāṣir-i Khusraw's Ode"; Meisami, "Nāṣir-i Khusraw." On *zuhdiyyāt* in the Arabic tradition, see James D. Martin, "The Religious Beliefs of Abū'l-ʿAtāhiya According to the Zuhdīyāt," *Transactions–Glasgow University Oriental Society* 23 (1970): 20–25; Sperl, *Mannerism in Arabic Poetry*, 71–96; Hamori, "Zuhdiyyāt"; Gregor Schoeler, "Bashshār b. Burd, Abū ʾl-ʿAtāhiyah, and Abū Nuwās," in Ashtiany and Johnstone, *ʿAbbasid Belles-Lettres*, 275–99; Kennedy, "Zuhdiyya."

67. See the translation and discussion of this poem in Hunsberger, "'On the Steed of Speech.'"

entire Muslim world who recalls for his readers the great military victories of past kings and their awe-inspiring monuments (e.g., the ruins of magnificent palaces of Ctesiphon) not to praise these figures but to remind his audience of the transitory nature of all earthly life. Death and related symbols of morbidity such as graves or ruins are thus dominant topoi in the *zuhdiyyāt-mawʿiẓa*, and ascetic-homiletic poets frequently employ the *ubi sunt* ("where is?") motif, often anaphorically, to reinforce the absolute transiency of earthly life. While lamenting the desolation, evil, and illusionary pleasures of the world, the preacher poet exhorts his audience to piety (*taqvā*), repentance (*tawba*, *istighfār*), and good works so as to guarantee themselves a place in the eternal world of God's court.

The mode of piety that is encouraged in this poetry can be broadly characterized as abstemious (*zuhd/parhīz/pārsāʾī*) in the sense that it categorically rejects the attractions and achievements of the material world and counsels the reader to adopt a sober code of conduct in line with religion (*dīn*), the Quran, normative Islamic law (*sharīʿat*), and the prophet's custom (*sunnat*). It decries *kufr* (unbelief/infidelity) and earthly idols (*but*) and enjoins the reader to have absolute trust in God (*tavakkul*) even in the face of adversity and to let a fear of God's wrath on Judgment Day guide their actions. Ascetic-homiletic poetry has sometimes been described as a long "string of admonitions" in verse on the aforementioned topics and other, related ones, such as divine unity, faith (*īmān*), the Quran, pious acts of obedience and worship (*ṭāʿat*), right guidance (*hudā*), shame (*sharm*), wisdom/intellect (*hikmat*, *khirad*), divine justice, and praise of the prophet, his family, and his companions.[68] Although this pejorative characterization of ascetic-homiletic poetry is unfair, the symbolic and conceptual world of *zuhdiyyāt* and *mawʿiẓa* does revolve around these concepts and motifs.[69]

IV. The *Qalandariyyāt* as Heterotopic Countergenre(s): Three Case Studies

"Well done, Young Infidel!": A Rogue Figure Poem of Sanāʾī

Although it is clear that the *qalandariyyāt* topoi were under development before Sanāʾī, it is only in his *dīvān* that we begin to find a substantial number of monothematic *qalandariyyāt* poems longer than the *rubāʿī* form.[70] His *dīvān* contains a representative sampling of all of the major subgenres of the *qalandariyyāt*, and given the considerable influence his poetry exerted on subsequent poets, it is likely that his *qalandariyyāt* poems served as foundational models for later *qalandarī* poets, such as ʿAṭṭār and ʿIrāqī. The following *qalandariyyāt* poem about a "young infidel" (*kāfir-bacha*) is an example of one of the most popular of these "models," the rogue figure poem.

68. Like panegyric poetry, ascetic-homiletic poetry does at times incorporate imagery and themes from wine poetry and even *qalandariyyāt*. The *zuhdiyyāt* poem by Sanāʾī that de Bruijn discusses in his *Persian Sufi Poetry* (38–40) is a perfect example.

69. Hunsberger and Meisami critique this atomized reading of Nāṣir-i Khusraw's ascetic-homiletic poetry in their recent studies on his poetry; see Hunsberger, "'On the Steed of Speech'"; Meisami, "Nāṣir-i Khusraw."

70. For a discussion of the early history of the *qalandariyyāt*, see Miller, "Qalandar King."

1 You have cut me off again from the Muslims—well done, young infidel!
You have made me a prisoner again—well done, young infidel!

2 In the ranks of lords of love—those "all-in" gambling types—
you place me again—well done, young infidel!

3 It seems you returned from apostasy (lit. being an infidel) to being Muslim only
in order to uproot Islam (lit. being Muslim)—well done, young infidel!

4 With a face like the fountain of the sun and tresses like crosses,
you renewed the Christian religion—well done, young infidel!

5 In the dilapidated *qalandarī* winehouse, in the ranks of the wine drinkers,
you know hundreds of strange disguises—well done, young infidel!

6 You are the Joseph of the era, and for you, behind each Moses
there are a hundred Jacobs—well done, young infidel![71]

The most striking feature of this poem is the repeated apostrophization of the "young infidel" in its laudatory *radīf*.[72] The use of this rhetorical device is widespread in Persian poetry. In most cases, it serves to highlight for the audience the focus of the poem.[73] In panegyric poetry, the poet apostrophizes the *mamdūḥ* using a combination of his name, one of his honorific titles, or an adjectival confection that praises as it identifies the *mamdūḥ* in a more allusive manner. In ascetic-homiletic poetry (including *naʿt* and *manāqib*), the apostrophized figure could be God, Prophet Muḥammad, one of the prophet's companions, or another important religious figure. When performed, such apostrophizations would likely prompt the performer to gesture physically in the direction of the addressee,

71. Sanāʾī, *Dīvān-i Sanāʾī*, 1008–9. This poem is not listed as a *qalandariyyāt* in Mudarris-i Rażavī's edition, but a similar version is listed in the *qalandariyyāt* section in the KM manuscript: Sanāʾī, *Kulliyyāt-i ashʿār-i Ḥakīm Sanāʾī Ghaznavī*, 575. I have followed the latter version of this poem. Persian text:

بردیم باز از مسلمانی زهی کافر بچه — کردیم بندی و زندانی زهی کافر بچه
در صفات پاکبازان در صف ارباب عشق — هر زمانم باز بِنشانی زهی کافر بچه
در مسلمانی مگر از کافری باز آمدی — تا براندازی مسلمانی زهی کافر بچه
با رخی چون چشمهٔ خورشید و زلف چون صلیب — تازه کردی کیش نصرانی زهی کافر بچه
در خرابات قلندر در صف می خوارگان — صد لباسات عجب دانی زهی کافر بچه
یوسف عصری و اندر زیر هر موسی ترا — هست صد یعقوب کنعانی زهی کافر بچه

De Bruijn, in his recent work ("The Ghazal in Medieval Persian Poetry," 382–83), translates and briefly discusses a different version of this poem from the edition of Sanāʾī's *ghazal*s produced by Valentina Zanolla for the Lirica Persica project, which he argues contains the "most reliable texts now available" of Sanāʾī's poems (p. 370).

72. See footnote 39 above on the elimination of the doubled *chih* in *kāfir-bacha*, and see footnote 42 for more on the age and gender of this "young infidel."

73. For more on the "poetic refrain" (*radīf*) in Persian poetry, see Paul E. Losensky, "'Demand, Ask, Seek': The Semantics and Rhetoric of the *Radīf Ṭalab* in the Persian Ghazal," *Turkish Studies Association Bulletin* 21 (1997): 19–40; Franklin D. Lewis, "The Rise and Fall of a Persian Refrain: The *Radīf ʿĀtash u Āb*,'" in *Reorientations: Arabic and Persian Poetry*, ed. Suzanne Pinckney Stetkevych, 199–226 (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994).

further highlighting the gravity of these moments in the poem and the importance of this literary device.[74] Sanāʾī's use of the apostrophe for the lowly "young infidel" plays off these expectations. It marks this most socially marginal and despised figure as the poetic axis of the poem while simultaneously inverting all of the attendant expectations of a figure who would be extolled in a poem. The return to this device in the *radīf* at the end of each line mocks it through its repetition to an almost absurd degree: even the most fulsome panegyrics do not typically apostrophize their *mamdūḥ* in every line of the poem!

The figure of the young infidel dominates the poem in other ways highly reminiscent of traditional *mamdūḥ*s, but in a decidedly antiheroic manner.[75] The young infidel is portrayed throughout the poem as the agent whose Herculean deeds animate its entire poetic world and whose extraordinary qualities are meant to engender astonishment in the audience. His actions are as awe-inspiring as those of the powerful Islamic kings, prophets, and other holy figures in normative forms of panegyric verse, even as they are their diametric opposite on the scale of social laudability. Inverting at the outset the move toward societal or spiritual "aggregation" (discussed below in connection with ʿIrāqī's poem), the infidel youth "cut[s]" Sanāʾī off from the "Muslims," making him a "prisoner again" in the "dilapidated *qalandarī* winehouse" (*kharābāt-i qalandar*) where the "lords of love," "'all-in' gambling types," and "wine drinkers" congregate in their mock court (lines 1–2, 5). He does not slay the enemies of Islam on the battlefield; he aids them, even if indirectly, by weakening Islam and imprisoning its adherents (lines 1, 3–4). He does not righteously propagate the *sharīʿat* and the pillars of the faith; he is a playful trickster or "man of wiles"–type character with "hundreds of strange disguises" who is hell-bent on the destruction both of Sanāʾī's respectable (Muslim) character and of the entire normative system of medieval Islamic society embodied by the opening persona of "Sanāʾī the Muslim poet" (lines 3, 5).

The pinnacle of the mock *mamdūḥ*'s treachery occurs, not surprisingly, at the poem's center point (lines 3–4).[76] It features a mock conversion of sorts, in which the young infidel's apparent return to the Islamic fold in the first hemistich of line 3 (his "retur[n] from apostasy to being Muslim") is revealed in the second hemistich to be nothing more than clever subterfuge aimed at "uproot[ing] Islam" itself. This stunning deed is followed in the next line with Sanāʾī's claim that the youth's beauty and cross-like tresses are so potently intoxicating that they have empowered him to "rene[w] the Christian religion" (line 4): they are an antidote to the superficial Islam practiced by most Muslims. By the end of the poem, Sanāʾī's own mock conversion is complete, as he concludes his enumeration of the

74. On the importance of gesturing in the performance of Persian poetry, see Lewis, "Reading, Writing and Recitation," 99, 109–10.

75. Sprachman has pointed to an analogous phenomenon in one of Sūzanī's satirical responses to a poem of Sanāʾī in which Sūzanī casts his penis as an "anti-*mamdūḥ*" ("Hajv and Profane Persian," 590). Similarly, Meisami has shown Abū Nuwās transforming wine into a mock *mamdūḥ*; see Meisami, *Structure and Meaning*, 332.

76. Meisami, in her exhaustive study of structural patterns in Persian and Arabic poetry, has shown that key elements of the poem are often placed at its center point (Meisami, *Structure and Meaning*, 149, 164, 182–83, 185, 191–95, 236).

young infidel's awe-inspiring transgressive feats by again praising his beauty and crowning him the "Joseph of the era"—the carnival king of the medieval Islamic (homoerotic) beauty contest—who is loved by a "hundred Jacobs."[77] Whether we read this last line as a kind of mock coronation or only as high praise, the radical inversion of the normative Islamic symbolic hierarchy in comparing an "infidel youth" to an Islamic prophet remains.

The mock conversion here is violent, even if liberatory and somewhat playful. The infidel youth is not passively proselytizing for Christianity on a corner in the marketplace—which would be impossible. He is disguising himself as a Muslim in order to "uproot" or even "overthrow" Islam (*bar-andāzī*). He is physically, or at least metaphorically (likely both), invading normative Islamic spaces to gain recruits to his Christian-*cum*-infidel-*cum*-*qalandarī* winehouse rite. This attack should ultimately be understood as salvific in the sense that it is ironically the infidel youth who will bring the poet and the townspeople to "true Islam." But this liberation of the Muslims from their superficial modes of piety can also be read in other ways. For example, it is a clear (mystical) inversion of royal panegyrics' typical kingly prerogative to protect Islamdom and defeat its enemies. But even more important, I think, is the way the poem plays off and spiritualizes the different types of "raids" seen in *ṣuʿlūk* ("brigand"), *mujūn*, and *khamriyyāt* poetry, which all tend toward the literal brigand, anacreontic, or sexual "raiding" models.[78] The infidel youth's raid on the Muslims is referenced only allusively in this poem, but the trope is developed in far greater, sometimes poem-length, detail in *qalandariyyāt* poetry of the city disturber (*proto-shahr-āshūb*) type.

This mock praise poem also shares another important feature with ascetic-homiletic and courtly panegyric poetry: its strong association with a particular physical location in the imaginal geography of medieval Islamic poetry. The symbol that is undoubtedly most closely associated with the *qalandariyyāt* generally is the "dilapidated winehouse" (*kharābāt*), which in this poem Sanāʾī specifies further as a "dilapidated *qalandarī* winehouse."[79] Literally, the *kharābāt* are "ruins"—a word that comes from the same *khāʾ-rāʾ-bāʾ* Arabic trilateral root as the word "destr[uction]" in Suhrawardī's famous characterization of the *qalandars* mentioned in the introduction—but in the poetry of this period the *kharābāt* is understood to be a place of wine, merriment, and debauchery. Here, being "ruined" or "destroyed" (*kharāb*, met. "drunk, wasted") is not an admonition to readers but rather the *sine qua non* of participation in this poetic world. This place of ruin or destruction does not function to warn the reader of the transience of mundane pleasures and glory, as do the lifeless "ruins" of ascetic-homiletic poetry (such as, most famously, the ruins of ancient Ctesiphon in

77. Joseph is considered both a prophet and a symbol of beauty *par excellence* in the Islamic tradition.

78. On the importance of raiding in *ṣuʿlūk* poetry, see Stetkevych, *Mute Immortals Speak*, 87–157. A few examples of sexual violation of the beloved as "raiding" in *mujūn* and *khamriyyāt* can be found in Kennedy, *Wine Song*, 53–54; Meisami, *Structure and Meaning*, 165–66.

79. De Bruijn, too, makes this point in his introductory study of Sanāʾī's *qalandariyyāt* poetry: de Bruijn, "*Qalandariyyāt* in Persian Mystical Poetry," 79–80. Although *kharābāt* is typically translated as "tavern," I have opted to translate it as "dilapidated winehouse" in an effort to convey (even if only indirectly) both the image of a "place of illicit drink" (i.e., tavern) and the sense of a "ruin" (the literal meaning of the term).

Khāqānī's *Madāʾin qaṣīda*).[80] Rather, in the *qalandariyyāt*, the *kharābāt* is alive with mystical merriment and serves as the center of transgressive activities. Its implied decrepitude—whether architectural, metaphorical, or both—is a reflection of the inner psychological state of its denizens and, if intended literally, an implicit critique of the vaunted palaces and grand architectural wonders that are celebrated, at times at great length, in other genres of poetry.[81] The "haunters of the *kharābāt*" (*kharābātiyyān*) reject the worldly logic of these ostentatious earthly structures not because of an ascetic disposition (as in ascetic-homiletic poetry, which sees all earthly monuments as transient and as distractions from heaven) but rather because it is only by psychologically mirroring the destruction of the *kharābāt* that they can achieve union with the mock king of the winehouse, the roguish beloved.

The *kharābāt* functions as a mock court of sorts in this poetry, and it is fully equipped with its own courtiers, such as the "lords of love" (line 2) and, in many other poems, cupbearers (*sāqī*) and minstrels, and even its own court regalia ("strange disguises," line 5).[82] In this poem, the infidel ruler of the court has even arrogated to himself the royal power to imprison Muslim subjects (line 1) (albeit with love)—a prerogative of kings and an experience that was of such concern to medieval Persian court poets that they developed it into its own thematic genre, the *ḥabsiyyāt* (prison poetry).[83] The Sufi "carnivalesque court" is decidedly not the royal court of medieval Islamic societies' political and religious elites that is portrayed in panegyric poetry, nor is it the heavenly court of God as fashioned by the ascetic-homiletic poets. It is their inverse. It is positioned outside of medieval Islamic society in both a geographical and a moral sense, with its geographic marginality in the poetic imagination serving as a spatial reminder of the "outside the bounds" nature of the socially and religiously transgressive activities (such as drinking, gambling, and illicit sexual activities) that occur in these houses of ill repute. One wishing to engage in such transgressive activities would necessarily need to do so outside of the bounds of the established social order, which are represented by the city and its institutions of religious and political power (e.g., courts, mosques, Sufi lodges).

80. Meisami, "Poetic Microcosms," 173–81.

81. On poems celebrating the architectural achievements of the political and religious elites and their role in promoting a "'monarchitectonics' of imperial ideology," see Paul E. Losensky, "The Palace of Praise and the Melons of Time: Descriptive Patterns in ʿAbdī Bayk Šīrāzī's *Garden of Eden*," *Eurasian Studies* 2 (2003): 1–29; idem, "'The Equal of Heaven's Vault': The Design, Ceremony, and Poetry of the Ḥasanābād Bridge," in *Writers and Rulers: Perspectives on Their Relationship from Abbasid to Safavid Times*, ed. Beatrice Grundler and Louise Marlow, 195–215 (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2004); idem, "Coordinates in Space and Time: Architectural Chronograms in Safavid Iran," in *New Perspectives on Safavid Iran Empire and Society*, ed. Colin P. Mitchell, 198–219 (New York: Routledge, 2011); idem, "'Square Like a Bubble': Architecture, Power, and Poetics in Two Inscriptions by Kalim Kāshāni," *Journal of Persianate Studies* 8 (2015): 42–70; Julie Scott Meisami, "Palaces and Paradise: Palace Description in Medieval Persian Poetry," in *Islamic Art and Architecture*, ed. Oleg Grabar and Cynthia Robinson, 21–54 (Princeton, NJ: Markus Wiener, 2001).

82. Although Sanāʾī does not explicitly refer to the winehouse as a court in this poem, he does do so in other poems. See, for example, Sanāʾī, *Dīvān-i Sanāʾī*, 74.

83. On the *ḥabsiyyāt*, see Sharma, *Persian Poetry at the Indian Frontier*, 68–106; Gould, "Wearing the Belt of Oppression."

At all of these levels, this rogue figure poem of Sanāʾī can be read as a mock panegyric. Some of the specific image complexes in this poem are unique, but the general carnivalesque poetic currents and frameworks from which Sanāʾī draws inspiration produce a predictable—though never boring—pattern of variation on these basic themes in other rogue figure poems.[84]

"*We Are Taking the Road from the* Qibla *to the Dilapidated Winehouse*": *ʿAṭṭār's Rogue Boast (Mock* Fakhr*)*

ʿAṭṭār is the second major poet who writes in the *qalandariyyāt* genre. His *qalandarī* poems clearly draw heavily on Sanāʾī's models, but he also developed the genre in new ways. His much more extensive development of the rogue figure and rogue boast subgenres is the most obvious example, although the issue of ʿAṭṭār's unique contributions to the *qalandariyyāt* genre is obviously more complicated than this and not one that can be dealt with in full here. The following poem is an example of one of ʿAṭṭār's rogue boasts.

1 We are taking the road from the *qibla*[85] to the dilapidated winehouse,
then we will do our prayers in the gambling house.

2 Sometimes we cause an uproar from the pain of the dregs;
other times we sigh from the pure wine of the winehouse.

3 Since we are not sober for a moment in the hermitage,
we will do the work of the winehouse drunk and wasted.

4 O wise elder! Come and see how gentle we are
to the youthful libertines just to get some dregs!

5 Those spiritual prattlers are repenting from our dregs
while we, without hypocrisy, are repenting from their spiritual conceits!

6 We are not boasting of "going all in" and debauchery,[86]
nor claiming any exalted states or stations.

7 Where are all our enlightenment and miracles?
For all we desire is enlightenment and miracles.

8 We are dreg-drinkers so we are no longer men of religion.
We are rendering infidelity lawful for the people of religion![87]

84. For an important discussion on the essential role of variation on a select range of themes, see Keshavarz's discussion of the "shifting field of similarities" in Saʿdī's poetry in *Lyrics of Life: Saʿdi on Love, Cosmopolitanism and Care of the Self* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2015), 108–35.

85. The *qibla* is the direction in which Muslims pray. It is determined by the location of the Kaʿba, the holiest shrine in Islam, which all Muslims face in prayer.

86. The oldest manuscript (Majlis 2600) reads *rindī* here instead of *mardī*; as the former seems to make more sense in this context, I have opted for this alternative reading.

87. A textual variant could change the meaning of this line to "we boast of infidelity to the people of religion."

9 Tell the people to do bad to us! For we
do not retaliate against or judge anyone.

10 O Sāqī! The people of longing/dregs in this circle are ready!
Give them wine, for we are doing the essential work of the wine.

11 We will checkmate the king—supported by one knight—(ref. "sun")
on the chess board
using only your face/rook, without even a single pawn.

12 We are the night riders traversing the desert to the heart's Kaʿba.
We meet and converse with the *shāhid*s of the soul![88]

13 Regarding acquiring learned and rational knowledge, like ʿAṭṭār this time
we take up the work of the winehouse for a day or two.[89]

In this complex tripartite rogue boast (1–3, 4–12 [4–9, 10–12], 13), ʿAṭṭār constructs a variation on the important *qalandariyyāt* end rhyme of *-āt*. The *-āt* rhyme was a popular choice for *qalandarī* poets because it rhymes with the Persian word for the *qalandar*s' lair, the *kharābāt*. To this common rhyme, ʿAṭṭār adds a twist, appending the poetic refrain *mī-kunīm* ("we do, we make"). The Persian verb *kardan*—the base infinitive form of the present form *mī-kunīm*—is almost always used as the verbal element of a compound verb. Its meaning is highly flexible and depends on the word(s) by which it is accompanied for much of its semantic meaning in different contexts. Its translation, therefore, can differ substantially from sentence to sentence. However, the shared base meaning of doing or making something or engaging in some activity remains constant. This action-oriented *radīf* is particularly apropos for this rogue boast poem since it keeps the reader ineluctably

Regardless of the way in which we read this line, the valorization of infidelity (*kufr*) over (*dīn*) remains.

88. The figure of the *shāhid* is a beautiful person—typically a young man—used in a Sufi meditative ritual called *shāhid-bāzī* in which the Sufi gazes upon the beautiful human form as an earthly embodiment of God's limitless beauty. See footnote 42 for more on the age and gender of this figure.

89. ʿAṭṭār, *Dīvān-i ʿAṭṭār*, 509–11. Persian text:

ما ره ز قبله سوی خرابات می‌کنیم — پس در قمارخانه مناجات می‌کنیم
گاهی ز دَردِ دُرد هیاهوی می‌زنیم — گاهی ز صافِ میکده هَیهات می‌کنیم
چون یک نفس به صومعه هشیار نیستیم — مست و خراب کار خرابات می‌کنیم
پیرا بیا ببین که جوانانِ رند را — از بهر دردیی چه مُراعات می‌کنیم
طاماتیان ز دُردی ما توبه می‌کنند — ما بی‌نفاق توبه ز طامات می‌کنیم
نه لافِ پاکبازی و رندی همی زنیم — نه دعویِ مقام و مقامات می‌کنیم
ما را کجاست کشف و کرامات کین همه — بر آرزوی کشف و کرامات می‌کنیم
دُردی‌کشیم و تا بنباشیم مرد دین — بر اهل دین به کفر مباحات می‌کنیم
گو بد کنید در حق ما خَلق زانکه ما — با کس نه داوری نه مکافات می‌کنیم
ای ساقی اهل درد درین حلقه حاضرند — می‌ده که کار می به مهمات می‌کنیم
سلطانِ یک سوارهٔ نَطعِ دو رنگ را — بی یک پیاده بر رخ تو مات می‌کنیم
ما شب‌روانِ بادیهٔ کعبهٔ دلیم — با شاهدانِ روح ملاقات می‌کنیم
در کسبِ علم و عقل چو عطار این زمان — هم یک دو روز کارِ خرابات می‌کنیم

focused throughout on the *actions* and *feats* for which ʿAṭṭār is praising himself and his fellow "night riders traversing the desert to the heart's Kaʿba" (line 12).

"Boast" or "self-praise" poetry (*fakhr*) has a long tradition in Persian and Arabic, with which poets such as Sanāʾī, ʿAṭṭār, and ʿIrāqī would have been deeply familiar. Numerous examples of pre-Islamic *fakhr* poetry have survived (although how truly "pre-Islamic" they all are is a debate for elsewhere), and it remained a fixture of Islamic Persian and Arabic poetics, too. Poets commonly include *fakhr* sections in polythematic poems that proclaim their unparalleled poetic skills, intellectual stature, or moral probity. Such boasts could move from the personal to the social register as well, becoming a poetic statement of a larger group's values, memorialization of its achievements, and assertion of its strength and unity.[90]

In ʿAṭṭār's poem, and in *qalandarī* poetry more generally, the traditional "boast" is not eliminated but transformed. It is more akin to the mock *fakhr* of the *khamriyyāt*, *hazliyyāt*, or *ṣuʿlūk* poetry in which the poet celebrates his rejection of social institutions and norms and the heterotopic countersites and individuals who inspire the Sufi carnival.[91] The *qalandarī* poet, however, is not only antisocial. He is also a "self-deprecator" (*kam-zan*), as both Sanāʾī and ʿAṭṭār term it in several other poems.[92] His boast is equal parts antisocial and anti-self—and at a deeper level, statements of the former type also serve the latter purpose since society and its structures are in a sense projections and outgrowths of the individual self and its illusion of separateness from Ultimate Reality/God. In a direct affront to the foundational logic of traditional *fakhr*, the *qalandariyyāt*'s mock *fakhr* can be understood as a poetic performance of the destruction of the self, a performative assertion that there ultimately is no self to praise or reintegrate (a point I will return to below): all is God, the beloved.

ʿAṭṭār's assertion in line 6 (the center of the poem) that "[w]e are not boasting of 'going all in' and debauchery / nor claiming any exalted states or stations" seems to be an indirect acknowledgment that this poem is a boast of a certain sort or at least could be interpreted that way. Notwithstanding ʿAṭṭār's claim, the very act of disassociating one category from another highlights the subterranean connections between them. The tension contained in this disavowal is noteworthy because it embodies the Janus-faced nature of countergenre poetics: one face must always look back to the poetics that it parodies even as it rejects and inverts it. The *qalandarī* poet does not want to "boast" even though he undeniably does boast of his "blame-seeking" (*malāmatī*) behaviors.[93] But poetic boasts of a political or

90. For a few examples of *fakhr* in different types of Arabic and Persian poetry, see Stetkevych, *Mute Immortals Speak*, 33–42, 274–83; Meisami, *Structure and Meaning*, 201–3.

91. On the rejection of traditional *fakhr* or use of mock *fakhr* in *ṣuʿlūk*, *khamriyyāt*, and *hazliyyāt*, see Stetkevych, *Mute Immortals Speak*, 87–157; Meisami, *Structure and Meaning*, 167, 219–20; Kennedy, *Wine Song*, 53–54, 56.

92. See Sanāʾī, *Dīvān-i Sanāʾī*, 311–12, 337–38; ʿAṭṭār, *Dīvān-i ʿAṭṭār*, 200–201, 361, 506–7.

93. The term used for "blame" here, *malāmat*, is important because many scholars maintain that *qalandarī* poetry was a poetic outgrowth of an early Islamic spiritual movement called the *malāmatī* (blame-seekers). See the studies cited in footnote 2. *Ṣuʿlūk* poets also portray themselves at times as targets of social opprobrium (Stetkevych, *Mute Immortals Speak*, 117–18).

spiritual nature are associated with courtly panegyric poets and, especially in the mind of the *qalandarī* poets, with their archnemeses, the "ascetics" (sing. *zāhid*). As ʿIrāqī says in line 8 of his poem below, "Pour me wine! For I have repented from asceticism / because I saw nothing from ascetics except boasting and ostentation."[94] The *qalandarī* poet, therefore, must mock the *fakhr* in terms that will alert the audience to the intended genre of parody while also radically inverting its horizon of expectations. This is the delicate dance of "rogue boasts" or, as the *qalandarī* poet would likely prefer to call it, self-deprecation (*kam-zanī*).

One of the most common ways in which rogue boast poems establish their connection to the larger *fakhr* tradition is through their sustained focus throughout the poem on the poetic "I" or "we" and their self-proclamation of their (un)praiseworthy acts and characteristics. Although not all or even necessarily the majority of poetic boasts follow this pattern, many do employ the first-person plural pronoun to boast of the exceptional qualities and achievements of their "tribe" or societal group.[95] The nature of the boasts in all of these poems differs substantially, but their shared poetic script of extended self-glorification/denigration by the poetic persona gives the reader an immediate sense that they are drawing from a shared repository of models and that their affinities are intended, even if only for parodic effect. In the multidimensional space of the Persian genre system, such poems would gravitate toward one another on this axis at least, stretching their primary generic fields in new directions through their deliberate and simultaneous adoption and transformation of *fakhr* poetry's vast historical repertoire.

In ʿAṭṭār's poem specifically, self-glorification takes a number of interesting forms—some already familiar, others novel variations. The opening boast can be read as a mock *raḥīl* (journey passage), a parodic response to the traditional *raḥīl* that shows similarities with the refiguring of the journey passage in *khamriyyāt* and *ṣuʿlūk* poetry.[96] ʿAṭṭār proudly proclaims that the journey of the poetic "we"—i.e., ʿAṭṭār and his fellow "night riders traversing the desert to the heart's Kaʿba" (line 12)— is not to the powerful court of a *mamdūḥ*, to God's heavenly court, or to a holy sanctuary on earth (e.g., the Kaʿba) but rather to the "dilapidated winehouse" (*kharābāt*): the carnivalesque court of the cupbearer (*sāqī*, line 10) and the wise elder (*pīr*, who is often portrayed as a "Magian"; line 4) discussed previously. In this *qalandarī* court, they cavort with courtiers who are the most marginal

94. ʿIrāqī, *Kulliyyāt-i Fakhr al-Dīn ʿIrāqī*, 108–9. ʿAṭṭār expresses a similarly negative view of boasting in a self-critical signature verse of another of his *qalandariyyāt*: ʿAṭṭār, *Dīvān-i ʿAṭṭār*, 392–93. Note, however, that Shafīʿī-Kadkanī doubts the attribution of this poem to ʿAṭṭār (Shafīʿī-Kadkanī, *Qalandariyya dar tārīkh*, 313).

95. See, in particular, the examples of the "stereotyped tribal *fakhr* genre" excerpted in Peter Webb, "Poetry and the Early Islamic Historical Tradition: Poetry and Narratives of the Battle of Ṣiffīn," in *Warfare and Poetry in the Middle East*, ed. Hugh Kennedy, 119–48 (New York: I. B. Tauris, 2013), 135, and the *fakhr* as "expression of rebellious individualism" in Abdullah El Tayib, "Pre-Islamic Poetry," in *Arabic Literature to the End of the Umayyad Period*, ed. A. F. L. Beeston et al., 27–113 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 82–83 (on *fakhr* more broadly, see 81–85). Meisami also discusses an example of mock *fakhr* in a *hazliyya* of Sūzanī in which the poet "enumerates his sins" in an analogous way (*Structure and Meaning*, 219).

96. See also the examples of mock *raḥīl* in *khamriyyāt* and the reformulation of the traditional *raḥīl* in *ṣuʿlūk* poetry in Kennedy, *Wine Song*, 39–41, 44–45, 54–56; Meisami, *Structure and Meaning*, 35, 100, 162; Stetkevych, *Mute Immortals Speak*, 87–157.

of social and religious actors (libertines/*rind*, line 4) and perform their prayers not in mosques but rather in illicit houses of wine and gambling (line 1). ʿAṭṭār represents this antithesis strikingly in the opening lines of the poem, where he portrays himself and his merry band turning away from the *qibla* to journey instead to the *kharābāt*, which is the *qibla* and holy sanctuary of the *qalandar*s. The poem's focus in both its opening and closing sections on the opposition between the road to the winehouse and the *qibla* (line 1) and the implied contrast between the "heart's Kaʿba" and the physical Kaʿba (line 12) establishes the inversion of the prayer direction or mock-Kaʿba motif as one of the foundational elements of this poem.[97]

ʿAṭṭār then transitions to exploring the theme of drunkenness, telling us that sometimes the agent of intoxication (wine) produces an "uproar" or "clamor" (*hayāhū*), other times "sighs" (line 2). This state of affective disruption is, as he insists in the third line, the permanent state of those who have chosen the way of the winehouse (*may-kadah*) or (Christian) hermitage (*ṣawmaʿa*).[98] One is never "sober" in these places, as the preacher/ascetic (*vāʿiẓ/zāhid*) poet of ascetic-homiletic poetry implores his readers to be, and one is not a true "rogue" unless one is constantly engaged in the antiheroic pursuit of wine, drunkenness, and social disruption. This obsessive and incessant celebration of drunkenness and depravity in the winehouse represents, as others have argued in the context of Arabic wine poetry (*khamriyyāt*), a type of mock heroism that parodies the grand heroic deeds and attributes of the courtly panegyric's *mamdūḥ*.[99]

Apostrophizing the wise, non-Islamic master of the *kharābāt* and drawing his attention to their favorable treatment of the young men of the winehouse (line 4), ʿAṭṭār returns to developing the opposition between the *kharābātiyyān* and their nemeses, the *ṭāmātiyyān* ("spiritual prattlers," figures associated, or at least allied, with the ascetic-homiletic poet in the conceptual universe of the *qalandariyyāt*; line 5).[100] He tells us in the first hemistich that the *ṭāmātiyyān* are busy repenting of their sins (in this case, drinking), but in the second hemistich he inverts the image, triumphantly announcing that the *kharābātiyyān* are joining them in repenting, but only in "repenting" from spiritual conceits (*ṭāmāt*).

97. Poetic "closure," to adopt Meisami's terminology, occurs in line 12 before the poetic "cap"—in this poem, the *takhallus*, or signature verse. Meisami uses the term "cap" to refer to concluding verses that mark a shift in focus or theme, including transitions to signature verses, supplications (*duʿā*), self-reflection, summative statements, admonition, or mock *raḥīl* (as seen in the example of ʿIrāqī's poem below). They can sometimes appear disjunctive with the rest of the poem. See Meisami, *Structure and Meaning*, 109, 118–20, 122.

98. In this poem and many other *qalandariyyāt* poems the "hermitage" (*ṣawmaʿa*) is to be understood as a Christian hermitage to which Muslims would go to drink illicit wine. In other poems, however, it seems to be associated with the religious centers of Muslim ascetics (*zāhid*) and/or hypocritical Sufis (as Lewis points out with regard to Ḥāfiẓ's poetry), who are the antithesis of the *qalandar* and other antinomian figures associated with the winehouse. See Franklin D. Lewis, "Hafez VIII: Hafez and Rendi," *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, ed. Ehsan Yarshater, 2002, updated 2012, https://iranicaonline.org/articles/hafez-viii.

99. Hamori, *On the Art of Medieval Arabic Literature*, 3–77; Meisami, *Structure and Meaning*, 35–38, 40, 164; Noorani, "Heterotopia and the Wine Poem."

100. *Ṭāmāt* (spiritual conceits) are associated with the figure of the traditional—and in the mind of the *qalandarī* poet, hypocritical—Sufi in *qalandariyyāt* poetry. For more on the term *ṭāmāt*, see Shafīʿī-Kadkanī, *Qalandariyya dar Tārīkh*, 287–93.

The mock-repentance motif illustrated here is another one of the mainstays of *qalandariyyāt* poetry, and it highlights the antithetical relationship between the poetic worlds of ascetic-homiletic and *qalandarī* poetry.

The refusal of the "haunters of the winehouse" to repent and cease tippling their illicit wine is by no means their worst sin. They seek the inversion of the entire moral order of the existing world: wine has led them to renounce religion entirely and make "infidelity" (*kufr*) lawful for the "people of religion" (line 8). The motif of the abrogation of the moral order occurs in a number of ways in *qalandariyyāt* poetry. Oftentimes it is expressed as the poet's having been "liberated" from or "rise[n] above good name and shame." Other times, as we see in this poem and the previous poem by Sanāʾī, *kufr* and other religions are celebrated as superior to Islam. Those who follow the path to the winehouse must not only reject the normative religion (*īmān*, *dīn*, and *sharīʿat*) of ascetic-homiletic and panegyric poetry but also be willing to extol the virtues of non-Islamic religious traditions and even profess infidelity or apostasy. The radically transgressive nature of these claims is astonishing if taken at face value. In the view of some medieval Islamic legal scholars, such statements could constitute apostasy (*ridda*), one of the most serious crimes in medieval Islamic society, which was punishable by death. While we should not read ʿAṭṭār's or other *qalandarī* poets' celebration of infidelity (or any of the *qalandariyyāt*'s other antinomian acts) literally, neither should we reduce it to some purely esoteric symbol that is completely divorced from the term's highly charged and distinctly negative valuation in different modes of religious and political discourse. The poetic potency of *kufr* and related carnivalesque motifs in *qalandarī* poetry is predicated on the radical transgressivity associated with these terms and images in the reader's mind.

The poem articulates the opposition between the established social and religious order and the carnivalesque poetic world of the *qalandariyyāt* in other ways as well. In line 9, ʿAṭṭār orders "the people" to "do bad" to him and his folk, for they do not "judge" or "retaliate against" anyone. The poet's profession of extralegality situates the *kharābātiyyān* and their winehouse outside normative legal and religious frameworks. Whereas these regimes regulate behavior and render judgment on its (im)permissibility, the *qalandarī* poet encourages his readers to be free of these binds.

ʿAṭṭār then returns to the themes of wine, beautiful youths, and mock *raḥīl* (lines 10–12). Apostrophizing the cupbearer (*sāqī*) and ordering wine for the novices of the winehouse (line 10), he praises the cupbearer's beautiful face (*rukh*) in a complex chess metaphor that also functions as a boast. This line's imagery is richer in Persian than it appears in the English translation because ʿAṭṭār is punning on the names for the two key figures in this line. *Rukh* means "rook" in the context of chess, and *sulṭān-i yik savārih* can also be read as a reference to the sun. Therefore, the boast here operates on two levels: (1) the poetic "we" of the poem uses the cupbearer's beautiful face to achieve the seemingly impossible task of checkmating the sun, and (2) they use a rook, without even a supporting pawn, to check the chessboard's king, who also has the aid of a knight.[101]

101. As an anonymous reviewer of this article pointed out, it is quite difficult to checkmate an opponent when all you have left is a rook. I am indebted to this reviewer for pointing out the incredible complexity of the

The main section of the poem ends with a striking image that brings us back to the opening line. ʿAṭṭār announces that "we"—the collective poetic persona that took the path from the *qibla* to the dilapidated winehouse in the first hemistich of the poem—"are the night riders traversing the desert to the heart's Kaʿba. / We meet and converse with the *shāhids* of the soul!" The image he crafts in this mock *raḥīl* of his roguish brethren as carnivalesque pilgrims crossing the desert to the winehouse is undoubtedly an ironic gesture toward the classical *raḥīl* through the desert. But there is also an emotive energy to the line that makes it feel like a rallying cry for the *kharābātiyyān*, announcing that rather than return to society, they will remain forever liminal (a point I return to below).

Indeed, the poem as a whole reads as a map of their poetic world. After it describes turning away from the *qibla* and heading toward the dilapidated winehouse in the mock *raḥīl* of the opening lines, the intervening lines (lines 2–11) elaborate the poetic world of the *kharābāt* (its dramatis personae, carnivalesque ethos, rituals, etc.) before returning to the mock *raḥīl* as ʿAṭṭār identifies his motley crew as the "night riders"[102] who are headed to the "heart's Kaʿba" to meet with the "*shāhid*s of the heart." As he implies in the opening hemistich (but makes explicit only in line 12), the dilapidated winehouse is the Kaʿba of the *qalandariyyāt*. This Kaʿba of the heart is not the *qibla* or the place of pilgrimage for outwardly pious Muslims with their prayer beads, prayer rugs,[103] and spiritual conceits (*ṭāmāt*). Rather, it is a mock Kaʿba, a *kharābāt* whose pilgrims are social outcasts who celebrate their mock *ḥajj* (pilgrimage) with wine, drunkenness, gambling, games, and beautiful youths. This is a carnivalesque Kaʿba that is simultaneously the *qalandarī* poet's *qibla*, holiest sanctuary, and court of disrepute.

The poem then concludes with a self-deprecating signature verse that again reinforces the essential dichotomy between the world of the winehouse and the rest of the world and centers the poem on the primary target of mock *fakhr*: ʿAṭṭār.[104] Rejecting the socially praiseworthy act of "acquiring learned (*ʿilm*) and rational (*ʿaql*) knowledge," the poetic "we" happily confess to "like ʿAṭṭār this time / take up the work of the winehouse." There is an implied contrast here between the antiheroic and unglorified "work of the winehouse/wine" (referenced in lines 3, 10, and 13) and the "work" of other sites of poetic activity—namely, royal courts, mosques/religious centers, and, in a metaphoric sense, God's heavenly court. Readers are left with a choice between these worlds. They can take the road to the *qibla* or to the royal courts or they can take "the road *from* the *qibla toward* the dilapidated winehouse" and the "gambling house" (line 1). But this decision is not just a religious or ideological one. It is a poetic one as well. Taking the road to the *qalandar*'s *kharābāt* entails not just abandoning the symbols, poetics, and genres of ascetic-homiletic and royal

imagery in this line and the fact that an important part of its boast lies in the pun described above.

102. The Persian word here, *shab-raw*, can also be read in a negative sense as "thief." However, I think that in this context it may be better read as "night goer" or "night rider."

103. Although these images are not included in the poem, the prayer beads (*tasbīḥ*) and prayer carpet (*sajjāda*) of pious Muslims are likewise standard symbols of normative religion that the persona of the *qalandariyyāt* rejects.

104. For the role and importance of the signature verse in Persian poetry, see Paul E. Losensky, "Linguistic and Rhetorical Aspects of the Signature Verse (*Takhallus*) in the Persian *Ghazal*," *Edebiyât* 8 (1998): 239–71.

panegyric poetry but rather, as ʿAṭṭār does here, inverting and reimagining them. He does not jettison the poetic mainstays of the *raḥīl*, the Kaʿba, the *qibla*, apostrophe, the court, or *fakhr*. He parodies them by selectively skewing their principal features to such an extent that their original uses are inverted even as they remain recognizable to a knowledgeable reader/audience member.

"O Young Man! Give Me Some Magian Wine": ʿIrāqī's Rogue Address Poem

The final poem that I will discuss is from the *dīvān* of ʿIrāqī. Although chronologically he comes later than Sanāʾī and ʿAṭṭār, he is often thought of as the consummate *qalandarī* poet because of the elaborate—though likely fictional—story in his hagiography of his conversion to the *qalandarī* way at the hands of a beautiful young *qalandar*.[105] The following poem, which is similar to the poem that ʿIrāqī purportedly recites to this young man (*pisar*) as he joins the wandering *qalandars*, is an example of a "rogue address" poem:[106]

1 O young man (*pisarā*)! Give me some Magian wine if you are our companion
for we are no longer fixed on the path of asceticism and piety.

2 I considered the Sufi lodge to be of no importance—I do not intend to be virtuous!
Fill me a chalice and bring it to me! What's the delay?

3 I have not gold nor silver, nor heart nor faith/religion—not even obedience!
It is only my companion and I in a corner with a song of poverty.

4 I am not of the people of asceticism and piety—bring me a goblet of wine!
For truthfully I have repented of my hypocritical worship.

5 Bring pure wine! But if you don't have that, bring the dark dregs to me
for from the dark dregs the heart and eyes will find illumination.

6 I went to the gambling house and saw players who went "all in,"
but when I went to the ascetics' lodge, all I found was deception.

---

105. For more on this story, see Matthew Thomas Miller, "Embodying the Beloved: (Homo)Eroticism, Embodiment, and the Construction of Desire in the Hagiographic Tradition of ʿIrāqī," *Journal of Middle Eastern Literatures* 21, no. 1 (2018): 1–27, https://doi.org/10.1080/1475262X.2018.1492134; idem, "'The Ocean of the Persians': Fakhr al-Dīn ʿIrāqī; Poet and Mystic," in *Mystical Landscapes: Voices and Themes in Medieval Persian Literature*, ed. Fatemeh Keshavarz and Ahmet T. Karamustafa (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, forthcoming).

106. Nafīsī identifies the following as the opening line of the poem:

پسرا، ره قلندر سزدار بمن نمایی که دراز و دور دیدم ره زهد و پارسایی

Both this line and the opening line in Muḥtasham's edition, given here in the text, are very similar to the following *bayt* that appears in the anonymous introduction immediately after ʿIrāqī converts to the *qalandarī* path:

پسرا، ره قلندر بزن ار حریف مایی که دراز و دور دیدم سر کوی پارسایی

See anonymous, "Muqaddima-yi Dīvān," in ʿIrāqī, *Kulliyyāt-i ʿIrāqī*, ed. Nafīsī, 46–65, at 50.

7 Since I broke my repentance, do not break our covenant.
At least once ask of my broken self: "How are you? Where are you?"

8 Pour me wine! For I have repented of asceticism
because I saw nothing from ascetics except boasting and ostentation.

9 Free us from the sorrow of the age with wine at least once
for I did not find anyone free from the sorrow of the world except through wine.

10 When I am drunk, what is the difference between the church and the Kaʿba?
When I abandoned the self, what is union? What is separation?

11 I went to circumambulate the Kaʿba, but they did not allow me to pass
into the sanctuary,
saying: "Go! You? Who are you to presume you can come inside the Kaʿba?"

12 At night I was knocking on the monastery's door when from inside I heard a call:
"ʿIrāqī! Come inside! You are our companion."[107]

This poem is built on two primary poetic features: addresses to the young male cupbearer and ʿIrāqī's acceptance and rejection in various spaces—moments that also entail implied even if not always elaborately detailed mock *raḥīl*s. The repeated address to the cupbearer grounds the poem in the world of the winehouse and continually reminds the reader that this is the *qalandar*'s true home, even as he wanders unsuccessfully elsewhere—most notably to the Kaʿba in the penultimate line. Although the cupbearer is not as omnipresent a figure as, for example, is the "young infidel" in Sanāʾī's rogue figure poem above, he still occupies a privileged position. He is apostrophized in the first word of the poem (*pisarā*), and the poem itself is an ongoing address to him in which lines of direct address in the imperative (lines 1–2, 4–5, 7–9) are punctuated by (almost) regular non-imperative interludes of ʿIrāqī's

107. This text is from ʿIrāqī, *Kulliyyāt-i Fakhr al-Dīn ʿIrāqī*, ed. Muḥtasham, 108–9 (with the addition of a و in the second hemistich of line 8 from Nafīsī's edition). With slight textual variations (the most significant of which is mentioned in the preceding note), this same poem appears in ʿIrāqī, *Kulliyyāt-i ʿIrāqī*, ed. Nafīsī, 295–96. The Persian text below is from Muḥtasham's edition:

پسرا، میِ مغانه بده ار حریفِ مایی — که نماند بیش ما را سرِ زهد و پارسایی
کم خانگه گرفتم، سر مصلحی ندارم — قدحی شراب پر کن به من آر، چند پایی؟
نه زر و نه سیم دارم، نه دل و نه دین، نه طاعت — منم و حریف کنجی و نوای بی نوایی
نه‌ام اهل زهد و تقوی به من آر ساغر می — که به صِدق توبه کردم ز عبادت ریایی
میِ صاف ار نداری به من آر تیره دردی — که ز دردِ تیره یابد دل و دیده روشنایی
به قمارخانه رفتم همه پاکباز دیدم — چو به صومعه گذشتم همه یافتم دَغایی
چو شکست توبهٔ من مَشِکَن تو عهد، باری — ز من شکسته بررس که: چگونه و کجایی؟
تو مرا شراب در ده که ز زهد توبه کردم — چو ز زاهدی ندیدم جز لاف و خودنمایی
ز غمِ زمانه ما را برهان به می زمانی — که نیافت جز به می کس ز غمِ جهان رهایی
چو ز باده مست گشتم، چه کلیسیا چه کعبه — چو به ترکِ خود بگفتم، چه وصال و چه جدایی
به طوافِ کعبه رفتم، به حرم رهم ندادند — که برو، تو خود که باشی که درون کعبه آیی
درِ دیر می‌زدم شب ز درون ندا شنیدم — که درون درآی عراقی که تو هم حریف مایی

reflection on his state and the nature of the world (lines 3, 6, 10, with lines 11–12 functioning as a "cap").[108]

The cupbearer in this poem should not be understood as a social inferior or menial service worker at whom ʿIrāqī is barking commands. ʿIrāqī's repeated calls to him for wine and attention are more supplications than demands. The youthful cupbearer is the poetic beloved, the mock king and representative of God in the *qalandar*'s carnivalesque world, with whom ʿIrāqī is establishing a new "covenant" (*ʿahd*, line 7), even if he sometimes remains distant and emotionally aloof from the poet (a conventional characteristic of the figure of the beloved in Persian poetry). ʿIrāqī's use of the term *ʿahd* here is noteworthy because it adds a considerable degree of gravity to the figure of the cupbearer and to ʿIrāqī's relationship with him. The normative covenant for all Muslims is God's covenant that he establishes in the Quran with his followers (Q 2:27). ʿIrāqī here breaks this covenant as he parodies it in his pledge of loyalty to his new lord of the winehouse.

The entire poem, in a sense, is ʿIrāqī's mock petition for subject status in the cupbearer's winehouse kingdom.[109] It opens with ʿIrāqī's supplication for wine and his announcement of his transfer of allegiance from the "path of asceticism and piety" to the way of the winehouse and its lord, the cupbearer.[110] ʿIrāqī repeatedly implores his new lord for wine because imbibing it is the ritual affirmation of allegiance to the cupbearer and the key to drawing closer to him. The wine here, ʿIrāqī tells us, is "Magian wine"—a designation that intensifies the transgressivity of the (already) illicit act of drinking by adding an element of religious transgressivity, too.[111] Wine and drunkenness (lines 4–5, 8–10, 12) and, to a lesser extent, the winehouse and the monastery (*dayr*; lines 3, 12) are the central images of this poem. They function as the symbolic antitheses of the images and concepts associated with the rejected people and path of asceticism and piety: asceticism and ascetics (*zuhd va pārsāʾī*, *zāhid*), religion (*dīn*), good behavior (*maṣlaḥī*), pious acts of obedience (*ṭāʿāt*), piety (*taqvā*), repentance (*tawba*), worship (*ʿibādat*), the Sufi lodge (*khānagāh*, *ṣawmaʿa*),[112] the Kaʿba, and, echoing ʿAṭṭār's poem above, boasting and ostentation (*lāf va khwudnamāʾī*). As he says in line 4, "I am not of the people of asceticism and piety (*zuhd va taqvā*)—bring me a goblet of wine!" (It is worth highlighting that the term "asceticism," *zuhd*, is the

108. See footnote 97 on poetic closure and "caps."

109. For other examples of pledges or transfers of allegiance in poems, see Samer M. Ali, *Arabic Literary Salons in the Islamic Middle Ages: Poetry, Public Performance, and the Presentation of the Past* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2010), 119–52; Majd Yaser al-Mallah, "Doing Things with Odes: A Poet's Pledges of Allegiance; Ibn Darrāj al-Qasṭallī's 'Hāʾiyyah' to al-Manṣūr and 'Rāʾiyyah' to al-Mundhir," *Journal of Arabic Literature* 34, no. 1–2 (2003): 45–81; Suzanne Pinckney Stetkevych, *The Mantle Odes: Arabic Praise Poems to the Prophet Muhammad* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2010), 3, 9–10, 16–17, 30–69; Stetkevych, *Poetics of Islamic Legitimacy*, 18, 37, 40, 48–109, 180–240.

110. Although it is only implied in this poem, in other *qalandarī* poems the point about the *qalandar* way's being an alternative path is made explicitly. For example, Sanāʾī says in reference to the winehouse and its bacchic rituals, "this is our religion (*dīn*) and the *qalandarī* way"; see Sanāʾī, *Dīvān-i Sanāʾī*, 653–54.

111. See footnote 62 on how similar themes were treated (quite differently) in Farrukhī's and ʿUnsurī's panegyrics.

112. In contrast to ʿAṭṭār's poem above, in ʿIrāqī's poem *ṣawmaʿa* seems to be associated with Muslim ascetics and/or hypocritical Sufis, as Lewis argues it is used in Ḥāfiẓ's poetry: Lewis, "Hafez VIII."

etymological origin of the genre of ascetic or religious poetry, *zuhdiyyāt*.) ʿIrāqī sharpens his rejection of this world by employing the mock repentance motif several times as well, telling us he is "repenting of" various pious acts such as "hypocritical worship" (line 4) and "asceticism" (line 8) and has "broke[n] [his] repentance" (line 7) in order to demonstrate his commitment to his new, illicit "covenant" with the beloved cupbearer. ʿIrāqī's heavy reliance on the mock repentance motif is particularly noteworthy because it directly parodies the central concern of ascetic-homiletic poetry: the call for repentance.

Like Sanāʾī and ʿAṭṭār, ʿIrāqī elaborates in positive terms the antithesis of the ascetic-homiletic and panegyric poetic worlds that he so stridently rejects in this poem: the winehouse, with its liberating, "Magian" wine (lines 1–2, 4–5, 8–10, 12), its music (line 3), its companions (lines 3, 7), and its gambling (line 6). The poet of this mock court is a rogue who flagrantly courts socioreligious opprobrium and ultimately aims to abandon his "self" (line 10) in a wine-induced stupor. On this alternative path, it is the transgression of normative Islamic law, not pious obedience to it, that produces spiritual advancement, while wine enables release from the "sorrow of the world" (line 9). Even in its "dark dregs" one can find "illumination" (line 5). Wine/drunkenness is perhaps the most radical element of the poetic world of the *qalandariyyāt* because it is the agent that reveals the illusory nature of the normative social and religious order that is celebrated so profusely in panegyric and ascetic-homiletic poetry. As ʿIrāqī suggests in line 10, it is capable of subverting the seemingly immutable social hierarchies and divinely ordained religious distinctions of earthly reality to the point at which there is no longer any difference between a church and the Kaʿba, or between the Kaʿba and a Christian monastery-*cum*-winehouse, as we see in the final two lines of ʿIrāqī's poem.

ʿIrāqī concludes his poem with a powerful two-line mock *ḥajj* (mock *raḥīl*)/mock Kaʿba cap that is prefigured both in the first line of the poem and at its center point (line 6).[113] In his opening declaration that he has abandoned the "path of asceticism and piety" there is an implied mock *raḥīl* because he later associates this "path" with physical locations that he reports having visited and observed, such as the "Sufi lodge" (*khānagāh*) and "ascetics' lodge" (*ṣawmaʿa*) (line 2, 6, 8). The implication, then, is that his opening address—"O young man!"—announces his arrival at a winehouse at the completion of the journey, which also took him to the more welcoming quarter of the "gambling house" in line 6 at the midpoint of the poem.

The entire picture of ʿIrāqī's peregrinations comes together beautifully in the closing lines, where he narrates his failed attempt to go on pilgrimage (*ḥajj*) to the Kaʿba in Mecca in order to circumambulate (*ṭawāf*) the holy shrine, as is incumbent upon all pious Muslims. He fails in this journey not because of a lack of spiritual resolve but rather because his way into the sanctuary (*ḥaram*) is blocked by an anonymous "they," who in the broader context of this poem should be understood as representatives of the antithetical poetic world of ascetic-homiletic poetry (e.g., the *zāhid* of line 8 and the institutionalized, hypocritical

113. As Meisami has pointed out in the context of the *qaṣīda*, Persian poets sometimes move the *raḥīl* to the end of the poem. See Meisami, *Medieval Persian Court Poetry*, 65; idem, "Poetic Microcosms," 158–60; idem, *Structure and Meaning*, 339.

Sufis and ascetics of the *khānagāh* and *ṣawmaʿa* from lines 2 and 6). Implicitly asserting their own self-importance and self-righteousness (the antithesis of ʿIrāqī-the-*qalandar*'s "abandon[ment of] the self" in the preceding line), they shoo ʿIrāqī away, asking him rhetorically, "Who are you to presume you can come inside the Kaʿba?" Rejected but not distraught, ʿIrāqī heads to the Christian monastery (*dayr*). In contrast to the Kaʿba of the pious Muslims, in the monastery-*cum*-winehouse he is welcomed with open arms as a "companion" (line 12). The monastery of the closing line harkens back to the implied winehouse in the opening of the poem, with the figure addressing ʿIrāqī as a "companion" in the final line being identical to or at least synonymous with (in a spiritual sense) the young cupbearer whom ʿIrāqī apostrophizes and tentatively calls "our companion" in the first line. By the conclusion of the poem, the cupbearer of the monastery has deemed ʿIrāqī worthy of acceptance into his winehouse kingdom, and the poem ends with him officially welcoming ʿIrāqī, saying "Come inside!" and affirming to all that, indeed, "You [ʿIrāqī] are our companion." The transfer of allegiance is complete. ʿIrāqī has reached his (spiritual) home. He is now a denizen of the winehouse.

This entire mock *raḥīl* image complex, which we see not only in this poem but quite prominently in ʿAṭṭār's poem, too, is a striking inversion of the concluding social or heavenly reintegration or "reaggregation" imperative that several scholars have argued characterizes much pre- and early Islamic and *zuhdiyyāt* poetry.[114] ʿIrāqī, like the *qalandarī* poetic personae of Sanāʾī and ʿAṭṭār, is ultimately integrated, but not into normative earthly or heavenly "society." He finds acceptance only in the liminal spaces that exist outside of or at best on the periphery of the medieval Islamic social sphere. The poem is built on his rejecting (lines 1–2, 4, 6, 8) and being rejected by (line 11) various representatives of the normative Islamic order before his ultimate cathartic acceptance into the Christian/Zoroastrian "monastery" as one of its "companions" in the last line of the poem.[115] The refusal of integration with mainstream Islamic society is mutual: as much as its representatives reject ʿIrāqī's assimilation, he rejects their company, denouncing them all as hypocritical, deceptive, ostentatious, boastful, and ultimately concerned only with the superficialities of Islamic piety. The only possibility of "reaggregation" for the *qalandar*, as for the *ṣuʿlūk* persona, lies in the heterotopic countersites associated with non-Islamic religious minorities or openly antinomian Muslim rogues.[116] But in contrast to the *ṣuʿlūk*, for the *qalandar* these liminal, asocial places are not the ultimate goal. They are doorways that take the *qalandar* beyond even the heavenly pavilion (the site of aggregation in *zuhdiyyāt*) to an ultimate reintegration into God, the beloved—a feat that can be accomplished only through the disintegration of the earthly self (line 10).

114. On "reaggregation" or "incorporation" in the traditional *qaṣīda*, see Jaroslav Stetkevych, *The Zephyrs of Najd: The Poetics of Nostalgia in the Classical Arabic Nasīb* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 26–49; Stetkevych, *Mute Immortals Speak*, 3–83. On "disintegration in this life" and "reintegration in the next world" in the *zuhdiyyāt*, see Meisami, *Structure and Meaning*, 175.

115. The conflation of seemingly irreconcilable religious particularities—e.g., Magian wine in a Christian monastery—occurs not infrequently in medieval Persian Sufi poetry.

116. On the rejection of "reaggregation" in *ṣuʿlūk* poetry, see Stetkevych, *Mute Immortals Speak*, 87–157.

V. Conclusion

The concluding image in ʿIrāqī's poem above captures the *raison d'être* of *qalandarī* poetics more broadly. ʿIrāqī, blocked from the sanctuary (*ḥaram*) of the Kaʿba in Mecca by self-righteous ascetics, institutionalized Sufis, and other guardians of traditional piety, must abort his *ḥajj* pilgrimage and undertake an alternative, mock *ḥajj* to the mock Kaʿba of the Christian/Zoroastrian monastery-*cum*-winehouse. The turn away from the Kaʿba in this poem (and, in other *qalandarī* poems, the turn away from the mosque, ascetics' lodge, etc.) is, in a sense, a metaphoric performance of the *qalandarī* poet's rejection of the poetic world of ascetic-homiletic and royal court poetry. At a more general level, the decision of Sanāʾī, ʿAṭṭār, ʿIrāqī, and other "rogue" poets to take the metaphoric path from the courts of God and the political elites to the mock court(s) of the Sufi carnival inaugurates anew in each *qalandarī* poem the intergeneric poetic game of constructing the *qalandariyyāt* and its carnivalesque counter(sub)genres.[117]

Although the basic thematic contours of the *qalandarī* poetic world are in place as early as Amīr Muʿizzī (d. ca. 1125–27) and Sanāʾī, and possibly even earlier if the attribution of the *qalandarī* poem to Burhānī (d.1072–73) is sound, the construction of *qalandarī* poetics did not end with them.[118] The intergeneric process of parodic inversion that created the *qalandariyyāt* in the first place continued as each new poet responded in new ways to the existing canon, spawning not just new *qalandarī* topoi but even new subgenres of the *qalandariyyāt* that reacted in highly specific ways to existing models and poetic scripts in the broader tradition of Perso-Arabic poetics.

The new typology of *qalandariyyāt* that I present here is admittedly provisional, but the broader point it illustrates is that there is considerable diversity in the poems placed in the *qalandariyyāt* category (a feature that is by no means unique to this genre), and each *qalandarī* poet engages this tradition in different ways, developing some types of *qalandarī* poems more than others. This disaggregation of *qalandariyyāt* poetry does not yield simple answers or nice and neat subcategories in all cases, but it does provide additional insight into this poetic type as a historical construct. It also challenges the much too frequent and overly simplistic portrayals of the Persian genre system as primarily composed of formal genres, with a few noteworthy thematic ones of secondary status—a view that is particularly problematic when applied to the earliest period of the development of shorter monothematic poems (later all classified, somewhat problematically, simply as *ghazal*s). My case study of a few prominent *qalandarī* poets from the late eleventh to thirteenth centuries is but a small window into this highly dynamic and variegated system. The manifest complexity observed in these poems should serve as a cautionary note against any simplistic, prescriptive, or ahistorical approaches to genre in Persian poetry and as an impetus for more detailed studies of other thematic genres and subgenres.

117. For discussions of the political and social import of the *qalandariyyāt* and their role in constructing a specific type of "rogue" Sufi spiritual subjectivity, see Miller, "Qalandar King" and idem, "Affected by God: Embodied Poetics and Somatic Epistemology in Medieval Persian Sufi Literature" (manuscript in preparation).

118. On the *qalandarī* poems of Burhānī and Amir Muʿizzī, see Miller, "Qalandar King."

Bibliography

Ahmad, Nazir. "Some Original Prose and Poetical Pieces of Hakim Sana'i." *Indo-Iranica* 16 (1963): 48–65.

Ali, Samer M. *Arabic Literary Salons in the Islamic Middle Ages: Poetry, Public Performance, and the Presentation of the Past*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2010.

Anonymous. "Muqaddimah-yi Dīvān." In *Kulliyyāt-i Shaykh Fakhr al-Dīn Ibrāhīm Hamadānī mutakhallas bih ʿIrāqī*, edited by Saʿīd Nafīsī, 46–65. Tehran: Kitāb-Khāna-yi Sanāʾī, 1362 [1983–84].

Antoon, Sinan. *The Poetics of the Obscene in Premodern Arabic Poetry: Ibn al-Hajjāj and Sukhf*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Anvarī, ʿAlī b. Muḥammad. *Dīvān-i Anvarī*. Edited by Muḥammad Taqī Mudarris-i Rażavī. Tehran: Intishārāt-i ʿIlmī va Farhangī, 1376 [1997–98].

ʿAṭṭār, Farīd al-Dīn. *Dīvān-i ʿAṭṭār*. Edited by Taqī Tafażżulī. Tehran: Shirkat-i Intishārāt-i ʿIlm va Farhang, 1375 [1996–97].

———. *Mukhtār-nāma: Majmūʿa-yi rubāʿiyyāt-i Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār Nīshābūrī*. Edited by Muḥammad Riżā Shafīʿī-Kadkanī. 2nd ed. Tehran: Sukhan, 1386 [2007–8].

Badawi, M. M. "ʿAbbasid Poetry and Its Antecedents." In *ʿAbbasid Belles-Lettres*, edited by Julia Ashtiany and T. M. Johnstone, 146–66. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

———. "From Primary to Secondary Qasīdas: Thoughts on the Development of Classical Arabic Poetry." *Journal of Arabic Literature* 11 (1980): 1–31.

Babcock, Barbara, and Victor Tuner, eds. *The Reversible World: Symbolic Inversion in Art and Society*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Rabelais and His World*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.

Berg, Gabrielle van den. "The Nasībs in the Dīvān of Farrukhi Sistani: Poetic Speech versus the Reflection of Reality." *Edebiyât* 9 (1998): 17–34.

Bruijn, J. T. P. de. "The Ghazal in Medieval Persian Poetry." In *Persian Lyric Poetry in the Classical Era, 800–1500: Ghazals, Panegyrics, and Quatrains*, edited by Ehsan Yarshater, 315–487. New York: I. B. Tauris, 2019.

———. *Of Piety and Poetry: The Interaction of Religion and Literature in the Life and Works of Ḥakīm Sanāʾī of Ghazna*. Leiden: Brill, 1983.

———. *Persian Sufi Poetry: An Introduction to the Mystical Use of Classical Persian Poems*. Richmond: Curzon, 1997.

———. "The *Qalandariyyāt* in Persian Mystical Poetry, from Sanāʾī Onwards." In *The Legacy of Mediaeval Persian Sufism*, edited by Leonard Lewisohn, 75–86. London: Khaniqahi Nimatullah Publications, 1992.

———. "Shahrangīz 1. In Persian." In *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., edited by P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C. E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, and W. P. Heinrichs. Leiden: Brill Online, posted 2012. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_COM_1026.

Bürgel, J. C. "The Pious Rogue: A Study in the Meaning of Qalandar and Rend in the Poetry of Muhammad Iqbal." *Edebiyât* 4 (1979): 43–64.

———. "Qasida as Discourse on Power and Its Islamization: Some Reflections." In *Qasida Poetry in Islamic Asia and Africa*, edited by Stefan Sperl and Christopher Shackle, 1:451–74. New York: E. J. Brill, 1996.

Clinton, Jerome W. "Court Poetry at the Beginning of the Classical Period." In *Persian Literature*, edited by Ehsan Yarshater, 75–95. Albany, NY: Bibliotheca Persica, 1988.

———. *The Dīvān of Manūchihrī Dāmghānī: A Critical Study*. Minneapolis: Bibliotheca Islamica, 1972.

———. "The Madāen Qasida of Xāqāni [Khāqānī] Sharvāni, I." *Edebiyât* 1 (1976): 153–70.

———. "The Madāen Qasida of Xāqāni [Khāqānī] Sharvāni, II: Xāqāni and Buhturī." *Edebiyât* 2 (1977): 191–206.

Culler, Jonathan D. *Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics and the Study of Literature*. New York: Routledge Classics, 2002.

Dahlén, Ashk P. "The Holy Fool in Medieval Islam: The *Qalandarīyāt* of Fakhr al-Dīn ʿArāqī." *Orientalia Suecana* 53 (2004): 63–81.

Defert, Daniel. "Foucault, Space, and the Architects." In *Politics/Poetics: Documenta X–The Book*, edited by Catherine David and Jean-Francois Chevrier, 274–83. Ostfildern-Ruit: Cantz, 1997.

Dubrow, Heather. *Genre*. New York: Methuen, 1982.

El-Rouayheb, Khaled. *Before Homosexuality in the Arab-Islamic World, 1500–1800*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Esots, Janis. "The Image of *Qalandar* in the *Dīvān-i Shams*." In *Light upon Light: Essays in Islamic Thought and History in Honor of Gerhard Bowering*, edited by Jamal J. Elias and Bilal Orfali, 239–55. Leiden: Brill, 2020.

Feuillebois-Pierunek, Ève. *A la croisée des voies célestes, Faxr al-Dīn ʻErâqi: Poésie mystique et expression poétique en Perse médiévale*. Tehran: Institut français de recherche en Iran, 2002.

———. “Le qalandar: Réalité et fiction en Perse médiévale.” In *Etrangeté de l’autre, singularité du moi: Les figures du marginal dans les littératures*, edited by Ève Feuillebois-Pierunek and Z. Ben Lagha, 111–27. Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2015.

Foucault, Michel. “Of Other Spaces.” *Diacritics* 16 (1986): 22–27.

Fouchécour, Charles-Henri de. “Iran VIII: Persian Literature, (2) Classical.” In *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, edited by Ehsan Yarshater, 2006, updated 2012. https://iranicaonline.org/articles/iran-viii2-classical-persian-literature.

Fowler, Alastair. *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Gelder, Geert Jan van. “Some Brave Attempts at Generic Classification in Premodern Arabic Literature.” In *Aspects of Genre and Type in Pre-Modern Literary Cultures*, edited by Bert Roest and Herman Vanstiphout, 15–31. Groningen: Styx, 1999.

Glünz, Michael. “Poetic Tradition and Social Change: The Persian Qasida in Post-Mongol Iran.” In *Qasida Poetry in Islamic Asia and Africa*, edited by Stefan Sperl and Christopher Shackle, 1:183–203. New York: E. J. Brill, 1996.

Gould, Rebecca. “Wearing the Belt of Oppression: Khāqānī’s Christian Qasida and the Prison Poetry of Medieval Shirvān.” *Journal of Persianate Studies* 9 (2016): 19–44.

Gruendler, Beatrice. *Medieval Arabic Praise Poetry: Ibn al-Rūmī and the Patron’s Redemption*. New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003.

Guillén, Claudio. “Genre and Countergenre: The Discovery of the Picaresque.” In *Literature as System*, 135–58.

———. “Literature as Historical Contradiction: *El Abencerraje*, the Moorish Novel, and the Eclogue.” In *Literature as System*, 159–217.

———. *Literature as System: Essays toward the Theory of Literary History*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1971.

———. “On the Uses of Literary Genre.” In *Literature as System*, 107–34.

———. “Toward a Definition of the Picaresque.” In *Literature as System*, 71–106.

Gulchīn-Maʿānī, Aḥmad. *Shahr-āshūb dar shiʿr-i fārsī*. Tehran: Amīr Kabīr, 1346 [1967–68].

Hamori, Andras. *The Composition of Mutanabbī’s Panegyrics to Sayf al-Dawla*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992.

———. *On the Art of Medieval Arabic Literature*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1974.

———. "Zuhdiyyāt." In *ʿAbbasid Belles-Lettres*, edited by Julia Ashtiany and T. M. Johnstone, 265–74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Hunsberger, Alice C. "'On the Steed of Speech': A Philosophical Poem by Nāṣir-i Khusraw." In *Pearls of Persia: The Philosophical Poetry of Nāṣir-i Khusraw*, edited by Alice C. Hunsberger, 147–90. New York: I. B. Tauris and Institute of Ismaili Studies, 2012.

Ingenito, Domenico. *Beholding Beauty: Saʿdi of Shiraz and the Aesthetics of Desire in Medieval Persian Poetry*. Leiden: Brill, 2021.

ʿIrāqī, Fakhr al-Dīn. *Kulliyyāt-i Fakhr al-Dīn ʿIrāqī (majmūʿa-yi āṯār-i Fakhr al-Dīn ʿIrāqī)*. Edited by Nasrīn Muḥtasham (Khuzāʾī). Tehran: Intishārāt-i Zavvār, 1382 [2003–4].

———. *Kulliyyāt-i Shaykh Fakhr al-Dīn Ibrāhīm Hamadānī mutakhallas bih ʿIrāqī*. Edited by Saʿīd Nafīsī. Tehran: Kitāb-Khāna-yi Sanāʾī, 1362 [1983–84].

Karamustafa, Ahmet T. *God's Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in the Islamic Later Middle Period, 1200–1550*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1994.

———. *Sufism: The Formative Period*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.

Kāshifī Shīrāzī, Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥusayn Vāʿiẓ. *Badāʾiʿ al-afkār fī ṣanāʾiʿ al-ashʿār*. Edited by Mīr Jalāl al-Dīn Kazzāzī. Tehran: Nashr-i Markaz, 1369 [1990–91].

Kaykāvūs b. Vushmgīr, ʿUnsur al-Maʿālī. *Qābūs-nāma*. Edited by Ghulāmḥusayn Yūsifī. Tehran: Shirkat-i Intishārāt-i ʿIlm va Farhang, 1345 [1966–67].

Kennedy, Philip F. *The Wine Song in Classical Arabic Poetry: Abū Nuwās and the Literary Tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

———. "Zuhdiyya." In *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., edited by P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C. E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, and W. P. Heinrichs. Leiden: Brill Online, posted 2012. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_COM_1392.

Keshavarz, Fatemeh. *Lyrics of Life: Saʿdi on Love, Cosmopolitanism and Care of the Self*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2015.

Khāqānī Shirvānī, Afżal al-Dīn. *Dīvān-i Khāqānī Shirvānī*. Edited by Żiyāʾ al-Dīn Sajjādī. Tehran: Intishārāt-i Zavvār, 1388 [2009–10].

Lewis, Franklin D. "Hafez VIII: Hafez and Rendi." In *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, edited by Ehsan Yarshater*Online*, 2002, updated 2012. https://iranicaonline.org/articles/hafez-viii.

———. "Reading, Writing and Recitation: Sanā'i and the Origins of the Persian Ghazal." PhD dissertation, University of Chicago, 1995.

———. "The Rise and Fall of a Persian Refrain: The *Radīf 'Ātash u Āb.*'" In *Reorientations: Arabic and Persian Poetry*, edited by Suzanne Pinckney Stetkevych, 199–226. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994.

———. “Sexual Occidentation: The Politics of Conversion, Christian-Love and Boy-Love in ʿAttâr.” *Iranian Studies* 42 (2009): 693–723.

———. “Sincerely Flattering Panegyrics: The Shrinking Ghaznavid Qasida.” In *The Necklace of the Pleiades: 24 Essays on Persian Literature, Culture and Religion*, edited by Franklin D. Lewis and Sunil Sharma, 209–50. Leiden: Leiden University Press, 2010.

———. “The Transformation of the Persian Ghazal: From Amatory Mood to Fixed Form.” In *Ghazal as World Literature*, vol. 2: *From a Literary Genre to a Great Tradition: The Ottoman Gazel in Context*, edited by Angelika Neuwirth, Michael Hess, Judith Pfeiffer, and Borte Sagaster, 121–39. Würzburg: Ergon, 2006.

Lewisohn, Leonard. “Hierocosmic Intellect and Universal Soul in a Qasida by Nāṣir-i Khusraw.” *Iran* 45 (2007): 193–226.

———. “Nāṣir-i Khusraw’s Ode to the Universal Soul and Intellect.” In *Pearls of Persia: The Philosophical Poetry of Nāṣir-i Khusraw*, edited by Alice C. Hunsberger, 53–70. New York: I. B. Tauris and Institute of Ismaili Studies, 2012.

———. “Prolegomenon to the Study of Ḥāfiẓ.” In *Hafiz and the Religion of Love in Classical Persian Poetry*, edited by Leonard Lewisohn, 3–73. New York: I. B. Tauris, 2010.

———. “Sufi Symbolism in the Persian Hermeneutic Tradition: Reconstructing the Pagoda of ʿAṭṭār’s Esoteric Poetics.” In *ʿAṭṭār and the Persian Sufi Tradition: The Art of Spiritual Flight*, edited by Leonard Lewisohn, 255–308. New York: I. B. Tauris, 2006.

Losensky, Paul E. “Coordinates in Space and Time: Architectural Chronograms in Safavid Iran.” In *New Perspectives on Safavid Iran Empire and Society*, edited by Colin P. Mitchell, 198–219. New York: Routledge, 2011.

———. “‘Demand, Ask, Seek’: The Semantics and Rhetoric of the *Radīf Ṭalab* in the Persian Ghazal.” *Turkish Studies Association Bulletin* 21 (1997): 19–40.

———. “‘The Equal of Heaven’s Vault’: The Design, Ceremony, and Poetry of the Ḥasanābād Bridge.” In *Writers and Rulers: Perspectives on Their Relationship from Abbasid to Safavid Times*, edited by Beatrice Grundler and Louise Marlow, 195–215. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2004.

———. “Linguistic and Rhetorical Aspects of the Signature Verse (*Takhallus*) in the Persian *Ghazal*.” *Edebiyât* 8 (1998): 239–71.

———. “The Palace of Praise and the Melons of Time: Descriptive Patterns in ʿAbdī Bayk Šīrāzī’s *Garden of Eden*.” *Eurasian Studies* 2 (2003): 1–29.

Losensky, Paul E. “‘Square Like a Bubble’: Architecture, Power, and Poetics in Two Inscriptions by Kalim Kāshāni.” *Journal of Persianate Studies* 8 (2015): 42–70.

Losensky, Paul E. *Welcoming Fighānī: Imitation and Poetic Individuality in the Safavid-Mughal Ghazal*. Costa Mesa, CA: Mazda, 1998.

al-Mallah, Majd Yaser. "Doing Things with Odes: A Poet's Pledges of Allegiance; Ibn Darrāj al-Qasṭallī's 'Hāʾiyyah' to al-Manṣūr and 'Rāʾiyyah' to al-Mundhir." *Journal of Arabic Literature* 34, no. 1–2 (2003): 45–81.

Martin, James D. "The Religious Beliefs of Abū'l-ʿAtāhiya According to the Zuhdīyāt." *Transactions–Glasgow University Oriental Society* 23 (1970): 11–28.

Mattock, John. "Description and Genre in Abū Nuwās." *Quaderni di studi arabi* 5/6 (1987): 528–40.

Meier, Fritz. *Abū Saʿīd-i Abū l-Ḫayr: Wirklichkeit und Legende*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.

Meisami, Julie Scott. "Arabic Mujūn Poetry: The Literary Dimension." In *Verse and the Fair Sex: Studies in Arabic Poetry and the Representation of Women in Arabic Literature*, edited by Frederick de Long, 8–30. Utrecht: M.Th. Houtsma Stichting, 1993.

———. "Ghaznavid Panegyrics: Some Political Implications." *Iran* 28 (1990): 31–44.

———. "The Grand Design: Medieval Persian Poetic Microcosms." In *Proceedings of the XIIth Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association*, 458–63. Munich: Judicium, 1990.

———. "A Life in Poetry: Hāfiz's First Ghazal." In *The Necklace of the Pleiades: 24 Essays on Persian Literature, Culture and Religion*, edited by Franklin D. Lewis and Sunil Sharma, 163–81. Leiden: Leiden University Press, 2010.

———. *Medieval Persian Court Poetry*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987.

———. "Nāṣir-i Khusraw: A Poet Lost in Thought?" In *Pearls of Persia: The Philosophical Poetry of Nāṣir-i Khusraw*, edited by Alice C. Hunsberger, 223–55. New York: I. B. Tauris and Institute of Ismaili Studies, 2012.

———. "Palaces and Paradise: Palace Description in Medieval Persian Poetry." In *Islamic Art and Architecture*, edited by Oleg Grabar and Cynthia Robinson, 21–54. Princeton, NJ: Markus Wiener, 2001.

———. "Places in the Past: The Poetics/Politics of Nostalgia." *Edebiyât* 8 (1998): 63–106.

———. "The Poet and His Patrons: Two Ghaznavid Panegyrists." *Persica* 17 (2001): 91–105.

———. "Poetic Microcosms: The Persian Qasida to the End of the Twelfth Century." In *Qasida Poetry in Islamic Asia and Africa*, edited by Stefan Sperl and Christopher Shackle, 1:137–82. New York: E. J. Brill, 1996.

———. *Structure and Meaning in Medieval Arabic and Persian Poetry: Orient Pearls*. New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003.

———. “Symbolic Structure in a Poem by Nasir-i Khusrau.” *Iran* 31 (1993): 103–17.

Miller, Matthew Thomas. “Affected by God: Embodied Poetics and Somatic Epistemology in Medieval Sufi Literature.” Manuscript in preparation.

———. “Embodying the Beloved: (Homo)Eroticism, Embodiment, and the Construction of Desire in the Hagiographic Tradition of ʿIrāqī.” *Journal of Middle Eastern Literatures* 21, no. 1 (2018): 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/1475262X.2018.1492134.

———. “Genre in Classical Persian Poetry.” In *Routledge Handbook of Persian Literature*, edited by Kamran Talattof. New York: Routledge, forthcoming.

———. “‘The Ocean of the Persians’: Fakhr Al-Dīn ʿIrāqī; Poet and Mystic.” In *Mystical Landscapes: Voices and Themes in Medieval Persian Literature*, edited by Fatemeh Keshavarz and Ahmet T. Karamustafa. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, forthcoming.

———. “The Qalandar King: Early Development of the *Qalandariyyāt* and Saljuq Conceptions of Kingship in Amir Moʿezzi’s Panegyric for Sharafshāh Jaʿfari.” *Iranian Studies*, forthcoming.

Monroe, James T. *The Art of Badīʿ az-Zamān al-Hamadhānī as Picaresque Narrative*. Beirut: Center for Arab and Middle Eastern Studies of American University of Beirut, 1983.

———. “Preliminary Study.” In *Al-Maqāmāt al-Luzūmīyah*, edited by James T. Monroe, 1–110. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Najmabadi, Afsaneh. *Women with Mustaches and Men without Beards: Gender and Sexual Anxieties of Iranian Modernity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.

Noorani, Yaseen. “Heterotopia and the Wine Poem in Early Islamic Culture.” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 36 (2004): 345–66.

Pourjavady, Nasrollah. “Rindī-yi Ḥāfiẓ (1).” In *Bū-yi Jān: Maqāla-hā-yi darbāra-yi shiʿr-i ʿirfāni-yi fārsī*, edited by Nasrollah Pourjavady, 214–47. Tehran: Intishārāt-i Markaz-i Nashr-i Dānishgāhī, 1372 [1993–94].

———. “Rindī-yi Ḥāfiẓ (2): Zuhd va rindī.” In *Bū-yi Jān: Maqāla-hā-yi darbāra-yi shiʿr-i ʿirfāni-yi fārsī*, edited by Nasrollah Pourjavady, 248–88. Tehran: Intishārāt-i Markaz-i Nashr-i Dānishgāhi, 1372 [1993–94].

Rafinejad, Daniel. “‘I Am a Mine of Golden Speech’: Poetic Language and Self-Reference in Nāṣir-i Khusraw’s *Qaṣida*s.” In *Pearls of Persia: The Philosophical Poetry of Nāṣir-i Khusraw*, edited by Alice C. Hunsberger, 39–52. New York: I. B. Tauris and Institute of Ismaili Studies, 2012.

Ridgeon, Lloyd. “Reading Sufi History through Ādāb: The Perspectives of Sufis, Jawānmardān and Qalandars.” In *Ethics and Spirituality in Islam*, edited by Francesco Chiabotti,

Ève Feuillebois-Pierunek, Catherine Mayeur-Jaouen, and Luca Patrizi, 379–402. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

Ṣafā, Ẕabīḥ Allāh. *Tārīkh-i adabiyyāt dar Īrān va dar qalamraw-yi zabān-i pārsī*. Vols. 1–5. Tehran: Intishārāt-i Firdaws, 1388 [2009–10].

Sanāʾī, Abū al-Majd Majdūd b. Ādam. *Dīvān-i Ḥakīm Abū al-Majd Majdūd b. Ādam Sanāʾī Ghaznavī*. Edited by Muḥammad Taqī Mudarris-i Rażavī. Tehran: Sanāʾī, 1388 [2009–10].

———. *Kulliyyāt-i ashʿār-i Ḥakīm Sanāʾī Ghaznavī* [facsimile of manuscript]. Edited by A. A. Bashīr. Kabul: Muʾassasa-yi Intishārāt-i Bayhaqī, 1356 [1977–78].

Schoeler, Gregor. "Bashshār b. Burd, Abū ʾl-ʿAtāhiyah, and Abū Nuwās." In *ʿAbbasid Belles-Lettres*, edited by Julia Ashtiany and T. M. Johnstone, 275–99. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Shafīʿī-Kadkanī, Muḥammad Riżā. *Muflis-i kīmīyā-furūsh: Naqd va taḥlīl-i shiʿr-i Anvarī*. Tehran: Sukhan, 1372 [1993–94].

———. *Qalandariyya dar tārīkh: Digardīsī-hā-yi yik īdiʾuluzhī*. Tehran: Sukhan, 1386 [2007–8].

———. *Ṣuvar-i khiyāl dar shiʿr-i fārsī: Taḥqīq-i intiqādī dar ṭatavvur-i īmāzh-hā-yi shiʿr-i pārsī va siyar-i naẓariyya-yi balāghat dar Islām va Īrān*. Tehran: Āgāh, 1350 [1971–72].

———. *Tāziyāna-hā-yi sulūk: Naqd va taḥlīl-i chand qaṣīda az Ḥakīm Sanāʾī*. Tehran: Āgāh, 1372 [1993–94].

Shamīsā, Sīrūs. *Anvāʿ-i adabī*. Tehran: Nashr-i Mītrā, 1370 [1991–92].

Sharma, Sunil. "Generic Innovation in Sayfī Buḫārāʾī's *Shahrāshūb Ghazal*s." In *Ghazal as World Literature*, vol. 2: *From a Literary Genre to a Great Tradition: The Ottoman Gazel in Context*, edited by Angelika Neuwirth, Michael Hess, Judith Pfeiffer, and Borte Sagaster, 141–49. Würzburg: Ergon, 2006.

———. *Persian Poetry at the Indian Frontier: Mas'ûd Sa'd Salmân of Lahore*. Delhi: Permanent Black, 2000.

———. "Shahrāshūb." In *Persian Lyric Poetry in the Classical Era, 800–1500: Ghazals, Panegyrics and Quatrains*, edited by Ehsan Yarshater, 569–78. New York: I. B. Tauris, 2019.

Sperl, Stefan. *Mannerism in Arabic Poetry: A Structural Analysis of Selected Texts (3rd Century AH/9th Century AD–5th Century AH/11th Century AD)*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Sprachman, Paul. "Hajv and Profane Persian." In *Persian Lyric Poetry in the Classical Era, 800–1500: Ghazals, Panegyrics and Quatrains*, edited by Ehsan Yarshater, 579–602. New York: I. B. Tauris, 2019.

Stallybrass, Peter, and Allon White. *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986.

Stetkevych, Jaroslav. *The Zephyrs of Najd: The Poetics of Nostalgia in the Classical Arabic Nasīb*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

Stetkevych, Suzanne Pinckney. *The Mantle Odes: Arabic Praise Poems to the Prophet Muhammad*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2010.

———. *The Mute Immortals Speak: Pre-Islamic Poetry and the Poetics of Ritual*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993.

———. *The Poetics of Islamic Legitimacy: Myth, Gender, and Ceremony in the Classical Arabic Ode*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002.

al-Suhrawardī, Abū Ḥafṣ ʿUmar. *ʿAwārif al-maʿārif*. Edited by Aḥmad ʿAbd al-Raḥīm Sāyiḥ and Tawfīq ʿAlī Wahba. Cairo: Maktabat al-Thaqāfa al-Dīniyya, 2006.

Szombathy, Zoltan. *Mujūn: Libertinism in Medieval Muslim Society and Literature*. Exeter: Gibb Memorial Trust, 2013.

Tayib, Abdullah El. "Pre-Islamic Poetry." In *Arabic Literature to the End of the Umayyad Period*, edited by A. F. L. Beeston, T. M. Johnstone, R. B. Serjeant, and G. R. Smith, 27–113. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Webb, Peter. "Poetry and the Early Islamic Historical Tradition: Poetry and Narratives of the Battle of Ṣiffīn." In *Warfare and Poetry in the Middle East*, edited by Hugh Kennedy, 119–48. New York: I. B. Tauris, 2013.

Yaghoobi, Claudia. *Subjectivity in ʿAṭṭār, Persian Sufism, and European Mysticism*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2017.

Zargar, Cyrus Ali. *Sufi Aesthetics: Beauty, Love, and the Human Form in the Writings of Ibn ʿArabi and ʿIraqi*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2011.

Zipoli, Riccardo. *Irreverent Persia: Invective, Satirical and Burlesque Poetry from the Origins to the Timurid Period (10th to 15th Centuries)*. Leiden: Leiden University Press, 2015.