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The Mi'yar al-ash'arī was composed by Ṭūsī (597-672/1201-1274) in 649/1251. In addition to dealing widely with Arabic and Persian meter, it contains ten chapters dedicated to the analysis of qāfiya: the first chapter is a general introduction (accompanied only by Arabic examples), whereas the following four are dedicated to Arabic qāfiya and the last five to Persian qāfiya.

The parallel treatment of qāfiya in the two traditions (Arabic and Persian) deserves attention per se, because it provides an opportunity to observe first-hand the relations that a scholar of the caliber of Ṭūsī found between the two contexts. The analysis he undertakes in the
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1 The contribution of the Mi'yar al-ash'arī to the Arabic-Persian theory of qāfiya has been the subject of two of our recent works: Zipoli (2003a; 2003b). This paper is a reduced and revised version of Zipoli-Pellô (2004), which includes an extensive bibliography on Arabic and Persian qāfiya.
2 Shams-i Qays (1595-60: hāf).
3 On the importance of the Mi'yar al-ash'arī for the theory of qāfiya, see Fasharaki's observations in Shams-i Qays (1994-5: 8). The Mi'yar al-ash'arī has been published – although never satisfactorily – four times: Ṭūsī (1902-3; 1984; 1990; Ḥāfiţ 2000: 159-306); for some remarks on the first edition, see Musul'mankulov (1989: 161), while for the second and third editions, see the respective reviews in Wahdiyyah Kamyar (1984-5: 191); even the fourth edition is not free of lacunae and inaccuracies. In Persia a new edition of the Mi'yar al-ash'arī, edited by Muhammad Fasharaki, is forthcoming; the sections on qāfiya in this new edition have already been published (Zipoli 2003b). On the life and works of Ṭūsī, see Mudarris Radawi (1991-2) and Ḥāfiţ (2000); two recent volumes with contributions on Ṭūsī are Ṭūsī (2003, with an exhaustive bibliography) and Ṭūsī (2003).
4 Evidence of a widespread interest on the two linguistic fronts is the fact that Shams-i Qays speaks of the need and a project for a 'parallel treatment' in this
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two different linguistic universes reveals, however, different degrees of novelty and value.

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

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

In this context it is important to mention two current commentators who follow the Persian model of ǧəfiya as set out by Tūsī. We are referring to Shams al-Dīn Muhammad-i Āmuli, the mid-19th-14th-century author of the encyclopedic text entitled Nafṣa‘is al-funūn fi āra‘is al-‘uyūn, which includes a section on ǧəfiya,7 and Yūsuf-i ‘Arūdī, who, probably in the first half of the 9th/15th century, dedicated some paragraphs to ǧəfiya in his commentary on Salāmān-i Sāwajī’s qaṣida-yi maṣnā’. The similarities between the theories of Yūsuf-i ‘Arūdī and Tūsī have already been identified by Musul‘mankulov,8 who, on the other hand, does not mention the first and more important revisiting of Tūsī by Āmuli.

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

Given that Āmuli’s comments on ǧəfiya is so little known and it is
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3 There continued to be references to Tūsī’s ‘heterodox’ theories in later periods: see Gladwin (1798: 151, 164-165), Tahānī (1967: 1, 407, 576; II, 1504), Garcin de Tassy (1970: 350), and Blochmann (1970: 81). In this context there are some important commentaries on the Miṣ‘yar al-ash‘ar; the most authoritative, entitled Mīṣcān al-ash‘ār, is a 19th-century work by the erudite Indian Muhammad Sa‘d Allāh-i Mursadībī (Mursadībī: 1883): the chapters on ǧəfiya from this text have been recently published in a critical edition by Muḥammad Fāshārakū with an Italian translation and comment by Stefano Pellò (Pellò 2003).  
4 In another circumstance the popularity of the Miṣ‘yar al-ash‘ar would seem also to have been favored by marginal factors. We are referring to the famous Persian mathematician and astronomer Ghiyāth al-Din Jamshīd-i Kāshānī (m. 823/1429) who, in a letter written from Timurid Samarkand to his father, acknowledges the importance of the Miṣ‘yar al-ash‘ar for the study of meter (Kāshānī 1996: 47-48): Kāshānī’s interest in Tūsī may be due to the educational and professional affinities between the two scientists (both were active in an astronomical observatory, Tūsī at Marīgha and Kāshānī at Samarkand).
strictly dependent on Tusi’s treatise, we thought it would be useful to compare the chapters by Tusi and Amuli on qa’fiya. The analysis of the two sections on Arabic qa’fiya is by Stefano Pellò and that of the two sections on Persian qa’fiya by myself. The conclusions are by Stefano Pellò.

To indicate references to excerpts from Tusi and Amuli we will use the abbreviations Mi’yar and Nafz is followed by the page number of the original text.

Riccardo Zipoli

1. A comparative analysis of the theories of Arabic qa’fiya in the Mi’yar al-ash’ar and the Nafz is al-funun

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

The most striking common features are the number of chapters, the description of their content, and the order in which they are arranged in the two texts: There are in fact five chapters in both cases in a corresponding sequence and each with a title indicating the treatment of similar topics. The titles on Arabic qa’fiya in the Mi’yar al-ash’ar are: (1) Dar hadd-i qa’fiya wa aqsam-i an’ “On the length of qa’fiya and on its types”; (2) Dar bayan-i huruf wa harakat-i ki ajza’-i qa’fiya bashand bar madhhab-i ‘arabi “On the explanation of the huruf and the harakat constituting the parts of qa’fiya in the Arabic doctrine”; (3)

Dar ahkam-i in huruf wa harakat” “On the rules of these huruf and harakat”; (4) Dar anwad-i qawafi ba nazdik-i ‘arabi “On the categories of the qawafì used by the Arabs”; (5) Dar ‘uyub-i qawafi ba nazdik-i ‘arabi “On the faults of the qawafì used by the Arabs.” The titles of the chapters on Arabic qa’fiya in the Nafz is al-funun, on the other hand, are as follows: (1) Dar ta’rif-i qa’fiya “On the definition of qa’fiya”; (2) Dar huruf-i ki dar qa’fiya-yi shir-i ‘arabi ri’ayat-i an kunand “On the huruf to be repeated in a qa’fiya in Arabic verse”; (3) Dar harakat-i ki dar qa’fiya-yi shir-i ‘arabi ri’ayat-i an kunand “On the harakat to be repeated in a qa’fiya in Arabic verse”; (4) Dar bayan-i aqsam-i qa’fiya-yi shir-i ‘arabi “On the explanation of the types of qa’fiya in Arabic verse”; (5) Dar ‘uyub-i qa’fiya-yi shir-i ‘arabi “On the faults in qa’fiya in Arabic verse.” As we see, the number of chapters, the indication of their content, and the order of the sequence correspond: the authors use practically the same titles for the fourth and fifth chapters, respectively, while the title for the first, second and third chapters have similar indications. Tusi and Amuli both adopt some typical features of the traditional structure of the Arabic-Persian works on qa’fiya: in both Arabic and Persian treatises, the first chapters are generally dedicated to a more or less broad definition of qa’fiya; similarly, the treatment of the faults of qa’fiya are usually dealt with in the last chapters.

As regards specific theoretical issues (we obviously leave aside the fact that at a general level the two texts basically agree, since they both draw on the classical Arabic theory of qa’fiya), the only fairly interesting common point is where both authors argue that there is no agreement between Arabic scholars on whether to consider the waw and the ya of the diphthongs aw and ay as a raf; both Tusi and Amuli quote this dispute between Arabic theoreticians of qa’fiya. In this case too, however, we cannot speak of a direct connection, since Amuli quotes as a source for this point al-Tibrizi’s treatise al-Wasta fi l-’arad wa-l-qawafi (indicated in Amuli’s text as Wasti), and not Tusi’s Mi’yar al-ash’ar. The phrases used in Persian are, moreover, very different (Tusi: waw wa ya chah sakhtan bashand wa mâ-qab-îshân mutâharrît qawm-i an-râ raf shumurand wa qawm-i na; Amuli: 12)

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

11 The following observations are based on the critical edition of the chapters on qa’fiya in the Mi’yar al-ash’ar published in Zipoli (2003b) for Tusi, and on the text published in Amuli (1958-1960: 1, 155-167) for Amuli.
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1) content and internal approach in each chapter; 2) theoretical positions and critical ideas; 3) terminology; and 4) quotations and examples.

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

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

If we now consider some more technical questions in his first chapter, Ṭūsī – as we said – quotes the definition of qāfiya attributed to al-Khalīfī for the purposes of revising it: i.e. to analyze it, highlighting the limits and suggesting an alternative definition. In particular, Ṭūsī reflects on the problems raised by the application of
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13 Mi‘yar: 5; Naqṣî: 158. Both authors, however, tend to consider the waw and the ya‘ of the diphthongs as the rāf (Mi‘yar: 13; Naqṣî: 162).
14 Mi‘yar: 3; Naqṣî: 155.
15 Mi‘yar: 6; Naqṣî: 158.
16 Mi‘yar: 6.
17 Naqṣî: 159.
19 Mi‘yar: 4.
this definition of qāfyā attributed to al-Khalīl, since in some metric contexts the line endings in the same composition could belong to several types of qāfyā simultaneously. 20 In Āmulī, who, as we said, accepts al-Khalīl’s definition without bothering to analyze it, there is no such discussion. Indeed the author of the Nāfī’s al-funūn judges all the other definitions of qāfyā he is aware of unsatisfactory. 21 On this subject we note that while Ṭūsī’s subsequent analysis will be in keeping with the definition he proposes for qāfyā, Āmulī, who indicated al-Khalīl as an absolute model, proceeds to analyze Arabic qāfyā according to a different model from that attributed to the Arab theoretician. 22

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

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

20 Mī’yār: 4.
21 Nafā’is: 155.
22 The general scheme used by Āmulī to analyze qāfyā turns out to be similar to that of Ṭūsī.
23 Mī’yār: 9; Nafā’is: 157.
24 Mī’yār: 8; Nafā’is: 157. In fact Āmulī mentions in a rather involuted way that the ā of the feminine can be the rawī if preceded by a quiescent hurāf, but this is a special case (see immediately below).
25 Mī’yār: 8.
26 Mī’yār: 9.
27 Mī’yār: 9.
28 Mī’yār: 10.
problem, but mentions the possibility that the function of the wasl can be exercised by a radical ḥā, without explaining the reason for this contradiction.29 Arguably, Āmulī simply chose to avoid including an element of uncertainty into his treatment.

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

as the rawi. Īṣārī’s suggestion for a gāfiya-yi muqayyad followed by the wasl (divided as we said into four types) is due to the need to obviate this terminological problem, and most importantly to prevent the exclusion, from the count of the gāfiya, of elements which are effectively part of it. The three cases we have quoted as examples are solved by Īṣārī as follows: 1) lam yuḥāṭīthbā’lam yurāqībā: alif = ta’s, qāṣī and dānī = dakhil, bā = rawi, ā = wasl, wāw = khurūf; 2) qāṣīhā/dānīhā: alif = ta’s, yā and ā = dakhil, yā = rawi, ā = wasl, alif = khurūf; 3) ʿalāhā/nadāhāh: alif = rawi, ā = wasl, alif = khurūf. In this context we must remember that Īṣārī highlights (as he also does at the beginning of his analysis) the limits of the definition of gāfiya attributed to al-Khalil,31 in a pair like qāṭīh/hāmīh (gāfiya-yi muqayyad with the ta’s and the wasl), according to Īṣārī, where the alif is the ta’s, the dāl and the mim are the dakhil, the yā is the rawi, and the ā is the wasl, following al-Khalil’s theory, the alif (the ta’s, according to Īṣārī) would be excluded from the gāfiya, since according to al-Khalil, the gāfiya is included between the last two quiescent hurrīf of the line (in this case the yā of prolongation and the ā of the pronoun).

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

29 Naṣīḥ’s: 157.
30 Mṭ’yr: 10-12.
31 Naṣīḥ’s: 11-12.
32 Naṣīḥ’s: 160-161.
33 Naṣīḥ’s: 157.
34 To support our supposition, it must be said that al-Akhfash explicitly declares that a non-radical hā, preceded by a quiescent harf, can be the rawi (see al-Akhfash 1970: 77-81).
As for the quotations and examples, the two texts are very different in terms of the authors’ approaches and intentions.

If we begin with quotations from sources on qāfiya, we find Tūsī quotes al-Khalīl (twice)\(^{41}\) and, generically, “others, amongst the most careful scholars of the Arabic language”\(^{42}\) without mentioning specific works. Āmuli quotes as many as five Arabic authors: al-Akhafash,\(^{43}\) al-Khalīl,\(^{44}\) Qutrub,\(^{45}\) Ibn Kaysān,\(^{46}\) and Ibn Jinnī.\(^{47}\) Moreover, Āmuli also indicates two texts: the Mughrīb\(^{48}\) (i.e. al-Mughrībī shahr al-qawāfī by Ibn Jinnī) and the Waflī\(^{49}\) (i.e. al-Waflī l-arif wa-l-qawāfī by al-Tibrīzī).

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

On the grounds of the above comparisons, we can stress the different approaches distinguishing the two texts. Tūsī’s text is characterized by his critical views as regards the classical Arabic theory on qāfiya and by some attempts at a systematic approach. The main features of Āmuli’s text, on the other hand, is the lack of any
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\(^{41}\) Mī'yār: 3, 12.
\(^{42}\) Mī'yār: 3.
\(^{43}\) Nafī'āz: 155, 158, 160.
\(^{44}\) Nafī'āz: 155, 156, 159.
\(^{45}\) Nafī'āz: 155.
\(^{46}\) Nafī'āz: 155.
\(^{47}\) Nafī'āz: 157, 158.
\(^{48}\) Nafī'āz: 157.
\(^{49}\) Nafī'āz: 158.
\(^{50}\) Nafī'āz: 155, 155, 156, 162.
2. A comparative analysis of the theories of Persian qāfiya in the Mi’yar al-ash’ar and the Naf’is al-funūn

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

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

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

As far as the theoretical positions are concerned, a comparative interpretation highlights how Tūsī’s heterodox arguments on the number of components (huruf harakat) in a qāfiya, the rawi-ye mudā’af, the ridf, and the wasl radiyf basically correspond to those found in Amuli. There are, however, some both minor and major differences.

While according to Tūsī there are five huruf in a qāfiya, Amuli sets the number at three. But this is not a real reduction since it is only due to a different method of counting the rawi for Amuli the rawi, whether mufrad or mudā’af, counts only one unit, whereas in Tūsī’s system it counts three units (one, for the mufrad, plus two for the mudā’af). The reduction from five to three harakat made by Amuli, compared to Tūsī’s model, on the other hand, reflects a substantial, effective change. In fact the two new harakat distinguishing Tūsī’s system from that of Shams-i Qays are missing: Amuli does not agree they should be included among the components of qāfiya.43

There is also a difference concerning the huruf that can be used as the second harf of the rawi-ye mudā’af. We are referring to the presence of rā instead of dāl.44 This change would seem to correspond to a belief held by Amuli, since he gives two examples (kār, dār) to support this possibility. But it is precisely the examples he adduces which highlight the weakness and inconsistency of Amuli’s theory. His very definition confirms, in fact, that the rawī-ye mudā’af is made up of two huruf following an alif, a waw or a yā. But this condition is not respected in the two examples he quotes. Moreover, the examples include also rānd, in which the ‘removed’ dāl plays the – this time canonic – functions of the second harf of the rawi-ye mudā’af.45 The picture is thus confused and Amuli’s position is unclear.

On the subject of the ridf, Amuli never strays significantly from
Coming to the question of the wasl and the radif, we discover another contradictory situation. Amuli basically accepts Tusi’s theory whereby the radif begins after the wasl or, when it is absent, after the ravī. Many of Amuli’s comments on the radif effectively closely follow those of Tusi (there is, however, a divergence on the question of the possible length, which Amuli describes as being shorter).38 On the other hand, Amuli’s definition of the wasl is not as detailed as that of Tusi (for example, Amuli does not mention the fact that the wasl must be quiescent and complete the syntagma to which it is suffixed). But the most serious inconsistency is caused again by his exemplification. The mim of shinudam and gushudam and the tā of dahān-at and sukhan-at, which Amuli adduces as examples of radif,39 are in fact, given his definitions (and those of Tusi), simply cases of wasl: this again leaves us puzzling over his real intentions. There is another case of inconsistent exemplification. Like Tusi, Amuli mentions the possibility that a poet can change the radif of a composition after a certain number of lines, provided he mentions and justifies this fact. The example of Kamal al-Din Isma’īl quoted by Amuli is the same as that cited by Tusi but we find again some inconsistencies.50

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

Amuli’s notes on the qaftiya-yi aṣlī and the qaftiya-yi ma’ūnī, on the shaygān, and on the qaftiya faults follow Tusi’s theory. There are, however, some important differences: 1) the absence in Amuli’s text of the fourth variation of the fault in a qaftiya linked to the rawī; this variation concerns the harakāt he refuses to recognize as elements of qaftiya;62 2) the use of the pair pisar-i-khabar-e by Amuli to provide and example of the fault in the wasl63 and by Tusi to give an example of the fault in the majra, but not vice versa,64 3) Amuli’s inclusion of iʿā among the faults of qaftiya65 (Tusi does not speak directly of iʿā among the faults in Persian qaftiya but nonetheless alludes to it when referring to the corresponding chapter on Arabic qaftiya, in which he does include iʿā).66

When discussing phraseology, it is easy to note how Amuli often follows to the letter Tusi’s model. The following phrases are cited by both authors (when there are differences we signal Tusi’s variation with inverted commas and Amuli’s between brackets): ba istqar ma’-tār wa-bādān “shuda ast” (shud) ki harf-i “awwal” (awwalyi-i ta) yak-i az in haft harf bāshad;67 ba’-dā-i ma’-nī bāshad wa ba’-dā-i “nabāshad” (na) ba sabab-i an ki ba’-dā ba infrad llez-i bāshad wa ba’-dā “ju-z-e bāshad az llez-i” (ne);68 wa tīkrā-i radif wajib buwd “magar” (mukarrar: this is a mistake) dar “tarjihā” (tarjihāt) yā an ī ki shā’-r ba taqīq-i bad’at radif bigdarānād,69 “ganj-i shaygān” (shaygān) ganj-i-rā gāyand kī dar way māl-i bisyār “bāshad” (buwd).70 Here, lastly, are just some of the various identical examples given: tuhī, pahlī, da’-wi, ma’-ni, minū, and marī in the case of the rawī-yi mufrad,71 rāst, dāstāh, sākht, and rāmd in the case of the rawī-yi

57 Mt’yāż: 16; Nafta is: 164. 58 Mt’yāż: 19; Nafta is: 164. 59 Nafta is: 164. 60 Mt’yāż: 21; Nafta is: 165. The second hemistich of the first of the two lines is different in Amuli compared to that mentioned by Tusi (the edition of Kamal al-Din Isma’īl’s diwan corroborates Tusi: the hemistich quoted by Amuli is part of the same composition but belongs to the previous line; see Kamal al-Din Isma’īl 1970: 222). Amuli’s quote, moreover, contains an obvious error: with miyānad instead of miyānad in the first line the theorized change of the radif does not occur. 61 Mt’yāż: 21-23; Nafta is: 165-166. 62 Mt’yāż: 27; Nafta is: 167. 63 Nafta is: 167. 64 Mt’yāż: 27. 65 Mt’yāż: 167. 66 Mt’yāż: 26, 15. 67 Mt’yāż: 16-17; Nafta is: 163. 68 Mt’yāż: 19; Nafta is: 164. 69 Mt’yāż: 20; Nafta is: 164. 70 Mt’yāż: 24; Nafta is: 166. 71 Mt’yāż: 16; Nafta is: 163.
3. Conclusions

In the light of our observations in the foregoing comparisons, we may say that the two texts being examined generally develop in parallel. Both in the Mi’yār al-ash‘ar and the Naṣīḥ’s al-funūn the section dedicated to Arabic qaṣīfa is structurally different from that dedicated to Persian qaṣīfa and this difference in structure characterizing the analysis of the two contexts in Tūsī’s treatise (‘classic’ for the Arabic and ‘innovative’ for the Persian) is clearly reflected in Ṭūsī’s text. Despite these similarities, as we have seen, the two authors do have different approaches: Ṭūsī adopts a theoretical and methodical approach while that of Ṭūsī is a traditional compilatory approach. In the wider context of the logical and prosodic analysis in the Mi’yār al-ash‘ar, Ṭūsī explicitly uses the part dedicated to Arabic qaṣīfa as the indispensable premise for studying Persian qaṣīfa, whereas Ṭūsī, who is more interested in presenting questions about rhyme in a factual way from the encyclopedic point of view of the Naṣīḥ’s al-funūn, simply describes the ‘state of the art’ as known to him.

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

We can consider the relative abundance of authorities cited by Ṭūsī on Arabic qaṣīfa and the almost total absence of such citations in Ṭūsī (who must surely have known them) from the same point of view: as highlighted in our comparison, Ṭūsī cites five Arabic authors (al-Akhfash, al-Khalfān, Qūṭrub, Ibn Kaysin, and Ibn Jinnī) and two works (al-Mughrīb fi sharḥ al-qawāfi di Ibn Jinnī and al-Waṣī fi ‘l-‘arīt wa-l-qawāfi by al-Tibrizī) which he raises to an indisputable prescriptive status, whereas Ṭūsī only mentions al-Khalfān, whom he mainly seems to cite as a founding pillar of the Arabic philological tradition to be referred to in seeking solutions to problems raised by it when applied to the Persian linguistic context.

Moreover, the number of Arabic sources mentioned in the Naṣīḥ’s al-funūn, and the large number of verse quotations we noted as being a
feature of the Arabic section of Āmuli’s treatise, but not of the Mi‘yār al-ash‘ār, strongly suggest that Āmuli could rely on several scholarly texts dealing with Arabic meter and qāfiya, and that the first section of the Mi‘yār al-ash‘ār was only consulted as a marginal work with no real authority.

The situation changes when it comes to the section dedicated to Persian qāfiya in the Naṣīr’s al-funūn: the close dependence of this part of Āmuli's treatise on Tūsī is clearly highlighted in the comparison on the subject. We must stress how in the section of Naṣīr’s al-funūn dedicated to Persian qāfiya no sources are mentioned: judging from the large number of Arabic authorities mentioned, it is highly unlikely that if the encyclopedist Āmuli had had a number of Persian sources available, he would have completely failed to mention them. In all probability, however, Āmuli turned to the Mi‘yār al-ash‘ār as the model for his own description for the theory of Persian qāfiya almost as an obligatory choice. As mentioned in the introduction, like Tūsī, Āmuli lived at the Ilkhānid court, where all the works by the Khorasani scholar (and not only the Mi‘yār al-ash‘ār) enjoyed great prestige. We can thus surmise that Tūsī’s analysis of Persian qāfiya was the standard reference work at the time and that the other historical authority on the subject, the al-Mu‘jam fī ma‘āyir ash‘ār al-cājam by Shams-i Qays (with theories differing from those of the Mi‘yār al-ash‘ār), was not available for Āmuli, who seems to have been obliged to turn to the only model available.9

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

---

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

9 Āmuli was, however, aware of the existence of theories on Persian qāfiya in line with that of Shams-i Qays, since Tūsī himself mentions them in some passages of the Mi‘yār al-ash‘ār.
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L'étalon des poésies, cet inconnu

Au mois de Šahrivar 1333 paraissait dans la revue Soxan, publiée à Téhéran sous la direction de Parviz Nātēl Xānārī, un beau poème du poète contemporain Hūjang Ḥāfezā (Sāye), intitulé Tarâne (chanson), et dont voici les premiers vers :

Tā to bā man-īzānāne bā man-ast
Bāy-e kām-e jāvedāne bā man-ast

To bahār-e delkāsh-y ī o man ā bāg
Šīr-o šowq-e šad javāne bā man-ast

Yād-e delnešān-āt ey omdā-e jān
Har kojā ravam ravāne bā man-ast

Nār-e nāšand-e sobh āgar tor-āst
Šīr-e gerye-ye šabāne bā man-ast

Barg-e 'eyš-e jām-ā čāng āgar ā dāt
Reqs-o mast-ī tarâne bā man-ast...

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