

CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS



---

Khāqānī and Andronicus Comnenus

Author(s): V. Minorsky

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*, Vol. 11, No. 3 (1945), pp. 550–578

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#) on behalf of [School of Oriental and African Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/609336>

Accessed: 01/03/2013 21:21

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press and School of Oriental and African Studies are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

# Khāqānī and Andronicus Comnenus

By V. MINORSKY

- § 1. On Khāqānī (his works, editions, commentaries).
- § 2. Andronicus Comnenus.
- § 3. Andronicus in Georgia and Shirvan.
- § 4. The Shirvān-shāh Akhsatān and Khāqānī.
- § 5. The "Christian" ode translated.
- § 6. Commentary.

Abbreviations: *Kh.* = Khanikov, *Mémoire*; *L.* = Lucknow edition of the *Kulliyāt*; *T.* = Tehran edition of the *Divān*; *Qor'ān* quoted in the translation of R. Bell.

## § 1. On Khāqānī

ONE of the greatest Persian poets, Afḍal al-Dīn Ibrāhīm Khāqānī, is still insufficiently known to the public. Only in 1937 was his *Divān* printed in Tehran, and before that date the readers had to content themselves with an inconvenient Indian lithograph published some seventy years ago.<sup>1</sup> The long Mathnavī (*Tuḥfat al-'Irāqayn*) in which the poet describes his pilgrimage accomplished in 551–2/1156–7 is available only in Indian lithographs.<sup>2</sup>

This scarcity of editions is due to the difficulty of Khāqānī's poems, which bristle with rare words, unusual similes and allusions to astrology, medicine, theology, and history, to say nothing of the numerous hints concerning the happenings of the poet's own life and time.

Even two and three centuries after Khāqānī's death his poems caused embarrassment to accomplished connoisseurs of Persian letters. Daulat-shāh calls the ode which we propose to study *bisyār mushkil* "very difficult", and cuts down his quotation from it on the grounds that it "requires a commentary" (*mauqūf ba-sharḥ*).<sup>3</sup> In fact, quite a number of explanations of the abstruse odes had to be composed for the benefit of readers, as will be seen from the following list:—

1. According to Daulat-shāh, Shaykh Ādharī explained Khāqānī's qaṣīda "on Christian matters" in his *Javāhir al-asrār* (840/1436), which is an abridgment of his previous work *Mafātīḥ al-asrār* (830/1427).

2. I owe to Professor C. A. Storey the reference to the rare *Sharḥ-i qaṣā'id-i Khāqānī*, Stambul, *Āsafīya*, ii, 1252, No. 93, due to the pen of the great poet Jāmī (A.D. 1414–1492).

3. Muḥammad d. Dā'ūd b. Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd 'Alavī Shādiyābādī, who sojourned at the court of Nāṣir al-Dīn Khiljī (906–916/1500–1510), wrote a full commentary on forty-four qaṣīdas of Khāqānī, Rieu, ii, 561.

<sup>1</sup> *Divān-i Khāqānī-yi Shirvānī*, ed. 'Alī 'Abd al-Rasūli, Tehran, 1316, 944 pp., containing a short introduction and a detailed index of names (pp. 945–979). The previous edition (*Kulliyāt*, but without the *Tuḥfat al-'Irāqayn*) was lithographed in Lucknow, 1293/1878, 2 vols., 1582 pp., with a commentary in the margin (see below).

<sup>2</sup> Ed. by Abu' l-Ḥasan, Agra, A.D. 1855, 222 pp. (with commentary); Lucknow, 1294/1877; several selections: Cawnpore, 1867; Lahore, 1867.

<sup>3</sup> *Tadhkirat al-shu'arā*, ed. E. G. Browne, p. 79.

4. The 'Alavī Lāhijī, one of the courtiers of Jahāngīr (1014–1037/1605–1628), dedicated to him a commentary on some qaṣīdas of Khāqānī, Rieu, ii, 562.

5. 'Abd al-Vahhāb b. Maḥmūd al-Ḥasanī al-Ḥusaynī al-Ma'mūrī, surnamed Ghanā'ī, wrote a commentary called *Maḥabbat-nāma* some time about 1090/1679, Ethé, *Cat. India Office*, i, col. 593. *Vide infra*.

6. Qabūl-Muḥammad, who compiled for the Sultan of Oudh (d. A.D. 1827) the dictionary *Haft-Qulzum*, wrote also the commentary *Farah-afzā* on ten qaṣīdas of Khāqānī, Sprenger, *Cat.*, p. 463.

7. Riḍā Qulī Khān (d. 1288/1871) explained the difficult verses of Khāqānī in his *Miftāḥ al-kunūz*, Rieu, *Supp.*, 221 (2). According to his own statement he worked independently, not having seen any of the previous commentaries.

8. The Lucknow edition (A.H. 1294) has a running commentary possibly utilizing the earlier works, but at many places bearing the signature of Maulānā Sayyid Muḥammad Ṣādiq 'Alī Lakhnautī (pp. 147, 637, etc.). The explanations inscribed in the margin, and sometimes inside the text, are very tiring for the eyes.

9. A commentary in Urdu entitled *Hall-i qaṣā'id-i Khāqānī* by Aḥmad Ḥasan Shaukat was published in Meerut in 1906.<sup>1</sup>

In spite of this plethora of exegeses, now and then the poet defied his commentators. In general, one can hardly expect Muslim commentaries compiled far from the field of Khāqānī's activities to be of much help in the particularly obscure passages and allusions (*vide infra*, p. 562, n. 4).

If the poet's countrymen had to cope with many knotty points in the *Dīvān*, it is obvious that, outside Persia and India, few attempts will have been made to assess the poetical value of Khāqānī. The single odes figuring in various readers and selections of the earlier part of the nineteenth century need not detain us.<sup>2</sup>

The only European who has produced a general study of our poet is N. V. Khanikov (1822–1878).<sup>3</sup> He began reading Khāqānī with a marginal commentary at the time when he was Consul-General in Tabriz and was collecting material for the history of the Shirvān-shāhs. His *Mémoire* is a valuable piece of research, but the Persian text of Khāqānī's poems which he quotes *in extenso* must hail from some very faulty MS. Nor had Khanikov much feeling for the metre.

C. Salemann's thesis on the quatrains of Khāqānī<sup>4</sup> is a careful essay with a full bibliography, glossary, and illustrative texts, although not carrying actual research beyond the findings of Khanikov. Salemann candidly confesses that he gave up the study of the chief source of Khāqānī's biography, namely his

<sup>1</sup> I do not know whether the commentary by Ḥasan Dihlavī (?), quoted in *Tarbiyat, Dānish-mandān-i Ādharbāyijān*, 130, is identical with any of the above.

<sup>2</sup> See a complete bibliography in Salemann, *Cheverostishiya*, pp. 13–14.

<sup>3</sup> Khanykoff, *Lettre à M. Dorn, Tabriz, 8th–20th April, 1857*, in *Bull. hist. et phil. de l'Ac. de St. Pétersbourg*, xiv, No. 23, col. 353–376 (various historical references in Khaqani, chiefly to the Russians); *Mémoire sur Khâcâni*. 1. Étude sur la vie et le caractère de Khâcâni, *J. As.*, aout-sept., 1863, pp. 137–200. 2. Texte et traduction de quatre odes de Khâcâni, *J. As.*, mars-avril, 1865, pp. 296–367.

<sup>4</sup> К. Залеманъ, *Четверостишия Хакани*, St. Petersburg, 1875, 87 + 97 pp.

*qaṣīdas*, after having discovered that “it was beyond my powers to understand them without a commentary”.

Both H. Ethé<sup>1</sup> and E. G. Browne<sup>2</sup> followed Khanikov's *Mémoire*. The conclusion of the former is that Khāqānī's poems, despite their forceful and melodious language, are characterized by an abundance of artificial *jeux de mots* and obscure hints. Browne finds still less redeeming features in Khāqānī, whose “style is generally obscure, extremely artificial, and even pedantic”. To some extent, the judgment of the two historians of Persian literature is difficult to gainsay, but the human and entertaining sides of Khāqānī's production appear much more clearly in Khanikov, who took more pains to ascertain the poet's atmosphere.

Recently Russian scholars of the younger generation (Yuri Marr, K. Chaykin, A. Boldirev) have become interested in the poet of Shirvan, and succeeded in explaining a number of difficult points. Still more important is the long chapter on Khāqānī included in the collection of literary essays by Professor Badī' al-Zamān Khorāsānī: *Sukhan va-Sukhanvarān*, ii/1, Tehran, 1312/1933. The general appreciation of Khāqānī occupies pp. 300–349, and is accompanied (pp. 349–403) by an illustrative selection of poetry. The author considers Khāqānī one of the great masters of the Persian tongue and a first class *qaṣīda* poet of his age. He notes the originality of his themes (*ibtikār-i maḍāmīn*), the easy overcoming of such technical difficulties as the unusual *radīfs*, the force of his descriptions, the vast range of his vocabulary and learning. He admits, however, that by indulging in a certain facile tendency Khāqānī becomes artificial (*az ḥadd-i ṭabī'at bīrūn*). By assuming his readers to be a match (*ham-tā*) to his learning he tends to be unintelligible. “The little acquaintance with the poetry of Khāqānī on the part of the majority of those interested in literature is not due to any tortuous or obscure ideas of the poet or to the fact that his thoughts lie outside common comprehension. Although such an explanation may be accepted for some of his verses, it is entirely untrue in the cases where Khāqānī describes nature, criticizes the manners of his contemporaries or sings their praises, for such lines are not unfamiliar to the public (*'umūm*), and the ideas (*khiyālāt*) of Khāqānī are within the range of common thought. The reason for this aloofness and the general insufficient acquaintance with the *ḍivān* lies rather in the poet's terms and mode of expression, which rest on the peculiar foundations of science and taste capable of finding favour (only) with the *élite*. Meanwhile, such learned verses are not appreciated by the common people, whose range of comprehension and reasoning is inadequate.”

Badī' al-Zamān refutes the idea that many of Khāqānī's verses (up to five hundred !) have no meaning, but admits that the labour involved in ascertaining their meaning is out of proportion to the result. The author has found in the *Mathnavī* a verse (ii, 3758) which seems to contain a censure of Khāqānī's obscurity. Several times the poet of Shirvan compares his poetry with the

<sup>1</sup> *Grundriss d. iran. Phil.*, ii, 263–5.

<sup>2</sup> *A Lit. Hist. of Persia*, i, 391–5.

“speech of the birds”, comprehensible only to Solomon (*vide infra*, p. 559). It is tempting, therefore, to read and interpret Jalāl al-Dīn’s verse as follows: “The speech of the birds of *Khāqānī* is but an echo; but where is the speech of the birds of Solomon?”<sup>1</sup>

Badī’ al-Zamān greatly admires *Khāqānī*’s talent for producing new combinations of words (*tarkīb*) and allusions, and calls his *divān* “a thesaurus of literary expressions”.

The essay of the Persian scholar, who prides himself on being untouched by the all-pervading European influences, has the merit of being amply illustrated by apposite quotations from the immense *Kulliyāt*. In *Khāqānī*’s poems the author has discovered a mass of new facts relating to his life, patrons, acquaintances, and rivals.<sup>2</sup>

Now that the *divān* is before us in a readable form one is more than ever struck by the wonderful mastery of the poet. Of course, the *qaṣīda* is a highly artificial class of poetry; but within its framework *Khāqānī* moves with prodigious skill and ease. It would be a fallacy to imagine that the poems are only fulsome panegyrics. In many of them the poet displays a fine sense of nature: stars, clouds, and sun-rises, the desert, mighty streams, and the sea. Even in the longish *ṣūfī* poem moving along the beaten tracks of piety there are some real gems:—

*natarsam z’ān-ki nabbāsh-i tabī’at gūr bishkāfad*  
*ki mahtāb-i sharī’at-rā ba-shab kardam nigahbānash*

“No fear for me that Nature, that body-snatcher, might ransack my tomb,  
“For I have made the moon-light of the Shari’at my night-watcher.”

The reverse of praise is satire, and the stabs of *Khāqānī*’s stiletto flash refreshingly throughout his *divān*. In his poem reminiscent of *Exegi monumentum*, he calls his rivals “suburb-whores and village-boors” (*gharzanān-i barzan-and u gharchagān-i rūstā*), with all the glitter of queer words and angry alliterations. At the risk of being accused of heresy I confess that, after this full-blooded speech, the mellowed but emasculated vocabulary of the followers of *Hāfiz* loses some of its lustre.

Above all the fireworks of words, metaphors, and similes the vistas of *Khāqānī*’s personality form the most attractive feature of his *divān*. The human element, which is so rare in the standardized ghazals with their hypocritical mixture of divine and profane, is abundant in his odes, satires, and dirges. If he languishes in prison we see the cross-bars of the skylight opening on the dark sky; if he laments his wife, he finds simple and human words in which to describe the one who “was my companion, nay, the memory of my life”<sup>3</sup>; if he speaks of the loss of his child, one agrees with *Khanikov*

<sup>1</sup> In the light of Badī’ al-Zamān’s discovery R. A. Nicholson has changed his translation in his commentary, *G.M.S.*, iv/7, p. 368.

<sup>2</sup> Muḥammad ‘Alī Tarbiyat, *Dānishmandān-i Adharbāyjān*, 1314/1935, pp. 129–132, also contains some new facts of *Khāqānī*’s biography.

<sup>3</sup> I have recommended this verse to be engraved on the tombstone of Lady Ross, buried in Stambul by the side of Sir Denison Ross.

that “sa douleur lui fait oublier sa science”. He likes travel and new impressions, he is vainglorious, he often gets into trouble with his patrons and enemies, and five of his longer poems are bitter complaints written in jail (*vide infra*, p. 361, n. 3). He is a personality and not a sanctimonious abstraction like so many of the worthies quoted in Persian anthologies. Even his learning and “pedanticism” do not resemble in the least a metrical commentary on the Qor’ān or a versified treatise on sufism. The traces of his inquisitive mind and retentive memory give a picture of the cultural standards of his age, of the studies, readings, and meditations of his contemporaries. The *ḍivān* contains 265 geographical and 384 personal names.<sup>1</sup> It is a repertory meriting a close study on the lines of the methods applied to Dante’s text.

### § 2. *Andronicus Comnenus*

There is now no doubt about the identity of the patron to whom Khāqānī addressed his “Christian” poem.<sup>2</sup> It is no less a person than the famous Andronicus Comnenus, whose talents, loves, crimes, and adventures startle and amaze even on the colourful background of contemporary Byzantium.

Andronicus (born *circa* A.D. 1120) was a cousin of the great Emperor Manuel (1143–1180), and appeared before the public eye somewhere about 1150 as the hero of an irregular love-affair with a princess whose sister was held in a still more unhallowed union by her uncle Manuel. He twice led expeditions against the doughty Armenian king of Cilicia, Thoros. The results were nil except for the personal friendships which the gay and gallant prince easily contracted with neighbours, whatever their persuasion, Latin or Muslim. No sooner was he transferred to the Hungarian front than he plotted with the King of Hungary and the Emperor Frederick against his own lord Manuel. The latter locked him up in a tower, whence he escaped after four years, only to be recaptured. Not before another eight years had he a better chance. This time (A.D. 1165) he sought refuge with the Russian Prince Yaroslav of Halich. As the King of Hungary wanted Andronicus for his own designs, Manuel hastened to pardon his cousin and the companion of his youth, for whom there always remained a weak spot in his heart. In 1167 Andronicus distinguished himself in the battle of Zeugmine (Zemlin), where he fought the Hungarians, but he felt disappointed at the sudden *rapprochement* of Manuel with King Béla. For a third time Andronicus was sent to Cilicia, but, even though he succeeded in unhorsing the terrible Thoros, he lost the day. He retired to Syria, there to give full vent to his romantic vein. He first dallied with the Princess Philippa of Antioch, and then with his own cousin Theodora, the widow of the King of Jerusalem, Baldwin III. Manuel, furious at the thoughtless behaviour of Andronicus, sent emissaries to blind him, but the faithful Theodora warned him in good time; so, taking her with himself, Andronicus set out on a new series of adventures, which lasted some twelve

<sup>1</sup> Among them, Jesus Christ alone is mentioned 207 times.

<sup>2</sup> Khanikov wrongly took him for Isaac Comnenus, but Kunik (in Dorn’s *Caspia*, 1875, p. 240) corrected this mistake.

years (1168 ?–1180). From Syria he went to Damascus, and thence, with the help of Nūr al-Dīn (d. 569/1174), on to “Persia”.<sup>1</sup> The lovers stopped at Harrān, where Theodora was delivered of a child, and passed through Mārdīn.<sup>2</sup> The further itinerary is little known. According to Michael the Syrian the travellers made for Erzerum (Karin); but this is possibly a later stage of Andronicus’s peregrination, after his return from the Caucasus. There are some reports that he proceeded to Baghdad and was well received at the court.<sup>3</sup> This may be the source of the later references to his apostasy, which even nowadays appear in some hostile authors, but are entirely refuted by Khāqānī’s unequivocal references to him as “the glory of the Apostles” and “the sincere friend of the Messiah”. The farthest point reached by the noble travellers was the Christian kingdom of Iberia (Georgia). We shall speak separately of the activities of Andronicus in Transcaucasia, on which the local chronicle throws interesting light.

After Georgia we find Andronicus on the north-eastern border of the Byzantine empire.<sup>4</sup> He is kindly received by the Turkish ruler Saltukh, the holder of the fief of Coloneia (now Shabin-Qara-hisar), who had encroached on some parts of the neighbouring Chaldian theme (i.e. Trebizond). Saltukh is said to have given Andronicus a strong castle.<sup>5</sup>

Apparently there is some misunderstanding in the sources concerning Saltukh (Σάλατοῦχος \*Saltuq). This name is particular to the family of the Turcoman rulers of Erzerum, who do not seem ever to have possessed Coloneia.<sup>6</sup> The agreement of the name Saltukh with the mention of Karin (= Erzerum) in Michael the Syrian makes it probable that Andronicus visited the court of this small dynasty, but the definite reference to Coloneia suggests that Andronicus finally passed under the protection of another Turcoman dynasty, that of Mengüjek, whose dominions alone form a suitable geographical frame to the subsequent events.

<sup>1</sup> Willermus Tyrensis Archiepiscopus, liber XX, cap. 2 (*Recueil des hist. des croisades*, i/2, 1844, p. 943)—a trustworthy witness of the events (d. after 1183). “Persia” in this case means only the area directly or indirectly dependent on the great Seljuks.

<sup>2</sup> Michael the Syrian, Jacobite patriarch of Antioch, died circa 1199, *vide Recueil, Sources Arméniennes*, p. 361.

<sup>3</sup> Diehl, *Figures Byzantines*, ed. 1927, ii, 86–134, whose source I have failed to trace.

<sup>4</sup> It is doubtful whether on his way to Coloneia he visited Persia. Nicetas Choniata does not mention such a *détour*, and Cinnamus applies the term “Persian” to the Muslim neighbours of the Byzantine Empire. The contemporary Seljuk ruler of Persia was Arslan II (556–573/1161–1177). One might also consider as “Persia” the dominions of the powerful Ildeguzids, atabeks of Azarbayjan, namely of Muḥammad Pahlavān-i Jahān (568–582/1172–1186). His possessions lay on the road from Georgia to Armenia (Erzerum, Coloneia), but Saltukh’s dominions bordered directly on Georgian territory in the basin of the Chorokh.

<sup>5</sup> Nicetas, ed. Bonn, pp. 185, 294.

<sup>6</sup> Their history is very little known, apart from some reference in I. Athīr, x, 147a (496); xi, 126: in 548/1153 Saltuq was defeated by the Georgians; xi, 185: in 556/1161 Saltuq was captured by the Georgians but redeemed by his daughter, wife of the ruler of Khilāt (Shah Arman); xi, 209: in 560/1165 the Dānishmandid Yaghī-Arslan kidnapped the fiancée of the Saljuq Qilij Arslan, who was the daughter of Saltuq b. ‘Ali b. Abu’l-Qāsim; xii, iii: in 597/1201 the Seljuk Rukn al-Dīn seized Erzerum, which belonged to the son of al-Malik (*li-walad al-malik*), son of Muḥammad, son of Saltuq, and this was the end of the dynasty.

The chief possessions of the Mengüjekids were Erzinjān, Coloneia (Koghūnia) and Kamākh. They were in close relations with Trebizond. They often attacked the Georgians and the Byzantines. The chief representative of the family at the time of Andronicus was Fakhr al-Dīn Bahrām-shāh (*circa* A.D. 1155–1218), known as a very clever ruler, fond of learning and poetry. Nizāmī dedicated to him his *Makhzan al-asrār* (according to Rieu, *circa* 575/1179). He was a likely prince to befriend a noble visitor.<sup>1</sup>

Whether Andronicus, as asserted by some hostile sources,<sup>2</sup> really made incursions into Byzantine dominions and traded in captives with Muslims is open to doubt; but his presence on the frontier was certainly most unwelcome to Constantinople, and a means was found to deal him a hard blow. On Manuel's instructions the ruler of Trebizond, Nicephorus Palæologus, sent men to kidnap Theodora. In despair at the loss of his beloved Andronicus hastened to make humble submission to the emperor and appeared before him wearing a chain round his neck.

Again Manuel pardoned him and assigned to him a residence at Cænæum in the Polemoniæ Pontus (now Üniye). Andronicus had now to wait but a short while before the news of the emperor's death reached him. The new emperor Alexis (1180–3) was eleven years old. Andronicus took up the attitude of one bound by oath to his father to ward off any danger from the royal family. The unpopularity of the dowager empress and her favourite the Protosebastos Alexis served him as a pretext to strike hard at his enemies. In 1183 he was crowned joint emperor with Alexis. Soon after the dowager empress was condemned to be strangled, the decision having been counter-signed by her youthful son. Then the latter's turn came, and he was strangled in his bed. Andronicus, still keeping his connection with Theodora, married the 11-year-old Agnes, who had been betrothed to Alexis. He reigned independently from 1183 to 1185, and the people welcomed his advent, as the two acknowledged objects of his policy were the elimination of Latin influence and the defence of the rights of the peasants against the landowners. A statue represented him as a toiler in modest garments and with a scythe in his hand. However, the terrorism of his old age was indiscriminate. His enemies exploited his excesses and executions. On 11th September, 1185, a mutiny broke out in the capital. Andronicus prepared to flee by sea to the Crimea, but the stormy sea threw him back on to the coast. He was caught and hanged in the circus.<sup>3</sup> Thus ended the reign which might have saved and regenerated the

<sup>1</sup> See Houtsma, *Mengüjek* in *E.I.* Important facts on the dynasty are quoted by van Berchem and Halil Edhem in *Corpus inscr. arab.*, iii, pp. 90–103.

<sup>2</sup> Cinnamus, vi, p. 251, and various Western European chronicles. How wild were the rumours circulating in the West may be instanced by the fantastic confusion in the report on the affairs in Constantinople which reached Ibn Jubayr during his sojourn in Sicily in January, 1185, *Rihla*, ed. Gibb Memorial, pp. 330–340 (tr. Schiapparelli, pp. 336–9 and 367).

<sup>3</sup> Lebeau, *Hist. du Bas-Empire*, 1834, xvi, ch. 89–91; Gibbon, ch. xlviii; Bréhier, *sub verbo*, in Baudrillart, *Dict. d'histoire . . . ecclésiastique*, ii, 1914, col. 1776–1182; A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire*, Madison, 1929, ii, 13–17, 88–95.



exhausted Empire had not Andronicus “lacked perhaps a little moral sense” (Diehl).

### § 3. *Andronicus in Georgia and Shirvan*

For a Byzantine prince Georgia had the natural attraction of a Christian and hospitable kingdom. There are also reasons to think that Andronicus had some particular links with King Giorgi III (1156–1184). The Trebizond chronicle of Michael Panaretus definitely affirms that the founder of the Trebizond Empire, Alexius, who was a grandson of Andronicus, was set on the throne with the help of his paternal aunt (*πρὸς πατρὸς θεία*), Queen Tamar (1184–1213), who succeeded her father Giorgi III. Thus some connection between the Comnenes and the Georgian Bagratids had been a well-known fact, but their actual link has been difficult to ascertain. Quite recently a Georgian scholar<sup>1</sup> has given a new interpretation to the passage of the official chronicle describing the arrival of Andronicus in Georgia “with a wife of dazzling countenance and with beautiful children”. The latter are said to be “the sister’s sons”, and the new suggestion is that this indication of parentage refers *not* to Andronicus but to Giorgi. Consequently it appears that the first wife of Andronicus was Giorgi’s sister. He must have married her *circa* 1144, and she gave birth to Manuel, the father of the first emperor of Trebizond. She probably died before Andronicus started on his adventures in Syria, for otherwise Giorgi “would hardly have shown so much kindness to his brother-in-law” being accompanied by Theodora. In the words of the chronicle<sup>2</sup> the king of Georgia gave him “as many towns and castles as he needed and assigned to him a residence in the neighbourhood of his own in Kakhetia, and opposite that of Aghsarthan, king of Shirvan”. This Muslim ruler’s mother was the Georgian Princess Tamar, King Giorgi’s aunt, and the cousins, Christian and Muslim, lived on excellent terms. Being pressed by the Khazars (?) of Darband, Aghsartan appealed to Giorgi for help. Giorgi raised a considerable army and, taking Andronicus with him, raided the region “of Muskir and Sharabam” and took the town Shaburan.<sup>3</sup> Under its walls Andronicus, by his behaviour, merited the approval of the whole army. The town was restored by Giorgi to Aghsartan.

As suggested by Pakhomov,<sup>4</sup> the invasion of Shirvan, which Andronicus helped to repel, was initiated by the ruler of Darband, Bek-Bars b. Muẓaffar.

<sup>1</sup> Prince Cyril Toumanoff, “On the relationship between the founder of the Empire of Trebizond and the Georgian queen Tamar,” *Speculum*, 1940, xv, 299–312.

<sup>2</sup> Brosset, *Hist. de la Géorgie*, i, 396.

<sup>3</sup> Muskir = Mushkur; Shaburan = Shābarān and Sharabam = Sharvān (?). Several of Khāqānī’s verses suggest that in his time Shirvan was called *Sharvān*. For example, T. 71 (already noticed by H. Ḥasan): “Do not blame Sharvān, for Khāqānī is from the town whose name begins with *shar* [*sharr* ‘evil’]. Why should you blame a town for the two letters with which *shar* [‘religious law’] begins and *bashar* [‘humanity’] ends,” etc. Cf. also T. 405: “*Shar-vān* has become *Shīr-van* [‘place of lions’], nay, *Sharaf-vān* [‘place of honour’], for metaphorically it has assumed the aspect of Baghdad and Egypt, thanks to the (canal of) Khayr-vān,” cf. T. 263 and 275.

<sup>4</sup> *O Derbendskom kniazhestve XII–XIII v.*, Baku, 1930.

The emancipation of Darband had taken place under his grandfather Sayf al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Khalifa al-Sulamī,<sup>1</sup> and already in A.D. 1124 the Georgian King David led an army against Darband in support of the rights of the Shirvān-shāhs. Pakhomov thinks that Shābarān (originally the north-eastern part of Shirvan on the eastern slope of the Shirvan range) was usually under the amīrs of Darband.

Bek-Bars's levy must have had a composite character, for in the odes<sup>2</sup> describing the victory over the invaders Khāqānī speaks of *Rūs* and *Alān* (T. 139, 475), *Rūs* and *Khazar* (T. 135), and *Rūs* and the *Sarīr* (T. 476). The old "kingdom of the Throne" (*Sarīr*) is the Avar principality in Daghestan. Bek-Bars's appeal to these valiant mountaineers was natural. The Iranian Alāns occupied in the North Caucasus a much larger area than their present-day descendants, the Ossets. It is unexpected to find the Khazar mentioned towards the end of the twelfth century. Some Khazars may have survived in the mountains, but it is more likely that their name was applied by Khāqānī to their successors in the steppes, the Qipchaq (Polovtsi, Comans), who were at this period active along the whole Caucasian front. At an earlier time the term *Rūs*<sup>3</sup> would have referred to Norsemen; but towards A.D. 1173 they were very much mixed with Slavs. The initiative of Bek-Bars was independent of Kiev, and he must have used bands of free-lances (бродники) who were roaming in the south, as a prototype of the future Cossacks. Khāqānī's odes would suggest that the invasion was twofold: by land and by sea, the latter being the contribution of the Rūs. Khāqānī (T. 36) claims the destruction of seventy-three Russian ships, and names *Jazīra-yi Rūynās* ("the Madder Island") and Lanbarān as the scene of the operations against the Rūs (T. 406). The island is supposed to be the present-day Sarā, to the south of the old estuary of the Kur. Lanbarān lies far upstream on the Kur (south of Barda'a). If Khāqānī is correct, the Russian seamen seem to have operated in the direction of the much earlier Russian raid of 332/942.<sup>4</sup>

The years of Andronicus's arrival in Georgia and of the expedition to Shābarān are known only approximately. All we can say is that he and Theodora could not have reached Giorgi's court before A.D. 1170.<sup>5</sup> The cautious Kunik (Dorn, *Caspia*, p. 240) placed the Russian attack on Shirvan "provisionally" in A.D. 1175, or "possibly" in A.D. 1173.

Another hint at the chronology of the events has been made by Professor K. Chaykin.<sup>6</sup> This scholar, an expert on the Persian poetry before A.D. 1200, has found in Khāqānī's dīvān several references to an event which caused

<sup>1</sup> Mentioned in Abu-Ḥamid al-Gharnāṭī, *Jour. As.*, 1925, No. 1, p. 85.

<sup>2</sup> Studied by Khanikov in *Mél. As.*, iii, 1853.

<sup>3</sup> They particularly interested the older generation of Russian scholars; see Dorn, *Caspia. Über die Einfälle der Russen*, 1875.

<sup>4</sup> On the geographical background see the *Hudūd al-'ālam*, pp. 398-411. Cf. Minorsky, *Rūs in E.I.*

<sup>5</sup> Such is also the view of Toumanoff, loc. cit., 310.

<sup>6</sup> *Khaqani, Nizami, Rustaveli*, fasc. i, ed. by the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., 1935.

much anxiety to his contemporaries. The astronomers had predicted the conjunction of the seven planets in the sign of Libra, which, in the opinion of some of them, was to be accompanied by a devastating hurricane. One remembers the blow dealt to the reputation of the great poet but unlucky astrologer, Anvarī, when this prediction proved false, and on the fatal day there was not wind enough for winnowing (Browne, ii, 368).

According both to the historians and to the computations of the astronomer Dobronravin, the conjunction of the planets took place on 29 Jamādī II 582/16 September, 1186. In five of his odes Khāqānī refers to the expected event as due to happen in another 32, 30, 13, 6, and 2 years. Consequently the third of them was written in A.H. 582 — 13 = 569 (A.D. 1173–4). This long strophic poem (T. 485–494) was dedicated to Akhsatān, as it seems, on the eve of Khāqānī's second pilgrimage, which he accomplished in 569 or 570. Chaykin insists on the "lowly and repentant tone" of the seventh strophe, in which the poet renounces all opposition to fate and pledges his mouth to silence, not without some malice: "Solomon is no more there to listen to the secrets of the birds; so, in front of the demons, I close my mouth." Chaykin connects this ode with Khāqānī's liberation from the jail into which he had been thrown for his previous attempt to leave Shirvan without permission. Such a hypothesis is very tempting psychologically,<sup>1</sup> and we can now fix pretty closely the date of his imprisonment, during which Shābarān was recaptured. The probable year of the expedition must be *circa* A.H. 569, i.e. in the early part of A.D. 1174 or perhaps in the later part of A.D. 1173, as already guessed by Kunik.<sup>2</sup>

The date and the cause of Andronicus's departure from Georgia remain obscure. Perhaps Manuel made representations to Giorgi and requested him not to harbour his enemy. Maybe some new facts on the first marriage of Andronicus came to light and disturbed Giorgi's peace of mind. Knowing the character of Andronicus, one might even suppose that, despite the presence of Theodora, he got into some new trouble with Georgian beauties.<sup>3</sup> But all these guesses are not supported by any evidence.

#### § 4. *The Shirvān-shāh Akhsatān and Khāqānī*

The *Aysartan* of the Georgian Chronicle is known in Muslim sources and in his own inscription (of 583/1187) as Akhsatān b. Minūchihir. The dates of his reign are uncertain (began to rule *circa* 544/1149, died *circa* 583/1187,

<sup>1</sup> Another ode, dated six years before the expected conjunction of planets (i.e. in 576/1180–1), is dedicated to the atabek of Azarbayjan Qizil-Arslan. In Chaykin's opinion, after his return from the second pilgrimage Khāqānī settled down in Tabriz and never revisited his birthplace Shirvan, but this view is contradicted by the facts quoted in Badī' al-Zamān, ii, 335.

<sup>2</sup> I see that Chaykin proposed to study the dating of the *qaṣīda* dedicated to Andronicus in fasc. ii of *Khaqani, Nizami and Rustaveli*, but I do not know whether he has carried out this intention.

<sup>3</sup> The Georgian princes Andronikashvili claim descent from Andronicus. I do not know whether they consider themselves as issued of the first marriage of Andronicus (*vide supra*, p. 557) or of some other connection.

or rather some time before 600/1203).<sup>1</sup> The name Akhsatān does not occur in any other part of the Muslim world, and it is surely only an abbreviation of the foreign Aghsartan, which in its complete form sounded inauspicious (*saratān* meaning in Arabic “a scorpion, a cancer”). The origin of the strange name should be sought in the Georgian background of the prince’s mother Thamar.<sup>2</sup> In fact the name *Aysartan* was known among the rulers of Kakhetia (north-eastern Georgia) in the eleventh to twelfth century.<sup>3</sup> Even in Georgian the name is foreign and I think it is connected with the North Caucasian epics. The name *Ξαρθαυος* appears already in the Græco-Iranian inscriptions of the north coast of the Black Sea. In Ossetic *āχsar* or *āχsart* means “might”. According to the stories devoted to the local heroes (Nart), there were two clans in the Great Nartia: *Aχsar* and *Aχsartak*.<sup>4</sup> The connections of Georgia with the Northern Caucasus were manifold. The second husband of Queen Thamar (1184–1212) was an Osset. Osset nurses must have been as prized in Georgian houses as they were in far-off Muscovy (ясыня). One might even assume that it was through nurseries that North Caucasian mythology influenced both Georgian onomastics and Russian folklore.<sup>5</sup>

Akhsatān was the chief patron of Khāqānī, who dedicated twenty-three of his odes to him, and several others to his wife ‘Iṣmat al-Dīn. In a poem addressed to Minūchihr (T. 603) Khāqānī refers to his twenty years’ faithful service,<sup>6</sup> and complains of his patron’s son (*khalaf*), who “tore the clothes of my glory so that it is past hope to patch them up”. Minūchihr had four sons; but should Akhsatān have been the offender, this fact might account for some later complications. In the long ode inscribed to the ruler of Darband Sayf al-Dīn Muẓaffar (L. 343, T. 187), the poet says:—

*Pār-am ba-Makka dīdī āsūda-dīl chu Ka’ba . . . .*

*Imsāl bīn ki raftam zī Makka-yi makārim*

“Last year thou sawest me with reposed heart at Mekka . . . .

“This year see that I have gone to the Mekka of largesse.”

As the raid carried out by the Darband army on Shirvan took place under the successor of Sayf al-Dīn, and as Khāqānī visited Mekka for the second time after this expedition, it is clear that the ode was composed one year after the first pilgrimage, i.e. in 552/1157. In the ode he requests his patron to remember “what endless darkness I saw in the dungeon of the evil

<sup>1</sup> See a detailed analysis of the very shaky chronology of the Shirvān-shāhs in Hādī Ḥasan, *Falākī-i Shirvānī*, 1929, pp. 12 and 32. The author has carefully studied the Russian literature on the subject.

<sup>2</sup> After the death of her husband, Minūchihr, she retired to a convent in Georgia.

<sup>3</sup> Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch*, p. 12.

<sup>4</sup> V. Miller, *Grundriss d. Iran. Philol.*, “Die Sprache d. Osseten,” p. 6; V. Miller-Freiman, *Osetinskiy slovar*, i, 242; G. A. Dzagurov, *Pamiatniki narod. tvorch. Osetin*, fasc. ii, Vladikavkaz, 1927, p. 3 (I was able to consult the latter through the kindness of H. W. Bailey).

<sup>5</sup> Minorsky, “L’épopée persane et la littérature populaire russe,” in *Hazāra-yi Firdausī*, Tehran, 1944, 48–57.

<sup>6</sup> If Khāqānī was born *circa* A.D. 1120, his “service” might have begun only about 1140. This would indicate that towards 555/1160 Minūchihr was still ruling.

of Shirvan (*dar chāh-i sharr-i Shirvān*)” and to draw to him a golden rope to bring him out from the jail. The verse points to the early beginning of Khāqānī’s misfortunes. Two of the jail-poems are dedicated to Andronicus; and at the time of Andronicus’s visit to Shirvan (i.e. after A.D. 1170) Khāqānī was in jail. According to Daulat-shāh the cause of this misfortune was Khāqānī’s flight from his master’s court to Baylaqān.<sup>1</sup> He was caught by the king’s henchmen and spent seven months in jail in Shābarān. One would be inclined to believe this circumstantial report were there not some difficulty about Shābarān, which, as we know, was reconquered by Akhsatān only with the help of his Christian allies. The ode bears no trace of the reconquest of Shābarān, an event which loomed large in the local life. It is more probable that Khāqānī was detained in Shamākhī, or in Baku, whither according to Khanīkov the residence was temporarily transferred.<sup>2</sup>

Five of Khāqānī’s poems<sup>3</sup> describe his sufferings in jail, and definitely such punishment struck him more than once, but the two *habsiya* dedicated to Andronicus seem to refer to the same term of imprisonment, despite their difference of tone.

The celebrated poem which forms the subject of the present article is remarkable for its sarcastic note. Under cover of the obeisance paid to the Christian ruler, Khāqānī writes with his tongue in his cheek. Purely in theory he explores the possibilities of a career as a Christian monk, to proclaim at the end his fidelity to Islām, in which he was born. The various episodes of his imaginary rise to high distinction in the Byzantine hierarchy are undisguised gibes at Christian superstitions (vv. 56, 58). One feels that in addressing Andronicus the poet wants to attract the attention of his own master the Shirvān-shāh. He carefully enumerates the rival Islamic potentates whose help he does *not* accept (vv. 24–5), and gives rein to his fantasy only supposing that “Muslims refuse justice to him” (v. 27). While he compares himself to Bīzhan thrown into a dungeon, he complains of the indifference of Kay-Khusrau (v. 11) enthroned high above. No one would be mistaken about the bearer of this Iranian title suddenly emerging from amidst references to Jesus, Mary, and the Antichrist.

The poem could have been dedicated to Andronicus on the assumption

<sup>1</sup> South of the present-day Shusha; see Minorsky, *Mūkān in E.I.* (Supplement).

<sup>2</sup> Khanīkov, *Mél. As.*, iii, 117; Pakhomov, *Kratkiy kurs istorii Azerbayjana*, Baku, 1923, p. 16. Cf. Hādī Ḥasan’s criticism, *Falakī*, p. 35. In any case the rise of Baku results from Khāqānī’s ode dedicated to Akhsatān (T. 34): “owing to his blessings Baku resembles nowadays the Bistām of Khāvarān (Khorasan ?); owing to his existence Baku collects tribute from Khazrān, Rayy, and Zirih-garān.” The latter is the famous Kubachi in Daghestan; Khazrān = “the Khazars”, or perhaps the canton now called Khazrī (north of Baku). “Rayy” is a puzzle, unless Khāqānī means that Akhsatān established rights on some dependency of the Seljuks of Rayy (?). At the period in question, Shirvan leant upon Georgia, whereas Darband sought help from the Seljuks.

<sup>3</sup> The poems beginning: *falak kazh-rawtar-ast az khaft-i tarsā* (T. 19); *rāhat az rāh-i dīl chanān bar-khāst* (T. 17); *har šubh pāy-i šabr ba-dāman dar-āvaram* (T. 244); *rūzam furū shud az gham ham gham-khurī nadāram* (T. 272); *šubh-dam chūn kalla bandad āh-i dūd-āsā-yi man* (T. 327).

that the noble guest would be duped by the sound of the familiar names and terms, but be unable to grasp the subtleties of Persian rhetoric. It is a matter of course that Andronicus knew no Persian, although he may have had some smattering of Turkish. The relations between the Byzantines and the Seljuks of Konia were multifarious. At one time the father of Andronicus, Isaac Comnenus, sought refuge in Konia. His eldest son John, Andronicus's own brother (born *circa* 1154), fled to the Seljuk capital, became a Muslim, and married the daughter of Sultan Mas'ūd Qilij Arslan, who bore him a son called Sulaymān-shāh.<sup>1</sup> Andronicus himself in his youth was captured by the Turks as he was travelling home across Asia Minor after the death of his father.<sup>2</sup>

The second *ḥabsiya* has not been noticed until now, for only in the Tehran edition (T. 272–6) is it endorsed as dedicated to '*Aẓīm al-Rūm, Mukhlis al-Masīḥ 'Izz al-Dawla* (i.e. Andronicus). In the Lucknow edition, i, 535, it is described as addressed to "the throne of Maḥmūd-shāh". This is an entirely arbitrary attribution based on the metaphor (v. 18): "(a king) high-minded like Maḥmūd (of Ghazna) has come and I am his slave Ayāz, for I can find no better customer of knowledge from all around his kingdom." Moreover, instead of the "sincere friend of the Messiah (*Mukhlis al-Masīḥ*)" to whom the poet appeals in the new edition (v. 10), the Lucknow text has "the hero of Iran (*pahlavān-i Īrān*)".

The longish ode contains 72 verses divided into two *matla'* (of 10 and 62 verses respectively). In the second *matla'* very many verses do not scan, and as the result of these metric disturbances the text does not make good sense. Some confusion in the ode might suggest at first sight that two odes have been amalgamated by a negligent scribe; but such an explanation is unlikely in view of the absence of repetitions in the difficult rhyme running throughout the poem (*-rī nadāram*). One might also ask whether the ode has not been re-dedicated; but the objection to this surmise would be that the ode bears definite traces of being intended for a Christian, and even in the Lucknow text nothing has been done to obscure this characteristic. Therefore the most likely explanation of some inconsistencies in the ode would be that from the beginning the ode had in view two patrons.<sup>3</sup>

If then from the obviously "Christian" part of the ode (T. verses 10, 23–38, 58, 67, 72) we try to build a bridge to some other patron connected with Andronicus, we have to consider the titles of the patron described (vv. 45–6) as *marzubān-i kishvar Bahrāmiyān ba-ḥasbat* and *pahlavān-i mulkat Dāvūdiyān ba-gouhar*. The title *marzubān* points to some prince on the periphery of the Islamic dominions. The origin of the patron going up to Bahrām and Dāvūd is the chief difficulty. { The obvious candidate for the descent from David (*Dāvūd*) would be the king of Georgia, for the Bagratid dynasty<sup>4</sup> boasted

<sup>1</sup> Nicetas, in Manuel, i, § 2, (72), ed. Migne, p. 383. Cf. Du Cange, *Historia Byzantina*, i, 189.

<sup>2</sup> Nicetas, in Manuel, i, 1 (68), ed. Migne, 379.

<sup>3</sup> T. 127: in the ode dedicated to Sayf al-Din, commander of Shamākhī, his lord Akhsatān receives his share of eulogy.

<sup>4</sup> The commentator in L., 273 (bottom), took the "Baqratiyān" for descendants of Hippocrates!

of having issued from the Jewish prophet. In the closely following verse 47 Khāqānī says: "thanks to thy magnanimity (*himmat*) I see Shirvān like unto Baghdād and Egypt; therefore I do not consider the Nile and the Tigris even as dried-up river-beds (*farghar*) in comparison with (the largesse flowing from) thy hand." The hint at Shirvān might be taken for a reference to Giorgi III's help in liberating Akhsatān's kingdom. One might then consider the ode as addressed jointly <sup>1</sup> to Andronicus and Giorgi, before the Byzantine prince left Georgia. The point which remains unsolved is the connection of the patron with Bahrām (*Bahrāmīyān ba-ḥasbat*), unless we take *ḥasbat* for "personal nobility", and interpret the eulogy as "Bahrāmian in thy noble character".

Another not entirely satisfactory interpretation of the address would be to connect it with the Mengüjekid prince to whose court Andronicus seems to have migrated after Georgia (*vide supra*, p. 556). His name was Fakhr al-Din *Bahrām-shāh*, and both his father and his son were called 'Alā al-Din *Dāvūd*. These rather uncommon names being attested in a family may have tempted some unscrupulous genealogist (*nassāba*) to imagine a noble pedigree for the descendants of the Turcoman Mengüjek.<sup>2</sup> In this connection one should discuss another curious point. Some MSS. in the heading of the ode describe the patron as *Tahamtan Pahlavān-i Īrān*. This is surely a combination based on vv. 10 and 16. As already mentioned, *Pahlavān-i Īrān* is the variant of the Lucknow edition for *Mukhlīṣ al-Masīhā*. This may be a pure interpolation of the scribe.<sup>3</sup> *Tahamtan* ("strong-bodied") has been taken from the verse running as follows: "Shirvan is a mirage of bewilderment (*sarāb-i vahshat*), and like the thirsty Bizhan I have no drinking-place except at Tahamtan's court." Here *Tahamtan*, the usual epithet of Rustam, is a counterpart of Bizhan, who was freed by that famous hero.<sup>4</sup> } [See *Addendum*, p. 578.]

After this long digression we come to the contents of the "Christian ode No. 2". Possibly the effect of the first ode was lost on the "Kay-Khusrau", and the new ode is unreservedly deferential towards his patron. Khāqānī is crestfallen: "I was once a peacock in the pleasaunces of the kings; to-day

<sup>1</sup> The ode could hardly have been addressed to Giorgi alone, in view of the numerous references to Byzantium (*Rūm*), Cæsar (*qaysar*), etc.

<sup>2</sup> In fact, Mengüjek may have been called Dāvūdī if he was a slave of Chaghri-bek Dāvūd, whose son Alp Arslan gave to him the fief of Erzinjan.

<sup>3</sup> This title cannot be equivalent to the *Pahlavān-i jahān*, which Khāqānī correctly gives to Muḥammad b. Ildiguz, atabak of Azarbayjan (T. 575).

<sup>4</sup> {It would be too far-fetched to imagine on the part of the poet a further reference to the patron's name. *Tahamtan* as a personal name is of course known in Ghazna, Ormuz, Fars, and Luristan. Curiously enough, a couple of centuries after Bahrām-shāh, the ruler of Erzinjan was called Ṭahar-tan: see *Zafar-nāma*, ii, 237 (under 802/1399). Thomas of Metzoph, in *Nève, Exposé des guerres de Tamerlan*, Brussels, 1860, p. 59, calls him *T'ak'rat'an*. In the *Razm-u-bazm*, ed. Köprülü, 243 (circa 783/1381) the prince appears under the arabicized name of *Muṭahhar-tan*, but I feel strongly that Ṭahar-tan is likely to be a vulgar form of *Tahamtan*. Nothing is known about the connection of this amir with the Mengüjekids; but even the appearance of such a name in Erzinjan might be an indirect but curious hint in favour of our second surmise, which otherwise is less satisfactory than the hypothesis about King Giorgi. }

my (ugly) feet remain but my plumage is gone" (v. 69). This time again the phantoms of Jesus and Mary, "Nestorius, Jacob, and Malkā," the Patriarch and the Catholicos, are evoked, but without any pricks and sneers.<sup>1</sup> With a delicate hint at the miracle of the child-Jesus, the poet says: "I am thy bird, order it to fly, for my crop (*zaghār*) is made but for thy lawful grain" (v. 67). This time no travesty about the wish to visit Constantinople, but only "the heart's desire for 'Irāq, Mekka, and the *ḥajj*" (v. 68). And to conclude: "Thou art a friend, so let God and the Messiah befriend thee, for I have no better protection than thy eye of contentment" (v. 72).

If the long ode No. 1 was composed soon after Andronicus stepped on to the soil of Shirvan, and before the opening of the military operations, the second ode seems to echo the success of the expedition for the reconquest of Shābarān recorded in the Georgian Chronicle. If not actually in jail, the poet was apparently still detained in Shirvan: "I am the detainee of *thy* citadel, not the prisoner of Shirvan" (v. 79). The situation seems to be just the reverse of the statement!

In conclusion we should mention a third poem, consisting of eleven verses, which in the Lucknow edition (L. 733) is printed without the name of the *mamdūh*, and appears in the new edition (T. 782) under the heading: "Praise to 'Izz al-Daula." The ode is colourless and devoid of any references to Christian religion. The patron must be a person of consequence: "Should his pearl-scattering hand grip his shining sword, it will bring the Eagle of the Heaven (Aquila) as a guest to the banquet of the Sword." The patron is definitely not in Shirvan: "Let him instruct the wind to bring from his court (*dargah*) to Shirvan a collyrium for the eyes of Khāqānī (i.e. a present)." The poet informs the patron that in a short time "the servant of his court" will bring him a crown from Baghdad and an allowance (*sar bahr*?) from Isfahan,<sup>2</sup> adding, however, that by doing so a crown will be placed on the head of the (Seljuk) Sultan himself.

All one can gather from the poem is that Khāqānī is on the eve of a journey to 'Irāq, and that he is hoping for a subvention, for which he, on his part, is ready to put in a word at high places. On the whole, nothing in the text of the ode authenticates its dedication to 'Izz al-Daula, especially if by the latter Andronicus is meant. The poem seems to be contemporary with the valedictory ode to Akhsatān analysed by Chaykin (*vide supra*, p. 559), and may reflect the resigned mood of the poet on the morrow of his release from prison.

#### § 5. *The "Christian" Ode*

For the explanation of this long ode (L. 271-8; T. 19-25) I was only able in the present circumstances to draw upon a manuscript commentary

<sup>1</sup> Except for one irrepressibly Khāqānīan verse: "I shall seek your contentment, even though I seek no fortune. I possess a Messiah, although I have not the ass's hoof," with reference to a relic (the hoof of Jesus's ass) exploited by an unscrupulous monk. *Vide infra* our commentary on v. 58.

<sup>2</sup> *Isfahān* in the text is dubious, but it is suitable as indicating the residence of the Seljuk Sultan.



(Camb. Univ. Library, No. 250, fol. 34b-37b),<sup>1</sup> and the commentary in the Lucknow edition, both inadequate: the former is too brief and the latter diffuse and often misleading. Khanikov had at his disposal some Persian commentary (according to Salemann, Ghanā'ī), but he used it critically. Much more than to the written tradition I owe to the advice of my learned friends Professor Muhammad Qazvini (in Paris, 1935) and H.E. S. H. Taqizadeh, two worthy representatives of true Persian scholarship.

A short survey of the contents of the ode will be useful for following its plan.

The poet complains of the anti-Christian treatment meted out to him by fate (vv. 1-5). He protests against his sufferings in jail (vv. 6-9). Neither Christ nor the stars come to his rescue (vv. 10-13). He is guiltless (vv. 14-21), and seeks no help from other kings (vv. 22-6). If Muslims are unjust to him, shall he, God forbid, desert Islām? (v. 27). This, after his punctual observance of the prescribed practices (vv. 28-32)? But since his enemies are threatening him, shall he escape from them to Christian lands and adopt Christian rites in the hope of rising high in the Christian hierarchy (vv. 33-59), and of explaining the mysteries of the Christian creed (vv. 60-4)? He might even disclose to the Cæsar the arcana of Zoroastrianism, mixed with some other exotic teachings (vv. 65-70). But enough of such Satanic thoughts (vv. 71-4). No need to travel far when the Byzantine prince is here (vv. 75-6). By all the sacred things of Christianity (vv. 77-86) and by the astrological omens (vv. 87-8), the poet beseeches the noble guest to obtain for him his master's permission to visit Jerusalem (v. 89), and winds up by praising the rosary of his own verses.

Almost every verse of the ode is intended to be a hint at some Christian dogma or practice, and the question arises as to the origin of Khāqānī's information. A detailed analysis will be given in the commentary, while here we shall indicate the main sources of his imagery:—

1. The *Qor'ān*, and especially the sūras bearing on Mary and the birth of Jesus (iii, 37-42; xix, 16-35, etc.), with the additional explanations found in the commentaries. As examples of such quotations and hints we may cite vv. 13, 14, 15, 20, 60-3.

2. The particular Muslim-Christian lore going back to the Christian apocrypha and legends, such as the story of the needle which hampered Jesus's ascent to heaven (vv. 3-5); that of Jesus dwelling in the Fourth Heaven next to the Sun (v. 12), etc.

3. Some points look as if they were based on the direct intercourse of Khāqānī with representatives of the Christian religion, and more especially Nestorians. Here belong the references to the attack of the enemies on Jesus (v. 32), the Syriac commentaries (v. 39), the term \*περικοπή (v. 39); Jesus's last words (v. 64), the betrayal of Judas (v. 72); the Syriac terms *shatikhā*, *dinh*, and the names of various fasts and holidays (vv. 80, 82); the con-

<sup>1</sup> The attribution of this MS. to Ghanā'ī in E. G. Browne's *Catalogue* is not certain, unless it is only a short extract from the original.

cordances of dates (v. 85), etc. It is very improbable that Khāqānī's mother, a Nestorian slave-girl converted to Islām,<sup>1</sup> could have contributed much to her son's knowledge of Christian arcana. It is safer to assume that this part of his information was derived not from direct intercourse with Christians but from some Islamic *maqālāt* describing the Christian religion. The most useful illustration of his allusions is found in Birūnī's *Chronology*, based (at least partly) on the report of a Muslim traveller to Constantinople (Abū'l-Ḥusayn al-Ahwāzī). The latter described the full ecclesiastic and administrative hierarchy of the Greeks. Khāqānī's mysterious *Tursīqos* must have been a misreading of some similar book.

4. The external rites and paraphernalia of the Christians may have been observed by the poet personally: the candelabrum, the horns blown by the monks, the details of the clothing of the divines and their practices of austerity. It is very likely that he visited Georgia. In an ode (T. 770) he tells the story of a man who lost one of his hairs in the Far West and thirty years later found it in the Far East, whither it had been brought by the Ocean. The poet says that in his case Georgia (*Abkhāz*) was the West and the court (of Shirvan) the sea, while his ailing body has thinned down to a hair. The burden runs thus: " (Were) Khāqānī and the Khāqān (on) the banks of the Kur (at) Tiflis, then the Kur (would) become the Oxus and Tiflis Samarqand." In another short epigram (T. 565) Khāqānī refers to the return of the " Shāh " from Abkhāz. He does not explain whether he himself was in the king's suite on that journey, but the nostalgic simile of the hair suggests that he had once been " in the West ". In a quatrain (T. 926) addressed to a beauty " living in Abkhaz " he uses a Georgian word:—

*Az 'ishq-i šalīb-i mū-yi Rūmī-rū'i*  
*Abkhāz-nishin gashtam-u Gurjī gū'i*  
*Az bas ki biguftam-ash: mū'ī, mū'ī*  
*Shud mū-yi zabānam va zabān har mū'ī*

" From love for the cross-wise hair of a Byzantine-faced (beauty)

" I became resident in Abkhāz, and speaking Georgian,

" So much I repeated: *moi, moi*

" That the pile of my tongue is gone, and each hair has become a (speaking) tongue."

*Moi* is a colloquial form of *modi* մոճո " come!", as explained by Yuri Marr, *Khāqānī, Nizami, Rustaveli*, i, 12. No doubt Khāqānī had many good

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the still obscure statements in the *Tuhfat*, p. 199: " of Nestorian and Mōbadian origin, of Islamic and godly nature. She was born in the country of Dhūghṭāb (?), the great \*Philippos was her ancestor. . . . She sat on the road of the temple (*miyāstū*), silently (listening) to sorcery (*hērūtī*). . . . She was brought from the Byzantine darkness; the slave-trader of righteousness (?) educated her." [The term *Mobadī* apparently refers too family of Christian priests. The name *Dhūghṭāb* (var. *Ūghṭāb*) sounds Armenian, many Armenian place-names ending in *tap'* (" flat "). The name might be restored as *Tūgh(a)tāb* and compared with *Tolatap'* (now *Teghtap*), a small valley to the east of Khinis. *Faylaqūs-i kabīr* may be some Christian worthy. In W. Wright's *A Short History of Syriac Literature*, 1894 (Russian ed., completed by P. Kokovtsov, 1902), I have failed to find anything relevant.] Dr. W. Henning suggests that the doubtful *miyāstū* should be read \**manāstīr* " or monastery ".

occasions to study the habits of the Georgians and their Orthodox clergy (vv. 1, 6, 7, 40–3, 86).

*Complaint of imprisonment and fetters, with a “transition” to praise the adherent of the creed of Jesus, the chief of Byzantium, the Qaysar ‘Izz al-Daula, and to move him to intercede and to obtain the release of the author.*

1. More crooked than the course of the Christian script is the course of Heaven,  
which holds me like a monk laden with chains.
2. Is God’s Spirit (i.e. Jesus) not in this world that the works of this enamelled  
cupola have become so Antichristian ?
3. My body is bent like Mary’s thread (*rishta*), my heart is lonely like the  
needle of Jesus.
4. I am shackled with ropes (*rishta*) here, as Jesus was pinned down there  
by a needle.
5. Why (was) the needle one-eyed like Antichrist to lurk in the pocket of  
Jesus ?
6. I am one whose days are clad in monks’ black garments ; therefore, nightly  
like a monk I raise my voice,
7. And with my morning horn-call I split the window cross (opening on to)  
the green roof (of the world).
8. From my sighs that make the sea boil, the bottom of the deep has become  
the desert where Jesus has to make his ablutions with sand.
9. The heavenly fathers (*ābā-yi ‘ulvī*) are inclement to me ; therefore, like  
Jesus, I have renounced my fathers.
10. What use to me that Luminary of Knowledge, since I am obscure, and it  
consists of shining particles ?
11. If it is the Kay-Khusrau of the portico of light, why has Bizhan fallen into  
the well of (the long night of) the Nativity ?
12. What comfort to the “ bird of Jesus ” (the bat) from Jesus, the neighbour of  
the Virgin Sun ?
13. Why does not Jesus heal his own bird, he who can give sight to a blind  
man ?
14. The progeny of the maiden of my nature (i.e. my poetry) is like Jesus  
speaking for the purity of His mother.
15. (My) words bear witness to my immaculate nature, just as the palm-tree  
to Mary’s miracle.
16. The five hundred years from the Prophet’s flight have not brought forward  
anyone like me ; behold, my proof is not false !
17. From this my heart, which is (pricked all over) like a honeycomb, I shall  
bring up a clamour of the bees in their bloody fight.
18. Let the (wick of my) oily tongue burn from the fire of my sighs like the  
heart of the Christian candelabrum.
19. Like a candelabrum my enemies suspend me and let me burn after they  
have attached me with three chains.

20. From blame I (sit) with downcast head like Mary, but my tears are as pure as the breath of Jesus.
21. Like the *alifs* standing (upright) in the words “ we obey ” (اطعنا) I turn my face and my back on blame (طعن).
22. No help to me from my friends' equity, nor dare I complain of it.
23. Against the evil of the time *In Deo, in Deo (resignatio mea)*; *abscessio, abscessio* from those aloof from God.
24. I want no help from the Abbasids, nor do I wish to be befriended by the Seljuks.
25. As this age refuses me justice, of what use to me are Arslan-Sultan and Boghra ?
26. As there is no Joseph to save me from famine, what difference to me between Benjamin and Judah ?
27. As Muslims refuse justice to me, shall I, God forbid, turn away from Islām ?
28. After acquiring my religion from the Seven Men, after the inspiration descended on me from the Seven Readers,
29. After reciting *al-Hamd* (I), *al-Rahmān* (IV), *al-Kahf* (XVIII), *Yā-Sīn* (XXXVI), *Tā-Sīn-Mīm* (XXVI), and *Tā-Hā* (XX),
30. After performing the prescribed timing of the pilgrimage, the circumambulation of the Ka'ba, the lapidation (of Satan), the running between the two hillocks, the reciting of *labbayk*, and (standing at) the place of prayers (*muṣallā*),
31. After so many “ forty-days retreats ” performed in the course of thirty years, shall I go to observe openly the “ fifty days ” ?
32. I have a handful of enemies acting like Jews ; like Jesus I fear their sudden attack.
33. What if I fled from the Jewish oppression to the gate of the Monastery of Sukūbā ?
34. What if I seek the threshold of Infidelity, and cease to seek the path of the religion of the Supreme Leader (*Ṣadr*) ?
35. Here is the Gate of the Abkhazians ajar, there is the Byzantine sanctuary in readiness.
36. Shall I deflect my course from God's house, the Qibla, towards Jerusalem (*Bayt al-Maqdis*) and the Niche of Solomon's temple (*mīhrāb-i Aqṣā*) ?
37. After fifty years of my Islām the cross-like fetters on my feet do not become me.
38. Shall I, from this dispensation, go to kiss the church-bell, shall I from this hostility gird up my loins with a *zonnār* (girdle) ?
39. Shall I prepare a Syriac commentary on the Gospel, explore the mysteries of Hebrew script ?
40. (Imagine) myself at (?) Nājurmakī and the monastery of Mukhrān, the gate of the Bagratids being my place of refuge,

41. (Imagine) me in the corner of a grotto as a horn-blower (monk) clad in a cassock (*chokhā*).
42. Amidst hard (*khārā*) stones, like the Patriarch, I shall don a rug (*palās*), instead of the waved-silk (*khārā*) vest (*šudra*).
43. As an ex-voto I shall suspend a cross round my neck, like that "wood of the True Cross" which they hang on the breast of a child.
44. Should they not show me esteem in the Abkhazian (country), I shall start thence on the way to Byzantium.
45. I shall open a school in the temple of Byzantium (*Rūm*) and shall refresh (*mutarrā*) the canons (*āyīn*) of the Metropolitan (*matrān*).
46. Like the Son of the Water-carrier, I shall change the *ridā* and the *ṭaylasān* for a *zonnār* and a *burnus* (cassock ?).
47. Before the Great Ṭursiqos I shall discourse on the Father and Son and the Holy Ghost.
48. Forsooth, in one word I shall bring forth the three hypostases out of the well of doubt into the open space of certainty.
49. The bishop will prefer my exegesis to that of Jacob, Nestorius, and Malkā.
50. I shall reveal the arcana of Divinity from (the conditions of) peerlessness ; I shall show the rise of Humanity from Matter.
51. You will see clerics (*kashīsh*) attracted by, and eagerly embracing the doctrines of a learned priest (*qasīs*) like myself.
52. They will call me a second Ptolemy, nay, recognize me as the Great Philippus (Faylaqūs).
53. I shall send an epistle on the Trinity (*thālīth (al-)thalātha*) to the Tuesday (*thalāthā*) Market in Baghdad.
54. The living and the dead will carry (the products) of the beak of my pen to Constantinople as the perfume and scent of embalmment.
55. I shall get hold of the staff of Moses and shape it into a cross (*chalīpā*).
56. With the droppings of the ass of Jesus I shall stop the hæmorrhage of the ailing Catholicos ;
57. I shall send to the khāns of Bokhara and Samarqand crowns made of its bridle.
58. With the tears of my eyes and my brow, I shall set the hoofs of the ass in gold and rubies rufescent.
59. By way of proofs, I shall dictate a compendium of true commentary, upon the three hypostases and the three \*περικοπαί (\**farquf*) of the Gospels :
60. What was that breath of the Spirit, that ablution and fasting, when Mary was naked with only the Spirit present,
61. That, while the casket of her womb was still under seal, the heart-kindling jewel came into being ?
62. What was that discourse Jesus made at his birth, what was that fasting at the time when Mary patiently bore the insults ?
63. How Jesus made birds of clay, how he revived the body of Lazarus ?

64. What meaning did Jesus put into his words on the gibbet: "I wish to go to my Father above" ?
65. And should the Cæsar ponder over the arcana of Zoroaster, I shall enliven (*zinda*) the rites of the Zand and the Avesta.
66. I shall explain what is Zand and what is the Fire from which Pāzand and Zand have been surnamed ;
67. What burning coal remained of the fire into which the Beloved of God (Abraham) once fell in bewilderment (*darvā*).
68. I shall weigh the arcana of the mobad on a scale (*qustās*) the grain-weight of which will be Qustā son of Lūqā :
69. Why does the fly wear a turban (and) an apron and why does the locust put on breeches of brocade ?
70. I shall dedicate to the Cæsar works better than the Chinese *Artang* or Tangalūshā.
71. But enough, o Khāqānī, of evil melancholy, for melancholy is suggested by Satan.
72. How can a bad companion (Judas) plot against Jesus ; how can a bad vazīr teach Dārā ?
73. Utter no such heresy, but renew the faith. Say : "I seek pardon for these cravings."
74. Say and witness that God is unique, exalted above my divagations.
75. What need to travel in dejection all the way down to Byzantium, when 'Izz al-Daula, chief of Byzantium, is here,
76. The right hand of Jesus, the glory of the Apostles, Mary's trustee, the refuge of the Christians ?
77. O thou, endowed with the Messiah's qualities, o scion of the Cæsars, verily I beseech thee,
78. By the Holy Ghost, the breath of the Spirit (Gabriel) and Mary, by the Gospel, the Apostles and the Messiah,
79. By the lawful cradle and virginal pregnancy ; by the hand and the sleeve through which the breath passed,
80. By Jerusalem, by the "Furthest Mosque" and the Rock, by the eucharist of the disciples and apostle(s) (*shalīkhā*),
81. By the bell, the zonnār, and the candelabrum, by John the Baptist (*Yahyā*), by the deacon and Baḥīrā ;
82. By Pentecost, by Epiphany (*dīnḥ*), by the night of the breaking of the fast (Easter Eve), by the Feast of the Temple, by the fasting of the Virgins;
83. By Mary's purity in her wedlock with Joseph, by the exemption of Jesus from the link of the foetal clot (*'īshā*).
84. By the root, branches, and foliage of the tree whose fruit came from the Exalted Spirit,
85. By the month of Tīr, which (in fact) occurred in Naysān, by the old palm-tree which then became rejuvenated,

86. By the clamour and wailing of the horn-blower (monk) in the monastery, by the irons on the limbs of the bishop,
87. By the *tathlīth* (triangular position) of the constellations (*burūj*), the moon and the stars, by the *tarbī'* and *tasdīs* of Tuesday (?),
88. By the *tathlīth* which constitutes the good omen for the Heaven, by the *tarbī'* (quadrangular position) of the cross of (my) air-hole,
89. (By all these I beseech you), ask the king of the world to grant me permission to visit Jerusalem.
90. For, as long as the Equator and the Axis appear as the cross of heaven,
91. It beseems the monk in the monastery of Heraclius to use these brilliant verses as his (pearl) beads.

### § 6. Commentary

1. The reference is to Greek script running from left to right.
2. *Rūh-Allāh* is the usual title of Jesus, to be distinguished from the Rūh sent by God to Mary, v. 66. *Dayr* originally means "a monastery".
3. Mary is said to have been a deft seamstress (Kh.). It has yet to be seen whether the French term "fil de la Vierge" describing autumnal spider-webs flying in the air is of Oriental origin.
4. Jesus was admitted to the fourth heaven on condition of not bringing with him anything sharp, but his ascent was impeded by a needle, which he overlooked in his pocket.
5. *Dajjāl* is said to be one-eyed; see *E.I.*
6. *Libās-i rāhibān-pūshīda-rūz* is one compound, "the one whose days, etc."
7. Cf. v. 83: *bād-parvā*. The poet seems to refer to the crosswise framing of the sky-light of his cell.
8. *Tayammum* (see *E.I.*) is the ablution which a Muslim travelling in a desert substitutes for the true *wuḍū'*.
9. *Ābā-yi 'ulvī* "constellations".
10. Judging by the following verses *akhtar-i dānish* is the Sun.
11. Reading with some MSS. *Kay-Khusrav-i wān-i nūr* instead of *Īrān-u Tūr* of Kh. and L. *Yaldā* is the symbol of a long and dark night. Sa'dī compares with it the stature of a tall negro. Some such simile explains the indecent use of this loan-word in Russian, Dal, *Slovar*, I, 1290. Bīrūnī, *Chronology*, 292, says that the Messiah was born on the 25 Kānūn I (December) on a "Thursday night" (meaning, on the night preceding Thursday).
12. The "virgin" Sun probably in view of *al-shams* being feminine in Arabic.
15. *Qor'ān*, xix, 23, 24: The birth-pangs drove Mary to the trunk of the palm-tree, and she said: "would that I had died before this." . . . Then he (the child) called to her from beneath her: "Grieve not; the Lord placed beneath thee a streamlet; shake down the trunk of the palm-tree, and it will let fall upon thee juicy (fruit)." Cf. Pseudo-Matthæi Evang., xx, in Tischendorff, *Evang. Apocrypha*, p. 87): Tunc infantulus Iesus laeto vultu in sinu matris suae residens ait ad palmam: Flectere arbor et de fructibus tuis refice matrem meam. Et confestim ad hanc vocem inclinavit palma cacumen suum usque ad plantas Mariae, etc. Another reference to the story is found in v. 85.

16. Cf. the praise of Isfahān, T. 362: *Pānsad-i hijrat chu man nazād yagāna*. Other examples of Khāqānī's self-glorification (*fakhr*) in T., p. 195:—

*Dānam-ki sāya-yi haqq dānad ki mī-na-dārad  
Dar āftāb-gardish giti chu man sukhanvar*

and the ode, p. 18, beginning

*Nist iqlīm-i sukhan-rā bihtar-az man pādshā, etc.*

Our v. 16 confirms the fact that the expression *pānsad-i Hijra* (T. 362) has only an approximate meaning and does not indicate that Khāqānī was born in the year 500/1106–7 (as wrongly assumed by Kh., 145). In fact, if the visit of Andronicus to Shirvan took place *circa* 1173–4 (i.e. A.H. 569), and the poet (as he suggests in v. 37) was at that time fifty years old, he must have been born *circa* 519/1125. On different grounds Chaykin is prepared to lower Khāqānī's birth-date still further to 528/1133–4, but I maintain my reasoning.

17. *Khūn-ālūd* literally "covered with gore", or rather "fighting a bloody fight".

20. *Qor'ān*, iv, 155: the Jews invented a calumny against Mary.

21. One of the most imaginative similes in Khāqānī.

25. Arslan-Sultan must be the Sultan of 'Irāq Arslan II b. Tughril (556–573/1161–1177), to whom Khāqānī rather inconsequentially dedicated an ode (T. 557). "Boghra" apparently is used as a typical name of the so-called Qara-khanid khans of Central Asia, of whom Khāqānī speaks disparagingly, v. 57.

26. Jacob's youngest and fourth sons, *Gen.*, xxxv, 23. Possibly derived from some commentary on the *Qor'ān*.

28–30. Note the numbers "seven", as opposed to the Christian "threes". References to the suras and the rites in Kh. Cf. *E.I.*: *Hadjdj*, *Muṣallā*, etc.

31. Possibly Lent *plus* the Easter week, or the Pentecost, called in Arabic *khamsīn*, v. 82. As v. 37 suggests that the poet is fifty years old, his pious retreats must have begun at the age of 20.

33. *Dayr-i Sukūbā* is not among the numerous monasteries mentioned in Yāqūt. *Sukūbā* is perhaps meant to represent the title "bishop".

34. *Ṣadr-i vālā*, the Prophet?

35. *Abkhāz* does not apply here to the original Black Sea people of this name (ancient *Ἀβασγοί*), but to the Georgians, who at that time were ruled by the Western (so-called "Abkhaz") branch of the Bagratid (v. 40) dynasty; cf. the terminology of Mas'ūdī in *Murūj*, ii, 69, 74.

36. *Aqṣā*, i.e. al-Masjid al-Aqṣā, the mosque built on the site of the Temple of Jerusalem, mentioned in the *Qor'ān*, xvii, 1, as the place visited by the Prophet in the course of his "nocturnal journey" (*isrā'*).

38. *Nāqūs* is a wooden gong serving as a bell. *Zonnār*, Greek *ζωνάριον*, the distinctive belt of the Christians.

40. Mukhran (originally *Mukhnar* "oak-grove") is a district between the affluents of the Kur: Ksani and Aragvi. Z. D. Avalishvili suggested to me (12.7.1936) the identification of the "Mukhran monastery" with the famous monastery of Shio-Mghvime lying on the northern bank of the Kur, some 7 km. to the west of the ancient capital Mtskheta. *Mghvime* means "a cave", and inside the monastery there exists a grotto in which St. Shio lived; Prince Vakhush't's *Geography of Georgia*, Russ. translation by Janashvili, 1904, p. 69. This detail supports the image of v. 41.



41. The terms *chokhā* and *šudra* are well known, but their practical vestimentary meaning in the twelfth century is not clear; cf. v. 45: *ridā*, *burnus*.

*Man-u-Nājurmakī* means “(henceforth) I shall be inseparable from N.” (Vide *supra*, p. 566, and cf. *Anvār-i Suhaylī*: *man-u kunj-i vīrāna-yi pūr-zan*: “I shall never again quit the corner, etc.”) No explanation has yet been suggested of *Nājurmakī*. My first idea was to read \**Bā-jarmakī* and explain it as the name of some Syrian divine from the well-known diocese *Bā-jarmaq* (comprising Kerkuk, etc.). St. Shio, founder of the monastery, was one of the thirteen Syrian fathers who arrived in Georgia in the fifth or sixth century A.D., although he himself was from Antioch. Cf. his *Vita* in Peradze, *Die Anfänge d. Mönchtums in Georgien*, in *Zeit. f. Kirchengeschichte*, 1928, pp. 51–6. In this case, too, Z. D. Avalishvili’s suggestion appears to me now preferable: he connects *Nājurmakī* with *Nač’armag-evi*, the summer residence of the Bagratid kings in the twelfth century. It lay close to Gori (Stalin’s birth-place), and Vakhusht identified it with the present-day Karaleti. Khāqānī may use *Nājurmakī* as a name of origin (*nisba*), “the one connected with N.”, such as King Giorgi III himself; but *Nājurmakī* may be a mere simplification of *Nač’armag-evi*, in which case the poet wishes not to be separated from the pleasaunce of the Bagratids, which must have been well known at the court of Shirvan, vide *supra*, p. 566.

43. The reference is certainly to *fāvāniyā* “*pæonia officinalis*” on which see Bīrūnī, op. cit., p. 297. The Christians maintain that the cross-like lines which are seen in the cut of this plant “originated at the time when Christ was crucified”. Bīrūnī refutes this theory by referring to the pre-Christian Greek authorities quoted by Galen. He refers to the practice of attaching a piece of this wood to epileptics “as a symbol of the resurrection from the dead”. Abū Mansūr Muwaffaq in his *Pharmacopœa*, No. 126 (Germ. transl. by Akhundov, p. 104) confirms Khāqānī by saying that pieces of *pæonia* are hung on children suffering from convulsions.

45. *Haykal-i Rūm*, meaning perhaps St. Sophia.

46. The memory of the Son of the Water-carrier must have been comparatively fresh in the time of Khāqānī. Under the year 504/1110, Ibn al-Athīr, x, 345, reports that when the preacher Yūsuf b. Ayyūb al-Hamdānī came to Baghdad he was plied with questions by a certain Ibn al-Saqqā. The preacher felt an odour of heresy coming from his words and remarked that he might perhaps die outside the pale of Islām, “and it happened that after a short while Ibn al-Saqqā went to the Byzantine dominions and became Christian.” The same story is repeated under 535/1140 on the occasion of the death of Yūsuf b. Ayyūb, *ibid.*, xi, 53. *Ṭaylasān* is a kind of veil which like an Indian *pagari* covers the neck and the shoulders of a divine.

47. *Ṭursīqūs*. No such title appears in the list of Byzantine officials in Bīrūnī, *Chronology*, 290 (tr. 284), unless it has been misread from *stratēgos* (*isradhighūs*), the initial *alif* having been put on top of the *šād*.

48. Note some irony about the Trinity.

49. Here our poet’s learning has failed him signally. He wants to recall the founders of the three great divisions of Oriental Christianity: Jacobite, Nestorian, and Melkite, but he does not realize that *Melkites* means only “royal” and is not derived from the name of a founder. Bīrūnī, op. cit., 288: *al-malkā’iyya* are called thus “because the Byzantine king is of their persuasion”.

50. Arab. *hayūlā*, Greek ὕλη.

51. There is no difference between *kashīsh* (Per.) and *qasīs* (Arab.), but Khāqānī seems to put more weight into the Arabic form. Note the alliterations *kashīsh*, *kashīsh*, *kūshīsh*.

52. *Faylaqūs* is the well-known ancient misreading of Philippos (Arab. *q* for *f*)—like *Nītas* for *Pontos*. One would expect “the Great \*Philippos” to be some scholar ranking with Ptolemy, but no suitable bearer of the name appears in G. Sarton’s great *Introduction to the History of Science*, i, 1927. On the other hand, the Muslims were acquainted with the story of the Emperor M. Iulius Philippos (“the Arab”), whom Christian tradition readily considered as the first Christian emperor (A.D. 244–9), earlier than Constantine; cf. Hauck, *Realencycl. für protest. Theologie*, xv, 1904, pp. 331–4. According to Mas’ūdi, *Tanbīh*, 133<sub>5</sub>, *Filibbus* went over to Christianity “and left the creed of the Šābians”; cf. Abu’l-Faraj, *Mukhtaṣar al-duwal*, ed. Pocock, 1663, 127 (tr. 80) = Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, vi, 34. The reference to him by Khāqānī would appropriately convey the idea of the rise of a former non-Christian to the highest dignity. To this may be added that Cl. Ptolemy as well was sometimes taken by the Muslims for a member of the royal house of Egypt. Mas’ūdi, *Tanbīh*, 115, gives a warning against such confusion, and some misunderstanding of this kind may have served as a bridge from Ptolemy to Philip.<sup>1</sup>

53. *Thālīth al-thalātha*, “the third of the three,” is the Arabic for “Trinity”.

54. *Ḥanūt-u ghāhīya mūtā-va ahyā*, “the dead and the living fetch the scents and perfumes,” meaning that the scents are for the former and the perfumes for the latter. This figure of speech is called *tabyīn va-tafsīr*.

55. *Chalīpā* (Syr. *šlībā*). The verse may refer to the Christian belief recorded in Bīrūnī, p. 297: “the sign (*āyat*) of Moses was his staff, which formed a straight (*mustatīl* ?) line. Now when Jesus came he threw his staff upon it, and a cross was formed, and thus the law of Moses was completed by the advent of Jesus.”

56. *Ru’āf*, “bleeding from the nose.” *Jathīq*, usual form for *Catholicos*. On the ass, cf. v. 58.

57. The hint is apparently at the barbaric horsiness of the Turkish khāns, who never invited Khāqānī to compose odes in their honour.

58. Here the Christians are taken to task for what seems to be only a Muslim idea of them: the ass of Jesus<sup>2</sup> does not appear to play any role in Christian practices, but is constantly referred to in Persian prose and poetry, cf. *Rāhat al-ṣudūr*, p. 506. The simile can be illustrated by contemporary habits. When the caliph sent to the sultan of Rūm ‘Ala al-Dīn Kay-Qubād a mule shod in gold, the sultan kissed its hooves, see Yazījī-oghlu ‘Alī in Gordlevsky, *Gosudarstvo Seljukov*, p. 83.

59. *Q.rq.f* or *f.rq.f* are explained by Persian commentators as “a book of the Christians”; cf. Vullers, ii, 722. The Arabic meaning of *qarqaf* “cold water, wine, small bird” and *qurquf* “small bird” are out of the question. The late Professor D. S. Margoliouth in reply to my inquiry wrote to me on 18th June, 1936: “I would suggest that Khāqānī’s word is a corruption (rather like *Faylaqūs*) for the Greek word *περικοπή* used by patristic writers for ‘text of scripture’, e.g. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* III. iv, 38: ἐκ τῶν προφητικῶν περικοπῶν. Possibly the three texts which Khāqānī proposed

<sup>1</sup> See, however, above p. 566 where the poet says that his mother was descended from *Faylāqūs al-kabīr*.

<sup>2</sup> See Matthew, xxi, 1–7, etc.

to cite in proof of the doctrine of the Trinity were First Epistle of St. John, verses 6, 7, 8." The suggestion seems to be excellent.

60-4. The circumstances of the birth of Jesus seem all to be derived from the *Qor'ān* and its commentators; see the articles 'Isā (D. B. Macdonald) and *Maryam* (Wensinck) in *E.I.*

60. *Qor'ān*, xix, 17: "Then We sent to her our Spirit, who took for her the form of a human being, shapely." The commentaries add that when Mary heard the tidings she put on her cloak (*tarahat 'alayhā jilbābahā*); Gabriel took her by the sleeves and breathed into the slit of her shift (*akhadha bikummay-hā fa-nafakha fī jaybi dir'i-hā*), Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, xvi, 42. Khāqānī's 'ūr "naked" refers to another commentary, according to which Mary had removed her shift into which Gabriel blew; she became pregnant when she put it on; see Wensinck, *Maryam* in *E.I.* The sūra lxvi, 16, puts the story more crudely.

61. Possibly a development of *Qor'ān*, xix, 20-1.

62. *Qor'ān*, xix, 27, 31: after the birth of Jesus Mary made a vow to fast and not to utter a word for a whole day. When her parents asked her questions, she only pointed to the child, and Jesus said: "Lo, I am the servant of Allāh; he has bestowed on me the Book and has made me a Prophet." The Nestorians observed the "Fasting of our Lady Mary" (*ṣaum Mart Maryam*), which began on the Monday following the Nestorian Annunciation (v. 85), and ended on Christmas Day; cf. Bīrūnī, op. cit., 310.

63. On birds and reviving the dead, iii, 44; but Lazarus is not mentioned in the *Qor'ān*.

64. This allusion to St. John xvii, 16, 28, is not in the *Qor'ān*, which says, iv, 156, that Jesus was not crucified, "nay, Allāh raised him to himself."

65-9. There is nothing on the Zoroastrians in the *Qor'ān*, and Khāqānī lived far from the regions where Zoroastrians were still to be found. The Avesta consists of original texts in the ancient language; Zand is the Middle Persian commentary in Pahlavī characters; Pāzand is the super-commentary in which the Middle Persian is transcribed in the better (Avestan) script with vowels. In v. 66 one would expect "Zand and Avesta" (to form a parallel to v. 65). It is not clear how "Pāzand and Zand" could have been surnamed after "Zand and the Fire", but v. 67 seems to support "the Fire", for otherwise the abrupt reference to Abraham is still less comprehensible. The poet has in view *Qor'ān*, xxi, 69, where Abraham, for his disrespect to the idols, is about to be burnt, but God commands the fire to give "coolth and peace to Abraham". The "burning coal" might be flowers, to suit the popular Muslim interpretation.

68. Qostā b. Lūqā, the famous Christian mathematician of Ba'labakk, who lived in the second half of the ninth century A.D.; see *E.I.*

69. The relation of this folklore to Zoroastrians is obscure.

70. *Artang* is known to Muslims as the illustrated book of Mānī. Its name has been found in Manichæan writings: *Ardhang*. Dr. W. Henning (8th July, 1944) tells me that the book was "a picture of the whole world". In Coptic texts it is called εἰκὼν.

The Babylonian sage whom Muslim authors call *Tīnkalūs* (or *Tīnqarūs*) and *Tankalūšā* is identical with the Hellenistic scholar Teucros of Babylon, who lived in the beginning of our era. The compiler Rhetorius (sixth century A.D.) calls his work *περὶ τῶν δώδεκα ζωδίων τοῦ λόξου κύκλου παρὰ φιλοσόφου*

ἀγαρηνοῦ Τεύκρου τοῦ Βαβυλωνίου. Already in A.D. 1648 the identity of *Tankalūšā* with *Teucros* was rightly claimed by Cl. Salmasius (Saumaise). The curious mutilation of the name is now attributed to its transmission through Middle Persian, the sign *w* standing in Pahlavi script also for *n* and *r*, and *l* and *r* being expressed by one sign. See Nallino, *Tracce di opere greche giunte agli Arabi*, in *A volume . . . to E. G. Browne*, 1922, pp. 356–363, and A. Borissov in *Jour. As.*, April, 1935, pp. 300–5 (who overlooked Nallino's excellent article).

72. *Dārā* (whom the Iranian tradition distinguished from his father *Dārāb*) was killed by his two ministers Mihyār and Jānūsiyār; *Shāh-nāma*, ed. Mohl, v, 86–8 (Tehran, vi, 1800).

78–88. A long catalogue enumerating pell-mell (and not without some malice!) all that Khāqāni can imagine as sacred to the Christians.

78. *Rūh al-quḏs* (also in v. 45): this definite reference to the Holy Ghost is interesting, for often the Muslims confuse it with Rūḥ-Allāh (i.e. Jesus), and complete the Trinity by including Mary as the third hypostasis; see *Maryam* in *E.I.* On the other hand, *Rūḥ* alone refers to the messenger of the Annunciation (Gabriel). "The sleeve" represents that slit through which the breath (*bād* "wind") penetrated Mary: *Ba-dast-u-āstīn-i bād-majrā* seems better than *āstīn-u-bād-u-majrā*.

80. *Qor'ān*, xvii, 1: "Glory to Him who journeyed by night with His servant from the Sacred Mosque (Ka'ba) to the Furthest Mosque (*al-masjid al-aqṣā*) around which we have bestowed blessing, that We might show him some of Our signs." The "Furthest Mosque" is supposed to refer not to the present-day mosque but to the site of the ancient temple of Solomon; see F. Buhl, *al-Kuḏs* in *E.I.* *Al-ṣakhra* is the rock considered as the navel of the world, on which the Omayyad 'Abd al-Malik built the famous Dome; see J. Walker, *Kubbat al-ṣakhra* in *E.I.* Cf. also Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, 1890, pp. 83–151.

The Jesuit Father Belot explains *taqḏīs* as "consécration eucharistique". *Anṣār* "companions" apparently stands for "disciples". *Shatīkhā* in Syriac is "the apostle" (in Arab. *sillīh*); cf. Bīrūnī, *Chronology*, 308, *ṣaum al-sillīhīn*.

81. Baḥīrā (in Aramaic "elected"), or Sergius, was the Christian monk who foretold the prophetic mission of the child Muḥammad when the latter visited Syria; see Wensinck in *E.I.*

82. *Khamsīn* must be the Pentecost; cf. Bīrūnī, op. cit., 'īd *al-Banṭīqustī*. Instead of *dhibh* one must certainly read \**dinh* "Epiphany". *Laylat al-Fīṭr* can be only Easter Eve. Bīrūnī, 302, knows that the Christian Lent lasts forty-eight days, beginning on a Monday and ending (*fīṭr*) on (the eve of) a Sunday. 'īd *al-haykal*, the Feast of the Temple, on Sunday after Easter; see Bīrūnī, op. cit., 314. *Ṣaum al-adhārā*, beginning on Monday after Epiphany and lasting three days, was observed by the 'ibādī and the Christian Arabs, in commemoration of the maidens whose fasting enabled them to escape from the captivity of the king of Ḥīra; Bīrūnī, op. cit., 314. This legend may be remotely connected with the story of the king of Ḥīra, al-Mundhir, who abducted from Emessa 400 girls and offered them as a sacrifice to the goddess 'Uzza; see [Pseudo]-Zachariah Rhetor, viii, § 5 (Ahrens-Krüger, p. 157; N. Pigulevskaya, *Siriyskiye istochniki*, Moscow, 1941, p. 159).

83. The variant: *ba-dūriy 'Īsā az payvand-i ashya*, "by the aloofness of Jesus from attachment to (material) things," makes good sense, but the unusual combination of 'Īsā and 'īshā would be typically Khāqānian. 'Īshā is a very

rare word of Syriac (or rather hybrid Syriac) aspect. Like the Persian *Masīhā*, it is unknown to Arabic dictionaries. It cannot be directly derived from the Arabic root 'yṣ "to live", for in Syriac an *s* would correspond to š. As to the meaning, the *Burhān-i qāṭi* explains it as "a womb", which does not fit into our verse. The Lucknow commentary defines it as *chīzi-ki badān farzand dar raḥim-i 'awrat marjūūd shavad, chanān-ki manī-va-khūn*, i.e. the formative elements of the foetus, corresponding to the Qor'ānic (xcvi, 2) '*alaq* "clotted blood". Cf. Dante, *Purgatorio*, xxv, 37, expounding the views of Thomas Aquinas on conception. Such a meaning suits our text better, for Jesus was born in the natural way, only his conception being miraculous. However, according to Bīrūnī, op. cit., 307, the Nestorians held the view that "the Messiah differs from mankind . . . his sojourning in the womb of his mother is contrary to the ways of human nature. The Annunciation may have occurred at a time when the embryo was already settled in the womb; it may have also occurred earlier or later".

84. Reading: *mīva-sh*. The "tree" apparently refers to the house of David and *rūh-i mu'allā* to Gabriel as delegated by God.

85. *Prima facie* this combination of the Persian and Syrian months should indicate the date of Jesus's conception. My learned friend S. H. Taqizadeh, the greatest authority on Persian eras, informs me that 25 March (Annunciation) of the year in which Christ was born corresponded to 1 Naysān of the Jews and, at the same time, to 30 Tīr of the Persians. Bīrūnī, op. cit., 294, rightly quotes the Annunciation (*subbār*) under 25 Adhār (March): "Gabriel came to Mary announcing to her the Messiah. From this day until the day of His birth is a little more than 9 months and 5 days . . . Jesus, though He had no human father, and though supported by the Holy Ghost, was in His earthly life subject to the laws of nature." But further, 309-310, he adds that the Nestorians celebrate Subbār on the first Sunday of Kanūn i (December) or on the last Sunday of Tishrīn ii (November), whereas the Jacobites celebrate it on the 10th of the Jewish Naysān; "this day fell, in the year preceding the year of Christ's birth, on the 16th of the Syrian Adhār." On the other hand, the verse as it stands definitely connects the miracle of the palm-tree with *ān zamān*, i.e. with the time when Tīr and Naysān coincided. The miracle, already quoted in v. 15, happened after the birth of Jesus.

86. The bishop is supposed to wear irons for the purpose of mortification (Russian вериги).

87, 88, 90. The poet feels the obsession of the "threes" and "fours", symbolizing the Trinity and the cross.

87. *Tathlīth* is the auspicious position of the planets when they are separated by four signs of the Zodiac (120°); *tarbī* (inauspicious) is the distance of three signs of the Zodiac (90°); *tasdīs* that of two signs of the Zodiac (60°). *Tathlīth-i burūj-u-māh-u anjum*, i.e. vaguely the *tathlīth* in which participate the signs of the Zodiac, the moon and the stars. *Ba-tarbī-u ba-tasdīs* (var. *tathlīth-i thalāthā*) is not clear. According to Bīrūnī's calculation, op. cit., p. 294, the Annunciation and the conception of Jesus took place on a Monday (25 Adhār a. Alex. 303). Khāqānī may have thought of "the eve of Tuesday". S. H. Taqizadeh suggests that in the present case *thalāthā* does not mean "Tuesday", but may be only a poetic licence for *thalātha* "the three (planets?)".

88. The verse possibly makes more concrete the references to *tahlūth* and *tarbī'*: the former (happily) in the sky, and the latter (unhappily) on the cross-bars of his cell.

91. *Rāhib andar dayr-i Hirqil* in the conclusion is more appropriate for presentation to a Christian prince than the variant adopted by T.: *'Isā andar bayt al-ma'mūr*: "Jesus in the frequented house." The reference would be to *Qor'ān*, lii, 4, which is usually explained as the Ka'ba. Thus Jesus would be invited to say his prayers in the Islamic sanctuary. Is this another touch of Khāqānī's irony?

#### ADDENDUM

All things considered, the second *ḥabsiya* (*vide supra*, p. 563) seems to be dedicated to Andronicus and Akhsatān. In the *Dīvān*, Akhsatān and his dynasty are several times referred to as Bahrāmī:

*Shāh-i mashriq āftāb-i gauhar-i Bahrāmiyān* (T. 404)

*'Adiltar-i Bahrāmiyān Parvīz-i Irān Akhsatān* (T. 463)

*Nizām-i daulat-i Bahrāmiyān Rashīd al-dīn* (T. 564)

Thus the application of this cognomen to the Shīrvān-shāh is certain. Some obliging genealogists may have connected the dynasty with Bahrām Chūbīn, similarly to what was done in the case of the Sāmānids. Whereas in the second *ḥabsiya* Akhsatān is called Bahrāmī by renown (*ḥasbat*), in T. 404 he is said to be of the Bahrāmī origin (*gauhar*) and in T. 129 he is called "the head of the family (*āl*) of Bahrām". How to explain then the second reference in Akhsatān's pedigree: *Dāvūdiyān ba-gauhar*? Akhsatān was son of a Georgian princess, and this circumstance may account for his connection with the prophet David.

#### ENVOI

I dedicate this article to my distinguished pupils Mrs. N. K. Chadwick and Prof. D. S. Robertson, F.B.A., who shared my enthusiasm for Khāqānī.