

This time the caliph ruled alone, with the help of his sons. He nominated Sulaymān heir-presumptive and gave to him the duties of vizier (*wāsiṭa*). When, after two months, Sulaymān died, he then appointed another son, Ḥaydara (Ḳāḷḷashandī, ix, 377-9). But a third son, al-Ḥasan, jealous because of this nomination, plotted against his father and brother. He seized power, killed several army leaders and formed a private corps, *Ṣibyān al-zarād*, the young cuirassiers. But the army, offended by the massacre, gathered in front of the palace and demanded al-Ḥasan's head. Al-Ḥāfiẓ then had his son poisoned by the agency of his Jewish doctor (*Ḳhiṭat*, iii, 27-9).

This time he appointed to the vizierate Bahrām, a Christian Armenian. But this choice provoked a revolt among the Muslims, for once Bahrām came to power he formed an Armenian army of 20,000 men, infantry and cavalry. The Egyptians are said to have feared that he would change the religion of Islam (Ibn Muyassar, 79 ff.).

The Muslim troops being discontented, the caliph incited against Bahrām the governor of Ascalon, Riḍwān b. Walakhashī, who had been banished by Bahrām, but Bahrām sent him away again to the prefecture of al-Ḡharbiyya. The people of Egypt were grateful to Riḍwān for having prevented the Armenians from entering Egypt when he was at Ascalon. He later gathered troops and Bedouins and drove Bahrām out of Cairo into Upper Egypt. The caliph, however, gave Bahrām a safe-conduct (*amān*) (Ḳāḷḷashandī, *Ṣubḥ*, xiii, 325) because of the intervention of the king of Sicily, Roger II (*Ṣubḥ*, vi, 458-63).

But once Riḍwān became vizier (*Ṣubḥ*, viii, 342-6), he seized all power and took the title of King (*malik*) (*Ḳhiṭat*, ii, 305). He was also a Sunnī; and when he attempted to depose the caliph he was assassinated in 542/1147 (*Ḳhiṭat*, ii, 173).

After this al-Ḥāfiẓ appointed no more viziers, but the troubles and the disturbance continued. He died of a violent intestinal colic (*ḳawlandī*) in Djumādā II 544/October 1146.

Bibliography: Ibn al-Aṭṭir, x; Ibn Aybak, *Kanz al-durar*, vi, ed. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Munadjiḍid, Cairo 1961; al-Makrizī, *Itti'āz al-ḫunafā'*, MS Istanbul, Topkapısarayı Ahmed III 3013; Idris 'Imād al-Dīn, *Uyūn al-akhbār*, vii; Cl. Cahen, *Quelques chroniques anciennes relatives aux derniers Fatimides*, in BIFAO, xxxvii (1937), 13 ff.; S. M. Stern, *The succession to the Fatimid imam al-Amir*, in *Oriens*, iv (1951), 193-255; M. Canard, *Un vizir chrétien à l'époque fatimite: l'Arménien Bahrām*, in *AEIO Alger*, xii (1954), 84-113; A. M. Magued, *Nuzum al-Fāṭimiyyin wa rusūmuhum*, 2 vols., Cairo 1953-5; F. Wüstenfeld, *Geschichte der Fatimiden-Chalifen*, Göttingen 1881, 300 ff.; S. Lane-Poole, *A history of Egypt*, London 1914, 166 ff.; G. Wiet, *Précis de l'histoire de l'Égypte*, iv, Cairo 1932; idem, in *CIA, Le Caire*, ii, 83 ff. (A. M. MAGUED)

ḤĀFĪZ, (ḲH'ADJA) ṢHAMS AL-DĪN MUḤAMMAD ṢHRĀZĪ, Persian lyric poet and panegyrist, commonly considered the pre-eminent master of the *ghazal* form. He was born in Ṣhrāz, probably in 726/1325-6, though Kāsim Ḡhanī argues for 717/1317 and others favour 720/1320. With a few marked absences, he seems to have spent the greater part of his life in Ṣhrāz, for long moving in or near the court-circle of the Muzaffarid dynasty. He is believed to have died in Ṣhrāz, in 792/1390 (or 791/1389), and his tomb is perhaps that city's best known monument. Though credited with learned works

in prose, his fame rests entirely on his *Diwān*. There are few aspects of the life and writing of Ḥāfiẓ that have not given rise, and especially from about 1930 to 1955, to vigorous scholarly dispute over matters of both interpretation and fact. The reverence in which he is held, not only in Persia but widely throughout East and West, as the undoubted composer of some of the world's most sublime and technically exquisite poetry, will doubtless ensure continued concern with these problems, however intractable and ultimately insignificant some of them may seem to be.

Apart from its general historical framework, the presumed facts of Ḥāfiẓ's life were for long largely drawn from biographical prefaces, from the usual anecdotal *taḏkhirā* sources like Dawlatshāh, or from casual references by writers like Mīrkh'ānd and his grandson. Such material has of course frequently been viewed sceptically; but most of it is of its nature difficult to disprove conclusively, and in one or two instances (as in an alleged encounter with Timūr, in 789/1387) research has only tended to strengthen, if not fully to confirm, the legend. Informative biographies of Persian poets are a notorious rarity, and it seems unlikely at this late date that any significant new material of an explicitly biographical nature will be discovered relating to Ḥāfiẓ. Though not a new technique, it has recently become fashionable to analyse the poems themselves for new biographical evidence or for some bearing on the material already to hand. The latest, and the most comprehensive and ingenious work of this kind, has been done by Kāsim Ḡhanī and by R. Lescot; but the net result so far is somewhat disproportionate to the formidable effort involved. At best, it has now been convincingly demonstrated that the *Diwān* bears a much more direct relationship to the milieu of its composition than was suspected in the traditional view. Such methods always have their dangers, particularly where the basic biographical material is itself so slight; in the case of Ḥāfiẓ, the problem is exacerbated by the continued lack of a reasonably authentic text. All this being so, it still seems proper to give here the main outlines of the life in more or less traditional form.

Ḥāfiẓ's father, Bahā' al-Dīn or Kamāl al-Dīn (some sources refer to his grandfather), is said to have migrated from Iṣfahān to Ṣhrāz, where he died in the poet's infancy, leaving the family in poor circumstances. In a close-knit, flourishing centre of Islamic civilization such as Ṣhrāz at that time was, humble beginnings were only a relative handicap; and it is plausibly suggested that Ḥāfiẓ received a thorough education on the usual classical lines. It was no doubt in youth that he earned the right to use the title *ḥāfiẓ* (Ḳur'ān-memorizer), which became his pen-name; the verse bears ample evidence of familiarity with Arabic, with the Islamic sciences and with Persian literature generally. He is reputed to have been among other things a baker's apprentice and a manuscript-copyist during these years of adolescence and early manhood; but, to judge in particular by the dedication of certain poems to Ḳiwām al-Dīn Ḥasan (d. 754/1353), sometime vizier to Shāh Abū Ishāk Indjū, he was into his poetic stride as a panegyrist before the age of thirty. An oft-cited poem (Brockhaus, no. 579; Ḳazvīnī-Ḡhanī, 363) mentions nostalgically other Ṣhrāz notables of this period, including the ruler himself. Already by his twenties, in the wake of the disintegration of the Il-Ḳhānīd order, Ḥāfiẓ had

lived through dynastic upheavals in and around Shīrāz.

A second phase in the poet's life begins in 754/1353 with the capture of Shīrāz, after a protracted struggle between the Indjū and Muẓaffarid dynasties, by Mubārīz al-Dīn Muḥammad. The latter ruled for five years, before being deposed and blinded by his son Djalāl al-Dīn Shāh Shudjā'. These years were apparently a period of rigid Sunni observance, hard on Hāfiz and his fellow-citizens alike; but the poet seems to have recommended himself with some success to Mubārīz al-Dīn's chief minister, Burhān al-Dīn Fath Allāh. The long reign of Shāh Shudjā' (759-86/1358-84), while at no time settled politically, and though far from being a period of continuous prosperity and success for Hāfiz, coincides with his phase of maturest composition. It was during these years that his fame spread throughout Persia, as well as westwards into Arabic-speaking lands and eastwards to India; it seems, nevertheless, that he declined invitations to remove to distant courts. The Muẓaffarid dynasty effectively came to an end at the hand of Timūr, in 789/1387, during the last few years of Hāfiz's life, though random representatives of it, like Shāh Shudjā' al-Dīn Manšūr, seem to have shown the poet sporadic favour to the end.

It is generally believed that Hāfiz was more or less out of favour with Shāh Shudjā' for a period of some ten years (768-78/1366-76), during which time he is said to have spent a year or two in Iṣfahān and Yazd. The reason for such a fall has never been fully explained, though it is traditionally related to the poet's allegedly libertine views and behaviour. Though thereafter he enjoyed favour, from time to time, from the throne and from ministers like Djalāl al-Dīn Tūrānshāh, he seems never fully to have regained his former standing. Yet it should be remembered that there is still no real certainty as to what such standing actually signified: certainly there is frequent reference to poverty throughout the poet's life (whether it be regarded as a complaint, a hint or a literary device), and there is no serious suggestion that he held a regular, richly rewarded office as "court poet". At one time he is said to have been a professor of Qur'ānic exegesis at a Shīrāz madrasa, but there is doubt as to which of his patrons might have obtained him this preferment and no record of his period of tenure.

Legend credits Hāfiz with editing his *Diwān* in 770/1368, i.e., over twenty years before his death, but no manuscript of this version is known. Less speculative, perhaps, but still unattested by real evidence, is the edition (with a preface of doubtful biographical value) compiled after the poet's death by a disciple, a certain Muḥammad Gulandām. From this traditional version are assumed to spring the thousands of manuscripts now extant and over 100 printed editions: many of these versions differ widely in the order and number of poems, in the order and number of verses within a given poem, and in their detailed readings. The bibliography is very extensive, and only some of the principal editions or translations can be mentioned here. (In general, it may be said that serious interest in Hāfiz seems to have passed, after his death, to the Ottoman world and to India, whence it came by the late 18th century to Europe, returning in strength to Persia only in the 20s and 30s of the present century). First, it should be mentioned that several manuscripts are known in Persia, in Europe and elsewhere, which date from about the second and third quarters of the 15th century, i.e., from thirty to sixty years after

the poet's death; the most reliable of these contain just under 500 poems, while later versions rise to 600 and beyond. (In 1958, P. N. Khānlari published a manuscript dated around 813/1410, which contains 152 poems in good textual condition). Derivative manuscripts, sometimes with commentaries in Persian, Turkish or Urdū, continued to circulate throughout the next four centuries.

The earliest historic recension, for long accepted as authoritative, and as a source of Hāfiz's life, was that of the Ottoman Sūdī (d. 1000/1591); he was at one time charged with having suppressed one or two poems of Shī'a sympathy, but modern scholarship has justified him by failing to find these poems in early manuscripts, and by casting at least some doubt on Hāfiz's Shī'ism. This recension was taken as the basis for another long-dominant edition, the three volumes (692 poems) of H. Brockhaus, Leipzig 1854-61. The late 18th and early 19th centuries saw much fragmentary and dilettante preoccupation with Hāfiz among Europeans (chiefly British and French), but a landmark in printed texts was the Calcutta edition of 1791 (725 poems), associated with the name of Upjohn; this edition was still based on late manuscripts and largely on the Sūdī recension; its introduction provided much of the material for the traditional life. J. von Hammer-Purgstall produced in 1812-3 a massive German prose-translation of the *Diwān*, which was known to Goethe at the time he was writing the *West-östlicher Diwan*. Between 1858 and 1864, i.e., roughly at the same time as the Brockhaus edition mentioned above, and using substantially the same sources, V. von Rosenzweig-Schwannau brought out another three-volume edition of the text, accompanied by a remarkably skilful verse-translation in German. The English renderings, partial or complete, of the late 19th century (those, for example, of H. Bicknell, H. Wilberforce Clarke, Gertrude Bell and W. Leaf) deserve only passing mention, despite interesting merits of their own. By 1900 a largely spurious, second-growth Hāfiz stood beside the several approximations to the real figure. The 20th century saw the rebirth of serious Hāfiz scholarship in Persia. Special mention has already been made of the fundamental research of Kāsim Ghani, but there are few eminent Persian scholars of the present day who have not contributed important articles in this field. In particular, three editions merit notice: that of 'Abd al-Rahīm Khalkhalī, Tehrān 1927 (495 poems, based on a manuscript of 828/1424, but marred by errors); that of Ḥusayn Pizhmān, Tehrān 1936 (994 poems, many marked as doubtful!); and that of Muḥammad Ḳazvīnī and Kāsim Ghani, Tehrān 1941 (576 poems; the most scientific and reliable edition so far, based on some very old manuscripts; contains a good introduction, but lacks a critical apparatus). A new edition, also based on very early manuscripts, is reportedly in preparation by H. Ritter.

It will be seen that the two basic tasks of all research on Persian poetry, the establishment of a significant biography and the edition of an authoritative text, have assumed added and special dimensions in the case of Hāfiz. In briefest sum, one may state the dilemma thus: no text of Hāfiz, however good in itself, can be fully intelligible at any level without a marked amplification in our knowledge of his life and times; yet much of such knowledge must come from an analysis of the text, and one can have little confidence in the results of analyses, however scrupulously conducted, that are

based on texts of doubtful reliability. It may well prove that neither task is fully susceptible of solution, even within limited terms of reference: while solidification of the biography must largely wait on the text, such expectation gives no ultimate certainty of a rich yield; any acceptable text will inevitably be based on virtually the sole criterion of seniority of manuscript, and the oldest Oriental manuscripts, particularly if falling outside the author's lifetime, are not necessarily the fullest or the most accurate in any absolute sense. This is especially true of poetry, and indications so far suggest that it is even more than normally true of the *Diwān* of Hāfiz. There is, too, the fundamental question of the poet's own intent: should everything he ever wrote (or perhaps merely countersigned) be included, even if he might himself have chosen to omit certain items from the supposed canon of 770/1368? Did he have second (or later) thoughts about the inclusion, the order, or the actual text of whole poems or individual verses? If we cannot now hope to answer questions of this kind, we should be cautious in claiming to do more in effect than publishing early manuscripts and observing their differences from later ones. Certain generally useful conclusions may be drawn, but we may well never be sure what such differences signify in any particular case.

Failure hitherto to solve these basic problems has never quenched interest in several secondary problems related to them. Scholars living in an age of non-representational art and literature are perhaps less concerned than most of their forebears (E. G. Browne in advance of his age here) to discover positively "whether Hāfiz meant what he said", whether he was a mystic or a libertine, a good Muslim or a sceptic, or all of these by turns. It is now generally claimed (without prejudice) merely that he spoke *through* the standard themes and terminology of hedonism, the lament for mortality, human and mystical love, and so on; that he was a superb linguistic and literary craftsman, who took these forms so far beyond the work of his predecessors that he practically cut off all succession; and that he revolutionized the *ghazal* and the panegyric both, by making the one the vehicle for the other in place of the *ḥaṣīda*. Nevertheless, useful new work has been done (particularly by R. Lescot) in establishing the chronology of certain poems so as to suggest a development in Hāfiz's attitude, style and methods. The secondary problem most hotly debated in recent years concerns the "artistic unity" of the poems: even supposing that the present varying order of verses were reduced to an original uniformity, is there any genuine unity in these *ghazals*, and did not Hāfiz invite later confusion by his failure to develop any theme consistently? There are indications that the problem is neither new nor specifically Western, for *Shāh Shudjā'* is supposed to have made some such criticism, according to an anecdote current no later than the time of *Kh'āndamīr*. Arguments have been put forward, by A. J. Arberry and by the writer, to suggest that the true unity of Hāfiz's poetry is not thematic or dramatic in the classical Western sense, but lies rather in a subtle weaving of imagery and allusion around one or more central concepts. These arguments have found some favour with J. Rypka and others, but have also been rejected, both explicitly and by implication, as either invalid or unnecessary.

Bibliography: in addition to the references in the text, see: Kāsim Qhānī, *Baḥṭh dar āthār wa aḥkār wa aḥwāl-i Hāfiz*, Tehrān 1321-2/1942-3

(2 vols. only appeared before the author's death); J. Rypka, *Iranische Literaturgeschichte*, Leipzig 1959, 256-68 and bibliographical references (the best and fullest summary to date); H. R. Roemer, *Probleme der Hafizforschung und der Stand ihrer Lösung*, Wiesbaden 1951; A. Gölpınarlı, *Hafiz Divanı*, Istanbul 1944 (useful preface); R. Lescot, *Chronologie de l'œuvre de Hafiz*, in *Bêt. Or.*, 1944, 57-100; A. J. Arberry, *Hāfiz: fifty poems*, Cambridge 1947 and reprinted, 1-34; idem, *Classical Persian literature*, London 1958, 329-63; Browne, iii, 271-319; *IA*, s.v. Hāfiz, by H. Ritter.

(G. M. WICKENS)

HĀFĪZ-I ABRŪ, the *laḥab* of 'Abd Allāh b. Luṭf Allāh b. 'Abd al-Raḥīd al-Bihdādīnī, Persian historian of the time of *Shāhrukh*, who died in 833/1430. He was also in the suite of *Timūr* as an excellent chess-player and accompanied him and *Shāhrukh* in some campaigns.

His first known work is probably the anonymous *Dhayl-i Djāmi' al-tawārikh* (unique MS: Nuru-osmaniye), which deals with the reign of *Uldjaytū* and *Abū Sa'īd*, the first part being an extract from the *Ta'rikh-i Uldjaytū Sultān* by al-Kāshānī. The next of his works, completed in 814/1412 by order of *Shāhrukh*, is the *Dhayl-i Zafarnāma-yi Shāmi* about the rest of the life of *Timūr*. Some time later he wrote a history of the reign of *Shāhrukh* to 816/1413 (unique MS: India Office). In 817/1414 he began at the request of *Shāhrukh* to translate and to complete an old Arabic geographical work called *Masālik al-mamālik wa-ṣuwar al-aḥālīm*, probably one of the redactions of al-Balkhī. In this unfinished and untitled work he could not repress his interests as a historian and included in it extensive historical passages especially on the history of *Fārs*, *Kirmān* and *Khurāsān*.

While occupied with this geographical work *Hāfiz-i Abrū* was in 820/1417 charged by *Shāhrukh* to compile a voluminous historical enterprise consisting of three famous older historical books, with supplements and a continuation written by himself. The result of this endeavour was the *Madjmu'a*, which contains: A. Introduction and Contents. — B. The Chronicle of al-Ṭabarī translated by Bal'amī. — C. Continuation of this work to 656/1258 by *Hāfiz-i Abrū*. — D. Introduction to the *Djāmi' al-tawārikh* of *Raḥīd al-Dīn* and list of its contents by *Hāfiz-i Abrū*. — E. The *Djāmi' al-tawārikh*. — F. History of the *Kurtid* Dynasty by *Hāfiz-i Abrū*. — G. Four small treatises on *Tughāy-Timūr*, *Amir Walī*, the *Sarbadārīs* and *Amir Arghūnshāh* by *Hāfiz-i Abrū*. — H. Continuation of the *Djāmi' al-tawārikh*, dealing with the events in *Ādharbāyджān* and Arabic *Irāk* in the years 703-95/1304-93. — I. History of the *Muzaffarid* Dynasty by *Hāfiz-i Abrū*. — J. The *Zafarnāma* of *Shāmi*. — K. The above mentioned Continuation of this work by *Hāfiz-i Abrū*. — L. History of *Shāhrukh's* reign to *Rabī' II* 819/May 1416. *Hāfiz-i Abrū* makes use in parts F, H and I of sources known to us. The first three-quarters of F are an extract from the *Harāt-nāma* by *Sayf b. Muḥammad Harawī*, about the first two-thirds of I are a simplification of the *Mawāhib-i ilāhi* by *Mu'īn al-Dīn Yazdī*. In H the history of *Uldjaytū's* and *Abū Sa'īd's* reigns is an extract from the *Dhayl-i Djāmi' al-tawārikh* mentioned above. The other passages of his supplements result from sources unknown to us or from oral tradition. L is the second redaction of his History of *Shāhrukh*. Some parts in G, H, I and L are closely connected with the historical passages of his geographical work.