

ARTICLE

The *Qalandar* King: Early Development of the *Qalandariyyāt* and Saljuq Conceptions of Kingship in Amir Mo‘ezzi’s Panegyric for Sharafshāh Ja‘fari

Matthew Thomas Miller

Roshan Institute for Persian Studies, University of Maryland at College Park, College Park, Maryland, USA
Email: mtmiller@umd.edu

(Received 3 November 2020; revised 19 July 2021; accepted 26 July 2021)

Abstract

Historical treatments of the “rogue lyrics” (*qalandariyyāt*) of medieval Persian poetry typically identify their origin in the Sufi poetry of Bābā Tāher, Abu Sa‘id, and Sanā‘i and portray them as a poetic instantiation of the intellectual and antinomian critiques of the formalistic modes of piety practiced in the increasingly powerful institutionalized Sufi orders. However, the *qalandari* panegyrics of the Saljuq court poets Borhāni and Amir Mo‘ezzi—arguably the earliest datable examples of this poetry—analyzed in this article complicate this narrative. They utilize the heterotopic poetics of the *qalandariyyāt* not to subvert or critique, but rather to augment the sociopolitical authority of the ruler of Qazvin, constructing a new and distinctly Saljuq model of Islamic kingship, a *Qalandar* King.

Keywords: Borhāni; carnivals; Islamic kingship; Amir Mo‘ezzi; panegyric; *qalandariyyāt*; Qazvin; Saljuq

The classic image of a *qalandar* in the Persian Sufi imaginary is that of an antinomian rogue. In their eponymous “rogue lyrics” (*qalandariyyāt*), most famously of Sanā‘i (d. 1131), ‘Attār (d. 1221), and ‘Erāqi (d. 1289), the *qalandars* and their closely related band of social reprobates—the *qallāsh* (rascal), *rend* (libertine), *owbāsh* (ruffian), haunter of the winehouse (*kharābāti*), roguish man of wiles (‘*ayyār*), etc.—are portrayed as disruptive forces who flout normative modes of piety, the rule of Islamic law (*shari‘a*), and the protocols of social comportment (*adab*). Although these rogue figures certainly drink copious amounts of wine and are continuously falling in love like the poetic personae in the closely related genres of the *ghazaliyyāt* (amatory poetry) and *khamriyyāt* (wine odes), the *qalandariyyāt* are concerned to a far greater degree with the celebration of transgression and antinomianism: the flagrant inversion of socioreligious hierarchies, the mocking of sacred symbols of religious authority, and the dispatching of anything—even their own selves—that blocks the path of love (*rāh-e ‘eshq*) to their illicit beloved, who is often of a non-Islamic origin.¹ The *qalandariyyāt*, in short, present the reader with a poetic world that is the nemesis and very antithesis of the Islamic social order. It is what we might call an Islamic heterotopia or carnival in the sense that its

¹ For more on *qalandariyyāt* poetry, see de Bruijn, “The *Qalandariyyāt* in Persian Mystical Poetry”; Miller, “Poetics of the Sufi Carnival”; Miller, “Genre in Classical Persian Poetry”; Lewisohn, “Sufi Symbolism in the Persian Hermeneutic Tradition”; Lewis, “Reading, Writing and Recitation,” 364–68, 559–78; Shafi‘i-Kadkani, *Qalandariyyeh dar tārikh*; Lewis, “Sexual Occultation”; de Bruijn, “Anvari and the Ghazal,” 23–27; Ritter, “Philologika XV”; and Meier, *Abū Sa‘id-i Abū l-Hayr*, 494–516.

imaginal world is a liminal space where antinomian figures invert normal socioreligious hierarchies and mock normative culture.² Or, at least, this is the image provided by the *qalandariyyāt*.

The question of the actual social function and cultural politics of this carnivalesque poetry is more complex. On one hand, there were various historical antinomian and libertine groups who are believed to have lived aspects of the *qalandari* topoi, and it is possible that this poetry drew inspiration from these historical groups to some degree.³ Abu Hafṣ ‘Umar al-Suhrawardī (d. 1234), for example, says in his oft-cited early-thirteenth-century account of the differences between the *qalandars* and *malāmatis* (blame-seekers) in the ‘*Awārif al-Ma‘ārif*, that the modus operandi of the *qalandars* was the “destr[uction] of customs and discard[ing] of the protocols of social interaction and engagement.”⁴ This brief summary of historical *qalandar* activity equally well encapsulates the main thrust of the *qalandar* poetic persona, and the convergence between these two would seem to mark this poetry with a socially subversive air, even if only by topical association.⁵

On the other hand, as numerous scholars have pointed out, the *qalandariyyāt* cannot be read literally as representative of the behaviors of its poets or admirers.⁶ There is no indication in Sanā’i’s or ‘Attār’s hagiographies that they engaged in anything even remotely approximating the antinomian behavior of the *qalandar* figures in their poetry. Even in the case of ‘Erāqī, who purportedly joined a wandering *qalandar* band after he fell in love with a beautiful young *qalandar* (male) youth, he ultimately becomes a leading spiritual

² I use the terms “heterotopia” and “carnival” here only in a general descriptive sense and in the hope of bringing this poetry into the broader conversations that have built up around these terms. Foucault uses heterotopia to refer to “counter-sites” or liminal spaces where deviant, subversive, and carnivalesque behavior and “heteroclitite” objects can be contained and safely displayed. In heterotopic spaces, normal relations are typically “contested and inverted.” For more on this term, see Foucault, “Of Other Spaces,” 24–27; and Defert, “Foucault, Space, and the Architects,” 275–76. The term “carnival” has its origins in Bakhtin’s work on the premodern carnivals of Europe, but it is now widely used in cultural studies to refer to spaces (real or imaginary) and cultural products that focus broadly on the transgression, inversion, and parody of social norms, hierarchies, and elite culture. See Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World*; and Stallybrass and White, *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*, 6–26.

³ There is no extant nonliterary evidence of *qalandars* as a historical group before the thirteenth century. There are, however, other types of antinomian groups active prior to the thirteenth century. On the historical *qalandars* and other antinomian groups in the premodern Islamic world, see Karamustafa, *God’s Unruly Friends*; Karamustafa, “Antinomian Sufis”; Karamustafa, *Sufism*, 155–66; Algar, “Impostors, Antinomians and Pseudo-Sufis”; Shafī’i-Kadkani, *Qalandariyyeh dar tārikh*; Ridgeon, “Reading Sufi History through Ādāb”; Ridgeon, “Short Back and Sides”; Ridgeon, “Shaggy or Shaved?”; Papas, *Mystiques et vagabonds*; Watenpaugh, “Deviant Dervishes”; and Digby, “Qalandars and Related Groups.”

⁴ Al-Suhrawardī, ‘*Awārif al-ma‘ārif*, 89. Al-Suhrawardī’s account is one of the most important early sources for all major treatments of the *qalandars*. See, for example, Meier, *Abū Sa‘īd-i Abū l-Hayr*, 496–97; Shafī’i-Kadkani, *Qalandariyyeh dar tārikh*, 137–39; Karamustafa, *God’s Unruly Friends*, 34–36; de Bruijn, “The *Qalandariyyāt* in Persian Mystical Poetry,” 76; de Bruijn, *Persian Sufi Poetry*, 73–74; Dahlén, “The Holy Fool in Medieval Islam,” 64; and Ridgeon, “Reading Sufi History through Ādāb,” 390–92.

⁵ Bürgel seems to go the furthest in reading this association literally, remarking that “in the course of Islamic history mystical movements more than once became a vehicle for social revolution. . . . Words like ‘scoundrel’ and ‘rogue’ were then no longer empty sounds, but were filled with dangerous reality. In the poetry of Sanā’i, the *qalandar* and *rend* are in the company of types one would tend to associate with social unrest such as the ‘*aiyyār*, the *qallāsh*, and the *owbash*, meaning rake, scoundrel, robber.” See Bürgel, “The Pious Rogue,” 46. Feuillebois-Pierunek also remarks that “for his contemporaries, his [Sanā’i’s] poetry unquestionably has a scandalous flavor” (*Pour ses contemporains, sa poésie a incontestablement une saveur de scandale*; “Le *Qalandar*,” 125). However, see footnote 10 for more on the complex relationship between purported transgressive or carnivalesque poetry and sociopolitical power.

⁶ Lewisohn, “Sufi Symbolism in the Persian Hermeneutic Tradition”; Lewisohn, “Prolegomenon to the Study of Hafiz,” 31–55; de Bruijn, *Persian Sufi Poetry*, 74–75; de Bruijn, “The *Qalandariyyāt* in Persian Mystical Poetry,” 85–86; Dahlén, “The Holy Fool in Medieval Islam,” 75. There are scholars, however, who do seem to read this poetry as reflective of actual practice, such as Papas, in “Son of His Mother,” 423–24. Dahlén and de Bruijn interestingly do make a qualified exception for ‘Erāqī due to the story of his conversion to the *qalandari* path in his hagiography. Although de Bruijn rejects a biographical reading of the *qalandari* poetry of Sanā’i and ‘Attār, he cautiously suggests that there may be a “relationship between letters and life” in the case of ‘Erāqī (*Persian Sufi Poetry*, 75). Dahlén similarly thinks some of ‘Erāqī’s poems are “direct reflections of [his] antinomian practice,” although most are not (“The Holy Fool in Medieval Islam,” 74–75).

figure in a mainstream Sufi order, the Suhrawardiyya.⁷ His hagiography testifies to the fact that he remained somewhat controversial for his unabashed “gazing upon beautiful faces” (*shāhed-bāzi*) and proclivity to fall in love with handsome young men wherever he went. However, he remained within the bounds of normative Sufi views on these practices and certainly did not live the life of an antinomian *qalandar*.⁸

Sanā’i, ‘Attār, and ‘Erāqi’s simultaneous association with mainstream varieties of Sufism and *qalandari* poetry may, as Ahmet T. Karamustafa has suggested, be evidence that the *qalandariyyāt* began as a self-critical Sufi poetic response to the increasingly powerful institutional Sufi orders and their formalistic modes of spiritual piety—in short, a poetic version of the theoretical critiques of the same issues by leading Sufis such as Qoshayri and Hojviri in this period.⁹ *Qalandari* poetry’s origin may indeed be tied up with this broader intellectual reaction against institutional Sufism, but its carnivalesque poetic space came to play several—and not necessarily subversive—roles in the Sufi tradition down to the modern period.¹⁰ For many Sufis, it became a poetic idiom that was capable of embodying in an imaginal manner the most radical of all human experiences—the experience of divine love and union—in an admittedly limited textual form.¹¹ For the proponents of the Sufi hermeneutic tradition, it became a mine for esoteric knowledge about the secrets of divine realities.¹² For poets, the *qalandariyyāt* operated as a heterotopic counter-genre to religious-homiletic (*zohdiyyāt/mow’ezeh*) and royal panegyric poetry.¹³ And these roles were not mutually exclusive.

Although all of these foregoing approaches to the poetics and cultural politics of *qalandari* poetry are part of the larger story of its history and development, they do not seriously engage with arguably two of the most important pieces of historical literary evidence: the *qalandari* poems by the father and son Saljuq court poets Borhāni (d.1072–73) and Amir Mo’ezzi (d. ca. 1125–27).¹⁴ These poems are among the earliest extant *qalandariyyāt*,

⁷ This story occurs in the anonymous hagiography of ‘Erāqi, which appears as an introduction in early manuscripts of his *divān* and became the basis for much of his subsequent hagiographic tradition. See “Moqaddemeh-ye *divān*.” Jāmi’s account of ‘Erāqi’s life in *Nafahāt al-ons* (599–602) is almost identical. There are reasons, however, to question the accuracy of ‘Erāqi’s hagiographic account. For a more detailed discussion of ‘Erāqi’s hagiography, see Miller, “Embodying the Beloved”; Miller, “Ocean of the Persians”; Shafī’i-Kadkani, *Qalandariyyeh dar tārikh*, 263, 320–23; Safā, *Tārikh-e adabiyāt dar Irān*, vol. 3, 1:567–76; Chittick, “‘Erāqi, Fakr-al-Dīn Ebrāhīm”; Massé, “‘Irāqi”; Mohtasham (Khozā’i), “Moqaddemeh-ye mosahheh”; and Zargar, *Sufi Aesthetics*, 105–12.

⁸ On ‘Erāqi’s practice of *shāhed-bāzi*, see Miller, “Embodying the Beloved.”

⁹ Karamustafa, *Sufism*, 165–66.

¹⁰ “Carnavalesque” or “transgressive” literature can be a subversive or conservative force in a social system (at times seemingly both at once) depending on the historical circumstances and is always at risk of being co-opted, as we will see below. For exploration of the complex interpretative issues involved in understanding this type of literature’s political implications, see Stallybrass and White, *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*; Noorani, “Heterotopia and the Wine Poem in Early Islamic Culture”; and Yaghoobi, *Subjectivity in ‘Attār, Persian Sufism, and European Mysticism*. Co-option not only happens to carnivalesque literature; it also happens to actual antinomian movements. See Watenpaugh, “Deviant Dervishes,” 536–38, 552, 555. For a modern treatment of the *qalandar* figure, see Bürgel’s study of how Muhammad Iqbal employs the rogue figure in “The Pious Rogue.”

¹¹ I am developing the idea of poetry and specifically poetic imagery as “imaginal embodiments” in my current book project, *Affected by God: Embodied Poetics and Somatic Epistemology in Medieval Persian Sufi Literature*, and I discuss some *qalandari* poetry there.

¹² For representative overviews of this approach to carnivalesque Sufi poetry, see Feuillebois-Pierunek, *A la croisée des voies célestes*; Lewisohn, “Sufi Symbolism in the Persian Hermeneutic Tradition”; Lewisohn, “Prolegomenon to the Study of Hafiz”; Feuillebois-Pierunek, “Le Qalandar”; Esots, “The Image of Qalandar in the *Divān-i Shams*”; Dahlén, “The Holy Fool in Medieval Islam”; Zargar, *Sufi Aesthetics*; and Pourjavady, “Rendi-ye Hāfez (1)” and “Rendi-ye Hāfez (2).”

¹³ Miller, “Poetics of the Sufi Carnival.”

¹⁴ Most of the studies cited in the preceding footnotes skip over Borhāni and Amir Mo’ezzi’s poems in favor of discussing the more traditional Sufi *qalandari* poets and poems. A few other scholars mention them in passing, but none discuss these poems in depth, especially with regard to their importance for the study of the *qalandariyyāt*. See Eqbāl, *Moqaddemeh*, x; Mo’in, “Borhāni va qasideh-ye u”; Qanbari, “Moqaddemeh,” XII–XIII n3; de Bruijn, “The *Qalandariyyāt* in Persian Mystical Poetry,” 81; Tetley, *The Ghaznavid and Seljuk Turks*, 92–94; de Bruijn, “The Qaside after the Fall of the Ghaznavids,” 107–8. There are two exceptions to this general rule, which will be discussed

and they are not authored by poets usually classified as “Sufi poets,” which complicates the typical Sufi-centered origin and development narrative of *qalandari* poetry.¹⁵ As I will show here through a close reading of these poems, they use *qalandari* poetry in a different way: not to attack or criticize any institution, but rather to buttress the sociopolitical order and the legitimacy of their patron, the ruler of Qazvin, Sharafshāh Ja‘fari. They see being associated with the *qalandari* world as a virtue and foundational part of a new model of Islamic kingship, the *Qalandar King*, whose political authority is legitimized through his deep connection to the spiritual realm of the “dervishes”—a pattern that connects these poems to broader developments in the construction of Saljuq imperial legitimacy as well.¹⁶ These poems represent a different perspective on the cultural position and function of the early *qalandariyyāt* while also demonstrating its considerable generic flexibility and a more variegated path of historical development.

The Standard Narrative on the Early Development of the *Qalandariyyāt*

The earliest traces of *qalandari* poetry in Persian literature are purported to be a number of quatrains (*robā‘iyyāt*, *do-beyti*, *tarāneh*) that are attributed to Bābā Tāher-e ‘Oryān (d. likely first half or middle of eleventh century), Abu Sa‘id Abu al-Kheyr (d. 1049), and Sheykh Yusof ‘Āmeri (active mid-to-late eleventh century, or at most early twelfth century).¹⁷ As one can see in the texts below, many of the prototypical features of longer *qalandariyyāt* poetry are clearly present in these short poems. “Rascality” (*qallāshi*) and “loverhood” (*‘āsheqi*) are elevated to the status of the highest virtues for the *qalandar* to aspire to, and they are set in direct opposition to the “Qur’anic recitation” (*qorrā‘i*, literally, “being a Qur’anic reciter”) and “ascetic piety” (*zāhedi*) celebrated by normative Islam. Indeed, for the wine-drinking and music-playing “adherents of unity” in the “quarter of the winehouse” (*kharābāt*) all earthly constructs lack meaning: home, family life, and even the essential theological binaries of heaven/hell and sin/obedience are meaningless, much less purely physical or metaphorical ones such as the sun/moon and whiteness/blackness.

Do-beyti of Bābā Tāher-e ‘Oryān:

مو آن رندم که نامم (جایم) بی قلندر نه خوان دیرم نه مان دیرم نه لنگر
چو روز آیه بگردم گرد کویت چو شو آیه به خشتان وانهم سر

I am that libertine whose name is *qalandar*/whose place is the *qalandar*—¹⁸
I have no home, no family, no monastery (*langar*) in this world.
When day comes I wander around your quarter,
When night comes I place my head on bricks.¹⁹

further below. For an overview of the life and poetry of Borhāni and Amir Mo‘ezzi, see: de Bruijn, “The Qaside after the Fall of the Ghaznavids,” 107–23; Meisami, “Mu‘izzi”; and Safā, *Tārikh-e adabiyyāt dar Irān*, vol. 2, 508–15.

¹⁵ For a discussion of the generic boundaries of the *qalandariyyāt*, please see Miller, “Genre in Classical Persian Poetry.”

¹⁶ Safi, *The Politics of Knowledge in Premodern Islam*.

¹⁷ I am grateful to the works of Karamustafa and Shafi‘i-Kadkani for drawing my attention to the examples in this section. See Karamustafa, *God’s Unruly Friends*, 32–33; and Shafi‘i-Kadkani, *Qalandariyyeh dar tārikh*, 39–40, 263, 296.

¹⁸ Shafi‘i-Kadkani argues that the term *qalandar* in its earliest uses refers to a place, not an individual figure, and only later becomes an individual figure (slightly before or in the period of Rumi and ‘Erāqi). See Shafi‘i-Kadkani, *Qalandariyyeh dar tārikh*, 37–45, 300–20.

¹⁹ There are several versions of the text of this *do-beyti*. I have blended them together in the translation above. The Persian text provided above is primarily based on the Dastgerdi version (‘Oryān, *Divān-e Bābā Tāher-e ‘Oryān*, 9). Shafi‘i-Kadkani also points to two other versions of the first line (*Qalandariyyeh dar tārikh*, 39, 263, 336). One version is very close to the Dastgerdi version, but he lists *jāyam* as an alternative reading for *nāmam* in the initial hemistich of the first line. He notes too that in the earliest source of Bābā Tāher’s poetry, collection 2546 in the Museum of Konya, the first line reads as follows:

مو آن بیرم که خاندم قلندر نه خانم بی نه مانم بی نه لنگر

Robā'i of Abu Sa'īd Abu al-Kheyr:

جز دوزخ و فردوس مکانی دگرست
قراپی و زاهدی جهانی دگرست

ما را بجزین جهان جهانی دگرست
قلاشی و عاشقی سرمایۀ ما

There is a world other than this for us
besides paradise and hell, there is another place
Rascality and loverhood are our capital,
Qur'anic recitation and ascetic piety are another world.²⁰

Tarāneh of Abu Sa'īd Abu al-Kheyr:

دو کوزه نبی خریدم پاره کم
تا کی کوی قلندری و غم و غم

من دانگی و نیم داشتیم حبه کم
بر بربط من نه زیر مانده است و نه بم

I had a share and a half, just a little less
I have bought a couple goblets of wine, just a little less
On my lute, neither high nor low pitch strings remained,
How much longer of the *qalandar* quarter and heartache?²¹

Robā'i of Yusof 'Āmeri:

در راه یگانگی چه طاعت چه گناه
رخسار قلندری چه روشن چه سیاه

در کوی خرابات چه درویش چه شاه
بر کنگره عرش چه خورشید چه ماه

In the quarter of the dilapidated winehouse, what difference is there between the
dervish and king?
In the path of oneness, what difference is there between acts of obedience and sins?
At the level of the throne, what difference is there between the sun and the moon?
For the face of a *qalandar*, what difference is there between whiteness and black?²²

These quatrains may indicate the existence of *qalandari* topoi in Persian poetry since the early to mid-eleventh century. But there are serious questions about the attribution of these poems to the aforementioned poets, and thus their dating too.²³

What is known for certain, however, is that beginning in the late eleventh century and twelfth centuries we begin to see a growing number of *qalandar*-inspired poems by poets as diverse as Borhāni, Amir Mo'ezzi, Sanā'i, Khayyām (d. 1131), Khāqāni (d. ca. 1186–99), and Anvari (d. 1189–90).²⁴ With the exception of Khayyām, the *qalandari* poems composed

²⁰ Ebn Monavvar, *Asrār al-towhid*, 1:329.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 1:73.

²² Quoted in 'Ayn al-Qozāt Hamadāni ("Tamihidāt," 228).

²³ The exact dating of Yusof 'Āmeri is unknown. Shafi'i-Kadkani says he wrote in the fifth/eleventh century, and he cannot have composed this poem any later than the beginning of the twelfth century because 'Ayn al-Qozāt Hamadāni cites it in his *Tamihidāt*. The attribution of these quatrains to Abu Sa'īd and Bābā Tāher is uncertain, as Shafi'i-Kadkani, Karamustafa, and de Bruijn point out. But, in the case of the Abu Sa'īd poems at least, they are mentioned in the *Asrār al-towhid*, meaning that they cannot date later than the mid-twelfth century. See Shafi'i-Kadani, *Qalandariyyeh dar tārikh*, 39–40, 263, 296; Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, 32–33; and de Bruijn, *Persian Sufi Poetry*, 13–18. On the contested question of whether Abu Sa'īd himself composed any poems, see a summary of these views in O'Malley, "From Blessed Lips," 10.

²⁴ Shafi'i-Kadani, *Qalandariyyeh dar tārikh*, 107–8, 141; de Bruijn, "Anvari and the Ghazal," 23–27. For a discussion of Sanā'i's *qalandariyyāt* see Miller, "Poetics of the Sufi Carnival." On Khayyām's purported *qalandari* quatrains (with the usual caveats about lack of certainty regarding the attribution of these poems to Khayyām), see Bürgel, "The Pious Rogue," 44. In addition to the *qalandariyyāt* by Anvari discussed in de Bruijn's work cited here, see also Anvari, *Divān-e Anvari*, 859; and Khāqāni Shervāni, *Divān-e Khāqāni Shervāni*, 629, 643.

by these poets are not quatrains, but rather *ghazals* and *qasidehs*. Sana'i's *divān*, by far, has the largest number of such poems. Indeed, some of the earliest manuscripts of the *divān*, which are organized into thematic divisions, include one section explicitly labeled as *qalandariyyāt*, providing us a unique window into what this thematic genre term meant in the first few centuries following Sana'i.²⁵

The *qalandari* poems in Sana'i's *divān* are a diverse bunch. More attention has been devoted to the famous shorter monothematic examples of *qalandari* poetry in these sections.²⁶ These are the poems that generally come to mind when the term *qalandariyyāt* is employed, and it is this tradition of monothematic *qalandari* poems that 'Attār and 'Erāqi largely follow. But there are a variety of different types of polythematic poems in the *qalandariyyāt* sections of these manuscripts as well.²⁷ The bulk of these poems fall into an expansive category that we might call "rogue homilies."²⁸ They share a common polythematic construction and a tendency toward what we might call an expository or didactic poetic mode in their treatment of more theoretical topics such as the "reasons" for the winehouse, the meaning of roguery (*qallāshi*), the connection between love and *kofr* (infidelity), etc., as de Bruijn has argued.²⁹ Interestingly, Sana'i also has a small number of *qalandari* praise poems for minor patrons and the Prophet Muhammad (*na't*), which use *qalandari* themes in varying degrees in key places throughout the poems to praise the patron or the prophet and reimagine them as something akin to the lord of the *qalandars* or a roguish lover.³⁰ These examples show the usage of *qalandari* topoi in praise poetry to be wider than Borhāni and Amir Mo'ezzi, but this subtype is not Sana'i's primary area of focus, nor are these poems substantially similar to the classic polythematic panegyrics of Borhāni or Amir Mo'ezzi that will be discussed later.³¹

²⁵ Several early manuscripts of Sana'i's poetry are organized on the basis of thematic genre (*madhiyyāt*, *ghazaliyyāt*, *qalandariyyāt*, *zohdiyyāt*). The two most important ones are the *Ketāb-khāneh-ye Mellī-ye Malek* (MIM) 5468 and the Kabul Museum 318 (KM) manuscripts. For more on these early manuscripts of Sana'i's poetic collections, see: de Bruijn, *Of Piety and Poetry*, 93–108; Miller, "Genre in Classical Persian Poetry"; and Ahmad, "Some Original Prose and Poetical Pieces of Hakim Sana'i." The only other medieval Persian work in which the author or manuscript editors have used the term *qalandariyyāt* in a thematic organization of poems is 'Attār's *Mokhtār-nāmeḥ*, which has a section of *robā'iyyāt* labeled "*dar khamriyyāt va qalandariyyāt*." For more on 'Attār's *qalandariyyāt* in the *Mokhtār-nāmeḥ*, see Miller, "Genre in Classical Persian Poetry."

²⁶ Lewis discusses and analyzes ten monothematic *qalandariyyāt* by Sana'i in "Reading, Writing and Recitation," 364–68, 559–78. For a discussion of several monothematic *qalandariyyāt* of Sana'i, 'Attār, and 'Erāqi as well as the subtypes of monothematic types of this genre, see Miller, "Poetics of the Sufi Carnival."

²⁷ For more on the formal diversity of the early *qalandariyyāt*, see de Bruijn, "The *Qalandariyyāt* in Persian Mystical Poetry"; Miller, "Genre in Classical Persian Poetry" and "Poetics of the Sufi Carnival."

²⁸ For examples of these poems, see Sana'i, *Divān-e Hakim Abu al-Majd Majdud ebn Ādam Sanā'i Ghaznavi*, ed. Modarres-e Razavi, 27–28, 32–33, 95–96, 108–9, 295–99, 325–26, 402–4, 404–6, 406–7, 407–8, 409–10, 410–11, 420–21, 428–29, 435–36, 453–54, 454–57, 497–99, 499–500, 577–79, 589–90, 590–92, 596–97, 622–23.

²⁹ de Bruijn, "The *Qalandariyyāt* in Persian Mystical Poetry," 84–86. I would diverge from de Bruijn's treatment of this subtype on two points. First, I think *na't* (praise of prophet) poems need to be classed as a separate type, as I have done here. And second, in my reading, de Bruijn is a little overzealous in placing poems into this category. There is more diversity in the poems he classifies into this group than his more limited typology allows for.

³⁰ There are four poems that have been identified as *qalandari na't* poems (the first two poems were identified by de Bruijn as *na't* poems and the second two were labeled as such by the editor of the KM manuscript). The four poems are: Sana'i, *Divān-e Hakim Abu al-Majd Majdud ebn Ādam Sanā'i Ghaznavi*, 23–24, 181–82, 388–92, 587–89. There are two poems that some manuscript editors have identified as short *qalandari* panegyrics for minor patrons: *Ibid.*, 164–65 (q 94), 339–40 (q 157). There also is a *tarkib-band* listed as a *qalandariyyāt* in the KM manuscript, which in Modarres-e Razavi's version (*Ibid.*) is listed as a panegyric, but not as a *qalandariyyāt*. The version of this poem in Modarres-e Razavi's edition is much longer, containing eight more stanzas than the KM manuscript. See: *Ibid.*, 717–33; Sana'i, *Kolliyyāt-e ash'ār-e Hakim Sanā'i Ghaznavi*, ed. Bashir, 524–25. Lastly, there is a short *qalandari* panegyric attributed to 'Erāqi, but its attribution to him is disputed. See 'Erāqi, *Kolliyyāt-e Fakhri al-Din 'Erāqi*, 311–14.

³¹ The use of *qalandari* imagery to praise patrons as rogue spiritual master-kings and express their political legitimacy in these terms also has interesting parallels with the later use of the *sāqi-nāmeḥ* (cupbearer ode) for political purposes. See Losensky, "Vintages of the Sāqi-nāma."

Sanā'i's *qalandariyyāt* clearly represent an already well-developed generic tradition, which suggests that the *qalandariyyāt* must have their origins at least in the mid-eleventh century, if the process of generic development was rapid, and potentially even earlier, if the process proceeded at a slower pace. This approximate dating does mesh well with the assignment of the *qalandari* quatrains above to the early-mid eleventh century, but without clearing up the attribution issues surrounding these poems this congruence remains only suggestive.

There is, however, a problem with this standard narrative of the history and development of the *qalandariyyāt*. It ignores or at best pays only passing lip service to two of the earliest specimens of *qalandari* poetry: the fourteen-line poetic fragment attributed to Borhāni and the polythematic panegyric with a *qalandari* introit (*nasib*) composed by his son, Amir Mo'ezzi. Given the uncertainty around the dating of the quatrains, these poems are arguably the earliest (approximately) datable evidence we have for *qalandari* poetry. This fact alone would seem to warrant a central place for these poems in any discussions of *qalandariyyāt*, but this has not been the case in scholarship on this genre. At the minimum, these *qalandari* royal panegyric poems represent a "road not taken" in the subsequent history of the *qalandariyyāt* and a productive complication for the neat Sufi-centered genesis narrative. Equally significant, they also challenge some of our assumptions about the social function of this carnivalesque poetry in medieval Persian culture.

Classical Panegyric Qasidehs with Qalandari Introits: Fake Qalandariyyāt, Royal Jokes, or Attempts to Forge a New Ideal of Islamic Kingship?

Almost no poetry of Borhāni remains extant. There are only fragments preserved in later sources, most of which are just a few select lines, and their attributions to him are not completely certain. The only sample of a significant size is the aforementioned *qalandari* poem that Mohammad Badr-e Jājarmi (fl. early to mid-fourteenth century) includes in a section entitled "*dar ash'ār-e moqaffā*" of his *Mo'nes al-Ahrār*. This poem is almost certainly a *qalandari* introit of a no longer extant panegyric.³² The mention of a *mamduh* in its final line and the similarities between it and the classic polythematic panegyric with a *qalandari* introit composed by Borhāni's son, Amir Mo'ezzi, for the same patron makes it unlikely that these verses were intended as a standalone poem. Rather, the combined evidence points to the likelihood that these two poems represent a type of panegyric preferred by this patron.

<p>همی نازم چو موسی در مناجات مبارک باشدم ایام و ساعات نه قرانی نمایم من نه طاعات بر آسایم ز تهدید عبادات چو کردم حق فرعونی مراعات خراباتی چه داند جز لباسات گهی پیش مُغنی در تحیات گهی گویم که ای مطرب غزل هات کشم نعره ز حجره در سماوات سببلم کرده مادر در خرابات کنم در صف قلاشان مباحات مکن بر من سلام ای خواجه هیهات ندانم من بجز هزل و خرافات خداوندی جوادی نیکویی ذات</p>	<p>هر آن روزی که باشم در خرابات هر آن روزی که در مستی گذارم مرا بی³³ خویشتن بهتر که سازم چو از بند خرد آزاد گردم مرا موسی بفرماید بتورا مرا گویی لباسات تو تا کی گهی اندر سجودم پیش معشوق گهی گویم که ای ساقی قدح خذ من و باده کشیدن تا ز مستی پدر بر خُم خمرم وقف کردست یکی آزاد مردم لابلالی چو می دانی که مرد تَرّهاتم خرافات خراباتی چه گویم سخن گویم ز شاهای جعفری اصل</p>
---	---

³² De Bruijn, "The Qaside after the Fall of the Ghaznavids," 107–8; Shafi'i-Kadkani, *Qalandariyyeh dar tārikh*, 298–99.

³³ Following Shafi'i-Kadkani (*Qalandariyyeh dar tārikh*, 297), I have opted for the variant reading of *bi* rather than *bā* here.

- 1 Each day that I am in the dilapidated winehouse,
I yearn/flirt/boast (*hami nāzam*) like Moses in his private prayers.
- 2 Each day that I pass in drunkenness
Blessed are those days and hours for me!
- 3 It is better that I make myself selfless
and not recite the Qurʾān or perform acts of asceticism and obedience.
- 4 Since I am freeing myself of the fetters of wisdom,
I will rest from the threats of worship.
- 5 Moses commands the Torah for me
since I showed such regard for the pharaoh.³⁴
- 6 You may say to me: “How long will you remain in disguise?”
But what does a haunter of the dilapidated winehouse know except disguises?
- 7 Sometimes I prostrate and do my prayers before the beloved;
other times I am in front of the singer paying my respects and offering
greetings.
- 8 Sometimes I say: “O cupbearer, grab a goblet!”
Other times I say: “O minstrel, give us a *ghazal*!”
- 9 Sometimes I drink wine until I am so wasted
that I cry out from my home to the heavens!
- 10 Father dedicated me to vats of wine.
Mother set me firm on the path to the winehouse.
- 11 I am a free and reckless man,
I boast in the ranks of the rascals!
- 12 Since you think that I am just a man full of foolish words,
alas!—don’t even say hello to me, sir.
- 13 Why should I speak of these wild tales of the winehouse?
[You think:] I do not know anything except satire and wild tales.
[Or, “Do I not know anything else apart from joking and nonsense?”]³⁵
- 14 I speak of a king of Jaʿfari origin—
a lord beneficent and good in essence.³⁶

The poem opens with the symbol that is most closely associated with *qalandariyyāt* poetry generally—i.e., the “dilapidated winehouse” (*kharābāt*)—which functions as a mock-court

³⁴ De Bruijn has discussed the images of Moses and the pharaoh as symbols of the “uncompromising attitude of the customer of the *kharābāt*” and human arrogance respectively (“The *Qalandariyyāt* in Persian Mystical Poetry,” 81).

³⁵ I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer for this alternative translation of this line.

³⁶ Persian text from: Jājarmi, *Moʿnes al-ahrār (jeld-e dovvom)*, 481–82.

of sorts,³⁷ fully equipped with its own cupbearers (*sāqi*) and minstrels (line 8).³⁸ In this heterotopic space it is “drunkenness,” self-dissolution, music, and roguery that are “blessed” and “boast[ed]” of, whereas Qur’ānic recitation, “worship,” “acts of asceticism and obedience,” and “wisdom” are rejected (lines 2–4, 8–11). Throughout the poem the poet repeatedly inverts normative Islamic customs and symbols (e.g., prayer before the beloved and singer, ritual parental dedication to wine and the “path to the winehouse”; lines 7, 10) and concludes in a mock-*fakhr* (boast), declaiming that he is in the “ranks of the rascals” (line 11). The content of the poem reflects the hallmarks of an early *qalandari* poem.

There are, however, two issues with this poem that need to be addressed. The first revolves around questions about the authenticity of its attribution to Borhāni. Jājarmi attributes this poem to Borhāni three centuries after he would have composed it, which means its attribution to him is by no means certain. Several scholars also have pointed out that a very similar poem is attributed to Sanā’i.³⁹ The two poems are nearly identical, with only minor wording differences in a few lines and an additional three lines present in Borhāni’s poem that are not in Sanā’i’s. The Sanā’i version of this poem is attributed to him in the early *Ketāb-khāneh-ye Melli-ye Malek* (MiM) 5468 manuscript (as reproduced in the Modarres-e Razavi edition of his *divān*), and it is explicitly labeled there as belonging to MiM’s *qalandariyyāt* section.⁴⁰ However, several scholars have argued that the evidence points more strongly to Borhāni as the original author of these verses, which may have either been (a) misattributed to Sanā’i at an early point or, (b) adopted and slightly revised by him. There are three pieces of evidence for this argument:⁴¹

- 1) The “king of Ja’fari origin” mentioned in the last line of the poem attributed to Borhāni in the *Mo’nes al-Ahrār* is likely a reference to the same patron as the patron of Amir Mo’ezzi’s later *qalandari* panegyric, Fakhr al-Ma’āli Abu ‘Ali Sharafshāh Ja’fari (or, perhaps, one of the previous Ja’fari rulers).⁴² Little is known about Sharafshāh Ja’fari and his rule in Qazvin, except that he came from a powerful family who claimed descent from Ja’far ben Abi Tāleb and served as the governors of Qazvin from approximately 1033 to Sharafshāh’s death in 1091–92.⁴³ Strengthening the identification of this “king of Ja’fari origin” in Borhāni’s poem as Sharafshāh also is the fact that the use of the “-āt” rhyme in both of their poems would facilitate the

³⁷ Although Borhāni does not explicitly refer to the winehouse as a court in this poem, other *qalandari* poets do so in other poems. See for example Sanā’i, *Divān-e Hakim Abu al-Majd Majdud ebn Ādam Sanā’i Ghaznavi*, ed. Modarres-e Razavi, 74.

³⁸ Although *kharābāt* is typically translated as “tavern,” I have opted to translate it as “dilapidated winehouse” in an effort to convey (even if only indirectly) both the image of a place of illicit drink (i.e., a tavern) and the sense of ruin (which is the literal meaning of the term).

³⁹ Sanā’i, *Divān-e Hakim Abu al-Majd Majdud ebn Ādam Sanā’i Ghaznavi*, 73–74 (q 27).

⁴⁰ For more on the MiM 5468 manuscript, which is believed to date to the twelfth or early thirteenth century, see Modarres-e Razavi, “Moqaddemeh-ye mosahheh,” CXLIX–CL; and de Bruijn, *Of Piety and Poetry*, 93–95, 98–99.

⁴¹ For these arguments, see discussions of attribution of this poem to Sanā’i or Borhāni in: Eqbāl, *Moqaddemeh*, x; Mo’in, “Borhāni va qasideh-ye u”; Shafi’i-Kadkani, *Qalandariyeh dar tārikh*, 297–99; Tetley, *Ghaznavid and Seljuk Turks*, 92–93; Qanbari, “Moqaddemeh,” XII–XIII n3; and Lewis, “Reading, Writing and Recitation,” 137. I am less convinced by the third reason, which is given by Shafi’i-Kadkani. Although he does not specify which “very old manuscript of Sanā’i’s *divān* from the 6th century [AH] in the Kabul Museum” he is referring to, I assume he is referencing the Kabul Museum 318 manuscript. The dating of this manuscript to the sixth (twelfth) century has been challenged by de Bruijn, who has argued that it is more likely from the eighth (fourteenth) century. I also have argued that the inconsistencies in this manuscript’s thematic groupings may corroborate de Bruijn’s later dating. See de Bruijn, *Of Piety and Poetry*, 99–100; and Miller, “Genre in Classical Persian Poetry.”

⁴² For an overview of the Ja’fari line, see: Mottahedeh, “Administration in Būyid Qazwīn,” 34–35, 35 n4.

⁴³ On Sharafshāh Ja’fari and Qazvin of this period, see Mottahedeh, “Administration in Būyid Qazwīn”; and Hillenbrand and Lambton, “Qazwīn.” The Ja’fari family is mentioned in Hamd Allāh Mostowfi’s *Tārikh-e gozideh* (795–96) and *Nozhat al-qolub* (801) and Abu al-Qāsem ‘Abd al-Karim ben Mohammad al-Rāfe’i’s *Kitāb al-tadwin fi dhikr ahl al-‘ilm* (see Mottahedeh’s “Administration in Būyid Qazwīn” for a full discussion of Rāfe’i’s treatment of the Ja’fari family).

incorporation of Sharafshāh Jaʿfari’s title *zu al-saʿādāt* into the poem—a title that is mentioned both in Amir Moʿezzi’s poem below and Mostowfi’s *Tārikh-e Gozideh*.⁴⁴

- 2) There are similarities between the poems of Borhāni and Amir Moʿezzi at the level of themes, wording, and rhyme, except that Amir Moʿezzi adds the *radif* “ast” to the “-āt” rhyme.
- 3) Sanāʾi’s version of this poem is not in the early Kabul Museum manuscript of Sanāʾi’s *divān*.

Regardless of whether this poem is originally from the pen of Sanāʾi or Borhāni, the fact that it was attributed to both figures at an early date makes it part of their poetic legacy to some extent. In the case of Sanāʾi this attribution is not surprising. As previously discussed, he is the first major poet who produced a substantial collection of *qalandariyyāt*. However, the attribution of this *qalandari* poem to Borhāni raises some interesting questions for the earliest history of the *qalandariyyāt*. Namely, does this poem—a *qalandari* introit of a panegyric *qasideh*—represent another early path of development for *qalandari* poetry that does not seem to have become widespread? Jājarmi, writing in the mid-fourteenth century, apparently found this combination plausible enough to include the poem with an attribution to Borhāni in his anthology. This attribution may not have been surprising to Jājarmi if he knew of other such early *qalandari* panegyrics by Borhāni or other courtly panegyric poets that are no longer extant.⁴⁵ Although admittedly we have veered into the realm of speculation here, it is worth at least posing the question of whether the subsequent Sufi dominance of the *qalandariyyāt* genre could have produced a documentary lacuna—an editorial amnesia of sorts—in the historical record for other early types of *qalandari* poetry. Fallen from favor and out of sync with the poetic times, these early non-Sufi experiments with *qalandari* poetry may not have been preserved as well as other more in-demand types of poetry.

The second issue with the Borhāni poem is the way it—and by extension his son Amir Moʿezzi’s poem—has been treated in the secondary scholarship on the *qalandariyyāt*. As mentioned above, most accounts pass over them with only a cursory mention or none at all. Equally problematic, however, is that the two works that do engage with them as poems do so in ways that misunderstand them or delegitimize their importance for the study of the *qalandariyyāt*. The shorter of the two treatments of Borhāni’s poem occurs in G. E. Tetley’s work that examines poetry as a source for the study of Ghaznavid and Saljuq history. In one of his chapters on Amir Moʿezzi’s poetry, he briefly discusses these two poems. In both cases he is rather unsure how to read them. He first suggests, citing ʿOwfi, that since Borhāni was apparently well known for “jokes” (*latāʿef*), this poem may just be that and nothing more. He then entertains the idea that perhaps this poem was inspired by the *malāmatiyyeh* ethos (which is often posited as a possible conceptual inspiration for *qalandari* poetry as well).⁴⁶ But, he then reverses course on this tentative suggestion and says it also is possible that the poem was a satire aimed at the *malāmatiyyeh*.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ Sharafshāh’s full name is listed in Mostowfi’s *Tārikh-e gozideh* (795) as Fakhr al-Maʿālī Zu al-Saʿādāt Abu ʿAlī Sharafshāh ben Mohammad ben Ahmad ben Mohammad Jaʿfari.

⁴⁵ Anna Livia Beelaert in her article about Jājarmi remarks that “the chapter on the *ḡazal* (2:952–1133) [in the *Moʿnes al-ahrar*], containing nearly three hundred poems by more than a hundred poets (most of them known only because of the *Moʿnes*), gives us a picture not entirely in keeping with modern critical consensus.” The fact that his work preserves many poems only known through his work and presents a “picture not entirely in keeping with modern critical consensus” is a virtue because it provides us with a window into the literary scene at his time. See Anna Livia Beelaert, “Jājarmi.”

⁴⁶ On *malāmatis* and their connection to *qalandars*, see al-Suhrawardi, *ʿAwārif al-maʿārif*, 82–92; Shafiʿi-Kadkani, *Qalandariyyeh dar tārikh*, 28–36, 101–41; Karamustafa, *God’s Unruly Friends*, 34–36; and de Bruijn, “The *Qalandariyyāt* in Persian Mystical Poetry,” 76.

⁴⁷ Tetley, *Ghaznavids and the Seljuk Turks*, 92–94.

There appears to be some internal textual support for the idea that Borhāni's poem is either satirical or frivolous in intent. Borhāni does say in the penultimate line: "Why should I speak of these wild tales of the winehouse? / [You think:] I do not know anything except satire and wild tales." (Alternatively, this hemistich also perhaps could be translated as "Do I not know anything apart from joking and nonsense?") Tetley reads this as suggesting that Borhāni may be admitting that the preceding *qalandari nasib* is just "satire" or "wild tales of the winehouse" with no necessary connection to the panegyric that follows it. I think this reading, however, is incorrect. Rather, I would argue that when we read lines 12–14 together their function as a transition and link between the *qalandari nasib* and the main panegyric section emerges. They seem to be saying that "you audience members may think that my [Borhani's] words in this *qalandari nasib* are nothing but the satirical or frivolous forms of speech that I am associated with, but actually they are important because in this poem 'I [will] speak of a king of Ja'fari origin.'" An implied "No!" could even be appended to the translation of line 14, further highlighting Borhāni's rejection of the application of the label of satire and "wild tales" to his *nasib*.⁴⁸ In this rejection he implies that there is a connection he is going to make clearer (as Amir Mo'ezzi does in the analogous place in his poem discussed below) between the *qalandari nasib* and the following panegyric section and, thus, between the *qalandari* world and the world of the "king of Ja'fari origin." The fact that, as I will show below, Amir Mo'ezzi's similar poem for the same patron is definitively not a satire on the *malāmatiyyeh* or just "wild tales" also militates against these interpretations put forward by Tetley. However, if in the unlikely event it was intended as a mock-*qalandariyyāt* introit, this itself would be tremendously interesting because it would indicate that the *qalandariyyāt* genre had reached such a point of widespread popularity and development by this early period that mock-*qalandariyyāt* were already being produced.

Tetley does not speculate on the intent of Amir Mo'ezzi's poem specifically, but in a concluding paragraph that comments on both poems together he expands upon another possibility that he mentions in passing when introducing Borhāni's poem in the beginning of this section. Specifically, he refers to these poems as "qalandari," "antinomian," and having "overtones of Sufism," but at the same time distances himself from these terms. Borhāni's poem appears to be *qalandari* poetry, but it is "many years before Sanā'i introduced the genre into Persian poetry." The poems may have "antinomian elements and overtones of Sufism," but this type of *qalandari* Sufi poetry would be "most unusual [for] this period" because it would only "become familiar in the mystical poetry of the next two centuries."⁴⁹ The question the reader is left asking—which is not answered—is: can these poems be Sufi/*qalandari*/antinomian or not? In the end, the reader is left with a wide series of possibilities and no resolution. These poems could be *qalandari*/Sufi/*malāmati* works, jokes, or satiric takes on *malāmatiyyeh*—mock-*qalandariyyāt* of sorts.

The approach of Mohammad Reza Shafi'i-Kadkani to these poems shares some similarities with Tetley's. Although in his characteristically erudite manner he engages with the poems at a deeper level than Tetley, he also seeks to distance them from what he terms "true qalandari poetry." He argues that the poems of Borhāni and Amir Mo'ezzi both contain a "jumble" (*dar ham rikhtegi*) or an "admixture" (*dar ham āmizi*) of symbols from the "paradigms of the dilapidated winehouse (*kharābāt*) and the mosque"—by which I believe he means the poetic symbols that are typically associated roughly with *qalandariyyāt* and religious-homiletic (*zohdiyyāt/mow'ezeh*) poetry. This confusion shows that these poets, as Shafi'i-Kadkani says when commenting on Borhāni's introit, "did not have direct experience with qalandari poetry, but rather took advantage of the existing tradition of qalandari poetry and composed an introit (*tashbibī*) in this style and praised his patron." These poems, in other words, are both faux *qalandariyyāt* because, as he concludes, "the dignity (*sha'n*) of the poets of true

⁴⁸ I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer for the suggestion of placing an implied "No!" at the beginning of line 14. However, I have interpreted this suggested "No!" in a different way than the reviewer intended.

⁴⁹ Tetley, *The Ghaznavids and the Seljuk Turks*, 92–94.

qalandari poetry is above panegyric poetry.”⁵⁰ This final statement is quite revealing. For Shafi’i-Kadkani, *qalandari* poetry is in its essence incapable of stooping to the level of panegyric poetry. Ergo, these panegyrics with *qalandari* introits cannot be regarded as “true” early examples of *qalandari* poetry. This is an ideological position about what types of poetry can and cannot be “true” *qalandari* poetry, and it is not surprising that Shafi’i-Kadkani takes this position, for he sees *qalandariyyeh* as an “ideology,” as the subtitle of his *Qalandariyyeh dar tārikh* book (*degardisi-hā-ye yek ide’olozhi*), announces.

I also am unconvinced by his argument that the symbols used in these poems confuse the conventional symbolic registers of *qalandariyyāt* and religious-homiletic poetry. There are a few symbols and images that may differ slightly from their standard usage in later *qalandariyyāt*, but none egregiously so. Moreover, slight differences, or even, as Shafi’i-Kadkani believes, inconsistencies, between these early *qalandariyyāt* and later ones should not necessarily be surprising in any case. They were written at the very earliest stages of the development of *qalandari* poetry, when the tradition was likely the most flexible and still solidifying its conventional stock of imagery and symbols. No poetic tradition, at any point, especially in its formative stages, should be expected to be wholly internally consistent.

Overall, I would argue, these introits read as typical *qalandari* poetry, and Sanā’i, or a very early editor of his *divān*, apparently thought so as well. As we learned above, this poem was either appropriated and slightly adapted by Sanā’i himself or was misattributed to him by one of the earliest manuscript editors of his *divān* and placed in his manuscript’s *qalandariyyāt* section. The symbolic disjuncture that Shafi’i-Kadkani argues exists between Borhāni and Amir Mo’ezzi’s poems and “true *qalandari* poetry” is not as obvious as is assumed in his dismissal of these poems as inauthentic *qalandari* poetry, and he does not argue the point beyond a passing assertion about the incompatibility of a few images (e.g., *monājāt* and *kharābāt*, *masti* and *mobārak*) in Borhāni’s poem.

Through a close reading of Amir Mo’ezzi’s poem in the following section, I will argue against Tetley and Shafi’i-Kadkani’s readings of these poems. They are not, in my reading, satires, jokes, “wild tales,” fake *qalandari* Sufi poetry, or bumbling attempts to take advantage of a new poetic trend. They are strategically engaging the young *qalandari* poetic world and its Sufi context with the goal of marshaling the cultural and symbolic capital associated with “*qalandar*-iness” to do something quite serious: to provide a new model of Islamic kingship to legitimize the rule of the Saljuq’s governor of Qazvin, Sharafshāh Ja’fari. Even if the possibility is left open that Borhāni’s poem—due to its truncated nature—may not be participating in this same poetic fashioning of a new model of roguish kingship, Amir Mo’ezzi’s poem leaves no doubt on this score.

“Among the Impossibilities”: Amir Mo’ezzi’s *Qalandar King*

The genre of royal panegyric poetry has been used since early Islamic history to celebrate and project power in the broadest sociological sense of this term. It propagates Islamicate cultural hegemony in the sense that its notion of power goes beyond the limits of the individual sociopolitical power of the figure being praised (*mamduh*) in the poem itself to include the cultural and religious values that are so crucial for ordering and disciplining society. In this way, the goal of Islamic panegyric poetry is not only—or even primarily—the glorification of the *mamduh*, but also the maintenance and legitimation of the entire Islamic sociopolitical order of which the *mamduh* is a titular head.⁵¹

⁵⁰ Shafi’i-Kadkani, *Qalandariyyeh dar tārikh*, 298–99.

⁵¹ The *mamduh* may not himself always live up to these standards, although this does not mean that these poems are sycophantic flattery. Rather, these poems should be understood as presenting their audience with an idealized portrait of the political figure that simultaneously functions as a social affirmation of the position’s ideal values and as an exhortation to the figure to actually live up to them. On the *qasideh*’s portrayal of royal *mamduhs* as idealized

Given the *qalandariyyāt*'s relentless assault on seemingly all normative Islamic values, one can be forgiven for wondering what role a *qalandari* introit could play in a traditional royal panegyric poem. The modi operandi of their poetic worlds seem utterly incompatible. However, this conflict is more apparent than real. To argue that the poetic worlds of the *qalandariyyāt* and royal panegyric parodically invert one another does not mean that these thematic domains are hermetically separate fields that can never operate in conjunction with each other to achieve certain poetic effects.

In the classical (polythematic) bi- or tripartite panegyric *qasideh*, the coexistence of disparate thematic units is the norm. Royal panegyrics often treat amatory, nature, or anacreontic themes in their introit (*nasib*) before transitioning to eulogic themes (*madh*) in the remainder of the poem. Whereas some scholars have seen the juxtaposition of radically disparate thematic concerns as a sign of the atomistic nature of Persian and Arabic poems, more recent literary studies have convincingly demonstrated that the introit (*nasib*) is integrally linked with the subsequent thematic section(s)—what some scholars have labeled its strophe and antistrophe respectively—in quite complex, even if not immediately obvious, ways. At times a *qasideh*'s strophe and antistrophe function in an antithetical relationship with one another; other times they operate in a parallel manner. Sometimes the beloved of the strophe is to be contrasted with the *mamduh* of the antistrophe; in other cases the opposition or similarity in the imagery of the two sections is intended to illustrate a point about the *mamduh* or the political situation. The different possible types of relationships between the strophe and the antistrophe are numerous, but in all cases both sections play a crucial role in the way the poem as a whole constructs meaning not *despite* but *because* of their thematic differences.⁵² This understanding of the *qasideh* as a poetic whole with interdependent thematic components means that we cannot reduce the wholistic meaning of the poem to the apparent meaning of any one section of the poem on its own. We need to adopt an interpretative mode of analysis that moves “beyond the section” (to critically adapt van Gelder's title) to an “inter-sectional” approach.⁵³

Islamic rulers in the context of Persian panegyric poetry, see Meisami, *Medieval Persian Court Poetry*, 43–48; Meisami, “Ghaznavid Panegyrics,” 32, 34; Bürgel, “Qasida as Discourse on Power and its Islamization”; Glünz, “Poetic Tradition and Social Change,” 184, 188; Sperl and Shackle, “Introduction,” 8; Shafī'i-Kadkani, *Mofles-e kimiya-forush*, 83–85, 95ff. Stefan Sperl originally made this argument in the context of Arabic panegyric poetry (“Islamic Kingship and Arabic Panegyric Poetry”; and *Mannerism in Arabic Poetry*, 9–27, 33–34).

⁵² Stefan Sperl was the first to use the terminology of “strophe” and “antistrophe” to discuss the different sections of the Arabic *qasideh*, arguing that the *qasideh* is typically structured in a strophe-antistrophe manner, with the *nasib* and *madih* sections functioning in an antithetical relationship with one another. The *madih* section, he maintains, “celebrates the societal values and virtues” associated with the patron (*mamduh*), which are inverted in the *nasib* by those associated with the “abandoned (campsite) ruins” (*atāl*) and the figure of the beloved. See Sperl, *Mannerism in Arabic Poetry*, 19–27. Meisami adopts Sperl's terminology, but correctly points out that the relationship between the *nasib* and *madih* can be both antithetical and parallel. See Meisami, *Medieval Persian Court Poetry*, 24–76; and Meisami, *Structure and Meaning*, 145–89. Gruendler, although concurring with Meisami that *nasib* and *madih* can be antithetical or parallel to one another, does argue that “[p]anegyric *qasā'id* for caliphs tend to be antithetical in structure. . . . The *habib*, protagonist of the *nasib* (strophe), and the ruler, protagonist of the *madih* (antistrophe), as well as their respective powers (fate and rulership) and their realms (*atāl* and state), constitute binary oppositions. As a whole, the *qasida* moves from affliction to redemption or from the sensual to the spiritual realm. Both binary structures reveal an inherent logic in the *qasida*'s separate themes, by ascribing the first part (Sperl's strophe) a functional role as a foil for or a contrast to the second part, concerned with the ruler (Sperl's antistrophe).” She also adds the term “metastrophe” to refer to the concluding “cap” lines. See brief discussion of this below and also Gruendler, *Medieval Arabic Praise Poetry*, 15, 52–59. Note too that the use of the terms strophe and antistrophe with respect to Persian and Arabic poetry differs in important ways from the classical meaning of these terms in Greek. Last, Tahera Qutbuddin also points out examples of both antithesis and parallelism in the *nasib* and *madih* sections of al-Mo'ayyad's panegyrics. See Qutbuddin, *Al-Mu'ayyad al-Shirāzi and Fatimid Da'wa Poetry*, 173–74, 213. For more on the complex thematic, symbolic, and structural interrelations of the *nasib* and other sections of the *qasideh*, see also Sells, “Guises of the Ghūl”; and Sells, “Like the Arms of a Drowning Man.”

⁵³ That is, the title of van Gelder's famous work, *Beyond the Line: Classical Arabic Literary Critics on the Coherence and Unity of the Poem*.

The panegyric *qasideh* of Amir Mo'ezzi for Sharafshāh Ja'fari is a particularly interesting example in this regard. In this poem Amir Mo'ezzi constructs a complex parallel relation between the seemingly antithetical poetic worlds of the *qalandari* strophe and the panegyric antistrophe in which he eulogizes Sharafshāh Ja'fari in terms drawn from royal panegyric poetry. It both presents an interesting case study of strophe-antistrophe interrelation and, more importantly for the present study, points to other potential roles that *qalandari* poetry may have played in the Persian poetic system outside of its role as a carnivalesque counter-genre to religious-homiletic and royal panegyric poetry.⁵⁴

- ۱ اگر سرای لباساتیان خرابات است
میان شهر همه عاشقان خراب شدند
مجوی زهد و خرابی کن و خراباتی
بیار ساغر فرعونی و به دستم ده
۵ نیفکنم سپر از باده خوردن از پی آنک
هر آن مکان که بُود اهل عشق را مأوی
میان عاشق و معشوق هست آن معنی
من آن کسم که همی سجده پیش عشق برم
هر آن سرود که در عشق عاشقانه بخاست
۱۰ مرا ز عشق مراعات نیست یک ساعت
به روزگار جوانی اسیر عشق شدم
روم مدام به درگاه آن خداوندی
جمال عالم فخر المعالی آن ملکی
ابو علی شرفشاه ابن عز الدین
۱۵ شرف ز جعفر و شاهی ز کنگرست اورا
از آن گرفت سماوات زیر پر جعفر
به جود جعفر برمک مثل زنند و مرا
ایا کسی که تورا خدمتش کفایت نیست
ایا کسی که به درگاه اوست موعد تو
۲۰ تو ای نتیجه دولت نجات احراری
تویی که بوم وصال تو خیر ایام است
مدار چرخ همه بر مراد توست مدام
اگر ز خلق مساحات ساحت فلک است بدان
خبر چگونه توان دادن از مخالف تو
۲۵ زمین چو نطع و قضا و قدر به سان حریف
مخالف تو چو شاه است و دولتش فرزین
حسود دیوسرشت تورا شهادت نیست
یکی شهادت من این بُود که سوگندش
میان مجمع فضال حجت آرم من
۳۰ چو باب جنّت خواند رسول قزوین را
به فرّ دولت تو من دلیل بنمایم
رضای توست رضای نبی رضای نبی
دلایل و حُجج مهتری ز مجلس توست
به مجلس تو شناید ز شهر و مولد خویش
۳۵ خذ المدیح و هات العطا همی گوید
به روز محشر اگر خلق را شفیع تویی
تو باشی ای ملک دادگر نخست کسی
عیان شدست به نزد ملوک سیرت تو
رسوم تو همه سرمایه هدایا گشت
- مرا میان خراباتیان لباسات است
مگر نگار من امروز در خرابات است
که عمر را ز خرابی همه عمارات است
که روز وعده موسی و گاه میقات است
مرا میانه میدان عشق دارات است
نه جای نکته طومار و جای طامات است
که قاصر آید از آن هر کجا عبارات است
بدان سجود وجود مرا کرامات است
مرا چون⁵⁵ سبع مثالی و چون تحیات است
که عشق را ز دل و جان من مراعات است
من این محل ز که جویم که از محالات است
که سید ملکان است و شاه سادات است
که از کمال و سعادات ذو السعادات است
که همچو جعفر برمک ستوده عادات است
که جعفری سیر و کُنگری مقامات است
که همت پسرش برتر از سماوات است
مثل به جود شرفشاه جعفری ذات است
ز روزگار تورا مالش و مکافات است
و عید او بلما توعدون هیهات است
که با تو دولت پاینده را مناجات است
تویی که وقت ثنای تو خیر اوقات است
تورا موافق دوران او ارادات است
که ساحت جود تورا مساحات است
نشان چگونه دهم زانکه او زاموات است
مدار چرخ چو شطرنج و در میان مات است
میان نطع به فرزین خویش شه مات است
برین سخن که بگفتم مرا شهادت است
به حق عزت عزی و آلت لات است
که حضرت تو به از روضه های جنات است
بدان که حضرت تو روضه ای ز روضات است
که خدمت تو ز عادات وز عبادات است
رضای خالق عرش است و آن ز طاعات است
که کعبه و حجر و حج اهل حاجات است
هر آن حکیم که از دولتش بشارات است
جواب هات ز تو خذ جواب خذ هات است
نه بیم حشر و نه بیم عذاب زلات است
که روز حشرش با مصطفی ملاقات است
چه جای بهمنی و نوذری حکایات است
ضمیر تو همه پیرایه هدایات است

⁵⁴ For a study of monothematic *qalandariyyāt* as a heterotopic counter-genre to religious-homiletic and royal panegyric poetry, see Miller, "Poetics of the Sufi Carnival."

⁵⁵ Qanbari's text reads *marā chun* here, but the Heyyeri edition of Mo'ezzi's *divān* provides the shortened, poetic contraction *marā cho* for metrical reasons. See Mo'ezzi, *Kollīyyāt-e Divān-e Mo'ezzi*, ed. Heyyeri, 128.

۴۰ ز رای و رایت تو تحفه سلاطین است
 کمال را ز مدار فلک زیادت نیست
 بلند گشت علامات رای و همت تو
 کجا روایت یک مدح تو کند راوی
 به مدح گفتن تو فتنه ام خداوندا
 ۴۵ ز آفرین تو شاها به خاطر عاطر
 چنانکه فخر ملوک است بیت تو ملکا
 مرا به حکمت و پروردن معانی بکر
 به دولت تو همه شاعران ز من پرسند
 همیشه تا که مه مهر و تیر و بهرام است
 ۵۰ خدای جلّ جلاله ز تو بگرداناد
 ز روزگار تو را نصرت و مساعدت است

ز نام و نامه تو نکته رسالات است
 کمال همت و جوذ تو را زیادات است
 چنانکه اوج زحل زیر آن علامات است
 همه روانی راوی بدان روایات است
 که از مدیح تو شغل مرا کفایات است
 چو منطقی کنم آن را که از جمادات است
 در آفرین تو بیتم طراز ابیات است
 نه از شمار دگر شاعران مقالات است
 هر آن سوال که مشکل تر از سوالات است
 همیشه تا که مه و سال و روز و ساعات است
 هر آنچه متصل حادثات و آفات است
 ز کردگار تو را عصمت و حمایت است

- 1 If the abode of the dissimulators is the dilapidated winehouse (*kharābāt*),
amongst the haunters of the winehouse there are disguises for me.
- 2 Throughout the city all of the lovers are wasted,
perhaps my beloved idol is in the dilapidated winehouse today!
- 3 Don't go after asceticism (*zohd*)—get wasted and become a haunter of the
winehouse!
For in life, all prosperity [lit. building up] comes from
drunkenness/destruction.
- 4 Bring that pharaonic cup and place it in my hands!
For it is the appointed day of Moses and the appointed time.
- 5 I will not toss aside my wine drinking implements because
I am still engaged in the middle of love's battlefield.
- 6 Any place that is a dwelling for the people of love
is not a place for the issues of scrolls and spiritual conceits.
- 7 Between the lover and the beloved there is an inner meaning
that fails wherever there are words.
- 8 I am that person who is always prostrated in prayer before love—
my existence becomes great with this type of worship.
- 9 Any ode that arose amorously in love
is like “the seven oft-recited verses” and heavenly greetings for me.
- 10 There is no regard for me from love for even an hour,
though from my heart and very soul there is regard for love.
- 11 In my youthful days I became a prisoner of love—
From whom should I seek this position that is among the impossibilities?
- 12 I am continually going to the court of that lord
who is master of kings and king of descendants of the prophet.

- 13 The beauty of the world, Fakhr al-Ma‘ali, that king
who is [known as] *Zu al-sa‘ādāt* because of his perfection and bliss
- 14 Abu ‘Ali Sharafshāh ebn ‘Ezz al-Din
who is laudable in his ways like Ja‘far Barmaki.
- 15 For him, honor is from Ja‘far and kingship is from the dervishes [i.e., spiritual
elect],⁵⁶
for he is Ja‘fari in disposition and dervish [spiritual elect] in station
(*maqāmāt*).
- 16 Ja‘far took the heavens under his wings [i.e., he flew in the heavens]
because the spiritual resolve of his son is greater than the heavens.
- 17 They cite the example of the generosity of Ja‘far Barmaki, and for me
the example of generosity is Sharafshāh of Ja‘fari stock.
- 18 O you whose service to him is not sufficient!
Punishment and revenge will come to you from the wheels of time.
- 19 O you whose appointed time is at his court!
His promise is “how far is that which you are promised!” [ref. Qur’an 23:36]
- 20 You, o offspring of fortune, are the deliverance of the freeborn,
eternal fortune converses in private with you.
- 21 You with whom the day of union with is great!
You with whom the time of praising is excellent!
- 22 The orbits are all continually arrayed in accordance with your desire,
your will is in accordance with its turning.
- 23 If in the creation of domains, there is the domain of the sky,
know that the domain of [your] generosity has many domains.
- 24 How can one give news of your enemy?
How could I [tell anything about him]? Because he is among the dead [now].
- 25 [For you,] the land is a game board, and fate and destiny are companions,
the celestial orbits are like chess and they have been defeated.
- 26 Your enemy is like the king and his fortune the queen—
on the chessboard he is checkmated with your queen.
- 27 The evil-natured jealous one is not evidence against you—
the words that I say here are testimonies from me.
- 28 One piece of my evidence is that his oath is sworn
by the truth of the honor of ‘Ozzā and the efficacy [lit. tool/utility] of Lāt.

⁵⁶ On the word *دُرْهَنِي*, which I have translated as “dervish,” see Shafi‘i-Kadkani, *Qalandariyeh dar tārikh*, 429 n10.

- 29 In the assembly of eminences, I maintain
that your presence is better than the gardens of paradise.
- 30 Since the prophet called Qazvin a gate of paradise,
know that your presence is a garden among the gardens of paradise.
- 31 I swear by your divine royal legitimacy (*farr*), I will prove
that serving you is one of the norms and acts of worship.
- 32 What pleases you is what pleases the prophet, what pleases the prophet
is what pleases the creator of the throne and that is among the acts of
obedience.
- 33 The proofs of the excellency of your assembly are
the *Ka'ba*, holy stone, and pilgrimage of the people in need.
- 34 Every wise person who has good fortune
hurries to your assembly from his city and birthplace.
- 35 He is always saying “take the praise” and “bring the gift”;
the response from you to “bring” is “take,” the response to “take” is “bring.”
- 36 If on resurrection day you are the intercessor for people,
there will not be fear of resurrection nor punishment for sins.
- 37 You, o just king, will be the first person
who on the day of resurrection meets with Mustafa [Prophet Muhammad].
- 38 Your character and conduct has been manifested for [all] kings—
what place do a Bahman and Nuzar have in the story?
- 39 All of your ceremonies become the source of gifts.
Your mind is the adornment of right guidance [in all its forms].
- 40 The mementos of kings are taken from your wise opinions and banner.
The fine points of treatises are taken from your name and chronicles.
- 41 Perfection does not increase with the turning of the celestial spheres,
[but] your perfection of spiritual fortitude and generosity does.
- 42 The zodiac sign of your insight and spiritual fortitude were ascendent
such that even the highest point of Saturn is below that banner.
- 43 Where a reciter declaims a panegyric about you,
all the fluency of the reciter goes to that recitation.
- 44 My temptation [i.e., my love] is praising you, o my lord,
for praise of you is sufficient enough payment for me.
- 45 Your praise, o my king, when it is in a noble mind,
it is among the tangible things when I express it.

- 46 Just as your house, o my king, is the praise of kings,
my verse in praise of you is the ornament of verses.
- 47 My wisdom and cultivation of topoi are fresh [lit. virginal].
They are not comparable to other poets.
- 48 Because of your fortune, all poets ask me
every question that is among the most difficult of questions.
- 49 As long as there are months of Mehr and Tir, and the day of Bahram,
and as long as there are months, years, days, and hours,
- 50 may God—great is his glory—repel from you
whatever is connected to misfortunes or calamities.
- 51 Time is your aid and assistance.
God gives you virtue and support.⁵⁷

The poem is a tightly constructed, polythematic panegyric in the traditional tripartite structure. There is a clear division between the *qalandari* introit (*nasib*; lines 1–11) and the panegyric (lines 13–43) with a short “journey” section (*rahil*; line 12) providing a transition between these two major parts. If we follow Gruendler’s modification of Sperl’s strophe-antistrophe framework, the panegyric antistrophe could be said to conclude at line 43 with the “metastrophe” beginning on line 44 and divided as follows: reflexive turn toward poetic persona/poetic craft/poetic boasts (*fakhr*) in lines 44–48 and a concluding “benediction” (*do‘ā*) in lines 49–51 for the *mamduh*, Sharafshāh Ja‘fari.⁵⁸

Mo‘ezzi opens the strophe/*nasib* (lines 1–11) in a mock-*fakhr* (mock-poetic boast) that serves multiple purposes. It announces Mo‘ezzi’s intention—through the apropos image of Mo‘ezzi taking on one of the “disguises” of the “haunters of the winehouse” (*kharābātiyān*)—to adopt the poetic persona of the *qalandari* poet while also centering the poem on the “dilapidated winehouse” (*kharābāt*) as the poetic axis of the introit. The introit maintains a strong focus on spatial elements throughout (for reasons that will become clear below). It unfolds in a “city” that is a “dwelling place for the people of love” and in which “all of the lovers are wasted” (lines 2, 6). Here, the poet seeks out his “beloved idol” (*negār*), the king of this city of love, at his mock-court, the dilapidated winehouse, which is reimagined as the rogue’s antiheroic “battlefield” (lines 2, 5). The courtiers of this mock-*mamduh*—the “dissimulators” (*lebāsātiyān*) and haunters of the winehouse (*kharābātiyān*; lines 1–3)—are all social outcasts, even outlaws, and the disreputable activities that they champion (e.g., drinking, trickery), through the *qalandari* poetic persona of Mo‘ezzi, make a mockery of normative social behavior and modes of religious piety (e.g., *zohd*, Sufi *tāmāt*; lines 3, 5–6). In this reversed world, “prayer before love” becomes their highest form of worship (line 8; mock-*qibla*/*Ka‘ba*) and love poetry their Qur’an (line 9). The introit/strophe of this poem, in short, reads as a typical *qalandari* poem.

The poem on the whole, however, is clearly not. It ultimately has another aim. In an astonishing reversal, by line 12 Mo‘ezzi transitions from the carnivalesque poetic world of the strophe to its thematic antithesis, the royal panegyric, in the poem’s antistrophe/metastrophe. Mo‘ezzi the rogue poet becomes Mo‘ezzi the court panegyrist—a persona switch made in line 12, performed in lines 13–43, and elaborated upon in the metastrophe, in lines 44–48. The city of love’s mock-court of the dilapidated winehouse is suddenly

⁵⁷ Mo‘ezzi, *Kolliyāt-e Divān-e Amir Mo‘ezzi-ye Neyshaburi*, ed. Qanbari, 113–15.

⁵⁸ On Gruendler’s addition of *metastrophe* to Sperl’s strophe-antistrophe terminology, see footnote 52 and Gruendler, *Medieval Arabic Praise Poetry*, 52, 56–59.

abandoned for the “(royal) court” (*dargāh*) of Sharafshāh Jaʿfari ensconced within the city gates of Qazvin (lines 5, 12, 19, 30). “Every wise person” (*hakim*), Moʿezzi tells us, “hurries” to the “assembly” (*majles*) of this royal court, where Sharafshāh Jaʿfari unstintingly showers gifts on poets who praise him in his “ceremonies” (*rosūm*; lines 34–35, 39). The contrast here between the “wise person[s]” (*hakim*) who are attracted to the royal court of the antistrophe and the various roguish figures in attendance at the mock-court of the dilapidated winehouse in the strophe is absolute.

The axis of the stylized court of Sharafshāh is not the master of the rogues, the “beloved idol” of the strophe, but rather an idealized Islamic ruler who possesses extraordinary generosity (*jud*; lines 17, 23, 41), divine royal legitimacy (*farr*; line 31), proximity to God and the Prophet Mohammad (lines 32, 36–37), justice (lines 37–38), right guidance (*hedāyāt*; line 39), and spiritual fortitude (*hemmat*; line 41). Especially noteworthy are a number of specific motifs in the antistrophe/metastrophe that are typically inverted in *qalandari* poetry. “Fate and destiny,” for example, are Sharafshāh Jaʿfari’s “companions” (*harif*; line 25)—not the fellow haunters of the winehouse—and his “enemy,” portrayed as associated with the pagan goddesses ʿOzzā and Lāt, is “checkmated” (i.e., defeated; lines 24–28) instead of the “self” of the *qalandari* poet. Similarly, terms such “acts of obedience” (*tāʾāt*; line 32) and “right guidance” (*hedāyāt*; line 39) are given a positive valuation by Moʿezzi in the antistrophe, and the Kaʿba, holy stone (*hajar*), and sacred pilgrimage (*hajj*) become the “proofs of the excellency of [Sharafshāh Jaʿfari’s] assembly” (line 33), rather than objects of mockery, as they do frequently in *qalandari* poetry.⁵⁹

Although it is clear that the poetic worlds of the strophe and antistrophe/metastrophe are inversions of one another at the thematic level, the question remains: How does this thematic inversion function to create the poem’s meaning as a poetic whole? That is, how do these disparate and even seemingly mutually exclusive poetic worlds work together in this poem to achieve Moʿezzi’s larger goal of praising Sharafshāh Jaʿfari? Analyzing the poem inter-sectionally reveals that Moʿezzi has carefully constructed a complex parallel relationship between the diametrically opposed poetic worlds of the strophe and the antistrophe/metastrophe. The roguish beloved who presides over the mock-court of the dilapidated winehouse and its miscreant courtiers (*kharābātiyān*, *lebāsātiyān*) in the strophe is in fact none other than the peerless political ruler he praises in the panegyric antistrophe/metastrophe.

Moʿezzi makes this parallelism clear in lines 11–15. The concluding hemistich of the introit—“From whom should I seek this position that is among the impossibilities?” (line 11)—encourages the audience to look back on the *qalandari* world of the strophe. It specifically asks them to identify where the “position” of “prisoner of love” can be found. The question seems redundant after reading the *qalandari nasib*: the prisoners of the beloved idol can, of course, be found in the dilapidated winehouse, the mock-court of the love-ravished city. But Moʿezzi nevertheless answers in the following line, telling his audience that he is headed to such a place now: “the court of that lord / who is master of kings and king of descendants of the prophet” (line 12). This line, functioning as a *rahil*, is both jarring and highly productive because it fuses the court and the imaginal geography of the “lord,” the “master of kings,” with those of the introit, creating a poetic whole, but a Janus-faced one composed of two radically opposed imaginal courts, courtiers, and associated values. Moʿezzi, perhaps in a bit of poetic foreshadowing, tells the reader that this “position” is “among the impossibilities” (line 11)—such is the dissonance brought about by the suddenly forced union of these two worlds.

In the subsequent line (13), Moʿezzi opens the *qasideh*’s antistrophe by identifying the hitherto nameless *mamduh* as Sharafshāh Jaʿfari. He continues the listing of his names in the first part of line 14 as well, but in its latter hemistich he begins a complex weaving

⁵⁹ See Miller, “Poetics of the Sufi Carnival.”

together of identities for Sharafshāh Jaʿfari that strengthens the link between the carnival-esque strophe and panegyric antistrophe:

- 14 Abu ʿAli Sharafshāh ebn ʿEzz al-Din
who is laudable in his ways like Jaʿfar Barmaki.
- 15 For him, honor is from Jaʿfar and kingship is from the dervishes [i.e., spiritual elect],
for he is Jaʿfari in disposition and dervish [spiritual elect] in station (*maqāmāt*).
- 16 Jaʿfar took the heavens under his wings [i.e., he flew in the heavens]
because the spiritual resolve of his son is greater than the heavens.
- 17 They cite the example of the generosity of Jaʿfar Barmaki, and for me
the example of generosity is Sharafshāh of Jaʿfari stock.

These lines revolve around wordplays with the term “dervishes” (*kongor*; line 15) and the name “Jaʿfar” (lines 14–17), which establish Sharafshāh’s political and spiritual bona fides. In quick succession, Moʿezzi likens Sharafshāh’s “ways” to Jaʿfar Barmaki (a wealthy and powerful vizier of the ʿAbbasids), claims his *sharaf* (honor, nobility) “is from Jaʿfar,” suggests that he is the descendent of Jaʿfar, and then returns to praise his generosity as Jaʿfari [Barmaki] “in essence.”⁶⁰ But the Jaʿfars mentioned in these lines are not all references to Jaʿfar Barmaki. In lines 15–16 Moʿezzi is referring to Jaʿfar ben Abi Tāleb, from whom the Jaʿfari family claimed descent.⁶¹ (He was the cousin of Mohammad and brother of ʿAli and also known as Jaʿfar al-Tayyār because of his “flight” to heaven—hence the flight reference.)⁶² The references to Jaʿfar in these lines are quite productive because they fuse together in the figure of Sharafshāh Jaʿfari the political and spiritual capital of both of these important Jaʿfars.

The crucial line, however, for understanding the relationship between the strophe and antistrophe of this poem is line 15. Moʿezzi makes explicit here what he hints at in line 12: namely, Sharafshāh Jaʿfari is the master of the strophe’s winehouse and the antistrophe’s regal court. He is the beloved idol, the king of the winehouse’s world, which places him near to God in the symbolic order of the *qalandariyyāt*, to be pined after, obeyed, idealized, and appreciated at least as a reflection of God on Earth, if not a godlike figure. But, as the rest of the panegyric makes clear, he also is an Islamic king—although not the traditional idealized political sovereign and protector of the Islamic realm of the classical panegyric.⁶³ His kingship (*shāhi*) is from the dervishes (*kongor*), for he himself is a “dervish [spiritual elect] in station (*maqāmāt*)” (line 15). He is to be understood as a new type of idealized Islamic ruler: an Islamic king who combines in one person the virtues of a member of the spiritual elect (*qalandar*, dervish) and political elite—a *Qalandar King*.

The *qalandari* introit in Amir Moʿezzi’s poem is thus not frivolous, satirical, or an inept experiment to integrate a new trendy form of poetry into the introit of the royal panegyric. On the contrary, it represents a serious attempt by Amir Moʿezzi—and quite likely his father, Borhāni, too—to harness the emerging spiritual capital associated with *qalandari* poetry for an innovative socio-poetic project. Even if this particular configuration of the traditional polythematic royal panegyric never gained a wider following, its use in eleventh-century

⁶⁰ On the Barmakid family, their reputedly extraordinary generosity and power, and their spectacular downfall, see van Bladel, “The Bactrian Background of the Barmakids”; Bosworth, “Abū Ḥafṣ ʿUmar al-Kirmānī and the Rise of the Barmakids”; Sadan, “Death of a Princess”; Meisami, “Masʿūdī on Love and the Fall of the Barmakids”; and Kruk, “A Barmecide Feast.”

⁶¹ Mottahedeh, “Administration in Būyid Qazwīn,” 34.

⁶² Veccia Vaglieri, “Djaʿfar b. Abi Ṭālib.”

⁶³ See studies cited in footnote 51.

Qazvin has a number of potential implications for the study of both the history of the Saljuq period and the development of the *qalandariyyāt*.⁶⁴

“Kingship . . . from the Dervishes”: *Qalandari* Kingship and Political Legitimacy in the Saljuq Period

Precisely when Sharafshāh succeeded to the governorship of Qazvin is not known, but if the attribution to Borhāni of the poem discussed above is authentic and the *mamduh* named in it is indeed Sharafshāh, it would indicate that he must have become governor by at least the early 1070s to have merited a panegyric referring to him as a “king.” At a political level, this chronology puts him well into the period of Qazvin’s vassalage to the Saljuq empire. The fact that Amir Mo’ezzi and, likely, Borhānī—both of whom were elite poets of the Saljuq court—were solicited to compose panegyrics for him suggests that Sharafshāh looked to the Saljuq court for leadership on not only political matters, but also cultural ones.⁶⁵ These two domains, of course, are never truly separate. As noted earlier with respect to royal panegyric poetry in the Islamicate poetic traditions, praise poetry for Islamic rulers seeks to propagate not just the ruler’s bare political power but the cultural hegemony of their value system as well. The panegyric *qalandari qasidehs* for Sharafshāh are no exception to this rule: they seek to praise him in ways that dovetail with the prevailing Saljuq “state ideology,” as Omid Safi terms it in his study of the Saljuqs’ political and cultural “apparatus.”⁶⁶

As all newcomers to the realm of elite power politics, the Saljuqs sought to bolster their legitimacy and build their power through a wide variety of ideological and institutional structures. They could not make hereditary claims to kingship, so they sought to justify their newfound political power by portraying themselves as the saviors of the ‘Abbasid caliphate and the defenders of “orthodox” Islam against the various purportedly “heretical” religious groups (e.g., Isma‘ilis) of the Eastern Islamic lands. They also are reported to have built a set of formidable cultural institutions that served as both a tangible testament to their piety and a means for surveillance and propagation of religious and spiritual views amenable to Saljuq rule. The most acclaimed example is the Nizamiyya of Baghdad, but they endowed many other smaller *madrasas* and Sufi lodges (*khānaqāhs*) and shrines as well.⁶⁷ It is this last point that is most pertinent to the present study—namely, their relationship to Sufism and the role Sufis played in their broader sociopolitical project.

If the existing historical chronicles and Sufi hagiographies are to be trusted, the Saljuqs made an unprecedented effort to incorporate Sufis into the political machinery of their empire from the earliest period of their rule.⁶⁸ Generous patronage for the *khānaqāhs* and shrine complexes of friendly Sufi saints was certainly part of this effort, but according to these works they also sought and received the “blessings” of Sufi saints to bolster their

⁶⁴ Lack of other extant examples makes it difficult to discern whether the poems of Borhāni and Mo’ezzi are representatives of what was once a more widespread tradition of panegyric *qasideh* poetry with *qalandari* introits or are only isolated examples of a quickly abandoned early development in the use of *qalandari* topoi. This *qalandari* panegyric does have certain parallels with later *sāqi-nāmehs* composed with political aims in mind. But these other examples occur much later and emerge from a different political and poetic scene. See Losensky, “Vintages of the Sāqi-nāma.”

⁶⁵ On Borhāni and Mo’ezzi’s close relationship with the Saljuq court, see: de Bruijn, “The Qaside after the Fall of the Ghaznavids,” 107–23; and Davarpanah, “Mo’ezzi Nišāburi.”

⁶⁶ Safi refers to the narratives of legitimacy crafted by the Saljuqs as the “Saljuq state ideology” in *The Politics of Knowledge in Premodern Islam*.

⁶⁷ Safi’s study, *The Politics of Knowledge in Premodern Islam*, provides the most in-depth account of the Saljuqs’ political and ideological “state apparatus,” as he terms it. But see also studies cited in the following footnotes for additional details, in particular Tor’s study, “Sovereign and Pious,” which argues for a more charitable reading of the historical sources on the sincerity of Saljuq rulers’ personal piety.

⁶⁸ Tor claims that the Saljuqs were actually the first “major rulers” to integrate Sufis into their political machine in a substantial way; the opening qualification in the sentence is my own. See Tor, “Rayy and the Religious History of the Seljuq Period,” 395.

claims to political legitimacy.⁶⁹ Numerous “Sufi legitimation” stories purportedly attest to this point. The two most famous ones revolve around the first Saljuq rulers, Tughril (d. 1063) and Chaghri (d. 1060). In the first, the chronicler Rāvandi in his *Rāhat al-sodur* (c. 1204–5) portrays the enigmatic Sufi saint Bābā Tāher (and two other less well-known Sufi saints) as meeting Tughril in Hamadan in 1055 on his way to conquer Baghdad and, after briefly questioning him, declares “I have put dominion of the world in your hands.”⁷⁰ The second is similar to the first in that it is a Sufi saint, this time Abu Sa’id, who is portrayed as the true source of the Saljuqs’ rise to power. This account, recorded in Ebn Monavvar’s *Asrār al-towhid* (c. between 1179 and 1192), says that Tughril and Chaghri came to visit Abu Sa’id before their key battle with the Ghaznavids.⁷¹ They pay their respects to the saint, honoring him as one would a king, as Safi points out, and Abu Sa’id then summarily announces that he has granted dominion (*molk*) over Khorāsān to Chaghri and over ‘Iraq to Tughril.⁷² Abu Sa’id also was apparently close to Saljuq viziers, in particular Nezām al-Molk, whose rise to power he is portrayed as predicting when Nezām al-Molk was only a child.⁷³ Nezām al-Molk was reportedly not only quite open about his relationship with Abu Sa’id, but even credited Abu Sa’id as both foretelling his rise to power and serving as the true source of his success.⁷⁴ The close connections between the Saljuq political elite and important Sufi figures continued, according to Sufi sources, until the last sultan of the great Saljuq empire, Sanjar (d. 1157–58).⁷⁵ Like his predecessors, he too is portrayed as owing his rule, and his life, to a powerful Sufi saint, Ahmad-e Jām (d. 1141), according to Ghaznavi’s *Maqāmāt-e Zhandeh Pil* (c. 1175).⁷⁶

⁶⁹ Ibid., 395, 399; Ephrat, “Seljuqs and the Public Sphere in the Period of Sunni Revivalism,” 143, 147; Renterghem, “Controlling and Developing Baghdad,” 129; Peacock, *Great Seljuk Empire*, 254–56, 270–71; Tor, “‘Sovereign and Pious,’” 42, 45, 49–50; Dabashi, “Historical Conditions of Persian Sufism during the Seljuk Period,” 153–59, 164–68; Karamustafa, *Sufism*, 144–45, 147, 152–53; Safi, *The Politics of Knowledge in Premodern Islam*, xxv, xxvi, 3, 7–8, 48–50, 66, 97–100, 125–57.

⁷⁰ Rāvandi, *Rāhat al-sodur*, 98–99. This account has been discussed in Safi, *The Politics of Knowledge in Premodern Islam*, 132–136; Tor, “‘Sovereign and Pious,’” 49; and Dabashi, “Historical Conditions of Persian Sufism during the Seljuk Period,” 154–55, 158. For more on the *Rāhat al-sodur* as a historical text, see Meisami, *Persian Historiography*, 237–56.

⁷¹ For more on the *Asrar al-towhid* as a hagiographic text, see O’Malley, “From Blessed Lips.”

⁷² Ebn Monavvar, *Asrār al-towhid*, 1:156. This account has been discussed in Safi, *The Politics of Knowledge in Premodern Islam*, 139–41; Tor, “Ray and the Religious History of the Seljūq Period,” 395; Peacock, *The Great Seljuk Empire*, 254–56; Tor, “‘Sovereign and Pious,’” 49; and Dabashi, “Historical Conditions of Persian Sufism during the Seljuk Period,” 156, 158.

⁷³ It is interesting that Bābā Tāher and Abu Sa’id, who are portrayed as the original Sufi “legitimizers” of the Saljuqs, also are often identified as composing the first *qalandari* poems. If the attribution of these early *qalandariyyāt* is correct, could their association with early *qalandari* poetry and the first Saljuq rulers have motivated Borhāni and Amir Mo’ezzi to utilize a *qalandari* introit in their panegyric for Sharafshāh? It is difficult to say for sure, but it is worth noting as a possibility.

⁷⁴ Ebn Monavvar, *Asrār al-towhid*, 1:59, 90, 179. These accounts have been discussed in Karamustafa, *Sufism*, 144–45; Safi, *The Politics of Knowledge in Premodern Islam*, 137–39, 142–44; and Dabashi, “Historical Conditions of Persian Sufism during the Seljuk Period,” 164–68. Tughril’s vizier, Khwājeh Abu Mansur Varqāni, likewise is said in the *Asrār al-towhid* to have had a close relationship with Abu Sa’id and Qushayri. See Safi, *Politics of Knowledge in Premodern Islam*, 141; and Dabashi, “Historical Conditions of Persian Sufism during the Seljuk Period,” 155–57.

⁷⁵ O’Malley argues that Ebn Monavvar’s *Asrār al-towhid* and Abu Rowh Loft Allah’s *Hālāt va sokhanān-e Abu Sa’id* portray Abu Sa’id’s descendants as “wield[ing] considerable local and regional political clout,” including functioning as the “primary representative of the people of Khābarān to the Saljuq sultan” and directly soliciting and receiving support from Sanjar for Abu Sa’id’s shrine. See O’Malley, “From Blessed Lips,” 11–12, 18.

⁷⁶ Primary source accounts commenting on the relationship between Sanjar and Ahmad-e Jām can be found in Ghaznavi’s *Maqāmāt-e Zhandeh Pil* (46–47, 59–63) and in Ahmad-e Jām’s own works, the *Rowzat al-moznebin* (see introduction) and his purported letters (gathered in the *Resāleh-ye Samarqandiyyeh*). For an English translation of *Maqāmāt-e Zhandeh Pil*, see Ghaznavi, *The Colossal Elephant and His Spiritual Feats*. Discussions of these episodes and Sanjar’s relationship with Ahmad-e Jām more broadly also appear in Karamustafa, *Sufism*, 147; Safi, *The Politics of Knowledge in Premodern Islam*, 144–56; Tor, “‘Sovereign and Pious,’” 49–50; Tor, “Ray and the Religious History of the Seljūq Period,” 395; and Dechant, “‘The Colossal Elephant’ Shaykh Ahmad-i Jam,” 166–72.

Although most scholars readily admit that many of these anecdotes may be of dubious historicity, they are still relied upon as trustworthy indicators of early Saljuq efforts to leverage their relationship with Sufis in their broader political legitimization narratives. There are two potential problems, however, with this position. First, all of these accounts appear in sources written many years after the events they discuss and, second, the earlier twelfth-century sources are all Sufi hagiographic works (which is not to say that they do not contain potentially valuable information, but they do need to be analyzed with this perspective in mind). There are no extant chronicles of early Saljuq history.⁷⁷ Rāvandi, writing in the opening years of the thirteenth century, at the end of the great Saljuq empire, is the first non-Sufi to mention any of these Sufi legitimization stories.⁷⁸ Putting aside Sufi hagiographic works, the pre-thirteenth-century textual evidence on the relationship between the Saljuq court and Sufi figures is less detailed. Nezāmi-ye ‘Arūzi (d. 1161), for example, in the *Chahār Maqāleh*, relates an anecdote in which Amir Mo‘ezzi complains that Nezām al-Molk pays little attention to anyone other than Sufis and religious clerics.⁷⁹ Ahmad-e Jām also dedicates his *Rowzat al-moznebin* to Sanjar and purportedly pens letters to him as well—both of which attest to some sort of connection between these figures.⁸⁰ But, it is important to underline, these pre-thirteenth-century, non-hagiographic sources do not provide evidence of the integration of the much more elaborate Sufi legitimization narrative found in Rāvandi, Ebn Monavvar, and Ghaznavi’s works.⁸¹ We can certainly tell from Ebn Monavvar and Ghaznavi’s works that by the late twelfth century the image of Saljuq rule as spiritually granted and upheld by the Sufis had become commonplace in the cultural imaginary of Sufi hagiography. It is less certain, however, both how far back these efforts go to link Sufi *baraka* to the Saljuq legitimization narrative and from whom this narrative originated.

The extant evidence reviewed so far seems to indicate that this narrative was first propagated by the Sufis in their hagiographic works and then only later adopted into historical works, such as Rāvandi. But Borhāni and Amir Mo‘ezzi’s panegyrics for Sharafshāh may complicate this view, providing earlier textual evidence of efforts to legitimate Saljuq political power by harnessing Sufi spiritual capital, even if in a slightly different manner than the stories above. Although we cannot fully know how Borhāni treated the question of Sharafshāh’s kingship due to his poem’s unfortunate truncation, Amir Mo‘ezzi, a non-Sufi court poet, clearly attempts to legitimize Sharafshāh’s kingship by rooting it in Sufi spiritual power. The poem’s fusion of the strophe’s world of the *qalandari* winehouse with Sharafshāh’s court, and by extension his entire political domain (lines 11–14), makes this political point implicitly. But, by line 15, Amir Mo‘ezzi leaves no doubt that we should understand Sharafshāh as a spiritually sanctioned ruler, declaring that his “kingship is from the

⁷⁷ Meisami, *Persian Historiography*, 141–45.

⁷⁸ It is worth noting that Rāvandi’s work has been criticized for being “unreliable” and “add[ing] episodes which sometimes defy credibility.” Its historical narrative is based largely on the slightly earlier *Saljuq-nāme* (w. 1176) of Zahir al-Din Nishāpuri (d. 1187), which does not contain the story of Tughril meeting Bābā Tāher. See Meisami, *Persian Historiography*, 229, 237–38, 243.

⁷⁹ See ‘Arūzi Samarqāndi, *Chahār maqāleh va tā’liqāt*, 146. Later historians, such as Ibn Khallikān (d. 1282), Ibn Kathir (d. 1373), and ‘Aqili (writing between 1470 and 1487), also comment on the close connection between the Saljuqs (Nezām al-Molk in particular) and Sufis, though they do not include any of these more elaborate legitimization stories. See Safi, *The Politics of Knowledge in Premodern Islam*, 49–50; and Peacock, *The Great Seljuk Empire*, 256, 270–71.

⁸⁰ Tor, “‘Sovereign and Pious,’” 50; Karamustafa, *Sufism*, 153–55; Safi, *The Politics of Knowledge in Premodern Islam*, 145–46; Dechant, “‘The Colossal Elephant’ Shaykh Ahmad-i Jam,” 167.

⁸¹ Dechant has astutely made this point with respect to Ahmad-e Jām legitimization narratives of Sanjar. There are no Saljuq histories or “court sources” that mention Ahmad-e Jām; “these [legitimation] anecdotes,” he argues, “only appear in hagiographic sources originating around Ahmad and the *awlād*’s community,” which “demonstrates that they [these narratives] were primarily meant to legitimize Ahmad[-e Jām] via a celebrity endorsement of the king.” Karamustafa likewise adds a note of caution regarding whether the claims of “fifth-generation hagiographers” can be fully trusted as representative of the historical reality of the nature of the relationship between Abu Sa‘id’s descendants and the Saljuqs. See Dechant, “‘The Colossal Elephant’ Shaykh Ahmad-i Jam,” 166–72; and Karamustafa, *Sufism*, 144–45.

dervishes” and he is “dervish [spiritual elect] in station (*maqāmāt*).” He may have “laudable” qualities and “honor” from Ja’far Barmaki and Ja’far ben Abi Tāleb (Ja’far al-Tayyār), but in the end the foundational legitimacy of his rule is provided by the “dervishes” and his elite spiritual station (line 14–17).⁸²

This poem’s anchoring of Sharafshāh’s kingship in Sufi spiritual power mirrors in important ways the more well-known legitimization narratives of Saljuq power found in the works of Rāvandi, Ebn Monavvar, and Ghaznavi. This overlap suggests that two tentative conclusions can be drawn here (tentative only because this is just one text from a local Saljuq court). First, it confirms that political figures within the Saljuq realm were seeking to harness Sufi spiritual power for their legitimization narratives already in the late eleventh century, indicating that Rāvandi, Ebn Monavvar, and Ghaznavi were likely drawing from an earlier tradition linking Saljuq political power to Sufi spiritual capital—not just inventing it in the late twelfth century. Second, since this poem originates in the context of the local Saljuq court of Qazvin, it does not appear that the Sufi legitimization narrative is solely the product of the Sufi hagiographic tradition, even if that tradition greatly embellished some of its more elaborate stories. Rather, Saljuq political elites and Sufi groups likely collaboratively and gradually constructed it over the course of Saljuq rule.

It also is important to point out, however, that Mo’ezzi’s poem differs from the Sufi legitimization anecdotes of Rāvandi, Ebn Monavvar, and Ghaznavi in certain ways. These differences may be a reflection of this gradual process of narrative construction or result from the particularities of Sharafshāh’s local religiopolitical milieu. The key difference between Mo’ezzi’s poem and the later Sufi legitimization stories is that Sharafshāh is identified as something of a Sufi figure himself—line 15: “dervish [spiritual elect] in station (*maqāmāt*)”—not just blessed by Sufis. The emphasis on Sharafshāh’s more formal connection to Sufi piety may be the result of panegyric poetry’s tendency to present an idealized portrait of the *mamduh*. But it also could suggest that he participated to some degree in Sufi groups in Qazvin. In either case, Mo’ezzi’s construction of a new model of Islamic kingship is a testament to the growing political power of Sufism in Qazvin and the broader Saljuq realm in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries. It suggests that there was a growing sense that the ideal Islamic king not only needed to be the political defender of the Islamic world and its social order, but also connected to—and perhaps even a master of—the spiritual domains administered by the Sufi saints.

Conclusion: The Development and Cultural Politics of the Early *Qalandariyyāt*

Borhāni and Amir Mo’ezzi’s poems offer us a unique window into the early history of *qalandari* poetry. These poems, ignored by most histories of the *qalandariyyāt* and dismissed by others as unimportant, provide insights into the development of both its poetics and its cultural politics. They are evidence of a more complicated origin of carnivalesque poetry in Persia: one that does not begin only with a few *robā’iyyāt* (with challenged attributions) and the famous monothematic *qalandariyyāt* of the Sufi poets Sanā’i, ‘Attār, and ‘Erāqi, but that also includes panegyric court poetry. Given Sanā’i’s admiration of the poetry of Amir Mo’ezzi, it is even worth considering whether the *qalandari* poetics in his much more famous and numerous *qalandariyyāt* were inspired as much or more by Amir Mo’ezzi, the court poet, as the purportedly earlier *qalandari* quatrains of Bābā Tāher, Abu Sa’id, and others.⁸³

⁸² It is interesting to note that Ahmad-e Jām, in *Rowzat al-moznebin*, refers to Sanjar’s kingdom as the “refuge of dervishes” (*malja’-e darvishān*) and claims that in his kingdom “the nobles and the masses, the dervishes and the rich all receive their share” (Ahmad-e Jām, *Rowzat al-moznebin*, 3, 5). Also discussed in Safi, *Politics of Knowledge in Premodern Islam*, 146–49.

⁸³ Lewis, “Reading, Writing and Recitation,” 137; Davarpanah, “Mo’ezzi Nišāburi.” In addition to Amir Mo’ezzi’s influence, there also is the *qalandari* introit of Borhāni that Sanā’i may have plagiarized, as discussed previously.

In terms of the cultural politics of the *qalandariyyāt*, the use by Borhāni and Amir Moʻezzi of a *qalandari* introit in a royal panegyric is evidence that regardless of whether or not the *qalandariyyāt* originally drew inspiration from genuinely antinomian social movements, institutional powers swiftly sought to tap into and co-opt its symbolic power for their own political ends. Usage of *qalandari* topoi from this early period should warn against any decontextualized or romanticized readings of the heterotopic poetics of the *qalandariyyāt* as necessarily subversive in a social, religious, or political sense. Despite the antinomian hagiographic stories of *qalandari* poets such as ʿErāqi or Abu Hafs ʿUmar al-Suhrawardi’s oft-cited contention that the *qalandars* are known for their “destr[uction] of customs and discard[ing] of the protocols of social interaction and engagement,” Amir Moʻezzi and Borhāni’s poems show that the carnivalesque poetics inspired by these historical antinomians could also be utilized for exactly the opposite purpose: establishing sociopolitical order and legitimacy.⁸⁴ In this particular case, Borhāni and Amir Moʻezzi employ the *qalandariyyāt*’s carnivalesque poetics to craft a new model of Islamic kingship that legitimizes its political power (at least partially) through Sufi spiritual authority—an early attestation of a broader sociopolitical trend in the Saljuq period.

Acknowledgments. I am deeply grateful to Fatemeh Keshavarz, Paul Losensky, Ahmet T. Karamustafa, Austin O’Malley, Alexander Jabbari, Cameron Lindley Cross, Michael Pifer, and Lynne Tatlock for their suggestions and feedback on various versions of this article. I am doubly grateful to Karamustafa, O’Malley, Cross, and the University of Maryland Interlibrary Loan Department’s heroic efforts in helping me obtain digital scans of a few works in the final stages of preparing this article, at which time the COVID pandemic had shut down transfer of (physical) books.

Bibliography

- Ahmad, Nazir. “Some Original Prose and Poetical Pieces of Hakim Sana’i.” *Indo-Iranica* XVI (1963): 48–65.
- al-Suhrawardi, Abu Hafs ʿUmar. *ʿAwārif al-maʿārif*. Edited by Ahmad ʿAbd al-Rahim Sāyih and Tawfiq ʿAli Wahbah. Cairo: Maktabat al-Thaqāfah al-Dīniyyah, 2006.
- Algar, Hamid. “Impostors, Antinomians and Pseudo-Sufis: Cataloguing the Miscreants.” *Journal of Islamic Studies* 29, no. 1 (2018): 25–47.
- Anvari, ʿAli ben Mohammad, and Mohammad Taqi Modarres-e Razavi. *Divān-e Anvari*. Tehrān: Enteshārāt-e ʿElmi va Farhangī, 1376 [1997–98].
- ʿAruzi Samarqandī, Nezāmi. *Chahār maqāleh va taʿliqāt*. Revised ed. Edited by Allāmeḥ Mohammad Qazvini and Mohammad Moʻin. Tehrān: Nashr-e Moʻin, 1388 [2009–10].
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Rabelais and His World*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1984.
- Beelaert, Anna Livia. “Jājarmi.” *Encyclopaedia Iranica*. 2008. <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/jajarmi>.
- Bladel, Kevin van. “The Bactrian Background of the Barmakids.” In *Islam and Tibet: Interactions along the Musk Routes*, edited by Anna Akasoy, Charles Burnett, and Ronit Yoeli-Tlalim, 43–88. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011.
- Bosworth, C. Edmund. “Abū Ḥafṣ ʿUmar al-Kirmānī and the Rise of the Barmakids.” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 57, no. 2 (1994): 268–82.
- Bürgel, J. C. “The Pious Rogue: A Study in the Meaning of Qalandar and Rend in the Poetry of Muhammad Iqbal.” *Edebiyāt* 4 (1979): 43–64.
- Bürgel, J. C. “Qasida as Discourse on Power and Its Islamization: Some Reflections.” In *Qasida Poetry in Islamic Asia and Africa*, vol. 1, edited by Stefan Sperl and Christopher Shackle, 451–74. New York: E. J. Brill, 1996.
- Chittick, William C. “ʿErāqi, Fakr-al-Dīn Ebrāhīm.” *Encyclopaedia Iranica*. 1998. <https://iranicaonline.org/articles/eraqi>.
- Dabashi, Hamid. “Historical Conditions of Persian Sufism during the Seljuk Period.” In *The Heritage of Sufism*, vol. 1, *Classical Persian Sufism from Its Origins to Rumi (700–1300)*, edited by Leonard Lewisohn, 137–74. Oxford, England: Oneworld, 1999.
- Dahlén, Ashk P. “The Holy Fool in Medieval Islam: The *Qalandariyyāt* of Fakhr al-Dīn ʿArāqi.” *Orientalia Suecana* 53 (2004): 63–81.
- Davarpanah, Hormoz. “Moʻezzi Nišāburi.” *Encyclopaedia Iranica*. 2008. <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/moezzi-nisaburi>.
- de Bruijn, J. T. P. de. *Of Piety and Poetry: The Interaction of Religion and Literature in the Life and Works of Hakim Sana’i of Ghazna*. Leiden: Brill, 1983.

⁸⁴ See comments and sources in footnote 10 for more on the complicated relationship between carnivalesque cultural products and political power.

- de Bruijn, J. T. P. de. "The *Qalandariyyāt* in Persian Mystical Poetry, from Sanā'i Onwards." In *The Legacy of Mediaeval Persian Sufism*, edited by Leonard Lewisohn, 75–86. London: Khaniqahi Nimatullah, 1992.
- de Bruijn, J. T. P. de. *Persian Sufi Poetry: An Introduction to the Mystical Use of Classical Persian Poems*. Surrey, UK: Routledge Curzon, 1997.
- de Bruijn, J. T. P. de. "Anvari and the Ghazal: An Exploration." In *Studies on the Poetry of Anvari*, edited by Daniella Meneghini, 7–36. Venice: Cafoscarina, 2006.
- de Bruijn, J. T. P. de. "The Qaside after the Fall of the Ghaznavids." In *Persian Lyric Poetry in the Classical Era, 800–1500: Ghazals, Panegyrics and Quatrains*, edited by Ehsan Yarshater, 102–61. New York: I. B. Tauris, 2019.
- Dechant, John. "'The Colossal Elephant' *Shaykh Ahmad-i Jām: Legacy and Hagiography in Islam*." PhD diss., Indiana University, 2015.
- Defert, Daniel. "Foucault, Space, and the Architects." In *Politics/Poetics: Documenta X, The Book*, edited by Catherine David and Jean-Francois Chevrier, 274–83. Ostfildern-Ruit, Germany: Cantz, 1997.
- Digby, Simon. "Qalandars and Related Groups: Elements of Social Deviance in the Religious Life of the Delhi Sultanate of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries." In *Islam in Asia*, vol. 1, *South Asia*, edited by Yohanan Friedmann, 60–108. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1984.
- Ebn Monavar, Mohammad. *Asrār al-towhid*. Edited by Mohammad Rezā Shafī'i-Kadkani. Tehrān: Enteshārāt-e Āgāh, 1376 [1997].
- Ephrat, Daphna. "The Seljuqs and the Public Sphere in the Period of Sunni Revivalism: The View from Baghdad." In *The Seljuqs: Politics, Society and Culture*, edited by Christian Lange and Songül Mecit, 139–56. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011.
- Eqbāl, 'Abbās. "Moqaddemeh." In *Divān-e Amir Mo'ezzi*, edited by 'Abbās Eqbāl. Tehrān: Ketāb-forushi-ye Eslāmiyyeh, 1318 [1939–40].
- 'Erāqī, Fakhr al-Din Ebrāhim ben Bozorgmehr. *Kolliyyāt-e Fakhr al-Din 'Erāqī (majmū'eh-ye āsār-e Fakhr al-Din 'Erāqī)*. Edited by Nasrin Mohtasham (Khozā'i). Tehrān: Enteshārāt-e Zavvār, 1382 [2003–4].
- Esots, Janis. "The Image of *Qalandar* in the *Divān-i Shams*." In *Light upon Light: Essays in Islamic Thought and History in Honor of Gerhard Bowering*, edited by Jamal J. Elias and Bilal Orfali, 239–55. Leiden: Brill, 2020.
- Feuillebois-Pierunek, Ève. *A la croisée des voies célestes, Fakh al-Din 'Erāqī: poésie mystique et expression poétique en Perse médiévale*. Tehrān: Institut Français de Recherche en Iran, 2002.
- Feuillebois-Pierunek, Ève. "Le *Qalandar*: Réalité et Fiction En Perse Médiévale." In *Etrangeté de l'autre, Singularité Du Moi: Les Figures Du Marginal Dans Les Littératures*, edited by Ève Feuillebois-Pierunek and Z. Ben Lagha, 111–27. Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2015.
- Foucault, Michel. "Of Other Spaces." *Diacritics* 16 (1986): 22–27.
- Gelder, G. J. H. van. *Beyond the Line: Classical Arabic Literary Critics on the Coherence and Unity of the Poem*. Leiden: Brill, 1982.
- Ghaznavi, Sadid al-Din Mohammad. *Maqāmāt-e Zhandeh Pil*. Edited by Heshmat Moayyad. Tehrān: Bongāh-e Tarjümeh va Nashr-e Ketāb, 1340 [1961–62].
- Ghaznavi, Sadid al-Din Mohammad. *The Colossal Elephant and His Spiritual Feats: Shaykh Ahmad-e Jām; The Life and Legend of a Popular Sufi Saint of 12th-Century Iran*. Translated by Heshmat Moayyad and Franklin D. Lewis. Costa Mesa, CA: Mazda, 2004.
- Glünz, Michael. "Poetic Tradition and Social Change: The Persian Qasida in Post-Mongol Iran." In *Qasida Poetry in Islamic Asia and Africa*, vol. 1, edited by Stefan Sperl and Christopher Shackleton, 183–203. New York: E. J. Brill, 1996.
- Gruendler, Beatrice. *Medieval Arabic Praise Poetry: Ibn al-Rūmī and the Patron's Redemption*. New York: Routledge Curzon, 2003.
- Hamadāni, 'Ayn al-Qozāt. "Tamhidāt." In *Mosannafāt*, edited by 'Afif 'Ossayrān, 1–354. Tehrān: Enteshārāt-e Dāneshgāh-e Tehrān, 1341 [1962–63].
- Hillenbrand, R. M., and A.K.S. Lambton. "Qazwīn." *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. 2nd ed. 2012. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_COM_0478.
- Jājarmī, Mohammad ebn Badr. *Mo'nes al-ahrār fi daqā'eq al-ash'ār (jeld-e dovom)*. Edited by Mir Sāleh Tabibi. Tehrān: Enteshārāt-e Anjoman-e Āsār-e Melli, 1350 [1971–72].
- Ahmad-e Jām. *Rowzat al-moznebin va jannat al-mushtāqin*. Edited by 'Ali Fāzel. Tehran: Bonyād-e Farhang-e Irān, 1368 [1989].
- Jāmi, Nur al-Din 'Abd al-Rahmān, and Mahmud 'Ābedi. *Nafahāt al-ons min hadarāt al-Qods*. Tehrān: Sokhan, 1386 [2007–8].
- Karamustafa, Ahmet T. *God's Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in the Islamic Later Middle Period, 1200–1550*. Salt Lake City, UT: University of Utah Press, 1994.
- Karamustafa, Ahmet T. *Sufism: The Formative Period*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.
- Karamustafa, Ahmet T. "Antinomian Sufis." In *The Cambridge Companion to Sufism*, edited by Lloyd Ridgeon, 101–24. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Khāqāni Shervāni, Afzal al-Din, and Ziyā al-Din Sajjādi. *Divān-e Khāqāni Shervāni*. Tehrān: Enteshārāt-e Zavvār, 1388 [2009–10].

- Kruk, Remke. "A Barmecide Feast: The Downfall of the Barmakids in Popular Imagination." In *Living Islamic History: Studies in Honour of Professor Carole Hillenbrand*, edited by Carole Hillenbrand and Yasir Suleiman, 92–106. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010.
- Lewis, Franklin D. "Reading, Writing and Recitation: Sana'i and the Origins of the Persian Ghazal." PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1995.
- Lewis, Franklin D. "Sexual Occidentation: The Politics of Conversion, Christian-Love and Boy-Love in 'Attār." *Iranian Studies* 42 (2009): 693–723.
- Lewisohn, Leonard. "Sufi Symbolism in the Persian Hermeneutic Tradition: Reconstructing the Pagoda of 'Attār's Esoteric Poetics." In *'Attār and the Persian Sufi Tradition: The Art of Spiritual Flight*, edited by Leonard Lewisohn, 255–308. New York: I. B. Tauris, 2006.
- Lewisohn, Leonard. "Prolegomenon to the Study of Hafiz." In *Hafiz and the Religion of Love in Classical Persian Poetry*, edited by Leonard Lewisohn, 3–73. New York: I. B. Tauris, 2010.
- Losensky, Paul E. "Vintages of the Sāqī-Nāma: Fermenting and Blending the Cupbearer's Song in the Sixteenth Century." *Iranian Studies* 47 (2014): 131–57.
- Massé, H. "'Irāqī." *Encyclopædia of Islam*. 2nd ed. 2011. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_3585.
- Meier, Fritz. *Abū Sa'īd-i Abū l-Hayr: Wirklichkeit Und Legende*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.
- Meisami, Julie Scott. *Medieval Persian Court Poetry*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- Meisami, Julie Scott. "Mas'ūdī on Love and the Fall of the Barmakids." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 2 (1989): 252–77.
- Meisami, Julie Scott. "Ghaznavid Panegyrics: Some Political Implications." *Iran* 28 (1990): 31–44.
- Meisami, Julie Scott. *Persian Historiography: To the End of the Twelfth Century*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999.
- Meisami, Julie Scott. *Structure and Meaning in Medieval Arabic and Persian Poetry: Orient Pearls*. New York: Routledge Curzon, 2003.
- Meisami, Julie Scott. "Mu'izzī." *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. 2nd ed. 2012. doi: 10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_5448.
- Miller, Matthew Thomas. "Embodying the Sufi Beloved: (Homo)Eroticism, Embodiment, and the Construction of Desire in the Hagiographic Tradition of 'Erāqī." *Journal of Middle Eastern Literatures* 21, no. 1 (2018): 1–27. doi: 10.1080/1475262X.2018.1492134.
- Miller, Matthew Thomas. "Poetics of the Sufi Carnival: The Rogue Lyrics (*Qalandariyyāt*) as Heterotopic Countergenre(s)." *Al-Uṣūr al-Wuṣṭā: The Journal of Middle East Medievalists*, forthcoming 2022.
- Miller, Matthew Thomas. "'The Ocean of the Persians': Fakhr al-Din 'Erāqī; Poet and Mystic." In *Religious and Mystical Literature* (A History of Persian Literature, vol. 6), edited by Fatemeh Keshavarz, Ahmet T. Karamustafa, and Ehsan Yarshater. New York: I. B. Tauris, forthcoming.
- Miller, Matthew Thomas. "Genre in Classical Persian Poetry." In *Routledge Handbook of Persian Literature*, edited by Kamran Talattof. Oxfordshire, UK: Routledge, forthcoming.
- Modarres-e Razavi, Mohammad Taqī. "Moqaddemeh-ye mosahheh." In *Divān-e Hakim Abu al-Majd Majdud ebn Ādam Sanā'ī Ghaznavi*, edited by Mohammad Taqī Modarres-e Razavi, XXXI–CLXVII. Tehrān: Enteshārāt-e Sanā'ī, 1362 [1983–84].
- Mo'ezzi, Mohammad ben 'Abd al-Malek Amir. *Kolliyyāt-e Divān-e Mo'ezzi*. Edited by Nāser Heyyeri. Nashr-e Marzbān, 1362 [1983].
- Mo'ezzi, Mohammad ben 'Abd al-Malek Amir. *Kolliyyāt-e Divān-e Amir Mo'ezzi-ye Neyshaburi*. Edited by Mohammad Rezā Qanbari. Tehrān: Enteshārāt-e Zavvār, 1385 [2006–7].
- Mohtasham (Khozā'i), Nasrin. "Moqaddemeh-ye mosahheh." In *Kolliyyāt-e Fakhr al-Din 'Erāqī*, edited by Nasrin Mohtasham (Khozā'i), i–lxxxiii. Tehrān: Enteshārāt-e Zavvār, 1382 [2003–4].
- Mo'in, Mohammad. "Borhāni va qasideh-ye u." *Dānesh-kadeh-ye Adabiyāt va 'Olum-e Ensāni-ye Tabriz* 1 (1327 [1948–49]): 7–18.
- Mostowfi, Hamd Allāh. *Tārikh-e gozideh*. Edited by 'Abd al-Hoseyn Navā'i. Tehrān: Amir Kabir, 1339 [1960–61].
- Mostowfi, Hamd Allāh. *Nozhat al-qolub*. 2 vols. Edited by Mir Hāshem Mohaddes. Tehrān: Enteshārāt-e Safir Ardehāl, 1396 [2017–18].
- Mottahedeh, Roy. "Administration in Būyid Qazwīn." In *Islamic Civilization, 950–1150*, edited by D. S. Richards, 33–45. Bruno Cassirer, 1973.
- "Moqaddemeh-ye Divān." In *Kolliyyāt-e Sheykh Fakhr al-Din Ebrāhīm Hamadāni Motakhallas Beh 'Erāqī*, edited by Sa'īd Nafisi, 46–65. Tehrān: Ketāb-Khāneh-ye Sanā'ī, 1362 [1983–84].
- Noorani, Yaseen. "Heterotopia and the Wine Poem in Early Islamic Culture." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 36, no. 3 (2004): 345–66.
- O'Malley, Austin. "From Blessed Lips: The Textualization of Abu Sa'id's Dicta and Deeds." *Journal of Persianate Studies* 12 (2019): 5–31.
- 'Oryān, Bābā Tāher. *Divān-e Bābā Tāher-e 'Oryān*. Edited by Vahid Dastgerdi. Tehrān: Amir Kabir, 1333 [1954–55].
- Papas, Alexandre. *Mystiques et vagabonds en islam: portraits de trois soufis qalandar*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2010.

- Papas, Alexandre. "The Son of His Mother: Qalandarī Celibacy and the 'Destruction' of Family." In *Family Portraits with Saints: Hagiography, Sanctity, and Family in the Muslim World*, edited by Catherine Mayeur-Jaouen and Alexandre Papas, 420–44. Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2014.
- Peacock, A. C. S. *The Great Seljuk Empire*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2015.
- Pourjavady, Nasrollah. "Rendi-ye Häfez (1)." In *Bu-ye Jān: Maqāleh-hā-ye Darbāreh-ye She'r-e 'Erfāni-ye Fārsi*, edited by Nasrollah Pourjavady, 214–47. Tehrān: Enteshārāt-e Markaz-e Nashr-e Dāneshgāhi, 1372 [1993–94].
- Pourjavady, Nasrollah. "Rendi-ye Häfez (2): Zohd va Rendi." In *Bu-ye Jān: Maqāleh-hā-ye Darbāreh-ye She'r-e 'Erfāni-ye Fārsi*, edited by Nasrollah Pourjavady, 248–88. Tehrān: Enteshārāt-e Markaz-e Nashr-e Dāneshgāhi, 1372 [1993–94].
- Qanbari, Mohammad Rezā. "Moqaddemeh." In *Kolliyyāt-e Divan-e Amir Mo'ezzi-ye Neyshaburi*, edited by Mohammad Rezā Qanbari, 1–Cl. Tehrān: Enteshārāt-e Zavvār, 1385 [2006–7].
- Qutbuddin, Tahera. *Al-Mu'ayyad al-Shirāzī and Fatimid Da'wa Poetry: A Case of Commitment in Classical Arabic Literature*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Rāvandi, Mohammad ebn 'Ali. *Rāhat al-sodur*. Edited by Muhammad Iqbal. London: Luzac, 1921.
- Renterghem, Vanessa van. "Controlling and Developing Baghdad: Caliphs, Sultans and the Balance of Power in the Abbasid Capital (Mid-5th/11th to Late 6th/12th Centuries)." In *The Seljuqs: Politics, Society and Culture*, edited by Christian Lange and Songül Mecit, 117–38. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011.
- Ridgeon, Lloyd. "Shaggy or Shaved? The Symbolism of Hair among Persian Qalandar Sufis." *Iran and the Caucasus* 14 (2010): 233–64.
- Ridgeon, Lloyd. "Reading Sufi History through Ādāb: The Perspectives of Sufis, Jawānmardān and Qalandars." In *Ethics and Spirituality in Islam*, edited by Francesco Chiabotti, Ève Feuillebois-Pierunek, Catherine Mayeur-Jaouen, and Luca Patrizi, 379–402. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Ridgeon, Lloyd. "Short Back and Sides: Were the Qalandars of Late Safavid Iran Domesticated?" *Journal of Sufi Studies*, no. 6 (2017): 82–115.
- Ritter, Hellmut. "Philologika XV: Fariduddin 'Attar. III. 7. (Der Diwan) (Mit Vergleich Einiger Verse von Sana'i Und Hafiz)." *Oriens* 12 (1959): 1–88.
- Sadan, Joseph. "Death of a Princess: Episodes of the Barmakid Legend in Its Late Evolution." In *Story-Telling in the Framework of Non-Fictional Arabic Literature*, edited by Stefan Leder, 130–57. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1998.
- Safā, Zabihollāh. *Tārikh-e adabiyāt dar Irān va dar qalamrow-e zabān-Pārsi*. 5 vols. Tehrān: Enteshārāt-e Ferdows, 1388 [2009–10].
- Safī, Omid. *The Politics of Knowledge in Premodern Islam: Negotiating Ideology and Religious Inquiry*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.
- Sanā'i, Abu al-Majd Majdud ebn Ādam. *Kolliyyāt-e ash'ār-e Hakim Sanā'i Ghaznavi* (facsimile). Edited by A. A. Bashir. Kābol: Mo'asseh-ye Enteshārāt-e Beyhaqi, 1356 [1977–88].
- Sanā'i, Abu al-Majd Majdud ebn Ādam. *Divān-e Hakim Abu al-Majd Majdud ebn Ādam Sanā'i Ghaznavi*. Edited by Mohammad Taqi Modarres-e Razavi. Tehrān: Enteshārāt-e Sanā'i, 1362 [1983–84].
- Sells, Michael A. "Like the Arms of a Drowning Man: Simile and Symbol Worlds in the Naqa Sections of Bashama's Hajarta Umama." In *Festschrift in Honor of Professor Ewald Wagner*, vol. 2, edited by W. Heinrichs and G. Schoeler, 18–41. Beirut: Beirut Studien, 1994.
- Sells, Michael A. "Guises of the Ghūl: Dissembling Simile and Semantic Overflow in the Classical Arabic Nasīb." In *Reorientations: Arabic and Persian Poetry*, edited by Suzanne Pinckney Stetkevych, 130–64. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1994.
- Shafī'i-Kadkani, Mohammad Rezā. *Mofles-e kimiya-forush: naqd va tahlil-e she'r-e Anvari*. Tehrān: Sokhan, 1372 [1993–94].
- Shafī'i-Kadkani, Mohammad Rezā. *Qalandariyyeh dar tārikh: Degardisi-hā-ye yek Ide'olozi*. Tehrān: Sokhan, 1386 [2007–8].
- Sperl, Stefan. "Islamic Kingship and Arabic Panegyric Poetry in the Early 9th Century." *Journal of Arabic Literature* 8 (1977): 20–35.
- Sperl, Stefan. *Mannerism in Arabic Poetry: A Structural Analysis of Selected Texts (3rd Century AH/9th Century AD–5th Century AH/11th Century AD)*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Sperl, Stefan, and Christopher Shackle, eds. "Introduction." In *Qasida Poetry in Islamic Asia and Africa*, vol. 2, 1–62. New York: E. J. Brill, 1996.
- Stallybrass, Peter, and Allon White. *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986.
- Tetley, G. E. *The Ghaznavid and Seljuk Turks: Poetry as a Source for Iranian History*. New York: Routledge, 2008.
- Tor, D. G. "'Sovereign and Pious': The Religious Life of the Great Seljuq Sultans." In *The Seljuqs: Politics, Society and Culture*, edited by Christian Lange and Songül Mecit, 39–62. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011.
- Tor, D. G. "Ray and the Religious History of the Seljuq Period." *Der Islam* 93, no. 2 (2016): 374–402.
- Veccia Vaglieri, L. "Dja'far b. Abi Tālib." *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. 2nd ed. 2012. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_islam_SIM_1916.
- Watenpugh, Heghnar Zeitlian. "Deviant Dervishes: Space, Gender, and the Construction of Antinomian Piety in Ottoman Aleppo." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 37, no. 4 (2005): 535–65.
- Yaghoobi, Claudia. *Subjectivity in 'Aṭṭār, Persian Sufism, and European Mysticism*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 2017.

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

Matthew Thomas Miller is Assistant Professor of Persian Literature and Digital Humanities at the Roshan Institute for Persian Studies at the University of Maryland, College Park.

Cite this article: Miller MT (2022). The *Qalandar* King: Early Development of the *Qalandariyyāt* and Saljuq Conceptions of Kingship in Amir Mo'ezzi's Panegyric for Sharafshāh Ja'fari. *Iranian Studies* 55, 521–549. <https://doi.org/10.1017/irn.2021.8>