SADI AND KHUSRAU

Compared as Lyricists
CHAPTER VI

SADI AND KHUSEW COMPARED AS LYRICISTS

It is a study in comparison and a study in contrast. Between the Shaykh and the Amīr similarity and dissimilarity seem to attain their respective extremes. From about one half of the Amīr’s Odes if we smuggle but one verse into the Shaykh’s collection we are sure to be caught out. But we may judiciously assimilate the entire remainder of the Amīr’s Diwan into the Shaykh’s Kulliyat and no one would be the wiser. We shall discuss below the subject in this same order; i.e. we shall first point out the dissimilarities between these two master ghazal-writers, and then we shall dwell upon their similarities, while we shall defer to the last the question of how Khusew’s diversity of style has back-lashed on his lyrical productions.

Now first take up the dissimilarities between Sādi and Khusew. Broadly speaking, they are two in number; one belonging to the style of expression; the other related to the art employed in versification. We shall deal with them in this same order:
**Style** - By now we have become fairly well acquainted with the style of Sadi's ghazal. It represents the perfection and consummation of an evolutionary process. It is the finale of the same symphony which Rudaki in his 'بِلْدَ بَيْتِي' - played so softly and so sweetly, and which was later taken up by the father and son - Jamāl and Kamāl. But with Khusraw it was otherwise; he played with Sādī, and he played on his own. And when he was working independently he was laying the foundation of a new poetical school. He was the sower of seeds, not a collector of harvest. It was he who originated the much-maligned still - admired د. And it is the intrusion of this (and something else besides, of which more later) which destroys the unity of effect in his Diwan. With one hand he gently plays over a lovers guitar, and with the other he skilfully constructs the groundwork for the above-mentioned literary curiosity. Just as we have been bullied by the musician, the change and clatter of the mason shocks us out of our reverie. It need not be emphasised how essentially the د with its pioneering seal for the new contrasts with Sādī's mellow and almost archaism. But the point which needs stressing is that the originator of this د is neither Nasiri, nor Zuhūrī, nor Nāṣīrī nor any other latter-day poet of Iran or India. It has older and much more respectable credentials, for its inception can be traced right back to the Amir's Diwan. No doubt, it was
then, but in a rudimentary and undeveloped stage. Yet the same embryo was there and it only needed time to grow up into a full organism. A few verses from Khusrav, each typifying some special and well-known feature of the above — will suffice to prove the point.

1. *Simile* - with a blend of the real and the fanciful

2. *Simile* - entirely, and wildly fanciful

3. *Elegance of Diction*

4. *Simulated Pathos*

5. *Unmelodious word collection*

Certainly these fanfares are a far cry from Sa'di.

But equally certainly, these are the original notes whose echo we can hear in the verses of the *Shāh-nāmeh*.

---

2. *Sīāh-ābādī-Khusrav*, p.66
3. Indd, p.66
4. Indd, p.66
5. Indd, p.5
The debut of such verses as well as their continual recurrence is the first characteristic which distinguishes the Amir from the Shaykh.

Art - The other point of difference to which reference was made earlier is the art of poetic ornamentation. Sadi uses it as a spice, for Khusraw its often the food. Indeed, because of the Amir's hyperbolic seal for it, the Art of words in him frequently degenerates into word-play. And he plays this game in every field, whether it be in prose or poetry, whether it be in a lyric or panegyric, a moral exhortation or an elegy, a tale of romance or a historical masnavi. Truely, the simplest way to express the difference between these two masters in the particular field is to point out that the prose master piece of the Shaykh is "Kulliyat", while that of the Amir is the . There is many a verse in Khusraw's Kulliyat whose origin seems to be not a 'thought concept' but a wordy concept'. Even when dwelling on a topic as somber as mysticism and even when striving to rival a poet as sober as Nizami, he can be to frivolous as to write:

\[ \text{\textit{\textcolor{red}{\textbf{I. Nata'ul Ammar, p.}}}} \]
Occasionally when writing some superb lyric in the best tradition of Sadi, he suddenly catches sight of some particular word, having quipping possibility. He pounces upon it and "consigns the lyric to the limbo". He opens the following Ghazal with dulcet tones and touching wistfulness:

And all of a sudden his memory remembers

Again, this Indian Sadi takes up his lyre and pours down this pathetic melody:

Till the fifth verse, all goes well, then he happens to write:

The mention of the fire and the burning and hissing firewood are irresistible temptation. His appetite for word play is excited and it cannot be appeased till he has served himself and the reader with this spicy

Sometimes his heated imagination works like an atomic reactor and word breeds word till we have a chain which seems to be endless. In a wellknown ghazal the fifth verse contains the

1. Hatif-ul Anwar, p
2. Divan-e-Khausrav, p.75
3. Ibid, p.392
word ' • thus:

Now hear the sixth and seventh lines:

Khusraw's command of language has been unrivalled before or since. And he had an over bearing power of versification to boot. Sometimes this mighty combination leads him to excess. One sad and typical example will suffice. Everyone knows the superb compound simile which Nizam employed to describe the quivering speckle of the 

Khusraw tries to surpass, or rather, to correct the Moulana and say the same thing in more appropriate words. In describing the vernal beauties of a garden, he writes:

No doubt, so far as literal exactitude is concerned he has outdone Nizam. The letters' has no comparable concept in the first hemistich, while Khusraw's well balances with the earlier. But has he really excelled Nizam? This is not a dissertation on Khusraw, as we need not enter into the minuteness of the case. It is sufficient.

1. Dinana-Khusraw, p. 471
2. Kulliyat-e-Khusara-e-Nizam Ganjavi, Tehran 1341, (Shamel) p
3. Shafruna, p. 1149
4. Dinana Sadain, p. 40
to point the difference between the phonetic values of Nizami's elegant ֶָֻּּּּּּּּּ and ַָּּּּּּּּּ on the one hand and Khusraw's clumsy ָָּּּּּּּּּ and ֶָּּּּּּּּ on the other. Nizami has offered us a graceful verse; Khusraw challenges us with a tongue twister. The art of poetry consists partly of matching the words with the ideas. Both Nizami and Khusraw have set themselves to depict the image of constant, rhythmic motion. With the natural flow of words in Nizami that end is fully achieved with his halting verse Khusraw is self-defeating in his appointed task. There is a further point to note here. Both these masters desire to depict a regularly-beating light presenting a pretty visual pattern with the balanced rhythm of his verse Nizami has fully succeeded to produce this effect. But Khusraw with his jars and jolts miserably fails in the attempt.

Of course, there are understandable excuses for this superabundance of art in Khusraw. He has made ample redemptions too. He was not only a court-poet but a courtier as well. He served three dynasties and about three times as many kings. And he had to amuse and daze and dupe them all with the magic wand of his art. Kings, perhaps because of their preoccupation with matters which help them to remain kings, are not usually favoured with refined literary taste. They can bask
in the garish sunshine; they cannot enjoy the soft twilight. Hence the never-ending quest of ornaments and artifices by those who want to please them. This, in the humble opinions of the present writer (as indirectly supported by the Amir's own confession which will be quoted shortly), was the real source of all the "Quips, and cranks, and wordy wiles" which are met with in Khusrav.

And yet the Amir was painfully aware that poetry, like all perfectionist occupations, was a jealous taskmaster and tolerated subservience to none but itself. It is to the eternal credit of Khusrav that he realized all this and hated the court life all the more for this. In his Majnum-Layla he wistfully recalls the independence of Nizam from king and court and his single-minded devotion to the poetical Muse; and with anguish self-pity he points to the heavy yoke on his own neck:

But, loving or hating, Khosraw had to bear the yoke and trail along his weary way. To cater for the taste of an erstwhile slave who happened now to squat on the royal throne --- this must have been the torture for a man of Khosraw's exquisite sensibility. (Need the reader be reminded here of the majestic Sadi who, in the very first verse of the royal panegyric in ِبِرْسُن, could drench the king with this bucket of icy-cold water:

\[
\text{بِرْسُنَ عَلَيْهِ مَاءٌ مَّاءٌ}
\]

It is a suggestive fact of Persian literary history that none of its great poetical Quintuplet --- Firdawsí, Nisâmî, Rûmî, Sâdî and Hâfîz --- had a permanent serving connection with any court. But, unhappily, Khosraw was not among those fortunate few. And his misfortune was all the more pitiable for he fully realised the malevolent effect of such bondage on poetical production, where simplicity cannot please, affectation must needs

---

I. Kulliyât, p. 223
he employed. It was this violence against the genius of poetry of which Khusrav was painfully conscious and about which he so openly complained. Again to quote from his Majnum-Layla:

These lines are worth a close scrutiny. They express quaintly yet intelligibly, Khusrav's views about ornate and simple poetry. Let us paraphrase them in the first person like the original. Says he:

I wanted to imitate Nizami. And I knew that I was quite capable of it. (This is turning indeed a full round-about; for while Khusrav indulged so much in verbal

I. Majnum-Layla, p
Nizami's haughty disdain for them is well-known. I abandoned my own style and surrendered myself to Nizami's Layla-Majnun. With my pen I sketched a copy (from Nizami) and set aside my own affectation (of style, i.e. I discarded my own affected style for Nizami's simplicity.) With facile fluency I washed off the paint and powder of the body-poetic, for these paint and powder are (the adjuncts of) an imperfect art and they have extended their name and fame through (being related to) my style (i.e. ornate poetry became famous not because it had any intrinsic worth but because it was my chosen style.) A captivating eye needs no collyrium. Conversely, it is fruitless to pencil with indigo a mis-shaped eye-brow (i.e. good poetry needs no art, and no amount of art can make good what is bad.)

Here we see an honest man indulging in self-criticism. He acknowledges Nizami's ascendancy over himself. He attributes it to Nizami's simple and direct diction and to his own inordinate hankering after artificiality.
and affection. He resolves to renounce for once in his
Majnûn-Layla his own style and to adopt that of Nizâmî
instead (with what results we shall see at the end of
this chapter.) That was the beginning and the end of
Khusrav’s notorious verbiety. Let others blame him for
the Original Sin; we admire him for his ultimate repen-
tance and atonement.

We have now dealt with the two chief particulars
which distinguish Khusrav’s ghazal from that of Sadi. It
is better to recapitulate them briefly. First we have
noted that while Sadi’s ghazal is the sublimation of the
style of Rudaki, Jalâl and Kamâl, Khusrav’s ghazal contains
the first buds and sprouts of the well-known .
The vital import of this contrast needs no stressing.
Secondly we have found that while the Shaykh’s language
is simple, direct and unadorned, the Amir’s writings are
often marred with affection, quips and wordy artifices,
sacrificing the natural beauty of poetry to paint and polish.

But happily our story does not end here. Khusrav
was too great an artist not to realise where he defaulted
and not to amend when he erred. And all the lovers of
the Persian language should be thankful that it was so.
Had the energies of such a potent and planetwise genius
petered out on trivialities the literature of that
ancient tongue would have suffered both in amplitude and
quality. With deep wisdom and discriminating taste he
chose his models for the different varieties of poetry. As to ghazal he went in plumb for our Shaykh. We can easily divine his meaning from the following modest lines in

\begin{align*}
\text{فَرَاضُ الْمِلَالِ} & \text{فَوَمُّلِتُ يَا بُعْتُ حَيَانِ وَدَمَّرُ،} \\
\text{ذَهَبَتْ مُحَيَّةً أَوْلَى فِي دَوْرِهَا} & \text{ذَهَبَتْ مُحَيَّةً أَوْلَى فِي دَوْرِهَا.}
\end{align*}

This choice of model, and not all the stuffings for the barbaric taste of the court in his Diwan, is the true measure of his poetical greatness. And he copied his model so faithfully that the replica is indistinguishable from the original. All traces of the are sloughed off; all shattels of word-magic are thrown away; and a new poet emerges robed in the grandeur of elemental simplicity and grace. Indeed, there is a such a flagrant diversity in the two styles of the Amir that it might well give rise to a suspicion of poeticschizophrenia. But a should know better. He should be a to make out the apparent from the real, the natural from the assumed. The supreme poetic intellect which appeared in this sub-continent during the past millennium, the fiery-hearted whose intercession

---

I. Mathnawi Qirânsa-Sa'days, p
was the hope of salvation for the saintly نَقْهُمُ وَالَنَّقَـرِ. We say that if such a mighty prodigy took up pen to write ghazal, would he, could he, put it down again without having equalled the very best in the class—the very best being in this case the lyrical master—creations of our own Shaykh? When thus inspired, Khusraw gets merged into Sadi, and no eye without the blessing of a squint can see them each apart. Of course, there are minor differences in their individual styles but they are mostly insignificant and serve only to set off their essential unity.

Incidentally, this identity of style found in the ghazals of the two masters absolves the present writer from dilating on Khusraw as a lyric writer. What has been written earlier in this connection about Sadi will suffice for Khusraw as well. When we have charted the sound it is needless to map the echo. However, to round off the present discussion as well as to point out the above-mentioned individual distinctions of style met with in Sadi and Khusraw, it seems proper to append a brief note on Khusraw as a lyricist also.

We have seen earlier that the chief quality of a lyricist is an intense love of beauty. We first discussed this matter in full where we discussed lyricism in general, and then we dealt with it in its particular application
to Sadi. Now let us see what the Amīr has to offer us in this field. Read this ghazal:

And again:

We find Sadi's worship of beauty here, and we find something more. We discover that in each of the above two odes all the verses are strung on a single thread. There is a unity of idea which runs through them all. We suffer no mental jolts caused by conceptually disjointed lines. There is a facile and felicitous transition from verse to verse. We had witnessed this quality in Sadi. And we find it in equal measure in

1. Diwan-i-Khusraw, p.185
2. Ibid. p. 18
Khusraw as well.

And in the second of the above two odes we perceive something else. It is one of those few happy instances where both the masters have written in same rhyme and metre. Khusraw’s ghazal has been reproduced above, and it is enough to quote Sadi’s opening lines only:

Let others hasten with their prisms and microscopes; we confess to detect no difference in the colouring and matter of the two specimens.

We had also earlier noted that the language as well as the tone of a lyric should be soft and sweet, so much so that even if a lover complained of his beloved he should do so without any palpable bitterness in his speech. We cited some instances of this from Sadi, and we can pile up an equal number from Khusraw as well. But for the sake of brevity we refer only to the second and third lines of the second of the above-quoted two ghazals, and then pass on to our next point.

We also observed before that a lyric’s orientation was always subjective, and that even when it dealt with objective nature it did so only to express or suggest the emotional effect of nature on the poet. Sadi’s sovereignty is rightfully recognised over this domain. But it is a

I. Kulliyat, p. 534
diarchy and not a monarchy, for we should not be unmindful of Khusrav's equally powerful claims. On this point also the testimony of the above two odes is decisive. However, if further proof be needed, after those two songs of vernal joy read this Persian "Ode to the West Wind".

While dwelling on Sadi we had also seen that even his treatment of mystical topics was typically lyrical. He did not soar up to heaven but brought down God to earth, for adoring Him and for cherishing Him; for singing His songs and pining in His love — just as a simple earthly lover would do for his simple earthly darling.

Khusrav follows suit but here we find a slight difference. Divine love is so thoroughly personified by Sadi that often it is after considerable groping that we catch hold of his true intent. But Khusrav sometimes puts in a pointer in the form of a suggestive word or phrase. For example, read this glorious ghazal:

I. Divān-i-Khusrav, p.74
2. Ibid, p.341
It is all mysticism hidden behind a material veil. But in the master-verse of the ode Khusrav uses the phrase, which partly raises the curtain and enables us to see within; thus:

Likewise, in another equally famous ghazal:

The problem of interpretation is solved by the final verse:

It is a small but notable difference, originating perhaps from the antecedents of the two poets. Sādi was a single-minded votary of the poetical Muse, while Khusrav was a disciple of the ( суфий ) as well. It is difficult to pass judgment on such fine matters of taste. However, if Rūmī's maxim:

is to be compulsorily followed generally then it must be followed in detail as well. But in that case what will happen to Rūmī's own Mathnawi which is a veritable repository of unadulterated Sufi doctrine? It is a moot and veracious question.

There is one other point which distinguishes the Amir from the Shaykh. It is not related to lyricism but we should like to mention it here. Sādi loses himself totally and irretrievably into his beloved. The metamorphosis is final; for his there is no mere an "I" but

I. Diwan-i-Khusraw, p. 341
3. Naṣravi Ḥāfiz, p. 29
4. Ibid., p.
only a "Thou". But the Amir (perhaps as private compensation for a courtier's public self-effacement?) often talks egotistically. For example:

It is a lover talking of his love in the abstract, with reference to no other person loved or otherwise but himself.

To complete this assessment of Khusraw as a lyricist it seems appropriate to gratify and to edify the reader with one of the best lyrical specimens to be found either in the poetical works of the Amir or, indeed, in the entire literary heritage of the Persian language. It is not a ghazal but the piece of a Mathnawi, but even so it is a lyric in the fullest sense of the word. (We must remember that the term lyric is related not to any particular poetical form but to the subject-matter and the mode of expression of poems compare the Lament of the Reed in the Koran, which is a lyric by every canonic of criticism.) It is the letter of Layla written to Majmun. The reader may remember that it was in this very Mathnawi of Majmun-Layla that Khusraw declared his intention of discarding his customarily ornate style and

1. Divan-i-Khusraw, p.29
2. Ibid, p.427
writing in simpler and more natural vein. Now see the fruit. Writes the pining Layla to her wandering Majnaun:

I. Mathnawi - Majnaun-Layla, pg. 148-54
This music effuses not from cords or strings; it comes out from the shreds of a torn heart.

This comparative study has reached its end at last. It has been a finely balanced affair, the scale now tipping this way now that. But our main question as to who carries the lyrical pain still remains undecided. We should make a final effort and have a closer and deeper look into the matter. Thus we shall discover that regarded simply as lyricists there is nothing to choose between Sadi and Khusraw. However, it will be seen that while Sadi is nothing but a lyricist Khusraw is a lyricist Khusraw and something else as well. And this appendage, as it were, to the Amir's lyricism is his recurrent engrossment with words at the expense and to the detriment of his subject-matter. At such moments he seems to forget that his affectation is clogging the fountain of his inspiration and his verse is falling into laboured ineffectuality. For lyricism with its simplicity and broad naturalness is the very antithesis of cant and artificiality. The alternation of emotional pathos and artistic playfulness in Khusraw was the total lyrical effect. It we see a person winking one moment and weeping the other the suspicion of imposture is fairly excusable. Such a double dye is calculated to put the sincerity and the integrity of the best poet in doubt.
We are not sure which window looks into the reality of his heart.

On the contrary, in Sadi we are never faced with this dilemma. There is no conflict either in his style or in his ideas. An unbroken unity prevails all round. Even where he employs art he seems to do so artlessly. A spirit of transparent and impeccable sincerity runs through his entire Kulliāt. And it is this truthful, natural and almost naïve approach to the affairs of love which makes him the supreme lyricist of the Persian language.
SADI AND HAFIZ

Compared as Lyricists
CHAPTER V

Sadi and Hafiz Compared as Lyricists

When two Immensities confront each other there is no measure to size them up. Had we set out to compare Sadi and Hafiz simply as ghazal-writers we would have found ourselves just in such a quandary. But, fortunately, our terms of reference have spared us that plight. We are concerned here with their ghazals not as ghazals but as lyrics. When so qualified, the discussion may hopefully lead to some definite conclusion.

First, let us differentiate between a lyric and ghazal. As we already know, the lyric is a personal, emotional, sweet, simple, short poem, and the emotion around which it centres is often that of personal love. The Persian ghazal in its origin was also just such a poem and at that time there was nothing to choose between it and the lyric. But the Persians do not excel in their amours only but they are a mightily witty people as well; and wit and epigram go hand in hand. The latter Persian poets discovered that, apart from its old amorous associations, the rounded couplet of the
ghazal was eminently suitable for making an epigram. And then the flood-gates burst and all heaven and earth poured into this Marvel Mars. And, wonder of wonders, the two flimsy walls of its couplet swallowed it all without showing the least stress or strain. And so, what was originally a Virgilian shepherd's pathetic ditty ended in a nicely-turned Baconian epigram.

And in this evolution of the Persian ghazal, substance and form kept pace. The language of the ghazal evolved with its subject-matter. As the one widened in scope, the other in its turn became richer, more complex and more elegant.

Sâdi and Hâfiz respectively represent the two extremes of this spectrum. There is some intermingling of hues, of course, but the overall effect is that of contrast. In the one (viz. Sâdi) the theme is love and the language is sweet and simple which is best suited to that theme. In the other (viz. Hâfiz) the variety of theme is as infinite as the patterns of man's mental kaleidoscope. And the language is also rich and ripe so that it may cope with the composer's ever new and exacting demands.

Another basic point of difference between these two poets is also worth noting. We find that, as with the old Persian poets, Sâdi's ghazal represents a conceptual unity. A single idea, usually dealing with some particular moment
or phase in the lover's life, runs through it from end to end. This uniformity has a favourable sub-conscious effect on the reader and assures him of the poet's earnestness and sincerity. On the other hand, the ghazal of Hafiz is usually a collection of heterogeneous verses each of which, like the English couplet of the Augustan Age, forms in itself an epigrammatic whole. This variety provides an intellectual feast, but emotionally its effect is disastrous. The swiftly-succeeding impressions vanish before they have sunk into the reader's heart. It is the difference of cinematograph and a slide-show, of earnest purpose and frivolous caprice.

However, we are not concerned here to stress the divergences between Sadi and Hafiz. Our task is to compare, and there can be no comparison in contrast. As we pointed out earlier, there happens to be some common ground between our two poets. And, fortunately, that common ground best suits our purpose, for it is their love poetry. And it is precisely this love poetry in which we can assess them as lyricists. The following comparison will consist of three parts, A, B, and C, dealing respectively with their Language, Subject-Matter, and Poetical Art. Part B which is about subject-matter will again be sub-divided into two sections, one dealing with Common Love, and the other with Mystical Love.

**A. Language** - Sadi talks while Hafiz discourses; these
five words epitomise the main difference in the two poets' language styles. Sadi is always conversational, with all the halts and jolts, the fitful breaks, and the ebb and flow of spontaneous conversation. But is not all natural speech like this? Does it not gain in truth what it loses in finish and design? In our intimate talk is a spade called a spade, or does it get the dignified appellation of an agricultural implement? Of course, every language is in a process of constant evolution, and a hundred years separated Sadi and Hafiz. But the difference in their language is not that of time, but of principle. Sadi is the son of Rashid and Rudaki; Hafiz is the father of Jami and Fugnani. The language of the following two verses is divided not by the gap of a century but by the gulf of opposite traditions:

**Sadi:**

۱. ظاهراً لست بر ایدوی سر،
۲. این هست چی که به چشمه آنت.

**Hafiz:**

۱. هر چا بستم این سیب در سیب،
۲. این چشمه می‌چشم و عاجل‌می‌گیرم.

It is simplicity against elegance, the natural word as it

---

1. *Kuliéyat*, p.709
flits to the lips against the artistic term as it is
dragged to paper. is a taboo among the latter-day
poets. But Sadi uses the word twice in the above
verse. And there is not a single in his entire line.
This contrasts significantly with Hefiz who employs the
no less than six times, making two single and two
double compounds.
is regarded as another ugly blemish which more
It is of two degrees. The milder one is termed
the extreme one is called . In Hefiz you
would search in vain even for the milder variety. But in
Sadi you have the right real thing with the added enormity of

Call the offence heinous, barbarous, or what you will. But
it is there and stays put, uncouth but unabashed, blundering
but unapologetic. The clock has been set back, not by
error, but with wilful purpose. This is not the language of
Sadi's contemporaries or his predecessors up to two hundred

1. Kulliyat, p.638
years. This is not the usual language of Sadi himself - Sadi who composed this renowned qasida:

سَمِّيَ الْعَلَومَ بِعَلَمٍ إِنَّمَا يَشْعُرُ الْعَلَمُ بِعَلَمٍ

Sadi who could write in his 

وَقَالَ قَلْبُ الْمُضْنَكَةِ

verses like this:

سَمَّيَ الْعَلَومَ بِعَلَمٍ إِنَّمَا يَشْعُرُ الْعَلَمُ بِعَلَمٍ

Sadi who adorned his 

عَلَمُ إِنَّمَا يَشْعُرُ الْعَلَمُ بِعَلَمٍ

with the qesi of Hamadan's story. We say, this is not the language of Sadi. This is that primal dialect in which Adam and Eve made love.

To sum up, we may say that between the respective poetical dictions of these two eloquent Shirazians there is the difference of a rustic's reed and a symphony orchestra. The one pierces our hearts, while the other drowns our ears in the rhythmic music of the spheres.

Subject-Matter — As we are concerned with lyricism only, our chief basis of comparison here will be the love poetry of these two poets and the matters dealt with in it. So, perforce, we shall have to exclude the best part of the Khweja's diwan which happens to be the best part of the Khweja as well. As said earlier, we propose to divide this Part into two Sections, one dealing with Common Love, the other with the Mystical Love.

1. Common Love — Even in the theme of common human love
we perceive some significant differences in the approach of the two poets. First and foremost, whereas Hafiz says to his beloved, “You and I”, and sometimes even: “I and you”, Sadi’s submission is: “You before me and before all others”, and not seldom: “You and you alone and none other”. In Hafiz we see two separate beings, with separate, sometimes even conflicting, ends and interests, confronting each other. In Sadi there is neither any confrontation nor any conflict. There is only one being of supreme beauty visible on the entire horizon of the poet’s vision. If beside that beauty there is a phantom, it is not the beauty’s lover but the beauty’s own shadow. It is suggestive in this connection that while Sadi has thirteen of his ghazals with the ۶۲۴۴۴۴۴۴۴۴، Hafiz has only three.

The ending lines (۶۲۴۴۴۴۴۴۴۴) of their ghazals are also worth nothing. In Persian love poetry the poet cannot eulogise himself for he represents the lover and to the lover self-praise is totally forbidden. But a relaxation exists in the case of the ghazal’s maqta where a poet may blow his own trumpet if he likes. Both our poets have availed themselves of this sanction, but each has done so in his own characteristic way. They present us with a difference, not only of quality, but of quantity as well. Sadi has about 724 ghazals.
(Furughl and Iqbal), and only 33 of them have self-praising mehtes. This contrasts with the 405 ghazis of Ḥāfiz (Qavamī) with their 45 self-eulogising endings. Their ration comes up to about 1 : 2.

And the matter does not end here. In 12 out of his 23 self-praising mehtes Ṣādi attributes his poetical inspiration to his love for the beloved. Two instances will suffice:

As opposed to this, out of the 45 self-extolling mehtes of Ḥāfiz it is only in six that we find any mention of love or the beloved at all. And even among these six, one is more an apothecary's prescription than a lover's tribute to his sweet-heart:

1. Kulliyāt, p. 610
2. Ibid., p. 674
3. Diwan-i-Ḥāfiz, p. 205
And in another, Hafiz blatantly breaks the age-old of etiquette of eastern love and boasts of his excellence over his beloved:

\[\text{کسی از نماز دماں دو مسی کو وت}\
\text{دست لپر زنادا ایران.}\

This aggressive egotism may make Hafiz an overbearing poet. But it would hardly qualify him for the modest yet more amiable title of a lyricist. The latter honour rightfully belongs to him who humbles himself before his beloved thus:

\[\text{کہ کسی از نماز دماں دو مسی کو وت}\
\text{دست لپر زنادا ایران.}\

The lover in Sadi lives only to love. He is a self-annihilating self. He is a sanguine person, hoping when no hope remains, knocking where the bolt is bolted and locked. He suffers greatly but with no bitterness in his heart he solicits mercy but with no complaint on his lips. He worships his beloved who represents for him his Holy Trinity of Beauty, Good, and Truth.

And what is this lover's counterpart in Hafiz? We find there a self-assured, self-centred synde, of ripe age and

1. Dilwan-i-Hafiz, p. 432
2. Kulliyat, p. 884.
riper experience, with a glib confession of love on his lips and an amused indulgence for his foolish paramour in his heart, now posing as a lover, anon as a Suffering Moses, and all at once as an aged gently admonishing the young beauty thus:

To elaborate and illustrate the points discussed above, let us select one ghazal each from Sadi and Hafiz and examine it verse by verse. The following piece is from one of the famous ghazals of the "ghazals";

1. Divan-e-Hafiz, p. 148
2. Idem, p. 397
The poet enters the ring with an astounding riddle coup, praising the ruby-wine, proposing a peep at the moon-browed beauties (' — mind, reader, it is not 'beauty' in the singular, but 'beauties' in the plural. We are in the presence of a libertine, not a lover), and giving a departing pinch to abstemious virtue:

Then he turns to the Sufi Longimanus and tears at his entangling snares:

Anon he appears as a disdainful dervish and heaps contempt on the trashy treasures of the two worlds:
Suddenly, as if awakening to his professed role of a love-poet, he lowers the key, simulates a sigh and utters a plaint against his fickle fairy:

\[
\text{Gunun man sibt-e tara'ad dar-e doon}
\]

\[
\text{Dast-e tara'ad dar-e doon, hameen-e bi}
\]

The ghazal contains two other couplets in like strain. And then it all ends up in a curious mess where the word \text{مَرْحَب} has none of its two usual meanings, the Beloved Temporal and the Beloved Divine, but signifies the \text{مَرْحَب} whose purity and piety are the objects of the poet's eulogium:

\[
\text{Kast abort-e hala'ali dar-e doon}
\]

\[
\text{Menayi sibt-e tara'ad dar-e doon, bi}
\]

This multi-coloured tapestry is a ghazal certainly, and one of the very best at that. But is it a lyric also? Well, one wonders.

But there should be no such doubt in the case of the following piece which has been selected almost at random from Sadi and is but one among the many more
hundreds like it in his diwan;

آم کرن کمی رود جوگر
پای، لی دومنان - نوکر

سپریم دا دویان باپی
سا دومنان کلی

آین ان روی شنیدی
کر دیو ای او دومن شور پی

اکرک ان دمی دیمی
این ان گویان دیمی

کر دیو ای ان دیمی

کور دویان لیدی

کور دویان لیدی

لیکن دیویان

lab. Kulliyat, p. 615
Here, from first to last, there is no change of theme, no altering of the key. In plaintive notes and with pitiful pathos a forlorn lover is pouring out his heart. The sequence of ideas is worthy of special note. In the first five verses the lover praises the beauty of his beloved, tenderly, melodiously, earnestly. Indeed, the thing is so earnest that the reader is carried away by the conviction that it is all objectively and literally true. Then in the sixth verse,
But he lets only half a line suffice for that:

And even of this half the better part is no complaint at all, but a revoking of the complaint and an apology for the deserter: If a lover be more accusatory than this he violates the code of love.

And then in the succeeding verses there follow a throbbing avowal of love, a total abnegation of the lover’s self, an entire submission to the beloved. Such utter surrender would have been unbelievable, but in the present context it is not. The wise poet has so praised the beloved that the lover’s infatuation for her appears to be entirely natural; truly, such exquisite beauty seems to be worthy of such intense devotion. This judicious bracketing of supreme beauty with extreme love is rarely absent from Sadi’s ghazals. And this, together with his simple language and easy style, is the secret which has made his love poetry so deeply affecting yet so naturally sincere.

But if this equation of beauty and love is to be emotionally effective the poet should be mindful of the type of the beauty which he describes. There is a beauty to enjoy and a beauty to worship. There is a dahlia in a dandy’s buttonhole and a wild lily on a hermit’s altar-stone. Look carefully at the following two portrayals of beauty:
An enchanting picture, no doubt, but the traces of the beauty-maker's pencil are clearly discernable in it.

This is no stage beauty, this is no Mrs Siddon's of the Covent Garden Opera; this is a "phantom of delight", this is the Wordsworthian Lucy herself. And surely at the altar of such a beauty the life of her lover seems but a humble offering.

2. Mystical Love — So far we have confined our discussion to the worldly beloved and her worldly lover. But the Sufis say, and we may now cross over to the other side. Here the vista changes from the worldly to the divine. There is a Beloved here as well, but it is with the capital B. In this mystical affair of love it is the celestial Beauty of God which attracts men. Sadi and Hafiz both come under its spell, but with a fundamental difference. While Sadi adores that Beauty, Hafiz tries to understand its nature. It is the difference of a lover and a gnostic, an عاشق and an عارف.

1. Divan-i-Hafiz, p. 177
2. Kulliyat, p. 711
And it may safely be asserted at the outset that if we are in quest of lyrics they are more likely to flow from the tongue of a lover than the pen of a Plotinus. It is significant that the mystical poetry of Hafiz is centred around wine and that of Sadi around Beauty. The implication is clear. According to Hafiz, just as the inebriating effect of wine helps the drinker to have extra-sensory perceptions, he who aspires to discover the nature of Divino Beauty should seek the guidance of ecstasy and rapture. Says Hafiz:

1. Mangu-l-Hafiz, p.15
2. Ibid, p.135
Those and hundreds of other verses like those in the Khawja's diwan repeatedly praise the wine and the tavern and the cup and the cup-bearer. Often, as in the above examples, their mystical significance is clear; but sometimes it is not and can only be inferred either from the general undertone of a particular poem or from some suggestive hint found in it. For example, read the following passage from a ghezali:

1. Ibid., p. 319
2. Ibid., p. 319
Upto the third verse the terminology of جَلَالٌ and جَرَارٌ and جَبَانٌ keeps us in doubt if we are in a public-house or a مَلاَكٌ. Then comes the fourth verse which resolves the doubt and assures us that the poet is dealing with the Real Thing:

Sadi's approach to mysticism is entirely different. He is not after discovering the Divine Reality: It has already been discovered to him. He has found it to be the Supreme and the Transcendental Beauty, the only beauty worth loving, the only loveliness worth desiring. He loves it with such genuine passion as if it were there before his eyes, in concrete shape and human form, to be touched and fondled and caressed and kissed. This is so much so that here also (as in Hāfīz) the reader gets confused as to the real meaning of the poet and cannot decide if the beauty thus described is human or divine. Unlike Hāfīz, the Sheykh very seldom gives a clue to his real intent. But, carefully, sometimes he does, as in the following passage:

1. Dīwan-i-Hāfīz, p.319
So far we do not know if the beauty thus praised is human or divine. Then come the following two verses which finally uncover the poet's meaning:

1. Kulliyat, p.635
2. Ibid, p.636
And this "child of Sadi's Divine Beloved" is also often indistinguishable from the brutal heartlessness of the worldly beauties, as in the following:

1. Kulliyat, p. 633
But for the use of ḫafān in the last verse, it would have been difficult to decide if the complaint of cruelty in the above passage was against the or against some fairfaced oppressor of the human species.

Indeed, Sadi's personification of the Deity verges on anthropomorphism. Other mystics also have applied the attributes of beauty to God. But their metaphorical meanings are plain to everyone who happens to remember his lessons in Shabistari's. It is not so with Sadi. His passion for the Divine Adorable has transmuted those metaphors into sensuous realities. And, as a corollary, it is the same passion which has transformed his mystical poetry into the finest lyrical verse of Persia.

Poetical Art - Something should also be said of these two composers' respective skills in the poetical art, for art is indispensable to all poetry, be it mystical, lyrical or otherwise. The art of poetry consists in the ability of the poet to suit his language to his idea, i.e. to express himself clearly, cogently, and effectively. As an extra for the special case of Persian and some other eastern languages, the poet should also have the power to use a given rhyme to best advantage. The poet's art has little to do with the ideas which a poet may wish to express; it is chiefly concerned with the technique of expressing those ideas. (Hence the famous dictum of ibn Khalladun that poetry is word, not concept). The
first eye-catching (or should we say ear-catching?) point of difference in Hafiz and Sadi's modes of expression is the quality of their pitch. The Shaykh is always subdued; the Khwaja never lowers his key. But this does not mean that the latter knows the music better. A lute may be as tuneful as a trumpet, or possibly more.

Sadi loves simplicity, but he is not a simploton poet. His mastery of the poetical art is vindicated when we see Hafiz competing with him in no less than 46 ghazals but succeeding to beat him in none. Hafiz entered the field with the great advantage of having Sadi's performances before his eyes, so he had the opportunity of bettering them if he could. But he did not. We only see an advance here and a set-back there, and the final result of the heat is a draw.

It may be instructive to reflect on the successes and failures of Hafiz in his competitive efforts against Sadi. First let us deal with the efficiency in the use of a rhyme. The following two instances will suffice.

The first example concerns the rhyme ۵۶۳۶۳. It was used by Sadi in one of these ghazals which were later copied by Hafiz. Sadi in his ghazal-writing was a lyricist and nothing but a lyricist. In this fact lay his strength and his weakness. Although he was unapproachable in that particular field, yet if a side-track existed Hafiz with his infinite resourcefulness could steal a march on him. This is exactly
what happened in this case. The rhyme نباست is of common occurrence in Persian, and, so, perhaps, Sadi lightly passes over it, thus:

دی نعمت برصحن بطلان برخاهن
فان نباست و برخاست نماید روا

Light or heavy, the verse is still a lyrical stroke before which even the Thunderer of India stands muffled;

Ghalib committed the folly of meeting the Shaykh on the latter's own ground. The sorry outcome was predictable, but not so Hāfiz, who was a shrewder artist than Ghalib. He assessed the various capabilities of this word, and then, changing the subject from pure love to the Prophet's Ascension, with one surge of his mighty genius swept away all the Mi'raj-names of Nasadi and Khwaja and their teeming trains.

1. Kulliyat, p. 348
2. Diwan-e-Ghalib, p. 39
3. Diwan-e-Hafiz, p. 32
Sadi stands bowled out. This may be poetical cricket. But, O honest reader, by the Heavenly God and the Earthly Names, this is not lyricism.

The next is our Shaykh's innings. It is the rhyme which a more unpooctical word may not be found in the whole repertory of Persian vocabulary. Unlike the Shaykh must have taken it as a challenge, and the finest lyricist of Persia rose to meet that challenge:

\[ \text{In the brimming treasure-chest of the Persia Muse it would be hard to come by even of brighter brilliance.} \]

And now we sadly see all the infinite sources of Hafiz drying up and the hapless Khamsa turning to a tiny trickle for inspiration.

\[ \text{And now we sadly see all the infinite sources of Hafiz drying up and the hapless Khamsa turning to a tiny trickle for inspiration.} \]

1. Dinsh-i-jafiz, p. 77
2. Ibid, p. 77
To appreciate the appeal of this verse it is necessary for one to be a Shirāzī. Since we cannot claim that honour, we may give a consolatory note to this pious effort and politely pass on.

(Incidentally, the only imagery which the term ʿāṯār could excite in the mind of an Indian poet-laureate was that of a slaughter-house, writes...)

The next thing to consider in the comparison of the poetical technique of Sadi and Hefiz is their power of expression. This faculty is of much more consequence to a poet than his ability to employ nicely a particular rhyme, for without it he cannot make himself fully understood by others. There are some instances in these two poets where they both have said the same thing but have expressed it in different ways. A Brief discussion of one such example will suffice to show which of the two was a better hand at this game.

Sādi:

2.

1. *Kulliyāt* (1898), p.332
2. *Kulliyāt*, p.697
Both verses appear to be in the best tradition of the Persian love poetry. In both, the sweethearts have scorpions' stings grafted to their tongues and the lovers have a pain-killing serum coursing through their veins. So in both verses the bitter retorts ("هفته جاور" ) of the sweethearts seem sugar and honey to their lovers. But this is only the appearance and we should beware lest it prevented us from discovering the hidden reality, when closely examined, the similarity between these two differs find their way and their words.

And beyond those words there is all dissimilarity and divergence. Hafiz by "پرتاب" proclaims, and by "استرس" stresses, the fact that his sugar-tongued sweetheart has nevertheless feasted him with not a few very sugary words. The sense of injury is there, the occasion and the expression of complaint are there, though they be doubly sugared with the two accompanying expressions, "پرتاب" and "استرس".

In these circumstances, one wonders if the poet is aiming at the praise of his lady-love's sweet speech or is implying an encomium on his own forgiving temper.

---

1. Divan-i-Hafiz, p.18
The verbal construction of the verse is also not wholly satisfactory. In this word is an obvious redundancy. Then the double apposition of slots and smokes of affectation.

And what does our Shaykh, the true lover, the sweet lyricist, have to offer us instead? First, in the first hemistich there is a melodious internal rhyme, and . Then there is a total, utter, absolute denial of the very existence of a . Mark the overwhelming force of that denial: . The phrase exudes the poet's conviction and compels the reader's belief. And where there is no injury received there is no injury to forgive. As opposed to the Khwaja's sugar-coated pill, with the Shaykh it is all sugar and no bitter medicine within.

It is time to take leave of these twin laureates of the Persian gha'ezal. Comparisons are always invidious, and the present one seemed almost sacrilegious to the writer. The pagan worshipper has solved himself of this embarrassment by assigning different spheres of creation to his different gods and adoring each with equal devotion. But, alas, the present Age of Reason barred us that escape and compelled us to analyse and classify and discriminate, what was worse, under our terms of reference we had to weight the scales against one of the two competing rivals, for we had to compare Sadi and Hafiz as lyricists, and not as gha'ezal-writers. Thus, while we had almost all the seven hundred and odd gha'ezals of the Shaykh for our review, we had to exclude the greater portion.
of the Khwaja's diwan, that greater portion being, unfortunately, his best and sublimest. However, had we widened the scope and compared them simply as ghazal-writers, we would have found that each was supreme in his own sphere. What those spheres or ghazal styles are we can best understand from the loving titles which their admiring countrymen have bestowed on them; Sadi the , and Hafiz the . In the present writer's humble opinion, has nothing to do with omen and augury. The rather, it signifies the Interpreter of the Occult, the Expounder of the Hidden Mysteries of the Universe. Perhaps it is the picture of himself, bearing aloft his Gospel of Verse, which one sees reflected in his own famous lines:

Verily, the Enigma of Existence and the Vision of Reality had been revealed to this Serene and Sailing Seer, who, vividly brings to mind the image of the in ibn Sinâ's delightful aphorism:

As for our Shaykh's title, , it seems to epitomise in two words what the present writer has striven to establish

1. Diwan-i Hafiz, p 105
in three chapters. If a lyric be a song of love sweetly sung, who is a better lyricist than a nightingale? And, truly it is with the nightingale that the Shaykh resembles. The poet himself seems to be conscious of this resemblance for he points to it in a pensive melody whose sweetness itself is the best proof of his claim:

I. Kulliyāt, p. 331