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Abstract

This article examines some strategies in the formation of the authorial personal voice in medieval Persian prose until the second half of the 7th/13th century. It studies four metaphors found in the prefaces to a range of prose compositions. The metaphors include a widely spread ‘a book as a bride’ simile; book as merchandise, book as a garden, as well as likening a book to a newborn. The subtle images of embellishing, cherishing, and procreation suggest the process of ‘bringing forth one’s own’ and thus legitimize the authors’ ownership of their works.

Introduction

The poetics of authorship—that is, the emergence of the authorial self and the evolution of means for conceptualizing the author—have long become pivotal issues in the study of medieval European, both Latin and vernacular, literatures.1 In the domain of Islamic literature, notably medieval Persian prose, however, no scholarly attempts at reconstructing the main historical stages in the formation of the personal authorial voice have yet been made. An essential and most promising direction in this sort of inquiry would appear to be the exploration of strategies for authorial self-presentation in texts. These comprise diverse ways of personal identification through self-naming, genealogy, geographical, communal, religious and other affiliations, as well as such seemingly autobiographical elements as personal accounts of the circumstances surrounding the composition of a book. To these one might add linguistic means of self-reference such as forms of personal pronouns and euphemistic lexical substitutes (e.g. bandah [‘slave’]=‘I’); it would also be rewarding to explore the syntactic–semantic category of passive versus active voice, for this is a significant marker signalling the writer’s choice of a certain stylistic mode (the neutral mode, the modesty and self-belittlement mode, and the like).

Germane to elucidating the idea of medieval authorship is also inquiry into a range of topoi and metaphors used by authors to describe both the process of creation and the product itself. To consider the metaphors of authorship I shall draw on evidence that came to light as a result of examining a wide range of prefaced primary sources from the
4th/10th centuries to the 7th/13th centuries. Indeed, it is prefatory writing where the authorial voice finds most conspicuous expression. The preface and, for this purpose, also the ‘postface’, the epilogue ( dibāchah and khātimah , respectively, as far as medieval Persian prose is concerned) belong to the domain of what Gérard Genette has termed paratexts; that is, those practices and conventions that accompany the text and mediate it to the reader.² Allowing myself a slight incursion into the terminology of the exact sciences, I shall describe the preface as an interface between audience and text. In this capacity the preface serves an instrument of authorial control; it provides the author’s statement of intent and suggests to the reader a certain interpretative approach. The study of prefatory writing therefore offers a vantage point for delving into a range of important issues of literary history and criticism, first and foremost author–reader relations, text reception and, most notably, the concept of authorship.

In the present paper I shall examine four concrete metaphors that appear to me instrumental in providing a clue to the self-positioning of a medieval author with respect to his work.

**Book as a Bride (‘Arūs), Author as a Bride-dresser (Mashṣātah)**

In all probability originating in Arabic poetics,³ the most widely used metaphor by far is that of ‘bride’ and ‘bride-dresser’. It is based on the anthropomorphic likening of a book to an unadorned ‘bride’ (‘arūs), who is being adorned and embellished by the author acting in this case as a mashṣātah (a ‘bride-dresser’). In a most curious and informative preface to the Raʿūdat al-ʿuqūl (compiled 598/1201–2) that represents an early 7th/13th-century reworking of the 4th/10th-century Marzbān-nāmah, the author, Muḥammad-i Ghāzi-yi Malatavī, ponders the aim of his work in the following manner:

\[
\text{I said to myself: ‘It is expedient to beautify this beauty and to perfect this perfection, for the delicacy of such a bride is in need of a befitting gem-encrusted girdle and the loveliness of this confined houri to perfection? (̣guftam in jamāl-rā tajmīl-i bāyad dād va ̣n kamāl-rā tākīmīl-i arzānī dāsht az ən kih malaḥat-i chunin ‘arūs-rā vishāh-i bāyad lāyiq va ḥusn-i in shāhind-jān-rā shanf-i bāyad muvāfīq.)}^4
\]

Muḥammad-i Ghāzi continues his musings as to the best way to deal with this not so young bride of 300 years. Like an experienced mashṣātah, he asks himself:

\[
\text{. . . which appearance would purify this bride from the freckles (or: blemishes) of old-maidenhood and what attire would bring the delicacy of this confined houri to perfection? (tā kudām zīyy in ‘arūs-rā az kalaf-i ‘unūs pāk gardānād va kudām ʿilīyat in ḫūr-i mahšūr-rā malaḥat bi-kamāl rasānād.)}^5
\]

The same topos of the ‘confined and unclaimed bride’ is employed by Saʿd al-Dīn Varāvīnī in the preface to his adaptation of the Marzbān-nāmah, compiled sometime between 607–622/1210–1225.⁶ Pronouncing a harsh judgment on the old version of the ‘Book of Marzbān’, written in the Ṭabarānī language, Saʿd al-Dīn Varāvīnī says:

\[
\text{You would think that this is a beautiful bride who remained behind the curtain of obscurity (in ‘arūs-i zībā kih az darūm-i pardah-i khumīl bimānd). Unlike}
\]
other damsels of compositions it did not traverse land and sea and did not win a
due reputation, for the reason that because it did not have an arrayed (\textit{arāstah})
appearance, claims of desire did not rise from within the readers to accept this
contestant . . .7

In the eyes of these and many other medieval authors who use the ‘bride’ metaphor,8
it is an act of \textit{mashshātah}—‘ornamentation’ or ‘decoration’—alone that can grant
their compositions general acceptance among the public and, to use the wording of Abū
Ma‘ālī Naṣrallah Munshi, the author of the \textit{Kalilah va Dimnah}, make them ‘win all the
climes and realms of the Earth in no time’ (\textit{dar muddat-i andak tamāmi-yi aqālim-i zamīn-
u bilād bigirad}).9 It is noteworthy that in most cases we have here works that represent
translation-cum-reworking of much older originals. The aspirations of the authors to
‘array’ the ‘body of a bride’ (i.e. the old content) with a proper ‘garb’ (i.e. an appropriate
form) reveal the authors’ conscientious attitude towards the dominant literary norm of
their time, which of all the textual functions emphasized the ornamental lingua-stylistic
one.10 The preoccupation with form, so characteristic of the second half of the 6th/12th
century onwards and which is sometimes perceived by scholars as derogatory towards
the content, may be better interpreted as the first buds indicating the development of a
conscious authorial self in terms of productive and creative force. For the awareness of
authorship evolves through the awareness of form.11

This connection is finely expressed in the intensification of meaning which the ‘ārūs–
mashshātah metaphor undergoes in some authors. In as much as an obligatory
component of the metaphor comprises the unveiling of the bride, ‘drawing her out of
the curtain of obscurity’ and putting her on display for appraisal, the act of \textit{mashshātah} in
fact causes a shift in the bride’s state, depriving her of virginity. Thus, Sa’d al-Dīn
Varā‘īnī employs the most explicit erotic language when speaking of his hesitation to
start the work. The ‘inner claimants’ that directed him towards the composing of the
book urge him as follows:

\begin{quote}
Unless you do not aspire (i.e., to rework the ‘Book of Mardbān’), [your] virility
is impotent; in the name of God, make yourself busy with depriving this virgin
of virginity and do not let any excuse [penetrate] your mind. (\textit{agar in ārzū tu-rā
nah, shahvat ‘innāst. Bism illāh bi-iftīḍād-i in ‘udhrat mashghul bāsh va hīch
‘udhr pish-i khāṭīr nānīh}.)12
\end{quote}

In another passage the same author describes the process of his work as \textit{iftirā ‘i in bikr-i
āmadah-i ghayb}, ‘depriving this otherworldly virgin of virginity’,13 thus metamorphos-
ing from a \textit{mashshātah} into a bridegroom of sorts. The eroticism of the metaphor
brings to the fore the author’s proprietary claims for his own work in the most forceful
and vivid manner. At the same time, the ownership is almost inevitably a partial one,
for it should be shared or even transferred to his patron, dedicatee of the book. Zahirī-
yi Samarqandi, after having performed his function of a \textit{mashshātah}, dispatches his
ornamented virgin-bride (\textit{bikr-i dishzhah}) (i.e. the \textit{Sīndbād-nāmah}) to the harem of his
patron: ‘I sent [the book] to the highest residence and to the generous harem of the
Master of the World’ (\textit{bi-shābistān-i ‘āli va ḥāram-i karam-i khudhāvand-i ‘alam
frīstādham}).14

The ambiguity in the rights of ownership, embodied in particular in the ‘author–
patron’ axis, is expressed in the metaphor—the second one I would like to consider
here—of a book as ‘merchandise’ (matā’) offered for purchase to a benevolent purchaser (kharīdār) by the author who acts as a ‘merchant’ or ‘trader’.

Book as ‘Merchandise’ (Matā’), Author as ‘Merchant’

The metaphor, seemingly plain and straightforward, possesses a double-edged meaning. On the one hand, the author is striving to command a market for his work, and in effect transfers his proprietorship to a purchaser. Thus, for example, Shams al-Dīn Daqwāyiq-i Marvāzī (end of the 6th/12th century–beginning of the 7th/13th century) cannot refrain from expressing his joy at procuring a buyer (in other words, a patron) for his Rāḥat al-arvāh. Using a characteristic topos of self-belittlement, he exclaims:

Praise be to God that on the latitudes of the fifth clime there appeared a buyer for our (i.e., my) slack (stagnant) merchandise and (there happened) a market-day for our sluggish commodity. (al-hamd li-llāh kih dar ‘ardah-i aqlım-i panjum in mata’-i kāsid-i mā-rā kharīdār-ī āmadah va in biḏā’at-i mu’attal-i mā-rā rūz-i bāzāri.)¹⁵

On the other hand, however, the metaphor enables an author to position himself as an original creator who not only disposes of his ‘merchandise’ at will, but also produces his work exclusively from his own—authorial—materials. For instance, in his Maqāmāt (compiled in 551/1156–57), Hamīd al-Dīn-i Balkhī, while remaining in the same semantic field of commercial terminology, is forthright enough in his negative attitude towards poetic borrowing in a prose text:

Compose with your own materials; like ungifted ones, / do not borrow the capital from others. (bā mayah-i khud bi-sāz chun bihunarān / sar-mayah bi-‘ariyyat makhāh az digarān.)¹⁶

In the same vein, Sa’d al-Dīn Varāvīnī takes an independent authorial stance and vigorously defends his artistry:

The knower of the seen and the unseen (i.e., God) is aware that I did not load any merchandise from the treasury of the thought of any word-master (az nihān-khānah-i fikrat-i hich ṣāhib-sukhan mata’-i dar bār-i khud nabastam); I considered nakedness worthier for myself than borrowed clothes. Each and every pearl which I set onto the pocket of my thought and into the collar of my expression, I took from the casket (chest; dwār) of my own thinking and each and every coral which I scattered from the sleeve of my mind and soul, I drew out from the store-house (khazānah) of my own memory . . . In front of me there were no verse-collections and notebooks / Nor did Jesus have aromatic roots and mortar (nah pish-i man davāvin bid-u daftar / nah ‘īsā-rā ‘aqāqīr-ast-u hāvan).¹⁷

A similar twofold signification is found in another—third—metaphor employed by medieval prose authors in prefaces to their works. It is founded on the comparing of a book with a garden (bāgh, gulshan), the author thus functioning as a gardener (bāghbān).
**Book as a Garden (Bāgh, Gulshan), Author as a Gardener (Bāghbān)**

While connected to the idea of cultivating the garden for the sake of a patron—‘I . . . decorated the outskirts of this garden (gulshan); from it I brought a flower to the Master . . . and sent a fruit to his park’, as Daqāyiqi-yi Marvazi puts it—¹⁸—the metaphor is also employed to accentuate the freshness of the author’s talent and his freedom from the influence of others: ‘It was only rarely that I smelled (i.e., made use of) the flowers which have been previously sniffed and touched upon (gul-hā-yi buyīdah va dast-mālīdah-i digarān);’,¹⁹ asserts the author of the Marzbān-nāmah in referring to verses that he wove into his composition.

Significantly, the bāgh–bāghbān metaphor implies the idea of growth and cherishing; of cultivating a garden that would surpass those of others in every aspect. Thus in his ḵāṭimah, Saʿd al-Dīn Varāvīnī, while recognizing the stylistic merits of earlier works in Persian, above all the legendary Kalīlah va Dimnah, advocates the excellence and superiority of his own ‘garden’.

. . . [All these books] resemble a garden (ḥādiqah) which, although sweet for the palates and acceptable for the spirits, contain but one kind of fruit (yak mīvah); they resemble an orchard (bustān) which, although it exhales fragrance for the senses and keeps noses perfumed, the morning breeze brings from it but one kind of aromatic scent (yak riḥān). However, the creation of this slave (sākhtah-i in bandah) comprises several varieties of styles of verbal ornamentation in such a way that it resembles the Garden of Paradise, full of colourful flowers of meaning, various scents of words, assorted fruits of aphorisms and different crops of allusions . . .’ (va in bi-jannat-i mānād pur az alvān-i azāhir-i maʿnī va ashkāl-i rayāhīn-i alfāz va ajnās-i fawākīh-i nukat va avāʿ-ī thimār-i ishārat . . .)²⁰

Together with the element of comparison, essential for the self-image of the author, what is peculiar and almost emblematic in the above extensive metaphor is the choice of wording: sākhtah (‘created’) and jannat (the ‘Garden of Paradise’), which evokes God’s creation. The allusion is enhanced by the depiction of a perfect harmony of senses—olfactory, gustatory and visual—thus giving an impression of the creative potency of the author himself.

Finally, the metaphor of a garden, which, as I have said, implies the idea of cherishing, of nursing a sapling (nahāl) into a full-grown tree, leads to our fourth metaphor—the metaphor of parenthood or fatherhood.

**Book as a Child (Farzand, Maulud, Tīft), Author as a Parent/Tutor (Pidar/Muʿallim)**

As a gardener nurtures a sapling, so the author in his parental capacity gives birth to a child, strengthening his bond with the new-born by giving him a name (i.e. title). In the case of a re-worked book, the naming or, more precisely the re-naming, carries a special significance, establishing the ultimate degree of authorship. Thus, Daqāyiqi-yi Marvazi declares:

. . . It is not praiseworthy [to leave] a new-born (maulud) without a name and wine without a bowl. Although originally the name of this book was
Bakhtiyar-nāmah, when the wood gets hollowed, it is named a casket (ḥuqqah) and when gold is made round it is named a ring (ḥalqah). As soon as the material takes a new form, it accepts a new name (mādāh chun širat-i nau girad nam-i nau padhirad). [That is why] I named this collection Rāhat al-arvāh fi surūr al-mifrah.21

The metaphor of parenthood may evolve into a more sophisticated metaphor of discipleship, when the author in the capacity of tutor gives a nick-name (laqab) to his gifted disciple. As Muḥammad-i Ghāzī al-Malatāvī asserts it:

There is an ancient custom and an established rule, to wit: when a child (farzand) comes into being, his father bestows a name on him. When he grows up, [the father] hands him over to a teacher (mu'allim) to refine his virtues (shama'il) and train his excellencies (faḍā'il). The teacher, having discerned the perfect intellect and the comprehensive cleverness [of the child], would not contend with the name that [the child's] father had given him. He would bestow a nick-name (laqab) on him, in order that under this nick-name he would become renowned in all parts of the world and amidst the elected. When I came across the Marzbān-nāmah, with all its delicate meanings and noble foundations, but bare of the ornamentation of expression and destitute of the decoration of attractiveness, I bedecked it in such a way that as long as the world exists it will remain safe from wearing out and it will be protected from shabbiness (chundān-kīh 'unm-r i 'alam-ast az badhāhat 'iman bashad va az rathāhat musallam). For this reason I nick-named it Raudāt al-'uqūl.22

Unlike poetry, where the concept of authorship evolved at quite an early stage, in medieval Persian prose the self-conscious attitude of the author to his work as his own creation matured very gradually, ensuing from the author’s attention to formal elements, for it is there that he could display his artistry in the strict framework of the given contents.23 In this regard one should point to the possible impact of poetry on the patterns of authorizing prose works by means of metaphors. Indeed, it is in poetic compositions that the ‘garden metaphor’ was first used to convey the idea of cultivating the poet’s own talent, a qasīdah by Nāṣir-i Khusrau (d. c.481/1088–9) being just one example:

... In the garden and meadow (bāgh-u rāgh) of the book of my writings, I will plant hyacinth and sweet herbs of prose and poetry (az nazm-u nathr sumbul-u rayhān kunam); I shall make fruits and flowers of themes (mīvah-vu gul az ma'amī sazam hamah), / And trees of choice expressions (khūb dirakhtān); As the clouds make the surface of the desert a garden (bustān), / I shall also make the surface of my notebook a garden (bustān); In a gathering of the wise I will scatter clever thoughts like flowers; If the dust of error should fall on those flowers, / There I will wash them bright with commentary.24

Together with the ‘garden metaphor’, the metaphors of craft—kindred to the metaphors of merchandise in our examples—are widely used in poetic compositions to convey the essence of poetic art. As Jerome W. Clinton has aptly shown, poets not infrequently make use of the metaphors referring to the field of handicrafts, such as
weaving, jewellery manufacture, painting and the like, in order to describe how they have constructed their poems. Thus, in his famous ode, starting with a matla: bā kārvān-i hūllah bi-raftam zi-Sistān / bā hūllah-i tanādah zi-dil bāftah zi-jān, Farrukhī (d. 429/1037–38) employs the expanded metaphor of embroidering a robe (hūllah) (i.e. his poem), into which he, as ‘designer’ (naqqāsh), ‘put both his hand and heart’. A similar range of craft-metaphors is found in Shams-i Qays-i Rāzī’s manual for poetry al-Mu’jam fi ma‘āyir ash‘ar al-‘Ajam (composed 630/1232–33), where he likens a poet to a skilful painter, a master jeweller, an artisan who is dexterous in his profession. Echoes of this metaphoric field are current in the texts I have examined above. Thus, Muḥammad-i Ghāzī-yi Malāṭyavī, in addition to taking upon himself the function of mashshātah, also implies the work of a jeweller in his desire to create a gem-encrusted girdle and earrings for his ‘beloved’; similarly, Sa‘d al-Dīn Varāvīn employs the imagery of jewellery manufacture, such as the pearls, coral and casket, in which the precious stones are to be stored in order to be polished and turned into valuable ornaments. In the same vein, Daqāyiq-yi Marvāzī evokes the image of a carver manufacturing a wine-bowl and a casket (huqqah) and, again, of a gold-smith making a ring (halqah). However, it seems that, as opposed to poetry, these craft images in prose writings never turned into expanded metaphors and were not used by authors to convey the idea of ownership of their works. Even so, the interaction of these metaphoric fields in poetry and prose deserves separate examination, a task that exceeds the scope of the present paper.

To conclude, the imagery discussed above brings to the fore a new approach to the idea of literature. It came to be realized, that, to quote Michel Foucault, ‘discourse that possesses an author’s name is not to be immediately consumed and forgotten; neither is it accorded the momentary attention given to ordinary, fleeting words’. The idea of authorship thus correlates with the concept of yādgār (‘remembrance’), the perpetuation of the author’s memory by his work: ‘it’s worthwhile that discourse would remain a memory from us / we shall pass away, but it will remain firm’ (sukhan bih ki mānād zi-mā yādgār/kīh mā bar-gudhārīm-u ú pāydār), as Zāhir-yi Samarqandi puts it.

At the same time, the figurative field of the metaphors reflects the fractured literary reality of medieval Persian prose. The necessarily inferior position of the author towards the Creator on the one hand, and the intricate relations between the author and his patron who is supposed to be the ultimate owner of the final product on the other, put medieval writers in a delicate situation, and might have placed a constraint on the development of authorial self-consciousness. To mitigate the contradiction, doxology and dedication became obligatory and integral parts of the preface. Moreover, the idea of ‘remembrance’ came frequently to be bestowed by the author on a dedicatee, to immortalize the latter’s name in the enduring monument of the word. Consideration of the metaphors conveying the authorial stance is a first step towards comprehending the poetics of authorship in the Persian prose of the Middle Ages. It should be buttressed with cross-genre study of the exposition of the aesthetic principles guiding the authors, their self-definition vis-à-vis the literary tradition, and other means of authorial self-referentiality by which medieval prose writers empowered themselves and their works.
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