

Hafiz and the Persians

Bahman Solati (Ph.D), September 2015

University of California, Berkeley

bahmansolati@berkeley.edu

ABSTRACT

Judging from the views of nonspeakers, Persian is among the world's most beautiful languages, with an almost irresistible ability to express poetic thought, especially of love. This, I believe, is where the Persians' brilliance lies, in the beauty and richness of their language and culture. Ḥāfīz was without a doubt one of the world's supreme erotic poets. His verses inspire intense "romanticism" (as comprehended by Persians) in both divine and human love. He often calls his admirers to participate in the art of loving and caring for others. This study examines the effect of the classical Persian poet Ḥāfīz Shīrāzī (d. 791/1389)—in his poetic language, thought, philosophy, and teachings—on Iran and Iranians today. By exploring Ḥāfīz's verses and applying them to different modes and times up to the modern era, I hope to demonstrate the extent of Ḥāfīz's influence on the people of Iran and the nation's attitude toward the poet.

Ḥāfīz's importance in Iranian society cannot be underestimated. Before the formation of the modern system of colleges and universities, Ḥāfīz's *Divān* was already a subject of literary research (*Ḥāfīz-shināsī*), along with Sa'dī's *Gulistān* and the Qur'ān (Solati 2013, introduction). Ḥāfīz is viewed not only as a poet but also as the incarnation of Iran's national spirit (Solati 2013, 21–22). His work is considered to be unrivaled; over the past seven centuries in Persia, no writer has matched his poetic skill, although many have tried.

The Spirit of the Persians

The history of Iran has certainly had its share of turbulence. Nonetheless, each time Iran has crumbled, it has reunited and prospered in the process. Geographic as well as economic factors have played roles in these cycles (Rypka 1968, 76–77).

Even under foreign dynasties Iranian unity was not shattered, because the state continued to be run by Iranians whose commitment to political equality and a spirit of national community was unwavering. Although the diversity of peoples and tribes that inhabited Iran certainly could have pushed it in a different direction, Iranian culture ironed out all these differences with a grace that impressed even non-Iranians. From ancient times up to the present day, history has proved Iranians to be a spiritually gifted people more moved by emotion than by reason and logic. This is borne out by the appearance of so many remarkable poets and scholars throughout the country's history. The emergence of so many fanatics, reformers, and heretics can be attributed

to centuries of anguish, disillusionment, and a characteristic disinterest in material things. In this regard Ḥāfiz's teaching has had a dominant influence on the Iranian psyche:

*If you fall in love with worldly property, you will have nothing to show,
Under this firmament, even the throne of Solomon dissolves in the wind.
Ḥāfiz, if you view the advice of the wise as reproach,
Let us cut the story short and "wish you a long life!"*

(Hafiz 1320/1941, g. 96, v. 4, 5)

*Neither the life of Khizr nor the state of Alexander last—
Do not, Dervish, resist this repulsive world.*

(Hafiz 1320/1941, g. 285, v. 5)

*The dangling locks of the darling of the world are twists and tricks;
The spiritual and the mystics do not dispute over her hair strand.*

(Hafiz 1320/1941, g. 288, v. 6)

*Do not tie your heart to the world and seek in drunkenness
The cup's reward and the tale of prosperous Jamshid.*

(Hafiz 1320/1941, v. 3)

We must not judge Iran's spirit by the occasional turmoil of recent history (Rypka 1968, 77).

The Consistency of Literature and Culture throughout Persian History

The literary history of Persia and of the Persian language begins roughly with the arrival of Islam in Iran. But Persian literature has not been limited to the Persian language. In fact, in the first centuries of Islam, Iranians played a significant role in the progress of literature in Arabic, to which they continued to make substantial contributions. Our review should therefore account for Persian literature written in both languages, although the brevity of this survey article allows us to consider Iranian literature in Arabic only briefly. We should not lose sight, either, of the fact that historic Iran—geographically broadly as it was—contained many Iranian tribes, dialects, and even languages. To the literary historian these expressions are less important as, with few exceptions, they proved unable to sustain written literatures and gave way to the dominance of Persian. Yet there were also tribes living in Iran of culturally non-Persian origin who, despite possessing a non-Persian native language, were imaginatively involved in Persian literature. Prominent among these were the Azerbaijani Turks. The importance of this becomes clearer when we bear in mind that the borders of the Muslim realm of Iran changed very significantly over time, with Central Asia and Khārazm waxing and waning in their influence. Under the

Şafavids' rule, first Iraq, then Afghanistan, and finally the Caucasian provinces were lost. The ethnically Iranian border regions came under the growing Turkish influence. All these provinces, to whatever nationality they belonged—and sometimes they were no longer subject to the state sovereignty of Iran at all—contributed to the wealth of Persian literature.

However, the scope of action of Iranian culture, and particularly the community sentiment of the dervish orders, extended far beyond the frontiers of the kingdom, into Ottoman Turkey and northwest India. These vast regions, thoroughly connected to Persian literature, took a vigorous part in its formation. This was especially true in India, to an extent that we can truly speak of an Indo-Persian literature (cf. Stanford 1986, 297–313).

As a result, Persian literature, like the Arabic, Ottoman Turkish, Latin, and Greek literatures, is a complex whole resulting from the common endeavor of nations that, in this case, extend from the Mediterranean to beyond the borders of India. This anthropo-geographical arrangement has given Persian literature great diversity and extensive distribution. When we add the Iranian contribution to writing in Arabic, the ensuing Persian literature reveals itself to be part of the communal accomplishment of the races and peoples that came into contact through Islam, a multinational culture that has in the past so remarkably enhanced human civilization (Rypka 1968, 111–12). If there has been any stability in the history of Persia, this has rested on the consistent nature of the Persian culture and the solid continuity of its remarkable literature. Iran has been home to many master philosophers, poets, mystics, and scholars, none more important to the people of Iran than Ḥāfīz. Although he lived almost seven centuries ago, the echo of Ḥāfīz's voice, his words of wisdom and his teachings to mankind are very much alive in the Iranian psyche and spirit. According to Leonard Lewisohn (2012), “Ḥāfīz's verse preserves its immortality through contemporaneity. Ḥāfīz has street-touch.” Comparing Ḥāfīz to Shakespeare, Peter Avery (2007) reminds us how much easier it is for even illiterate Iranians to grasp the challenging theological, spiritual, and social references in Ḥāfīz's poems, to recite his stanzas by heart with sophistication and profundity of emotion, than it is for the modern educated English speaker to recognize even the most rudimentary of Shakespeare's literary allusions (Lewisohn 2012, introduction). Despite the magnitude of Ḥāfīz's contribution, the historical details of his life are exceptionally vague, and the brief references found in *tadhkiras* (anthologies with biographical sketches) are often unreliable and sometimes even fabricated. This dearth of reliable information has led some scholars and researchers to use Ḥāfīz's own poetry as a reference for factual details about his life and historical milieu, sometimes to an unreasonable degree. The earliest surviving document about Ḥāfīz is an introduction to Ḥāfīz's *Divān* (or collected works) written by one of his contemporaries, who has been widely believed to be named Muḥammad Gulandām (Hafiz 1320/1941). However, many scholars are still uncertain about the true identity of this author as well as the accuracy of the text (Khurramshahi, 2002).

Hāfiz is considered by his admirers and many scholars of Hāfizology to be the poet of love; in fact, he was inspired by the poetic tradition known as the religion of love (*madhhab-i 'ishq*) (Lewisohn 2012).

*Once Love taught me the art
Of fine speech, all my words became
The key to debates in every congress.*

(Hafiz 1320/1941, g. 211, v. 7)

*I have never seen a more magnificent reminder
Than the words of love that remain in this revolving dome.*

(Hafiz 1320/1941, g. 211, v. 7)

Hāfiz's Influence on Persians as a Spiritual People

Every Persian has a private connection to Hāfiz. It matters not whether he or she is erudite, illiterate, spiritual, or a *rind* (inspired libertine), as Hāfiz called himself. All Persians find in him a piece of themselves, discern in him an uncharted place, a sweet-scented memory from the inner garden of which he is the sole protector. Because of this emotional intimacy with him, the poet's tomb is a place of pilgrimage for all Persians. People from all corners of the society—writers, poets, scholars, prime ministers, lowly bureaucrats, and beggars—go there for solace and to receive the poet's message in the peaceful silence of their heart (Shayegan 1995, 16).

*When you pass by our tomb, wish for benediction,
For to the rinds of the world it will be a place of pilgrimage.*

(Hafiz 1320/1941, g. 201, v. 3)

How can we explain the popularity of Iran's most perplexing poet? How does his symbolic language link with a fame that makes Hāfiz a bosom friend in every household? His power to speak to Persians results not so much from the simplicity of his diction as from the enigmatic messages that his verse awakens in all listeners and readers, all of whom seem to find in it an answer to their questions, a reference to their desires, an understanding of their secrets. For example, love in Hāfiz takes different forms depending on which level it is imagined on. For some, this love is fervent and worldly; for others, it is a deep longing for their original dust. For all those who open themselves to what lies behind the veil of enigmatic language, it will be the heavenly Cherished Friend (Browne 2002; Shayegan 1995, 16). This is how the poet connects with his admirers, by providing them with what they desire, "because for Hāfiz love, spiritual and profane, is the very essence of existence" (Loloi and Oxley 2013, xvi). In an introduction to

Persian literature (*Bahār va adab-i Fārsī*), Bahār (1373/1994) asserts that poetry is only recognized as good when the imagination of the poet instigates its composition (v. 2, p. 4). In Bahār's opinion, it is impossible for someone of bad character to compose verses that please people of all classes. This kind of poetry must come from a righteousness of spirit (Gulbun 1351/1972, 4: 3–6). Bahār further asserts that the finest poets develop their art, their ability to compose the most eloquent ghazals, out of their devotion to Ḥāfīz, following his style in great detail (Bahār 1373/1994; Solati 2013).

Thus, appreciative listeners and readers vary according to their understanding, or insensibility, but no one goes away empty-handed. “With the reading of Ḥāfīz, as with the Qur'ān, the less one comprehends intellectually, the more one receives spiritually” (Shayegan 1995, 16–17). By the connotation of concealed tonalities infinitely echoing on the senses, changing correspondences into expressive states increasingly intensified, this poetry penetrates the heart, creating a juxtaposition of states of the soul, by which the individual soul and the symbolic sense of the poem synchronize and harmonize in the mystical formation of a specific state.

*The Lord of pre-eternity offered us the Treasure of love's sorrow
So that we may descend into this ravaged dwelling*
(Hafiz 1320/1941, g. 364, v. 3).

As Dick Davis (2012) asserts, Ḥāfīz, more than any other Persian poet, constantly suggests shifting possibilities of meaning. This is certainly one explanation for his enormous reputation: the ability of his poems to be read—perfectly legitimately—in a number of ways, making him the poet nearest and dearest to Persian-speaking readers (xxix). The other most important factor in Ḥāfīz's popularity with Iranians and non-Iranians is the irony in his poems. To a person of cheerful nature, the uncertainty of life under the oriental autocracy—a state of mind promoted by Islam, especially the unhappy Shi'a—was appalling (Rypka 1968, 84). People stepped onto the political stage and then vanished as if they had never existed. No lasting progress followed. There was only random escape from dismay and violence. Fury, misery, and a feeling of complete insignificance prompted cynicism. Mysticism followed the same track. Rarely, in the literature of this time, do we hear humor, which in private life Iranians enjoy in abundance. Rare exceptions to the prevailing dour mood can be found in Niẓāmī's story of the Seventh Princess in the *Haft Paykar* and occasionally in Sa'dī's *Gulistān*, such as when the latter author notes, “If they take Jesus' ass to Mecca, when it returns, it is still an ass” (quoted in Limbert 2004). In Ḥāfīz's poetry, in contrast, satire, irony, and wit are copiously expressed.

*I repented and swore that I would never kiss
The salty lip of the cup bearer again; but now I am biting
My own lip, and I wonder why I ever listened to an idiot.*

(Lewisohn 1391/2012, 89; Hafiz 1320/1941, g. 312, v. 5)

The other aspect of Ḥāfīz's appeal is his encouragement of forgiveness and pursuit of peace. Since 1979 Iran has followed an isolated route of confrontation in opposing the global influence of Western values and particularly those of the United States. To some extent, one could interpret this as an echo of the Iranians' historical sense of their uniqueness and cultural importance. The Iranian Revolution of 1979 broadly heralded Islamic revival, showing that the belief that the Middle East would develop on a Western model had been erroneous. As often before, others followed Iran's lead. The West's repeated failure to adequately respond to reformist overtures from Iran already looks like a historic error. One such opportunity came after the attacks in the United States on September 11, 2001, when high Iranian authorities (including not only the moderate president Mohammed Khatami but also the supreme leader) quickly condemned the terrorist attacks, and ordinary Iranians displayed their compassion with candlelit lanterns in the streets of Tehran—again showing a noticeable contrast between Iranian attitudes and those of other Middle Eastern peoples (Axworthy 2007, 288). This expression of sympathy (for the mourning of a nation whose attitude toward Iran has always been unfriendly) recalls Ḥāfīz, who advised his fellow Persians to tolerate their enemies and not seek revenge.

Do not pursue cruelty and do as you please,

For in our order of faith, there is no greater sin other than this.

(Hafiz 1320/1941, g. 76, v. 7)

Another opportunity came later in 2001, when Iran gave significant help to the coalition forces fighting the Taliban, in particular helping to persuade the Northern Alliance to accept democratic arrangements for post-Taliban Afghanistan. In 2002 the Iranians were rewarded with George W. Bush's "Axis of Evil" speech, which lumped Iran together with Saddam Hussein's Iraq and North Korea (Axworthy 2007, 288). Persians are a people motivated by spirituality. Although not everyone follows Ḥāfīz's teaching, his voice echoes in all Persian minds.

Ḥāfīz, place your head on the threshold of submission,

For if you argue, fate will argue back.

(Hafiz 1320/1941, g. 151, v. 7)

Plant the tree of amity so that it might bear the apple of the heart's desire

Uproot the sapling of animosity, for it bears myriad predicaments.

(Hafiz 1320/1941, g. 111, v. 1)

As Ḥāfiz reminds us, whenever the voices of lust, greed, desire, envy, and hatred are heeded, that of compassion and kindness fades away. All these impurities are motivated by logic and reason, in Ḥāfiz's opinion; they are what reason desires, for it constantly has its own interest at heart—or, better put, “in mind.” This is why Ḥāfiz invites us to love and care instead of hate and hostility. Indeed, he considers true wisdom to lie in peace and kindness toward others. He urges us to be thankful for what we have rather than covet things we desire (Dashti 1385/2006, 59). Many modern Iranian scholars and leaders have allowed Ḥāfiz's words of wisdom to guide lives of great achievement. Examples include the renowned poet and scholar Muḥammad-Taqī Bahār (d. 1330/1951) and Muḥammad 'Alī Furūghī (d. 1321/1942), a Qājār writer, poet, translator, and official (Milani 2008, 1:152). In his essays, Furūghī (1354/1976) called for greater attention to the classical poets, in particular those of the pre-Tīmūrīd era, who he argued were fundamental to Iran's national and cultural heritage (1:224–26). Furūghī believed that for the Iranian people (and indeed for all of humankind) the key to rising from ignorance to humane and decent social behavior was to practice the teachings of the medieval masters (cf. Solati 2013).

Cultural Modernization

Iran has not been aggressive toward its neighbors for almost five hundred years. During this time, it has been attacked by foreign powers and thereby compelled to defend its sovereignty and national integrity. Morally and spiritually, however, Persians believe one should not act aggressively unless provoked. During the eight-year war (1980–88) imposed on Iran by Iraq, Saddam Hussein's forces used chemical weapons on the Iranian people while Iran, which possessed an arsenal of chemical weapons, refrained from using them on civilians. This brings to mind Ḥāfiz's advice from almost seven hundred years ago:

Of both worlds the serenity is these two sayings' commentary:

“To friends benevolence. With foes tolerance.”

(Hafiz 1320/1941, g. 5, v. 7)

It would be very naive to believe that Iran's restraint in the 1980–88 war was based purely on this advice. Nonetheless, we cannot deny that the teachings of our poets and mystics, in particular Sa'di and Ḥāfiz, have great impact and influence on the people of Iran, in their daily life and moral conduct. There are, of course, good and bad people in every society, but not every culture possesses a poet named Ḥāfiz.

Iran is not exempt from the global course of modernization, or from the latter's propensity to remake the world in its image, subverting local cultures. The Iranian encounter with the West and its modernity led to the evolution of several forms of accommodation. During much of the

twentieth century, modern philosophy in the Iranian vein has generally subordinated social and political dialogue. In harmony with the state and with foreign powers, this philosophy espoused a national dogma that regarded Islam and Islamic culture as a system that by its nature must clash with modernity. However, Ḥāfīz’s teaching, while greatly respecting Islam and Qur’ānic verses, advocates humanitarian conduct regardless of faith and belief. During the late nineteenth century, the neoclassical movement was another display of the dominance of our classical poets over contemporary writers, as I have discussed at length in *The Reception of Ḥāfīz* (Solati 2013).

A second group of traditional intellectuals, including Jamal al-Din al Afghani, advocated accepting innovation into Islamic principles. Afghani, who worked diligently with the Iranian constitutionalist movement, brought together Islamic cultural teachings and Western scholarship, technology, and nationalist policies, paradoxically, in an antifoign, pro-Islamic chauvinism. The objective was to harmonize an Islamic restructuring movement with modern science and notions by allowing modernity to absorb the tenets and culture of Islamic civilization.

The predicament faced by profane ideology in Iran led to the emergence of Islamist beliefs that challenged Western ideologies and systems of modernity on nativist grounds. These forms of nativism have significance in many social contexts where Western modernity has been viewed as a nuisance. Turning answers back into questions, these movements challenge modernity’s description of itself as the “complete answer” to the enigma of history. The contemporary rise of Islamic politics is part of a long and problematic effort to adjust to the modern culture of social variation within the historical and cultural framework of the Iranian social order. The complications, pressures, and even inconsistent environment of political Islam mirror the struggles of specific groups with the culture of modernism. Islam, as a doctrine and as a cultural structure, is endeavoring to produce an original cultural environment. In the absence of local cultural depictions of modernity in the non-Western world, understanding modernization is almost always a heavy burden. This was the case during the colonial and postcolonial eras, and it remains true today, when modernizing states are trying to keep their hold on power. Furthermore, as long as Western modernity proudly declines to come to terms with cultures and practices outside of its heritages, modernity will be properly viewed as an extension of foreign supremacy and unfamiliar cultural domination.

Under circumstances of cultural relegation and political tyranny, culture becomes politicized. Some manners of being—customary habits and routines—are first demolished by the transformation of modernity. In response to innovation, societies, led by their literati, seek a renaissance of past culture. The formerly anathematized modes of being, now lost, are revived by scholars, and this “conventional” culture is converted from a mode of being into a political awareness and belief, offering itself as the frontline of the “soul.” The soul here signifies reminiscences of rural life. It is as though these modes of being have an afterlife or are reborn. These lost modes of life, or rather their enduring ciphers, are turned into a conceptual idea that

offers a refuge of stability in the face of intense transformation, and that draws on communal nostalgia. The most fascinating thing about this conceptual renaissance is that a worldly remainder of “being” remains, giving the ideology an ontological feeling that raises it above sheer intellect in the minds of its supporters. This ideology is intended for mass diffusion in rural settings, and it upholds a sign of spiritual rebirth.

The aim of ideologies based on discourses of authenticity is to uphold modernity, not to revive fundamentalism. What suggests the contrary is simply that the sentimental manner of politicization is particularly operative in conflicts among rivals of contemporary ideologies, and this power has been recognized. The movements encouraged by these ideologies seek a precise form of modernity, one they view as consonant with general tradition. Since tradition has already been tangibly exiled and proven ineffective by modernity, their efforts must integrate tradition, be it real or imagined, with the objective foundations of modernity. There is a curious magic to this moment in that tradition picks up the objects of modernity as though they were never in any way unfamiliar, as if they were in complete harmony with a primeval and original purpose. Of course, the point of rooting these objective forms in the partialities of the form is to turn them into a radical weapon against the intruding rivals.

It is imperative to note that conventional custom does not merely melt in the natural course of time; instead, it is viewed as dominated by a stranger, alien tradition. The opponent is within and without, and society is called on to rid itself of all traces of the adversary’s incursion. This universal culture of modernity is clearly connected to a soulless greed that preys on the normal order of things. The normal order is understood in the given forms of premodern social grouping: family, clan, tribe, ethnicity, and religion. The shift from these horizontal forms of social organization to vertical forms, such as class and occupation, signifies the displacing of a self-evident uniqueness, forcing people to seek a new identity. The philosophy of realism calls people to hold these new forms, which it links to old values, thus generating a bond of endurance where there once was hollowness in the people’s souls.

It is only through the crisis brought by secular political organizations and ideas that we have seen the rise of social movements based on freshly created Islamic and even ethnic identities. These movements endorse social and political establishments that are modern and plan to impel modernization yet are emblematically imbedded in local and traditional cultures and practices. Based on concepts of individuality, these movements signify the fragmented and even global process of quantifiable modernization, on the one hand, and the localization or cultural accommodation of modernity, on the other. These apparently inconsistent formations should be assumed as the new and noteworthy appearance of modernities of our time. We should attempt to appreciate them and their effects in their specificity, without reverting to basic

misrepresentations about the renaissance of ancient instincts or religious extremism (Mirsepassi 2000, 186–89).

Conclusion

Ḥāfīz lived in the tempestuous interlude between Genghis Khān and Tīmūr; a period of instability, in which trivial dynasties rose and fell, generating social chaos and political timidity. Yarshater notes, I believe appropriately, that the panegyric lines in the *Dīvān* echo the political instability of the time, and the dominance and fall of dynasties such as the Īnjū, the Muẓaffarīd and the Jalāyirīd. However, it was at the same time an era of enormous cultural and literary progression; a period when masterpieces were produced in various fields, as illustrated not only by the splendor of Ḥāfīz’s language, but also by the gratitude of his contemporaries (Yarshater, *Elr*, 11: 465).

Khurramshāhī reminds us that there has been much debate on whether Ḥāfīz was simply doing his job as a court poet, or if perhaps he was using his outstanding talent of irony to deceive his naive medieval patrons and appeal to his more intelligent admirers (Khurramshāhī, *Elr*, 11: 468). Scholars also debate whether or not Ḥāfīz was a court poet who composed poetry merely for financial benefits. Most of Ḥāfīz’s life as a poet was spent in the era of Shāh Shujā‘ and many of the references from this time are *pas seuls* on the theme of happiness or salvation from tyranny and adversity, giving the researcher ample evidence to believe that his adverts at the court and his frequent praise of Shujā‘ and Shāh Manṣūr were based simply on his personal admiration for them. This view is contrary to the opinions of those who consider Ḥāfīz a court poet by profession. We know that Ḥāfīz developed a sincere admiration for these kings, and that the verses he composed in praise of them were nothing less than statements of his opinion.

Ḥāfīz can thus be classified as a poet whose talent in the art of rhetoric and lyricism exceeds that of other poets. Ḥāfīz’s achievements won him a vast number of followers, but their perpetual and consistently inferior repetition of his ideas and images appear pale in the light of his excellence. Any poet wishing to replace Ḥāfīz will have to surpass his bequest and create a new dimension in poetry (Losensky 1998, 122) However, few poets are able to ignore that which is defined as poetic utterance by the masters of classical poetry (Bate 1970, 89-90). Ḥāfīz is absent in body and his living voice can never be recaptured, but his legacy has set the standard from which poets must derive their inspiration and the echo of his voice continues to be heard through the work of his followers.

References

- Ahur, P. 1369/1990. *Ayana dar-i tarikh*. Tehran: Shabaviz.
- Avery, P., trans. 2007. *The Collected Lyrics of Hafiz of Shiraz*. Cambridge: Archetype.
- Axworthy, M. 2007. *Iran: Empire of the Mind*. London: Penguin.
- Bahār, M. T. 1373/1994. *Sabk Shinasi*. Vol. 2. Tehran: Amir Kabir.
- Bate, W. J. 1970. *The Burden of the Past and the English Poet*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Browne, E. G. 2002. *A Literary History of Persia*. Vols. 3 and 4. Cambridge: Goodword.
- Dashti, A. 1385/2006. *Kakh-i Ibda'*. Tehran: Zavvar.
- Davis, D., trans. 2012. *Faces of Love: Hafiz and the Poets of Shiraz*. Washington, DC: Mage.
- Furūghī, M. 1354/1976. *Maqalat-i Furughi*. Vol. 1. Tehran: Tus.
- Gulbun, M. 1351/1972. *Bahar va adab-i Farsi*. Vol. 4. Tehran: Kitabha-yi Jibi.
- Hafiz. 1320/1941. *Divan-i Khawja Shams al-Din Muhammad Hafiz Shirazi*, edited by M. Qazvini and Q. Ghani. Tehran: Intisharat-i Zavvar.
- Hafiz. 1362/1984. *Dīvān-i Shams al-Din Muhammad Hafiz Shirazi*. Vol. 2, edited by P. N. Khanlari. Tehran: Kharazmi.
- Khurramshahi, B. 2002. *Hafiz's Life and Times*. Vol. 11. New York: Encyclopedia Iranica. <http://www.iranicaonline.org/pages/citing-iranica>.
- Lewisohn, L. 2012. "Prolegomenon to the Study of Hafiz." In *Hafiz and the Religion of Love in Classical Persian Poetry*, edited by L. Lewisohn. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Lewisohn, L., trans. 1391/2012. *Dush didam ki mala'ik dar-i maykhana zadand*. Tehran: Nashr-i Markaz.
- Limbert, J. 2004. *Shiraz in the Age of Hafez*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Loloi, P., and W. Oxley, trans. 2013. *Poems from the Divan of Hafez*. South Devon, UK: Acumen.
- Milani, A. 2008. *Eminent Persians: The Men and Women Who Made Iran, 1941–1979*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Mirsepassi, A. 2000. *Intellectual Discourse and the Politics of Modernization: Negotiating Modernity in Iran*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Molavi, A. 2005. *Soul of Iran: A Nation's Journey for Freedom*. New York: Norton.
- Rypka, J. 1968. *History of Iranian Literature*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: D. Reidel.
- Shayegan, D. 1995. Introduction to *The Green Sea of Heaven: Fifty Ghazals from the Diwan of Hafiz*, translated by E. T. Gray. Ashland, OR: White Cloud.
- Solati, B. 2013. *The Reception of Hafiz*. Leiden, the Netherlands: Leiden University Press.
- Stanford, S. 1986. *Iranian Relations with the Ottoman Empire in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth centuries*. Vol. 7, edited by S. Stanford. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.