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INTRODUCTION

The present fifth volume of the survey of Persian literature is devoted to poetry down to the Mongol invasion. Volume VI, which, it is hoped, will follow in due course, will continue the history of poetry from the time of Ṣa'dī and Rūmī onwards. The decision to devote at least two volumes to this, the most important genre of Persian writing is a departure from the original plan; it was dictated by the great mass of material, but also by the insistent request of several readers for an index of what has been covered up till now. The change in programme has led to certain inconsistencies within the book, the most noticeable of which is doubtless the fact that the general bibliography (p. 3-18) contains a fair number of titles that are never actually cited, as they are relevant only for the later periods.

In preparing this volume it has been possible to use a certain amount of material left behind by C.A. Storey, in particular his handwritten lists of the older editions and translations of most of the dīwāns and mathnaws discussed in these pages, a small number of references to biographical sources and a card-index of the older catalogues of Persian manuscripts. However, because of the wealth of information contained in the old catalogues (especially those by Rieu, Ethé, Pertsch and Sprenger) I have chosen to re-index almost all of the catalogues consulted by Storey, as well as those published after his death, and have used the cards only to double-check the entries, for which purpose they have proved very valuable. For the biographies the present author must bear sole responsibility.

The selection of authors to be included has not been easy. Although Storey, in the previous volumes, in general discussed only works that are actually extant (following in this, as in much else, the excellent model of Brockelmann's history of Arabic literature), it seemed to me that, at least for the earliest period of Persian poetry, it would be useful to attempt a relatively comprehensive survey of all the poets of whose work anything remains, however slight this might be. This seemed all the more necessary as a distinction between authors of 'extant dīwāns' and poets 'without a dīwān' is a fairly artificial one, since many of the dīwāns of ancient poets are in fact fairly recent compilations; this question is discussed in some detail in Appendix IV. At the same time, limits have had to be set to the presence of comprehensiveness, first of all by excluding all poets who are known only by name, but have not actually left us with any verses; this is bio-bibliography and not a
prosopography of Persian poetry. Second, the selection has been restricted to authors writing in what can roughly be called standard literary Persian; dialect poets, apart from the famous names of Bābā Tahir and Bundar, have been excluded, though this was perhaps a mistake. Third, except in the very earliest period, so-called occasional poets have, in general, been excluded and the selection limited to more or less professional men (and women) of letters. For example, I have thought it of little use to list the various local notables who are enumerated together with a meagre sample of their verses, in Ibn Funduq’s Tārkīh i Bainag, except in the very few cases where these people are mentioned also in some other source. To be sure, some doubtless equally obscure authors have been given entries, but it is impossible to be entirely consistent in this matter.

The entries follow a standard tripartite scheme: biography, codeology (where codices exist) and bibliography. The biographies are obviously the most important part and they differ, I think, from those in all previous histories of Persian literature in that they have been compiled on the basis of primary sources, and not on that of the unreliable, or indeed mendacious, ‘biographical’ compendia of the Timurid period and later. More on the value of the individual sources, and on the selection of the poets included, will be found in the notes at the beginning of chapters II and III.

The codeological sections are the least satisfactory ones. In the course of the work it became increasingly clear that the declared intention of publishing ‘the most complete possible inventory of manuscripts, printed (or lithographed) editions, prose and verse translations (of entire works or of substantial extracts)’, as rashly promised in JRAI 1990, p. 371, was neither feasible nor worth such a ‘complete’ inventory have served any useful purpose. In the case, for example, of the dhwāns of the more popular poets, there is really no point in listing hundreds of manuscripts from the 18th and 19th centuries and it would have been better to have restricted the selection from the outset to the oldest copies. Unfortunately the futility of the original plan only became evident after a fairly large part of this volume had been written, and, although in the latter half of the volume the codeology is more selective, even there there is much that should have been left out. It is hoped that the sixth volume will be more successful in this respect.

Manuscripts are listed under the name of the town where they are at present located (or of their last known location), arranged in roughly geographical order from West to East, beginning with Europe, and then, within each locality, by date. Much space and effort could have been saved by quoting only the hijrī dates, and not converting them into Christian dates as well, but in this I have emulated Storey’s practice in the previous volumes. For the actual conversion I have tried to follow a scientific principle and only offered a precise Julian or Gregorian equivalent in cases where the day of the week is indicated in the source; for details the reader is referred to the article ‘Ta’rīkh’ in EI2. Dates not actually mentioned in the manuscripts are evident as such; if, for example, a manuscript has been attributed to the 16th century but not on the basis of a colophon or of some other clear indication, but merely of a (however well-founded) deduction by the editor of the relevant catalogue it will be cited as belonging to the ‘16th century?' - with a question mark - or else no date will be suggested. The names of scribes are quoted from chapter III onwards, and then mostly only for the older manuscripts; this limits the usefulness of the relevant entries in the index, but I think these chapters will not be entirely without value to students of codeology.

For the older printed editions from Iran it has seemed more prudent to refer once and for all to Mūshā’s bibliography (see below, p. 12) rather than copying out references to books that I have not seen. The Indian lithographs are cited mainly from Storey’s notes, mostly based on the collections in the (then) British Museum and the India Office in London. Modern editions have been listed where they have come to my knowledge, but I am painfully aware of the gaps on the shelves of the libraries in post-colonial London.

The bibliographical sections are arranged chronologically and begin with references to the primary and other mediaeval sources. A fairly comprehensive listing of modern monographs has been attempted. Articles in journals or collective volumes are listed more selectively; in particular, those devoted primarily to the aesthetic appreciation of works of poetry or elucidating only a small number of individual passages are not in general included. Similarly, references to standard histories of Persian literature, such as those by Ethé, Browne, Shībī, Ṣīyāvī, ʿAbbāsī, etc., have mostly been dispensed with, but I have given references to Ṣafā’ī’s big history cum anthology.

Concerning the transliteration of Arabic and Persian enough has been said below, p. 1-2. Turkish names and words which occur in texts in Arabic script have been transliterated, as far as the consonants are
concerned, according to the same system, but the Turkish values have been used for the vowels. Plene spelling of the vowels is, as a rule, indicated by a macron, but for typographical reasons this has had to be omitted in the case of ö and ü. Russian titles are cited in Cyrillic script, but want of the necessary special characters has meant that those in Tajik, Uzbek, Azeri, etc., have usually had to be transliterated.

The present volume came out in three fascicules, published in 1992, 1994 and 1997 respectively. It is inevitable that the first two parts now already require a certain amount of revision, and unavoidable, perhaps, that I have also changed my mind about certain questions, some of them fairly important ones. The ongoing state of these researches is reflected by appendices II to IV and by the corrigenda and addenda. The reader seeking information about any particular work or author will in the first instance probably find it most convenient to consult the indexes, where the material scattered throughout the volume has been registered.

It is a pleasant duty to reiterate the thanks expressed on p. 2, 243, 610 and elsewhere to those scholars who have helped me with suggestions and criticism and sent me books or offprints. I add now my thanks to Nasrullah Pîr-jawâdi, who generously sent me books and journals from Tehran. R. Zipoli has given me all the volumes of the *Lirica Persica* series. Mahmûd Ja'farî has assisted me with some difficult Persian texts. Charlotte de Blois and Lydia Wright have again helped with the proofs of the last fascicule.

*Postscript:* The typescript of the last fascicule was completed at the end of 1996, but technical difficulties delayed printing until the spring of the following year. Publications that have subsequently come to my attention could, unfortunately, not be taken into account.
PERSIAN LITERATURE

A BIO-BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SURVEY

BEGUN BY THE LATE

C. A. STOREY

VOLUME V, PART 1

POETRY TO ca. A.D. 1100

by

François de Blois

THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY
OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND
1992
This is the first of the five projected fascicles of Persian Literature V (Poetry). An introduction to the whole volume, which will explain and, I trust, justify the principles followed in compiling the work will appear together with the last fascicle. In the mean while the indulgent reader is referred to the preliminary remarks in JRAS 1990, p. 370-5, and those at the beginning of the 'General Bibliography' and 'Manuscript Collections', below.

For the sake of consistency, the system of transliteration (or rather of partial transliteration and partial transcription) employed in the previous volumes of this survey has been retained, with minor alterations: for purely typographical reasons the subscript lines under gh, etc., have had to be omitted, and the letters ū and ū appear with one, rather than two, subscript dots. The Persian final silent hā' is, as before, transliterated as -h, but the particles ba, bi and na appear always without -h. I have conformed - but only under protest - with the usual - but absurd - orientalist practice of ignoring the kasrah i idāfah when it occurs in personal names, except in cases where the idāfah construction represents filiation; thus we write 'Nāṣir i Khusrau' and 'Mas'ūd i Sa'd i Salāmān', but (for example) 'Sa'id Nafisā'. The particle is, however, transliterated in names occurring in book-titles. The so-called majhūl vowels (ā and ā) are distinguished in classical Persian, Afghan and Indo-Persian names, titles and quotations, but not in references to modern Western Persian sources. Thus the name of the poet Rūdakī, when it occurs in a modern Iranian book-title, will be rendered as 'Rūdakī', an annoying, but, I think, unavoidable inconsistency. A purely scientific transcription of early Neo-Persian (to which I have aspired in my other publications) would also require, for example, the use of -dh (or -d), rather than -d, after vowels
or of the preposition 'pa', rather than 'ba', but I have thought it best not to inflict this on the readers of the present book. Similarly, no attempt has been made to indicate the metrical lengthening of final short vowels in verse quotations.

The work on this volume has been financed by the Royal Asiatic Society out of the funds bequeathed to it by the late Professor Storey, the father of the project. A condition for this has been that the typescript of the first fascicle be completed within a period of two years. This short deadline has meant, in particular, that it has not been possible to visit manuscript collections and other libraries abroad and that the work has had to be compiled exclusively on the basis of material available in London. An unavoidable consequence of this has been that a number of recent publications could not be used (as they have not been acquired by London libraries). It is hoped that at least the most important omissions will be rectified in the addenda to be published in the final fascicle.

It remains for me to express my gratitude to Professor A.D.H. Bivar who, first as a member of the Society's publications committee, and then as president of the R.A.S., has shown great interest in and concern for this project and has made many valuable suggestions concerning both the content and the physical preparation of this publication. Other colleagues who have kindly agreed to read and comment upon the whole or part of the typescript are C.E. Bosworth, J.T.P. de Bruijn, S. Digby, J.S. Meisami, B.W. Robinson and, in particular, A.H. Morton, who has proposed a large number of corrections and improvements. I have profited from the advice of all of these scholars, though in some cases it has reached me too late to have been given the attention that it deserves. My thanks go also to Charlotte de Blois for help with proof-reading and to the Society's honorary treasurer, John Payne, for manifold support.

January 1992

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY AND LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Note: Where several editions are listed, all references are, when not otherwise noted, to the one first mentioned (in most cases the oldest). It is a cause of constant dismay that editors of Persian texts (as opposed to the universal practice with regard, for example, to Greek and Latin books) almost always refuse to give any kind of page-concordance to previous editions of the same work. It is not possible to remedy the situation here. But future editors of these texts might wish to take the very slight trouble of indicating the page numbers of the editions first mentioned in this list in the margins of their publications, thus making it possible for readers to use their editions in conjunction with this book (and with many previous reference works). Where no page numbers are indicated, the reader is referred to the index of the book in question.


AION = Istituto Universitario Orientale. Annali (Naples).
GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY


al-ʿaṣr, ed. M.R. al-Tabbākh, Aleppo 1349/1930; ed. 'Abd al-Fattāḥ Muḥammad al-Hulū, n.p., n.d. (the preface to volume I - the only one available to me - is dated Cairo 1388/1968); ed. Sāmī Makkī al-Anī, 2 vols., Baghdad 1390-1/1970-1. (Quoted according to the running numbers, which are identical in the latter two editions.)
CHI = Cambridge History of Iran, Cambridge 1968- (in progress).


Doerfer = G. Doerfer, Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen, 4 volumes, Wiesbaden 1963-76.


EI = The Encyclopaedia of Islam, 4 volumes and Supplement, Leiden 1908-36 (also in German and French editions).

EI2 = id., New edition, Leiden 1960- (in progress; also in French).


Ethē, Bodl. Catalogue = see Manuscript Collections, Oxford.

Ethē, I.O. Catalogue = see Manuscript Collections, London.

Ethē, Vorl. = H. Ethē, 'Rūdagī's Vorläufer und Zeitgenossen. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der ältesten Denkmäler neupersischer Poesie', in Morgenländische Forschungen. Festschrift Herrn Professor Dr. H.L. Fleischer... gewidmet, Leipzig 1875, p. 53-68.


FIR = Farhang i Iran-zāmīn.


GIRPH = Grundriß der iranischen Philologie, ed. W. Geiger and E. Kuhn, 2 volumes, Strassburg 1896-1904.


Hidâyat, Majma = Rida Qu'il Khān Hidāyat, Majma‘ al-fuṣūshā (completed in 1288/1871-2), 2
volumes, Tehran 1295/1878; ed. M. Husaffa, Tehran 1336-40sh./1957-61. Cf. PL I p. 911-2. (Only the first volume of the new edition is at present available to me.)


Horn, Einl. = Horn's introduction to his edition of LF (q.v.).


JA = Journal asiatique.

Jâjarmî = Muhammd b. Badr al-Jâjarmî, Mu'nis al-‘abrîr fî daghîiq al-‘asbîr (completed in 741/1341), ed. S. Tabîbî, 2 volumes with continuous pagination, Tehran 1337-50sh./1959-71. (The extra pages inserted between p. 144 and 145 of volume I, numbered there with Arabic letters, are quoted here as 'I p. 144+i' etc.)


JASS = Journal (Proceedings) of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta.

JBBRAS = Journal of the Bombay Branch, Royal Asiatic Society.


Justi = F. Justi, Iranisches Namenbuch, Marburg 1895.


Lazard, Langue = G. Lazard, La langue des plus anciens monuments de la prose persane, Paris 1963.

LF = Asadî’s neupersisches Wörterbuch Lughat-i Furs ... herausgegeben von Paul Horn (ab-handlungen d. k. Gesellschaft der Wissen-schaften zu Göttingen, phil.-hist. Klasse, Neue Folge Band I, Nro. 81, Berlin 1897 (A critical edition of the Vatican manuscript); Kitaâb i lughat i furs, ta’llîf i Abû Mansûr ‘Alî b. Ahmad i Asadî i Tûsî ... ba tashîb wa irtiṣâm i ‘Abbâs i Lîghâl, Tehran 1319sh./1940-1 (Based on Horn’s edition and three manuscripts in private collections, ‘ain’, ‘sîn’ and ‘nûn’); ed. M. Dabîr-Siyâqî, Tehran 1336sh./1957 (essentially a reprint and thus not quoted here); ed. F. Mujtabâ’î and A. A. Sâdiqî, Tehran 1365sh./1986 (based on a manuscript in the Pahlavi University Library (quoted here as ‘P’) with many variants from other as yet un-published manuscripts).

LN = Lughat-nâmah, founded by ‘A. Dih-khudâ, continued by M. Mu’in et al., Tehran 1325-60sh./1946-81.

Mâjâlis al-nafā’îs = Two amplified Persian translations of the Eastern Turkish Mâjâlis al-nafâ’îs by Mîr ‘Alî-Shûr Nawâ’î (died 12 Jamâdâ II 906/1501), ed. ‘A. A. Biikmat, Tehran 1323sh./1945, one (p. 1-178 of the edition) by Fâhîrî (see above), the other (p. 179-409) an anonymous translation completed in 929/1522-3.


MINORSKY, V. Minorsky, Iranica. Twenty articles, Tehran 1964 (Title also in Persian; Bist maqlâlah i Minorsky).


GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY


MDAM = Majallah i dânish-kadah i adabîyât (wa ‘ulûm i insânî i dânish-gâh) i Mashhâd (or: Firdausî). (Revue de la faculté des lettres de Meched).

MDAT = Majallah i dânish-kadah i adabîyât (wa ‘ulûm i insânî) i Tîhrân. (Revue de la faculté des lettres).


Munz. = A. Munzawi, Fihrist i nushkah-hā i khatṭī i fārsī, 6 volumes in 7, Tehran 134bsh./1969 sqq. (last volume not dated. Quoted here by the running numbers. In general I refer to 'Munz.' only when I have no other information about a given manuscript. See also the introductory remarks to 'Manuscript collections', below.)

Munz. Pak. = id., Fihrist i mushtarik i nushkah-hā i khatṭī i fārsī i Pākistān, Lahore/Islamabad 1362sh./1983 - (in progress). (This important book was not available to me during the work on fascicule V/1; relevant references will be given in the addenda.)

Mushār = Khān-Bābā Mushār (and others), Fihrist i kitāb-hā i chāpī i fārsī, 5 volumes, Tehran 1350sh./1961 to 2535sh.sh./1976.


Nachrichten ... Göttingen = Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen

Nadhir Ahmad = 'Notes on important Arabic and Persian MSS. found in various libraries in India', JASB N.S. XIII, 1917, p. lxvii-lxxxix, XIV, 1918, p. cxciv-cclxvi. References are to the serial numbers in the Persian section of the latter part.


NDAT = Nashrīyah (intermittently: Najallah) i dānish-kadah i adabīyāt (wa ‘ulūm i insānī) i Tabrīz (Revue de la faculté des lettres de Tabriz).


OCM = Oriental College Magazine.

OLZ = Orientalistische Literaturzeitung.

O. Suec. = Orientalia Suecana.

Pertsch = see Manuscript collections, Berlin.


PL = the present Persian Literature. With PL I compare the much extended Russian translation by Yu. E. Bregel': Ч.А. Сторк, Персидская литература, био-библиографический обзор, 3 volumes, Moscow 1972.


Rendiconti = Rendiconti della (Reale) Accademia (nazionale) dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche.

Rieu, Rieu, Suppl. = see Manuscript collections, London.


Rivāyat (Dhābhar) = Ervad Bamanji Nusservanji Dhābhar, The Persian Rivayats of Hormazdār Frmarz and others (translated with many corrections and much new material), Bombay 1932.

Robinson, Paintings = see Manuscript collections, Oxford.

RSO = Revisti degli studi orientali.

Rypka = J. Rypka, and others, Dějiny perské a tādžické literatury, Prague 1956; 2nd enlarged edition 1963; Iranische Literaturgeschichte (revised translation from the Czech), Leipzig 1959; History of Iranian Literature (translated, with further additions, from the previous versions), Dordrecht 1968. (All references are to the English edition.)


Ṣafā, Tārīkh = id., Tārīkh i adabiyāt dar Frān, Tehran 1332sh./1954 - (in progress). (The earlier volumes have been re-published in several more or less revised editions; the edition used is specified in each case.)


SB Berlin = Sitzungsberichte der (königlichen) preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

SB München = Sitzungsberichte der (königlichen) bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-philologische Klasse.

sh. = shamsī.
sh.sh. = shāhanshāhī.


Sprenger = see Manuscript Collections, Lucknow.

St. = Storey’s handwritten notes.


MANUSCRIPT COLLECTIONS

Note: In the main part of this Survey manuscripts will be listed under the name of the place where they are located (or of their last known location). Within each entry these will be arranged in a roughly geographical order from West to East, beginning with the British Isles, and not, as in the present list, alphabetically. 'Late' manuscripts, i.e. those copied after 1250/1834-5, are recorded selectively (and usually omitted if they are listed in Munzawi); those copied after 1300/1882-3 have in general been ignored.

Publications describing manuscripts in three or more locations can be found in the General Bibliography (above). This should therefore be consulted for all references to works not listed below.

Aberystwyth

Adana
Türkiye Yazmaları Toplu Kataloğu 01, Adana, II Halk Kütüphanesi ve Müzesi, 3 volumes, Ankara 1985-6.

Aligarh

Ann Arbor

Antalya
Türkiye Yazmaları Toplu Kataloğu 07, Antalya, 5 volumes, Istanbul 1982-4.
Baku
Āłyazmaları Katalogu, by M.S. Sultanov, 2 volumes, Baku 1963-77.

Bankipore (Patna)


Berlin
Heinz = Persische Handschriften Teil 1 ... besprochen von W.H. (=Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland. Band XIV,1). Wiesbaden 1968. [Ms. in Berlin and Tübingen].

Pertsch = Verzeichnis der persischen Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin von W. Pertsch. Berlin 1886. (The manuscripts are at present still divided between the Staatsbibliothek Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz and the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, both in Berlin.)


Bombay

Brelvi = Supplementary catalogue of Arabic, Hindustani, Persian and Turkish MSS. and descriptive catalogue of the Avesta, Pahlavi, Zoroastrian and Persian MSS. in the Mulli Firoz Library. Compiled by S.A. Brelvi ... and Ervd B.N. Dhabhar. [The Neo-Persian Mss. were catalogued at Brelvi]. Bombay 1917.


Bratislava

Cairo


Calcutta
A.S.B. 1 = List of Arabic and Persian MSS. acquired on behalf of the Government of India by

A.S.B II = List of ... MSS. acquired ... during 1908-10. Calcutta [1910?].


Ivanow Curzon = Concise descriptive catalogue of the Persian manuscripts in the Curzon Collection, Asiatic Society of Bengal. By W.I. Calcutta 1926.


Cambridge

Browne Cat. = A catalogue of the Persian manuscripts in the Library of the University of Cambridge by E.G.H. Cambridge 1896.

Browne Coll. = A descriptive catalogue of the Oriental MSS. belonging to the late E.G. Browne [and at present deposited in the Cambridge University Library]. By E.G. Browne. Completed & edited ...
Fleischer... Accedit F.A. Eberti ... Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum orientalium bibliothecae ducaleis Guelferbytanae. Leipzig 1831.

Dublin


Dushanbe (Stalinabad)
Acad. = Каталог восточных рукописей Академии Наук Таджикской ССР. (Title also in Tajik: Fahristi [from vol. II: Fehristi, payhokhoi shargi Akademiya Fanhoi RSS Tojikiston), edited by A.M. Mirzoev et al. Stalinabad (from vol. III: Dushanbe) 1960- (Apparently in progress.)

Bertel’s/Bakoev = А. Бертельс и М. Бакоев: Алфавитный каталог рукописей, обнаруженных в Горно-Бадахшанской автономной области экспедицией 1959-1963 гг. Москва 1967. (English title: Alphabetic catalogue of manuscripts found by 1959-1963 expedition in Gorno-Badakshsan autonomous region. 'The manuscripts themselves were returned to their owners... The films and photostats are kept at the Department of Oriental Studies in Dushanbe').


MANUSCRIPT COLLECTIONS


Edinburgh


Eton

Glasgow

Weir = 'The Persian and Turkish manuscripts in the Hunterian Library of the University of Glasgow', by T.H. Weir, JRAS 1908, pp. 596-606.

Gotha

Nachträge = 'Nachträge und Verbesserungen zu den Katalogen der persischen und türkischen Handschriften', in: Die arabischen Handschriften der herzoglichen Bibliothek zu Gotha... Verzeichnet von Dr. Wilhelm Pertsch. V. Gotha 1892, p. 481-554.

Göttingen
Halle

Hamadan
see Rasht

Hamburg

Heidelberg

Helsinki

Herat
See Kabul.

Hyderabad (Deccan)
Aṣafiyah = Fihrist i kutub i 'arabī, fārsī wa urdu i makhzanah i kutub-khānah i Aṣafiyah i Sarkār i 'allī... Hyderabad 1332/1913-4 to 1355/1936-7.


Isfahan

Islamabad

Ganj-Baksh/Munzawi = [Same title]. By A. Munzawi. 4 vols. 1979-82.

Istanbul (Constantinople)
Where no more recent publication is indicated, references are to the (notoriously unreliable) defters, or title-indexes, for the various collections, which were published in Constantinople at the end of the last century. Storkey's card-index includes material from the defters for the following collections: Aksaray (now: Valide Camii), Amuca Hüseyin Paşa, Ağır Efendi, Atif Efendi, Ayasofya, Beşir Ağa, Beyazıt, Çelebi Abdullah Efendi, Esat Efendi, Fatih Camii, Feyzullah Efendi, Halet Efendi, Hekimoğlu Ali Paşa, Kara Mustafa Paşa, Kılıç Ali Paşa, Lâleli, Murat Molla, Selimyê (now: Pertev Paşa), Ummumi (now: Beyazıt Devlet Halk Kütüphanesi), Yahya Efendi, Yeni Cami.


Edhem/Stouchjine = Les manuscrits orientaux illustrés de la Bibliothèque de l'Université de Stamboul. Par Fahmi Edhem et Ivan Stouchjine (Mémoires
Konya

Ates = 'Konya kütüphanelerinde bulunan bazı mühim yazmalar', by A. Ateş, in Belletin XVI/4, 1952, p. 49-130.


Lahore


Public Libr. = Taʃīli fihris i makhtūţat i fārisīyāh i Panjab Public Library by Manṣūr Ahsan ʿAbbās. 2 volumes. Lahore 1966.

Shērānī = Fihrist i Makhtūţat i Shērānī by M. B. Husain. 3 volumes. Lahore 1968-73.


Leeds


Leipzig

Fleiss = Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum qui in Bibliotheca Senatoria Civitatis Lipsiensis asservantur (Codices arabici persici turcici descripsti ab H.O.F.). Grimae 1838.

Vollers = Katalog der islamischen ... Handschriften der Universitäts-Bibliothek zu Leipzig von K.V. Leipzig 1906.
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CHAPTER I:
THE ORIGINS OF PERSIAN POETRY

Persian poetry (shīr or nāzm) is distinguished from prose (nathr) by two indispensable formal components: end-rhyme (gāfiyān) and quantitative metre (arūd or wāzn), i.e. the regular succession of long and short syllables. Both of these features - together with others - are shared by Persian and Arabic poetry. Both, moreover, are conspicuously absent from all demonstrably pre-Islamic poetic works in Iranian languages. The conclusion, thus, virtually imposes itself that the Persian Muslims borrowed the principles of rhyme and of quantitative metre from Arabic.

Of course, the Iranians had poetry long before Islam. The oldest surviving works of Iranian verse are the Gāthenās and Yashts of the Avesta. Although the language, the religious concepts and the poetic imagery of the Avesta are all close to those of the Vedas of ancient India, there is no trace in the Avesta of a quantitative metre of the sort which we find in the Vedas or in Greek poetry. The ancient Iranians evidently had a different system of versification from their Indian cousins. At present, the majority opinion among Iranologists is that the poetic structure of the Gāthenās is based exclusively on the number of syllables per line, though a minority view (to which the present author inclines) holds that the Gāthenās conform to a system of accentual metre; more precisely, I think it most likely that the Ahu-uuaitān Gāthenā (=Yasna 28-34) consists of verses with a fixed number of stresses (3 in each half-verse) and a variable number of unstressed syllables, while the four other Gāthenās (Yasna 43-46; 47-50; 51; 53) have verses with a fixed number of syllables as well as a fixed number, and more-or-less fixed position of stresses. As for the Yashts, Geldner's view that these are constructed of verses with a fixed number of syllables still has many supporters, though Henning maintained, with what seem to me very strong - if somewhat elliptically formulated - arguments, that the verses of the Yashts have a fixed number of stressed syllables only, while the number of unstressed syllables varies. The same accentual principle underlies, according to the penetrating analyses of Henning and Boyce, pre-Islamic

zum Wort-Akzent in den Gathas und im Pashto', Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 42, 1983, p. 167-75), Meillet thought that it was an accent of a Latin type and Kuryłowicz maintained (with very dogmatic and basically untenable arguments) that it was fixed on the penultimate syllable. 1

1K. Geldner, Uber die Metrik des jüngeren Avesta, Tübingen 1877.
2A bibliography (down to 1962) of studies on the metre of the Yashts can be found in G. Gropp, Wiederholungsformen im Jung-Avesta (Dissertation), Hamborg 1967, p. 186-90; see also Gropp's own remarks, pp. 9-10. To those must be added in particular G. Lazar's rather inconclusive article 'La métrique de l'Avesta récent', Acta Iranica 23 (=Orientalia J. Duchesne-Guillemin emeriti obieta), Leiden 1964, p. 283-300.

Middle-Persian and Parthian poetry, of which a good number of examples have come down to us both in Zoroastrian and in Manichaean script. The earlier suggestion by Benveniste¹ that Middle-Persian poetry was based on mere syllable-counting required such a degree of tampering with the extant texts that it can effectively be disregarded, but also the occasionally expressed claim that it conformed with some kind of quantitive system has never been substantiated. Thus, Neo-Persian poetry, in basing itself on a system of a strictly regulated succession of long and short syllables, without any regard to the number or position of stresses, marks a clean break with Iranian pre-Islamic poetry.

With rhyme the situation is perhaps slightly more complicated. Although there is no hint of deliberate rhyme in the Avesta, the Manichaean Middle-Persian and Parthian hymns, or such manifestly pre-Islamic Zoroastrian poems as the Draxt I Asurīg and the Ayādgar I Zarērān,² there are a small number of early Persian poems that do rhyme, but have no regular system of quantitative metre. Two poems of this sort have been preserved in Zoroastrian script in the manuscripts of the Pahlavi texts,³ a collection of miscellaneous religious and non-religious writings assembled, apparently, as a school-book for learners of the Middle-Persian language. One of these,⁴ a poem rhyming consistently in -ēn, bewails the Arab conquest of Iran and pines for deliverance; it thus clearly belongs to the Islamic period. Another text⁵, also rhyming in -ēn, laments the impermanence of the world. It has an internal rhyme in its first verse (as is canonical in Arabic and Neo-Persian qasīdas), as well as a sort of refrain (every second verse ends with the words andar gēhān). Although a precise dating of the latter text is not possible, there is no patent reason why it too should not belong to the Islamic period. In Arabic script we have the text which the anonymous Tārīkh i Sīstān⁶ says was inscribed on the fire-temple at Karkōy and which consists of 8 periods rhyming in -ōsh followed by one unrhymed line. The verses, if authentic, are presumably transcribed from an original in Zoroastrian script. Of course, it is well known that Zoroastrians continued to compose Middle-Persian documents of various sorts well into the Islamic period. It is thus in principle altogether possible that these few samples of rhymed poetry were all written during the Islamic period in conscious imitation of Arabic poetry. In this case one would, however, have to conclude that rhyme - the more immediately tangible of the two essential components of Arabic poetry - was introduced into Persian earlier than quantitative metre. Clearly post-Islamic examples of rhymed, but not quantitative poetry include the couplet attributed, most probably wrongly, to Abū Ḥāfṣ al-

---

¹Fr. Benveniste, 'Le Mémorial de Zarēr, poème pehlevi mazdeen', JA 220, 1932, p. 245-93.
²U. Utas, 'On the composition of the Ayātākār I Zarērān', Acta Iranica 5 (=Monumentum H.S. Nyberg II), Leiden (etc.) 1975, p. 399-418, analyses as 'rhyme' the fact that a number of periods in this poem are concluded by verbs with the personal ending for the 3rd person singular -ed/-ēd (in Utas's transcription -ēt), but this is at very best a rhetorical device and can hardly be regarded as a structural principle underlying the whole poem.
³Pahlavi Texts, ed. J.W. Jansen-Asana, 2 volumes, Bombay 1897-1913.
⁵Pahlavi Texts II p. 54, translated and discussed by Henning in 'A Pahlavi poem' (see above) p. 647-8.
⁶Tārīkh i Sīstān, p. 37.
honour Muhammad b. Waṣīf extemporized some laudatory verses in Persian. His example was then immediately followed by Bābbān i Kūrd and Muhammad b. Mukhallad. And thus Persian poetry was born. The story is, of course, not necessarily true and indeed the question of who was the ‘first Persian poet’ is essentially a futile one. But the anecdote does certainly do justice to the circumstances, and to the approximate time (middle of the 3rd/9th century), in which Neo-Persian poetry came into being. When the court poets, who were accustomed to eulogising their masters in an already highly stylised type of Arabic poetry, found that they were no longer understood by the Iranian soldier-kings who had seized power on the Eastern fringe of the dār al-islām, they were compelled to switch to Persian and to perpetuate in that language the same forms and poetic traditions with which they were accustomed from Arabic. Although now working in Persian, they continued to produce poems of a distinctly Arabic type, employing monorhyme, quantitative metre as well as a perhaps somewhat simplified version of the same stylised imagery.

But to say that the early Persian poets borrowed the principles of quantitative metre from Arabic does not necessarily mean that the metres that they used were the same as those already in use in Arabic poetry. Their procedure was not quite the same as that of the Roman poets, who not only adopted the general poetic canons of the Greeks, but even forced their language into the same metres which the Greek tradition held

Sughdī, to which Lazard has contributed an important study, and perhaps a few other small fragments, of which, however, one cannot be certain whether they are in fact poems and not merely rhyming jingles. As for the so-called verse translation of the Qurʾān, a fragment of which was discovered in Qum, and which, according to its editor, represents ‘a bridge between accentual and quantitative poetry’, in the light of the unanimous insistence by Islamic tradition that the Qurʾān, despite its rhymed periods, and despite the fact that a good number of its Ḥāȳaḥ can be scanned according to the rules of Arabic prosody, is not poetry (ṣīr), one must seriously doubt whether this Persian paraphrase was intended to be anything more than an imitation of the rhymed prose of the Arabic original.

According to an anecdote in the Tārīkh i Sīstān, the first person to compose a poem in (Neo-)Persian was Muhammad b. Waṣīf, a secretary to the Saffarid ruler Yaʿqūb b. Ḍalīl. When the latter declared that he was unable to understand the Arabic verses that were being recited in his

2. C.F. Meier, Maḥṣat I pp. 9-10. The whole first section of Meier’s book (p. 1-13) is a sober and convincing refutation of the attempts by various scholars to derive Neo-Persian quantitative metre (and in particular that of the rubā’t) from alleged pre-Islamic Iranian prototypes.
3. Edited by A.ʿA. Rādzī under the title Pul-i miyān i shir i hījāy wa arūsī i Rawās dar qūrūn i awaīl i hījāy, tarjaman i Ḥangān as du juw i qurʾān i ṣajād, Tehran 1352/1374.
5. See below, no. 111.

6. See the fanciful discussion of the question in ‘Aṣfī I p. 19-22. The verses which ‘Aṣfī (and later authors) claim were composed by one ʿAbbās of Marv in 193/808-9 in honour of the future caliph al-Muʿāwīya are, as many Iranian and European scholars have emphasised, clearly a forgery from a much later time. Cf. Lazard, Poètes I, p. 11-12, with further literature.
appropriate for the several types of poetry: hexameter for heroic and didactic poems, the Lesbian metres from lyrics, iambics for tragic dialogue, etc. To be sure, some of the most common metres in Persian, such as mutaqāriba muthammam mbdhuf (or sālim) U--U--U--U(--), hazaj musaddas mbdhuf U--U--U--U(--), and raml muassadda mbdhuf --U--U--U-- occur also in basically the same form in Arabic, with the difference only that the Arabic mutaqārib,¹ hazaj and raml all permit in certain places the use of either a long or a short syllable (ancepitae); the mutaqāri, for example, scans U-XU-XU-XU--; while in the corresponding Persian metres the places in question are always occupied by long syllables. These Persian metres thus make the impression of having been modelled on the 'sound', school-book versions of the corresponding Arabic metres, in which the long ancepitae are regarded as standard, the short ancepitae as a permitted variation of the standard pattern. On the other hand, many Persian metres, particularly those commonly used in lyric poetry, do not correspond to any Arabic metre, this despite the fact that the traditional Persian prosodic theory has given them elaborate Arabic names and attempted to 'derive' them from the standard Arabic metres with which they share a name. It is thus clear that the pioneers of Persian poetry, besides borrowing, or rather adapting, some of the

¹In Arabic mutaqāri is relatively rare, certainly not so common as in Persian, but there is no foundation for Elwell-Sutton's suggestion (p. 172) that this metre was copied 'from Persian to Arabic'. It is used in two poems in Noldeke's Delectus veterum carminum arabicorum, p. 79 and 80, by Ka'b and al-Majāshī, poets from the time of the Arab conquests of the 7th century. Quite apart from the fact that there is no evidence for quantitative metre (to say nothing of mutaqāri) in Persian at such an early date, it is most unlikely that these Arab tribal bards should have known anything of Persian poetry.

Arabic metres, also developed a number of new, purely Persian metres of an Arabic (i.e. quantitative) type. To these the prosodists later assigned more or less artificial Arabic names.

In his important book The Persian metres¹ L.P. Elwell-Sutton has shown the inadequacy of the traditional Arabic-based analysis of Persian metres, refuted (I should think for good) the notion that the latter can be derived totally from Arabic models and laid the foundation for a new approach to the formal analysis of Persian poetry on the basis of the prosodic patterns actually occurring in Persian verse. However, Elwell-Sutton went a step further and claimed that the Persian system of quantitative metre has in fact nothing to do with Arabic, but continues the formal traditions of pre-Islamic Persian poetry. This claim is, however, totally unsubstantiated. Neither Elwell-Sutton nor anyone else has succeeded in analysing Old or Middle-Iranian poetry (of which a considerable amount has survived) along quantitative lines, and as long as such an analysis has not succeeded we cannot but assume that that poetry was not quantitative. In fact, as has already been mentioned, a very strong case for an accentual basis of Middle-Iranian poetry has been made by such experts as Henning and Boyce. It is most regrettable that Elwell-Sutton, by referring to antiquated studies by Iranicists like Benveniste, Nyberg, and Christensen, or non-Iranicists like Marr,² must inevitably induce non-specialist readers to think that the study of pre-Islamic Iranian poetry is a field where anything goes. In fact it is one where there is now a fairly large degree of consensus among competent judges.

The question of why the Persian poets of the Islamic period invented the particular non-Arabic

¹Cambridge 1976.
²p. 181.
metres that they did is one about which one can only hazard a guess. It would seem, however, most probable that educated Persian Muslims of the first centuries after the hijrah, schooled as they were in Arabic poetry and, perhaps more importantly, in *taqwīd*, the science of Qur'ānic recitation, with its painfully exact measurement of the length of every syllable, must have become aware of the varying length of the syllables in their own language, as well as of the metrical patterns typical of it. When they began to compose poetry of an Arabic type in their own language they obviously felt it imperative to maintain a consistent pattern of long and short syllables in each verse. It was not necessary, however, to use the actual patterns occurring in Arabic poems. It was left to the metricalians of later times to analyse these Persian patterns and to force them more or less violently into the scheme devised by the Arabic prosodists.

If we ignore stanzaic poetry, which in all periods of Persian literature has played only a marginal role, we can divide Persian poems into those which have monorhyme (i.e. the same rhyme occurs at the conclusion of every verse from the beginning to the end of the poem), on the one hand, and *mathnawīs* (i.e. those consisting of rhymed couplets) on the other. Poems with monorhyme, which we can conveniently designate as 'lyric' verse, range from two-line epigrams to odes of more than a hundred verses, though really long odes are very much less common in Persian than in Arabic. In the early periods lyric poems are most frequently panegyrics (poems flattering a king or some other patron), though we also find elegiac didactic poems (often lamenting old age, or expressing pessimistic sentiments), erotic and bacchic poems, lampoons (generally directed against rival poets or tight-fisted ex-patrons) and assorted facetiae. Religious pieces are relatively rare before the time of Sanā'ī (first half of the 6th/12th century), though later they become the dominant type of lyric poetry. All of these genres are well-known in Arabic and the stylised structural and rhetorical devices of Arabic lyrics are imitated freely by the Persian authors.

Poems consisting of rhymed couplets are generally long to very long (the *Shāh-nāmah* has about 60,000 verses) and of either narrative or didactic content. Indeed the distinction between narrative and didactic *mathnawīs* is not always clear-cut; Asadī's *Karshāsp-nāmah*, for example, though fundamentally a story-poem, indulges in long paraesetic excursions, as do many later epics. Although long instructive and narrative poems in rhymed couplets are by no means unknown in Arabic, it is considerably less common there than in Persian and has certainly never enjoyed the same status as the Persian *mathnawī*. Moreover, in Arabic this sort of poetry is restricted to a single metre (*rajaz*), while writers of Persian *mathnawīs* have a greater choice of metres, though even they use only half a dozen metres with any frequency. The subject-matter of Persian narrative poems is in many cases taken from the legendary and semi-legendary traditions of pre-Islamic Iran. This is the case with Firdausī's *Shāh-nāmah*, Asadī's *Karshāsp-nāmah* and the other heroic poems belonging to the Persian

---

1In the present book the English word 'verse' will be used consistently to render Arabic/Persian *bait*. Each 'verse' consists, as a rule, of two 'half-verses' (*misrā*). In monorhyme the rhyme occurs at the end of the 'verse', i.e. at the end of every second *misrā* only, except in the first verse of a given poem, where, in general, both half-verses rhyme. In *mathnawī*, the two *misrā* of any given verse rhyme together. Thus a 'verse'/bait is here what in European poetic systems would be called a 'couplet'.
'epic cycle', but also such romantic epics as Gurgānī’s ʻWis u Rāmīn or Nīzāmī’s Khusrav-Shīrīn, as well as overtly Zoroastrian works like Kāvās’s Maulūd i Zartusht. But there are also poems based on Arabic, Islamic and Islamicized Biblical traditions such as the various versions of Yusuf u Zulaikha, ‘Aiyūqī’s Warqah u Gulsām or Nīzāmī’s Laīlē-Мajnūn. Others again can be traced to Hellenistic sources, e.g. ‘Unṣūrī’s Wāmis u ‘Ahrūr or the versions of the legend of Alexander by Nīzāmī and others. Three of the very earliest Persian mathnawīs of which we have any knowledge, namely Rūdākī’s Kālīlah u Dimna and Sindbād-nāmah, and the anonymous, but roughly contemporary Bīluhar u Būdhāsaf, all retell in Persian the same (ultimately Sasanian or Sasanianised Indian) stories which Abūn al-Lūḥīqī had put into Arabic rhymed couplets more than a century earlier. All three of these Persian poems are in ramal metre, which, as can be seen from the table, is based on the same recurring pattern as rana, the canonical metre of Arabic couplets. And the same pattern underlies also the haza metre employed in the earliest poetical version of the Shāh-nāmah, that by Mas‘ūdī al-Marwazī, and in other early mathnawīs, whether narrative (Wis u Rāmīn) or didactic (Māsīrī’s Dānjish-nāmah, Nāṣir i Khusrav’s Rūshnā’ī-nāmah) and well as in many long poems of later authors (e.g. Nīzāmī’s Khusrav-Shīrīn and its many imitations or Rūdākī’s Mathnawī i ma’navī).

1 I.e. the two versions of the Shahryār-nāmah by Farrukhī (below, p. 111) and Mukhtarī (Chap. III), the Burzūst-nāmah attributed (most probably wrongly) to ‘Aṭa’ī, the Bahman-nāmah and Kūsh-nāmah attributed to Erān-šāh and the anonymous Kāfarbarsūn-nāmah, Bārū Gushasp-nāmah and Farrāsh-nāmah (all to be discussed in Chap. III).
2 For the latter see Chap. III (Appendix).
3 For Abūn’s Kālīlah wa Dimna see de Blois, Bursoy p. 5, 96.
4 See below, p. 191-2.

It is thus quite clear that the narrative and didactic poetry of the Persians, like their lyrical verse, had Arabic antecedents both for its content and for its general form.

raja: -U---U---U--- etc.
ramal: -U---U---U--- etc.
haza: U---U---U--- etc.

One of the striking features of early Persian narrative poems is that their authors repeatedly and insistently tell us that their poems are based on an 'old book'. In other words, they are verifications of pre-existing written narratives. In at least one case the source used by the poet is actually extant (the Middle Persian Zand i Wahman-Yasht used by Kāvās’s) and in some others it can at least be identified (e.g. Abū Nu‘ayīd’s Kitāb i Karshāsp as the probable source of Asādi’s epic). In general these sources can be assumed to have been in Persian prose and to have been translated either from an Arabic or a Middle-Persian original, though in a few cases (Maulūd i Zartusht and Wis u Rāmīn) the poet appears to have worked directly on the basis of a source in Middle-Persian.

Despite the insistence by the authors of these narratives that they are merely retelling what they found in a 'book', attempts have occasionally been made to view early Persian poetry in the
light of the well-known theory of 'oral poetry', a theory which has had a very strong influence particularly on the Anglo-Saxon school of Homeric studies, but which has also been applied with interesting results to such fields as pre-Islamic Arabic poetry. In the case of Persian, this theory would imply the existence of an uninterrupted tradition of poetry handed down from generation to generation from remote Iranian antiquity all the way to the professional Shāh-nāmah-reciters of the present. Support for this conception might be sought in the fact that in Firdausī's Shāh-nāmah, alongside the many passages where the poet speaks of the 'old book' that he has put into verse, there are also a number of places where he states, or implies, that he has 'heard' the story he is about to tell from an 'old dīhān' or the like. But it is much more likely that in all the passages of this sort the poet is merely repeating, in verse, the statement by his written source that it has derived its information from the person in question. Thus, when at the beginning of the story of Būrūzōy the poet invites us to listen to the words of Shādān, the son of Būrzīn, the casual reader could be forgiven for thinking that Firdausī actually heard Shādān tell this story. In fact, we know from the 'older preface' to the Shāh-nāmah that Shādān, son of Būrzīn, was one of the 'four men' who collaborated in the compilation of the prose Shāh-nāmah that was written for Aḥmad Mansūr b. Abū Razzāq in Mubarram 346/957, one of Firdausī's written sources. Firdausī's reference to Shādān is thus clearly lifted directly from his source. Further on in the text, at the beginning of the story of Hurmuzd, the poet speaks quite vividly of a meeting which he had with Mākh, the margrave of Herat, a wise old man, whom Firdausī asks for information about the reign of king Hurmuzd and whose reply the poet then proceeds to quote. But this is manifestly a poetic fiction. Mākh the masbān of Herat is clearly identical with another of the 'four men' whose name appears in the manuscripts of the 'older preface' as Shāh of Herat (2.4.2 is either a misreading of 2.4.1, or vice versa). The same is apparently also the case with the story of the 'interpretation' of the game of chess which Firdausī tells on the authority of Old Shāhīy, evidently yet another of the 'four men', whose name occurs in the 'older preface' as Māhūy (this, like the previous example, must be seen in the light of the close similarity of initial m- and sh- in early Persian handwriting). It is, of course, not out of the question that the young Firdausī might actually have met one or the other of the 'four men', but it is rather unlikely that he should have known three of the four.

Further evidence for the dependence of the Persian epic tradition on written sources, rather than on a living oral tradition can be seen in the fact that a good number of the proper names that figure in that tradition appear in a form that can only be explained in terms of the misreading of written sources. Thus the name of Tahmūsīr (or -rath) clearly results from the mispointing in

---

1See in particular O. M. Davidson, 'The crown-bestower in the Iranian Book of Kings', Acta Iranica 23 (= Papers in honour of Professor Mary Boyce), Leiden 1985, p. 61-148, especially pp. 103-42 (The authority and authenticity of Ferdowsī's Book of Kings).

2See the collection of passages in Davidson p. 113-5.


---

1See below, p. 121-6.

2Moscow edition VIII p. 316 (Hurmuzd v. 15 sqq.)


4The former (evidently preferable) spelling is used in Khāliqī-Muṭlaq's new edition of the Shāh-nāmah.
Arabic script of *Tahmūrab,¹ for Middle-Persian t'budap and Avestan Taxma- Urupi.² Similarly the name given to Faramūn's evil son Tūr³ is evidently a mispointing (again conceivably only in Arabic script) for Tūz,⁴ representing Middle-Persian tww.⁵ Or Isfandīyār,⁶ a corruption in Arabic script for Isfandiyād (or Isp-),⁷ for Middle-Persian spndyt or spndd't,⁸ for Avestan Spantūdāta-.⁹ Or Nastūr, a mispointing of Bastūr, Middle-Persian bstwī, Avestan Bastauwairī-.¹⁰ For G/Karsāsp, from Karsāsp, see below, p. 83, footnote no. 2. The question of whether all these spellings were in fact already used by Firdausī and are not merely the result of later scholastic corruptions must, for the adherents of the theory of oral poetry, be irrelevant, since the prerequisite of this theory is precisely the assumption of an uninterrupted oral tradition from antiquity to the present day. Such a tradition ought not to be able to be led astray by scribal errors, whether before or after the time of Firdausī, who is but one link in an unbroken chain of oral poets.

It is quite clear that a theory of oral poetry will only work if it is possible to posit a continuing formal tradition of versification. In the case of the Homeric epics, for example, it is assumed that the stories of the Trojan War and of the adventures of Odysseus were retold by generation after generation of bards, all using the same hexametre verse, the same (or much the same) somewhat artificial poetic language (which was not identical with any of the spoken Greek dialects), the same set of similes and standard epithets, etc., until the time when one particular version of the poems was set down in writing. Of course, we cannot prove that this was actually the case, but it is not an implausible hypothesis. But Firdausī and his contemporaries did not have this kind of tradition behind them. They were pioneers. Persian poetry with rhyme and quantitative metre was, as we have seen, only a bit more than a century old. This innovation cut them off from the old poetic tradition. When they told the same stories as the pre-Islamic minstrels, as is evidently the case with Gurgānī's Ḫsūs u Rāmīn,¹ their link with their predecessors was through books, not through a living tradition.

Our conclusion can thus only be that the Shahnāma, as it was written by Firdausī, was not oral poetry, but book-literature. However, almost as soon as it was written down, it most certainly did turn into oral poetry on the tongues of the rhapsodists, who developed and elaborated the epic orally and have continued to do so to the present. The tremendous degree of disagreement already between the oldest manuscripts of the poem cannot be explained purely in terms of the carelessness and

¹Cf. Tahmūraf (with -f for Iranian -β) in Tābārī’s Ta’rīkh I. p. 174 l. 17.
²Justi p. 320-1.
³Or Tūr? Rhymes with šobr in the Moscow edition of the Shahnāmah IV. p. 215 v. 104, in the Leningrad manuscript only.
⁴Thus in Taba’sīlibī. The Northwest-Iranian form Tūzh is represented by the spelling Tūz in Tābārī, Ibn al-Nadīm, Bairūzī, etc.
⁵Justi p. 328-9, with the untenable suggestion that Middle-Persian tww represents a misreading of Arabic Tūr.
⁶Thus repeatedly in the Maulūd I Zartusht, rhyming with rōzgar, kāḥ, tāj-der etc.
⁷Thus in Nöldeke’s Delectus, p. 67 l. 11.
⁸In Middle-Persian script y and d are identical. It is thus difficult to say whether -yd is a misreading (in MP. script) of -dād or whether it represents a genuine South-Western dialect form corresponding to Avestan Spantūdāta-.
¹⁰Justi p. 65.
unscrupulousness of generations of scribes. It is quite clear that from a very early date the scribal and oral textual traditions have constantly influenced one another. But this is an oral tradition which does not (as is assumed to have been the case with the Homeric poems) culminate and end with a book. In Iran the book is the point of departure.

CHAPTER II:
FROM THE MIDDLE OF THE 9TH CENTURY TO THE LAST QUARTER OF THE 11TH

The poets discussed in this chapter are essentially those quoted in Asadî’s Lughat i furs and in Râdûyânî’s Tarjumān al-balâghah, as well as a few others who can confidently be regarded as their contemporaries. Asadî’s work cannot be dated precisely, but its author was still alive some years after 458/1066.1 It appears that Asadî continued to revise the work up until the end of his life and indeed that he left it unfinished at his death.2 The family represented by the Vatican and India Office manuscripts contains a few quotations from poets of the first half of the 6th/12th century, namely a number of verses by Mu‘izzî and one by Khâtûnî, as well as one by Māhsatî, who would appear to have lived in the same period. These are missing in the other manuscripts and evidently represent very early interpolations. Apart from these, everyone quoted by Asadî can safely be assumed to have made his name as a poet by the end of the third quarter of the 11th century at the latest. (This is naturally not true of the poets quoted only in the marginal additions to manuscript nūn, which have nothing to do with Asadî. These contain many samples of verse of the 6th/12th century). Râdûyânî’s work was evidently written after 482/10893 and in any event before Ramadan 507/1114, the date of the unique manuscript. Râdûyânî quotes on the whole the same poets as Asadî. To these two 11th century sources we can add two from the 12th century, namely

1 See below, no. 37.
2 This is suggested in the introduction in manuscript P.
3 See Ateg’s introduction, p. 29-34, and below, no. 28.
1. A long qaṣīdah by one `Abhari in praise of the Seljuq Aḥmad Rakhshān (455/1063 to 465/1072); the king's name is mentioned in the 3rd verse is quoted by Jājarmī. Hidayat, who quotes a dozen lines from the same poem, as well as some other verses, calls their author `Abd al-Majīd `Abhari Ghaznavī, evidently identifying him with the `Abd al-Majīd `Abhari whom `Auffī had included near the end of his chapter devoted to what he rather inadequately calls the Seljuq poets of Ghaznī and Lahore (and which in fact contains mainly the panegyrists of the later Ghaznavids). If the two are in fact identical it would seem that `Auffī lacked reliable information about when this poet lived. But perhaps we have rather two different `Abhariī.


2. Abū 1-`Abbās al-Fadlī b. `Abbās al-Rabinjānī in the author of a poem, quoted in various anthologies, lamenting the death of the Samanid Nasr (II) b. Abnād (which occurred on 1 Shabān 331/943) and the succession of his son Nūḥ. It is likely that the numerous verses attributed in the Lughat i furs (and later dictionaries) to Abū 1-`Abbās (i.e. `Abbāsī), or to `Abbāsī belong to the same poet. The fragments of his work indicate that he was at one point exiled from his native country and took refuge in Farghānah.


Tha'libī, Thimār al-qulāb, Cairo 1326/1908, p. 147-8; LF (see indexes); Rādūyānī p. 25; `Arūfī.
3. A single verse by Abū 'Abīr 'Anbarī (or 'Abbāsī) is quoted in Asadī's LF, s.v. farkand.

4. A handful of verses by Abū 1-'Alī al-Shushtarī are quoted by Asadī and Rādūyānī; the latter authority mentions also a treatise of his on prosody. He must have lived well before the time of Manṭūchihri, as the latter mentions him in a list of ancient poets.3

LF (see indexes); Rādūyānī p. 2, 49, 74, 85; Waṭwāṭ p. 46; Qazwīnī in his edition of 'Arūḍī p. 127 n. 1; S. Naftīṣī, 'Abū 1-'Alī 1-Shustarī', Sharq 1/5, 1310/1931, p. 265–8; LN s.v. 'Abū 1-'Alī' p. 634; Safā, Tārīkh 11* p. 438–9; Khaiyām-pūr p. 20; Lazard, Poètes I p. 15 n. 2; Eīr s.v. 'Abūl'-1-'Alī 1-Soštari' (M. Zand).

5. Abū 'Ali Ṣahibī is credited with one verse in manuscript sīn of LF (ed. Iqbal p. 427; also in Sībāḥ p. 276).

Cf. LN s.v. 'Abū 'Ali' p. 674.

6. Abū 'Ali Šīmūr was the governor of Khurāsān on behalf of the Samanids from 380/990–1 onwards, later rebelled against them and died in 387/997. One of his verses is quoted in the Vatic-an manuscript of LF, s.v. sīn.

Cf. Lazard, Poètes I p. 14; Khaiyām-pūr p. 94.

7. Two verses are attributed to one Abū 'Aṣīm in LF (see indexes).

Cf. LN s.v. 'Abū 'Aṣīm' p. 568–9; Khaiyām-pūr p. 19.

1Thus LF, Ms. 1ain.

2LF, Ms. sīn.

3Dīwān, ed. Dabīr-Sīyāqī p. 113.

8. Abū Dharr al-Būzjānī was a Sīfī saint. Jāmī tells us that Sebūktīgin (reg. 366/977 to 387/978) visited him and presented him his infant son Māhānūd (born 361/971–2). The same authority adds that the saint died in 387/978. Apart from one Arabic and two Persian verses quoted by Jāmī we have a single verse attributed to (presumably the same) 'Bū Dharr' in the marginal additions to manuscript nūn of LF s.v. sangalah.

LF (ed. Iqbal) p. 501; Jāmī, Nafabāt p. 322; Hīdūyāt, Riyād p. 43; Hīdūyāt, Majmā' I p. 67; Buzurg I p. 40; LN s.v. 'Abū Dharr i Būzjānī' p. 454; Khaiyām-pūr p. 17; Lazard, Poètes I p. 14; Eīr s.v. 'Abū Ḍarr Būzjānī' (M. N. Osmanov).

9. Abū 1-Haitham Gurgānī is the author of a didactic qaṣīdah (inc. yak-‘st ṣurāt i har nau a nēst z-In t gudhār e chī-ṟā kih hai‘at i har ṣurāt-e bawad bīsīyār) which has been preserved for us thanks to the two commentaries written to answer the long series of philosophical-theological questions posed by it: one by an anonymous pupil of the author (who is perhaps identical with the Muḥammad b. Sūrkh al-Nāṣībūrī, whose commentary on the poem is mentioned by 'Ali b. Ẓaid b. Bāqira), the other the Kitāb Jāmī’ al-bikmatan by Naṣīr i Khurasan. Both commentators were Ismā‘īls, and both seem to imply that Abū 1-Haitham belonged to the same sect, though the qaṣīdah itself is written from the standpoint of taqīyāh. The first-mentioned commentary contains a somewhat mysterious passage (p. 43) where the author accuses Rūdaḵī, Shahīd al-Balkhī and Mus‘abī of having distorted Abū 1-Haitham’s thought; this would seem to imply that the latter flourished in the first half of the 4th/10th century (if not
earlier) and the lines (19-21) in which the author laments the fact that the world is at present under evil auspices would indeed seem to suggest that they were written before the spectacular political successes of the Ismâ'îlî da'wah towards the end of the 3rd/9th century.


Commentaries: Commentaire de la qasida ismaélienne d'Abu'l-Haitham Jorjani attribué à Muhammad ibn Sorkh de Nishapour... edited with a Persian and a very extensive French introduction by H. Corbin and M. Mu'In, Tehran/Paris 1955 (= Bibliothèque iranienne 6. Title also in Persian); Nasir-e Khusraw Kitab-e Jam'i al-Hikmatain Le livre réunissant les deux sagesses... texte persan édité avec une double étude préliminaire en français et en persan par H. Corbin et M. Mo'In, Tehran/Paris 1953 (= Bibliothèque iranienne 3).


10. Abū Ḥanīfah Iskāfī or Iskāfī is mentioned in three passages in the Tārikh i Baihaqī in connection with events during the early part of the reign of Sultan Ibrāhīm b. Mas'ūd of Ghaznav (451/1059 to 492/1099), where four long odes of his are quoted. His poetic career at the Ghaznavid court must, however, have begun a good deal earlier if we are to believe Sanā'ī's statement that 'Bū Ḥanīfah' wrote a poem for 'Ensūrī' (who appears to have died in the early part of Mas'ūd's reign⁴). 'Arūḍī is in any case correct in listing him among the Ghaznavid poets. 'Auffī, on the other hand, says that he flourished at the time of Sanjār, i.e. at the beginning of the 12th century, which would appear to be an error. Even greater confusion reigns with Hidāyat, who confused him with a scribe of the Samanid period, Abū l-Qāsim al-Iṣkāfī, and stated that he died in 386/996. Recently Bosworth has suggested that our poet might be identical with one Abū Ḥanīfah Panjdhī, of whom Bākharzī quotes some Arabic verses. One Persian verse by 'Abū Ḥanīfah i Iṣkāfī' is quoted in the Vatican manuscript of LF, s.v. pashang, another in the marginal additions in manuscript nūn, s.v. Bhvān.


11. Abū l-Harr (Bū l-Harr) is credited with one verse in LF, ed. Iqbal, p. 455 (also in Siḥāb p. 282). A poet of that name is mentioned also in a characteristically unflattering verse by Labībī (no. 37 of the collection by Rypka/Borecky, also from LF).

Cf. LN s.v. 'Abū l-Hurr' p. 396.

¹Thus Baihaqī.
²LF, 'Arūḍī, 'Auffī.
³See below, no. 149.

¹No. 303.
12. Abū l-Harth (or: al-Hārith) Harb b. Muḥammad al-Qazı-warī al-Harawī is included by 'Aufrī in his chapter on the Ghaznavid poets where we find a ghazal of six verses and a rubā‘ī. Two further verses by ‘Haqq-warī’ are quoted in the marginal additions to manuscript nūn of LF.


13. Abū 1-Khaṭīr Munajjīmī Gūrgānī (or: Gurgānī) is quoted as the author of two verses in manuscript sīn of Asadī’s Lughat i Furs,5 to which Nakhjavānī’s Sīḥāb al-furs6 adds one further verse.

Cf. LN s.v. ‘Abū 1-Khaṭīr’ p. 448.

14. Abū Laiḥ al-Ṭabarī, who was known already to Rādūyānī, is the author of a ghazal of seven verses quoted by ‘Aufrī in his chapter on the Ghaznavid poets. He is presumptively identical with the author of the ode which Jāfarī ascribes to Bā Laiḥ Gurgānī. Ḥidāyat, who calls him ‘Abū Laiḥ Ṭabaristānī Gurgānī’, adds a third poem.

Rādūyānī p. 39 (and Atesh ad loc.); ‘Aufrī II p. 66; Jāfarī II p. 475-9; Ḥidāyat, Majma‘ I p. 81-2; Buzurg I p. 263; LN s.v. ‘Abū Laiḥ’ p. 790-1; Safā, Tārīkh I6 p. 598-9; Khalīyām-pūr p. 23.

15. Abū 1-Mathāl al-Bukhārī is included by Ḥarūdī and by ‘Aufrī, who quotes three of his

verses, among the poets of the Samanid period. There is a verse by Ḫusrawwānī lamenting his death.1


16. Abū 1-Muʿayyad al-Balkhī merits a brief entry in ‘Aufrī’s chapter on the Samanid poets. His versification of the story of Yūsuf and Zulaikḥā is mentioned in one of the versions of the preface to the poem on the same subject formerly attributed to Firdausī (ed. Efē, v. 170-1). His main importance, however, was as an antiquarian and prose writer. A work with the title Kitāb i ‘ajā‘ib i barr wa bahr, apparently written jointly by Abū 1-Muʿayyad and one Bishr Muqāssim, is quoted in the Tārīkh i Sistān (p. 13) and the other reports of ‘marvels’ which the same history gives on the authority of Abū 1-Muʿayyad come presumably from the same work. We possess in fact a geographical work entitled ‘Ajā‘ib al-dunyā (or ‘Ajā‘ib al-ashyā‘)2 which, at least according to its preface, was written by ‘Abū 1-Muʿayyad Abū Muḥī al-Balkhī for the Samanid Nūh b. Manṣūr (365/975-6 to 387/997), but as that book clearly belongs to a much later period the connection between Abū 1-Muʿayyad and Nūḥ cannot be regarded as assured. His version of the Shāh-nāmah (apparently in prose) is mentioned in the Tārīkh i Balʿamī, by ‘Unṣūr al-Maʿallī and Ibn Isfandīyar. al-Bairūnī refers in one passage to a Shāh-nāmah by a certain Abū ‘Alī Muḥammad b. Ahmad al-Balkhī al-Shā‘īr,3

1Thus vocalised (apparently by Muș‘in) in the second LN article devoted to this poet, for the ḥfwry given in ‘Aufrī and in LF (at least according to Iqţāb); Ḥidāyat has ḥfwry.
2Thus only in Sīḥāb, p. 180.
3LF, ed. Iqţāb, p. 293.
4Sīḥāb, p. 180, in one manuscript.
6p. 226.

3See below, p. 228. 4See PL II p. 123-4 and Efē s.v. ‘Ajā‘ib al-Donyā (L.P. Smirnova).
which he tells us was based on the Kitāb siyar al-mulūk of Ibn al-Muqaffa’ and other sources; it is possible that this 'Abū 'Ali' is identical with Abū Mu‘a‘iyad, i.e. he was the father of a man with the given name (ism) 'Ali and the honorary title (laqab) al-Mu‘a‘iyad. The Mujmal al-tawārīkh, speaking of the various recensions of the Iranian national saga, mentions a number of works 'in prose' by 'Abū l-Mu‘a‘iyad' (in the manuscript used by the editor the name is followed by a lacuna in which the word 'Balḵi' could be restored) such as the stories of Narīman, Sām, Ka‘b Qubād, Aḥrār yāb etc.; it is not clear whether these were separate works or rather parts of his Shāh-nāma. In the same category must be placed also his Kitāb i Karshāhp, mentioned in the Tārīkh i Sīstān (p. 35).


17. Abū l-Mu‘a‘iyad al-Raunaqī al-Bukhārī is another of the Samanid poets quoted by 'Aufl; Wālihī claims to know more precisely that he lived during the time of the last Samanids and of the first Ghaznavids. It is perhaps possible that some of the fragments which the sources attribute to 'Abū Mu‘a‘iyad’ belong to him rather than to his namesake from Balḵ.


18. Abū l-Muṣaffar ‘Abd al-Jabār b. al-Ḥasan al-Baiḥaqī al-Jāmī, the ǧāhīb al-barīd at Nāsībūr during the time of Mas‘ūd, is frequently mentioned in Baiḥaqī’s history of the period. His contemporaries Tha‘ālibī and Bākhārsī both quote a number of his Arabic verses, and Ibn Funduq, after referring to the two afore-mentioned literary historians and repeating a few of the Arabic verses that they had added, adds three more in Persian. It is likely that he is also the author of the verse which the Vatican manuscript of LF, s.v. ʿābād, attributes to 'Abū l-Muṣaffar j.kh.j.

LF (ed. Horn) p. 34; Tha‘ālibī, Tātīmmāh II p. 90-1; Bākhārsī no. 405; Baiḥaqī (see the index, s.v. ‘Jāmī’); Ibn Funduq p. 178-9: ‘A. Iqbālī, ‘Abū l-Muṣaffar ‘Abd al-Jabār b. Ḥusayn (sic) i Jāmī (az shu‘arā i nīmah i awall i garn i panjum), Shary I, 1310ah./1922, p. 705-8; LN s.v. ‘Abū l-Muṣaffar’ p. 843; Khāyām-pūr p. 23.

19. Abū Naṣr Ahmad b. Ḫabrām al-Ṭālīqānī was one of the panegyrics of the Seljuq minister Nizām al-mulk (d. 485/1092). Bākhārsī quotes three Arabic verses from an ode to this dignitary. ‘Aufl repeats two of these and adds two pairs of Persian verses. One further verse is ascribed to 'Bu Naṣr i Ṭālīqān' in manuscript nūn of LF.1 There are

1ed. Iqbāl p. 471.
Täliqânä, one in Dailam and the other near Marw i Rûd; if this poet was a native of the latter he might then be identical with the 'Abû Nasr i Marghâzû' to whom Asâdî attributes one verse, s.v. farhâst. Two further verses are ascribed by the same authority to an unspecified 'Abû Nasr'.

Bâkharzî no. 304; LF (references in the article); 'Auî II p. 69; LN s.v. 'Abû Nasr' p. 893 and 908; Khâiyâm-pûr p. 24 (two entries).

20. One verse by Abû l-Qâsim Mihrânî is quoted in the Vatican manuscript of LF (ed. Horn p. 83).

21. Abû Sa'îd Fa'dî Allâh b. Abî l-Khair, the famous mystic, was born (according to the hagiographic sources) on 1 Muḥarram 357/967 and died on 4 Sha'âbân 446/1054. The prose works attributed (probably wrongly) to him will be described in PL IV (Sufism); we are concerned for the moment only with his supposed rubâîya. The two principal sources for his life, the Hâlât u sukhunân i Shâîkh Abû Sa'îd b. Abî l-Khair by the saint's great-great-grandson Lutf Allâh b. Sa'îd b. As'âd b. Sa'îd b. Fa'dî Allâh b. Abû Sa'îd and the Asrâr al-tauhîd fi maqâmât al-shâîkh Abû Sa'îd, by a cousin of the preceding, Muhammad b. Munâwar b. As'âd etc., from the first and second half of the 6th/12th century respectively, both quote a number of quatrains that Abû Sa'îd is supposed to have

recited on various occasions, but both also deny explicitly that these are the work of Abû Sa'îd himself: the Hâlâtî quotes him as saying that the poetry that 'falls from my lips' is the composition of the 'arzûn, i.e. the earlier Sûfîs, and that most of it is by Abû Sa'îd's teacher, Abû l-Qâsim Bishr, while the Asrâr states (on the authority of the author's grandfather, the saint's grandson) that although some people (jamâ'at â) believe that the verses that the master recited were of his own composition, the fact is that he composed only one verse and one rubâîa (both quoted) and that everything else was a repetition of what had been composed by his pîrs. In the introduction to his edition of the poems, Sa'îd Nafîsî has attempted to refute the idea that Abû Sa'îd wrote no poetry (apart from the three verses quoted in the Asrâr) by referring to the many passages in the Asrâr, the Hâlât and other relatively early sources which refer to the recitation of verses by Abû Sa'îd, but this is really a petitio principii; the sources are unanimous in conceding that Abû Sa'îd recited poetry; they deny, however, that the verses were of his own composition. Ivanov has quite rightly emphasised that 'it is improbable that the admiring biographer of his own holy ancestor should have missed an opportunity to add to the fame of the Shaykh by corroborating the general belief in the latter's poetical talents. If he has done otherwise there cannot be any doubt that this was due to the fact that memory was still fresh and the real state of things could not be misrepresented.' Of course, this does not rule out the possibility that at least some of the verses which the older

1LF, ed. Iqâbî, p. 36; ed. Mujtabâ'i/Sâdîqî p. 44. Also in Qawwâl p. 9 and Sîbîh p. 36.

2One in ed. Iqâbî p. 477; the other is quoted s.v. sarsabêk (ed. Iqâbî p. 77; ed. Mujtabâ'i/Sâdîqî p. 69; also in Sîbîh) and attributed by some of the manuscripts to Kishâbî.

3Ed. Zhukovskiy, St.-Petersburg 1899; ed. Afsâr, Tehran 1331ah./1952 and reprints; see PL I p. 926-9.


5Old edition, p. 54.

6Old edition, p. 263.

7Calcutta catalogue p. 189-90.
sources put into the mouth of Abū Sa‘īd might indeed be of great antiquity and thus of real importance for the history of Persian poetry. At the same time it is clear that in the surviving collections any authentic kernel has been encompassed in a mass of late elaboration. The task of disentangling the two remains to be done.


22. Abū Sa‘īl al-Jurjānī is mentioned in a verse by Manūchihrī (Dīvān, ed. Dabīr-Sīyāqī p. 113) as one of the illustrious poets of Khurāsān. According to ‘Auṣī he flourished under ‘Amar b. Laith (died 287/900).


‘Auṣī II p. 2-3; Shams p. 255, 276; Hīdāyat, Ḥajja’ p. 66; Khāyām-pūr p. 18; EIr s.v. ‘Abū Salīk’ (M.N. Osmanov).
23. Abu Shakhur al-Balkhi is the author of the *Afif-nama*, completed, according to *Afif*, in 336/947-8. A verse apparently belonging to this work (Lazard’s fragment 186) seems to indicate that he began work on the poem in 333, and another (fragment 130) that he began ‘this book’ at the age of 33; it has thus been deduced that the poet was born in 300/912-3. The *Afif-nama* was apparently a long *mathnawi* in mutaqarib metre, largely of moralising content. Besides the fragments explicitly assigned to Abu Shakhur, Sa‘id Na‘fis [followed (with a certain amount of hesitation by Lazard)] has attributed to the *Afif-nama* a number of further verses quoted anonymously in the *Tubah al-muluk*. We also have a fair number of fragments of Abu Shakhur’s lyrical poems.


24. Abu Shuaib Salihi b. Muhamad al-Harawi is included by ‘Afif among the poets of the Samanids. We have no more precise indication of his dates apart from the (highly questionable) statement by Hidayat that he was born during the last years of Rodaki’s life, i.e. towards the middle of the 4th/10th century.


25. Abu Zura‘ah al-Mu‘ammari (or al-Ma‘ari?) al-Jurjani is mentioned in *Afif*’s chapter on the Samanid poets in connection with an unnamed amir of Khurasan, who asked Abu Zura‘ah whether he could compose poems as well as Rodaki, whereupon he produced three verses affirming his superiority over that poet.


26. Abu 1-Hasan ‘Alb l. Ilyas al-‘Aghaji al-Bukhari is mentioned in *Arudi’s* list of the

*The name is given thus by *Afif*. Besides the form A/‘Agaji of -ch (The ‘Elbi, *LF*, Radiani etc.) we find also A/‘Agah’ (I‘Agh). We have here a type well attested during the Ghaznavid period and later, for a high-ranking court official, roughly a chamberlain (Arabic ba‘ij). It has frequently been claimed that the word is Turkish (evidently only because of its similarity with the well-known Turkic-Mongolian title *agha*) but this has been doubted by Doerfer II p. 72, and Horn, *Einl.* p. 17, has already quite rightly drawn attention to the unlikelihood that a Turkish title should have been in use as early as the time of the Samanids. However, his own suggestion that *Aghaji* is ‘wohl Nebeneros von *aghā* “Anfang” is unsatisfactory both from a semantic and from a phonetic point of view (Persian *aghā* is a loan-word from Sogdian and has *-z*, not *-ch*, in both languages). I wonder whether at least the shorter of the two forms given above might not be connected with Sogdian *āgya*, ‘covering’, with the suffix -i (< *hik*) (for Buddhist Sogdian *ha* and its cognates see D.N. Mackenzie, *The Buddhist Sogdian texts of the British Library*, Leiden 1976, II p. 73, and for the assimilation of *d*-cf. see L. Gershevilich, *A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian*, Oxford 1954, §288). *āgya* (< *hik*), ‘coverer’, i.e. ‘one who veils the king from the public’, would be a close parallel to (and perhaps even a translation of) the corresponding Arabic title, *ba‘ij*. The longer form (*d/aghāji*) is more difficult to account for, but one might venture to suggest
Samanid poets. ʿAufī includes him in his chapter on the ‘great kings’ who indulged in poetry, calls him an saʿIr and states that he was himself the subject of panegyrics, and on the basis of this Naftisī (apparently encouraged by Ḥidżayy’s uncontrollable statement that Ṭẖāhjī served as a governor in Kirmān) has suggested that our poet was in fact the brother of the ruler of Kirmān, Mūḥammad b. ʿĪyas (died 356/967 or 357/968). But this suggestion seems gratuitous, especially since Thaʿālibī (writing about two centuries before ʿAufī) says nothing of our poet being a prince. Moreover, the title Ṭẖāhjī is not that of a prince, but of a court official. ʿAufī states further that Ṭẖāhjī was a contemporary of Daqīqī and proceeds to quote a number of fragments of his, including a Persian rendering of a verse attributed to ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib, and two verses in which he brags of his proficiency in such courtly talents as horsemanship, archery, chess-playing and poetics. An Arabic translation of the last-mentioned verses by Abū l-Qāsim ʿĪsamī b. Ahmad al-Shajārī, who lived at the time of the collapse of the Samanid kingdom, is quoted in Thaʿālibī’s Yatīmat al-dahr (where li l-aʿṣājm is a misreading for li l-ʾaṭḥāj); the same verses are quoted again, together with two other Arabic verses in the entry devoted to our poet in the same author’s Tatīmmat al-yatīmah, though here, strangely, Thaʿālibī attributes the translation to Ṭẖāhjī himself.

Thaʿālibī Yatīmah IV p. 79-80; id., Tatīmmah II p. 114; LF passim; Rāḍūyānī p. 35, 84, 95, 128 (and ʿĪṣāʾī’s notes, p. 123-4); ʿArūdī p. 28 (and Qazwīnī ad loc.); ʿAufī I p. 31-2 (and Qazwīnī’s

that it is an Arabic broken plural of the Iranian word and that the title al-ʾaṭḥājī is merely an abbreviation for ʾaṭḥājī al-ʾaṭḥājī, ‘chief chamberlain’ (cf. qūṭī l-qūṭī and the like).

and Naftisī’s notes ad loc.); Shams p. 213; Ḥidżayy, Majmaʾ I p. 11; ʿEṭāʾ, Vorl. p. 62-3; Buzurg I p. 9; Sāfī, Tārīkh I p. 429-31; ʿAlī ʿAbd al-Mūmin p. 8 (with further references); LN s.v. ʾAṭḥājī” p. 126; Lazard, Poètes I p. 14; C.E. Bosworth, Minorsky Volume p. 119; Fīr ʾAṭḥājī Bokārī” (ʿAlī, Zaryāb).

27. A single verse by one Ahmad Barmak (or Barmakī) is quoted in the Vatican manuscript of LF s.v. milk.

28. Two verses by an otherwise unknown Ahmad i Manṣūr referring to the captivity of ‘the Qara-khan’, (i.e. evidently Ahmad I b. Khīr, who was taken prisoner by Malik-Shāh in 482/1090) are quoted by Rāḍūyānī p. 23. They are important because they give the termīnus post quem for Rāḍūyānī’s book. The same verses are quoted anonymously by Wāṭāt p. 77.

29. Ahmad Wāṭātī (i?), the author of a single verse quoted by Rāḍūyānī, p. 10, is also unknown.

30. ʿAṭḥājī is the name by which the author of Warqah u Gulshāh refers to himself.2 There seems to be no other mention of him in Persian literature apart from the two verses attributed to an author of the same name in the marginal additions to manuscript nūn of Assādī’s Lughat i fars.3 The poem in question, which is preserved in a unique, but obviously very old manuscript, is a mathnawī of more than 2200 verses in mutaqārib metre and is dedicated to a patron whom the poet calls1 sultān Naḥḥād, Abū l-Qāsim, sultān i ghāzī and amīr

1Thus Siḥāb p. 187.
2p. 3 and 122.
3Ed. ʿĪṣāʾī p. 223, 305.
4p. 3.
(read: amīn?) i milāli; it would seem most likely that this is the well-known Yamān al-daulah wa Amin al-Millah Abū l-Qasim Mahmūd b. Sebūktagin of Ghaznawī (389/999 to 421/1030) though it cannot, perhaps, be ruled out entirely that a later monarch with the same kunya and ism is intended. An interesting stylistic feature of the poem is the fact that nine times² the poet interrupts the narrative to put short lyrical pieces into the mouths of various characters; these, too, are in mutaqārib, but use monorhyme.

The poem is based on the pre-Islamic Arabic story of the love of 'Urwa b. Hijām al-'Udhārī and his cousin 'Afrū'; it is found in the Kitāb al-ağhānī of Abū l-Faraj al-Isfahānī³ and was evidently the subject of a lost Kitāb 'Urwa wa 'Afrū mentioned in the Fihrist of Ibn al-Nadīm. The author himself tells us⁴ that he has extracted his poem zi akhbār i tāzī u kutb i 'arab. Ateş has claimed an influence of the Arab-Persian story on the French romance of Floire et Blancheflor, but the evidence for this is fragile.⁵

Iranian critics have been rather dismissive of the literary merits of 'Aiyūqī's poem. None-the-

---

² Other possibilities would be the Seljuk Mughṭal Abū l-Qasim Mahmūd b. Muḥammad (511/1111 to 525/1125) or the Khawārizmish Shāh Sultan-Shāh Abū l-Qasim Maḥmūd b. Tl-Arslān (568/1172-3 to 589/1193). If the former were indeed 'Aiyūqī's patron it might be possible to equate our poet with the Majd al-Dīn 'Aiyūq who 'Auīzī (II p. 384-5) includes among the Seljuk poets after Muḥīzī. Critics have however observed that the style of Qurghāt u Gulsāh points more towards the Ghaznavid than to the Seljuk school of poets.

³Bülliq edition of 1868, vol. XX p. 152-8; also in Brünnow/Fischer, Arabische Chrestomathie p. 29-36 of the Arabic section.

⁴Ed. Flügel, p. 306.

⁵P. 5 and 122.

⁶See the discussion in Melikian-Chirvani p. 10-11.

---

The beginning of the poem is lost. In the manuscript the first 16 verses (inc. ba nām-i khudāwand i bālā u past * kih az hastī-ash hast shud har chīh hast) are written, as the editor has noted, in a much later hand. In fact, all these verses are lifted word for word from the dibākāh of Khwājū Kirmānī's Humāy-Humāyūn, completed in 732/1331-2¹ (vs. 1-5 = H.-H. 1-5; vs. 6 = the last verse of the section headed dar tauḥīd; vs. 7-11 in dar naʿt; vs. 12-16 in dar ḥasab). The text contains other lacunae as well.

Ms.: İstanbul Topkapı, Hazine 841 (Karatay 386. 13th century? Pictures).

Edition: Tehran 1343sh./1964 (Ed. Dh. Şafā).


---

¹See infra, chapter IV.

There is also another anonymous, and evidently later Wargah u Gulshâh in hazâj metre (inc. in the Delhi editions: shinîdam k-andar aiyâm i payambar * yak-ê khâil-ê bud-ê bâ jáh u bâ farr). The relationship (if any) of this and of the various Turkîsh and Kurdish versions of the story to 'Aiyûqâl's poem remains to be examined.

Ms.: Tehran Ilâhiyât I p. 250 (18th-17th century? Beginning missing); Majlis VIII p. 469 no. 2617 (18th century?); Univ. XII 3880 (recent); Univ. XIV 4775 (recent); Shûrâ i Islâmî I 98 (recent).


Tehran 1331/1913-4.

31. An otherwise unknown 'All b. Ahmad wrote his Ikhtiyârât (or Intikhâb) i Shâh-nâmâh in 474 /1081-2. See below, p. 152.

32. Amir 'All Pûr i Tiqân (or: 'All-pûr Tiqân?) is credited with a total of twelve verses by Râdûyânî, half of them riddles, and a few of them are repeated by Wâtûf and (anonymously) by Shams. His identity has not been established, but he is clearly not the well-known Qarakhanid ruler Bûrîtîgîn, as the latter's Muslim name was not 'Allî, but IbrâÂîl.

Râdûyânî p. 18, 48, 100-1 (and Ateq's notes, p. 102-6); Wâtûf 16-7; Shams p. 401; Khaiyân-pûr p. 106.

33. 'All Qurî Andugânî is credited with a handful of verses in Assâdî's Lughat i furs.

LF (see the indexes to the three editions); LN s.v. 'All i Qurt (? sic) i Andukânî' p. 242-3.

34. Abü Ma'sûr 'Amârâh b. Muhammâd al-Marwâzî wrote an elegy on the last Samanid ruler, Ismâîl (II) al-Mustansîr (died 395/1005) as well as an ode to the Ghaznavid Mahammad (ruled from 388/998), both of which, along with a number of other fragments, are quoted by 'Afuî. According to the 12th century biography of Abû Sa'id b. Abî l-Khair (357/967 to 440/1049) by his great-grandson Muhammad b. Munawwar, the saint was so impressed by one of 'Amârâh's verses that he and all his disciples made a pilgrimage to the poet's grave in Marw. The story is at least chronologically possible.2 Hidâyat's statement that he died in 360/970-1 is, on the other hand, wrong.

1 The 14th century Varqâ ve Gûlshâh by Yûsuf-i Meddâh has been edited (with English translation) by G.M. Smith, Leiden 1976. In her introduction the editor makes a brief comparison of Yûsuf's poem with the two Persian versions (p. 12-15) and lists later Turkish recensions of the same story (p.15-16).

2 Ateq's reading of the name. The manuscript of the Tarjumân has wwr tky n (three clear dots under the 'p' on fol. 275a, and a fairly distinct ihmâl sign over the 'r' on fol. 242a). The reading in Ikhâl's edition of Wâtûf (‘All Yûsî Tiqân) is thus probably wrong.

The name is written thus, with fatbah on the first letter and shaddâh on the second, in both of its occurrences in Râdûyânî, as well as once in the Vatican manuscript of LF (see Horn, Einl. 24) and this reading must doubtless be accepted despite the rather ludicrous polemics by Bahâr (Fargâh 11, 1328ah./1949, p. 355, and Dânîsh 11, 1329ah. /1950, p. 121) against Ateq in favour of the reading 'Umârah, 'Amârâh, besides enjoying the support of the ancient manuscript of the Tarjumân al-bâlîghah, is definitely the lectio difficilior.

The anecdote is repeated by Jâmî (both in his Nafsâhât and his Bahûristân) and by other late authors (for whom see Ethê).
A versified Pand-nāmah ascribed to Anşārī is found in Bombay Rehatse p. 233 no. 45.

36. 'Abd Allāh al-'Arīdī (or 'Arīdī) is known to us only from the two verses of his cited in LF (see indexes).


37. Abū Manṣūr ʿAlī b. Ahmad al-Asādī al-Tūsī is the author of the Karshāsp- (or Garshāsp-) nāmah,² of five Munāzarāt, and of the oldest surviving Neo-Persian dictionary and anthology of verse, the invaluable Lughat i furs. Besides these we are very fortunate to possess a copy in his own handwriting of the Kitāb al-abniyah 'an ḫadāʾiq al-adwiyyah of Abū Manṣūr Muwaffaq b. ʿAlī al-Harawi, the oldest surviving dated Persian manuscript in Arabic script; in the colophon the scribe gives the date of completion as Shawwāl 447 (December 1055 or January 1056) and his name as ʿAlī b. Ahmad al-Asādī al-Tūsī al-Shāʾīr, from which we can conclude that he was at that time already active as a poet. His magnum opus, the Karshāsp-nāmah, was completed, as the poet tells us,

1Thus in the introductions to manuscripts P, 'ain and nūn of his Lughat i furs. Hīdīyat and others give his kunyah as Abī Naṣr.

²The expected Neo-Persian representation of Avestan Karmašasp- would be Karshāsp, and it is only the fact that this form is apparently not attested in Neo-Persian which prevents me from using it here. Since Asādī himself (in his copy of the Kitāb al-abniyah) hardly ever distinguishes between k and g, the vulgar spelling with G- has no authority, and it is indeed possible that the three dots of its -š- result similarly merely from the mis-copying of the ibnāl sign which Asādī and other early scribes customarily put over š, though a purely phonetic development of -rs- to -rsh- is perhaps not impossible (pace Justi, p. 162a). It is good to see that Khāliqi-Mūtlaq, in his new edition of the Shēh-nāmah, now also writes 'Garshāsp', rather than 'Garshāsp'.

³On the basis of this work five rubāʾīyāt were edited and translated in S. de Lagier de Beaurecueil, Khwāja 'Abdullāh Anşārī, Beyrouth n.d. (preface dated 1963) p. 308-9.
us,¹ in 458/1066 and is dedicated to a ruler of Nakhchivan whom he calls ‘Malik Bû Dulaf,’² ‘Jahândîr i Dairânî’³ and ‘zi tukhm i Barâhîm i paighambar.’⁴ This king does not seem to be mentioned in historical sources. We do know, however, of an Abû Dulaf al-Shabûbî who ruled in Nakhchivan ca. 370/980; Asadî’s patron must have been a descendant and namesake of his. Afterwards Asadî appears to have attached himself to the court of Shujâ’ al-Daulah Manûchîhr b. Shâwûr, who ruled in Ani (Armenia) as a vassal of the Seljuk Alp Arelâm from some time after 466/1072;⁵ this prince’s name (Manûchîhr) and title (Shujâ’ al-Daulah) are mentioned in Asadî’s Munâzarah i rumb u qaus. With this we lose track of him. Hidâyat’s statement that he died in 465/1072-3 is not unlikely, but, as usual, unconfirmed.

The responsibility for the extraordinary degree of confusion which for a long time surrounded Asadî’s biography rests firmly on the shoulders of that notorious liar, Daulat-shâh. According to this ‘authority’, Asadî, the author of the Karshâsp-nâmâh, was an older contemporary of Firdausî and, indeed, the latter’s teacher. He declined the invitation to write the Shâh-nâmâh and entrusted this task to his ‘pupil’, but when Firdausî was forced to flee from Ghaznah he gave his unfinished manuscript to Asadî, who composed, in less than a day, the last 4000 verses of the poem. Ethê, noticing the blatant contradiction between Daulat-shâh’s statement that Asadî was Firdausî’s elder and the author’s own statement that he completed his epic in 458/1066 (more than a century after his ‘pupil’s’ birth), attempted to reconcile the two by positing the existence of two Asadîs: Asadî père, Firdausî’s contemporary, the author of the Munâzarah (whose patron ‘Manûchîhr’ Ethê identified with Mahmûd), and Asadî fils, the author of the Karshâsp-nâmâh and Lughat i furs and the copyist of Nuwaffaq’s handbook of pharmacology. This construction, which for many years was accepted virtually unanimously by scholars,¹ was refuted by Chaykin in an article published in 1934, in which the true identity of the poet’s patron is established and other weighty arguments against the existence of an ‘older’ Asadî are adduced. Daulat-shâh’s story is, in short, pure fantasy.

The Karshâsp-nâmâh is a long epic in mutaqârib metre (inc.: sipâs az khudâ, Isad i raˇnumây * kih az kâf u nûn kard gâtî ba pay) consisting, as we are told in one of the versions of the concluding sections,² of some 9000 verses. The poem deals with the adventures of Karshâsp, the grandfather of Rustam, which, as the poet explicitly tells us (chap. 11), Firdausî had not included in his Shâh-nâmâh, despite the fact that it is ‘a branch from the same tree’, i.e. part of the same epic tradition. As for his source, the poet speaks of ‘a book of the adventures of Karshâsp’, possibly identical with the Kitâb i Karshâsp of

¹Ed. Yaghma’î, chap. 144, l. 2.
²Chap. 10, 1. 4 = ed. Huart l. 201.
³Loc. cit. Cf. chap. 5, l. 32 = ed. Huart l. 195; ‘shâh i Dairânî’. In both passages Yaghma’î omits the ‘Dairânî’ of the manuscripts to ‘Arrânî’ (thus also Hidâyat 1 p. 113), but it is doubtful whether there is any justification for this.
⁴The following verse; the meaning of the statement that the king in ‘from the seed of Abraham’ is merely that he was – or claimed to be – of Arab extraction.
⁵The date of the conquest of Ani by Alp Arelâm. See V. Minorsky, Studies in Caucasian history (Cambridge Oriental Series No. 6), London 1953, p. 58 and (for Manûchîhr) p. 80-8.

¹Rieu, Supp. p. 134, while accepting Ethê’s two Asadîs, noted already the fragility of the construction which made one the son of the other.
²Ed. Yaghma’î, p. 477, footnote 10, v. 4, from the Mashhad manuscript.
Abû Nu‘ayyad al-Balkhî, mentioned in Tārîkh-i 
Sîstân. In fact, it is clear that the story of 
Kârsâspâ is of great antiquity. The dragon-slayer 
Kârsâspâ is mentioned a number of times in the 
Avesta and figures (as Kârsâsp) significantly in 
Middle-Persian religious writings, but the story 
that Asadî tells has few points of contact with 
what we know from older sources.

Mss.: Oxford Elliot 140 (Ethê 507. Pictures); Elliot 141 (Ethê 508. Incomplete); London 
Or. 2780 I (Rieu Suppt. no. 201. Dated 8afr 800 /1397. End missing. Pictures); Or. 11586 (Mered- 
dith-Owens p. 73. 14th century? Fragments of a Ms. 
found in a binding); Or. 12805 (Meredith-Owens p. 76. 
Dated 981/1573-4. Pictures); I.O. 893 (Dated 
1003/1594-5. Damaged and incomplete); Or. 2878 
(Rieu Suppt. no. 202. 16th century? The prologue 
and epilogue omit any mention of the poet’s 
patron. Pictures); Or. 11678 (Meredith-Owens p. 73. 
Dated 1045/1635-6); Edinburgh 
Univ. 271 (16th century?); Paris Supplément 496 (Blochet 1186. 
Dated 11 Rahî-i II 1174/1760); Supplément 1376 
(Blochet 1187. Dated 26 Ramadân 1262/1846); Suppli- 
ément 1377 (Blochet 1188. Dated 4 Sha‘bân 1294 /1877); 
Hanover [acc. to Fysee, B.B.R.A.S. cata- 
logue]; Cairo 96 mîm adab fârisî (Tirzâ 1870. 
Dated 1037/1627-8); Istanbul 
Topkapi, Hazine 674 
(Karay 385. Dated 756/1354; the oldest copy. 
Pictures); Aya Sofya 3287 (Mîkûfîm-hâ p. 171 no. 

1 P. 35. 
2 Cf. H.S. Nyberg, ‘La légende de Keresâsp. Trans- 
scription des textes pehlevi, avec une traduction nouvelle 
et des notes philologiques’, Oriental studies in honour of 
Cursetiji Erchiji Pavra, London 1933, p. 336-52, reprinted in 
Monumentum H.S. Nyberg (=Acta Iranica 7), Leiden (etc.) 1975 
p. 379-95. 
3For the manuscripts see also M. Mînwâ, ’Nuskhah-hâ i 
qadîm i Garâsâsp-nâmah’, Aâdîsh u Farvarish XIV, 
1323ah./1945, p. 569-74, and J. Khâliq-Mûtlaq, Iran-nâmah 

399. Apparently dated 905/1499-1500; Tehran 
Sipah-sâlîr (Acc. to Yaghmâ’î’s edition p. xvi; 
apparently not in the published catalogue. Dated 
10 Muharram 860/1455); Millî 119 (Acc. to 
Yaghmâ’î’s. Dated 1237/1821-2); Millî 1106/1 
(Dated 1240/1824-5); Majlis III 1167 (Dated 
1264/1848); Gulistân/Athâbây 8 (Selections); 
Mashhad Ridâlì III p. 92, no. 56; Bombay 
Rehatsekh p. 164 no. 129 (End missing. ‘Seems to be almost a 
different work’, Fysee p. 14); Brebli p. xxxii 
no. 24 (Dated, according to Dabhab no. 119, 4 
Farvardîn 900 (?) Y./1530. Damaged); B.B.R.A.S. 
Persian 3 (Apparently completed on 7 Rajab 
1025/1616, though in the colophon the year has 
been altered to 625/1228); Nâvâsî Collection of 
Mîhâr Naoroji Kûtâr (acc. to Fysee, B.B.R.A.S. 
catalogue p. 14); Hyderâbâd Nâdîr Ahmad 225; 
Sâlîr Jung IV 1114/4 (17th century?). Yaghmâ’î 
mentions three further Ms. in private collections 

Extracts: Gotha 40 fol. 11b sqq. (Bahî al- 
durar).

Parts of the work are intertranslated into 
various manuscripts of the Shâh-nâmâh, or 
manuscripts containing extracts from that poem and 
from other epics such as: London 
Or. 4906 fol. 
10a-68b, 73a-101b; Or. 2926 fol. 15a-54; Paris 
Supplément 502 fol. 1r sqq.; Florence 
Laurenziana 
Or. 5; Berlin Ms. or. fol. 209; Leningrad 
Publ. 
Lib. Suppt. 90; Dorn 333; Bankîpore Suppt. I 1792 
fol. 523b-606a; and doubtless many others.

The ‘Kârsâsp-nâmah included in the Parsa 
riwâyat entitled Khulâsâh i dîn (cf. Paris Suppl. 
46 = Blochet 201/5) is not the same work.)

Editions: Paris 1926 (Le livre de Gorchâsp po- 
ème persan d’Asadî junior de Toûs publié et tra- 
duit par Clément Huart. Tome premier. No more 
published.)

1For details of these manuscripts see below, ad 
Firdausî, Shâh-nâmâh).


Translations: (Gujarati): Ms.: Navsari Meherji Rana p. 139 no. 18 (3 volumes. Dated 21 Ādar 1189 Y./1820). An extract from a Gujarati version (the story of Karshasp and the Brahmin) is found in Navsari Meherji Rana p. 139 no. 17 (two hands, dated 1178 Y./1806-9 and 1185 Y./1815-6 respectively). Breivi, p. xxxiii, mentions a Gujarati version of the Karshasp-nâmah 'made by Novroji Kavanji and printed in 1852 A.D. ... A later edition (of the same translation?) also exists in the Library.'

(French): for the first half of the poem see editions; the remainder is translated in: Le livre de Gerchâsp poème persan d’Asâdî de Toûs traduit par Henri Massé. Tome second et dernier. Paris 1951.

Asâdî's other principal poetic work is the five Munâzârat, or poetical contests, namely: (1) a debate between lance and bow (munâzârah i rumb u qaus); (2) between heaven and earth (munâzârah i âmân u zamin); (3) between Muslim and Zoroastrian (munâzârah i muslim u garb); (4) between Arab and Persian (munâzârah bā 'arab kunad ba fâdî i 'ajam); (5) between day and night (munâzârah i shab u rûz). The last-mentioned of these is quoted in extenso by Daulat-shâh and other anthologists.

Ms.: Oxford Elliot 37 fol. 222a sqq. (Ethê 1333 = Daqâiq al-ashâr).


ten-Congresses, Berlin 1882, II/1, p. 48-135 (contains an edition and translation of no. 1, 2 and 5); Ye. E. Bertel's, Пятие мунаээра Асади Тусского; UZIV 19, 1958, p. 55-88 (=editio and translation of no. 4).


LF (Two verses - one from the Karshasp-nâmâh and one from another poem - are quoted in the Vatican manuscript, ed. Horn p. 50, 72; a large number of quotations are included in the marginal additions to manuscript nûn); Watwât p. 74 (quoting a dâ-baîtî); Mustaufî (ed. Navâ'î) p. 719; Daulat-shâh p. 35-9; Hidayat, Majma' I p. 107-10 with extensive extracts from the Karshasp-nâmâh); V. Rugarli, 'Il libro di Gershasp, poema di Asâdî', Giornale della Società asiatica italiana IX, 1896, p. 33-80; K.I. Chaykin, 'Асәди старший и Асәди младший', Федоров 934-1934, Leningrad 1934, p. 119-60; M. Molé, 'Garâsarp et les Sagars', La nouvelle Clio III, 1951, p. 128-33; LN s.v. 'Asâdî'; Khayyâm-pûr p. 38-9 (with further references); Šâfâ, Târîkh II' p. 403-21; Shaffî'I-Kadkani, Šuwar p. 613-25; J. Khâliqi-Mutlaq, 'Gar-dish-I dar Garshasp-nâmâh', Irân-nâmâh I, 1362sh. /1983, p. 380-423, 513-589, II, 1362sh. /1983, p. 94-147; N. Amirî, 'Lughât i 'arabî dar Garshasp-nâmâh', Nâm-wârah i Duktur Mabûdî i Afsâhî III, 1-3.

The two verses are quoted also, to illustrate the same lemmata, in Sibâh p. 147, 173.
38. Abū Nazar 'Abd al-‘Azīz b. Mansūr al-‘Asjadi al-Marwāzi eulogised the Ghaznavids Māmūd and Mas‘ūd (I) and appears to have survived into the reign of Maudūd (432/1041 to 440/1048), if we are to believe Mu‘izzī when he reminds one of his patrons that the father of the latter had vouched for ‘Asjadi ‘in the days of Chaghri and Maudūd’.

Miss: A selection of his poems is found in Tehran Univ. IX 2487 (17th century).


39. Abū Bakr2 (or: Abū l-Mahāsin3) al-‘Azraqī

1‘Azraqī’s personal name is not indicated in the biographical sources. Qazwī (ad ‘Arūdī p. 174) proposed tentatively that his name might have been Ja‘far on the basis of the verse in his Diwatn (ed. Naftsi no. 64, v. 2281) which reads gur ba zarr i ja‘farī īstam na-girī, khusrau-ñ s be-nawāl-ñ-hā u sarak-hā khwaram man ja‘farī. It might be noted that the rhyme guarantees that the last word is indeed ja‘farī (with gār i ma‘rūf) and that it is thus impossible to read man ja‘far-ñ, ‘I, a (man called) Ja‘far’.

2No. 5. The poem does occur in the 13th century London manuscript, Or. 3713, on fol. 23a, but with the superscription wa la-hu fi-bi, implying (perhaps implausibly) that it was dedicated to the same patron as the previous poem in this collection, i.e. Tughān-shāh. Incidentally, there is often considerable discrepancy between this old manuscript and the edition with regard to the names mentioned in the superscriptions.

3Above, p. 82.

4See below, p. 118.
have been in the first decade of the 11th century. Taqī Kashfī (who was in the habit of giving totally fanciful dates for the deaths of the poets included in his anthology) says that Azraqī died in 527/1132-3 which is much too late, as Qazwīnī quite rightly observed; if Ismā‘īl was really Firdawsī’s host at the beginning of the 11th century he is not likely to have had a son who lived well into the second quarter of the 12th. Despite this, Nafīsī has attempted to rescue our poet’s claim to extraordinary longevity by pointing out that some copies of Azraqī’s diwān contain a poem (no. 25 of his edition) praising the Ghaznavid Abū l-Malik Arslān-shāh (509/1115 to 512/1118) and another (no. 24) dedicated to his successor Yāmīn al-daulah Bahram-Shāh (512/1118 to 547/1152). But Nafīsī himself admits that he found the first of these poems in only two (unspecified) manuscripts and the second in only one and that their authenticity is thus far from certain. To this I can add that neither of the poems is to be found in the excellent 13th century London manuscript of Azraqī’s diwān.

‘Aufī states that Azraqī versified the book of Alfīyīh wa Shalīfīyīh (or however the title is to be read) in order to cure his master Tughān-shāh of impotence and proceeds to give a lurid description of how the remedy took effect. Azraqī’s poem is doubtless connected with the (lost) Arabic works Kitāb al-alfiyyah al-ṣaghīr and ...al-kabīr listed by Ibn al-Nadīm under the heading ‘books written about sexual intercourse in the guise of titillating anecdotes’. ‘Aufī adds that Azraqī’s poem was illustrated. Bāhraqī tells us how Mas‘ūd had one of his pleasure-domes decorated with copulation scenes from the ‘book of Alfīyīh’, evidently not Azraqī’s version, though the latter could well have been the object of the (lost) ‘refutation’ (Nafīsī dat kitāb Alfīyīh wa Shalīfīyīh which Abū Bakr b. Khusraw al-Uṣūd wrote for the atabeg of Azerbaijan, Qızil Arslan (581/1186 to 587/1191).3

Some late authors (Daulat-shāh and Hājjī Khalīfah, both expressly on the authority of others) claim that Azraqī ‘wrote’ (i.e. presumably versified) the Sindbād-nāmāh, but as long as no quotations from this work have been identified this cannot be regarded as certain. There are two references to the story of Sindbād in Azraqī’s diwān: in one3 the poet appears to claim the authorship not only of the akhba‘r i Sindbād, but

---

1 al-Fihrist, ed. Flügel, p. 314.
2 P. 121.
3 Mentioned in the introduction to Abū Bakr’s Muḥiṣn-nāmāh; see G.M. Meredith-Owens, Minorities Volume p. 435.
5 No. 7, v. 191. This poem is something of a problem insofar as it occurs also in copies of the diwān of Mukhtarān, including the oldest copy, London Or. 3713, completed in 637/1239. However, the same manuscript also contains the diwān of Azraqī and attributes the poem to him as well (fol. 33a). Mukhtarān did indeed write, if not a Shah-nāmāh, at least a Shahryār-nāmāh and this might be seen as an argument for attributing the poem to him. Cf. the edition of Mukhtarān’s diwān by J. Hume‘ī, Tehran 1341/1962 p. 80-1 (note that Hume‘ī misquotes the number of his codex optimus as Or. 4514 – this is in fact a different, later copy of the diwān – and overlooks the fact that the manuscript attributes the poem to both poets).

---

1 apud Sprenger p. 16. Hīḍāyat puts Azraqī’s death one year earlier.
2 See his introduction, p. viii-xl.
3 I take it that Alfīyīh and Shalīfīyīh are the names of two women who figure in the story. Ḥājjī Khalīfah explains at least the first of these by saying that Azraqī’s poem dealt with a woman who had had a thousand (alif) lovers. The second name was presumably invented to rhyme with the first; compare, however, (non-standard) Arabic shallāfah, ‘prostitute’.
also of the ṭariḵh-i Shāh-nāmeh; but - assuming the poem is indeed by Aẓraqī - it would seem more likely that the author is in fact alluding to two well-known poems from the past. In the other Aẓraqī says that the 'poetry' in the counsels of Sindbād is 'difficult' but that he will elucidate its 'expressions' (maʿānī) if the king gives him sufficient funds. This would seem to refer to a 'difficult' older version of the story (perhaps Bīdakī's?) which Aẓraqī is proposing either to replace by a more up-to-date version, or perhaps merely to supply with a commentary. In either case it is by no means certain that Aẓraqī ever carried out this undertaking; the account of how Aẓraqī 'wrote' the Sindbād-nāmah may have been extrapolated from these verses.

Aẓraqī's diwān, of which three 13th century manuscripts have been reported (in Dublin, London and Cambridge), and from which, moreover, 'Auñī quotes a good number of poems, would seem a very promising candidate for a critical edition.

Ms.: Dublin Beatty 103 V (Ms. completed Dhū l-hijjah 699/1300. End missing); London Or. 3713 fol. 18b-35b (Rieu Suppt. no. 211 III. Ms. completed 5 Safar 697/1298); Or. 3376 fol. 109a-129a (Rieu Suppt. no. 234 III. Dated 2 Dhū l-qa'dah 1002/1594. Imperfect); S.O.A.S. 35350 (Dated 1006/1597-8); Or. 2880 fol. 140b-197b (Rieu Suppt. no. 224 III. Completed Jamādā I 1245/1829); Or. 2995 fol. 2b-87a (Rieu Suppt. no. 223 I. Dated 10 Ramadān 1264/1848); Or. 909: Cambridge Or. 1724/4 (Dated Rajab 604/1208, according to Mīrūf- ḥānī I p. 541); Browne Coll. V.4 (Pictures); Paris Supplément 725 I (Blochet 1206. 16th cen-

tury?); Supplément 724 (Blochet 1207. Dated 12 Ramadān 1008/1600); Supplément 701 (Blochet 1246. Dated 8 Shābān 1016/1607. Contains the diwāns of Aẓraqī and of Zāhīr al-dīn Fārīyābī, but the pages are in disorder); Berlin Sprenger 1384 (Persbach 711. Dated 27 Jamādā II 1044/1634); İstanbul Hakkı-oğlu ʿAli Pāşa 669/7 (Mīrūf- hānī I p. 461); Madinah ʿArif Hikmat 39 (Nūshkhāh-hā V p. 484); Isfahan (Nūshkhāh-hā VI p. 596); Tehran Majlis 6228/3 (Munz. no. 21485 inspexit. Dated Rabī I 996/1588); Majlis III 1183/2 (Dated 1003/1594-5); Adabiyāt II p. 11 (Dated 1007/1598-9) [Munz.]; Malik 4829 (Munz. no. 21486 inspexit. 16th century?); Majlis III 1058-9 (Dated 1010/1601-2); Adabiyāt I p. 245 (Dated 20 Ramadān 1013/1605); Univ. VIII 1408/2 (Dated Shawwāl 1015/1607); Milī 200/1 (Nūshkhāh-hā VI p. 194. Dated 1045/1635-6); Majlis II 349 (Dated 1026/1719-2); Dānish-saray-i ʿAli (Nūshkhāh-hā V p. 640. Dated 13 Shābān 1219/1804); Majlis 4684/1 (Munz. no. 21504 inspexit. Dated 1256/1840); Majlis II 348 (Dated 1261/1845); Gulistan/Khānāy 7 (Dated 1287/1870-1); Malik 4956/1 (Munz. no. 21496 inspexit); Milī II 569/3; Adabiyāt II p. 16 [Munz.]; Milī IV 1973 (16th century?); Milī V 2694 (18th century?); Milī 39 (Nūshkhāh-hā IV p. 158); Malik 5174 (Munz. 21517 inspexit); Shūrā-i Islāmī I 91 p. 64-114; Qum Mar'āšhī XIV 5415 (17th century?); Rasht p. 1121 (17th century?); Kashan (Nūshkhāh-hā VII p. 730. Qajar period); Mashhad Ridawī VII 346 (Dated 20 Muḥarram 1011/1602); Ridawī VII 344 (Dated Rabī I 1261/1845); Ridawī VII 343 (Dated 1286/1872-1); Univ. 111; Tashkent Acad. 781. (Dated 1269/1852-3); Acad. 782. (Dated 1270/1853-4); Hyderabad Aṣfāfiyāh III p. 288; Lucknow Sprenger 151; Calcutta Ivanov Curzon 190 (17th century?); Nafisi (p. xii-xv) mentions various manuscripts in private collections including one completed on 2 Dhū l-qa'dah 821/1418. Cf. Munz. III 21484-528.

1no. 64, v. 2275-6:
ha ri bān d shahyār-e pand-hā i sindbād
nēk dānād k-andar ā dushār bāhad shāh-irī
mān maʿānī-hā i ā-rā yāwār i dānīsh kunās
gar kunad bakht i tō shāh-ē khāṭir-as rā yāwārā.
Selected poems: **Oxford** Elliot 37 fol. 98a (Eṭāl 1333 = Daqā'iq al-ashār); Whinfield 54 (Beeston 2662/11. Dated 9 Rajab 1012/1603); **Cambridge** Browne Coll. V.65 no. 18 (Anthology dated 27 Ramadān 827/1424); **Paris** Supplément 783 fol. 4r sqq. (Blochet 1981. 16th century?); Supplément 1252 fol. 10v (Blochet 1992. 17th century?); **Rome** Ms. Caetani 60 (Piemontese 17. Dated 1 Sha'bān 1013/1604); **Tehran** Majlis XVII 5975 (18th century?); Majlis VIII 2326 (17th century?); **Calcutta** Ivanow 927 fol. 167v-172 (Modern).

Editions: **Tehran** 1338/1357 (Ed. ʿA. ʿAbd al-Rasūlī); 1336sh./1957 (Ed. S. Nafīsī).


40. Bābā Tāhir ʿUryān is a sūfī saint and the reputed author of a number of faḥlawyāt, i.e. quatrains in ḥazaj metre and non-standard Persian. The closest thing that we have to a historical fact about him is the story that Rāwandī tells us about his meeting with Toghril at the time when the latter entered Hamadan, i.e. in 447/1055. Attempts to deduce the date of his birth from one of the quatrains are pure speculation.¹ He is not mentioned as a poet by any early source; it is particularly striking that Shams i Qais, who devotes an extensive discussion to faḥlawyāt, mentions only Bundār (q.v.) and not the supposedly so famous Bābā Tāhir as an author of such pieces. Attempts by various scholars to determine the dialect basis of the quatrains have not led to coherent results. It seems most probable that the recitation and copying of the poems by speakers of several idioms have resulted in a dialect mixture.

His du-baitās have been noted in the following manuscripts: **London** I.O. 4582/7 (Dated 1274/1858); **Paris** Supplément 1542 (Blochet 1072. 19th century); Supplément 1435 fol. 5 sq. (Blochet 2183. Manuscript dated 1 Dhū l-bijjah 1262/1846); **Berlin** Minutoli 297 (Pertsch 697); Ms. or. oct. 1151 (Heinz 85); **Leningrad** Acad. A67 (Index 1726. Dated 1204/1789-90); Univ. 1280, 1281a (Tagirdzhano- p. 6); **Konya** Museum 2547 (Dated 1284/1444-5, according to M. Minuvi, NDAT IV/2, 1235sh./1946, p. 54-9); **Baku** I 337 (Dated Shawwāl 1278/1862); **Tehran** Majlis XVII 5975/57 (16th-17th century?); Univ. XIII 4361 (17th-18th century?); Univ. XIII 4430 (19th century?); **Masnad** Univ. 332/5 (Ms. contains the date 14 Muḥarram 1264/1847); Riddawī VII 930 (Dated Shaʾbān 1222/1807); Univ. 318 p. 12-23 (Dated 29 Dhū l-bijjah 1292/1876); **Calcutta** Ivanow 923 fol. 310. Further late MSS. in Munz. IV p. 2827-8.

**Editions:** **Tehran** 1274/1857-8; 1306sh./1927 (ed. W. Dastgīrdī); reprinted several times; 1336sh./1957 (ed. H. K. Kirmānī); 1384sh./1976 (J.

¹By calculating the numerical values of the letters occurring in certain words Mirza Mehdi khan deduced that he was born in 326/973-8. On the basis of the word alf occurring in the same poem Yāsami concluded that he was born in A.D. 1000. Of course, time-reckoning on the basis of anni domini was unknown even to the Christians in mediaeval Persia.
Maqsūr, Sharb i abwāl u āthār u du-baitī-hā ī Bābā Tāhir ī 'Uryān; contains on p. 85-184 an edition of 365 quatrains and 4 ghazals; 1363sh./1984 (ed. M. Ištāhī-Gumshārī, 2nd edition); Bombay 1297/1880; 1301/1883-4; 1308/1890-1 (96 p. Collection of quatrains ascribed to Khayyām, Bābā Tāhir, Aḥbāb Saʿyīd and Aḥsānī, together with the latter's Munāṣṣīt); London 1902 (The Lament of Bābā Tāhir, being the Rubāʿīyat of Bābā Tāhir, edited and translated by E. Heron-Allen with a verse rendering by E.C. Brenton), Lahore 1924 (ed. Maulawī Wajīhāt Hu-sain);


Translations: besides those mentioned under 'editions': (German verse): G. L. Lessczynski, Die Rubāʿīyat (sic) des Bābā Tāhir 'Uryān oder die Gottestränen des Herzen aus dem west-medischen (sic) Originale..., Munich n.d. [1920].


41. Badī'ī and 42. Badā'ī'ī: The former is included by 'Aufī among the poets of the Samanid period. He gives his name as Abū Muhammad al-Badī'ī b. Muhammad b. Mahmūd al-Balkhī and quotes a number of verses2 from an ode in praise of Abū Yahyā (sic) Tāhir b. al-Fadl al-Sağhānī (died 381/991)3 and two verses from another poem. Hindiyat4 attributes six verses from the mentioned ode to a poet whom he calls Muhammad b. Mahmūd Balkhī, with the pen-name Badā'ī'ī, and whom he claims to have been a contemporary of Sultan Mahmūd. The same author then proceeds to say that this Badā'ī'ī is the author of the Pand-nāmah i Anōshērūwān, from which he quotes 91 verses, most of which can be found in the poem published by Schefer as Rābat al-insān. Naftī suggested, with a certain amount of hesitation, that Hindiyat might have confused two different poets, 'Aufī's Badī'ī and the author of the Pand-nāmah, who, in the manuscript from which Hindiyat transcribed his extracts, was apparently called Badā'ī'ī. This would seem to be confirmed by the discovery of a second manuscript of the poem in Leningrad, which the hand-list indicates as the Pand-nāmah i Noshērūwān i 'Adil by Muhammad

---

2Seven in Browne's edition, eight in Naftī's, with four more verses, from 'other manuscripts', in a footnote.
3See below, p. 230.
b. Mahmūd Badrī i Bahkhī. If the author's name is really given in this form in the manuscript one should perhaps reconsider the possibility that he is in fact identical with the poet mentioned by 'Aūfī, but this requires confirmation. One verse by (the same?) Badrī i Bahkhī is quoted in Siḥbā b. 269, and one by Badrī i Bahkhī in manuscript nūn of LF (ed. Iqbal p. 474).

The manuscript used by Hidāyat included a fair number of verses missing in Schefer's copy, among them the first six verses of the poem. Instead of these Schefer's version has a prose introduction in which the name of the author is given as 'Sharīf i shā'ir i jawa'ī and the title of the poem as Rūbat al-insān. But this introduction as clearly spurious; Fouchécour has observed that it is virtually identical with the introduction in two manuscripts of a Rūbat al-insān in prose and that it was from this work that the copyist has lifted it.

This Pand-nūmah (inc.: sipās az khudwānd i charkh i buland * kih dar dil na-gunjadi az sān chūn u chand) purports to contain the wise sayings which Anšāh al-Ruwwān had inscribed on the 23 turrets of his throne. These are then given in 98 stanzas of 4 rhymed couplets each in mutaqārib metre. Basing himself on the fact that the poem quotes two verses by 'Unsūrī, Schefer claimed that 'l'auteur a dû être le contemporain d'Onsory ou vivre peu d'années après lui', and Nafisi has also argued that the style of the poem points towards a dating in the second half of the 5th/9th century, a date accepted also by Rypka,1 Lazar2 and Fouchécour. The date of the Leningrad manuscript (708/1308-9) provides, in any event, the terminus ad quem of the work. The poem is perhaps related to the (lost) Kitāb al-tāj of Ibn al-Muqaffa3 and

1 P. 251.
2 Poètes p. 28.

NINTH TO ELEVENTH CENTURY

belongs in any case to the many versions, in prose and verse, of the wise counsels of the celebrated Sassanian autocrat.

Mss.: Parīs Suppl. 1325 (Blochet 1763, who claims that the manuscript, which he considered to have been written in Turkey towards the year 1480, is 'l'original exécuté sur les ordres de l'auteur'); Leningrad Acad. C1102 (Index 479. Dated 708/1308-9).

Editions: Ch. Schefer, Chrestomathie persane I, Paris 1883, p. 206-232 (Persian section; see also his 'Notice', p. 205-7 of the French section); S. Nafisi, Mihr II, 1313sh./1934, p. 181-8, 254-64 (Based on Schefer's edition, with additional verses from Najmī).

Besides the fundamental work by Nafisi (see editions) cf. Šafā, Tārīkh i p. 422-8; Khayyām-pūr p. 81; LN s.v. Badrī i Bahkhī; Fouchécour, Moralia p. 46-9.

43. Ibn Ahmad al-Badrī al-Ghaznavī is credited with a rubā'ī in 'Aūfī's chapter on the Ghaznavid poets.

'Aūfī II p. 67; Khayyām-pūr p. 80.

44. Abū l-Ḥasan 'Allī al-Bahrāmī al-Sarakhsī is included by both 'Arūdī and 'Aūfī (who cites a dozen of his verses) among the poets of the Ghaznavid period. Rāzī says that he lived at the time of Mahmūd, while Hidāyat states that he flourished under that king's father Sebūktīgīn (died 387/984-9) and that he himself died in 500/1106-7 but these statements can hardly both be correct. A treatise on metrics with the title Kitāb ghaybat

1 Thus 'Aūfī; the ism was evidently missing already in 'Aūfī's source, since Badrī i Bahkhī is included in the section devoted to 'poets of this (i.e. Ghaznavid) period whose name and ism are not known', in Nafisi's edition (p. 298) the name is supplied as 'Hasanīyāh', but on what authority?
al-'arūḍīyīn (or: al-'arūdīyin, i.e. 'of Arabic and Persian prosody') is mentioned by 'Arūdī and by Shams and the former adds that he also wrote a work on rhymes, Kanz al-qawāfī by one 'Izz al-dīn Shāhī 'Allī i 'Izz al-dīn al-Sarakhsi, but closer examination of the book is required to determine if it really is a work of the 10th or 11th century. It would appear that the book mentioned by 'Auṣfī with the title Khujastah-nāmah also dealt with poetries.

LF passim, 'Arūdī p. 28, 30 (and Qazvīnī's notes); 'Auṣfī II p. 55-7; Shams p. 151, 159, 267; Jāucceedī II p. 457-8; Rāzī II p. 40; Hīdāyat, Majma' I p. 173; LN s.v. 'Abū l-Ḥasan 1 Bahramī' p. 400-1; Buzurg I p. 148; Khayyām-pūr p. 93 (with further references); Ṣafā, Tārīkh I p. 567-9; R. Levy, 'Kanz al-Qawāfī (or al-Qawāfī)' by 'Allī 'Izz al-dīn Bahramī-yi Sarakhsi', A Locust's Leg. Studies in honour of S. H. Taqizadeh, London 1962, p. 134-8; Eīr s.v. 'Bahramī Sarakṣī' (Z. Sāfa).

45. The Bāl'āmī who is named as the author of two verses quoted by the Farhang i Jahāngīrī is presumably one or the other of the well-known Samanid waṣīrs, Abū l-Fadl Muḥammad b. 'Ubayd Allāh al-Bal'āmī (died 329/940), or his son Abū 'Allī Muḥammad, called Amīrak (died probably after 382/992).

Collection of fragments (2 verses), French translation, discussion and literature: Lazard, Poètes I p. 32, 135, II p. 140. See also Eīr s.v. 'Amīrak Bāl'āmī' (Dj. Khaleghi-Motlagh).

1P. 30.
2P. 159.
3In 'Auṣfī II p. 68 'Bahramī' is an error for Mukhtār. See below, no. 113.

46. Bassām i Kūrī is the author of a poem commemorating the defeat of the Kharajite leader Amīrār by Yaʿqūb b. Laith in 251/865.

Collection of fragments (5 verses), French translation, discussion and literature: Lazard, Poètes I p. 18, 57, II p. 16.

Ṭārīkh i Sīstān p. 211-2; Meier, Mahsati p. 11.

47. Bihrūz Ţabari is known to us only from 'Auṣfī, who includes him under the Ghaznavid poets and quotes two verses of his lampooning a mean patron.

48. Bundār (or Pindār?) al-Rāzī is included by 'Arūdī in his list of the poets who served the Buyyids. Musaṭāfī and Shams i Qais state that he composed fahlawīyāt, i.e. dialect poetry, and the latter quotes two verses to illustrate the metrical licenses in which he indulged (much to Shams's disapproval). Daulat-shāh adds that his patron was Majd al-daulah (387/997 to 420/1029) and that he composed poetry in Arabic, Persian and 'Dailami'. Hīdāyat, finally, who gives the poet's laqab as Kamāl al-dīn, states that both he and his patron died in 401/1010-1; this is wrong with regard to Majd al-daulah and can thus not be regarded as reliable for the poet either.

'Arūdī p. 28 (and Qazvīnī ad loc.); Shams p. 145-6; Musaṭāfī p. 723-4; Jāuncatedī II p. 487-92; Daulat-shāh p. 42-3; Rāzī III p. 21-3; Hīdāyat, Majma' I p. 171; Hīdāyat, Ṣamā' I p. 173-4; 'A. Igbīlī, 'Bundār i Rāzī, yāk-i az qadīm-tārin shu'ārā i pahlavī-zabān', Mihr VII p. 28-36; Khayyām-pūr p. 89 (with further references); Lazard, Poètes I p. 15; Eīr s.v. 'Bondār Rāzī' (Z. Sāfa).

III p. 67.
49. **Burbanī** was the father of the celebrated Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Malik al-Muʿizzī.¹ His given name must therefore have been 'Abd al-Malik. Arūḍī tells the story of his own encounter with Muʿizzī in 510/1116-7, in the course of which the latter told our informant that his father, the poet-laureate (amīr al-shuʿārāʾ) Burbanī died in Qazwīn at the beginning of Malik-shāh (i.e. not long after 465/1072-3) and handed over to his son his position at the court. 'Arūḍī then quotes a verse which the old man recited on this occasion, but it is possible that the verse is not by him, but by Adīb Mukhtar.² A rubāʿī by Burbanī is quoted by Rādūyānī, a poem of 14 verses by Jā-jarmāl and three further verses from an unidentified jūn were added by Iqbāl. Rādūyānī p. 110-1 (and Ateq ad loc.); 'Arūḍī p. 28, 41 (and Qazwīnī’s notes p. 154-5, 168-9); Jā-jarmāl II p. 481-2; Iqbāl’s introduction to his edition of the dīwān of Muʿizzī, Tehran 1318h. /1939, p. ii-iv; M. Muʿīn, ‘Burbanī wa qaṣīda haʾīn a’lā ʾrāt’, NDAT 1/1, 1327h./1948, p. 7-18; Safā, Tāhirīkh II p. 430-2; Khaiyām-pūr p. 84.

50. Abū ʿl-Fath ‘Alī b. Muhammad al-Bustī, who served as a secretary under Sbūtūgin and Mahmūd, is a well-known Arabic poet. A few fragments of Persian verse (in which, it seems, he indulged only in an amateur capacity) have come down to us as well. LF (one verse s.v. chaghd); Rādūyānī p. 85 (and Ateq’s notes, p. 94-5); Watwāt p. 57; 'Auṭī I p. 64-5; Daulat-shāh p. 26-7; Jāmī, Nafāḥāt p. 405, no. 425; Hīḍūyat, Majmaʾ I p. 70; Ethē, Vorl. p. 55-7; P. Baidāʾī, ‘Shaikh Abū ʿl-Fath i Būstī’, Amsρāhān XVIII, 1316h./1936, p. 221-4; LN s.v. ‘Abū ʿl-Fath’; Safā, Tāhirīkh I p. 457-8 Khaiyām-pūr p. 20-1; FR s.v. ‘Bustī’ (J. W. Fück); Lazard, Poètes I p. 14; Efr s.v. ‘Bustī’ (Z. Safa).

51. Abū Manṣūr Qasīm b. Ibrāhīm al-Qāʾīnī al- mulaqqaṭ bi Buzurjmihr was another bilingual poet, five of whose Arabic verses are quoted by Thaʿālībī. ‘Auṭī, who gives him the title amīr and includes him in his chapter on the ‘great kings’ who composed poetry, repeats two of these (with explicit reference to Thaʿālībī as his source) and then quotes seven Persian verses, two of them from an ode to Sultan Mahmūd. He is presumably identical with the ‘Buzurjmihr i Qasīmī’ whom Shams al-Qāṣ mentions, alongside Bahrāmī (q.v.), as one of the Persian prosodists.

Thaʿālībī, Tatimmah II p. 45; ‘Arūḍī p. 28 (and Qazwīnī ad loc.); ‘Auṭī I p. 33; Shams p. 151-2; Safā, Tāhirīkh I p. 570; Khaiyām-pūr p. 84.

52. **Daqīqī** is remembered primarily as the author of some thousand verses concerning the legend of Zoroaster and his patron, Gushtās, which Firdausī incorporated into his Shāh-nāma.¹ His name is given by ‘Auṭī as Abū Manṣūr Muhammad b. Ahmad, by others as Muhammad b. Ahmad, his birthplace as Tūs, Balkh, Samargand or Bukhārā. The dates which the anthologists give for his death are contradictory and improbable. We possess fragments of an ode which he wrote for two of the Samanids, Manṣūr b. Nūr (350/961 to 365/975-6) and his son Nūb b. Manṣūr (365/975-6 to 387/997); this gives us an approximate idea of when he flourished.

In the introduction to his Shāh-nāma,² Firdausī tells how the ‘young man’ Daqīqī undertook the versification of the Book of Kings; however he had ‘bad companions’ and was killed by one of his

¹See below, chap. III.
²See below no. 113.

¹Moscow edition VI p. 65-135.
slaves before he could complete the poem. At the beginning of the section on Gushtasp, Firdausi tells how Daqiqi appeared to him in a dream and asked him to insert into his poem the 'thousand verses' on Gushtasp and Arjasp which he had completed 'when my life ended'. Firdausi proceeds to do so, though not without some disparaging remarks on the quality of his predecessor's poetry. Firdausi's words have been widely understood to mean that Daqiqi's work on the Shāh-nāma consisted only of the verses subsequently incorporated into Firdausi's epic, but they could also mean simply that the episode in question was the last that Daqiqi completed before his 'life ended', but not necessarily the only one he wrote. That Firdausi incorporated this particular fragment into his own poem was of course a convenient way of deflecting from himself any recriminations that pious Muslims might raise against the positive image of Zoroaster in the Book of Kings; it need not mean that this was all that he had of his predecessor's work. Indeed, 'Auff says that Daqiqi wrote 20,000 verses of his Book of Kings. This is not necessarily true; however, the Tārīkh-nāma i Harāt attributes some 70 couples in mutaqārib metre and in epic style to Daqiqi, and it seems entirely possible that these are indeed fragments of his Shāh-nāma, though they could conceivably belong to a different work of his. They include what are evidently the opening lines of the poem (Lazard's fragments 267-9, beginning ba yazdān i dāwar khudāwānd i jān * kih charkh āfrīd u zamin u zamān).

In frag. 205-6 the poet says that 'Daqiqi has chosen four things from the good and bad in the world': red lips, the sound of the harp, wine and the Zoroastrian religion (dīn, var. kesh i zard-hishti). One of the basis of these verses, it has repeatedly been argued that Daqiqi was in fact a Zoroastrian; this seems, however, most unlikely. To begin with, the statement that he has 'chosen' (bar gusūdast) Zoroastrianism would be decidedly strange if the poet had been born and raised in the old religion; it would seem rather to point to a conversion. But, that a Muslim in 10th century Persia should have converted to another religion and then flaunted his apostasy in verse is something that can hardly be imagined. The verses must mean that the Muslim poet has 'chosen', 'given preference to', 'expressed admiration for' Zoroastrianism, but not actually formally adhered to it. This sentiment belongs, together with the invocation of 'idols', or with the praise of wine and other forbidden pleasures, to the stylised naughtiness of Muslim poetry and should not be regarded as an expression of religious convictions. The Muslim names that 'Auff and his successors give to the poet and to his father are not necessarily correct, but neither should they be dismissed out of hand. And the verses at the beginning of his epic (frag. 267-8) show clearly that their author was at least nominally a Sunnite Muslim.


Baihaqī p. 376-7, 386-7; LF passim (one new verse in ed. Muṣṭafā i/Sādīqi p. 197); Raḍīyanī passim; 'Arūḏi p. 39; Watūt p. 38; Shams passim; 'Auff I p. 11-3; Jājamī II p. 454-7; Ḥidrīyat, Majmaʿ i p. 214-7; Sāfī, Tārīkh i p. 406-19; Khāĭām-i Tūsī p. 210; Shaffiʿ-i Radkanī, Şuvar p. 424-9; D. J. Khalegi-Hotlieh, 'Daqiqi's Gebursaort'
slave (gulâm, presumably meaning a slave-soldier) of the amîr of Sîstân and Saffarid vassal Khalâf i Bânû; the young Farrukhî was in the service (and presumably also a slave) of a land-owner (dîhqân) in that country. On finding himself unable to support a wife on the salary he received from the latter, the young poet ran away from his master and went to the ruler of Chaghânîyân, Abû l-Muṣaffar (i.e. evidently Abû l-Muṣaffar Fâkhîr al-da‘lâh Ahmad b. Muḥammad), while the latter was supervising the branding of his colts, and attracted his attention with two opposite poems, for which he was at once richly rewarded. In the former poem the author describes his voyage from Sîstân to Chaghânîyân, and alludes to the coincidence of a Muslim ‘Id with Nau-rûz, from which it is possible to determine the date of the poem, and thus the approximate date of Farrukhî’s arrival in Chaghânîyân, as 1 Shawâl 406/March 1016. Seeing that ‘Arûdî implies that the poet was already married at the time of his arrival, he could hardly have been born much later than 385/995. Not long afterwards, the poet transferred his allegiance yet again to an even more powerful patron, Sultân

---

1For his name, see below, no. 114 (ad Munjîb).
2Dâwân, ed. ‘Abd al-Râsâlî, p. 331-3.
3In the year 385 Y. Nau-rûz, i.e. 1 Farwardîn, fell on 12 March. 1 Shawâl 406, the feast marking the end of Ramadân, corresponds, according to the usual tables, to 13 March, but the new moon could easily have been visible already on the 12th. The date of the poem was first determined by Ateq, as it turns out correctly, despite the fact that he took as his point of departure the erroneous assumption that at the time in question Nau-rûz was fixed to the vernal equinox. In reality, Muslims continued to celebrate Nau-rûz according to the Zoroastrian calendar at least until the time of the introduction of the Jalâlî calendar in 1079; this can be seen from the dates given for Nau-rûz in the Târîkh i Bâlûqî. The other date which Ateq considered, 405, is not likely: In that year 1 Shawâl fell on (roughly) 25 March 1015, Nau-rûz on 13 March.
Mahmūd. To him are dedicated the majority of the poems in Farrukhī’s dīwān where we find also a celebrated elegy on his death (Dīwān, p. 92–9), which occurred in 421/1030; besides these we find eulogies of Mahmūd’s two successors, Muhammad and Mas’ūd, including one which would appear to have been presented to the latter on ‘Id al-fitr 422/1031.1 If we are to believe Labib’s statement2 that Farrukhī died young, we cannot put his death very much later than this.3

The biographical tradition deteriorates markedly with Daulat-shāh, who tells us that Farrukhī was born in Tirmidh (a long way from Sīstān), that he was a pupil of ‘Uṣūrī and that he wrote a treatise on rhetoric called Tarjumān al-balāghah (presumably the work by that name by Rādūyānī).4

Mas. of his Dīwān: London Or. 3246 I (Rieu Suppt. no. 204. Dated Ramadān 1248/1833); Or. 2945 (Rieu Suppt. no. 203. Dated Jumād̲h II 1276/1859. The basis of the Tehran edition of 1301); I.O. 902 (incomplete); Leningrad Univ. 1003b (Romskowicz’s p. 8); Istanbul Universite FY 329 (sūlīm Rīza Pāgā 1171. Ates 8. Dated Dhal 1-Hijjah 1247/1832); Najaf 1387 (Munz. 25026. Dated Ramadān 1253/1837); 1384 (Munz. 25053); Tehran Adabiyāt I p. 266 (18th century?); Malik 5384 (Munz. no. 25024 inspexit. Dated 1249/1833-4); Majlis 5284 (Munz. 25036 inspexit); Majlis 4897 (Munz. 25037 inspexit); Majlis III 1038; Qum Mar‘ashī VI 2367; Mashhad Rīḍawī VII 508 (Dated 1125/1713); Univ. 147 (Dated 4 Rabi‘ I 1210/1795); Rīḍawī VII 502 (Dated 1 Muḥarram 1253/1837); Rīḍawī VII 505 (Dated Rajab 1263/1847); Rīḍawī VII 509 (Dated 1288/1871-2);

2See below, no. 92.
3The date given by Hīdāyat, 429/1037-8, is thus just about possible, but not that given by Taqī (apud Sprenger, p. 15) and Xdhar, namely 470/1077-8.
4The Tarjumān al-balāghah is attributed to Farrukhī already by Yaqūt.
all the Persian poets. His life very soon became shrouded in legend and all that can really be said about him with any degree of certainty is what the poet himself tells us, but even this is not always easy to discern given the textual problems posed by the Shāh-nāmah, the surviving manuscripts of which diverge immensely from one another.

The fundamental scholarly studies of Firdausi and the Shāh-nāmah remain those by Nöldeke¹ and Taqi-zādah.² The recent inception of the first really critical edition of the poem by Khāligi-Muṭlaq (the first two volumes of which are available at the time of writing) promises to put the study of the epic on an entirely new footing and to make obsolete much of what has been written up till now, including, very possibly, these paragraphs.³

¹Th. Nöldeke, 'Das iranische Nationalepos', Giron II, p. 130-211; second, much revised, edition printed separately under the same title, Berlin/Leipzig 1929; English translation by I.T. Bogdanov, Journal of the K.R. Cama Oriental Institute VII, 1930; Persian translation (Shahnâmah i millî i Turān) by B. Alawī with an introduction by S. Nafti, Tehran 1327/1.44. All references are to the 2nd German edition.

²Taqi-zādah's contributions were first published under the pseudonym 'Muḥaffalî as a series of 13 articles in the journal Kawkâb (Kaveh), N.S. 1-11, 1920-1. They were reprinted in a slightly shortened form as 'Shâh-nâmah wa Firdausî', Has. Fird. p. 17-108, and again in their original form as part of the volume Firdausî wa Shâh-nâmah i i, ed. H. Yaghmāšî, Tehran 1349/1970-1 (separate pagination). Nöldeke's appreciation of Taqi-zādah's contributions was published (posthumously) under the title 'Ein Beitrag zur Schahname-Forschung', Has. Fird. (European section) p. 58-63.

The many passages in which the poet invokes the Ghaznavid Mahmūd tell us in any event that at least the final version of the work was completed during his reign (389/999 to 421/1030). Moreover, the majority of the manuscripts of the Shāh-nāmah end with verses referring to the completion of the poem on the day Ard (25th) of Sipandarmād A.H. 400 (panj hashtād bār), i.e. 8 March 1010. However, in a number of old manuscripts the date of completion is given rather as 25 Sipandarmād A.H. 384 (sīh șad sāl u hashtād u chār), i.e. 12 March 994, and the year '384' is given as the date of the completion of Firdausī's poem also at the end of Bundarī's Arabic translation, a work that is older than any of the existing Persian manuscripts which contain the closing lines of the poem. Finally, a small number of manuscripts have, after the usual closing verses, an 'epilogue' in verse in which the author (ostensibly Firdausī himself) says that he completed the story (dāstān) in the year of the hijrah 389 (nahum sāl u hashtād bā sīr-sād) while staying with one Ahmad b. Muhammād, the ruler of Khānī in Lanjān (near Isfahān). The precise date of the completion of the poem is given first according to the Muslim calendar as Tuesday 25 Muḥarram, which in the year in question corresponds to Tuesday 14 January 999, then a few verses later, as the Persian date day Aṣāmīn (27th) of Bahman,


1The same sum is also formulated in different ways in different manuscripts. Cf. Haz. Fird p. 70.

2This was published and translated by C. Schefer in an appendix to his edition of the Safar-nāmah of Nāsir i Khusrav, Paris 1881, p. 298-302.

i.e. 14 February 999. Taqī-zādah argued that these dates belong to three successive recensions of the Shāh-nāmah: Firdausī completed his first version on 25 Sipandarmād A.H. 384 = 12 March 994, which corresponds (according to Taqī-zādah) in that year to 25 Muḥarram (the Muslim date mentioned in the 'epilogue'); the second version (to which the epilogue belongs) was completed on 27 Bahman A.H. 389 = 14 February 999 (the verses mentioning 'Tuesday 25 Muḥarram' having been wrongly introduced from the closing section of the first version), and only after this did Firdausī go to Ghaznah where he presented his third and final version of the poem to Mahmūd in the year 400/1009-10 (whereby the date '25 Sipandarmād' would have been introduced into this version from the first). This ingenious reconstruction has not met with universal approval. A number of scholars, beginning with Miḥnūwā, have argued that the 'epilogue' is not the work of Firdausī at all and that it records not the composition of the Shāh-nāmah but the copying of the text which took place not in 384 but in 584 (reading šaḥsh-sād instead of the palaeographically virtually identical sīr-sād), in which year Tuesday 25 Muḥarram would correspond to Tuesday 7 February 1290. It would thus be the anonymous 13th century scribe, and not Firdausī, who enjoyed the hospitality of the ruler of Khānī in Lanjān. Unfortunately, this does not entirely solve the chronological problems, since
25 Muharram 684 (7 February 1290) does not correspond to 27 Bahman either according to the Zoroastrian calendar, nor according to the Jalali calendar, though in the latter case the divergence is only of 5 days. Nonetheless, Minhâz is certainly right to say that the author of the 'epilogue' does not in fact explicitly claim to have composed the Shâh-nâmeh and that, moreover, it is written in a style quite unlike Firdausi’s. More recently still, Atesg has argued that the text of the epic contains allusions to events as late as 409/1019 (Mahmud’s conquest of Qannûg2), which, if correct, would mean that all of the dates mentioned in the various versions of the closing verses are too early, at least for the final version of the work. In any event, the main problem with the theory of three successive recensions is that even those manuscripts which claim the completion of the poem for 384 and thus presumably represent a pre-Ohannadiv recension of the epic, nonetheless contain passages lauding Mahmud (who did not even become king until 389/999) and in general do not seem to represent a different textual tradition from those giving the date 400. Thus, if Firdausi did compose different versions of the Shâh-nâmeh, these versions must have become so completely mixed up with one another in the subsequent manuscript tradition (and in the oral tradition) that it is now impossible to ascertain which verses belong to which recension.

The concluding section also contains (again with considerable variation from manuscript to manuscript) verses in which the poet gives his age as ‘65’, ‘71’ or ‘almost 80’ and speaks of having laboured on the epic for 35 years. Various attempts have been made to deduce from these verses the exact date of the poet’s birth1 as well as the date when he began work on the poem, but all this seems futile as long as the text has not been sorted out. In the meanwhile we should content ourselves with the knowledge that at the time when he completed his masterpiece (whether in 384 or 400 or even a few years later) the poet was an old man (something between 65 and 80), that his birth must consequently have fallen in the first half of the 4th/10th century, and that he began work on the poem well before the time of Mahmud.

Nişâmî ‘Arûdî, writing a little more than a century after Firdausi’s time, is our earliest biographical source. Indeed, it is probable that everything that we find in the later biographers (as well as in the three prose introductions to the Shâh-nâmeh itself) is either taken, directly or indirectly, from ‘Arûdî or else freely invented.2 According to this author Abû l-Qâsim Firdausî was a rich land-owner (dâhâqâq) from the

1Nâsîdeke, p. 25, suggested, with great caution and explicit reference to the uncertain state of the text, that the poet’s age ‘65’ might be combined with the year ‘389’ mentioned in the ‘epilogue’ to give a birth-date of 323 or 324 (935 or 936), in which case the poet would have been 76 or 77 (‘almost 80’) on completion of the ‘final version’ in 400. The date 324 was approved by Taqiz-zâdah and officially accepted by the Iranian government. Most recently A. Sh. Shahbazi has attacked the problem in his article ‘The birthdate of Firdausi (3rd Dey 308 Yazdigardi = 3rd January 949)’, ZDMG 134, 1984, p. 98-105. Shahbazi’s arguments are based on uncontrollable assumptions, such as the number of verses that the poet wrote per day, and side-steps the textual problems. An entirely different set of dates have been proposed by A.B. Nizim-zâdah, ‘Firdâsh i sûdân i Sh. N.’, Ayandah XI/4-5, 1364sh./1985-6, p. 252-65.

2For a critical confrontation between ‘Arûdî and the later sources see Nâsîdeke §§20-23. The fragmentary preface in the Florence manuscript (which shares many elements with the Bâyazanpur preface and with Daulat-shâh’s biography) is edited, translated and analysed in Piemontese’s article (see below p. 123).
village of Bāzī, in the district of Ţabarān, in the province of Tūs. He worked on the Shāh-nāmeh for 25 years and, when it was finished, had it copied out by ‘Ali Daulām and recited publicly by Abū Dula‘. The governor of Tūs, Huyayi (or Husain) b. Qutaibah rewarded him for his efforts by remitting the tax (kharāj) due on his land. Thereupon Firdausī went with his book and his reciter to Ghaznaw where, with the help of the waṣīr, the poem was brought to the attention of Maḥmūd. But the minister’s enemies attacked the poet for being a Shi‘ite (rafdī), and a Mu‘azzilite to boot, with the result that the sultan rewarded him with a paltry 20,000 dirhams. The poet, gravely offended, gave the money to a bath-house attendant and a beer-seller (i.e. two very lowly persons) and fled from Ghaznaw. At first he took refuge in the house of Ismā‘īl al-Warrāq, the father of Azraqi, in Herat. Six months later he fled to the ruler of Ṭabarān, the sipahbād Shahryār, at whose court he composed a satire against Maḥmūd. But the sipahbād, fearing the wrath of that king, purchased the manuscript of the satire for 100,000 dirhams and had it destroyed. The last part of ‘Arūdī’s account (which he claims to have heard in 514/1120–1 from the poet Mu‘izzī, who in turn had it from the Amir ‘Abd al-Razzāq of Tūs) tells how Maḥmūd, on hearing his minister recite a verse from the Shāh-nāmeh, regretted at last his shabby treatment of the great poet and ordered that a camel-train of indigo valued at 60,000 dinārs be sent to the him, together with the king’s apolo-

gies. But as the caravan entered the town of Tūs by one gate, Firdausī’s corpse was carried out through another.

‘Arūdī’s story is a good one, and on the whole not implausible, but is it true? The main difficulty involves Firdausī’s supposed satire. ‘Arūdī maintains that this poem was destroyed by the ruler of Ṭabarān, apart from the six verses which our author quotes. This would have to mean that the satire (hajw-nāmeh) which we find — apparently in widely diverging forms — in so many of the manuscripts of the Shāh-nāmeh has been elaborated from these six authentic verses. Final judgement on this matter must, however, await a critical edition of the satire.2

Apart from the Shāh-nāmeh and the Satire, a number of lyrical pieces have been attributed to Firdausī by the anthologists; these have been collected by Ethē.3 But as there seems to be no mention of them in early sources they must be regarded as, at least, doubtful.4 The religious

---

1 Cf. Nöldeke § 22.
2 M. Shērānī in his Chahār maqāalah bar Firdausī wa Shāh-nāmeh, D.I.w. (=?) 1355/1946 (originally published in Urdu in the 1920’s) argues that the hajw-nāmeh has been constructed out of verses from the Shāh-nāmeh and quotes (p. 105–9) a number of parallel verses from the two poems. This deserves further investigation, though of course it must also be determined whether the passages which Shērānī quotes from the Shāh-nāmeh are authentic and not rather interpolations from the hajw-nāmeh. The question of formulaic repetitions within the Shāh-nāmeh (a well-known feature of epic poetry in all languages) should also not be left out of consideration.
4 The earliest authority to quote anything of Firdausī’s, apart from the Shāh-nāmeh and the Satire, is ‘Afużī I, p. 33, where we find two verses from an ode to Maḥmūd and a gnomic git‘ah of five verses. The latter is, however, almost certainly either by Maḥmūd b. ‘Abdī (see below p. 194) or else expanded from two of his verses.

---

2This has generally been presumed to mean the Bāwandī Shahryār III, who ruled from 358/969 to 396/1006, which would require a very early date for the final completion of the poem (well before 400). But perhaps the intended ruler in the ‘minor Bāwandī’ Abū l-Faḍlārīn Shahrlyār b. ‘Abbas b. Shahrlyār, who left an inscription dated 413/1022 (see Minorsky, Iranica p. 155 n. 1) or one of the other later Bāwandīs, about whom, in any case, we know very little.
mathnawi Yūsuf u Zulaikha is now no longer generally regarded as the work of Firdausī and will be discussed, together with other early works of uncertain authorship, in the appendix to chapter III.

The Šah-nāmah is a mathnawi of about 80000 verses (inc. ba nām i khudāwānd i jān u khirad * k-az In bartar andēshah bar na-ghharad), a grandiose compendium of the legendary and (from the time of Alexander onwards) semi-legendary history of Iran, beginning with the ‘first king’ (in Zoroastrianism the first man) Gayōmart and continuing down to the Islamic conquest, a re-telling of the Iranian national tradition which, though not specifically Islamised, has at least been shorn of most of its overtly Zoroastrian content and thus made broadly acceptable to a Muslim audience. The ultimate source of Firdausī’s poem is the (for us lost) Sasanian book to which early Arabic authors refer either by its name in Middle-Persian (Khwadāy-nāmag) or in Arabic (Siyar al-mulūk). The book was translated from Middle-Persian into Arabic by Ibn al-Muqaffa (died ca. 140/757), whose version was followed by others, whereby it remains unclear whether these merely reworked the older translation or actually made use of the Sasanian original. All of these Arabic versions are lost, but we can form a fairly precise idea of their contents (and of those of their source) from the account of pre-Islamic Iran given by such historians as Ṭabarī and Ḥamzah al-Isfahānī. In Neo-Persian there were at least four versions of the Book of Kings before Firdausī, namely the Šah-nāmah in verse by Manṣūr al-Marwazi (probably well before 355/966), the version, presumably in prose, by Abū l-Muʿayyad al-Balkhī (in the Sasanian period) — with which the ‘Šah-nāmah of Abū Ḥaṣan al-Balkhī’, mentioned by Bārūnī, is perhaps identical — the incomplete versification by Daqīqī (from about the same time), and, most importantly, the prose version prepared for the governor of Tūs, Abū Mansūr Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Razzāq, in Mubarram 346/957. As Taqī-zādah has demonstrated, a small portion of the latter has been preserved in the ‘older preface’ which we find at the beginning of many copies of Firdausī’s Šah-nāmah. The most significant argument for this rests on a passage in Bārūnī which tells us that ‘in the Šah-nāmah’ Ibn ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Tūsī had fabricated for himself a genealogy tracing him back to the prameval king Manūchir; this genealogy is found precisely in the ‘older preface’. According to this preface, the prose Šah-nāmah was compiled for the governor by his minister, Abū Mansūr Maʿmārī, with the help of a number of ‘wise men’ from various parts of Khūrāsān, four of whom are mentioned by their (evidently Zoroastrian) names. It has generally been assumed that the ‘four men’ translated the Book of Kings from Middle- to Neo-Persian, though the text does not actually say anything about translating, but merely about their ‘bringing forth’ (firāz-āwrdan) of the ‘books of the kings’. As the text, a few lines later, specifically mentions the (Arabic) writings of Ibn al-Muqaffa and Ḥamzah al-Isfahānī it must be assumed that these were also used in compiling the Persian Šah-nāmah and that the function of the ‘four men’ was perhaps little more than to augment the Arabic histories

1 See below, no. 105.
2 See above, no. 16.
with the help of certain Zoroastrian texts.\footnote{The story of the game of chess, for which Firdausi refers explicitly to one of the 'four men' (see above, p. 55), is in fact taken from an extant Middle-Persian text, the Wizārisbn i chatrang, and clearly has nothing to do with the Khosrow-nāman. There is no trace of the story in Tabari. For these passages see above, p. 54-5.} Nöldeke, who did not seem to have been aware of any pre-Firdausian version of the Book of Kings in Neo-Persian apart from the 'Shāh-nāmah of Abū Mansūr', assumed, reasonably enough, that the latter was in fact the 'ancient book' on which Firdausi based his poem and the same opinion was upheld by Taqī-zādah and, it seems, everyone else since. However, seeing that Taqī-zādah has demonstrated that there were other Persian Shāh-nāmahs prior to that of Abū Mansūr, the assumption that only the latter could have been Firdausi's source requires re-examination. In fact, there are three passages in Firdausi's poem (all of them in the final section, the history of the Sasanians) where the poet refers explicitly to one or the other of the 'four men' and where consequently his dependence on the Shāh-nāmah of Abū Mansūr is manifest.\footnote{Ed. Khūliqī-Mutlaqī, Dabbāk v. 291.} On the other hand, in the earlier portions of the epic (i.e. the greatest part of the text) not only are there no references to the 'four men' but, more significantly, there are at least two passages where Firdausi's account is at odds with what we happen to know of the Shāh-nāmah of Abū Mansūr. One is in the story of Dabīb, where Firdausi tells us how Faredūn stopped the stone with which his brothers were trying to kill him by means of 'a magic spell' (afsūn).\footnote{Haz. Fird. p. 137. But according to the 'older preface' Faredūn stopped the stone 'with his foot'. It is, of course, possible that Firdausi changed the story to suit his purposes, but if he had really introduced the 'spell' in an attempt to heighten the drama of the incident one would not have expected him to do so in such an off-hand fashion, without further elaboration. An even clearer example is in the history of the Arsacids. Here, Firdausi tells us that he had no information about 'their dates' (tārīkh-īshān) and that 'Apart from their names I have not heard anything about them, nor have I seen anything in the book of kings' (k-az ēshān jūz az nām na-šnīdah-az * na dar nāmah i khusrawān dīdah-az). But Bairūnī\footnote{P. 114.} tells us explicitly that the 'Shāh-nāmah of Abū Mansūr' gave both the names and the length of the reigns of the Arsacid kings and proceeds to convey this information in the form of a table. Moreover, the names that he gives from this source are quite different from those given by Firdausi, whose list of the Arsacid kings is more like the one which Bairūnī quotes a few pages earlier\footnote{Cf. Ḥamza al-Īsfahānī, Kītāb taʾrīkh sinī mulūk al-ard wa l-ānbiyyāʾ, Berlin 1930/1922, p. 13.} as those given by Ḥamza al-Īsfahānī, supposedly from the Avesta. It is thus quite clear that the 'book of kings' which Firdausi had before him when he was writing his account of the Arsacids was not the 'Shāh-nāmah of Abū Mansūr' known to Bairūnī, but rather some other version. This contradiction has been known for a long time and Taqī-zādah made a rather hesitant attempt to explain it away by proposing that there might have been a textual discrepancy between the manuscript of the prose Shāh-nāmah used by Firdausi and the one available to Bairūnī. But seeing that both authors were writing at about the same time and that at that

In general Firdausi's tendency is rather to play down the mythical and supernatural elements in the Iranian national tradition. Note for example his very bland treatment of the story of Khosrau's flight to heaven.\footnote{Moscow edition VII p. 116, Ashkānīyān 64-5.}
time the Shāh-nāmah of Abū Mansūr was only a few decades old, such a hypothesis is not particularly plausible. It would seem much more likely that Firdausī had the (then relatively new) Shāh-nāmah of Abū Mansūr at his disposal only at the time when he was writing the final section of his poem (that devoted to the Sasanians) and that for the earlier sections (the bulk of the work) he depended on one of the earlier Persian translations of the Book of Kings. In short, though there can be no doubt that Firdausī's poem is based on written sources, we cannot necessarily presume that it is all based on a single source.

The oldest dated manuscript of the Shāh-nāmah is the Florence manuscript,1 containing only the first half of the work, which is dated Tuesday the 3rd (or 30th)2 of Muharram 614 (11 April or 9 May 1217). The manuscript, though it has been in Europe for centuries, was only recently identified as a copy of Firdausī's epic. Previously, the oldest codex was believed to be the British Library copy (Add. 21,103) which contains the date Muharram 675 (1276). But this is indicated only on the restored final leaf in a note which states that the date was copied from the 'original' (manqūl 'an-hu). It is, however, not certain that the 'original' from which the (apparently) 16th century copyist supplied the missing pages of the London manuscript is identical with the mutilated copy to which they were appended. The fact that the last page had to be replaced suggests rather that it was already missing at the time of the restora-

tion. These two are the only known manuscripts bearing dates from the 13th century. There are a handful of dated copies from the 14th (see below, Dublin, Leningrad, Istanbul, Cairo, Karachi, New York). The mass of the manuscripts are from the 15th century or later.

A very interesting feature of many of the later manuscripts is that large segments of other poems of the Persian 'epic cycle' (Kāršāsp-nāmah, Burzō-nāmah etc.) have been inserted into the text at more or less appropriate places. To what extent this 'greater Shāh-nāmah' results merely from the endeavour of the scribes to create as complete a text as possible, and to what extent it reflects a contamination of the scribal tradition by the oral tradition, remains to be examined.

The majority of the manuscripts have one (or more) of the following prosa prefices:

'Preface i': The so-called older preface (inc. sipās u āfrīn khudāyī rā kīh īn jahān u ān jahān rā āfrīd), is contained in the majority of the older manuscripts (though not in the oldest, the Florence copy). As already mentioned, this consists largely of material salvaged from the preface to the old prose Shāh-nāmah. A critical edition was prepared by Qazwīnī.1 The pioneering French translation by Wallenbourg2 has been superseded by a richly annotated English version by Minorasky.3 More recently a new edition of the Persian text with numerous (often rather daring) conjectu-

2The manuscript has rōth which can represent either. Piemontese (p. 11) reads 30th with reference to the fact that 3 Muharram 614 was, according to the usual tables, not a Tuesday but a Wednesday (12 April), but this betrays a lack of understanding of the fundamental problems involved in all conversion tables.

1In his āfrīt maqālah II, Tehran 1313h./1934, p. 1-64: a revised edition based on the collation of a larger number of manuscripts was published by Qazwīnī in Nas. Fird. p. 123-48.
2Notice sur le Shāh'-Namé de Ferdousi, et traduction de plusieurs pièces relatives à ce poème, Vienna 1810, p. 25-69.
eral emendations and an extensive commentary was published by Monchi-Zadeh. For the archaic linguistic features in the older preface see Lazard, Langue p. 36-7 et passim.

'Preface ii': beginning haṃd (u sipāš) u sitāvīsh mār khudā rā 'azza wa jalla kih khudā i har du jaḥān ast. This is presumably what Qazwīnī called the 'middle preface' (muqaddamah i ausat). Its contents are summarised in Rieu p. 536.

'Preface iii': beginning with the verse ifiti-tāb i sukhan ān bih kih kunad ah i kamāl * bā thanš i maliku l'-arsh i khudā i muta'ālī. This preface was written by (or perhaps rather for) the Timurid Bāysunghur b. Shāh-rukh in 829/1425-6. Though it does not appear to have been published as such, the greater part of it is incorporated into the Persian introduction in Macan's edition of the epic.

Extensive lists of manuscripts have been published by I. Mendelsohn, in Firdausī Celebration 935-1935, ed. D.E. Smith, New York 1936, and by I. Afšār in his Kitāb-shināštī i Firdausī, Teheran 1347/H.1969; the latter list has also been incorporated, with additions, into Munzawi's general catalogue of Persian manuscripts (Munz. IV 31332-31855). Unfortunately, both lists contain a large number of errors. Afšār's compilation suffers in particular from the absence of bibliographic references and from the fact that it does not usually distinguish between more-or-less intact manuscripts on the one hand and loose leaves or even detached miniatures on the other. The selective list that follows has been compiled independently of those just mentioned (though it has been compared with them) and aims less at 'complete-


Dispersed Manuscripts: The 'Demotte' manuscript (it is a deplorable convention to name a dispersed manuscript after the vandal, who was responsible for its mutilation) is attributed by art historians to the first half of the 14th century. It was dismembered during the early part of this century; its pages were ripped out and sold separately, many of the miniatures were detached and pasted at random on to pages of text and new bits of text were manufactured to fill the blank spaces. For the present location of the surviving fragments and a reproduction and identification of the known miniatures see O. Grabar and S. Blair, Epic images and contemporary history. The illustrations of the great Mongol Shahnama, Chicago/London 1980, supplemented by S. Blair, 'On the track of the "Demotte" Shāh-nāmah manuscript', in Les manuscrits du moyen-orient... Actes du colloque d'Istanbul, ed. F. Déroche, Istanbul/Paris 1989, p. 125-31. Three other early manuscripts are reconstructed and discussed in M.S. Simpson, The Illustration of an Epic. The earliest1 Shahnama manuscripts, New York/London 1979, and attributed by the author to 'around the year 1300';2 these are the 'first small Shāh-nāmah' (the largest fragment of which is Dublin Beatty 104), the second small Shāh-nāmah3 and the codex of which the

1Sic; the author evidently means 'earliest illustrated'.

2A much earlier dating of the 'first small Sh.N.' was claimed by E. Blochert, 'On a Book of Kings of about 1200 A.D.', Rupa XLI, 1930, p. 3-10. This has been rejected by subsequent scholars.
largest portion is preserved in the Freer Gallery (Washington). The author gives admirably precise information about the present location of the individual folios of these manuscripts. She also touches more briefly on the 'Schulz' Shāh-nāmāh, the remnants of which are in the Metropolitan Museum (New York) and which appears to belong to the same school. Yet another dispersed manuscript (the largest portion of which is now in Dublin, Beatty 110) contained at one point a rosette with the date 741/1340-1. For the location of the other known leaves see E. Grube, Muslim miniature paintings from the XIII to XIX century from collections in the United States and Canada, Venice 1962, p. 32, supplemented by Simpson, op. cit., p. 45, no. 15, and her discussion, p. 9-10. Another, later, dispersed manuscript is the 'Houghton' (or 'Shāh Tahmāsp') Shāh-nāmāh which is attributed to the 16th century and was vandalized by Houghton in the 1970's. The study by M.B. Dickson and S.C. Welch, The Houghton Shahnameh, 2 voirs., Cambridge (Mass.) 1981, was prepared before its dispersal on the art market. Dublin Beatty 104 (77 detached leaves from the 'first small Sh.N.', with miniatures. 14th century?); Beatty 110 (see also Kh.-M. III p. 385; Fragment containing about one fourth of the work, including a portion of preface i, from a manuscript containing the date 741/1340-1; see above, 'dispersed manuscripts'. Pictures); Beatty 111 (Ten folios from the 'Demotte' manuscript, attributed to the 14th century. Pictures); Beatty 114 (Kh.-M. III p. 380-1. Fragment. Apparently part of the same original Ms. as London Or. 2780 - for which see Asadi, Kurschāsp-nāmāh - dated 809/1307. Pictures); Beatty 118 (One illustrated folio. 15th century?); Beatty 157 (Kh.-M. III p. 401. Dated Junādā I 885/1480. Preface i. Epilogue combines the versions dated 384 and 400. Pictures); Beatty 158 (Kh.-M. III p. 402. Dated 23 Junādā I 885/1480. Preface i. Epilogue of 384. Pictures); Beatty 214 (Dated 955/1548. Preface iii. Lacunae. Pictures); Beatty 230 (16th century? With date 384); Beatty 256 (5 illustrated folios. 16th century?); Beatty 270 (With pictures, one of which is dated Mubarram 1066/1655); T.C.D. 1549 (Dated 1067/1656-7 according to Robinson, Paintings p. 161. Pictures); Beatty 271 (17th century? Pictures); Beatty 277 (Fragment. 16th century? Pictures); Beatty 295 ('DATED' 8 Dhūl hijjah 965/1501, but this seems to have been tampered with. Pictures); T.C.D. 1551 (Pictures); Manchester Lindesiana 8 (=Robinson 613-31. Dated 860/1456 according to the Hand-list, but Robinson says he was unable to find any date and attributes the miniatures to the 16th century. Pictures); Lindesiana 733 (=Robinson 475-8. 694-788. Dated 1195/1781, but according to Robinson this applies only to the restored final leaves; he attributes the rest to the 16th century. Pictures); Lindesiana 9 (=Robinson 431-74. 15th century? Preface i. Interpolations from Bursūz-nāmāh. Pictures); Lindesiana 932 (=Robinson 575-562. Dated Mubarram 949/1542. Pictures); Lindesiana 910 (=Robinson 481-549. 769-800. 16th century? Pictures); Lindesiana 121 (Dated 1024/1615). Lindesiana 909 (=Robinson 1481-1579. Dated 23 Junādā II 1060/1650. Interpolations from Bursūz-nāmāh. Pictures); Lindesiana 869 (dated 1227/1812. Pictures); Lindesiana 525 (18th-19th century? Pictures); Lindesiana 220 (18th-19th century? Imperfect); Oxford Ouseley Add. 176 (Ethē 501; Robinson p. 16-22. Written for Ibrahim b. Shāh-Rukh [early 16th century]. Preface iii. Glossary. Pictures); Ms. Pers. c. 4 (Ethē 1977; Robinson p. 74-6; Kh.-M. III p. 397-8. IV p. 243-5. Dated 4 Sha'bān 852/1448. Preface ii. I Picture); Elliot 325 (Ethē 493; Robinson p. 48-54; Kh.-M. IV p. 17-9. Dated 14 Ramadān 899/1494. Preface i. Pictures); Ouseley 369 (Ethē 494; Robinson p. 94-7. Dated Rabī' II 959/1552. Preface iii. Pictures); All Souls MS. 288 (Coxe II/1 p. 77; Robin-
son p. 185-6. Dated 26 Safar 988/1580. Breaks off at death of Iskandar. "Includes the episode of Barṣū'. Pictures"; Pers. d. 44 (Beeston 2537. Colophons dated 24 Shawwāl 1000/1592 and 4 Rabī‘ I 1001/1592. Imperfect); Dep. b. 5 (Beeston 2538; Robinson p. 104-6. 16th century? Preface iii. Pictures); Ouseley 345 (Ethē 495. 16th century? Pictures?); Ouseley 344 (Ethē 496; Robinson p. 115-118. Dated 1010/1601-2 [Robinson says 1009]. Preface iii. Pictures); Ind. Inst. Pers. 7 (Beeston 2539. Dated 9 Mubarram 1016/1607. First and last folios missing); Hyde 49 (Ethē 497. Dated 1022/1613. Preface ii and i. and followed by a vocabulary); Ouseley 370 (Ethē 498. Contains a note dated 22 Bahman-mān 1049/1639); Ind. Inst. 32 (Beeston 2540. 19th-20th century? Pictures); Whinfield 1 (Beeston 2541. 19th century? Pictures); Bodl. 716 (Ethē 499. Preface iii. Pictures); Fraser 60 (Ethē 500. Preface iii. Glossary. 1 picture); Hyde 50 (Ethē 502. The beginning of the Bāysunghur (? prefacel is missing); Ouseley 247-249 (Ethē 503. 3 volumes of a set of originally 4. Preface iii); All Souls 289 (Coxe II/1 p. 77. Pictures); Eton 117 (First half); 118 (Second half); 119 (First half. All 3 Mss. modern); Richmond Keir III.133-75 (Dated 25 Jumādā I 879/1475. Pictures); Keir Suppt. p. 13-26 (=New York Kraus 114–27. Dated Dhū l-bi`ijiāh 945/1539. Pictures); Keir III.355-84 (Dated 15 Sha‘bān 1035/1626. Beginning missing. Pictures); London Add. 21,103 (Rieu p. 533-4; Kh.-M. III p. 381-3, IV p. 41-7. Dated, according to the restored final leaf, Mubarram 675/1276.1 Preface i); S.O.A.S. 46483 (Fragment containing the episode of Bahram Gur. 13th century?); Or. 2833

1For a description of this manuscript and reproductions of its miniatures see The Shāh-nāmah of Firduṣaṣ with 24 illustrations from a fifteenth-century manuscript formerly in the Imperial Library, Delhi, and now in the possession of the Royal Asiatic Society described by J.V.S. Wilkinson with an introduction on the paintings by Laurence Binyon, London 1931.
liam 21-1948 (Cat. p. 406. 2 illustrated folios. 16th century?); Collection of Sir Harold Bailey (according to Robinson, I.0. catalogue p. 188 no. 1. Dated 3 Dhū l-qa'dah 1012/1604); Fitzwilliam 311 (Cat. p. 301. Dated 1041/1630-1. Pictures); Corpus 202 (Browne Suppl. 786. Dated 1053/1643-4. Second part. Pictures); Add. 269 (Browne Cat. CXCVII. 16th-17th century? Preface iii. Pictures); Add. 835 (Browne Cat. CXCIX. 16th-17th century?); Add. 312 (Browne Cat. CXCVIII. 17th-18th century? Preface iii and i. Glossary); Or. 1354 (2nd Suppt. 171. 18th century?); Nn. I. 20. (Browne Cat. CXCVI. Preface i); Corpus 203 (Browne Suppt. 787. Fragment); Browne Coll. V.69* (Ends with death of Rustam. Preface i); Leeds P. 42 (17th century?); Edinburgh National Lib. 738 (Dated Rajab 965/1552); Univ. 265 (16th century? Pictures); Univ. 266-267 (Contains a seal dated 1041/1631-2); Univ. 268-269 (Preface ii); Fife Dunimarle Castle (Robinson, Paintings p. 79. Dated 850/1446-7. Pictures); Madrid Bibl. de Palacio patrimonio nacional II 3.218 (Kh.-M. IV p. 27-8. Dated 901/1495-6. Preface ii); Paris Supplément 1946 (Blochet 1175. 14th century? Two leaves only); Supplément 493 (Blochet 1162; Kh.-M. III p. 394-5, IV p. 238-42. Dated 5 Dhū l-qa'dah 844/1441. Date of completion given as 384. Pictures); Supplément 494 (Blochet 1163; Kh.-M. III p. 395-6. Dated 27 Jumādā I 848/1444. Pictures); Ancien fonds 228 (Blochet 1164/Richard; Kh.-M. III p. 17-8. Dated 22 Ramadān 895/1490. Preface iii. Pictures); Ancien fonds 278 (Blochet 1165/Richard. Completed 21 Safar 901/1495, but some leaves replaced later. Preface i and satire); Supplément 1280 (Blochet 1161. 15th century? Preface iii. Pictures); Supplément 489 (Blochet 1166. Completed Jumādā II 963/1566. Preface iii. Pictures); Supplément 492 (Blochet 1168. Dated 12 Ramadān 1004/1596. Missing leaves replaced and pictures added in 18th century?); Supplément 1256 II (Blochet 1199. 16th century? 5 leaves. Pictures); Ancien fonds 229 (Blochet 1167/Richard. 16th or 17th century? Preface iii); Supplément 1026 (Blochet 1169. Three hands which Blochet dates between the 16th and 18th centuries. First half of poem with Preface iii); Supplément 1122 (Blochet 1170. 16th or 17th century? Preface i. Pictures); Supplément 490 (Blochet 1171. Dated Dhū l-qa'dah 1012/1604. Pictures); Supplément 1307 (Blochet 1172. Dated 15 Ramadān 1023/1614. Pictures); Supplément 491 (Blochet 1173. Dated 1027/1618. Preface iii. Pictures); Supplément 1027 (Blochet 1174. 18th century? Pictures); Strasbourg Landauer 6 = Hoghoughi 19 (15th century? 2nd half only. Pictures); Landauer 5 = Hoghoughi 18 (Dated 8 Rabi' I 1224/1809. Pictures); Leyden 494 (Cat. DCXXXI. Kh.-M. III p. 393, IV p. 232-3. Dated 15 Ramadān 840/1436. Pictures); Genoa Ms. C.VII.145 (Piemontese 172. 19th century. 2nd half only. Contains extracts from Burzū-nāmah. Pictures); Florence Bibl. Naz. Centr. Ms.C.III.24 (Piemontese 146. Dated Muharram 614/1217. First half only); Bibli. Naz. Centr. Ms.C.III.48 (Piemontese 146. 15th century? Preface i. Pictures); Laurenziana Framm. Or. 1 (Piemontese 78. 15th century. 3 folios only); Laurenziana Or. 5 (Piemontese 79. Dated Shawwāl 990/1582. Preface i. Contains extracts from Karšāsp-nāmah and Sām-nāmah. Pictures); Venice Bibl. Armena Ms. 2012 (Piemontese 413. Dated 981/1573-4. Incomplete); Bibl. Armena Ms. 2134 (Piemontese 414. 19th century. 2nd half only. Incomplete. Pictures); Rome Vatican Ms. Pers. 118 (Rossi p. 126-7; Kh.-M. III p. 396, IV p. 242-3. Dated 848/1444-5. Preface iii); Casanatense Ms. 4893 (Piemontese 245. Dated Ramadān 1036/1627. Has a preface dedicated to Sultan Ḥusain Bāghārī, followed by preface iii. Contains Dāštān 1 Eāk i

1 For this manuscript see above, p. 124 and Kh.-M. III p. 380-1, V p. 31-41.
script contains portions of the Karshasp-namah;
Ms. or. fol. 147 (Pertsch 704. Dated Jamadi II 1073/1663. Preface iii); Ms. or. fol. 209 (Pertsch 18; Stouchkine 33. Dated 12 'of the second month' 1077/1666. Down to the death of Afrasiyab. Evidently contains interpolations from Karshasp-
namah, Burzo-namah, etc. Pictures); Ms. or. fol.
172 (Pertsch 702; Stouchkine 63. 17th century? 
Preface i. Pictures); Hamilton 260 (Pertsch 702a; 
Stouchkine 65. First half only. Preface i. Owner's
note dated 1765 AD. Pictures); Ms. or. fol. 189
(Pertsch 705; Stouchkine 67. Dated 1199/1784-5. 
Preface iii. Pictures); Minutili 134 (Pertsch 700; 
Stouchkine 73. Dated 15 Shawwal 1245/1830. 
Pictures; Minutili 20 (Pertsch 701. Modern frag-
ment); Ms. or. fol. 3380 (Stouchkine 32. 19th 
century. First part only. Pictures); Cracow Majda
p. 96 no. 3 (Dated 1028/1619); Wroclaw Majda p.
94 no. 3 (17th century? Pictures); Vienna Flügel
501 (also Kh-M. III p. 400-1. Dated 15 Shawal
882/1478. Preface i according to Kh-M.; Flügel
502 (Dated Mubarak 1016/1607. Preface iii. 
Pictures); Flügel 503 (Completed 9 Rabī’ I 1026
/1617. Pictures); Kraf† CLXXXVI (Dated 1169/1755-
6); Zagreb (Nuskhah-hā II p. 26. Dated Ramadan
982/1574. Pictures); Bucharest M.O. 333 (Nuskhah-
hā XI/XII p. 978. Pictures); Cluj M.O. 203 (Nus-
Uppsala Tornberg LIV (Dated 5 Dhū 1-hijjah 1011
/1603. Pictures); Leningrad2 Dorn CCXXXIX
Dated Jamadi I 733/1333. Lacunae. Pictures); Acad.
C 52 (G.-D. 2. Fragmentary, Pictures); Publ. Lib.
New Series 117 (Kostygoa 410 = G.-D. 3. 15th cen-

1See also the detailed discussion of this Ms. by J. Khā-
liq al-Mušāf, ‘Mu‘arrifī’ī’ī ṭak nuskhah al mu‘tabar ‘ī Sh. A.’,
Farkhundah-payšām 1360mī. 1901, p. 60-105.
from the Karshāsp-nāmah. Pictures); Suppt. i 1795 (18th century? Has a colophon – apparently spurious or copied from the prototype – dated 4 Ramadān 789/1387. Many leaves missing or misplaced. Has the epilogue dated 389. Pictures); Suppt. i 1793 (Dated 23 Ramadān 1246/1831. Pictures); Calcutta Ivanov 421 (also Kh.-M. III p. 399-400. Completed Shawāl 882/1478. The concluding verses mention the date 384. Preface iii); Būhār 276 (16th century? Preface iii. Pictures); Būhār 277 (16th century? Preface iii. Pictures); Ivanov 422 (17th century? Preface i. Pictures); Los Angeles Univ. M743 (Nuskhā-hā XI/XII p. 57. 18th century? Beginning and end missing); Univ. W7 (Nuskhā-hā XI/XII p. 57. 19th century? Last part only); Univ. W9 (Nuskhā-hā XI/XII p. 57. 18th century? End missing); Univ. W14 (Nuskhā-hā XI/XII p. 57. 17th-18th century? Beginning and end missing); Univ. W132 (Nuskhā-hā XI/XII p. 57. 18th century? End missing); Ann Arbor 280 (16th century? Pictures); Baltimore Walters Art Gallery (Robinson, Paintings p. 122. Dated 365/1548. Pictures); Princeton I (Dated Jumādā 1 951/1544. Defective at beginning. Preface iii. Pictures); 2 (Dated 1065/1654-5. Pictures); 3 (Dated 1085/1674-5. Preface i. Pictures); 4 (Dated 1009/1600-1. Pictures); 406 (Pictures); 407 (Dated 15 Rabi‘ II 1257/1841. Preface i); New York A large number of copies and fragments (one dated 753/1352) are described in B.W. Robinson, The Kevorkian Collection: Islamic and Indian manuscripts, miniature paintings and drawings, New York 1953 (unfortunately not at present available to me); Kraus 114-127 (see supra: Richmond); Jackson-Yohannan 1 (Dated 996/1588. Down to death of Alexander. Beginning missing. Preface i. Pictures); Kraus 128-143 (16th century? Pictures); Jackson-Yohannan 2 (Dated 1 Muharram 1011/1602. Beginning missing. Pictures); Jackson-Yohannan 3 (Dated 12 Sha‘bān 1016/1607. Preface i and satire. Pictures); Public
the author in English and Persian (the latter containing the largest part of the Bāysunghūr preface) and an appendix, containing the interpolated episodes and found in different manuscripts by Turner Macan. 4 vols; Bombay 1849 (with Macan’s appendix and glossary. Illustrated); 1272/1856–7 (again with Macan’s appendix etc. Illustrated); 1275/1858–9 (based on Macan. Illustrated); 1300/1882–3 (Ed. by ‘Abd al-Samad, Jawhar, Husain Kashmarî and ‘Ayyene-e-khusheed’, or the ‘Shah-Nama’ of Firdousi as edited by Khurshedji Minocherji Kateli. 6 parts); 1914 (Photozincographic reproduction of the Shiraz edition. Illustrated); 1914 (The Shahnameh of Firdausi. Its full text [in Gujarati characters] and its translation in Gujarati by Mhtir Navroji Kutar and Faramarz Navroji Kutar. Apparently only one volume published); Lucknow 1287/1870–1 (2 vols. Illustrated); 1884; Lucknow and Cawnpore 1886 (with glossary. 4 vols.); Cawnpore 1874 (based on Macan, with preface and glossary); Tehran 1247/1831–2 (Preface by ‘Abd al-Muhammad al-Kazî); 1836; 1265/1848–9 to 1267/1850–1 (based on Macan. 4 pts. Illustrated); 1276/1859–6; 1310/2sh.1931–4 (Ed. M. Ramadān. Based on Macan, Mohl, and Vullers, ‘Abd al-Muhammad, Auliya’, Sami and a Ms. 5 vols.); reprinted 1341sh./1963; 1313/2sh.1934–5 (Ed. Sa‘īd Nafisī and others. Vols. 1–6 are a revision of Vullers’s edition, 7–9 are based on Macan and Mohl. With critical notes. Illustrated); 1335sh./1956–7 (Ed. M. Dabīr-Sīyāq on the basis of Macan’s edition. 6 vols.); 1350sh./1971–2 (Ed. M. J. Mahjūb); Paris 1838–78 (Le Livre des Rois ... publiée, traduit, et commenté par M. J. Mohl. 7 vols.); For a (still valuable) critical commentary on the first volume see F. Rücker, ‘Bemerkungen zu Mohl’s Ausgabe des Firdousi, Band I’. ZDMG VIII, 1854, p. 239–329, X, 1856, p. 127–282; Shiraz 1849; Leyden 1877–84 (Firdusí Liber Regus, ed. J. A. Vullers and S. Landauer. A ‘criti-

Libr. (Mendelsohn p. 45. Dated 1023/1614); Jackson-Yohannan 4 (Completed Shawl 1079/1669. Preface iii, with Preface i and satire added later. Pictures); Jackson-Yohannan 5 (16th–17th century? Down to death of Alexander. Pictures); Public Libr. (Mendelsohn p. 58. 19th century); Cambridge (Mass.) Harvard Pers. 25 (Nuskhah-hā IV p. 5. 16th century? Pictures); A number of separate illustrated leaves from various copies (including 6 from the ‘Demotte’ Ms.) are found in the Fogg museum; see Schroeder II, III–VIII, X, XII, XXVII–XXVIII and further leaves listed in Norgren/Davis; Philadelphia Lewis Coll. 50 (16th/16th century? Pictures); Lewis Coll. 52 (Dated 1000/1591–2. Pictures); Lewis Coll. 51 (16th/17th century? Preface i. Pictures); Lewis Coll. 54 (17th/18th century? Pictures); Lewis Coll. 55 (Has a seal dated 1140/1727–8. Pictures); Lewis Coll. 56 (One volume of a set. Pictures); Lewis Coll. 57 (187th century? Preface i. Pictures); Lewis Coll. 58 (19th century? Pictures); Lewis Coll. 59 (Dated 1244/1828–9. Pictures); Washington Library of Congress (Dated 1137/1724–5. Pictures) (Mendelsohn).

Besides these there are a large number of uncatalogued manuscripts, fragments of manuscripts, loose pages and detached miniatures in many private collections and art galleries.

Ms. containing the Bāysunghūr preface only: London I.O. 871; I.O. 2860; Istanbul Köprüli, Fazıl Ahmet Paşa 1632/I (Cat. II p. 397. 16th century?).

Editions: Calcutta 1811 (The Shah Nāma, being a series of heroic poems, on the ancient history of Persia... Edited under the superintendence of M. Lumsdon. Vol. I only); 1829 (The Shah Nāma: an heroic poem ... carefully collated ... and illustrated by a copious glossary of obsolete words and obscure idioms: with an introduction and life of
cal' edition based on Macan and Mohl. 3 vols. only published, ending with the reign of Dārā son of Dārā. The manuscript of the remaining two volumes was prepared by F. Wolff and is now in the library of the Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft in Giessen; c.f. ZDMG 141, 1991, p. 88); Moscow 1960-71 (Дах-наме. Критический текст). Ed. Ye. E. Bertel’s, ‘A. al-H. Nūshīn et al. 9 volumes. This first critical edition based on manuscripts suffers from the fact that it used too few manuscripts as well as from the eclectic method followed by the editors. The later volumes — for which Nūshīn bears the main responsibility — are considerably more useful than the earlier ones; Dushanbe 1964-66 (ed. X. Ayīnī, Z. Ahorī, V. Sirus, A. Dehnoaqulow; 9 volumes in Tajik script, with variant readings); New York 1968 — (ed. J. Khāliqī-Muţlaq. In progress. A splendid critical edition).


Glossaries:


3) Ganj-nāmah dar hall i lughat i Shāh-nāmah by ‘Alī al-Makki ibn Taṭfīr al-Bisti[m]. Completed 7 Jamādā II 1070/1668. Ms.: London I.O. 891 (Dated 14 Shawwāl 1070/1669); Hyderabad Sālār Jung IV 1112 (18th century? End missing); Sālār Jung IV 1113 (19th century?).

4) F. Wolff, Glossar zu Firdosīs Schahname, Berlin 1938; reprint Hildesheim 1965. This glossary and concordance is a fundamental work for studies of the Shāh-nāmah and of the history of the Persian language; id., 'Verbesserungen und Zusätze zum Schahname-Glossar', ZDMG 141, 1991, p. 88-113 (published from the martyred author’s posthumous papers).

5) R. Shafaq, Farhang i Shāh-nāmah bā sharb i hāl i Firdāsī, Tehran 1320sh./1941; 2nd edition 1350sh./1972.

Complete (or nearly complete) translations:


(Turkish verse): Fragments or two (or the same?) translations. Ms.: Vienna Flügel 504 (Dated Jamādā I 1078/1667); Flügel 505 (before 1703 A.D.). For other verse translations see Rieu, Catalogue of the Turkish manuscripts in the British Museum, p. 154 sq. and Gibb, History of Ottoman poetry II p. 390.

(Turkish prose): Ms.: İstanbul Yıldız 7951/309 (3 vols. Edhem and Stchoukine XVI. Dated 1187


(Gujarati): by Jamshedji Kharshedji Desai. Ms.: Navsari Meherji Rana p. 143 no. 38 (first part only); Shāh-nāmeh. Translated into Gujarati from Firdousi from the commencement up to the reign of king Minocheher by J.J. Modi, with an appendix containing an account of the kings, according to the Avesta, Pahlavi and other Persian books. Bombay 1904.

(Russian): Книга о Царях, tr. S. Sokolow, Pt. I [to the death of Farēdu], Moscow 1905; Further extracts from his translation (Zály и Rudabé, Rosém и Sahráb) are printed in Krymsky's Istoriya Persi, Vol. 1/4, Moscow 1913, pp. 277-408; книга царей... перевод М. Лозинского, под ред., с комментариями и статьей Ф.А. Розенберга, Moscow-Leningrad 1934.


Retellings of the whole of the epic, or of individual episodes (for children or otherwise), in various languages, are numerous, but need not be listed here. See, however, M.A.R. Khan, ‘Shāh-nāmah epitomised’, Indo-Iranica XI, 1958, /1 p. 78-87, /2 p. 9-22, /3 p. 44-71.

Extracts and abridgements:

1) Ikhtiyārāt i Shāh-nāmah (or Kitāb i intikhāb i Shāh-nāmah) written by one ‘Alī b. Ahmad for Malik-Shāh and completed, according to the author, in 474/1081-2. After the compiler's introduction (inc. ala' al khirad-mand i rōshan-rūwān * haqiqat k-az in dūr bash az kamān) there follow extracts from Firdausi's poem under various headings ('praise of the prophet', 'praise of kings', 'description of old age' etc.). The narrative content of the Shāh-nāmah plays no role in it. See the account of the work in the Gotha catalogue. 1 Mss.: Gotha 48 (Ms. written for Sultan Muhammad Khān b. Murād Khān, regn. 1594-1603). 2 The same work is evidently found also in Istanbul Universitet FY 147 (Ates 7. Dated 910/1504-5. Beginning missing) and perhaps also in London I.O. 882 (Dated Rabī‘I 945/1538). Badly damaged. Ethē’s tentative identification of the Ms. with the ikhtiyārāt of Mas‘ūd b. Sa‘d b. Salmān – for which see the following entry – is apparently quite arbitrary.

2) ‘Au‘fī II p. 33 mentions the Ikhtiyārāt i Shāh-nāmah by the famous poet Mas‘ūd i Sa‘d i Salmān (for whom see Chapter III). The work does not seem to be mentioned elsewhere. Perhaps this is a wrong attribution of the just mentioned Ikhtiyārāt of ‘Alī b. Ahmad?

3) An anonymous Miṣṭāb i Shāh-nāmah in prose was written in 845/1441-2. Ms.: Leyden 1659(2) (Cat. MMDLXXVIII. Dated 1112/1700-1).

4) Extracts from the Shāh-nāmah, with connecting passages in prose, are contained in the majmū‘ah of Niẓām al-dīn Ahmad Gilānī, a pupil of Bahā’ al-dīn Muhammad al-Amulī (d. 1030/1620-1). Ms.: Berlin Petermann 175 fol. 11b-21a (Pertsch 45); the same anthology is reported also in Hyder-ābad Aṣafīyāh II p. 970 no. 306.

5) Munaktab i Shāh-nāmah or Khulāsah i Shāh-nāmah or Tārīkh i (Dīl-gushā) Shamsār-khānī by Tawasqīd Beg, son of Tūlak Beg, (for whom see Pl. I, p. 1008-9) written for the governor of Ghaznī, Shamsār Beg, in 1063/1653. Ms.: Manchester Lin- desiana 145 (Dated 1063/1653); Lindesiana 135 (17th-18th century?); Lindesiana 402 (Dated 1265/1848-9); Oxford Ouseley 222 (Ethē 504. Dated 9 Dhu l-bi‘jja 1144/1732); Ind. Inst. Pers. 101 (Beeston 2542. Dated 13 Dhū l-bi‘jja 1239/1824); Ind. Inst. Pers. 89 fol. 177-232 (Beeston 2543. 19th century. A fragment of the work); Eton 120, 121 (Dated 1194/1780); London Add. 25,798 (Rieu p. 539-40. 17th century?); I.O. 883 (Dated 25 Safar of the 46th year of ‘Alamgīr = 1114/1702); I.O. 884 (Dated 3 Rajab of 1st year of Raffi al-Jallālat, identified by Ethē with Raffi al-darajjāt, which would date this Ms. to 1131/1719); Or. 371 (Rieu p. 540. Dated Shāh-bāb 1155/1742. Pictures); I.O. 885 (Dated 9 Shawwāl 1170/1757); I.O. 886 (Dated 5th year of Shāh-hīlām 1177/1763-4); I.O. 887 (Dated 6 Jumādā II 1186/1772); S.O.A.S. 4764 [or 436467] (Dated 25 Shāh-bāb 1196/1782); Egerton 1105 (Rieu p. 540. 18th century?); Add. 6939 (Rieu p. 540. A transcript of the preceeding with a translation by J. Hadden Hindley); Add. 7725 (Rieu

1This work is mentioned in the colophon of Tehran Gulistan/Xībāy II 352, where the author is called ‘Alī b. Ahmad al-Qā‘īnī.

2This manuscript is wrongly identified by Munzawi no. 27248.
NINTH TO ELEVENTH CENTURY

(Sources: Dated Rab'i' I 1198/1784; Add. 6611 (Rieu p. 540. Dated Dhū l-Qa'dah 1212/1798); Add. 27,269 (Rieu p. 540. 18th century); Add. 5619 (Rieu p. 540. 18th century); Add. 24,415 (Rieu p. 541. Dated Dhūl-bijjah 1218/1804); Or. 7031 (Meredith-Owens p. 67. Dated 1238/1822-3); Ross and Browne CLXXX (Dated 8 Rajab 1259/1843); Or. 7539 (Meredith-Owens p. 68. 19th century. Abbreviated); Or. 8761 (Meredith-Owens p. 69. 18th or 19th century. Pictures); I.O. 888 (modern); I.O. 889; I.O. 890 (defective); Cambridge Co. 6. 60 (Browne Cat. CC); Dated 25 Dhū l-bijjah 13th year of Muhammad Shāh = 1143/1730-1); Add. 411 (Browne Cat. CCI.); Corpus, No. 108 (Browne Suppt. 235); Edinburgh Univ. 270 (Dated 1090/1679); New Coll. Or. 29; Paris Ancien 1788. 99A (Blocchet 1181/Richard. Dated 10 Rab'i' II 1143 = 1137 Bengal era = 12th year of Muhammad Shāh Ghāzi/1730); Supplément 1894 (Blocchet 1184. Dated Rab'i' II 1213/1798); Supplément 198 (Blocchet 1182. 18th century?); Supplément 197 (Blocchet 1183. 18th century? Incomplete); Supplément 1731 (Blocchet 1185. 18th century? Incomplete); Copenhagen; Mehren XLIII; Mehren XLIV; Berlin Sprenger 1619 (Pertsch 708); Ms. or. 4° 221 (Pertsch 709); Ms. or. oct. 1080 (Heinz 180); Stchoukine 76. Dated 1251/1835-6. Pictures); Leipzig Voller 917; Mashhad Ridawī III p. 90 no. 55 (listed in the catalogue as a manuscript of the Shāh-nāmah, but its conclusion is quoted as 'shud tamām Shāh-nāmah i Dil-gushāy'); Bombay Rehatse 152 no. 89 (Dated 1129/1717); Univ. IV (Dated 2 Dhū l-Qa'dah 1224/1809); Naksarī Meherji Rana p. 19 no. 28/II (First part only. Dated 1215 Y./1854-5); Meherji Rana p. 97 no. 105; Uch 283 (Dated 29 Ramādān 1226/1714. Pictures); Bankipore I 10; Suppt. i 1796 (Dated 3 Safar 1239/1823); Suppt. i 1797 (19th century. Pictures); Poona Bhrat Ithānā Samshodhak Mandal no. 69 (Acc. to Bombay Univ. catal. p. 268); Hyderabad Sālīr Jung IV 1106 (18th century? Pictures); Sālīr Jung IV 1107 (Dated 1224/1809); Sālīr Jung IV 1108 (Dated 30 Muḥarram 1245/1829); Sālīr Jung IV 1109 (18th century?); Calcutta Ivanow 423 (18th century? Defective at end); Ivanow Curzon 185 (Dated 12 Shab‘ān 17th year of Muhammad Shāh/1147/1735. The 2nd half of the Ms. supplied by a modern hand); Ivanow Curzon 186 (Contains a seal dated 1134/1721-2); Ivanow Curzon 187 (19th century? One picture); Būhrā 278 (19th century?); Madras I 290; I 291 (Dated 1137/1724-5); Dacca Univ. 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 (all late).


(6) Shāh-nāmah i Bakht-āwar-khānī, by Bahādur 'Ali, son of Ilāh-wirdī Khān 'Alam-īr-shāhī (the latter died in 1079/1668-9 according to the Naʿāthir al-umārā). See Rieu Catal. p. 1037b. The author of the Bombay University Catalogue says that this work is 'but a clever copy' of the Muntakhab i Shāh-nāmah by Tawakkul Beg, but without the verses. Ms.: Bombay Univ. XXXVIII.

(7) Shāh-nāmah i nakhir by Khurshed, son of Iṣfandiyār, of Nawāsīr, for Captain Aungier in 1671. Ms.: London Royal 16 B. xiv (Rieu p. 541. Dated Shariwar 1040 Y./1671. The author's original draft); Add. 6938 (Rieu p. 541. Transcript of the first part of the preceeding with a translation by J. Haddon Hindley).

Partial translation: see under Ms.

(8) 'Itr i Shāh-nāmah composed by Shāhīm (7) 'Alī-khān, known as Shāh-'Alam-Ibrāhīmī Sabzvārī Awādī in 1121/1709-10, for whom see the Berlin catalogue, p. 739. The author epitomises the poem
in prose, with extracts from the original. The last section is devoted to the history of the kings of Delhi down to Shāh-Ilām II. Ms.: Berlin Ms. orient. Fol. 276 (Pertsch 707. Autograph? The Ms. contains first of all the author's own transcript of the Bāysunghur preface dated 6 Rabī I 1142 = 1137 fasālī = 11th year of Muhammad Shāh /1729. Then in a different script the text of the epitome, of which the last 4 leaves are in a different hand and dated the beginning (ghurrah) of Shawkāl 1123/1711).


(10) Figrist a Shāh-nāmāh, or Muntakhab i Shāh-nāmāh, written in 1147/1734-5 by Bhīm Sēn, with the takhallus Muhīb. Ivanow describes it as 'a versified table of contents' of the Shāh-nāmāh, Keshavars, however, as 'a prose version' of the same. (Inc. in both Mss.: alā'ī sāhib i dānish, khirad-war * dar in nāmāh ba fikr i zafar bi-ngar). Ms.: London Wellcome 424 (Dated 1230/1815); Calcutta Ivanow 424 (Dated 1177/1763-4).

(11) A verse abridgment, again with the title Figrist a Shāh-nāmāh, by Shīrīn Parand (date?) is found in London I.O. 892 (Dated 1166/1752-3. Incomplete)


(13) Khulāṣah a Shamsār-khānī, a meta-bridgement of no. 5 above, was prepared by Jamīl al-dīn Bījnōrī in 1821. Ms.: Hyderabad Sālār Jung IV 1110.


Unspecified verse abridgment: Ms.: Narsavi Meherji Rana p. 101 no. 124(1).

Unspecified prose versions: Ms.: Tashkent Acad. IX 6305 (18th-19th century?); Los Angeles Univ. C6 (Nushkhāh-hā XI/XII p. 57. 18th century?).

Three extracts from the Shāh-nāmāh, followed by one from the Hūsain-hūsainyān of Khvājā, are contained in: London Add. 27,261 II (Rieu p. 866-71. Dated Jumādā II 814/1411).


Miscellaneous collections of extracts:
Ms.: Istanbul Revan kōskū 1896/III (Karayat 904); Manchester Lindeisiana 131c (Dated 1140/1727-8); Lindeisiana 260 (18th century?); Lindeisiana 841 b.c (Dated 1085/1674-5); Florence Laurenciana Or. 306 fol. 123v-157r (Piemontese 95 II. Dāstān i Suhrāb bā Rustām. Dated 20 Jumādā II 975/1567?); Narsavi Meherji Rana p. 87 no. 44; Bombay Univ. XVIII (dāstān i Rustām u Akwān-dēw u Isfandīyār); Univ. XIX (Isfandīyār-nāmāh); Univ. XX (dāstān i Rustām u Isfandīyār); Univ. XXI (Bāhman-nāmāh); Univ. XXIX (dāstān i Kāmūs i Khashānī. Dated 16 Tīr 1044Y. /1675); Univ. XXX (dāstān i Kā'ūs); Univ. XXXI (Kā'ūs-nāmāh. Dated 6 Asfandārānad 1024Y./1665); Univ. XXXIV (dāstān i Rustām u Isfandīyār); XXXIX (Suhrāb-nāmāh); Univ. XXXVI (From the beginning to the birth of Rustām); Univ. XXXVII ('from the battle of Yūzādār khūr... to Bēzan's coming to Kay-Khusraw with Gustaham').
LF passim; Rādūyānī passim; ‘Arūḍī passim; ‘Aufī II p. 32-3; Shams passim; Daulāt-shāh p. 49-55; ‘Hidāyat, Haṣma’ I p. 382-438; Khāyām-pūr p. 440-2 (with much further literature).

Apart from the already mentioned studies by Nödeke (which contains a survey of the older literature), Taqī-zādah and Khāliqī-Muṭlaq,1 the following might serve as a sample of the extensive secondary literature on Firdowsī and the Shāh-nāma:


1See above, p. 113-4, 127.
who congregated at the court of Mambūd at Ghaznāh. He is remembered mainly on account of his poetical duel with ‘Unsūri, consisting of a long ode by Ghaḍā‘īrī in praise of Mambūd rhyming in lām, a reply by ‘Unsūri with the same rhyme, and a counter-reply by Ghaḍā‘īrī; the poems are quoted in extenso by Hidāyat and at least the first two are apparently found in some copies of ‘Unsūri’s Diwān.1 ‘Arūdī mentions him among the poets who eulogised the Būyids and it is therefore likely that he was attached to them before going to Ghaznāh. The other biographical ‘information’ given by Hidāyat, including the statement that he died in 428/1034-5, cannot be confirmed.

Bairūnī, Kitāb al-jamāhīr fī ma‘rīfat al-jawāhir, ed. Krenkov, Hyderabad 1355/1936-7, p. 80 (one verse); LF (4 verses quoted in the margin of Ms. nūn only); Rādūyānī passim (and Ates’ notes p. 96-7); ‘Arūdī p. 28 (and Gaswīnād al-loc.); Waṭwaṭ p. 19, 74; ‘Auffī II p. 59-60; Shahīs passim; Jāzārī II p. 463-7; Daulat-shāh III p. 33-5; Rāzi III p. 19-21; Adhar p. 1098-1101; Hidāyat, Majmā‘ I p. 368-72; ‘A. Iqbal, ‘Ibyā‘ i yak qit‘ah i shi‘r as Ghaḍā‘īrī i Rāzi‘, Aramghān XV, 1313sh./1934, p. 333-6 (Also in his Majmā‘ i maqālāt p. 328-31); id., ‘Chand nukhta i ta‘zah rāji ba shā‘ir i maḥshār Ghaḍā‘īrī i Rāzi‘, Amīrīsh wa Pārwarish IX/10, 1318sh./1930, p. 17-22 (=Majmā‘ i maqālāt p. 525-9); M. Dabairy-Siyāqi, Ghaḍā‘īrī wa ash‘ār i Ū, Tehran 1334sh./1955; Šafā, Tārikh I p. 570-5; LN s.vv. ‘Ghaḍā‘īrī’ p. 243-4 (Db. Šafā); Khayyām-pūr p. 419 (with further references).

60. ‘Askīm Ghamnāk is known to us only from the handful of verses quoted in Asādī’s Lughat i furs. Cf. Horn, Einl. p. 26.

1Thus Tha‘alibī. ‘Auffī gives his name as Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allāh, but does not mention the name Ghaḍā‘īrī.

2The identity of ‘Junādī’ and ‘Ghawrā’ does not appear to have been noted in the secondary literature.
Gurgānī's poem. This is followed by eulogies of Togrul's minister, Khvājah Abū Nāṣr b. Mansūr, and of his governor in Isfahan, Khwājah Abū l-Fath b. Muhammad, the poet's actual patron. He then tells us how this governor asked him what he thought of the story of Wīs and Rāmīn. The poet replies 1 that it is fine story, put together by six wise men in 'Pahlawī'. But today not everyone understands that language. Moreover, 'in those days poetry was not a profession' (ān-gah shā'irī pēshah na-būda-st). If those authors were alive today they would see 'how speech is now produced' and 'how (quantitative) metre (wazn) and rhymes (qawā'ī) are imposed upon it'. At the request of the governor Gurgānī takes it upon himself to retell the old story with the requisite poetic embellishment. This section has generally been understood to mean that Gurgānī's source, the 'Pahlawī' book of Wīs and Rāmīn was a poem, but without quantitative metre or rhyme. Although this is certainly possible, it does not seem the only conceivable interpretation of Gurgānī's words. It could be that he is simply saying that his source was in prose, and indeed could not have been otherwise, since 'in those days' that which a Muslim author would recognise as 'poetry' did not even exist. To be sure, the existence of a Middle-Persian poem (or poems) on the subject is evident-

1 Ed. Todua/Gwakharia p. 28. See the translation in Minorsky, *Iranica* p. 153-4 (=BSOS XI, 1946, p. 2-3) and the important remarks by Boyce, *JRAI* 1957, p. 37-8. In a later contribution (BSOS XXV, 1962, p. 278-9) Minorsky rightly upholds (against Zarīn-kūb, Sukhan IX/10, 1337ah./1919, p. 1015-8) that 'Pahlawī' here means 'Middle-Persian' and not the local vernacular of of north-Western Persia. Gurgānī tells us precisely that the old book of Wīs and Rāmīn was studied by people in order to learn 'Pahlawī'; with the latter the poet thus means a literary language and not a colloquial dialect. See also G. Lazard, Minorsky Volume p. 366-7 and note 19.

ly implied by Ḥamzah al-Isfahānī 1 when, in his commentary on the dīwān of Abū Nuwās, he explains the Arabic poet's phrase fihrjadat Rāmīn wa Wīs by saying that 'fihrjadāt are like odes' (ka l-qasā'īd), 2 but this may refer not to a poetic version of the whole story but rather to a collection of songs put into the mouths of the two lovers. Something similar would seem to be implied by the verse of Rūmī's 3 which asks whether the reader has not seen the dīwāns of Wīs and Rāmīn (dawāwīn i Wīsah u Rāmīn) or heard the tales (bīkāyāt) of Wāmiq and 'Adhrā. There may thus well have been 'dīwāns' of the two lovers, alongside the story of their adventures, in the same way that there is an Arabic dīwān of Majnūn alongside the story of his romance with Lailā. It is consequently not certain that the 'odes' of Wīs and Rāmīn were identical with the source used by Gurgānī. In any event, the fact that Gurgānī has evidently based his poem directly on a Middle-Persian book and not (like Firdausī or Assadī) on documents already relatively far removed from their Sassanian sources goes a long way towards explaining the decidedly Zoroastrian flavour of so much of what we find in it. The specifically Parthian background of the story has been well developed by Minorsky and need not be discussed here.

Wīs u Rāmīn has survived in a very small number of manuscripts. The pronounced amorality character of the work and, particularly, the fact that it appears to condone adultery on the part of a woman meant that the work, if read at all, was widely regarded as indecent. Despite this, it had


2 Fīrjord is clearly an Arabic spelling of Middle-Persian frāsārd, a word known to us as the designation for the individual 'chapters' of the Avestan text *Vendidad*.

a great influence on the formation of the style of the Persian romantic epic.

A number of authors have made extensive comparisons between the story of Wis and Ramin and the well-known Celtic legend of Tristan and Isolde. However, in the absence of any plausible explanation of how this story could have migrated from Persia to mediaeval Europe it must be assumed that the apparent similarities between the two are due in part to the recurrence of certain universal folkloristic motives, and in part to the fact that both have as their point of departure an identical human situation: the story of a young woman forced against her will to marry an older man.

'Affi reports that, apart from Wis u Ramin, the only other known composition by Gurgani were five verses (quoted by 'Affi) satirising one Thi-qat al-mulk (? Shahryar). A lyrical poem of eight verses is quoted by Jajarmi.

Ms. of Wis u Ramin: Oxford Elliot 273 (Ethe 522); Paris Supplément 1380 (Blochet 1203. 16th century); Berlin Sprenger 1378 (Pertsch 681. Dated 28 Rabii' II 1270/1854. Copied from the Calcutta Ms.); Istanbul Beyazit (olim Umumi) 5411 (see Todua/Gwakharia p. xxviii); Tehran Gulistan /Bayani p. 534 (17th century?) [Munz.]; Bombay Univ. no. 137 (Cat. p. 220-2. Defective at both ends); Hyderabad Sālār Jung IV 1117 (End missing. Has a seal dated 1020/1611-2); Calcutta Ivanov 429 (16th century?) =Lucknow Sprenger 199, the basis of the Calcutta edition. Cf. Munz. IV 36323-8.

Excerpts: London Add. 12,560 fol. 177-185 (Rieu p. 821-2. Dated Sha'ban 1228/1813); Turin Nallino 68 fol. 86b-90b (dated Rabii' II 745/1344, now destroyed. Contained the ten letters); Tehran Malik 5611/4 (Munz. 36324 inspexit. 18th century?)

With a preface in prose); Other anthologies are listed in the introduction to the edition by Todua /Gwakharia.

Editions: Calcutta 1864-5 (Ed. W. Nassau Lees and Munshi Ahmad Ali); Tehran 1314sh./1935 (Ed. M. Mīnūnī); 1337sh./1959 (Ed. M.J. Mahjoub); 1349sh./1970 (critical edition by M.A. Todua and A.A. Gwakharia, based on 5 complete Persian manuscripts, 5 anthologies and the Georgian translation); Dushanbe 1966 (in Tajik script).

Translations: (Georgian): The old Georgian version (Visramiani) is attributed to Sargis T'mogveli (12th century) and is of great importance for the history of the Persian text. Editions: Tiflis 1884 (ed. I. Chavchavadze, A. Saradjishvili and P. Umilashvili); 1962 (Visramiani. Tekst, исследование и словарь, ed. A.A. Gvakhariya and M.A. Todua).


(Russian): Visramiani. Грузинский роман 12 века и персидская поэма 11 века Вис и Рамин, translated (from the Georgian) by B.T. Rudenko and (from the Persian) by M.M. D'yakonov, Moscow/Leningrad 1938; Translated from the Georgian by Ts. Yordanishvili, Tiflis 1949, reprint 1960; Вис и Рамин, translated from the Persian by S. Lipkin, Moscow 1963.

(French): Le roman de Wis et Ramin, traduit par H. Massé, Paris 1959 (from the Persian).

'Arūdī p. 28 ('Farrukhī i Gurgānī' is evidently a scribal error for 'Fakhrī...'; See Qazwīni ad loc.); 'Affi II p. 240; Shams p. 80, 145; Musta'fī p. 824; Jajarmī II p. 952; Wālih (quotes ca. 700 verses from Wis u Ramin according to Pertch p. 623); Midāyat, Majma'ī p. 375-6; K.H. Graf, 'Wis und Ramin', ZDMG 23, 1869, p. 375-433 (contains a partial verse translation); R. von Stackelberg,


63. Hâkkâh Margâzî is quoted a dozen times in Asadî’s LF (see the indexes). There appears to be no other mention of him.

64. A qit‘ah of two verses by an otherwise unknown Hallâh is quoted by ‘Aufî (II p. 65) in his chapter on the Ghaznavid poets.

65. Ḥânjâlah al-Bâdhîsî is listed by ‘Aufî amongst the poets of the Tâhirids. Nîzâmi ‘Arûdi tells the story of the profound effect which two of his verses had on Ahmad b. ‘Abd Allâh al-Khujistânî before the time when the latter entered the service of Muḥammad b. Tâhir (died 259/872-3). It is, however, not clear whether Arûdi regarded him as Ahmad’s contemporary or whether he flourished at an earlier date. The date given for the poet’s

1The nishahb is found only in the marginal additions to manuscript nûn of LF; see Iqbal’s edition p. 106, 280.
death by Hidāyat, namely 219/835, seems rather too early.


'Arūdī p. 26; 'Auflī II p. 2; Hidāyat, Majma' I p. 199

66. A single verse by an otherwise unknown Ḥaram-Shāh (or Khurram-shāh?) is quoted in manuscript P of LF, s.v. bāhūr. He is evidently not the same as the Khurram-shāh Kirkānī who is quoted by Jājarmī (II p. 381, 1068) and Rāzī (I p. 277).

67. Two verses by an otherwise unknown Ḥazī Bustā are quoted by Rādūyānī (p. 12).

68. Ḥusain Ilāqī is known to us only from Rādūyānī, p. 108-9, who credits him with six verses from a contrived poem without the letter alif. The same verses are quoted anonymously by Waṭwātī, p. 65-6, and by Hidāyat, Majma' I p. 508, where they are attributed to Munjāk. Ates, in his note on the passage in Rādūyānī, considers the possibility that he is identical with Turkī Kashī Ilāqī (q.v.).

Cf. Ṣafā, Tārīkh I' I p. 456.

69. A single verse by one Kiyā Ḥusainī Qazwīnī is quoted in the Vatican manuscript of LF s.v. rang. He is perhaps identical with the author of four verses cited by 'AUfī (II p. 67) amongst the Ghaznavid poets whose name appears in Browne's edition (following Ms. E.) as Muhsin i Qazwīnī, in Ms. S. as ʿAṣīr Fūrūz and in Hidāyat (Majma' I p. 511), who merely repeats the information given by 'AUfī, as Muhsin i Farāhī(?).

70. Abū 'Alī ibn Sīnā, the famous physician and philosopher, died in 428/1036-7; cf. PL II p.

3, 43, 200-2. He is credited with a number of Arabic and Persian poems, the most substantial of the latter being a gāṣīda of 27 verses concerning hygiene, preserved in Paris Ancien fonds 384 III (Blochet 2041/Richard. 15th century?) and Tehran Univ. IX 2596 (majmū'ah dated 16 Ramadān 1087/1676). Besides this a number of qīṭ'ahs and ruḥā'īyāt are attributed to him in various anthologies.

A quatrains of his and a reply to it by Abū Sa'īd b. Abī l-Khair: Ms.: Paris Supplément 793 fol. 103v-104r (Blochet 1984. 16th century?). Six apparently unpublished quatrains are found in Paris Supplément 1777 fol. 326 in marg. (according to M. Achen, Eīr III p. 103).

Editions: H. Ethé, 'Avicenna als persischer Lyriker', Nachrichten... Göttingen XXI/1, 1875, p. 555-67; Stalinabad 1933 (in Tajik script); Dushanbe 1980.

Translation (Russian verse): İbīn Sina. Isbarno (various translators), Tashkent 1981.


71. Abū 'Alī Ilyās is cited as the author of a single verse in LF s.v. pashūl. Perhaps he is the father of the poet 'Alī b. Ilyās Khaḥī (above, p. 75-7).
72. Abū l-Ḥasan Ḣanṣūlī, Masʿūd’s secretary (daṣbīr), died on Monday, 6 Shaʿbān 429 (15 May 1038). Rāḍūyānī quotes two of his verses.

Rāḍūyānī p. 47 (and Ates ad loc.)

73. Ismāʿīl (II) b. Nūh al-Muntāṣir, the last Samanid ruler, who was killed in 396/1005, was an amateur poet as well.

‘Afī’ I 22–3 (‘Manṣūr’ is an error for ‘Muntāṣir’); H. Ethé, ‘Die Lieder des kisā’ā’ (see infra, no. 91) p. 149–53 (translation of ‘Afī’ I’s entry); LN s.v. ‘Ismāʿīl’ I p. 2533–4; Khayyām-pūr p. 40; Lazard, Poètes I p. 15.

74. Ismāʿīl Rashīdī is credited with a single verse in LF, s.v. taryān. Evidently not the 12th century poet Rashīdī Samarqandi.

75. Abū l-Muzaffar Naṣr b. Muḥammad al-Istighāfī al-Naṣrī is known only as the author of a single erotic du-bait quoted by ‘Afī’ in his chapter on the Samanid poets.


76. ‘Abd al-Rahīm ‘Iyādī Sarakhsī is represented by a number of poems in Hīdāyat’s anthology, among them elegies on Ibn Sīnā (died 428/1036–7), Alp-Arsālān (died 465/1072) and Bākhtarāī (died 467/1076) and an ode to Malik-Shāh (465/1072 to 485/1092). If these are indeed all his one must doubt Hīdāyat’s statement that he was a contemporary of

1 Bāhāqī p. 539.

2 The name is given thus is LF, ed. Iqbāl, p. 357, apparently on the authority of manuscript sīn, and in Sīhāb p. 238; Farhang-i Jāhāngīrī (apud Hīrī, Einl. p. 18) has Ismāʿīl Rashīdī. In the Vatican manuscript of LF he appears merely as Rashīdī.

Muʿizzī and Niẓāmī ‘Arūdī. One verse by ‘Iyādī is quoted in the Vatican manuscript of LF. It is astonishing that no other reference to him has been found before the 19th century.

LF (ed. Hīrī) p. 120; Hīdāyat, Majma’ I p. 354–5; Khayyām-pūr p. 411.

77. Abū l-Muḥammad Mahmūd b. ‘Umar al-Jauhari al-Sāʿīgh al-Harawi is the author of two long odes quoted by ‘Afī’, who includes him in the section on the poets of the Saljuqs of Khorāsān and who tells us that he lived at the time of the Ghaznavīs Farrukhzād (443/1052 to 451/1059). He is presumably the same poet as the ‘Jauhari’ whom ‘Arūdī includes in his list of the poets of the Khaqānī dynasty.

‘Arūdī p. 152 (and Qazwīnī ad loc); ‘Afī’ II p. 110–7; Sūfī, Tāriḵh I p. 438–43.


79. Kāʾūs-Kai (doubtless a metrically dictated inversion for Kāʾūs-Kāʾūs), the son of Kai-Khusrav, of Kai is, according to verses 1524 and 1541, the author of the Zoroastrian religious mathnavī commonly called Zarāstash-tī-nāma; see also verses 45–6, where the author speaks of his ‘father’ (bāb) Kai-Khusrav, son of Dārā, of Kai. Although his authorship has been noted more or less clearly by Nie, Storey and Sūfī, the poem has traditionally been attributed to the 13th century Zoroastrian poet Zarāstasht b. Bahram b. Pāzūdī. 1 In fact, the

1 For whom see below, chap. III.
verse in which this name is mentioned (1554) is clearly part of a rhymed colophon; Zarātusht is thus not the author, but merely the copyist of the manuscript from which some (or all) of the surviving copies descend. The original poem ends either with verse 1533,1 or perhaps with 1539. Moreover, between the end of the original poem and the beginning of Zarātusht’s colophon (v. 1551) there is an older rhymed colophon in which the anonymous scribe announces that he ‘wrote’ (i.e. copied) the story on the basis of the words (gufīr) of Kāʾōs-Kai b. Kai-Khusrau – on whose soul he invokes blessings (i.e. the author was already dead) – in two days during the month of Ḫbān, ‘when the world was frozen’ (kih gōtī ḥusurūd). ‘I began’, he continues, ‘on the day Adur (=9th); on Ḫbān (10th) I was drunk while at the festival (i.e. the festival of Ḫbānagān), and on the evening of Ḫwar (11th) I finished writing it’. The year is given in two of the manuscripts available to Rosenberg as 647 (chū ʻhaft bā shash-sad) of Yazdgird, but in the Leningrad manuscript as 347 (... sī-sad).2

1Rempis thought that the original poem ended with v. 1534, arguing that the verb niwistam in 1535 necessarily means ‘I copied’ rather than ‘I composed’. However, the original poet also refers in several places to his having not merely ‘spoken’, but also ‘written’ the poem; e.g. v. 1525: chu bānī tā ʻin khatī gufīr i man... Potentially more significant is the fact (to which Rempis also draws attention) that in some of the manuscripts the poem actually ends with v. 1533, but even this can only be regarded as proof that the original poem ended here (rather than that the prototype was accidentally torn off at this point) when a steama codicum has been established which shows that the manuscripts containing the shorter version really represent a different textual tradition from those containing the rhymed colophons.

2The S.O.A.S. manuscript, which seems on the whole to belong to the same family as the Leningrad codex, has (fol. 36b) ...sh.y.q.d (sic!). This could easily represent a miscopying of an old manuscript in which šiṣad was written with an iḥsāl sign over its first letter.

earlier date was rejected by the editor (who knew that the supposed author, Zarātusht b. Bahram, lived in the 7th/13th century) as an obvious textual corruption, but Rempis has since quite correctly pointed out that it is the only one possible. 11 Ḫbān 647 Y. would correspond to 13 August 1278 Julian, on which date it is impossible to imagine that ‘the world was frozen’. On the other hand, 11 Ḫbān 347 corresponds to 28 October 978 Julian (or 4 November projected Gregorian). From this Rempis concluded that Kai-Kāʾōs’s poem must have been written before this date, i.e. it must be roughly contemporary with Daqiqi’s uncompleted Shān-nāmah. However, the possibility should also be considered that the date has been tampered with (e.g. by Zarātusht b. Bahram) and that consequently both years are wrong. The verses in which Hurmuzd ‘predicts’ (e.g. the destruction of Iran by invaders from the land of the Turks (v. 1401) would point rather to a date during the Ghaznavid or Seljuq period, i.e. not before the last part of the 4th/10th century.1 On the other hand, the observation that ‘the world was frozen’ in the middle of Ḫbān does indeed seem to require a date before the end of the 11th century at the latest.2 An early dating is certainly supported by the archaic linguistic features of the text, to which Rosenberg had already drawn attention,3 without, however, drawing the necessary conclusions.

The title of the poem (inc. sukhan rā ba nām i khudāy i jahān * bi-ārāyad az [or: bi-āghāz dar]

1This observation holds good, of course, also for the author’s source for this part of the poem, i.e. the Sarm Yawm-Yaft. I intend to return to the question of the dating of that work on an opposite occasion.

2In A.D. 1101 (for example) 11 Ḫbān would correspond to 27 September Julian (or 4 October projected Gregorian), which seems rather early for a ground frost in any part of Iran. A later dating would move us even further forward in the calendar.

3See p. xvi-xxvi of his introduction.
ashkār u nihān) is given in some of the manuscripts as Zarātusht-nāmah (Book of Zoroaster), in others as Kitāb-i maulūd-i Zartusht (Book of the birth of Zoroaster),¹ and the latter is evidently correct, as it is mentioned by the poet himself in v. 1523 (chu maulūd i Zartusht kwānī tāmām...). Indeed the poem does deal with the birth and childhood of Zoroaster and with his early prophetic career, down to the conversion of Gušṭāp. The author tells us (v. 14 sqq.) that it is based on a 'royal book' in 'Pahlawi script' which was in the possession of the chief priest (mōbad i mōbad-dān) and that at the request of that divine he versified it in 'Persian script' (khaṭṭ i darāf).²

The account of the life of the prophet which then follows is very close to that which we find in surviving Middle-Persian books such as Dēnkard and the Epistles of Žādsparām and it is most likely that one of these is in fact the 'book' to which the poet refers. After the account of the conversion of Gušṭāp we find, rather abruptly, a new dībāḵṭāb (v. 1260 sqq.) followed by the story of how Zoroaster asked Hurmuz in vain for immortality and had to content himself with an account of the future history of the world down to the coming of the final saviour. This section is a fairly close verse paraphrase of the surviving Zend I Wahrman-Yasht. Its irrelevance for the story of the 'birth' of Zoroaster might lead one to suspect that the whole section from v. 1259 to 1522 is an interpolation, but one should perhaps not expect too much structural unity in a work of this sort. In any case, there does not seem to be an appreci-

¹ The name of the prophet occurs in the poem as Zarātusht, Zartusht, Zar(at)usht or Zararat, depending on the requirements of the metre. All of these reflect Avestan Zarəməstra- (it is perhaps then better to read Zarətusht, etc. ?). The usual Neo-Persian forms of the name, Zardusht and Zard’husht continue Middle-Persian Zardu(k)hsht.

² V. 25.

able difference in language or style between the versified Wahrman-Yasht and the other parts of the poem.

Mss.: Manchester Lindesiana 300 (Cat. p. 235. 18th century?); Oxford Ouseley 40 (Eté 1947. 19th century); Ouseley 397 (Eté 1948. Incomplete); London Roy. 16 B. viii. (Rieu I p. 46-7. 17th century?); Add. 27,268 fol. 1-76 (Rieu I p. 49. Dated Ardashirish 1046Y./1676); Ross and Browne CCXIII (18th century?); S.O.A.S. 1227 fol. 20a-35b (Inspexi. 18th century? First 29 verses missing); Glasgow T.5.5. (Weir 3. Dated 30 Ardashirisht 1046Y./1676); Paris Supplément 200 (Bocchet 198/2; Unvala p. 34. Dated 1103Y./1733-4); Supplément 48 (Bocchet 199/1; Unvala p. 22-4. Copied from a Ms. dated 1103Y., apparently Supplément 200, in 1760-1); Supplément 199 (Bocchet 197; Unvala p. 34. Dated 1205/1790-1); Munich Cod. Zend. 72 (Bartholomae p. 238; Unvala p. 76); Leningrad Kokand Collection 38 fol. 141-159v (See Rosenberg’s edition p. iii-x. Ms. completed 1656/1657-8). Manṣūhad Univ. 179 (Dated 18 Safar 1268/1851); Bombay Brelvi p. xxix no. 16 (Dated 1095Y./1725-6); Univ. LIII(1) (Dated 18 Bahman 1164Y./1795). Final portion of printed edition, including date, missing here. Called Maulūd-i Zaratusht). Navašari Meherji Rana p. 29 no. 49 (Dated Bahman 1228 Y./1859); Meherji Rana p. 101 no. 125(1). Meherji Rana p. 101 no. 126; Meherji Rana p. 103 no. 136; Cambridge (Mass.) Harvard Pers. 16 (Nuskhāh-hā IV p. 5). Cf. Muns. VI 4657-89.

Prose paraphrase: Ms.: Oxford Fraser 259 (Eté 1949).

Translations: (Gujrati): Ms.: Navsari Meherji Rana p. 76 no. 51 (Dated 10 Dai 1151/1782).
(French): see editions.
(German): 'Das Zarathustra-Buch, deutsch von H. Kanus-Créde', Iranistische Mitteilungen 11, 1977, (contains also a translation of Rempis's article).

The older literature is surveyed in Rosenberg's introduction and in PL I, p. 162. Add to these: C. Rempis, "Qui est l'auteur du Zaratusht-Nâmeh?", Mélanges d'orientalisme offerts à Henri Massé, Tehran 1342sh./1963, p. 337-42; R. 'Affî's introduction to his edition of Zarâtsht's Ardâ-Wirâf-namah, Mashhad 1343sh./1964-5, p. 9-18; Safâ, Târîkh III p. 434-47 (overlooks Nieu, Storey and Rempis and claims that 'everyone' has attributed the poem to Zarâtsht b. Bahram); J.B. Sa'îd, 'Zar-rasî i chîd wâzha i zarâtsht-nâmeh', Jashn-nâmeh i Muhammad Farwîn i Gunâbâdî, Tehran 1975, p. 69-77.

80. Two verses by an otherwise unknown Kâshî are quoted in manuscript nûn of LF (ed. Iqbal p. 325, 519-200).

81. Kâr i Khar ('ass's penis') is given as the author of a pair of pornographic verses quoted by Râdûyânî, p. 47.

82. Kaukabî Marwâzî is included in 'Affî's chapter on the Ghaznavid poets, where six of his verses are quoted. 'Affî II p. 65; Hidâyat, Majma' I p. 487; Khâiyâm-pûr p. 493.

83. A single verse by Khabbâz Qâ'imî is quoted in LF, s.v. khâibîwâz. Presumably not identical with the following.

84. Khabbâz al-Nâisâbûrî is included by 'Arûdî and 'Affî among the Samanid poets and the latter cites two of his verses. Hidâyat claims that he died in 342/953-4, but it is not known where he found this information.1 'Arûdî p. 28 (and Qazwînî ad. loc.); 'Affî II p. 27; Hidâyat, Majma' I p. 199; Ethê, Vorl. p. 50-1; Safâ, Târîkh I p. 438; Khâiyâm-pûr p. 186-7 (with further references); LN s.v. 'Khabbâzî' p. 240; Lazard, Poêtes I p. 15.

85. Khaffâf is quoted a good number of times in Asâdi's LF and once by Shams i Qâla. LF passim; Shams p. 394; Khâiyâm-pûr p. 193.


87. Abû Sa'id Khatîrî is quoted several times in Asâdi's LF (where the Ms. also have hâry and bsyry). One half-verse is quoted by Râdûyânî. LF (see the indexes to the 3 editions); Râdûyânî p. 75.

88. Khujastah Sarakhshî is quoted about a dozen times in Asâdi's LF, but is otherwise unknown. LF passim; Khâiyâm-pûr p. 187.

89. Abû Tâhir al-Tâiyîb b. Muhammad al-Khusrawânî merits a short entry in 'Affî's chapter on

1Wilîh (apud Ethê, Vorl. p. 50-1) quotes three verses by one Abû 'Ali b. Ḥâkîm Khabbâz which refer to the latter's father, Khabbâz, as a doctor. Ethê's equation of the latter with Khabbâz appears to be arbitrary.
the Samanid poets. Shams i Qais quotes two verses of his, mocking old men who dye their hair, in which he incorporated a verse by Rödakī. Later authors, however, turn the story around and quote two verses of Rödakī's with which he responded to Khusrawānī's attack. The qiṭ‘āh attributed to Rödakī - and indeed the whole anecdote - is most probably spurious. They form thus a very weak basis for the contention that the two poets were contemporaries. Khusrawānī might well have lived a generation later.


90. Abū Bakr Muhammad b. ‘Alī al-Khusrawālī al-Hakīm is frequently quoted by Asadī and Rädgyānī. ‘Auﬁ quotes odes that he dedicated to the Buyid wasîr al-Sāhib Ismā’îl b. ‘Abbâd (d. 385/995) and to the Ziyarid ruler of Gurgân, Shams al-Ma’ālī Qubūs b. Wushtmîr (387/978 to 402/1012). Bâkharzî mentions him in connection with these same patrons and quotes a number of his Arabic verses.

Bâkharzî no. 305; LF passim (and Horn, Einl. p. 18); Rädgyānī passim (and Ateş’s notes p. 124–5); Wawwāt p. 76; ‘Auﬁ II p. 18–19; Safā, Tārīkh I b p. 433–5; Khayyām-pūr p. 191; Lazard, Poètes I p. 15.

1Va. 485–6 of Nâfisī’s second edition of Rödakī’s fragments, with indication of sources (all late).

91. Abū l-Ḥasanī al-Kisā’î al-Marwazi is evidently identical with the ‘ascetic’ whom Bâkharzî calls Abū l-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. Muḥammad al-Kisā’î al-Marwazi and to whom he attributes two Arabic verses. ‘Auﬁ devotes a long entry to him, quoting, among other things, a qasīdah in which the poet states that he was born on a Wednesday, three days before the end of Shawwâl in 341 (=16 March 953) and that at the time of the composition of the poem he had reached the age of 50, i.e. he was still alive in 391/1000–1. ‘Auﬁ also quotes an ode in praise of ‘Ṣulṭān i Ghāzī Yamīn al-da‘lah’, i.e. Mâmûd of Ghaznah, and a religious poem in praise of ‘Alī. ‘Arûdī, on the other hand, includes him among the Samanid poets; if correct, this would suggest that he was patronised successively by the Samanids and Ghaznavids. The collection of his fragments by Riyādī contains a total of 292 verses which the editor considers authentic and references to a number of spurious poems. Among the former special mention is due to a substantial poem (the first in the volume) of 50 verses quoted by Taqī Kâshî in the supplement (tadhîlb) to his Khulāṣat al-ash‘âr (Bankipore VIII no. 684); the authenticity of the poem is assured by the fact that two of its verses are quoted by Asadī and one by Rädgyānī. Kisâ’î is frequently mentioned in disparaging terms in the poems of Nâṣir i Khusraw (see the index to his dîwân); however, the exchange of poems between Kisâ’î and Nâṣir quoted by Taqī (followed by Hidāyat) is manifestly spurious.

Collections of fragments: H. Etê, ‘Die Lieder des Kisâ’î’, Sitzungsberichte ... München 1874, p. 135–53 (with German ‘verse’ translations); M.A.

1Thus ‘Arûdî; the late tadkhirah for which see Etê’s article - call him Abû l-Ḥasan Majd al-dîn.
Riyābī, Kisā'ī i Marwāzī. Zindaḡī, andīshah wa shī' r-i ī, Iran 1367šh./1989.
Bākhrzī no. 288; LF passim (very frequently quoted; there are several new verses in the ed. Mujtabā'ī/Sādiqī); Rādūyānī passim (and Ategā's notes p. 97-8); Naṣīr al-dīn al-Qazwīnī al-Rāzī, Kitāb al-naqd (ed. Muḥaddith i Urmāwī, Tehran 1331šh./1952) p. 252, 628; 'Arūdī p. 28 (and Qazwīnī's notes ad loc.); 'Aūfī II p. 33-9 (and Naṣīr's notes in the new edition); Shams p. 272, 320; Rāzī II p. 7-9; Hīdāyāt, Majma' I p. 482-5; LN s.vv. 'Abū Isḥāq' 369-70 and 'Kisā'ī'; Khayyām-pûr p. 485 (with further references); Šāfā, Tārīkh I6 p. 441-9; Shafī'ī-Kadkhānī, Šuwar p. 430-3; Lazzard, Šo'etes I p. 14; E3 s.v. 'Kisā'ī' (J.H. Kramers/J.T. de Bruijn, with further literature).

92. Labībī, whose name and place of origin are not recorded, was a contemporary of Farrukhī and 'Unsuri, as is clear from his verses quoted by Rādūyānī:

gar Farrukhī bi-murd, chirā 'Unsuri na-murd?
pīr-e bi-mând dār u jawnā-bi razfāt sūd.
farzānā-bi razfāt u zī raftan-šah har ziyān,
dēwānā-bi-mānd u zī māndan-šah hēch sūd.
'(If Farrukhī has died, why hasn't 'Unsuri died?
An old man stayed long but a young man has departed quickly. A wise man departed, and from his departure comes only harm; a madman remained, and his remaining is no good to anyone').

These verses would be of considerable importance for the chronology of Persian literature in the first half of the 5th/11th century if we had reliable information about the vital statistics of any one of the three poets involved. As we do not, and as we have not even any independent confirmation that Farrukhī predeceased 'Unsuri, it cannot entirely be ruled out that the text of the ancient manuscript of Rādūyānī's book has been mispointed and that what Labībī actually wrote was gar Farrukhī na-murd, chirā 'Unsuri bi-murd, etc. Labībī is evidently the author of five verses quoted by Biaḥqī referring, as the historian tells us, to an event during the reign of Mas'ūd I (though the manuscripts of Biaḥqī's work give the name of the poet as 'Laīthī'). Moreover, 'Aūfī, in his chapter on the Ghaznavid poets, quotes a fairly long qasī-dah of his in which the poet gives the kunyah of his patron as 'Abū 1-Muṣaffar'; 'Aūfī identifies the latter as 'Amīr Abū 1-Muṣaffar Yūsuf b. Naṣīr al-dīn', but this is definitely wrong (as both Bahār and Rypka/Borecký have noted, apparently independently); for one thing, Mahmūd's brother's name was Abū Ya'qūb Yūsuf etc., and for another the poet calls his patron a 'king' (pād-shāh). It is thus probable that the poem was in fact addressed to the ruler of Chaghānīyān, Fakhr al-daulah Abū Muṣaffar Ahmad b. Muhammad b. Ahmad. Whether it is in fact the work of Labībī is, however, not certain, as it is ascribed in later tadkhīrāhs to Farrukhī and has also found its way into copies of the dīwān of Manṣūhirī, Lāmī'ī and Azraqī. Apart from these poems we have a good number of quotations from Labībī in the Lughat i furs, which cites this poet very frequently. Most of the surviving fragments are from invectives and a large portion of them are vehemently pornographic.


1Thus already Hīdāyāt p. 445, who calls the dedicatee 'Abū 1-Muṣaffar Muḥtār i Chaghānī' but attributes the ode to Farrukhī. Bosworth, Iran IX, 1981, p. 12, considers the possibility that the poet's patron was Abū 1-Muṣaffar Naqīr b. Naṣīr al-dīn, another brother of Mahmūd's, but was he a 'pād-shāh'?
3 and again reprinted in the first instalment of his Galj ı bāz-yāftah, Tehran, 1334/1555, p. 1-34.)

LF passim (two new fragments in ed. Mujtabā'ī/Sādiqi p. 97, 132); Rādīyānī p. 32 (and Ates ad loc.); Bāhaqī p. 73-4; 'Auff I p. 40-1; Hīdāyat, Majma' I p. 494 (Labībī) and 446-5 (the poem he attributes to Farrukhī); Dīwān i Farrukhī, ed. A. 'Abd al-Rasūlī, Tehran 1311/1932-3, p. 5 of the introduction; M.T. Bahār, 'Qaṣīdah i Labībī', Ayandah III, 1306/1927, p. 151-7 (an edition of the one long ode; reprinted in the LN article); LN s.v. 'Labībī'; Sāfā, Tārīkh II p. 547-50; Khāiyām-pūr p. 500; EI s.v. 'Labībī' (J.T.P. de Brujin).

93. Lāmī'ī Dihistānī, 1 or Gurgānī, 2 is listed by 'Arūḍī among the panegyristes of the Seljuqs. There are three poems in his Dīwān praising a king named Nāshirwān, or, as one verse 3 has it, 'mīr Fakhr al-daulah Nāshirwān, khudāwānd i jahān', evidently the Ziyārid ruler of his native Gurgān, (A)nāshirwān b. Manūchihr, who occupied his throne under the uneasy tutelage of the Ghaznavids and Seljuqs from around 420/1029 to perhaps as late as 441/1049-50. 4 He would appear to have been Lāmī'ī's first patron. Afterwards he entered the service of the Seljuqs, praising their two well-known wazirs, 'Amīd al-mulk Abū Nasr al-Kundurī (who served Toghūt and was eliminated shortly after the succession of Alp Arslān) and Niẓām al-mulk, as well as the latter's master, Alp Arslān (455/1063 to 466/1072).

Neither of two oldest tadhkirahs (those of 'Auff and Daulat-shāh) devotes an entry to this poet. The latter does, however, mention one Lāmī'ī Bukhārī among the pupils of Sūsani. If this is true, we must surely have two poets with the same name. The authors of the later tadhkirahs evidently confused the two: Ādhar makes Lāmī'ī a pupil of Muhammad al-Ghazālī and says that he died in Samargand. Hīdāyat repeats this last piece of information and adds that his death occurred during the reign of Sanjar (511/1118 to 552/1157), which is much too late, at least as far as our poet is concerned.

The hitherto recorded dated manuscripts of his Dīwān are without exception late. Apart from those listed by Munzawi (III 25647-58) we could mention: London Or. 2889 fol. 10-24a (Rieu Suppl. no. 212 II. Completed 28 Jumādā I 1289/1876); R.A.S. Storey bequest no. 3, fol. 15b-17a (Uncatalogued; inspexi. This Dīwān is added by a second hand to an evidently older codex and dated 1289/1852-3); Cambridge Browne Coll. V. 88 pp. 144-179 (Dated 1266/1849-50). Leningrad Univ. 941* (Salemann-Rosen p. 15); Univ. 1003c (Romaskewics p. 87).


LF (one verse in ed. Mujtabā'ī/Sādiqi p. 30-1; there is another verse in the marginal additions to manuscript nūn, ed. Iqbal p. 420); 'Arūḍī p. 28; Shams p. 335, 360; Jājamī I 142-3; Daulat-shāh p. 102; Ādhar p. 160-2; Hīdāyat, Majma' I p. 494-501; LN s.v. 'Lāmī'ī' p. 74-6 (S. Nafisi); Khāiyām-pūr p. 499-500; Sāfā, Tārīkh II* p. 386-98; Shāfī'ī-Kadkanī, Šuwar p. 641-8; EI s.v. 'Lāmī'ī' (J.W. Clinton).

1Thus 'Arūḍī.
2Shams; Jājamī ('Lāmī'ī al-Jurjānī').
3Ed. Dabīr-Siyāqi, no. 80, v. 977.


95. A single verse by one Māḥmūdī is quoted in LF s.v. kasak (or kasakh) (ed. Horn p. 69; ed. Iq-bal p. 297; also in Shāhī p. 185). Horn identified this poet with Zainabī Māḥmūdī (below, p. 239), but this is only a guess.

96. Māṣārīā is the author of a medical poem of some 5000 verses in hāzaj metre (inc. ba nām-i pāk i dādār i jāhān ast * kib bakhshāyī y dānā i nihān ast). Nothing is known of him except what can be deduced from that work, the title of which is given in the text (twice) as Dānish-nāmah, in the colophon, however, as Kitāb-i Mānsūrī ba nām; the latter title would seem to imply that the poem is based on the well-known medical compendium al-Kitāb al-mansūrī of Muḥammad b. Zakhariyā al-Rāzī, but there seems to be nothing in the text to support this. The title given in the colophon is thus probably spurious. The author tells us that he began his poem in Shawwāl 367/978 and completed it in 370/980-1 when he was more than 46 years old, thus indicating that he was born about 324/936.

97. Abū l-Muẓaffar Makkī b. ʻIbrāhīm b. ʻAlī al-Panjhīrī is included by ‘Aṭṭī among the poets of the Ghasnavids.

Rāḏūyānī p. 69 (and Aṭṭī ad loc.); ‘Aṭṭī II p. 46; Rāzī (Calcutta edition p. 38-9); Hīḍīyat, Majma’ I p. 66; LN s.v. ‘Abū l-Muẓaffar’ p. 843, 848; Khayām-pūr p. 23.

98. Mawānī Bukhārī is credited with four gnomic verses in ‘Aṭṭī’s chapter on the Samanid poets.

‘Aṭṭī II p. 27; Hīḍīyat, Majma’ I p. 510; Ethel, Vorl. p. 49-50; Khayām-pūr p. 554.

99. Abū Saʿīd b. Muḥammad al-Mansūrī al-Samarqandī is included by ʻArūḍī and ‘Aṭṭī among the Ghasnavid poets. ʻAṭṭī quotes, among

The work is dedicated to one Nāṣir i Daulat, evidently the governor of Khurāsān, Abū l-Hasan Muḥammad b. ʻIbrāhīm b. Shīmar, who received the title Nāṣir i daulah after the ascension of the Samanid Nūh (II) b. Mānsūr in 365/975-6.


1Thus ‘Aṭṭī, Shams calls him Ghāzānī Laukārī (p. 231) or simply Ghāzānī (p. 233). Ghāzānī is the name of a quarter in Herat, but it is also a personal name, thus Ghāzānī could simply mean ‘descendant of a certain Ghāzānī’. Laukārī is a locality near Marv.

2This reading of the name (or perhaps Māṣārīā), rather than the expected Muyassarīā, is assured by the metre.

1In Rāḏūyānī: Makkī i Panjhīrī. ‘Aṭṭī gives the name as above except that Browne (following Ms. E) omits the first yā of the nībah; Ms. S has al-Panjhīrī. Rāzī (followed by Hīḍīyat) gives the name as Abū l-Muẓaffar ʻIbrāhīm only.

2Thus in Ms. S of ‘Aṭṭī and in Hīḍīyat. Ms. E – followed in Browne’s edition – has Abū Saʿīd.
other things, an ode which he dedicated to Sultan Mahmud; a fuller version of the same poem is quoted by Jajarmi and Hidayat and five verses from it can be found already in Raduyani. Another long ode to Mahmud is quoted in the old jung published by Yaghma'i. Presumably the same Manshuri is the author of two verses quoted in the Punjab and Tehran (Malik) manuscripts of LF s.v. haft-arang (the second verse is also in the marginal additions to manuscript nūn). Watwāt reports that in his Kans al-gharā'īb Ahmad Manshuri collected artificial poems of the type called mutalawwin, which, if vocalised differently, can be scanned in two different metres.

LF (ed. Iqbal) p. 292; ed. Mujtaba'i/Sadiqi p. 21; Raduyani p. 64, 88 (and Ates's notes p. 140); 'Arudi p. 28 (and Qaswini ad loc.); Watwāt p. 55; 'Auffi II p. 44-6; Jajarmi II p. 459-61; Yaghma'i p. 118-22; Hidayat, Majma' I p. 506; LN s.v. 'Abū Sa'id' 508, and 'Abbad' 1273, 1356; Şafā I 6 p. 553-5; Khayām-pūr p. 566.

100. Mansur b. 'Ali al-Mantiqi al-Ra'zi, known as Mordi ('myrtle', or perhaps rather Muwarrid?) eulogised the Būyid waṣīr of Ra'i al-Shāhī Isma'il b. 'Abbād (367/977-8 to 385/995).


1More precisely: one of the verses cited by Raduyani on p. 64 occurs also in Jajarmi's and Hidayat's versions, the two verses on p. 88 occur in 'Auffi and Hidayat (but not in Jajarmi) and the other two on p. 64 are found only in Raduyani.

2Manturī' is a typographical error for Manshurī; see the ghalaṭ-nāmah.

3Thus 'Auffi.

2Neo-Persian Manuchir is the etymologically correct continuation of Avestan Manūshīra-, 'of the seed of Manush'. But at an early date popular etymology re-interpreted the name as Mīnūchehr, 'heavenly-faced', frequently spelt my-. Cf. Justi p. 191-3.

2No. 34, five verses from the end (reference supplied by A.H. Morton).

3Clinton, p. 23-5, takes a hypercritical view of the link between Manuchirī and the Ziyarids, but appears to have overlooked the verse just mentioned.
kad-khūdā in Rai for a short period in 423 to 424 (1032-3), and it was evidently after serving this representative of the Ghaznavids in Rai that our poet betook himself to the court of the king himself. In one place, in fact, he claims that Mas'ūd had brought him from Rai on an elephant, but this must perhaps be taken with a pinch of salt. There is in any case no evidence that Manū-chihrī entered the service of the Ghaznavids before the time of Mas'ūd, and no indication that he outlived that ruler. The tadhkira gives the date of his death as 432/1040-1, 439/1047-8, or as late as 483/1090.  

Apart from qaṣīdahs and the usual shorter poems Manū-chihrī's ḏīwān contains 11 celebrated muzammals, a form of strophic poetry not known to have been used by any earlier Persian author. He has been admired in particular for his description of nature.

Manuscripts of his ḏīwān are frequent, but overwhelmingly late (19th or 20th century), and it is on these modern copies that the existing editions are based. There is, however, an as yet unused manuscript in Tehran dated 1010/1601-2 as well as a few old manuscripts with more or less extensive selections from the poems. (Blochet's 16th century dating of the Paris manuscript needs closer scrutiny). That the vulgate text is, none-

theless, not all that bad can be seen from the fairly close agreement between the text given by Dabīr-Siyāqī for the first strophe of his poem no. 58 with the version quoted by Rādūyānī, p. 105. MSS.: London Or. 2844 (Rieu Supp. no. 206. Dated 1274/1857-8); Or. 2889 fol. 75b-119a (Rieu Supp. no. 212 V. Completed 28 Jumādā I 1293/1876); R.A.S. Storey bequest no. 3, fol. 96b-155b (Uncatalogued; Insepexi. Contains the qaṣīdīd and the 7th, 3rd, 1st and the beginning of the 2nd muzammāl of Dabīr-Siyāqī's edition, breaking off in the middle of latter); Cambridge Browne Coll. V.1 (Dated 1290/1873); Browne Coll. V.2 (Dated 22 Muharram 1295/1878. qaṣīdīd only); Paris Supplément 725 II (Blochet 1206. 16th century?); Leningrad Univ. 1004 (Romaskewicz p. 8. Dated 1271/1854-5; Univ. 1276 (Tagirzhanov p. 8); Istanbul Universite FY 917 (=Halis Ef. 1647. Ateş 10. Dated 20 Dhū 1-hijjah 1285/1869); Baku I 338 (Dated 1260/1844); I 339 (Dated 1274/1857-8); Tehran Univ. XIV 4669 (Dated 1010/1601-2, with an introduction); Majlis 4906 (Munz. 26235 Insepexi. Dated 1260/1844); Shūrā i Islāmī I 91 p. 1-63; Sari Shīhāb Collection (Nuskahah-hā VI p. 621. Dated 1209/1794-5); Qum Mar'ashi V 1930; Mashhad Univ. 157, 158, 159; Lahore Univ. II p. 134 (Dated 1249/1833-4. See OCM III/2, 1927, p.74); Banki pore I 14 (19th century); I 15 (19th century); Hyderabad Asafiyah I p. 734 no. 309; Calcuttaivanov Curzon 188 (modern); Lucknow Sprenger 349 (Dated 1010/1601-2). A large number of late manuscripts are listed by Munzawi (III 28230-91) and in Dabīr-Siyyāqī's introduction.

Selected poems: London Or. 2880 fol. 118b-140a (Rieu Supp. no. 224 II. Completed Jumādā I 1245/1829. A selection of qaṣīdīd only); Cambridge Browne Coll. V.66 no. 36 (Anthology dated 27 Ramadān 827/1424); Calcutta Ivanov 927 fol. 1s v sq. (Modern); Tehran Malik (Dated Rabī‘ I 1011/1602, according to Dabīr-Siyyāqī's introduction, p. viii); Majlis VIII 2326 (17th century?).


102. ʿAbū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Maʿrūfī al-Bālkhī is credited by ‘AuFi with two verses from an ode which he says were dedicated to the Samanid ruler ʿAbd al-Malik b. Nūb b. Naṣr (343/954-5 to 350/961). Moreover, Dīn-khūdī refers to an unpublished source which has him recite an ode in the presence of the ruler of Sīsṭān, Khalaf b. Ahmad (died 399/1008-9).

Collection of fragments (45 verses); French translation, discussion and literature: Lazard, Poètes I p. 31, 128-33, II p. 132-8.

LF passim; Rāḏūyānī p. 44; ‘AuFi II p. 16; Shams passim; Jājārī II p. 953; Hidāyāt, Majma’ I p. 506; Khaiyām-pūr p. 551.

103. Marvārīḏī is credited with a single verse in LF, s.v. lāmah.

104. ʿAbū l-Qāsim Masrūr b. Muḥammad al-Ṭāliqānī is known to us only from the verses quoted by ‘AuFi in his chapter on the Ghaznavid poets. These include a qaṣīdah of fifteen verses in praise of the wazīr ʿAbū l-Qāsim Ahmad b. Ḥasan.


105. Masʿūdī al-Mawzāzī is the author of the earliest known version of the Shāh-nāmah (inc. nakhustān Gāvāmārd ʿAmād b. ʿAbū l-Gāmī)

1LN s.v. ‘Abū ʿAbd Allāh’ p. 608.
injured by his royal patron and was exiled to India on account of two verses in which he warned of the growing power of the king’s enemies, comparing these with ants (mār) who had turned into serpents (mār). According to the same historian the king pardoned Mas’ūd on the following Nau-rūz (6 March 1040). He is presumably identical with the ‘Mas’udī i Ghaznavī’ cited in LF s.v. warrafān (or warraqān) and by Rādūyānī p. 38. ‘Auﬁ gives us further samples of his verse. Hijrāyat’s statement that our author was a leading Shi’ite religious scholar cannot be traced to any early source, and seems in any case most improbable.

Baihaqī p. 594, 611; LF (see the indexes to the three editions); Horn, Einl. p. 28 wrongly identifies our poet with Mas’ud i Sa’d i Sa’di, for whom see infra, chap. III; Rādūyānī p. 36, 38 (and Atef’s notes, p. 125-6); ‘Arūdī p. 28 (and Qazwīnī ad loc.); Watwāt p. 27 (and Iqbal ad loc.); ‘Auﬁ II p. 63; Rāzī III p. 38-9; Hidrīyat, Majma’ I p. 503; Safā, Tārikh I p. 555-7; Khayyām-pūr p. 538.


108. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭahar al-Rāzī was a secretary to one of the Qarakhanids and a contemporary of Mah-
müd. ‘Arūḍī praises the style of his letters. Rādūyānī quotes four of his verses; two of these (which in turn incorporate an explicit quotation from Khusravānī) occur also in a fragment of five lines which ‘Afu‘ī (and later authors) ascribes to Firdauṣī. Obviously, the attribution to Muhammad is supported not only by the greater antiquity of Rādūyānī, but also by the fact that, as the less famous poet, he is also less likely to have had stray verses wrongly attached to his name.

Rādūyānī passim (and Ateş’s notes p. 100-1); ‘Arūḍī p. 13, 24 (and Qazwīnī’s notes); Wātāpī p. 78; Ǧafr, Tārīkh 16 p. 439-41; Lazard, Poètes I p. 14.

109. Muhammad b. Mukhallad is mentioned by the author of the Tārīkh i Sīstān in the same context as Muhammad b. Wasif2 and Bassānī i Kūrd.3

Collection of fragments (3 verses), French translation, discussion and literature: Lazard, Poètes I p. 19, 58, II p. 17.


110. Abū ‘Apū Allāh Muḥammad b. Sāliḥ flourished under the Samanids, according to ‘Afu‘ī, who quotes four of his verses. His nisbah is given in the printed text of ‘Afu‘ī as al-Walvālījī, but by Ḥidāyat,4 who refers explicity to ‘Afu‘ī as his source, as Nawā’iḥī. Qazwīnī5 equated him with the poet mentioned by Manūčehrī6 in a list of ancient poets as ʿan-ki ṣāmad as Nawā’iḥī.7 It is therefore likely, as Qazwīnī argued, that Nawā’iḥī is the correct reading.


111. Muḥammad b. Wasif composed, according to the author of the Tārīkh i Sīstān, the first Persian poem in quantitative metre, namely an ode in honour of Yaʿqūb b. Laith, probably at about the time when the latter captured Herat in 253/867. Another poem bemoans the death of ʿAmr b. Laith and alludes to the events of 296/790-99.


112. Abū Sharīf Ahmad b. ‘Allī Mukhalladī7 Jurjānī is, according to ‘Arūḍī and ‘Afu‘ī, the name of the author of two verses stating that all that remains of the glory of the Samanids and the Sasanids is the praise bestowed upon them by Bārbad and Rōdākī respectively; he must therefore have lived after the fall of Samanids.3 Rādūyānī

1Thus ‘Afu‘ī. ‘Arūḍī calls him ‘Sharīf Muḥalladī Gurgānī’.

2Thus pointed (one dot over the khār and a dot under the dāl muhāl) in Rādūyānī fol. 281b. The other sources fluctuate between ‘Mukhalladī’ and ‘Mujalladī’.

3Arabic verses to the same effect are quoted (in all cases anonymously) by ‘Afu‘ī (I p. 13: two verses), Žahīrī (p. 29: four verses) and Rāwandī (Rāwandī al-sudīr, ed. M. Iqbal, London 1921, p. 62: three verses). Qazwīnī (ad Juwainī I p. 163) says that one of the verses is not the one mentioning Rōdākī — occurs also in a qaṣīda by Abī Isḥāq Ibrāhīm b. Yaḥyā al-Ghaẓī, who died in 524/1129-30; see Qazwīnī ad ‘Arūḍī p. 100-1 and EI² Suppl. s.v. ‘Ghaẓī’ (C.E. Bosworth). As long as the authorship of the Arabic verses is not established the question must remain open as to whether the Persian verses are translated from the Arabic or vice versa.
quotes a translation by him of a prophetic hadith and this is followed by further translations (not specifically attributed, but perhaps also by Mukhallad) of a series of sayings by 'Ali. One verse by 'Abū Sharif is quoted in the Vatican Manuscript of LF s.v. bīnī, and the same verse is quoted in Sīhāb p. 299 as the work of 'Mujalladī'. 'Mujalladī' is also quoted six times in the marginal additions to manuscript nūn of LF and four connected verses are cited in Sīhāb (p. 46).

LF passim; Rādūyānī p. 119-21 (and Atesh ad loc.); ‘Arūḍī p. 27 (and Qazwīnī ad loc.); ‘Auffī I p. 13-4; LN s.v. ‘Abūnāhī ‘Abdu ‘Abbās’ 539; S. Nafīsī, ‘Mukhalladī i Gurgānī’, HDAT IV/1, 1335 sh./1956, p. 18-22; Ṣafā, Tūrīkh I6 p. 557-9; Khayyām-pūr p. 93, 529

113. al-Adīb Abū Ǧâfar Muḥammad b. Ḥabīb al-Mukhtar was a contemporary, and evidently also a friend, of Bāḥkharzī (died 546/1055), who quotes, among many other samples of his Arabic poetry, three verses dedicated to Abū Ibrāhīm Ismā’īl b. Ghuṣn. Two of these are quoted also by ‘Auffī in the first entry of his chapter on the poets of the Seljuq. There is a lacuna at the beginning of this entry in the manuscripts used by Browne, who supplied the missing name of the author as Bahramī; this is doubtless wrong. The Arabic verses are - as mentioned - by Mukhtar and he must consequently be the author of the five Persian verses quoted there as well. According to Ḥubal the author of the 'Tadhkirah i ‘Arafāt'1 states explicitly that Muḥammad ‘Auffī ascribes the last of these verses to Abū Mukhtar; it is thus clear that the name Mukhtar still stood in the manuscript of ‘Auffī’s work available to that author. The same verse occurs already in ‘Arūḍī, who says that it was recited by Būrūnī at the time when he gave over his position as poet-laureate to his son Mu’izzī, whereby ‘Arūḍī seems to imply that the verse is in fact by Būrūnī. If this is true Mukhtar must have quoted it in his own qīf‘ah, though it is just as likely that Būrūnī was in fact quoting Mukhtar. Daulat-shāh2 and other late authors ascribe the same verse to Niḡm al-mulk.

Bāḥkharzī no. 488; ‘Auffī II p. 68; Ḥubal’s introduction to his edition of the dīwān of Mu’izzī, Tehran 1318 sh./1939, p. ii-vi.

114. Abū l-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. Muḥammad al-Tirmidhī al-ma‘rūf bi-Munjik3 flourished at the court of the Al-i Muḫtār, the rulers of Chaghāniyān, just to the north of his birthplace, Tirmidh, on the Amā Daryā. ‘Auffī quotes an ode to ‘Abū l-Muẓaffar Tāhir b. al-Fadl, a form which represents a contamination of the names of Abū l-Ḥasan Tāhir b. al-Fadl (died 381/991) and of his successor Abū l-Muẓaffar Ḥabīb b. Muḥammad. That the poem was in fact dedicated to the latter is clear from the fuller version of it quoted by Ḥidāyat5 and in an early jung,6 where the poet addresses his patron as ‘Abū l-Muẓaffar Shāh i zamīn.7 The same

1See above, p. 104.
2P. 59.
3In the Tarjumān al-balاغhah regularly vocalized muniy. His sobriquet appears to be derived by means of the Eastern Iranian nisbah suffix -chīk from the sunj, ‘bee’, a derivation suggested by the poet himself in a verse quoted by Asadī to illustrate that word: had chand baqr-as sukhān-as ‘Ali u shirīn * ārē, ‘asal i shirīn n-ynad masrāg as sunj, ‘although I am lowly, my words are elevated and sweet: indeed, sweet honey comes only from bees’.
5Munjik I p. 508, with the erroneous statement that the patron was in fact Tāhir b. Ḥusayn Sīstānī.
6Yaghmā’I p. 116-8.
7Thūs Yaghmā’I p. 117. Ḥidāyat has ...shāh i jahān.
patron is addressed as 'Abū l-Muṣaffār Shāhī l-Chaghānīyān Āhmad' in three verses of Munjīk's quoted by Rādūyānī. On the other hand, in Asadī's Luqāt l-furs we find a verse which several of the manuscripts state was recited by 'Shahīd', mocking Munjīk in the presence of Māmūd of Ghaznah, as well as two verses by Munjīk himself which are clearly his reply to the attack. Shahīd al-Balkhī died, of course, long before the time of Māmūd,; it is however not impossible that Munjīk attended the court of that ruler and engaged there in a slanging match with some poet whom the copyists confused with Shahīd. Munjīk is one of the poets most frequently quoted by Asadī and Rādūyānī and thus clearly enjoyed a considerable reputation up to a century after his own time. Many of his surviving verses (like those of Labbībī) are of a satirical and decidedly scatological vein.

LF passim; Rādūyānī passim (and Ateş's notes, p. 93); Watwāt p. 39, 49, 74; 'Auğī I p. 13-14; Shams p. 324, 346, 351; Hīdāyat, Majma' I p. 506-8; LN s.v. 'Munjīk' (Dh. Saʃā); Saʃā 1' p. 42-48; Khaiyām-pūr p. 566 (with further references); Lazār, Poètes I p. 14; Shafi'i-Kadkanī, Sūwar p. 434-8.

1P. 58. A longer version of the poem can be found, once again, in Hīdāyat, who calls its dedicatee 'Abū Muṣaffār Malik Āhmad Saʃfārī', the last word evidently a mis-reading of 'Ṣaʃfārī', the Arabicised version of Chaghānī. The verse would seem to decide the question of Abū l-Muṣaffār's personal name: it was Āhmad and not Mūṣaffār (as 'Ubū has it; cf. Bosworth, op. cit., p. 11).

2Ms. sīn and in the margin of Ms. 'ain (ed. Iqbāl p. 273) as well as in Sībāh (p. 174-5) all s.v. bukanjak. The verse is also quoted, and attributed to Shahīd, but without the connection to Munjīk and Māmūd, in the Vatican Ms. under the same lema. Lazār includes the verse among the fragments of Shahīd as no. 93.

3Quoted in Ms. sīn s.v. bukanjak and the marginal additions to Ms. mīn s.v. munjak (see ed. Iqbal p. 272).

115. Abū l-Husain (or al-Hāṣan) Mūṣaffār b. Mūṣaffār al-Murādī exercised his poetic talents mainly in Arabic. Tha'ālibī, in his Yatimat al-dahr,1 quotes some two dozen of his Arabic verses, including a fragment of an ode to Naṣr (II) b. Āhmad (301/914 to 331/943) and verses which he is said to have recited just before his death to al-Jahānī (who served as waṣīr during the early part of Naṣr's reign).2 Rūdākī wrote an elegy on his death.


116. A single verse by one Murāṣṣafī is quoted in LF s.v. parwāzah.

117. Abū Ṭaiyib Muṣaffār b. Ḥātīm al-Muṣaffābī was a high-ranking official in the service of the Samanid ruler Naṣr (II) b. Āhmad (301/913-4 to 331/942-3), rising to the rank of waṣīr before his eventual execution. It has been suggested that he had sympathies with the Ismāʿīlīs. A verse of his is quoted in the anonymous Ismāʿīlī commentary on the qasīda of Abū l-Haitham Gurgānī.3 His fragments include what seems to be a complete poem on the vanity of the world.4

1IV p. 12-13.


3See above, p. 63-4.

4Lazār's verses 2-15, preserved in the Tājīh i Bāhāṣī. Hīdāyat attributes six of these verses to Daqīqī, doubtless wrongly.


118. An otherwise unknown Muwaqqarī is the author of a 'long' gaṣīdah of which Ādīyânī (p. 106) quotes the first four verses.

119. Muṣaffarī Panjdhī Marwī is included by Ṭarūdī and `Auffi (who quotes a dozen verses of his) among the poets of the Ghaznavids. He is apparently identical with the Muṣaffarī quoted repeatedly by Asadī.

LF passim (and Horn, Einl. p. 28); Ṭarūdī p. 28 (and Qaswīnī ad loc.); `Auffi II p. 63-5; Hidāyat, Majma' I p. 505; Khaiyām-pūr p. 549.

120. Abu Sarrāghāb Ṭabī al-Rāhīmī b. Ahmad `al-Balkhī al-Āmīnī al-Najībī is the author of an ode of 16 verses in honour of Mahmūd of Ghaznah, quoted by `Auffi. It is presumably with him (and not with Najībī al-Sāgharji, whom Ṭarūdī mentions as one of the poets at the court of Khād Khān b. Tafghāj Khān) that we must identify the 'Najībī' to whom Asadī attributes one verse. The 'Nijādī' (error for 'Najībī'), one of whose verses is quoted by Ādīyânī, is perhaps also the same poet.

1Thus in Hidāyat, who explicitly gives `Auffi's Lubāb as the source of his information. In the printed text of the Lubāb the name appears as Muṣaffar Panjdhī; Horn misread Hidāyat's 'Marwī' as 'Marwā'; in fact Panjdhī is near Marwānī.

2Thus `Auffi; Hidāyat has Ahmad.

3P. 28 and 46.

121. A single verse is attributed to one Naṣīrī (or rather Naṣīrī) in the Vatican manuscript of LF (ed. Horn p. 40; also in Sihāb p. 138).

122. A substantial ode by Naṣīr Jafārī is quoted by Jājarmī and a shorter version of the same poem is given by Hidāyat, who calls its author Naṣīr Nasawī. Hidāyat's text contains a verse giving the name of the poet's patron as 'Bū ʿl-Fatḥ Malik-Shāh' (465/1072 to 485/1092); the verse is missing in Jājarmī's version, though the superscription in the latter does identify Malik-Shāh as the object of the poet's attentions. Hidāyat, however, claims that the author's patron was 'Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd Saʿīdī', evidently confusing our poet with 'Auffi's Naṣīr Lughawī, the boon-companion of Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd Ghaznowī (see below, no. 124).

Jājarmī II p. 475-7; Hidāyat, Majma' I p. 636-7; Khaiyām-pūr p. 588.

123. Abu Muʿāwīya Naṣīr al-Khusrawī al-Qubadīyānī al-Marwāzī, with the pen-name Ḥujjat, the celebrated Ḥusaynī propagandist, is discussed in PL I, p. 1138-41, to which the following is a supplement. The year of the poet's birth is indicated in

1The name appears thus (as A.H. Morton informs me) in all the manuscripts of his Safar-nāmeh. Only in Schefer's edition (and its various off-shoots) do we find 'Abū Muʿāwīya al-dīn Naṣīr...'. (evidently either a conjecture or an error on the part of the French scholar) which Dabbī-Siyāqi has in turn 'emended' to 'Abū Muʿāwīya Hamīd al-dīn Naṣīr...', but there is no support for this.
one of his poems\(^1\) as 394/1003-4 and this is consistent with his account in the *Safar-nāmah*\(^2\) of how on the eve of Thursday 6 Jumādā II 437 (19 December 1045) he suddenly awakened 'from forty years' sleep'. 'Forty' is here a round number; his precise age on that date would have been 42 or 43 lunar years.\(^3\) His travels through Persia, Syria, Egypt and Arabia and back to Central Asia in the years 437-444 (1045-1052) are described in detail in his *Safar-nāmah*. In his last years the poet settled in the district of Yumān, in Badakhshān, his loneliness in that remote place being the subject of constant complaint in the poems. The latest clearly established date in his biography is the year 462/1069-70, when he dedicated his *Kitāb Jāmi' al-bikhmatain* to an otherwise unknown amīr of Badakhshān, 'Ali b. Asad b. al-Jārīrī. Jāmī al-Tawā'īkh,\(^4\) states that Nāṣir died in 481/1088-9; this date has been widely accepted and, though not improbable, has no authority, all the more so since the same Jāmī al-Khālīfah, in two different places in his *Kashf al-sunūn*,\(^5\) has him die as early as 431/1039-41, as does already Daulat-shāh. This date is naturally impossible. Later tradition, reflected by a spurious 'autobiography' and by the *tdh*-\(1\) made Nāṣir into a mighty magician who lived for more than a hundred years.

His extant theological works (*Gushāyīsh* u rahāyīsh, Khuwān al-ikhwān; Zād al-musāfi̧rīn; Wažh i dīn; the prose *Rōshanā'īn-nāmah*, or Shāsh sāq; Ḥāmī al-bikhmatain - all to be discussed in PL IV) are at least in part translations of *ismā'īl* tracts in Arabic. In addition we have his travelogue (*Safar-nāmah*) and the *dīwān*. Of the two didactic *mthnwān* traditionally attributed to him, one, the *Sa'ādat-nāmah* is clearly the work of his 8th/14th century namesake Nāṣir al-dīn b. Khusru al-ʾīsfahānī, whose pen-name Sharīf is mentioned in the closing verses of that poem; it will be discussed *infra*, chapter IV, under 'Sharīf'. The long-standing confusion between the two explains, among other things, Daulat-shāh's statement that our poet was born in Isfahān. The other *mthnwān*, *Rōshanā'īn-nāmah*, the authenticity of which has also been doubted, will be discussed separately below. Of Nāṣir's Arabic *dīwān*, to which he occasionally refers,\(^2\) no trace remains.

Nāṣir's *dīwān* consists almost entirely of religious and didactic poems, though occasionally dedicated to the Fatimid caliph al-Mustansir, or to the dāʾī l-duʿāʾī, al-Muʿāyīyid fī l-dīn al-Shirāzī, are far removed in character from the usual laudatory *qāṣīdah*. Ms.: *London* I.0. 903 fol. 97-112 (Dated Dhū l-qaʿdah 714/1315. 78 poems only); I.0. Delhi 1297 (18th century?); Or. 10919 (Meredith-Owens p. 60. Dated 1276/1859-60); Or. 3323 (Rieu Supp. no. 210. Dated 9 Jumādā I 1296/1879. Contains also the spurious *autobiography*); Or. 2845 (Rieu Supp. no. 209. 19th century? End missing); *Berlin* Sprenger 1416 (Pertsch 710. 'Nicht ganz neu'); Ms. or. quart. 2026 (Heinz 389. With *autobiography*); *Vienna* Flügel 506

\(^{1}\)DIWĀN, ed. Mīnūwī/Muḥaqiq, no. 242, v. 27.
\(^{3}\)Storey, following Taqī-ṣūdāh, states that the poet was born in the month of Dhū l-qaʿdah. This is based on a line in the poem *mulāqāt* 1, v. 56, the author of which says that he was born in Dhū l-qaʿdah of the year 388 (with variants in the manuscripts). If the poem is really by Nāṣir, the year must be wrong. It is however more likely, as the editors of the critical edition think, that the poem is spurious, i.e. that it is by an unidentified older contemporary of Nāṣir's.
\(^{4}\)Cited by Ethē, *ZUMG* 33, p. 649.
\(^{5}\)Ilī p. 598 and 600 (new edition II col. 990 and 991).

\(^{1}\)For which see PL I p. 1140-1.
\(^{2}\)DIWĀN, no. 63 ult.; 177, v. 51-2.
(Dated Dhū l-bijjah 1259/1843-4. With a prose preface); Leningrad Acad. C1702 (Cat. VIII 5; Index 1480. Dated 1334/1915-6); Istanbul Çelebi Abdullah Ef. 290 (Munz. no. 26421. Dated Jumādā II 736 /1336); Universite FY 315 (Atē 11. Dated Shawwāl 1262/1846); Universite FY 799 (= Halis Ef. 8626. Atē 12. Dated 18 Jumādā I 1265/1853. Contains the 'autobiography'); Najaf Amīr al-mu'āminīn 1434 (Munz. 26429); Tehran Majlis 8421/2 (Munz. no. 26422. In a daftar dated 868/1463-4); Majlis II 388 (Written for the Ottoman Sultan 'Muhammad b. Mahmūd', i.e. either Muhammad I, died 886/1481, or Muhammad II, died 1012/1603-4); Malik 5567/2 (Munz. no. 26425. 17th century?); Univ. XI 3201 (Dated 29 Jumādā II 1201/1787); Ḥuṣayn p. 115 (18th century?); Millī IV 1672 (Dated 4 Sha'ban 1229 /1814); Millī III 1204 (Dated 29 Dhū l-qa'dah 1252 /1837); Gulistan/Ātābāy II 485 (Dated 1253/1837-8); Gulistan/Ātābāy II 488 (Dated Dhū l-bijjah 1261/1845); Gulistan/Ātābāy II 488 (Dated 1268 /1849-50); Gulistan/Ātābāy II 487 (Dated Muharram 1268/1851); Gulistan/Ātābāy II 489; Millī V 2028; Mashhad Ridawī VII 965/2 (Ms. completed 1041/1631-2. Selections only); Ridawī IX 1163 (Dated 28 Rabī' II 1261/1845); Ridawī IX 1162 (Dated Rajab 1266/1850); Dushanbe Acad. I 325 (Dated 11 Jumādā II 1050/1640); Hyderabad Ḡasāfīyah I p. 734 no. 300 (Dated 1104/1692-3); Kapurthala 179 (OCM III/4, 1927, p. 290); Lucknow Sprenger 265 (2 copies, one of which was dated 1037/1627-8); Madras I 70 and 71 (both copies called 'qaṣā'id i Ḥujjat'); Princeton 38 fol. 364-450 (dated 815 /1412-3); and many late MSS. (Nāṣir became popular towards the end of the 19th century); cf. Munz. III 26420-71.

Selections from his poems: Oxford Elliot 37 fol. 4b, 29a, 191b, 209b (Ethē 1333 = Daqāq al-ash'ār. On fol. 67a a tasmīt of 33 strophes); Cambridge Browne Coll. V.65 no. 31 (Anthology dated 27 Ramadān 827/1424); Berlin Sprenger 1378 fol. 442a sq. (Pertsch 681. Dated 28 Rabī' II 1270 /1854. Apparently copied from the Calcutta Ms.); Istanbul Körprüli, Fani Ahmet Paşa 1620/12 (Cat. II p. 376); Calcutta Ivanov 927 fol. 28v-47v (late).


Partial editions: H. Ethe, 'Auswah aus Nāṣir Chusraus' Kaṣīladen', ZDMG 36, 1882, p. 478-508 (based mainly on the I.O. manuscript, i.e. the oldest, with German verse translation); id., 'Kürze Lieder und poetische Fragmente aus Nāṣir Khusraus Divān', Nachrichten..., Göttingen, 1882, p. 124-52; E.G. Browne, 'Nasir-i-Khusraw, poet, traveller, and propagandist (Text and verse translation of a hundred couplets ... from the first five poems of N.-i-Rh.'s Divān)', JRAS 1905, p. 313-52; Also: Calcutta 1926 (ed. M.K. Shrirāż, contains 'only the portions prescribed for the M.A. examination of the Calcutta University'); Stalinabad 1957 (Gulchīne az devoni asbhor, ed. K. Aini, in Tajik script); Tehran 1340sh./1961-2 (Pāndzhāb qāsidah az Ḥakīm Nāṣir i Khusraw i Qūbā-dīvānī az rūy i qadir-tarin nuskhāh i khāṭī, ed. M. Muḥaqiq), reprint 1341sh./1962-3.

Commentaries: A fragment (commenting one poem = Divān, ed. Taqawī/Mīnuwī p. 120 (not in the new edition) of a commentary by Maulānā Qudā Mahmūd Bahrī (first half of 12th/18th century) is contained in Madras II 611.

Translations: (German and English verse): see partial editions.
in Pisces and the moon in Aries\(^1\) and there was a conjunction of 'the stars' in Libra. The year given in the manuscripts varies from as early as 323 to as late as 463,\(^2\) with an array of intermediate dates. But in none of the years mentioned in the manuscripts did 1 Shawwāl fall in late February or early March (i.e. when the sun is in Pisces); moreover, at none of the various times in Nāṣir’s lifetime when 1 Shawwāl did fall in February/March does there seem to have been any conjunction in Libra. Ethē, ignoring the statement about the conjunction, emended the line mentioning the year to read ‘440’, when 1 Shawwāl corresponded roughly to 9 March 1049. However, since Nāṣir was in Cairo at that time, Ethē was forced to assume that the author revised the poem later in Yumgān, without changing the original date. Taqīzādah, to whom we owe the only extensive investigation of the question,\(^3\) suggested that the verse mentioning the position of the sun and moon might be a spurious addition and proposed that the date mentioned in the original text might have been 1 Shawwāl 460, corresponding to 3 August 1068, on which date Jupiter and Saturn were both in Libra, although not actually in conjunction. But as these two planets had been in conjunction the previous September in the last segment of Virgo (i.e. just before Libra) contemporary observers might have regarded their close proximity in August 1068 as amounting to a repeated conjunction. Most recently Mīnūrī\(^4\) tried to cut the Gordian knot by propo-

\(^1\)The latter statement is of no independent significance; on the first day of a Muslim month the (new) moon will generally be in the next sign after the sun.

\(^2\)See his introduction to the 1925-8 edition of the Dīwān, p. lv-lviii.

\(^3\)M. Mīnūrī, ‘Rūshānā’I-nāmah i Nāṣir i Khusrav wa Rūshānā’I-nāmah i manūs i manūb ba ʊ’, Yād-nāmah i Nāṣir i Khusrav, Mashhad 2535ah.sh./1976, p. 574-80.
sing that the Ṛoshanā'-i-nāmāh is not by Nasir i Khusraw at all, but by a later poet who used the same takhallus (Hujjat) and also happened to live in Yumgān and that the correct date of the poem is 1 Shawwāl 643, i.e. roughly 19 February 1246 (643 instead of the 343 attested in a number of manuscripts, si-sad being supposedly a misreading of shash-sad). On this date the sun was indeed in Pisces; moreover, in that year there was a conjunction between Jupiter and Saturn in Libra; but, alas, not in February, but in September! The problem, thus, remains intact.1 Quite apart from the fact that he has not solved the chronological difficulties, Minuwī’s suggestion that there were two Hujjats, in the same obscure Yumgān is a most improbable one. If the poem is not by Nasir (and it remains to be proved that it is not), then it would certainly seem more likely that the three verses alluding to Hujjat or to Yumgān were interpolated by someone who wanted to pass the poem off as a work of Nasir’s. In any event, v. 218, which says that Hujjat resided in Yumgān ‘like a king’ (pādshah-wār) is sufficiently reminiscent of the legends about Shāh Saiyid Nasir to make it seem most likely that it is an interpolation. The same interpolator might then have altered the original date to something that he thought fell in Nasir’s lifetime; uncertainty about when the presumed author actually lived would account for the wild discrepancy between the dates given. But it must be repeated that no convincing arguments have yet been advanced against Nasir’s authorship. If the poem is by someone else, it can still hardly be by anyone who lived much after the time of Nasir. The doctrines expounded in the poem are in line with the Ismā’īl dogmas of the Fatimid period and show no trace of the ghulūw so characteristic of Iranian Nizārī Ismailism from the 12th century onward. Moreover, the language of the work (particularly in the version published by Semenov) has some striking archaic features, e.g. the frequent use of the particles mar ... rā. What, of course, is required, as with so many Persian texts, is a critical edition based on all the available manuscripts and a thorough comparison of the language, style and content of the poem with Nasir’s other works. As for the unsolved chronological problem, it might help to abandon Taqī-zādah’s preconception that qirān akhtarān must necessarily mean ‘conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn’. Perhaps some other conjunction is intended?

1 Ivanov, Problems..., p. 55-6, dismisses Ethé’s (and presumably also Taqī-zādah’s) ‘complex speculations’ and opts for the date 444/1053, which he found in one manuscript, but which, like the dates found in the other manuscripts, is irreconcilable with the data given in the following lines. Ivanov’s arbitrary dating was accepted, without further discussion, by Rypka, p. 189. D. Sajjādī, in his article ‘Tabāqāt dar Raushānā'-i-nāmāh i Nasir i Khusraw’, on p. 262-72 of the volume cited in the previous footnote, begins by misrepresenting what everyone else has said about the dating of the work and proceeds with some purely subjective remarks about the ‘weak’ style of the poem.

Mss.: London I.0. 904 (Dated 1061/1651); I.0. 1761/5 (a late copy; however, the fact that the kasrah i idāfah is ‘almost always’ indicated by ṭā’ suggests that it was copied from a very old manuscript); I.0. 4057; Paris Supplément 1777 fol. 158r sqq. in marg. (Blochet 1845. Ms. dated 852/1449); Supplément 1398 fol. 4v sqq. (Blochet 1970. Dated 861/1456-7); Supplément 1417 fol. 41v sqq. (Blochet 1662. Dated 15 Ramadan 879/1475); Supplément 781A fol. 249v sqq. (Blochet 1972. Dated Rabī‘ I 892/1487); Leyden 968 (2) (Cat. DCXXX. Dated 855/1451); Gothia 6/6 (gives the date of composition as 420); Leningrad Acad. C1102/4 (Cat. VII 1; Index 2054. Dated 710/1310-1; the oldest recorded copy); Univ. 1113 (Romaskewicz p. 9. Dated 1318/1900-1); Acad. A144/3 (Cat. VIII 2;
Index 2052. Dated 1338/1919-20; Acad. B1809/4 (Cat. VIII 3; Index 2053); Konya Mevlâna II 318/VI (Ms. dated 885/1480-1); İstanbul Şehid Ali Paşa 2703/9 fol. 166b-178a (Cf. H. Ritter in Der Islam XXV, 1939, p. 82 and Mikrûfîm-hâ I p. 515. Dated 11 rajab 752/1352); 'Lala Ismail' (=Lâlâli) 487/9 (Mikrûfîm-hâ I p. 500. Dated 741/1340-1); Nuruosmaniye 4196/4 fol. 330b-338b (Ateğ 15. Dated 27 Rajab 825/1421); Köprüli, Fazîl Ahmet Paşa 1097/3 (Cat. II p. 300. Ms. dated Sha'bân 940/1437); 'Millat Efendi Ali Emir' 1017/8 (according to Mikrûfîm-hâ I p. 487. Dated 855/1451); Nuruosmaniye 4964/37 fol. 195b-205a in marg. (Ateğ 16. 15th century?); Universite FY 593/9 fol. 231b-228b [sic Ateğ; for 238b? (Ateğ 17. Dated 890/1485); Topkapı, Hazine 299 (Karatağ 387); Kayseri Resid Efendi 607 fol. 1b-13b (Karabulut 465); Tehran Malik 4925/3 (Munz. 30158. Dated 842/1438-9); Majlis 8421/1 (Munz. 30161. Dated 868/1463-4); Majlis VIII p. 213 no. 2344/2 (Dated 15 Sha'bân 883/1478. Beginning missing); Majlis 5299 (Munz. 30164. 16th century?); Malik 5124 (Munz. 30165. 15th century? Incomplete); Univ. XI 3142/4 (Dated 10 Jumâdâ II 950/1543. Date of poem given as 343); Univ. XIV 4736/9 (17th century?); Malik 5076/5 (Munz. 30168. 17th century?); Majlis 4869 (Munz. 30169. 17th century?); Univ. XII 3533/3 (Dated 1228/1813); Gulistan/Atââyî II 490 (Dated Dhût l-qa'dah 1574/1858); Dushanbe Acad. II 328 (Dated Safar 1289/1872); Acad. II 329; Bombay Rehatseck p. 128 (Dated 25 Sha'bân 926/1520); Banki pore Suppt. i 1981 (18th century? Date of composition given as 323 as in the older I.O. copy). Cf. Munz. IV 30165-77. 

Extracts: İstanbul Nuruosmaniye 4904/14 fol. 63b-68a (Ateğ 18. Dated 940/1533-4); Köprüli 1597 fol. 166b-178a (see Taeschner in Islamica V, 1932, p. 320); Tehran Gulistân/Atââyî II 488 (Dated Dhût 1-bijâh 1261/1845). 

Editions: (See also above, under dîwân). H. Ethê, 'Nâsir Chusraw's Rûsânînâmâ ... oder Buch der Erleuchtung ...' ZDMG 33, 1879, p. 645-664, 34, 1880, p. 428-464, 617-42 (critical edition with German verse translation); see also the corrections in F. Teufel, 'Zu Nâsir Chusraw's Rûsânînâmâ, ZDMG 36, 1882, p. 96-106; Ethê's text was reprinted in the Berlin 1341/1922 edition of Nâsir's Safar-nâmâ (separate pagination); Bombay ca. 1915; A.A. Semenov, 'Shuguanico-ismailitische reedaction "Khimm Svetâ" ... Narsi-ija-Hosrovà', Zapiski Kollegii Vostokovedenov V, 1930, p. 589-610 (edition of a modern Ismâ'îl manuscript which contains some interesting variants).

A poem entitled Xfâq u Anfus is attributed to Nâsir in Kayseri Râすぎ Efendi 607/2 fol. 14b-17b (Karabulut 343).

A collection of 'mathnawiyât i Ḥâkim Nâsir i Khusraw', including also ghazals, by a poet who uses the takhallus 'Khusraw' (evidently not our poet) is found in Cluj M.O. 21425 (Nuskhah-hâ'ı XI/XII p. 989).

Nâsir does not appear to be mentioned as a poet1 before the 8th/14th century. Cf. Mustaufî p. 826, Jâzɜmî II p. 884-5; Şîbâh (see index); Daulat-shâh p. 61-4; Hidâyât, Majma' I p. 607-33; Hidayât, Riyâd p. 232-43; A.V. Zhukovskiy, Tészny Nasisri Khosrova, ZVORAO 4, 1896, p. 388-93 (with an edition of the tarjel-band); W. Ivanov, Nâsir-i Khosraw and Ismailism, Leiden/Bombay, 1948; l.d., Problems in N.i Kh.'s biography, Bombay 1956 a

1The number is given wrongly as 2346 in the catalogue. See p. 56 of the same volume.

2Two verses by 'Nâsir i Khusraw' are quoted in Wâţfî p. 69. I have not found them in the dîwân and in the absence of other early citations of Nâsir's verses one must suspect a scribal error.
revised version of the preceding); A.E. Bertels', Nasır-i Hossýn i Ismá'ílliyân, Téhrân 1346/1367-8; Khayeým-púr p. 687-8 (with further references); Sañá, Tábírkíh 34° p. 443-69; H. Mubaqiq, 'Justice in i tradín i wa ta'birát i Nasír i Khusraw dar abádítí wá amtháal wa ash'árí i 'arab', MDAT X/1, 1340/1961, p. 32-93; id., 'Alawi bóján i Nasír i Khusraw', Yaghmá 44/153, 1340/1961, p. 35-41; id., Tahdíl i ash'ár i Nasír i Khusraw (áyát i gur-i, abádítí, lughálí, amtháalí), Téhrân 1344/1965, p. 151-63; id., 'Násír-i Khusraw and his spiritual nisháh', Yádnámáh i Irání i Minorsky', Téhrân 1348/1969, p. 143-8; id., 'Tâshbíh i diwán i Nasír i Khusraw', Námah i Minowí, Téhrân 1350/1971-2, p. 405-22 (contains a revised edition of a number of poems); Fouchécour, Nature p. 228-9; Shaffí-Tábadáli, Suwar p. 550-63; Yádnámáh i Nasír i Khusraw, Mashhad 2535/1976 (38 articles, including several contributions to the textual criticism and interpretation of the diwan); Poonaíwála p. 111-25 (with further references); A. Dashtí, Tašuir-i az Násír i Khusraw, Téhrán 1362/1983.

124. Násír Lughawí (or Baghawí) is known to us only from the rubá'íi in which he laments the despoil of the Ghaznavid Muhammád b. Mahmúd in 421/1030; it is quoted by Baihaquí, who says that its author was one of the boon-companions (nád-fmán) of the dethroned king, as well as by 'Auí.

Thus 'Auí. In the two passages in Baihaquí where this person is mentioned we find 'Náshír i Baghawí', though for the latter name the variant 'Lughawí' occurs in both passages. It is likely (as Náfiwall suggested) that this is a scribal error for 'Násír (or Náshír) i Baghawí (or Lughawí)', Baghawí is the nisháh from Bagh (or Bagháshán), a village between Marv and Herat; cf. Samánfol. 86a (new edition II p. 273) and Yáquf, Buldán I p. 694.

NINTH TO ELEVENTH CENTURY

Baihaquí p. 74-5 (see also Náfíl's edition p. 76 and Fayid's new edition p. 85-4 and the notes in the latter two); 'Auí II p. 65-6; LF s.v. 'Násír i Lughawí' p. 173, and supra, n. 122.

125. A certain Abú l-Hasanl Ornázdí is quoted a number of times in Asadí's Lughât i furs. The juxtaposition of these improbable names would seem to suggest a Zoroastrian convert to Islam. Perhaps the same as Yazdání (no. 153)?

LF passim; Shams p. 113; Hídáyát, Majma' I p. 66 (one verse); Khayeým-púr p. 80.

126. Pérsz (Fayrúz) al-Mashriqí flourished, according to 'Auí, under 'Amr b. Laith (265/878-9 to 287/990). It is possible that he is identical with the Pérsz from whom Rádúyání quotes one verse. Hídáyát gives the date of his death as 283/896.


LF (ed. Iqbalí) p. 87, (ed. Mutâbá'í/Sádqi) p. 157 (a new verse); Rádúyání p. 25; 'Auí II p. 2; Hídáyát, Majma' I 381.

127. Abú l-Qásim Ziyád b. Muhammad al-Qamarí al-Jurjání heads 'Arúdí's list of the poets of the 'kings of Tabaristan', i.e. the Ziyáds, and 'Auí quotes an ode by him dedicated to the Ziyárid Shams al-Ma'alí Gábúš b. Wusmaír (367/978 to 402/1012), whose grandson, 'Unsúr al-Ma'alí b. Ká-Sá, mentions him in his Gábúš-námah. Qamarí is never quoted by Asadí, but Rádúyání (followed by Usfwi) cites a good number of his verses to illustrate various rhetorical figures.


1The kunyáh is mentioned only by Shams i Qais.
own poems,\(^1\) in Shādhī-Rbād, just outside Tabriz. He appears to have spent his whole life in the service of the minor dynasties of Adharbājān and Transcaucasia. His dīwān consists largely of odes to the Rawādids of Tabriz, Abū Mansūr Waḥṣūdān (416/1025 to 451/1059) and his successor Abū Naṣr Mamlān, as well as the Shaddādids at Ganjāh, ‘All Lashkarī b. Mūsā (425/1033–4 to 441/1049–50) and Fadil (or Fadūn) b. Abī l-Aswār (459/1067 to 466/1073–4), but also to others, including Asadī’s patron Abū Dulāf. Nāṣir i Khusrau describes in his Safar-nāmah\(^2\) his meeting with Qatrān in Tabriz in 438/1046. The most recent date that can be adduced from his poems is Friday 1 Dhu l-Ḥijjah 462 (10 September 1070) on which day Mihrāḡān coincided with a Friday and a new moon (‘Adīnah u mihrāḡān u māḥ i nau * bādand khujastāh har sīh bar khusrāu).\(^3\) Hidāyat says that he died in 465/1072–3, while Taqī\(^4\) makes it as late as 485/1092.

The introduction in manuscript ‘ain of the Lughat i furs, ostensibly the work of Asadī himself, mentions an older Persian dictionary by ‘Qatrān i šāh‘ir’. Asadī thus obviously knew him not only as a lexicographer, but also as a poet. The fact that he never actually quotes any of Qatrān’s verses in his own dictionary merely underscores the fact that the purpose of the latter was to illustrate the rare words used by the Eastern Persian poets; the poems of a Western writer like Qatrān were thus for his purposes of no significance. Qatrān’s interest in lexicography is confirmed by Nāṣir i Khusrau when he tells us that he ‘came to me and brought the dīwān of Munīk and the dīwān of Daqīqī and read them in my presence and asked me about every expression (ma‘nāw) which

---

\(^1\) Dīwān, ed. Nakhjavānī, p. 66.
\(^3\) See Dīwān p. 355 and Taqī-zādah ad loc.
\(^4\) Apud Sprenger p. 16.
he found difficult. I told him its meaning and he wrote it down'. The point of the anecdote is clearly that the divan of these poets contained Eastern Iranian (i.e. Sogdian etc.) words that were incomprehensible to a Western Persian like Qatran, who consequently took advantage of the presence of an educated visitor from the East (such as Nasir) to ascertain their meaning. It was exactly the same gap in comprehension which induced another Easterner, Asadi, to compile, again for the benefit of the literati of North-Western Persia, his Lughat-i fars. Nasir's own comment on the incident, namely that Qatran 'writes good poetry, but does not know Persian well', is of course facetious.1

A good-sized collection of Qatran's poems (ca. 1400 verses) is contained in a manuscript2 from a private collection in Tabriz supposedly copied on 11 Rabi'i I 529/1134 - about half a century after the poet's death - by Ali b. Ishaq al-Abiwardi al-Sha'iri, whom scholars have identified with the celebrated poet Anvari. The name of the latter was, however, most probably Muhammad b. Ali b. Ishaq.3 Unfortunately, the manuscript seems to have disappeared sight shortly after its discovery and there have been rumours in Iranian literary circles4 that it is in fact a modern forgery from the same factory which produced the notorious fake copies of the ruba'iyyat of Khayyam and of the qasida-namah. As long as the manuscript is not available for study it is thus imprudent to draw any conclusions from the data contained in it.

Manuscripts of Qatran's divan include an exceptionally large number of spurious poems, among them several by Roodaki.1 Mss.: London Or. 3246 fol. 263-86 (Rieu Suppt. no. 204 III. Dated Ramadan 1248/1833. Attributed to Roodaki), but contains a note by Baha'i b. 'Abd Allâh Firuz b. Fatih 'Ali Shah stating that, with the exception of the two poems beginning madar i mai and yad i jay i Miliyân, these poems are in fact the work of Qatran); Or. 2847 fol. 94-130 (Rieu Suppt. no. 245. Dated 26 Rajab 1279/1863. Selections); Or. 7894 (Meredith-Owens p. 54. Dated 1295/1878. 'Attributed in a note at the end to Roodaki'); Or. 3317 (Rieu Suppt. no. 207. 19th century? The endorsement 'Divan i Hakim Roodaki' is corrected in a note); Or. 2879 (Rieu Suppt. no. 208. 19th century?); R.A.S. Storey bequest no. 3, fol. 1b-94a (Uncatalogued; inspexi); I.O. 3688; I.O. 4590, fol. 118-126a (selections); Cambridge Browne Coll. V.3 (Dated 7 Jumada I 1261/1845. Formerly in the possession of Ridâ-Quli Khan Hindiyat and apparently used by him in the compilation of his Majma' al-fusabâ'); Paris Suplement 1502 (Blichot 1204. Dated Safar 1257/1841); Suplement 1529 (Blichot 1205. Dated 22 Safar 1294/1877. Attributed to Roodaki); Teheran Univ. XII 3944/7 (17th century? 'With poems by Roodaki?'); Majlis VII 2477 (Dated 1206/1791-2); Majlis 4099/1 (Munz. 25357. Dated Mubarram 1207/1792); Millî 203/2 (Nuskhah-hâ VI p. 202. Dated 1245/1829-30. With poems by Roodaki); Sipah-salâr IV p. 522 (Dated 1250/1834-51; Munz.); Gulistan/Atabây II 377 (Dated 28 Safar 1258/1842); Millî III 1402 (Dated 1256/1840); Millî V 2297/1 (Attributed to Roodaki); Gulistan/Atabây II 378; Isfahan (Nuskhah-hâ VI p. 596); Mashhad Ridawî VII 519 (Dated 1267/1850-1); Ridawî VII 521 (Dated

1See Lazard, Language p. 17 n. 32.
2Cf. M. Bayani, 'Divan i Qatran i Tabrizi ba khatt i Anvari i Abiwardi', Yaghma III, 1329sh./1961, p. 465-74, with a reproduction of three pages from the manuscript. The same three pages are reproduced also in Nakhjavání's introduction to his edition of the divan.
3See below, chap. III.
4As I have been told by A.H. Morton.

1See below, no. 134.
19 Rajab 1277/1861. With poems by Rūdkā; Rīdāwī VII 520 (Dated 3 Rabī‘ I 1283/1866. With poem by Rūdkā); Peshawar Iṣlāmīyah 1823(5) (Dated 1134/1721-2); Hyderabad Iṣlāmīyah IV 1119 (17th century?); Calcutta Iwanov 430 (Dated 1018/1609-10. Contains two collections of poems; the one in the centre of the page corresponds, according to Iwanov, to London Or. 3317, that in the margins to Or. 2879. Attributed at the beginning to Rūdkā but in the colophon to Qatārīn); Private collections ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn Bayāt (Nuskhah-hā VI 68. Dated 1007/1598-9); Nakhjavānī’s edition mentions 8 Ms., all in private collections, including the supposedly 12th century Ms. described above. Cf. Muns. III 25352-62.


131. The poetess Rābi‘ah bint Ka‘b al-Qusdārī is included in ‘Aufī’s chapter on the Ghaznavid poets where we find several of her poems, including an early example of a mulāmāt (a poem with alternating Persian and Arabic verses). Her passion by bi-lingual contrivances is attested also by the poem attributed to her by Jājarmī, a Persian poem incorporating the Arabic words which make up the shahādah and the labwālah. Further specimens of her poetry are quoted by Rādūyānī (who calls her ‘Ibnat Ka‘b’) and by Shams. The romantic account of her poetry in ‘Aṭṭār’s Ilāhī-nāmah (for which see Ates and Meier) has evidently no value as a biographical source.


132. Rāfī‘I Naishabūrī figures in ‘Arūdī’s list of the poets of the kings of Tabaristan, i.e. the Ziyarids. Jājarmī attributes to a poet the same name an ode the dedicatee of which is indicated with the words, khīlat u tashrif i mīr al-μu'minīn ibn al-Jahīr, evidently the well-known ważīr of the caliphs al-Qā'im and al-Muqtadī and
ally of Malik-Shāh, Fakhr al-aulālah Abū Nāṣr Muhammad b. Muḥammad b. Jahīr (waṣīr from 454/1062 to 471/1078; died 483/1090).1 Ḥidāyat quotes a shorter version of this poem, and a good number of others, claims that their author lived at the time of Māhmūd and ‘Uṣūrī and names the former and his minister Ḥasan Maimandī as the dedicatees of two of the poems cited. But Naṣīḥī has shown that this is all wrong and that Ḥidāyat simply misunderstood the names occurring in the poems. For his part, Naṣīḥī committed the blunder of stating that Ibn Jahīr lived in the 6th/12th century and that consequently there must have been two poets by the name of Rāfīʾi Naḵšābūrī, one (‘Arūdi’s) in the 4th/10th century and another in the 6th/12th. In fact Ibn Jahīr lived, as mentioned, in the 5th /11th century; it is thus perfectly possible that the same Rāfīʾi eulogised both him and one of the last Ziyarids. Shams quotes two verses by Rāfīʾi, one of which he states to be an imitation of a verse by Muʿīzī, but it is by no means certain that it was not in fact the other way round. 

143. Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-

maʿrūf bi Rōdah(?)2 al-Balkhī is cited by ‘Auffī in his chapter on the poets of the Ghaznavids, where we find five single verses (fard), a type of poetry in which, according to ‘Auffī, he specialised.


134. Abū ‘Abd Allāh Jaʿfar b. Muḥammad b. Ha-
kīn b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ʿAdam al-Rūdkākī (Persian: Rōdākī) al-Shāʾir al-Samarqandī, the most celebrated Persian poet prior to Firdawṣī, was born in the village of Rōdak, outside Samarqand, and made his name as the eulogist of the Samanid ruler of Bukhārā, Abū ʿI-Hasan Naṣr (II) b. Ahmad (reg. 301/914 to 331/943). Early poets such as Daqīqī, Firdawṣī, Abū Zurāʾsh and Nasīr i Khusrāw allude more or less explicitly to his blindness and ‘Auffī indeed says he was born blind, but this has been doubted by many modern scholars, who have referred to the vivid descriptions of nature in a number of his verses. According to Asadī1 Rūdkākī’s divān consisted of more than 180,000 lines (an even larger number is claimed by later authors). Of this prodigious output little has survived. We have one long ode (the splendid poem beginning mādar i mai) dedicated to Abū Jaʿfar Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. Khalaf, who was governor of Sīstān on behalf of the Samanids from 310/922-3 to 352/963, a handful of shorter poems and a considerable number of fragments, mostly single verses, quoted by Asadī, Rādīyanī and others. Apart from his lyrical pieces Rōdākī evidently wrote several mathnawīs, the most celebrated of which was his

1Of. E2 s.v. ‘Dhahīr (Baṇū)’ (Cl. Cohen).
2The shubhurād is given in the manuscripts of ‘Auffī’s book as r.w.r.d.h., which does not seem to have any meaning. Naṣīḥī (ad ‘Auffī p. 673) claims that in ‘other’ (unspecified) ‘saftnah and tadhrkārs’ the name is given as r.w.d.h., evidently ‘Rōdah’, ‘gut, string of an instrument’.

1Not Rūd/Kīṣarī, as some authors have it. In a verse by ‘Arūdi (quoted by ‘Auffī II p. 7) Rōdākī-st rhymes with Kūdākī-st.
2Thus according to Samʿānī and ‘Auffī (who traces the nasab only as far as the poet’s father). Daulat-shāh gives his kunyah (doubtless wrongly) as Abū ʿI-Hasan.
versification of Kalīlah wa Dimnah. According to the 'older preface' to the Shāh-nāmah, Nasr b. Ahmad ordered his minister Balʿamī to have the book of Kalīlah wa Dimnah translated from Arabic to Persian, and then commanded Rōdakī to turn it into verse. The same story is found in Firdausī’s Shāh-nāmah with the characteristic added detail that the amīr appointed 'interpreters' (guzāran-dah) to 'read' the book to Rōdakī (who was, of course, blind). A number of fragments in ramal metre, quoted in Asadī’s Lughat i furs, were identified by Horn as belonging to that well-known collection of stories. The present author, who is preparing a new edition of the fragments of Rōdakī’s narrative poems, has so far been able to identify the location in the story of about 50 verses. Moreover, Nöldeke observed already that the fragments in ramal also contain verses that clearly belong to the story of Sindbād and the Seven Ministers, and after the publication of Zahirī’s prose version of the Sindbād-nāmah, Dabīr-Sivāghī was able to place a few further verses in that story. This presents us, however, with a chronological problem. Samānī states that Rōdakī died in his native village in 329/940-1 and this date has been generally accepted. But Zahirī states that his source, the Persian prose translation of the Sindbād-nāmah by Khwājah ‘Amīd Abū l-Fawāris Fanarūzī (or Qaṣ) was written in the year 339/950-1 for Abū Muḥammad Nūb b. Mansūr al-Sāmānī, evidently an error for Abū Muḥammad Nūb (II) b. Nasr (regn. 331/943 to 343/954), and that before that time 'no-one had translated it' (i.e. into Neo-Persian). Arabic versions had, of course, existed earlier, e.g. that by Abān al-Lāḥiqī. It seems most unlikely that Zahirī could have been unaware of the versification of that book by his famous compatriot; we must thus consider the possibility either that Zahirī was grossly mistaken about the date of his source, or that Rōdakī did not die until after 339.

Rōdakī, who enjoyed a tremendous reputation for about two centuries after his death, fell out of favour with the adepts of the highly mannered style of the Mongol period. It is most instructive to compare Arūjī’s exuberant praise of Rōdakī’s verses on the Jāy i Mūliyān with Daulat-shāh’s dismissal of the same verses. Only in the 19th century did the simple and direct style of the ancient Khurāsānī poets come back into favour with Persian literati, by which time the overwhelming mass of Rōdakī’s authentic verses had disappeared.

But the memory of his name had not vanished, as can be seen from the fact that in the intervening years that name had been used in connection with one of the notorious literary frauds with which the history of Persian literature is so richly littered, namely the manufacture of a Pseudo-Dīwān i Rōdakī. As scholars like Hasān b. Luṭf Allāh al-Rāzī, the 17th century, and Rida-Qul Khān Hīdāyat, in the 19th, quite clearly noted, this Pseudo-Dīwān consists in fact of poems by Qatrān supplemented by a handful of the well-known

---

1For the following see de Blois, Burzūqī, p. 51-2.
3Moscow edition VIII, Nūshīn-rūwān 3452 sqq.
4Horn, Einl. p. 18-21.
5In the collections by Nafīzī and Braginsky the Kalīlah fragments are not separated from the other verses in ramal. Nafīzī, moreover, arbitrarily ascribes to Rōdakī a good number of verses in ramal by Taiyān.
6Apud Horn, Einl. p. 21.
7P. 25.

---

1 Cf. the introduction to Ateş’s edition of Zahirī’s Sindbād-nāmah, p. 10 n. 1.
poems of Rūdaki's quoted in the *tadhkirahs*. Unfortunately, some Western scholars have fallen victim to this mystification.²

For manuscripts of the *(Pseudo-)*Divān see Qat-rān.


Translations: *(Russian)*: besides those listed in the previous paragraph see: *Rudaki*. Tr. V.V. Derzhavin and V.V. Levik, Stalinabad 1949; reprint 1955; *Избранные*. Tr. V. Levik and S. Lipkin, Moscow 1957; reprint 1958, 1978.

¹Hidayat, followed by Nafīsī and others, has argued that Qat-rān's poems were attributed in good faith to Rūdakī as a result of a confusion between the name of latter's patron, Naṣr b. Ahmad, and that of one of the former's protectors, Abū Naṣr Mālān. But such a mix-up seems hardly likely.

²Ethē, whose article on Rūdakī was published in 1873 (before Ḥidayat's *Maṣna'i al-Fugabāq*), rallied to the Persian scholar's opinion in his later contribution in *Gīrīb* II p. 220.

Baihaqi p. 61, 239, 366, 599; Tārīkh-i Sīstān 316-24; *LP* passim (he is the most frequently quoted poet; there are several hitherto unattested verses in the newly published Punjab manuscript); Rūdūyānī passim (and Ateši's notes, p. 90-2); Sam'ānī, *Rūdakī*, vol. 262a-b; ʿArūdī p. 28, 31-4; Naṣrī p. 4, 14, 83; *Auff II* p. 6-9; Shams passim; Mus-taufig p. 732; Jājarmī II p. 453-4; Daulat-shāh p. 31-3; Rāzī III p. 235-43; H. Ethē, *Rūdakī, der Sāmānīdendichter*, *Nachrichten...Göttingen*, 1873, p. 663-742 (still valuable as a guide to the late *tadhkirahs*); Ḥidayat, *Maṣna'i* I p. 236-40; E.D. Ross, *Rudaki and Pseudo-Rudaki*, *JRS* 1924 p. 609-44; id., *A Qasida by Rudaki*, *JNAS* 1926, p. 213-37 (contains a critical edition of the ode *mādar i na*... by H. Qazwīnī and a translation by Ross); id., *Rudaki's *Kallila wa-Dimna*" in his *Forward* to Tawny/Penzer, *The Ocean of Story*, V, London 1926 p. xii-xx (discusses a few of the fragments already identified by Horn); L. Melzer, *Über einige Verse Rudakins*, *ZDMG* 91, 1937, p. 404-6 (emendations to Qazwīnī/Ross); M. Dabir-Siyāqī, *'Rūdakī wa Sindbād-nāmah*, *Yaghmā* VIII, 1334sh./1955, p. 218-23, 320-4, 413-6 (the article locates 10 verses of Rūdakī's in the story of Sindbād and 32 in Kallīlah and Dimnah); M.I. Zand, *Sohbihironi shoīrī - ustod Rūdakī*, Stalinabad 1957; A. Mirzoyev, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Rūdakī, Stalin-abad 1958 (published simultaneously in Tajik and Arabic character versions); id., Abū ʿAbd Allāh Rūdakī wa inḵishāf-i ghazal dar ʿaghr-hā i 10-15, Stalinabad 1957; id., Rūdakī and the history of gazel in X-XX vv., Stalinabad 1958 (translation of the preceding); id., Rūdakī: živě and tvořivost, Moscow 1968; id., *One more spurious manuscript of Rudaki's verses*, *Iran Society Silver Jubilee souvenir*, Calcutta 1970, p. 247-57; Rūdakī wa zamoni ā. (*Maṣna'i magalah*), ed. A. Mirzoyev, Stalin-abad 1958; M. Mu'īn, *Yak qasīdah i Rūdakī* (i.e.,ā bōy i āyā i Nūliyān), MDAT VI/3-4, 1338sh./1959,


135. Abū ’Abd Allāh Ṣaḥīh b. ’Abd Allāh al-Nukatī al-Lahaurī appears, if the nisbah is correct, to be the earliest Persian poet born in India. ‘Aufī quotes an ode of his praising Sultan Mas‘ūd i shahīd’, i.e. Mas‘ūd I (421/1030 to 432/1040) and a qīt‘ah addressed to one Shāhanshāh b. Shāh i Nāshābbūr b. Ibrāhīm. One verse by rzwih knky is quoted in the Vatican manuscript of LF s.v. shahāsh.

LF (ed. Horn) p. 49 (ed. Iqbāl quotes the verse, from Horn, on p. 79 and 219 and ‘emends’ the name to Rūdkhā); ‘Aufī II p. 57–8; LN s.v. ‘Nukatī’; Safā, Tārīkh I b. 600–1; Khaiyām-pur p. 244 (‘Rūzbī‘h’) and 614 (‘Nukatī’); I. Hussain, The early Persian poets of India (A.H. 421-679), Patna 1980, p. 6–10.

136. Ṣaffār Marghazaī is known to us only from the few verses quoted by Ṣaḏī. LF (see the indexes to the three editions); Naftis III p. 1219–20; LN s.v. ‘Ṣaffār’ p. 222, Khaiyām-pur p. 337.

137. Ṣā‘īn (reading uncertain) al-Balkhī is the author of the rubā‘ī quoted in the Tārīkh i Sīs-tān (p. 324) which mentions mīr i shahīd, i.e. the title given posthumously to the Safardī ruler Abū Ja‘far Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. Kafāf (died 352/963).

Collection of fragments (1 rubā‘ī), French translation, discussion and literature: Lazard, Poètes I p. 31, 134, II p. 139.

138. Abū ʿl-Ḥasan Shahīd b. Ḥusain al-Balkhī was, according to Yāqūt, a contemporary of the geographer Abū Zaid al-Balkhī (born in 234 or 235 i.e. 848–50); he wrote at least one ode in honour of the Samanid ruler Nasr (II) b. Ahmad (301/913–4 to 331/942–3). Rūdkhā composed an elegy on his death.


139. Two verses are attributed to one Shāh-Sār (or -Sār?) in Asadī’s LF.

140. Shākir and 141. Jullāb: A marginal addition in manuscript nūn of Asadī’s Lughat i fursī s.v. ‘Jullāb’ explains that this is the name of a poet at Bukhārā and attests this with a verse by Khusravānī bemoaning the death of Abū l-Mathālī and ‘Shākir i Jullāb’. If the text is correct we must either assume that ‘Shākir’ and ‘Jullāb’ were two names for the same poet, or that Shākir was the son of Jullāb. At the same time, we must consider the possibility of the minor emendation ‘Shākir u Jullāb’, which would also give us two poets. In any event, the poet (or poets) in question must, like Khusravānī and Abū l-Mathālī, have lived during the Samanid period, if not earlier. The fact that LF quotes a good number of verses by ‘Shākir’, ‘Shākir i Bukhārā’, ‘Jullāb’ and ‘Jullāb i Bukhārā’, but never combines the two names, makes it seem most likely that we have to do with two different persons. Two verses by ‘Shākir i Bukhārā’ are quoted by Shams i Qais and it is evidently to the same author that we must credit the three verses by ‘Shākir’ quoted by Rādūyānī. LF passim (and Horn, Einl. p. 22); Rādūyānī p. 17, 29, 34; Shams p. 233; Dh. Ṣafā, ‘Du shārīr i gum-nīm’, MDAT II/3, 1334sh./1955, p. 1-5; Khayīyān-pūr p. 130 (s.v. ‘Jullāb’), 287 (s.v. ‘Shākir’); Ṣafā, Tārīkh I 6 p. 399-401; Lazard, Poètes I p. 14.

142. Shuhra i Ḩāqq is similarly credited with two verses in LF. Nafisī has recovered three more verses from Surūrī’s MF and a ghazal of 13 verses from an ‘old saffināh’. One more verse is quoted by Ṣibāḥ p. 260.


143. Sipīrī Nāwarā’-al-nahrī’ is included in ‘Aufī’s chapter on the Samanid poets, where two verses of his are cited. He is perhaps identical with the ‘All Sipīrī whom ‘Arūdī includes in his list of the poets of the Alī Khāqānī.


144. The Vatican manuscript of LF attributes, s.v. nakkhīz, two verses to an otherwise unknown ‘Surūdī’. However, the India Office manuscript (see Ethē’s catalogue, col. 1335) and Ṣibāḥ p. 132 attribute it to Ṣudakī, for which ‘Surūdī’ is apparently only a scribal error.

1See above, p. 66-7.

2Ed. Iqbal p. 30.

3An argument for the identity of the two might be seen in the fact that in Asadī’s entry suflaḥ one and the same verse is attributed to ‘Jullāb i Bukhārā’ in the Vatican manuscript (ed. Horn p. 13) and in Qawwāl, but to ‘Shākir i Bukhārā’ in manuscript sān (ed. Iqbal p. 480) and to ‘Shākir’ in Ṣibāḥ (p. 280). However, it is quite common for different manuscripts of LF to attribute the same verse to different poets, especially if their names are similar. Further confusion is caused by the mysterious ‘rt’āy, to whom the Vatican manuscript of LF, s.v. ghārī (ed. Horn p. 15), attributes a single verse; in manuscripts sān and nūn (ed. Iqbal p. 66), the India Office manuscript (Ethē, I.O. Cat. col. 1334) and Ṣibāḥ (p. 57) the verse is attributed to ‘Shākir i Bukhārā’. Ethē (loc. cit.) suggested that the rassā in the Vatican codex might be a misreading of ‘Ghazānī’. In the late lexica (see Horn’s apparatus criticus) the verse is attributed to Abū Salīk Gurgānī.

1Idāyat calls him Sipīrī Bukhārā‘ī and adds that he was a contemporary of Abū l-Ma‘ayyad al-Balkhī and of Abū l-Mathālī, but this is presumably only a personal deduction on the part of the 19th century scholar.
145. Ṭahāwī is mentioned in ‘Arūdī’s list of the Samanid poets. Two verses are attributed to a poet of that name, s.v. niḥāzī, in manuscript sīn and (the first verse only) also in the manuscript P of LF as well as in Šībāh p. 94 (var. ‘Tukhārī’; this form also in Hīdāyat, Majmaʾ I p. 199 s.v. ‘Khabbāzī’). ‘Ṭahāwī’ is well known as the nisbah relating to the village of Tabā in Egypt; it is an unlikely name for a Persian poet, but perhaps he was the mauzā of an Egyptian. In the face of the manuscript evidence it is in any event imprudent3 to replace the name by the lectio faciliore ‘Tukhārī’.

146. Abū al-Ḥasan Tāhir b. al-ʿIṣāl, the amīr of Chagḥāniyān, died in 381/991. ‘Auforcing him in his chapter on poetizing princes where he cites a number of his verses, further samples of which are quoted by Asadī and Rāzi.  

LF passim; Rāzi p. 21 (and Ateq ad loc.): ‘Auforcing I p. 27–9; Khayyām-pūr p. 352; Safā, Tārīkh I6 p. 428–9.

147. Abū ʿAbbās Ahmad b. Muhammad b. Yūsuf al-Sinjī al-Tayyān was — I paraphrase, here and in what follows, Samʿānī’s notice — a native of the village of Sinj (near Marw).4 The greatest part of his poetry, which was well-known in Marw, consisted of buffoonery and jesting,5 but later he repented and renounced poetry. He also worked as a builder (thus apparently his sobriquet Taiyān ‘hod carrier’) and is credited with the construction of the minaret of the mosque at Bāb al-Madīnāh (evidently in Marw) and the one at the mosque in Sinj. A good number of verses by Taiyān Margazi are quoted by Asadī. He is clearly not identical with the Taiyān Barmā Kirmānī quoted by Rāzi and Hīdāyat,3 who must — judging from his style — belong to a later period.4

LF passim; Samʿānī fol. 375b (new edition IX p. 118);6 LN s.v. ‘Taiyān’ p. 380–2; Khayyām-pūr p. 360.

148. Turkī Kasmī Tiğā (or however this name is to be read)6 is included by ‘Auforcing, who quotes four of his verses, among the Samanid poets. One further verse is quoted in manuscript P of Asadī’s Lughat i furūs. His name is mentioned in a verse by Manṣūchīrī.7 See also Ḥusayn Tiğā.


1P. 28; thus in all three Mss. according to Qaṣṣābī’s note.

2The Aya Sofya manuscript has (according to ed. Mujtahādī/Sādīqī p. 79) the same spelling, except that the ‘t’ is written like ‘k’. The attribution to Taiyān in Iqbal’s edition p. 105 is apparently only in the marginal additions to Ms. mūn.

3See Dīr-ḥudūd, LN s.v. ‘Ṭahāwī’ p. 177.

4According to Yaqūt, Būdān III p. 161–2, Sinj (thus vocalised by Yaqūt) is the name of two villages near Marw; one is called Sinj ʿAbbād, the other is one of the biggest villages of Marw al-Shāhājiyān, four farsangs from the metropolis. In the old facsimile edition of Samʿānī the poet’s native place is given as Shaikh, the name of a village near Isfahān (cf. Yaqūt, Būdān III p. 327–8). But the fact that both Samʿānī and Asadī explicitly connect this poet with Marw makes it difficult to accept that ‘Sinj’ is the correct reading.

5Read with the new edition: ‘al-sakḥ wa l-mutākhayyabh’.

6Rāzi I p. 268–70 (in the edition the name is written ʿṬahāwī’).

7Hīdāyat, Majmaʾ I p. 328–9.

8See below, Chap. III. The two Taiyāns are clearly distinguished in the LN article. Note that the two verses attributed to Taiyān in LF (ed. Iqbal p. 61) and Šībāh (p. 59) are ascribed (doubtfully wrongly) to Taiyān Barmā in Qaṣṣābī p. 134.

9Many thanks to C.R. Bosworth for providing me with photocopies of the relevant pages from the new edition.

10See Nafiʾ ad ‘Auforcing, p. 666.

11Dīr-ḥudūd, ed. Dābir-Sīyāqī no. 33.
149. Abū l-Qāsim Ḥasan b. Ḥamad al-‘Unṣūrī has left us with a fairly small diwān (perhaps only a selection of his poems) consisting almost entirely of odes to the Ghaznavid Mahmūd, his brother Nasr and Yaʿqūb and his minister Maimandī. He was still alive during ‘Isd al-fitr in 422/September 1031, on which occasion he and Zainabī, according to Bāhāqī’s eye-witness account, received a rich reward from Mahmūd’s son, Masʿūd.1 We also have a poem by Manūchīrī,2 who did not arrive in Ghaznav until some time in the reign of Masʿūd, eulogising ‘Abū l-Qāsim Ḥasan Ṭūstād i Ṭūstādān i zamānāh ‘Unṣūrī’. However, the fact that ‘Unṣūrī’s diwān contains only one poem addressed to Masʿūd suggests that he died not long after the latter’s succession. The date given by Daulat-shāh for the poet’s death (431/1039-40) is thus perhaps rather too late. Other tadkhirahs make him live as long as 441/1049-50.

‘Afuī says that, besides his odes, ‘Unṣūrī dedicated a number of mathnawīs to Mahmūd ‘like Shāh-bahr u ‘Ain al-Ḥayāth and Wāmiq u ‘Adhrā and Khing bu t u Surkh bu t’. It is very interesting that ‘Unṣūrī’s contemporary Bairūnī, in his catalogue of his own writings (and those of Muḥammad

1Bāhāqī (p. 274) says that on that occasion Masʿūd rewarded the ‘obscure poets’ (shā‘irān kih bē-gānāh-tar būdand) with 20 000 dirām (each or in total?), ‘Alawī Zainabī with 50 000 dirām, ‘Unṣūrī with 1000 diwān and the ‘singers and jesters’ with 30 000 dirām. Clinton, on p. 30 of his book on Manūchīrī (see above, no. 101), has interpreted this passage as implying an intentional slighting of Mahmūd’s panegyrist by the new king, but this is far from certain; we have, as far as I can see, no information about the exchange rate between the (silver) dirām and the (gold) dinār during the Ghaznavid period, but the fact that ‘Unṣūrī alone is rewarded with gold would seem rather to imply a particular honour.


2Rādūyānī p. 86; also in Watwā, p. 78.
Persian remains, however, unknown. It has also become clear that the 16th century Turkish Wāmiq u ‘Adhrā of Lāmi‘ī, which the author claims to be a translation of ‘Unṣūr’s poem, has in fact little in common with the latter.

Qarīb and Ṣafā have taken seriously the story which they found in their copies of the 12th century Persian translation (by al-Husain b. Asad al-Dihistānī and Mu‘ayyadī) of al-Faraj ba’d al-shiddah by Abū Allī al-Muhassin b. Allī al-Tanūkhī, which quotes the words of ‘Unṣūr the poet’ about how, having lost his father as a young man, he became a travelling merchant, was robbed of all his belongings and only narrowly escaped with his life. However, in the Arabic original of Tanūkhī’s work the name of the narrator is given as Abū l-Gūsām ‘Ubaid Allāh b. Muhammed b. al-Ḥasan al-’Abgāśī al-Shā‘īr; moreover, the name ‘Abgāśī occurs also in the Topkapi manuscript (dated 706/1306-7) of the Persian translation. The ‘correction’ of ‘Abgāśī to ‘Unṣūr can consequently not even be blamed on the Persian translator, but only on later copyists. Quite apart from this, it must be noted that Tanūkhī died in 384/994 and is thus not very likely to have known ‘Unṣūr. It is probable that also Hīdāyat’s story2 of how the young ‘Unṣūr was attacked by robbers and subsequently sold into slavery goes back to the same murky source.3

Editions of Wāmiq u ‘Adhrā: Lahore 1967 (Ed. M.M. Shafī); Tbilisi 1983 (Знамение Наследие Усурти, ed. I. Kaladze. Contains the manuscript fragments, reproduced photographically from Shafī’s edition, the other quotations, reproduced from Qarīb’s edition of the dīwān, a Russian translation and commentary).

Manuscripts of his Dīwān: Oxford Eliott 114 (Ethé 521. Modern); London Or. 3246 fol. 213b-262 (Rieu Suppl. no. 204 II. Dated Ramadan 1248/1833); Or. 10936 (Meredith-Owens p. 61. Dated 1276/1859-60); Or. 2843 (Rieu Suppl. no. 205. Dated 28 Dhū l-Hijjah 1278/1862); Or. 2889 fol. 24b-43b (Rieu Suppl. no. 212 III. Completed 28 Jumādā I 1293/1876. qasīd only); Or. 10937 (Meredith-Owens p. 61. 19th century); Cambridge Or. 236 (Browne Suppl. 954. 19th century copy of Calcutta Ivanov 428); Browne Coll. V.88 pp. 2-139 (Dated 1266/1849-50); Leningrad Univ. 941w (Salemann-Rosen

possible, the fact that the nisbah al-’Abgāśī (from ‘Abd al-Wais) appears only in this passage must lead one to suspect that they might not be the same person.

3See the critical edition by Isāmāl Jākhimī, II, second printing, Tehran 1363sh./1984-5, p. 911. The name occurs also (again only in the Topkapi Ms., against ‘Unṣūr’ in the other copies) at the end of the story, p. 915.


3As was suggested by A.H. Morton, with whom I have discussed this and other aspects of ‘Unṣūr’s biography.
NINTH TO ELEVENTH CENTURY

p. 134); reprint 1341sh./1962-3; 1342sh./1963-4 (Ed. M. Dabir-Siyahi; non vidi).

An anonymous commentary on a qasidah attributed to him, with numerous quotations from poets of the 10th to 14th centuries (e.g. Asadi, Farrukhi, Munjik, Najib Jarbahaqani, Qatran, Rokaki and 'Unsuri himself), with the title Risalih dar bāb-i qasidah-i iughatifay-i baksh-i 'Unsuri, is contained in: Paris Ancien fonds 531 I (Blochet 1887 /Richard. 17th century?).


LF passim; Rādūyānī passim (and Ateq's notes, p. 88-90); 'Arūfi p. 28, 35; Wāvūt passim; 'Aurf p. 29-32; Mustaufī p. 738-9; Shams passim; Jājarmī p. 129, 214-5; Daulat-shāh p. 44-7; Hidāyat, Majma' I p. 355-67; M. 'A. Tarbiyat, Wāmiq u 'Ahdra, Armağanī XII/8, 1310sh./1931, p. 519-31; Khayyām-pūr p. 409-10 (with further references); Safā, Tīrīkh I p. 559-67; M.J. Majbūrī, Wāmiq u 'Ahdra i 'Unsuri', Sukhan XVIII, 1347sh./1968, p. 43-52, 131-42; Shaffī I-Kadkanī, Sūwar p. 526-39; Fouchecour, Nature p. 1-80; B. Uta, 'Did 'Ahdra remain a virgin', Or. Suec. XXXIII-XXV, 1986, p. 429-41 (important); I. Kaladze, 'Un ignoto introcchio romanzo classico nella letteratura persiana' (concerns the sources of W.U. 'A.), Annali di Ca' Foscari XXIII/3, 1984, p. 119-32; J.S. Meissami, 'Ghaznavid panegyrics: some political implications', Iran XVIII, 1990, p. 31-44 (contains a translation and commentary of the ode in Qarīb p. 10-13); LN s.v. 'Unsuri' p. 395; EI s.v. 'Unsuri' (V.P. Bünchener).

150. Two verses by Ahmad Ushnānī are quoted

The consonants are clearly pointed in Rādūyānī. The vocalisation is by Ateq, with reference to Sānandjī, fol. 40a, who says that the nisbah Ushnānī refers to Qanatari. Ahmad Ushnānī in Baghdaḏ. But it seems more likely, in the case of this Persian poet, that we have to do with a professional name from ushnānī, 'potash'.
by Rūdūyānī. He is presumably identical with the Ushānī Jāyārī one of whose verses is quoted in LF.

LF s.v. mūbad; Rūdūyānī p. 63 (and Ates ad loc.).

151. Abū 'Abd Allāh Abū al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad al-'Uṭāridī is credited by 'Auṭī with two rubā‘ī-yāt and with two verses from a qaṣīdah. He says that he was one of the māḏiḥān 1 ḥaḍrat 1 yāmīnī, which presumably means 'eulogists of the Ghaznavid dynasty' rather than necessarily 'of Sultān Yāmīn al-daulah Maḥmūd'.

'Auṭī II p. 57; Ḥiḍāyat, Majma‘ I p. 342; Khayyām-pūr p. 396; Ṣafā, Tārīkh 16 p. 597.

152. Maḥmūd al-Warrāq is the author of two verses cited by Ḥiḍāyat, who states that he flourished under the last Tāhrid ruler, Muḥammad b. Tāhir (248/662 to 259/872-3).


Cf. Ḥiḍāyat, Majma‘ I p. 178.

153. An otherwise unknown Yāzdānī is quoted by Rūdūyānī no fewer than six times (for a total of seven verses). I wonder whether he is not identical with Asadī’s ʿOrmazdī (q.v.)?

154. Yūsuf ʿArūḍī, a number of whose verses are quoted in Asadī’s LF, is evidently identical with the Abū Yūsuf whom Rūdūyānī mentions as the author of a treatise on prosody. ʿArūḍī quotes a further two verses of his which Rūdūyānī (p. 95), however, ascribes (in a slightly different form) to Ṣaḥrā.

LF passim (and Horn, Einl. p. 31); Rūdūyānī p. 2; Shams p. 335; S. Naftī, ʿYūsuf i ʿArūḍī, Šaṛq 1, 1310sh./1922, p. 758-60; Dh. Ṣafā, ʿDu

shāʿir i ʿamūm-nām', MDAT II/3, 1334sh./1955, p. 5-7; Ṣafā, Tārīkh 16 p. 437-8; Khayyām-pūr p. 661; Lazard, Poètes I p. 15 n. 2.

155. 'Abd al-Jabbārī Zainābī 2 al-ʿAlawī 3 al-Maḥmūdī is included by ʿArūḍī and 'Auṭī among the poets of the Ghaznavids. 'Auṭī quotes, among other things, two odes dedicated to Maḥmūd; further verses praising the same king (they mention 'Abū 1-Qāsim'), and with the same metre and rhyme as 'Auṭī's second sample (and thus possibly from the same poem, though the verses do not overlap) are quoted by Jārjārī. Bāḥaqaẓī, on the other hand, mentions him on three occasions as a highly esteemed panegyrist of Maḥmūd's son, Masʿūdī, one of these in connection with the events of the year 422/1031. See also above, p. 184 (Maḥmūdī).

Bāḥaqaẓī p. 131, 274, 280; LF passim; Rūdūyānī passim (and Ates's notes p. 92-3); ʿArūḍī p. 28 (and Qazwīnī ad loc.); Wawātī p. 20; 'Auṭī II p. 39-40; Shams p. 350; Jārjārī p. 458-9; Ḥiḍāyat, Majma‘ I p. 241; Ṣafā, Tārīkh 16 p. 560-3.

156. Zarrīn-Kītāb Marghazī 5 is credited with two verses in Asadī’s LF (though several of the manuscripts ascribe one of these to ʾAmārah) and a third is added by Nakhjawaṇī’s Ṣibāb al-furs (p. 189).

1Thus Rūdūyānī p. 8.
2Thus clearly pointed all 10 times in Rūdūyānī and several times in the manuscripts of LF (see Horn, Einl. p. 21, and ed. Mujtabāʾī/Gādiqī p. 90) and in Qawṣūn (p. 190). From the pun that 'Auṭī makes on the name it is clear that the latter read it as 'Zainātī' (or 'Ẓīmatī'), a reading defended with much ire by Bāḥr (Dānish 1, 1323sh./1945, p. 601-3), but the authority of Asadī and Rūdūyānī clearly outweighs that of 'Auṭī.
3Thus 'Auṭī and Bāḥaqaẓī.
4'Auṭī.
5The nisbah is only in LF, ed. Mujtabāʾī/Gādiqī, p. 195.
LF (see the indexes to the three editions);
Sibāb (see index); LN s.v. 'Zarrīn-Kitāb' p. 371.

ERRATA

P. 40, ad Turin, last line: read 'destroyed'
P. 70, line 1: read 'two Tāliqānā'
P. 76, line 9: read 'Ilyās'
P. 79, line 21: read 'miniatures'
P. 115, 8 lines from bottom: read 'not in 389 but in 689'
P. 116, line 1: read '689'
P. 116, line 12: read 'Mahmūd's conquest of Qannauj'
P. 117, last line of footnotes: read 'below, p. 124'
P. 119, line 7: read 'destroyed'
P. 119, footnote 2: Shērānī's book was published, apparently in Afghanistan, in Dalw (=Aquarius) 1355(sh.7).
P. 126, 13 lines from bottom: read 'incorporated'
P. 152, line 15: read 'compiler's'
P. 153, 2 lines from bottom: read 'preceding'
P. 196, 2nd line of entry on Mukhtār: read 'contemporary'
P. 196, 5 lines from bottom: read 'explicitly'
P. 223, line 10: read 'possibility'