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CHAPTER III:
FROM THE END OF THE 11TH CENTURY
TO THE FIRST QUARTER OF THE 13TH

The present chapter carries the history of Persian poetry down to the time of the Mongol invasion. For general chronological orientation we have taken the Lubāb al-albāb of ʿAufl (completed before 625/1228) and the Kitāb al-muʾjam of Shams i Qais (after 628/1230–1). Between them ʿAufl and Shams quote virtually all of the significant Persian poets of the pre-Mongol period. Other poets are included only if there is a fairly strong reason to assume that they flourished prior to the date of these two authorities. Anonymous narrative poems that have been ascribed to pre-Mongol times are described in the appendix.

The marginal additions in manuscript 'nūn' of Asadī's Lughat i furs do not quote any authors who can be dated later than the 6th/12th century. I have thus included in this chapter all of the names that are cited at least twice in those marginalia (in so far as they have not already appeared in Chapter II), as well as those quoted once, if they are mentioned also in some other source. But I thought it imprudent to perpetuate names mentioned only once, and not otherwise confirmed.

1Though these two authorities are virtually contemporaries, ʿAufl's emigration to India meant that he was less well in touch with the most recent developments of poetry in Persia. Thus, while Shams knows both Jamāl al-dīn and his son Kamāl al-dīn, ʿAufl is aware only of the former. The only other major figures known to Shams, but ignored by ʿAufl, are Fakhrī and Qamar. The reader will notice that in this chapter, as in the previous one, the amateur poets quoted in the first half of ʿAufl's book have for the most part been omitted.
A doubtless important source which I regret not having been able to use at first hand is the *Nuzh'at al-majālis*, a large collection of *rubā‘ī*ms put together by Jamāl al-dīn Khalīl al-Sharwānī around the middle of the 7th/13th century. I understand that an edition of this work was published a few years ago in Tehran, but my efforts to locate a copy of it have been unsuccessful. Thus for the moment we must content ourselves with the table of contents published by Dānish-paštāh in 1973.¹

Of the later *tadhkīrāt* the only ones consistently excerpted for this chapter are those by Mustaufi, Daulat-shāh, Rāzī—who is quoted by volume and page number of the (abyssmal) Tehran edition, as well as by the running numbers in *Ethē*’s summary, which in many cases conveys a more accurate picture of what Rāzī actually wrote—and Hīdāyat. The general historical sources have, of course, been exploited whenever I have been aware of them; Rāwandī’s history of the Seljuqs has proved particularly valuable. Among those works

¹See his article in *Rāh-nisā‘ i kitāb XV*, 1331/1373, p. 568-82, with a list of the poets quoted. The *Nuzh'at al-majālis* is preserved in a unique manuscript (Istanbul Carullah 667) dated Thursday 25 Shawwāl 731/1331 and copied by ‘Īsā’ī b. Isfandiyār al-Abharī, who in the earlier literature (Reimp et al. *et al. Khalīm, Meier ad Mahsati*) was considered to be the author. However, it seems that the real author is the minor poet Jamāl al-dīn Sharwānī (of whom we shall have more to say in chapter IV), for it contains, towards the end, a *qasīdah* by Sharwānī referring to ‘*this safinah*’ and addressing his patron, the Sharwānī-shāh ‘Alī al-dīn Farhūrz (II).’ The precise dates of the latter are not known, but his coins bear the names of the caliphs al-Nāṣir, al-Mustansīr and al-Musta’sī; he must therefore have reigned from before 622/1225 to after 640/1242. I suspect that the *Nuzh’ah* was put together fairly late in this reign, for some of the poets quoted in it could hardly have come to prominence before the second quarter of the 13th century. It is naturally also possible that the 14th-century copyist has made some additions to it.

that have not to my knowledge previously been consulted by historians of Persian literature one might mention in particular the *Fārīkh al-mustabsīr* of Ibn al-Mujāwir, written not long after 626/1228.¹

I have profitted greatly from the comments of A.D.H. Bivar, C.E. Bosworth; C.P. Melville and in particular A.H. Morton; the most important of their contributions have been credited at the appropriate point. Books and offprints relevant to the present chapter have been received from several of these scholars as well as from J.T.P. de Bruijn, M. Glünz and J.S. Meisami. Lydia Wright has helped with the proof-reading.

¹57. *Dīyā‘ al-dīn ‘Abd al-Rāfī‘* b. Abī l-Fath al-Harawī is represented by a number of poems in ‘*Auff*’s anthology, from which we learn that he served successively the last Ghaznavid Khursam-Malik (655/1160 to 682/1185) and the Ghori Mu‘izz al-dīn Mu‘ammad b. Sām (558/1163 to 599/1203). ‘*Auff* also tells us that he excelled in medicine and the funūn i lughat. (See also no. 206, ad Ḥusain al-Ḥājib).

¹*Auff* II p. 327-34, 413; *Dagā‘iq al-asbā‘ah* (Oxford Elliot 37 fol. 5a, 197a = *Ethē* 1333); Rāzī

¹Ed. O. Lōfgren, Leyden 1951-4. For the date and authorship of this work see G.R. Smith, *Ibn al-Mujāwir’s 7th/13th century guide to Arabia: the eastern connection*, *Occasional papers of the school of Abbasid studies III*, 1990, p. 71-88. The poets relevant to this chapter quoted by Ibn al-Mujāwir are Ḥasan Ghaznavī (p. 301, anonymously), Ḥusain Kirhamī (p. 84; see below no. 205), Nukhātī (p. 176, wrongly attributed; see no. 249), Șibīr (p. 197), Șamā‘ī (p. 265: ‘al-sha‘ir al-Ghaznavī’), Shāh Bū Rājā, (p. 84; see no. 286), Ẓahir Șeryrbī (p. 246: ‘al-Ẓahīrī’). He also quotes four of his own Persian verses (p. 44, 235), two from Gharā‘ī’s *Kīn u Ṭūfīn* (p. 235, 255, both anonymously), one by Ẓārībī Nuḵātī (p. 194, name misspelt in the Nms.; this verse supplements those mentioned above, p. 226-7) and one that remains unidentified (p. 53).
the ruler of Tabas Isma‘îl b. Muhammad Gilakî, who is known to have been alive in 493/1099-1100. If we assume that ‘Abd al-Wâsî’ was at least twenty when he praised Toghrîl-Teqîn, then the date of his birth cannot be put later than 470/1077-8. Sam’ânî was born in 506/1113 and is unlikely to have travelled to Herat to study with ‘Abd al-Wâsî’ much before 526/1132, by which time the latter would have been at the least well into his 50s and possibly a good deal older. By then he had perhaps already retired as a court-poet and devoted himself to religious studies. Taqî Kâshî gives the date of his death as 555/1160.

According to Daulat-shâh our poet was a native of Ghardistân, emigrated from there to Herat and then to Ghaznah, where he entered the service of Bahrâm-shâh, but defected to Sanjar when the latter captured Ghaznah (i.e. in 530/1135). Šâfî includes Bahrâm-shâh in his list of Jabalî’s patrons, repeating in this context Daulat-shâh’s story, but I have been unable to find any poems in the published dîwân mentioning Bahrâm-shâh by name; thus the ‘information’ given by Daulat-shâh seems most questionable. Daulat-shâh goes on to reject (in a rare fit of good judgement) the story told by Mustafî according to which ‘Abd al-Wâsî’ began life as an illiterate countryman who attracted the attention of a rich patron with some extemporised verses that he addressed to a group of camels. This is hardly a likely background for the teacher of Islamic traditions that we know ‘Abd al-Wâsî’ to have been.

Mss.: Dublin Beatty 103/II (Ms. completed Dhū l-bijjah 699/1300. Beginning missing); Oxford Whinfield 54 (Beeston 2662/9, Dated 9 Rajab 1012/1603. Selections); Ouseley 23 (Ethê 538. Has seal dated <1>179/1765-6); Ouseley Add. 19 (Ethê

---

1 p. 700 of his edition of the dîwân.
539. Owner's note dated 1127/1715; Elliot 116 (Eté 540); London Or. 3320 (Rieu Supp. 217. Dated 23 Rabî' I 1016/1607); Halle D.M.G. 19 (Dated 1016/1607-8); Leningrad Salemann 253; Romaskiewicz 7; Tashkent Acad. 160/VI (Semenov 801. Dated 1269/1852-3); Acad. 238/X (Semenov 802. Ms. Dated 1270/1853-4); Istanbul Topkapı, Hazine 796 fol. 187b sqq. (Karayat 887. The Ms. is dated Rabî' I 810/1407 and contains pictures); Lâlâ Ismail 463 (See Şafâ's edition I p. iii–iv. Dated Rabî' II 980/1572); Hekimoğlu Ali Paşa 669/2 (Niârîfîfî Bahâ I p. 420-1 and Şafâ's edition I p. vii); Tehran Bayânî 56/4 (Nushkâh-âh I p. 15. Dated 995/1587); Majlis 4841/5 (Munz. 24576. Dated Rabî' II 996/1588); Sıhâb al-Sâlîr II 393 (16th century? End missing); Majlis III 1024 (Dated 1001/1592-3); Malik 5307/6 (Munz. 24581. 17th century?); Majlis III 1025 (17th century? Incomplete at both ends); Peskharâw Islâmîyah 1823/4 (Dated 1134/1721-2); Calcutta Ivanov 448 (Dated 1224/1809). Cf. Munz. III 24572-97; Munz. Pak. VII p. 60 (4 Mss.).


Samânis (new edition) III p. 191; al-Kâtib al-İşfahânî, Kharîdat al-qâsr (see Leyden Cat. II p. 236); 'Auftî II p. 104-10; Şams p. 358; Ibn al-Fuwaṭî, al-Juz' al-râbî' min taḥkîmâl muṣâfâhî al-ādâb fi muṣâfâhî al-alâqâb, ed. M. Jawâd, Damascus 1962-7, no. 2558; Mustâuffî p. 740-1; Daqâiq al-ashârî (Oxford Elliot 37 = Eté 1935, fol. 92a, 133b, 251a); Jâmâ'î I p. 109-12, 120-3; Daultâshâh p. 73-5; Râzî II p. 118-23 (no. 608); Tâqî (see London Or. 3506 fol. 396a sqq. = Rieu Supp. 105); Hidâyat, Majma' I p. 185-92; Browne, History II p. 341-2; 'A. al-H. Nawâ'î, 'Chand nukta'raî' ba abâl i 'Abdu l-Wâsî' i Jabâlî', Yâdârî 1/8, p. 44-6; LN s.v. 'Jabâlî' p. 211-2; Şafâ, Târîkh II p. 650-6; Khâyâm-pûr p. 127; ET s.v. 'Abd al-Wâsî' (Hurt/Massé); EIr s.v. 'Abd al-Vâse' Jabâlî' (Dh. Şafâ).

159. Abû l-’Alâ Iskânî is remembered mainly on account of the scurrilous attack on him which Khâqânî included in his Tuhfat al-’irâqâîn. Here he is accused not only of the moral defects that one expects to find mentioned in polemics of this sort, but also of being an atheist and an adherent of the Ismâ‘îlî leader Aâsân b. al-Šâbbâh. The biographical information that we have about him appears largely to have developed out of the exegesis of these verses. Mustâuffî, who says that Abû l-’Alâ was Khâqânî’s teacher, quotes three verses in which the former claims to have committed sodomy with his pupil and another poem of nine verses retracting this claim and offering his apologies to Khâqânî. The second poem can be found (together with two more qâ’a’âh) in the old anthology published by Yaghmâhî (where it has one additional verse); here the author calls himself the ‘master’ (êtêlî) and ‘father-in-law’ (pîdar-khâwândah) of Khâqânî, says that he had reached the age of 60 and that at the age of 16 (variant: ‘around 40’) he had come from Arrânî to Sharwân. Daultâshâh says that Abû l-’Alâ was the master both of Khâqânî and of Falâkî and claims (with explicit reference to Mustâuffî’s Târîkh i guzâ’î, though in fact Mustâuffî says nothing of the sort) that he married his daughter to Khâqânî after first having promised her to Falâkî. He then quotes eight verses with the same metre and rhyme as the nine quoted by Mustâuffî and in Yaghmâhî’s anthology, but not one of his verses agrees with

1Hidâyat gives him the ‘name’, or rather the title, Nişâm al-âmîn.
2For this work see below, no. 224.
3Bad variant: Erân.
any of those quoted by them. 1 Rāzī quotes the poem in a form which combines verses from Mustauffī’s and Daulat-shah’s versions, as well as some more poetry, including a substantial qaṣīdah to the Shawrān-shāh Manūchīhr (II), who was Khaṅgānī’s first patron and who ruled from 516/1122 at the earliest until some time between 555/1160 and 566/1170. 2 Here Ābū 1-‘Alā 2 gives his own age as 55, speaks of Sanā’ī and ‘Imādī as having already died and defends himself against the accusation of having treacherously divulged the king’s secrets to an un-named enemy. We shall return to this poem in the discussion of ‘Imādī’s vital statistics.

Khaṅgānī, Tuhfat al-‘īrāqān, ed. Qarīb, p. 235-7; Mustauffī p. 722-3 (also in Juras 1900, p. 741-2, with variants); Yaghmā’ī p. 190-1; Daulat-shāh p. 70-1; Rāzī III p. 299-303 (no. 1397); Aḏhar I p. 204-5; Hidāyat, Majma’ I p. 81; N. Khanikov, JA 6th série, tome IV, 1864, p. 149-62 (translation of and commentary on Khaṅgānī’s inventive); Browne, History II p. 392-3; Ḥādī Ḥasan, Falakī-i-Shirvānī, London 1929, p. 55, 56-6 ('Abū 1-‘Alā’s Qaṣīdah'); Shujā’ al-mulk Shīrāzī, ‘Abū 1-‘Alā’ i Ganjavī, Argamān XIV, 1312h/1933, p. 705-13; Khuyām-pūr p. 20; Eir s.v. ‘Abu 1-‘Alā Ganjavī’ (Z. Sajjādī).

160. Saʿīdī Ābū 1-‘Allā b. al-Husain al-Marvāzī is included in ‘Auffī’s chapter on the poets of Khuṣār after the time of Sanjar, where two of his qaṣīdahs are quoted: one dedicated to an un-named dignitary, the other to ‘Ṣulṭān iskandar’, the name by which ‘Auffī designates the Khwārazm-shāh ‘Alā’ al-dīn Muhammad b. Tekish (596/1200 to 617/1220). 1

1The verses quoted by Daulat-shah give every impression of having been elaborated from those given by Mustauffī. Thus Daulat-shah’s last verse bi-gufsan bi-guftan na-gufsan na-gufsan ‘ifi said it, I said it, if I didn’t, I didn’t; if I ... him, I did it, if I didn’t, I didn’t’, is evidently someone’s improvement on the last verse of Mustauffī’s version: ba ḵay y ak-ē rāh du qaṣīdah bi-guftan na-gufsan na-gufsan na-gufsan (‘Not once, but two hundred times I said: I did not ... him, I did not, I did not, I did not’).

2Earlier estimates (by Ḥādī Ḥasan and Minorsky) for the end of his reign need to be revised following the publication by Kouymjan of a coin of Manūchīhr’s dated ‘Aḥ. 350 wa ḵamsīn wa ḵams-siwaḥ; the restoration of the date 555/1160 is assured by the fact that this coin names the caliph al-Mustanẓīr (555/1160 to 566/1170) and the (Seljuq) sultan Surālām (who reigned only from Rābī’ I 555/1160 to Rābī’ II 556/1161). Khaṅgānī, in his elegy on the death of Manūchīhr (d.‘Aḏhar, ed. Sajjādī, p. 530, without substantial variants), speaks of his ‘thirty-year reign’ (ṣe-salāḥ waḵul ʻalām i jahān). According to the Georgian Chronicle Manūchīhr’s father, Farābūn (Ap’ridun) II, was killed during a battle with the ruler of Darband in November of the Georgian year 340 (A.H. 514, A.D. 1120). But if Manūchīhr really succeeded his father in 514 and did not die until after 555, then he must have ruled for at least 41 lunar years. Khaṅgānī’s ‘thirty years’ could conceivably mean ‘thirty-odd years’, but hardly ‘forty-one’. In the light of this contemporary evidence we must conclude either that the date given by the Georgian source for the death of Farābūn is wrong, or else that Manūchīhr did not ascend the throne until some years after his father’s death. Manūchīhr certainly died before 566/1170 (the last year of the caliphate of al-Mustanẓīr, whose name still occurs on coins of Manūchīhr’s successor Akhbarsan). Thus he died between 555/1160 and 566/1170 and began ruling fewer than 40 years before this, i.e. not before 518/1122. See: M. Brossel, Histoire de la Géorgie I (translation of the Georgian chronicle), St. Petersburg 1849, p. 364; Ḥādī Ḥasan, Falakī-i-Shirvānī p. 11-12, 22-3; id., Researches in Persian literature, Hyderabad 1958, p. 6; V. Minorsky, A History of Sharvān and Darband, Cambridge 1958, p. 135-6; D.K. Kouymjan, ‘A unique coin of the Shirvāns̄hāh Minūchīhr I dated A.H. 555/1160 A.D.’, in Near Eastern numismatics, iconography, epigraphy and history. Studies in honor of George C. Miles, Beyrouth 1974, p. 339-46; id., A numismatic history of Southeastern Caucasia and Adharbayjān based on Islamic coinage of the 5th/11th to the 7th/13th centuries (Microfilm). Ann Arbor 1969, p. 165-73.

1The poem mentions the dedicatee’s laqab ‘Alā’ al-dīn, his name Muhammad, as well as his father’s name Tekish. Following his defeat of the Qara Khitāy in 607/1210, Muhammad assumed the title ‘iskandar al-thānī’.
By contrast, Râzî (followed by Hidâyat) makes him a native of Isfahan, says that he served Berk-yâruq as ʿArîdî i lashkar, and quotes a few of his poems. Hidâyat adds that he died in 512/1118-9.

Zubdat al-nuṣräh wa nukhart al-ʿurrah, abridged by al-Bundârî from the original of al-Kâtib al-Isfahânî, ed. M.Th. Houtsma (his Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire des Seldjoucides II), Leyden 1889, p. 63; Râwandî, Râbat al-ṣūdûr, ed. M. Iqâbî, p. 136; Juwainî II p. 2 (and Qazwînî's note); Sharwânî, Nuzḥat al-majâlis (see above, p. 242); Râzî II p. 358-9 (no. 864; name garbled in the edition); Hidâyat, Majmaʿ I p. 78-9; Browne, History II p. 186; Qazwînî, Yâd-dâshht-hâv VII p. 107-8; Khâiyâm-pûr p. 597.

163. 'Abū Maṣûrî i Bā Yûsuf' is mentioned by 'Arûdî as one of the poets at the court of Tughân-shâh B. Alp-Arsânî (who was still alive in 476/1083-4). 'Arûdî adds that he met Abû Maṣûrî in Herat in 509/1115-6 on which occasion he heard from the latter an anecdote about Tughân-shâh and Araqî. This Abû Maṣûrî is doubtless identical with the poet whom 'Auî calls Abû Maṣûrî 'Abd al-Raṣîd b. Ahmad b. Abî Yûsuf al-Haravî (omit the second 'îbn'). 'Auî quotes the mat'âsî of a gasâdâh and a rubâ'î by this poet; however, he includes him in his chapter on the early Ghasnavid poets, evidently in error.

'Arûdî p. 43, 44 (and Qazwînî ad loc.); LF ed. Iqâbî p. 249 (one verse in Ms. nûn in marg.); 'Auî II p. 61; LN s.v. 'Abû Maṣûrî' p. 869-70; Khâiyâm-pûr p. 24.

164. Abû Naṣr Ahmad b. Abî l-Hasan al-Nâmâkî (al-NAME) al-Jâmi, called Abînâd Âdîn, or Zandah-pîl, the famous mystic, is said to have been born in 441/1049-50 and to have died in 536/1141-2. A dîwân is ascribed to him in a number of manuscripts, almost all of them of Indian

1In the edition 'Saïyd 'Ali', but Ethê quotes the name as 'Saïyd Abî 'Ali', as in 'Auî.

provenance, and none older than the 17th century, though some rubā'īms are apparently attributed to him in the 13th-century Nuzhat al-majālīs. See also PL 1 p. 950 n. 3.

Mss. of his dīwān: London I.O. 2863 (DATED Ramadān 1069/1659. Contains on fol. 56b-68a a collection of poems by his sons and descendants); I.O. 4803a (DATED 22 Rabī’ I 1100/1689); Or. 268 I (RIEU p. 551. 18th century); Or. 5599 fol. 53a-106b (Meredith-Owens p. 50. DATED 1231/1815. Pictures); I.O. 910; Cambridge Or. 1556 (2nd Suppt. 344. 17th century?); Leningrad Acad. B 2307 fol. 1b-28a (INDEX 1365. DATED 1125/1713-4); Acad. B 128 (INDEX 1354); Tehran Malik 6053/15 (Munz. 22086. 17th century?); Lahore Univ. I/2 p. 142 (DATED 1109/1697-8); Bombay Brelvi p. xxiv no. 9 (DATED 1076/1665-7); Lucknow Sprenger 88 (DATED 1080/1669-70); Bankipore I 23 (17th century?); Hyderabad Āsafiyah I p. 716 no. 451; CALCUTTA Ivanow 436 (modern); Ivanow Curzon 191 (DATED 5 Jumādā I 1224/1809). Cf. Munz. III 22085-9; Munz. Pak. VII p. 36-8.

Editions: Cawnpore 1879; 1881; 1885; 1898; Lucknow 1923.

Sharwānī, Nuzhat al-majālīs (see above, p. 242); Rāzī II p. 177-9 (no. 667); Hidāyat, Majma‘ I p. 67-8; id., Riyāḍ p. 51-3; ET s.v. ‘Abdād-i Djmā‘ (P. Neier); EIR s.v. ‘Abdād-e Jāmā‘ (H. Moosyyad).

165. al-Shaikh Ahmad b. Muḥammad - the name is followed in the defective manuscript by a word that looks like ‘al-mīm’ and then by a lacuna - is credited in ‘Auffī’s chapter on the poets of Ghaznah and Lahore after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157) with a single poem which ‘Auffī says is ‘in the manner of Mukhtarī’. In fact it is clearly inspired by the ode in Mukhtarī’s dīwān, ed. Humā‘ī, p. 512-5. Rāzī quotes the same poem, but, for the reason given below (no. 199, ad Hamīd al-dīn) wrongly ascribes it to another poet.
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166. Majd al-dīn ‘Ajīyq is represented by one ghazal in ‘Auffī’s chapter on the poets of Khurāsān after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157). See also above, p. 78 n. 1. ‘Auffī II p. 354-5; Hidāyat, Majma‘ I p. 541; Khayyām-pūr p. 413.

167. ‘Ajabī Khujandī is credited by ‘Auffī with a qaṣīdah in praise of Sharaf al-dīn Ḫusayn al-Nasafi.1


168. ‘Ajbī Jūzjānī2 is mentioned in ‘Auffī’s chapter on the poets of Khurāsān after the time of Sanjar, where we find two qaṣīdahs, both of which mention the poet’s patron Ḫusayn al-dīn Sām b. Ḫusayn, the Ghordī, who reigned for a few months in 544/1149.


169. Shihāb al-dīn ‘Am‘aq (thus the conventional reading, but perhaps better Ghamghaq?)3

---

1For whom see ‘Auffī I p. 164-9; Rāzī III p. 388-92 (no. 1459); Sāfā, Tārīkh II p. 764-7; Khayyām-pūr p. 296.
3The rasaṣṣ ‘aq occurs in all the sources and the final syllable -aṣṣ is confirmed notably by a verse of Anwarī’s (dīwān, ed. Mudarris i Rīdwālī, I p. 273, 6), where it occurs in the rhyme. It has no meaning in Persian or Arabic and has not been explained. Sāfā’s suggestion that ‘Am‘aq might be an error for ‘Aq‘āq, ‘magpie’, would require the most implausible assumption that the latter perfectly common word was replaced in various independent traditions by one and the same meaningless form. If, however, one assumes that the letters are correct, but the pointing possibly wrong, one
al-Bukhari was a panegyrist of the Qarakhanids of Samarkand. His *Divan* has not come down to us as such, but a good number of his poems are quoted in the *tadhkirah* (notably, it seems, by Taqī Kāshī) and these have been collected by Naftī (unfortunately without indication of the sources for the individual poems, so that for many of them the question of their authenticity remains in abeyance). Of the *qasidas* dedicated to identifiable patrons the great majority invoke Nāsir al-ḥaq wa l-dīn Shams al-mulk Abū l-Ḥasan Naṣr b. ʾIbrāhīm (460/1068 to 472/1080). We have also one poem1 (or possibly two2) to his brother and successor Khıdır b. ʾIbrāhīm (who appears to have ruled only for a year or so). Ṭarūḥī tells us that Amīr ʾAmīrʾaq was the poet-laureate at the court of Khıdır, with other poets under him, and narrates an elaborate story of his rivalry with Rashīdī for the king’s favour. But the account that Ṭarūḥī gives of the splendour of Khıdır’s court is not confirmed by the historical sources, who have nothing to say about his short-lived and uneventful reign. It is thus possible that Ṭarūḥī, who is notoriously lax with regard to historical details, has confused Khıdır with his more famous brother Naṣr. There is also one poem3 to Naṣr’s father-in-law, the Seljuk Alp-Arslān (455/1067 to 465/1072). The poem printed by Naftī on p. 179-83 is not by ʾAmīrʾaq, but (according to ʿAuфи) by ʿAlī i Yaʿqūb (below, no. 174); the ʾBū l-Muzaf-

might suggest that ʿGhazāḥqā ṭq could represent Turkish qasgaq, ‘salt-wort’, for which see G. Clauson, *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish*, Oxford 1972, p. 627b.

1Naftī, p. 157-62. The dedication to ʿJamāl i sluṭ, khāṭīb i muʿāṣṣan ... ʿAlī Khıdır’ is on p. 159.
2Naftī, p. 137-9, invokes, despite its superscription, ʿJamāl i sluṭ, khāṭīb i muʿāṣṣan, which seems to be ʿAmīrʾaq’s name for Khıdır (see the previous note).
3Naftī p. 188-9.

far ʾIbrāhīm mentioned therein is thus not the Qarakhanid ʾIbrāhīm II (who ruled for a short time from 526/1132 onwards), but his Ghaznavid namesake.

ʿAmīrʾaq’s datable *qasidas* thus all belong to the third quarter of the 5th/11th century. However, Daulat-shāh, on the authority of the supposed Ṭāʾīkh i ṣīl i Saljūq of Abū Tahir Khāṭūn,1 says that when Sanjar’s daughter Māh i Mulk Khāṭūn died (which, according to Ibn al-ʾAthīr,2 was in 524/1130), he commissioned ʿAmīrʾaq, who was then ‘old, weak and blind’, to write an elegy for her. Although it is not impossible that ʿAmīrʾaq lived until this date, we ought to have a more reliable informant than Daulat-shāh before accepting this possibility as a fact. Taqī has our poet live another two decades until 543/1148-9.


Collections of poems and fragments: *Tābrīz* 1307ah./1928; *Tehran* 1339sh./1961 (Divan i ʿAmīrʾaq i Bukhari, ed. S. Naftī, with an extensive introduction containing references to all the available sources).

1*LD* ed. Igīb p. 13, 19-20 (ʿʿAmīrʾaq’), 44 (ʿʿAmīrʾaq’), 399, 400, 504-5, 508 (all verses in Ms. nūn in marg.); Ṭarūḥī p. 28, 46-7; Wāṭṭāt p. 44-5; ʿAuʿī II p. 181-91; Shams p. 322; Jāīmālī II p. 499-500; Daulat-shāh p. 64-5; Rāżī III p. 409-20 (no. 1474); Taqī (London Or. 3506 fol. 279b sqq. = Rieu Suppt. 105; Paris Supplément 799

1For this (probably fictitious) work see below, p. 400 (Khāṭūnī).

2al-Kāmil fi l-taʾrīkh, ed. Tornberg, X p. 468.
a well-known poem lamenting these events. After the death of his patron he appears to have lived for a while in Bakh, where he wrote poems in praise of local princes and of the qādī al-qadī Hamīd al-dīn, whose Maqamat i Hamīdī (written in 551/1156-7) are mentioned. He also addressed some odes to the atabeg Qūth al-dīn Mauddūd b. Zangī, who ruled in Mosul from 544/1149 onwards, and the Seljuk sultan Sulaimān b. Muḥammad, who ruled from 555/1160 to 556/1161. The most recent date that can be extracted from the dīwān is that of the festival of Bahmanjah in 'the year 533 of the dating of the Persians', i.e. 1 December 1164, which he mentions in one poem. 2

There exist a number of versions of an anecdote linking him with some catastrophic but unfilled prophecies in connection with a conjunction of the stars in 582/1186, but it is not clear whether Anvari is supposed to have lived until then, or whether he made his predictions some years in advance. The tadhrirahs give a wild array of dates for his death and the question has been much debated by modern scholars, but the poems themselves would suggest, as has been seen, a date not long after 560/1164-5.

Apart from his qašīdahs - many critics have regarded him as the foremost practitioner of panegyrical poetry in Persian - Anvari has left a large number of invectives of a ferocity which, though not unique, is nonetheless astonishing.

The only more or less critical edition of his dīwān is that by Muḥarrar i Ṭiḍāwi, who at least consulted the oldest dated copy (London Or. 3713) 3 and two of the old Istanbul manuscripts

---

1Only this much of his name is certain. His contemporary Ṭahārī Samargandī, in his unpublished Aghrād al-siyāsah, calls him Muḥammad b. 'Ali (thus according to Ateg, Ṣalām Ansiklopedisi, s.v. 'Enver') p. 278); the apparently contemporaneous author of the introduction in some copies of the dīwān (e.g. London Or. 3486/I) has 'Ali b. Muḥammad b. Iṣḥāq, while 'Auṣfī has Aḥmad al-dīn Muḥammad b. Muḥammad. That his grandfather was indeed Iṣḥāq is confirmed by the verse in his dīwān, ed. Muḥarrar i Ṭiḍāwi p. 302 ult. The 'Ali b. Iṣḥāq al-Abūwardī who supposedly copied the Tabrīz Na. of the dīwān of Qatārīn in 529/1134 (see above, p. 216) is in any case certainly not Anvari, though this could possibly be the name of his father. 2

1Dīwān p. 201-5.

2Dīwān p. 415, 1. 7: sīl bar pānqad u sīl u sīh ši tārīkh i qānān. 3His Ms. 'ṭ'. Wrongly described in volume 1, introduction, p. 18, as a Paris manuscript, but correctly identified in volume II, introduction p. 146-7.
and recorded variants from a number of others. However the edition is not complete, since the editor has omitted some poems that he considers obscene; for these the older edition by Najīnā can be consulted.

Mss.: Dublin Beatty 103 (Copied jointly by Muḥammad-Shāh b. 'Ali b. Māḥūd Ḥafṣānī - the scribe responsible for the oldest London copy - and by Abū Naṣr Muḥammad b. Ḥamād al-Yamānī and dated 23 Dhū 1-bījah 699/1300); Manchester Lindesiana 111 (16th century?); Lindesiana 839 (Dated 1023/1614); Lindesiana 277 (17th century?); Lindesiana 524 (Dated A.D. 1859); Oxford Laud 133 (Ethē 543. Owner's mark dated 941/1534-5); Whinford 54 (Beeston 2662/1. Dated 9 Rajab 1012/1603. Selections); Ouseley 13 (Ethē 544. Dated 1 Dhū 1-bījah 1015/1607); Elliot 40 (Ethē 545. Completed 16 Dhū 1-bījah 1018/1610); Elliot 113 (Ethē 546. Dated 1019/1610-1); Ouseley 1,2 (Ethē 555. Dated 1082/1671-2. ḡāṣīdahs only); Elliot 39 (Ethē 547. 17th century?); Ouseley 36 (Ethē 548. 17th century?); Ouseley 123 (Ethē 549. 17th-18th century?); Elliot 41 (Ethē 550); Elliot 42 (Ethē 551); Elliot 43 (Ethē 552); Fraser 64 (Ethē 553); Ouseley Add. 135 (Ethē 554); Walker 98 (Ethē 556); London Or. 3713/V (Rieu Suppt. 211; M-R's tā'?). Copied by Muḥammad-Shāh b. 'Ali b. Māḥūd Ḥafṣānī and dated 6 Rabi' I 692/1293); Or. 3486/1 (Rieu Suppt. 220. Dated 841/1437-8. With preface); I.O. 939 (Dated Rabi' I 987/1579. Two different collections); I.O. 2864 (Dated 18 Ramaḍān 1009/1601); Add. 7732 (Rieu p. 555. ca. 1011/1603; a number of folios were replaced in 1200/1786-8); Or. 4514/V fol. 78b-116b (Rieu Suppt. 215. Completed 14 Rabi' I 1023/1614); I.O. 946 (Robinson 146-51. Ms. dated 12 Jumādā II 1038/1629. 'Intikhāb i diwān', with 2 extraneous pictures); I.O. 2865 (Dated 1 Ramaḍān 1038/1629); I.O. 935 (Dated 7 Muharram 1061/1650); Add. 25,019 (Rieu p. 554-5. Dated Shawwāl 1083

/1672); Add. 5617 (Rieu p. 555. Dated Dhū 1-qa'dāh 1087/1677); I.O. 944 (Dated 1 Dhū 1-qa'dāh 1094 /1681. ḡāṣīdah); Add. 22,381 (Rieu p. 555. 17th century? Various leaves missing); I.O. 945 (Dated 1120/1708-9. ḡāṣīdah); Add. 16,763 (Rieu p. 555-6. Dated 1129/1717. Contains only the ḡāṣīdahs, among them several that are manifestly spurious); Or. 3233 (Rieu Suppt. no. 218. Dated 20 Rajab 1154 /1741); S.O.A.S. 44585 (18th century?); S.O.A.S. 24943 (18th century?); Or. 11956 (Meredith-Owens p. 64. 18th-19th century?); I.O. 936-938; I.O. 940-943; Cambridge Or. 6. 31. (Browne Cat. CVI. 15th or 16th century?); Add. 213 in marg. (Browne Cat. CXXXIII. 16th or 16th century? ḡāṣīdahs only); Or. 6. 27. (Browne Cat. CVI. 16th century?); Or. 1687 (2nd Suppt. 435. 16th century?); Or. 6. 34. (Browne Cat. CVII. Dated 15 Sha'bān 1124/1712); for other undated copies see Browne Suppt. 507-511, 952, 1052-1055, Browne Coll. V.30. Edinburgh New Coll. Or. 40; Paris Supplément 823 fol. 1 sqq. (Blocchet 1968. 13th century? Fragment); Supplément 519 (Blocchet 1223. Dated 857/1453); Supplément 518 (Blocchet 1224. Dated 931/1524-5); Supplément 514 (Blocchet 1228. Dated Dhū 1-bījah 1035 /1526); Supplément 783 fol. 58v sqq. (Blocchet 1981. 16th century? Selections); Supplément 515 (Blocchet 1225. Dated 23 Jumādā I 1010/1601); Supplément 516-7 (Blocchet 1226-7. Dated Dhū 1-qa'dāh 1027/1618); Supplément 1895 (Blocchet 1229. 19th century?); Rome Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Ms. Caetani 72 (Piemontese 285. Copied by Muḥammad 'Allī and dated 10 Ṣafar <104/1642); Munich (Amer Ergänzungsheft 352. Dated 931/1524-5); 170 Quatr. (Amer 20. Dated 1234/1818-9); Berlin Ms. or. fol. 148 (Pertzsch 713. Dated 4 Muharram 993- /1585); Sprenger 1375 (Pertzsch 714. Dated 7

1According to Nasim, p. 346 no. 2, it is dated 1054/1644.
Mubarram 34th year [of Aurangzēb] = 1102/1691, altered to '1115'; Petermann 193 (Pertsch 714*; 'Nicht ganz neu'); Sprenger 1376 (Pertsch 715. Dated 1227/1812); Petermann 716/2 (Pertsch 682. Selections); Ms. or. fol. 3012 (Heinz 111); Gotha 49 (Dated Dhū l-qa'dah 1027/1618); Vienna Kraft CLXXXVII (Dated 1013/1604–5); Flügel 511 (has an owner's note dated 1081/1670–1); Uppsala Zettersrēsten 420 (Dated Sha'bān 1249/1833–4); Leningrad Dorn CCCCXXV (Copied by Ibn Muḥammad Qāsim al-Kirmānī and dated Dhū l-biijjah 1003/1595); Acad. C 1658 (Index 1390. Dated 1015/1606–7. Selections only); Dorn CCCCXXVI (Dated Rabī‘ II 1022/1613); Acad. C 56 (Index 1388. Dated 1050/1640–1); Acad. A 17 (Index 1383); Acad. B 123 (Index 1384); Acad. B 124 (Index 1385); Acad. A 125 (Index 1386); Acad. C 819 (Index 1389. *qāsīdah only); Istanbul Fatih 3784 (Ritter-Reinert p. 119; Mudarris i Ridawilān's *ādām. Copied by Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad al-Hāfiẓ and dated Shawwāl 708/1309); Fatih 3786 (Ritter-Reinert p. 120; Mudarris i Ridawilān's 'āsin. 'Probably' by the same scribe as the preceding); Ayasofya 2051/5 (Mīkrūfīm-hā I p. 409–10. Ms. apparently dated Shawwāl 730/1330. *qāsīdah'); Lālā Ismaił 447/7 (Mīkrūfīm-hā I p. 500. Selected poems in a Ms. dated 741/1340–1); Universite FY 496/2 (Ateş 68. Copied by al-Busain b. Muḥammad al-Maḏīnī and dated 21 Jumādā I 759/1358); 'Harāj-chi-oğlu' (sic) 925 (Mīkrūfīm-hā I p. 88. Dated 1 Mubarram 839/1434); Fatih 3781 (Ritter-Reinert p. 150. 13th century? Seal of Bayezid II); Fatih 3783 (Ritter-Reinert p. 121. 'Schwerterhandschrift der vorigen'); Universite FY 254 (oilīm Riza Pasha 393. Ateş 69. 16th century?); Universite FY 358 (oilīm Riza Pasha 498. Ateş 70. Copied by Muḥammad b. Naṣr 'Allī and dated 1026/1617); Universite FY 534/2 (Ateş 71. Dated 15 Jumādā II 1048/1638); Universite FY 9 (Ateş 72; Edhem/Stouchkine XXXVIII. Copied by 'Abd al-Rahīm b. Muḥammad Bihbīhānī and dated 26 Rabī‘ I 1079/1668); Fatih 3782 (Ritter-Reinert p. 121. Copied by Abū Muḥammad 'Abd al-Rahīm Bihbīhānī and dated 19 Shawār 1082/1671); Topkapı, Revan 1013 (Karnatak 394. 18th century? *qāsīdah'); Universite FY 77 (Ateş 75. 18th century? *qāsīdah'); Hekimoğlu Ali Paşa 669/1 (Mīkrūfīm-hā I p. 420–1. Apparently old); Cairo 153 mīm abad fārisī (Tirāzī I 624. Selected poems in Ms. dated 823/1420); 93 mīm abad fārisī (Tirāzī I 623. Dated 13 Safar 1103/1691); 4 abad fārisī (Tirāzī I 621); 123 abad fārisī (Tirāzī I 622); 103 abad fārisī (Tirāzī I 625); 70 mīm abad fārisī (Tirāzī II 1815); Mardinah 'Arif Hikmat 38 (Nuskhah-hā V p. 484. Dated 993/1585); Najaf 1373 (Munz. 21730. 17th century?); Hamadan I'timād al-daulah (Nuskhah-hā V p. 345. Ms. apparently dated 6 Shawwāl 1017/1609); same collection (Nuskhah-hā V p. 343. Dated 1062/1652); Tehran Sipah-sālār II 1164 (13th century? Beginning and end missing); Malik 5267 (13th century? Munz. 17451; apparently M-R's kāf); Bayānī 54/2 (Nuskhah-hā I p. 15, dated there 768/1366–7; apparently M-R's dālī, though he gives its date as 753/1352); Gulistan/Atābāyī II 420/II (Ms. dated 826/1427–8. Selection of *qāsīdahs); Gulistan/Atābāyī II 466/1 (14th–15th century? Selections); Milī I I p. 476 (15th century? incomplete); Univ. XIX 3983 (15th–16th century?); Adabiyyāt II p. 16 (Dated 977/1569–70); Univ. X 2685/1 (Ms. copied by Niẓām Dihlawī and dated Mubarram 985/1577); Majlis 8890 (Munz. 21674. Dated 988/1580); Gulistan/Atābāyī I 44 (Copied by Khān-Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Ghanī Quraishī and dated Sha'bān 989/1581); Bayānī 56/2 (Nuskhah-hā I p. 15. Dated 995/1587); Univ. IX 2487/2 (Dated 1 Rabī‘ I 1001/1592); Sipah-sālār II 1166 (Dated 1008/1596–7); Gulistan/Atābāyī I 43 (Dated 1 Rabī‘ II 1015/1608); Gulistan/Atābāyī I 42; Gulistan/Atābāyī I 45; Gulistan/Atābāyī I 46; et al.; Mashhad 'Abd al-Hamīd Malikī (Nuskhah-hā V p. 28. 15th–16th century? End missing. Pictures); Ridawī VII 363 (Dated 25 Ramadan 1008/1599);
Ridawī VII 357 (M.R.'s 'alīf'). Dated Rabī‘ I 1023/1614); Ridawī VII 358 (M.R.'s 'p'). Dated 23 Dhū l-qa‘dah 1058/1648); Ridawī VII 360/1 (17th century?); Ridawī VII 361 (17th century?); Ridawī VII 356 (17th century?); Ridawī VII 354 (18th century?); Ridawī VII 359 (18th century?); Ridawī VII 355 (Dated 1236/1820-1); Durshābhe Ābād. II 366-368; Peshawar Islāmīyah 1792; Lahore (Numerous Ms. from the 15th century and later are listed in Munz. Pak. VII p. 41-4); Bombay Rehatser p. 162 no. 124 (Dated 989/1581); Univ. 106; Nawāri Meherjī Rana p. 33 no. 82; Aligarh Subb. p. 35 no. 59; Kapurthla (For a Ms. dated 1016/1607-8 see OCM III/4, 1927, p. 19); Hyderabad Ḥṣafiyyah I p. 742 no. 597; Lucknow Sprenger 99 (Dated 692 /1293); Bankipore I 25 ('Dated' 700/1300-1, 'but the appearance of the MS. shows that it belongs to the 15th century A.D.'); I 26 (Dated Sha‘bān 992 /1584); I 27 (16th century?); Madras II 586 (Dated 1104/1693-2); I 67; Calcutta Ivanov 450 (16th century?); Ivanov 451 (Copied by Muhammad Qazwīnī Ja‘ṣaṣqālī and dated 1008/1699-1600); Būḥār 290 (Dated Jumādā I 1012/1603. Lacunae); Ivanov 453 (Dated 14th year of Aurangzēb 1671); Ivanov 452 (17th century?); Ivanov 454 (18th century?); Cambridge (Ms.). Houghton Pers. 8.5 (Nuskhā-ḥā IV p. 4. 15th-16th century? Pictures); Houghton Pers. 10 (Nuskhā-ḥā IV p. 4. Dated 1059/1649). Cf. Munz. III 17451-5 ('Kullīyāt'), 21656-797 ('Diwān'). Further Ms. in private collections are listed in the introductions to the editions by Nafṣṣā (p. 1-111) and Muddarris i Ridawī (I p. 17-19).

Editions: Tabriz 1260/1844; 1266/1849-50; Delhi 1296/1878 ('Qāṣīdāt'). 770 pp.; Lucknow 1297/1880 ('Kullīyāt i naṣr'); 1306/1889 (same title); 1897 (same title); Bombay 1937 ('Qāṣīdāt'); Tehran 1337sh./1958 (ed. S. Nafṣṣā, with extensive introduction); 1337-40sh./1959-61 (ed. M.T. Muddarris i Ridawī. 2 volumes with continuous pagination, with a biography at the beginning of Vol. 2); reprinted 1364sh./1986.

Commentaries:

(1) Shāh i qāṣīdā (or: diwān) i Anwarī by Muhammad b. Dā‘ūd b. Muhammad b. Māhūd 'Alāvī Shāhī-ābādī and dedicated to the sultan of Mālwāh, Naṣīr al-Dīn Khājīj (regn. 906/1500 to 916/1510). Ms.: London I.O. 947 (Dated 24 Muharram 1056/1646); I.O. Delhi 1291 (Dated 1080/1669-70); Or. 362 (Rieu p. 556. 17th century?); Add. 25,820 (Rieu p. 556. Dated Sha‘bān 1232/1817); Paris Supplément 1383 (Blochet 1230. Dated 25 Jumādā I 1036/1627); Bankipore I 28 (18th century?); I 29 (18th century?); Lahore (Munz. Pak. VII p. 44-5: five copies); Hyderabad Ḥṣafiyyah III p. 514 no. 165; Calcutta Muddārah CXXVII (17th century?).

(2) Shāh i (abān i) qāṣīdā i Anwarī of Mīr Ḍūl Hayrānī Buṣayni Fārābī. According to Nasrābādī (who wrote around 1083/1672-3) he had recently been put to death in Shirāz. See Nasrābādī p. 276; Khwāsh-gū (Ethē’s summary) no. 642. Ms.: Oxford Ouseley 43 fol. 72-161 (Ethē 557. 17th century?); London I.O. 948/I (Ms. dated 19 Ramadān of the 19th year of ʿAlām-gūr/1087/1676); Or. 361 (Rieu p. 556-7. 17th century?); S.O.A.S. 4676 (Dated 29 Rabī‘ I 1135/1722); I.O. 949; I.O. Delhi 1241/2; Paris Supplément 1524 (Blochet 1231. Dated Rabī‘ II 1072/1661. Autograph?); Leningrad Acad. B 126 (Index 2406); Acad. B 127 fol. 1a-53a (Index 2407. Incomplete); Istanbul Universite FY 547 (Ates 76. Dated 1164/1750-1); Tehran Majlis III 1105 (Dated 1028/1619); Majlis III 1106 (Dated 1230/1815); Majlis IV 409 (Dated 1240/1824-5);

1Shāhī-ābādī is another name for Mānūd, capital of the kingdom of Mālwāh (Sto.). For his commentary on the qāṣīdā of Khāqānī see below, no. 224.
Majlis II 410; Mashhad Ridawī III/vx Ms. 63 (Apparently an autograph); Ridawī VII 701/1 (Dated Rabī‘ II 1022/1613); Pakistan (Munz. Pak. VII p. 45–6: seven copies in Lahore – the oldest dated 1041/1632 – and Karachi); Lucknow Sprenger 100; Bankipore I 30 (Dated 1211/1796–7); Calcutta Ivanov 455/1 (Dated 1118/1706–7); Ivanov Curzon 193 (18th century?); Ivanov Curzon 194/1 (18th–19th century?).


(3) The same author’s commentary on the mugāt-ṭa‘āt. Mss.: Oxford Ouseley 43 fol. 162a–199 (Ethé 557. 17th century?); Bodl. 371 (Ethé 558. Fragment); London I.O. 948/II (Ms. dated 19 Ramadān of the 19th year of ‘Alamārīr/1087/1676); Or. 3312 (Rieu Suppt. 219. Dated Dūh 1-bijjah 132', i.e. perhaps 1132/1720); I.O. Delhi 1241/3; Leningrad Acad. B 2242 (Index 2408. Dated 1054/1644–5); Acad. D 2 (Index 2409); Tehran Majlis III 1105 (Dated 1028/1619); Majlis III 1106 (Dated 1230/1815); Majlis II 409 (Dated 1240/1824–5); Majlis II 410; Mashhad Ridawī III/vx, Ms. 63/II (Apparently an autograph); Ridawī VII 701/2 (Dated Rabī‘ II 1022/1613); Ridawī III/vx Ms. 70 (Dated 1055/1645); Bankipore I 30 (Dated 1211/1796–7); Lucknow Sprenger 100; Calcutta Ivanov 455/II (Dated 1118/1706–7); Ivanov Curzon 194/1 (18th–19th century?).

(4) Unidentified commentaries: Madras I 266; Bombay Rehatkāl p. 135 no. 28 (Dated 21 Sha‘bān 1112/1701).


171. Ahmad b. ‘Umar b. ‘Alī al-Nigāmī al-‘Arūḍī al-Samarqandī was a minor poet at the court of the Ghorids and a major prose writer, the author of the already frequently cited Chahār maqālah. What we know of his life derives entirely from that book. He was born in Samarkand and reached the age of reason before 504/1110–1, the earliest date which he mentions in connection with his own activities. He was in Balkh in 506/1112–3 and Herat in 509/1115–6. He met Mu‘izzī for the first time outside Tūs in 510/1116–7. He evidently spent some time in Naisābūr (he mentions being

1As he calls himself in Chahār maqālah p. 3.
there in 512/1118-9, 514/1120-1 and 530/1135-6) but was outside Herat with the Ghorida ‘Alā’ al-dīn Ḥusain in 547/1152. The Chahār maqālah were almost certainly written in, or shortly before, 552/1157 and dedicated to the Ghordih prince Ḥusayn al-dīn ‘Alī b. Mas‘ūd. Of his further life we know nothing.

Apart from the five verses of which ‘Arūdī himself says (p. 53) that he improvised them in the presence of one the Ghordis we have only a few fragments, largely of satirical content, quoted by ‘Auffī and his successors.

‘Auffī II p. 7, 207-8; Mustaufī p. 753; Daulat-shāh p. 60-1; Rāzī III p. 352-4 (no. 1426); Hidāyat, Majma’ II p. 635; Qazwīnī’s introduction to his edition of the Chahār maqālah (summarised in Browne’s English introduction); Khayyām-pūr p. 609; EI² s.v. ‘Nizāmī ‘Arūdī Samarkandī’ (H. Massé).

172. al-Sayyid al-ajall Ashrafī al-Samarqandī is included by ‘Auffī in his chapter on the poets of Transoxania after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157) where we find, along with some other poets, verses from two odes to an unspecified Khwārazm-shāh and a rubā‘ī which ‘Auffī tells us was composed in Bukhārā in the year 597/1200-1; this contradicts Taqī’s claim that Ashrafī died in 593/1198-9.¹ The later anthologists ascribe to him a good number of poems, hardly any of which overlap with ‘Auffī’s selection. Among those quoted by Hidāyat is a short piece mentioning khudāwand i gēttī, malik Arslān * panāh i hamah mulk i Afrāsiyāb, evidently one of the Qarakhanids; but is it really his?

A selection of poems by ‘Saiyid Ḥasan Ashrafī’ is contained in Oxford Whinfield 54 (Beeston

¹Taqī, apud Sprenger p. 16 no. 30. The same date is given also by Khāhar.

2662/7. Dated 9 Rajab 1012/1603); it remains to be examined whether these do not in fact belong to Saiyid Ḥasan Ghaznavī (alias Ashraf), despite the fact that the latter is represented (under his usual name) by a separate selection in the same manuscript.

‘Auffī II p. 390-2; Shams p. 389; Rāzī III p. 362-8 (no. 1431); Hidāyat, Majma’ I p. 101-2; id., Riyād p. 168-9; Khayyām-pūr p. 44.

173. Aṣğī al-dīn b. al-Najīb al-Samarqandī was still alive at the time that ‘Auffī composed his anthology. ‘Auffī quotes only four of his verses, two of them a rubā‘ī mocking Sa’d Najjārī (q.v.).

‘Auffī II p. 396; Khayyām-pūr p. 45.

174. Abū 1-‘Alā’ ‘Ata’ b. Yaʿqūb al-Kātib, al-ma’rīf bi Nā-kūk,¹ i.e. ‘out of tune’, was a secretary in the service of the Ghoznavid Ibrāhīm b. Mas‘ūd (450/1059 to 492/1099). ‘Auffī gives the date of his death as 491/1098², says that he left diwan in Persian and Arabic and that he was imprisoned in Lahore for eight years by the order of Ibrāhīm. The diwan of Mas‘ūd i Sa’d contains two elegies on the death of ‘Ata’ i Yaʿqūb and another poem addressed to him during his lifetime. ‘Auffī quotes several of his Persian poems. For the Burzū-nāmah wrongly attributed to him see below no. 317.

Bākharzī no. 350; Mas‘ūd i Sa’d, Diwan, ed. Vāsini, p. 50, 367, 603-4; al-Kātib al-Isfahānī, Kharidat al-qāṣr (Leyden Cat. II p. 240); ‘Auffī I p. 72-5; Hidāyat, Majma’ I p. 342-3 (‘Ata’ i Rāzī); Qazwīnī/Browne, JRAS 1906, p. 42-4; Ṣafā,

²Hidāyat has 471/1078-9; i.e. in his copy of ‘Auffī he read sab’in instead of tis’in. The two words are of course very similar in Arabic script. 
with the title malik al-mulūk, presumably Arslān’s predecessor, Ghiyāth al-dīn Sulaimān (555/1160 to 556/1161), and at least one praising a certain Rukn al-dīn, probably Arslān’s successor Toghṛḷ III (571/1176 to 590/1194). The editor’s attempts to discover other Seljuqs and atabegs in the poems are either inconclusive or definitely wrong; there is in particular no evidence for his contention that Athīr had already reached the Seljuq court at the time of Muḥammad II.

Athīr also praised a number of ministers and at least one (and probably several) of the Al ī Khujandī, the leaders of the Shāfi‘ī religious faction in Isfahan, though here again it is difficult to know exactly which members of that family are intended. The editor has included no fewer than eleven Khujandīs (several of them fictitious) in his long list of Athīr’s patrons, but the only one unambiguously named in the poems, namely Jamāl al-dīn Masʿūd, is absent from his list.

Daulat-shāh says that Athīr fled from Khurāsān to the West at the time of the rebellion of the Ghuzz against Sanjar (i.e. ca. 548/1153), and although this seems possible from a chronological point of view, it is perhaps merely a deduction. Taqī puts his death in 608/1211-24 and says that only with great difficulty did he find a copy of his dīwān containing about 10,000 verses.5


---

1Thus (with further honorifics) in the India Office manuscript (see Humayun-Farrukh’s introduction p. xxxiii n. 1). Rāwandā and ‘Auffi call him merely Athīr Akhṣḳatī.
2Thus Shams p. 273.
3Akhṣḳatī (thus pointed and vocalised in Yāqūt, Buldan I p. 162) is evidently an Arabicised form for the local name, Akhṣḳatī (or however the first vowel is to be read); cf. (Manichean) Sogdian ʾx̣y-, ‘to rule’, and (Christian) Sogdian kṇḳ and ḳḥ, ‘town’.
4Dīwān p. 68.
1For this and the older Mashhad Ms. see below, no. 247 (Mu'izzI).

The contents of this article are the following:
Biography [p. 271]; 'Major' works: (1) Khuzan-
namah [p. 276]; (2) Asar-namah [p. 278];
(3) Nantiq al-tair [p. 281]; (4) Husbat-namah
[p. 288]; (5) Ilah-namah [p. 291]; (6) Diwan
[p. 294]; (7) Muskur-namah [p. 296]; 'Minor',
spurious and doubtful works (alphabetically by
title) [p. 297]; Literature [p. 318].

Biography: 'At'tar's contemporary 'Auffi
includes him in the chapter devoted to the
poets of Khwārazm-shah after the time of Sanjar, calls him
Farīd al-dīn Abū Hamīd Abū Bakr al-'Attār al-Nai-
sābūrī and speaks of him in the present tense,
from which fact one might conclude that he was
still alive when 'Auffi composed his work in about
618/1221, or at least that 'Auffi had not yet heard
of his death. Another contemporary, Shams i Qais,
quotes a single verse (not apparently in the
diwan) by 'Farīd i 'At'tār' mentioning the
Khwārazm-shah Muḥammad b. Tekish (596/1200 to
617/1220). Our next source, Ibn al-Fuwatī, calls
him Farīd al-dīn Sa'īd b. Yūsuf b. 'Ali al-Nais-
sābūrī, now known as al-'Attār, and quotes Naṣīr al-
dīn Tūsī (who was born in 597/1200 and was Ibn al-
Fuwatī's teacher) as saying that he met 'At'tār in
Naisābūr, that he was an eloquent and learned old
man and that he 'was martyred in Naisābūr at the
hands of the Tatars', i.e. evidently during the
sack of Naisābūr in 617/1220. Tūsī was only twenty
at that time and must therefore have been very

1The personal name Sa'īd does not seem to occur in any
other source and results perhaps from the misunderstanding
of a report which spoke of the 'late' (sa'īd) 'At'tār. In the
Tebran (Gulfān) Ms. of 'At'tār's collected works, copied in
731/1331 (less than a decade after the death of Ibn al-
Fuwatī) the poet is called Farīd al-daulāh <wa> al-dīn
Muḥammad al-'At'tār al-Nisābūrī.
young when he met the poet. The statement that 'Aṭṭār was killed by the Mongols is repeated (and elaborated) by a number of later authorities, though other, earlier or later, dates for his death have also been offered.

Any attempt at reconstruction of his biography is inexorably entwined with the question of which of the many works that have come down to us under his name are really his. Early attempts (notably by Qazwīnī in his introduction to Nicholson's edition of 'Aṭṭār's Tadhkīrat al-sulīyā') have lent heavily on the apparent auto-biographical and auto-bibliographical statements in the poems Maghar al-ajā'ib and Lisān al-ghaib, with their account of the poet's conversion from Sunnism to Shiism, of the persecution that he suffered on this account in his homeland, of his extensive journeys in India, Turkestan etc. and his flight to Mecca, where he wrote Lisān al-ghaib. To be sure, it has long been noted that the style and religious content of these poems differ markedly from 'Aṭṭār's supposedly early works, but it was assumed that his manner and outlook had evolved during his career. However, the intensive study of the 'Aṭṭār corpus, first by Shērānī and then by Nafīsī and (most systematically) by Ritter has led to the conclusion that these two works are forgeries from around the middle of the 15th/16th century. More precisely, they are the work of a Shiite poet from Tūn who on the one hand calls himself 'the second 'Aṭṭār' or 'the 'Aṭṭār of the age' - and thus in effect admits that he is not the original 'Aṭṭār - and who alludes more than once to poets of the Mongol period like Rūmī, Hāfiz and Qāsim Anwār, but who on the other hand puts verses into his poems stating that they were composed in the 6th/12th century and claiming as his own the authentic works of 'Aṭṭār.

But once these two forged works have been rejected we are left with very little material for a biography. 'Aṭṭār tells us virtually nothing about himself, his poems contain hardly any allusions to contemporary persons or political events and revolve very much in a timeless world of mysticism. We do, however, possess his introductions to the Mukhtār-nāmah and the Khusraw-nāmah which give us the information that he was indeed a druggist ('Aṭṭār) by profession and that he wrote at least some of his poems while working in his pharmacy. They also supply us with an approximate chronology of his poems. The prose preface to the Mukhtār-nāmah mentions (twice, and both times in the same order) five previous works: (1) Khusraw-nāmah, - i.e. the first, apparently lost, version of the same - (2) Asrār-nāmah, (3) Mantiq al-tair, (4) Muṣībat-nāmah and (5) Dīwān; he also mentions two poems that he had by then already destroyed: Jawāhir-nāmah and Sharh al-qalb. Some friends, he says, complained of the difficulty of finding their way in his huge collection of shorter poems, whereupon he extracted his rubā‘iyāt from the dīwān, destroyed some of them and rearranged the others in the present (6)


2 Nafīsī, Jast u-rūj dar māhī wa 'Aṭṭār i Farīd al-Dīn 'Aṭṭār i Wihābūrī, Tehran 1320h./1942. See also the note in his edition of 'Afsī p. 734-45.


4 See Ritter, Der Islam 25, p. 152-5.
Mukhtâr-nâmah. In the verse preface to the surviving revised version of the Khusrav-nâmah\(^1\) the author mentions the same six titles and adds (7) the Ilâhî-nâmah. He refers further to an unnamed friend who had objected that the original Khusrav-nâmah was too long and that, moreover, the author had repeated part of that poem in his Asrâr-nâmah (this confirms the order of the first two books as given above); thereupon 'Attâr reworked and abridged the former poem. The abridged Khusrav-nâmah is the last poem that is now generally accepted as the work of 'Attâr.

It is, however, possible that some of the remaining works in the corpus are his as well, namely those belonging to Ritter’s ‘Group II’, of which the most important are the Ushtur-nâmah, the Jauhar al-dhât and the Hailâj-nâmah. Naqshâ ascribed these to the 15th-century author of the above-mentioned forged works, ‘Attâr Tûnî, but Ritter\(^2\) has shown that they are already attested in manuscripts of the 14th\(^3\) and early 15th centuries and also that their content differs significantly from the works of the Shi'ite forger. If they are not by ‘Attâr then they must be the works of an earlier pseudopigraphist who (like the poet from Tûn) laid claim to ‘Attâr’s authentic works. If authentic, the Ushtur-nâmah must be ‘Attâr’s poem number (8), for in the prologue the author mentions only the five indubitably authentic mathnâwîs; if it is a forgery it must in any case have been forged at a time when the other works of Pseudo-‘Attâr had not yet come into existence. It is followed by (9) Jauhar al-dhât, the author of which mentions the Ushtur-nâmah and the Muṣâbât-nâmah and says that he is still working on the Hailâj-nâmah. This (10) Hailâj-nâmah, in turn, refers back to the Jauhar al-dhât. However, since the works in ‘Group II’ have not as yet been studied in detail we have thought it more prudent to leave them, for the while, among the ‘doubtful’ writings.

‘Attâr’s two earliest poems (Khusrav-nâmah and Asrâr-nâmah) are strikingly similar not only in title but also in their general character to Niqshâ’s first two books, Makhzan al-asrâr and Khusrav-Shirin. In the absence of an absolute chronology of ‘Attâr’s works it is difficult to say who influenced whom. Niqshâ in any event admits in the preface to his first poem to familiarity with Sanâ’î’s Hadîqah but gives no hint of knowing anything of ‘Attâr.

The mathnâwîs by, or ascribed to, ‘Attâr are mostly found in collective manuscripts, generally with the title Kulliyât i ‘Attâr. These differ in their contents one from the other and the works contained in them have been catalogued separately (and selectively)\(^2\) in what follows. A large number of Mss. of ‘Attâr’s ‘Kulliyât’ and of collective Mss. containing one or more of his poetic works together with works of other authors

---

\(^1\)Id. p. 146-52. Ritter distinguishes two prefaces (both found in all the Mss. consulted by him): one belonging to the original version of the work and a second referring specifically to the circumstances of the abridgment. The difficulty here is that the supposed first preface mentions, among other poems, the Mukhtâr-nâmah, while the preface to the Mukhtâr-nâmah mentions, as we have seen, the Khusrav-nâmah. If the two parts of the preface really belong to separate versions (which I think is not certain) it is evident that in revising the poem the author made some changes in the original preface, notably adding the reference to the Mukhtâr-nâmah.

\(^2\)Oriens XI p. 7-8.

\(^3\)The Konya Ms. of Jauhar al-dhât is dated 735/1335 (if correctly read).

\(^1\)See Muḥaqqiq’s edition p. 42.

\(^2\)Because of the large number of available copies I have aimed at some degree of completeness only for Mss. copied down to about the end of the 9th/15th century.
are listed by Ritter, *Oriens* XI p. 8-62, and a smaller selection is in Munz. III 17876-911.

Edition of the 'Kulliyāt': Lucknow 1872.

Authentic works:

1) *Khusrav-nāmah*, also called *Khusrav u Gul, Gul u Khusrav or Gul u Hurmuz* (inc. ba nām i ān-khīg ganj i jism u jān sākht * tilās i ganj i jān har du jahan sākht*), is a romantic story of the son of the king of the Byzantines and the daughter of the ruler of Khusīstān. The author says that it is based on a prose work by one Badr Ahvāzī. The verse introduction (for which see above, 'biography') indicates that 'Aṭṭār reworked and shortened his original version of the book. Ritter remarked that all the Mss. known to him contain this introduction; it is thus uncertain whether any trace of the older version has survived (despite the claims of various cataloguers to the contrary). See Ritter, *Der Islam* XXV, p. 114-52, and, for a detailed summary of the story, id. p. 160-72.

Mss.: 1) *Dublin* Beatty 117/V (Dated 821/1418); Beatty 288 (19th century? Pictures); *Oxford* Ouseley 371/4 (Ethē 626. 16th century?); Ouseley 353/1 (Ethē 627. Ms. has a note dated '13' which Ethē interprets as 1013/1604-5); Elliot 206/8 (Ethē 622. Contains a seal dated 1020/1611-2); Ouseley 374/4 (Ethē 623. Ms. dated 23 Jumādā 1 1027/1618); Elliot 208/4 (Ethē 624. Ms. dated 4 Dhū 1-bijjah 1078/1668); Elliot 204/6 (Ethē 625); Elliot 204/3 (Ethē 625); *London* Or. 2888/II (Rieu Suppt. 237. Dated Rabi‘II 893/1488); I.O. 1023/8 (Dated 1025/1616); Add. 16,787/V (Rieu p. 576). Dated Sha‘bān 1191/1777; I.O. 1031/2; I.O. 1033/6; I.O. 1035/3; *Cambridge* Add. 817 (Browne Cat. CCXIX. Dated 1177/1763-4); *Paris* Supplément 1434 (Blochert 1294. Dated Shawwāl 696/1297, some leaves restored in 19th century. Blochert claims that it 'contient une rédaction du poème beaucoup plus étendue que celle qui se lit dans le manuscrit 1291'); Supplément 811 fol. 521v sqq. and 554v sqq. (Blochert 1291. Ms. dated 27 Shawwāl 1013/1605. Apparently contains two different versions of the poem); *Leningrad* Kokand Collection 38 fol. 406-412 (See Rosenberg's edition of the Zaratushtra-nāmah p. x. Dated 1064/1663-4); *Istanbul* Ateş Collection (*Oriens* XI p. 9-10. Dated 22 Rabī‘II 816/1413); Universite FY 538/4 (Ateş 119. Dated 826/1423); Topkapa, Ahmet III 3059/4 (Karataş 484; *Oriens* XI p. 11-2. Ms. dated 27 Shawwāl 841/1438); Nurusmaniyeh 4199/5 (*Oriens* XI p. 13. Ms. dated 13 Rajab 847/1443); Universite FY 1315/5 (Ateş 120; *Oriens* XI p. 13-4. Ms. dated Rabī‘I 848/1444); Halet 234/8 (*Oriens* XI p. 14-7. Ms. dated 889/1484); Universite FY 473/3 (Ateş 121; *Oriens* XI p. 19. Dated 24 Shawwāl 900/1495); Topkapa, Revan 1044 (Karataş 500; *Der Islam* XXV p. 173. Copied by Ṭumān b. Sultān ‘Ali in 981/1573-4. According to Karataş the Mss. contains Jauhar al-dhāt, but Ritter says it is *Khusrav-nāmah* Pictures); Fatih 4052/7 (Ritter-Reinpert p. 120-30; *Oriens* XI p. 24-5. 16th century?); Universite FY 213-214/3 (Ateş 122; *Oriens* XI p. 20-4. Dated 10 Shawwāl 1058/1648); Lāleli 2010/8 (MikrāFilīm-hā I 403); *Madinah* ʿArif ʿIlmat 30 (Nuskhah-hā V p. 484. Ms. dated 859/1455. Presumably this poem; the catalogue has 'Khusrav u Shīrīn'; *Hamadan* Iṭīmād al-da‘lah (Nuskhah-hā V p. 345. Ms. dated 28 Shawwāl 831/1428); *Tehran* Ma‘lis III 1147/5 (Ms. dated 840/1436-7); Aṣghar Mahmāvī (Nuskhah-hā III p. 483-4. Dated 1 Sha‘bān 884/1479); Malik 5228 (Munz. 33345. Dated Mubarram 905/1499); *Lahore* Univ. II/1 p. 175-9 (No. 6, 'Gul u Khusrav', and no. 10, 'Gul u Hurmuz', of a Ms. dated 857/1453); *Calcutta* Ivano 477/2 and /11 (Ms. dated 1006/1597-8. Two copies of different versions of the poem); Būhrān 300/I (18th century).

(2) Ansrār-nāmah, a collection of edifying anecdotes which, unlike those in 'Attār's later works, are not bound together by a frame-story. The beginning occurs in two different forms (inc. I: ba nām i ān kih jān rā nūr i dīn dād * khirad rā dar khudā-dānī yagīn dād; inc. II: ba nām i ān kih az khāk ādam-ē kard * zi kaff-e u zi dūd-ē 'ālam-ē kard). Summary in Ritter, Meer, p. 30-1. Ms.: 1 Dublin Beatty 117/IV (Ms. completed 821/1418); Beatty 321/III (Ms. copied by 'All b. Muhammad and dated 821/1418); Beatty 324/II (Copied by Häjjī Ahmad b. Sāliḥ al-Tūlāmī in 846/1442-3); Beatty 163 fol. 271b sqq. (Ms. dated 12 Rabā' II 881/1476); Oxford Elliot 207/14 (Ethē 622. Contains a seal dated 1020/1611-2); Ouseley 374/3 (Ethē 623. Ms. dated 23 Jumādā I 1027/1618); Elliot 208/9 (Ethē 624. Ms. dated 4 Dhū l-biḥjah 1078/1668); Elliot 205/16 (Ethē 625); London I.O. 1034/2 (Copied by Muhammad Häjjī b. 'Abār Häjjī and dated 20 Rajab 807/1405). Ms. 11325 fol. 70b-137b (Meredith-Owens p. 72. With a colophon in Uighur script dated 862/1457-8. Pictures); Or. 451/III (Rieu Suppt. 235. Ms. dated 22 Rajab 877/1472. Pictures); Or. 2747/V (Rieu Suppt. 236. Ms. dated 22 Dhū l-biḥjah 889/1485); Or. 332/III (Rieu p. 578. Dated 1000 to 1004/1591-2 to 1596-6); Add. 16,787/III (Rieu p. 576. Dated Sha'bān 1191/1777); I.O. 1031/12; I.O. 1033/3 (Incomplete). Cambridge Or. 1698/7 (2nd Suppt. 443. Ms. dated 829/1425-6); Paris Supplément 1398 fol. 70v-173v (Blochet 1970).

1See Ritter, Orients XI, p. 60-2; Munz. IV 27285-336; Munz. Pak. VII(1) p. 165-8.
XI p. 10-1. Ms. dated 9 Sha' bān 989/1581; University FY 213-214/14. (Atey 122; Oriens XI p. 20-4. Ms. completed 1060/1650; Fatih 4052/4 (Kitter-Reinert p. 129-30; Oriens XI p. 24-5. 16th century?); Ḥayun Karahmār 1788/1 (Oriens XI p. 10. Copied by 'Alī b. Rūzbahān and dated 824/1421); Cairo Tabawwuf fārisī 23/8 (Oriens XI p. 34-5. Ms. dated 1 Muhammad 852/1448; 139 mīm adab fārisī (Tirāzī 1354/6. Ms. dated 20 Muhammad 858/1454); Medīnah Ḥarīf Ḥikmat 113 adab fārisī (Nuskhāh-hā V p. 511-2. Ms. dated Jumādā II 844/1440); Tabriz Millī 3634/1 (Nuskhāh-hā IV p. 309. Ms. dated 1 Safar 885/1480); Hamadan Ḥītimād al-daulah (Nuskhāh-hā V p. 345. Ms. dated 28 Shawwāl 831/1428); Shīrāz Wiṣāl (Nuskhāh-hā p. 293 no. 34. Ms. dated 892/1487); Tehran Gūlistān/Kūtābāy II 327/II (Ms. copied by Abū Bakr b. 'Alī al-Isfārā'īnī and dated Sha' bān 731/1331); Malik 5974/3 (Munz. 27290. Dated Rajab 808/1405-6); Malik 5955/1 (Munz. 17880. Ms. dated 819/1416-7); Aqājīn III 1147/4 (Ms. dated 840/1436-7); Gūlistān/Attabāy II 325/IV (Ms. dated 25 Ramadān 880/1476. Pictures); Asghar Mahdawi (Nuskhāh-hā III p. 483-4. Ms. dated 884/1479-80); Bayānī 55/I (Nuskhāh-hā I p. 15. Copied by Amr Allāh b. Shaikh Waws Nakhjavānī and dated 901/1495-6); Gūlistān/Attabāy II 324 (Copied by Shāh Mahmūd al-Nishābūrī in 970/1562-3); Mashhad Ridāwī VII 770/1 (Ms. dated 10 Rajab 911/1505); Ridāwī VII 769/5 (Has a note dated 1052/1542-3); Tashkent Acad. II 855/6 (Dated Jumādā I 827/1424); Lahore Univ. II/1 p. 175-9 (No. 12 of a Ms. dated 857/1453); Lucknow Sprenger 140; Bankapore 51 in marg. (14th century?); I 47/II (Dated 13 Sa'far 1123/1711); Calcutta Ivanov 477/6 (Ms. dated 1006/1597-8); Ivanov 478/2 (17th century?); Ivanov 479/3 (17th century? Calis itself 'Intikhab i A.N.'); Ivanov 484 (17th century?); Ivanov Curzon 204/5 (Ms. contains seals dated 1169/1755-6); Būhār 300/III (18th century?); Cambridge (Mass) Hofer Collection (Nuskhāh-hā IV p. 11. Ms. dated 827/1424).


(3) Mantiq al-tair or Maqāmāt al-tayr (inc. āfīn jān-āfīn i pāk rā * ʾān-kih jān bakhshīd musht-e khāk rā). According to the verses at the end of some of the manuscripts, the poem was completed on Tuesday, the 20th of Ramadān (māh i khudā), 573/Tuesday 14 March 1178.1 But in other Ms. (including the oldest) the khātrimāh is missing altogether. The poem is based on the Rīsālāt al-tayr by Muḥammad (or Ḥamd) al-Ghassālī and tells the allegorical story of the search of the birds for a king. The frame-story is interspersed with many interesting sub-stories. Summary in Ritter, Meer, p. 8-18.

Mss.:Dublin Beatty 117/II (Dated 819/1416-7); Beatty 321/II (Ms. copied by 'Alī b. Muḥammad and dated Sa'far 821/1418); Beatty 124 vol. II no. vii (Ms. completed Sa'far 840/1436); Beatty 324/I (Copied by Ḥājī Ahmad b. Sālūk al-Tūlāmī in 847/1443-4); Beatty 153 fol. 2b sqq. (Ms. dated 12 Rabī II 881/1478); Beatty 160 (signed by Sultān 'Alī al-Mashhādī, who died in 919/1513); Manches¬ter Lindesiana 540 (Dated 1007/1598-9); Oxford Pers. d. 71 fol. 1-137a in marg. (Beeston 2564. Ms. completed 16 Ramadān 874/1470. Several leaves missing); Elliott 246 (Ethē 628; Robinson 501-7. Dated 19 Jumādā I 898/1493. Pictures); Ouseley Add. 105 (Ethē 629. Dated 3d year of Akbar/1557-8); Ouseley 63 (Ethē 630. 16th century?); Elliott

1London Add. 16,788 gives the year 570/1174-5, while Or. 4151 and Berlin Ms. or. oct. 270 make it 583/1187-8.

Supplément 1906 (Blochet 1299. 16th century? First pages restored); Supplément 2025 (Blochet 2457. 16th century?); Supplément 811 fol. 294v sqq. (Blochet 1291. Ms. dated 27 Shawwal 1013/1605); Supplément 656 (Blochet 1301. Dated Rajab 1045 /1635); Supplément 655 (Blochet 1302. 17th century?); Supplément 1662 fol. 58v sqq. (Blochet 2187. Dated 1215/1800-1); Supplément 1709 (Blochet 1303. 19th century?); Supplément 1710 (Blochet 1305. 19th century?); Supplément 1907 (Blochet 1304. 19th century?); Basel Tschudi Collection (Oriens XI p. 10. Dated Muharram 828/1424); Turin Bibl. Reale Ms. Or. 40 (Piemontese 338. Copied by Nāṣīr b. Ḥasan al-Makki and dated Safar 887/1453. Pictures); Parsa Bibl. Palatina Ms. 1975 (Piemontese 238. 16th century?); Rome Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Ms. Caetani 35 (Piemontese 284. 18th century?); Hamburg Orient. 209 (Brockelmann 161); Tübingen Cd. 1858 (Ewald p. 15. Dated 887/1482-3); Munich Cod. or. 284 (Aumer 33. Dated 900/1494-5); 169 Quatr. (Aumer 34. Dated 973/1565-6); 187 Quatr. (Aumer 32); Berlin Ms. or. oct. 2150 in marg. (Heinz 207. The main body of the Ms. was copied by Darʾīsh Manṣūr b. Ḥusayn Tāʾūsī and dated Jamāʿa II 800/1398); Ms. or. oct. 268 (Pertsch 753; Stchoukine 3. Copied by Atīq al-Tūmūi and dated Shaʿbān 860/1456. Pictures); Ms. or. oct. 3581 (Heinz 23. Copied by Nīzām al-dīn Tībrānī and dated 1 Muharram 963/1555); Sprenger 1382 (Pertsch 758. Has a seal dated 1213/1798-9); Minutooli 143 (Pertsch 757. Dated Ramadān 1258 /1842); Petermann I 455 (Pertsch 756; Stchoukine 49. Dated 27 Rabiʿ I 1259/1843. Pictures); Ms. or. oct. 269 (Pertsch 754); Ms. or. oct. 270 (Pertsch 755); Ms. or. oct. 1532 (Heinz 118. Fragment); Ms. or. oct. 1531 (Heinz 285); Vienna Flügel 516/1 (Dated 20 Muharram 902/1496); Flügel 517/1; Uppsala Zetterstätten 423-7; Leningrad

Millâ 3634/2 (Nuskhah-hâ IV p. 309. Ms. dated 1 Shârâb 885/1480); Ramadân I’tâamâd al-da‘lalâh (Nuskhah-hâ V p. 345. Ms. dated 28 Shawwâl 831/1428); Tehran Shûrâ-i Islâmî I 154 (Supposedly 6th/12th century); Gulistan/Atâbây II 327/II (Ms. copied by Abû Bakr b. ‘Alî al-Isfârâ’î and dated Shâbân 731/1331); Malik 5974/2 (Munz. 35650. Dated Jumâdâ I 808/1406); Adabîyât I p. 502 (Dated Rajab 830/1427); Malik 5955/1 (Munz. 17880. Ms. dated 819/1416-7); Majlis III 1147/3 (Ms. dated 840/1436-7); Miftâh (Munz. 35468. Dated 19 Shâbân 862/1458); Majlis 8981/2 (Munz. 35470. Dated 886/1463-4); Gulistan/Atâbây II 325/II (Ms. dated 25 Ramadân 880/1476. Pictures); Asghar Mahdavî (Nuskhah-hâ III p. 483-4. Ms. dated 884/1479-80); Bayâni 15 (Nuskhah-hâ I p. 9. 15th century?); Bayâni 16 (Nuskhah-hâ I p. 9. 17th century?); Gulistan/Atâbây II 328 (Dated 30 Muharram 1236/1820); Gulistan/Atâbây II 330 (Dated Rabî‘I 1257/1841); Gulistan/Atâbây II 329 (Dated Ramadân 1258/1842); Mashhad Ridwân VII 770/4 (Ms. dated 10 Rajab 911/1505); Ridwân VII 769/3 (Has a note dated 1052/1642-3); Tanzimat Acad. II 855/2 (Ms. dated 6 Jumâdâ I 827/1424); Dushânbe Acad. II 416-422 (multiple copies; the oldest, no. 418, is dated 20 Safar 987/1579); Lahore Univ. II/1 p. 175-9 (No. 11 of a Ms. dated 857/1453); Bombay Univ. X/2 (Dated 23 Rabî‘I 1004/1595. Incomplete); Lucknow Sperger 132 (several copies); Bankipore I 51 (14th century?); I 50 (Dated 7 Jumâdâ I 842/1438. Pictures); I 46/III (17th century?); Calculutta Ivanov 477/7 (Ms. dated 1006/1597-8); Ivanov 479/1 (17th century?); Bûhâr 301 (17th century? Damaged); Ivanov Curzon 205 (Dated 25 Ramadân 1114/1703); Ivanov 480/1 (Dated 49th year of Aurangzâb/1116/1704-5); Bûhâr 300/IV (18th century?); Cambridge (Mass) Hesper Collection (Nuskhah-hâ IV p. 11. Ms. dated 827/1424).


Translations: (Turkish): The Old Anatolian translation by Süleyman Gûlshehî, written in 717/1317-8, has been published (fascimile of the Ms.) in Ankara 1957; see Orçins XI p. 56 (with further literature). Further versions by Kuratovalî Da‘îfi Pîr Mebmed b. Evrânûs (d. 967/1559-60), Fedâ‘î Dede (1045/1635-6), Ahamd Sîwâlî and Mîr ‘Alî Shârî Nawâî (in Chaghatai) are discussed there as well. Modern Turkish translation: Mantikû’t-‘ayr tercemesi, by A. Gölpinarî, Istanbul 1944.

(Urdu): two translations (one in Dakhâni verse) are mentioned by Ethê ad I.O. 1031/5.

(French prose): Hantic uttair ou le langage des oiseaux, poème de philosophie religieuse traduit... par M. Garcin de Tassy, Paris 1863, reprinted 1982.


Commentaries: By Shams'ī (d. ca. 1005/1596-7) in Turkish. Ms.: Istanbul Carullah 1716 (Oriens XI p. 55).


(4) *Mu'ṣibat-nāmah*, also called *Nuz'hat-nāmah* or Jawāb-nāmah (inc. hamd i pāk az jān i pāk ūn pāk rā * kih khilafat dād musht-e khāq rā*). Summary in Ritter, Meier, p. 18-30.

Mss.: Dublin Beatty 117/III (Dated 24 Muharram 821/1418); Beatty 321/IV (Ms. copied by 'Ali b. Muhammad and dated Ša'ār 821/1418); Beatty 121 (Dated 833/1429-30. Modern pictures); Beatty 153 fol. 345b sqq. (Ms. dated 12 Rabi' II 881/1476); Manchester Lindesiana 45a (=Robinson p. 150. Dated 939/1532-3. Pictures); Lindesiana 259 (Dated 1093/1682); Oxford Elliot 207/12 (Ethē 622. Contains a seal dated 1020/1611-2); Ouseley 374/17 (Ethē 623. Ms. dated 23 Jumādā I 1027/1618); Elliot 209/11 (Ethē 624. Ms. dated 4 Dhu l-Ḥijjah 1078/1668); Ind. Inst. Pers. 47 (Beeston 2566. Dated 16 Jumādā II 1177/1763); Elliot 204/5 (Ethē 625); Ouseley Add. 132 (Ethē 633); London I.O. 1034/5 (Ms. copied by Muhammad Ḥājjī b. Bābā Ḥājjī and

1See Ritter, *Oriens* XI, p. 56-60; Munz. IV 35064-103; Munz. Pak. VII(1) p. 191-3.

completed 1 Dhū l-qa'dah 812/1410); Or. 4151/IV (Rieu Suppt. 235. Ms. dated 22 Rajab 877/1472. Pictures); Or. 2747/IV (Rieu Suppt. 236. Ms. dated 22 Dhū l-Ḥijjah 889/1485); Or. 332/II (Rieu p. 578. Dated 1004/1595-6); I.O. 1032/10 (Dated 1025/1616); Add. 7737/III (Rieu p. 816. Dated Rabi' II 1033/1624); Add. 16,787/IV (Rieu p. 576. Dated Sha'bān 1191/1777); I.O. 1031/15; I.O. 1033/1; I.O. Delhi 1271; *Cambridge* Or. 1698/6 (2nd Suppt. 443. Ms. dated 829/1425-6); *Paris* Supplément 1491 (Blochet 1309. Dated 20 Dhū l-qa'dah 868/1287. First page restored); Supplément 1429 (Blochet 1308. 13th century? Beginning and end restored. The Ms. contains also extracts from other *mathnawīs* attributed to 'Attār. Ancien fonds 256/II (Blochet 1295/Richard. Contains a note dated 889/1484); Supplément 811 fol. 357v-438 (Blochet 1291. Ms. dated 27 Shawwāl 1303/1605); Berlin Minutoli 232 (Pertsch 761. Two hands); Petermann 404/1 (Pertsch 46. End missing); Gotha 51; *Vienna* Flügel 516/2 (Dated Dhū l-Ḥijjah 901/1495. Second half only; if correctly identified); *Uppsala* Tornberg CLXII; *Leningrad* Acad. D 436 fol. 263b-330a (Index 3464. Ms. dated 1001/1592-3); *Konya* Mevlâna Müzesi 1734/3 (Ateş 47; *Oriens* XI p. 8-9. Ms. copied by İbrahimîm b. 'Iwād al-Marāghi and dated Rajab 860/1281); Mevlâna Müzesi 91/3 (Ateş 47; *Oriens* XII p. 9. Copied by the same scribe and evidently dated 26 Muharram 693/1293); Mevlâna Müzesi 1704 (Oriens XI p. 57. Dated Ramadān 867/1463); *Istanbul* Nafız Paşa 455 (Oriens XI p. 57. Dated 5 Dhū l-Ḥijjah 740/1340); Ateş Collection (Oriens XI p. 9-10. Ms. dated Jumādā II 816/1413); Ayasofya 4792/26 (Oriens XI p. 57. Dated 816/1413-4); Türk ve İslâm Eserleri Müzesi 2044/15 (Ms. dated 816/1413-4); Nuruoğlu 4198/1 (Ateş 118. Ms. dated 825/1422); Universität FY 538/3 (Ateş 119. Ms. dated 826/1423); Atif Efendi 2241/2 (Oriens XI p. 31-33. Ms. dated 4 Dhū l-Ḥijjah 828/1425); Sülüryaniye, Murad Buhari
Ilaahi-namah is the story of a king who asks his six sons in turn what they would most desire. They ask for predictable worldly things, the futility of which the king demonstrates with a series of mostly short anecdotes. The beginning exists in three different versions, for which see Ritter's edition (inc. I: ba nām i kirdigār i haft aflāk * kih paidā kard ādam az kaf-e khāk; inc. II: ba nām i ān kih mulk-ash bē zawāl ast * ba waqf-ash nutq i šābib-āgl lāl ast; inc. III: ilāhī-nāmah rā āghāz kardam * ba nām-at bāb i nāmah bāz kardam). Summary in Ritter, Meer, p. 4-8.

1 See Ritter, Oriens XI p. 47-9; Munz. IV 27568-661; Munz. Pak. VII/1 p. 169-70.
623. Ms. dated 23 Jumādā I 1027/1618); Elliot 208/8 (Ethē 624. Ms. dated 4 Dhū l-biijjah 1078/ 1668); Elliot 204/1 (Ethē 625); London I.O. 1034/3a-b (Copied by Muḥāmmad Ḥājī b. Bābā Ḥājī and dated 20 Ramadān 807/1405); Add. 27,261/XIII (Rieu p. 868-71. Dated Jumādā II 814/1411); Or. 4151/I (Rieu Suppt. 235. Ms. dated 22 Rajab 877/1472. Pictures); Or. 2747/II (Rieu Suppt. 236. Ms. dated 22 Dhū l-biijjah 889/1485. Incomplete); Or. 332/I (Rieu p. 578. Dated 1000 to 1004/1591-2 to 1595-6); I.O. 1032/2 (Dated 1026/1616); Add. 7089 (Rieu p. 578. 17th century? With additional verses at beginning and end); Add. 16,787/II (Rieu p. 576. Dated Shaʾbān 1191/1777); I.O. 1031/14; Cambridge Or. 1698/I (2nd Suppt. 443. Ms. dated 829/1426-5); Or. 1284 (2nd Suppt. 150. 16th century?); Paris Ancien fonds 224 (Blochet 1307/ Richard. 14th century? In the Bibliothèque Nationale since 1668); Ancien fonds 256/III (Blochet 1295/Richard. Contains a note dated 889/1484); Supplément 1526 (Blochet 1296. Dated 905/1499- 1500); Supplément 811 fol. 453v sq. (Blochet 1291. Ms. dated 27 Shawwāl 1013/1605); Supplément 1355 fol. 104v sq. (Blochet 1997. Dated Rabīʿ I 1/0/82/1871); Basel Tschudi Collection (Oriens XI p. 10. Ms. completed in Muḥarram 828/1424); Leningrad Acad. D 436 fol. 146b-204b (Index 3464. Ms. dated 1001/1592-3); Konya Mevleva Mūsesi 1703 (Oriens XI p. 47. Dated 20 Muḥarram 833/1429); Istanbul Fatih 3674 (Ritter-Reinert p. 130. Dated 4 Jumādā II 729/1328. Inc. II); Süleymaniye, Darülumuṣevi 234/2 (Oriens XI p. 27-8. Ms. dated Jumādā II 811/1408. Inc. II); Ateg Collection (Oriens XI p. 9-10. Dated Jumādā II 816/1413); Ayasofya 4792/27 (Oriens XI p. 47. Dated 816/1413- 4); Türk ve İslâm Eserleri Mûzesi 2044/14 (Oriens XI p. 47. Ms. dated 816/1413-4); Universite FY 538/1 (Atég 119. Ms. dated 826/1423); Atif Efendi 2241/16 (Oriens XI p. 31-33. Ms. dated 4 Dhū l- biijjah 828/1425); Süleymaniye, Murad Buḥarī 213/3

(Oriens XI p. 10-1. Copied by Sulaimān b. ʿAli- shāh b. ʾAbū l-Dāniyāl and dated 23 Ramadān 837/1434); Nuruosmaniye 4199/1 (Oriens XI p. 13. Ms. dated 13 Rajab 847/1443); Universite FY 1315/3 (Atég 120; Oriens XI p. 13-4. Ms. dated Rabīʿ I 848/1444); Türk ve İslâm Eserleri Mûzesi 1992/2 (olim Nuruosmaniye 3786. Oriens XI p. 12-3. From the library of Şhāh-rukh. d. 860/1454. Pictures); Nafis Pasā 353/1 (Oriens XI p. 14. Dated 10 Rabīʿ I 856/1452); Halet 1014/8 (Oriens XI p. 48. Dated Rabīʿ I 852/1458); Fatih 3673 (Ritter-Reinert p. 130. Dated 863/1458-9); Universite FY 473/1 (Atég 121; Oriens XI p. 19. Dated 7 Dhū l-biijjah 896/1491); Halet 234/6 (Oriens XI p. 14-7. Ms. dated 889/1484); Ayasofya 1659/6 (Oriens XI p. 17- 9. Dated Shaʾbān 889/1484); Ayasofya 2110/2 (Oriens XI p. 19-20. Ms. completed 902/1514); Fatih 4052/6 (Ritter-Reinert p. 129-30; Oriens XI p. 24-5. 16th century?); Universite FY 213-214/7. (Atég 122; Oriens XI p. 20-4. Dated 3 Rajab 1059/ 1649); Cairo Taṣawwuf fārisī 23/5 (Oriens XI p. 34-5. Ms. dated 1 Muḥarram 852/1448); 139ーム adab fārisī (Tirāz 815/1. Ms. dated 20 Muḥarram 858/1454); Medinaž ʿArif Nikmat 143 adab fārisī (Nuskhah-hā V p. 571-2. Ms. dated Jumādā II 844/ 1440); ʿArif Nikmat 30 (Nuskhah-hā V p. 484. Ms. dated 859/1455); Tabriz Milli 3634/4 (Nuskhah-hā IV p. 309. Ms. dated 1 Safar 856/1450); Ramadān Iʿtimād al-dawlah (Nuskhah-hā V p. 345. Ms. dated 28 Shawwāl 831/1420); Tehran Gulistān/ATABAY II 327/V (Ms. copied by ʿAbū Bakr b. ʿAli al-Isfahānī and dated Shaʾbān 731/1331); Malik 5974/4 (Munz. 27570. Dated 10 Shaʾbān 808/1406); Malik 5955/1 (Munz. 17880. Ms. dated 819/1416-7); Majlis III 1147/1 (Ms. dated 840/1436-7); Gulistān/ATABAY II 325/1 (Ms. dated 25 Ramadān 880/1476. Pictures); Aṣghar Mahdavī (Nuskhah-hā III p. 483-4. Ms. dated 884/1479-80); Gulistān/ATABAY II 457/III (Ms. completed Rabīʿ I 1083/1672); Taşkent Acad. II 855/1 (Ms. dated 6 Jumādā I 827/1424); Dushan-
be Acad. II 407 (17th century?); Lahore Univ. II/1 p. 175-9 (No. 13 of a Ms. dated 857/1453); Lucknow Sprenger 139; Bankipore I 47/I (Dated 24 Ramadan 1133/1721);¹ Calcutta Ivanov 477/3 (Ms. dated 1006/1597-8); Ivanov 478/1 (17th century?); Ivanov Curzon 204/4 (Ms. contains seals dated 1169 /1755-6).


Translations (Turkish verse): ‘İbret-nüma by Shemsî, dedicated to Murâd III. Ms.: Leipzig Fleischer CCCXXIV (Dated Rabî’ I 1025/1616); Istanbul Bayezid 3315 (Oriens XI p. 49).


(English prose): The Ilaḥi-nāma or Book of God, translated (with copious notes) by J.A. Boyle, Manchester 1976.

(6) ‘Attār’s Diwān consists almost entirely of ghazals of pseudo-erotic and religious inspiration. For a translation and detailed discussion of a large number of poems see Ritter, Oriens XII p. 1-83.

dated 10 Rajab 911/1505. 'Ghazaliyyat'); Tashkent Acad. II 855/4 (Ms. dated 6 Jumādā I 827/1424);
Lahore Univ. II/1 p. 175-9 (No. 7 of a Ms. dated 857/1453); Lucknow Sprenger 121; Bankipore I 46/XXII (17th century?); I 52 (19th century?); Calcutta Ivanov 477/1 (Dated 1006/1597-8); Ivanov 487 (17th century?).


Mss.: Dublin Beatty 321/VI (Ms. copied by 'Ali b. Muhammad and dated Šafār 821/1418); Beatty 153 fol. 429b sqq. in marg. (Ms. dated 12 Rabî‘ II 881/1476); Oxford Elliot 207/21 (Ethē 622. Contains a seal dated 1020/1611-2); Oxford 374/21 (Ethē 623. Ms. dated 23 Jumādā I 1027/1618); Elliot 209/21 (Ethē 624. Ms. dated 1 Dhū l-Bi‘jāh 1078 /1668); Elliot 205/18 (Ethē 625); London Or. 353/III (Rieu p. 577. Dated Šafār 877/1472). A few lines missing at beginning of preface); Or. 2747/I (Rieu Suppt. 236. Ms. dated 22 Dhū l-Bi‘jāh 889 /1485. Incomplete); I.O. 1032/12 (Dated 1025 /1616); Add. 16,787/VI (Rieu p. 576. Dated Sha‘bān 1191/1777); Cambridge Or. 1670-1/II (2nd Suppt. 421. Photograph of a Ms. in a private collection. 15th century?); Paris Supplément 811 fol. 749v sqq. (Blochet 1291. Ms. dated 27 Shawwāl 1013 /1605); Leningrad Acad. A 85 (Index 3964);

1See Ritter, Orleans XII p. 227-8; Munz. IV 34706-26.


Cairo 139 mām adab fārisī (Ţirāzī 1835/6. Ms. dated 20 Muḥarram 858/1454); Medinan ʻ Ārif Hikmat 143 adab fārisī (Nuskhah-hā V p. 571-2. Ms. dated Jumādā II 844/1440); Tehran Gulistān-Āṭābây II 327/VI (Copied by Abū Bakr b. ʻ Ali al-Isfārā’ī in and dated Shaβbān 731/1331); Majlis 1114/7 (Ms. dated 840/1436-7); Lahore Univ. II/1 p. 175-9 (No. 8 of a Ms. dated 857/1453); Bombay Rehatsk p. 167 no. 137; Calcutta Ivanov Curzon 204/1 (Ms. contains seals dated 1169/1755-6).

Collections of rubāʻīyāt (different from Mukhtār-nāmah?): Mss.: Dublin Beatty 185 fol. 1-10 (15th century?); London Or. 11077 fol. 292b (7 quartrains. 13th century?); Leningrad Kokand Collection 38 fol. 391-405 (See Rosenberg’s edition of the Zarátusht-nāmah p. x. Ms. completed 1066 /1655-6).


Doubtful and spurious works:

(1) Aṣrār al-suhūd (inc. hast bi-si li l-rabhānī l-rabhā maṣḥaf i āyat i aṣrār i qadām: scansion?!), a collection of versified anecdotes from the lives of the saints.

Mss.: Leipzig Vollers 1048/II (Dated 1007 /1598-9. ‘Aṣrār-nāmah’); Lucknow Sprenger 125; Other Mss.: Munz. IV 27276-83.
Edition: Lahore 1894.

(2) **Bē-sar-nāmah** (inc. **man ba ghair i tu nāban nam dar jāhān * qādir-ā, parwardagaīr-ā, jāwidān**) is similar in content to the second part of the *Ushtar-nāmah*.

Mss.: **Oxford** Elliot 207/17 (Ethē 622. Contains a seal dated 1020/1611-2); Ouseley 374/18 (Ethē 623. Ms. dated 23 Jumādā I 1027/1618); Elliot 205/14 (Ethē 624); Fraser 250 (Ethē 634. Dated 1112/1700-1. Defective); **London** I.O. 1036/2 (Dated 17 Sha‘bān 1105/1694); Or. 10940 fol. 71b-77b (Meredith-Owens p. 71. Ms. dated 1181/1767-8); I.O. 1031/7; I.O. 1033/7; I.O. 1049; **Paris Supplément** 811 fol. 445v sqq. (Blochet 1291. Ms. dated 27 Shawwāl 1013/1605); Supplément 1485 (Blochet 1320. 19th century); **Vienna** Krafft CXCI (Dated 1232/1816-7); **Leningrad** Acad. D 436 fol. 261b-263a (Index 3464. Ms. dated 1001/1592-3); **Istanbul** Universite FY 213-214/12. (Ateg 122; Orients XI p. 20-4. Ms. completed 1060/1650); Universite FY 167 (Ateg 144. 19th century?); Lucknow Sprenger 123; **Bakpore** I 47/VI (Ms. contains dates in 1123/1711 and 1133/1720); **Calcutta** Ivanov 477/12 (Ms. dated 1006/1597-8); Ivanov Curzon 204/9 (Ms. contains seals dated 1169/1755-6). Cf. Muns. IV 27908-20.

Editions: **Cawnpore** 1850; 1891; 1897; **Lucknow** 1872 (in the *Kulliyāt*); 1877 (twice, with other works); 1902/1886; 1315/1897; **Tehran** 1309/1891-2; 1319/1901; 1325/1907.

(3) **Bubbul-nāmah** or Gul u Bubbul (inc. qalam bar dār i rāz i dil ‘iyān kun * sar-āgīhās-ash ba nān i ghāib-dān kun*). The story of Solomon and a nightingale. In two 15th century Ms. it is attributed to one ʿAttār Tūnī, i.e. the author of the forged *Maṣhar al-‘ajāʾib* and *Lisān al-ghāib*. Note, however, the early dates in the Lahore, Istanbul and London manuscripts.

Mss.: **Dublin** Beatty 321/VI (Ms. copied by ʿAlī b. Muḥammad and dated Safar 821/1418); **Oxford** Elliot 207/8 (Ethē 622. Contains a seal dated 1020/1611-2); Ouseley 374/8 (Ethē 623. Ms. dated 23 Jumādā I 1027/1618); Elliot 209/14 (Ethē 624. Ms. dated 4 Dhū l-biḥāj 1078/1668); Elliot 205/12 (Ethē 625); **London** I.O. 1034/4 (Ms. copied by Muḥammad Hājjī b. Bābā Hājjī and completed 1 Dhū l-qaʿdah 812/1410); I.O. 1032/5 (Dated 1026/1618); Or 5415 fol. 67b-71b (Meredith-Owens p. 90. 16th-17th century?); I.O. 1031/3; I.O. 1033/8; **Cambridge** Or. 1698/3 (2nd Suppt. 443. Ms. dated 829/1425-6); Ll. 6. 15 (Browne Cat. CCCV/II. Dated 976/1568-9); Or. 257/3 (Browne Suppt. 177. Dated 1273/1856-7); Or. 274/1 (Browne Suppt. 178. Dated 1273/1856-7); **Paris Supplément** 1398 fol. 35v sqq. (Blochet 1970. Dated 861/1456-7); Supplément 781A fol. 278v sqq. (Blochet 1972. Ms. dated Rabī I 892/1487); Ancien fonds 343/II (Blochet 1297/ Richard. 16th century? End missing); Supplément 811 fol. 448v-452v (Blochet 1291. Ms. dated 27 Shawāw 1013/1605); **Basel** Tschudi Collection (Orients XI p. 10. Ms. completed in Muḥarram 828 /1424); **Leningrad** Acad. D 436 fol. 237b-241a (Index 3464. Ms. dated 1001/1592-3); Acad. C 1166 fol. 172b-19b (Index 3463. Ms. dated 1115/1703-4); **Kokand** Collection 38 fol. 223-245 (See Rosenberg’s edition of the *Zārutuṣh-nāmah* p. x. Dated 1064/1653-4); **Istanbul** Suleymaniye, Darülmesnevi 234/3 (Orients XI p. 27-9. Ms. dated Jumādā II 811 /1408); Atif Efendi 2241/3 (Orients XI p. 31-33. Ms. dated 4 Dhū l-biḥāj 828/1425); Topkapı, Ahmet III 3059/2 (Orients XI p. 11-2. Ms. dated 27 Shawwāl 841/1438. Incomplete); Topkapı, Hazine 697 (Karatomy 501. Copied by Ḥabīb b. Ḥusayn Samargandī in 871/1466-7. Different incipit); Halet 234/9 (Orients XI p. 14-7. Ms. dated 889/1484); Topkapı, Koğuşlar 1031/II (Karatomy 922. Dated 965/1557-8); Fatih 4052/8 (Ritter-Reinert p. 129-30; Orients XI p. 24-5. 16th century?); Universite FY 213-214/11. (Ateg 122; Orients XI p. 20-4. Ms. completed 1060 /1650); **Kabul** (Orients XI p. 27. In an anthology
supposedly dated 803/1400-1); Lahore Univ. II/1 p. 176-9 (No. 15 of a Ms. dated 857/1453); Bankipore I 47/V (Ms. contains dates in 1123/1711 and 1133 /1720); Calcutta Ivanov 477/14 (Ms. dated 1006 /1597-8). Cf. Munz. IV 27712-26; Munz. Pak. VII(1) p. 608-9.
Editions: Lucknow 1872 (in the 'Kulliyāt');

(4) Dīwān i mu'jīsāt. Ms.: Manchester Lindesiana 543 (18th century?).

(5) Haft wādī begins with the same verse as the Muṣḥbat-nāmah. It is apparently an extract from Maṭṭiḳ al-tair and other poems.
Ms.s.: Oxford Elliot 207/9 (Ethē 622. Contains a seal dated 1020/1611-2); Ouseley 374/12 (Ethē 623. Ms. dated 23 Jumādā I 1027/1618); Elliot 205/13 (Ethē 625); London I.O. 1032/4 (Dated 1025/1616); I.O. 1031/6; I.O. 1033/15; I.O. 1050 (defective); Paris Supplément 811 fol. 438v sqq. (Blochet 1291. Ms. dated 27 Shawwāl 1013/1605); Leningrad Acad. D 436 fol. 256b-261a (Index 3464. Ms. dated 1001/1592-3); Istanbul Universite FY 213-214/18. (Ates 122; Orien X p. 20-4. Ms. completed 1060/1650); Tehran Malik 5062/7 (Munz. 17893. Ms. dated 956/1549); Bankipore I 40/X (17th century?); Suppt. i 1982 (18th century?); Calcutta Ivanov 477/4-5 (Ms. dated 1006/1597-8. Two copies of the same poem); Ivanov Curzon 204/11 (Ms. contains seals dated 1169/1755-6); Bihār 299/II (Dated 1203/1788-9). Cf. Munz. IV 36631-5.

(6) Ḥallāǰ-nāmah (inc. bi nām i kirdīḡār i fard i bē-chūn * kih mā-rā az 'adam āwūd bērūn) is presented in I.O. 1046 as the 'third daftār' of the Jauhar/Jawāhīr al-dhāḥ. It is, according to Ritter, 'a poor imitation of the second part of the Uṣhtar-nāma'. See also above, p. 274-5.
Ms.s.: Manchester Lindesiana 797 (17th century?); London Or. 6634 (Meredith-Owens p. 66. Dated 861/1456-7); Or. 353 II (Rieu p. 577. Dated Ṣafar 877/1472. Latter half only); I.O. 1048 (Dated 2 Ṣafar 902/1498); I.O. 1046 fol. 335b sqq. (Dated 1139/1726-7); Cambridge Or. 1670-1/II (2nd Suppt. 421. Photo-stat of a Ms. in a private collection. 16th century?); Istanbul Halet 234/2 (Orien XII p. 14-7. Ms. dated 889/1484); Medīnah ‘Arīf Hīkmat 143 adab fārisī (Nuskhāh-hā V p. 571-2. Ms. dated Jumādā II 844/1440); Lahore Univ. II/1 p. 175-9 (No. 3 of a Ms. dated 857/1453). Cf. Munz. IV 36676-91.
Edition: Lucknow 1872 (in the 'Kulliyāt');

(7) Jauhar (or Jawāhīr) al-dhāḥ (inc. ba nām i ān-kīh nūr i jīm u jān ast * khudāy i əshkārā u nīhān ast), in two daftars. This work belongs together with the Uṣhtar-nāma (which it quotes) in the central position that both works give to Ḥallāǰ. See above, p. 274-5.
Ms.s.: Dublin Beatty 321/V (Ms. copied by 'Ali b. Muḥammad and dated Ṣafar 821/1418. 'Jauhar-nāmah'); Manchester Lindesiana 797a,b (16th century?); Oxford Ouseley 371/1 (Ethē 626. 16th century?); Ouseley 353/2 (Ethē 627. Ms. has a note dated 10/13/1604-5); Elliot 206/3 (Ethē 622. Contains a seal dated 1020 /1611-2); Ouseley 374/7 (Ethē 623. Ms. dated 23 Jumādā I 1027/1618); Elliot 208/3 (Ethē 624. Ms. dated 4 Dhu l-hijjah 1078/1668); Elliot 204/8 (Ethē 625); London Or. 11325 in marg. (Meredith-Owens p. 72. With a colophon in Uighur script dated 862/1457-8. Pictures); Or. 353/I (Rieu p. 576-7. Dated Ṣafar 877/1472. Deficient at beginning and end; the leaves missing at the beginning have been replaced by the beginning of the Ilāhī-nāma, in a modern hand); Or. 2888/I (Rieu Suppt. 237. Dated Rabi‘ II 893/1488); I.O. 1047 (Dated 10 Shawwāl 1021/1612. 2nd daftar only); I.O. 1046 (Dated 1139/1726-7); I.O. 1031/17; I.O. 1033/2 (first daftar only); I.O.
1035/2 (incomplete); Paris Supplément 1795/II (Blochet 1292. Dated 4 Safar 821/1418); Supplément 1366 fol. 70r sqq. (Blochet 1993. Dated Rabī‘ I 1009/1600); Supplément 811 fol. 179v sqq. (Blochet 1291. Ms. dated 27 Shawwāl 1013/1605); Berlin Dizes A 12° no. 1 (Pertsch 759. Dated Safar 850/1445. Fragment of daftar 1); Petermann 461 (Pertsch 760. Dated Sha‘bān 860/1456, but Pertsch thinks it is ‘erheblich jünger’. Daftar 1, beginning missing); Ms. or. oct. 2415 (Heinz 203. 2nd daftar); Vienna Flügel 518 (also Duda p. 52-3. Contains seals of Shāh-rūkh, regn. 807/1404 to 850/1446, and of the Ottoman Bayezit I – acc. to Flügel – or II – acc. to Duda); Leningrad Acad. D 436 fol. 48b-145a (Index 3464. Ms. dated 1001/1592-3); Kokand Collection 38 fol. 305-388 (See Rosenberg’s edition of the Zarātusht-nāmah p. x. Ms. dated 1064/1653-4). ‘Jawāhir-nāmah’; Acad. C 1165 fol. 128b-221a (Index 3462); Konya Müze 90 (Ateş 44. Copied by ‘Uthmān b. Ḥusain al-Bahwānī and dated 10 Jumādā I 735/1335); Istanbul Topkapı, Ahmet III 3059/1 (Karatay 484; Orients XI p. 11-2. Ms. dated 27 Shawwāl 841/1438); Haliet 234/6 (Orients XI p. 14-7. Ms. dated 889/1484); Ayasofya 1659/2 (Orients XI p. 17-9. Ms. dated 26 Rabī‘ II 890/1485); Topkapı, Revan 1044 (Karatay 500; Der Islam XXV p. 173. Copied by Ahmad b. Sulṭān ʿAll in 981/1573-4. According to Karatay the Ms. contains Jauhar al-dhāt, but Ritter says it is Khusrav-nāmah. Pictures); Esat 2568 (Duda p. 40. Dated 998/1589-90, Part 1 only); Topkapı, Revan 1042 (Karatay 499. Copied by ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Khwārizmī. 16th century? Pictures); Universite FY 213-214/4. (Ateş 122; Orients XI p. 20-4. Dated 1 Rajab 1057/1647); Medina ʿArif Ḥikmat 143 adab fārisī (Nushkhāh-hā V p. 571-2. Ms. dated Jumādā II 844/1440); Tabriz Milli 3634/3 (Nushkhāh-hā IV p. 309. Ms. dated 1 Safar 885/1480); Tehran Malik 5974/6 (Munz. 28971. Ms. dated Rabī‘ II 809/1406); Mashhad Ridawī VII 769/2 (Has a note dated 1052/1642-3); Dushanbe Acad. II 415 (17th century?); Lahore Univ. II/1 p. 175-9 (No. 1 of a Ms. dated 857/1453); Bankiropore I 46/I (17th century? Bk. ii only, incomplete); I 49 (17th century? Bk. ii only); Calcutta Ivanov 482 (15th-16th century?); Ivanov 477/13 (Ms. dated 1006/1597-8. Beginning only); Ivanov 483 (17th century? Beginning only); Ivanov Curzon 204/2 (Ms. contains seals dated 1169/1755-6); Būhār 299/IV (Beginning only). Cf. Munz. IV 28970-9011.


(8) Jumjumah-nāmah, the story of a skull that has been brought back to life, possibly a fragment of an authentic work, according to Ritter.


Possibly the same work, with the title Qiṣṣah (or Ḥikāyāt) i Sultān Jumjumah: Oxford Fraser 124/54 (Etteh 1239); Gotha 45/7; Leningrad Acad. B 2172 fol. la-5b (Index 1086); Acad. B 4497 fol. 138b-144b (Index 1087).


(10) Kanz al-ḫaqāʾiq begins with three verses which are identical with the 1st, 3rd and 5th of the Asrār-nāmah. See the summary of this work by Ritter, Der Islam XXV, p. 158-9.


1Ethē reads the title as Khayyāt-nāmah, which (following Sprenger) he renders as 'Book of transition', but to my knowledge khayyāt means only 'needle': moreover, in the verse in which the author indicates the title of the poem, quoted by Sprenger, the metre requires khayyāt.

Tehran Malik 5062/12 (Munz. 29706. Ms. dated 956/1549); Bankipore I 46/VII (17th century?); Calculata Ivanov Curzon 204/15 (Ms. contains seals dated 1169/1755-6); Ivanov 486 (=Sprenger 136. 17th-18th century?); Būhār 299/I (Dated 1203/1788-9). Cf. Munz. IV 29706-9.

(12) Khasāʾin al-asrār, is, according to one of the two owners' titles in the Oxford Ms., the title of the mathnawi whose prose preface begins with the words fa l-wāṣdatu li man wuḥṣīdat dhātubī bi l-dhāt.

Mss.: Oxford Pers. e. 71 fol. 2-313 (Beeston 2571. 16th century? Beginning and end missing).

(13) Lisān al-ghaib (inc.: ism i taubīd ibtidā i nām i ā-st * surgh i rūh-am jamlaqā dar dān i ā-st), supposedly written in Mecca at the end of 'Attār's life. It is by the same forger as Maḥzar al-qaʿājīb.

Mss.: Manchester Lindesiana 797c (16th century?); Oxford Ouseley 371/2 (Ethē 626. 16th century?); Elliot 206/4 (Ethē 622. Contains a seal dated 1020/1611-2); Ouseley 374/6 (Ethē 623. Ms. dated 23 Jamādā I 1027/1618); Elliot 209/13 (Ethē 624. Ms. dated 4 Dhū l-hijjah 1078/1668); Elliot 205/20 (Ethē 625); London I.O. 1031/16; I.O. 1033/11 (incomplete); Paris Supplément 1366 fol. 113v seqq. (Blochet 1983. Ms. contains dates between 1009/1600 and 1010/1602); Supplement 811 fol. 35v seqq. (Blochet 1291. Ms. dated 27 Shawwal 1013/1605); Rome Vatican Pers. 89 (Rossi p. 107. Dated 22 Shawwāl 47th year of ʿAlamgīr, i.e. 1114/1703); Hanover p. 140-157 acc. to Rossi; Istanbul Universite FY 213-214/6. (Ateş 122; Orients XI p. 20-4. Ms. completed 1060/1650); Tabriz Milli 3634/6 (Nuskhah-hā IV p. 309. Ms. dated 1 Safer 885/1480); Bankipore I 46/VI (17th century?); Calculata Ivanov Curzon 204/7 (Ms. contains seals dated 1169/1755-6). Cf. Munz. IV 33058-21.

(14) Māngūr-nāmah, or Hallāj-nāmah (inc. būd maŋūr, ai ‘ajab, shūrdah-bāl * dar rah i taβqīq ŏ rā sad kasālj), a brief account of the death of Hallāj. In many copies it is inserted into the Wāṣlat-nāmah.


(15) Māshâr al-‘ajā‘ib (inc. āfrīn jān, āfrīn bar jān i jān * zûn-khī hast ŏ āshkārū u nihān), a hagiography of ‘All. The date of the composition is given (medially) in one verse as 584/1188 (pāŋsād u hashtād u chār), when the author was supposedly 100 years old, and in another there is a chronogram for 586/1189 (sirr i ‘ajā‘ib). In several verses the author calls himself a citizen of Tūn. It is certainly a forgery. See Bombay Univ. Cat. p. 60-5 (summarising Shērānī), Ritter, Der Islam XXV, p. 137-8 and Naftī, p. 126sq.

Mss.: Oxford Ouseley 371/3 (Ethē 626. 16th century?); Ouseley 353/4 (Ethē 627. Ms. has a note dated ‘13 which Ethē interprets as 1013/1604-5); Elliot 206/5 (Ethē 622. Contains a seal dated 1020/1611-2); Ouseley 374/16 (Ethē 623. Ms. dated 23 Jamâdâ I 1027/1618); Elliot 209/12 (Ethē 624. Ms. dated 4 Dhū l-bijjah 1078/1668); Elliot 204/2 (Ethē 625); London Add. 6621 (Rieu p. 579. 17th century? Consists of 73 leaves detached from a larger volume, the whole of the Māshâr al-‘ajā‘ib, and a further leaf containing the conclusion of another, unidentified, poem); I.O. 1031/18; I.O. Delhi 1270; Cambridge Or. 651/1 (Browne Suppt. 1210. Dated Rabi‘ I 1201/1787); Browne Coll. V.8 (Dated Safar 1286/1869. Apparently contains several other mathnaws); Paris Supplément 811 fol. 90v sqq. (Blochet 1291. Ms. dated 27 Shawwâl 1013/1605); Leningrad Kokand Collection 38 fol. 1-120 (See Rosenberg’s edition of the Zarâtsūdht-nāmah p.iii. Dated 1066/1655-6); Istanbul Nuruosmaniye 4199 mûkerrer (Ateğ 133. Copied by Muḥammad Râdâ al-Mashhâdî and dated 990/1582); Universite FY 213-214/2. (Ateğ 122; Orients XI p. 20-4. Dated 27 Dhū l-qa‘dah 1058/1648); Shiras Wīsāl (Nuskhâh-hâ 293 no. 34. Ms. dated 892/1487); Bombay Univ. 24; Banki pores 146/II (17th century? Incomplete); I 48 (18th century?); Calcutta (=Lucknow Sprenger 131. Dated 1186/1772-3. Pictures); Ivanow Curzon 204/6 (Ms. contains seals dated 1169/1756-6); Bū̄hâr 300/II (18th century?); Bū̄hâr 302 (18th century?). Cf. Munz. IV 3523-39.


(16) Miftâh al-futūb (inc. panâh i man ba bāyi‘é kih na-mîrâd * ba āh-e ‘udhr i šad ‘isâyân padhīrâd) was written by a man from Zanjân in 688/1289-90, or, as other copies have it, 587/1191-2. A text-book of ascetic exercises. See Ritter, Der Islam XXV, p. 157.

Mss.: Oxford Ouseley 353/3 (Ethē 627. Ms. has a note dated <10>13/1604-5); Elliot 207/19 (Ethē 622. Contains a seal dated 1020/1611-2); Ouseley 374/10 (Ethē 623. Ms. dated 23 Jamâdâ I 1027/1618); Elliot 208/7 (Ethē 624. Ms. dated 4 Dhū l-bijjah 1078/1668); London Or. 4151/V (Rieu Suppt. 235. Ms. dated 22 Rajab 877/1472); I.O. 1032/9
thought it authentic, but Ritter pointed out that it is not traceable before the 15th century and is lacking in all the old manuscripts of the *Kulliyāt*, that it is not mentioned in 'Attār’s authentic works and that ‘von der gedankenwelt ‘Attār’s darin eigentlich nichts zu spüren ist'.

Mss.: 1 Dublin T.C.D. 1556; 2 Manchester Lindesiana 895a (Dated 1202/1787-9); Lindesiana 241c (Dated 1210/1795-6); Lindesiana 541 (18th century?); 3 Oxford Elliot 207/10 (Ethē 622. Contains a seal dated 1020/1611-2); Ouseley 374/14 (Ethē 623. Ms. dated 23 Jumādā I 1027/1618); Elliott 209/15 (Ethē 624. Ms. dated 4 Dhu l-bi‘ bajah 1078/1668); Fraser 247 (Ethē 632. Dated 14 Rabī‘I 43rd year of ‘Alamgir/1699); Elliott 205/15 (Ethē 625); 4 London I.O. 1032/1 (Dated 1025/1616); Harl. 5464 fol. 67-144 (Rieu p. 790. Dated Rabī‘ II 1078/1667. With Turkish glosses); Sloane 3588 I (Rieu p. 579-80. Dated Dhu l-bi‘ bajah 1083/1673); Harleian 5447 I (Rieu p. 580. 17th century?); Or. 5932 fol. 17b-54b (Meredith-Owens p. 90. Dated 1150/1737-8. With interlinear Turkish translation); I.O. 1037 (Has a seal dated 1172/1758-9); I.O. 1038 (Dated 18 Shawwāl 1191/1777); Add. 6632 III (Rieu p. 803. Dated Jumādā I 1192/1778); Add. 7734 (Rieu p. 580. Dated Shawwāl 1193/1779. With Turkish glosses); Ross and Browne XXXII (Dated 1197/1783); I.O. 1039 (Dated 4 Dhu l-qā‘dah 1209/1795); Sloane 3264 (Rieu p. 580. 18th century. With a Latin translation by Solomon Negri); Add. 6960 II (Rieu p. 580. 19th century copy of Sloane 3264); I.O. 1031/4; I.O. 1033/5; I.O. 1040-1042; Wellcome 413 Cambridge Browne Coll. Sup. 6 fol. 17a-45b (17th-18th century? End missing); Add. 784

1Oriens XIII-XIV, p. 228-9.
2Mss. of this work are extremely common; we limit ourselves therefore to a small sample. See Ritter, *Oriens* XIII-XIV p. 229-38; Munz. IV 28266-321; Munz. Fak. VII(1) p. 170-83.
(Browne Cat. CCXXI. Dated 1161/1748. A few Turkish glosses); Add. 250 (Browne Cat. CCXXXI. Recent); Glasgow T. 5.20 (Weir 14. Dated 9 Jumâdâ I 1100 /1689); S.7 (Weir 15); Edinburgh New Coll. Or. 32; Paris Supplément 1398 in marg. fol. 113v-175v (Blochet 1970. Dated 861/1456-7); Supplément 781A fol. 300v sqq. (Blochet 1972. Ms. dated Rabi‘ I 992/1487); Anciens fonds 7/XXI (Blochet 2147 /Richard. 16th century? Incomplete at end); Ancien fonds 343/I (Blochet 1297/Richard. 16th century?); Supplément 1366 fol. 46-53 (Blochet 1993. Dated 11 Safar 1009/1600); Supplément 811 fol. 649v-658 (Blochet 1291. Ms. dated 27 Shawwâl 1013/1605); Supplément 1255 (Blochet 1316. Dated 1087/1676-7); Supplément 649 (Blochet 1310. 17th century? Incomplete); Supplément 651 (Blochet 1311. 17th century? End missing); Supplément 648 (Blochet 1312. 17th century?); Ancien fonds 261/II (Blochet 1313 /Richard. 17th century? With Turkish glosses); Supplément 650 (Blochet 1314. 17th century?); Supplément 652 (Blochet 1315. 17th century? Beginning missing); Supplément 653 (Blochet 1317. Dated 1149/1736-7); Supplément 947 (Blochet 1318. Dated 6 Safar 1205/1790); Supplément 1683 fol. 112v sqq. (Blochet 2188. 19th century); Supplément 1686 fol. 73r sqq. (Blochet 2190. 19th century); Supplément 1687 fol. 92v sqq. (Blochet 2191. 19th century); Supplément 1688 fol. 73r sqq. (Blochet 2192. Dated 1277/1860-1); Supplément 1689 fol. 42v sqq. (Blochet 2193. 19th century); Supplément 1691 fol. 54r sqq. (Blochet 2194. Ms. completed in 1299 /1881-2); Supplément 1693 fol. 53v sqq. (Blochet 2196. Dated 1263/1847); Supplément 1695 fol. 60v sqq. (Blochet 2197. 19th century); Supplément 1697 fol. 81v sqq. (Blochet 2199. 19th century); Supplément 1698 fol. 95r sqq. (Blochet 2200. 19th century); Supplément 1700 fol. 38v sqq. (Blochet 2201. 19th century); Supplément 1701 fol. 31r sqq. (Blochet 2202, with erroneous call-number. 19th century. Incomplete); Supplément 1702 fol. 157v sqq. (Blochet 2203. 19th century); Supplément 1736 fol. 134v sqq. (Blochet 2204. 19th century?); 2104; Arabe 2315 fol. 30v-60; Suppl. turc 381/I; Supplément turc 1408 fol. 146 sqq.; Göttingen Divsahl /Luft 58 (Dated [1]189/1775); Divsahl/Luft 60 (Dated 1258/1842-3); Divsahl/Luft 69; Berlin Petermann II Nachtr. 9 (Pertsch 688/6. Dated Rajab 981/1573); Ms. or. quar. 182 (Pertsch 749); Ms. or. quar. 183 (Pertsch 750); Ms. or. quar. 25 (Pertsch 751); Gotth 50; Munich 178 Quatr. (Au- mer 30. Dated 1077/1666-7); 219 Quatr. (Au mer 31. Dated 1185/1771-2); Clm. 87 (Au mer 28); Uppsala Tornberg CLX; Tornberg CLXI; Bratislava 570 (16th century?); 571; 572 (17th century?); Vienna Flügel 517/2; Flügel 1935; Flügel 1936; Kraft KLXXXIX; Leningrad Acad. B 149 (Index 433. Dated 964/1556-7); Acad. C 1166 fol. 257b-258b (Index 3463. Ms. dated 1115/1703-4); Dorn CCCLX (Dated 1133/1720-1); Dorn CCCLXI (Dated 1234/1818-9); Dorn CCCLXII; and many more copies (see Acad. Index 429-461); Konya Mevlâna Müzesi 1460/3 (Oriens XIII-XIV, p. 229. Ms. dated 867/1462-3); Istanbul Topkapı, Koğuşlar 949 (Karayat 493. Copied by Nuri b. Hüsnâ Shabângâ Shâhî and dated Mubarram 877/1472); Halet 234/10 (Oriens XI p. 14-7. Ms. dated 889/1484); Universite FY 593/4 (Ates 135. Dated 890/1485); Nuruosmaniye 5008/2 (Ates 136. Dated Dhû l-bijjah 1061/1642); Topkapı, Revan 2021/XV (Karayat 924. Dated 1057/1647); Universite FY 213-214/17. (Ate 122; Oriens XI p. 20-4. Ms. completed 1060/1650); Topkapı, Ahmet III 1559 (Karayat 485. Dated 1078/1667-8); Universite FY 378 (olîm Riza Pâşa 3069. Ate 137. Dated 1102 /1690-1); Topkapı, Emanet Hazinesi 1333 (Karayat 489. Dated 1114/1702-3); Topkapı, Revan 420 (Kar ayat 487. Dated 1128/1716); Topkapı, Hazine 719 (Karayat 490. Dated 1128/1716); Topkapı, Emanet Hazinesi 1320 (Karayat 491. Dated 1151/1738-9); Universite FY 586 (olîm Riza Pâşa 3488. Ate 138. Dated 3 Safar 1185/1771); Universite FY 67 (Ate
139. 18th century?); Nuruosmaniye 4993 (Atég 140. 18th century?); Topkapı, Revan 421 (Karayat 488. 18th century?); Université FY 95 (Atég 141. Dated 1220/1805-4?); Topkapı, Bağdat 98 (Karayat 486); Topkapı, Koğuşlar 1021 (Karayat 492); Dushanbe Acad. II 409-413; Banki Shope Suppt. i 1838 in marg. (Ms. dated 15 Dhū 1-bijjah 910/1505); I 46/XII (17th century?); Rampole Saulat 51-52 (recent); Gâlcûtta Ivanov 477/10 (Ms. dated 1006/1597-8); Ivanov 480/2 (Dated 1087/1678-7); Ivanov Curzon 204/13 (Ms. contains seals dated 1169/1755-6); Ivanov 481 (18th century?); Bûhûr 303 (19th century?); Princeton 422 (Modern).

Editions: London 1809 (Pend-ei-Åtår, ed. J.H. Hindley); Paris 1819 (Pennamâh, ou Le livre des conseils..., traduit et publié par M. le Bn Silvestre de Sacy); Constantinople 1251/1835; 1257 /1841; 1260/1844; 1266/1849-50; 1267/1850; 1291 /1874-5; (See also translations: Turkish; Bulaq 1243/1827-8; 1244/1828-9; 1253/1837-8; 1280/1863; Kâzras 1845; Bombay 1277/1860; Lucknow 1264/1848 (30 p. according to Sprenger p. 356); 1872 (in the 'Kuliyyat'); Tehran 1290/1873; Lahore (ca. 1870); 1294/1877; 1887; 1888; 1892 (with a commentary); Bombay 1867; Cawnpore 1290/1873, 1888; and evidently many others.


Editions: Constantinople 1229/1814, 1266/1849-50, 1280/1863-4, 1282/1865-6, (all with the Persian text).

Also in Turkish verse by Nağâlî, dedicated to the same Sultan. Mss.: Leipzig Fleischer CCCVI fol. 25v-44v. A fragment of one or the other of these translations is found in Vienna Kraft CXCVI.


(Arabic): The Persian text was published with an interlinear translation by Ahmad Nasib Khâlî Watson in Alexandria 1289/1872.

(German): Pennamâh, tr. G.H.F. Nesselmann, Königsberg 1871.


(Swedish): Pand-Nâmâh, tr. E. Hermelin, with a re-print of Silvestre's text and a transliteration, Stockholm 1929.

Commentaries:

(a) Sa'âdat-nâmah by Shemî'î Prizrenî (died after 1009/1600), in Turkish, incorporating (at least part of) the Persian text and a Turkish translation. He also wrote commentaries on Makhzan al-âsrûr, Mantûq al-tair, Mathnawî i ma'nawî, Gulistân, Bûstân, Tuhat al-abràr, Subbat al-abràr, Bahâristân, and the dîwâns of Haiîz and Shânî. Mss. are common in Turkey (see Orients XIII-XIV, p. 232-3). Those in European libraries include: Manchester Lindesiana 889 (Dated 1077 /1666-7); London Sloane 3588 II (Rieu p. 580. Dated Dhû 1-bijjah 1003/1673); Cambridge Dd. 11. 16. (Browne Cat. CCXX. Dated 5 Safar 1028/1619); Glasgow T.7.10 (Weir p. 607 no. 22. Dated 1030 /1620-1); Paris Anciens fonds 329 (Blochet 1319 /Richard. 17th century?); Supplément turc 341, 383, 578, 579, 695; Bologna Bibl. Universitaria (Piemontese 8-14: several copies); Hambourg Orient. 264 fol. 1v-70r (Brockelmann 285. Ms. has an owner's note dated 1051/1641-2); Wiesbaden (M. Götz. Türkische Handschriften II, 1968, no. 632-3); Leipsig Cleischer XXIX/2 (Dated 5 Safar 1070 /1667); Fleischer CCCVII/1; Berlin Ms. or. oct.
127 (Pertsch 752. Has a note dated 1082/1671-2); 
Vienna Flügel 1938 (Dated 1128/1716); Leningrad 
Dorn CCCLVIII.

(b) Muḥāfīz, a commentary, also in Turkish, by 
‘Abd al-Rahmān ‘Abdī, written at the time of Mehmet 
IV (1058/1648 to 1099/1687). Ms.: See Orients 

(c) By Shu‘ūrī, again in Turkish. Ms.: Istana-
bul Darülmesnevi 185 (Orients XIII-XIV, p. 234-5. 
Autograph dated Rabī‘ I 1083/1672).

(d) By Ismā‘īl Ḥāqqī (1063/1653 to 1137/1724-
5). Ms.: See Orients XIII-XIV, p. 235. Also 
Manchester Lindesiana 165 (Cat. p. 244. Dated 
1186/1772-3).

Editions: Constantinople 1250/1834-5; 1287 
/1870.

(e) Barg i darwīshān (in Turkish) by Muṣṭafā 
Rafī‘-ā, written in 1143/1730-1 for Mir Iskandar, 
the son of the Ottoman governor in Cairo. Ms.: 
Vienna Kraft CXC (Autograph?)

(f) By Ḥāfiz Mehmend Murād (d. 1264/1848). See 
Orients XIII-XIV, p. 236. Editions: Constantinople 
1252/1836-7; 1260/1844; 1286/1869-70.

For two further anonymous commentaries see 

(21) Rumīs al-‘āshiqlīn. Ms.: Istanbul Univer-
Ms. completed 1060/1650).

(22) Si faṣīl. Ms.: London Or. 8363 (Meredith-
Owens p. 69. Dated 1298/1881); Tehran (2 modern 

(23) Ushtur-nāmah or Shutur-nāmah (inc. ihtidā 
bar nāmī i ḥayī i lā-yāṣāl * sānī‘ i ashyā ‘u ibdā‘ 
i jālāl with variants) contains a rather striking 
story in which a puppeteer is used as a symbol for 
the divinity. The figure of Ḥallāj plays a major 
part in it. See above, p. 274-5.

(25) Waš̲̃lat-nāməš (inc. ibtīdā awval ba-nām i kirdigār * khāliq i haft u shash u panj u chāhar) is the work of a certain Buhūl according to the concluding verses in some of the copies (including the Basel manuscript and Calcutta Curzon 206; the verses are quoted by Sprenger and Ivanov). In others the names mentioning this name have been excised.

Ms.: Dublin Beatty 321/I (Ms. copied by ʿAlī b. Muhammad and dated Safar 821/1418); Beatty 155 fol. 528b sqq. (Ms. dated 12 Rabīʿ II 881/1476); Oxford Pers. d. 71 fol. 137b-191b in marg. (Beeston 2564; Ms. completed 16 Ramadan 874/1470); Ouseley 371/5 (Ethē 626. 16th century?); Elliot 207/7 (Ethē 622. Contains a seal dated 1020/1611-2); Ouseley 374/2 (Ethē 623. Ms. dated 23 Jumādā I 1027/1618); Elliot 209/17 (Ethē 624. Ms. dated 4 Dhū l-bijjah 1078/1668); Elliot 204/4 (Ethē 625); London I.O. 1034/6 (Copied by Muhammad Hājjī b. Bābā Hājjī and dated 1 Dhū l-qaʿdah 812/1410); Or. 2747/VI (Rieu Suppt. 236. Ms. dated 22 Dhū l-bijjah 889/1485); Add. 7736/II (Rieu p. 579. Dated Shaʾbān 968/1562); Or. 5415 fol. 54b-65b (Meredith-Owens p. 90. 16th-17th century?); I.O. 1031/10; I.O. 1033/14; Cambridge Or. 1698/4 (2nd Suppt. 443. Ms. dated 829/1425-6); Or. 259/2 (Browne Suppt. 1355. Recent copy of one of the Calcutta Ms.); Paris Supplément 811 fol. 544v sqq. (Blaeucl 1291. Ms. dated 27 Shawwāl 1013/1605); Supplément 654 (Blaeucl 1293. Dated Ramadan 1110/1699); Basel Tscheda Collection (Oriens XI p. 10. Ms. completed in Mubarram 828/1424); Vatican 121/I (Rossi p. 128. 19th century?); Leningrad Acad. D 436 fol. 241b-254b (Index 3464. Ms. dated 1001/1592-3); Konya Mevlana Müzesi 1698/2 (Oriens XI p. 19. Ms. dated Rabīʿ I 893/1488); Istanbul Nuruosmaniye 4982/9 (Ateş 118. Ms. dated 825/1422); Topkapı, Ahmed III 3059/1 (Karağay 484; Oriens XI p. 11-2. Ms. dated 27 Shawwāl 841/1438); Halet 234/13 (Oriens XI p. 14-7. Ms. dated 889/1484); Ayasofya 1659/4 (Oriens XI p. 17-9. Dated 26 Rabīʿ II 890/1485); Fatih 4052/9 (Ritter-Reinert p. 129-30; Oriens XI p. 24-5. 16th century?); Cairo 139 mls adab fārsī (Tirāz 1835/5. Dated 20 Mubarram 858/1454); Madīnah ʿArif Ḥikmat 30 (Nuskhāh-hā V p. 484. Ms. dated 859/1455); Hamadan ʿImām al-daulah (Nuskhāh-hā V p. 345. Ms. dated 28 Shawwāl 831/1428); Lahore Univ. II/1 p. 175-9 (No. 14 of a Ms. dated 857/1453); Lucknow Sprenger 134 and 157; Bankipore I 47/VI (Ms. contains dates in 1123/1711 and 1133/1720); Calcutta Ivanov 477/9 (Ms. dated 1006/1597-8); Ivanov Curzon 206 (=Sprenger 157. Dated Ramadan 1066/1656 and attributed to 'Shaikh al-shuyūkh Shaikh Buhūl'); Ivanov Curzon 204/2 (Ms. contains seals dated 1169/1755-6); Bühār 299/III (Dated 1203/1788-9); Ivanov 1st Suppt. 797 (Dated 12 Jumādā II 1259/1843). Cf. Munz. IV 36272-95.


‘Attār’s chapter on the poets of Khūrāsān after the time of Sanjār (i.e. after 552/1157), where he follows two other poets from Sīstān, Farīd al-dīn and Shams al-dīn (below, nos. 190, 291). ‘Afü1 quotes a qīf’ah in which the poet defends his decision to remain unmarried, and a number of rubā’īyāt (one of them of a decidedly ‘Khaiyamic’ flavour). Rāzī, otherwise dependent on ‘Afü1, adds a qāṣidah, the dedication of which is not named. Hidāyat says that ‘some’ give him the nisbah Tabrīzī; in other words, Hidāyat confused him with the 10th/16th-century poet Badī’ Tabrīzī; the fragment that he attributes to our poet beginning shāhanshāh-e kih dā’im ... is in fact quoted by Ṭāhir (I p. 111-2) as the work of Badī’ Tabrīzī.

‘Afü II p. 349-51; Rāzī I p. 297-9 (no. 309); Hidāyat, Majma’ I p. 168; Khāyām-pūr p. 81 (Badī’ i Sīstānī).

178. Bārānī is cited as the author of three verses in LF ed. Iqībāl p. 16, 49, 394 (Ms. nūn in marg.).

179. The first three verses of a poem by one Dālūmāl are quoted by Shams i Qais. A longer version of the same is quoted by Ṭāhir, who includes its author among the the poets of Qazwīn, and by Hidāyat.


180. Three verses are ascribed to a certain Dāmārī in LF ed. Iqībāl p. 162, 395, 396 (Ms. nūn in marg.).

Thus in ‘Afü1, Ms. S, apart from the fact that the last word is apparently pointed s.kh.r.y. Browne, evidently with Ms. E, has al-Sanjārī. Rāzī includes this author among the poets of Sīstān. Hidāyat calls him Ḥakīm Badī’ al-zamān al-Turkūzī al-Sanjārī and says that he was a native of Turkūz, a locality in Sīstān; with this he presumably has in mind the citadel trūkūn mentioned in the ībār al-nūlak of Malik-shāh in ‘Afü1’s chapter on the poets of Khūrāsān after the time of Sanjār (i.e. after 552/1157), where he follows two other poets from Sīstān, Farīd al-dīn and Shams al-dīn (below, nos. 190, 291). ‘Afüg quotes a qīf’ah in which the poet defends his decision to remain unmarried, and a number of rubā’īyāt (one of them of a decidedly ‘Khaiyamic’ flavour). Rāzī, otherwise dependent on ‘Afüg, adds a qāṣidah, the dedication of which is not named. Hidāyat says that ‘some’ give him the nisbah Tabrīzī; in other words, Hidāyat confused him with the 10th/16th-century poet Badī’ Tabrīzī; the fragment that he attributes to our poet beginning shāhanshāh-e kih dā’im ... is in fact quoted by Ṭāhir (I p. 111-2) as the work of Badī’ Tabrīzī.

‘Afüg II p. 349-51; Rāzī I p. 297-9 (no. 309); Hidāyat, Majma’ I p. 168; Khāyām-pūr p. 81 (Badī’ i Sīstānī).

178. Bārānī is cited as the author of three verses in LF ed. Iqībāl p. 16, 49, 394 (Ms. nūn in marg.).

179. The first three verses of a poem by one Dālūmāl are quoted by Shams i Qais. A longer version of the same is quoted by Ṭāhir, who includes its author among the the poets of Qazwīn, and by Hidāyat.


180. Three verses are ascribed to a certain Dāmārī in LF ed. Iqībāl p. 162, 395, 396 (Ms. nūn in marg.).

Thus in ‘Afüg, Ms. S, apart from the fact that the last word is apparently pointed s.kh.r.y. Browne, evidently with Ms. E, has al-Sanjārī. Rāzī includes this author among the poets of Sīstān. Hidāyat calls him Ḥakīm Badī’ al-zamān al-Turkūzī al-Sanjārī and says that he was a native of Turkūz, a locality in Sīstān; with this he presumably has in mind the citadel trūkūn mentioned in the ībār al-nūlak of Malik-shāh in ‘Afüg’s chapter on the poets of Khūrāsān after the time of Sanjār (i.e. after 552/1157), where he follows two other poets from Sīstān, Farīd al-dīn and Shams al-dīn (below, nos. 190, 291). ‘Afüg quotes a qīf’ah in which the poet defends his decision to remain unmarried, and a number of rubā’īyāt (one of them of a decidedly ‘Khaiyamic’ flavour). Rāzī, otherwise dependent on ‘Afüg, adds a qāṣidah, the dedication of which is not named. Hidāyat says that ‘some’ give him the nisbah Tabrīzī; in other words, Hidāyat confused him with the 10th/16th-century poet Badī’ Tabrīzī; the fragment that he attributes to our poet beginning shāhanshāh-e kih dā’im ... is in fact quoted by Ṭāhir (I p. 111-2) as the work of Badī’ Tabrīzī.

‘Afüg II p. 349-51; Rāzī I p. 297-9 (no. 309); Hidāyat, Majma’ I p. 168; Khāyām-pūr p. 81 (Badī’ i Sīstānī).

178. Bārānī is cited as the author of three verses in LF ed. Iqībāl p. 16, 49, 394 (Ms. nūn in marg.).

179. The first three verses of a poem by one Dālūmāl are quoted by Shams i Qais. A longer version of the same is quoted by Ṭāhir, who includes its author among the the poets of Qazwīn, and by Hidāyat.


180. Three verses are ascribed to a certain Dāmārī in LF ed. Iqībāl p. 162, 395, 396 (Ms. nūn in marg.).
interest for the light that it sheds on the history of a remote corner of Central Asia on the eve of, and just after, the Mongol invasion.

The poet's contemporary Shams al-din al-Haddad, known as Khālah,1 says of him that he was 'by descent a man of Fārs, though brought up in Khujand'.2 Diyā himself says 'my birthplace and origin are from Fārs, like Salmān', but qualifies this by adding: 'for my words are Persian, (like) pearls of (the sea of) Oman';3 it would thus seem possible that the poet is using the word 'birthplace' somewhat freely. Rāzī includes him in his chapter on Shiraz and says that he came from Fārs to Khurasān in his youth (dar awān i jawānī). Of the various patrons who are celebrated in his panegyrics I have so far been able to identify only three with personages known from historical sources: One is the Khwārazm-shāh Ala al-din Muhammad to whom Diyā dedicated an ode in the aftermath of this king's victory over the Qara-Khiṭay in 607/1210; the poem is quoted, and the circumstances of its composition mentioned, also by Juwainī. Another is al-malik al-kabīr Izz al-dīn Tēmūr Malik-Shāh, to whom several poems are directed, one with the date 616/1218-9;4 he is doubtless the Tēmūr Malik whose brave (if futile) defence of Khujand against the Mongols in 617/1220 is known to us, again from Juwainī.5 The third is al-šāhīb al-ażam Fakhr al-dunyā wa l-dīn Mahmūd

1In preparing the following notes I have made use of a set of photographs, preserved in the library of the School of Oriental and African Studies, London, made from the 'Robertson' Ms., which is dated 20 Rajab 981/1573. This is written in a good, legible nasta'ī 'Jīq hand. The poems are not arranged alphabetically; the qasīdāt and strophic poems are grouped together according to their dedicatee and are

1LN s.v. 'Ḍamīrī' p. 68; Khayyām-pūr p. 346.

181. Sa'd al-dīn Mas'ūd Da'lwat-yār was a poet in Bukhārā at the end of the 6th/12th and beginning of the 7th/13th century. 'Auffī, who says that his father was a converted Zoroastrian, quotes, among other things, a rubā'ī which he composed 'at the time when I ('Auffī) was in the service of Tāj al-dīn Ṣadr al-sharī'ah' (i.e. al-Ṣadr al-kabīr 'Umar II b. Mas'ūd, 593/1196-7 to before 603/1206). 'Auffī refers also to an elegy that he had composed for the predecessor of that worthy, al-Ṣadr al-sa'īd, and which some of the wits of Bukhārā saw as a plagiarism of verses by 'Sirājī' (evidently one of the two poets of that name quoted earlier in 'Auffī's book).

'Auffī I p. 178, II p. 385, 387-8; Rāzī III p. 424 (no. 1482); Khayyām-pūr p. 213.

182. Dībājī Samarqandī was, according to Hidāyat, a contemporary of Qāṭrān and Asadī. Hidāyat quotes an ode addressing 'Mīr i fādīl Fādīlun', evidently either Qāṭrān's patron or one of the later Shaddādis of the same name. LF ed. Iqbal p. 161 and 397 (Ms. nūn in marg.) quotes two different variants of one verse by Dībājī to illustrate two place-names in Georgia.

Hidāyat, Majma' I p. 218; Khayyām-pūr p. 213.

183. Diyā Fārsī flourished in Khujand during the first part of the 7th/13th century (the poems contain dates ranging between 600/1203-4 and 638/1240-1). His dīwān is extant, notably in a very old manuscript in Tehran, though it has not yet been published,1 and is of considerable

---

1See below, no. 222.

2Shams's poem is included in the dīwān of Diyā', fol. 89b-90a, where the verse in question reads: tu pārsī-nasab-i chūn Khujand mānsa'at ast as sīhī tafṣīhur i Salmān i pārsī ba Khujand.

3Fol. 4a: ma-rā chu Salmūn az Fārs ast maulud u aql s kib pārsī sukhan-am hast durr i 'umānī.

4Fol. 107a.

5Juwainī I p. 71-2.
Ulugh Yalawách, 1 the Muslim governor of Khujuand during the early part of the reign of Chaghatal. 2 A good number of poems (among them one with the date 603/1208-7), 3 and an elegy on his death, 4 are dedicated to al-sultân Mu'izz al-dunyâ wa l-dîn Abû l-Hârith Muhammâd Qâlich Taflhâj (i.e., Tâvaqqâj) Khân, and another group (again including an elegy) 5 to al-sultân Rûkân al-dunyâ wa l-dîn Mas'ûd b. Muhammâd b. Mas'ûd Taflhâj Khân, presumably his son. Their titulature suggests that these two belonged to the Qarakhanids of Farghânâh, but they do not seem to be recorded elsewhere. A large number of poems are dedicated to a potentate in Marghînân, Hûsâm al-dîn Hasan b. 'Ali Yâghhû (or Pîgîhû)? 6 Malik-shâh al-Marghînânî. This patron is perhaps identical with al-malik al-mu'âzgam Pîgîhû-Malik whom 'Auffî includes in his chapter on the royal amateur poets. 1 Other poems evoke al-ispâhsâlîr al-mu'âiyid Nîșâm al-dîn Yâghhû (Pîgîhû) Malik, who is perhaps the same as the just-mentioned Hûsâm al-dîn, or perhaps rather a relative of his; others evoke al-ispâhsâlîr al-mu'âiyid Nîșâm al-dîn Ulugh Tûgsân. A very large number of poems are dedicated to al-malik al-kabîr Ikhtîyâr al-dîn Malik-shâh 'As'âd b. Mas'ûd, of which some explicitly mention Khujuand and one contains the date 638/1240-1, 2 evidently the most recent year mentioned in the dîwân; he would thus seem to have been one of the governors of Khuzistan and under the Mongols. He is also the dedicatee of an ode by Saif Isfaranî 3 which in turn praises 'Dîyû' i Pârâî'. A poem with the date 14 Safar 633/1235 invokes al-ispâhsâlîr 'Imâd al-dîn Mahmûd b. 'As'âd, evidently the son of Ikhtîyâr al-dîn. A good number of poems eulogise Malik al-islâm Nâsîr al-dîn 'Ali b. 'Ali, to whom the poet applies epithets such as shâh i shâfi'î' and nûr i Khujuand, evidently a high-ranking cleric.

The dîwân contains also a poetical compliment to a colleague, Shams al-dîn al-Haddâdi, as well as Shams al-dîn's reply (quoted at the beginning of this article). Râzî quotes a different pair of poems exchanged between these two, and a pair of

1Yalawch is a Turkish word for 'ambassador, messenger'. Our poet treats it, doubtless under the constraints of the metre, as disyllabic. Cf. fol. 5b (metre: hâsâm): ma'dâr i sîluk Fakhru i-baqgi wa l-dîn * panâh i khâiq Ulugh Yalawch i sâgâm. The same reading is required also on fol. 3b paen.
2See the detailed article on Mahmûd Yalawch and his family by Th.T. Allain in In the service of the Khan, ed. 1. de Rachewiltz (et al.), Wiesbaden 1983, p. 122-31.
3Fol. 9a.
4Fol. 13a sqq.
5Fol. 37b sqq.
6In the 'Robertson' Ms. the word is consistently written with the points of the first two letters amalgamated into an inverted pyramid of three dots; one can thus equally well read y.b.gh.w or b.y.gh.w (it would be good to know how it is pointed in the Gulistân Ms.). Yet Yâghhû is well-known Turkish (or Eastern Iranian) royal title (see Doerfer IV p. 124-36). Pîgîhû occurs in Chaghatal Turkish (and in the Persian lexicon) as the name for a kind of falcon, but is not attested in any early texts (id., II p. 427-8, and the Nachtrag, IV p. 438).

1'Auffî I p. 52-9; see also Hidâyat, Majma' I p. 173-4; Nafsiyat's notes to Baihaqi p. 1370-5; LN s.v. 'Pîgîhû' p. 748-9; Khâyiym-ustar p. 38; Safâ, 737-dîn II p. 729-31. Nafsiyat has correctly noted that the poems quoted by 'Auffî on p. 55-8 are clearly not by this king, but addressed to him, and has surmised that there is a lacuna in the text with the result that the name of their author has dropped out. This is not unlikely, but there is no basis for his assumption that this unknown author is the 'Hûsâm al-dîn Bakhtyâr b. Zangî Saljûqî' with whom Hidâyat arbitrarily identified our Pîgîhû-Malik. Further confusion is caused by Nafsiyat's attempts to amalgamate 'Dîyû's various patrons into a single person.
2Fol. 127b.
3For whom see below, chapter IV. The poem is quoted in Nafsiyat's notes to Baihaqi, p. 1390-2.
poems exchanged with one Shihāb al-dīn (presumably Shihābī Khujandī, below no. 299). Badā‘unī and Hidāyat, misled, no doubt, by the title Malik-Shāh which occurs in so many of his poems, put our poet in the early Seljuq period. Taqī1 (followed by Adhr) says that he died in 622/1225, which, though at least in the right century, is still too early.

Ms.: Tehran Golestān/Atābāy II 299 (Ms. signed by Ḥasan b. Yūsuf and dated 20 Rajab 666/1268, but Atābāy thinks this scribe is responsible only for the final pages and that the Ms. is possibly an autograph). Another Ms. was at one time in the possession of D.S. Robertson;2 I am not aware of its present location. Cf. Munz. III 24275.


184. al-Ḥakīm Diya‘ al-dīn Mahmūd al-Kabīlī is the author of a qīṭ‘ah and four rubā‘iyāt which he wrote out for ‘Auffī when the latter met him in Ghaznah (not long before 607/1210-1).

‘Auffī II p. 416-7; Rāzī II p. 105 (no. 592); LN s.v. ‘Diya‘ al-dīn’ p. 80-1; Khaiyām-pūr p. 348.

1Sprenger p. 16 no. 31.

2See the account of the Ms. at the beginning of this article.

185. al-Ḥakīm Majd al-dīn Fāhi‘ī al-Bukhārī was a contemporary of ‘Auffī, who tells us that he was illiterate (uzmī), but none the less an accomplished poet. The samples of his work quoted by ‘Auffī contain a qīṭ‘ah and two rubā‘īs lampooning Sa‘d al-dīn Kāfī (below, no. 277).


186. A certain Fakhīr al-dīn composed two poems describing a contest between the pen and the sword of which one (inc. Ḥan u nai chūn padid šamad zi ṣan‘ i kirdigār dar mīyān i tēgh u kikk uftād jang u ārsār) has been published by Ethē from the important anthology Daghīq al-ash‘ār. It contains a verse1 eulogising Malik-shāh (presumably the first king of that name, 465/1072 to 485/1092).

Ms.: Oxford Elliot 37 fol. 221a (Ethē 1333).


187. al-ʾAmīr al-ʿAlīm Falak al-dīn Ibrahim al-Samānī is the author of three gharaqs quoted by ‘Auffī in his chapter on the poets of Western Persia after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157). ‘Auffī says that he was a descendant of the Samanid kings and that he was born in Transoxania but lived in ‘Irāq.

‘Auffī II p. 401-2; Khaiyām-pūr p. 258 (‘Samānī i ʿIrāq’).

188. Falakī Sharwānī flourished at the court of the Sharwān-shāh Manuchir II, who reigned from

1Namely the penultimate verse of the poem, reading: sāyāh i yasān Malik-shāh āftāh i khusrawān * àn shahansha-y (sic lege) kām-yāh, àn pād-shāh i kām-gār.
516/1122 (or somewhat later) until 555/1160-1 (or not long afterwards), the only king mentioned in his published poems. It is therefore likely that he died before this monarch (the date 577/1181-2 given by Taqī and others is probably a good deal too late). Khāqānī composed an elegy on Falakī’s death in which he indicates that his colleague and compatriot died young. His statement, in the same poem, that Falakī was ‘aware of the mysteries of the nine spheres’ (zi rāz i nūh falak āgāh) has been taken as evidence that our poet was a professional astronomer (which would explain his pen-name, Falakī), but it might just as well be nothing more than a word-play on the part of Khāqānī. From his own poems we know that Falakī’s personal name was Muḥammad, that he was imprisoned for a time in the fortress of Shābārān, but was later pardoned and set free by Maʿānīchīr.

Several of his poems contain significant data concerning the history of the Caucasus, the most interesting being a long elegy commiserating with Maʿānīchīr and, in particular, with his consort Thamar, on the death of her brother, the Georgian king Demetre I. According to the Georgian chronicle Demetre died in 375 Georgian (A.D. 1155), having abdicated and retired to a monastery one year earlier. It has not, I think, been noticed that Falakī’s poem confirms this date with a chronogram in the otherwise rather absurd verse (line 64): shak nēst kih tārīkh i wafat-ash khālal 2 ša əb 2 dar qāʿidah i ʿālam u ʿadl i ʿUmar Awurd; the numerical value of the letters in the words from khālal to ʿadl inclusive is 1467, which is

the year of the Seleucid era corresponding to A.D. 1156-7.

The Indian scholar Hādī Ḥasan published his 1929 collection of Falakī’s poems on the basis of the Munich anthology (Cod. or. 279), collated with the selections quoted in various tadḥīkhārāt. Later the same scholar discovered a number of hitherto unknown poems in the Madras manuscript and he published these, together with the new variants to the poems which he had previously edited, in his monograph of 1958. The Tehran edition of Falakī’s so-called dīwān is essentially a reprint of the older of Hādī Ḥasan’s collections. It has not yet been investigated whether the Tehran (Gulistān) manuscript adds anything new to Falakī’s oeuvre.

Mas.: Bologna Biblioteca Universitaria Ms. 3283/I (Piemontese 3. 13th century? Contains one qāṣīdah, the 1st in H.H.’s edition); Munich Cod. or. 279 fol. 93-133 (Amer 18. 17th century?); Tehran Gulistān/Ṭūbābā II 355; Lucknow Sprenger 199 (two copies, one of which was dated 1015/1606-7 and evidently represented an extract from Taqī); Aligarh Subb. p. 34 no. 48; Madras I 195/IV (15 poems).


Sahs p. 392-3; Sharwānī, Nuṣḥat al-majālis (see above, p. 242); Mustaufī p. 743; Jāfarī I p. 144+vi-144+vi, 191-5; Yaghmāʾ I p. 260-3 (both of these quote poem no. X of H.H.’s edition); Dau- lat-shāh p. 103-4; Hādī II p. 287-92 (no. 1386; name misspelt in the edition); Taqī (see London Or. 3506 fol. 500a sqq. = Rieu Suppt. 105; Paris Supplément 799 fol. 214q sqq. = Blochet 1242); Šāhī I p. 198-204; Ṣadīq, Majmaʿ I p. 381-2; Hādī Hasan, Falakī-i-Shirvānī: his times, life, and works, London 1929 (see also his list of mostly un-published tadḥīkhārāt, p. 70-4; review by V. Minorsky, BSOS V, 1928-30, p. 903-10); id., ‘Muḥammad Falakī-i-Shirvānī and his unique dīwān

1See above, p. 248, n. 2.

2See Khāqānī’s dīwān, ed. Sajjadī, p. 918-9 and Hādī Ḥasan’s first monograph, p. 44-5.

3Text (from the Madras Ms.) and translation in Hādī Ḥasan’s Researches, p. 63-7.

4See M. Brossot, Histoire de la Géorgie I (translation of the Georgian chronicle), St. Petersburg 1849, p. 382.

189. Faqīhī Harwazī is credited with four verses in 'Auffī's chapter on the poets of the Seljuqs of Khurāsān. 'Auffī II p. 174-5; Ḥidāyat, Majma'a I p. 381; Khaiyām-pūr p. 452.

190. Farīd al-dīn 'Allī al-Munajjīm al-Sijzī,¹ called Jāsūs al-aflāk, 'he who spies on the spheres', astronomer and poet, was a contemporary of 'Auffī, who states that he himself had been 'in his service', evidently during his short stay in Sistan in the early part of the 7th/13th century. 'Auffī says further that Farīd was the brother of al-Ṣadr al-ajall Naṣīr <al-dīn> al-Sharī'ānī, the wāzīr to the king of Nīmrūd (i.e. the ruler of Sistan), that he had led a dissolute youth, but by the time our author met him he was a pillar of Islam. 'Auffī represents him with a qīt'ah satirising the malābidah (i.e. the Ismā'īlīs) and two rubāfīs.

'Auffī II p. 347-8; Rāzī I p. 295 (no. 306); Khaiyām-pūr p. 446 ('Farīd i Sistānī').

191. Farīd al-dīn al-Kātīb (or, persic, Farīd i dābīr) was a scribe in the Seljuq chancery. 'Auffī quotes a tarjī'-band praising Mas'ūd b. Muḥammad (529/1134 to 547/1152). Žāhīr al-dīn (followed by Rāwāndī and others) quotes a rubā'ī which he composed after Sanjar's defeat at the hands of Qara-Khitay (in 536/1141) and another commenting on the embassy of the Ghazznavī Bahramshah¹ to the Ghurīd Saif al-dīn Sūrī in the year 543/1148-9. Jājarmī (and the Daqā'iq al-asbā'ār) adds a question and answer poem. An ode to 'Farīd i dābīr' is found in the dīwān of Mujīr al-dīn Bāliaqānī.² Daulaat-shāh adds the (questionable) information that Farīd was a pupil of Anwārī. Žāhīr al-dīn Naisābūrī, Saljūq-nāmah, Tehran 1332sh./1953, p. 46-7; Rāwāndī, Rābat al-sudūr, ed. N. Iqbal, Leyden/London 1921, p. 173, 175; 'Auffī I p. 152-4; Sharwānī, Nas'hat al-majalis (see above, p. 242); Daqā'iq al-asbā'ār (Oxford Elliot 37 = Ethé 1333, fol. 184b); Jājarmī II p. 432-4; Daulaat-shāh p. 106-7 (quotes from Mināhāj i Sirāj); Ḥidāyat, Majma'a I p. 377; Browne, History II p. 346; Khaiyām-pūr p. 446-7.

192. Sharaf al-afṣādīl Muḥammad b. Umar al-Farqādī is represented by a number of poems in 'Auffī's anthology, two of them odes to the Ghurīd Ghiyāth al-dīn Muḥammad b. Sām (558/1163 to 599/1203). He is perhaps not identical² with the Farqādī included by 'Abd al-Jalīl Rāzī (ca. 560/1165) in his list of Shiite poets.


¹Both Žāhīr al-dīn (p. 46) and Rāwāndī (p. 175) have, wrongly, 'Mas'ūd'.
³My doubts are fuelled, first, by the early date of 'Abd al-Jalīl's book and, second, by the fact that 'Auffī's Farqādī was the son of a man with the decidedly non-Shīite name 'Umar.
193. al-Ḥakīm ‘Alī b. Muḥammad al-Fathī al-Ghaznawī is included in ‘Aṭīf’s chapter on the poets of Ghaznah and Lahore after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157) where we find a religious qaṣīdah (mutilated in Browne’s manuscript, but a fuller version of it has been published by Nafisī from an unidentified safīnah) as well as two rubā’īs.

‘Aṭīf II p. 413-4 (and the note in Nafisī’s edition, p. 760); Daqāqīq al-ash‘ār (Oxford Elliot 37 = Ethé 1333, fol. 4a); Rāzī I p. 333 (no. 344); Hidāyat, Majmā’ I p. 372 in marg.; id., Riyāḍ p. 228; Khayyām-pūr p. 432.

194. Firdaus Samargandi, the ‘minstrel-girl’ (muṭriḥah), is quoted by Juwainī (followed by Mustaufī) as the author of a rubā’ī congratulating the Khwārazm-shah ‘Alā’ al-dīn Muḥammad on his victory over the Ghorids (in 601/1204).

She is presumably not identical with the ‘Muṭriḥah’ of Kāshghār whose verses bemoaning the death of a certain Tughān-shāh are cited by Khādar.

Juwainī II p. 56; Mustaufī p. 757; Khayyām-pūr p. 440.

195. Ṭabīr al-dīn al-Futūḥī al-Marwāzī was a contemporary and friend of Adīb Sābir, as is evident from the versified compliments exchanged between the two and quoted by ‘Aṭīf. The diwān of Anwari contains a poem2 attacking Futūḥī (at least according to the superscription in the edition; the name does not occur in the actual verses) and in the same diwān we find another poem3 in which Anwari addresses his complaints to a certain king and his minister and a reply1 with the same rhymes which (again according to the superscription) Futūḥī addressed by royal and ministerial command to Anwārī. The same superscriptions identify the addressees of Anwārī’s poem as ‘Malik-shāh’ (III; 547/1152 to 548/1153) and ‘Nīṣām al-mulk’, but the reply supposedly by Futūḥī speaks of fifteen years having passed since the death of Abū 1-Ḥasan ‘Irsānī. The latter was executed by Sanjar in 545/1147-8.2 Futūḥī’s poem must consequently have been composed around 560/1165, at which time there was no king by the name of Malik-shāh. Anwārī’s diwān also contains a ḍiq‘ah3 mocking the town of Balkh but which (again according to the superscription in the printed diwān and to Hidāyat) was in fact written by Futūḥī and maliciously ascribed by him to his rival. Unfortunately the supposedly critical edition by Mudarris i Rīḍwān (who did have a number of very old manuscripts at his disposal) fails to make clear whether the rubrics in question are in fact contained in any of the old copies; the whole question of the relationship between Futūḥī and Anwārī remains thus very much in abeyance.

Hidāyat ascribes to Futūḥī a number of short poems not found in other printed sources and Ṣafā adds five ghazals, again without any indication of their provenance.

‘Aṭīf II p. 148-53; Sharwānī, Nuz‘at al-majā‘lis (see above, p. 242); Rāzī II p. 16-20 (no. 521); Hidāyat, Majmā’ I p. 372-3; Furūzānfar I p. 389-90; ‘A. al-Ḥ. Nawāzī, ‘Anwārī va Futūḥī i shā‘ir’, Yād-gār II/9 p. 70-80; Ṣafā, Tārīkh II p. 688-90; Khayyām-pūr p. 433 (with further references); 1N.S. v. ‘Athīr’ p. 1022-3; Mudarris i

1 Khādar (old edition) p. 343; Khayyām-pūr p. 547; Meier, Māhsūṭī p. 42-3 (with further discussion).
2 Ed. Mudarris i Rīḍwān p. 714.
3 Ibid., p. 752-3.
Rida'i's introduction to his Diwan i Anwar II p. 101.

196. Ghassali Marwazi is known to us only as the author of five verses quoted in 'Auffi's chapter on the poets of the Seljuqs of Khurasan. 'Auffi II p. 163; Khayyam-pur p. 418.

197. One verse by Mujir Ghiyathii is quoted in LF ed. Iqbal p. 248 (Ms. nun in marg.). He is perhaps identical with the Ghiyathii to whom two verses are ascribed in Sibah p. 42.

198. Hamid al-din Taj al-shu'ara' al-Dihistanii is credited with one qis'a in 'Auffi's chapter on the poets of Khurasan after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157).

199. Hamid al-din (i?) Mas'ud b. Sa'd Shali-kob,1 ('rice-pounder'),2 apparently the son of the famous Mas'ud b. Sa'd, is cited by 'Auffi in his chapter on the poets of Gzannah and Lahore after the time of Sanjar where we find a short poem describing a pen, the last part of which is missing in the Ms. available to Browne. Razi, whose copy of 'Auffi was evidently defective in much the same way, ascribes to our poet the verses found in 'Auffi's next entry, that devoted to Ahmad b. Muhammad.3

1Thus 'Auffi. In the Tehran edition of Razi's Haft Igla the name appears as Hamid al-din Mas'ud b. Shali-kob, but the text quotes it from the London Ms. as Hamid al-din Mas'ud b. Sa'd Shali-kob.

2This is to my knowledge the earliest Persian attestation for the Indian loan-word shali (Sankrit shali-), 'unhusked rice'.

3See above, p. 252-3.
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'Auffi II p. 411-2; Razi I p. 344-5 (no. 360); Khayyam-pur p. 173; LN s.vv. 'Hamid al-din' p. 809 and 'Shali-kob' p. 123.

200. Hamid Karunii is quoted by Shams as the author of a poem with alternating Arabic and Persian verses. The same name occurs as the author of a ghazal quoted in Jami's Mu'nis al-ashrur.


201. Haqiqi (thus p. 18, 403) or Haqiqi Sugh1 (p. 84, 305) is quoted four times in LF ed. Iqbal (Ms. nun in marg.).

202. Saiyid Isma'il Ashraf dhul-shahadatayn al-Hasan b. Muhammad al-Husaini1, usually quoted as 'Saiyid Hasan' or 'Saiyid Ashraf', began his career as a eulogist of the Gnazivad Bahram-shah. There are many number of poems in his diwan celebrating that king's battles against his rebellious commander in Lahore, Muhammad b. Ali Bahlal, in 512-3/1119, events to which the poet was an eyewitness. It appears that he compromised himself in some way with the Ghorid conquerors in Gzannah and when Bahram-shah retook his capital in 544/1149-50 Saiyid Hasan felt it safer to depart to Nishapur, where he penned a poem expressing his apologies.

1Thus Rawni p. 187. Abu'l-Hasan Baihaqi calls him al-imam mafkhar al-lisanin ra'is asfild al-sadaq Abu Muhammad al-Hasan b. Muhammad al-Husaini. The anonymous compiler of his diwan calls him Hasan b. Ahmad, which could easily be a misreading for Hasan b. Muhammad. By contrast, 'Auffi (according to Ms. S) calls him Saiyid al-ajall Ashraf al-din Fakhr al-saadat al-Hasan b. Nasir al-Aswani (Ms. E, followed by Browne, has '...Abu l-Hasan'). It is not entirely impossible that both are correct, i.e. that his father Muhammad had the lagab Nasir (al-din). That he was a Husaini saiyyid is confirmed by his diwan p. 26 l. 1: ar pa'i ibn-kih Hasan-nam u husaini-nasib-am ...
and congratulating the king on his victory. In the same year Abū 1-Ḥasan al-Baihaqī met him in Naṣībūr as our poet was getting ready to depart for a pilgrimage to Mecca. On his return from the holy places he entered the service of the Seljuqs; he praised Sanjar1 (who died in 552/1157), wrote an elegy on the death of Ghiyāth al-dīn Mas'ūd II2 (who died in 547/1152) and poems celebrating the coronation of Malik-shāh III3 in 547/1152 and that of Sulaimān b. Muḥammad4 in 555/1160; the latter appears to be the latest date that can be established in his dīwān. He also praised the Khwārizm-shāh Ataṣīz (521/1127 to 551/1156) and the Qarakhanid Maḥmūd II b. Muḥammad, who ruled in Khurāsān until 558/1162-3. The author of the anonymous preface to Saiyid Ḥasan’s dīwān, who collected the poems shortly after the death of their author, says that Ḥasan bequeathed his books to the afore-mentioned Maḥmūd; this would mean that he died at some time between 555/1160 and 558/1162-3. Strangely, his contemporary Abū 1-Ḥasan al-Baihaqī, writing in 555/1160, apparently claims that he had died already in 548/1153-4 in Sarakhs.5 The biographical sources offer also 535, 536 and 565 as dates for his death.

Mas. of his dīwān: Oxford Whinfield 54 (Beeston 2662/6. Dated 9 Rabi‘ II 1012/1603. Selections); London Or. 4514/VI (Rieu Supp. 215. Completed 14 Rabi‘ II 1023/1614); I.O. 932 (=Robinson 146-51); Ms. dated 12 Jumādā II 1038/1629); I.O. 932 (Dated 24 Shawwāl 1069/1659); Or. 1777/I (Rieu p. 999-1000. 19th century? Apparently only extracts); I.O. 931; Paris Supplément 797 fol. lv sqq. (Blochet 19th. 16th century?); Istanbul Nuruosmaniye 3810 (Ateş 53. 16th century?); Tehran Bayānī 56/8 (Nuskhah-hā I p. 16. Dated 995/1587. Selection); Gülistan/Atābāyī II 432/II; Mashhad Rīdā’ī VII 402 (Dated Muḥarram 1012/1603); Rīdā’ī VII 741/2 (Ms. dated 10 Rabi‘ II 1055/1645); Tashkent Acad. II 783 (Dated 1289/1869-3); Acad. I 784 (Dated 1270/1853-4). Cf. Munz. III 22713-24.


He also wrote a Tarjamat waṣīyat amīr al-muʾminīn ‘Allī b. Abī Ṭālib, one hundred Arabic sayings ascribed to ‘Allī, each translated by a Persian verse, dedicated to Masʿūd b. Muḥammad b. Malik-Shāh.

Mss.: Vienna Flügel 121/4 (Copied by Ismā’il b. ‘Allī al-Kāshī and dated 7 Jumādā I 753/1352. Wrongly ascribed to Waṭṭāṭ in the catalogue); Istanbul Universite FY 1356 (Ateş 54. 16th century?). It would not be surprising if other copies supposedly of Waṭṭāṭ’s Sad kalimah eventually revealed themselves to contain this work.

Abū 1-Ḥasan al-Baihaqī (Ibn Funduq, Lubāb al-albān; Ḥāwānī, Ḥabat al-ṣūdūr, ed. M. Iqbāl, London 1921, passim; ‘Auṣf I I p. 270-6; Shams passim (quoted once as ‘Ṣayyid Ashraf’, otherwise as ‘Ṣayyid Ḥasan i Ghaznavī’); Daqiqīg al-ashʾar (Oxford Elliot 37 = Ethē 1333, passim); Mustauffī p. 727-8; Jāفارī I I p. 202-4; Daulat-shāh p. 104-6; Rāzī I I p. 318-24 (no. 335); Taqī (quoted in

1Bā wandī p. 193 = dīwān p. 49-52.
5Thus according to Mudarris i Rīdawī, p. xxxix.
6Robinson’s entry creates the erroneous impression that this copy contains poems by two authors, ‘Ḥasan ‘Aznawī (sic) and ‘Ṣayyid Ḥasan’. The true situation is made clear in Ethē’s description.

Unpublished. An extract from the chapter on the saiyida of Ghaznah from a Ms. in the Ateş i quds i Rīdawī in is in part quoted, in part paraphrased in Persian in a piecemeal fashion, by Mudarris i Rīdawī, p. x, xxx, xxxix of his introduction.
the difference between our ‘Hasan Mutakallim’ and ‘Saliy Müsam al-Naisaburi’, a gha‘al of whose he quotes on p. 1074.


204. Gādī Hīshām1 (or: Hujaim2) is known only from Ibn Isfandīyar (writing in 613/1216-7), who enumerates him among the holy men of Tabaristān and then proceeds to quote a long macaronic poem, that is to say a farcical composition in Persian, but with a large admixture of Arabic and pseudo-Arabic (i.e. Persian words with Arabic case-endings pinned on to them), beginning: ai ba farhang u ‘ilm daryā‘u * laisa mā-rā ba juz tu hamtā‘u.

Ibn Isfandīyar, Tarikh i Tabaristān, ed. ‘A. Iqbāl, Tehran 1320sh./1941, I p. 131-5 (the poem is also in Browne’s epito, p. 81-5, with variants); Hīdāyat, Majma‘ I p. 465 (quoting Ibn Isfandīyar); Khayyām-pūr p. 629 (‘Hujaim i Axuml’).

205. A du-baitī by al-Ḥusām al-Kirmānī - of whom I have found no other mention - is quoted in the Ta‘rīkh al-mustabsir of Ibn al-Mujawir, ed. Löfgren, p. 84. With the help of the accompanying Arabic translation the corrupt text can be emended as follows:

guṭṭā: rukh i tu chī-st? gul i surkh? yāsmīn?
guṭtā: gul-e st rēktāh bar barg i yāsmīn
guṭtā *kh: shakkar ast labān i tu *yā ‘aqīq?
guṭtā *kh: shakkar ast u ‘aqīq-e na az *yāsmīn
(I said: ‘What is your cheek? A red rose? Jasmine?’ He/she said: ‘It is a rose spread out on a

1The shamsī date is given in the journal as ‘1312’, evidently in error.

2Jājarmī II p. 640 l. 5.

jasmine leaf.' I said: 'Are your lips sugar or carnelian?' He/she said: 'They are sugar and a carnelian, but not the sort that comes from the Yemen.'  

206. al-Sayyid al-aajall Kamāl al-dīn Iftikhār al-Bujjāb al-Ḥusayn al-Ḥasanī al-Nāǰib is known to us only from 'Auffī, who says that he flourished at the court of 'ṣūlān i shahīd', i.e. the last Ghiznavid Khusraw-Malik (555/1160 to 582/1186), and who quotes a poem in which he addressed 'Abd al-Rāfi' al-Marwānī.  

'Auffī II p. 413; Khaiyām-pūrin p. 145.

207. 'Imādī, or as 'Auffī also calls him, Ustād al-a'immaḥ 'Imād al-dīn al-Ghaznavī, was attached to the court of the rulers of Māzandarān, the land to the south of the Caspian Sea. The greatest part of his surviving poems is dedicated to one Saif al-dīn 'Imād al-daulah Farāmarz; this can hardly be anyone other than the Bawandid prince Farāmarz b. Rustām, who was one of the rivals for the control of Māzandarān after the death of his grand-father (or great-grand-father) Ḥusayn al-daulah Shahryār in ca. 508/1114-5 and who is reported to have submitted to the authority of his (great-)uncle 'Alā' al-daulah 'Ali in 511/1117 or shortly afterwards. It would appear that 'Imādī 

\[\text{1The Arabic translation has '... īlā al-agāq alladhī min (bad variant: fī) al-yaman' and adds the evidently spurious gloss: 'ai al-akān alladhī yusamāq 'aqiq al-yaman'. I take it that the 'Yaman' required by the rhyme is used here in the meaning 'Yaman' (which is what the printed text has instead of it).}

\[\text{2For whom see above, p. 243.}

\[\text{3For these dates see Elr s.v. 'Al-e Bāvand' (W. Made-}

luq) and for the identity of 'Imādī's patron see the important article by Qaswānī cited in our bibliography. M. S. \text{Israel}i argued (against Qaswānī) that the patron was one 'Imād al-dīn Farāmarz b. Mardawī, of Gurğān, but at the time in question Māzandarān means Tabaristān, not Gurğān.}
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served 'Ali as well, for Ibn Isfandiyār implies that 'Imādī addressed his poem to the atabeg 'Abd al-Rahmān Ṭughān-yūrek at the time when the latter had fled from Ardaqūl and taken refuge at the court of 'Alā' al-daulah 'Ali; the verse which the historian cites in this context comes from a tarkīb-band quoted in its entirety in the old anthology published by Yaghmā'.  

'Imādī also addressed a number of poems to the Seljuq Rukn al-dīn Toghhrīl (II) b. Muhammad (526/1132 to 529/1134), two of which are quoted in extenso by Rāwandī, who states unambiguously that they are by the same 'Imādī who otherwise eulogised the shāh i Māzandarān. One of these poems can also be found in 'Auffī. There is thus no justification for the claim by Taqī Kāshī, and others since, that there were two 'Imādīs, one at Ghaznah ('Auffī's 'Imād al-dīn Ghaznavī, alias 'Imādī) and the other in Māzandarān (supposedly called 'Imādī Shahryārī).

Abū l-Rajā' Qummī quotes from two odes by 'Imād Ghaznavī (as he calls him once), or 'Imādī (as he calls him on two other occasions) in praise of Gīvān al-dīn, who was Toghhrīl's minister until 528/1133-4, one of them in imitation of an ode to the same minister by Sañī'. The same source mentions also 'Imādī's step-son (pisar-khwāndah) by the name of Ṣadīq.

A poem by Abū l-'Alā' Ganjašī dedicated to the Sharwān-shāh Mānqūšh II, who died not long after 585/1160 (and in any case before 566/1167), speaks explicitly of the death of 'Imādī (chu shud

\[\text{1This seems the most likely reading of the Turkish name ('falcon-heart'), despite the fact that Ibn Isfandiyār (and some others) omit the -n- (probably by haplography). This 'Abd al-Rahmān was executed by order of Sultan Mas'ud in 541/1147; see Qaswānī, Yed-baht-hā VI p. 26 and C.E. Bosworth in \textit{CHI V} p. 126, 132 (with further references).}

\[\text{2Bāvandī p. 210-2 = 'Auffī II p. 262-4.}

\[\text{3See above, p. 248-9.}
ruwān i 'Imādī ...'); thus the dates given for 'Imādī's death by Taqī (573/1177-8) and Aḍhar (582/1186-7) are too late. Rieu (and others since) thought that the words 'shāh Jahān-pahlāwān' which occur in one of the odes in the London manuscript refer to the Ejdūgūzd atabeg of Azerbaijan of that name (who ruled from 517/1115 to 528/1186), but here they are evidently not a name, but the epithet of some other ruler.


L.F. ed. Igbāl p. 249 (one verse by 'Imādī 'Azīzī - read Ghaznavī? - in Ms. nūn in marg.); Abū l-Raḥīm Qumī, Tārīkh al-wuzurā'ī, ed. M.T. Dānnish-pazhūh, Tehran 1363sh./1985, p. 10, 18, 121-2; Rāwandi, Rāhat al-sūdūr p. 57, 209, 210-4, 372; Ibn Ishāfyār, Tārīkh i Tabarestān, ed. 'A. Iqābī, Tehran 1320sh./1941, I p. 107 (=Browne's epitome p. 59); 'Auff II p. 257-67 (and the notes in Naftaši's edition, p. 722-8); Shams passim; Jājarī II p. 615-8, 1108-9; Yaghīānī I p. 103-12 (five poems by 'Imādī i Ghaznavi'); Shāh p. 308 (one verse by 'Imādī i Ghaznavi'); Rāzī III p. 23-31 (no. 1069); Taqī (see London Or. 3050 fol. 449b sqq. = Rieu Supp. 105; Paris Supplément 799 fol. 252v sqq. = Blochet 1242); Aḍhar II p. 574-80, III p. 1093-7; Hīdāyat, Majmaʾ i p. 380-2; Ḥāfī Ḥasan, Falakī-i-Shirwānī, London 1929, p. 96; M. Gawkin, 'Mamduh i 'Imādī' in his Fīṣīṣ mağālah II, 2nd edition, Tehran 1332sh./1953, p. 343-54; Saʿfā, Tārīkh II p. 743-50; M.S. Israeli, 'Imādi: his life, times and works', Islamic Culture XXXIV, 1960, p. 176-94 (contains a list of his patrons, but several of them have been wrongly identified); Khayyām-pūr p. 407; LN s.v. 'Imādī i Shahryārī' p. 300; E.F. s.v. 'Imādī' (M.S. Israeli); E.F. Supp. s.v. 'Imādī' (J.T.P. de Bruijn).

208. Two verses by Abū l-'Abbās (Bul-'Abbās) Imāmī are quoted by Shams, p. 207.

209. Tāj al-dīn Ismā'īl al-Bākharzī is included by 'Auff (on whom all the other sources listed below are entirely dependent) among the poets of the Seljugs of Khurāsān. His entry includes two ghazals and a number of rubāʾīyāt, among the latter a elegy on the death of Abū l-Hasan Talbāh.1

'Aff I I p. 156-9; Sharwānī, Nuṣ'hat al-majālās (see above, p. 242); Rażī II p. 168-9 (no. 656); Saʿfā, Tārīkh II p. 692-4; Khayyām-pūr p. 40; LN s.v. 'Tāj al-dīn' p. 72-3.

210. Ṣakīn Jalālī (or Ḥalālī)3 is included in 'Auff's section on the poets in Transoxania during the Seljuk period, where we are told that he wrote satirical verses in the vein of Sōzānī but at the end of his life turned his hand to 'serious' poetry. As a sample of the latter our informant quotes some verses from a 'famous qāṣīdah and one rubāʾī'.

Furūzānfar, followed by Saʿfā, maintained that the 'khar i khum-khānah' ('ass of the wine-shop') who is the victim of so many of Sōzānī's satires and who, if we are to believe Sōzānī, was a Christian, is to be identified with 'Auff's Ṣakīn Jalālī; the basis for this is a verse in one of

1For whom see no. 304.

2Thus the first words of 'Auff's entry. In both the Mss. available to Browne the correct heading for the article is missing, having been replaced by that of the previous entry: '...Šoṣanī'.

3Thus Ms. S.
these satires which Fūrūzānfar quoted as: ḥamah saudā-šā ṣār-ḵīn naqš ku nad * ba Jalālī ḥarīdah i alogāb. But the now available printed dīwān of Sūzandi has in the verse in question not Jalālī, but Jalab-ō; compare Jalab at the end of the previous verse. This reading certainly seems to make better sense, but even with Jalālī the verse is hardly unambiguous.

'Auffī, II p. 196-9; Fūrūzānfar I p. 228 n. 1; LN s.v. Jalālī i Mā-warā'-a-nahrī' p. 72; Ṣafā, Ṭārīkh II p. 623.

211. al-Īmām al-ajall Jalāl al-dīn malik al-kalām Fāḍl Allāh al-Khuwārī (Khuwar is a village near Rai) is the subject of an entry in 'Auffī's chapter on the amateur poets of 'Īraq, where we find, among other things, an ode of eleven verses which, still according to 'Auffī, he addressed to Sultan Tekish (the Khwārazm-shāh) at the time when his troops were outside the gates of Rai (i.e., evidently in 588/1192). Zakarīya al-Qazwīnī quotes a slightly different version of the same poem, gives its author the same name (al-Jalāl al-Khuwārī), but says that the verses were addressed to Tekish's opponent, the Seliqur Toghriil (III) b. Arslān, when he had drawn up his troops outside Rai. Jalāl al-dīn, we are told, went to the sultan together with Ṣadqr al-dīn al-Mawsān to complain of the damage that the king's horses were doing to the crop; after listening to the verses Toghriil ordered his men to leave the fields alone.

Daulat-shāh tells (on the authority of the supposed Ṭārīkh i īl i Saljūq of Abū Ṭāhir Khā-

1 Ed. Shāh-Husainī p. 12, last verse; in the other Ms. used by the editor the verse is missing altogether. Despite this, the editor (on p. 20 of his introduction) maintains the equation of 'khar i khum-khamal' with Jalālī Jalālī; but offers no arguments to support it.

2 (Zakarīya?) 2-13 = 'Auffī' 1-3; 2.4 is not in 'A.; 2.5 = 'A.8; 2.6 = 'A.11.
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tūnī) exactly the same story about a poet's successful intercession with a king on behalf of the peasants and quotes five verses of which the last two are virtually identical with the last two in Zakarīya's version, but he gives the name of the poet as Abū l-Mafakhir Rāzī and that of the king as Mas'ūd b. Muhammad b. Malik-shāh (529/1134 to 547/1152), and says that the incident took place 'at the time when he set out from Māzandarān.' The reference to Māzandarān seems meaningless in connection with Mas'ūd, but fits in with 'Auffī's version: Tekish did in fact approach Rai from Māzandarān.

Qazwīnī drew attention to the similarity between the verses which 'Auffī ascribes to Jalāl al-dīn and those which Daulat-shāh gives to Abū l-Mafakhir and suspected that Jalāl al-dīn plagiarised the earlier poet; unfortunately he seems to have overlooked the parallel passage in Zakarīya. In the light of the latter it now seems more likely that Daulat-shāh (or his supposed source) has garbled both the name of the poet and that of the king and, moreover, in quoting the verses off the top of his head, has re-composed the first three of them.

I can find no reference to a poet by the name of Abū l-Mafakhir Rāzī before Daulat-shāh. This article is an attempt to explain his attribution of these verses to Abū l-Mafakhir as the result of a confusion between the two patriots.

1 For which see below, no. 225 ( Kháītūnī).

2 I suppose that this is what 'ba waqt i 'asūmat i Māzandarān' means.

3 Barbier de Meynard, Dictionnaire géographique, historique et littéraire de la Perse, Paris 1861, p. 213 n. 1 says (apparently on the authority of Mustaufī's Muṣ'ābat al-qulūb, but I have failed to find this information in that book) that the village of Khuwar was the birth-place of two poets, Malik al-kalām Fāḍl Allāh, who flourished at the time of Tekish, and Abū l-Mafakhir, who lived at the time of the Seljuq Mas'ūd. If this information is in fact contained in a source anterior to Daulat-shāh it would be easy to explain his attribution of these verses to Abū l-Mafakhir as the result of a confusion between the two patriots.
authority states also (this time without reference to Khāṭīnī) that the same Abū l-Mafākhir composed ‘several’ odes in praise of the Shiite Imam ‘Allāl al-Ridā and proceeds to quote the first verse of one of these (beginning bāl i muraššā ...). More or less extended versions of this poem are quoted by later sources, but in some of these the poem is attributed to Fakhr al-dīn Rāzī. In at least one version it ends with a verse in which the author gives his name as ‘Mafākhir’ or, perhaps better, ‘Mufākhir’.

See (for Jalāl al-dīn): ‘Afī I p. 276-8 (and Qazwīnī ad loc.); Sharwānī, Nuz'hat al-majālis (see above, p. 242); Zakarīyā’ al-Qazwīnī, Khatūr al-bilād, ed. Wüstenfeld, Göttingen 1848, p. 243-4; Rāzī III p. 32-3 (no. 1071); Khayyām-pūr p. 132; and (for Abū l-Mafākhir): Daulat-shāh p. 76-7; Rāzī III p. 33-4 (no. 1072); Ādhar III p. 1101-6 (and Nāširī’s notes, with further information on the ode to ‘Allāl al-Ridā); Hīdīyāt, Majma’ I p. 376 (‘Fakhīrī i Rāzī’); LN s.v. ‘Abū l-Mafākhir’ p. 857; Khayyām-pūr p. 24 (‘Abū l-Mafākhir’) and 425  (‘Fakhīrī’).

213. Jamāl al-dīn Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-İṣfahānī,1 the father of Kamāl al-dīn,2 flourished in Isfahan during the second half of the 6th/12th century. ‘Afī seems to imply that he was by profession a goldsmith and in one of his own verses Jamāl speaks of how the clouds and the wind, in two seasons, are always like me: in spring the one is a painter and in autumn the other a goldsmith,3 though it could be that here zar-gar means not ‘goldsmith’ but ‘illuminator of manuscripts’ (Arabic mudahhīb), or indeed that the verse is merely a metaphorical allusion to its author’s poetic prowess. If our poet was indeed a painter of miniatures it is then possible (though hardly certain) that he is identical with the ‘Jamāl i naqqāsh i Isfahānī’ who, according to Rāwandī, illustrated a book of poetry for Sultan Toghrīl III b. Arslān in 581/1184-5.4

1The name is quoted thus by Rāwandī (p. 33); similarly ‘Afī and Shams, who call him Jamāl al-dīn (or Jamāl Muhammad) (‘Abd al-Razzāq. The evidence of these three independent early sources (Rāwandī was a contemporary of the poet) clearly outweighs that of Ibn al-Fuwātī (see the references below, p. 354) who refers to our poet’s son an Kamāl al-dīn Abū l-Fadl Ismā'īl b. Abī Muhammad ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-İṣfahānī. Zakarīyā’ al-Qazwīnī, like many others after him, calls our poet Jamāl (al-dīn) ‘Abd al-Razzāq and Ādhar even expressly states that his given name was ‘Abd al-Razzāq, but this only reflects the fact that from about the middle of the 13th century readers were no longer familiar with the use of the kāsrāh i ǧārāsh to indicate filiation.

2For whom see below, no. 217.

3Dastgīrī, p. 335, 1. 3: tā chu man bāshānd abr u bād dā' i dar du fašl * dar rabi' I in naqş-bānd-ū, dar khasān an zar-gar-ū.

4Rāwandī p. 57. What speaks against the identity of the two is the fact that when Rāwandī quotes Jamāl’s poetry he refers to him not as ‘Jamāl i naqqāsh’ but with the names cited above. There is a poem in Jamāl’s dJVān (p. 255) addressing ‘Jamāl i naqqāsh’ (thus in the third verse), but is not really clear whether it is by our poet (as M. Iqbāl maintained in his notes to Rāwandī, p. 477), or rather directed to him (as Dastgīrī claims in his introduction, p. vii-ix). Sharwānī’s Nuz’hat al-majālis apparently quotes...
Janālī's Dīwān contains a small number of odes to the Seljukus Arslān (556/1161 to 571/1176) and Toghril III (571/1176 to 590/1194), and a larger number to the Bāvarid ruler of Māzandarān, Ḥusām al-dīn Ardashīr b. Ḥasan (560/1165 to 568/1173), but most of his poems eulogise local dignitaries of Isfahan. In Jamālī's lifetime, and in that of his son, the political and religious life in that town was dominated by the bitter and often bloody rivalry of the Ḥasanīs (led by the Āl i Sā'id) and the Shāfī'īs (led by the Banū l-Khuja'ī). The largest number of Jamālī's odes are addressed to the Ḥasanī ġāḏas Rūkhn al-dīn Mas'ūd and his son Rūkhn al-dīn Sā'id. We know from the Dīwān of Kamāl al-dīn that Jamālī died before Sā'id and the latter lived perhaps until 600/1203-4.¹ But Jamālī also served the rival Shāfī'ī faction: his Dīwān contains a good number of poems addressing one 'Ṣadr al-dīn', but without personal names, making it difficult to say which one of the Shāfī'īs 'Ṣadr is intended.² There is also an elegy on the death of one Jamāl al-dīn Māhmūd,³ who, if the text is correct, is presumably Jamāl al-dīn Māhmūd b. 'Abd al-Latīf al-Khuja'ī, who died after (but probably not long after) 551/1156.¹

The Dīwān contains poems which Jamālī sent to his colleagues Khāqānī,⁴ Muṣīr Bālaqaqānī,⁵ and Wātāq.⁶ Taqī Kāshī⁷ puts our poet's death in 586/1192, which seems possible, but, like virtually all the dates in Taqī's book, is quite likely to be without foundation.

Mss.: London Or. 2880/IV (Rieu Suppl. 224. Complet ed Jumādā I 1245/1829); Paris Supplément 735 (Bouchet 1321. 16th century?); Supplément 783 fol. 7r sqq. (Bouchet 181. 16th century? Selections); Istanbul Ayasofya 2051/12 (Mikrūfīlm-hā I p. 409-10. Ms. apparently dated Shawwāl 730/1330); Tehran Aṣghar Mahdawi 113/III (Nuskhāh-hā II p. 95. Dated 1006/1597-8); Adabīyāt II 156/II (Dated Dhū l-qa’dah 1007/1599); Baṣārī 11 (Nuskhāh-hā I p. 9. 16th century?); Millī (Nuskhāh-hā IV p. 196. Copied by Muḥammad b. Mullā-ārī Ḥusaynī and dated Dhū l-bi‘ajah 1010/1602); Lucknow Sprenger 295; Madras I 195/II (Selections). Cf. Munz. III 2224-68,

Editions: Tehran [1318h./1939] (ed. Adīb Nāshābūrī); 1320h./1941 (ed. W. Dastgūrī); reprinted 1362h./1983.

Rāwandī, Rāḥat al-pudūr, ed. M. Iqbal, London 1921 (see the index); 'Afu'f II p. 402-4; Shams p. 206, 372-8; Zakariyā, b. Muḥammad al-Qazwīnī, Šāhīr al-bilād, ed. Wüstenfeld, Göttingen 1848, p. 197; Mustafīf p. 724; Dāqiq al-šāhīr (Oxford Eilott 37 = Ethē 1333, fol. 12b, 27b, 142b); Jā-jāmī I p. 46-9, 79-80; Daulat-shāh p. 141-8; Rāzī

¹See below no. 227. But we must await a critical edition of Jamālī's Dīwān before ruling out the possibility that the poem really commemorates Māhmūd's younger relative Jamāl al-dīn Mas'ūd.
²P. 85-8.
³P. 124-8.
⁴P. 146-8.
⁵Apud Sprenger p. 16 no. 29.
with the Jauhari whom 'Arúdí includes among the poets of the Qarakhanids.

'Arúdí p. 28; 'Aufí II p. 208-9; Rází III p. 354-6 (no. 1427); L.N. s.v. 'Hamíd al-dín' p. 808; Khiyân-pûr p. 141.

215. Kâfî (i) Abû l-Faraj al-Rûnî, evidently the son of the celebrated Abû l-Faraj al-Rûnî is
given as the author of two fragments quoted by 'Aufí in his chapter on the poets of Western

imitating the same Arabic models.) Daulat-shâh quotes the
first of the two poems cited by Jâjârî, but adds that its
author was a pupil of Abû Šâbir and a contemporary of Abî
Abd Allâh Tabrizî who in fact refers at some length to Mahsâtî in
the commentary to his own Qasîdah haulyânah. But Meier was hardly
right to suggest that there were two poets who both used the
name 'Jauhari i zar-gar', one at the time of Farrukhzâd and
the other a century later at the time of Sulaimân-shâh; the
poems quoted by 'Aufí and by Jâjârî are evidently all by
one and the same poet. See 'Aufí II p. 110-7; Jâjârî I
p. 85-6, 147-9; Daulat-shâh p. 118-21; Rází III p. 423-4
(no. 1481); Hidâyat, 'Ma'jâ' I p. 184-5 (new edition I
p. 504-6, and Muâffâ's notes); Safâ, Târîkh II p. 438-43;
Meier, Mahsûtî p. 60-1; Khiyân-pûr p. 141.

1For whom see below, no. 275.
Persia during the Seljuq period, one of them addressed to Latif Zakhi Maraghi.1

'Amuí II p. 238 (and the notes in Na'iri's edition p. 707-8); Hidâyat, Majma' I p. 481; Kha'iym-pur p. 481.

216. Jamäl al-din Na'îrî i Shams, known as Kâfirak i Ghasznî ('the little heathen of Ghasnah') is the author of ten satirical verses quoted by 'Amuí in his chapter on the poets of Ghasnah and Lahore at the time of the Seljuqs.

'Amuí II p. 297; Râzî I p. 333 (no. 345); Hidâyat, Majma' I p. 485; Kha'iym-pur p. 480.

217. Kamâl al-dîn Ismâ'îl b. Jamâl al-dîn Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Razzaq al-Isfahâni,2 also called Khallâq al-ma'ârî, succeeded his father first of all as the eulogist of the Hâfiz qâdi Rûkn al-dîn Sâ'id b. Mas'ûd. One of his odes to this worthy contains the date Ramadân 585/11893 and must consequently be one of his earliest compositions. In another qâjîdah directed to the same patron he recalls the services of his deceased father and gives his own age 'not more than twenty'4 and in yet another he bewails the death of Rûkn al-dîn Sâ'id and congratulates his son Rûkn al-dîn Mas'ûd on his succession as qâdi. This poem appears to imply that the events in question occurred in the year 600/1203-4,5 though the convoluted phrasing and the roundness of the number both suggest that we should use this information with caution. The poems to Sâ'id and Mas'ûd together make up by far the greatest part of the Dîwân. However, like his father, Kamâl also directed a small number of poems to the leaders of the rival Shâfi'i faction, which in Kamâl's lifetime was led by Sadr al-dîn 'Umar al-Khujandi, who presumably took over the leadership of the Shâfi'is after the death of Sadr al-dîn Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Latif in 592/1196.6 He also sent one poem to the leader of the twelve Shiites in Qum, Ra'i and Amul, 'Izz al-dîn Ya'bû b. Muhammad al-Shâri'i al-Murtadâ.7

There is one poem to the Khâvarzam-shâh 'Ali al-dîn Tekish, who defeated the Seljuqs in 590/1194 and became the effective overlord of Isfahan, and one to his successor Jalâl al-dîn Meng-burni2 (617/1220 to 628/1231). The Dîwân also includes poems to one of the Bâwandid kings of Mâzandarân, to two of the Salghurids of Fârs, Sa'd b. Zangî (601/1203 to 628/1231) and his successor Abû Bakr, and others. He exchanged poems with Aṭhîr al-dîn Aumânî3 and is himself the addressee of an Arabic letter from the well-known mystic al-Suhrawardî.4

Ibn al-Fuwaṭî says that Kamâl al-dîn was martyred by the Tartars in Isfahan in the year 636; Daulat-shâh specifies that it was on 2 Jumâdâ I of that year (i.e. December 1237, two years after the fall of Isfahan to the Mongols) and tells an elaborate story of how Kamâl was living as a sufi outside the town, how the Mongols

1See below, no. 227.

2This poem is quoted also by Juvainî II p. 165-6 and contains the king's much discussed Turkish name in a verse the metre of which is at least reconcilable with the still most plausible reading 'Meng-burnî' (from maw, 'mole', and burnu, 'nose'): jâlîl i dunüyâ u dîn Meng-burnî ân shhâ-f kîh Izâd-ash ba sazâ kard bar jâhân sultân. The reading #Meng-Tinî recently proposed by P. Jackson (Iran XXVII, 1980, p. 45 and 51 n. 1) does not fit the metre and rests, moreover, on an untenable argument involving the name of an entirely different person.

3For whom see below, chap. IV.

4Published in Bahr al-'ulûmi's introduction, p. ix-x.
tried to force him to reveal the location of treasures hidden by the townfolk and thereby tortured him to death. If Kamāl really died some time after the Mongol invasion he must have completed his dīwān before the cataclysm, for there seem to be no allusions to it in the poems.

Apart from the panegyrics, which constitute the largest portion of his dīwān, Kamāl also wrote a good number of poems of religious inspiration. We also have a short treatise in Arabic, Risālat al-ghus.1

1Ms. of his dīwān (in some copies styled Kulliyāt): 2Dublin Beatty 103/I (Ms. completed Dhū l-hijjah 699/1300. End missing); Beatty 337 (16th century? Defective. Presumably Bahr al-‘ulūmī’s chīh-bā‘, ‘124 pp.’); Manchester Lindesiana 217 (Dated 1029/1620); Oxford Elliot 66 (Ethē 639. Dated 12 Muharram 981/1573); Elliot 68 (Ethē 641. Dated Dhū l-qa‘dah 1000/1592. Lacunae); Elliot 65 (Ethē 638. Dated Jumādā I 1023/1614); Elliot 229 (Ethē 640); Elliot 69 (Ethē 642); Elliot 67 (Ethē 643); London I. O. 1055 (Copied by Sultan ‘Ali Mashhādī in 905/1499-1500); Or. 473 (Rieu p. 580-1. Dated Rabī‘ II 1007/1598); Add. 18,414 (Rieu p. 581. Dated Ramadān 1029/1620); Add. 7092 (Rieu p. 581. Dated Shawwāl 1036/1627); I. O. 1056 (Dated 27 Dhū l-qa‘dah 1036/1627); Add. 7748 (Rieu p. 581. 17th century? First page missing); I. O. 1057; Cambridge Browne Coll. V.9 (‘The spelling as well as the writing is archaic’); Christ’s, Dd.3.4 (Browne Suppt. 601); King’s, No. 171 (Browne Suppt. 602); Paris Supplément 795 fol. 78v sqq. (Blochet 1969. Dated 29 Dhū l-qa‘dah 848/1445); Supplément 1821 (Blochet 1323. 16th century?); Supplément 1117 (Blochet 1324. Dated 28 Jumādā I 1010/1601); Supplément 1312 (Blochet 1325. 17th century? Pictures); Parma Bibli. Palatina Ms. 2789 (Piemontese 239. Copied by Mīrzā ‘Abd al-Latif. 16th century?); Hamburg Orient. 232 (Brockelmann 162. Dated 15 Muharram 1025 /1616); Halle D.M.G. 26 (Dated 999/1590-1); Berlin Sprenger 1427 (Pertsch 762. ‘Old and correct’ according to Spr.); Leningrad Dorn CCCLX; Dorn CCCLX fol. 1-425; Acad. A 1240 (Index 1613); Acad. C 77 (Index 1614); Konya İzzet Koyunoğlu Kitabevanesi (Mikrūfīm-hā I p. 97. Copied by ‘Ali b. Husain Mashhādī and dated 17 Dhū l-qa‘dah 682 /1283. Bahr al-‘ulūmī’s ‘ain’); Istanbul ‘İsmâ‘îl Şâ‘ib’ (7) 3775 (Mikrūfīm-hā I p. 449. Anthology dated 27 Jumādā II 681/1282); Bağdatlı Vehbi 1758 (Mikrūfīm-hā I p. 97. 13th century? Bahr al-‘ulūmī’s kaf‘); Ayasofya 2051/14 (Mikrūfīm-hā I p. 409-10. Ms. apparently dated Shawwāl 730/1330); Türk ve islam Eserleri Müzesi 1950/3,9 (olim Fatih 3753. Ritter-Reinert p. 244-5. Ms. copied by Manṣūr b. Muḥammad b. Waraqah Bihbāhānī and dated Muharram 801/1398); Topkapı, Ahmet III 2488 (Karatay 502. Copied by Muḥammad Pirdübākī and dated Rajab 866/1462); Universiteit FY 768 (olim Halis Efendi 4061. Ateş 151. Dated Ramadān 992/1584); Universiteit FY 59 (Ateş 152. 16th century?); Universiteit FY 1464 (Ateş 154. Dated 3 Ramadān 1081 /1671); Tehran Malik 5246 (Muns. 25503. 13th century?); Bayānī 59 (Muskah-hā I p. 17. 13th century? The marginalia - in a second hand - are dated 988/1580. These two Ms. are presumably Bahr al-‘ulūmī’s Jām and Mīm); Majlis 4029 (Muns. 25506. Dated 17 Shab‘ān 721/1321. Bahr al-‘ulūmī’s Mīm- jīm); Gulistān/Āṭabāy II 314 (Copied by Muḥammad b. Ḵālid al-Īṣfahānī and dated 1 Shawwāl 722 /1322. First 23 pages added later); Majlis III 1049 (With the possibly forged date 725/1325); Gulistān/Āṭabāy II 315 (Copied by Ḫusain b. ‘Ali century?); Supplier 891. Dated 22 Dhū l-qa‘dah 381/1664); Paris Supplément 795 fol. 78v sqq. (Blochet 1969. Dated 29 Dhū l-qa‘dah 848/1445); Supplément 1821 (Blochet 1323. 16th century?); Supplement 1117 (Blochet 1324. Dated 28 Jumādā I 1010/1601); Supplement 1312 (Blochet 1325. 17th century? Pictures); Parma Bibli. Palatina Ms. 2789 (Piemontese 239. Copied by Mīrzā ‘Abd al-Latif. 16th century?); Hamburg Orient. 232 (Brockelmann 162. Dated 15 Muharram 1025 /1616); Halle D.M.G. 26 (Dated 999/1590-1); Berlin Sprenger 1427 (Pertsch 762. ‘Old and correct’ according to Spr.); Leningrad Dorn CCCLX; Dorn CCCLX fol. 1-425; Acad. A 1240 (Index 1613); Acad. C 77 (Index 1614); Konya İzzet Koyunoğlu Kitabevanesi (Mikrūfīm-hā I p. 97. Copied by ‘Ali b. Husain Mashhādī and dated 17 Dhū l-qa‘dah 682 /1283. Bahr al-‘ulūmī’s ‘ain’); Istanbul ‘İsmâ‘îl Şâ‘ib’ (7) 3775 (Mikrūfīm-hā I p. 449. Anthology dated 27 Jumādā II 681/1282); Bağdatlı Vehbi 1758 (Mikrūfīm-hā I p. 97. 13th century? Bahr al-‘ulūmī’s kaf‘); Ayasofya 2051/14 (Mikrūfīm-hā I p. 409-10. Ms. apparently dated Shawwāl 730/1330); Türk ve islam Eserleri Müzesi 1950/3,9 (olim Fatih 3753. Ritter-Reinert p. 244-5. Ms. copied by Manṣūr b. Muḥammad b. Waraqah Bihbāhānī and dated Muharram 801/1398); Topkapı, Ahmet III 2488 (Karatay 502. Copied by Muḥammad Pirdübākī and dated Rajab 866/1462); Universiteit FY 768 (olim Halis Efendi 4061. Ateş 151. Dated Ramadān 992/1584); Universiteit FY 59 (Ateş 152. 16th century?); Universiteit FY 1464 (Ateş 154. Dated 3 Ramadān 1081 /1671); Tehran Malik 5246 (Muns. 25503. 13th century?); Bayānī 59 (Muskah-hā I p. 17. 13th century? The marginalia - in a second hand - are dated 988/1580. These two Ms. are presumably Bahr al-‘ulūmī’s Jām and Mīm); Majlis 4029 (Muns. 25506. Dated 17 Shab‘ān 721/1321. Bahr al-‘ulūmī’s Mīm- jīm); Gulistān/Āṭabāy II 314 (Copied by Muḥammad b. Ḵālid al-Īṣfahānī and dated 1 Shawwāl 722 /1322. First 23 pages added later); Majlis III 1049 (With the possibly forged date 725/1325); Gulistān/Āṭabāy II 315 (Copied by Ḫusain b. ‘Ali
b. Muḥammad al-Ṭabīb and dated 14 Shawwāl 732 (1332); Sīpāh-sālār II 1255 (15th century?); Univ. XV 5121 (Copied by ʿAlī Dargāhī and dated 8 Rabīʿ I 975/1567); Sīpāh-sālār II 1256 (16th century?); Majlis III 1050 (Copied by Muḥammad Mihr Ghāzī and dated 1012/1603-4); Bayānī 17 (Nuskhāhā I p. 10, 16th century?); Majlis II 380 (Dated 1015/1606-7); Gulistān/Āṭābāy II 316 (Copied by Ḍabd al-Ghanī Jāmī Lankarī and dated Jumādā I 1021 /1112); Majlis II 379 (Dated 1036/1626-7); Sīpāh-sālār II 1254 (Dated 1071/1660-1); Gulistān/Āṭābāy II 436/II (not before 16th century); Gulistān/Āṭābāy II 317-9; etc. Nashḥād Rīḍāwī VII 523 (Dated 1 Šaʿābān 1019/1610); Bombay Rehatsek p. 142 no. 60 (Dated 9/1578); Rehatsek p. 162 no. 125 (Dated 1024/1615); Lucknow Sprenger 306; Bankipore I 54 (15th century?); I 55 (16th century?); Has a seal dated 1044/1634-5); Hyderabad Āqāfīyāh I p. 746 no. 246 (Dated 991/1583); Aligarh Subb. Ms. p. 37 no. 5 (Dated 992/1584); Calcutta Iванов 488 (18th century?); Bāḥār 304 (18th century?). Cf. Muns. III 25500-63.

Editions: Bombay 1307/1889-90 (‘Kuliyyāt’);

Translations (English): The hundred love songs of Kamāl ad-dīn of Isfahān (i.e. his quatrains), 'translated' by L.H. Gray and 'done into English verse' by E.W. Mumford, London 1903.

Shams passim; Juwainī II 153, 165-7; III 20; Zakariyāʾ b. Muḥammad al-Qazwīnī, ʿĀṭār al-bilād, ed. Wüstenfeld, Göttingen 1848, p. 197; Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, Majnūn al-ʿāḏāb fi muʿjam al-ʿalğāb, in OCM Suppl. to vol. XV/4, 1939, p. 14-50; Mustaʿfī p. 746; Daqīq al-ṣaḥār (Oxford Elliot 37 = Ethé 1333, passim); Jājarmī passim; Jāmī, Bahārīsānī; Daulat-shāh p. 148-54; Rāzī II p. 373-83 (no. 870); ʿĀṭār III p. 980; Hīdāyat, Majnūn I p. 489-94; id., Riyād p. 229-30; H. Masūrūr, 'Sharḥ i bāl i Kamālū l-dīn Ismāʿīlī i Isfahānī', Armaghān VII, 1308sh./1926, p. 19-23, 104-17, 301-12; 'A. Ibīlī,


218. Al-Imām al-Qāsim Kamāl al-dīn Ziyād al-Isfahānī is quoted by ‘Auфи in his chapter on the poeticising clerics, where we find a poem of religious content (quoted also, with some variants, by Jājarmī) and two rubāʾīs. Quatrains of his are cited also by Abū l-Raǰāʾ al-Qumānī and (apparently) by Sharwānī.


219. Bahāʾ al-dīn al-Karīm al-Samarqandī is included by ‘Aufinity in his chapter on the poets of Transoxania after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157) where we are told that, though a native of Samarqand, he entered the service of the ruler of Sīstān, Malik Shams al-dīn (evidently Shams al-dīn Muḥammad – or Ahmad – b. Tāj al-dīn Naғr,

1Thus ‘Aufinity, Hīdāyat gives his name as Bahāʾ al-dīn ‘Abd al-Karīm.
559/1164 to 564/1169). 'Auffi has also poems dedicated to one Qâdî Isfarâ'înî and to a personage whom the poet addresses as Malik al-
sâdah Niğm al-dîn Shâh.

'Auffi II p. 367-71; Râzî III p. 361-2 (no. 1430; follows 'Auffi); Hidâyat, Najmâ' I p. 481-2 (has one poem not in 'Auffi); Khâiyâm-pûr p. 485.

220. Abû l-Ha'fl 'Umar b. Ibâhîm al-Khâiyâmî, also (and perhaps wrongly) called Khâiyâmî,

Identification proposed by C.E. Bosworth, in litteris. The name is cited thus on three occasions by his contemporary al-Khâznî and is probably correct, although the kurnah Abû l-Ha'f is not mentioned by any other source (in the manuscripts of some of his treatises the kurnah appears rather as Abû l-Fath). His father's name (Ibâhîm) is mentioned also by Ibn Funduq and Ibn al-Athîr. Both Ibn Funduq and 'Arûdî give him the Jaqub Hajjat al-haçiq. 

In it (al)-Khâiyâmî or (al)-Khâiyâmî? The former is used in most of the early sources both in Arabic (al-Khâznî, al-Zamakhshari, Ibn al-Athîr) and in Persian ('Arûdî); compare also the verse by Khâznî (Dîvan, ed. Sa'îdî, p. 58) mentioning 'Umar i Khâiyâmî. But 'Umar al-Khâyiâmî is found often enough to make it difficult (though not, perhaps, impossible) to dismiss it as a mere graphic error, thus in Mas. of al-Kâtib, Fakhir al-dîn al-Kâzî, Ibn al-Qîfîz, Zakariyâ' al-Qawwâlnî; in the Mas. of Ibn Funduq (and those dependent on him) 'al-Khâiyâmî and 'al-Khâiyâmî both occur (see p. 97 l. 2; p. 110 l. 10; p. 112 l. 1; p. 117 l. 6; p. 119 l. 6; p. 126 l. 10; p. 163 l. 3 of the Arabic section, with the critical apparatus; according to my collation London Or. 9033 always has 'al-Khâiyâmî' except in the passage corresponding to p. 117 of the edition, where it too has 'al-Khâiyâmî'). It is tempting to speculate that 'Khâiyâmî' ('tent-maker') was the nick-name of a more or less remote ancestor and that his progeny consequently bore the 'nisbah al-Khâyiâmî; the usual Persian form 'Umar i Khâyiâmî would then mean not 'Umar the tent-maker' but 'Umar the son (i.e. descendant) of the tent-maker', while the Arabic 'Umar al-Khâyiâmî' would represent a misunderstanding of the ambiguous Persian form. M.M. Tabâtabâî has argued that we should distinguish between the scientist Khâyiâmî and the (Persian and Arabic) poet Khâyiâm, but the sources do not bear this out. Even more untenable is Tabâtabâî's attempt to identify the author of the rubû'iyât with one 'Alî al-dîn 'Ali b. Muhammâd b. Ahmad b. Khâlîf al-Khûrânî al-

the celebrated astronomer and mathematician, and reputed author of a large number of Persian rubû'iyât. The facts of his life and scientific achievement are well attested through his own writings (in Arabic) and the testimony of his contemporaries (al-Khâznî, al-Zamakhshari, Ibn Funduq, 'Arûdî) and of other early historical and biographical sources. Ibn Funduq, who, still a child, was presented by his father to Khâyiâmî in 507/1113-4, tells us, among other things, that 'Umar, his father and his ancestors were natives of Naisabûr and quotes his horoscope, from which it has been calculated that 'Umar was born on 18 May 1048 (which would correspond to a date in Dîh l-qâ'dah or Dîh l-hijjah 439). 'Arûdî, who met Khâyiâmî in 506/1112-3 in Balkh, states that he made a pilgrimage to the master's grave in Naisabûr in 530/1135-6, 'four years' (thus in the best manuscript; the others have 'some years') after his death; if the former reading is accepted it can be concluded that 'Umar died in 526/1131-2.

Ibn Funduq tells us further that 'Umar enjoyed the intimacy of the Qârakhânîd Shams al-mulûk

au'jâs al-alâqâb, ed. M. Jawâd, Damascus 1962-7, no. 1571) says that 'he wrote a dîvan in Persian and his poems are many and famous in Khûrân and Azerbaijan. Of the verses which I have translated [nagâhât can hardly mean anything else] from his handiwork are these' (there follow two verses in Arabic). (In his foot-note the Arab editor also expresses the opinion that 'Allî, and not the scientist 'Umar, is the 'famous poet'.) This 'Allî b. Muhammâd appears to be otherwise unknown. The verses quoted are of the usual sort of homoerotic taghâzul and have no affinity either with the 'Khâiyâmî' quatrains or with the (in my judgement) authentic Arabic poems of Khâyiâmî.

For the supposed letter from Sanâ'î to 'Umar seen de Bruijn, Of piety and poetry, Leyden 1983, p. 77-8, with further literature. Even if the letter were to be accepted at face value it would still add nothing to what we know about Khâyiâmî.
(i.e. Naṣr I b. Ibrāhīm, 460/1068 to 472/1080) and the Seljuq Malik-shāh I (465/1072 to 485/1092), but that Sanjar disliked him. The same author says also that Khāiyāmī was of bad character and mean spirit (na'īs) al-khaluq wa dāyi'iq al-ṣātān). Ibn al-Athīr says that 'Umar b. Ibrāhīm al-Khāiyāmī, Abū ʿl-Muṣaffar al-Isfīzarī (who was with 'Umar when 'Arūḏī met him) and Maimūn b. al-Najīb al-Wāsītī were among the 'leading astronomers' whom Malik-shāh employed to set up an astronomical observatory (raṣād) in 467/1074-5. 2 'Arūḏī tells an anecdote about 'Umar's services as an astrologer to the king' (i.e. evidently Muḥammad I b. Malik-shāh) in 508/1114-5.

Several of 'Umar's scientific and philosophical writings survive and have been published and translated into several European languages, the most important being his treatise on algebra (Risālah fī l-bārāhīn 'alā masāʾil al-jabr wa ʿal-muqābilah) which the competent specialists regard as a major landmark in the history of mathematics.

1 Evidently a scribal error for Abū ʿl-Hātim al-Muṣaffar, for whom see PL II p. 446-7 (with further references).
2 In his entry for that year Ibn al-Athīr refers to two events of astronomical interest: first the calendar reform which fixed Nau-rūz to the point where the sun enters Aries and second the establishment of the observatory; Khāiyāmī and the others are mentioned only in connection with the second of these. The fact that he mentions the two events in succession is evidently the sole basis for the claim by later authors that Khāiyāmī was involved in (or indeed the principal architect of) the reform of the calendar. But Ibn al-Athīr does not actually say this. Moreover, it is well known that the Jalālī era does not begin in 471/1075 but in 471/1079 (15 March); from the fact that the observatory was built in 467 Ibn al-Athīr has evidently wrongly extrapolated the conclusion that the calendar reform was effected in the same year.
3 They are most conveniently accessible in the edition (fascicules from Ms.) and Russian translation by R.A. Rosenfeld & A.P. Yushkevich, 'Qāmār Khāiyāmī, Traktāţī, Moscow 1961.

But his interests ranged also over other fields. The famous grammarian al-Zamakhšārī reports on a discussion that he had with Khāiyāmī on a moot point of Arabic lexicography and Ibn Funduq tells an anecdote about 'Umar’s intervention in a scholarly debate about variant readings of the Qur’an.

Two treatises in Persian prose have been published as the work of Khāiyāmī, but both are of very questionable authenticity. One, the Naurūz-nāmah 1 was published by Mīnūwī on the basis of a single manuscript in Berlin. There is, however, a second, shorter, copy of the work in London 2 and in this manuscript the introductory section, and with it the attribution to Khāiyāmī, is missing. The book, which is clearly not the work of a professional astronomer, is written from the standpoint of a Persian chauvinism of which there seems to be no trace in Khāiyāmī’s authentic writings. The other is a little and quite elementary compendium on philosophy titled either Risālah fī kulliyat al-wujūd or Sīsilat al-tartībī, 3 and which appears to claim 'Umar’s authorship in all the recorded copies. Its first section gives the impression of having been copied from some Ismā‘īlī theosophical tract (it expounds the theory of the ‘ten intelligences’), but at the end the compiler tries to cover his traces by quoting (without attribution) the well-known passage from al-Ghazālī’s al-Munqidh min al-dalāl in which the

1 Edited from the Berlin Ms. by M. Mīnūwī, Tehran 1933, and reprinted several times. A fascicule of the Ms. and a Russian translation can be found in Rosenfeld’/ Yushkevich.
3 Published in Rosenfeld’/ Yushkevich p. 108-15 of the Arabic/Persian section and also in Yaghaṭī p. 35-42, with variants from the Hyderabad edition of 1941. There is a French translation by A. Christensen, ‘Un traité de métaphysique de ‘Umar Ḫayyām’, Le Monde Oriental (Uppsala) I, 1906, p. 1-16.
author declares that the road to truth has been
found neither by the speculative theologians
(mutakallimun), nor by the philosophers, nor by
the I mam ‘Ilis, but only by Sufis.

Like many Persian intellectuals of his time,
Khaiyami dabbled in Arabic poetry and some samples
of his verses in that language are quoted by al-
Kattib al-Isfahani, Ibn al-Qifti, the unidenti-
fied author of the ‘appendix’ (al-Risalah al-mul-
baqah) 2 to Ibn Funduq’s ‘continuation’ (Yatimma)
to al-Sijistani’s Siwan al-Bikhah, and finally by
al-Shahrazuri. 3 Ibn al-Qifti (likewise apparently
al-Kattib) quotes four verses from a poem with a
double rhyme in -ṣid and the two other sources
quote six verses from the same poem (of which
three overlap with Ibn al-Qifti, giving us a total
of seven verses) and add four verses from another
poem with a double rhyme in -ṣiri. In using this
highly unusual rhyming technique ‘Umar was doubt-
less consciously copying the famous luzumiyat of
Abu l-‘Ala’ al-Ma‘arrisi. The imagery at least in
the second one of these poems is in fact rather like

1His Khairdat al-qasr is not accessible to me, but from
the secondary literature one gains the impression that he
quotes the same four verses as Ibn al-Qifti.

2For this work see D.M. Dunlop’s introduction to his
edition of The Muntakhab Siwan al-Dikhah of Abu Sulaiman al-
Sijistani, The Hague (etc.) 1979, p. xxiv-xxv, followed by
an account of the manuscripts. I have worked with London Or.
9033 (not in the published catalogues), where the Risalah occupies fol.
129c to 149b and the section on al-Khaiyami is on fol.
144b-145a. The Risalah obviously predates 639/1241,
the date of the oldest Ms. (Istanbul Murat Mula 1408).

3al-Shahrazuri quotes some (not all) of the verses found
in al-Risalah al-mulbaqah, on which he is evidently depend-
ent. The verses contained in the last three sources are
quoted (not always correctly) and translated in A.S.
 Tritton, ‘Umar Khayyam as an Arabic poet’, BSOS XXVII,
1964, pp. 451-3, evidently in total ignorance of the
previous literature on the subject.

1Compare, for example, Khaiyami’s:
asghu mina l-fahshah i jaharn wa khayyam
‘afzan wa l-fahshah mi taqzini fahshah
’(‘I fast from vile conduct abstaining both publicly
and secretly and my fast-breaking is to bless my creator’),
with Ma‘arrisi’s much finer line (Lusum ma la yazam, ed. ‘Azz
Zandi, Cairo 1891-2, I p. 262):
aqar qam taka l-hayati wa innasu
fahshah wa yaum dhaka ‘u ‘ayyidu
(‘I am fasting for the whole of my life and only death
will be my fast-breaking; on that day I shall celebrate my
feast’).

A good number of authors have quite rightly drawn
attention to parallels between the content of the ruba‘iyat
and that of Ma‘arrisi’s Lusumiyat. Whoever wrote:
but-ka‘nah u ke‘bah ka‘nah i bandagi ast,
nagul sadan tartahah i bandagi ast,
sunnur u kalisiya u tambuh u qalib
baqtan ki hams nishahah i bandagi ast.

(‘The idol-temple and the Ka‘bah are houses of bondage.
Beating the wooden bell [of the Christians] is the song of
bondage. The girdle, the synagogue, the prayer-beads and the
cross, in truth all of them are signs of bondage’) could
hardly have been ignorant of Ma‘arrisi’s notorious verses
(Lusum ma la yazam II p. 201):
hafat al-humfat wa l-na‘srāt haddat
wa yahdū bi hārat wa l-na‘srāt madallalah,
ithnāni ahu l-arjd dhā ‘aqil bi-l-
dinn wa ikharu dayioun lā ‘aqila lāh
(‘The true believers are in error, the Christians are
not on the right path, Judaeus is confused, the Magians are
led astray. The people of the earth are of two kinds: the
one with reason but without religion, the other religious
but devoid of reason.’) But this similarity is in itself no
argument for the attribution of the ruba‘iyat to Khaiyami.

What the author (or authors) of the ruba‘iyat have in common
with Ma‘arrisi is their clear rejection of Islamic orthodoxy.
But at the same time the hedonism of the ruba‘iyat contrasts
very strongly with the austere asceticism and moralism
of Ma‘arrisi’s outlook.

Ma‘arrisi’s, despite the fact that the decidedly
religious tone of Khaiyami’s piece contrasts
strikingly with the scepticism which runs through
Ma‘arrisi’s work (and also the Persian ruba‘iyat
ascribed to Khaiyami). One has thus the impres-
sion that in his Arabic poems Khayyāmī imitated Maʿarrī’s poetic technique, but did not emulate his unorthodox ideas.

al-Risālah al-sulḥqah (followed by al-Shahrāzūrī) adds a few more qīṭʿahs with ordinary (single) rhymes; one of these, however, is quoted already by al-Thaʿalībī (who died two decades before Khayyāmī was born) and ascribed by him to Abū Sahl al-Nīṣīrī. Even if this attribution is not necessarily correct the verses are in any case older than Khayyāmī.

None of the 12th-century sources say anything to suggest that ʿUmar wrote poetry in Persian. ʿArūḍī, who has a lot to say about Khayyāmī the astrologer, makes no reference to him in his chapter on Persian poetry, and even in the 13th century he remains unknown to ʿAuffī and Shams. It is particularly striking that ʿAuffī, who not only anthologised virtually all of the Persian professional poets down to his own time, but also really scraped the bottom of the barrel to immortalise the largest possible number of amateur rhymesters, has absolutely nothing to say about him. However, a small number of Persian quatrains are ascribed to ʿUmar in works by some of ʿAuffī’s contemporaries. Thus, one Persian rubāʿī by ʿIbn al-Khayyām, or, as another manuscript has it, ʿUmar al-Khayyām, is quoted in an Arabic treatise by Fakhr al-dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1209-10). Then the mystic Najm al-dīn Dāyāh, writing (in ca. 619/1222) of how many a miserable philosopher, atheist (dahrī) and materialist (ṭābīʿī) denies the resurrection, singles out ‘one of the most distinguished of them’, ʿUmar i Khayyām, and quotes two quatrains ridiculing the Muslim belief

A few more are added by Jājamī in the 14th century. The earliest substantial manuscripts of the rubāʿīyya ascribed to Khayyām belong to the 15th century and in 867/1462-3 Yār-Abād b. Ḥusayn Rashīdī Tabrīzī put together a collection of 554 rubāʿīyya with the title ʿTarāb-ḵānah. In some later manuscripts the number of quatrains is even greater.

It is accepted now, I should think, by everyone that the great majority of the quatrains that have come to be ascribed to ʿUmar could not possibly be his. To begin with, a good number of them have been attributed to other authors as well. Moreover the language, style and content of the poems show them to be the product of different periods and authors. It is clear that by the 15th century at the latest the name of the famous philosopher and scientist had become a collective pseudonym for authors of rubāʿīyya, especially those of hedonistic, fatalistic and more or less overtly anti-Islamic content, in the same way that that of Abū Saʿīd b. Abī l-Khāir had become the point of crystallization for a whole corpus of mystical quatrains. In the Mongol period ʿKhayyām is no longer a historical person but a genre. It must be said that we have to do with an important genre and one that says much about the intellectual climate in those times.

To be sure, some of the quatrains are doubtless of considerable antiquity. Five of the rubāʿīyya that are eventually attributed to ʿUmar

---

1 The verses 11-3 of Tritton’s collection correspond to the first, second and last lines of the four-verse qīṭʿah quoted in Thaʿalībī, Ẓafīmah IV p. 399, 1. 5-8. See also Qazwīnī’s edition of ʿArūḍī, p. 214 note 1.

2 For this date see above, p. 242.
are already quoted (anonymously) in Zahirī’s *Sindbād-nāmah*, a book written some 30 years after ‘Umar’s death. This does not prove that they are his, but it does show that they were in circulation during ‘Umar’s lifetime, or shortly afterwards. It is also clear that a certain number of quatrains were explicitly attributed to ‘Umar within a century of his death. Of course, it is not impossible that ‘Umar did compose the odd poem in Persian (though they cannot have been many) and that at least some of those quoted by 13th and 14th-century authors really are his, but as long as it is not possible to say when and under what circumstances the mythicization of ‘Umar began it remains quite plausible that this process was already under way by the early part of the 13th century and that consequently none of the *rubā’iyāt* are authentic.

It is tempting to think that the mythical ‘Umar first emerged in a novel, perhaps involving (among other motives) the famous anachronistic story of how the philosopher ‘Umar i Khayyām, the minister Niẓām al-mulk and the leader of the ‘Assassins’ Ḥasan b. al-Ṣabbāḥ had been friends as school-boys and then set out, each in his own way, to make his mark in the world. Of the three protagonists the scholar ‘Umar is intrinsically the least colourful and thus the one most in need of amplification. In the light of the general stereotyped view in the Islamic world of the philosopher as the enemy of religion and morals ‘Umar could very conveniently have been built up into an atheistic bogey. This hypothetical romance, like all such works in Persian (compare *Sindbād-nāmah*, *Marvbān-nāmah*, *Kalīlah u Dimnah*, etc.), would have been adorned with a rich collection of interspersed *rubā’iyāt* and other poetic snippets, in part composed by the author, in part salvaged from other works, and readers could consequently easily have come to the conclusion that these verses were the actual words of the characters in the novel. A parallel to this would be, once again, Abū Sa‘īd, who very soon was declared the author of the quatrains quoted in the romantic accounts of his holy deeds (and this despite the fact that the authors of the earliest such accounts expressly denied that Abū Sa‘īd was a poet) and much the same thing could well have happened with Maḥṣatī as well.

The existence of such a novel, say towards the end of the 12th century, would explain for one thing the relatively consistent style, content and quality of the oldest stratum of ‘Khayyāmic’ quatrains; these quatrains reflect the taste of the unknown author. Literati knew that they had to do with a work of fiction and did not confuse the fictionalised characters in the novel with their historic prototypes. Less discerning readers failed to make this distinction. With time the historical ‘Umar falls into oblivion and his romanticised double slips into his shoes.

This is not the place to discuss Edward FitzGerald’s famous poem *Rubā’iyāt of Omar Khayyām* of 1859, which belongs to the history of English and not of Persian literature. We should not, however, fail to mention that the immense popularity of FitzGerald’s creation played a decisive role in instigating a large amount of scholarly interest in the *rubā’iyāt* or that the fascination of the West for these little poems rubbed off with time in Persia as well. ‘Khayyām’ exerted a tremendous

---

1Zahirī p. 33, 39, 157, 284, 340 (one verse).

2See in particular A.J. Arberry, *The romance of the Rubā’iyat*, London 1959. The older printings of FitzGerald’s poems are listed below. For the relationship between this poem and the Persian sources see the meticulous study by Heron-Allen (below, under Editions: London 1899).
influence on such major figures of 20th century Persian literature as Šādiq Hidāyat and his name continues to be invoked with passion in the ideological debates that have so shaken the country in the present century.\footnote{Cf. R. Gelpke. Die iranische Prosaliteratur im 20. Jahrhundert I, Wiesbaden 1962 p. 21-37.}

The serious study of Khayyāmī and the rubā‘īyat begins with Zhukovskiy’s article on the ‘wandering quatrains’ from 1897; it was here for the first time that the possibility was discussed that some of these poems might not really be the work of the famous scientist. During the first half of the present century research was dominated by attempts at a critical philological analysis of the manuscripts of the rubā‘īyat (Christansen, Csillik, Remps), but these attempts remained largely fruitless due to the relative lateness and general unreliability of all the manuscripts. By contrast, some Iranian scholars (notably Fūrūghī and Dashti) left the manuscripts largely out of consideration and attempted to assemble a small corpus of ‘authentic’ quatrains from those quoted by 13th and 14th-century authorities. These researches led to interesting results, but suffer from an insufficiently critical approach to the sources. After the Second World War work was diverted for a few decades by the appearance of two quite cleverly forged manuscripts in Dublin and Cambridge which led many scholars to believe that the true Khaiyām had at long last come to light. Major contributions to unmasking these forgeries came from Minuwī, Minorsky and Humā‘ī. As for the present, it would seem doubtful whether we have really come very much beyond the position expressed in Schaedler’s famous dictum of 1934 that the name of ‘Umar i Khaiyām is one which ‘is to be struck out from the history of Persian literature’.

\footnote{Mas., many in private collections in India and elsewhere, are listed in chronological order in the appendix to Remps’s book from 1935 (see below: Translations, German). Only a small sample has been reproduced here.}
15 Jumādā II 934/1528. 175 quatrains; Supplément 1481 (Blochet 1211. 16th century? 34 quatrains. Pictures); Supplément 793 fol. 104r sqq. (Blochet 1984. 16th century?); Supplément 1366 fol. 393 sqq. (Blochet 1993. Ms. contains dates between 1009/1600 and 1010/1602); Supplément 1458 (Blochet 1212. Dated 1268/1651-2. 95 quatrains); Gotha 9/14 (Ms. dated 5 Rabī‘ I 1131/1721); Berlin Ms. or. fol. 246/49 (Pertsch 674. Ms. contains a note dated 1796. 380 quatrains); Bratislava 579; Vienna Flügel 645 fol. 249r-253v (Ms. dated 855 /1451-2); Flügel 507 (Dated 15 Jumādā II 957 /1550); Leningrad Acad. B 2290 (Index 1717. Dated 991/1583); Acad. C 112 fol. 292a-314a (Index 1718. Dated 1060/1650); Acad. A 877 (Index 1715. Dated 1097/1685-6); Acad. A 67 fol. 73b-104a (Index 1714. Dated 1204/1789-90); Acad. A 18 (Index 1713. Apparently dated 1221/1806-7); Acad. B 253 (Index 1716); also Acad. (Index) 1721-4; Istanbul Ayasofya 2032 fol. 194b-206b (Rempis p. 180. Anthology dated 861/1456-7); Nuruosmaniye 3892 fol. 1b-66b (Ateş 22. Dated 865/1460-1); Esat 882/2 (Mikrûfil-hâ I p. 497. Dated 19 Dhū l-qa‘dah 876 /1472); Topkapi, Mehatat Reşat 541 (Karataş 389. Copied by Hamid Allah Shākh-zādah. 15th century?); Topkapi, Hazine 811 (Karataş 388. Copied by Ali-al-jusaini and dated 924/1518. One picture signed by Bihzād); Nuruosmaniye 4904/33 (Ateş 23. Dated 940/1533-4); Nuruosmaniye 3894/2 (Ateş 24. 16th century?); Topkapi, Hazine 1093 fol. 75b sqq. (Karataş 894); Tehran Asghar Mahdawi 589 in marg. (Nuskhah-hâ II p. 71-2. Dated 1 Rajab 821/1417); Majlis 8421/3 (Munz. 29984. In an anthology dated 868/1463-4); Gulistan/Atābābāy I 194 (15th century? Copied by Sultan ‘Ali al-Mashhadāi; etc. Tashkent Acad. II 766-780; Dushanbe Acad. II 337 (15th-16th century?); Acad. II 338-342 (5 late copies); Pakistan [(see Munz. Pak. VII p. 22-24 for various copies in Lahore, Karachi etc., the oldest dated 12 Sha‘bān 975/1568); Bombay Rehatsek p. 149 no. 78; Bankapore I 16 (16th century?); Suppt. i 1971 (Dated 21 Dhū l-qa‘dah 1139/1727); Suppt. i 1804 (19th century); Lucknow Sprenger 324; an anthology in the Guri Praṣāda Saksena dated 826/1423, with 206 quatrains ascribed to Kh., is mentioned by Rempis; Calcutta Nadī Collection (Dated 911 /1656; see the facsimile edition by M. Mehfuz-ul-Haq. Calcutta 1939); Princeton 6 (Copied by Faraj Ali al-Jaffīq and dated 868/1463-4). Cf. Munz. IV 29980-30061.}


Editions of the quatrains: [Calcutta] 1252 /1836 (492 quatrains); Tehran 1274/1857 (230 quatrains, followed by others ascribed to Bābā Tāhir, ‘Aṭṭār and Inṣāf, and two tarjīfs ascribed to Shams i Tabrīz and to Nāṣir i Khusraw); 1274/1857 (454 quatrains, again followed by Bābā Tāhir etc.); 1278/1861 (460 quatrains); 1279/1862 (The Munājāt ascribed to Āsārī, followed by quatrains supposedly by Abū Sa‘īd, Bābā Tāhir and Khayyām); 1313/1895 (128 pages, with Bābā Tāhir etc.); 1318 /1900; 1321-2/1904 (129 pages. Contains quatrains ascribed to Khayyām, Bābā Tāhir and various other
poems); 1341/1922 (396 quatrains); 1342/1923 (selection of 201 quatrains by S. Hidāyat); 1342 /1923 (ed. M. Ramađânī), reprinted with pictures 1315sh./1926; 1305sh./1926 (ed. S. Naftīnī, 445 quatrains), reprinted 1306sh./1928; 1306sh./1927 (364 quatrains), reprinted 1307sh./1928, 1308sh./ 1929; 1310sh./1931 (Les rubaiyat d’Omar Khayyam. Texte persan et traduction en vers français par A.G. Eťessam-Zadeh [Abū 1-Qāsim I’tisām-žādah], with a Persian introduction by S. Naffīnī. I’tisām-žādah’s translation was reprinted in Paris, 1934); 1313sh./1934 (Tārānah-hā i Khaiyām, ed. S. Hidā yat. Pictures); 1321sh./1942 (ed. M. ‘A. Furūghī and Q. Ghanī); 1338sh./1959-60 (Kullīyyāt i ṣāhīr i pārī i ḥākīm ‘Umar i Khaiyām, ed. M. ‘Abbāsī from the forged Cambridge Ms.; contains also the Persian prose writings ascribed to Kh. and an extensive essay); 1348sh./1969 (Quatrains Khayyamiens. Nouvelle traduction ... accompagnée du texte persan par Mahdy Foulavand [Fūlāvānd]); 1971 (The Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam. A new translation in verse by Abbas Aryanpur-Kashani and Manoocehr Aryanpur, with the Persian text and pictures); and many more, some multilingual, and many with pictures generally in the worst possible taste; Paris 1867 (Les quatrains de Khèyam, [édités et] traduits du persan par J.B. Nicolas. 464 quatrains, based on the Tehran edition of 1278); 1983 (Omar Khayyam Quatrains, Hafiz Ballades, introduction et choix de poèmes traduits du Persan par Vincent Monteill; with the Persian text); Tabriz 1285/1968-9 (453 quatrains); Lucknow 1285/1968 (716 quatrains), reprinted 1287/1970; 1295/1978 (with notes. 763 quatrains), reprinted 1298/1880 (763 quatrains); 1300/1882 (764 quatrains); 1301/1883 (762 quatrains); 1312/1894 (770 quatrains); 1322 /1904; 1342/1924 (described as 7th edition); Calcutta 1870 (ed. H. Blochmann. 62 quatrains); 1939 (The Rubā‘iyāt of ‘Umar-i-Khayyām. Persian text edited from a manuscript dated 911 A.H. (1605 A.D.) in the collection of Professor S. Naṣīb Ashraf Naḍवī with a facsimile of the manuscript by M. Naḥfuz-ul-Haq); Muradabad 1291/1874 (87 quatrains); Bombay 1296/1878 (756 quatrains, with others ascribed to Bābā Tāhir etc.), reprinted 1297/1879, 1298/1880; 1308/1890 (The same 756 quatrains ascribed to Khaiyām, plus Bābā Tāhir, Abū Sa‘īd and Anṣārī, together with the latter’s Munājāt) reprinted 1309/1891; 1311/1893; 1312 /1894; 1320/1902 (140 pages, with Bābā Tāhir etc.); 1321/1903 (751 quatrains); 1324/1906 (120 pages, with Bābā Tāhir etc.); London 1883 (The Quatrains of Omar Khayyām. The Persian text with an English verse translation by E.H. Whinfield. 500 quatrains, mainly after Nicolas), 2nd edition 1901 (508 quatrains); 1899 (The Rubā‘iyāt of Omar Khayyām, being a facsimile of the manuscript in the Bodleian Library ... with a transcript into modern Persian characters, translated with an introduction and notes, and a bibliography, by E. Heron-Allen. 158 quatrains), second enlarged edition the same year; 1899 (Edward Fitzgerald’s Rubā‘iyāt of Omar Khayyām with their original Persian sources collated from his own MSS., and literally translated by Edward Heron-Allen); 1928 (The Quatrains of ‘Omar-i-Khayyām. Persian text taken from the two newly discovered oldest manuscripts with an English prose version by F. Rosen. Printed Berlin); 1931 (... The Persian text with paraphrase, and the first and fourth editions of Fitzgerald’s translation by Brigadier-General E.H. Rodwell); 1949 (The Quatrains of Omar Khayyam. Ed. and trans. by A.J. Arberry from the forged Chester Beatty Ms.); St. Petersburg 1888 (based on the edition Tabriz 1285); Hyderabad 1893; Constantinople 1319/1901 (Dīwān i Shāhī bā Naṣīb i ḥadrat i Luqān wa Rubā‘iyāt i ‘Umar i Khaiyām, 755 in number, followed also by rubā‘iyāt ascribed to Bābā Tāhir), reprinted 1324/1906, 1326/1908; 1332 /1914 (with a Turkish translation by ‘Abd Allāh
Jaudat [Cevdet], 531 quatrains, reprinted with pictures 1926; 1340/1922 (With Turkish translation and introduction by Hüseini Danış. Pictures), reprinted 1340/1927; [Worcester, Mass.] 1907 (Edward Fitzgerald's Rubāʿiyāt of Omar Khayyām. With a Persian text, a transliteration and a close prose and verse translation by Eben Francis Thompson); Amritsar 1325/1907 (914 quatrains, with an introduction in Urdu by Imām al-dīn); Delhi 1910 (Rubāʿiyāt of Omar Khayyām. Part I. Qafrīl-nāmāh. Commentary by Hafiz Anwar Ali Siddiqi...); Lahore 1923 (Urdu introduction by Shaikh Allāh-bakhsh); 1924 (Ka’s al-kirām ya’ārī sharb i rubāʿiyāt ... Persian text with an Urdu commentary by Mīr Wālī Allāh); [1934] (Maʿī-khānāh i Khaiyām. With a metrical Urdu translation by Qizilbaš Dihlawī); 1353/1934 (Maʿī-khānāh i Khaiyām. With an Urdu paraphrase and commentary by M. Māhmūd Shāhdānī); Isfahan 1343/1925; Berlin 1304sh./1925 (The Quatrains of the learned ‘Omar-i-Khaiyām, ed. F. Rosen; cf. London 1928); 2nd edition 1928; Damascus 1926 (ed. Ahmad al-Sāfī al-Najafī); Copenhagen 1927 (Critical studies in the Rubāʿiyāt of ‘Umar-i-Khayyām. A revised text with English translation by A. Christensen); Baghdad 1928 (With Arabic translations in prose and verse by Jamīl ʿīdī al-Zahāwī), reprinted 1928; 1350/1931 (‘Umar al-Khaiyām, ‘āṣrūh, sīrātuh ..., with introduction and literal Arabic translation by Ahmad ʿAbīdī al-Sar-rāf); 2nd edition 1949 (reviewed by H. Ritter, Oriens III, 1950, p. 157-8); Khairpur 1930 (Rubāʿiyāt i khum-kadah i Khaiyām. With a Sindhi verse translation by Mīr ʿAlī-nawāz Khān, called ʿAḳīm Līsān al-Ghāib); Allahabad [ca. 1930] (With Urdu introduction, literal translation and notes by Jalāl al-dīn Ahmad Jaʿfari); 1933 (with a preface in Urdu by Mahēshprasad); Damascus 1350/1931 (With Arabic verse translation by Ahmad al-Sāfī al-Najafī and introductory notes by M. al-Qaswīnī and Adīb al-Taqī); Szeged 1933 (Les manuscrits mineurs des Rubāʿiyāt de ’Omar Khayyām dans la Bibliothèque Nationale. Textes originaux ... publiés avec une introduction écrite en langue hongroise et un abrégé français par Dr. Barthélemy Csilliki); London/Szeged 1934 (The principal manuscripts of the Rubāʿiyāt of ’Umar-i-Khayyām in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. Volume 1 ... Transcribed and edited with introductory notes by Dr. B. Cs. No more published); Azamgarh 1933 (Khaiyām sur us-kē sawānīb u tašānīf par nāgidānīn naṣar, by S. Sulaimān Nadwī); Moscow 1935 (With a Russian translation and introduction by A. Bolotnikov); 1959 (ed. B.M. Aliyev and M.N. Osmanov; the first volume contains a facsimile of the Cambridge Ms. ‘dated’ 604, the second the text and translation); Stalinabad 1955 (ed. M. Zand, based on the Mss. supposedly dated 604 and 658); Delmar (N.Y.) 1977 (The Rubāʿiyāt of ‘Umar Khayyām translated with an introduction by Perickehr Kasra; with the Persian text, indication of the source for each quatrain and references to previous English versions); Berkeley 1991 (Rubāʿiyāt of Omar Khayyam translated and annotated by Ahmad Sa’dī; with the Persian text, English verse translation and references to sources and other translations).

Fitzgerald’s translation in English verse:
More than three hundred editions of this version are listed in Potter’s Bibliography of 1929, and there have been many more since. In the following we can restrict ourselves to a few of the older printings (mainly from Storey’s notes):
(i) The first edition (75 stanzas): London 1859 (Rubāʿiyāt of Omar Khayyām, the astronomer poet of Persia. Translated into English verse); reprinted Madras 1862 (Rubāʿiyāt ..., reprinted privately from the London edition (1859); with an extract from the Calcutta Review, no. 11x; a note by M. Garcin de Tassy, and a few additional quatrains. 3 pts.); London 1898; 1901 (twice); 1909
The text of the fourth edition followed by that of the first, with notes showing the extent of his indebtedness to the Persian original, a biographical preface [by M. Kerney], Fitzgerald's sketch of the life of Omar, and a foreword by Talcott Williams; London 1899 ('The four editions with the original prefaces and notes', edited by William A[lidis] Wright); 1903 (Letters and literary remains of Edward Fitzgerald. In seven volumes ... Vol. VII, containing the four editions); Leipzig 1910 (based on Wright's edition, London 1899).

Other translations: In the following we have tried to restrict ourselves to the versions which appear to be based on Persian originals and have omitted obvious meta-translations from Fitzgerald (for the older of which, once again, Potter's Bibliography can be consulted). However, as it has not been feasible to check all of these books, it is possible that a few of the latter have slipped in as well.

(French verse): See editions Tehran 1310sh. /1931; also: Rubaiyat d'Omar Khayyam. Mis en rimas francoises d'apres le manuscris d'Oxford par Jules de Marthold, Paris 1901; Les robaï ... Etude suivie d'une traduction française en decalque rythmique avec rimes à la persane, by Arthur Guy, Paris 1935 (with indication of the sources for each rubā'ī).


1 The variations between the text of this Fifth Ed. [contained in the 1889 edition of the Letters and literary remains of Edward Fitzgerald] and that of the Fourth Ed. consist in some 18 words and punctuation marks only. They are taken from a copy of the Fourth Ed. which contained them, in Fitzgerald's hand-writing...1 (Potter p. 51). 'Most reprints of the so-called Fourth version follow the revised text which constitutes the Fifth version.' (Potter p. 45).


(German prose and verse): Chr.H. Rempis, 'Omar Chajjām und seine Vierzeiler (two translations, with indication of the sources, introduction and list of Ms. and editions).

(Turkish): See editions Constantinople 1332/1914, 1340/1922.

1This translation, concerning which the most generous verdict would be that it is an attempt to send up the world of scholarship, has provoked a large amount of polemic literature. It might suffice to mention: J.C.E. Bowen, Translation or travesty? An enquiry into Robert Graves’s version of some Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam, Abingdon 1973.

1The biographical sources which do not mention Khaiyām as a Persian poet are mocked with a star.

1See PL I p. 1107; Brockelmann I p. 468-9, Suppt. I p. 850-7.

2The early 17th-century Persian translation by Maqṣūd-Allāh Tabrīzī (see PL I p. 1107) has now also been published (ed. M.T. Dānish-pazhūb and W. Surūr-Maurī, Tehran 1365sh./1987; the entry on Khayyām can be found on p. 394-7). The translation substitutes two Persian rubā'īs for the Arabic verses quoted in the original work.

E.G. Browne, 'Yet more light on 'Umar-i-Khayyām', JRASt 1899, p. 409-11; Mustauffi [730/1332-90] p. 728 (with one or two quatrains, depending on the Ms.); Jāfārī [autograph 741/1341] II p. 1144-6 (13 quatrains); Daulāt-shāh p. 138-9; Rāzī II p. 256-9 (no. 750); Adhar II p. 674-85; Hīdāyat, Majma' I p. 200; id., Rīyād p. 191-2.

222. Shams al-dīn Muḥammad b. al-Muʿayyad al-Ḥaddādī al-maʿrūf bi Khālāhį is credited with eight verses in 'Auflī’s chapter on the poets of the Seljuqs of Khuršān.

'Auflī II p. 164; Khaiyām-pūr p. 135 (‘Jamāl i Tirmidhī’).
223. Fakhr al-dīn Ḫālid b. al-Rabīʿ al-Makki al-Tūlānī was a contemporary and friend of Anwārī. ‘Auṭfī prefixes his significant selection from Ḫālid’s verse with the story (repeated by Jāmī and others), of how the Ghorid king, ‘Ala’ al-dīn Husain (544/1149 to 556/1161), on hearing that Anwārī had made him the object of some satirical verses, tried to coax the famous poet to his court and how Anwārī was warned of the king’s true intentions by an elusively formulated letter from Ḫālid.


224. Afdal al-dīn Ḫāqānī,1 who also called himself Ḩāqāqiqī and Hassān al-majmā, was a native of Ṣarwān.2 The date of his birth is indicated in the qīṭ‘ah beginning:3

1Khāqānī’s personal name is not indicated unambiguously in the poems, nor is it mentioned by the early biographical sources. Mustaufī, and most of the those after him, give it as Ibrāhīm. For his supposed name ‘Badī’ see presently.
2As he says quite clearly in Tuhfat al-fīrāqīn, p. 34: mīlād-i man as biliq-i Ṣarwān, and elsewhere. Khanikov erroneously made him a native of Ganjāh.
3Dīwān, ed. Sajjādī, p. 808-9. Surprisingly, this very famous poem appears to be missing in the ancient London manuscript.

‘Chūn ṣamān ‘ahd i Sanā’ī dar nawasht
āsmān chūn man sukhān-gustar bi-zād
chūn ba Ghausān sābir-e shud zār e khāk
khāk i Ṣarwān sābir-e digar bi-zād
(‘When time rolled up the life-span of Sanā’ī heaven gave birth to a wordsmith like me. When in Ghaznav one sorcerer1 departed under the soil, the soil of Sharwān gave birth to another sorcerer’). The poet then proceeds to list a number of parallels from the past, some legendary, (the death of Joseph coincides with the birth of Moses, etc.), but one is historic (the death of Abū Ḫanifa and the birth of al-Ṣaḥīfī both occurred, according to the standard sources, in 150/767). In another poem Ḫāqānī states:2
badal man āmadam andar jahān Sanā’ī rā
bad-In daillī pidar nān i man badīl nihād
(‘I came into the world as a substitute for Sanā’ī; the proof for this is the fact that my father called me badīl’, i.e. ‘replacement’).3 It is thus clear that Ḫāqānī was born in the year that Sanā’ī died. Unfortunately (and typically) the precise date of Sanā’ī’s death is not certain, but it was clearly after 511/1117 (the ascension of Ḡārām-shāh) and quite probably 525/1130-1.4

1Poetry is ‘permitted sorcery’ (ṣīhr ḥalāl).
2ed. Sajjādī p. 850.
3This verse has been much belaboured to prove that Ḫāqānī’s personal name was Badīl, but it must be observed that Badīl is not a Muslim name. I understand it to mean that the boy was known within the family as ‘Badīl’ because he was the ‘replacement’ for a recently deceased elder brother.
4See below no. 284. Some scholars have understood the words in Ḫāqānī’s ode to Isfahān (ed. Sajjādī p. 357): pāngād i hijrat chu man na-zād yagānah to mean that Ḫāqānī was born in the year 500/1106-7, but in fact they evidently mean: ‘the first five centuries of the hijrah did not give birth to anyone as unique as I (the child of the 6th century)’. He says the same thing about himself again on p. 24, l. 14, and also about Akhsatān on p. 461 l. 3.
In his versified travelogue, *Tuhfat al-ʾīrāq qaīn*, Khāqānī tells us, among other things, that his grandfather had been a weaver and his father ʿAllī a carpenter; his mother was a cook who had been born a Nestorian Christian (i.e., clearly not an Armenian or Georgian) but had converted to Islam. Khāqānī lost his father at an early age and was brought up by his uncle, the doctor Kāfī 1-dīn ʿUmar b. ʿUthmān, who instructed him in the sciences and of whom Khāqānī speaks in many places with great tenderness. His problematic relationship with the older poet, Abū 1-ʿAlāʾ Ganjaʾī, has been discussed above.1 Khāqānī’s first patron was the ruler of Sharwān Manūchirī (II) b. Farādūn, the patron also of Abū 1-ʿAlāʾ and of Falakī. In Dhū l-qaʿdah,2 evidently of the year 550 (November-December 1155),3 Khāqānī set out on a pilgrimage—the description of which occupies the greater part of his *Tuhfat al-ʾīrāq qaīn*.4 This took him first to the camp (lashkar-gāh) of Seljuk sultan Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd.5 He then continued his journey to Hamadān, Baghdad (an encomium on the Abbasid caliph is inserted here) and Kūfah and visited the tomb of ʿAllī. After crossing the desert he arrived at ʿArafāt, Minā and Mecca. After performing the pilgrimage the poet visited Madīnah and proceeded to Mosul. In the final section the poet tells about his childhood and praises extensively Jamāl al-dīn Muḥammad b. ʿAllī al-Isfahānī (the wazīr of the atabeg of Mosul) but also the Shāfiʿī leader Muḥammad b. al-Khuṇdī and his two brothers.1

Shortly after his return to Sharwān Khāqānī was thrown into gaol; we have a poem which he sent from prison to the ruler of Darband, Saʿīf al-dīn Muṣaffar, in which he reminds the latter that the two had met last year in Mecca. After the death of Manūchirī (probably not long after 555/1160 and certainly before 566/1170), an event which Khāqānī commemorates in an elegy,2 our poet entered the service of his son and successor Akhsatān,3 his principal patron. Khāqānī did not fare better at his hands than he had at those of his father. A few years later we find him in prison again airing his complaints in a poem ostensibly directed to a Byzantine prince who, as Minorsky has shown, must have been the future emperor Andronicus Commnenus, who is known to have been in Sharwān as a guest of the Georgian king at some time in the 1170s. (The Muslim kings of Sharwān were de facto vassals of the Georgians, though there is of course nothing in Khāqānī’s panegyrics to suggest that they were anything other than mighty and independent rulers).

1P. 247-8.

2Tuhfat p. 84.

3In his ode to the city of Isfahan (ed. Sajjadi p. 355) he says that he was in Mosul in 551 (thānūn alīf). We know from the *Tuhfat* that he visited that town on his way back from Mecca; he must therefore have been in Mecca in Dhū l-ḥijjah 550 (January-February 1156). In the same poem he says that he was in Baghdad last year (pār). In the *Tuhfat* he says that he visited Baghdad on the way to Mecca, which would put the composition of the ode to Isfahan also in 551/1156. For the supposed reference in this poem to Mujīr Baʿlabāʾī see below, no. 248.

4The first part of the *Tuhfat* describes an earlier visit to ʿIrāq and the hunting-reserve (shikār-gāh) of the Seljuk sultan, where he made the acquaintance of the sultan’s wazīr. The latter gave Khāqānī a precious ring which the poet, on his return to Sharwān, was forced to surrender to his master.

5Mentioned by name on p. 85.

6For whom see below, no. 227 (Khuṇdī).

7For Khāqānī’s elegy and its significance for determining the dates of Manūchirī’s reign see above p. 248 n. 2.

8The name Akhsatān (in Georgian Aghsartan) is apparently of Ossetic origin (see Minorsky, *Iranica* p. 130). He was still alive in 584/1188 (when Niẓām dedicated his *Lailā-Majnūn* to him) and died before 600/1203-4 (from which year we have an inscription of his successor Farrukh-zād b. Manūchirī).
Khāqānī made the pilgrimage to Mecca at least one more time and ultimately settled in Tabrīz, as he indicates quite clearly in a number of his poems. The dhīwān contains a few poems praising the Khwārazm-shāh Ata'z (521/1127 to 551/1166), the Seljuq Arsān b. Toghral (556/1161 to 571/1176), and the atabeg of Azerbaijan Qizil-Arsān b. Eldūgz (582/1186 to 587/1191). Juwainī quotes a qīf'āh which he says Khāqānī composed for the Khwārazm-shāh Tekshī when the latter entered Isfahān (in 592/1196) and this appears to be the most recent date that can be established in the poet's biography. Musta'fī says he died in 582/1186-7 (which is too early, if we are to believe Juwainī) and was buried in Surkhāb (near Tabrīz), but Soviet archaeologists claim to have found his tomb in the Republic of Azerbaijan, with an inscription giving the date of his death as 595/1198-9.

Apart from his panegyrics Khāqānī composed a good number of poems of religious content, a large portion of them evidently after his withdrawal from the court in Sharwān. Many of the poems are of a personal nature, several regretting the deaths of his wife, son and daughter. There are also some poems with savage attacks on Rashīd al-dīn Watūrē.

Khāqānī's dhīwān, which is notorious for its obscurity, is fortunately preserved in a number of old manuscripts, notably in London Or. 7942, which was copied in Khujand in 664/1266 and apparently derives from a codex written in the poet's lifetime. This and three other copies form the basis for the careful critical edition by Sajjādī.

Mss.:

Manchester Lindesiana 290 (17th century?); Lindesiana 208 (17th century? 'Qasā'id'); Lindesiana 522 (18th century? imperfect); Lindesiana 513 (18th century?); Lindesiana 200 (18th century? 'Qahalīyāt'); Oxford Elliot 74 (Ethē 561. Dated 999/1590-1); Ouseley 192 (Ethē 562. Dated 12 Jumādā II 1006/1698); Elliot 73 (Ethē 563. Dated 27 Jumādā I 1011/1602); Ouseley 382 (Ethē 564. Dated 17 Jumādā II 1011/1602); Whinfield 54 (Beeston 2682/3. Dated 9 Rajab 1012/1603. Selections); Fraser 61 (Ethē 560. Dated 7 Sha'bān 1015/1606); Elliot 75 (Ethē 565. Dated Sha'bān 1040/1631); Pers. d. 92 (Beeston 2554). A number of leaves were restored by a second hand which added the date 29 Rajab 34 (sc. of 'Alāmīr) = <1>100/1689); Ouseley Add. 133 (Ethē 566. Dated 5 Rabi' I 1109/1697); Walker 74 (Ethē 570. Dated 26 Jumādā II 1129/1717. qasīdahs only); Walker 99 (Ethē 567. Many glosses); Elliot 76 (Ethē 568); Elliot 77

1The London Ms. concludes with a colophon giving the name of the scribe as Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. al-Husain al-Sāshānī and the date of completion as 8 Shawwāl 664; the year is spelt out very clearly. The first half (or 'volume') of the Ms. ends on fol. 223a with a finely gilded medallion reading: bi rasch khisānnt al-asīr al-sa'īm al-'iṣ'īdī Yahyā b. Ḫāmid al-Khuraysntī fī sānat arba' wa tis'īn wa khamsa-as-īαh min al-ḥirra al-nabawīyāh. Since both 'volumes' of the Ms. and the final colophon are all evidently in the same handwriting, one must assume that the medallion was copied from the prototype and that it is the latter which entered the library of the amīr in question (who is unknown to me) in 594/1197-8.

2I have re-collated a few poems with the London Ms. and have nothing adverse to report. Sajjādī's long introduction is less satisfactory, mainly because of his excessive reliance on secondary sources, especially Forūnāfārī. Ms. contains among both the dhīwān and Tahfīz al-'irğān, generally styled 'Kulliyāt i Khāqānī', are listed here and again below, for the latter work.
(Ethé 569. Incomplete); Bodl. 748 (Ethé 571. Many glosses); London Or. 7942 (Meredith-Owens p. 5). Dated 8 Shawwâl 664/1266;¹ Sajjâdi’s Jaâm; I.O. 961 (Dated 7 Rabî‘ I 1004/1595); I.O. 962 (Dated 10 Safer 1006/1597); I.O. 950/II (Dated 13 Safer 1007/1598); Add. 25,808 (Rieu p. 558-9. 16th century?); Add. 16,773 (Rieu p. 559. 16th century?); Add. 7726 (Rieu p. 559. 16th century?); Add. 25,018 (Rieu p. 560. 16th century?); Or. 7042 (Meredith-Owens p. 51. 16th century?); Or. 9872 (Meredith-Owens p. 59. 16th century?); I.O. 951/I (=Robinson 146-51. Dated 12 Jumâdâ II 1038/1629. ‘Intikhâb i dîwân’); I.O. 966 (Dated 16 Rabî‘ I 1101/1689); Add. 7727 (Rieu p. 559. 17th century?); Add. 25,809 (Rieu p. 559-60. 17th century?); Or. 10922 (Meredith-Owens p. 60. 17th century?); I.O. 963 (Has an owner’s note dated 1183/1769-70); Add. 16,772 (Rieu p. 560. 18th century); I.O. 965 (17th or 18th century?); I.O. 964; I.O. 967; I.O. 3028; RAS 297; Cambridge Or. 1350 (2nd Suppt. 170. Dated 30 Jumâdâ I 1035/1626); Or. 1349/2 (2nd Suppt. 169. 17th century?); Or. 6. 28 (Browne Cat. CCVIII); King’s, No. 167 (Browne Suppt. 542); Or. 255 (Browne Suppt. 1061); Jesus, No. 6 (Browne Suppt. 1062); Edinburgh Univ. 275 (16th century?); Univ. 274 (17th century?); Univ. 99 (Has an owner’s mark dated 1172/1757-8); Univ. 100 (88 gaşâdâhs); Univ. 276; New Coll. Or. 26; Paris Supplément 1771 (Blochet 1237. Two hands, attributed by Blochet to the 13th and 15th centuries respectively); Ancien fonds 133 fol. 182v-186v. (Richard. Ms. contains a note dated Jumâdâ I 752 /1351. A few poems only); Supplément 1816 (Blochet 1232. 14th century? Contains also Tuhfah and letters. Sajjâdi’s ‘pâ’); Supplément 623 (Blochet 1233. 16th century?); Supplément 620 (Blochet 1234. Dated 1009/1600-1); Supplément 621 (Blochet 1235. 17th century?); Supplément 622 (Blochet 1236. Dated 2 Dhû 1-qâ’dah 1081/1671); Supplément 626 (Blochet 1238. 17th century?); Supplément 624 (Blochet 1239. 17th century?; Fragment); Berlin Ms. or. quart. 2023/1 (Hain 303. Dated 942/1535-6); Ms. or. fol. 299 (Pertsch 739; Minotuli 197 (Pertsch 740); Petermann 463 (Pertsch 741); Spengler 1431 (Pertsch 743); Petermann 716/1 (Pertsch 682. Selections); Vienna Flûgel 514/1; Leningrad Acad. C 1424 (Index 1489. 14th century?; Lacanae); Acad. C 63/II (Index 3439. Dated 1029/1620); Acad. D 3 (Index 1490. Dated 1047/1637-8); Dorn CCCLIII; Chanykov 51; Acad. B 137 (Index 1487); Acad. C 61 (Index 1488); Acad. B 136 (Index 3437); Acad. C 62 (Index 3438); Istanbul Fatih 3810 (Ritter-Reinert p. 122-3. Copied by Arslân b. Aitughî and dated 1 Muḥarram 702/1302); Ayasofya 2051/15 (Mîkûrîfîm-hâ I p. 409-10. Ms. apparently dated Shawwâl 730 /1330); Topkapı, Ahmet III 2363 (Karayâ 395. Dated Ramadân 867/1463); Topkapı, Revan 1016 (Karayâ 396. Copied by Muḥammad Rahîm and dated Muḥarram 1005/1596); Universität Fy 258 (olim Riza Paşa 246. Ateş 77. 16th century?); Est 2633/1 (Duda p. 52. Dated Ramadân 1025/1616); Universität Fy 699 (olim Halis Efendi 6672. Ateş 78. Dated 1031/1621-2); Universität Fy 534 (Ateş 79. Dated 12 Shawwâl 1048/1639); Nuruosmaniye 4182 (Ateş 80. 17th century?); Calar Dîr al-kutub 153 mîm adab fârisî (Tirâzî I 677. Anthology dated 823/1423); 85 mîm adab fârisî (Tirâzî I 675. Dated Junumâ 858/1454); 86 mîm adab fârisî (Tirâzî I 676. Dated 1009/1600-1); 144 adab fârisî (Tirâzî I 674. Dated Sha’hân 1012/1604); Hamadan I’timâd al-daulâh (Nuskhah-hâ V p. 345. Ms. apparently dated 6 Shawwâl 1017/1609); Tehran Majlis III 976 (12th century? Some leaves replaced later. Sajjâdi’s mîm-jîm); Sâdiq Anşârî (Sajjâdi’s sâd. 13th century?); Adabiyât I p. 253 (13th-14th century?); Gulistân /Atâbây I 188 (Dated 16 Safer 950/1543). Majlis III 977 (Copied by Majd al-dîn ‘All in 999/1590-1); Gulistân/Atâbây I 190 (Copied by Ibn Shams al-
dân Muhammad Mu‘jizî al-Yazî and dated Rajab 1001/1593; Sipah-sâlîr II 1131 (Dated 1002/1593-4); Gulistan/Âtabây I 191 (Dated 1006/1597-8); Bayânî I 10 (Nuskâh-hâ I p. 9. Copied by Qutb al-dîn b. Hassan Tûnî and dated 1013/1604-5); Sipah-sâlîr II 1189 (Dated 1015/1604-5); Gulistan/Âtabây I 187 (Copied for Akbar, regn. 1556-1605); Gulistan/Âtabây I 189 (Copied by Muhammad Latîf al-mashhûr bi Shâhî al-Bukhârî and dated Rajab 1018/1609); Gulistan/Âtabây I 183 (Copied by Mu‘izz al-dîn Hussain Lankarî and dated Safar 1019/1610); Majlîs III 979 (Dated 1038/1628-9); Majlîs III 979 (17th century?); Gulistan/Âtabây II 182 (Dated 9 Dhî l-qadâ‘ 1206/1792); Gulistan/Âtabây I 186; etc.;

Masnad Ridawi VII 407 (Copied by Hâjjî ‘Ali Samargandî and dated 2 Rabi‘ 1 I 847/1443); Ridawi VII 413 (Dated 898/1492-3); Ridawi VII 406 (Dated 950/1543-4); Ridawi VII 405 (Dated Ramadân 1007/1599); Ridawi VII 412 (Dated 7 Jamâdâ II 1016/1607); Dushanbe Acad. II 370 (Dated 956/1549); 369 (Dated 1054/1644-5); 371-372; Pakistan (see Munz. Pak. VII p. 52-7; numerous copies of which the oldest is dated 15 Rabi‘ 1 I 963/1556); Bombay Rehatsep p. 158 no. 113-114; Brelvi p. xxx; Navsari Meherji Rana p. 89 no. 55 (Dated 1005/1596-7); Lucknow Sprenger 318 (several copies);

Bankipore I 31 (‘beautiful Nasta‘î�q ... apparently 14th century?’); I 32 (Copied by Qâsim Shirazi and dated 1027/1618); Hyderabad Asafiyah I p. 722 no. 436; I p. 742 no. 261, 583; II p. 1254 no. 72;

Madras I 82-87; II 587; Calcutta Bûhâr 291 (16th century?); Ivanov 456 (16th century?); Ivanov Cunz 196 (Dated 1086/1675); Ivanov 457 (17th century?); Ivanov 458 (18th century?); Ivanov 2nd Suppt. 976 (18th century?); Bûhâr 292 (19th century? Incomplete); Philadelphia Lewis Coll. 60 (16th century? Pictures). Cf. Munz. III 22816-924.

Editions: [Lucknow] 1294/1878 (2 vols.); Lucknow 1309/1892; 1908; Tehran 1316sh./1937 (ed. ‘Ali ‘Abd-al-Râsûlî); 1336sh./1957 (ed. M. ‘Abbâsî);

1338sh./1959 (ed. D. Sajjadi. Quotes the variants from four MSS.).


Edition and (Russian) translation of the rubâ‘iyat: K. Salesmann, Chetvertostotnââ Xâkânî, St. Petersburg 1875;

Translitions of selected poems (Russian verse): Xâkânî, Yârikâ, Moscow 1908; Xâkânî, Yeter in rûhe, перевод ... M. Simeljnikov, Moscow 1986; Xâkânî Yârîm: Rubâ‘, tr. B. Aylanov, Baku 1981.

Commentaries:1

1 (1) A commentary on the qaṣâ‘îd of Khâqânî, ascribed (implausibly) to Jâmi‘, is reported in Hyderabad Asafiyah II p. 1252 no. 93.

2 (Sharî ‘îdwan or qaṣâ‘îd) i Khâqânî by Muhammad b. Dâ‘ûd b. Muhammad ‘Alawî Shâhî-i-bâbâ (see above, p. 263), for sultan Nâṣir al-dîn Khâjîj, who reigned from 906/1500 to 916/1510. It elucidates only a selection of the qaṣâ‘îd. Ms.: Oxford Fraser 63 (Exth 572. Dated Shawwâl 1042/1633); Ouseley Add. 181 (Exth 573); London I.O. 968 (Two hands, the later dated Dhû l-qadâ‘ 995/1587); Add. 25,811 (Rieu p. 561. Dated Shawwâl 1080/1670); Add. 27,315 (Rieu p. 561-2. Dated Dhû l-qadâ‘ 1107/1696. With an introduction dedicated to Jahângîr by ‘Alawî Lâhîjî in which the latter appears to claim the authorship of the commentary); Add. 10,579 II (Rieu p. 820. Dated Shâbân 1149/1736. 34 qaṣâ‘îds only); Or. 363 (Rieu p. 561. 17th century?); I.O. 969 (defective); I.O. 970 (fragment); I.O. Delhi 1283A-B; Edinburgh Univ. 277 (Dated 1045/1635-6); Paris Supplément 1036 (Blohchet 1240. 19th century); Tehran Sipah-

1See also Minorsky, Irand â 120-1.

2This version is perhaps also contained in Bombay Rehatsep p. 138 (see below: unidentified commentaries). (Sto.)
sālar V p. 188 (Dated 4 Muḥarram 1000/1591); Millī I 20 (Dated Jumādā II 1032/1623); Majlis II 412 (Dated 1238/1822-3); Rāshid al-Dīn Khāqānī V 661 (17th century?); Tashkent Univ. 49 (Dated 1142/1730); Pakistan (Various copies, the oldest dated 7 Ramaḍān 1014/1866, are listed in Munz. Pak. VII p. 57-8); Lucknow Sprenger 319 (Dated 1062/1652); Bankipore I 34 (Dated 1036/1626-7); I 35 (Dated 1223/1808-9); Hyderabad Aṣāfīyah II p. 1252 no. 110, 112; Madras 267; Calcutta Būhār 293 (18th century?); Ivanov 459-460 (2 copies, 18th century?); Ivanov Curzon 196 (18th century? Fragment). Cf. Munz. V 37402-25.

(3)Sharḥ i mushkilat i dīwān i Khāqānī (as it is called in the Istanbul Mss.) or Mahabbat-nāmah by 'Abd al-Wahhāb b. Muḥammad al-Husainī al-Hasanī al-Ma‘ṣūrī, called Ghānātī (Ghīnātī?). Pertsch (followed by Ethē ad I.O. 968 and by Minorsky) tentatively equated this commentator with the scribe Abū Turāb 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Husainī who completed his copy of Khāqānī’s Tūḥfat al-‘īrāqānī (=Berlin Pertsch no. 744) on 23 Rajab 1090/1679, but the identification seems unlikely if the dates in the Istanbul Mss. are correct. 'Abd al-Rasūlī, who used this commentary in preparing his edition of the dīwān, says that it was written in 1018.1 Mss.: London Or. 7910 (Meredith-Owens p. 53. 18th-19th century?); and probably also I.O. Delhi 1287 A (Sto.); Cambridge Or. 250 (Browne Suppt. 1060. Dated 1235/1819-20); Berlin Sprenger 1432 (Pertsch 742. Dated 17 Muḥarram '32', which Pertsch, on the basis of the above-quoted hypothesis concerning the authorship of this commentary, interpreted as 1132/1719); Vienna Flügel 515 (Dated 18 Rabī‘ I 1141/1728); Istanbul Universite FY 489 (Ateş 81. Dated 22 Shawwāl 1025/1616); Nuruosmanīye 3972 (Ateş 82. Dated 22 Muḥarram 1041/1631); Topkapı, Hazine 883 (Karatay 397.

1See his introduction, p. x.
II 3rd year of Ahmad Shâh/1750; Ouseley Add. 107 (Etéh 578. Dated 1201/1786-7); Elliot 384 (Etéh 579. Dated 16 Rabî‘ II 1209/1794); Pers. d. 49 (Beeston 2555. Dated 1284/1867-8); Fraser 62 (Etéh 576); Ouseley Add. 91 (Etéh 577); London I.O. 950/I (Dated 13 Şafar 1007/1598); Add. 25,018/IV-V (Rieu p. 560. 16th century? With the author’s prose preface); Add. 7728 (Rieu p. 560. 16th century?); Add. 25,018 (Rieu p. 560. 16th century?); Or. 9872 (Meredith-Owens p. 59. 16th century?); Add. 7732 fol. 126-217 (Rieu p. 555. Dated Dhū l-qa‘dah 1011/1603. Contains also ‘some other poems by Kh.’); Add. 7667/I (Rieu p. 809. Dated 1022/1613); I.O. 951/II (=Robinson 146-51. Dated 12 Jumãdã II 1038/1629. 1 extraneous picture); I.O. 955 (Dated 14 Mubarram 1058/1648); I.O. 954 (Dated, ‘as it seems’, 1078/1667-8, and followed by a prose summary. Slightly defective); I.O. 2866 (Dated 12 Dhû l-qa‘dah ‘8010’ – for 1080/1670? –); Add. 25,810 (Rieu p. 560. Dated Mubarram 1088/1677. With marginal annotations); SOAS 46725/I (Dated 21 Şafar 1094/1683); Add. 23,553 (Rieu p. 561. Dated 1096/1685. With variant readings and glosses); I.O. 956 (Dated 24 Rabî‘ I 1099/1688); Add. 16,776 (Rieu p. 561. 17th century? Incomplete); Add. 16,775 (Rieu p. 561. 17th century? With the preface); Add. 16,774 (Rieu p. 561. 17th century? With preface and marginal notes); Ross and Browne CLXII (17th century?); I.O. 957 (Dated 1134/1721-2. Copious glosses): Or. 3401/I (Rieu Suppt. 221. Dated Jumãdã II 1259/1843. With the preface. Imperfect at end); I.O. 952; I.O. 953 (copious glosses); I.O. 958; I.O. 959; I.O. Delhi 1223 (two copies); RAS 295-296; Cambridge Or. 1348/1 (2nd Suppt. 168. Ms. dated 5 Rabî‘ I 1023/1614); Or. 1350 (2nd Suppt. 170. Dated 30 Jumãdã I 1035/1626); King’s, No. 115 (Browne Suppt. 279. Dated 1072/1661-2); Or. 277 (Browne Suppt. 278. Dated 1100/1688-9); Or. 1349/1 (2nd Suppt. 169. 17th century?); Or. 1568 (2nd Suppt. 355. 18th century?); Or. 255 (Browne Suppt. 1061); Jesus, No. 6 (Browne Suppt. 1062); Edinburgh Univ. 278; Paris Supplément 1816 (Blochet 1232. 14th century?); Supplément 623 (Blochet 1233. 16th century?); Supplément 620 (Blochet 1234. Dated 1009/1600-1); Supplément 621 (Blochet 1235. 17th century?); Supplément 620 (Blochet 1236. Dated 2 Dhû l-qa‘dah 1081/1671); Supplément 1366 fol. 161v seqq. (Blochet 1993. Ms. contains dates between 1009/1600 and 1010/1602); Supplément 625 (Blochet 1241. Dated Râmadãn 1093/1682); Supplément 317 fol. 98 seqq. (Blochet 2179. 18th century?); Berlin Ms. or. quart. 2023/2 (Heinz 303. Dated 942/1535-6); Spruner 1433 (Pertsch 744. Copied by Abû Turâb ‘Abâl-Wahhâb al-Husainî and dated 23 Rajab 1090/1679); Spruner 1434 (Pertsch 745); Spruner 1435 (Pertsch 746); Vienna Flügel 513 (Dated Jumãdã I 1028/1619); Flügel 514/2; Copenhagen Mehren CVIV/2; Leningrad Acad. C 63/I (Index 3439. Dated 1029/1620); Acad. A 26 (Index 644. Dated 1054/1644-5); Acad. C 25 (Index 643. Dated 1222/1807); Acad. B 139 (Index 645); Acad. B 3974 (Index 646); Acad. C 62 fol. 1b-84b (Index 3438); Dorn CCCCLI; Chanykov, 50; Istanbul Ayasofya 1762/2 (Atêiş 83. Copied by Mas‘ûd b. Nâgûr al-Mutâtabbîb and dated Rabî‘ I 791/1389); Topkapî, Ahmet III 2363 (Karataş 395. Dated Râmadãn 867/1463); Nuruosmaniye 4964/19 (Atêş 84 and 371. 15th century?); Université F 877 (olim Halîs Efendi 8637. Atêiş 85. 17th century?); Esat 2633/2 (Duda p. 52. Added by a second hand to a Ms. dated Râmadãn 1025/1616); Université F 880 (olim Halîs Efendi 4262. Atêş 86. Dated 1 Dhû l-qa‘dah 1287/1872); Cairo 6 mîm mîjâmî fârisî (Tirâzî I 269. Dated Şafar 1106/1694); Tehran Gulistan/Atâbây I 190 (Ms. copied by Ibn Shams al-dîn Mubârak Mu‘jîzî al-Yazdî and dated Rajab 1001/1593); Sipah-sâliûr II 1106 (Dated 1013/1604-5); Gulistan/Atâbây I 191 (Dated Rabî‘ II 1006/1597); Bayânî 9 (Nuskhah-hâh I p. 9. 16th century?); Gulistan/Atâ-
bāy I 187 (Copied for Akbar, regn. 1566-1605); Gulistān/Atābāy I 176 (Dated 1 Dhū l-Ḥijjah 1015/1607. Pictures); Gulistān/Atābāy I 189 (Copied by ‘Abd al-Bukhārī) and dated Sha‘bān 1015/1606 or 1025/1616); 1 Sipah-sālār II 1108 (Dated 1032/1822-3); Gulistān/Atābāy I 180 (Copied in 1035/1625-6 by Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Mullā Mīr al-Husainī al-Ustādī); Mājlis II 326 (Dated 1053/1643-4); Sipah-sālār II 1107 (Copied by Muhammad Masīm Shīrāzī in 1063/1653); Gulistān/Atābāy I 181 (Intikhāb. Copied by ‘Abd al-Rashīd, who lived in the 19th century); Shūrā i Islāmī I 351 (Copied by Mīr ‘Ali Haravī); Arak Bayūt (Muskhān-hā VI p. 65. Dated 993/1585); Nashshad Riḍawī VII 407 (Copied by Hājjī ‘Ali Samargāndī and dated 2 Rabī‘ I 847/1443); Riḍawī VII 406 (Dated 950/1543-4); Riḍawī VII 412 (Dated 1 Jamādā II 1016/1607); Riḍawī VII 198 (Dated 1029/1620); Riḍawī VII 199 (Dated 1140/1727-8); Dushānbe Acad. II 369 (Dated 1054/1644-5); 373; Pakistan (various copies listed in Munz. Pak. VII p. 46-51); Bombay Univ. 108; Rehati,p. 187 no. 19-20 (2 Mss., one dated 24 Rabī‘ I 1063/1653); Rehati p. 129 no. 12; Lucknow Sprenger 321 (several copies, one — evidently the one now in Berlin — of which was dated 1090/1679); Bankipore I 33 (Copied by Muhammad Sar‘īd b. Mirzā Muhammad al-Bukhārī in 1014/1605-6); Suppt. i 1806 (Dated 1024/1615); i 32 l/VI (Copied by Qāsim Shīrāzī and dated 1027/1618. Pictures); Suppt. i 1807 (Dated 9 Dhū l-Ḥijjah 1092/1681. Beginning missing); Hyderabad Ḥaḍīth-i 1476 no. 98, 107, 165; Calcutta Ivanov Curzon 197 (Dated 7 Rabī‘ II 1042/1632); Ivanov 461 (18th century?); Ivanov Curzon 198 (Dated 17 Sha‘bān 12th year of Muḥammad-Akbar /1232/1817); Ivanov 462; Philadelphia Lewis Coll. 60 (16th century?). Cf. Munz. IV 2854-606.

Editions: Agra 1855 (with a commentary); Cawnpore 1284/1867 (Abridged, with marginal notes based on ‘Abd al-Salām’s commentary); Lahore 1867 (Intikhāb ... Tuḥfat al-‘īrāqayn, followed by a commentary compiled once again from that of ‘Abd al-Salām); Lucknow 1876; 1930 (Sharh Tuḥfat al-‘īrāqayn. Text with an Urdu commentary by ‘Abd al-Bārī ʿĀsī); Tehran 1333h./1954 (ed. Y. Qarīb from various, mostly late, Mss., with an introduction).

Commentaries:
1 Sharḥ i tuḥfat al-‘īrāqayn by Shaikh ‘Abd al-Salām, written in 1057/1647. Mss.: London I.O. 960 (Dated 17 Dhū l-Qa‘dah 1059/1649); I.O. Delhi 1242; Lucknow Sprenger 322; ‘Probably’ the same commentary is found also in Oxford Walker 90 (Etē 581. Dated 1076/1665-6); Pakistan (Several copies listed in Munz. Pak. VII p. 51-2).
3 (same title), anonymous, but (according to Etē) different from the two preceding works. Begins at once with the first verse of the poem. Ms.: London I.O. 2867.
5 (same title) by Saiyid Ismā‘īl Abjadi, begun in 1200/1786. Ms.: Madras II 612 (Dated 1249/1833-4).

1The date is given — according to the catalogue — in figures as ‘1016’ but in words as anl wa khamshah (ns?) ‘ishrān. The Ms. contains after the diwān a second colophon in which the scribe calls himself ‘Muḥammad Latif al-nashshār bi Shokhl al-Bukhari’ (Atābāy reads ‘al-Najjarī’) with the date Rajab 1018/1609.

1For whom see PL I p. 778, 1334.

1There is a lacuna in this text evidently after p. 222 l. 16; the end of the article on Khâqânî is missing and what follows is the last part of the entry on Mājīr Ballaqānī (see Nafti's edition, p. 406).


225. al-Ustād al-Muwaffaq Abū Ṭahir al-Khaṭṭānî is mentioned a number of times in al-Bundari's abridgment of 'Imād al-dīn's expanded Arabic translation of Anāsharwān b. Khâlid's history of the Seljuqs, where we read that he was one of the foremost wits at the time of Muḥammad (I) b. Malik-shāh (498/1105 to 511/1118) and the mustafti to Khātūn, i.e. the sultan's queen. The text speaks of him as deceased; since al-Bundari habitually draws attention to his own additions it would appear that Khātūn must have died before 'Imād al-dīn (d. 597/1138) and possibly before Anāsharwān (d. 532/1138 or shortly afterwards). The same source tells us that he satirised several of the sultan's ministers and officials, in prose and in verse, and quotes (in 'Imād al-dīn's Arabic verse translation) a number of his epigrams. A few short Persian poems, largely of satirical content, are preserved in other sources. Zakariyā' al-Qazwīnī says that in the mosque in Sâwâh there is 'a library which

1 Zubdah p. 102: wa ilā Ḫâhir 'urrihi.
2Qazwīnī has noted that the Persian original of the epigram translated in Zubdah p. 106 l. 13-4 is preserved in 'Aufī I p. 68 l. 10-11, where, however, it is attributed to Mu'in al-mulk al-Qâsim.
takes its name from the waṣīr (sic) Abū Tāhir al-
Khāṭūnī containing all the fine books which
existed in his time1 as well as astronomical
instruments and the like.2 Rāwandi says that he
himself saw Malik-shāh’s Shīḵār-nāmah (hunting
journal) in the hand-writing of Abū Tāhir
Khāṭūnī3, but it is not clear to me whether this
implies that Khāṭūnī wrote such a work during the
reign of Malik-shāh (i.e. that he was already
attached to the court before 485/1092), or merely
that he copied a manuscript of such a work at a
later date.

On two occasions2 Daulat-shāh quotes the
Tārīkh i āl i Saljūq of Abū Tāhir Khāṭūnī, one
time for an anecdote referring to the reign of
Masʿūd b. Muhammad b. Malik-shāh (529/1134 to
547/1152) and another in connection with the death
of Sanjar’s daughter in 524/1130. However, if
Khāṭūnī had really written a history of the
Seljuqs and if it was still accessible (directly or
indirectly) to Daulat-shāh more than 300 years
later, then it would seem most astonishing that
none of the historians who wrote about that
dynasty betray any knowledge of such a work.
Besides this, both of the stories which Daulat-
shāh claims to have from this history are in their
own right extremely dubious, as we have shown in
the appropriate entries.3 One should therefore
perhaps not give too much credence to another
passage4 in which Daulat-shāh claims to be

1 Yūsūf (Buldān III p. 24), writing about half a century
before Zakariyya’, also speaks of a library in Sāwah, ‘of
which none was larger in the world’, but he adds that it was
burned by the Mongols during their sack of the town in
617/1220-1. It is thus clear that Zakariyya’, though writing
in the present tense, is in fact copying his information from
an old book.
2 Daulat-shāh p. 64, 76-7.
3 See above, p. 255 (‘Aṣṣaq) and 342-3 (Jailāl al-dīn).
4 Daulat-shāh p. 58.

quoting Khāṭūnī’s book on the lives of the poets
(Kitāb maṣāqīb al-shuʿara’).

LFP ed. Horn p. 31 (one verse by ‘ustād Muwaf-
faq al-dīn Abū Tāhir Ṣanūṭī’ - or thus at least
Horn’s reading - in the Vatican Ms.);1 Zahir al-
dīn Naisabūrī, Saljūq-nāmah, Tehran 1332sh./1953,
p. 34; Rāwandi, Rābīṭ al-ṣudūr, ed. M. Iqbal, Lon-
don 1921, p. 131, 136; al-Bundārī, Zubdat al-
uṣrārah wa nukhbat al-ṣuṣrāh, ed. M. Th. Houtsma
( = his Recueil de textes relatifs à l’histoire
des Seljoucides II), Leyden 1889, p. 89, 105-8,
110, 113; Shams p. 94-5, 256; Zakariyya’ al-Qaz-
winī, Āthār al-bilād, ed. Wüstenfeld, Göttingen
1848, p. 259; Sīḥāb p. 225; Daulat-shāh p. 29, 58,
64, 76-7; Hidāyat, Majma’ I p. 66-7; Qazwinī’s
introduction to ‘Auff I p. vii-viii n. 1, his note
on p. 317, and his Yād-dāšṭāh V p. 280-1; Bowne,
History II p. 326-7; LN s.v. ‘Abū Tāhir’
p. 556-7; Khaiyām-pūr p. 19 (with further references);
Efr s.v. ‘Abū Tāher Kāṭūnī’ (Dj. Khaleghi-
Motlagh).

226. Two verses by Ṣārim al-dīn Khīrāh refer-
ing to Qiwām al-dīn (who was minister to Toghril
II until 528/1133-4) are quoted by Abū 1-Rajā’
Qumār, Tārīkh al-wusūrā’, ed. M.T. Dānish-pažūh,

227. al-Ṣadr al-ismān al-ajall Ṣadr al-millah
wa l-dīn al-Khujaṇdī; and al-Ṣadr al-ajall Jāmāl
al-dīn al-Khujaṇdī are the subjects of two success-
seive entries in ‘Auff I’s chapter on the religious
dignitaries who dabbled in poetry and ‘Auff quotes
a number of pieces by each of them.2 We have to
do with two members (not sufficiently identified
by ‘Auff) of a distinguished family of Shīfi’ī

1 As pointed out above, p. 59, this verse is an early
interpolation in Asadī’s book.
clerics, originally from Khujand (in Central Asia), but who gained prominence in Isfahan, the banū 1-Khujandī (or, in Persian, Khujandīyān). Though for their own sake they do not merit a place in the history of Persian belles-lettres they were the patrons of several major poets of our period (Athīr, Jamāl al-dīn, Kamāl al-dīn, Khāqānī, Raḍī’ l-‘unbānī, Qāmar, Zāhir Fārīyābī). For this reason, but also because of the confusion which has surrounded them in the secondary literature, we find it expedient to enumerate here the most important members of this family.1

Abū Bakr Muḥammad (I) b. Thābit b. al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī al-Khujandī, the founder of the Khujandī lineage in Isfahan, was sent from Mawr to Isfahan by Niẓām al-mulk and died in 483/1090-1.2

His son, ‘Abd al-Latīf (I) succeeded him as the ra’īs of the Shāfī’īs in Isfahan and was assassinated by the Ismā’īlīs in 523/1129.3 His brother Ahmad died on 1 Shawwāl 531/1137.4

For the banū 1-Khujandī see (apart from the primary sources listed in following footnotes): Qawānīn’s notes in his edition of ‘Auṣfī I p. 355; his Yād-dāšt-hā IV p. 191; Naṣīrī’s takmilah to his edition of ‘Auṣfī, p. 798-9; Humāyan-Farrukh’s introduction to his edition of the dīwān of Athīr ḤakimKhātī p. xcv-xlxi (lists eleven members of the family, some of them fictitious or doublets of others in the same list); the chapter on Isfahan in H. Hama, Die Ausbreitung der Maṭḥī‘īschen Rechtsschule von den Anfängen bis zum 8./14. Jahrhundert, Wiesbaden 1974, p. 146-50 (very incomplete).5


2 Ibn al-Athīr X p. 464. Zakarīyā’ al-Qazwīnī, Athrār al-bilād, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 198, likewise says that ‘Ṣadr al-dīn ‘Abd al-Latīf al-Khujandī’ died in Shawwāl 523; however he also tells an anecdote about this ṣadr and the atabeg Muḥammad b. Elūgūts (who reigned half a century later), quoting three Persian verses with which Ṣadr al-dīn admonished that ruler. It is thus clear that Zakarīyā’ has confused ‘Abd al-Latīf I with his grandson ‘Abd al-Latīf II.6

3 Ibn al-Athīr X p. 251.

4 See Zuhday al-nuṣṣār wa nukhbat al-‘uṣrah, abridged by al-Bundarī from the original of ‘Imād al-dīn al-İsfahānī, ed. M. Th. Houtsma (= his Recueil de textes relatifs à l’histoire des Seldjoucides II), Leyden 1889, p. 320-1.

5 See above, p. 304.


7 Ibn al-Athīr X p. 241.


9 Ibn al-Athīr XI p. 150.
killed. There is an elegy on the death of his brother Jamāl al-dīn Māhūd in the dīwān of Jamāl al-dīn Mūhammad b. ‘Abd al-Razzāq.¹

The just-mentioned Jamāl al-dīn Māhūd is not to be confused with Jamāl al-dīn Mas‘ūd al-Khujandī, whose relationship with the other members of the family is not clear, but who evidently belonged to the next generation. A number of his letters (one of them addressed to the atabeg Mūhammad Jahan-Pahlavān b. ʿElūdūz, 570/1175 to 582/1186) and several of his Persian poems are preserved in a 13th-century anthology;² the fact that he wrote poetry in Persian suggests that he might also be the ‘Jamāl al-dīn’ cited by ‘Aulf. There is an ode to him in the dīwān of ʿAthīr Akhsikatī.³

This Mas‘ūd is perhaps the brother of ʿṢadr al-dīn Abū ʿl-Qāsim ‘Abd al-Latīf (II), the son of Mūhammad II. He was born in Rajab 535/1141, assumed the leadership of the Shāfiʿīs of Isfahan after (though presumably not right after) his father and died in Jumādā I 588/1184.⁴

He was succeeded by his son ʿṢadr al-dīn Mūhammad (III). He was killed by the military governor

¹Ed. Dastgīrī, Dastgīrī, p. 259–61. Ṭāqāb and name occur on p. 280 l. 5, but see above, p. 346–7.
²al-Muḥkārāt min al-rasāʾil, ed. ʿAṣḥāb, Tehran 2535h.s.h./1976–7, p. 70–1, 71–2 (the letter to Jahan-Pahlavān), 87, 88 (the poem), 110. There is also a letter addressed to him on p. 62–5.
³Ed. Huṣayn-Farrukh, p. 298–301. His name is very clearly mentioned, and used as the basis for a pun, on p. 300 l. 3; see also the reference to Khujand in the next line. But the editor has allowed himself to be misled by the superscription according to which the qaṣīdah is dedicated to Jamāl al-dīn Māhūd.

⁵See Rāwandī, Rāwandī, ed. M. Iqbelī, London 1921, p. 381; Ibn al-ʿAthīr XII p. 81; al-ʿSubkī IV p. 80. al-ʿSubkī gives his name as Mūhammad b. ‘Abd al-Latīf b. Mūhammad b. ‘Abd al-Latīf (including him among the other Muḥammad of the relevant ṭabaqāt) and specifies that he was the grandson of Abū Bakr Mūhammad (II) b. ‘Abd al-Latīf b. Mūhammad b. Thābit b. al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī. Ibn al-ʿAthīr calls him ʿṢadr al-dīn Māhūd (sic) b. ‘Abd al-Latīf b. Mūhammad b. ‘Abd al-Latīf b. Mūhammad b. Thābit raʾis al-shāfiʿīyyah bi ʿIsfahān, with an obvious lacuna at the place indicated. (Qawāänn, misled by Ibn al-ʿAthīr, regarded him as the uncle, rather than the son, of his predecessor). Ibn al-ʿAthīr includes his death at the hands of Sunur in the events of 592 and this date is confirmed by Rāwandī; the old edition of al-ʿSubkī has his die in Jumādā I or II 572, but in the new edition (ed. ʿA. al-F. M. Hulī and M.W. al-Tanābī, Cairo 1964–76, VI p. 134–5) this has been corrected to 592. A letter of Mūhammad b. ‘Abd al-Latīf dated Jumādā I 558/5 can be found in al-Muḥkārāt min al-rasāʾil p. 283.
231. Köhyarî1 Ṭabarî, a citizen of Aṣul, is credited with two rubā'îs in 'Aufl's chapter on the poets of Western Persia during the Seljuk period.

'Aufl II p. 240; Ḥidāyat, Majma' I p. 487 (follows 'Aufl); Khayyām-pūr p. 493.

232. Köshkakî2 al-Qā'înî was a poet at the court of Sanjar. 'Aufl says that he specialised in invectives and quotes two samples of his satirical verse. Abū 1-Rajâ' Qumā, who quotes a rubā'î referring to Sanjar's defeat at the hands of the Ghuzz (in 548/1154) and Rāzî adds two different poems about that same event.


233. Latîf al-dīn Zakî Marāgha'î is included in 'Aufl's chapter on the poets of Transoxania after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157). 'Aufl tells us that, although his family was from Marāghah, Latîf was born and raised in Kāshghar, and quotes two long qaṣīdahs, both apparently dedicated to the same ruler who, in the first is called 'Khusraw Mu'izz i dunyâ wa dīn' (who is said to be a descendant of Sanjar), in the second 'Khusraw i sharq Mu'izz al-dīn wa 1-dunyâ'. Elsewhere (II p. 238) the same authority quotes a laudatory verse that 'Latîf al-dīn Dhakī (sic) Marâgha'î addressed to Kāfî b. Abī 1-Faraj Rūnî, together with the flattering reply of the latter.

'Aufl II p. 238, 371-7; Rāzî III p. 264-5 (no. 1384); Ḥidāyat, Majma' I p. 241-2; LN s.vv. 'Latîf

---

1Thus 'Aufl; Ḥidâyat has Kōhîrî.

2Thus 'Aufl II p. 174 (in the text), p. 358 (in Ms. E) and the other sources. The evidently erroneous variant Kōshkî is found in 'Aufl II p. 174 (in the superscription) and p. 358 (in Ms. S).

234. Lu’lu’īī is the first name in ‘Arūdī’s list of the poets of the ‘house of the Kháqān’, i.e. the Qarakhanids. Two verses are ascribed to a poet of this name in the marginal additions to Mas. nūn of Asadī’s Lughat i furs. Another two verses are quoted by Shams and four rubā’īyāt are (according to Nāfīsī) ascribed to Lu’lu’īī in the Nuzhāt al-majālis of Jamāl al-dīn Sharwānī. To these Nāfīsī has added another two verses from ‘other dictionaries’ – one of them can be found in Surūrī’s Majma’ al-furs;2 the other (Nāfīsī’s first verse on p. 39) I have not located – and another rubā’ī from an unidentified anthology. But Nāfīsī unnecessarily complicates things by raising the question of whether some or all of these verses might belong not to ‘Arūdī’s Lu’lu’īī but to the ‘kād-khudā’ (variant: dīh-khudā) Lu’lu’īī mentioned by Asadī in his Karshāsp-nāmah.3 In fact, Asadī refers to this person only as a dabīr and gives no indication that he was a poet. The marginal additions in Mas. nūn of LF have, of course, nothing to do with Asadī; the connection that Nāfīsī draws between the verses quoted there and the passage in the Karshāsp-nāmah is thus without foundation.

235. The poetess Mahsâtī1 is, with Abū Sa’īd and Khayyāmī, the third of the great semi-legendary figures associated with the early Persian rubā’ī. We have no information whatsoever about the historical person who presumably lurks behind the legend. ‘Atārī, in one of the stories in his Ilāhī-nāmah, depicts Mahsâtī as a singing-girl at the court of Sanjar (511/1118 to 552/1157), but Mustaufi and his successors situate her at the court of Mahmūd Ghaznavī (388/998 to 421/1030).

The Vatican manuscript of Asadī’s Lughat i furs ascribes one verse to Mahsâtī, but in other copies of that dictionary the same verse is attributed to Rūdakī. Consequently one cannot be certain whether or not this name was known already to Asadī. A single quatrain by ‘Mahsâtī the scribe’ (dabīr) is quoted by Shams to illustrate a bad rhyme. Only with the great anthologies of Sharwānī and Jājarmī do we begin to have a substantial selection of her rubā’īyāt, exactly as is the case with Khayyāmī.

Mahsâtī and her lover Amīr Ahmad are the protagonists of a novel which cannot be dated precisely, but of which the oldest copy appears to be a London manuscript dated 867/1462-3.2 This situates their story in the timeless past, in the exotic, semi-foreign town of Ganjāh and the prose narrative is interspersed with the quatrain3 which the two lovers are supposed to have addressed to one another. 257 rubā’īyāt (and a few poems in other metres) attested in anthologies and other sources, but without those found exclusively in manuscripts of the novel, were collected (together

1The name Mahsâtī (metrical variant: Mahastī) is discussed at length by Meier, p. 43-57, with the plausible conclusion that it is a compound of mḥ, ‘moon’, and the early Indian loan-word satī, ‘virtuous lady’.
2London Or. 8755 fol. 22b-108a (Meredith-Owens p. 69). This will be discussed, together with other works of narrative prose, in PL III/3.
with a German translation) by Fritz Meier in *Die schöne Mahsatî. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des persischen Vierzeilers, I* (as yet no more published), Wiesbaden 1963, in which all the available sources are critically assessed, the fundamental work for the study of this author. A smaller collection of poems had previously been published by T. Shihâb under the title *Dżâwâl i Mahsatî i Ganjâwî*, Tehran 1335sh./1956, 2nd edition 1336sh./1957. The poems ascribed to Mahsatî are all of amatory, and generally decidedly sentimental content, though a small number (among them the half-quatrain quoted in LF) are pornographic.


236. *Majd al-dîn* Abû l-Barakât is included in ‘Aufî’s chapter on the poets of Khurâsân after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157) where he is represented by a long ode, evidently in imitation of one by Lâmi‘I (whose name is mentioned in the 13th verse),1 dedicated to a ruler whom ‘Aufî calls ‘U’ay al-dîn râ’sîn i Khurâsân’, and to whom the poet applies the grander title of sa’ïrid i Erân. Hidâyat quotes the same poem, but calls its author Abû l-Barakât Baihaqî, evidently identifying him with the person included by Ibn Funduq in his history of his native town (p. 246) as *Majd al-dîn* Abû l-Barakât al-Fâdî b. ‘Ali al-‘Alawî (with a genealogy reaching back to ‘Ali b. Abî Tâlib). Ibn Funduq proceeds to tell us that this

1See Musaffî’s remarks in his edition of *Hidâyat, Majma‘* I p. 217 note 5.

man was a poet and prose-writer in Persian and Arabic and illustrates his talents with five Arabic verses. But ‘Aufî’s failure to refer to his Majd al-din as a sa’ïrid or an ‘Alawî speaks rather against the identification.


237. *Majd al-dîn* Muḥammad al-Pâyêzî al-Nasawî is also cited in ‘Aufî’s chapter on the poets of Khurâsân after the time of Sanjar, where we find five of his rubâ’îyât. ‘Aufî says that he was one of the poets of ‘Sultân Sikanîdar’, i.e. the Khwârazm-shâh ‘Alâ’ al-dîn Muḥammad b. Tekish (596/1200 to 617/1220),2 that he himself saw him in Nasâ in the year 600/1203-4 and that Majd al-dîn was the author of a poetical account of the deeds of the Khwârazm-shâhs with the title *Shâhânshâh-nâmah*.

‘Aufî II p. 345-6; Râzî II p. 35 (no. 540); Khaiyâm-pîr p. 101 (‘Pâyêzî i Nasawî’).

238. Three verses by one *Malaqâbâdî* (?) are quoted by Shams p. 236.

239. *al-Qâdî* al-imâm Shams al-dîn Mansûr b. Mahmûd al-Gzandî was, according to ‘Aufî, a religious scholar and physician who entered the services of the Khitây. ‘Aufî quotes two of his odes, the first of which praises a commander of the Khitây with the name Aḥmad and the title *tayangû*.3 The opening verse of this *qaşîdah* is

1Thus Browne’s reading, on the basis of one of the two Ms. of ‘Aufî’s book. The two Ms. of *Hâfi‘at lâqîm* consulted by Ethê have ‘al-Dânîrî’ or ‘b. al-Dânîrî’.

2See above, p. 249 (Abî ‘Alî).

3For which see Doerfer II p. 651-2, with further literature. It does not seem possible to say whether or not this Aḥmad is identical with any of the *tayangûs* mentioned in the historical sources.
quoted also by Shams, who calls its author Qādī Mansūr Farhānī. Zakariyā' al-Qazwīnī quotes the first three verses of the same poem, but calls its author 'qādī madīnat Bukhārā ẓādr al-shari'ah', apparently confusing him with one of the Al i Burhān; Zakariyā' is, however, evidently correct in seeing this poem as the model for another with the same unusual rhyme by Shams Tabāsī.¹


240. Mas‘ūd b. Sa‘d b. Salmān has left us with a substantial diwān that is not only very rich in autobiographical data, but which also contains much information on the history of North-Western India during the last quarter of the 5th/11th century.² He was born, as he indicates quite clearly in a number of poems, in Lahore, and not, as ‘Auft maintains, in Hamadān, nor in any of the other improbable places claimed by the authors of later tadhkīrahs. His father Sa‘d was a rich landowner and an official in the Ghaznavid administration³ and Mas‘ūd followed in his footsteps, serving five successive sultans, from Ibrāhīm b. Mas‘īm (451/1059 to 492/1099) down to Bahrām-shāh (511/1117 to 552/1157), by four of whom are mentioned in his poems. The earliest piece which can be dated precisely is his ode celebrating the appointment by Sultan Ibrāhīm of his son Sa‘f al-ḍāulah Māḥṣūd as the governor of the Ghaznavid possessions in India; the poem fixes this event to

1 The Zoroastrian New Year fell on 26 February in 1075 and 1076 and on 25 February in 1077, each of which would correspond to a date in Tāj. The calculations in Qazwīnī/Browne, JRAS 1905, p. 714-5, which put the poem earlier, involve the false assumption that Nau-rūz was fixed to the vernal equinox.

² The date given by ‘Arūḏī, namely 472/1079-80, is much too early.

³ For which see below, no. 292.

² The following notes are based almost entirely on Qazwīnī’s classic study of 1905-6, where the reader can find the verses that attest the data summarized here.

³ He is evidently the Sa‘d i Salmān mentioned by Bāḥqā (p. 501) in his account of the events of the year 427/1036.
though some of the verses composed during his second imprisonment seem to imply that Mas'ud had been accused (wrongly, he says) of misappropriation of funds. He was eventually pardoned by Sultan Mas'ud, i.e. before the death of the latter in 508/1115. The rest of his life seems to have been uneventful. He certainly lived until after the accession of Bahram shah. Hidayat and others state, on the authority of Nizami 'Arudi, that our poet died in 515/1121-2. Although this date is not mentioned in the published text of the Chahar maqalat, it is possible that it was contained in some manuscript of that work and is in any event not implausible.

'Aufi says Mas'ud left three diwan, in Persian, Arabic and 'Hindhi' (i.e. some Indian vernacular). Only the first of these has come down to us, but Watat does cite a good number of Mas'ud's Arabic verses in his Haḍa'iq al-sibh. There is no trace of his Indian diwan. For his supposed epitome of the Shah-nama see above p. 152-3.

Mss. of his diwan: Manchester Lindesiana 95 (16th century?); Oxford Elliot 37 fol. 69a (Ethel 1333 = Daqa'iq al-ash'ar. 4 tamsmis); Whinfield 54 (Beeston 2662/5. Dated 9 Rajab 1012/1603. Selections); Elliot 109 (Ethel 526. Dated 27 Muharram 1018/1609); London Add. 7793/I (fol. 1-164. Rieu p. 549. Dated Ramadān 1005/1597. Apparently Nūri-

Qazwini has taken perhaps a too sceptical view of the alleged Indian diwan. He points to various passages where Mas'ud parades his proficiency in Arabic and Persian but says nothing of 'Indian'. 'It would be absurd', Qazwini writes, 'for anyone to boast of knowing two languages while concealing the fact that he was acquainted with a third.' But this argument overlooks the fact that in Ghaznavid India Arabic and Persian were prestige languages, while the native tongues were not. It would seem most likely that Mas'ud, as the scion of a family long established - as he himself states - in Lahore, did know the local language and it is thus not impossible that he might have composed the odd poem in it.

yân's bâ?); Egerton 701 (Rieu p. 548-9. Dated Ramadān 1008/1600. Nūriyân's qâf); I.O. 2862 (Dated 28 Dhû l-qa'dah 1023/1614); I.O. 908; Paris Supplément 798 (Blochet 1210. 16th century?); Munich Cod. or. 279 fol. 1-91 (Amer 18. 17th century? Selections); Leningrad Acad. D 187 (Index 1628. Dated 1012/1603-4); Salemann 15; Komayasker 8; Konya Izet Kuyuoglu Kutubhanesi FY 1006 (Ates, Istanbul Universite Cat. 21. Dated Shawwāl 1011/1603); Istanbul Hekimoğlu Ali Paşa 669/6 (Mikrürfilm-hâ I p. 420-1. Apparently old); Tehran Gulistan/Atabây III 430/I (Bayânî apparently attributes the Ms. to the 16th century); Asghar Mahdavî (Nuskhâhâ II p. 78. Dated 12 Rabî' I 1045/1635); Mashhad Faculty of Theology (ex-Maulavi collection. Nuskhâhâ V p. 29 no. 197. Dated 1009/1600-1. Nūriyân's sîn); Taşkent Acad. 160/1 (Semenov 763. Dated 1268/1851-2); Acad. 238/IX (Semenov 764. 19th century); Dushanbe Acad. II 336 (18th century?); Lahore Univ. (Munz. Pak. VII p. 22. 16th century?); Hyderabad (Sindh) (Munz. Pak. VII p. 22. 15th-16th century?); Aligarh Subb p. 33 no. 32; Calcutta Ivanov 435 (= Spranger 353. 18th century?). Cf. Munz. III 25913-41.

Editions: Persia 1298/1879; Tehran 1318h. /1939 (Ed. R. Yāsims; with an extensive introduction) and reprints; 1362h./1983 (again reprinted from Yâsim; with a new introduction); 1364-5h./1986 (ed. M. Nūriyân in 2 vols., with variants from six Ms. in the second volume).

LP ed. Ibâd p. 30. 396 (Ms. nūn in marg.); 'Arudi p. 28. 45-6 (and Qazwini's notes); Watât passim; al-Kâtib al-Iṣfahānî, Khwarīdat al-qasr (see Leyden Cat. II p. 240); 'Aufi II p. 246-52; Shams passim; Jâjarmâli II p. 618-24; Daulat-shâh p. 47-9; Râzī II p. 542-54 (no. 1032); Taqâ (see London Or. 3506 fol. 152b sqq. = Rieu Suppt. 105); Ādhar II p. 817-34; Hidayat, Najma' I p. 514-41; M. Qazwini (tr. E.G. Browne), 'Mas'ud-î Sâ'd-î-Salman', JRAS 1905, p. 693-740; 1906, p. 11-51; S.

241. Fakhr al-dīn Masʿūdī, of Marv, is included in ‘Auffī’s chapter on the poets of the Seljuqs of Khurāsān, where we read that he was a leading religious authority who also produced poetry. He is evidently not identical with the earlier Masʿūdī Marwāzī, of whom ‘Auffī knows nothing. ‘Auffī II p. 163-4; Khayyām-pūr p. 539.

242. Muʿāyяд al-dīn al-Nasafī is the author of two didactic *mathnawīn*, *Naṣīḥ al-ḡābah ilā l-ṣibā* (inc.: *ai mašābāh i āsmān i hudā * w-*ai maʃaţīb i jannāti l-maʃâw*; and dedicated to one Majd al-dīn), and *Pahlawān-nāmah* (inc.: *marbaštā ai raʃīq i ham-dam i man * bi-shnu In sar-gudhešt i pur-gham i man*); both are preserved in a 13th-century London manuscript, but neither has been published or studied. If he is in fact (as seems likely) the father of Shihāb al-dīn b. Muʿāyяд al-Samargandi, then he must have flourished in Samarqand around the middle of the 6th/12th century. ‘Auffī, who mentions the Pahlawān-nāmah, puts its author at the very beginning of his chapter on the poets of Transoxania after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157) and quotes, among other things, a *qaṣīda* and a *qīṭā* in which the poet addresses a ruler by the name of Jālāl al-dīn; the latter is presumably identical with the ‘Pahlavān i jahān Jālāl al-dīn’ to whom the Pahlawān-nāmah is dedicated.1 The *laqab* Jālāl al-dīn was used by several of the Qarakhanids, notably al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī (524/1130 to 526/1132)2 and ‘Alī b. al-Ḥasan (551/1156 to ca. 556/1160),3 either one of whom could conceivably have been Muʿāyяд’s patron. Two poems are attributed to ‘Maʿāyяд i Nasafī’ in the Tārīkh-nāmah i Harāfī and a further qīṭā in five verses is added by Hidāyāt. Ms. of the two *mathnawīs*: London I.O. 929 (Dated Jumādā I 637/1239). (Neither poem is in Munz.).


243. Fakhr al-dīn Abū Sa’d4 Mubārak-shāh b. al-Ḥussain5 al-Marwārūdī (Persian: Marw-ī-ruđī) died, according to Ibn al-Aṭhīr,6 in Shawwāl 602/1206.7 He was, the historian assures us, a

---

1The distinguished Pakistani scholar did not, of course, really have access to an 11th-century manuscript of Masʿūd’s poem; here ‘codex’ means ‘text’.  
2Above, p. 191-2.  
3See below, no. 298.  
4Ibn. 96a.  
6Ibn. 96b.  
7The *kuṇyah* is mentioned only by Ibn al-Puqatī. His father’s name is given thus by ‘Auffī and Ibn al-Puqatī. The published text of Ibn al-Aṭhīr has ‘al-Ḥasan’, presumably a scribal error.  
8XII p. 160-1. The same author, XII p. 101, mentions ‘al-Fakhr Mubārak-Shāh’ in connection with Ghiyāṯ al-dīn’s conversion to the Shīʿī *madhhab*, but I suspect that here the author has confused our Mubārak-shāh with Fakhr al-dīn al-Rūḏī.  
9The same date is given by Ibn al-Puqatī, who claims that Naṣīḥ al-dīn Tūnī ‘told me’ it, but given the fact that Ibn al-Puqatī’s whole entry agrees more or less literally with Ibn al-Aṭhīr the claim has to be taken with a grain of salt.
fine poet in Persian and in Arabic and had enjoyed a high position with the ruler of Ghaznawī and Herat, Ghiyāth al-dīn al-Kābir (i.e., the Ghurid Muḥammad b. Sām, 558/1163 to 599/1203). ‘Afti quotes, among other verses of his, a long qaṣīdah in praise of that king’s predecessor Saif al-dīn Muḥammad b. Ḥusayn (556/1161 to 558/1163), while Minhāj i Širāzī says that he himself had seen in the private quarters of the daughter of the aforementioned Ghiyāth al-dīn a manuscript of a history (or of a Nisbat-nāmah, as he calls it) of the Ghurid kings, in verse, composed by Mubārak-shāh and originally dedicated to ‘Ala’ al-dīn Ḥusayn Jahān-sāz (544/1149 to 556/1161), but later re-dedicated to Ghiyāth al-dīn. The six maṭnawī verses in muṭaqāribi metre by ‘Fakhr al-dīn Mubārak-shāh Marwānī’ which are quoted in the Raudāt al-jannāt of Mu‘īn al-dīn Isfīzārī in his account of that dynasty evidently belong to the work in question.

Mustaufī (followed by Khwānd-mīr and Ḥājī Khalīfah) says that Mubārak-shāh is the author of the Madkhal i manṣūm i nujūm, presumably the well-known versified treatise on astrology which is ascribed in some manuscripts to Naṣīr al-dīn Ṭūsī.

1In Ibn al-Fuwaštī wrongly ‘Mawmūd’.
2For this work, which has since been published (see our bibliography), cf. PL I p. 356, where (line 14) ‘1648’ is an error for ‘1648’.
3With variants in the Mas. Khwānd-mīr and Ḥājī Khalīfah both quote the title in the Arabic form al-Madkhal al-maṣūm II barb al-nujūm.
4See PL II p. 55. The work is also contained (but not attributed to any author) in an old anthology in Tehran from which it was published, with variants from four other Mas., in Yaghmā’ī p. 15-32. One of these copies (Yaghmā’ī’s muṣnḥ-dāl) contains a dedication to a certain Jalāl al-dīn bar (read: Bī) Maḥmūd Muḥammad i Ahmad and concludes with verses giving the date of composition as 1 Jumādā I 616/1219. (Cf. Calcutta, Ivanov Curzon 645, where the name of the patron is garbled and the date altered to 816). The same date (616) is found also in a manuscript of a work with the same title (presumably the same poem) in Isfahan, Kitāb- khānas i Kitabātāh i Madrasah i Ṣadr (see Nuskahāh b V 315, no. 22/1) inscribed there to ‘Fakhr al-dīn Mubārak-shāh Ghaznavī Buhkārī (sic)’. If this date is correct, the poem cannot be the work of Mubārak-shāh (who died 14 years earlier). See further S. Nafīn, ‘Ash’ār i Fārsī i Khwājah’, in Yūsuf-nāmah i Khwājah Naṣīr al-dīn i Tūsī I, Tehran 1353sh./1957, p. 34-44, where Tūsī’s authorship is upheld.
5For whom see also Fī Supp. s.v. ‘Fakhr-i Mudabbir’ (C.E. Bosworth).
6Gawāsī flourished under ‘Ala’ al-dīn Khaḷījī, at the end of the 7th/13th or the beginning of 8th/14th century, as correctly stated in PL III p. 5; the date given above, p. 13, is wrong.
244. al-Sayyid Shafar al-dīn Muḥammad b. Nāšir al-‘Alawī was, according to ‘Auṭī, the elder brother of Sayyid Ḥasan Ghaznavī; this information is in so far problematic as those authorities who are not dependent on ‘Auṭī give Sayyid Ḥasan’s father the name Muḥammad, not Nāšir.1 His contemporary Sanā’ī extols him in his Kār-nāmah i Balkhī as well as in a qaṣīda in which he uses the same radīf (ātash u āb) that Sayyid Muḥammad employed in his qaṣīda quoted by ‘Auṭī and dedicated (according to the same authority) to Sultan ‘Alā’ al-daulah (i.e. Mas‘ūd III, 492/1099 to 508/1115).

1His laqab is quoted thus by Sanā’ī in his Kār-nāmah; ‘Auṭī gives it as Jamāl al-dīn.

2See above p. 333 n. 1, where the possibility of reconciling the two traditions is discussed. Qazvīnī accepted that the two were brothers, but Mudarris i Rādawī (in his introduction to Sayyid Ḥasan’s dīwān) and Gh. M. Khan (in Islamic Culture XXIII, 1949, p. 220-1) both claimed, apparently independently, that Sayyid Muḥammad was the brother of a different Sayyid Ḥasan (namely the one whose death is lamented in the dīwān of Mas‘ūd i Sa’d, ed. Yāsīnī, p. 62-3; the name of this Sayyid’s father is, however, not indicated in the poem) and that ‘Auṭī consequently confused the two Ḥasans.
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Mas‘ūd i Sa’d composed a ḡīṭ ‘āsh praising the poetry of Sayyid Muḥammad i Nāṣir and another bewailing the death of ‘Alawī. ‘Auṭī quotes two more of his poems, one of which Rāzī (followed by Hidāyat) claims to have been dedicated to Bahram-Shāh (512/1118 to 547/1152).


245. The dīwān of a certain Mubyī, who, in the manuscripts, is generally, but almost certainly wrongly, identified with Mubyī l-dīn ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jalānī, the founder of the Qādirī order (died 561/1166), and which is not apparently attestable before the 11th/12th century, will be discussed below, chapter V.

246. The dīwān of one Mū‘īn, supposedly the work of the Indian saint Mu‘īn al-dīn Chishti (died 633/1236), but preserved only in very late copies, has been discussed in PL I p. 943 n. 3.

247. Amīr al-shu‘arā‘, Abu ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Malik al-Mu‘īzzi al-Naṣīḥūrī was the leading poet at the courts of the Seljuqs Malik-shāh (465/1072 to 485/1092), Berk-yarq (487/1094 to 498/1105), Muḥammad (498/1105 to 511/1118) and Sanjar (511/1118 to 552/1157). He also addressed poems to their ministers (especially Niẓām al-
mulk), the Ghaznavid Bahrām-shāh (Sanjar’s contemporary and vassal) the Khwārazm-shāh Atsiz (521/1127 to 551/1156) and others. Niẓāmī ‘Arūdī met the famous poet, as he tells us, in 510/1116-7 when Sanjar and his court were encamped on the outskirts of Tūs, and again in 514/1120-1 in Naṣīrābād, and at the first of these encounters Mu‘izzī told our informant the story of the beginning of his career, namely of how he had inherited the post of poet-laureate from his father Burhānī in the early part of the reign of Malik-shāh; but for a year failed to gain admittance to the king’s presence or to draw his salary, how he was eventually introduced to the sultan by the amīr ‘Ali b. Farāhāns and ingratiated himself with the ruler by means of two extemporised rubāʾīs, and how he was awarded the title ‘Amīr Mu‘izzī’ with reference to Malik-shāh’s jagab Mu‘izz al-dunyā wa l-dīn. According to ‘Aūfī Mu‘izzī was killed by a stray arrow shot by Sanjar during target practice and an ‘arrow’ is mentioned also in two qīṭāhs that Sanā‘ī composed lamenting Mu‘izzī’s death. However, there is a poem by Mu‘izzī recounting how he had been wounded by the sultan’s arrow, spent twelve months convalescing, but in the end recovered and returned to the court. It would seem thus that Mu‘izzī’s long absence from the court gave rise to rumours that he had died and that Sanā‘ī took these false reports at face value. But in this event one cannot use Sanā‘ī’s verses as evidence that he necessarily outlived Mu‘izzī. Taqī puts Mu‘izzī’s death in 542/1147-8. It is striking that ‘Arūdī consistently mentions Mu‘izzī’s name without any of the usual eulogies that one would expect him to apply to a deceased contemporary; this might seem to indicate that the latter was still alive when ‘Arūdī completed his book in 552/1157.

Mu‘izzī was greatly admired by men of letters of his own time and of several generations afterwards; in the eyes of ‘Aūfī he joins Rūdakī and ‘Unṣūrī to complete the trinity of preeminent panegyrists. His dīwān, which Iqbāl has edited on the basis of late manuscripts, deserves a critical edition using the 14th-century London codex and exploiting the copious quotations from his verse contained in early anthologies.

Mss.: London I.0. 913 (Ms. copied by ‘Abd all-Mu‘min al-‘Aflāwī al-Kāshī in 713-4/1314-5. Pictures); I.0. 3027 (Dated 19 Shawwāl 1018/1610);

1This is the famous India Office ‘Six dīwān’, containing a selection of poems by (1) Kū‘izzī, (2) Aḥār Akhsāṣī, (3) Aḥār Sāhīr, (4) Qasim Iṣfahānī, (5) Shams Tabāsī and (6) Nasīr i Khurṣat, of which nos. 3, 5 and 6 are signed and dated. For the minatures see Robinson, 55-56. The first picture illustrates ‘Arūdī’s story of Mu‘izzī’s first meeting with Malik-shāh (but the king is identified in the accompanying text as Sanjar). Most of the other pictures show a poet (with turban and more or less pronounced Persian physiognomy) in the presence of a king and his courtiers (usually Mongol in features, dress and hair-style). According to Robinson the poet is in each case ‘presenting or reading a scroll of verse’ to the ruler, but this is hardly correct. For one thing, Persians do not write their poems on scrolls, but in codices, and for another, what is depicted is clearly not a scroll but a rolled-up piece of fabric. It seems to me that what the pictures show is the receipt by the poet of a ‘robe of honour’ (khil‘ah) as a reward for his panegyrics, a situation very well known to the readers of Persian and Arabic texts. The Ms. now in the India Office was at one time in the possession of the Safavid royal family and has in many places the seal of one
I.O. 912 (Dated 1 Dhu 'l-biijjah 1046/1637); Add. 10,588 (Rieu p. 552-3. 17th century? Ca. 8000 verses); Cambridge Browne Coll. V.65 no. 15 (Anthology dated 27 Ramadan 827/1424); Browne Coll. V.5 (Dated 19 Ju'da' 1252/1836); Paris Supplément 783 fol. 21v sqq. (Bichet 1981. 16th century?); Supplément 1035 (Bichet 1222. Dated 17 Safar 1242/1826); Vienna Flügel 508 (Dated 14 Rajab 1241/1926); Leningrad Salemann 15; Istanbul Universitete FY 335 (Olim Reza Paşa 1180. Atek 29. 17th century?); Hekimoğlu Ali Paşa 669/8 (Hikru-film-hä I p. 420-1. Apparently old); Najaf Amīr al-mu'āminin 1660 (Munz. 26066. 18th century?); Tehran Univ. VIII 2116 (Ascribed by the cataloguer to the 13th or 14th century. Ms. contains an evidently forged note with the date 16 Dhu 'l-qa'dah 553/1158); Univ. IX 2122 (15th-16th century? Again with a forged date Rajab 662/1264); Majalis 6228/4 (Munz. 26059. Dated 12 Rabī' II 996/1588); Univ. XV 5266 (17th century?); Malik 5579 (Munz. 26064. 18th century?); Gulistan/Āthābāy II 432/1; Mashhad Rıdvan VII 965/6 (Ms. dated 1041/1631-2);1 Tashkent Acad. 238/II (Semenov 785. Dated 1270/1853-4); Lucknow Sprenger 387 (Two copies); Calcutta Ivanov 437 (17th century?); Ivanov 927 fol. 235v-268, 412v-425v (Modern); Būrār 287 (19th century?); Cf. Munz. III 26056-26129.

Editions: Tehran 1310/1939 (Ed. 'A. Iqbal, with biography); 1362/1939 (Ed. N. Šāyiri). Non vidi.

İsmâ'îl (certainly not İsmâ'îl I, probably İsmâ'îl III, according to A.H. Morton). There is in Mashhad (Rıdvan VII 965) a Ms. containing the same six dwâms, plus those of two poets from the 13th century (Rūkūn al-dîn Dâ'wâd-dâr and Fârid i Ahwâl, both to be discussed in chapter IV) copied by Șâdr al-dîn Muḥammad b. Ja'far İşafahânî with dates between 1039/1629-30 and 1041/1631-2; it seems likely that the Mashhad Ms. was copied (see also Bânish's introduction to his edition of the dîwan of Shams Tabâsî, p. xlvi-xlvii).

1See p. 423 fn.

248. Mujir al-dîn Bâlaqânî was, as his nisbâh indicates, a native of the town of Bâlaqân, in Transcaucasia, to the south of Sharwân, a compatriot and contemporary of Kháqânî, whom he addressed in his poems. During the 12th century Bâlaqân stood on the boundary between the sphere of influence of the Sharwân-shâhs and Georgians, on the one hand, and that of the Seljuqs and

LF ed. Horn, passim (all quotations, some of them anonymous, are found only in the Vatican and India Office MSS.);1 also ed. Iqbal p. 187 (Ms. nûn in marg.); 'Arûdî p. 28, 33, 40-2, 50; Abû l-Rajâ 'Qamî, Târikh al-wusârat, ed. M.T. Bânish-pâshâ, Tehran 1363/1985, p. 14; Râwandî, Râbash al-sûdâr, ed. M. Iqbal, London 1921, passim; 'Auîj II p. 69-86; Shams passim; Mustafaî p. 748-9; Daqîqî ash-ashâr (Oxford Elliot 37 fol. 62b, 110b, 139s. 181a. 187a, 190a, 201a = Ethé 1333); Jâjârî I p. 131-4, 144-xliv-144-xl, 216-8, II p. 1056; Daulat-shâh p. 57-60; Râzî II p. 250-6 (no. 747); Taqī (see London Or. 3506 fol. 236b sqq. = Rieu Suppt. 105); Hîdâyat, Majma' I p. 570-93; Browne, History II p. 327-30; M. Qâzâwî, 'Qâsidah i Mu'izzî' in his Bîst maqâlah, 2nd edition, Tehran 1332/1954, I p. 75-84 (article written in 1343/1924); id., 'Abî Râdî Khusrawânî Tûrfah, 'Sharh i bâl i Amîr Mu'izzî', Armaghân IV p. 529-48; V p. 15-30; Nafî's notes on Bahâqî III p. 1279-94; J. Marek, 'Amîr Mu'izzî (Einige Verse im Ver- gleich zweier Traditionen)', Archiv Orientální 24, 1956, p. 252-71; Şâfî, Târikh II p. 508-23; Khâyîn-pûr p. 552; Fouche'cou, Nature p. 201-26; ET' s.v. 'Mu'izzî' (J.S. Helsami).

1For these interpolated quotations see above, p. 59.

2There is an ode praising Kháqânî in Mujir's Dâwân, ed. Abâdî, p. 20-2, and a qîf'ah attacking him on p. 320; see also p. 393.
Elduguzids, on the other, and this situation is reflected in Mujir’s diwan. This contains a few poems to the Sharwan-shah Manuchehr II, who died not long after 555/1160-1, and these must consequently belong to the earliest part of his career. The majority of his odes are addressed to the atabegs Nusrat al-din Jahan-pahlawan b. Elduguz (571/1175 to 582/1186) and his successor Qizil Arslan (d. 587/1191) and to the Seljuk Arslan b. Toqhril (556/1161 to 571/1176), nominally the master, but in fact the puppet of Jahan-pahlawan. ‘Auffi tells an anecdote about his rivalry with Athir Akhsikath on the ear of Qizil Arslan.5

In his famous ode of the town of Isfahan Khagan speaks of how an ‘accursed devil’ (ddeh i rajia) had mocked that city and how the Isfahani had in some way held Khagan responsible for the attack, an accusation which he rejects energetically. The commentators have identified this ‘devil’ with Khagan’s supposed pupil Mujir (rajia being an anagram for the latter’s name). There is in fact a (by Persian standards) decided

2See above, p. 248 n. 2.
3Rieu says that Mujir wrote an elegy on the death of Qizil Arslan (and consequently outlived him), referring to ‘fol. 27’ of the London Ms. There are indeed some elegiac verses on fol. 27b of that copy, but they are in fact a short extract from the poem on p. 43-8 of Nazzis’s edition. When the verses are read in context it becomes clear that Mujir is in fact consoling Qizil Arslan on the demise of his father. Daulat-shah says that Mujir addressed poems to Elduguz, but this too I have been unable to confirm.
4The poem quoted by ‘Auffi in this context is in the diwan, p. 295-6.
5E.g. the 17th century commentary by Ghanati (see above p. 391), whose gloss is reproduced in F. Spiegel, Chrestomathia Persica, Leipsig 1846, p. 100-1.

Evidently only a short extract.

1P. 396.
2The poem is in Dastgirid’s uncritical edition of Jamali’s diwan, p. 400-1, but this proves nothing.
3See above, p. 384 n. 3.
4Tagi (apud Sprenger p. 16 no. 28) puts his death in the year 594/1197-8, which (for once) must be roughly correct.
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ly restrained ruba’i in Mujir’s diwan poking fun at the people of Isfahan. Zakariya al-Qazwini alludes to this epigram and says that the ra’is of Isfahan ordered all the local poets to respond to it, collected their efforts in a volume and sent it to Mujir. Daulat-shah says that Mujir composed the quatrain when the atabeg sent him to that town as a tax-collector and he adds another ruba’i by the Isfahani poet Shafarz al-din i Shafgarh replying to it, but he too has nothing to say of Khagan in this context. Razi quotes the same two ruba’i and adds an obscene qiftah supposedly by Jamali al-din attacking both Mujir and Khagan, though Razi himself leaves Khagan out of the business. Razi goes on to say that Mujir was subsequently murdered in a bath-house by the Isfahan mob. The anecdote, at least in this final form, involves a blatant chronological contradiction: Khagan’s ode was evidently composed in 551/1156, but Mujir was still alive at the time of Qizil Arslan, thirty years later; if he did insult the Isfahani he could hardly have paid for it, at that time, with his life.

Mujir’s diwan contains several highly artificial poems (for example one in which he uses only the letters that do not take diacritical points) and a fair number in Arabic or with alternating Arabic and Persian verses.
the time of the Ghaznavids Mas'ud III b. Ibrāhīm (492/1099 to 508/1115) and Abū ʿAlī Muḥājir Afsān b. Mas'ud (509/1116 to 511/1117) and survived into the reign of the latter's successor, Bahramshāh. The first period of his career is represented by one poem written for Mas'ud during the lifetime of his father (i.e. before 492/1099) and apparently also by six gaṣīdahs4 and one tarkhīb5 addressed to a ruler whom the poet calls by the name Fanā-khusrāu and by the titles ʿAqīd al-daulah, Nughīth al-dīn and Shāhanshah i Būyā. Of the three Buyids (al i Būyā) known to history as Fanā-khusrāu6 the only one who lived in the time of Mukhtarī is Abū ʿAlī Fanā-khusrāu b. Abī Kālījār, who ruled Naubandajān, in Fārs, as a vassal of the Seljuqs and is reported to have died in 487/1094. Although the titles used by Mukhtarī do not seem to be mentioned in other sources, the identity of his patron with this Fanā-khusrāu would appear to be supported by a verse7 implying that the former was a contemporary (and opponent) of the Fatimid caliph al-Mustanṣir, who also died in 487/1094.

It appears that Mukhtarī was out of favour, or even in exile from Ghazna, for most of Mas'ud's reign, during which he attended the courts of various other rulers, notably the Seljuq ruler of Kirmān, Arslān-shāh I (495/1101 to 537/1142), the dedicatee of a large number of his poems, and also visited India. But he returned to Ghazna with the
This is the last identifiable date in the dīwān. Taqī Kāshī, followed by others, puts his death in 544/1149-50 or 554/1159 but these dates are, as usual, worthless.

Mukhtarī was a younger contemporary of Mas'ūd i Saʿd, whom he praised, and an older contemporary of Sanāʾī, by whom he was praised.

Mukhtarī's dīwān is preserved notably in the 13th-century London manuscript Or. 3713, which forms the basis for the careful and richly annotated edition by Jalāl al-dīn Humāʾī. As already mentioned, the London manuscript contains (apparently in the same hand) the dīwān of Azraqī and at least one poem is attributed by its scribe to both poets. Thus the occurrence of a given poem even in this oldest manuscript does not absolutely guarantee its authenticity. This codex (and, of the others) also contains a didactic mathnawi, Hunar-nāmah i Yamlīnī, (inc.: gunbad i lājward i dāʿirah-gard * sāl-khwahār sipīhr i sāl-naward) dedicated to the ruler of Tabas, Yamlīn al-daulah Ismāʿīl i Gīlakī, but also containing an epilogue praising the Ghaznavid Malik-Arsānī. The former is known to have been alive in 493/1099-1100 and is reported to have been an Ismāʿīlī. Although the Hunar-nāmah does deal with matters close to the hearts of the Ismāʿīlīs (astrology, cosmology etc.) there is nothing in the text that would reveal any attachment of the poet to their specific doctrines.

1Mukhtarī-nāmah p. 317, with references also to other taḥkīrāt. Spruner, p. 16 no. 15, quotes only the later date.

2Above, p. 33 n. 5. I should like to add now that the poem dedicated to Abū l-Mulūk Arslān-Shāh ascribed to Azraqī in Naṣīrī's edition of his dīwān (where it is no. 25; see above, p. 92) - but not in the London Ms. - is in fact by Mukhtarī (see his dīwān, p. 85-90); pseudo-Azraqī/Nafīsī no. 23 (likewise missing in the section of Or. 3712 devoted to Azraqī) is also by Mukhtarī (see his dīwān, p. 157-9).
Mas. of the 

Dīwān: Oxford Whinfield 54 (Beeston 2662/4. Dated 9 Rajab 1012/1603. Selection); Laud 295 (Ethé 527); London Or. 3713/VI (Rieu Suppt. 211. Copied by Muḥammad-Shāh b. ‘All b. Māhmad Ḥafṣānī and dated 6 Rabī’ II 692/1293); Or. 4514/VII (Rieu Suppt. 215. Completed 14 Rabī’ II 1023/1614); Or. 3374 (Rieu Suppt. 216. Dated 1287/1870-1); Pariz Supplément 744 (Blochet 1209. 16th century?); Supplément 783 fol. 14r sqq. (Blochet 1981. 16th century? Selection); Leningrad Salemann 15; Romaskewicz 7; Tehran Sīpāh-sāžr II 1265 (16th century?); Majlis III 1059 (Dated 1010 /1601-2); Shūrā i Ilāhī I 35 (16th-17th century?); Qum Marāshī XVI 4813 fol. 1-87 (Dated 1259 /1843); Tashkent Acad. 160/III (Semenov 799. Dated 1269/1852-3); Acad. 238/VII (Semenov 800. Ms. Dated 1270/1853-4); Lahore Shūrānī (Munz. Pak. VII p. 59. 16th century?); Bankipore I 24 (16th century?). Cf. Munz III 25840-73.


The Shahryār-nāmah attributed to Mukhtarī presents its own problems. The existence of such a poem was first adduced by Rieu in his detailed description of the manuscript London Add. 24,095 (Rieu p. 542-3. 17th century? Pictures; the contents of the manuscript are published in Humāyī’s edition of Mukhtarī’s dīwān, p. 797-949). This codex contains five disconnected fragments: Frag. I (fol. 1a-11a) tells the story of the battles of Shahryār with Farāmārs and with Queen Farāng of Sarandīb and of those of the Dīw Arhang with

Arjāsp and Zawārah. Frag. II (fol. 12-3) tells of a meeting between Zāl and Solomon. Frag. III (fol. 14) is the most important. It contains what are clearly the closing verses of a poem which calls itself ‘Nāmah i Shahryār’, which the author, ‘Mukhtarī’ versified in the course of three years and dedicated to ‘Mas‘ūd-shāh’, who is described as being ‘gul i bāgh u bustān i Maḥmūd-shāh’, i.e. a flower from the garden of king Maḥmūd, evidently the Ghaznavid Maḥmūd III. A transitional verse then leads directly into Frag. IV and V (fol. 15-6), two extracts from the Shāh-nāmah dealing with the adventures of Isfandiyār.

A second manuscript supposedly containing Mukhtarī’s Shahryār-nāmah was acquired in Persia by the Russian scholar Chaykin and is now in Dushanbe Acad. II 352. An edition of this has been published by Ghiyāth-Husayn Būglīl under the title Shahryār-nāmah i ‘Uthmān i Mukhtarī i Ghaznavw, Tehran 1358sh./1979. The attribution of this poem, the beginning and end of which are missing in the unique manuscript, to Mukhtarī evidently rests on the fact that it includes in very much the same form the contents of the first fragment in the London manuscript (p. 116-40 of the edition). The question, however, is whether the first three fragments in the London manuscript really all belong to the same poem.

Husayn, when he first published the London fragments, without having access to the Dushanbe manuscript, pointed out quite rightly that they contain a large number of linguistic irregularities, in particular bad rhymes (e.g. rhymes between majhūl and maʿrūf vowels and between dāl and dḥāl). Nonetheless, he was inclined to think that they do represent an authentic, if youthful and immature, work by Mukhtarī. But in his posthumous Mukhtarī-nāmah the same scholar came to the conclusion that the poem, by then more familiar to him from the Dushanbe manuscript, could not
possibly be by the Mukhtārī, the study of whose diwān had occupied so many years of his life, but was the work of another Mukhtārī, dedicated to another Masʿūd, himself the son or descendant of some Maḥmūd (not him of Ghaznah), probably in India.

I think that the objections raised by Humāy against the attribution of the Dushane Shahryār-nāmah to Mukhtārī, or indeed to any Persian poet of the 11th or 12th century, are valid. At the same time the idea that the history of Persian literature should have known two Mukhtārīs, both of whom had a patron by the name of Masʿūd, and that both Masʿūds should have been descendants of a king by the name of Maḥmūd, is quite a far-fetched one. I should think it more likely that fragment III of the London manuscript (a fragment unaffected, it seems, by the above-mentioned linguistic deficiencies) is indeed the conclusion of an epic poem by our Mukhtārī on the adventures of Shahryār, but that the compiler of the London manuscript combined this text (which he found, presumably, on a loose leaf from an old copy) with material from a later version of the story of Shahryār (namely that contained in the Dushane manuscript) as well as with two extracts from the Shāh-nāmah. In short, Mukhtārī did compose a Shahryār-nāmah, but all that we have of it are its final verses.

The one question that remains is that of the relationship between the Dushane Shahryār-nāmah, wrongly ascribed (by its modern editor) to Mukhtārī, and the Shahryār-nāmah contained in a Bankiropore manuscript and ascribed there to Farrukhi. An examination of the latter work shows that the two are indeed quite different poems, although they do tell very much the same story. Here and there I have even found stray verses that are identical or virtually identical in the two, though the preceding and following verses are different. It would thus seem likely either that the author of the Dushane Shahryār-nāmah was familiar with the poem ascribed to Farrukhi, or else that both versions are based on the same source in prose.

2) Arūdī p. 28 (and Qazwīnī’s notes p. 150-1); ‘Aufī II p. 412; Shams p. 330, 381-2, 442; Daqāqīg al-ash‘ār (Oxford Elliot 37 = Ethé 1333 fol. 97a, 108a, 149a, 243a, 246a); Jājarmī I p. 116-8, 218-9; Daulat-shāh p. 93-4; Rāzī I p. 324-31 (no. 337); Taqī (see London Or. 3506 fol. 325a sqq. = Rieu Suppt. 105); Hidāyat, Majma’ I p. 598-607; Qazwīnī/Browne, JRAS 1906 p. 44-6;
Saftā, Tārikh II p. 501-7; id., Hamāsah p. 311-5; Kahlīyām-pūr p. 528-9; C.E. Bosworth, The later Ghaznavids, Edinburgh 1977 (see index. s.v. ‘Uthmān’; J. Humāy, Mukhtārī-nāmah, Tehran n.d. (published posthumously; the preface is dated 1360/81); Gh.-H. Bigdīlī, ‘Shahryār-nāmah i ‘Uthmān i Mukhtārī i Ghaznavī’, Ayandah VI/1-2, 1359/80. 1980, p. 77-86; EI² s.v. ‘Mukhtārī’ (J.S. Meisami).

250. Muṣaffarī, ‘a poet from Khorāsān’, (evidently not identical with the Muṣaffarī Panjīdīhī cited above, p. 200) composed an ode to the Bāwan-did Nuṣrat al-dīn Rustam b. ‘Ahl (ca. 536/1142 to 560/1165) the first verse of which is quoted by Ibn Isfandiyār, Tārikh i Tabaristan, ed. ‘A. Iqbal, Tehran 1320sh./1941, I p. 113, and again II p. 84.

251. Muṣīs al-Islām Najīb al-dīn Abū Bakr al-Tirmidī al-Khaṭṭāṭ is represented by three

1 See above, p. 111.
rubā'īs in ‘Aufī’s chapter on the poets of Ghaznah and Lahore after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 1157), but all but the last of them are mutilated in Browne’s manuscript. ‘Aufī says that he excelled both in serious and in frivolous poetry. ‘Aufī II p. 415–6; Khaiyām-pūr p. 597.

252. A qaṣīda by ʿIkbāl Muḥammad b. ʿṬāḥ al-Naḡmī al-Bābī al-Ḥālī is quoted by Ibn Funduq with words that imply that the two were contemporaries; i.e. he lived in the first half of the 6th/12th century.

Ibn Funduq p. 259; Khaiyām-pūr p. 597.

253. No fewer than ten verses by a certain Naḡmī are quoted in the marginal additions to Ms. nūn of Asadī’s Lughat i furūs. Their author could be identical with the Naḡmī Farghānī whom ‘Arūḍī (p. 28 and 46) mentions among the poets of the Qarakhanids and the contemporaries of ‘Am‘aqq the fragment on p. 157 in fact mentions Farghānī.


254. Saʿd al-dīn Asʿad al-Naẓmī al-Samarqandī is included in ‘Aufī’s chapter on the poets of Transoxania after the time of Sanjar, where we are told that he specialised in the composition of rubā’īs, a number of which are quoted. From the verses addressed to him by Asghar Samarqandī it is evident that he lived at the end of the 6th/12th or the very beginning of the 7th/13th century. He can thus hardly be identical with the ‘Naẓmī i Sāgharchi’ (Sāgharch is a village near Samarqand) whom ‘Arūḍī lists among the poets at the court of the Qarakhanid Khār b. Ibrāhīm (ruled briefly from 1080). ‘Arūḍī p. 28, 46 (and Qaswīnī’s notes, p. 152). For an earlier Naẓmī see above, p. 200.

Thus ‘Aufī is in both passages in which he is mentioned. ʿĪṣā, who is evidently entirely dependent on ‘Aufī, omits ‘Naẓmī’ and includes this poet in his chapter on Bukhārī; i.e. he read ‘Naẓmī’ as ‘Bukhārī’.

1See above, p. 267.

2Thus ‘Aufī in both passages in which he is mentioned. ʿĪṣā, who is evidently entirely dependent on ‘Aufī, omits ‘Naẓmī’ and includes this poet in his chapter on Bukhārī; i.e. he read ‘Naẓmī’ as ‘Bukhārī’.

1See above, p. 267.
the author says that he was then 49 (haft sab'), indicating that he was born in 535/1140-1. His earliest work is the didactic poem Makhzan al-asrār (=M.A.), which he dedicated to Fakhr al-dīn Bahram-shāh b. Dā'ūd, the ruler of Arzinjān from about 550/1155 to about 615/1218. From the dates of his subsequent poems it is clear that the M.A. must belong to the early part of Bahram-shah's reign. The possibility of a more precise dating is suggested by a verse in which Nižāmī speaks of how the prophet Muḥammad has already 'slept' for a certain number of 'days'; the oldest and best manuscript (London I.O. 989, copied in 637/1239) gives this number as '550'.

2 As the poet tells us in his Lailə-Majni‘ūn, Moscow edition, p. 77 (IX 46). In the same poem, p. 87 (XII 9), he says: gar shud pidar-am ba munnat (var.: nisbat) i jad hast va‘if bismul-haqqi va‘if yusuf pisar i zaki Mu‘ayyad, but it is not entirely clear to me whether this means that Yūsuf was the name of his father or rather of his grandfather. Zakariyā al-Qazwīnī (and others after him) gives his kunyah as Abī Muḥammad. Daulatishāh and his successors call him Niżām al-dīn Abī Muḥammad b. Yūsuf b. Mu‘ayyad Mu‘arrizī; for the names given on his (supposed) tomb see below, p. 447.

2Chu dur gar-chih dar bahr i Ganjah guma an ‘i wali as quhistān i shahr i Qum an. The verse is quoted by Khāhar (who says that Nižāmī’s father came from Tafrihz, near Qum) and also quoted (and rejected) in a foot-note in DastgirdI’s version of the second part of the Iskandar-nāmah, p. 29. The corresponding line in the Baku edition (p. 19) has no trace of the verse, from which one must conclude that it is not found in any of the manuscripts on which that edition is based.

1Moscow edition p. 72 (IX 4).

2Zambio p. 146.

3See the Baku edition, p. 26 (X 17). The I.O. Ms. (Fol. 4s, followed by Bland’s edition; see below p. 480) has: ‘550 are (too) many days of slumber’ (pānsag u panjāh bas aiyām i khwāb), but the Baku apparatus quotes the variants ‘570’ (pānsag u haftah) or ‘880’ (pānsag u hashtah); the reading adopted by the editor (evidently from the Paris Ms.) is panjāh nah (or nuh) bas aiyām i khwāb, but this does not seem to make any sense, nor can I scan it. The dates implied by the three first-mentioned variants are 561, 586 and 591, only the first of which seems possible; the last would put this poem later than Lailə-Majni‘ūn (composed in 584/1188), the second would leave only one year for the composition of Khuṣraw-Shir‘īn (which was at least begun before 582/1186).
spurious.¹

His second work, Khusrau-Shīrīn (Kh. Sh.),² contains eulogies to the Seljuk sultan Togrul (III) b. Arslān (571/1176 to 590/1194), to his nominal vassal (but actual master) the atabeg of Azerbaijan, Abū Ja'far Muhammad Jahān-pahlavān b. Eldūğuz (571/1175 to 582/1186), and to one Qızil-shāh, evidently the latter's brother, Qızil-Arsān, who was to succeed his brother and rule from 582/1186 to 587/1191. Towards the end we find once again verses ostensibly giving the date of completion of the poem, but differing from copy to copy (556/1160, 571/1175-6, 576/1180-1,³ not all of which are reconcilable with the dedications).

Some, but not all, of the manuscripts also have an epilogue,⁴ evidently added by the poet at a later date, in which he refers to the death of his patron, the atabeg Muḥammad (in 582/1186), and praises his successor, Qızil-Arsān, and the heir-apparent, Nuṣrat al-dīn Abū Bakr Muḥammad. His third poem, Laylā-Majūn (L. M.), was written, as we read in the prologue, after the completion of his Khusrau-Shīrīn at the invitation of the ruler of Sharwān, Jalāl al-daulah wa l-dīn Abū l-Muzaffar Akhlatān, whom we have already encountered as the patron of Khāqānī. The date of completion of the work is given (for once quite unambiguously)⁵ as the end (salkh) of Rajab 584/September 1198.

The next poem in most of the copies of Niẓāmī's opus is Haft paiker (H. P.), dedicated to the ruler of Marāghah, Ḡūr al-dīn b. ʿAq-Sunqur, whose Turkish name Niẓāmī quotes apparently as Kūr e-Arsān.⁶ The date of composition is given, again without significant variants, as 14 Ramāḍān 593/1197.³

Finally we have his retelling of the adventures of Alexander in two poems in the same metre, but with separate dībājaha; we shall refer to them as the first and second parts of the Iskandarnāma (Isk. N. i and ii). In many copies the two parts are styled Sharaf-nāmah and Iqtīlān-nāmah.

¹See the Moscow edition p. 49 (V 94-5) where the date is given (without significant variants) in the first verse in letters (thai wa tai dāl), in the second in words (hashtūd u chahūr ba'd pāngūd).
³Prague edition p. 302 (LI1I 63-4). The year is expressed in some Ms. with words, in others with letters.
respectively, but in others the two names are reversed, which is reason enough to avoid both of them. One also finds for the parts Iskandar—or Sikandar—nāmaḥ i barrī and bahri respectively, and for the second also Khirad-nāmaḥ. There are some problems involved both with the absolute chronology of these poems and with their relative chronology within Niẓāmī’s opus. In Isk.N.i, p. 63 of the Baku edition, the poet lists his previous creations as: Makhzan al-asrār (1.38), Khusraw-Shīrīn (1.39), La‘l-e-Majnūn (1.40) and Haft Paikar (1.41), but the last verse is missing in a number of manuscripts, including the two ancient codices in Oxford and Paris. Moreover, in an earlier passage in the same poem1 the author says explicitly that he has already created ‘three pearls’ before undertaking this new ornament’, i.e. the Iskandar-nāmaḥ. It would thus appear that at least the first part of the Iskandar-nāmaḥ was written before Haft Paikar (i.e. before 593/1197), but that after the composition of the latter someone (either Niẓāmī or perhaps more probably a later interpolator) added the verse referring to Haft Paikar, but neglected to alter the verse giving the number of the earlier poems as three.2

The prologue to Isk.N. i contains a dedication to a king whose iqāb is given3 as ‘Nuṣrat al-dīn’. The superscription in some of the manuscripts identifies this patron as Nuṣrat al-dīn Abū Bakr, i.e. the man whom we have already met, as crown-prince, in the (secondary) epilogue to Khusrav-Shīrīn, and who succeeded his uncle and ruled from 587/1191 until 607/1210. However, other copies have the apparently fictitious name Nuṣrat al-dīn Abū Ḥāfiz and quite a few have only Nuṣrat al-dīn or ‘the late king’ and the like. But if we look not at the rubrics but at the actual text we see a verse in which the poet makes a rather elaborate pun on the name Bēshkīn;4 the poet’s patron is thus evidently not the atabeg Nuṣrat al-dīn Abū Bakr but his contemporary Nuṣrat al-dīn Bēshkīn, the ruler of Ahar. The name Nuṣrat-

1P. 46 (IX 12). As the apparatus informs us, this verse is missing in some copies.

2There is a fairly large corpus of coins of ‘Malik al-asrār’ Bēshkīn b. Muhammad’ naming also the atabeg Abū Bakr b. Muhammad and the caliph al-Nāṣir li dīn Allāh, some with the mint-name Ḥarir and the date 594/1197-8. Coins of ‘Nuṣrat al-dīn Mahmūd b. Bēshkīn b. Muhammad’ (i.e. his son) bear dates from 610/1213-4 up to 623/1226. The name Bēshkīn (‘whose hatred is more’) is confirmed by Niẓāmī’s pun and by the Armenian spelling Bēshk’; the Muslim literary sources have also byūkyn, ‘Amīr sipāḥ-skār i ajall i kabīr Nuṣrat al-dīn byūkyn’ is mentioned in a letter from the atabeg Muhammad b. Eldūzi dated 20 Muḥarram 578/1182 preserved in al-Mukhārjī’s maqāla al-rāzī‘i. Ibn al-Fawwāṣ speaks of a battle near Tabriz in 605/1208-9 between Nuṣrat al-dīn byūkyn and ‘Izz al-dīn Ahrān Abah, the (otherwise unknown) ruler of Nārāḡah (evidently a relative of the dedicatee of Ḥ.P.), in which the latter was killed; elsewhere the same author quotes the Ta‘rīḵ Bēshkīn by a certain al-qādī ʿAbd al-dīn. Bēshkīn’s iqāb Nuṣrat al-dīn is consequently well attested in the historical sources and it occurs also in poems of Šāhīr Fārābī (see below p. 557). His son is mentioned repeatedly in Nasawī’s biography of the Khwārezmshāh Jalāl al-dīn Meng-burānī, though both in the Arabic original and in the Persian translation his name is cited consistently as Nuṣrat al-dīn Muhammad (sic) b. byūkyn (sic). Thus Niẓāmī’s patron is attested as an amīr from 570/1172 and as a malik from 594/1197 onwards. He died at some time between 605/1208-9 and 610/1213-4. There is no support in any source for the claim that the atabeg Abū Bakr used the name Bēshkīn. References: Shīhīb al-dīn al-Nawārī, Sīrat al-sultān Jalāl al-dīn Meng-būrānī, ed. Boudias, Paris 1693; pāsim; the anonymous Persian translation of the name, ed. M. Minuwi, Tehran 1344/1726; pāsim, and the editor’s
The other of the earthquakes was actually perceptible in Ganjah.

Other copies of *Isk.N.* ii (among them the ancient Paris manuscript) replace this dedication by a eulogy to a king called 'Izz al-dīn and Abū l-Fath Masʿūd b. Nūr al-dīn, doubtless the atabeg of Mosul Masʿūd II b. Nūr al-dīn Arslān-shāh (607/1211 to 615/1218). However, the text of this eulogy is, apart from the names, almost entirely identical with the dedication in *Isk.N.* i and it can thus hardly be doubted that it is spurious. If Nizāmī had really (as has so often been claimed) re-dedicated his poem to another ruler he would surely have taken the trouble of composing a new dedication rather than merely recycling the one he had composed for *Isk.N.* i.

The narrative of *Isk.N.* ii concludes with a series of chapters describing the circumstances of the death of a number of Greek sages. The last of these (the death of Socrates) is followed by a section on the death of Nizāmī at the age of 63 (which, if this and the date suggested above for his birth are both correct, would mean that he died in 598/1201-2). And after this follows in the majority of the manuscripts (including those which have the name Nuşrat al-dīn in the prologue) an evocation of 'Malik 'Izz i dīn', though a few have here too 'Malik Nuşratu l-dīn', and some notes p. 295-6, 407-8; Yāğūt, Buldān i p. 409; al-Mukhtārī, *min al-raslīʿ* i, ed. I. Afsārī, Tehran 2555hs.h./1977, p. 140-1; Ibn al-Fuwaṭī, *al-Juzʿ al-rābīʿ* i min talkhis sajjāʿ al-sūkh (TX 5, 1997, ed. M. Jawāḥ, Damascus 1982-7, no. 18, 1998; V. Minorsky, 'Caucasia II', ESOAS XIII/4, 1951, p. 868-77; D.K. Kouymjian, A numismatic history of Southeastern Caucasia and Adharbājān based on Islamic coinage of the 7th/11th to the 9th/13th centuries (Microfilm), Ann Arbor 1969, p. 369-405. - I am very grateful to A.H. Morton who set me on the path to the correct identification of Nizāmī's patron and who supplied me with practically all of these references. I see now that the great Persian scholar M. Qazwīnī already suggested this identification (if tentatively) in his posthumously published *Yād-dāstān* i, p. 73.

1P. 500 (LXI 4), though in at least one copy (London Or. 5334) Nuşrat al-dīn is replaced by 'Izz al-dīn.

2Baku edition p. 10 (VI 10); thus in all the manuscripts consulted by the editor. The edition by Wahāb Destgārdī (cited in the Baku apparatus as 'W') has 'malik 'Izz i dīn', but this is evidently a wild conjecture by the Persian editor.

3P. 20 (VI 27-8).

verses later, we find again the name 'Mas'ūd'.
The simplest explanation for these discrepancies would seem to be that Niẓāmī died before completing Isk. N. ii and that a subsequent editor penned the whole final section (beginning with the account of Niẓāmī's death), including in it a dedication to his own patron, 'Izz al-dīn Mas'ūd II. Subsequently the contradiction between the prologue and the epilogue was ironed out in some copies either by replacing 'Izz al-dīn by Nuṣrat al-dīn in the epilogue, or by replacing Niẓāmī's dedication in the prologue by one to 'Izz al-dīn Mas'ūd. But in a large number of manuscripts the discrepancy between Niẓāmī's prologue and the editor's epilogue remains, as indeed it should.

The above remarks suggest the following chronology for Niẓāmī's poems: Makhsūs al-asrār after 550/1155 and quite possibly in or shortly after 561/1166; Khusrav-Shārī'īn between 571/1176 and 582/1186 (with the epilogue added between 582/1186 and 587/1191); Lailā-Żājmūn 584/1188; the first part (and perhaps also the unfinished second part) of Iskandar-nāmah after this date but before 593/1197 (the date of the next poem); Hafī zālār in 593/1197; the second part of Iskandar-nāmah in any case before 610/1213 (the latest possible date for the death of Nuṣrat al-dīn Bēshkīn). The final section of Isk. N. ii was added by an unknown poet during the reign of 'Izz al-dīn Mas'ūd (607/1211 to 615/1219).

For the death of the poet the tadhkira gives, as usual, a vast array of dates, many of them clearly impossible, and it has also been the subject of much debate among modern scholars. The question was reopened, but not solved, by the discovery in Azerbaijan of what purports to be Niẓāmī's grave. The Arabic inscription thereon is known to me from the only partially intelligible hand-copy published by Bertel's without indication of the place where the inscription was found (presumably Ganjah?) nor of the nature of the monument to which it appertains; it is also unclear whether the inscription is supposed to belong to the original tombstone or to a later replacement. What can be read is the name Niẓām al-dīn Abū Muḥammad b. (sic) Ilyās b. Yūsuf b. Dhakī (hardly Zakī). This is followed by what looks like fi rābi al-siyām, which would be a decidedly strange way of saying 'on 4 Ramaḍān', then by two words that I cannot read, and finally by what appears to be sanāt khams wa sitt-mi'āh, i.e. 605/1208-9. But one really needs some words to the effect that 'he died' or 'he was buried' for the whole to make sense. The date given here would fit with the chronology suggested above, but one must hesitate to accept it without access to a proper publication of the grave-inscription.

Apart from the narrative poems Niẓāmī also composed a small number of lyrical pieces, mostly ghazals, and almost entirely of religious content. In his Lailā-Żājmūn2 he speaks of having put together a diwān; it is thus clear that at least one collection of his shorter poems was in circulation by 584/1188. 'Auff quote a few of them. Copies of Niẓāmī's diwān are astonishingly rare.

Mss.: Manchester Lindesiana 247 (16th century? Selections); Oxford Elliot 88 (Ethē 618); Ouseley

1 P. 230, l. 62.

2 Moscow edition p. 39 (V 2).
Add. 114 (Ethé 619); Cambridge Or. 13 (Browne Suppt. 1110. Contains selections from his ghazal-
yâ‘ît); Berlin Sprenger 1486 (Pertsch 691/2 and Sprenger 428); Istanbul Ayanofya 2051/10 (Mihrû-
figh-hâ-i p. 409-10. Ms. apparently dated1 Shaw-
wâl 730/1330); Tehran 11â‘îyâ‘î I p. 61 (Dated 896/1490-1); Rampore State Library (Nâhir Ahsan
188); Calcutta Bû‘â‘îr 294 (18th century)?; Cf. Munz. III 26644-7.2

Editions of the dîwân: Tehran 1318sh./1929
(Ganjînah i ganjâ‘î, ed. W. Dastgirdî. Contains also a biography and glossary); 1334sh./1954-6
(ed. M. Tabâ‘îshî; non vidi); 1339sh./1958 (ed.
S. Nafisî; non vidi); Baku 1981 (Ghazalîyâ‘î, ed.
M. Sultân-sâ‘îd, alias Sultanov; from Nafisî). The
edition ostensively of the dîwân of Nîzâmî published
in Agra 1828/1866-7 contains the poems of
someone else; according to Ethé its text 'differs
entirely' from that of the Oxford Ms. 'in which
not a single â‘îsâ‘îd or ghazal of that edition can be
found'.

Translations: (Russian verse) Lirika, trans.
Y. E. Bertel's and K. A. Lipakerov, Moscow 1947;
Lirika (various translators), Moscow 1960; also in
Nizami Gandjevi: Sobranie sochinenii, Moscow 1985

1According to the description in Mihrûfigh-hâ this
masâ‘îd was copied by Mu‘â‘îmud b. Ahsam b. Mu‘â‘îmud Tabrizî
Sirri and contains three colophons with a date in Shawwâl
730; this year is mentioned also by Ritter (Der Islam XXI,
1933, p. 96; XII, 1934, p. 104, etc.). However, the Ms.
contains towards the end the dîwân of Nâ‘îr Bukhâ‘î1, who
was still alive in 767/1365-6 (see below, chap. IV) and is
thus unlikely to have completed his dîwân more than 30 years
earlier. It remains thus to be examined whether Nâ‘îr's
dîwân is a later addition to the Ms., or whether the date
'730' (assuming that is written out in Arabic) cannot be
read as '929'.

2The Strasbourg Ms. listed by Munzawî is not of the
dîwân but of the Khamshah and can be found below in its
proper place.

(Czech verse): Chvály, trans. J. Rypka and P.
Eisner, Prague 1953.
of Nîzâmî', A volume of oriental studies presented
to Edward G. Browne, Cambridge 1933, p. 224-7; J.
Rypka, 'Chand ghazal i tâ‘îsah as Nîzâmî i Ganja',
Armaghân XVI, 1314sh./1935, p. 9-31; Nafisî in his

The mathnawîs of Nîzâmî were assembled and
edited, evidently some time after the author's
death, in a collection generally known as the
Khamshah ('five'), less commonly as the Sittah
('six') - the count depends on whether the two
parts of the Iskandar-nâmeh are reckoned as one
poem or as two - or else as Panj ganj ('five
treasures'). There are also some manuscripts
containing one or more of the individual poems
(most, though not all, of these are in fact
truncated copies of the Khamshah) and quite rarely
we find one of Nîzâmî's poems in a collection with
other mathnawîs. The oldest recorded copy of any
of the poems in a public (and thus accessible)
collection1 is the London Makzan al-asrâr in just
such a miscellaneous manuscript dated 637/12392
and it is followed by the Leningrad copy of the
same poem from 710/1310-1 in a similar collection
of religious writings in prose and verse. The
earliest more-or-less complete manuscripts of the
Khamshah are from the middle of the 14th century,
namely the Paris copies of 763/1362 and 767/1366,

1A copy of one (or both?) of the parts of the Iskandar-
nâmeh, supposedly dated 631/1234, has been reported in a
private collection in Tehran (see below, p. 474), but this
needs to be checked before any conclusions can be drawn.

2This copy contains also the two mathnawîs by Mu‘â‘îyad
al-Nasafî (see above, p. 416-7) and the three authentic
mathnawîs of Sanâ‘î (below, p. 520-4). It is evidently the
basis for Bland's edition of M.A. (see below, p. 480).
the Berlin and Lahore manuscripts of 765/1363-4 and the Oxford copy of 767/1365 (by the same scribe as the older Paris codex), but there also a few fragmentary Khamsahs dated to the first half of the same century.¹

A pioneering attempt at a critical evaluation of the text of Nizāmī was made by Ritter and Rypka in their edition of Haft paikar from 1934. In his introduction Ritter divided the consulted manuscripts into two families: 'a', represented mainly by the two copies made by Ahmad b. al-Husain b. Sānāh (Paris Supplément 1817 and Oxford Ouseley 274-275), and 'b', the chief representative of which is the contemporaneous Berlin manuscript Minutoli 35. Only those verses that appear in both families are regarded as genuine. Those found only in 'b' are printed in square brackets, those particular to 'a' are relegated to the foot-notes. In other words, Ritter and Rypka thought that in the first century and a half after the poet's death two independent interpolated texts had come into existence; by paring away the supernumerary verses particular to each of these recensions it would be possible to restore the poet's original words. This approach, which, despite the small number of copies used, certainly produced a plausible reading of the Haft paikar, has not been followed by more recent scholars.

Since the 1940s useful critical editions of all six poems have been prepared by a team of

¹The dates found in Khamsah Mss. from before the year 800 of the hijrah are: 712/1312-3 (Tehran, incomplete); 718/1318 (Tehran, incomplete); 763/1362 (Paris); 765/1363-4 (Berlin, Lahore); 767/1365-6 (Oxford, Paris); 773/1371-2 (Arak); 776/1374-5 (Istanbul); 778/1376-7 (Leningrad); 786/1384 (Paris); 788/1386 (Tehran); 790/1388 (London); 791/1389 (Oxford, incomplete); 793/1391 (Tehran); 794/1392 (Istanbul). Details of all of these Mss. are given below.

²Dastgirdi's drastically truncated version of L.M. is in an extreme example of his method.

ry? Pictures); Beatty 182 (Dated Sha'ban 915/1509. Pictures); Beatty 195 (Copied in 936/1529-30 by Murshid 'Atār al-Shirāzī. Pictures); Beatty 196 (Same year and scribe as Beatty 195. Pictures); Beatty 222 (Dated Shawar 959/1552. Without M.A. Pictures); Beatty 224 (M.A., with a miniature containing the date Dhū l-biẓāh 960/1553); Beatty 276 (Copied by Mullā Barqū and Mullā 'Abūd-Shāh and dated 1081/1671. Pictures); Beatty 283 (18th century?); T.C.D. 1567 ('Isk. N.'); Manchester Lindesiana 6 (=Robinson p. 148-50. Dated 24 Rabī‘ II 824/1421, but the colophon is possibly forged. Kh. Sh. only. Pictures attributed to the 18th century?); Lindesiana 36 (=Robinson p. 70-88. Dated Shawar 849/1445. Pictures); Lindesiana 9 (15th century?); Rylands Pers. 856 (Robinson p. 203-20. Pictures ascribed to 16th century?); Lindesiana 198 (Dated 1012/1603-4); Lindesiana 186 (Dated 1012/1603-4. H.P. only); Lindesiana 61 (Dated 1023/1614. M.A. only); Lindesiana 35 (=Robinson p. 227-8. Dated 3 Dhū l-qa‘dah 1037/1628. Pictures); Lindesiana 246 (Dated 1087/1676-7. H.P. and L.N.); Lindesiana 101b (Dated 1104/1692-3. M.A. only); Lindesiana 100 (Dated 1111/1699-1700. 'Isk. N.'); Lindesiana 216 (18th century? L.M. only); Lindesiana 796 (Dated 1240/1824-5. Oxford Ouseley 274-275 (Ethē 585. Copied by Ahmad b. al-Busain b. Sānāh and completed in Rabī‘ I 767/1365); Ouseley 304 (Ethē 586. Dated 14 Dhū l-biẓāh 841/1438); Ouseley Add. 137 (Ethē 605. Dated [978/1573-4 or 981/1476-7. L.N. Pictures.); Elliot 194 (Ethē 594; Robinson 134-45, 676-9, 898-903. 15th century? Pictures, some of which were added later); Elliot 192 (Ethē 587; Robinson 564-605. Dated 22 Murhāb 907/1501. Pictures); Ouseley 205 (Ethē 607. Contains a seal dated 934/1527-8. H.P. and Isk. N. i); Marsh. 579 (Ethē 588; Robinson 710-25. Dated 956/1549. Pictures); Pers. d. 102 (Beeston 2845. Contains a seal dated 971/1563-4. L.M. Pictures); Douce 348 (Ethē 596. Dated 980/1572-3. Pictures. L.M., H.P. and Isk. N. i); Elliot 196 (Ethē 595. Dated 999/1590-1. M.A. missing); Ouseley 316 (Ethē 589; Robinson 1046-9. The copyist is given in one place as Mīr ‘Ali and in another as Bābā-shāh; Ethē remarks that 'the handwriting is the same throughout', which would imply that the two names belong to the same person, but Robinson identifies the latter with the Bābā-shāh who signed the Cambridge Fitzwilliam Haft paikar in 979/1571-2 and suggests that the former might be Mīr ‘Ali of Herat, who 'died in 1550. Pictures'); Elliot 239 in marg. (Ethē 604; Robinson 904-14. Dated Shawrāl 990/1582 according to Ethē, but Robinson says only that the Ms. contains the dates Rabī‘ II 979/1571 - which he believes to be an error for 989/1581 - and, in another place, 989/1581. Pictures. Kh. Sh. and, according to Robinson, also L.M.); Elliot 193 (Ethē 590. Dated 1010/1601-2); Whinfield 607 (Beeston 2558. Dated 1 Murhāb 1014/1605. L.M.); Whinfield 69 (Beeston 2557. Dated 10 Safar 1014/1605. Kh. Sh.); Elliot 197 (G.O.). (Ethē 591. Dated Ramadān 1021/1612. Lacunae. Pictures); Pers. c. 28 (Beeston 2661/1. Dated 14 Murhāb 1029/1619. Pictures added later. Isk. N. i); Pers. c. 28 (Beeston 2661/3. Dated 9 Rabī‘ I 1031/1621. Isk. N. ii); Laud 128 (Ethē 615. Dated 14 Rabī‘ I 1037/1627. Isk. N. ii); Marsh. 584 (Ethē 608. Dated 1042/1632-3. Lacunae. Isk. N. i); Elliot 336 (Ethē 616. Rabī‘ I 1053/1643. Isk. N. i); Ouseley 317 (Ethē 592; Robinson 1064-71. Dated Shawrāl 1056/1646. Pictures); Ouseley 302 (Ethē 600. Dated 16 Murhāb 1059/1649. M.A. only); Ouseley 165 (Ethē 609. Dated 26 Dhū l-qa‘dah 1101/1690. Isk. N. i with Glosses); Walker 80 (Ethē 617. Dated 6


\[1^{\text{I}}\] I learn from C. Melville that the Eton manuscripts are now kept in the University Library at Cambridge.

\[2^{\text{I}}\] Apart from the catalogues listed above, p. 31-2, see also R. M. Tilley, *Miniatures from Persian manuscripts ... in the British Library and the British Museum*, London 1977 (quoted as 'Tilley'). The book also contains descriptions of a number of detached miniatures (not included here).

\[3^{\text{I}}\] The Ms. in the Khalili collection (which also contains a number of loose leaves, not listed here) are being catalogued by the present author.

\[4^{\text{I}}\] 'ca. 1400'; Khalili 564 (Copied by Muḥammad b. Saʿīd al-Qārī and dated 20 Ramadān 804/1402).

936/1529. Pictures); Or. 2265 (Rieu p. 1072; Tittley 316. Completed Dhū l-bijjah 949/1543. Pictures); Or. 1578 (Rieu p. 574; Titley 301. Dated 952/1546-6. 11 leaves were replaced in 1264/1848. H.P. Pictures); I.O. 985 (=Robinson 136-9. Dated 1 Safar 955/1548. M.A. and Isk.N. i and ii. Pictures); Khalili 710 (Dated 956/1549. M.A. Pictures); Or. 9869 (Meredith-Owens p. 70. Dated 960/1553. Last folio missing); Or. 1216 (Rieu p. 571; Titley 313. Dated Ramādān 961/1554. Pictures); Khalili 455 (Dated Rabī‘ I 964/1557. Pictures); I.O. 1000 (Copied by Muhammad Bāqir b. Mullā Mīr ‘Alli and dated Rabī‘ I 965/1557. L.M. Pictures); Add. 26,144 (Rieu p. 571. Dated Jumādā II 968/1561. Does not contain H.P.); I.O. 973 (=Robinson 303-20. Dated Rabī‘ II 975/1567. Pictures); I.O. 990 (Dated Dhū l-bijjah 976/1569. M.A. only); I.O. 986 (Dated 976/1568-9. M.A., L.M., Kh.Sh.); I.O. 991 (Dated 989/1581. M.A. only); Add. 17,329 (Rieu p. 571. Dated Mubarram 994/1585-6); I.O. 1008 (Dated 7 Rabī‘ II 994/1586. Isk.N. i); Or. 7045 (Meredith-Owens p. 67; Tittley 320. Dated 994/1586. Pictures much later); I.O. 1004 (Dated 998/1589-90. H.P. only); Ross and Browne XXX (Contains the date 21 Ramādān 1000/1592); Or. 4385 (Rieu Suppt. no. 228. Completed Sha‘bān 1006/1598); Or. 12208 (Meredith-Owens p. 75; Tittley 323. Dated 40 Ikhān /1595-6. Pictures); Harleian 503 (Rieu p. 574. 16th century? Isk.N. i); Add. 27,360 (Rieu p. 571-2; Tittley 312. 16th century? Pictures); Or. 1363 (Rieu p. 572; Tittley 314. 16th century? Pictures); Or. 2932 (Rieu Suppt. 227; Tittley 318. 16th century? Pictures, some later); Ross and Browne XXXI (=Robinson 324-41. Pictures, which Robinson ascribes to the 16th century); I.O. 974 (=Robinson 1068-77. Dated 22 Rabī‘ II 1014/1605. Pictures); I.O. 1022 (Dated 25 Sha‘bān 1016/1607. Isk.N. ii);

1The pictures are described and reproduced in The poems of Nizami described by Laurence Binyon, London 1928.

I.O. 1007 (Dated 6 Ramādān 1017/1608. Isk.N. i); I.O. 992 (Dated 1017/1608-9. M.A., with copious glosses); Ross and Browne XXXII (Dated 4 Safar 1018/1609. M.A. only); I.O. 983 (Dated 1024/1615. Isk.N. i, H.P., M.A., Kh.Sh.); Or. 7046 (Meredith-Owens p. 68. Dated 1027/1619. Without L.M.); Add. 16,781 (Rieu p. 573. Dated Rabī‘ I 1028/1619. M.A. only); R.A.S. 249 (Dated 1036/1626-7. ‘Isk.N.’); Add. 26,145 (Rieu p. 572. Dated Rabī‘ II 1042/1632. Imperfect at the end); I.O. 979 (Dated 1049/1639-40. Isk.N. ii missing); I.O. 1009 (Dated 11 Jumādā II 1053/1643. Isk.N. i. Pictures); I.O. 975 (Dated Rajab 1054/1644); I.O. 980 (Has a dedication dated 12 Ramādān 1061/1651. Isk.N. ii missing); I.O. 1765/7 (Ms. contains the date 28 Dhū l-qa‘dah 1066/1656, but not all parts are in the same hand. M.A. only); I.O. 2870 (Dated 27 Mubarram 1070/1659. M.A. only); I.O. 977 (Dated 1072/1661-2. Pictures); Add. 6613 (Rieu p. 572; Tittley 309. Dated Rabī‘ II 1076/1665. Pictures); Or. 12066 (Meredith-Owens p. 74; Tittley 321. Dated 1076/1665-6. Imperfect at both ends. Pictures); R.A.S. 247 (Dated 1077/1666-7); I.O. 993 (Dated 5 Rabī‘ I 1079/1668. M.A. only); Add. 26,147 (Rieu p. 574. Isk.N. i with a few pages missing at the beginning. The last 3 folios, which contain verses giving the date of composition as 597/1200-1, are dated 7 Rabī‘ I 1090/1679); I.O. 988 (Dated 1090/1681. L.M. and Kh.Sh., the latter incomplete); Add. 19,500 (Rieu p. 573. Dated Mubarram 1097/1686. M.A. with copious marginal notes); Add. 23,547 (Rieu p. 572. 17th century?); Add. 6614 (Rieu p. 574. 17th century? Some leaves at both ends replaced by a second hand. Isk.N. i); Khalili 543 (17th century? Pictures); I.O. 1023 (Dated 16 Mubarram 1117/1705. Isk.N. ii only); Add. 26,146 (Rieu p. 574. Dated Jumādā I 1117/1705. Isk.N. i); I.O. 1001 (Dated 19 Rajab of year 49 <of ‘Ismā‘īl? /1705>. L.M.); I.O. 994 (Dated 13 Sha‘bān 1134/1722. M.A. only, with glosses); I.O. 1027 (Dated
15 Safar 1139/1726. *Isk.N. ii*, defective; I.O. 985 (DATED 18 SAFAR 1150/1737. M.A. only, with glosses); Ross and Browne CLXII (Possibly dated 1150/1737-8. *Isk.N. i* only); I.O. 2869 (DATED 27 JUMA'AD II 22nd year of MUHAMMAD-SHAH/1153/1740. M.A. and Kh.Sh.); I.O. 1010 (DATED in the reign of MUHAMMAD-SHAH [1131/1719 to 1161/1748]. *Isk.N. i* only); Or. 10940 fol. 1b-70b in marg. (Meredith-Owens p. 71. MS. dated 1181/1767-8. M.A.); I.O. 1011 (DATED 27 MUBHARRAM 1187/1773. *Isk.N. i* only); I.O. 1005 (DATED 1195/1781. H.P. only); I.O. 987 (Completed 25 JUMA'AD I 1200/1786. M.A., H.P., Kh.Sh.); I.O. Delhi 1259 (DATED 1204/1789-90. L.M.); R.A.S. 250 (DATED 1212/1797-8. *Isk.N. ii*); Add. 23,548 (RIEU p. 573. 18th century? M.A.); Or. 4730 (RIEU Suppt. 230; TITLEY 302. 18th century? H.P. in Hebrew script. Imperfect. Pictures); Add. 16,783 (RIEU p. 574. 18th century? Some leaves missing at end. *Isk.N. i*); Add. 26,148 (RIEU p. 574. 18th century? Some leaves missing at beginning. *Isk.N. i*); Add. 16,782 (RIEU p. 575. 18th century? *Isk.N. ii*); I.O. 1003 (DATED 26 DHU-L-HIJjah 1222/1808. L.M. only); Ross and Browne CLXIV (18th century? *Isk.N. ii* only); I.O. 1024 (DATED 4 SAFAR 1233/1818. *Isk.N. ii* only); Add. 25,799 (RIEU p. 575. DATED DHU-L-HIJjah 1227/1816. *Isk.N. i*); Or. 4386 (RIEU Suppt. no. 229, dated 1 SHA'BAAN 1237/1822); Or. 8756 (Meredith-Owens p. 69. DATED 1252/1836-7. *Isk.N. ii*); Or. 7047 (Meredith-Owens p. 68. DATED 1253/1837-8. L.M. and H.P.); Or. 4730 (Meredith-Owens p. 39. 18th-19th century? H.P. in Hebrew script. Imperfect); I.O. 978; I.O. 981 (without *Isk.N. ii*); I.O. 984 (without *Isk.N. i* and *Isk.N. ii*. Pictures); I.O. 996 and 997 (both M.A., incomplete); I.O. 999 (Kh.Sh. Pictures); I.O. 1002 (L.M.); I.O. 1006 (Modern copy of H.P.); I.O. 1012-1017 (All *Isk.N. i* only, the last two defective); I.O. 1025-1026 (Both *Isk.N. ii* only); I.O. 2868 (without *Isk.N. i* and *Isk.N. ii*); I.O. 2871 (M.A. only); I.O. 2873 (Kh.Sh. only);
and ghazalīfāt); Corpus, No. 229 (Browne Suppt. 1372. H.P.); Add. 3736 (Browne Suppt. 763. 'Isk.N.); Christ's, Dd.5.12 (Browne Suppt. 764. 'Isk.N.); Glasgow 5.7 (Weir 12. Dated 1102/1690-1. 'Isk.N. ii); Edinburgh Univ. 280 (Dated 1104/1692-3. L.M.); Univ. 279 (Dated 8th year of Shāh-‘Ajam 1180/1766-7. 'Isk.N. i); New Coll. Or. 38; Univ. 101-3 (M.A., Kh.Sh., 'Isk.N. i); Paris Supplément 1817 (Brockel 1247. Copied by Ahmad b. al-Hussain b. Sāmah1 with various dates during 763/1362); Supplément 580 (Brockel 1248. Dated 1 Dhūl-bi‘ajjah 767/1366. First leaf missing. Pictures); Supplément 816 in marg. (Brockel 1382. Dated 1086/1384. A second hand has added the text of the Ḥajja ṭul-bahrain to this Ms. and dated his work 1 Dhū 1-bi‘ajjah 811/1409). Supplément 584/I-II (Brockel 1535. Ms. dated 8 Sha‘bān 800/1398. M.A. and Kh.Sh., both incomplete); Supplément 2040 (Brockel 2454. Completed Ramadān 820/1417). Supplément 579 (Brockel 1249. Dated Thursday 21 Jumādā II 840, i.e. 27 December 1436 or 3 January 1437). Supplément 1777 fol. 243 sqq. (Brockel 1645. Dated 25 Safar 852/1448. M.A.); Supplément 591 (Brockel 1274. Dated 3 Dhūl-bi‘ajjah 870/1466. L.M., with Kh.Sh. in marg.); Supplément 781 fol. 3v sqq. (Brockel 1971. Ms. dated Rabī‘ I 892/1487. Without 'Isk.N. ii); Ancien fonds 280 (Brockel 1276/Richard. Dated 19 Muharram 900/1494. 'Isk.N. i and ii); Supplément 1112 (Brockel 1260. 15th century? Without M.A. Pictures); Supplément 582 (Brockel 1262. 15th century? M.A., H.P. and Kh.Sh.); Ancien fonds 362 (Brockel 1268/Richard. 15th century? Kh.Sh. Pictures); Supplément 578 (Brockel 1250. Dated Dhūl-bi‘ajjah 909/1504. Pictures); Ancien fonds 281 (Brockel 1277/Richard. Dated 5 Jumādā II 933/1527. 'Isk.N. i and ii); Supplément 985 (Brockel 1264. Dated Dhūl-bi‘ajjah 944/1538 by Mi‘r 'Alī Mashhadī. M.A. Pictures); Supplément 794 fol. 226v sqq. (Brockel 1536. Dated 10 Ramadān 978/1572. 'Isk.N. ii); Ancien fonds 370 (Brockel 1269/Richard. Dated 7 Jumādā I 960/1553. First 8 folios added later. Kh.Sh.); Decourtemanche 1896 (Brockel 1251. Completed 966/1558-9. Pictures); Supplément 1956 (Brockel 1252. Dated 22 Jumādā II 989/1561. Pictures); Supplément 575 (Brockel 1253. Completed 22 Shawwāl 972/1565). Supplément 581 (Brockel 1254. Completed 976/1568-9. Pictures); Supplément 794 fol. 1v sqq. (Brockel 1536. Dated 1 Sha‘bān 978/1570. 'Isk.N. ii); Supplément 794 fol. 202-358 in marg. and 342-359 (Brockel 1536. Dated 20 Jumādā II 979/1571. H.P.); Supplément 575 (Brockel 1255. Dated 989/1581). Supplément 1303 (Brockel 1275. Dated 1004/1595-6. Pictures. H.P.); Supplément 2026 (Brockel 2455. 16th century? Fragment containing H.P. and parts of Kh.Sh. and 'Isk.N.); Supplément 585 (Brockel 1273. 16th century? L.M., beginning missing); Supplément 1454 (Brockel 1263. 16th century? M.A.); Supplément 574 (Brockel 1256. Dated 1021/1612-3); Supplément 1029 (Brockel 1257. Various dates ranging from 1029 to Shāfīf 1034/1624. Pictures); Supplément 1890 (Brockel 1258. Various dates, the most recent of which is 1 Sha‘bān 1034/1625. Pictures); Ancien fonds 230 (Brockel 1278/Richard. Dated with a chronogram to the year 1035/1625-6. 'Isk.N. i and ii); Ancien fonds 363 (Brockel 1270/Richard. Dated 1039/1629-30. Kh.Sh.); Supplément 1111 (Brockel 1259. Dated Shāfīf 1060/1650. Pictures); Supplément 973 (Brockel 1279. Dated Rabī‘ II 1061/1651, later altered to 1073/1663. 'Isk.N. i and ii); Supplément 1897 (Brockel 1261. 17th century? Without Kh.Sh. or 'Isk.N. ii); Supplément 586 (Brockel 1265. 17th century? M.A.); Supplément 958 (Brockel 1266. 17th century? M.A.); Supplément 588 (Brockel 1271. 17th century? Kh.Sh.); Supplément 1898 (Brockel 1280. 17th century? 'Isk. N. i); Supplément 1198 (Brockel 1281. 17th century? 'Isk.N. i, end missing); Supplément 964 (Brockel 1272. Dated 12 Dhūl-bi‘ajjah

Vatican Pers. 155 (Rossi p. 150. Dated 1254/1838-9. L.M.); Leyden DCXXXIV-IX, MMDLXXX, MMDCXXXIV (late or undated copies of individual poems); Heidelberg P. 328 (Berenbach II p. 100. Completed 907/1501-2); Hamburg Orient. 215 in marg. (Brockelmann 179. Has an owner's note dated 12 Muharram 1014/1605. Isk.N. i incomplete); Orient. 225 (Brockelmann 160. Dated 12 Rajab 1029/1620. Kh.Sh. only); Orient. 199 (Brockelmann 158. Dated 27 Muharram 1059/1649. Isk.N. i only); Orient. 200 (Brockelmann 159. Isk.N. ii only); Tübingen Ms. III b. 32 (Heinz 384. Dated 2 Muharram 1232/1816. Isk.N. i); Halle D.M.G. 20 (Dated 1152/1739-40); D.M.G. 21 (16th century? Isk.N. i missing. Pictures); D.M.G. 23 (16th century? Kh.Sh. only. Incomplete. Pictures); D.M.G. 22 (18th century? L.N. only. Pictures); D.M.G. 24 (19th century? Kh.Sh. only. Incomplete); Leipzig Vollaers 920-1 (both 'Isk.N.'); Munich 205 Quatr. (Aumer 24. Dated 1044/1634-5. M.A.); Cim. 37 (Aumer 21. Pictures); 46 Quatr. (Aumer 22); Cod. or. 264 (Aumer 23. L.N., H.P., Isk.N. i-ii); 91 Quatr. (Aumer 25. 'Ziemlich neu'. H.P.); 138 Quatr. (Aumer 26. Isk.N. i); Berlin Minutoli 35 (Pertsch 724. Various dates in 764/1363-2 and 765/1363-4); Diez fol. 74/5 (Pertsch 699°. Copied by Jaffar al-Hăfız al-Tabrīzī and dated 14 Rabī‘ I 820/1417. M.A., beginning missing); Ms. or. quart. 1970 (Heinz 334. Dated 20 Dhū l-hijjah 849/1446. Isk.N. ii. Pictures); Ms. or. oct. 1259 (Heinz 86. Completed 867/1462-3); Ms. or. quart. 1665 (Stchoukine 9. Copied by Sultân Husain b. Sultân ‘Allî and dated 1 Jumādā II 890/1485. Pictures); Ms. or. oct. 2076 (Heinz 385. Dated 5 Ramadan 890/1485); Minutoli 5 (Pertsch 730. Dated 897/1491-2. H.P. only); Diez A. fol. 7 (Pertsch 719; Stchoukine 4. Pictures ascribed to mid 15th century. The Ms. has a seal of Sultân Salīm Khān, i.e. presumably Selim I, 918

The hijīrī and Christian years are quoted thus in Piemontese's description; in the older catalogue Pizzi had read the date as '793'. Piemontese quotes the colophon as saying sanat thaṣāth wa sub‘-mi‘ah, but this is evidently a misprint.

For whom see Robinson, Paintings p. 48.
/1512 to 926/1520); Sprenger 1475 (Pertsch 728; Stchoukine 13. Without Isk.N. i–ii. Pictures ascribed to mid 15th century, but altered later); Ms. or. oct. 3749 (Heinz 160; Stchoukine 12. 48 separate leaves, some with pictures, ascribed to the late 15th century); Ms. Diez. A. oct. 2 (Pertsch 689; Stchoukine 38. L.M. only. Pictures, possibly late 15th century, but later repainted); Ms. or. oct. 2050 (Heinz 162; Stchoukine 21. Copied by Hasan b. Kamāl al-dīn al-Hādī al-Ya‘zī and dated 7 Sa‘far 910/1504. Pictures); Ms. or. fol. 192 (Pertsch 723; Stchoukine 16. Dated Rama‘dān 956/1549. Incomplete. Pictures); Ms. or. quart. 1940 (Stchoukine 20. Dated Sha‘bān 975/1568. Pictures); Minutili 1 (Pertsch 725; Stchoukine 23. Dated 981/1573–4. Pictures, some of which were added later); Petermann II, 698 (Pertsch 727; Stchoukine 25. Copied by Dōst Muḥammad b. ‘Alī Dōst al-Maddāh al-Baijātānī and dated 10 Rama‘dān 994/1586. Without Isk.N. ii. Pictures); Ms. or. oct. 1583 (Heinz 237. Copied by Shihāb al-dīn i Manṣūr and dated 20 Rabī‘ I 1000/1592); Ms. or. fol. 193 (Pertsch 728. Copied by Ibrāhīm al-Khashāmī in 998/1589. Without Isk.N. ii); Ms. or. quart. 1938 (Heinz 307. 16th century? L.M., H.P., Isk.N. ii); Ms. or. fol. 107 (Pertsch 720; Stchoukine 31. Dated Sha‘bān 1041/1632. Pictures added later); Petermann II, 112 (Pertsch 721. Copied by Bahā’ al-dīn i ‘Alī Ridā in 1052/1642–3); Sprenger 1484 (Pertsch 732. Dated 24 Dhū l-qa‘dah 1068/1658. Isk.N. ii only); Ms. or. fol. 209 (Pertsch 18. Dated 12 Sa‘far 1077/1666. This Ganjīnāh contains, among other things: [no. 8] Isk.N. i, [9b] Kh.Sh., [10d] M.A.); Ms. or. quart. 1981 (Stchoukine 58. Copied by Ṣadr al-dīn Muḥammad b. ‘Īsā Muḥammad al-‘Uryānī and dated Jumādā II 1083/1672. Pictures added later); Sprenger 1485 (Pertsch 737. Dated 25 Dhū l-hijjah of 41st year of an un-named ruler [presumably Aurangzēb], which is equated with 1008 [presumably an error for 1108/1697].

M.A. only); Ms. or. oct. 4048 (Stchoukine 81. Dated 16 Dhū l-qa‘dah 1178/1765. Kh.Sh. Pictures apparently later); Sprenger 1483 (Pertsch 733. Dated 1212/1757–8. Isk.N. ii only); Minutili 154 (Pertsch 722; Stchoukine 45. Dated 14 Dhū l-qa‘dah 1247/1832. Pictures); Ms. or. oct. 1977 (Heinz 277; Stchoukine 75. Isk.N. ii. Pictures ascribed to 19th century); Sprenger 1513/4 (Pertsch 684. M.A. only); Petermann 453 (Pertsch 729. H.P. only); Ms. or. fol. 298 (Pertsch 731. Isk.N. i only, with the verses dating the poem to 597);

Gotha 41 (fragments of a Ms. of M.A.); Dresden 1 (Dated 985/1577–8); Bratislava 556 (Copied by Ni‘mat Allāh b. ‘Alī-shāh al-Khurāsānī and dated 12 Rama‘dān 893/1488. Some leaves replaced in 19th century);

Wrocław Brockelmann Pers. 1 (Dated 12 Rajab 1011/1603); Brockelmann Pers. 2 (H.P. only);

Vienna Flügel 512 (see also Duda p. 33–7. Contains the dates Rama‘dān 905/1500 and 3 Sha‘bān – acc. to Duda 3 Sa‘far – 906/1500 or 1501. Isk.N. ii missing. Pictures);

Copenhagen Mehren XCIX (Dated 1096/1685. Isk.N. i); Mehren XCIX (Dated Muḥarram 1235/1819); Mehren C–CI (Two late copies of Isk.N. ii);

Uppsala Tornberg CLII (Dated 1 Muḥarram 842/1438); Tornberg CL (Dated 843/1439–40. Pictures); Tornberg CLII (Dated 17 Shawwāl 984/1577. M.A.); Zetterstén 421 (Dated Shawwāl 1029/1620); Tornberg CLXXII fol. 145a–152a (Fragment of H.P.)3; Helsinki 88b (Contains various dates in 1171/1757–8. Pictures); 85 (Isk.N. i);


1For the pictures see K. Adahi, A Khamsa of Nizami of 1139, Uppsala 1981.

2See below, no. 322.

1Besides the sources listed above, p. 27-8, see also I. Stichoukine, Les peintures des manuscrits de la 'Khamāsh' de Niẓāmī au Topkapı Sarayî Müzesi d'Istanbul, Paris 1977 (quoted as 'Stichoukine').

2See above, p. 448 (dīwān).

3This is the oldest recorded date of the 'Khamāsh' in Istanbul. For Harīne 750, supposedly copied in 779, see below n. a. 979.

4Thus Ritter in the introduction to his edition of Haft pa'īzar, p. viii, with the remark that the last digit of '794' is 'unseicher'. Ritter gives the name of the scribe as Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Ḥusainī b. Sānā and identifies him with the son of the copyist of the 14th-century Oxford and Paris Ms. Ahmad b. al-Ḥusain b. Sānā (note the different spelling). Karastay, however, gives the date of the Ms. as Jumādā I 990/1582 and the scribe's name as M. b. A. b. al-Ḥusainī b. Sānā.
various dates in 830-1/1426-8); Topkapı, Hazine 789 (Karatay 399. Dated Ramadān 842/1439); Topkapı, Hazine 779 (Karatay 400; Stchoukine i. Copied by ʻīmād Khabbāz Abū-Kūhī and ʻAbd al-Rahmān Khwārazmī, who dated their work Sha'bān 843/1440 and 857/1453 respectively. Pictures); Topkapı, Hazine 774 (Karatay 401; Stchoukine ii. Dated Sha'bān 844/1440-1. Pictures); Topkapı, Revan 862 (Karatay 402; Stchoukine ii. Dated Rabī' I 846/1442. Pictures); Topkapı, Hazine 870 (Karatay 403; Stchoukine iv. Copied by Abū Bakr b. Ismā'īl b. Muhmūd b. ʻAlī al-Fārūqī and dated Rabī' I 848/1444. Pictures); Fatih 3749 (Ritter-Reinert p. 126. Dated 4 Ramadān 849/1446); Topkapı, Hazine 781 (Karatay 404; Stchoukine v. Copied by Yūsuf al-Jāmī in 849/1445-6. Pictures); Topkapı, Revan 855 (Karatay 406; Stchoukine vi. Dated Rabī' I 850/1446. Pictures); Topkapı, Hazine 786 (Karatay 405; Stchoukine vii. Copied by Ibn Iskandar Quhistānī and dated Shawwāl 850/1446-7. Pictures signed by Sulṭān ʻAlī al-Bāwardī); Topkapı, Revan 866 (Karatay 407; Stchoukine viii. Copied by ʻAlī b. Nizām al-Danghānī in 850/1446-7. Pictures); Ayasofya 3861/2 (Atēq 97. Copied by Shaikh al-Iṣlām b. Ḫusayn al-Šiddīqī and dated 857/1452); Topkapı, Hazine 773 (Karatay 408; Stchoukine x. Copied by ʻAbd al-Rahmān b. Muhammad Ḳāmī al-Qadīm in 858/1459-1. Pictures); Topkapı, Revan 872 (Karatay 409. Copied by ʻAbd ʻĪlāh and dated Rajab 879/1474); Topkapı, Revan 874 (Karatay 411; Stchoukine xii. Dated Rabī' II 881/1476. Pictures); Topkapı, Hazine 781 (Karatay 410; Stchoukine xi. Copied by Shaikh Muhmūd Pir-Budāqī and Fakhr al-dīn Abūn, who dated their segments 29 Rabī' II 886/1481 and Sha'bān 886/1476 respectively. Pictures); Topkapı, Revan 880 (Karatay 475. Copied by Riḍāʾī and dated 885/1481-2. M.A. only); Topkapı, Hazine 762 (Karatay 412; Stchoukine xiii. Copied by ʻAbd al-Rahmān al-Yaʿqūbī and dated Muḥarram 886/1481. Pictures); Fatih 3750 (Ritter-Reinert p. 126-7. Copied by Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. Naṣr Allāh Ḫosayn Amīr and dated Dhū 1-ḥijjah 888/1484); Topkapı, Hazine 754 (Karatay 413; Stchoukine xiv. Copied by Muḥshid al-dīn Muḥammad al-Kātib in 888/1483-4. Pictures); Topkapı, Hazine 768 (Karatay 414; Stchoukine xv. Copied by Muḥammad b. ʻĪbrāhīm b. Maʿṣūd and dated Dhū 1-qaʿdah 890/1485. Pictures); Topkapı, Hazine 731 (Karatay 477. Copied by Mīr Saḥīḥ b. Qutluğ Khwājah Samargandī and dated Rabī' II 894/1489. L.M. only); Topkapı, Hazine 767 (Karatay 415; Stchoukine xvi. Copied by Ḫusayn Kulūyā and dated Muḥarram 895/1489. Pictures); Topkapı, Hazine 1008 (Karatay 416; Stchoukine xvii. Copied by Shaikh Muḥshid al-dīn and dated Rabī' II 895/1490. Pictures); Topkapı, Revan 876 (Karatay 417. Copied by ʻAlī b. ʻAbd Allāh Kātib in 897/1491-2); Topkapı, Hazine 787 (Karatay 418; Stchoukine xviii. Copied by ʻAlī b. Ḥājjī al-Mudhahhib and dated Dhū 1-ḥijjah 899/1494. Pictures); Nurūsomiya 3781 (Atēq 98. Copied by Muḥammad b. Ḫalāl al-Qummī and dated 6 Shawwāl 899/1494); Topkapı, Hazine 759 (Karatay 425; Stchoukine xxiii. Dated Sha'bān 900/1495. Pictures); Topkapı, Hazine 778 (Karatay 426; Stchoukine xxiv. Dated Shawwāl 900/1495. Pictures); Topkapı, Hazine 792 (Karatay 427; Stchoukine xxv. Dated 902/1496-7. Pictures); Topkapı, Hazine 775 (Karatay 428; Stchoukine xxvi. Dated Muḥarram 903/1497. Pictures); Topkapı, Bağdat 145 (Karatay 429; Stchoukine lxii. Copied by Mīrābī Ḳāshānī and dated Muḥarram 904/1498. Pictures ascribed to the 16th century); Université FY 286 (olim Riza Paşa 2901. Atēq 102. Dated 26 Jamādā II 905/1500); Topkapı, Hazine 769 (Karatay 430; Stchoukine xxviii. Dated Rajab 905/1500. Pic-

1Stchoukine gives the call-number as 'H. 724'.

1Thus Stchoukine. Karatay has 'Rabī’ I 796 (1491)' but this is clearly an error for 896/1491.
between the mid 15th to the mid 16th century); Topkapi, Hazine 783 (Karayat 439; Stchoukine xxiv. Copied by Munıım al-dın Muhammad al-Aubdî al-ısmaıî in 919/1513. Pictures); Topkapi, Hazine 766 (Karayat 440; Stchoukine xxxv. Copied by Haji ııı Ṭātib and dated Rajab 922/1516. Pictures); Universite FY 1309 (Ateğ 103; Edhem/Stchoukine XXVI. Copied by Yār-Muhammad Harawî and dated Ramadān 923/1517. Pictures); Topkapi, Revan 860 (Karayat 441; Stchoukine xxxvi. Copied by Murshid Kättib ‘Atṭār in 927/1521. Pictures); Topkapi, Ahmet III 3549 (Karayat 432; Stchoukine li. Copied by Shīh Muhammad Naishābūrî for the Safavid Ismâyîl I, d. 930/1524. Pictures added later); Topkapi, Revan 877 (Karayat 442; Stchoukine lvii. Copied by Muhammed Qâsim b. Sultan Muhammad ‘ıshqabâdî and dated Ramadān 933/1527. Pictures later); Topkapi, Hazine 785 (Karayat 443; Stchoukine xxxvii. Copied by Sultan Muhammad Nur in 934/1527-8. Pictures); Topkapi, Revan 871 (Karayat 444; Stchoukine lxvi. Copied by Yār-Muhammad al-Harawî and dated Ramadān 934/1528. Pictures of various dates); Topkapi, Revan 865 (Karayat 446; Stchoukine xxxviii. Dated 17 Jamādā II 925/1529. Pictures); Topkapi, Revan 856 (Karayat 445; Stchoukine lxvi. Dated Ramadān 935 /1532. Pictures, repainted later); Topkapi, Hazine 760 (Karayat 447; Stchoukine xl. Copied by Murshid al-Kättib al-Shirāzī and dated Jamādā I 941/1534. Pictures); Topkapi, Hazine 758 (Karayat 448; Stchoukine xlii. Copied by Murshid al-Kättib al-Shirāzī and dated Rajab ııı 945/1538. Pictures); Topkapi, Hazine 785 (Karayat 449; Stchoukine xliv. Dated Rajab ııı 945/1538. Pictures); Topkapi, Hazine 756 (Karayat 451; Stchoukine xlv. Copied by Muhammad Qiwām Shirāzī and dated Rajab ııı 951/1544. Pictures); Topkapi, Revan 867 (Karayat 452; Stchoukine xlvii. Dated Rajab ııı 956/1549. Pictures); Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi 1990 (olim

1Stchoukine: ‘H. 479’.
2Stchoukine: ‘H. 757’.

16th century?1 Pictures); Topkapı, Hazine 751 (Karayat 461. Copied by Hīdāyat Allāh Shīrāzī. 16th century? Pictures); Topkapı, Revan 869 (Karayat 462. 16th century?); Topkapı, Hazine 763 (Karayat 463; Stchoukine lvi. 16th century? Pictures); Topkapı, Revan 868 (Karayat 464. 16th century?); Topkapı, Hazine 764 (Karayat 465; Stchoukine lxii. Pictures); Topkapı, Hazine 772 (Karayat 466. 16th century? Pictures); Topkapı, Hazine 767 (Karayat 467; Stchoukine xxvi. Copied by Sultān ‘Alī Mashhadī. Pictures attributed to late 15th century); Topkapı, Hazine 777 (Karayat 468; Stchoukine lxx. 16th century? Pictures); Topkapı, Hazine 790 (Karayat 469; Stchoukine xli. 16th century? Pictures); Topkapı, Revan 879 (Karayat 476; Stchoukine xlviii. Copied by Sultān Muḥammad. 16th century? L.M. only. Pictures by three artists); Topkapı, Revan 881 (Karayat 479; Stchoukine lx. 16th century? Isk. N. ii and L.M. Pictures); Topkapı, Revan 882 (Karayat 480; Stchoukine xxxix. Copied by ‘Imād b. Muḥammad al-Harawī. 16th century? H.P.?2 Pictures); Universitës FY 141 (Ateş 115; Edhem/Stchoukine XL. 16th century? Pictures); Topkapı, Revan 878 (Karayat 472. Copied by Muḥammad ‘Alī b. ‘Īz al-dīn and dated Rabiʾ I 1051/1641); Topkapı, Hazine 730 (Karayat 478; Stchoukine xix. Copied by ‘Abd Allāh Mirzā and dated 1087/1676-7, but Stchoukine thinks that the date has been altered and that the pictures belong to the late 15th century. L.M. only);

1Ostensibly copied by Sultān ‘Alī Mashhadī, illuminated by Muslām Yār in 916/1510-1 and illustrated by Bihṣād in 918/1512-3, but Stchoukine says that the colophon is a fake and that the Ms. was produced in Istanbul, ca. 1560.
2Stchoukine says that this Ms. contains Nizāmī’s H.P. Karayat says it is the ‘Iṣbād-ḥālāt’, but the incipit which he quotes (ai jahān-šīrīn, khowdā y jahān ñ qānī’ u subūd’ ñ makhān u samañ) belongs to none of Nizāmī’s poems, though it is in the metre of H.P.
Kh.Sh., H.P., 'Isk.N.' Pictures); Gulistan/Xtabay
II 527 (Dated 1240/1824-5, M.A.); Gulistan/Xtabay
II 524 (Completed in 1248/1832-3); Gulistan/Xtabay
II 523 (Completed in 1250/1834-5); Gulistan/Xtabay
II 506 (Dated 1278/1861-2. Kh.Sh. Pictures);
Gulistan/Xtabay II 521 (Pictures in Qajar style);
Gulistan/Xtabay II 520 ('old'; end supplied by a
second hand and dated Jumādā I 1250/1834); Gulistan/
Xtabay II 511; Gulistan/Xtabay II 514 (Copied
by Mahmūd Shīrāzī); Gulistan/Xtabay II 516; Gulis-
tan/Xtabay II 525 (L.M., incomplete. Pictures);
Gulistan/Xtabay II 526 (L.M.); Gulistan/Xtabay II
502 ('Isk.N.', incomplete); Gulistan/Xtabay II 504
(Fragment of 'Isk.N.'); Gulistan/Xtabay II 505
(Isk.N. i-ii, end missing. Pictures); Mashhad
Ridawī VII 300 (13th-14th century?); Ridawī VII
301 ('Dated' 867/1462-3, but the cataloger thinks
it belongs to the 17th century); Ridawī VII 302-
303 (both 17th century?); Tashtkent Acad. II 840-
843 (All 17th century. No. 842 has pictures); 845
(Dated 989/1581. Isk.N. i-ii); Dushanbe Acad. II
375-402 (many copies of the Khansāh or individual
poems. The oldest, no. 376, is dated 994/1586 and
lacks L.M. No. 375 and 378 have pictures); Peshawar
Univ. (Munz. Pak. VII p. 65. Dated Rajab 809
/1406-7); Khaipur Public Library (Munz. Pak. VII
p. 65. Dated 864/1469-60); Lahore Forman Chris-
tian College (Munz. Pak. VII p. 101. 'Isk.N.'
supposedly 'dated' 4 Muharram 597/12001); Shērānī
(Munz. Pak. VII p. 70. 13th century? M.A.); Shērān-
nī (Munz. Pak. VII p. 65. Dated 15 Shawwāl 765
/1364. End of 'Isk.N.' missing); Public Library
'Isk.N.' Pictures); Shērānī (Munz. Pak. VII p. 65.
Ms. copied by Maulānā Aqṣār Tabrizī and dated
Rajab 877/1472. M.A., Kh.Sh., L.M.); Univ. (Munz.

1This is given in a number of late copies as the date of
composition and has doubtless been misunderstood by
Munsawa's informant.

Pak. VII p. 70. Dated 1 Ṣafar 883/1478. M.A.);
Univ. (Munz. Pak. VII p. 65. Dated 20 Ramaḍān 900
/1495. Pictures); Bombay Rehatak p. 169 no. 144
(Ms. of 'Maḥṣūn ṣa-rār'; without indication of
author. Rehatak says that the Ms. 'was made in
A.H. 552, or perhaps A.H. 750'; the former is in
fact the date indicated in many Mss. for the com-
position of Nizāmī's poem, the latter, perhaps the
date of copying, corresponds to 1349-50); Rehatak
p. 151 no. 84-87 (4 copies of Isk.N. i or ii, the
oldest dated 970/1562-3); Rehatak p. 170 no. 149-
150 (2 copies of H.P., one dated 1085/1674-5);
Rehatak p. 134 no. 27 (Dated Asfandārmand 1045Y.
/1676. Kh.Sh. only); Navvāri Meherji Rana p. 85
no. 32 (H.P., Kh.Sh., L.M.); Meherji Rana p. 95
no. 91/1 (L.M.); Meherji Rana p. 96 no. 95 (M.A.);
Meherji Rana p. 96 no. 99 ('Isk.N.' incomplete);
Aliqarh (various copies of individual poems, the
oldest a H.P. dated 996/1588, are listed in Subh
Mss. p. 38-43); Hyderabad (various copies, none
older than 1006/1597-8, and mostly undated are in
Āqṣāfīyah p. 148, 242, 1480, 1482, 1486, 1478,
1490); Rampore State Library (Nadhr Ahmad 205-6.
Two copies of Kh.Sh., the latter with pictures, dated
983/1575-6 and 984/1576-7 respectively); State Library (Nadhr Ahmad 224. Dated 1021/1612);
Sault 35-47 (late copies of individual poems);
Lucknow Sprenger 422 (several copies); Bankiropo
I 37 (Copied by Muḥammad b. 'Ali and dated 20
Ṣafar 835/1431); I 38 (Completed 3 Rajab 883/1478.
Pictures); Supp. i 1837 (Dated 13 Dhū l-Ḥijjah
898/1485. Pictures); I 40 (15th century? H.A. and
L.M. Pictures); Supp. i 1811 (Dated Jumādā I 922
/1516. Fragment of Kh.Sh.); Supp. i 1812 (16th
century? Isk.N. i only, end missing); I 39 (16th
century? L.M. and end of Isk.N. ii missing);
Supp. i 1808 (Dated Muḥarram 1041/1631); Supp. i
1809 (Dated Shawwāl 1047/1638. Without L.M.
Pictures); Supp. i 1810 (17th century? H.P. and
Isk.N. ii missing); I 42 (17th century? Isk.N. i
only. Pictures); I 43 (Dated 27 Ṣafar 1143/1730. Isk.N. i only); I 44 (Dated 11 Ṣafar 1144/1731. Isk.N. i only. Pictures); I 41 (Dated 22 Dhu-l- hijjah 1237/1822. Kh.Sh. only. Pictures); Suppt. i 1813 (19th century. Isk.N. i); Suppt. i 1814 (19th century. Fragment of Isk.N. i); Madrasa 1 118, 122-4, 140, II 56 (late or undated copies of individual poems); Calcutta Ivanow 473 (18th-19th century? Isk.N. i-ii only); Madrasah CXXVIII (Copied by Muḥammad ʿAlī b. Darwīṣ ʿAlī and dated 919/1513. M.A. and Kh.Sh.); Būhar 295 (Dated 941/1534-5. Pictures); Būhar 296 (Dated 16 Rabʾ II 1041/1631. M.A.); Ivanow 471 (Dated 1083/1672-3. Kh.Sh.); Ivanow 467 (Fragment dated 1085/1674-5); Ivanow 466 (Dated 1090/1679); Ivanow 468 (Dated 1090/1679. M.A.); Ivanow 472 (17th century? Kh.Sh.); Ivanow 475 (Dated 27th year of Muhammad-Shāh 1157/1744. Isk.N. ii); Ivanow 470 (Dated 1169/1755-6. L.M.); Ivanow 474 (18th century? Isk.N. i); Ivanow Curzon 200 (18th century? Isk.N. i. Pictures); Ivanow Curzon 201 (18th century? Isk.N. ii); Madrasah CXXXIX (Dated 1812. H.P.); Madrasah CXL (19th century? H.P.); Ivanow 2nd Suppt. 977 (19th century? Kh.Sh.); Ivanow 2nd Suppt. 978 (19th century? Isk.N. i); Madrasah CXXVII (Isk.N. ii missing); Washington Vever 236 (Contains the date 837/1433-4. Pictures); Vever 237 (15th century? Pictures); Vever 238-40 (Three pages, one with the date 15 Rabʾ II 903/1497); Vever 249 (Completed in 934/1527-8. Pictures); Vever 253 (16th century? Pictures); Vever 254 (16th century? M.A. missing. Pictures); Vever 260 (16th century? M.A. and Isk.N. ii missing. Pictures); Vever 272 (Dated Rajab 1055/1645. Isk.N. i-ii missing. Pictures); Vever 51 (an

'anthology' containing 'sections from' M.A., Isk.N. i, Kh.Sh., H.P. and Sanăʾ ʿĪsā ʿĪsā Habīb 17th century? Pictures); and various detached pages; Princeton 7 (Copied by Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Tustarī al-Kāḥdāhī and dated 20 Shawwāl 849/1446. Pictures); 8 (Dated 898/1492-3. Fragments of M.A., Kh.Sh., L.M., H.P. Pictures apparently added later); 9 (Copied by al-Rāʾīs al-Shīrāzī in 970/1662-3. Pictures); New York Jackson-Yohannan 6 (Dated 853/1449-50. Pictures); Jackson-Yohannan 7 (Copied by Naʿīm al-dīn and dated 24 Shawwāl 915/1510. Pictures); Jackson-Yohannan 8 (Copied by Sulṭān Muḥammad Nūr in 931/1524-5. Pictures); Jackson-Yohannan 10 (H.P. Copied, according to the colophon, by Aḥsan in 988/1580, but the pictures are all signed by Bihzād and must thus, if authentic, be more than 50 years older); Jackson-Yohannan 9 (16th century? Pictures); Morgan Collection (see Martinovitch, JAOS 45, 1925, p. 108. Dated 1087/1675-6); Various illustrated copies, none older than the 16th century, are listed in B. Schmizt, Islamic manuscripts in the New York Public Library, New York/Oxford 1992, p. 76-9, 94-6, 196-200, 208-9, 359-60); Philadelphia Lewis Coll. 64 (16th century? Isk.N. i. Pictures); Lewis Coll. 62 (Copied by Hājj Muhammad al-Jārpaḏaḡānī [sic cat. and dated 1037/1627-8. Pictures); Lewis Coll. 63 (19th century? Pictures); Lewis Coll. 65 (Dated 1248/1832-3. Isk.N. i. Pictures); Cambridge (Mass) Hofer Collection (Nuskhah-hā IV p. 11. Ms. dated 827/1424. 'Isk.N.', Kh.Sh., L.M.); id. (Nuskhah-hā IV p. 10. Dated 933/1429-30).

Editions of the Khamsah: Bombay 1834; 1838; 1265/1849 (ed. Faḍī al-dīn Khamkâr, without Isk.N. ii); 1285/1869 (Mīrāž Bāqir's press, again without Isk.N. ii); 1298/1881 (ed. Fath al-Kārīm); 1328/1910 (ed. Muẓaffarī); Tehran 1261/1845; 1314-6/1896-8; 1341sh./1962-3; Tābrīz 1261/1845.

Complete translation of the *Khamsah* and *diwan* (Russian verse): Низами Ганджеви: Собрание сочинений, 5 volumes, Moscow 1985, reprinted in 3 volumes, Baku 1991 (various translators; the works are listed separately below).

Translation of extensive extracts from the *Khamsah* and *diwan* (Russian verse): Низами Стихотворения и поэмы (various translators), Leningrad 1981.

The individual poems:

1) *Makhzan al-asrār* (inc.: bi-smi l-lāhi l-rhamāni l-rażīm * hast kalīd i dar i ganj i ḫakīm*); for its date and dedicatee see above p. 439-40. Ни zijami's earliest book is also the only one without a continuous narrative content. Instead it contains, after extended opening sections, twenty homilies, each illustrated by a short anecdote. The author avows his indebtedness to Sanā'ī's *Hadīqah*.

Mas.: see *Khamsah*.

Editions: London 1844 (*Makhzan ul asrār, the treasury of secrets... Edited from an ancient manuscript* ... by Nathaniel Bland); Cawnpore 1869 (with marginal notes); Lucknow 1869; 1872; 1881 (with a commentary, Zuhūr al-asrār, by Zuhūr al-Ja'far Bankūrī); Lahore [1887] (with marginal notes by M. Ridā); [1921] (with the same notes);

1The identity of this manuscript is not revealed (Bland's second volume, which was to have contained the variants and commentary, was never published), but I have no doubt that the edition is based on London 1.O. 989, i.e. the oldest recorded copy. The edition appears to agree throughout with the text of the I.O. Ms., though not with the superscriptions (which are nask in the Ms.), but Bland has modernised the orthography and filled a few lacunae towards the end. This edition was used (though not given sufficient weight) by the editor of the Baku edition, but otherwise seems to have attracted little attention. When I consulted the British Library's copy in 1994 the pages were still uncot.
belong to this work). In the introduction the author says that he had previously composed a similar work on the difficult verses of the two parts of the Iskandar-nāmah. Ms.: London Add. 26,149 (Rieu p. 573. Has a note of purchase dated 1089/1678-9. Incomplete); Or. 2934 (Rieu Suppt. 233. Beginning missing. Contains a note of purchase dated 1091/1680); I.O. 998 (incomplete); París Supplément 587 (Blochet 1267. 18th century? Beginning only); Tehran Majlis II 932; Taschkent Acad. II 848-849; Calculutta Fort William College (Sprenger 424); Râmpore Saulat 157 and apparently also 158 (both 18th or 19th century); Hyderabâd Āṣâfîyah II p. 625 no. 290 (Dated 1069-1658-9); Āṣâfîyah II p. 1482 no. 185; Madras II 593.


(3) Sharīb i Makhan al-asrār by ʻAbd al-ʻAzīz b. Ḥasan b. Ṭāhir Jaumūrī (d. 975/1567). Ms.: Hyderabâd Āṣâfîyah III p. 200 no. 1301 (Dated 1109/1697-8).

(4) Sharīb i Makhan al-asrār, beginning with the first verse of the poem followed by the gloss: ifṭāti bī kitāb bā tāqīmā in miqrīz i awal bar tasmiyâh etc. The I.O. Ms. designates one Muḥammad b. al-Khalīl Sa'd al-dīn as kītīb al-kalīmāt, i.e. copyist and perhaps also author of the work. Ms.: London I.O. 2872 (Dated Jumādā I <10>51/1641).

(5) [same title] by Qāḍī ʻIbrāhīm Ṭaṭa'ī, evidently dependent on Muḥammad b. Qivām. Ms.: London I.O. Delhi 1060 (dated 1221/1806); Hyder-

(ii) Khusrav-Shīrīn (inc.: khudāvand-ā, dar i tawīfīg bu-gahāy * nizāmī rā rah i taḥqīq bu-nayā); for the title, date and dedicatee see above p. 440. The romantic story of the Sasanian emperor Khusrav Parvēz and his queen, the Armenian princess Shīrīn, much expanded and elaborated from the account of these persons in the Shāh-nāmah.

Ms.: see Khamsah.

Editions: [Bombay] 1249/1833 (ed. ʻAlamsh Māzandarānī. Pictures); Lahore 1288/1871 (with marginal notes); 1310/1892-3 (‘2nd edition’, with marginal notes); Lucknow 1288/1871; Cawnpore 1881; 1304/1887; Tehran 1313h./1934 (ed. Wāḥīd Dastgīrdī, with notes) and reprints; 1343h./1964-5 (ed. Ḥ. Pāzāmān Bakhtyārī); 1344h./1965 (ed. A. Nūrī); 1353h./1974 (ed. A. al-Ḥ. Aṣāfīyah II p. 1482 no. 183 (Dated 1068/1657-8); Calculutta Ivanov Curzon 203 (18th century?).

(6) An unidentified commentary with the same title, beginning, without any introduction, with the first verse of the poem is found in Calculutta Ivanov 469 (18th century?).

(7) The text of Makhzan al-asrār with an incomplete commentary in Turkish is found in a Ms. which once belonged to the well-known historian ʻIsā’ī b. ʻAbd al-Wahhab, called Küçük Câlebi (died 1173/1759-60), presumably the author of the commentary. Ms.: Istanbul Esat 2901 (Duda p. 59).


1See the discussion by N. Ahmad, Indo-Iranica (Calcutta) XIX/3, 1966, p. 25-8.
2Shaiikh ʻAbd al-ʻAsīn Dihlawī b. Ḥasan b. Ṭāhir Jaumūrī, a Chishtī shâikh, born at Jaumūrī in 898/1492-3, was taken to Delhi at the age of one and a half years by his father, a well-known sufi. Among his works was a Risâlāh i ʻālimyâh. ʻAbd al-Ḳādir Badât ibnī was one of his pupils. He died on 6 Jumādā II 976/1667.' (Sto.)
tālniho II. Contains a critical edition and translation of the Farhād–Shirīn episode, a detailed summary of the whole poem and a study of the earlier and later versions of the story.


(French prose): Le roman de Chosroès et Chufirîn traduit du persan par Henri Massé, Paris 1970 (omits the beginning and end).


(German prose and verse): Chosrou und Shirin; Übertragung ..., Nachwort und Erläuterungen von J. C. Bürgel, Zurich 1980.

(Russian prose): Хосров и Ширин. Вещественно-художественный перевод с фарсы комментарии Г. В. Абдулла, М. Н. Османова, Baku 1985.


Abridgment: Ms.: London Or. 2933 (Rieu Supp. 231; Titley 326. Dated 25 Muharram of the 8th year of Muḥammad Shāh = 1139/1726).

Prose paraphrase: Surūd i Khusrawī, written by Ghulam Husain Khan Munshi in 1230/1815, for some English officers. The same author also wrote abridgments of the two parts of the Iskandar-nāma (see below). Ms.: London Add. 27,270 (Rieu p. 575-8. Autograph).


(iii) Lailā–Majnūn (inc.: ai nām i tu bihtarīn sar-āghāz x bē nām i tu nāmah kai kunām bān); for the title, date and dedicatee see above p. 440-1. A retelling of a famous love-story from pre-Islamic Arabia.

Ms.: see Khamsah.

Editions: [India] 1264/1848; Lucknow 1286 /1870; 1888; Bombay 1292/1875; 1302/1885; Lahore 1307/1890; Cawnpore 1904; Tehran 1313th sh./1934 (ed. W. Dastgirdī, with notes) and reprints; Moscow 1965 (critical edition by A. A. Alekser–Zade [Persian title page: 'Alī–Aqshar–zādah] and F. Babayev).


(German prose, abridged): Leila und Majnun. Der berühmteste Liebesroman des Norgrenlandes erstmal aus dem Persischen verdichtet und mit einem Nachwort versehen von Rudolph Gelpke, Zurich 1963 (with photographs of miniatures).


Epitome: Ms.: Gotha 40/4 (Babr al-durar. 'Offenbar sehr alt').

(iv) Ḥaft pākar (inc.: aijāhān-dādah būd khwēš az tu * bāch būdī na-būdah pāsh az tu): for the date and dedicatee see above p. 441. Nizāmī's second reworking of an episode of Sassanian history from the Shāh-nāma, this time that of the emperor Bahrām i Gōr. Its central and most famous portion is occupied by the seven stories with which Bahrām
is regaled by his queens on seven consecutive nights, among them the famous story of 'Turandot' (though the author does not actually use this name). But the moralist Nişāmī goes on to counterbalance the sensuality of these tales by the story of the unjust minister and his seven victims, and in so doing succeeds in giving the poem a structural coherence and unity of purpose which I should think is without parallel in Islamic narrative literature. It is Nişāmī's masterpiece.1

Mss.: see Khamsah.

Editions: [Bombay] [1849] (The Book called [sic] Huft Piker of Mowlana Shaik Nizamsee Sahib Allibhir Ruhma the stories of Buhram Goor; Lathographed [sic] by Lucksheemon Wilhooyee, with marginal notes); [Lucknow] 1288/1871 (with appendix of supernumerary verses contained in the Bombay edition); Lucknow 1290/1873 (with the same appendix); 1904; [Lucknow] 1304/1887; [Prague (printed Istanbul) 1934 (Haft peikar, ein romantisches Epos des Nişāmī Genge'I herausgegeben von H. Ritter und J. Rypka. = Monografie archivu orientálního, Vol. III); Tehran 1315sh./1936 (ed. W. Dastgirdi, with notes) and reprints; Moscow 1987 (critical edition by T.A. Nagerramov [= Tahir Ahmad-oghli Mubarramov]).

Translations (English 'blank verse'): C.E. Wilson, The Haft paikar (The seven beauties) ... translated from the Persian with a commentary, 2 volumes, London 1924 (the translation is complete, though partially in Latin, but based on an inadequate text. The commentary, which occupies the whole of the second volume, is still of value).

1Ritter, in his introduction to the Prague edition, calls the Haft paikar 'das beste und schönste romantische Epos der neupersischen Dichtung und zugleich ... eine der bedeutendsten poetischen Schöpfungen der morgenländischen indogermanischen Literatur überhaupt'.


Partial translations: (German verse): F. von Erdmann, Die Schöne vom Schlosse... Kazan 1832; second edition under the title Behram-gur und die russische Fuerstentochter, Kazan/Berlin 1844 (with the Persian text and extensive notes); Die sieben Prinzessinnen; Nacherschreibung in Versen von M. Remané, ausgewählt und aus dem Persischen übersetzt von B. Alavi, Berlin 1980.


(Italian prose): F. Gabrieli, 'Versioni da Nişāmī', AION X, 1937-8, p. 31-72 (three episodes).


(v) Iskandar-nāmah, in two parts, called respectively Sharaf-nāmah (inc.: khudā-y āja, jahān-pādshāhī tu-rā-st * zi mā khidmat āyād, khudā-y tu-rā-st) and Iqbal-nāmah (inc.: khirad har-kuja ganj-ē ārad padā * zi nām-i khudā sāzad ān-rā
kalíd). The story of Alexander, following, and in the same metre as, the Shāh-nāmah, but with a strongly religious colouring. For its date and dedicatee see above p. 441-6.

Mss.: See Khamsa.

Editions: (a) Sharaf-nāmah and Iqbal-nāmah together: Calcutta 1910; 1825; 1835; 1263/1847; 1269/1852; Lucknow 1293/1905 (with interlinear Urdu translation and marginal notes by Fatḥ Muḥammad); Cawnpore 1878 (with marginal notes on the Isk. N. i alone).

(b) Sharaf-nāmah (Isk. N. i) alone: [Calcutta] [1810] (incomplete); 1812 (with the title Muntakhab al-shirāḥ i Sikandar-nāmah, and on the English title page: The Secander Nāma of Nizāmī. With a selection from the works of the most celebrated commentators, by Beder Ali & Mir Hosain Ali), reprinted 1825; 1243/1828; Calcutta 1818; [Lucknow] 1282/1865-6 (with marginal notes); 1873; Lucknow 1878-9 (ed. with marginal notes by M. Ḥādi ‘Alī and followed by a glossary entitled Farhang i Sikandar-nāmah by S. Ibn i Ḥasan b. Qāsim ‘Alī); 1889 (reprint of the Calcutta edition of 1812); 1894; Bombay 1277/1860-1 (with marginal notes); 1292/1875; 1907; [Cawnpore?] 1862 (with marginal notes); Cawnpore 1868 (with marginal notes); 1869; 1870; 1314/1896 (with interlinear Urdu translation and notes by Bābā Rām); Lahore 1889; Delhi 1316-7 (1898-9) (2 vols. with notes); 1323/1906 (Jild i thānī i Sikandar-nāmah i barfī, with notes by Ḥ. ʿAkhund-zādāh); Tehran 1316/1929 (ed. W. Dastgīrdī, with notes) and reprints; Baku 1947 (critical edition by K. A. Xilzadā). The story of Alexander, following, and in the same metre as, the Shāh-nāmah, but with a strongly religious colouring. For its date and dedicatee see above p. 441-6.

(c) Iqbal-nāmah (Isk. N. ii) alone: Calcutta 1852-69 (Khirad-nāmah Ḥisakandary; also called the Sikandar-nāmah Babry, by Nizāmī, edited by S. Speur and Ḥa Ḥ. Muḥammed Shooshtere, 2 fasc., the second edited by Ḥa Ḥ. Ahmad ‘Alī; Bombay 1277/1860; Cawnpore 1288/1871; 1878; 1892; Lucknow 1879; Tehran 1317/1939 (ed. W. Dastgīrdī, with

NIZĀMĪ

Translators of one or both parts: (English prose): H. Wilberforce Clarke, The Sikandar Nāma of Bara, or Book of Alexander the Great... translated ... with critical and explanatory remarks, with an introductory preface, and with a life of the author, collected from various Persian sources, London 1881 (Isk. N. i).


(German prose): Das Alexanderbuch (Isk. N. i and ii, the prologues and epilogues abbreviated), trans. and annotated by J. Chr. Bürgel, Zurich 1991.

Partial translations: (French prose): Expédition d’Alexandre le Grand contre les Russes: Extrait de l’Alexandreide ou Iskendèr-Nâmé de Nizâmy, traduit ... par Louis Spitznagel ... traduction entièrement refondue ... par F.B. Charmoy ... Tome premier, St. Petersburg 1828 (with the Persian text, recording variants from a large number of Mss.).


Commentaries and glossaries (all apparently only to Isk.N. i):

(1) A work by one Ḥāmid b. Jamāl Bukhārī al-Husainī (Dorn: al-Fuṣuṭī) al-Jaunpurī (inc.: baṃ bē nīḥayat wa sipās bē ghyāt [Dorn: bē 'ṣāḥīḥ] etc.) and dedicated to Parīd al-dīn Abū 1-Muṣafar Shīr-Shāh (947/1540 to 952/1545) contains, according to Rieu, 'a commentary on some difficult verses in the first part of Iskandar Nāmah'. In the subscription of the Leningrad copy the work is called Kīlīd i kitāb i Sharaf-nāmah, but Dorn says (on what basis?) that the author 'parafrased the work under the title de kasf al-daḡāqiṣ ...' and states that it is a glossary of the Arabic words occurring in the Isk.N. Mss.: London Add. 10, 579/I (Rieu p. 820. Dated Muharram 1096/1684); Leningrad Dorn D fol. 14-37 (Dated 3 Jamādā I 1176/1762). Cf. Munz. Pak. VII p. 130.

(2) Fawā'id (Qawā'id, Qawā' id) i 'All-shērī by Muhīr al-dīn b. Niẓām al-dīn, written in 968/1559-50 for Naṣīr al-dīn 'All-shērī. See the description in Sprenger. Mss.: London Add. 28, 243 II (Rieu p. 859. 18th century?); Cambridge Browne Coll. Sup. 2 (Dated 1006/1695-6); Halle D.W. 25 (Has a seal dated 1206/1791-2). Incomplete; title not indicated in the Ms.; 'vielleicht identisch' with the work described by Rieu and Sprenger; Berlin Sprenger 1481 (Pertsch 734. Dated 8 Rabī' I 1269/1852); Lucknow Sprenger 425 (several copies); Calcutta Ivanow Curson 202 (Dated 10 Rabī' II 1082/1671). Cf. Munz. Pak. VII p. 130-2.

(3) A commentary beginning sipās bē qiyās wa sitāyish bē shumār mar khāliq ē rā... Ms.: Munich 188 Quatr. (Amer. 27. Dated 1139/1726-7).

(4) Shāb i (abyāt i) Iskandar-nāmah by Sirāj al-dīn 'All Khān, called Ārsū (d. 1169/1755-6). 'This commentary forms the basis of the glosses to the lithographed Lucknow [sic] edition of the [first part of?] the Sīkandar-nāmah, 1263 and 1266, 8vo. 311 pp. 23 bayts, also of the notes of

Badr'ālly and Myr Hosayn in the Calcutta edition, 1812, 4to. and of the somewhat fuller commentary of the Calcutta edition of 1253, reprinted 1260 = 1844, lithographed at Bombay with three other works on the margin, 1281 folio, the commentaries are all essentially identical.' (Sprenger). Mss.: London Or. 3513 (Rieu Suppt. no. 232. 18th century?); Berlin Sprenger 1492 (Pertsch 736); Rampore Sautaul 148-150; Lucknow Sprenger 426 (two copies). Edition: in the margins of the Bombay edition of the poem of 1277/1860.

(5) Shāb i Sharaf-nāmah by Mullā Muḥammad Sa'd Allāh of Patna, written in 1196/1782. Mss.: Lucknow Sprenger 427; Extracts from the same work are apparently contained in Berlin Ms. or. oct. 70 fol. 1b-18b (Pertsch 735).


(8) Commentary by Pīr 'All Rasūl-pūrī. Ms.: Rampore Sautaul 151 (modern); Lucknow Sprenger 425.


(10) Shāb i Sikandar-nāmah, an anonymous commentary which Eddé declares to be 'different not only from that of the Calcutta edition, but also from all those described in Rieu [...]; Pertsch [...], and A. Sprenger'. It begins, without any preface, with the first verse of the poem, which is then glossed: la-ūma khalalq 1-līn wa l-insān illā lī ya'budūnī. bi pād-shhān in mm,lakat in ash'ār wa jāhān-dārān in wālāyīn in afkār ... Ms.: London I.O. 1018; I.O. 1019 (incomplete).

(11) Shāb i abyāt i Iskandar-nāmah, 'another anonymous commentary on the difficult verses of the first part of the Isk.N.' Ms.: London I.O. 1020.
(13) Killid i Sikandar-nāmah, 'a similar, but shorter glossary'. Ms.: Oxford Ms. Pers. e. 11 (Ethē 1982); Calculina Ivanov 1st Suppt. 796 (19th century? 'Apparently the same work').
(14) Two copies of an anonymous commentary (the second of which is a mere fragment) are found in Berlin Ms. Or. oct. 70 fol. 19b-53b and 54-61 (Pertsch 735).
(15) Unidentified commentaries. Ms.: Cambridge Corpus, No. 213 (Brovne Suppt. 766. Dated 1246/1830-1); Bombay Univ. VII (Dated 4 Rabi' I 1241/1825).

Abridgments: Futūbšt i Sikandarī, in prose, made by Ghulām Ḥusain (see above, ad Khusrav-Shīrīn), the first part in 1209/1794-5 and the second in 1221/1806-7. Ms.: Cambridge Add. 314 (Brovne Cat. CCXVII. Part 1); Add. 315 (Brovne Cat. CCXVIII. Dated 9 Shawwal 1221/1806, apparently the autograph. Part 2).

Selections from the Khamsah:
(1) Khulāṣat i khamsah, a collection of extracts arranged under topical headings. The poem from which each quotation is taken is indicated, the first extract being from the opening section of M.A. (inc.: ai hamah hastī zi tu paidā shudah + khāk i daʿīf az tu tumānā shudah). The manuscripts evidently differ considerably from one another; most copies have 37 chapters, but some omit chapters 5 (on love) and 31 (women), perhaps out of prudery. A number of the copies also have a preface in prose (inc.: bar aṣḥāb i daulat wa arbaʿī i muknat wajib wa lāsim ast kih baʿd az qirāʾat i qurʾān etc.) which the editor considers spurious. The author and date of the compilation are unknown; the oldest dated copy is Istanbul Esat 2918 from 883/1479.

Mss.: Dublin Beatty 178 fol. 106-51 in marg. (16th century? In 38 chapters, presumably this work); Oxford Walker 44 (Ethē 599. Dated 6 Muharram 1152/1739. Incomplete); Ouseley Add. 106 (Ethē 597, with the preface); Bodl. 102 (Ethē 598); London I.O. 982 (=Robinson 145. Dated 982 /1574-5. 1 picture); Add. 7731 (Rieu p. 575. 16th century? With the preface); Add. 19,661/I (Rieu p. 845. 16th century?); Grenville xxxviii (Rieu p. 575. 17th century?); Add. 7730 (Rieu p. 575. Dated Safar 1231/1816); I.O. 2874; R.A.S. 363 (Pictures); Paris Supplément 590 (Blochet 1288. Dated 20 Ramadān 991/1583); Ancien fonds 354/VI (Blochet 1289/Richard. Ms. dated 26 Dhū 1-qaʿdah 994/1586. 30 chapters only); Supplément 589 (Blochet 1286. 16th century?); Supplément 1406 (Blochet 1287. 16th century? End missing); Supplément 592/I (Blochet 1290. Dated 25 Rajab 1148/1735. Beginning missing); Naples Bibl. Nazionale Ms. III. G. 41 (Piemontese 230/III. Ms. dated Shawwal 924/1518); Leyden II 633; Hamburg Orient. 218 fol. 1v-68r (Brockelmann 184. Dated 967/1569-60); Berlin Sprenger 1476 (Pertsch 738. 3 copies of different recensions of the work bound together: the first undated, the second dated Jumādā II 1087 /1676, the third 18 Rabi' I 22nd year of Aurangzēb /1679); Leningrad Acad. C 1863 fol. 8a-22b (Index 1174. Chap. 28-40 only); Istanbul Esat 2918 (Duda p. 59-60. Dated 1 Dhū 1-bijjah 883/1479); Fatih 3742 (Ritter-Reinert p. 128. Copied by Pīr Ḥusain al-Kātib. 15th century?); Universite FY 356 (olim Riza Pasa 1585. Ateş 107. Copied by Murshid al-dīn Muḥammad and dated Muharram 916/1510); Universite FY 528 (Ateş 108. Dated Dhū 1-qaʿdah 955/1548); Topkapı, Revan 884 (Karatay 483; Stchoukine lx. Copied by Muḥammad Ḥusain al-Ḥusaini in Muharram

1Arberry gives the title as 'Khulāṣat i Jamšīd', but I wonder whether the last word is not a mis-reading of 'khamsah'?
982/1574. Pictures); Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi 1922/1 (Olim Fatih 3743. Ritter-Reinert p. 249. 15th-16th century?); Universite FY 154 (Ateş 109. Copied by ‘Aqīd al-Mudhahhib. 16th century?); Topkapı, Emanet Hazinesi 1654 (Karayat 482. Copied by Shāh Maḥmūd. 16th century?); Cairo Dār al-kutub 57 sadeb fārisī Tā’īyat (Tīrāṣī 1 p. 131. Dated 901/1495-6) [Munz.]; Tehran Daftar i Miḥṭāb 298 (Munz. 29643. Dated Jumādā II 967/1560; Guilsan/Kōtāb 2 515; Shūrā i Islāmī 1 102; etc.; Terhkent Acad. II 844 (17th-18th century?); Acad. VI 4425; Dushanbe Acad. II 403-406; Pakistan (various copies, the oldest dated 1017/1608-9, are listed in Munz. Pak. VII p. 69-70); Calcutta Ivanov 476 (=Sprenger 423. Dated 1135/1722-3); Bankipore I 45 (Dated 1061/1651); Hyderabad Aṣṣafiyah II p. 1478 no. 124 149; Philadelphia Lewis Coll. 66 (Dated 982/1574-5. Presumably this epi-


A different version of this selection, in which are also incorporated selections from mathnawīs of Amīr Khusrav and Jāmī, is found in Berlin Petermann 486/1 (Pertsch 16. Dated 6 Dhū l-hijjah 1052/1643) and evidently also Leningrad Dorn CCCXXIII (Dated 955/1548); Acad. C 112 fol. 1b-21a (Index 1173. Dated 1060/1650).

(2) Extensive extracts from all six poems occupy the larger portion of the anthology in New York Jackson-Yohanan (Dated, according to the catalogue, 123<0>0/1815, but perhaps rather 1<0>23/1614; none of the many authors excerpted in it lived past the first quarter of the 17th cen-
tury. Pictures).

(3) Unspecified epitome: Mus.: Glasgow V.8.21 (Weir 13. ‘Kītāb al-intikhab’); Istanbul Bullets-
ite FY 472/11 (Ateş 110. Dated 888/1492-3); Univers-

tite FY 508 (Ateş 111. 16th century?).

`Aufī II p. 396-7; Shams p. 80, 145-6; Zaka-

ryā'ī al-Qaswīnī, `Aṭṭār al-bilād, ed. Wüstendon, p. 351-2; Mustauffī p. 752-3; Jāfargīlī II p. 624-8 (one qāṣīdah); Daulat-shībī p. 128-31; Rāzī II p. 493-501 (no. 988); Adhar III p. 1327-43; Hidā-

yat, Ḥaqīmī I p. 637-54; id., Ḥiyād p. 149-53; W. Bacher, Niẓāmī’s Leben und Werke und der zweite Teil des Niẓammī’schen Alexanderbuchs. Mit persi-

schen Texten aus Anhang ..., Leipzig 1871; id., Memoir of the life and writings of the Persian poet Niẓāmī, and analysis of the second part of his Alexander-Book (translated from the preceding by S. Robinson), London 1873; J. J. Modi, 'The date of the death of Niẓāmī', JBBRAS XII, p. 143-50; H. Ritter, Über die Bildersprache Niẓāmīs, Berlin /Leipzig 1927; Ye. E. Bertel’s, Niẓāmī. Tvorcheskiy put’ poeta, Moscow 1956; id., ‘Niẓāmī, Mernografiya’ (an extensive biographical and critical study, published posthumously in his:) Izbrannye trudy: Niẓāmī and Fuzūlī, Moscow 1962, p. 13-450; Safāī II p. 796-824; Khayyām-pūr p. 610 (with much further literature); Colloquio sul poeta persiano Niẓāmī e la leggenda iranica di Alessandro Mango, Rome 1977 (articles on the Isk.N. by Zarrinkoob, Chełkowski, Meier, Scarcia, Safa, Bauzani); A. E. Krymski, Niẓāmī and his contemporaries, Baku 1981; B. Zanjānī, 'Tārīkh i wilādat u waqāt i Niẓāmī i Ganjavī', Ayandah X/12, 1363sh./1984, p. 875-8; J. S. Mei-

sami, ' Allegorical gardens in the Persian poetic tradition: Nezami, Hafiz, Hafez', International Journal of Middle East studies XVII, 1985, p. 229-

80; Frǎn-shināsī III/3 and III/4, 1370sh./1991-2 (papers held at two conferences in 1991); ERZ s.v. 'Niẓāmī Ganjavī' (P. Chełkowski; with further literature).
259. Parwâz Khâtûn (which Dîh-khûdâ emends to the female name Parwûn Khâtûn) is credited with three verses in LF ed. Iqâbî p. 505-6 (Ms. nûn in marg.)

LN s.v. 'Parwûn Khâtûn'.

260. One verse is ascribed to Pisar i Râmî in two different entries in LF ed. Iqâbî p. 18, 303 (Ms. nûn in marg.).

261. Qâdî Sharwânî is cited as the author of a total of eleven verses in Abû l-Rajâ' Qumâl, Târîkh al-wuzûrâ', ed. M.T. Dânish-pashâbûh, Tehran 1363sh./1985, p. 153, 155, 165, 173-4, all referring to events during the reigns of the Seljuqs Malik-shâh III (547/1152 to 548/1153) and his successor Muhammâd II.

262. Malik al-shu'arâ' Qâdîrî is the author of a poem of twenty verses quoted by Jâjarmî and addressed (according to Jâjarmî's superscription) to Alp Arslân (455/1063 to 465/1072). But the name of this king does not appear in the poem itself; instead this ends with a verse evoking one 'khudâ-wand i mu'âiyad, mîr Wâdân-shâh bin 'Abdâd', whom I am unable to identify. Hidâyat quotes twelve verses from the same poem, but ascribes them wrongly to Qâdîrî Hindûstânî, i.e. the Moghol prince Dârâ Shukh b. Shâh-ja'hân.

One verse by perhaps the same Qâdîrî is quoted in the marginal additions in Ms. nûn of Aâsâl's dictionary.


263. Nîzâm al-dîn Ma'bûd Isfahânî, called Qamarî is the author of good-sized collection of poems preserved in an early 14th-century manuscript in London and who is also quoted once by Shams i Qâis; I regret greatly that I have been unable to find a copy of the printed edition of his dîwân. The London codex has a few introductory lines stating that the majority of his poems are in praise of the 'Alî i Khujaנד, the leaders of the Shâfî'î faction in Isfahân. Unfortunately, the poems have no superscriptions (apart from the usual 'wa lâhu a'idan'); the patrons who are mentioned in the verses themselves include Khâlfah i 'Ajâm Rûm al-dîn (clearly one or the other of the 'Alî i Sâ'id, the leaders of the Huna'î faction in Isfahân), Khân i a'zam Salghur-shâh (evidently one of the Salghurid atabegs in Fârs), Shâh i Erân 'Imâd al-dîn, Malik Sa'd al-dîn (alias Ulugh i a'zam atâbeg) and Khân i a'zam Qutb al-dîn.

Ms. : London I.O. 1028 (Ms. copied by 'Abd al-Mu'min al-'Alawî al-Kâshî in 713-4/1314-5. Pictures); Mashhâd Ridawî VII 965/7 (Ms. dated 1041/1631-2). For these two Ms. see above, p. 423 n. 1 (Mu'izzî) and also Muns. III 25856-6.


Shams p. 356; Hidâyat, Majma' I p. 635-6; Khâyî-vâr-pûr 475 ('Qamarî') and 607 ('Nîzâm i Isfahânî').

264. Qiwâlî Gânjâ'î is the author of a well-known qaṣîdah ma'nâ'î ash illustrating the rhetorical figures, noted in PL III (Rhetoric) p. 207-8. The poem is dedicated to the atabeg of Azerbaijan Qizil Arslân (582/1186 to 587/1191) and can be found in a large number of anthologies; to those mentioned in PL III it will suffice to add Jâjarmî I p. 86-94 and Yaghmâ'î p. 198-202.

1Thus in the ancient Ms. of his dîwân; Shams refers to him as Anîr Ma'bûd Qamar, while Hidâyat calls him Nîzâm al-dîn Qamarî.

2For whom see above, p. 401-5.
The only other recorded work\(^1\) of this author is a highly artificial ode illustrating the figure known as taqīm; an extract from it can be found in Shams (p. 359-60), the full text in Jāirmi (I p. 118-9).

Daulat-shāh (p. 128) calls this author Qiwāmī Mustafarizī and supplies us with the highly questionable information that he was the brother of Nuṣārī. See also Khayyām-pūr p. 476.

265. Badr al-dīn al-Qiwāmī al-Rāzī (as ‘Aufl calls him) or Qiwāmī Khabbāz (‘the baker’, as he is called in the 14th-century London manuscript of his *diwān*) flourished in the first half of the 6th/12th century. In an ode to Qiwām al-dīn Darguzānī, who was wazīr to the Seljuk sultans Muhāmmed II, Dāqūd and Toghrīl II, and was executed in 527/1133, Qiwāmī alludes to the recent death of ‘the late sultan’,\(^2\) evidently that of Muhāmmed in 525/1131, and seems to indicate also that he owed his pen-name Qiwāmī to his patronage by this very Qiwām al-dīn. But the majority of his poems are of religious or didactic content, many of them praising ‘Allā and the imāms of the twelve Shiites, and in quite a few of them the poet pays his compliments to the leader of the Shiites in Rai, Nāqīb al-nuqabā’ Sharaf al-dīn Muḥammad b. ‘Allī Murtadrā. The *diwān* contains also (p. 20-1) an exchange of poems between Qiwāmī and ‘Imādī.


---

\(^1\)Munissant III 25391-2 lists two copies of the *'diwān* of Qiwāmī Ganjāvī; one of these is in fact yet another copy of the *gāsīdah maqṣūb* in an anthology (Tehran Majlis VIII 2326), the other a commentary on the same in Taşkent Acad. II 851.

\(^2\)Dīwān p. 46: dar ān fītrah kih shud sūltān i mādī * zi lashkar-gah ba dāru l-ulūk i riḍwān.

---


266. al-Amīr Qiwāmī al-Khwāfī\(^1\) is included by ‘Aufl amongst the poets of Khurāsān after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157). ‘Aufl states that he met this poet in Naisābūr, on which occasion Qiwāmī recited one of his verses satirising a doctor, a certain Sa’d, who had once in Herat prescribed a medicine to our poet which only made him more ill than before.

‘Aufl II p. 357; Rāzī II p. 175 (no. 664); Khayyām-pūr p. 476.

267. Three *gāsīdah* by one Kamāl al-dīn Qūṭbī al-Marwī, followed by another by perhaps the same ‘al-Marghāzī, are contained in an old anthology in Bologna. The first two poems evoke a king who is addressed as ‘shāh i muẓaffar’ and ‘shāh khusraw malik ‘Uthmān*, whom Piemontese has proposed to identify with Muẓaffar al-dīn Qızıl Arslān ‘Uthmān b. Eldūğūz, the atabeg of Azerbaijan from 582/1186 to 587/1191. I have found no other reference to a poet of this name.

Ms.: Bologna Biblioteca Universitaria Ms. 3283/II (Piemontese 3. 13th century?).

268. Ustād al-a’īsmah ṭadī al-dīn Muḥammad al-Naisābūrī is enumerated by ‘Aufl among the religious scholars of Naisābūr who produced Persian poetry. He is evidently identical with ‘al-Ṭadī al-Naisābūrī’, the principal opponent of Fakhr al-dīn al-Rāzī in his famous ‘debates’

---

\(^1\)The nisbāh refers to Khwāf in Kūhestān.
(münāṣārat) on points of Islamic law. Fakhr al-
dīn, who had a very low opinion of Raḍī’s intelli-
gence, speaks of one particular debate in the
year 582/1186, ‘the year for which the astrologers
had predicted a windy deluge’,¹ and in another
passage² he says that after going to Samarqand
and staying there for ‘some years’ he returned to
Bukhārā and engaged in another debate with Raḍī.
Ibn Abī l-Wafā’ mentions ‘al-Raḍī al-Naisābūrī’
(presumably the same one) in his biographical
dictionary of Ḥanfī scholars.

As a poet Raḍī eulogised several of the
Qurākhānids. Ḥāḍī Ḥasan and Naʾfīṣī have both
tried (it seems independently) to identify
the patrons mentioned in his poems, but they have
come to in part different and in both cases unsat-
sactory results so that one must await the
full publication of the surviving poems before the
question can be settled. From the extracts quoted
by them it is, however, evident that a large por-
tion of the poems eulogise a king with the titles
Nūṣrāt al-dunyā wa l-dīn and Arslān-Khān and who
is apparently not (as both scholars maintained)
‘Uthmān I (600/1203-4 to 607/1211) but rather his
father Nūṣrāt al-dunyā wa l-dīn Arslān-Khān Ibrā-
hīm IV b. al-Ḥusain (574/1178 to 600/1203-4).
Other poems mention one Abū l-Muẓaffar, evidently
the uncle and predecessor of the just-mentioned
Ibrāhīm; Abū l-Muẓaffar Masʿūd II b. al-Ḥasan
(556/1160 to 574/1178), others one Ghiyāth i mil-
lat, evidently Masʿūd’s son and co-ruler Ghiyāth
al-dunyā wa l-dīn Muḥammad IV. He also praised
several of the Rī y i Burhān, the spiritual leaders
of Bukhārā; Ḥāḍī Ḥasan quotes (p. 449) a poem
mentioning the year 559/1163-4 and addressing
a cleric whom the poet calls merely ‘Ṣād ḫ i aslī l
Burhān’, evidently the šād r Muḥammad I b. ‘Umar.

¹Munāṣārat p. 32. For this event see above, p. 257.
²p. 53.

‘Aufī quotes a Persian poem to one ‘Abd al-
‘Azīz,¹ probably the son of the just-mentioned
Muḥammad, ‘Abd al-‘Azīz II (ca. 570/1174 to
593/1196-7), as well as two Arabic verses directed
to ‘Burhān al-islām Tāj al-dīn’, evidently his

Adhar and Hidāyat (both apparently following
Taqī) confused Raḍī’s principal patron ‘Arslān-
Khān” with the Seijuq Arslān b. Ṭoghril; their
error was set right by Qazwīnī. Taqī² gives the
date of his death as 598/1201-2.

Mas. of his dīwān: Paris Supplément 791 fol.
76v sqq. (Blochet 1988. Dated 18 Shawwāl 1006
/1598); Supplément 797 fol. 92r sqq. (Blochet
1990. 16th century?); LENINGRAD Univ. 1202a
(Romaskevicz p. 7); TEHRAN Gulistân/Aṭābāy
430/IV (Bayānī apparently attributes the Ms. to
the 16th century); Adabīyāt II p. 11 (In a daftar
dated 1007/1598-9); Univ. IX 2589/1 (Dated 12 Ju-
mādār II 1015/1606); Lucknow Sprenger 457; ALIGARH
Subb. Mas. p. 35 no. 66 (Dated 1008/1599-1600).

Fakhr al-dīn al-Rāzī, Munāṣārat, ed. Fath
Allāh Khulaif, 2nd edition, Beyrouth 1984, passim;
‘Aufī I p. 219-28 (and Qazwīnī ad loc. and the
note in Naṣīfī’s edition p. 633); Shams passim
(see the index s.v. Raḍī); Zakariyā’ al-Qazwīnī,
Āṭhār al-bilād, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 252, 317; Ibn
Abī l-Wafā’, al-Jawāhir al-muḍīf al-thaqāfī al-
ṣanāfīyah, Hyderabad 1322/1914, II p. 370; Rāżī II
p. 243-50 (no. 746); MFS p. 278; Adhar II p. 686-
91; Hidāyat, Majma‘ I p. 231-4; id., Riyād p. 78,
194-5; Ḥāḍī Ḥasan, The poet Raḍī’ud-dīn of Nishā-
pur His life and times, Aryan Fath (Bombay) XIII,
1942, p. 446-54, 496-507; Naṣīfī’s to Bhaiqāl
p. 1339-46, 1397-9; Ṣafā, Tārīkh II p. 849-52;
Khayyām-pūr p. 234.

¹‘Aufī I p. 226 l. 9.
²Apud Sprenger p. 18 no. 26.
The Persian diwan of Rafi' al-din Lumbani, which, though still unpublished, is extant notably in a 13th-century manuscript in Dublin, cannot be the work of Rafi' the elder, since many of the poems in it were obviously composed as much as thirty years after the time of his death, but must belong to a younger namesake, evidently the Rafi' al-din Lumbani al-Isfahani of whom 'AfuI speaks as of a contemporary. His diwan contains odes to the Khwārazmšāh Jalāl al-din Mengburni (617/1220 to 628/1231), the leaders of the religious factions in Isfahan (Sadr al-din 'Umar al-Khujandī and Rukn al-din Mas'ud b. Sā'īd) and the Salghurid ruler of Fārs, Abū Bakr b. Sa'd b. Zangī (628/1231 to 658/1260), all of whom we have already encountered as patrons of Kamāl al-din Isfahānī, as well as various wasirs and unidentified persons. The poems by 'Rafi' al-din al-Lumbānī which are quoted by Jājārānī are doubtless all by this same Rafi' the younger.

Ibn al-Fuwatī has a short entry on two poets, Kamīl al-din Abū l-Maḥbūsan b. 'Abd al-‘Azīz b. Mas'ūd al-Lumbānī and his brother Rafi' al-din <b>.> 'Abd al-‘Azīz b. Mas'ūd, and quotes four Arabic verses by the former. If the latter is indeed the Persian poet Rafi' the younger, then his father, 'Abd al-‘Azīz b. Mas'ūd, is presumably the person whom al-Ṣafādī calls Abū Tāhir 'Abd al-‘Azīz b. Mas'ūd b. 'Abd al-‘Azīz al-Lumbānī (text:

1The published text has: 'Jahu sah'īr fī ghāyṣt al-ḥusn wa dīwān wa rasā'ilī', but this is presumably an error for '.... wa dīwān rasā'ilī'.

2Either Jamsāl al-din Maḥmūd or (and perhaps more probably) his younger relative Jamsāl al-din Mas'ūd; see above, p. 403-4.

3The story seems to imply that the Shafi’i faction supported Toghril’s coup; the Sadr’s household was thus fair game for the abbe’s forces.
al-Lubñānī) min ahl Ḩisfāḥān (without laqab), who 'went to Baghdad in the company of Ṣadr al-dīn 'Abd al-Laṭif al-Khūjandī and died in the year 584' i.e. 1188-9, presumably Rafī, the elder, though in this case either the date of his death given by al-Ṣafādī, or that implied by Zakarīyā', must be some three years off. The situation is, however, complicated by the fact that 'Abd al-Karīm al-Raflī I al-Qaswīnī (a contemporary of Rafī, the elder) has an entry on one 'Abd al-'Aẓīz b. Muḥammad *al-Lubnānī (text: al-Lubnānī) al-Ḥisfāḥānī (again without laqab), an Arabic scholar and author of commentaries, whom al-Raflī I 'met in Ḩisfāḥān' and who 'accompanies the Khujandī ẓādars to Qazwīn in the year 581', i.e. 1185-6, and who would also seem a likely candidate for identification with the elder Rafī. It is possible that 'Muḥammad' is an error for 'Masʿūd', though it is perhaps not entirely unthinkable that 'Abd al-'Aẓīz b. Muḥammad and 'Abd al-'Aẓīz b. Masʿūd are two different, but contemporaneous, persons from the same village. In the latter case the question of which of the two is to be identified with Rafī the elder would have to remain open.

Amlī Rāzī has two successive entries in his chapter on Ḩisfāḥān, the first (no. 871) on Rafī al-dīn Masʿūd Lūbānī (edition: Lūbānī), but one of Ethan's manuscripts apparently has 'b. Masʿūd' – , who was supposedly a contemporary of Kamāl al-dīn Ḩisfāḥānī, the second (no. 872) on Rafī al-dīn 'Abd al-'Aẓīz Lubānī (again mispointed in the edition). It remains to be examined whether the verses cited by Rāzī in either of the two entries are actually in the extant dīwān. (None of them are in 'Auffī). Rāzī's account is consistent with Ibn al-Fuwaṭī and al-Ṣafādī in so far as he appears to have a Masʿūd and an 'Abd al-'Aẓīz in two successive generations, but if 'Abd al-'Aẓīz died ca. 587/1191 (or slightly earlier), then his father could hardly have been a contemporary of Kamāl Ḩisfāḥānī.

Taqī says that Rafī al-dīn 'Abd al-'Aẓīz Lūbānī died in 603/1206-7, but this is too late for Rafī the elder and too early for Rafī the younger. Later authors perpetuate the confusion.


270. Rafī Marwānī appears to be mentioned only in 'Auffī's chapter on the poets of the

1I.e. 'Abd al-Laṭīf II (see above, p. 404).
2Kitāb al-tadwīn fi dhikr ahl al-ḥilā l bi Qazwīn, London Add. 21,468 (=Arab. Cat. 959), fol 454a (Inspex). The passage is quoted (explicitly from al-Raflī I) and with the same name, also in 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Suyūṭī, Buḥyāt al-wāṣīf fi ṭabaqāt al-lughawīyān wa l-nūḥāb, ed. Muḥammad al-Fadl Ibrāhīm, n.p. (apparently Cairo) 1384/1964-5, no. 1551.
Seljuqs of Khurāsān, where we find four rubā‘īyāt and two ghazals.

‘Auffī II p. 161-2; Ṣafā, Tārīkh II p. 638-9; Khalyām-pūr p. 236.

271. Raffī al-dīn al-Marzbānī al-Fārisī is cited by ‘Auffī in his chapter on the poets of Western Persia after the time of Sanjar (i.e., after 552/1157), where we find two qaṣīdahs addressed to a king who, in the first poem, is called Sulṭān Malik-Arsālān, in the second Shāh-i jahān Arslān, evidently the Seljuq Mu‘izz al-dīn Arslān b. Toghrīl (556/1161 to 571/1176). Rāzī includes in his chapter on the distinguished citizens of Shīrāz and states that some authorities make him a contemporary of the ancient poets Ḫaṃšah Bāḏghānī and Abū Sa‘īd Gurgānī, while others say that he was one of the poets of the Seljuqs. Rāzī wisely expresses preference for the latter opinion and proceeds to quote five poems, none of them in ‘Auffī. Further verses are added by Hidāyat.

‘Auffī II p. 398-400; Sharwānī, Nuzh‘at al-majālis (see above, p. 242); Rāzī I p. 194-6 (no.

1Marzbān is the name by which the poet refers to himself (see ‘Auffī II p. 399, l. 18). ‘Auffī says further (II p. 400) that there were two leading poets by the name of Raffī, namely in an earlier age Raffī Marzbān, who was also known by the epithet ‘Fārisī dabār, and then (in ‘Auffī’s own time) Raffī Lumbānī. Zakariyā al-Qazwīnī (Āthār al-bišā, ed. Wüstenfeld, Göttingen 1848, p. 197) lists ‘Raffī Fārisī dabār among the eminent poets of Isfahān, but since no other source seems to link this Raffī with Isfahān we must assume that Zakariyā has confused him with Raffī Lumbānī (the younger).

2The early dating rests presumably on a confusion between him and Marzbān b. Rustām b. Sharrūn, the author of the oldest (lost) version of the Marzbān-nāmah and who, according to Ibn Iṣfandiyār, (Tārīkh i Tabaristanī, ed. A. Iqbal, Tehran 1320/1941, I, p. 137; Browne’s epitome p. 86) also wrote a diwān in the dialect of Tabaristan.

189); Hidāyat, Majma‘ I p. 502-3; Khalyām-pūr p. 235-6 (‘Raffī i Shīrāzī’); LN s.v. ‘Raffī i Shīrāzī’ p. 565.

272. Ustād Abū Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Rashīdī al-Samargandī flourished in the last quarter of the 5th/11th century. Our earliest source, ‘Arūdī, says that the young Rashīdī was one of the many poets at the court of the Qarakhanid Khādīr b. ʿIrābān (who ruled for a year or so from 472/1080) and as such subordinated to the amīr al-shu‘arā‘ Am‘aq, and that he enjoyed special favour with the sultan’s queen ʿSatī Zainab (it is evidently to her that his Zainab-nāmah, mentioned by ‘Auffī, was dedicated). ‘Arūdī reports further on the rivalry between ‘Am‘aq and the saiyyid al-shu‘arā‘ Rashīdī and quotes three verses with which the latter lampooned the former. ‘Auffī, who includes Rashīdī in his section on the poets in Transoxania during the Seljuq period, quotes from a qaṣīdah which he dedicated to Abū l-Fatḥ Malik-Shāh (485/1092 to 485/1092) - name and kunyah are both mentioned in the verses - whom our poet could well have served either before or after Khādīr. The same authority also quotes a poem dedicated to one of the later Qarakhanids, Qadir-khān Abū l-Ma‘ālī Jibra‘īl b. Ahmad (492/1099 to 495/1102). Rashīdī exchanged poems with Mas‘ūd i Sa‘īd i Salmān. ‘Auffī (followed by Rāzī and others) quotes a gift ‘āvah of four verses addressed to Mas‘ūd and a long poem which he claims to be Mas‘ūd’s response, but the latter is in fact evidently Rashīdī’s answer to a qaṣīdah addressed to him by Mas‘ūd (and included in the diwān of the latter), written during Mas‘ūd’s imprisonment by order of the Ghaznavid Ibrāhīmī.

1The name is quoted thus, without ism, by ‘Auffī. Qazwīnī (in his notes to ‘Arūdī p. 152) gives his ism as ‘Abd Allāh or ‘Abd-al-Sa‘īd, but indicates no source for these.

2See Qazwīnī in JRAI 1906 p. 34-7.
Shams quotes an elaborate poem by Rashidī Samarqandī to illustrate the device known as taushīh. Daulat-shāh claims that he was a pupil of Qatrān, the teacher of Rūbānī Samarqandī, and of Zahr āl-dīn Fārūqī, adding in the last quoted passage that he wrote a narrative poem called Mihr u Wafā. One verse by (our?) Rashidī is quoted in LF, ed. Iqbalī, p. 404 from the marginal additions in Ms. nūn. The possibility that our poet might also be the Isma‘īl Rashidī quoted in LF/Iqbalī p. 357 was rejected supra p. 170, where '12th century' is a mistake for 'late 11th century'.

'Aufī' II p. 176-81; Shams p. 362-4; Daulat-shāh p. 67, 109, 110; Rāzī III p. 345-52 (no. 1425); has two poems not in 'Aufī': 'Hidayat, Majma' I p. 87-8 ('Arshādī'); Khaiyām-pūr p. 230; Šafā, Tāriḵh II p. 547-51; LN a.v. 'Rashidī' p. 473.

273. Abū Bakr b. Muhammad b. 'Alī al-Ībānī, called also 'Uṯārid al-thānī, is represented by a sizeable selection of poems in 'Aufī's anthology, one of them eulogising, as our source tells us, the Ghaznavid Bahram-shāh (511/1117 to 552/1157). 'Aufī does not inform us of his nisba, but Daulat-shāh has a brief entry on one Ḥakīm Rūbānī Samarqandī, presumably our poet, who he says was a pupil of Rashidī and whom he represents by two verses not quoted by 'Aufī. Jāmārī quotes two substantial poems, one of them a Saugand-nāmah pledging allegiance to Bahram-shāh. Rāzī quotes a few verses from the same poem and says also that after serving Bahram-shāh our poet attached himself to the court of the Khwarazm-shāh Atsīs (521/1127 to 551/1165). He is clearly not identical with the Amīr Rūbānī several of whose verses are cited by Fīrishtah in his account of the events of the year 624/1227.1

LF ed. Iqbalī p. 156-7 (one verse in Ms. nūn in marg.); 'Aufī II p. 282-6; Daqqaq al-ash'ar (Oxford Elliot 37 = Ethé 1333, fol. 41b); Jāmārī I p. 144vii to 144viii, 21v-3; Daulat-shāh p. 109; Rāzī III p. 371-3 (no. 1433); 'Hidayat, Majma' I p. 240; id., Riyād p. 195; G. M. Khan in Islamic culture XXIII, 1949, p. 228, 232-4 (partial edition and translation of the Saugand-nāmah); Khaiyām-pūr p. 240; Šafā, Tāriḵh II p. 610-4.

274. Rūbī Valwālījī is the author of a handful of satirical verses, but also of two long odes, quoted by 'Aufī in his chapter on the poets of the Seljuqs of Khurasān. In one of the latter he engages in some ritualised boasting, comparing himself with Mas'ud i Sa'd i Slimān, and calling himself the third in series after Farrukhī and Qatrān; it is from the latter verse that Daulat-shāh evidently extrapolated the 'information' that he was a pupil of Qatrān. In fact the same poem mentions also 'Farīd i Ghilānī', who was one of the religious scholars who debated with Fakhr al-dīn al-Rāzī towards the end of the 6th/12th century; it is thus in this period that we must place our poet.

He is perhaps identical with Rūbī Shāristānī, the author of a poem, quoted by 'Hidayat from the tadkhīrah of Aḥbādī, praising 'Abū l-Muẓaffar Tamghāj-khan', evidently the Qarakhanid Abū l-Muẓaffar Qilich Tamghāh-Khan Mas'ud (556/1161 to 574/1178), Zahirī's patron.

'Aufī II p. 165-74; Daulat-shāh p. 67; MF p. 932 (verse by 'Hakīm Rūbī'); 'Hidayat, Majma' I

p. 240-1; Şafii, Tārīkh II p. 639-43; Khāiyām-pūr p. 241 (two entries).

275. Abū 1-Faraj b. Mas‘ūd al-Rūnī was a panegyrist of the Ghaznavids and of their governors in Lahore. His nisbah Rūnī (if it be indeed a nisbah) has not been explained satisfactorily. 'Auff says explicitly that Abū 1-Faraj was born in Lahore, and the 10th/16th-century Indian historian Badrānī (as he calls him) that ‘rwyn is the name of a village in the dependencies of Lahore, but today it is apparently (sic! gōyā) ruined and no trace of it remains'. In the absence of independent confirmation one must suspect that the ‘village' in question was invented to explain the name of the famous poet. By contrast, Mustauff says that our poet hailed from Rūnah in Khurāsān, and there is in fact still a village by this name in the environs of Nāsimbūr. There is (or was) also a Rūn in Sīstān (mentioned repeatedly in the Tārīkh i Sīstān). Whether either of these really has anything to do with the poet is another question.

Rūnī’s diwān consists largely of odes to the Ghaznavids Abū 1-Muṣṭafār Ibrāhīm (461/1070 to 492/1099, or shortly afterwards) and his son and successor Abū Sa‘d Mas‘ūd III (died in 508/1116), whom he praised as governor (malik) of Lahore during his father’s lifetime and then later as sultan, and to various personalities at their courts. Mas‘ūd i Sa‘d refers to him as his master. The dates given for his death by the tadhkira (489/1096 in Taqī Kāshī and even earlier in some of the others) are, as usual, worthless. Rūnī certainly survived into the reign of Mas‘ūd and was apparently alive at least until the end of 495/1102, judging from the poem dedicated to

Mas‘ūd (his name occurs in the third verse) beginning shāh rā rōy i bahkt gūl-gūn bād * jashn i ābān bar ā humayūn bād and ending jashn u alāyān i ‘Id u ‘asm i safar * bar shahāyīr ma‘īsūn bād; the festival of Ābānāḡān coincided with ‘Id al-‘adhūr in 495/1102, when both fell on 25 September.

Mss.: Dublin Beatty 103/IV (Ms. completed Dhū l-bi‘jah 699/1300); Oxford Whinfield 8 (Beeston 2827/21, 16th century); Whinfield 54 (Beeston 2662/10. Dated 9 Rajab 1012/1603. Selections); Marsh. 55 (Éth 523. End missing); London Or. 3713/I (Rieu Suppt. 211. Copied by Muḥammad Shāh b. ‘All b. Muḥammad Iṣfahānī and dated 6 Rabī‘ II 692/1293); Add. 27,318 (Rieu p. 547-8. 16th century?); Add 7793/II (fol. 165-244. Rieu p. 549. Dated Ramādān 1021/1612); I.O. 905 (Dated 24 Shawwāl 1069/1659. End missing); Or. 11958 (Meredith-Owens p. 64. Dated 1154/1741-2); Or. 1777/II (Rieu p. 999-1000. 19th century? Selections); I.O. 328 fol. 378-432; Paris Supplément 797 fol. 15v sqq. (Bloomfield 1990. 16th century?); Supplément 759 (Bloomfield 1208. 17th century?); Supplément 760 fol. 73v sqq. (Bloomfield 1556. 17th century?); Hamburg Orient. 228 (Brockelmann 157); İstanbul Hekimoğlu Ali Paşa 669/12 (‘Mikrufilm-hā I p. 420-1. Apparently old); Tashkent Acad. 2141 (Semenov 765. Dated 1106/1694/5. Pictures); Hamadan 1’timād al-daulah (Nukhkhān-hā V p. 234. Ms. apparently dated 6 Shawwāl 1017/1609); Tehran Majlis 484/1 (Munz. 21376. Dated Rabī‘ II 998/1588); Miftah 623 (Nukhkhān-hā VII p. 154. 16th century?); Lahore 4 Ms. in Munz. Pak. VII p. 21-2); Peshawar Islāmi-yah 1823/2 (Dated 1134 /1721-2); Calcutta Ivanov 431 (Dated 1078/1667-8); Ivanov 432 (17th century? These two Ms. are also described in Sprenger 66); Ivanov Curzon 189 (17th century? Incomplete); Būhār 280 (19th century?). Cf. Munz. III 21375-417 (many late Ms.).

Editions: Bombay 1319-20/1902 (in the margin of Diwān i ‘Unūrī); Tehran 1305sh/1926 (Ed. K.I.

1Muntakhab al-tawārīkh h, Calcutta 1866, p. 37.
Chaykin, based on 6 MSS. in private collections; Mashhad n.d. (Preface dated 1347/1968-9. Ed. M. Mahdavī-Dāmghānī; based mainly on the Dublin Ms.). 'Arūdī p. 28 (and Qazwīnī ad loc.). Watwāt passim; 'Aūfī II p. 241-5; Shams passim (see the index s.v. 'Bulfaraj'); Mustaufī p. 718; Daqā'īq al-ash'ār (Oxford Elliot 37 fol. 128b, 136b, 143a, 146a, 152a = Ethé 1333); Jājarmī I p. 256-7; Rāżī I p. 339-44 (no. 358); Taqī (see London Or. 3506 fol. 135b sqq. = Rieu Suppt. 105); Hidāyat, Majma' I p. 70-8; LN s.v. 'Abū l-Faraj' p. 715; Šafā, Tūrīk II p. 470-6; Khaiyām-pūr p. 21; C.E. Bosworth, The later Ghaznavids, Edinburgh 1977, passim; Eīr Suppt. s.v. 'Abū 'l-Faraj' (J.T.P. de Bruijn); Eīr s.v. 'Abū'l-Faraj Rūnī' (M. Siddiqī).

[275a. Daulat-shāh knows nothing of Abū l-Faraj Ṣījzī, but he does have an entry on one Abū l-Faraj Ṣījzī, the contents of which are repeated by the later tadkhīrah, and quotes three verses by him. This Abū l-Faraj was supposedly a panegyrist of Abū `Alī Sīmūr (recte Sīmūr). When the latter was defeated by Māhūd of Ghaznah (in 384/994) the victor resolved to have his revenge on Abū l-Faraj, who had previously penned a satire against him, but the poet's life was saved by his former pupil, Mahmūd's poet-laureate 'Unṣūrī. This supposedly early poet is not mentioned by any source before Daulat-shāh and I should think that he is entirely fictitious; more precisely that he is a mythical doppelgänger of Abū l-Faraj Rūnī (who might have been supposed to hail from Rūn in Sīstān, see above) transported back into the early Ghaznavid period.

Daulat-shāh claims to have seen a number of his poems in collections, but Rāżī says that he knows only the three verses cited by Daulat-shāh, while Ādhar says explicitly that everything else that has been ascribed to Abū l-Faraj Siṣjūzī is in fact by Abū l-Faraj Rūnī. A collection of poems by Abū l-Faraj Siṣjūzī is reported in Paris Supplément 783 fol. 51r sqq. (Blochet 1981, 16th century?) but it would be very surprising if these did not reveal themselves to be by Rūnī.

Daulat-shāh p. 39-40; Rāżī I p. 293 (no. 303; name mis-spelt in the edition); Ādhar I p. 420-2; Hidāyat, Majma' I p. 70; Browne, History II p. 153; LN s.v. 'Abū l-Faraj' p. 716; Khaiyām-pūr p. 21; Eīr s.v. 'Abū'l-Faraj Sejzī' (M. Dabīršāqi).

276. Šīhāb al-dīn Šābir b. Ismā'īl al-Tirmidī, generally known as Adīb Šābir, divided his time between the court of the Seljuq Sanjar (511/1118 to 552/1157) and that of the Khwārazm-shāh Atsiz (521/1127 to 568/1172). His diwān consists almost entirely of panegyric poems dedicated to one or the other of these kings or else to various persons in their retinue, the largest number being in praise of Sanjar's ra'īs i Khurāsān Majd al-dīn 'Ali b. Ja'far al-Mūsawī, in whom we must see Šābir's principal patron. In the end he was caught up in the rivalry between his two royal masters. According to Juwainī, Sanjar sent Adīb Šābir with a message to Atsiz. While at the court in Khwārazm our poet discovered that Atsiz had sent two men (Juwainī says that they were malāhīdah, i.e. Ismā'īlīs) to murder the sultan. Šābir sent a message to Sanjar warning him of the plot and Atsiz, having somehow found out about the poet's message, had the latter drowned in the Oxus. The implication of the story is thus that Šābir, while posing as a panegyrist of the Khwārazm-shāh, was in fact a spy in the service of a rival power. Although Juwainī does not give the

1Thus 'Aūfī. The Iṣāb Shīhāb al-dīn and the names Šābir b. Ismā'īl are mentioned in poems addressed to him by Watwāt. In his own poems he calls himself Šābir and Adīb and confirms that he was a native of Tirmidh.
precise date of this event, he implies that it was at some time between 538/1143-4 and 542/1147-8. Daulat-shah, who repeats the same story, gives the date of Sabir's death as 546/1151-2, but this seems too late.

Mss. of his dīwān: Oxford Whinfield 54 (Beeston 2662/13. Dated 9 Rajab 1012/1603. Selections); London I.0. 911 (Copied by 'Abd al-Mu'min al-'Alawi al-Kašāi and dated Muḥarram 714/1314. Pictures); Or. 327 (Rieu p. 552. 16th century?); Or. 2846/II (Rieu Suppt. 239. Dated Rabī‘ I 1019/1610. Imperfect at beginning); Paris Supplément 1386/I (Blochet 1214. Dated 12 Safar 1039/1629 by Muhammad Ḥakīm b. Kamāl al-dīn al-Kirmani); Berlin Petermann 716/3 (Pertsch 682. Selections); Tehran Univ. VIII 1408/I (Dated Shawwāl 1015/1607); Guliştān/Atābāy I 5 (Dated 5 Shawwāl 1246/1831); Guliştān/Atābāy I 6; Mashhad Ridāvī VII 965/4 (Ms. dated 1041/1631-2); Lahore (2 Mss., one dated 24 Dhū l-bi‘ajja 1047/1638, are mentioned by Munz. Pak. VII p. 39); Peshawar (Munz. Pak. VII p. 39); Bombay Rehtakar p. 140 no. 48; Lucknow Sprenger 73; Hyderabad Asafiyah p. 288 no. 926 (Time of Shah-I-Jahan, i.e. 17th century). Cf. Munz. Ill 24088-126.

Editions: Tehran 1331sh./1952 (Ed. 'Alī Qawīm); 1343sh./1964 (ed. M.‘A. Nāṣib).


1For this, and the Mashhad Ms., see above, p. 423 fn.

277. Sa‘d al-dīn Sharaf al-ḥukamā Kāfī al-Bukhārī is quoted by ‘Aufī as the author of a gnomic qasīdah, in which the poet calls himself Sa‘d Kāfī, and of a poem addressed to ‘Aufī’s maternal uncle, Majd al-dīn Muḥammad b. ‘Aḏnān Sukhakatī, who was chief physician at the time of the Qarakhanid İbrāhīm (IV) b. Ḫusain (574/1178 to 600/1203-4).

‘Aufī II p. 378-82, 386-7; Sharwānī, Nuz‘hat al-majālis (see above, p. 242); Rāzī III p. 420-i (no. 1477); Hidāyat, Majma‘ I p. 481; Khaiyām-pūr p. 481 (‘Kāfī i Bukhārā’).

278. Sādīd al-dīn Sharaf al-nudamā ‘Alī b. ‘Umar al-Ghaznavī, whom ‘Aufī also calls Mu‘izzī i Ghaznavī (but was this name actually used by the poet, or rather merely bestowed on him by the anthologist?), is quoted by ‘Aufī in his chapter on the poets of Ghaznawī and Lahore after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157), where we find three panegyrical poems, the first and third of which mention as his patron the Ghaznavid Širāz al-da‘ūlah Khusrau-Malik of Lahore (555/1160 to 582/1186). Rāzī quotes four verses from the first of these, but says that their author was a panegyrist of Khusrau-shāh b. Bahram-shāh (ca. 552/1157 to 555/1160). It is certainly possible that Sādīd al-dīn served both sultans in succession, in which case his sobriquet Mu‘izzī Ghaznavī could refer to Khusrau-shāh’s title Mu‘izz al-da‘ūlah. But it could also be that Rāzī has misquoted the name of the patron.

‘Aufī II p. 405-7; Rāzī I p. 332 (no. 342; the laqab is misprinted); Khaiyām-pūr p. 263; C.E. Bosworth, The later Ghaznawīs, Edinburgh 1977, p. 128.
A certain Sa'īd al-dīn is included by 'Auffī, who says that he met this poet in Nasā, presumably during his stay in that town in 600/1203-4, in his chapter on the poets of Western Persia after the time of Sanjar. The verses quoted by 'Auffī include an elegy on the death of one Fakhru al-dīn Zangi b. Munawwar.

'Auffī II p. 404-5; Hīdāyat, Rīyūd p. 218-9; Khaiyām-pūr p. 339 ('Sa'īd i Isfahānī').

Sa'īd al-Tā'ī is the author of a poem lamenting the impenetrability of the world, quoted by 'Auffī in his chapter on the poets of Western Persia during the Seljuk period.

'Auffī II p. 238-9; Hīdāyat, Majma' I p. 248 (follows 'Auffī); Sa'īd, Tārīkh II p. 694-5; Khaiyām-pūr p. 270.

281. al-Ḫakīm 'Ali b. Ahmad al-Sa'īfī al-Naisābūrī is included in 'Auffī's chapter on the poets of the Seljuqs of Khurāsān, where he is credited with four ghazals and two rubā'īs. 'Auffī's contemporary Shams i Qais quotes (the same?) Sa'īfī Naisābūrī as the author of a contrived poem in which every misrā' contains the words sang and sim. The latter is cited also by Jājarmī, who adds a second poem of the same type. Daulat-shāh, who also has a few verses from the poem cited by Shams, adds that Sa'īfī was a eulogist of the Khwārazm-shāh 'Alā' al-dīn Tekish (586/1172 to 596/1200). There is also a 'Sa'īfī' to whom Rāzī, in his chapter on Naisābūr, ascribes one rubā'ī. Whether our poet is really identical with the Sa'īfī mentioned in PL III p. 240 is unclear.

'Auffī II p. 159-61; Shams p. 355-6; Jājarmī I p. 144+xv to 144+xvii; Daulat-shāh p. 108; Rāzī II p. 287 (no. 757); 'Ādar II p. 692-3; Hīdāyat, Maj-

1See above, p. 411 (Majd al-dīn).

282. al-Ḫakīm Shihāb al-dīn Muḥammad b. 'Alī al-Sā'īgh is included by 'Auffī, who admits to knowledge of only one religious qasīdah, in his chapter on the poets of Ghaznaw and Lahore after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157).

'Auffī II p. 414-5; LN s.v. 'Sā'īgh' p. 3; Khaiyām-pūr p. 329.

283. Maḥmūd b. 'Alī al-Sanāʿī al-Marwāsī is included in 'Auffī's chapter on the poets of the Seljuqs of Khurāsān. Rāzī repeats a few of the verses cited by 'Auffī, adding to them the information (or perhaps rather only his deduction) that our poet attended the court of Sanjar. Hīdāyat, who likewise offers no verses apart from those quoted by 'Auffī, says that he traded satires with Sūzānī.

'Auffī II p. 145-7; Rāzī II p. 13-14 (no. 518; name mis-spelt in the edition); Hīdāyat, Majma' I p. 248; Sa'īd, Tārīkh II p. 685-8; Khaiyām-pūr p. 276.

284. Abū ʿl-Majdī Majdūd b. ʿAdām Ghaznawī, called Sanāʿī was the foremost religious poet of the first half of the 12th century. His life and work have recently been the subject of an exhaustive study by de Bruijn and the following is for the most part a synopsis of some of his conclusions. Sanāʿī was born probably around 480/1087 (certainly not as early as 427/1045-6, as is claimed in several of the tadkhirahs) in Ghaznaw. The earliest period in his career is represented by a number of poems addressed to various middle-

1The kunyah is given thus by 'Auffī and on the title page of some of the old Mas. The other components of the name are all attestable in the poems themselves.
ranking bureaucratic, military and religious figures of the time of Mas‘ūd III (ca. 492/1099 to 508/1115). Although the sultan’s name is mentioned in these poems, none of them are actually addressed to him and it is thus likely that the young poet did not succeed in having himself presented to the king. He also courted the leading poets at Ghaznah, Mas‘ūd I Sa‘d (whose diwan he collected) and Mukhtarī. Before the end of Mahmūd’s reign he left his native town for Balkh, where he composed his first major work, the Kārnāmah I Balkhī, in which he gives, from a distance, a spirited portrait of life in Ghaznah; the approximate date of the poem is clear from the fact that he still speaks of Mahmūd as the reigning sultan. In Balkh he entered the service of a certain Ibrāhīm An‘ād, but he fell out with the latter and saw himself forced to flee to Sarakhs, where he enjoyed the patronage of a leading Ḥanāfī cleric, Muhammad b. Mansūr, to whom he dedicated a number of poems, including his mathnawī Sair al-‘ibād. He also appears to have spent some time in Herat. He returned to Ghaznah during the reign of Bahram-shāh (511/1117 to 552/1157), who is the dedicatee of his principal work, Ḥadiqat al-baqī‘IQah, and of a number of panegyric poems. From the preface to the Ḥadiqah by Sanā‘I’s disciple Muḥammad al-Raffā, it is evident that the poet died before that sultan, since Raffā‘ tells us that his own posthumous edition of the poem was made at the explicit command of Bahram-shāh. According to a supposed eye-witness account of Sanā‘I’s death that has been appended in many manuscripts to Raffā‘s preface (though it is clearly not by Raffā‘ himself) the poet died on Sunday 11 Sha‘bān 525. This date corresponds, according to the tables, to 9 July 1131, which was a Thursday; but it is by no means impossible that the new moon did not become visible in Ghaznah until three days later than the (approximate) date implied by the tables and that Sanā‘I consequently died on Sunday 12 July. The discrepancy between the day of the week given in the source and that suggested by the tables is in any event no reason to reject the source. The date 525/1131 appears to be consistent with the dates given in the rhymed epilogue to the Ḥadiqah, which suggest that Sanā‘I completed one version of the poem at the beginning of 525 and that Raffā‘ finished his (posthumous) edition of it in 534/1139-40. For the (wildly differing) dates given by the taḥdīrakh seen de Bruijn p. 23-5.

Sanā‘I’s diwan contains both profane (mainly panegyric) and religious poems. For the textual history, which is extraordinarily complicated, see de Bruijn pp. 91-112. Some copies (in part with the title Kullīyāt) include one or more of the poet’s mathnawīs, which we, however, will list separately.

Mas.-1 Oxford Ms. Pers. d. 51 (Beeston 2549. Dated 29 Rabī‘I 1007/1598); Elliot 108 (Etché 537); London I.O. 927 (ash‘ār i Sanā‘I, including also mathnawīs);2 Add. 27,311 (Rieu p. 551. 16th century?); Add. 16,779 II (Rieu p. 825. 16th century?); Or. 4514/III (Rieu Suppt. 215. Completed 14 Rabī‘I 1023/1614); I.O. 928 (=Robinson 146-51. Ms. dated 12 Jumādā II 1038/1629. Small selection, with 1 extraneous picture); Or. 3302 (Rieu Suppt. 214. ‘Before A.H. 1280/1863-4); Paris Supplément 705 (Blochet 1221. 16th century? Selections only); Istanbul Velideddin 2627/6-7 (Ritter, Der Islam XXII, 1934, p. 102-3); de Bruijn p. 102-3. Dated 10 Rabī‘I 1168/1265); Halet Efendi 135/3 (Mihrūfū’lm-hā I p. 498. Ms. dated 717/1317-8.

1See also de Bruijn p. 95-8 and Munz. III 23584-614.

2For this and other Mas. see Nazir Ahmad, ‘Some original prose and poetical pieces of Hakīs Sanā‘I’, Indo-Iranica XVI/2, 1963, p. 48-65, who says (p. 50) that the I.O. Ms. contains a colophon dated 17 Safar 1006/1597.
Selection); Aysafyia 2051/4 (Hikrufilm-ha) I p. 409-10. Ms. apparently dated Shawal 730/1330, 'qasr id'); Nafiz Paqa 894 (Ritter, Der Islam XXII, 1934, p. 103. Dated 13 Dhul 1-hijjah 1013
/1605); Nuruosmaniye 3809 (Ateg 31. 17th century?); Tehran Milli 2353 (see de Bruijn p. 100-1. Supposedly 12th century?); Bayani (Nushkah-ha I p. 16. Dated 995/1587); Univ. II 13/1 (Ms. dated 1 JumadI I 1003/1595); Gulistan/Kastbây I 275; Mashhad Malik 5468 (see de Bruijn p. 98. 12th-13th century?); Ridawi VII 440 (Dated Rabii' I 1022
/1613); Tashkent Acad. I 786-787 (17th century?); Kabul Museum 318 (Cat. p. 157; de Bruijn p. 98-100. Supposedly 12th century); Bankipore I 22 (16th-century?); Calcutta Ivanov 438/2 (16th-
17th century?).


Mathnawis (1) Kâr-nâmah i Balkh-i, also called Mutâyyabah-nâmah (inc: waib-ak ai naqsh-band i bê khâmah * qâsid i râyûn i bê-nâmah). See above, p. 518.

Mss.: Oxford Ms. Pers. d. 51 fol. 482b sqq. (Beeston 2549. Dated 29 Rabii' I 1007/1598); Elliot 108 (Ethâ 537); London I.O. 916/2 (Ms. dated JumadI II 637/1240. Defective); I.O. 914/5; I.O. 927 fol. 380a sqq.; Istanbul Bagdati Vehbi 1672/3 (Ritter, Der Islam XXII, 1934, p. 102; de Bruijn p. 123-4. Ms. copied by Abû Sa'id Maudûd al-Işfahânî and dated 7 Shawwl 552
/1157); Velieddin 2627/4 (Ritter, Der Islam XXII, 1934, p. 102-3; de Bruijn p. 102-3, 126. Ms. dated 14 JumãdI I 684/1285); Fatih 3734/5 (Ritter-Rei- nert p. 115. Ms. copied by Gulshanî Harawi and dated 884/1479-80); Tehran Univ. II 13/2 (Ms. dated 1 JumãdI I 1003/1595); Dushanbe Acad. II 350 (17th-18th century?). Cf. Munz. IV 32964-73.

Editions: N.T. Mudarris i Ridawi i FIZ IV/3, 1334sh./1955, p. 297-354, and again in his Mathna-
wî-ha i Nâkhîn Sanâ'î, Tehran 1348sh./1969, p. 141-
78.

(2) Sair al-ibad ilâ I-ma'âd, or Kunûs al-
rumûs, (inc: marhaban ai barûd i sultân-wash * takht-at az ãb u tâj-at az ãtash) is accompanied in some copies (beginning with the Istanbul Ms. dated 674/1275) by a commentary in prose which some modern scholars have ascribed (most probably wrongly) to Fakhr al-dîn Râzî. Cf. de Bruijn p. 118.

Ms.: Oxford Ms. Pers. d. 51 fol. 466b sqq. (Beeston 2549. Dated 29 Rabii' I 1007/1598); Elliot 108 (Ethâ 537); London I.O. 916/2 (Ms. dated JumâdI II 637/1240); Or. 3302 fol. 186b-221a (Rieu Suppt. 214. 'Before A.H. 1280' /1633-4); Or. 4514/II (Rieu Suppt. 215. Completed 14 Rabii' II 1023/1614); I.O. 914/4; I.O. 917/1 (Copied by Qiwâm b. Muhammed Shîrâzî); I.O. 927 fol. 365a sqq.; Leningrad Acad. C 1102 fol. 260b-286b (Index 2275. Dated 708/1307-8); Istanbul Bagdati Vehbi 1672/2 (Ritter, Der Islam XXII, 1934, p. 102; de Bruijn p. 123-4. Ms. copied by Abû Sa'id Maudûd al-Işfahânî and dated 7 Shawwl 552
/1157); Nafiz Paqa 410 (Ritter, Der Islam XXII, 1934, p. 105. Dated Safar 674/1275. With the comment-
ary); Velieddin 2627/3 (Ritter, Der Islam XXII, 1934, p. 102-3; de Bruijn p. 102-3, 126. Ms. dated 14 JumãdI I 684/1285); Aysafyia 2051/3 (Hikrufilm-ha) I p. 409-10. Dated 25 Shawwl 730
/1330); Universits FY 538/12 (Ateg 47. Dated 826
with the name Fakhrī-nāmah. Afterwards, he began work on a book with the title Hadīqat al-baqīqah (etc.). Some envious people tried to disperse (mutafarrīg kardan) his book (i.e. presumably the fair copy that he had sent to the king) by taking away parts of it. Unable to recover these lost parts the poet re-edited what he had composed (ān-chih guftah būd; presumably meaning his own rough draft) and sent it to Khwājā Imām Burbān al-dīn in Baghdad. Then he compiled another copy from the material remaining in his possession (ān-chih ba dast i 5 bimānd). After the poet’s death the author of the preface prepared a copy at the command of Bahrām-shāh. It seems as though the surviving manuscripts of the poem go back to, and in part combine, the various recensions mentioned in this preface. Two of the oldest manuscripts (Istanbul Bağdatlı Vehbi 1672 - copied in 552/1157, two decades after the death of the author - and Velieddin 2627 of 684/1285) actually give the poem the title Fakhrī-nāmah and de Bruijn has shown that at least the older of these seems to contain Sānā’ī’s first, considerably shorter, version (or perhaps rather the truncated edition of the same prepared by the ‘envious people’?). Most other manuscripts contain a versified epilogue, apparently written by Sānā’ī for the copy that he sent to Baghdad and subsequently reproduced in the definitive edition by Raffā’. In some copies this contains the information that the epilogue in question was written between 524 and 525 (i.e. 1130-1). In others we find instead the dates 525 and 534 (the latter, corresponding to 1139-40, being perhaps the date of the completion of Raffā’s recension) and others again contain what is apparently a contamination of the two versions.

Mas.:1 Dublin T.C.D. 1559 (Dated 930/1523-4); Beatty 380 (17th century?); Manchester Lindesiana

1See above p. 000 (dīwān).

1Cf. de Bruijn p. 119-39; Munz. IV 29095-225.
843 (Copied by Ahmad b. al-Habīb Abī Ishaq in Shawwāl 681/1283. See also de Bruijn p. 126; Lindesiana 13 (16th century?); Lindesiana 12 (=Robinson p. 226-7. Dated Rajab 1016/1607. Pictures); Lindesiana 106 (17th century?); Oxford Fraser 93 (Ethē 531. Dated 20 Shawwāl 1002/1594); Ms. Pers. d. 51 fol. 264b sqq. (Beeston 2549. Dated 29 Rabī‘ I 1007/1598); Ouseley Add. 37 (Ethē 534. Dated 12 Dhū 1-qa‘dah 1066/1646); Ouseley 315 (Ethē 533. Dated during the governorship of Sultān Muḥammad Murād-bakhsī, who died in 1071/1661, but Ethē thinks this colophon was added later); Whinfield 83 (Beeston 2550. End missing); Ind. Inst. Pers. 43 (Beeston 2561. 18th century?); Elliot 151 (Ethē 528); Elliot 152 (Ethē 529); Elliot 153 (Ethē 530); Elliot 154 (Ethē 532); Ouseley Add. 88 (Ethē 535); London I. O. 916/1 (Ms. dated Jumādā II 637/1240. Defective); Add. 25,329 (Rieu p. 550. Dated Safar 890/1485); Or. 358 (Rieu p. 550. 16th century?); Or. 4514/I (Rieu Suppl. 215. Completed 14 Rabī‘ II 1023/1614); I.O. 918 (Dated 1027/1618); Add. 16,778 (Rieu p. 551. Dated 1040/1630-1); Or. 6985 (Meredith-Owens p. 67. Dated 1048/1638-9); I.O. 915/1 (Ms. completed Mubarram 1061/1651); Add. 16,777 (Rieu p. 549-50. Dated 1076/1665-6); I.O. 919 (Dated 26 Shawwāl 1077/1667); Add. 26,150 (Rieu p. 551. 17th century?); I.O. 914/1; I.O. 917/2 (Copied by Qiwām b. Muḥammad Shīrāzī. Incomplete); I.O. 920; I.O. 921 (defective); I.O. 922 (defective); Cambridge Or. 1584 (2nd Suppl. 370. Dated 1004/1595-6); Add. 3209 (Browne Cat. CCCII. Dated 3 Safar 1012/1603 and copied from and collated with a Ms. dated Ramaḍān 617/1220); Add. 810 (Browne Cat. CCIV. Dated 26 Rabī‘ II 1032/1623); Or. 254 (Browne Suppl. 392. Dated 1067/1656-7); Or. 272 (Browne Suppl. 393. Dated 1094/1683); Browne Coll. V.6; Paris Supplément 1494 (Blochet 1215. Dated 7 Rabī‘ II 908/1502); Supplément 1839 (Blochet 1216. Dated 1/1221/1710); Supplément 703 (Blochet 1217. 18th century?); Strasbourg Landauer 20 (=Hoghughī 8. Dated 1 Jumādā II 1035/1621); Landauer 21 (=Hoghughī 9. Dated 29 Dhū 1-ḥiḥah 1099/1688); Turin 70/1 (Dated 1003/1595); 69 (Dated 1049/1640); Rome Vatican Pers. 88 (Rosai p. 106-7. Copied by Sāiyd Jamāl al-dqīn b. Muḥammad al-Ḥusaynī and dated 19 Shabān 1020/1611); Belot Cat. V p. 181 no. 2579 (Dated 887/1579. Pictures); Heidelberg Or. P. 430 (Berenbach II p. 88; de Bruijn p. 126. Copied by Ahmad b. Maḥṣūd b. Muḥammad and dated 687/1288); Göttin gen Divisah/Luft 57 (Dated 27 Ramaḍān 1024/1615); Munich 174 Quatr. (Ameur 19); Berlin Sprenger 1513/1 (Pertsch 684. Dated Rabī‘ II 894/1498); Sprenger 1512 (Pertsch 717. Dated 27 Mubarram 1067/1656); Vienna Flügel 509 (also Duda p. 65-6. Dated 1 Dhū 1-qa‘dah 1052/1643); Leningrad Acad. A 16 (Index 1037); Acad. A 885 (Index 1038); Acad. A 973 (Index 1039); Acad. C 54 (Index 1041); Dorn CCCL (Pictures); Istanbul Bağdatlı Vehbi 1672/1 (Ritter, Der Islam XXI, 1934, p. 102; de Bruijn p. 123-4. Ms. copied by Abū Saʿīd Muḥammad al- Ḳafāḥī and dated 7 Shawwāl 552/1157. Title given as Fakhhrī-nāmah); Vellelind 2627/1 (Ritter, Der Islam XX, 1934, p. 102-3; de Bruijn p. 102-3, 126. Dated 14 Jumādā I 684/1285. 'Fakhhrī-nāmah', with preface); Esat 1387 (Duda p. 63; Der Islam XX p. 103. Early 14th century? 'Fakhhrī-nāmah?'); Ayasofya 176/1 (Atac 32. Dated Safar 79/138; Ayasofya 176 (Ritter, Der Islam XXI, 1934, p. 103-4. Dated 828/1424-5); Fatih 3734/1-2 (Ritter-Reinert p. 115. Ms. copied by Uluslanı Harawī and dated 884/1479-80. 'Fakhhrī-nāmah' with Raffā‘īn preface); Università Fire 475/1 (Atac 33. Copied by Alī b. Ḥajdār and dated 25 Rajab 898/1490); Ayasofya 3865 (Ritter, Der Islam XXII, 1934, p. 104. 15th century?); Nuruo smaniye 2361 (Atac 34. 15th century?); Fatih 3732 (Ritter-Reinert p. 116. 16th century?).

^1Thus p. 107. On p. 106: '1029'.

LA T E ELE V EN T TO EARLY THIRTEENTH CENTURY
century?); Topkapi, Hazine 277 (Karayat 391. Dated Rabi' I 912/1506); Türk ve İslam Eserleri Muzesi 1977 (olim Fatih 3733. Ritter-Reinert p. 115-6. Copied by Mun'im al-din al-Aubadadi and dated Rabi' I II 915/1509); Şehit Ali 1165 (Ritter, Der Islam XXII, 1934, p. 104. Dated 986/1578); Nafiz Paşa 894 (Ritter, Der Islam XXII, 1934, p. 103. Dated 13 Dhul-1-bijjah 1013/1605); Nuruosmaniye 2363 (Ateş 35. Dated 10 Dhul-1-qa'adah 1018/1610); Nuruosmaniye 2364 (Ateş 36. Dated 1032/1622-3); Universite FY 37 (Ateş 37. Copied by Mubibb 1 'Ali b. Ibrāhīm al-Mashhadi and dated 15 Rabi'I II 1039/1629); Topkapi, Revan 1039 (Karayat 392. Dated 1039/1629-30); Nuruosmaniye 2362 (Ateş 38. Copied by 'Abd al-Rasih and dated 1046/1636-7); Universite FY 1245 (Ateş 39. Dated 12 Rabi'I II 1093/1682); Universite FY 177 (Ateş 40. Dated 2 Safar 1098/1686); Tehran Milli 2335 (see de Bruijn p. 100-1. Supposedly 12th century); Shūrā-i Islāmī I 309 (olām Bāyānī. Copied by 'Abd Allah b. Ahmad b. As'ad Tājī and dated 24 Ramadān 691/1292); Majlis VIII 2346 (cf. de Bruijn p. 126-7. Dated 758/1356-7); Gulistān/Ātābāy I 271 (Copied by Murshid al-din and dated 900/1494-5); Sipah-sālār II 1130 (Dated 920/1514); Gulistān/Ātābāy II 431/I (Ms. copied by Pīr ʿUṣain al-Shirāzī and dated Šabʿān 934/1528); Sipah-sālār II 1131 (Dated 1017/1608-9); Gulistān/Ātābāy II 451/II (Dated 1 Jumādā II 1018/1609); Gulistān/Ātābāy I 273 (Copied by Qutb al-din b. ʿUṣain and dated Rabi'I I 1025/1616); Majlis II 917 (Dated 1025/1616); Shūrā-i Islāmī I 259 (olām Bāyānī. Copied by Pīr Muḥammad Qāsim in 1051/1641-2); Gulistān/Ātābāy I 270 (Dated 29 Ramadān 1070/1660); Gulistān/Ātābāy I 269 (Contains a seal dated 1072/1661-2); Gulistān/Ātābāy II 433/II (Ms. dated 1 Safar 1073/1662); Gulistān/Ātābāy I 272; Gulistān/Ātābāy II 454/I; Majlis I 625; Majlis I 653 ('old'); Majlis II 916 (15th century?); Sipah-sālār II 1132; Tankhent Acad. II 790 (Dated 11 Safar 1010/1601); Dushanbe Acad. II 344-349; Bombay Rehatsek p. 134 no. 25 (Dated 1005/1596-7); Univ. 111 (Dated 1 Safar 1106/1694); Rehatsek p. 134 no. 24 (Dated 46th year of 'Alamgir/1718. With a commentary); Rehatsek p. 133 no. 23; Kapurthala 59 (OCH II/4, 1927, p. 19. Dated 1086/1675-6); Aligarh Subb. p. 41 no. 49 (Dated 1057/1647); Lucknow Sprenger 496 (several copies); Bankipore I 18 (15th century?); I 17 (18th century?); Suppt. i 1805 (18th century?); Hyderabad Asafiyah I p. 414 nos. 389 (Dated 871/1466-7); 388, 497; Asafiyah III p. 196 no. 1503; Madras 107-110; Calcutta Bābār 281 (16th century? End missing); Ivanov 438/4 (16th-17th century?); Būhār 282 (Copied by Muḥammad Riḍā Mīrzā and dated Rabi'I I 1033/1623-4, some leaves added later); Madrasah CXXXV (Dated 3 Sha'bān 1099/1687); Ivanov 439 (17th century?); Ivanov 444 (17th century? Bk. I only); Ivanov 442 (Dated 1186/1772-3); Ivanov 440 (18th century? Defective); Ivanov 441 (18th century?); Ivanov 443 (18th century?); Chicago Collection of Hājj Isḥāq al-Māzinī I p. 75; de Bruijn p. 124-5. Copied by Siyāwush b. ʿAbī l-Fadl al-Marwāzī and dated 2 Sha'bān 588/1192. Title given as Ilāhī-ānāmah. Defective).


Abridgments:
(a) Intikhāb (or Muntakhāb) i ḍadīqāh, or Intikhāb (Istanbul copies: Muntakhāb az muntakhāb i ḍadīqāh, (inc.: bānd bē bad sifāt i yazdān rā * madd bē gaddh dāh i subbān rā, or in some copies: bānd u shukr u thānā 'alā l-ḥīāqā * dāh ī baq rā sazd ba istiqāqāq = 'incipit II'), by an author
who calls himself Dā‘ī, presumably Niẓām al-dīn Maḥmūd b. al-Ḥasan al-Ḥusainī al-Shirāzī, known as Dā‘ī, who collected his diwān in 865/1460-1, when he was 55 years old, and who is also the author of a commentary on Rūmī’s Mathnawī. In at least some copies it contains verses in which the compiler says that with it he has reduced his earlier epitome of the Hadīṣqah to 1001 verses; it remains to be investigated whether any of the MSS. listed here contain the earlier version. In some copies the work is attributed to Sāhānī himself, or else to ‘Aṭṭār. See also de Bruijn, p. 121.

MSS.: Oxford Ouseley 190 (Ethē II 2405; Robinson 1037-44. Copied by ‘Alī al-Kātib al-Sultānī who died ‘about’ 950/1543, according to Ethē, while one of the miniatures is signed by Kamāl Tabrīzī who seems to have flourished about 1575 according to Robinson. Pictures, apparently by several artists); Richmond Keir III.298-301 (Dated 978/1570-1. Pictures); London Or. 11523 (Meredith-Owens p. 73. Copied by Shāh Maḥmūd Naṣḥāpūrī, ca. 950/1543); I.O. 925 (incipit II); Berlin Petermann 444 (Pertsch 718. Copied by Muṭṭān b. Raffī al-dīn al-Adhamī and dated Rajab 905/1500. Title given as Thamrat al-badīṣqah li ahl al-baqīṣqah); Vienna Flügel 510 fol. 3v-42r (see also Duda p. 15-19, where the MS. is ascribed to the 16th century. Pictures); Istanbul Topkapı, Revan 1040 (Karabay 393. Copied by Shams al-dīn Muḥammad al-Sharīf al-Kirmānī in 916/1501-2. Incipit II. Title given as Ḥadāṣqat al-badīṣqah); Universitè FY 498 (Ataq 43. 16th century?); Universitè FY 1122 (Ataq 45. 17th century?); Tehran Gulistan/Atābāy I 274 (15th century? Pictures, one of which is signed by Bahān Quill Afsfar Naqqāsh); Gulistan/Atābāy I 276; Gulistan/Atābāy II 455; Bombay Univ. 13; Lucknow Sprenger 130 (incipit II); Bankipore I 19 (Copied by Muḥammad ‘Alī b. ‘Īzz al-dīn Ahmad and dated 3 Dhūl-ḥijjah 1061/1651. Ca. 1200 verses).

I 20 (Copied by Jān Muḥammad b. Maulānā Khizr. 16th century?); Calcutta Ivanov 446 (Dated 33rd year of Aurangzèb/1101/1689-90).


(b) Unidentified or unspecified epitomes:

MSS.: Paris Supplément 704 (Blochet 1218. 16th century?); Ancien Fonds 325 fol. lv-4r (Blochet 2156/Richard. Ms. dated 1071/1661. 79 verses only); Leningrad Dorn CCCLI (Copied by Shāh Maḥmūd in 928/1522); Istanbul Universitè FY 538/17 (Ataq 41. Dated 826/1423); Universitè FY 1080 (Ataq 42. 15th century?); Tehran Gulistan/Atābāy II 461/III (Ms. contains a seal with the date 1107/1695-6).

Commentaries and glossaries:

(a) Laṭīf‘ī al-badā‘iq min nasrā‘is al-daqā‘iq, or in some copies Sharb al-badīṣqah, by ‘Abd al-Latīf b. ‘Abd Allāh al-‘Abbāṣī (died 1048/1638-9 or 1049/1639-40), for whom see PL I p. 807 n. 5. A revised text of the Hadīṣqah on the basis of various manuscripts with commentary, completed in 1042/1632-3 with help from Mīr ‘Imād al-dīn Maḥmūd, called Ilāhī (see PL I p. 815-6). Some MSS. appear to contain an abridged version. See the description in the I.O. catalogue.

MSS.: Oxford Whinfield 24 (Beeston 2552. Dated 1093/1682); London I.O. 923 (Dated 20 Jamā‘dā I 1044/1634. Apparently the author’s autograph of the abridged version); I.O. 924 (Written in the reign of Muḥammad Shāh); Or. 11664 (Meredith-Owens p. 73. 17th century? Defective at end); I.O. Delhi 1257 (18th century? Incomplete); Or. 9744 (Meredith-Owens p. 70. 19th century? Presumably this

work is intended); Cambridge King's, No. 151 (Browne Supplt. 394. Dated Rabī‘ I 1102/1690. Title given as Mīrāt al-badī‘iṣ, presumably the same work?); Edinburgh Univ. 273 (Dated <10>51/1641-2); Turin Bibli. Nazionale Ms. III.3 (Piemontese 354. Dated 17 Dhu 1-qa‘dah 1049/1640); Bankipore I 21; Cutcuta Ivanov 445 (Dated 38th year of Aurangzēb /1107/1695-6. 2nd half only); Ivanov Curzon 192 (17th-18th century?); Būḥār 283-4 (19th century?); Aligarh Subb. p. 49 no. 12.

Edition: Lucknow 1877 (according to the Bankipore Catalogue I p. 29, where a detailed account of the work can be found); 1304/1886.

(b) Sharḥ i badī‘at i Ḥakīm Sanā‘ī by Muḥammad Nūr Allāh Abrārī Ghaznavī. Ms.: Lucknow Sprenger 497; Aligarh Subb. p. 48 no. 4.
(c) Taʿrīqah bar badī‘at by Mīrāz ‘Alā al-dīn Abū Ḥasan Ḥāfiz, called ‘Alī, governor of Lūhārū, and Maulawī Muḥammad Rukan al-dīn Qādirī Ḥāfizī. Apparently comments only on the first two chapters. See Browne, Cat. CCIV.

Edition: Lūhārū 1290/1873.

(d) Unidentified commentary: Paris Supplément 1678 (Blochet 1219. 18th century? Beginning and end missing);
(e) Miftāh al-badī‘at, an anonymous versified vocabulary (begins with the first verse of Niẓāmī’s Makhzan al-asrār). Ms.: Cutcuta Ivanov 447 (17th century?).

Doubtful and spurious works:
1) Taʿrīqah al-taḥqīq (inc.: ibtīdā‘ i sukhān ba-nām-i khudā-st aḥ-ḵā bē mithl u shīb u bē hamātā-st) is attributed in the oldest Ms. (Istanbul University FY 593) to one Abū Ḥasan b. al-Ḥasan

al-Nakhjawaṃī, doubtless the true author. It has been claimed that the last verse (khaṭa‘ i nām bār as‘ādat bād ...) contains, in the last three words, a chronogram for the year 744/1343-4; this is possible, but the formulation of the verse is not such that it must necessarily contain a chronogram. It seems to me therefore that the question of the date of the poem remains open. Later manuscripts contain interpolated verses ascribing the work to Sanā‘ī and stating that it was composed in 528/1133-4. We have thus clearly to do with a poem that was composed in good faith by the otherwise unknown Abū Ḥasan b. al-Ḥasan, but later fraudulently ascribed to Sanā‘ī.

Ms.: London I.O. 926 (Dated 15 Jamā‘ā II 1061/1651); I.O. 914/2; Istanbul University FY 593/4 (olim Raza Paşa 3009. Ateş 570. Ms. dated Ramadān 890/1485. Title given in the superscription as Miṣbah al-arwāḥ and in the colophon as Taʿrīqah al-muḥaqiqīn. Author given as Malik al-‘Arifīn Abū Ḥasan b. al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad al-Nakhjawaṃī al-ma‘rūf bi 1-jāmī'); Universite FY 474/6 (Ateş 50. Dated 22 Ramadān 898/1493. Apparently attributed to Aḥmad b. Kirmānī); Universite FY 70 (Ateş 51. Dated 1274/1857-8); Bombay Rehtsek p. 128 (Dated 946/1539-40. The author's name is given as Abū Ḥasan b. Ḥasan b. Muḥammad al-Khwāfī);

1Hājī Khalīfah (new edition II col. 1705) mentions this poem (he quotes its first aṣgā‘) as Miṣbah al-arwāḥ al-asrār al-asbāb and ascribes it to al-Shaikh Aḥmad al-dīn Abū Ḥasan b. al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad al-Nakhjawaṃī al-Kirmānī who he says died in 534/1139-40. It seems, however, that this authority has confused the present work with the Miṣbah al-arwāḥ of Aḥmad al-dīn Kirmānī; the name that he gives its author is a contamination of those of the two authors in question.


A large number of Ms. (only the oldest of which are reiterated here) are listed in Utas's edition, p. 11-40. See also Munz. IV 30234-43.
authorship, de Bruijn (p. 114-5) considers it probably spurious.


(5) Tahrimat al-galām, or Tajrubat al-‘ilm, is another short Mathnawī without dedication and is likewise probably spurious (see de Bruijn p. 115-7).


Arūḍī p. 28; Abū l-Rajā’ Qummī, Tārīkh al-wuzūrā’, ed. M.T. Dānish-paṣhūh, Tehran 1363sh./1985, p. 17-18; Rāwandi, Rābat al-sudūr, ed. M. Iqbālī, passim; ‘Auīfī II p. 252-7; Shams passim; Mustafaī p. 736; Daqīq al-‘asbār (Oxford Eliot 37 = Ethè 1333, fol. 5b, 17b, 85a); Jājarmī (see the index); Daulat-shāh p. 95-9; Taqī (see London Or. 3506 fol. 285b sqq. = Rieu Suppt. 105); Hidāyat, Najmā’ I p. 254-74; id., Rīyūd p. 196-210; H. Ritter, ‘Philologica VIII: Anṣārī Herewī - Senā’ī Gawanwī’, Der Islam XXII, 1935, p. 89-105; R.A. Nicholson, A Persian Forerunner of Dante, Townson-Sea 1944; Safā, Tārīkh II p. 552-86; Khayām-
died in 598/1201-2, to Hidāyat in 597/1200-1, but these dates seem very late.

I wonder whether Shihāb al-dīn Shāh 'Alī al-Ghaznawī is not identical with 'Alī b. al-Muzaffar al-Shihābī al-Ghaznawi, the author of a mathnawi with the title Pahlavān-nāmah, extracts from which make up the first part of the didactic anthology Bahār al-durar (only reported Ms.: Gotha 40). The epitone, and presumably also the poem itself, begins with the verse be nām i khudāvand i kaiwān u āhār * kih hast āfrīndash i pīl u mūr; from the metre alone it is evident that this has nothing to do with the Pahlavān-nāmah of Mu'ayyad al-Nasafi. The poem does not appear to be recorded elsewhere, but the fact that all the other poets who are epitomised in the Bahār al-durar lived in the 11th (Firdausī, Abūl Wāsīt, 12th (Nūrī) or 13th (Gāni) centuries suggests that 'Alī b. al-Muzaffar might belong to the pre-Mongol period.

286. Shāh Bū Rajā' - or perhaps rather Shāh i Bū Rajā' (i.e. Shāh, son of Abū Rajā') - is listed by 'Arūdī among the Ghaznavid poets. 'Aufl calls him 'Jākīm Shihāb al-dīn Shāh 'Ali Abū Rajā' al-Ghaznavī, (read either Shāh 'Ali i Abī Rajā' or Shāh 'Ali Abū Rajā'); and quotes, along with some shorter pieces, two odes to Abū l-Muzaffar Bahram-Shāh b. Mas'ud (511/1117 to 552/1157; the king's name is mentioned in both poems). Ibn al-Mu'ayyad quotes two verses 'li ibn al-Rajā' (read li Abī l-Rajā' or li ibn Abī l-Rajā')). According to Adhar he

1Thus according to 'Aufl. In the verses themselves the dedicatee is addressed only as Diya' al-dīn.

2The name given to him by Rabī', namely Shihāb al-dīn Shāh Abū 'Ali Rajā', is evidently a corruption of this.
288. Shamālī (or Shimālī) al-Dīhistānī is the author of a substantial qaṣīdah (quoted by Jājarmī) in praise of a king who is named in the verse: tāju l-mulūk Nuṣrat i dīn, khorasān-e kīh hast * bar nām i 3 ūrī hamah mulk i Ṭabarsīsīn; evidently the Bawandī Nuṣrat al-dīn Rustam b. ‘Ali (ca. 536/1142 to 560/1165). He is presumably identical with the Shamālī who is the victim of some satirical verses by Sābir which are quoted by ‘Auffī. Hīdāyāt quotes some verses from the ode cited by Jājarmī and adds two more poems.


289. Shams al-dīn Lāgharī is quoted by Rāwandī (Rābat al-sūdūr, p. 394-5) as the author of three verses mocking the bātinīyān (Ismā’īlīs).

290. Shams Sujāsī is, according to Mustaufī, a poet who collected the dīwān of Zahir Fārābī and who died in 602/1205-6. He is thus presumably to be identified with the un-named author of the prose introduction which we find in some copies of Zahir’s poems. (See below, p. 558). One qaṣīdah by Shams al-dīn al-Sujāsī is found in Bologna Biblioteca Universitaria Ms. 3283/V (Piemontese 3. 13th century?) and three verses by 'Shams al-dīn Tāhir Snūsī are cited by Rāzī. Sharwānī, Nuzhat al-maṣālis (see above, p. 242); Mustaufī p. 736; Rāzī III p. 201-2 (no. 1301); Hājjī Khalīfah III p. 293, no. 5532.

291. Shams al-dīn Mubārak-Shāh b. al-‘A’āz al-Sijzī is quoted in ‘Auffī’s chapter on the poets of Khurasān after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157), where we find, among other things, a qaṣīdah dedicated to Naṣīr al-dīn, the wazīr of the maliks of Nīmrūz (i.e. Sīstān),1 a rubā‘ī addressed to one Bahrām-shāh (evidently not the Ghaznavīd, but his namesake, the ruler of Sīstān from 610/1212 to 618/1221), a eulogy on one Naṣīr al-dīn ‘Uthmān (evidently the brother of the just-mentioned Bahrām-shāh, khwāwand Naṣīr al-dīn ‘Uthmān b. Bārb, who died in 604/1207-8)2 and a poem which he wrote (still according to ‘Auffī) during his imprisonment in Kirmān.

‘Auffī II p. 348-9; Rāzī I p. 293-4 (no. 304); Khaiyām-pūr p. 306 ('Shams i Sanjārī').

292. Shams al-dīn Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Karīm al-Ṭabāsī3 is the author of a slender dīwān preserved notably in two ancient manuscripts in Dublin and London. Hardly anything is known about him except that in one of his poems4 he mentions the building of a fortress in the year 591/1195. ‘Auffī speaks of him in the past tense. Zakariyā al-Ḡawwānī says that Shams al-Ṭabāsī was a pupil of Raḍī al-dīn al-Naisbūrī and that it was his teacher who encouraged him to emulate the style of Khāqānī. The same author quotes the first verses of an ode (which we know also from ‘Auffī and from Shams’s dīwān) employing the same rhyme and metre as a ‘famous’ poem by the qādī of Bukhārā ‘Ṣadr al-sharī‘ah’ (in fact it is by Manṣūr b. Māhmod al-Usjandī5) and he adds that Shams’s poem was addressed to the wazīr of Bukhārā’. Zakariyā6 says further that Shams died young.

At least one of Shams’s odes is clearly dedicated to one or other of the Burhānī ṣadru.7

1Thus in ‘Auffī, Ma’. 'S'. Browne, following Ma’. 'F', reads the nisbah as al-Sanjārī.

2For this wāṣīr see above, p. 328 (Fārīd al-dīn).
3According to Ta‘īrīkh i Sīstān p. 392-3.
4Thus ‘Auffī.
5Dīwān p. 89.
6See above, p. 411-2.
7Dīwān p. 72-4. In l. 1268 the patron is addressed as afṣar i Burhānīyān.
But the majority of his poems are addressed to a wāzīr whom he calls Niẓām al-mulk Ṣadr al-dīn Muhammad b. Muhammad, who has not been identified satisfactorily, but who is perhaps the 'wāzīr of Būkhārā' mentioned by Zakariyā. Modern scholars have described Shams as a poet at the court of the Karakhanids, but it does not seem possible to substantiate this.

Mss. of his dīwān: Dublin Beatty 103/VI (Ms. completed Dhu 1-bijjah 639/1300. Beginning missing); Oxford Elliot 86 (Ethē 621); London I.O. 1030 (Copied by 'Abd al-Mu'min al-'Alawī al-Kāshī and dated Dhu 1-qa'dah 713/1314. Pictures); İstanbul Heimoğlu Ali Paşa 669/3 (Middle Film-hā I p. 420-1. Apparently old); Tehran Bayānī 56/5 (Nuskhā-hā I p. 15. Dated 995/1587); Mashhad Ridāwī VII 965/5 (Ms. dated 1041/1631-2); Rampore State Library (Nadbīr Ahmad 177. qasā'id). Cf. Munz. I 23881-90.

Edition: Mashhad 1343ah./1965 (ed. T. Binš, mainly from the Dublin and India Office Ms., with extensive notes).


293. al-Ḥakīm Shamsī al-A‘rāf al-Būkhārī was another of the poets connected with the Xi 1 Būkhārā. ‘Auffı quotes, among other things, a qītah composed after the death of ‘Ṣadr i sa‘īd’ (a title given both to ‘Abd al-‘Azīz I b. ‘Umar and to his great-grandson ‘Abd al-‘Azīz II, who died in 593/1196-7, and who is evidently intended here) and another addressed to al-Ṣadr al-kabīr ‘Umar (II) b. Manṣūd (who succeeded the just mentioned ‘Abd al-‘Azīz II and died before 603/1206).


294. Sharaf al-ḥukamā‘ Shamsī Dīhistānī is credited with one ghazal in ‘Auffı’s chapter on the poets of Khurāsān after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157).


295. Sharaf al-dīn Panjiḥī is the subject of the last entry in ‘Auffı’s chapter on the poets of Khurāsān after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157). ‘Auffı says that he was from the vicinity of Zāwah and Khwāf (south of Naisābūr); in this case the nīsbah Panjiḥī (if correctly read) cannot refer to Panjiḥī near Marv, but must relate to the similarly named conglomerate of villages in Khusṭān. ‘Auffı says further that he followed the manner of KūshkāĪ and Rūḥī and quotes verses in which he satirised one Shā‘ī din, a rubā‘ directed against a certain Shīhāb al-dīn, and an exchange of invectives between him and one Sirjāl Iṣfārā’īnī.


296. Sharaf al-dīn Muḥammad, with a by-name which has traditionally been read as Shufurwah or Shafurwah (or -wa‘ī), but for which the correct reading is perhaps Shafurūh, was a member of a dis-

1Name and patronyms are found on p. 55 l. 966 and p. 78 l. 1353 (with textual varianta in the latter passage).
2For this, and the Mashhad Ms., see above, p. 423 fn.
tlinguished family of Ḥānafī clerics in Isfahān and the author of an extant (but unpublished) Persian dīwān.

In the London manuscript, which was studied by Qazwīnī, the majority of the poems are dedicated to a king by the name of Shams al-dīn Muḥammad, apparently the atabeg Jahān-pahlavān Muḥammad b. Eldūgūz (571/1175 to 582/1186). There is only one poem lauding the Seljuq Arslān b. Ṭoghrīl (556/1161 to 571/1176) - this ode is quoted also by ‘Aṭṭī and one praising his successor Ṭoghrīl III. The latter, a strophic poem, is found also (in virtually the same form as in the London manuscript) in Dau al-shāh’s entry devoted to our poet. However a slightly different version of the same poem is quoted by Rāwandī (anonymously, but in a context where Rāwandī seems to be claiming the authorship for himself), but here it evokes the Rūm-Seljuq Ghiyāth al-dīn Kāi-Khusrāu I (588/1192 to 607/1210, with an interruption), the dedicatee of Rāwandī’s history. Moreover it is also included in Jājarmī’s anthology as the work of Rāwandī but with a dedication to Kāi-Khusrāu’s brother and rival Rukn al-dīn Sulaimān II (592/1196 to 600/1204), the king to whom Rāwandī

\(^1\)Nāfiṣatī, in the notes to his edition of ‘Aṭṭī, has collected the material on the various members of this family contained in the Kīṭāb al-jawāhir al-qadīmāt of Ibn Abī l-Wafā. They seem to have used a shared shubrah which appears in the printed text as ‘ibn sfrwḥ’ or ‘ibn wfrwḥ’ or ‘ibn sfrwyyḥ’ or ‘ibn sfrwyḥ’ with other predictable graphic variants (q or gh or w for f; etc.) The fluctuation between -f- and -w- is less easy to explain away as mere scribal negligence and suggests rather an Iranian form with -f-; in this case the various Arabic spellings could reflect a local (Isfahāni) variant of Persian shah-ruy(y), ‘Blackface’. There is in any event no justification for the claim by the authors of the late taḏkīrāt that ‘Shfwrwh’ (or whatever) is the name of a village near Isfahān; ‘ibn Shfwr Bah’ is clearly a family name referring to a remote ancestor.

\(^1\)Yaḥyā Ṣaḥḥāḥ Khwān, kiḥ ḍī Ṣawāṣ i ḍīgar (text: Ṣawāṣ ḍīgar, which is un-grammatical) \* as nām i ṣawāṣ ma’sumāl u maṣūṣān ast.
the manuscripts of the dīwān of Sharaf al-dīn from Daulat-shāh's tadhkirah.

What is obviously a much fuller recension of Sharaf's dīwān is found in the Calcutta manuscript and this contains (according to Ivanow) not one but a large number of poems to Toghril as well as some to Elügüz, but this needs checking.

'Aufi gives our poet's name as Sharaf al-daulah wa l-dīn Muḥammad (i) *Shafrūh, but Jājarmi, like most of the later authors, quotes him as al-imām al-saʿīd Sharaf al-dīn ʿAbd al-Muʿmin (i) *Shafrūh al-Isfahānī.1 'Muḥammad' and 'ʿAbd al-Muʿmin' cannot both be correct.2 It seems that the later tradition has erroneously identified our poet with another well-known member of the same family, namely ʿAbd al-Muʿmin b. Ḥibat Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Ḥibat Allāh b. Hamzah al-maʿrūf bi *Shafrūh, the author of the Aṭbāq al-dhahab, an Arabic moralising homily in imitation of al-Zamakhsharī's Aṭṭār al-dhahab. Ibn Abī l-Wafāʾ3 says that this writer went to Damascus in 569/1173-4 and thence to Cairo, where he met Ṣāḥib al-dīn. al-Ṣafādī4 actually gives his iṣqab as Sharaf al-dīn and adds that he returned from Egypt to Damascus at the end of 570/1175 and then went back to Isfahan, where he died. In any case it is clear that the banū *Shafrūh produced a good number of learned men and that there is an obvious danger of confusing them with one another. "Aufi's identification of our poet avoids this danger and has also the advantage of greater antiquity.

1 Thus Jājarmī II p. 1079.
2 Nafiṣī claims that Muḥammad was his name and 'ʿAbd al-Muʿmin his iṣqah, but 'ʿAbd al-Muʿmin is not a iṣqab.
3 al-Jawāhir al-mudjīth, Hyderabad 1332/1914, I p. 332 and II p. 375. In the latter passage his iṣāb is given as dāwrh, in the former it is corrupted to dāwrh.
and give no indication of the names of any patrons or identifiable contemporaries. Daulat-shâh claims that he was a pupil of Sùzanî. Râzî, who is otherwise entirely dependent on 'Aufî, includes him among the poets of Samargand.

'Arûdî p. 28 (and Qazwînî ad loc.); 'Aufî II p. 199-207; Daulat-shâh p. 102; Râzî III p. 368-71 (no. 1432); Hîdâyat, Majma' I p. 344-5; Nafisî in his edition of Bahaqi, p. 1397; Khâiyâm-pûr p. 298; Sa'îf, Târikh II p. 636-8.

298. Shihâb al-dîn Ahmad b. al-Mu'ayyad al-Samargandi follows in 'Aufî's anthology immediately after Mu'ayyad al-Nasafi.1 Although the sources do not specifically say that the former is the son of the latter it is most likely that this is in fact the case. The assumption is supported by the fact that Shams quotes him as 'Shihâb i Mu'ayyad i Nasafi'; the father evidently hailed from Nasaf, the son from Samargand. 'Aufî quotes two substantial qasîdas of his, the second of which is dedicated to an un-identified Násîr i dîn. One verse from this poem2 is quoted, and attributed to Shihâb, by Shams i Qais; the same verse and one other from the same poem3 occur also (with minor variants) as the first and third verses of a qîf'âh which Sa'îf b. Muhammad al-Harawi4 ascribes to 'Mu'ayyad i Nasafi'. It is thus possible that Shihâb is quoting here two verses of his father's. Râzî adds one qasîdah and two verses not quoted by 'Aufî, while Hîdâyat adds two further poems, one of which refers to the poet's patron as 'Malik Tâmgâhâ Khân Mas'ûd Rûk al-dîn wa l-dunya'. Further poems are quoted by Nafisî from an unidentified safînah, and one of these1 is dedicated to 'khusrâu i mashriq Mas'ûd', evidently the same monarch. There were two Qarakhanids by the name of Mas'ûd, but if we are to attach any importance to the fact that 'Aufî includes our poet (and his father) in his chapter devoted to bards who flourished after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157), then the intended ruler must be Rûk al-dîn wa l-dunya Qâlîch Tâmgâhâ Khân Mas'ûd (II) b. al-Hasan (ca. 558/1160 to 574/1178).2 Our poet is presumably identical with the 'Shihâb i dîn i Mu'ayyad' praised in a poem by Sûzanî,3 whose principal patron was precisely the afore-mentioned Mas'ûd II.

Qazwînî4 wrote that the 'Shihâbî' listed by 'Arûdî (p. 28) among the poets of the Seljuqs is 'apparently' (gûrā) to be identified with Shihâb al-dîn b. Mu'ayyad, but this seems far from certain. In the surviving verses our poet refers to himself as 'Shihâb', not 'Shihâbî'.

' Aufî II p. 362-7; Shams p. 441; Sharwînî, Nuz'hat al-majâlis (see above, p. 242); Râzî III p. 356-60 (no. 1429); Hîdâyat, Majma' I p. 310-1; Nafisî's notes to his edition of Bahaqi, III p. 1352-5, 1534-46, 1549; Sa'îf, Târikh II p. 769-74; LN s.v. 'Ahmad' p. 1451-2; Khâiyâm-pûr p. 310 ('Shihâb i Samargandi').

299. Shihâbî Ghazâl (or Ghazzât) Khujandî5 is known to us only from a few fragments quoted by

---

For whom see above, p. 416-7.
2 'Aufî II p. 366, l. 13-14.
3 Loc. cit., lines 17-8.
4 Târikh-nâmâh i Harât, Calcutta 1944, p. 78.
5 For whom see O. Pritsak, Der Islam XXI, 1953-4, p. 55. Pritsak himself (op. cit., p. 48; following Qazwînî) identified Shihâbî's patron as Mas'ûd (I) b. Muhammad (488/1095 to 490/1097), but this must be rejected for the reason indicated above.
6 Dîwân, p. 441.
7 In his commentary to 'Arûdî, p. 155.
b. 'Ali al-Sūzanī and Muḥammad is also the name by which he refers to himself in his poems.1 However, he gives his father's name as Mas'ūd (not 'Ali)2 and indicates that he followed his father in the profession of poetry. He was born, again according to 'Afuṭī, in Nṣaf (Nakshabāb), but spent most of his life in Samargand, and he is often called Sūzanī Samargandī. His pen-name comes from sūzan, 'needle', and was evidently chosen to match the sharp wit of his satires.3 His time can be determined from the fact that his qaṣīdahs mostly address the rulers of Samargand during the second and third quarters of the 12th century. His earliest unambiguously identifiable patron is the Qarakhanid Arslān-shāh Muḥammad (II) b. Sulaimān (495/1102 to ca. 523/1129), and he praised his successors down to Qulī Ṭamghāḥ Khān Rukn al-dīn Mas'ūd (II) b. Ḥasan (ca. 556/1161 to 574/1178), his principal patron. He also praised the clerical rulers of Bukhārā (the šadra of the āl i

1Dīwān p. 446, l. 1 and 183, l. 21. The editor (on p. 3 of his introduction) also cites verses in which the poet appears to call himself 'Umar and Bū Bakr. However in the first verse (=Dīwān p. 112, l. 4) one of the manuscripts available to the editor has not nām i mān chūn ṣabīl bi 'Edīl 'Umar khwāmānd khāliq, but ... 'Edīl hamākh khwāmānd ... and this reading must obviously be preferred ('ṣabīl i 'Edīl' here means 'Muḥammad'). The verse giving his name (nām) as Bū Bakr is found in a religious poem (Dīwān p. 1, second verse from the bottom) which, as the editor admits, is missing in most copies of the Dīwān. It is probably spurious. It is, however, not impossible that the poet had Abū Bakr as a kunyah. Nafāṣ (in the notes to his edition of 'Afuṭī, p. 694) quotes a verse in which Sūzanī appears to give his name as Ibrāhīm, but in the printed Dīwān (p. 267, l. 8) we read not mān gar Ibrāhīm nāmān, but gar na Ibrāhīm nāmān.

2Dīwān p. 183, l. 21; 389, ult. and elsewhere. There are a number of poems in the Dīwān in which he plays on the name, e.g. p. 390-2, 447. 'Afuṭī's story according to which he chose the name as a result of a love affair with a needle-maker need hardly be taken seriously.
Burhān), the Seljuq Sanjar and various lesser personages. There is one (authentic?) poem1 eulogising the Khwārazm-shāh Atsiz. In one poem2 addressed to Mas'ud's wazīr Sa'd al-mulk Mas'ud b. Am'ad he mentions the date Hubarram 560/1164. Da'ulat-shāh (himself a native of Samarqand) says that Sōzanī died in 569/1173-4; since he gives this date in connection with a precise localisation of the poet's grave it is likely that he found the date on the gravestone; it could thus very well be correct. As there are verses in which the poet gives his age as past 80 he must then have been born before 489/1096.

Sōzanī is, however, most famous not for his panegyrics but for his facetiae and his often grotesquely obscene invectives. In one poem3 he lists his illustrious predecessors in the art of diatribe: Munjīk,4 Khujastah,5 Khwājah Najībī,6 Khuṣīrī,7 Ťaiyān,8 Qarī,9 'Ammāq10 and Yakkāk.11 Identifiable victims are the poets Sanā'ī and Waṭwāt; the Nīzāmī against whom one of his poems is directed12 is presumably not Nīzāmī of Ganjān, whom he is unlikely to have met, but rather Sōzanī's compatriot Nīzāmī 'Arūḍī Samarqandī.13 The satirical poems contain many rare

1Dīwān p. 341-2.
2p. 141-2.
3p. 93.
4See above, p. 197-8.
5Above, p. 177, where it is wrongly stated that he is 'otherwise unknown'.
6Perhaps Najībī Farghānī, above p. 436.
7Above, p. 177.
8Above p. 230-1.
9Above p. 214.
10Above, p. 253-6.
11Above, p. 167, where again 'no other mention' can now be struck out.
12P. 62-4.
13It is noteworthy that 'Arūḍī makes no mention of him in his Chahār maqālah. For the person that Sōzanī calls khar i khew-khānah see above, p. 341-2 (Jalāl).
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(i.e. dialect or slang) words and are of great lexicographical interest, or rather would be if we had a better text at our disposal. The qasīdahs on the other hand are written in an unencumbered style reminiscent of the poets of the 10th and 11th centuries.

Da'ulat-shāh says that in his old age Sōzanī repented, made the pilgrimage to Mecca and devoted himself to edifying poetry. This may well be true, though it could just as well be a mere topos.

Mas. of his dīwān: Oxford Elliot 110 (Ethé 541. Lacunae); Ousley Add. 89 (Ethé 542); London Or. 11521 (Meredith-Owens p. 63. 16th-17th century?); Cambridge Or. 563 (Browne Suppt. 1071); Paris Supplément 783 fol. 57v sqq. (Bichet 1981. 16th century? Selections); Berlin Sprenger 1520 (Pertsch 716); Istanbul Fatih 3831 (Ritter-Reinert p. 116-7. Dated Sha'ban 880/1475); Tehran Gulistan/Khābāy II 465/IV (14th-15th century? 7 qasīdahs only); Sipah-ulār II 1204 (Dated 1033/1623-4); Gulistan/Khābāy I 278 (Dated Shawwāl 1258 /1842); Manṣūrī Rādīwīlī VII 441 (Dated 4 Hubarram 1204/1789); Dushanbe Acad. II 364 (Dated 1129 /1717); Acad. II 363 (19th century?); Lucknow Sprenger 528 (two copies); Calcutta Ivanov 449 (Dated 1011/1602-3). Cf. Munz. III 2362-249.


'Aufī II p. 191-8; Shams p. 260-2;1 Qawwāl passim; Mustaufī I 733-4; Daqīq al-ṣahīr (Oxford Elliot 37 = Ethé 1333, passim); Jā'ārī I p. 10-11, 26-30, 204-8, II p. 917-9, 942-3, 1212-3; Da'ulat-shāh p. 100-3; Rāzi III p. 392-400 (no. 1461);

1Shams quotes (anonymously in Qazwī's Ms., but attributed to Sōzanī in the others; see the new edition, p. 284-7, and above p. 348 say Jauhar) two poems illustrating tajdīn (breaking of words at the rhyme, here for comical effect). Of the two only the latter is in the printed dīwān (p. 329).

303. al-Ṣadr al-na'jali Fakhr al-ru'asā' Tāj al-dīn al-Ābī was a contemporary of 'Auffi, who describes him as one of the dignitaries of Sarakhs and who quotes a number of his poems. Ibn Isfandiyār cites two rubā'īs by 'Tāj al-Ābī'.


304. Shihāb al-dīn Abū l-Hasan Talbāh, of Marv, is included in 'Auffi's chapter on the poets of the Seljuqs of Khurasan, where we find an elegy on the death of Samā'ī and eighteen rubā'īs, a genre which, still according to 'Auffi, accounts for the greatest part of his output. Rāzi's statement that he 'also' (i.e. like Samā'ī) lived at the time of Sanjar is perhaps only a surmise.

'Auffi II p. 153-6; Sharwanī, Nus'hat al-majalis (see above, p. 242); Rāzi II p. 14-6 (no. 519); Adhar II p. 656-7; Safa, Tarih II p. 690-2; Khayyam-pur p. 17 ('Abū l-Hasan') and 358 ('Talbāh i Marwazi').

1As is implied by 'Auffi's words khitthah i Marw ba sakān i 6 usufkhir.
2See above, p. 517.
Balkh. 1 Daulat-shah - like those dependent on him - says that he died in 578/1182-3, in his 97th year, which would put his birth in 481/1088-9, and adds that his grave is to be found in Gurgan,2 the capital of Khwarazm; from this one can perhaps deduce that Daulat-shah (or his source) had these dates from the tombstone. The implied birth-date is in any case consistent with Juwaini's statement that Rashid was 'past his 80th year' when he greeted the accession to the throne of the Khwarazm-shah 'All al-din Tekish in 568/1172, indicating that he was born a few years before 488/1095. The year given for his death in Yaqut's biographical dictionary, namely 573/1177-8 (in figures and not spelt out), is perhaps a scribe's error for 578.

Rashid was chief secretary (gibih diwan al-
insah) under the Khwarazm-shah Atsiz (521/1127 to 551/1156) and his successor El-Arslan (died 568/1172); in one of his verses he says that he served the former for 'thirty years', i.e. for the whole of his reign. His loyalty to Atsiz earned him the enmity of the Seljuk sultan Sanjar who, according to an anecdote told by Juwaini (and repeated by many others), at one point resolved to have Rashid cut into thirty pieces, but who was dissuaded from doing so by his own chief secretary, Muntajab al-din al-Juwaini, the uncle of our informant's great-grandfather. We possess a considerable number of Rashid's letters, both of those he wrote on behalf of his masters (in Arabic to the caliph and his entourage, in Persian to Sanjar and others) as well as of his own private letters in both languages. 1 Rashid's Persian diwan, containing more than 8500 verses in Naftai's edition, consists largely of poems eulogising Atsiz. The fact that none of the poems is dedicated to that king's successors led Naftai to the conclusion that Rashid left Khwarazm after the death of Atsiz, but this overlooks the fact that many of his letters were clearly written on behalf of El-Arslan and several refer explicitly to events during his reign. 2 Thus the absence of poems dedicated to Atsiz's successors shows only that Rashid compiled his diwan long before the end of his life.

For his prose writings in Persian and Arabic see my article in ET 1. A discussion of his paraprases (in prose and verse) of the sayings of the first four caliphs is planned for PL IV (Traditions).

Mss. of the diwan: Dublin Beatty 103/III (Ms. completed Dhul 1-bijjah 699/1300); London Or. 3376/II (Rieu Suppt. 234. Dated 2 Dhul 1-qa'dah 1002/1594. Imperfect at end); Add. 16,791 (Rieu p. 553. Dated Ramad'an 1063/1653); Or. 283 (Rieu p. 553. 17th century?); Or. 2889/IV (Rieu Suppt.

1 Those Persian letters which Watavat collected himself in Abkar al-akhar fl l-ras'ul wa l-ash'ar and 'Ar'is al-
khawatir wa naftai's al-awadir were published, with an extensive introduction, by Q. Teymurani as Nashab-i Rashid al-din Watavat, Tehran 1338sh/1960, and a large number of Arabic letters were published (from an unidentified source) by Muhammad Fahmi under the title Majmu'at ras'ul Rashid al-din al-Watavat, 2 parts, Cairo 1315/1897-B. Ten of the latter are translated and analyzed by H. Horst, 'Arabische Briefe der Horsamadhsa an den Kalifenhof aus der Feder des Rashid al-Din Watavat', ZDMG 116, 1966, p. 24-43, and the same author has summarised many of the Persian letters (including several that have not yet been published) in his book Die Staatsverwaltung der Grofsenwagen (sic) und Horsamadhsa, Wiesbaden 1964.

2 E.g. Majnu'ah I p. 24 and 31 refer to the accession of the caliph al-Mustanjid in 555/1160.
212. Completed 28 Jamādā I 1293/1876; Tehran
Majlis 1841/1 (Munz. 26969. Dated Rabī‘ II 996
/1588); Sipah-sālār II 1196 (18th century?);
Masnad Riḍāwī VII 428 (Dated Jumādā I 1012
/1603); Lucknow Sprenger 464 (Dated 1064/1653-4);
Madjma‘ I 20 (‘very old’). Cf. Munz. III 26968-83.
Edition: Tehran 1339sh./1961 (ed. S. Nafisī,
with an extensive introduction).

Ibn Fundūq, Tatimmat ǧīwān al-ḥikmah, ed. M.
Shafigh, Lahore 1935, p. 165-8 of the Arabic
section and 112-3 of the Persian; al-Kātib al-
Iṣfahānī, Kharidat al-qaṣr (the section on Watbāt,
containing a good number of his Arabic letters
and verses, was published by M. Shafigh in OCM,
1934-5, at the end of fascicles XI/1, XI/2, XI/3, XII/4,
separate pagination); Ibn Isfandiyār, Tārīkh i
Tabaristan, ed. ‘A. Iqbal, Tehran 1320sh./1941, I
p. 109-12 (also Browne’s epitome p. 62-5); Yaqūt,
Ishāhād VII p. 91-5; ‘Aṣūf I p. 80-6; Shams passim;
Juwanī II p. 6-14, 18; Zakariyyā b. Muhammad al-
Qazwīnī, Aṭhār al-bīlād, ed. Wüstenfeld, Göttingen
1848, p. 223-5; al-Mukhtarāt min al-rasā‘i, ed.
I. Afshār, Tehran 2535sh./1976-7, p. 149-52,
284-3 (various letters); Mustaūfī p. 856-7;
Daqīq al-ashqār (Oxford Elliott 37 = Ethē 1333,
passim); Jājarmī passim; Daulat-shāh p. 87-92;
Jāmī, Bahāristān; Rāṣī II p. 68-76 (no. 563); Taqī
(his entry is printed in Nafisī’s introduction,
p. 10-15; see also London Or. 3506 fol. 368b sqq. =
Rieu Suppt. 105; Paris Supplément 799 fol. 122r
sqq. = Biochet 1242); Hīdāyat, Majmā‘ I p. 222-31;
Browne, History II p. 330-3; Furūsānjāfār I p. 345-
56; Bahār II p. 400-3; Brockelmann I p. 276-6,
Suppt. I p. 486; A. Ateş, ‘Raṣāl al-Dīn Watbāt’ in
eserlerinin bazıı yazma nüshaları’, Tarih dergisi
X, 1959, p. 1-24; Khayyām-pūr p. 229 (with further
references); Sa‘īd, Tārīkh II p. 628-36; PL III/1
p. 85-7, 176-8; EJ2 s.v. ‘Rašīd al-Dīn Watbāt’.

309. Muḥammad b. ‘Uṯmān al-Yāmīnī al-Kātib
is included by ‘Aṣūf in his chapter on the poets
of Ghaznah and Lahore at the time of the Seljugs,
where we find a qaṣīda dedicated to the Ghaznavid
Yāmīn al-daulah Bahārān-shāh (511/1117 to 552
/1167), to whom he owed his pen-name, as well a
number of ghazals and rubā‘īyāt. ‘Aṣūf also
mentions a lost work of his with the title Bazz-
ārā i Fakhrī. Hīdāyat splits the poems cited by
‘Aṣūf between two poets, ‘Kātib i Khurāsānī’ and
‘Yāmīnī i Ghaznawī’, both of whom he makes con-
temporary theories of Muḥammad of Ghaznah.

LF ed. Iqbal p. 17 (one verse by ‘Muḥammad i
‘Uṯmān’ in Ms. nūn in marg.); ‘Aṣūf II p. 687-91;
Hīdāyat, Majma‘ I p. 485-6 (‘Kātib’), 656
(‘Yāmīnī’); Sa‘īd, Tārīkh II p. 619-21; Khayyām-pūr
p. 384 (‘Uṯbā i Kātib’) and 660 (‘Yāmīnī i Ghaz-
nawī’).

310. al-Kāfī Ẓafar al-Hamadānī is the first
name in ‘Aṣūf’s chapter on the poets of Western
Persia during the Seljuk period. Here we find a
ghazal as well as a qaṣīda praising a king by the
name of Malik-shāh, who could in principle be
either Malik-shāh (I) b. Alp-Arslān (485/1092 to
485/1092) or Malik-shāh (II) b. Muḥammad (547/1152
to 548/1153), though Ẓafar’s position at the very
beginning of the chapter would seem to favour
identifying his patron with the former.2 The
12th-century Shī‘ite apologist ‘Abd al-Jalāl al-
Kāfī wrote that although Kāfī Ẓafar was a Sunnite,
his diwān contains so many poems in praise of ‘Alī
and his family that people suspected him of

1The nisbah, which is clearly indicated at the begin-
ing of ‘Aṣūf’s entry, is, in the superscription, corrupt in both
Mas. (see Browne’s apparatus criticus) and was ‘emended’ by
Browne most unfortunately to ‘al-Uṭbā’.

2Differently Sa‘īd.
Shi'ism. Eight short poems by 'Zafar Hamadânî', all of homiletic content, are quoted in the anonymous Babr al-fawâ'id, a work written at the beginning of the second half of the 6th/12th century; in one of these the poet refers to himself as 'Zafar' and in another he alludes to Malik-shâh (I) and his minister Tâj al-mulk (died 486/1093).\(^1\) The old anthology published by Yaghmâ'i contains two substantial poems by Kâfî Zafar, one of them an ode to a person addressed as 'şadr i İslâm saiyidu l-wuzarâ' and as 'şstâd i ra'Is Noshirwân' evidently the wasîr Anûshérwân b. Khâlid (died 532/1140).

Abû l-Râjî\(^2\) Qummî\(^2\) quotes two verses by Aqâb al-dîn Abû l-'Ashâ'îr, 'the son of Kâfî Zafar', and al-Kâtib al-Isfahânî devotes an entry to the same person in the chapter of his Kharîdat al-qaar devoted to the notables of Hamadân,\(^3\) evidently with the information that he died after 555/1160.


1The verse, which is quoted both on p. 3 and on p. 443, reads: ân kî-st mulk-shâh u mar În kî-st tâj i mulk ân kî-st qadr-khwâîn i salâtîn i nân-dâr. The metre does not allow 'Malik-shâh', but it can hardly be doubted that with 'mulk-shâh' and 'tâj i mulk' the poet is indeed alluding to the sultan and his wasîr.


3See Leyden Cat. II p. 234.

311. Zâhir al-dîn Abû l-Faḍl Tâhir b. Muhammad Fâryâbî was, like his contemporary Aḥîr Akhsâkatî, a native of Eastern Iran who emigrated to the North-West. His first major patron seems to have been the ruler of Našâbûr, the 'King of the East' 'Aqâb al-dîn Toğhân-shâh, who died in Mubarram 582/1186,\(^1\) the dedicatee of about a dozen of his poems. Ibn Isfandîyr says that for some time Zâhir served at the court of the Bâwendî ruler of Tabaristan, Husâm al-daulâb Abû l-Hasan Ardashîr b. al-Hasan (568/1173 to 602/1205-6), and then departed, with Ardashîr's permission, to 'visit' the atabeg of Azerbaijan Qizzal Arslân b. Elüdûz (582/1186 to 587/1191).

Poems to both of these (a rather larger number to the latter) can be found in his dîwân. After the death of Qizzal Arslân Zâhir praised the atabeg Nusrat al-dîn Abû Bakr (591/1195 to 607/1210), his principal patron. However, it must be said that although a good number of poems do mention this ruler by name (i.e. Abû Bakr) there are at least two odes\(^2\) to his contemporary Nusrat al-dîn Bâsh-kîn, the ruler of Ahar and dedicatee of Nişâmî's Iskandar-nâmah.\(^3\) It is therefore possible that some of the many poems which mention only 'Nusrat al-dîn', without personal names, might in fact have been directed towards the latter, rather than the atabeg. There is also at least one poem to the


2The poem beginning on p. 52 of Bânish's edition mentions Bâshkîn in the verses as well as in the superscription in Ms. alif. The poem beginning on p. 243 mentions 'Nusrat i dîn Bâshkîn' in the verses and names this king again in the superscription in Ms. alif. The rubric in other Ms. identify Abû Bakr as the dedicatee of both poems, as does Bânish.

3The historical material concerning this ruler is collected above, p. 443 n. 2.
Seljuq Toghril III and one to Khāqānī's patron Akhsatān. Several poems are addressed to one or more of the Khujandī ṣadrīs of Isfahan, and to various ministers.

Mustaufī says that Zahir died in Tabrīz in 598/1201-2. Some copies of his dīwān contain a preface (inc. sipās be nīhāyat u āfrīn be pāyān qādir-e rā kih du shams dar ḫujrah i dimāgh i mā afrākh), the author of which (not named, but evidently the Shams al-dīn Sujāsī who, again according to Mustaufī, collected Zahir's poems) states that he had hoped to meet Zahir, but that the latter had died before he could do so. He thereupon collected Zahir's poems and dedicated the compilation to the wasīr Majd al-daulah wa l-dīn.

Zahir is a poet who has been particularly badly served by the copyists and printers. At least some (and possibly all) of the editions lithographed in India ostensibly of the dīwān or 'Kulliyāt' of Zahir Fārābī contain the works of a different and much later poet (according to Naftāī the 11th/17th-century writer Zahir Shīrāzī), while the old Tehran edition (and evidently many of the manuscripts) contains many poems by Shams Tabāsatī. Taqī Bīnīsh, in his careful edition of Zahir's dīwān, has attempted to eliminate the spurious poems, but since he had only late manuscripts at his disposal his results cannot be regarded as altogether final.

Mss.: Dublin Beatty 331 (Copied by Murshid al-Kātib and dated 20 Dhi l-biḥajj 882/1478); Beatty 262 (Copied by Shāh Qāsim and dated 'Jumādā' 1023/1614. Pictures); Manchester Lindesiana 261 (16th century?); Lindesiana 574 (Dated 1105/1693-4); Oxford Whinfield 8 (Beeston 2827/20. Dated 18 Rabī' II 1008/1599); Whinfield 54 (Beeston 2862/2. Dated 9 Rajab 1012/1603. Selections); Elliot 120 (Ethis 583. Dated 26 Rajab 1015/1606); Elliot 119 (Ethīs 582. Incomplete; with the preface); Elliot 421 (Ethīs 584); London Or. 3325 (Rieu Supp. 222. Dated Ramaḍān 873/1469. Contains the preface); Add. 19,498 (Rieu p. 562-3. 16th century?); Or. 3301 (Rieu Supp. 223. 16th century? With preface); Or. 10916 (Meredith-Owens p. 59. 16th-17th century?); Add. 7733 (Rieu p. 563. Dated Shawwāl 1035/1626); Or. 2880/I (Rieu Supp. 224. Completed Jumādā I 1245/1829); I.O. 971; Cambridge Or. 1696 (2nd Supp. 441. Dated 902/1496-7); Or. 1347 (2nd Supp. 167. 16th century?); Oo. 6. 46. (Browne Cat. CCX); Paris Supplément 795 fol. iv sqq. (Blochet 169. Dated 8 Ramaḍān 847/1443); Supplément 701 (Blochet 1246. Dated 8 Shabābān 1016/1607. Contains the dīwāns of Azzaqī and of Zahir al-dīn, but the pages are in disorder); Supplément 700 (Blochet 1243. 17th century?); Supplément 807 (Blochet 1244. 17th century?); Supplément 1841 (Blochet 1245. 19th century); Berlin Ms. or oct. 69 (Pertsch 747. Dated Monday 11 Jumādā II 7/1152/1739); Minutoli 24 (Pertsch 748. Has a seal dated 1158/1745); Sprenger 1523 (Pertsch 691/1. Dated 1712/1802-3); Ms. or oct. 2855 (Heinz 374. Dated 6 Ṣafar 1290/1873); Vienna Kraft CLXXXVIII; Uppsala Tornberg CLXVII (Ms. dated 28 Shawwāl 831/1428. Contains, according to the catalogue, the dīwān of Zahir al-dīn as no. 2, and that of Ḥasan [sci. Dihlawī] as no. 4, but of the incipits quoted there the former belongs to Ḥasan and the latter to Zahir); Leningrad Acad. C 1962 fol. 1b-49b (Index 1562. Ms. dated 878/1473-4); Acad. A 481 fol. 1b-144a (Index 1559. Dated 989/1581); Acad. C 64 (Index 1561. Dated 1241/1825-6); Acad. B 138 (Index 1560); Istanbul Evat 2655 (Duda p. 70.Copied by Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Sharaf al-'Arabī Abūh and dated 10 Rabī' II 717/1317); Aya-
sofya 2051/16 (Mikrūfīma-hā i p. 409-10. Ms. apparently dated Shawwāl 730/1330); University FY 496/1 (Ates 88. Copied by al-Ḫusayn b. Muhammad al-Madīnī and dated 21 Jumādā I 759/1358); Topkapi, Hazine 795 fol. 218b sqq. (Karatay 887. Ms. dated Rabī‘ I 810/1407. Pictures); University FY 668 (olim Halis Efendi 4842. Ateğ 89. Copied by Shaik h b. Hasan b. Ahmad al-Saghīr and dated 840 /1436-7); Nuruosmaniye 4190 fol. 102b-182b (Ateğ 90 and 431. Dated 7 Jumādā II 844/1440 or 884 /1479); Fatih 3842 (Ritter-Reinert p. 123-4. 15th century? Has an owner's mark dated 906/1500-1); University FY 1120 (olim Halis Efendi 5362. Ateğ 91. 15th century?); University FY 157 (Ateğ 92. Dated 1044/1634-5); Hekimoğlu Ali Paşa 669/5 (Mikrūfīma-hā i p. 420-1. Apparently old); Cairo 57 mīm adab fārisī (Tirāzī I 761. Dated 1047/1637-8); 58 mīm adab fārisī (Tirāzī I 762); Tehran Majlis VIII 2460 (13th century?); Bāyānī 54/1 (Nuskhah-hā i p. 15. Dated 768/1366-7); Malik 4925/11 (Munz. 24426. 'Circa' 842/1438-9); Gulistan/Ktābāy II 420/III (Ms. dated 862/1457-8. Selection of qaṣīda of and tarkībāt); Bāyānī 12 (Nuskhah-hā i p. 9. Copied by Ghiyāth al-dīn Qāsimī and dated 883/1478-9); Sipah-salār II 1223 (Dated 895/1489-90); Gulistan/Ktābāy II 435/II (Ms. dated 866/1461); Bāyānī 56/1 (Nuskhah-hā i p. 15. Dated 995/1587); Gulistan/Ktābāy II 305 (Has an owner's mark with the date 1000/1691-2); Univ. IX 2598/3 (Dated Jumādā I 1015/1606); Gulistan/Ktābāy II 304; Gulistan/Ktābāy II 306; Mashhad Ridawī VII 741/1 (Ms. dated 10 Rabī‘ I 1055 /1645); Siddīqī VII 360/2 (17th century?); Dursunbâne Acad. II 374 (Dated 14 Rabī‘ I 1077/1666); Pakistan (see Munz. Pak. VII p. 159-60); Bombay Rehatse k p. 142 no. 57; Lucknow Sprenger 542 (with the preface); Aligarh Subb. Ms. p. 31 no. 6 (Dated 1009/1600-1); Bankapore I 36 (15th cen-

tury? With the preface); Madras 29 (15th century?). Cf. Munz. III 24419-96.

Editions containing (or purporting to contain) Zahir’s dīwān: Calcutta 1245/1829-30; Lucknow 1295 /1878; 1307/1895; 1331/1913; 1926; Tehran 1334 /1906 (ed. Shaikh Aḥmad Shīrāzī); 1338/1909-60 (ed. H. Radī); Cawnpore 1916; Mashhad 1337sh./1959 (critical edition by T. Binish).

His qaṣīda maṣū‘ī is found in Istanbul University FY 931/5 (Ates 93. Dated 2 Rabī‘ I 962 /1555).


312. Zahir al-dīn ‘Abbāl Allāh b. Shafrūh was, according to ‘Aunī, the cousin (pisar-sam) of Sharaf al-dīn i Shafrūh. The dīwān ascribed to him in London I.0. 934 is evidently the work of a later poet (according to Qaswānī, it is by Rukn al-dīn b. Raflī al-dīn Kirmānī, a contemporary of Shafrūh). 1

1The verse attributed to Zahir on p. 114 in fact belongs to a qaṣīda by Jamāl al-dīn Iṣfahānī; see M. Iqbal in his edition of Rāwandī’s Rābat al-qudūr p. 36 n. 4.

2For whose see above, p. 539-43, where the name of their common ancestor is discussed.
Mustausfī, but according to Nafisī it is by the 14th-century poet Rukn al-dīn Harawī, known as Rukn i Sāʾīn).

‘Auffī I p. 273-4 (and Qazwīnī ad loc.); Sharwānī, Nūṣ'hat al-majālis (see above, p. 242); Ṣāisi II p. 366 (no. 868; from ‘Auffī); Ḥidāyat, Riyād p. 104; Khaiyām-pūr p. 363 (‘Zahīr i Ḥṣafahān’).

313. Ismāʿīl b. Ḥbrāhīm, known as Zar-ruš, is included by ‘Auffī in his chapter on the poets of Ghazines and Lahore at the time of the Seljuqs, where we find two of his ghazals.


APPENDIX:
ANONYMOUS NARRATIVE POEMS
ATTRIBUTED TO THE PRE-MONGOL PERIOD

314. The Bahman-nāmah and the Kōsh (or Gōsh) nāmah were obviously written by one and the same poet at the very beginning of the 12th century; his identity has, however, not been established satisfactorily. In the modern secondary literature (as well as on the title-page of ‘Auffī’s edition of the Bahman-nāmah) the two poems have been ascribed to one E/Irān-shāh, but the name is not in fact mentioned in this form in any source. The basis for the attribution is a passage in Bahār’s edition of the Mujmal al-tawārikh (p. 92) which states that the hero Zāl i zar died during the reign of Dārū (Darius), and adds that the only book in which the author found this information is a version (nuskhah) of the Bahman-nāmah ‘which Ḥakīm yr-nān b. Abī l-Khāir versified’. The name is indistinct in the Paris manuscript, the only copy available to the editor, who consequently suggested that it might represent a corruption of Erān-shāh or Erān-shahrī. However, there are other copies of the Mujmal, among them a Dublin manuscript dated 823/1420, and here the name is written quite clearly as ‘yr-nān’. This could, I think, conceivably represent Erān-nishān ‘Erān’s sign (of glory, or the like)’, or perhaps Erān-sitān, ‘conqueror of Erān’; Bahār’s emendations, though possible, are not particularly likely.

What, however, is more important is the fact that the information for which the author of the Mujmal refers to this book (namely that Zāl died during the time of Dārū) is not to be found in the extant Bahman-nāmah and also that the one verse which he quotes from the poem cannot be located in the work that we have before us. If Erān-nishān (or whatever) did in fact write a Bahman-nāmah, then it is clearly not our Bahman-nāmah. Indeed the author of the Mujmal, speaking as he does of this ‘version’ of the Bahman-nāmah, seems to imply that he was aware of more than one telling of the story.

Ḥidāyat reports that ‘some people say’ that the Bahman-nāmah is by Jamāl i Mihrījirī, whom, in another place, he lists among the contemporaries of Lāmi-i, repeating there the information that he is the author of this poem. Unfortunately, this

---

1His edition of ‘Auffī p. 646.
2According to Dānish-pashuh the Nus’hab contains also rubā’īyāt by ‘izz al-dīn (i) Ṣafarūh, whom Zakariyā b. Muhammad al-Qazwīnī (Athār al-bilād, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 197) enumerates among the poets of Isfahān.
4Dublin Beatty 322, of which a microfilm is in my possession. The passage which interests us in on fol. 23b. For other Wns. of the Mujmal see PL I p. 1229.
5As was observed already by Riou, Suppt. p. 136.
7Mujma 4 I p. 494.
Janālī does not seem to be mentioned anywhere else. Finally, on the endorsement of London Or. 2780 the poem is attributed to Ḥdharī (as it is also in Munzawī), but this is merely the result of a confusion between this Bahman-nāmah and Ḥdharī's epic of the same name celebrating the Bahmanī sultans of Delhi.

The opening section of the Bahman-nāmah has come down to us in several different forms. The version given in the two Paris manuscripts, followed by 'Affī's edition (inc.: zi mā āfrīn bar jahān-āfrīn * kih 6 rū sīzad bar jahān āfrīn), speaks of ten years having passed since the death of Malik-Shāh, which would seem to indicate that the poem was composed in 495/1101-2. The author then launches into an encomium of that king's son Muhammad, who was not officially invested as sultan until 498/1105, but who was in open rebellion against his half-brother, Berka-yārūq, from 490/1097 onwards. It is thus by no means impossible that our poet could have dedicated this work to Muhammad as early as 495. The prologue in London Or. 2976 (inc.: nakhūstīn sukhan nām i dādar i dād * kih bā yād i 6 nām-hā hast bād) also contains the verses implying the completion of the poem in 495, but does not apparently name the ruler to whom it is dedicated. The oldest copy, London Or. 2780/III begins with the same verses as Asadī's Karshāsp-nāmah (i.e. these verses were interpolated by a copyist to fill a lacuna in his prototype) and also mentions Muhammad by name; this version then proceeds to describe at length (according to Rieu) two events during the first part of that king's reign: the capture of the Ismā'īlī stronghold Shahdiz (near Isfahan) in 500/1107 and the defeat of the 'king of the Arabs', i.e. Amīr al-'Arab Sa'īf al-daulah Sādaqā b. Mazyid, in Rajab 501/1108. It would thus seem most likely that the poem was originally completed, and dedicated to the rebellious Muhammad, in 495/1101-2, but that the author revised and up-dated his preface some five years later.

The poem contains the story of Isfandiyār's son Bahman and his wars against the family of Rustān, an episode narrated at some length in the Shāh-nāmah, but much elaborated here. It tells of his coronation, his adventures with Katāyūn, the daughter of the king of Kashmir, and Hūšā, the daughter of the king of Egypt, the death of Rustān and of Bahman's campaign against Rustān's relatives in Sīstān. Bahman captures Zāl, kills Farāmār and pursues Rustān's daughters to India. He captures the two girls and also Rustān's grandson, Adharbūzīn, son of Farāmār. After defeating the whole family Bahman abdicates in favour of Hūšā and is killed by a dragon while hunting.

In the later of the two London manuscripts the Bahman-nāmah is preceded (on fol. 59b-62a) by the Dāstān i Adharbūzīn, a short fragment elaborating further on the war between Bahman and Adharbūzīn.  

1 Mss. of the Bahman-nāmah: Oxford Pers. c. 26 (Beeston 2544/3, Ca. 8000 verses); London Or. 2780/III (Rieu Suppt. 201. Dated Rabī' I 800/1397, Pictures); Or. 2976/II (Rieu Suppt. 197. Dated 1 Jumādā I 1252/1836. Interpolated into the Shāh-nāmah. Pictures); Paris Ancien fonds 277 (Blochet 1192/Richard. 17th century?); Supplément 500 (Blochet 1193. Dated 7 Asfandārām, 1064 Yazd./1695); Tehran Univ. IX 2414 (17th-18th century?); Arak

1 See Sa'īf, Ḡamāsah p. 315-6; Rastegar, Problematik p. 31-3.
Bayāt (Nuskhah-hā VI p. 66. Dated 885/1480-1. Interpolated into the Shāh-nāma); Navāri Meherji Rana p. 98 no. 109; Hyderabad Sālār Jung IV 1114/1 (17th century?). Cf. Munz. IV 27894-27900.


The Kōsh-, (Gōsh-?)nāmah (inc. turā ai khirad-mand i rōshan-rwān * zabān kard yazdān az In sān rwān) is the work of the same author, who, in the prologue, refers to the reward he had received for the Bahman-nāmah and mentions yet again the defeat inflicted by his master on the ‘king of the Arabs’. The author of the Mujmal al-tawārikh mentions in succession the akhār-i Bahman and the qisāsah i Kōsh i ʿFil-dandān while enumerating the poems composed in the manner of the Shāh-nāmah.

This poem tells the story of two kings of China at the time of Farādūn, namely Kōsh, the brother of Dabhāk, and his son Kōsh i ʿFil-dandān. An edition is being prepared by J. Matinī.

Ms.: London Or. 2780/IV (Kiev Supp. 201 Ms. dated Safar 800/1397. Pictures).

Mujmal p. 2; Safā, Hamāsah p. 296-300; J. Matinī, ‘Kōsh i ʿFil-gūn, nabard i pīdar u pisar’, Irān-nāmah II/2, 1985-6, p. 290-300; id., ‘Kōsh yā Gūsh?’; Trān-nāmah VI/1, 1987, p. 1-14; id., ‘Farādūn wa sar-zamīn i āftāb i tābān’, Irān-shi-

11 i.e. the editio minor of 1876-8 (see above p. 150).

315. The Bānū-Gushasp-Nāmah tells the story of one of Rustam’s daughters. It has been published nor as yet studied in detail.

Mss.: Oxford Ouseley 28 (Ethē 509, 16th century? End missing); Ouseley 30 (Ethē 515, Extracts only, with interpolated verses); Pers. c. 26 (Beeston 2545/5. 612 verses. End missing); Paris Supplément 498 fol. 145v sqq. (Blochet 1194, 18th century). Cf. Munz. IV 27647-51.

Extracts interpolated into copies of the Shāh-nāmah: London Or. 2926 fol. 249b-251a (Rieu Supp. 196/IX. Ms. completed Rabī’ I 1249/1833).

Cf. Mohl’s translation of the Shāh-nāmah I p. lxxiv-lxxv; Safā, Hamāsah p. 300-2; Rastegar, Problematik p. 30-1.

316. A fragment of a versification of the famous story of Bilavbar u Dūdīnāf transcribed into Manichaean script (33 verses, not one of which is complete) was discovered by Henning among the documents from Turfan. The primary interest of the fragment is its antiquity; the unique copy is, according to Henning, ‘not later than the first half of the 10th century’. The poem itself would appear to be by a contemporary imitator of Dūdīkī.

317. The Būrzū-nāmah recounts the adventures of Būrzū, the son of Suhrāb and grandson of Rustam, at least the first part of which are an obvious doublet of the story of Suhrāb as we know it from the Shāh-nāmah: The orphaned Būrzū is brought up by his mother in the land of Tūrān. He joins Afrāsāyēb in his wars against the Iranians, meets Rustam on the battlefield, engages him in battle, but at the last moment is recognised by and reconciled with his grandfather. Būrzū then defects to the Iranian side and wages war against Afrāsāyēb. There is long episode involving the sorceress Sūsān. In the end the hero is killed by a demon.

A fairly short version of the story (ca. 4000 verses) has been interpolated into a number of copies of Firdausī’s Shāh-nāmah and was published in the appendix to Macan’s edition of that poem. Much more extended versions are in existence, but these remain unpublished. The descriptions of their contents in various publications suggest significant differences among the existing manuscripts, which perhaps contain several different poems with the same name.

The authorship of the Būrzū-nāmah has been the subject of much confusion. The first scholar to draw attention to the work was Anquetil-Duperron who declared, without giving any reason, that it was the work of one ‘Atā’ī. This information was doubted already by Mohl. But Blochet, in his description of the manuscript bequeathed by Anquetil to the Bibliothèque Nationale, attributed the work without further ado to ‘Khadjāj ‘Amid

'Aṭāī ibn Ya‘qūb, surnommé ‘Aṭāī Razī’, i.e. to the poet whom we have encountered above (p. 267-8) as ‘Aṭā’ī i Ya‘qūb, and to whom Hīdāyat ascribed (evidently wrongly) the nisba hāzī. This attribution has been widely accepted both by western and by Iranian scholars, but has never been substantiated. Its basis has, however, finally become clear with the publication of Mirzoev’s description of the manuscript in Dushanbe which contains on fol. 150a (i.e. about 12 pages from the end of the poem) a verse which Mirzoev quotes as: khudāy-ā ‘aṭā bar ‘aṭā’ī kūn ‘aṭā’ī kī hāstād dārmānah u bē-nawā’ī. As it stands, the verse does not scan; what is required is evidently something like ... ‘aṭā kūn ‘aṭā’ī kī hāstām (sic!) dārmānah u bē-nawā. That this really contains the name of the author is far from certain; ‘aṭā bar ‘aṭā means perhaps simply ‘gift upon gift’, rather than a gift to ‘Aṭā’. But it is apparently this verse which induced Anquetil to ascribe the poem to one ‘Aṭā’ī, whom Blochet then identified, quite arbitrarily, with the ‘Aṭā’ī i Ya‘qūb known to him from the tadkhīrah.

The Būrzū-nāmah does not seem to be mentioned in any early source and there are no dated copies before the 16th century. The question of whether it is really as old as has formerly been believed must, however, be deferred until such time as a scholarly edition of the poem is available.

Mss.: Oxford Fraser 85 (Ethē 511. Dated 1012/1603-4. Apparently only an extract); Pers. c. 26 (Beeston 2544/4. 316 verses); Paris Supplément 497 (Blochet 1191. Dated day Khurshīd, month Mīhr, 1102/7.1733. Story of Sūsān only); Supplément 499 (Blochet 1189. Copied in 1760. Beginning and end missing. Pictures); Supplément 499a (Blochet 1190. Dated 1174/1760 and copied from the same 17th century Mss. as the preceding. Pictures); Rome Sbah 652 (Dated 1014/1605-6. See the article by Piemontese); Cluj (Mentioned by Piemontese and Richard);
Istanbul Laleli 1668 (17th century? Incomplete at both ends. See the description by Richard); Dushanbe Acad. II 324 (19th century); Navsari Meherji Rana p. 98 no. 110. Cf. Munz. I 4463-7.

Extracts inserted in Ms. of the Shāh-nāma, or containing fragments of various epics: Manchester Lindesianis 9 (=Robinson 431-74. 15th century? Pictures); Lindesianas 909 (=Robinson 1481-1579. Dated 23 Jumādī II 1060/1650. Pictures); Oxford All Souls MS. 288 (Robinson p. 185-6. Dated 26 Safar 988/1580. Pictures); London Or. 4906 fol. 261a-303a (Rieu Supпт. 195/II. 17th century?); Or. 2926 fol. 193a-221b (Rieu Supпт. 196/VIII. Compiègnes 1 I 1249/1833); Paris Supplément 1027 fol. 201-236 (Blochet 1174. 18th century?); Supplément 1023 fol. 55v sqq. (Blochet 1180. 8000 verses. 19th century); Supplément 502 fol. 235 sqq. (Blochet 1198. 18th century); Supplément 1307 fol. 173v-207v; Smith-Lesouef 222 fol. 263-304 (these two according to Richard's article p. 242 n. 1); Genoa Bibl. Universitaria Ms. C.VII.145 (Piemontese 172. 19th century?); Naples Bibl. Nazionale Ms. III.G.68 and 68bis (Piemontese 220-221, the former dated 977/1569); Uppsala Tornberg CLXXXII/2; Leningrad Dorn CCCCXXI (16th century? Pictures); Dorn CCCCXXI (=16th century?); Acad. C 51 (17th century?); and doubtless many others.

Edition: in Macan's Shāh-nāma IV p. 2160-296. Translation (Gujarati): Ms.: Navsari Meherji Rana p. 142 no. 29 ('Burjor-Nameh: Vols. 8-10 and 12-15'). In the index the title is given as 'Barsu-Nāma'.


1 See below, p. 582 fn.

LATE ELEVENTH TO EARLY THIRTEENTH CENTURY

Anquetil-Duperron, Le Zend-avesta, Paris 1771, I/1 p. 536; Mohl's translation of the Shāh-nāma I p. lxxv-1xxviii; Šafā, Hamāsah p. 303-10; id., Taṛīkh II p. 477-83; A.M. Piemontese, 'I manoscritti persiani del fondo Sbath nella biblioteca Vaticana e un nuovo 'Barsūnāma', Rendiconti, ser. 8, vol. 33, 1978, p. 447-64; F. Richard, 'Une copie du Barzū-Nāma à la bibliothèque Sülleymanîye, le manuscrit Laleli 1668', Studia Iranica 13, 1984, p. 241-8; Eir s.v. 'Barsū-nāma' (Huart /Massé); Eir s.v. 'Borsū-nāma' (W.L. Hanaway, Jr.).

What is possibly a different Barzū-nāma is found in Cambridge King's, No. 56 (Browne Supпт. 171. 'Dated 829/1425-6, in error, apparently, for 1019/1610-11'. Browne describes it as 'not agreeing with the poem in London Or. 4906 and says that it 'deals with the adventures of Rustam and Subrab'. The colophon gives the author's name as Maulānā Shams al-dīn Nuhammad Kauji).

318. Farāmasr-nāma is the name of two different poems dealing with the adventures of Rustam's son Farāmarz. The two were combined, together with material from the Shāh-nāma and (it seems) other components of the Persian epic cycle, in the edition lithographed in Bombay in 1906; the credit for unravelling them belongs to Khālīqi-Nuṭlaq. Some poetic form of the Farāmarz-nāma was known already to the early 12th-century author of the Mūṣalt al-tawārīkh.

The 'first' or 'short' Farāmarz-nāma is attested in a fair number of manuscripts (inc. in most copies: ba nām i khudāwānd i rūzī-dīhm i yakā qīṣṣāh ārām birūn az nīhān). The anonymous
author calls himself 'a slave of the pure heart of Firdausi' (ghulām-e dil i pāk i Firdausī am) and claims to have the story from 'Sarw of Marv'. The latter is clearly identical with 'Azād Sarw', whom Firdausī gives as his source for the story of the death of Rustam1 and who, still according to Firdausī, 'was in Marw with Ahmad i Sahl', i.e. the Samanid governor of Marw, who was executed in 307/919, about a century before the time of Firdausī. It is thus quite clear that both Firdausī and his anonymous 'slave' must have had the material that they claim to derive from Azād Sarw not orally from him, but from some written source; the same source was used also by Tha'ālibī, who tells much the same story of Rustam's death. The 'short' Farāmasz-nāmah dwells in particular on its hero's adventures in India and includes an episode in which he debates with the Brahman and converts the king of India to the 'Persian religion'.

London Or. 2926 (a heavily interpolated copy of the Shāh-nāmah) contains, apart from the 'small Farāmasz-nāmah', also the story of the demon Shabrang (fol. 146a-167b) and his battles with Rustam and Farāmarz, this also on the supposed authority of Azād Sarw,2 and two other fragments dealing with the birth of Farāmarz.

The 'second' Farāmasz-nāmah was known to Khāliqi-Muṭlaq only from the Bombay lithograph, where it accounts for about the last 6000 verses. There is, however, at least one manuscript of this poem (London, Ross and Browne CLXVII), where it calls itself the 'great Farāmasz-nāmah'.3 The beginning in this version is copied from the first pages of the Shāh-nāmah (the opening verse is identical is both poems). The first verse which I have been able to locate in the lithograph is on fol. 9b 1. 2 (corresponding to p. 146 1. 16 of the edition); thereafter the edition seems to agree largely with the manuscript until about p. 382.1 The text does not appear to give any clear indication of the time or place of composition. Khāliqi-Muṭlaq has noted that this version shares two stories with the Nuz'hat-nāmah i 'Alā'ī of Shah-mardān b. Abī 'l-Khaib, a work compiled at the end of the 6th/11th or beginning of the 6th/12th century, but a careful investigation of the two texts is required before it can be said whether one has borrowed the stories from the other, or whether both have them from a common source.

Mss.: Oxford Ms. Pers. e. 13 (Ethé 1978); London Ross and Browne CLXVII (Dated 1166/1752-3. Insperxi); Or. 2946 fol. 50-109 (Rieu Supp. 199/II. 18th century?); Or. 2926 fol. 167b-179b (Rieu Supp. 196/VI, completed Rabi II 1249/1833. Interpolated into the Shāh-nāmah); Paris Supplément 498 fol. 1-48 (Blobchet 1194. Dated 12 Rab I II 1173/1759); Leningrad Publ. Lib. New Series 65 (Kostygova 405. Dated 20 Dhu l-qa'dah 1039/1630. Interpolated into the Shāh-nāmah); Bombay Breivi p. xxxii no. 22 (Dated 1244 Y./1874-5); Univ. XXV (Cat. p. 291. Defective at both ends); Cama p. 151, 177; Navsari Meherji Rana p. 91 no. 65 (Dated 4 Ardibilisht 956 Y./1586); Hyderabad Śāh Jung IV 1114/2 (17th century?). Cf. Nuzn. IV 32626-7.


A Gujarati translation (or several) is found in Navsari Meherji Rana p. 77 no. 58 (Imperfect); Meherji Rana p. 141 no. 26 (Imperfect).

1i.e. the page with the printed number '382'. The pagination in the lithograph is a mess.

1Shāh-nāmah, Moscow edition VI p. 322. For the following see also Khr. s.v. 'Azād Sarv' (B. Khāleghi-Muṭlaq).
2For this so-called Shab-rang-nāmah see also Ṣaffā, Ḥaṁsah p. 323.
3The title is given on fol. 1a as 'Farāmasz-nāmah i kalān' and on fol. 1b as 'Farāmasz-nāmah i buzurg'.
319. The *Humāy-nāmah*, a rambling story of the love of an Egyptian prince for the daughter of the king of Syria, is preserved in a unique manuscript in Dublin. The first page of the text (fol. 2) is supplied in a different hand (the poem begins on the verso with: sipās az khudāy-yē kih jān āfrīd * sipīhr u zamīn u zamān āfrīd) and this added leaf has in the margin an endowment-notice with the date Ramadān 712/1313, which, if authentic, would appear to give a terminus ad quem for the poem itself. The supposed title 'Kitāb i Humāy-nāmah' is scribbled on the recto of the same added page and is followed by 'Shāyistah', perhaps the pen-name of the author. Arberry claimed that the style of the poem makes it 'more or less contemporary with the Garshāsp-nāma and the *Vīs u Rāmān*'. He suggested also that its author was 'a crypto-Zoroastrian', but his only evidence for this are some rather vague verses (vs. 50-1) praising fire. The poem is dedicated to an unidentified 'glorious amīr'.1

Ms.: Dublin Beatty 301.


320. The *Jahāngīr-nāmah* is included here, for convenience, among the anonymous works of the pre-Mongol period although its author actually identifies himself as an otherwise unknown 'Qāsim the panegyrist' (Qāsim i mādīb) who 'versified this book in Herat', and although its pre-Mongol dating is anything other than certain. It is the story of Rustam's son Jahāngīr, whose adventures are remarkably similar to those of Shūrāb and even more so to those of Burzūs. Like them he is brought up among the Turanians, meets his father on the battlefield, but (like Burzūs) is recognised by his father and reconciled with him. He joins the Iranian ranks, fights on behalf of Kā-Kākās and after various adventures is killed by a dēw while hunting.

This poem stands apart from the other components of the 'epic cycle' through its language (Arabic words are fairly common) and its largely Islamic content.


Editions: Bombay 1847 (according to the Asaf-yaḥ catalogue III p. 100); 1867 (ibid. p. 630); 1892.


321. The *Kūk-i-Khādūr-nāmeh* is a little story of an incident in the childhood of Rustam. Ms.: Oxford Pers. c. 26 (Beeston 2544/2).

Extracts interpolated in copies of the Shāh-nāmah: London Or. 2926 fol. 107b-112b (Rieu Suppt., *Bārgīrī*, *BSOAS* LIV, 1991, p. 571-3 (with a photograph of the first page of the Ms. and a discussion of the endowment-notice).
no. 196 III, completed Rabī‘ I 1249/1833); R process
Casanatense Ms. 4893 (Piemontese 245. Dated Rama-
ğan 1036/1627).
Edition: In Mṣa‘n’s Shāh-nāmah IV p. 2133-60.
Ṣafā, Hamāsah p. 318-22; Rastegar, Problematik
p. 28-30.

322. Yūsuf u Zulaikha, the oldest of several
Persian versifications of the Biblical and Qur’ānic story of Joseph and the wife of Potiphar
(inc. ba nām i khudāwand i har du saray 9 kih
jāwād bāshad hamēshah ba jāy), has been published
as the work of Firdausī.1 The earliest source
that ascribes a poem on this subject to Firdausī
appears to be the 829/1425-6 'Bāysunghur' preface
to the Shāh-nāmah,2 where we read that the great
poet, after his flight from Ghaznah, eventually
made his way to Baghdad and the court of the
caliph, where he composed his version of the story
of Joseph.3 It is to the same period that the
oldest known manuscripts of the work belong.4
None of the earlier biographical sources have
anything to say about such a poem nor do there
seem to be any quotations from it in pre-Timurid
writings. And even in the Timurid period the work
does not appear to have been universally known as
a composition by Firdausī, otherwise it would be
difficult to explain why Jāmī makes no mention of
it in his own poem on the same subject, composed
in 888/1483.

None the less, the authenticity of the work
was upheld by scholars such as Ethé, who published

---

1For whom see above, p. 112-59.
2See above p. 126.
3The three verses quoted in Mṣa‘n’s introduction, p. 56,
are v. 121, 125 and 126 of Ethé’s edition.
4The earliest dated copy is the Berlin Ms. of 819/1416.
It is to be regretted that the author of the Berlin cata-
logue has not stated explicitly whether or not the poem is
ascribed to Firdausī in that codex.

an edition of the first half of the poem, as well
as by Nöldeke and Taqī-Ẓādah in their already
frequently mentioned monographs on Firdausī. It
was, however, challenged by Shērānī in the 1920s,
by Qārīb and Mīnuwī in the 1940s and by Nafīsī in
1950 and since then has generally been considered
disproved. But I do not think that the arguments
hitherto put forward by either side can be
considered totally satisfactory.

Any attempt to sort out the historical
circumstances of this poem is faced before all
else by the desolate state, even by Persian
standards, of the whole of its introductory
section. It is in fact clear that the book has
been re-attributed and re-dedicated several times
in the course of its history. This process has
even continued into recent times; the Tehran
edition of 1299/1882 contains, immediately after
the seven opening verses found in the manuscripts,
a versified encomium on the then ruling Nāṣīr al-
dīn Shāh Qājār. This sort of thing has evidently
happened before to the same poem. Unfortunately,
Ethé’s edition (the only one which quotes
variants), rather than trying to sort out the
various families of manuscripts, has thrown them
together into one great eclectic stew and thus
totally confused the history of the text. It is,
however, to his credit that he has at least
supplied us with a critical apparatus with the
help of which some of the confusion can be cleared
up.

The main basis for the attribution of the poem
to Firdausī is evidently the section in the intro-
duction (p. 23-5 of Ethé’s edition) in which the
author is represented as saying, first of all,
that he is an accomplished poet whose words every-
one knows and who has recited many a story. But
now he regrets the sins of his youth and has
become tired of Farādūn, Dābbāk, Kāj-Qubād and the
rest. ’I am wasting’, he says, ’half of my life
filling a whole world with the name of Rustam' (kīh yak nāmah az 'umr i khvad kam kunam * jahān-e pur az nām i Rustam kunam). After listing a number of other heroes of the national epic with whom he is now 'fed-up' (sīr) the author declares his intention to devote his talents to a worthy subject taken from the holy book. If the poem is not by Firdausī, the question inevitably arises of who else 'wasted half his life' singing the tales of Rustam and the other heroes. Or so at least it seems on the basis of the published texts.

However, in two Ethē’s manuscripts ('M' and 'W') a large part of this section is in fact missing. These copies lack in particular the verse in which the poet speaks of having retold the 'words of the kings' (v. 253), all of those mentioning the heroes of the Šahān-nāmah (v. 263-70), as well as those where he says that he will not tell 'another story of kings' (v. 291-3) and that his previous compositions were 'lies' (v. 295). When these are left out the whole passage takes on an entirely different appearance: the author is a supposedly famous poet who has previously recited many 'books of lovers' (v. 253: nāmah i dostān), which, good Muslim that he is, he now regrets. He is, in other words, not an ex-heroic but an ex-romantic poet. The absence, in 'M' and 'W', of all the verses referring to kings and heroes is all the more striking as it is precisely these manuscripts which otherwise offer a particularly full text; Ethē cites them as the representatives of his 'larger redaction'. It is therefore unlikely that they, of all copies, should have abridged this important section. Instead it should be clear that here at least they contain the original text and that the other manuscripts\(^1\) go back to a prototype into which a number of verses were interpolated specifically to give credence to the attribution of the poem to Firdausī. Without the added verses the textual evidence for such an attribution collapses completely. It seems thus that any future truly critical edition of Yūsuf u Zulaikāh must take as its point of departure a clear distinction between an (interpolated) 'Firdausīan' and a (possibly also interpolated) 'non-Firdausīan' family of manuscripts.\(^1\)

The same two manuscripts 'M' and 'W' contain (in v. 24-102) a eulogy of an un-named king whom the poet calls sultań i ḫīṣ-hā and who in a chapter-heading is given the no less vague title of pād-shāh i ilām and it is presumably in him that the author of the Bāysunghur preface saw the caliph of Baghdad.\(^2\) This section seems to be missing in all the manuscripts of the 'Firdausīan' redaction. Several of these have no dedication, but one (London Or. 2930, Ethē's 'B') has at an entirely different point in the introduction (Ethē prints it as v. 168-223) a rather interesting account of how the story of Joseph had previously been versified by two different poets: first by the well-known Abū l-Mu'ayyad Bālkhī\(^3\) and later by an otherwise unknown Bakhtyārī. The author says that he was in the presence of the 'mīr i ḫīṣq' in Aḥwāz when the latter mentioned Bakhtyārī’s versification of the story and requested our poet to re-do the work. Yet another dedication, not found in any of Ethē’s manuscripts (nor in the three which I have collated), was published by Qarīb from a copy in his possession and is also

\(^1\)The question is of course complicated by the possibility of cross-contamination of the two families.

\(^2\)As did Ethē in his article of 1888. In Gīrāf II p. 230 he retracted this and, following Nöldeke, identified Firdausī’s patron with one or other of the Buyid amīrs.

\(^3\)See above, p. 67-8.
found, according to Nafsī, in a quite modern manuscript of his own. This eulogises Abū 1-Fawāris Tughān-shāh b. Alp-Arslan, the Seljuk governor of Herat from before 465/1072 to at least 476/1083-4, the patron of Azreqī and, according to ‘Arūdī,2 an illustrious benefactor of poets in general. In this dedication the author thanks his patron effusively for having had his released from prison; in this connection we find two verses3 which Nafsī reads as:

\[\text{Amānī-st bisyār muddat ba jāy} \]
\[\text{kīh az darjī i sultān u bukm i khudāy} \]
\[\text{az in qal'ah dīl-shāh bērūn shavād} \]
\[\text{ba nāzādī i shāh i humāyūn shavād} \]

and which he translates as: 'Il y a longtemps qu’Amānī reste ici. L’ordre du Sultan et la volonté divine lui permettront de sortir en toute joie de cette forteresse et d’aller auprès de son auguste roi'; i.e. Yūsuf u Zulaikhā is the work of an otherwise unknown poet by the name of Amānī, a name which, after Nafsī, has made an astonishingly quick entry into the annals of Persian literature. It must, however, be said that the verses are hardly unambiguous and that both Qarīb and Minhūrī had already published them without suspecting the presence of a proper name. One could, I should think, equally well read amān (= ammān) nūst bisyār..., 'But he will not be in this place for much longer, for he will depart from this fortress' etc. But quite apart from this the question remains as to whether the dedication to Tughān-shāh is really part of the original poem or whether it is an interpolation (obviously a very early interpolation) by someone who had salvaged an older work and re-dedicated it to this king. In either case the passage does give us the terminus ad quem for the poem. One would like to know in particular whether the manuscripts with the dedication to Tughān-shāh also have the dedication to mīr i ‘Irāq or that to the pād-shāh i islām and whether they contain the verses about the author's supposed previous works in the field of heroic poetry. Qarīb and Nafsī say nothing to suggest that the latter are missing in their manuscripts.

It is thus clear that the manuscripts offer the choice of at least three different dedications and that as yet no objective arguments have been offered for the greater authority of one over the others. At least two of them (and very possibly all three) must be spurious. The question of which (if any) goes back to the original author can only be settled on the basis of a critical examination of all of the copies and their grouping in a stemma codicum.

The debate over the time and authorship of what we can, at least, now confidently call the pseudo-Firdausīan Yūsuf u Zulaikhā has inevitably detracted from the study of the content of what is doubtless an interesting early work of Persian narrative poetry and of its sources and its place in the Islamic genre of qisas al-anbiyā'.

---

1See above, p. 91.
2P. 43-4.
3They are quoted in context by Qarīb, Amūsāsh wa Farwārish IX/11-12 p. 13.
Supplément 1360 (Blochet 1177, 16th century? Pictures); Supplément 1055 (Blochet 1178, 19th century); Berlin Ms. orient. oct. 2302 (Heinz 228; Stchoukine 5. Dated 1 Safar 819/1416. Incomplete. Pictures); Uppsala Tornberg CLXXXII fol. 153b-217a (end missing); 1 Najaf (Munz. no. 36940. Dated 1287/1870-1); Tabriz Milli 2749 (Nuskhah-âh IV p. 316 no. 458); Tehran Univ. XV 4101 (Dated 18 Rajab 1207/1793); Milli (Nuskhah-âh IV p. 141. Dated 1242/1825-7); Maliki (Munz. no. 36936. Dated Safar 1250/1834); Majlis VII 2699 (Dated 1262/1846); Herat Museum 50 (Catalogue p. 329. Dated 1269/1852-3); Tashkent Acad. 195 (Semenov 759. 19th century); Pakistan (five Ms., all late, are listed in Munz. Pak. VII p. 19-20); Bombay Rehataek p. 170 no. 151 (Dated 1226/1811); Bankiopore I 12 (Dated 1240/1824-5. Pictures); Calcutta Ivanov 425 (Dated 877/1472-3. Poor condition); Bûhâr 279 (Dated 1038/1628-9); Lucknow Sprenger 223 (Two copies, one of which is apparently now Calcutta Ivanov 425); Los Angeles Univ. M920 (Nuskhah-âh XI/XII p. 95. Dated 26 Rajab 1243/1828. Beginning apparently missing). Cf. Munz. IV 36930-

1Microfilm in my possession. Tornberg's account of the Ms. is highly misleading; in fact it contains four different works, but the folios of the first two are mixed up with each other and it must be left to someone who actually has the Ms. in front of him (rather than merely a microfilm) to sort them out. The first work, after a dihâjâh of ten lines (inc.: ba nâm i khudâwând bê juft u yâr Â kih has râz-dân ast u has râz-dâr) is the story of Gushtâfap from the Shâh-nâmah (Moscow edition VI p. 65 sq.) The second is the Bûreâr-nâmah in a form very close to that published by Macan; this ends on fol. 144a (same verses as Macan IV p. 2296). After one blank page we find (fol. 145a-152a), again without any title, an extract from Niğâzâl's Haft païkar (Moscow edition p. 278 l. 21 to p. 311 l. 280). Then, after two blank pages, the poem under discussion in this article, beginning on fol. 153b in Eshâ, and breaking off on fol. 217a with the verse 8 lines from the bottom on p. 122 of the Cawnpore 1881 edition. The Ms. is not dated, but has a note recording its acquisition in Constantinople in A.D. 1782.
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Partial edition: Oxford 1908 (Yûsuf and Zali-khâ by Firdausi of Tûs edited ... by Hermann Ethê. Fasciculus priamus, containing the first half of the poem; based on 4 Ms. and the Tehran and Lucknow editions).

Translations: (German verse): O. Schlecht-Wasenr. Jussuf and Suleicha, romantisches Helden- gedicht von Firdusi, Vienna 1889. (Extracts from this translation also in Verhandlungen des VII. internationalen Orientalisten-Congresses ... Semitische Section, Vienna 1888, p. 47-72 and ZDMG 41, 1887, p. 577-99).


1These are the correct bibliographical details of the book cited above p. 119 n. 2.