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FROM THE PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

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

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

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

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

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

Manuscripts are listed under the name of the town where they are at present located (or of their last known location), arranged in roughly geographical order from West to East, beginning with Europe, and then, within each locality, by date. Much space and effort could have been saved by quoting only the hijri dates, and not converting them into Christian dates as well, but in this I have emulated Storey’s practice in the previous volumes. For the actual conversion I have tried to follow a scientific principle and only offered a precise Julian or Gregorian equivalent in cases where the day of the week is indicated in the source; for details the reader is referred to the article ‘Ṭarīkh’ in EF². Dates not actually mentioned in the manuscripts are evident as such; if, for example, a manuscript has been attributed to the 16th century not on the basis of a colophon or of some other clear indication, but merely of a (however well-founded) deduction by the editor of the relevant catalogue it will be cited as belonging to the ‘16th century?’ - with a question mark - or else no date will be suggested. The names of scribes are quoted from chapter III onwards, and then mostly only for the older manuscripts; this limits the usefulness of the relevant entries in the index, but I think these will not be entirely without value to students of codecology.

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

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

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

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

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

This volume came out in three fascicules, published in 1992, 1994 and 1997 respectively, the last with fairly extensive addenda and corrigenda. For the present second, revised, edition the addenda have been inserted into the appropriate place in the text, errors have been corrected and a few of the articles (notably those on the spurious writings of Nāṣir i Khusraw, on Shaḥīd Bābāhū and on Raḍ‘i Ḭunbāḥī) have been rewritten in the light of my subsequent researches. However, it has not been possible to work through the manuscript catalogues published since the early nineties and the codicological sections have consequently been reprinted virtually without change.


It is a pleasant duty to reiterate the thanks expressed at various places in the first edition to those scholars who have helped me with suggestions and criticism and sent me books or offprints. First of all to Professor A.D.H. Bivar who, first as a member of the Society’s publications committee, and then as president of the R.A.S., has shown great interest in and concern for this project and has made many valuable suggestions concerning both the content and the physical preparation of this publication, and to the Society’s former honorary treasurer, John Payne, for manifold support. Other colleagues who have helped me with their suggestions are A.L.F.A. Beelaert, C.F. Bosworth, J.T.P. de Bruin, S. Digby, C.W. Ernst, Abdullah Ghičhánt, M. Glužn, J.S. Meisami, C.P. Melville, B.W. Robinson, but in particular A.H. Morton, who has proposed a very large number of corrections and improvements, only a few of which are explicitly credited in the pages that follow. Naṣrullāḥ Fūr-jawādī generously sent me a large number of books and journals from Tehran. R. Zipoli has given me all the volumes of the *Lirica Persica* series. Mahmīd Jafārī has assisted me with some difficult Persian texts. Charlotte de Blois and Lydia Wright helped with the correction of the proofs of the first edition.
Important note: All cross-references (in the text and the index) are to the pages of the first edition. These are indicated in square brackets throughout the volume.
Note: Where several editions are listed, all references are, when not otherwise noted, to the one first mentioned (in most cases the oldest). It is a cause of constant dismay that editors of Persian texts (as opposed to the universal practice with regard, for example, to Greek and Latin books) almost always refuse to give any kind of page-concordance to previous editions of the same work. It is not possible to remedy the situation here. But future editors of these texts might wish to take the very slight trouble of indicating the page numbers of the editions first mentioned in this list in the margins of their publications, thus making it possible for readers to use their editions in conjunction with this book (and with many previous reference works). Where no page-numbers are indicated, the reader is referred to the index of the book in question.


‘Arūḍī = Aḥmad b. ‘Umar al-Nīẓāmī al-‘Arūḍī al-Samarrqandī, Chāhār maqāllaḥ (completed in 552/1157), ed. M. Qazwīnī,
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London/Leiden 1910; ed. M. Mu'ın, Tehran 1331sh./1952-3, and reprints. See also the translation by E.G. Browne, London 1921.


Bahār = M.T. Bahār, Sābāk-shināst, 3 volumes, Tehran 1321sh./1942.


Bākhārzī = Ābu Ḥasan ‘All b. al-Ḥasan al-Bākhārzī (died 467/1075), Dumyat al-qaṣr wa ʿṣrat ahl [5] al-ʿaṣr, ed. M.R. al-Ṭabākh, Aleppo 1349/1930; ed. ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ Muḥammad al-Hulw, n.p., n.d. (the preface to volume I - the only one available to me - is dated Cairo 1388/1968); ed. Sāmī Makī al-‘Āni, 2 vols., Baghdad 1390-1/1970-1. (Quoted according to the running numbers, which are identical in the latter two editions.)


de Blois, Burzōy = F. de Blois, Burzōy’s voyage to India and the origin of the Book of Kiltah wa Dinmah (=Royal Asiatic Society, Prize Publication Fund, Vol. XXIII), London 1990.


CHI = Cambridge History of Iran, Cambridge 1968- (in progress).


DMBI = Da‘īrāt i ma‘ārif i buzurghi islāmī, (English title-page: The Great Islamic Encyclopaedia), ed. Kazım Musavi Bujnurdeş, Tehran 1369sh./1990 - (the first four volumes are available to me).

Doerfer = G. Doerfer, Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen, 4 volumes, Wiesbaden 1963-75.


EI1 = The Encyclopaedia of Islam, 4 volumes and Supplement, Leiden 1908-36 (also in German and French editions).

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


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

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


Fiz = Farhang i Irān-zamān.


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


连续的页码，德黑兰1337-50sh./1959-71。这些额外的页码插入到第144页和第145页的卷一，数位，这些都用阿拉伯字母表示。（引文如下：“144+1”等。）

Jamī, Bahāristān = 'Abd al-Rahmān Jamī, Bahāristān (written in 892/1487), Cawnpore 1911; Tehran 1311sh./1932-3; ed. A. Afšāh-zād (Afshazdod), Dushanbe 1972.


JASB = Journal (& Proceedings) of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta. [9]

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


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


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


LF = Asadī’s neupersisches Wörterbuch Lughat-i Furs ... herausgegeben von Paul Horn (=Abhandlungen d. k. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, phil.-hist. Klasse, Neue Folge Band 1. Nro. 8), Berlin 1897 (A critical edition of the Vatican manuscript); Kitāb i lughat i furs, ta’līf i Abū Manṣūr ‘Alt b. Ahmad i Asadī i Ṭūs ... ba taṣāfī wa thīmān i ‘Abbās i Iqbal, Tehran 1319sh./1940-1 (Based on Horn’s edition and three manuscripts in private collections, ‘ain’, ‘stn’ and ‘nnn’); ed. M. Dabir-Siyāqi, Tehran 1336sh./1957 (essentially a reprint of Horn and thus not quoted here); ed. F. Mujtabā’ī and ‘A.A. Șādiqi, Tehran 1365sh./1986 (based on a manuscript in the Panjab University Library, quoted here as ‘P’, with many variants from other as yet unpublished manuscripts); Fereidī Rōbābī Salīmī, Fārhang, the oldest extant lexicon of the Persian language, compiled by (...) Asadī Ṭūsī (...) with correction of the Persian text and translation into English, edited from the Vatican manuscript, and compared with (...) other manuscripts and editions. From section alif to lām. (Unpublished dissertation, Cambridge, not dated in the available photocopy [ca. 1980]).

LN = Lughāt-nāmah, founded by ‘A.A. Dīh-khudā, continued by M. Mu’in et al., Tehran 1325-60sh./1946-81.

Majālis al-nafā’t = Two amplified Persian translations of the Eastern Turkish Majālis al-nafā’t by Mīr ‘Ali-Shēr Nawārī (died 12 Jumādā II 906/1501), ed. ‘A.A. Ḥikmat, Tehran 1323sh./1945, one (p. 1-178 of the edition) by Fakhru’ (see above), the other (p. 179-409) an anonymous translation completed in 929/1522-3.


MDAM = Majallah i dąnsk-kadah i adabīyāt (wa ‘ulām i insānt i dānsk-gāh) i Mashhad (or: Firdaust). (Revue de la faculté des lettres de Meched).

MDAT = Majallah i dąnsk-kadah i adabīyāt (wa ‘ulām i insānt) i Tihrān. (Revue de la faculté des lettres).


MF = Muhammad Qāsim b. Ḥājjī Muhammad Kāshānī, known as Surūr (died after 1036/1626-7), Majma’ al-furs (or: Farhang i Surūrī),


Mudabbirî = Mâymüd Mudabbirî, *Sharh i aţšâl u ašb-hâr i shâri'ân i bîr-dawân dar qari-hâ* in 3/4/5 i hifz i qarnart, n.p., 1370sh./1991. (Contains the collected fragments, with brief biographies and bibliographies, of most of the ‘minor’ poets discussed in this volume. Unfortunately, this work did not become available until after the publication of the major part of my first edition. I have not added references to the individual entries but refer the reader in principle to this useful publication.)


Munz. = A. Munzawfi, *Fihris i nuskhah-hâ i khâft i fârst*, 6 volumes in 7, Tehran 1348sh./1969 seq. (last volume not dated. Quoted here by the running numbers. In general I refer to ‘Munz.’ only when

I have no other information about a given manuscript. See also the introductory remarks to ‘Manuscript collections’, below.


Mushâr = Khân-Bâbâ Mushâr (and others), *Fihris i kitâb-hâ i chapt i fârst*, 5 volumes, Tehran 1350sh./1961 to 2353sh.sh./1976.


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

Nadrîr Ahmad = ‘Notes on important Arabic and Persian MSS. found in various libraries in India’, *JASB N.S. XIII*, 1917, p. lxvii-xviii, XIV, 1918, p. xciii-ccclvi. References are to the serial numbers in the Persian section of the latter part.


**NDAT =** Nashtriyâ (intermittently: Majallah) i dînîsh-kadah i adabiyyât (wa 'ulamâ i inšâr) i Tahrîlz (Revue de la faculté des lettres de Tabriz). [13]


OCM = Oriental College Magazine.

OLZ = Orientalistische Literaturzeitung.

Or. Suec. = Orientalia Suecana.

Pertsch = see Manuscript collections, Berlin.


PL = the present Persian Literature. With PL I compare the much extended Russian translation by Yu. E. Bregel: ЧА. Стори, Персидская Литература, био-библиографический обзор, 3 volumes, Moscow 1972.


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

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


Rivàyats (Dhabbar) = Ervad Bamanji Nusserwanji Dhabbar, The Persian Rivâyats of Hormazdār Framarz and others (translated with many corrections and much new material), Bombay 1932.

Robinson, Paintings = see Manuscript collections, Oxford.

RSO = Revisti degli studi orientali.

Rypka = J. Rypka, and others, Dějiny perské a tátelské literatury, Prague 1956; 2nd enlarged edition 1963; Iranische Literaturgeschichte [15] (revised translation from the Czech), Leipzig 1959; History of Iranian Literature (translated, with further additions, from the previous versions), Dordrecht 1968. (All references are to the English edition.)
Saif Harawi = Saif b. Muḥammad b. Ya'aqūb, Tārtkh-nāmah i Harāšt (ca. 721/1321; cf. PL I p. 354-5), ed. M.Z. al-Ŝidqi, Calcutta 1944 (contains a large number of quotations from poets of the pre-Mongol period. References have been given only to a few lesser known authors.)


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

Salimi = see LF


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

SB München = Sitzungsberichte der (königlichen) bayrischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-philo-logische Klasse.


sh. = shamsī.

sh.sh. = shāhanshāhī.

Shafi'i-Kadkanī, Šawwar = M.R. Shafi'i-Kadkanī, Šawwar i khiyāl dar shi'r i pārsī, Tehran 1350h./1971; 2nd (much expanded) edition Tehran 1358h./1979-80; 3rd edition Tehran 1366h./1987. (Quoted according to the 2nd/3rd edition.)


Sprenger = see Manuscript Collections, Lucknow.

St. = Storey’s handwritten notes.

**GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY**

7th/13th or 8th/14th century, ed. Ḥ. Yaghmāʾī, Tehran 1343h./1964.


ZDMG = *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*. [19]
Note: In the main part of this Survey manuscripts will be listed under the name of the place where they are located (or of their last known location). Within each entry these will be arranged in a roughly geographical order from West to East, beginning with the British Isles, and not, as in the present list, alphabetically. 'Late' manuscripts, i.e. those copied after 1250/1834-5, are recorded selectively (and usually omitted if they are listed in Munzawi).

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

Aberystwyth

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

Aligarh
Subhān Allāh Ōriyantal Lā'ārārīt Muslim Yüniversiti 'Alt Garh murattabah i Suyid Kāmil Husain... Aligarh 1930.

Ann Arbor

Antalya
Türkiye Yazmaları Toplulu Kataloğu 07, Antalya, 5 volumes, Istanbul 1982-4. [20]

Baku
Alyazmaları Katalogu, by M.S. Sultanov, 2 volumes, Baku 1963-77.

Bankipore (Patna)


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

Pertsch = Verzeichniss der persischen Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin von W. Pertsch. Berlin 1888. (The manuscripts are at present still divided between the Staatsbibliothek Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz and the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, both in Berlin.)


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


Rehatsek = Catalogue raisonné of the Arabic, Hindostani, Persian, and Turkish MSS. in the Mullal Firuz Library. Compiled by E.R. Bombay 1873.


Bratislava

Cairo

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


Browne Hand-list = A hand-list of the Muhammadan manuscripts ... in the Library of the University of Cambridge by E.G.B. Cambridge 1900.

Browne Suppt. = A supplementary hand-list of the Muhammadan manuscripts ... in the Libraries of the University and Colleges of Cambridge by E.G.B. Cambridge 1922.


Fitzwilliam = A descriptive catalogue of the additional illuminated manuscripts in the Fitzwilliam Museum acquired between 1895 and 1979 (excluding the McClean Collection) by F. Wormald and P.M. Giles. 2 volumes with continuous numeration. Cambridge (etc.) 1982.

Cambridge (Massachusetts)
Schroeder = Persian miniatures in the Fogg Museum of Art by E. S. Cambridge (Mass.) 1942.

Copenhagen
Christensen-Ostrup = Description de quelques manuscrits orientaux appartenant à la Bibliothèque de l'Université de Copenhague par A.C. et J.Ø. (=Oversigt over det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskabs Forhandlinger, 1915, no. 3-4, pp. 255-84.)

Dacca

Dresden

Dublin


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

Bertel’s/Baev = A. Bertelse and M. Baev: Alphabetic catalog of manuscripts of the Gorno-Badakhshan autonomous region. The manuscripts themselves were returned to their owners... The films and photostats are kept at the Department of Oriental Studies in Dushanbe.


Edinburgh


Eton

Catalogue of the oriental manuscripts in the Library of Eton College compiled by D.S. Margoliouth. Oxford 1904. (The Mss. are now mostly housed on loan in Cambridge University library).

Glasgow


Gotha


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

Göttingen


Halle


Hamadan

see Rasht

Hamburg


Heidelberg

Helsinki

Die arabischen, persischen und türkischen Handschriften der

Herat

See Kabul.

Hyderabad (Deccan)

Aṣafiyah = Fihrist i kutub i ‘arabī, fārsī wa urdu i nakhkānah i kutub-
khānah i Aṣafiyah i Sarkār i ‘Alt... Hyderabad 1332/1913-4 to
1335/1936-7.

Fihrist i mashrāh = Fihrist i mashrāh i ba’īd i kutub i naftah i
galāntiyah i makhzānah i kutub-khānah i Aṣafiyah i Sarkār i ‘Alt. By Mir

Sālār Jung = A concise descriptive catalogue of the Persian manuscripts
in the Sālār Jung Museum and Library compiled by Muhammad Ashraf.
Hyderabad 1965 - (apparently in progress). [27]

Isfahan

‘Umūmi = Fihrist i nuskah-hā i khaṭṭ i kitāb-khānah i ‘umūmi i
Isfahān, nigārsh i Jawād i Maqṣūd i Hamadānī, Jild i awval. Tehran

Islamabad

Ganj-Bakhsh/Tasbīḥ = Fihrist i nuskah-hā i khaṭṭ i kitāb-khānah i
ganj-bakhsh i markaz i tahdītāt i fārsī i Irān u Pakistan. By M.H. Tasbī-
ḥī. 3 volumes. Rawalpindi 1350-51/1971-6.

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

Istanbul (Constantinople)

Where no more recent publication is indicated, references are to the
(notoriously unreliable) defter, or title-indexes, for the various collec-
tions, which were published in Constantinople at the end of the last
century. Storey’s card-index includes material from the defter for the
following collections: Aksaray (now: Valide Camii), Amuca Hüseyin
Paşa, Aşir Efendi, Arif Efendi, Ayasofya, Beşir Ağa, Beyazıt, Celebi
Abdullah Efendi, Esat Efendi, Fatih Camii, Feyzullah Efendi, Hafez
Efendi, Hekimoğlu Ali Paşa, Kara Mustafa Paşa, Kızıl Ali Paşa, Lāleli,
Müraz Molla, Selimiye (now: Pertev Paşa), Umumii (now: Beyazıt
Devlet Halk Kütüphanesi), Yahya Efendi, Yeni Cami.

Ateş = Istanbul Kütüphanelerinde farsça manzul eserler I (Üniversitę

Duda = ‘Die persischen Dichterhandschriften der Sammlung Es’ad

Duda, Ferhād = ‘Die Handschriften von Stamboul und Umgebung zum
Theme Ferhād und Şirin’, in H.W. Duda, Ferhād und Şirin
(= Monografie Archivu Orientāniho II), Prague 1933, p. 180-213.

Edhem/Stchoukine = Les manuscrits orientaux illustrés de la
Bibliothèque de l’Université de Stamboul. Par Fehmi Edhem et Ivan
Stchoukine (Mémoires [28] de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie de Stamb-

Horn = P. Horn: ‘Persische Handschriften in Constantinopol’, ZDMG
54, 1900, p. 275-332 and 475-509.

Hüseyin = Türkiye Yazmaları Toplulu Katalogu 34/III, Istanbul,
Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Amca Zade Hüseyin Paşa ve Hekimbaşı Musa

Karatay = Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi Kütüphanesi. Farsça Yazmalar

Köprülü = Fihrist makhttat maktabat Kârımlı (Title also in English:
Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Köprülla Library), by R. Şeşen, C. İzgi,
C. Akpunar. 3 volumes. Istanbul 1406/1986.


Kabul
*Manuscrits d’Afghanistan par S. de Laugier de Beaurecueil.* (Describes various collections in Kabul and Herat). Cairo 1965.

Karachi

Kashan

Kayseri

Konya


Lahore


Shârârî = *Fihrîst-i Makhtûtât-i Shârârî* by M. B. Ḥusain. 3 volumes. Lahore 1968-73.


Leeds

Leipzig
Fleischer = *Catalogus librorum manusciptorum qui in Bibliotheca Senatoria Civitatis Lipsiensi asservantur (Codices arabici persici turcici descripti ab H.O.F.).* Grimae 1838.

Vollers = *Katalog der islamischen ... Handschriften der Universitäts-Bibliothek zu Leipzig von K.V.* Leipzig 1906.

Leningrad (Sankt-Peterburg, Petrograd)


Chanykov = *Die Sammlung von morgenlandischen Handschriften, welche die Kaiserliche Öffentliche Bibliothek zu St. Petersbourg im Jahre*


Leyden

de Jong = Catalogus codicum orientalium Bibliothecae Academiae Regiae Scientiarum quem, a clar. Weijersio inchoatum, post hujus mortem absolvit et editid Dr. P. de J. Leyden 1862.

London
Ellis Coll. = [The Ms. belonging to the collection of A.G. Ellis described, mainly by A.J. Arberry, in] Luzac’s Bibliotheca Orientalis XLIV, 1945, p. 3-35, where they bear numbers from M1 to M446.


I.O. 3651-4453 = [Typewritten hand-list found in Storey’s papers].


[N.B.: ‘I.O. 1-3076’ are the running numbers in Ethé’s catalogue, but ‘I.O. 3651-4804’ are the library’s accession numbers. I regret this inconsistency. Visitors to the library wishing to call up one of the manuscripts in Ethé’s catalogue need to write (for example) ‘Ethé 3076’ on their call-alip.]


Rieu Suppt. = Supplement to the Catalogue of the Persian manuscripts in the British Museum by C.R. London 1895.


S.O.A.S. = [Manuscripts in the School of Oriental and African Studies, cited according to the card catalogue.]

Wellcome = A descriptive and analytical catalogue of Persian manuscripts in the library of the Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine by Fateme Keshavarz. London 1986.

Lucknow
Sprenger = A catalogue of the Arabic, Persian and Hindustani manuscripts, of the libraries of the King of Oudh, compiled ... by A.S. ... Vol. I containing Persian and Hindustani poetry. Calcutta 1854; reprinted Osnabrück 1979. [Most of these MSS. were destroyed or dispersed at the time of the ‘Mutiny’, but Sprenger’s descriptions include manuscripts in the Library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal and his own private library (now in the Berlin Staatsbibliothek) as well as a number of printed or lithographed books.] [33]

Lund
Codices orientales Bibliothecae Regiae Universitatis Lundensis recensuit C.J. Tornberg. Lund 1850.

Manuscript Collections

Supplementa. Lund 1853.

Madras


Manchester


Masjhad
Fâdîlyah = Fihrist i kutub i kitâb-khânah i madrasah i Fâdîlyah. 1309sh./1930.


Gauhar-Shâd/Fâdîl = Fihrist i nuskah-hâ i khâtta i kitâb-khânah i jami’ i Gauhar-shâd i Masjhad by Mahmûd Fâdîl. 3 volumes. Masjhad 1363-7sh./1985-9. [34]

Ridawî = Fihrist i kutub i kitâb-khânah (î mubârakah) i âstân i quds i Ridawî. Mashhad 1345/1926-7 - (in progress).

Univ. = Fihrist i naskhah-hâ i khattî i kitâb-khânah i dânish-kadah i adabiyyât u ’lâm i instân i dânish-gâh i Firdawsî by Mahmûd Fâdîl. n.p. 1354sh./1976.

Moscow

Munich
Aumer = Die persischen Handschriften der K. Hof- und Staatsbibliothek in München beschriftet von J.A. Munich 1866.


Navsari

New York

Kraus = Islamic paintings from the 11th to the 18th century in the collection of Hans P. Kraus, [38] by E.J. Grube. New York n.d. [Collection now dispersed on the art market].

Oxford


Ethé = Catalogue of the Persian ... manuscripts in the Bodleian Library begun by ... Ed. Sachau ... completed ... by H.Ethé. Oxford 1889.

Ethé II = Catalogue... Part II ... additional Persian manuscripts, by the late H.E. Oxford 1930.


Paris


Peshawar

Philadelphia

Princeton
1-206 = Descriptive catalog of the Garrett Collection of Persian, Turkish and Indic manuscripts ... in the Princeton University Library. By


Qum

Hujiatlyah = Fīhrist i nuskhah-hā i khaṭṭ i kitāb-khānah i madrasah i hujiatlyah i Qum. By R. Ustādī. Qum 1354sh./1975.

Marʾashī = Fīhrist i nuskhah-hā i khaṭṭ i kitāb-khānah i ʿumānī i ḥaḍrat i ʿīyāt allāh al-ʿuznā Najta in Marʾasht... By S.M. Marʾashī and S.A. Husainī. Qum 1354sh./1975. (Apparently in progress.)

Riḍawiyah = Fīhrist i nuskhah-hā i khaṭṭ i kitāb-khānah i madrasah i riḍawiyah in Qum. By M. Ṭabītabāʾī. Qum 1355sh./1976.

Rampore

Rasht

Richmond


Rome


Sarajevo

Soﬁa

Stockholm

Strasbourg (Strassburg)

Landauer = Katalog der hebräischen, arabischen, persischen und türkischen Handschriften der kaiserlichen Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek zu Strassburg. Strassburg 1881.

Tabriz


Tashkent
Kahl = Персидская, Арабская и Тюркская рукописи Туркестанской Публичной Библиотеки. Составил Е. Каль. Tashkent 1889.

Univ. = Описание (таджикских) персидских, арабских и турукских рукописей Фундаментальной Библиотеки Среднеазиатского Государственного Университета (им. В. И. Ленина). By A.A. Semenov. 2 volumes. Tashkent 1935-56.

Tashqurghan

Tehran

Adabiyât II = Majmû'at i waqf i jânâb ûâqa i ʿAlt-Asghar i Hikmat. By M.T. Dânish-pazhûh. Supplement to MDAT X, 1341sh./1962.

Adabiyât III = Fihrist i nuskhah-hâ i khattì i kitâb-khânah i dânish-kadah i adabiyât: majma'at i imâm jum'ah i kirmân... By M.T. Dânish-pazhûh. Offprint from MDAT XVI/1, 1344sh./1965.


Gulistan/Bayânî = Fihrist i kitâb-khânah i saltanaft. By M. Bayânî. Tehran, n.d. [Not seen; quoted from Munz.]

Huyûq = Fihrist i nuskhah-hâ i khattì i kitâb-khânah i dânish-kadah i huqûq u ʿułamâ i siyâst i igâziat i dânish-gîh i Tîhrân. By M.T. Dânish-pazhûh. (Title also in Arabic and French). Tehran 1339sh./1961. [39]

Ma'ârîf = Fihrist i kutub i khattì i kitâb-khânah i 'umâmi i ma'ârif. By ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz Jawâhirî in Kelâm. (English title on back cover of vol. i: Catalogue of Persian and Arabic manuscripts of the Public Library of the Ministry of Education), 2 volumes. Tehran 1313-4sh./1934-5. (Mss. apparently now in the Kitâb-khânah i Millî.)

Ma'âlî = Fihrist i kitâb-khânah i ma'âlis i shârâr i millî. By F. Hujjat and (for the first volume only) M.T. Dânish-pazhûh. Tehran 1345-8sh./1966-9.

Ma'âlî = Fihrist i kutub i khattì i kitâb-khânah i 'umâmi i ma'ârif. By ʿAbd al-ʿAzîz Jawâhirî in Kelâm. (English title on back cover of vol. i: Catalogue of Persian and Arabic manuscripts of the Public Library of the Ministry of Education), 2 volumes. Tehran 1313-4sh./1934-5. (Mss. apparently now in the Kitâb-khânah i Millî.)

Majlis II = Fihrist i kitâb-khânah i ma'âlis i shârâr i millî (Kutub i khatt: Fârst) ... Jîld i sîwvom az nashrîyât i kutub-khânah. Tehran 1318-21sh./1939-42.


Mîllî = Fihrist i nusakh i khattì i kitâb-khânah i millî. By Sâyiûd ʿAbd Allâh Anwarî. Vol. 1-6 (the last volume of the Persian series) Tehran 1343-54sh./1965-76.


Shârâr i Islâmî = Fihrist i kitâb-hâ i khattì i kitâb-khânah i ma'âlîs i sinâ. [Title in vol. II: ... ma'âlîs i shârâr i islâmî (sinâ i sîbâg)]. By M.T. Dânish-pazhûh and Bahâ' al-dîn ʿIlmî Anwârî. 2 vols. Tehran 1353-9sh./1974-80. [40]


Tübingen
Ewald = Verzeichniss der orientalischen Handschriften der Universitäts-Bibliothek zu Tübingen. Tübingen 1839.

Heinz = see Berlin.

Turin
Nallino = I manoscritti arabi, persiani, siriaci e turchi della Biblioteca Nazionale e della R. Accademia delle Scienze di Torino illustrati da C.A.N. (Memorie della R. Accademia delle Scienze di Torino. Serie II, tom. L., Turin 1900.) [Most of these manuscripts were destroyed by fire in 1904].

Uch
A descriptive catalogue of the Oriental manuscripts in the Dargah library Uch Sharif Gilani Bahawalpur State prepared by Dr. Ghulam Sarwar. Bahawalpur, n.d. [ca. 1959].

Uppsala


Vienna
Duda = Die illuminierten Handschriften und Inkunabeln der österreichischen Nationalbibliothek... Dorothea D. Islamische Handschriften I Persische Handschriften Textband. Vienna 1983.

Flügel = Die arabischen, persischen und türkischen Handschriften der Kaiserlich-Königlichen Hofbibliothek zu Wien ... beschrieben von Professor Dr. G.F. 3 vols. Vienna 1865-7.


Wolfenbüttel
See: Dresden.

Wroclaw (Breslau)
Brockelmann = Verzeichnis der arabischen, persischen, türkischen und hebräischen Handschriften der Stadtbibliothek zu Breslau von C.B. Breslau 1903.

Majda = See General Bibliography.


Yazd
Waziri = Führst i miskah-hā i khaft i kitāb-khānah i Waziri i Yazd... by M. Shīrwinī. 5 vols. Tehran 1350-8sh./1971-9. [42]
CHAPTER I: THE ORIGINS OF PERSIAN POETRY

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

Of course, the Iranians had poetry long before Islam. The oldest surviving works of Iranian verse are the Gâthás and Yashts of the Avesta. Although the language, the religious concepts and the poetic imagery of the Avesta are all close to those of the Vedas of ancient India, there is no trace in the Avesta of a quantitative metre of the sort which we find in the Vedas or in Greek poetry. The ancient Iranians evidently had a different system of versification from their Indian cousins. At present, the majority opinion among Iranologists1 is that the poetic structure of the Gâthás is based exclusively on the number of syllables per line, though a minority view2 (to which the [43] present author inclines) holds that the Gâthás conform to a system of accentual metre; more precisely, I think it most likely that the Ahuna vaistâ Gâthâ (= Yasna 28-34) and the Vâ$hîštâ Gâthâ (= Yasna 53) consist of verses with a fixed number of stresses and a variable number of unstressed syllables, while the three other Gâthás (Yasna 43-46; 47-50; 51) have verses with a fixed number of syllables as well as a fixed number, and more or less a fixed position of stresses. As for the Yashts, Geldner’s view1 that these are constructed of verses with a fixed number of syllables still has supporters,2 though Henning3 maintained, with what seem to me very strong - if somewhat elliptically formulated - arguments, that the verses of the Yashts have a fixed number of stressed syllables only, while the number of unstressed syllables varies. The same accentual principle underlies, according to the penetrating analyses of Henning4 and Boyce,5 pre-Islamic [44] Middle-Persian and Parthian poetry, of which a good number of examples have come down to us both in Zoroastrian and in Manichaean script. The earlier suggestion by Benveniste6 that Middle-Persian poetry was based on mere syllable-counting required such a degree of tampering with the extant texts that it can effectively be disregarded, and also the occasionally expressed claim that it conformed with some kind of quantitative system has never been substantiated. Thus, Neo-Persian poetry, in basing itself on a system of a strictly regulated succession of long and short syllables, without any regard to the number or position of stresses, marks a clean break with Iranian pre-Islamic poetry.

With rhyme the situation is perhaps slightly more complicated. Although there is no hint of deliberate rhyme in the Avesta, the Manichaean Middle-Persian and Parthian hymns, or such manifestly pre-

---

1 K. Geldner, Uber die Metrik des jüngeren Avesta, Tübingen 1877.
2 A bibliography (down to 1962) of studies on the metre of the Yashts can be found in G. Gropp, Wiederholungsformen im Jung-Avesta (Dissertation), Hamburg 1967, p. 188-90; see also Gropp’s own remarks, p. 9-10. To these must be added in particular G. Lazard’s rather inconclusive article “La métrique de l’Avesta récent”, Aenea Iranica 23 (= Orientalia J. Duchesne-Guillarmod et obtenu, Leiden 1984, p. 283-306).
6 E. Benveniste, Le Mémorial de Zârêh, poème pehlavi mazdân”, JA 220, 1932, p. 245-93.
Islamic Zoroastrian poems as the Droxt i Astārāt and the Ayādghār i Zarērān, there are a small number of early Persian poems that do rhyme, but have no regular system of quantitative metre. Two poems of this sort have been preserved in Zoroastrian script in the manuscripts of the Pahlavi texts, a collection of miscellaneous religious and non-religious writings assembled, apparently, as a school-book for learners of the Middle-Persian language. One of these, a poem rhyming consistently in -dn, bewails the Arab conquest of Iran and pines for deliverance; it thus clearly belongs to the Islamic period. Another text, also rhyming in -dn, laments the impermanence of the world. It has an internal rhyme in its first verse (as is canonical in Arabic and Neo-Persian qaṣīdatāh), as well as a sort of refrain (every second verse ends with the words andar gērān). Although a precise dating of the latter text is not possible, there is no patent reason why it too should not belong to the Islamic period. In Arabic script we have the text which the anonymous Tārīkh i Sīstan says was inscribed on the fire-temple at Karkūy and which consists of eight periods rhyming in -dsn followed by one unhymed line. The verses, if authentic, are presumably transcribed from an original in Zoroastrian script. Of course, it is well known that Zoroastrians continued to compose Middle-Persian documents of various sorts well into the Islamic period. It is thus in principle altogether possible that these few samples of rhymed poetry were all written during the Islamic period in conscious imitation of Arabic poetry. In this case one would, however, have to conclude that rhyme - the more immediately tangible of the two essential components of Arabic poetry - was introduced into Persian earlier than quantitative metre. Clearly post-Islamic examples of rhymed, but not quantitative poetry include the couplet attributed, most probably wrongly, to Abū Ḥafs Ś6 al-Sughdī, to which Lazard has contributed an important study, and perhaps a few other small fragments, of which, however, one cannot be certain whether they are in fact poems and not merely rhyming jingles. As for the so-called verse translation of the Qurān, a fragment of which was discovered in Qum, and which, according to its editor, represents a bridge between accentual and quantitative poetry, in the light of the unanimous insistence by Islamic tradition that the Qurān, despite its rhymed periods, and despite the fact that a good number of its dhārah can be scanned according to the rules of Arabic prosody, is not poetry (shīr). One must seriously doubt whether this Persian paraphrase was intended to be anything more than an imitation of the rhymed prose of the Arabic original.

According to an anecdote in the Tārīkh i Sīstan, the first person to compose a poem in (Neo-)Persian was Muhammad b. Wāsīf, a secretary to the Safārid ruler Yaqīb b. Laith. When the latter declared that he was unable to understand the Arabic verses that were being recited in his [47] honour by Muhammad b. Wāsīf, extemporised some laudatory verses in Persian. His example was then immediately followed by Bāsānī i Kārd and Muhammad b. Mukhallad. And thus Persian poetry was born. The story is, of course, not necessarily true and indeed the question of who was the first Persian poet is essentially a futile one.

1 B. Utas, 'On the composition of the Ayyāshikār i Zarērān', Acta Iranica 5 (Monumentum H.S. Nyberg ii), Leiden (etc.) 1975, p. 399-418, analyses as 'rhyme' the fact that a number of periods in this poem are concluded by verbs with the personal ending for the 3rd person singular -ed-ś (in Utas's transcription -ē), but this is at best a rhetorical device and hardly be regarded as a structural principle underlying the whole poem.
4 A new edition, with detailed discussion, of this so-called 'rhymed ballad in Pahlavi', actually a Neo-Persian semi-quantitative poem in Pahlavi script, can be found in my article 'A Persian poem lamenting the Arab conquest', in Studies in honour of Clifford Edmond Bosworth, Ii, Leiden (etc.) 2000, p. 82-95.
5 Pahlavi Texts ii p. 54, translated and discussed by Henning in 'A Pahlavi poem' (see above) p. 647-8.
6 Tārīkh i Sīstan, p. 37.

2 Cf. Meier, Muḥaṣṣī p. 9-10. The whole first section of Meier's book (p. 1-13) is a sober and convincing refutation of the attempts by various scholars to derive Neo-Persian quantitative metres (and in particular that of the rubā‘i) from alleged pre-Islamic Iranian prototypes.
3 Edited by A. 'A. Rādī under the title Pul-t miyān i shi’r-i hējāt-i maṭbalāt i farāt dar qurān i avval i hējāt, tarnamāh i abānān az du jazv-i qurān-i nafid, Tehran 1532h/1954.
4 Tārīkh i Sīstan, p. 209-12. See also the discussion by S.M. Stern, Minorities Volume, p. 546-9.
5 See below, no. 111.
6 See the fanciful discussion of the question in 'Aṣfī i p. 19-22. The verses which 'Aṣfī (and later authors) claim were composed by one 'Abbās (or Abū 1-Abbās) Mawzīn in 193/808-9 in honour of the future caliph al-Maʿmūn are, as many Iranian and European scholars have emphasised, clearly a forgery from a much later time. Cf.
But the anecdote does certainly do justice to the circumstances, and to the approximate time (middle of the 3rd/9th century), in which Neo-Persian poetry came into being. When the court poets, who were accustomed to eulogising their masters in an already highly stylised type of Arabic poetry, found that they were no longer understood by the Iranian soldier-kings who had seized power on the Eastern fringe of the dār al-islām, they were compelled to switch to Persian and to perpetuate in that language the same forms and poetic traditions with which they were accustomed from Arabic. Although now working in Persian, they continued to produce poems of a distinctly Arabic type, employing monorhyme, quantitative metre as well as a perhaps somewhat simplified version of the same stylised imagery.

But to say that the early Persian poets borrowed the principles of quantitative metre from Arabic does not necessarily mean that the metres that they used were the same as those already in use in Arabic poetry. Their procedure was not quite the same as that of the Roman poets, who not only adopted the general poetic carsons of the Greeks, but even forced their language into the same metres which the Greek tradition held appropriate for the several types of poetry: hexameter for heroic and didactic poems, the Lesbian metres for lyrics, iambics for tragic dialogue, etc. To be sure, some of the most common metres in Persian, such as mutaqātīb muthamman maḥdīf (or sālim):

U—U—U—U—(—),

hazaj musaddas maḥdīf:

U—U—U—U—,

and ramal musaddas maḥdīf:

U—U—U—U—,

occur also in basically the same form in Arabic, with the difference only that the Arabic mutaqātīb, hazaj and ramal all permit in certain places the use of either a long or a short syllable (anceptes); the mutaqātīb, for example, scans U-XU-XU-XU-(—); while in the corresponding Persian metres the places in question are always occupied by long syllables.

These Persian metres thus make the impression of having been modelled on the ‘sound’, school-book versions of the corresponding Arabic metres, in which the long anceptes are regarded as standard, the short anceptes as a permitted variation of the standard pattern. On the other hand, many Persian metres, particularly those commonly used in lyric poetry, do not correspond to any Arabic metre, this despite the fact that the traditional Persian prosodic theory has given them elaborate Arabic names and attempted to ‘derive’ them from the standard Arabic metres with which they share a name. It is thus clear that the pioneers of Persian poetry, besides borrowing, or rather adapting, some of the [49] Arabic metres, also developed a number of new, purely Persian metres of an Arabic (i.e. quantitative) type. To these the prosodists later assigned more or less artificial Arabic names.

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

---

1 Cambridg 1976.

2 p. 181.
ibly induce non-specialist readers to think that the study of pre-Islamic Iranian poetry is a field where anything goes. In fact it is one where there is now a fairly large degree of consensus among competent judges.

The question of why the Persian poets of the Islamic period invented the particular non-Arabic [50] metres that they did is one about which one can only hazard a guess. It would seem, however, most probable that educated Persian Muslims of the first centuries after the hijrah, schooled as they were in Arabic poetry and, perhaps more importantly, in *tajvid*, the science of Qur'anic recitation, with its painfully exact measurement of the length of every syllable, must have become aware of the varying length of the syllables in their own language, as well as of the metrical patterns typical of it. When they began to compose poetry of an Arabic type in their own language they obviously felt it imperative to maintain a consistent pattern of long and short syllables in each verse. It was not necessary, however, to use the actual patterns occurring in Arabic poems. It was left to the metrimeticians of later times to analyse these Persian patterns and to force them more or less violently into the scheme devised by the Arabic prosodists.

If we ignore stanzaic poetry, which in all periods of Persian literature has played only a marginal role, we can divide Persian poems into those which have monorhyme (i.e. the same rhyme occurs at the conclusion of every verse from the beginning to the end of the poem), on the one hand, and *mathnawis* (i.e. those consisting of rhymed couplets) on the other. Poems with monorhyme, which we can conveniently designate as 'lyric' verse, range from two-line epigrams to odes of more than [51] a hundred verses, though really long odes are very much less common in Persian than in Arabic. In the early periods lyric poems are most frequently panegyrics (poems flattering a king or some other patron), though we also find elegiac-didactic poems (often lamenting old age, or expressing pessimistic sentiments), erotic and bawdy poems, lampoons (generally directed against rival poets or tight-fisted ex-patrons) and assorted facetiae. Religious pieces are relatively rare before the time of San'ā'ī (first half of the 6th/12th century), though later they become the dominant type of lyric poetry. All of these genres are well-known in Arabic and the stylised structural and rhetorical devices of Arabic lyrics are imitated freely by the Persian authors.

Poems consisting of rhymed couplets are generally long to very long (the *Shah-nāmah* has about 60 000 verses) and of either narrative or didactic content. Indeed the distinction between narrative and didactic *mathnawis* is not always clear-cut; Asadī's *Kardšāp-nāmah*, for example, though fundamentally a story-poem, indulges in long paratactic excursions, as do many later epics. Although long instructive and narrative poems in rhymed couplets are by no means unknown in Arabic, they are considerably less common there than in Persian and have certainly never enjoyed the same status as the Persian *mathnawī*. Moreover, in Arabic this sort of poetry is restricted to a single metre (rajas), while writers of Persian *mathnawī* have a greater choice of metres, though even they use only half a dozen metres with any frequency. The subject-matter of Persian narrative poems is in many cases taken from the legendary and semi-legendary traditions of pre-Islamic Iran. This is the case with Firdausī's *Shah-nāmah*, Asadī's *Kardšāp-nāmah* and the other heroic poems belonging to the Persian [52] 'epic cycle', but also such romantic epics as Gurgānī's *Wts u Rāmor* or Niẓāmī's *Khusrav-Shīrin*, as well as overtly Zoroastrian works like Kāi-Kāvē's *Māvūl i Zartosht*. But there are also poems based on Arabic, Islamic and Islamicised Biblical traditions such as the various versions of *Yūnūs u Zulaykha*, ʿAjūjī's *Warqah u Gulshāh* or Niẓāmī's *La'īṭ-Mahīnā*. Others again can be traced to Hellenistic sources, e.g. ʿUṣūnī's *Wānīq u Aḏbrā* or the versions of the legend of Alexander by Niẓāmī and others. Three of the
very earliest Persian mathnawis of which we have any knowledge, namely Rōdaki's Kattlah u Dimnah and Sindbad-nāmah, and the anonymous, but roughly contemporary Bilashar u Badhāsaf,1 all retell in Persian the same (ultimately Sasanian or Sasanianised Indian) stories which Abū al-Lāhijāq had put into Arabic rhymed couplets2 more than a century earlier. All three of these Persian poems are in rāmal metre, which, as can be seen from the table, is based on the same recurring pattern as rājāz, the canonical metre of Arabic couplets. And the same pattern underlies also the hāzaj metre employed in the earliest poetic version of the Shāh-nāmah, that by Maṣ'ūdī al-Marwāzī,3 and in other early mathnawis, whether narrative (Wīs u Rāmīn) or didactic (e.g. Māsārī's Dānīsh-nāmah) and well as in many long poems of later authors (e.g. Nizāmī's Khurwar-Shīrīn and its many imitations or Rūmī's Mathnawi i ma'navī). [53] It is thus quite clear that the narrative and didactic poetry of the Persians, like their lyrical verse, had Arabic antecedents both for its content and for its general form.

| rajāz:       | -U- U- U- etc. |
| rāmal:      | -U- U- U- etc. |
| hāzaj:      | U- U- U- etc.  |

One of the striking features of early Persian narrative poems is that their authors repeatedly and insistently tell us that their poems are based on an 'old book'. In other words, they are versifications of pre-existing written narratives. In at least one case the source used by the poet is actually extant (the Middle-Persian Zand i Wāhman-Yashī used by Kā'kābī4 and in some others it can at least be identified (e.g. Abū Mu'āyāyīd's Kitāb i Karshtāsp as the probable source of Asādī's epic). In general these sources can be assumed to have been in Persian prose and to have been translated either from an Arabic or a Middle-Persian original, though in a few cases (Maqūlāt i Zarrūsshi and Wīs u Rāmīn) the poet appears to have worked directly on the basis of a source in Middle Persian.1

Despite the insistence by the authors of these narratives that they are merely retelling what they found in a 'book', attempts have occasionally been made to view early Persian poetry in the [54] light of the well-known theory of 'oral poetry',2 a theory which has had a very strong influence particularly on the Anglo-Saxon school of Homeric studies, but which has also been applied with interesting results to such fields as pre-Islamic Arabic poetry. In the case of Persian, this theory would imply the existence of an uninterrupted tradition of poetry handed down from generation to generation from remote Iranian antiquity all the way to the professional Shāh-nāmah-reciters of the present. Support for this conception might be sought in the fact that in Firdausi's Shāh-nāmah, alongside the many passages where the poet speaks of the 'old book' that he has put into verse, there are also a number of places where he states, or implies, that he has 'heard' the story he is about to tell from an 'old dīhān' or the like.3 But it is much more likely that in all the passages of this sort the poet is merely repeating, in verse, the statement by his written source that it has derived its information from the person in question. Thus, when at the beginning of the story of Būržūzī4 the poet invites us to listen to the words of Shādān, the son of Būrzīn, the casual reader could be forgiven for thinking that Firdausī actually heard Shādān tell this story. In fact, we know from the 'older preface' to the Shāh-nāmah9 that Shādān, son of Būrzīn, was one of the 'four men'5 who collaborated in the compilation of the prose Shāh-nāmah that was written for Abū Manṣūr b. 'Abd al-Raẓāqī in Muḥarram 346/957, one [55] of Firdausī's written sources.6 Firdausī's reference to Shādān is thus clearly

1For the possibility that the source of the latter was a Middle-Persian poem see below, p. 162-3.
2See in particular O.M. Davidson, 'The crown-bestower in the Arabian Book of Kings', Acta Iranica 23 (Papers in honour of Professor Mary Boyce), Leiden 1985, p. 61-148, especially p. 103-42 ("The authority and authenticity of Ferdowsi's Book of Kings").
3See the collection of passages in Davidson p. 113-5.
5See below, p. 136.
6See below, p. 121-6.
lifted directly from his source. Further on in the text, at the beginning of the story of Hurmuz, the poet speaks quite vividly of a meeting which he had with Mākbōl, the marjār of Herat, a wise old man, whom Firdausī asks for information about the reign of king Hurmuz and whose reply the poet then proceeds to quote. But this is manifestly a poetic fiction. Mākbōl the marzābōn of Herat is clearly identical with another of the ‘four men’ whose name appears in the manuscripts of the ‘older preface’ as Shāhī of Herat (Shāhī is either a misreading of Shāhī, or vice versa). The same is apparently also the case with the story of the invention of the game of chess which Firdausī tells on the authority of ‘old Shāhī’, evidently yet another of the ‘four men’, whose name occurs in the ‘older preface’ as Shāhī (this, like the previous example, must be seen in the light of the close similarity of initial m- and s/sh- in early Persian handwriting). It is, of course, not out of the question that the young Firdausī might actually have met one or the other of the ‘four men’, but it is rather unlikely that he should have known three of the four.

Further evidence for the dependence of the Persian epic tradition on written sources, rather than on a living oral tradition can be seen in the fact that a good number of the proper names that figure in that tradition appear in a form that can only be explained in terms of the misreading of written sources. Thus the name of Ṭahmūrat (or Ṭahmūrat) clearly results from the mispointing in [56] Arabic script of Ṭahmūrab, for Middle-Persian ṭḥmwraba and Avestan Taxma- Urupi-6 Similarly the name given to Farūdīn’s evil son Tūr6 is evidently a mispointing (again conceivably only in Arabic script) for Tūr,7 representing Middle-Persian tūr.8 Or Iṣfandīrī,9 a corruption in Arabic script for Iṣfandīyād (or Iṣfandīyād)10, for Middle-Persian spndīyād or spndīyād,11 for Avestan Spantōdāta.-12 Or Nastūr, a mispointing of Bastūr, Middle-Persian Bastaurāb.1-3 For G/Karshāp, from Karšāp, see below, p. 83, footnote no. 2. The question of whether all these spellings were in fact already used by Firdausī and are not merely the result of later scribal corruptions must, for the adherents of the theory of oral poetry, be irrelevant, since the prerequisite of this theory is precisely the assumption of an uninterrupted oral tradition from antiquity to the present day. Such a tradition ought not to be able to be led astray by scribal errors, whether before or after the time of [57] Firdausī, who is but one link in an unbroken chain of oral poets.

It is quite clear that a theory of oral poetry will only work if it is possible to posit a continuing formal tradition of versification. In the case of the Homeric epics, for example, it is assumed that the stories of the Trojan War and of the adventures of Odysseus were retold by generation after generation of bards, all using the same hexameter verse, the same (or much the same) somewhat artificial poetic language (which was not identical with any of the spoken Greek dialects), the same set similes and standard epithets, etc., until the time when one particular version of the poems was set down in writing. Of course, we cannot prove that this was actually the case, but it is not an implausible hypothesis. But Firdausī and his contemporaries did not have this kind of tradition behind them. They were pioneers. Persian poetry with rhyme and quantitative metre was, as we have seen, only a bit more than a century old. This innovation cut them off from the old poetic tradition. When they told the same stories as the pre-Islamic minstrels, as is evidently the case with Gurgīn’s Wts h Rāmn,4 their link with their predecessors was through books, not through a living tradition.

Our conclusion can thus only be that the Shāh-nāmah, as it was written by Firdausī, was not oral poetry, but book-literature. However,
almost as soon as it was written down, it most certainly did turn into oral poetry on the tongues of the rhapsodists, who developed and elaborated the epic orally and have continued to do so to the present. The tremendous degree of disagreement already between the oldest manuscripts of the poem cannot be explained purely in terms of the carelessness and [58] unscrupulousness of generations of scribes. It is quite clear that from a very early date the scribal and oral textual traditions have constantly influenced one another. But this is an oral tradition which does not (as is assumed to have been the case with the Homeric poems) culminate and end with a book. In Iran the book is the point of departure.

Addendum (December 2000): This chapter has been reprinted as it appeared in the first edition (1992), with correction of a few mistakes and some additions to the bibliography.

The origin of the Persian metrical system, and its relationship with the Arabic, have since been the subject of several articles (all without reference to our discussion) in the volume Arabic prosody and its applications in Muslim poetry, ed. L. Johanson and B. Utas (=Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul, Transactions, Vol. 5), Uppsala 1994; see in particular: p. 35-43 (J.T.P. de Bruijn, ‘The individuality of the Persian metre khoft’); p. 45-59 (G. Doerfer, ‘Gedanken zur Entstehung des rubûr’); p. 81-90 (G. Lazard, ‘Le mètre équipe baloutchi et les origines du motaqâreh’); p. 129-41 (B. Utas, ‘Arabic and Iranian elements in New Persian prosody’).


In the addenda to the first edition (p. 612-4) I drew attention to the fact that a further sample of (apparently) pre-Islamic narrative poetry is the fragment quoted in the Vatican manuscript of Asadi’s LF (ed. Horn p. 34; Salimi p. 274; omitted in Iqâbî’s edition) from ‘the book of Pirân ī Wêsâh in the Pahlawân language’.1 The Ms. has:

In Persian:

Nöldeke (cited in Horn’s footnote) recognised the words tundur, afroîdij and sâzûd in the second ‘half-verse’ and Henning (in the handwritten notes in his copy of Horn, kindly lent to me by N. Sims-Williams) emended the first four words as given below. Standing on the shoulders of these illustrious predecessors we might propose reading the whole thing as:

azd-am kard, sâhryâr, kã-t hîr wasmâd
tundur afroîdij u tum sãzûd

which could mean something like: ‘I have made it known, oh king, that it is for your sake that the thunder was ignited2 and the darkness brought forth’. Pirân, son of Wêsâh, figures in the Shôh-nâmah as a courtier of Afrasyâb, but it is difficult to place the verses in the story. The language of the fragment is like that of Dvaxt i Āsôtig and Ayâdûr i Zarêrûn in that it is basically Parthian with an admixture of Persian,3 a Partho-Persian poetic koine, and thus comparable to the language of the Homeric poems (mainly Ionic, but with an admixture of other dialects). Both lines have nine syllables and (it seems) four stresses each, but whether or not the apparent ‘rhyme’ between wasmâd and sâzûd is intentional can hardly be judged from a single pair of lines.

1 Tundur nâmah in Pirân i Wêsâh gaftand be pahlawân zabân, followed again by the word fahâlta in red (according to Salimi).

2 The idea of thunder being ‘ignited’ seems strange, of course, but is perhaps not impossible in poetry. Alternatively, one could read tanîr (thus Henning, tentatively) afroîdij u hîrân (?!) sâzûd, ‘...the oven was lit and the banquet prepared’.

3 Sâhryâr is Persian, though it could of course be ‘emended’ to Parthian šahrâb. For hîr, cf. Parthian tr, Middle-Persian xtr, Pûzûnd hîr, xtr, ‘thing, wealth’. wasmâd is a Parthian postposition, ‘on account of’ (also in Dvaxt i Āsôtig); the LF is evidently wrong to define it as ‘many’ and to equate it with the identically written word in the verse from Rûdâkî cited in the same lemma. The two verbs in the last line are semi-Persianised variants of Parthian afroîdij and sâzûd (as against Persian afroîz and xtr-): sâzûd is a Parthian second past participial in -ad.
CHAPTER II
FROM THE MIDDLE OF THE 9TH CENTURY
TO THE LAST QUARTER OF THE 11TH

The poets discussed in this chapter are essentially those quoted in Asadi’s Lughat i furs and in Rádýjâni’s Tarjumân al-bolghazahâh, as well as a few others who can confidently be regarded as their contemporaries. Asadi’s work cannot be dated precisely, but its author was still alive some years after 458/1065. It appears that Asadi continued to revise the work up until the end of his life and indeed that he left it unfinished at his death. The family represented by the Vatican and India Office manuscripts contains a few quotations from poets of the first half of the 6th/12th century, namely a number of verses by Mu’izzî and one by Khátîñi. These are missing in the other manuscripts and evidently represent very early interpolations. Apart from these, everyone quoted by Asadi can safely be assumed to have made his name as a poet by the end of the third quarter of the 11th century at the latest. (This is naturally not true of the poets quoted only in the marginal additions to manuscript nân, which have nothing to do with Asadi. These contain many samples of verse of the 6th/12th century.) Rádýjâni’s work was evidently written after 482/1089 and in any event before Ramâdân 507/1114, the date of the unique manuscript. Rádýjâni quotes on the whole the same poets as Asadi. To these two 11th-century sources we can add two from the 12th century, namely [60] ‘Arûdî’s Chahâr Maqâlah (completed in 552/1157) and Watqî’s Hadâ’iq al-sîhr (very heavily dependent on Rádýjâni) and finally two from the 13th, ‘Auîfî’s Lubbâl al-âlîbîb (the earliest Persian anthology) and Shams’s al-Mu’jâm fi nu’êtir ashâr al-‘âlam. These six books, apart from stray references in the early historians and, of course, from the surviving poems themselves, represent pretty much the sum total of what we know about the first two centuries of Persian poetry. It will become evident from the biographies that follow how very little this often is. Later sources are almost entirely dependent on ‘Arûdî and ‘Auîfî for the more-or-less authentic biographical information which they contain about the early poets, but this has been augmented by much that is uncontrollable and in

most cases evidently false. They do, however, often quote genuine poems not cited by earlier authorities; particularly valuable for our purposes is the 14th-century anthology Mu’înis al-a‘âbîr by Jâîrmi. The only later sahîhârah which have consistently been cited in the present chapter are those by Daulat-shâh (15th century) and Hidîyât (19th century) and the information contained in these has been sifted with great caution. Given the scarcity of genuine biographical information no attempt has been made to arrange the following entries in chronological order; the ordering is strictly alphabetical. Anonymous works of the pre-Mongol period (which are generally even more difficult to date) will be found in appendix I.

Not included here are poets known to us by name, but who have not left us any verses. We have also excluded the versifying amateurs (often at considerable length) in the first volume of ‘Auîfî’s work, apart from those who are also quoted (and thus evidently recognised as more or less respectable poets) by Asadi or Rádýjâni. [61]

1. A long qaṣîda by one ‘Abhârî in praise of the Seljûq Alp Arslân (455/1063 to 465/1072; the king’s name is mentioned in the 3rd verse) is quoted by Jâîrmi. Hidîyât, who quotes a dozen lines from the same poem, as well as some other verses, calls their author ‘Abd al-Majîd ‘Abhârî Ghazâwî, evidently identifying him with the ‘Abd al-Majîd ‘Abhârî whom ‘Auîfî had included near the end of his chapter devoted to what he rather inadequately calls the Seljûq poets of Ghazânî and Lahoro (and which in fact contains mainly the panegyrics of the later Ghazâwîds). If the two are in fact identical it would seem that ‘Auîfî lacked reliable information about when this poet lived. But perhaps we have rather two different ‘Abhârîs.


2. Abû 1,‘Abbâs al-‘Abdî, b. ‘Abbâs al-Râbînî, is the author of a poem, quoted in various anthologies, lamenting the death of the Samarîd Naṣîr (II) b. Ahmad (which occurred on 1 Sha‘bân 331/943) and greeting the succession of his son Nûh. It is likely that the numerous verses

1 in the late anthologies: al-Bukhârî, in fact Râbînî is located near Samarqand.
attributed in the *Lughat i furs* (and later dictionaries) to ‘Abū l-‘Abbās (i.e. ‘Abbās), or to ‘Abūl-‘Abbās’ belong to the same poet. The fragments of his work indicate that he was at one point exiled from his native country and took refuge in Farghānah.


3. A single verse by Abū ‘Abīr ‘Anbarī (or ‘Abbās) is quoted in Asadī’s *LF*, s.v. farandād.

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


5. Abū ‘Alī Sāḥibī is credited with one verse in manuscript *ṣn* of *LF* (ed. Iqbal p. 427; also in *Shīh* p. 276).


6. Abū ‘Alī Simjur was the governor of Khurāsān on behalf of the Samanids from 380/990-1 onwards, later rebelled against them and died in 387/997. One of his verses is quoted in the Vatican manuscript of *LF*, s.v. *ṣn*.


---

1 *Thus* *LF*, Ms. ‘āin.

2 *LF*, Ms. *ṣn*.

3 Dīmān, ed. Dābir-Sīyāhī p. 113.

---

7. Two verses are attributed to one Abū ‘Ašīm in *LF* (see indexes). Cf. *LN* s.v. ‘Abī ‘Ašīm’ p. 568-9; Khayyām-pūr p. 19. [63] 8. Abū Dharr al-Būzjānī was a Sufi saint. Jāmi tells us that Śeṅgktigīn (reg. 366/977 to 387/997) visited him and presented to him his infant son Maḥmūd (born 361/971-2). The same authority adds that the saint died in 387/997. Apart from one Arabic and two Persian verses quoted by Jāmi we have a single verse attributed to (presumably the same) ‘Bī Dharr’ in the marginal additions to manuscript *nān* of *LF* s.v. *sangalāh*.


9. Abū l-Hāθam Gurgānī is the author of a didactic *qaṣīdah* (inc. yak-št sārat i har nas’ u nūst z-in-t gudhār * chi-rā kih hā’at i har sārat-e bowad bīsīyār) which has been preserved for us thanks to the two commentaries written to answer the long series of philosophical-theological questions posed by it: one by an anonymous pupil of the author (who is perhaps identical with the Muhammad b. Surkh al-Naṣīḥīrī, whose commentary on the poem is mentioned by ‘Alī b. Zaid al-Bahaqī), the other the Kīthā Jāmī’s al-ḥikmatatun by Nāṣīr i Khusraw.1 Both commentaries were in their turn used by ‘Abī l-Hāθam, and both seem to imply that Abū l-Hāθam belonged to the same sect, though the *qaṣīdah* itself is written from the standpoint of *taṣfiyāt*. The first-mentioned commentary contains a somewhat mysterious passage (p. 43) where the author accuses Rūḍākī, Shahīd al-Balḥātī and Muş’ābī of having distorted Abū l-Hāθam’s thought; this would seem to imply that the latter flourished in the first half of the 4th/10th century, if not [64] earlier. And the lines (19-21) in which the author laments the fact that the world is at present under evil auspices might indeed suggest that they were written before the spectacular political successes of the Ismā‘īlī da‘wah towards the end of the 3rd/9th century.


---

1 See below, no. 123.
Commentaries: Commentaire de la qasida ismaélienne d’Abu‘l-Haitham Jorjani attribué à Muhammad ibn Sorkh de Nishapour... edited with a Persian and a very extensive French introduction by H. Corbin and M. Mo‘in, Tehran/Paris 1955 (= Bibliothèque iranienne 6. Title also in Persian); Naṣr-e Khosrow Khān-e Jam‘al-Hikmatan Le livre réunissant les deux sagesse... texte persan édité avec une double étude préliminaire en français et en persan par H. Corbin et M. Mo‘in, Tehran/Paris 1953 (= Bibliothèque iranienne 3).


10. Abū Ḥanifah Iskāfī or Iskāf2 is mentioned in three passages in the Tārīkh i Baihaqi in connection with events during the early part of the reign of Sulṭān Ibrāhīm b. Mas‘ūd of Ghazna (451/1059 to 492/1099), where four long odes of his are quoted. His poetic career at the Ghaznavid court must, however, have begun a good deal earlier if we are to believe Sanā‘i’s statement that ‘Bū Ḥanifah’ wrote a poem for ‘Unṣūrī (who appears to have died in the early part of Mas‘ūd’s reign).3 ‘Arūfī is in any case correct in listing [65] him among the Ghaznavid poets. ‘Auffi, on the other hand, says that he flourished at the time of Sanjar, i.e. at the beginning of the 12th century, which would appear to be an error. Even greater confusion reigns with Hidīyat, who confused him with a scribe of the Samanid period, Abū l-Qāsim al-Iskāfī, and stated that he died in 386/996. Recently Bosworth has suggested that our poet might be identical with one Abū Ḥanifah Panjdhī, of whom Bākharzī4 quotes some Arabic verses. One Persian verse by ‘Abū Ḥanifah i Iskāfī is quoted in the Vatican manuscript of L. F., s.v. pashang, another in the marginal additions in manuscript nūn, s.v. awāng.

Collection of fragments: M. Dabīr-Siyāqī, Abū Ḥanifah i Iskāfī, Tehran 1333/155.


11. Abū l-Ḥarīrī 1 Ḥarib b. Muhammad al-Ḥaq-wari2 al-Ḥarawi is included by ‘Auffi in his chapter on the Ghaznavid poets where we find a ghacal of six verses and a rubā‘. Two further verses by ‘Ḥaq-wari’ are quoted in the marginal additions to manuscript nūn of LF.


12. Abū l-Ḥurr (Bū l-Ḥurr) is credited with one verse in L. F., ed. Iqābī, p. 455 (also in Ṣafāh p. 282). A poet of that name is mentioned also in a characteristically unflattering verse by Labībī (no. 37 of the collection by Ṣafāk/Boressky, also from L. F.), where it rhymes with ashtar.


13. Abū l-Khaṭīr Munajjīm3 Gūzgānī4 (or: Gūzgānī5) is quoted as the author of two verses in manuscript sdn of Asadī’s Lughāt i Furs,6 to which Nakhljwānī’s Ṣūḥāh al-furs7 adds one further verse.


1In ‘Auffi written without alif after the ḫa but in L. F. (quasi: ‘Abū l-Ḥarā’).
2Thus vocalised (apparently by Mo‘in) in the second L. N. article devoted to this poet, for the rubā‘y given in ‘Auffi and in L. F. (at least according to Iqābī); Hidīyat has Ḫīyāy.
3Thus only in Ṣafāh, p. 180.
4L. F., ed. Iqābī, p. 293.
5Ṣūḥāh, p. 180, in one manuscript.
7P. 228.
14. Abū Laih al-Tabarī, who was known already to Rādīyānī, is the author of a ghazal of seven verses quoted by "Auflī in his chapter on the Ghaznavid poets. He is presumably identical with the author of the ode which Jāmāl ascribes to “Bā Laih Gurgānī”. Rādī adds a third poem, cited also by Hīdāyat, who calls him “Abū Laih Taḥburistānī Gurgānī”.

Rādīyānī p. 39 (and Aṣṭād ad loc.); “Auflī II p. 66; Jāmāl II p. 467-9; Rādī III p. 102 (no. 1157); Hīdāyat, Majma’ I p. 81-2; Buzurg I p. 263; LN s.v. “Abū Laih” p. 790-1; Saffā, Tārīkh I6 p. 598-9; Khayām-pūr p. 23.

15. Abū l-Mathāl al-Bukhārī is included by “Arūfī and by “Auflī, who quotes three of his [67] verses, among the poets of the Samanid period. There is a verse by Khusravwānī lamenting his death.1


16. Abū l-Mu’āyяд al-Balkhī merits a brief entry in “Auflī’s chapter on the Samanid poets. His versification of the story of Yūsuf and Zulaikhā is mentioned in one of the versions of the preface to the poem on the same subject formerly attributed to Firdausī (ed. Etbē, v. 170-1).2 His main importance, however, was as an antiquarian and prose writer. A work with the title Kitāb i ajā’ib i barr wa bahār, apparently written jointly by Abū l-Mu’āyяд and one Bishr Muqassim, is quoted in the Tārīkh i Sīstān (p. 13) and the other reports of ‘marvels’ which the same history gives on the authority of Abū l-Mu’āyяд come presumably from the same work. We possess in fact a geographical work entitled Ajā’ib al-dunya (or Ajā’ib al-asbāb)3 which, at least according to the preface in the Cambridge manuscript, was written by ‘Abū l-Mu’āyяд Abū Mu’ta’l al-Balkhī for the Samanid Nūh b. Mansūr (365/975-6 to 387/997), but as that book clearly belongs to a much later period the connection between Abū l-Mu’āyяд and Nūh cannot be regarded as assured. His

---

1 See below, p. 228.
2 See below, p. 579.

---

1 The name appears thus on p. 3 of the edition. On p. 2 the manuscript used by the editor has “Auflī l-Mu’āyяд al-Balkhī” followed by a blank, but the old Berlin manuscript has “Abū l-Mu’āyяд al-Balkhī” in both passages; see the facsimile edition published in Tehrān 1359sh. /2001, fol. 2a, lines 11 and 20.

2 Etbē p. 54.
that he [69] lived during the time of the last Samanids and of the first Ghaznavids. It is perhaps possible that some of the fragments which the sources attribute to 'Abū l-Mu'āyяд belong to him rather than to his namesake from Balkh.


18. Abū l-Mu'azzafar: 'Abd al-Jabbār b. al-Ḥasan al-Baihaqī al-Jumāhī,1 the šāhib al-burhān at Nasībūr during the time of Mas'ūdī, is frequently mentioned in Baihaqī's history of the period. His contemporaries Tha'lībī and Bākhrāzī both quote a number of his Arabic verses, and Ibn Funduq, after referring to the two afore-mentioned literary historians and repeating a few of the Arabic verses that they had adduced, adds three more in Persian. It is likely that he is also the author of the verse which the Vatican manuscript of LF, s.v. 'abād, attributes to 'Abū l-Mu'azzafar j.kh.j.

LF (ed. Horn) p. 34; Tha'lībī, Tātimmah II p. 90-1; Bākhrāzī no. 405; Bāihaqī (see the index, s.v. 'Jumāhī'); Ibn Funduq p. 178-9; A. Iqbal, 'Abū l-Mu'azzafar 'Abd al-Jabbār b. Ḥusayn (sic) i Jumāh (at shu'ara' i nihā' i awwa'il i qarn i janam)', Sharq 1, 1311/1922, p. 705-8; Qazwīnī, Yād-dāšt-hā III p. 25-6; LN s.v. 'Abū l-Mu'azzafar' p. 843; Khaiyām-pūr p. 23; Qazwīnī, Yād-dāšt-hā III p. 25-6.

19. Abū Naṣr Ahmad b. Ibrāhīm al-Tāliqānī was one of the panegyристs of the Seljuk minister Niẓām al-mulk (d. 485/1092). Bākhrāzī quotes three Arabic verses from an ode to this dignitary. 'Affi repeats two of these and adds two pairs of Persian verses. One further verse is ascribed to 'Bū Naṣr i Tāliqānī' in manuscript nūn of LF.2 There are two [70] Tāliqānīs, one in Dailam and the other near Marw i Rōd; if this poet was a native of the latter he might then be identical with the 'Abū Naṣr i Marghāzī' to whom Asādī attributes one verse, s.v. far-

1Thus vocalized in Sam'ālī, new edition, III p. 326 no. 936.
2ed. Iqbal p. 471.

1LF, ed. Iqbal, p. 35; ed. Majshī's/Safīqī p. 44; also in Qazwīnī p. 9 and Sīnāh p. 36. This Abū Naṣr is treated as a separate poet by Idarār-e ch. p. 44.
2One in ed. Iqbal p. 477; the other is quoted s.v. sarshāh (ed. Iqbal p. 77; ed. Majshī's/Safīqī p. 69; also in Sīnāh) and attributed by some of the manuscripts to Khūtī.
5Old edition, p. 54.
6Old edition, p. 263.
posed by his ptrs. In the introduction to his edition of the poems, Sa’id Naṣīḥī has attempted to refute the idea that Abū Sa’īd wrote no poetry (apart from the three verses quoted in the Asūrā) by referring to the many passages in the Asūrā, the Ḩalāt and other relatively early sources which refer to the recitation of verses by Abū Sa’īd, but this is really a pettio principii; the sources are unanimous in conceding that Abū Sa’īd recited poetry; they deny, however, that the verses were of his own composition. Ivanow1 has quite rightly emphasised that ‘it is improbable that the admiring biographer of his own holy ancestor should have missed an opportunity to add to the fame of the Shaykh by corroborating the general belief in the latter’s poetical talents. If he has done otherwise there cannot be any doubt that this was due to the fact that memory was still fresh and the real state of things could not be misrepresented.’ Of course, this does not rule out the possibility that at least some of the verses which the older [72] sources put into the mouth of Abū Sa’īd might indeed be of great antiquity and thus of real importance for the history of Persian poetry. At the same time it is clear that in the surviving collections any authentic kernel has been encompassed in a mass of late elaboration. The task of disentangling the two remains to be done.


1Calcutta catalogue p. 189-90.


Editions: Munich 1875-8 (Die Ruhbā’s des Abū Sa’īd bin Abul-khair, SB München 1875, p. 145-168, 1878, p. 38-70. 92 quatrains edited and translated in German ‘verse’ by H. Eshé); Bombay 1294/1877; 1297/1880; 1308/1890-1 (96 Collection of quatrains ascribed to Khashām, Bābā Tāhir, Abū Sa’īd and Asfārā, together with the latter’s Munāfāt; Cracow 1895 (Abu Sa’id Fadlallah ben Abulchair i [73] tegot czerwiersze, przetł. z perskiego Damianna Rolicz-Lieder); Lahore 1934; 1935 (ed. Maulawi Māhmūd al-Hasan Kānpūrī, with Urdu translation and commentary); Tehran 1334/Ah./1955 (Sukhanāt i munẓām, ed. S. Nafṣī. Edition of 720 rubā’īyāt, and fragments in other metres, from the various ancient and modern sources listed on p. 177-200); See also Mauvali ‘Abdul Wali, ‘The Rubā’īyāt of Abu Sa’id ibn Abu’l Khair’, JASB N.S. V, 1909, p. 421-56, VII, 1911, p. 637-67 (edition of 400 quatrains from the Calcutta and London Add. 7822 Mss., with some critical remarks), and H.D. Graves Law, ‘Some more quatrains of Abū Sa’īd bin Abī’l Khair’, JASB N.S. XII, 1916, p.185-237 (text and prose translation of 98 further quatrains from the Bombay edition of 1297 and a Ms. which the author found ‘among the débris of an Oriental book-shop in Hyderabad City’).

Translations (English, German and Urdu) see under editions; moreover: The Rubaiyat of Abu Sa’id bin Ab’il-Khair (sic) done into English verse by D.C. Datta, Jaipur 1943; 2nd edition. Jaipur 1971.


22. Abū Sa’dik al-Jūrjănī is mentioned in a verse by Manṭibihri (Dīwān, ed. Dabīr-Sīyāqī p. 113) as one of the illustrious poets of Khurāsān. According to ‘Auṣf he flourished under ‘Amr b. Lāth (died 287/900).

23. Abū Shakūr al-Balkhī is the author of the Āfrīn-nāmah, completed, according to ‘Auﬁ, in 336/947-8. A verse apparently belonging to this work (Lazard’s fragment 186) seems to indicate that he began work on the poem in 333, and another (fragment 130) that he began ‘this book’ at the age of 33; it has thus been deduced that the poet was born in 300/912-3. The Āfrīn-nāmah was apparently a long mathnawī in mutaqqārib metre, largely of moralising content. Besides the fragments explicitly assigned to Abū Shakūr, Sa’īd Naﬁsī (followed with a certain amount of hesitation by Lazard) has attributed to the Āfrīn-nāmah a number of further verses quoted anonymously in the Tuhfat al-mulūk. We also have a fair number of fragments of Abū Shakūr’s lyrical poems.


24. Abū Shu‘ābī Shālīb b. Muhammad al-Harawī is included by ‘Auﬁ among the poets of the Samanids. We have no more precise indication of his dates apart from the (highly questionable) statement by Hidāyat that he was born during the last years of Rādākī’s life, i.e. towards the middle of the 4th/10th century.


1For whom see below, p. 419.

25. Abū Zur‘a’ī al-Mu‘āmmari (or al-Mu‘āmar?) al-Jurjānī is mentioned in ‘Auﬁ’s chapter on the Samanid poets in connection with an unnamed amīr of Khurāsān, who asked Abū Zur‘a’ī whether he could compose poems as well as Rādākī, whereupon he produced three verses affirming his superiority over that poet.


26. Abū l-Hasan ‘Ali b. Iyās al-Qahhārī al-Bukhārī2 is mentioned in ‘Arūdī’s list of the [76] Samanid poets. ‘Auﬁ includes him in his chapter on the ‘great kings’ who indulged in poetry, calls him an amīr and states that he was himself the subject of panegyrics, and on the basis of this Naﬁsī (apparently encouraged by Hidāyat’s uncontrollable statement that Qahhārī served as a governor in Kirmān) has suggested that our poet was in fact the brother of the ruler of Kirmān, Muhammad b. Iyās (died 356/967 or 357/968). But this suggestion seems gratuitous, especially since Thar‘alībī (writing about two centuries before ‘Auﬁ) says nothing of our poet being a prince. Moreover, the title Qahhārī is not that of a prince,

2The name is given thus by ‘Auﬁ. Besides the form Abū Qahhārī or -chī (Thar‘alībī, LF, Rādīyānī etc.) we find also Abū ‘Aqīhājī (‘Arūdī, Shams). We have here a title, well attested during the Ghazaav period and later, for a high-ranking court official, roughly a chamberlain (Arabic ḥabīb). It has frequently been claimed that the word is Turkish (evidently only because of its similarity with the well-known Turko-Mongolian title āğa) but this has been doubted by Doerfer II p. 72, and Horn, Einl. p. 17, already drew attention to the unlikelihood that a Turkish title should have been in use as early as the time of the Samanids. However, his own suggestion that Qahhārī means ‘woven Nebenform von ḥağhaḥ “Anfang”’ is unsatisfactory both from a semantic and from a phonetic point of view (Persian ḥabīb is a loan-word from Sogdian and has -c, not -ch, in both languages). I wonder whether at least the shorter of the two forms given above might not be connected with Sogdian ḥabāb, ‘covering’, with the suffix -ī (for Buddhist Sogdian ḥabīb and its cognates see D.N. MacKenzie, The Buddhist Sogdian texts of the British Library, Leiden 1976, II p. 73, and for the assimilation of š-t- into s see J. Gmelinitch, A Grammar of Mancuan Sogdian, Oxford 1954, 288). ḥabāb, ‘covering’, i.e. ‘one who veils the king from the public’, would be a close parallel to (and perhaps even a translation of) the corresponding Arabic title, ḥajib. The longer form Qahhārī is more difficult to account for, but one might venture to suggest that it is an Arabic broken plural of the Iranian word and that the title al-Qahhārī is merely an abbreviation for *Qahhārī al-Qahhārī, ‘chief chamberlain’ (cf. qabīl ḥabīb and the like).
but of a court official. Auch states further that Āghājī was a contemporary of Daqīqī and proceeds to quote a number of fragments of his, including a Persian rendering of a verse attributed to ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, and two verses in which he brags of his proficiency in such courtly talents as horsemanship, archery, chess-playing and poetizing. An Arabic translation of the last-mentioned verses by Abū I-Qāsim Ismā‘īl b. Ahmad al-Shajārī, who lived at the time of the collapse of the Samanid kingdom, is quoted in Tha‘alibī’s Yatmat al-dahr (where li l-a‘ājīm is a misreading for li l-a‘ghājī); the same verses are quoted again, together with other Arabic verses, in the entry devoted to our poet in the same author’s Tā’īnmat al-yāṭmāh, although here, strangely, Tha‘alibī attributes the translation to Āghājī himself.

Tha‘alibī Yatmat IV p. 79–80; id., Tatimmah II p. 114; LF passim; Rādūyānī p. 35, 84, 95, 128 (and Ateş’s notes, p. 123–4); ‘Arūfī p. 28 (and Qazwīnī ad loc.); ‘Aṣfī I p. 31–2 (and Qazwīnī’s [77] and Nafīsī’s notes ad loc.); Shams p. 213; Hitlay, Majma‘ I p. 11; Ethé, Vorl. p. 62–3; Buzurg I p. 9; Safā, Tarikhnd p. 429–31; Khayyām-pūr p. 8 (with further references); LN s.v. ‘Aghājī’ p. 126; Laizard, Poètes I p. 14; C.E. Bosworth, Minorsky Volume p. 119; Idārāh-chi p. 152–61; Ehr ‘Āghājī Bojārī’ (A. Zaryab); DMBI s.v. ‘Āghājī’ (J. Shi’ār).

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

28. Two verses by an otherwise unknown Ahmad I Manṣūr referring to the captivity of ‘the Qaraḵān’, (i.e. evidently Ahmad I b. Khıdır, who was taken prisoner by Malik-Shah in 482/1089) are quoted by Rādūyānī p. 23. They are important because they give the terminus post quem for Rādūyānī’s book. The same verses are quoted anonymously by Watwāt p. 77.

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

30. ‘Aiyūqī is the name by which the author of Warqah u Gulshāh refers to himself.2 There seems to be no other mention of him in Persian literature apart from the two verses attributed to an author of the same name in the marginal additions to manuscript nūn of Asad’s Laghāt i fars.1 The poem in question, which is preserved in a unique, but obviously very old manuscript, is a mathnawī of more than 2200 verses in mumāqātī metre and is dedicated to a patron whom the poet calls2 sulṭān Muḥammad, Abū I-Qāsim, sulṭān i ḡāzāt i amīr [78] (read: amīr?) i nālā; it would seem most likely that this is the well-known Yāmīn al-dawlah wa Amin al-millāh Abū I-Qāsim Muḥammad b. Sibīkīnīn of Ghaznāvī (389/999 to 421/1030) though it cannot, perhaps, be ruled out entirely that a later monarch with the same kunyah and ism is intended. An interesting stylistic feature of the poem is the fact that nine times4 the poet interrupts the narrative to put short lyrical pieces into the mouths of various characters; these, too, are in mumāqātī, but use mon rhyme.

The poem is based on the pre-Islamic Arabic story of the love of Urwa b. Ḫizām al-‘Uḏrī and his cousin ‘Afra‘; it is found in the Kitāb al-aḥlāt of Abū I-Faraj al-‘Īsābānī2 and was evidently the subject of a lost Kitāb ‘Urwa va ‘Afra‘ mentioned in the Fihrist of Ibn al-Nadīm.6 The author himself tells us7 that he has extracted his poem zi akhhār i dād d kalb i ‘urab. Ateş has claimed an influence of the Arabic-Persian story on the French romance of Flore et Blancheflor, but the evidence for this is fragile.8

Iranian critics have been rather dismissive of the literary merits of ‘Aiyūqī’s poem. None of the [79] less, it is of considerable interest for the

1Ibid. Islāl p. 223, 305.
2P. 3.
3Other possibilities would be the Seljuq Muḥādh b. Abū I-Qāsim Muḥammad b. Muḥammad (511/1118 to 525/1130) or the Khwārizm-shah Sulṭān Abū I-Qāsim Muḥammad b. Il-Azhān (568/1172-3 to 589/1193). If the latter were indeed ‘Aiyūqī’s patron it might be possible to equate our poet with the Majd al-dīn ‘Aiyūqī whom ‘Aṣfī (II p. 354-5) includes among the poets of Khurāsān after Sa‘īdar. However, critics have suggested that the style of Warqah u Gulshāh points more towards the Ghaznavī than to the Seljuq school of poets.
54th edition of 1868, vol. XX p. 152-8; also in Brunnow/Fischer, Arabische Chrestomathie p. 29-36 of the Arabic section.
6Ibid. Flügel, p. 306.
7P. 5 and 122.
8See the discussion in Melikian-Chirvani p. 10-11.
history of Persian narrative poetry and is an important document of the early Neo-Persian language, all the more so given the antiquity of the unique manuscript.

The beginning of the poem is lost. In the manuscript the first 16 verses (inc. ba nâm i khudawand hâlâ u past * kih az hast-ash hast shud har chîh hast) are written, as the editor has noted, in a much later hand. In fact, all these verses are lifted word for word from the ḏibājah of Khwâjû Kirmâni’s Humâyûn, completed in 732/1331-2 (vs. 1-5 = H.-H. 1-5; vs. 6 = the last verse of the section headed dar tauhid; vs. 7-11 in dar na’t; vs. 12-16 in dar hasab). The text contains other lacunae as well.

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


There is also an anonymous, and evidently later Warqâ wa Gulshâh in hâzâj metre (inc. in the Delhi editions: shintadam k-endar aytâm i payambar * yak-e khâlî-ê bud-ê bâ fûh u bê fûr). The relationship (if any) of this and of the various Turkish and Kurdish versions of the story to ‘Ayyûqî’s poem remains to be examined.

Mss.: Tehran Ilâhiyât 1 p. 250 (16th-17th century? Beginning missing); Majlis VIII p. 469 no. 2617 (18th century?); Univ. XII 3880 (recent); Univ. XIV 4775 (recent); Shi‘a i Isla‘î I 98 (recent).


32. Amûr ‘Alî Pûr i Tîghûn (or: ‘Alî-pûr Tîghi?) is credited with a total of twelve verses by Râdüyânî, half of them riddles, and a few of them [81] are repeated by Wâtîvât and (anonymously) by Shams. His identity has not been established, but he is clearly not the well-known Qarakhanid ruler Bûrutigen, as the latter’s Muslim name was not ‘Ali, but Ibrahim.
Râdüyânî p. 18, 48, 100-1 (and Ateş’s notes, p. 102-6); Wâtîvât 16-7; Shams p. 401; Khâyâm-pûr p. 105.

33. ‘Alî Qûrî Andûgânî is credited with a handful of verses in Asâdí’s Lughât i fries.
LF (see the indexes to the three editions); LN s.v. ‘Alî i Qurî (sic) i Andûkânî’ p. 242-3.

1 The 14th-century Varqâ va Gulshâh by Yâsû-i Med’dâh has been edited (with English translation) by G.M. Smith, Leiden 1976. In her introduction the editor makes a brief comparison of Yâsû’s poem with the two Persian versions (p. 12-15) and lists later Turkish recensions of the same story (p. 15-16).
2 Ateş’s reading of the name. The manuscript of the Târubûn has pwr tûy (three clear dots under the ‘p’ on fol. 275a, and a fairly distinct shûf sign over the ‘r’ on fol. 242a). The reading in Jâbi’s edition of Wâtîvât (‘Ali Yûzû Tîghûn) is thus probably wrong.
34. Abū Maṣūr ʿAmmāraḥ b. Muḥammad al-Mawāṣi wrote an
elegy on the last Sanmād ruler, Ismāʿīl (II) al-Mustaṣāf (died 395/1005)
as well as an ode to the Ghaznavid Muḥammad (ruled from 388/998), both
of which, along with a number of other fragments, are quoted by ʿAṣūf.
According to the 12th-century biography of Abū Saʿīd b. Abī I-Khaīr
(357/967 to 440/1049) by his great-great-grandson Muḥammad b.
Munawwar, the saint was so impressed by one of ʿAmmārah’s verses
that he and all his disciples made a pilgrimage to the poet’s grave in
Mawāṣ. The story is at least chronologically possible.2 ʿHidāyāt’s
statement that he died in 360/970-1 is, on the other hand, wrong. [82]

L. Fassim; Rāḍīyānī p. 28, 45 (and Ates’s notes, p. 118-20); Muḥammad b.
Munawwar (see above, p. 70) ed. Zhukovski, p. 350;
ʿAṣūf II p. 24-6 (and Naṣfī’s notes, p. 654-6, with a quotation from the
14th-century Majmaʿ al-anṣāb of Shāhānkchā); ʿHidāyāt, Majmaʿ I
p. 350; ʿEbēh, Vorl. p. 63-8; ʿA. ʿIqbāl, “ʿUmrān i Marwāz,” Sharq I
p. 360; ʿEbn Ṭāhir, S. 195-1951; ʿAbd Allāh b. ʿAridī, known to us only from
the two verses of his cited in L. Fassim (see indexes).

35. For Abū Ismāʿīl ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Anṣārī, the
celebrated Han−βalite mystic (360/1066 to 481/1089), see provisionally
PL. I p. 924-7, where the literature on the 20 ghazals ascribed to him can
be found. His prose works will be discussed in PL. IV. A few of his
rubāʿīyat are quoted in the Kashf al-asrār of his pupil Maḥbūb.3 Other
editions are:

1The name is written thus, with faṭḥah on the first letter and ḥaddah on the second,
in both of its occurrences in Rāḍīyānī, as well as once in the Vatika manuscripts
of L. Fassim (see Horn, Einl. 24) and this reading must doubtless be accepted despite the
rather ludicrous polemics by Ṭāhir (Yaghmat II, 1328h./1949, p. 355, and Dānīsh II,
1329h./1950, p. 121) against Ates in favour of the reading Ṭūmāraḥ. ʿAmmārah, besides
enjoying the support of the ancient manuscript of the Surūr mad al-bulghāb, is
definitely the lectio difficilior.

2The anecdote is repeated by Ṭāhir (both in his Naṣfī’s notes and his Baharīyāt) and by
other late authors (for whom see ʿEbn Ṭāhir).

3On the basis of this work five rubāʿīyat were edited and translated in S. de
Laugier de Beaurecueil, Khodjâ ʿAbdallâh Ansârî, Beyrouth n.d. (preface dated 1963)
p. 308-9.

NINTH TO ELEVENTH CENTURY

Bombay 1308/1880-1 (96 p. Collection of quatrains ascribed to
Khaṭīb, Bābā Tāhir, Abū Saʿīd and Anṣārī, together with the latter’s
Munāṣab); Iran 1361h./1982-3 (Rubāʿīyat i munāṣab ba Khwājah ʿAbd
Allāh i Anṣārī, ed. M. Mudabbirī. Contains 217 quatrains; the sources
for each are indicated in a rather cryptic fashion - there is no biblio-
graphy or identification of the editions used - in the notes. From the
latter it becomes clear that a very large proportion of the poems have also
been attributed to others, in particular Abū Saʿīd b. Abī I-Khaīr). [83]
A versified Fand-namah ascribed to Anṣārī is found in Bombay
Rehatse 233 no. 45.

36. ʿAbd Allāh al-ʿAridī (or ʿAridī) is known to us only from the
two verses of his cited in L. Fassim (see indexes).


37. Abū Maṣūr ʿAllī b. Muḥammad al-Ṭūsī is the author of the
Kashfshāp (or Garshkāh)-nāmah,2 of five Munāṣabāt, and of the
oldest surviving Neo-Persian dictionary and anthology of verse, the
invincible Lughat i furs. Besides these we are very fortunate to possess a
copy in his own handwriting of the Kitāb al-ahbāyāt "an ḫadqāl aḥ-
bāyāyat of Abū Maṣūr Muwafiq b. ʿAllī al-Haraḵī, the oldest surviv-
ing dated Persian manuscript in Arabic script; in the colophon the scribe
gives the date of completion as Shawwaq 447 (October 1055 or
January 1056) and his name as ʿAllī b. Muḥammad al-Ṭūsī al-Shārīr,
from which we can conclude that he was at that time already active as a
poet. His magnus opus, the Kashfshāp-nāmah, was completed, as the
poet tells [84] us,3 in 458/1066 and is dedicated to a ruler of

1Thus in the introductions to manuscripts P, ʿain and ʿān of his Lughat i furs).
Hidāyāt and others give his kānyah as Abī Nasser.

2The expected Neo-Persian representation of Avestan Kersāāspā would be
Kuršāp, and it is only the fact that this form is apparently not attested in Neo-Persian
which prevents me from using it here. Since Asadi himself (in his copy of the Kitāb al-
ahbāyāt) hardly ever distinguishes between k and g, the vulgate spelling with G has
no particular authority, and it is indeed possible that the three dots of its šh- result
simply merely from the mis-copying of the š̄īn sign which Asadi and other early
scribes customarily put over š, though a purely phonetic development of ṣh– to ṣh– is
perhaps not impossible (pace Lust, p. 162a). It is interesting that Khaliqi-Muṭlaq, in
his new edition of the Shīr-nāmah, now also writes ‘Kashfshāp’, rather than ‘Garshkāh’.

3Ed. Yaghmā‘ī, chap. 144, 1. 2.
Nakhchivâni whom he calls ‘Malik Bû Dulaf,’1 ‘Juhânârî dî Dairânât’2 and ‘zi tâkham i Barâtma i pağhelmâr’.3 This king does not seem to be mentioned in historical sources. We do know, however, of an Abû Dulaf al-Shaibâni who ruled in Nakhchivan ca. 370/980; Asadî’s patron must have been a descendant and namesake of his. Afterwards Asadî appears to have attached himself to the court of Shujâ‘ al-daulah Manîchîh b. Shâwûr, who ruled in Ani (Armenia) as a vassal of the Seljuq Alp Arslân from some time after 456/1066;4 this prince’s name (Manîchîh) and title (Shujâ‘ al-daulah) are mentioned in Asadî’s Munzâzarât i rumh u quas. With this we lose track of him. Hîdâyat’s statement that he died in 465/1072-3 is not unlikely, but, as usual, unconfirmed.

The responsibility for the extraordinary degree of confusion which for a long time surrounded Asadî’s biography rests firmly on the shoulders of that notorious liar, Daulat-shâh. According to this ‘authority’, Asadî, the author of the Karshâsp-nâmah, was an older contemporary of Firdausî and, indeed, the latter’s teacher. He declined the invitation to write the Shâh-nâmah and entrusted this task to his ‘pupil’, but when Firdausî was forced to flee from Ghaznah he gave [85] his unfinished manuscript to Asadî, who composed, in less than a day, the last 400 verses of the poem. Ehtê, noticing the blatant contradiction between Daulat-shâh’s statement that Asadî was Firdausî’s elder and the author’s own statement that he completed his epic in 458/1066 (more than a century after his ‘pupil’s’ birth), attempted to reconcile the two by positing the existence of two Asadîs: Asadî pêre, Firdausî’s contemporary, the author of the Munzâzarât (whose patron ‘Manîchîh’ Ehtê identified with Mahmûd), and Asadî fils, the author of the Karshâsp-nâmah and Lughat i fars and the copyst of Muwaffaq’s handbook of pharmacology. This construction, which for many years was accepted virtually unanimously by Western scholars,1 was refuted by Cheykin in an article published in 1934, in which the true identity of the poet’s patron is established and other weighty arguments against the existence of an ‘older’ Asadî are adduced. Daulat-shâh’s story is, in short, pure fantasy.

The Karshâsp-nâmah is a long epic in mutaqâbir metre (inc.: sipas az khudâ, taz i ra-i-nûmûd * kîh az kof u nân kard gût bû pây) consisting, as we are told in one of the versions of the concluding sections,2 of some 9000 verses. The poem deals with the adventures of Karshâsp, the great-great-uncle of Rustam, which, as the poet explicitly tells us (chap. 11), Firdausî had not included in his Shâh-nâmah, despite the fact that it is ‘a branch from the same tree’, i.e. part of the same epic tradition. As for his source, the poet speaks of ‘a book of the adventures of Karshâsp’, possibly identical with the Khud i Karshâsp of [86] Abû Mu‘â‘îyad al-Balkhi, mentioned in Târîkh i Shâhân.3 In fact, it is clear that the story of Karshâsp is of great antiquity. The dragon-slayer Karshâsp is mentioned a number of times in the Avesta and figures (as Karshasp) significantly in Middle-Persian religious writings,4 but the story that Asadî tells has few points of contact with what we know from older sources.

Mss.5 Oxford Elliot 140 (Ehtê 507. Pictures); Elliot 141 (Ehtê 508. Incomplete); London Or. 2780 I (Rieu Suppt. no. 201. Dated 1397. End missing. Pictures); Or. 11586 (Meredith-Owens p. 73. 14th century? Fragments of a Ms. found in a binding); Or. 12985 (Meredith-Owens p. 76. Dated 1391/1573-4. Pictures); I.O. 893 (Dated 1303/1594-5. Damaged and incomplete); Or. 2878 (Rieu Suppt. no. 202. 16th century? The prologue and epilogue omit any mention of the poet’s patron. Pictures); Or. 11678 (Meredith-Owens p. 73. Dated 1344).

1 Rieu, Suppt. p. 134, while accepting Ehtê’s two Asadîs, noted already the fragility of the construction which made one the son of the other.
2 Id. Yâhâbî’s, p. 477, footnote 10, v. 4, from the Mashhad manuscript.
3 p. 85.
a prose translation); *Teheran* 1317ah./1938-9 (ed. H. Yaghmaį); Critical edition of the whole poem; reprinted 1354ah./1975.


Translations: (Gujarati): Ms. *Navsari* Meherji Rana p. 139 no. 18 (3 volumes. Dated 21 Ādār 1189 Y./1820). An extract from a Gujarati version (the story of Karshāsp and the Brahmī) is found in *Navsari* Meherji Rana p. 139 no. 17 (Two hands, dated 1178 Y./1808-9 and 1185 Y./1815-6 respectively). Brevi, p. xxxii, mentions a Gujarati version of the *Karshāsp-nāmah* ‘made by Novroji Kavasji and printed in 1852 A.D. ... A later edition [of the same translation?] also exists in the Library.’

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

(German): A translation by H. Kauzas-Credé has been published in instalments in *Iranistikische Mitteilungen* XXVI, 1996, to XXVIII, 1998.

Asadi’s other principal poetic work is the five *Munāzarát*, or poetic contests, namely: (1) a debate between lance and bow (*munāzarah i rumb u qaus*); (2) between heaven and earth (*munāzarah i zmān u zmān*); (3) between Muslim and Zoroastrian (*munāzarah i muslim u gahr*); (4) between Arab and Persian (*munāzarah ha’i gharr kunad ba fidā i qiam*); (5) between day and night (*munāzarah i shab u rāz*).

The last-mentioned of these is quoted in extenso by Daulat-shah and others. Ms.: *Oxford* Elliot 37 fol. 222a sqq. (Eth 1333 = *Daqīq al-aslār*).


Cf.: H. Ethé, ‘Über persische Tenzenz’, *Verhandlungen des fünften internationalen* [89] *Orientalisten-Congresses*, Berlin 1882, II/1, p. 48-135 (Contains an edition and translation of no. 1, 2 and 5); Ye. E. Bertel’s, Πέμες τοιαύται Ασάδη Ταςτικου; *UZIV* 19, 1958, p. 55-88 (=edition and translation of no. 4).

A *tasmi‘* of 13 strophes is likewise found in *Oxford* Elliot 37 fol. 68a (Eth 1333 = *Daqīq al-aslār*) as well as in some copies of the *dhwān* of Qajarān. Edition: J. Khālīqi-Muṣlla, *’Asadi i Tāt*, *MDAM* XIII, 1356ah./1978, p. 643-78.


38. Abū Nazār Abīl-Aʿlā b. Maṣḥūr al-ʿAṣjaḏī al-Marvāzī eulogised the Ghaznavids Māhmūd and Masʿūd I (L) and appears to have survived into the reign of Maudūd (432/1041 to 440/1048), if we are to believe Muʿīzzī2 when he reminds one of his patrons that the father of the latter had enjoyed the praise of ‘Aṣjaḏī ’in the days of Chaghārī and Maudūd’.

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


1The two verses are quoted also, to illustrate the same lemmata, in Sādūq p. 147, 173.


39. Abū Bakr (or: Abū l-Maḥṣūn) al-Aẓraʾī [91] al-Harawī has left us with a fairly slender dhwān (2675 verses in Nafisi’s edition), consisting largely of odes dedicated to two Seljuk princes: Abū l-Fawāris Shams al-daulāh Tughān-shāh b. Alp-Arsālān Mūhammad b. Chaghārī, who was the ruler of Herat during the reign of his father (Alp-Arsālān, died 465/1072) and that of his brother (Mālīk-Shāh) at least until 476/1083-4 (from which year we possess a coin minted in his name), and Abū l-Muzaffar Aḥmād-shāh b. Qāwūr b. Chaghārī, who was blinded by order of Malik-Shāh shortly after his succession. We also have one poem lauding - at least according to the superscription in Nafisi’s edition3 - the holy man Abū Allāh al-Aṣjaḏī (396/1006 to 481/1089).4 All of this indicates that Aẓraʾī must have flourished in the third quarter of

---

1Thus twice in ‘Aṣjaḏī and in Hādīyāt.

2Thus ‘Aṣjaḏī. It is, of course, possible that our poet had the tim Abū Bakr and the khanqah Abū l-Maḥṣūn. Qazwīnī (ed ‘Aṣjaḏī p. 174) proposed tentatively that his tim might have been Jaffār on the basis of the verse in his dhwān (ed. Nafisi no. 64, v. 2281) which reads ba gūr r khwār r jaffār dar-am na-ghāt, khesrū-dā * bē-nawāt-ha l harrām mā jaffār tart, that the rhyme guarantees that the last word is indeed jaffār (with ya‘i m-ruqf) and that it is thus impossible to read man jaffār-kh, a (man called) Jaffār.

3No. 5. The poem does occur in the 13th-century London manuscript, Or. 3713, on fol. 23a, but with the superscription wa laha laha, implying (perhaps implausibly) that it was dedicated to the same patron as the previous poem in this collection, i.e. Tughān-shāh. Incidentally, there is often considerable discrepancy between this old manuscript and the edition with regard to the names mentioned in the superscriptions.

4Above, p. 82.
the 11th century; this is consistent also with Mustauffi's statement that Azraqī was a contemporary of the Ghaznavid Ibrāhīm (451/1099 to 492/1099) as well as with 'Arūnlī's story of how Firdausī took refuge with Azraqī's father, Ismā'īl al-Warrāqī, in Herat, after his flight from Ghaznah,1 which - if the story is true - must [92] have been in the first decade of the 11th century. Taqī Kāshgārī2 (who was in the habit of giving totally fanciful dates for the deaths of the poets included in his anthology) says that Azraqī died in 527/1132-3, which is much too late, as Qazvīnī rightly observed; if Ismā'īl was really Firdausī's host at the beginning of the 11th century he is not likely to have had a son who lived well into the second quarter of the 12th. Despite this, Nafīṣī has attempted to rescue our poet's claim to extraordinary longevity by pointing out that some copies of Azraqī's dīwān contain a poem (no. 25 of his edition) praising the Ghaznavid Abū l-Mu'ālekh Arslān-shāh (509/1115 to 512/1118) and another (no. 24) dedicated to his successor Yāmīn al-daulah Bahram-shāh (512/1118 to 547/1152). But Nafīṣī himself admits3 that he found the first of these poems in only two (unspecified) manuscripts and the second in only one and that their authenticity is thus far from certain. To this I can add that neither of the poems is to be found in the excellent 13th-century London manuscript of Azraqī's dīwān.4

'Āufī states that Azraqī versified the book of Alifīyah wa Shafīyah (or however the title is to be read)5 in order to cure his master Tughān-shāh of impotence and proceeds to give a lurid description of how the remedy took effect. Azraqī's poem is doubtless connected with the (lost) Arabic works Kitāb al-alifīyah al-aghīr and ... al-khaṭb [93] listed by Ibn al-Nadīm under the heading 'books written about sexual intercourse in the guise of titillating anecdotes'.6 'Āufī adds that Azraqī's poem was illustrated. Bahāqī7 tells how Mas'ūd had one of his pleasure-domes decorated with copulation scenes from the 'book of Alifīyah', evidently not Azraqī's version, though the latter could well have been the object of the (lost) 'refutation' (Naqdat kitāb Alifīyah wa Shafīyah) which Abū Bakr b. Khusrāu al-Ustād wrote for the atabeg of Azerbaijan, Qızıl Arslān (581/1186 to 587/1191).2

Some late authors (Daulat-shāh and Ḥājjī Khālīfī, both expressly on the authority of others3) claim that Azraqī 'wrote' (i.e. presumably versified) the Sindbād-nāmah, but as long as no quotations from this work have been identified this cannot be regarded as certain. There are two references to the story of Sindbād in Azraqī's dīwān: in one4 the poet appears to claim the authorship not only of the akhbār i Sindbād, but [94] also of the tārīkh i Shāh-nāmah; but - assuming the poem is indeed by Azraqī - it would seem more likely that the author is in fact alluding to two well-known poems from the past. In the other5 Azraqī says that the 'poetry' in the council's Sindbād is 'difficult' but that he will elucidate its 'expressions' (ma'arif) if the king gives him sufficient funds. This would seem to refer to a 'difficult' older version of the story (perhaps Rūdkhā'ī's?) which Azraqī is proposing either to replace by a more up-to-date version, or perhaps merely to supply with a commentary. In either case it is by no means certain that Azraqī ever carried out

---

1P. 121.
2Mentioned in the introduction to Abū Bakr's Ma'Rī's-nāmah; see G.M. Meredith-Owens, Minorski Vol. p. 435.
3Daulat-shāh p. 72: wa gūyand kī kītāb i Sindbād ... az musanafat i ṣa'; Ḥājjī Khālīfī no. 7259: wa ra'a'isu bi kaft̄ bo'ed al-'ulamā' anna-hu (ṣ. Sindbād-nāmah) li l-bātik al-azraqī.
4No. 7, v. 191. This poem is something of a problem insofar as it occurs also in copies of the dīwān of Muhktārī, including the oldest copy, London Or. 3713, completed in 697/1298. But the same manuscript also contains the dīwān of Azraqī and attributes the poem to him as well (fol. 33a); however, in missing in the collection of Azraqī's poems in the Dūblīn manuscript. Cf. the edition of Muhktārī's dīwān by I. Ḥumāyūn, Tehran 1341/1962 p. 80-1 (note that Ḥumāyūn misquotes the number of his codex optimus as Or. 4514 - this is in fact a different copy of the dīwān - and overlooks the fact that the manuscript attributes the poem to both poets).
5No. 64, v. 2275-6: kābī bīnadh shahādāt dhān-hāh i sindbād nīk dūndūk k-anādr ḍa'shwär hikāādā shahādār man ma'ādāh-hāh i ā-ra ʿaywar i dānimk humāyūn gur bātkā c to šaḥādā shāhšīn rā ʿaywar.
this undertaking; the account of how Azra'îj 'wrote' the *Sindbad-nama* may have been extrapolated from these verses.

Azra'îj's *dhvân*, which exists in at least one 13th-century manuscript and from which, moreover, 'Auat quotes a good number of poems, would seem a very promising candidate for a critical edition.

Mes.: Dublin Beauty 103 V (Ms. completed Dhi'l-i-bijah 699/1300, End missing); London Or. 3713 fol. 18b-35b (Rieu Suppt. no. 211 III. Ms. completed 5 Safar 697/1298); Or. 3376 fol. 109a-129a (Rieu Suppt. no. 234 III. Dated 2 Dhi l-qa'âdah 1002/1594. Imperfect); S.O.A.S. 35350 (Dated 1006/1597-8); Or. 2880 fol. 140b-197b (Rieu Suppt. no. 224 III. Completed Jumâdâ I 1245/1829); Or. 2995 fol. 2b-87a (Rieu Suppt. no. 213 I. Dated 10 Ramaḍân 1264/1848); I.O. 909; Cambridge Browne Coll. V.4 (Pictures); Or. 1724/4 (modern forgery 'dated' Rabî' 604/1208; see also *Mikrîfîlm-hâ* I p. 541); *Paris Supplément* 725 I (Blochet 1206. 16th century?); [95] Supplément 724 (Blochet 1207. Dated 12 Ramaḍân 1008/1600); Supplément 701 (Blochet 1246. Dated 8 Sha'bân 1016/1607. Contains the *dhvân* of Azra'îj and of Zahîr al-dîn Fârâyîn, but the pages are in disorder); *Berlin* Sprenger 1384 (Pertsch 711. Dated 27 Jumâdâ I 1044/1634); Istanbul Hâkim-e'ûtlu 'Ali Pâsha 669/7 (Mikrîfîlm-hâ I p. 461); *Madînah* 'Arîf Hikmat 39 (Nâshshâh-hâ V p. 484); *Isfahân* (Nâshshâh-hâ VI p. 596); *Tehran* Majlis 6228/3 (Munz. no. 21485 insipixit. Dated Rabî' II 996/1588); Majlis III 1183/2 (Dated 1003/1594-5); Adabîyât II p. 11 (Dated 1007/1598-9) [Munz. I; Malik 4829 (Munz. no. 21486 insipixit. 16th century?); Majlis III 1058-9 (Dated 1010/1601-2); Adabîyât I p. 245 (Dated 20 Ramaḍân 1013/1605); Univ. VIII 1408/2 (Dated Shawwâl 1015/1607); Millî 200/1 (Nâshshâh-hâ VI p. 194. Dated 1045/1635-6); Majlis II 349 (Dated 1206/1791-2); Dânish-sarây i 8îlî (Nâshshâh-hâ V p. 640. Dated 13 Sha'âbân 1219/1804); Majlis 4684/1 (Munz. no. 21504 insipixit. Dated 1256/1840); Majlis II 348 (Dated 1261/1845); Gulistan/Azâbây 7 (Dated 1287/1870-1); Malik 4956/1 (Munz. no. 21496 insipixit); Millî 569/3; Adabîyât p. 16 [Munz. I; Millî IV 1973 (16th century?); Millî V 2694 (18th century?); Millî 39 (Nâshshâh-hâ IV p. 158); Malik 5174 (Munz. 21517 insipixit); Shûrâ i Islâmî I 91 64-114; *Qum* Mar'âshi XIV 5415 (17th century?); *Rashî* p. 1121

1i.e. London Or. 3713. The Cambridge copy Or. 1724 is a modern forgery (see below, p. 366-7). For Dublin Beauty 103, see below, p. 609 fn.
this undertaking; the account of how Azraqi ‘wrote’ the Sindbad-namah may have been extrapolated from these verses. Azraqi’s dhwān, which exists in at least one 13th-century manuscript1 and from which, moreover, ‘Aṣafi quotes a good number of poems, would seem a very promising candidate for a critical edition.

Mss.: Dublin Beatty 103 V (Ms. completed Dhū l-ḥijjah 699/1300, End missing); London Or. 3713 fol. 18b-35b (Rieu Suppt. no. 211 III. Ms. completed 5 Safar 697/1298); Or. 3376 fol. 109a-129a (Rieu Suppt. no. 234 III. Dated 2 Dhū l-qa’dah 1002/1594. Imperfect); S.O.A.S. 35350 (Dated 1006/1597-8); Or. 2880 fol. 140b-197b (Rieu Suppt. no. 224 III. Completed Junūdālā 1245/1829); Or. 2995 fol. 2b-87a (Rieu Suppt. no. 213 I. Dated 10 Ramaḍān 1264/1848); I.O. 909; Cambridge Browne Coll. V.4 (Pictures); Or. 1724/4 (modern forgery ‘dated’ Rajab 604/1208; see also Mikrīfdīn-hā I p. 541); Paris Supplément 725 I (Blochet 1206. 16th century?); [95] Supplément 724 (Blochet 1207. Dated 12 Ramaḍān 1008/1600; Supplément 701 (Blochet 1246. Dated 8 Sha’bān 1016/1607. Contains the dhwāns of Azraqi and of Zahir al-dīn Fāryābī, but the pages are in disorder); Berlin Sprenger 1384 (Pertsch 711. Dated 27 Jumādī-īdād 1044/1634); Istanbul Hāfīz-āqīl ‘Ali Pāsha 669/7 (Mikrīfdīn-hā I p. 461); Madīnah ʿArif Ḥikmat 39 (Nuskhah-hā V p. 484); Isfahān (Nuskhah-hā VI p. 596); Tehran Majlis 622/83 (Munz. no. 21485 inspexist. Dated Rabī‘ II 996/1588); Majlis III 1183/2 (Dated 1003/1594-5); Adabiyyāt II p. 11 (Dated 1007/1598-9) [Munz.]; Malīk 4829 (Munz. no. 21486 inspexist. 16th century?); Majlis III 1058/9 (Dated 1010/160-2); Adabiyyāt I p. 245 (Dated 20 Ramaḍān 1013/1605); Univ. VIII 1408/2 (Dated Shawwal 1015/1607); Ḍāʾī 200/1 (Nuskhah-hā VI p. 194. Dated 1045/1635-6); Majlis II 349 (Dated 1260/1791-2); Dānish-sarāy i Ḍāʾī (Nuskhah-hā V p. 640. Dated 13 Shaʿbān 1219/1804); Malījī 4684/1 (Munz. no. 21504 inspexist. Dated 1256/1840); Majlis II 348 (Dated 1261/1845); Gūlidān/Atibāy 7 (Dated 1287/1870-1); Malīk 4956/1 (Munz. no. 21496 inspexist); Malījī 569/3; Adabiyyāt II p. 16 [Munz.]; Malījī IV 1973 (16th century?); Malījī V 2694 (18th century?); Malījī 39 (Nuskhah-hā IV p. 158); Malījī 5174 (Munz. 21517 inspexist); Shūrā i Islāmī I 91 p. 64-114; Qum Marʿāshī XIV 5415 (17th century?); Rashī 1121

17th century?); Kashan (Nuskhah-hā VII p. 730. Qajar period); Mashhad (Rūdavī VII 346 (Dated 20 Muharram 1011/1602); Rūdavī VII 344 (Dated Rabī‘ II 1261/1845); Rūdavī VII 343 (Dated 1288/1871-2); Univ. 111; Tashkent Acad. 781. (Dated 1269/1852-3); Acad. 782. (Dated 1270/1853-4); Hyderabad (Asfāfiyāh III p. 288); Lucknow Sprenger 151; Calcutta Ion Hofner 190 (17th century?); Naṣīrī (p. xii-xv) mentions various manuscripts in private collections including one completed on 2 Dhū l-qa’dah 821/1418. Cf. Munz. III 21484-528. [96]

Selected poems: Oxford Elliot 37 fol. 98a (Ebenh 1333 = Daqqāq al-ash‘ār); Whinfeld 54 (Beeston 67/11. Dated 9 Rabjāb 1012/1603); Cambridge Browne Coll. V.65 no. 18 (Anthology dated 27 Ramaḍān 827/1424); Paris Supplément 783 fol. 4 sqq. (Blochet 1981. 16th century?); Supplément 1252 fol. 10v (Blochet 1992. 17th century?); Rome Ms. Caetani 60 (Piemontese 17. Dated 1 Sha’bān 1013/1604); Tehran Majlis XVII 5975 (18th century?); Majlis XVII 2326 (17th century?); Calcutta Ion Hofner 927 fol. 167v-172 (Modern).


40. Bābā Tāhir ‘Uryān is a ṣaffi saint and the reputed author of a number of fahālifīwā’ī, i.e. quatrains in hajaw metre and non-standard Persian. The closest thing that we have to a historical fact about him is the story that Rāwandi tells us about his meeting with Ṭoḡrul at the time when the latter entered Hamadan, i.e in 447/1055. Attempts to deduce the date of his birth from one of the [97] quatrains are idle speculation.1

1 i.e. London Or. 3713. The Cambridge copy Or. 1724 is a modern forgery (see below, p. 366-7). For Dublin Beatty 103, see below, p. 609 fn.
He is not mentioned as a poet by any early source; it is particularly striking that Shams i Qais, who devotes an extensive discussion to fahlvanâyat, mentions only Bundar (q.v.) and not the supposedly so famous Bâbâ Tahir as an author of such pieces. Attempts by various scholars to determine the dialect basis of the quatrains have not led to coherent results. It seems most probable that the recitation and copying of the poems by speakers of several idiom have resulted in a dialect mixture.

His du-ba’its have been noted in the following manuscripts:

London I.O. 4582/7 (Dated 1274/1858); Paris Supplément 1542 (Blichot 1072, 19th century); Supplément 1435 fol. 5 sq. (Blichot 2183; Manuscript dated 1 Dhul-hijjah 1262/1846); Berlin Minutoli 297 (Pertech 697); Ms. or. oct. 1151 (Heinz 85); Leningrad Acad. A67 (Index 1726. Dated 1204/1789-90); Univ. 1280, 1281a (Tagirdzhianov p.6); Konya Museum 2547 (Dated 1248/1444-5, according to M. Minuwi, MDAT IV/2, 1325sh./1946, p. 54-9); Baku 1337 (Dated Shawwâl 1278/1862); Tehran Majlis XVII 5995/57 (16th-17th century?); Univ. XIII 4351 (17th-18th century?); Univ. XIII 4430 (19th century?); Mashhad Univ. 332/5 (Ms. contains the date 14 Muḥarram 1264/1847); Rjâdsh VII 930 (Dated Shaban 1222/1867); Univ. 318 p. 12-23 (Dated 29 Dhul-hijjah 1292/1876); Calcutta Ivanov 923 fol. 310. Further late Ms. in Munz. IV p. 2827-8.

Editions: Tehran 1274/1858-9; 1306sh./1927 (ed. W. Dastgîri); reprinted several times; 1336sh./1957 (ed. H. K. Kirmâni); 1354sh./1976 (J. [98] Mosâqir, Sharh i alyavâ u tâhâr u du-ba’ît-hâ i Bâbâ Tahir i ‘Uryân; contains on p. 85-184 an edition of 365 quatrains and 4 ghazals); 1363sh./1984 (ed. M. Ilîhî-Qumshâri, 2nd edition); Bombay 1297/1880; 1301/1883-4; 1308/1890-1 (96 p. Collection of quatrains ascribed to Khâiyâm, Bâbâ Tahir, Abu Sa’îd and Anšârî, together with the latter’s Munâštâ); London 1902 (The Lament of Bâbâ Tahir, being the Rubâ’îyât of Bâbâ Tahir, edited and translated by E. Heron-Allen with a verse rendering by E.C. Brenton), Lahore 1924 (ed.}

1By calculating the numerical values of the letters occurring in certain words Mirza Mehol Khan deduced that he was born in 326/973-8. On the basis of the word af occurring in the same poem Yâsami concluded that he was born in A.D. 1000. Of course, time-reckoning based on the basis of ani domini was unknown even to the Christians in medieval Persia.

Maulawî Wajîhât Husain; Dushane 1963 (Babi Tohir. Muntakhabi rubalyât, ed. M. Rahimî, with 196 quatrains and 2 ghazals).


Translations: besides those mentioned under ‘editions’ (German verse): G.L. Leszczynski, Die Rubâ’îyat (sic) des Bâbâ Tahir ‘Uryân oder die Gottestränen des Herzen aus dem west-medischen (sic) Original... Munich n.d. [1920].


41 Bâdi and 42. Bâdi‘îyat: The former is included by ‘Aufi among the poets of the Samanid period. He gives his name as Abu Muhammed al-Badi’ b. Muhammad b. Mahmud al-Balkhi and quotes a

1Thus according to the table of contents and the errata slip. In the article itself the author’s name is given as Syed Ali Bilgrami.

number of verses from an ode in praise of Abū Yahyā (thus in the poem) Tāhir b. al-Fadl al-Saghānī (died 381/991) and two verses from another poem. Hīdāyatī attributes six verses from the mentioned ode to a poet whom he calls Muḥammad b. Māhmūd Bālkhī, with the pen-name Badā'ī, and whom he claims to have been a contemporary of Sūfī Māhmūd. The same author then proceeds to say that this Badā'ī is the author of the Pand-nāmah i Anšār-e-Rawān, from which he quotes 91 verses, most of which can be found in the poem published by Schefer as Rāhat al-insān. Nafāsī suggested, with a certain amount of hesitation, that Hīdāyat might have confused two different poets, ‘Auft’s Badā’ and the author of the Pand-nāmah, who, in the manuscript from which Hīdāyat transcribed his extracts, was apparently called Badā’ī. This would seem to be confirmed by the discovery of a second manuscript of the poem in Leningrad, which the hand-list describes as the Pand-nāmah i Nāshīr-e-Rawān i ādil by Muhammad [100] b. Māhmūd Badā’ī Bālkhī. If the author’s name is really given in this form in the manuscript one should perhaps reconsider the possibility that he is in fact identical with the poet mentioned by ‘Auft, but this requires confirmation. One verse by (the same?) Badā’ī is quoted in Sīrah p. 269, and one by ‘Badā’ī in manuscript min of LF (ed. Iqbal p. 474).

The manuscript used by Hīdāyat included a fair number of verses missing in Schefer’s copy, among them the first six verses of the poem. Instead of these Schefer’s version has a prose introduction in which the name of the author is given as ‘Sharfī i shā’t i jawn’ and the title of the poem as Rāhat al-insān. But this introduction is clearly spurious; Fouchécour has observed that it is virtually identical with the introduction in two manuscripts of a Rāhat al-insān in prose and that it was from this work that the copyist has lifted it.

This Pand-nāmah (inc.: sipās az khudawand i charqī i buland * kih dar dīl na-gunfūd az o chān u chand) purports to contain the wise sayings which Anšār-e-Rawān had inscribed on the 23 turrets of his throne. These are then given in 98 stanzas of 4 rhymed couplets each in muqā‘ātīb metre. Basing himself on the fact that the poem quotes two verses by ‘Unṣūrī, Schefer claimed that ‘l’auteur a dû être le contemporain d’Onory ou vivre peu d’années après lui’, and Nafāsī has also argued that the style of the poem points towards a dating in the second half of the 5th/11th century, a date accepted also by Rypka, and Fouchécour. The date of the Leningrad manuscript (708/1308-9) provides, in any event, the terminus ad quem of the work. The poem is perhaps related to the (lost) Kīdāb al-sāf of Ibn al-Muqaffā and [101] belongs in any case to the many versions, in prose and verse, of the wise counsels of the celebrated Sassanian autocrat.

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

Editions: Ch. Schefer, Chrestomatīa persica I, Paris 1883, p. 206-232 (Persian section; see also his ‘Notice’, p. 205-7 of the French section); S. Nafāsī, Mīhr II, 1313h./1934, p. 181-8, 254-64 (Based on Schefer’s edition, with additional verses from Majma’).

Besides the fundamental work by Nafāsī (see editions) cf. Safī, Tarīk al-jām p. 422-8; Khaylām-pār p. 81; LN s.v. ‘Bādī’ i Bālkhī’; Fouchécour, Moralia p. 46-9; Idrā‘ī ch’ p. 168-70.

43. Ibn Ahmad al-Badrī al-Ghaznavī is credited with a rubā’ī in ‘Auft’s chapter on the Ghaznavī poets.

44. Abū l-Hasan ‘All al-Bahrānī al-Sarakhšī is included by both ‘Arūdī and ‘Auft (who cites a dozen of his verses) among the poets of the Ghaznavī period. Rāzi says that he lived at the time of Māhmūd, while Hīdāyat states that he flourished under that king’s father ‘Abdolkāhin (died 387/948-9) and that he himself died in 500/1106-7 but these statements can hardly both be correct. A treatise on metrics with the title Kītāb ghīyāt [102] al-‘arāḍītīn (or: al-‘arāḍītīn, i.e. ‘of Arabic and Persian

1P. 251.
2Poètes p. 28.
3Thus ‘Auft’s ism was evidently missing already in ‘Auft’s source, since Badrī is included in the section devoted to ‘poets of this (i.e. Ghaznavī) period whose name and noms are not known’. In Nafāsī’s edition (p. 298) the name is supplied as ‘Husainīyān’, but on what authority?
prosody’) is mentioned by ‘Arūdi and by Shams and the former adds that he also wrote a work on rhymes, *Kanz al-qāfiyah*. There is in fact in London, I.O. Delhi 1217, an apparently unique manuscript of a work entitled *Kanz al-qawāf* by one ‘Īzz al-dīn Shāhk ‘Alī i ‘Īzz al-dīn al-Sarakhshī, but closer examination of the book is required to determine if it is really a work of the 10th or 11th century. It would appear that the book mentioned by ‘Auﬁ with the title *Khujastah-nāmah* also dealt with poetics.


45. The *Bal’ami* who is named as the author of two verses quoted by the *Farhang i Jāhāngīrī* is presumably one or the other of the well-known Samanid wazirs, Abū 1-Faṣl Muḥammad b. ‘Ubaid Allāh al-Bal’ami (died 329/940), or his son Abū ‘Ali Muḥammad, called Amīrār (died probably after 382/992).


46. *Bassām* i Kord is the author of a poem commemorating the defeat of the Kharijite leader ‘Amīrār by Yaṣṭīb b. Luth in 251/865.


*Ṭārikh i Sīstān* p. 211-2; Meier, *Mahsa‘t* p. 11.

---

1 P. 30.
2 P. 159.
3 In ‘Auﬁ II p. 68 ‘Bahramī’ is an error for Mukhtar. See below, no. 113.

47. Bihrūz Ṭabarī is known to us only from ‘Auﬁ,1 who includes him under the Ghaznavid poets and quotes two verses of his lampooning a mean patron.

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


49. *Burhānī* was the father of the celebrated Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Malik al-Mu‘izzī.2 His given name must therefore have been ‘Abd al-Malik. ‘Arūdi tells the story of his own encounter with Mu‘izzī in 510/1116-7, in the course of which the latter told our informant that his father, the poet-laureate (amr al-shārār?) Burhānī died in Qazvin at the beginning of the reign of Malik-shāh (i.e. not long after 465/1072-3) and handed over to his son his position at the court. ‘Arūdi then quotes a verse which the old man recited on this occasion, but it is possible that the verse is not by him, but by Abīd Mukhtār.3 A *rubā‘* by Burhānī is quoted by Rādiyānī, a poem of 14 verses by Jājarmī and three further verses from an unidentified *jung* were added by Ṣafā.

Rādiyānī p. 110-1 (and Ateq ad loc.); ‘Arūdi p. 28, 41 (and Qazwīnī’s notes p. 154-5, 168-9); Jājarmī II p. 481-2; Ṣafā’s introduc-

---

1 P. 67.
2 See below, p. 421-3.
3 See below, p. 196-7 (no. 113).
tion to his edition of the ḏawān of Muʿīzī, Tehran 1318h./1939, p. ii;
iv; M. Muʿīn, Ḏurūḥāt wa ḡaḏaḥā iʿār, NDAT I/1, 1327h./1948, p. 7.
18; Ṣafā, Tārīkh I/6 p. 430-2; Khayyām-pūr p. 84.

50. ʿAbū ʿAlī b. Muḥammad al-Bustī, who served as a secre-
tary under Sebūkṭī and Māhmūd, is a well-known Arabic poet. A few
fragments of Persian verse (in which, it seems, he indulged only in an
amateur capacity) have come down to us as well.

LF (one verse s.v. chaghād); Rādiyānī p. 85 (and Aṭīaʾs notes, p.
94-5); Wajīū p. 57; ‘Auṭī I p. 64-5; Daulat-shāh p. 26-7; Jāmī,
Naḥāfī p. 405, no. 425; Hīḍīyāt, Majmaʾ I p. 70; Eṭrā, Vorl. p. 55-7;
P. Baidāʾī, ‘Ṣaḥḥ Abu ʿAlī-Fath-i Bustī’, Armaghān XVIII, 1316h./1936,
p. 221-4; LN s.v. ‘ʿAbū l-Fath’; Ṣafā, Tārīkh I/6 p. 457-8 Khayyām-pūr
[105] p. 20-1; Idārār-e chū p. 272-84; EL2 s.v. ‘Busī’ (J.W. Fück);
Lazard, Poètes I p. 14; Eīr s.v. ‘Bosī’ (Z. Safa).

51. ʿAbū ʿAlī ʿAmīr ʿAbbās b. Ḥārūn al-Qāṭīn al-muṣaqqaṭ bi
Būzūrjaʿīnīh was another bilingual poet, five of whose Arabic verses are
quoted by Ṣāḥiblībī. ‘Auṭī, who gives him the title ʿAmīr and includes him
in his chapter on the ‘great kings’ who composed poetry, repeats two of
these (with explicit reference to Ṣāḥiblībī as his source) and then quotes
seven Persian verses, two of them from an ode to Sulṭān Māhmūd. He is
presumably identical with the ‘Būzūrjaʿīnīh i Ṭasīqī’ whom Shams i Ḥaq
mentions, alongside Ḥarāmī (q.v.), as one of the Persian prosodists.

Ṣāḥiblībī, Tatāmān I p. 45; ʿArūqī p. 28 (and Qaẓwīnī ad loc.);
‘Auṭī I p. 33; Shams p. 151-2; Ṣafā, Tārīkh I/6 p. 570; Khayyām-pūr
p. 84.

52. Daqīqī is remembered primarily as the author of some thou-
sand verses concerning the legend of Zoroaster and his patron, Gushṭāp,
which Firdausī incorporated into his Shāh-nāma.1 His name is given by
‘Auṭī as ʿAbū ʿAmīr ʿAbbās b. ʿAbbās b. Shams i Ḥaq;
by others as Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. ʿAbbās, his birthplace as Ṭūs, Balkh, Samarqand or Bu-
khāra. The dates which the anthologists give for his death are con-
tradictory and improbable. We possess fragments of an ode which he
wrote for two of the Samanids, ʿAmīr b. Nūḥ (350/961 to 365/975-6)
and his son Nūḥ b. ʿAmīr (365/975-6 to 387/997); this gives us an
approximate idea of when he flourished.

In the introduction to his Shāh-nāma, Firdausī tells how the
‘young man’ Daqīqī undertook the versification of the Book of Kings;
his contemporary had ‘bad companions’ and was killed by one of his [106]
slaves before he could complete the poem. At the beginning of the sec-
section on Guḥštāp, Firdausī tells how Daqīqī appeared to him in a
dream and asked him to insert into his poem the ‘thousand verses’ on Gushṭāp
and Arjāsp which he had completed ‘when my life ended’. Firdausī pro-
ceeded to do so, though not without some disparaging remarks on the
quality of his predecessor’s poetry.2 Firdausī’s words have been widely
understood to mean that Daqīqī’s work on the Shāh-nāma consisted
only of the verses subsequently incorporated into Firdausī’s epic, but
they could also mean simply that the episode in question was the last that
Daqīqī completed before his ‘life ended’, but not necessarily the only
one he wrote. That Firdausī incorporated this particular fragment into his
own poem was of course a convenient way of deferring from himself
any recriminations that pious Muslims might raise against the positive
image of Zoroaster in the Book of Kings; it need not mean that this was
all that he had of his predecessor’s work. Indeed, ‘Auṭī says that Daqīqī
wrote 20 000 verses of his Book of Kings. This is not necessarily true;
however, the Tārīkh-nāma i Ḥarīf of Saḥīf ʿArwāi attributes some 70
couples in muṣaqqāṭ metre and in epic style to Daqīqī, and it seems
totally possible that these are indeed fragments of his Shāh-nāma,
though they could conceivably belong to a different work of his. They
include what are evidently the opening lines of the poem (Lazard’s frag-
ments 267-9, beginning ba yazdān i dānār khudāwān i jān * kīh charkh
āfrud u zamin u zamān).

In frag. 205-6 the poet says that ‘Daqīqī has chosen four things
from the good and bad in the world’: red lips, the sound of the harp,
wine and the Zoroastrian religion (dīn, var. kāsh i zar dīn). One of
the basis of these verses, it has been [107] repeatedly been argued that Daqīqī was
in fact a Zoroastrian; this seems, however, most unlikely. To begin
with, the statement that he has ‘chosen’ (bar gachda-st) Zoroastrianism
would be decidedly strange if the poet had been born and raised in the

2Moscow edition VI p. 136.
old religion; it would seem rather to point to a conversion. But, that a Muslim in 10th-century Persia should have converted to another religion and then flaunted his apostasy in verse is something that can hardly be imagined. The verses must mean that the Muslim poet has ‘chosen’, ‘given preference to’, ‘expressed admiration for’ Zoroastrianism, but not actually formally adhered to it. This sentiment belongs, together with the invocation of ‘idols’, or with the praise of wine and other forbidden pleasures, to the stylised naughtiness of Muslim poetry and should not be regarded as an expression of religious convictions. The Muslim names that ‘Afi and his successors give to the poet and to his father are not necessarily correct, but neither should they be dismissed out of hand. And the verses at the beginning of his epic (frag. 267-8) show clearly that their author was at least nominally a Sunnite Muslim.


53. Two verses by an otherwise unknown Dauqi, referring to Abū l-Fath al-Buni, are quoted by Rādiyāni, p. 12.

Cf. LN s.v. ‘Dauqi’, p. 181; Khayyam-pur p. 218

1See above, p. 104 (no. 50).

54. Dīhqān Khūzij is known to us only from four verses quoted by Rādiyāni p. 15, 22.

55. One verse by Fākhir or Fakhri is quoted in LF (ed. Iqbal p. 168); also in Qawwāl p. 139 and Sīhā p. 130.

56. A verse by Rūdaki, quoted by ‘Afi, mentions Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muhammad b. Mūsā al-Farābī and Shahīd as the two foremost poets of their time; he must therefore have flourished in the second half of the 3rd/9th century.


57. Abū l-Ḥasan ‘Ali b. Jūlūgh al-Farruḫi al-Sijzi was one of the principal poets of the early Ghaznavid period. The story of his early life is related by ‘Arefi: his father Jūlūgh had been a [109] slave (ghulām, presumably meaning a slave-soldier) of the umr of Sashān and Saffarid vassal Khalaf i Bāna; the young Farruḫi was in the service (and presumably also a slave) of a land-owner (dihštān) in that country. Finding himself unable to support a wife on the salary he received from the latter, the young poet ran away from his master and went to the ruler of Chaghāniyān, Abū l-Muẓaffar (i.e. evidently Abū l-Muẓaffar Fakhr al-daula Ahmad b. Muhammad2), while the latter was supervising the branding of his colts, and attracted his attention with two apposite poems, for which he was at once richly rewarded. In the former poem the author describes his voyage from Sīstān to Chaghāniyān, and alludes to the coincidence of a Muslim ‘id with Naurūz, from which it is possible to determine the date of the poem, and thus also the approximate date of Farruḫi’s arrival in Chaghāniyān, as 1 Shawwāl 406/March

1The reading and meaning of the name are uncertain; see Horn, Einl. p. 26 and my article in ELR.
2For his name, see below, no. 114 (ad Manṣik).
1016. Seeing that 'Arūdī implies that the poet was already married at the time of his arrival, he could hardly have been born much later than 385/995. Not long afterwards, the poet transferred his allegiance yet again to an even more powerful patron, Sultān [110] Māhmūd. To him are dedicated the majority of the poems in Farrukhi's Dīwān where we find also a celebrated elegy on his death (Dīwān, p. 92-5), which occurred in 421/1030; besides these we find eulogies of Māhmūd’s two successors, Muhammad and Masʿūd, including one which would appear to have been presented to the latter on ‘id al-fitr 422/1031.2 If we are to believe Labībī’s statement3 that Farrukhi died young, we cannot put his death very much later than this.4

The biographical tradition deteriorates markedly with Daulat-shāh, who tells us that Farrukhi was born in Tirmidh (a long way from Sistān), that he was a pupil of ‘Uṣūrī and that he wrote a treatise on rhetoric called Tarjumān al-balāghah (presumably the work by that name by Rādīyān).5

Mss. of his Dīwān: London Or. 3246 i (Rieu Suppt. no. 204. Dated Rāmādān 1248/1833); Or. 2945 (Rieu Suppt. no. 203. Dated Jumādā II 1275/1859. The basis of the Tehran edition of 1301); I.O. 902 (incomplete); Leningrad Univ. 1003b (Romskiewicz p. 8); Istanbul Universitē FY 329 (olim Raza Paşa 1171. Atēq 8. Dated Dhu l-Hijjah 1247/1832); Najaf 1387 (Munz. 25026. Dated Rāmādān 1253/1837); 1384 (Munz. 25053); Tehran Adabīyāt I p. 266 (18th century?); Malik 5384 (Munz. no. 25024 inspexit. Dated 1249/1833-4); Majlis 5284

1In the year 385 Y. Naurūz, i.e. 1 Farvardin, fell on 12 March. 1 Shawwāl 406, the feast marking the end of Rāmādān, corresponds, according to the usual tables, to 13 March, but the new moon could easily have been visible already on the eve of the 12th. The date of the poem was first determined by Ateş, as it turns out correctly, despite the fact that he took as his point of departure the erroneous assumption that at the time in question Naurūz was fixed to the vernal equinox. In reality, Muslims continued to celebrate Naurūz according to the Zoroastrian calendar at least until the time of the introduction of the Jalālī calendar in 1073; this can be seen from the dates given for Naurūz in the Tārīkh i Bahāqī. The other date which Ateş considered, 405, is not likely: In that year 1 Shawwāl fell on (roughly) 25 March 1015, Naurūz on 13 March.


3See below, no. 92.

4The date given by Hidayat, 420/1037-8, is thus just about possible, but not that given by Taqī (spud Spranger, p. 15) and Adhar, namely 470/1077-8.

5The Tarjumān al-balāghah is attributed to Farrukhi already by Yaqīt.
Baihaqi p. 280; 'Unsur al-Ma’muri, Qabur-namah (ed. Yusuﬁ) p. 150; LF passim (a critical edition and translation of the fragments contained therein is given by Rykpa and Borecky [=RB] p. 41-75); Raddawi passim (and Ate’s notes, p. 98-90); ‘Arshi p. 28, 36-40 (and RB p. 30-4); Wajwaj passim (and RB p. 28-30); ‘Auﬁ II p. 47-50 (and RB p. 35-50); ‘Auﬁ, Jashanî (facsimile) p. 353 (no. 1125); Shams passim (and RB p. 38-41); Jaffar p. 130-1; Da'dat-shaﬁ p. 55-7; Adhar p. 86-8; Hidayat, Majma’ 1 p. 439-55; J. Rykpa and M. Borecky, ‘Farruki [in French], Archiv oriental 16, 1948, p. 17-75 (contains a critical edition of those verses cited in Asadi’s Lughat i Fars and other early sources, confronting them with the variants in ‘Abd al-Rasuli’s edition of the dvân); A. Ate, ‘Farrukh chah zoamn ba Chaghâniyân raft’, MDAT VIII/2, 1339h./1961, p. 1-12 (Also in Turkish in Zâriyati Meemasa IV, 1961, p. 23-32); Khayâm-pür p. 440 (with further references); Saﬁ, Tahirî 10 p. 531-46; Gh. Yusuﬁ, Farrukhî i Sattarî. Barih dar sharîh i ahwâl wa râzgâr wa shîr i a, Mashhad 1341h./1962-3; Shafirî-Kadîrî, Sūvar p. 486-98; Fouchécourt, Nature p. 1-180; M. Mullohalmdaw, Farrukhî Sattar, Dushanbe 1978; R. Zipoli, ‘Ayînah dar shîr i Farrukhî wa Sai’d wa Hâfiz, Tehran 1366h./1987; M. Mullohalmdaw, Farrukhî Sattar (in Tajik), Dushanbe 1978; J.S. Meisami, ‘Ghaznavid panegyrics: some political implications’, Iran XXVIII, 1990, p. 31-44 (translations of and commentary on several of his poems); C.E. Bosworth, ‘Farrukhî’s elegy on Mahmûd of Ghurzâ’, Iran XXIX, 1991, p. 43-9 (with translation and detailed commentary); EF2 s.v. ‘Farrukhî’ (Huart/Massé); ELs s.v. ‘Farrokhi’ (J.T.P. de Buijsn).

58. ‘Abû l-Qâsim Firdawsi,1 the author of the Iranian national epic, is arguably the greatest of [113] all Persian poets. His life very soon became shrouded in legend and all that can really be said about him with any degree of certainty is what the poet himself tells us, but even this is not always easy to discern given the textual problems posed by the Shâh-nâmah, the surviving manuscripts of which diverge immensely from one another.

1Bundari (p. 3 of the edition cited on p. 149), an early and reliable source, gives his names as ‘Abû l-Qâsim Mamsûr b. al-Hasan al-Firdawsi al-Tusi. Later authors give his personal name also as Ahmad or Hasun and diverge also concerning his father’s name.
or possibly the same day in 1011. However, in a number of old manuscripts the year of completion is given rather as 384 of the hijrah (February 994 to February 995) and the year ‘384’ is given as the date of the completion of Firdausi’s poem also at the end of Bandari’s Arabic translation, a work that is older than any of the existing Persian manuscripts, which contain the closing lines of the poem.

Besides this, a very small number of manuscripts have, after the usual closing verses, an ‘epilogue’ in verse, in which the author (ostensibly Firdausi himself) says that he completed the story (dastan) in the year of the hijrah 389 (nahum sül u hashtdát bá st-sád) while staying with one Ahmad b. Muhammad, the ruler of Khán i Lanján (near Isfahan). The precise date is given first according to the Muslim calendar as Tuesday 25 Muharram, which in the year in question would correspond to Tuesday 17 January 999, then, a few verses later, as the Persian date day Asmán (27th) of Bahman, [115] which in that year corresponds to 14 February. Taqí-zádah argued that these dates belong to three successive recensions of the Sháh-námah; Firdausi completed his first version on 25 Sifandármd in A.H. 384 = 12 March 994, which cor-

1 There are two possible ways to understand this configuration of a Zoroastrian date with an Islamic year. One is that the event in question occurred on the 25 Sifandármd which fell during the Islamic year 400 (= August 1009 to August 1010), that is on 8 March 1010. The other is that it occurred on 25 Sifandármd of the khurját year that corresponded on Nau-riz in A.H. 400 (= 14 March 1010), that is on 8 March 1011. For details see the article ‘Ta’rifi’ in EN, section viii (‘The tax year’) and the literature cited there. In either case, the conversion takes account of the fact that the five epigraphal days still stood, in Firdausi’s time, between the months of Abán and Adhar (see my article ‘The Persian calendar’, Iran 34, 1996, p. 39-54). The objections voiced in a review of first edition of IH, v, in BSQAS 56, 1993, p. 601, are not valid.

2 In the apparatus of the Moscow edition this reading is cited only for the manuscript ‘K’ (i.e. Cairo, Dār al-košch 73 strikt férst; see below p. 141), where the year is given as st-sád sül u hashtdát w chdr, without indication of the month or day. But in other manuscripts (see Haz. Fir, p. 70) the same sum is formulated with different words and in at least some of these the precise date of completion is given as 25 (Ard) Sifandármd, which would correspond to 12 March 994 or 995 (according to the two possible interpretations mentioned in the previous footnote). It should be obvious that if 384 and 400 are in fact the years in which two different recensions of the epic were completed, then the date ‘25 Sifandármd’ can be correct in only one of the two years; the poet is most unlikely to have finished the revision on the exact anniversary of the first version.

3 This work was published and translated by C. Schefer in an appendix to his edition of the Safar-námah of Nátir i Khusrw, Paris 1881, p. 298-302.

responds (according to Taqí-zádah) in that year to 25 Muharram (the Muslim date mentioned in the ‘epilogue’); the second version (to which the epilogue belongs) was completed on 27 Bahman A.H. 389 = 14 February 999 (the verses mentioning ‘Tuesday 25 Muharram’ having supposedly been wrongly introduced from the closing section of the first version), and only after this did Firdausi go to Ghaznav where he presented his third and final version of the poem to Mahmúd in the year 400/1009-10 (whereby the date ‘25 Sifandármd’ would have been introduced into this version from the first). This elaborate construction has not met with universal approval. A number of scholars, beginning with Minuwi,2 have argued that the ‘epilogue’ is not the work of Firdausi at all and that it records not the composition of the Sháh-námah but a copying of the text which took place not in 389 but in 689 (reading shash-sád instead of the palaeographically virtually identical st-sád), in which year Tuesday 25 Muharram would correspond to Tuesday 7 February 1290. It would thus be the anonymous 13th-century scribe, and not Firdausi, who enjoyed the hospitality of the níler of Khán i Lanján. Unfortunately, this does not solve the chronological problems, since [116] 25 Muharram 689 (7 February 1290) does not correspond to 27 Bahman either according to the Zoroastrian calendar, nor according to the Jáláli calendar, though in the latter case the divergence is only of five days.3 Nonetheless, Minuwi was certainly right to say that the author of the ‘epilogue’ does not in fact explicitly claim to have composed the Sháh-námah and that, moreover, it is written in a style quite unlike Firdausi’s.

1 Haz. Fir, p. 79. According to Wünschenfels’s table 25 Muharram 384 corresponds to Sunday 11 March 994, but, of course, tables give only approximate equivalents. In any case, 25 Sifandármd/12 March was a Monday, while the ‘epilogue’ speaks of Tuesday 25 Muharram. Taqí-zádah is thus forced to reckon with a scribal error (‘tobir’i’) in the text of the epilogue.

2 A. Minuwi, ‘Khán i Hazinah i Firdausi va bátín i istisht i Yáhr u Zulákhba ba Firdausi’, Rüşt-i nvar V/3, 1323h./1944, p. 16-36.

3 27 Bahman 658 Yandgirdi corresponds to 25 November 1289; 27 Bahman 211 Jáláli to 2 February 1290. According to my calculations, during the time when the epilogue could have been composed, 27 Bahman of the Zoroastrian calendar corresponds to a Tuesday about 25 days into Muharram only in 421/1030 and 558/1163 (in both cases according to the late Sassanian positioning of the epagomenae). It would thus seem more likely that it was written in one of these years and that the year given in the text was intentionally altered by a scribe wishing to assign the verses to Firdausi.
More recently still, Ateş has argued that the text of the epic contains allusions to events as late as 409/1019 (Mahmūd's conquest of Quraish), which, if correct, would mean that all of the dates mentioned in the various versions of the closing verses are too early, at least for the final version of the work. In any event, the main problem with the notion of two or three successive recensions is that even those manuscripts which claim the completion of the poem for 384 and thus presumably represent a pre-Ghaznavid recension of the epic, nonetheless contain passages lauding Mahmūd (who did not even become king until 389/999) and in general do not seem to represent a different textual tradition from those giving the date 400. If, as Indeed seems likely, Firdausī did release two (or perhaps even more) different versions of the Shāh-nāmeh during his lifetime, these versions must have become so completely mixed up with one another in the subsequent manuscript tradition (and in the oral tradition) that it is now impossible to ascertain which verses belong to which recension.

The concluding section also contains (again with considerable variation from manuscript to manuscript) verses in which the poet gives his age as '63', '71' or 'almost 80' and speaks of having laboured on the epic for 35 years. Various attempts have been made to deduce from these verses [117] the exact date of the poet's birth as well as the date when he began work on the poem, but all this seems futile as long as the text has not been sorted out. In the meanwhile we should content ourselves with the knowledge that at the time when he completed his masterpiece (whether in 384 or 400 or even a few years later) the poet was an old man (something between 65 and 80), that his birth must con-sequently have fallen in the first half of the 4th/10th century, and that he began work on the poem well before the time of Mahmūd.

Nīẓāmī 'Arūfī, writing a little more than a century after Firdausī's time, is our earliest biographical source. Indeed, it is probable that everything that we find in the later biographers (as well as in the three prose introductions to the Shāh-nāmeh itself) is either taken, directly or indirectly, from 'Arūfī or else freely invented.1 According to this author Abū l-Qāsim Firdausī was a rich land-owner (dīhghān) from the 1118 village of Būzkh, in the district of Tabarān, in the province of Tūs. He worked on the Shāh-nāmeh for 25 years and, when it was finished, had it copied out by 'Ali Dailam and recited publicly by Abū Dulaf. The governor of Tūs, Huayai (bad variant: Ḥusayn) b. Qutaibah rewarded him for his efforts by remitting the tax (kharj) due on his land. Thereupon Firdausī went with his book and his reciter to Ghaznah where, with the help of the wazīr, the poem was brought to the attention of Mahmūd. But the minister's enemies attacked the poet for being a Shi'ite (raffi), and a Mu'tazilite to boot, with the result that the sultan rewarded him with a paltry 20,000 dirhams. The poet, gravely offended, gave the money to a bath-house attendant and a beer-seller (i.e. two very lowly persons) and fled from Ghaznah. At first he took refuge in the house of Īsā'īl al-Warrāq, the father of Azraqi, in Herat. Six months later he fled to the ruler of Tabaristān, the sipahbād Shahryār,2 at whose court he composed a satire against Mahmūd. But the sipahbād, fearing the wrath of that king, purchased the manuscript of the satire for 100,000 dirhams and had it destroyed. The last part of 'Arūfī's account (which he claims to have heard in 514/1120) from the poet Mu'īzī, who in turn had it from the Amīr 'Abd al-Razzāq b. Tūs) tells how Mahmūd, on hearing

2Nödelke, p. 25, suggested, with great caution and explicit reference to the uncertain state of the text, that the age '65' might be combined with the year '389' mentioned in the 'epilogue' to give a birth-date of 333 or 324 (935 or 936), in which case the poet would have been 76 or 77 ('almost 80') on completion of the 'final version' in 400. The date 324 was approved by Taṣfīz-dādāh and officially accepted by the Iranian government. Most recently A. Sh. Shahbazi has attacked the problem in his article 'The birthdate of Firdausī' (3rd Dec 308 Yezdigard = 3rd January 949)', ZDMG 134, 1984, p. 98-105. Shahbazi's arguments are based on uncontrollable assumptions, such as the number of verses that the poet wrote per day, and side-steps the textual problems. An entirely different set of dates have been proposed by A.R. Nīẓām-zādah, 'Tārīkh-i ibrāhīm-i Sh.N.', Ayandeh 414-5, 1364/Ah.1985-6, p. 252-65.

1For a critical confrontation between 'Arūfī and the later sources see Nödelke [20-23]. The fragmentary preface in the Florence manuscript (which shares many elements with the Bāyazigit preface and with Daulat-shah's biography) is edited, translated and analysed in Piemontese's article (see below, p. 124).
2This has generally been presumed to mean the Bāvandād Shahrūyr III, who ruled from 358/969 to 396/1006, which would require a very early date for the final completion of the poem (well before 400). But perhaps the intended ruler is the 'minor Bāvandād' Abū l-Fuwārid Shahrūyr b. 'Abbas b. Shahrūyr, who left an inscription dated 413/1022 (see Minorsky, Iranica p. 155 n. 1). I see now that the possibility of identifying this person with the sipahbād mentioned by 'Arūfī was considered also by W. Middeleer in EIR 1 p. 749 (s.v. 'Al-e Bāvand') as well as by Ş. Şajjī in DMII 1 p. 589.
his minister recite a verse from the Shāh-nāma, regretted at last his shabby treatment of the great poet and ordered that a camel-train of indigo valued at 60 000 dinārs be sent to him, together with the king’s apologies. But as the caravan entered the town of Tūs by one gate, Firdausī’s corpse was carried out through another.

‘Aridi’s story is a good one, and on the whole not implausible, but is it true? The main difficulty is that it was composed by the ruler of Tabaristan, apart from the six verses which our authors quote. This would have to mean that the satire (hajw-nāma) which we find - apparently in widely diverging forms - in so many of the manuscripts of the Shāh-nāma has been elaborated from these six authentic verses. Final judgement on this matter must, however, await a critical edition of the satire.2

Apart from the Shāh-nāma and the Satire, a number of lyrical pieces have been attributed to Firdausī by the anthologists; these have been collected by Eihē.3 But as there seems to be no mention of them in early sources they must be regarded as, at least, doubtful.4 The religious [120] māthnawī entitled Yāsuf u Zaikhār is now no longer generally regarded as the work of Firdausī and will be discussed, below, p. 576-84.

The Shāh-nāma is a māthnawī of about 60 000 verses (inc. ba nām i khudawand i jān u khirad * k ar t e b a rd anāshah bar na ghdharad), a grandiose compendium of the legendary and (from the time of Alexander onwards) semi-legendary history of Iran, beginning with the ‘first king’ (in Zoroastrianism the first man) Gayōmart and continuing down to the Islamic conquest, a retelling of the Iranian national tradition which, though not specifically Islamicized, has at least been shown of most of its overtly Zoroastian content and thus made broadly acceptable to a Muslim audience. The ultimate source of Firdausī’s poem is the (for us lost) Sassanian book to which early Arabic authors refer either by its name in Middle Persian (Khwādaty-nāma) or in Arabic (Siyar al-mulūk). The book was translated from Middle Persian into Arabic by Ibn al-Muqaffa’ (died ca. 140/757), whose version was followed by others, whereby it remains unclear whether these merely reworked the older translation or actually made use of the Sassanian original. All of these Arabic versions are lost, but we can form a fairly precise idea of their contents (and of those of their source) from the account of pre-Islamic Iran given by such historians as Tabari and Ḥamzah al-Iṣṭahārī. In Neo-Persian there were at least four versions of the Book of Kings before Firdausī, namely the Shāh-nāma in verse by Mas‘ūdī al-Marwazī (probably well before 355/966),1 the version, presumably in prose, by Abū l-Ma‘āyīdat al-Balkhī (in the Samanid period)2 - with which the ‘Shāh-nāma of Abū ‘All [121] al-Balkhī’, mentioned by Bairūtī, is perhaps identical - the incomplete version by Dāqiqī (from about the same time),3 and, most importantly, the prose version prepared for the governor of Tūs, Abū Manṣūr Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Razzāq, in Muharram 346/957. As Taqīzādah has demonstrated, a small portion of the latter has been preserved in the ‘older preface’ which we find at the beginning of many copies of Firdausī’s Shāh-nāma. The most significant argument for this rests on a passage in Bairūtī which tells us that ‘in the Shāh-nāma’ Ibn ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Tūsī had fabricated for himself a genealogy tracing him back to the primaeval king Manūchehr; this genealogy is found precisely in the ‘older preface’.6 According to this preface, the prose Shāh-nāma was compiled for the governor by his minister, Abū Manṣūr Ma‘arī, with

1Cf. Noldeke §22.
2M. Shirāzi in his Chahār maqāalah bar Firdaus v s Shāh-nāma, n.p. (apparently Kabul) 1356/1977 (originally published in Urdu in the 1920s) argues that the hajw-nāma has been constructed out of verses from the Shāh-nāma and quotes (p. 105-9) a number of parallel verses from the two poems. This deserves further investigation, though of course it must also be determined whether the passages which Shirāzi quotes from the Shāh-nāma are authentic and not rather interpolations from the hajw-nāma. The question of formalic repetitions within the Shāh-nāma itself (a well-known feature of epic poetry in all languages) should also not be left out of consideration.
4The earliest authority to quote anything of Firdausī’s, apart from the Shāh-nāma and the Satire, is ‘Aaṣfī II p. 33, where we find two verses from an ode to Mahmud and a gnomic qiftah of five verses. The latter is, however, almost certainly either by Muḥammad b. ‘Abdī (see below p. 194) or else expanded from two of his verses.
5See below, no. 105.
6See above, no. 16.
7See above, no. 52.
9Ibid. p. 144-6.
the help of a number of ‘wise men’ from various parts of Khurāsān, four of whom are mentioned by their (evidently Zoroastrian) names. It has generally been assumed that the ‘four men’ translated the Book of Kings from Middle- to Neo-Persian, though the text does not at this point actually say anything about translating, but merely about their ‘bringing forth’ (frīd-sāwarda) of the ‘books of the kings’. As the text, a few lines later, specifically mentions the (Arabic) writings of Ibn al-Muqaffa’ and Ḥamzah al-Isfahānī it must be assumed that these were also used in compiling the Persian Shāh-nāma and that the function of the ‘four men’ was perhaps little more than to augment the Arabic histories 2 with the help of certain Zoroastrian texts. 2

Nöldeke, who did not seem to have been aware of any pre-Firdausian version of the Book of Kings in Neo-Persian apart from the Shāh-nāma of Abū Manṣūr, assumed, reasonably enough, that the latter was in fact the ‘ancient book’ on which Firdausi based his poem and the same opinion was upheld by Taqī-zādah and, it seems, everyone else since. However, seeing that Taqī-zādah has demonstrated that there were other Persian Shāh-nāmas prior to that of Abū Manṣūr, the assumption that only the latter could have been Firdausi’s source requires re-examination. In fact, there are three passages in Firdausi’s poem (all of them in the final section, the history of the Sasanians) where the poet refers explicitly to one or the other of the ‘four men’ and where consequently his dependence on the Shāh-nāma of Abū Manṣūr is manifest. 3 On the other hand, in the earlier portions of the epic (i.e. the greatest part of the text) not only are there no references to the ‘four men’ but, more significantly, there are at least two passages where Firdausi’s account is at odds with what we happen to know of Abū Manṣūr’s Shāh-nāma. One is in the story of Dāhīhāk, where Firdausi tells us how Farādīn stopped the boulder with which his brothers were trying to kill him by means of ‘a magic spell’ (afṣānat). 4 But according to the ‘older preface’ Farādīn stopped the rock ‘with his foot’. 5 It is, of course, possible that Firdausi changed the story to suit his purposes, but if he had really introduced the ‘spell’ in an attempt to heighten the drama of the incident one would not have expected him to do so in such an offhand fashion, without further elaboration. 1 An even clearer example is in the history of the Arsacids. Here, Firdausi tells us that he had no information about ‘their dates’ (tārīkh-ī ishān) and that ‘apart from their names I have not heard anything about them, nor have I seen anything in the book of kings’ (k-az ʾishān jūz az nām na-batūdah-am nā dar nāmāh i khusrāwīn delah-am). 6 But Bārīrī 3 tells us explicitly that the Shāh-nāma of Abū Manṣūr gave both the names and the length of the reigns of the Arsacid kings and proceeds to convey this information in the form of a table. Moreover, the names that he gives from this source are quite different from those given by Firdausi, whose list of the Arsacid kings is more like the one which Bārīrī quotes a few pages earlier 4 as those given by Ḥamzah al-Isfahānī, supposedly from the Avesta. 5 It is thus quite clear that the ‘book of kings’ which Firdausi had before him when he was writing his account of the Arsacids was not the Shāh-nāma of Abū Manṣūr known to Bārīrī, but rather some other version. This contradiction has been known for a long time and Taqī-zādah made a rather hesitant attempt to explain it away by proposing that there might have been a textual discrepancy between the manuscript of the prose Shāh-nāma used by Firdausi and the one available to Bārīrī. But seeing that both authors were writing at about the same time and that at that time the Shāh-nāma of Abū Manṣūr was only a few decades old, such a

1 In general Firdausi’s tendency is rather to play down the mythical and supernatural elements in the Iranian national tradition. In the mentioned passage in the ‘older preface’ the author is in fact justifying some of the more incredible incidents in the Book of Kings, claiming that they have a deeper meaning, known only to the wise, ‘such as the heroic deed (dašahrūd) of Arish, and such as that stone which Afīrūdīn stopped with his foot, and such as the snakes which emerged from Deli-hāk’s shoulder’. Only the last of these is found in this form in Firdausi’s poem. The story of Arish (Avesta arsha-ku) and his superhuman bow-shot is well known from the Arabic off-shoots of the Book of Kings, but is entirely missing from Firdausi’s poem. Compare also Firdausi’s very bland treatment of the story of Kāʾū’s flight to heaven.


3 Aḥdar p. 116-7.

4p. 114.


6 Firdausi, Fird. p. 140.

2 The story of the invention of the game of chess, for which Firdausi refers explicitly to one of the ‘four men’ (see above, p. 55), clearly has nothing to do with the Khosrovy-nāma and there is no trace of the story in Tabari.

3 For these passages see above, p. 54-5.


5 Firdausi, Fird. p. 137.
hypothesis is not particularly attractive. It would seem much more likely
that Firdausi had the (then relatively new) Shakh-nama of Abū Mansūr as
his disposal only at the time when he was writing the final section of his
poem (that devoted to the Sasanians) and that for the earlier sections (the
bulk of the work) he depended on one of the earlier Persian translations
of the Book of Kings. In short, though there can be no doubt that Fir-
dausi's poem is based on written sources, we cannot necessarily presume
that it is all based on a single source.

The oldest dated copy of the Shāh-nāma is the Florence manus-
script, which contains only the first half of the work and is dated Tues-
day the 3rd (or 30th) of Muḥarram 614 (11 April or 9 May 1217).
The manuscript, though it has been in Europe for centuries, was only
recently identified as a copy of Firdausi's epic. Previously, the oldest
codex was believed to be the British Library copy (Add. 21,103) which
contains the date Muḥarram 675 (1276) on the restored final leaf in a
note which states that this date was copied from the 'original' (muqāṭāt
'om-hū). It is not absolutely certain that the 'original' from which the
(apparently) 16th-century copyist supplied the missing pages of the
London manuscript is identical with the mutilated copy to which they
were appended, though this is likely. [125] These two are the only
known manuscripts bearing dates from the 13th century. There are
a handful of dated copies from the 14th (see below, Dublin, Leningrad,
Istanbul, Cairo, Karachi, New York). The mass of the manuscripts are
from the 15th century or later.

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

1See the detailed description by A.M. Piemontese, AJON 40, 1980, p. 1-38, 189-
242.

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

The majority of the manuscripts have one (or sometimes more) of
the following prose prefaces:

'Preface i': The so-called older preface (inc. sipās u āfrīn khudāy
rā khān i jahān u ān jahān rā āfrīd), is contained in the majority of the
older manuscripts (though not in the oldest, the Florence copy). As
already mentioned, this consists largely of material salvaged from the
preface to the old prose Shāh-nāma. A critical edition was prepared by
Qazwini. The pioneering French translation by Wallenbourg has been
superseded by a richly annotated English version by Minorsky. More
recently a new edition of the Persian text with numerous (often rather
daring) conjectural [126] emendations and an extensive commentary was
published by Monchi-Zadeh. For the archaic linguistic features in the
older prose see Lazar, Langue p. 36-7 et passim.

'Preface ii': beginning hamd (u sipās) u stāibish mar khudā rā
'saz va jalla kh khudā i har da jahān ast. This is presumably what
Qazwini called the 'middle preface' (muzaddamān i aṣṣūf). Its contents
are summarised in Riesz p. 536.

'Preface iii': beginning with the verse jīfūtah i sukhān i bih kh
kamāl ahi i kamāl * ba thanā i màlik i 'arsh i khudā i mita'āt. This
preface was written by (or perhaps rather for) the Timurid Baysunghur
b. Shāh-rukh in 829/1425-6. Though it does not appear to have been
published as such, the greater part of it is incorporated into the Persian
introduction in Macan's edition of the epic.

Extensive lists of manuscripts have been published by I. Mendel-
1936, and by I. Afshār in his Kiūb-shīnātāt i Firdausi, Tehran
1347sh./1969; the latter list has also been incorporated, with additions,
into Munzawi's general catalogue of Persian manuscripts (Munz IV

1In his Btt maqālāt II, Tehran 1313sh./1934, p. 1-64; a revised edition based on
the collation of a larger number of manuscripts was published by Qazwini in Hat. Fird.

2Notice sur le Shakh-'Nâmé de Ferdowsî, et traduction de plusieurs pièces rela-
tives à ce poème, Vienna 1810, p. 25-69.

3V. Minorsky, 'The earlier preface to the Shakh-nama', in Studi in onore di G.

4D. Monchi-Zadeh, Topographisch-historische Studien zum iranischen Nation-
31332-31855). Unfortunately, both lists contain a large number of errors. Afshar’s compilation suffers in particular from the absence of bibliographic references and from the fact that it does not usually distinguish between more-or-less intact manuscripts on the one hand and loose leaves or even detached miniatures on the other. The selective list that follows has been compiled independently of those just mentioned (though it has been compared with them) and aims less at ‘completeness’ [127] than at controllability. For a detailed description of some of the oldest manuscripts see the articles by J. Khāliq-Mušaq in Itān-nāmāz III p. 378-406, IV p. 16-47, 225-255, VII p. 63-94 (quoted in what follows as ‘Kh.-M.’ with volume and page number).

**Dispersed Manuscripts:** The ‘Demotte’ manuscript (it is a deplorable convention to name a dispersed manuscript after the vandal who was responsible for its mutilation) is attributed by art historians to the first half of the 14th century. It was dismembered during the early part of the twentieth century; its pages were ripped out and sold separately, many of the miniatures were detached and pasted at random on to pages of text and new bits of text were manufactured to fill the blank spaces. For the present location of the surviving fragments and a reproduction and identification of the known miniatures see O. Grabar and S. Blair, *Epic images and contemporary history. The illustrations of the great Mongol Shahnana*, Chicago/London 1980, supplemented by S. Blair, ‘On the track of the “Demotte” Shahnāma manuscript’, in *Les manuscrits du moyen-orient... Actes du colloque d’Istanbul*, ed. F. Deroche, Istanbul/Paris 1989, p. 125-31. Three other early manuscripts are reconstructed and discussed in M.S. Simpson, *The Illustration of an Epic. The earliest Shahnana manuscripts*, New York/London 1979, and attributed by the author to ‘around the year 1300’; these are the ‘first small Shahnāmā’ (the largest fragment of which is Dublin Beauty 104), the ‘second small Shahnāmā’ and the codex of which the [128] largest portion is preserved in the Freer Gallery (Washington). The author gives admirably precise information about the present location of the individual folios of these manuscripts. She also touches more briefly on the

1Sic; the author evidently means ‘earliest illustrated’.
2A much earlier dating of the ‘first small Sh.N.’ was claimed by E. Bichoet, ‘On a Book of Kings of about 1200 A.D.’, *Repam* LXI, 1930, p. 3-10. This has been rejected by subsequent scholars.

*Schula* Shahnāmā, the remnants of which are in the Metropolitan Museum (New York) and which appears to belong to the same school. Yet another dispersed manuscript (the largest portion of which is now in Dublin, Beauty 110) contained at one point a rosette with the date 741/1340-1. For the location of the other known leaves see E. Grube, *Muslim miniature paintings from the XIII to XIX century from collections in the United States and Canada*, Venice 1962, p. 32, supplemented by Simpson, op. cit., p. 45, no. 15, and her discussion, p. 9-10. Another, later, dispersed manuscript is the ‘Houghton’ (or ‘Shāh Tāhmāsp’) Shahnāmā which is attributed to the 16th century and was vandalised by Houghton in the 1970s. The study by M.B. Dickson and S.C. Welch, *The Houghton Shahnāmeh*, 2 vols., Cambridge (Mass.) 1981, was prepared before its dispersal on the art market. **Dublin** Beauty 104 (77 detached leaves from the ‘first small Sh.N.’, with miniatures. 14th century?); Beauty 110 (see also Kh.-M. III p. 385; Fragment containing about one fourth of the work, including a portion of preface i, from a manuscript containing the date 741/1340-1; see above, ‘dispersed manuscripts’. Pictures); Beauty 111 (Ten folios from the ‘Demotte’ manuscript, attributed to the 14th century. Pictures); Beauty 114 (Kh.-M. III p. 360-1. Fragment. Apparently part of the same original Ms. as London Or. 2780 - for which see Asadi, *Karshāp-nāmā - dated 800/1397*. Pictures); Beauty 118 (One illustrated folio. 15th century?); Beauty 157 (Kh.-M. III p. 401. Dated Jumādā I 885/1480. Preface i. Conclusion combines the versions with the dates 384 and 400. Pictures); Beauty 158 (Kh.-M. III p. 402. Dated 23 Jumādā I 885/1480. Preface i. With date of composition 384. Pictures); [129] Beauty 214 (Dated 955/1548. Preface iii. Lacunae. Pictures); Beauty 230 (16th century? With date 384?); Beauty 256 (5 illustrated folios. 16th century?); Beauty 270 (With pictures, one of which is dated Muharram 1066/1655); T.C.D. 1549 (Dated 1067/1665-7 according to Robinson, *Paintings* p. 161. Pictures); Beauty 271 (17th century? Pictures); Beauty 277 (Fragment. 16th century? Pictures); Beauty 295 (‘Dated’ 8 Dhi l-hijjah 909/1501, but this seems to have been tampered with. Pictures); T.C.D. 1551 (Pictures); Manchester Lindesiana 8 (= Robinson 613-31. Dated 860/1456 according to the Hand-list, but Robinson says he was unable to find any date and attributes the miniatures to the 16th century. Pictures); Lindesiana 933 (= Robinson 475-8, 694-768. Dated 1195/1781, but according to Robinson this applies only to the restored final leaves; he attributes the
rest to the 15th century. Pictures); Lindesiana 9 (=Robinson 431-74, 15th century? Preface i. Interpolations from Burzûz-nâmah. Pictures); Lindesiana 932 (=Robinson 575-612. Dated Muḥarram 949/1542. Pictures); Lindesiana 910 (=Robinson 481-549, 769-800. 16th century? Pictures); Lindesiana 121 (Dated 1024/1615); Lindesiana 909 (=Robinson 1481-1579. Dated 23 Jumâdâ II 1060/1650. Interpolations from Burzûz-nâmah. Pictures); Lindesiana 869 (Dated 1227/1812. Pictures); Lindesiana 525 (18th-19th century? Pictures); Lindesiana 220 (18th-19th century? Imperfect); Oxford Ouseley Add. 176 (Ethis 501; Robinson p. 16-22. Written for Ibrahim b. Shâh-Rukh [early 15th century]. Preface iii. Glossary. Pictures); Ms. Pers. c. 4 (Ethis 1777; Robinson p. 74-6; Kh.-M. III p. 397-8, IV p. 243-5. Dated 4 Sha'bân 852/1448. Preface ii. I Picture); Elliot 325 (Ethis 493; Robinson p. 48-54; Kh.-M. IV p. 17-9. Dated 14 Ramadân 899/1494. Preface i. Pictures); Ouseley 369 (Ethis 494; Robinson p. 94-7. Dated Rabi' II 959/1552. Preface iii. Pictures); All Souls MS. 288 (Coxe II/I p. 77); Robinson p. 185-6. [130] Dated 26 Şafar 988/1580. breaks off at death of Iskandar. 'Includes the episode of Barzûz'. Pictures); Pers. d. 44 (Beeston 2537. Colophons dated 24 Shawwal 1000/1592 and 4 Rabi' I 1001/1592. Imperfect); Dep. b. 5 (Beeston 2538; Robinson p. 104-6. 16th century? Preface iii. Pictures); Ouseley 345 (Ethis 495. 16th century? Pictures); Ouseley 344 (Ethis 496; Robinson p. 115-118. Dated 1010/1601-2 [Robinson says 1009]. Preface iii. Pictures); Ind. Inst. Pers. 7 (Beeston 2539. Dated 9 Muḥarram 1016/1607. First and last folios missing); Hyde 49 (Ethis 497. Dated 1022/1613. Preface ii and i. and followed by a vocabulary); Ouseley 370 (Ethis 498. Contains a note dated 22 Bahman-mâh 1049/1639); Ind. Inst. 32 (Beeston 2540. 18th-19th century? Pictures); Whinfield I (Beeston 2541. 19th century? Pictures); Bodl. 716 (Ethis 499. Preface iii. Pictures); Fraser 50 (Ethis 500. Preface iii. Glossary. I picture); Hyde 50 (Ethis 502. The beginning of the Bûysûnghor (?) preface is missing); Ouseley 247-249 (Ethis 503. 3 volumes of a set of originally 4. Preface iii); All Souls 289 (Coxe II/I p. 77. Pictures); Eton 117 (First half); 118 (Second half); 119 (First half. All 3 Mss. modern); Richmond Keir III.133-75 (Dated 25 Jumâdâ I 879/1475. Pictures); Keir Supp. p. 13-26 (=New York Kraus 114-27. Dated Dhu-l-hijjah 945/1539. Pictures); Keir III.355-84 (Dated 15 Sha'bân 1035/1626. Beginning missing. Pictures); London Add. 21,103 (Rieu p. 533-4; Kh.-M. III p. 381-3, IV p. 41-7. Dated, according to the restored final leaf, Muḥarram 675/1276.1 Preface i); S.O.A.S. 46485 (Fragment containing the episode of Bahârmân Gûr. 13th century?); Or. 2833 [131] (Rieu Supp. 263. Dated Ramaḍân 807/1405. The version edited by Ḥamd Allâh Mustaufi on the basis of the 'best manuscripts' and copied in the margin of his Zafîr-nâmah);2 Or. 1403 (Rieu p. 534-5; Kh.-M. III p. 392-3, IV p. 233-8. Dated 11 Ramaḍân 841/1438. Preface i. Contains the version with the date 384 and the 'epilogue' referring to the completion of the poem in 389. There is also a rhymed colophon with the date 10 Muḥarram 779/1377. Pictures); Or. 12688 (Meredith-Owens p. 75. Dated 850/1446-7. 2 vols. Pictures); Add. 18,188 (Rieu p. 535; Kh.-M. III p. 403-4, IV p. 245-6. Dated 23 Jumâdâ II 891/1486. Pictures); R.A.S. 239 (Preface iii. Pictures. One of the miniatures contains a banner with the inscription 'al-sulûm al-a'zam Muhammad Jawr', a name borne by two Timurid princes of the middle of the 9th/15th century. The fly-leaf has seals of Bâbur and of other Mughuls and an autograph note by Shâh Jahân dated 8 Jumâdâ II 1037/1628);3 Or. 4384 (Rieu Supp. no. 198. 15th century? Preface i and date of composition 384. Some lacunae. Pictures); Add. 15,531 (Rieu p. 535-6. Dated Dhu-l-hijjah 942/1536. Preface i. Pictures); I.O. 863 (=Robinson 269-91. Dated 18 Dhu-l-qâdah 967/1560. Preface iii. Pictures); Or. 12084 (Meredith-Owens p. 74. Dated 972/1564-5. 3 vols. Pictures); I.O. 869 (Dated Dhu-l-hijjah 987/1580. Slightly defective. Preface iii); I.O. 872 (Dated Ramadân 991/1583. Preface ii); Add. 27,302 (Rieu p. 536. Dated 994/1586. Preface ii. Pictures); Ross and Browne XXIII (Dated 1008/1599-1600. Preface i. 'Between ff. 158 and 159 ... have been inserted twenty-four folios [132] in a later hand, containing the Epistles of Barzûz and Sâsan'); I.O. 860 (Completed 16

1The month is not indicated by Rieu. Kh.-M. quotes the colophon as: lâhibun jâr (or kalabat) mîn al-na'âmah fî Muḥarram samât khâns wa sahibun wa sit-mîsh. kalâh fi muna'id is-lâm 675.
2A facsimile of the manuscript, with an introduction in Persian and German by N. Rastgir, has now been published as Zafîr-nâmah i Ḥamd Allâh i Mustaufi [in indirân i Shâh-nâmah i Aâb i-Oâzâm Ferdoust, 2 vols., Tehran and Vienna 1377h./1999.
3For a description of this manuscript and reproductions of its miniatures see The Shât-nâmah of Ferdoust with 24 illustrations from a fifteenth-century manuscript formerly in the Imperial Library, Delhi, and now in the possession of the Royal Asiatic Society described by J.V.S. Wilkinson with an introduction on the paintings by Laurence Brison, London 1931.
1164/Richard; Kh.-M. III p. 17-8. Dated 22 Ramadán 895/1490; Preface iii. Pictures; Ancien fonds 278 (Blochet 1165/Richard. Completed 21 Safar 901/1495, but some leaves replaced later. Preface i and satire); Supplément 1280 (Blochet 1161. 15th century? Preface ii. Pictures); Supplément 489 (Blochet 1166. Completed Jumâdâ II 953/1546. Preface iii. Pictures); Supplément 492 (Blochet 1168. Dated 12 Ramadân 1004/1596. Missing leaves replaced and pictures added in 18th century); Supplément 1256 II [135] (Blochet 1199. 16th century? 5 leaves. Pictures. Ancien fonds 229 (Blochet 1167/Richard. 16th or 17th century? Preface iii); Supplément 1026 (Blochet 1169. Three hands which Blochet dates between the 16th and 18th centuries. First half of poem with Preface iii); Supplément 1122 (Blochet 1170. 16th or 17th century? Preface i. Pictures); Supplément 490 (Blochet 1171. Dated Dhu l-qâdah 1012/1604. Pictures); Supplément 1307 (Blochet 1172. Dated 15 Ramadân 1023/1614. Pictures); Supplément 491 (Blochet 1173. Dated 1027/1618. Preface iii. Pictures); Supplément 1027 (Blochet 1174. 18th century? Pictures); Strasbourg Landauer 6 = Hoghoughi 19 (15th century? 2nd half only. Pictures); Landauer 5 = Hoghoughi 18 (Dated 8 Rabî` I 1224/1809. Pictures); Leyden 494 (Cat. DCXXXI; Kh.-M. III p. 393, IV p. 232-3. Dated 15 Ramadân 840/1436. Pictures); Genoa Ms. C.VII.145 (Piemontese 172. 19th century. 2nd half only. Contains extracts from Burzû-nâmâh. Pictures); Florence Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms.Cl.III.24 (Piemontese 145. Dated Muharram 614/1217. First half only);1 Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms.Cl.III.48 (Piemontese 146. 15th century? Preface i. Pictures); Laurenziana Framm. Or. 1 (Piemontese 78. 15th century. 3 folios only); Laurenziana Or. 5 (Piemontese 79. Dated Shawwâl 950/1582. Preface i. Contains extracts from Karshâsp-nâmâh and Sâm-nâmâh. Pictures); Venice Biblioteca Armena, Ms. 2012 (Piemontese 413. Dated 981/1573-4. Incomplete); Bibliothèque Armena, Ms. 2134 (Piemontese 414. 19th century. 2nd half only. Incomplete. Pictures); Rome, Vatican Library, Ms. Pers. 118 (Rossi p. 126-7; Kh.-M. III p. 396, IV p. 242-3. Dated 848/1444-5. Preface iii); Casanatense Ms. 4893 (Piemontese 245. Dated Ramadân 1036/1627. Has a preface dedicated to Sûlàn Husâin Bâiqârâ, followed by preface iii. Contains Dâstân-i Kuk-i [116] Kauhûd. Pictures); Naples Ms. III.G.68 (Piemontese 220. Dated 20 Rabî` I 977/1569. Preface i. Contains extracts from Burzû-nâmâh. Pictures); Ms. III.G.68 bis (Piemontese 221. 18th century? 2 volumes containing the first half of the work. Extracts from Burzû-nâmâh. Pictures); Hamburg, Orient. 197-198 (Brockelmann 154-155. Two volumes. Preface ii); Giessen, Asch 70 (Dated 1030/1620-1. Pictures; according to Mendeslohn); Pers. 28 (Dated 1051/1641-2; Mendeslohn); Persch 48 (90 folios. 16th century? Mendeslohn); Gotha Nachtrâg 477 (Dated 31st year of Aurangzéb 1687-8. First half only. Preface iii); Halle no. 774 (Mendeslohn); Munich, Cim. 36 (Aumer 8; Kh.-M. IV p. 28-9. Dated 26 Jumâdâ I 902/1497. Pictures); 16 Quatr. (Aumer 14. Dated 1048/1638-9. Preface beginning: al-hamdû li ilâh rabb al-`âlamin hund u sipâs i bê qiyâs mar khudawand râ kih jahân u jahân râ bûyfird. Pictures); 12 Quatr. (Aumer 15. Same preface as preceding Ms. Pictures); 14 Quatr. (Aumer 12. Preface iii); 15 Quatr. (Aumer 13. Dated 1129/1717. Preface iii); Cod. or. 244 (Aumer 9. Dated Dhu l-qâdah 1064/1654. First half only); 13 Quatr. (Aumer 10. Pictures); Cim. 91 (Aumer 11. First half only. Preface iii); Berlin Ms. or. fol. 4255 (Stichouline 10; Kh.-M. III p. 405-6. IV p. 247-8. Dated 19 Rabî` I 894/1489. Pictures); Ms. Diez A. fol. 1 (Pertsch 703; Stichouline 26. Dated 1002/1593-4. Preface iii. Pictures); Ms. or. fol. 359 (Pertsch 706; Stichouline 19. Has a stamp of Sûlàn Ahmad b. Muhammad [=Ahmad I (1603-17) or Ahmad II (1703-30)]. Stichouline attributes to 16th century. Preface iii. Pictures); Ms. or. fol. 4251 (Stichouline 30. Dated Shawwâl 1014/1605. Pictures. From the description of the pictures it appears that this [137] manuscript contains portions of the Karshâsp-nâmâh); Ms. or. fol. 147 (Pertsch 704. Dated Jumâdâ II 1073/1663. Preface iii); Ms. or. fol. 209 (Pertsch 18; Stichouline 33; Dated 12 'of the second month' 1077/1666. Down to the death of Aftâsîyâb. Evidently contains interpolations from Karshâsp-nâmâh, Burzû-nâmâh, etc. Pictures); Ms. or. fol. 172 (Pertsch 702; Stichouline 63. 17th century? Preface i. Pictures); Hamilton 260 (Pertsch 702; Stichouline 65. First half only. Preface i. Owner's note dated 1765 A.D. Pictures); Ms. or. fol. 189 (Pertsch 705; Stichouline 67. Dated 1199/1784-5. Preface iii. Pictures); Minutoli 134 (Pertsch 700; Stichouline 73. Dated 15 Shawwâl 1245/1830. Pictures); Minutoli 20 (Pertsch 701. Modern fragment) Ms.

---

1 For this manuscript see above, p. 124 and Kh.-M. III p. 380-1, V p. 31-41. A facsimile has been published in Iranistische Mitteilungen XXI/1, 1991.
1 For the Leningrad manuscripts see L.T. Gyozalyan, M.M. Dyakonov, RuSSkIe pисьма и письменный памятники XVII-VIII вв в Ленинградских Собраниях, Leningrad 1934 (abbreviated G./D.). Gyozalyan was responsible for the description of the manuscripts, Dyakonov for the (detailed and very valuable) codicology.


1Four miniatures from the first volume of this manuscript are in Richmond Keir III.126-31; see the discussion in Robinson’s catalogue, p. 150-42 (and plates).
1246/1831. Pictures); Calcutta 421 (also Kh.-M. III p. 399. 400. Completed Shawwäl 882/1487. The concluding verses mention the date 384. Preface iii); Buhâr 276 (16th century? Preface iii. Pictures); Buhâr 277 (16th century? Preface iii. Pictures); Ivanov 422 (17th century? Preface i. Pictures); Los Angeles Univ. M743 (Naskhah-âh XI/XII p. 57. 18th century? Beginning and end missing); Univ. W7 (Naskhah-âh XI/XII p. 57. 19th century? Last part only); Univ. W9 (Naskhah-âh XI/XII p. 57. 18th century? End missing); Univ. W14 (Naskhah-âh XI/XII p. 57. 17th-18th century? Beginning and end missing); Univ. W132 (Naskhah-âh XI/XII p. 57. 18th century? End missing); Ann Arbor 280 (16th century? Pictures); Baltimore Walters Art Gallery (Robinson, Paintings p. 122. Dated 955/1548. Pictures); Princeton 1 (Dated Jumâda I 995/1544. Defective at beginning. Preface iii. Pictures); 2 (Dated 1065/1654-5. Pictures); 3 (Dated 1085/1674-5. Preface i. Pictures); 4 (Dated 1009/1600-1. Pictures); 406 (Pictures); 407 (Dated 15 Rabû II 1257/1841. Preface i); New York A large number of copies and fragments (one dated 753/1352) are described in B.W. Robinson, The Kevorkian Collection: Islamic and Indian manuscripts, miniature paintings and drawings, unpublished typescript, New York 1953. These have since been dispersed on the art market; Kraus 114-127 (see supra: Richmond); Jackson-Yohannan 1 (Dated 996/1588. Down to death of Alexander. Beginning missing. Preface i. Pictures); Kraus 128-143 (16th century? Pictures); Jackson-Yohannan 2 (Dated 1 Muharram 1011/1602. Beginning missing. Pictures); Jackson-Yohannan 3 (Dated 12 Sha'âbân 1016/1607. Preface i and satire. Pictures); Public Libr. (Mendelssohn p. 45. Dated 1023/1614); [146] Jackson-Yohannan 4 (Completed Shawwäl 1079/1669. Preface iii, with Preface i and satire added later. Pictures); Jackson-Yohannan 5 (16th-17th century? Down to death of Alexander. Pictures); Public Libr. (Mendelssohn p. 58. 19th century); Cambridge (Mass.) Harvard Pers. 25 (Naskhah-âh IV p. 5. 16th century? Pictures); A number of separate illustrated leaves from various copies (including 6 from the 'Demotte' Ms.) are found in the Fogg museum; see Schroeder II, III-VIII, X, XII, XXVII-XXVIII and further leaves listed in Norgen/Davis, Philadelphia Lewis Coll. 50 (15th/16th century? Pictures); Lewis Coll. 52 (Dated 996/1588. Preface i. Pictures); Lewis Coll. 53 (Dated 1000/1591-2. Pictures); Lewis Coll. 51 (16th/17th century? Preface i. Pictures); Lewis Coll. 54 (17th/18th century? Pictures); Lewis Coll. 55 (Has a seal dated 1140/1727-8. Pictures); Lewis Coll. 56 (One volume of a set. Pictures); Lewis Coll. 57 (18th century? Preface i. Pictures); Lewis Coll. 58 (19th century? Pictures); Lewis Coll. 59 (Dated 1244/1828-9. Pictures); Washington Library of Congress (Dated 1137/1724-5. Pictures) [Mendelssohn]. Besides these there are a large number of uncatalogued manuscripts, fragments of manuscripts, loose pages and detached miniatures in many private collections and art galleries.

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

Editions (complete, nearly complete or ongoing): Calcutta 1829 (The Shah Nameh: an heroic poem ... carefully collated ... and illustrated by a copious glossary of obscure words and obscure idioms: with an introduction and life of [147] the author in English and Persian [the latter containing the largest part of the Bâyânghur preface] and an appendix, containing the interpolated episodes etc. found in different manuscripts By Turner Macan. 4 vols); Bombay 1849 (with Macan's appendix and glossary. Illustrated); 1272/1867-8 (again with Macan's appendix etc. illustrated); 1275/1858-9 (based on Macan. Illustrated); 1300/1882-3 (Ed. by Nîr Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Šamad and Muḥammad Ḥasan Khashâʾî); 1316/1898 ("Ayeene-e-Khursheji, or the Shah-Nameh of Firдоūsī as edited by Khursheji Minučešqab Kâtalî. 6 parts); 1914 (Photocinographic reproduction of the Shiraz edition. Illustrated); Lucknow 1287/1870-1 (2 vols. Illustrated); 1884; Lucknow and Cawnpore 1897 (with glossary. 4 vols.); Cawnpore 1874 (based on Macan, with preface and glossary); Teheran 1247/1831-2 (Preface by Ḥājjī ʿAbd al-Muḥammad al-Râzî); 1836; 1265/1848-9 to 1267/1850-1 (based on Macan. 4 pts. Illustrated); 1276/1859-6; 1310-2/1931-4 (Ed. M. Râmâdžân. Based on Macan, Mohîl, Vuļlers, ʿAbd al-Muḥammad, Auliya'ī Sam'î and a Ms. 5 vols.); reprinted 1341/1963; 1313-5/1934-5 (Ed. Sa'îd Naîšî and others. Vols. 1-6 are a revision of Vuļlers's edition, 7-9 are based on Macan and Mohîl. With critical notes. Illustrated); 1335/1956-7 (Ed. M. Dâbir-Siyāqî on the basis of Macan's edition. 6 vols.); 1350/1971-2 (Ed. M.J. Mahjûb); Paris 1838-78 (Le Livre des Rois ... publié, traduit, et commenté par M. J. Mohîl. 7 vols); For a (still valuable) critical commentary on the first volume see F. Richter, 'Bemerkungen zu Mohîl's Ausgabe des Firdüsi,


Glossaries and concordances:


(9) Mahmūd Zanjānī, Farhang i jāmī i Shāh-nāmah, Tehran 1372sh./1993.

Complete (or nearly complete) translations:


(Turkish verse): Fragments or two (or the same?) translations:

Ms.: Vienna Flügel 504 (Dated Jumâda I 1078/1667); Flügel 506 (before 1703 A.D.). For other verse translations see Rieu, Catalogue of the Turkish manuscripts in the British Museum, p. 154 sq. and Gibb, History of Ottoman poetry II p. 390.


(French prose): Mohl's translation (see under editions, Paris) was republished (without the text) as Le livre des Rois par Abou'l-kasim Firdousi, 7 vols., Paris 1876-8. Extracts from the same were again reprinted, with slight revision, in Firdousi. Le livre des rois... traduit... par J.M. Extraits choisis et revus par Gilbert Lucard, Paris 1979.


(German prose): A complete literal translation, based on the Moscow edition, by H. Kanus-Credé was published in instalments in Iranistische Mitteilungen VI, 1972 to XXVIII, 1998 (with some gaps).

Translations of substantial portions:

(English): The poems of Ferdosi translated by J. Champion, Vol. I (No more published), Calcutta 1785, reissued London 1788; Soohrab, a poem: freely translated from the original Persian of Firdousi; being a portion of the Shâhnâma of that celebrated poet by J. Atkinson, Calcutta 1814 (in rhymed couplets, with the Persian text); republished (with significant revision) in Atkinson’s The Shâh-nâme of 1852 (see below, p. 155), p. 543-608; Episodes from the Shâh Nameh... by S. Weston, London 1815; Roostâb Zâbool and Soohrab, from the history of Persia: entitled Shah Namah; or, Book of Kings, by Ferdousi. Translated into English verse, with the original text annexed: notes, plates, & an appendix, by W.T. Robertson, Calcutta 1829; Episodes from the Shâh-nâme by J.J. Modî, 2 vols., Bombay 1906-7; The Shah-nâme of Far- dusi, by A. Rogers (large extracts translated in rhymed couplets, with
Excerpts and abridgements:

1. *Iktihārāt i Shāh-nāmah* (or *Kitāb i intihāb i Shāh-nāmah*) written by one *Allā b. Āhmad* for Malik-Shāh and completed to the text, in 674/1081-2. After the compiler’s introduction (inc. *allā bi khatrā mand i rūshān-ravān* *hasiqat k-az in dār bāsh az kamān*) there follow extracts from Firdausi’s poem under various headings (*praise of the prophet*, *praise of kings*, *description of old age* etc.). The narrative content of the *Shāh-nāmah* plays no role in it. See the account of the work in the *Gotha catalogue*. 1 Ms.: *Gotha* 48 (Ms. written for Sultan Muhammad Khān b. Murād Khān,regn.1594-1603). 2 The same work is evidently found also in *Istanbul* Univesite FY 167 (Ateş 7. Dated 910/1504-5. Beginning missing) and perhaps also in *London* I.O. 882 (Dated Rabī‘ I 945/1538. Badly damaged. Ethel’s tentative identification of the Ms. with the *Iktihārāt* of Mas‘ūd b. Sa‘d b. Salmān - for which see the following entry - is apparently quite arbitrary). 3

2. *‘Allī II* p. 33 mentions the *Iktihārāt i Shāh-nāmah* by the famous poet Mas‘ūd i Sa‘d i [153] Salmān (for whom see below, p. 412-4). The work does not seem to be mentioned elsewhere. Perhaps this is a wrong attribution of the just mentioned *Iktihārāt* of *‘Allī b. Āhmad*?

3. An anonymous *Miṣfāh i Shāh-nāmah* in prose was written in 1457/1441-2. Ms.: *Hedeyn* 1659(2) (Cat. MMDLXXVIII. Dated 1112/1700-1).

---

1 This work is mentioned in the colophon of Tehran Gulistan-Ashbāy II 352, where the author is called *‘Allī b. Āhmad al-Qāʃtār*.
2 This manuscript is wrongly identified by Munawwi no. 27248.
3 I learn from Iran-shāhīd XII/3, 1379h.-2000, that an edition of the *Biāhār* was published in Mashhad in the same year.
(Dated 1090/1679); New Coll. Or. 29; Paris Ancien fonds 99A (Blochert 1181; Richard. Dated 10 Rabî‘ II 1143 = 1137 Bengali era = 12th year of Muhammad Ghiyath-1730); Supplément 1894 (Blochert 1184; Dated Rabî‘ II 1213/1758); Supplément 198 (Blochert 1182. 18th century?); Supplément 197 (Blochert 1183. 18th century? Incomplete); Supplément 1731 (Blochert 1185. 18th century? Incomplete); Copenhagen, gen Mehren XXIII; Mehren XLIV; Berlin Sprenger 1619 (Pertsch 708); Ms. or. 4° 221 (Pertsch 709); Ms. or. oct. 1080 (Heinz 180); Stchkouikine 76. Dated 1251/1835-6. Pictures); Leipzig Vollers 917; Mashhad Ridawi III p. 90 no. 55 (listed in the catalogue as a manuscript of the Shâh-nâmâh, but its conclusion is quoted as ‘shud tamâm Shah-nâmâh i Dil-gushâd’); Bombay Rehatse k p. 152 no. 89 (Dated 1129/1717); Univ. IV (Dated 2 Dhû l-Qa‘dah 1224/1809); Navsari Meherji Rana p. 19 no. 28/II (First part only). Dated 1215 Y./1845-6; Meherji Rana p. 97 no. 105; Uch 283 (Dated 29 Ramaḍân 1126/1714; Pictures); Bankipore I 10; Suppt. i 1796 (Dated 3 Safar 1239/1823); Suppt. i 1797 (19th century. Pictures); Poona Bhârat lîthâsa Samshodhak Mandal no. 69 (Acc. to Bombay Univ. catal. p. 268); Hyderabad Sâlûr Jung IV 1106 (18th century? Pictures); Sâlûr Jung IV 1107 (Dated 1224/1809); [155] Sâlûr Jung IV 1108 (Dated 30 Muharram 1245/1829); Sâlûr Jung IV 1109 (18th century?); Calcutta Ivanow 423 (18th century? Defective at end); Ivanow Curzon 185 (Dated 12 Sha‘bân 17th year of Muhammad Shâh/1147/1735. The 2nd half of the Ms. supplied by a modern hand); Ivanow Curzon 186 (Contains a seal dated 1134/1721-2); Ivanow Curzon 187 (19th century? One picture); Bihâr 278 (19th century?); Madras I 290; I 291 (Dated 1137/1724-5); Dacca Univ. 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 (all late).


(English): J. Atkinson: The Shâh-nâmâh of the Persian poet Firdausi, translated and abridged in prose and verse, with notes and illustrations by J. Atkinson, London 1832. (Although it is nowhere stated in the volume, this is in fact essentially a translation of the ‘Shamshehr-khânê’, as was noted by Rieu p. 540. Atkinson’s book concludes with a reprint of his Soohrah, as mentioned above, p. 150). For another translation, see under Mss., London Add. 6939.

(6) Shâh-nâmâh i Bahkti-nawâr-khânê, by Bâhidûr ‘Ali, son of Ilah-wardî Khân ‘Alâm-gîr-shâhî (the latter died in 1079/1668-9 according to the Mu‘tâhir al-umárî). See Rieu p. 1037b. The author of the Bombay University Catalogue says that this work is ‘but a clever copy’ of the Manṭukhâb i Shâh-nâmâh by Tawakkul Beg, but without the verses.

Ms.: Bombay Univ. XXXVIII.

(7) Shâh-nâmâh i nathîr by Khurshïd, son of Isfandîrî, of Nâvsârî, for Capt. Aungier in 1671. Ms.: London Royal 16 B. xiv (Rieu p. 541. Dated Sharîwar 1040 Y./1671. The author’s original draft); Add. 6938 (Rieu p. 541. Transcript of the first part of the preceeding with a translation by J. Haddon Hindley).

Partial translation: see under Mss.

(8) Ifrîsh i Shâh-nâmâh composed by Shâhîm (?) ‘Ali-khân, known as Shâh-i Alam-ibrahîmi. Abâzwarî Ahwâd’hî in 1120/1709-10, for whom see the Berlin catalogue, p. 739. The author epitomises the poem [156] in prose, with extracts from the original. The last section is devoted to the history of the kings of Delhi to Shâh-i Alam II. Ms.: Berlin Ms. orient. Fol. 276 (Pertsch 707). Autograph? The Ms. contains first of all the author’s own script of the Bâysungurh preface dated 6 Rabî’ I 1142 = 1137. Jâfîrl = 11th year of Muhammad Shâh/1729. Then in a different script the text of the epitome, of which the last 4 leaves are in a different hand and dated the beginning [ghurrâb] of Shawwâl 1123/1711).


(10) Ifrîsh i Shâh-nâmâh, or Muntakhab i Shâh-nâmâh, written in 1147/1734-5 by Bhîm Sûnî, with the takhallus Multûbîb. Ivanow describes it as a ‘versified table of contents’ of the Sh.N., Keshavarz, however, as ‘a prose version’ of the same. (Inc. in both Mss.: aţa ai sâhibîn dînash, khirîd-wâr = dar in nâmâh ba fikr û shurîf bi-ngar). Mss.: London Welwone 424 (Dated 1230/1815); Calcutta Ivanow 424 (Dated 1177/1763-4).

(11) A verse abridgment, again with the title Ifrîsh i Shâh-nâmâh, by Shîrîn Paranî (date?) is found in London I.O. 892 (Dated 1166/1752-3. Incomplete).

(12) Durrâh i châhâr-pîrâh by Farîdîn b. Muhammad Qâsim Halâl-khurm Mâzandarânî and three others, written for Fath ‘Ali Shâh in 1216/1801-2. The section on the Pâshâdîyân, by the afore-mentioned

(13) Khudhiih i Shamsi-khan, a meta-abridgement of no. 5 above, was prepared by Jamil al-din Bij Norris in 1821. Ms.: Hyderabad Saliar Jung IV 1110.


Unspecified verse abridgement: Ms.: Navsari Meherji Rana p. 101 no. 124(1).

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

Three extracts from the Shâh-nâmah, followed by one from the Humâi-Humayûn of Khwajû, are contained in: London Add. 27,261 ll (Rieu p. 868-71. Dated Jumâdâ I 814/1411).


Miscellaneous collections of extracts:

Mss.: Manchester Lindesiana 131c (Dated 1140/1727-8); Lindesiana 260 (18th century?); Lindesiana 841 b,c (Dated 1085/1674-5); Florence Laurentiana Or. 306 fol. 123v-157r (Fiemontese 95 II. Dastân i Shâhrab bâ Rustam. Dated 20 Jumâdâ II 975/1567); Gotha 40/6 (Bahr al-durar); Istanbul Revan köşkü 1896/III (Karayat 904); Navsari Meherji Rana p. 87 no. 44; Bombay Univ. XVIII (dastân i Rustam u Akvân-dow u Isfandiyār); Univ. XIX (Isfandiyâr-nâmah); Univ. XX (dastân i Rustam u Isfandiyār); Univ. XXI (Bahman-nâmah); Univ. XXIX (dastân i Kārūn i Kashânī. Dated 16 Titr 1044Y./1675); Univ. XXX (dastân i Kârûs); Univ. XXXI (Kârûs-nâmah. Dated 6 Asfandiyar 1024Y./1655); Univ. XXXIV (dastân i Rustam u Isfandiyār); XXXIX (Shâhrab-nâmah); Univ. XXXVI (From the beginning to the birth of Rustam); Univ. XXXVII (‘from the battle of Yâzadurukh... to Bzan’s coming to Kay-Khusraw with Gustaham’). [158]

1F.R. passion; Râduyânî passion; ‘Arûdî passion; Aufti II p. 32-3; Shams passion; Doulat-shâh p. 49-55; Hidâyat, Majnâna I p. 382-438; Khâjiyân-pîr p. 440-2 (with much further literature).


1See above, p. 113-4, 127.

59. Abî Zaid1 Muhammad b. 'Ali al-Ghadîrî (or: al-Ghadîr)2 al-Râzî was one of the poets [160] who congregated at the court of Mahmûd at Ghaznah. 'Aruñî lists him among the poets of the Bûyids; if this is true, then he is likely to have served the last Bûyid rulers in Ray before the Ghaznavid conquest of that city in 420/1029. He has left us with one complete poem, a long ode in all in praise of Mahmûd, which, according to a Ghaznavid poet of the next generation, Mas'ûd i Salâm,3 al-Ghadîrî sent from Ray to Ghaznah and for which he received a reward of 1000 dinârs. Mahmûd's poet laureate, 'Unûsûrî, penned a reply with the same rhyme and metre, a devastating lampoon of the rival poet's talents. Jâîâmî includes Ghadîrî's ode in his Mu'ânis al-a'harî and the texts of it and of 'Unûsûrî's response were included by Taqû in the small selection of 'Unûsûrî's poems in Khulât-al-ashâr, whence it has made its way into the manuscripts and printed editions of 'Unûsûrî's dhâvân.4 The same two poems, and a third, supposedly al-Ghadîrî's reply to 'Unûsûrî, again with the same rhyme and metre, were printed by Hîdâyât, but as long as the third poem has not been traced to earlier sources its authenticity must remain doubtful. The two biographical "information" given by Hîdâyât, including the statement that the poet died in 426/1034-5, cannot be confirmed. It seems that Hîdâyât confused him with the theologian Abî Ahmad b. Ḥusain al-Ghadîrî.

Bairûrî, Kitab al-jamîlîr fl ma'rifat al-ja'âhirî, ed. Krenkow, Hyderabad 1355/1936-7, p. 80 (one verse); LF (4 verses quoted in the margin of Ms. nân only); Râdiyûnî passim and Ateq's notes p. 96-7; 'Aruñî p. 28 (and Qazwînî ad loc.); Watwât p. 19, 74; 'Afuû II p. 59-60; Shams passim; Jâîâmî II p. 463-7; Daulat-shâh II p. 3-5; Râzî III p. 19-21; Taqû (British Library Ms. Or. 3506, fol. 45b-47a); Ædhar p. 1098-1101; Hîdâyât, Majma'î I p. 368-72; 'A. Icðîlî, "Ibya i yak qifah i shi'r

1.Thus 'Afuû; Hîdâyât has Abî Ya'zîd.
2.The manuscript of Râdiyûnî's Tarjumân al-balighah has 'Ghadîrî' four times, as do the poet himself and 'Unûsûrî in their poetical debate; 'Ghadîrî' appears twice in Râdiyûnî as well as in a verse by Mânîshchîrî (Dhâvân, ed. Dabîr-Siyâsî, p. 86). The latter sources fluctuate between the two forms.
4.For the relationship between Taqû's anthology and the copies of 'Unûsûrî's so-called dhâvân, see below, p. 605-7.
az Ghada'arī i Rādī', Armaghan XV, 1313sh./1934, p. 333-6 (Also in his Majma'ah i maqalāt p. 328-31); id., 'Chand nuktah i tāzah rūfī' bā shārīr i makhār Ghada'arī i Rādī', Āmizāt wa Parvarish IX/10, 1318sh./1930, p. 17-22 (=Majma'ah i maqalāt p. 525-9); M. Daghşār-Siyāqi, Ghada'arī wa asbārī rā, Tehran 1334sh./1955; Šāfi', Tārikh I p. 570-5; LN s.v. 'Ghada'arī' p. 243-4 (Dh. Šafii); Khayyām-pūr p. 419 (with further references); Eīr s.v. Ǧuda'arī Rādī.

60. Hakim Ghannānī is known to us only from the handful of verses quoted in Asadī's Lughat i furs. Cf. Horn, Einl. p. 26. [161]

61. Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ghawwāsī ('pearl-fisher') al-Junaidi is mentioned by Tha'ālībī as a bilingual (i.e. Arabic and Persian) poet who 'is alive now' (Tha'ālībī died in 429/1037-8; the first version of his Yatīmah was completed in 384/994, but was later augmented by the author). The same authority quotes eight of his Arabic verses, including two addressed to one al-Sayyid Abū ja'far al-Mīsawī. 'Auṣfī, referring explicitly to Tha'ālībī's Yatīmah, quotes the same two verses but says that they were addressed to the well-known Būyid ważīr al-Ṣāhib Isma'īl b. 'Abbād (d. 385/995). He then proceeds to quote four of his Persian verses in praise of wine. Further verses by (presumably the same) Ghawwāsī are quoted in Asadī's Lughat i furs, including a complete rubā'ī in Punjab manuscript, s.v. muk.

Tha'ālībī Yatīmah IV p. 318-9; LF (see the indexes to the 3 editions, and Horn Einl. p. 26); 'Auṣfī p. 23-4; Rāzī II p. 189 (quotes the same Persian verses as 'Auṣfī); Ešte, Vorl. p. 49; Šafī' I p. 441 (confuses 'Auṣfī with Tha'ālībī); LN s.vv. 'Junādi' p. 132 and 'Ghawwāsī' p. 352; Khayyām-pūr p. 138-9; Laudard, Poëtes I p. 15; Idārah-chi p. 128-30.

62. Fakhr al-dīn As'ad al-Jurjānī (Gurgānī) is the author of the romantic epic of Wīs u Rāmīn. After the customary invocation of God and his Prophet (inc. sipās u ḍīrīn ʿan pād-shāh rā * kih gītī rā pādī
dard u mā rā) the poet launches into an extensive encomium on the Seljuq ī Qārī (429/1038 to 455/1063) in which he dwells in particular on that king's conquest of Isfahan in 441/1050, which date must be seen as the terminus post quem for [162] Gurgānī's poem. This is followed by elegies of ī Qārī's minister, Khwājā Abū Naṣr b. Mānṣūr, and of his governor in Isfahan, Khwājā Abū ʿI-lāh b. Muḥammad, the poet's actual patron. He then tells us how this governor asked him what he thought of the story of Wīs and Rāmīn. The poet replies1 that it is fine story, put together by six wise men in 'Pahlāwi'. But today not everyone understands that language. Moreover, 'in those days poetry was not a profession' (ān-gah šārīr pēshāh na-bālū-st). If those authors were alive today they would see 'how speech is now produced' and 'how (quantitative) metre (ważīr) and rhymes (gawwāf) are imposed upon it'. At the request of the governor Gurgānī takes it upon himself to retell the old story with the requisite poetic embellishment. This section has generally been understood to mean that Gurgānī's source, the 'Pahlāwi' book of Wīs and Rāmīn was a poem, but without quantitative metre or rhyme. Although this is certainly possible, it does not seem the only conceivable interpretation of Gurgānī's words. It could be that he is simply saying that his source was in prose, and indeed could not have been otherwise, since 'in those days' that which a Muslim author would recognise as 'poetry' did not even exist. To be sure, the existence of a Middle-Persian poem (or poems) on the subject is evidently [163] implied by Hamzaš al-Iṣfahānī2 when, in his commentary on the dīvaṁ of Abī Nuwās, he explains the Arabic poet's phrase firjārāt Rāmīn wa

1 Ed. Todua/Gawakharia p. 28. See the translation in Minorsky, Iranica p. 153-4 (=BSOAS XI, 1946, p. 2-3) and the important remarks by Boyce, JES 1957, p. 37-8. In a later contribution (BSOAS XXV, 1962, p. 278-9) Minorsky rightly upholds (against Zarrīn-kūb, Suhkhan IX/10, 1337sh./1958, p. 1015-8) that 'Pahlāwi' here means 'Middle-Persian' and not the local vernacular of north-Western Persia. Gurgānī tells us precisely that the old book of Wīs and Rāmīn was studied by people in order to learn 'Pahlāwi'; with the latter the poet thus evidently means a literary language and not a colloquial dialect. See also G. Laudard, Minorsky Volume p. 366-7 and note 19.

Wts by saying that ‘fjxardat are like odes’ (ka l-qasā‘ād), but this may refer not to a poetic version of the whole story but rather to a collection of songs put into the mouths of the two lovers. Something similar would seem to be implied by the verse of Rūmān’s which asks whether the reader has not seen the dhwās of Wts and Rāmīn (dawān-i Wats u Rāmān) or heard the tales (hikāyāt) of Wārmīq and ‘Adhrā. There may thus well have been ‘dhwās’ of the two lovers, alongside the story of their adventures, in the same way that there is an (Arabic) dhwān of Majnūn alongside the story of his romance with Lailā. It is consequently not certain that the ‘odes’ of Wts and Rāmīn were identical with the source used by Gurgānī. In any event, the fact that Gurgānī has evidently based his poem directly on a Middle-Persian book and not (like Firdausī or Asadī) on documents already relatively far removed from their Sasanian sources goes a long way towards explaining the decidedly Zoroastrian flavour of so much of what we find in it. The specifically Parthian background of the story has been well developed by Minorsky and need not be discussed here.

Wts u Rāmān has survived in a very small number of manuscripts. The pronounced amoral character of the work and, particularly, the fact that it appears to condone adultery on the part of a woman meant that the work, if read at all, was widely regarded as indecent. Despite this, it had [164] a great influence on the formation of the style of the Persian romantic epic.

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

4Auff reports that, apart from Wts u Rāmān, the only other known composition by Gurgānī were five verses (quoted by ‘Auff) satirising one

1 ‘Fjxardat is clearly an Arabic spelling of Middle-Persian fyxardat, a word known to us as the designation for the individual ‘chapters’ of the Avestan text Vendidad.


(Czech): O lásce Visy a Rámin, translated (presumably from the Persian) by V. Kubíčková, Prague 1979.


63. Հախակ Marghâzî is quoted a dozen times in Asadî’s LF (see the indexes). Sôzânî enumerates him among the distinguished satirical poets.

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

65. Հանձաղի al-Hâdghî is listed by ‘Auîf amongst the poets of the Tahirids. Nîzâmî ‘Arûdi tells the story of the profound effect which two of his verses had on Ahmad b. Abd Allah al-Khujištî before the time when the latter entered the service of the Safarîd ʿAlî b. Lâhî. This Ahmad went on to rebel against the Safarîds in 261/875. It is, however, not clear whether ‘Arûdi regarded him as Ahmad’s contemporary or whether he was supposed to have flourished at an earlier date. The
date given for the poet’s [168] death by Hidżayat, namely 219/835, seems rather too early.


‘Arīdī p. 26; ‘Auff p. 2; Hidżayat, Majmā’ I p. 199; Elr s.v. ‘Hanẓāla’.

66. A single verse by an otherwise unknown Haram-Shāh (or Khurrām-shāh?) is quoted in manuscript P of LF, s.v. bahār. He is evidently not the same as the Khurram-shāh Kirmānī who is quoted by Jājarmī (II p. 981, 1068) and Rāzī (I p. 277).

67. Two verses by an otherwise unknown Ḥazī Bustī are quoted by Rādīyānī (p. 12).

68. Husain Īlāqī is known to us only from Rādīyānī, p. 108-9, who credits him with six verses from a contrived poem without the letter alif. The same verses are quoted anonymously by Waywān, p. 65-6, and by Hidżayat, Majmā’ I p. 508, where they are attributed to Muniqj. Ateş, in his note on the passage in Rādīyānī, considers the possibility that he is identical with Turki Kashi Ilaqī. 1


69. A single verse by one Kiyyā Husainī Qazwīnī is quoted in the Vatican manuscript of LF s.v. rang. He is perhaps identical with the author of four verses cited by ‘Auff (II p. 67) amongst the Ghaznavid poets whose name appears in Browne’s edition (following Ms. E.) as Muhsin i Qazwīnī, in Ms. S. as ۳۲۰۹ ۳۵۵۵۵۵ and in Hidżayat (Majmā’ I p. 511), who merely repeats the information given by ‘Auff, as Muhsin i Farhari (?).

70. Abū ‘Allī Biyās is cited as the author of a single verse in LF s.v. pashāl. Perhaps he is the father of the poet Abū ‘Allī Biyās Āghājī (above, p. 75-7)? [170]

71. Abū 1-Ḥasan ʿIrāqī, Masʿūd’s secretary (daʿīr), died on Monday, 6 Shawbān 429 (15 May 1038). 1 Rādīyānī quotes two of his verses.

Rādīyānī p. 47 (and Ateş ad loc.)

72. Ismāʿīl (II) b. Niḥ al-Muntaṣīr, the last Samanid ruler, who was killed in 395/1005, was an amateur poet as well.

‘Auff I 22-3 (‘Mantsır is an error for ‘Muntaṣīr’); H. Ethé, ‘Die Lieder des Kisā’i’ (see infra, no. 91) p. 149-53 (translation of ‘Auff’s

1Below, p. 231.
entry); LN s.v. ‘Ismā‘īl’ p. 2533-4; Khayyām-pūr p. 40; Lazard, Poètes I p. 15; Idārah-chi p. 239-46.

74. Ismā‘īl Rashīdī is credited with a single verse in LF, s.v. taryān. Evidently not the late 11th-century poet Rashīdī Samarqandī.2


76. ‘Iyādī is cited by ‘Auflī as the author of an elegy on the death of Ḥāfiz b. al-Ḥasan al-Bāḥṭarī (in 467/1075). Ḥidāyat calls him ‘Abd al-Raḥīm ‘Iyādī Sarakhsī and quotes a number of his poems, among them the verses in ‘Auflī and also eulogies on Ibn Sinā (died 428/1036-7) and Ḍalʿ-Darāsī (died 465/1072) and an ode to Malīk-Shāh (465/1072 to 485/1092). If these are indeed all his one must doubt Ḥidāyat’s statement that he was a contemporary of [171] Muʿāzzi and Niẓāmī ‘Arūdī. One verse by ‘Iyādī is quoted in the Vatican manuscript of LF. LF (ed. Horn) p. 120; ‘Auflī I p. 71; Ḥidāyat, Majma‘a I p. 354-5; Khayyām-pūr p. 411.

77. Abū l-Mahāmīd Muhāmid b. ‘Umar al-Jauhārī al-Sā‘īgh al-Harawī (as ‘Auflī calls him), or (as he styles himself) ‘Jauhari i zar-gar’ (Arabic sa‘īgh and Persian zar-gar both mean ‘goldsmith’) is quoted by ‘Auflī as the author of two odes. The first contains a verse addressing ‘malik tāj i mulik i āsr Farrukh-zād i Farrukh-pai’ (p. 112 v. 20) and ‘Auflī is thus probably right to say that our poet was a contemporary of the Ghaznavid Farrukh-zād (443/1052 to 451/1059), though it is surprising that he includes him in the chapter devoted to the poets of Seljuqs, not those of the Ghaznavids. This poem is clearly an imitation of one by

1The name is given thus in LF, ed. J. G. Mill, p. 357, apparently on the authority of manuscript sin, and in Šāhī p. 238; Farangh i Jāhāngīrī (ed. Horn, Einl. p. 18) has Ismā‘īl Rashīdī. In the Vatican manuscript of LF he appears merely as Rashīdī.

2For whom see below, p. 507-8.

3[In the first edition this entry was printed as foot-note 2 on p. 348-9.]

Qatārīn:1 Jauhari quotes the first mīrāt of Qatārīn’s poem at the very end of his own, though he refers to its author only as ‘ustad i sufhan’. ‘Auflī’s second ode is a light-hearted complaint about having received an old horse from the stable-master of an unnamed sultan; in the penultimate verse the author calls himself ‘Jauhari i zar-gar’. Jājarmī quotes two poems by ‘malik al-kalām Jauhari i zar-gar’ and both of them (like ‘Auflī’s second ode) end with the poet’s signature. (Muṣaffā maintains the second of these is an imitation of a well-known qastdah by Muʿāzzi, but I do not think the similarity is very great; both are merely imitating the same Arabic models.) Daulat-shāh quotes the first of the two poems cited by Jājarmī, but adds that its author was a pupil of Aḏīb Ǧūbīr and a contemporary of Aḥṭār Akhsīkātī, that he was a native of Bahlūl who settled in Ifṣahān, that his patron was Sulaimān-shāh b. Muhammad b. Malīk-shāh (555/1160 to 556/1161) and that he versified the story of Māhsatī and Aḥmād (though our informant adds that others say that this story was composed by Niẓāmī (sic!) and that only God knows the truth of the matter. The later sources add nothing new. It seems likely that all the ‘information’ given by Daulat-shāh is wrong and that his claim that Jauhari lived at the time of Sulaimān-shāh was extrapolated from a verse in the last poem quoted by ‘Auflī (p. 117 v. 5) in which the poet refers to the Sulaimān (Solomon) of the Qurʾān. As for Jauhari’s supposed versification of the story of Māhsatī and Aḥmād, it must be evident from Daulat-shāh’s formulation that he had no first-hand knowledge of such a work. It is possible, as Meier suggested, that Daulat-shāh confused our poet with the late 13th-century alchemist and rhymesmith ‘Abd Allāh Jauhari Tabrīzī who in fact refers at some length to Māhsatī in the commentary to his own Qastdah hafttyab. 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 Farrukh-zād and the other a century later at the time of Sulaimān-shāh; the poems quoted by ‘Auflī and by Jājarmī are evidently all by one and the same poet.

The ‘Jauhari’ whom ‘Arūdī (p. 28) includes in his list of the poets of the Qaraḵhanids is more likely to be the later writer Hamīd al-dīn al-Jauhari,2
'Auff II p. 110; 7; 'Ijamiri p. 85; 6, 147; 9; Daulat-shah p. 118; 21; Rast III p. 423; 4 (no. 1481); Hiidayat, Majma' 1 p. 184; 5 (new edition 1 p. 504; 6, and Mushaf's notes); Safa, Tarikh II pp. 438; 43; Meier, Mah- satt pp. 60; 1; Khaiyam-pur p. 141.


'Arûdi p. 28; 'Auff II p. 11; Hiidayat, Majma' 1 p. 185; LN s.v.

'Abû Ishâq' p. 370; Safa, Tarikh II p. 396; 7; Khaiyam-pur p. 142; Idrahar-chi p. 41.

79. Kâ’ûs-Kai (doubtless a metrically dictated inversion for Kâ- Kâ’ûs), the son of Kâ-Khusrau, of Kâ, is, according to verses 1524 and 1541, the author of the Zoroastrian religious mathnavi commonly called Zarathush-namah; see also verses 45; 6, where the author speaks of his 'father' (bâh) Kâ-Khusrau, son of Dârâ, of Kâ. Although his authorship has been noted more or less clearly by Rieu, Storey and Safa, the poem has traditionally been attributed to the 13th-century Zoroastrian poet Zarathush b. Bahrâm b. Pâzudû.1 In fact, the 1172 verse in which this name is mentioned (1554) is clearly part of a rhymed colophon; Zarathush is thus not the author, but merely the copyist of the manuscript from which some (or all) of the surviving copies descend. The original poem ends either with verse 1332,2 or perhaps with 1539. Moreover, between the end of the original poem and the beginning of Zarathush's colophon (v. 1551) there is an older rhymed colophon in which the anonymous scribe announces that he 'wrote' (i.e. copied) the story on the basis of the words (gâfûr) of Kâ’ûs-Kai b. Kâ-Khusrau - on whose

1For whom see below, Pl. VI.

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

2The S.O.A.S. manuscript, which seems on the whole to belong to the same family as the Leningrad codex, has fol. 36b) ... sh.y.u.d (sic). This could easily represent a miscopying of an old manuscript in which stand was written with an shmal sign over its first letter. This observation holds good, of course, also for the author's source for this part of the poem, i.e. the Zand 1 Wahnman-Ushti. I intend to return to the question of the dating of that work on an appositive occasion. 3In A.D. 1101 (for example) 11 Absn would correspond to 27 September Julian (or 4 October, projected Gregorian), which seems rather early for a ground frost in any part of Iran. A later dating would move us even further forward in the calendar.
doubt that the poem might well have been composed at any period up to just before the time of Zarathush b. Bahram, i.e. up to the middle of the 13th century.

The title of the poem (inc. suh*on r̡*b an n̡m 1 k̡mhdy d jḥn̡m * bī. d̠rb̠yad az [or: bi-ab̠h̠zd dar]) [174] 'āsh̠h̠r̠u u nil̠n̡h̠m' is given in some of the manuscripts as Zarathush-nāmâh (Book of Zoroaster), in others as Kitāb-i maušḷād-i Zarathush (Book of the birth of Zoroaster), and the latter is evidently correct, as it is mentioned by the poet himself in v. 1523 (chā maušḷād i Zarathush k̡hvānt t̲ān̡mām...). Indeed the poem does deal with the birth and childhood of Zoroaster and with his early prophetic career, down to the conversion of Gušhtasp. The author tells us (v. 14 sqq.) that it is based on a 'royal book' in 'Pahlavi script' which was in the possession of the chief priest (mōbd i mōbadān) and that at the request of that divine he versified it in 'Persian script' (k̡hatt i dar).3

The account of the life of the prophet which then follows is very close to that which we find in surviving Middle-Persian books such as Denkard and the Epistles of Zādaspāram and it is most likely that one of these is in fact the 'book' to which the poet refers. After the account of the conversion of Gušhtasp we find, rather abruptly, a new d̠rb̠yad (v. 1260 sqq.) followed by the story of how Zoroaster asked Hurmuz in vain for immortality and had to content himself with an account of the future history of the world down to the coming of the final saviour. This section is a fairly close verse paraphrase of the surviving Zand-i Wuhman-Yashat. Its irrelevance for the story of the 'birth' of Zoroaster might lead one to suspect that the whole section from v. 1259 to 1522 is an interpolation, but one should perhaps not expect too much structural unity in a work of this sort. In any case, there does not seem to be an appreciable [175] difference in language or style between the versified Wuhman-Yashat and the other parts of the poem.

---

1 This is the revised verdict expressed in the corrigenda to the first edition, p. 621. On this basis Khā-Kaβ'os ought to have been excluded from the present chapter.

2 The name of the prophet occurs in the poem as Zarathush, Zartusht, Zara(i)hust or Zarattušt, depending on the requirements of the metre. All of these reflect Avestan Zaraštuastra- (it is perhaps then better to read Zarathush, etc.). The usual Neo-Persian forms of the name, Zardush and Zar'husht, continue Middle-Persian Zarud(ka)št.

3 V. 25.
80. Two verses by an otherwise unknown Kashfī are quoted in manuscript nān of LF (ed. Iqībāl p. 325, 519-200).

81. Kuukabi Marwāzī is included in ‘Auff’s chapter on the Ghaznavid poets, where six of his verses are quoted. ‘Auff II p. 65; Hīdāyat, Majmā‘I p. 487; Khayyām-pūr p. 493.

82. Kār-i Khar (‘ass’s penis’) is given as the author of a pair of pornographic verses quoted by Rādūyānī, p. 47.


84. Khabbāz al-Naṣīṣbūrī is included by ‘Arūdī and ‘Auff among the Samanid poets and the latter cites two of his verses. Hīdāyat claims that he died in 342/953-4, but it is not known where he found this information.

‘Arūdī p. 28 (and Qazwīnī ad. loc.); ‘Auff II p. 27; Hīdāyat, Majmā‘I p. 159; Ethē, Vorl. p. 50-1;1 Sa‘īfī, Tārīkh 6 p. 438; Khayyām-pūr p. 186-7 (with further references); LN s.v. ‘Khabbāz’ p. 240; Lazard, Poètes I p. 15; Idrārā-chī p. 110-1.

85. Khaffāfī is quoted a good number of times in Asadī’s LF and once by Shams i Qais.

---

1Ethē quoted in this connection three verses that Wālib ascribes to one Abū ‘Alī b. Ḥakīm Khabbāz and which refer to his father, Khabbāz, as a doctor, whom Ethē equated with Khabbāzī. But Ethē retracted this suggestion in I.O. Cat. col. 444 no. 912, where it is noted that the three verses are cited also by Rāzī (Tebriz edition, II p. 436).

---

1See below, p. 548.

2V. 488-6 of Naṣīf’s second edition of Rūdakī’s fragments, with indication of sources (all late).
90. Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. ‘Alī al-Khusrāwī al-Sarakhshī al-Hakīm is frequently quoted by Asadī and Rādiyānī. ‘Auﬁ quotes ode 1 that he dedicated to the Buyid wazīr al-Sāhib Ḩasanī b. ‘Abbāsī (d. 385/995) and to the Ziyarid ruler of Gurgān, Shams al-Ma‘ālī Qābūs b. Wusmghīr (367/978 to 402/1012). Bākhrāzī mentions him in connection with these same patrons and quotes a number of his Arabic verses.

Bākhrāzī no. 305; LF passim (and Horn, Einl. p. 18); Rādiyānī passim (and Aṭī’s notes p. 124-5); Watūwī p. 76; ‘Auﬁ II p. 18-19; Ṣafā, Tārīkh 16 p. 433-5; Khāyīm-pūr p. 191; Lazard, Poètes 1 p. 15; Idārah-chī p. 226-37. [179]

91. Abū l-Ḥasan1 al-Kisā‘ī al-Marwāzī is evidently identical with the ‘ascetic’ whom Bākhrāzī calls Abū l-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. Muḥammad al-Kiṣā‘ī al-Marwāzī and to whom he attributes two Arabic verses. ‘Auﬁ devotes a long entry to him, quoting, among other things, a qaṣīda in which the poet states that he was born on a Wednesday, three days before the end of Shawwāl in 341 (= 16 March 953) and that at the time of the composition of the poem he had reached the age of 50, i.e. he was still alive in 391/1000-1. ‘Auﬁ also quotes an ode in praise of ‘Ṣulṭān i Ghāzī Ṭūn-i-daulah’, i.e. Muḥammad of Ghaznah, and a religious poem in praise of ‘Alī, ‘Arulī, on the other hand, includes him among the Samanid poets; if correct, this would suggest that he was patronised successively by the Samanids and Ghaznavids. The collection of his fragments by Ṣafā also contains a total of 292 verses which the editor considers authentic and references to a number of spurious poems. Among the former special mention is due to a substantial poem (the first in the volume) of 50 verses quoted by Taqī Khāshī in the supplement (taḏkīrah) to his Ḳhuṣrāw al-asḥār (Bankipore VIII no. 684); the authenticity of the poem is assured by the fact that two of its verses are quoted by Asadī and one by Rādiyānī. Khāshī is frequently mentioned in disparaging terms in the poems of Nāṣir i Khusrāu (see the index to his ḍunān); however, the exchange of poems between Khāshī and Nāṣir quoted by Taqī (followed by Ḥidāyat) is manifestly spurious.

1Thus ‘Arūf; the late taḏkīrah - for which see Eib’s article - call him Abū Ḥishāq Majd al-dīn.
name was Abi Ya'qub Yaysuf etc., and for another the poet calls his
patron a 'king' (pad-shah). It is thus probable that the poem was in fact
addressed to the ruler of Chaghānīyān, Fakhr al-daulah Abi Muṣaffar
Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. Ahmad.1 Whether it is in fact the work of
Labībī is, however, not certain, as it is ascribed in later tadḥīkhrahs
to Farrukhī and has also found its way into copies of the divān of
Manūchīhīr, Lāmīrī and Aẓraṣ. Apart from these poems we have a good
number of quotations from Labībī in the Lughat i fars, which cites this
poet very frequently. Most of the surviving fragments are from inves-
tives and a large portion of them are vehemently pornographic.

Collections of fragments: J. Rypka and M. Borecký, ‘Labībī’,
Archiv Orientální 14, 1943, p. 261-307 (a critical edition and German
translation of the fragments); M. Dabir-Siyāqi, Labībī va ashrār i a,
Tehran, 1332ah./1953 (first published in Mihr VIII, 1331sh./1952,
p. 310-2, 367-71, 650-3 [182] and again reprinted in the first instalment
of his Ganj i bāz-yāftar, Tehran, 1334ah./1955, p. 1-34.)

1 LF 124, 168 (two new fragments in ed. Mujtabārī/Sādiqī p. 97, 132);
Rādiyāni p. 32 (and Ateq ad loc.); Bahaqī p. 73-4; ‘Auﬁ II p. 40-1;
Saﬁ Haravī p. 510 (two verses); Hidayat, Majmu’ I p. 494 (Labībī)
and 445-6 (the poem he attributes to Farrukhī); Divān i Farrukhī, ed. ‘A,
‘Abd al-Rasūlī, Tehran 1311ah./1932-3, p. 5 of the introduction; M.T.
Bahār, ‘Qaṣidat i Labībī’, Ayandah III, 1306sh./1927, p. 151-1 (an edi-
tion of the one long ode; reprinted in the LN article); LN s.v. ‘Labībī’;
Saﬁ, Tārkīh I6 p. 547-50; Khayyām-pūr p. 500; E2 s.v. ‘Labībī’ (J.T.P.
de Bruijn).

93. Lāmīrī Dihistānī,2 or Gurgānī,3 is listed by ‘Ardūi among the
paeonists of the Seljuqs. There are three poems in his divān praising a
king named Nūshīrwān, or, as one verse4 has it, ‘mīr Fakhr al-daulah
Nūshīrwān, khudāwand i jahān’, evidently the Ziyarid ruler of his native
Gurgān, (A)nūshīrwān b. Manūchīhīr, who occupied his throne under the

1Thus already Hidayat p. 445, who calls the dedicatee ‘Abi l-Muṣaffar Muṣaffar i
Chaghānīyān’ but attributes the ode to Farrukhī. Bosworth, Iran XIX, 1981, p. 12,
considers the possibility that the poet’s patron was Abi l-Muṣaffar Nāṣr b. Nāṣr al-dīn,
another brother of Muḥammad’s, but was he a ‘pad-shah’?

2Thus ‘Ardūi.

3Shams; Jājarmī (‘Lāmīrī al-jurjānī’).

4Ed. Dabir-Siyāqi, no. 80, v. 977.

uneasy tutelage of the Ghaznavids and Seljuqs from around 420/1029 to
perhaps as late as 441/1049-50.1 He would appear to have been Lāmīrī’s
first patron. Afterwards he entered the service of the Seljuqs, praising
their two well-known wazirs, ‘Aūfī al-mulk Abi Nāṣr al-Kundūrī (who
served Toghril and was eliminated shortly after the succession of Alp
Arslān) and Niẓām al-mulk, as well as the latter’s master, Alp Arslān
(455/1063 to 465/1072).

Neither of two oldest tadḥīkhrahs (those of ‘Auﬁ and Daulat-shāh)devotes an entry to this [183] poet. The latter does, however, mention
one Lāmīrī Bukhārī among the pupils of Sūzanī. If this is true, then
surely two poets with the same name. The authors of the later
tadḥīkhrahs evidently confused the two: ‘Adhār makes Lāmīrī a pupil of
Muḥammad al-Ghazālī and says that he died in Samarqand. Hidayat
repeats this last piece of information and adds that his death occurred
during the reign of Sanjar (511/1118 to 552/1157), which is much too
late, at least as far as our poet is concerned.

The hitherto recorded dated manuscripts of his divān are without
exception late. Apart from those listed by Munawwī (III 25647-58) we
might mention: London Or. 2889 fol. 10-24a (Rieu Suppt. no. 212 II
 Completed 28 Jun Mīrā 1293/1876); R.A.S. Storey bequest nos. 3, fol.
156b-175a (Uncatalogued; inspexi. This divān is added by a second
hand to an older codex and dated 1269/1852-3); Cambridge
Browne Coll. V.88 pp. 144-179 (Dated 1266/1849-50); Leningrad
Univ. 941* (Salemann-Rosen p. 15); Univ. 1000c (Romaskevicz p. 87).

Dated 28 Rabī’ II 1270/1854).

Editions: Tehran 1295/1878; 1319sh./1931 (ed. S. Nafṣī);

1LF (one verse in ed. Mujtabārī/Sādiqī p. 30-1; there is another
verse in the marginal additions to manuscript nān, ed. Iqbal p. 420);
‘Ardūi p. 28; Shams p. 335, 360; Jājarmī I p. 142-3; Yaghmārī p. 93-5;
Daulat-shah p. 102; ‘Adhār p. 160-2; Hidayat, Majmu’a I p. 494-501;
LN s.v. ‘Lāmīrī’ I p. 74-6 (S. Nafṣī); Khayyām-pūr p. 499-500; Saﬁ, Tārkīh
I5 p. 386-98; Shafi’i-Kadkanī, Šawwar p. 641-8; E2 s.v. ‘Lāmīrī’ (J.W.
Clinton). [184]

1 Cf. C.E. Bosworth, ‘On the chronology of the Ziyārids in Gurgān and
Tabārezdīstān’, Der Islam XL, 1964, p. 25-34.


95. A single verse by one Māḥmūdī is quoted in LF s.v. kassak (or kashak) (ed. Horn p. 69; ed. Iṣqāl p. 297; also in Sīḥāt p. 185). Horn identified this poet with Zainab Māḥmūdī (below, p. 239), but this is only a guess.

96. Māṣarī2 is the author of a medical poem of some 5000 verses in ḥazaj metre (inc. ba nām i pāk i daḵār i jahān ast * kih baḵbāhāy u dānā i niḥān ast). Nothing is known of him except what can be deduced from that work, the title of which is given in the text (twice) as Denīšīn-nāmāh, in the colophon, however, as Kitāb i Manṣūr bi nigm; the latter title would seem to imply that the poem is based on the well-known medical compendium al-Ḵīṭāb al-manṣūrī of Muhammad b. Zakarīyā Rāzī, but there seems to be nothing in the text to support this. The title given in the colophon is thus probably spurious. The author tells us that he began his poem in Shawwāl 367/978 and completed it in 370/980-1 when he was more than 46 years old, thus indicating that he was born about 324/936. [185] The work is dedicated to one ‘Nāṣir i Daulat’, evidently the governor of Khurāsān, Abū l-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm b. Simjūr, who received the title Nāṣir al-daulah after the ascension of the Samanid Nūḥ (II) b. Mansūr in 365/975-6.


1Thus ‘Auﬁ. Shams calls him Ghazwānī Laukāri (p. 231) or simply Ghazwānī (p. 233). Ghazwānī is the name of a quarter in Herat, but it is also a personal name, thus Ghazwānī could simply mean ‘descendant of a certain Ghazwān’. Laukāri is a locality near Ma’āw.

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

1In Rādiyānī: Māṣarī is Samarqandī is included by ‘Arūḏī and ‘Auﬁ among the Ghaznavid poets. ‘Auﬁ quotes, among [186] other things, an ode to Sultan Māḥmūd; a fuller version of the same poem is quoted by Jājamī and Ḥidāyat and five verses from it can be found already in Rādiyānī.3 Another long ode to Māḥmūd is quoted in the old jung published by Yaghmāʾī. Presumably the same Manṣūrī is the author of two verses quoted in the Punjab and Tehran (Malik) manuscripts of LF s.v. haft-ḵᵛāng (the second verse is also in the marginal additions to manuscript nīn). Wafātī reports that in his Kanz al-gharā’ib Ahmad Māḥmūdī collected artificial poems of the type called matulawwīn, which, if vocalised differently, can be scanned in two different metres.

2More precisely: one of the verses cited by Rādiyānī on p. 64 occurs also in Jājamī’s and Ḥidāyat’s versions, the two verses on p. 88 occur in ‘Auﬁ and Ḥidāyat (but not in Jājamī) and the other two on p. 64 are found only in Rādiyānī.
100. Maṣār b. 'Ali al-Manṭiqi al-Rāzi, known as Mārqā ('myrtile', or perhaps rather Muwarrād?) eulogised the Bāyūd waṣīr of Rai al-Saḥib Ismā'īl b. 'Abdāb (367/977-8 to 385/995).


Bairūnī, Kitāb al-jamāḥīr fī mar'ifat al-jawāhīr, ed. Krenkow, Hyderabad 1355/1936-7, p. 81 (one verse by 'Maṣūr Māرد'; not in Lazard); LF (ed. Iṣbāl) passim (quoted only in the marginal additions to manuscript nūn); Rādiyānī p. 53, 55 (and Ates's notes, p. 133); 'Arūji p. 28 (and Qazwinī ad loc.); Wāṣwāt p. 4, 47, 83; 'Aúfī II p. 16-8; Shams p. 275, 308; Jāmānī II p. 464-3; Hidāyāt, Majma' I p. 508-9; Saḥāf, Tārtīkh 16 p. 431-3; Khayām-pūr p. 568.

101. Abū l-Najm Ahmad b. Qays b. Ahmad al-Dāmghānī, known as Manūchīrī (or Minūchīrī),3 flourished under the Ghaznavī Maṣūd I (421/1030 to 432/1040), to whom a large portion of his surviving poems is dedicated. His earliest patron, the one to whom he owed his pen-name, appears to have been the Ziyarid Falak al-Ma'ālī Manūchīrī b. Qābis (402/1012 to 420 or 412/1029), who is identified in the superscriptions in at least some of the manuscripts as the dedicatee of poems no. 27 and 31 of Dābir-Siyyāqī's edition. Admittedly, the name of this prince is not actually mentioned in the odes in question. However, in one of the poems written after his arrival in Ghaznavī, Manūchīrī alludes to his previous service in Rai and Gurgān,1 which would certainly seem to suggest that he had been at the court of one or another of the Ziyarids.2 Two of his poems (no. 13, 48) are dedicated to Khwāyā (Abū) Tāhir, who was Maṣūd's [188] kāḏ-khuṭā in Rai for a short period in 423 to 424 (1032-3), and it was evidently after serving this representative of the Ghaznavids in Rai that our poet betook himself to the court of the king himself. In one place,3 in fact, he claims that Maṣūd had brought him from Rai on an elephant, but this must perhaps be taken with a pinch of salt. There is in any case no evidence that Manūchīrī entered the service of the Ghaznavids before the time of Maṣūd,4 and no indication that he outlived that ruler. The tadhkīrāhs give the date of his death as 432/1040-1, 439/1047-8, or as late as 483/1090.5

Apart from qasīdahs and the usual shorter poems Manūchīrī's dīvwān contains eleven celebrated masammāys. He has been admired in particular for his description of nature.

Manuscripts of his dīvwān are frequent, but overwhelmingly late (19th or 20th century), and it is on these modern copies that the existing editions are based. There is, however, an as yet unused manuscript in Tehran dated 1010/1601-26 as well as a few fairly old manuscripts with more or less extensive selections from the poems. (Blochet's 16th century dating of the Paris manuscript needs closer scrutiny). That the vulgate text is, nonetheless, [189] not all that bad can be seen from the fairly close agreement between the text given by Dābir-Siyyāqī for the first strophe of his poem no. 58 with the version quoted by Rādüyānī, p. 105.

1No. 34, five verses from the end (reference supplied by A.H. Morton).
2Clinton, p. 23-5, takes a hypercritical view of the link between Manūchīrī and the Ziyarids, but appears to have overlooked the verse just mentioned.
3No. 34, twelve verses from end.
4'Aūfī quotes two verses which he says are from an ode in praise of 'Ṣalīḥ Yāmīn al-daḡaḏāh', i.e. Māḥmūd, but in the dīvwān they are found in a poem (no. 17) which, according to the superscription, was addressed to Maṣūd, and the historical allusions in the poem prove that this is correct.
5Thus Taqī, apud Sprenger p. 15.
6Curiously, Sprenger recorded the same date for the manuscript formerly in the library of the king of Oudh, in Lucknow, adding that it had 188 pages (the Tehran catalogue records 180 pages). Are the two manuscripts perhaps identical? Or was one copied, colophon and all, from the other?
Paris Supplément 725 II (Becot 1206. 16th century); Leningrad Univ. 1004 (Romaskewicz p. 8. Dated 1271/1854-5); Univ. 1276 (Tagirdzhanov p. 6); Istanbul Université FV 917 (=Halis Ef. 1647; Ates 10. Dated 20 Dhū 1-hijjah 1285/1869); Baku 1338 (Dated 1260/1844); I 339 (Dated 1274/1857-8); Tehran Univ. XIV 4669 (Dated 1010/1601-2, with an introduction); Majlis 4906 (Munz. 26235 inspexit. Dated 1260/1844); Shīrāz I İslāmī I 91 p. 1-63; Sāri Shīhāb Collection (Nuskhahā-va 6 p. 621. Dated 1209/1794-5); Qum Mar'ashi V 1930; Mashhad Univ. 157, 158, 159; Lahore Univ. II p. 134 (Dated 1249/1833-4. See OCM III/2, 1927, p.74); Bankiire I 14 (19th century); I 15 (19th century); Hyderabad Asafiyah I p. 734 no. 399; Calcutta Ivanov Curzon 188 (modern); Lucknow Sprenger 349 (Dated 1010/1601-2). A large number of late manuscripts are listed by Munzawi (III 2820-91) and in Dabin-Shīyāq’s introduction.

Selected poems:
London Or. 2880 fol. 118h-140a (Rieu Suppt. no. 224 II. Completed Jumādā I 1245/1829. A selection of qasā'id only); Cambridge Browne Coll. V.65 no. 36 (Anthology dated 27 Ra‘dān 387/1242); Calcutta Ivanov 927 fol. 1s v sq. (Modern); Tehran Malik (Dated Rabī’ I 1011/1602, according to Dabin-Shīyāq’s introduction, p. viii); Majlis VIII 2326 (17th century). [190]

Editions:
Tehran 1285/1868-9; 1290/187; 1295/1878; 1297/1880; 1301/1883-4; 1326h.1948 (Ed. M. Dabin-Shīyāq); reprinted 1 1338h.1959, 1347h./1968. Paris 1886 (Menoutcheri, poète persan du 11ème siècle de notre ère (du 11ème siècle de l’hégire). Texte, traduction, notes et introduction historique par A. de Biberstein Kazimi). The same scholar had previously published a Spéimen du Divan ... de Menoutcheri, Versailles 1876.


1 Apparently with revision. Only the first version of Dabin-Shīyāq’s edition is available to me.


102. ‘Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muhammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Marrūf al-Balkhī is credited by ‘Aufi with two verses from an ode which he says were dedicated to the Samanid ruler ‘Abū al-Malik b. Nūh b. Nāṣr (343/954-5 to 350/961). Moreover, Dib-ḥudī refers to an unpublished source which has him recite an ode in the presence of the ruler of Sistan, Khalaf b. Ahmad (died 399/1008-9).


1 LF passim; Rādiyānī p. 44; ‘Aufi II p. 16; Shams passim; Jārmānī II p. 953; Hīdāyat, Majma’ I p. 505; Khāyām-pūr p. 551.

1LF s.v. ‘Abu ‘Abd Allah’ p. 608.
103. Marwārī is credited with a single verse in LF, s.v. lāmāh.

104. Abū l-Qādis Masrūr b. Muhammad al-Tūlūlānī is known to us only from the three verses quoted by 'Auffi in his chapter on the Ghaznavid poets. These include a qaṣīda of fifteen verses in praise of the warī' Abū l-Qāsim Ahmad b. Ḥasan.


105. Mas‘ūd al-Marwazi is the author of the earliest known version of the Shāh-nāma (inc. nakhtūstīw Gardumārt amād ba shūhī bī ba gōt [192] dar girāf-ash pēth-gāthī). Two fragments of his poem are quoted in the Kitāb al-bad‘a wa l-ta‘rīkh of Mūtahhar b. Tāhir al-Maqqālī, a work written in about 355/966, which is thus the terminus ad quem of our poet. It is however likely, as Lazard has argued, that he wrote well before the time of al-Maqqālī, perhaps towards the end of the 3rd/9th century. Judging from these fragments and from the references in Thā‘alībī’s Gharār mulkī al-furs his poem encompassed the whole of the legendary history of the Iranians from Gardumārt to the fall of the Sasanian empire.

Collection of fragments (3 verses), French translation, discussion and literature: Lazard, Poètes I p. 22, 73, II p. 47; see also Idrārah-či p. 20-2.

106. Mas‘ūd4 or Mas‘ūdī5 al-Rāzī6 served at the court of Sulṭān Mas‘ūd. Bāhraṯ relates how, during the Mihrāgan festival in 430/1039,7

1The second mirāt according to Qazwīnī’s emendation; in the manuscript used by Huart the verse reads nakhtūstī Gardumārt amād ba shūhī girāf-ash ba gōt darīn pēth-gāthī, which scans as mas̄uqṭaṭīb muḥammān sītlam. However, since the other two verses quoted by Mūtahhar are clearly hatgā ‘mūsaddās mēshhdīf the emendation of the first line is unavoidable. (Differently I. Khālq-Mūlaq, ‘Pirmānā-i wazān i Shāh-nāma’, Iran-ō-dinārī I, 1363b, 1990, p. 46-70. It might be noted that there are other manuscripts of Mūtahhar’s work (cf. Sazgin I p. 337).


4Thus Bāhraṯ, ‘Auffi, Wāṣṭūlī, Ṣafī.

5LF, Rāḍīyānī, ‘Areffī, Hīdīyatī; it is possible, as Qazwīnī suggested, that both forms are correct, in other words that the poet’s ien was Mas‘ūdī, his takhālīs ‘Mas‘ūdī, i.e. ‘calligrapher of Sulṭān Mas‘ūd’.

6‘Auffi, and the latter takhālīs.

7Bāhraṯ gives the date of the incident as Tuesday 27 Dhū l-hijjah 430. According
dausī. Obviously, the attribution to Muḥammad is supported not only by the greater antiquity of Rādīyānī, but also by the fact that, as the less famous poet, he is also less likely to have had stray verses wrongly attached to his name.  

Rādīyānī passim (and Ateš’s notes p. 100-1); ‘Aribī p. 13, 24 (and Qazwīnī’s notes); Waṭwāt p. 78; Ṣafā, Tārīkh 16 p. 439-41; Lazaḡī, Poêtes I p. 14.

109. Muḥammad b. Mukhallad is mentioned by the author of the Tārīkh i Ṣūṭān in the same context as Muḥammad b. Waṣīfī and Bassām i Kūrī.  

Collection of fragments (3 verses), French translation, discussion and literature: Lazard, Poëtes I p. 19, 58, II p. 17.  
Tārīkh i Ṣūṭān p. 212; Meier, Mahsāt p. 11.

110. Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ṣalīḥ flourished under the Samanids, according to ‘Auṭī, who quotes four of his verses. His nisba is given in the printed text of ‘Auṭī’s Lābāb as al-Walwālī, but by Ḥidāyat, who refers explicitly to ‘Auṭī as his source, as Navaḏālī. Qazwīnī4 equated him with the poet mentioned by Manūshīrī5 in a list of ancient poets as an-ki āmad az Nawāḏālī.6 It is in 1985 therefore likely, as Qazwini argued, that Nawaḏālī is the correct reading.  

111. Muḥammad b. Waṣīf composed, according to the author of the Tārīkh i Ṣūṭān, the first Persian poem in quantitative metre, namely an ode in honour of Yaḥṣūb b. Laith, probably at about the time when the latter captured Herat in 253/867. Another poem bemoans the death of ‘Amr b. Laith and alludes to the events of 296-7/909-10.  


112. Abū Sharīfī Ahmad b. ‘All Mukhālladī Ṣurjānī is, according to ‘Auṭī and ‘Auṭī, the name of the author of two verses stating that all that remains of the glory of the Sasanians and the Samanids is the praise bestowed upon them by Bābar and Rūdāki respectively; he must therefore have lived after the fall of Samanids. Rādīyānī [196] quotes a translation by him of a prophetic ḥadīth and this is followed by further translations (not specifically attributed, but perhaps also by Mukhālladī) of a series of sayings by ‘Auṭī. One verse by ‘Bū Sharīfī’ is quoted in the Vatican manuscript of LF s.v. bint, and the same verse is quoted in Šīh p. 299 as the work of ‘Mujāhīdī’. ‘Mujāhīdī’ is also quoted twice in the marginal additions to manuscript nūn of LF and four connected verses are cited in Šīh (p. 46).


113. al-Adīb Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. Ḥamad al-Mukhtarī was a contemporary, and evidently also a friend, of Bākharzī (died 467/1075),

---

1Thus ‘Auṭī: ‘Aribī calls him ‘Sharīf Muḥjalladī Gurgānī’.
2Thus pointed (one dot over the ḫaf and a dot under the dīl muḥnī) in Rādīyānī fol. 281b. The other sources fluctuate between ‘Mukhālladī’ and ‘Mujāhīdī’.
3Arabic verses on the same effect are quoted by ‘Auṭī (I p. 13: two verses); Zāhītī (p. 29: four verses) and Rūwans̄ī (Rūwans̄ī al-maṭārī, ed. M. Ḥūdīl, London 1921, p. 62: three verses). Qazwīnī (ad Jāmīhā 1 p. 163) says that one of the verses - but not the one mentioning Rūdākī - occurs also in a quasideh by Abū Ḥabīb Ibrāhīm b. Yalāyī al-Ghazzī, who died in 524/1129-30; see Qazwīnī ad ‘Aribī p. 100-1 and EP Suppl. s.v. ‘Ghazzī’ (C.E. Bosworth). As long as the authorship of the Arabic verses is not established the question must remain open as to whether the Persian verses are translated from the Arabic or vice versa.
who quotes, among many other samples of his Arabic poetry, three verses dedicated to Abū Ḫairām Ṣamīl b. Ghuṣn. Two of these are quoted also by ‘Afsī in the first entry of his chapter on the poets of the Seljuqs. There is a lacuna at the beginning of this entry in the manuscripts used by Browne, who supplied the missing name of the author as Bahrami; this is doubtless wrong. The Arabic verses are - as mentioned - by Mukhtar and he must consequently be the author of the five Persian verses quoted there as well. According to Iqbal the author of the ‘Tadkhirat i ‘Arāfī’ 1 states explicitly that Muhammad ‘Afsī ascribes the last of these verses to Abū Mukhtar; it is thus clear that the name Mukhtar still stood in the manuscript of ‘Afsī’s work available to that author. The same verse occurs already in ‘Arāfī, who says 197 that it was recited by Burhanī at the time when he gave over his position as poet-lauraeus to his son Mu’izzī, 2 whereby ‘Arāfī seems to imply that the verse is in fact by Burhanī. If this is true Mukhtar must have quoted it in his own qitā’ah, though it is just as likely that Burhanī was in fact quoting Mukhtar. Da‘lat-shāh 3 and other late authors ascribe the same verse to Nizām al-mulk.

114. Abū I-Ḥasan ‘Ali b. Muhammad al-Tirmidhī al-ma‘rūf b. Munījk 4 flourished at the court of the ǧāl i Muḥtār, the rulers of Chaghānīyān, 5 just to the north of his birthplace, Tirmidh, on the Amā Daryā. ‘Afsī quotes an ode to ‘Abū I-Muzaffar Ṭāhir b. al-Faḍl’, a form which represents a contamination of the names of Abū I-Ḥasan Ṭāhir b. al-Faḍl (died 380/991) and of his successor Abū I-Muzaffar Ahmad b. Muhammad. That the poem was in fact dedicated to the latter is clear from the fuller version of it quoted by Ḥiḍāyat 1 and in an early jung, 2 where the poet addresses his patron as ‘Abū I-Muzaffar Shah i zamīn’ 3 the 3rdPERSON. 198 the patron is addressed as ‘Abū I-Muzaffar Shah i Chaghānīyān Ahmād’ in three verses of Munījk’s quoted by Ḥiḍāyat. 4 On the other hand, in Ṣaṣi’s Lughat i fars we find a verse which several of the manuscripts 5 state was recited by ‘Ṣahīd’, mocking Munījk in the presence of Ṣaṣi’s father Ghażnawī as well as two verses by Munījk himself 6 which are clearly his reply to the attack. Shahīd al-Balkhī died, of course, long before the time of Mahmūd; it is however not impossible that Munījk attended the court of that ruler and engaged there in a slanging match with some poet whom the copyists confused with Shahīd. Munījk is one of the poets most frequently quoted by Ṣaṣi and thus clearly enjoyed a considerable reputation up to a century after his own time. Many of his surviving verses (like those of Muḥtārī) are of a satirical and decidedly scatological vein.

1L ‘ithn ‘as-sam, 2 Ḥiḍāyat passim; Ṣaṣi’s passim (and Aṭṭe’s notes, p. 93); Wajwī p. 193; AF u II p. 13-14; Shams p. 324, 346, 351; Ḥiḍāyat, Majma‘ 1 p. 506-8; LN s.v. ‘Munījk’ (Dī ‘Ṣaṣī); ‘Ṣaṣī f p. 424-8; Khayyām-pūr p. 566; Lazard, ‘Poètes’ p. 14; Shaṣī’s Kādān, ‘ṣanah p. 434-8; Idrāh-ṣhi p. 184-224. 199

115. Abū I-Husayn (or al-Hasan) Muhammad b. Muhammad al-Muṣrādī exercised his poetic talents mainly in Arabic. Ṣaṣi’s in his Fathma al-dahr, 7 quotes some two dozen of his Arabic verses, including

1Majma‘ 1 p. 508, with the erroneous statement that the patron was in fact Tāhir b. Ḫusayn Ṣaṣīnī.

2Yaghmā’ī p. 116-8.

3Ṭāhir Yaghmā’ī p. 117. Ḥiḍāyat has Ṣahīd i jahdān.

4P. 58. A longer version of the poem can be found, once again, in Ḥiḍāyat, who calls its dedicatee ‘Abū Muṣaffar Malik Ahmad Ṣaffī’, the last word evidently a mis-reading of ‘Ṣagḥān’, the Arabicised version of Chaghānī. The verse would seem to declare the question of Abū I-Muzaffar’s personal name: it was Ahmad and not Muhammad (as Ṣaṣi has it; cf. Browne, op. cit., p. 11).

5Quoted in Mṣ. n n s.v. bādakjāk and the marginal additions to Mṣ. n n s.v. munjak (see ed. Iqbal p. 272).


1Perhaps meaning the ‘ṣaṣīt al-ṣārūf of Aḥṣād!? 2See above, p. 104.

3P. 59.

4In the Turjumān al-balāghah regularly vocalised nūjījik. His sobriquet appears to be derived by means of the Eastern Iranian nishah suffix -nīshtar from the noun ‘boz’, a derivation suggested by the poet himself in a verse quoted by Ṣaṣi to illustrate the word: har chand baṣṭār-am sukhān-ām ‘ṭal u štrin’ = ṣan u štrin n-ayād magor at munj. ‘Although I am lowly, my words are elevated and sweet; indeed, sweet honey comes only from bees’. 3For these see C.E. Bosworth, ‘The rulers of Chaghānīyān in early Islamic times’, Iran XIX, 1981, p. 1-20.
a fragment of an ode to Nasr (II) b. Ahmad (301/914 to 331/943) and verses which he is said to have recited just before his death to al-Jahihānī (who served as wazir during the early part of Nasr’s reign). Rödaktī wrote an elegy on his death.


116. A single verse by one Muraşshā’ī is quoted in LF s.v. parvāzāh.

117. Abū Ṭāiyib Muḥammad b. Hātim al-Muṣṭabhī was a high-ranking official in the service of the Samanid ruler Nasr (II) b. Ahmad (301/914 to 331/943), rising to the rank of wazir before his eventual execution. It has been suggested that he had sympathies with the Ḥamānīis. A verse of his is quoted in the anonymous Ḥamānī commentary on the qaṣdah of Abū ʿAbd-al-Haṭīm Gurgānī.2 His fragments include what seems to be a complete poem on the vanity of the world.3 [200]


118. An otherwise unknown Muwaqqarī is the author of a ‘long’ qaṣdah of which Rādūyānī (p. 106) quotes the first four verses.

119. Muṣaffārī Panḏūlī Marwānī is included by ʿArūḍī and ‘Auffi (who quotes a dozen of his verses) among the poets of the Ghaznavids.

1For the two Arabic verses wrongly attributed to him by Nafṣī on the basis of a passage in the divvān of Kamāl al-dīn Ismāʿīlī, called Khallāq al-muṣṭabhī, see the edition of that divvān by H. Bahj al-ʿUtūmī, Tehran 1348sh./1970, lxxxii-lxxxiv, 518.

2See above, p. 63-4.

3Lazard’s verses 2-15, preserved in the Tārsīk i Baihaqī. Ḥidyiṭāyat attributes six of these verses to Daqiqi, doubtlessly wrongly.

Thus in Ḥidyiṭāyat, who explicitly gives ʿAuffi’s Labib as the source of his information. In the printed text of the Labib the name appears as Muṣaffārī Panḏūlī. Horn misread Ḥidyiṭāyat’s ‘Marwānī as ‘Haravī’; in fact Panḏūlī is near Marwān-Rūdī.

He is presumably identical with the Muṣaffārī quoted repeatedly by Asfāfī.

LF passim (and Horn, Einl. p. 28); ‘Arūḍī p. 28 (and Qazwīnī ad loc.); ‘Auffi II p. 63-5; Ḥidyiṭāyat, Majmūʿ I p. 505; Khaiyām-pūr p. 549.

120. Abū Sarrāqār ʿAbd al-Raḥmānī b. Ahmad al-Balkhī al-ʿAmīnī al-Najjār is the author of an ode of 16 verses in honour of Māhmūd of Ghaznavī, quoted by ʿAuffi. It is presumably with him (and not with Māhmūd al-Sāhilī, whom ʿArūḍī2 mentions as one of the poets at the court of Khwāja Khān b. Ṭalḥāj Khān) that we must identify the ‘Najjār’ to whom Asfāfī attributes one verse. The ‘Nijādī’ (error for ‘Najjār’? one of whose verses is quoted by Rādūyānī, is perhaps also the same poet. [201]

LF s.v. šatrang (and Horn ad loc.); Rādūyānī p. 72 (and Atesq ad loc.); ‘Auffi II p. 41-2; Ḥidyiṭāyat, Majmūʿ I p. 89; LN s.v. ‘Abū Sarrāqār p. 501; Saḥā, Tarīkh I p. 599-600; Khaiyām-pūr p. 64.

121. A single verse is attributed to one Na-shinās (or rather Nasḥinās?) in the Vatican manuscript of LF (ed. Horn p. 40; also in Ṣahā p. 138).

122. A substantial ode by Naṣīr Jaʿfarī is quoted by Jājarmī and a shorter version of the same poem is given by Ḥidyiṭāyat, who calls its author Naṣīr Nasawī. Ḥidyiṭāyat’s text contains a verse giving the name of the poet’s patron as ‘Bā i-Fāṭḥ Malik-Shāh’ (465/1072 to 485/1092); the verse is missing in Jājarmī’s version, though the superscription in the latter does identify Malik-Shah as the object of the poet’s attentions. Ḥidyiṭāyat, however, claims that the author’s patron was ‘Muḥammad b. Māhnūd Saljuqī’, evidently confusing our poet with ‘Auffi’s Naṣīr Lughawī, the boon-companion of Muḥammad b. Māhnūd Ghaznavī (see below, p. 212-3).

Jājarmī II p. 475-7; Ḥidyiṭāyat, Majmūʿ I p. 636-7; Khaiyām-pūr p. 588.

1Thus ‘Auffi; Ḥidyiṭāyat has Ahmad.

2P. 28 and 46. For this poet see below, p. 437.
123. Abū Mu'in Nasīr b. Khusrū al-Qabīdiyyānī al-Marwazī, with the pen-name Ḥujjāt, the celebrated Ismāʿīlī propagandist, is discussed in PL I p. 1138-41, to which the following is a supplement. The year of the poet’s birth is indicated in [202] one of his poems as 394/1003-4 and this is consistent with his account in the Safār-nāmah of how on the eve of Thursday 6 Jumādā II 437 (19 December 1045) he suddenly awakened ‘from forty years’ sleep’. ‘Forty’ is here a round number; his precise age on that date would have been 42 or 43 lunar years.4 His travels through Persia, Syria, Egypt and Arabia and back to Central Asia in the years 437-444 (1045-1052) are described in detail in his Safār-nāmah. In his last years the poet settled in the district of Yumgūn, in Badakhshān, his loneliness in that remote place being the subject of constant complaint in the poems. The latest clearly established date in his biography is the year 462/1069-70, when he dedicated his Kitāb Jamiʿ al-hikmatanī to an otherwise unknown amīr of Badakhshān, ʿAll b. Ansād b. al-Ḥārith. Ḥājī Khalīfah, in his Taqwim al-tawārīḵa, states that Nasīr died in 481/1088-9; this date has been widely accepted and, though not improbable, has no authority, all the more so since the same Ḥājī Khalīfah, in two different places in his Kāshf al-qarāb, has him die as early as 431/1039-41, as does already Daulat-shāhī. This date

1The name appears thus (as A.H. Morton informs me) in all the manuscripts of his Safār-nāmah other than those copied from a printed edition. Only in Schefer’s edition (and its various offshoots) do we find ‘Abū Mu’in al-dīn Nasīr...’ (evidently either a conjecture or an error on the part of the French scholar). ‘Asfī’ II p. 262 quotes a verse by the 12th-century poet Shatraljī (for whom see below, no. 297) with the statement: Nāṣir i Khaurasān kord khwān-ī lagah Hamiī al-dīn, and it is evident on the basis of this that Dahrī-Šīrāzī emended Schefer’s (mis)reading in the Safār-nāmah to ‘Abū Mu’in Hamiī al-dīn Nasīr...’.

2Dīvān, ed. Minawī/Mahqiqī, no. 242, v. 27.


4Storey, following Taqī-ṣalāḥ, states that the poet was born in the month of Dhi i-l-qādāh. This is based on a line in the poem musahāj 1, v. 56, the author of which says that he was born in Dhi i-l-qādāh of the year 358 (with variants in the manuscripts). If the poem is really by Nasīr, the year must be wrong. It is however more likely, as the editors of the critical edition think, that the poem is spurious, i.e. that it is by an un-identified older contemporary of Nasīr’s.

5Cited by Ḗbī, ZDMG 33, p. 649.

6I.II p. 598 and 600 (new edition II col. 990 and 991). For a discussion of these passages, which are not without textual problems, see the discussion of the Safār-nāmah below, p. 206.

is naturally impossible. Later tradition, reflected by a spurious ‘autobiography’ and by the tahdīkhānā of [203] made Nasīr into a mighty magianist who lived for more than a hundred years.

His extant theological works (Gushṭiyāt u raḥaytah; Kuwān al-muṣṭafīn; Wajīf i din; the prose Roshānī-nāmah; or Shakhs fir; Jamiʿ al-hikmatanī— all to be discussed in PL IV) are at least in part translations of Ismāʿīlī tracts in Arabic. Besides these we have his travelogue (Safār-nāmah) and the Dīvān. The two didactic maḥnawīs traditionally attributed to him, namely the Saʿīdat-nāmah and the Roshānī-nāmah, are discussed below (p. 206-211) under the heading ‘spurious works’. Of Nasīr’s Arabic Dīvān, to which he occasionally refers, no trace remains.

Nasīr’s Dīvān consists almost entirely of religious and didactic poems which, though occasionally dedicated to the Fatimid caliph al-Mustanṣir, or to the dāʾir-i dawʻāt, al-Muʿayyid fī l-dīn al-Shīrāzi, are far removed in character from the usual laudatory quāṣīdahs. Miss. London I.O. 903 fol. 97-112 (Dated Dhi i-qādāh 714/1315; 78 poems only); 1. O. Delhi 1297 (18th century?); Or. 10919 (Meredith-Owens p. 60, Dated 1276/1859-60); Or. 3323 (Rieu Suppt. no. 210. Dated 9 Jamūdā I 1396/1879. Contains also the spurious ‘autobiography’); Or. 2845 (Rieu Suppt. no. 209, 19th century? End missing); Berlin Sprenger 1416 (Pertsch 710. ‘Nicht ganz neu’); Ms. or. quart. 2026 (Heinz 359, With ‘autobiography’); Viennam Fligel 506 [204] (Dated Dhi i-hijjah 1259/1843-4. With a prose preface); Leningrad Acad. C1702 (Cat. VIII 5; Index 1480. Dated 1334/1915-6); Istanbul Cebei Celebi Abdullāh Ef. 290 (Munz. no. 26421. Dated Jamūdā II 736/1336); Université FY 315 (Ateg 11, Dated Shawwāl 1262/1846); Université FY 799 (= Halis Ef. 8626. Ateg 12, Dated 18 Jamūdā I 1269/1853. Contains the ‘autobiography’); Najaf Amīr al-muʾminīn 1434 (Munz. 26429); Tehran Majlis 8421/2 (Munz. no. 26422. In a daftar dated 868/1463-4); Majlis II 388 (Written for the Ottoman Sultan Muḥammad b. Murād, i.e. either Muḥammad II, died 886/1481, or Muḥammad III, died 1012/1603-4); Malik 5567/2 (Munz. no. 26245. 17th century?); Univ. XI 3201 (Dated 29 Jamūdā II 1201/1787); Ḫuṣūq p. 115 (18th

1For which see PL I p. 1140-1.

2Dīvān, no. 64 ult.; 177, v. 51-2.

3For this manuscript see below, p. 423 fn.
century); Milli IV 1672 (Dated 4 Sha‘bān 1228/1814); Milli III 1204 (Dated 29 Dīh 1-qa‘ădah 1252/1837?); Gulistan/Atibay 1 485 (Dated 1253/1837-8); Gulistan/Atibay 1 488 (Dated Dīh 1-bijjah 1261/1846); Gulistan/Atibay 1 486 (Dated 1266/1849-50); Gulistan/Atibay 1 487 (Dated Muharram 1268/1851); Gulistan/Atibay 1 489; Milli V 2082; Masajid Rīdāwī VII 965/2 (Ms. completed 1041/1631-2; Selections only); Rīdāwī IX 1163 (Dated 28 Rabi‘ II 1261/1845); Rīdāwī IX 1162 (Dated Rajab 1266/1850); Dushanbe Acad. II 325 (Dated 11 Jamādī II 1050/1640); Hyderabad Aṣafiyā I p. 734 no. 300 (Dated 1104/1692-3); Kapurthala 179 (OCM III/4, 1927, p. 290); Lucknow Sprenger 265 (two copies, one of which was dated 1037/1627-8); Madras I 70 and 71 (both copies called ‘qat‘adah i Ḥujjat’); Princeton 38 fol. 364; 450 (dated 815/1412-3); and many late Ms. (Nāṣir became popular towards the end of the 19th century); cf. Munz. III 2640-71.

Selections from his poems: Oxford Elliot 37 fol. 4b, 29a, 67a, 191b, 209b (Edhē 1333 = Daqīq al-asb‘ār. On fol. 67a a taswīt of 33 strophes); Cambridge Browne Coll. V.65 no. 31 (Anthology dated 27 Ramadān 827/1424); Berlin Sprenger 1378 fol. 442a sq. [205] (Pertsch 681. Dated 28 Rabi‘ II 1270/1854. Apparately copied from the Calcutta Ms.); Istanbul Köprüli, Fazıl Ahmet Paşa 1620/12 (Cat. II p. 376); Calcutta Ivanov 927 fol. 28v-47v (late).


Commentaries: A fragment, commenting one poem = Divān, ed. Taqāwī/Minuwī p. 120 (not in the new edition), of a work by Maulānā Qoṭb Mahmūd Bahīrī (first half of 12th/18th century) is contained in Madras II 611.

Translations: (German and English verse): see partial editions.


(Russian verse): Naṣīr Xosrow: Ḵᵛ返回搜狐, ed. I. Braginsky, Moscow 1979 (various translators; includes sections from the Divān as well as from the Rūshānāt-nāmeh and the Sa‘ādat-nāmeh.)

Spurious works:
(1) Sa‘ādat-nāmeh is a collection of moral precepts in some 300 verses (inc. διπ λας ωράτων ταύτα ἐν ιδίῳ βασίς * ba har hašt kho bōšt kā khudā bāšt). It was first published by Fagnan in 1888, from the Paris manuscript suppletment 781A, then reprinted (from Fagnan, with some emendations) in the appendix to the edition of Naṣīr’s Safar-nāmeh published in Berlin in 1314/1922-3, and then (from the Berlin edition, but collated with a manuscript in the editor’s possession) in Taqāwī’s edition of Naṣīr’s Divān of 1307sh./1928. In Taqāwī’s manuscript the text ends with a verse in which the author tells his readers to heed ‘the words of Sharīf’, evidently the author’s signature; there is no mention in this recension of the name Naṣīr. But in some other copies ‘Sharīf’ is replaced by ‘Naṣīr i Khusrav’, while the manuscript published by Fagnan retains the verse mentioning ‘Sharīf’ (three lines from the end) but adds a final verse giving the author’s name as ‘Naṣīr b. Khusrav’. It is quite obvious that (except in the version represented by Taqāwī’s manuscript) the text has been tampered with. The poem is clearly not by Naṣīr i Khusrav, whose pen-name was ‘Ḥujjat’, not ‘Sharīf’, and whose style is quite unlike that of the author of the Sa‘ādat-nāmeh; moreover, the
latter poem contains no trace of Ismā'īlī doctrines. Nothing else is known of this Shārif, except that he must have lived before the middle of the 9th/15th century, the date of the earliest manuscripts. A striking feature of the poem is the vehemence with which the author denounces the 'great ones' and his insistence that, after the prophets and saints, the best of mankind are the peasants, and then the artisans.

The modern Persian scholar M.T. Bahārī identified the author of the Sa'dādat-nāma as one Nāṣīr al-dīn b. Khusrāw Ishfāḥānī, who supposedly died in 735/1334-5, referring in a foot-note to the entry on the Sa'dādat-nāmah in the Kashf al-zunūn of Hājjī Khalīfah. This is an error on the part of Bahārī. In Flügel's edition of the Kashf al-zunūn the Sa'dādat-nāmah is described as the work of 'Nāṣīr Khusrāw al-Ishfāḥānī, who died in the year 431' and the same date, 431, is given for Nāṣīr's death also in the entry on the Safar-nāmah. It emerges from the critical edition by Yaltkaya and Bilge that the date was left blank in both entries in the author's rough draft, but that at least in the former entry the date '431' is indicated in the Ismā'īl Paşa manuscript, presumably reflecting the author's fair copy. In fact this is the (erroneous) date given already by Da'ūlat-shāh for the death of Nāṣīr i Khusrāw, just as it is Da'ūlat-shāh who (again wrongly) made Nāṣīr a native of Ishfān. It is thus clear that Hājjī Khalīfah has merely repeated the erroneous data that he found in Da'ūlat-shāh and did possess any independent information about some different 'Nāṣīr b. Khusrāw Ishfāḥānī'. In the edition of the Kashf al-zunūn published in Bulaq in 1277/1861 the date '431' occurs (in figures and words) in the entry on the Safar-nāmah but is misprinted as '731' in the entry on the Sa'dādat-nāmah (again first in figures, and then spelt out in words). It is not clear whether Bahārī's '735' is again a misprint in the (unidentified) oriental edition of the Kashf al-zunūn consulted by him, or whether it is simply a mistake of his own. In any case, this date has no authority and it does not justify assigning the Sa'dādat-nāmah to 'Nāṣīr b. Khusrāw Ishfāḥānī'; this person is fictitious.

Mss.: Dublin Beatty 139 (Dated 23 Sh caravan 869/1465); London Or. 12396 fol. 26a-40a (Meredith-Owens p. 76. 15th century? Inspekt);²

²Meredith-Owen's description of the manuscript is not correct. The first work in the manuscript (fol. 1a-24b) is a fragment of a poem in munqatāb metre, evidently by Nāṣīr Bakhrā'īl (his name is mentioned several times in the text). Fol. 25a has the pencilled title 'Sa'dādat-nāmah i Nāṣīr i Khusrāw'. Fol. 26a-40a contain an incomplete copy of the Sa'dādat-nāmah, with the usual incipit, and the name 'Nāṣīr i Khusrāw' in the preliminary verse, but the gilded nāšad apparently gives the title as Hidāyat-nāmah. The first of the two poems is adorned with pictures.
i Khusrav' occurs in the Leiden manuscript in the line following Ethē's verse 566. Nowhere does the work refer explicitly to Ismā'īlī, or even general Shiite, doctrines, though the discussion of the exoteric and esoteric meanings of the Qurʾān (v. 430-1) might suggest an Ismā'īlī connection. Towards the end of the poem (555-8) the author states that he completed the work in the year so-and-so, on the first of Shawwāl, when the sun was [207] in Pisces and the moon in Aries and there was a conjunction of 'the stars' in Libra. The year given in the manuscripts varies from as early as 323 to as late as 463,1 with an array of intermediate dates. But in none of the years mentioned in the manuscripts did 1 Shawwāl fall in late February or early March (i.e. when the sun is in Pisces); moreover, at none of the various times in Nāṣir's lifetime when 1 Shawwāl did fall in February/March was there any conjunction in Libra.

Ethē, ignoring the statement about the conjunction, emended the line mentioning the year to read '440', when 1 Shawwāl corresponded roughly to 9 March 1049. However, since Nāṣir was in Cairo at that time, Ethē was forced to assume that the author revised the poem later in Yumgān, without changing the original date. Taqīzādah, to whom we owe an extensive investigation of the question,2 suggested that the verse mentioning the position of the sun and moon might be a spurious addition and proposed that the date mentioned in the original text might have been 1 Shawwāl 460, corresponding to 3 August 1068, on which date Jupiter and Saturn were (according to Taqīzādah's calculation) both in Libra, although not actually in conjunction. But as these two planets had been in conjunction the previous September in the last segment of Virgo (i.e. just before Libra) contemporary observers might have regarded their close proximity in August 1068 as amounting to a repeated conjunction.

More recently Minuwī3 proposed [208] that the Roshandār-t-nāmah is not by Nāṣir i Khusrav at all, but by a later poet who used the same

1The last-mentioned date is in Semenov's manuscript.
3M. Minuwī, 'Roshandār-t-nāmah i Nāṣir i Khusrav va Roshandār-t-nāmah i mashgāz i manstāb ha a', 'Yad-nāmah i Nāṣir i Khusrav', Mashhād 2535sh.sh./1976, p. 574-80. The same volume contains also (on p. 362-72) an article by D. Ṣafarījā, 'Tabīqīg dar Roshandār-t-nāmah i Nāṣir i Khusrav', which likewise argues against the authenticity of the poem, purely on the basis of stylistic arguments, for my taste rather too subjectively.

[Note: The text continues with a discussion of astronomical events and their implications for the dating of the poem, as well as a critique of previous scholars' interpretations.]

[Note: The text concludes with a reference to a specific astronomical phenomenon and its relevance to the dating of the poem, concluding with a statement about the authenticity of Nāṣir's authorship and the role of such phenomena in literary analysis.]
very superficial IsaVIII colouring is the result of interpolation. As for the linguistic argument, the mentioned feature would not in fact be very unusual in a poetic work of the 11th century.

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

Acad. II 328 (Dated Şafar 1289/1872); Acad. II 329; Bombay Rehatsek p. 128 (Dated 25 Şaban 926/1520); Bankipore Supp. i 1981 (18th century) Date of composition given as 323 as in the older I.O. copy. Cf. Munz. IV 30156-77.

Extracts: İstanbul Nurusosmaniye 4904/14 fol. 63b-68a (Ateş 18, Dated 940/1533-4); Koprülü 1597 fol. 166b-178a (see Taeschner in Islamico V, 1932, p. 320); [211] Tehran Gulistan/Âtâbay II 488 (Dated Dhu l-hijjah 1261/1845).

Editions: (See also above, under divanı). H. Ethé, ‘Nâşir Chusran’s Rusûnânâma ... oder Buch der Erleuchtung ...’ ZDMG 33, 1879, p. 645-664, 34, 1880, p. 428-464, 617-42 (critical edition with German verse translation); see also the corrections in F. Teufel, ‘Zu Nâşir Chusran’s Rusûnânâma’, ZDMG 36, 1882, p. 96-106; Ethé’s text was reprinted in the Berlin 1341/1922 edition of Nâşir’s Safar-nâmeh (separate pagination); Bombay ca. 1915; A.A. Semenov, ‘Shyutinkosmosohitnaya redaktsiya “Knyiga Sveta” ... Nasir-i-Husrow’, Zapiski Kollegii Vostokovedov V, 1930, p. 589-610 (edition of a modern Ishâfî manuscript which contains some interesting variants).

(3) A poem entitled Âğû a Ânûs is attributed to Nâşir in Kayseri Râşid Efendi 607/2 fol. 14b-17b (Karabulut 343).

(4) A collection of ‘mathnavüyi ta Ḥâkim Nâşir i Khurasan’, including also ghazals, by a poet who uses the tâbâhâs ‘Khurasan’ (evidently not our poet) is found in Cuj M.O. 21425 (Nuskhah-hâz XII/XII p. 989).

Nâşir does not appear to be mentioned as a poet before the 8th/14th century. 3 Cf. Mustaufi p. 826; Jâārînî II p. 884-5; Sîhâh (see index); Daulat-shâh p. 61-4; Hidyätât, Majmâ’ p. 607-33; Hidyâyât,
124. Nasir Jughwali\(^1\) (or Baghawi?) is known to us only from the rubā‘ in which he laments the death of the Ghaznavid Muhammad b. Mahmūd in 421/1030. It is quoted by Baihaqī, who says that its author was one of the boon-companions (nadhīmān) of the dehorned king, as well as by ‘Aufī. [213]

Baihaqī p. 74-5 (see also Nafṣī’s edition I p. 76 and Faiyād’s new edition p. 84-5 and the notes in the latter two); ‘Aufī II p. 65-6; LN s.v. ‘Nashir u Lughwali’ p. 173, and supra, no. 122.

---

\(^1\)Thus ‘Aufī. In the two passages in Baihaqī where this person is mentioned we find ‘Nashir u Baghawi’, though for the latter name the variant ‘Lughwali’ occurs in both passages. It is likely (as Nafṣī suggested) that this is a scribal error for ‘Nashir (or Nasir) i Baghawi (or Lughwali)’. Baghawi is the nisbaḥ from Bagh (or Baghshāh), a village between Merv and Herat; cf. Sam’ānī fol. 86a (new edition II p. 273) and Yūqūt, Buldan I p. 694.

---

125. A certain Abū l-Hassan Ormazdī is quoted a number of times in Asadī’s Lughāt i furs. The juxtaposition of these improbable names would seem to suggest a Zoroastrian convert to Islam. Perhaps the same as Yāzdānī (no. 153)?

LF passim; Shams p. 113; Hīdīyāt, Majmā‘ I p. 66 (one verse); Khayyām-pūr p. 80.

126. Pērōz (Farīrūz) al-Mashrīqi flourished, according to ‘Aufī, under ‘Amr b. Lait (265/878-9 to 287/900). It is possible that he is identical with the ‘Pērōz’ from whom Rādīyānī quotes one verse. Hīdīyāt gives the date of his death as 283/896.


127. Abū l-Qāsim Ziyād b. Muhammad al-Qanmastī\(^2\) al-Jurjānī heads ‘Arūfī’s list of the poets of the ‘kings of Tabaristān’ (in this case, presumably the Ziyarids), and ‘Aufī quotes an ode by him dedicated to the Ziyarid Shams al-Ma‘ālī Qābūs b. Washmār (367/978 to 402/1012), whose grandson, ‘Unṣūr al-Ma‘ālī Kīs Kūs, mentions him in his Qābūs-nāmas. Qanmastī is never quoted by Asadī, but Rādīyānī (followed by Wātūwī) cites a good number of his verses to illustrate various rhetorical figures.


128. Qari’ al-dhār is quoted frequently in Asadī’s Lughāt i furs, and once in Rādīyānī’s Tarjumān al-balaghah. There is a verse mocking ‘Qari‘ by ‘Asjādī,\(^3\) which suggests that the two were contemporaries.

---

\(^1\)The lāwūnīt is mentioned only by Shams i Qāris.

\(^2\)The vocalisation Qanmastī is explicitly noted in Rādīyānī fol. 269v.

\(^3\)LF, ed. Iqālī, p. 492 (from the marginal additions to Ms. nārā).
129. Qassir i Ummi is the author of a verse quoted by Asadī addressed to Aṭba `Abd Allāh Muhammad Khusrav i Ėrān-zamīr, the Ghaznavid, who ruled for a short time in 421/1030 and again in 432/1040-1. Two further verses of his are quoted by Rādiyānī.

L.F. s.v. kāfī; Rādiyānī p. 42 (and Aṭbā ad loc.); `Arūdī p. 28 (and Qazwīnī ad loc.). Khâyām-pūr p. 471.

130. al-Hākim Sharaf al-zamān Qatārīn al-`Aḍūdī al-Tahrīrī was born, as we learn from one of his [215] own poems, in Shāhī-ābdād, just outside Tabrīz. He appears to have spent his whole life in the service of the minor dynasties of Ādharbājjan and Transcaucasia. His ādūn consists largely of odes to the Rawwādīs of Tabrīz, Abū Mansūr Wāḥshūdān (416/1025 to 451/1059) and his successor Abū Naṣr Māmān, as well as the Shāhādīs of Ganjār, `Alī Lashkārī b. Mūsā (425/1033-4 to 441/1049-50) and Fadl (or Fadlūn) b. Abī l-Aswār (459/1067 to 466/1073-4), but also to others, including Asadī’s patron Abū Dūlah. Naṣīr i Khusraw describes in his Safar-nāma his meeting with Qatārīn in Tabrīz in 438/1046. The most recent date that can be adduced from his poems is Friday 1 Dhi ḵiḥja 462 (10 September 1070) on which day Mīrāḍūn coincided with a Friday and a new moon (ādūn u mīrāḍūn u māh i nau * ḫordKhajastāh 1h.sīh-bar khusrāw). Ḥīdāyat says that he died in 465/1072-3, while Tagī makes it as late as 485/1092.

The introduction in manuscript qā’in of the Lughat i fars, ostensibly the work of Asadī himself, mentions an older Persian dictionary by Qatārīn i shāhī. Asadī thus obviously knew him not only as a lexicog-

1Aṭbā’s reading. The name appears in the manuscript of Rādiyānī’s book, fol. 252a, as qā’inānay. The same spelling, without vocalisation, is found in `Arūdī and the Vatican Ms. of L.F.; Ms. nānī and Sīdībī p. 26 have Qassirī.

2Thus in `Aṭbā. Dūlah-shāh calls him `Imām al-sha’arā Qatārīn b. Manṣūr Ṭirmizī (sic), while Ḥīdāyat has Abī Manṣūr Ṭimsīl b.-`Aḍūdī. The superscription in the manuscript supposedly dated 529/1134 has Abī Manṣūr Qatārīn al-Ṭimsīl (or al-Jīlī? the photograph is unclear) al-Ādharbājji, but see below, p. 216. For `Aḍūdī compare the poem (ādūn p. 259-60) dedicated to one Amir `Abd al-dīn.

3Lūhān, ed. Nakhjavānī, p. 66.

4See dīwān p. 355 and Taqī-zāḥī h ad loc.

5Apūl Sprünger p. 16.

A good-sized collection of Qatārīn’s poems (ca. 1400 verses) is contained in a manuscript copied from a private collection in Tabrīz supposedly copied on 11 Rabī‘ I 529/1134 - about half a century after the poet’s death - by `Alī b. Ḥāshāq al-Abjwardī al-Sha’īrī, whom scholars have identified with the celebrated poet Anwarī. The name of the latter was, however, most probably Muhammad b. `Alī b. Ḥāshāq. Unfortunately, the manuscript seems to have disappeared from sight shortly after its discovery and there have been rumours in Iranian literary circles that it is in fact a modern forgery from the same factory which produced the notorious fake copies of the rubā‘īyat of Umār i Khayyām and of the Qībās-nāma. As long as the manuscript is not available for study it is thus imprudent to [217] draw any conclusions from the data contained in it.

1See Lazard, Langua, p. 17 n. 32.

2Cf. M. Bayānī, Dīwān i Qatārīn i Tabrīz i khah i Anwar i Abjwardī, Yaghma III, 1329sh./1951, p. 465-74, with a reproduction of three pages from the manuscript. The same three pages are reproduced also in Nakhjavānī’s introduction to his edition of the dīwān.

3See below, p. 256.

4As I have been told by A.H. Morton.
Manuscripts of Qarān’s divān include an exceptionally large number of spurious poems, among them several by Rūdakī. 1 Mss.: London Or. 3246 fol. 253-86 (Rieu Suppt. no. 204 III. Dated Ramaḍān 1248/1833. Attributed to Rūdakī, but contains a note by Bahman b. ʿAbd Allāh Mīrızā b. Fath ʿAli Shāh stating that, with the exception of the two poems beginning nādār i mai and yād i jāy in Māliyān, these poems are in fact the work of Qarān); Or. 2847 fol. 94-130 (Rieu Suppt. no. 245. Dated 26 Rajab 1279/1863. Selections); Or. 7894 (Meredith-Owens p. 54. Dated 1295/1878. ʿAttributed in a note at the end to Rūdakī”); Or. 3317 (Rieu Suppt. no. 207. 19th century? The endorsement ‘Dvān i Ḥakim Rūdakī’ is corrected in a note); Or. 2879 (Rieu Suppt. no. 208. 19th century?); R.A.S. Storey bequest no. 3, fol. 1b-9a (Uncatalogued; inspexi); I.O. 3688; I.O. 4599 fol. 118-126a (selections); Cambridge Browne Coll. V.3 (Dated 7 Jumādā I 1261/1845. Formerly in the possession of Rūdā-Quī Khān Hidyāyat and apparently used by him in the compilation of his Majma’ al-fusūḥā’); Paris Supplément 1502 (Bliche 1204. Dated Safar 1257/1841; Supplément 1529 (Bliche 1205. Dated 22 Safar 1294/1877. Attributed to Rūdakī); Tehran Univ. XII 3944/2 (17th century? ‘With poems by Rūdakī’); Majlis VIII 2477 (Dated 1206/1791-2); Majlis 4099/1 (Munz. 25537. Dated Muharram 1207/1792-9); Milli 203/2 (Nasḵh-hā VI p. 202. Dated 1245/1829-30. With poems by Rūdakī); Sipāḥ-sāḥār IV p. 522 (Dated 1250/1834-5) [Munz. I]; Gulistān/Āṭābāy II 377 (Dated 28 Safar 1258/1842); Milli III 1402 (Dated 1256/1840); Milli V 2297/1 (Attributed to Rūdakī); Gulistān/Āṭābāy II 378; Isfahān Nasḵh-hā VI p. 596); Mashhad Riḍāwī VII 519 (Dated 1267/1850-1); Riḍāwī VII 521 (Dated [218] 19 Rajab 1277/1861. With poems by Rūdakī); Riḍāwī VII 520 (Dated 3 Rabi‘ 1 1283/1866. With poems by Rūdakī); Peshawar Islāmiyāh 1823(5) (Dated 1134/1721-2); Hyderabad Sālār Jung IV 1119 (17th century?); Calculaita Ivanon 430 (Dated 1018/1609-10. Contains two collections of poems; the one in the centre of the page corresponds, according to Ivanon, to London Or. 3317, that in the margins to Or. 2879. Attributed at the beginning to Rūdakī but in the colophon to Qarān); Private collections ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn Bayāt (Nasḵh-hā VI 68. Dated 1007/1598-9); Nakhjavānī’s edition mentions 8 Mss., all in private collections, including the supposedly 12th-century Ms. described above. Cf. Munz. III 25352-82.


131. The poetess Rābī‘ah bint Ka‘b al-Quzdārī is included in ‘Aūfī’s chapter on the Ghaznavid poets where we find several of her poems, including an early example of a mulamamat’ (a poem with alternating Persian and Arabic verses). Her passion for bilingual contrivances is attested also by the poem attributed to her by Jārjārī, 1 a Persian poet incorporating the Arabic words which make up the shahādāt and the laḥnu‘ah. Further specimens of her poetry are quoted by Rāḥiyānī (who

---

1See below, p. 223-4.
calls her ‘Ibnat Ka'b’) and by Shams. The romantic account of her in ‘Ajūt’s Ilḥâl-nâmâh (for which see Ateş and Meier) has evidently no value as a biographical source.


132. Râfî’t Nishâbûrî figures in ‘Arsûf’s list of the poets of the ‘kings of Tabaristan’, which, at least in this context, evidently means not the Ziyârids, but the Bâwandids. This is clear from the appendix (dhat) to Ibn Isfandiyâr’s Târîkh-i Tabaristan, when it quotes verses of his praising the Bâwandid Shahryâr b. Qârin (ruled from before 498/1108 to ca. 508/1114-5). The old anthology published by Yaghmâ’î has a poem by Râfî’t praising Nizâm al-mulk (died 485/1092). Jâjarmi attributes to a poet of the same name an ode the dedicatee of which is indicated with the words khâtât u tashrif i nîr al-murwîn ibn al-Jâfhir, evidently the well-known wazîr of the caliphs al-Qâ'im and al-Muqtâfî and [220] ally of Malik-Shâh, Fakhr al-daulâh Abû Nasr Muhammad b. Muhammad b. Jahîr (wazîr from 454/1062 to 471/1178; died 483/1090).1 Hîdâyat quotes a shorter version of this poem, and a good number of other sources, claims that their author lived at the time of Mahmûd and ‘Umarî and names the former and his minister Hasan Maimandî as the dedicatees of one of the poems cited. But Nafisi has shown that this is wrong and that Hîdâyat simply misunderstood the occurrences in the poems. For his part, Nafisi committed the blunder of stating that Ibn Jahîr lived in the 6th/12th century and that consequently there must have been two poets by the name of Râfî’t Nishâbûrî, one (‘Arsûf’s) in the 4th/10th century (under the Ziyârids), and another in the 6th/12th. In fact Ibn Jahîr lived, as mentioned, in the 5th/11th century. It is thus clear that we have only one Râfî’t Nishâbûrî and that he flourished in the last quarter of the 11th century and the first quarter of the 12th.

1 Cf. EJ2 s.v. ‘Djahîr (Barsî)’ (Cl. Cohen).

Shams quotes two verses by Râfî’t, one of which he states to be an imitation of a verse by Mu’izzî, but it is by no means certain that it was not in fact the other way round.

L.F. (ed. Iqâbl, p. 165, 333; two verses from the marginal additions to Ms. nôn); ‘Arisûf p. 28; Shams p. 278, 437; Jâjarmî II p. 485-7; Ibn Isfandiyâr, Târîkh-i Tabaristan (ed. Iqâbl, dhat p. 174; see also Browne’s episteme p. 256); Yaghmâ’î p. 101-2; Hidayat, Majma’ I p. 220-1; S. Nafisi, Ahwâl... Râdakî III p. 1302-3; Khayyâm-pûr p. 222; LV s.v. ‘Râfî’ti Nishâbûrî’ and ‘...Nishâbûrî’ (two entries) p. 98; Qazwîni, Yâd-dashk-hâ III p. 99.

133. Abû Muhammad ‘Abd Allâh b. Muhammad al-ma’rûf bi Râdâh(?) al-Balkhî is cited by ‘Arisûf in his chapter on the poets of the Ghaznavîds, [221] where we find five single verses (fârâd), a type of poetry in which, according to ‘Arisûf, he specialised.


134. Abû ‘Abd Allâh Is’far b. Muhammad b. Hasan b. ‘Abd al-Rahmân b. Adâm al-Rûdhakî (Persian: Râdakî(?) al-Shâ’ir al-Samarqandî,3 the most celebrated Persian poet prior to Firdâusî, was born in the village of Rûdak, outside Samarqand, and made his name as the eulogist of the Samanid ruler of Bukhârâ, Abû I-Hasan Nasr (II) b. Ahmad (reg. 301/914 to 331/943). Early poets such as Daqûqî, Firdâusî, Abû Zur’a’î and Nasîr i Khurasu allude more or less explicitly to his blindness and ‘Arisûf indeed says he was born blind, but this has been doubted by some modern scholars, who have referred to the vivid descriptions of nature in a number of his verses. According to Asadî4 Rûdakî’s dhashn consisted of more than 180 000 verses (an even larger

1 The stuhrah is given in the manuscripts of ‘Arisûf’s book as r.w.r.d.h., which does not seem to have any meaning. Nafisi (ad ‘Arisûf p. 673) claims that in ‘other’ (unspecified) raffnahs and sükâkrahs the name is given as r.w.d.h., evidently ‘Râdîth’, ‘got, string of an instrument’.

2 Not Rûdakî, as some authors have it. In a verse by ‘Arsûf (quoted by ‘Arisûf II p. 7) Rûdakî reads rhymes with Rûdakî-r.

3 Thus according to Sam’î and ‘Arisûf (who traces the nusub only as far as the poet’s father). Danlât-shâh gives his nusub (doubtless wrongly) as Abû I-Hasan.

number is claimed by later authors). Of this prodigious output little has survived. We have one long ode (the splendid poem beginning āmad i nān) dedicated to Abū Ja'far Ahmad b. Muhammad b. Khalaf, who was governor of Sīstān on behalf of the Samanids from 310/922-3 to 352/963, a handful of shorter poems and a considerable number of fragments, mostly single verses, quoted by Asadi, Rādiyyānī and others. Apart from his lyrical pieces Rōdāki evidently wrote several mathnawah, the most celebrated of which was his [222] version of Kalilah wa Dimnah. According to the older preface to the Shāh-nāmah,2 Nāṣr b. Ahmad ordered his minister ḫāleem to have the book of Kalilah wa Dimnah translated from Arabic to Persian, and then commanded Rōdāki to turn it into verse. The same story is found in Firdawsi’s Shāh-nāmah with the characteristic added detail that the amir appointed ‘interpreters’ (gazātarandah) to ‘read’ the book to Rōdāki (who was, of course, blind). A number of fragments in rāmal metre, quoted in Asadi’s Loghat i jurs, were identified by Horn3 as belonging to that well-known collection of stories. The present author, who is preparing a new edition of the fragments of Rōdāki’s narrative poems, has so far been able to identify the location in the story of about 50 verses. Moreover, Nöldke observed already4 that the fragments in rāmal also contain verses that clearly belong to the story of Sindbād and the Seven Ministers, and, after the publication of Zahirī’s prose version of the Sindbād-nāmah, Dabīr-Siyāqi was able to place a few further verses in that story. This presents us with a slight chronological problem. Sam‘ānī states that Rōdāki died in his native village in 329/940-1. But Zahirī5 states that his source, the Persian prose translation of the Sindbād-nāmah by Khwājā ʿAmīd Abī l-Fawwāris Fānānīzī (or Qa’) was written in the [223] year 339/950-1 for ‘Abū Muhammad Nāṣr b. Maṣhrūr al-Sarmanī’, evidently an error for Abū Muhammad Nāṣr (regn. 331/943 to 343/954).6 and that before that time ‘no-one had translated it’ (i.e. into Neo-Persian. Arabic versions had, of course, existed earlier, e.g. that by Abūn al-lābiqī). It is, however, possible that Rōdāki did not ‘translate’ the whole of the Sindbād-nāmah, but rendered only a few of the stories.

Rōdāki, who enjoyed a tremendous reputation for about two centuries after his death, fell out of favour with the adepts of the highly mannered style of the Mongol period. It is most instructive to compare Ṣafīqī’s exuberant praise of Rōdāki’s verses on the Jōy i Mūliyān with Daulat-shāh’s dismissal of the same verses. Only in the 19th century did the simple and direct style of the ancient Khurāsānī poets come back into favour with Persian literati, by which time the overwhelming mass of Rōdāki’s authentic verses had disappeared. But the memory of his name had not vanished, as can be seen from the fact that in the intervening years that had been used in connection with one of the notorious literary frauds with which the history of Persian literature is so richly littered, namely the manufacture of a Pseudo-Dhūwāta rōdākī. As scholars like Ḩasan b. Lūfī Allāh al-Rāzī, in the 17th century, and Ḥāfīz Khān Ḥīdāyat, in the 19th, quite clearly noted, this Pseudo-Dhūwāta consists in fact of poems by Ṭarīqān supplemented by a handful of the well-known [224] poems of Rōdāki’s quoted in the nadjāhirāh. Unfortunately, some Western scholars have fallen victim to this mystification.7 For manuscripts of the (Pseudo)-Dhūwāta see Ṭarīqān.


Collections of fragments: The basic work on this poet remains S. Nafisi, Abulwāl wa ashrār i Rōdākī, 3 volumes, Tehran 1309th./1930 to 1319th./1940, with an edition of the fragments in the last volume. A revised edition of this book, with additional fragments (altogether 1047

---

1 For the following see de Blois, Barjāy, p. 51-2.
3 Moscow edition VIII, Nādīn-nawīn 3452 sqq.
4 Horn, Einbl. p. 18-21.
5 In the collections by Nafisi and Braginsky the Kalilah fragments are not separated from the other verses in rāmal. Nafisi, moreover, arbitrarily ascribes to Rōdāki a number of verses in rāmal by Ṭayyān. (Since the above was written a collection of Kalilah fragments has been published by Dabīr-Siyāqi; see the bibliogaphy).
6 Asadī, Horn, Einbl. p. 21.
7 P. 25.
8 Cf. the introduction to Aṯār’s edition of Zahirī’s Sindbād-nāmah, p. 10 n. 1.
9 Ḥīdāyat, followed by Nafisi and others, has argued that Ṭarīqān’s poems were attributed in good faith to Rōdāki as a result of a confusion between the name of latter’s patron, Nāṣr b. Ahmad, and that of one of the former’s protectors, Abū Nāṣr Mamlān. But such a mix-up seems hardly likely.
10 Ṣafīqī, whose article on Rōdāki was published in 1873 (before Ḥīdāyat’s Majma’ al-fathāḥ), rallied to the Persian scholar’s opinion in his later contribution in Gijrāf 220.

Translations: (Russian): besides those listed in the previous paragraph see: Rūdakī. Tr. V.V. Derzhavin and V.V. Levik, Stalinabad 1949; reprint 1955; Ибрагимов. Tr. V. Levik and S. Lipkin, Moscow 1957; reprint 1958, 1978. [228]


135. Abū ‘Abd Allāh Rūzbih b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Nukatī al-Lahaurī appears, if the nisbah is correct, to be the earliest Persian poet born in India. ‘Aṣūf quotes an ode of his praising ‘Sālih Mas‘ūd i shahīd’, i.e. Mas‘ūd I (421/1030 to 432/1040) and a qirṣā addressed to one Shāhanshāh b. Shāh i Nāshībūr i Ilbūrī. One verse by ‘rvenh riknī’ is quoted in the Vatican manuscript of LF s.v. shāshāh.

136. Şaffâr Marghazî is known to us only from the few verses quoted by Asâdî.

 LF (see the indexes to the three editions); LN s.v. ‘Şaffâr’ p. 222, Khayyâm-pûr p. 337; Idârâh-chî p. 38.

137. Şâhî (reading uncertain) al-Balkhî is the author of a rubâ‘î quoted in the Tarikh i Sîstân (p. 324) which mentions ‘mîr-i shahîd’, i.e. the title given posthumously to the Saffarid ruler Abû ʿIṣâfar Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. Khâlîf (dated 352/963).

Collection of fragments (1 rubâ‘î), French translation, discussion and literature: Lazard, Poètes I p. 31, 134, II p. 139; see also Idârâh-chî p. 82; Bosworth, Saffarids p. 288.

138. Abû ʿI-Ḥasan Shahîd (or perhaps better: Shuhâhid) b. al-Ḥusain al-Balkhî al-Warrâq al-Mutakallim was a philosopher and a poet in Persian and Arabic who died (according to Yaqqût, followed by al-Safâdî) in 315/927. He was a contemporary and close friend of the polymath Abû Zâid al-Balkhî and of the mu’tazâlî theologian Abû ʿI-Qâsim al-Balkhî (the three Balkhis were the subject of a joint biography, used by Yaqqût) and a bitter rival of the famous philosopher Abû Bakr al-Râzî. The latter wrote a polemic against Shahîd on the subject of pleasure (al-luṭṭidâh) and another on eschatology (al-ma‘âd), both now lost. The epitome of al-Sijistânî’s Šivân al-hikmâh contains a short extract from a work by Shahîd on the ‘superiority of the pleasures of the soul over those of the body’, perhaps the object of al-Râzî’s attack.

Shahîd was a professional scribe and had a reputation as a meticulous copyst. His Arabic poetry, which is quoted by al-Marghânî, Yaqqût and ‘Auffî, includes two qitâbî mocking Ahmad b. Abû Rabî‘ah, who was the wâzîr of the Saffarid ‘Amr b. al-Laith between 278/891 and 287/900. Yaqqût tells us that he also satirised Ahmad b.

Sâhî, the famous governor of Khorâsân, and had to flee his anger, but returned to Balkh after Ahmad’s execution (i.e. in 307/920).

But Shahîd is mainly remembered as a Persian poet. His famous contemporary Rökâl wrote a elegy on his death, and he is mentioned with respect by other Persian poets of the 4th/10th to 6th/12th centuries, but afterwards his poems fell into oblivion, apart from the verses preserved by the anthologists and lexicographers. These include an anatoly poem of eight lines quoted by Jâjjâmî, a extract from a qaṣîdah which ‘Auffî says he dedicated to the Samâni Naṣîr II (301/914 to 331/933), a poem with alternating Persian and Arabic verses and some couplets from a narrative poem, apparently of romantic content. Not surprisingly, several of the stray verses cited in the dictionaries have a philosophic or gnomic flavour.


1For this work see below, p. 360. In his brief entry (three lines) on Shahîd (Shuhâhid) b. al-Ḥusain al-Balkhî, the anonymous author credits him with two satirical verses (not otherwise attested):

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

140. Shākir and 141. Jullāb: A marginal addition in manuscript nān of Asadi’s Luzhag i fursì v.s. ‘Jullāb’ explains that this is the name of a poet at Bukhārā and attests this with a verse by Khusravānīmoaning the death of Abī l-Mathal2 and ‘Shākir i Jullāb’. If the text is correct we must either assume that ‘Shākir’ and ‘Jullāb’ were two names for the same poet, or that Shākir was the son of Jullāb. At the same time, we must consider the possibility of the minor emendation ‘Shākir u Jullāb’, which would also give us two poets. In any event, the poet (or poets) in question must, like Khusravānī and Abī l-Mathal, have lived during the Samanid period, if not earlier. The fact that LF quotes a good number of verses by ‘Shākir’, ‘Shākir i Bukhārā’, ‘Jullāb’ and ‘Jullāb i Bukhārā’, but never combines the two names, makes it seem most likely that we have to do with two different persons. Two verses by ‘Shākir i [229] Bukhārā’ are quoted by Shams i Qais and it is evidently to the same author that we must credit the three verses by ‘Shākir’ quoted by Rādūyanī.

LF passim (and Horn, Einl. p. 22); Rādūyanī p. 17, 29, 34; Shams p. 223; Dh. Ṣafā, ‘Du sha’ir i gum-nān’, MDAT II3/3, 1334sh./1955 p. 50.

1Ed. Iqbal p. 30.
2See above, p. 66-7.
3An argument for the identity of the two might be seen in the fact that in Asadi’s entry saftūn one and the same verse is attributed to ‘Jullāb i Bukhārā’ in the Vatican manuscript (ed. Horn p. 13) and in Qawwās, but to ‘Shākir i Bukhārā’ in manuscript sēn (ed. Iqbal p. 480) and to ‘Shākir’ in Sībatā (p. 280). However, it is quite common for different manuscripts of LF to attribute the same verse to different poets, especially if their names are similar. Further confusion is caused by the mysterious ‘r’my, to whom the Vatican manuscript of LF, s.v. ghelī (ed. Horn p. 15), attributes a single verse in manuscripts sēn and nān (ed. Iqbal p. 66), the India Office manuscript (Ehi, I, O. C. col. 1334) and Sībatā (p. 57) the verse is attributed to ‘Shākir i Bukhārā’. Ehi (loc. cit.) suggested that the nān in the Vatican codex might be a misreading of ‘Ghaznīnī’, in the late lexica (see Horn’s apparatus criticus) the verse is attributed to Abī Saffī Curgīnī.

1Hidayat calls him Sipirhi Bukhārā’ and adds that he was a contemporary of Abī l-Mahāyāl al-Bukhārī and of Abī l-Mathal, but this is presumably only a personal deduction on the part of the 19th-century scholar.
2P. 28; thus in all three MSS. according to Qazwīnī’s note.
3The Aya Soya manuscript has (according to ed. Mujahidī Sāliḥ p. 79) the same spelling, except that the ‘r’ is written like ‘k’. The attribution to Ṭayyib in Iqbal’s ed.-

script evidence it is in any event imprudent\(^1\) to replace the name by the lectio facilior ‘Tukhārī’. See also Ídārah-chí p. 34 (who reads ‘Tukhārī’).

146. Abū al-Ḥasan Tihār b. al-Fadl, the amir of Chaghāniyān, died in 381/991. ‘Aṣufi includes him in his chapter on poeticising princes where he cites a number of his verses, further samples of which are quoted by Asadī and Rādiyānī.

LF passim; Rādiyānī p. 21 (and Aṣiq ad loc.); ‘Aṣufi I p. 27-9; Khaiyām-pîr p. 352; Sāfā, Tārīkh 16 p. 428-9; Ídārah-chí p. 171-83.

147. Abū 1-Abbās Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Sinjī al-Ṭathān was a paraphrase, here and in what follows, Samānī’s notice — native of the village of Sinj (near Marw).\(^2\) The greatest part [231] of his poetry, which was well-known in Marw, consisted of bucolic poetry and jesting,\(^3\) but later he repented and renounced poetry. He also worked as a builder (thus apparently his sobriquet Tāyān, ‘bod carrier’) and is credited with the construction of the minaret of the mosque at Bū al-Madīnāh (evidently in Marw) and the one at the mosque in Sinj. A good number of verses by ‘Tāyān Marghāzi’ are quoted by Asadī. He is clearly not identical with the Tāyān Bammī Kirrānī quoted by Rāzi\(^4\) and Hidāyāt,\(^5\) who must — judging from his style — belong to a later period.\(^6\)


1Pace Dhib-khodā, LN s.v. ‘Tabarsi’ p. 177.

2According to Yāqūt, Buldān II p. 161-2, Sinj (thus vocalised by Yāqūt) is the name of two villages near Marw; one is called Sinj Aṭābād, the other is one of the big- gest villages of Marw al-Shāhjān, four furang from the metropolis. In the old fac- simile edition of Samānī the poet’s native place is given as Shāhī, the name of a vil- lage near Isfahān (cf. Yāqūt, Buldān III p. 327-8). But the fact that both Samānī and Asadī explicitly connect this poet with Marw makes it impossible to doubt that ‘Sinj’ is the correct reading.

3Read with the new edition: ‘al-ašāfī wa l-mattArsahah’.

4Rāzi I. p. 208-70 (in the edition the name is written ‘b’n’).


6See PL VI. The two Tāyāns are clearly distinguished in the LN article. Note that the two verses attributed to Tāyān in LF (ed. Kāshāi) p. 61 and Sīhāb (p. 59) are ascribed (doubtless wrongly) to Tāyān Bammī in Qeṣwān p. 134.

7Many thanks to C.E. Bosworth for providing me with photocopies of the rele- vant pages from the new edition.

1See Nafaṣ al ‘Aṣufi, p. 656.

2Dīwān, ed. Dābīr-Sīyāqī no. 33.

3See below, Appendix IV.

4Bāqī (p. 274) says that on that occasion Masʿūd rewarded the ‘obscure poets’ (ṣīhāb al-kh bīn-gūyūb tar būrāld) with 20 000 dirhams (each or in total?), ‘Alawī Zainīb with 50 000 dirhams, ‘Unṣūrī with 10 000 dirhams and the ‘singers and jesters’ with 30 000 dirhams. Clinton, on p. 30 of his book on Manūcheshrī (see above, no. 101), has interpreted this passage as implying an intentional slighting of Maḥmūd’s panegyrist by the new king, but this is far from certain; we have, as far as I can see, no information about the exchange rate between the (silver) dirham and the (gold) dinár during the Chaghāniyān period, but the fact that ‘Unṣūrī alone is rewarded with gold would seem rather to imply a particular honour.

5Dīwān, ed. Dābīr-Sīyāqī, no. 33.
'Adhrā and Khng but u Surkh but'. It is very interesting that Ünsuri's contemporary Bārūrī, in his catalogue of his own writings (and those of Muhammad [233] b. Zakaryāya al-Rāzi), tells us that he himself translated the story of Wāmīq and 'Adhrā, the 'tradition of Qāsim al-Surār [i.e. 'destined to happiness'], corresponding to Persian shad-bahar' and 'Ain al-Hayţāb and 'the tradition of the two idols of al-Bāmīyān [evidently the same as Ünsuri's 'white idol and red idol']', as well as other stories. There is evidently some connection between the two authors' treatment of the same tales; one must imagine either that Bārūrī translated Ünsuri's epics into Arabic, or (less probably, I think) that Ünsuri based his poems on Bārūrī's Arabic (or Persian?) prose versions.

A number of mašnawī fragments in mutaqābīrī metre have been preserved in Asādi's Luzhāt i furs and Rādiyāni quotes two verses explicitly from the story of the two idols. Our knowledge of Ünsuri's narrative poet was revolutionised in the 1950's when M. Shafi discovered, stuffed into the binding of a manuscript dated 526/1132, substantial fragments of a yet older manuscript which the Pakistani scholar

2In connection with the question of the relationship between Ünsuri's and Bārūrī's versions of Wāmīq u 'Adhrā, etc., it is perhaps worth mentioning that Bārūrī, in his (extant, but unpublished) Kitāb al-nisab bain l-filḥis wa l-jashārāt ft l-hayţāb, as quoted (or summarised) by the 12th-century scientist Abū al-Rahmān al-Khāzīnī in his Kitāb nuṣūb al-lubūn, Hyderabad 1359/1940, p. 37, cites those two verses by Ünsuri:

3-4n pās hāzūr sāl hū nās andārūn bi-bī

sāl-4 hāzūr nān u mahbāt sād hāzūr rāy

('Oh king! May you live and reign for a thousand years, and after that may you prosper in pleasure for another thousand years. And may each year be a thousand months, each month a hundred thousand days, each day a thousand hours and the hour a thousand years.')! Bārūrī works out how long the poet's patron would have to live in order to fulfill this extravagant wish (side-stepping the question of whether the 'years' mentioned in the last half-verse are lunar or solar years, Bārūrī assigns them the round number of 360 days and calculates the total days of the patron's life as 72 followed by 18 months) and claims (if we are to believe al-Khāzīnī) that the verses are Ünsuri's comment on the mathematical puzzle known as the chess problem (which involves calculating the value of $2^{64} - 1$), a problem famously solved by Bārūrī himself. The two verses are cited also in a slightly different form in Sīdūr p. 204, and the first verse only in the Vatican Ms. of LF svh. 51.

3Rādiyāni p. 86; also in Wādqw p. 78.

Identified as Ünsuri's Wāmīq u 'Adhrā. That this work derives ultimately from a Greek source had been observed long ago on the basis of the obvious Greek names occurring in the fragments cited by Asādi. Following the publication of Shafi's material the collaboration of two Scandinavian scholars, the Iranist B. Utas and the classicist T. Hägg, led to the discovery that Ünsuri's poem derives from the Hellenistic romance of Metiochus and Panthepos, a work known, like its Persian offshoot, only from fragments. Through what intermediaries the story passed from Greek to [234] Persian remains, however, unknown. It has also become clear that the 16th-century Turkish Wāmīq u 'Adhrā of Lāmīrī, which the author claims to be a translation of Ünsuri's poem, has in fact little in common with the latter.

Qarīb and Šāfā have taken seriously the story which they found in their copies of the 13th-century Persian translation (by al-Husain b. Ayyād al-Dihistānī al-Muĉiyyānī of al-Faraj ba'd al-shīdah) by Abū 'Ali al-Muḥassan b. 'Ali al-Tūnkhī, which quotes the words of Ünsuri the poet about how, having lost his father as a young man, he became a travelling merchant, was robbed of all his belongings and only narrowly escaped with his life. However, in the Arabic original of Tūnkhī's work the name of the narrator is given as Abū l-Qāsim Ubaid Allāh b.
Muhammad b. al-Hasan al-ʿAbqaṣī al-Shāfiʿī; moreover, the name ʿAbqaṣī [235] occurs also in the Topkapı manuscript (dated 706/1306–7) of the Persian translation. The ‘correction’ of ʿAbqaṣī to ʿUnṣūrī can consequently not even be blamed on the Persian translator, but only on later copyists. Quite apart from this, it must be noted that Tanūkhī died in 384/994 and is thus not very likely to have known ʿUnṣūrī. It is probable that also Hīdāyat’s story of how the young ʿUnṣūrī was attacked by robbers and subsequently sold into slavery goes back to the same murky source.  

Editions of Wāmiq uʿAhdār: Lahore 1967 (Ed. M.M. Shafi); Tbilisi 1983 (Qur’anskoje nasledie Unsoiri, ed. I. Kalazde. Contains the manuscript fragments, reproduced photographically from Shafi’s edition, the other quotations, reproduced from Qarib’s edition of the dīvān, a Russian translation and commentary).

Manuscripts of his dīvān: Oxford Eliott 114 (Ethē 52), Modern; London Or. 3246 fol. 213–262 (Rieu Suppnt. no. 204 II. Dated Ramlān 1248/1833); Or. 10936 (Meredith-Owens p. 61. Dated 1276/1859–60); Or. 2843 (Rieu Suppnt. no. 208. Dated 28 Dhī ʿl-Ḥijjah 1278/1862); Or. 2889 fol. 24b–33b (Rieu Suppnt. no. 213 II. Completed 28 Jumādā I 1293/1876. qasīdāt only); Or. 10937 (Meredith-Owens p. 61. 19th century); Cambridge Or. 236 (Browne Suppnt. 954. 19th century copy of Calcutta Ivanow 428); Brown Coll. V.88 pp. 2–139 (Dated 1266/1849–50); Leningrad Univ. 941w (Salemann-Rosen p. 15); [236] Univ. 1003a, 1038, 1087c, 1202c (Romaskiewicz p. 8).

1With variants. See the edition by ʿAbdul al-Shāfiʿī, III, Beyrouth 1398/1978 p. 393 (qīṣaṣah 365). The editor (in his foot-note in volume II, qīṣaṣah 246) equates this person with the poet Abī l-Qāsim ʿUbayd Allāh b. Muhammad al-Sawī, whom Tanūkhī quotes more than a dozen times in al-Farār ba’d al-ḥiṣbah as well as in his Nisbāt al-munzhirāt wa ʿabbār al-mudallilāt (see the indexes in al-Shāfiʿī’s editions of the two books, under ‘al-Sawī’) and who was apparently a close friend of the author. Although this equation is possible, the fact that the nisba ʿAl-Aṣqīsī (from ʿAbd al-ʿAṣqīsī) appears in this manuscript, and not only in the Topkapı Ms., against ‘Unṣūrī’ in the other copies) at the end of the story, p. 915.

2See the critical edition by Jusuf Hākimī, II, second printing, Tehran 1363h./1984–5, p. 911. The name occurs also (again only in the Topkapı Ms., against ‘Unṣūrī’ in the other copies) at the end of the story, p. 915.

3Hīdāyat, Maṣnūn 1 p. 355.

4As was suggested by A.H. Morton, with whom I have discussed this and other aspects of ʿUnṣūrī’s biography.

5For the manuscript tradition, see below, Appendix IV.

Istanbul Universitesi FY 328 (oiltin Rza Paşa 33. Ateş 9. Has a weaqf notice dated 1095/1684); Tehran Majlis III 1032 (Undated but, as the catalogue has shown, part of a now mutilated Ms. written in 1010/1601–2); Qarīb 189/1 (Nashikh-ha V p. 648. Dated 6 Shabān 1207/1793); Majlis III 1031 (Dated 1211/1796–7); Majlis VIII 2468 (18th century); Asghar Mahdawi 464/5 (Nashikh-ha II p. 119. Dated Dhu l-qa’dah 1225/1810); Milli III 1489 (Dated 1255/1839–40); Majlis II 375 (Dated 1256/1840); Majlis II 376 (Dated 1262/1846); Gulistan/Āsibāt II 332 (Dated 5 Muharram 1262/1846); Millī III 1481 (Dated 1296/1879); Sipah-salār II 1236 (19th century); Malik 4963/3 (Munz. no. 24885); Malik 5467/1 (Munz. no. 24914); Qum Mar’ashi XVI 4813 fol. 88–167 (Dated 1259/1843); Mar’ashi XI 4164 (Dated Dhu l-Ḥijjah 1263/1847); Mashedī Rādawī VII 499 (Dated Dhu l-Qa’dah 1261/1845); Rādawī VII 498 (Dated 1274/1857–8); Rādawī VII 497 (Dated 1278/1861); Univ. 146; Lahore Univ. II p. 135 (Munz.); Peshawar Islamiyāh 1823 (1) (Dated 1134/1721–2); Hyderabad Sālār Jung IV 1115 (19th century?); Calcutta Ivanow 427 (18th century?); Ivanov 428 (= Lucknow Sprenger 437. 18th century?); Princeford 5 (Made in the reign of Shāh Jahān [1628–58]. qāṣīdāt only); Qarīb refers to three Mss. in his private collection. Cf. Munz. III 24881–91.

Selected poems: Oxford Eliott 37 fol. 180a, 200b, 208a, 235a, 240a (Ethē 1333 = Daqīq al-ʿasbār); London Or. 1858 fol. 65–78 (Rieu p. 1031. 19th century); Tehran Majlis XVII 5976 (18th century?); Majlis VIII 2326 fol. 4–13 (17th century?); Univ. IX 2478/4 (17th century?); Calcutta Ivanow 927 fol. 273v–277v (Modern).


An anonymous commentary on a qasīda attributed to him, in numerous quotations from poets of the 10th to 14th centuries (e.g. Asa-dī, Farrukhi, Munjīk, Najib Jarbāḥaqīn, Qatrān, Rādawī and ʿUnṣūrī himself), with the title Rishāl dar bāb i qasīdāt i šahātā i hukmāt ʿUnṣūrī, is contained in: Paris Ancien fonds 331 I (Blochet 1887/Richard. 17th century!).


150. Two verses by Ahmad Ushshami are quoted [238] by Raddiyan. He is presumably identical with the Ushshami Jiybarki whose one of verses is quoted in LF.

LF s.v. mohbad; Raddiyan p. 63 (and Ateq ad loc.); Idarah-ichi p. 37.

151. Abi ‘Abd Allah ‘Abd al-Rahman b. Muhammad al-Uthari is credited by ‘Auifi with two ruba’iyat and with two verses from a qasidah. He says that he was one of the madhikan i hadarat i yamini, which presumably means ‘eulogists of the Ghaznavid dynasty’ rather than necessarily ‘of Sulaym Yamini al-daualah Mahmud’.

‘Auifi II p. 57; Hidayat, Majma’ 1 p. 342; Khaiyam-pur p. 396; Saafi, Tarikh 10 p. 597.

The consonants are clearly pointed in Raddiyan. The vocalisation is by Ateq, with reference to Surhini, fol. 40a, who says that the abjad Ushshami refers to Qanaraki al-Ushshami in Baghdad. But it seems more likely, in the case of this Persian poet, that we have to do with a professional name from ustha, ‘potash.’

152. Mahmud al-Warrifi is the author of two verses cited by Hidayat, who states that he flourished under the last Tahirid ruler, Mohammad b. Tahir (248/862 to 259/872-3).

Cf. Hidayat, Majma’ 1 p. 511.

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

154. Yusuf ‘Arudi, a number of whose verses are quoted in Asadi’s LF, is evidently identical with the ‘Abi Yusuf’ whom Raddiyan mentions as the author of a treatise on prosody. Shams quotes a further two verses of his which Raddiyan (p. 95), however, ascribes (in a slightly different form) to Muniyu.

LF passim (and Horn, Einl. p. 31); Raddiyan p. 2; Shams p. 335; S. Nafi, ‘Yusuf i ‘Arudi’, Sharq I, 1310/31931, p. 570-60; Dh. Saafi, [239] ‘Du sha’ir i yam-nam’, MDAT II/3, 1334/1955, p. 5-7; Saafi, Tarikh 16 p. 437-8; Khaiyam-pur p. 661; Lazard, Poetes I p. 15 n. 2.

155. ‘Abd al-Jabbari Zainabi al-Alawi3 al-Mahmudi is included by ‘Atufi and ‘Auifi among the poets of the Ghaznavids. ‘Auifi quotes, among other things, two odes dedicated to Mahmud; further verses praising the same king (they mention ‘Abi i-Qasim’), and with the same metre and rhyme as ‘Auifi’s second sample (and thus possibly from the same poem, though the verses do not overlap) are quoted by Jajarmi. Baihaqi, on the other hand, mentions him on three occasions as a highly

1Thus Raddiyan p. 8.
2Thus clearly pointed all 10 times in Raddiyan and several times in the manuscripts of LF (see Horn, Einl. p. 21, and ed. Mujtaba/i’Sadiqi p. 90) and in Qazvini (p. 190). From the pun that ‘Auifi makes on the name it is clear that the latter read it as ‘Zainati’ (or ‘Zinati’), a reading defended with much ire by Bahar (Damihi 1, 1328/1949, p. 601-3), but the authority of Asadi and Raddiyan clearly outweighs that of ‘Auifi.
3Thus ‘Auifi and Baihaqi.
4‘Auifi.
esteemed panegyrist of Mahmūd’s son, Mas’ūd, one of these in connection with the events of the year 422/1031. See also above, p. 184 (Mahmūd).

Baihaqi p. 131, 274, 280; LF passim; Rādiyānī passim (and Atey’s notes p. 92-3); ‘Arūdī p. 28 (and Qazwīnī ad loc.); Watwāt p. 20; ‘Aṣṭī II p. 39-40; Shams p. 359; Ḥājīmī p. 458-9; Hidīyat, Majmā’ i p. 241; Ṣafā, Tārirh 16 p. 550-3.

156. Zarrīn-Kitāb Marghazī is credited with two verses in Asadī’s LF (though several of the manuscripts ascribe one of these to ‘Ammānī) and a third is added by Nakhljwānī’s Shāh al-furs (p. 189). [240]

LF (see the indexes to the three editions); Shāh (see index); LN s.v. ‘Zarrīn-Kitāb’ p. 371. [241]

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 Labāb al-albāb of ‘Aṣṭī (completed before 625/1228) and the Kitāb al-mu’jam of Shams i Qais (after 628/1230-1). Between them ‘Aṣṭī and Shams quote virtually all of the significant Persian poets of the pre-Mongol period.1 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 appendix I.

The marginal additions in manuscript ’nān” 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. [242]

A doubtless important source which I regret not having been able to use at first hand is the Nuzhat al-majālis, a large collection of rubā’is put together by Jamāl al-dīn Khaṭīb al-Shawrānī around the middle of the 7th/13th century. An edition of this work was published a few years ago in Tehran, but my efforts to locate a copy of it remained for a long time unsuccessful and I had to content myself in the first instance with the table of contents published by Dānish-pazhūh in 1973.2 [See now appendix III].

Of the later tadḥkirah the only ones consistently excerpted for this chapter are those by Mustaṭfī, Daulat-shāh, Rāzī - who is quoted by

---

1Though these two authorities are virtually contemporaries, ‘Aṣṭī’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, ‘Aṣṭī is aware only of the former. The only other major figures known to Shams, but ignored by ‘Aṣṭī, are Falākī and Qamar. The reader will notice that in this chapter, as in the previous one, the amateur poets quoted in the first half of ‘Aṣṭī’s book have for the most part been omitted.

2See his article in Tādż-nīn i Kitāb XV, 1351sh./1973, p. 568-82, with a list of the poets quoted.
volume and page number of the (abysmal) Tehran edition, as well as by
the running numbers in Eihée’s summary, which in many cases conveys a
more accurate picture of what Râzî actually wrote - and Hidîyûl. The
general historical sources have, of course, been exploited whenever I
have been aware of them; Râwandi’s history of the Seljuqs has proved
particularly valuable. Among those works [243] that have not to my
knowledge previously been consulted by historians of Persian literature,
one might mention in particular the Tarîkh al-mustahbir of Ibn al-
Mujâwirî, written not long after 626/1228,1

represented by a number of poems in ‘Auli’s anthology, from which we
learn that he served successively the last Ghâznawîd Khusrav-Malik
(555/1160 to 582/1186) and the Ghurid Mu’tizz al-dîn Muhammad b.
Sâmî (558/1163 to 599/1203). ‘Auli also tells us that he excelled in medici-
ne and the funun i lughat. (See also no. 206, al Hüsain al-Hâjîb,)

*Auli II p. 327-34, 413; Dâqiqî al-asbâr (Oxford Elliot 37 (11, 5a, 197a = Eihée 1333); Râzî II p. 144 (no. 628); [244] Hidîyûl, Majma’a
I p. 336-7; Sâfî, Tarîkh II p. 715-8; Khâiyâm-pûr p. 376; Efr s.v. “Abî al-
Râfî” (Z. Sâjâdî).)

158. ‘Abd al-Wâsî b. ‘Abd al-Jâmi al-Jabali al-Shâfî’î2 was
a native of the jâbâl Harât. Samânî says that he learnt traditions from him

1 Ed. O. Löfgren, Leyden 1951-4. For the date and authorship of this work see G.R. Smith, ‘Ibn al-Mujâwirî’s 7th/11th century guide to Arabia: the eastern con-
nection’, Occasional papers of the school of abbasid studies III, 1990, p. 71-88. The poets
relevant to this chapter quoted by Ibn al-Mujâwirî are Hasan Ghâznawî (p. 301, anonymously); Husân Kirmânî (p. 84; see below no. 205); Mûktârî (p. 178, wrongly
attributed; see no. 249); Shâbîr (p. 197); Sânî (p. 265: “al-shâ’ir al-Ghâznawî”), Shâh Bû Râjî (p. 84; see no. 286); Zâhir Fârûqî (p. 246: “al-Zâhirû”). He also quotes four of
his own Persian verses (p. 84, 235), two from Ghâznawî’s Risû al-Rumûs (p. 135, 255, both anonymously), one by Rûbîh Nûktî (p. 94, names misspelt in the Ms.; this verse
supplements those mentioned above, p. 226-7) and one that remains unidentified
(p. 53).

2 As he is called by Samânî. ‘Auli calls him al-Imâm al-bânnimîm Bâdî’ al-zamân
al-zamân Abî l-Fâdîl ‘Abî l-Wâsî b. ‘Abû al-Jamî’ al-Jabali al-Harawi al-Adîb. I can see no reason to doubt that the religious scholars mentioned by Samânî and by Ibn al-
Fuwatî is the same person as the poet quoted by ‘Auli.

in Herat and that he heard some of his poems in Marv.1 He is men-
tioned also by al-Kâsit al-Jâfârî in the unpublished section of his
Khadarat al-qasîr among the (Arabic) poets of Herat, apparently with
the information that he died ‘after 540’, i.e. after 1145-6. ‘Auli says that he
was an accomplished poet in Arabic and Persian (he quotes, among other
things, two poems with alternating Arabic and Persian verses). His Per-

1 Fustâl la-nâ ‘am ‘Abî ‘Abd Allah Muhammad b. ‘Abî b. al-’Umârî bi Harât wa samâ’u shâ’iru min shâ’irî-hi bi Marv. Similarly Ibn al-Fuwatî, who in turn quotes
Samânî’s Kitâb al-mudhâfiyât, evidently Samânî’s Mudhâfiyât ur-râtibí Baghdâtî. For an
extract from this book see Leyden Arab. Cat. II p. 201-2; Brockelman Suppl. I: p. 565
(briefly cited as ‘Dhâhî...’).

2 This Ms. was unfortunately not used by Safî in preparing his edition.

3p. 700 of his edition of the ārwâr.
seems most questionable. Daulat-sháh goes on to reject (in a rare fit of good judgement) the story told by Musta’uf according to which ‘Abd al-Wáṣí’ 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-Wáṣí’ to have been.

Mss.: Dublin Beatty 103/II (Ms. completed Dhū l-hijjah, 699/1300. Beginning missing); Oxford Whinfield 54 (Beeston 2662/9). Dated 9 Rajab 1012/1603. Selections); Ouseley 23 (Idhír 538. Has seal dated <1> 179/1765-6); Ouseley Add. 19 (Idhír 539. [246] Owner’s note dated 1127/1715); Elliot 116 (Idhír 540); London Or. 3320 (Rieu Suppt. 217. Dated 23 Rabi’ II 1016/1607); Halle D.M.G. 19 (Dated 1016/1607-8); Leningrad Salamenn 253; Romaszkewicz 7; Tashkent Acad. 160/VI (Semevski 801. Dated 1269/1852-3); Acad. 238/X (Semevski 802. Ms. Dated 1270/1853-4); Istanbul Topkapı, Hazine 796 fol. 187b sq. (Karatay 887. The Ms. is dated Rabi’ II 1810/1407 and contains pictures); Lállá Ismá’il 463 (See Şáfí’s edition I p. iii-iv. Dated Rabi’ II 980/1572); Hekimoglu Ali Paşa 669/2 (Hüfuf 418. Dated I p. 420-1 and Şáfí’s edition I p. vii); Tehrání Bayání 56/4 (Nuskhah-há I p. 15. Dated 995/1587); Magílis 484/5 (Munz. 24576. Dated Rabi’ II 996/1588); Sipásh-sáli II 393 (16th century? End missing); Magílis III 1024 (Dated 1001/1592-3; Malik 5307/6 (Munz. 24581. 17th century?); Magílis III 1025 (17th century? Incomplete at both ends); Peshawar Islámiyyah 1823/4 (Dated 1134/1721-2); Calcutta Ivanov 448 (Dated 1224/1809). Cf. Munz. 24572-97; Munz. Pak. V II p. 60 (4 Mss.).

Editions: Lahore 1862; Tehrání 1339-41/sh./1960-2 (ed. Dh. Şáfí. Two volumes, with biography in vol. II p. 683-721). 1

Sámá‘ání (new edition) III p. 191; al-Kátib al-İsáfahání, Khairátat al-qasr (see Leyden Cat. II p. 236); ‘Afil II p. 104-10; Shams p. 358; Ibn al-Fawúsí, al-Juz’ al-rábi’ min tahtákhs ma’jam al-dáwání fî muqam al-aláqah, ed. M. Jawád, Damascus 1962-7, no. 2558; Musta’uf p. 740-1; Daqíqíg al-ashár (Oxford Elliot 37 = Ethé 1333, fol. 92a, 133b, 251a); Jákarti I p. 109-12, 120-3; Daulat-sháh p. 73-5; Rázi II p. 118-23 (no. 608); Taqí (see London Or. 3506 fol. 396a sqq. = Rieu Suppt. 105); Hidáyat, Ma’jam I p. 185-92; Browne, History II p. 341-2; ‘A. al-İlí, Nawá’í, ‘Chand naktáb rá‘í’ab ahwál fî ‘Abd al-Wáṣí’i Jábálí’, Yâdí 3/8, p. 44-6; LN s.v. ‘Jábálí’ p. 211-2; Şáfí, Târîkh II p. 650-6; Khiyám-pür p. 127; EF S.év. ‘‘Abd [247] al-Wáṣí’ (Huart/Massé); EIr s.v. ‘‘Abd-al-Váṣí’i Jábálí’ (Dh. Şáfí). 2

159. Abú l-‘Alí’ Ganjá’í is remembered mainly on account of the sardulous attack on him which Kháqání included in his Tuhfát al-qulūb. 2Here 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 Ismá‘ílí leader Háyán b. al-Sabbáh. The biographical information that we have about him appears largely to have developed out the eXcesses of these verses. Musta’uf, who says that Abú l-‘Alí’ was Kháqání’s teacher, quotes three verses in which the former claims to have committed sodomy with his pupil and another poem of nine verses retraction this claim and offering his apologies to Kháqání. The second poem can be found (together with two more qifáhs) in the old anthology published by Yaghmá’í (where it has one additional verse); here the author calls himself the ‘master’ (qustád) and ‘father-in-law’ (gídar-khánád) of Kháqání, says that he had reached the age of 60 and that at the age of 16 (variant: ‘around 40’) he had come from Arrád to Shárván. Daulat-sháh says that Abú l-‘Alí’ was the master both of Kháqání and of Faláki and claims (with explicit reference to Musta’uf’s Târîkh i quludkhá) that he married his daughter to Kháqání after having promised her to Faláki. He then quotes eight verses with the same metre and rhyme as the nine quoted by Musta’uf and in Yaghmá’í’s anthology, but not one of his verses agrees with [248] any of those quoted by them. 4Rá‘í quotes the poem in a form which combines verses from Musta’uf’s and Daulat-sháh’s versions, as well as some more poetry, including a substantial qasídah to the Shárván-sháh Manúchich (II), who was Kháqání’s first

---

1Hidáyat gives him the ‘name’, or rather the title, Niżám al-dín.
2For this work see below, no. 224.
3Ibid variant: Érán.
4The verses quoted by Daulat-sháh make every impression of having been elaborated from those given by Musta’uf. Thus Daulat-sháh’s last verse bî-qalám bî-qalám na-galám na-galám * bî-qalám bî-qalám na-galám na-galám (‘if I said it, I said it, if I didn’t, I didn’t; if I didn’t, I didn’t’), is evidently someone’s improvement on the last verse of Musta’uf’s version: ba jāy i yak-e ráh da bî bâr qalám bî-qalám na-galám na-galám (‘Not once, but two hundred times I said: I did not ... him, I did not, I did not, I did not!’).
patron and who ruled from 516/1122 at the earliest until some time between 555/1160 and 566/1170. Here Abū l-‘Alī gives his own age as 55. [249] 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.


1Earlier estimates (by Hādī Hašan and Minorsky) for the end of his reign need to be revised following the publication by Kouymjian of a coin of Manchīchī’s dated 342 nābāt khānsa wa khamsa wa khamsa-mān; the restoration of the date 555/1160 is assured by the fact that this coin names the caliph al-Mustanquf (555/1160 to 566/1170) and the (Seljuq) sultan Sulaimān (who reigned only from Rābī‘ II 555/1160 to Rābī‘ I or II 556/1161). Khaqānī, in his elegy on the death of Manchīchī (dīwān, ed. Sajjadi p. 530, without substantial variants), speaks of his ‘thirty-year reign’ (nābāt mulk a milān i jahān). According to the Georgian Chronicle Manchīchī’s father, Farādīn (Ap’irimus) 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 Manchīchī really succeeded his father in 514 and did not die until after 555, then he must have ruled for at least 41 lunar years. Khāyām’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 Farādīn is wrong, or else that Manchīchī did not ascend the throne until some years after his father’s death. Manchīchī certainly died before 566/1170 (the last year of the caliphate of al-Mustanquf, whose name still occurs on coins of Manchīchī’s successor Akhṣāṣān). Thus he died between 555/1160 and 566/1170 and began ruling fewer than 40 years before this, i.e. not before 516/1122. See: M. Bronet, Histoire de la Géorgie (translation of the Georgian chronicle), St. Petersburg 1849, p. 364; Hādī Hašan, Falakī-Shīrāzī p. 11-12, 22-3; id., Researches in Persian literature, Hyderabad 1958, p. 6; V. Minorsky, A history of Shavān and Darband, Cambridge 1958, p. 135-6; D.K. Kouymjian, ‘A unique coin of the Shirvānshāh Manchīchī II 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 Caucasian and Adharbayjān based on Islamic coinage of the 5th/11th to the 7th/13th centuries (Microfilm), Ann Arbor 1969, p. 165-73.

160. Saiyid Abū ‘Ali b. al-Husain al-Marwāzī is included in ‘Auṣf’s chapter on the poets of Khurāsān after the time of Sanā‘ī, where two of his qāstāds are quoted: one dedicated to an unnamed deity, the other to ‘Sulṭān Iskandār’, the name by which ‘Auṣf designates the Khwārazm-shāh ‘Alī al-dīn Muḥammad b. Teksh (596/1200 to 677/1272). [250]

‘Auṣf II p. 339-45; Rāzī II p. 16 (no. 520); Hīdīyat, Majma‘ I p. 82; Sāfā, Tārīkh II p. 844-5; Khāyām-pūr p. 20.

161. Dīh-khudāyī Abū l-Ma‘ālī al-Rāzī is quoted by ‘Auṣf in his chapter on the poets of Iraq during the Seljuq period as the author of two substantial qāstāds, the second of which addresses a certain ‘Abū l-Fath Muṣṭafā; a different ode praising this same person is quoted by Jācurmānī. These three poems are quoted also by Hīdīyat, who identifies the poet’s patron as the Seljuq Abū l-Fath Maṣ‘ūd b. Muḥammad b. Ma‘līk-shāh (529/1134 to 547/1152) and adds that Abū l-Ma‘ālī died in 541/1146-7. See also the next entry.

162. Abū l-Ma‘ālī Naḥḥās is the author of a poem of four verses, quoted by Rāwandī (and after him by Rashīd al-dīn), in Rāwandī’s source the Saiyida-nāmah of Zahir Naṣībūrī,3 and (in Arabic translation) by al-Kātib al-Isfahānī, lamenting the rapid coming and going of ministers after the death of Nizām al-mulk (in 485/1092). Juwainī calls him Abū l-Ma‘ālī Naḥḥās Rāzī and says that he composed poems in praise of Ḥabash b. Altun-fāq, who was the governor of Khurāsān during the
reign of Berq-yārūq and was killed by Sanjar in 493/1110.1 If he was indeed a native of Rāi then it is not unlikely that he is identical with the subject of the preceding entry. [251]

By contrast, Rāzī (followed by Hidāyat) makes him a native of Isfahan, says that he served Berq-yārūq as 'ārid i laškar, and quotes a few of his poems. Hidāyat adds that he died in 512/1118-9.

A qāṣīdah of 16 verses quoted in the Nuzhat-nāmah i 'Alā'ī is ascribed in one of the old manuscripts to Abū l-Ma'āli Naḥḥās, but other copies quote it anonymously. It has been published, from a manuscript of the Nuzhat-nāmah, as the work of Rōdākī in Naḍafī's book on the latter poet,2 but there is no good authority for this attribution.


163. ‘Abū Mansūr i Bā Yūsuf’ is mentioned by ‘Arūḍī as one of the poets at the court of Tughān-shāh b. Alp-Arslān (who was still alive in 476/1083-4). ‘Arūḍī adds that he met Abū Mansūr in Herat in 509/1115-6 on which occasion he heard from the latter an anecdote about Tughān-shāh and A caravan. This Abū Mansūr is doubtless identical with the poet whom ‘Auffi calls Abū Mansūr ‘Abd al-Raṣḥīd b. Abū Yūsuf al-Harawī (omit the second ‘ibn’). ‘Auffi quotes the maqīl of a qāṣīdah and a rubāt by this poet; however, he includes him in his chapter on the early Ghaznavid poets, evidently in error.


2 2nd edition (see above, p. 224), p. 497, vs. 147-62.
two) to his brother and successor Khîdîr b. Ibrâhîm (who appears to have ruled only for a year or so).  

1. "Àfû'í Khûjînî is credited by "Àfû'í with a qaṣîda in praise of Sharaf al-dîn Hûsâm al-Nasâ'î.  
3.  

167. "Àjûbî Jûzîjânî is mentioned in "Àfû'í’s chapter on the poets of Khûrâsân after the time of Sanjûr, where we find two qaṣîdahs, both of which mention as the poet’s patron Bahâ’ al-dîn Sîm b. Hûsain, the Ghorid, who reigned for a few months in 544/1149.  
4. "Àfû'í II p. 352-4; MF p. 278 (verse by "Àjûbî Gurgânî"); Hidâyât,  
6. Shâhâb al-dîn ‘Amîraq (thus the conventional reading, but perhaps better Ghâmghâq)?)  
7. [254] al-Bukhârî was a panegyrist of the Qarâkhânids of Samârqand. His divân has not come down to us as such, but a good number of his poems are quoted in the taškhirâs (notably, it seems, by Taqî Kâshî) and these have been collected by Nâfisî (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 qaṣîdahs dedicated to identifiable patrons the great majority invoke Nâsîr al-haqq wa l-dîn Shams al-mulk Abî l-Hasan Nasr b. Ibrâhîm (460/1068 to 472/1080). We have also one poem (or possibly  

1. For whom see "Àfû'í I p. 164-9; Râzî III p. 388-92 (no. 1459); Safât, Tîrîkî II p. 764-7, Khâyâm-pûr p. 296.  
2. Thus "Àfû'í, Hidâyât calls him Shams al-dîn "Àjûbî Jûzîjânî.  
3. The ra‘m ‘mûq occurs in all the sources and the final syllable -aql is confirmed notably by a verse of Anvari’s (divân, ed. Mudarris i Ridawi, I p. 273, 6), where it occurs in the rhyme. It has no meaning in Persian or Arabic and has not been explained. Safât’s suggestion that ‘Amîraq might be an error for ‘Aqlaql, ‘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 might suggest that ‘Ghâmghâq could represent Turkish gümquéq, ‘tail-wait’, for which see G. Clauson, An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish, Oxford 1972, p. 627b.  

"Amîraq’s datable qaṣîdahs thus all belong to the third quarter of the 6th/11th century. However, Daulat-shâh, on the authority of the supposed Tâlîhî-i al i Safîq of Abî Tîhîr Khâtûnî, 3 says that when Sanjûr’s daughter Mâhî Mulk Khâtûn died (which, according to Ibn al-Ahvîr, 4 was in 524/1130), he commissioned ‘Amîraq, who was then ‘old, weak and blind’, to write an elegy for her. Although it is not impossible that ‘Amîraq lived until this date, we ought to have a more reliable informant than Daulat-shâh before accepting this possibility as a fact. Taqî has our poet live another two decades until 543/1149-50.  


Collections of poems and fragments: Tâbrîz 1307sh./1928;  

Tehran 1339sh./1961 (Dîwân i ‘Amîraq i Bukhârî, ed. S. Nâfisî, with an extensive introduction containing references to all the available sources).  

1. Nâfisî, p. 133-7, invokes, despite its superscription, ‘Jamîl i malk, khâqân i mu‘azzam’, which seems to be ‘Amîraq’s name for Khîdîr (see the previous note).  
3. For this (probably fictitious) work see below, p. 400 (Khâtûnî).  
4. al-Kâmil fî l-târîkîh, ed. Torshberg, X p. 468.
170. Auhad al-din Anwarî was the most famous panegyrist in the generation following Mu’izzî. The wealth of anecdotal information in the late mediaeval tadkhirahs obscures his biography rather than elucidating it. The following is a digest of what can actually be deduced from his poems and from early historical sources.

Anwarî was born in (or near) Abîward in the Dashî Khâwarîn. In one poem he indicates that his father had been a courtier in the service of some Seljuq princess. Anwarî himself attended the court of Sanjar during the second half of his long reign. According to Juvainî, he accompanied Sanjar when, in 542/1147, the latter besieged the Khwârazm-shâh Atszz in Hazâr-asp. Anwarî’s contribution to the war effort being to write poems mocking the enemy, which Sanjar’s archers then shot into the besieged fortress. Atszs retaliated by doing the same with verses by his court poet, Watwât. When Sanjar was defeated and captured by the Ghuzz in 548/1153 Anwarî composed [257] a well-known poem lamenting these events. 2 After the death of his patron he appears to have lived for a while in Balkh, where he wrote poems in praise of local princes and of the qa’dî al-qa’dât Hamîd al-dîn, whose Maqamat i Hamîdî (written

1Only this much of his name is certain. His contemporary Zahîrî Samurquandi, in his unpublished Ahrîr al-sûrâh, calls him Muhammad b. ‘Ali (thus according to Atesh, Islâm Aushkaydah, s.v. ‘Inver!’ p. 278); the apparently contemporaneous author of the introduction in some copies of the dâwân (e.g. London Or. 3486f) has ‘Ali b. Muhammad b. Ishaq, while ‘Ali has Auhad al-dîn Muhammad b. Muhammad. That his grandfather was indeed named Ishaq is confirmed by the verse in his dâwân, ed. Mardvârî i Ridâwî p. 302 stâh. The ‘Ali b. Ishaq al-Abîwardî who supposedly copied the Tabriz Ms. of the dâwân of Qâtrîn in 529/1134 (see above, p. 216) is in any case certainly not Anwarî, though this could possibly be his name of his father.

2Dâwân p. 201-5.
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in 551/1156-7) are mentioned. He also addressed some odes to the sultan Qâbir al-dîn Ma’budî b. Zangi, who ruled in Mosul from 544/1149 onwards, and the Seljuk sultan Sulaimân b. Muhammad, who ruled from 555/1160 to 556/1161. The most recent date that can be extracted from the dâwân is that of the festival of Bahramjanah in ‘the year 533 of the dating of the Persians’, i.e. 1 December 1164, which he mentions in one poem.1

There exist a number of versions of an anecdote linking him with some catastrophic but unfulfilled prognoses in connection with a conjunction of the stars in 382/1186, but it is not clear whether Anwarî is supposed to have lived until then, or whether he made his predictions some years in advance. The tadkhirahs give a wild array of dates for his life and the account 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 qudsâhash - many critics have regarded him as the foremost practitioner of panegyric poetry in Persian - and his ghazaâls, Anwarî has left a large number of investeges of a ferocity which, though not unique, is nonetheless astonishing.

The only more or less critical edition of his dâwân is that by Mardvârî i Ridâwî, who at least consulted the oldest dated copy (London Or. 3713)2 and two of the old Istanbul manuscripts [258] 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 Naftî can be consulted.

Mss.: Dublin Beatty 103/X (Copied jointly by Muhammad-Shâh b. ‘Ali b. Maḥmûd Iṣfahânî - the scribe responsible for the oldest London copy - and by Abî Naṣr Maḥmûd b. Ahmad al-Yamânî and dated 23 Dîhû l-hijjah 699/1300); Manchester Lindestiana 111 (16th century?); Lindestiana 839 (Dated 1023/1614); Lindestiana 277 (17th century?); Lindestiana 524 (Dated A.D. 1859); Oxford Land 133 (Ethê 543. Owner’s mark dated 941/1534-5); Whinfâlde 54 (Beeston 2662f. Dated 9 Rajab 1012/1603. Selections); Ouseley 13 (Ethê 544. Dated Dîhû l-hijjah 1015/1607); Elliott 40 (Ethê 545. Completed 16 Dîhû l-hijjah

1Dâwân p. 415, l. 1: zal bar potzand az u az u az zîrîr ī gijm.

2Hta Ms. ‘r’. Wrongly described in volume I, introduction, p. 18, as a Paris manuscript, but correctly identified in volume II, introduction p. 146-7.
1018/1610; Elliot 113 (Bihé 546. Dated 1019/1610-1); Ouseley 1,2
(Bihé 555. Dated 1082/1671-2. qasādāh only); Elliot 39 (Bihé 547. 17th century?); Ouseley 36 (Bihé 548. 17th century?); Ouseley 123 (Bihé 549. 17th-18th century?); Elliot 41 (Bihé 550); Elliot 42 (Bihé 551); Elliot 43 (Bihé 552); Fraser 64 (Bihé 553); Ouseley Add. 135 (Bihé 554); Walker 98 (Bihé 555); London Or. 3713/V (Rieu Supp. 2111; M.
R’s tr). Copyied by Muhammad-Shāh b. ‘Ali b. Mahmūd Isfahānī and dated 6 Rabī’ II 692/1293; Or. 3486/I (Rieu Supp. 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 1200/1785-6); Or. 4514/V fol. 78b-116b (Rieu Supp. 215. Completed 14 Rabi‘ II 1023/1614); I.O. 946 (= Robinson 146-51. Ms. dated 12 Jumādā II 1038/1629. “Intikhab i ḍawān”, with 2 extraneous pictures); I.O. 2865 (Dated 1 Ramada’n 1038/1629); I.O. 933 (Dated 7 Muḥarram 1061/1650); Add. 25,019 (Rieu p. 554-5. Dated Shawwāl 1083/1672); [259] Add. 5617 (Rieu p. 555. Dated Dhu’l-qi’dah 1087/1677); I.O. 944 (Dated 1 Dhu’l-qi’dah 1094/1683. Qasādāh); Add. 22,381 (Rieu p. 555. 17th century? Various leaves missing); I.O. 945 (Dated 1120/1708-9. Qasādāh); Add. 16,763 (Rieu p. 555-6. Dated 1129/1717. Contains only the qasādāh, among them several that are manifestly spurious); Or. 3233 (Rieu Supp. 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 Oo. 6. 31. (Browne Cat. CCCV. 15th or 16th century?); Add. 213 in marg. (Browne Cat. CCCCXXIII. 15th or 16th century? qasādāh only); Or. 6. 27. (Browne Cat. CCC. 16th century?); Or. 1687 (2nd Supp. 435. 16th century?); Oo. 6. 34. (Browne Cat.
CCCVI. Dated 15 Shaw‘bān 1124/1712); for other undated copies see Browne Supp. 507-511, 952, 1052-1055, Browne Coll. V.30; Edinburgh New Coll. Or. 40; Paris Supplication 823 fol. 1 sqq. (Blochet 1968. 13th century? Fragment); Supplication 519 (Blochet 1223. Dated 857/1453); Supplication 518 (Blochet 1224. Dated 931/1524-5); Supplication 514 (Blochet 1228. Dated Dhu’l-hijjah 1035/1526); Supplication 783 fol. 58v sqq. (Blochet 1981. 16th century? Selections); Supplication 515 (Blochet 1225. Dated 23 Jumādā I 1010/1601); Supplication 516-7

1 According to Nasim, p. 346 no. 2, it is dated 1054/1644.
Late Eleventh to Early Thirteenth Century

Lucnow Sprenger 99 (Dated 692/1293); Bankipore I 25 (‘Dated’ 700/1300-1, ‘but the appearance of the MS. shows that it belongs to the 13th century A.D.’); I 25 (Dated Sha’bān 992/1584); I 27 (16th century?); Madras II 586 (Dated 1104/1692-3); I 67; Calcutta Ivanova 450 (16th century?); Ivanov 451 (Copied by Muhammad Qazwīnī Jussaqq and dated 1008/1599-1600); Bāhirār 290 (Dated Jumādā I 1012/1603). Lacunae; Ivanov 453 (Dated 14th year of Aurangzēb/1671); Ivanov 452 (17th century?); Ivanov 454 (18th century?); Cambridge (Mass.) Houghton Pers. 8.5 (Naskhah-hā IV p. 4. 15th-16th century? Pictures); Houghton Pers. 10 (Naskhah-hā IV p. 4. Dated 1059/1649). Cf. Munz. III 17451-5 (‘Kulliyāt’); 21656-197 (‘Divān’). Further Ms. in private collections are listed in the introductions to the editions by Nafṣī (p. I-lii) and Mudarris i Ravidī (I p. 17-19).

Editions: Tabriz 1260/1844; 1266/1849-50; Delhi 1296/1878 (‘Qaṣīdā’; 770 pp.); Lucknow 1297/1880 (‘Kulliyāt i nāżm’); 1306/1889 (same title); 1897 (same title); Bombay 1937 (‘Qaṣīdā’); Tehran 1337th./1958 (ed. S. Nafṣī, with extensive introduction); 1337-40th./1959-61 (ed. M. T. Mudarris i Ravidī. 2 volumes with continuous pagination, with a biography at the beginning of Vol. 2); repr. 1364sh./1986.

Commentaries:
(1) Sharḥ i qaṣīdā (or: ḍvān) i Anwarī by Muhammad b. Dāʾūd b. Muhammad b. Māhmūd ‘Alāwī Shāhīrābādī and dedicated to the sultan of Mālwāḥ, Nāṣir al-dīn Khaḷījī (reg. 906/1500 to 916/1510). Mss.: 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 Shab’ān 1232/1817); Paris Supplément 1383 (Biochet 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 Aṣafiyyah III p. 514 no. 165; Calcutta Madrasah CXXXVI (17th century?).

(2) Sharḥ i (abyūr i) qaṣīdā i Anwarī of Mir Abū l-Ḥasan Ḥusaini Farahānī. According to Naṣḥīrābādī (who wrote around 1083/1672-3) he

3Shāhīrābādī is another name for Mālwāḥ, capital of the kingdom of Mālwāḥ (Sto.). For his commentary on the qaṣīdā of Khāṣṣānī see below, no. 224.
had recently been put to death in Shīrāz. See Naṣrābādī p. 276; Khwāsh-gā (Ethē’s summary) no. 642. Ms.: Oxford Ouseley 43 fol. 72-16 (Ethē 557. 17th century); London I.O. 948/II (Ms. dated 19 Ramadān of the 19th year of ʿĀlam-gīr/1087/1676); Or. 361 (Rieu p. 556-7. 17th century?); S.O.A.S. 46676 (Dated 29 Rabi‘ I 1135/1722); I.O. 949; I.O. Delhi 1241/2; Paris: Supplément 1524 (Blochet 1231. Dated Rabi‘ II 1072/1661. Autograph?); Leningrad Acad. B 126 (Index 2406); Acad. B 127 fol. 1a-53a (Index 2407. Incomplete); Istanbul: University, F.Y. 547 (Ateş 76. Dated 1164/1750-1); Tehran Majlis III 1105 (Dated 1028/1619); Majlis III 1106 (Dated 1230/1815); Majlis II 409 (Dated 1240/1824-5); [264] Majlis II 410; Mashhad Rīḍāwī III/vx Ms. 63 (Apparently an autograph); Rīḍāwī VII 701/1 (Dated Rabi‘ II 1022/1613); Pakistan: Munz. Pak. VII p. 45-6; seven copies in Lahore – the oldest dated 1041/1632 – and Karachi); Lucknow: Sprenger 100; Bankiāpore I 30 (Dated 1211/1796-7); Calcutta: Ivanov 455/I (Dated 1118/1706-7); Ivanov Curzon 193 (18th century?); Ivanov Curzon 194/1 (18th-19th century?).

Edition: Tehran 1349h./1961 (Sharḥ i mushkilāt i dīwān i Anwār, ed. Mudarris i Rīḍāwī).

(3) The same author’s commentary on the muqattaʿāt. Ms.: Oxford Ouseley 43 fol. 162a-199 (Ethē 557. 17th century?); Bodl. 371 (Ethē 558. Fragment); London I.O. 948/II (Ms. dated 19 Ramadān of the 19th year of ʿĀlam-gīr/1087/1676); Or. 3312 (Rieu Suppt. 219, Dated Dhū ḵ-ḥijjah ‘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 Rīḍāwī III/vx Ms. 63/II (Apparently an autograph); Rīḍāwī VII 701/2 (Dated Rabi‘ II 1022/1613); Rīḍāwī III/vx Ms. 70 (Dated 1055/1645); Bankiāpore I 30 (Dated 1211/1796-7); Lucknow: Sprenger 100; Calcutta: Ivanov 455/I (Dated 1118/1706-7); Ivanov Curzon 194/II (18th-19th century?).

(4) Unidentified commentary: Madras I 266; Bombay: Rehatkh 11.9-16. (Dated 21 Dīwānābād 1112/1701).


171. Abūl b. ʿUmar b. Āli-i-Nizāmī al-ʿArūṣī al-Samarqandi1 was a minor poet at the court of the Ghurids and a major prose writer, the author of the already frequently cited Chahār maqālaḥ. What we know of his life derives entirely from that book. He was in Samarqand 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 Murʿzīzī for the first time outside Tōs in 510/1116-7. He evidently spent some time in Nalīshtūr (he mentions being [266] there in 512/1118-9, 514/1120-1 and 530/1135-6) but was outside Herat with the Ghordī ʿAlāʾ al-din Iūsain

1As he calls himself in Chahār maqālaḥ p. 3.
in 547/1152. The *Chahār maqālah* were almost certainly written in, or shortly before, 552/1157 and dedicated to the Ghorid prince Ḥusām al-dīn ‘Alī b. Maṣʿūd. Of his further life we know nothing.

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

‘Afuṭī II p. 7, 207-8; Mustafī p. 753; Daulat-shāh p. 60-1; Rāzī III p. 352-4 (no. 1426); Hīdāyat, *Majma‘* 1 p. 635; Qazwīnī’s introduction to his edition of the *Chahār maqālah* (summarised in Browne’s English introduction); Khāyām-pūr p. 609; *EI*2 s.v. ‘Nizāmī ‘Arūḍī Samarqandī’ (H. Massé).

172. al-Sayyid al-ajall Ashrafī al-Samarqandī is included by ‘Afuṭī in his chapter on the poets of Transoxiana after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157) where we find, along with some other poems, verses from two odes to an unspecified Khwārazm-shāh and a *rubā‘* which ‘Afuṭī tells us was composed in Bukhārā in the year 597/1200-1; this contradicts Taqī’s claim that Ashrafī died in 595/1198-9.1 The later anthologists ascribe to him a good number of poems, hardly any of which overlap with ‘Afuṭī’s selection. Among those quoted by Hīdāyat is a short piece mentioning khhudawand i gētt, malik Arslān *parād i hamah mulk i Afrāsiyāb* evidently one of the Qarakhanids; but is it really his?

A selection of poems by ‘Sayyid Hasan Ashrafī’ is contained in *Oxford Whinfield 54* [267] (Beeston 2662/7). Dated 9 Rajab 1012/1603) it remains to be examined whether these do not in fact belong to Sayyid Hasan Ghaznavī (alias Ashrafī), despite the fact that the latter is represented (under his usual name) by a separate selection in the same manuscript.

‘Afuṭī II p. 390-2; Shams p. 389; Rāzī III p. 362-8 (no. 1431); Hīdāyat, *Majma‘* 1 p. 101-2; id., *Riyād* p. 168-9; Khāyām-pūr p. 44.

173. Aṣīl al-dīn b. al-Najīb al-Samarqandī was still alive at the time that ‘Afuṭī composed his anthology. ‘Afuṭī quotes only four of his verses, two of them a *rubā‘* mocking Sa’d Najībī (see below, no. 254).

---

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

---

174. Abū 1-*‘Alla* ‘Aṭīb b. Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyīb al-Kātib, *al-ma‘ṣrāf bi Nāk-kūk,*1 i.e. ‘out of tune’, was a secretary in the service of the Ghaznavī Ḥrāhmī b. Maṣʿūd (450/1059 to 492/1099). ‘Afuṭī gives the date of his death as 491/1098,2 says that he left *dīwan* in Persian and Arabic and that he was imprisoned in Lahore for eight years by the order of Ḥrāhmī. The *dīwan* of Maṣʿūd i Sa’d contains two essays on the death of ‘Aṭīb i Yaḥyīb3 and another poem addressed to him during his lifetime. ‘Afuṭī quotes several of his Persian poems. For the *Burūz-nāmah* wrongly attributed to him see below no. 317.


175. Aṭīb al-dīn Abū 1-Īfāq Muhammad b. Abī Tāhir al-Akhsikātī4 is a native of Akhsikātī(h), the capital of Farghānā,5 who emigrated to Western Persia and attached himself to the courts of the Seljuk sultans and their (nominal) subjects, the atabegs of Azerbaijan. The only three kings who are unambiguously (and repeatedly) mentioned in his panegyrics are the Seljuk Arslān b. Togrul (556/1161 to 571/1176), whose death is commemorated in an elegy,6 the atabeg Muẓaffar al-dīn Qizil Arslān b. Ėlīḡūzū (582/1186 to 587/1191)

---


2Hīdāyat has 471/1078-9; i.e. in his copy of ‘Afuṭī he read sab‘īn instead of târīn. The two words are of course very similar in Arabic script.

3Thrus (with further honorifics) in the *India Office manuscript* (see Humāyūn-Farrāthā’s introduction p. xxxii n. 1). Rāwānī and ‘Afuṭī call him merely Aṭīb Akhsikātī.

4Thrus Shams p. 273.

5Akhsikātī (thus pointed and vocalised in Yaḥyā, Bābūnī p. 162) is evidently an Arabized form for the local name, Akhsikātī (or however the first vowel is to be read); cf. (Manichean) Sogdian *šāyā*, ‘to rule’, and (Christian) Sogdian καρπός and ἱερός, ‘holy’.

6Dīwān p. 68.
and one 'Ali b. daulah Fakhr al-din 'Arab-shah, whom the poet apostrophizes as shah-i Qubistan, meaning presumably not the Qubistân in Eastern Iran, but Media/al-i-Bilad, i.e., one of the local dynasts in the mountains around Hamadân. For the identification of the other rulers praised in his poems the rubrics in the manuscripts of the divan (and in the printed edition) are of no use, as these are almost always fallacious. There is, however, at least one poem praising one Ghayth al-din. 

[269] with the title malik al-malak, presumably arsalân's predecessor, ghayth al-din Sulaimân (555/1160 to 556/1161), and at least one praising a certain rukn al-din, probably arsalân's successor toghril III (571/1176 to 590/1194). The editor's attempts to discover other seljuqs and stabeghs in the poems are either inconclusive or definitely wrong; there is in particular no evidence for his contention that athîr had already reached the Seljuq court at the time of Muhammad II.

athîr also praised a number of ministers and at least one (and probably several) of the Âl-i khujandi, the leaders of the shafi'i 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 four whom khujandis (several of them fictitious) in his long list of athîr's patrons, but the only one unambiguously named in the poems, namely janâl al-din mas'ûd, is absent from his list.

daulat-shah says that athîr fled from khurâsân 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. Taqî puts his death in 608/1211-25 and says that only with great difficulty did he find a copy of his divan containing about 10,000 verses.

Mss.: Oxford Elliot 38 (Eth 620); London i.o. 1029 (Ms. copied by 'abd al-mu'min al-'ala'î al-kashânî in 713-4/1314-5. Pictures.

1This is zakariyâ b. al-qaâwini, âthîr al-bilad, ed. Wüstenfeld, Göttingen 1848, p. 228; al-i-bilad ribât-yâsikh 'usâr khat Qubistan.

2Divan 1 290.

3P. 257-8.

4Divan p. 300. For this janâl al-din and the other members of the khujandi family see in detail below, no. 227 (ed. khujandi).

5Taqi, apud spranger p. 16 no. 27.

6Spranger 346.

---

Humâyûn-Farrukh's sîr); [270] Or. 258 (Rieu p. 563-4. 15th century?); Or. 10912 (meredith-owens p. 59. 17th century?); Cambridge Or. 1388 (2nd Supp. 183. 17th century?); Naples Bibl. Nazionale Ms. III, f.25 (Piemontese 222. 16th century?); Istanbul Aya sofya 2051/13 (Mikrîâfan-î h. i p. 409-10. Ms. apparently dated shawwâl 730/1330; Hekimoğlu Ali Paşa 669/11 (âthîr-i farrukh-i h. i p. 421); Tehran Golestaniatâtâbây II 465/2 (14th-15th century? four qaṣîdahs); Majlis 684/1 (Munz. 21433. Dated 996/1588); Majlis III 1183/1 (Ms. dated 1003/1594-5); Malik 4733 (Munz. 21435. Dated 26 sha'âbân 1005/1596. Humâyûn-Farrukh's nâm); Univ. XIV 4676 (Dated Safar 1013/1604); Malik (nuqshâh-hâ VI p. 198. Dated 1020/1611-2); Majlis VIII 2372 (Ms. contains the date 1081/1670-1); Malik 5307/15 (Munz. 21440. 17th century?); Mashhad Ridawi VII 965/1 (Ms. dated 1041/1631-2); Ridawi VII 342 (17th century?); Lucknow Sprenger 120; Calcutta Behrâ 297 (16th century?); Princeton 10 (Dated 920/1514-5). Cf. Munz. III 21431-48.


176. Fârid al-din 'A'târâ was the principal religious poet during the second half of the 12th century, the generation between Sanâ'î and Rûmi. [271] The contents of this article are the following: 2 Biography (p. 271); 'Major' works: (1) Khusrâv-nâmâ (p. 276); (2) Âsrâr-nâmâ (p. 278); (3) Manîq al-târîf (p. 281); (4) Mu'izzat-nâmâ (p. 288); (5) Ilâhî-nâmâ (p. 291); (6) Dîwân (p. 294); (7) Muhammad-nâmâ (p. 296); 'Minor', spurious and doubtful works (alphabetically by title) (p. 297); Literature (p. 318).

---

1For this and the older Mashhad Ms. see below, no. 247 (Mu'izzî).

2For 'A'târ's 'Tadhkîrât al-a'diliyâ' (in prose) see PL 1 p. 930-3.
Biography: ‘Aṭṭār’s contemporary ‘Aψfi includes him in the chapter devoted to the poets of Khwāzān after the time of Sanjar, calls him Farīd al-dīn Abū Hāmid Abū Bakr al-‘Aṭṭār al-Nasībārī and speaks of him in the present tense, from which fact one might conclude that he was still alive when ‘Aψfi composed his work in about 618/1221, or at least that ‘Aψfi had not yet heard of his death. Another contemporary, Shams i Qais, quotes a single verse (not apparently in the dīwān) by ‘Farīd i ‘Aṭṭār’ mentioning the Khwāzām-shīh Muhammad b. Tekiš (596/1200 to 617/1220). Our next source, Ibn al-Fuwāṭi, calls him Farīd al-dīn Saʿīd b. Yūsuf b. ‘Ali al-Nasībārī,1 known as al-‘Aṭṭār, and quoting Naṣīr al-dīn Ṭūsī (who was born in 597/1200 and was Ibn al-Fuwāṭi’s teacher) as saying that he met ‘Aṭṭār in Nasībār, that he was an eloquent and learned old man and that ‘he was martyred in Nasībār at the hands of the Tatār’, i.e. evidently during the sack of Nasībār in 617/1220. Ṭūsī was only twenty at that time and must therefore have been very [272] 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 Taqdībār al-aʿlāyá) have lent heavily on the apparent auto-biographical and auto-bibliographical statements in the poems Maqār al-ʿiqāb and Līsān 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 Līsān 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

1 The personal name Saʿīd does not seem to occur in any other source and results perhaps from the misunderstanding of a report which spoke of the ‘late’ (saʿīd) ‘Aṭṭār in the Tehran (Gulštān) Ms. of ‘Aṭṭār’s collected works, copied in 731/1331 (less than a decade after the death of Ibn al-Fuwāṭi) the poet is called Farīd al-dīn Muhammad al-‘Aṭṭār al-Nasībārī.

2 Intensive study of the ‘Aṭṭār corpus, first by Shīrāzī and then by Naṣīrī and (most systematically) by Ritter has [273] led to the conclusion that these two works are forgeries from around the middle of the 9th/10th 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, Hāfīz and Qāsim i Anārī, 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 Khusrāw-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) Khusrāw-nāmah, i.e. the first, apparently lost, version of the same - (2) Arsār-nāmah, (3) Mastiq al-tair, (4) Muḥtār-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 rubāʾīyat from the


2 Naṣīrī, Jawābir dar awdil wa iḥār i Farīdā i-dīn ‘Aṭṭār i Nāṣībār, Tehran 1320sh./1942. See also the notes in his edition of ‘Aṭṭār p. 734-45.


4 See Ritter, Der Islam 25, p. 152-5.
\textit{diwan}, destroyed some of them and rearranged the others in the present [274] (6) \textit{Mukhtar-námah}. In the verse preface to the surviving revised version of the \textit{Khusraw-námah} the author mentions the same six titles and adds (7) the \textit{Iblís-námah}. He refers further to an unnamed friend who had objected that the original \textit{Khusraw-námah} was too long and that, moreover, the author had repeated part of that poem in his \textit{Asrar-námah} (this confirms the order of the first two books as given above); therefore \textit{Attār} reworked and abridged the former poem. The abridged \textit{Khusraw-námah} is the last poem that is now generally accepted as the work of \textit{Attār}.

It is, however, possible that some of the remaining works in the corpus are his as well, namely those belonging to Ritter’s ‘\textit{Group II},’ of which the most important are the \textit{Ushkur-námah}, the \textit{Jauhar al-dhāt} and the \textit{Haidaj-námah}. Nafisi ascribed those to the 15th-century author of the above-mentioned forged works, \textit{Attār Tūnī}, but Ritter\footnote{Or \textit{Oriens XI} p. 7-8.} has shown that they are already attested in manuscripts of the 14th\footnote{The \textit{Konya} Ms. of \textit{Jauhar al-dhāt} is dated 735/1335 (if correctly read). The \textit{Leyden} Ms. of \textit{Ushkur-námah} is dated 786/1384.} and early 15th centuries and also that their content differs significantly from the works of the Shiite forger. If they are not by \textit{Attār} then they must be the works of an earlier pseudopigraphist who (like the poet from Tūnī) laid claim to \textit{Attār}’s authentic\footnote{See \textit{Munusqājī}’s edition p. 42.} works. If authentic, the \textit{Ushkur-námah} must be \textit{Attār}’s poem number (8), for in the prologue\footnote{Because of the large number of available copies I have aimed at some degree of completeness only for Ms. copied down to about the end of the 9th/15th century.} the author mentions only the five indubitably authentic \textit{mathnawīs}; if it is a forgery it must in any case have been forged at a time when the other works of \textit{Pseudo-Attār} had not yet come into existence. It is followed by (9) \textit{Jauhar al-dhāt}, the author of which mentions the \textit{Ushkur-námah} and the \textit{Mustaqīm-námah} and says that he is still working on the \textit{Haidaj-námah}. This (10) \textit{Haidaj-námah}, in turn, refers back to the \textit{Jauhar al-dhāt}. However, since the works in ‘\textit{Group II}’ have not as yet been studied in detail we have thought it more prudent to leave them, for the while, amongst the ‘doubtful’ writings.

\textit{Attār}’s two earliest poems (\textit{Khusraw-námah} and \textit{Asrar-námah}) are strikingly similar not only in title but also in their general character to Nizāmī’s first two books, \textit{Makhzan al-asrār} and \textit{Khusraw-Shāhīn}. In the absence of an absolute chronology of \textit{Attār}’s works it is difficult to say who influenced whom. Nizāmī in any event admits in the preface to his first poem to familiarity with Sanā’ī’s \textit{Hūdūq} but gives no hint of knowing anything of \textit{Attār}.

The \textit{mathnawīs} by, or ascribed to, \textit{Attār} are mostly found in collective manuscripts, generally with the title \textit{Kulliyāt} i \textit{Attār}. These differ in their contents one from the other and the works contained in them have been catalogued separately (and selectively)\footnote{Ibid. p. 160-72.} in what follows. A large number of Ms. of \textit{Attār}’s \textit{Kulliyāt} and of collective Ms. containing one or more of his poetic works together with works of other authors [276] are listed by Ritter, \textit{Oriens XI} p. 8-62, and a smaller selection is in \textit{Munus} III 1787-911.

Edition of the \textit{\textquoteleft Kulliyāt\textquoteright}:

\textit{Lucknow} 1872.

\textbf{Authentic works:}

(1) \textit{Khusraw-námah}, also called \textit{Khusraw u Gul, Gul u Khusraw or Gul u Hurmuz} (inc. \textit{ba nā m i an-kh gal j i jīm u jān sōkti tīlim i gal i jān har du jāhān sōkti}), is a romantic story of the son of the king of the Byzantines and the daughter of the ruler of Khūzestān. The author says that it is based on a prose work by one Badr Ahwāzī. The verse introduction (for which see above, ‘biography’) indicates that \textit{Attār} reworked and shortened his original version of the book. Ritter remarked that all the Ms. 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, \textit{Der Islam} XXV, p. 114-52, and, for a detailed summary of the story, ibid. p. 160-72.
Mss.: 1 Dublin Beatty 117/V (Dated 821/1418); Beatty 288 (19th century? Pictures); Oxford Ouseley 371/4 (Ethé 626. 16th century?); Ouseley 353/1 (Ethé 627. Ms. has a note dated ‘13 which Ethé interprets as 1013/1604-5); Elliot 206/6 (Ethé 622. Contains a seal dated 1020/1611-2); Ouseley 374/4 (Ethé 623. Ms. dated 23 Jumâdâ I 1027/1618); Elliot 208/4 (Ethé 624. Ms. dated 4 Dhî l-hijjah 1078/1668); Elliot 204/6 (Ethé 625); Elliot 204/3 (Ethé 625); London Or. 2888/II (Rieu Suppt. 237. Dated Rabi' II 893/1488); I.O. 1032/8 (Dated 1025/1616); Add. 16,787/V (Rieu p. 576. Dated Sha'bân 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 (Blochet 1294). Dated Shawwâl 696/1297, some [277] leaves restored in 19th century. Blochet 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. (Blochet 1291). Ms. dated 27 Shawwâl 1013/1605. Apparently contains two different versions of the poem); Leningrad Kokand Collection 38 fol. 406-512 (See Rosenberg’s edition of the Zarzadnâh-nâmah p. x. Dated 1064/1653-4); Istanbul Asç Collection (Orients XI p. 9-10. Dated 22 Rabi' II 816/1413); Université FY 538/4 (Ates 119. Dated 826/1423); Topkapı, Ahmet III 3059/4 (Karatay 484; Orients XI p. 11-2. Ms. dated 27 Shawwâl 841/1438); Nuruosmaniye 4199/5 (Orients XI p. 13. Ms. dated 13 Rajab 847/1443); Université FY 1315/5 (Ates 120; Orients XI p. 13-4. Ms. dated Rabi' II 1484/1444); Haleb 234/8 (Orients XI p. 14-7. Ms. dated 889/1484); Université FY 473/3 (Ates 121; Orients XI p. 19. Dated 24 Shawwâl 900/1495); Topkapı, Revan 1044 (Karatay 500; Der Islam XXV p. 173. Copied by Ahmad b. Sulûk ‘Ali in 981/1573-4. According to Katayat the Ms. contains ‘Ashrâr al-dhârîn, but Ritter says it is Khusrau-nâmah. Pictures); Fatih 4052/7 (Ritter-Reinert p. 129-0; Orients XI p. 24-5. 16th century?); Université FY 213-214/3. (Ates 122; Orients XI p. 20-4. Dated 10 Shawwâl 1058/1648); Lâleli 2010/8 (Mekteb-ﬁlm-hâ I 403); Madnînâ 4Arif Hikmat 30 (Nasqâh-hâ I V p. 484. Ms. dated 859/1455. Presumably this poem; the catalogue has ‘Khusrau u Shîrîn’); Hamadân I’timâd al-daulâh (Nasqâh-hâ I V p. 345. Ms. dated 28 Shawwâl 831/1428); Tehran Majlis III 1147/5 (Ms. dated 840/1436-7); Asghar Mahdawi (Nasqâh-hâ III p. 483-4. Dated 1 Sha’tân 884/1479); Malik 5228 (Munz. 33345. Dated Moharram 905/1499); Lahore Univ. II/I p. 175-9. Ms. (no. 6, ‘Gul u Khusrav’, and no. 10, ‘Gul u Hurmuz’, of a Ms. dated 857/1453); Calcutta Ivanov 477/2 and 11 (Ms. dated 1006/1597-8. Two copies of different versions of the poem); Bûhár 300/I (18th century?); [278] Cambridge (Mass) Hearer Collection (Nasqâh-hâ IV p. 11. Ms. dated 827/1424).

Editions: Lucknow 1878-9 (with marginal glosses); Tehran 1340/1921 (ed. A. Suhaili-Khwânsâri).

(2) ‘Ashrâr-nâmah, a collection of edifying anecdotes which, unlike those in ‘Aţâr’s later works, are not bound together by a frame-story. The beginning occurs in two different forms (inc. I: ba nâm bî lân ki hân râ när bî dîn dîd * khirad râ dar khvad-daññî yagin dîd; inc. II: ba nâm bî lân ki hân az khâk ‘adam-e kardin * zi kafk-e u zî dîd-bî ‘lam-e kardin. Summary in Ritter, Meer, p. 30-1."

Mss.: 1 Dublin Beatty 117/IV (Ms. completed 821/1418); Beatty 322/III (Ms. copied by Ali b. Muhammad and dated Safar 821/1418); Beatty 324/II (Copied by Haüji Ahmad b. Sâliû al-Tâlîmî in 846/1442-3); Beatty 153 fol. 271 sqq. (Ms. dated 12 Rabi’II 881/1476); Oxford Elliot 207/14 (Ethé 622. Contains a seal dated 1020/1611-2); Ouseley 374/3 (Ethé 623. Ms. dated 23 Jumâdâ I 1027/1618); Elliot 208/9 (Ethé 624. Ms. dated 4 Dhî l-hijjah 1078/1668); Elliot 205/16 (Ethé 625); London I.O. 1034/2 (Copied by Muhammad Haüji b. Bâlû Haüji and dated 20 Rajab 807/1405); Or. 11325 fol. 70b-137b (Meredith-Owens p. 72. With a colophon in Ughur script dated 862/1457-8. Pictures); Or. 4151/III (Rieu Suppt. 235. Ms. dated 22 Rajab 877/1472. Pictures); Or. 2747/V (Rieu Suppt. 236. Ms. dated 22 Dhî l-hijjah 889/1485); Or. 332/II (Rieu p. 578. Dated 1000 to 1004/1591-2 to 1595-6); Add. 16,787/V (Rieu p. 576. Dated Sha’bân 1191/1777); I.O. 1031/I; 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. Dated 861/1455-6); [279] Ancien fonds 256/I (Blochet 1295/1296. Contains a note dated 889/1484. First 2 folios restored);

1See Ritter, Orients XI, p. 60-2; Munz. IV 27285-336; Munz. Pak. VII(1) p. 165-8.
Supplement 1429 fol. 10sqq. in marg. (Blochet 1308, 13th century); Supplement 1526 in marg. (Blochet 1296. Dated 905/1499-1500); Supplement 658 (Blochet 1306. Dated Ramadân 1008/1600. Incomplete); Leyden 310(1) (Cat. II DCL. Dated 786/1384); Basel Tschudi Collection (Oriens XI p. 10. Ms. completed in Muharram 828/1424); Florence Bibl. Nazionale Centrale Ms. Cl. III. 10 (Pieniak 127). Apparently dated 17 Rajab 844/1440; Gotha 52; Vienna Fligel 516/3 (Copied 2 Safar 902/1496 from an original dated 642/1244-5); Leningrad Acad. C1102 fol. 221a-226a (Index 133. Dated 708/1308-9); Acad. D 436 fol. 20Sb-234b (Index 3464. Ms. dated 1001/1592-3); Konya Mevlâna Müzesi 1734/2 (Ateş 46; Oriens XI p. 8-9. Copied by İbrahim b. ʿIyâd al-Maʿrâği and dated 19 Rajab 656/1258); Mevlâna Müzesi 91/2 (Ateş 46; Oriens XI p. 9. Copied by the same scribe and dated 5 Dhu l-ḥijjah 676/1278); İstanbul Üniversitesi FY 446 (Oriens XI p. 61. Copied by ʿAli b. Dîstîr u Khudî al-Rîfiʿî al-Anqârî al-Khaṭîb and dated 27 Dhu l-ḥijjah 725/1325); Halâl Ilâve 56 (Oriens XI p. 61. Copied by KhâÜzîb b. ʿUmar al-Qunwî and dated 23 Dhu l-ḥijjah 735/1335); Ateş Collection (Oriens XI p. 9-10. Ms. dated Jumâdâ II 816/1413); Türk ve İslâm Eserleri Müzesi 2044/1 (Oriens XI p. 61. Ms. dated 816/1413-4); Ayaşofya 4792/25 (Oriens XI p. 61. Dated 816/1413-4); Aṭṭuf Efendi 2241/15 (Oriens XI p. 31-3. Ms. dated 4 Dhu l-ḥijjah 828/1425); Nuruosmaniye 4199/2 (Oriens XI p. 13. Ms. dated 13 Rajab 847/1443); Üniversite FY 1315/1 (Ateş 120; Oriens XI p. 13-4. Ms. dated Rabîʾ I 848/1444); Türk ve İslâm Eserleri Müzesi 1992/1 (olim Nuruosmaniye 3786. Oriens XI p. 12-3. From the library of Shahrukh, d. 850/1447. Pictures; Hamidiye 627 (Oriens XI p. 61. Dated Rabîʾ I 887/1482); Halâl 234/7 (Oriens XI p. 14-7. Ms. dated 889/1484); Süleymaniye, Murad Buhari 213/4 [280] (Oriens XI p. 10-1. Ms. dated 9 Shaʿbân 989/1581); Üniversite FY 213-214/14. (Ateş 122; Oriens XI p. 20-4. Ms. completed 1060/1650); Fatih 4052/4 (Ritter-Rei neit p. 129-30; Oriens XI p. 24-5. 16th century); Ayyun Karahânsar 1788/1 (Oriens XI p. 10. Copied by ʿAli b. Rözbîhân and dated 824/1421); Caire Taşawwuf fûrâşi 23/8 (Oriens XI p. 34-5. Ms. dated 1 Muharram 852/1448); 139 mîm adâb fûrâşi (Târîx 1835/4. Ms. dated 20 Muharram 858/1454); Malûnîn ʿArif Hikmat 143 adâb fûrâşi (Nuskhâ-hâ V p. 571-2. Ms. dated Jumâdâ II 844/1440); Tabriz Millî 393/4 (Nuskhâ-hâ IV p. 309. Ms. dated 1 Safar 885/1480); Hamadân Pîmâd al-daulâl (Nuskhâ-hâ V p. 345. Ms. dated 28 Shawwâl 831/1428); Shiraz Wîsâl (Nuskhâ-hâ p. 293 no. 34. Ms. dated 829/1427); Tehran Gulistan/Âتابîy II 327/II (Ms. copied by Abî Bakr b. ʿAli b. Isfârâʿîfî and dated Shaʿbân 731/1331); Malîk 597/4 (Munj. 2290). Dated Rajab 808/1405-6; Malîk 595/1 (Munj. 17880. Dated 819/1416-7); Majlis III 1147/4 (Ms. dated 840/1436-7); Gulistan/Âتابîy II 325/IV (Ms. dated 25 Ramadân 880/1476. Pictures); Asghar Mahdawi (Nuskhâ-hâ III p. 483-4. Ms. dated 884/1479-80); Bâyâtî 55/1 (Nuskhâ-hâ I p. 15. Copied by Amr Allah b. Shâikh Uwais Nâjîjahâhî and dated 901/1495-6); Gulistan/Âتابîy II 324 (Copied by Şâh Mahmûd al-Nâsîbûrî in 970/1562-3); Mashhad Ridwâni VII 770/1 (Ms. dated 10 Rajab 911/1505); Ridwâni VII 769/5 (Has a note dated 1052/1642-3); Tashtekîn Acad. II 855/6 (Dated Jumâdâ I 827/1424); Lahore Univ. II/1 p. 175-9 (No. 12 of a Ms. dated 857/1453); Lucknow Sprenger 140; Bankiore I 51 in marg. (14th century?); I 47/II (Dated 13 Safar 1123/1711); Calcutta Ivanov 477/6 (Ms. dated 1066/1557-8); Ivanov 478/2 (17th century?); Ivanov 479/3 (17th century? Calls itself 'Intikhab i A.N.'); Ivanov 484 (17th century?); Ivanov Curzon 204/5 (Ms. contains seals dated 1169/1755-6); Bûhâr 310/III (18th century?); Cambridge (Mass.) Hofer Collection (Nuskhâ-hâ IV p. 11. Ms. dated 827/1424). [281]


Translation (Turkish): by Hûdûrî, at the time of Selim I. See Oriens XI p. 62.


(3) Marâqî al-fûrâ’ or Mâqâmât al-tâyyîr (inc. âfîn jân-âfîn i pûk rû * ân-kîn jân bâkhsâhî musthî-l khâb rû). According to the verses at the end of some of the manuscripts, the poem was completed on Tuesday,
the 20th of Ramadan (muhār i kholā), 573/Tuesday 14 March 1178. 1 But in other Ms. (including the oldest) the khitāmah is missing altogether. The poem is based on the Risālat al-tair, extant in Arabic and Persian prose versions attributed to Muhammad (or Ahmad) al-Ghazālī. 2 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. 3 Dublin Beatty 117/II (DATED 819/1416-7); Beatty 321/II (Ms. copied by ʿAli b. Muhammad and dated ʿAshar 821/1418); Beatty 124 vol. II no. vii (Ms. completed ʿAshar 840/1436); Beatty 324/I (Copied by ʿAbd al-Malek b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Mufarrek in 847/1443-4); Beatty 153 fol. 2b sqq. (Ms. dated 12 Rabii 2 881/1476); Beatty 160 (signed by Sulṭān ʿAli al-Maṣḥūdī, who died in 919/1513); Manchester Lindesian 540 (DATED 1007/1598-9); Oxford Pers. d. 71 fol. 1-137a in marg. (Beeston 2564. Ms. completed 16 Ramadān 874/1467. Several leaves missing); Elliot 246 (Ethē 628; Robinson 501-7. DATED 19 Jumādā II 898/1493. Pictures); Ouseley Add. 105 (Ethē 629. Dated 3d year of Akbar 1557-8); Ouseley 63 (Ethē 630. 16th century?); 282 Elliot 207/13 (Ethē 622. Contains a seal dated 1020/1611-2); Ouseley 374/I (Ethē 623. Ms. dated 23 Jumādā I 1027/1618); Elliot 209/18 (Ethē 624. Ms. dated 4 Dhu l-Ḥijjah 1078/1668); Elliot 205/17 (Ethē 625); Seld. Sup. 25 (Ethē 631); Whinfield 67 (Beeston 2565. Imperfect at both ends); Eton 123; London Add. 27, 261/XIV (Riu p. 868-71. Ms. dated Jumādā I 814/1411. Beginning only); Or. 12003 (Meredith-Owens p. 74. DATED 848/1444-5); Or. 11325 fol. 1b-70a (Meredith-Owens p. 72. With a colophon in Uighur script dated 862/1457-8. Pictures); Or. 4151/II (Riu Suppt. 235. Ms. dated 22 Rajab 877/1472. Pictures); Or. 2747/III (Riu Suppt. 236. Ms. dated 22 Dhu l-Ḥijjah 1374/1485); I.O. 2875 (DATED 985/1577-8); Add. 7735 (Riu p. 577-8. 16th century?); Or. 1227 (Riu p. 578. 16th century? Several leaves missing at both ends); I.O. 1032/6 (DATED 1025/1616); Add. 7737/II (Riu p. 816. Dated Rabī 2 1033/1624); Add. 16,788 (Riu p. 578. Dated Dhu ʿIlhām 1051/1641); I.O. 1036 (DATED 17 Shābān 1105/1694); Add. 16,787/I (Riu p. 576. Dated Shābān 1191/1777); Hetsel 3265 (Riu p. 578. 18th century?); Or. 5010 (Meredith-Owens p. 65. DATED 1288/1871-2. Pictures); I.O. 1031/5; I.O. 1035/1; I.O. 1043-1045; Cambridge Or. 1698/5 (2nd Suppt. 443. Ms. dated 829/1425-6); Or. 195 (Browne Suppt. 1263. DATED 852/1448-9); Or. 264 (Browne Suppt. 1264. DATED 900/1494-5); Or. 190 (Browne Suppt. 1262. DATED 925/1519); Corpus, No. 231 (Browne Suppt. 1265. DATED 1239/1823-4); Dd. 11. 17. (Browne Cat. CCXXIII); Paris Suppiment 1777 fol. 1v sqq. in marg. (Bochet 1645. Ms. dated 852/1448); Suppiment 781 A fol. 359r sqq. (Bochet 1972. Ms. dated Rabī 1 892/1487. End missing); Ancien fonds 348 (Bochet 1298/Richard). DATED 9 Jumādā I 897/1492. Pictures); Ancien fonds 318/I (Bochet 1300/Richard. 15th century? End missing. Pictures); Suppiment 657/I (Bochet 1466. Copied by Muhāmmed b. Murshid b. ʿAlī al-Naqāth, 15th century?); 283 Suppiment 1906 (Bochet 1299. 16th century? First pages restored); Suppiment 2025 (Bochet 1457. 16th century?); Suppiment 811 fol. 264v sqq. (Bochet 1291. Ms. dated 27 Shawwāl 1013/1605); Suppiment 655 (Bochet 1301. DATED 1045/1635); Suppiment 655 (Bochet 1302. 17th century?); Suppiment 6682 fol. 58v sqq. (Bochet 2187. DATED 1215/1800-1); Suppiment 1709 (Bochet 1303. 19th century?); Suppiment 1710 (Bochet 1305. 19th century?); Suppiment 1807 (Bochet 1304. 19th century?); Basel Tschudi Collection (Orients XI p. 10. DATED Muhārām 828/1424); Turin Bibl. Reale Ms. Or. 40 (Piemontese 338. Copied by Nāṣir b. Hasan al-Makki and dated ʿAshar 87/1453. Pictures); 1 Parma 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); 187 Quattr. (Aumer 34. DATED 973/1565-6); 187 Quattr. (Aumer 32); Berlin Ms. or. oct. 2150 in marg. (Heinz 207. The main body of the Ms. was copied by Darwīsh 1 A facsimile of the Turin Ms. was published in Tehran in 1994. 1 2 The Risālat al-tair (or tuwar) in Persian prose has been published for the first time, and the Arabic prose version republished, in Majmuʿat i ʿithār i farsi i Ahmad al-Ghazālī, ed. Ahmad Mūsjāhīd, Tehran 1973b.1-991-2, p. 7-92 of the second series of pages. The editor thinks that the Persian risālah is ‘certainly’ by Ahmad Ghazi (Kī, the Arabic ‘probably’ by his brother Muhammad. See also, with different conclusions, Ritter, Meer, p. 8-18 (and the literature cited there); EP s.v. ‘al-Ghazālī, Ahmad b. Muhammad’ (H. Ritter); EP 2 s.v. ‘Simurgh’. 3 See Ritter, Orients XI, p. 50-56; Munz. IV 35445-577; Munz. Pak. VII(1) p. 193-8.)
Isfârâni and dated Shâbân 731/1331); Malik 5974/2 (Munz. 35480; Dated Jumâdâ I 808/1406); Adâbâyî 1 p. 502 (Dated Rajab 830/1427); Malik 5955/1 (Munz. 17880. Ms. dated 819/1416-7); Majlîs III 1473 (Ms. dated 840/1436-7); Miîfâh (Munz. 35468. Dated 19 Shâbân 862/1458); Majlîs 8981/2 (Munz. 35470. Dated 868/1463-4); Gulistân/Atâbây II 325/II (Ms. dated 25 Ramaḍân 880/1476. Pictures); Aṣghâr Mâhdâwi (Nuskhâh-hâ III p. 483-4. Ms. dated 884/1479-80); Bayânî 15 (Nuskhâh-hâ I p. 9. 15th century?); Bayânî 16 (Nuskhâh-hâ I p. 9. 17th century?); Gulistân/Atâbây II 328 (Dated 30 Muḥarram 1236/1820); Gulistân/Atâbây II 330 (Dated Rashî I 1257/1841); Gulistân/Atâbây II 329 (Dated Ramaḍân 1258/1842); Mashhad Râdawî VII 770/4 (Ms. dated 10 Rajab 911/1505); Râdawî VII 769/3 (Has a note dated 1052/1642-3); Tashkent 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/I p. 175-9 (No. 11 of a Ms. dated 857/1453); Bombay Univ. X/2 (Dated 23 Rashî I 1004/1595. Incomplete); Lucknow Springer 132 (several copies); Bankipore I 51 (14th century?); I 50 (Dated 7 Jumâdâ I 842/1438. Pictures); I 46/III (17th century?); Calcutta Ivanov 477/7 (Ms. dated 1006/1597-8); Ivanov 479/1 (17th century?); Bûhâr 301 (17th century? Damaged); Ivanov Curzon 205 (Dated 25 Ramaḍân 1114/1703); Ivanov 480/1 (Dated 49th year of Auranzâbâ 1116/1704-5); Bûhâr 300/IV (18th century?); Cambridge Mass) Hofer Collection (Nuskhâh-hâ IV p. 11. Ms. dated 827/1424).


Translations: (Turkish): The Old Anatolian translation by Süleyman Gûlîshehrî, written in 717/1317-8, has been published (facsimile of the Ms.) in Ankara 1957; see Orients XI p. 56 (with further literature). Further versions by Kurvat olâlî Pir Mîmêm b. Evrânî (d. 967/1559-60), Fedâî Dedê (1045/1635-6), Ahmad Siwâstî and Mîr 'AÎl Shîrâ Nâwî (in Chaghâhâti) are discussed there as well. Modern Turkish translation: Mantik-ı-tayr tercemesi, by A. Gölpınarlı, Istanbul 1944.

(‘Urdu): two translations (one in Dak’hîni verse) are mentioned by Elhâd I.O. 1031/5.


(Swedish): Mantiq-at-Tayr, tr. E. Hermelin, 2 volumes, with a reprint of Garcin de Tassy’s Persian text, Stockholm 1929. [288]


Epitome: Intikhâb i Mantiq i Tair in 16 maqâllahs, written by Muhammad Badakhshânî for Bayezid II. Ms.: Istanbul Fatih 3678 (Ritter-Reinert p. 130. Autograph dated 898/1492-3).

Commentaries: By Shamî (d. ca. 1005/1596-7) in Turkish. Ms.: Istanbul Carullah 1716 (Orients XI p. 55).

Modern Persian prose paraphrase: Bab šây i St-murchh, by Nîmat Allah Qâfî, called Shakîb, Tehran 1343sh./1964.

(4) Musâbât-nâmeh, also called Naz'hat-nâmeh or Jawâb-nâmeh (inc. ħand i pâk az jân i pâkân pâk râ * kîh khilâfat dâd maktî-ê khâk râ). Summary in Ritter, Meer, p. 18-30.

1See below, p. 313.
 avanzo. Ayasofya 4792/26 (Orients XI p. 57. Dated 816/1413-4). Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi 2044/15 (Ms. dated 816/1413-4); Nuru- sonunye 4198/1 (Ates 118. Ms. dated 825/1422); Üniversite FY 538/3 (Ates 119. Ms. dated 826/1423); Atf Efendi 2241/2 (Orients XI p. 31-33. Ms. dated 4 Dihâ 1-hijjah 828/1425); Söyleşimyanesi, Murad Buhari 231/1 [290] (Orients XI p. 10-1. Copied by Sulaimân b. ‘Ali-shâh b. Dânîyâl and dated 10 Dihâ 1-hijjah 836/1433); Nuruusunyane 4199/3 (Orients XI p. 13. Ms. dated 13 Rajab 847/1443); Üniversite FY 1315/2 (Ates 120; Orients XI p. 13-4. Ms. dated Rabî I 848/1444); Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi 1992/4 (olim Nuruusunyane 3786. Orients XI p. 12-3. From the library of Shâh-rukh, d. 850/1447. Pictures); Nazif Paşa 456/1 (Orients XI p. 14. Dated 28 Ramaḍân 865/1450; Halât 234/4 (Orients XI p. 14-7. Ms. dated 889/1484); Ayasofya 1659/3 (Orients XI p. 17-9. Ms. dated 26 Rabî’I 890/1485); Halât 329 (Orients XI p. 57-8. Dated 890/1485); Topkapı, Ahmet III 1527/2 (Karatay 495; Orients XI p. 20. Copied by Abd Allah al-Samargandi and dated Rajab 902/1497; With Turkish translation); Fatih 4052/5 (Ritter-Reinert d. 130-92; Orients XI p. 24-5. 16th century); Üniversite FY 213-214/5. (Ates 122; Orients XI p. 20-4. Dated 15 Jumâdâ I 1059/1649); Cairo Taşavwuf fârisî 236/6 (Orients XI p. 34-5. Dated 1 Muharram 852/1448); 139 mîm adab fârisî (Tirâzî 1835/3. Ms. dated 20 Muharram 858/1454); Tabriz Millî 1936/4 (Nushkâh-hâ V p. 309. Ms. dated 1 Şafar 885/1480); Hamadan Pîtimâd al-daûlât (Nushkâh-hâ V p. 345. Dated 3 Dihâ I-qa’dah 830/1427); Shiraz Wâljî (Nushkâh-hâ p. 293 no. 34. Ms. dated 892/1487); Tehran Gulistân/âtâyâbâh II 327/4 (Ms. copied by Abbî Bakr b. ‘Abbî al-Iṣfârînî and dated Shahîbân 731/1331); Malik 5955/1 (Munz. 17880. Ms. dated 819/1416-7); Asghar Mahdawi (Nushkâh-hâ III p. 483-4. Ms. dated 884/1487-90); Gulistân/âtâyâbâh II 325/III (Ms. dated 25 Ramaḍân 880/1476. Pictures); Majlis III 1147/2 (Ms. dated 840/1436-7); Malik 5062/9 (Munz. 35981. Dated 952/1545-6); Mashhad Râdîwî VII 770/3 (Ms. dated 10 Rajab 911/1505); Rûdîwî VII 769/4 (Has a note dated 1052/1642-3); Tashêkât Acad. II 853/5 (Ms. dated 6 Jumâdâ I 827/1424); Dushânbê Acad. II 414 (17th century); Lahore Univ. III/1 p. 175-9 (No. 5 of a Ms. dated 857/1453); Lucknow Spîrêgê 124 [291] (two copies); Bankipore I 46/IV (17th century?); I 47/IV (Dated 17 Rajab 1123/1711); Calcutta Ivanov 477/8 (Ms. dated 1006/1597-8); Ivanov 478/3 (17th century?); Ivanov 479/2 (17th century?); Ivanov Curzôn 204/3 (Followed by a colophon – evi-

1See Ritter, Orients XI, p. 56-60; Munz. IV 35064-103; Munz. Pak. VII/1 p. 191-3.
dentilly forged or copied from the original - dated 13 Rajab 699/1300.
The Ms. contains seals dated 1169/1755-6); Cambridge (Mass) Hofer Collection (Naskhāt-hā IV p. 11. Ms. dated 827/1424).
Translations (Turkish): For the translation by Pir Mehmemmed (for Murad II) and the abridged Turkish version by Ahmadī (with the misleading title Asrār-nāmah) see Oriens XI p. 58-60.

(5) Ilāhī-nāmah 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 nūm ighārār i ḥaḍt i ʾkāf al-kāf * kih paizd kard ādam az kaf-ʾē khak; inc. II: ba nūm i ṣīn kih man-ash bē zanjīl ast * bā māw-ʾē širīg fī ʿābr-ʾē ṣāl ast; inc. III: īlāhī-nāmah rā ʾgāhāt kardam * ba nūm-ār bāb i nāmah hāz kardam). Summary in Ritter, Meer, p. 4-8.

Ms.:† Dublin Beatty 117/1 (Ms. completed 821/1418); Beatty 153 fol. 116 sqq. (Ms. dated 12 Rabī’ II 881/1476); Manchester Lindesiana 225 (Dated 1143/1730-1); Oxford Pers. d. 71 (Beeston 2564. Ms. completed 16 Ramadān 874/1470. Several leaves missing); Elliot 207/11 (Ethé 622. Contains a seal dated 1020/1611-2); Ouseley 374/5 [292] (Ethé 623. Ms. dated 23 Jumādā I 1027/1618); Elliot 208/8 (Ethé 624. Ms. dated 4 Dhī 1-ḥijjah 1078/1668); Elliot 204/1 (Ethé 625); London I.O. 1034/3a-b (Copied by Muhammad Hājjī b. Bābā Hājjī and dated 20 Ramadān 807/1405); Add. 27,261/XIII (Rieu p. 868-71. Dated Jumādā II 814/1411); Or. 4151/1 (Rieu Suppt. 235. Ms. dated 22 Rajab 877/1472. Pictures); Or. 2747/II (Rieu Suppt. 236. Ms. dated 22 Dhī 1-ḥijjah 889/1485. Incomplete); Or. 332/1 (Rieu p. 578. Dated 1000 to 1004/1591-2 to 1595-6); I.O. 1032/2 (Dated 1025/1616); Add. 7089 (Rieu p. 578. 17th century? With additional verses at beginning and end); Add. 16,787/II (Rieu p. 576. Dated Shaʿbān 1191/1777); I.O.

1See Ritter, Oriens XI p. 47-9; Munz. IV 27568-661; Munz. Pak. VII/1 p. 169-70.
(Nasākh-hā IV p. 309. Ms. dated 1 Safar 885/1480); Hamadan
Tinād al-daulah (Nasākh-hā V p. 345. Ms. dated 28 Shawwāl
831/1428); Tehran Gulistān/Aṭābāy II 327/V (Ms. copied by Abū Bakr
b. ‘Alī al-Isfārā’īn and dated Shabrān 731/1331); Malik 5974/4 (Munz.
27570. Dated 10 Shabrān 808/1406); Malik 5955/1 (Munz. 17880. Ms.
dated 819/1416-7); Majlis III 1147/1 (Ms. dated 840/1436-7);
Gulisṭān/Aṭābāy II 325/I (Ms. dated 25 Ramaḍān 880/1476. Pictures).
Asghar Mahdawi (Nasākh-hā III p. 483-4. Ms. dated 884/1479-80);
Gulisṭān/Aṭābāy II 457/III (Ms. completed Rabi‘ I 1083/1672);
Tasbīkh
Acad. II 855/I (Ms. dated 6 Jumādā I 827/1424); [294] Dushanbe
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 Ramaḍān 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).
Editions: Lucknow 1872; Tehran 1316/1898-9; 1356/1937-8;
1359sh./1959 (ed. F. Rūḥānī, based mainly on Ritter, but without
variants), reprinted 1351sh./1972, 1359sh./1980; Istanbul/Leipzig 1940
(‘Abbāsi. Die Geschichte des Königs mit seinen sechs Söhnen, ed. H.
Ritter; the only critical edition). 2
Translations (Turkish verse): 1 Bürat-nûmâ by Shemsi, dedicated to
Murād III. Mss.: Leipzig Fleischer CCCXXIV (Dated Rabi‘ I
1025/1616); Istanbul Bayezid 3315 (Ornix XI p. 49).
(French prose): Le livre divin, tr. F. Rouhani, Paris 1961,
reprinted 1990.
(English prose): The Ḥādiṭ-i-nāma or Book of God, translated (with
copious notes) by J.A. Boyle, Manchester 1976.

(6) ‘Attār’s Dīwān 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, Ornix XII p. 1-83.

Mss. 2 Oxford Elliot 207/20 (Eṭhē 622. Contains a seal dated
1020/1611-2); Ouseley 374/19 (Eṭhē 623. Ms. dated 23 Jumādā I
1027/1618); Elliot 209/20 (Eṭhē 624. Ms. dated 4 Dīhil-i-hijjah
1078/1668); [285] Elliot 205/11, 19 (Eṭhē 625); Elliot 46 (Eṭhē 630);
London I.O. 1032/II (Dated 1025/1616); I.O. 1031/II; Cambridge
Or. 1670-1/l (2nd Suppt. 421. Photostat of a Ms. in a private collection.
16th century?): Paris Splement 1795/I (Bloanet 1292. Ms. dated 4
Ṣafar 821/1418); Supplement 811 fol 465v sqq. (Bloechet 1291. Dated
27 Shawwāl 1013/1605); Leningrad Acad. C 1611 (Index 1576.
Dated 1044/1634-5. Lacumae); Istanbul Ayasofya 2910/6 (Ornis XII p.
86. Ms. dated 706/1306-7. 14 gastada); Halet Ilavé 238/2 (Ornis p.
85. Ms. dated 727/1326-7); Ayasofya 2051/6 (Ornis XII p. 86;
Mīrāfīlm-hā I p. 409-10, Ms. apparently dated Shawwāl 730/1330.
dated Jumādā II 811/1408. ‘Ghaṣalīyyat wa rubbiyyār’); Ayasofya
3857/23 (Ornis XII p. 86. Ms. dated 816/1413-4); Topkapı, Ahmet III
3059/5 (Karatay 484; Ornis XI p. 11-2. Ms. dated 27 Shawwāl
841/1438); Halet 234/14 (Ornis XI p. 14-7. Ms. dated 889/1484);
Ayasofya 1659/5 (Ornis XI p. 17-9. Ms. dated 26 Rabi‘ II 890/1485);
Universite FY 473/2 (Ates 121; Ornis XI p. 19. Ms. completed 5
Jumādā I 902/1497); Universite FY 490 fol. 1b-88b (Ates 123, 13th
century? ‘Muntakhab i ghazalīyyat’); Fatih 4052/1 (Ritter-Reinert
529-30; Ornis XI p. 24-5. 16th century?); Medinan ‘Arif Hikmat 143
dabārī (Nasākh-hā V p. 571-2. Ms. dated Jumādā II 844/1440); Tehran
Majlis VIII 2600 (First part copied by Fadl Allah Qazwīnī and
dated 688/1289; second part by Hasan Ḥāji Muhammad and dated 1 Dīhil-
hijjah 707/1308); Gulistān/Aṭābāy II 327/I (Ms. copied by Abī Bakr
b. ‘Alī al-Isfārā’īn and dated Shabrān 731/1331. ‘Kībat qaṣīrd wa ghazalīyyat’);
Bayānī 13 (Nasākh-hā I p. 9. 14th century?); Bayānī 14
(Nasākh-hā I p. 9. 14th century? Selections); Shīrāz i Isānī I 306 (14th
century?); Gulistān/Aṭābāy II 326 (Has a note dated 14 Rajab
1128/1716. 83 ghazals only); Mashhad Ridawī VII 770/2 [296] (Ms.
dated 10 Rajab 911/1505. ‘Ghaṣalīyyat’); Tasbīkh 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/I (Dated
1006/1597-8); Ivanov 487 (17th century?).
Editions: Tehran 1319sh./1940 (ed. S. Naftis) reprinted
1335sh./1956, 1339sh./1960; 1341sh./1962 (ed. T. Tafadūlī), reprinted
1345sh./1967.)


1See Ritter, Oriens XIII-XIV p. 227-8; Munz. IV 34706-26.
Supplément 1485 (Blochet 1320, 19th century); Vienna Kraft CXCl (Dated 1232/1816-7); Leningrad Acad. D 436 fol. 261b-263a (Index 3464. Ms. dated 1001/1592-3); Istanbul Univeriste FY 213-214/12, (Ates 122; Orıens XI p. 20-4. Ms. completed 1060/1650); Universite FY 167 (Ates 144, 19th century?); Lucknow Sprenger 123; Bankipore 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. Munz. IV 27908-20.

Editions: Cawnpore 1850; 1891; 1897; Lucknow 1872 (in the 'Kalpadta'); 1877; twice, with other works); 1302/1885; 1315/1897; Tehran 1309/1891-2; 1319/1901; 1325/1907.

(3) Bulbul-nāmah or Gul u Bulbul (inc. qalām bar dār i rāz i dīl 'īyan kun * sar-āghāz-ash ha nām i ghāib-dān kun). The story of Solomon and a nightingale. In two 15th-century MSS. it is attributed to one 'Atār Ťīnī, i.e. presumably the author of the forged Mazhīr al-'ajā'īb and Līstān al-ghāib. Note, however, the early dates in the Dublin, Istanbul and London manuscripts.

Mss.: Dublin Beaty 321/VI (Ms. copied by 'Ali b. Muhammad and dated Safar 821/1418); Oxford [299] Eliot 207/8 (Ethē 622. Contains a seal dated 1020/1611-2); Ouseley 374/8 (Ethē 623. Ms. dated 23 Jumādā I 1027/1618); Eliot 209/14 (Ethē 624. Ms. dated 4 Dhu l-hijjah 1078/1668); Eliot 205/12 (Ethē 625); London I.O. 1034/4 (Ms. copied by Muhammad Hājjī b. Bābā Hājjī and completed 1 Dhu l-qa'dāh 812/1410); I.O. 1032/5 (Dated 1025/1616); Or 5415 fol. 678-71b (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); LI. 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 Supplication 1398 fol. 35v sqq. (Blochet 1970. Dated 861/1456-7); Supplément 781A fol. 278v sqq. (Blochet 1972. Ms. dated Rābi‘ I 892/1487); Ancien fonds 343/II (Blochet 1297/ Richard. 16th century? End missing); Supplément 811 fol. 448v-452v (Blochet 1291. Ms. dated 27 Shawwāl 1031/1605); Baseli Tschudi Collection (Orıens XI p. 10. Ms. completed in Muharram 828/1424); Leningrad Acad. D 436 fol. 237b-241a (Index 3464. Ms. dated 1001/1592-3); Acad. C 1166 fol. 172b-219b (Index 3463. Ms. dated 1115/1703-4); Kokand Collection 38 fol. 223-245 (See Rosenberg’s edition of the


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

(5) Haft wādī begins with the same verse as the Mustub-nāmah. It is apparently an extract from Mantiq al-fair and other poems.

Mss.: Oxford Eliot 207/9 (Ethē 622. Contains a seal dated 1020/1611-2); Ouseley 374/12 (Ethē 623. Ms. dated 23 Jumādā I 1027/1618); Eliot 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 Supplication 811 fol. 438v sqq. (Blochet 1291. Ms. dated 27 Shawwāl 1031/1605); Leningrad Acad. D 436 fol. 255b-261a (Index 3464. Ms. dated 1001/1592-3); Istanbul Univeriste FY 213-214/18. (Ates 122; Orıens XI p. 20-4. Ms. completed 1060/1650); Tehran Malik 506/2 (Munz. 17893. Ms. dated 956/1549); Bankipore I 46/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) Haijâ‘-nâmah (inc. bi nâm i kirdigâr i fard i hâ-chân * khî nhâ¬râ az ‘adâm oward hêrân’ is presented in I.O. 1046 as the ‘third dâftar’ of the Jauhar/Sawâhir al-dhât. It is, according to Ritter, ‘a poor imitator of the second part of the Ushkâr-nâmâ’. See also above, p. 274-5.

Mss.: Manchester Lindesiana 797 (17th century?); London Or. 6634 (Meredith-Owens p. 66, [301] Dated 861/1456-7); Or. 353 II (Rieu p. 577, Dated Şafar 877/1472, Latter half only); I.O. 1048 (Dated 2 Şafar 902/1496); I.O. 1046 fol. 335b sqq. (Dated 1139/1726-7); Cambridge Or. 1670-1/III (2nd Suppt. 421. Photostat of a Ms. in a private collection. 15th century?); İstanbul Halet 234/2 (Orients XI p. 14-7, Ms. dated 889/1484); Medînah ‘Arif Hikmat 143 adab fârisî (Nuskhah-hâ V p. 571-2. Ms. dated Jumâdâ II 844/1440); Lahore Univ. II/1 p. 175-9 (No. 3 of a Ms. dated 857/1453). Cf. Munz. IV 36676-91.


(7) Jauhar (or jawâhir) al-dhât (inc. ba nâm i an-kîh nûr i jîm u jân asî * khudî y îshkarû y nhân asî), in two dâftars. This work belongs together with the Ushkâr-nâmâh (which it quotes) in the central position that both works give to Haijâ‘. See above, p. 274-5.

Mss.: Dublin Beatty 321/V (Ms. copied by ‘Ali b. Muhammãd and dated Şafar 821/1418, ‘Jauhar-nâmâh’); Manchester Lindesiana 797a,b (16th century?); Oxford Ouseley 371/I (Ehê 626, 16th century?); Ouseley 353/2 (Ehê 627. Ms. has a note dated <10>131604-5); Elliot 206/3 (Ehê 622. Contains a seal dated 1020/1611-2); Ouseley 374/7 (Ehê 623. Ms. dated 23 Jumâdâ I 1027/1618); Elliot 208/3 (Ehê 624. Ms. dated 4 Dhû-l-hijjâh 1078/1668); Elliot 204/8 (Ehê 625);

London Or. 11325 in marg. (Meredith-Owens p. 72. With a colophon in Üghûr script dated 862/1457-8. Pictures); Or. 353/I (Rieu p. 576-7. Dated Şafar 877/1472. Deficient at beginning and end; the leaves missing at the beginning have been replaced by the beginning of the Hâch-nâmâ, in a modern hand); Or. 2888/I (Rieu Suppt. 237. Dated Rabî‘ II 893/1488); I.O. 1047 (Dated 10 Shawwâl 1021/1612, 2nd dâftar only); I.O. 1046 (Dated 1139/1726-7); I.O. 1031/17; I.O. 1033/2 (first dâftar only); I.O. 1035/2 [302] (incomplete); Paris Supplément 1795/II (Blochet 1292. Dated 4 Şafar 821/1418); Supplément 1366 fol. 70r sqq. (Blochet 1993. Dated Rabî‘ I 1009/1600); Supplément 811 fol. 179v sqq. (Blochet 1291. Ms. dated 17 Shawwâl 1031/1605); Berlin Diez A 12o. no. 1 (Pertsch 759. Dated Şafar 850/1446. Fragment of dâftar I);

Petermann 461 (Pertsch 760. Dated Shu‘bân 860/1456, but Pertsch thinks it is ‘erhebblich jünger’. Daftar 1, beginning missing); Ms. or occ. 2415 (Heinz 203. 2nd dâftar); Vienna Flügel 518 (also Duda p. 52-3. Contains seals of Shâh-rûkh, regn. 807/1404 to 850/1446, and of the Ottomans Bayezid I - acc. to Flügel - or II - acc. to Duda); - Leningrad Acad. D 436 fol. 48b-145a (Index 3464. Ms. dated 1001/1592-3); Kolkand Collection fol. 305-388 (See Rosenberg’s edition of the Zaratûshtrî-nâmah p. x). Ms. dated 1064/1653-4, ‘Jawâhir-nâmâh’); Acad. C 1165 fol. 128b-221a (Index 3462); Konya Müze 90 (Atœ 44. Copied by ‘Uthmân b. Usain al-Bahwânî and dated 10 Jumâdâ I 735/1335); İstanbul Topkapî Amet III 3059/1 (Karâyat 484; Orients XI p. 11-2. Ms. dated 27 Shawwâl 841/1438); Hâlet 234/6 (Orients XI p. 14-7. Ms. dated 889/1484); Ayasofya 1659/2 (Orients XI p. 17-9. Ms. dated 26 Rabî‘ II 890/1485); Topkapî, Revan 1044 (Karâyat 500; Der Islam XXV p. 173. Copied by Ahmad b. Sultân ‘Ali in 981/1573-4. According to Karâyat the Ms. contains Jauhar al-dhât, but Ritter says it is Khusru-r-nâmâh. Pictures); Esat 2558 (Duda p. 40. Dated 998/1589-90, Part I only); Topkapî, Revan 1042 (Karâyat 499. Copied by ‘Abd al-Rahmân al-Khwârazmî. 16th century? Pictures); Université FY 213-214/ (Atœ 122; Orients XI p. 20.4. Dated 1 Rabî‘ 1057/1647); Medînah ‘Arif Hikmat 143 adab fârisî (Nuskhah-hâ V p. 571-2. Ms. dated Jumâdâ II 844/1440); Tabriz Millî 3643/4 (Nuskhah-hâ IV p. 309. Ms. dated 1 Şafar 885/1480); Tehran Malîk 5974/6 (Munz. 28971. Ms. dated Rabî‘ II 809/1406; Mashhad Ridwân VII 769/2 (Has a note dated 1052/1642-3); [303] Dushânbe Acad. II 415 (17th century?); Lahore Univ. II/1 p. 175-9 (No. 1 of a Ms. dated 857/1453); Bankipore I 461 (17th century? Bk. ii only, incomplete); I 49 (17th century? Bk. i 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); Bihâr 299/IV (Beginning only). Cf. Munz. IV 28970-901.


1If this ‘Abd al-Rahmân al-Khwârazmî is the same as the copyist mentioned on p. 468, then this Ms. must be dated to the middle of the 15th century.
(8) Jumjudmah-nāmah, alias Qissah (or Hikayat) i Sultan Jum
judmah, is the story of a skull that has been brought back to life, possibly a fragment of an authentic work, according to Ritter. For parallels in the Ilahī-nāmah and the Usxtar-nāmah, and in the Arabic version (Gotha, Arabic catalogue IV 453), see Ritter, *Meer* p. 100-1, 640.

Mss.: Oxford Fraser 124/54 (Ethē 1239); Gotha 45/7; Leningrad
Acad. B 2172 fol. 1a-5b (Index 1086); Acad. B 4497 fol. 133b-144b (Index 1087); Istanbul Universitie FY 213-214/10. (Atč 122; Oriens XI p. 20-4. Ms. completed 1060/1650); Kayseri Râşîd Efendi Eki 224/12 (Karabulut 358).

An edition (from the Oxford and Leningrad Ms. and from two copies of a Judaico-Persian transcription) has been published, with a translation in English, facsimiles of the two mentioned Mss. and commentary in J.P. Asmussen, *Studies in Judaico-Persian literature*, Leyden 1973, p. 67-109.

(9) Kanz al-arsr or Kanz al-har (inc. sipas u humd bar khallag i ʿalam * kih az khēd e padīd ʿavard ādam) ends with verses stating that it was completed in 699/1299-1300. The author calls himself ‘the ‘Attār of the age’ (ʿAttār i zamān). See Ritter, *Der Islam* XXV, p. 157-8.


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

Mss.: Oxford Eliot 207/18 (Ethē 622. Contains a seal dated 1020/1611-2); Ouseley 374/9 (Ethē 623. Ms. dated 23 Jumādā I 1027/1618); Eliot 209/19 (Ethē 624. Ms. dated 4 Dhū l-hijjah 1078/1668); London Or. 4151 V (Rieu Suppl. 235. Ms. dated 22 Rajab 877/1472. Pictures); I.O. 1032/7 (Dated 1025/1616); I.O. 1031/13; I.O. 1033/16; Leningrad Acad. C 1166 fol. 63b-105b (Index 3463. Ms. dated 1115/1703-4); Istanbul Universitie FY 213-214/13 and 16. (Atč 122; Oriens XI p. 20-4. Ms. completed 1060/1650); Tehran Gulistan/Atabāy II 325/3 (Ms. dated 25 Ramādān 880/1476. Pictures); Malik 5062/13 (Munz. 33026. Ms. dated 965/1557-8); Banki ꞌI 46/IX (17th century?); Calcutta Ivanov 477/15 (Ms. dated 1006/1597-
8); Ivanov Curzon 204/14 (Ms. contains seals dated 1169/1755-6). Cf. Munz. IV 33024-31.


Mss.: Oxford Eliot 209/16 (Ethē 624. Ms. dated 4 Dhū l-hijjah 1078/1668); London I.O. 1033/10 (incomplete); Leningrad Acad. C 1166 fol. 140b-171b (Index 3463. Ms. dated 1115/1703-4); Istanbul Universitie FY 213-214/22. (Atč 122; Oriens XI p. 20-4. Ms. completed 1060/1650); [305] Tehran Malik 5062/12 (Munz. 29706. Ms. dated 956/1549); Banki ꞌI 46/VII (17th century?); Calcutta Ivanov Curzon 204/15 (Ms. contains seals dated 1169/1755-6); Ivanov 486 (=Sprenger 136. 17th-18th century?); Būhār 299/1 (Dated 1203/1788-

(12) Khazā’īn al-asrār, is, according to one of the two owners’ notes in the Oxford Ms., the title of the mathnavī whose prose preface begins with the words fa-i wohdatu li man wushtidh dīhātbi bi dīhāt. Begins with: *Der Islam* Pers. c. 71 fol. 2-313 (Beeston 2571. 16th century? Beginning and end missing).

(13) Lisān al-ghaib (inc. ism i tawḥīd ibtidā i nām i ʿāsī ṭurgh i rāḍ-im jumlagt dar dām i ʿāsī). Supposedly written in Mecca at the end of ‘Attār’s life. It is by the same forger as Maḥazar al-ʿaṯārīr.

Mss.: Manchester Lindesiana 797c (16th century?); Oxford Ouseley 371/2 (Ethē 626. 16th century?); Eliot 206/4 (Ethē 622. Cont. 1Ethē reads the title as Khayātī-nāmah, which (following Sprenger) he renders as ‘Book of transition’, but to my knowledge khayāt means only ‘needle’; moreover, in the verse in which the author indicates the title of the poem, quoted by Sprenger, the metre requires khaiyāt.
tains a seal dated 1020/1611-2; Osueley 374/6 (Ehê 623. Ms. dated 23 Jumâdâ I 1027/1618); Elliot 209/13 (Ehê 624. Ms. dated 4 Dhu l-hijjah 1078/1668); Elliot 205/20 (Ehê 625); London I.O. 1031/16. I.O. 1033/11 (incomplete); Paris Supplément 1366 fol. 113v seq. (Blochet 1993. Ms. contains dates between 1009/1600 and 1010/1602); Supplément 811 fol 35v sqq. (Blochet 1291. Ms. dated 27 Shawwâl 1013/1605); Rome Vaticano Pers. 89 (Rossi p. 107. Dated 22 Shawwâl 47th year of Ḥâmîr, i.e. 1114/1703); Hanover p. 140-157 acc. to Rossi; Istanbul Universitâsî FY 213-214/6. (Atêq 122; Oriens XI p. 20-4. Ms. completed 1060/1650); Tabriz Millî 3634/5 (Nuskhâhâ-î IV p. 309. Ms. dated 1 Şafâr 885/1480); Bankiopœ I 46/VI (17th century?); Calcutta Ivanov Curzon 204/7 (Ms. contains seals dated 1169/1755-6). Cf. Munz. IV 3558-21. [306]


(14) Manşür-nâmâh, or Hallâj-nâmâh (inc. bâd manşûr, ai 'ajûb, shîrdâh-hâl * dar ra-hâ tâbîîq ð ra-št konâl), a brief account of the death of Hallâj. In many copies it is inserted into the Wâjif-nâmâh.


(15) Mazâhar-al-'ajûb (inc. āfrîm jân, āfrîm dar jân i jân * zân-ki hâst ð ãshkârû râhîn), a hagiography of 'All. The date of composition is given (mendaciously) in one verse as 584/1188 (pânzad u hâshât u chât), when the author was supposedly 100 years old, and in another there is a chronogram for 585/1189 (sîrî 1 'ajûb). In several verses the author calls himself a citizen of Tîn. It is certainly a forgery. See Bombay Univ. Cat. p. 6-5 (summarising Shérâni), Ritter, Der Islam XXV, p. 137-8 and Nafâî p. 126sqq.

Mss.: Oxford Osueley 371/3 (Ehê 626. 16th century?); Osueley 353/4 (Ehê 627. Ms. has a note dated ‘13 which Ehê interprets as 1013/1604-5); Elliot 206/5 (Ehê 622. Contains a seal dated 1020/1611-2); Osueley 374/16 (Ehê 623. Ms. dated 23 Jumâdâ I 1027/1618); Elliot 209/12 (Ehê 624. Ms. dated 4 Dhu l-hijjah 1078/1668); Elliot 204/2 [307] (Ehê 625); London Add. 6621 (Rieu p. 579, 17th century? Consists of 73 leaves detached from a larger volume, the whole of the Mazâhar-al-'ajûb, and a further leaf containing the conclusion of another, unidentified, poem); I.O. 1031/18; I.O. Delhi 1270; Cambridge Or. 651/1 (Browne Suppl. 1210. Dated Rabî' II 1201/1787); Browne Coll. V.8 (Dated Şafâr 1286/1869. Apparently contains several other mathnawîs); Paris Supplément 811 fol. 90v sqq. (Blochet 1291. Ms. dated 27 Shawwâl 1013/1605); Leningrad Dorn CCCLIV ( Copied by Dost Muhammed apparently in 947/1540-1); 1 Kokand Collection 38 fol. 1-120 (See Rosenberg's edition of the Zârâtshâr-nâmâh p. iii. Dated 1066/1655-6); Istanbul Nurusamînî 4199 mûkêrker (Atêq 133. Copied by Muhammed Ridâ al-Mashhadî and dated 990/1582); Universitâsî FY 213-214/2. (Atêq 122; Oriens XI p. 20-4. Dated 27 Dhu l-qâdâh 1058/1648); Shiraz Wîglî (Nuskhâhâ-î p. 293 no. 34. Ms. dated 892/1487); Bombay Univ. 24; Bankiopœ I 46/II (17th century? Incomplete); I 48 (18th century?); Calcutta (= Lucknow Sprenger 131. Dated 1186/1772-3. Pictures); Ivanov Curzon 204/6 (Ms. contains seals dated 1169/1755-6); Bûhár 300/II (18th century?); Bûhár 302 (18th century?). Cf. Munz. IV 35223-39.


(16) Miftâh-al-futûh (inc. panâh in man ba-hayî-e kih na-murad = ba dî-ê 'ahdr i šad i ši'ân padîrad) was written by a man from Zanjân in 688/1289-90, or, as other copies have it, 587/1191-2. A textbook of ascetic exercises. See Ritter, Der Islam XXV, p. 157.

1 For this Ms., identified by Dorn as ‘Attâr's Asrâr-nâmâh and with a date which he read as 927/1521, compare the photograph of the last page (five final verses and colophon) published by C. Adî in Studia Iranica XXII, 1953, figure 3, where the date appears rather to be 947/1540-1. The poem concluding on this page is definitely not the Asrâr-nâmâh, but evidently a recension of the Mazâhar-al-'ajûb differing from that in ‘Imâd’s edition (where I have not been able to find the five verses); the third verse from the end corresponds to the last line of the copy of Mazâhar-al-'ajûb contained in Istanbul Universitâsî FY 213 (see Oriens XI p. 20).
authentic, but Ritter\(^1\) pointed out that it is not traceable before the 15th century and is lacking in all the old manuscripts of the Kulliyāt, that is not mentioned in ‘Attār’s authentic works and that ‘von der gedankenwelt ‘Attār’s darin eigentlich nichts zu spüren ist’.

\(^2\) Ms. of this work are extremely common; we limit ourselves therefore to a small sample. See Ritter, Orients XIII–XIV p. 229–38; Munz, IV 28266–32; Munz. Pak. VII(1) p. 170–83.
1009/1600); Supplément 811 fol. 649 v-658 (Bloch 1291. Ms. datered 27 Shawwal 1013/1605); Supplément 1255 (Bloch 1316. Dated 1087/1676-7); Supplément 649 (Bloch 1310. 17th century? Incomplete); Supplément 651 (Bloch 1311. 17th century? End missing); Supplément 648 (Bloch 1312. 17th century? Ancien fonds 26/11 (Bloch 1313/Richard. 17th century? With Turkish glosses); Supplément 650 (Bloch 1314. 17th century? Supplément 652 (Bloch 1315. 17th century? Beginning missing); Supplément 653 (Bloch 1317. Dated 1149/1736-7); Supplément 947 (Bloch 1318. Dated 6 Safar 1205/1790); Supplément 1683 fol. 112 v sq. (Bloch 2188. 19th century); Supplément 1686 fol. 73 r sq. (Bloch 2190. 19th century); Supplément 1687 fol. 92 v sq. (Bloch 2191. 19th century); Supplément 1688 fol. 73 r sq. (Bloch 2192. Dated 1277/1860-1); Supplément 1689 fol. 42 v sq. (Bloch 2193. 19th century); Supplément 1691 fol. 54 r sq. (Bloch 2194. Ms. completed in 1299/1881-2); Supplément 1693 fol. 53 v sq. (Bloch 2196. Dated 1263/1847); Supplément 1658 fol. 60 v sq. (Bloch 2197. 19th century); Supplément 1697 fol. 81 v sq. (Bloch 2199. 19th century); Supplément 1698 fol. 95 r sq. (Bloch 2200. 19th century); Supplément 1700 fol. 38 v sq. (Bloch 2201. 19th century); Supplément 1701 fol. 31 r sq. (Bloch 2202. With erroneous call-number. 19th century. Incomplete); Supplément 1702 fol. 157 v sq. [311] (Bloch 2203. 19th century); Supplément 1736 fol. 134 v sq. (Bloch 2204. 19th century?); 2104; Arab 2315 fol. 30-60; Suppl. turc 381/4; Supplément turc 1408 fol. 146 sq.; Göttingen Divs halsh/Luft 58 (Dated [11]89/1775); Divs halsh/Luft 60 (Dated 1258/1842-3); Divs halsh/Luft 59; Berlin Petermann II Nachtr. 8 (Pertsch 688/6). Dated Rajab 981/1573); Ms. or. quar. 182 (Pertsch 749); Ms. or. quar. 188 (Pertsch 750); Ms. or. quar. 25 (Pertsch 751); Gotha 50; Munich 178 Quatr. (Aumer 30. Dated 1077/1666-7); 219 Quatr. (Aumer 31. Dated 1185/1771-2); Cim. 87 (Aumer 28); Uppsala Tornberg CLX; Tornberg CLXI; Bratislava 570 (16th century?); 571; 572 (17th century?); Wenna Flügel 517/2; Flügel 1935; Flügel 1936; Kraft CLXXXIX; Leningrad Acad. B 149 (Index 433. Dated 964/1556-7); Acad. C 1166 fol. 257b-258b (Index 3463. Ms. dated 1115/1703-4); Dorn CCCLV (Dated 1133/1720-1); Dorn CCCLVI (Dated 1234/1818-9); Dorn CCCLVII; and many more copies (see Acad. Index 429-461); Konya Mevlana Mîzesi 1460/3 (Ortens XIII-XIV. p. 229, Ms. dated 867/1462-3); Istanbul Topkapı, Koğušlar 949 (Karatay 493. Copied by Nîrî b. Husain Shâbângî Shâhîd and dated Muḥarram 877/1472); Halet 234/10 (Ortens XI p. 14-7. Ms. dated 889/1484); Univerität FY 593/4 (Ates 135. Dated 890/1485); Nuruosmaniye 5008/2 (Ateş 136. Dated Dhu'l-hijjah 1051/1642); Topkapı, Revan 2011/IV (Karata 924. Dated 1057/1647); Universität FY 213-214/17. (Ateş 122; Ortens XI p. 20-4. Ms. completed 1060/1650); Topkapı, Ahmet III 1559 (Karatay 485. Dated 1078/1667-8); Universität FY 378 (olim Riza Paşa 3069. Ateş 137. Dated 1102/1690-1); Topkapı, Emniyet Hazinesi 1333 (Karata 489. Dated 1114/1702-3); Topkapı, Revan 420 (Karatay 487. Dated 1128/1716); Topkapı, Hazine 719 (Karatay 490. Dated 1128/1716); Topkapı, Emniyet Hazinesi 1320 (Karata 491. Dated 1151/1738-9); Universität FY 586 (olim Riza Paşa 3488. Ateş 138. Dated 3 Safar 1185/1771); Universität FY 67 (Ateş 139. 18th century?); [312] Nuruosmaniye 4993 (Ateş 140. 18th century?); Topkapı, Revan 421 (Karatay 488. 18th century?); Universität FY 95 (Ateş 141. Dated 1220/1805-4); Topkapı, Bagdat 98 (Karatay 486); Topkapı, Koğušlar 1021 (Karatay 492); Dushanbe Acad. II 409-413; Bankipore Suppl. i 1838 in marg. (Ms. dated 15 Dhu'l-hijjah 910/1505); I 46/XII (17th century); Rampore Saulat 51-52 (recent); Calcutta Ivanov 477/10 (Ms. dated 1006/1597-8); Ivanov 480/2 (Dated 1087/1676-7); Ivanov Curzon 204/13 (Ms. contains seals dated 1169/1755-6); Ivanov 481 (18th century?); Bôhár 303 (19th century?); Princeton 422 (Modern).

Editions: London 1809 (Pendeh-ī Attar, ed. E.H. Hindley); Paris 1819 (Pend-namêh, ou Le livre des conseils... traduit et publié par M. le 8ème 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; Kazan 1845; Bombay 1277/1860; Lucknow 1264/1848 (30 p. according to Sprenger p. 356); 1872 (in the "Kållytar"); Tehran 1290/1873; Lahore [ca. 1870]; 1294/1877; 1887; 1888; 1892 (with a commentary); Bombay 1887; 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 Mağâli, dedicated to the same Sultan. 
Mss.: Leipzig Fleischer CCCVI [312] fol. 25v-44v. A fragment of one or the other of these translations is found in Vienna Kraft CXCl.
(French): see editions. An older French translation by Romain de Paris, dated 1725, is contained in Munich 20 Quatr. (Aumer 29, Autograph).
(Arabic): The Persian text was published with a interlinear translation by Ahmad Rashid Khalwati in Alexandria 1289/1872.
(German): Pendnâmeh, tr. G.H.F. Nesselmann, Königsberg 1871.
(Swedish): Pand-Nâmeh, tr. E. Hermelin, with a reprint of Silvester's text and a transliteration, Stockholm 1929.

Commentaries:
(a) Suâdat-nâmeh by Shemî, in Turkish, incorporating (at least part of) the Persian text and a Turkish translation. He also wrote commentaries on Muzâkan al-asrâr, Mutâq al-asrâr, Mathâwât i ma'navî, Gulistan, Bostân, Tahfet al-abhr, Subhat al-abhr, Bahâristân, and the dhvâtes of Hāfiz and Shâhî. 1 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 Dhî h-i hijah 1083/1673); 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?); Suppîlemment turc 341, 383, 578, 579, 695; Bologna Bibl. Universitaria (Piemontese 8-14: several copies); Hamburg Orient. 264 fol. 1v-70r (Brockelmann 285. Ms. has an owner's note dated 1051/1642-2); Wiesbaden (M. Götz, Türkische Handschriften II, 1968, no. 632-3); Leipzig Fleischer XXIX/2 (Dated Sâfar 1078/1667); Fleischer CCCVII/1; Berlin Ms. or. oct. 127 [314]

1See EP 3 s.v. 'Shemî' (I.T.P. de Brujin, with further literature), where it is suggested that the commentator Shemî is not the same person as the 16th-century poet Shemî Prizrenî.

Persian 752. Has a note dated 1082/1671-2); Vienna Flügel 1938 (Dated 1128/1716); Leningrad Dorn CCCCXL.
(b) Muftî, a commentary, also in Turkish, by 'Abd al-Rahmân. Dated at the time of Mehemet IV (1058/1648 to 1099/1687). Mss.; See Orients XIII-XIV, p. 233-4.
(c) By Shu'ârî, again in Turkish. Ms.; Istanbul Darûlmesnevi 185 (Orients XIII-XIV, p. 234-5. Autograph dated Rabî 1 1083/1672).
(d) By Ismâ'îl Haqqî (1063/1653 to 1137/1724-5). Mss.; 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) Bârg-i darvâshân (in Turkish) by Muştafa Râfî, written in 1143/1730-1 for Mir Iskandar, the son of the Ottoman governor in Cairo. Ms.: Vienna Kraft CXC (Autograph).

For two further anonymous commentaries see Orients XIII-XIV, p. 236-7.


(22) Si fâzî. Ms.; London Or. 8363 (Meredith-OWens p. 69.
Dated 1298/1881); Tehran (2 modern Ms. listed by Munz.). Cf.
Munz. IV 31286-8.

(23) Ushtur-nâmeh or Shutur-nâmeh (inc. ibtidâ bar nâm i haîy i la-yazal * sâni* i asâyâ u ibdî* i faîlî with variants) contains a rather striking story in which a puppeteer uses a symbol for the divinity. The figure of Hâlî plays a major part in it. See above, p. 274-5. [315]
Ms.; Manchester Lindesiana 797â (16th century?); Oxford Elliot 207/13 (Eshê 622. Contains a seal dated 1020/1611-2); Osney 374/13 (Eshê 623. Ms. dated 23 Junmâh 1 1027/1618); Elliot 209/5 (Eshê 624. Ms. dated 4 Dhî h-i hijah 1078/1668); Elliot 204/7 (Eshê 625); London I.O. 1354/1 (Ms. copied by Muhammad Hâjî b. Bâbâ Hâjî and completed 1 Dhî F-qâ'dah 812/1410); Add. 7736/1 (Rieu p. 578-9. Dated
Sha'bān 968/1532); Or. 7987 (Meredith-Owens p. 68, where the title is quoted as 'Astarānmeh', 17th-18th century?); I.O. 1031/1; I.O. 1033/12; Cambridge Or. 1698/2 (2nd Suppt. 443. Ms. dated 829/1428-6); Paris Supplem. 1795/II (Blochet 1292. Dated Shawwāl 820/1417); Supplem. 811 fol. 331v sqq. (Blochet 1291. Ms. dated 27 Shawwāl 1013/1605); Leyden 310(2) (Cat. II DCLII. Dated 786/1384-5); Basel Tschudi Collection (Orients XI p. 10. Dated 5 Dhū l-qa'dah 821/1418); Rome Vatican Pers. 121/2 (Rossi p. 128. 19th century?); Leningrad Acad. D 436 fol. 25a-47b (Index 3464. Ms. dated 1001/1592-3). Acad. A 79 fol. 1b-14b (Index 145. Dated 1233/1817-8); Acad. C 1165 fol. 1a-128b (Index 3462. Apparently two different versions); Istanbul Atil Efendi 2241/14 (Orients XI p. 31-33. Ms. dated 4 Dhū l-ḥijjah 828/1429); Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi 1992/2 (olim Nuruosmaniye 3786. Orients XI p. 12-3. From the library of Shāh-rūkh, d. 850/1447. Pictures); Halet 234/3 (Orients XI p. 14-7. Ms. dated 889/1484); Ayasofya 1695/I (Orients XI p. 17-9. Ms. dated 26 Rabi' II 890/1485); Universite Fy 459/I (olim Reza Fāna 448. Ates 149. Dated Ramaḍān 945/1539); Universite Fy 213-214/15. (Ates 122. Orients XI p. 20-4. Ms. completed 1060/1650); Cairo 9252/2 (olim Nuruosmaniye 3786. Orients XI p. 14. Ms. dated 26 Rajab 877/1472); Medineh 'Arif Hikmat 143/2 (olim Nuruosmaniye 3786. Orients XI p. 14. Ms. dated 26 Rajab 877/1472); Tehran Asghar Mahdawi 8/3 (Nuskhāh-hā II p. 94-5. Ms. dated 27 Shawwāl 804/1407); Mashhad Ridawī 769/6 (Has a note dated 1052/1642-3); Tashkent Acad. II 855/II (Dated 6 Jumādá I 827/1424); [316] Lahore Univ. II/1 p. 175-9 (No. 4 of a Ms. dated 857/1453); Bankiapore I 46/XII (17th century?); I 47/III (Dated 27 Shawwāl 1123/1711); Calcutta Ivanov Curzon 204/8 (Ms. contains seals dated 1169/1755-6); Ivanov 485 (Dated 1180/1766-7). Cf. Minz. IV 27505-21.


Epitome: Istanbul Universite Fy 538/6 (Ates 119. Ms. dated 826/1423).

(25) Waṣṭah-nāmah (inc. ai, ba nām-at kār-hā rā īfītāh * nāt bē nām i tu dar omar ē falāh).

Mss.: Oxford Elliot 207/16 (Ethis 622. Contains a seal dated 1020/1611-2); Elliot 208/6 (Ethis 624. Ms. dated 4 Dhū l-ḥijjah 1078/1668); London I.O. 1032/3 (Dated 1025/1616).

178. Barānī is cited as the author of three verses in LF ed. Isqālī p. 16, 49, 394 (Ms. nān in marg.).

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

Shams p. 224; Ḥāfar III p. 1166; Hidāyat, Majma' I p. 218; Khayyām-pūr p. 214.

180. Three verses are ascribed to a certain Damiri in LF ed. Isqālī p. 162, 395, 396 (Ms. nān in marg.). [320]

LN s.v. ‘Dāmirī’ p. 68; Khayyām-pūr p. 346.

181. ʿAbī al-dīn Masʿūd Daʿūlat-yrā was a poet in Bukhārā at the end of the 6th/12th and beginning of the 7th/13th century. ‘Aṣūfī, who says that his father was a converted Zoroastrian, quotes, among other things, a ṭuhbat which he composed ‘at the time when I (“ʿAṣūfī”) was in the service of Tāj al-dīn Sadr al-sharīʿah’ (i.e. al-Sadr al-kabīr ʿUmār II b. Masʿūd, 593/1196-7 to before 603/1206). ‘Aṣūfī refers also to an elegy that he had composed for the predecessor of that worthy, al-Ṣadr al-ṣaʿīd, and which some of the wis of Bukhārā saw as a plagiarism of verses by ‘Ṣirāj’ (evidently one of the two poets of that name quoted earlier in ‘Aṣūfī’ s book).

‘Aṣūfī 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 Qatrān and Ṣadīqī. Hidāyat quotes an ode addressing ‘Mîr-i faḍlāl Fadlīn’, evidently either Qatrān’s patron or one of the later Shaddādīs of the same name. LF ed. Isqālī p. 161 and 397 (Ms. nān 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. Dīyā Pārsī 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 (321) 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-dīn al-Haddādī, known as Khālīfā,2 says of him that he was ‘by descent a man of Fārs, though brought up in Khujand’,3 Dīyā 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’,4 it would thus seem possible that the poet is using the word ‘birthplace’ somewhat freely. Rāzī includes him in his chapter on Shīrāz and says that he came from Fārs to Khurāsān in his youth (dar awān i jāwān). 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 Khwāz̄am-shīh ‘Abī al-dīn Muhammad to whom Dīyā dedicated an ode in the aftermath of this king’s victory over the Qara-Khātāy 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 615/1218-9;5 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.6 The third is al-ṣāhib al-aʿzām Fakhir al-dunyā wa l-dīn Mahmūd [322] Ulugh Yalavāch,7 the Muslim governor of Khujand dur-

---

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 nastaʿlīq hand. The poems are not arranged alphabetically; the qatāfūdās and strophics are grouped together according to their dedicatee and are followed by the nqāţeṭāt.
2See below, no. 222.
3Shams’s poem is included in the dawān of Dīyā, fol. 89b-90a, where the verse in question reads: in pārān-nasāb-i chāl Khujand mandān-ast ast i ẓāḥī tafṣīkhor i Salmān i fārsīm ba Khujand.
4Fol. 4a: mā-rā chāl Salmān i Fārs ast mašād u asl = kih pārā sabkhan-um hast dār t setμatān.
5Fol. 107a.
6Juwainī 1 p. 71-2.
7Yalavāch is a Turkish word for ‘ambassador, messenger’. Our poet treats it, doubtless under the constant stress of the metre, as dialytic. Cf. fol. 5b (metre: ḥaṭṭi): mādār i malk Fakhir-i Ḿaq̄ī wa l-dīn = panūd i khwāl Ulugh Yalavāch i aʿzām. The same reading is required also on fol. 3b paen.
ing the early part of the reign of Chaghatai. A good number of poems (among them one with the date 603/1206-7) are dedicated to al-sūlān Mu'taz al-dunyā wa 1-din Abū 1-Fāris Muhammad Qulch Taťaghā (i.e. Tāvāqā) Khān, and another group (again, including an elegy) to al-sūlān Rukn al-dunyā wa 1-din Mas'ūd b. Muhammad b. Mas'ūd Taťaghā Khān, presumably his son. Their titulus suggests that these two belonged to the Qarakhanids of Farghana, but they do not seem to be recorded elsewhere. A large number of poems are dedicated to a potentate in Marghānān, Husam al-dīn Ḥasan b. 'Alī Yabghū (or Pīghū?) Malik-shāh al-Marghānīnī. This patron is perhaps identical with al-malik al-mu'azzam Pīghū-Malik whom 'Aūfī includes [323] in his chapter on the royal amateur poets. Other poems evoke al-ispahānī al-mu'ayyid Niẓām al-dīn Yagbī (Pīghū) Malīk, who is perhaps the same as the just-mentioned Husam al-dīn, or perhaps rather a relative of his; others evoke al-ispahānī al-mu'ayyid Niẓām al-dīn Ulugh Tūṃānī. A very large number of poems are dedicated to al-malik al-kahīr ʻIyṭiyār al-dīn Malik-shāh As'ād b. Mas'ūd, of which some explicitly mention Khuja-n and one contains the date 538/1240-1, which is evidently the most recent year mentioned in the divān; he would thus seem to have been one of the governors of Khujand under the Mongols. He is also the dedicatee of an ode by Saḥif Isfandārī which in turn praises 'Diyyā'ī Fārsī'. A poem with the date 14 Safar 633/1235 invokes al-ispahānī ʻImād al-dīn Maḥmūd b. As'ād, evidently the son of ʻIyṭiyār al-dīn. A good number of poems eulogise Malik al-islam Nāṣir al-dīn ʻAlī b. ʻAlī, to whom the poet applies epithets such as shāh i shahīdān and nār i Khuja-n, evidently a high-ranking cleric.

The divān contains also a poetic compliment to a colleague, Shams al-dīn al-Haddādī, as well as Shams al-dīn's reply (quoted at the beginning of this article). Ṣārī quotes a different pair of poems exchanged between these two, and a pair of [324] poems exchanged with one Shihāb al-dīn (presumably Shihāb Khujandī, below no. 299). Bādī'īnī and Ḥidāyat, misled, no doubt, by the title Malik-Shāh which occurs in so many of his poems, put our poet in the early Seljuq period. Taqī (followed by Adharī) says that he died in 622/1225, which, though at least in the right century, is still too early.

Mss.: Tehran Qullūstān/Ābāyī II 299 (Ms. signed by Ḥasan b. Yūsuf and dated 20 Rajab 666/1268, but Ābāyī 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; I am not aware of its present location. Cf. Munz. III 24275.

Juwainī II p. 79; Ṣārī I p. 189-93 (no. 188); Bādī'īnī, Mumtahb al-tawārīkh I, Calcutta 1868, p. 23-8 (transl. p. 38); Ḥidāyat, Majmūa I p. 325-6; id., Ryād p. 225; D.S. Robertson, 'A forgotten Persian poet of the thirteenth century', JRAS 1951, p. 103 (with an account of the Ms. in the author's possession); M. Ḥasan/D.S. Robertson, 'Diyyā-ī Fārsī', JRAS 1952, p. 105-7; Naftī's notes to Bahāqī p. 1362-70 and 1511-29; LN s.v. 'Diyyā'ī l-dīn' p. 78-9; Khayyām-pīr p. 327 ('Diyyā i Khuja-nī'); Šafī, Tārīkh II p. 827-33.

1 See the detailed article on Maḥmūd Yalavāch and his family by Th.T. Allens in In the service of the Khans, ed. 1. de Rachewiltz (etc.), Wiesbaden 1993, p. 122-31.
2 Pol. 9a.
3 Pol. 13a sqq.
4 Pol. 37b sqq.
5 In 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.g.h.w or b.y.g.h.w (it would be good to know how it is pointed in the Guliastī Ms.). Yagbī is well-known Turkish (or Eastern Iranian) royal title (see Doerfer IV p. 124-36). Pīghī occurs in Chaghātai Turkish (and in the Persian lexicon) as the name of a kind of falcon, but is not attested in any early texts (id., II p. 427-8, and the Nachtrag, IV p. 438).
6 'Aūfī I p. 52-9; see also Ḥidāyat, Majmūa' I p. 173-4; Naftī's notes to Bahāqī p. 1370-5; LN s.v. 'Pīghī' p. 748-9; Khayyām-pīr p. 98; Šafī, Tārīkh II p. 729-31. Naftī has correctly noted that the poems quoted by 'Aūfī 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 'Husam al-dīn Bahkhūyā b. Zangi Saljūqī' with whom Ḥidāyat arbitrarily identified our Pīghī-Malīk. Further confusion is caused by Naftī's attempts to amalgamate Diyyā's various patrons into a single person.
7 Pol. 127b.
184. al-Ḥakīm Diyāʾ al-dīn Muḥammad al-Kabuli is the author of a qīrāt and four ruḥāt yāzīr which he wrote out for ʿAuḥī when the latter met him in Ghaznah (not long before 607/1210-1).

ʿAuḥī II p. 416-7; Rāzī II p. 105 (no. 592); LN s.v. ‘Diyāʾ al-dīn’; 50-1; Khayyām-pūr p. 348. [325]

185. al-Ḥakīm Majd al-dīn Fāhīm al-Bukhari was a contemporary of ʿAuḥī, who tells us that he was illiterate (ummut), but none the less an accomplished poet. The samples of his work quoted by ʿAuḥī contain a qīrāt and two ruḥāt yāzīr lampooning Saʿd al-dīn Kāfi (below, no. 277).


186. A certain Fakhr al-dīn composed two poems describing a contest between the pen and the sword of which one (inc. ḥamūn u nai čān padūd ānād ẓi ʃanī i kirdiḡār * dar miyān i tēğh u kīl k u fītād jang u kāzīr) has been published by Eibē from the important anthology Daqīq al-ashkār. It contains a verse1 eulogising Maḥḵūl-shāh (presumably the first king of that name, 465/1072 to 485/1092).

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


187. al-Amīr ʿAlīm Fālak al-dīn İbrāhīm al-Sāmānī is the author of three ghazals quoted by ʿAuḥī in his chapter on the poets of Western Persia after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157). ʿAuḥī says that he was a descendant of the Samanid kings and that he was born in Transoxania but lived in ʿIrāq.

ʿAuḥī II p. 401-2; Khayyām-pūr p. 258 (‘Sāmānī i ʿIrāq’).

188. Fālakī Ṣhawānī flourished at the court of the Sharwān-shāh Manūchīhhr II, who reigned [326] from 516/1122 (or somewhat later) until 555/1160-1 (or not long afterwards),1 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 Fālakī’s death2 in which he indicates that his colleague and compatriot died young. His statement, in the same poem, that Fālakī was ‘aware of the mysteries of the nine spheres’ (zi rāz i nūh fālak ʿaḡāḥ) has been taken as evidence that our poet was a professional astronomer (which would explain his pen-name, Fālakī), 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 Fālakī’s personal name was Muḥammad, that he was imprisoned for a time in the fortress of Shābarān, but was later pardoned and set free by Manūchīhhr.

Several of his poems contain significant data concerning the history of the Caucasus, the most interesting being a long elegy3 commiserating with Manūchīhhr and, in particular, with his consort Thamar, on the death of her brother, the Georgian king Demetra. According to the Georgian chronicle4 Demetra 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 Fālakī’s poem confirms this date with a chronogram in the otherwise rather absurd verse (line 64): shak nēst kī tārīḵi w waftatsakh khalal ē ʃarb * dar qādīdah i alām u ʿadl i ʿUmār ṣawwur; the numerical value of the letters in the words from khalal to ʿadl inclusive is 1467, which is [327] the year of the Seleucid era corresponding to A.D. 1155-6.

The Indian scholar Ḥādī Ḥasan published his 1929 collection of Fālakī’s poems on the basis of the Munich anthology (Cod. or. 279), collated with the selections quoted in various tādhibkārs. 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

1Namely the penultimate verse of the poem, reading: ʿayyah i yezdān Maḥḵūl-shāh ʿaṭḥāb i khwāraṇūn * ān shahansha-y (sic: leges) kām-yāh, ān pūd-ahāh i kām-gār.

2See Khāqānī’s divān, ed. Snjālī, p. 918-9 and Ḥādī Ḥasan’s first monograph, p. 445.

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

4See M. Brouset, Histoire de la Géorgie I (translation of the Georgian chronicle), St. Petersburg 1849, p. 382.
Tehran edition of Falak'i’s so-called *dawr* is essentially a reprint of the older of Hādī Ḥasan’s collections. It has not yet been investigated whether the Tehran (Galistan) manuscript adds anything new to Falak'i’s oeuvre.

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

**Editions:** London 1929 (ed. Hādī Ḥasan); Tehran 1345AH./1966 (ed Ṭabīrī Shīhāb).

Shams p. 392-3; Shārvānī, *Nuzhet al-majālis* (see below, appendix III); Sa’īf Harawī p. 144 (one verse); Mustaufī p. 743; Jājanī 1 p. 144v+144v+vi, 191-5; Yaghmārī p. 260-3 (both of these are the same poem); Daulāt shāh p. 103-4; Rāzī III 1 p. 287-92 (no. 1386; name misspelt in the edition); Taqī (see London Or. 3506 fol. 50v sqq. = Rieu Suppl. 105; Paris Supplement 799 fol. 214v sqq. = Blochet 1242); Ḥadār I 1 p. 198-204; Hidāyāt, *Majma‘* I p. 381-2; Hādī Ḥasan, *Falakī-i-Shirvānī:* his times, life, and works, London 1929 (see also his list of mostly un-published Ṭahbrakhs, p. 70-4; review by Y. Minorsky, *BSOS* V, 1928-30, p. 903-10); id., ‘Muhammad Falakī-i-Shirvānī and his unique *dawr*’ [328] in Madras’, *Islamic Culture* XXIV/2, 1950, p. 77-107, XXIV/3, 1950, p. 145-86; id., *Researches in Persian literature,* Hyderabad 1958, p. 29-94 (contains the text and translation of the new poems in the Madras Ms.); Sa’īf, *Torkāh* II 1 p. 774-6; Khaiyām-pūr p. 454; *EF* s.v. *Falakī Shirvānī* (Hādī Ḥasan); *EIL* s.v. *Falakī*.

189. *Faqīh* Marwazi is credited with four verses in ‘Aulī’s chapter on the poets of the Seljuqs of Khūrāsān.


190. *Forqādi* ‘Ali al-Munajjam al-Sijzī,‘Ali who speaks on the spheres’, astronomer and poet, was a contemporary

1Browne quotes the *nizāḥ* (twice) as al-Sanjārī, but this is a distinct scribal error in his Ms. In his new edition of ‘Aulī (p. 487) Naṣīf emends the text (but without quoting the reading of the Ms.) to al-Sijzī.

1For whom see also below, no. 291 (Shams al-dīn).

2Both ‘alī al-dīn (p. 46) and Rāwandi (p. 175) have, wrongly, ‘Masrīd’.

3In Add. p. 315-6.

4My doubts are fuelled, first, by the early date of ‘Abd al-Jalīl’s book and, second, by the fact that ‘Aulī’s *Farqādi* was the son of a man with a decidedly non-Shiite name ‘Umar.

of ‘Aulī, 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.

‘Aulī says further that Farīd was the brother of al-Sadr al-ajall Nasir al-dīn al-Shārījī, the wazīr to the king of Nimruz (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. ‘Aulī represents him with a *qiṭār* satirising the *malūdizādah* (i.e. the Ismā‘īlīs) and two *rubā‘īs*.

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

191. *Farqādi* al-dīn al-Kātīb (or, *persice,* Farīd i dabīr) was a scribe in the Seljuk chancery. ‘Aulī quotes a *tarjī‘*-band praising Masrīd b. [329] Muhammad (529/1134 to 547/1152). ‘Azīr al-dīn (followed by Rāwandi and others) quotes a *rubā‘* which he composed after Sanjar’s defeat at the hands of the Qara-Khitāy (in 536/1141) and another commentary on the embassy of the Ghaznaqādī Bahrām-shāh2 to the Ghurid Sa‘īf al-dīn Shīrūr in the year 543/1148-9. Jājanī (and the *Daqī‘i al-ashrāf*) adds a question and answer poem. An ode to ‘Farīd i dabīr’ is found in the *dwār* of Mujūr al-dīn Baqaqānī. Daulāt shāh adds the (informational) question that Farīd was a pupil of Anwārī.


192. Sharaf al-aflāfī Muhammad b. ‘Umar al-Farqādi is represented by a number of poems in ‘Aulī’s anthology, two of them odes to the Ghurid Ghīyāḥ al-dīn Muhammad b. Sīm (558/1163 to 599/1203). He is perhaps not identical4 with the Farqādi included by ‘Abd al-Jalīl Rāzī (ca. 560/1165) in his list of Shiite poets.

1For whom see also below, no. 291 (Shams al-dīn).

2Both ‘Aulī al-dīn (p. 46) and Rāwandi (p. 175) have, wrongly, ‘Masrīd’.


4My doubts are fuelled, first, by the early date of ‘Abd al-Jalīl’s book and, second, by the fact that ‘Aulī’s *Farqādi* was the son of a man with a decidedly non-Shiite name ‘Umar.

193. al-Ḥakīm ‘Alī b. Muḥammad al-Futūḥī al-Ghaznawī is included in ‘Afuṣ’s chapter on the poets of Ghazna 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 Nafisi from an unidentified safīnah) as well as two ṭabāts.


194. Firdaus Samarqandi, the ‘minstrel-girl’ (mutribah), is quoted by Juwaini (followed by Mustaufi) as the author of a rubâ‘ī congratulating the Khwārazm-shāh ‘Alī al-dīn Muhammad on his victory over the Ghurids (in 601/1204).

She is presumably not identical with the ‘Mutribah’ of Kāshghār whose verses bemoaning the death of a certain Ṭuḡhān-shāh are cited by Adhar.1

Juwaini II p. 56; Mustaufi p. 757; Khaiyām-pūr p. 440.

195. Athīr al-dīn al-Futūḥī al-Marwazī was a contemporary and friend of Adīb Sāhib, as is evident from the versified compliments exchanged between the two and quoted by ‘Afuṣ. The dhvān of Anwārī 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 dhvān we find another poem3 in which Anwārī addresses his complaints to [331] a certain king and his minister and a reply4 with the same rhymes which (again according to the superscription) Futūḥī addressed by royal and ministerial command to Anwārī. The same super-

scriptions identify the addresses of Anwārī’s poem as ‘Maḥīk-shāh’ (III, 547/1152 to 548/1153) and ‘Nīzām al-mulk’, but the reply supposedly by Futūḥī speaks of fifteen years having passed since the death of ‘Alī b-Hāsan ‘Imrānī. The latter was executed by Sanjar in 545/1147-8.5 Futūḥī’s poem must consequently have been composed around 560/1165, at which time there was no king by the name of Maḥīk-shāh. Anwārī’s dhvān also contains a qīf‘ah2 mocking the town of Balkh but which (again according to the superscription in the printed dhvān and to Hīdīyat) was in fact written by Futūḥī and maliciously ascribed by him to his rival. Unfortunately the supposedly critical edition by Muṭarrīsī Ridwānī (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.

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


196. Ghazālī Marwazī is known to us only as the author of five verses quoted in ‘Afuṣ’s chapter on the poets of the Seljuqs of Khurāsān. ‘Afuṣ II p. 163; Khaiyām-pūr p. 418.

197. One verse by Muṭqī Ghiyāṭī is quoted in LF ed. Iqbal p. 248 (Ms. nūn in marg.). He is perhaps identical with the Ghiyāṭī to whom two verses are ascribed in Šahīb p. 42.

198. Hamīd al-dīn Tāj al-shur‘ātī al-Dihistānī is credited with one qīf‘ah in ‘Afuṣ’s chapter on the poets of Khurāsān after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157).

1Adhar (old edition) p. 343; Khaiyām-pūr p. 547; Meier, Muhṣatt p. 42-3 (with further discussion).
2Ed. Muṭarrīsī Ridwānī p. 714.
3Ibid., p. 752-3.
5According to Samarqandi fol. 398b.
199. Hāmid al-dīn (?) Mas'ūd b. Sa'd Shāhī-kūb,1 (‘vice-pounder’),2 apparently the son of the famous Šāhīd i Sa'dā, is cited as ‘Aufl in his chapter on the poets of Ghaznah 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. Rāż, whose copy of ‘Aufl was evidently defective in much the same way, ascribes to our poet the verses found in ‘Aufl’s next entry, that devoted to ‘Alī Muḥammad b. Muḥammad.3 [333]

‘Aufl II p. 411-2; Rāż I p. 344-5 (no. 360); Khayyām-pûr p. 173; LN s.vv. ‘Hāmid al-dīn’ p. 809 and ‘Shāhī-kūb’ p. 123.


201. Ḥaqiqī (thus p. 18, 403) or Ḥaqiqī Ṣūfī (p. 84, 305) is quoted four times in LF ed. Isbāl (Ma. nūn in marg.).


1Thus ‘Aufl. In the Tehran edition of Rāż’s Haft ʿIṣrān the name appears as Hāmid b. Mas'ūd Shāhī-kūb, but Eibh quotes it from the London Ms. as Hāmid al-dīn Mas'ūd b. Sa'd Sīyākkī.2

2This is to my knowledge the earliest Persian testament for the Indian loan-word shalāt (Sanskrit śāyati), ‘un-blessed rice’.

3See above, p. 252-3.

4Thus Rāwandī p. 187. Ābī l-Ḥasan Bābāqī calls him al-imām mas'ūd sīyāk sīnānī rā's afṣādī al-sāhid Abī Muḥammad al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad al-Ḥusnānī. The anonymous compiler of his dīvān calls him Haṣān b. Ahmād, which could easily be a misreading for Ḥasan b. Muḥammad. By contrast, ‘Aufl (according to Ms. S) calls him Saiyid al-ḥāj Ashraf al-dīn Fakhr al-sāhid al-Ḥasan b. Nisār al-'Alawi (Ms. E, followed by Browne, has ‘...Ābī l-Ḥasan’). It is not entirely impossible that both are correct, i.e. that his father Muḥammad had the laqab Nisār (al-dīn). That he was a Ḥasanī saiyyid is confirmed by his dhwān p. 261: 1: az pī i dīn-khā Ḥasan-nūn u ḥusnaini-nazah-um ...

He also wrote a Tarjamat waṣīyat amîr al-mu’mînin ‘Âli b. Abî Tâlib, one hundred Arabic sayings ascribed to ‘Ali, each translated by a Persian verse, dedicated to Mas‘ûd b. Muhammad b. Malik-Shâh.

Mss.: Vienna Flügel 121/4 (Copied by Ismâ‘îl b. ‘Ali al-Kâshi and dated 7 Jumâdâ I 753/1352. Wrongly ascribed to Watwât in the catalogue); İstanbul Universite FY 1355 (Ateş 54. 16th century?). It would not be surprising if other copies supposedly of Watwât’s Ṣad kalimah eventually revealed themselves to contain this work.


1 Unpublished. An extract from the chapter on the sa’yids of Ghaznav from a Ms. in the Avesta i quds i Ridawi is in part quoted, in part paraphrased in Persian in a pieceded fashion, by Mudarris i Ridawi, p. x, xxx, xxxix of his introduction.

2 The ahmen date is given in the journal as ‘1312’, evidently in error.

203. Hasan Mutakallim is the author of a poem cited by Jâjarmî and which has also found its way into the old Tehran edition of the Divan of Manûchîrî, whence it was reprinted and translated by Kazimîrî in his edition of the same poet. It is in fact fairly reminiscent of Manûchîrî’s style. The author indicates the name of his patron in a verse1 which reads: kamâl i dawat Bî Riḍa k-‘afarin-ash * bawad dar khâbah zain i alîqī wa khâbah; Dîh-khûdât identified the latter with Kamâl al-daulah Abû Riḍa Faḍl Allâh, who was chief secretary under Malik-shâh and Niqâm al-mulk and lost his post in 478/1083-4. However, the verse just cited says that the poet’s patron was praised ‘in the Friday sermons’, indicating that he was a king, not a middle-ranking bureaucrat. As a possible candidate one could perhaps propose the Ghaznavid Kamâl al-daulah Shâr-zâd (508/1115 to 509/1116); unfortunately it is not known whether he bore the kunyah Abû Riḍa.

Hidâyât quotes the same poem, but attributes it to Hasan Mutakallim Nâsâbûrî, a poet of the 8th/14th century,2 but it is hardly in his style. For his part Jâjarmî was evidently well aware of [337] the difference between our ‘Hasan Mutakallim’ and ‘Sayyid Hasan al-Nâsâbûrî’, a ghazal of whose he quotes on p. 1074.

Jâjarmî II p. 637-41; Hidâyât, Majnûn II p. 14; Kazimîrî, Menouchehri (see above, p. 190), poem no. 5, and notes; LN s.v. Abû 1-Riḍâ p. 459.

204. Qâdi Hîshâm3 (or: Hujaimî)4 is known only from Ibn Isfandîr (writing in 613/1216-7), who enumerates him among the holy men of Tabaristan 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 a ‘îm daryâ‘u * lasa mâ-râ ba juz tu hântu‘u.

Ibn Isfandîr, Târîkh i Tabaristan, ed. A. Iqbal, Tehran 1320sh./1941, I p. 131-5 (the poem is also in Browne’s epitome, p. 81-
5. with variants); Hūdīyat, Majma'ī. I p. 465 (quoting Ibn Isfandiyār); Khayyām-pūr p. 629 (‘Hujaymī Āmūlī’).

205. A du-ba'īti by al-Husain al-Kirmānī - of whom I have found no other mention - is quoted in the Tavākh al-mustahbar of Ibn al-Mujāwir, ed. Lōfgren, p. 84. With the help of the accompanying Arabic translation the corrupt text can be emended as follows:
guftā: ruḥū tū cīt-sāt? gu lū surkū? yāsmin?
guftā: gu lū tī ρεκταή bār bāyāg yāsmin
guftā *khī: shakakr ast labānī tū ‘yā qātq?
guftā *khī: shakakr ast u qātq-n āz ‘yamīną
(I said: What is your cheek? A red rose? Jasmine?) He/she said: ‘It is a nose spread out on a [338] 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-ajall Kamāl al-dīn Ithāfār al-Hujjāb al-Husayn al-Hasani al-Hājjīb is known to us only from ‘Arūfī, who says that he flourished at the court of ‘sulṭān i shahīd’, i.e. the last Ghaznavid Khurṣuṭ Malik (555/1160 to 582/1186), and who quotes a poem in which he addressed ‘Abd al-Rāfī al-Harawi.¹

‘Arūfī p. 413; Khayyām-pūr p. 145.

207. ‘Imādī, or as ‘Arūfī also calls him, Ustād al-a‘immah ‘Imād al-dīn al-Ghaznawī, 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 Farāmārzd; this can hardly be anyone other than the Bāwandī prince Farāmārzd b. Rustam, who was one of the rivals for the control of Māzandarān after the death of his grand-father (or great-grand-father) Husayn al-daulah Shahryārī in ca. 508/1114-5 and who is reported to have submitted to the authority of his (great-?)uncle ‘Allī al-daulah ‘Ali in 511/1117 or shortly afterwards.¹ It would appear that ‘Imādī [339] served ‘Allī as well, for Ibn Isfandiyar implies that ‘Imādī addressed his poem to the atabeg ‘Abd al-Rahmān Tughān-yārīk at the time when the latter had fled from Ardabil and taken refuge at the court of ‘Allī al-daulah ‘Ali; the verse which the historian cites in this context comes from a sīrkī-band quoted in its entirety in the old anthology published by Yaghmārī.²

‘Imādī also addressed a number of poems to the Sejūq Rūkan al-dīn Toghril (II) b. Muhammad (526/1132 to 529/1134), two of which are quoted in extenso by Bāwandī, who states unambiguously that they are by the same ‘Imādī who otherwise eulogised the shahīd i Māzandarān. One of these poems can also be found in ‘Arūfī.³ There is thus no justification for the claim by Taqī Kāshī, and others since, that there were two ‘Imādīs, one at Ghaznawī (‘Arūfī’s ‘Imād al-dīn Ghaznawī, alias ‘Imādī) and the other in Māzandarān (supposedly called ‘Imādī Shahryārī).⁴

Abū l-Ra‘īf Quņmī quotes from two odes by ‘Imād al-Ghaznawī (as he calls him once), or ‘Imādī (as he calls him on two other occasions) in praise of Qiwām al-dīn, who was Toghril’s minister until 528/1133-4, one of them in imitation of an ode to the same minister by Sanāī. The same source mentions also ‘Imādī’s step-son (pisar-khwāndah) by the name of Sa’dīq.⁵

A poem by Abū l-’Allā’ī Ganjā’ī dedicated to the Shahrwān-shāh Manūchehr II, who died not long after 555/1160 (and in any case before 566/1170),⁶ speaks explicitly of the death of ‘Imādī [340] (wa shud rawān i ‘Imādī ...); thus the dates given for ‘Imādī’s death by Taqī (573/1177-8) and Ādhar (582/1186-7) are too late. Rieu (and others since) thought that the words ‘shah Jahn-pahlavān’ which occur in one of the odes in the London manuscript refer to the Šādīūzd atabeg of

¹The Arabic translation has ‘... lā al-qātq alladāh min (bad variant: fl al-yamān) and adds the evidently spurious gloss: ‘alī al-makān alladāh yusammā al-qātq al-yamān’. I take it that the ‘Yamān’ required by the rhyme is used here in the meaning ‘Yamān’ (which is what the printed text has instead of it).
²For whom see above, p. 243.
³See above, p. 248-9.
Azerbaijan of that name (who ruled from 571/1175 to 582/1186), but here they are evidently not a name, but the epithet of some other ruler.


208. Two verses by Abū 1-Abbās (Bul-Abbās) *Imānī* are quoted by Shams, p. 207.

209. Tāj al-dīn *Ismā’īl* al-Bākharmī is included by 'Aulf (on whom some other sources listed below are entirely dependent) among the poems of the Seljuqs of Khorāsān. His entry includes two ghazals and a number of *rubā‘* lyādī, among the latter a elegy on the death of Abū l-Ḥasan Tālībān.

1 Thus the first words of 'Aulf'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: 'Sūzanān'.

2 Thus Ms. 8.

3 Ed. Shab-Husaini 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 *'hār i khun-khun* with Ḥakīm Jalālī, but offers no arguments to support it.

4 The (okarya?) 1-3 = (Aulf) 1-3; Z. 4 is not in 'A.; Z. 5 = 'A. 8; Z 6 = 'A. 11.

210. Ḥakīm Jalālī (or Jalālī) is included in 'Aulf's section on the poets in Transoxania during the Seljuq period, where we are told that he wrote satirical verses in the vein of Sūzanān 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 *quatūd* and one *rubā‘*.

Furūzānfar, followed by Ṣafā, maintained that the *'hār i khun-khun* ('ass of the wine-shop') who is the victim of so many of Sūzanān's satires and who, if we are to believe Sūzanān, was a Christian, is to be identified with 'Aulf's Ḥakīm Jalālī; the basis for this is a verse in one of [342] these satires which Furūzānfar quoted as: *hamah sauulānī *ān-khun maqīn kun *ba Jalālī jardīāt i ālāb*. But the now available printed *divān* of Sūzanān 3 has in the verse in question not 'Jalālī', but *jalālāb*; compare *jalālāb* at the end of the previous verse. This reading certainly seems to make better sense, but even with *Jalālī* the verse is hardly unambiguous.

'Aulf II p. 198-9; Furūzānfar I p. 228 n. 1; *LN* s.v. *Jalāl i Māwarā‘a-nāfī* p. 72; Ṣafā, *Tārikh* II p. 623.

211. al-Imām al-ajal Jalāl al-dīn malik al-kalām Fadl Allāh al-Khwārī (Khārwar is a village near Rai) is the subject of an entry in 'Aulf's chapter on the amateur poets of Ṭraq, where we find, among other things, an ode of eleven verses which, still according to 'Aulf, he addressed to Sultan Teksh (the Khwarazmshāh) at the time when his troops were outside the gates of Rai (i.e. evidently in 388/1192). Zakariyā al-Qazwini quotes a slightly different version of the same poem, 4 gives its author the same name (al-Jalāl al-Khwārī), but says...
that the verses were addressed to Tekish’s opponent, the Seljuq Toghril (III) b. Arslân, when he had drawn up his troops outside Rai. Jalâl al-din, we are told, went to the sultan together with Şadr al-din al-Wazzîn to complain of the damage that the king’s horses were doing to the crops; after listening to the verses Toghril ordered his men to leave the fields alone.

Daulat-shâh tells (on the authority of the supposed Tarikh i 21 i Seljûq of Abî Tâhir Khâtûnî) that two exact 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 Zakariyâ’s version, but he gives the name of the poet as Abû l-Mafkhîr Râzî and that of the king as Mas’ûd b. Muhammad b. Malik-shâh (529/1134 to 547/1152), and says that the incident took place ‘at the time when he set out from Mâzandarân’. The reference to Mâzandarân means meaningless in connection with Mas’ûd, but fits in with ‘Aafi’s version: Tekish did in fact approach Rai from Mâzandarân.

Qazwînî drew attention to the similarity between the verses which ‘Aafi ascribes to Jalâl al-din and those which Daulat-shâh gives to Abû l-Mafkhîr and suspected that Jalâl al-din plagiarised the earlier poet; unfortunately he seems to have overlooked the parallel passage in Zakariyâ. In the light of the latter it now seems more likely that Daulat-shâh (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 Abû l-Mafkhîr Râzî before Daulat-shâh. This authority states also (this time without reference to Khâtûnî) that the same Abû l-Mafkhîr composed ‘several’ odes in praise of the Shiite imam ‘Ali al-Ri’î and proceeds to

1For which see below, no. 225 (Khâtûnî).
2suppose that this is what ‘əţkînu 2âr 3j̲u’na i Mâzandarân’ means.
3Barber de Meynard, Dictionnaire géographique, historique et littéraire de la Perse, Paris 1861, p. 213 n. 1 says (apparently on the authority of Mustaﬁn’s Nuzh haq al-qâlid, but I have failed to find this information in that book) that the village of Khwârî was the birth-place of two poets, Malîk al-kalâm Fadl Allâh, who flourished at the time of Tekish, and Abû l-Mafkhîr, who lived at the time of the Seljuq Mas’ûd. If this information is in fact contained in a source anterior to Daulat-shâh it would be easy to explain his attribution of these verses to Abû l-Mafkhîr as the result of a confusion between the two compatriots.

quote the first verse of one of these (beginning bâl i murasa ‘...’). 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-din Râzî. In at least one version it ends with a verse in which the author gives his name as ‘Mafkhîr’ or, perhaps better, ‘Mufkhîr’.

See (for Jalâl al-din): ‘Aafi I p. 276-8 (and Qazwînî ad loc.); Sharwâni, Nuzh haq al-majalis (see below, appendix III); Zakariyâ al-Qazwînî, Ahtâr al-bilad, ed. Wüstenfeld, Göttingen 1848, p. 243-4; Râzî III p. 32-3 (no. 1071); Khâyâm-pûr p. 132; and (for Abû l-Mafkhîr): Daulat-shâh p. 76-7; Râzî III p. 33-4 (no. 1072); Adhar III p. 1101-6 (and Nâşiri’s notes, with further information on the ode to ‘Ali al-Ri’î); Hidîâyat, Majma’ I p. 376 (‘Fâhîrî al-Râzî’); ‘A.î â Dî’ûd, Qâṣâ’dîh â Abî l-Mafkhîr i Râzî ë manstâb ba inâm Fâhîr i Râzî’[i.e. ‘bâl i murasa ‘...’, with a quasi-critical edition of the poem], Murâîf XVIII/1, 1380ah./2001, p. 95-107; LN s.v. ‘Abî l-Mafkhîr’ p. 857; Khâyâm-pûr p. 24 (‘Abî l-Mafkhîr’) and 425 (‘Fâhîrî’).

212. Jamâl Ashharî and the already discussed Ahtâr Aksîkârî were, according to ‘Aafi, two poets whom the atabeg Qâzî Arslân (582/1186 to 587/1191) summoned to his court when he grew tired of the lax services of Mujîr Balaqânî; in the mocking verses by Mujîr which ‘Aafi quotes in this connection he is referred to merely as ‘Ashharî’. A substantial qaṣâ’dâh by presumably the same Malik al-shar’arî Jamâl al-din al-Ashharî is quoted by Jâzîrî.

‘Aafi II p. 223; Sharwâni, Nuzh haq al-majalis (see below, appendix III); Jâzîrî II pp. 497-9. [345]

213. Jamâl al-din Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Razzaq al-Isfahânî,1 the father of Kamûl al-din,2 flourished in Isfahan during the second half of

1The name is quoted thus by Râwandi (p. 33); similarly ‘Aafi and Shamûs, who call him Jamâl al-din (or Jamâl) Muhammad (‘Abd al-Razzaq. The evidence of these three independent early sources (Râwandi was a contemporary of the poet) clearly outweighs that of Ibn al-Fawwâd (see the reference below, p. 354) who refers to our poet’s son as Kamûl al-din Abû l-Fadl Ismâ’îl b. Abû Muhammad ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Abd al-Razzaq al-Isfahânî. Zakariyâ al-Qazwînî, like many others after him, calls our poet Jamâl al-din ‘Abd al-Razzaq and Ahtâr even expressly states that his given name was ‘Abd al-Razzaq, 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 kázrâh i isfâhân to indicate filiation.

2For whom see below, no. 217.
the 6th/12th century. 'Afsîf seems to imply that he was by profession a goldsmith and in one of his own verses Jamâl 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', though it could be that here zar-gar means not 'goldsmith' but 'illuminator of manuscripts' (Arabic mudâhakih), or indeed that the verse is merely a metaphorical allusion to his 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 'Jamâl i naqâšî i Isfâhânî' who, according to Râwândî, illustrated a book of poetry for Sultan Toqhrî (III) b. Arslân in 580/1184-5.²

Jamâl's divân contains a small number of odes to the Seljûqs Arslân (556/1161 to 571/1176) and Toqhrî III (571/1176 to 590/1194), and a larger number to the Bâwânîd ruler of Mâzandârân, Hûsâm al-dîn Ardâshîr b. Hûsan (560/1165 to 568/1173), but most of his poems eulogise local dignitaries of Isfâhan. In Jamâl'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 Hânahîs (led by the Aû i Sî'îd) and the Shâhfriyân (led by the Bânî Hûshânî). The largest number of Jamâl's odes are addressed to the Hânahî Shîkhî i Rûkn al-dîn Mas'ûdî and his son Rûkn al-dîn Shîkhî. We know from the divân of Kamâl al-dîn that Jamâl died before Sî'îd and the latter lived perhaps until 600/1203-4.³ But Jamâl also served the rival Shâhfri faction: his divân contains a good number of poems addressing one 'Sadîr al-dîn', but without personal

¹ Divân, ed. Dastgirî, p. 335, 1. 3: tâ chu man bâshandabr u bêt dê 'em dar dâsî fard (â zar-gar) in naghâ-fând, dâ kharîh 'em dar dâsî fard. ² Râwândî p. 57. What speaks against the identity of the two is the fact that when Râwândî quotes Jamâl's poetry he refers to him not as 'Jamâl i naqâšî' but with the names cited above. There is a poem in Jamâl's divân (p. 295) addressing 'Jamâl i naqâšî' (thus in the third verse), but it is not really clear whether it is by our poet (as M. Ijâbî maintained in his notes to Râwândî, p. 477), or rather directed to him (as Dastgirî claims in his introduction, p. vii-x). Shâhshânâ's Nuzhat al-majâlis apparently quotes both 'Jamâl al-dîn i 'Abd al-Razzâq' and 'Jamâl i Naqâšî' which, if confirmed, would be a further argument against identifying these with one another. Ibn Isfandîrî (Tâyirî in Tahâritân, ed. 'A. Ijâbî, Tehran 1332h./1941, II p. 120) quotes a verse from a poem by 'Naqâšî i shîdhî' in praise of the Bâwânîd Hûsân al-dîn Ardâshîr; the latter was in fact one of Jamâl's patrons, but I have not found the verse in his divân. ³ See below, no. 217.

³ For these see the detailed account below, no. 227 (Khuñândî).

² Divân, p. 296-61. Seven verses from this poem are quoted (anonymously, and without the verse naming the deceased) by Râwândî, p. 373.

³ See below no. 227. But we must await a critical edition of Jamâl's divân before ruling out the possibility that the poem really commemorates Mahmûd's younger relative Jamâl al-dîn Mas'ûdî.
213a. Janati b.v.  (Bammâ?) of Nakhshab, a panegyrist of the minister 'Ali al-mulk Shara'ī al-dîn Amîrâk, is quoted by 'Aufî II p. 394-6 as the author of a tarjî band, a qastîdah and a rubâî. For his patron, see also 'Aufî I p. 148-9.

214. Musta'ufi i marshiq Hamîd al-dîn al-Jauhari is the addressee of a comical poem by Sûzânî which has been preserved by Shams. 'Aufî quotes the opening words of Sûzânî's poem (albeit in a somewhat different form) and proceeds to quote three rubâîs and two qif'âs by Jauhari himself. Râzî, who cites a number of verses not found in 'Aufî, includes Jauhari among the poets of Samarqand. It is perhaps he, and not al-Jauhari al-Shîrîghî al-Harawî, who should be identified [349] with the Jauhari whom 'Arûfî includes among the poets of the Qarakhanids.

'Arûfî p. 28; 'Aufî II p. 208-9; Râzî III p. 354-6 (no. 1427); L.N. s.v. 'Hamîd al-dîn' p. 808; Khâyîân-pûr p. 141.

215. Kâfî (i) Abî l-Faraj al-Rûnî, evidently the son of the poet of the celebrated Abî l-Faraj al-Rûnî, is given as the author of two fragments quoted by 'Aufî in his chapter on the poets of Western [350] Persia during the Seljûq period, one of them addressed to Latîf Za'îl Marâghi.


216. Jamâl al-dîn Nâşîr i Shams, known as Kâfîrak i Ghazânî ('the little heathen of Ghaznâh') is the author of ten satirical verses quoted by 'Aufî in his chapter on the poets of Ghaznâh and Lahore at the time of the Seljûqs.

---

1Shams p. 260-1; for the attribution see below, no. 302 (Sûzânî).
2See above, p. 171 (no. 77).
3For whom see below, no. 275.
4Below, no. 233.
of Mázandarán, to two of the Salghurids of Fārs, Sa’d b. Zanglī (601/1203 to 628/1231) and his successor Abū Bakr, and others. He exchanged poems with Aṭhīr al-dīn Aumānī and is himself the addressee of an Arabic letter from the well-known mystic al-Suhrawardī.2

Ibn al-Fuwaḍ says that Kamāl al-dīn ‘was martyred by the Tatars in Isfahan in the year 635’; Daulāt-shāhīs specifies that it was on 2 Jumādā I of that year (i.e. December 1227, two years after the fall of Isfahan to the Mongols) and tells an elaborate story of how Kamāl was living as a Sufi outside the town, how the Mongols [352] tried to force him to reveal the location of treasures hidden by the townsfolk and thereby tortured him to death. If Kamāl really died some time after the Mongol invasion he must have completed his dhwān 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 dhwān, Kamāl also wrote a good number of poems of religious inspiration. We also have a short treatise in Arabic, Risālat al-qawān.3

Mss. of his dhwān (in some copies styled Kulliyat):4 Dublin Beatty 103/1 (Ms. completed Dhū l-Hijjah 699/1300. End missing); Beatty 337 (16th cent.? Defective. Presumably Bahār al-ṣulūm’s chīmaḥā, ‘124 pp.’); Manchester Lindesianae 217 (Dated 1029/1620); Oxford Elliot 66 (Ethere 639. Dated 12 Muharram 981/1573); Elliot 68 (Ethere 641. Dated Dhū l-qa’dah 1000/1592. Lacunae); Elliot 65 (Ethere 638. Dated Jumādā I 1023/1614); Elliot 229 (Ethere 640); Elliot 69 (Ethere 642); Elliot 67 (Ethere 643); London I. O. 1055 (Copied by Sultan ‘Alī Mashhādi in 905/1499-1500); Or. 473 (Rieu p. 580.1. Dated Rabi’ II 1007/1598); Add. 18,414 (Rieu p. 581. Dated Ramadān 1029/1620); Add. 7092 (Rieu p. 581. Dated Shawwāl 1036/1627); I.O. 1055 (Dated 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 Supp. 601); King’s, No. 171 (Browne Supp. 602); Paris Supplément 795 fol. 78v.

1For whom see PL VI.
2Published in Bahār al-ṣulūm’s introduction, p. ix-x.
3Published in Bahār al-ṣulūm’s introduction, p. cv-cxiv.
4See also the list of Mss. (some of them unfortunately not adequately identified) in Bahār al-ṣulūm’s introduction p. xcvii-xcviii.

1The Ismailī Shīb collection is part of the University Library in Ankara (see World Survey III p. 298-9).
century?); Majlis II 380 (Dated 1015/1606-7); Galistân/Âtâbây II 316 (Copied by 'Abd al-Ghanî Jamî Lankârî and dated Jumâdâ I 1021/1612); Majlis II 379 (Dated 1036/1626-7); Sipah-sâlih II 1254 (Dated 1071/1660-1); Galistân/Âtâbây II 436/II (not before 16th century); Galistân/Âtâbây II 317-9; etc. Mashhad Râisâvi VII 523 (Dated 1 Safar 1019/1610); Bombay Rehtaks p. 142 no. 60 (Dated 9/87>6/1578); Rehtak p. 162 no. 125 (Dated 1024/1615); Lucknow Sprenger 306; Bankiopore I 54 (15th century?); I 55 (16th century?); has a seal dated 1044/1634-5; Hyderabad Asafiyah I p. 746 no. 246 (Dated 991/1583); Alligarh Subh. Ms. p. 37 no. 5 (Dated 992/1584); Calcutta Ivanov 488 (18th century?); Bûhâr 304 (18th century?). Cf. Munz. III 25500-63.


218. al-Imâm al-âlîm Kamâl al-dîn 'Ispahanî is quoted by 'Auîf in his chapter on the poeticising clerics, where we find a poem of religious content (quoted also, with some variants, by Jâjarmi) and two nûhâs. Quatrains of his are cited also by Abu l-Rak'î al-Qummi and by Shârâwînî.


219. Bahâ'î al-dîn al-Karîmî al-Samargandî is included by 'Auîf in his chapter on the poets of Transoxania after the time of Sanjâr (i.e. after 1552/1557) where we are told that, though a native of Samargand, he entered the service of the ruler of Sîstân, Malik Shams al-dîn, evidently Shams al-dîn Muhammad - or Âhmad - b. Tij al-dîn Naşr, [356] (559/1644 to 564/1169).2 'Auîf has also poems dedicated to one Qâdi Isfârâînî and to a personage whom the poet addresses as Malik al-âdâb Nîzâm al-dîn Shâh.

'Auîf II p. 367-71; Râzî III p. 361-2 (no. 1430); follows 'Auîf'; Hîdîyât, Majmâ'a I p. 481-2 (has one poem not in 'Auîf'); Khaîyâm-pûr p. 488.

220. Abu l-Hâfiz 'Umar b. Ibrâhîm al-Khaîyâmî,3 also (and perhaps wrongly) called Khaîyâm,4 [357] the celebrated astronomer and

---

1Thus 'Auîf. Hîdîyât gives his name as Bahâ'î al-dîn 'Abd al-Karîm.2Identification proposed by C.E. Netterton, in litteris.3The name is cited thus on two occasions by his contemporary al-Khâzimî and is probably correct, although the kunyah Abu l-Hâfiz is not mentioned by any other source (in the manuscripts of some of his treatises the kunyah appears rather as Abu l-Fâth). His father's name (ibrisînî) is mentioned also by Ibn Funduq and Ibn al-â'bîr. Both Ibn Funduq and 'Avâfî give him the Isfâhâb Bayân al-baqî.4Is it (al-)Khaîyâmî or (al-)Khaîyâmî? The former is used in most of the early sources both in aroabic (al-Khâzînî, al-Zamakhshârî, Ibn al-â'bîr) and in Persian (Cávârî'; compare also the verse by Khâzînî (Dineh, ed. Sajâîdî p. 58) mentioning "Umâr al-Khäuserî"). But "Umâr al-Khäuserî is found often enough to make it difficult (though not, perhaps, impossible) to dismiss it as a mere graphic error, thus in Ms. of al-Kâfîb, Fâlîd al-dîn al-Râdî, Ibn al-Qifî, Zacâriyâ' al-Qazwînî; in the Ms. of Ibn Funduq (and those dependent on him) al-Khaîyâmî and 'al-Khaîyâmî' both occur (see p. 971 2; p. 110 l. 10; p. 112 l. 1; p. 117 l. 6; p. 119 l. 6; p. 126 l. 10; p. 163 l. 1. of the Arabic section, with the critical apparatus; according to my collation London Or. 9033 always has 'al-Khaîyâmî' except in the passage corresponding to p. 117 of the edition, where it too has 'al-Khaîyâmî'. It is tempting to speculate that 'Khaîyâmî' ('tenant-maker') was the nick-name of a more or less remote ancestor and that
mathematician, and reputed author of a large number of Persian rubā‘iyāt. The facts of his life and scientific achievement are well attested through his own writings (in Arabic) and the testimony of his contemporaries (al-Khāzīnī, al-Zamakhschī, Ibn Fudqū, ‘Arrūḏī) and of other early historical and biographical sources. Ibn Fudqū, who, still a child, was presented by his father to Khaiyāmī in 507/1113-4, tells us, among other things, that ‘Umar, his father and his ancestors were natives of Naṣībūr 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 Dhī l-qa‘dah or Dhū l-bihiq 439). ‘Arrūḏī, who met Khaiyāmī in 506/1112-3 in Balkh, states that he made a pilgrimage to the master’s grave in Naṣībūr 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 Fudqū tells us further that ‘Umar enjoyed the intimacy of the Qarakhānīd Shams al-mulūk [358] (i.e. Naṣr I b. Ibrāhīm, 460/1068 to 472/1080) and the Seljuq Malik-shīr I (465/1072 to 485/1092), but that Sanjar disliked him. The same author says also that Khaiyāmī was of bad character and mean spirit (sa‘īyī al-khuluq wa dai‘iy al-‘a‘tān). Ibn al-

his progeny consequently bore the nisba al-Khayyāmi; the usual Persian form ‘Umar i Khaiyāmī would then mean not ‘Umar the tent-maker’ but ‘Umar the son (i.e. descendant) of the tent-maker’, while the Arabic ‘Umar al-Khāyīmī’ would represent a misunderstanding of the ambiguous Persian form. M.M. Tabūštābī has argued that we should distinguish between the scientist Khaiyāmī and the (Persian and Arabic) poet Khaiyāmī, but the sources do not bear this out. Even more untenable is Tabūštābī’s attempt to identify the author of the rubā‘iyāt with one ‘Ali al-dīn ‘Ali b. Muhammad b. Ahmad b. Khūsrow al-Shāhi bi l-Khāyīmī of whom Ibn al-Fawāsi (Majmū‘ al-‘addih fi wa‘fātum al-‘a‘bīd, ed. M. Jawād, Damascus 1962-7, no. 1571) says that he wrote a dhatin in Persian and his poems are many and famous in Khorasan and Azerbaijan. Of the verses which I have translated [naqshat can hardly mean anything else] from his handwriting are these [there follow two verses in Arabic]. In his foot-note the Arab editor also expresses the opinion that ‘Ali, and not the scientist ‘Umar, is the ‘famous poet’. This ‘Ali b. Muhammad appears to be otherwise unknown. The verses quoted are of the usual sort of homorotic taghazuz and have no affinity either with the ‘Khaiyāmī quadrains’ or with the (in my judgement) authentic Arabic poems of Khaiyāmī.

1For the supposed letter from Sana‘ī to ‘Umar see de Brujin, 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 Khaiyāmī.

Athīr says that ‘Umar b. Ibrāhīm al-Khajīmī, Abū l-Muẓaffar al-
Iṣfīzārī (who was with ‘Umar when ‘Arrūḏī met him) and Māmūn b. al-
Najjāb al-Wāṣīfī were among the ‘leading astronomers’ whom Malik-shīr employed to set up an astronomical observatory (rafaq) in 467/1074-5. 2 ‘Arrūḏī tells an anecdote about ‘Umar’s services as an astrologer to the ‘king’ (i.e. evidently Muhammad I b. Malik-shīr) in 506/1114-5.

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 fi l-
Iḥrādīn ‘alā masā’il al-jabr wa l-muqābālah) which the competent specialists regard as a major landmark in the history of mathematics. [359] But his interests ranged also over other fields. The famous grammarian al-Zamakhshīrī reports on a discussion that he had with Khaiyāmī on a most point of Arabic lexicography and Ibn Fudqū tells an anecdote about ‘Umar’s intervention in a scholarly debate about variant readings of the Qur’ān.

Two treatises in Persian prose have been published as the work of Khaiyāmī, but both are of very questionable authenticity. One, the Na‘ūrūz-nāmah, 4 was published by Minawī on the basis of a single manuscript in Berlin. There is, however, a second, shorter, copy of the work in London 5 and in this manuscript the introductory section, and with it

1Evidently a scribal error for Abī <Hātim> al-Muẓaffar, for whom see PL II p. 446-7 (with further references).

2In his entry for that year Ibn al-Athīr refers to two events of astronomical interest: first the calendar reform which fixed Nāzirūz to the point where the sun enters Aries and second the establishment of the observatory; Khaiyāmī 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 Khaiyāmī 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 Jälīlī era does not begin in 467/1075 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.

3They are most conveniently accessible in the edition (facsimiles from Ms.) and Russian translation by B.A. Rozenfeld and A.P. Yushkevich, ‘Osnov Khizirin Traktatov’, Moscow 1961.

4Edited from the Berlin Ms. by M. Minawī, Tehran 1933, and reprinted several times. A facsimile of the Ms. and a Russian translation can be found in Rozen-

the attribution to Khayyāmi, 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 Khayyāmi’s
authentic writings. The other is a little and quite elementary compendium
on philosophy titled either Rīslāḥ Kālīyat al-wūjūd or Sīslāt al-tarāb,1
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’ili theosophical tract (it expounds the theory of the ‘ten intel-
ligences’), but at the end the compiler tries to cover his traces by quoting
(without attribution) the well-known passage from al-Ghazzālī’s al-Muq-
qādī min al-dalāl in which the [360] author declares that the road to
truth has been found neither by the speculative theologians (mutakallimīn),
nor by the philosophers, nor by the Ismā’īlis, but only by Sufis.

Like many Persian intellectuals of his time Khayyāmi dabbled in
Arabic poetry and some samples of his verses in that language are quoted
by al-Kātib al-Isfahānī,2 Ibn al-Qīṭīfī, the unidentified author of the
‘appendix’ (al-Rīslāḥ al-mulahqah)3 to Ibn Fundūq’s ‘continuation’
(Tatimnah) to al-Sīstānī’s Sīwān al-ḥikmah, and finally by al-
Shahrarażī.4 Ibn al-Qīṭīfī (likewise apparently al-Kātib) quotes four
verses from a poem with a double rhyme in -dīdī and the two other
sources quote six verses from the same poem (of which three overlap
with Ibn al-Qīṭīfī, giving us a total of seven verses) and add four verses

1Published in Rozinfil’d Ell’Ushkevich p. 108-15 of the Arabic/Persian section and
also in Yaghmā’i p. 35-42, with variants from the Hyderabad edition of 1941. There is
a French translation by A. Christensen, Un traité de méthaphysique de ‘Omar (Khayyām),
Le Monde Oriental (Uppsala) 1, 1905, p. 1-16.

2His Khurtiat al-qasr is not accessible to me, but from the secondary literature
one gains the impression that he gives the same four verses as Ibn al-Qīṭīfī.

3For this work see D.M. Dunlop’s introduction to his edition of The Mantuvaḥāb
Sīwān al-Ḥikmah of Abū ʿAbd Allāh Ismā’īl, The Hague (etc.) 1979, p. xxv-xxv,
followed by an account of the manuscripts. I have worked with London Or. 9033 (not
in the published catalogues), where the Rīslāḥ occupies fol. 129a to 140b and the sec-
section on al-Khayyām is on fol. 144b-145a. The Rīslāḥ obviously predates 639/1241,
the date of the oldest Ms. (Istanbul Usul Mutba 1408).

4al-Shahrarażī quotes some (not all) of the verses found in al-Rīslāḥ al-
mulahqah, on which he is evidently dependent. The verses contained in the last three
sources are quoted (not always correctly) and translated in A.S. Tritton, ‘‘Umar
Khayyām as an Arabic poet’, BSOS XXVII, 1964, p. 431-3, evidently in total
ignorance of the previous literature on the subject.

from another poem with a double rhyme in -dīdī. In using this highly
unusual rhyming technique ‘Umar was doubtless consciously copying the
famous luzūmīyāt of Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ma‘arrī. The imagery at least in the
second one these poems is in fact rather like [361] Ma‘arrī’s,1 despite the
fact that the distinctly religious tone of Khayyāmi’s piece contrasts
strikingly with the scepticism which runs through Ma‘arrī’s work (and
also the Persian rubā‘īyyāt ascribed to Khayyāmi).2 One has thus the
impression [362] that in his Arabic poems Khayyāmi imitated Ma‘arrī’s
poetic technique, but did not emulate his unorthodox ideas.

al-Rīslāḥ al-mulahqah (followed by al-Shahrazūrī) adds a few
more rubā‘īs with ordinary (single) rhymes; one of these, however, is
quoted already by al-Tha‘labī (who died two decades before Khayyāmi

1Compare, for example, Khayyāmi’s: astāmū mina l-fashāḥī jahānā wa khyaflat
aghfīnna wa šafāṭī bi taqaddīma šafātī (‘I fast from the bile conduct abstaining both publicly and secretly and my fast-
breaking is to bless my creator’), with Ma‘arrī’s much finer line (Luzumīyāt l-mā li yalzimā,
al-‘Azīz Zand, Cairo 1891-2, I p. 262):
ana šā’īṭan tali l-hujatī wa inna’mā
šafīr l-tāhlimāna wa yasamna dhikr a‘ūṣiyā
(‘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’).

2A good number of authors have quite rightly drawn attention to parallels between
the content of the rubā‘īyyāt and that of Ma‘arrī’s Luzūmīyāt. Whoever wrote:
ba‘al-khnāṣ u kā‘bah khnāṣāh bī bindagāt ast,
naqūṣ juzān tahtīnūn bindagāt ast,
ysanūna kaljisīyat bī taqqūlī wa sa‘īb
hasguq bi hamah nizāhīnā l bindagāt ast.
(‘The idol-temple and the Ka‘bah are houses of bondage. Beating the wooden bell
of the Christian) is the song of bondage. The girdle, the synagogue, the prayer-bands
and the cross, in truth all of them are signs of bondage’) could hardly have been
ignorant of Ma‘arrī’s notorious verses (Luzumīyāt l-mā li yalzimā II p. 201):
hujat al-basīfātūn wa l-majṣūdūn mīkhāt
wa yahdīha ḥātarān wa l-majūsūd mudākhalāt,
*ihsānūna akhā l-arfi: dhnū ‘aqūl bi-lār
a‘ūn wa dhnīr dhinānūn lā là yuqūl lāb.
(‘The true believers are in error, the Christians are not on the right path, Judaea is
corrupted, 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 itself in no argument for the attribution of the rubā‘īyyāt to Khayyāmi. What
the author (or authors) of the rubā‘īyyāt have in common with Ma‘arrī is their clear
rejection of Islamic orthodoxy. But at the same time the hedonism of the rubā‘īyyāt con-
trasts very strongly with the austere asceticism and moralism of Ma‘arrī’s outlook.
was born) and ascribed by him to Abū Sahl al-Nīnī. Even if this attribution is not necessarily correct the verses are in any case older than Khayyām.

None of the 12th-century sources say anything to suggest that ʿUmar wrote poetry in Persian. Ṭūrci, who has a lot to say about Khayyām the astrologer, makes no reference to him in his chapter on Persian poetry, and even in the 13th century he remains unknown to ʿAuffi and Shams. It is particularly striking that ʿAuffi, 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 rhyme-smiths, has absolutely nothing to say about him. However, a small number of Persian quatrains are ascribed to ʿUmar in works by some of ʿAuffi’s contemporaries. Thus, one Persian rubāʾi is by Ḥbn 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 Dāyah, writing (in ca. 619/1222) of how many a miserable philosopher, atheist (dahrī) and materialist (rubāʾī) denies the resurrection, singles out “one of the most distinguished of them”, ʿUmar i Khayyām, and quotes two quatrains ridiculing the Muslim belief [363] in the hereafter, among them the one quoted by Fakhr al-dīn. Another rubāʾi is attributed to ʿUmar i Khayyām by Juwainī in his history of the Mongol conquests (658/1260). And no fewer than 31 quatrains are ascribed to ʿUmar in the Nuzhat al-majālis of Jamāl al-dīn al-Sharwānī, an anthology assembled around the middle of the 13th century.2 A few more are added by Jāmālī in the 14th century. The earliest substantial manuscripts of the rubāʾīyat ascribed to Khayyām belong to the 15th century and in 867/1462-3 Yār-Āhmād b. Ḥasan Rashīdī Tābrīzī put together a collection of 554 rubāʾīyat with the title Tarāb-khānah. 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

---

1The verses 11-3 of Tritton’s collection correspond to the first, second and last lines of the four-verse qu’rah quoted in Thālabī, Yatimah IV p. 309, 1. 5-8. See also Qushairī’s edition of ʿArīfī, p. 214 note 1.
2See below, appendix III.

---

1Ẓuhūrī p. 33, 39, 157, 284, 340 (one verse).
adorned with a rich collection of interspersed rubā‘iyāt and other poetic snippets, in part composed by the author, in part [365] 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 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 Mahsati as well. [See now also appendix III.]

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 ‘Khayyamic’ 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‘iyat of Omar Khayyám’ of 1859, which belongs to the history of English and not of Persian literature.2 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 [366] influence on such major figures of 20th-century Persian literature as Šādīq Hidāyat and his name continues to be invoked with passion in the ideological debates that have so shaken the country in the last hundred years.3

The serious study of Khayyām and the rubā‘iyāt begins with Zhukovsky’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 20th century research was dominated by attempts at a critical philological analysis of the manuscripts of the rubā‘iyāt (Christensen, Calilik, Rempis), but these attempts remained largely fruitless due to the relative lateness and general unreliability of all the manuscripts. By contrast, some Iranian scholars (notably Furtigh and Dabī) 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 Khayyām had at long last come to light. Major contributions to unmasking these forgeries came from Minawī, Minorsky and Humā‘ī. As for the present, it would seem doubtful whether we have really come very much beyond the position expressed in Chaeder’s famous dictum of 1934 that the name of ‘Umar i Khayyām is one which ‘is to be struck out from the history of Persian literature’. [367]

Mss. of the rubā‘iyāt:1 Dublin Beatty 178 fol. 67-105 in marg. (16th century?); Beatty 303 (modern forgery ‘dated’ 658/1259-60); T.C.D. 1571; T.C.D. 1572; Oxford Osleley 140 (Izār 525. Copied by Māḥmūd Pirbūdāği and dated 865/1460));1 Ind. Inst. Pers. 111 (Beeston 2547. Dated 24 Rabī‘ I 1179/1765, 625 quatrains); Whinfeld 33 (Beeston 2548. E. Fitzgerald’s copy of a copy of Osleley 140); Bodl. 367 (Izār 524); London Or. 596 fol. 1b-35b (Meredith-Owens p. 50, 16th century?); Or. 331 (Rieu p. 547. Dated Ramaḍān 1033/1624 and attributed on the flyleaf to Sarmad. Beginning missing. 540 quatrains); Or. 5011 fol. 1b-43 (Meredith-Owens p. 49. Dated 1079/1668-9); Or. 330 (Rieu p. 546-7. 18th century? 423 quatrains); I.O. 906 (Dated 1811); Or. 9857 fol. 136b-155a (Meredith-Owens p. 83. Dated 1277/1860-1); I.O. 907; Cambridge Add. 1055 fol. 174b-220b

116 Mss., many in private collections in India and elsewhere, are listed in chronological order in the appendix to Rempis’s book from 1939 (see below: Translations, German). Only a small sample has been reproduced here.

1See above, p. 70-2.
2See in particular A.J. Arberry, The romance of the Rubā‘iyat, London 1959. The older printings of FitzGerald’s poem are listed below. For the relationship between this poem and the Persian sources see the meticulous study by Heron-Allen (below, under Editions: London 1989).
(Browne's Cat. CCH. Has an owner's note dated 1195/1781. More than 800 quatrains); Or. 1724 (Modern forgery 'dated' Razab 604/1208. See the facsimile published in Moscow); 1 Paris Supplément 1777 fol. 314v-320v in marg., 326v-328v (Blachet 1645. Ms. dated 852/1448); Supplément 1417 fol. 598v-90a (Blachet 1662. Dated Ramadān 879/1475); Supplément 1817 fol. 17-18 (Blachet 1247. Before 913/1506-7); Supplément 823 fol. 92v sqq. (Blachet 1698. Dated 15 Jumāḍā II 934/1528. 175 quatrains); 2 [369] Supplément 1481 (Blachet 1211. 16th century? 34 quatrains. Pictures); Supplément 793 fol. 104s sqq. (Blachet 1894. 16th century?); Supplément 1336 fol. 252 sqq. (Blachet 1912. Dated 1268/1851-2. 95 quatrains);

Gotha 9/14 (Ms. dated 5 Rabi' I 1131/1719); 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 Jumāḍā 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 (Remps p. 180. Anthology dated 861/1456-7); Nurusmāniye 3892 fol. 1b-66b (Atēq 22. Dated 865/1460-1); Esat 2882/2 (Mehmet Reşit 1 p. 497. Dated 19 Dhūl ḫaḍrāt 876 /1472); Topkapı, Mehmet Reşit 541 (Karayat 389. Copied by Hāmid Allāh Shaikh-zādah, 15th century?); Topkapı, Hazine 811 (Karayat 388. Copied by 'Ali al-Ḥusainī and dated 924/1518. One picture signed by Bihāzād); Nurusmāniye 4904/33 (Atēq 23. Dated 940/1533-4); Nurusmāniye 3894/2 (Atēq 24. 16th century?); Topkapı, Hazine 1093 fol. 75b sqq. (Karayat 894); Tehran Aqṣ̄̄ghar 589 in marg. (Neskāh-hād II p. 71-2. Dated 1 Rajab 821/1417); Majlis 8421/3 (Munz. 29984. In an anthology dated 868/1463-4); Gulistan-Aṭābāy I 194 (15th century? Copied by Sulṭān Ḥāmid-al-Maḥsadāy; etc. Tashkent Acad. II 766-780; Duschanbe Acad. II 337 (15th-16th century?); Acad. II 338-342 (5 late copies);

1 The Cambridge Ms. contains several other divvets, including that of Azzaqīfī, as noted above, p. 94
2 A detailed description of the Ms. in Paris can be found in Caillīk's two books (see editions, Szeged 1933 and 1934).
sages collated from his own MSS., and literally translated by Edward Heron-Allen); 1928 (The Quatrains of Ṭumān-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 Briggs-Gerard General E.H. Rodwell); 1949 (The Quatrains of Omar Khayyām. 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 (Dvāran bā Ṣaḥḥā bā Naṣāž bā Ḍarāt bā Lūgān wā Ruhā’īyāt ‘i ʿUmar i Khayyām, 755 in number, followed also by rubā’īyāt ascribed to Bābā Tāhir), reprinted 1324/1906, 1326/1908; 1332/1914 (with a Turkish translation by ‘Abd Allāh Jaudat [Çevdet]. 1372 531 quatrains), reprinted with pictures 1926; 1340/1922 (With Turkish translation and introduction by Huseiṇi Damis. Pictures), reprinted 1340/1927; [Worcester, Mass.] 1907 (Edward Fitzgerald’s Rubā’īyat 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 (Rubā’īyat of Omar Khayyām. Part I. Ghafil-nāmah. Commentary by Hafiz Anwar Ali Siddiqi…); Lahore 1923 (Urdu introduction by Shāhī Khālīl-Ḵalβ-al); 1924 (Kā’s al-ḵirān yā’rīn shirh k rubā’īyāt)… Persian text with an Urdu commentary by Mir Wali Allāh); [1934] (Maḥkāhān-i Khayyām. With a metrical Urdu translation by Qızībāsh Dilhāwī); 1335/1934 (Maḥkāhān-i Khayyām. With an Urdu paraphrase and commentary by M. Mahmūd Shāhīd); Isfahān 1343/1925; Berlin 1304/1925 (The Quatrains of the learned ‘Omar-i-Khayyām, ed. F. Rosen; cf. London 1928; 2nd edition 1928; Damascus 1926 (ed. Ahmad al-Saff al-Najafi); Copenhagen 1927 (Critical studies in the Rubā’īyat of ‘Umar-i-Khayyām. A revised text with English translation by A. Christensen); Baghdad 1928 (With Arabic translations in prose and verse by Jamāl Sādūq al-Zahawī), reprinted 1928; 1350/1931 (‘Umar al-Khayyām, ʿasrūr, ʿaṣruh, … , with introduction and literal Arabic translation by Ahmad Hāmid al-Sarrāf); 2nd edition 1949 (reviewed by H. Ritter, Oriens Ill., 1950, p. 157-8); Khaipur 1930 (Rubā’īyat i khum-kadāsh i Khayyām. With a Sindhi verse translation by Mir ’Alī-nawāž Khān, called Ḥakīm Līsīn al-Ghābī); Ḵaḥābād [ca. 1930] (With Urdu introduction, literal translation and notes by Jāḥīd al-dīn Ahmad Jafar); 1933 (with a preface in Urdu by Maḥēḵār-pasād); Damascus 1350/1931 (With Arabic verse translation by Ahmad al-Saffi
al-Najafi and introductory notes by M. al-Qazwīnī and Adīb al-Taqī; Szeged 1933 (Les manuscrits [373] mineurs des Rubā‘iyāt de ‘Omar Khayyām dans la Bibliothèque Nationale. Textes originaux ... publiés avec une introduction écrite en langue hongroise et un abrégé français par Dr. Barchélemy Csisák); London/Szeged 1934 (The principal manuscripts of the Rubā‘iyāt of ‘Umar-i-Khayyām in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. Volume I ... Transcribed and edited with introductory notes by Dr. B. Cs. No more published); Azangārā 1933 (Khayyām aur us-kē savānīh u taşanţīf par nāţādānāh nazar, by S. Sulaimān Nāvī); Moscow 1935 (With a Russian translation and introduction by A. Bolotnikov); 1959 (ed. R.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 Ms. supposedly dated 604 and 658); Delmar (N.Y.) 1977 (The Rubā‘iyāt of ‘Umar Khayyām translated and annotated by Ahmad Saidi; with the Persian text, indication of the source for each quatrains and references to previous English versions); Berkeley 1991 (Rubā‘iyāt of Omar Khayyām translated and annotated by Ahmad Saidi; 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):


(ii) The second edition (110 stanzas): London 1868; reprinted Columbus (Ohio) [1870]; London 1905; 1908 (with introduction and notes by E. Heron-Allen); 1928.


(iv) The fourth and ‘fifth’ editions (101 strophes): London 1879 (Rubā‘iyāt of Omar Khayyām; and the Sa‘dī and Aḥsā‘. Rendered into English verse); reprinted New York 1885 (without the Aḥsā‘); New York/Boston [1896]; Los Angeles 1899 (With a prose translation from the French of J.B. Nicolas and an introduction by James B. Scott’); London 1900 (‘With a commentary by H.M. Batson and a biographical introduction by E.D. Ross’); 1901 (ditto); 1905.


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.

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 hard-writing...’ (Potter p. 51).
2 ‘Most reprints of the so-called Fourth version follow the revised text which constitutes the Fifth version.’ (Potter p. 45).
(French verse): See editions Tehran 1310h./1931; also: Ruba'iyat d'Omar Khayyam, Mis en rimes françaises d’après le manuscrit d’Oxford par Jules de Marthold, Paris 1901; Les rubâ… Étude suivie d’une traduction française en décalque rythmique avec rimes à la persane, by Arthur Guy, Paris 1935 (with indication of the sources for each rubâ’).


1 This 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 polemi cal literature. It might suffice to mention: J.C.E. Bowen, Translation or Transvesty? An enquiry into Robert Graves’s version of some Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam, Abingdon 1973.

1 The biographical sources which do not mention Khayyâmi as a Persian poet are marked with a star.
tucci, ‘Le quatrine di ‘Omar Khayyām nei manoscritti persiani conservati in Italia’ [with an edition of 18 quatrains], Rendiconti, ser. IX, vol. II, 1991, p. 179-90; M.M. Tabātabā’ī, Khayyām yā Khayām, Tehran 1370sh./1991 (a collection of articles, mostly published some time ago); F. Mujāhid Shirwānī and H. Shiāyān, Nigāh ba Khayyām ham-rāh ba rubā‘yāt, Tehran 1370sh./1991; S.A. Mir-Afzalī, ‘Rubā‘yāt i Khayyām dar shakhs jagh i khabār i fard’, Mu‘arif X, 1372sh./1994, p. 131-40; id., ‘Rubā‘yāt i aslī i Khayyām kadom ast?’ Nashr i Dānish XV/5, 1374sh./1995, p. 4-16; EI s.v. ‘Omar Khayyām’ (V. Minorskey).\footnote{Since the completion of this article the new edition of the EI has published two entries s.v. ‘Umar Khayyām’. Both fail to reflect the present state of research and both also contain an excessive number of factual errors. Undoubtedly, the old article by Minorskey is a better point of departure.}


222. Shams al-dīn Muḥammad b. a-Mu‘ayyad al-Haddādī al-mar‘af bi Khālīd\footnote{2} merits a very brief entry in ‘Aufī’s chapter on the poets of Transoxania after the time of Sanjar; elsewhere ‘Aufī quotes two verses addressed by Shams al-dīn to ‘Aufī’s own contemporary Shi‘bī Ghaz(‘) al Khujandī.\footnote{3} His presence in Khujandī in the first part of the 7th/13th century is confirmed by the two poems that he addressed to Dīyā’ Pārsī.\footnote{4} Jājmārī quotes a ghazal by (presumably the same) malik al-muḥaqiqīn Haddādī and with the poetic signature ‘Haddādī’ in the last verse. Rāzī, besides repeating two of the rubā‘yāt quoted already by ‘Aufī, adds a few other poems, one of them a qaṣidah to Sanjar (511/1115 to 552/1117), and claims that this poet was a relative of Nīsām al-mulk Tūsī. Nafṣī quotes six odes from unidentified safnūn, but at least three of these are in fact by the above-mentioned Dīyā’ Pārsī.\footnote{5}

223. Fakhr al-dīn Khālid b. a-Rābī‘ al-Makki al-Tullānī was a contemporary and friend of Anwarī. ‘Aufī prefixes his significant selection from Khālīd’s verse with the story (repeated by Jājmārī and others), of how the Ghorid king, ‘Alā’ al-dīn Hāsān (544/1149 to 556/1161), on hearing that Anwarī had made him the object of some satirical verses, tried to coax the famous poet to his court and how Anwarī was warned of the king’s true intentions by an elusively formulated letter from Khālīd. ‘Aufī II p. 138-45; Yaghmā‘ī p. 180 (three verses by ‘Fakhr al-dīn Khālīd’); Hidāyāt, Majma‘ I p. 376-7; Browne, History II p. 381; Safī, Tārīkh II p. 604-7; Khayyām-pūr p. 183; Mudarris in Rādī’s introduction to his Dīwān in ‘Anwarī II p. 103-4.

224. Afdal al-dīn Khāqānī,\footnote{2} who also called himself Haqīqī Qā’in and Hindān al-qā‘am, was a native of Shārvān;\footnote{3} The date of his birth is indi-
cated in the qif'ah beginning:  
chân zamân 'uhd i Sanâ’á dar nawsht
asmân chân man sukhun-yustar bi-zâd
chân ba Ghaznîn sâhir-ê shud zê rî i khâk
khâk i Shârâwân sâhir-ê ditgar bi-zâd

('When time rolled up the life-span of Sanâ’á heaven gave birth to a
word-smith like me. When in Ghaznî one sorcerer2 departed under the
soil, the soul of Shârâwân 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 Abî Hanîfah and the birth of al-Shäfì’â both
occurred, according to the standard sources, in 150/767). In another
poem Khajâqîn states:  
badal man ânadam andar jahân Sanâ’á râ
bad-tn dallî pîder nâm i man bâdî nîhah

('I came into the world as a substitute for Sanâ’á; the proof for this is the
fact that my father called me bâdî’, i.e. 'replacement'.)  
It is thus clear that
Khajâqîn was born in the year that Sanâ’á died. Unfortunately (and
typically) the precise date of Sanâ’á’s death is not certain, but it was
clearly after 511/1117 (the ascension of Bahîmîn-šahîh) and quite proba-
bly 525/1130-1.  

In his versified travelogue, Tuhfât al-îrâqânî, Khajâqîn tells us,
among other things, that his grandfather had been a weaver and his
father ‘Ali a carpenter; his mother was a cook who had been born a
Neotestorian Christian (i.e. clearly not an Armenian or Georgian, unless the

1Divwân, ed. Sajîjî, p. 808-9. Surprisingly, this very famous poem appears to be
missing in the ancient London manuscript.
2Poetry is ‘permitted sorcery’ (sîr bâlât).
3ed. Sajîjî p. 850.
4This verse has been much belaboured to prove that Khajâqîn’s personal name was
Badî’, but it must be observed that Badî’ is not a Muslim name. I understand it to mean
that the boy was known within the family as ‘Badî’ because he was the ‘replacement’
for a recently deceased older brother.
5See below no. 284. Some scholars have understood the words in Khajâqîn’s ode
to Isfahan (ed. Sajîjî p. 357)  pîder i hijrât chu man no-zâd vaghnuh to mean that
Khajâqîn was born in the year 500/1166-7, but in fact they evidently mean: ‘the first
centuries of the hijrât 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, 1. 14, and also
about Ashna on p. 461 l. 3. Plausible arguments for putting Khajâqîn’s birth in
521/1127-8 are adduced in Reinert’s article of 1965 (see below, bibliography).

1P. 247-8.
2Tuhfât p. 84.
3In his ode to the city of Isfahan (ed. Sajîjî p. 355) he says that he was in Mosul
in 551 (thât nâm alîf). We know from the Tuhfât that he visited that town on his way
back from Mecca; he must therefore have been in Mecca in Dîh-i-bijjân 550 (January-
February 1150). In the same poem he says that he was in Baghdad ‘last year’ (înrê). In
the Tuhfât he says that he visited Baghdad on the way to Mecca, which would put the
composition of the ode to Isfahan also in 551/1150. For the supposed reference in
this poem to Mojjî Bahâqânî see below, no. 248.
4The first part of the Tuhfât describes an earlier visit to ‘Iraq and the hunting-
reserve (shikrûr-gâh) of the Seljûq sultan, where he made the acquaintance of the
sultan’s wazîr. The latter gave Khajâqîn a precious ring which the poet, on his return
to Shârâwân, was forced to surrender to his master.
5Mentioned by name on p. 85.
6For whom see below, no. 227 (Khujandî).
555/1160 and certainly before 566/1170), an event which Khāqānī commemorated in an elegy, our poet entered the service of his son and successor Akhsatān, 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, seems to have been the future emperor Andronicus Comnenus, 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). [386]

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 *dvān* contains a few poems praising the Khwārazmshāh Atsiz (521/1127 to 551/1156), the Seljuq Arslān b. Toghrī (556/1161 to 571/1176), and the atabeg of Azerbaijan Qızıl-Arslān b. Əfdūgūz (582/1185 to 587/1191). Juwainī quotes a *qīfah* which he says Khāqānī composed for the Khwārazmshāh Tekish 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. Mustaṭfī says he died in 582/1185-7 (which is too early, if we 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. [5]

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 a few poems with savage attacks on Rashīd al-dīn Watwāt. Khāqānī’s *dvān*, 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 [387] derives from a codex apparently written in the poet’s lifetime. [1] This and three other copies form the basis for the critical edition by Sājjādī. [2]

1. Manchester Lindesianæ 290 (17th century?); Lindesianæ 208 (17th century? *Qāṣidah*); Lindesianæ 522 (18th century? imperfect); Lindesianæ 513 (18th century?); Lindesianæ 200 (18th century? *Hāẓu’ilādār*); Oxford Eliot 74 (Ethē 561; Dated 999/1590-1); Osseley 192 (Ethē 562; Dated 12 Juumādā II 1006/1598); Elliot 73 (Ethē 563. Dated 27 Juumādā I 1011/1602); Osseley 382 (Ethē 564. Dated 17 Juumādā I 1011/1602); Whinfield 54 (Beeston 2662; Dated 9 Rajab 1021/1603. Selections); Fraser 61 (Ethē 565. Dated 7 Sharbān 1015/1606); Elliot 75 (Ethē 565. Dated Sha’bān 1040/1633); Pers., d. 92 (Beeston 2554. A number of leaves were restored by a second hand which added the date 29 Rajab 34 [sc. of *Aılmangr*] = <1>100/1689); Osseley Add. 133 (Ethē 566. Dated 5 Rabī’ I 1109/1697); Walker 74 (Ethē 570. Dated 26 Juumādā II 1129/1717. *qāṣidah* only); Walker 99 (Ethē 567. Many glosses); Elliot 76 (Ethē 568); Elliot 77 [388] (Ethē 566). But this is not the case with the *dvān* of Khāqānī, which is notoriously obscure. It is fortunately preserved in a number of old manuscripts, notably in London Or. 7942, which was copied in Khujand in 664/1266 and apparently [387] derives from a codex apparently written in the poet’s lifetime. [1] This and three other copies form the basis for the critical edition by Sājjādī. [2]

1. London Ms. Or. 7942 concludes with a colophon giving the name of the scribe as Ahmad b. Muhammad b. al-Husain al-Simārī and the date of composition as 8 Shawwāl 664; the year is spelt out very clearly. However, the first half (or ‘volume’) of the Ms. ends on fol. 223a with a finely gilded medallion reading: bi rasm khizvat al-‘utim al-tamun al-tdad Tahsī b. Hannūd al-Khwārazmī fī asrār arba‘ wa ta’tīn wa khams-mi‘th min al-‘ajrāb al-nabawīyyīn, indicating that it was completed as early as 594/1197-8. Since both ‘volumes’ of the Ms. are all in the same quite characteristic handwriting and are on the same batch of paper I would assume that the date given in the panel is that of the manuscript and that the ‘colophon’ with the date 664/1266 was added by a later owner. I understand from A.L.F.A. Reed that M. Shafi‘i-Kadkani maintains that the ‘outer pages’ of this Ms. are the work of ‘a, to him, well-known forger’. To this one must reply that the Ms. has actually been in the British Museum since 1913. [2] I have re-collated a few poems with the London Ms. and have nothing adverse to report. Sājjādī’s long introduction is less satisfactory, mainly because of his excessive reliance on secondary sources, especially Fūrückānī.

2. Ms. containing both the *dvān* and *Tahsīb al-‘aṣqā‘in*, generally styled *Kulliyah i Khāqānī*, are listed here and again below, for the later work.
569. Incomplete); Bodl. 748 (Ethel 571. Many glosses); London Or. 7942 (Meredith-Owens p. 53. ‘Dated’ 8 Shawwal 664/1266); Sajjadi’s lām]; I.O. 961 (Dated 7 Rabi’ II 1004/1595); I.O. 962 (Dated 10 Safar 1006/1597); I.O. 950/II (Dated 13 Safar 1007/1598); Add. 25,808 (Rieu p. 559-9. 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. 7942 (Meredith-Owens p. 51. 16th century?); Or. 9872 (Meredith-Owens p. 59. 16th century?); I.O. 951/I (= Robinson 146-51). Dated 12 Jumādā II 1038/1629, ‘Intikhab al-dhour’; I.O. 966 (Dated 16 Rabi’ I 1101/1690); 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 (176 or 18th century?); I.O. 964; I.O. 967; I.O. 3028; RAS 297; Cambridge Or. 1350 (2nd Suppt. 170. Dated 30 Jumādā I 1035/1625); Or. 1349/2 (2nd Suppt. 169. 17th century?); Oo. 6. 28. (Browne Cat. CCCVIII); King’s, No. 167 (Browne Suppt. 342); 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 qasīdahs); Univ. 276; New Coll. Or. 26; Paris Supplément 1771 (Blöchot 1237. Two hands, attributed by Blöchot to the 13th and 15th centuries respectively); Ancien fonds 133 fol. 182v-186v. (Richard. Ms. contains a note dated Jumādā I 752/1351. A few poems only); Supplément 1816 (Blöchot 1232. 14th century?); Contains also Talghah and letters. Sajjadi’s ‘pl.’); Supplément 622 (Blöchot 1235. 16th century?); Supplément 620 (Blöchot 1234. Dated 1009/1600-1); Supplément 621 (Blöchot 1235. 17th century?); Supplément 622 (Blöchot 1236. Dated 2 Dhu l-qa‘dah 1081/1671); Supplément 626 (Blöchot 1238. 17th century?); Supplément 624 (Blöchot 1239. 17th century?); Fragment); Berlin Ms. or. quart. 2023/1 (Heinz 303. Dated 942/1535-6); Ms. or. fol. 299 (Pertsch 739); Minotuli 197 (Pertsch 740); Petermann 463 (Pertsch 741); Sprenger 1431 (Pertsch 743); Petermann 716/I (Pertsch 682. Selections); Vienn Flügel 514/I; Leningrad Acad. C. 1424 (Index 1489. 14th century? Lacunae); 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);
Brelvi p. xxx;  *Nasviri* Mehechji Rana p. 89 no. 55 (Dated 1005/1596. 7);  Lucknow Sprenger 318 (several copies);  Bankipore I 31 ("beautiful, ful Nasta'īlī ... apparently 14th century");  I 32 (Copied by Qasim Shīrāzī and dated 1027/1618);  *Hyderabad* Āṣāfīyāh I p. 722 no. 436; I p. 742 no. 261, 583;  II p. 1254 no. 72;  *Madras* I 82-87;  II 587;  Calcutta Bihār 291 (16th century?);  Ivanov 456 (16th century?);  Ivanov Curzon 196 (Dated 1086/1673);  Ivanov 457 (17th century?);  Ivanov 458 (18th century?);  Ivanov 2nd Supp. 976 (18th century?);  Bihār 297 (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. "ʿAlī ʿAbd-al-Rasūlī);  1335sh./1957 (ed. ʿAbd-al-Rasūlī);  1335sh./1959 [391] (ed. ʿAlī ʿAbd-al-Rasūlī).  Quotes the variants from four Ms.

Partial editions:  *Tehran* 1351sh./1972 (Gīsādah i asīr i Kh. i Sh., ed. ʿAbd-al-Rasūlī).

Edition and (Russian) translation of the rubāṭ-i Khāfir:  K.  Salleman,  Chetnorskamia Khakani,  St. Petersburg 1875.


Commentaries:  

1.  A commentary on the *qaṣāʾid* of Khāqānī, ascribed (impossibly) to Jāmiʿ, is reported in  *Hyderabad* Āṣāfīyāh II p. 1252 no. 93.

2.  *Sharḥ i Qūnān (or *qaṣāʾid*) i Khāqānī* by Muḥammad b. Dīwān b. Muḥammad ʿAlawī Shīrāzī (see above, p. 263), for sultan Naṣr al-dīn Khājā, who reigned from 906/1500 to 916/1510.  It elucidates only a selection of the *qaṣāʾid*.  Ms.:  Oxford 1042 /1633;  *Ouseley* Add. 181 (Eīhī 573);  London 101, 598 (Two hands, the later dated Dīwān l-qaṣāʾid 995 /1587);  Add. 25, 7811 (Rieu p. 561.  Dated Shawwāl 1080/1670);  Add. 27, 315 (Rieu p. 561-2.  Dated Dīwān l-qaṣāʾid 1107/1696.  With an introduction dedicated to Jahāngīr by ʿAlawī Lāhījī in which the latter appears to claim the author-

---

1See also  *Minorsky,*  *Iranica* p. 120-1.

2This version is perhaps also contained in Bombay Rehatsk.  p. 138 (see below: unidentified commentaries).  (Sto.)

3See his introduction, p. x.
Dated 16 5afar 1044/1634); Tehran Univ. II 28 (Dated 10 Jamadi I 1037/1628); Maʿarif I 138 (Dated 1232/1817); Majlis II 411; Lahore Univ. (Munz. Pak. VII p. 58-9. Dated 7 Dhii l-qaḍah 1104/1693); Hyderabad Ashafiyah II p. 1252 no. 114; Madras II 588 (Dated 1241/1825). Cf. Munz. V 37392-400.

(4) Fareh-qilb by Abu'l Muhammad, the author of Haft Qasams, comments on ten qaṣidas of Khaqânî. Ms.: Bankipore Suppl. ii 2336; Lucknow Sprenger 320.


(6) Unidentified commentaries. Cambridge Or. 6. 33. (Browne Cat. CCIX); Leningrad Acad. C 1426 fol. 140a-170b (Index 2577. Ms. dated 1065/1654); Acad. C 1520 (Index 2578. Incomplete); Bombay Rehatseki p. 138 no. 41 (Dated 1068/1657-8. 'Composed during the reign of Jâhângir'); Aligarh Subh. Ms. p. 48 no. 1 (Dated 1062/1617); See also Munz. V 37429-33.

Tuhfat al-ṭurâqân, or rather, as it is called in the oldest Ms. (Vienna mist. 454), Khatam al-gharâb, describes Khaqânî's first pilgrimage to Mecca; for its contents and date see above p. 384-5. (Begins, after a preface in prose, with the verse: mā-um nazāraqān i shan-nâk + z-trhuqah i sâh u mahrâh i khâık).

Mss.: Dublin T.C.D. 1586; Manchester Lindesiana 558 (Dated 1083/1672-3); Lindesiana 136 (Dated 1130/1718); Lindesiana 92 (Dated 1170/1756-7); Oxford Fraser 61 (Ethâ 560. Dated 7 Sharbân 1015/1606); Ouseley 69 (Ethâ 574. Dated Muḥarram 1063/1652); Ouseley 383 (Ethâ 575. Dated 16 Jamadi II 3rd year of Ahmad Shâh 1750); [1949] Ouseley Add. 107 (Ethâ 578. Dated 1201/1786-7); Elliot 384 (Ethâ 579. Dated 16 Rabî' II 1209/1794); Pers. d. 49 (Beeston 2555. Dated 1284/1676-8); Fraser 62 (Ethâ 576); Ouseley Add. 91 (Ethâ 577); London I. O. 950/I (Dated 13 Šafar 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 Dhî l-qaḍah 1011/1603). Contains also 'some other poems by Kh.'; Add. 7667/I (Rieu p. 809.

Dated 1022/1613); I. O. 951/I (= Robinson 146-51. Dated 12 Jamâdî II 108/1629. 1 extraneous picture); I. O. 955 (Dated 14 Muharram 1068/1658); I. O. 954 (Dated, 'as it seems', 1078/1667-8, and followed by a prose summary. Slightly defective); I. O. 2866 (Dated 12 Dhî l-qaḍah '8010' - for 1080/1670?); Add. 25,810 (Rieu p. 560. Dated Muḥarram 1088/1677. With marginal annotations); SOAS 46725/1 (Dated 21 Šafar 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 Supp. 221. Dated Jamâdî 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/I (2nd Suppl. Ms. dated 5 Rabî' I 1023/1614); Or. 1350 (2nd Suppl. 170. Dated 30 Jamâdî I 1055/1646); King's. No. 115 (Browne Suppl. 279. Dated 1072/1661-2); Or. 277 (Browne Suppl. 278. Dated 1100/1689-9); I. O. 1349/I (2nd Suppl. 169. 17th century); Or. 1568 (2nd Suppl. 355. 18th century?); [989] Or. 255 (Browne Suppl. 1061); Jesus. No. 6 (Browne Suppl. 1052); Edinburgh Univ. 278; Paris Supplément 1816 (Bletchet 1232. 14th century?); Supplément 623 (Bletchet 1233. 16th century?); Supplément 620 (Bletchet 1234. Dated 1009/1600-1); Supplément 621 (Bletchet 1235. 17th century?); Supplément 622 (Bletchet 1236. Dated 2 Dhî l-qaḍah 1081/1671); Supplément 1366 fol. 161v seqq. (Bletchet 1993. Ms. contains dates between 1009/1600 and 1010/1602); Supplément 625 (Bletchet 1241. Dated Ramadân 1093/1682); Supplément 317 fol. 98 seqq. (Bletchet 2179. 18th century?); Berlin Ms. or. quart. 2023/2 (Heinz 303. Dated 942/1535-6); Sprenger 1433 (Persch 744. Copied by Abî Turâb 'Abî al-Whâlîh al-Husainî and dated 23 Rajab 1060/1679); Sprenger 1434 (Persch 745); Sprenger 1435 (Persch 746); Vienna Mitz. 843 (uncatalogued. Dated 12 Jamâdî I 593/1197. See the detailed description by I. Afsâhî, Maʿarif XVI, 1375/1999, p. 3-38); Flügel 513 (Dated Jamâdî I 1028/1619); Flügel 514/2; Copenhagen Mehren CIV/2; Leningrad Acad. C 63/I (Index 3439. Dated 1029/1620); Acad. A 26 (Index 644. Dated 1054/1644-5); Acad. B 25 (Index 643. Dated 1022/1617); Acad. B 139 (Index 645); Acad. B 3974 (Index 646);
Acad. C 62 fol. 1b-84b (Index 3438); Dorn CCCLII; Chanykov 50; Istanbul Ayasofya 1762/2 (Ates 83. Copied by Mas'ud b. Mansur al-Mutatabbib and dated Rabi' I 791/1389); Topkapı, Ahmet III 2363 (Karanay 395. Dated Ramadān 867/1463); Naruosmaniye 4964/19 (Ates 84 and 371. 15th century?); Üniversite F 877 (oleh Halis Efendi 8637; Ates 85. 17th century?); Esat 2635/2 (Duda p. 52. Added by a second hand to a Ms. dated Ramadān 1025/1616); Üniversite F 880 (oleh Halis Efendi 4626; Ates 86. Dated 1 Dhū l-Qa'dah 1287/1872); Cairo 5 mīn mājaffā'ī fārsī (Tirzāz 269. Dated Ṣaḥar 1106/1694); Tehran Gulistan/Aṭṭābāy I 190 (Ms. copied by Ibn Shams al-dīn Mūhsamad Mūsā al-Yazdī and dated Rajab 1001/1593); Sipah-sālār II 1106 (Dated 1013/1604-5); Gulistan/Aṭṭābāy I 191 (Dated Rabi' II 1006/1597); Bayātī 9 (Nasḵah-hā p. 9. 16th century?); [396] Gulistan/Aṭṭābāy I 187 (Copied for Akbar, rēg. 1556/1605); Gulistan/Aṭṭābāy I 178 (Dated 1 Dhū l-Ḥijjah 1015/1607. Pictures); Gulistan/Aṭṭābāy I 189 (Copied by al-Bukhārī and dated Sha'bān 1015/1606 or 1025/1616); 1 Sipah-sālār II 1108 (Dated 1032/1622-3); Gulistan/Aṭṭābāy I 180 (Copied in 1035/1625-6 by Mūhsamad b. Mūlī Mīr al-Husainī al-Ustādī); Mājīs II 326 (Dated 1053/1643-4); Sipah-sālār II 1107 (Copied by Mūhsamad Māshī Ṣḥrāzī in 1063/1653); Gulistan/Aṭṭābāy I 181 (inḵīṭāḥ. Copied by ‘the famous calligrapher’ Aḥmad al-Rashīd, presumably the person of that name who died in India in 1081/1670; see Elr s.v. “Aḥmad-al-Rashīd Daylami” by P. P. Source); Shūrā i 351 (copied by Mīr ‘Alī Harawi); Arak Bāyāt (Nasḵah-hā VI p. 65. Dated 993/1585); Mashhad Ridwān VII 407 (Copied by Ḥājjī ‘Alī Samarqandī and dated 2 Rabi' I 847/1443); Ridwān VII 406 (Dated 950/1543-4); Ridwān VII 412 (Dated 7 Jumādā II 1016/1607); Ridwān VII 198 (Dated 1029/1620); Ridwān VII 199 (Dated 1140/1727-8); Dushāmbāc Acad. II 369 (Dated 1054/1644-5); 373; Pakistan (various copies listed in Munz. Pak. VII p. 46-51); Bombay Univ. 108; Rehtak p. 187 no. 19-20 (2 Mss., one dated 24 Rabi' II 1063/1653); Rehtak p. 129 no. 12; Lucknow Sprenger 321 (several copies, one - evidently the one now in Berlin - of which was dated 1090/1680); Bankiāpore I 33 (Copied by Mūhsamad Sa'id b. Mīrāz Mūhsamad al-Bukhārī in 1014/1605-6); Suppt. I 1806

1The date is given - according to the catalogue - in figures as ‘1015’ but in words as alf wa khamsat ‘inherit’. The Ms. contains after the divvān a second codex in which the scribe calls himself ‘Muḥammad Latf al-maz̲ẖbûr bi Shōkhī al-Bukhārī’ (Aṭṭābāy reads ‘al-Najjār’) with the date Rajab 1018/1609.
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(Dated 1024/1615); I 32/I, VI (Copied by Qāsim Shārāzī and dated 1027/1618. Pictures); Suppt. I 1807 (Dated 9 Dhū l-‘qādah 1092/1681. Beginning missing); Hyderābād 3āfīyā fī (Jāmī 176. no. 98, 107, 165; Cakutia Ivanov Curzon 197 (Dated 7 Rabi` II 1042/1632); Ivanov 461 (16th century?)); [397] Ivanov Curzon 198 (Dated 17 Sha`bān 12th year of Mūhsamad-Ākbar/1232/1817); Ivanov 462; Philadelphia Lewis Coll. 60 (16th century?). Cf. Munz. IV 2851/6-606. Editions: Agrā 1855 (with a commentary); Cawnpore 1284/1867 (Abridged, with marginal notes based on ‘Abd al-Salām’s commentary); Lahore 1867 (inḵīṭāḥ ... Tufāf al- ihtirāqān, followed by a commentary compiled once again from that of ‘Abd al-Salām); Lucknow 1876; 1930 (Tufāf al- ihtirāqān. Text with an Urdu commentary by ‘Abd al-Ḥāfīz Āsī); Tehran 1333sh./1954 (ed. Y. Qarbī from various, mostly late, Mss., with an Introduction).

Commentaries: (1) Sharḥ i tufāf al- ihtirāqān by Shaikh ‘Abd al-Salām, written in 1057/1647. Mss.: London I.O. 960 (Dated 17 Dhū l-‘qādah 1059/1649); I.O. Delhi 1242; Lucknow Sprenger 322; ‘Probably’ the same commentary is also found in Oxford Walker 90 (Esthē 581. Dated 1076/1665-6); Pakistan (Several copies listed in Munz. Pak. VII p. 51-2).

(2) (same title) by Ghulām-Muḥsamad N.h.w.sh. y (7?). Mss.: Oxford Ouseley 61 (Esthē 580. Dated 5 3afar 1124/1712).

(3) (same title), anonymous, but (according to Esthē) different from the two preceeding works. Begins at once with the first verse of the poem. Mss.: London I.O. 2867.


(5) (same title) by Saiyid Ismāʾīl Abjadi, 1 begun in 1200/1786.


225. al-Ustād al-Muwaqqaf Abū Tāhir al-Khāṭūnī is mentioned a number of times in al-Bundārī’s abridgement of ‘Imād al-dīn’s expanded Arabic translation of Anūsharwān b. Khālīd’s history of the Seljuqs, where we read that he was one of the foremost historians of the time of Muhammad (I) b. Malik-shāh (579/1183) and the musallaf to the Khāṭūnī, i.e. the sultan’s queen. The text speaks of him as deceased;1 since al-Bundārī habitually draws attention to his own additions it would appear that Khāṭūnī must have died before ‘Imād al-dīn (d. 579/1183) and possibly before Anūsharwān (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.2 A few short Persian poems, largely of satirical content, are preserved in other sources. Zakariyyā’ al-Qazwīnī says that in the mosque in Sāwār there is ‘a library which [400] takes its name from the ważīr (sic) Abū Tāhir al-Khāṭūnī containing all the fine books which existed in his time’ as well as astronomical instruments and the like.3 Rāwandi says that he himself saw Malik-shāh’s Shīhār-rūmān (hunting journal) ‘in the handwriting of Abū Tāhir Khāṭūnī’, 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 occasions4 Daulat-shāh quotes the Tārtīkh al-‘alā’ al-Sulṭān of Abū Tāhir Khāṭūnī, one time for an anecdote referring to the reigned of

1Zahdah p. 102: wa tālā dhikūr ‘umārī.”
2Qazwīnī has noted that the Persian original of the epigram translated in Zahdah p. 106.13-4 is preserved in ‘Aṣafi p. 68.1.10-11, where, however, it is attributed to Mu‘ān al-mulk al-Aṣamam.
3Yaqūt (Balḍūn III p. 24), writing about half a century before Zakariyyā’, also speaks of a library in Sāwār, ‘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 67/1220-1. It is thus clear that Zakariyyā’, though writing in the present tense, is in fact copying his information from an old book.
4Daulat-shāh p. 64, 76-7.
Mas'ūd b. Muḥammad b. Malik-shāh (529/1134 to 547/1152) and another in connection with the death of Sānjār’s daughter in 524/1130. However, if Khāṭṭānī 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.1 One should therefore perhaps not give too much credence to another passage2 in which Daulat-shāh claims to be [401] quoting Khāṭṭānī’s book on the lives of the poets (Kitāb maḏāhib al-šawārīḍ).


226. Two verses by Sārīm al-dīn Khūraḥ referring to Qiwām al-dīn (who was minister to Topkhiī until 528/1133-4) are quoted by Abū l-Raḥīm Qummi, Tārīkh al-uważārat4, ed. M.T. Dānish-pazhūh, Tehran 1363sh./1985, p. 12.

1See above, p. 255 (‘Anṣār) and 342-3 (Jaʿlī al-dīn).
2Daulat-shāh p. 58.
3As pointed out above, p. 59, this verse is an early interpolation in Akand’s book.

227. ‘Alād-dīn al-Imām al-ajall Sād al-millah wa l-dīn al-Khuṵjandī and ‘Alād-dīn al-ajall Jamāl al-dīn al-Khuṵjandī are the subjects of two successive entries in ‘Afsī’s chapter on the religious dignitaries who dabbled in poetry and ‘Afsī quotes a number of pieces by each of them.1 We have to do with two members (not sufficiently identified by ‘Afsī) of a distinguished family of Shāfiʿī2 clerics, originally from Khujand (in Central Asia), but who gained prominence in Isfahan, the bānta l-Khuṵjandī (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 (Aṭṭīr, Jamali al-dīn, Kamāl al-dīn, Khūṯnī, Rāfī’ Lūstānī, Qarmāt, Zāhīr Fārābī). 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.3

Abū Bakr Muhammad b. b. Thabīt b. al-Ḥasan b. ‘Ali Khujandī, the founder of the Khujandī lineage in Isfahan, was sent from Marw to Isfahan by Nizām al-mulk and died in 483/1090-1.4 His son, ‘Abd al-Latīf (I) succeeded him as the raʿī of the Shāfiʿīs in Isfahan and was assassinated by the Ismāʿīlīs in 523/1129-30. His brother Ahmad died on 1 Shaʿbān 531/1137.5 ‘Afsī Ibn al-Ṭurīrī says

1‘Afsī f. 265-8.
2For the bānta l-Khuṵjandī see (apart from the primary sources listed in the following notes): Qazvīnī’s notes in his edition of ‘Afsī f. 355; his Yād-dāšt-hā IV p. 191; Naṣīr’s al-nukhbat to his edition of ‘Afsī, p. 798-9; Hamdīyān-Farangī’s introduction to his edition of the divān of Abīl-ʿAbdallāh AL-bakhtātī and al-Shīrāzī’s introduction to his edition of the divān of Abīl-ʿAbdallāh AL-bakhtātī (both eleven members of the family, some of them fictitious or doublets of others in the same list); the chapter on Isfahan in H. Halm’s Die Ausbreitung der lippischen Rechtsschule von den Anfängen bis zum 8./9. Jahrhundert, Wiesbaden 1974, pp. 146-50 (very incomplete). [See also the comprehensive article ‘Alī i Khujandī in DMBI (Sayyid ‘Ali i Dārābī), with in part different conclusions.]

4Ibn al-Ṭurūs X p. 464. Zakariyyā’ al-Qazvīnī, Aḥār al-bīlād, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 198, likewise says that Sād al-dīn ‘Abd al-Latīf al-Khuṵjandī’ died in Shawwāl 523; however he also tells an anecdote about this sadr and the atabeg Muhammad b. Ebdiguz (who reigned half a century later), quoting three Persian verses with which Sād al-dīn admonished that ruler. It is thus clear that Zakariyyā’ has confused ‘Abd al-Latīf I with his grandson ‘Abd al-Latīf II.

5Ibn al-Sabkī f. 50.
that Abû l-Muzaffar b. al-Khujandî (presumably a brother of these two) was assassinated by a Shiite (ulamâ') while descending from the preacher's chair in the mosque at Râî in 496/1102-3.1

1. Abû al-Latîf I was succeeded by his son Șâdr al-dîn Abû Bakr Muhammad (II). According to șândî al-dîn al-Kâtîb, he fell foul of Sultan Mas'ûdî in 542/1147-8 and had to flee from Isfahan together with his brother Jamâl al-dîn Mâhîmûd and other members of the family, whereas the local mob sacked the Shî'î madrasah and burned its library. The fugitives were received graciously by Jamâl al-dîn Muhammad al-Jâwîd, the wazir to the atabeg of Mosul, but soon afterwards they made peace with the sultan and returned to Isfahan. Șîândî al-dîn says further that he himself met Jamâl al-dîn Mâhîmûd in Baghdad in 543/1148. In his Tuhfet al-'iraqîn (written ca. 551/1156) Khâqâni praises Șâdr al-dîn Muhammad and his brother Jamâl al-dîn Mâhîmûd.2 al-Sukkî3 says that Muhammad II became (evidently after these events) the wâlî of the Mâhârash Nizâmîyâh in Baghdad and that he died while travelling between Baghdad and Isfahan on 22 Shawwâl 552/1157. Ibn al-Athîr4 says that at the time of his death a great riot (fitnâh ta'zîmah) broke out in Isfahan in which many people were killed. There is an elegy on the death of his brother Jamâl al-dîn Mâhîmûd in the diwan of Jamâl al-dîn Muhammad b. Abû al-Razzâq.5

The just-mentioned Jamâl al-dîn Mâhîmûd is not to be confused with Jamâl al-dîn Mâhîfîz al-Khujandî, whose relationship with the other members of the family is not clear, but who evidenced addressed to the atabeg Muhammad Jahân-Pahlawân b. Ėlîdâzûr, 570/1175 to 582/1186).

1. Ibn al-Athîr X p. 251.
4. Ed. Quill p. 238-40. The verses mention șâdr al-dîn and șîahmûd al-
5. Khujandî.
7. wafqiyât, ed. Ritter et al., 1931 seqq., III no. 1330.

and several of his Persian poems are preserved in a 13th-century anthology; the fact that he wrote poetry in Persian suggests that he might also be the șâmîd al-dîn' cited by șAfu. There is an ode to him in the diwan of Abî Akhârât.2

This Mas'ûdî is perhaps the brother of șâdr al-dîn Abû l-Qâsim Abû al-Latîf (II), the son of Muhammad II. He was born in Râî 551/1151, assumed the leadership of the Shî'îs of Isfahan after (though presumably not right away) his father and died in Jumâdâ I 588/1184.3

He was succeeded by his son șâdr al-dîn Muhammad (III). He was killed by the military governor (shâhshâh) of Isfahan, Falâk al-dîn Sînâqur al-Tawîl, in Jumâdâ II 592/1196.4

Muhammad III is the last of the șâdr to be mentioned by al-Sukkî, who, although he died almost two centuries later (in 771/1370), evidently derived his knowledge of the Shî'îs of Isfahan from a source written at the end of the 12th century. Muhammad would appear to have been succeeded by șâdr al-dîn șUmar al-Khujandî (perhaps his son), whom we seem to know only from the panegyrics of Kamâl al-dîn and Râî.5

1. al-Muhtârîs min al-râstîl, ed. I. Abîhîr, Tehran 2535sh.sh./1976-7, p. 70-1, 71-2 (the letter to Jahân-Pahlawân), 87, 88 (the poems), 110. There is also a letter addressed to him on p. 62-5.
2. Ed. Humâyûn-Farokhî p. 298-301. His name is very clearly mentioned, and used as the basis for a pan, on p. 300 l. 3; see also the reference to Khujandî in the next line. But the editor has allowed himself to be misled by the superscription according to which the quâfâl is dedicated to Jamâl al-dîn Mâhîmûd.
4. See Râwûndâ, Râhât al-sâdîr, ed. M. Iskâîl, London 1921, p. 381; Ibn al-Athîr XII p. 81; al-Sukkî IV p. 80. al-Sukkî gives his name as Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Latîf b. Muhammad b. 'Abd al-Latîf (including him among the other Muhammad of the relevant tabâqâh) and specifies that he was the grandson of Abû Bakr Muhammad (II) b. 'Abd al-Latîf b. Muhammad b. Thûbî b. al-Hassân b. Alî. Ibn al-Athîr calls him șâdr al-dîn Mâhîmûd (sic) b. 'Abd al-Latîf b. Muhammad <b. 'Abd al-Latîf b. Muhammad. Thûbî refers al-shâhshâh bi l-Fâshîhîn, with an obvious lacuna at the place indicated. (Qâwini, misled by Ibn al-Athîr, regarded him as the uncle, rather than the son, of his predecessor). Ibn al-Athîr includes his death at the hands of Sînâqur in the events of 592 and this date is confirmed by Râwûndâ; the old edition of al-Sukkî has him die in Jumâdâ I or II 572, but in the new edition (ed. 'A. al-Ş. M. Huwâl and M. M. al-Tanabî, Cairo 1964-67, VII p. 134-5) this has been corrected to 592. A letter of 'Abd al-Latîf b. 'Abd al-Latîf' dated Jumâdâ I <5>8> can be found in al-Muhtârîs min al-râstîl p. 283.
Lumhānī, and who was presumably the last of the şadrs before the Mongol invasion. The family, however, survived the conquest. Juwaini (III p. 79-80) mentions one qādi l-qudāt Jamāl al-millah wa l-dīn Muḥammad al-Khujandī in connection with the events of the year 650/1252-3.

228. A single verse by one Khursādī is quoted in two different places (p. 12 and 115-6) by Shams i Qais. [406]


`Auṣṭi II p. 407-11; Ťāzī I p. 332-3 (no. 343); Ḥidāyāt, Majmaʿ I p. 199; Khāyām-pūr p. 191; (Khursādī i Bukhārī); C.E. Bosworth, The later Ghaznavids, Edinburgh 1977, p. 128.

230. Masʿūdī Kinānī[4] (roof-maker) Jārbādhaqānī, a satirical poet at the time of the Ṣeljuqs Ṭūḥrī II and Ṣaṯūnī, appears to be known only from Abū I-Raṣīl Qummi, who quotes four of his quatrains, one of them mocking Ṣaṯūnī al-dīn, Masʿūdī’s wazīr from 530/1136 to 532/1138, another directed against Muʿāyya al-dīn Marzūb, who occupied the same position from 539/1144-5 to 540/1145-6.


1 `Auṣṭi. Ťāzī calls him Abī Bakr b. al-Musläm al-Khursādī, but in Ḥidāyāt this is garbled to Shaikh Jamāl al-dīn Abī al-Munhāb, islām Khursādī Bukhārī.

2 `Auṣṭi’s precise words are: dar doulat i Khursādī Makī ibbat ha da wa dar aswāq i i‘ādām i salāmah i muṣāṣṣī gābāt yftah.

3 `Auṣṭi referring to the dedicatee of the poem as *sulfāt hū i ahshād*; the poem itself contains in a verse that is mutilated in the only Ms. available to the editor (p. 408, l. 13) the name *‘Abī I-Muẓaffar*. Ḥidāyāt quotes a few verses from this poem (the variants are recorded in Brown’s apparatus criticus) and reads instead of the mutilated half-verse: *wāris hū i šukr hū i ahshād Khursādī Makī, khwarsuxad i malk*, but this is perhaps merely Ḥidāyāt’s own emendation.

4 Thus three times in Abī I-Raṣīl. On p. 128: ṭuṣ.”

231. Kūhārī[1] Ťabāšt, a citizen of Āmul, is credited with two rubā‘īs in ʻAuṣṭi’s chapter on the poets of Western Persia during the Seljuq period.

`Auṣṭi II p. 240; Ḥidāyāt, Majmaʿ I p. 487 (follows ʻAuṣṭi); Khāyām-pūr p. 493.

232. Kūshkār[2] al-Qārī was a poet at the court of Sanjar. ʻAuṣṭi says that he specialised in invectives and quotes two samples of his satirical verse. Abū I-Raṣīl Qummi quotes a rubā‘ī referring to Sanjar’s defeat at the hands of the Ghuzz (in 548/1154) and Ťāzī adds two different poems about that same event.


233. Lāṭīf al-dīn Zakī Marāḡhā’ī is included in ʻAuṣṭi’s chapter on the poets of Transoxania after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157). ʻAuṣṭi tells us that, although his family was from Marāḡh, Lāṭīf was born and raised in Kāshqār, and quotes two long qasĭda s, both apparently dedicated to the same ruler who, in the first is called *Khuṣru Muʿizz i dūnයā wa din*, (who is said to be a descendant of Sanjar), in the second *Khuṣru i shqār Muʿizz al-dīn wa Ḵurḏūnā* Elsewhere (II p. 238) the same authority quotes a laudatory verse that *Lāṭīf al-dīn Dāḥḵā (*sic*) Marāḡhā’ī* addressed to Kāfī b. Abī I-Faraj Rūfī, together with the flattering reply of the latter.


234. Luṭufī is the first name in ʻArnū’s list of the poets of the ‘house of the Khāqān’, i.e. the Ārakhanids. Two verses are ascribed to a poet of this name in the marginal additions to Ms. nān of Asādī’s Lughāt i furūṣ. Another two verses are quoted by Shams and four
rubā’iyāt are ascribed to Lu’lu’i in the Nuzhat al-majāls of Janāl al-dīn Sharwānī. To these Nafīsī has added another two verses from other dictionaries – one of them can be found in Surūrī’s Majma’ al-furs; the other (Nafīsī’s first verse on p. 39) I have not located – and another rubā’i from an unidentified anthology. But Nafīsī unnecessarily complicates things by raising the question of whether some or all of these verses might belong not to ‘Arūj’s Lu’lu’i but to the ‘kad-khūd (variant: dīkh-khūd) Lu’lu’i’ mentioned by Asādī in his Karshāq-nāmah.2 In fact, Asādī refers to this person only as a dabīr and gives no indication that he was a poet. The marginal additions in Ms. nān of LF have, of course, nothing to do with Asādī; the connection that Nafīsī draws between the verses quoted there and the passage in the Karshāq-nāmah is thus without foundation.

LF ed. Iqbal p. 333 and 350 (Ms. nān in marg.); ‘Arūj p. 28; Shams p. 359 (1 verse in Qazwīnī’s edition, two in the new edition p. 381); Sharwānī (see below, appendix III); Nafīsī’s Dīvān i Amīrāq (see above, p. 253) p. 36-9. [409]

235. The poetess Mahsātī3 is, with Abū Sa’īd and Khayāmī, 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 (apparently) lurks behind the legend. ‘Aṭṭār, in one of the stories in his Ilāh-nāmah, depicts Mahsātī as a singing-girl at the court of Sanjar (511/1118 to 552/1157), but Mustauffi and his successors situate her at the court of Maḥmūd Ghaznawī (388/998 to 421/1030).

The Vatican manuscript of Asādī’s Lughāt i furs ascribes one verse to Mahsātī, 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 Asādī. A single quatrain by ‘Mahsātī 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’iyāt, exactly as is the case with Khayāmī.

1Dabīr-Siyāqu’s edition, p. 309, but in some of the Mss. it is ascribed not to ‘Lu’lu’i’ but to ‘Maulawi’.
2īd. Huart vs. 294; ed. Yaghmā’ī p. 21 vs. 31.
3The name Mahsātī (metrical variant: Mahsāti) is discussed at length by Meier, p. 43-57, with the plausible conclusion that it is a compound of māh, ‘moon’, and the early Indian loan-word satī, ‘virtuous lady’.

Mahlāt 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 867/1462-3.1 This situates their story in the timeless past, in the exotic, semi-forgotten land of Ganjah and the prose narrative is interspersed with the quatrains which the two lovers are supposed to have addressed to one another. 257 rubā’iyāt (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 [410] with a German translation) by the late Fritz Meier in Die schöne Mahlāt. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des persischen Vierzeilers, I (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. Shīhāb under the title Dīvān i Mahsātī i Ganjāvī, Tehran 1355h./1956, 2nd edition 1363h./1957 (and reprints). The poems ascribed to Mahlāt are all of amatory, and generally decidedly sentimental content, though a small number (among them the half-quatrain quoted in LF) are pornographic.2

Translation of 257 quatrains (Italian); Mahlāt Ganjāvī, La luna e le perle, trans. R. Bargiggī with introduction and notes by D. Meneghini, Milan 1999.


236. Majī al-dīn Abū l-Barakāṭ is included in ‘Aṭṭār’s chapter on the poets of Khurāsān after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157)
where he is represented by a long ode, evidently in imitation of one by Lāmī (whose name is mentioned in the 13th verse), dedicated to a ruler whom 'Auffi calls 'Tāj al-dīn ra’sī i Khurāsān', and to whom the poet applies the grander title of saiyīd i Ėrân. Hīdāyāt quotes the same poem, but calls its author Ābbī l-Barakāt i Bābāqī, evidently identifying him with the person included by Ibn Funduq in his history of his native town (p. 246) as Ābbī al-dīn Ābbī l-Barakāt al-Fāqī, b. ‘Alī al-‘Alawī (with a genealogy reaching back to ‘Alī b. Ābbī al-Tāℓīb). Ibn Funduq proceeds to tell us that this [411] man was a poet and prose-writer in Persian and Arabic and illustrates his talents with five Arabic verses. But ‘Auffi’s failure to refer to his Ābbī al-dīn as a saiyīd or an ‘alawī speaks rather against the identification.

‘Auffi’ II p. 318-23; Hīdāyāt, Majmā’ I p. 85-6; Khayām-pūr p. 15 (‘Ābbī l-Barakāt i Bābāqī’).

237. Majd al-dīn Muḥammad al-Pāyēzī al-Nasawi is also cited in ‘Auffi’s chapter on the poets of Khurāsān after the time of Sanjār, where we find five of his rubā‘yīs. ‘Auffi says that he was one of the poets of Sultān Silkanār, i.e. the Khvārzam-shāh ‘Alā’ al-dīn Muḥammad b. Tekshā (596/1200 to 617/1220),3 that he himself saw him in Nasā in the year 600/1203-4 and that Majd al-dīn was the author of a poetical account of the deeds of the Khvārzam-shāhs with the title Shahrānshāh-nāmeh.

‘Auffi’ II p. 345-6; Rāzī II p. 35 (no. 340); Khayām-pūr p. 101 (‘Pāyēzī i Nasawi’).

238. Three verses by one Malaqībādī (?!) are quoted by Shams p. 236.

239. al-Qādī al-imām Shams al-dīn Maḥmūd al-Ūzjījī was, according to ‘Auffi, a religious scholar and physician who entered the services of the Khīṭāt. ‘Auffi quotes two of his odes, the first of which praises a commander of the Khīṭāt with the name Ahmad and the

gīte toyaqāqa.1 The opening verse of this qaṣīdah is [412] quoted also by Shams, who calls its author Qadī Maḥṣūr Farghānī. Zakariyā al-Qazwīnī quotes the first three verses of the same poem, but calls its author ‘qaṣīd nādīn Bahrāmī sa’d al-sharī’īs’, apparently confusing him with one of the Āl i Burhān; Zakariyā2 is, however, evidently correct in seeing this poem as the model for another with the same unusual rhyme by Shams Tabāshī.

‘Auffi I p. 194-8 (and Qazwīnī’s notes); Shams pp. 273; Zakariyā al-Qazwīnī, Āthār al-bīlād, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 272-3; Hīdāyāt, Majmā’ I p. 306; Khayām-pūr p. 305 (‘Shams i Ūzjāndī’).

240. Masʿūd b. Saʿd b. Salmān has left us with a substantial dīwān 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.3 He was born, as he indicates quite clearly in a number of poems, in Lahore, and not, as ‘Auffi maintains, in Hāmadān, nor in any of the other improbable places claimed by the authors of later tasāvīrīts. His father Saʿd b. al-Ṭabar was a rich landowner and an official in the Ghaznavid administration4 and Masʿūd followed in his footsteps, serving five successive sultans, from ʿIbrāhīm b. Masʿūd (451/1059 to 492/1099) down to Bahrām-shāh (511/1117 to 552/1157), all of whom are mentioned in his poems. The earliest piece which can be dated precisely is his ode celebrating the appointment by Sultan ʿIbrāhīm of his son Saʿīd al-daʿulah Muḥmūd as the governor of the Ghaznavid possessions in India; the poem fixes this event to [413] the year 469 (tai u āṣa u sīh jft), i.e. 1067-7, and roughly the same date would appear to be implied in another ode to Muḥmūd alluding to the fact that Nau-rūz fell in the Muslim month of Rajab.5 His poems describe in some detail Mah-

1For which see Doerfer II p. 651-2, with further literature. It does not seem possible to say whether or not this Ahmad is identical with any of the toyaqāqa mentioned in the historical sources.

2For which see below, no. 292.

3The 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 summarised here.

4He is evidently the Saʿīd i Salmān mentioned by Bābāqī (p. 501) in his account of the events of the year 427/1036.

5The 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 Rajab. 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.

---

1See Mūsaffā’s remarks in his edition of Hīdāyāt, Majmā’ I p. 217 note 5.

2Thus Browne’s reading, on the basis of one of the two Ms. of ‘Auffi’s book. The two Ms. of Rāzī’s Haft ṣūrat are composed by Ėbū have ‘al-Bānīnī’ or ‘b. al-Bānīnī’.

3See above, p. 249 (Ābbī ‘Alī).
mûd's military campaigns against the Hindus, in which the poet appears to have participated personally, and are of especial interest since Mahmûd's governorship is not mentioned by any of the medieval historians. But after a while he was imprisoned by order of the sultan for a total of ten years; since İbrahim was still on the throne after the poet's release the date of his imprisonment cannot have been later than 482/1089-90.1 In the poems written during his incarceration the poet gives no real indication of the cause of his misfortune, but it is possible, as ʿArûfî claims, that this was the result of the deposition and imprisonment of Mâmmûd by his father, İbrahim, who suspected that his son was plotting to defect to the Seljuqs.

Masûd was eventually pardoned by İbrahim and he subsequently returned to Lahore. When İbrahim died, probably shortly afterwards, he was succeeded by his son Masûd III, who appointed his own son, the future sultan Shâr-zâd, as his governor in Lahore. Our poet enjoyed the favour of the new governor and especially that of his deputy, Aḥâ Naṣr Fârist, who had him appointed viceroy of Châlânder (or Jâr-). But later he was imprisoned for a second time, evidently in the wake of the disgrace of his patron Aḥâ Naṣr, [414] though some of the verses composed during his second imprisonment seem to imply that Masûd had been accused (wrongly, he says) of misappropriation of funds. He was eventually pardoned by Sultan Masûd, 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 Bahârâm-shâh, Ḥidâyat and others state, on the authority of Nizâmî ʿArûfî, that our poet died in 515/1121-2. Although this date is not mentioned in the published text of the tshâr maqâlah, it is possible that it was contained in some manuscript of that work and is in any event not implausible.

ʿArûfî says Masûd left three dhwâns, in Persian, Arabic and 'Hindû' (i.e. some Indian vernacular). Only the first of these has come down to us, but Wâwât does cite a good number of Masûd's Arabic verses in his Ḥadâʾiq al-sîhr. There is no trace of his Indian dhwân.1 For his supposed epitome of the Shâh-nâmah see above p. 152-3.

Mss. of his dhwân: Manchester Lindesiana 95 (16th century?); Oxford Elliot 37 fol. 69a (Eṣṭâ 1332 = Dâqqa'îq al-ashkârâr, 4 tasâmat); Whinfield 54 (Beeston 2662/5, Dated 9 Rajab 1012/1603. Selections); Elliot 109 (Eṣṭâ 526, Dated 27 Muḥarram 1018/1609); London Add. 7793/1 (fol. 1-164. Rieu p. 549, Dated Ramāḍān 1005/1597. Nûrîyân's bâhâ); [415] Egerton 701 (Rieu p. 548-9, Dated Ramāḍān 1008/1600. Nûrîyân's qâf); I.O. 2862 (Dated 26 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; Romaskiewicz 8; Konya Izzet Koyunoğlu Kitâbuhânesi FY 1006 (At eş, Istanbul Universîte Cat. 21. Dated Shawâwâl 1011/1603); Istanbul Hekimoğlu Ali Paşa 669/6 (Mindi'inl-hâ: 2 p. 420-1. Apparently old); Tehran Gulistanî/Atabâyî 430/1 (Bayânî apparently attributes the Ma. to the 16th century); Asghar Mahdawi (Nusâkhâ-ha II p. 78. Dated 12 Rabi'î 1 1045/1635); Mashhad Faculty of Theology (ex-Maulawi collection. Nusâkhâh-hâ V p. 29 no. 197. Dated 1009/1600-1, Nûrîyân's qâf); Tashkent Acad. 160/1 (Semenov 763, Dated 1268/1851-2); Acad. 238/IX (Semenov 764, 19th century); Dusunbe Acad. II 336 (18th century?); Lahore Univ. (Munz. Pak. VII p. 22, 16th century?); Hyderabad (Sindî) (Munz. Pak. VII p. 22, 15th-16th century?); Aliqar Subh p. 33 no. 32; Calcutta Ivanov 435 (= Sprenger 353. 18th century?). Cf. Munz. III 25913-41.

Editions: Persia 1296/1879; Tehran 1318sh./1939 (Ed. R. Yâsimî; with an extensive introduction) and reprints; 1362sh./1983 (again reprinted from Yâsimî, with a new introduction); 1364-Sh./1986 (ed. M. Nûrîyân in 2 vols., with variants from six Mss. in the second volume).

1Qawâwî has taken perhaps a too sceptical view of the alleged Indian dhwân. He points to various passages where Masûd parades his proficiency in Arabic and Persian but says nothing of 'Indian'. 'It would be absurd', Qawâwî 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 Masûd, 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.


241. Fakhr al-dīn Masūdī, of Marw, is included in Āfūf’s chapter on the poets of the Seljuq of Khusraw, where we read that he was a leading religious authority who also produced poetry. He is evidently not identical with the earlier Mas‘ūd Marawzī,2 of whom Āfūf knows nothing.

Āfūf II p. 163-4; Khaiyām-pūr p. 539.

242. Mu‘aṣṣāf al-dīn al-Nasāfī is the author of two didactic math-nawvis, Nasīm-al-ṣabāb ilā l-sabū (inc.: ai masūbāt i ẓamān i huḍa * wa-maṣūb i jannat i ma‘ān), and dedicated to one Majd al-dīn3, and Pahlavān-nāmāh (inc.: marhabā al ra‘ṣāf i ham-dam i man * bi-sīnaw in sar-gudhāsht i pur-gam 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. Mu‘aṣṣāf al-

3The distinguished Pakistani scholar did not, of course, really have access to an 11th-century manuscript of Mas‘ūd’s poems; here ‘codex’ means ‘text’.

2Above, p. 191-2.

3T.P. de Bruijn, who has studied the two mathnawvis, tells me that he thinks the dedication of the Nasīm al-ṣabāb is Awnawī’s praise Majd al-dīn Abū Sa‘dān’s tūrāf, for whom see above p. 331; Mūwardī’s edition of Awnawī’s Mathnawī II p. 76-7; Nafṣī’s edition of the same Mathnawī p. xlv-xxiv.

Samarqandī then he must have flourished in Samarqand around the middle of the 6th/12th century. Āfūf, who mentions the Pahlavān-nāmāh, 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 [417] other things, a qaṣīdah and a qīfah in which the poet addresses a ruler by the name of Jalal i dīn; the latter is presumably identical with the ‘pahlavān i jahān Jalal al-dīn’ to whom the Pahlavān-nāmāh is dedicated.2 The laqab Jalal al-dīn was used by several of the Qarakhanids, notably al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī (524/1130 to 526/1132)3 and al-Ḥasan (551/1156 to ca. 556/1160),4 either one of whom could conceivably have been Mu‘aṣṣāf’s patron. Two poems are attributed to ‘Mu‘aṣṣāf b. Nasaf’ in the Tārīkh-nāmāh of Hūṣūr and a further qīfah of five verses is added by Hīdāyat.

Ma. of the two Mathnawīs: London I.O. 929 (DATED JUMĀDĀ I 637/1239). (Neither poem is in MUNZ.)

Āfūf II p. 359-62; Rāzi III p. 356 (no. 1428); Sa‘īd b. Muhammad al-Harawi, Tārīkh-nāmāh i Hūṣūr, Calcutta 1944, p. 77-8; Hīdāyat, Majma‘ I p. 509-10; Nafṣī’s notes to Baihaqī, III 1547-9; Sāfā, Tārīkh II p. 767-9; Khaiyām-pūr p. 579.

243. Fakhr al-dīn Abū Sa‘dān Mubārak-shāb b. al-Ḥusain al-Marwarrūdī (Persian: Marv-i-rūdī) died, according to Ibn al-‘Athīr,7 in Shawwāl 602/1206.8 He was, the historian assures us, a [418] fine poet in Persian and in Arabic and had enjoyed a high position with the ruler of Ghaznav and Herat, Ghıyāb al-dīn al-Kābir (i.e. the Ghord

1See below, no. 298.

2Fed. 96a.

3See O. Pritsk, Der Islam XXXI, 1953-4, p. 52.

4Cf. Pritsk, op. cit. p. 54 and (specifically for his laqab) Ateş’s Turkish introduction to Zakariyā, p. 49-70.

5The name is mentioned only by Ibn al-Fuwāṣī.

6His father’s name is given thus by Āfūf and Ibn al-Fuwāṣī. The published text of Ibn al-‘Athīr has ‘al-Ḥasan’, presumably a scribal error.

7XII p. 160-1. The same author, XII p. 101, mentions ‘al-Fakhr Mubārak-Shāb’ in connection with Ghıyāb al-dīn’s conversion to the Shī‘ī madhhab, but I suspect that here the author has confused our Mubārak-Shāb with Fakhr al-dīn al-Rūzī.

8The same date is given by Ibn al-Fuwāṣī, who claims that Naṣīr al-dīn Tūsī ‘told me’ it, but given the fact that Ibn al-Fuwāṣī’s whole entry agrees more or less literally with Ibn al-‘Athīr the claim has to be taken with a grain of salt.
Muhammad b. Sâm, 558/1163 to 599/1203). 'Auﬁ quotes, among other verses of his, a long qasidah in praise of that king’s predecessor Sâif al-dîn Muhammad b. Ḥusain (556/1161 to 558/1163), while Minhâj i Širâj says that he himself had seen in the private quarters of the daughter of the afore-mentioned Ghîyâth al-dîn a manuscript of a history (or of a Nizârat-nâmah, as he calls it) of the Ghôrid kings, in verse, composed by Mubârâk-shâh and originally dedicated to 'Alî al-dîn Ḥusain Jahân-nâgâ (544/1149 to 556/1161), but later re-dedicated to Ghîyâth al-dîn. The six mathnâvs in mutaqqârib metre by Fakhr al-dîn Mubârâk-shâh Marwâzi’ which are quoted in the Rau’dât al-jannât of Mu’in al-dîn Isfizârî in his account of that dynasty evidently belong to the work in question.

Mustaﬁ (followed by Khwând-mîr and Ḥâjjî Khâliîfâh) says that Mubârâk-shâh is the author of the Madkhal i maqâmî i nujâm, presumably the well-known versified treatise on astrology which is ascribed in some manuscripts to Naṣîr al-dîn Tûsî. 1 [419]

Extant, but unpublished, is the didactic mathnâv Raḥîq al-taḥqîq (inc.: bâdâh i ishâq dar âhî, a stghî, * tâ shawad lâf i ’aqîl dar bâtî) by an author who, in the superscription to the Ayyâsafâya manuscript, is identified as Fakhr al-dîn Mubârâk-shâh Ghôrî and who indicates in the final verse that he completed the work in Mâhrâm 584/1188. (bâd mâh i Mâharrâm, awwal-i sâhî * sâlî i hîrât ba hârîf i tâh fâ dâlî). Mss.: Istan-

1 In Ibn al-Fuwâst wrongly ‘Mu’âammad’.
2 For this work, which hee since been published (see our bibliography), cf. PL I p. 355, where (line 14) ‘1648’ is an error for ‘1468’.
4 See PL II p. 55. This 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 Mss., in Yaghmâî’s târîkh dâlî. One of these copies (Yaghmâî’s mîr dâlî) contains a dedication to a certain Iskâl al-dîn bar (read: Blû) Muhammîd Muhammâd b. Ahmad and concludes with verses giving the date of composition as 1 Jamâ’dî II 616/1221. (cf. Calcutta, Ivanon 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 Isfâhân, Kišâb-khânah i Ribwâysh i Mîrdâsâh i Sadr (see Nuzûkh-hâ V p. 313, n. 22) I) ascribed there to ‘Fakhr al-dîn Mubârâk-shâh Ghâzânî Bukihrî (sic!). If this date is correct the poem cannot be the work of Mubârâk-shâh (who died 14 years earlier). See further S. Nafa’i, ‘Aṣâhir i fârîs i Khwâsî’, in Yâd-nâmâh i Khwâsî Naṣîr al-dîn i Tûsî I, Tehran 1338h./1957, p. 34-44, where Tûsî’s authorship is upheld.

1 For whom see also El2 Sup. s.v. “Fakhr-i Mudabbir.” (C.E. Bowworth).
2 Qawwâl flourished under ‘Alî al-dîn Khâlíî, at the end of the 7th/14th or the beginning of 8th/14th century; cf. PL III p. S.
3 His āqîl is quoted thus by Sanî’î in his Kār-nâmâh; ‘Auﬁ gives it as Jamâl al-dîn.

244. al-Sâyi’d Sharaf al-dîn 3 Muhammad b. Nâsîr al-‘A’âwi was, according to ‘Auﬁ, the elder brother of Saiyid Hasan Ghaznavi; this information is in so far problematic as those authorities who are not dependent on ‘Auﬁ give Saiyid Hasan’s father the name Muhammad, not
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Now shows there (contra Ross) that this author is not identical with his near contemporary the genealogist (in prose) Mubârâk-shâh Muhammad b. Ḥâjî Muqâsî- al-Qarâshî. 1 More recently Munzâwî has confused him with the lexicographer Fakhr al-dîn Mubârâk-shâh Qawwâs, who lived a century later. 2

Nāṣir.\(^1\) His contemporary Sanā’i extols him in his Kār-nāmah i Balkhī as well as in a qayādah in which he uses the same radīf (qāsidah u ṣāb) that Sāyiḍ Muḥammad employed in his qayādah quoted by ‘Auẓī and dedicated (according to the same authority) to Sultan ‘Alī al-daulah (i.e. Mas’ūd III, 492/1099 to 508/1115). [421] Mas’ūd i Sa’d composed a qīfah praising the poetry of ‘Sāyiḍ Muḥammad i Nāṣir’ and another bewailing the death of ‘Muḥammad al-Awli’i. ‘Auẓī quotes two more of his poems, one of which Rāzī (followed by Hīdāyat) claims to have been dedicated to Bahram-Shāh (512/1118 to 547/1152).


245. The dhvān of a certain Muḥyī, who, in the manuscripts, is generally, but almost certainly wrongly, identified with Muḥyī l-din ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Jīlānī, the founder of the Qādirī order (died 561/1166), and which is not apparently attestable before the 11th/17th century, will be discussed in a later volume of this survey.

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

247. Amīr al-shu’urārī Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Malik al-Muṭṭīz al-Naisībūrī\(^2\) was the leading poet at the courts of the

---

\(^1\) See above, p. 333 n. 1, where the possibility of reconciling the two traditions is discussed. Qazwīnī accepted that the two were brothers, but Mudarris i Riḍawi (in his introduction to Sāyiḍ Ḥasan’s dhvān) and Ch. M. Khan (in Islamic Culture XXIII, 1949, p. 220-1) both claimed, apparently independently, that Sāyiḍ Muḥammad was the brother of a different Sāyiḍ Ḥasan (namely the one whose death is lamented in the dhvān of Mas’ūd i Sa’d, ed. Yāsīmī, p. 62-3; the name of this Sāyiḍ’s father is, however, not indicated in the poem) and that ‘Auẓī consequently confused the two Ḥasans.

\(^2\) Thus ‘Auẓī.

Seljuq Malik-shāh (465/1072 to 485/1092), Berk-yārūq (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), [422] the Ghaznavid Bahram-Shāh (Sanjar’s contemporary and vassal) the Khwārazm-Shāh Atsīz (521/1127 to 551/1156) and others. Niẓām ‘Arūḍī 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 Naisībūr, and at the first of these encounters Muṭṭīzī 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\(^1\) 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 ‘Alī b. Fārānīzād and ingratiated himself with the ruler by means of two extemporised rubā’īs, and how he was awarded the title ‘Amīr Muṭṭīzī with reference to Malik-shāh’s lasāb Muṭṭīz al-dunyā wa l-dīn. According to ‘Auẓī Muṭṭīzī was killed by a stray arrow shot by Sanjar during target practice and an ‘arrow’ is mentioned also in two qīfahs that Sanā’ī composed lamenting Muṭṭīzī’s death.\(^2\) However, there is a poem by Muṭṭīzī\(^3\) 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 Muṭṭīzī’s long absence from the court gave rise to rumours that [423] 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 Muṭṭīzī. Taqū puts Muṭṭīzī’s death in 542/1147-8. It is striking that ‘Arūḍī consistently mentions Muṭṭīzī’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 ‘Arūḍī completed his book in 552/1157.

---

1See above, p. 104.
3Dhvān p. 575-7. The discrepancy was noted by Hīdāyat, Majmū’a I p. 571, Hīdāyat Ḥasan, Fuṣūṣ-i Shīrwat p. 56 and in Ḥazīl’s introduction to Muṭṭīzī’s dvān, p. in e. Ḥazīl discusses in this context also another poem (dvān p. 378-9) addressed to Qwām al-mulk Muḥammad b. Fakhīr al-mulk, who was wazīr from 500/1106 to 511/1118, but the ‘arrow’ mentioned in this poem is evidently to be understood metaphorically. Thus one cannot accept the very early date which Ḥazīl assigns to Muṭṭīzī’s accident.
Mu'izzī was greatly admired by men of letters of his own time and of several generations afterwards; in the eyes of 'Aṣfi he joins Rādī and ʿUṣūrī to complete the trinity of preeminent panegyrists. His ḍhūnān, which Ḥāfīz 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.O. 913 (Ms. copied by 'Abd al-Mu'min al-ʿAlwāl al-Ḵāshī in 713-4/1314-5; Pictures); I.O. 3027 (Dated 19 Shawwal 1018/1610); [424] I.O. 912 (Dated 1 Dhi ṭīn-Šīhah 1046/1637); Add. 10,388 (Rieu p. 352-3. 17th century? Ca. 8000 verses); Cambridge Browne Coll. V.65 no. 15 (Anthology dated 27 Ramadan 827/1424); Browne Coll V.5 (Dated 19 Jumādā I 1252/1836); Paris Supplement 783 fol. 21v sqq. (Blöchet 1981, 16th century?); Supplement 1035 (Blöchet 1222. Dated 17 Ša’ār 1242/1826); Vienna Flügel 508 (Dated 14 Rajab 1241/1826); Leningrad Salammun 15; Istanbul Universite FY 335 (alím Ruza Paşa 1180. Ateş 29. 17th century?); Hekimoglu Ali Paşa 669/8 (Mikrāfīlm-hā I p. 420-1. Apparently old); Najaf Āmir al-muʾmīnīn 1600 (Muniz. 26066. 18th century?); Tehran Univ. VIII 2116

1This is the famous Indian Office 'Six ḍhūnān', containing a selection of poems by (1) Mu'izzī, (2) Ḥāfīz Akbakštī, (3) Ḥāfīz Šīrī, (4) Qamar Isfahānī, (5) Shams Tabāsi and (6) Nāṣir i Khusraw, of which none, 3, 5 and 6 are signed and dated. For the miniatures see Robinson 1-53. The first picture illustrates 'Ārūdī'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 Menged 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 of the poet of a 'robe of honour' (ḵūnīfah) as a reward for his panegyrics, a situation very well known to readers of Persian and Arabic texts. The Ms. now in the Indian Office was at one time in the possession of the Safavid royal family and has in many places the seal of one Ismā'īl I, probably Ismā'īl III, according to A.H. Morton. There is in Mashhad (Ridwān VII 965) a Ms. containing the same six ḍhūnān, plus those of two poets from the 13th century (Rūkūn al-dīn Da'wāl-i and Ḥāfīz al-Abwāl, both to be discussed in Pl. VI) copied by Sadr al-dīn Muhammad b. Jafar Isfahānī with dates between 1039/1629-30 and 1041/1631-2; it seems likely that the Mashhad Ms. was copied (or excerpted) from the one now in the Indian Office (see also British's introduction to his edition of the ḍhūnān of Shams Tabāsi, p. xvi-xlvi).
poems.¹ During the 12th century Bālaḵān stood on the boundary between the sphere of influence of the Shārwar-shāhs and Georgians, on the one hand, and that of the Seljuqs and [426] Ėldūḡizids, on the other,² and this situation is reflected in Muftī’s ḍhwān. This contains a few poems to the Shārwar-shāh Manūẖihr II,³ who died not long after 555/1160-1,⁴ and these must consequently belong to the earliest part of his career. The majority of his odes are addressed to the atabegs Nusrat al-dīn Ḫâǧâh-pahlavān b. Ėldūḡāz (571/1175 to 582/1186) and his successor Qızīl Arslān (d. 587/1191)⁵ and to the Seljuq Arslān b. Toghrīl (556/1161 to 571/1176), nominally the master, but in fact the puppet of Ḫâŋâh-pahlavān. ‘Afsī tells an anecdote about his rivalry with Abū Aḵẖāẖâfi in the ear of Qızīl Arslān.⁶ Taqī⁷ puts his death in the year 594/1197-8, which (for once) must be roughly correct.

In his famous ode in praise of the towns of Isfahan, Khâqānī speaks of how an ‘accursed devil’ (dēw i rafīm) had mocked that city and how the Isfahānīs had in some way held Khâqānī responsible for the attack, an accusation which he rejects energetically. The commentators⁸ have identified this ‘devil’ with Khâqānī’s supposed pupil Muftī rafīm being an anagram for the latter’s name). There is in fact a (by Persian standards) decidedly [427] restrained rubā’ti in Muftī’s ḍhwān⁹ poking fun at the people of Isfahan. Abū 1-Raḡā Qummi, a nearly contemporary source, cites one verse from this quatrains and then a verse with which the ‘people of Isfahan’ replied to Muftī’s attack. The story is expanded in later sources. Zakariyā’ al-Qazwīnī alludes to this same epigram and says that the ruṭāt of Isfahan ordered all the local poets to respond to it, collected their efforts in a volume and sent it to Muftī. Daŭlat-shāh says that Muftī composed the quatrains when the atabeg sent him to that town as a tax-collector and he adds a rubā’ti supposedly by the Isfahānī poet Shāraf al-dīn i Şafrūḥ replying to it (and which contains the verse already quoted, anonymously, by Abū 1-Raḡā), but he too has nothing to say of Khâqānī in this context. Rāzī quotes the same two rubā’tis and adds an obscene qīfʿiḥ supposedly by Jamāl al-dīn¹ attacking both Muftī and Khâqānī, though Rāzī himself leaves Khâqānī out of the business. Rāzī then goes on to say that Muftī was subsequently murdered in a bath-house by the Isfahān mob. But this is perhaps merely a fanciful elaboration of the old story.

Muftī’s ḍhwān 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.

Mss.: Oxford Elliot 86 (Fīḥā 559. Dated 28 Dhū l-qa’dah 1005/1597. Ābdī’s hs); Whinfield 54 (Beeston 2662/12. Dated 9 Rajab 1012/1603. Selections); London Add. 8993 (Rieu p. 562. Dated 12 Shābān 1016/1607. Evidently only a short extract. Ābdī’s fr); [428] Paris Supplément 783 fol. 42r sqq. (Blochet 1981. 16th century? Selections); Berlin Petermann 716/4 (Pertsch 682. Selections); Istanbul Lâlā Īsmāl 487/14 (Mkhrṭbām-hā 1 p. 500-1. Selected poems in a Ms. dated 741/1340-1. Ābdī’s lām); Hekimoḡlu Ali Paşa 669/4 (Mkhrṭbām-hā 1 p. 420-1. Has a waqf-notice dated 1097/1685-6, but is apparently a good deal older. Ābdī’s ‘ain); Tehran Univ VIII 1883/1 (16th century? Ābdī’s mīm); Dh-khūḏā (Nashḵāb-hā III p. 19. Dated 1009/1600-1); Majlis 87150 (Dated 1020/1611-2. Ābdī’s mīm-lm); Lucknow Sprenger 388. Cf. Mnuz. III 25759-66.


¹There is an ode praising Khâqānī in Muftī’s ḍhwān, ed. Ēbdī, p. 20-2, and a qīfʿiḥ attacking him on p. 302; see also p. 393.
³Dhwān p. 87-9, 112-6.
⁴See above, p. 248 n. 2.
⁵Rieu says that Muftī wrote an elegy on the death of Qızīl Arslān (and consequently ostensible 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 Abūī’s edition. When the verses are read in context it becomes clear that Muftī is in fact consoling Qızīl Arslān on the demise of his father. Daŭlat-shāh says that Muftī addressed poems to Ėldūḡāz, but this too I have been unable to confirm.
⁶The poem quoted by ‘Afsī in this context is in the dhwān, p. 295-6.
⁷Apūd Sprenger p. 16 no. 28.
⁸E.g. the 17th-century commentary by Ghānī (see above p. 392), whose gloss is reproduced in F. Spiegel, Chrestomathia Persica, Leipzig 1846, p. 100-1.
⁹p. 396.
Although the titles used by Mughārī do not seem to be mentioned in other sources, the identity of his patron with this Fāṇā-khusraw would appear to be supported by a verse implying that the former was a contemporary (and opponent) of the Fatimid caliph al-Mustanṣir, who also died in 487/1094.

It appears that Mughārī was out of favour, or even in exile from Ghaznah, for most of Mas'ūd’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 Ghaznah with the [430] ascension of Malik-Arslān, his principal patron. Only two poems in the ḍwān are addressed to Malik-Arslān’s successor, his brother Bahārām-shāh,²

In the last part of his life Mughārī paid what was apparently a short visit to Samarqand, where he dedicated a good number of poems to the Qarakhanid Arslān-khān Muhammad (II) b. Sulaimān (495/1012 to ca. 523/1130) and various persons of his court. One of these appears to speak of seventeen years having passed in the reign of Muhammad b. Sulaimān,³ and would thus imply that Mughārī was in Samarqand in 512/1118-9, and another poem,⁴ dedicated to one Khwāja Sa’d al-mulk, evidently a dignitary at the court of Muhammad, would appear to have been written on the occasion of the beginning of Ramadān 513/1119.⁵

[431] This is the last identifiable date in the ḍwān. Taqī Kāshf, followed

¹See above, p. 398 n. 1 (Khāqān).
³Ḍwān p. 43-7, 76-7, 105-14, 541-63, 474-5, 521-4; in the last ‘Būyā’ rhyme with sukūf etc.
⁴p. 541-57.
⁵The other two are the celebrated amr al-umārāt ‘Aṣūd al-da‘lāla Fāns-khusrav (338/949 to 372/983) and the ruler of Rai, Fāns-khusrav b. Majd al-da‘lāla Rastān (succeeded his father in 420/1029).
by others, puts his death in 544/1149-50 or 554/11591 but these dates are, as usual, worthless.

Mukhtārī was a younger contemporary of Mas'ūd i Sa'd, whom he praised, and an older contemporary of Sanā'ī, by whom he was praised.

Mukhtārī’s diwan 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 Humā'ī. As already mentioned,2 the London manuscript also contains (apparently in the same hand) the divān 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 London manuscript does not absolutely guarantee its authenticity. This codex (and some of the others) also contains a didactic mathnawī, Hunar-nāmah i Yamīnī, (inc.: gunhāb i lājwār i dā'īwah gār sāl khwārādār sipīhr i sāl-nawārad) dedicated to the ruler of Tabas, Yamīn al-daulah Ismā'īlī; Gilakī, but also containing an epilogue praising the Ghaznavid Malik-Arslān. The former is known to have been alive in 493/1099-1100 and is reported to have been an Ismā'īlī. Although the Hunar-nāmah does deal with matters close to the hearts of the Ismā'īlīs (astrology, cosmology etc.) there is nothing in the text that would reveal any attachment of the poet to their specific doctrines. [432]

Mss. of the Divān: Oxford: Whinfield 54 (Beeston 2662/4; Dated 9 Rajab 1012/1603; Selection); Laud 295 (Ethb. 527); London: Or. 3713/VI (Rieu Suppt. 211. Copied by Muhammad-Shāh b. ‘Ali b. Mahmūd Isfahānī and dated 6 Rabī‘ II 692/1293);3 Or. 4514/VI (Rieu Suppt. 215. Completed 14 Rabī‘ II 1023/1614); Or. 3374 (Rieu Suppt. 216. Dated 1287/1870); Paris: Supplément 744 (Blochet 1209. 16th century?); Supplément 783 fol. 14 sqq. (Blochet 1981. 16th century?)

Jalālī corresponds to 9 December.

1Mukhtārī-nāmah p. 317, with references also to other tadkikats. Sprenger, p. 16 no. 15, quotes only the later date.

2Above, p. 93 n. 5. I should like to add now that the poem dedicated to Abū l-Molkī Arslān-Shāh ascribed to Azraqī in Nafisi’s edition of his diwan (where it is no. 25; see above, p. 92) - but not in the London Ms. - is in fact by Mukhtārī (see his Diwan, p. 85-90); pseudo-Azraqī/Nafisī no. 23 (likewise missing in the section of Or. 3712 devoted to Azraqī) is also by Mukhtārī (see his Diwan, p. 157-9).

3Thus Rieu Suppt. p. 142, beginning of first column, and Humā’ī p. 12 of his edition, Rieu Suppt. p. 143, end of the first column, misquotations the date as 692’. As noted above, p. 93 n. 5, Humā’ī gives this Ms. - his ‘rād’ - the wrong call-number.
Humā'ī, 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 naḥāl and maʿrūf vowels and between dat and dhal). Nonetheless, he was inclined to think that they do represent an authentic, if youthful and immature, work by Mukhtārī. But in his posthumous Mukhtārī-nameshah the same scholar came to the conclusion that the poem, by then more familiar to him from the poem manuscript, could not [434] possibly be by Mukhtārī Ghaznavī, the study of whose divān had occupied so many years of his life, but was the work of another Mukhtārī, dedicated to another Mas'ūd, himself the son or descendant of some Māhmūd (not him of Ghaznah), probably in India.

I think that the objections raised by Humā'ī against the attribution of the Dushanbe Shahr-yr-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 Mas'ūd, and that both Mas'ūds should have been descendants of a king by the name of Māhmūd, 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 Shahr-yr, 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 Shahr-yr (namely that contained in the Dushanbe manuscript) as well as with two extracts from the Shah-nāmah. In short, Mukhtārī did compose a Shahr-yr-nāmah, but all that we have of it are its final verses.

The one question that remains is that of the relationship between the Dushanbe Shahr-yr-nāmah, wrongly ascribed (by its modern editor) to Mukhtārī, and the Shahr-yr-nāmah contained in a Bankipore manuscript and ascribed there to Farrukhī.1 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 [435] verses are different. It would thus seem likely either that the author of the Dushanbe Shahr-yr-nāmah was familiar with the poem ascribed to Farrukhī, or else that both versifications are based on the same source in prose.

1'Arīdī p. 28 (and Qazwīnī's notes p. 150-1); 'Aafi II p. 412;1 Shams p. 330, 381-2, 442; Daqiqī al-ashʿar (Oxford Elliot 37 = Estē 1333 fol. 97a, 108a, 149a, 243a, 246a); Jājamī I p. 116-8, 218-9; Dašlat-shāh p. 93-4; Razi I p. 324-31 (no. 337); Taqī (see London Or. 3506 fol. 325a sqq. = Rieu Suppl. p. 105); Hīdajāt, Majma' I p. 598-607; Qazwīnī/Browne, JRAS 1906 p. 44-6; Saffā, Tārīkh II p. 501-7; id., Hamsānah4 p. 311-5; Khaīyām-pūr p. 528-9; C.E. Bosworth, The later Ghaznavids, Edinburgh 1977 (see index. s.v. 'Uthmān); J. Humā'ī, Mukhtārī-nāmah, Tehran n.d. (published posthumously; the preface is dated 1360h./1981. Fundamental); Gh.-H. Bigdilī, 'Shahr-yr-nāmah i Uthmān i Mukhtārī i Ghaznavī', Ayandah VI/1-2, 1359h./1980, p. 77-86; E.R. s.v. 'Mukhtārī' (J.S. Meisami).

250. Muzaffarī, 'a poet from Khurāsān', (evidently not identical with the Muzaffarī Panjdhīlī cited above, p. 200) composed an ode to the Bāwandīd Naṣrat al-dīn Rustam b. 'All (ca. 536/1142 to 560/1165) the first verse of which is quoted by Ibn Isfandiyār, Tārīkh i Tabaristan, ed. 'A. Iqbal, Tehran 1320h./1941, p. 113, and again II p. 84.

251. Mu'īz al-islām Najīb al-dīn Abū Bakr al-Tirmidīī al-Khaṭṭāt is represented by three rubā'īs [436] in 'Aafi's chapter on the poets of Ghaznah and Lahore at the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157), but all but the last of them are mutilated in Browne's manuscript. 'Aafi says that he excelled both in serious and in frivolous poetry.

'āfi II p. 415-6; Khaīyām-pūr p. 597.

252. A qašīdah by Hākim Muhammad b. Ḥasāl al-Najībī al-Bashtīnī 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; Khaīyām-pūr p. 597.

1'Aafi mentions Mukhtārī in passing in connection with Ahmad b. Mū'īz al-dīn Rustam b. 'All (above p. 252). His actual entry on Mukhtārī has dropped out of the Ms. used by Browne, but it is quoted explicitly by Rāzī.

---

1See above, p. 111.
253. No fewer than ten verses by a certain Najībī are quoted in the marginal additions to Ms. nah of Asadī’s Laghat i farā. Their author could be identical with the Najībī Farghānī whom ‘Arūdī (p. 28 and 46) mentions among the poets of the Qaraqhanids and the contemporaries of ‘Amrīq; the fragment on p. 157 in fact mentions Farghānī. LF ed. Iqbal p. 18, 156, 157, 242, 249, 402, 502, 502-3, 509, 529 (all verses from Ms. nah in marg.); Naqshī’s Dīvān i ‘Amrīq, p. 39. 43.

254. Sa’d al-dīn As’ad al-Najībī al-Samarqandi1 is included in ‘Auff’s chapter on the poets of Transoxania after the time of Sanjar, where we are told that he specialised in the composition of rubā’iyāt, a number of which are quoted. From the verses addressed to him by Asīl Samarqandi2 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 [437] with the ‘Najīr i Sagharchī’ (Sagharch is a village near Samarqand) whom ‘Arūdī lists among the poets at the court of the Qaraqhanid Khūdr b. Ibrāhīm (ruled briefly from 472/1080).3

1 ‘Auff II p. 383-4, 396; Rāzī III p. 422 (no. 1478); Khaiyām-pūr p. 268 (‘Sa’d i Samarqandī’).


256. Abī ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥusain b. Ibrāhīm al- ‘Nātanzī al-Adīb, who died in Muḥarram 497/1103, according to Samra’ī, has been mentioned briefly in PL. III (Lexicography) p. 61, 4.8. A few fragments of

1Thus ‘Auff in both passages in which he is mentioned. Rāzī, who is evidently entirely dependent on ‘Auff, omits ‘Najīrī’ and includes this poet in his chapter on Bukhārī; i.e. he read ‘Najīrī’ as ‘Bukhārī’.
2See above, p. 257.
3‘Arūdī p. 28, 46 (and Qazwīnī’s notes, p. 152). For an earlier Najīrī see above, p. 200.
4The Mīrzāt discussed there has been published (ed. Sajjadi, Tehran 1342/1967). It is my intention to return to these works in the planned final fascicle of PL. III.

his Persian verse are quoted by Watūt and Shams and some samples of constricted poetry in Arabic and Persian, among them the one verse quoted by Watūt, can be found in the anonymous Yawāṣī al-‘ulām. A poem by ‘Adīb al-Ṭabarī4 is included in Jārmi’s anthology (I p. 144-ii to 144-iii). From the fact that the poet mentions ‘sulṭān i ażam’ and ‘Ghazzīn’ the editor has concluded that he was a contemporary of Māhmūd, but this is far from certain. I wonder whether ‘al-Ṭabarī’ is not a scribal error for ‘al-Naṭanzī’, as the two words are very similar in Arabic script. [438]

Samra’ī fol. 564ra; Watūt p. 17 (one verse); Yawāṣī al-‘ulām, ed. M.T. Dānīsh-pazhūh, Tehran 1345/1966, p. 177, 179; Shams p. 317-8, 353, 402-3; Khaiyām-pūr p. 35-6; Ehr. s.v. ‘Adīb Naṭanzī’ (P.A.N. Monzawi).

257. Sa’d al-dīn Mas‘ūd al-Naukī is the author of three poems cited by ‘Auff, one of which expressly mentions the Ghaznavid Rūmshāh as his patron. Saif Harawī quotes two verses by ‘Mas‘ūd Naukī’ and one by ‘Naunik’. Rāzī includes him among the poets of Junābād.

5 ‘Auff II p. 291-5; Saif Harawī p. 50, 92; Rāzī II p. 311 (no. 808); Khaiyām-pūr p. 621.

258. Niẓāmī Ganja‘ī, whose personal name was Ilyās,2 is the most celebrated narrative poet of the Persians after Firdawsī. His nisbaḥ designates him as a native of Ganja (Elizavetpol, Kirovabad) in Azerbaijan, then still a country with an Iranian population, and he spent the whole of his life in Transcaucasia; the verse in some copies of his poetic works

1The same name - and presumably the same poem - is recorded also in the anonymous Dāṣqī al-asbār (Oxford Elliot 37 = Elībī 1333, fol 192b). This anthology (which I have not seen myself) evidently shares quite a bit of its material with Jārmi. The most recent poet quoted therein appears to be Jārmi’s father, Badr al-dīn.
2As to the poet tells us in his Līlāt-Majānūn, Moscow edition, p. 77 (IX 46). In the same poem, p. 87 (XII 9), he says: gur shad pīsār-em ba moomāt (voc. nisbat) i jad * ȳsuf pīsār i Zōdī Muṣawīyd, but it is not entirely clear to me whether this means that ȳsuf was the name of his father or rather of his grandfather. Zākṣīrī al-Qazwīnī (and others after him) gives his kunya as Abī Muḥammad Danīl-shāh and his successors call him Niẓām al-dīn Abī Muḥammad b. ȳsuf b. Muṣawīyd Muṭarrīzī; for the names given on his (supposed) tomb see below. p. 447.
which makes him a native of the hinterland of Qum is a spurious interpolation.\footnote{Chu dar gar-chih dar luby in Ganjsh gom am * welé et qhisstan i shahr i Qum am. The verse is quoted by Asfar (who says that Nizami's father came from Tafrah, near Qum) and also quoted (and rejected) in a note in Dastgirdi's edition of the second part of the Iskandar-nâmeh, p. 29. The corresponding section 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.}

In the prologue to his \textit{Laîêt-Majnûn}, which, as we shall see in a moment, was written in 584/1188, [439] the author says that he was then 49 (haft sabb),\footnote{See the Baku edition, p. 26 (X 17). The I.O. Ms. (fol. 4a, followed by Bland's edition; see below p. 480) has: '550 are (too) many days of slumber' (pandsh u pandsh bas aiyam i khvath), but the Baku apparatus quotes the variant '570' (pandsh u bughâd) or '580' (pandsh u hashtat), the reading adopted by the editor (evidently from the Paris Ms.) is pandsh nahi (or nahi?) bas aiyam i khvath, 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, 581 and 591, only the first of which seems possible; the last would put this poem later than \textit{Laîêt-Majnûn} (composed in 584/1188), the second would leave only one year for the composition of \textit{Khusraw-Shirin} (which was at least begun before 582/1186).} indicating that he was born in 535/1140-1. His earliest work is the didactic poem \textit{Ma'âsran al-asrâr} (=M.A.), which he dedicated to Fâhhr al-dîn Bahram-shâh b. Dâ'ûd, the ruler of Arzînjan from about 550/1155 to about 615/1218.\footnote{See the apparatus in the Baku edition, p. 248-9, and Rieu p. 565. None of the Ms. used in preparing the Baku edition have these verses in the first hand (in 't' they were added by a second hand; 't' is Dastgirdi's printed edition). In any event, the verses do not speak expressly of the composition, but only of the 'writing' of the poem. I think it possible that they go back to an early physiognomical colophon recording the copying of the poem in 582 and that the earlier dates in some Mss. represent attempts by subsequent copyists to 'amend' the supposed date of composition.} From the dates of his subsequent poems it is clear that the M.A. must belong to the early part of Bahram-shâh's reign. The possibility of a more precise dating is suggested by a verse in which Nizami speaks of how the prophet Muhammad 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'.\footnote{For the title, see presently.} Muslim tradition puts the death of the prophet in A.H. 11; the verse thus seems to imply that the poem was composed in 561/1165-6.

On the other hand, some of the manuscripts of M.A. end with verses stating that the poem was written in 582/1157, 559/1164, or 582/1186, but no such date is mentioned in the oldest copy, nor in other early manus-

\footnote{These are the dates recorded in the Baku edition, p. 773 i. 55 and apparatus. The catalogues mention others as well.}
The next poem in most of the copies of Niżāmī’s opus is Ḥaft poïkar (H.P.). This is the only one of his works that is available in critical edition worthy of that name, thanks to the efforts of Ritter and Rypka, who distinguished two families of manuscripts. In the superior ‘b’ recension H.P. is dedicated to the ruler of Marāghah, ‘Alī b. Ḥādī b. ʿĀq-Sunqur, whose Turkish name Niżāmī quotes as Kūrīz-ı-Asrār, and the date of composition is given (in words) as 14 Ramaḍān 593/1197. But in the ‘a’ recension the name of the dedicatee is misquoted as Q[Iṣṭa]-Asrār, while the verse indicating the year of composition has been altered, apparently to read 598/1202.  

Finally we have his retelling of the adventures of Alexander in two poems in the same metre, but with separate dībājāhs; we shall refer to them as the first and second parts of the Iskandar-nāmah (Ish. i and ii). In many copies the two parts are styled Sharef-nāmah and Ḥaqīqān-nāmah [442] respectively, but in others the two names are reversed, which is reason enough to avoid both of them. One also finds for the two parts Iskandar- for Sikandar-nāmah i barī and bahīs respectively, and for the second also Khirād-nāmah. There are some problems involved both with the absolute chronology of these poems and with their relative chronology within Niżāmī’s opus. In Ish. i, p. 53 of the Baku edition, the poet lists his previous creations as: Makhzan al-asrār (l. 38), Khusrav-Shirīn (l. 39), La'il-e-Majnūn (l. 40) and Ḥaft poikar (l. 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 poem the author says explicitly that he has already created ‘three pearls’ before undertaking this ‘new ornament’, i.e. the Iskandar-nāmah. It would thus appear that at least the first part of the Iskandar-nāmah was written before Ḥaft poikar (i.e. before 593/1197), but that after the composition of the latter someone (either Niżāmī or perhaps more probably a later interpolator) added the verse referring to Ḥaft poikar, but neglected to alter the one giving the number of the earlier poems as three. 

The prologue to Ish. i contains a dedication to a king whose laqab is given as ‘Nūṣrat al-dīn’. The superscription in some of the manuscripts identifies this patron as Nūṣrat al-dīn Abī Bakr, i.e. the man whom we have already met, [443] as crown-prince, in the secondary epilogue to Khusrav-Shirīn, and who succeeded his uncle and ruled from 587/1191 until 607/1210. However, other copies have the apparently fictitious name Nūṣrat al-dīn Abī l-Fath and quite a few have only Nūṣrat 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; the poet’s patron is thus evidently not the abūtek Nūṣrat al-dīn Abī Bakr but his contemporary

---

1See the Prague edition p. 18 (V 12). The text has ‘ahōh Kulp-Asrālān’ (the vocalisation given by the editors is wrong), presumably an elided form, or poetic licence, for ‘Kūrīz-Asrār, ‘āz意大 lion’. Ibn al-Fuṣūṣī refers to this ruler as ‘Alī b. Ḥādī b. ʿĀq-Sunqur, which is garbled (the first ‘b’ is certainly wrong). al-Nasawī calls him ‘Alī b. Ḥādī (unpointed). He died, according to Ibn al-Aṭā’īr (who gives the year) and Ibn al-Fuṣūṣī (year and month) in Dāhil l-qādah 604/1208. See Ibn al-Aṭā’īr, al-Kamil fl hār-rabb, ed. Torberg, XII p. 182; Ibn al-Fuṣūṣī, al-Jawār’ al-rabb min taḥākh majma’ al-ʿādāb fī muṣṭanf al-ʿalāmāb, ed. M. Jawādī, Damascus 1962-7, no. 1598; Shiḥb al-dīn al-Nasawī, Sīrāʾ al-walīn, ṭatāʾat al-dīn Mūsā barāʾī, ed. Housad, Paris 1991, p. 129; Qazwīnī, Tādāšt-ī-ha VI p. 45-6; Elż a.v. ‘Marāghah’ (V. Minorsky); Elż. e.v. ‘Ālākūn-ī-Marāqū (K. A. Luther).


3The apparatus in the Prague and Moscow editions indicates a number of different variants, but the intended date seems to be 600 601 602. I am preparing an article on this question and, in general, on the two recensions of H.P. and limit myself for the moment to saying that the testimony of the manuscripts of the ‘a’ recension has no authority in this matter.

4The title Sharef-nāmah is mentioned by the poet himself in Ish. i (Baku edition) p. 39 (VIII 124), and the name Ḥaqīqān-nāmah is alluded to in Ish. i, ii p. 225 (XII 41). But it is not clear from either passage that these names refer specifically to the first and second parts, rather than to the Ish. as a whole.

---

1Ep. 43 (IX 49-51).

2In some Ms. H.P. actually comes at the end (after Ish. i and ii), as it evidently did in the copies known to Amir Khurasānī, who completed his own Khurasān in 701/1301-2 (before the date of any of the surviving Ms. of Niżāmī’s Khurasān). The order of Khurasān’s five poems (clearly indicated by the author at various points in the text) is (1) Mafṣūl al-anwār, (2) Sīrāʾ al-Khurasān, (3) Majnūn-lālīt, (4) Ḥāvīn i Sīkandar, (5) Ḥādīs bāhshīt.

3Baku edition p. 46 (X 11).

4P. 46 (X 12). As the apparatus informs us, this verse is missing in some copies.
Nuṣrat al-dīn Bēshkīn, the ruler of Ahar.¹ The name Nuṣrat al-dīn [444] occurs also in most copies in the epilogue.² Many of the manuscripts of Ḩk.N. ii also have a passage in their prologue praising ‘Malik Nuṣrat al-dīn’³ and twice mentioning his name Bēshkīn.⁴ This dedication goes on to speak of an earthquake which (evidently in the recent past) had stricken Ganjah. The historical sources

¹There is a fairly large corpus of coins of ‘Malik al-umār Bēshkīn b. Muhammad’ naming also the ṣabaḵ Abī Bakr b. Muhammad and the caliph al-Nūrī b. Allāb, some with the mint-name Ahar and the date 594/1197-8. Coins of ‘Nuṣrat al-dīn Muḥammad 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 Nīzāmī’s poem and by the Armenian spelling Bēshēn; the Muslim literary sources have also Bēshēn. ‘Amīr nishṭ-i sālār i aṣḥāb Nuṣrat al-dīn Bēshkīn’ is mentioned in a letter from the ṣabaḵ Muḥammad b. Šeṭābī dated 20 Muharram 578/1182 preserved in al-Muḥtaṣab min al-rāsūlī, Ibn al-Fawātīḥ speaks of a battle near Tabriz in 605/1208-9 between Nuṣrat al-dīn Bēshkīn and ‘Izz al-dīn Anšāl Abah, the (otherwise unknown) ruler of Marāqeh (evidently a relative of the dedicatee of Ḩ.P.), in which the latter was killed; elsewhere the same author quotes the Tarīḫ Bēshkīn by a certain al-ṣāḥib Aflāl al-dīn. Bēshkīn’s faqāḥ Nuṣrat al-dīn is consequently well attested in the historical sources and it occurs also in poems of Zāḥīr Fāryābī (see below p. 557). His son is mentioned repeatedly in Nāsimī’s biography of the Khwārzm-shāh Jalāl al-dīn Meng-būrāq, though both in the Arabic original and in the Persian translation his name is cited consistently as Nuṣrat al-dīn Muḥammad (i.e.) Bēshkīn (i.e.). Thus Nīzāmī’s patron is attested as an amīr from 578/1182 and as a malīk from 594/1197-8 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 ṣabaḵ Abī Bakr used the name Bēshkīn. Reference: Shihāb al-dīn al-Nasawī, Ṣūrat al-ṣāḥib Jalāl al-dīn Meng-būrāq, ed. Houdas, Paris 1891, passim; the anonymous Persian translation of the same, ed. M. Minawī, Tehran 1344A.H./1965, passim, and the editor’s notes p. 295-6, 407-8, Yāqūt, Buldān, I p. 405; al-Muḥtaṣab min al-rāsūlī, ed. I. Afsārī, Tehran 2255Kh./1977, p. 140-1; Ibn al-Fawātīḥ, al-fāṭiḥ al-ṭilāḥ ‘min sīlah-i maḵuṇa al-tābīn fī maḵṣūṣ maḡmū‘, ed. M. Jawād, Damascus 1962-7, no. 18, 1598; V. Minorsky, ‘Campania II’, BSOAS XIII/4, 1951, p. 869-77; D.K. Kozynjah, A numismatic history of Southeastern Caucasian and Acharbayan based on Islamic coinage of the 5th/11th to the 7th/13th centuries (Microfilm), Ann Arbor 1969, p. 369-409. I am very grateful to A.H. Morton who set me on the path to the correct identification of Nīzāmī’s patron and who supplied me with practically all of them references. I see now that the great Persian scholar M. Qazwīnī already suggested this identification (if tentatively) in his posthumously published Tabdih-dāvāri-hā IV p. 73.

²p. 500 (LXI 4), though in at least one copy (London Or. 2834) Nuṣrat al-dīn is replaced by ‘Izz al-dīn.

³Baku edition p. 19 (VI 10); thus in all the manuscripts consulted by the editors. The edition by Ḩājjī Dastgīrd (cited in the Baku apparatus as ‘W’) has ‘malīk ‘Izz al-dīn’, but this is evidently a wild conjecture by the Persian editor.

⁴P. 20 (VI 27-8).

¹See Ibn al-Abīrī XII p. 72, 113. The first of these only is mentioned in N.N. Anbarasys and C.P. Melville, A history of Persian earthquakes, Cambridge (etc.) 1982, p. 42.

²In these Ms. Ḩk.N. ii chap. VI is replaced by Ḩk.N. i chap. X-IX with the following alterations: X: 10 is replaced by Ḩk.N. ii vii 11 (the verse mentioning Mossālī); X 11-12 are replaced by the five verses printed in the apparatus to Ḩk.N. ii p. 19; after XI 5 the Ms. consulted by me insert the verse quoted in the apparatus (mentioning Alp Arslān).

³p. 221-2.

⁴p. 222, l. 5.

⁵See the apparatus in the Baku edition and Rīsu, p. 570a.

⁶p. 230, l. 62.
ogy of Nizâmi’s works can be found below in appendix II (p. 585-591).

For the death of the poet the tadkhîrahs give, 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 Nizâmi’s grave. The Arabic inscription thereon is known to me from the only partially intelligible [447] hand-copy published by Bertel’s [1] without indication of the place where the inscription was found (presumably Ganja?) 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 Nizâm al-dîn Abû Muhammad b. (sic) Ilyâs b. Yûsûf b. Dhâkt (hardly Zakî). This is followed by what looks like fi ṭabî’i al-sîyân, which would be a decidedly strange way of saying ‘on 4 Ramadân’, then by two words that I cannot read, and finally by what appears to be sanat khamis wa sitt-mi’âh, 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 Nizâmi also composed a small number of lyrical pieces, mostly ghazals, and almost entirely of religious content. In his Latîf-Majnûn [2] he speaks of having put together a dîwân; it is thus clear that at least one collection of his shorter poems was in circulation by 584/1188. ‘Auff’ quotes a few of them. Copies of Nizâmî’s dîwân are astonishingly rare.

Mss.: Manchester Lindesiana 247 (16th century? Selections); Oxford Elliot 88 (Ethê 618); Ouseley Add. 114 (Ethê 619); [448] Cambridge Bridge Or. 13 (Browne Suppt. 1110. Contains selections from his ghazals); Berlin Sprenger 1486 (Pertsch 691/2 and Sprenger 428); Istanbul Ayasofya 2051/10 (Mîrîfrîn-hâ 1 p. 409-10. Ms. apparently dated 1 Shawwât 730/1330); Tehran Iâliyyât I p. 61 (Dated 896/1490-1); Rampore State Library (Nadhîr Ahmad 188); Calcutta Bûhrâ 294 (18th century?). Cf. Munz. III 2664-7.2

Editions of the dîwân: Tehran 1318sh./1929 (Ganjînâh i ganjvâd, ed. W. Dastgirîdâ). Contains also a biography and glossary; 1334sh./1954-5 (ed. M. Tabâtabâtî; non vidi); 1337sh./1958 (ed. S. Naﬁsî; non vidi); Baku 1981 (Ghazalyân, ed. M. Sultân-zâdah, alias Sultanov; from Naﬁsî). The edition ostensibly of the dîwân of Nizâmî published in Agra 1283/1866-7 contains the poems of someone else; according to Ethê its text ‘differs entirely’ from that of the Oxford Mss. ‘in which not a single kaşf adh or ghazal of that edition can be found’.


The nathnâwîs of Nizâmî were assembled and edited, evidently some time after the author’s death, in a collection generally known as

1According to the description in Mîrîfrîn-hâ this majnûn’ah was copied by Mahmûd b. Ahmad b. Muhammad Tabrîzî Sirjî and contains three coleophons with a date in Shawwât 730; this year is mentioned also by Ritter (Der Islam XXI, 1933, p. 96; XXII, 1934, p. 104, etc.). However, the Ms. contains towards the end the dîwân of Nâsir Bukhârî, 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 Nâsir’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 ‘930’.

2The Strasbourg Ms. listed by Munzâwi is not of the dîwân but of the Khwânsah and can be found below in its proper place.
the *Khamshah* (‘five’), less commonly as the *Sittah* (‘six’) - the count depends on whether the two parts of the *Iskandar-nāma* are reckoned as one poem or as two - or else as *Panji 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 Nizāmī’s poems in a collection with other *mathnawīs*. The oldest recorded copy of any of the poems in a public (and thus accessible) collection1 is the London *Makhlūl al-āsrār* in just such a miscellaneous manuscript dated 637/1239 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, [450] 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 are also a few fragmentary *Khamshahs* dated to the first half of the same century.3

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 Ṭahān b. al-Ḥusain b. Sānah (Paris Supplément 1817 and Oxford Ouseley 274—275), and ‘b’, the chief representative of which is the contemporary 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.1

Since the 1940s useful critical editions of all six poems have been prepared by a team of [451] Azeri scholars following a general plan laid down by Bertol’s. These are based on for the most part the same selection of *Khamshah* manuscripts and mainly follow the above-mentioned Paris and Oxford copies; the editors did not use the Berlin manuscript and made no attempt to divide the codices into families. Nonetheless, their full critical apparatus makes these the only editions (apart from the Ritter/Rypka *H.P.*) that are likely to be of any use to serious students.2 By contrast, Dastgirdi’s editions of the six poems published in Tehran in the 1930s, though supposedly based on a large number of manuscripts, quote hardly any variants and the editor’s choice of readings and his distinction between ‘authentic’ and ‘spurious’ verses seem to be largely arbitrary.3 It is astonishing that even some Western scholars have designated Dastgirdi’s editions as the ‘best’ or used them as the basis for translations into European languages. His explanatory notes are, however, often quite useful.

In the list that follows the manuscripts which contain one, several or all of the poems are assembled in a single sequence; where nothing else is noted the codices can be assumed to contain all the poems.

---

1 A copy of one (or both?) of the parts of the *Iskandar-nāma*, 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.

2 This copy contains also the two *mathnawīs* by Maʿarīyad al-Nasafi (see above, p. 416-?) and the three authentic *mathnawīs* of Sanaʿī (below, p. 520-4). It is evidently the basis for Bland’s edition of M.A. (see below, p. 480).

3 The dates found in *Khamshah* Mars. 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 (Cambridge, incomplete); 793/1391 (Tehran); 794/1392 (Istanbul). Details of all of these Mars. are given below.
Mss.¹ Dublin Beatty 124 vol. 1 (Colophon dated 20 Jumādā 11 838/1435); 25 Rabi‘ II 839/1435. Pictures; Beatty 162. (Dated 886/1481-2. Pictures; Beatty 171. (Dated 8 Dhu‘l-qa‘dah 897/1492. Pictures; Beatty 137 (15th century? Without Isk. N. ii. Pictures); Beatty 141 (15th century? Pictures); [452] Beatty 182 (Dated Sha‘bān 915/1509. Pictures; Beatty 195 (Copied in 936/1529-30 by Murshid ʿAṯfūr al-Shirāzī. Pictures); Beatty 196 (Same year and scribe as Beatty 195. Pictures; Beatty 222 (Dated Şafar 959/1552. Without M.A. Pictures); Beatty 224 (M.A., with a miniature containing the date Dhu‘l-hijja 96/609/1553?); Beatty 276 (Copied by Mullā Barqī and Mullā ʿArab-Shāh and dated 1081/1671. Pictures); Beatty 283 (18th century?); T.C.D. 1567 (‘Isk. N.’); [Manchester] Lindesianæ 6 (= Robinson p. 148-50. Dated 24 Rabi‘ II 824/1421, but the colophon is possibly forged. Kh. Sh. only. Pictures attributed to the 16th century); Lindesianæ 36 (= Robinson p. 70-88. Dated Şafar 849/1445. Pictures); Lindesianæ 9 (15th century?); Lindesianæ 856 (16th century?); Rylands Pers. 856 (Robinson p. 203-20. Pictures ascribed to 16th century); Lindesianæ 198 (Dated 1012/1603-4?); Lindesianæ 186 (Dated 1012/1603-4. H. P. only); Lindesianæ 61 (Dated 1023/1614. M.A. only); Lindesianæ 35 (= Robinson p. 227-8. Dated 3 Dhu‘l-qa‘dah 1037/1628. Pictures); Lindesianæ 246 (Dated 1087/1676-7. H. P. and L. M.); Lindesianæ 101b (Dated 1104/1692-3. M.A. only); Lindesianæ 100 (Dated 1111/1699-1700. ‘Isk. N.’); Lindesianæ 216 (18th century? L. M. only); Lindesianæ 796 (Dated 1240/1824-5); Oxford Ouseley 274-275 (Ethis 585. Copied by Ahmad b. al-Husain b. Sāmān and completed in Rabi‘ I 767/1365); Ouseley 304 (Ethis 586. Dated 14 Dhu‘l-hijja 841/1438); Ouseley Add. 137 (Ethis 605. Dated 978/1573-4 or 981/1476-7. L. M. Pictures.); Elliot 194 (Ethis 594; Robinson 134-45, 667-9, 898-903. 15th century? Pictures, some of which were added later); Elliot 192 (Ethis 587; Robinson 564-605. Dated 22 Muḥarram 907/1501. Pictures; Ouseley 205 (Ethis 607. Contains a seal dated 934/1527-8. H. P. and Isk. N. i)); Marsh. 759 (Ethis 588; Robinson 710-25. Dated 956/1549. Pictures); [453] Pers. d. 102 (Beeston 2845. Contains a seal dated 971/1563-4. L. M. Pictures.); Douce 348 (Ethis 596. Dated 980/1572-3. Pictures. L. M., H. P. and Isk. N. i); Elliot 196 (Ethis 595. Dated 999/1590-1. M.A. missing); Ouseley 316 (Ethis 589; Robinson 1046-9. The copyist is given in one place as Mir ‘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 Mir ‘Ali of Herat, who ‘died in 1550’. Pictures); Elliot 239 in marg. (Ethis 604; Robinson 904-14. Dated Shawwāl 990/1582 according to Ethē, but Robinson says only that the Ms. contains the dates Rabi‘ 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 (Ethis 590. Dated 1010/1601-2); Whinfield 70 (Beeston 2538. Dated 1 Muḥarram 1014/1605. L. M.); Whinfield 69 (Beeston 2557. Dated 10 Šafar 1014/1605. Kh. Sh.); Elliot 197 (G.O.) (Ethis 591. Dated Ramdān 1021/1612. Lacunae. Pictures); Pers. c. 28 (Beeston 2661/1. Dated 14 Muḥarram 1029/1619. Pictures added later. Isk. N. i); Pers. c. 28 (Beeston 2661/3. Dated 9 Rabi‘ I 1031/1621. Isk. N. i); Laud 128 (Ethis 615. Dated 14 Rabi‘ I 1037/1627. Isk. N. ii); Marsh. 654 (Ethis 608. Dated 1042/1632-3. Lacunae. Isk. N. i); Elliot 336 (Ethis 616. Rabi‘ II 1052/1642. Isk. N. ii); Ouseley 317 (Ethis 592; Robinson 1054-71. Dated Šafar to Ramdān 1056/1646. Pictures); Ouseley 302 (Ethis 600. Dated 16 Muḥarram 1059/1649. M.A. only); Ouseley 155 (Ethis 609. Dated 26 Dhu‘l-qa‘dah 1101/1690. Isk. N. i with Glosses); Walker 80 (Ethis 617. Dated 6 Shābān 1104/1693. Isk. N. ii); [454] Ms. Pers. c. 1. (Ethis 1981. 16th-17th century? Isk. N. ii missing); Whinfield 71 (Beeston 2559. 17th century. H. P.); Walker 68 (Ethis 610. Dated 12 Dhu‘l-hijja 1136/1724. Isk. N. i); Fraser 69 (Ethis 611. Contains a seal dated 1148/1735-6. Isk. N. i); Bodl. 761 (Ethis 613. Contains a seal dated 1198/1783-4. Isk. N. i); Ouseley Add. 107 (Ethis 601. Dated 1201/1786-7. M.A.); Ouseley 277 (Ethis 612. 18th century? Isk. N. i); Walker 79 (Ethis 614.

¹Compare Munt. IV 27352-493 (‘Iskandar-nāmāh’); 28033-253 (‘Pānī gang’); 29504-620 (‘Khursun u Shīrte’); 33682-819 (‘Lalīt u Majīnān’); 34730-869 (‘Mubimān al-amārī’); 36498-36603 (‘Haft paikar’); Munt. Pak. VII p. 65-130. Our list is intended mainly to complement those compiled by Munzawi, rather than to reproduce them. See also Fozil Sülimonov, Нашсий «Xamsa»งilla 175ш. Роман, Tashkent 1985 (in Uzbek, Russian and “English”; descriptions of and illustrations from 22 Ms. in various collections, some not otherwise catalogued).


Dated 25 Ramaḍān 1224/1809. Isk.N. i; Whinfield 61 (Beeston 2462; Dated 25 Muharram 1230/1815. Isk.N. i; Elliot 195 (Eibhè 995, Dated 23 Ramaḍān 1230/1815); Pers. 1.11 (Beeston 2561. Dated 12 Dhī al-Ḥijjah 1247/1832. Last part of H.P. only); Ind. Inst. Pers. 89 fol. 153-76 (Beeston 2563. 19th century. Selections from Isk.N. i; Marsh. 369 (Eibhè 602. M.A. only); Sale 29 (Eibhè 603. M.A. only); Elliot 124 (Eibhè 606. Substantial fragments of L.M.); Ind. Inst. Pers. 69 (Beeston 2556; L.M. and Isk.N. ii, here styled 'Sharaf-nāmah'); Pers. d. 56 (Beeston 2560. H.P.); Eton 1122 (Dated 1033/1623-4. M.A.); Richmond Kejr III.7-27 (14th century? H.P., L.M., M.A., Kh.Sh. Pictures); Kejr III.82-1000 (Dated Safar 848/1444. Pictures); Kejr III.180-192 (15th century? L.M. and parts of H.P. and 'Isk.N.'); Kejr V.7-41 (Dated 10 Rabi' II 912/1506. Pictures added later); Kejr III.296 (Dated Shawwāl 917/1511. One picture); London 1 O. 989 (Dated Rabī' II 637/1239. M.A. only); Or. 13297 (Titley 324A. Dated 790/1388. Inspxi. Pictures); Add. 7779 (Rieu p. 564-70. Dated Shawwāl 802/1400); Or. 13529 (Titley 308. 'Isk.N.' With pictures attributed to 'ca. 1400'. Inspxi.; [455] Khalilī 564 (Copied by Muḥammad b. Su'ūd al-Qārī and dated 20 Ramaḍān 804/1402. Fragment of M.A., the other poems more or less complete. 3 extraneous pictures pasted over the text); Add. 27,261 (Rieu p. 868-71; Titley 98. Ms. dated Jumādā Ī II 814/1411. Pictures); Khalilī 709 (Dated 14 Ramaḍān 819/1416. M.A.; H.P., Isk.N. i-ii, all incomplete. Extraneous pictures painted over the text); Or. 7534 (Meredith-Owens p. 68. Dated 821/1418. Isk.N. i); Add. 27,259/1 (Rieu p. 866-7. Dated Dhū l-hijjah 821/1419); Or. 12087 (lacks Isk.N. i).

1 I learn from C. Melville that the Eton manuscripts are now kept in the University Library at Cambridge.

2 Apart from the catalogues listed above, p. 31-2, see also N.M. titley. Miniatures from Persian manuscripts ... in the British Library and the British Museum. London 1977 (quoted as 'Pretty'). The book also contains descriptions of a number of detached miniatures (not included here).

3 M.A., Kh.Sh., and H.P. are all followed by colophones with dates in 788, with the name of the scribe effaced in all three (... Muḥammad b. Muḥammad ... is legible in the last); L.M. is dated 790; Isk.N. i is undated; Isk.N. ii is missing.

4 Or. 13529 is a fragment of a beautiful old Ms. of Isk.N. i (called in the superscription to the epilogue 'jīlāt i mawāl at Sharaf-nāmah i Iskandār'), interspersed with new pages (now separated) in shīkāhāt script.

5 The MSS. in the Khalili collection (which also contain a number of loose leaves, not listed here) are being catalogued by the present author.


1 The pictures are described and reproduced in the pictures of Nasimi described by Lawrence Boyce, London 1928.
The miniatures in Or. 12208 are reproduced and discussed in B. Breed, *The Emperor Akbar’s Khamsa of Nizami*, London 1995.
791/1389, End of Kh. Sh. and whole of H.P.; Or. 421 (Browne Suppt. 448. Dated 846/1442-3; Add. 3408 (Browne Hand-list 354). The first four poems were copied by Tūrān-shāh b. Tāj al-dīn b. Bābāz al-dīn and dated between 848/1444-5 and 850/1446-7. "İsk. N." was added in 1240/1824-5); Or. 245 (Browne Suppt. 447. Dated 853/1449); Fitzwilliam 1-1969 (Cat. p. 540-3. 15th century? Pictures); St John's, No. 30 (Browne Suppt. 456. Dated 947/1540-1. Pictures); Fitzwilliam 373 (Cat. p. 379-80. Copied by Muhammad Muhsin Tabrızī in 949/1542-3. Pictures); Fitzwilliam 18-1948 (Cat. p. 403-4. Copied by Bābā-shāh al-İsfahānī in 969/1561-2. H.P. Pictures); Oo. 6. 11. (Browne Cat. CCXI. Contains various dates in 992/1584. Pictures); Oo. 6. 29. (Browne Cat. CCXII. Completed 5 Jumādā 1 i 993/1585); Or. 244 (Browne Suppt. 446. Dated 996/1588); Corpus, No. 209 (Browne Suppt. 428. 16th century? Kh. Sh.); Or. 805 (Browne Suppt. 450. 16th century?); Or. 1572 (2nd Suppt. 359. Dated 1019/1610-1); Corpus, No. 161 (Browne Suppt. 1171. ‘About 1023/1614-5’. M.A.); Add. 3139 (Browne Cat. CCXIII. ‘Not older than the 17th century’. Pictures); Add. 586 (Browne Cat. CCXIV. Dated 25 Dhū l-hijjah 31st year of ʿAlāmgar/1687. M.A.); Fr. 5. 9. (Browne Cat. CCXXVI/II. Dated 27 Dhū l-hijjah 1036/1627. M.A.); Add. 207 (Browne Cat. CCXVI. 16th or 17th century? Kh. Sh. Pictures); Corpus, No. 212 (Browne Suppt. 765. Dated 1247/1831-2. ‘İsk. N.’); Or. 243 (Browne Suppt. 445); Christ’s College, Dd.4.13 (Browne Suppt. 452); King’s, No. 152 (Browne Suppt. 453); Corpus, No. 234 (Browne Suppt. 1172. M.A.); King’s, No. 257 (Browne Suppt. 455. Kh. Sh.); Or. 13 (Browne Suppt. 1110. L.M. and selections from Kh. Sh., H.P. and gazalzâyên); [460] Corpus, No. 229 (Browne Suppt. 1336. H.P.); Add. 3736 (Browne Suppt. 763. ‘İsk. N.’); Christ’s, Dd.5.12 (Browne Suppt. 764. ‘İsk. N.’); Glasgow S.7 Weir 12. Dated 1102/1690-1. ‘İsk. N. i); Edinburgh Univ. 280 (Dated 1104/1692-3. L.M.); Univ. 279 (Dated 8th year of Shah-ʿAlām/1180/1766-7. ‘İsk. N. i); New Coll. Or. 38; Univ. 101-3 (M.A., Kh. Sh., ‘İsk. N. i); Paris Supp- jelent 1817 (Bilocet 1247. Copied by Ahmad b. al-Husain b. Sānāh with various dates during 763/1362); Supp-jlement 580 (Bilocet 1248. Dated 1 Dhū l-hijjah 767/1366. First leaf missing. Pictures); Supp-jlement 816 in marg. (Bilocet 1382. Dated <7> 86/1384. A second hand has ad-jed the text of the Majmaʿ al-bahrāin to this Ms. and dated his work 1


1The hijr and Christian years are quoted thus in Piemontese’s description; in the older catalogue Pizzi had read the date as ‘959’. Piemontese quotes the colophon as saying zanat haṭṭah wa sub-ul-ma‘ubah, but this is evidently a misprint.

1For whom see Robinson, Paintings p. 48.
Dated 981/1573-4. Pictures, some of which were added later; Petermann II, 698 (Pertsch 727; Stichouline 25. Copied by Dost Muhammad b. ‘Ali Dost al-Maddhâl b. Majlisâni and dated 10 Ramâdân 994/1586. Without Isk.N. ii. Pictures); Ms. or. oct. 1583 (Heinz 237. Copied by Sihibâl al-din i Mânsûr and dated 20 Rabi‘ I 1000/1592); Ms. or. fol. 193 (Pertsch 726. Copied by Ibârîm al-Kashârî in 998/1589, Without Isk.N. ii); Ms. or. quart. 1938 (Heinz 307. 16th century? L.M., H.P., Isk.N. i); Ms. or. fol. 107 (Pertsch 720; Stichouline 31. Dated Sha‘bân 1041/1632. Pictures added later; Petermann II, 112 (Pertsch 721. Copied by Bahîr al-din ‘Ali Rîdâ in 1052/1642-3); Sprenger 1484 (Pertsch 732. Dated 24 Dhî 1-qâ’dah 1068/1658. Isk.N. ii only). Ms. or. fol. 209 (Pertsch 18. Dated 12 Safar 1077/1666. This Ganîftuh contains, among other things: (no. 8a) Isk.N. i, [9b] Kh.Sh., [10d] M.A.); Ms. or. fol. 4048 (Stichouline 58. Copied by Sadr al-din Muhammad b. ‘Isâ Muhammad al-‘Uryânî and dated Jumâdâ II 1083/1672. Pictures added later); Sprenger 1485 (Pertsch 737. Dated 25 Dhî 1-hijjah of 41st year of an unnamed ruler [presumably Aurantrâb], which is equated with 1008 [presumably an error for 1108/1697]. M.A. only); [465] Ms. or. fol. 4048 (Stichouline 81. Dated 16 Dhî 1-qâ’dah 1178/1765. Kh.Sh. Pictures apparently later); Sprenger 1483 (Pertsch 733. Dated 1212/1757-8. Isk.N. ii only); Minutoli 154 (Pertsch 722; Stichouline 45. Dated 14 Dhî 1-qâ’dah 1247/1832. Pictures); Ms. or. oct. 1977 (Heinz 277; Stichouline 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 Allah b. ‘Ali-shâh al-Khurshâni and dated 12 Ramâdân 893/1488. Some leaves replaced in 19th century); Wrocław Brockelmann Pers. 1 (Dated 12 Rajab 1011/1603); Brockelmann Pers. 2 (H.P. only); Vienna Fügêl 512 (see also Duda p. 33-7. Contains the dates Ramâdân 905/1500 and 3 Sha‘bân - acc. to Duda 3 Safar - 906/1500 or 1501. Isk.N. ii missing. Pictures); Copenhagen Mehren XCIX (Dated 1096/1685. Isk.N. i); Mehren XCVIII (Dated Muhamrân 1235/1819); Mehren CCI (Two late copies of Isk.N. i); Uppsala Tornberg CLI (Dated Muhamrân 842/1438); Tornberg CLI (Dated 843/1439-40. Pictures);1 Tornberg CLI (Dated 17 Shawwâl 984/1577. M.A.); Zetterstéen 421 (Dated Shawwâl 1029/1620); Tornberg CLXXXII fol. 145a-152a (Fragment of H.P.);1 Helsinki 88b (Contains various dates in 1171/1577-8. Pictures); 85 (Isk.N. i); Leningrad Acad. C 1102 fol. 124b-210b (Index 3987. Dated 710/1310-1. M.A. only); Univ. 354 (Salemann-Rossen p. 14. Dated 778/1377-6 according to the Moscovian edition of H.P.); Acad. B 1006 fol. 79b-111a (Index 121. Dated 847/1443-4. Isk.N. i); Univ. 1229 a-b (Romaskewickz p. 6, 15. Dated 856/1452. Kh.Sh., H.P.); [466] Acad. D 408 (Index 125. Dated 883/1478-9. Isk.N. ii. Pictures); Dorn CCCXXVIII (Dated 884/1479-80. Pictures); Dorn CCCXXVIII (Copied by Darwish Muhammad Tâgî and dated 886/1481-2. Pictures); Acad. A 19 (Index 1190. Dated 896/1490-1. Lacunae. Pictures); Acad. C 1735 (Index 1197. Dated 899/1493-4. Pictures); Acad. C 57 (Index 1192. Dated 901/1495-6); Dorn CCCXXIX (Dated 908/1502-3. Pictures); Dorn CCCXL (Copied by Munîm al-din al-Ashârî in 913/1507-8. Lacunae. Pictures); Dorn CCCXLIX (Index 936/1529-30. M.A.); Dorn CCCXLI (Copied by Sulîmân Muhammad Nîr in 937/1530-1. Kh.Sh. only); Acad. D 212 (Index 1199. Dated 950/1543-4. Pictures); Dorn CCCXL (Copied by Muhammad Qâsim b. Shîr ‘Ali in 979/1571-2. Pictures); Acad. C 818 (Index 1195. Dated 982/1574-4); Dorn CCCXLIV (Dated 990/1582-3. Last leaves added in the 19th century). Isk.N. i-ii. Pictures); Acad. C 2409 (Index 1198. Dated 1041/1631-2); Acad. C 855/1 (Index 3986. Dated 1109/1697-8. M.A.); Acad. B 1167 (Index 1122. Dated 1127/1715. Isk.N. i); Acad. C 1148 (Index 4625. Dated 1134/1721-2. H.P.); Dorn CCCXLVIII (Index 1189/1775-7); Kh.Sh.); Acad. B 1985 (Index 123. Dated 1206/1791-2. Isk.N. i); Acad. C 1138 (Index 124. Dated 1214/1799-1800. Isk.N. i); Acad. C 58 (Index 1193. Dated 1236/1820-1); Dorn CCCXLII; Dorn CCCXLI; Dorn CCCXLIV (Copied by Ahmad al-‘Ustânî. Isk.N. [i and ii] and beginning of H.P. only. Pictures); Dorn CCCXLV (End of Kh.Sh., L.M., H.P., Isk.N. i); Acad. B 129 (Index 120. Isk.N. i-ii); Acad. A 22 (Index 1148. Kh.Sh., incomplete); Acad. A 23 (Index 1149. Kh.Sh., incomplete); Acad. B 132 (Index 1150. Kh.Sh.); Acad. C 1685 (Index 1151. Kh.Sh., incomplete. Pictures); Acad. C 1919 fol. 192b-250a (Index 1152. Kh.Sh.); Acad. D 654 (Index 1153. Kh.Sh. Pictures); Acad. B 2486 (Index 1191. H.P. and ‘Isk.N. only. Pictures); Acad.


1 See below, p. 582 fn.
C 59 (Index 1194. Large lacunae. Pictures); Acad. C 1674 (Index 1196. Lacunae. Pictures); [467] Acad. D 367 (Index 1200. Large lacunae. Pictures); Acad. A 20 (Index 3657. L.M. Pictures); Acad. B 130 (Index 3679. L.M.); Acad. C 1919 fol. 3a-25h, 25o-289b (Index 3680, 4626, L.M., H.P.); İstanbul1 Ayasofya 2051/1 (Mihrâb-ih-hâ I p. 409-10, Ms. apparently dated2 Shawwâl 730/1330. M.A. only); Fâtih 3747, 3748, 3752 (Ritter-Reinert p. 125; Duda, Ferhât p. 193, 3 volumes, copied by İmâd and dated Rabî‘ 776/1374-5);3 Topkapı, Hazine 690 (Karâyet 474. Copied by Âhmed b. Muhammed al-mulaqqab bi Jâlîî and dated 8âfar 788/1386. H.P. only); Halet Efendi muhaq 137 (Mihrâb-ih-hâ I p. 10. Dated 788/1386, ‘ask N.’ only); Topkapı, Revan 861 (Karâyet 460. Apparently contains the date Jumâdâ II 794/1392);4 Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi 1950/1 (olu’m Fâtih 3753. Ritter-Reinert p. 244-5. Ms. copied by Mansûr b. Muhammed b. Wârâqaq Bibi hasanî and dated Muhamarr 801/1398. Pictures); Universites FY 308 (Atet 112, 14th century? M.A. only); Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi 1459 (Duda, Ferhât p. 194. Latest colophon dated Muhamarr 816/1413); Nurus- maniye 3783 (Ates 96. Dated 10 Muhamarr 831/1427); Fâtih 405/1 (Ritter-Reinert p. 245. Ms. copied by three scribes, with various dates in 830-1/1425-6); [468] Topkapı, Hazine 789 (Karâyet 399, Dated Ramadân 842/1349); Topkapı, Hazine 779 (Karâyet 400; Stouchkine i. Copied by İmâd Khabîbîz Abû-kâhî and ‘Abd al-Rahmân Khuwârizmi, who dated their work Shâbân 843/1440 and 857/1453 respectively. Pictures); Topkapı, Hazine 7745 (Karâyet 401; Stouchkine ii. Dated Shâbân 844/1440.1. Pictures); Topkapı, Revan 862 (Karâyet 402; Stouchkine iii. Dated Rabî‘ I 846/1442. Pictures); Topkapı, Hazine 870

1 Besides the sources listed above, p. 27-8, see also I. Stouchkine, Les peintures des manuscrits de la Khanouch de Niğâmî au Topkapı Sarayi Müzesi d'Istanbul, Paris 1977 (quoted as "Stouchkine").

2 See above p. 448 (draft).

3 This is the oldest recorded dated Ms. of the Khanouch in Istanbul. For Hazine 750, supposedly copied in 779, see below s.a. 979.

4 Thus Ritter in the introduction to his edition of Haft paikûr, p. viii, with the remark that the last digit of "794" is "unsicher". Ritter gives the name of the scribe as Muhammad b. Âhmed b. al-Husûn b. Sânî and identifies him with the son of the copyist of the 14th-century Oxford and Paris Ms., Âhmed b. al-Husûn b. Sânah (note the different spelling). Karâyet, however, gives the date of the Ms. as Jumâdâ I 990/1582 and the scribe’s name as M. b. A. b. al-H. Sânîn.

5 Stouchkine gives the call-number as ‘H. 724’.

1 Thus Stouchkine. Karatay has ‘Rabî‘ I 796 (1491)’ but this is clearly an error for 896/1491.
al-Mudahhib and dated Dhū l-Hijjah 899/1494. Pictures); Nurus-
manîye 3781 (Atêq 98. Copied by Muhammâd b. Jâlîl al-Qummi
and dated 6 Shawwâl 899/1494); Topkapı, Hazine 759 (Karataş 425; Stchou-
kine xxiii. Dated Sha‘bân 900/1495. Pictures); Topkapı, Hazine 778
(Karataş 426; Stchoukine xxiv. Dated Shawwâl 900/1495. Pictures);
Topkapı, Hazine 792 (Karataş 427; Stchoukine xxv. Dated 902/1496-7,
Pictures); Topkapı, Hazine 775 (Karataş 428; Stchoukine xxvii. Dated
Muharrâm 903/1497. Pictures); Topkapı, Bağdat 145 (Karataş 429;
Stchoukine lxiii. Copied by Mithâlî Kâshânî and dated Muharrâm
904/1498. Pictures ascribed to the 16th century); Üniversite FY 286
(olim Riza Paşa 2901. Atêq 102. Dated 26 Jamâdî II 905/1500); Top-
kapı, Hazine 769 (Karataş 430; Stchoukine xxviii. Dated Rajab
905/1500. Pictures); [470] Topkapı, Revan 873 (Karataş 433; Stchou-
kine liv. Copied by Mâhîmûd b. Jâlîl b. Mâhîmûd al-Qummi and dated
Rabi‘ II 906/1500. Pictures added later); Nurusmanîye 3780 (Atêq 99,
15th century?); Üniversite FY 1313 (Atêq 100; Edhem/Stchoukine XXV,
15th century? Pictures); Üniversite FY 539 (Atêq 101; Edhem/Stchoukine
XXVI. Attributed by Atêq to 15th, by Edhem/Stchoukine to 17th century. Apparently without İsk.N. ii.
Pictures); Topkapı, Revan 858 (Karataş 419; Stchoukine lix. 15th century?
1 damaged picture); Topkapı, Revan 857 (Karataş 421; Stchoukine xxii. Copied by Muhammâd al-Husâinî.
15th century? Pictures); Topkapı, Bağdat 147 (Karataş 422; Stchoukine
p. 92. 15th century?); Topkapı, Bağdat 146 (Karataş 423; Stchoukine
lii. 15th century? Pictures ascribed to 16th century); Topkapı, Revan
859 (Karataş 424; Stchoukine xxi. 15th century? Pictures); Nurusma-
niye 3784 fol. 1b-70a (Atêq 113. 15th century? M.A. only); Fatih 3751
(Ritter-Reinert p. 127. 15th century?); Topkapı, Hazine 1510/II (Karataş
348; Stchoukine lxv. Copied by Lütf Allâh b. Yahyâ al-Tahtânî and
dated Rajab 906/1501. Pictures); Topkapı, Revan 863 (Karataş 431;
Stchoukine xxx. Dated Sha‘bân 906/1501. Pictures); Topkapı, Hazine
8741 (Karataş 434; Stchoukine xxiv. Copied by Murshid al-dîn in
909/1503-4. Pictures); Topkapı, Hazine 791 (Karataş 435. Copied by
Husan al-İsfahânî in 911/1505-6. Pictures); Topkapı, Hazine 770
(Karataş 437; Stchoukine xxxii. Copied by Murshid al-dîn Muhammâd
in 918/1512-3. Pictures); Topkapı, Hazine 778 (Karataş 438; Stchoukine
Pictures); Topkapı, Hazine 753 (Karataş 470; Stchoukine ix. One picture
is dated 919/1513, others are ascribed by Stchoukine to various
dates between the mid 15th to the mid 16th century); [471] Topkapı,
Hazine 783 (Karataş 439; Stchoukine xxxiv. Copied by Mu‘imîn al-dîn
Muhammâd al-Ashba‘î al-Husainî in 919/1513. Pictures); Topkapı,
Hazine 766 (Karataş 440; Stchoukine xxxv. Copied by Hâji ‘Ali Kâbî
and dated Rajab 922/1516. Pictures); Üniversite FY 1309 (Atêq 103;
Edhem/Stchoukine XXVI. Copied by Yâr-Muhammâd Harawi and dated
Râmâdân 923/1517. Pictures); Topkapı, Revan 860 (Karataş 441;
Stchoukine xxxvi. Copied by Murshid Kâbî ‘Atîf in 927/1521. Pictures);
Topkapı, Ahmet III 3559 (Karataş 432; Stchoukine li. Copied by
Shâh Muhammâd Naşıhbîrî for the Sâfawi Ismâ‘îl I, d. 930/1524.
Pictures added later); Topkapı, Revan 877 (Karataş 442; Stchoukine Ixiv.
Copied by Muhammâd Qâsim b. Sulṭân Muhammâd İshqâbâdî and
dated Râmâdân 933/1527. Pictures later); Topkapı, Hazine 785 (Karataş 443;
Pictures); Topkapı, Revan 871 (Karataş 444; Stchoukine Ixiv. Copied by
Yâr-Muhammâd al-Harawi and dated Râmâdân 934/1528. Pictures of
various dates); Topkapı, Revan 865 (Karataş 446; Stchoukine xxxviii.
Dated 17 Jumâdâ II 935/1529. Pictures); Topkapı, Revan 856 (Karataş
445; Stchoukine Ixivii. Dated Ramâdân 935/1529. Pictures, repainted
later); Topkapı, Hazine 760 (Karataş 447; Stchoukine xl. Copied by
Murshid al-Kâbî al-Shihrâzî and dated Jumâdâ Â 941/1534. Pictures);
Topkapı, Hazine 758 (Karataş 448; Stchoukine xlii. Copied by Murshid
al-Kâbî al-Shihrâzî and dated Rabi‘ II 945/1538. Pictures); Topkapı,
Hazine 765 (Karataş 449; Stchoukine xlii. Dated Rabi‘ II 945/1538.
Pictures); Topkapı, Hazine 755 (Karataş 450; Stchoukine xlv. Dated
Rajab 947/1540. Pictures); Topkapı, Hazine 756 (Karataş 451; Stchou-
kine xlv. Copied by Muhammâd Qawwâm Shihrâzî and dated Rabi‘ II
951/1544. Pictures); Topkapı, Revan 867 (Karataş 452; Stchoukine xlvii.
Dated Rabi‘ II 956/1549. Pictures); [472] Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi
1990 (olim Fatih 3752bis. Ritter-Reinert p. 127. Copied by Salim and
dated 959/1552 and 961/1554. Pictures); Topkapı, Revan 870 (Karataş
454; Stchoukine xlviii. Copied by ‘Ali Qâlî b. Qâira and dated Muharrâm
963/1555. Pictures); Topkapı, Hazine 793 (Karataş 453. Copied by
Muhammâd Riđâ‘î and dated Rajab 963/1556); Topkapı, Hazine 780

1 Stchoukine says that this Ms. contains Niẓāmī’s H.P. Karatay says it is the ‘Iṣḥāḥ-‘nāma’, but the incipit which he quotes (‘ā‘ī jahān-āfīrīn, khudū bi jahān * sūnī is mubdi’i ma‘nān u mazān’) belongs to none of Niẓāmī’s poems, though it is in the metre of H.P.

2 The supposedly old Ms. Tabriz Millī 405 was conserved by Tharwatayn for his edition of Kh.Sh. (see above p. 451 fn.). He remarks (p. 64 of the introduction) that it is much ‘altered’ and definitely inferior to the old Paris and Oxford Ms. Tabriz Millī 45 was used by the same scholar in his edition of Isk.N. I, where we are told that it contains H.P. and Isk.N. ii-ii, is signed by Ismā‘īl Mīmāzīd and was completed in Rabī‘ II 754/1353.
lacunae); Univ. XV 5179 (DATED 718/1318. Pictures);¹ Univ. XV 5134

¹Univ. 5179, containing L.M., H.P. and Isk. N. i-i (these called ‘Iskandar-nāmah’ and ‘Sharaf-nāmah’ respectively), is now available in a facsimile edition (with introductions by J. Sturzaizeh and M. Dānishpāzūb, Tehran 1368/1989). The quality of the photography is poor and the text is consequently not easy to read. The Ilkūnāmah has evidently been rearranged for the facsimile; the pages of each poem are numbered separately, with no foliation visible on the photographs, and the miniatures, which can hardly be called masterpieces, have been photographed separately and pasted into the book. The date 718 (1318) occurs in figures at the end of H.P. and written out in Arabic (but not very clear in the facsimile) at the end of Isk. N. i. The last two pages seem to be in a different hand from the rest.

²This is given in a number of late copies as the date of composition and has doubtless been misunderstood by Munzawī’s informant.
p. 65. Dated 15 Shawwāl 765/1364. End of ‘Iṣk. N.’ missing; Public Library (Munz. Pak. VII p. 101. Dated 864/1459-60. ‘Iṣk. N.’ Pictures); Sherādī (Munz. Pak. VII p. 65. Ms. copied by Maulānā Āzhār Tabīrī and dated Rajab 877/1472. M.A., Kh.Sh., L.M.); [477] Univ. (Munz. Pak. VII p. 70. Dated 1 Safar 883/1478. M.A.); [478] Univ. (Munz. Pak. VII p. 65. Dated 20 Ramaḍān 900/1495. Pictures); Bombay Rehatkhan p. 169 no. 144 (Ms. of ‘Makhzan al-ṣarrār’, without indication of author; Rehakhan 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 Ms. for the composition of Nizāmī’s poem, the latter, perhaps the date of copying, corresponds to 1349-50); Rehatkhan p. 151 no. 84-87 (4 copies of Iṣk. N. i or ii, the oldest dated 970/1562-3); Rehatkhan p. 170 no. 149-150 (2 copies of H.P., one dated 1085/1674-5); Rehatkhan p. 134 no. 27 (Dated Afsandārmad 1045Y./1676. Kh.Sh. only); Naviṣari 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 (Iṣk. N. incomplete); Aligarh (various copies of individual poems, the oldest a H.P., dated 996/1588, are listed in Subb. Mss. p. 38-43); Hyderabad (various copies, none older than 1006/1597-8, and mostly undated are in Asafiyah p. 148, 242, 1480, 1482, 1486, 1478, 1490); Rampore State Library (Nadīr Ahmad 205-6. Two copies of Kh.Sh., the latter with pictures, dated 983/1576-7 and 984/1576-7 respectively); State Library (Nadīr Ahmad 224. Dated 1021/1612); Sanatl 35-47 (late copies of individual poems); Lucknow Sprenger 422 (several copies); Bankapore I 37 (Copied by Muhammad b. Ḍafī and dated 20 Safar 835/1431); I 38 (Completed 3 Rajab 883/1478. Pictures); Suppt. i 1837 (Dated 13 Dhi 1-hijjah 849/1485. Pictures); I 40 (15th century? M.A. and L.M. Pictures); Suppt. i 1811 (Dated Jumādā I 922/1516. Fragment of Kh.Sh.); Suppt. i 1812 (16th century? Iṣk. N. i only, end missing); I 39 (16th century? L.M. and end of Iṣk. N. ii missing); Suppt. i 1808 (Dated Muḥarram 1041/1631); Suppt. i 1809 (Dated Shawwāl 1047/1638. Without L.M. Pictures); Suppt. i 1810 (17th century? H.P. and Iṣk. N. ii missing); I 42 (17th century? Iṣk. N. i only. Pictures); [478] I 43 (Dated 27 Safar 1143/1730. Iṣk. N. i only); I 44 (Dated 11 Safar 1144/1731. Iṣk. N. i only. Pictures); I 41 (Dated 22 Dhi 1-hijjah 1237/1822. Kh.Sh. only. Pictures); Suppt. i 1813 (19th century. Iṣk. N. i); Suppt. i 1814 (19th century. Fragment of Iṣk. N. i); Madras I 118, 122-4, 140, II 590 (late or undated copies of individual poems); Calcutta I 473 (15th-16th century? Iṣk. N. i-ii only); Madrasah CXXVIII (Copied by Muhammad ‘All b. Darwish ‘All and dated 919/1513. M.A. and Kh.Sh.); Būhār 295 (Dated 941/1534-5. Pictures); Būhār 296 (Dated 16 Rabi’ I 1041/1631. M.A.); Ivanov 47 (Dated 1083/1672-3. Kh.Sh.); Ivanov 467 (Fragment dated 1085/1674-5); Ivanov 466 (Dated 1090/1679); Ivanov 468 (Dated 1090/1679. M.A.); Ivanov 472 (17th century? Kh.Sh.); Ivanov 475 (Dated 27th year of Muhammad-Shāh/1157/1744. Iṣk. N. ii); Ivanov 470 (Dated 1169/1755-6. L.M.); Ivanov 474 (18th century? Iṣk. N. i); Ivanov Curzon 200 (18th century? Iṣk. N. i. Pictures); Ivanov Curzon 201 (18th century? Iṣk. N. ii); Madrasah CXXXIX (Dated 1812. H.P.); Madrasah CXL (19th century? H.P.); Ivanov 2nd Suppt. 977 (19th century? Kh.Sh.); Ivanov 2nd Suppt. 978 (19th century? Iṣk. N. i); Madrasah CXXVII (Iṣk. 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 Rabi’ 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 Iṣk. N. ii missing. Pictures); Vever 272 (Dated Rajab 1055/1645. Iṣk. N. ii missing. Pictures); [479] Vever 51 (an ‘anthology’ containing ‘sections from’ M.A., Iṣk. N. i, Kh.Sh., H.P. and Sān’ā’ī’s Hadīqa. 17th century? Pictures); and various detached pages; Princeton 7 (Copied by Mahmūd b. Muhammad b. Yūsuf al-Tustārī al-Kāghadhi 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-Kātib al-Shirāzī in 970/1562-3 Pictures); New York Jackson-Yohannan 6 (Dated 853/1449-50. Pictures); Jackson-Yohannan 7 (Copied by Na‘im al-din and dated 24 Shawwāl 915/1510. Pictures); Jackson-Yohannan 8 (Copied by Sulṭān Muḥammad Nārī in 931/1524-5. Pictures); Jackson-Yohannan 10 (H.P. Copied, according to the colophon, by Āzhār in 988/1580, but the pic-


2Jackson-Yohannan 8 is evidently (though this is for some reason not explicitly mentioned in the volume) the manuscript some of whose miniatures are reproduced in P.I. Cheklovskii, Mirror of the invisible world. Tales from the Khamsah of Nicami, New York 1975, with a prose summary of Kh.Sh., L.M. and H.P. only.
tures 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 Martinovich, JAOS 45, 1925, p. 108. Dated 1087/1675-6); Various illustrated copies, none older than the 16th century, are listed in B. Schmiz, 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? Ish. N. i. Pictures); Lewis Coll. 62 (Copied by Hājjī Muḥammad al-Jālpādaqīnī (sic cat.) and dated 1037/1627-8. Pictures); Lewis Coll. 63 (19th century? Pictures); Lewis Coll. 65 (Dated 1248/1832-3. Ish. N. i. Pictures); Cambridge (Mass) Hofer Collection (Naskhāt-ī IV p. 11. Ms. dated 827/1424. Ish. N., Kh. Sh., L. M.); id. (Naskhāt-ī IV p. 10. Dated 833/1429-30).

Editions of the Khamsah: Bombay 1834; 1838; 1265/1849 (ed. Fadl al-dīn Khamkhar, without Ish. N. ii); 1285/1869 (Mīrzā Bāqir’s press, again without Ish. N. ii); 1298/1881 (ed. Fāth al-Karīm); Tehran 1261/1845; 1314-6/1896-8; 1341sh./1922-3; Tehran 1261/1845. [480]

Complete translation of the Khamsah and dhvān (Russian verse): Nizāmi Ganjevī; Sobranie sočinenij, 5 volumes, Moscow 1959, reprinted in 3 volumes, Baku 1991 (various translators; the works are listed separately below).

Translation of extensive extracts from the Khamsah and dhvān (Russian verse): Nizāmi Stikhotvorenija i poemy (various translators), Leningrad 1981.

The individual poems:

(i) Makhzan al-asrār (inc.: bi-smi llāhi l-rabbānī l-raḥīm * hast kalīl īd dar i gongi ilākhī); for its date and dedicatee see above p. 439-40. Nizāmi’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 Šafī’i’s Hādīṣah.

Mss.: see Khamsah.

Editions: London 1844 (Makhzan ul asrār, the treasury of secrets... Edited from an ancient manuscript ... by Nathaniel Bland); Cambridge 1869 (with marginal notes); Lucknow 1869; 1872; 1880 (with a commentary, Zuhār al-asrār, by Zuhār al-Ḥasan Bahnūtī); Lahore [1887] (with marginal notes by M. Ridā); [1921] (with the same notes); 1922 [481] (with notes substantially the same); Tehran 1313sh./1934 (ed. Wajīd Dastgirdī, with notes) and reprints; 1363sh./1984 (ed. B. Tharwatiyān; non viādī); Baku 1960 (critical edition by A.A. Alizādā).


(Russian verse): Собрание сочинений, trans. K.A. Lipskerov and S.V. Shervinskii, Moscow 1959; this version is also in Nizāmi Ganjevī; Sobranie sočinenij, Moscow 1985 (reprint Baku 1991).


1The identity of this manuscript is not revealed (Bland’s second volume, which was to contain the variants and commentary, was never published), but I have no doubt that the edition is based on London I.G. 988, i.e. the oldest recorded copy. The edition appears to agree throughout with the text of the I.G. Ms., though not with the superscriptions (which are as end 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 uncut.
Commentaries:

(1) Sharh i Makhtan al-asrâr, by Muhammad b. Qiwân b. Rustam b. Ahmad b. Maḥmûd al-Balkhi, known as Karî (Karkhî, Bakra?), elucidating 1310 difficult verses, was written, as the author says in at least two different places, in 795/1392-3 (the chronogram cited by Sprenger giving the date of composition as 1091/1680 does not [482] belong to this work).¹ 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-nâmah*. Mss.: *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); *L.O.* 998 (incomplete); *Paris* Supplément 587 (Blochet 1267. 18th century? Beginning only); *Teheran* Majlis II 932; *Tashkent* Acad. II 848-849; *Calcutta* Fort William College (Sprenger 424); *Rampore* Sault 157 and apparently also 158 (both 18th or 19th century); *Hyderabad* Āṣafiyah III p. 625 no. 290 (Dated 1069-1658-9); Āṣafiyah II p. 1482 no. 183; *Madras* II 592.


(3) *Sharh i Makhtan al-asrâr* by ‘Abd al-‘Azîz b. Ḥasan b. Tâhir Jaunpûrî (d. 975/1567).² *Ms.*: *Hyderabad* Āṣafiyah III p. 200 no. 1301 (Dated 1109/1697-8).

(4) *Sharh i Makhtan al-asrâr* by ‘Abd al-‘Azîz b. Ḥasan b. Tâhir Jaunpûrî, a Chisti shahî, born at Jaunpûr in 898/1492-3, was taken to Delhi at the age of one and a half years by his father, a well-known mutî. Among his works was a *Risâlah i ṣâḥîḥah*. ‘Abd al-Qâdir Badi‘înî was one of his pupils. He died on 6 Junûdî II 976/1567.? (Stc.)


² Shaikh ‘Abd al-‘Azîz Dîhlawî b. Ḥasan b. Tâhir Jaunpûrî, a Chisti shahî, born at Jaunpûr in 898/1492-3, was taken to Delhi at the age of one and a half years by his father, a well-known mutî. Among his works was a *Risâlah i ṣâḥîḥah*. ‘Abd al-Qâdir Badi‘înî was one of his pupils. He died on 6 Junûdî II 976/1567.? (Stc.)

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


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

(Russian prose): Хосров и Ширин. Филологический перевод с фарсы и комментарии Г.Ю. Алиева, М.Н. Османова, Baku 1985.


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

Prose paraphrase: Sarıı i Khasrawi, written by Ghulâm Hüsain Khân Munsî in 1230/1815, for some English officers. The same author also wrote abridgments of the two parts of the İskandar-namâh (see below). Ms.: London Add. 27, 270 (Rieu p. 757-5. Autograph).

Modern epilogue: Khulasâh i Khusraw u Shirin, with commentary, by S. Sirjânî, Tehran 2535ah.sh./1976-7.

(iii) Lailê-Majnûn (inc.: a nâm tu bihartn sar-aghâz * bê nâm i tu nâmâh kai kusam bâz); for the title, date and dedicatee see above p. 440-1. A retelling of a famous love-story from pre-Islamic Arabia. [485]

Mss.: see Khamsah.

Editions: [India] 1264/1848; Lucknow 1286/1870; 1888; Bombay 1292/1875; 1302/1885; Lahore 1307/1890; Cavnpore 1904; Tehran 1313ah./1934 (ed. W. Dastgirî, with notes) and reprints; 1364ah./1985 (ed. B. Tharwatîyân; non vidi); 1369ah./1990 (ed. B. Zanjânî; non vidi); Moscow 1965 (critical edition by A.A. Alesker-zade [Persian title page: ʿAlî-Asghar-zâdah] and F. Babayev).


(German prose, abridged): Leila und Madshun. Der berühmteste Liebesroman des Morgenlandes erstmal aus dem Persischen veredelt und mit einem Nachwort versehen von Rudolf Gelpke, Zurich 1963 (with photographs of miniatures).


Epitome: Ms.: Gotha 40/4 (Bahr al-durar. ‘Offenbar sehr alt’). (iv) Haft paikar (inc.: ai jahân-iddah bêt khwêsh az tu * êch bêtë na-badah pêsh az tu); for the date and dedicatee see above p. 441. Niżãmî’s second reworking of an episode of Sasanian history from the Shâh-namâh, this time that of the emperor Bahram i Göhr. Its central and best known portion is occupied by the seven stories with which Bahram [486] 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 Niżãmî goes on to counter-balance 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 Niżãmî’s masterpiece.2

1 I have seen only the Indian reprint. It is claimed there that this is a translation from the Persian, but its dependence on the book by Mattin and Hill, though unacknowledged, is manifest.

2 Ritter, 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 indo-germanischen Literatur überhaupt’. 

Mss.; see Khamshah.

Editions: [Bombay] (1849) (The Book called [sic] Huft Piker of Mowlana Shaikh Nizamee Sahib Allibir Rahma the stories of Bubram Goor; Lathographed [sic] by Luckeheemon Wilhoj ee, 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 (Huft pekler, ein romantisches Epos des Nizami Genge'i herausgegeben von H. Ritter und J. Rypka. = Monografie archivu orientálního, Vol. III); Tehran 1315h./1936 (ed. W. Dastgirdi, with notes) and reprints; 1373h./1994 (ed. B. Zanjani; non vidi); Moscow 1987 (critical edition by T.A. Magerramov [= Tahir Ahmad-oghlu Muharram-ov]).

Translations (English ‘blank verse’): C.E. Wilson, The Huft 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). [487]


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


(v) Iskandar-nâmah, in two parts, called respectively Sharaf-nâmâh (inc.: khudây-á, jahân-pâdshâh tu-râ-st * zî má khidmat ayad, khudâ’t tu-râ-st) and Igbál-nâmâh (inc.: khirad har-kujt ganj-e ârad padid * zî nâm i khudâ sâzdân ān-râ kallid). [488] The story of Alexander, following, and in the same metre as, the Shah-nâmâh. For its date and dedicatee see above p. 441-6, below p. 585-91, and also for a summary of the contents my article ‘Iskandar-nâma of Nizami’ in Ebr.

Mss.: See Khamshah.

Editions: (a) Sharaf-nâmâh and Igbál-nâmâh together: Calkutta 1810; 1825; 1835; 1263/1847; 1269/1852; Lucknow 1293/1905 (with interlinear Urdu translation and marginal notes by Fath Muhammad); Cawnpore 1878 (with marginal notes on the Isk. N. i alone).

(b) Sharaf-nâmâh (Isk. N. i) alone: Calkutta [1810] (incomplete); 1812 (with the title Muntakah al-shurîh i Sikandar-nâmâh, and on the English title page: The Secundar Nâma of Nizami. With a selection from the works of the most celebrated commentators, by Beder Ali & Mir Hosain Ali), reprinted 1825; 1243/1828; Calkutta 1818; [Lucknow] 1282/1865-6 (with marginal notes); 1873; Lucknow 1878-9 (ed. with marginal notes by M. Hâdi ‘Ali and followed by a glossary entitled Fârhang i Sikandar-nâmâh) by S. Ibn i Hasan b. Qâsim ‘Ali); 1889 (reprint of the Calkutta 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 Bâlâk Râm); Lahore 1889; Delhi 1316-7/1898-9 (2 vols. with notes); 1323/1906 (Iild i thânt i Sikandar-nâmâh i barrt, with notes by H. Aklund-zâdah); Tehran 1316h./1939 (ed. W. Dastgirdi, with notes) and reprints; 1368h./1989 (ed. B. Tharwattyân); [489] Baku 1947 (critical edition by A.A. Alizâdâ).
(c) Ịpẖāl-nāmāh (Iṣk. N. ii) alone: Calcutta 1852-69 (Khīrād-nāmāh Iṣkandāry, also called the Sikandar-nāmāh Bāber, by Nizāmī, edited by A. Sprenger and Aga Mohammed Shoosherey, 2 fasc., the second edition by Āghā Ahmad 'Alī); Bombay 1277/1860; Cañnpore 1288/1871; 1878; 1892; Lucknow 1879; Tehran 1317 h./1939 (ed. W. Dastgirdī, with notes) and reprints; Baku 1947 (critical edition by F. Babayev).

Translations of one or both parts: (English prose): H. Wilberforce Clarke, The Sikandar Nama, or 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 (Iṣk. N. i).


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

Partial translations: (French prose): Expédition d'Alexandre le Grand contre les Russes: Extrait de l'Alexandreide ou Ìskendër-NAME de Nizâmî, 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.).

(German verse): H. Ethē, 'Alexanders Zug zum Lebensquelle im Land der Finsternisse. Eine Episode aus Nizâmîs Iṣkandernâmâ [i], übersetzt, kommentiert und besonders seinem mystischen Inhalt nach genauer beleuchtet' (with the Persian text), SB Münchener 1871, p. 343-405.

(Swedish prose): Sikandar-nāmāh I-XV (=about the first 900 verses of Iṣk. N. i), trans. A. E. Hermelin, Lund 1933: [490]

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

(1) A work by one Hāmid b. Jamāl Buhkārī al-Hāssānī (Dorn: al-Ḥusainī) al-Jaunpūrī (inc.: ẖamd bihāyāt wa sipās bē ghāyāt (Dorn: bē 'indāyāt etc.) and dedicated to Farīd al-dīn Abū l-Muẓaffar Shīr-Shāh (947/1540 to 952/1545) contains, according to Rieu, 'a commentary on some difficult verses in the first part of Iskandar Nāmāh'. In the subscription of the Leningrad copy the work is called Kīld i kitāb i Sharaf-nāmāh, but Dorn says (on what basis?) that the author 'paralt averdonné à son ouvrage le titre de kashf al-daqaqīq ...' and states that it is a glossary of the Arabic words occurring in the Iṣk. N. Ms.: London Add. 10,579 l (Rieu p. 820. Dated Muḥarram 1096/1684); Leningrad Dorn D fols. 14-37 (Dated 3 Jumādā I 1176/1762). Cf. Munz. Pak. VII p. 130.

(2) Fawā'id (Qawā'id, Qawā'id) i 'Alī-shēr by Muḥyī l-dīn b. Nīzhām al-dīn, written in 956/1549-50 for Naṣīr al-dīn 'Alī-shēr. See the description in Sprenger. Ms.: London Add. 26,243 II (Rieu p. 859. 18th century?); Cambridge Browne Coll. Sup. 2 (Dated 1086/1675-6); Halle D.M.G. 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 Rabi' I 1269/1852); Lucknow Sprenger 425 (several copies); Calcutta Ivanov Curzon 202 (Dated 10 Rabi' II 1082/1671). Cf. Munz. Pak. VII p. 130-2.

(3) A commentary beginning sipās be qiyās wa sidīyāsh bi shumār mar khāliq ē rā... Ms.: Munich 188 Quartr. (Aumer 27. Dated 1139/1726-7).

(4) Shārš i (abyāt i) Iskandar-nāmāh by Sirāj al-dīn 'Alī Khān, called Ārzū (d. 1169/1755-6). 'This commentary forms the basis of the glosses to the lithographed Lucknow [sic] edition of the [first part of] the Sikandar-nāmāh, 1263 and 1266, 8vo. 311 pp. 23 bayts, also of the notes of [491] Badr'alayyār and Myr Hosāyq 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, 1261 folio, the commentaries are all essentially identical.' (Sprenger). Ms.: London Or. 3513 (Rieu Suppt. no. 232, 18th century?); Berlin Sprenger 1482 (Pertsch 736); Rampore Sautal 148-50; Lucknow Sprenger 426 (two copies).


(5) Shārš i Sharaf-nāmāh by Mullā Muḥammad Sā'd Allāh of Patna, written in 1196/1782. Ms.: Lucknow Sprenger 427; Exclus
from the same work are apparently contained in Berlin Ms. or. oct. 70 fol. 1b-18b (Pertasch 735).
(8) Commentary by Sāhīb ʿAlī Rasūl-pūrī. Ms.: Rampore Saulat 151 (modern); Lucknow Sprenger 425.
(9) A short commentary written by order of Jahāngīr and dated by a chronogram to 1025/1616. The author’s name is given by Bīrgvī as ‘Amar Ali’, for which Storey (in the margin of Bīrgvī’s catalogue) proposes ‘Amānī’, evidently Aḥmad Allāh Amānī Husainī (for whom see PL I p. 812 fn. 1). Ms.: London I.O. Delhi 1245; a commentary with the same incipit was reported in Lucknow Sprenger 425.
(10) Shahr i Sīkandar-nāmeh, an anonymous commentary which Ethē declares to be ‘different not only from that of the Calcutta edition, but also from all those described in Rieu [...]; Pertesz [...], and A. Sprenger’. It begins, without any preface, with the first verse of the poem, which is then glossed: la-mā khalqītu ʿl-jān wa l-ṭistān illa li yābūda-ni. bar pād-shahān i mamlakat i asḥar wa ẓahān-darān i viloyat i aqḥar [...]. Ms.: London I.O. 1018; I.O. 1019 (incomplete).
(11) Shahr i abūs i Sīkandar-nāmeh, ‘another anonymous commentary on the difficult verses of the first part of the Iṣkān N.’ Ms.: London I.O. 1020. [492]
(13) Kitāb i Sīkandar-nāmeh, ‘a similar, but shorter glossary. Ms.: Oxford Ms. Pers. e. 11 (Ethē 1982); Calcuta 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-33b and 34-61 (Pertasch 735). (15) Unidentified commentaries. Ms.: Cambridge Corpus, No. 213 (Browne Suppt. 766. Dated 1246/1830-1); Bombay Univ. VII (Dated 4 Rabi' I 1241/1825).

Abridgments: Futūḥāt i Sīkandarī, in prose, made by Ghiyāth Husain (see above, ad Khasruʾ-Shāhīn), the first part in 1209/1794-5 and

the second in 1221/1806-7. Ms.: Cambridge Add. 314 (Browne Cat. CCXVII. Part 1); Add. 315 (Browne Cat. CCXVIII. Dated 9 Shawwāl 1221/1806, apparently the autograph. Part 2).

Selections from the Khamsah:
(1) Khūlṣūt 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.: aḥ hamah hasti zi tu paidā shudah * khāk i daft az tu tuwāndā 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 asbāb i dālāt wa arsbā i malānāt wādāb wa lāzimāt ast khābād az qirāt i qirātān 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. [493]

Ms.: Dublin Beatty 178 fol. 106-51 in marg. (16th century? In 38 chapters, presumably this work:1 Oxford Walker 44 (Ethē 599, Dated 6 Muḥarram 1152/1739. Incomplete); Ouiseley 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 (Riū p. 575. 16th century? With the preface); Add. 19,661/II (Riū p. 845. 16th century?); Grenville xxxviii (Riū p. 575. 17th century?); Add. 7730 (Riū p. 575. Dated Safar 1231/1816); I.O. 2874; R.A.S. 363 (Pictures); Paris Supplément 590 (Blothet 1288. Dated 20 Ramadān 991/1583). Ancien fonds 354/V (Blothet 1289/Richard. Ms. dated 26 Dāri 1-qaḍah 994/1586. 30 chapters only); Supplément 589 (Blothet 1286. 16th century?); Supplément 1406 (Blothet 1287. 16th century? End missing); Supplément 592/I (Blothet 1290. Dated 25 Rajab 1148/1735. Beginning missing); Naples Bibli. Nazionale Ms. III. G. 41 (Piemontese 230/III. Ms. dated Shawwāl 924/1518); Leyden Cat. II 633; Hamburg. Orient. 218 fol. 1v-68b (Brockelmann 184. Dated 967/1559-60); Berlin Sprenger 1476 (Pertasch 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

1Arberry gives the title as ‘Khulṣūt i Jamāhīd’, but I wonder whether the last word is not a misreading of ‘khamsah’?}
Aurangzêb (1679); Leningrad Acad. C 1863 fol. 8a-22h (Index 1174, Chap. 28-40 only); İstanbul Est 2918 (Duda p. 59-60. Dated 1 Dhî l-ḥijjah 883/1479); Fatih 3742 (Ritter-Reinert p. 128.Copied by Frz Husain al-Kâtib. 15th century?); Üniversite FY 398 (olim Rza Pasha 1585. Ateş 107. Copied by Murshid al-dîn Muhammad and dated Muḥarram 916/1510); Üniversite FY 528 (Ateş 108. Dated Dhî l-qâda' 955/1548); Topkapı, Revan 884 (Karayat 483; Stechoukine Ix. Copied by Muslim Husain al-Husaini in Muḥarram 982/1574. Pictures): [494] Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi 1922 I (olim Fatih 3743. Ritter-Reinert p. 249. 15th-16th century?); Üniversite FY 154 (Ateş 109. Copied by ‘Aḍud al-Mudḥahhib. 16th century?); Topkapı, Emanet Hazinesi 1654 (Karayat 482. Copied by Shâh Mâhmûd. 16th century?): Cairo Dâr al-kuṭub 57 adâb fârîst Tâ’rîf (Tirâzî I p. 131. Dated 901/1495-6) [Munz.]; Tehran Daftar-i Miśrâ 298 (Munz. 29643. Dated Jumâdâ II 967/1550); Gülîşân/Arâbî II 515; Shîrâz-i İslâmî I 102; etc.; Tashkent 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); Bankiıpore I 45 (Dated 1061/1651); Hyderâbâd Asâfiyah II p. 1478 no. 124 149; Philadelphîa Lewis Coll. 66 (Dated 982/1574-5. Presumably this epitome). Cf. Munz. IV 29640-67.


A different version of this selection, in which are also incorporated selections from mathnavîs of Amir Khusraw and Jâmi‘, is found in Berlin Petermann 486/1 (Pertsch 16. Dated 6 Dhî l-ḥijjah 1052/1643) and evidently also Leningrad Dorn CCCXXXIII (Dated 955/1548); Acad. C 112 fol. 1b-214a (Index 1173. Dated 1060/1650).

(2) Apparently extensive extracts from all six poems occupy the larger portion of the anthology in New York Jackson-Yohannan 11 (Dated, according to the catalogue, 123<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 century. Pictures).

(3) Unspecified epitomes: Mss.: Glasgow V.8.21 (Weir 13. ’Kitâb al-imtihab’); İstanbul Universite FY 472/11 (Ateş 110. Dated 898/1492-3); Üniversite FY 508 (Ateş 111. 16th century?). [495]


259. Parwêz Khâtûn (which Dîh-khûtûd emends to the female name Parwîn Khâtûn) is credited with three verses in LF ed. Iqbal p. 505-6 (Ms. ndn in marg.).

LN s.v. ‘Parwêz Khâtûn’.

260. One verse is ascribed to Pisar i Râmî in two different entries in LF ed. Iqbal p. 18, 303 (Ms. ndn in marg.).
261. Qādī Sharwānī is cited as the author of a total of eleven verses in Abū l-Rajā‘ Qummi, Tārīkh al-maṣāris, ed. M.T. Dāiniha-pazhūh, Tehran 1363sh./1985, p. 153, 155, 165, 173-4, all referring to events during the reigns of the Seljuq Malik-shāh III (547/1152 to 548/1153) and his successor Muhammad II.

262. Malik al-shu‘ārā‘ī Qādirī is the author of a poem of twenty verses quoted by Jājarmī and addressed (according to Jājarmī’s superscription) to Alp Arslān (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 ‘khudāwand i mu‘ayyad, mīr Wārdān-shāh bin Ahmad’, whom I am unable to identify. Hidāyat quotes twelve verses from the same poem, but ascribes them wrongly to Qādirī Hindūstānī, i.e. the Moghol prince Dārā Shukh b. Shāh-jahān.

One verse by perhaps the same Qādirī is quoted in the marginal additions in Ms. nān of Asdān’s dictionary,


263. Nizām al-dīn Mahmūd Isfahānī, called Qamar, is the author of a good-sized collection of 497 poems preserved in an early 14th-century manuscript in London and who is also quoted once by Shams i Qoš. I regret greatly that I have been unable to find a copy of the printed edition of his dīwān. The London codex has a few introductory lines stating that the majority of his poems are in praise of the Āl i Khujad, the leaders of the Shāfi‘ī faction in Isfahan. Unfortunately, the poems have no superscriptions (apart from the usual ‘wa lahu aidan’); the patrons who are mentioned in the verses themselves include Khalifshāh i ‘Ājām Rukn al-dīn (clearly one or another of the Āl i Sā‘īd), the leaders of the Hanafi faction in Isfahan, Khān i a‘zam Salghur-shāh (evidently one of the Salghurīd atabeks in Fars), Shāh i Ėrān ‘Imād al-dīn, Malik Sa‘d al-dīn (alias Ulugh i a‘zam atābeq) and Khān i a‘zam Qub al-dīn.

1Thus in the ancient Ms. of his dīwān; Shams refers to him as Amīr Mahmūd Qamar, while Hidāyat calls him Nizām al-dīn Qamar.

2For whom see above, p. 401-5.

3There is also a poem by Rāfi‘ Lushānī (the younger) (see below, no. 269; the verses are in Hwassād’s edition on p. 139) addressing khulifshāh i ‘ajam u shah i sharf i dīwān i tābār, apparently Rukn al-dīn Mā‘īdī.
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Mss.: London I.O. 1028 (Ms. copied by ‘Abd al-Mu‘min al-‘Alawi al-Kashī in 713-4/1314-5. Pict.) ; Mashhad Ridvān VII 965/7 (Ms. dated 1041/1631-2). For these two Ms. see above, p. 423 n.1 (Mu‘izzī) and also Munz. III 25385-6.


Shams p. 356; Hidāyat, Majma‘ I p. 635-6; Khāiyām-pūr p. 475 (‘Qamarī’) and 607 (‘Nizām i Isfahānī’).

264. Qiwāmī Ganjāpī is the author of a well-known qastdah muṣnā‘ah illustrating the rhetorical figures, noted in PL III (Rhetoric) p. 207-8. The poem is dedicated to the atabeg of Azerbaijan Qızl Arslān (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 Jājarmī I p. 86-94 and Yaghmā’ī p. 198-202. [498]

The only other recorded works of this author are one qatrain ascribed to him by Sharwānī and a highly artificial ode illustrating the figure known as taqsim; an extract from the latter can be found in Shams (p. 359-60), the full text in Jājarmī I p. 118-9.

Dastarl-shāh (p. 128) calls this author Qiwāmī Mutarrīzī and supplies us with the highly questionable information that he was the brother of Nizāmī. See also Khāiyām-pūr p. 476.

265. Badr al-dīn al-Qiwāmī al-Rūzī (as ‘Aṣūf calls him) or Qiwāmī Khabbāz (‘the baker’, as he is called in the 14th-century London manuscript of his dīwān) flourished in the first half of the 6th/12th century. In an ode to Qiwāmī al-dīn Darguzānī, who was wazir to the Seljuq sultans Mahmūd II, Dā‘ūd and Toğhrūl II, and was executed in 527/1133, Qiwāmi alludes to the recent death of ‘the late sultan’,2 evidently that of Mahmūd in 525/1131, and seems to indicate also that he owed his pen-name Qiwāmī to his patronage by this very Qiwāmī al-dīn. But the majority of his poems are of religious or didactic content, many of them praising ‘Āli and the imāms of the twelve Shiites, and in quite a few of

1Munzawi III 25391-2 lists two copies of the ‘dīwān’ of Qiwāmī Ganjāpī; one of these is in fact yet another copy of the qastdah muṣnā‘ah in an anthology (Tehran Majlis VIII 2326), the other a commentary on the same in Tashkent Acad. II 851.

2See below, p. 601.

3Dīwān p. 46: dār dīn firah kim shud sultan i madd * zi lāshkār-gah ba dāmā t-malik i rīvātūn.
them the poet pays his compliments to the leader of the Shiites in Ra‘i, Naṣīr al-nuqqābī Sharaf al-dīn Muḥammad b. ‘Ali Murtaḍā. The ḏhvān contains also (p. 20-1) an exchange of poems between Qiwāmī and ‘Imādī.


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

ʿAuﬁ II p. 357; Rāzī II p. 175 (no. 664); Khayām-pūr p. 476.

267. Three qaṣdaḥs by one Kamāl al-dīn Qoṭbī al-Marwī, followed by another by perhaps the same ‘al-Marghāzī’ are contained in an old anthology in Bologna. The first two poems evocate a king who is addressed as ‘ṣāḥīh muẓaffar’ and ‘ṣāḥīh ḥusayn malik ‘Uṭhumān’, whom Piemontese has proposed to identify with Muẓaffar al-dīn Qızl Arslān ‘Uṭhumān b. ʿEldūglūz, the atabeg of Azerbaijan from 582/1186 to 587/1191. I have found no other reference to a poet of this name.

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

268. Ustād al-ʿāẓimma Radī al-dīn Muḥammad al-Naisābūrī is enumerated by ʿAuﬁ among the religious scholars of Naisābūr who produced Persian poetry. He is evidently identical with ‘al-Radī al-Naisābūrī’, the principal opponent of Fakhr al-dīn al-Rāzī in his famous ‘debates’ [500] (mundžarāt) on points of Islamic law. Fakhr al-dīn, who had a very low opinion of Radī’s intelligence, 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 Samarkand and staying there for ‘some years’ he returned to Bukhārā and engaged in another debate with Radī. Ibn Abī ʿWafāʾ mentions ‘al-Radī al-Naisābūrī’ (presumably the same one) in his biographical dictionary of Ḥaṣfī scholars.

As a poet Radī eulogised several of the Qarakhānīs. Ḥādī Ḥasan and Nafsī have both attempted (as it seems independently) to identify the patrons mentioned in his poems, but they have come to in part different and in both cases unsatisfactory 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 portion of the poems eulogise a king with the titles Nūṣrat al-dunyā wa l-dīn and Arslān-Khān and who is apparently not (as both scholars maintain) ‘Uṭhumān I (600/1203-4 to 607/1211) but rather his father Nūṣrat al-dunyā wa l-dīn Arslān-Khān Ibrāhīm IV b. al-Husain (574/1178 to 600/1203-4). Other poems mention one Abū l-Muzaffar, evidently the uncle and predecessor of the just-mentioned Ibrāhīm, Abū l-Muzaffar Masʿūd II b. al-Ḥasan (556/1160 to 574/1178), others one Ghiyāth i millat, evidently Masʿūd’s son and co-ruler Ghiyāth al-dunyā wa l-dīn Muḥammad IV. He also praised several of the Āl i Burhān, the spiritual leaders of Bukhārā; Ḥādī Ḥasan quotes (p. 449) a poem mentioning the year 559/1163-4 and addressing a cleric whom the poet calls merely ‘Ḳifāh i nasl i Burhān’, evidently the sadr Muḥammad I b. ‘Umar. [501] ʿAuﬁ quotes a Persian poem to one ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz,3 probably the son of the just-mentioned Muḥammad, ‘Abd al-ʿAzīz II (ca. 570/1174 to 593/1196-7), as well as two Arabic verses directed to ‘Burhān al-islām Tāj al-dīn’, evidently his successor, ‘Umar II, ʿAuﬁ’s own teacher.

ʿAdhar and Ḥidāyāt (both apparently following Taqī) confused Radī’s principal patron ‘Arslān-Khān’ with the Seljuq Arslān b. Toghrul; their error was set right by Qazwīnī. Taqī4 gives the date of his death as 598/1201-2.

---

1 Mundžarāt p. 32. For this event see above, p. 257.
2 ʿAuﬁ I p. 226 l. 9.
3 Apud Sprenger p. 16 no. 26.
It is possible, but not certain, that this poet is identical with the Raфи al-din Abû Ja'far Muhammad al-Neisâbûri who is given as the author of the Persian moralising tract Makârim al-akhlâq.\(^1\) Ms. of his divân: Paris Supplément 791 fol. 76v sqq. (Blochet 1988, Dated 18 Shawwâl 1006/1598); Supplément 797 fol. 92r sqq. (Blochet 1990. 16th century); Leningrad Univ. 1202a (Romashkewicz p. 7); Tehrân Gulistân/Aībâyî II 430/IV (Bayârî apparently attributes the Ms. to the 16th century); Adabiyât II p. 11 (In a daftar dated 1007/1598-9); Univ. IX 2589/I (Dated 12 Jumâdâ II 1015/600); Lecknow Sprenger 457; Alîgarh Subb. Ms. p. 35 no. 66 (Dated 1008/1599-1600). Cf. Munz, III 23192-7.


269. Raﬁ’ al-din al-Lunbâni (Lunbân is a village near Isfahân) is the name given to two different writers, possibly father and son, who have been confused with each other in apparently all the previous secondary literature. Raﬁ’ the elder is mentioned by Zakarîyâ al-Qazwînî in his entry on the village of Lunbân, where his names are given as al-adîb al-Fâdhîl ‘Abd al-‘Azîz al-mulaqqâb bi l-Raﬁ’. He was (our source tells us) the author of some fine poems and of a collection of letters\(^2\) and was closely associated with Jamâl al-din al-Khujandî.\(^3\) At one point he applied (it would seem successfully) for a job as the keeper of the library of Sadr al-din al-Khujandî, presumably the sâdî ʿAbd al-Lâṭif II, the leader of the Shâfi‘î faction in Isfahân from after 552/1157 until his death in 588/1194. We are told further that Raﬁ’ was killed during the conflict between sultân Toğrîl (i.e. the Seljuq Toğhrîl III, 571/1176 to 590/1194) and ‘the sons of atâbeg Muḥammad’, i.e. evidently at the time when Toğhrîl freed himself from the tutelage of the Eidsügûzids (587/1191); Raﬁ’ was namely one of a party of supporters of the Khujandîs who were travelling from Isfahân to Baghdâd when they were ambushed and robbed by one of the Eidsügûzid commanders and it was in this raid that he lost his life.\(^4\) Zakarîyâ quotes six of his verses in Arabic and two of those in Persian. He is presumably the Raﬁ’ al-Lunbânî several of whose Arabic letters are quoted by the anonymous 13th-century compiler of al-Mukhtârât min al-rasâîl. [503]

The Persian divân of Raﬁ’ al-din Lunbânî, which 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 al-Lunbânî al-Isfahânî of whom ʿAuﬁ speaks as of a contemporary. I regret greatly that I have not been able to find a copy of the edition of his divân published some years ago by Taqî Binish, apparently on the basis of the Dublin manuscript,\(^5\) but I have consulted the valuable article by the same scholar from 1971, which describes the Dublin copy and cites the incipits and patrons of all the poems found there. This codex contains odes to the Khârâzim-shâh Jalâl al-din Meng-burnî (617/1220 to 628/1231), the leaders of the religious factions in Isfahân (Ṣadr al-din ʿUmar al-Khujandî and Ruğûn al-din Masʿûd b. Śâdî) and the Salghurid ruler of Fârs, Muẓaffâr al-din Abû

\(^1\) Cf. Pouchécoeur, Moralits p. 283-8, who refers to an edition of the Makârim al-akhlâq by Dânish-pazhîhî, Tehran 1341ash./1962 (which I have not seen). This work is evidently not the same as the thus titled Arabic work by Raﬁ’ al-din al-l-Hana b. al-Fâdî al-Tâbri (see PL I p. 176-7, 1252), though the identical laqab suggests that there might be some confusion involved in the identification of the author of the Persian work.

\(^2\) The published text has: ‘laha ashtâr ft ghûyût al-haum wa divân wa rasâjlî’. This is presumably an error for ‘... wa divân rasâjlî’.

\(^3\) Both in the sense of probably more likely to be associated with Jamâl al-din Masʿûd; for these, and for the sâdî ʿAbd al-Lâṭif II, see above, p. 403-4.

\(^4\) The story seems to imply that the Shâfi‘î faction supported Toğhrîl’s coup; the sâdî’s household was thus fair game for the atâbeg’s forces.

\(^5\) They have been shown a photocopy of the title-page of this edition, which reads Divân in Raﬁ’u l-din l-i Lunbânî (ṣarn i shahâm in hijrî) bar axät i nasîhîl i muṣâarîkh i 619 [?] i hijrî, etc.; date and place of publication are not indicated on the photocopy. Presumably 619 is a misprint for 699, the date of Dublin Beatty 103?
Bakr b. Sa'd b. Zangî (628/1231 to 658/1260), all of whom we have encountered as patrons of Kamâl al-din Isfahânî,1 as well as various ministers and as yet unidentified persons. The poems by 'Raft' al-dîn al-Lumbânî which are quoted by Jâjarmi are clearly all by this same Raft the younger.2

Since the publication of the entry on Raftî in the first edition of this survey, in 1994, a new version, ostensibly of the dhwân of Raftî al-dîn Lumbânî, was published by M. Huwaidâ, strangely without any reference either to Bînîsh’s edition or to the Dublin manuscript. This is an exceedingly poor piece of work,3 but it does contain, as an appendix, a small collection of Arabic or bilingual poems, evidently taken from an old anthology copied in Dînî l-qâ‘ah 728/1328.4 These additional poems are manifestly not by Raftî the younger, but by Raftî the elder. Thus, the six Arabic verses quoted by Zakâryâ’ al-Qazwînî can be found in Huwaidât’s appendix at the beginning of a bilingual tarjît (clearly much corrupted in the edition) on p. 186. The same appendix contains an Arabic ode to the above-mentioned sadr ‘Abd al-La‘îf (II) al-Khujandî,5 and a bilingual poem in which the poet gives his own name as ‘Abd al-‘Azîz Lumbânî,6 again in agreement with Zakâryâ’. I am not able to offer a positive identification for the other patrons mentioned in these appended poems,7 but they are clearly different from those addressed in the Persian dhwân. The editor has also inserted a small number of Persian rubûts and other short poems from the same old manuscript into the main body of the dhwân; these (or at least some of them) are identified in the footnotes with the signum wâw and evidently also belong to the elder Raftî. The styles of the two authors seem rather different, though the bilingual tarjît of the younger Raftî quoted by Jâjarmi, p. 795-9, does seem to imitate the manner of his elder namesake.

Ibn al-Fuwaštî has a short entry1 on two poets, Kamîl al-dîn Abî l-Mahâsin b. ‘Abî al-‘Azîz b. Masûd al-Lumbânî and ‘his brother’, whom he calls Raftî al-dîn ‘Abd al-‘Azîz b. Masûd, and quotes four Arabic verses from the former. There is clearly a mistake here. If the two are indeed brothers, then we must presumably correct the second name to Raftî al-dîn ‘Abî al-‘Azîz b. Masûd, with omission of the šîm. al-Šafâdat has an entry on Abî Ťâhir b. ‘Abî al-‘Azîz b. Masûd b. ‘Abî al-‘Azîz Lumbânî (text: al-Lumbânî) [504] min ahl Isfahânî (without laqab), who ‘went to Baghdad in the company of Šâdîr al-dîn ‘Abd al-La‘îf al-Khujandî (i.e. ‘Abd al-La‘îf II) and died in the year 584’ i.e. 1188-9, presumably Raftî the elder, though in this case either the date of his death given by al-Šafâdat, or that implied by Zakâryâ’, must be some three years off. The situation is, however, complicated by the fact that ‘Abd al-Kâfir al-Râfî’î al-Qazwînî (a contemporary of Raftî the elder) has an entry on one ‘Abî al-‘Azîz b. Muhammad al-Lumbânî (text: al-Lumbânî) al-Isfahânî (again without laqab), an Arabic scholar and author of commentaries, whom al-Râfî’î ‘met in Isfahan’ and who ‘accompanied the Khujandî sadrs to Qazwîn in the year 581’, i.e. 1185-6, and who would also seem a likely candidate for identification with the elder Raftî. It is possible that ‘Muhammad’ is an error for ‘Masûd’, though it is perhaps not entirely unthinkable that ‘Abî al-‘Azîz b. Muhammad and ‘Abd

---

1See above p. 350-2.

2Jâjarmi quotes a total of thirteen poems by Raftî, all of them in Bînîsh’s list, apart from the tarjît in Jâjarmi p. 799-810, which seems to be missing in the Dublin manuscript.

3For example, the three tarjîts by Raftî the younger published in the edition of Jâjarmî’s Makhtîs al-abhar p. 790-810, can be found also in Huwaidată’s edition of the dhwân, p. 131-142, but Huwaidat has taken the stanzas of the three poems, mixed them up, and rearranged them in a single alaphatic series! Apparently, the editor does not know what a tarjît is.

4See the very vague account of this manuscript in Huwaidat’s introduction, p. 6. I deduce (but regret that the editor has not said this explicitly) that the poems published on p. 171-200 of the edition, are all taken from this source.

5Ibid., p. 175-178; the name of the dedicatee is found (misprinted) on p. 177, the fifth verse.

6Ibid., p. 195.

7On p. 196-8 the editor has (apparently without noticing it) published fragments of two different poems: the metre changes after the first meṣrâ of the last verse on p. 196. The second of these, at least, addresses one Muhammad b. Yûnes, Šûrin al-dîn, perhaps Abî Ḫanîd Muhammad b. Yûnes al-Muṣa’lî, a prominent Shî‘î scholar in the second half of the 6th/12th century.

---

1The entry was published by Manlawî in the supplement to OC XV/A, 1939, p. 55, and begins: ‘Kamîl al-dîn Abî l-Mahâsin b. ‘Abî al-‘Azîz b. Masûd al-Lumbânî (text: al-Lumbânî) al-shâ’ir wa khwa akhû Raftî al-dîn ‘Abî al-‘Azîz b. Masûd wa kāna shâ’irun aṣāmîd...’. The editor proposed emending akhû to ibn, but this is more radical than the emendation proposed above.

al-‘Azîz b. Mas‘ûd 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 Rafî’ the elder would have to remain open. In any event, the quoted sources concur in indicating that the given name of the elder Rafî’ was ‘Abd al-‘Azîz, that he was intimately associated with the Khujandî šâdîr and that he died at some time between 584/1188-9 and 587/1191.

Amin Râzî has two successive entries in his chapter on Isfahân, the first (no. 871) on Rafî’ al-dîn Mas‘ûd Lubânî (edition: Lubânî), - but one of Ehtê’s manuscripts apparently has ‘b. Mas‘ûd’ - , who was (the author tells us) a contemporary of Kamâl al-dîn Isfahânî, the second (no. 872) on Rafî’ al-dîn ‘Abd al-‘Azîz Lubânî (again mispointed in the edition). The poems in the first entry can be found in the Persian dívân of Rafî’ the younger, who was indeed a contemporary of Kamâl Isfahânî. In the second entry at least some of the verses are evidently by Rafî’ the elder,1 whose name, as we have seen, was indeed ‘Abd al-‘Azîz. It is thus clear that Râzî was still aware of the fact that there were two different poets by the name of Rafî’ Lubânî. [505]

Tagî2 says that Rafî’ al-dîn ‘Abd al-‘Azîz Lubânî died in 603/1206-7, but this is too late for Rafî’ the elder and too early for Rafî’ the younger. Later authors perpetuate the confusion.


Editions:3 [Place? Date?] (Ed. T. Biniš, non vidi); [n.p.] 1373sh./1995 (Ed. M. Huwâïdî).

‘Abd al-Karîm al-Rafî’, Kitâb al-tadhîn (see the text); ‘Auffî II p. 400-1 (none of the verses cited are in Huwâïdî’s edition); Zakaryâ’ al-Qâzwînî, Aštâr al-bîlîdî, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 301-2; al-Mukhtarât min

1The first rubâ’î in entry 872 appears in Huwâïdî’s edition on p. 165, from Ms. wâw. The next three rubâtât are on p. 170, 168 and 166 respectively, all without indication of the source. These are followed by a ghâzal, printed in the edition on p. 152, from wâw, and by four verses from the already mentioned poem on p. 196, in Huwâïdî’s appendix.

2Aepd Sprenger p. 17 no. 38.

3See the discussion of these editions in the article.
quote five poems, none of them in ‘Auffi. Further verses are added by Hidâyat.

‘Auffi II p. 398-400; Sharwânî, Nuzhat al-majâles (see above, p. 242); Râzî I p. 194-6 (no. 189); [507] Hidâyat, Majma’ I p. 502-3; Khâyâm-pâr p. 235-6 (‘Râfî i Shirkâ); LN s.v. ‘Râfî i Shirkâ’ p. 565.

272. Ustâd Abû Muhammad b. Muḥammad al-Râshîdî al-Samarqandî1 flourished in the last quarter of the 5th/11th century. His earliest source, ‘Auffi, says that the young Rashîdî was one of the many poets at the court of the Qarakhanid Khâdîr b. Ibrâhîm (who ruled for a year or so from 472/1080) and as such subordinate to the amir al-shu’â’râ’ ‘Am’âq, and that he enjoyed special favour with the sultan’s queen Sa’dâ Zainab (it is evidently to her that his Zainab-nâmah, mentioned by ‘Auffi, was dedicated). ‘Auffi reports further on the rivalry between ‘Am’âq and the saiyîd al-shu’â’râ’ Rashîdî and quotes three verses with which the latter lampooned the former. ‘Auffi, who includes Rashîdî in his section on the poets in Transoxania during the Seljuk period, quotes from a qasîdah which he dedicated to Abû l-Fath Malik-Shâh (465/1072 to 485/1092) - name and kurnah are both mentioned in the verses - whom our poet could well have served before or after Khâdîr. The same authority also quotes a poem dedicated to one of the later Qarakhanids, Qâdir-khân Abû l-Mâturîdî Jibrîl b. Âhmad (492/1099 to 495/1102). Rashîdî exchanged poems with Mas’ûd i Sa’dî i Salmân. ‘Auffi (followed by Râzî and others) quotes a qit’tah of four verses addressed to Mas’ûd and a long poem which he claims to be Mas’ûd’s response, but the latter is in fact evidently Rashîdî’s answer to a qasîdah addressed to him by Mas’ûd (and included in the dhwân of the latter), written during Mas’ûd’s imprisonment by order of the Ghaznavid Ibrâhîm.2 [508] Shams quotes an elaborate poem by Rashîdî Samarqandî to illustrate the device known as taqshîth. Daulat-shâh claims that he was a pupil of Qâdrîn,3 the teacher of Râhînî Samarqandî,4 Sa’d al-dîn Isfaranî5 and of Zâhir al-dîn

1The name is quoted thus, without ism, by ‘Auffi. Qazwînî (in his notes to ‘Arîdî p. 152) gives his ism as ‘Abd Allâh or ‘Abd al-Sâyi’d, but indicates no source for these.

2See Qazwînî in Jâzîr 1906 p. 34-7.

3Daulat-shâh p. 67.

4P. 109.

5Id.

Fârîyâbî,1 adding in the last quoted passage that he wrote a narrative poem called Mîhr u Waḥîf. One verse by (our?) Rashîdî is quoted in LF, ed. Iqâbî, p. 404 from the marginal additions in Ms. nân. The possibility that our poet might also be the Ismâ’îl Rashîdî quoted in LF/Iqâbî p. 357 was rejected supra p. 170.

‘Auffi p. 28 (and Qazwînî ad loc.), 46-7; ‘Auffi II p. 176-81; Shams p. 362-4; Daulat-shâh p. 67, 109, 110; Râzî III p. 345-52 (no. 1425; has two long poems not in ‘Auffi); Hidâyat, Majma’ I p. 87-8 (‘Arshâdî); Khâyâm-pâr p. 230; Şafâ, Târîkâ II p. 547-51; LN s.v. ‘Rashîdî’ p. 473.

272a. Abû Muhammad Rûzbîhân b. Abî Naṣr al-Basîlî al-Fasâî al-Shirazi, known as Shaikh i Shutûlîb, a mystic and prolific author in Arabic and Persian, is reported to have lived from 522/1128 to 606/1209. He is not cited as a poet in early sources, but various poetical compositions, among a fair-sized maânovî with the title Tuhfat al-dirfân (inc.: ay qadîm e kih dar jalaq i qidam * nabowad dhâri i tu qartn i ‘adam) are attributed to him in later collective manuscripts.

Selections of his poems have been noted in (for example) London I.O. 1693 fol. 84a in marg.; I.O. 1747 fol. 68b; I.O. 1766 fol. 30a; Konya [a Ms. is mentioned, without call-number, by Ernst p. 154]; Istanbul Universite FY 538/19 (Ateş 95. Dated 826/1423. Tuhfat al-dirfân).

Collections of poems (including Tuhfat al-dirfân) have been published in: M.T. Mîr, Sharh i hâl u âthâr u ashârâr i (...) R.B., Tehran 1354sh./1975, p. 52-103; Gh. ‘A. Āryâ, Sharh i ahyât u âthâr u majmâ’ah i ashârâr i (...) R.B., Tehran 1363sh./1984, p. 78-159.


273. Abû Bakr b. Muhammad b. ‘Alii al-Rûhânî, called also ‘Utîrî al-thânî, is represented by a sizable selection of poems in ‘Auffi’s anthology, one of them eulogising, as our source tells us, the Ghaznavid

1P. 110.
Bahram-shah (511/1117 to 552/1157). 'Afsi does not inform us of his nisbah, but Daulat-shah has a brief entry on one Hakim Ruhani Samarqandi, presumably our poet, who he says was a pupil of Rashidi and whom he represents by two verses not quoted by 'Afsi. Jajarmi quotes two substantial poems, one of them a Saugand-namah pledging allegiance to Bahram-shah. Razi quotes a few verses from the same poem and says also that after serving Bahram-shah our poet attached himself to the court of the Khwairazm-shah Atsiz [509] (521/1127 to 551/1156). He is clearly not identical with the Amir Ruhani several of whose verses are cited by Firishtah in his account of the events of the year 624/1227.1

If ed. Igbal p. 156-7 (one verse in Ms. nain in marg.); 'Afsi II p. 282-6; Saif Harawi p. 237-8 (five verses from the Saugand-namah); Daqiqi al-ash'at (Oxford Elliot 37 = Etha 1333, fol. 41b); Jajarmi I p. 144+vi to 144+viii, 211-3; Daulat-shah p. 109; Razi III p. 371-3 (no. 1433); Hidaiyat, Majma' 1 p. 240; Id., Riyad p. 195; G.M. Khan in Islamic culture XXIII, 1949, p. 228, 232-4 (partial edition and translation of the Saugand-namah); Khayyam-pur p. 240; Safa, Tarih II p. 610-4.

274. Ruhji Walwaliyi is the author of a handful of satirical verses, but also of two long odes, quoted by 'Afsi in his chapter on the poets of the Seljuqs of Kharasai. In one of the latter he engages in some ritualised boasting, comparing himself with Mas'ud i Sa'd i Salman, and calling himself the third in series after Farrukhi and Qatrun; it is from the latter verse that Daulat-shah evidently extrapolated the 'information' that he was a pupil of Qatrun. In fact the same poem mentions also Farid i Ghiyani, who was one of the religious scholars who debated with Fakhr al-din al-Razi 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 Ruhji Shahristan, the author of a poem, quoted by Hidayat from the tadkirah of Auhadi, praising 'Abu l-Muzaffar Tamghaj-khan', evidently the Qarakhanid Abu l-Muzaffar Qlich Tamghach-Khan Mas'ud (556/1161 to 574/1178), Zahir's patron.2
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A verse by (the same?) Ruhji is quoted by Saif Harawi p. 69. The same author quotes (p. 116, 616, 623) three poems by 'Walwaliyi' (Ruhji? Or the Samanid poet Muhammad b. Safi, supra p. 194-5?)


275. Abu l-Faraj b. Mas'ud al-Ruini was a panegyrist of the Ghaznavids and of their governors in Lahore. His nisbah Ruini (if it be indeed a nisbah) has not been explained satisfactorily. 'Afsi says explicitly that Abu l-Faraj was born in Lahore, and the 10th/16th-century Indian historian Badaktu11 states in connection with Abu l-Faraj Ruini (as he calls him) that 'rwyin is the name of a village in the dependencies of Lahore, but today it is apparently (sic! go?d) 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, Mustafii says that our poet hailed from Ruinah in Kharasani, and there is in fact still a village by this name in the environs of Nalasibir. There is (or was) also a Ruin in Sistin (mentioned repeatedly in the Tarih i Sistin), whether either of these really has anything to do with the poet is another question.

Ruini's divan consists largely of odes to the Ghaznavids Abu l-Muzaffar Ibrahiim (451/1059 to 492/1099, or shortly afterwards) and his son and successor Abu Sa'id Mas'ud III (died in 508/1115), 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'ud i Sa'd refers to him as his master. The dates given for his death by the tadkirah (489/1096 in Taqi Kashi and even earlier in some of the others) are, as usual, worthless. Ruini certainly survived into the reign of Mas'ud and was apparently alive at least until the end of 495/1102, judging from the poem2 dedicated to [511] Mas'ud (his name occurs in the third verse) beginning shah r roy i bakht guin bau ' jashin i abun bar o humayun bau and ending jashin u aiyin i 'id u azin i safar ' har ah bar shahryar mainin bau; the festival of Abanagin coincided with 'id al-adha in 495/1102, when both fell on 25 September.

1Tarih i Firishkah, ed. Briggs, I p. 115.

1Musaakhab al-asavirik b, Calcutta 1868, p. 37.
2Ed. Chaykin p. 41-2; Ed. Mahdawi p. 55-6.
Mss.: Dublin Beatty 103/IV (Ms. completed Dhu-l-hijjah 699/1300); Oxford Whinfield 8 (Beeston 2872/21, 16th century); Whinfield 54 (Beeston 2662/10. Dated 9 Rajab 1012/1603. Selections); Marsh. 55 (Ethê 523. End missing); London Or. 3713/I (Rieu Suppt. 211. Copied by Muhammad Shâh b. 'Alî b. Maḥmûd Ishfâhân and dated 6 Rabî‘ II 692/1293); Add. 27,318 (Rieu p. 547-8. 16th century?); Add 7793/II (fol. 165-244. Rieu p. 549. Dated Ramadân 1021/1612); I.O. 905 (Dated 24 Shawwâl 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. (Blochet 1900. 16th century?); Supplément 759 (Blochet 1208, 17th century?); Supplément 760 fol. 73v sqq. (Blochet 1556, 17th century?); Hamburg Orient. 228 (Brockelmann 157); Istanbul Hekimoğlu Ali Paşa 669/12 (Miṣrîyan-ḥâ I p. 420-1. Apparently old); Tashkent Acad. 214/ (Semenov 765. Dated 1106/1694-5. Pictures); Hamadan Ḥtimâd al-daulah (Nûkhah-ḥâ V p. 345. Ms. apparently dated 6 Shawwâl 1017/1609); Tehran Majlîs 4841/l (Munz. 21376. Dated 9 Rabî‘ II 996/1588); Miftâḥ 623 (Nûkhah-ḥâ VII p. 154. 16th century?); Lahore (4 Ms. in Munz. Pak. VII p. 21-2); Peshawar Islamiyáh 1823(2) (Dated 1134/1721-2); Calcutta Ivanov 431 (Dated 1078/1667-8); Ivanov 432 (17th century? These two Ms. are also described in Sprunger 66); Ivanov Curzon 189 (17th century? Incomplete); Bâbîr 280 (19th century?). Cf. Munz. III 21375-417 (many late Mss.).


‘Arâfî p. 28 (and Qazwîni ad loc.); Wâwîl passim; ‘Aṣfî I p. 241-5; Shams passim (see the index s.v. ‘Bulāräj‘); Mustauff p. 718; Daqiq al-ash‘âr (Oxford Elliot 37 fol. 128b, 136b, 143a, 146a, 152a = Ethê 1333); Jâjarî I p. 256-7; Râzî I p. 339-44 (no. 358); Taqî (see London Or. 3506 fol. 135b sqq. = Rieu Suppt. 105); Hidâyât, Majma‘ I p. 70-8; LN s.v. ‘Abû l-Faraj‘ p. 715; Sâfa‘, Tãrîkh II p. 470-6; Khayyâm-pûr p. 21; C.E. Bosworth, The later Ghaznavids, Edinburgh 1977, passim; E Publication s.v. ‘Abû l-Faraj‘ (J.T.P. de Brujin); Elr s.v. ‘Abû l-Faraj‘ Rûnî‘ (M. Siddiqi).

[275a. Dautil-shâh knows nothing of Abû l-Faraj‘ Rûnî‘, but he does have an entry on one Abû l-Faraj‘ Siţîsi, the contents of which are repeated by the later tadhkîrât, and quotes three verses by him. This Abû l-Faraj‘ was supposedly a panegyrist of Abî ‘Ali Simjir (recte Simjîr). When the latter was defeated by Maḥmûd of Ghaznah (in 384/994) the victor resolved to have his revenge on Abû l-Faraj‘, who had previously penned a satire against him, but the poet’s life was saved by his former pupil, Maḥmûd’s poet-laureate ‘Unṣūr. This supposedly early poet is not mentioned by any source before Dautil-shâh and I should think that he is entirely fictitious; more precisely that he is a mythical doppelgänger of Abû l-Faraj‘ Rûnî‘ (who might have been supposed to hail from Rûn in Sîstân, see above) transported back into the early Ghaznavid period.

Dautil-shâh claims to have seen a number of his poems in collections, but Râzî says that he only saw the three verses cited by Dautil-shâh, while Âdhar says explicitly that everything other than these that has been ascribed to Abû l-Faraj‘ Siţîsi is in fact by Abû l-Faraj‘ Rûnî‘. A collection [513] of poems by Abû l-Faraj‘ Siţîsi is reported in Paris Supplément 783 fol. 51r sqq. (Blochet 1881, 16th century?) but it would be very surprising if these did not reveal themselves to be by Rûnî‘.

Dautil-shâh p. 39-40; Râzî I p. 293 (no. 303; name misspelt in the edition); Âdhar 1 p. 420-2; Hidâyât, Majma‘ I p. 70; Browne, History II p. 153; LN s.v. ‘Abû l-Faraj‘ p. 716; Khayyâm-pûr p. 21; Elr s.v. ‘Abû l-Faraj‘ Sejmîl‘ (M. Dabirsüâq).]}

276. Shihâb al-din Sâbîr b. Ismîll al-Tirmidhi,1 generally known as Adîb Sâbîr, divided his time between the court of the Seljûq Sanjâr (511/1118 to 552/1157) and that of the Khwarazm-shâh Atsa (521/1127 to 568/1172). His dhvân 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 Sanjâr’s râras i Khurâsân Majd al-din ‘Ali b. Ja‘far al-Musawwî, in whom we must see Sâbîr’s principal patron. In the end he was caught up in the rivalry between his two royal masters. According to Juwâînî, Sanjâr sent Adîb

1This ‘Aṣfî. The irâq Shihâb al-din and the names Sâbîr b. Ismîll are mentioned in poems addressed to him by Wâwîl. In his own poems he calls himself Sâbîr and Adîb and confirms that he was a native of Tirmidhî.
Sābir with a message to Ataṣū. While at the court in Khwārzm our poet discovered that Ataṣū had sent two men (Juwainī says that they were mālīḥīdāh, i.e., Ismā'īlīs) to murder the sultan. Sābir sent a message to Sunjar warning him of the plot and Ataṣū, having somehow found out about the poet’s message, had the latter drowned in the Oxus. The implication of the story is that Sābir, while posing as a panegyrist of the Khwārzm-shāhī, was in fact a spy in the service of a rival power. Although Juwainī does not give the [514] precise date of this event, he implied that it was at some time between 538/1143-4 and 542/1147-8, Daulat-shāhī, who repeats the same story, gives the date of Sābir’s death as 546/1151-2, but this seems too late.


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

277. Sa’d al-dīn Sharaf al-‘ulkamāl Kāfī al-Bukhārī is quoted by ‘Aṭūf as the author of a gnomic qatādah, in which the poet calls himself Sa’d Kāfī, and of a poem addressed to ‘Aṭūf’s maternal uncle, Majd al-dīn Muhammad b. ‘Adnān Sukhakatsī, who was chief physician at the time of the Qarakhanid Ibrāhīm (IV) b. Husain (574/1178 to 600/1203-4).

‘Aṭūf II p. 378-82, 386-7; Sharwānī, Naz‘hat al-majalis (see below, appendix III); Rāzī III p. 420-1 (no. 1477); Hindāyat, Majma‘ I p. 481; Khayyām-pūr p. 481 (‘Kāfī i Bukhārāt’).

278. Sādī al-dīn Sharaf al-nudamāl ‘Ali b. ‘Umar al-Ghaznawī, whom ‘Aṭūf also calls ‘Mu‘izzī i Ghaznawī’ (but was this name actually used by the poet, or rather merely bestowed on him by the anthologist?), is quoted by ‘Aṭūf in his chapter on the poets of Ghaznaw and Lahore after the time of Sanjar (i.e., after 552/1157), where we find three panegyric poems, the first and third of which mention as his patron the Ghaznavid Sirāj al-daulah Khurram-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 Khurram-shāh b. Bahram-shāh (ca. 552/1157 to 555/1160). It is certainly possible that Sādī al-dīn served both sultans in succession, in which case his sobriquet Mu‘izzī Ghaznawī could refer to Khurram-shāh’s title Mu‘izzī al-daulah. But it could also be that Rāzī has misquoted the name of the patron.

‘Aṭūf II p. 405-7; Rāzī I p. 332 (no. 342; the laqab is missprinted); Khayyām-pūr p. 263; C.E. Bosworth, The later Ghaunavids, Edinburgh 1977, p. 128. [516]

279. A certain Sa‘īf al-dīn is included by ‘Aṭūf, who says that he met this poet in Nasā, presumably during his stay in that town in 600/1203-4, 2 in his chapter on the poets of Western Persia after the time of Sanjar. The verses quoted by ‘Aṭūf include an elegy on the death of one Fakhr al-dīn Zangi b. Munawwar.

‘Aṭūf II p. 404-5; Hindāyat, Riyāḍ p. 218-9; Khayyām-pūr p. 339 (‘Sa‘īf i Isfahānī’).
280. Šaft al-Ṭīf is the author of a poem lamenting the impermanence of the world, quoted by ‘Auﬁ in his chapter on the poets of Western Persia during the Seljuq period.

‘Auﬁ II p. 238-9; Hidâyat, Majma’ I p. 248 (follows ‘Auﬁ); Şafā, Tārīkh II p. 694-5; Khayyām-pūr p. 270.

281. al-Ḥakām ʿAli b. Ahmad al-Šaﬁ al-Naisābūrī is included in ‘Auﬁ’s chapter on the poets of the Seljuqs of Khurāsān, where he is credited with four ghazals and two rubā’īs. ‘Auﬁ’s contemporary Shams i Qais quotes (the same?) Šaﬁ Naisābūrī as the author of a contrived poem in which every mīraṭ contains the words sang and šm. The latter is cited also by Jāhārī, who adds a second poem of the same type. Daʿūlāt-shāh, who also has a few verses from the poem cited by Shams, adds that Šaﬁ was a eulogist of the Khwārazm-shāh ʿAlī al-dīn Teykā (568/1172 to 596/1200). There is also a ‘Šaﬁ’ to whom Rāzī, in his chapter on Naisābūr, ascribes one rubā’ī. Whether our poet is really identical with the Šaﬁ mentioned in PIG III p. 240 is unclear.

‘Auﬁ II p. 159-61; Shams p. 355-6; Jāhārī p. 144-xvi; Daʿūlāt-shāh p. 108; Rāzī II p. 267 (no. 757); Ḧāshar II p. 692-3; Hidâyat, Majma’ I p. 252; [517] Şafā, Tārīkh II p. 626-8; Khayyām-pūr p. 284.

282. al-Ḥakīm Sīhāb al-dīn Mūhammad b. ʿAlī al-Ṣārīqī is included by ‘Auﬁ, who admits to knowledge of only one religious qaṣīdah, in his chapter on the poets of Ghaznaw and Lahore after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157).

‘Auﬁ II p. 414-5; LN s.v. ‘Ṣārīqī’ p. 3; Khayyām-pūr p. 329.

283. Māmūd b. ʿAlī al-Sanaʿī al-Marwazī is included in ‘Auﬁ’s chapter on the poets of the Seljuqs of Khurāsān. Rāzī repeats a few of the verses cited by ‘Auﬁ, adding to them the information (or perhaps rather only his deduction) that our poet attended the court of Sanjar. Hidâyat, who likewise offers no verses apart from those quoted by ‘Auﬁ, says that he traded satires with Sīhāb.

‘Auﬁ II p. 145-7; Rāzī II p. 13-14 (no. 518; name misspelt in the edition); Hidâyat, Majma’ I p. 248; Şafā, Tārīkh II p. 685-8; Khayyām-pūr p. 276.

284. Abū l-Majd1 Majdūd b. ʿĀdam Ghaznawī, called Sanaʿī 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. Sanaʿī was born probably around 480/1087 (certainly not as early as 437/1045-6), as is claimed in several of the tadhkīrahah in Ghaznawī. The earliest period in his career is represented by a number of poems addressed to various middle-[518] ranking bureaucratic, military and religious figures of the time of Mardūk 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 of Ghaznawī, Mardūk ibn Saʿūd (whom dhūn he collected) and Mukhārī. Before the end of Mardūk’s reign he left his native town for Balkh, where he composed his first major work, the Kūn-namah i Balkh, in which he gives, from a distance, a spirited portrait of life in Ghaznawī; the approximate date of the poem is clear from the fact that he still speaks of Mardūk as the reigning sultan. In Balkh he entered the service of a certain Imām Asʿād, but he fell out with the latter and saw himself forced to flee to Sarakhs, where he enjoyed the patronage of a leading Hanafi cleric, Muḥammad b. Mānṣūr, to whom he dedicated a number of poems, including his mulknamah Sair al-tibdī. He also appears to have spent some time in Herat. He returned to Ghaznawī during the reign of Bahrām-shāh (511/1117 to 552/1157), who is the dedicatee of his principal work, Hadīqat al-hātqah, and of a number of panegyric poems. From the preface to the Hadīqat by Sanaʿī’s disciple Muḥammad al-Raﬀī it is evident that the poet died before that sultan, since Raﬀī tells us that his own posthumous edition of the poem was made at the explicit command of Bahrām-shāh. According to a supposed eye-witness account of Sanaʿī’s death that has been appended in many manuscripts to Raﬀī’s preface (though it is clearly not by Raﬀī himself) the poet died on Sunday 11 Shawwāl 525. This date corresponds, according to the tables, to 8 July 1131, which was a Wednesday; the discrepancy between Wednesday and Sunday seems too

1The karnāh is given thus by ‘Auﬁ and on the title page of some of the old Ms. The other components of the name are all attestable in the poems themselves.
great to be explained simply by a delayed sighting of the new crescent and suggests that the date has been tampered with. [519] But the year 525/1131 does seem to be consistent with the dates given in the rhymed epilogue to the Hadīghah,1 which suggest that Sanā’ī completed one version of the poem at the beginning of 525 and that Raffā’ī finished his (posthumous) edition of it in 534/1139-40. For the (wildly differing) dates given by the tudkhārahs see de Bruijn p. 23-5.

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

Mas.: Oxford Ms. Pers. d. 51 (Beeston 2549. Dated 29 Rabi’I 1007/1598); Elliot 108 (Bibl. 537); London I.O. 927 (ashār i Sanā’ī, including also mathnawis);3 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 Rabi’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 (Blcchet 1221. 16th century? Selections only); Istanbul Velidieddin 2627/6-7 (Ritter, Der Islam XXII, 1934, p. 102-3; de Bruijn p. 102-3. Dated 10 Rabi’I 684/1285); Halet Efendi 1353 (Mīrāqīm-hā I p. 498. Ms. dated 717/1317-8. Selection); [520] Ayasofya 2051/4 (Mīrāqīm-hā I p. 409-10. Ms. apparently dated Shawwāl 730/1330. ‘gāšt-hā’); Nafiz Paşa 894 (Ritter, Der Islam XXII, 1934, p. 103. Dated 13 Dhūl-hijjah 1013/1605); Nurumoaniye 3809 (Ateş 31. 17th century?); Tehran Milli 2353 (see de Bruijn p. 100-1. Supposedly 12th century);4 Bayānī (Nasukhā-hā I p. 16. Dated 995/1587); Univ. II 13/1 (Ms. dated 1 Jumādā I 1003/1595);

Gulistan-Āzbāyī I 275; Mashhūd Malik 5468 (see de Bruijn p. 98. 12th-13th century?); Rīdāwī VII 440 (Dated Rabi’I 1022/1613); Tashkent Acad. II 786-787 (17th century?); Kabul Museum 318 (Cat. p. 157; de Bruijn p. 98-100. Supposedly 12th century. Facsimile published in Kabul, 1356sh./1977); Bankipore I 22 (16th century?); Cacutta Ivanow 438/2 (16th-17th century?).

Editions: Tehran 1274/1858; 1320sh./1941 (ed. Murdāsī i Rīdāwī); 1336sh./1957 (ed. Mazāhīr i Mushāfī); 1341sh./1962 (revised and enlarged version of Murdāsī’s edition), reprinted 1356sh./1976; Bombay 1328/1910.

Mathnawīs:

(1) Kār-nāmāh i Balkhī, also called Mutāyabāh-nāmāh (inc.: wa’āk al naqsh-band i bē hāmāh * qāṣīd i ṭajgān i bē-nāmāh). See above, p. 518.


(2) Sair al-bīrādī l-ma‘ād, or Kunūz al-ramūz, (inc.: māhshāb i bārd i sulṭān-wash * fa’ḥt-at az ḍh u tāj-at az ṭāṣash) 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-dīn Rāzī. Cf. de Bruijn p. 118.
(3) Hadigat al-baqiqah wa shari‘at al-farigah, (inc.: ai darun-parwar i biran-arby * ai khirad-bakhsh i bekhirad-bakhshty) Sanati’s best-known work, is a long didactic poem with some interspersed narrative passages. The textual history of the work is discussed by de Brujin, p. 119-39. Many copies begin with a preface in prose by Mu‘ammad b. ‘Ali al-Rafig (which, in some manuscripts, has been clumsily reworked into a preface to the divan attributed to Sanati himself) describing the genesis of the poem: Bahram-shah invited Sanati to attend his royal court, but the poet excused himself and instead sent him a poem {523} with the name Fukht-r-namah. Afterwards, he began work on a book with the title Hadigat al-baqiqah (etc.). Some envious people tried to dispense (mutsafarrig 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 (an-chih gafah badd; presumably meaning his own rough draft) and sent it to Khwajah Imám Burhán al-dín in Baghdad. Then he compiled another copy from the material remaining in his possession (an-chih ha dast i o binanda). After the poet’s death the author of the preface prepared a copy at the command of Bahram-shah. 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 Fukht-r-namah and de Brujin has shown that at least the older of these seems to contain Sanati’s first, considerably shorter, version (or perhaps rather the truncated edition of the same prepared by the ‘envious people’?). Most other manuscripts contain a verified epilogue, apparently written by Sanati for the copy that he sent to Baghdad and subsequently reproduced in the definitive edition by Rafi’i. 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 Rafi’i’s recension) and others again contain what is apparently a contamination of the two versions.

Mss.: [Dublin] T.C.D. 1559 (Dated 930/1523-4); [Bodleian] 380 (17th century?); [524] Manchester Lindesiana 843 (Copied by Ahmad b. al-

1See above p. 520 (divan).
Hašib Abī Ḩabīl q. 29 in Shawwāl 681/1283. See also de Bruijn p. 126; Lin- desiana 13 (16th century?); Lindesiana 12 (= Robinson p. 226-7. Dated Rajab 1016/1607. Pictures); Lindesiana 106 (17th century?); Oxford Fraser 93 (Eṭḥē 531. Dated 20 Shawwāl 1002/1594); Ms. Pers. d. 51 fol. 264b sqq. (Beeston 2549. Dated 29 Rajab 1 1007/1598; Ouseley Add. 37 (Eṭḥē 534. Dated 12 Dhū l-qa'dāh 1056/1646; Ouseley 315 (Eṭḥē 533. Dated during the governorship of Sultan Muhammad Murād-bakhsh, who died in 1071/1661, but Ethat thinks this colophon was added later); Whinfield B3 (Beeston 2550. End missing); Ind. Inst. Pers. 43 (Beeston 2551. 18th century?); Elliot 151 (Eṭḥē 528); Elliot 152 (Eṭḥē 529); Elliot 153 (Eṭḥē 530); Elliot 154 (Eṭḥē 532); Ouseley Add. 88 (Eṭḥē 535); London I.O. 916/1 (Ms. dated Jumādā 2 637/1240. Defective; Add. 25,329 (Rieu p. 550. Dated Saḥāf 890/1485); Or. 358 (Rieu p. 550. 16th century?); Or. 451/4 (Rieu Supp. 215. Completed 14 Rabī’ II 1023/1614); I.O. 918 (Dated 1027/1618); Add. 16,778 (Rieu p. 551. Dated 1040/1630-1); Or. 9655 (Meredith-Owens p. 67. Dated 1048/1638-9); I.O. 915/1 (Ms. completed Muharram 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. Muhammad Shīrāzī. Incomplete); I.O. 920; I.O. 921 (defective); I.O. 922 (defective); Cambridge Or. 1584 (2nd Supp. 370. Dated 1004/1595-6); Add. 3209 (Browne Cat. CCIII. Dated 3 Safar 1012/1603 and copied from and collated with a Ms. dated Ramādān 617/1220); Add. 810 (Browne Cat. CCIV. Dated 26 Rabī’ II 1032/1623); Or. 254 (Browne Supp. 392. Dated 1067/1656-7); Or. 272 (Browne Supp. 393. Dated 1094/1683); Browne Coll. V.6; Paris Suppement 1494 (Blocchet 1215. Dated 7 Rabī’ II 908/1502); Suppement 1839 (Blocchet 1216. Dated <1 > 122/1710); Suppement 703 (Blocchet 1217. 18th century?); [525] Strasbourg Landauer 20 (= Hoyghūghi 8. Dated 1 Jumādā II 1035/1621); Landauer 21 (= Hoyghūghi 9. Dated 29 Dhū l-hijjah 1069/1658); Tūrin 70/1 (Dated 1003/1595); 69 (Dated 1049/1640); Rome Vatican Pers. 88 (Rossi p. 106-7. Copied by Sāyiḏ Jamāl al-dīn b. Muḥammad al-Husainī and dated 19 Shāb‘ān 1020/1611); [1] Leyden Cat. V. p. 181 no. 2579 (Dated 987/1579. Pictures); Heidelberg Or. P. 430 (Berenbach II p. 88; de Bruijn p. 126. Copied by Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. Muhammad and
al-Shirāzī and dated Shāh bān 934/1528); Sipah-sālār II 1131 (Dated 1607/1608-9); Gulistan/Attabāy II 451/II (Dated 1 Jumādā II 1018/1609); Gulistan/Attabāy I 273 (Copied by Qutb al-dīn b. Ḥasan and dated Rabī’ I 1025/1616); Majlis II 917 (Dated 1025/1616); Shāhī Ḥasanī 259 (olūm Bayānī. Copied by Mīr Muḥammad Qāsim in 1051/1641-2); Gulistan/Attabāy I 270 (Dated 29 Ramaḍān 1070/1660); Gulistan/Attabāy I 269 (Contains a seal dated 1072/1662-1); Gulistan/Attabāy II 433/II (Ms., dated 1 Ṣafar 1073/1662); Gulistan/Attabāy I 272; Gulistan/Attabāy II 454/II; Majlis I 625; Majlis I 653 (‘old’); Majlis I 916 (15th century); Sipah-sālār II 1132; Tashkent Acad. II 790 (Dated 11 Ṣafar 1010/1601); Dushanbe Acad. II 344-349; Kabul Museum 318 (Cat. p. 157; de Bruijn p. 98-100. Supposedly 12th century. Facsimile published in Kabul, 1356h.[1977]; [527] Bombay Rehatsek p. 134 no. 25 (Dated 1005/1596-7); Univ. 111 (Dated Ṣafar 1106/1694); Rehatsek p. 134 no. 24 (Dated 40th year of ʿĀlam-giri/1718. With a commentary); Rehatsek p. 133 no. 23; Kapurthala 59 (OCM II/4, 1927, p. 19. Dated 1086/1675-6); Allgarh Subh. p. 41 no. 49 (Dated 1057/1647); Lucknow Sprenger 496 (several copies); Bankiopore I 18 (15th century?); I 17 (16th century?); Suppt. i 1805 (18th century?); Hyderabad Āṣafyah I p. 414 nos. 389 (Dated 871/1667-8); 388, 497; Āṣafyah III p. 196 no. 1503; Madras 107-110; Calcutta Būhār 281 (16th century? End missing); Ivanov 438/4 (16th-17th century?); Būhār 282 (Copied by Muhammad Rīdā Mīrṣī and dated Rabī’ I 1033/1623-4; some leaves added later); Madrasah ČXXV (Dated 3 Shāh bān 1099/1687); Ivanov 439 (17th century?); Ivanov 444 (17th century? Bk. 1 only); Ivanov 442 (Dated 1186/1772-3); Ivanov 440 (18th century? Defective); Ivanov 441 (18th century?); Ivanov 443 (18th century?); Chicogo Collection of Ḥa’il Ina’il (Mirkīfūlm-Hā d. I. p. 75; de Bruijn p. 124-5. Copied by Siyāwūsh b. ʿAbī l-Fāḍl al-Marwazi and dated 2 Shāh bān 588/1192. Title given as ʿAlīh-nīmāh. Defective). Editions: Bombay 1275/1858-9; Lucknow 1295/1878; Tehran 1329h./1950-1 (ed. M. T. Muhammad i Ṣadiq; see the review by H. Ritter, Orients V, 1952, p. 190-2, and de Bruijn p. 123).


Abridgments:

(a) Ṣīḥāb (or Muntakhab) i hadīqah, or Ṣīḥāb (Istanbul copies: Muntakhab) az muntakhab i hadīqah, (inc.: ʿādāt b. hadīqat i yazdān rā’ maddh b. gaddh dārāt i subhān rā, or in some copies: ṣīḥāb u shakur u thānā ʿalā l-tīyat ʿdāt i ḥaq rā sazd ba istīqāqah = ‘incipit II’), by an author [528] who calls himself Dāʾī, presumably Nizām al-dīn Mahmūd b. al-Hāsān al-Ḥusainī al-Shīrāzī, known as Dāʾī, who collected his dīwān in 856/1450-1, when he was 55 years old, and who is also the author of a commentary on Rūmī’s Mathnawī.1 In at least some copies it contains verses in which the compiler says that with it he has reduced his earlier epitome of the Ḥadīqah to 100 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 Sanāʾī himself, or else to ʿĀṭār. See also de Bruijn, p. 121.

Mss.: Oxford Osceola 190 (Ethē 356, Dated 930/1523-4); Canonici Or. 122 (Ethē 2405; Robinson 1037-44. Copied by ʿAli al-Kātib al-Sulṭānī 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 Naʾshābīpūrī, ca. 950/1543); I.O. 925 (incipit II); Berlin Petermann 444 (Pertsch 718. Copied by Muʾīn b. Raḍī al-dīn al-ʿAdī hamī b. and dated Ṣafar 905/1500. Title given as Thumarat al-ḥadīqah li ʿabī al-hadīqah); 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 (Karataş 393. Copied by Shaṃs al-dīn Muḥammad al-Shārīf al-Kirmānī in 916/1510-1. Incipit II. Title given as Ḥadīqat al-ḥadīqah); Université Fry 498 (Ateş 43. 16th century?); Université Fry 1122 (Ateş 45. 17th century?); Tehran Gulistan/Attabāy I 274 (15th century? Pictures, one of which is signed by Bahrām Qāfī Afshār Naqāqāh); Gulistan/Attabāy I 276; Gulistan/Attabāy II 455; Bombay Univ. 13; Lucknow Sprenger 130 (incipit II); Bankiopore I 19 (Copied by Muhammad ʿAṭā b. ʿIzz al-dīn Ahmad and dated 3 Dhū l-Ḥijjah 1061/1651. Ca. 1200 verses); I 20 (Copied by Jān Moḥammad b.

1See also Ebr s.v. ‘Dāʾī Shīrāzī’ (Dh. Ṣafā), where the abridgement of the Ḥadīqah is not mentioned.

(b) Unidentified or unspecified epitomes: Mss.: Paris Supplément 704 (Blochet 1218. 16th century?); Ancien fonds 325 fol. 1v-4r (Blochet 2156/Richard. Ms. dated 1071/1661. 79 verses only); Leningrad Dom CCCLI (Copied by Shāh Muḥammad in 928/1522); Istanbul Université FY 538/17 (Atēs 41. Dated 826/1423); Université FY 1080 (Atēs 42. 15th century?); Tehran Gulistān/Atābāy II 461/III (Ms. contains a seal with the date 1107/1695-6).

Commentaries and glossaries:
(a) Latīf al-hadīṭa'q min naftā'is al-duqā'iq, or in some copies Sharḥ al-hadīṭa'q, by 'Abd al-Lātīf b. 'Ābd Allāh al-Abbaušī (died 1048/1638-9 or 1049/1639-40), for whom see PL I p. 807 n. 5. A revised text of the Hadīṭa'q on the basis of various manuscripts with commentary, completed in 1042/1632-3 with help from Mir 'Imād al-dīn Muḥammad, 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 Jumādā I 1044/1634. Apparently the author’s autograph of the abridged version); I.O. 924 (Written in the reign of Muḥammad Shāh); Or. 11684 (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?); [530] Cambridge King’s, No. 151 (Browne Suppl. 394. Dated Rabī‘ I 1102/1690. Title given as Mirāt al-hadīṭa'q, presumably the same work?); Edinburgh Univ. 273 (Dated <10>51/1641-2); Turin Bibli. Nazionale Ms. III.3 (Piemontese 354. Dated 17 Dhū l-Qa‘dah 1049/1640); Bankiopore I 21; Calcutta Ivanov 445 (Dated 38th year of Aurangzēb/1107/1695-6. 2nd half only); Ivanov Curzon 192 (17th-18th century?); Bihār 283-4 (19th century?); Aligarh Subb. p. 49 no. 12.
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Edition: Tehran 1348sh./1969 (in Mathnawi-hā i Ḥakīm Sanāʾī, ed. M.T. Mudarris in Riḍwān, p. 17-47. J.T.P. de Bruijn tells me that this poem has been republished as the work of Fīz al-dīn Mahmūd Kāshānī (died 735/1334-5), in Sīh shahr bar savānīh al-ʿushkhaṭq i Ahmad i Ghazālī, ed. A. Mījāhīd, Tehran 1372sh./1993, p. 3-30).

(4) Ḵān-nāmah is a short didactic work without dedication or internal indication of its [533] authorship. de Bruijn (p. 114-5) considers it probably spurious.

Mss.: London I.O. 914/7; I.O. 915/3 (Dated Muḥarram 1061/1651); I.O. 927 fol. 393b-411; Istanbul Velieddin 2627/2 (Ritter, Der Islam XXII, 1934, p. 102-3; de Bruijn p. 102-3, 126. Ms. dated 14 Jumādā I 684/1285); Faith 3734/3 (Ritter-Reinert p. 115. Ms. copied by Gulshānī Ḥarawī and dated 884/1479-80); Tehran Sīphal-sālār 347/2 (Munz. 32392. Dated 920/1514); Dushanbe Acad. II 351 (17th-18th century?). Cf. Munz. IV 32390-4.

(5) Taḥrimat al-qalam, or Taqribat al-ilm, is another short māthnāwī without dedication and is likewise probably spurious (see de Bruijn p. 115-7).


1ʿArūfī p. 28; Abū ʿI-l-Raʾṣān Qumnī, Tārīkh al-wusūrāt, ed. M.T. Dānih-pazūhī, Tehran 1365sh./1985, p. 17-18; Rāwīdī, Rābat al-sudūr, ed. M. Ḥaqūlī, passim; ʿAuṣī II p. 252-7; id., Jawāmiʿ III p. 58, 316; Shams passim; Mustaʿṣfī p. 660, 736; Daqaqīq al-akbār (Oxford

285. Majd al-dîn Iftikâr al-ḫâkäm Abû l-Šâhîr (or al-Shâhârî) al-Sândîfî is included in ‘Aufî’s chapter on the poets of Khurásân after the time of Sanjâr (i.e. after 552/1157), where we find a gâštāh dedicated to one ‘Pahlawânî al-jâhân Dyâ’ al-dîn Qâdî al-Tîlâk’. 2


286. Shâh Bû Râjî - or perhaps rather Shâh in Bû Râjî (i.e. Shâh, son of Abû Râjî) - is listed by ‘Aridî among the Ghaznavid poets. ‘Aufî calls him al-Ḫâkim Shâhâb al-dîn Shâh ‘Alî Abî Râjî al-Ghaznavî, 3 (read either Shâh ‘Alî al-Ḫâkim Râjî or Shâh ‘Alî Abî Râjî), and quotes, along with some shorter pieces, two odes to Abû l-Muzaffar Bahrâm-Shâh b. Mas‘ûd (511/1117 to 552/1157; the king’s name is mentioned in both poems). Ibn al-Mujâwîr quotes two verses ‘li ibn al-Râjî’ (read li

1This ghâzal by Sanâ‘î is also quoted anonymously (and not identified by the editor), with some significant variants, in Jâjarmî II p. 1106-7.
2Thus according to ‘Aufî. In the verses themselves the dedicatee is addressed only as Dyâ’ al-dîn.
3The name given to him by Râzî, namely Shâhâb al-dîn Shâh ‘Alî Râjî, is evidently a corruption of this.
verse: tāju l-malāk Nusrāt i dān, khasrau-ē kih hast * bar nām i 0 āt ḥanāh mulk i Tabarsāt; evidently the Bāwandid Nusrāt 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 Shāhīr which are quoted by ‘Auft. Hidāyat quotes some verses from the ode cited by Jājjāmī and adds two more poems.


289. Shams al-dīn Lāghārī is quoted by Rāwandi (Rāhat al-sudār, p. 394-5) as the author of three verses mocking the bāṭiniyān (Ismā‘īlīs).

290. Shams Sujaśī is, according to Mustaftā, a poet who collected the dhvān of Zāhir Fāryābī 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 Zāhir’s poems. (See below, p. 558.)

One gāstūdah by Shams al-dīn al-Sujaśī is found in Bologna Biblioteca Universitaria Ms. 3283/V (Piemontese 3, 13th century?) and three verses by ‘Shams al-dīn Tāhir Sujaśī’ are cited by Rāzī.

Sharwānī, Nuz’bat al-majālis (see below, appendix III); Mustafī p. 736; Rāzī III p. 201-2 (no. 1301); Ḥājjī Khalīfah III p. 293, no. 5532.

291. Shams al-dīn Mubārak-Shāh b. al-A’azz al-Sijrī2 is quoted in ‘Auft’s chapter on the poets of Khurāsān after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157), where we find, among other things, a [537] qif’il dedicated to Nāṣir al-dīn; the wazir of the maliks of Nīmroḵ (i.e. Sistan),2 a rubā‘ī addressed to one Bahrām-shāh (evidently not the Ghaznavid, but his namesake, the ruler of Sīstān from 610/1212 to 618/1221), a eulogy on one Nāṣir al-dīn ‘Uthmān (evidently the brother of the just-mentioned Bahrām-shāh, khudawand Nāṣir al-dīn ‘Uthmān b. Ḥarb, who died in 604/1207-8)3 and a poem which he wrote (still according to ‘Auft) during his imprisonment in Kirmān.

1Thrus ‘Auft, Ms. ’S’. Browne, following Ms. ‘E’, reads the nizāḥah as al-Sanjarī.
2For this wazir see above, p. 328 (Farād al-dīn).
3According to Tārīkh i Sīstān p. 392-3.

LATE ELEVENTH TO EARLY THIRTEENTH CENTURY

445

‘Auft II p. 348-9; Rāzī I p. 293-4 (no. 304); Khāyām-pūr p. 306 (‘Shams i Sanjarī’).

292. Shams al-dīn Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Karim al-Tabāsī1 is the author of a slender dhvān preserved notably in two ancient manuscripts in Dublin and London. Hardly anything is known about him except that in one of his poems2 he mentions the building of a fortress in the year 591/1195. ‘Auft speaks of him in the past tense. Zakāryā’ī al-Qazwīnī says that Shams al-Tabāsī was a pupil of Raṣī al-dīn al-Naisabūrī 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 ‘Auft and from Shams’s dhvān) employing the same rhyme and metre as a ‘famous’ poem by ‘the qādī of Bukhārā Ṣadr al-sharṭah’ (in fact it is by Maṣṭūr b. Maḥmūd al-Ūjandī)3 and he adds that Shams’s poem was addressed to the wazir of Bukhārā’. Zakāryā’ī says further that Shams died young.

At least one of Shams’s odes is clearly dedicated to one or other of the Burhānī ṣadra.4 [538] But the majority of his poems are addressed to a wazir whom he calls Nīṣām al-mulk Ṣadr al-dīn Muhammad b. Muhammad,5 who has not been identified satisfactorily, but who is perhaps the ‘wazir of Bukhārā’ mentioned by Zakāryā’ī. Modern scholars have described Shams as a poet at the court of the Qarakhanids, but it does not seem possible to substantiate this.6

1Thrus ‘Auft.
2Dhvān p. 89.
3See above, p. 411-2.
4Dhvān p. 72-4. In l. 1268 the patron is addressed as ofṣar i Burhānīyān.
5Name and patronym are found on p. 53 l. 965 and p. 78 l. 1355 (with textual variants in the latter passage).
6The eight verses ascribed to Shams Tabāsī in the Afkār al-wazīrd of Saif al-dīn Ḥājjī b. Nīṣām ‘Aṣlī, ed. J. Husaini Urmiwī, Tehran 1337/1959, p. 5-6, in which the poet quotes some verses which he says were addressed to him in a dream by the ghost of Firdausī, are in fact by Shams al-dīn Ḥarb (from Jābāl, a village near Qum; see Ādāb, new edition, II p. 1258-9, where a different poem of his can be found), as will be demonstrated in the entry devoted to this poet in PL VI. The ‘quotation’ from Firdausī recurs in the ‘Baṣyānghūr’ preface to the Shah-nāmeh as well as in other late sources, as is discussed (with incorrect conclusions) by M.A. Riyāhī, Sar-ṣawādah-ṣaw al-Firdausī-shīfti, Tehran 1372-3/1993-4, p. 305-8. (I am indebted to Kambiz Eslami of Princeton, who called my attention to this for me inaccessible publication and provided photocopies of the relevant pages.)

Edition: Mashhad 1343h./1965 (ed. T. Biniş, mainly from the Dublin and India Office Mss., with extensive notes).


293. al-Ḥâkim Shamsî al-'Araj al-Bukhârî was another of the poets connected with the Āl i Burhân of Bûkâhârî. 'Aufi quotes, among other things, a qîra'âth composed after the death of 'Abd al-sa'îd (a title given both to 'Abd al-'Azîz I b. 'Umar [539] and to his great-grandson 'Abd al-'Azîz II, who died in 593/1196-7, and who is evidently intended here) and another addressed to al-Ṣâd al-kâhîr Umar (II) b. Manûzîd (who succeeded the just mentioned 'Abd al-'Azîz II and died before 603/1206).


294. Sharaîf al-ḫuqâ'â Shamsî Dhihistânî is credited with one ghâzal in 'Aufi's chapter on the poets of Khurásân after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157).

'Aufi II p. 355; Khaiyâm-pûr p. 308.

295. Sharaîf al-dîn Panjâdîh is the subject of the last entry in 'Aufi's chapter on the poets of Khurásân after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157). 'Aufi says that he was from the vicinity of Zâwâh and

1 Instead of the Panjîdîh of Ms. E, Ms. S. has in one place by hûdî, in another the same name without dots.
2 For whom see above, p. 407 and 509.
3 Nâshîf, in the notes to his edition of 'Aufi, has collected the material on the various members of this family contained in the Kêtâb al-jawâhir al-mud'allî fi ta'âqût al-hanâfîyabah of Ibn Abî 1-Wâfî. They seem to have used a shared shurbîrî which appears in the printed text as 'îbn šîrîh' or 'îbn šîrîh' or 'îbn šîrîh' with other predictable graphic variants (q or gh or m for f; etc.) The fluctuation between š and m is less easy to explain away as mere scribal negligence and suggests rather an Iranian form with š-b: in this case the various Arabic spellings could reflect a local (Isfahânî) variant of Persian shub-nîyâth, 'Black-face'. There is in any event no justification for the claim by the authors of the late ta'âqûtîn that Šîrâwîrah (or whatever) is the name of a village near Isfahân; 'îbn Šîrîh' is clearly a family name referring to a remote ancestor.
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Ghiyāth al-dīn Kāi-Khusrau 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-Khusrau's brother and rival Rūkn al-dīn Sulaimān II (592/1196 to 600/1204), the king to whom Rāwandī [541] (as he himself tells us) had originally intended to dedicate his book. As quoted by Jājarmī, the poem is a rebus or picture-poem; in the second mīrāj of each verse the words are represented by pictures and the reader is evidently expected to put in the words that fit the metre and rhyme. In the unique manuscript of Rāwandī's book there are apparently no pictures, but the poem is preceded by a rubā'ī which instructs the reader to 'recite one half (of each verse) as it is written, for the other half has meaning and metre through the names of the pictures'; it is thus clear that in Rāwandī's original manuscript the poem must have appeared in the same semi-pictorial form as in Jājarmī's anthology.

A.H. Morton has recently devoted a detailed study to this picture-poem and pointed out that the versions quoted by Daulat-shāh and in the London manuscript are very close to each other; in particular both omit one verse, thus spoiling the structure of the stanzas. He suggests that the poem is in fact by Sharaf al-dīn and was dedicated to Toghrul and that it was quoted by Daulat-shāh evidently from a copy that was already defective in the same way as the London manuscript. Rāwandī then re-worked the ode as a picture-poem and re-dedicated it first to Sulaimān and then to Kāi-Khusrau, Jājarmī in turn quoted it either from the first (now lost) version of Rāwandī's history, or from some other unknown work of his. This is certainly a plausible conclusion, though one might wonder whether the poem is not really by Rāwandī and that it was dedicated by him to three Seljuqs in succession, but that the notoriously unreliable Daulat-shāh has wrongly ascribed it to Sharaf al-dīn. It would in this case have entered [542] the manuscripts of the dīvān of Sharaf al-dīn from Daulat-shāh's tādīkhārah.

What seems to be a much fuller recension of Sharaf's dīvān is found in the Calcutta manuscript and this contains (according to Ivanow) not only but a large number of poems to Toghrul as well as some to Ėldūgūz, but this needs checking.

1Yak nima nībahānih khvān, kik dā nīm i digar (text: nīmā digar, which is ungrammatical) * az nīm i sawwar ma'nawī h os mūsulīn ast.
from the same poem from occur also (with minor variants) as the first and second verses of a q̄iṣaḥ which Saif b. Muhammad al-Harawi aspirates to ‘Mu‘ayyad i Nasafi’. It is thus possible that Shihāb is quoting here two verses of his father’s. Rāzi adds one ḡisṭaḥ and two verses not quoted by ‘Auﬁ, while Hidayat adds two further poems, one of which refers to the poet’s patron as ‘Ma‘lik Tamghāḥ Khān Mās‘ūd Rūkan al-dīn wa l-dunyā’.

Further poems are quoted by Nafṣī from an unidentified safānah, and one of [545] these is dedicated to ‘khuṣrau i mashriq Mās‘ūd’, evidently the same monarch. There were two Qarakhānids by the name of Mās‘ūd, but if we are to attach any importance to the fact that ‘Auﬁ includes our poet (and his father) in his chapter devoted to bards who ﬂourished after the time of Sānjār (i.e. after 552/1157), then the intended reader must be Rūkan al-dīn wa l-dunyā Qalīb Tamghāḥ Khān Mās‘ūd (II) b. al-Hasan (ca. 556/1160 to 574/1178). Our poet is presumably identical with the ‘Shihāb i dīn i Mu‘ayyad’ praised in a poem by Sāzān, whose principal patron was precisely the aforementioned Mās‘ūd II.

Qazwīnī wrote that the ‘Shihāb’ listed by ‘Auﬁ (p. 28) among the poets of the Seljuqs is ‘apparently’ (ḡayy) to be identiﬁed with Shihāb al-dīn b. Mu‘ayyad, but this seems far from certain. In the surviving verses our poet refers to himself as ‘Shihāb’, not ‘Shihāb’.

‘Auﬁ II p. 362-7; Shams p. 441; Sharwānī, Nuz̄hat al-majalīs (see below, appendix III); Rāzi III p. 356-60 (no. 1429); Hidayat, Majma‘ I p. 310-1; Nafṣī’s notes to his edition of Baihaqī, III p. 1352-5, 1534-46, 1549; Sāfā, Tarṭīb II p. 769-74; LN s.v. ‘Aḥmad’ p. 1451-2; Khaṣyām-pūr p. 310 (‘Shihāb i Sarmaqandī’).

299. Shihāb Ghazāl (or Ghazāl) Khujandī? is known to us only from a few fragments quoted by [546] ‘Auﬁ. These include a rubā‘?

---

1For whom see above, p. 416-7. 2Auﬁ II p. 366, l. 13-14.
mocking Sanjar, evidently in the aftermath of his defeat at the hands of the Ghuzz in 548/1153, and some verses in praise of Shihāb al-daulah wa l-dīn, wazīr in Herat. ‘Aufī also quotes two verses which he heard from the poet’s own mouth (evidently in Buhkārā) and which had been addressed to him by ‘Būrān i islām’ (i.e. al-sadr al-kabīr ‘Umar II. b. Mas‘ūd, the clerical ruler of Buhkārā from 593/1196-7 to ca. 616/1219) at the time when Shihāb arrived in Buhkārā from Marw. Two poems by perhaps the same Shihābī are quoted by Saif Harawī. See also above p. 324 (Diyāb) and 381-2 (Khālīsh).

‘Aufī II p. 392-3; Saif Harawī p. 103-4, 120; Rāzī III p. 459 (no. 1527); Khaiyām-pūr p. 311.

300. Mu‘īn al-dīn Sīrāj Bakkī is the author of two ghazzals quoted by ‘Aufī in his chapter on the poets of Khūrāsān after the time of Sanjar (i.e. after 552/1157). Rāzī has in his chapter on the notable men of Bakkī an entry on one ‘Sīrāj al-dīn’ which begins with the same words as ‘Aufī’s entry on Sīrāj Bakkī, but quotes a different set of verses, and states that this poet served at the court of the Khwārazm-shāh.

‘Aufī II p. 323-4; Rāzī II p. 76-7 (no. 565); Hidāyat, Majmā‘ I p. 247; Khaiyām-pūr p. 264 (‘Sīrāj’ and ‘Sīrāj’).

301. Jamāl al-dīn Fakhr al-shu‘rā’ī Muḥammad b. ‘Alī al-Sīrājī is also quoted in ‘Aufī’s chapter on the poets of Khūrāsān after the time of Sanjar as the author of three poems, two of them expressly dedicated to the last Ghaznavīd ruler of Lahore, Sīrāj al-daulah Khusrāw-Malik (555/1160 to 582/1186) from whom the poet evidently had his pen-name.

This poet and the one mentioned in the previous entry are evidently both different from the Sīrājī, alīsī al-dīn Khurasanī, a native of Khurasan who attached himself to the sultan of Delhi Shams al-dīn Iltumish (607/1211 to 633/1236) and whose dīwān has been published by Nazir Ahmad (Aligarh 1972) which a valuable introduction in Persian and English. He is on the border between our period and the next, but has been held over for the next volume of this survey.

‘Aufī II p. 324-7; Hidāyat, Majmā‘ I p. 245; Khaiyām-pūr p. 246 (‘Sīrāj’ i Khurāsānī’).
grave stone; 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 poem he lists his illustrious predecessors in the art of diatribe: Muṣhīj, Khujastah, Khwājieh Najibī, Khatīrī, Tāyīān, Qarī, and Ḥakīkāt. Identifiable victims are the poets Sanāʾī and Wāṭwāṭ; the Niẓāmī against whom one of his poems is directed is presumably not Niẓāmī of Ganjak, whom he is unlikely to have met, but rather Sōzanī’s compeer Niẓāmī Arūḍī Samarqandī. The satirical poems contain many rare (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 qastāhs on the other hand are written in an unencumbered style reminiscent of the poets of the 10th and 11th centuries.

Daulatsāh 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.

Mss. of his diwān: Oxford Eliot 110 (Eteth 541. Lacunae); Oasly Add. 89 (Eteth 542); London Or. 11521 (Meredith-Owens p. 53, 16th-17th century?); Cambridge Or. 563 (Brownes Supp. 1071); Paris Supplément 783 fol. 57v sqq. (Blechet 1891, 16th century? Selections); Berlin Sprenger 1520 (Pertsch 716); Istanbul Fatih 3831 (Ritter-Reinert p. 116-7. Dated Shab’būn 880/1475); Tehran Gulistān/Āṭābāy II 465/15 (14th-15th century? 7 qastāhs only); Sipahā-sālār II 1204 (Dated 1033/1623-4); Gulistān/Āṭābāy I 278 (Dated Shawwāl 1258/1842);

1P. 93.
2See above, p. 197-8.
3Above, p. 177.
4Perhaps Najibī Farāghīnī, above p. 436.
5Above, p. 177.
6Above, p. 230-1.
7Above, p. 214.
8Above, p. 253-6.
9Above, p. 167.

1It is noteworthy that Arūḍī makes no mention of him in his Chahār maqālah. For the person that Sōzanī calls shtar-i khtum-khtuh see above, p. 341-2 (falsā).
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 Gurgān.¹ the capital of Khwāzām; from this one can perhaps deduce that Dulaat-shāh (or his source) had these dates from the tombstone. The implied birth-date is in any case consistent with Juwaït’s statement that Rashīd was ‘past his 80th year’ when he greeted the accession to the throne of the Khwārism-shāh ‘Alā al-dīn Tekish in 568/1172, indicating that he was born a few years before 488/1095. The year given for his death in Yāqūt’s biographical dictionary, namely 573/1177-8 (in figures and not spelled out), is perhaps a scribe’s error for 578.

Rashīd was chief secretary (ṣāḥib dawān al-insāḥ) under the Khwārism-shāh Ātsız (521/1127 to 551/1165) and his successor Āl-i- Ārsāl (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 Ātsız earned him the enmity of the Seljuq sultan Sanjar who, according to an anecdote told by Juwaït (and repeated by many others), at one point resolved to have Rashīd cut into thirty pieces, but who was dissuaded from doing so by his own chief secretary, Muntājāb al-dīn al-Juwaït, the uncle of our informant’s great-grandfather. We possess a considerable number of Rashīd’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 [553] letters in both languages.² Rashīd’s Persian dawān, containing more than 8500 verses in Naṣīf’s edition, consists largely of poems eulogising Ātsız. The fact that none of the poems is dedicated to that king’s successors led Naṣīf to the conclusion that Rashīd left Khwārism after the death of Ātsız, but this

¹ Dulaat-shāh p. 91, using the arabicized form Ḫarāshīyah.
² These few Persian letters that Warāt collected himself in Abū’l-ʿalāʾ ʿAlī al-khwārism shāh wa ʿAlī al-mardvīd were published with an extensive introduction, by Y. Tûsirkân as Nāmāh-hā i Rashīd al-dīn Warāt, Tehran 1333/1950, and a large number of Arabic letters were published (from an unidentified source) by Muhammad Fahmi under the title Miṣnaʿat ruṣūlī Rashīd al-dīn al-Warāt, 2 parts, Cairo 1315/1897-8. Ten of the latter are translated and analysed by H. Horst, ‘Arabische Briefe der Ḥūrāznmächte an den Kalifenhof aus der Feder des Ṣadīq al-dīn Warāt’, 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 Großeignungen (sic) und Ḥūrāznmächte, Wiesbaden 1964.
overlooks the fact that many of his letters were clearly written on behalf of El-Arsân and several refer explicitly to events during his reign.\footnote{E.g. Majma‘āt I p. 24 and 31 refer to the accession of the caliph al-Mustanjid in 555/1160.} Thus the absence of poems dedicated to Ațaz’s successors shows only that Rashīd compiled his dhawān long before the end of his life.

For his prose writings in Persian and Arabic see my article in \textit{EP}. A discussion of his paraphrases (in prose and verse) of the sayings of the first four caliphs is planned for \textit{PL IV} (Traditions).

Mss. of the \textit{dhawān}: \begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Dublin} Beatty 103/Ill (Ms. completed Dhu‘l-hijjah 699/1300);
\item \textit{London} Or. 3376 (Rieu Suppt. 234. Dated 2 Dhū‘l-qa‘dah 1002/1594. Imperfect at end);
\item Add. 16,791 (Rieu p. 553. Dated Ramadān 1063/1653);
\item Or. 283 (Rieu p. 553. 17th century?);
\item Or. 2889/IV (Rieu Suppt. 212. Completed 28 Jumādā I 1293/1876);
\item \textit{Tehran} Majlis 4841/1 (Munz. 26969. Dated Rabi‘ II 996/1588);
\item \textit{Sipahsālār} II 1196 (18th century?);
\item \textit{Masjīd} Rashīd ‘Allī VII 428 (Dated Jumādā II 1012/1603);
\item \textit{Lucknow} Spranger 464 (Dated 1064/1653-4);
\item \textit{Madras} I 20 (‘very old’).
\end{itemize}


309. Muhammad b. ‘Uthmān al-Yāmīnī al-Kātib is included by ‘Auṣfī in his chapter on the poets of Ghazna and Lahore at the time of the Seljuqs, where we find a qaṣdah dedicated to the Ghaznavid Yāmīn al-Dīn al-daulah Bahrām-shāh (511/1117 to 552/1157), to whom he owed his pen-name, as well a number of ghazals and rubā‘iyāt. ‘Auṣfī also mentions a lost work of his with the title \textit{Bāzūn-ṭrā ‘u Fakhrī}. Hīdāyāt splits the poems cited by ‘Auṣfī between two poets, ‘Kātib i Khurasānī’ and ‘Yāmīn i Ghaznavī’, both of whom he makes contemporaries of Mahmūd of Ghazna.


310. al-Kāfī Zafar al-Hamadānī is the first name in ‘Auṣfī’s chapter on the poets of Western Persia during the Seljuq period. Here we find a ghazal as well as a qaṣdah praising a king by the name of Malik-shāh, who could in principle be either Malik-shāh (I) b. Alp-Arsân (465/1072 to 485/1092) or Malik-shāh (III) b. Mahmūd (547/1152 to 548/1153), though Zafar’s position at the very beginning of the chapter would seem to favour identifying his patron with the former.\footnote{Different Šāfī.} The 12th-century Shi‘ite apologist ‘Abd al-Jalīl al-Rāzī wrote that although Kāfī Zafar was a Sunnite, his \textit{dhawān} contains so many poems in praise of ‘Ali and his family that people suspected him of being a Shi‘ī. Eight short poems by ‘Zafar Hamadānī’, all of homiletic content, are quoted in the anonymous \textit{Bahr al-fawā‘īl}, a work written at the beginning of the second half of the 6th/12th century; in one of the poems the poet refers to himself as ‘Zafar’ and in another he alludes to Malik-shāh (I) and his minister Tāj al-mulk...}
(died 485/1093).\textsuperscript{1} The old anthology published by Yaghmārī contains two substantial poems by Kāfī Zafar, one of them an ode to a person addressed as ʿsadr i islām sāyiyyu i ʿuṣūrāt" and as ʿostād i-raʿās Noshirvān" evidently the wazir Anōshērūn b. Khālid (died 532/1140).

Abū l-Raǰāʾ Qummī quotes two verses by Abūhad al-dīn Abū ʿAshīr, the son of Kāfī Zafar, and al-Kātib al-Īṣfahānī devotes an entry to the same person in the chapter of his Khārdat al-qāṣr devoted to the notables of Hādāḏin,\textsuperscript{3} evidently with the information that he died after 555/1160.


311. Zāhīr al-dīn Abū l-Faḍl Tāḥār b. Muḥammad Fārābī was, like his contemporary Ṭaḥīr Akhšāki, a native of Eastern Iran who emigrated to the North-West. His first major patron seems to have been the ruler of Naisābūr, the ‘King of the East’ ʿAṣdāl al-dīn Toghrān-shāh, who died in Muharram 582/1186,\textsuperscript{4} the dedicatee of about a dozen of his poems. Ibn Isfandīrāy says that for some time Zāhīr served at the court of the Bāwandid ruler of Tabaristān, Hūsām al-daulah Abū l-Ḥasan Ardashīr b. al-Ḥasan (568/1173 to 602/1205-6), and then departed, with Ardashīr’s permission, to ‘visit’ the atabeg of Azerbaijan Qzīl Arslān b. Ǝldāġūz (582/1186 to 587/1191). Poems to both of these (a rather larger number to the latter) can be found in his dīvān. After the death of Qzīl Arslān, Zāhīr praised the atabeg Nuṣrat al-dīn Abū 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. Abū Bakr) there are at least two odes\textsuperscript{1} to his contemporary Nuṣrat al-dīn Bēshḵin, the ruler of Ahār and dedicatee of Niẓāmī’s Iskandar-nāmah.\textsuperscript{2} It is therefore possible that some of the many poems which mention only ‘Nuṣrat al-dīn’, 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 [558] Ṣeljuq ʿToḡrī III\textsuperscript{3} and one to Ḵāḫānī’s patron Akhsatān.\textsuperscript{4} Several poems are addressed to one or more of the Khujaḏi sādars of Hādāḏan, and to various ministers.

Musṭaḵfī says that Zāhīr died in Tabriz in 598/1201-2. Some copies of his dīvān contain a preface\textsuperscript{3} (inc. spās bē nīyāt u dāfn bē pāyān qādir-e rā kih du sham! dar ḫaṣrāh i dāmsh i mā aḥfrōkh, the author of which (not named, but evidently the Shams al-dīn Suǰāḵī who, again according to Musṭaḵfī, collected Zāhīr’s poems)\textsuperscript{6} states that he had hoped to meet Zāhīr, but that the latter had died before he could do so. He thereupon collected Zāhīr’s poems and dedicated the compilation to the wazir Majd al-daulah wa l-dīn.

Zāhīr is a poet who has been particularly badly served by the copyists and printers. At least some of the editions lithographed in India ostensibly of the dīvān or ‘Kullīyāt’ of Zāhīr Fārābī contain the works of a different and much later poet (according to Naṣīfī the 11th/17th-century writer Zāhir Shīrāzī), while the old Tehran edition (and evidently many of the manuscripts) contains many poems by Shams Tabāsī. Tatī Bīnīsh, in his careful edition of Zāhīr’s dīvān, 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.: \textit{Dublin} Beaty 331 (Copied by Murshīd al-Kātib and dated 20 Dhī 1-ḥijjah 882/1478); Beaty 262 (Copied by Shāh Qāsim and dated 3\textsuperscript{1} The poem beginning on p. 52 of Bīnīsh’s edition mentions Bīshḵin in the verses as well as in the superscription in Ms. alif. The poem beginning on p. 243 mentions ‘Nuṣrat i dīn Bēshḵin’ in the verses and names this king again in the superscription in Ms. alif. The rubrics in other Ms. identify Abū Bakr as the dedicatee of both poems, as does Bīnīsh.

\textsuperscript{2} The historical material concerning this ruler is collected above, p. 443 n. 2.

\textsuperscript{3} The name ʿToḡrī is mentioned on p. 42.

\textsuperscript{4} See Bīnīsh’s edition, p. 2-9.

\textsuperscript{5} See above, p. 536.
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'Jumàdà' 1023/1613. Pictures); Manchester Lindesiana 261 (16th century?); Lindesiana 574 (Dated 1105/1693-4); [559] Oxford Whinfield 8 (Beeston 2827/20; Dated 18 Rabîû 1008/1599); Whinfield 54 (Beeston 2662/2; Dated 9 Rajab 1012/1603. Selections); Elliot 120 (Ethê 583. Dated 26 Rajab 1015/1660); Elliot 119 (Ethê 582. Incomplete; with the preface); Elliot 421 (Ethê 584); London Or. 3325 (Rieu Suppt. 222, Dated Ramađân 873/1469. Contains the preface); Add. 19,498 (Rieu p. 562-3. 16th century?); Or. 3301 (Rieu Suppt. 223. 16th century? With preface); Or. 10916 (Meredith-Owens p. 59. 16th-17th century?); Add. 7733 (Rieu p. 563. Dated Shawwâl 1035/1626); Or. 2880/I (Rieu Suppt. 224. Completed Jumâdã I 1245/1829); I.O. 971; Cambridge Or. 1696 (2nd Suppt. 441. Dated 902/1496-7); Or. 1347 (2nd Suppt. 167. 16th century?); Or. 6. 46 (Browne Cat. CCXV); Paris Supplément 795 fol. 1v sqq. (Blochet 1969. Dated 8 Ramadã 847/1445); Supplément 701 (Blochet 1246. Dated 8 Shahrûn 1016/1607. Contains the ðawwār of Asrâqâq and of Zâhir al-dîn, 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 Jumâdã II c.15> 152/1739); Minotûli 24 (Pertsch 748. Has a seal dated 1158/1745); Sprenger 1523 (Pertsch 691/1. Dated 1217/1802-3); Ms. or. oct. 2855 (Heinz 374. Dated 6 Safar 1290/1873); Vienna Krafft CLXXXVIII; Uppsala Torbern CLXVII (Ms. dated 28 Shawwâl 831 /1428. Contains, according to the catalogue, the ðawwār of Zâhir al-dîn as no. 2, and that of Hasan [sic. Dihlawî] as no. 4, but of the incipits quoted there the former belongs to Hasan and the latter to Zâhir); 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 Esat 2655 (Duda p. 70. Copied by Muhammad b. Muhammad Sharâf al-‘Arabi Abîth and dated 10 Rabîû 1177/1317); [560] Ayasofya 2051/16 (Mîkhâtîf-î-ûm I p. 409-10. Ms. apparently dated Shawwâl 730/1330); Université FY 496/1 (Atêq 88. Copied by al-Husain b. Muhammad al-Madînî and dated 21 Jumâdã I 759/1358); Topkapû, Hazine 796 fol. 218b sqq. (Karatay 887. Ms. dated Rabîû 1810/1407. Pictures); Université FY 668 (olim Halîf Efendi 4842. Atêq 89. Copied by Shâhîk b. Hasan b. Ahmad al-Saghîr and dated 840/1436-7); Numen 1490 fol. 102b-182b (Atêq 90 and 431. Dated 7 Jumâdã II 844/1440 or 884/1479);[1] Fatih 3842 (Ritter-Reinert p. 123-4. 15th century? Has an owner’s mark dated 906/1500-1); Université IV 1220 (olim Halîf Efendi 5362. Atêq 91. 15th century?); Université FY 157 (Atêq 92. Dated 1044/1634-5); Hekimoglu Ali Paşa 669/5 (Mîkhâtîf-î-ûm I p. 420-1. Apparently old); Cairo 57 mîm abad fârisî (Tirâzû I 761. Dated 1047/1637-8); 58 mîm abad fârisî (Tirâzû I 762); Tehran Majlis VIII 2460 (13th century?); Bayânî 54 (Nuskhûh-û-î I p. 15. Dated 768/1366-7); Malik 4925/1 (Munz. 24246. ‘Circa’ 842/1438-9); Guliastân/Atâbây II 420/III (Ms. dated 862/1457-8. Selection of qaṣîdahs and qârtbât); Bayânî 12 (Nuskhûh-û-î I p. 9. Copied by ‘Uthmân al-dîn Qâsimî and dated 883/1478-9); Sipah-sâlâr II 1223 (Dated 895/1490-9); Guliastân/Atâbây II 435/II (Ms. dated 866/1461); Bayânî 56 (Nuskhûh-û-î I p. 15. Dated 955/1548); Guliastân/Atâbây II 305 (Has an owner’s mark with the date 1000/1591-2); Univ. IX 2559/3 (Dated Jumâdã I 1015/1606); Guliastân/Atâbây II 304; Guliastân/Atâbây II 306; Mashhad Ridawî VII 741/1 (Ms. dated 10 Rabîû II 1055/1645); Ridawî VIII 360/2 (17th century?); Dushanbe Acad. II 374 (Dated 14 Rabîû I 1077/1666); Pakistan (see Munz. Pak. VII p 159-60); Bombay Rehatsek p. 142 no. 57; Lucknow Sprenger 542 (with the preface); Aligarh Subh. Ms. p. 31 no. 6 (Dated 1090/1680-1); Bankipore I 36 (15th century? With the preface); [561] Madras 29 (15th century?); Cf. Munz. III 2441-96.

Editions containing (or purporting to contain) Zâhir’s ðawwâr: Calcutta 1245/1829-30; Lucknow 1295/1878; 1307/1895; 1331/1913; 1926; Tehran 1324/1906 (ed. Shaikh Ahmad Shirzâd); 1338/1959-60 (ed. H. Ra’dî); Cawnpore 1916; Lâhâbbâd n.d. (‘qaṣîda’). apparently authentic, with a long introduction in Urdu by Maulawi Hâfiz Jalal al-dîn Ahmad Ja’farî Zainabî; Mashhad 1337/1959 (critical edition by T. Binâh).

His qaṣîdah maṣna‘î is found in Istanbul Université FY 931/1 (Atêq 93. Dated 2 Rabîû II 962/1555).

Ibn Isfandîrî, Tarîkh i Tabarîstan, ed. A. Iqbal, Tehran 1330-1941, I p. 120-1 (also in Browne’s epilogue, p. 71-3); As‘ûfî II p. 298-307 (and the note in Na‘îrî’s edition p. 733-4); Shams passion; Dâqîq al-ash‘ûr (Oxford Elliot 37 = Ethê 1333, passim); Mustafti p. 737-8; Hâjramî passim; Daulat-shâh p. 109-14;[2] Râzî II p. 77-82 (no.

[1] Different dates are given in Atêq’s two entries.

312. Zahir al-din 'Abd Allāh b. Shafrih was, according to 'Auff, the cousin (pisir-'amn) of Sharaf al-din i. Shafrih. The divān ascribed to him in London I.O. 934 is evidently the work of a later poet (according to Qazwīnī, it is by Rukn al-din b. Rafi' al-din Kirmānī, a contemporary of [562] Musta'ūfī, but according to Nāfi'ī it is by the 14th-century poet Rukn al-din Harawī, known as Rukn i Sā'īn).

'Auff I p. 273-4 (and Qazwīnī ad loc.); Sharwānī, Nac'hat al-majālis (see below, appendix III). 3 Rāzī II p. 366 (no. 868; from 'Auff); Hīdāyat, Rūyād p. 104; Khāiyām-pūr p. 363 ('Zahir i Isfahānī'); EP s.v. 'Shufrūsā'.

313. Iṣmā'īl b. Ibrāhīm, known as Zarr-ēsh, is included by 'Auff in his chapter on the poets of Ghaznaw and Lahor at the time of the Seljuqs, where we find two of his ghazals.

'Auff II p. 295-7; Rāzī I p. 331-2 (no. 340); Khāiyām-pūr p. 247.

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

314. The Bahman-nāmah and the Kösh- (or Gōsh-) nāmah were manifestly 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 'Auff's edition of the Bahman-nāmah) the two poems have been ascribed to one 'Ibrān-shāh'. The basis for this attribution is a passage in the Mujmal al-tawārīkh (p. 92 of Bahār's edition) which states that the hero Zāl i zar died during the [563] reign of Dārā (Darius), and adds that the only book in which the author found this information is a version (mukhāh) of the Bahman-nāmah 'which Ḥakīm NW. b. Aḥī l-Khair versified'. The name of this versifier is indistinct in the Paris manuscript (the only copy available to Bahār); both Moli2 and Bahār read it tentatively as 'yrūnšn', which does not make sense in this form, but Bahār suggested that it might represent a corruption of Īrānšāh or Īrānshāh. There are other copies of the Mujmal, among them a Dublin manuscript dated 823/1420,3 where the name is written quite clearly as 'yrūnšn'. On the other hand, in the old copy in Berlin (completed on Sunday 4 Shawwāl 751/1350) the name does appear to be Īrānšāh.4 This would seem to support Bahār's emendation.

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 Dārā) is not to be found in the extant Bahman-nāmah and also that the one verse which he quotes from the poem cannot

---

1For whom see above, p. 539-43, where the name of their common ancestor is discussed.

2This edition of 'Auff p. 646.

3Also contains contains rubā'īs by 'Irānšāh, whom Zakariyā b. Muhammad al-Qazwīnī (Afshār al-bālūd, ed. Wüstefeld, p. 197) enumerates among the poets of Isfahān.
be located in the work that we have before us. If ‘Erân-shâh’ did in fact write a Bahman-nâmah, then it is clearly not our Bahman-nâmah. Indeed the author of the Majma‘, speaking as he does of this ‘version’ of the Bahman-nâmah, seems to imply that he was aware of more than one telling of the story.

Hidâyat reports that some people say that the Bahman-nâmah is by Jamâlî Mîhrîjîrî, whom, in another place, he lists among the contemporaries of Lâmi‘, repeating there the information that he is the author of this poem. Unfortunately, this [564] Jamâlî does not seem to be mentioned anywhere else. Finally, on the endorsement of London Or. 2780 the poem is attributed to Âdharî (as it is also in Munzawi), but this is merely the result of a confusion between this Bahman-nâmah and Âdharî’s epic of the same name celebrating the Bahman sultans of the Deccan.

The opening section of the Bahman-nâmah has come down to us in several different forms. The version given in the two Paris manuscripts, followed by ‘Affî’s edition (inc.: zi mâ ãfrîn bar jahân-ãfrîn * kîh ã râ stîcâd bar jahân ãfrîn), speaks of ten years having passed since the death of Malik-Shâh, 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, Berk-yâruq, 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.: nakhustun sukhan nân i dâdâr i dâd * kîh bê yâd i ô nâm-há hast bâd) 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 Asadî’s Karshâsp-nâmah (i.e., these verses were interpolated by a copyist to fill a lacuna in his prototype). and also mentions Muhammed by name; this version then proceeds to describe at length (according to Rieu) two events during the first [565] part of that king’s reign: the capture of the Ismâ’îlî stronghold Shahdid (near Isfahan) in 500/1107 and the defeat of the ‘king of the Arabs’, i.e. Amîr al-‘Arab Saîf al-daulah Sâdâqa b. Mazâyad, in Rajab 501/1108. It would thus seem most likely that the poem was originally completed, and dedicated to the rebellious Muhammed, in 495/1101-2, but that the author revised and updated his preface some years later.

The poem contains the story of Isfandiyâr’s son Bahman and his wars against the family of Rustam, an episode narrated at some length in the Shâh-nâmah, but much elaborated here. It tells of his coronation, his adventures with Katâyûn, the daughter of the king of Kashmir, and Humây, the daughter of the king of Egypt, the death of Rustam and of Bahman’s campaign against Rustam’s relatives in Sîrân. Bahman captures Zâl, kills Farâmiz and pursues Rustam’s daughters to India. He captures the two girls and also Rustam’s grandson, Âdharbûrizân, son of Farâmiz. After defeating the whole family Bahman abdicates in favour of Humây and is killed by a dragon while hunting.

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


1 As was observed already by Rieu, Supp. p. 136.
3 Majma‘ I p. 494.
4 In Supplement 500 ‘Mahmûd’, doubtless wrongly.
5 Differently Rieu, who thinks that the first version of the poem must have been dedicated to Berk-yâruq.
6 Hidâyat evidently knew the poem in this same version, since he writes (Majma‘ I p. 110) that the dîbâjân of the Bahman-nâmah and of the Karshâsp-nâmah ‘are like one another’.

1 See Sâfâ, Hamûsûh p. 315-6; Rastegar, Problematik p. 31-3; DMBI v.v. ‘Âdharbûrizân-nâmah’ (F. Mujtabâ‘î).

Majmal p. 2, 92; Hidäyat, Majma' 1 p. 110, 494; Mohl's translation of the Shäh-námâh 1 p. lxxiv-1xxxi; S. Nafisi, 'Jamal i Mihrijo'rl', Ayandah I, 1304h./1925, p. 589-95; Khiyâyî-pîr p. 136; Rastegar, Problematik p. 25-8; Sa'd, Hamzâsh p. 289-94; Ehr s.v. 'Bahman-nama' (W.L. Hanaway, Jr.).

The Kosh- (Gosh-?)nâmah (inc. tu-râ ai khirad-mand i rûshani-ravân * zabân kard yazân az in sân ravân) is the work of the same author, who, in the prologue, refers to the reward he had received for the Bahman-nâmah and mentions yet again the defeat inflicted by his master on the 'king of the Arabs'. The author of the Majmal al-tawârîkh mentions in succession the akhbar i Bahman and the qizas i Kish i Pîldândân while enumerating the poems composed in the manner of the Shäh-nâmâh.

This poem tells the story of two kings of China at the time of Farâdîn, namely Kosh, the brother of Da'ijâhâk, and his son Kosh in Pîldândân. An edition is being prepared by J. Matini.


315. The Bân-i-Gushasp-nâmah tells the story of one of Rustam's daughters. It has neither been published nor as yet studied in detail.

Ms.: Oxford Ouseley 28 (Eihâd 509. 16th century? End missing); Ouseley 30 (Eihâd 510. Extracts only, with interpolated verses); Pers. c. 26 (Beeston 2544/5. 612 verses. End missing); Paris Supplément 498 fol. 145v sqq. (Blohiet 1194. 18th century). Cf. Munz. IV 27647-51.

1 I.e. the editio minor of 1876-8 (see above p. 150).

316. A fragment of a versification of the famous story of Bilawhar u Bödsâf transcribed into Manichean 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 Rôdaki.


317. The Burzûz-nâmah recounts the adventures of Burzû, the son of Suhrib and grandson of Rustam, at least the first part of which are an obvious doublt of the story of Suhrib as we know it from the Shäh-nâmâh: The orphaned Burzû is brought up by his mother in the land of Tûran. He joins Afrasyâb 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 Burzû then defects to the Iranian side and wages war against Afrasyâb. There is long episode involving the sorceress Sûsûn. 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 Firdausi’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 Burzū-nāmah has been the subject of much confusion. The first scholar to draw attention to the work was Anquetil-Duperron who, declaring, without giving any reason, that it was the work of one ‘Atāi’. 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 [569] Khādūj ‘Amid ‘Atāi ibn Ya’qūb, surnommé ‘Atāi Rāzi, i.e. to the poet whom we have encountered above (p. 267-8) as ‘Āṭī or Ya’qūb, and to whom Hidżayt ascribed (erroneously wrongly) the nisbaḫ Rāzi. 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 ‘ati bar ‘ati kal ‘ati nishān darmandūd u bethnaw attributable. As it stands, the verse does not scan; what is required is essentially something like ... ‘ati kal ‘ati nishān (sic!) darmandūd u bethnawāt. That this really contains the name of the author is far from certain; ‘ati kal ‘ati means perhaps simply ‘gift upon gift’, rather than a gift to ‘Atāi’. But it is apparently this verse which induced Anquetil to ascribe the poem to one ‘Atī, whom Blochet then identified, quite arbitrarily, with the ‘Atāi Ŷa’qūb known to him from the tadbikrāhs.

The Burzū-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.

Mas.: Oxford. Fraser 85 (Ethé 51). Dated 1012/1603-4. Apparently only an extract; Pers. c. 26 (Beeston 2544/4). 3116 verses; Paris Supplément 497 (Blochet 1191. Dated day Khuršūd, month Mihr, 1102 Y./1733. Story of Sīsān 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 Ms. as the preceding. Pictures); Rome Shath 652 (Dated 1014/1605-6. See the article by Piemontesi); Cluj (mentioned by Piemontesi and Richard); [570] Istanbul Lâlêli 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-nāmah, or containing fragments of various epics: Manchester Lindesianæ 9 (= Robinson 431-74. 15th century? Pictures); Lindesianæ 909 (= Robinson 1481-1579. Dated 23 Jumādā II 1060/1650. Pictures); Oxford All Souls Ms. 288 (Robinson p. 185-6. Dated 26 Ša’rār 988/1580. Pictures); London Or. 4906 fol. 261a-303a (Rieu Suppl. 195/II. 17th century?); Or. 2926 fol. 193a-221b (Rieu Suppl. 196/VIII. Completed Rabī’ 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—Lesouëf 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; Leiningrad Dorn CCCXXXI (16th century? Pictures); Dorn CCCXXX (=16th century?); Acad. C 51 (17th century?); and doubtless many others.


Translation (Gujarat): Ms.: Navsari Meherji Rana p. 142 no. 29 (‘Burjor-Namah: Vols. 8-10 and 12-15’. In the index the title is given as ‘Barzu-Nāmeh’).


Anquetil-Duperron, Le Zend-avesta, Paris 1771, Lx/ p. 536; Mohl’s translation of the Shāh-nāmah I p. Ixxv-lxxviii; Şafī, Hamdūlah p. 303-10; id., Türitā II p. 477-83; A.M. Piemontesi, ‘I manoscritti persiani del fondo Shath nella biblioteca Vatica e un nuovo

1See below, p. 582 fn.
hero’s adventures in India and includes an episode in which he debates with the Brahmins and converts the king of India to the ‘Persian religion’.

London Or. 2926 (a heavily interpolated copy of the Shah-nama) contains, apart from the ‘short Farâmarz-nama’, also the story of the demon Shab-rang (fol. 146a-167b) and his battles with Rustam and Farâmarz, this also on the supposed authority of Azad Sarw,1 and two other fragments dealing with the birth of Farâmarz.

The ‘second’ Farâmarz-nama was known to Khâliqi-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 CLXXXVI), where it calls itself the ‘great Farâmarz-nama’.2 The [573] beginning in this version is copied from the first pages of the Shah-nama (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 l. 2 (corresponding to p. 146 l. 16 of the edition); thereafter the edition seems to agree largely with the manuscript until about p. 382.3 The text does not appear to give any clear indication of the time or place of composition. Khâliqi-Muṭlaq has noted that this version shares two stories with the Nazhat-nama of ‘Alâ’i of Shâh-mârdân b. Abî l-Khair, a work compiled at the end of the 5th/6th or beginning of the 6th/7th 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.

Mas.: Oxford Ms. Pers. e. 13 (Eithâ 1798); London Ross and Browne CLXXXVI (Dated 1166/1752-3: Inspecti); Or. 2946 fol. 50-109 (Rieu Suppt. 159/II. 18th century?); Or. 2926 fol. 167b-179b (Rieu Suppt. 196/VI, completed Rabì I 1249/1833. Interpolated into the Shah-nama); Paris Supplément 458 fol. 1-48 (Blochet 1194. Dated 12 Rabì II 1173/1759); Leningrad Publ. Lib. New Series 65 (Kostygova 405.

1 For this so-called Shab-rang-nama see also Sâfâ, Hamstah p. 323. A Shab-rang-nama (with an incipit different from that in the London Ms.) is also in Leyden de Jong 1166 (with owner’s note dated 1082/1652).
2 The title is given on fol. 1 a as ‘Farâmarz-nama i kalûn’ and on fol. 1 b as ‘Farâmarz-nama i bâzûrè’.
3 I.e. the page with the printed number ‘382’. The pagination in the lithograph is a mess.

1The verse is found in the Bombay edition on p. 78. Everything which precedes it in the edition does not belong to the Farâmarz-nama.
2Shah-nama, Moscow edition VI p. 322. For the following see also Elr. s.v.
Dated 20 Dhul 1-qa’dah 1039/1635. Interpolated into the Shâh-nâmâh.

Bombay Brevali 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 Ardibehsh 956 Y./1586);

Hyderabad Sâllâr Jung IV 1114/2 (17th century?). Cf. Munz. IV 32526-7.


A Gujarati translation (or several) is found in Navsari Meherji Rana p. 77 no. 58 (Imperfect); Meherji Rana p. 141 no. 26 (Imperfect).


319. The Humây-nâmâh, 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: sipâr az khudâ-y-î kih jân āfrîd * sipâr u zamân u zamân āfrîd) and this added leaf has in the margin an endowment-notice with the date Râmâdân 712/1313, which, if authentic, would appear to give a terminus ad quem for the poem itself. The supposed title ‘Kitâb i Humây-nâmâh’ is scrabbled on the recto of the same added page and is followed by ‘Shâhîstâh’, perhaps the pen-name of the author. Arberry claimed that the style of the poem makes it ‘more or less contemporary with the Garshasp-nâmâ and the Viz u Râmîn’. 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 amîr’. 1

Ms.: Dublin Beatty 301.


1Vs. 4330: amîr i humâyûn. The ‘i’ is required by the metre. Matîni (p. 318) was thus wrong to suggest that the poem was ‘probably dedicated to a prince by the name of Amîr Humâyûn’.


320. The Jahângîr-nâmâh is included here, for convenience, among the anonymous works of the pre-Mongol period although its author actually identifies himself as an otherwise unknown ‘Qâsim the panevyrist’ (Qâsim i mâdi’h) 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 Jahângîr, whose adventures are remarkably similar to those of Suhûrî and even more so to those of Burzû. Like them he is brought up among the Turanians, meets his father on the battlefield, but (like Burzû) is recognised by his father and reconciled with him. He joins the Iranian ranks, fights on behalf of Kâdî-Kâ’ûs and after various adventures is killed by Qâdî 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.

Ms.: Paris Supplément 498 fol. 50-144 (Blochet 1194. Dated 15 Jumâdâ I 1173/1760, incorporating a fragment of an older Ms. Ca. 6300 verses); Bombay Univ. p. 292-3 no. XXVIII (apparently incomplete).

Cf. Munz. IV 29013-4.

Editions: Bombay 1847 (according to the Aṣadîyyah catalogue III p. 100); 1867 (ibid. p. 630); 1892.

Mohl’s translation of the Shâh-nâmâh I p. lxxiii-lxxiv; Saîfû, Hamâsah p. 324-5.

321. The Kuk-i-Kûhâz-d-nâmâh 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 Shâh-nâmâh: London Or., 2926 fol. 107b-112b (Rieu Suppt. no. 196 III, completed Rabî’ I 1249/1833); [576] Rome Casanatense Ms. 4893 (Piemontese 245. Dated Râmâdân 1036/1627).

Saîfû, Hamâsah p. 318-22; Rastegar, Problematik p. 28-30.
322. **Yüṣuf u Zulaikha**, the oldest of several Persian versifications of the Biblical and Qur'anic story of Joseph and the wife of Potiphar (in: **ba naṃ i khudāna u har du sarbā * kih jāved bāshid hamēshah ba ḫāy**), has been published as the work of Firdausī. The earliest source that ascribes a poem on this subject to Firdausī appears to be the 829/1425-6 'Bāyunghur' preface to the *Shāh-nāmah*, where we read that the great poet, after his flight from Ghazan, eventually made his way to Baghdad and the court of the caliph, where he composed his version of the story of Joseph. It is to the same period that the oldest known manuscripts of the work belong. 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 Ethē, who published [577] an edition of the first half of the poem, as well as by Nöldke and Taqī-žādah in their already frequently mentioned monographs on Firdausī. It was, however, challenged by Shārānī in the 1920s, by Qārīf and Mīnūwī in the 1940s and by Nāfīsī 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 Nāṣir al-dīn Shāh Qājār. This sort of thing has evidently happened before to the same poem. Unfortunately, Ethē’s edition (the only one which quotes variants), rather than trying to sort out the various families of manuscripts, has thrown them all 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 introduction (p. 23-5 of Ethē’s edition) in which the author is represented as saying, first of all, that he is an accomplished poet whose words everyone knows and who has recited many a story. But now he regrets the sins of his youth and has become tired of Farēdūn, Zahhāk, Kāi-Qubād and the rest. ‘I am wasting’, he says, ‘half of my life [578] filling a whole world with the name of Rustam’ (kih yāk nāmāh az ‘umr i khwed 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’ (sēr) 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. 252), all of those mentioning the heroes of the *Shāh-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: nāmāh i dōstān), 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 con-

---

1 For whom see above, p. 112-59.
2 See above p. 126.
3 The three verses quoted in Macan’s introduction, p. 56, are v. 121, 125 and 126 of Ethē’s edition.
4 The earliest dated copy is the Berlin Ms. of 819/1416. It is to be regretted that the author of the Berlin catalogue has not stated explicitly whether or not the poem is ascribed to Firdausī in that code.
tain the original text and that the other manuscripts go back to a prototype into which a [579] number of verses were interpolated specifically to give credence to the attribution of the poem to Ferdowsi. Without the added verses the textual evidence for such an attribution collapses completely. It seems thus that any future truly critical edition of Yasn u Zalikha must take as its point of departure a clear distinction between an (interpolated) ‘Firdausian’ and a (possibly also interpolated) ‘non-Firdausian’ family of manuscripts.

The same two manuscripts ‘M’ and ‘W’ contain (in v. 24-102) a eulogy of an un-named king whom the poet calls sultan i iltim-ha and who in a chapter-heading is given the no less vague title of pad-shah i islām and it is presumably in him that the author of the Bâysunghur preface saw the caliph of Baghdad. This section seems to be missing in all the manuscripts of the ‘Firdausian’ redaction. Several of these have no dedication, but one (London Or. 2930, Ethê’s ‘B’) has at an entirely different point in the introduction (Ethê prints it as v. 168-223) a rather interesting account of how the story of Joseph had previously been verified by two different poets: first by the well-known Abî l-Mu’ayyad Bakhšī, and later by an otherwise unknown Bakhšī. The author says that he was in the presence of the ‘mtr i Irāq’ in Ahwāz when the latter mentioned Bakhšī’s verification of the story and requested our poet to re-do the work. Yet another dedication, not found in any of Ethê’s manuscripts (nor in the three which I have collated), was published by Qarib from a copy in his possession and is also [580] found, according to Nafisi, in a quite modern manuscript of his own. This eulogises Abî l-Fawāris Tughān-shah b. Alp-Arsâlân, the Seljuq governor of Herat from before 465/1072 to at least 476/1083-4, the patron of Azraqi, and, according to ’Arudi, an illustrious benefactor of poets in general. In this dedication the author thanks his patron effusively for having had him released from prison; in this connection we find two verses which Nafisi reads as:

Amān-st biṣyār muddat ha ḫay
kīh az darī j sultān u hukm i khudāy
az in qal’ah dīl-shād bērīn shawad
ba nazāl i shāh i humāyān shawad

and which he translates as: ‘Il y a longtemps qu’Amâni reste ici. L’ordre du Sultan et la volonté divine lui permettront de sortir en toute joie de cette forte desse et d’aller auprès de son auguste roi’; i.e. Yasn u Zalikha is the work of an otherwise unknown poet by the name of Amâni, a name which, after Nafisi, 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 Qarib and Minuwi had already published them without suspecting the presence of a proper name. One could, I should think, equally well read amā (= ammā) nēst biṣyār…, ‘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-shah 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 [581] 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-shah also have the dedication to mtr i Irāq or that to the pad-shah i islām and whether they contain the verses about the author’s supposed previous works in the field of heroic poetry. Qarib and Nafisi 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-Firdausian Yasn u Zalikha has

---

1 The whole ‘autobiographical’ section is missing in London, Ross and Browne XVII, which contains a very different and much shorter introduction.

2 The question is of course complicated by the possibility of cross-contamination of the two families.

3 As did Ethê in his article of 1888. In GRPH II p. 230 he retracted this and, following Nödeke, identified Firdausi’s patron with one or other of the Buyid amirs.

4 See above, p. 67-8.

5 See above, p. 91.

6 p. 43-4.

7 They are quoted in context by Qarib, Amānī wa Pārwaršī XIX/11-12 p. 13.
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 qiṣaṣ al-anbiyāt.  

Mas.: Oxford Walker 64 (Ethē 506. Dated 9 Jumādā II 1140/1728. Ethē’s ‘W’); Eilic 414 (Ethē 506. Dated 19 Jumādā I 1232/1817. Ethē’s ‘E’); London Ross and Browne XVIII (= Robison 545-8. ‘Apparentlv written prior to A.H. 1000’/1591-2. Pictures, Inspeksi); Or. 6964 (Meredith-Owens p. 67. Dated 13 Jumādā I 1029/1620. Inspeksi; the text resembles ‘E’); Add. 24,093 (Rieu p. 545-6. Dated Muḥarram 1055/1645. Ethē’s ‘M’); Or. 2930 (Rieu Suppl. 200. Dated 7 Rabi’ II 1244/1828. Ethē’s ‘B’); R.A.S. 243A (not in Codrington’s catalogue. Ethē’s ‘A’); Cambridge Browne Coll. V.71 (Dated 10 Rajab 1242/1827. Beginning differs greatly from Ethē’s edition. 1 Picture); [582] Paris Supplément 1360 (Blochet 1177. 16th century? Pictures); Supplément 1055 (Blochet 1178. 19th century); Berlin Ms. orient. oct. 2302 (Heinz 228; Stichoukine 5. Dated 1 Safar 819/1416. Incomplete. Pictures); Uppsala Tornberg CLXXII fol. 153b-217a (end missing);[1] Najaf (Munz. no. 36940. Dated 1287/1870-1); Tehrān Univ. XV 4101 (Dated 18 Rajab 1207/1793); Milli (Naskhā-hā IV: 141, Dated 1242/1826-7); Malik (Munz. no. 36936. Dated Safar 1250/1834); Majlis VIII 2699 (Dated 1262/1846); Herat Museum 50 (Catalogue p. 329. Dated 1269/1852-3); Tashkent Acad. 195 (Semovov 759. 19th century); Pakistan (five Mss., all late, are listed in Munz. Pak. VII p. 19-20); Bombay Rehatsek p. 170 no. 151 (Dated 1226/1811);  

1 Microfilm 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 (other than merely a microfilm) to sort them out. The first work, after a ḏibajah of ten lines (inc.: ba nām i khudmand be ḥaft u ẓār * bāb ham rāz-dān ast u ham rāz-dān) is the story of Gushārān from the Shāh-nāmah (Moscow edition VI p. 65 sqq.). The second is the Barzī-nāmah 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 Nicānī’s Ḥaft poškar (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 as in Ethē, and breaking off on fol. 217a with the verse 8 lines from the bottom on p. 122 of the Cawpore 1881 edition. The Ms. is not dated, but has a note recording its acquisition in Constantinople in A.D. 1782.

Bankiøre I 12 (Dated 1240/1824-5. Pictures); Calcula Ivanov 425 (Dated 877/1472-3. Poor condition); Bībār 279 (Dated 1038/1628-9); Lucknow Sprenger 223 (Two copies, one of which is apparently now Calcula Ivanov 425); Los Angeles Univ. M920 (Naskhā-hā XI/XII p. 95. Dated 26 Rajab 1243/1828. Beginning apparently missing). Cf. Munz. IV 36930-43. [583] 


Partial edition: Oxford 1908 (Yūsf and Zalīkhā by Firdau’s of Tūs edited ... by Hermann Eit.; Pasciuculus primas, containing the first half of the poem; based on 4 Mss. and the Tehran and Lucknow editions).  

Translations: (German verse): O. Schlecht-Wsscheid, Jussuf und Suleicha, romanistisches Heldengedicht von Firdausi, 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).  


APPENDIX II:
SOME AFTERTHOUGHTS ON THE CHRONOLOGY
OF NIZĀMĪ’S WORKS
AND THAT OF THE SHARWA-ŠĀHS

In the entry on Nizāmī (above, p. 438-47) an attempt has been made to establish the relative chronology of his six great poems and to extract from the contradictory evidence in the manuscripts a precise date for at least some of them. A new look at the two parts of the Iskandar-nāmah (referred to here, as previously, as Isk.N. i and ii) has made it possible now in part to corroborate and in part to revise the conclusions expressed in those pages. Those conclusions that I would now wish to uphold and to underline are those concerning the relative place of the Isk.N. in Nizāmī’s oeuvre (i.e., before, and not after, Haft paḵar) and the identity of the dedicatee (the Malik of Ahar, Nuṣrat al-din Bāshkīn b. Muhammad). On the other hand, my statement1 that ‘the whole final section’ of Isk.N. ii (from chap. XL of the Baku edition onwards) was composed by an anonymous editor, some years after Nizāmī’s death, is evidently wrong. It seems rather that only chap. XL (the account of Nizāmī’s death at the age of 63) is a posthumous interpolation; chapters XLI-XLII are by Nizāmī, but they have been altered by the copyists and appear in the printed editions in a corrupted form.

To clarify this long outstanding problem it is necessary to take a fresh look at the evidence of the manuscripts of Isk.N. ii. As far as is possible to judge,2 these fall into three fairly distinct families (we

1First edition, p. 446. The paragraph has been omitted in this second edition.
2Unfortunately, the catalogues, apart from those by Riou, are almost entirely useless for the questions under discussion. It is astonishing how many modern cataloguers, in their so-called descriptions of Mss. of the Khamsah, have regurgitated at great length the ‘information’ contained in the usual literary histories about the dates of Nizāmī’s works and the identity of his patrons, but have not taken the trouble to impart to their readers the relevant data actually contained in the Mss. that they are claiming to describe.
disregard those copies in which chapters VI or XLI-XLII are missing).

Group I is represented in the Baku apparatus apparently only by Ms. ‘E’, a copy in the Hermitage (Leningrad), made for the Timurid Shāh-rukh and completed 10 Rabi‘ II 835/1431, but this recension can also be found in two London manuscripts from the first quarter of the 15th century, and two others from the 16th; a wider search would doubtless reveal other copies, and possibly older ones. Those available have in chapter VI the (doubtless authentic) dedication to Nūsrat al-dīn Bēshkin, whose personal name (Bēshkin) is mentioned twice (vs. 27-8), but without the verse mentioning Mosul, and contain the account of the earthquake in Ganjah. In two of the available copies (Add. 27,259 and Add. 17,329), but not the others, the interpolated chapter on the death of Nizāmī (chap. XL) is missing. Then, in the epilogue (chap. XLI-XLII) these manuscripts all once again invoke ‘Malik Nūsrat al-dīn’ in XLI 5, omit the verse mentioning the name Mas‘ūd (XLII 62) and instead have one giving the date of the completion of the poem as May (Aīyār) 590/1194 (though one of the copies has the less plausible date May 592/1196). These codices then conclude the poem with verses containing Nizāmī’s poetic signature. [588]

Group II is represented by the majority of the copies used for the Baku edition, among them the ancient manuscript in Paris. These replace chapter VI by the spurious dedication to the atabeg of Mosul ‘Īzz al-dīn Abī I-Fath Mas‘ūd b. Nūr al-dīn (ruled 607/1211 to 615/1218), which, as we have seen, is in fact copied, apart from the names, from Nizāmī’s invocation of Nūsrat al-dīn Bēshkhin at the beginning of Isk. N. I. In the epilogue they similarly replace ‘Malik Nūsrat al-dīn’ by ‘Malik ‘Īzz al-dīn’ in XLI 5, add the verse mentioning ‘Mas‘ūd’ (XLII 62) and omit the verse giving the date of composition. Some of the copies (among them the Paris manuscript) then also omit the concluding verses (XLII 66-8) mentioning the name ‘Nizāmī’.

Group III has the dedication to Nūsrat al-dīn Bēshkhin in the prologue, but that to ‘Īzz al-dīn Mas‘ūd in the epilogue, as printed in the Baku edition. The manuscript basis for this recension is slender. It clearly goes back to a copy belonging to Group I, but where the final pages had got lost and the missing verses were subsequently supplied from a manuscript belonging to Group II.

Once these three families have clearly been separated it can, I think, hardly be doubted that it is Group I alone which contains the original form of Nizāmī’s prologue and epilogue. Group II represents an edition made after Nizāmī’s death in which the poem has been rededi-

1The old Tehran Ms. Univ. 5179 (dated 718/1318; see above, p. 474, fn.) jumps from VI 1 to VII 1, leaving out most of the dedication, and is also incomplete (and very corrupt) at the end, stopping a third of the way down the last page with XXXIII 2. Chapter VI is truncated in the same way in several other Ms., e.g. in London Khalili 455 (dated 964/1557).

2Omitted from our list of Ms.; the colophon is quoted in the edition, p. 231-2. In the epilogue (chap. XLI-XLII) ‘E’ appears to share most of its readings with ‘B’ (a Baku Ms. dated Ramadān 979/1572), while in the prologue (chap. VI) it shares its significant variants with ‘D’ (Leningrad Public Library, dated 986/1490; apparently belongs to our Group III), but no variants from ‘B’ are quoted for this chapter. Is the chapter perhaps missing in ‘B’ (as it is in the Mss. mentioned in the preceding footnote)?

3Namely Add. 27,259 (Rieu p. 866-7), dated 821/1419 and Or. 12,087 (Meredith-Owens p. 75), dated 823/1420, both of which I have collated.

4Add. 17,329 (Rieu p. 571), dated 994/1585-6 (collated); Add. 26,144 (Rieu p. 571), dated 968/1561 (not at present available for collation, but quoted from Rieu).

5These verses, and others, are missing in Add. 17,329 and (according to the apparatus) also in ‘E’, but they are found in the other two Ms. collated by me.

6Printed (evidently from Dastgirdi’s edition) as vs. 11 in the Baku edition.

1Add. 27,259 has clearly: navad dar gudusheshat ci piçand shurad (Rieu’s reading, confirmed by collation). Or. 12,087 and Add. 17,329 definitely have navad dar gudusheshat ..., and this reading is reported also for ‘E’ and ‘B’ in the apparatus to XLII 61. The graphic difference between ‘du’ and ‘dar’ is, of course, very slight. However, since Nizāmī completed his Haft pākār in 593/1197, it would seem unlikely that he should have finished another work only one year earlier. (The Calcutta edition of 1869, which is clearly based on a Ms. belonging to Group I, has the obviously erroneous date 599 in the main text, but records the variant 592 in the apparatus. The latter reading is also in the modern Ms. London R.A.S. 250, dated 1212/1797-8).

2At least some of the Ms. of this group (e.g. Or. 12,087) have the verse (XLII 38, found also in the Ms. of the other families) giving the poet’s age as 60, though this and the following 13 verses are missing in Add. 27,259. If Nizāmī was 60 in May (roughly Jamād-I) 590, then he must have been born in the twelve months ending in Jamād-I 550/1136, but this is difficult to reconcile with the verse in Lahlil-Mo‘ini (see above, p. 438-9) indicating that he was born in 555/1140-1.

3See above, p. 445.
cated (by the editor) to the atabeg of Mosul. Since this atabeg did not even begin to rule until 607/1211, it was obviously necessary for the editor to suppress the verse in which the author said that he had completed his poem in 590/1194. This is then most likely to be the true date.

[589]

Let us now look at the first of the two poems that make up the *Iskandar-nāmah*. We have seen that this was definitely composed after *Lailī-Majnūn*, which Niẓāmī completed in 584/1188 for the Sharwān-shāh Akhsatān. But in *Isk.N.* i we find a significant passage in which the poet says that ‘King Akhsatān’ has passed away, recalls the favours that the late monarch had bestowed on him and encourages his (unnamed) successor to surpass him in munificence. Although it is not explicitly stated, the verses do seem to imply that the addressed ruler is Akhsatān’s son. This in turn suggests that Niẓāmī began work on the *Iskandar-nāmah* with the intention of presenting it to one of the Sharwān-shāhs, but this family evidently lost control of the area around Ganjāh before Niẓāmī could complete the poem, which he consequently dedicated to the new strong man in Transcaucasia, Nusrat al-dīn Bēshān. It is these observations which suggest the following chronology of Niẓāmī’s works. *Makhtan al-asrār* is written after 550/1155 and quite possibly in or shortly after 561/1166. *Khusrav-Shīrīn* follows between 571/1176 and 582/1186 (with the epilogue added between 582/1186 and 587/1191). *Lailī-Majnūn* is completed in 584/1188 and presented to Akhsatān, who dies very shortly afterwards. Niẓāmī now begins work on a new grandiose project, the story of Alexander, to be presented to Akhsatān’s successor, but he too soon departs from the scene. The poet completes the two parts of the Life of Alexander and dedicates both to the Malik of Ahar, completing the last part in May 590/1194. The earthquake mentioned in the prologue to *Isk.N.* ii is in all probability that of Rabī’ I 590 (February or March 1194), which [590] must then have been in very fresh memory. Niẓāmī’s last work, *Haft pānikar*, was completed three years later, in Ramadān 593/1197. There is no good reason to think he survived for long after that date.

The evidence of Niẓāmī’s poems, but also of other literary sources, allows us also to complement and revise the picture of the chronology of the Sharwān-shāhs previously drawn mainly on the basis of the numismatic evidence. As already discussed, 2 Manūchīr (II) b. Afrādūn, the brother-in-law and vassal of the Georgian king Demetre I, became king of Sharwān some years after 514/1120, was still alive in 555/1160, and died probably very soon afterwards. His son Akhsatān (I) became king by, in any case, 566/1170, the year of the death of the caliph al-Mustanṣīr (whose name appears on his earliest coins). Niẓāmī’s verses in *Isk.N.* i mean that we can move the previous accepted *terminus ad quem* for Akhsatān’s death forward by about a decade: he died in, or shortly after, 584/1188, and in any case well before 590/1194. For the following period up to 622/1225 we have numismatic or epigraphic evidence for four kings, namely Manūchīr’s sons Shāhānshāh4 and Farrukhzād, and his grandsons Farīburz (II) b. Afrādūn (with an inscription dated 600/1203-4) and Karshāp b. Farrukhzād, and some other names are mentioned in passing (and not necessarily correctly) for this [591] period in historical sources. But it seems impossible to determine the relative chronology of these doubtless very minor rulers; it could also well be that several of them reigned at the same time. The Sharwān-shāhs reemerge briefly from obscurity with ‘Alā’ al-dīn Farīburz (III) b. Karshāp b. Farrukhzād b. Manūchīr, whose coins mention caliphs from al-Nāṣir to al-Mustāṣem, showing that he ruled from, at the latest, 622/1225 to, at least, 640/1242 and it is in fact likely he is the unnamed king of Sharwān of whom Ibn al-Athīr speaks in the events of 622: in this year, the historian tells us, the Sharwān-shāh (i.e. Farīburz) deposed his father (i.e. Karshāp), who

1 See D.K. Kouymjian, *A numismatic history of Southeastern Caucasus and Athetaqayn based on Islamic coinage of the 5th/11th to the 7th/13th centuries* (Microfilm), Ann Arbor 1969.
2 Above, p. 248-9, fn. 2; 326-7.
3 Kouymjian p. 169-82.
4 This spell on the coins. The common noun *shahanshah* normally has a short vowel in its second syllable in Neo-Persian.
fled to the Georgians, raised an army against his son and was defeated. Farîburz is the dedicatee of the work discussed in the following appendix. His son Akhsatân II left a number of coins all with the date 653/1255-6 (very possibly accession issues). 1 Ibn al-Fuwaṭî says that Akhsatân II was killed by Hûlegû in 658/1260. 2

APPENDIX III: SHARWÂNÎ’S NUZ’HÂT AL-MAJÂLÎS AND THE EARLY PERSIAN RUBÂ'Î

Thanks to the generosity of Dr ʻAbd Allâh Ghîchânî (Tehran) 1 I now have a copy of Muhammad Amin Riyâbi’s edition of the Nuz’hat al-Majâlîs of Jamâl al-dîn Khâlib Sharwânî, 2 the unavailability of which in London libraries has already been the object of regret (supra p. 242).

The Nuz’hat al-majâlîs is a collection of no fewer than 4139 rubâ’îs arranged in seventeen thematic chapters. The majority of the quatrains are attributed here to some known or unknown author, though quite a large number are quoted anonymously (with rubrics like lâ ghaîrîh, lâ a’drî, lâ ërâfî, lî qâlîhî, or merely with a thematic heading); some are headed with the ambiguous rubric akhbar (‘another’ by the same poet? Or ‘another poem’?). It is preserved in a unique manuscript (Istanbul Carullâh 667) dated Thursday 25 Shawwâl 731/1331 and copied by Ismâ’il b. Isfandîyar al-Abhârî, who in the earlier literature (Rempis et al. ad Khâlibînî), Meier ad Mahsâfatî was considered to be the author. However, it seems that the real author is the minor poet Jamâl al-dîn Khalîl Sharwânî. A fairly large number of quatrains in the anthology are ascribed to this Sharwânî himself, and indeed most sections end with one or more poems of his. In particular he is the author of the last attributed quatrain (no. 4215), which addresses ‘shâh i Sharwânî, ‘Alâ’i dîn’, and which is followed immediately by a gâshdâh (p. 613-5) in which the

1 Dr Ghîchânî, with whom I have been able to discuss a number of points concerning early Persian poetry, is the author of a valuable study of the rubâ’îs and other poetical fragments inscribed on the 13th-century glazed tiles from Takht-i Sulaymân (Ash’ur i sârî i kâsh-kâsh i Takht-i Sulaymân, Tehran 1371sh./1992). These tiles are important evidence for the dating of the individual quatrains, but, since the verses are in all cases cited anonymously, they do not, unfortunately, contribute very much to the solution of the big-bibliographical questions that are the subject of the present book.

2 Tehran, 1366sh./1987.

1Kouvymian p. 228-32.
2Ibn al-Fuwaṭî, al-Jâz’ al-râbi’ min saltânîs majmûa’ al-ûdîb fi mu’jam al-alqâb, ed. M. Jâwâd, Damascus 1962-7, no. 1592. This information seems trustworthy despite the fact that Ibn al-Fuwaṭî has (so so often) garbled the name of Akhsatân’s father to ‘Alâ’ al-dîn Farîmarz (sic) b. Gushmait (sic).
same poet addresses this king by name [593] (Shah i Sharwānī, ‘Ali al-dīn <Far> Burz) and refers to the safahā which he has prepared for him, that is to say the present anthology. From this dedication we can conclude not only that Sharwānī is indeed the author of this anthology, but also that it was compiled during the reign of Farūr Burz III, which we have dated (in the preceding appendix) to (probably) 622/1225 to (at the latest) 653/1255-6. It would seem that in its original form the Nuz'hat must have ended with this gashtdak; the fourteen rubāts that follow it in the manuscript, all quoted anonymously, were evidently added at some time in the fairly short interval separating the compilation of Sharwānī's anthology and the copying of the unique manuscript in 731/1331. And elsewhere in the manuscript we find, here and there, a small number of quatrains ascribed to well-known political figures from the second half of the 13th century, e.g. one (no. 1270) by ‘Ṣāḥib i sādīd Shams al-dīn', doubtless Shams al-dīn Juwainī, who was executed in 683/1284, three decades after the latest possible date for the compilation of the anthology. And indeed, with a miscellany of this kind it seems inevitable that any copyist, or indeed owner, would find it normal to add some of his own favourite quatrains at a suitable place in the collection. The gap of, at the very most, a century between compilation and copying means, however, that these additions do not really make a great deal of difference.

A number of quatrains are quoted more than once, in different sections, and are sometimes ascribed to a different poet on their second occurrence. And it should come as no surprise that a large number of quatrains ascribed elsewhere to [594] Khayyāmī, Abū Sa'īd, Rūmī and others, or included in the published dīvāns of some well-known poet, are found here with an entirely different attribution. Sharwānī's anthology illustrates as well as anything else that the problem of 'wandering quatrains' is by no means specific to Khayyāmī; the Persian rubāt wanders by nature.

As has been mentioned, Sharwānī is the oldest substantial source for the quatrains ascribed to Khayyāmī and to Mahsāt, and his anthology has for a long time now been exploited, in manuscript, by scholars working on these two figures. It is, however, worth mentioning that Sharwānī also ascribes two quatrains (no. 252 and 1567; the former is one of the anti-religious quatrains elsewhere, and famously, ascribed to Khaiyāmī), to Pisar i Khūfī i Ganjān, alias Amīr Ahmad, the doubting fictitious lover of Mahsāt; there is also one (no. 87) ascribed to Khīfī i Ganjān and another to Dakhīr i Khīfī i Ganjān. It seems thus that the anthologist (or whoever else is responsible for these entries) had before him some early version of the romance of Mahsāt and Amīr Ahmad and had no scruples against quoting the fictitious characters in that novel as if they were no different from the historical personages cited elsewhere in the book. But in the light of this the value of the Nuz'hat al-majālīs as a source for the 'authentic' quatrains of Mahsāt, and indeed of Khaiyāmī, seems somewhat diminished.

Among the authors cited by Sharwānī there are quite a few others of whom one does not know whether they are real or fictitious, and indeed [595] this makes little difference, as their names are in any case otherwise unknown. Many of these are doubtless poets of Transcaucasia, compatriots and contemporaries of the anthologist. The rubāt is the principal form of occasional verse in Persian and it is thus not surprising that a large number of the items in this anthology are ascribed not to professional poets, but to various political, scholarly and literary personalities. Among the latter is the well-known Arabic writer 'Ali b. al-Hasan al-Bākharzī (died 467/1075),3 to whom four quatrains are ascribed; a few samples of his Persian verse, among them several rubāts, are known already from 'Auff (I p. 68-71), who tells us that his Persian quatrains were collected, and arranged alphabetically, in a book with the title Tarāb-nāmah. It is worth mentioning that in one of the

---

1 A ghazal of four verses by 'Pisar i khūfī i ganjān' is cited by Saff Hara, Tārikh-nāmah i Hardt p. 449. Four verses by 'Shāhī i ganjān' are quoted in Sīhāb p. 86, 191, 209 fn., 294.

2 No. 1680, but the text is not quite in order here, for the next quatrains is headed 'il ghūrāb' not 'il ghūrātāb'.


4 Sīhāb p. 85-6. He is perhaps also the author of the quatrains (no. 2597) ascribed to Abū 1-Hasan 'Ali (see Sīhāb p. 55).
entries in his own 

_**Dunyat al-qasr wa 'usrat abt al-qaṣṣ**_. Bākharzī cites Arabic quatrains in the _rubāʿi_ metre by several authors (among them himself and his father, Abū Ḥālīl b. Abī ʾAlī Ṭayyīb al-Bākharzī²) and in particular one by Abū ʾAlī Abābūs Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Bākharzī, the brother of his father’s teacher, thus bringing the history of the Arabic _rubāʿī_ back as far as [596] the 4th/10th century.³ Also represented in Sharwānī’s anthology is Muʿīn al-dīn Ahmad b. ʿAbd al-Razzāq al-Ṭanṭārānī, who wrote a famous Arabic _gaṣīdah tarījīyah_ for Niẓām al-mulk,⁴ and who is credited here with five Persian quatrains.⁵ Or again the famous religious author Ahmad b. Muḥammad Ghazālī, to whom seven quatrains are attributed,⁶ and several other well-known persons.

Students of Persian literature are indebted to the editor, M.A. Riyāḥī, not only for making this important source available in print, but also for his useful indexes and notes and for a long introduction, which contains in particular an alphabetical list of all the authors quoted in the _Nuzʿat al-majālis_, with brief biographical notes on those of whom something is known. Had the book been available earlier I would probably have made somewhat different decisions about the chronological scope of the present volume, as well as about which authors were to be included. But as it is it will for now probably suffice to add references only to those poets who have already been included in this survey and who are represented also in the _Nuzʿat al-majālis_. These addenda have been kept as brief as possible, giving in most cases only a cross-reference to our discussion above and to the relevant section in [597] Riyāḥī’s introduction. It is my intention to discuss some of the further poets quoted in this anthology in the first chapter of _PL VI_.

---

¹Bākharzī no. 338.
²For whom see Ṭhaʿalībī, _Tasnīmah_ II p. 37-40; Bākharzī no. 439.
³Entries on this Abū ʾAlī Abābūs can be found in _Samānī_, new edition, II p. 17, and Bākharzī no. 450. Neither source gives his dates, but the fact that his brother, Abī Nasr Ahmad b. Ibrāhīm al-ʾArībī, was the teacher of Bākharzī’s father indicates that he must have put two generations before the author of the _Dunyat al-qasr_.
⁴Brockelmann I p. 232, Suppt. I p. 446.
⁵See Riyāḥī p. 96. One verse by ʿAmīr Muʿīz (read: Muʿīn) al-dīn Ṭanṭārānī is quoted in Zāhīr p. 275, and another by ʿamīr Muʿīz ṭīṭīyī in the same lexicon, p. 244.
⁶See Riyāḥī p. 54.
Fakhr al-dīn Khālid (supra p. 382; Rihāyī p. 87): 11 quatrains attributed to Fakhr al-dīn Khālid Harawi, Fakhr Harawi, Fakhr Khālid or Khālid Harawi.

Khāqānī (supra p. 382-99; Rihāyī p. 81): 20 quatrains.

Jamāl Khujandī (supra p. 401-5; Rihāyī p. 65) is quoted 13 times (no. 156, 916-7, 1201, 1311-2, 1801, 3042, 3235, 3269, 3371-3), all without specification of his personal name. Two further quatrains are ascribed merely to ‘Khujandī’.

Laṭīf al-Muṣārī (supra p. 407-8; Rihāyī p. 72, with further references): 7 quatrains. The [600] editor is probably correct to identify this poet with the author of an ode addressed to the Ghoriid Muṣārī al-dīn Muḥammad b. Sām (ruler in Ghaznawī from 569/1173 to 602/1206) quoted by Badā’ūnī,1 although the printed text has ‘Nāzūkī Muṣārī (‘ī), but he is wrong to make this poet a contemporary of Abū ʿl-Faraj Ṛūnī, rather than of his son Kāfī b. Abū ʿl-Faraj.

Laṭīf b. Ṭūlū (supra p. 408; Rihāyī p. 94-5): four quatrains, and one (no. 655) ascribed to Luṭū Samarquandi, presumably the same poet.

Māhsatī (supra p. 409-10; Rihāyī p. 97-8): 61 quatrains.

Majd al-dīn Abū ʿl-Barakāt (supra p. 410-1; Rihāyī p. 55): one quatrain by (this?) Abū ʿl-Barakāt.

Majd al-dīn Pāyāzī (supra p. 411) is presumably identical with the Majd Pyyūdī to whom quatrain no. 1241 is ascribed.

Masʿūd b. Saʿd (supra p. 412-6; Rihāyī p. 96): 3 quatrains (nos. 632, 2107, 3436).


Muḥammad Ghaznawī (supra p. 420-1; Rihāyī p. 66) is quoted once under this name (no. 3970) and is presumably also the person cited as Jamāl Muḥammad (no. 1988) and as Jamāl Ghaznawi (no. 2925).

Muʿīzzī (supra p. 421-5; Rihāyī p. 96): 22 quatrains.


1Munāxtab al-tawādrith, Calcutta 1868, 1 p. 54. This poem is followed by another in praise of the same ruler by ‘Qādī ʿImād Balkhī’, evidently not (unless Badā’ūnī is mistaken about the identity of the patron) the well-known author of the Magātāndī i Hamīdī. Qādī ʿImād al-dīn ʿUmar b. Muḥammad al-Balkhī, who died a century before the time of Muḥammad b. Sām, but some later namesake.
Sa’d al-dīn Najārī Samarqandi (supra p. 436-7; Rīyāḥī p. 73) is perhaps the Sa’d Samarqandi to whom quatrains no. 1292 is ascribed.

Niẓāmī Ganja’ī (supra p. 438-9; Rīyāḥī p. 100) is explicitly credited with three quatrains (no. 303, 1016, 1933); a further seven are ascribed merely to (presumably the same) Niẓāmī (no. 1044-5, 1079, 2478, 2634, 2829, 3545). Rīyāḥī says that none of the ten are in Dastgirdī’s edition of Niẓāmī’s dhvān.

Qiwāmī Ganja’ī (supra p. 497-8; Rīyāḥī p. 91) is cited as the author of one quatrain (no. 551); another is ascribed merely to Qiwāmī (no. 3408).

Badr Qiwāmī (supra p. 498-9; Rīyāḥī p. 62): two quatrains.

Khwāwī is cited five times; perhaps Qiwāmī Khwāwī (supra p. 499; Rīyāḥī p. 68).

Raḍī Neshābūrī (supra p. 499-501; Rīyāḥī p. 70) is explicitly credited with 13 quatrains; a further 26 are ascribed to Imām (or Maulūnā) Raḍī (al-dīn) or simply Raḍī (al-dīn).

Raḍī Lushānī (supra p. 502-5; Rīyāḥī p. 70-1): two quatrains. One quatrain (no. 1885) is ascribed to ‘Marzbān’, presumably Raḍī al-dīn Marzbān Fārṣī (supra p. 506-7; Rīyāḥī p. 56, with erroneous information).

Rashīdī Samarqandi (supra p. 507-8) is perhaps the same as the Rashidī Samarqandi to whom one quatrain is ascribed (Rīyāḥī p. 69).

Abū l-Faraj Rūnī (supra p. 510-2; Rīyāḥī p. 56): one quatrain (no. 753).

Adīb Sābir (supra p. 513-4; Rīyāḥī p. 59): 5 quatrains.

The ‘Saifī’, to whom 5 quatrains are ascribed, is perhaps Saifībn Nisābūrī (supra p. 516-7; Rīyāḥī p. 76). [602]

Samā’ī (supra p. 517; Rīyāḥī p. 75): one quatrain.

Sanā’ī (supra p. 517-34; Rīyāḥī p. 75): 33 quatrains.

Shaḥeryārī (supra p. 535; Rīyāḥī p. 80): one quatrain.

Shaḥm Sūjāsī (supra p. 536; Rīyāḥī p. 72-3, with discussion): 67 quatrains. Rīyāḥī draws attention to the fact that there is a Ms. of the Hikmat al-ishrāq of Suhrawardī in Ankara, Ismail Sālib 649 (Mikrātīn-i 1 p. 317) signed by presumably the same Shaḥm Sūjāsī and dated 14 Sha bhīn 617/1220. Consequently, the date 602/1205-6 which Mustaũfī gives for his death is probably wrong.

Shaḥm Ṭabāštī (supra p. 537-8; Rīyāḥī p. 79): two quatrains.

1Izz al-dīn Ḭaḥānī is quoted as the author of a quatrain in Hidāyat, Mawqūf I p. 339.
2op. cit., no. 982.
From an early date it must have been customary to collect the shorter poems of a Persian author in a *dtwān*, literally a 'register' or 'archive', in the same way as was the practice with Arabic poetry. We have already cited the passage in the *Safar-nāmeh* of Nāṣir i Khusrau in which the author speaks of how, in 438/1046, he helped Qāṭrān to study 'the *dtwān* of Munjil and the *dtwān* of Daqiqī' 1. It is thus clear that the poems of these celebrated authors of the Samanid period had been gathered into *dtwāns* before the middle of the 11th century, though both of these collections are now lost. Elsewhere Nāṣir speaks of his own two *dtwāns* in Persian and Arabic, put together obviously in his own lifetime. 2 We have also seen [604] that Niẓāmī 3 and ʿAttār 4 both collected their own shorter poems, while those of ʿAṭār Fārābī were collected by another, after his death. 5 But the great majority of the three-hundred-odd poets that have been discussed in this volume are known to us only from isolated poems preserved in anthologies or histories and from the stray verses quoted in dictionaries or manuals of literary practice. Their *dtwāns*, in so far as they ever existed, disappeared long ago. To be sure, modern editors have published so-called *dtwāns* of several of these early poets, but these have all been reassembled from the scattered quotations and have no manuscript authority as original, intentional collections of the work of the poet in question.

There are, however, just over thirty Persian poets of the pre-Mongol period who are represented by manuscripts containing, or claiming to contain, the *dtwān* of the author in question, either as a separate book, or as part of a collection (majmūʿah) of several *dtwāns*. None of these manuscripts is contemporary with the author, and indeed no manuscript of a Persian *dtwān* has been discovered which can be dated with certainty to the pre-Mongol period. 1 But there are several such codices from the second half of the 13th, or from the 14th century. Ignoring those known only from copies of uncertain date or of questionable authenticity we can propose the following as a cautious list of pre-Mongol poets with *dtwāns* attestable in manuscripts from the Ilkhanid period: 2 Aṣraḵ, Nāṣir i Khusrav, Anwarī, [605] Aṭār ʿAkhsāṣḵi, ʿAṭār, Kamāl ʿIṣṭaḥāni, Khaqāni, Muʿtazī, Mukhtārī, Qamar, Qiwāmī Rāzī, Rūdī, Šāhīr, Ṣanāʾī, Shams Ṭabarī, ʿAṭār Fārābī.

On the other hand, there are a number of undoubted early poets whose *dtwāns* are known to us only from manuscripts of the Safavid period or later, that is to say, not before the end of the 16th century, and in many cases not before the 18th or 19th century. These include several important early poets (Farruki, Lāmī, Manšehrī, Qāṭrān, ʿUṣūrī), as well as some later ones (e.g. Hasan Ghaznavī, Šīrāzī, Masʿūd i Saʿd, Ṣaṭṭi, Naṣībūrī, and others). From the point of view of textual criticism, without denying that the poems in these *dtwāns* are, on the whole, more or less authentic, one must emphasise that they represent a reedition of the collected poems which cannot be traced back further than the Safavid period, at the earliest.

Since completing the three chapters that make up the bulk of this volume I have had the opportunity (an opportunity culpably passed up at an earlier stage) of taking a closer look at the British Library's copy of the first rubān of the enormous anthology Khulāṣat al-ashʿār wa zubdāt al-afkar 3 of Taṣqī al-dīn Muḥammad b. Sharaḵ Taṣqī al-dīn ʿAli Ḥusainī Kāshānī. Taṣqī completed the first version of this book in 992/1585 and the enlarged second edition in 1016/1607-8. Of the well over 600 entries contained in the complete work the London manuscript has those devoted to 23 early authors, each of whom is represented by an astonishingly large number of poems. After the long introduction, the first chapter is

---

1 For the London Ms. of Khaqānī's *dtwān*, which has a dedicatory panel with the date 594/1197-8, see above, p. 387, fn.
2 The order follows that in which the poems have been discussed in this volume.
3 London Or. 3506 (Risse, Suppl. 105). For Taṣqī's book see Spranger p. 13-40; *PL I* p. 803-5; Gūldin i Muʿāṭib p. 524-56 (with a list of manuscripts); *EF* k.v. 'Taṣqī' i- Din Kishī'.
devoted to [606] ʿUnṣuri, where the author concludes his (largely worthless) biographical sketch with the statement that, after much searching, he has succeeded in finding a divan of this poet, containing nearly 3000 verses, but as most of these poems were, in Taqi’s opinion, ‘boring’, he made only a small selection from them for inclusion in his anthology. But Taqi’s ‘selection’ is, for all practical purposes, identical with the collection of poems included in the printed editions of ʿUnṣuri’s so-called divan,2 and evidently also in the manuscripts on which these editions are based, the only difference being that in the printed divan the poems are arranged alphabetically by rhymes, while in the anthology they are not. One [607] must consequently conclude either that Taqi’s claim that it was he who made this selection is a blatant lie, or else that all the manuscripts of ʿUnṣuri’s divan (or at least all the manuscripts available to the editors) derive from Taqi’s anthology. Seeing that all the recorded manuscripts of the divan postdate Taqi by many years, the latter alternative is in any case chronologically plausible.

The next section of the Khulṣat al-ashʿar is devoted to Manūchihrī. This time Taqi ends the biography with the statement that Manūchihrī’s divan is unknown in Iran and that consequently he has been able to find only a few of this author’s poems in old anthologies and treatises. But he promises to add the others should he ever discover a complete copy of the divan. And the selection that follows is indeed only a small sample of the poems that we read in the printed divan. It seems therefore that either Taqi himself, or else one of the later Safavid antiquarians, did eventually find a copy of Manūchihrī’s collected works. It is noteworthy that the oldest reported manuscripts of that divan are dated to the year 1010/1601-2,2 that is to say, between the time of the first and the second editions of Taqi’s anthology. Their relationship with Taqi’s selection remains to be examined.

It would be interesting to examine the other chapters in the first rubān of the Khulṣat al-ashʿar along the same lines, but this can be left [608] to others. For the moment it will suffice to say that at least some of the so-called divans of early Persian poets are nothing more that extracts from the Khulṣat al-ashʿar, or possibly from one of the other extant Safavid anthologies. If this is confirmed (and obviously the case of each author must be examined separately), then the methodology for the critical edition of these poets will be simplified to a considerable extent: future editors will be able to ignore all of the manuscripts of the divans and concentrate first on establishing the standard text as contained in the best copies of the Safavid compendia and then confronting this with the handful of precious fragments contained in the old anthologies and dictionaries.

In the case of those poets whose collected works are found in manuscripts of the 13th and 14th centuries the primary duty of editors is naturally to retrieve and publish the Ilkhanid recension (or recensions) contained in these codices. This is a task with which scholars have until now hardly begun. Once the Ilkhanid redaction has been retrieved it will then be possible to confront this with the Safavid vulgate (here too in many cases probably represented mainly, or exclusively, by Taqi) and thus to form some objective idea of the methodology and general reliability of the Safavid editors.

1The edition of ʿUnṣuri’s divan by M. Dabīr-Sīyāqī, Tehran 1342/1963 (which I have now been able to consult; see above, p. 237) is based mainly on a manuscript with the title Majmūʿ al-qasidātād and which the editor claims (p. ix of the introduction) was compiled by Taqi al-dīn Muhammad al-Ḥusainī ‘in the years 1067 and 1068’. This is in fact evidently an extract from the Khulṣat al-ashʿar (see the passage quoted in the next footnote). It is really surprising that Dabīr-Sīyāqī did not seem to realize that the name of the person who supposedly compiled the Majmūʿ al-qasidātād in 1067/1656-7 is in the same case as that of the man who compiled the famous Khulṣat al-ashʿar more than 70 years earlier.

2Cr. 3506, fol. 12a (compare ʿUnṣuri Dabīr-Sīyāqī p. xxx, quoting the so-called Majmūʿ al-qasidātād: masawwifāt in tārīqāt, ānā Taqiyya ibn Muhammad al-Ḥusainī, baʿd az tāfāḥaš bi sīyār divan-t az ā dar quṭār bā ḏīrār hāzī bāt bi, wa akhtār ār qasidāt-ād masawwifāt (Dabīr-Sīyāqī: masawwifāt) ast chandākh Hāvāndār-ash bāčī bā tālāf ast, wa li hādū chandā Khālqāz az ān inšāḥūmb namādād dar ān khālqāz darz namādām.

I have compared the lithograph of 1328/1881 and the largely identical selection in Qarib’s edition of 1329h./1944. Dabīr-Sīyāqī’s edition is, as mentioned, based mainly on the ‘Majmūʿ al-qasidātād’ (i.e. unwittingly on Taqi), collated with Qarib’s edition, with an appendix of additional verses from the lexica etc.

1For 54h: ammā divanā in way dar Irān chandān shukrāt-t nashārād va dar miyār in masūdūdatā manṣaraf nist, ātāh bāʿd ā rāzqātā in ā dar majmūʿāt-sā hā ḍāqamāt wa ra zā tā ṭuṯqūdiqatīn māstār va māqālātīn ast va chand qasidātā kīr darān khālqāz shahāt shudā az āq-jumbālā hā ast, in shétaisāvāštātāh mīn ā dar māqālātāh tāsamīt ā divān āt sār āchārī shukrāt, baqāt ā shārūrāt rātīfāt ā bātā bā ṭawīlātā wādātāwādāt ārādātā. For 55h: ʿalābūl ʿalābīl ā dar māqālātāh tāsamīt ā divān āt sār āchārī shukrāt, baqāt ā shārūrāt rātīfāt ā bātā bā ṭawīlātā wādātāwādāt ārādātā.
Unfortunately the task of any conscientious editor is made more complicated by the fact that within the last half century or so the forgery of Islamic manuscripts has risen to an astonishing level of technical sophistication. The forgers’ workshops have acquired an excellent knowledge of the history of Persian and Arabic palaeography and orthography, often using genuine old paper and (609) traditional techniques. Where they have been caught out it has mostly been not because of any physical defects of their products, but through their careless approach to the text. (The decision to copy ‘13th-century’ manuscripts of the rubā’īyat of ‘Umar i Khayyām from an edition printed in Berlin in the 1920s is a striking example). It must be hoped that improved techniques for the technical analysis of for example ink, combined with a greater attention to basic principles of textual criticism will gradually lead to a weeding out of spurious ‘old’ manuscripts, but in the meanwhile it is unfortunately necessary to adopt a sceptical attitude to all Persian manuscripts that show up out of the blue on the international art market or that find their way into libraries without an accountable provenance.\footnote{See R. Frye, ‘Islamic book forgeries from Iran’, in Islamwissenschaftliche Abhandlungen (Festschrift for Fritz Mauer), Wiesbaden 1974, p. 106-9. One of the pieces described and illustrated in Frye’s article, namely a copy of the spurious Arabic dīwān of the Shi‘ite imām ‘Ali Zain al-Ābdīn al-Sajjīd, ‘dated’ 299/911, with inter-linear glosses in Persian (which, if they were authentic, would make it by far the oldest dated document in Neo-Persian) has since been acquired by a London art collector and has been examined at some length by the present author. It is a masterpiece of the art of counterfeiting.}

\footnote{I have now acquired a microfilm of Dublin Beatty 103, which has colophons with dates in 699/1300, and contains ten dīwāns, most of them already noted in this survey, namely those of Kamāl Ismā‘īl, ‘Abd al-Wāsī Jabalt, Warāzin, Rūh, Aẓrāqī, Shams Tabāsi, Najīb Jarbāsī, abdu (see PL VI), Ra‘f Luḥbānī, Iṣāmī (PL VI) and Anwārī. A comparison of the selection of Aẓrāqī’s poems with that in the 13th-century London Ms. Or. 3713 reveals the two to be disconcertingly similar. As noted already in the Beatty catalogue, the Dublin manuscript has clearly been tampered with (there are two fake miniatures, one ‘dated’ 699). Without wishing to pass judgement on the manuscript as a whole I would strongly advise scholars undertaking an edition of any of the ten dīwāns to exercise critical judgement in their use of this copy.}
Abū (l-)Ḥarrār (read: Abū l-Ḥurr) 65, 614
Abū (l-)Ḥasan ʿĀlī b. al-Ḥasan: see Bāhzarāz
Abū (l-)Ḥasan Bahāqī: see Ibn Fudhāq
Abū (l-)Ḥasan Ḥusainī Farāhānī 263-4
Abū (l-)Ḥasan Ḥamānī 331, 362
Abū (l-)Ḥasan Ṭabāqī 170
Abū (l-)Ḥasan Ṭālib: see Ṭālibah
Abū (l-)Ḥusain Khārjī 177
Abū Jaʿfar Mūsawī (Ṣayyid) 161
Abū (l-)Khāṭir Mūnajjim Gūrgānī (or Gurgānī) 66
Abū Lāthīr Ţabarī (or Gurgānī) 66, 614
Abū (l-)Maʿṣūrī Ṣahābī Rāzī 250-1, 597, 627
Abū (l-)Maʿṣūrī Rāzī (Dīḥ-kuhdāy) 250
Abū (l-)Maʿṣūrī Rāzī 343-4
Abū (l-)Māḥsūn b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Lūnbānī 503
Abū Maḥṣūrī Bā Yūsuf 251
Abū Maḥṣūrī Māʿmārī 121
Abū Maḥṣūrī Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Razzāq 54, 121
Abū Maḥṣūrī Muwaffaqq b. ʿAlī Harawī 83
Abū (l-)Mathāl Būkhrān 66-7, 615
Abū (l-)Muʿāyad Bālkhī 67-8, 579, 615
Abū (l-)Muʿāyad Raʿaʿaqq Būkhrān 68-9, 615
Abū Muṭṭī Bālkhī 67
Abū (l-)Muzaffar ʿAbd al-Jabbars b. Hassan Bāhzarāz Jumaḥī 69, 615
Abū (l-)Muzaffar b. al-Khwāndī 403
Abū (l-)Muzaffar: see also Ahmad b. Muḥammad Ṣaghānī; Makki b. Ibrāḥīm; Masʿūd b. Hassan; Naṣr b. Muḥammad
Abū Naṣr Ahmad b. Ibrāḥīm Ṭālīqānī 69-70
Abū Naṣr Fārisī 413
Abū Naṣr Marγhāzī 70, 615
Abū (l-)Qāsim Ṣabhir 71
Abū (l-)Qāsim Iskāfī 65
Abū (l-)Qāsim Ismāʿīl b. Ahmad Shajārī 76
Abū (l-)Qāsim Mīhrānī 70
Abū (l-)Qāsim Muʿāfdī (or Muʿāfhdīn) 193
Abū Rūdā Fadl Allāh (Kamāl al-daulah) 336
Abū Saʿīd Fadl Allāh b. Abī l-Khair 70-3, 363, 597
Abū Saʿīd Khāṭīrī (Ṣary, Ṣaryr): see Khāṭīrī
Abū Saʿīd Mādūd Isfahānī (copyist) 520
Abū Saʿīd Jurfānī 73
Abū Shakhīr Bālkhī 74, 615
Abū Sharif Ahmad b. ʿAlī Muhallādī (Mujallādī) Gurgānī 195-6
Abū Shuʿabī Shābī b. Muḥammad Harawī 74-5
Abū Ṭāhir: see Khāṭīnī
Abū Ṭāhir (Khwājā) 187-8
Abū Ṭāhir Ṭayīb b. Muḥammad: see Khurrawānī
Abū Turāb ʿAbd al-Wahhāb Ḥusaini (copyist) 392, 395
Abū Yusuf (early prosodist) 238
Abū Zurrāʾsh Muʿammār (Maʿmārī?) 75, 615
Abūṣayd 564
Abū Ṣanṭanīz: see Ṣanṭanīz
Abū Ṣābir: see Ŝābir b. Ismāʿīl
Abū Ṣābir 437
ʿAbd Mudhāhhib (copyist) 494
ʿAbd al-din (qādī) 443 fn.
ʿAbd al-Ḥaqqī (Abū l-Ḥasan ʿĀlī b. Ṣayyid Būkhrān) 75-7, 169, 615
Abūmad (Amīr) (ʿPisar i Khāṭib i Ganjāh) 409, 594
Abūmad (Ṭayyārī) 411
Abūmad b. ʿAbd Allāh Khujistānī 167
Abūmad b. ʿAbd Allāh Muʿārrī (Abū l-ʿAlī) 360-1
Ahmad b. ʿAbd al-Razzāq Tantārānī (Muʿīn al-dīn) 596
Ahmad b. Abī l-Ḥasan Nāmākī Jāmī (Abū Naṣr): see Ahmad (i) Jām
Ahmad b. ʿAlī Muhallādī 195-6
Ahmad b. Arslān (Shams al-mulk) 381
Ahmad Barmākī (i) 77
Ahmad b. Ḥabīb Abī Iṣḥāq (copyist) 524
Ahmad b. (al-)Ḥājī Ḥasan Sarāʾī (copyist) 393
Ahmad b. ʿAbd al-Qāsim 191
Ahmad b. Hasan Ṣamāʾaṇī 530-1
Ahmad b. Husain b. Ṣāḥib (copyist) 450, 452, 460
Ahmad Husaini (copyist) 466
Ahmad b. Ibrāhīm Bāhzarāzī Aʿrābī (Abū Naṣr) 595-6
Ahmad b. Ibrāhīm Tāḥūnānī (Abū Naṣr) 69-70
Ahmad i Jām 251-2, 598
Ahmad Khān ʿAlī (Mīrzā ʿAlī) al-dīn) 530
Ahmad b. Maḥmūd b. Muhammad (copyist) 525
Ahmad b. Maḥṣūrī 77
Ahmad b. Muʿayyad Samāʾaṇī (Shihāb al-dīn) 544-5
Ahmad b. Muḥammad: see Ghazālī
Ahmad b. Muḥammad (ruler of Khān i Lānjān) 114-5
Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. Ḥusain Səmānī (copyist) 387 fn.
Ahmad b. Muḥammad Jalāl (copyist) 467
Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. Khalaf (Abī Jaʿfar) 221
Ahmad b. Muḥammad Khujandī 402
Ahmad b. Muḥammad Nāmākī Sarāʾaṇī 185-6
Ahmad b. Muḥammad al-Mīmī (copyist) 252-3, 332
Ahmad b. Muhammad Ṣaghānī (Abī l-Muzaffar Fakhr al-daulah) 109, 181, 197-8
Ahmad b. Muhammad Ṣinjī Marγhāzī (Abū l-ʿAbbāsī): see Tayyān
Ahmad b. Qās Dāmghānī: see Ṣanṭanīz
Ahmad b. Sālīk Tūlamī (Ḥājī): (copyist) 278
Ahmad b. Sulṭān ʿAlī Harawī (copyist) 277, 472
Ahmad b. ʿUmar b. ʿAlī ʿAzīz Harawī (copyist) 277
Ahmad b. ʿUmar b. ʿAlī Nīzāmī Sarāʾaṇī: see ʿArūdī
Ahmad Uḥnānī 237-8, 627
Ahmad Wāṭīkī 77
Ahmedī (Turkish translator) 291
ʾĀyīyūq (Majd al-dīn) 78 fn., 253, 615
ʾĀyīyūq 77-80
ʾAṣābi Khujandī 253
ʾAṣābi Ẓarījānī 253
ʾĀḵ̄esāṭān (i) b. Ṣanṭanīz (Sharwān-shāh) 248 fn., 385, 441, 558, 589-90
ʾĀḵ̄esāṭān (ii) b. Fārbarūz (Sharwān-shāh) 591
ʾĀlī al-dīn: see Fārbarūz; Ẓarījānī
ʾĀlī al-mulk ʿArāfī al-dīn Amīrāk 630
ʾĀlī (Mīrzā ʾAlī al-dīn Abūkh Khān) 530
ʾĀlī Khān Lānjānī 391
ʾĀlī (ʿArūdī) (Sharwān-shāh) 384
ʾĀlī (Mīrzā ʿAlī al-dīn Abūkh Khān) 530
ʾĀlī Khān Lānjānī 391
ʾĀlī (ʿArūdī) (Sharwān-shāh) 384
ʾĀlī Nīzāmī Sarāʾaṇī: see ʿArūdī
ʾĀlī b. Ṣadāqī (ruler of Badakhshān) 202
ʾĀlī Bahrāmī Sarakhshī 101-2, 196
ʾĀlī Dālīm 118
'Ali Dargâhî (Shaikh) (copyist) 354
'Ali b. Dâ'ît i Khudâ Rifâ'î
Amârî Khâlîfî (copyist) 279
'Ali b. Farîmarz (amir) 422
'Ali b. Hâji Muthâbih (copyist) 469
'Ali b. al-Hasan (Abû l-Hasan); see Bâkhârzi
'Ali b. Hasan (Jâlâ al-dîn) (Qurânhânîdî) 417
'Ali b. Husain Maghibî (copyist) 353
'Ali Husainî 368
'Ali b. Ilyâs Aghâjî Bukhârî 75-7, 169, 615
'Ali b. Ishâq Abîwardî 216, 256 fn.
'Ali b. Ismâ'îl b. 'Arab-shâh Husainî (copyist) 474
'Ali b. 'Irz al-dîn Sarakhsî 102
'Ali b. Je'far Mūsâ'î (Majî al-dîn) 513
'Ali b. Jûlîgh Sîjî; see Farrukhî
'Ali Kâtb Sultânî (copyist) 528
'Ali ra'îshârî b. Mâsû 215
'Ali Makî b. Ta'fîr Bistânî 149
'Ali b. Mas'ûd (Husam al-dîn) 166
'Ali m. Muhammad: see Fatih Ghaznavî
'Ali m. Muhammad (copyist) 278
'Ali m. Muhammad Bûsî 104-3, 6
'Ali m. Muhammad Ghazvânî Lâkurî (Abû l-Hasan) 184, 622
'Ali m. Muhammad Khâyiyâm (Abû l-dîn) 356-7 fn.
'Ali m. Muhammad Khâyiyâm Marwâzî (Abû l-Hasan) 179-80, 622
'Ali m. Muhammad Tirmidîhî; see Munjîk
'Ali Munkâ'î Sîjî (Jâsûs al-âlîf) 328
'Ali m. Muzaffar Shâhîbî Ghaznawî 535, 637
'Ali b. Nozâm Damghânî (copyist) 468
'Ali Pâr i Tîghân 80-1
'Ali Qurt Andûgânî 81
Arûdî b. Rûzbîlân (copyist) 280
'Ali Saramqandî (copyist) 390
'Ali Sîpîrî 229, 629
'Ali Shâhânî (Dîkhqân) 543-4
'Ali b. 'Umâr Ghaznavî (Sadîd al-dîn) 515
'Ali Yûzî Tîghân 80 fn.
'Ali b. Zaid Bâhaqî (Abû l-Hasan); see Ibn Fundûq
'Ali quîl b. Qâra (copyist) 472
Amân Allah Amânî Hûsainî 635
'Amânî (suposed author of Yusuf u Zulaikha) 580
Amûq Bâkhârî 253-6, 507, 548
'Ali m. Muhammad 'Ali Ardistânî (copyist) 472
Amîrâk ('Alî al-mulik Shâraf al-dîn) 630
Amîrân-shâh b. Qâwûrî (Abû l-Muzaffar) 91
Amûrnâh b. Muhammad Marwâzî (Abû Manşûr) 81-2
Amr Allah b. Shâhîk Uwaïs
Nakhjavânî (copyist) 280
Anbar (Abû 'Abîrî) 62
Andronicus Conmenus 385
Anoshtorâvân (Sasanian) 99-101
Anoshtorâvân b. Khâlid 556
Anoshtorâvân b. Manîchîhr
(Ziyârîdî) 182
Anûdârî (Abû Ismâ'îl) 'Abd Allah b. Muhammad 82-3, 91
Anvari (Abû ad-dîn) 256-65, 330-1, 382, 598, 609 fn.
Arâb-shâh ('Alî al-dîn) 256-65
Arâb-shâh (Mûllâ) (copyist) 452
Arûdî b.Hasan (Husam al-dîn Abû l-Hasan) (Bâ'wandî) 346, 557
Arûdî ('Abd Allah) 83
Ausadî; see Rashîdî Sarâmâqandî
Arslân (Qarakhanid) 266
Arslân Abâh (Izz al-dîn) 443 fn.
Arslân b. Aitughîdi (copyist) 389
Arslân b. Krîhî ('Âlî al-dîn) 441 fn.
Arslân-khan; see Ibrâhim b. Husainî
Arslân-shâb (Abûl Kirmân-shâh) 244
Arûdî (Abûm Yazîd Sarâmâqandî) 4, 265-6, 548
'Arûdî (Sîrî al-dîn 'Ali Khân) 490-1
As'ad (Imâm) 518
As'ad (Fakhî al-dîn); see Gurgânî
As'ad b. 'Abd al-Qâhir b. *
Shâraf ibn Bâhâlârî (Imâm al-dîn) 602
As'ad b. Mas'ûd (Malik Ikhîtîyr al-dîn) 323
As'ad b. Muhammad (copyist) 419
As'ad Najârî Sarâmâqandî (Sa'd al-dîn); see Najârî
Asadî (Abû Manşûr 'Abî b. Ahmad Tâsî) 10, 59, 83-90, 216, 241, 597
Asttarî (Jamâl al-dîn) 344, 598
Ashrafî; see Hasan b. Muhammad Ghaznavî
Ashrafî Sarâmâqandî 266-7
Ashîl al-dîn Sarâmâqandî 267
Asafî (Abû Nazâr 'Abd al-Asîz b. Manşûr Marwâzî) 90, 214
'Atîbî b. Ya'qûb b. Malik Ghaznavî 267-8, 568-9
'Atîbî (sanâ'îd) see 'Atîbî b. Ya'qûb 'Atîbî 568-9
Atîrî (al-dîn) Akhtestâkî (Muhammad b. Abî Tâhîr) 268-70, 344, 404, 420, 598
Atîrî al-dîn Amûmî 351
'Atîq (Tûnî) (copyist) 283
'Atîrî (Farîd al-dîn) 219, 270-71, 409, 528, 598, 628-30
'Atîrî Tûnî 273, 298
'Auîfî (Sadîd al-dîn Muhammad b. Muhammad) 4, 60, 241, 610
Austânî al-dîn Kirmânî 531 fn.
Avicenna: see Ibn Sinâ
Azzâd Sarwî 572
Azhâr (copyist) 479
'Azîz (al-dîn) Shâhrûf 602
Azrâqî (Abû l-Mahsûn Abî Bakrî) 90-6, 251, 431, 609 fn., 617
Bâbâ-shâb (copyist) 453, 459
Bâbî Tûhî 'Uryân 96-9, 617
Bâdhîlî 99-101
Bâdhîlî b. Muhammad b. Mahmûd Bâlkhî (Abû Muhammad) 99-101, 617
Bâdhîlî al-dîn Turkî Sîjî 318-9, 630
Bâdhîlî 100
Bâdhîlî Tabrîzî 319
Bâdrî Ahwâzî 276
Bâdrî Qâwîmî; see Qâwîmî Râzî
Bâdhî Ghaznavî 101
Baghawî 212-3
Bâdhî al-dîn 'Ali-Rižâ (copyist) 464
Bahâdîr 'Abî l-İlah-wirdî Khan 155
Bahramî Qulî Asfâhî (painter) 528
Bahramî (Abû l-Hasan 'Ali Sarakhsî) 101-2, 196
Bahramî-shâh (ruhel of Sîstân) 537
Bahramî-shâh b. Dîfâd (Fakhî al-dîn) 439
Bâ'ûrî 232-3, 626-7
Bâ'ûrî (Abû l-Hasan 'Ali al-Hasan) 4-5, 595, 598, 621
Bâ'ûrî b. Zangi Saljûqî (Husam al-dîn) 323 fn.
Bâ'ûrî 579
Bakr b. 'Abd al-'Azîz Nînî (Abû Sâhi) 363
Bakrî; see Muhammad b. Qâwîm Bâlkhî
Bahântî 102
Bânhûrî (Zuhûr al-Hasan) 480, 483
Bânhûrî (Kamâl al-dîn) 532
Hasan Mutakallim 336-7
Hasan Mutakallim Naisaburi (Siyaid) 239-20
Hasan b. Naser: see Hasan b. Muhammad Ghaznavi
Hasan Qariri (copyist) 474
Hasan ʿAli b. ʿAbd al-Qahhar 334-5
Hasan b. Yusuf (copyist) 324
Hasan b. Qariri: see Khalqani
Hazi Busti 168
Hennung (W.G.) 613
Hidivat (Ridżu'll Khān) 7-8, 393
Hidivat (Sādīq) 366
Hidivat (ʿAlāʾ) Shīrāzī (copyist) 462, 473
Hishām (qādī) 337
Huḍjiri (Turkish translator) 281
Hujaim (qādī) 357
Hujata: see Nāsr (i) Khurasan
Husain b. ʿAli b. Muhammad al-Tābiʿ (copyist) 353-4
Husain b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Dihlawi Muʿayyadī 234-5
Husain Hasan al-Hāfi (Kamāl al-dīn) 338
Husain b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Qurṭubī (Abū al-Qāsim): see ʿUmrānī
Husain b. ʿAlī b. ʿAbd al-Qahhar Bākhrāzī (Abū al-Qāsim): see ʿUmrānī
Husain b. ʿAbd al-Qahhar Nāznānī [Abū ʿAbd Allāh] 437-8, 632-3
Husain Ilāqī 678, 621
Husain Khūlīyāh (copyist) 469
Husain b. Muhammad Mārīnī (copyist) 247
Husaini Qazwinī (Kiyyā) 168
Husam al-dīn: see Ardashīr b. Ḥasan
Husam Kirmānī 337-8
Husam Nasaft (Sharaf al-dīn) 253
Huyayy (sic lege) b. Qutaibah 118
Ibn ʿAbd al-Razzāq: see Abū ʿAbd al-Muṣṭafa Muhammad b. ʿAbd al-Razzāq
Ibn (al-)Fawāṣī 271, 356-7 fn., 503, 591 fn., 602
Ibn Iṣkandar Qhīṣīṣī (copyist) 468
Ibn al-Jaḥš (Fakhr al-daulah) 210-9
Ibn al-Qāsim b. Muhammad (copyist) 209-11
Ibn Muhammad Qāsim Kirmānī (copyist) 260
Ibn al-(Maja)jūt 243
Ibn b. ʿAlī (Muhammad) 354-5
Ibn Shams al-dīn Muhammad Muʿīzī jazī (copyist) 389-90
Ibn Sinā (Abū ʿAlī) 168-9, 597
Ibnat Kaʿbah: see Rādiʿah
Ibrāhīm b. Husain (Nasr al-dīn Arslān-khān) (Qarakhānī) 500, 515
Ibrāhīm b. ʿIwād Marāghī (copyist) 279 (twice)
Ibrāhīm Kashmīrī (copyist) 464
Ibrāhīm b. Muhammad Bukhārī Jāḥiṣī (Abū ʿAbd Allāh): 171, 621
Ibrāhīm Shāhī (Pakal al-dīn) 325
Ibrāhīm Thātī (qādī) 482-3
Ibrāhīm b. Yahyā Ghaṣnī 125 fn.
Ikītīyār al-dīn ʿAṣād b. Masʿūd (Malik) 323
Ilāhī (Mīr) ʿImād al-dīn Māḥmūd: 520
Ilāqī (Husain) 678, 621
Ilāqī (Turkī Khaṣṣī) 231
Ilyās (Abū ʿAlī) 169
Ilyās b. Yūsuf: see Nūzānī
Iʿmād (copyist) 467
Iʿmād (al-dīn) ʿAṣād b. ʿAbd al-Qāhir b. ʿṢafhrūʿ Isbāhānī 602
Iʿmād ʿAṣārī 340
Iʿmād (al-daulah) Fārānār (Bawandāī) 338
Iʿmād (al-dīn) Ghaznavī: see ʿImād
Iʿmād Khābūz Abūkhirī (copyist) 468
Iʿmād (al-dīn) Māḥmūd Ilārī 529
Iʿmād (al-dīn) Muhammad Harawī (copyist) 473
Iʿmād 328-41, 498, 598, 605
Iʿmārūn (BūlʿAbābā) 341
Iʿmārūn (Abū ʿAlī ʿAbd Allāh): 331, 332
Iʿrān (Allāh) 562-7
Iʿrāqī (Abū ʿAlī ʿAbd Allāh): 170
Iṣfārāʾī (Abū Ḥamīd Muzaffar) 358
Iṣkāfī ʿAbdul Fāhīṣ (copyist) 64-5, 597
Iṣkāfī (Abū ʿAlī ʿAbd Allāh): 65
Iṣkandar Street: see Muhammad b. ʿAbd Allāh: 409
Iṣmāʿīl Abaṭī 397, 632
Iṣmāʿīl b. Ḥusain Shāh (Abū ʿAlī ʿAbd Allāh): 76
Iṣmāʿīl b. ʿAli Khānī (copyist) 335
Iṣmāʿīl Bākhrāzī (Tāj al-dīn) 341, 398
Iṣmāʿīl b. Ghusūn (Abū Ibrāhīm) 196
Iṣmāʿīl Haqqī 314
Iṣmāʿīl b. Ibrāhīm Zaraʾīrī 562
Iṣmāʿīl b. Isfandāryāb Abaṭī 242
Iṣmāʿīl b. Muhammad (copyist) 474 fn.
Iṣmāʿīl b. ʿAli b. Ṭabīʿ (Kājūk) 335
Iṣmāʿīl b. Muhammad: see Kamāl Isfahānī
Iṣmāʿīl b. Muhammad Gīlākī 245, 431
Iṣmāʿīl b. Nūḥ Muntasir Sāmānī 170, 621
Iṣmāʿīl ʿEmārī 170, 508
Iṣmāʿīl Warrāq 91, 118
Iṣṭighnārī (Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muzzafar Naṣr b. Muhammad): 170, 621
Iṣyāqī (Abū al-Raṣūl) 170-1, 540, 591, 621
Izāz al-dīn: see Arslān Abah; ʿAlāʾ b. ʿAlāʾ Abah, 602
ʿIzz al-dīn: see Arslān Abah; Masʿūd b. Arslān-Abah; ʿIzz al-dīn Shafirūʿ Isbāhānī 562 fn., 602
Jabālī: see ʿAbd al-Wāṣī ʿAbd al-Wāṣī; ʿAbd al-Wāṣī, 455, 463
Jafar b. Muhammad: see Rūdakī Jafar b. Muhammad Jafar al-dīn (pahlavān i Jāhān) 417
Jafar al-dīn Faḍl Allāh Khwārī 342-4, 598
Mehmed b. Muhammed b. Yusuf Tustari Kühadhî (copyist) 479
Mehmed b. Murshid b. 'Ali al-Naqib (copyist) 282
Mehmed b. Naqi al-din Tabrizi (copyist) 474
Mehmed Firdausi (copyist) 353, 367, 468
Mehmed Shihârî (copyist) 476
Mehmed b. 'Umar: see Jauhari Şê'î-ghâ Harawi; Zamakhshari
Mehmed Warrag 238
Mehmet Yalâwâc 321-2
Mehmed 184
Mehmed 55
Mehmet 349 fn., 409-10, 594, 600, 632
Mehmet b. Najib Wâli 358
Mehmet 184-5
Mehmed (al-din) Abû l-Barakât 410-7, 600
Mehmed (al-din) 'Ayyüq 78 fn., 253, 615
Mehmed (al-din) 'Ali (copyist) 389
Mehmed (al-din) Muhammed Pâyêzî 411, 600
Mehmed (al-din) Şandali 534
Mehmed Ṭûyûd: see Mehmed Muhammed
Mehmed b. 'Ādam: see Sani Şê-it Mâkh 55
Mehmet b. İbrahim al-Panjûri (Abû l-Muzaffer) 185
Mehmet Tüllûn (Fakh al-din) see Mehmet al-Fârûki
Malaqâîbâdi 411
Malik Muhammed Tabrizi (copyist) 472
Mamârî (Abû Mansûr) 121
Mamârî (Abû Zurrât) 75, 615
Manîlân (Abû Naṣr) 215
Mâwarî Bukhârî 85, 622
Mannûrî (Ahmad b. Muhammed Samaqandî) 185-6
Mansûr b. 'Ali Manûqi Râzî (Mûr or Muwarrîd) 186-7, 622
Mansûr b. Hasan Taṣî (Abû l-Qâsim): see Firdausi
Mansûr b. Husain Taṣî (Darwîsh) (copyist) 283
Mansûr b. Mehmed Üçânî Pârgâhâr (Qâdi Shams al-din) 411-2, 537
Mansûr b. Muhammed Bibbâhî (copyist) 353
'Mansûr' b. Nûh: see Muntâşir
Mansîrî Râzî 186-7, 622
Manûcîhir (Ilî) b. Farîdân (Sharwan-shâh) 248-9, 325-7, 384-5, 426, 590
Manûcîhir b. Qâbûs (Falak al-Ma'âlî) 187
Manûcîhir b. Şâwûr (Shu'â' al-daula) 84
Maqûlî (Turkish translator) 312-3
Maqûlî (Arabic Tafrizî) 378 fn.
Marhuzî 499
Marîfî Balkhî 191
Marwârdî 191
Marzûnî Fârîsî (Rafî al-din) 506, 601
Mansûr b. Muhammed Taqiquânî (Abû l-Fadîl) 191
Mausûd b. 'Alî (Nûr al-din) Arslân-shâh 445-6, 588
Mausûd b. 'As'îd (Sa'd al-mulk) 506-7, 601
Mausûd Daulat-yar (Sa'd al-din) 320
Mausûd b. Hasan (Abû l-Muzafîr) (Mûr or Muwarrîd) Timghâlî Khan 500, 509, 545, 547
Mausûd Khujandî (Jamal al-din) 622
Mausûd Khânî 406
Mausûd b. Mansûr Mutâshâbîb (copyist) 395
Mausûd Naukî 438, 633
Mausûdî (Râzi Ghâznavi) 192-3, 537
Mausûdî i Sa'dî i Salmân 152-3, 267, 332, 412-6, 420 fn., 421, 431, 507, 510, 518, 600, 606
Mausûdî Marwazî 191-2, 622
Mausûdî Marwazî (Fakh al-din) 416
Mausûdî Isfahânî (Abû Sa'dî) (copyist) 520
Maullânâ Azzhar Tabrizî (copyist) 476
Mehmedmed (Pin) 291
Meng-burnî (Jalâl al-din) 351
Mih cannî (Abû l-Qâsim) 70
Minûcîhirî: see Manûcîhirî
Mîr 'Ali (one or more copyists) 453, 474
Mîr 'Ali Harawi (copyist) 306
Mîr 'Ali Meshhadî (copyist) 460
Mîr Muhammed Qâsim (copyist) 456
Mîr Mu'izz al-din Husein b. Muhammed Mirak (copyist) 475
Mîr Shaikh b. Qutluq Khwajâ Musârândî (copyist) 469
Mîrzâ 'Abd al-Latif (copyist) 353
Mîthâlî Khânî (copyist) 469
Mûrîd (Muwarrîdî) (Mansûr b. 'Alî Manûqi) Râzî 186-7, 622
Mu'addîb (Abû l-Qâsim) 193
Mu'ayyadî (al-din) Nasafî 416-7, 449 fn., 544-5, 632
Mu'ayyadî (Husein b. Asad Dîhatî) 234-5
Mu'âmîrî (Abû Zurrât) 75, 515
Mubârkâshâh b. Azz 'Sijî (Shams al-din) 536-7
Mubârkâshâh b. Husein Marwî-rodî Ghörtî (Fakh al-din) 417-20, 600
Mubârkâshâh Qutluq (Fakhîr i Mudâbbirî) 419
Mubârkâshâh Qawwâs: see Qawwâs
Mufâkhir (Shi'ite poet) 344
Muhammed b. 'Abd al-Karîm: see Shams Taftshî
Muhammed b. 'Abd Allâh Junaiî (Abû 'Abd Allâh) 161
Muhammed b. 'Abd Allâh: see Mubârkâshâh
Muhammed b. 'Abd al-Malik: see Mû'izzâ
Muhammed b. 'Abd al-Razzaq (Abû Mansûr) 54, 121
Muhammed b. 'Abd al-Razzaq: see Jalâl al-din Isfahânî
Muhammed b. Abû 119 fn., 193-4
Muhammed b. Abû Tâhir (Abû l-Fadîl): see Ahtîr Ahtik]},2
Muhammed b. 'Adrânî Suhhuntî (Majd al-din) 515
Muhammed b. Ahmed: see Buirînî; Daqiqî
Muhammed b. Ahmed (Jalâl al-din Abû Muhammed) 418 fn.
Muhammed b. Ahmed Bâlî (Abû 'Ali) 67-8
Muhammed b. Ahmed Muhtârî (Abû Jâfar) 196-7
Muhammed b. Ahmed Yamânî (Abû Naṣr) (copyist) 478
Muhammed b. Ahmed (copyist) 479
Muhammed b. 'Ali (copyist) 477
Muhammed b. 'Ali Bâhàlîm 333
Muhammed b. 'Ali Darwîsh 'Ali (copyist) 478
Muhammed b. 'Ali Ghânî: see Taftshî to 159-60
Muhammed b. 'Ali Husein (Taqî al-din): see Tâfî Kâshî

Рاشیدalcon میثماد b. میثماد: see Watad
Rashidi (Ismā‘īl) 170, 508
Rashidi Samargandi 254, 507-8, 601
Rainward 540-2
Rüzî (Fakhr al-dīn) 377-8, 417 fn., 499-500, 521
Rempi, Chr. 172-3
Ridā Naqqāš b. میثماد 'Ali-khān (میرزا) 156-7
Ridā-Quli Khan: see Hidayat
Riyāzī (copyist) 468
Rūdāh (or r.w.r.d.b.) ('Abd al-Lāh b. میثماد Bākhī) 220-1
Rūdākī (Abī 'Abd al-Lāh Ja'far b. میثماد Samargandi) 108, 178, 195, 199, 217-8, 221-6, 227, 237, 409, 423, 624, 625, 627
Rūdākī, Rūdākī, 'Rūdāqī': see Rūdākī
Rūhānī (Abū Bakr b. میثماد) 508-9, 636
Rūhānī (Amīr) 509
Rūhī Shārāstānī 509
Rūhī Walwālī 509-10, 539, 636
Rukn al-dīn De'wār-dār 424 fn.
Rukn al-dīn Harawī 509 fn.
Rukn al-dīn b. Rauf al-dīn Kirmānī 561
Rūnī (Abī l-Fa'raj) 349, 510-12, 601, 609 fn.
Rustam b. 'Ali (Nusrāt al-dīn) (Bawandī) 435, 536
Ribābī Shīrāzī (copyist) 475
Sāhib b. Ismā‘īl Tirmidhī (Abī) 330, 313-4, 536, 601
Sād b. (al-dīn) Kāfī Buhkārī 325, 515
Sād (al-dīn) Najīrī Samargandī: see Najīrī
Sādī b. Salāmī 412
Sādātī b. مایزیاد (Sāfī al-daulah) 565
Safī al-dīn 'Ali b. 'Umar Ghaznavī 515
Sādīq (step-son of 'Imādī) 339
Sāfī al-dīn Khujandi: see Khujandi
Sāfī al-dīn Muhammad b. IBUTāb Muhammad Uyyānī (copyist) 464
Sāfī al-dīn Muhammad b. Ja'far Isfahānī (copyist) 424 fn.
Sāfī al-dīn Muhammad b. میثماد (Nūrān al-mulk) 538
Saffār Marghazi 227, 624
Sāfī al-dīn 511
Sāhibī (Abī 'Ali) 62
Sāhīd (family) 346, 350, 497, 503
Sāhīd Tīrī 516
Sāfī (al-dīn) Isfaranī 323, 508
Sāfī Nasībārī ('Ali b. Ahmad) 516-7, 601
Sāhīgī (Shīhāb al-dīn Muhammad b. 'Ali) 517
Sāfī Isḥākī: see: Ḥasan b. میثماد Ghaznavī
Sāfī Isḥākī: see: Ḥasan b. میثماد Ghaznavī: Ḥasan Mutakallim Nāṣībūrī
Sālīh b. میثماد al-Harawī (Abī Shu'āb) 74-5
Sālih (copyist) 472
Sām b. Ḥusayn (Bābā al-dīn) 253
Sāmā'ī Marwāzī 517, 550, 602
Sāmānī 'Uqbādī: see: Īfīsāk al-dīn Ībrāhīm
Sāmānī 339, 357 fn., 383, 420, 422-3, 431, 449, 480, 517-34, 548, 602, 636-7
Sāndali (Majd al-dīn) 534
Sānī Bākhī 227, 624
Sārim al-dīn Khirārī 410
Sārgis Tīmūrgelī 165
Ṣarwī Marwāzī 572
Ṣarwī (Abī l-Qāsim 'Ubayd Allāh b. میثماد) 234 fn.
تقدیرالله ب. محمد: سازه‌های فرهادی
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (-copyist) 459
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (-copyist) 460
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (-copyist) 461
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (-copyist) 462
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 463
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 464
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 465
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 466
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 467
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 468
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 469
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 470
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 471
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 472
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 473
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 474
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 475
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 476
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 477
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 478
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 479
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 480
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 481
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 482
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 483
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 484
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 485
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 486
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 487
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 488
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 489
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 490
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 491
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 492
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 493
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 494
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 495
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 496
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 497
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 498
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 499
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 500
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 501
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 502
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 503
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 504
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 505
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 506
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 507
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 508
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 509
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 510
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 511
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 512
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 513
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 514
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 515
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 516
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 517
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 518
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 519
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 520
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 521
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 522
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 523
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 524
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 525
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 526
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 527
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 528
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 529
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 530
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 531
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 532
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 533
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 534
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 535
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 536
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 537
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 538
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 539
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 540
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 541
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 542
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 543
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 544
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 545
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 546
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 547
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 548
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 549
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 550
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 551
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 552
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 553
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 554
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 555
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 556
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 557
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 558
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 559
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 560
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 561
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 562
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 563
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 564
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 565
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 566
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 567
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 568
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 569
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 570
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 571
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 572
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 573
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 574
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 575
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 576
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 577
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 578
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 579
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 580
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 581
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 582
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 583
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 584
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 585
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 586
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 587
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 588
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 589
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 590
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 591
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 592
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 593
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 594
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 595
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 596
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 597
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 598
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 599
تقدیرالله ب. هایج کمال (copyist) 600
t2

Flôres et Blancheflor 78
garshasp-nâmah: see karshasp-nâmah
gharib-nâmah 532
Gôsh-nâmah 566-7
gul e bulbul (attr. to ‘Attâr) 298-300, 629
Gul e hurmaz: see Khusrâw-nâmah
gul e Khusrav: see Khusrâw-nâmah
hadûtat e haqiqat (Sanâ’i) 480, 518, 522-30
haft-pâkûr (Nižâmi) 441, 450, 485-7, 635
haft wâdil (attr. to ‘Attâr) 300
Hâlij-nâmah (attr. to ‘Attâr) 274-5, 300-1
Hâlij-nâmah (attr. to ‘Attâr) 306, 629
hamûyûn hamûyûn (Khwâjû) 79
hamûyûn-nâmah 574-5
Hamûyûn i yamûq (Mukhâ-ri) 431
îlâyih-nâmah (‘Attâr) 291-4, 409
îqlab-nâmah (Nižâmi): see Iskandar-nâmah
işhâd i bayân (attr. to ‘Attâr) 308
Ishq-nâmah (attr. to Sanâ’i) 532, 637
Iskandar-nâmah (i bard, bahtir) (Nižâmi) 441-6, 487-92, 585-90, 633
Iskandar-nâmah (anon., in prose) 629
jabângir-nâmah 575
jaâver al-dâtî (attr. to ‘Attâr) 274-5, 300, 301-3
jaâver-nâmah: see Mustâbat-nâmah
Jawâd al-dâtî: see Jawâh al-dâtî
Jawâh al-dâtî: see Jawâh al-dâtî
Jawâhîr-nâmah: see Jawâh al-dâtî
Junjûnah-nâmah (attr. to ‘Attâr) 303, 629-30
kalilah wa dimnah (Rûdaki) 222
Kanz al-tsârî (attr. to ‘Attâr) 303
Kanz al-bâhîr (attr. to ‘Attâr) 303
Kanz al-shahrâb (Masnû’i) 186
Kanz al-haqqîq (attr. to ‘Attâr) 304
kâr-nâmah i Balîkht (Sanâ’i) 518, 520-1
Karshasp (Kitâb î) (Abû Mu‘à’îyad) 68, 85-6
Karshasp-nâmah (Asâdî) 83-8, 125, 564
Karshasp-nâmah (prose) 87
Khâyîfâ-nâmah (attr. to ‘Attâr) 304-5
Khamas (Khusrâu) 442 fn.
Khamas (Nižâmi) 449-80
Khazîn al-asrâr (attr. to ‘Attâr) 305
Khind-but u Surkh-bat (‘Usumrî) 253-2, 627
Khîrad-nâmah (Nižâmi): see Iskandar-nâmah
Khulâsat i khamsah 492-4
Khusrav u Gul: see Khusrav-nâmah
Khusrav u Shîrîn (Nižâmi) 440, 483-4
Khusrav-nâmah (‘Attâr) 274, 275-6, 278-9
Khîth: see the remainder of the title
Kosh-nâmah 566-7
Kûk-i-Khûshâz-nâmah 575-6
Kunûz al-asrâr (attr. to Sanâ’i) 532
Kunûz al-rumûz: see: Sâir al-tîbâd
laîl (u) Mahtân (Nižâmi) 440-1, 447, 484-5, 635
Lisân al-shâbî (attr. to ‘Attâr) 272-3, 305-6
muqâbal in maqâm i nayâm 418-9
Mubâkân al-asrâr (Nižâmi) 439, 440, 480-3
munshâr-nâmah (attr. to ‘Attâr) 303
Munshirî (Kitâb î) (Râzî) 184
Muntiq al-târî (‘Attâr) 281-8
Muzaffar al-muyyâr: see Muntiq al-târî
Marzbân-nâmah 506 fn.
Ma‘âlîd i Zarutsî (Kâ-Kâ’ûnî) 174-6, 621
Mazhar al-qâtîb (attr. to ‘Attâr) 272-3, 306-7, 628
Metochus and Parthenope 233
Mîshâb al-futûh: see Tartâl al-tâhîq
Mu’âlîm al-tawârîkh wa l-qisâs 31, 562-3, 566, 571
Mukhîr-nâmah (‘Attâr) 273-4, 296-71
Munâzârat (Asâdî) 88-9
Mustâbat-nâmah (‘Attâr) 288-91
Mîshâb al-arwâh: see Tartâl al-tâhîq
Nasîm al-sabî tâlî l-sabî (Mu‘à’îyad Nasafî) 416-7, 632
Naurûz-nâmah: see: Khâyîfâ-nâmah
Nishât-nâmah (Mubârak-shâbî) 418
Nuz ‘ôt al-ahbâb (attr. to ‘Attâr) 308, 629
Nuz ‘ôt-nâmah: see: Mustâbat-nâmah
Pahlavi texts 44-5
Pahlavân-nâmah (‘Ali b. Muzaffarî) 533, 637
Pahlavân-nâmah (Mu‘à’îyad Nasafî) 416-7
Pand-nâmah (attr. to Anûrî) 83
Pand-nâmah (attr. to ‘Attâr) 308-14, 629
Pand-nâmah i Anûshkârvan 99-101
Panj ganî (Nižâmi): see Khamsah
Pîrân i Weshâ 612-4
Rāhāt al-insān 99-101
Rébāt al-tabāqāt (Mubarak-shāh) 419
(al-rittālah al-muhāqah) (anon.,
continuer of Sijistānī) 360, 625
Risālat al-ṣawār (or al-tawārā) (attribu.
to Ahmad or Muhammad
Ghazālī) 281, 628-9
Rūshān al-rāmīāh (attrib. to Nāṣīr i
Khusrāw) 206-211
Rumūz al-ʿāshīqīn (attrib. to ʿAṭār)
314
Saʿḍāt-nāmah (attrib. to Nāṣīr i
Khusrāw) 623
Sair al-ʿibād ilā l-maʿād (Sanāʾī)
518, 521-2, 637
Shab-rang-nāmah 572, 638
Shāh-bahr uʿAin al-hayāh
(ʿUnṣūrī) 232-3, 627
Shāhānshāh-nāmah (Majd al-dīn
Pāyāzī) 411
Shāh-nāmah (Abū ʿAli Balkhī)
67-8
Shāh-nāmah (Ṭirdaust) 54-8,
112-59, 222
Shāh-nāmah (Masʿūdī Marwazī)
191-2
Shāh-nāmah ‘of Abū Mansūr
121-4
Shāhryār-nāmah (attrib. to Far-
rūkhī) 111, 434-5
Shāhryār-nāmah (attrib. to
Mukhtārī) 432-5
Sharaf-nāmah (Nizāmī): see
Iskandar-nāmah
Shustar-nāmah: see Ushur-nāmah
St fast (attrib. to ʿAṭār) 314, 629
Sīkandar-nāmah: see Iskandar-
nāmah
Sindbad-nāmah (various versi-
sions) 93-4, 222-3, 624
Sittah (Nizāmī): see Khamshām
Sultān Junjumah (Qāsimī) 303,
629-30
Tohrmat al-qalam (attrib. to
Sanāʾī) S33
Tuhrābat al-ilām (attrib. to Sanāʾī)
533
Türābkhānah (attr. to Khayāmī)
363, 369
Turāb-nāmah (Bākhārzī) 595
Turat al-tabāqāt (attrib. to Sanāʾī)
530-2
Turqat al-muḥāqqiqūn: see Turāq-
al-tabāqāt
Turjamān wāṣīyat amr al-
muʿāminīn ‘Aft b. Abī Ṭālīb
(Ḥasan Ghazānī) 335
Tirzān and Ṣaṣāl 164, 167
Tuhfat al-irāqān (Khāṣṣī) 247,
384-5, 393-7
Ukhūr-nāmah (attrib. to ʿAṭār)
274-5, 314-6, 630
Vissrāmī Ān 165
Wahman-Yašt (Zand I) 173-4
Wāmiq uʿAdrā (ʿUnṣūrī) 232-5
Wāmiq uʿAdrā (various versi-
sions) 234
Warqah u Gushah (ʿAiyūqī) 77-
80
Warqah u Gushah (anon., in
hazay) 80
Wāṣīyat-nāmah (attrib. to ʿAṭār)
316
Wāṣīrat-nāmah (attrib. to ʿAṭār)
306, 316-7
Wis u Rūmā Ṣ (Gurgānī) 161-7,
243 fn.
Wisārīsh I chatriang 122 fn.
Yawāgt i al-ulām 632-3 (twice)
Yasaf u Zulaiḥkhī 576-84
Zād al-sādikūn: see Turq al-
tabāqāt
Zaināb-nāmah (Rashīdī) 507
Zand I Wahman-Yašt 173-4
Zardazuki-nāmah (Kai-Kūšī)
171-6, 621
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hīr 613 fn.
Isfandīyār-āṭī 56
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Karshāsp 83 fn.
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Māhsāt 409 fn.
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fn.
Manūs, bīḍr 187 fn.
Meng-burnī 351 fn.
Menji 197 fn.
Nāṣīrshā 617
Naṣūr 56
Niʿēshābūr 617
pahlavī 162, 612
pīghā 322 fn.
pīšīk 616
Qohistān (=al-Jīlān/Media) 268
sāt 409 fn.
Shafrūh (Shufurwāh, etc.) 540
fn.
shāhānshāh, Shāhānshāh 590 fn.
shāhī 332
Spondū-šāhī 56
Tāhmārūn-ī 55-6, 614
Taxma- Urupī 56
tayyārāt 411
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wesānāb 613 fn.
yahqa 322 fn.
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