

ON THE COMPOSITION OF THE AYYĀTKĀR Ī ZARĒRĀN*

An edition of the text of the small Book Pahlavi work entitled *Ayyātkār ī Zarērān* (hereafter *AZ*), "Memoir of the Zarēr family", is found in H.S. Nyberg's *Manual of Pahlavi*¹. Owing to the fortunate fact that Nyberg was able to finish the second part of his *Manual*, the glossary (1974), it is also possible to reconstruct his interpretation of the more complicated passages of this work. On the whole, the text is not especially difficult, but it raises some questions as regards the formal composition and the use of certain verbal forms and tenses. Some observations in these respects will be given below.

This text has a comparatively long history in European Pahlavi studies. W. Geiger published a translation of it and a comparison with the corresponding part in *Šāh-nāmah*, in 1890², and Nöldeke contributed a number of remarks in 1892³. The Pahlavi text itself was made generally available a few years later, when Jamasp-Asana published it in his renowned *Pahlavi Texts, contained in the Codex MK copied in 1322 A.C. by the scribe Mehr-Āwān Kai-khūsirū*⁴.

The textological situation seems to be quite simple. All known versions are directly descended from Jamasp-Asana's Codex MK, dated 691 A.Y. = 1322 A.D. and, unfortunately, badly worm-eaten⁵.

* These notes are intended as preliminaries to a forthcoming study on verbs and preverbs in the *Ayyātkār ī Zarērān* which I had the privilege to discuss with Professor Nyberg a few months before his death. They are a quite inadequate tribute to the example and memory of my great teacher.

¹ Part I, Wiesbaden 1964, pp. 18-30; critical notes, pp. 185-186; editorial notes, pp. XII-XIII.

² "Das Yātkār-i Zarērān und sein Verhältnis zum Šāh-nāme", *Sitzungsber. d. philos.-philol. u. hist. Cl. d. k. bayer. Akad. d. Wiss.*, II: 1, pp. 43-84.

³ *ZDMG* 46, pp. 136-145.

⁴ I, Bombay 1897; II [= the same and further texts], with an introd. by B.T. Anklesaria, Bombay 1913.

⁵ It is described in detail by B.T. Anklesaria in his introduction to *Pahlavi Texts*, pp. 1-8; according to Nyberg, *Manual* I, p. xi, n. 1, there is uncertainty as to its present whereabouts; on the copyist, Mihrāpān ī Kai Xōsrōi, and the copyist of his model, his grandfather's uncle Rōstahm ī Mihrāpān, see J.C. Tavadia, *ZDMG* 98 (1944), pp. 313-332.

There are in addition a copy of MK, dated 1136 A.Y. = 1767 A.D., designated JJ by Jamasp-Asana⁶, and a number of later transcripts (by E.W. West and others)⁷. It has been my objective here to follow as closely as possible the text of MK, as it is represented in Jamasp-Asana's *Pahlavi Texts* (pp. 1-16), with the hope that the critical apparatus there is reasonably complete and reliable. The text of AZ is there given with variant readings from MK and JJ, possibly with emendations from a transcript by E.W. West and certainly also with some emendations by Jamasp-Asana himself. The text will be quoted with reference to the paragraph numbers in *Pahlavi Texts*. As for the system of transcription, this our child of sorrow, I am still using the slightly modified version of Nyberg's system employed in my recent article "Verbal forms and ideograms in the Middle Persian inscriptions"⁸.

In more modern times the text of Jamasp-Asana has been re-edited in transcription, with introduction, translation, notes and glossary by A. Pagliaro⁹, and this edition, in its turn, formed the basis of E. Benveniste's important re-evaluation of the nature of this text in his article "Le mémorial de Zarēr, poème pehlevi mazdéen"¹⁰. Since the publication of his bold attempt to convert the text of AZ into hexasyllabic verse, there has been general agreement on the poetical character of this text, even though the nature of its metrical system has been subject to different interpretations. This verse element is, however, not present to the same extent all through the composition. AZ, as we know it, is not a wholly homogeneous work. With regard to the contents, the text may be divided into three sections: §§ 1-34, a summarizing introduction; §§ 35-68, the prophecy of Jāmāsp and its immediate consequences; §§ 69-114, a description of the battle¹¹.

The section of Firdausi's (i.e. here Daqīqī's) *Šāh-nāmah* which corresponds to AZ §§ 1-34 (4 pp. in *Pahlavi Texts*) runs through 271

⁶ Description by Anklesaria in *Pahlavi Texts*, introd., pp. 8-10.

⁷ Cf. *Pahlavi Texts*, introd., pp. 10-11; Geiger, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

⁸ *Acta Orientalia*, Copenhagen, 36 (1974), pp. 83-112; on transcription, see p. 85.

⁹ "Il testo pahlavico Ayātkār-i-Zarērān, edito in trascrizione, con introduzione, note e glossario", *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Cl. di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, VI: I, Rome 1925, pp. 550-604.

¹⁰ *Journal Asiatique* 220 (1932), pp. 245-293.

¹¹ The initial invocation, *pat nām... nipēsihēt*, left without a § number in *Pahlavi Texts*, is not taken into account.

baits or 19 pages of text in the Russian edition of that work¹². This introductory section in *AZ* is obviously a summary of the full epic version, and seems to be a summary in prose in which verses from a poetical original shine through here and there (esp. in direct discourse). It is on the whole narrated in past tense, although with much direct discourse in present tense. However, some forms cause difficulties: YH̄WNyt: *bavēt* in § 3 (a mistake for *būt*?) and YTWNyt: *āyēt* in § 4 (a form of *frēstītan* would suit the context much better, and a slight emendation of the ideogram to ŠDRWN seems legitimate; *u-šān* first in the § would then furnish the agent of an emended form *frēstīt*). The past tense narration then runs smoothly till the end of § 26, although it is possible to see remnants of poetry here and there, e.g. in § 20:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <i>šmāh hač ānōd āyēt</i> | You come from there, |
| <i>tāi amāh hač ētār āyēm</i> | till we come from here, |
| <i>u šmāh amāh vēnēt</i> | and you see us, |
| <i>[u] amāh šmāh vēnēm</i> | [and] we see you. |

§ 6 *ēvak vīdrafs yātūk u ditikar nām-x“āst ī hazārān* also has a very epic ring; compare *Šāh-nāmah*, baits 126-127:

| | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| گوی ییرو جادو ستنه سترگ | یکی نام او بیدرفش بزرگ |
| که هرگز دلش جز تباهی نخواست | دگر جادوی نام او نام خواست |

In the end of § 26 something interesting happens. The narration seems to change from past (M̄HYTWNt: *zāt*) to present tense (pzdynd: *pazdēnd*, BYDWNd: *kunēnd*) which is kept till the end of § 31. With regard only to this passage it might seem that the present indicatives are used in description of simultaneous action, but in the light of the use of tenses further on in the text, this can hardly be the full truth. The explanation is rather that a verse passage is being quoted:

| | |
|--|---|
| § 26 ...] <i>u nāi pazdēnd</i> | ...and they play the flute |
| <i>u gāž-dūmb</i> ¹³ <i>vāng kunēnd</i> | and sound the horn, |
| § 27 <i>u-š kārván ēvārz kunēnd</i> | and they muster the troops for him, |
| <i>u pilván pat pīl ravēnd</i> | and the elephant-men ride the elephants, |

¹² Firdausī, *Šāh-nāmah*, vol. VI, Moscow 1967, ed. M.-N. O. Osmanov, pp. 68-86, baits 39-312.

¹³ Cf. Nyberg, *Manual* II, s.v.

u stōrpān pat stōr ravēnd
u vartēn-dār pat vartēn rav[ē]nd

and the horsemen ride the horses,
 and the charioteers drive the
 chariots.

§ 28 *vās ēstēt + šif(á)rg(?)*¹⁴
vās kan-tígr ī purr-tígr
u vās zrēh ī rōšn
u vās zrēh ī čahār-kárt
 § 29 (*u*) *kārvān ī ērān(-šahr) ētōn*
bē-ēstēnd

Many a sword(?) appears,
 many a quiver full of arrows
 and many a bright armour
 and many a fourfold armour.
 The troops of the Iranians appear
 so

ka vāng bē ō asmān šavēt
u pattān bē ō dōšāx^a šavēt
 § 30 *pat ráh kú šavēnd*
vitárg ētōn bē-brīnēnd
*apāk [súmb?]*¹⁵ *áp bē-+š[ē]pēnd*
*ī tāi ē mǎh*¹⁶ *x^aartán nē-šāyēt*

that the clamour goes to Heaven
 and right to Hell it goes.
 Wherever on the way they go,
 they make their passage so,
 they stir up water with [the hoofs?]
 which for one month is impossible
 to drink.

§ 31 *tāi 50 rōč rōšn nē-bavēt*
múrv-ē-č nišēm nē-vindāt (for -ēt?)
*bē ka ō aspān bāšn nēzakān tēh*¹⁷

For 50 days there is no light;
 not a single bird finds its nest
 but on the mane of the horses,
 the point of the lances,
 or they sit down on the lofty
 mountain.

aivāp ō kóf ī sar-búrz nišīnēnd

(Probably interpolated
 explanation).

(*hač gart u dūt šap u rōč nē-paitāk*)

Compare *Šāh-nāmah*, baits 305-312:

بزد نای و کوس و بنه بر نهاد
 درفش هایون فرخنده شاه
 سپاهی گه هرگز چنان کس ندید
 کس روز روشن ندید ایچ راه
 همی ناله کوس نشنید گوش
 همه نیزه ها ز ابر بگذاشته
 چو بیشه نیستان بوقت بهار
 ز کشور بکشور همی شد سپاه

چو روزی بیخشید و جوشن بداد
 بفرمود بردن زپیش سپاه
 سوی رزم ارجاسپ لشکر کشید
 زتاریکی وگرد پای سپاه
 زبس بانگ اسپان و از بس خروش
 درفش فراوان بر افراشته
 چو رسته درخت از بر کوهسار
 ازین سان همی رفت گشتاسپ شاه

¹⁴ Cf. Nyberg, *Manual* II, s.v.; or metathesis +šifigr?; ī rōtastahm, interpolation?

¹⁵ Or *apāk* for adj. *a-pāk* and no addition?

¹⁶ *āp*, interpolation?

¹⁷ Two lines?

It is the same and not the same. The poetical ornamentation of the same basic hyperboles is rather differently wrought. Another important difference is the fact that Daqīqī's version is narrated in past tense, while *AZ* here seems to have present tense. A few cases of unexpected present tense in a text like *AZ* could, of course, be explained away somehow, but the occurrence of present forms, especially in §§ 35-114, is so consistent and grammatically well integrated that I think we have to accept that the underlying poetical text must have been composed in *praesens historicum*. We know so little about Middle Persian epic poetry that we cannot say if such a use of present tense narration of past events was unusual or otherwise. It is, however, a striking fact that it seems to be unknown in early New Persian epic poetry.

How should the metrical system of the verse passages in *AZ* be defined? That is a difficult question, and it must be admitted that the analysis is not made easier by the archaic transcription used here. But as long as we know so little about the time of composition of the underlying poem¹⁸, other conceivable systems of transcription would also get us into difficulties, especially as regards the number of syllables and the quality of the rhymes. The general discussion of Middle Persian metrics is well-known¹⁹. Suffice it to mention that W.B. Henning in his two articles "The disintegration of the Avestic studies"²⁰ and "A Pahlavi poem"²¹ convincingly showed that the earlier theories of a purely syllabic metre in Middle Iranian (and Avestan) poetry could not be maintained and that we instead should look for a constant number of stressed syllables (*arses*) to a line. In "A Pahlavi poem" Henning turns his special attention to the *Draxt ī Asūrīk*, which was the first Middle Persian text to be presented as verse by E. Benveniste²². Choosing "a few connected passages, selected at random" (p. 642), Henning managed to show not only that there are four stresses to the line, with a caesura in the middle, but also that "it seems that the limits of variation in the number of syllables are precisely set" (p. 645). He continues: "The differences between the maximum and the average, and between the minimum and

¹⁸ Beginning of the 6th century A.D. acc. to Nöldeke, *Das iranische Nationalepos*, 2: e Aufl., Berlin-Leipzig 1920, p. 5; accepted by Benveniste, *JA* 220, p. 291.

¹⁹ A good recent survey is found in S. Shaked, "Specimens of Middle Persian verse", *Henning Mem. Vol.*, 1970, pp. 395-405.

²⁰ *TPS* 1942 (publ. 1944) pp. 40-56.

²¹ *BSOAS* 13 (1949-50), pp. 641-648.

²² *JA* 217 (1930), pp. 193-225.

the average are apparently equal. Thus, in the *Draxt-i Asūrīg* the average number of syllables to a line is 12; the maximum is 14, the minimum 10...". Already in his "Disintegration" (p. 53) he had stated that "the line of three arses comprised between five and ten syllables, as a rule, but in this case the average number was seven or eight".

These suggestions by Henning were put into full-scale practice by Mary Boyce in her *Manichaean hymn-cycles in Parthian*²³, where she gives a detailed description of the metres in the two hymn-cycles *Huwidagmān* and *Angad Rōšnān* (pp. 45-59). Both cycles use metres with four stressed syllables to the line (with caesura), but *Huwidagmān* is shown to have on the average $1\frac{1}{2}$ syllables more in the line than *Angad Rōšnān*: 12.82 (varying from 10 to 17) as against 11.34 (varying from 8 to 16) syllables (pp. 46-47). There is also statistical evidence of other differences between the sets of metres, but listing the different types of distribution of stressed and unstressed syllables, Mary Boyce comes to a good 25 patterns already for the half-lines (pp. 49-54), and these with no apparent system. On top of this there arise occasional difficulties in deciding which syllables take the stress (p. 54). This must lead us to the conclusion that there are metrical rules supplementing the general frame set by the number of stresses (and, in places, caesura). So far these rules seem to have eluded our recognition²⁴.

Returning now to *AZ*, it seems safe to assume that the verse found there is held within the frame of three stresses to the line and that the line comprises between five and ten syllables having an average between seven and eight, i.e. exactly as suggested by Henning in the quotation from "Disintegration" given above²⁵. In the present state of these studies, I am afraid that we must stop there. In this type of material there are too many factors of uncertainty to allow even for making statistics, the original form, length and number of the lines being unknown. If the riddles of Middle Iranian versification are to be solved, I think this must be done on the basis of texts where the verse lines are definable with certainty on graphical or other grounds. Among other things that should mean that the copyists knew that they were writing verse.

²³ London Oriental ser., 3; London 1954.

²⁴ Cf. also Shaked, *op. cit.*, pp. 397, 403-405.

²⁵ The possibility of counting the line as six stresses with a caesura in the middle should not be completely ruled out, but the distribution of rhymes makes that less likely.

One more aspect of the verse in *AZ* has to be discussed: the rhymes. Of the 24 lines quoted above at least 18 rhyme in some way or other. Considering the unreliability of the text, that might seem sufficient proof in itself, but it is not so certain, after all. All these rhymes are present indicative verbal endings (possibly apart from a +*šifigr?*/*tigr* in § 28), and so it will often be seen to be also further on in the text. According to the common rules of Middle Persian grammar and the obvious poetical aim to finish a clause within the line, this is more or less what could be expected also without rhyming rules. A short look at earlier suggestions and examples of rhyme in Middle Iranian poetry gives a somewhat confusing picture:

H.S. Nyberg, in "Ein Hymnus auf Zervān in Bundahišn"²⁶, presents a text of lines elegantly rhyming in pairs (p. 223), but Henning in "A Pahlavi poem" (p. 646, n. 5) summarily dismisses the possibility of the passage in question being a poem at all. He does so in connection with a general discussion on rhyme, where he states "that in the whole of the Western Middle Iranian material so far recognized as poetical there is not a single rhyme in the strict sense. There are accidental rhymes and assonances, but the principle of rhyme as such, the deliberate rhyme, seems to have been unknown". Yet, in the next paragraph he publishes an *andarz* text from Jamasp-Asana's *Pahlavi Texts* (p. 54) arranged as a poem rhyming all through in *-ān* (incl. interior rhyme in the *matla'* in the manner of *Qaṣida*). Commenting upon it, he leaves it an open question if this is a true Middle Persian poem or an imitation of [New] Persian models.

In his article "A rhymed ballad in Pahlavi"²⁷, J.C. Tavadia finds (p. 30) that the last-mentioned poem may have a Sasanian origin. On the other hand he expresses doubt as to the time of origin of the poem he himself publishes in this article²⁸. This text is once more taken from the inexhaustible *Pahlavi Texts* (pp. 160-161)²⁹, and it is arranged by Tavadia as a poem rhyming in *-ān* all through its 30 lines and with one or two caesuras to the line³⁰.

S. Shaked, in his already quoted contribution to the *Henning Memorial Volume* (pp. 395-405), seems to disregard rhyme completely

²⁶ ZDMG 82(1928), pp. 217-235.

²⁷ JRAS 1955, pp. 29-36.

²⁸ See also M. Boyce, JRAS 1957, p. 41 with n. 2.

²⁹ Publ. as prose by H.W. Bailey; *Zoroastrian problems*, Oxford 1943, pp. 195-196.

³⁰ Doubts on this arrangement are expressed by Shaked, *op. cit.* p. 405, n. 37.

as a relevant element in Middle Persian poetic structure, but in the paper "Andarz ī Wehžād Farrox Pērōz containing a Pahlavi poem in praise of wisdom"³¹, A. Tafazzoli, on much the same text material, comes to the opposite conclusion. He makes his own arrangement (independently) of the *andarz* text (from *Pahlavi Texts*, pp. 74-75) published by Shaked (*op. cit.*, pp. 398-400) as "a hymn to wisdom" making it rhyme in *-tar* all through. He rearranges the "poem in praise of wisdom", re-edited by Shaked (*op. cit.*, pp. 400-401) after an earlier publication by Tavadia³² of another piece from *Pahlavi Texts* (pp. 165-166), finding in it three strophes rhyming in *-ag*, *xrad* and *-tar*, respectively, and his conclusion is (p. 58): "Most Pahlavi poems so far noticed in the Pahlavi works, as well as those preserved in Persian script in the Islamic books, are consciously rhymed".

It seems as if the problem of rhyme in Middle Persian is about as complicated as that of metre. Apart from the apparent difficulties in defining with certainty the end of verse lines embedded in what is presented as prose in late manuscripts, the relation between "conscious" and "consistent" use of rhyme seems to be an essential point. Where is the borderline between accidental and deliberate rhymes? Rhymes may be used, of course, as a facultative stylistic device, i.e. "conscious" but not "consistent". Furthermore, "consistent" could mean consistent with rules which we are unable to discern at present. The conclusion of Benveniste regarding the rhymes in *AZ* was that the verses "often rhyme" with the cautious addition "sans être constante ni complète"³³. On the above material and what is to be brought forth below, it seems to me that the verses found in *AZ* show a deliberate use of rhymes at least as a facultative device, possibly also consistent with some hidden rules—it must be remembered that these verses most probably were meant to be sung³⁴.

The discussion of the text of *AZ* had reached the end of § 31 (supra p. 403). §§ 32-33 are, once more, narrated in past tense, but

³¹ *Īrān-šīnāsī* 2(1350/1971): 2, pp. 45-60; also publ. in *Studia Iranica* 1(1972): 2, pp. 207-217.

³² "A didactic poem in Zoroastrian Pahlavi", *Indo-Iranian Studies*, I, Santiniketan 1950, pp. 86-95; also publ. in *M.P. Kharegat Mem. Vol.*, Bombay 1953, pp. 271-275.

³³ *JA* 220, p. 251; *ibid.*, p. 293, he speaks, although in a wider perspective, of "la constance relative de la rime".

³⁴ See Mary Boyce, "The Parthian *gōsān* and Iranian minstrel tradition", *JRAS* 1957, p. 28 with n. 1, and *passim*.

the last paragraph of this first section falls back into present tense, possibly in verse:

§ 34 *pas zanēnd 300 mēx ī āsēnēn* Then they pitch 300 iron poles,
*ī pātīš bandēnd 300 + xīrs(?)*³⁵ to which they fasten 300 rings(?),
kē har + xīrs-ē 300 drāi i zarrēn in each ring of which 300 golden
 bells

pātīš ākúst-ēstēt are hung.

The second section comprises §§ 35-68 (5 pp. in *Pahlavi Texts*), describing the prophecy of Jāmāsp and its immediate consequences. The corresponding passage in *Šāh-nāmah* occupies baits 313-434 in the Russian edition (VI, pp. 87-95). The contents of the two versions are quite similar, at times strikingly similar. The main difference is that *Šāh-nāmah* is almost exclusively concerned with the prophecy, while *AZ* takes the second half of this section to describe King Vištāsp's reaction on the prophecy. Narration in *Šāh-nāmah* is, of course, in past tense. *AZ*, on the other hand, has almost completely present tense narration in this section (the two possible exceptions in § 50 will be treated below), and it is generally rather easy to distinguish the lines of the original poem:

§ 35 *pas vištāsp ō kai-gāh nišinēt* Then V. seats himself on the throne
u jāmāsp bītāxs ō pēs x'āhēt and calls J., the Bītāxs, forward.
gōbēt kū mán dānēm He says (that): "I know
kū tō jāmāsp dānāk that you, J., are wise
u vēnāk [u] šnāsák hē(h) and clear-sighted [and] knowing.
 § 36 *ēn-ič dānēt (?)* Do you also know this:
kū ka 10 rōč vārān āyēt when it is raining 10 days,
čand srišk ō damīk āyēt how many drops fall on the earth,
u čand srišk apar srišk āyēt and how many drops fall upon
 drops?

§ 37 *u ēn-ič dānē(h) (?)* And do you also know this:
kū [ka] urvarān viškōfēt when the plants blossom
katām hān gúl i rōč viškōfēt which of those flowers that
 blossoms in the day

u katām hān ī šáp (?) and which one in the night,
katām hān ī fratāk (?) which one the next day?

§ 38 *ēn-ič dānē(h) kū + mih(á)rg(?)*³⁶ Do you also know this: of the
 clouds

³⁵ Cf. Nyberg, *Manual* II, s.v.

³⁶ Cf. Nyberg, *Manual* II, s.v.

katām hān āp dārēt
u katām hān nē-dārēt
 § 39 *ēn-ič dānē(h) (?)*
kū fratāk-rōč ē[ē] bavēt

andar hān aždahāk-rāzm ī vištāspān

hác pūsarān u brātārān
ī mán kai-vištāsp-šáh
kē zīvēt u kē mīrēt

which one has water
 and which one has not?
 Do you also know this:
 what will be to-morrow
 in that Dragon-battle of the
 Vištāsp;
 among the sons and brothers
 of me, K.,
 who will live and who will die?"

The corresponding passage in *Šāh-nāmāh*, baits 314-322:

| | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| فرود آمد از باره بر شد بگاه | بشد شهریار از میان سپاه |
| کجا رهنمون بود گشتاسپ را | بخواند او گرانایه جاماسپ را |
| چراغ بزرگان و اسیهبدان | سر مویدان بود و شاه ردان |
| که بودی بر او آشکارا نهان | چنان پاک تن بود و تابنده جان |
| ابا او بدانش کرا پایه بود | ستاره شناس و گرانایه بود |
| ترا دین به داد و پاکیزه رای | پیرسید ازو شاه و گفتا خدای |
| جهاندار دانش ترا داد و بس | چو تو نیستاندر جهان هیچ کسی |
| بگویی همی مرا روی کار | بیایدت کردن ز اختر شمار |
| کرا بیشتر باشد اینجا درنگ | که چون باشد آغاز و فرجام جنگ |

The differences in accentuation of the contents seem to be mostly within what could be ascribed to differences in poetical temperament and milieu. The mode of expression is more archaic in *AZ*, and it is especially striking that Daqīqī's version has such a religious tone as opposed to the completely secular spirit of *AZ*.

The main criteria for reading this passage (and others) in *AZ* as verse are: short sentences, often repeating the same structure over and over again; often irregular word order (better examples further on); rhythmically recurring repetitions of words and phrases; use of standing epithets (better examples further on); general rhythmical qualities, very often allowing the text to be scanned in series of three stresses between pauses. In many of these respects, among others the word order, the text is closely related to *Šāh-nāmāh*. With this it shall not be claimed that the text arranged as lines of poetry above (and below) necessarily appears in the shape it had in the original epic. Many of the lines are probably close to the original,

while others must have suffered considerable corruption during some 7-800 years of oral and written textual history (Codex MK being dated 1322 A.D.)³⁷.

Considering the narrow textual basis (two interdependent MSS) and the uncertainty as to metrical and other rules applicable to this type of poetry, I have generally made no attempt to reconstruct an imagined original. Furthermore, it would be too cumbersome here to republish the whole text, verse by verse. Such a text would look rather much like the one already produced (although not complete) by Benveniste, the main difference being that it would be possible to put back most of the words he had to exclude in order to follow his own strict rule of six syllables to the line. In the following only verse lines of special interest, for instance in relation to corresponding parts of *Šāh-nāmah*, will be quoted.

It may be of some relevance here to add a short note on the relation of *AZ* to the so called *Jāmāsp-nāmak* or *Ayyātkār ī Jāmāspik*, the *Jāmāspi* of the Parsees³⁸. This work is preserved in a fragmentary and confused way, only part of it being known in the original Pahlavi, the rest surviving in Pazand, the so called Parsi (i.e. transcription of Pahlavi in Arabic writing) and New Persian translation³⁹. Its chapter XVI (no. as in the reconstruction by Messina), which is the only one fully preserved in Pahlavi, has been analysed as verse (octosyllabic and partly rhyming) by E. Benveniste, who discusses it in detail in his article "Une apocalypse pehlevie: le *Žāmāsp-Nāmak*"⁴⁰. The main subject matter which *AZ* has in common with this work is the simple fact that "*Jāmāsp bītaxš*", being questioned by "*Vištāsp-šāh*" foretells the future, but there are also some formal similarities. The text is obviously adapted from an original in verse. This is valid for chapter XVI, as argued by Benveniste, but it may also

³⁷ According to Mary Boyce, *Hdb. d. Orientalistik*, I: IV: 2: 1, p. 56, *AZ* was presumably written down after the Arab conquest.

³⁸ There seems to be but uncertain evidence for the distinction made by Mary Boyce, *Hdb. d. Orientalistik*, I: IV: 2: 1, p. 50, to the effect that *Jāmāsp-nāmak* should be just one chapter (XVI) of the longer work *Ayyātkār ī Jāmāspik*.

³⁹ The Pahlavi, Pazand and New Persian (and Gujarati) text material has been published and translated by J.J. Modi, *Jāmāspi, Pahlavi, Pāzend and Persian texts*, Bombay 1903; partly re-edited in transcription, supplemented with the Parsi text and a reconstruction of the Pahlavi, and translated by G. Messina, *Libro apocalittico persiano Ayātkār ī Žāmāspik*, Rome 1939.

⁴⁰ *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 106(1932), pp. 337-380; Benveniste uses the text as published by H.W. Bailey in *BSO[A]S* 6(1930-32), pp. 55-85, 581-600, 822-824.

be so for other parts of the work, although it is difficult to establish the actual verse lines on the basis of the often quite confused secondary material in Pazand and Parsi⁴¹. In chapter XVI the verse lines are characterized by four stresses with a caesura in the middle and quite frequent rhymes of the same somewhat uncertain verbal type as in *AZ*⁴². This holds true also for the occasional lines of chapter XVI left out as interpolations by Benveniste.

The first chapter of the *Ayyātkār ī Jāmāspik* has some apparent connections with *AZ*. Paragraph I.7 (in Messina's reconstruction) is partly an exact parallel to § 1 of *AZ*. It runs (in the transcription used here): *ēn ayyātkār ī jāmāspik xʷānēnd, pat hān gāh nipišt ka vištāsp-šāh dahyupat būt, u-š dēn ravākēnīt, u-š xʷatāyēh spurrik kart, u-š ōi daxšak mat hān ī vazurg kārēčār ī apāk [uzdēs-]paristišn ī xyōnān būt*, "This they call the Memoir of Jāmāsp. It was written at the time when V. was ruler and the Religion was propagated by him and the dominion was made perfect by him. And to him came the sign, the one of the great which took place with the idol-worship of the X"⁴³. The remainder of the first chapter (I.8-14 in Messina's reconstruction) refers to the prophecy of Jāmāsp as described in the second of *AZ*. As a matter of fact I.10-12 render, partly word for word but in some confusion, §§ 35-38 of *AZ* (see above p. 409), although this description of the prophetic gifts of Jāmāsp is not put in the mouth of Vištāsp, as in *AZ*, but is ascribed to Jāmāsp himself.

Another similarity between the *Ayyātkār ī Jāmāspik* and the second section of *AZ* is found in the standing formulae introducing direct discourse. *AZ* repeatedly uses the phrases */pas/ gōbēt jāmāsp bītaxš kū* (§§ 40, 43, 45, 63, 66, 90) and *pas gōbēt vištāsp-šāh kū* (§§ 42, 68). This corresponds to the use of *pūrsīt* (or *pursēt*?) *vištāsp-šāh kū* and *guft-iš jāmāsp /i/ bītaxš kū* in *Ayyātkār ī Jāmāspik* (passim). The reversed word order, rhythmic qualities and stereotyped use of these formulae give them an epic ring, but the dependence on Avestic models is also unmistakable (*pərəsaī zaraθuštrō, āaī mraoī ahurō mazdā*,

⁴¹ So e.g. chapter XVII in the reconstruction of Messina, *op. cit.*, pp. 74-77, certainly gives the impression of having been based upon a verse composition.

⁴² See above p. 405; cf. Benveniste, *RHH* 106(1932), pp. 365-366.

⁴³ This parallel further diminishes the probability of the rather arbitrary suggestion by Benveniste, *JA* 220, p. 250, that the corresponding passage in *AZ* should be read with *an gāh* instead of *ān gāh* and translated "ce récit dit de Zārēr a été écrit en un autre lieu" and that this must needs be a reference to another—Parthian version of *AZ*.

etc.)⁴⁴. It is remarkable that these formulae in the metrical parts of the *Ayyātkār ī Jāmāspik* are in a metre characterized by three stresses to the line while the general metre has four stresses (e.g. XVI.1: *pursīt vištāsp-šāh / kū ēn dēn ī apēčāk—čand sāl ravāk bavēt / pas hač hān čē āvām—u zamānāk rasēt*(/)). The somewhat clumsy construction *guft-iš jāmāsp* also raises some doubt: is it a remodelling of a *praesens historicum*: *gōbēt jāmāsp*, as in *AZ*? On the whole, it seems as if *AZ*, at least in some respects, has been a formal model for the version of the *Ayyātkār ī Jāmāspik* which can be reconstructed from the preserved text material.

In the second section of *AZ* there are many further passages that have close parallels in *Šāh-nāmah*, e.g. *AZ* § 42:

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>pas gōbēt vištāsp-šāh</i> | Then V. says: |
| <i>kū pat xʷarrāh ī ohurmāzd</i> | “By the glory of O. |
| <i>u dēn ī māzdesnān u jān</i> | and the Mazdayasnian religion and the life |
| [ī] <i>zarēr brāt sōkand xʷarēt</i> (for -am?) | of brother Z. I (?) swear |
| <i>kū-t nē-zanām u nē-ōzanām</i> | that I shall not strike and not kill you |
| <i>u nē tō-ič pat dēpāhr dārām</i> | and I shall not either hold you in anger”. |

and *Šāh-nāmah*, baits 328-330:

| | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| بدین و بدین آور پاک رای | جهانجوی گفتا بنام خدای |
| بیان گرانایه اسفندیار | بیان زرب آن نبرده سوار |
| نفرمایمت بد نه خود من کنم | که نه هرگزت روی دشمن کنم |

AZ § 46:

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>fratāk-rōč ka patkōfēnd</i> | Tomorrow when they encounter each other, |
| <i>nēv pat nēv u varáz pat varáz</i> | brave against brave and boar against boar, |
| <i>vás māt apāk</i> (for <i>apē</i>)- <i>púhr</i> | many a mother without son |
| <i>vás. [púhr] apē-pit</i> | many a son without father |

⁴⁴ This does not necessarily mean that these passages are direct translations from Avestan; they are rather archaic formulae influenced by the Avesta but with specific rhythmic and stylistic qualities in Pahlavi; cf. G. Widengren, *Festschrift Eilers*, 1967, pp. 280-281; cf. also *pas āxēzēt* initially in *Ayyātkār ī Jāmāspik* XVI. 27 (Benveniste 58) and 41 (Benveniste 84), and comment by Benveniste, *RHH* 106, p. 370.

| | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <i>u vās pīt apē-pūhr</i> | and many a father without son |
| <i>u vās brāt apē-brāt</i> | and many a brother without brother |
| <i>u vās zān (šōdōmand) apē-šōd</i> | and many a wife without husband |
| <i>bavēnd</i> | will be |

and *Šāh-nāmah*, baits 336, 342:

به پیش اندر آیند مردان مرد هوا تیره گردد زگرد نبرد

بسی بی پدر گشته بینی پسر بسی بی پسر گشته بینی پدر

In *AZ* § 50:

pas vištāsp-šāh ka-š hān sax⁴⁵ān Then V., when he has heard this
āšnūt word,
hač + farrax⁴⁵ān-gāh falls (?) from the throne to the
ōpāst (for ōftēt?) ground
 we meet the two only forms (written 'šnwt and 'wpst) that seemingly fall outside narration in present tense in this section. However, *āšnūt* may be seen as the predicate of a temporal clause of anterior action and *ōpast* as a secondary assimilation to that form or as the predicate of a continuation of the temporal clause⁴⁶. The corresponding verse (412) in *Šāh-nāmah* runs:

چو شاه جهاندار بشنید راز بران گوشه تخت خسپید باز

There are also great differences between *Šāh-nāmah* and *AZ* in this second section. There is, for example, no trace in *Šāh-nāmah* of the appearance, in turn, of Zarēr (*AZ* §§ 55-56), Pāt-Xōsrōi (§§ 57-58), Frašāvart (§§ 59-60) and Spandi-dāt (i.e. Isfāndiyār; § 61) urging the king to rise and return to the throne in reliance on their respective fighting capacity. Instead Daqīqī makes Jāmāsp speak for them all (baits 425-431):

خردمند گفتا بشاه زمین که ای نیک خو مهتر بافرین
 گرایشان نباشند پیش سپاه نهاده بسر برکیانی کلاه
 که یارد شدن پیش ترکان چین که باز آورد فره پاک دین
 تو زین خاک بر خیز و بر شو بگاه مکن فره پادشاهی تباہ

⁴⁵ Cf. Nyberg, *Manual* II, s.v.

⁴⁶ Cf. the next verb: *girēt* in § 51.

که داد خدایست و زین چاره نیست خداوند گیتی ستمگاره نیست
 زانده خوردن نباشدت سود کجا بودنی بود و شد کار بود
 مکن دلت را بیشتر زین نژند بداد خدای جهان کن پسند

Compare *AZ* § 53 (lines 2-4 also occur in §§ 55, 57, 59, 61):

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <i>pas jāmāsp [bitāxs] gōbēt</i> | Then J., the Bitaxs, says: |
| <i>hakar šmāh bagān sahet</i> | "If it please you, lord, |
| <i>(u) hač ēn xāk apār-āxēzēt</i> | rise from the ground |
| <i>u apāč ō kai-gāh nišinēt</i> | and sit again on the throne, |
| <i>čē šāyēt būtan ka šāyēt būtan</i> | because it will be as it will be, |
| <i>ka ēn man guft bavēt</i> | as it was said by me it will be!" |

On the whole, it may be said that this second section of *AZ* gives a far more archaic and much less religious version of the prophecy of Jāmāsp than does Daqīqī in *Šāh-nāmāh*.

The third and last section of *AZ*, comprising §§ 69-114, describes the battle against Arjāsp and the Xyōns⁴⁷. It has been remarked already by Nöldeke that the battle description here appears in a very concise form, at least in comparison to the versions found in *Šāh-nāmāh* and Ṭabari⁴⁸, and the description in *AZ* certainly gives the impression of a one-day battle, ending with the utter defeat of the Xyōns, leaving only Arjāsp alive and sent back mutilated to his own country as a warning to others. This section takes seven pages in *Pahlavi Texts* (pp. 9-16). The corresponding passage in *Šāh-nāmāh* may be considered to run till the first flight of Arjāsp⁴⁹ after some two weeks of fighting (see bait 548, p. 103) while the war goes on till the death of Arjāsp much further on (p. 203).

However, this last section of *AZ* is not a summary in the same way as the introductory section. It is true that the beginning is very abrupt, but from § 70 onwards the text has the appearance of a complete and coherent composition standing in a close relationship to an original in verse, although it is not always so easy to distinguish the verse lines here as in the previous section. The first paragraph (69) gives the contents of baits 435-465 in *Šāh-nāmāh* in a very concise form. Still it is possible also here, albeit with some difficulty, to arrange the text in lines:

⁴⁷ Cf. Avesta, Yt. 9.29-30, Yt. 19.84-87.

⁴⁸ See *Das iranische Nationalepos*, 2.e Aufl., Berlin-Leipzig 1920, pp. 5-6; cf. also Boyce, *Hdb d. Orientalistik*, I: IV: 2: 1, 1968, p. 56 with n. 6.

⁴⁹ Russian ed., VI, pp. 95-117, baits 435-787.

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>pas vištāsp-šāh ō kōf-sār nišinēt</i> | Then V. seats himself on the mountain top, |
| [<i>u-š?</i>] <i>zāvār apāk</i> ⁵⁰ 12 12 <i>bēvár</i> | with [him] a force of 12 × 12 thousand; |
| <i>arjāsp</i> ⁵¹ <i>ō kōf-sār nišinēt</i> | A. seats himself on the mountain top |
| <i>u-š zāvār</i> ⁵² 12 <i>bēvár bēvár</i> | and with him a force of 12 thousand thousand. |

Then there is obviously a gap in the narration ⁵³, corresponding to baits 466-547 in *Šāh-nāmah*, before the introduction of Zarēr in § 70:

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>u hān tāhm spāhpāt ī nēv zarēr</i> | And that brave commander, valiant Z. |
| <i>kārēčār ōgōn nēv kunēt</i> | fights so well |
| <i>čigōn ka ātūr dažēt</i> ⁵⁴ | as when the fire burns |
| <i>andār ō nayistān ōftēt</i> | [and] engulfs the reeds |
| <i>u-š vāt-ič hayyār bavēt</i> | and the wind also assists it; |
| <i>ka šamšēr frāč-zanēt dāh</i> | when he strikes the sword forward, ten, |
| <i>u ka apāč-vēžēt</i> 11 <i>xyōn ōzanēt</i> | and when strikes back, eleven X. he kills; |
| <i>ka gušnāk [u] tišnāk bavēt</i> | when he becomes hungry [and] thirsty, |
| <i>xūn [ī] xyōn vēnēt šāt bavēt</i> | he sees the blood of the X. [and] becomes glad. |

Šāh-nāmah (baits 549-551) is, for once, a little briefer:

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| سمند ی بزرگ اندر آورده زیر | پیشی اندر آمد نبرده زیر |
| چو اندر گیا آتش و تیز باد | بلشکرگه دشمن اندر فتاد |
| مر اورا نه استاد هر کشت بدید | همی کشت زیشان همی خوابنید |

And the continuation also runs quite parallel in the two works.

As was the case with the prophecy in the previous section of *AZ*, the battle description is narrated almost exclusively in present tense. The exceptions are very few: two instances of *būt* in § 69 have just been mentioned (probably interpolations); the phrase *apar/frāč*

⁵⁰ *būt*, interpolation?

⁵¹ *ī xyōnān x^aatāi*, interpolation?

⁵² *būt*, interpolation?

⁵³ This is strengthened by the fact that a number of events foretold in the prophecy of Jāmāsp never occur in the battle description.

⁵⁴ A probable emendation of d't'; Nyberg reads *yazēt*, "god".

ō pād/pai ēstāt appears thrice: §§ 73, 79 (preceded by *nē-dāt*), 99 (followed by *guft*), where *ēstāt* may be considered a “present prefect” similarly *ēstāt* in § 102)⁵⁵ and the accompanying forms, *nē-dāt* and *guft*, cases of secondary form assimilation, but the contexts are a little uncertain in so far as it is difficult to arrange them in verse lines; in § 100 there is the form *apar-nišast* (probably a mistake, emended by Nyberg to *-nišinēt*) and in § 106 BR’ wcyt, to be read *bē-vičūt* or *bē-vazēt*?

Some more parallels with the text of *Šāh-nāmah* may be instructive. Thus AZ §§ 76-79:

| | |
|---|---|
| § 76 <i>pas vištāsp-šāh hač kōf-sár</i> <i>nikāh kunēt u gōbēt</i> <i>kū ham</i> ⁵⁶ <i>pat ēt</i> ⁵⁷ <i>dārām ku-mān</i> <i>ōzāt</i> | Then V. from the mountain top looks and says: “I do think that for us has been killed |
| <i>zarēr ī ērān spāhpāt</i> <i>čē nūn nē-āyēt parrišn ī kamānān</i> <i>u vāng [ī] nēv-martān</i> | Z., the commander of the Iranians, because now the twanging of the bows is gone and the clamour of the valiant men, |
| § 77 <i>bē hač šmāh ērān kē hast kē</i> <i>šavēt</i> <i>u hač zarērān kēn x’āhēt</i> <i>tāi ka-š hān hamāk ī man duxt</i> <i>pat zanēh aviš dahām</i> <i>kē andar hamāk šāhr ī ērān</i> <i>zān hač ōi hu-čihrtār nēst</i> | but who is there among you Iranians who goes and exacts revenge for the Zarērs, so that to him my daughter H. I shall give in marriage, who in the whole land of E. no woman is more beautiful than her, |
| § 78 <i>u-š mǎn [u] katāk ī zarēr.</i> <i>spāhpatēh ī ērān aviš dahām</i> | and to him the family estate of Z. [and] the command over the Iranians I shall give”. |
| § 79 <i>hēc ēr u āzāt passáx^u nē-dāt</i> (for <i>-dahēt</i> ?) | No Iranian noble replied/replies. |

The possible rhymes on other endings that verbal *-ēt* in § 76 are especially interesting. *Šāh-nāmah* is more elaborate. This passage covers baits 594-620, of which the directly parallel ones are the following:

⁵⁵ The two *kart ēstāt* in §§ 74, 100 are probably interpolations.

⁵⁶ HWHm.

⁵⁷ HWHyt.

- 594 چو گشتاسپ از کوه سر بنگرید مر اورا بدان رزمگه بر ندید
 گمانی برم گفت کان گرد ماه که روشن بدی زو همه رزمگاه
 نبرده برادرم فرخ زریز که شیر ژیان آوری ی بزیر
 فگندست بر باره از تاختن بپاندند گردان ز انداختن
 598 نیاید همی بانگ شه زادگان مگر کشته شد شاه آزادگان
- — —
- 616 بلشکر بگفتا کدامت شیر که باز آورد کین فرخ زریز
 که پیش افگند باره بر کین اوی که باز آورد باره و زین اوی
 پذیرفتم اندر خدای جهان پذیرفتن راستان و مهان
 که هرگز میانه نهد پیش پای مر اروا دم دخترم را همای
 620 نجیبید زیشان کس از جای خویش ز لشکر نیاورد کس پای پیش

The continuation differs considerably in the two works, owing to the fact that in *Šāh-nāmah* the special hero Isfandiyyār is made to take over much of the function of Bastvar in *AZ*.

In *AZ* the passage which treats Bastvar's vengeance on Vidrafš for killing his father Zarēr (§§ 79-108) is in fact the central part of the whole composition, and it has many archaic and interesting features. The beginning of Bastvar's lament at his father's death (§§ 84-87) was discussed already by Chr. Bartholomae⁵⁸ who even, but for special purposes, suggested that the text of § 84 might be taken from a song or an epic poem. Benveniste (*JA* 220, p. 280) considers this lament "le passage le plus significatif du texte, celui qui en affirme le plus nettement l'élan épique et la structure métrique". This seems to be a reasonable statement, although he needs some engineering to get hexasyllabic lines all through, but it remains obscure where and how he finds the "dialect elements characteristic of the North-West" mentioned in the same place⁵⁹.

It is rather so that the absence of clearly Parthian elements, alien to ordinary Book Pahlavi, is a striking characteristic of this text, which is generally supposed to be an adaptation of a Parthian

⁵⁸ *Zur Kenntnis der mitteliranischen Mundarten*, IV, pp. 21-23.

⁵⁹ Benveniste refers to Bartholomae, *ibid.*, but as far as I can see, no such conclusion is to be found there; cf., however, Bartholomae, *ibid.*, p. 25, on Parthian elements in the *Draxt ī Asūrik*.

original. There is one more passage alleged to bear traces of a "northern redaction"⁶⁰, Bastvar's incantation of his arrow in §§ 92-93. H.S. Nyberg, too, finds Parthian elements here. He obviously reads the first line differently from the previous editors: ⁺*nūn, tigr, hač man šavāi*⁶¹ / *pērōz-āvar ayēh*⁶², considering *ayēh* as the Parthian 2nd sing. ind. of "to be" (= Man. Parth. 'yy). This looks an ingenious explanation, but in consideration of the lack of other typically Parthian elements, it remains uncertain. True, there is a genuinely Parthian phrase in the last line of this incantation (end of § 93): *yat-ō rōč yāvēr*⁶³, but this *yat-ō* is also used in the colophon of *AZ*⁶⁴, which can hardly be suspected of having a Parthian model, and its power of evidence is thus considerably diminished.

In conclusion it may be stated that the text of *Ayyātkār ī Zarērān* has come down to us in a form which betrays much of an original verse composition, narrated in present tense. The original poem has undergone different treatment in different parts of the text. Thus the first section (§§ 1-34) seems to be an abridgement of the original, partly in prose and then in past tense, partly preserving the verses of the poem and with them the present tense narration. The second section (§§ 35-68) gives a coherent description of Jāmāsp's prophecy and may be considered to render the original version in a rather complete way. With one or two possible exceptions it is composed in present tense all through, and it is generally quite easy to divide the text into (approximate) verse lines, each within the frame of three stressed syllables, often rhyming in pairs. The third and last section (§§ 69-114) again seems to be an abridgement or, but less likely, an unintentional shortening of the original. Between §§ 69 and 70 substantial parts of the description of the battle against Arjāsp and the Xyōns are missing. This section, too, is almost completely narrated in present tense. The three or four exceptions may easily be put to the account of the copyists. The verse structure is the same as in

⁶⁰ Benveniste, *JA* 220, p. 284, and before that Pagliaro, *op. cit.*, p. 588.

⁶¹ Cf. *Manual* II, s.v. *šutan*.

⁶² See *Manual* I, p. 175, under "Parthian forms"; Pagliaro Benveniste read 'YŠ = *kas*.

⁶³ Cf. Henning, *BSOAS* 13, p. 643 n. 5, and Nyberg, *Manual* II, s.v. *yat-ō*; Pagliaro and Benveniste read *gatān*; the same phrase occurs in *Draxt ī Asūrik* § 20 (*Pahlavi Texts*, p. 110).

⁶⁴ *Pahlavi Texts*, p. 16, § 4; cf. Henning, *loc. cit.*

the second section, although the reconstruction of the verses is not always without problems.

What has been called "the original poem" above must have been an epic composition from Sasanian times. Most probably that composition had one or more Parthian models, but it is important to note that there is little or nothing in the actual wording of the *Ayyātkār ī Zarērān* to betray such a dependence. As long as this work was read as prose, the irregularities in the word order were certainly striking and required an explanation, but when we now read most of it as verse, these irregularities are explainable according to the rules of Persian poetical syntax, so well attested in *Šāh-nāmah*. On the whole the state of preservation of this poem within what appears as prose in the text of the *Ayyātkār ī Zarērān* in Codex MK (dated 1322 A.D.) is remarkably good, and this would support the hypothesis that the poem was transmitted orally till a time not far distant from the writing down of the immediate model of this part of MK by Rōstahm ī Mihrāpān in the 13th century A.D.