BO UTAS

ON THE COMPOSITION OF THE AYYÂTKÂR Ī ZARÊRÂN*

An edition of the text of the small Book Pahlavi work entitled Ayyâtkâr ī Zarêrân (hereafter AZ), “Memoir of the Zarêr family”, is found in H.S. Nyberg’s Manual of Pahlavi. 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 Šâh-nâmeh, in 1890, and Nöldeke contributed a number of remarks in 1892. 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-Āwân Kai-khâsrû.

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-eaten.

* These notes are intended as preliminaries to a forthcoming study on verbs and preverbs in the Ayyâtkâr ī Zarêrân 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.
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, Mihrâpân ī Kai Kôsrî, and the copyist of his model, his grandfather’s uncle Rûstâm ī Mihrâpân, 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-Asana ⁶, 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. Pagliaro ⁹, 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 mazdēen” 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 battle ¹¹.

The section of Firdausi’s (i.e. here Daqiqi’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.
¹⁰ *Journal Asiatique* 220 (1932), pp. 245-293.
¹¹ The initial invocation, *pat nām ... nipēšēhēt*, left without a § number in *Pahlavi Texts*, is not taken into account.
baits or 19 pages of text in the Russian edition of that work.\footnote{Firdausi, \textit{S"ah-n"amah}, vol. VI, Moscow 1967, ed. M.-N. O. Osmanov, pp. 68-86, baits 39-312.} This introductory section in \textit{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: \textit{YHWYN}t: \textit{bavet} in § 3 (a mistake for \textit{b"ut}?\) and \textit{YTWYN}t: \textit{\text{"ayet}} in § 4 (a form of \textit{fr"estit}\textit{an} would suit the context much better, and a slight emendation of the ideogram to \textit{SDRWN} seems legitimate; \textit{u-"san} first in the § would then furnish the agent of an emended form \textit{fr"estit}). 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:

\begin{verbatim}
\text{\text{"sm\u{a}h} ha\c{c} \text{"an\u{o}d} \text{"ayet}}
\text{\text{t\aa}i am\u{a}h ha\c{c} \text{"et\u{a}r} \text{\"ay\u{e}m}}
\text{\text{u \text{"sm\u{a}h} am\u{a}h \text{\"en\u{e}t}}
\text{[u] am\u{a}h \text{"sm\u{a}h \text{\"en\u{e}m}}
\end{verbatim}

You come from there,
till we come from here,
and you see us,
[and] we see you.

§ 6 \text{\text{"evak vidra}s y\u{a}t\u{u}k u \text{\text{"a}tikar n\u{a}m-x\text{"a}st i haz\u{a}r\u{a}n} also has a very epic ring; compare \text{\text{"S\u{a}h-n\u{a}mah}, baits 126-127:}}

\begin{verbatim}
\text{\text{"yki nam au \text{\text{"i}derf\u{u}sh} \text{\text{"ezr\u{e}g}}
\text{\text{"keh \text{\text{"e}r\u{e}g} \text{\text{"aal}\text{"eeh} \text{\text{"e}kh\u{a}s\u{e}t}}
\end{verbatim}

\text{In the end of § 26 something interesting happens. The narration seems to change from past (MHYTWN\textit{t}: \textit{zat}) to present tense (pzd\textit{\u{e}}yd\textit{\u{e}}: \textit{pazd\text{"e}nd}, 'BYDWN\textit{d}: \textit{kun\text{"e}nd}) 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}:

\begin{verbatim}
\text{\text{"§ 26 ...} u n\u{a}i pazd\text{"e}nd
\text{u g\u{a}z-d\text{"a}mb\footnote{Cf. Nyberg, \textit{Manual II}, s.v.} v\u{a}ng kun\text{"e}nd
\text{\text{"§ 27 u-\text{"s} k\text{"a}rv\u{a}n \text{\text{"e}v\u{a}r\u{e}z kun\text{"e}nd
\text{u pil\u{a}v\u{a}n \text{\text{"a}t pil \text{\text{"r}av\text{"e}nd
\end{verbatim}

... and they play the flute
and sound the horn,
and they muster the troops for him,
and the elephant-men ride the elephants,
u störpán pat stór ravěnd
u vartēn-dår pat vartēn ravēnd

§ 28 vās ēstēt +šif(ā)rg(?) 14
vās kan-tigr i purr-tigr
u vās zrēh i rōsn
u vās zrēh i čahār-kārt
§ 29 (u) kārvān i ērān(-šahr) ētōn
bē-estēnd

ka vāng bē ō asmān šavēt
u pattān bē ō dōšāxš šavēt
§ 30 pat ráh kū šavēnd
vītārg ētōn bē-brīnēnd
apāk [sūmb?] 15 āp bē+hšēpēnd
i tāi ē māh 16 xārtān nē-šāyēt

§ 31 tāi 50 rōč rōsn nē-bavēt
mūrvē-č nīšēm nē-vindāt (for -ēt?)
bē ka ō aspān bāsn nēzakān tēh 17
aivāp ō kōf i sar-būrz nīshēnd
(hač gart u dūt šap u rōč nē-paitāk)

(Probably interpolated explanation).

Compare Sāh-nāmah, baits 305-312:

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

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 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.

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.

(Probably interpolated explanation).

14 Cf. Nyberg, Manual II, s.v.; or metathesis +šifgr?; i 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 Daqiqi'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 poem, 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-known. Suffice it to mention that W.B. Henning in his two articles "The disintegration of the Avestic studies" and "A Pahlavi poem" 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 (arzes) to a line. In "A Pahlavi poem" Henning turns his special attention to the Draxt i Asūrik, which was the first Middle Persian text to be presented as verse by E. Benveniste. 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

---


20 TPS 1942 (publ. 1944) pp. 40-56.


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 *Huvidagmān* and *Angad Rōšnān* (pp. 45-59). Both cycles use metres with four stressed syllables to the line (with caesura), but *Huvidagmān* 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 recognition 24.

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 above 25. 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.

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 $\ddot{s}$īfgr?/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 Bundahīšn” 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 maṭla’ 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 article 28. 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 line 30.

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.
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 Wehzād 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 Šhaked (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 Šhaked (op. cit., pp. 400-401) after an earlier publication by Tavadia 32 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 sung 34.

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

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 zanénd 300 méx i āsēnēn
  i pātīš bandénd 300 + xīrs(?) 35
kē har + xīrs-ē 300 drāi i zarrēn

pātīš ākūst-ēstēt

Then they pitch 300 iron poles, to which they fasten 300 rings(?), in each ring of which 300 golden bells 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
  u jāmāsp bitāxš ō pēš xēåhēt
  gōbēt kū mān dānēm
kū tō jāmāsp dānāk
  u vēnāk [u] śnāsāk hē(h)
§ 36 ēn-īc dānēt (?)
kū ka 10 rōc vārān āyēt
čand srišk ō damīk āyēt
  u čand srišk apar srišk āyēt

Then V. seats himself on the throne and calls J., the Bitaxs, forward. He says (that): “I know that you, J., are wise and clear-sighted [and] knowing. Do you also know this: when it is raining 10 days, how many drops fall on the earth, and how many drops fall upon drops?

§ 37 u ēn-īc dānē(h) (?)
kū [ka] urvarān viškōfēt
katām hān gūl i roč viškōfēt
u katām hān i šāp (?)
katām hān i fratāk (?)
§ 38 ēn-īc dānē(h) kū + mih(ā)rg (?)36

And do you also know this: when the plants blossom which of those flowers that blossoms in the day and which one in the night, which one the next day?

Do you also know this: of the clouds

katám hän áp dárêti
u katám hän nê-dárêti
§ 39 ên-ič dânê(h) (?)
kû fratâk-rôle chêvît
andal hän aždahák-râzm i vištâspân

hâc pusaran u brâtarân
i máni kai-vištâsp-sâh
kê zivêt u kê miret

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
Vištâsp;

among the sons and brothers
of me, K.,
who will live and who will die?”

The corresponding passage in Sâh-nâmâh, baits 314-322:

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 Daqiqi’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 Sâh-nâmâh. 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.)

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 i Jāmāspik, the Jāmāspī of the Parsees. 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 translation. 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”. 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 i Jāmāspik.

39 The Pahlavi, Pazand and New Persian (and Gujarati) text material has been published and translated by J.J. Modi, Jāmāspī, Pahlavi, Pāzand 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 Ayyātkār i Žāmāspik, Rome 1939.

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 Parsi. 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. This holds true also for the occasional lines of chapter XVI left out as interpolations by Benveniste.

The first chapter of the Ayyātākār i 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 ayyātākār i jāmāspik xānēn, pat hān gāh nipišt ka viśṭāsp-sāh dahyupat būt, u-š dēn ravākēnīt, u-š xātāyēh spurrik kart, u-š ōi daxšak mat hān i vazurg kārēcār i apāk [uzdēs-]paristiśn i xyoñān but, “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”.

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 Viśṭāsp, as in AZ, but is ascribed to Jāmāsp himself.

Another similarity between the Ayyātākār i Jāmāspik and the second section of AZ is found in the standing formulae introducing direct discourse. AZ repeatedly uses the phrases /pas/ gōbēt jāmāsp bitaxš kū (§§ 40, 43, 45, 63, 66, 90) and pas gōbēt viśṭāsp-sāh kū (§§ 42, 68). This corresponds to the use of pārśīt (or pursēt?) viśṭāsp-sāh kū and guft-iš jāmāsp /i/ bitaxš kū in Ayyātākār i 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 (pārōsat zaradhustrō, āt mraot ahūrō 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.
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 Žarêr a été écrit en un autre lieu” and that this must needs be a reference to another—Parthian version of AZ.
etc.). It is remarkable that these formulae in the metrical parts of the Ayyātkār i Jāmāspik are in a metre characterized by three stresses to the line while the general metre has four stresses (e.g. XVI.1: pursūt vištāsp-šāh | kū ēn dēn i apēcāk—cānd sāl ravāk bavēt | pas hač hān čē āvām—u zamāndk rasēt/). The somewhat clumsy construction guš-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 i 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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pas gōbēt vištāsp-šāh} & \quad \text{Then V. says:} \\
\text{kū pat xērrāh i ohurmāzd} & \quad \text{"By the glory of O.} \\
\text{u dēn i māzdesnān u jān} & \quad \text{and the Mazdayasnian religion} \\
[\text{i} \text{zarēr brāt sōkānd xērēt (for}} & \quad \text{and the life} \\
\text{-am?)}} & \quad \text{of brother Z. I (?) swear} \\
\text{kū-t nē-žanām u nē-ōzanām} & \quad \text{that I shall not strike and not kill} \\
\text{u nē tō-ič pat dēpāhr dārām} & \quad \text{you} \\
\end{align*}
\]

and Šāh-nāmah, baits 328-330:

AZ § 46:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{fratāk-rōč ka patkōfēnd} & \quad \text{Tomorrow when they encounter} \\
\text{nēv pat nēv u varāz pat varāz} & \quad \text{each other,} \\
\text{vās māt apāk (for apē)-pūhr} & \quad \text{brave against brave and boar} \\
\text{vās [pūhr] apē-pit} & \quad \text{against boar,} \\
\end{align*}
\]

many a mother without son
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 āxēsēt initially in Ayyātkār i Jāmāspik XVI. 27 (Benveniste 58) and 41 (Benveniste 84), and comment by Benveniste, RHH 106, p. 370.
u vás pít apē-púhr
and many a father without son
u vás brát apē-brát
and many a brother without brother
u vas zán (šodómand) apē-šód
and Šāh-nāmah, baits 336, 342:
bavénd

In AZ § 50:

pas vištāsp-šāh ka-š hān saxán
Then V., when he has heard this word,
āsnút

hač + farrax'éán-gáh⁴⁵ o damák
falls (?) from the throne to the ground
opašt (for ōfšté?)

we meet the two only forms (written 'šnwt and 'wpst) that seemingly fall outside narration in present tense in this section. However, āsnút may be seen as the predicate of a temporal clause of anterior action and ōpašt 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:

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-Xōrāi (§§ 57-58), Frašāvarz (§§ 59-60) and Spandī-dāt (i.e. Isfandiyār; § 81) 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):

⁴⁶ Cf. the next verb: gīrēt in § 51.
Compare *AZ* § 53 (lines 2-4 also occur in §§ 55, 57, 59, 61):

*pas jâmâsp [bitâxš]* gôbêî'  
*habar šmâh bagân sahêî*  
*(u) hač ēn xák apâr-âxêzêî*  
*u apâc ô kai-gâh nišînêî*  
*cê šâyêî bûtân ka šâyêî bûtân*  
*ka ēn man gûft bavêî*

Then J., the Bitâxš, says:

“If it please you, lord,  
rise from the ground  
and sit again on the throne,  
because it will be as it will be,  
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 Jâmâsp than does Daqîqî in *Šâh-nâmâh*.

The third and last section of *AZ*, comprising §§ 69-114, describes the battle against Arjâsp and the Xyôns. It has been remarked already by Nöldêke that the battle description here appears in a very concise form, at least in comparison to the versions found in *Šâh-nâmâh* and Ţabarî, and the description in *AZ* certainly gives the impression of a one-day battle, ending with the utter defeat of the Xyôns, leaving only Arjâsp 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 *Šâh-nâmâh* may be considered to run till the first flight of Arjâsp after some two weeks of fighting (see bait 548, p. 103) while the war goes on till the death of Arjâsp 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 *Šâh-nâmâh* 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.
Then V. seats himself on the mountain top, with [him] a force of 12 × 12 thousand; A. seats himself on the mountain top and with him a force of 12 thousand thousand.

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

* u hān tāhm spāhpāt i nēv zarēr
* And that brave commander, valiant Z.

* kārečār ōgōn nēv kmēt
* fights so well
* čigōn ka ātūr dażēt
* as when the fire burns
* andār ō nayistān ǒštēt
* [and] engulfs the reeds
* u-š vāt-ič hayyār bavēt
* and the wind also assists it;
* ka šamšēr frāč-zanēt dāh
* when he strikes the sword forward, ten,
* u ka apāč-vēžēt 11 xyōn őzanēt
* and when strikes back, eleven X.
* and when he becomes hungry [and]
* ka gušnāk [u] tišnāk bavēt
* he kills;
* thirsty,
* xūn [i] xyōn vēnēt sāt bavēt
* he sees the blood of the X. [and]
* becomes glad.

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

* بیش اندرا آمد نبرده زیر
* پلشکرگه دشمن اندرا فتاد
* سمند ی برگ ی آندرا آورده زیر
* چو اندرا یا آتش و تیز باد
* مرا ورا نه استاد هرکش بید
* همی کشت زیشان همی خوابید

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 büt in § 69 have just been mentioned (probably interpolations); the phrase apar/frāč

---

50 büt, interpolation?
51 i xyōnān xuatāi, interpolation?
52 büt, 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) 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 -nišīnēt) and in §106 BR wcyt, to be read bē-viĉit or bē-vazēt?

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

§ 76 pas vištāsp-sāh haç kōf-sār
nikāh kunēt u gōbēt
kū ham 56 pat ēti 57 dārām ku-mān
ōzāt
zarēr i ērān spāhpāt
če nūn nē-āyēt parrišn i kamānān
u vāng [i] nēv-martān
Then V. from the mountain top looks and says:
"I do think that for us has been killed
Z., the commander of the Iranians,
because now the twanging of the
bows is gone
and the glamour of the valiant
men,
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,
and to him the family estate of Z.
[and] the command over the
Iranians I shall give".

§ 77 bē haç šmāh ērān kē hast kē šavēt
u haç zarērān kēn xēähēt
tāi ka-š hān hamāk i man dūxt
pat zanēh āviš dahām
kē andar hamāk šāhr i ērān
zān haç ői hu-čiḥriār nēst

§ 78 u-š mān [u] katāk i zarēr-
spāhpātēh i ērān aviš dahām

§ 79 hēc ēr u āzāt passāxī nē-dāt
(for -dahēt?)
No Iranian noble replied/replies.

The possible rhymes on other endings that verbal -ēt in §76 are especially interesting. Śāh-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.
The continuation differs considerably in the two works, owing to the fact that in Šäh-nāmah the special hero Isfandiyār is made to take over much of the function of Bastvar in AZ.

In AZ the passage which treats Bastvar’s vengence on Vidrafs 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 place 59.

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 Drax i Asārik.
original. There is one more passage alleged to bear traces of a “northern redaction”\textsuperscript{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: \textit{†nūn, tigr, hač man šavāt\textsuperscript{61} / pērōz-āvar ayēh\textsuperscript{62}}, considering \textit{ayēh} as the Parthian 2nd sing. ind. of “to be” (= Man. Parth. \textit{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): \textit{yat-ō rōč yāvēl\textsuperscript{63}}, but this \textit{yat-ō} is also used in the colophon of \textit{AZ\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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

\textsuperscript{60} Benveniste, \textit{JA} 220, p. 284, and before that Pagliaro, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 588.

\textsuperscript{61} Cf. \textit{Manual II}, s.v. \textit{šutan}.

\textsuperscript{62} See \textit{Manual I}, p. 175, under “Parthian forms”; Pagliaro Benveniste read \textit{YȘ = kas}.


\textsuperscript{64} \textit{Pahlavi Texts}, p. 16, § 4; cf. Henning, \textit{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 i 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 i 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 i Mīhrāpān in the 13th century A.D.