

A Pahlavi Poem

By W. B. HENNING

THE study of the Pahlavi poetry, so spiritedly initiated by M. Benveniste¹ twenty years ago, seems to have come to a dead end. That certain Pahlavi texts, as the *Ayādgar-ī Zarērān* or the *Draxt-ī Asūrīg*² (the Dispute of the date-palm with the goat), are poems, is conceded on all sides; but the formal problems, the problems of rhythm, metre, and rhyme, remain in the dark. It seems doubtful whether the material at hand is capable of leading us to definite conclusions. There are two main obstacles. Firstly, the notorious sloppiness of the copyists leaves too much room for conjecture; the mere addition or omission, at the editors' discretion, of the word for "and" and the *ḥarf-i iḏāfet* is sufficient to disturb the rhythmical balance. Secondly, as a rule we do not know the dates of composition, and therefore cannot tell how the words were pronounced by the authors; it makes a considerable difference to the metre (whatever it was) whether we put down *paḏak* or *paig*, *mazdayasn* or *mazdēsn*, *rōšn* or *rōšan*, *aḏak* or *aig*, *šikanj* or *škanj*, *giyān*³ or *gyān*, *yazat* or *yazd*, *awiš* or *ōš*,⁴ *druyist* or *drīst* or *društ* or *durust*, *hačaḏar* or *azēr*.

One thing is clear: a biased approach will not lead to convincing results. On the strength of the preconceived notion, carried forward from the study of the Avesta (where matters are equally dubious), that the metre is a purely syllabic one, the Pahlavi poems were made to suffer a great deal of emendation; where the usual procedure of omitting inconvenient words produced lines too short to fit into the scheme, either words were added or their pronunciation distorted.⁵ The alternative theory, namely that the metre is accentual, seems to offer better prospects. It relieves us of the necessity of changing the texts overmuch; the number of syllables to a line can be left as variable as it is; and the precise pronunciation, *rōšn* or *rōšan*, becomes a matter almost of indifference.

Clear evidence in favour of the accentual verse can be found in the very text that formed the starting-point of M. Benveniste's investigations, the *Draxt-ī Asūrīg*. The whole of this poem, which is less encumbered with glosses than most other Pahlavi texts, is written in fairly long lines, of twelve syllables on an average, with a caesura in the middle. There is a recurring formula, which fills the first half of lines, *x. až man karēnd* "they make *x.* out of me". The first word can be one of one, two, or three syllables, so that the first half of a line can have five, six, or seven syllables. Does this not indicate that the metrical

¹ *J.A.*, 1930, ii, 193 sqq.; 1932, i, 245 sqq.

² The *Babylonian* (not *Assyrian*) tree.

³ This seems to me a wrong form altogether.

⁴ *J.A.*, 1932, i, 276 line 7, 278 u.

⁵ As *asp* and *aspə*, *J.A.*, 1932, i, 280; *xyōnān* and *xyōnān*, 286; *astə*, 286; *dastə*, 287; *poštə*, 278; even *ī-mə*, 274, and *ōvaš*, 270 (for *uš*); *mazdēsnān*, 274, but *mazdayasnān*, *J.A.*, 1930, ii, 194 sq.

value of a word is wholly independent of its number of syllables? The second halves of the lines are not in any way affected by the greater or lesser length of the first halves:—

12	<i>čōb až man karēnd</i>	<i>kē tō grīw</i> ¹ <i>māzēnd</i> ²	5 + 5 = 10
11	<i>rasan až man karēnd</i>	<i>kē tō pāy bandēnd</i>	6 + 5 = 11
42	<i>ambān až man karēnd</i>	<i>wāžārgānān wasnād</i> ³	6 + 6 = 12
34	<i>kamar až man karēnd</i>	<i>kē āznāyēnd</i> ⁴ <i>pad murwārīd</i> ⁵	6 + 8 = 14
6	<i>gyāgrōb až man karēnd</i>	<i>kē wirāzēnd mēhan ud mān</i>	6 + 8 = 14
16	<i>tabangōk až man karēnd</i>	<i>dārūgdān wasnād</i>	7 + 5 = 12
37	<i>maškžag</i> ⁶ <i>až man karēnd</i>	<i>kē sūr abar wirāzēnd</i>	7 + 7 = 14

It is not intended to give a full transcription of the *Draxt-ī Asūrīg* here, a text that bristles with difficulties. A few connected passages, selected at random, will be sufficient to show that the impression produced by the few lines quoted above out of context is not misleading.

1	<i>draxt-ē rust est</i>	<i>tar ō šahr asūrīg</i>	4 + 6 = 10
	<i>bun-aš hušk est</i>	<i>sar-aš est tarr</i>	4 + 4 = 8
	<i>warg-aš nay māmēd</i>	<i>bar-aš māmēd angūr</i>	5 + 5 = 10
	<i>šīrēn bār āwarēd</i>	<i>mardōhmān wasnād</i> ⁷	6 + 5 = 11

15	<i>tābistān sāyag hēm</i>	<i>pad sar šahrdārān</i>	6 + 5 = 11
16	<i>šīr</i> ⁸ <i>hēm varžigarān</i>	<i>angubēn āzādmardān.</i>	6 + 7 = 13

¹ The old word for "neck" still persists in modern dialects, e.g. that of Sangisar (Zhukovskiy ii, 314). One does not see why it should be changed to *gardan* (Unvala, *BSOS.*, ii, 645, followed by Benveniste, *J.A.*, 1930, ii, 194).

² *māz-* is apparently a dialect word, from *mārz-*, in the sense of Persian *mālīdan*, to which it belongs by etymology; another example of the loss of *-r-* in this position is Persian *māze*, *māzū* "spine", from **mārzu-* "the place of the vertebrae" (derived from Av. *mərəzu-* "vertebra", cf. *JRAS.*, 1942, 242). I do not think that there is any talk of "kissing" in this line (as Mr. Unvala suspected, loc. cit.).

³ This Parthian word is common throughout the text (= MPers. *rāy*). Failure to recognize it has produced some interesting misunderstandings, cf. Benveniste, p. 200.

⁴ Probably belongs to Persian *āzīdan/āzādan* (the forms are not clear); cf. *čū dībā ba-zarr āzāde* (*āzāde*) in the *Shahname*.

⁵ Although many forms and words are Parthian (or Median), many others belong to the Southern dialect. The confusion reminds one of that familiar from the later *Fahlawiygāt*; how much of it belonged already to the original text is not by any means clear. It would be easy enough to harmonize.

⁶ "A leather cloth (a *sufre*) on which they serve the dinner."

⁷ This is cast in the form of a riddle. The reader or listener is left to guess, from the description, that the date-palm is meant. "Its leaves resemble the (leaves of) reeds"—in shape, of course, not in taste (as Bartholomae said, *Mir. Mund.*, iv, 24). That the last two words belong to this paragraph is shown by para. 28 (see below).

⁸ Junker has two ideograms for *šakar* "sugar" in the *Frahang*, both of them due to misunderstanding. "*HLY*" is sometimes = *HLB* = *šīr* "milk" vii 4 (*LBN*' also occurs, see p. 67, n. 20), sometimes = *HL*' (i.e. *hallā*) = *sik* "vinegar" v 2 where the correct word is relegated to the variants (*sik* and *sirke*); in *Pahl. Texts* 30, 6 = *Husrav ud Rēdak* 31, "*HLY*" *ī truš* is "astringent vinegar" = Arab. *xall thiqqīf* (Tha'alibi). The other series, v 2 = xxxi 2-3, contains the Semitic word for "beer" (or date-wine), Aram. *šīkrā*, etc. The Persian words are *hur* and another that I cannot read (it occurs in the *Kārnāmag* vii 8 "As they had no wine, they offered him beer").

17	<i>tabangōg aṣ man karēnd</i> <i>šahr ō šahr barēnd</i>	<i>dārōgdān wasnād</i> ¹ <i>biṣišk ō biṣišk.</i>	7 + 5 = 12 5 + 5 = 10
18	<i>āšyān hēm murwīzagān</i>	<i>sāyag kārđāgān.</i> ²	7 + 5 = 12
19	<i>astag</i> ³ <i>bē abganēm</i> <i>kad hirzēnd mardumag</i>	<i>pad nōg būm rōyēd</i> <i>kum bē nē wināsēnd</i>	6 + 5 = 11 6 + 6 = 12
20	<i>bašn-um</i> ⁴ <i>est(?) zargōn</i> <i>hawīž mardumag</i> <i>aṣ man bār x^warēnd</i>	<i>yad ō rōž yāwēd.</i> ⁵ <i>kēš nēst may ud nān</i> <i>yad amburd ōštēnd</i> ⁶	5 + 5 = 10 5 + 5 = 10 5 + 5 = 10

27	<i>wāzēnd-um pad afsān</i> <i>ku wāš a'i ud wad-xrad</i>	<i>pārsīg mardōhm</i> <i>abē-sūd draxtān</i>	6 + 4 = 10 7 + 5 = 12
28	<i>yad</i> ⁷ <i>tū bār āwarē</i> <i>gušn-at abar hirzēnd</i> ⁸	<i>mardōhmān wasnād</i> <i>pad ēwēn čē gāwān</i>	6 + 5 = 11 6 + 6 = 12
29	<i>x^wad gumānīg ahēm</i> ⁹	<i>ku rūspīg-zādak a'i</i> ¹⁰	6 + 7 = 13

30	<i>abēzag Dēn Māzdēs-nān</i>	<i>čē čāšt</i> ¹¹ <i>x^wābar Ōhrmazd</i>	7 + 6 = 13
31	<i>yud aṣ man kē buz hēm</i>	<i>yaštan nē šahēd keč</i> ¹²	6 + 6 = 12
32	<i>čē ḡw aṣ man karēnd ;</i> <i>Gōš-urwa, yazd</i> <i>hawīž Hōm tagīg—</i>	<i>andar yazišn yazdān—</i> <i>harwīn čahārpayān,</i> <i>nērōg aṣ man est.</i>	6 + 6 = 12 4 + 6 = 10 5 + 5 = 10

¹ *dārōgān wasnād* would make better sense.

² "Migrants" or "tramps".

³ "Date-stones."

⁴ "If the people leave (the young shoot) alone, so that they refrain from hurting me, my crown will be green till the end of the days."

⁵ The identical, wholly Parthian, phrase recurs in the *Ayādgar-i Zarērān* para. 93 (p. 13, line 5). Parth. *yad* is found several times in the text under review. The explanation given in *BSOAS.*, xii, 52, cannot be fully maintained in view of the ideogram *HN = yad* in the Parthian inscriptions, see *ibid.* 54, 66. The ideogram is 𐭍𐭎 = "if", which corresponds best to OIr. *yadi*; several interrelated forms may have coalesced in *yad*. [Cf. even in the colophon to the Book of Zarēr, *P.T.*, 16¹⁸, *yad.ō rōž fraškerd.*]

⁶ "Until they have had their fill." Instead of *ōšt-* one could also read *awišt-*, more closely conforming to Man. Parthian *wyšt-*.

⁷ "*HT*," if not simply a mistake for *yt*, is presumably the ideogram for that same word. If the Pahlavi *HT* (already in inscriptions) is an ancient mistake for *HN = hēn*, it may have been used in this text to represent the Parthian ideogram *HN = hēn = yad*. Cf. above. At any rate, it does not correspond to *ag* "if", to judge by para. 25, *HT 'L 'YK = yad ō kū*.

⁸ The Parthian form is preferable on account of para. 19 (see above), where *hīrz-* seems better than *arž-*. Perhaps one should replace all ideograms by strictly Parthian or Median forms; I fear I have not been sufficiently consistent.

⁹ Here the full Parthian form is spelled out, not too correctly. In the same line the apparent *'yš* represents *ayi* or *a'i* "you are", Parthian *'yy*. So also in para. 53, *tū kust a'i ēdar* "you are affixed here" (you are stuck here).

¹⁰ "Until you can bear fruit for men, they have to lead a male to you, as they do with cattle. I would even go so far as to suspect that you were born out of wedlock."

¹¹ = which.

¹² Uncertain. *Kyč* may be = Parthian *kyč*, which equals Persian *kas*. On the other hand, the rhythm (cf. *kardan nē šahēd* at the end of lines) may favour the explanation proposed by Bartholomae, *loc. cit.*, 26, line 5.

33	<i>hawīž</i> ¹ <i>bār-yāmag</i> ² <i>yud až man ke buz hēm</i>	<i>čē</i> ³ <i>pad pušt dārēm</i> <i>kardan nē šahēd.</i>	5 + 5 = 10 6 + 5 = 11
—————			
35	<i>mōžag hēm saxtag</i> ⁴ <i>angustbān husrōgān</i>	<i>āzādān wasnād</i> <i>šāh hāmhirzān.</i> ⁵	5 + 5 = 10 6 + 4 = 10
36	<i>mašk-um karēnd ābdān</i> <i>pad garm rōž ud rabīh</i> ⁶	<i>pad dašt ud viyābān</i> <i>sard āb až man est.</i>	6 + 6 = 12 6 + 5 = 11
—————			
39	<i>nāmag až man karēnd</i> <i>daftar ud pādaxšūr</i>	<i>frawardag dibwān</i> ⁷ <i>abar man nibēsēnd</i>	6 + 6 = 12 6 + 6 = 12
—————			
42	<i>ambān až man karēnd</i> <i>kē nān ud pust</i> ⁸ <i>ud panūr</i> <i>kāpūr ud mušk syā(w)</i> <i>was yāmag šāhwār</i> <i>pad ambān āwarēnd</i>	<i>wāžārgānān wasnād</i> <i>harwīn</i> ⁹ (?) <i>rōγn-xwardīg</i> ¹⁰ <i>ud xaz</i> ¹¹ <i>tuxārīg</i> <i>padmōžan kanīgān</i> <i>frāž</i> ¹² <i>šahr čē Ērān</i>	6 + 6 = 12 7 + 5 = 12 5 + 5 = 10 5 + 6 = 11 6 + 6 = 12
—————			
49	<i>kad buz ō wāžār barēnd</i> <i>harw kē dah drahm nē dārēnd</i>	<i>ud pad wahāg dārēnd</i> <i>frāž ō buz nē āsēd</i> ¹³ ;	7 + 6 = 13 7 + 6 = 13

¹ Doubtful. MSS. 'Lc.

² "Satchel", = Persian *bārjāme*.

³ = which.

⁴ "Of morocco leather". *saxtag* belongs to Pers. *saxtiyān*; cf. also the Sogdian form mentioned in *BSOAS.*, xi, 714, n. 6.

⁵ "The archer's thumb-stall [not 'gloves'] for the illustrious companions of the king."

⁶ Cf. *Sb.P.A.W.*, 1934, 33, n. 4 (Man. MPers. *rbyh*).

⁷ Or *dibwān* (not, of course, to be read *dabirān*), the ancestor of Persian *dīwān*. Originally *dipi* + *pāna*, hence "where one keeps and looks after the documents, writings, etc.". The word was early shortened to *dēwān* (by *dīwēwān*). In this form it is attested (apart from Arm. *divan*) as the name of one of Mani's books, his Epistles. Each epistle was called a *dyb* = *dib* in Middle Persian, e.g. *Muhr Dib* "the Epistle of the Seal"; the whole collection was a *dipi-pāna*-. Surely the oldest example of the use of this word for the collection of a man's writings.

⁸ Var. *pišt*. Both pronunciations existed also in Persian.

⁹ MSS. *HRWNN* = ? Scarcely = *mēs* (*Fr.P.*, vii 3) or *ālū(y)* (*ibid.*, iv 6 note 32). Cf. *P.T.*, 16¹⁶.

¹⁰ *Rōγn-xwardīg*, literally "butter-food", means "sweetmeats" in Pahlavi. The "Southern" form *rōwn-xwardīg* in the *Husraw ud Rēdag*, para. 37, corresponds to *halāwī* in the Arabic version. In spite of the help afforded by Tha'alibi, Mr. Unvala misunderstood the word as "side-dish".—The Man. MPers. form is *rwyyn*, see *BSOAS.*, xi, 57, n. 56.—Possibly the line ran originally *rōγn ud rōγn-xwardīg*.

¹¹ "Tokharian marten-furs"? *Hz* = *xaz* occurs in the list of fur-animals in *GrBd.*, 96¹².—Or should one read *mušk syā(w)* [*čē*] *buz tuxārīg* "black musk [of] the 'Tokharian' goat" (= Musk deer)?—Neither *xaz* nor *mušk* are articles usually associated with the name of Tokhāristān/Balkh.

¹² *Fr'č* is used in Man. Parthian, but in the Parthian inscriptions there is *prhš* instead, e.g. *HN prhš* 'L = *yad frāxš ō*. This curious form represents the ancient nominative, i.e. *frānxš* = Av. *frqš* = Skt. *prāñ*, with loss of the nasal; it shows that Bartholomae's rule, *Grdr. Ir. Phil.*, i, 1, p. 11, § 24, is not correctly formulated.

¹³ Thus rather than *āyēd*.

*amrāw*¹ *pad dō pašēž*
dān ud astag tō šowē

kōdagān xrīnēnd
*frāž ō kōy murdān.*²

6 + 5 = 11
7 + 5 = 12

It is not claimed that the mere statement that this is accentual poetry relieves us of the need for further investigation. On the contrary, a great deal of work will be required in order to discover the accented syllables, their place within the lines, and other questions of detail. For example, it seems that the limits of variation in the number of syllables are precisely set. The differences between the maximum and the average, and between the minimum and 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 (with a single exception, in para. 1, which is sufficient to render the text suspect); the variation therefore is 2. In the Manichæan Middle Persian hymn analysed in *Trans. Phil. Soc.*, 1944, 56, the average number is also 12, but the variation is 3 (max. 15, min. 9). There are thus subtle differences in the structure of the verses which should be further explored. In the fragment published by Schæder, *Studien*, 290 sq. (alphabetic hymn, end of 'Ain to Tau with tailpiece) the average is 11, the variation 2:—

[]	³	<i>wād anōšag</i> ⁴ <i>uxašbōy</i>	$x + 6$
<i>parwarzēd au bagān</i>			<i>ad zamīg ud draxtān.</i>	6 + 6 = 12
<i>čašmag rōšnēn</i>			<i>dālūgān āfrīdagān.</i>	4 + 7 = 11
<i>kōfān nāsāg</i>			<i>wyāwarāg ud bagēihr.</i>	4 + 6 = 10
<i>radnēn ārām</i>			<i>əsparhmāwend</i> ⁵ <i>wyāg.</i>	4 + 5 = 9
<i>šahrān anāsāg</i>			<i>mān mān ud gāh gāh.</i>	5 + 5 = 10
<i>Tau sažēd argāwīft</i>			<i>šahrdārān masišt</i>	6 + 5 = 11
<i>namāž ud əstāwišn</i>			<i>au Mār-Mānī</i> ⁶ <i>uxašnām.</i>	6 + 6 = 12
<i>āfrīd āfrīd</i>			<i>pad nawāg</i> ⁶ <i>rōž wuzarg</i>	4 + 6 = 10
<i>au Mār-Zaqō amōžag</i>			<i>ad hamag ram</i> ⁷ <i>rōšnēn.</i>	7 + 6 = 13
			Average	5·1 + 5·8 = 10·9

The following verses seem to confirm the rule; here the average number of syllables is 9·5, the variation 2·5 (max. 12, min. 7). They belong to a Parthian "alphabetic" hymn, of which the strophes B—Z and T—N are preserved in

¹ It is strange that all students of this text, even Bartholomæ (loc. cit., 27), have stumbled over the perfectly ordinary ideogram for "date".—*Amrāw* is the appropriate Parthian form (Man. 'mr'w, against Arm. *armav*); however, at the end of the text, para. 54, *xurmā* is written in clear (*hwlm'y*, "hwlm'k").

² The goat predicts that the hopes which the date-palm put on its seeds (in para. 19, see above) will come to nought. Hence, "may your pips and stones end up in (lit. go forward to) the alley of the dead"? I feel rather uncertain of the reading of the last two words, *kōy murdān*; may one compare the Persian phrase *kūče-yi xāmūšān* "cemetery"? At any rate, Mr. Unvala's version has little to commend itself, "Wounded to the life thou wilt be destroyed exterminated by the spiritual leaders"!

³ The first word remains uncertain.

⁴ So, of course.

⁵ "The rest-house of the Jewels is a flowery place."

⁶ "On the great New Year's day."

⁷ So to be read.

full. Each strophe has two long lines ; the subdivisions are not marked in the MS., but there is scarcely any uncertainty on that account. From M 763, hitherto unpublished :—

			Whole strophe.	
1	<i>Brādarān amwastān</i> <i>wižīdagān wēxtagān</i> ¹	<i>ud wahigarān</i> <i>ud āzād puhrān</i>	6 + 5 = 11 7 + 5 = 12	23
2	<i>Gyānān rōšnān</i> <i>frāhīft āstūnān</i>	<i>wižīdagīft argāw</i> <i>ud bām fraزندān</i>	4 + 6 = 10 5 + 5 = 10	20
3	<i>Dārēd abrang</i> <i>ku bawēd āspurr</i>	<i>pad bag abdēs</i> <i>kalān abēnang</i>	4 + 4 = 8 5 + 5 = 10	18
4	<i>Harwīn handām</i> <i>pad āstāwišn</i>	<i>padrāst dārēd</i> <i>ō anjaman rāmišn</i>	4 + 4 = 8 4 + 6 = 10	18
5	<i>Wēxt ud wižīd hēd</i> <i>ēw āž hazārān</i>	<i>āž madyān wasān</i> <i>ud dō āž bēwarān</i>	5 + 5 = 10 5 + 6 = 11	21
6	<i>Zādag hēd</i> <i>ud noxzādān</i>	<i>čē žīrīft abarēn</i> <i>čē rōž āspurrīg</i>	3 + 6 = 9 4 + 5 = 9	18
<hr/>				
7	<i>Tābēd rōšnīft</i> <i>dahēd bāwag</i>	<i>frāhīft anōšag</i> <i>au warzīgār</i> ^u <i>xēbē</i>	4 + 5 = 9 4 + 6 = 10	19
8	<i>Yudēd pad abrang</i> <i>rōž āfrīdag</i>	<i>pad im dōšambat</i> <i>čē abē-āstārīft</i>	5 + 5 = 10 4 + 6 = 10	20
9	<i>Kič kič āž āsmāh</i> <i>padwahēd wandēd</i>	<i>pad</i> ^u <i>xāstwānīft</i> <i>ud āfrīnēd</i>	5 + 4 = 9 5 + 4 = 9	18
10	<i>Lāb ud nīmastīg</i> ² <i>hīrzēd āstār</i>	<i>barēd ewbidān</i> <i>andāsēd gowīndag</i> ³	5 + 5 = 10 4 + 6 = 10	20
11	<i>Mēhmān rōšn</i> <i>pad rāmišn</i>	<i>marđōhm paštag</i> <i>au angūn žāmēd</i>	3 + 4 = 7 3 + 5 = 8	15
12	<i>Nīwarēd</i> ⁴ <i>āškīft</i> <i>ud andēšēd</i>	<i>pad trixt čaxšābed</i> <i>pad žafr žīrīft</i>	5 + 5 = 10 4 + 4 = 8	18
		Average	4·5 + 5 = 9·5	19

To turn now to the thorny question of the rhyme, I will say straightway that in the whole of the Western Middle Iranian material so far recognized as poetical⁵ there is not a single rhyme in the strict sense. There are accidental

¹ "Selected by sifting", Pers. *bīxtan*. Cf. below str. 5. In MPers. *zwyxtn* occurs (same meaning).

² This transcription of *nmstyg* is indicated by Parth. inscr. *nymstyk* (Inscr. of Shapur, line 4, cf. also Sprengling, *AJSLL.*, lviii, 169 sq.), which is rendered by *παράκλησις* in the Greek version, i.e. "appeal, request". This meaning fits the Manichæan texts far better than "adoration". Both spelling and meaning are at variance with the derivation from OIr. *namah-*, which has to be abandoned.

³ Here spelled *gwndg*, but elsewhere *gwyndg*. "Failings, offences."

⁴ *nywryd* (*nī* + *var-*).

⁵ I do not regard as a poem the passage from the Great Bundahishn (p. 10) to which M. Nyberg has given such prominence (*ZDMG.*, lxxxii, 222 sqq.). The wording indicates clearly that the passage is merely a Pahlavi version of an Avestan text (quite possibly of an *Avestan* poem).

rhymes and assonances ; but the principle of the rhyme as such, the deliberate rhyme, seems to have been unknown. The passages quoted above, from Pahlavi and Parthian,¹ show that sufficiently. Especially as the answer to the question has some importance for the history of Persian literature, we should be careful to confine the use of the word to cases in which rhyme was consciously applied as a poetic embellishment.

Yet even the most cautious will not be able to deny the presence of conscious rhyme in a Pahlavi poem that to the present has remained unnoticed. It forms part of one of the *Andarz* texts in Jamasp-Asana's *Pahlavi Texts*, the so-called Pahlavi Shahname, to which the other poetical Pahlavi books belong. The passage (p. 54) is conspicuous by its curious, plainly poetic, diction. Its text is in a sad condition : words have been left out, there are a few glosses, some lines may be missing altogether ; nevertheless, its poetic character is beyond doubt. The rhyme goes through the whole poem, in the manner of a Qaṣīde ; indeed, there is interior rhyme in the *maṭla'*. It seems that, apart from the opening line, two lines always made up a strophe ; the first line of each strophe ended in *andar gēhān* (to gain such regularity one has to assume that a whole line has been allowed to drop out). There are several uncertain points in the text printed here ² :—

0	<i>Dārom andarz-ē az dānāgān</i>	<i>az guft-ī pēšēnīgān</i>
1	<i>Ō šmāh bē wizārom</i> <i>agar [ēn az man] padīrēd</i>	<i>pad rāstīh andar gēhān</i> <i>bavēd sūd-ī dō-gēhān</i>
2	<i>Pad gētī vistāx^w ma bēd</i> <i>čē gētī pad kas bē nē hišt-hēnd</i>	<i>was-ārzōg andar gēhān</i> <i>nē kūšk ud [nē] xān-u-mān</i>
3	[one line missing ?]	
	<i>šādīh-ī pad dīl čē xandēd</i>	<i>ud čē nāzēd gētīyān</i>
4	<i>Čand mardomān dīd-hom</i> <i>Čand x^wadāyān³ dīd-hom</i>	<i>was[-ārzōg ?] andar gēhān</i> <i>mih-sardārīh abar mardomān</i>
5	<i>Awēšān mih wēš-mēnīdār</i> <i>awēšān abērāh⁵ šud-hēnd</i>	<i>bē raft-hēnd andar gēhān⁴</i> <i>abāg dard bē raft-hēnd asāmān⁶</i>
6	<i>Harw kē čūn ēn dīd—čē rāy</i> <i>ka nē dārēd gētī pad spanj⁷</i>	<i>ka wastār andar gēhān</i> <i>ud [nē] tan pad āsān</i>

¹ M. Benveniste quoted two passages to prove the existence of rhyme in Man. Parthian (*J.A.*, 1930, ii, 223). In the first, the words at the end of the lines should be read (a) *framanyōg*, (b) *abēstaft*, (c) *wilāstīft*, (d) *mānag*. In the second, we have (a) *wasnād*, (b) *əstād*, (c) *mardōhmān*, (d) *paidāg* ; 'st[*d*], in the place of 'st[*d*], is wrongly restored (the next word is [*mdy*]'*n*). There are no strophes in the second passage, which is an "alphabetical" hymn. Far better accidental rhymes can be found in most Parthian poems.

² The words I have added are in square brackets.

³ A gloss : *spāhbedān* "generals".

⁴ Another gloss : *ku amāh mihtar hēm andar gēhān* "thinking 'we are the greatest in the world' ". Presumably to explain *wēš-mēnīdār*.

⁵ MSS. 'pl's (= *āfrāh*) instead of 'pyl's.

⁶ A variant : *āsmān* (which also would make sense of a sort). I prefer the rarer word, *a-sāmān*, which here, in conjunction with *abē-rāh*, probably had the meaning of Pers. *bisā mān*.

⁷ Not *spōz* here. Cf. *P.T.*, 56¹⁸-57¹ *gētī pad əspranj dār ud tan pad āsān*.

- 0 I have a counsel from the Wise, from the sayings of the Ancient.
 1 To you I will explain it, truthfully, in the world ; if you accept [it from me],
 you will have profit for both worlds :—
 2 Do not put your trust in earthly goods, desiring much, in the world ; for
 earthly goods have never been left in anyone's hands, neither a palace,
 [nor] house and hearth.
 3 Joy in the heart ? Why laugh and be proud, worldlings ?
 4 How many men have I seen, [desiring] much, in the world ! How many
 princes have I seen, lording it over mankind !
 5 Grandly, in overweening pride, they strode in the world—they have gone
 where there is no way, in pain they went, poor and homeless.
 6 Anyone, when he has seen that—what use if he remains pledged¹ to the
 world ? if he fails to consider the earthly existence an inn, the body a
 facile thing ?

The poem raises a number of important problems ; their discussion has to be held over to another occasion. Is this an ancient poem, or merely an imitation of Persian models ? Can its date be determined ?² The sentiment, the distrust of the world, seems appropriate to all periods of Persian and Middle Persian literature ; it would have been appropriate to the time of Burzōi. The rhythm would perhaps improve, if one put more modern forms into the text, in the place of the conventional heavy-vowelled Middle Persian forms (e.g. in 2b *čè gētī pa kás be-n'-hīštand*).

¹ Or "self-abandoned". The word had both meanings. Cf. the passages collected by M. F. Kanga, *The Testament of Khusrav I*, p. 3, n. 4 (add *Pahl. Texts*, 143, 5).

² The *terminus ante quem* is A.D. 956 (if the figure—324—in the first colophon, *P.T.*, 83, deserves to be trusted).