

# Modarres-e Reḡavi's Edition of Anvari's *divān*: A Critical Assessment

Giacomo Brotto  
Sapienza Università di Roma, Italia

**Abstract** The aim of this paper is two-folded: 1) to discuss Modarres-e Reḡavi's edition of Anvari's *divān* in order to show that this edition, although still very valuable, should be used cautiously: even for non-philological, literary-oriented studies manuscripts should be checked. These should include not only the newly-discovered codices, not used by the editor, but also the manuscripts he used, which must be double-checked; 2) to give a solid starting point to any scholar attempting to investigate Anvari's *divān* from a philological perspective, by showing in which areas Modarres-e Reḡavi's edition is lacking and to what extent.

**Keywords** Anvari. Persian literature. Persian manuscripts. Persian poetry. Philology. Saljuqid literature.

**Summary** 1 Introduction. Modarres-e Reḡavi's Edition. – 2 Modarres-e Reḡavi's Method. – 3 The *Apparatus*. – 4 Conclusions.



## Peer review

Submitted 2024-03-11  
Accepted 2024-06-04  
Published 2024-07-25

## Open access

© 2024 Brotto | © 4.0



**Citation** Brotto, G. (2024). "Modarres-e Reḡavi's Edition of Anvari's *divān*: A Critical Assessment". *Annali di Ca' Foscari. Serie orientale*, 60, 89-116.

## 1 Introduction. Modarres-e Reḡavi's Edition

Born in Xorāsān in the first decades of the twelfth century CE,<sup>1</sup> Owḡad al-din Anvari is one of the most important Persian authors of the classical period. His compositions, as usual for a poet of his age, mainly consist of panegyrics addressed to prominent men of his time, who were willing to accept the poet's services and pay him in return. Such poems, even beyond their intrinsic literary beauty, are an invaluable source to deepen our knowledge of the later part of the Saljuqid period.

Anvari was both successful during his lifetime – he praised both the sultan Sanjar and his vizir, Nāṣer al-din Tāher nephew of Neẓām al-Molk – and highly appreciated by later poets, who considered him a model to imitate. His style is notoriously difficult: not only allusions to almost all fields of knowledge of his time can be found in his poems, especially astrology, but he also routinely employed complex figures of speech.

His *divān* (collection of [lyrical] poems) has been edited twice; a first edition by Sa'īd Nafisi was published in 1958, and a second one by Modarres-e Reḡavi in 1959-61, in two volumes.<sup>2</sup> Scholars agree on preferring the latter, compiled on the basis of fifteen witnesses.<sup>3</sup> J.T.P. de Bruijn writes: "The modern editions by Sa'īd Nafisī and Modarres Raẓawī are both based on early manuscripts, but Raẓawī offers a far more reliable text than Nafisī" (1986).

MR (Modarres-e Reḡavi, thus abbreviated from now on) originally wrote two introductions:<sup>4</sup> at the beginning of the first volume he briefly details his editing method and describes the witnesses he used (Anvari 1959-61, 1: 15-22), while a much longer introduction was published at the beginning of the second volume, which appeared a couple of years later (2: 31-163). Here MR gives information about the poet's life, work and patrons (Anvari 1959-61, 2: 31-140), enumerates the previous printings of Anvari's poems (2: 141), describes again the manuscripts used for the edition (2: 142-58) and summarises again his editing method (2: 158-63), which he had already described in the introduction to the first volume.

---

This paper was written with the help of many people: first and foremost my supervisors, Daniela Meneghini and Paola Orsatti. Many thanks also to Anna Livia Beelaert for discussing this topic with me, pointing out useful bibliography such as Ritter 1952 and Čangiz Golām-'Alī Bāy Burdi 1991, and to Mojarrad Mojtabā for helping me to understand the final page of Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye dānešgāh-e Tehrān, microfilm 2615.

- 1 The precise birth date is not known.
- 2 Poems will be referred to by the number assigned to them in this edition.
- 3 I choose to translate *nosxe* (pl. *nosax*) as 'witness' rather than 'manuscript' in the context of discussing the edition since two of MR's witnesses, also called *nosxe*, are lithographical editions of Anvari's *divān*, not manuscripts.
- 4 In later editions of MR's work only the second, longer introduction has been reprinted, and it was placed at the beginning of the first volume.

One obvious problem MR's edition has is its incompleteness. MR did not edit any of the compositions he perceived as obscene, not wanting to publish poems full of vulgar words in a book he meant for students.<sup>5</sup> F. de Blois, in the section of *Persian Literature: A Bio-Bibliographical Survey* dedicated to Anvari, wrote:

The only more or less critical edition of his [Anvari's] *dīwān* is the one by Mudarris i Riḡawī, who at least consulted the oldest dated copy (London Or. 3713) and two of the old Istanbul manuscripts and recorded variants from a number of others. However the edition is not complete, since the editor has omitted some of the poems that he considers obscene; for these the older edition by Nafīsī can be consulted. (de Blois 2004, 221)<sup>6</sup>

Over time, especially after the discovery of old manuscripts that were not used by MR,<sup>7</sup> various scholars started to question the reliability of MR's work. While not discussing the edition itself, two important studies on Anvari's poetry by Iranian scholars, Šahīdī and Šafī'ī Kadkani, do not quote the poet's lines from this edition, but the authors give their own version of the texts they analyse, relying on various other sources.

Šahīdī's commentary of Anvari's *divān* was printed in 1978.<sup>8</sup> In the introduction the author writes: "When commenting a line, the first thing that needs to be done is to establish the correct form of the line, or at least a form close to it" (Šahīdī 1978, *dāl-he*), and he then proceeds to clarify on which manuscripts he relied to ascertain the correct version of the lines he is commentating.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> As stated by MR himself in Anvari 1959-61, 2: 162. It is not unusual for editions of classical poetry printed in Iran to be bowdlerised. How satire/obscene poetry (*hajn/hazl*) has been treated by editors is described in Zipoli 2016, XXXI-XXXL.

<sup>6</sup> De Blois apparently did not know about Tehran, *Ketābxne-ye majles-e šurā-ye eslāmi*, 86666, dated 680 h.q./1281-82 CE.

<sup>7</sup> No complete list of the known manuscripts of Anvari's *divān* exists. Partial ones, sometimes with very brief descriptions, can be found in de Blois 2004, 221-5; Monzavi 1971, 2235-42 and Derāyati 1389, 5: 58-68, as well as in the editors' introductions to the two printed editions. Dublin, Chester Beatty, Per. 103 is extensively described in Arberry, Minovi, Blochet 1959, 4-11. London, British Library, Or. 3713 is also extensively described, in Rieu 1895, 141-3. Brief descriptions of the two Istanbul manuscripts, Istanbul, Fāteḡ, 3784 and Istanbul, Fāteḡ, 3786 can be found in Ritter, Reinert 1986, 119-20.

<sup>8</sup> This book is *de facto* a traditional commentary written in the twentieth century. Šahīdī relies heavily on the classical commentaries of Farāhānī and Šādiābādī, and nearly always concerns himself with the explanation of individual lines, with a particular focus on lexicon, while never analysing poems as a whole.

<sup>9</sup> He relied on:

1. An incomplete manuscript of which M. Minovi gave him a reproduction, to which he refers to as *nosxe-ye minow*. Thirteenth-fourteenth century CE; it corresponds to Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye dānešgāh-e Tehrān, microfilm 4113.

Šafi'i Kadkani, as part of a series of annotated anthologies meant to enable modern day students to read classical poetry, published a selection of Anvari's poems, with an introduction and many annotations (Šafi'i Kadkani 1993). He also did not follow MR's text, but many times preferred the readings given by old, unused manuscripts.<sup>10</sup>

In recent years a number of articles were written by Iranian scholars (Karami, Amini, Kowṭari 2014; Ḍabiḥi 2016; Nurāyi, Aḥmadpur 2016),<sup>11</sup> all of them stating the need of a new edition of Anvari's *divān*. This is mainly justified by enumerating the multiple old manuscripts that were not used by MR,<sup>12</sup> the five main and oldest ones being:<sup>13</sup>

- Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye dānešgāh-e Tehrān, microfilm 2615, not dated.
- Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye dānešgāh-e Tehrān, microfilm 4113, not dated.
- Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye majles-e šurā-ye eslāmi, 86666, dated 680 Q./1281-82 CE. It is the oldest known dated copy of Anvari's *divān*.<sup>14</sup>

- 
2. Another incomplete manuscript owned by A. Afšār Širāzi, to which he refers to as *nosxe-ye afš*. Thirteenth-fourteenth century CE; it corresponds to Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye dānešgāh-e Tehrān, microfilm 2615.
  3. Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye majles-e šurā-ye eslāmi, 86666; dated 1281-82 CE.
  4. MR's printed edition.

He ignored Nafisi's edition, as he considered it *maḡluṭ* (faulty). For a brief description of these manuscripts see "Appendix 2".

**10** As stated in Šafi'i Kadkani 1993, 10. No specific manuscripts are mentioned. In Šafi'i Kadkani 1993, 69 note 69, the author refers to Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye dānešgāh-e Tehrān, microfilm 4113.

**11** Each of these articles gives a different list of manuscripts that should be used for the new edition. No one tries to outline a criterion on the basis of which manuscripts should be selected. For the lists of manuscripts given in those articles, see appendix 2.

**12** Karami, Amini, Kowṭari 1392 clearly states the need of a new edition with similar arguments to the ones made in this paper; the authors also quote MR's claim to have registered only the "important and necessary" variant readings and take note of the lack of a proper method. However, their approach is not consistent. They state the impossibility of working only on the newly found codices (138), but then they proceed to mention among the *nosax-e mowred-e estefāde dar tašḥih-e tāze-ye qašāyed-e Anvari* (witnesses that ought to be used in the new edition of Anvari's panegyrics) only manuscripts that MR has not used. Moreover, in spite of what was written earlier about MR's work, in the lines edited as samples of their method, the editing is made *bā tava-jjoh be nosxebadal-e divān o nosax-e xaṭṭi-ye yādšode* (referencing the variant readings of the *divān* [edited by MR] and the aforementioned manuscripts [not used by MR]). Ḍabiḥi 2016 states the need of a new edition, lists both manuscripts used and unused by MR, but does not discuss neither MR's edition (except by alluding in the abstract to *naqš dar qerā'at-e nosxehā-ye estefāde šode* 'mistakes in reading the utilised witnesses') nor any methodological issues.

**13** Brief descriptions of these codices can be found in "Appendix 2".

**14** The last page is damaged and the day and month of completion are not readable, only the year is.

- Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye Sepahsālār, 209, not dated.<sup>15</sup>
- Dublin, Chester Beatty, Per. 103, dated 699 Q./1300 CE.

Among western scholars similar statements were made by A.L. Bee-laert, who, after discussing the manuscripts not used by MR, wrote: “Anvarī's *Divān* is badly in need of a new edition” (2017).

## 2 Modarres-e Reḡavi's Method

To begin a discussion on why MR's edition, and especially its *apparatus*, should be used by scholars with caution, it is first necessary to summarise what MR says about the method he followed (as stated in Anvari 1959-61, 1: 15-22).

1. He made a list of poems “on the basis of some witnesses”.
2. He ordered the poems alphabetically, by rhyme.<sup>16</sup>
3. He wrote down the whole *divān* on the basis of this list, then he added the poems present in “a number of witnesses” to have a complete version of the *divān*.
4. He compared the *divān* thus obtained with everyone of the selected witnesses,<sup>17</sup> then choosing Istanbul, Fāṭeh, 3784<sup>18</sup> as his base manuscript (*siglum* ‘*lām*’ in the *apparatus*), describing it as: “older and more solid than the other witnesses”.
5. He states that: *extelāfāt-e nosax-rā ke dar natije-ye moqābele peydā šod ānče-rā ke mohemm o lāzem did dar deyl-e šafhāt yāddāšt kard* (Among the differences between manuscripts [i.e. variant readings] that became evident during the process of comparison [i.e. collation] *the ones that seemed important and necessary* were recorded in the footnotes [i.e. the *apparatus*]).<sup>19</sup>
6. He adapted the text to the modern orthographical standard.
7. He compared the text with “thirty old witnesses and anthologies”,<sup>20</sup> and included the poems found in them that were not already present in his text.

---

<sup>15</sup> *Non vidi*.

<sup>16</sup> Tackling the highly complex issue of what part of a line precisely is to be considered its *qāfiye* (rhyme) is far beyond the scope of this paper. MR simply ordered the poems alphabetically, considering the letters of the first line in reverse order, beginning from the last. The expression ‘by rhyme’ will be used for simplicity.

<sup>17</sup> By this he means the manuscripts selected to be used for the edition.

<sup>18</sup> Dated 1309 CE. For a brief description see “Appendix 1”.

<sup>19</sup> Emphasis added.

<sup>20</sup> The word *jong* properly refers to illustrated anthologies of prose and poetry. See Simpson 2015.

8. He compiled the glossary and the indexes.<sup>21</sup>

Furthermore, the editor states that he checked the form in which Anvari's lines were quoted in classical dictionaries, such as the *Jahāngiri*. Another important information is provided in the methodological additions in the introduction to the second volume (Anvari 1959-61, 2: 158-63):<sup>22</sup> even when all manuscripts were clearly wrong (e.g. a line did not fit the metre), MR never included personal conjectures in the text, but always chose between what he found in the manuscripts. This is probably also true for the headings. Many poems have a heading mentioning a clearly wrong addressee (as the name of another patron is mentioned in the poem itself). MR simply chose one of the titles mentioned in the manuscripts, even if he knew they were wrong.<sup>23</sup>

In regard to the outlined method, a series of remarks must be made.

- a. The editor's starting point was a text he himself compiled (from unidentified sources), not a specific copy to which he subsequently collated other witnesses. This makes the starting point inevitably biased. No criterion that guided the selection of witnesses is ever given, nor the editor explains how he chose between variant readings. MR also does not give any information on how manuscripts could be related to each other.
- b. In many manuscripts used by the editor<sup>24</sup> poems are not arranged 'by rhyme' (according to the last letters of each *beyt*) as it happens in other manuscripts and most modern editions. They are instead ordered in a much different way, loosely grouped by addressee or theme (de Blois 1995).<sup>25</sup> In listing and describing the manuscripts he used, MR does not systematically give information on how poems were arranged,<sup>26</sup> nor

---

**21** He describes the process in detail; this part is summarised since it is not relevant to the present discussion.

**22** In particular 160.

**23** This is shown, e.g., by *qaṣide* 'panegyric' 67: the title mentions abu al-Ḥasan 'Emrāni, but MR states in his introduction that it is clear 'Emrāni is not the addressee of the poem (Anvari 1959-61, 2: 26-7).

**24** E.g. 'eyn, *te* and *kāf*, see "Appendix 1".

**25** For the specific instances of Sanā'i's and Nezāri's poems see de Bruijn 1983, 91-112 and Čangiz Golām-'Ali Bāy Burdi 1370, 20-5. Manuscripts of Anvari's *divān* ordered in this way include: Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye majles-e šurā-ye eslāmi, 86666; London, British Library, Or. 3713; Dublin, Chester Beatty, Per. 103; Istanbul, Fāteḥ, 3786; Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye malek, 5267; Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye Dānešgāh-e Tehrān, microfilm 2615; Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye dānešgāh-e Tehrān, microfilm 4113 and Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye majles-e šurā-ye eslāmi, 86544.

**26** Except for Istanbul, Fāteḥ, 3784, *siglum* 'lām', in which "[poems are] ordered accordingly to the last *ḥarf* of each line, excluding the *radif*" and Istanbul, Fāteḥ, 3786, *siglum* "eyn", in which: "[poems] are not ordered according to the last letters of each line,

any indication to where a poem is situated in manuscripts not arranged 'by rhyme' is provided anywhere. This could have been useful not only to understand the criterion by which poems were originally organised, but also to know which poems were traditionally thought to be linked together. This information could prove important in understanding the poems themselves.

- c. Istanbul, Fāteḥ, 3784, *siglum* 'lām', was chosen as the editor's *nosxe-ye aṣli* (base witness) partly on the false assumption it was the oldest among the collected manuscripts. London, British Library, 3713, *siglum* 'te', is older,<sup>27</sup> but it was at first described imprecisely by MR, who states: "This is a photographic reproduction (*nosxe-ye 'aksi*) of a collection of *divāns* of different poets kept in the Paris national library" (Anvari 1959-61, 1: 18); he also probably did not know the date.<sup>28</sup> This mistake was fixed in the introduction to volume II,<sup>29</sup> but the choice of *lām* as *nosxe-ye aṣli* had already been made.  
This is not the only instance of MR giving misleading information on a manuscript: he mentions the date 753 Q./1352 CE for Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye bayāni, 54/2, *siglum* 'dāl' (Anvari 1959-61, 1: 17), although the scribe's *subscriptio* clearly mentions 768 Q./1367 CE.<sup>30</sup>
- d. The editor did not record every variant reading in the *apparatus*, but only the ones he deemed "important and necessary". Even trusting the editor not to have excluded any potentially correct variant reading, this makes it impossible to forward any hypothesis on the relation between manuscripts using only MR's *apparatus*.
- e. The "thirty old witnesses and anthologies" to which the editor compared his almost finished work are never described, nor any *siglum* is assigned to any of them in the introductions. The use of these unidentified witnesses could explain

---

but it seems that another order is being observed. Panegyrics dedicated to a patron follow each other, and in the same way *qet'es* addressed to that patron follow the panegyrics". In the descriptions of some of the other manuscripts the editor quotes the *matla'* 'opening couplet' of the first *qaṣide*, from which the order of the poems can be guessed.

**27** Dated 693 HQ/1293 CE. For a brief description see "Appendix 1".

**28** At first he only probably had, or looked at, a reproduction of the *folia* in which Anvari's *divān* is written (ff. 36v-125r), that has no date. The date of completion is written after Moxtāri's *divān*, on f. 173v.

**29** MR quotes Minovi's correct description of the manuscript, including its date, in Anvari 1959-61, 2: 146-8.

**30** As evident from the copyist's *subscriptio* as transcribed by MR himself, Anvari 1959-61, 2: 144. The exact day is given, 16th of *du l-hijjah* 768 HQ/21st of August 1367. This was noted in de Blois 2004, 224. The correct date is also stated in Monzavi 1971, 2235, item 21663.

the presence in the *apparatus* of *sigla* such as 'sin', to which no witness corresponds; it seems that some of those witnesses were assigned a *siglum* by the editor during his work, but he did not state them anywhere.<sup>31</sup>

### 3 The Apparatus

As widely known, the most important part of a critical edition is the *apparatus*. Even if some of the variant readings chosen by the editor are proven to be wrong, a well built *apparatus* allows any scholar to study the textual tradition of the edited work independently of the editor's opinion. In a case such as Anvari's *divān*, where the relationship between manuscripts has not yet been studied, it is even more important to be able to systematically compare the variant readings given by different witnesses.

In this perspective, a sample analysis was conducted on *qašides* 80 and 84, by comparing their text as given by the four oldest manuscripts used by MR with the printed text and the *apparatus*. In appendix 3 every variant reading given by those manuscripts that has not been recorded in MR's *apparatus* is given.<sup>32</sup>

The chosen manuscripts are:

1. Istanbul, Ketābxāne-ye Fāteḥ, 3784, *siglum* 'lām'. *Qašide* 80 is present in ff. 28r-29r, *qašide* 84 in ff. 35r-36r.<sup>33</sup>
2. Istanbul, Ketābxāne-ye Fāteḥ, 3786, *siglum* 'eyn'. *Qašide* 80 is present in ff. 60r-61r, *qašide* 84 in 58v-60r.
3. Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye Malek, 5267, *siglum* 'kāf'. *Qašide* 80 is present in ff. 38r-38v, *qašide* 84 in ff. 43r-44r.
4. London, British Library, Or. 3713, *siglum* 'te'. *Qašide* 80 is present in ff. 58v-59r, *qašide* 84 in 58r-58v.

A brief description of these four manuscripts is given in "Appendix 1". According to their descriptions as given in both introductions, MR seems to have heavily relied on them; this is especially true of the two Istanbul manuscripts *lām* and *'eyn*.

---

<sup>31</sup> 'sin' is present, for example, in the *apparatus* of *qašides* 71 and 77.

<sup>32</sup> Since the editor, at times, records in the *apparatus* every kind of non merely graphical variant reading (e.g. the difference between spellings كى and ك for *ke*), including the presence or absence of the conjunction *o* and the confusion between the demonstratives *ān* and *in*, every non merely graphical variant reading has been taken into consideration.

<sup>33</sup> Istanbul, Fāteḥ, 3784 has pencil written numbers on the upper left corner every 10 ff. The count appears, from 20 onwards, to be off by 1 (20 is 19, 30 is 29 and so on). This seems to be a simple miscounting issue, I could not find a place where a page might have fallen among the first 20.

The two *qašides* are addressed to the same patron, Šadr al-din Moḡammad, likely a great-grandson of the famous vizir Neẓām al-Molk (Anvari 1959-61, 2: 67-8). They share the same rhyme, metre and general structure; moreover, in both prologues the poet describes his love sickness (in 80 his beloved, *ma'suq*, is far away, in 84 the poet chooses to depart from him) from which he finds comfort at his patron's court. The transitional lines, *gorizgāh*, are also very similar.

This comparison has shown that many variant readings were not reported in the *apparatus* by the editor: e.g. *qašide* 80, l. 8, the variant reading *nāle*] *nowḡe* is recorded only as given by witnesses *ṭā* and *mim*; this variant reading is also present in *lām* and *te*; *qašide* 84, l. 42, *šaxs-e ajal*] *a'dā-t-rā* in 'eyn is not recorded at all. Recording the presence of variant readings only in some of the manuscripts in which they are actually present can cause the reader to underestimate their importance and diffusion.

Even things as potentially relevant as absent or misplaced lines are at times not recorded properly: e.g. in *qašide* 80 ll. 6-10 appear in a completely different order in *lām* and *te*, 8>6>9>7>10; this is not recorded at all. Of course any formal analysis of a poem cannot ignore the order of the lines. In regard to *qašide* 80, l. 14, MR adds a note saying that in witness *te* only the first 14 lines are present: this is not true, in *te* the whole poem can be read. The presence of *qašide* 84 in manuscript *te* is ignored altogether; the manuscript is not listed in the *apparatus* among the ones in which this poem is present.

Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye malek, 5267, has many interlinear corrections (in which a word perceived to be wrong is corrected by writing the 'correct' one above it, between two lines of text) and additions: lines that were thought to be missing were added outside the main body of text, in the margins. This is clearly signalled in the manuscript itself since before both *qašides* 80 and 84 the Arabic letters صح are written near their headings, indicating that the text was 'corrected' (Arabic *ṣaḡḡa*) by comparing it with another copy (Déroche, Sagaria Rossi 2012, 216-22). MR's approach to these additions is not coherent: sometimes the editor acknowledges them, sometimes he records the variant readings present in these interlinear corrections or added lines without mentioning that they do not belong to the main body of text, some other times he just ignores them.

For *qašide* 84, l. 7, MR records: '*azm*] *dar ḡāšīye-ye kāf* (in *kāf*'s additions): '*odr*. This shows that MR was aware of the issue. For *qašide* 80, ll. 19-20, MR records *eḡkām*] *farmān* and *farmān*] *ta'id* in *kāf*. These two lines are actually absent from *kāf*'s main text, and are added in the margins; it is in these additions that these variant readings are present. Examples of the editor not recording these corrections and additions are plenty, see "Appendix 3".

Even though proposing a new text is not the aim of this paper, the editor's choices do appear at times questionable: e.g. in *qašide* 80, l.

3, *havā siyāh be kerdār-e qirgun xaftān // falak kabud nemudār-e nil-gun meḡfar* (The air [was] as black as a tar coloured kaftan, the sky [was] as blue as a Nile coloured helmet),<sup>34</sup> MR chooses *nemudār* instead of another *be kerdār* in the second *meṣrā'*, even with *be kerdār* being present in all four witnesses above mentioned and maintaining a perfect parallelism between the two *meṣrā'*s.<sup>35</sup> In *qaṣide* 84, l. 7, *bahāne-ye safar o 'azm-e raftan āvardi // del-at ze ṣoḡbat-e yārān malul gašt maḡar* (You have brought forward excuses for a voyage and the intent to go, has your heart grown tired of the company of friends?), MR chooses 'azm (intent) over 'oḡr (forgiveness/pardon), which is present in all four witnesses above mentioned.<sup>36</sup> In *qaṣide* 84, l. 23, *če dast-e u be saxā dar če abr dar neysān // če ṭab'-e u be soxan dar če baḡr-e bi-ma'bar* (His hand in generosity [i.e. his generous hand] resembles a cloud in the month of Neysān, his aptitude for speech resembles a sea without crossings),<sup>37</sup> MR chooses *abr dar neysān* (the cloud in the month of Neysān) over *abr-e bi-noqṣān* (the cloud without fault): this second reading, present in *te* and *lām* (MR's *nosxe-ye aṣli*),<sup>38</sup> preserves a closer parallel between the two *meṣrā'*s, with both the patron's hand and his aptitude for speech compared to a noun described by an adjective build with the prefix *bi-*, 'without'.<sup>39</sup>

**34** 'Nile coloured helmet' indicates the deep and shining blue-gray of the night sky. The translation of *meḡfar* is at times problematic, for it can indicate both the helmet and the mail or network of steel worn under it.

**35** In the *apparatus* he records *be kerdār* as a variant reading present in *lām*, his base witness, but not in the other three, see "Appendix 3". The correctness of the second *be kerdār* is reinforced by Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye dāneṣḡāh-e Tehrān, microfilm 2615 and Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye dāneṣḡāh-e Tehrān, microfilm 4113 which both have this reading. The meaning or translation of the line does not drastically change.

**36** This might have happened because MR did not record 'oḡr as a variant reading present in *lām*, 'eyn and *te*. See "Appendix 3". The correctness of 'oḡr is reinforced by Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye dāneṣḡāh-e Tehrān, microfilm 2615 and Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye dāneṣḡāh-e Tehrān, microfilm 4113, which both have this reading. The line thus reads "You brought forward excuses for a voyage and [asked for] forgiveness for going away...".

**37** Meaning the patron's hand is as generous as a spring cloud gifting rain and his aptitude for speech is as wide as an immeasurable sea (the cloud being an established symbol of generosity, the sea, with its width and richness of pearls, an established metaphor associated with speech). The Persian construction with two *čes* per *meṣrā'* was translated quite freely.

**38** This is not acknowledged in the *apparatus*, where only *čo abr dar neysān*] in *ṭā* and *če: čo abr-e bi-noqṣān* is recorded.

**39** Moreover *Neysān*, the month traditionally associated with spring, of common use in spring descriptions, is identifiable as *lectio faciliōr*. The reading *bi-noqṣān* is also present in both Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye dāneṣḡāh-e Tehrān, microfilm 2615 and Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye dāneṣḡāh-e Tehrān, microfilm 4113. Furthermore, the juxtaposition between *abr-e bi-noqṣān* and *baḡr-e bi-ma'bar* is also present in other lines of Anvari's *divān*, e.g. *qaṣide* 81, l. 11 (Anvari 1959-61, 1: 199). The *beyt* would thus read: "His hand in generosity [i.e. his generous hand] resembles/it is more generous than the cloud without fault, his aptitude for speech resembles/it is more rich than the sea without crossings".

Crucial information about manuscripts, even key ones, seems to be lacking: e.g. Istanbul, Fāteḡ, 3786, one of MR's main witnesses, is never mentioned to be in disorder, as shown by facts such as *qaṣide* 59 beginning on f. 5v, being interrupted and then continuing on what is now f. 40r. In this manuscript, also, *qaṣide* 68 is written twice: ff. 33v-34v have the first 24 lines while ff. 126r-127v have the whole text, albeit with a completely different *maṭla'*, *duš čun čašme-ye x<sup>w</sup>oršid-e sepehrdāvār // gašt az časm nehān dar pas-e parde šab-e tār* (Last night, when the sun's disk became invisible to the eyes beneath that veil that is the dark night...). The *maṭla'* printed in the edition is: *di čo beškast šahanšāh-e falak nowbat-e bār // v-az sarāparde-ye šab gerd-e jahān kard hešār* (Yesterday, when the king of kings in the sky [i.e. the sun] interrupted court time [i.e. set] and the world became encompassed by night's veil...).<sup>40</sup> Neither the double presence of this *qaṣide* nor the different *maṭla'* are recorded in the *apparatus* (Anvari 1959-61, 1: 154).

#### 4 Conclusions

MR's edition has been used for many years without taking into account or discussing its multiple problems, especially among western scholars.<sup>41</sup> This is somewhat surprising since another of MR's editions of medieval Persian poetry, Sanā'i's *Ḥadīqatu l-Ḥaqīqah* (in Arabic, *The Garden of Truth*), was the object of a very harsh review by H. Ritter, who wrote:

As praiseworthy as this edition is, this preface already makes clear that the editor, much differently from the great master Muḡammad Qazvini, is one of those Persian scholars who do not give much value to precision and proper documentation. (Ritter 1952, 190)

Ritter proceeded to point out to multiple instances of poorly described manuscripts, the absence of any criterion in the evaluation of variant readings and, judging from the facsimile reproductions of the *folia* of some manuscripts printed in the edition, many inaccuracies in the recording of variant readings in the *apparatus*.

I hope to have shown that anyone who wishes to study Anvari's *divān* has to take into account how MR's edition was made, and

---

<sup>40</sup> Both *maṭla'*s are temporal clauses, linked by *enjambement* to the following line (*ruy benmud mah-e 'id...* "Id's moon showed its face..."). An *eżāfe* particle seems to have fallen for metrical reasons between *parde* and *šab* (or *parde* is to be considered an apposition of *šab-e tār*).

<sup>41</sup> Up until now: still in de Bruijn 2019 Anvari's poems are quoted *verbatim* from MR's edition, without saying anything about it.

proceed accordingly. Although MR's work is still the essential starting point for any research on Anvari and certain aspects of it still are very valuable, especially the learned and extensive introduction, the text and the *apparatus* must always be closely scrutinised, not only by reading old manuscripts not used by MR, but also by double-checking the ones used by the editor. This is especially important for future philological works on Anvari's poetry, which is highly necessary.

## Appendix 1<sup>42</sup>

Manuscripts that are not ordered alphabetically, by rhyme, are all organised in approximately the same way: they begin with *qaṣide* 60, addressed to Sanjar, and tend to group together poems (both *qaṣides* and *qeṭ'es*) addressed to the same patron. This tendency, however, is not always followed: more than one block of poems having the same addressee can be found in the same manuscript while poems addressed to a different patron are, at times, inserted in the 'wrong' block; moreover, some texts seem to be grouped by 'theme' (e.g. *qeṭ'es* of similar subject).

It is to be noted that the order of poems in these manuscripts is never exactly the same.

The four manuscripts used for the sample collation of *qaṣides* 80 and 84 are:

1. *lām*: Istanbul, Fāteḥ, 3784. Copied by Moḥammad b. 'Abdallāh b. Moḥammad al-Ḥāfeẓ and completed in *avāxer-e māh-e Šavvāl* 708 Q. (late Šavvāl 708 Q.)/April 1309 CE.

Layout of the page: two columns, 29 lines per page. Poems are ordered alphabetically, by rhyme (*radif* excluded). The first poem is *qaṣide* 18, *maṭla' agar moḥāvel-e ḥāl-e jahāniyān na qaḏā-st // čerā majāre-ye aḥvāl bar xelāf-e reḡā-st* (if the constant turning [i.e. changing] of the mortals condition is not [dictated by] Fate, why the flowing of events is different from what is wanted [by humans]?).<sup>43</sup> MR declares it to

---

<sup>42</sup> For all the following manuscripts, references to Monzavi's catalogue, Monzavi 1971, have been added when possible. To avoid repetitions manuscripts will be ordered sequentially across appendixes 1 and 2; when a manuscript appears in more than one list, the number of its first mention will be referenced, where it will have been briefly described.

<sup>43</sup> Literal translation. The line means: If the state of things/the world does not change according to *qaḏā* (Fate, divine decree), why does not it change in the way that humans want? It is a rhetorical question, of course things change per divine decree, and so things do not go how mortals want them to go. This conventional wisdom theme is developed throughout the *qaṣide's* prologue.

be his *nosxe-ye aṣli*. Corresponds to item 21660 in Monzavi (1971, 2235).

2. 'eyn: Istanbul, Fāteḥ, 3786. Neither the name of the scribe nor the date are present since it lacks the final pages and with them the copyist's *subscriptio*. MR dates it to the end of seventh Q.-beginning of eighth Q./end of thirteenth-beginning of fourteenth century CE.

Layout of the page: two columns, 19 lines per page, one *meṣrā'* per column. Poems are not ordered by rhyme. The first poem is *qaṣide* 60, *maṭla' gar del o dast baḥr o kān bāšad // del o dast-e xodāyḡān bāšad* (If a heart and a hand were a sea and a mine they would be the sultan's heart and hand). It seems to be an unfinished product, f. 110v is the last page for which the *jadval* has been traced; many headings are not written. Some *folia* are not in the original order and some seem to have fallen. Corresponds to item 21659 in Monzavi (1971, 2235).

3. *kāf*: Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye malek, 5267. Neither the name of the scribe nor the date are present since it lacks the final pages and with it the copyist's *subscriptio*. MR considers it very old, written in the seventh Q./thirteenth century CE. This dating is also given in the catalogue (Afšar et al. 1975-76, 264).

Layout of the page: two columns, 20 lines per page, one *meṣrā'* per column. Poems are not ordered by rhyme. The first poem is *qaṣide* 60, *maṭla' gar del o dast baḥr o kān bāšad // del o dast-e xodāyḡān bāšad* (If a heart and a hand were a sea and a mine they would be the sultan's heart and hand). MR describes it as 'full of mistakes'. It was compared with another manuscript and there are many corrections, in which the correct word is written above the perceived mistake, between the lines; lines that were thought to be missing were added in the margins. Corresponds to items 17451 and 21658 in Monzavi (1971, 1847 and 2235 respectively).<sup>44</sup>

4. London, British Library, Or. 3713. Collection of seven *divāns*, Anvari's is the fifth, ff. 36v-125r. Copied by Moḡammadšāh b. 'Āli b. Maḥmud al-Eṣfahāni,<sup>45</sup> completed on the 6th of Rabi' II 693 Q./13th of March 1294 CE.

Layout of the page: four columns, 31 lines per page, one *meṣrā'* per column, two consecutive *beyts* (couplets) per line. Poems are not ordered by rhyme. The first poem is *qaṣide* 60,

---

<sup>44</sup> Both in the margins and between the two columns of text, vertically. In Mozavi 1971 the first time is mentioned under *kollyāt-e Anvari* the second under *divān-e Anvari*.

<sup>45</sup> He was not the only one to work on this manuscript. According to Rieu (1895, 143), Hamgar's quatrains were copied by Eṣḡāq b. Qevām Moḡammad Hamgar, the poet's grandson.

*maṭla' gar del o dast baḥr o kān bāšad // del o dast-e xodāygān bāšad* (If a heart and a hand were a sea and a mine they would be the sultan's heart and hand).

## Appendix 2

The following section lists the manuscripts mentioned by the three above quoted papers arguing the necessity of a new edition.

Karami, Amini, Kowṭari 2014

5. Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye dānešgāh-e Tehrān, microfilm 2615. The original was part of the private collection of Afšār Širāzi. The final page was lost and with it the copyist's *subscriptio*. Neither the name of the scribe nor the date are present, it could date back to the seventh Q./thirteenth century CE.<sup>46</sup>

Layout of the page: two columns, 17 lines per page, one *mešrā'* per column. Poems are not ordered by rhyme. Lines that were thought to be missing have been added at times in the margins. The first poem is *qašide* 60, *maṭla' gar del o dast baḥr o kān bāšad // del o dast-e xodāygān bāšad* (If a heart and a hand were a sea and a mine they would be the sultan's heart and hand). It is Šahidi's '*nosxe-ye afš'*' and it seems to be now lost (Beelaert 2017). Corresponds to item 21710 in Monzavi (1971, 2238).<sup>47</sup>

6. Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye majles-e šurā-ye eslāmi, 86666.<sup>48</sup> Dated 680 Q./1281-82 CE, it is the oldest known dated copy of Anvari's *divān*. The last page is badly damaged, and much of the copyist's *subscriptio* is not readable, including the copyist's name and the day and month in which the manuscript was completed.

Layout of the page: two columns, 19 lines per page, one *mešrā'* per column. Lines that were thought to be missing have been added at times in the margins. Poems are not ordered by rhyme. The first poem is *qašide* 60, *maṭla' gar del o dast baḥr o kān bāšad // del o dast-e xodāygān bāšad* (If a

---

<sup>46</sup> Described by Nafisi in the introduction to his edition of Anvari's *divān*. He considers it written in the thirteenth-fourteenth century.

<sup>47</sup> The date Monzavi refers to, 1086 h.q./1675-76 CE, is on the new last page, clearly added later when the manuscript was restored.

<sup>48</sup> This number is the *šomāre-ye tabt*. The *šomāre-ye fehrest* is 13503.

- heart and a hand were a sea and a mine they would be the sultan's heart and hand).
7. Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye Sepahsālār, 209. Lacks both the initial and the final part. Neither the name of the scribe nor the date are present, Ḍabiḥi states that it is "clearly is from seventh century Q./fourteenth century CE" (Ḍabiḥi 2016, 70).  
Layout of the page: two columns, 19 lines per page, one *meṣrā'* per column. Corresponds to item 21657 in Monzavi (1971, 2235).<sup>49</sup>
  8. Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye majles-e šurā-ye eslāmi, 86544.<sup>50</sup> Copied by Aḥmad b. 'Āli b. Aḥmad Širāzi, completed on the 20th of Šafar 785 Q./2nd of May 1383 CE.  
Layout of the page: two columns, 19 lines per page, one *meṣrā'* per column. The first poem is *qaṣide* 60, *maṭla' gar del o dast baḥr o kān bāšad // del o dast-e xodāyγān bāšad* (If a heart and a hand were a sea and a mine they would be the sultan's heart and hand).
  9. Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye majles-e šurā-ye eslāmi, 1260.<sup>51</sup> *nasta'liq* writing of the seventh Q./fourteenth-fifteenth century CE.<sup>52</sup>
  10. Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye majles-e šurā-ye eslāmi, 85326.<sup>53</sup> Copied by Ḥasan b. 'Āli Suzi Sāvaji,<sup>54</sup> completed on the 20th of Rabi' II 988 Q./14th of June 1580 CE. Corresponds to item 21674 in Monzavi (1971, 2236).<sup>55</sup>
  11. Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye majles-e šurā-ye eslāmi, 212281.<sup>56</sup> Written in *nasta'liq*, tenth-eleventh Q./sixteenth-seventeenth century CE.<sup>57</sup>

<sup>49</sup> *Non vidi*. The description is taken from Karami, Amini, Kowṭari 1392; Ḍabiḥi 2016; Monzavi 1971. The order of the poems is not noted, nor with which composition Anvari's *divān* begins. Ḍabiḥi considers it one of the oldest and 'most complete' copies of Anvari's *divān*, but adds that there are many mistakes.

<sup>50</sup> This is the *šomāre-ye ṭabt*, the *šomāre-ye fehrest* is 13582.

<sup>51</sup> This number is the *šomāre-ye nosxe*, the only given.

<sup>52</sup> *Non vidi*. No further information is provided by the authors.

<sup>53</sup> This number is the *šomāre-ye ṭabt*. A '*šomāre-ye nosxe*' is given as 910, no mention of the *šomāre-ye fehrest*.

<sup>54</sup> This is the copyist's name as given in Monzavi 1971, 2236 and Nurāyi, Aḥmadpur 2016. The one given in Karami, Amini, Kowṭari is Luzi b. 'Āli al-Sāvaji. As shown by the *šomāre-ye ṭabt* and the date, however, the manuscript is the same.

<sup>55</sup> *Non vidi*. Information taken from Karami, Amini, Kowṭari 1392; Nurāyi, Aḥmadpur 2016; Monzavi 1971. No further details are given.

<sup>56</sup> This number is the *šomāre-ye ṭabt*. The *šomāre-ye fehrest* is not given. A *šomāre-ye nosxe* 98, *sorud*, is mentioned.

<sup>57</sup> *Non vidi*. No further information given.

12. Širāz, Ketābxāne-ye ḥeḡrat 'Alā al-din Ḥoseyn, 1214. Dated 1248 Q./1832-33 CE.<sup>58</sup>
13. Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye majles-e šurā-ye eslāmi, 8431.<sup>59</sup> Copied by Moḡammad 'Ebrat Nāyebi and finished in 1242 Q./1826-27 CE.<sup>60</sup>

### Dabihi 2016

The author gives two lists, one with manuscripts MR has not used, another with some MR has used.

Manuscripts not used by MR:

14. Tehran, *Ketābxāne-ye dānešgāh Tehrān*, microfilm 4113. It lacks both the initial and the final part, some ff. seems to have fallen inside also. Neither the name of the scribe nor the date are present, estimated to have been copied at the end seventh-beginning eighth Q./end thirteenth-beginning fourteenth century CE. It is Šahidi's '*nosxe-ye minow*' (see Beelaert 2017) and it is also the witness used by Šafi'i Kadkani (1993, 69, fn. 69). Layout of the page: two columns, 17 lines per page, one *mešrā'* per column. Poems are not ordered by rhyme. It begins with the last 5 couplets of *qašide* 160. A heading found in f. 128v, *in bāb aš'ār o moqatta'āt-e parākande dar ḡaqq-e x<sup>w</sup>āje Tāher bā ḡamm-e šā'eri o estegfār az u* (This part: scattered poems in honour of lord Tāher and chastising poetry, and asking for forgiveness)<sup>61</sup> could suggest that this manuscript was put together by copying multiple antigraphs. = 6)
15. Dublin, Chester Beatty, Per. 103. Dated 699 Q./1300 CE. Collection of 10 *divāns*, Anvari's is the tenth, ff. 306v-401v. Copied by abu Našr Moḡammad b. Aḡmad b. Moḡammad b. 'Āli ibn رحو b. No'mān al-Yamāni<sup>62</sup> and Moḡammadšāh b. 'Āli b. Maḡmud b. Šādbaxt al-Ešfahāni.<sup>63</sup> The first copied ff. 2-160 and 286-305, the second ff. 161-285, 306-13 and 351-401.

---

**58** *Non vidi*. No further information given.

**59** This number is the *šomāre-ye taḡbt*, the *šomāre-ye fehrest* is not given. A *šomāre-ye nosxe* 5845 is mentioned.

**60** *Non vidi*. No further information given.

**61** The last words are very difficult to read, the reported text is somewhat conjectural. '*az u*' can be interpreted both as 'asking for forgiveness for the fact of being a poet' and 'asking for forgiveness to Tāher'; being that '*ḡamm-e šā'eri*' is mentioned immediately before, the first option seems better.

**62** Thus in Arberr, Minovi, Blochet 1959, 10.

**63** The same scribe who copied London, British Library, Or. 3713.

Layout of the page: four columns, 29-31 lines per page, one *meṣrā'* per column, two consecutive *beyts* per line. Poems are not ordered by rhyme. The first poem is *qaṣīde* 60, *maṭla' gar del o dast baḥr o kān bāšad // del o dast-e xodāygān bāšad* (If a heart and a hand were a sea and a mine they would be the sultan's heart and hand). Corresponds to item 21657 in Monzavi (1971, 2235).<sup>64</sup>

16. Tehran, *Ketābxāne-ye dānešgāh-e Tehrān*, microfilm 170/1. The original is part of the private collection of Ḥakim Oġlu Pāšā. Neither the name of the scribe nor the date are present, though it is said to have been written in the eighth/ninth Q./fourteenth-fifteenth century CE. Collection of 12 *divāns*, Anvari's is the first, ff. 1-100.

Layout of the page: columns, 35 lines per page. Corresponds to item 21797 in Monzavi (1971, 2242).<sup>65</sup>  
= 7)

17. Tehran, *Ketābxāne-ye dānešgāh Tehrān*, microfilm 240/2.<sup>66</sup> Copied by Ḥoseyn b. Moḥammad b. Moḥammad b. abi al-Qāsem Madini in 759 Q./1357-58 CE.

Layout of the page: 19 lines per page. Corresponds to item 21662 in Monzavi (1971, 2235).<sup>67</sup>

18. Tehran, *Ketābxāne-ye dānešgāh-e Tehrān*, 8527. Neither the name of the scribe nor the date are present. Ḍabiḥi states it is: "clearly from the eighth-ninth century Q./fourteenth-fifteenth century CE".<sup>68</sup>

#### Manuscripts used by MR

= 4)

= 1)

19. Mašhad, *ketābxāne-ye Āstān-e qods-e reḡavi*, 11851 *siglum 'ṭā'* in MR's edition. Neither the name of the scribe nor the date are present; about it MR says: "it is relatively old and

---

<sup>64</sup> Described in great detail in Arberry, Minovi, Blochet 1959, 4-11.

<sup>65</sup> *Non vidī*. The description is taken from Ḍabiḥi 2016 and Monzavi 1971. The order of the poems is not noted, nor with which composition Anvari's *divān* begins. Corresponds to item 21797 in Monzavi 1971, 2242.

<sup>66</sup> *Non vidī*. The description is taken from Ḍabiḥi 2016. The exact date is not given, nor is any information on the order of the poems. The number of columns is also not stated. Monzavi 1971 gives a different reference: *2/496 nasx-e Ḥoseyn farzand-e Moḥammad abu al-Qāsem Madini. 9 j. 1/759. film-e ān dar dānešgāh-aš* [the author means the *Ketābxāne-ye dānešgāh-e Tehrān*] *420 hast. [filmhā: 441]*. Since the scribe and the date are the same, I suppose the number was changed.

<sup>67</sup> *Non vidī*. Description taken from Ḍabiḥi 2016 and Monzavi 1971. No further information is provided.

<sup>68</sup> *Non vidī*. The description is taken by Ḍabiḥi 2016. No further information is given.

its writing is more or less of the eighth century Q./fourteenth century CE" (Anvari 1959-61, 2: 146).<sup>69</sup> Layout of the page: two columns, 15 lines per page. It begins with what in MR's edition is l. 17 of *qaṣide* 16 *z-ānke emruz az ulū l-amr-i*<sup>70</sup> *o yazdān dar nobi // hamčonin gofta-st o haqq in-ast o digar torrahāt* (since today you are among the *ulū al-amr*, thus has God spoken in the Quran, this is the truth, all other things are insignificant).<sup>71</sup>

= 3)

= 2)

Nurāyi, Aḥmadpur 2016

= 5)

= 6)

= 8)

= 19)

= 7)

20. Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye majles-e šurā-ye eslāmi, 86834.<sup>72</sup> It is an anthology containing a selection of poems from 17 different poets, including Anvari. It has no date, it is said to have been written at the end of sixth Q./end thirteenth-beginning fourteenth CE.<sup>73</sup>

= 10)

It is to be noted that although all three papers underline the necessity of a scientific method in compiling a new edition, no such method is described. This can already be seen by the different lists of manuscripts suggested by the authors: a criterion on the basis of which manuscripts should be selected is never stated, nor a philological argument to justify using a witness over another is ever made; witnesses are included or excluded seemingly at random.

---

**69** When it was first described, in the preface to the first volume (Anvari 1959-61, 1: 18), no date was given.

**70** Arabic, quote from Quran IV, 59. The line is connected by *enjambement* to the preceding one.

**71** *Non vidi*. The description is taken from Anvari 1959-61, 2: 146 and Ḍabiḥi 2016. The order of the poems is not noted. It is to note that it must have been acquired by the *Ketābxāne-ye Āstān-e Qods-e Reḡavi* quite recently: MR describes it as part of the private collection of a friend of his, *āqā-ye Šahrām*, and is not mentioned in de Blois 2004 among the manuscripts of Anvari's *divān* present in that library.

**72** This number is the *šomāre-ye tabt*, the *somāre-ye fehrest* is not given.

**73** *Non vidi*. Description taken from Nurāyi, Aḥmadpur 2016. No further information is given.

Furthermore, when discussing the process of selecting between different variant readings, none of those papers try to set any fixed rule. A scholar wanting to follow a 'scientific method' needs to be guided by a series of established (and philologically justified) criteria, the eventual infringement of which must be explicitly justified case by case.<sup>74</sup>

### Appendix 3

Line by line list of the differences between Modarres-e Reḡavi's text of *qaṣīde* 80 and 84 and manuscripts Istanbul, Fāteḥ, 3784 (*siglum* 'lām'), Istanbul, Fāteḥ, 3786 (*siglum* 'eyn'), London, British Library, Or. 3713 (*siglum* 'te') and Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye malek, 5267 (*siglum* 'kāf').

Every variant reading *not recorded* in the *apparatus* is given here. Witnesses are referred to using MR's *sigla*.<sup>75</sup>

Even being aware of the importance of distinguishing between corrections and additions made by the original scribe and the ones made by later readers, and how difficult it can be at times to tell them apart, given the editor's inconsistent approach to *kāf*'s corrections and addend lines, every variant reading regarding those additions and corrections is also recorded here.

#### Qaṣīde 80

l. 1b *be-d-ān*] in *lām* and *te*: *bar ān*.

l. 2a *čenān šab-i*] in 'eyn and *te*: *šab-i čenān; bezāyad*] in *kāf*: *bar ārad*. This variant reading is recorded in the *apparatus*, but it is not mentioned that *bezāyad*, MR's chosen reading, is written above *bar ārad*.

l. 3a *be kerdār*] in *lām*: *bekard az*;<sup>76</sup> *nemudār*] in 'eyn, *kāf* and *te*: *be kerdār*.

l. 4b *do ṣad*] in 'eyn: *hazār*.

---

<sup>74</sup> An excellent methodological example in the field of Iranian studies is Xāleqi Moṭṭāq's edition of Ferdowsi's *Šāhnāme*, his method clearly explained in Ferdowsi 1988: *nuzdah-sioyek*. It is to be noted that, due to the continuous contamination between written and oral tradition in the textual transmission of the *Šāhnāme* and the very large number of surviving manuscripts, Moṭṭāq's work was arguably much harder.

<sup>75</sup> Some of those variant readings and/or omissions are noted in the *apparatus* as present in only some of the witnesses in which they are present. At times MR records a variant reading as attested in a manuscript even when it is not.

<sup>76</sup> The dot above *ze* is clearly visible.

l. 5a *rox-am*] *zax-am* in *te*;<sup>77</sup> *jān*<sup>2</sup>] in *kāf*: *del*. This variant reading is recorded in the *apparatus*, but it is not mentioned that *jān*, MR's chosen reading, is written above *del*.

ll. 6-7 omitted in 'eyn and *kāf*. MR only records the absence of l. 7 from 'eyn. In *kāf* both lines are absent from the main text but they are added outside of it, l. 6 on the left margin and l. 7 on the right one, without any variant reading.

ll. 6-10 The order of these lines is different in *lām* and *te*: 8-6-9-7-10. l. 6b *ze*] in *lām*: *dar*.

l. 8a *faza'*] in *te*: *foru'*; l. 8b *nāle*] in *lām* and *te*: *nowḡe*.

*kāf* has the same reading as MR's text, *nāle*, but *nowḡe* is written above *nāle*. This is not noted in the *apparatus*.

l. 10b *z-āh-e nāle*] in *lām*, 'eyn, *kāf* and *te*: *z-āh o nāle*.

l. 11b *ze*] in *kāf*: *zad* (*dāl* was later elided).

l. 12a The conjunction *o* is added after *derāz* in *lām*, 'eyn and *te*; *do čašm-am*] in *kāf*: *ze čašm-am* (*do*, MR's chosen reading, is written above *ze*); *ze nowk*] in 'eyn and *te*: *be nowk*; *hami*] omitted in *lām*.

MR's *apparatus* records *ze nowk*] in *kāf*: *do nowk*, but it does not show that in this manuscript *be nowk* is written above *do nowk*.

l. 13b *bar*] in *lām* and *te*: *dar*.

MR's *apparatus* shows *aṭar*] in *kāf*: *xabar*. It does not show that *aṭar*, MR's chosen variant reading, is written both above *xabar* and in the left margin.

l. 14a 'ešve] in *lām* and *te*: 'ešq; *be dast-e ešve hame šab gerefte dāman-e del*] in 'eyn: *be dast-e 'ešq gerefte omid dāman-e del* (MR's *apparatus* shows the variant reading *dast-e ešve hame šab gerefte dāman-e del*] in *kāf*: *be dast-e 'ešq gerefte omid dāman-e del*, but not that the editor's chosen text is added above the line).<sup>78</sup>

Referencing this line, in footnote 8 of the *apparatus*, MR writes: "Witness *te* does not have more than the first 14 lines of this *qašide*, which, from here onwards, has fallen from this witness" (Anvari 1959-61, 1: 196). This is not true. In fact, in manuscript *te*, *beyt* 15 follows *beyt* 14 in the very same line of text, with the first *beyt* occupying columns 1-2 and the second columns 3-4. Together they make up the last line of f. 58v, the poem continuing without any interruption on the next page.

l. 16a *xodāy*] in *lām*: *xodā*.

l. 18. The four conjunctions *o* are omitted in *lām*, *kāf* and *te*.

l. 19a *eḡkām*] in *te*: *farmān*; l. 19b *farmān*] in *lām*: *peymān*, in *te*: *ta'id*. Lines 19-20 are omitted in *kāf*, where they are added in the margins; MR's *apparatus* records for l. 19a *eḡkām*] in *kāf*: *farmān*, as well as l. 19b *farmān*] in *kāf*: *ta'id*, but not that these two variant readings are

<sup>77</sup> Conjectural transcription. In Arabic script the dots above *xe* and *ze* are clearly visible, زخم; cannot be read *zaxm* 'wound' because of the metre.

<sup>78</sup> MR's *apparatus* only notes 'ešve] in 'eyn: 'ešq, without reporting the full variant.

only present in the added lines, not in the main text. Also, in those added lines, l. 19a *be nik] bar nik* is not noted in the *apparatus*.<sup>79</sup>

l. 21a *qaḡā*] in 'eyn: *falak*; l. 21b *qadar*] in *kāf*: *qamar*, with *qadar*, MR's chosen variant reading, written over *qamar*.

The *apparatus* notes l. 21a *towfiq*] in *kāf*: *towqi*'. In *kāf* *قبيع* is written above *be towfiq*, showing that, according to whoever made the correction, the correct reading was *be towqi*'. However, this footnote does not show that MR's chosen variant reading is actually part of *kāf*'s main text. Also, the *apparatus* notes *qaḡā*] in *kāf*: *falak*, but not that *qaḡā*, MR's chosen variant reading, is written above *falak*.

l. 22a *qaḡā*] in *kāf*: *qadar*, with *qaḡā*, MR's chosen variant reading, written above *qadar*; l. 22b *qadar*] in 'eyn: *falak* (MR's *apparatus* erroneously records *qadar*] in 'eyn: *qaḡā*).

MR's *apparatus* records *qadar*] in *kāf*: *falak*, but not the full variant reading: *qadar bepičad*] in *kāf*: *falak betābad*, with *qadar bepičad* written above the writing line.

l. 24 *konand*] in *lām*: *كنند*, in both *mešrā*'s;<sup>80</sup> l. 24b *v-az ān*] in *kāf*: *v-az in*, with *v-az-ān*, MR's chosen variant reading, written over *v-az in*.

MR's *apparatus* records l. 24a *k-az-in*] in *kāf*: *az ān*, but not that *k-az-in*, MR's chosen variant reading, is written above *az ān*;

l. 25b *navāl-aš*] in 'eyn and *kāf*: *navāz-aš* (in *kāf* *لش*, *l-aš*, is written over *navāz-aš*, showing that, according to who made the correction, the correct reading was *navāl-aš*).

MR's *apparatus* records l. 25a 'etāb-aš] in *kāf*: *nehib-aš*, but not that 'etāb-aš, MR's chosen text, is written over *nehib-aš*.

l. 26a *ān*] in *lām* and *te: in; in*] in *lām*, 'eyn and *te: ān; baxur-e 'abir*] in *lām*: *baxur o 'abir*; l. 26b *in*] in *lām* and *te: ān; ān*] in 'eyn and *te: in*, omitted in *lām* (where *in* is added in the margin); *boxār-e šarar*] in *lām*, *kāf* and *te: boxār o šarar*.

ll. 27 and 28 omitted in *kāf*, where they are added in the margins. MR's *apparatus* records l. 27b *ke*] in *kāf*: *čo*, without mentioning that this variant reading is only present in the added line, not in the main text. In l. 28a the variant reading *va gar] agar*, present in the added text, is not recorded. In the same added line the variant reading *gah] gar* could also be present.

l. 27a *baḡr-e saxā*] in *te: baḡr o saxā; hami*] omitted in *te*; l. 27b *ke*] in *te: čo*.

l. 29a *ze sim o zar*] in 'eyn: *ze sim-e zar; deram*] in *lām*: *gohar*.

MR's *apparatus* also does not record that in *kāf* *gohar* is written over *deram*. The variant reading *deram*] in *te: gohar* is recorded, which

---

<sup>79</sup> In *kāf* the end of the added l. 20 could have the variant reading *bebaste kamar] na baste magari*, but the text is small and partially erased, making it very difficult to read.

<sup>80</sup> Maybe to be read *gonbad* (dome). The variant reading *konand*, chosen by the editor, gives a much better meaning.

makes the editor's statement in footnote 8 of the preceding page, here quoted in regard to l. 14, even more puzzling.

l. 30b *be raf'at o hemmat*] in *lām* and *te*: *be hemmat o raf'at*.

The variant reading *baxšeš*] in *kāf*: *raf'at* is recorded in the *apparatus*, but it is not shown that *baxšeš*, MR's chosen variant reading, is written over *baxšeš*.

l. 31 omitted in 'eyn and *kāf*; in the latter it is added in the margin.

l. 32 *ma-rā*] in *kāf*: *to-rā*. The situation in *kāf* is peculiar: l. 31 was originally omitted, but afterwards someone tried to integrate l. 31 by writing some words above l. 32, the first *mešrā'* of which has been written between the two columns. In the manuscript the line reads *to-rā saẓad ke bovad gāh-e naẓm-e medḡat-e to // bayāḡ ruz o siyāhi šab o qalam meḡvar* with *tā'at o farmān* written above the first *mešrā'*, *marā saẓad ke bovad gāh-e naẓm-e medḡat-e to* written vertically between the two writing columns and *falak ḡolām qaḡā bande qadar čākar* written above the second *mešrā'*.

l. 33a *meh az jahān aḡar andar jahān*] in *te*: *hazār jān be jahān dar aḡar*;<sup>81</sup> *aḡar andar jahān*] in *lām*: *be jahān dar aḡar*; *andar jahān*] in *kāf*: *andar u* (*be jahān dar aḡar* is written above the line);<sup>82</sup> l. 33b *be-d-u andar*] in *te*: *be-d-u-yi dar*

MR's *apparatus* records l. 33b *be-d-u andar*] in *lām*: *be-d-u dar*. This is incorrect. This manuscript, like *te*, has the variant reading *be-d-u-yi dar*, which, in opposition to the recorded *be-d-u dar*, fits the metre. MR records the variant reading *be-d-u dar* also for witness *kāf*. This is also incorrect: *kāf*'s main text reads *be-d-u andar*, the variant reading chosen by MR, with *be-d-u-yi dar* written over it.

ll. 34-7. MR records the omission of these lines in *kāf*, but not that they are all added in the margins.<sup>83</sup>

ll. 35-9. Line 38 directly follows l. 35 in *lām*, where the order is: 35>38>36>37>39.

l. 35b *diyār*] in *lām*: *zamāne*. This variant reading could also be present in *kāf*'s added lines.

ll. 36-7 omitted in *te*.

---

<sup>81</sup> *hazār* not dotted, هزار جان.

<sup>82</sup> MR's footnote 14 at page 197, recording *aḡar andar jahān kasi*] in *kāf*: *be jahān dar aḡar kasi*, is wrong.

<sup>83</sup> The text is small and hard to read, the conjunction *o* seems to have been omitted both after *ḡekmat* and *hešmat*, in the first and second *mešrā'* of l. 34 respectively, as does the *o* after *hešmat* in l. 35b. *to* in l. 37a seems also to be omitted.

l. 38a *saxā bi*] in *te*: *saxā-ye*.<sup>84</sup> Footnote 21 at page 197 of MR's edition, likely<sup>85</sup> recording l. 38b *dar vojūd bi*] in *kāf*: *bi vojūd dar*, is wrong, in *kāf* the text is the same as MR's edition.

l. 39a *xašm*] in *kāf*: *xašm*.

l. 40a *xašm*] in *lām* and *kāf*: *qahr*.

The variant reading in l. 40b *nasreyn-aš*] in *kāf*: *nasreyn* is recorded, but it is not shown that it seems to have been corrected by the presence of *بینش*, *eyn-aš*, above *nasreyn*.

l. 41a *x<sup>w</sup>ori*] in *'eyn*: *x<sup>w</sup>oram*.

l. 42a *tiḡ-e to*] in *lām* and *te*: *xašm-e to*.

MR's *apparatus* also does not record that in *kāf* the variant reading *xašm* is written above *tiḡ*.

l. 44a *xāk o čō bād*] in *lām* and *te*: *bād o čō xāk*; l. 44b *dāvar*] in *kāf*: *yāvar*.

l. 45 omitted in *'eyn*.

#### Qašide 84

MR does not mention at all that this poem is also present in manuscript *te*. All the variant readings from this manuscript are recorded here.

l. 1a *čo*] in *kāf*: *ke*, with *čo*, MR's chosen variant reading, written above *ke*.

l. 4a *čo andar ātaš 'ud*] in *'eyn* and *te*: *čo ātaš andar 'ud*.

l. 5b. The variant reading *nadāram*] in *kāf*: *natābam* is recorded in the *apparatus*, but that *nadāram*, MR's chosen variant reading, is written above *natābam*, is not.

l. 6b *nāraside*] in *te*: *nāgoḡašte*.

l. 7a *'azm*] in *'eyn*, *lām* and *te*: *'oḡr*.

In *kāf* *'oḡr* is written over *'azm*, MR's chosen variant reading. This seems to be one of the few instances in which the editor explicitly acknowledges the existence of *kāf*'s additions in the *apparatus*, recording: *'azm*] in *kāf*'s *additions* (*ḡāšīye*): *'oḡr*.

l. 8a *raftan*] in *kāf*: *ḡeybat* (*raftan*, MR's chosen variant reading, is written above *ḡeybat*); *kardan*] in *kāf*: *raftan* (*kardan*, MR's chosen variant reading, is written above *raftan*). MR's footnote 4 (Anvari 1959-61, 1: 209), recording the variant reading *vaqt-e raftan o*

<sup>84</sup> This variant reading could be also present in *'eyn*, but it is not easy to see if the copyist actually wrote the *be*'s body (*سَخَا* vs. *سَخَاي*).

<sup>85</sup> Line 38 has two '20's written above it, referencing footnotes. The second, after *bi* in the second *mešrā'*, is probably a misprint for '21', since footnote 20 records the variant reading *jud o saxā-ye kaf*, corresponding to the first 20 of l. 38, written after *kaf*, and no '21' is present above any of page 197 lines despite the presence of a footnote with this number.

*hengām-e safar*] in 'eyn: *ferqat o hengām-e raftan* is wrong, 'eyn's text is the same as the printed edition.

l. 9b. The variant reading *x<sup>w</sup>ištan* in *kāf*: *dustān* is recorded in the *apparatus*, but it is not shown that *x<sup>w</sup>ištan*, MR's chosen variant reading, is written above *dustān*.

l. 11a *x<sup>w</sup>āhi ānjā mānd*] in *te*: *ānjā x<sup>w</sup>āhi mānd*; l. 11b *be yekdigar*] in *te*: *be hamdigar*.<sup>86</sup>

l. 12a *begoft bebar dar gereftam-aš*] in 'eyn: *begoftam dar bar gereftam-aš*.

l. 13a *āstān-e jāh*] in 'eyn, *kāf* and *te*: *āstān-e xaṭar*; l. 13b *māl*] in 'eyn: *molk*; *ustād*] in 'eyn: *ostād*.

l. 14a. In *kāf* the variant reading *xabar* is written above *xaṭar*, MR's chosen variant reading.

l. 15 omitted in *kāf* and *te*, in *kāf* it is added in the margin without any variant reading.

l. 16a *xāk*] in 'eyn: *māh*.

l. 19a *xodāy*] in *kāf*: *xodā*.

l. 20a. MR's *apparatus* records *mellat o molk*] in *kāf*: *mamlakat o din*. This is wrong. The variant reading present in witness *kāf* is *molk-at o din* that, contrary to *mamlakat o din*, fits the metre (also, *mellat o molk*, MR's chosen variant reading, is written above *molkat o din*); l. 20b *ebtedā be 'adl*] in *kāf*: *ebtedā-ye 'adl*, with *be 'adl* written above it, indicating that, according to the person who made the correction, the section was to be read *ebtedā be 'adl*. MR's *apparatus* notes *ebtedā be 'adl*] in 'eyn: *ebtedā-ye 'adl*; this is also wrong, witness 'eyn has *ebtedā be 'adl*.

l. 22 omitted in 'eyn and *kāf*; l. 22b *basāyat*] in *lām* and *te*: *basāṭat*. In *kāf* this line is added in the margin, with the variant reading *basāyat*] *basāṭat*.

l. 23a *dar neysān*] in *lām* and *te*: *bi-noqšān*; l. 23b *baḥr*] in *te*: *rud*.

l. 24b *be taqviyat*] in 'eyn: *ze taqviyat*, in *kāf*: *ze tarbiyat*.

l. 25b *šur o fetne*] in *lām*, 'eyn, *kāf* and *te*: *šur-e fetne*.

MR's *apparatus* records *šur o fetne*] in 'eyn: *suz-e fetne*. This is probably wrong, as the dot of the supposed *ze* most likely refers to *jāh*'s *jim* in the line above, and the relevant word is to be read *šur*, albeit with no dots over *šin*.

MR's *apparatus* also records l. 25a *vasan*] in *lām*: *rasan*. Due to the way the scribe writes *res* and *vāvs*, it is possible that this variant reading does not exist.

ll. 26-7. The order of these two lines is reversed in *lām* and *te*.

l. 26a *če šir o če gorg*] in *lām* and *te*: *če kabk o če كرك*.<sup>87</sup>

<sup>86</sup> In *lām* there seems to be a dot above *mānd mim*, but *nānd* does not exist.

<sup>87</sup> I am not sure كرك is to be read *gorg* 'wolf', as in MR's edition. Even if it is not an animal frequently mentioned by Persian poets (although it appears in Ferdowsi's *Šāhnāme*,

- ll. 27-31 MR's *apparatus* records that these lines are omitted in *kāf*, but it does not show that they are added in the margins, except l. 31.
- l. 28b *xāre]* in *kāf*'s added lines: *xarāre*.<sup>88</sup>
- l. 29a *mehrgiyā]* in *kāf*'s added lines: *mehrgiyāh*.
- l. 30 *qadr]* in 'eyn omitted. MR records the addition of *čarx* in the same *mešrā'* but not this omission, which makes the line fit the metre.
- l. 32a *bā setāre sude]* in *lām* and *te*: *sude bā setāre*; l. 32b *gašte]* in *lām* and *te*: *bude*.
- l. 33a *farzānegān]* in 'eyn: *x<sup>w</sup>oršid o mah*.
- l. 34b *jašn]* in *lām* and *te*: *bazm*.
- ll. 35-6. The order of these two lines is reversed in *lām* and *te*.<sup>89</sup>
- ll. 38-42. MR's *apparatus* records in different footnotes that ll. 38, 40, 41 and 42 are omitted in *kāf*. All lines from 38 to 42 are not present in *kāf*, including l. 39.
- ll. 39-41 Omitted in 'eyn.
- l. 39b 'elm] in *lām*: *ǧalm*.<sup>90</sup>
- l. 42a *ḥesām-e qahr-e to šaxš-e ajal zanad be do nim]* in 'eyn: *ḥisām-e qahr-e to a'dā-t-rā zanad be do nim*.<sup>91</sup>
- l. 43a *qahr-at]* in 'eyn and *kāf*: محنت; in manuscript *kāf qahr-at*, MR's chosen variant reading, is written above محنت.<sup>92</sup>
- l. 44a *dāruy o taryāk]* in *lām*, 'eyn and *te*: *dāruy-e taryāk*, in *kāf*: *dāru va taryāk*;

---

in Farroxi's poetry and in other lines of Anvari's *divān*), reading *karg* 'rhinoceros' might be correct: "When his [the patron's] falcon is hunting, what's a partridge and what's a rhinoceros? (He catches both preys, even if one is easy and the other should be impossible.) When his horse is advancing on his path, what is a sea and what is a plain? (He traverses both, even if one is easy and the other should be impossible)". Furthermore, the rhinoceros is mentioned as the *mamduḥ*'s prey, being very difficult to capture, in Farroxi's poetry; see de Fouchécour 1969, 152. The line has a comprehensible meaning also by reading *gorg*, but the hyperbole and the symmetry between *mešrā*'s do not work as well (and, to the extent of my knowledge, the very commonly mentioned wolf is never a prey of the *mamduḥ*'s hawk, see de Fouchécour 1969, 156).

The unusual mention of a small prey, the partridge, alongside a very big one, the rhinoceros or the wolf, could explain why *kābk* 'partridge' present in many old manuscripts (*lām*, *te*, Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye dānešgāh-e Tehrān, microfilm 2615 and Tehran, Ketābxāne-ye dānešgāh-e Tehrān, microfilm 4113), was changed to *šir* 'lion' by copyists who did not understand the line and mechanically replicated the hendiadys *šir o gorg* 'lion and wolf'. It is likely that the reading *šir*, chosen by MR, is not the correct one.

**88** Small and difficult to read, the extra letter, that makes the line not fit the metre, is surely a mistake.

**89** In l. 37, in MS *lām* there seems to be a meaningless dot below کرد.

**90** *ǧalm* is an Arabic *mašdar* meaning 'being lustful', nearly never used in Persian. This dot is very likely a mistake.

**91** *ḥisām* does not exist and it is not metrically possible, but the *yā*'s two dots are clearly written.

**92** Both *mehnat* 'toil' and *maḥn-at* 'your striking/your strike', are in theory possible readings. (With that scorpion's stinger of toil/that is toil, or with that scorpion's stinger that's your striking/strike.)

Also, in *kāf* the variant reading *nax<sup>w</sup>āhad* is written as a correction above *nayārad*.

l. 45 omitted in 'eyn and *kāf*; l. 45b *ze dast*] in *lām* and *te*: *be dast*.

l. 46a *bāre-i-st*] in *kāf*: *bāre-ast*; l. 46b *manzel-i-š bud*] in *lām* and *te*: *manzel-i bud-aš*.

l. 48a *čarx*] in *te*: *bād*; *b-āvāz-e ra'd*] in *kāf* and *te*: *b-ārām-e xāk*, with *b-āvāz-e ra'd*, MR's chosen variant reading, written above *b-ārām-e xāk* in manuscript *kāf*; *jastan*] in 'eyn and *te*: *jonbeš*; l. 48b *be qadd-e kuh o tan-e pil*] in 'eyn: *be qadd-e pil o tan-e kuh*.

MR's *apparatus* records *jastan*] in *kāf*: *jonbeš*, but it does not show that *jastan*, the editor's chosen variant reading, is written above *jonbeš*.

l. 50a *gah*] in 'eyn, *lām* and *te*: *bar*.

l. 51a *sang*] in 'eyn: *la'l*; l.51b *axtar o axgar*] in *kāf*: *axgar o axtar*.

l. 53b *bar*] in 'eyn: *dar*.

l. 54a *be-d-ān*] in *lām*, 'eyn, *kāf* and *te*: *bar ān*; <sup>93</sup> *nanehad*] in *kāf*: بنهند, with the variant reading *benehad* written above the writing line; <sup>94</sup> l.

54b *be ḡanjaram*] in 'eyn and *kāf*: محنجرم, in *te*: محجرم. <sup>95</sup>

l. 56a *madiḡ*] in *lām*, 'eyn and *te*: *be madḡ*. In *kāf* the variant reading *be madḡ* is written above *madiḡ*, MR's chosen variant reading.

l. 58a *ze xākhā*] in *kāf*: *ze xārḡā*, with *ze xākhā*, MR's chosen variant reading, written above *xārḡā*. MR's *apparatus* records *ze xākhā*] in 'eyn: *ze xārḡā*. This is wrong, 'eyn has *ze xākhā*, just like the printed edition.

l. 59a 'olovv o raf'at] in *kāf* and *te*: 'olovv-e raf'at; l. 59b *šerešk o čehre*] in *kāf*: *serešk-e dide*, with *o čehre*, MR's chosen variant reading, written above *dide*.

l. 60b *kamar*] in *te*: *magar*/حكر. <sup>96</sup>

l. 62a *na bix o na šāx*] in 'eyn and *kāf*: *na šāx o na bix*; l. 62b *bār*] in *lām* and *te*: *barg*.

---

<sup>93</sup> In *te* both *be-d-ān* and *bar ān* could be read.

<sup>94</sup> No diacritical dot is present on the first letter, so both *nanehand* and *benehand* are possible readings. In the correction written above the writing line a dot is placed under the first letter, pointing to the reading *benehad*.

<sup>95</sup> Could be read *moḡanjær*, a rare Arabic word for 'throat', mentioned for example in the *Majma' fī biḡār al-anwār*, a sixteenth-century dictionary by Muḡammad al-Fattinī (s.v. *ḡanjær*, consulted online through the website [arabiclexicon.hawramani.com](http://arabiclexicon.hawramani.com), available at <http://arabiclexicon.hawramani.com/>).

<sup>96</sup> The first letter could be a *mim* with a large head as well as a *ḡe* (e.g. *jegar*). In any case the correct reading is *kamar*, the one chosen by MR.

## Bibliography

- Anvari, Owḡad al-din (1337-40 Š./1959-61 CE). *Divān-e Anvari*. 2 vols. Edited by M.T. Modarres-e Reḡavi. Tehran: Bongāh-e tarjome va našr-e ketāb.
- Afšār, I. et al. (1354 Š./1975-76 CE). *Fehrest-e ketābhā-ye xaṭṭi-ye Ketābxāne-ye Malek-e vābaste be Āstān-e qods-e reḡavi. Jeld-e dovvom* (Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in the Ketābxāne-ye Malek, Connected to [the Foundation] Āstān-e Qods-e Reḡavi). Tehran: Čāpxāne-ye dānešgāh-e Tehrān.
- Arberry, A.J.; Minovi, M.; Blochet, E. (1959). *The Chester Beatty Library. A Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts and Miniatures*. Vol. 1, MSS 101-150. Dublin: Hodges Figgis & co.
- Beelaert, A.L. (2017). s.v. "Anwarī. Auḡad al-dīn". *Encyclopaedia of Islam THREE*. [https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopaedia-of-islam-3/anvari-awhad-al-din-COM\\_24932?s.num=7&s.f.s2\\_parent=s.f.book.encyclopaedia-of-islam-3&s.q=Anwarī](https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopaedia-of-islam-3/anvari-awhad-al-din-COM_24932?s.num=7&s.f.s2_parent=s.f.book.encyclopaedia-of-islam-3&s.q=Anwarī).
- de Bruijn, J.T.P. (1983). *Of Piety and Poetry*. Leiden: de Goeje Fund.
- de Bruijn, J.T.P. (1986). s.v. "Anwarī". *Encyclopædia Iranica*. <https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/anvari>.
- de Blois, F. (1995). "Divān, III. Collected Works of a Poet". *Encyclopædia Iranica*. <https://iranicaonline.org/articles/divan>.
- de Blois, F. (2004). *Persian Literature A Bio-Bibliographical Survey*. Vol. 5, *Poetry of the Pre-Mongol Period*. 2nd Revisited Edition. London: Routledge.
- de Bruijn, J.T.P. (2019). "The Qaside After the Fall of the Ghaznavides 1100-1500 CE". Yarshater, E. (ed.), *Persian Lyrical Poetry in the Classical Era*. London: Tauris, 102-61.
- Čangiz Gōlām-'Alī Bāy Burdi (1370 Š./1991 CE). *Zendegi wa āṭar-e Nezār* (Life and Works of Nezārī). Tehran: Entešārāt-e 'elmi. [Persian translation by Mahnāz Šadri, the original was published in Russian].
- Dabiḡi, R. (1395 Š./2016 CE). "Tašḡih-e enteḡādi-ye abyāt-i az divān-e Anvari" (Critical Edition of Some Lines of Anvari's Collection of Lyrical Poems). *Dāneškade-ye adabiyāt o 'olum-e ensāni - dānešgāh-e Ešfahān*, 52(3), 67-80.
- Derāyati, M. (1389 Š./2010 CE). *Fehrestvāre-ye dastnevishā-ye Irān* (The Abridged Catalogue of Iran Manuscripts). Mašhad: Mo'assese-ye farhangī-ye pažuheši al-Javād.
- Déroche, F.; Sagaria Rossi, V. (2012). *I manoscritti in caratteri arabi*. Roma: Viella.
- Ferdowsi, abu al-Qāsem (1366 Š./1988 CE). *Šāhnāme*, vol. 1. Edited by J.X. Motlaq. New York: Bibliotheca Persica.
- de Fouchécour, C.H. (1969). *La description de la nature dans la poésie lyrique persane du XI<sup>e</sup> siècle. Inventaire et analyse des thèmes*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Karami, M.H.; Amini, M.R.; Kowṭari, H.R. (1392 Š./2014 CE). "Qašāyed-e Anvari va lozum-e tašḡih-e tāze az ānhā" (Anvari's Panegyrics and the Necessity of a New Edition of Them). *Majalle-ye šerpažuhi (bustān-e adab) - Dānešgāh-e Širāz*, 5(4), 136-50.
- Monzavi, A. (1350 Š./1971 CE). *Fehrest-e nosxehā-ye xaṭṭi-ye fārsi* (Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts). Tehran: Markaz-e Dāyerat al-mā'āref-e bozorg-e eslāmi.
- Nurāyi, E.; Aḡmadpur, M.A. (1395 Š./2016 CE). "Naqd o barrasi-ye tašḡihāt-e pišin-e divān-e Anvari" (Critique and Study of Anvari's Songbook Previous Editions). *Āyine-ye Mirāt*, 14(1), 355-72.

- Rieu, C. (1895). *Supplement to the Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the British Library*. London: Order of the Trustees.
- Ritter, H. (1952). "Review of 'Kitāb-i Ḥadīqat al-ḥaqīqa wa-šarī'at at-ṭarīqa' by Macdūd B. Ādam as-Sanā'ī edited by Mudarris Riżavī". *Oriens*, 5(1), 190-2.
- Ritter, H.; Reinert, B. (1986). "Die persischen Dichterhandschriften der Fatih-Bibliothek in Istanbul". *Oriens*, 29-30, 110-258.
- Šafi'i Kadkani, M.R. (1372 Š./1993 CE). *Mofles-e kimiyyāforuš. Naqd o taḥlil-e še'r-e Anvari* (Poems by Anvarī). Tehran: Soxan [The 'translation' is the title as given on the English frontispiece, at the back of the book; literally "A poor alchemy seller. Critique and analysis of Anvarī's poetry".]
- Šahidi, S.J. (1357 Š./1978 CE). *Šarḥ-e loġāt o moškelāt-e divān-e Anvari* (Commentary to Anvarī's Collection of Lyrical Poems, Lexicon and Difficult Parts). Tehran: Šerkat-e entešārāt-e 'elmi va farhangi. [The third edition was consulted, dated 1382 Š./2003 CE.]
- Simpson, M.S. (2015). s.v. "Album". *Encyclopaedia of Islam THREE*. <https://referenceworks.brill.com/display/entries/EI30/COM-24201.xml?rskey=fBYrwn&result=1>.
- Zipoli, R. (2016). *Tesori e serpenti. Poesia persiana oscena dal X al XX secolo*. Venezia: Cafoscarina.