TO THE HISTORY OF ORIENTAL TEXTOLOGY

O. F. Akimushkin

TEXTOLOGICAL STUDIES AND THE "CRITICAL TEXT" PROBLEM

Modern textology is based upon the historical method. It means that we must take into account, that any document appearing in certain social and historical environment, comes to us changed by different corrections, alterations or comments made by book-owners, copyists and editors (who, sometimes unconsciously but in some cases deliberately, changed the text, answering the social demands of their time). The whole life of a document till the appearance of its last variant, as we get it, should be considered in the aspect of its historical environment, its social, political and ideological atmosphere, the circumstances of its author's life, as well as the lives of its later modificators and 'co-authors'. True is the statement made by D. S. Likhachev, that "the history of any text is, to some extent, the history of its creators " [1].

For this reason the publication of documents, making them comprehensible to a modern reader, should be just one of the tasks of a textologist. His work includes many other aspects, which make it even more difficult. First, the history and the life of the text in question should be reconstructed, then follows the reconstruction of the text itself — as closely as possible to the original or to the version supported by its most reliable and authentic copies. This method does not exclude the formal classification of its variants, comparison of similarities and differences, establishing common protographs and drawing of genealogical schemes. But this kind of classification no longer presents the main task of modern textology. The subsequent work of scholars on literary sources or historical studies would have been impossible without the results and conclusions of textological research. To sum up, the work of a textologist forms a basis for all further studies.

The new aims of textology, not limited just to the publication of a verified text, make new demands of the investigator's scholarly "equipment". "A good textologist must have a wide attitude to the object of his research. The more he is employing paleography, archaeography, history, literary and artistic studies, the more convincing and irrefutable become his arguments " [2]. And even more: "A textologist should become a historian of literature, social sciences and of everyday life; he must know the history of the church, paleography, archaeography and philology. This is the minimum" [3].

These words of D. S. Likhachev coincide with the statements of E. E. Berthels: "Publication of a document is neither mechanical nor technical work. This is a special type of a complicated research work. Before starting it, one should learn about its author, his place in the history of literature and the place of the document among the author's works, as well as his vocabulary and style... A philologist must be at the same time a historian, a linguist and a specialist in literature. Without this knowledge all his work will be in vain" [4]. These words are absolutely true. The whole experience of those orientalists who work with manuscripts proves it. It is true that not every philologist can be a textologist, *i. e.* a specialist who has mastered the whole range of methods for the study of a text, of its history and of all alterations made during its existence. There are many examples when this truism was ignored or neglected. It was considered not so long ago that the publication of a document was an easy task confined to mechanical registration of differences between two or more copies. An extremely complicated and wearisome textological task was given to young specialists, yesterday students, who were not ready for this kind of work. It was thought that the peculiarities and secrets of this science could be discovered in the process. As a result, such work was condemned to failure from the very beginning.

Let us turn to the primary abilities required of a textologist. One should:

1. have a good knowledge of the language, especially of the time when the document he is studying originated: he must know the peculiarities (sometimes dialectological) of the language of the region where the document was written;

2. be able to read texts in different scripts used at different periods and for different purposes, *i. e.* to know paleography, as well as the orthographic system of these scripts. For iranologists these are, first of all, the classical Arabic "six scripts" (*muhaqqaq, rayhān, riqā', tawqī', naskh*), *ta'līq and nasta'līq* with their cursive modifications like *shekesteh-i ta'līq and shekesteh-i nasta'līq*;

3. be aware of historical lexicology and dialectology (especially the vocabulary of the region and of the time when the document was written). A textologist must know

the language of the documents of that period, that is to be well-read, and to know the peculiarities of the genre and of the literary etiquette of the time;

4. know the style and phraseology of the author in question, as well as the whole range of his works;

5. form a clear idea of the history of the text, recognize the author's additions and those made by others, distinguish variants, versions and wordings in order to choose the best copies for a critical publication;

6. know the historical background that led to the origin of a new author's (or non-author's) version or variant (expanded or abridged), etc.;

7. know the historical toponymics, everyday realities, special (for example, poetic), social, economical, theological and religious terminology.

Along with all this, a textologist should keep in mind:

a) the author's ethics and moral principles, his attitudes and behavior . This refers to the study of variants which appeared at a later date;

b) the sources used by the author, their origin and environment;

c) other sources where the text in question is cited; contemporary works (especially their early copies) often help to reconstruct the original text [5].

This is how I see the methodological apparatus of a textologist — the investigator of manuscripts.

Approaching a document a textologist must clearly see the aims and problems of his research, as well as the audience to which his publication is addressed. It is obvious, that different scholars prefer to solve different problems. A linguist, for whom the oldest copy reflects the earliest language forms, is interested in the publication of all existing variants of the text — that is to be able to follow the history of the language and the evolution of graphics and orthography. Students in literature and history are much more interested in the history of the text: the earliest copy alone will not solve their problems. For them the publication of the earliest copy is not a solution, since it does not necessarily preserve the oldest text of the document (the same concerns textological variants). If for a linguist it is preferable to have an exact publication of the text, that is a facsimile publication retaining all the peculiarities of its script and language, other scholars need a corpus of reviews with all stylistic, lexical, phraseological, etc., peculiarities referring to all available copies of the text. The earliest version of the text alone will hardly satisfy them, because they have different tasks.

To sum up, scientific publications even of one and the same document can be addressed to different readers, and those who prepare them should not mix together all possible methods in one publication. Thus one should not include orthographic differences present in different copies into a text under preparation or into a reference corpus, since this makes the future work with the text much more complicated [6]. As it is proved by the works of Prof. Dj. Matini (Iran) on the Persian historical orthography, most of the known old manuscripts (of the 11th—14th centuries) never followed any stable and fixed orthographic system [7].

It should be noted, that any work preceding the publication of a literary monument is quite different from a

work on a historical narrative, as well as that one on a vast epic or poetic composition (*mathnawī*) is different from a publication of small poetic forms (*dīwān*). The last case becomes rather complicated if we do not have the author's own *dīwān*, but the one composed posthumously by his friends, colleagues or admirers of his talent. If the author's collection (like *safīneh, djung, bayāz*) had not been available to them, we can not be sure that all they have collected really belongs to the same author. The poet wrote his verse, they were distributed and collected by his admirers, colleagues, etc. Some of them included into their albums all his poems, others — only what they liked. There were collectors of poems written in certain genre or form, or on certain subjects only. These albums were copied and distributed all over the country. To make the story short, it was a usual process, a cultural "chain reaction".

To illustrate our statement, let us take the *dīwān* of Shams al-Dīn Muhammad Hāfiz (d. 1389). It is known that the poet has not composed his complete *dīwān*. It was collected by one Muhammad Gulandām from Shiraz (probably a legendary figure). In his preface he complains that Hāfiz had paid little attention to his poetic heritage, so later it was necessary to look for his verse everywhere with the help of the poet's friends and admirers. On the other hand, in seven of his *ghazals* the poet himself refers to a collection of his poems (*safīneh*). It is probable, that this collection was actually used as a foundation for his posthumous *dīwān*. At present we know 14 dated copies of this *dīwān* and of collections of poems by Hāfiz that differ in size and number between 43 *ghazals* (manuscript no. 555 of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Tadjik Academy of Sciences) to 496 *ghazals* (manuscript no. 3822 of the Nuri Othmaniyya Library). These were copied between *shawwāl* 805 / April 1403 (Tadjik copy) and 825 / 1421—1422 (Nuri Othmaniyya copy). The difference in the number of *ghazals* is great. For example, the *dīwān* of *radjab* 813 / November 1410 (Aya Sofia no. 9945) contains 455 *ghazals*, the *dīwān* of 822 / 1419 (Rewan Koshku, no. 948) has 442 *ghazals*, the above mentioned *dīwān* of 825 / 1421—1422 — 496 *ghazals* [8]. At the same time there is still something to be added from the remaining 11 copies [9]. This proves, that the nucleus of the "Dīwān-i Hāfiz" was rather stable; on the other hand, it continued to expand during the first 30 years of the 15th century. Depending on the place from where the manuscripts of the "Diwān" originated, this process was going on with different speed. This fact is proved by the most competent scientific publications of "Dīwān-i Hāfiz" made in Iran in 1941 by A. Ghani and M. Qazwini (495 *ghazals*), in 1977 by R. 'Uyuzi and A. Behruz (507 *ghazals*) and in 1980 by P. Natelkhanlari (486 *ghazals*).

Here lies the most difficult work for a textologist who can not neglect any *ghazal* that bears the *takhallus* of Hāfiz. Speaking in modern terms, the poet did not sign his *dīwān* for "publication". It means, that to answer the question of the authenticity of Hāfiz's poems, the whole complex of literary (including phraseological, lexical and stylistic), textological, historical and philological analysis must be applied. How many agonizing doubts, rejected hypothesis, long-lasting and thorough search are behind this! Fortunately, many representatives of the Persian classical literature collected their poems with a view of making their own *dīwāns*, thus leaving a proof collection for publication. While a poet is still writing his verse, he reviews his old

collection, thus creating a new version (or variant) of his *dīwān*. It contains all his poems written before a certain period of time. The difficulties presented by such collections become evident, when it turns up, that the author, for some personal reasons, omitted in his new version certain poems present in the earlier one. It could be done for many reasons: time-serving, political situation, ideology, even self-criticism. The poet could include also revised versions of his old poems. We can not be sure that the order of poems, as they are arranged in a *dīwān*, really coincide with their real chronological order. In any case, a thorough research of the poetic heritage of 'Alīsher Nawā'i (1441— 1501) by late Prof. H. Suleyman has shown that the "age" definitions of his Turkish poems are rather conventional; Nawā'i's four *dīwāns* contain poems written at different periods of the poet's life [10].

The same apparently happened to all *dīwāns* compiled and divided into separate books by their authors when they were already past their prime, like the *dīwāns* by Amīr Khusraw Dihlawī (1253—1325) and 'Abd al-Rahman Djāmī (1414—1492).

We think, that the most reasonable solution of this problem is, first of all, the study and publication of the earliest versions of *dīwāns*. Only after a thorough research and comparison of the available copies (or even better — of all copies), of their relation and ties, of the history of the text and its versions, etc., a textologist may define the character of the text to be published. In this case, the aim of this publication could be:

1. a text which is as close as possible to the author's original version (an autograph, copies compared with the autograph, or copies that can be traced back to the autograph present special cases [11]);
2. the text of a reliable authorized version or variant. If it can not be surely distinguished, then one of the versions belonging to the same period;
3. a text which is close to the copies made within some definite period, let us say in the 13th century (like "Shāh-nāmeh" by Firdowsī. Vol. 1—9. Moscow, 1960—1971). In this case of great importance are copies (or a list of copies) that survived from that period, which could serve as a good basis for the future research work;
4. as the first stage, the revelation of the latest version among a series of edited and abridged variants of the basic texts, *i. e.* of the initial text, when the authorized text itself, as well as any of its intermediate variants, are not available. This is the most complicated case: the task here is not to get the author's text immediately, but to go through several stages: first the latest version or variant is established; basing upon it the previous one can be found, etc. The most evident example is the multi-layer Persian translation of the Arabic text of "Tarīkh-i Bukhārā" by Narshakhī, which was subject to several (not less than four) changes, reductions, wordings, additions and revisions [12].

Special attention should be paid to the term "text version". In my opinion, academician D. S. Likhachev gives a clear and, at present, apparently the only correct definition of this term: "... versions are united not through similar mechanical mistakes and common passages, but by certain ideas, stylistic principles, etc. Every version of a literary monument is not a mechanical stage of its life, not the re-

sult of common mistakes transferred from the arch-type into its copies (as considered by those textologists who follow mechanical principles in their analysis) but the result of conscious and deliberate activities of one of the scribes" [13].

Consequently, a version is a definite and stable period in the development of any text. For this reason one should not put together different versions of one text. It is not acceptable, since every version is worth to be studied and then published. Unfortunately, all the large-scale publication projects of our Institute which I know, like "Djāmi' al-tawārīkh" by Rashīd al-Dīn, "Khamseh" by Nizāmī Gandjawī, "Shāh-nāmeh" by Firdowsī, and smaller publications, like "Gulistān" and "Būstān" by Sa'dī done by R. M. Aliev (not speaking about other publications made in our country), go against the rules of textual criticism and of textology itself. No matter how thoroughly they are done, how thoughtful and convenient are the reference footnotes, how many correct readings were discovered, and how many text riddles solved, they do not withstand criticism from this point of view [14].

I am not going to discuss the method of choosing copies for future study, it is enough to say that in this field Russian orientalists-textologists have created a reliable and strict system (I mean E. E. Berthels, A. N. Boldyrev and their disciples, most of them iranologists and turcologists).

It is well known, that the most popular and widely read monuments of the classical Persian literature have reached us in hundreds of copies. Usually these contain corrupted texts, which sometimes wander very far from the authorized versions. These texts have failed to withstand the burden of time and popularity. And what should be done by a textologist whose main rule is an obligatory study of all available copies for choosing the best text? For instance, how to approach "Shāh-nāmeh" when there are nearly 600 copies from different periods? Or "Dīwān-i Hāfiz" represented by nearly 450 copies? Or "Khamseh" by Nizāmī, of which there are nearly 220—230 copies (or nearly 600, if to count copies of separate poems)? Or "Būstān" and "Gulistān" by Sa'dī — nearly 150 and 330 copies correspondingly? An innovation method has been found by A. A. Romaskevich (see endnote 14) and then developed by E. E. Berthels while working on the texts of "Khamseh" and "Shāh-nāmeh" [15]. Its main idea was to analyze, besides the available early copies, also the best copies of those made later, say in the 15th and 16th centuries. Naturally, this method does not give a hundred percent guarantee that nothing is omitted. (For example, the Florentine manuscript of "Shāh-nāmeh" of 1217 is very similar to that of 894 /1489, of the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek in Berlin). Nevertheless, this principle (which I can define as "the principle of correction") forms a solid methodological basis for the science of textology: first any text is studied from its earliest copies, and its history is unveiled (its versions belonging to different stages, gradual changes, restorations, etc.), then the best copies are selected, and after that it is possible to choose the type of publication. This method, unfortunately, has been only proclaimed but not actually introduced into practice (as we have mentioned, the publications listed above had joined the available versions in a surprising manner. The text of "Djāmi' al-tawārīkh" by Rashīd al-Dīn suffered less than the others — see note 14).

To sum up, the principal mistakes were:

1. at the first stage not enough attention was given to the text of the copies that had been chosen a priori. Investigation into the history of the text was started only after the text had been compiled. Before compiling the text the editor should have already known what versions or variants, and referring to what copies, he would take;

2. the spell of the earliest texts, a desire to collect as much as possible of them almost forgetting about the history of the text. Though the oldest copies often give different versions (especially multi-layer documents), all found were brought together;

3. the text of documents was not studied in a complex. In this matter not the facts themselves are important, but their place in a system, their correlation and connections between them. The latter may help to find relations between different readings of separate versions;

4. "objective-passive and subjective-active approach to the text" has been proclaimed [16]. This emphasized subjectivism in choosing "correct" readings not supported by philological research.

All this could have been avoided if not for "a brake through the open door" of textological problems. Many of these have been long time ago solved by textologists working in the field of Russian and Classical studies. One should only refer to their experience, summarized by D. S. Likhachev in his "Textology", which could be equally applied to Oriental documents — if to keep in mind their specific features and peculiarities.

After the necessary analytical and research work a textologist (a linguist, or a specialist in literature or history) should choose the kind and type of the future publication. This he must follow without any deviation. The classification of these types may look in the following way:

1. the choice of the best only copy. The text may bear only corrections of obvious mistakes done by the scribe. It means, that the conception of "investigator's choice" must be abandoned;

2. the selection of the best and satisfactory copy as the basic one. It is allowed to introduce better readings and corrections from other copies into the main text. (We may note that the number of positive reviews on the publications of one version is not numerous. Compare the publications of Rashīd al-Dīn, Firdowsī, etc.);

3. the basic text group may include several copies with similar texts, dating within a limited period of time or going back to the same protograph. Other manuscripts should be used to correct and specify readings and to register principal differences in reference indexes;

4. a compilation of the text (resulting from its critical analysis) and selection of the best readings from many copies — when it is impossible to give priority to any of them. A classical example of this is the publication of the "Memoirs" by Vāṣifī excellently done by A. N. Boldyrev. After a long-lasting and tedious work he proved that Vāṣifī had written several draft variants of his "Memoirs" but produced no final authorized version.

I would like to stress once more, that the choice of kinds and types of publications is preceded by a thorough study of the text in order to reveal its history. The whole textological apparatus, of which I spoke above, is widely used here. All these types are characterized by an impor-

tant feature: criticism of the text represented in separate copies implies the selection, comparison, analysis and synthesis of all possible readings, as well as their strict documentation.

If we turn to Russian publications (and not only Russian), we may see that their title pages bear definitions like: 1. critical, 2. scientific and critical, 3. unified critical, 4. unified text. Let us see what is hidden behind these terms, and if there are any criteria for them. Do these definitions correspond to the methods spoken above?

What is a "critical text"? This is a technical term used in textology referring to a text at its definite historical stage. It is compiled by a scholar according to the task set before him (see above). For this work one must use the textological apparatus of critical definition, analysis, comparison, synthesis of preferable readings along with a strict system of reference to them in reference notes. This term shows what kind of scientific work has been done on the copies of the text. In this way this term defines the text thoroughly processed by a textologist. And this is all! But scientific approach must be present in all the four methods of text-processing mentioned here. A scientific publication can not exist without it. At the same time, we can not say definitely, that one method corresponds to a critical text, another method — to some other type. Who and when has decided that a critical text is the one composed on the evidence of one or two basic copies, a unified-critical — on the materials of three-four or a group of basic copies, a unified text — on the materials of numerous copies (when there is no basic text)? Why five or seven copies that are taken as basic can not produce a critical text? I think, that this technical term which defines the kind of work done on the text, should not be mixed up with the method of research or the type of publication.

In the same way, a critical text should not be opposed to a unified text, because, on one hand, a unified text is the result of a critical approach, on the other hand, I do not know any publications of a document (no matter how it is defined) that do not contain reference notes with readings from the basic text. This fact has also been noticed both by E. E. Berthels [17] and A. A. Romaskevich [18]. I am sorry to state, that all prepared texts contain elements of different readings.

Such a definition like "scientific and critical text" is nothing but a tautology, since a scientific approach to a text is equal to a critical approach. All the above mentioned methods of preparing a text for publication must be scientific and, consequently, critical. The difference lies only in the methods and the type of publication, but the approach is the same — scientific. Obviously, one should abandon the practice of individual characteristics, because these definitions (including "a unified text") have little to do with the real scientific process. We may justly say: "publication of a text" [19] keeping in mind that this is a scientific publication with an introduction on the method of research, history of the text (its versions and variants) from the time of its creation till the moment of its publication (or till some certain stage in its history). It should be followed by a corresponding apparatus [20] indicating different readings, interpolations and scribe's mistakes. Only in this case we can avoid contradictions and subjectivism at the same time. Speaking about facsimile publications, *i. e.* a photographic reproduction of one of the text copies, we should say :"a facsimile publication of the text" [21] (if

it is not preceded by a scientific introduction on its history, and on the aims of the publication). This term can be applied to a printed text publication of some copy without any textological, philological, literary, or historical research.

Finally, I would like to note, that mistakes in textological research (alongside with its achievements) are natural. These failures make a logical stage in the development of science. Some 30—40 years ago text research was performed only by a narrow circle of philologists. Now hundreds of specialists are working on texts. A great interest in the national history and culture is growing in the Oriental countries. They are interested in their heritage which had survived in the form of written documents. Naturally, the role of textology is growing considerably, since its aim is to discover these monuments and to satisfy the great interest of the Oriental peoples in their national treasures.

Notes

1. D. S. Likhachev, *Tekstologiia. Na materiale russkoĭ literatury 10—18 vekov* (Textology. On the Materials of the Russian Literature of the 10th—18th centuries) (Moscow, Leningrad, 1962), p. 23.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 28.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 549.

4. E. E. Berthels, "Voprosy metodiki podgotovki kriticheskikh izdanij klassicheskikh pamiatnikov literatur Blizhnego i Srednego Vostoka" ("Methodological problems of preparing critical publications of the classical literary monuments of the Near and Middle East"), *Pervaia vsesoiuznaia konferentsiia vostokovedov. Tezisy dokladov i soobshchenii* (Tashkent, 1957), p. 237—42.

5. The example of such a correction could be the reading of one *bait* from Saʿdī's "Gulistan" suggested by R. M. Aliev and of the same *bait* (more precisely, of one word) that is given by Shihāb al-Dīn ʿAbdallāh Shīrāzī, wildly known as Vaṣṣāf, in his historical work "*Tadjziyat al-amṣār wa tazdjiyat al-aʿṣār*" (dated 712 / 1313). R. M. Aliev suggested to read it *makhdūmī* ("servant"). V. F. Minorsky pointed out to the erroneous interpretation of this *bait* and gave a correct reading of Vaṣṣāf's word as *mahbūbī* — "nice creature". The same *bait* is given by Vaṣṣāf in a complete poem of Saʿdī in its translation into Arabic. See V. F. Minorsky, "Teksty persidskikh klassikov" ("Texts of the Persian classics"), *Kratkie soobshcheniia Instituta narodov Azii*, 65, (1964), pp. 105—11.

6. We can take, for example, the publication of "*Djami' at-tawārikh*" by Rashīd al-Dīn where "the old forms of some words appearing in the earliest manuscripts" were preserved in the text. See A. Ali-zade, "Ot sostavitelia nauchno-kriticheskogo teksta" ("The Critical Text Compiler's Preface"), *Fazlullah Rashid-ad-din. Dzhami-at-tavarih*, iii (Baku, 1957), p. 3. On the other hand, graphemes of the Persian alphabet listed in the Arabicized form are given there in modern transcription (*ibid.*, pp. 3—4). There is no link between the first decision and the following one.

7. The research and conclusions of Prof. Dj. Matini are of great interest to paleographers. He proved that it was practically impossible to date manuscripts precisely (*i. e.* within 25—50 years) relying upon the "old orthography". This way of dating is not precise and exact. See Dj. Matini, "Rasm al-khatt-e farsi dar qarn-e pandjom-e hidjri", *Madjalleh-e daneshkadeh-e adabiyat-e daneshgah-e Mashhad, sal-e sevvom*, 2—3 (1346/1967), pp. 159—206; "Tahavvol-e rasm al-khatt-e farsi az qarn-e sheshom ta qarn-e sizdahom-e hidjri", *ibid., sal-e chaharom*, 3 (1347/1968), pp. 125—62.

8. See *Dīwān-i Ḥāfiz. Bar asas-e seh noskheh-e kamel-e kohan-e mo'arrekh ba salha-ye 813, 822 and 825 hidjri-ye qamari. Ba tashih-e Dr. Rashid ʿUyuzi va Dr. Akbar Behruz* (Tabriz, 1977), pp. 15—21.

9. The dates of these copies are: 807 / 1404—1405, *rabīʿ II* 808 / October 1405, 810 / 1407—1408, 811 / 1408—1409, *radjab* 813 / November 1410, 813—814 / 1410—1412, 816 / 1413—1414, 12 *rabīʿ I* 818 / May 20, 1415, 821 / 1418, 822 / 1423—1424 (the copy of Khalkhali) 836 / 1432—1433, and 817—838 / 1414—1435.

10. Hamid Suleyman, *Tekstologicheskoe issledovanie liriki Alishera Navoi* (Textological study of the poetry of ʿAlisher Nawāʾi). *Avtoreferat dissertatsii doktora filologicheskikh nauk* (Tashkent, 1961), pp. 27—9.

11. It seems that the best publication of the autograph is a facsimile publication with a scientific preface. This is used by many scholars, though there are some exceptions (usually rather rare). We mean the publication of three poems from the first "Khamseh" of the Persian poet ʿAbdī-bīk Shīrāzī (1515—1580), prepared by Azerbaijan scholar Abu-l-Fazl Rahimov after the autograph dated May 13, 1578, which also includes the text from "Kulliyāt" (Collected works) by the same author, copied in 969 / 1561—1562. The latter was used "to show both variants and the later work by the poet on his poems" (see "*Abdi-bik Shirazi. Haft akhtar*". The text prepared by A. G. Rahimov (Moscow, 1974), p. 11; "*Āyīn-i Iskandarī*". Compilation of the text and preface by A. G. Rahimov (Moscow, 1977), p. 7). But this is not evident to the reader. It is true that A. G. Rahimov published the autograph of 1578, but the formal registration of various readings, missed or added *baits* from "Kulliyāt" does not seem to be convincing, even if at first it looks quite fundamental. The problem is, that in the preface the investigator of the three poems — "*Majnūn va Laylī*", "*Haft akhtar*" and "*Āyīn-i Iskandarī*" (Moscow 1966, 1974, 1977) — had to follow the history of both variants of these poems, to show their differences, not leaving this to textologist and historians of literature. Consequently, a useful and necessary publication was not completed.

12. O. I. Smirnova, "Nekotorye voprosy kritiki teksta ("Sbornik letopisej" Rashid ad-Dina, "Shah-name" Firdousi i "Istoriia Bukhary" Narshakhi)" ("Some problems of text-criticism: "A Collection of Chronicles" by Rashīd al-Dīn, "Shāh-nameh" by Firdowsī and "The History of Bukhārā" by Narshakhī"), *Pis'mennye pamiatniki Vostoka. 1968* (Moscow, 1970), pp. 164—5.

13. D. S. Likhachev, *op. cit.*, pp. 15, 116—7, 120, 122, 124.

14. According to A. A. Romaskevich, the work on the text of "Djami' al-tawārikh" by Rashīd al-Dīn was started in 1936 and completed in 1940. Seven copies were used, which were organized in three groups:

1) the 14th century manuscript of the State Public Library in Tashkent (now in the Institute of Oriental studies of the Uzbekistan Academy of Sciences, no. 1620) and the manuscript of the *Topkapu Sarayı* Library in Istanbul (Revan Köşkü, no. 1518) copied in October-November 1317;

2) manuscript no. V.3.1 of the National Library (St. Petersburg) dated June 20, 1407; manuscript Add. 7628 of the British Museum (London) dated not later than 1433; the manuscript of the Teheran Museum dated May 25, 1596;

3) manuscript D66 of the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental studies, the Russian Academy of Sciences, dated 1576, and the manuscript of the Bibliotheque Nationale (E. Blochet dates it to the 14th century, though it seems that it was copied not earlier than the middle of the 15th century, see A. A. Romaskevich, "Introduction", *Fazlallāh Rashīd al-Dīn. Djami' al-tawārīkh*, iii, pp. 7—14.

The first group represents the first authorized version which was finished by Rashīd al-Dīn on the 25th of April, 1305. The second group is the second author's version of 1310, and the third is the version revised by Shihāb al-Dīn Ḥāfiz-i Abrū (d. in 1430), a historian

of the time of Shāhrukh (1405—1447). Though the published text is based on the manuscripts of the first group, readings from the 2d and 3d groups were also inserted. It would have been better not to include the readings of the 3d group into the reference notes at all — this made the text more complicated and overloaded with readings from non-authorized version. The readings of the 2nd group should also have been registered. Little is said in the introduction about the history of the second authorized version, about its stylistic peculiarities and factological additions.

The same happened to the publication of the five poems ("Khamseh") by Niẓāmī Gandjawī. This work was accomplished in 1939—1941 by a group of scholars of the Azerbaijan Branch of the Academy of Sciences directed by E. E. Berthels. He made a very important conclusion on the history of these texts: "manuscripts copied after the 16th century are practically useless for the work on the text", see E. E. Berthels, "Rabota nad tekstom Nizami", *Izbrannye trudy. Nizami i Fuzuli* ("Work on the text of Niẓāmī", *Selected works. Niẓāmī and Fuzūlī*) (Moscow, 1962), p. 459. For this reason ten copies of the text (four of them of the 14th century) and the publication of Vahid Dastgerdi (Teheran, 1934—1938) were selected. Of these manuscripts six were followed in most cases, forming two groups, their texts representing two versions already current in the 14th century. The first group was represented by three 14th century copies (1362, 1365 and 1375—1376) and by one 15th century copy (1493). To the second group belonged one copy of the 14th century (1366) and one copy of the 15th century (1411). Their description is given in the article by E. E. Berthels. The copy of 1362 was used as the basic text. In this case the methodological principle is broken: two versions were put together. Consequently, we got a unified text of the two versions.

At present the Azerbaijan Academy of Sciences is preparing the poems of Nizami for publication. This task is very urgent, since now we have solid background for the preparation of the text: there are 13 copies of Niẓāmī's "Khamseh" of the 14th century in the libraries of the world: of 718/1318—1319, 763/1362, 765/1364, 766/1365, 767/1366, 773/1371—1372, 777—778/1375—1376, 779/1377—1378, 786—788/1384—1386, 788/1386—1387, 788—790/1386—1388, 790—793/1388—1390, 796/1393—1394. It should be noted, that it is time, when we must reject the method of preparing the text of "Khamseh" only on the basis of its copies. Niẓāmī himself never planned to write "Khamseh" in one stroke. It appeared and was developed during a long period of time. His poems were assembled as a "collection" not by the author himself but after his death. A different problem are the "answers" and *naẓīreh* to his poems written by the other poets, who planned to write them in the form of "Khamseh" from the very beginning. I think, that we can come much closer to the author's original, if we start publishing the earliest copies of separate Niẓāmī's poems. By the way, the oldest copy of "Iskandar-nāmeh" is dated by the 27th of *djumādā II* 631/March 30, 1234, that is nearly a quarter of a century after the poet's death; and the oldest manuscript of "Makhzan al-asrār" I know was copied on the 9th of *muḥarram* 710/June 8, 1310.

"Shāh-nāmeh" by Firdowsī. The work on this great epic was started in the beginning of the 1950s by a group of scholars of the Institute of Oriental studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, under the guidance of E. E. Berthels. After his death (in 1957) it was continued by the editorial board. Four principal copies were chosen: manuscript Add. 21103 of The British Museum, London, dated 675/1276—1277, manuscript Dorn 329 of the National Library, St. Petersburg, of 733/1333, manuscript C 1654 of the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental studies, of 849/1445; manuscript C 822 of the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental studies, of the middle of the 15th century. For a detailed textological analysis of these manuscripts see: A. E. Berthels, L. T. Guzaliyan, O. I. Smirnova, "Novoe izdanie Shah-name" ("A new publication of Shāh-nāmeh"), *Kratkie soobshcheniia Instituta vostokovedeniia Akademii nauk*, 13 (1955), pp. 3—12. Moreover, the Arabic translation of the epics was used — the one made by al-Fatḥ al-Bundārī in 1218—1227. The basis for the publication was quite reliable (which is proved by the following research), though it could have been supported by two or three dated copies of the 14th century. The purpose of this publication was the reconstruction of the text available in the 13th century. Even though many existing copies of "Shāh-nāmeh" were not used, I can not dare to say that the textological principle was broken. At that time, and even now, this task was impossible. Anyway, the compilers were not very thorough in choosing the copies since they have registered only two versions (see E. E. Berthels, "Voprosy metodiki...", p. 240). They have not determined whether these were authorized or non-authorized versions. Only later M. N. Osmanov in his article "Otnositel'no nekotorykh dat zhiznennogo puti Firdousi" ("Concerning some dates in the life of Firdowsī") has recognized two authorized versions of 384/994—995 and of 400/1009—1010 (*Kratkie soobstcheniia Instituta Vostokovedeniia*, 65 (1964), pp. 132, 134). Following the differences between these two versions A. E. Berthels supposed that they gave ground for distinguishing "two versions of "Shāh-nāmeh edited by Firdowsī himself". See A. E. Berthels, "Ot sostavitelia", *Firdousi. Shah-name. Kriticheskij tekst*. ("From the compiler", *Firdowsī. Shāh-nāmeh*. Critical text), ix (Moscow, 1971), p. 8. These words appear in the preface to the last volume! But the case is much more complicated. Besides the two authorized versions, another one, let us call it "the southern version", was clearly determined. Its text is represented in the copies of the National Library (Dorn 329) and of the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental studies (C 1654). This is a non-authorized version of an authorized text by Firdowsi, of 400/1009—1010. Finally, the most important discovery, as demonstrated by L. T. Guzaliyan, (see "Ispravleniia v drevneishei rukopisi Shah-name" ("Corrections in the earliest manuscript of Shāh-nāmeh"), *Istoriko-filologicheskii zhurnal*, 2 (Erevan, 1972), pp. 77—98) is that the scribe who made the London copy of 675/1276—1277 used two copies of the protograph. One of these was the abridged authorized version of 384/994—995, the other — the expanded version of 400/1009—1010.

Strictly speaking, the readings of this manuscript can not serve the basis for the reconstruction of the initial text. It is possible to say, that at least three versions are joint in our publication of "Shāh-nāmeh" (1960—1971). As the result we do not have the text "as it was at the beginning of the 13th century" — which was the aim of those who prepared the publication. It turned out to be a combined text of the beginning of the 14th century. Nevertheless, I may confirm that it is the best text ever prepared in the history of Iranian studies, and that it is much more reliable than its previous publications. I think that now, when we have enough experience, we should continue this work. For this purpose we must assemble the fifteen dated copies of the 14th century and two copies of the 13th century. These are the already mentioned London copy and the recently found Florence copy (unfortunately, only the first volume of "Shāh-nāmeh") dated by 30 *muḥarram* 614/March 9, 1217. To these manuscripts I can also add the text of "Shāh-nāmeh" from Deutsche Staatsbibliothek in Berlin (Ms. Or. 2.4255) copied in 894/1489, which is very similar to the Florentine manuscript. After studying and comparing all these copies, using the experience of the work on "Shāh-nāmeh", a scholar can reconstruct the text of one of the authorized versions (possibly of 400/1009—1010) as it was known at least in the second half of the 12th century.

"Gulistān" by Sa'dī. The text of this popular composition was prepared and published by R. M. Aliev in 1959 in Moscow. In this case the main task of textology (*i. e.* a research on the history of the text, its versions and variants) was neglected. Though nine copies were formally used by R. M. Aliev, no appropriate research was done on the versions of the text. The same spell of looking for "the oldest" copy with the best text led the scholar away from publishing one of the three distinguished versions: the one of the beginning of the 14th century (not of the end of the 13th century as assumed by the editor), or the combined version of 1385, or a separate version of the 14th century that is represented in several copies of the 16th century. R. M. Aliev's conclusions are: none of the used copies "could rep-

resent the original author's version, though being very close to it" (see R. M. Aliev, "Gulistan Sa'di i kritika teksta" ("Gulistān Sa'd: and text criticism"), *Uchenye zapiski Insituta vostokovedeniya AN SSSR*, 19 (1958), p. 97). This is why the editor followed "the princi-ple of active and critical choice in looking for the best reading among all suggested variants". *(Ibid.,* p. 97). It means that readings from different versions are mixed up in the published text. "Gulistān" by Sa'dī is a multi-layer text consisting of different versions, renova-tions, changes and corrections, which we distinguish as the most difficult case in textology. As there is no autograph, one should ap-proach the original text starting from the latest, non-authorized version towards an earlier one, till he comes to the version closest to the origi-nal text.

    The same can be said about the publication of Sa'dī's "Būstān" made by R. M. Aliev in Teheran in 1968. The editor could not avoid the temptation of putting together all early copies, though he knew that these were four non-authorized versions of the text (the first and the second are *pre-Bīsutūn*, the first *Bīsutūn* of 726 / 1326 and the second *Bīsutūn* of 734 / 1333—1334). Actually, the editor had to take the versions with the most clear and stable text, make a research and publish it, *cf.:* R. M. Aliev, "Predislovie", *Sa'dī-nāneh (Būstān)* — ("Introduction", *Sa'dī-nāmeh. Būstān)* (Teheran, 1968), pp. 13—57.

    15. E. E. Berthels, "Shāh-nāme i kritika teksta" ("Shāh-nāmeh and text criticism"), *Sovetskoe vostokovedenie*, 1 (1955), pp. 94—5.

    16. R. M. Aliev, "Volia issledovatelia i problema metoda sostavleniia kriticheskogo teksta" ("Investigator's will and the methodo-logical problem of compiling a critical text"), *Pis'mennye pamiatniki Vostoka.* 1968, p. 9.

    17. E. E. Berthels, "Voprosy metodiki...", pp. 240—1.

    18. A. A. Romaskevich, "Introduction", pp. 12—3.

    19. For example, *Faẓlallāh Rashīd al-Dīn. Djāmi' al-tawārīkh.* Part 3. Publication of the text by A. Ali-zadeh.

    20. It is considered that the main criteria of a "critical text" is the presence of references on different readings. Do not we have the same apparatus in the "unified" or "unified-critical" text publications where non-correct readings are registered? Such an apparatus is the sign and the component of text criticism. It gives a preferable reading and reflects the history of the text, changes in its style and lan-guage form the time of its creation up to a certain historical moment.

    21. For example, *Faẓlallāh Rashīd al-Dīn. Djāmi' al-tawārīkh.* Facsimile publication by K. Jahn, ii.

Manuscripta Orientalia

International Journal for Oriental Manuscript Research

Vol. 1 No. 2 October 1995

CONTENTS

Colour plates: "Iskender-nāme" by Aḥmedī (1334/35—1412/13), MS C133 from the collection
of St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences (see p. 47—61).

F r o n t   c o v e r:

Fol. 58a. Iskender and Gülshah, 10.7 × 10.9 cm.

B a c k   c o v e r:

Plate 1. Fol. 93b. Iskender Slaying a Dragon, 10.7 × 13.2 cm.
Plate 2. Fol. 140b. The Poet Aḥmedī (?), 10.7 × 14.3 cm.
Plate 3. Fol. 249b. The Religious Dispute in the Presence of Sultan Orkhan, 10.7 × 14.7 cm.
Plate 4. Fol. 254a. The Murder of Sultan Murad I, 10.7 × 14.3 cm.