

Achtung!

Dies ist eine Internet-Sonderausgabe des Aufsatzes
„Towards an automatical analysis of a translated text and its original“
von Jost Gippert (1993).

Sie sollte nicht zitiert werden. Zitate sind der Originalausgabe in
Studia Iranica, Mesopotamica et Anatolica 1, 1994 [1995], 21-59
zu entnehmen.

Attention!

This is a special internet edition of the article
“Towards an automatical analysis of a translated text and its original”
by Jost Gippert (1993).

It should not be quoted as such. For quotations, please refer to the
original edition in
Studia Iranica, Mesopotamica et Anatolica 1, 1994 [1995], 21-59.

Alle Rechte vorbehalten / All rights reserved:

Jost Gippert, Frankfurt 1998-2011

Towards an automatical analysis of a translated text and its original:

The Persian epic of *Vīs u Rāmīn* and the Georgian *Visramiani*

Jost GIPPERT

0. In the field of Oriental studies, computers have not yet been as widely accepted as in other disciplines as a means of linguistic and literary analysis. In the present paper¹, I shall discuss the facilities the computer offers when applied for the special purpose of comparing two texts that have an internal relationship with each other in that one of them is a translation of the other. As I intend to show, this relationship cannot be established "automatically" by just entering the two texts; instead, it requires a lot of additional information that can only be handled manually.

1. The romance of *Vīs and Rāmīn* as versified by the 11th century writer Gurgānī is regarded as one of the most important literary products of Persia. The text has hitherto seen four scholarly editions, the first of which appeared in Calcutta 1865². Only the latest of these editions which was prepared by Magali TODUA and Alexander GWAKHARIA from the Georgian Academy in Tbilisi³ has taken into account the fact that there

¹ My thanks are due to Michael GLÜNZ (Berne) and Donald RAYFIELD (London) who read a draft version of this paper and made valuable proposals as to wording, transcription method and the like. All remaining shortcomings and errors are mine, of course.

² *Wīs o Rāmīn. A Romance of Ancient Persia*. Translated from the Pahlawi and rendered into Verse by Fakhr al-dīn, As'ad al-Astarabādi, al-Fakhri, al Gurgāni. Edited by Captain W.N. LEES LL.D. and Munshi Ahmad Ali. Calcutta 1865. = Bibliotheca Indica, vol. 47 / N.S. fasc. 48,49,52,54,76. Reprint Osnabrück 1982 (here: LEES).

³ *Vīs va Rāmīn of Fakhr al-dīn Gorgānī*. Persian critical text composed from the Persian and Georgian oldest manuscripts by Magali A. TODUA and Alexander A. GWAKHARIA. Edited by Kamal S. AINI. Tehran 1970. = Iranian Culture Foundation, 101 (here: TG). — The other scholarly editions are: *Vis and Rāmīn. A Romance of Ancient Iran, Originally Written*

exists a Georgian version of the text dating back as early as the end of the 12th century. This is the so called *Visramiani* which was introduced to the European scholarly world through the English translation from 1914 by Oliver WARDROP⁴. Of its four Georgian editions, only the one prepared by Alexander GWAKHARIA and Magali TODUA⁵ considers the relationship between the *Visramiani* and its Persian model.

1.1. What then can a thorough comparison of the two texts aim at? In my view, such a comparison can have at least six aims. The first one consists in establishing the actual relationship between the two texts, viz. whether the Georgian text is indeed a translation of the Persian original (as most scholars believe today) or whether it is only a free adaptation (as has sometimes been claimed). The second aim lies in establishing the wording

in Pahlavi and Rendered into Persian Verse by Fakhroddin Gorgāni C. 1054 A.D. Edited .. by Mojtabā MINOVI. First Volume: Text. Tehran 1935 (here: MINOWĪ); Faxr ud-dīn Gurgānī, Wīs u Rāmīn. Bā moqaddīme-yī mabsūt wa ḥawāšī wa ta'liqāt wa farhang-i wāzehā wa fihristhā-yī segāne. Ba ihtimām-i Muḥammad Ġa'far MAHĠŪB. Tehrān 1959 (here: MAHĠŪB). — The first (partial) translation into a European language was done by K.H. GRAF (Wīs und Rāmīn. In: ZDMG 23, 1869, 375-433); a complete English translation was published only recently by George MORRISON (Vis and Ramin. Translated from the Persian of Fakhr ud-dīn Gurgānī. New York and London 1972; here: MORR.).

⁴ *Visramiani*. The Story of the Loves of Vis and Ramin. A Romance of Ancient Persia. translated from the Georgian Version by Oliver WARDROP. London 1914. = Oriental Translation Fund, N.S., 23 (here: WARD.). — The text has twice been translated into German, first by Ruth NEUKOMM and Kita TSCHENKÉLI (*Wisramiani oder die Geschichte der Liebe von Wis und Ramin. Übertragung aus dem Georgischen und Nachwort von Ruth NEUKOMM und Kita TSCHENKÉLI*. Zürich 1957) and now again by Nelly AMASCHUKELI und Natella CHUZISCHWILI (*Wis und Ramin. Roman einer verbotenen Liebe im alten Persien. Aus dem Georgischen. Übersetzung von Nelly AMASCHUKELI und Natella CHUZISCHWILI*. Herausgabe, Redaktion und Nachwort von Elke ERB. Leipzig 1991; here: Leipzig).

⁵ *Visramiani*. *Ṭekṣṭi gamosacemad moamzades, gamoḳvleva da leksiḳoni daurtes Aleksandre GVAXARIAM da Magali TODUAM.* / *Visramiani*. (The Old Georgian Translation of the Persian Poem *Vis o Ramin*). Text, Notes and Glossary by A. GWAKHARIA and M. TODUA. Tbilisi 1962 (here: GT). — The other editions are: *Visramiani*, edd. Ilia ČAVČAVAŽE, A. SARAGŠVILI and P. UMIKAŠVILI. *Ṭpilisi* 1884; *Visramiani*. Al. BARAMIŽis, P. ĪNGOROQVAS da K. KEKELIŽis redakciit da šesavali čerilit. *Leksiḳoni I(uṣtine) ABULAŽisa*. *Ṭpilisi* 1938 (here: BIK); and *Visramiani*. In: *Čveni saunže. Žveli mcerloba*. (Our treasure. The old literature). Red. Al. BARAMIŽE. Tbilisi 1968, pp.17-280. = *Čveni saunže. Kartuli mcerloba oc ṭomad*. (Our treasure. Georgian literature in 20 vols.). 2 (popular edition; here: Saunže).

of the Persian text as present when it was translated into Georgian; it must have been still very close to the original wording at that time because the Persian text is believed to have been written only two centuries earlier (between 1040 and 1054). This aim was kept in mind by GWAKHARIA / TODUA when they prepared their edition, and only by a new comparison can this edition be evaluated (and, eventually, improved). The third aim would consist in establishing the original wording of the Georgian version as one of the most important literary monuments preserved in this language. This, too, may be done with respect to criticizing the existing editions. As a fourth aim of a comparison, I think of analyzing the translation method as used by the translator, esp. with respect to consistency in rendering key words. As a fifth aim, I expect it to reveal the information the Persian original offers as to the Old Georgian language, esp. with respect to words otherwise unknown and to the etymology of words, and as the sixth and perhaps most important aim I hope it to bring out new information as to the sound system of New Persian at the time of the translation.

1.2. A short depiction of the phenomena involved may be necessary here to show why I consider the effort of a comparison worth undertaking.

1.2.1. As was said before, most scholars nowadays believe that the Georgian Visramiani is a close translation of Gurgānī's *Vīs u Rāmīn* epic although it is in prose, not a metrical text like its Persian model. The close relationship becomes obvious just by comparing the sequence of chapters and confronting their names as in the synoptical table given as appendix 1 at the end of this paper: although the partitioning disagrees to a certain extent and although some chapter titles have no equivalents, the plot of the story is visibly maintained without changes⁶. And within chapters it can easily be demonstrated as well that the translator intended to keep as close

⁶ A Turkic version of the epic which was written by the 16th century writer Lāmî shows much less affinity in this respect. (The text has not yet been edited, but is accessible through a manuscript preserved in the Preußische Staatsbibliothek, Berlin). — Magali TODUA is just editing the revised Persian text as accomplished by the 18th century writer Nāmī Isfahānī (cf. *Kutaisi Universitetis Moambe / Bulletin of Kutaisi University*, vol. 1, 1993, pp. 25-64; vol. 2, 1993, pp. 26-108).

to the original as possible, just by arranging the Georgian text according to the metrical units of the Persian; cp. the synoptical presentation of the beginning of chapter 24 given as appendix 2 below. Maia MAMACAŠVILI who devoted a whole monograph to the question of the relationship between the Georgian and the Persian text⁷ came to the same conclusion; she drew our attention to the fact that some of the manuscripts preserving the *Visramiani* contain otherwise unknown punctuation marks which coincide with bayt or half-bayt boundaries in the Persian text.

1.2.2. What information the Georgian text offers with respect to the original wording of Gurgānī's epic can be illustrated with some passages where TODUA / GWAKHARIA's edition differs from MAHĠŪB's. E.g., in his chapter 40, MAHĠŪB reads the following bayt (40, 37)⁸:

tu gōyē šīr-i man rūbāhə gašt-ast
*w-az-īn saxtī **rux-am** čūn kāhə gašt-ast*

This is translated by MORR. (77-78) in the following way:

"It is as if the lion of my soul is become a fox
 and **my cheeks** become like straw from this suffering."

In TG, we read instead (25, 107):

tu gōyē šīr-i man rūbāhə gašt-ast
*az-īn saxtī u **kōh-am** kāhə gašt-ast*

With the usage of *kōh-am* "my mountain" instead of *rux-am* "my cheek(s)" this is nearer to the Georgian version (GT 16: 75, 17-19):

lomisa msgavsi zali čemi gamelebula
*da šečirvebisagan **mta čemi** gavaḳebula*

⁷ Gorganis "Vis o Ramin" da kartuli Visramiani (Gurgānī's "Vīs u Rāmīn" and the Georgian "Visramiani"). Tbilisi 1977.

⁸ Text passages from the Persian text are here quoted by chapters and verses, quotations from the Georgian text by chapters, pages, and lines. Translations are quoted according to pages; that a given translation is quoted, is indicated by the reference to WARD. and MORR., resp. The transcription used for the Persian as presented here is to be regarded as tentative because final decisions are being aimed at only as results of this investigation. The Georgian is transliterated in the usual manner.

This was rendered by WARD. in the following way (66):

"From the strength of a lion I am reduced to that of a fox,
and by sorrow **my mountain** is become a valley".

A word-by-word translation would run as follows:

"My strength, equal to (that) of a lion, has become (like the one of) a fox,
and from grief, **my mountain** (i.e. the mountain which is me)
has become a valley."

An opposite case is TG 25, 42, where we read

hanūz-aš būdā pušt-i lab ču mulham
lab-aš čūn angabīn u bāda dar ham

"Yet was the '**back**' of his lip like **silk cloth**,
his **lip** like honey and wine (mixed) in one".

as against MAHĠŪB's wording (40,8)

hanūz-aš būdā rux čūn lāla xurram
lab-aš čūn angabīn u bāda dar ham

which was rendered by MORR. (75):

".. his **cheek** was as yet **splendid** as the **tulip**,
his **lip** like honey and wine mixed".

Here, the Georgian seems to support MAHĠŪB's text (GT 16: 73,15-16):

bageni lalsa ugvandes.
".. his **lips** were like **ruby**" (WARD. 64)

Although we have only one sentence as an equivalent to the two half-bayts in question here, we may assume that the translator chose the word *lal-*"ruby" because it sounded similar to the Persian *lāla* "tulip".

1.2.3. The way in which the Persian text can be used for establishing the original wording of the Georgian version, can be demonstrated in an equal manner.

In the 1938 edition (BIḶ), we find the following clause (8: 24,7-8):

guloansa piri broçeulisa quavilsa uguandis
da žabansa siquitlita — grianḵalsa.

This wording is in accordance with all manuscripts and is easily understandable, as WARDROP's translation shows (28):

"The face of the brave was like the flower of a pomegranate;
of the cowardly, like a **scorpion** with yellowness."

With GWAKHARIA/TODUA, however, we have to conject a different reading (GT 8: 49, 27-28)

guloansa piri broçeulisa quavilsa uguandis
da žabansa siquitlita — drahkansa.

which would mean

"Of (lit. to) a brave (man), the face looks equal to the blossom of a pomegranate, and of (lit. to) the coward, (it looks equal) to the **drahḱani** (-coin) by (its) yellowness."

For only this wording would agree with the Persian text (TG 16,29):

yak-ē-rā gūna šud hamrang-i dīnār
yak-ē-rā čihra šud mānand-i gul-nār

"The cheek of the one was the color of a **dīnār**;
the face of the other like the pomegranate blossom." (MORR. 43)

A literal translation would run as follows:

"Of the one, the cheek became equal in colour to a **dīnār** (coin),
of the (other) one, the face became similar
to the pomegranate blossom."

The restitution of the Georgian text with the name of the coin *drahḱan-i* instead of *griankal-i* "scorpion" is unproblematical from a palaeographical point of view; cp. the two words ღრაჰკანი and ღრიანკალი in (modern) Mxedruli script. And that Georg. *drahḱan-i* would be the normal equivalent of Persian *dīnār* can be seen in TG 24, 56 ≈ GT 15: 71,12-13 where both words are confronted. Besides, we may compare Lk. 20,24 where Georgian *drahḱan-i* renders Greek δηνάριον, the immediate etymon of Persian *dīnār*.

From a plentiful list of similar cases we may quote, e.g., BIK 13: 42,13 with Georgian ნიშანი *nišani* "sign" (in accordance with all mss.) which

would have to be expected as the equivalent of Persian نشان *nišān* only as in GT 23: 65,13 ≈ TG 23,16, whereas GT (13: 63,39) have the correct ნიშატი *nišaṭi* as the counterpart of Persian نشاط *nišāṭ* "merriment" (TG 22, 10); and BIK 16: 52,15 has Georgian დასწავლებული *daṣcavlebuli* "learned, instructed" (in accordance with a majority of mss.) as against GT 16: 72,6 with დასაწყლებული *dasacqlebuli* "pitiful, deplorable" which is the correct equivalent of Persian مهجور *mahjūr* "lost, forlorn". For the case of GT 15: 70,18 ≈ TG 24,32 cp. below.

1.2.4. As to the translation method as used by the Georgian translator, we have already stated that his general outline must have been to keep as close to the original as possible. For deviations from this rule, we may suggest the following reasons:

1.2.4.1. One main reason may be styled as "ideological": The translator had to "convert" the text from Gurgānī's Islamic background to the Christian background prevailing in Georgia. As a main effect, this conversion resulted in the omitment of the first two chapters as well as the last one, all of which are devoted to the praise of Allāh and Muḥammad in the original, and in a radical shortening of the introduction (chapters 3-7), which deals with the proper Islamic-Persian environment in which Gurgānī's opus was accomplished. Within the "conversion" phenomena, we may note the interesting substitution of Persian *darwēš* by Georgian *glaxa*-meaning "poor man, beggar" (e.g. TG 23,79 ≈ GT 14: 67,16 or TG 24,56 ≈ GT 15: 71,13), or of the Islamic paradise guardian, *Riḍwān*, and of fairies, *parī*, by Georgian *kaži* "monster" (TG 25,53 ≈ GT 16: 73,27 / TG 25,131 ≈ GT 16:76,6).

1.2.4.2. A similar effect is often produced by the necessary adaptation of specific elements of the Persian natural environment to the Georgian "reader" not familiar with them. This may be observed mainly in the areas of fauna and flora, but also with respect to Persian geographic names, month names, star names and the like; cp. the following sample list:

Persian *nahang* "crocodile" > Georgian *lomi* "lion" (TG 16, 14 ≈ GT 8: 49,13);

P. *gawazn* "roe, deer" > G. *veluri txa* "wild goat" (23,146 ≈ 14: 68,37-38);

P. *āhū* "gazelle" > G. *veluri txa* "wild goat" (23,9 ≈ 14: 65,9-10; 25,4 ≈ 16: 71,36-72,1);

P. *gurg* "wolf" > G. *avaza* "panther" (23,9 ≈ 14: 65,10);

P. *xurmā* "date tree" > G. *vardi* "rose" (23,69 ≈ 14: 67,2-3: *xurmā bē-xār* "date [tree] without thorns" vs. *vardi ueḳlo* "rose without thorns"); but in 25,184 ≈ 15: 78,4 *xurmā* "date (fruit)" is rendered by the Georgian borrowing *xurma*;

P. *sarv* "cypress" > G. *nazui* "spruce" (24,65 ≈ 15: 71,23; 25,5 ≈ 16: 72,1; 25,130 ≈ 16: 79,5);

P. *lāla* "tulip" > G. *vardi* "rose" (24,66 ≈ 15: 71,25, but cp. G. *lali* "ruby" ≈ P. *lāla* in 25,42 as treated above);

P. *ra'd-ī nou-bahārān* "spring thunder" > G. *šemodgomata karni* "autumn winds" (16,5 ≈ 8:49,5-6);

P. *tīq-ī hinduvāni* "Indian blade" > G. *basris qmali* "dagger (of steel) from Basra" (16,46 ≈ 8:50,8);

P. *Tīr u Keyvān* "Mercury and Saturn" > G. *maṣkulavni* "stars" (22,14 ≈ 13:64,1);

P. *nīsān* "April-May" > G. *zapxuli* "summer" (25,11 ≈ 16: 72,9);

P. *day-māh* "December-January" > G. *zamtari* "winter" (25,11 ≈ 16: 72,9) and > G. *gazapxuli* "spring" (25,116 ≈ 16: 75,29-30 *abr-i dey-mahī* ≈ *gazapxulisa grubeli* "spring cloud");

Esp. interesting in this respect is the frequent substitution of P. *māh* "moon" by G. *mze* "sun" (or *mze da mtvari* "sun and moon", e.g. TG 15,25 ≈ GT 7: 48,24 *mah* > *mze da mtvari*; 22,1 ≈ 13:63,23: *māh-e māhān* "the moon of the moons = Vīs" > *mze-vita Visi* "Vis, the sun-like"; 25,48 ≈ 16: 73,21: *sīmbār māh* "silver moon" > *sulieri mze* "sun endowed with a living soul"; but cp. 25,45 ≈ 16: 73,18: *māh-i jānvar* "moon endowed with a living soul" > *mtvare gavsili* "full moon"), and the treatment of the name of the river *Jeyhōn* (Oxus): This is taken over as a borrowing in the

form *žeon-i* in TG 24,52 ≈ GT 15:71,7 where it is further explained as *rōd-ī Marv* "the river of Marv" ≈ *Maravisa çqal-i* "the water of Marv"; it is simply omitted in 15,20 ≈ 7: 48,19-20, but rendered by *Mtkvari*, the name of the main river of Georgia, the *Kura*, in 23,4 ≈ 14: 65,1 and 25,181 ≈ 16: 77,37.

Here of course, conclusions can only be drawn when the whole material has been collected, for we may always be misled by single cases. Contrast, e.g., TG 24,57 ≈ GT 15: 71,14 where Georgian *kanžari* "wild ass" renders Persian *naxjīr* "prey (animal)" with TG 25,140 ≈ GT 16: 76,18 where Georgian *nadiri* "prey (animal)" stands for Persian *gōr* "wild ass".

1.2.4.3. One important reason for deviations from the original is the addition of explanations for textual clarity. This may be illustrated by passages such as TG 24,32-35:

pas āngah rōy u mis har dū bi-āvard
tilism-i har yak-ē-rā šūrat-ē kard
ba āhan har duvān-rā bastā bar ham
ba afsūn band-i har dū kardā muḥkam
hamē tā basta mādē band-i āhan
ze band-aš basta mādē mardā bar zan
w-agar band-aš kas-ē bar ham šikastī
hamān gah mardum-ē basta bi-rastī

"Then she brought brass and copper,
described the talisman of each party;
then tied them together with iron,
sealed the fastening of both with a spell.
So long as the iron clasp should be fastened
would a man remain spellbound and impotent with a woman.
But should anyone break its clasp,
there and then the spellbound male would be released."

(MORR. 71-72)

This is rendered in the Georgian text as follows (GT 15: 70,18-24):

merme zizaman spilenzi da rvali moigo
da grznebita rayt-me tilismi šekmna:

ori Moabadis saxe da erti Visisi;

šeuloca ra-me da rḱinita ertman-ertsa zeda magrad šeačedna.
ziḱa magalitat grzneuli iḱo da ese ori čxibi asre vita-me šekmnili iḱo,
romel vi-re-mca igi ertgan dačedili iḱvnen,

Moabad Vissa zedan šekruli iḱos
da tu vin gaqsnida, mas-ve čamsa gaisqneboda.

"Then the nurse took copper and bone,
 and **with some sort of enchantment** made a talisman;
two in the likeness of Moabad, and one of Vis;
 she uttered some charm,

firmly welded them upon another with iron.

The nurse was a rare sorceress,
and these two bonds were made in such a manner,
that as long as they were welded together,
Moabad should be bound with regard to **Vis**,
 and if anyone undid these,

at this moment he (Moabad) would be unbound." (WARD. 59)

Note that the edition WARDROP had at hand read ძუალი *zuali* "bone" instead of რუალი *ruali* "bronze" ≈ Persian روی *rōy*. Between *ori* "two" and *Moabadis* we should expect *erti* "one": "two, [namely] one in the likeness of Moabad, and one of Vis".

A similar case is TG 25,128:

ba har ḱāl-ē ba baxšāyiš sazāy-am
ke čūnīn dar dam-ī surx-aždahāy-am

"By any standard I am worthy of mercy,
 caught as I am in the jaws of a **fierce dragon!**" (MORR. 78)

Here, the Georgian translator felt it necessary to motivate the "red" colour (*surx*) of the "fierce dragon" *aždahā* in the following way (GT 16:76,2-4):

(.. me var ..) ḱovlita sakmita sabralo,
amit romel čitlisa gvel-vešapisa,
ḱacisa sisxliisa msmelisatvis, dapḱrobil var.

"(I am ..) in everything to be pitied,
 for I am enthralled by a **red dragon**
which drinks men's blood." (WARD.67)

1.2.4.4. On the other hand, the translator has sometimes felt free to omit passages which seemed unnecessary or excessive to him. So, e.g. he dismissed nearly all of chapter 37 (of the earlier editions ≈ TG 23, 109-134) which contains a detailed description of Vīs as arrayed by her nurse. Instead we read the following lines which we may take as an apology (GT 14: 68, 20-22 / WARD. 56):

ra ama țirilita dașura da mo-re-çqnarada, suli daiço, esre dașuenda, romel razom-ca vin brzeni da gonieri iços, naasalsa-ca kebasa missa ver mihxvdebis.

"When she had dried these tears and again become calm, her spirits revived, and she became so beautiful, that **no one**, however wise and clever he might be, **could achieve** one-hundredth part of her praise."

1.2.4.5. For the purpose of better understandability, e.g. in order to avoid a hysteron-proteron etc., the translator sometimes rearranged sentences or verses as in TG 16,27:

basā asp-ī siyāh u mard-i burnā
ke gašt az gardə xing u pērə-sīmā

"Many were the black horses and young men
 who became white and hoary because of the dust." (MORR. 42-43)

which he rendered as follows (GT 8: 49,24-26):

mravali qırma kacı daberebul iqvis
da šavi cxeni gaçarmagebul iqvis.

"Many youths became like old men,
 and black horses grew white." (WARD. 28)

1.2.4.6. One major source of deviations is the poetic skill of the translator who seems to have been trained in recognizing alliterations, figurae etymologicae, plays on words etc. and to have endeavoured to reproduce

them in his translation. Under this aspect we may understand why he chose the following words (GT 65: 249,4-6):

tu me daberebul var, mižnuroba čemi ar damberebia:
axali qma zuelisa zalisagan čamoikrvis.

"Though I may be old, my love has not aged;
a **new tune** may be struck from an **old string**." (WARD. 318)

when rendering TG 82,5:

tan-am gar pīrə šud, mihr-am na-šud pīr,
navā-yi nou tuwān zad bar kuhan zīr

"Though my body has grown old, my love has not -
'one can play a **new tune** on an **old fiddle**'." (MORR. 293)

Obviously, the alliteration to be seen in *zuel-i* "old" and *zal-i* "string" was introduced as an image of the alliteration found in Persian *navā* "tune" and *nou* "new".

The same explanation may hold true for the wording in GT 16: 74,11-12:

da, tu-ca bedman čemman me gamčira,
bednierobisa bedi mas-mca nu moešorebis.

"Though my fortune has forsaken me,
may the **good fortune of happiness** never abandon her." (WARD. 65)

Here, the translator may have looked for an equivalent of the threefold alliteration *b... b... b...* as present in TG 25,70:

w-agar-če baxtə bā man xordə zēnhār
mar-ō-rā baxtə farrux bād u bēdār

"Though fortune has broken faith with me,
may glorious **fortune be afoot** for her!" (MORR. 76)

Sometimes he may even have added poetic devices of his own, such as the alliteration using *bed-i* "fate, fortune" and *bedit-i* "unfavourable, wretched" in GT 16: 71,30-31:

ra gul-čarsrulsā Ramins gauznelda sakme da uġono ikmna,
gaubeditda mižnurobisagan bedi,

"When the matter had grown irksome to Ramin, the bereft of heart,
and he became resourceless,
and his **fate** waxed **wretched** through love ..." (WARD. 62)

Here, the Persian original has no stylistic equivalent (TG 25,1):

ču bar Rāmīn-i bē-dil kārə šud saxt
ba ʿišq andar mar-ō-rā xwārə šud baxt

"When the plight of the brokenhearted Rāmīn grew more,
his **fortunes** in love **declined**." (MORR. 73)

Incidentally, however, such poetical figures may have developed by chance, in that the translator had no choice as to the words to be used. The problem is to decide which words can be regarded as "normal" correspondences. Cp., e.g., the cooccurrence of *mtuare*- "moon" and *mṭuer-i* "dust" in GT 7: 48,20-22:

mati mṭueri asre amağlda,
romel hgvanda, tu mtuare da mṭueri xuašadsa itquian ertgan.

"Their **dust** rose so high
that it seemed as if the **moon and the dust** were holding
provey converse." (WARD. 25)

Here, the Persian text has *xāk* "earth" and *māh* "moon" (TG 15,22):

hamē raft az zamīn bar āsəman gard
tu guftē xākə bā mah rāzə mē-kard

"The **dust** went right up from earth to heaven;
you would have sworn the **earth** exchanged secrets
with the moon." (MORR. 41)

From the material investigated so far it seems that Persian *xāk* otherwise is most frequently translated by Georgian *miça*- "earth" or *nacar-i* "ashes"; but the final decision whether the translator intended a play of words using *mṭueri* beneath *mtuare* must be left open until the whole text has been worked through.

A similar case may be seen in GT 14: 66,5-7 where *vecxlisa vašli* "apple of silver" translates TG 23,41 *sīb-i sīmīn* "idem", given that Persian *sīm(īn)*

is represented by Georgian *lari* (< Persian *lārī* "from the province of Lār") in GT 14: 69,7 ≈ TG 23,153.

1.2.4.7. One set of divergences between the two texts can only be explained by assuming either that the translator misunderstood the original or that he used a manuscript model with variants today unknown. One such example is GT 13: 64,15-17 where only the Georgian text speaks of "casting lots":

igi zogžer dedisa sišorisatuis țirodis
da zogžer Viroys siquarulisatvis, da çilni qarnis:

"Sometimes she wept because of separation from her mother,
 and sometimes on account of Viro's love,
and she cast lots". (WARD. 51)

Here the Persian text has *nāla zade* "lamented" (TG 22,25):

gah-ē bi-grīsātē bar yād-i Šahrō
gah-ē nāla zadē bar dard-i Vīrō

"Now she wept at the memory of Shahrū,
 now **lamented** in grief for Vīrū." (MORR. 64)

But it becomes conceivable that the translator read *qur'ī zadē* instead of *nāla zadē* if we compare GT 16: 72,27-29:

da çilni qarnis moqvrisa saxelsa,
tu bolosa žamsa čemi da misi sakme vit ertgan ikmnebis-o?

"(Sometimes he ...) **cast lots** in the name of his beloved,
 and said: Shall her lot and mine be united at last?" (WARD. 63)

with TG 25,23:

gah-ē qur'ī zadē bar nām-i yār-aš
ke bā ō čūn buwad farjām-i kār-aš

"Now he **told lots** using his lover's name,
 to see how his fortunes would end with her." (MORR. 74):

Another example may be seen in GT 16: 73,12-13 where in the Georgian text Rāmīn's face is compared with a garden in spring:

gazapxul çalkoṭi tu-ca keḗluci-a,

Raminis piri atas-ḗer mas uṭurpe iḡo.

"Although the **garden** is charming **in spring**,

Ramin's face was a thousandfold more lovely." (WARD. 64)

The Persian text uses a "rose" for the comparison instead (TG 25,39):

gul ar-ḗe saxtə nekō būd u barbār

rux-ī Rāmīn nekōtar būdə ṣad bār

"However passing fair and **luxuriant** a **rose** might be,

Rāmīn's cheek was a hundred times fairer." (MORR. 75)

For an explanation, we could think of a misreading yielding *bahār* "spring" instead of *barbār* \approx *purbār* "rich (in blossoms)"; but we have to be aware that *bahār* would not fit metrically in the given position.

A third example is met with in GT 16: 75,12-13 where the Georgian text compares a "mattress" (*sagebel-i*) with a "snake" (*guel-i*):

missa tualsa dḡe nateli bnel iḡuis

da mas kueṣe ṣavrisa amo sagebeli vita gueli iḡuis.

"Daylight was as darkness to his eyes.

The pleasant couch of brocade under him was **like a serpent**."

(WARD. 62)

Here the Persian text speaks of "thorns" (*xār*) instead (TG 25,14):

ba čašm-aš rōz-i rōšan tārə būdē

ba zēr-aš xazz u dēbā xārə būdē

"The bright day was dark in his eyes,

silk and brocade **thorns** under him." (MORR. 73)

In this case, two explanations are possible: Either Georgian *guel-i* "snake" was chosen because the Persian model had *mār* "snake" instead of *xār* "thorn(y)"; or the translator aimed at presenting a rhyme, viz. *bnel iḡuis* vs. *guel(i) iḡuis*.

An obvious example is TG 25,48 ≈ GT 16: 73,21 where Georgian *miça* "earth, ground" seems to be used as an equivalent of Persian *zamān* "time, world" for which we have to posit *zamīn* "earth, ground".

The reason for such deviations cannot always be stated with certainty, though. Thus we find an unexpected *čino-* "owl" in GT 16: 75,1-2:

magra misi siamovne simčarisa župti-a
da misi simxiarule činosaebr bediti-a.

"But his pleasure is the twin of bitterness,
 and his merriment is wretched **as an owl's**." (WARD. 66)

The corresponding Persian verse contains the word *xumār* "aftereffect" (TG 25,93):

kujā xwaššī-šə bā talxī-šə yār-ast
čunān k-aš xurramī juft-ī xumār-ast

".. its sweetness is the companion of its bitterness,
 as its delight matches its aftereffect." (MORR. 77)

The most appropriate solution would consist in presuming a misreading of *juft* "pair, match" by *juǧd* "owl"; but *juft* is present in the Georgian text in the form of *župt-i*, an obvious borrowing of the Persian word. So we must either assume that the translator played with the Persian words intentionally, or that he tried to mediate between different models.

Still less clear is the usage of "pure crystal" in the following context (GT 16: 77,6-7):

šenisa tanisagan čemi broli utalao-a *da šenisa saubrisagan*

"From thy form is my **pure crystal**,
 and from thy conversation ..." (WARD. 69)

Here, the Persian text speaks of *yāsmīn* "jasmine" instead (TG 25,159):

ze andām-ī tu bāšad yāsmīn-am *ze guftār-ī tu bāšad āfērīn-am*

"your eyes (be) as **jasmine** (for me),
 your words as blessings .." (MORR. 79)

The expected equivalent of Georgian *broli* "crystal" would be Persian *bolur(īn)* which can hardly be assumed in the position of *yāsmīn*.

1.2.4.8. It should be noted in this context that there are unexpected convergences, too, between the two texts which again show that the translator tried to keep as close to his model as possible. In this respect we may note, e.g., the rendering of a Persian bahuvrīhi-composite by a Georgian "inverted" bahuvrīhi as in the case of *xasta-dil* "broken-hearted" in TG 23,20:

ču Vīs-ī xasta-dil-rā dīdā dāya ze šādī gaštā jān-aš nēkə-māya

"When the nurse saw Vis **brokenhearted**,
her soul grew full of happiness." (MORR. 65)

which is translated by Georgian *gul-dačqlulebul-i*, lit. "heart-wounded" (GT 14: 65,19-20):

*ra gul-dačqlulebuli Visi naxa zizaman,
misisa naxvisa sixarulita aivso.*

"When the nurse saw the **heart-wounded** Vis,
she was filled with gladness at the sight." (WARD. 52-53)

Another such case is the Persian figure *tu guftē* "you('d) say", frequently occurring as in TG 16,31:

*tu guftē nāgahān dū kōh-i pōlād
dar ān šahrā ba yak-dīgar dar-uftād*

"You would have sworn two steel mountains
clashed on that field." (MORR. 43)

Lit.: "You'd say, suddenly two mountains of steel
fell on one-another in that steppe."

This figure is often rendered by Georgian *tu stkva* "as if you('d) say" (GT 8: 49,29-30):

tu stkva, orni mtani basrisani ertman-ertsa šeetaḡnes-o.

"(The two armies met) **like** two mountains of steel
falling together." (WARD. 28)

Lit.: "(The two armies met,) **you'd say**, two mountains of steel
crashed on one-another".

Although Georgian თუ *tu* is a conjunction meaning "(as) if" and does not correspond grammatically to Persian *tu* "you", it seems to have been preferable for the translator because of its similar sounding.

1.2.5. Looking for the explanatory value the Persian text offers with respect to the Georgian language as used in the *Visramiani*, we may first of all think of misunderstandable or otherwise unknown words. One such case is GT 14: 67,21-22, where the word *šarux-i* appears:

čavida igi žami da dge,

odes ertman kuman ori šaruxi dasces.

WARDROP's translation (55) seems to be tentative, and it makes hardly any sense:

"That time and that day are past
when a tortoise overcame two **nightingales**".

In a footnote, WARDROP wonders whether the word is "P[ersian]" and whether it could be a "proper name". He seems not to have realized that it had first been treated by the 17th century Georgian lexicographer, Sulxan-Saba ORBELIANI, who did not claim to be able to explain it: *čadra-kis mgerisa ars, tu sxva, ar vici* "It is from the game of chess, or something else, I don't know". In the present edition of his lexicon⁹ we are referred to the bird name *čaxrux-i* "nightingale" again, a notice that may have been influenced by the Georgian lexicographer of the 19th century, Davit ČUBINAŠVILI; according to his Georgian-Russian dictionary¹⁰ *šaruxi* was "Persian" ("*špars[uli]*") as well, and it denoted a "*bulbulis msgavsi mprinveli, соловей*", i.e. a "bird similar to the nightingale". This meaning alone is recorded once again in the eight volume "Explanatory dictionary

⁹ Sulxan-Saba ORBELIANI, *Leksiķoni kartuli. Čigni 1-2*. Tbilisi 1966 / *Txzulebani otx tomad, tomi 4/1-2*, Tbilisi 1965-1966.

¹⁰ *Kartuli-rusuli leksiķoni / Gruzino-russkij slovar'*, Sanktpeterburg 1887 / Repr., ed. by A. ŠANIŽE, Tbilisi 1984.

of the Georgian language"¹¹: *šarux-i "bulbulis msgavsi prinveli"*. The correct meaning of the verse in question and of *šarux-i* is now presented in the new German translation, however (Leipzig, 63):

"Vorbei ist die Zeit, da ein Läufer zwei **Türme** fällte."

That this is really a metaphor taken from the game of chess (as Saba presumed), becomes clear at once if we compare the Persian text (TG 23,83):

šud ān rōz ū šud ān hangām-i farrux
ke bi-twānīstā zad pīl-ē du šah-rux

"That day and that fortunate time are gone
when a bishop could take two **castles**." (MORR. 67)

While *šarux-i*, revealing itself as a loan from Persian *šah-rux* here, seems no longer to have been used in Georgian, *ku* "tortoise" has been preserved until nowadays as the equivalent of Persian *pīl* "elefant" = "bishop in chess".

A second field where we can expect the Persian text to have an explanatory value for the Georgian, is the etymology of Georgian words. So, e.g., Georgian *kaḱabi* "partridge" appears in GT 25,144 as an equivalent of Persian *kabk* "idem", and it becomes at once plausible to derive the Georgian word from the Persian (assuming a metathesis of stops).

1.2.6. The main explanatory value of the Georgian text for the Persian original will consist in establishing the phonetics of 12th century Persian with the help of Persian elements (loans) in the Georgian text. There is a general problem, however, in that it is not always easy to decide whether a Persian word was taken over just at that time (and it is only in this case that the *Visramiani* can help us) or whether it was borrowed into Georgian earlier. So for every single word, an investigation of its own is necessary, as the following short hand list may illustrate:

¹¹ Kartuli enis ganmartebiti leksiḱoni, red. Arnold ČIKOBAVA, 1-8, Tbilisi 1950-1964; here vol. 7, 1962.

- 1.2.6.1. Persian *ā-šoft-a* — Georgian *aḡ-špot-ebuli* "stirred up" (e.g. TG 15,28 ≈ GT 7: 48,27): older instances exist (e.g., in Bible translation, Sap.Sal. 18,19 *aḡ-a-špot-eb-des*);
- P. *pīl* — G. *pilo-* "elephant" (e.g. 16,17 ≈ 8: 49,17-18): older instances exist (e.g., Ps. 44,9);
- P. *darafš* — G. *droša* "flag" (e.g. 16,21 ≈ 8: 49,22): older instances exist (e.g., in the so-called "Nino-legend", *Mokcevey kartlisay*, 119,7; cp. Armenian *drawš*);
- P. *bēzār* — G. *abezar* "estranged" (e.g. 16,36 ≈ 8: 49,37): do. (the word is borrowed from Middle P. *abēzār*; cp. my study "Iranica Armeno-Iberica", Wien 1993, p. 1-7);
- P. *xāṣ(š)agān* — G. *xasagian-* "nobles" (e.g. 16,73 ≈ 8: 50,38-39): no older instances known so far;
- P. *meydān* — G. *moedan-* "playground" (e.g. 16,90 ≈ 8: 51,11): no older instances known;
- P. *u(m)mēd* — G. *imed-* "hope" (e.g. 16,93 ≈ 8: 51,13): older instances exist (cp. "Iranica Armeno-Iberica", p. 84-91);
- P. *juft* — G. *župt-* "pair, twin" (e.g. 16,110 ≈ 8: 51,30); no older instances known;
- P. *zabūn* — G. *zabun-i* "coward" (e.g. 16,112 ≈ 8: 51,33); no older instances known; cp. *žaban-* "id.";
- P. *nišāt* — G. **nišat-* "merriment" (as discussed above); cp. *ga-nišāt-ian-eba* "become happy" in the so-called Gelati-Bible (12th century), Judg. 16,24;
- P. *kāravān* — G. *karavan* "caravan" (e.g. 22,28 ≈ 13: 64,20); no older instances known;
- P. *za²frān* — G. *zapran-* "saffron" (e.g. 22,29 ≈ 13: 64,21); older instances exist (e.g., in the so-called Šaṭberd-codex from the 10th century, within the Georgian version of Gregorius Nyssenus, *De hominis opificio*: 125,17);

P. *jamāza* — G. *žama(za)*- "fast camel" (e.g. 23,17 ≈ 14: 65,15); no older instances known;

P. *zang* "rust" — G. *da-žang-ebuli* "rusty" (e.g. 23,25 ≈ 14: 65,24); no older instances known;

P. *diram* — G. *drama* "drachma" (e.g. 23,38 ≈ 14: 66,2); older instances exist (e.g., in the 11th century vita of Grigor Xanzteli: 268,40);

P. *turinj* — G. *turinž*- "lemon fruit" (e.g. 23,41 ≈ 14: 66,6); no older instances known;

P. *nadīm* — G. *nadim*- "companion" (e.g. 23,67 ≈ 14: 66,39); no older instances known;

P. *šahrux* — G. *šarux*- "castle (in chess)" (as discussed above); no other instances known;

P. *yāqut* — G. *iagund*- "jacinth" (e.g. 23,138 ≈ 14: 68,25); older instances exist (e.g., in the Šaṭberd-codex, within Epiphanius of Cyprus, De gemmis: 134,29); both words seem to have been borrowed from different languages;

P. *naxčir* — G. *nadir*- "prey animal" (e.g. 23,152 ≈ 14: 69,6); older instances exist (e.g., Gen. 25,28), and it is not sure whether both words are connected at all;

P. *dēv* — G. *dev*- "demon" (e.g. 24,31 ≈ 15: 70,15-16); older instances exist (e.g., in the legend of St. Šušaniḳ, ascribed to the 5th century; cp. my forthcoming study "Daemonica Irano-Caucasica"¹²);

P. *rōy* — G. *rval*- "bronze" (e.g. 24,32 ≈ 15: 70,18); older instances exist (e.g., Ex. 25,4); cp. Armenian *aroyr*: both this and G. *rval*-presuppose a Middle Iranian *rōδ*-¹³;

¹² To appear in the Gedenkschrift für Otakar KLÍMA, Prague 1994.

¹³ The Georgian word has recently been dealt with by R. BIELMEIER (in: *Lingua restituta orientalis. Festgabe für Julius ASSFALG*. Hrsg.v. Regine SCHULZ und Manfred GÖRG. Wiesbaden 1990, S. 35).

P. *nam* — G. *nam*- "moistness" (e.g. 24,46 ≈ 15: 70,35); no older instances known;

P. *dāg* — G. *dağ*- "brand mark" (e.g. 25,30 ≈ 16: 73,1); no older instances known;

P. *sunbul* — G. *sumbul*- "hyacinth" (e.g. 25,40 ≈ 16: 73,13-14); no older instances known;

P. *mušk(īn)* — G. *mušk*- "musk" (e.g. 25,41 ≈ 16: 73,14); no older instances known;

P. *kāfūr* — G. *kapur*- "camphor" (e.g. 25,41 ≈ 16: 73,15); no older instances known;

P. *qabā* — G. *qaba*- "men's coat" (e.g. 25,46 ≈ 16: 73,19); no older instances known;

P. *baxt* — G. *bed*- "fortune" (as discussed above); older instances exist (e.g., Jes. 65,11); are both words related?;

P. *dōzax(ī)* — G. *žožoξ-et*- "hell" (e.g. 25,103 ≈ 16: 75,14); older instances are very frequent in Bible translation (e.g., Ps. 6,6); the G. word must be from a form like Parthian *dōžoξ*;

P. *juwān-mard(ī)* — G. *žomard-(oba)*- "nobleness" (e.g. 25,125 ≈ 16: 75,36-37); no older instances known;

P. *but* — G. *but*- "idol" (e.g. 25,130 ≈ 16: 76,6); no older instances known;

P. *yōz* — G. *avaz*- "panther" (e.g. 25,144 ≈ 76,23); older instances exist (e.g., in the Šatberd-codex, 76,22); what is the actual relationship between the two words?;

P. *xurmā* — G. *xurma*- "date" (as discussed above); no older instances known;

P. *zēnhār* — G. *zenaar*- "caution, care" (e.g. 25,217 ≈ 16: 79,3); no older instances known;

P. *afsār* — G. *avšara*- "halter" (e.g. 25,240 ≈ 16: 79,24); no older instances known.

One main point of interest in this respect will be the question whether there are indications that the distinction between \bar{o} and \bar{u} and between \bar{e} and \bar{i} was still perceivable. In this respect we may note Georgian *kos-i* and *buk-i* as equivalents of Persian کوس *kōs* "drum"¹⁴ and بوق *būq* "trumpet", appearing several times side by side in TG 16,3-11 / GT 8: 48,35-49,10. It may be interesting to note as well that Persian *-q* is represented as a velar stop in *buk-i*.

1.2.6.2. Additional problems are met with in this connection with proper names. The general question is, whether they were taken over from spoken or from written Persian. Besides, we have to be aware that they must have always been highly liable to corruption during the manuscript transmission within Georgian. For this we may compare, e.g., the name of the river Oxus, *Jeyhōn*, which is now and then rendered as *žeon-* with a variant reading *žoen-*. The whole set of difficulties can be illustrated by two passages containing several names. The first one is TG 15,4, where we are offered the following list:

ze Āzarbāyāgān u Rayy u Gēlān

ze Xūzistān u Istarx u Sipāhān

"(nobles) from Āzerbaijān, Reyy, and Gīlān,

from Khūzistān, Istarkh, and Isfahān." (MORR. 40)

In the Georgian version, we read the following names (GT 7:48,5-7):

adrabadaganelni, raelni, gelanelni,

xuzištanelni, aštābaxrelni, aspaanelni.

"(nobles) from Adrabadagan, Ray, Gēlān,

Xūzistān, Istaxr, Isfahān".

For most of them, there exist some more or less divergent variants such as *adrabaganelni, darbadaganelni, adrabadaganelni; ranelni; aštārabatelni,*

¹⁴ Incidentally, Georgian *kos-i* cannot be connected with Georgian *m-gosan-i* "minstrel" ≈ Persian کوسان *kōsān* / گوسان *gōsān* (GT 38: 73,20 ≈ TG 49,15) as was proposed by Mzia ANDRONIKAŠVILI in her monograph on Iranian-Georgian linguistic contacts (Narkvevebi iranul-kartuli enobrivi urtiertobidan / Očerki po iransko-gruzinskim jazykovym vzaimootnošenijam. I. Tbilisi 1966, 308), because of the divergent stops (*k-* vs. *g-*).

aṣṭarabasranelni, aṣṭarabatelni, aṣṭrabarelni, aṣṭarxanelni; ispaanelni. So it is understandable why WARDROP proposed to connect the second entry erroneously with the name of the province *Ran*, i.e. the Old Georgian name of today's Karabağ (25):

"(nobles) from Adraba[da]gan, Ra [? Ran], Gelan,
Khuzistan, Astabakhar (var. Astabar or Astabasran), Aspa[a]n".

The *-b-* in the name of the city of Istaxr cannot be explained palaeographically within any Georgian script (cp. *სტარაბანო*, *არაბარქანი*, and *არაბარქანი*); but it may be due to a confusion with Astarābād, the other name of the author's home Gurgān (so Faxr ud-dīn Gurgānī himself was called As'ad al-Astarābādī, too). For the name of Isfahān, the variants *aspa(a)n-* and *ispa(a)n-* occur side by side elsewhere within Georgian tradition.

As a second example we may quote the list of beautiful women present at Vis's wedding (TG 8,65-74):

čū Šahrō māhəduxt az Māhə-ābād
čū ādarbādagānī sarv-i āzād
ze Gurgān Abənōš-i māhə-peykar
hamēdūn az Dehistān Nāz-i dilbar
ze Ray Dinārəgēs u ham Zarīngēs
ze būm-i kōhə Šīrīn u Farangēs
ze Iṣfāhān du but čūn māh u xwaršēd
xujasta Ābənāz u Ābənāhəd
ba gouhar harduwān duxt-ī dabīrān
Gulāb ū Yāsəman duxt-ī wazīrān
hamēdūn Nāz u Ādargūn u Gulgūn
ba rux čūn barf u bar-ō rīxəta xūn
Sahī nām ū sahī bālā zan-ī šāh
tan az sīm ū lab az nōš ū rux az māh
Šakarlab Nōšə az būm-ī Humāwar
saman rang ū saman bōy u samanbar

"Like Šahrō, daughter of Media, from Māh-Ābād,
like a free cypress from Āzarbaijān,

from Gurgān Ābnōš, with the form of the moon,
at the same time from Dehistān charming Nāz,
from Ray Dīnargēs and Zarīngēs,
from the foot of the mountain Šīrīn and Farangēs,
from Isfahān two idols like moon and sun,
fortunate Ābnāz and Ābnāhēd
by descent both daughter(s) of scribes, ..
Gulāb and Yāsaman, daughter(s) of viziers,
as well Nāz and Āzargūn and Gulgūn,
with a cheek like snow with blood sprinkled on it,
Sahī by name and ‘upright’ by stature, the Šāh’s wife,
her body of silver, her lip of nectar, her cheek (like) the moon,
Šakarlab Nōš from the land of Humāvār,
jasmine (her) colour, jasmine (her) scent, jasmine-wearing."

These names are rendered by the Georgian tradition in the following way
(GT 2: 35,37-36,5):

Šahro Mahduxṭ *adrabadaganeli,*
Abanoš {v.l. *manoš, monao, man mo*} *gurganeli*
{v.l. *aspburganeli, aspuraganeli, aspagur*},
Naslakit dehistaneli,
Dinarges {v.l. *dinigruz, dinarguz, danirges*} *da Zaringes*
{v.l. *zargines, zarnisges*};
mtis-zirelni Širini da Gurgesi {v.l. *gergesi, gurgeni*}
aspaanelni {v.l. *aspaaneli, aspaneli, ispanelni*}, *orni mzisebrni*
ķeklucni: Abanozi {v.l. *abanozni*} *da Abanoed*
{v.l. *abaned, abanod*} -
orni ķeklucni kalni mçignobarta asulni;
Žulabi {v.l. *žalabi*} *da Iasaman* {v.l. *diasaman, diasman*}
— *vazirisa* {v.l. *vezirisa*} *asulni* {v.l. *asuli*};
Šakarlab Noš {*da Abanoš*} *eraqeli;*
iqo: Nazi {*monazi* mss.}, *Adraguni da Gulgunoi* {v.l. *gulguni*}
širazelni {v.l. *šarazneli*},
Sainam {v.l. *šainam, šainaš*} *da Saibala* {v.l. *saibla da, sibla*}
— *Šahi Moabadis colni.*

"Šahro Mahduxt, from Adrabadagan,
 Abanoš from Gurgan, Naslakit from Dehistan,
 Dinarges and Zaringes;
 Širin-i and Gurges-i from the foot of the mountain,
 from Isfahān, two sun-like beauties: Abanoz-i und Abanoed,
 two beautiful women, daughters of scribes;
 Gulab-i and Iasaman, a vizier's daughters;
 Šakarlab Noš from Eraq;
 there were: Naz-i, Adragun-i and Gulgun-i from Šīrāz,
 Sainam and Saibala, Šah Moabad's wives.

An especially interesting feature of the Georgian text in this respect is that the author himself, *Faxr ud-dīn Gorgānī*, is called *Paxpur* here which would correspond to the Persian title *faǧfūr* "emperor of China" (1: 34,18); and that his client for whom he composed the epic is called *Ibdal-Meliki-vaziri* (1: 34,12) instead of *Abu-l Fath Muẓaffar*.

2. Let us return to the question now in which way we may think of applying computers to the given task. From the examples discussed above it may have become clear that there is hardly any field of investigation that can be supported by automatical analyses without a lot of preparatory work to be done before. In my view, there are at least three essential stages:

2.1. The first step consists in bringing both texts into an electronic form ("encoding"). This step has now been fulfilled for the Georgian part: I read it in 1992 using an optical scanner and corrected it manually afterwards. As for the Persian text, this too exists in electronic form. It was entered as a basis for Emiko OKADA's and Kazuhiko MACHIDA's study called "Peru-sha bungaku. Bunka-no dētābēsu-ka — josei-no seikatsu to shikō-o chūshin-ni" ("Persian literature. Transformation of culture into a database. With emphasis on women's thought and life") which appeared in three parts in Tōkyō 1991. This study contains a type list with frequency, i.e. an alphabetical list of all word-forms occurring in the text, with their frequency; a frequency list of the types, i.e., a list of the word-forms arranged according

to their frequency (part I); a type concordance, i.e. an index of the occurrences of all wordforms, without context (part II); and the whole text (part III; it is identical with the one as edited by MAHĠŪB). For several reasons, however, I decided to start a new encoding of the Persian text: Firstly, the text as entered in Japan was simply not yet available to me. Secondly, it contains all Persian material in the original script, which bears the disadvantage that it is ill suited to linguistic (esp. phonetic) investigations as it is. Besides, it seems to provide no material for grammatical analysis and no hints for distinguishing between homographs, and it obviously does not reveal any information about the position of words within the verse, esp. with respect to metrics and rhymes. So it would have to be reorganized anyway for the present purposes. Instead, I am glad to be supported by Soraya DIVSHALI who has been engaged with typing in the Persian text (according to TODUA / GWAKHARIA's edition) in transcription for some time now, and we hope to finish this stage within another year's time.

2.2. The second stage will consist in preparing both texts for a complete indexation as to occurrences of words and word forms. Such an indexation can easily be achieved using programs such as the "WordCruncher" (Brigham Young University); the only preparation necessary for it is providing the texts with indexation marks such as, for the Persian text, chapter and verse numbers or, for the Georgian text, page and line numbers. The resulting indexes will be useful as an aid for the main task, which is the third stage:

2.3. This stage consists in preparing both texts for an automatic comparison, i.e., for joint indexation with respect to all points of investigation as discussed above. Here we have to be aware that from the beginning we should aim at integrating as much information as possible, in order to facilitate analyses on all levels of linguistic and philological interest. Let me illustrate what I mean using four different arrangements of the beginning of chapter 15 (TG / 7 GT).

2.3.1. The least informative encoding would just consist in a synoptical marking of verse units, which would mean to arrange the Georgian text according to the Persian original:

11a <i>ču az šāh āgahī āmad ba Vīrō</i>	11a <i>cna Viroman ambavi Šahi Moabadisi,</i>
11b <i>ke ham z-ō kīna dārad ham ze Šahrō</i>	11b <i>vita mas-ca emṭerebis da Šahrosa-ca</i>
12a <i>ze har šahr-ē u az har jāyāgāh-ē</i>	12a <i>da qovlisa kveqanisa</i>
12b <i>hamē āmad ba dargāh-aš sipāh-ē</i>	12b <i>didebulni da laškarni mivides missa da šeqrilan</i>
"When news of the king reached Vīrū,	"At that time when Viro learnt the tidings of
how he was in feud against him and Shahrū,	Shah Moabad,
from every city and every place	how he was become an enemy to him and to
an army came to his court."	Shahro also,
	and had collected from every land
	magnates and soldiers ..."

It goes without saying that the information retrievable from such an arrangement is scanty; the only result we could produce by this would be a "synoptical" word index.

2.3.2. If we aim at retrieving informations about the interdependency of words in both texts, we need at least an additional marking of keywords:

11a <i>ču az šāh¹ āgahī² āmad³ ba Vīrō⁴</i>	11a <i>cna³ Viroman⁴ ambavi² Šahi¹ Moabadisi,</i>
11b <i>ke⁵ ham z-ō⁶ kīna⁷ dārad⁸ ham ze Šahrō⁹</i>	11b <i>vita⁵ mas-ca⁶ emṭerebis⁷⁺⁸ da Šahrosa-ca⁹</i>
12a <i>ze har¹⁰ šahr-ē¹¹ u az har¹² jāyāgāh-ē¹³</i>	12a <i>da qovlisa¹² kveqanisa¹³</i>
12b <i>hamē āmad¹⁴ ba dargāh-aš¹⁵ sipāh-ē¹⁶</i>	12b <i>didebulni da laškarni¹⁶ mivides¹⁴ missa¹⁵</i>
	<i>da šeqrilan</i>

Here, all words that have a counterpart in the other text are marked with a unique number so that their equivalents can be searched for automatically. This marking is not satisfying yet, either, because it may turn out necessary to retrieve informations about syntactical relations, too, which do not become transparent like this at all. So we could think of marking syntactical units instead as in the following way:

11a [<i>ču</i>] ¹ [<i>az šāh</i>] ² [<i>āgahī</i>] ³ [<i>āmad</i>] ⁴ [<i>ba Vīrō</i>] ⁵	11a [<i>cna</i>] ⁴ [<i>Viroman</i>] ⁵ [<i>ambavi</i>] ³ [<i>Šahi Moabadisi</i>] ² ,
11b [<i>ke</i>] ⁶ [<i>ham z-ō</i>] ⁷ [<i>kīna dārad</i>] ⁸ [<i>ham ze Šahrō</i>] ⁹	11b [<i>vita</i>] ⁶ [<i>mas-ca</i>] ⁷ [<i>emṭerebis</i>] ⁸ da [<i>Šahrosa-ca</i>] ⁹
12a [<i>ze har šahr-ē</i>] ¹⁰ [<i>u</i>] ¹¹ [<i>az har jāyāgāh-ē</i>] ¹²	12a da [<i>qovlisa kveqanisa</i>] ¹²
12b [<i>hamē āmad</i>] ¹³ [<i>ba dargāh-aš</i>] ¹⁴ [<i>sipāh-ē</i>] ¹⁵	12b <i>didebulni da [laškarni]¹⁵ [mivides]¹³</i>
	<i>[missa]¹⁴ da šeqrilan</i>

This method, too, has a disadvantage in that it does not allow for an internal analysis and that grammatical phenomena cannot be searched for. So we would need at least a combined encoding of keywords **and** of grammatical units as in the following way:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 11a [č _u] ¹ [az ₂ šāh ₃] ² [āgahī ₄] ³ [āmad ₅] ⁴ [ba ₆ | 11a [cna ₅] ⁴ [Viroman ₇] ⁵ [ambavi ₄] ³ [Šahi ₃ |
| Vīrō ₇] ⁵ | Moabadisi _x] ² , |
| 11b [ke ₈] ⁶ [ham ₉ z ₁₀ -ō ₁₁] ⁷ [kīna ₁₂ dārad ₁₃] ⁸ | 11b [vita ₈] ⁶ [mas ₁₁ -ca ₉] ⁷ [emṭerebis ₁₂₊₁₃] ⁸ da ₁₄ |
| [ham ₁₄ ze ₁ Šahrō ₁₆] ⁹ | [Šahrosa ₁₆ -ca ₁₄] ⁹ |
| 12a [ze ₁₇ har ₁₈ šahr ₁₉ -ē ₂₀] ¹⁰ [u ₂₁] ¹¹ [az ₂₂ har ₂₃ | 12a [da ₂₁] ¹¹ [qovlisa ₂₃ kveqanisa ₂₄] ¹² |
| jāyagāh ₂₄ -ē ₂₅] ¹² | |
| 12b [hamē ₂₆ āmad ₂₇] ¹³ [ba ₂₈ dargāh ₂₉ -aš ₃₀] ¹⁴ | 12b didebulni _{xx} da _{xxx} [laškarni ₃₁] ¹⁵ [mivi- |
| [sipāh ₃₁ -ē ₃₂] ¹⁵ | des ₂₇] ¹³ [missa ₃₀] ¹⁴ da _{xxxx} šeqrilan _{xxxxx} |

2.4. Of course, I do not regard the methods of encoding additional informations in the way as presented here (using brackets, numbers and the like) as practicable in any way; they are meant just as an illustration of the problems involved. What we need instead is a thorough morphological analysis of the single words in both texts (just as it was procured for many biblical texts or the like in other projects) **plus** detailed informations about the interdependencies between the two texts and the words contained in them. Only then will the computer be able to help extending our knowledge in the present field of investigation, in that it will allow for a quick and complete search under different topics through two texts of about 150 pages length at a time. As for the way how it will be best prepared for this purpose, I have as yet no final solution.

Georgian text:						
Title (according to Ward.)	Ward.	Leipzig	Saunže	BIK	GT	№.
The beginning of the story of Vis and Ramin	1-3	19-20	17-18	3-4	33-34	1
The story of Vis and of Ramin, and his eldest brother Shah Moabad	4-7	21-24	18-21	5-7	34-37	2
(Vis's and Ramin's birth and youth)	8-10	24-26	21-22	8-9	37-38	3
The letter written by the nurse of Vis to Shahro, the mother of Vis	11-15	26-27	22-24	10-11	38-40	4
.. They bring Vis from Khuzistan into the City of Hamian	13-15	28-29	24-25	12-13	40-41	5
Here the wedding of Vis and her brother Viro and the coming of Moabad's	16-24	30-38	25-32	14-20	41-48	6
Here Shah Moabad sets forth to fight Viro	25-26	38-39	32-33	21-22	48	7
Here is the great battle between Moabad and Viro	27-31	39-43	33-36	23-26	48-52	8
The investment of Viro's castle by Moabad, and the discourse of Vis	32-40	43-50	36-42	27-33	52-58	9
Moabad's letter to Shahro	41-44	51-54	42-44	34-36	58-60	10
Viro learns of the abduction of his wife and his mourning thereat	45-46	54-55	44-45	37-38	60-61	11
Ramin becomes enamoured of Vis	47-49	55-58	45-47	39-41	61-63	12
Here is the wedding of Moabad and Vis	50-51	58-59	47-49	42-43	63-64	13
The lamentation and weeping of the nurse for the carrying away of Vis	52-57	59-65	49-53	44-48	64-69	14

							Persian text:
Nº.	TG	Lees	Nº.	Minowī	Mahgūb	Morr.	Title (according to Morr.)
1	1-6	1-6	1	1-6	1-5	1-4	(Praise to God)
2	7-10		2	6-9	5-7	4-6	Praise of Muḥammad
3	10-15		3	9-15	7-11	6-10	Praise of Sultan Abū Ṭalīb Ṭughrilbeg
4	16-18		4	15-17	11-13	10-12	Praise of Khvājah Abū Naṣr Ibn Manṣūr ibn Muḥammad
5	18-21		5	17-21	13-16	12-14	The taking of Isfahān by the sultan
6	21-26	7-9	6	21-24	16-18	14-16	Praise of ‘Amīd Abū’l-Faṭḥ Muzaffar
7	26-30	9-12	7	24-28	18-21	16-19	The Sultan leaves Isfahān; account of the author
8	31-38	13-19	8	28-31	21-23	19-21	The story of Vīs and Rāmīn begins
			9	31-33	24-25	21-23	The beauties of moonlike face look on at King Moubad’s banquet
9	38-41	19-22	10	33-36	25-27	23-25	Moubad asks Shahrū’s hand in marriage and she makes a compact with him
10	42-45		11	36-38	27-29	25-27	Vīs is born to her mother
			12	39	29-30	27	Vīs and Rāmīn are brought up in Khūzān at the nurse’s side
11	46-48	22-25	13	40-42	30-32	27-29	The nurse writes a letter to Shahrū who sends an envoy to fetch Vīs
12	48-50	25-26	14	42-44	32-33	29-31	Shahrū gives Vīs in marriage to Vīrū but both fail to gain their desire
13	51-62	26-28	15	44-49	34-37	31-34	Zard comes to Shahrū as messenger
			16	50-52	37-39	35-36	Vīs questions Zard and hears his answer
			17	52-55	39-41	36-38	Zard returns from Vīs to Moubad
14	62-64	34-36	18	55-57	41-43	38-40	News reaches Moubad of Vīrū’s taking Vīs in marriage
15	64-66	36-50	19	57-59	43-44	40-41	Vīrū learns of Moubad’s coming to do battle
16	66-73		20	59-64	45-49	41-45	The battle between Moubad and Vīrū
			21	65-66	49-50	45-46	Shāh Moubad is routed by Vīrū
17	74-76		22	66-67	50	46-47	Moubad sends an envoy to Vīs
			23	67-68	51	47-48	
18	76-84		24	68-71	51-54	48-50	Vīs replies to King Moubad’s messenger
			25	71-72	54-55	50-51	Shāh Moubad’s envoy returns from Vīs
			26	73-76	55-57	51-53	Moubad consults his brother about Vīs
19	84-91	50-52	27	77-78	58-59	53-55	Moubad writes a letter to Shahrū and subverts her with riches
			28	79-80	59-60	55	Description of the goods sent by Moubad to Shahrū
			29	80-83	60-63	56-58	How Shahrū surrendered Vīs to Shāh Moubad; the sinister aspect of that night
			30	84	63	58-59	Moubad enters the castle and brings out Vīs
20	92-93	54-55	31	85-86	63-64	59	Vīrū receives tidings that the king has carried off Vīs
21	93-97	55-60	32	86-90	64-67	60-62	Rāmīn sees Vīs and falls in love with her
22	97-99		33	90-92	68-69	63-64	Moubad brings Vīs to Marv the royal abode
23	99-108	60-63	34	92-96	69-72	64-67	The nurse learns of the plight of Vīs and goes to Marv
		63	35	96	72	67	Vīs replies to the nurse
		63-67	36	97-99	72-74	67-68	The nurse replies to Vīs

Georgian text:						
Title (according to Ward.)	Ward.	Leipzig	Saunže	BIK	GT	№.
The binding of the virility of Moabad by Vis and the nurse	58-61	65-68	53-56	49-51	69-71	15
The story of Ramin's love	62-73	68-80	56-65	52-61	71-80	16
The parting of Ramin from the nurse and her coming before Vis	74-81	80-87	65-70	62-67	80-85	17
The nurse's second visit to Ramin	82-89	87-94	70-75	68-73	86-91	18
The nurse parts from Vis and sees Ramin for the third time	90-93	94-97	75-78	74-76	91-94	19
Vis sees Ramin in Moabad's throne-room and becomes enamoured of him	94-96	98-99	78-80	77-78	94-95	20
The nurse goes to Ramin	97-100	100-103	80-83	79-81	96-98	21
The union of Ramin and Vis	101-106	103-108	83-87	82-86	98-102	22
Moabad learns of the love of Ramin and Vis	107-113	108-115	87-92	87-92	103-108	23
Moabad takes away Vis and comes to Marav and Khurasan	114-116	115-117	92-94	93-94	108-109	24
Vis's parting from Moabad	117-120	117-121	94-97	95-98	109-113	25
Ramin goes to Vis	121-122	121-123	97-98	99-100	113-114	26
Moabad learns that Ramin has gone to Vis	123-129	123-130	98-103	101-106	114-119	27
Moabad lights a fire for Vis to swear by	130-136	130-136	103-108	107-112	119-124	28
Moabad's wanderings in search of Vis	137-139	136-138	108-110	113-115	124-126	29
Moabad comes to Marav and learns tidings of Vis	140-145	139-143	110-114	116-120	126-130	30
Ramin brings Vis to Marav, and the rejoicing and banquet of Moabad	146-156	144-154	114-123	121-129	130-138	31
Moabad's campaign against Greece, and his committal of Vis and her nurse	157-163	154-161	123-128	130-136	139-144	32
Vis's lament for Ramin's absence	164-166	161-164	128-130	136-138	144-146	33
Ramin goes from Marav to Ashkap'hut'hidevan to be united to Vis	167-174	164-172	130-136	139-144	146-152	34
Moabad learns that Vis and Ramin are together	175-184	172-180	136-142	145-151	152-159	35
Shahro's lament and weeping for Vis	185-197	181-193	142-152	152-161	159-168	36
Moabad learns of the meeting of Vis and Ramin	198-204	193-199	152-157	162-166	168-173	37
Moabad invites Shahro and Viro and makes a banquet	205-207	199-201	157-158	167-168	173-174	38
Bego's good counsel to Ramin	208-213	201-206	158-162	169-172	174-178	39
Shah Moabad's advice, instruction, and command to Vis	214-217	206-210	162-165	173-176	178-181	40

							Persian text:
№.	TG	Lees	№.	Minowī	Mahğūb	Morr.	Title (according to Morr.)
			37	99-102	74-76	69-70	The nurse arrays Vīs; her description
24	109-112	67-68	38	102-106	76-79	70-73	The nurse puts a spell on Shāh Moubad to render him impotent with Vīs
25	113-130	69-87	39	106-108	79-81	73-74	Rāmīn walks in the garden and laments his love for Vīs
			40	108-124	81-93	75-85	Rāmīn meets the nurse in the garden and tells her his plight
26	130-140	87-89	41	124-134	93-100	85-92	The nurse wins Vīs over to Rāmīn by stratagem
27	140-153	89-93	42	134-147	100-110	92-102	The nurse returns to Rāmīn in the garden
		93-100					
28	153-157	100-106	43	148-151	111-113	102-105	Vīs sees Rāmīn and falls in love with him
29	157-160		44	152-155	114-116	105-107	The nurse goes once more to Vīs with news
30	160-167	106-112	45	155-161	116-120	107-111	Vīs and Rāmīn come together
			46	161-162	121	111-112	Vīs and Rāmīn go to Kūhistān to join Moubad
31	168-176	112-118	47	162-171	122-128	112-117	Moubad discovers the secret of Vīs and Rāmīn
32	176-179	118-121	48	171-174	128-130	117-120	Shāh Moubad returns from Kūhistān to Khurāsān
33	180-185	121-126	49	174-180	130-135	120-124	Vīs goes from Marv the royal abode to Kūhistān
34	186-188	126-128	50	180-182	135-137	124-125	Rāmīn goes to Kūhistān after Vīs
35	188-194	128-130	51	182-187	137-140	125-129	Moubad discovers Rāmīn's visit to Vīs, complains to his mother, and writes a letter
		130-133	52	188-189	141	129-130	Moubad goes from Khurāsān to Hamedān
36	195-198	133-136	53	189-192	142-144	130-132	Virū sends a reply to Moubad
37	198-208	136-140	54	193-195	144-146	132-134	Moubad chastises Vīs
		140-144	55	195-202	146-152	134-139	Moubad goes to the fire temple; Vīs and Rāmīn flee to Reyy
38	208-211	144-151	56	202-205	152-154	139-141	Shāh Moubad wanders the world in search of Vīs
39	211-218		57	206-208	154-156	141-142	Rāmīn writes a letter to his mother
			58	208-213	156-160	142-145	Moubad's mother gives him news of Vīs and Rāmīn and writes a letter to Rāmīn
40	218-233	151-168	59	213-229	160-171	146-156	Moubad sits at the banquet with Vīs and Rāmīn, and Rāmīn sings of his plight
41	233-238		60	229-233	171-175	156-159	Moubad receives tidings of the roman emperor and goes to war
42	238-243	168-172	61	233-238	175-179	160-164	King Moubad takes Vīs to the castle of Ishkaft e Dīvān
43	243-247	173-175	62	239-241	179-181	164-166	Vīs laments Rāmīn's departure
44	247-259	175-185	63	242-253	181-189	166-174	Rāmīn comes to Vīs at the castle of Ishkaft e Dīvān
45	259-270	185-194	64	253-264	190-198	174-182	King Moubad comes from Rome and goes to Vīs at the castle of Ishkaft e Dīvān
46	270-279	194-201	65	264-271	198-203	182-187	Shahrū laments before Moubad
			66	271-273	203-205	187-188	Moubad replies to Shahrū and speaks of the beating of Vīs and the nurse
47	279-28	202-209	67	273-282	205-211	189-195	Moubad entrusts Vīs to the nurse; Rāmīn comes into the garden
48	289-299	209-217	68	282-292	212-219	195-202	The king receives news of Rāmīn, and goes into the garden
49	299-302	217-220	69	292-295	219-221	202-204	Moubad holds a banquet in the garden and the songster minstrel sings a song
50	303-310	220-226	70	295-302	221-226	204-209	Bihgū counsels Rāmīn
51	310-312	226-228	71	302-304	226-228	209-210	Moubad counsels Vīs

Georgian text:						
Title (according to Ward.)	Ward.	Leipzig	Saunže	BIK	GT	№.
Vis and Ramin part in anger	218-225	210-216	165-170	177-182	181-186	41
Ramin falls in love with Gul	226-231	217-222	170-174	183-188	186-191	42
The wedding of Ramin and Gul-Vardi	232-234	222-224	174-176	188-189	191-193	43
Ramin's letter abandoning Vis	235-238	224-227	176-178	190-192	193-195	44
Vis receives Ramin's letter	239-247	228-235	178-185	193-199	195-201	45
Vis falls sick through grief	248-249	236-237	185-186	200-201	201-202	46
Vis's conversation with Mishkin	250-251	237-238	186-187	202-203	203-204	47
The first letter of Vis to Ramin	252-256	239-242	187-190	204-207	204-207	48
The second letter of Vis to Ramin	257-259	243-245	190-192	208-209	207-209	49
The third letter of Vis to Ramin	260-262	245-247	192-193	210-211	210-211	50
The fourth letter of Vis to Ramin	263-265	247-250	193-195	212-214	210-212	51
The fifth letter of Vis to Ramin	266-268	250-252	195-197	215-216	212-214	52
The sixth letter of Vis to Ramin	269-271	252-255	197-199	217-219	214-216	53
The seventh letter of Vis to Ramin	272-274	255-257	199-201	220-221	216-218	54
The eighth letter of Vis to Ramin	275-277	257-260	201-203	222-224	218-220	55
The ninth letter of Vis to Ramin	278-280	260-262	203-204	225-226	220-222	56
The tenth letter of Vis to Ramin	281-286	262-267	204-209	227-231	222-226	57
Ramin thinks on Vis	287-292	267-273	209-213	232-236	226-230	58
Rap'hed informs his daughter of Ramin's desertion	293-299	273-279	213-218	237-242	231-235	59
Ramin sees Adina	300-301	280-281	218-219	243-244	236-237	60
Ramin's letter to Vis	302-306	281-286	219-223	245-248	237-240	61
Ramin comes to Marav	307-312	286-288	223-227	249-253	241-245	62
Vis's answer	313-315	292-294	227-230	254-256	245-247	63
Vis's further discourse	316-317	294-296	230-231	257-258	247-248	64
Ramin's reply	318-319	296-298	231-232	259-260	248-250	65
Vis's answer	320-321	298-300	232-234	261-262	250-251	66
(Ramin's answer)	322-324	300-302	234-235	263-264	251-253	67
(Vis's answer)	325-326	302-303	235-236	265-266	253-254	68

							Persian text:
№.	TG	Lees	№.	Minowī	Mahğūb	Morr.	Title (according to Morr.)
52	312-316	228-230	72	304-307	228-230	210-212	Viš replies to Moubad
53	316-324	231-236	73	307-315	230-236	212-218	Rāmīn goes to Gūrāb and becomes exiled from Viš
54	324-332	236-244	74	316-324	236-243	218-224	Rāmīn goes to Gūrāb, sees Gul, and falls in love with her
55	332-337	244-248	75	324-327	243-245	224-226	Rāmīn marries Gul
			76	327-328	245-246	226-227	Gul takes offense at Rāmīn's words
56	337-342	248-258	77	329-339	246-254	227-235	Rāmīn writes a letter to Viš
57	342-349						
58	349-353	258-261	78	339-346	254-259	235-240	The nurse goes to Rāmīn at Gūrāb
59	353-357	261-263					
		264					
60	357-363	264-269	79	346-383	259-286	240-263	Viš writes a letter to Rāmīn and begs a meeting
61	363-366	269-271		352-354	263-265	243-245	First letter
62	366-369	271-274		355-357	265-267	245-247	Second letter
63	369-372	274-276		358-360	268-270	247-249	Third letter
64	372-375	276-278		361-363	270-272	249-251	Fourth letter
65	375-378	278-281		364-366	272-274	251-253	Fifth letter
66	378-381	281-283		367-369	274-276	253-255	Sixth letter
67	382-384	283-286		370-372	276-278	255-256	Seventh letter
68	385-387	286-288		373-375	278-280	257-258	Eighth letter
69	387-390	288-290		376-378	280-282	258-260	Ninth letter
70	390-394	291-293		379-380	283-286	260-261	Tenth letter
71	394-397	293-296	80	383-386	286-288	263-265	Viš sends Āzīn to Rāmīn
72	397-402	296-299	81	386-390	288-291	265-268	Viš laments her separation from Rāmīn
73	402-409	299-305	82	390-397	291-296	268-272	Rāmīn regrets his marriage with Gul
74	409-417	305-310	83	397-404	296-302	273-277	Gul learns of Rāmīn's regretfulness
75	417-419	311-312	84	404-406	302-303	278-279	Āzīn comes to Rāmīn from Viš
76	419-422	312-315	85	407-409	304-306	279-281	Rāmīn sends a fair to Viš
77	422-426	315-317	86	410-413	306-308	281-283	Viš learns of the coming of Rāmīn
78	426-429	318-320	87	413-447	308-334	283-306	Rāmīn comes to Viš at Marv
79	429-434	320-324		416-421	310-314	285-289	Rāmīn replies to Viš
80	434-438	324-329		421-427	314-319	286-289	Viš replies to Rāmīn
81	438-440						
82	440-442	329-331		427-429	319-320		
83	443-444	331-332		429-431	320-322		
84	445-448	332-335		431-434	322-324	296-306	Rāmīn replies to Viš
85	448-450	335-336		434-436	324-325		

Georgian text:						
Title (according to Ward.)	Ward.	Leipzig	Saunže	BIK	GT	№.
(Ramin's answer)	327-328	303-304	236-237	267-268	254-255	69
(Vis's answer)	329-330	305-306	237-238	269-270	255-256	70
(Ramin's answer)	331-332	306-307	238-239	271	256-257	71
(Vis's answer)	333-334	307-308	239-240	272	257	72
(Ramin speaks again)	335-336	308-309	240-241	273	258	73
(Vis's answer)	337-338	309-310	241-242	274-275	258-259	74
(Ramin's answer)	339	311	242-242	276	259-260	75
(Vis's answer)	340-346	311-318	242-242	277-282	260-265	76
(Ramin's answer)	347-349	318-321	248-250	283-285	265-267	77
(Vis's answer)	350-351	321-322	250-251	286-287	267-268	78
(Ramin's answer)	352-353	322-323	251-252	288-289	268-269	79
(Vis's answer)	354-356	324-326	252-254	290-292	269-271	80
The union of Ramin and Vis	357-362	326-331	254-258	293-297	271-276	81
Moabad goes to the chase	363-367	332-336	258-262	298-301	276-279	82
(The nurse thinks on Vis)	368-371	336-340	262-264	302-304	279-282	83
Vis's letter to Ramin	372-376	340-343	264-268	305-308	282-285	84
Ramin's soliloquy (Here Vis's letter comes to Ramin)	377-378	344-345	268-269	309-310	285-287	85
Ramin comes to Marav	379-381	346-348	269-271	311-313	287-289	86
Ramin slays Zard	382-385	348-352	271-274	314-316	289-291	87
Shah Moabad is slain by a boar	386-388	352-354	274-275	317-318	291-293	88
The accession of Ramin	389-396	354-360	275-280	319-324	293-298	89

							Persian text:
№.	TG	Lees	№.	Minowī	Mahğūb	Morr.	Title (according to Morr.)
86	450-452	337-338		436-437	325-326		
87	452-453	338-339		437-439	327-328		
88	453-454	339-340		439-440	328	301	
89	455-456	340-341		440-441	328-329		
90	456-458	341-342		441-443	329-330		
91	458-459	342-343		443-444	331-332		
92	459-461	343-344		444-445	332-333		
93	461-464	345-346		445-447	333-334		
		346-347	88	447-449	334-335	307-308	Vīs grows angry, leaves her vantage point, and shuts the doors on Rāmīn
94	465-467	347-349	89	449-451	335-337	308-309	Vīs repents of what she has done
95	467-471	349-352	90	451-464	337-347	309-318	Vīs sends the nurse after Rāmīn and follows
96	471-475	352-355		455-459	340-343	312	
97	475-477	355-357		459-460	343-344	315	
98	477-479	357-358		460-462	344-345	316	
99	479-486	358-360		462-464	345-347		
100	482-486	360-363	91	464-468	347-350	319-321	Vīs turns from Rāmīn in anger; he follows her
101	486-489	364-366	92	469-472	350-352	322-324	Rāmīn makes his appearance before Shāh Moubad
102	489-496	366-371	93	472-485	352-355	324-326	The king goes to the chase from the old castle in the season of spring
		371-374	94	475-478	355-357	326-328	Shāh Moubad goes to the chase and takes Rāmīn with him
103	496-499	374-377	95	478-482	357-360	329-331	Vīs laments Rāmīn's departure and appeals to the nurse for remedy
104	500-507	377-379	96	482-486	360-363	331-334	Vīs writes a letter to Rāmīn
		379	97	486-488	363-365	334-335	Rāmīn receives the letter of Vīs
105	597-510	379-382	98	489-494	365-369	335-339	Rāmīn enters the castle by a stratagem; the death of Zard
106	510-513	382-384					
107	513-515	384-386	99	494-496	369-370	339-341	Rāmīn carries off Moubad's treasure and flees to Dailamān
108	515-516	386-387	100	496-497	370-371	341	Moubad learns that Rāmīn has absconded with the treasure and Vīs
109	517-520	387-390	101	497-500	371-374	342-344	Moubad meets his end without battle or bloodshed
110	520-528	390-396	102	501-506	374-378	344-348	Rāmīn sits on the royal throne
111	528-530	396-398	103	506-508	378-380	348-349	The death of Vīs
112	530-534	398-500	104	509-512	380-382	349-352	Rāmīn sets his son on the throne and haunts the fire temple to his dying day
113	534-542	500	105	512-520	383-388	352-357	Conclusion

24. *andar bastan-ī dāya mar šāh-i Moubad-rā bar Vīs*

- 1a *ču dāya Vīsə-rā čūnān bi-ārāst*
 1b *ke xwaršēd az rux-ī ō nūrə mī-xwāst*
- 2a *du čašm-ī Vīsə az girya nay-āsūd*
 2b *tu guftē har zamān-aš dardə bi-fzūd*
- 3a *nihān az har kas-ē mar dāya-rā guft*
 3b *ke baxt-ī šūr-i man bā man bar-āšuft*
- 4a *dil-am-rā sīrə kard az zīndagānī*
 4b *w-az-ō bar kandə bīx-ī šādəmānī*
- 5a *na-dānam čāra-ē juz kuštan-ī xwēš*
 5b *ba kuštan rasta gardam z-īn dil-ī rēš*
- 6a *agar tū mar ma-rā čāra na-jōyē*
 6b *w-az-īn andīša jān-am-rā na-šōyē*
- 7a *man īn čāra ke guftam zūdə sāzam*
 7b *bad-ō kūtah kunam ranj-ē dirāz-am*
- 8a *kujā har gah ke Moubad-rā bi-bēnam*
 8b *tu gōyē bar sar-ī ātaš našēnam*
- 9a *če marg āyad ba pēš-ī man če Moubad*
 9b *ke rōz-aš bādə ham-čūn rōz-i man bad*
- 10a *agar-če dil ba āb-ī šabrə šust-ast*
 10b *havāy-ī dil hanūz az man na-just-ast*
- 11a *hamē tarsam ke rōz-ē ham bi-jōyad*
 11b *nihufta rāz-i dil rōz-ē bi-gōyad*
- 12a *ze pēš-ī ān ke ō jōyad ze man kām*
 12b *tu-rā gustardə bāyad dar rah-aš dām*
- 13a *ke man yak sālə na-spāram bad-ō tan*
 13b *bi-parhīzam ze pād-afrāh-i dušman*
- 14a *na-bāšad sūk-i Qāran kam ze yak sāl*
 14b *ma-rā yak sālə bēnī ham bad-īn hāl*
- 15a *na-dārad Moubad-am yak sālə āzarm*
 15b *kujā ō-rā ze man na bīm u na' šarm*
- 16a *yak-ē neyrangə sāz az hōšəmandī*
 16b *m-agar mardīšə-rā bar man bi-bandī*

24.

1a *ra zizaman šekazma Visi,*

2a *ṭirilisagan ar gamoisvenebdis,*

2b *tu stkva, čamsa da čamsa čiri moemateboda.*

{15. 69-71} *Visisa da zizisagan Moabadisa mamacobisa šekrva*

3a *merme Visi sačutro-moçqenilman malvit kaçtagan zizasa utxra da*

3b *"čemi bedi mebrzviš dge da game. šeexveça:*

4a *gazğa guli čemi sicocxlisagan*

4b *da gamqmara ziri čemisa sixarulisa xisa.*

5a *ara vici, tu čemi gone ra-ğa-a tavisā moqlvisagan kide,*

5b *romel nu-tu-mca siqvilita daveqsen čemsa qopasa!*

6a *aç tu šen čemsa gonesa ar ezeb*

6b *da ama čirisagan ar miqsni,*

7a *me, vita mitkvams, agre adre tavsa moviqlav,*

8a *amit romel, ra Moabads davinaxav,*

8b *vita-mca cecxlsa ševsdgebodi.*

9a *sikvdilisa danaxva da misi — sçorad mičns.*

9b *gmertman Moabadis sačutro asre mçare kmnas, vita čemi.*

10a *tu-ca žeret datmobisa çqlita guli daubania*

10b *da gulis-neba čemgan ar uzebnia,*

11a *amis mešinian, romel ver gazlos*

11b *da xvašiadi damaluli gamoacxados.*

12a *açe vi-re igi čemgan nebase ezebdes,*

12b *šen gzasa zeda maxe dauge.*

13a *ese icode, romel me ert çlamdis tavsa ar mivscem*

13b *da me tvit siqvдилisatvis tav-gançiruli var.*

14a *mamisa čemisa tkivili amisagan umcro ar egebis.*

14b *munamdi me esre vikmnebi,*

15a *ert çlamdis Moabad ar damtmobs da ar-ca mimišvebs,*

15b *amit romel mas čemgan ar-ca rcxvenian da ar-ca ešinian.*

16a *aç šemiçqale, šeneburad daiurve,*

16b *misi mamacoba šekar čemzeda.*