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Extended Abstract

1. Introduction
Correcting *Shahnameh* in a seamless manner and delivering this text in all aspects to what exactly is Ferdowsi’s hymn, makes it difficult and even impossible to do with the current means. However, the editors of *Shahnameh* in recent decades have attempted to bring the text closer to the poet's original hymn by relying to the critical writing of this book and using the scientific methods. However, the research in the context of *Shahnameh* has not been completed at all, and the accuracy of this book has led to many studies. Now that the critical text of *Shahnameh* has come to be known as the final (until now) text of the book, the accuracy and deliberation of its writings and its spurious writing can render the writings in need of revision to a final, acceptable one. Accordingly, in this article, the writing of "nadido" in the Siavash's story and the writing of "Be golshahr goft Ank Khoram Behesht/ nadid o nadanad ke dehghan che kesht" in the story of the "Beresan Shir/ Koja posht fil avardi be zir" from the story of Great War of Keykoshrov were examined. Then, in addition to criticizing the previous theories about these writings, a careful study of *Shahnameh* script, Ferdowsi’s storytelling method, and the logic of the story and the help of Shahnameh manuscripts have been suggested the forms of "nadidu" and "Bastaam Shir" instead of the two writings that are above mentioned.

2. Theoretical Framework
In this essay, we have tried to gain a better understanding of the two writings in Ferdowsi’s *Shahnameh* by carefully examining and criticizing the previous views with a careful view of the texts and by considering the scientific principles and rules of text correction. Rules of text correction and
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prudent help from other features that make the text of *Shahnameh* clearer, have been the general framework of our work in this research.

3. Method

Accuracy in the writings of purified *Shahnameh* of Khaleghi Motlagh and the reflection of the spurious versions were not the basis of his work, and the attention given to other *Shahnameh* publications and the use of lateral sources and marginal references are one of the most scientific areas of research of *Shahnameh* text that helps to purify it. Thus, with a critical emphasis on manuscripts, and with a view to the past principles of Persian writing, accuracy in storytelling, and Ferdowsi’s style of storytelling, we have endeavored to examine two writings of *Shahnameh* and our edited versions.

4. Conclusions and Discussion

Siavash, after going to Tooran, builds a city there and calls it Siavakhsgerd. It is so magnificent that it dazzles the viewers. After visiting that city, Piran goes to his wife, Golshahr, and says this to Siavakhsgerd:


The second constellation of the first line does not make perfect sense now. The intellectuals and commentators of *Shahnameh* have tried to solve this problem in some way. Khaleghi Motlagh has added a note to the above set of verses that does not help to eliminate the ambiguity of the line. Kazazi called "ندید و", with the help of Florentine manuscript "ندیده", and Joveini offered "نه دید" with reference to the ancient Persian script and using the Florentine manuscript. None of these suggestions will help to fix the problem of this line.

In our opinion, the problem of this line is due to a feature of the Persian script. Therefore, the recorded correction must be the same as that found in the version of Khaleghi Motlagh, albeit with a slight change in the writing and the writing of "ندید" and "ندیده" in the narrow and in the form of "ندیدو". In other words, the elimination of the conjunction of the pronoun "اً", which also falls in the omission, has caused the pronoun to be mistaken for ‘ا’ after
the verb "نید" and such problems may arise to see "و". On the other hand, the word "و" and "ند" must be narrowed down to "see" in order to solve this problem, because 'و' is the shortened line of 'اور', the subject of the sentence.

At the beginning of the Great Keykhosrow War, many kings of the kingdom come to help him and they are all introduced with some defined short names. One of these lands is Gharjistan, which, according to the authorship of Khaleghi Motlagh, the king has thus been introduced in the following way:

Records in Moscow version, Jeihooni, Jules Mull and Second Edition of Khaleghi Motlagh’s correction are like the recording of Khaleghi Motlagh in the first edition. The first issue that can be raised here is that Ferdowsi also mentions the kings of other lands he introduces before and after King Gharjistan, but he does not say the name of King Gharjistan based on the correction of Khaleghi Motlagh and other authorized and semi-valid corrections. This caused Kazazi to put Florence's simple and unique writing in the text.

Among the various writings cited in Shahnameh manuscripts, "Bastaam" is of relative importance although not all of them may be a search for another manuscript that cannot be reached with the present possibilities. However, in such a situation Bastaam's writing can be credited with a relative certainty. But the examination does not end at this stage, but we think that the writing of Shir after Bastaam can also mean King Gharjistan, and if we do not accept it, we can accept Lion in its famous sense.

5. Conclusion

In this article, we examined and corrected two writings of Shahnameh. First, a review of Siavash's story was examined and found in all the editions of Shahnameh except for Jules Mull. In this writing, the verb of “Nadid” word is seen with a hyphen next to the letter "va" and is translated as "ایا" in the text. Consequently, there is a disturbance in the meaning of the lines and verses afterwards. We have shown that the correct face of this writing is "ند"، which should be shortened to "ورند"، given in the Persian script and the elimination of h in writing and with the help of Shahnameh manuscripts, as well as the Ferdowsi storytelling style. In this reading, where the verb of
"ئد" stands beside its subject, the pronoun "او", the line also finds an independent meaning, and the subsequent passages will remain true.

Another writing was "Barsaan e Shir". Since Ferdowsi in the lines before and after this line of every territory he names, the king also mentions it by name, it is also better in this line to carefully record the manuscripts and the chaos that includes the king’s name. It’s weird, let's get to the text. So we took "Bastaam" instead of “Barsaan”, and gave two justifications for writing "Shir". We first saw "Shir" in this general title of the kings of Gharjistan. By accepting this argument, one can guess that the meaning of "Shir" was unknown to the scribe, and hence it was taken in the same sense as its predecessor, the predatory animal, and also from "Bastaam" to the king’s name. Another aspect we considered in this line for "Shir" is the same well-known meaning of the word, the predatory animal, which can also be justified in the context of Ferdowsi’s word in this line. However, whether in the first case or in the second case, Bastaam e Shir’s writing is superior to "Barsaan e Shir", and is better to be left out of context.
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