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PREFACE

THE present volume concludes the series of studies in Arabic literary papyri as envisaged in the Preface to Volume I. The studies reveal a steadily accelerating literary activity in both the religious and secular fields throughout the Umayyad period. Poets and scholars in the various fields used concurrent oral and written transmission for the publication, transmission, and preservation of their literary products. The isnād, particularly in its multiple forms, was used to a much greater degree in the religious than in the secular fields. For poetry the family isnād took second place to that stemming from a poet’s personal secretary, kātīb, or from his transmitter, rāwī. A characteristically Arab approach and critical outlook mark Islāmic literature of this period and of the early decades of ‘Abbāsid rule.

Recent finds of Arabic papyri await processing and study. Inspection and classification of relatively small Arabic papyri collections that have lately found their way to the United States revealed several literary texts from the early ‘Abbāsid period itself. These include a leaf written in a schooled but small Kūfic script from an early, if not the earliest, version of the Kadīlah wa Dinmah, extracts from the poetry of Sayyid al-Ḥimyarī, Abū al-‘Atāhiyah, and Abū Nuwās, and other verses yet to be identified. It is probable that other texts representative of early ‘Abbāsid literature are to be found among the rest of the extant collections.

In contrast to the comparative rarity of literary documents, Arabic papyri collections include large groups of private correspondence. The letters throw considerable light on several facets of the life and mores of middle-class urban society—an intriguing field that awaits an eager explorer.

In closing, I wish to express my appreciation to Director George R. Hughes of the Oriental Institute for his interest and encouragement, and again to our Editorial Secretary, Mrs. Elizabeth B. Hauser, for her skillful editing of the manuscript, and to her successor, Mrs. Jean Eckenfels, for cheerfully seeing the volume through the press.
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PART I

GRAMMAR
References in the sources to Muḥammad’s concern with his scribes’ careful and clear writing are not lacking, though Muslims prefer to overlook them or to explain them away because of their implication for the dogma of Muhammad’s illiteracy. This dogma is well illustrated by the fifth/tenth-century controversy that arose in respect to a tradition reported by Ibn Ḥanbal, Bukhārī, and Dārīmī that Muḥammad “wrote with his own hand” some of the alterations in the preamble of the Treaty of Ḥudaybiyyah.7 Zaid ibn Thābit reported that Muḥammad instructed him in the correct writing of the letter sīn in the basmalah formula.8 The caliph Muʿāwiyyah instructed his secretary ‘Ubaib ibn Abī Aws to make full use of diacritical points because as Muḥammad’s secretary Muʿāwiyyah had been instructed by Muḥammad to do so.9 This statement reinforces my conclusions in favor of the pre-Islamic use of diacritical points10 and the belief that Muḥammad himself could at least read.11

Concern for correct speech and for good penmanship in reference to both the Qurʾān and administrative functions went hand in hand and increased as the great conquests of the first century of Islam led to an increasing number of non-Arab converts and called for more and more scribal work in the state bureaus of the capital and the provinces. ‘Umar I wrote ‘Abd Allāh ibn Masʿūd in Kūfah to be sure that his public recitation of the Qurʾān was in the clear Arabic speech of the Quraish, in which the Qurʾān was revealed, and not in the dialect of the Banū Hudayfah.12 Both ‘Umar and ‘Abd Allāh ibn Masʿūd preferred to have the Qurʾān dictated by young men of the Quraish and the Thaqaf, and Thaqafītes were preferred by ‘Uthmān as Qurʾānic copyists.13 These preferences are reflected in the membership of the editorial committee that ‘Uthmān appointed for the preparation of this standard edition of the Qurʾān.14 Again, we find ‘Umar I, who flogged his own son for incorrect speech,15 ordering his governor of ‘Irāq Abī Mūsā al-Ashʿarī to flog a secretary who had committed a grammatical error in a letter and further instructing Abī Mūsā to have Abī Al-Aswad al-Duʿālī teach the Baṣrīs grammatical reading of the Qurʾān (iʿrāb).16


2 Ibn Asakir V 248 f.; Diabah II 332; Maqqari, The History of the Mohammedan Dynasties in Spain . . . , trans. Pascual de Gayangos [Oriental Translation Fund of Great Britain and Ireland, “Publications” LIII] (London, 1840) 204 f.; Ibn Saʿd I 174, pp. 73 f., states emphatically that Muhammad himself wrote in an additional treaty clause: “Muḥammad ibn Abī Lālah is to teach you what he has been taught from his Lord the All-Merciful.” Strach 1 747 makes no reference to Muhammad’s writing on this occasion, but ibn Saʿd I 235 implies that he wrote. Charles C. Torrey was convinced that Muhammad was able to read and write Arabic and even argued that possibly he could read Hebrew also (see our Vol. II 257, n. 9).


4 Suyūṭī, Tadhrib al-aʿrāf fi sharh Tadhrib al-Nawawī (Cairo, 1307/1889) p. 192 (citing Ibn ‘Asakir): “Qari b. Saʿdī and Abū Bakr Bājī (403/1012–81) and involved scholars in the east as well (see e.g. Ibn ‘Asakir V 239 f.; Diabah II 332; Maqqari, The History of the Mohammedan Dynasties in Spain . . . , trans. Pascual de Gayangos [Oriental Translation Fund of Great Britain and Ireland, “Publications” LIII] (London, 1840) 204 f.). Ibn Saʿd I 248 f., pp. 73 f., states emphatically that Muhammad himself wrote in an additional treaty clause: "Muḥammad ibn Abī Lālah is to teach you what he has been taught from his Lord the All-Merciful." Strach 1 747 makes no reference to Muhammad’s writing on this occasion, but ibn Saʿd I 235 implies that he wrote. Charles C. Torrey was convinced that Muhammad was able to read and write Arabic and even argued that possibly he could read Hebrew also (see our Vol. II 257, n. 9).”


6 Suyūṭī, Tadhrib al-aʿrāf fi sharh Tadhrib al-Nawawī (Cairo, 1307/1889) p. 192 (citing Ibn ‘Asakir): “Qari b. Saʿdī and Abū Bakr Bājī (403/1012–81) and involved scholars in the east as well (see e.g. Ibn ‘Asakir V 239 f.; Diabah II 332; Maqqari, The History of the Mohammedan Dynasties in Spain . . . , trans. Pascual de Gayangos [Oriental Translation Fund of Great Britain and Ireland, “Publications” LIII] (London, 1840) 204 f.). Ibn Saʿd I 248 f., pp. 73 f., states emphatically that Muhammad himself wrote in an additional treaty clause: “Muḥammad ibn Abī Lālah is to teach you what he has been taught from his Lord the All-Merciful.” Strach 1 747 makes no reference to Muhammad’s writing on this occasion, but ibn Saʿd I 235 implies that he wrote. Charles C. Torrey was convinced that Muhammad was able to read and write Arabic and even argued that possibly he could read Hebrew also (see our Vol. II 257, n. 9).”

7 See OIP L 38, which has been overlooked by the able scholar Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Asad in a recent work where he assumes that he is the first to suggest the probable use of diacritical points in pre-Islamic times (Masādīr, p. 41). The key verb ṭaqāsh in reference to writing is found in Abū al-Qāsim Ḥabīb ibn Abī ‘Abd Allāh al-Qāsim (fl. 525/689), Kūthāb al-kuttab, ed. Dominique Sourdel, Bulletin d’études orientales XIV (1954) 134, along with a long list of synonyms said to mean ṭaqāsh. Cf. Nabia Abbott, “Arabic paleography.” Ars Islamica VIII (1941) 88 f., 101. The verb ṭaqāsh is not found in the Concordance.

8 See OIP L 46.

9 Khaṭṭāṭ III 406.

10 Cf. Ibn Fāris, Sūrih, p. 57.

11 See e.g. OIP L 48 f. and Bukhārī II 383.

12 Khaṭṭāṭ II 8; Iṣḥāq I 20 f.

The same concern eventually induced Abū al-Aswad al-Du‘ali, encouraged or so ordered by Ziyād ibn Abīhi (Ziyād ibn Abī Sufyān), to use the dot or point to indicate by its position the three basic vowels in the written Qur‘ān. Both men showed general concern for correct Arabic, spoken and written, and Ziyād, some say, was motivated by both personal and official reasons since his sons spoke incorrectly and he demanded accuracy from his secretaries.

Added motivation for mastery of the language came with the establishment of Arabic as the language of the state bureaus in the time of ‘Abd al-Malik (66-86/685-705) and his governor of Iraq, the former schoolteacher Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf al-Thaqafi. Many are the anecdotes that throw light on the deep concern of both these rulers for grammatically correct spoken and written Arabic. ‘Abd al-Malik regretted his own early negligence of Prince Walīd’s education in this respect in that he was reluctant to send the youth to the desert to acquire correct speech from the eloquent among the Bedouins. ‘Abd al-Malik developed a sharp ear for his heir’s linguistic errors and reminded Walīd that he who would rule the Arabs must first have command of their speech. Walīd therefore retired for six months with a number of grammar teachers in a belated effort to learn grammar but failed to master the subject. ‘Abd al-Malik himself credited his fast-graying hair to the tensions of his frequent public speeches and the fear of uttering a solecism, for not even he nor Ḥajjāj was free from such errors. Perhaps Walīd’s difficulty with grammar gave him full appreciation of the linguistic competence demanded of Qur’ānic-readers, for it was he who as caliph first put professional readers on the state payroll. At least one scholar, who was anxious to avoid service under Ḥajjāj but dared not refuse an appointment, deliberately spoke incorrectly in Ḥajjāj’s hearing in the hope that Ḥajjāj would cancel his appointment, and indeed he did. ‘Umar II took ‘Umar I for his model and, like the latter, was extremely severe with members of his family and others who were guilty of incorrect Arabic.

Numerous anecdotes involving the linguistic and grammatical errors of rulers and scholars have found their way into historical and biographical works as well as into the adab and linguistic literature. The subject of incorrect Arabic itself gave rise to long series of interrelated works, the lahn and tashīf categories, covering errors in spoken and written Arabic made by the various professional groups, especially secretaries, linguists, grammarians, littérateurs, and scholars in general, as well as errors made by the general public (lahn al-‘drumah). This subject has engaged the attention of Arabists intermittently for close to a century. Here we find Kisa‘ī (d. 189/805) heading the list, to be followed in the course of the third/ninth century by Ibn al-Sikkīt, Abū ‘Uthmān Bakr ibn Muḥammad al-Māzīnī, Abū Ḥātim al-Sijistānī, Dānawarī, and Thā‘lab (d. 291/904) among others.

The same period saw a number of works written specifically for the education and guidance of state secretaries and for the younger members of the learned professions, religious and secular. This category

---

11 See OIP L 39, with references cited in nn. 106-57. Several conflicting accounts credit now Abū al-Aswad and now Ziyād with the initiative in this matter (see e.g. Marāṭīb, pp. 8-11; Sirāfī, pp. 15 f., 19; Zubaydī, p. 14; Aḡhārī X 105 f.; Irshād VII 200 f.; Irshād I 18 f.).
13 E.g. Jāḥīz, Bayān II 210; ʿIḍā IV 423.
15 Jāḥīz, Bayān I 149.
16 Thā‘labī, Loḥṭāfī, p. 18; see also our Vol. II 228.
17 Irshād I 25.
18 Ibn ‘Asakīr I 25.
19 E.g. Irshād I 8-27.
21 E.g. Fāḥī, pp. 4 f.; Khāṣīṣ III 273-309; Māzīrī II 390 f.;
22 See e.g. George Krotkov, "The 'lahn al-‘awān' of Abū Bakr as-Zubaydī," Bulletin of the College of Arts and Sciences in Baghdad II (Baghdad, 1957) 1-15, which brings the current list of such works to 49, more than half of which have survived and some of which have been published.
is the familiar adab al-kātib or ḍab al-kuttāb, which, apart from covering the subject pertaining to each group, stressed for all groups the basic qualifications for the mastery of Arabic, namely correct use of orthography and good penmanship.

As state and private secretaries gained professional prestige and literary stature, they improved their penmanship and cultivated literary styles. This development is well illustrated by the career of Sālim ibn 'Abd Allāh, the scholarly secretary of the caliph Hīshām (105–25/724–43). A client of many parts, Sālim was known for his eloquence as well as for his fine and accurate hand. He was also the teacher and son-in-law of the better known Umayyad secretary 'Abd al-Ḥamīd ibn Yaḥyā (d. 132/750), famed for his literary style and for his delineation of the power of the pen. Others turned their attention to the art of penmanship itself and presently developed a series of "pens" or scripts for secular use as distinct from the earlier Qur'ānic scripts. The earliest of the professional script-men of 'Abbāsid times is known simply as Qutbāh (d. 154/771). His significant contribution to calligraphic chancellery scripts as well as that of several of his successors has been detailed elsewhere by this writer.

In the meantime Qur'ānic-readers and scholars as forerunners of professional grammarians devoted much attention to Qur'ānic orthography. We have no independent contemporary records as to the progress of linguistics and grammar in the Umayyad period. Dānī (371–444/981–1053), our fullest and best-informed author on the subject, was fully aware of the lack of adequate records for this early period. The sources now available yield little more than the names of Qur'ānic-readers, copyists, and calligraphers. They present us with contradictions and give rise to questions that still remain to be answered and, all in all, leave much to be desired. We know little indeed of Abū al-Aswād al-Dāhilī as the first grammarian and of his handful of leading pupils and of their pupils except that they too acquired some reputation as grammarians of Bāṣrah. Some of them paid special attention to the orthography of the Qurān, for we read that Nasr ibn 'Āṣim al-Laithī (d. 89/708) was the first to "point" vowels in the Qurān and mark off the verses in fives and tens. But not until the generation of Ibn Abī Iṣḥāq (d. 117/735 or 127/744 or 745 at age 88) and Yaḥyā ibn Yaʿmar (d. 129/746 or 747) do bits of significant information become available. Yaḥyā is said to have been among the first to vowel the Qurān, and Muhammad ibn Sirīn (d. 110/728) is reported as possessing a Qurān pointed by Yaḥyā himself. Yet the Bāṣrans did not consider Yaḥyā a leading grammarian. This distinction was readily bestowed on Ibn Abī Iṣḥāq, who is credited with a basic role in the evolution of Qur'ānic orthography. This could mean that Ibn Abī
Ishaq extended the point-voweling system, along perhaps with the use of colors, for other orthographic signs such as the hamzah and shaddah. Dam reports that he himself acquired an old copy of the Qur’ān, dated Rajab 110/October 728 and written by Mughirah ibn Minā, which had red dots for the hamzah, shaddah, and tanwīn “in accordance with the ancient practice of the east.” Whatever basic contribution was made by Ibn Abī Ishaq, the point-orthography system continued to evolve and to develop regional variations. The controversy as to the use of anything but the bare consonants in Qur’ānic codices shifted to consideration of the essential minimum of orthographic devices needed to insure ready and accurate reading of the sacred text. With the general acceptance of the point-vowels, the “pointer” (nāqīt), whose exacting duty was to supply the consonantal text with the essential orthography, won early recognition and achieved professional status relative to a Qur’ānic-reader comparable in a way with that of a ṭabī to a poet.

It is readily to be seen that the development of the first steps of elementary grammar grew out of the needs of Qur’ānic-readers, secretaries, and teachers during the Umayyad period. The case of Mu’adh al-Harrā’ is instructive. He started as a schoolteacher and soon clashed over methods of teaching grammar with Abū Muslim (d. 109/727), tutor to the sons of Abd al-Malik. Their clash resulted eventually in the exchange of satirical verses between them. Mu’adh is credited with being among the first to introduce accent (taṣrīf), presumably of both the noun and the verb if we are to judge by the few examples of his teaching reported in later sources. He is furthermore credited with having written books on grammar in the Umayyad period, and presumably he wrote such books thereafter during his exceptionally long life. He was the friend and advisor of the “poet of the Shi‘ah,” Kumait ibn Zaid (60-126/679-743), who at times failed to heed his advice only to regret it. Mu’adh, himself a productive poet of a sort, composed verses on these episodes, but his poetry was characterized later as “similar to the poetry of grammarians.” Whatever Mu’adh’s accomplishments were, he was considered no more than a minor grammarian and was remembered as much, if not more, for having been the teacher of his paternal nephew Ru‘ās (d. 187/803) and of Kīsā’ī (d. 189/805) and Yahyā ibn Ziyād al-Farrā (d. 207/822), all three of whom were considered the founders of the Kūfān school of grammar. Mu’adh’s contemporary Qāsim ibn Ma’n al-Maṣ‘ūdī (d. 175/791), all-round scholar and Ḥanafī but reluctant judge of Kufah, was referred to as “the Sha’bi of his time” because of his encyclopedic knowledge, which included poetry, language, and grammar, and he was also credited with grammatical works and a system of grammar that was rejected though Yahyā ibn Ziyād al-Farrā, Laith ibn Naṣr, and Ibn al-A‘rābī were among his pupils.

In the meantime some of Mu’adh’s Basran contemporaries of the Umayyad period and some of his younger Kūfān contemporaries of early ‘Abbāsid times did produce among them all sorts of primarily

---

28 Ibid. p. 87.
31 See ibid. p. 9 for Naṭ ibn Abī Nu’aim (d. 169 A.H.) and his nāqīt.
32 Zubaidî, pp. 136 ff.; Ḳibīb III 293; Ḳughyah, p. 303.
33 Suyūṭî, Kitāb al-ṭiqrîb ft’īm waṭl al-nahw (Ḫaidarābd, 1339/1940) p. 84; Ṭashkupīzâlah, Kitāb mifṭâḥ al-su‘ādah I (Ḫaidarābd, 1328/1910) 112-14, 125 ff.
34 E.g. Fihrist, p. 65; Ḳibīb III 290. Mu’adh’s general contemporary ‘Alqamah ibn Abī ‘Alqamah, traditionist and schoolteacher who died in the reign of Manṣūr (126–58/754–758), taught Arabic philology, prosody, and grammar; see Ibn Rustah, p. 216:
35 His proverbial longevity gave rise to verses of younger rival poets in the reign of Ḥarūn al-Rashīd (see e.g. Ḫābib, Ḳayyada III 423 f. and VI 327; ‘Uyun IV 59 ff.; Ma’sūdī II 130; Ḳibīb III 290 f.; Ibn Khallīkān II 130 f. (= trans. III 372 f.).
36 E.g. Fihrist, p. 65; Ḳibīb III 288 ff., 293-95.
37 E.g. Ḳibīb II 270, III 288 and 290, and references cited.
38 Ṣamīrī, p. 109; Fihrist, p. 69; Zubaidî, pp. 146 ff., 219 ff.; Ḳhāṭīb X 245; Ḳibīb III 31 f.; Ḳibīb VI 199–202; Ḳughyah, p. 381:
39 صنف كتاب في البحر وله منه مذهب متفرق.
lexical and grammatical works. Some of these works reflected the emergence and growth of these subjects as individual professional disciplines, while others served the practical needs of pupils, secretaries, copyists, and booksellers. So far as Qur’anic orthography was concerned, Ibn Abi Ishaq’s contribution remained basic despite some additions and local variations reflected in a series of orthographic works in the titles of which naqṣ and ṣakāl (or their derivatives) alone or in combination are the key words. Dānī, who himself wrote several such works, mentions some of his predecessors, beginning with Khalil ibn Aḥmad. None of these early sources have come down to us, and of the extant sources not one gives a complete and integrated account of the system that was evolved by Khalil, though Dānī provides us with many of its specific details. Khalil no doubt found the Qur’anic orthography that was in use somewhat confusing and certainly too cumbersome for linguistic and literary purposes, particularly for grammar and poetry. We do indeed find his system specifically associated with poetry manuscripts as distinguished from the system used for the Qur’an. He probably worked out the basics of the new system of vowels in conjunction with his treatise on meters (ʿarūd), with which his name is more widely associated. Furthermore, the use of dots or points (nuqāt) as orthographic symbols even when they were differentiated by number, position, and color was neither adequate in scope nor suggestive phonetically or visually of their intended purpose. Khalil’s idea of using small letters for the three basic vowels and for some abbreviations as well as for distinguishing unpointed consonants was certainly an improvement in these respects. The ṣafṭaḥ, ḍammah, and kasrāḥ representing ʿalif, wāw, and yā’ were more explicit and meaningful as was also the use, for example, of a small ʿašrān and a small kāʾa’ for ñaṭīd and ḍiyāfī respectively. It should be noted that Khalil’s Medinan contemporaries used the final dāl instead of the initial letter ʿašrān for ñaṭīd.

Just when Khalil introduced the new orthography is difficult to determine. I suspect it was quite early in his career and in that of his favorite pupil, Sibawaih, who is associated with him in its use. Considering Khalil’s major role in the evolution of Sibawaih’s Kitāb and the very nature of the work itself as to both its prime subject of grammar and its evidential poetry, it is probable that at first the use of the new symbols for the Kitāb and the use of some symbols of Qur’anic orthography overlapped. Second-century papyri give no evidence of and literary sources make no specific reference to the use in secular works of any vowel orthography prior to the time of the youthful Khalil. Yet, a restrained use of Qur’anic orthography probably served at first the needs of teachers, poets, traditionists, and particularly grammarians, whose specialty was prized by these others. The Umayyad poet Farazdaq (d. 110/728) finally expressed his own need and appreciation of the contribution of the linguist and grammarian Abū ‘Amr ibn al-ʿAlā’ (d. 154/771) in an eloquent verse that is illustrative of a poet’s need of the language specialist. Khalil himself stressed his own decisive influence on the professional success or failure of the poets of his day in

---

47 See Muhkām, Intro. p. 25.
48 Ibid., pp. 9, 47. See ibid. Intro. pp. 32 f. for a list of 17 authors of such works, beginning with Abū al-Aswad al-Du‘allī and ending with ʿAli ibn ʿIsā al-Rammānī (d. 384/994); cf. Fihrist, p. 35.
49 See Muhkām, pp. 6, 9, 19 f., 22, 35 f., 42, 49, and, for applications of the system, pp. 209–60 passim; cf. OIP L 39 and references there cited.
50 Muhkām, Intro. p. 27 and text pp. 7 and 32; 32.
51 Whether or not Khalil used a second stroke instead of a vertical one for the ṣafṭaḥ is hard to say. Scripts with varying degrees of slant in the ʿalif were and still are common. The kasrāḥ is believed to be either the initial stroke of the letter yā’ written in either of its two forms, the regular and the reversed yā’ ʿ and ʿ respectively.
52 In time the kāʾa’ lost its head and became a horizontal stroke; see Muhkām, pp. 42, 49 f., 51 f., and, for further details of the early Medinan and Basran practices, pp. 49–53.
53 E.g. ibid., pp. 49 f.
54 Indirect evidence of such overlapping is soon even in printed editions of the Kitāb (see e.g. Sibawaih II 312 in connection with ʾishām and see also Wright, Grammar I 71, 80).
55 Muʿārif, p. 268 (Ibn Qutaibah, Al-muʿārif, ed. Tharwat ʿUsashah [1960] p. 540); Marḍīb, p. 15:
strong and colorful terms.\textsuperscript{56} Equally well attested is the professional traditionist’s acknowledged need of grammar. Ayyūb al-Sikhitiyānī (68–131/687–748), teacher of Khalīl, urged his followers to learn grammar.\textsuperscript{57} Shu’āib ibn Aḥmazah (d. 162/779), court secretary to the caliph Ḥishām, for whom he wrote a large collection of hadith from Zuhār’s dictation, was known for his fine and accurate penmanship.\textsuperscript{58} Shu’āib’s manuscripts were later shown by his son to Ibn Ḥanbal, who praised them for their “beauty, accuracy, vocalization,” etc.\textsuperscript{59} The leading Baṣrān traditionist, Ḥammād ibn Sālamah ibn Dinār (d. 167/784),\textsuperscript{60} who studied grammar early,\textsuperscript{61} was a pupil of the Qur’ānic-reader ‘Āṣim al-Qārī (d. 127/744)\textsuperscript{62} and of ‘Isā ibn ‘Umar al-Thaqafī (d. 149/766) and Khalīl himself.\textsuperscript{63} He won recognition as a grammarian in a class with Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alā’.\textsuperscript{64}

Though sought out primarily as an expert in hadith, Ḥammād demanded correct speech from his pupils and corrected their grammatical errors as he is said to have done with the young Sibawayh, who then left Ḥammād to study grammar with Khalīl even as Ḥammād himself had done before him.\textsuperscript{65} Ḥammād, like his father,\textsuperscript{66} committed his materials to writing. The sources have not yet yielded a reference to the use of either system of orthography by Ḥammād, though they give evidence of the use of some orthographic symbols by his fellow Baṣrān traditionist Abū ‘Awānah al-Waddāh ibn Khālid (d. 170/786 or 176/792), who could read but not write and who therefore sought help with his manuscripts from one who paid special attention to the diacritical points and vowels so that he could read them correctly.\textsuperscript{67} Ḥammād and Abū ‘Awānah had several pupils in common, at least three of whom became associated specifically with a comparatively liberal use of orthography in contrast to pupils who used vowel signs sparingly. The three pupils, namely ‘Affān ibn Muslim (134–220/752–835),\textsuperscript{68} Ḥabban ibn ‘Amir,\textsuperscript{69} and Bahz ibn Asad,\textsuperscript{70} were closely associated with Ibn Ḥanbal as teachers and colleagues. It is from Ibn Ḥanbal that we learn of their orthography, while others simply mention their accurate manuscripts in which special attention was paid to names.\textsuperscript{71} Ibn Ḥanbal, on the other hand, commented that no one escapes manuscript errors even when not for the fear of Allah he would curse the tomb of Khalīl because he introduced distressing problems in prosody:

\textit{...}

(\textit{Ma’āritib}, p. 39).


\textsuperscript{58} Dāhābī I 205; Ibn ‘Aṣikīr VI 231.

\textsuperscript{59} Jarb I 1, p. 345: Ḥabban ibn ‘Amir. For Shu’āib see our Vol. II 177 f.

\textsuperscript{60} Jāhiz, \textit{Bayān} II 135; \textit{Inbāh} II 105.

\textsuperscript{61} Ma’āritib, p. 24; Ibn al-Jazari I 229.

\textsuperscript{62} See \textit{Ma’āritib}, p. 66, for both teachers.

\textsuperscript{63} See \textit{Ma’āritib}, p. 66, for both teachers.

\textsuperscript{64} E.g. Aghānī VII 223; \textit{Nuzjah}, pp. 42 f.; \textit{Ma’āritib}, p. 32 f.; \textit{Inbāh} I 329 f.

\textsuperscript{65} Aghānī VII 223; \textit{Ma’āritib}, p. 66; \textit{Nuzjah}, pp. 42 f.; \textit{Ma’āritib}, p. 32 f.; \textit{Inbāh} I 330.

\textsuperscript{66} See e.g. Ibn ‘Aṣikīr VI 216–28.

\textsuperscript{67} Jarb IV 2, pp. 40 f.: Ḥabban ibn ‘Amir. See also our Vol. II 61, 80, 226, 236.

\textsuperscript{68} See e.g. Ibn Sa’d VI 52 f. and VII 2, pp. 51 and 78; \textit{Khatīb} XII 276. Cf. our Vol. II 55.

\textsuperscript{69} See e.g. \textit{Khatīb} VIII 257.

\textsuperscript{70} See e.g. Jarb I 1, p. 431; Dāhābī, \textit{Masān al-‘iddāl fi tariqīm al-rijāl} (Cairo, 1327/1907) I 164.

\textsuperscript{71} See e.g. \textit{Khatīb} XII 275 f.

\textsuperscript{72} Jarb I 1, p. 431; \textit{Khatīb} XII 273 f.: \textit{‘AAIM} bi wa lāmin al-sakhan al-sunna ‘alā qatl al-muhtār fī ṭawāl yūth ‘alā kādim: 10 (said to Ibn Munadhir [d. 199/815]).

\textsuperscript{73} See \textit{Khatīb} XII 275 f. for an example.
the Qur'anic and Kufic or semi-Kufic scripts themselves were so used by Christians or Muslims, the logical conclusion is that these traditionists used the new small-letter vowels as devised by Khalil. The advantages of Khalil's letter vowel orthography over the older dot or point system was so evident that it is not surprising that it spread so quickly and was used at first by some even for Qur'anic manuscripts, though most of the generally conservative Qur'anic-readers either held on to the old point system or presently reverted to it "because it was the practice of the Companions and the Successors." The Kufan Kisa'i (d. 189/805), well known as a Qur'anic-reader, grammarian, and royal tutor, had al-Muhajir ibn 'Asim as his private pointer (nāqī). But, though Kisa'i's variant readings and grammatical preferences are frequently cited, there is no specific indication as to which system he and al-Muhajir used. When we read that the people "pointed" their Qur'an copies in accordance with Kisa'i's public reading, we wonder whether his large audiences in Kufah and Baghdad used the old orthography to the exclusion of the new system. We know further that Kisa'i was among the first to compose a work on spelling, Kitāb al-fāthah, in which he must have taken note of the new system at least for non-Qur'anic manuscripts. A younger Kufan grammarian, Muhammad ibn Ziyād, better known as Ibn al-'Arabī (ca. 150–231/767–846), definitely used the fāthah in his manuscripts.

The introduction and ready acceptance of Khalil's system did not necessarily imply its full use in a given manuscript, whether it was Qur'anic or secular. The use of either system in a particular field was controlled and selective for the most part in this early period, as both the sources and the papyri indicate. Literary papyri that can be dated roughly from about the mid-second to about the mid-third century of the Hijrah do confirm practices indicated in the sources. While some use no orthographic signs whatsoever, not even the diacritical points, more do use them though in varying degrees; and some supplement the orthographic signs by use of small letters to distinguish unpointed consonants. The letter vowels appear in fewer documents and are used more sparingly than the diacritical points, and both are more apt to be used with proper names or with particularly dubious words as evidenced in many of our prose documents also in a Heidelberg papyrus roll dated 229/844. By contrast, and understandably enough, orthographic symbols were more freely used for poetry, as in our Documents 6 and 7 (see pp. 150 and 165).

Despite a mild controversy, inspired by cultural and social rather than religious motives, concerning the liberal or full use of orthographic symbols, individual teachers, secretaries, poets, linguists, and grammarians exercised their own judgment in the matter. As a rule they were guided by the intellectual or social level of their prospective readers relative to the latter's own professional or official positions.

---

11 See e.g. Wright, Facsimiles, Pls. XX and XCV; Eugène Tisserant, Specimina codicum orientalium (Bonnæ, 1914) Pl. 54; Agnes Smith Lewis and Margaret D. Gibson, Forty-one Facsimiles of Dated Christian Arabic Manuscripts ("Studia Siniatica" XIII [Cambridge, England, 1907]) Pls. II and III; Georges Vajda, Album de paleographie arabe (Paris, 1958) Pl. 4.
12 See e.g. Wright, Facsimiles, Pls. VI and XIX; Namadhij, Pls. 17, 19, 21, 64, but Pl. 7 illustrates a 5th-century heavy Kufic Qur'an which shows full use of the secular orthography.
13 Mukham, pp. 22, 42 f. The older system continued to be used for Qur'anic manuscripts for several centuries more. Scholarly works covering the subject of orthography primarily but not exclusively were produced by Qur'anic scholars and grammarians of the period (see e.g. Mukham, Intro. pp. 32 f. and text p. 9; see also Abbott in Ars Islamica VIII 81, 83.
14 Mukham, p. 13; Khatib V 283.
15 E.g., Inbâth II 271.
16 Khatib V 283.
17 See e.g. Vol. II, Documents 5 and 12, and Documents 1–5 below.
18 See e.g. Vol. I, Documents 1 and 3 pp. 1 f.; Vol. II, Documents 2, 6–8, 11–13, and pp. 87–91; see also Documents 1 and 2 below.
19 Carl H. Becker, Papyri Schott-Reinhard I ("Veroffentlichungen aus der Heidelberger Papyrus-Sammlung" III [Heidelberg, 1906]) 8 f.; Gertrud Melamede, "The meetings at al-'Aṣāba, " Le monde oriental XXVIII (1934) 4 plates between pp. 56 and 57.
Authors of textbooks for the young and handbooks for the relatively inexperienced would-be professionals were more apt to make liberal use of orthography. On the other hand, authors of manuscripts intended for the cultured class, for professional peers, and for official superiors would limit orthographic symbols to a minimum, thus tacitly flattering the recipient by implying his full command of the language. Inadvertent or intentional disregard of this guideline was likely to bring indignant protest or disapproval, as illustrated by the contemporary poets ‘Abbās ibn al-Aḥnaf and Abū Nuwās (d. 198/813) and of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ṭāhir (d. 230/844 or 845), governor of Khurāsān.

The general secular concern with and approaches to correct lexical and grammatical forms and their practical and adequate representation in writing are reflected in a series of works usually titled *kitāb al-hiǧā‘*, as was the work of Kisā‘ī mentioned above, or more descriptively *kitāb al-khaṭṭ wa al-hiǧā‘*. Such works were produced by leading Basran and Kūfān grammarians of the third and fourth centuries such as Abū Ḥāṭim al-Sijistānī, Mubarrad, Tha‘lab, Muḥammad ibn al-Qāsim ibn al-Anbārī, and Ibn Durustawāiḥ, to mention a few in chronological order. Furthermore, in the *adāb al-kātib* or *adāb al-kutūb* category of secretarial “textbooks” chapters or whole sections were devoted to these problems. For instance, Ibn Qutaibah’s *Adab al-kātib* has a section headed *taqwīm al-yadd* followed by one headed *taqwīm al-līsān* and thus stresses both written and oral spelling and grammar.

Still another type of work, usually from the hands of state secretaries, dwelt on linguistic competence and literary style but stressed also the type, size, and quality of scripts as such. Works of this type were more apt to be titled *al-kuṭūb wa al-khāṭṭ* or *al-khāṭṭ wa al-kuṭūb*, for example those written by Ibn Thawwāb (d. 277/890) and ʿIḥāq ibn Ibrāhīm al-Tamīmī (d. 320/932). Finally, there was a type of work with such titles as *al-khāṭṭ wa al-qalam* or *risālah *fi* al-khāṭṭ*. They were written generally by scholars or state secretaries who were renowned for their excellent penmanship and concerned mainly with the classification of scripts and calligraphic techniques. The basic role such authors played in the evolution of Arabic scripts—beginning with the Umayyad secretary ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd ibn Yahyā (d. 132/750), reaching a high peak during the reign of Ma‘mūn with the state calligrapher Abū al-‘Abbās Aḥmad ibn Abī Khālid al-Aḥwal and others, and climaxing with the calligrapher-wazīr Ibn Muqlah (d. 328/940)—has been discussed elsewhere by this writer.

In all these extensive and interrelated linguistic and scriptorial developments, despite the frequent references to the pious motives that led the aged Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alā‘ to destroy his roomful of linguistic and literary works, we find no true parallel to the initially heated controversy over committing hadith to writing. As already seen, a controversy somewhat parallel to that over supplementing the bare consonants of the Qur’ānic text (rasm al-Qur‘ān) with orthographic symbols did arise but steadily subsided after the introduction of the letter-vowel orthography devised by Khalil. For, in contrast to the rare use of the vowel symbols in early papyri, literary documents and other works dating roughly from about the mid-third century and later give evidence of the increasing use of orthographic signs, even to their full use in some scholarly works written in calligraphic scripts but mostly on paper or parchment. Excellent

---

84 See Sā‘īl, *Adab al-kutūb*, p. 61, for those and several other objectors; see also Franz Rosenthal’s translation of Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawhīdī’s epistle on penmanship, *Ars Islamica* XIII—XIV 17 f., and *Nuwaiti* VII 15.

85 See *OIP* L 41, with references cited in n. 184.

86 See e.g. *Ibnūb I* 150, II 62, 113, 271, and III 208, 251. See also *Jumal*, pp. 290–81 and 290 f., where Zajjāji briefly covers the subject and refers to his own *Kitāb al-hiǧā‘*.


89 See *OIP* L 41, with references cited in n. 184.


92 See e.g. *Mukkām*, pp. 10–13, for prominent Companions and Successors who either opposed or permitted the use of these symbols.
ORTHOGRAPHY AND SCRIPTS

illustrations of the combination of full orthography with fine Kūfic-nasḵī and early Maghribī scripts are available on paper specimens from Abū ‘Ubaid’s Gharīb al-ḥadīth, dated 252/866, Malik ibn Anas’ Muwaṭṭa’ in bold nasḵī and thulūth scripts of the Maghribī variety with all its lavish final-letter flourishes, dated 277/890. Ibn Qutabib’s Gharīb al-ḥadīth, dated 279/892, and Abū al-‘Amaithal al-Ārābī’s Kitāb al-ma’thūr, dated 280/893. There are, on the other hand, codices from the second half of the third century, written on paper, papyrus, or parchment in different styles of scripts that vary in quality from poor to fine and that use both diacritical points and vowels in varying degrees of frequency. Furthermore, type of script, quality of penmanship, and use of orthographic symbols vary sometimes within a manuscript that is of considerable length. Known codices are a copy of Shāfi’ī’s Risālah written on paper in a cursive hand, dated 265/878 and attested to by Rabī’ ibn Sulaimān al-Murādī (d. 270/883 or 884), a paper copy of the Masā’il of Ibn Ḥanbal written in a rather poor hand and dated 266/879, a papyrus manuscript of the Jāmī’ of Ibn Wahb in a fine hand that varies from stiff to quite cursive nasḵī and dated 276/889, and a parchment manuscript of St. Mark the Hermit dated 288/901 and now in the library of the University of Strasbourg. In regard to orthographic symbols, our documents that date from about the mid-third century or after (Documents 1, 2, 6, 7) also vary from rare to all but full usage, as do a few others that have come to my attention but are not included in the present volume.

A few works of the second century and a goodly number of the third and fourth centuries have survived in fourth-century copies written on paper or in rare instances on parchment. They are representative of scripts characteristic of both the eastern and the western varieties. Simple or elaborate Kūfic and thulūth scripts are used sometimes for titles and headings. Some of the manuscripts are written in a stiff style, while others are in a more cursive nasḵī, and still others are in a Maghribī variety of this favorite book hand. A few are in the common nondescript mutlaq hand, which is nevertheless reasonably legible. A rough survey of illustrations available to me revealed a variety of choice in the extent to which use was made of orthographic symbols. Though in some manuscripts they were used not at all or very rarely, in most of the manuscripts examined they were used either freely or to the full extent. The manuscripts available in reproductions cover a wide variety of subjects and represent leading authors in their respective fields. Though not all the copyists mentioned are readily identifiable, a few are well known scholar-copists or scholar-booksellers. Christian and scientific manuscripts apart, the extant dated manuscripts from the fourth century include the Gharīb al-ḥadīth (311/923) of Abū ‘Ubaid, the Sirr

---

101 See Moritz, Arabic Palaeography, Pls. 119-20.
al-nahv (first half of 4th century) of Zajjājī,103 the Kitāb (351/962) of Sibawayh,104 and the Hadhf min nasab Quraish of Mu‘arrīj ibn ‘Amr al-Sadūsī, copy from the hand of Abū Ịṣḥāq Ibrahīm ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Najīrami (d. 355/966), grammarian and scholar-copyist who was patronized by Kāfar of Fāṭimid Egypt and who was a member of a family of three generations of scholar-booksellers.105 The second half of the fourth century yielded many more dated manuscripts. These include the Muhkhtasar (359/970)106 of Abū Muṣ‘ab al-Zuhrī, the Dīwān al-adab (363/974) of Ịṣḥāq ibn Ibrahīm al-Fārābī,107 the Hidāyah (364-66/974-76) of Ịsmā‘īl ibn ‘Abbād al-Ṣāḥib,108 the Sharḥ al-mu‘allāqāt (371/981) of Abū Ja‘far Abī Ahmad ibn Muhammad al-Nahhās,109 the Akhbār al-nahwiyyān al-Baṣrīyyān (376/987)110 of Sīrāfī written in beautiful calligraphic Kufic and Kufic-maskhūḥ scripts by ‘Abī Ịbīn Shāhdān al-Rūzī, whose knowledge of Arabic left something to be desired, the Dīwān Abī al-'Aswad al-Du‘ālī (380/990) in cursive vocalized script,111 the Kunā wa al-asmā’ (381/991)112 of Daulābī, and the Dīwān al-Mutanabbi (398/1008).113

The ample manuscript evidence as to orthography and penmanship actually reflects the sustained concern of the intelligentsia in maintaining high standards for both. The biographical literature for the various professions, including the sciences, yields numerous references to scholars who themselves produced or searched for and acquired manuscripts known for their accuracy, legibility, and beauty of scripts. The libraries of the rich and powerful, especially those of caliphs and wazirs, frequently became the depositories of the choicest of such manuscripts, through commission and purchase or through confiscation and bequests.114 The rank and file of students, young scholars, and laymen had to be content with the indifferent commercial products of the average copyists or booksellers, for whose services and stock of books there was ever increasing demand. Famed scholar-bibliophile-booksellers such as Nadīm, Yāqūt, and Qiftī reveal in their works115 a keen awareness of the quality of the manuscripts they acquired and described. Accuracy of text is their first concern, with stress now on legibility, now on beauty of scripts, or on the lack of either or both of these qualities as the case may be. They give special attention to manuscripts of lexical and grammatical works in these respects. Most of their descriptive terms are commonplace adjectives used alone or in various combinations.116 Among the most frequently used terms that stress primarily accuracy of text are مظبوط، صحيح صادق الزواج والنقل, those that stress legibility and quality of penmanship are خط مربع، خط صيد حسن، جميل ملهم، خط مرغوب به and عتيب، تعلق، رياضي، محقق، فائق، فائق. Frequently reference to a well known and easily recognized hand of a famous scholar, copyist, or calligrapher is simply خط معرفه; "his handwriting is known."

---

102 See ibid. Pl. 122.
103 See ibid. Pl. 121; Namadhij, Pl. 17.
104 See Namadhij, Pl. 64, and Mu‘arrīj ibn ‘Amr al-Sadūsī, Kitāb hadhf min nasab Quraish, ed. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Manajjīd (Cairo, 1990) Intro. pp. 10 f. For the Najīrami family see GAL S I 201 f.; Fihrist, p. 87; Irshad I 278 f.; Inbāh I 170 f.; p. 39 below.
105 See Namadhij, Pl. 18.
106 See Wright, Facsimiles, Pl. LX.
107 See Namadhij, Pl. 19.
108 See ibid. Pl. 21.
109 See Sirāfī, Intro. pp. 8 f. and 3 plates; Namadhij, Pl. 22. See also p. 15 below.
110 See Wright, Facsimiles, Pl. VII.
111 See Vajda, Album de paléographie arabe, Pl. 18.
112 See Wright, Facsimiles, Pl. XLVII.
113 Qiftī willed his magnificent library to his patron, the Ayyūbid ruler of Aleppo (Inbāh I, Intro. pp. 20 f.; Zubaidī, pp. 291 f.). See also p. 36 below.
114 See e.g. Fihrist, pp. 7, 40, 107; Irshad I 81 f., II 266 f., and V 236; Inbāh I, Intro. pp. 13 and 20 and text, pp. 7–9.
115 We are not concerned here with the profusion of literary expressions on the functions and power of the pen as against those of the sword, which start with Surah 90:4 and continue throughout Islamic literature.
Nadim, in a significant passage, reports having seen a large manuscript collection with autographs and written on leather, parchment, papyrus, and paper by scholars of the first and second centuries, beginning with Abū al-'Aswād al-Du‘ālī and including such Qur‘ānic scholars and grammarians as Yahyā ibn Ya‘mar, Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alā‘, Sibawaih, Kisa‘ī, Abū ‘Amr al-Shaibānī, Yahyā ibn Ziyād al-Farrā‘, Aṣma‘ī and Ibn al-A‘rābī (d. 231/846).¹¹⁷

However, in this as in a supplementary passage that concentrates on the manuscripts of Bedouin authors,¹¹⁸ Nadim does not characterize the penmanship of individual Umayyad scholars, apart from that of the Qur‘ānic calligrapher Khālid ibn Abī al-Ḥajjāj, whom Walīd I employed to copy Qur‘āns, poetry, and akhkhār.¹¹⁹ ‘Abd al-Malik’s state secretary Rauḥ ibn Zinbā‘ is referred to as ‘Irāqī in his penmanship and Fārisī in his style,¹²⁰ which would indicate an angular Kūfic or Kūfic-naskhī script. Attention has been drawn (p. 5) to the fine and accurate hand of the scholarly Sālim ibn ‘Abd Allāh, secretary to Hishām. Specific details in references to the manuscripts and penmanship of ‘Abbasid scholars are more readily available. Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alā‘ pointed out to Akhīfash al-Akbar how easy it was to confuse carelessly formed ṭa‘ and waw and hence misread a verse.¹²¹ Khalīl, we are told, took pains with his manuscripts and disapproved of small light scripts (khaṭṭ raqīq),¹²² usually associated with the love-sick because they too are emaciated¹²³ but used also by traveling scholars in the interest of light weight and paper economy.¹²⁴ The eloquent Bedouin scholar Abū Shībāl al-‘Uqaill, patronized by Harūn al-Rashīd and the Barmakids and teacher of Ibn al-A‘rābī, wrote an ancient hand (khaṭṭ ‘alīq).¹²⁵ We know that Ibn al-A‘rābī used the fathah in his manuscripts (see p. 9).

Descriptive references to the manuscripts and penmanship of third-century copyists, booksellers, and scholars are generally made on the basis of third-century manuscripts actually seen by Nadim, Yaqūt, or Qiṭṭī. The bookshop of Ibn Waddā‘ al-Azdī of Baghdād was a rendezvous of scholars where many of their discussions and debates took place in the fourth decade of the third century. There was keen competition for Ibn Waddā‘’s hand copies, which soon became and for centuries remained highly prized collectors’ items. Qiṭṭī, writing in 630/1232-33, reported that he examined critically several of Ibn Waddā‘’s copies, including a section of the Diwān al-A‘shā and a copy of Abū ‘Ubaid’s Amthāl, and found them to be the most carefully executed.¹²⁶ So far, I have found no references to Ibn al-Sikẖīt’s penmanship, a fine old ‘Irāqī, that is, Kūfic, hand, to judge by an excellent specimen from a copy of the Ta‘rikh al-mulāk al-‘Arab that is dated 243/857.¹²⁷ Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Tamīmī, known as

---

¹¹⁷ See Fihrist, p. 40; Ibnābī I 7-9 reproduces the passage. See also Ars Islamica VIII 76 f., where I have dealt at length with the basically significant implication of this passage, namely the availability in the 3rd century and after of autograph manuscripts of 1st- and 2nd-century authors. I have since drawn attention to a considerable number of instances from the second half of the 1st century onward of an author’s or a collector’s manuscripts passing on to some member of his family, usually a son or a nephew and occasionally even a daughter, or to one or more of his leading pupils and transmitters (see e.g. our Vols. I 18 f. and 23-28, II 28 f., 37 f., 54 f., 156 f., 172 f., 175-78, 218, 227, 230 f.). Still other references to the survival of the manuscripts of several leading Umayyad poets and scholars will be noted in the present study. The number of specific references to the fate of 2nd- and 3rd-century manuscripts grew as competition for them increased among scholars, booksellers, and rulers. Rulers used their wealth and power, as seen above, to acquire especially desirable books or collections for their personal or state libraries. Bequests (wasiyyah, tirhah) of works or libraries became increasingly common in the 3rd century. The numerous benefits of such bequests for all concerned were listed and extolled at some length by the tireless author and bibliophile Jāḥiṣī in his Hayawān I 100 f.

¹¹⁸ See Fihrist, p. 47.

¹¹⁹ Ibid. pp. 9, 40; OIP L 54; Abbott in Ars Islamica VIII 76.


¹²¹ Muzhir II 300 f., 363.


¹²³ Sīli, Adab al-kuttāb, pp. 59 f.; Mubādarāt I 60.

¹²⁴ See Vol. II 89.

¹²⁵ Fihrist, p. 46; Muzhir II 304.

¹²⁶ Ibnābī I 53 and II 134: اقتبسَ مِنْهُ فِرَاءَهُ مِنْ الأَنتِفَاقِ وَالْتَحْقِيقِ مَا لَا شَاءَهُ فِي غَرْبِهِ (see also Fihrist, p. 80).

¹²⁷ See Vajda, Album de paléographie arabe, Pl. 3, and Namāḏaḏīj, Pl. 12. Note the free use of diseryial points and the absence of vowels.
Hazanbal, a transmitter from Ibn al-Sikkît, receives high praise for his penmanship. The autograph copy of the Kitâb al-qabâ'il of Muḥammad ibn Ḥabîb (d. 245/860) that was written on Khurasanian ṭâlîḥ paper for the famous library of the wazir Fâṣîb ibn Khâqân was seen by Nadîm, who was impressed with its accuracy. Manuscripts from the prolific hand of Muḥammad ibn Ḥabîb's pupil Sukkârî (212–75/827–88) were desired for their accuracy. Ibrâhîm ibn Muḥammad ibn Sa'dân ibn al-Mubârak, a third-generation scholar and bibliophile, was known for his accurate penmanship and faithful transmission. Zajjâj sought to ingratiate himself with his patron the wazir Qâsim ibn `Abd Allân and with the caliph Mu’tadid (279–89/892–902) by completing and recasting the Jâmi’ al-manṭaqq of Abû Ja’far al-`Askarî. He had Aḥmad ibn Ibrâhîm al-Tîrmîdî, one-time teacher of Zajjâj’s former Kûfî teacher Tha’lîb and a penman in much demand, make but a single copy of the revised and completed Jâmi’ on fine Khurasanian ṭâlîḥ paper for the caliph’s library. Several of the pupils and associates of Tha’lîb were also both scholars and booksellers known for their good penmanship. Among them were Abû Ḥasan al-Tîrmîdî, Abû Mûsâ al-Hâmidî, and Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allân al-Kirmanî al-Warraq, whose copy of Ibn Qutaibah’s Ma‘ârif was acquired by Qifṭî, who describes the manuscript and its scholar-copist in superlative terms. Of Tha’lîb’s younger associates, the wealthy ‘Ali ibn Muḥammad al-Asîlî, better known as Ibn al-Kûfî (254–344/868–956), author and bibliophile, won high praise for his autographed manuscripts, which were seen and used by Nadîm, Yâqût, and Qifṭî. Mubarrad, who wrote a good hand, considered himself a warraq and had several close associates who were scholar-booksellers. Mubarrad and Tha’lîb as famed and rival leaders of the Baṣrân and Kûfân schools of grammar had in common several common enterprise pupils who were known for their knowledge of grammar and good penmanship. Among these pupils were Tha’lîb’s son-in-law Abû ‘Ali al-Dinawârî (295–320/908–32) whose father, Walîd ibn Muhammad al-Tâmîmî al-Masâdirî, better known as Wallad (d. 263/877), was the first to establish in Egypt a family of grammarians and scholar-booksellers. Abû al-‘Alâ’ al-Makki (d. 317/929) made copies of the works of Zubair ibn Bakkâr al-Zubairi (d. 256/870), one of which was seen by Qifṭî, who praised it highly. ‘Abd Allân ibn Muḥammad, grammarian and tutor in the household of Muṣṭâdîr’s (295–320/908–32) wazir ‘Ali ibn ‘Isâ, was known for his good hand. The excellent penmanship of the


130 Tha’lîb’s younger associates, the wealthy ‘Ali ibn Muḥammad al-Asîlî, better known as Ibn al-Kûfî (254–344/868–956), author and bibliophile, won high praise for his autographed manuscripts, which were seen and used by Nadîm, Yâqût, and Qifṭî. Mubarrad, who wrote a good hand, considered himself a warraq and had several close associates who were scholar-booksellers. Mubarrad and Tha’lîb as famed and rival leaders of the Baṣrân and Kûfân schools of grammar had in common several common enterprise pupils who were known for their knowledge of grammar and good penmanship. Among these pupils were Tha’lîb’s son-in-law Abû ‘Ali al-Dinawârî (295–320/908–32) whose father, Walîd ibn Muhammad al-Tâmîmî al-Masâdirî, better known as Wallad (d. 263/877), was the first to establish in Egypt a family of grammarians and scholar-booksellers. Abû al-‘Alâ’ al-Makki (d. 317/929) made copies of the works of Zubair ibn Bakkâr al-Zubairi (d. 256/870), one of which was seen by Qifṭî, who praised it highly. ‘Abd Allân ibn Muḥammad, grammarian and tutor in the household of Muṣṭâdîr’s (295–320/908–32) wazir ‘Ali ibn ‘Isâ, was known for his good hand. The excellent penmanship of the
wazir Ibn Muqlah (272–328/886–940) was too well known to be always described, though Nadim makes frequent references to manuscripts from his hand.\(^{141}\) Yağút comments also on the good penmanship of Ibn Muqlah’s father and brother.\(^{142}\) We read that Abū al-Paraj al-‘Il̄fahānī (284–356/897–967) frequented the flourishing book market (stīg al-warraṣīn) and bought good original sources, including manuscripts autographed by authors or copyists, which he used in his compositions,\(^ {143}\) a statement that is amply substantiated by the terms Abū al-Paraj uses in his “documentation” in the Aghānī.\(^{144}\) Abū al-Paraj’s rough copy of the Aghānī was written on the backs of discarded sheets or fragments (zuhār) in the ta’līq script,\(^ {145}\) a comparatively small and quite cursive script much used for memoranda, marginal notations, and rough copies. His contemporary Abū ‘Alī al-Qālī (288–356/901–67) wrote his rough copy of the Bārī’ on the backs of discarded sheets,\(^ {146}\) probably also in the ta’līq script or in a related comparatively small cursive hand. Abū ‘Alī al-Qālī’s attachment to the autograph copy of the Jamharah of Ibn Duraid, which necessity forced him to sell, so touched the heart of the buyer that he returned the book with a gift of money.\(^ {147}\) Sirāfī was an ascetic who provided for his personal needs by copying ten pages daily in a fine hand.\(^ {148}\) Several members of his family were scholar-bookdealers\(^ {149}\) who probably employed copyists. Sirāfī himself used some of his pupils as copyists for his works,\(^ {150}\) and reference has been made above (p. 12) to ‘Alī ibn Shādhān al-Rāzī’s calligraphic copy of the Akbkār al-naḥwīyyān al-Baṣrīyyān; ‘Alī ibn Muhammad, better known as Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī, who was a greatly appreciative pupil of Sirāfī,\(^ {151}\) wrote a treatise on penmanship (Risālah fī ‘ilm al-kitābah) which is cited above (see p. 5, n. 26). Sirāfī’s

---

141 Fihrist, pp. 42, 55, 69, 74, 80, et passim.
142 Irshād III 160 f.
143 Fihrist, p. 115. The phrase al-Kitāb al-mansūba, which was regularized by Ibn Muqlah, but hardly so in the present context and in the light of Abū al-Paraj’s source terminology, which reveals his great reliance on manuscript sources.
144 A quick spot-check of Aghānī XI to XXI showed that Abū al-Paraj’s most frequently used term is “I copied,” which occurs 60 times, while “I found” occurs 10 times, and “he mentioned” only 4 times. These terms, in the order of their frequency, are used in the formulas are used in the formulas of discarded sheets or manuscripts for their notes and the rough copies of their works, as we know the Kūfī judge Shawk ibn ‘Abd Allah (95–177/714–793) and Shafī’ī to have done in their youth (for Shafī’ī see Khatib IX 280; for Sharīk see Nabia Abbott, Two Queens of Baghdad: Mother and Wife of Hadrūn al-Bashid [Chicago, 1946] pp. 56–58, and Irshād VI 369). Sometimes a scholar would hastily or pointedly jot down his answer to a note or a letter at the foot or on the back of a page, as we know Hammad ibn Bustān al-Arīfīn [Cairo, 1348/1929] pp. 32 f., and IR 384–86 respectively). Such practices came to be frowned upon in cultured circles as small economies that exposed writer and reader to trouble or embarrassment and, above all, “encouraged the destruction of older manuscripts, which is madness” (Sulayma, Adab al-kutabah, I 59; cf. IR 384–88 respectively). Such practices came to be frowned upon in cultured circles as small economies that exposed writer and reader to trouble or embarrassment and, above all, “encouraged the destruction of older manuscripts, which is madness” (Sulayma, Adab al-kutabah, I 59; cf. IR 384–88 respectively).
145 In its second sense the term zuhār al-dafūtūr refers to the writing of pithy remarks, bits of wisdom, epigrams, or appropriate quotations in prose or verse such as are placed on the cover or on the flyleaf or at section headings of a book. For we read that Abū Zaid al-Ansārī, after listening to a certain well read and cultured man whose memory was stocked with choice reports and who quoted nothing but the best, exclaimed: “It is, by Allah, as though all his knowledge is on the backs of books.” On this remark the narrator comments: “He means that nothing but the best is written on the backs of manuscripts” (al-zuhār al-dafūtūr; see Khatib al-Baghdādī, Taqīq al-ilm, ed. Yuâsif al-‘Ashāsh [Damascus, 1938/1949] p. 141). So impressed was Qifti with this type of literary product that he made an anthology of it which he titled Inbah (see IR 1, Intro. p. 23, No. 26, and text pp. 53 f., see also Khatib, Taqīq al-ilm, p. 134, and Irshād III 151).
contemporary the secretary, grammarian, and literary critic Āmidī of Mwāţānah fame used a fine ancient script.\textsuperscript{155} ‘Alī ibn Naṣr al-Barniqī, active in Egypt in 384/994, copied many books that became collector’s items, among them a copy of the Jamhārah of Ibn Durād.\textsuperscript{154} Jurjānī (d. 392/1002), judge, poet, essayist, literary critic, and author of the Wasṣūḥa, was described as combining the poetic talent of Buḥtūrī with the prose style of Jāḥiṣ and the penmanship of Ibn Muqlāh.\textsuperscript{157} Ibn Jinnī, author of the well known Khaṣṣah, was not only himself a good penman but supervised the penmanship of his three sons\textsuperscript{158} and counted among his pupils the artist and “matchless” calligrapher Ibn al-Bawwāb (d. 423/1032).\textsuperscript{159} Abu Naṣr al-Jawhari (d. ca. 398/1007), author of the Sihdi, was teacher, scholar, and calligrapher who taught penmanship and himself used the proportioned scripts in the style of Ibn Muqlāh.\textsuperscript{160} His pupil the bookseller Ibrāhīm ibn Sāliḥ, who completed and made the final copy of the Sihdi after Abu Naṣr al-Jawhari’s death, was also known for his scholarship and good penmanship though he was not of the caliber of the master in either field.\textsuperscript{161}

In contrast to the numerous references to scholars, copyists, and booksellers who wrote fair, good, or excellent hands, references to poor penmen in the literary fields seem to be quite rare.\textsuperscript{162} I have so far found but six such references, and three of these were made with some qualifications. The hand of ‘Alī Ḥulwām (d. 333/944), pupil and transmitter of Sukkārī (see p. 14), is described as extremely poor yet schooled.\textsuperscript{163} The hand of Ibn Akin Āl-Shafī, a bookseller patronized by Ibn ‘Abdus al-Jahshiyārī (d. 331/942), is described as not good-looking but appreciated by scholars for its accuracy.\textsuperscript{164} Ibn al-Marāgī (d. 371/981), realizing that he lacked artistry in his script, wrote verses on the back of his commentary on the Jumāl of Zajjājī apologizing for his poor though accurate hand.\textsuperscript{165} Sūlī mentions three secretaries who wrote poor or extremely bad hands but observes elsewhere that ambiguity or uncertainty occurs even in fine and good penmanship “and as for deplorable penmanship, its case is difficult (and even) impossible,”\textsuperscript{166} an observation that can readily be confirmed by papyrologists and editors of ancient manuscripts, especially such manuscripts as are written in a bare consonantal script.
ORTHOGRAPHY AND SCRIPTS

It is clear from the foregoing representative list that the qualities desired in secular manuscript copies were faithful transmission, grammatical accuracy, and good penmanship. In order to meet the first two requirements an author's private copyist and the commercial copyist who functioned also as a bookseller had to have command of the language and be familiar with, if not indeed well versed in, the discipline he served. Good penmanship for all general purposes of the literary fields involved careful execution of each consonant, adequate but not excessive orthography, uniformity in the style of scripts and in any use of colors, and abbreviations to indicate source and correctness. Furthermore, the good secretary and penman in the literary fields as a rule had to avoid the extremes represented by the hasty careless work of inferior commercial copyists and the marked artistry of the professional calligraphers who utilized their skills to adorn Qur'ānic manuscripts, special state documents, and royal diplomatic correspondence.

167 See e.g. Nuwairi IX 214–17.
168 Sull, Adab al-kutub, p. 50; Nuwairi VII 18.
170 Sull, Adab al-kutub, pp. 50, 57.
TWO GRAMMATICAL DOCUMENTS

Our two grammar fragments, without ḫnādā’ or names of scholars, give no clue as to their dates or authors, and the literary sources have not provided a close enough parallel to the text of either document to permit positive identification. The approximate dating of both documents is, therefore, based partly on their scripts and partly on the progress of grammatical studies in Egypt and North Africa in the second-third/eight-ninth centuries. The script of Document 1 has affinities with north Arabic types in which the open ‘āin appears as late as the eight/fourteenth century.1 The more cursive script of Document 2, with its comparatively liberal use of diacritical points and vowels, is in keeping with the scripts of late third-century literary papyri, such as that of the second part of the Jāmi‘ of Ibn Wahb,2 which is about as different from the script of the first part as the script of Document 2 is different from that of Document 1.

Different as the scripts of these two documents are, in their careful execution both reflect the increasing emphasis that scholars of the second and third centuries, particularly grammarians and philologists, placed on good penmanship. They appreciated accuracy and legibility from their colleagues and, as a rule, demanded it from their pupils, copyists, and booksellers.

1 See Vajda, Album de paleographie arabe, Pl. 53 (dated 770/1368).
DOCUMENT 1

Oriental Institute No. 17619. Late third/early tenth century.

Fine papyrus, broken at top, 12 × 17 cm. (Pl. 1). The text is written on the verso of a late third/late ninth-century legal document of which only the names of some witnesses remain.

Script.—The closely written somewhat angular book hand yields to a smaller and very cursive one for the familiar formulas of line 3 but to a less cursive hand for line 14, which ends the section. Characteristic letter forms are the final kaf and the open medial 'ain, though the latter is not consistently used. Medial sad is sometimes indicated by a small sad below it. The pen was lifted, so that generally the vertical strokes were written downward. Diacritical points and vowels are sparsely used. A semicircle is used for the hamzah. The vowels and other orthographic signs are not always carefully placed in relation to the letters to which they belong. Scribal errors are canceled with neat lines as in lines 7, 9, 11, and 12.

TEXT

1 traces only

| مبَنَّ الا وَفْغَةَ عَلَى مَا عَلَمَتْ |  
| وأَحْمَدَ الَّهِ كَمْ تَبِعَ الَّلَّهُ الْرَّحْنَمَ |  
| وَقَدْ بَكَّنَ الْجَرِّ مَانَعًا لِلْفِعْلِ كَفْرَلِكَ أَعْجِبًا أَكْلُكُ |  
| رَفْغَةً وَأَعْجِبًا اِشْبَاعِكَ رَفْغَةً وَذَا قَلْتَ أَكَلَكَ رَفْغَاً |  
| كَانَتْ الْكَافِ فِي مَوْضُعِ الْفَاعِلِ فَنُعَّمَها الْإِضَافَةُ |  
| الْجَرِّ فَقَعَ الْفِعْلَ إِلَى الْقَوْفَ عَلَى هَذَا قَلْتَ |  
| اِشْبَاعِكَ رَفْغَةً كَانَتْ الْكَافِ فِي مَوْضُعِ الْفَاعِلِ |  
| الْمَلِسُوبُ فَنُعَّمَها الْإِضَافَةُ مِنَ النَّصِبِ وَذَاكِلُ |  
| لَانَ الْعَامِلَ قَدْ يَعْمِلُ فِي الْعَامِلِ وَلَوْ لَا ذَلِكَ أَبْنِي الْجَرُّ |  
| أَقِمَ مِنَ الْفِعْلِ وَالْنَّصِبِ الْآَثَرُ الْأَكْرُ تَقُولُ رَأْسُ |  
| زَيْدًا ضَارِبًا أَمْرًا فَنُنْصِبُ ضَارِبًا لَّوْقَعَ فَلْؤَلْكُ بِهِ وَقِيَ |  
| ضِمْرِي فَقَعَ وَقَعَ بَعْدَ وَقَلَمَ يَبْنِهِ الْعَامِلَ أَنْ كَانَ عَامِلٌ أَنْ يَعْمِلُ |  
| فَيَهُ عَامِلُ فَأْفَهُمُ الْحُكْمَ أَنْ شَأَّ الَّهُ |  

Comments.—The vowels and other orthographic signs are not so liberally used nor so carefully formed or placed as one might expect in a text of this nature. The writer or copyist was concerned mainly with desinental syntax, as against حركة بناء حركة إعراب الآخرين. He relied less on vowel signs than on sentences to explain the grammatical analysis and to clarify the governance of the declinable noun as used in verbal sentences with more than one object. The technical terminology is mainly that of the Basran school of grammar, as shown by the consistent use of the caravan term favored by most Kufans, to indicate the genitive case. On the other hand, line 12 has the phrase لَوْقَعَ فَلْؤَلْكُ بِهِ، which reflects the Kufan term لَوْقَعَ فَلْؤَلْكُ بِهِ، as against the Basran term التَّحْمُّلُ المَعْلُومٌ، to indicate the transitive verb.

Lines 1–2. These lines end a section that dealt with the indeclinable noun. The traces at the end of line 1
could be 2, indeclinable, was written with a final alif which was corrected to ya\textsuperscript{a}. Didactic expressions such as "as I have informed you" of line 2 and "understand that (well), Allāh willing," of line 14 were carried over from oral instruction into teachers' written works. A wide variety of such expressions appears, with varying degrees of frequency, in for example the Kitāb of Sibawaih, the Majālīs of Tha‘lab, and the Khaṣṣā’iṣ of Ibn Jinni, who uses  

Line 3. The use of pious formulas at the beginning or end of a section, though they are not always given a separate line, seems to have been a common practice from the start. They are freely used in the works mentioned in the preceding comment.

Lines 4-10. Simple illustrative sentences beginning with such verbs as  or and followed by a noun or a pronominal phrase in the nominative case, for example  or  , are commonly used in most grammatical works. Complex sentences beginning with these verbs where a relative clause or a subordinate sentence is called for, as in our text, are also readily used. The initial  frequently alternates with by way of clarification as to the virtual meaning of the sentence (ma’na taqdiri). Commentators on earlier grammatical works dwell at length on such sentences. They dwell on the possible changes in the word order and the introduction of various particles that in turn affect the end-voweling which may or may not change the initial meaning of the sentence (see e.g. Sibawaih I 79-81; Jumal, pp. 25, 37 f., 45, 133, 135 f.; Ibn Fāris, Sāhibī, p. 118; Khaṣṣā’iṣ I 279-84, for an instructive chapter on  in the sources; Abū Ḥayyān, pp. 137, 304-24; Ibn Ya’ish, Sharḥ mufaqāṣal al-Zamakhshārī, ed. G. Jahn [Leipzig, 1882-86] I 817 f. and II 1192-94; Wright Grammar II 47 f., 59, 252, 286).

Lines 10-11. The relative strength of the three cases is indicated in the declension of the noun, where the genitive of some of the triptote or first declension takes the accusative ending, and even more so in the diptote or second declension, which is characterized by this regulation. The greater ease in pronouncing the fāṭrah resulted in its wider general use than either the ḍammah or the kasrah, alone or in succession (see e.g. Khaṣṣā’iṣ I 69-73; Asrār, p. 99).

Lines 11-14. This illustrative sentence, used in part to elucidate the syntax of the preceding one, stresses the fact that the direct object of the initial verb,  or  , is itself the subject of the following gerundial or verbal-noun action, which in turn takes a direct object. The sentence itself is used by practically all of the grammarians, some of whom point out that since all three nouns are in the accusative this word order is essential to the preservation of the subject-object relationship of the nouns “Zaid” and “Amr.” The of our text alternates with in the sources (see Wright, Grammar II 24 and 307, on this use of the indicative and jussive moods).

Line 14. See comment on lines 1-2.
PERF 735. Late third/early tenth century.

Papyrus fragment, 12 × 16 cm. (Pl. 2). A rough estimate of the original width of the page is about 22 cm. (see comment on recto 8).

Script.—Readily legible naskhi book hand. Many of the vertical strokes start with a hooked head, and some have a slight wave. The lower end of a few of the alif’s turns slightly to the left or to the right. Most of the ligatured vertical strokes were written downward, showing that the pen was lifted frequently. Diacritical points are more liberally used here than in Document 1. Except in نَمَّ of verso 2, vowels are used only in connection with desinental syntax, as in Document 1. The hamzah is not indicated. The circle is used for sectional punctuation.

TEXT

Recto

[هذا باب ما ۰ عمل ما الخجازية بعف ونصب و:] نذل [١٠۲] إذا بدأت بالاسم]


[في الخير إلا يبطل عملاً نحو] و و و زيد: [٦۵۶] قاب: [٦۵۶] لا ينتمي]

[إذا أدخلت حرف] بالحروف: [١٠۲] لئ لا النك ما مازد [٦۵۶] بالنصب]

[نجر] منطقة بالباء: و و و فعت على كل حال نحو قيل ما خارج

[عبد الله وما قاوم زيد] ولا جالس علم وكل هذا هنف إذا

[قدمت الخبر: ۰]

[هذا باب التنزع في العمل] تقول ضربت وضريب: زيد إذا اخبرت

[الْمُحْضَر على الظاهر وقول ضربت: و و: ضريبة]

[و] إذا قدمت المضرم قلت ضربت وضريب: اخا] كلا الالفت

[في الخليفة ضربت وضريب: الزيدان وضر: بين وضربت]

Verso

[الزيدان وفي الجمع ضربت وضربت: ب: ضربت وضربت]

[اخوانك فهمه: ۰ هذا باب نعم و و: نعم هناك مها فلان ضعفان]

[والذك قيلك قب: ير: زيد ابغيًا على نعم [النصب وجب: لكل]]

[ور: ير: فا: والذك قيلك قب: ير: زيد: [وبن: العجم غلام]]

[ذاب وقول في النكرة نعم رجلًا زيد] [وبن: غلام غلام: فائفية]

[نعم] و و: و و: النك الذي ثقب عليه خبر Past خبر ليبدا محفوف]]


[وفق: الب: والاسم الذي ثقب عليه خبر Past خبر ليبدا محفوف]]

[في آخرة الناء ولن شُكْتُي فقول نعمت المرأة هده]


[وذلك قيل مد: (فاذا أنجبت) فails: قب: ير: زيد: نعم ال: و:]

21
Comments.—The text consists of concise statements of "rules" that govern three controversial grammatical themes: the negative particle لَا (recto 1-7), verbs indicating reciprocal action (recto 7-verso 2), and پُلُبُسُ and نَعْمَ as irregular verbs of praise and blame (verso 2-11). The reconstruction of the missing text is perforce conjectural to a certain degree. Nevertheless, it is based largely on clues and phrases found in comparable works dating from the late second/late eighth to the early fourth/early tenth century. The order in which the above-mentioned three themes are treated varies in the sources on hand. The sources most pertinent to the concise text of our papyrus are Sibawaih's كِتَابٍ and Zajjājī's جُمَالٍ and his ظُهُرٍ and to a lesser extent Zamakhshärī's مُفَاصَالٍ and Ibn al-Anbārī's أَسْرَار. Lively controversy among rival grammarians centered on numerous points, including those involved in the three themes of our text. The nature and method of such discussions are reflected in Tha'lab's مَجَالِس and Zajjājī's مَجَالِسَ الْعَلَامَةَ. A brief but studied presentation is to be found in Zajjājī's ظُهُر. Fuller treatment by Abū 'All al-Fārisī and by his pupil Ibn Jinnī is reflected in the latter's كَجَر. A more systematic and detailed account of the reasons underlying the various methods and points of view is provided by Ibn al-Anbārī in his all but exhaustive Insāf. Later grammarians, despite some voluminous works, tend to multiply the illustrative examples but lack system and clarity in the elucidation of the "تَلَال" and, all in all, add little that is basic to the three themes of our papyrus.

Recto 1–2. The heading لَا بَابٌ ما is in keeping with the wording of the heading in verso 2. The rest of the reconstruction is suggested by Zajjājī (Jumal, p. 119): لَا بَابٌ ما...اءِل اهل الحجاز. The space available in the papyrus does not allow for this comparatively lengthy statement. The reconstruction is therefore according to the sense (معنی) rather than the wording (لغظة) of Zajjājī’s text, for this particular sense is called for by the very fragmentary text of the papyrus.

Recto 2–3. The Hijāzians and the Basrans followed Qur'ānic usage in likening the particle لَا to the irregular weak verb لايسا as in the case governance indicated in recto 1–2. On the other hand, the Tamīmites, except those who were aware of the Qur'ānic usage of لَا, disputed its similarity to لايسا and insisted that it called for the nominative case for both subject and predicate, and their view was upheld by the Kūfans. The Basrans conceded the logic of the Tamīmite-Kūfan position but nevertheless held to the Qur'ānic usage when لَا was used alone. However, when لَا was combined with "تَلَال" the Hijāzians and the Basrans followed the Tamīmite-Kūfan usage. The reconstruction of our text is based on Jumal, p. 119, line 5 (see also e.g. Sibawaih I 21–23 and Asrār, p. 59).

Recto 3–5. Basran and Kūfan grammarians agreed on the use of the genitive in this construction but disagreed on the reason for its use.

Recto 5–7. Sibawaih in emphasizing the general use of the nominative in such verbal sentences justifies constructions of the type found in recto 1–2 as differentiating nominal from verbal sentences, again as in the case of لايسا (Sibawaih I 22 f.).

Recto 8. The line probably starts with a heading that begins with هذا باب ما as in verso 2. The heading used by Sibawaih for sentences indicating reciprocal action is very long and all but self-explanatory. That used by Zajjājī is not much shorter. A modern editor of Ibn al-Anbārī's Insāf, Muḥammad Muḥyī al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd, supplies the heading الكل الدولية في العمل والفعال في التنازع. Abū Ḥayyān Muḥammad ibn Yusuf al-Andalusi uses the heading التنازع في العمل, which in combination with هذا باب ما fits well in the space available for the reconstruction of the first part of recto 8 (see Sibawaih I 28; Jumal, p. 123; Insāf [1961] I 83; Abū Ḥayyān, p. 131).

Recto 8–verso 2. In this type of verbal sentence the Basrans and the Kūfans agreed that both verbs
should precede the noun but disagreed as to which of the two verbs governs the expressed noun. The Kufans argued in favor of the governance of the first verb since it starts the sentence and, with the exception of Kisa’i (d. 189/805), limited the first verb to the first person singular. Their reconstruction of the basic reciprocal verbal sentence is differs and added. The Basrans took a more inclusive view. They accepted the governance of the first verb but without limiting it to the first person singular. Furthermore, they definitely preferred the governance of the second verb, for they considered the noun originally governed by the first verb to have been suppressed. They therefore reconstructed the statement to yield in each case two verbal sentences, as for example and . The second point of controversy between the Basran and the Kufan grammarians centered around the agreement in person and number of the governing verb and the noun. Here again the Basrans allowed a more inclusive usage of the dual and plural forms of the verb than did the Kufans, whose more limited use of these forms was in keeping with their view that the initial verb of the sentence was the governing verb. Our text supplies clues sufficient to indicate that it represents the more inclusive Basran view on the two major points of difference stated above. The reconstruction is borrowed largely from Sibawaih and Zajjājī (Sibawaih I 28-31; Jumal, pp. 123-25; Insāf [1961] I 83; Abū Ḥayyān, pp. 131-33).

Verso 1. It is clear from the surviving text in verso 3-11 that the papyrus represents the Basran view that and are verbs and not the Kufan claim that they are nouns. Sibawaih, in his Kitāb, covers the subject in Chapter 145, which is more comprehensively titled . This is the earliest available Basran exposition of these two terms as weak verbs of praise and blame respectively. Some of his successors, whether of the Basran or the Kufan school of grammar, define these two terms in both the lexical and the grammatical sense while others are concerned only with the latter, as in our text. Zajjājī (d. 337/949) has the simple heading , which fits quite well in the space available in our text. Ibn al-Anbārī (d. 577/1181) uses which fits equally well in the available space. Zajjājī’s statement is used in the reconstruction because it is much closer in date to the probable date of our text (see Sibawaih I 256 f.; Jumal, p. 121; Insāf [1961] I 97; Asrar, p. 42).

Verso 3-6. The sources briefly point out that and as verbs that begin a sentence must take their subject, if defined (mu’arraf), in the nominative case and, if undefined (munakkar), in the accusative case. This statement is usually followed by another brief but not so obvious statement, namely that the second noun of the sentence is always placed in the nominative case for one of two reasons (or such variants as or , and ). The explanation of these two reasons or views is, as often as not, deferred until after the presentation of illustrative verbal sentences whose subject is either a single noun or two or more nouns in conjunction or two nouns in the construct state, that is, illustrative sentences similar to those in verso 3-6 (see Sibawaih I 258 f.; Jumal, p. 121; Khaṣṣā’ī I 395 f.; Asrar, p. 45; Ibn Ya’īsh, Sharh mufassal al-Zamakhsharī II 1034 f.; Abū Ḥayyān, pp. 396, 399).

Verso 6-8. These lines return to the two reasons mentioned in verso 3-4, either of which requires that the noun, “Zaid,” be put in the nominative case. The first reason is that which consists of the two verbal sentences which involves the predicate of the second sentence must be put in the nominative. The second reason for “Zaid” to be in the nominative is stated in the briefest possible terms, that is,
the full sense of which can be better grasped when it is followed by an explanatory statement such as

or, in the words of Zajjāji

and the words of Zajjāji (see Sibawayh I 259; *Jumal*, p. 121; *Aqrār*, p. 45; Ibn Ya‘ish, *Sharḥ mufassal al-Zamakhshari* II 1034 f.; ‘Abd Allāh ibn Yūsuf ibn Hishām, *Al-mughni al-labīb* [Cairo, 1299/1882] II 44).

For the full phrase, see comment on lines 1–2 of Document 1.

**Verso 8–11.** Note the careful pointing of in verso 9 to prevent misreading of the word with its three consecutive similarly formed letters. On the other hand, the careful pointing of in verso 10 reflects a preference for the use of ṣā‘īn instead of hamzah, a practice reported by Akhfash al-Awsat (d. 215/830 or 221/835) and by Abū ‘Alī al-Fārisī (d. 377/987) as being favored by some of the Arabs (Abū Ḥayyān, p. 388, details the progressive steps in the emergence of this form).

Though generally indeclinable, these verbs of praise and blame do occur in the third person masculine and feminine. Sibawayh draws attention to and accepts the wide use of the singular forms even when the subject is dual or plural. The reconstruction called for in verso 9 and 10 reflects the use of the feminine singular instead of for both a singular and a dual subject. Furthermore, the use of the masculine singular dominates even when the subject is feminine, but more so for the feminine plural than for the singular and the dual. The dominance of the masculine—not reflected in our text—is noted and explained with varying degrees of elaboration on the generally greater strength of the masculine forms of indeclinable verbs and of declinable verbs whose subject is collective or generic (see Sibawayh I 260; *Jumal*, pp. 121 f.; *Khaṣṣā‘ī* III 244; *Insāf*, pp. 104, 107, 111; Ibn Ya‘ish, *Sharḥ mufassal al-Zamakhshari* II 1028, 1035–37; Abū Ḥayyān, pp. 389 f., 400 f.; cf. Khalaf al-Aḥmar, *Muqaddimah fī al-naḥw*, ed. ‘Izz al-Dīn al-Tanūkhī [Damascus, 1381/1961] pp. 95–97; *Bab al-maḏkūr wa-l-mawṣūṭ*, and Wright, *Grammar* I 97 and II 290).

**Verso 11.** The text returns to the construction of nominal sentences referred to at the beginning of verso 8 (see comment on verso 6–8). The Başrāns permitted this construction, though they generally preferred verbal sentences.
THE EVOLUTION OF GRAMMAR

TEXTBOOKS

The texts of Documents 1 and 2 can be safely said to represent the views of the Basran grammarians on the subjects covered in these fragments. Furthermore, the almost too concise presentation of the points involved indicates that both documents represent brief introductory grammars. We shall follow the development of this type of grammar as one phase of the general progress and expansion of the linguistic and literary sciences to about the mid-fourth/mid-tenth century. 'Irāq’s leading role in this development is basic to our understanding of its progress in Egypt and farther west.

The supply of brief elementary grammars increased steadily to meet the demands of teachers (mu'allimun) in the mosque schools as well as those of private tutors (mu'addibun) and their charges at court and in the homes of the nobility and the wealthy. We know of several teachers and tutors who were active in the reigns of Mu‘awiyah and ‘Abd al-Malik and most of whom are said to have been older or younger students of Abū al-Aswad al-Du‘alī. But, as far as I have been able to discover, only the Basran Ibn Abi Ishaq and the Kufan Mu‘ādh al-Harrārī were credited with writing and dictating grammars in Umayyad times. Ibn Abī Ishaq’s family isnād traces back through his father and grandfather to ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. The family produced several more generations of scholars, among them a uterine nephew and pupil, Maslamah ibn ‘Abd Allāh, who in his old age was tutor to Prince Ja‘far, son of the caliph Ma‘ṣūr. Ibn Abi Ishaq himself was a pupil of Naṣr ibn ‘Āṣim al-Laithī and Yahyā ibn Ya‘mar. We find him together with his pupil and colleague ‘Īsā ibn ‘Unar al-Thaqafi (d. 149/766) attending the sessions of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (d. 110/728), and both wrote notes from Ḥasan’s dictation. Ibn Abī Ishaq’s own teaching circle in the mosque was situated next to that of Muḥammad ibn Sīrīn (d. 110/728), who disliked Ibn Abī Ishaq’s interpretation of poetry but was eventually reconciled to his orthodox use of poetry. As a grammarian and Qur’ānic-reader Ibn Abī Ishaq was credited with a basic role in the development of Arabic orthography (see pp. 5–7). As a teacher he dictated the Kitāb al-hamzah and was active in formal discussions with his contemporaries. He was frequently compared and contrasted with his former pupil who came to be considered as his rival, Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alā‘ (ca. 70–154/ca. 689–771), one of the famous seven Qur’ānic-readers and teacher of both Khalīl ibn Ahmad and Sibawayh. Eventually Khalīl’s estimate of their respective scholarly merits, namely that Ibn Abī Ishaq was the better grammarian and Abū ‘Amr the better philologist, came to be generally accepted. A second contrast drawn between these two Basrans was that Ibn Abī Ishaq was more given to analogy and accidence than was Abū ‘Amr and that the former was, indeed, the first to make a real breakthrough in grammatical theory. His enthusiastic pupil Yūnus ibn Ḥabīb (d. 182/798 at age close to 100) went as far as to declare that, for his

1 Thakhuprizādah, Kitāb miftah al-su‘ādah II 127; see also pp. 3–6 above. For Abū al-Aswad al-Du‘alī’s leading pupils as students of grammar see e.g. Irshād VII 200 f. and Isbāh II 381 f., III 337 f., 343 f.
3 Fihrist, p. 41; Sīrāfī, p. 80; Irshād VI 70.
4 E.g. Isbāh II 106.
day, Ibn Abī Ishaq and grammar were synonymous. Furthermore, these two scholars were different in temperament, tribal origin, and social standing. Ibn Abī Ishaq was more forthright, while Abū 'Amr was more politic, especially with those in authority. Ibn Abī Ishaq, a mawld, made sharp verbal thrusts at upper-class Arabs and drew in return from the sharper-tongued Farazdaq verses of seething satire. Abū 'Amr, on the other hand, gloried in his South Arab origin and the role of the South Arabs in the establishment of Islam. He drew largely on those of eloquent speech among the city Arabs and the Bedouins for his knowledge of Arabic, its dialects, and its poetry. Yet he, too, was at first satirized by Farazdaq, who on coming finally to realize his need for the niceties of grammar and philology made peace with Abū 'Amr, whom he then praised in eloquent verse (see p. 7). The families of each of these leading Basrans produced a number of scholars. Ibn Abī Ishaq’s descendants were Qur’ānic-readers well versed in grammar, especially his grandson Ya’qūb ibn Ishaq al-Hadrami (d. 205/820 at age 88), a grammarian who ranked eighth in the list of the ten most famous Qur’ānic-readers in Islam and who counted among his pupils Abū Ḥātim al-Sijistānī and Abū ‘Uthmān Bakr ibn Muḥammad al-Māzīnī. Three of Abū ‘Amr’s brothers seem to have been overshadowed by him, but two of his sons won recognition, Khalaf as a student of Bashshār ibn Burd and transmitter of his poetry and Muʿāwiyah as a poet. Even a daughter (not named) is mentioned as attending her father’s lectures along with Aṣmaʾī among others. Abū ‘Amr’s grandson Jahm ibn Khalaf (n.d.) was a versatile scholar who was compared for his knowledge of poetry and its obscurities to Khalaf al-Ahmar and Aṣmaʾī and who typified for the poet Ibn Munādhīr the entire family.

Even before the passing of the aged Abū ‘Amr, Khalaf ibn Ḥamad and his star pupil, Sibawayh, had become dominating figures in the fields of philology and grammar in Basra, while in Kūfah Kīṣāʾī had joined forces with Muʿādh al-Harrāʾ and Ruʿāsī. It is at this time that the sources first mention the composition of a brief general grammar called the Faṣāl (or Fāṣāl) fi al-naḥw, which according to some was “composed by the Kūfānīs” and according to others was the work of Ruʿāsī, the then leading Kūfān grammarian and teacher of both Kīṣāʾī and Yahyā ibn Ziyāḍ al-Farra. If we are to consider the Faṣāl a joint Kūfān venture, then Muʿādh, Ruʿāsī’s uncle and teacher, must have had a hand in it (see p. 6). The work itself was written no later than the second decade of ‘Abbasid rule, since according to Kīṣāʾī’s own statement he was already studying the book in the lifetime of the Qur’ānic-reader Ḥamzah
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10 Majālis al-ulamāʾ, pp. 13 f.
11 E.g. Sirāfi, p. 27; Marāṭib, pp. 12 f.; Zubaidi, p. 27.
12 Majālis al-ulamāʾ, p. 233.
14 Fihrist, pp. 30, 36; Majajlis al-ulamāʾ, pp. 63 f., 106; Marāṭib, pp. 12, 27, 77 f.; Zubaidi, pp. 51, 102; Khatib VII 436 f.; Irshad VII 302; Ibn al-Jazari II 386–89.
15 See Majālis Thaḥlab I 138; Zubaidi, p. 31; Fihrist, p. 423.
16 Aghānī III 44 (= Aghānī [1827—] III 189 f.).
18 E.g. Fihrist, p. 47.
19 E.g. Majālis al-ulamāʾ, pp. 266, 269.
20 Nuzhah, p. 32; Irshad VI 480; Bughyah, p. 35; Muzhir II 400.
al-Zayyāt (d. 156/773). Kisāʿī found the work unsatisfactory and sought answers to some of his questions from Khalīl and among the Bedouins, and later he himself wrote a Mukhāṣṣar fi al-nahw. There is, furthermore, the often repeated statement of Ruʿāsī that Khalīl borrowed his book the Fāṣal from him and made use of it and passed some of the borrowed materials to his pupil Sibawaih, who in his Kūtāb cites Ruʿāsī simply as “the Kūfan.”

During the period of the Basrans Khalīl and Sibawaih and the Kūfans Ruʿāsī and Kisāʿī, the production of books in the fields of Arabic language and literature kept pace with that of books on Qurʿānic studies, Tradition and history and accelerated rapidly for some two centuries, as the long lists of such works credited to grammarians, philologists, lexicographers, poets, and literary critics readily attest. Many of the leading grammarians of Baṣrah, Kūfah, and Baghdād wrote several grammatical works ranging from elementary textbooks to lengthy, sophisticated volumes covering the history and theories of language. Many of the leading grammarians began their professional careers as teachers or private tutors, and a comparative few of these rose to the enviable position of royal tutor. More of their fellow “graduates” hired out as copyists or copied and marketed their own works, while still others as copyist-booksellers started family businesses which grew and prospered for several generations. Most of them, in whichever capacity, seem to have been motivated by the specific needs of their charges or by the lure of personal recognition and prestige or by the rewards of a lucrative market or by a combination of these motives. For here, again, we find no parallel to the initially heated controversies over the writing-down of hadīth and the “sale of religious knowledge” (baʾīʿ al-ʿilm) either through fees for instruction or sale of Qurʿānic and hadīth manuscripts. Even the initial opposition to the transmitting and writing of wounding satirical poetry was soon disregarded as the ancient satires were more than matched in the noqāʾid of Jarīr and Farazdaq (see pp. 132 ff.). The formal study of grammar and language, having been associated from the start with the correct reading and interpretation of the Qurʿān, acquired a religious overtone among pious Companions and Successors who taught these subjects without fees as personal contributions to the cause. But, when ʿAbd al-Malik made Arabic the official language of the state and Walīd I put Qurʿānic-readers on the public payroll, command of the language became a sine qua non in both the religious and the secular fields, especially for the increasing number of largely Persian converts who sought professional careers in religious or administrative positions. Thereafter any scruples about charging modest fees for language instruction and copying of manuscripts and the sale of language books was limited to a few who for reasons of personal piety or temperament neglected the economic rewards of their profession. Two outstanding instances of such an individualistic outlook that readily come to mind are provided by Abū Ṭālib ibn al-ʿAlāʾ and Khalīl. Abū Ṭālib, who equated knowledge of Arabic with knowledge of the faith, wrote down everything and counseled others to do so but burned his large and valuable library in his old age. The gifted and dedicated Khalīl was so engrossed in his original studies that he preferred poverty to lucrative patronage though his students and colleagues were exploiting his

---

22 Majālis al-ʿulamāʾ, p. 266.
23 Majālis al-ʿulamāʾ, pp. 266, 171; Khatīb XI 404; Inbāḥ II 258.
24 Majālis al-ʿulamāʾ, p. 269; Fihrist, p. 65; Nuzhah, p. 42; Inbāḥ II 271. See Tāshkupīzādah, Kūtāb muṭāḥ al-maʿād I 121, for Kisāʿī’s verses on the necessity of knowing grammar.
25 Fihrist, pp. 64 f.; Irshād VI 480; Nuzhah, p. 33; Mushir II 400.
27 Irshād I 8. Muʿālāt, pp. 95 f., for early representative views on the benefits of knowing grammar.
28 See e.g. Marāṭīb, p. 15; Majālis al-ʿulamāʾ, p. 115; Mushir II 304. Cf. Ahmad Fāṭīmī, ʿArār al-Maʿmūn (Cairo, 1346/1927) III 114.
30 E.g. Sirāṭ, pp. 38 f.; Inbāḥ I 344.
contributions for their own profit. On the other hand, when Sibawaih's foremost pupil, Akhfash al-Awsat, known as "the path to the Kitab," set out to defend Sibawaih's reputation after the deplorable treatment the latter had received at the hands of the Kufan grammarians led by Kisā'ī in the famous but still controversial affair of the zunbūryah, Akhfash was won over by Kisā'ī, who paid him a handsome fee for reading Sibawaih's Kitab with him and employed him as tutor to his sons. Furthermore, with an eye to personal prestige and profit Akhfash stopped short of complete clarity in his grammatical works so that he would be sought out for personal instruction. The more dedicated and pious Abū 'Amr Šāliḥ ibn Išḥāq al-Jarmī (d. 225/840) and Abū 'Uthmān Bakr ibn Muḥammad al-Māzinī (d. 249/863), fearing lest Akhfash's "monopoly" on the transmission of Sibawaih's Kitab might tempt him to claim it as his own work, persuaded him, for a fee (amount not stated), to read it with them, and they then made it readily available to the public. Both scholars were much occupied with the study of the Kitāb, Abū 'Amr with the identification of its more than a thousand verses of poetry, while Abū 'Uthmān declared that he who would write a large grammar after Sibawaih should be ashamed of himself. Both scholars were sought after as transmitters of the Kitāb, as teachers, and as authors of brief grammars among other works, and both attained first rank as leaders of the Báṣran school and received the accompanying material rewards though no amount of money could induce Abū 'Uthmān to read the Kitāb with a Jew because it contained over three hundred citations from the Qur'ān.

Linguistic studies progressed rapidly from the time of the Umayyads and the first handbooks of orthography and accidence to the basic contributions of the Báṣrans Ibn Abī Išḥāq and Abū 'Amr ibn Yunus ibn Habīb (d. 182/798), who greatly appreciated Ibn Abī Ishaq's intellectual gifts and in particular his contribution to the science of grammar, registers the rapid progress since Ibn Abī Išḥāq's day as follows: "If any one today knew no more than he did, he would be a laughingstock" (Srāfī, p. 26; see also pp. 25 f. above).

---

31 E.g. Nuẓūḥ, p. 29; Irshād IV 182.
32 Fīḥrist, p. 52; Srāfī, p. 30; Nuẓūḥ, p. 84. See also Mardīb, p. 69.
33 Majālis al-'ilmām, No. 4, pp. 8–10. See Zūbādī, pp. 68–73, for several accounts of this episode, especially pp. 71–73 for Akhfash's own account, which is repeated in part in Irshād II 36 f.; see also Irshād II 349 and 358 f. and Inṣuf, No. 99, pp. 292–95 (= Inṣuf [1961] I 702–6). The long-standing controversy is centered on a difference of opinion between the Báṣrans and the Kufans as to the correct case called for in a certain sentence construction involving compound pronouns. The several accounts, differing considerably as to what actually took place when the question was debated by Sibawaih and Kisā'ī and as to the other persons involved, including in particular the role played by the Bedouins, gave rise to a secondary controversy that has engaged Arabists for a century. Kisā'ī's or his partisans' conspiracy with the Bedouins is accepted by such scholars as Johann Füück, August Fischer, and Régis Blachère, minimized or denied by others such as John A. Haywood and Joshua Blau, while the entire episode is considered a legend by Sidney Glazer. See e.g. Gustav Fliigel, Die grammatischen Schulen der Araber (Leipzig, 1862) pp. 45–51; Inṣuf (1918) Intro. pp. 79 f.; Abū Ḥāfūṣ (1947) p. xliii; Füück, Arabische Untersuchungen zur arabischen Sprach- und Stilgeschichte (Sächsische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Phil.-hist. Klasse, “Abhandlungen” XLV I [Berlin, 1950]) p. 30 and references there cited; Blachère, Histoire de la littérature arabe des origines à la fin du XVe siècle de J.-C. I (Paris, 1952) 90 f., 127; Haywood, Arabic Lexicography (1960) p. 17 and references there cited; Blau, "The role of the Bedouins as arbiters in linguistic questions and the mas'a al azžunbariya," Journal of Semitic Studies VIII (1963) 42–51.

While I am not convinced of Kisā'ī's personal participation in a conspiracy to blacken the name of Sibawaih, yet I am inclined not to minimize the influence of the eloquent Bedouins (fīḥrist al-a'rābī) who were sought out by such pioneer scholars as Abū 'Amr ibn al-'Aṣīr, Abū 'Amr ibn al-'Āla', and Abū 'Amr al-Shabābī, described as belonging to the group of scholars who, like leading and aspiring poets of their day, awaited an audience with early 'Abbasid wazirs or caliphs, or of others who were enticed into the provincial courts, especially that of Abū Alī ibn Tahir, governor of Khurāsān, or of still others who were sought out by such major lexicographers as Ibn Durāz and Abū Naṣr al-Jawhari.

The stated amount of the fee, or gift as it is also referred to, varies from 50 dinars (e.g. Mardīb, p. 74; Srāfī, p. 51; Irshād II 40) to 70 dinars (e.g. Zūbādī, p. 74; Irshād II 37, 350).

31 E.g. Zūbādī, p. 74; Irshād II 36. Akhfash's younger Kufan contemporary Ibn al-'A'rābī, described as a distinguished teacher received 1,000 dirhems a month (Irshād VII 7).
31 Fāhīs, fāhīs fī ṣaḥābātān 1 9 f.; Srāfī, pp. 50 f.; Irshād II 40 f.; Nuẓūḥ, p. 84.
31 E.g. Zūbādī, p. 77.
31 E.g. Srāfī, p. 50; Irshād II 388; Bughyah, p. 203.
31 See e.g. Mardīb, p. 84; Srāfī, pp. 71, 95.
31 E.g. Irshād II 82, Mardīb, p. 79; Srāfī, p. 76; Zūbādī, p. 59; Fīḥrist, p. 57.
31 E.g. Ibn Khallikān I 115 (= trans. I 265); Bughyah, p. 205. See our Vol. II 9–10 for early aversion to teaching or learning from Christians and Jews. See Nuẓūḥ, p. 21, and Bughyah, p. 406, for an earlier converted Jew who was a good grammarian.
31 Yūnus ibn Ḥabīb (d. 182/798), who greatly appreciated Ibn Abī Išḥāq's intellectual gifts and in particular his contribution to the science of grammar, registers the rapid progress since Ibn Abī Išḥāq's day as follows: "If any one today knew no more than he did, he would be a laughingstock" (Srāfī, p. 26; see also pp. 25 f. above).
al-‘Alā’, which led to the magnificent contributions of Khalil and his intellectual heirs and particularly Sibawaih in his Kitāb.\footnote{Khalil’s major contribution to Sibawaih’s Kitāb was not lost on their contemporaries and immediate successors and subsequent grammarians and their biographers nor were the lesser contributions of some “forty” others; see Fihrist, p. 51 (repeated in Inbāh II 347).} The same period saw an increasing number of books on specific topics relating to language and grammar and an increasingly lengthy and sophisticated approach to the theories and principles of language and grammar—an approach concerned primarily with fiqh al-nahw, usūl al-nahw, and ‘ilāl al-nahw to the neglect of the needs of beginners and literate laymen. This situation was fully grasped by Khalaf al-‘Almar (d. ca. 180/796), who set out to help remedy it, as he tells us in the brief preface to his Muqaddimah fi al-nahw, which can be summed up as follows: “When I saw that all the grammarians and Arabic experts have resorted to lengthy volumes and much theory and analysis, forgetting in the meantime the needs of beginners and laymen for lighter materials, easy to memorize, absorb, and understand, I gave thought to writing a brief book . . . that would enable the beginner to dispense with such lengthy works. So I composed these pages . . . so that whoever reads, memorizes, and studies the text will know the basis of all the grammar he needs for correct speech and writing or for reciting poetry or for composing a formal speech or epistle.”\footnote{Khalaf al-‘Almar, Muqaddimah fi al-nahw, ed. ‘Irz al-Dim al-Tanukhf, pp. 33 f.}

Khalaf al-‘Almar’s Muqaddimah fi al-nahw and Kisa’i’s Mukhtasar fi al-nahw may have met the needs of their own generation but hardly those of the next century, during which the science of grammar continued to progress and the differences between the Basran and Kufan schools became more marked as literacy and culture reached new peaks. Many leading grammarians of the Basran, the Kufan, and the so-called Baghdad mixed school produced elementary or intermediate textbooks, which must have varied considerably in extent and quality. The key word in the titles of most such text books is muḥtasār or muqaddimah, while muḍḥkal, muqarrib, and mūjaz are infrequent alternatives. These key words in contrast to others such as kāmil, jāmi’, usūl, or ‘ilal, all frequently appearing in long lists of titles of the works of many leading grammarians, indicate the level and the nature of each work. The following list though not exhaustive gives an adequate picture of the continued production of comparatively brief introductory and secondary grammars, most of them authored by leading grammarians, from late in the second to about the end of the fourth century of Islam.

Yahyā ibn al-Mubārak al-Yāzīdī (ca. 126–202/744–817) was the first of a family of four generations of scholars, poets, royal tutors, and courtiers. He, as the Basran tutor of Prince Ma’mūn, found himself in competition for Hārūn al-Rashīd’s favor with Prince Amīn’s Kufan tutor Kisa’i\footnote{See e.g. Abbott, Two Queens of Baghdad, pp. 174–79 and 182–84 and references cited.} and like him wrote a Mukhtasar fi al-nahw.\footnote{E.g. Fihrist, pp. 50 f.; Inbāh VII 240; Inbāh III 240; Nuzhāh, p. 50.} Hishām ibn Mu’āwiyah al-‘Āṣīrī (d. 209/824), a pupil of Kisa’ī and a Kufan tutor, also wrote a work with this title,\footnote{E.g. Fihrist, p. 70; Inbāh VII 254.} while the more famous Akhfash al-Awsat (d. 215/830 or 221/835) also wrote a work with this title,\footnote{E.g. Fihrist, p. 53; Inbāh IV 244; Inbāh II 42. The title is not a play on “the Awsat” attached to his name since he was known as “the Asghar” in his own lifetime to distinguish him from Sibawaih’s teacher Akhfash al-Akbar (see Muṣḥir II 433 f. and 456 and Bughyah, p. 436; cf. Inbāh II 36).} in addition to producing his own Mukhtasar nahw al-muta’llimin, while the more famous Akhfash al-Awsat (d. 215/830 or 221/835) also wrote a work with this title,\footnote{E.g. Fihrist, p. 53; Inbāh IV 244; Inbāh II 42. The title is not a play on “the Awsat” attached to his name since he was known as “the Asghar” in his own lifetime to distinguish him from Sibawaih’s teacher Akhfash al-Akbar (see Muṣḥir II 433 f. and 456 and Bughyah, p. 436; cf. Inbāh II 36).}
which was well received\(^4^9\) and, despite its title, considerably advanced since it called for several commentaries (\textit{shurūḥ}) in succeeding generations.\(^5^0\)

Two sons of Yaḥyā ibn al-Mubārak al-Yazīdī, Muḥammad (d. 214/829) and ‘Abd Allāh (n.d.), followed in his footsteps as courtiers and tutors, and each wrote a \textit{Mukhtasar fī al-nahw},\(^6^1\) as did Yaḥyā’s grandson ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad (n.d.),\(^6^2\) pupil of Yaḥyā ibn Ziyād al-Farrā, and his great-grandson Muḥammad ibn al-‘Abbās (d. 310/922), tutor to the sons of the caliph Muqtaṣīd.\(^6^3\) Among their contemporaries who wrote a \textit{Mukhtasar fī al-nahw} were the schoolteacher and bibliophile Muḥammad ibn Sa‘dān ibn al-Mubārak (161–231/777–845) and his son Ibrāhīm\(^6^4\) as well as the then ranking Baṣrī grammarian Abū ’Uṭmān al-Māzīnī.\(^6^5\) Abū Ḥātim al-Sijjīstānī (d. 255/869), a bibliophile and possibly a bookseller,\(^6^6\) inferior as a grammarian to Abū ‘Amr al-Jarmānī and Abū ’Uṭmān al-Māzīnī\(^6^7\) and a severe critic of the Kuṭfī grammarians,\(^6^8\) was ordered by Ya’qūb al-Ṣaffār to write and forward to him a \textit{Mukhtasar fī al-nahw}.\(^6^9\) Ibn Qādīm (d. after 253/867), pupil of Yaḥyā ibn Ziyād al-Farrā and Abū ‘Amr al-Jarmānī, teacher of Tha‘lab, and tutor of Prince Muṭazz, whom he feared as caliph because he had disciplined him, also wrote a \textit{Mukhtasar fī al-nahw}.\(^7^0\) Ibn Qutaibah (d. 276/889) and his son Abū Jaʿfar Abū Ḥamīd,\(^7^1\) with an eye to the advancement of the science which he titled \textit{Al-Muṣaffaqī mukhtasar fī al-nahw}.\(^7^2\)

The next generation of grammarians, most of them pupils and avowed partisans of either Mubarrad or Tha‘lab and some of them pupils of both, produced brief grammars along with more sizable linguistic and literary works. Among them were Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Kāsān (d. 299/912),\(^7^3\) Abū ‘Aḥf al-Dīnawrī (d. 289/901), \&c., \(311/923\), who was leader of the Baṣrans after Mubarrad,\(^7^4\) and the ranking scholar after him, Abū Ḥamīd ibn al-‘Abbas (d. 310/922), tutor to the sons of the caliph MuQTIF. Tha‘lab and some of them pupils of both, produced brief grammars along with more sizable linguistic and literary works. Among their contemporaries who wrote a \textit{Mukhtasar fī al-nahw} were the schoolteacher and bibliophile Muḥammad ibn Sa‘dān ibn al-Mubārak (161–231/777–845) and his son Ibrāhīm\(^6^4\) as well as the then ranking Baṣrī grammarian Abū ’Uṭmān al-Māzīnī\(^6^5\) and a severe critic of the Kuṭfī grammarians,\(^6^8\) was ordered by Ya’qūb al-Ṣaffār to write and forward to him a \textit{Mukhtasar fī al-nahw}.\(^6^9\) Ibn Qādīm (d. after 253/867), pupil of Yaḥyā ibn Ziyād al-Farrā and Abū ‘Amr al-Jarmānī, teacher of Tha‘lab, and tutor of Prince Muṭazz, whom he feared as caliph because he had disciplined him, also wrote a \textit{Mukhtasar fī al-nahw}.\(^7^0\) Ibn Qutaibah (d. 276/889) and his son Abū Jaʿfar Abū Ḥamīd,\(^7^1\) with an eye to the advancement of the science which he titled \textit{Al-Muṣaffaqī mukhtasar fī al-nahw}.\(^7^2\)

The uncertainty stems from the unpointed \(\textit{ṣ} \) which is rendered \(\textit{ṣ} \) or \(\textit{ṣ} \) in some sources and \(\textit{ṣ} \) or \(\textit{ṣ} \) in others (see e.g. \textit{Fihrīst}, p. 58; \textit{Ṣafrī}, p. 94; \textit{Inbāb} II 59; \textit{Bughyah}, p. 265).

\(^{50}\) E.g. \textit{Fihrīst}, p. 56 f.; \textit{Zubaidī}, p. 77; \textit{Irshād} II 82 and IV 268; \textit{Inbāb} II 81; \textit{Nuzakah}, p. 90.
\(^{51}\) E.g. \textit{Nuzakah}, p. 200; \textit{Inbāb} III 165; Ḥājīj Khalīfah V 78, 450. See pp. 153–58 below for \textit{tafsīr} and \textit{sharḥ} literature.
\(^{52}\) E.g. \textit{Irshād} II 151 and III 240.
\(^{53}\) E.g. \textit{ibid.} II 134.
\(^{54}\) E.g. \textit{ibid.} III 199.
\(^{55}\) \textit{Fihrīst}, pp. 70, 79; \textit{Irshād} I 280 and VII 12; \textit{Inbāb} I 185. For Ibrāhīm see also p. 14 above.
\(^{56}\) \textit{Irshād} VII 19, line 18: شَرْح مَعْصَرُ المَلِّي‏
\(^{57}\) The uncertainty stems from the unpointed \(\textit{ṣ} \) which is rendered \(\textit{ṣ} \) or \(\textit{ṣ} \) in some sources and \(\textit{ṣ} \) or \(\textit{ṣ} \) in others (see e.g. \textit{Fihrīst}, p. 58; \textit{Ṣafrī}, p. 94; \textit{Inbāb} II 59; \textit{Bughyah}, p. 265).
\(^{58}\) E.g. \textit{Nuzakah}, p. 116; \textit{Inbāb} II 59.
\(^{59}\) See e.g. \textit{Marītīb}, p. 24, 26 f., 74 f.
\(^{60}\) \textit{Zubaidī}, p. 100.
\(^{61}\) E.g. \textit{Fihrīst}, p. 68; \textit{Irshād} VII 16; \textit{Bughyah}, p. 59.
\(^{62}\) E.g. \textit{Fihrīst}, pp. 77 f.; \textit{Inbāb} II 146; \textit{Bughyah}, p. 291.
\(^{63}\) E.g. \textit{Fihrīst}, p. 50; \textit{Irshād} VII 144; \textit{Inbāb} III 232; Ḥājīj Khalīfah V 88. For the unusual and eventually mutually profitable financial arrangement between Mubarrad and Zajjāj see e.g. \textit{Khaṭīb} VI 90 and \textit{Inbāb} I 159–62 and III 249 f.
\(^{64}\) E.g. \textit{Fihrīst}, p. 74; \textit{Inbāb} I 150; \textit{Khaṭīb} V 210.
\(^{65}\) \textit{Fihrīst}, p. 81; \textit{Irshād} VI 281; \textit{Inbāb} III 59.
\(^{66}\) E.g. \textit{Irshād} I 382 f.
\(^{67}\) \textit{Fihrīst}, p. 79; \textit{Khaṭīb} IX 61; \textit{Irshād} IV 254; \textit{Irshād} II 22; \textit{Bughyah}, p. 263.
\(^{68}\) \textit{Fihrīst}, p. 61; \textit{Inbāb} I 165; Ibn Khalīfah I 13 f. (= trans. I 28 f.); Ḥājīj Khalīfah V 450.
\(^{69}\) \textit{Fihrīst}, p. 62; \textit{Zubaidī}, p. 122; \textit{Irshād} III 145, 149.
\(^{70}\) \textit{Fihrīst}, p. 83; \textit{Nuzakah}, pp. 150 f.; \textit{Irshād} I 411; \textit{Bughyah}, pp. 130 f.
THE EVOLUTION OF GRAMMAR

whose manuscript copies Qifti praised so highly,\textsuperscript{70} and Muhammad ibn ‘Uthmân al-Ja’û (d. ca. 320/932),\textsuperscript{71} an associate of Muhammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Kaisān. Among Zajjāj’s leading pupils who, like him, wrote a \textit{Mukhtasar fi al-naḥw} may be mentioned Muhammad ibn ‘Alī al-Marāghī al-Warrāq (n.d.),\textsuperscript{72} the Persian Abū ‘Alī Lughdah (n.d.),\textsuperscript{73} and the Egyptian Abū Ja’far Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Naḥḥās (d. 337/949).\textsuperscript{74} Abū al-’Abbās Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad, better known as Ibn Wallād (d. 332/943), was also a pupil of Zajjāj, who considered him superior to Abū Ja’far al-Naḥḥās.\textsuperscript{75} Either Ibn Wallād or a contemporary Egyptian grammarian also named Abū al-’Abbās Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad (al-Muhallabī) or both men wrote a \textit{Mukhtasar fi al-naḥw}.\textsuperscript{76} Ibn Wallād, third-generation member of a family of grammarians and booksellers, in all probability wrote a short grammar in competition with Abū Ja’far al-Naḥḥās, his foremost rival in Egypt.\textsuperscript{77}

The more basic and well received of the textbooks listed above no doubt represented progress in grammatical science. Those of Mubarrad and Zajjāj, like those of the earlier Abū ‘Amr al-Jarmī and Abū ‘Uthmān al-Māzīnī, later called for commentaries.\textsuperscript{78} The steady production of elementary and secondary grammars continued to engage leading scholars such as Sirāfī (d. 368/979), who, unlike the mercenary Akhfāsh al-Awsāt, made his works so simple and clear that they needed no commentary from him or others.\textsuperscript{79} Ibn Fāris (d. 395/1004 or 1005)\textsuperscript{80} and Abū Naṣr al-Jawhari (d. ca. 398/1007) are each credited with an introductory or brief grammar.\textsuperscript{81}

THE PROGRESS OF LINGUISTIC STUDIES IN EGYPT

The foregoing list of textbooks brings us to the latest probable limit of the age of papyrus in Egypt, its homeland, where it continued to be used after the imported and superior Khurasanian and Chinese papers began to be supplemented by the local paper products of ‘Irāq toward the end of the second/eighth century.

We now turn our attention to progress in the study of Arabic philology and grammar in Egypt itself. ‘Irāq’s and particularly Baṣrāh’s priority and sustained leadership in both fields is enthusiastically upheld by Abū al-Ṭayyib al-Lughawi in contrast to the poor picture he gives for the Hijāz. Yet, it is he who reports the authoritative role of the Meccan ‘Ikrimah ibn Khālid al-Makhzūmī (d. 115/733), to whom Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alā’, the then leading Basran philologist, from time to time wrote inquiring about \textit{ḥuruf al-Qur’ān}.\textsuperscript{82} Furthermore, Abū ‘Amr believed that ignorance of Arabic philology went hand in hand with heresy.\textsuperscript{83} In Medina, as in Basrāh, traditionist-jurists were aware of the significance of grammar for their professions. The encyclopedic Sha’bī encouraged grammatical transmission of \textit{ḥadīth}.\textsuperscript{84} The Medinan Zuhrī, committed to the writing-down of \textit{ḥadīth}, is credited with saying that “the people have not initiated

\textsuperscript{70} E.g. \textit{Fihrist}, p. 78; \textit{Bughyah}, p. 60. See also p. 14 above, with references cited in n. 135.
\textsuperscript{71} Khaṭīb III 47; \textit{Nuzhah}, p. 185; \textit{Irshād} VII 46; \textit{Inbāh} I 269.
\textsuperscript{72} \textit{Fihrist}, p. 86; \textit{Irshād} VII 47; \textit{Inbāh} III 196.
\textsuperscript{73} \textit{Irshād} III 83; \textit{Inbāh} III 43; \textit{Bughyah}, pp. 222 f.
\textsuperscript{74} \textit{Inbāh} I 101; Ibn Khallikān I 35 (= trans. 1 81).
\textsuperscript{75} Zubaidī, p. 238; \textit{Inbāh} I 998.
\textsuperscript{76} \textit{Fihrist}, p. 84; \textit{Irshād} II 38 f.; \textit{Bughyah}, pp. 169 f.
\textsuperscript{77} Zubaidī, pp. 238 f.; \textit{Inbāh} I 99-101; \textit{Bughyah}, p. 169. See also p. 37 below.
\textsuperscript{78} See e.g. \textit{Inbāh} III 165; \textit{Bughyah}, p. 344; Hājī Khalīfah V 78, 88, 450 f.
\textsuperscript{79} E.g. \textit{Irshād} III 86: ٍ؟بَلْ وَلَعَلَّ ذَٰلِكَ لَا يَعْبُدُ اللَّهَ أَيُّهَا الْمَلَأُ بِاللَّهِ يَا تَفْسِيرِ.\textsuperscript{80} E.g. \textit{ibid.} II 7; Hājī Khalīfah V 70.
\textsuperscript{81} E.g. \textit{Irshād} II 268.
\textsuperscript{82} \textit{Mirditī}, p. 15.
\textsuperscript{83} \textit{Nuzhah}, p. 16: (cf. \textit{ibid.} p. 77; see also p. 27, n. 27 above).
\textsuperscript{84} \textit{Irshād} I 29.
a manly practice more pleasing to me than learning grammar and eloquent speech.” Shāフィ’s earlier studies were in philology, poetry, and eloquence of style, all of which he later used in the Hijaz as well as in ‘Iraq and Egypt in his career as traditionist-jurist (see pp. 33–35). Mecca in the second half of the second century was still the prime convention center during pilgrimages for exchange of political intelligence and literary knowledge, and Medina with its Nāф ibn Abī Nu‘aim and Mālik ibn Anas had great drawing power for Qur’ānic-readers, traditionists, and jurists. But with the passing of such leaders and the emigration of other outstanding scholars, including ShāFil, to ‘Iraq and other provinces, the Hijaz lost what cultural leadership it had had. Aṣma’ī was disappointed with Mālik because of his neglect of grammar, for which Mālik offered the surprising excuse that Rabi‘ah al-Ra‘ī was even worse in that respect. Mālik’s attitude may have influenced some of his followers to some extent, just as Abū Ḥanīfah’s reputed neglect of hadith influenced some of his followers. Had these two scholars, with their basically different intellectual approaches and outlooks, been primarily grammarians, Abū Ḥanīfah would have been in the front ranks of the Baṣrī grammarians and Mālik a leader among the Kūfīs. But in Abū Ḥanīfah’s younger days the study of grammar was still in its infancy as a distinct discipline, and even in Mālik’s last decades the Baṣrī grammarians’ emphasis on analogy (qiṣṣa) had yet to be challenged from within and to play a significant role in the stabilizing of the rival Kūfī school with its emphasis on tradition and usage. Abū Ḥanīfah’s outstanding pupil Abū Yusuf al-Qaḍī was taught an embarrassing lesson on the value of grammar by Kīsā‘ī, while his distinguished fellow pupil and colleague Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Shaibānī patronized not only traditionists and jurists but also grammarians and poets, among whom he divided his inheritance equally, and Mālik’s young pupil ShāFil was already proficient in philology and poetry. The loss of its political power, the migration of its enterprising young scholars, and the great progress of linguistics in ‘Iraq combined finally to relegate the Hijaz to a minor role in the study of linguistic sciences. Abū al-Ṭayyib al-Lughawi (d. 351/962 or 963) stated emphatically that he knew of no Medinan master philologist. His view was tacitly endorsed by the cosmopolitan Spanish scholar Zubaidī (d. 379/989), who bypassed the Hijaz in his list of provinces. The originality and contribution of the ascetic Arab genius Khalīl ibn Ahmad and the receptivity and vast industry of his favorite and star pupil, the Persian Sibawaih, were quickly recognized throughout Islam and unanimously confirmed in Mecca itself. For ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad al-Tawwāzī (d. 230/845 or 238/852), pupil and close associate of Aṣma’ī and Abū ʿUbaidah, reported that at a general gathering in Mecca of literary scholars from all the provinces (probably during a pilgrimage) all agreed, despite provincial pride and rivalry, that Khalīl excelled all the Arabs in intelligence and that he was the key to the sciences and their skillful diversifier.

We have approached Egypt through the roundabout way of the Hijaz because of the especially close cultural relationship that existed between these two provinces in the first two centuries of Islam. We can safely assume that Egypt was represented at the above-mentioned Meccan gathering by scholars

---

86 See e.g. Adīb al-ShāFil‘ī, pp. 44, 58, 102–5, 128, 179.
89 As jurists the Mālikites were generally referred to as aḥl al-hadīth as against the Ḥanīfīs, who were known as aḥl al-ra‘î (see Vol. II 2, 12, 16, 19, 35, 62, 83, 113).
90 Majīla al-‘ulamā’, p. 121: فكان أبو يربس بدأ لا يدع آن ياق: 139. نظر أبويريبس بعد ذلك في النحو: 121. Aṣma’ī’s contemporary Sufyan ibn ‘Uyaynah had no use for analogy in any field since he considered it a device of the devil (see e.g. Tha‘alibī, Latī‘ī, p. 6, and cf. our Vol. II 35).
91 Dhahabī, Manāqib al-Imām Abī Ḥanīfah (Cairo, 1366/1947) p. 54.
93 Fihrist, pp. 57 f.; ShāFil‘ī, pp. 107 f.; Nuzhah, p. 71; Inbah II 126.
94 Marāṭīb, p. 29.
whose interest in philology and grammar as well as in belles-lettres was ancillary to their profession as Qur’anic-readers and to a lesser extent as traditionists and jurists (see pp. 6 f.), Egypt had a fairly good number of such scholars even though she had yet to produce a full-fledged professional philologist or grammarian. Zubaidi was the first to include Egyptians, none of whom were earlier than the third century, among the scholars in these two closely related sciences. Grateful as we are for his contributions, his generally brief entries leave much to be desired. Six of the thirteen Egyptians listed receive three lines at most, and dates are frequently lacking. Suyūtī’s coverage of Egyptian philologists and grammarians starts with Ibn Hishām, famed as editor of the Sirah of Ibn Ishaq and an expert also in the linguistic sciences. He had settled in Egypt, where Shāfī‘ī, whom he considered an authority on language, later joined him and the two exchanged many citations from the poetry of the Arabs. Both Zubaidi and Suyūtī are misleading since they give the impression that grammar and philology were all but totally neglected in Egypt until the third century. Actually second-century Egypt made considerable progress in the fields of Qur’ānic readings and law, both of which disciplines called for a workable knowledge of Tradition and the linguistic sciences. For Egyptian scholars kept in close touch with the cultural developments first in Mecca and Medina and later in ‘Iraq. Scanty as our sources are on these cultural contacts, they yield significant evidence of the influence of the Hijāz and ‘Iraq on second-century Egypt, particularly in the religious and related linguistic sciences. As a result of the Arab migration westward, which started with the conquest of Egypt, many of the Companions settled in Egypt and were followed by a greater number of the Successors. Among the latter was a group of ‘ulamā‘, many of whom were Medinans. We read for instance that ‘Umar II sent Nāfis ibn Hurmuz, client and pupil of Medina’s leading traditionist ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, to Egypt to instruct the people in the sunnah. Abd al-Rahmān ibn Hurmuz al-A’raj (d. 117/735), considered by some as the first to introduce formal study of language in Medina, settled in Egypt and died in Alexandria. The Egyptian ‘Amr ibn al-Ḥārith (94–148/712–65), client of the Ansār, pupil of Zuhri, and teacher of Mālik and Laith ibn Sa‘d, was appointed tutor in 133/750 in the household of Egypt’s governor Šāliḥ ibn ‘Ali, whom he accompanied to Syria in 137/755. ‘Amr was a versatile scholar who held public discourse on Qur’ānic readings, Tradition, and law as well as on philology and poetry. His Egyptian pupil Laith, though known primarily as a jurist, was as versatile. ‘Uthmān ibn Sa‘d, better known as Warsh (115–97/733–812), was of Coptic origin. He studied Qur’ānic readings with Nāfis ibn Abi Nu‘aim, achieved leadership in that field, and was an expert in Arabic.

In the meantime Shafi‘ī’s career and life had all but run their course in the Hijāz, the Yemen, and ‘Iraq before he settled in Egypt in 198 A.H. His early and intensive training was that of a well rounded gentleman, with emphasis on language and literature. Having spent many years (17 according to the record) in the desert with the Banū Hudhail, famed as the most eloquent of the Arabs, he returned to Mecca as an expert in poetry, history, and accounts of the battle days of the Arabs (ayyām al-‘Arab) among
his several other accomplishments. To these he now added the study of Tradition and law, beginning with the *Muwatta* of Mālik. In Mecca he studied Qur’ānic readings with the reader ʿAbd Allāh ibn Qusṭāṭīn (d. 170/786 or 190/806). ʿIsāʾī was said to have composed a grammar which he himself discarded after a visit to Baṣrah and which he replaced with a second work that was considered by the biographers as of no account. Since Shāfīʾi was himself a poet of sorts and a prose stylist, poetry and grammar were no mere tools for use in his other intellectual pursuits but subjects to be cultivated independently. When law eventually captured his imagination and occupied his great talents, he did not neglect the intellectual interests of his youth. Among his literary admirers were Ibn Ḥishām, ʿAbū ʿUbayd, and Aṣmaʾī. Aṣmaʾī sought him out in Mecca for his transmission of the poetry of the Banū Hudhayl and Shanfūrā. Mālik recognized his young follower’s intellectual gifts, and Ibn Ḥanbal bore witness to his clarity of thought and eloquent diction in addition to considering him a godsend for the preservation of the *sunnah*.

When Shāfīʾi settled in Egypt, it did not take the leading Egyptian scholars long to appreciate his worth. Aḥmad ibn ʿAbd ar-Rahmān al-Miṣrī (171–250/787–864), the leading Egyptian scholar of his day, had almost as many interests as did Shāfīʾi, with whom he associated. Yūnus ibn ʿAbd al-Aʿlā (170–264/786–877), who studied Qur’ānic readings with Warsh and ṣaḥīḥ with Shāfīʾi, felt that whenever Shāfīʾi discoursed on Arabic, poetry, or law it would be said that he was most learned in that subject. Sarj al-Fāl, known for his knowledge of language and poetry, had frequent sessions with Shāfīʾi, and other philologists attended his lectures just to enjoy his command of the language. Shāfīʾi’s sustained interest in these many fields was attested to by his foremost pupil, Rabīʿ ibn Sulaimān al-Murādī (d. 270/883 or 884), who describes the master’s teaching day from dawn to noon as consisting of four successive seminars, beginning with Qur’ānic science, followed by Tradition with commentary and a period for discussion and study, and ending with philology, prosody, grammar, and poetry. It is in the light of his great versatility that Shāfīʾi’s own terse expressions on the effects of the various disciplines on an individual’s standing and character yield their full significance. Ḥarmalah ibn Yahyā (166–243/783–857), Egyptian pupil and close associate of Shāfīʾi, reports him as saying: “Philologists are the jinns of mankind; they comprehend what others fail to perceive.”

---

105 Young Shāfīʾi’s first interest was in poetry: Ṭālal Muḥammad ibn ad-Diriy (d. 219/834) Ṣamāʿ (d. 219/834), and ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr al-Ḥamīdī (d. 219/834). See Mawardi, *Adab ahdunya wa al-din* (Cairo, 1343/1925) p. 23: *ṣamāʿ* (d. 219/834) Ṣamāʿ (d. 219/834), and ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr al-Ḥamīdī (d. 219/834). See Mawardi, *Adab ahdunya wa al-din* (Cairo, 1343/1925) p. 23: Ṭālal Muḥammad ibn ad-Diriy (d. 219/834), Ṣamāʿ (d. 219/834), and ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr al-Ḥamīdī (d. 219/834).

106 For Shāfīʾi’s subsequent studies in the religious sciences see *Irshād* VI 369 f.; see also our Vol. II 54–56 and 81.

107 For Shāfīʾi’s poetry, see *Irshād* VI 320 f.
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118 *Irshād* VI 380. For Yūnus ibn ʿAbd al-Aʿlā, see e.g. Jarīʾ IV 2, p. 243; Dhahabi II 98 f.; Ḥusn I 169.

119 Bughyāh, p. 252.

120 *Irshād* VI 380.

121 *Irshād* VI 380.

122 Ibid. VI 383.

123 See Māwardī, *Adab al-danūr wa al-dīn* (Cairo, 1345/1925) p. 23: Ṭālal Muḥammad ibn ad-Diriy (d. 219/834), Ṣamāʿ (d. 219/834), and ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr al-Ḥamīdī (d. 219/834). See Māwardī, *Adab al-danūr wa al-dīn* (Cairo, 1345/1925) p. 23: Ṭālal Muḥammad ibn ad-Diriy (d. 219/834), Ṣamāʿ (d. 219/834), and ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr al-Ḥamīdī (d. 219/834).

124 *Irshād* VI 380. For Shāfīʾi’s poetry, see e.g. Jarīʾ IV 2, p. 243; Dhahabi II 98 f.; Ḥusn I 169.

125 Bughyāh, p. 252.

126 *Irshād* VI 380.

127 Ibid. VI 383.

128 See Māwardī, *Adab al-danūr wa al-dīn* (Cairo, 1345/1925) p. 23: Ṭālal Muḥammad ibn ad-Diriy (d. 219/834), Ṣamāʿ (d. 219/834), and ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr al-Ḥamīdī (d. 219/834). See Māwardī, *Adab al-danūr wa al-dīn* (Cairo, 1345/1925) p. 23: Ṭālal Muḥammad ibn ad-Diriy (d. 219/834), Ṣamāʿ (d. 219/834), and ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr al-Ḥamīdī (d. 219/834).
Thus, in second-century Egypt intellectual interests were expanding, being stimulated first by learned visitors and settlers from the east who represented practically all of the Islamic and the linguistic and literary disciplines, as Suyūṭī and his predecessors recorded so diligently. The easterners were soon followed by eager and inquiring students and scholars from the western provinces of North Africa and especially from Umayyad Spain. North Africa had its Īyād, son or brother of Awānah ibn al-Ḥakam (d. 158/775), grammarian and teacher of the better known Abū al-Ṭalād al-Mahī (d. 253/867). Among the early Qur‘ānic-readers to visit Egypt was the Cordovan Ghāzi ibn Qais (d. 199/814), who was already a well known tutor when ‘Abd al-Raḥmān I (138–72/756–88) entered Cordova. Ghāzi’s journey eastward was made no later than 150/767 since he transmitted hadith from Ibn Juraij, who died in that year, and he also transmitted from Awwā’ī (d. 157/773). He studied Qur‘ānic readings with Nāfī’ ibn Abī Nu‘aim, the Muṣṭaṣṣa with Mālik himself, and language with Aṣma‘ī and men of like caliber.

A second Spanish scholar, Shamīr ibn Mundhir, poet, philosoper, and grammarian, journeyed (raḥal) to the east and settled in Egypt, where Ibn Wahb (d. 197/812) was among his pupils. A third Spaniard, Muhammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh, while on his journey to the east sought out the Egyptian Warsh for study of Qur‘ānic readings and returned to Spain to serve as tutor to the sons of Ḥakam I. Egypt’s role as a halfway center where scholars from the east and the west met for instruction and discourse is well illustrated in the case of Abū al-Ḥasan al-Aṣāz, a former pupil of Kīsā‘ī. Abū al-Ḥasan was sought out in 227/842 by a group of Spanish scholars who were instructed by him. He is one of only three entries in Zubaidī’s first group (tabaqqah) of Egyptian grammarians, the other two being Wallād (see below) and Māḥmūd ibn Ḥāṣān (d. 272/885 or 886). All that Zubaidī tells us about Māḥmūd is that he was the teacher of the son of Wallād. Qīṭfī adds that he was an early and leading grammarian who, like Wallād and others, followed the path of Kāhlīf, and Suyūṭī supplies his death date.

It is clear from the foregoing brief survey that Egypt was alert to the developments in the linguistic sciences in both the Hijāz and ‘Irāq, particularly in the religious branches of these disciplines, and that her own participation increased progressively before, during, and after Shāfi‘ī’s brief residence in that province until his death in 204/820.

Walīd ibn Muḥammad al-Tamīmī al-Masādri, better known as Wallād (d. 263/877), was Egypt’s first full-fledged professional philologist-grammarian. He was of Basran origin but grew up in Egypt and returned east as a youth in search of knowledge. He studied grammar in Medina with a former pupil of Khalīf, known only as Muhallabī, who was not skillful or thorough. Wallād then journeyed to Basrah to study with Khalīf himself, with whom he stayed for some time and from whom he “took much.” This could have been no later than 175/791, the latest accepted date for the death of Khalīf. If Wallād was about sixteen at the time, his birth date would fall about 159/776, which would make him over a hundred years old at his death and allow him some three-quarters of a century for industrious intellectual pursuits. The length of Wallād’s stay in ‘Irāq is not stated. We do know that, being of Basran origin,
he had family connections there. This fact, along with 'Iraq's political and cultural leadership at the time, the young man's own ambition, and his reputed accomplishment while he was in 'Iraq, would indicate that he spent several years in that province, as one of his young sons was to do several decades later (see below). Before returning to Egypt, Wallad revisited Medina and debated his former teacher, who had to concede his superiority.

Wallad's contribution to linguistic studies in Egypt encompasses three related categories. He imported books from 'Iraq, starting with books for his own personal study. He speeded up the dissemination of knowledge and the sale of books by establishing a family of three generations of scholar-booksellers (see below). He achieved personal leadership as a teacher-transmitter in philology and grammar, thus laying the foundation for Egyptian authorship of works in these fields. Nevertheless, despite the general acknowledgment of his enterprising role, the sources yield few details of his long career. We do not know what books he studied in 'Iraq and with whom he studied them, nor do we know what books he introduced into Egypt or which ones he himself transmitted. He is seldom referred to as a bookseller (Ảrrdɡ) though a son and a grandson are each referred to as the son of the bookseller.

Wallad had two sons, Ahmad and Muhammad. Little is known of Ahmad besides the fact that he was a grammarian of Baghdad who lived in Egypt and there transmitted material on the authority of Mubarrad. Muhammad (d. 298/910), on the other hand, was much better known despite a comparatively short life of fifty years as against his father's advanced age. He and at least one of his sons were known as scholar-booksellers (see p. 14). Muhammad in all probability started his education with his aged father. Be that as it may, we find him, while he was still a youth, studying with the Egyptian grammarians Maḥmūd ibn Ḥassān (d. 272/885 or 886) and with Abū 'Ali al-Dīnawārī (d. 289/901), who had settled in Egypt. Like his father before him and drawn by the same forces, Muhammad went east to 'Iraq to complete his education and stayed for eight years. He sought out both Mubarrad and Tha'lab, among others (not named), and in time became tutor to the sons of an influential land-tax collector in Baghdad. He was particularly anxious to make a copy of Sibawaih's Kitab from Mubarrad's personal copy, something which Mubarrad permitted no one to do. Story has it that Muhammad bribed Mubarrad's son to make the manuscript available to him in small sections at a time. When Mubarrad discovered this he took Muhammad to court and demanded his imprisonment, from which fate he was rescued by his government employer. Eventually Muhammad did get to read the Kitab back to Mubarrad, presumably for the latter's usual fee of 100 dinars. Muhammad's personal copy of the Kitab, written no doubt with his reputed accuracy and good penmanship (see p. 14), became a family heirloom and a collector's item that eventually graced the library of Ibn al-Furat, known also as Ibn Ḥinzābah (308–91/921–1001), the Ikhshidid wazir who paid handsomely for any manuscript he desired. We do not know the details of Muhammad's personal contacts with Tha'lab, whose views he probably acquired in part from Tha'lab's son-in-law Abū 'Ali al-Dīnawārī, who had settled in Egypt and who was Muḥammad's stepfather. Abū 'All also had a personal copy of Sibawaih's Kitab, which he had read first with Abū 'Uṭmān Bakr ibn Muḥammad

130 Zubaidī, p. 233, and Jāḥiṣḥ III 354: لَمْ يَكُن بعَصْر كِبْرٍ ثَيْن مِن كِتَاب النَّقْحِ وَاللَّغَةِ فَيَلِهِ عَلَى مَصْرُوْمِهِ كُتُبٍ كَتِبَ تَيْتَ؛ أَكَانُ حَوْيَاً (384–947/994–1001), the Ikhsāshid wazir who paid handsomely for any manuscript he desired.

131 Iṣbāḥ III 224 f. For Ibn Khallīkān I 131 (= trans. I 320) for Ibn Ḥinzābah's general interest in copies of manuscripts.
al-Mazini and again with Mubarrad. Both Abu ‘Ali and Muḥammad were recognized leaders in Egypt in the study of language and grammar according to the Basran school, but their reputation rested more on their study and teaching of the Kitāb and its dissemination through pupils’ copies and other book sales than on the single work by Muḥammad and the two by Abu ‘Ali which Zubaidi dismisses as either of no account or as lacking in originality.

A second basic work that we know Muḥammad took back with him to Egypt was a copy of the Kitāb al-‘ain, the work having been first brought from Khurāsān to Baṣra by a bookseller in 248/862. The immediate and heated controversy that followed, alike among the Kufans and the Baṣrans, led by the staunch Abu Ḥātim al-Sijistānī (d. 285/899), as to Khalīl’s authorship of the work, did not hinder its intensive study and quick distribution in ‘Iraq and the eastern provinces or its early transmission to Egypt, North Africa, and Spain. Muḥammad ibn Wallād transmitted the Kitāb al-‘ain on the authority of the poet and littératur ‘Ali ibn Mahdī al-Kisrāwī (d. 283/896 or 289/902), tutor in the household of the better known poet and scholar ‘Ali ibn Yahyā ibn al-Munajjim (d. 275/888), whose great and famous library was stocked with books on many subjects, including the natural and physical sciences. ‘Ali ibn Mahdī no doubt had ready access to ‘Ali ibn Yahyā’s rich and growing library, to which he may even have contributed a copy of the Kitāb al-‘ain, since he was a recognized authority on the work and it was he who later transmitted it to Ibn Durūstawaih (258–346/871–958).

Further stimulation from ‘Iraq was provided by ‘Ali ibn Sulaimān, better known as Akhfash al-Asgāhar (d. 315/927), who was in Egypt in the years 287–300/900–912, and by the controversial Mu’tazilite Abū al-ʿAbbās al-Nāshī, whose legal and linguistic theories forced him to flee from ‘Iraq to Egypt, where we find him in 280/893 and until his death in 293/906. Muḥammad ibn Wallād had two sons, Abū al-ʿAbbās ʿAḥmad, who was better known as Ibn Wallād (d. 352/943), and the younger Abū al-Qāsim ʿAbd Allāh (n.d.), both of whom transmitted Sibawaih’s Kitāb from their father. ʿAbd Allāh, considered the less able of the two brothers, is the last member of the family reported to have inherited his father’s autograph copy of this work, which was used by the visiting Spanish scholar Muḥammad ibn Yahyā al-Rabāḥī (d. 358/969), who furthermore transmitted from ʿAbd Allāh bits of the Wallād family history to his own pupil Zubaidī.

The family tradition of scholar-booksellers was carried on by Ibn Wallād, whom we have already met along with his fellow pupil and rival Abū Ja’far al-Naḥḥās and as the probable author of a brief grammar (see p. 31). The rivalry between these two scholars was accentuated partly by their different professional emphases and partly by their personalities. Though both were of the Baṣran school of grammar, Ibn Wallād was a stricter follower of Sibawaih, as the title of his Intisār Sibawaih ‘alā al-Mubarrad indicates, while Abū Ja’far al-Naḥḥās leaned toward the views of Mubarrad and Akhfash al-Asgāhar, with both of whom he had studied in ‘Iraq and again with Akhfash during the latter’s long stay in Egypt (287–300 A.H.). We have record of but one public confrontation between the two rivals, in the presence of an...
Egyptian ruler (not named), and Ibn Wallād was declared to be in the right, a decision that was upheld later by Zubaidi. The two rivals were both students and transmitters of poetry. Ibn Wallād is reported as saying that he transmitted the *diwan* of Ru'bah ibn al-'Ajjaj (d. 145/762) on the authority of his father on the authority of his grandfather, who stated that when he was still a schoolboy he heard the poet in person. If we take the statement literally, the grandfather would have to be Wallād, who grew up in Egypt and died there in 263/877, that is, some 118 years after the death of the poet. If the report is to be accepted, “grandfather” (*jadd*) would have to mean an “ancestor” who was contemporary with Ru'bah. Ibn Wallād's own compositions were comparatively few, but they and the man himself were well received. Abū Ja'far al-Nahḥās, on the other hand, was a more prolific author with some fifty titles to his credit, but his poor delivery, mean disposition, and miserly habits made him more acceptable in his works than in his person, though many sought him out for his store of knowledge. Among those who sought him out was the Cordovan chief justice and bibliophile Mundhir ibn Sa'id (265-355/878-966), whose personality was in marked contrast to that of Abū Ja'far since he is described as having good presence and delivery in addition to being an expert debater and a born poet. He did not hesitate to correct, in public, Abū Ja'far's dictation of the poetry of Qais ibn Mu'ādh and thus roused his displeasure, so that Abū Ja'far refused to permit him to use his copy of the *Kitab al-'ain* for collation with the copy which Mundhir had made in Qairawān. Mundhir was then directed to Ibn Wallād, whom he found to be both learned and agreeable and who made his copy of the *Kitab al-'ain* available to Mundhir. Abū Ja'far later relented and made his copy of the book also available to the visitor, who on his return to Spain to grace the court of 'Abd al-Rahman III (300-350/912-61) transmitted the *Kitab al-'ain* on the authority of Ibn Wallād only.

Among other contemporaries of Ibn Wallād and Abū Ja'far al-Nahḥās who either visited or settled in Egypt to teach or study should be mentioned Jāhiẓ' nephew Yamūt ibn al-Muzarra (d. 304/916 or 917), who made several visits to Egypt, the last being in 303 A.H. He was followed later by Ibn Qutaibah's son Abū Ja'far Ahmad, who was appointed deputy judge for Egypt in 321/933 and who died there the next year. Ibn Qutaibah's works had already made their way into Egypt and the west. Abū Ja'far Ahmad had inherited his father's numerous manuscripts, which he claimed to have memorized. His own reputation as a scholar had preceded him to Egypt, where he dictated all of his father's works to large audiences which included both Ibn Wallād and Abū Ja'far al-Nahḥās. His son 'Abd al-Wālijid, who had served him as legal secretary, remained in Egypt and transmitted materials on the authority of his father's manuscripts. Among other contemporaries of Ibn Wallād and Abū Ja'far al-Nahḥās who either visited or settled in Egypt to teach or study should be mentioned Jāhiẓ' nephew Yamūt ibn al-Muzarra (d. 304/916 or 917), who made several visits to Egypt, the last being in 303 A.H. He was followed later by Ibn Qutaibah's son Abū Ja'far Ahmad, who was appointed deputy judge for Egypt in 321/933 and who died there the next year. Ibn Qutaibah's works had already made their way into Egypt and the west. Abū Ja'far Ahmad had inherited his father's numerous manuscripts, which he claimed to have memorized. His own reputation as a scholar had preceded him to Egypt, where he dictated all of his father's works to large audiences which included both Ibn Wallād and Abū Ja'far al-Nahḥās. His son 'Abd al-Wālijid, who had served him as legal secretary, remained in Egypt and transmitted materials on the authority of his father's manuscripts.

---
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on the authority of his grandfather. An even more distinguished scholar, the philologist Abū ‘Alī al-Qāfī, visited Egypt during his long journey on the way to Spain (328-30/940-42) though details of his stay in Egypt are not given in the sources at hand.

In the meantime a number of native Egyptians had attained recognition and leadership in various branches of linguistic studies. Among these may be mentioned ‘Abd Allāh ibn Fażārah (d. 282/895) and Abū Tāhir Ahmad ibn Ishāq (d. 301/913 or 914), each covered by Zubaidī in a one-line entry which is repeated with little or no added information by later authors. A better known Egyptian grammarian, ‘Alī ibn Ḥasan al-Hunā‘ī (d. 309/921), had studied both the Basran and Kufan systems but leaned toward the former. He was credited with several compositions that were in demand and that he copied in a fine and accurate hand and marketed himself. There were also Abū Bakr al-Malāṭī (d. 330/941), imam of the Mosque of ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ in Cairo and tutor to sons of nobility, Abū Tahir Ahmad ibn Ishaq (d. 301/913 or 914), each covered by Zubaidī in a one-line entry which

Hasan ibn ‘Ali (d. 379/989), already a leading grammarian in the days of Kufir and teacher of both Egyptian and visiting scholars, and Abū ‘Adī al-Miṣri (d. 381/991), who had studied with Abū Ja‘far al-Naḥḥās. There was also Abū Bakr al-Adfuwī (304–88/916–98), still another pupil of Abū Ja‘far al-Naḥḥās and transmitter of his works. He was the leading Egyptian Qur’ānic-reader and commentator of his day, whose works were praised alike by Egyptians and non-Egyptians and whose leading pupil, ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Ḥaufī (d. 430/1039), was in turn the leading Qur’ānic scholar of his day and produced comprehensive works on the Qur’ān and on grammar.

We have covered enough of Egypt’s promotion of and participation in the basic linguistic sciences and have examined most of the pertinent surviving manuscripts, both as to writing materials and scripts, from the second through the fourth century—the end limit of the age of papyrus—to justify certain conclusions. Egypt though not a pioneer in these fields—perhaps partly because of her predominantly non-Arab, non-Muslim population for the greater part of the period—was nevertheless constantly in touch with the linguistic developments first in the Hijāz and then in ‘Irāq. Aware of the difference in approach of the Basrani and Kufani schools, Egyptian grammarians and philologists sought out the leaders of both schools but eventually leaned heavily toward the Basran school, though not without some intergroup differences. Egypt in addition to being the geographic center of the Muslim world served also as a cultural halfway center for students and traveling scholars from the eastern and western provinces. In book importation and the local book trade, the close ties among scholar, copyist, and bookseller, early and firmly established in ‘Irāq, were as firmly established in Egypt, as the multiple roles of the ‘Alladi and ‘Alami families adequately illustrate. It is to these factors that we owe the survival of the majority of literary manuscripts from the second through the fourth century, whether they are of papyrus, parchment, or paper and whether or not the original works or their surviving copies originated on Egyptian soil.
PART II

LITERATURE
A SPEECH OF ‘AMR IBN AL-ĀṢ AND DESCRIPTIONS OF THE IDEAL MAIDEN

PERF. No. 712. Mid-second/third quarter of eighth century.

Medium quality papyrus, 17 × 14 cm. The fragment is the lower part of a single sheet with several large and some smaller lacunae (Pls. 3–4). There are narrow margins all around. The cleanness of the cut at the top suggests that it is the work of a modern dealer.

Script.—The naskhi script shows the early characteristic of the lifting of the pen so that most of the vertical strokes were written downward. On the other hand, liberal use of hooked verticals, characteristic of the later formalized naskhi book hand, was not common before the mid-second/mid-eighth century. The total absence of diacritical points and other orthographic signs represents the practice of a conservative minority of scholars. The circle is used for punctuation. The double circle of verso 5 may indicate collation.

TEXT

Recto

1 قال عمرو بن العاص أن لكل شجرة اصلاً لكل اصل
2 فرع ونكل جيل سيل ي لكل خبير اهداء وان امير الموت
3 اصل الفروع فروع الجذوع قد استخصكم بمحة
4 واستخصكم لنفسه فاختاركم لقول وصبركم للسعود
5 فاخليصنا طليبه واطليا بفاح بالسمع والطاعة

6 وحسن النواص في وقت السير واللذة
7 وقال يا [رب بن عائ] إلا وقد اعشق في الذى فيكن فتولاكن خلوا
8 في معنى: سواء هذا في الكتاب من النساء والذوات
9 قال الأحنف بن قيس أن اللذ لله اسر وأفضل الصفات
10 في منزل الحمر

جارية عذري في حلة خضرا في فوق الجهر في بيت مخبر

Verso

1 قال جارية بن قدامة بل جارية حضور ساكنة في القصور من خوات الخدور
2 تناك نيتية عجبة مهية جوف عالية ان اعرضاها اصبرت وإن
3 قبلها اصبرت وأن كنت صادر رويت

4 قال نصر بن الحجاج بل جارية ادبية مشعبة العقل لبيبة كريمة في اهله
5 حسونة ابنت عم فلان فين ابنة فلال فين تأتي حبيبة
6 قال فلان بن فلان بن [جارية]

7 0
Comments.—The lost upper part of the recto probably contained a short speech or speeches of ‘Amr ibn al-Āṣ or some other contemporary political and military leader or leaders, the unifying feature being the *khutbah*. The lost upper part of the verso must have contained more individual descriptions of a desirable maiden. The lost text of recto 6, of which very few traces remain, may have alluded to either the protection of or the abstinence from women during wartime, or more probably it contained a brief heading for the second section of the text. On the other hand, abrupt transition from one theme to another was not uncommon in early literary collections and modern editors of even later book-length manuscripts frequently feel the need to supply sectional headings.

Though all the men named in the text are identifiable, the sources on hand have as yet yielded no parallel to any of their statements. The text of the statements of recto 9 to verso 11 can be pointed and voweled in various ways to give different slants in meaning. It is sometimes difficult to decide which of the possible readings the writer had in mind. On the whole, the general character of all these statements reflects remarkable restraint for this category of Arabic literature. This restraint can perhaps be explained partly by the character of the speakers and partly by the implication that the maiden each speaker describes is desired as a prospective Arab wife of equal social status rather than as a non-Arab concubine.

Recto 1–6. The *amīr al-muʾminīn* of recto 2 must be either ‘Umar I or Muʿawiyah. The relationships of both these caliphs with ‘Amr ibn al-Āṣ is discussed below, along with pertinent comment on the papyrus text (see pp. 47–53).

Recto 7–8. Space and remaining traces best fit reconstruction of the name as Yaʿqūb ibn ‘Atā. The only such person in the early sources is Yaʿqūb ibn ‘Atā ibn Abī Fābī (n.d.), of whom little beyond his name seems to be known though his father (d. 114/732 at age 88) was a well known Meccan school-teacher and traditionist (Ibn Saʿd V 360, 344–46; Ibn Rustah, p. 221; Jāḥiṣī, *Bayān* I 251; *Maʿārif*, p. 271; Dhahabī I 92; see also our Vol. II 16, 112, 149, 153).

Yaʿqūb is citing a book which advocates the taking of enjoyment of women and of other pleasures without allowing any of these to master one. The second sentence, with its key word خَلَصَوْا, alludes loosely to the Qurʾānic permission of such pleasure-taking (see e.g. Sūratāh 3:13, 4:3, 7:31). For the enjoyment of similar pleasures in the world to come see e.g. Sūratāh 37:46, 43:71, and 47:15. The theme of this section brings to mind the description of the cloistered houris, good and comely, who await the martyrs and the true believers in the world to come (see e.g. Sūratāh 55:54–76 and cf. *Concordance* I 526 حور).

Recto 9–10. Note the crowding of line 10, the last on the page, and the interlinear phrase.

Aḥnaf ibn Qais al-Tamīmī of Baṣrah (d. ca. 68/688) was the acknowledged leader of his tribe, which had settled in ‘Irāq. The four men mentioned after him in the text were his contemporaries who, either as tribesmen or as South Arabs, were at times associated with him. As an able general Aḥnaf played no small part in the conquest of Khurāsān and in the First Civil War of Islām. As an active statesman Aḥnaf played significant roles from the time of ‘Umar I until his death in the reign of ‘Abd al-Malik (see e.g. Tabarī II 2565–68, 2680, 2867, 2897–2900, 2903 for Aḥnaf’s early campaigns). His association with ‘Ali and Muʿāwiyyah is discussed below. History has accorded Aḥnaf an enviable reputation as a man of wisdom, integrity, and, above all, patient forbearance which became proverbial. Nature, on the other hand, stinted him as to physical endowment. He was clubfooted—hence the name Aḥnaf—and
narrow shouldered, had buck teeth and a receding chin. He lost an eye in battle or through smallpox and was bald-headed. These and a few other deformities were no doubt responsible for his limited family. He had but one son, who proved to be weak, lazy, and of no account, and a granddaughter who died young (e.g. *Ma‘ārif*, pp. 216 f., 284; *‘Uyūn* IV 35; *Tha‘ālibī*, *Lata‘if*, pp. 105, 109; Ibn Khallikān I 291 [= trans. I 641]; see Ibn ‘Asākir VII 18–23 for a long and fairly representative list of Aḥnaf’s qualities and of his sayings, followed by a list of his physical deformities). He was known to have come to the aid of women, especially widows and victims of war, and to have counseled Mu‘āwiyah on great forbearance toward one’s children (e.g. ‘Āmidī, *Al-mu‘āẓanah baina shi‘r Abī Tammām wa al-Buḥtūrī*, ed. ʿĀhmād ʿSāqr [Cairo, 1961] p. 194; *‘Uyūn* IV 437).

In view of Aḥnaf’s physical deformities and sterling qualities, it is not surprising that his is the most restrained of the statements in our text. His reluctance to dwell on physical pleasures is confirmed by relevant statements, some of which are quite outspoken (see e.g. Ibn ‘Asākir VII 21; Ibn Khallikān I 289 [= trans. I 637]; Ibn al-Ṭiqtaqā, *Al-fakhārī* [1896] p. 79; جنبيا مجاسفا ذكر الطعام والنساء فلما اغضض أن يكون الرجل وصافوا ليطبه مذاحا فلرجه مثلا بضغو إلى النساء but see also *‘Uyūn* IV 96). He was generally against seeking women’s counsel and against levity (Ibn ‘Asākir VII 18). He gave orders that no woman was to follow his bier. But a prominent elderly woman of his tribe, described as his maternal cousin in some of the sources, passed by his burial and stopped to deliver an impromptu eulogy that covered his many commendable qualities, including his consideration for women, much to the embarrassment of Mus‘ab ibn al-Zubair, in whose cause Aḥnaf had fallen (e.g. Jāḥiṣ, *Bayān* II 312; Ibn Abī Ṭāhir Ṭa‘īfur, pp. 50 f.; *Amādī* III 28; Ibn ‘Asākir VII 24).

**Verso 1–3.** Note the use of the verb نشر in verso 2 rather than نظر. The unpointed personal name of verso 1 is sometimes pointed to read Ḥārithāthi, but more often the man is identified as the Baṣrān Jāriyah ibn Ḥudmāh al-Tamīmī, especially in the earlier sources, all of which, however, can be safely assumed to be later than the papyrus text. In tribal and local politics, Jāriyah was second only to Aḥnaf, who addressed him as “uncle” and “cousin,” as a mark of respect since they were not such close relatives as some thought (Ibn Sa‘d VII 1, p. 38; *Isṭā‘īb* I 94; *Iṣṭābah* I 444). Both men were leading ‘Alīd generals who took part in the First Civil War of Islam as a last resort, and both were appeased by Mu‘āwiyah sometime after the abdication of Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī in 41/661 (see pp. 54 f.). Aḥnaf, officiating at the funeral of Jāriyah (after 50/670), concluded his prayer with these words: “May Allah bless you! You envied not the rich nor despised the poor” (*‘Uyūn* II 321).

Jāriyah’s stipulation for a personable noble maiden, protected and chaste, of a specified figure, attractive, responsive, and considerate could hardly be objected to by his companions, even though they had ideas of their own.

**Verso 4–5.** Naṣr ibn al-Ḥajjāj (fl. ca. mid-first century A.H.) is identified as the son of Ḥajjāj ibn ‘Ilāḥ al-Tamīmī, who witnessed Muḥammad’s victory at Khaibar, after which he converted to Islam. Ḥajjāj returned to Mecca with the false report that Muḥammad had been defeated and taken prisoner and that he, Ḥajjāj, wished to collect what money his wife had and what debtors owed him so that he could return in time to trade in the spoils of Khaibar. His real objective, however, was to secure his capital and return to Muḥammad. He was with Muḥammad at the time of the conquest of Mecca and is said to have died during the reign of ‘Umar I (Ibn Sa‘d IV 2, pp. 14 f.; Ya‘qūbī II 57 f.; *‘Uyūn* I 274; *Isṭā‘īb* I 129 *Iṣṭābah* I 641). His son Naṣr does not seem to have figured prominently in any political role but is known to have accompanied Abū Mūsā al-ʿAsh‘ārī on his campaign to Persia and was present with him at the conquest of Tustar in 17/638 as was also Aḥnaf (Ṭabarī I 2542, 2551; Yāqūt I 847–49; *Khizānah* II 111). A poet of sorts, he is remembered rather as an extremely handsome young man who was attractive to the matrons of Medina. Some of these ladies, including, it is said, Hind bint ‘Utbaḥ, mother of Mu‘āwiyah, and Fārī‘ah,
the literate mother of Hajjaj ibn Yusuf, addressed romantic verses to him (see Nabia Abbott, “Woman and the state on the eve of Islam,” AJSL LVIII [1941] 269–79, for a historical biography of the aggressive Hind). When 'Umar heard a woman reciting some of these verses, he, ever concerned for the morals of the City of the Prophet (see Tabari I 2745 f. and our Vol. II 108–10), summoned Naṣr, ordered his head shaved, and exiled him to Baṣrah and soon exiled a second Tamimite for much the same reason “to join his cousin in Baṣrah” (Ibn Sa'd III 1, pp. 204 f.; Jāḥiẓ, Muhāsibīn, pp. 236 f., 286–89; 'Uyūn IV 23 f.; Mubarrad, p. 333; Mas'ūd IV 98 f.; Aḥānī IV 98; 'Iqd II 463 and VI 119; see Khizānāh II 108–12 for later authors who give the story with some variations). Baṣran women, orthodox or Kharijite, were known for their freedom of action, which presently induced Ziyād ibn Abīhi (Ziyād ibn Abī Sufyān), as Mu‘āwiyah’s governor of ‘Irāq, to take drastic action against them (see Mubarrad, p. 582; ‘Iqd VI 96 f., 101; see also Abbott, “Women and the state in early Islam,” JNES I [1942] 352).

In Baṣrah, Naṣr again got into trouble, this time with Mujāshi b. Mas'ūd al-Tamīmī, illiterate Bedouin general and deputy-governor of Baṣrah under ‘Uqba ibn Ghażwān (15–16/636–37; see Tabarī I 2238; Ya’qūb I 166; Yāqūt I 241 f.; Zambara, p. 39). In the presence of Mujāshi, Naṣr wrote in the sand his declaration of love to be read by Mujāshi’s beautiful and literate wife Shumailah and she responded by doing the same. Mujāshi dismissed Naṣr and either had someone read the love messages for him or forced the truth out of his wife, whom he then divorced. Naṣr is said to have composed some verses denying any wrongdoing, but Ibn Qutaiba suspected the verses to be spurious. The beautiful Shumailah later married Ibn 'Abbās. Mujāshi, a Zubairid partisan, fell in the Battle of the Camel (Anṣāb I 137; 'Uyūn IV 24; Dinawārī, p. 156; Aḥānī XIX 143). We hear of Naṣr once again when he strove in vain to have the caliph Mu‘āwiyah recognize the paternity of his half-brother 'Abd Allāḥ ibn al-Hājjāj, even as Mu‘āwiyah had already recognized the paternity of his half-brother Ziyād ibn Abī Sufyān in 44/664 ('Iqd VI 133 f.; Tabarī III 480). The caliph Mahdī, in 159/776, condemned Mu‘āwiyah’s decision and reversed it.

Naṣr’s statement is the only one in the document to include culture and intelligence as desirable qualities in a maiden. Such an outlook no doubt rendered the handsome Naṣr doubly attractive to such high-placed, aggressive, and literate women as those mentioned above. One should keep in mind that, despite the one-man moral censorship by ‘Umar I, the high-born Arab woman was still for the most part a free and outspoken agent in a changing society in which the veil and seclusion had yet to take hold of her and thereafter leave a clear field for the accomplish.1 songstress and the slave-concubine (see Abbott in JNES I 106–26 and 341–68, esp. pp. 113 f., 123, 351 f.; see also Jāḥiẓ, Qiyān in Thalāth rasā’īl, ed. Joshua Finkel [Cairo, 1344/1926] pp. 56–59, and ‘Iqd VI 96 f.).

Verso 5. First-cousin and other interfamily, intertribal marriages, though generally practiced and approved for the sake of economic and tribal numeric! strength, were nevertheless recognized as having the drawback of limiting the choice of wives and, in the case of first cousins, of ultimately debilitating the health of the families and hence of the tribe. Arguments, on individual and tribal bases, for and against such marriages are readily available (see e.g. 'Uyūn II 67 and IV 3, 6, 71; Ibn Abī Tahir Taifūr, p. 107; 'Iqd VI 103, 117; Amālī III 47; Khālidiyān, Kitāb al-asbāb wa al-nasāʾir, ed. Sayyid Muḥammad Yusuf, I [Cairo, 1958] 228–31; Jāḥiẓ, Niṣā‘ in Rasā‘īl, ed. Ḥasan al-Sanحūbī [Cairo, 1355/1933]).

Verso 6–7. In all probability the speaker is another Tamīmite or else a member of a South Arab tribe (see comment on verso 10–11).

Verso 8–9. Zaid ibn Jabalah al-Tamīmī was another associate of Ṭāḥaf. He admired Ṭāḥaf and considered him in some respects superior to himself and for that very reason felt justified in asserting himself against Ṭāḥaf’s provocative behavior ('Uyūn I 285; Aḥānī XXI 20; Ibn 'Asākir V 451). Both men were in the 'Irāq delegation to ‘Umar I. When Ṭāḥaf made a favorable impression on that caliph, Zaid attempted to counteract it but was rebuked by ‘Umar. Ṭāḥaf’s eloquent argument at the time persuaded ‘Umar to send more colonists to ‘Irāq and to order its governor, Abū Mūsā al-Ash'arī, to undertake an
irrigation project in the interest of that province's economy (e.g. *Iqd* II 62 f.). When, after the First Civil War, the Banū Tamim, led byĀḥnaf, made peace with Muʿāwiyah, Zaid served for some time as chief of police underʿAbd Allāh ibn Āmir, Muʿāwiyah's governor of ʿIrāq (41-44/661-64; see Tabarî II 15; Ibn Asākir V 450; Zambaur, p. 39). Though there are occasional references to Zaid's wisdom, very few of his sayings have survived in contrast to the numerous citations credited toĀḥnaf (see e.g. *Uyūn* I 245, 285; *Iqd* IV 203). The papyrus text's long list of intensive verbal adjectives in addition to expressing Zaid's desire for a highly gifted, vivacious, captivating, exciting, anxiety-vanquishing, and pleasure-giving maiden does credit also to his eloquence.

Verso 10-11. Hāni ibn Urwah al-Muradî al-Mudhhiji (d. 60/680) is identified as a Yemenite partisan of ʿAlī, on whose side he and his son fought, as did Āḥnaf, in the Battle of Sīfīn in 37/657 (see Waqʿat Sīfīn, pp. 153 and 231). Hāni remained a staunch Shiʿite, and his headquarters in Kūfah became a gathering place for local partisans and a refuge for fellow tribesmen in flight from Muʿāwiyah or his governors (Mubarrad, pp. 71 f.; Tabarî II 229-31, 244-56, 268-71; *Iqd* I 136). After the fall of Ḥusain ibn ʿAlī at Karbala* (61/680) Hāni and Muslim ibn ʿAqîl, to whom Hāni had given refuge, plotted the death of ʿUbaid Allāh ibn Ziyād, who, on discovering the plot, executed both men (Ibn Saʿd IV 1, p. 29; Dinawari, pp. 245 f.; Tabarî II 229-32, 244-60; *Iqd* IV 378).

Hāni, it should be noted, is the only one to use a simile in his description. A swift walking pace was and still is admired in a young maid. The verb *walqa*, “to hasten,” though used for humans, is generally used to describe the vigorous swift pace of a she-camel (*nāqa walqa*). A slow measured step was and still is generally preferred in a mature woman. The walk and talk of women, young and old, have received much attention in Arabic poetry and prose literature (see e.g. *Uyūn* IV 81-84; Ibn Abi Awān, *Kitāb al-tashbihāt*, ed. ʿAbd al-Muʿīd Khan [London, 1950] pp. 101 f.; Yazdī, pp. 151 f.; Khālidīyān, *Kitāb al-ashbh wa al-nazāʿir* I 50 f., 53-59, 102, 200-205). Women were readily compared to swords or associated with swords as being slender and well formed or well tempered, or acquainted with and quick to face danger, or sharp tongued (Jābīz, *Nisāʾ* in *Rasāʾil*, pp. 274 f.; *Amālī* I 233; see also Lane, *Mishr*, pp. 1485 f.). Figures of speech apart, in pre-Islāmic and early Islāmic times, women accompanied men on raids and to battle. Enough of them took part in the actual fighting, using clubs and daggers or whatever they could lay their hands on, to call for clarification of their legal status as “warrior women” (see e.g. Muslim XII 187: النساء الغازيات). The simile was the most widely used figure of speech in describing not only the walk and talk but almost any feature or characteristic of women. It was used more frequently in poetry than in prose and in the latter more in the ʿAbbāsid than in the Umayyad period—a development that has some bearing on the dating of our document (see p. 78).

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

I

The amīr al-muʿminīn, “commander of the believers,” of recto 2 must be either ʿUmar I, who was the first caliph thus addressed, or the caliph Muʿāwiyah. Both caliphs placed ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ in command of large expeditionary forces, ʿUmar I for the initial conquest of Egypt and Muʿāwiyah for its reconquest from Muslim rebels during the First Civil War of Islām. My first reaction to the text of recto 1-6 was that the unnamed caliph referred to was probably Muʿāwiyah. Research into the relationships of ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀṣ with ʿUmar I, ʿUthmān ibn ʿAffān, and Muʿāwiyah strongly reinforced my first impression even though a parallel to the papyrus text in an explicit historical context, which alone can provide certainty, is yet to be found.

A brief sketch of ʿAmr's military and political career is in order. His family, like that of Muʿāwiyah and
other leading Quraishites of Mecca, was strenuously opposed to the mission of Muḥammad. It is well
known that ‘Amr’s conversion, generally placed shortly before the conquest of Mecca, took place only
after he and such other notables as Khālid ibn al-Walid and ‘Uthmān ibn Ṭalhah had come to realize that
Muḥammad was within reach of ultimate victory. Muḥammad, sensing ‘Amr’s military qualities and
Mu‘awiyah’s political acumen, placed ‘Amr in command of sizable expeditionary forces that included
both Abū Bakr and ‘Umar, and used Mu‘awiyah as his secretary. What is not so well known is ‘Amr’s
struggle to come to terms with his own immediate family situation. His mother, a war captive used by
several men, “assigned” him to ‘Āṣ ibn Wā’il, who, according to ‘Amr himself, showed little interest in
him in contrast to the attention he paid to his younger half-brother Hishām. Later, ‘Amr compared
himself unfavorably with Hishām because Hishām had accepted Islam early and had died in its cause
during the conquest of Syria. Political rivals and gossipers seldom allowed ‘Amr to forget either the
shadow over his birth or his late conversion.

Furthermore, ‘Amr harbored a deep-seated and long-lasting resentment against ‘Umar on social,
political, and personal grounds—a resentment that was reciprocated by ‘Umar both before and during
his caliphate. Though kept under control for the most part, the undercurrent of mutual resentment and
mistrust flared on occasion into harsh words and accusations between the authoritative caliph and his
ambitious general, even though both men realized the need and the advantage of co-operation between
them in the momentous first decades of Islam. ‘Umar I saw to it that ‘Amr, though appointed governor-
general of Egypt, did not for long have sole control of that rich province, particularly its financial
administration and the distribution of its large revenues.

There was not much love lost between ‘Umar I and Mu‘awiyah either. But Mu‘awiyah had the advan-
tage of a clear-cut birthright and was, moreover, more restrained and politic with ‘Umar I as with most
people, including ‘Amr. After their successful campaigns in Syria and Egypt, Mu‘awiyah and ‘Amr as
governors-general of Syria and Egypt respectively presented conflicting claims before ‘Umar I. ‘Amr,
realizing that he was losing the argument, did not hesitate to disrupt the meeting by interrupting and
slapping Mu‘awiyah in the face.

‘Umar I’s suspicions and fears of ‘Amr were reinforced by ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān, who is said to have induced ‘Umar to call a halt on ‘Amr’s march on Egypt and to curtail his powers as governor of that

---

1 See e.g. Sarh I 167, 187 f., 234 f., 361 f., 372 for this group’s mocking taunts of Muḥammad and his followers and the Qur’ānic revelations called forth thereby.
2 See Vol. I, Document 6, esp. p. 82, with references cited in comment on recto 18–verso 1; see also Ya‘qūb II 28 f.; Zubairi, Kitāb nasab Quraish, ed. E. Lévi-Provençal (Le Caire, 1903) p. 322; Anṣāb I 232 f.; Ṭabarî I 1600–1605; Istī‘āb II 434 f.
3 See e.g. Sarh I 168–87; Ibn Sā‘d VII 2, pp. 188, 192; Anṣāb I 829 f.; Ya‘qūb II 85; Ṭabarî I 1894–96; Ibn Taghribirdî I 71: قالت لصرور بن الناصي ثَرَيْوَةَ الله سلام وهما ينكران: قال عمر بن عوف، يا أبا زيد، ما أدرى ما أدرى كأنني لست من فتى، قد تعلم أن الأمر ليس من نافذ.
4 See e.g. Ya‘qūb II 87 and Istī‘ab IV 168, where both ‘Amr and Mu‘awiyah are listed among the secretaries of Muḥammad, but ‘Amr functioned as such only occasionally.
5 See e.g. Anṣāb I 215; Istī‘āb II 595; Istī‘ab II 289 and IV 11.
6 E.g. Ibn Sā‘d II 2, p. 8; Istī‘āb II 434, 505; Isbâh III 1–4, 1243–45; Fāṭih, p. 50.
7 E.g. Wāq‘at Siffin, pp. 444, 562, 583, 624; Ṭabarî I 3335, 3357, 3405; ‘Uyūn I 284; Istī‘ab II 434; Jāḥîsh, Bayān III 223; Fāṭih, pp. 49 f.; Istī‘ab IV 11–13, 39.
8 Fāṭih, p. 146:

كَال عُمْرُو بِنِ النَّاصِي قَصِّي اللَّهُ يَوْمَ الْيَمِين، وَفَلَتْ رَأَى المَعَامِرَةِ وَلَا يَدَعُو اللَّهَ وَاللَّهُ بِأَمْوَالِ الْمُعَاذِرِينَ وَلَا يَجْهَلُ الْقُطْلَ يَنْفِلُ لِيَحْلِمُ الحَتَّةٌ عَلَى الْحَيَارِ يَمِيكَ.

9 Ibid. p. 70; Jāḥîsh, Bayān II 291.
10 Fāṭih al-baladīn, p. 210; Fāṭih, pp. 147 f.; Istī‘ab I 47 f.
11 Istī‘ab I 17. The sequel to this episode is not reported. ‘Amr, however, was to use the element of “shocking surprise” on several later occasions in the interest of himself and Mu‘awiyah, who came to recognize the ruse as characteristic of ‘Amr (see n. 24 on p. 50 below).
province. Even on his deathbed Umar rebuked Amr severely for being overly ambitious, as the Oriental Institute's unique papyrus fragment from Ibn Ishq's Ta'rikh al-khulafa' revealed. In his rebuke, Umar assumed that Amr expected to stay in power through co-operation with Mu'awiyah as a prospective caliphal candidate. The implication is that Amr himself would not aspire to the caliphate, because he was the son of a captive woman. Uthman as caliph, motivated partly by nepotism and partly by mistrust of Amr, soon removed the latter from the governorship of Egypt. The ignominious Amr, feeling much wronged, went into political retirement throughout the rest of the caliphate of Uthman—a fact which in itself reflects the deep antipathy between the two men. Uthman, threatened by the Egyptian rebels, appealed to Amr among others to use his influence with them, and Amr in turn urged the troubled caliph to mend his own ways. Though Amr at heart favored the Medinan opposition, he remained neutral through the election of Ali, the subsequent outbreak of the First Civil War, and Ali's victory in the Battle of the Camel in 36/657.

The sources differ as to who took the initiative in the alliance that was soon formed between Amr and Mu'awiyah, though the weight of evidence points to Mu'awiyah. Amr, accompanied by his sons Abd Allah and Muhammad and his secretary Wardan, having first discussed the situation with them, journeyed north to meet and bargain with Mu'awiyah on a basis of partnership, in which Amr was ultimately to play the role of caliph-maker in return for the still coveted governorship of Egypt from which Uthman had removed him. Amr and Mu'awiyah had several qualities of leadership in common along with others that were complementary. Mu'awiyah, the astute politician with proverbial patience, genuine or not, in the face of great provocation contrasted sharply with the comparatively quick-tempered Amr. But in war strategy and the use of the element of surprise at a critical moment to avert a defeat if not, indeed, to turn it into victory, Amr had much the advantage over Mu'awiyah. Mu'awiyah himself, during the caliphate of Umar I, had been the unfortunate victim of this strategy of Amr's. Now Amr, allied with Mu'awiyah against Ali, was to use the element of surprise in their common interest on at least three occasions. The first was in a preliminary encounter with Ali prior to the Battle of Siffin (37/657) when Amr deliberately exposed himself and caused the shocked Ali to turn away in disgust. The second occasion was during that battle, in which Amr's sons Abd Allah, who was but thirteen years younger than his father, and the younger Muhammad were active along with Wardan, Amr's secretary and standard-bearer. As he sensed that the battle was going against him, Amr sprang the surprise of the well known episode of raising Quranic manuscripts on spearheads and demanding that the Book arbitrate...
their differences.\textsuperscript{22} The third occasion of surprise was at the subsequent Arbitration of Adhrūh, when ‘Amr outwitted ‘Alī’s representative Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘ārī, who declared ‘Alī deposed while ‘Amr reaffirmed Mu‘āwiya as caliph.\textsuperscript{23} The resulting quick disorganization of ‘Alī’s forces, followed by a schism within his party, did more damage to ‘Alī’s cause than all of Mu‘āwiya’s intrigues and ‘Amr’s reputed military generalship. It was at this point that Mu‘āwiya himself pointed out to ‘Amr and others of his leading supporters the advantages of an immediate march on Egypt, the coveted governorship of which he had already promised to ‘Amr as the reward for his services. Mu‘āwiya accepted ‘Amr’s military plan for the invasion and quick conquest of the province and at the same time corresponded with key figures in Egypt urging them to support ‘Amr.\textsuperscript{24}

This last occasion seems to be the most logical background for the speech of ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ that is recorded in recto 1–6 of our papyrus, and analysis of the text yields the same conclusion. Conceivably ‘Amr could have used the figurative phraseology of recto 1–3 to apply to any one of the three caliphs under whom he served—‘Umar I, Uthmān, and Mu‘āwiya.

If we assume that the papyrus text refers to ‘Umar I, then the most probable occasion for ‘Amr’s speech would have been either prior to his initial march to ‘Arish or on the arrival of the reinforcements under four commands that ‘Umar I later sent him.\textsuperscript{25} Impatient and suspicious of the delay in this first conquest of Egypt, ‘Umar wrote ‘Amr a letter accusing him of purposeful delay for personal reasons, reminding him that Allāh grants victory only to those who are true and sincere and ordering him to address the people and urge them on to a whole-hearted and united effort, to give public support to the four commanders previously sent him, and to attack the enemy as one man.\textsuperscript{26} But even without such constant stress and strain between caliph and general, ‘Amr would hardly have used the first sentence of recto 4, “and he has chosen you exclusively for himself,” to apply to ‘Umar. For to ‘Umar, as to Abū Bakr before him and ‘Alī later and as ‘Amr himself had come to realize, allegiance was owed first to Islam and the community of believers and not to any one person, caliph or general. This was dramatically illustrated by ‘Umar’s removal from military command and trial of Khalid ibn al-Walid, whose generalship in the conquest of ‘Īraq and Syria had won him the title “The Sword of Allāh.”\textsuperscript{27}

‘Uthmān, in view of his personal relationship with ‘Amr (see pp. 48 f.), need hardly be considered as the amir al-mu’tamīn referred to in our papyrus text.

Thus, we come back to Mu‘āwiya as the caliph most probably referred to in our document. For there is ample evidence that, despite their public declarations, ‘Amr and Mu‘āwiya each had at heart primarily his own self-interest (see e.g. n. 18 above). Furthermore, ‘Amr’s forces for the Battle of Siffin (37/657) and for his second conquest of Egypt (38/658) were Syrian troops provided by Mu‘āwiya for the specific purpose of opposing ‘All and transferring Egypt’s allegiance from ‘Alī to himself, pending the outcome of the proposed arbitration.\textsuperscript{28} For following the truce agreement to arbitrate, the Syrians took the oath of allegiance to himself, pending the outcome of the proposed arbitration.\textsuperscript{28}

\textsuperscript{22}\textit{Waq‘at Siffin}, pp. 545–47, 565; Ibn Sa‘d IV 2, pp. 3 f.; Ya‘qūbī II 219; ‘Ṭabarī I 3333–38; Mas‘udī IV 381; Dinawarī, p. 201. Dinawarī, pp. 209–10, gives full details of the drafting of the truce agreement and the most detailed text of the treaty itself, which is dated Wednesday, the 16th of Safar 37/3rd of August 657.

\textsuperscript{23} Ibn Sa‘d III 1, p. 21; Jāḥiṣ, \textit{Bayān} I 183, 271; ‘Ṭabarī I 3356 f.; Ya‘qūbī II 221 f.; Dinawarī, pp. 213 f.; Mas‘udī IV 391–98; \textit{Idd} IV 346–49.

\textsuperscript{24} ‘Ṭabarī I 3396–98: قَالَ مَعَارِفَةُ النَّافِئِ يَا أَبِي النَّافِئِ إِنْ أَمَرْتُكُمْ بِالْحَجَّةِ فَانَا أَمَرُوْ بِالْحَجَّةِ لِيَفْتَرِقُ النَّافَئُ. \textit{Ibid.} I 3400 gives Mu‘āwiya’s parting words to ‘Amr as follows: ارْسِلْكُمْ يَا عُمُّوْ بَنْطَوْيَهَ الْحَجَّةِ وَالْحَجَّةِ فَانَا أَمَرُوْ بِالْحَجَّةِ لِيَفْتَرِقُ النَّافَئُ.}

\textsuperscript{25} Fudūḥ, pp. 61 f.; Ibn Taghribīrī I 9.

\textsuperscript{26} Fudūḥ, p. 79.

\textsuperscript{27} Khalīl’s son ‘Abd al-Rahmān was with Mu‘āwiya at the Battle of Siffin as one of ‘Amr’s standard-bearers and high in Mu‘āwiya’s council. He was inspired by his father’s reputation to engage in several courageous single combats against some of ‘Alī’s leading supporters, including Jāriyah ibn Qadāmah of verso 1–3 of our papyrus (see \textit{Waq‘at Siffin}, pp. 233, 412, 450, 482, 485, 489; Dinawarī, pp. 197, 209). Later, when ‘Abd al-Rahmān was suggested as Mu‘āwiya’s successor, Mu‘āwiya, it is said, had him poisoned to clear the way for his own son Yūsuf (\textit{Aṣbāḥ} XIV 12).

\textsuperscript{28} E.g. Ya‘qūbī II 226; ‘Ṭabarī I 3400, 3406; Kindī, p. 29; Mas‘udī IV 421.
allegiance to Mu'awiyah in Dhū al-Qa'dah 37/April 658. Moreover, the text of recto 4–6 is addressed not to a general assembly of troops but to their commanding officers. Some of 'Amr's trusted commanding officers who accompanied him on his second conquest of Egypt had served under him in his first conquest of that province and thus were given a fresh and impressive demonstration of 'Amr's resourcefulness in accomplishing his aims.

The phrase “in private or in public” of recto 6 was already current in the time of Muḥammad and occurs in both the Qur'ān and the standard hadith collections. It occurs also in the literary sources in contemporary reference to 'Amr himself and to Ziyād ibn Abī Sufyān, among others, as being the same in private and in public. The phrase “with hearing and obedience” of recto 5, along with several variants, was also current in the time of Muḥammad and after and is likewise found in the Qur'ān and even more frequently in the hadith collections in reference to several religious duties and military commands with the emphasis on absolute obedience to the commands of Allāh as revealed through Muḥammad. The extension “to hear is to obey” in reference to the commands of a caliph came first to be associated with Mu'awiyah, who was soon to be generally accused of turning the caliphate into an absolute monarchy. Moreover, even before he claimed the caliphate, Mu'awiyah, in negotiating the initial alliance with 'Amr, had insisted on 'Amr's allegiance and obedience in return for the governorship of Egypt for life, though Egypt was yet to be reconquered.

After his second conquest of Egypt (36/658) 'Amr left his son 'Abd Allāh as deputy-governor of Egypt and returned, along with his secretary Wardān, to Mu'awiyah's representative at the arbitration which followed in Shawwān 38/January 659. After 'Amr had outwitted Abū Mūsā al-Ash'ārī, who declared Ali deposed, and reaffirmed Mu'awiyah as caliph, there developed renewed stress and strain between 'Amr and Mu'awiyah. Wardān, who usually drew up the agreements between them, had previously pointed out to 'Amr that the governorship of Egypt for life was not much of a reward since 'Amr was already an old man. The Shi'i Naṣr ibn Muzāḥim (d. 212/827), author of Waq'at Siffin, reports that at the Battle of Siffin Mu'awiyah accused 'Amr of coveting the caliphate for himself and that during the conference between 'Amr and Abū Mūsā al-Ash'ārī preliminary to the fateful Arbitration of Adhruh Abū Mūsā had suggested his son-in-law 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb as their common choice, to which 'Amr countered by suggesting his own son 'Abd Allāh. It is not surprising, then, that after his unexpected reaffirmation of Mu'awiyah as caliph, the aging 'Amr felt that more was due him for his great services than the lifetime governorship of Egypt. Mas’ūdī reports that 'Amr stayed away from Mu'awiyah, who eventually called on him. Realizing 'Amr's trend of thought, Mu'awiyah tricked him by first isolating him from
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[51] Ṭabarī II 199.
[52] E.g. Futūḥ, pp. 61 f. See Ḥusr I 113 for Khārijah ibn Ḥudhafah, who accompanied 'Amr on both conquests, after the second of which 'Amr appointed him chief of police and called on him at times as his substitute in leading the public prayer service. In the latter function he was mistaken for 'Amr and was murdered in the well known triple assassination plot of 40/661 in which the intended victims were 'Ali, Mu'awiyah and 'Amr himself (see e.g. Ya'qūbī II 351 f.; Dinawari, pp. 227–29; Ṭabarī I 3457–65; Mas’ūdī IV 426 f.).
[53] E.g. Sūrah 2:274, 13:22, 14:31, 35:29; Concordance II 447 and IV 340. See also e.g. Ibn Ḥanbal, Al-mu‘nūd II 256, 363, 459 and esp. IV 309, which refers to Muhammad as being the same in private and in public.
[54] Ibn ‘Asākir VI 424; Ibn Ṭahḥārīrī I 72 f.
[56] Concordance II 540 f. and IV 35–37. See also e.g. Bukhārī III 5 f. and IV 401–3, 419; Muslim XII 222–28; Ibn Ḥanbal, Al-mu‘nūd IV 130, 202. The phrase is absent in ‘Umar’s speeches (see e.g. Ṭabarī I 2137 and 2144, for his brief inaugural speech; ibid. I 2757–62, esp. pp. 2757 f.; Sīrah I 1017; Ibn Sa’d III 1, pp. 196 f.).
[57] Waq‘at Siffin, pp. 43–46; Ibn Sa’d VI 2, pp. 2 f.; Dinawari, pp. 167–69; Ṭabarī I 3249–54. For further references see n. 17 on p. 49 above.
[58] Ya’qūbī II 203. 'Amr's age at the time of his death in 43/664 is variously given as 78, 90, 98, and 100 (see e.g. Ibn Sa’d VII 2, pp. 188 f.; Mas’ūdī V 60; Ḥadīth II 435; Ibn Ṭahḥārīrī I 130 f.).
[59] Waq‘at Siffin, pp. 445, 493 f., 621; Dinawari, p. 188.
[60] Waq‘at Siffin, pp. 621, 623, 629; Dinawari, pp. 211–13; Ṭabarī I 3335 f.; Mas’ūdī IV 396. 'Abd Allāh's mother was 'Amr's legal Arab wife (see e.g. Ibn Sa’d IV 2, p. 8).
his followers and then threatening his very life until ‘Amr was forced to declare anew his own allegiance publicly and to call on the people to accept Mu‘awiya as the best available caliph. In a written agreement drawn at this time, Mu‘awiya specified *al-sam* wa *al-ta‘ah* in return for no more than the previously agreed-on governorship of Egypt for life, which had already begun officially in Rabī‘ I 38/July 658. On his return to Egypt late in 39/spring 660 ‘Amr could hardly have been well enough disposed toward Mu‘awiya to be urging wholehearted support of his cause in any of the subsequent military engagements. The next year brought ‘All’s assassination followed by Mu‘awiya’s public inauguration of his own reign. Hasan ibn ‘All’s short reign ended in Rabī‘ I 41/July 661 with his abdication, which finally brought Mu‘awiya the allegiance of all the provinces of the empire.

Ibn Sa‘d’s entry on ‘Amr ibn al-‘As, though only briefly covering his early alliance with Mu‘awiya, reports yet another rift and reconciliation between them, which led to a new agreement at about the end of 39/early 660. The account states that when the affair (*amr*) was in Mu‘awiya’s hand—and the *amr* must refer to the Syrians’ acceptance of Mu‘awiya as their caliph—Mu‘awiya felt he had given ‘Amr too much in a lifetime governorship of Egypt with total control of its revenues and that ‘Amr saw to it that Mu‘awiya drew no profit from the great wealth of Egypt. ‘Amr, for his part, felt that Mu‘awiya should be willing in the event of complete victory to add the governorship of Syria to that of Egypt, which Mu‘awiya refused to consider. The bitter quarrel that followed would have severed their alliance but for the mediation of Mu‘awiya ibn Ḥudaij, who had served both men well at the Battle of Siffin and later and who now brought about the reconciliation and new written agreement between them. The significant clauses of this agreement were Mu‘awiya’s explicit insistence on ‘Amr’s allegiance and obedience and a change in the tenure of ‘Amr’s governorship of Egypt from life to seven years.

This change would seem, on the face of it, to be a complete victory for Mu‘awiya, particularly in view of ‘Amr’s advanced age. There is, however, some evidence that the seven-year clause was perhaps intended as a concession to the aging ‘Amr and his son ‘Abd Allāh. For we find that Mu‘awiya’s triumphal entry into Kūfah in 41/661 was followed by his appointment of ‘Abd Allāh as governor of that city. But on second thought Mu‘awiya either canceled the appointment before it took effect or soon removed ‘Abd Allāh from the governorship in order to eliminate any possibility of being caught in Syria between ‘Amr in Egypt and his son in Kūfah, these two provinces being the most strategic, geographically and politically, of Mu‘awiya’s hard-won empire. ‘Amr himself may have helped to bring about the annulment of his son’s appointment or else to have hastened his removal from the governorship of Kūfah. For Mu‘awiya soon found himself short of funds to distribute as largess to the members of the numerous delegations from ‘Irāq and the Hijāz that came to his court in Syria during the first year of his uncontested

---

98 Mas‘ūdī IV 402–6.
99 *Ibid.* IV 405:
100 Ţabarī I 3400, 3443; Kindī, p. 31.
101 Ibn Sa‘d IV 2, pp. 5 f.; Ţabarī I 3464.
102 Ţabarī II 206 f. gives an instance of ‘Amr’s attempts to belittle Mu‘awiya as a new caliph. In contrast, ‘Amr himself had addressed Mu‘awiya as *amīr al-mu‘minīn* while the Battle of Siffin was in progress (*Iqd* I 26).
103 Mas‘ūdī V 14; Ţabarī I 199.
104 Ibn Sa‘d IV 2, pp. 5 f.: لما صار الامير في يدي معارية استكرّ علامة مصر اعترض ما عاشه ورأى عروض ان الامير كله قد صلح به وبديعه.... وظن ان معاوية
106 Both men must have felt this to be more than ever probable, knowing the rapidity with which ‘All’s strength was being sapped by political factions and the Kharijite revolt.
107 Ibn Sa‘d IV 2, p. 6.
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caliphate. He appealed to 'Amr for funds from Egypt's revenues, and 'Amr's only answer was to remind Mu'awiyah of the terms of their agreement. On the other hand, 'Abd Allah did in fact succeed his father in 43/664 as governor of Egypt for at least a brief period, which in Waqiqi's report, however, extends to some two years. But Tabari reports the curious statement that Mu'awiyah removed ('azala) 'Abd Allah ibn 'Amr from the governorship of Egypt in the year 47/March 667–February 668, that is, at the very time that the agreement of late 39/early 660, which stipulated the seven-year clause, was due to expire. We have already seen that early in the alliance between 'Amr and Mu'awiyah, Wardan had pointed out to 'Amr that his reward of lifetime governorship of Egypt was unsatisfactory. Wardan had suggested further that 'Amr bargain for the succession of his heirs. 'Amr had then spoken to Mu'awiyah about this but had been turned down. Nevertheless, 'Amr himself did not dismiss the idea of a family succession. His son Muhammad was primarily a soldier with no taste or talent for politics. That left 'Abd Allâh, who had on several occasions acted as his father's deputy-governor, as 'Amr's political heir. 'Amr, as we have seen above, at one time in his talks with Abu Musa al-Ash'ari had even suggested 'Abd Allâh as a caliphal candidate. In view of all these facts, it seems not at all improbable that Mu'awiyah, faced with a total break between himself and 'Amr when as yet only Syria and Egypt acknowledged him as caliph, did indeed make a concession to 'Amr and his son 'Abd Allâh in the seven-year agreement, which he ignored shortly after 'Amr's death in 43/664 until its formal expiration in 47/667. Here we must leave this tantalizing question until new source materials provide more clear-cut information. In any event, the several near-breaks between the fairly well matched and primarily self-seeking 'Amr and Mu'awiyah, each keenly aware of the other's strong and weak points, illustrate each one's awareness of his own capabilities. Mu'awiyah one day asked 'Amr: "What is the measure of your intelligence?" "I have not undertaken anything ever from which I could not extricate myself," answered 'Amr. "As for me," countered Mu'awiyah, "I have not undertaken any matter whatsoever from which I wish to be extricated." On still another occasion Mu'awiyah characterized himself as one who uses not his sword where his whip serves his purpose, nor his whip where his tongue is sufficient, adding that he would not permit matters between him and the people to get so out of hand as to reach the breaking point even if no more than a hair held them together. These self-appraisals, one must concede, were certainly borne out in the relationships of both 'Amr and Mu'awiyah so that they came to be counted in the foreranks of shrewd men and astute and wily politicians.

All in all, the foregoing survey of 'Amr's ups and downs with the first four caliphs, on the one hand, and with Mu'awiyah, on the other, points to the latter as the most probable amir al-mu'minîn of our papyrus text. Furthermore, in view of the increasing stress and strain between 'Amr and Mu'awiyah in the post-arbitration period, the over-all tone of 'Amr's speech best reflects their relationship in the period between the truce agreement with 'Ali and the fateful arbitration itself. For this was the period in which discipline deteriorated markedly in 'Ali's camp but held fast among Mu'awiyah's well disciplined forces, as it was also the exhilarating period during which Mu'awiyah was first acknowledged by the Syrians as their caliph and 'Amr, with troops supplied by Mu'awiyah, achieved his second conquest of Egypt and received the long-coveted governorship as his well earned reward.
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50 Dinawari, pp. 235 f.
51 Ya'qubi II 264; Mas'udi V 61; Iṣṭî'âb II 436; Ibn Taghrîbîrdî I 139. Zambaur, p. 25, does not record this event.
52 Tabari II 28, citing Waqidî.
53 Tabari II 84.
54 Ya'qubi II 209 f.
55 'Uṣûn I 9; 'Uṣûn I 25.
56 Wâq'at Sîffîn, pp. 529 f., 614; Tabari I 3283 f.; Mas'udi V 80. See also p. 59 below.
We have seen (pp. 44–47) that in addition to Ya‘qūb ibn ‘Atā’, who is the author or transmitter of our papyrus text, five other men are mentioned in the second section, which begins with recto 7, and that these five were close contemporaries. The sources reveal Aḥnāf ibn al-Tarmīmī as the central figure, with whom the others were closely associated on various occasions as fellow tribesmen and co-delegates or as ‘Alī’s supporters. Aḥnāf’s guiding principles seem to have been to serve and safeguard the interests of his tribe, the Tamīmites, and to support the regularly constituted caliphal authority. He advocated the settlement of political disputes by negotiation and compromise, failing which he took refuge in neutrality. But he did not stop short of participating in rebellion and civil war as a last resort in the interest of justice as he saw it. He remained neutral in the rebellion against ‘Uthmān and throughout the first stages of the First Civil War that ended with ‘Ali’s victory in the Battle of the Camel. The continuation of the rebellion against ‘Ali, headed this time by Mu‘āwiyah in formidable alliance with ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ, came as a shocking and ominous surprise. Aḥnāf’s natural inclination toward ‘Ali, as representing the Prophet’s family and as the duly elected caliph who had already fought on the battlefield for the right to his office, was enough to convert him from a neutral to a whole-hearted supporter of ‘Ali for the remainder of the First Civil War. The Tamīmites fought well under his command in the ensuing Battle of Siffin. He was among those who questioned ‘Amr’s and Mu‘āwiyah’s motives in raising the Qur’ānic manuscripts, and he strenuously opposed the truce that followed. He was on hand at the drawing of the truce agreement and cautioned ‘Ali repeatedly to be wary of the wily ‘Amr and Mu‘āwiyah and specifically warned him in the strongest terms possible not to yield to ‘Amr’s demand to delete the amīr al-muw‘āminīn appended to his name in the drafting of the truce agreement. When it was time for the Arbitration of Adhruh, Aḥnāf, realizing that Abū Mūsā al-Asḥā’ī was no match for ‘Amr and convinced that he himself was more than a match for the latter, entreated ‘Ali in vain to appoint him or other of Muḥammad’s Companions as a counselor to Abū Mūsā. All he could then do was to give the departing Abū Mūsā his advice, which, like that offered ‘Ali, went unheeded.

After the death of ‘Ali and the abdication of Ḥasan ibn ‘Ali, Aḥnāf and his Tamīmites took the oath of allegiance to Mu‘āwiyah and co-operated with his successive governors of Baṣrah. Mu‘āwiyah was a firm believer in keeping communications open between the ruler and the tribal leaders as his counselors and helpers (raṣūlāt). It took the patient yet dignified prudence (hi‘l) for which he was proverbially famed for the right to his office, was enough to convert him from a neutral to a whole-hearted supporter of ‘All, headed this time by Mu‘āwiyah in formidable alliance with ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ, came as a shocking and ominous surprise. Aḥnāf’s natural inclination toward ‘Ali, as representing the Prophet’s family and as the duly elected caliph who had already fought on the battlefield for the right to his office, was enough to convert him from a neutral to a whole-hearted supporter of ‘Ali for the remainder of the First Civil War. The Tamīmites fought well under his command in the ensuing Battle of Siffin. He was among those who questioned ‘Amr’s and Mu‘āwiyah’s motives in raising the Qur’ānic manuscripts, and he strenuously opposed the truce that followed. He was on hand at the drawing of the truce agreement and cautioned ‘Ali repeatedly to be wary of the wily ‘Amr and Mu‘āwiyah and specifically warned him in the strongest terms possible not to yield to ‘Amr’s demand to delete the amīr al-muw‘āminīn appended to his name in the drafting of the truce agreement. When it was time for the Arbitration of Adhruh, Aḥnāf, realizing that Abū Mūsā al-Asḥā’ī was no match for ‘Amr and convinced that he himself was more than a match for the latter, entreated ‘Ali in vain to appoint him or other of Muḥammad’s Companions as a counselor to Abū Mūsā. All he could then do was to give the departing Abū Mūsā his advice, which, like that offered ‘Ali, went unheeded.

62 When it was time for ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Abbas, but objections were raised to having two North Arabs as the wazir (of Mu‘āwiyah. Aḥnāf had his own advice, which, like that offered ‘Ali, went unheeded.

64 E.g. ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ, came as a shocking and ominous surprise. Aḥnāf’s natural inclination toward ‘Ali, as representing the Prophet’s family and as the duly elected caliph who had already fought on the battlefield for the right to his office, was enough to convert him from a neutral to a whole-hearted supporter of ‘Ali for the remainder of the First Civil War. The Tamīmites fought well under his command in the ensuing Battle of Siffin. He was among those who questioned ‘Amr’s and Mu‘āwiyah’s motives in raising the Qur’ānic manuscripts, and he strenuously opposed the truce that followed. He was on hand at the drawing of the truce agreement and cautioned ‘Ali repeatedly to be wary of the wily ‘Amr and Mu‘āwiyah and specifically warned him in the strongest terms possible not to yield to ‘Amr’s demand to delete the amīr al-muw‘āminīn appended to his name in the drafting of the truce agreement. When it was time for the Arbitration of Adhruh, Aḥnāf, realizing that Abū Mūsā al-Asḥā’ī was no match for ‘Amr and convinced that he himself was more than a match for the latter, entreated ‘Ali in vain to appoint him or other of Muḥammad’s Companions as a counselor to Abū Mūsā. All he could then do was to give the departing Abū Mūsā his advice, which, like that offered ‘Ali, went unheeded.

After the death of ‘Ali and the abdication of Ḥasan ibn ‘Ali, Aḥnāf and his Tamīmites took the oath of allegiance to Mu‘āwiyah and co-operated with his successive governors of Baṣrah. Mu‘āwiyah was a firm believer in keeping communications open between the ruler and the tribal leaders as his counselors and helpers (raṣūlāt). It took the patient yet dignified prudence (hi‘l) for which he was proverbially famed.
for Aḥnaf to hold his own with Muʿāwiya as caliph. Muʿāwiya, for his part, aware of Aḥnaf’s powerful influence in Ḫisā ḫ and aspiring to that same quality of ḥilm, having first angrily provoked his erstwhile enemy, came in time to court, use, and admire him, even as ‘Umar I had done some three decades earlier. When Aḥnaf and Jariya ibn Qudamah came in 50/670 with a Baṣrān delegation to Muʿāwiya, they and two other leaders each received a gift of 100,000 dirhems. Aḥnaf’s independent spirit combined with his sense of loyalty was well illustrated on several occasions when Muʿāwiya sought his support for the succession of his son Yazīd. Unimpressed with the youthful Yazīd and opposed to dynastic succession, Aḥnaf remained silent while a group of influential leaders summoned by Muʿāwiya praised Yazīd and favored his succession. ‘Amr ibn Saʿd’s high praise of Yazīd was considered excessive even by Muʿāwiya. It included the metaphor jadha ʿgārīs’, which is closely related to one used earlier by ‘Amr ibn al-ʿĀṣ (see recto 3 of our papyrus text) to describe presumably Muʿāwiya himself. When in 53/673 Muʿāwiya called on Aḥnaf to speak his mind, all Aḥnaf would then say was: “I fear Allāh too much to speak falsehood and I fear you too much to speak the truth.” But on another occasion he is reported as saying to Muʿāwiya: “You know Yazīd better than any one of us—how he conducts himself by night or day in private or in public. Do not feed him this world while you are on your way to the next one.” It took Muʿāwiya several years, beginning in 53/673, to win enough support so that he could actually appoint and reaffirm Yazīd as his heir in 56/676. Once this step was taken, Aḥnaf accepted it and remained loyal to Yazīd as heir and as caliph. But even after Yazīd was appointed as heir, Muʿāwiya continued to seek support for him from those who had remained neutral and especially from those who
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66 Ibn Khallikān I 283 (= trans. I 635 f.). At an early meeting after Muʿāwiya’s caliphate had been firmly established, Muʿāwiya expressed his lasting anger at the very thought of the Battle of Siffin. Aḥnaf minced no words in assuring Muʿāwiya that should he renew the war Aḥnaf and his followers would be more than ready to meet him in battle again; then Aḥnaf rose and walked out. Muʿāwiya commented: “That is the man who, if angered, has one hundred thousand of the tribe of Tamīm to share his anger without asking him the reason for it.” A second angry exchange of words between Aḥnaf and Muʿāwiya took place when Aḥnaf protested the cursing of ‘Ali (Waʿf al Siffin, p. 636; ‘Iqd IV 28, 366; Nuwairi VII 237 f.).

67 Muʿāwiya even took Aḥnaf into his confidence in a harem affair, with the result that Aḥnaf received a tongue-lashing and rough handling from one of Muʿāwiya’s wives. For this episode see Ibn Qayyim al-Janūsiyyah, Kāhēb ʿakhār al-nisiṣ (‘Iqd IV 368; Muʿallafat Ibn al-Jauzi, Al-aḤam has been questioned and that it is now believed by some to be the work of Ibn al-Jauzi (see e.g. Khair al-Dīn al-Zirkili, Majalis Tha‘lab l 72; see also Futufy, Fudūh al-shām [Cairo, 1911] II 28; Tabari I pp. 40-42, 425; Dinawari, p. 290; Wujūd [pseudo], Fudūh al-ahdān [Cairo, 1315/1899] I 79).

68 As saying to Muʿāwiya: “You know Yazīd better than any one of us—how he conducts himself by night or day in private or in public. Do not feed him this world while you are on your way to the next one.”

69 Muʿāwiya called on Aḥnaf to speak his mind, all Aḥnaf would then say was: “I fear Allāh too much to speak falsehood and I fear you too much to speak the truth.”

70 But on another occasion he is reported as saying to Muʿāwiya: “You know Yazīd better than any one of us—how he conducts himself by night or day in private or in public. Do not feed him this world while you are on your way to the next one.”

71 Muʿāwiya even took Aḥnaf into his confidence in a harem affair, with the result that Aḥnaf received a tongue-lashing and rough handling from one of Muʿāwiya’s wives. For this episode see Ibn Qayyim al-Janūsiyyah, Kāhēb ʿakhār al-nisiṣ (‘Iqd IV 368; Muʿallafat Ibn al-Jauzi, Al-aḤam has been questioned and that it is now believed by some to be the work of Ibn al-Jauzi (see e.g. Khair al-Dīn al-Zirkili, Majalis Tha‘lab l 72; see also Futufy, Fudūh al-shām [Cairo, 1911] II 28; Tabari I pp. 40-42, 425; Dinawari, p. 290; Wujūd [pseudo], Fudūh al-ahdān [Cairo, 1315/1899] I 79).

72 Once this step was taken, Aḥnaf accepted it and remained loyal to Yazīd as heir and as caliph. But even after Yazīd was appointed as heir, Muʿāwiya continued to seek support for him from those who had remained neutral and especially from those who
still opposed him either because they were opposed to the principle of dynastic succession or because they were themselves caliphal aspirants. Ahnaf’s influence in this matter must have had its effect during these critical succession years.

In his own province, ‘Iraq, Ahnaf supported Ziyād ibn Abī Sufyān and his son ‘Ubaid Allāh. He advised Mu‘āwiyah and Ziyād against eliminating some of the ever increasing and increasingly bold mawādī, pointing out to Mu‘āwiyah that they were maternal relatives and to Ziyād that the Qur‘ān and the practice of Muḥammad were against such a step, and he added that the mawādī class rendered lowly but needed services in the market place. Ahnaf’s support of ‘Ubaid Allāh was not affected by the latter’s coolness toward him. When Mu‘āwiyah was considering the appointment of a governor of Baṣrah to replace ‘Ubaid Allāh, he asked for nominations from the Baṣran delegation. Several of the men spoke in favor of their candidates, but Ahnaf remained silent until Mu‘awiyah called on him to speak. “If you appoint one of your family,” said Ahnaf, “we consider no one the equal of ‘Ubaid Allāh.” And ‘Ubaid Allāh, already governor of Kūfah, had Baṣrah restored to his jurisdiction, but not without an admonition from Mu‘āwiyah for his failure to appreciate Ahnaf. Later, when the Second Civil War broke out soon after the death of Yazīd I (64-683) and ‘Ubaid Allāh himself had to flee Baṣrah, Ahnaf alone stood by him. But when ‘Ubaid Allāh fell in battle and the Khārijites turned from allies to rivals of ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubair, Ahnaf threw in his lot with the latter. Ahnaf remained a soldier and a general to the end. He was with ‘Ubaid Allāh on the expeditions to Khūrāsān and fought and fell in ‘Iraq on the side of Muṣ‘ab ibn al-Zubair.

LITERARY BACKGROUND

I

The over-all literary style of the speech of ‘Amr ibn al-‘Aṣ is appropriate for any period of his life. Brief terse prose was generally characteristic of pre-Islāmic, early Islāmic, and Umayyad times. This is well illustrated by the extant papyrus manuscripts representative of administrative correspondence from the time of ‘Amr’s first conquest of Egypt to the first decades of ‘Abbāsid rule. Extant historical and literary works of the second and third/eighth and ninth centuries further attest the preference throughout the Umayyad period for elegantly concise prose in conversation, oratory, and correspondence. The use of rhymed prose, as in recto 1-2 of our document, and an occasional figure of speech, primarily a simile or a metaphor involving familiar desert flora and fauna such as the palm tree of recto 2-3 and the camel of verso 10-11, were equally characteristic of the literary taste of the time. However, one has to keep in mind that, though oratory was cultivated, the much admired literary figure of pre-Islāmic and Islāmic times was not so much the orator as the poet. The poet who was also a master orator ranked at the very

74 Tabari II 196-98; Ma‘ṣūdī V 72 f.; Amīlī III 177 f.; Husr II 115.
75 Iqd III 413; Ibn ‘Asākir VII 15: Fīh mā yiqūn āsār al-mulūm fī ṣam‘āl al-adhāb, mā yiqūn āsārātīm ṣawā‘ib ‘alā rūsārīm wa-dhālikān: See our Vol. II 34 for Mu‘āwiyah’s and Zuhrī’s attitude and for the mawādī’s increasing participation in the learned professions.
77 Tabari II 192, 432-38; Ibn Khallikān I 291 (= trans. I 640).
78 Tabari II 156, 170; Ibn Khallikān I 2.
79 Ibn Sa‘d VII 1, p. 69; Ma‘rif, p. 217; Tabari II 682-85, 720, 750; Ibn Khallikān I 291 (= trans. I 640); see also pp. 44 f. above.
80 See the many documents published in Becker, Papryri Schott-Reinhart I, Adolf Grohmann, Arabic Papryri in the Egyptian Library I (Cairo, 1934), and Abbott, The Karrah Papryri from Abydodito in the Oriental Institute.
81 Iḥṣān al-Nuss, Al-khitṭabah al-siyāsīyah fī ʿasr Bani Umayyah (Damascus, 1965), has brought together some representative speeches for various occasions of this period.
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top of the literary class. Certainly in the campaigns of Muḥammad and the conquests of the Umayyads the primary propagandists were the poets who accompanied the armies. It was they, whether reciting ancient poetry or improvised verses suited to the occasion, who upheld the morale of the troops and taunted the enemy. They were reinforced by the political and military leaders on hand, most of whom quoted ancient verse and many of whom were poets of a sort and recited their own poetry. Formal military speeches were brief as a rule and comparatively rare. These literary ideals and practices help in part to explain the abundance of poetry, spurious or otherwise, in Ibn Iṣḥāq’s Sirāh and Naṣr ibn Muzāḥim’s Waq‘at Ṣifīn, dating respectively from the first and the second half of the second/eighth century. It is therefore not surprising that Jāḥiẓ and his contemporaries and their predecessors paid more attention to poets and their poetry than to prose literature, including public speeches of various categories, but took special note of orators who were also poets or men of wisdom and learning. Jāḥiẓ was aware that he had not done the orators justice as to classification according to time, tribe, and merit—a treatment he shirked in order to content himself with general references only, though he did later give a brief account of some tribal and regional orators, especially those who were South Arabs, and he did touch on oratory in connection with other subjects, especially akhbār.

Yet, despite the comparative neglect of rhetoric as such, the private discourse and public speeches of outstanding personalities, beginning with Muḥammad, attracted special attention and seem to have been early committed to writing and collected along with some official correspondence. Some of these materials, oral or written, must have been available to Ibn Iṣḥāq, Naṣr ibn Muzāḥim, and Wāqīḍī and his secretary Ibn Sa’d, all of whom have preserved for us scattered samplings of this type of early prose literature. Certainly their successors, including Jāḥiẓ, had access to such collections, especially well known collections devoted to the speeches of Muḥammad and the first four caliphs. The court secretary of Ma’mūn, Sahl ibn Ḥārūn (d. 215/830), himself a poet, orator, and author and the librarian largely responsible for the great collection of Ma’mūn’s famed library, the Dār al-ḥikmah, produced several types of anthologies, including poetry and public speeches. Jāḥiẓ lists and comments on a number of orators, while Ibn Qutaibah and Ibn ‘Abd Rabbih both devote a section to a collection of speeches going back to the time of Muḥammad. Some classification of formal speeches, such as Friday sermons in the mosques and inaugural speeches of caliphs and governors, seems to have been made early in Umayyad times to judge formal speeches of Muḥammad and the first four caliphs. The court secretary of Ma’mūn, Sahl ibn Ḥārūn (d. 215/830), himself a poet, orator, and author and the librarian largely responsible for the great collection of Ma’mūn’s famed library, the Dār al-ḥikmah, produced several types of anthologies, including poetry and public speeches. Jāḥiẓ lists and comments on a number of orators, while Ibn Qutaibah and Ibn ‘Abd Rabbih both devote a section to a collection of speeches going back to the time of Muḥammad. Some classification of formal speeches, such as Friday sermons in the mosques and inaugural speeches of caliphs and governors, seems to have been made early in Umayyad times to judge

---

82 Jāḥiẓ, Bayān I 25 f., 62, and 244 (citing Abū 'Amr ibn al-'Alā) and III 372 f. (citing Abū 'Ubaid and Yūnūs ibn Ḥābīb). takes up this theme and gives reasons for the relative positions of poet and orator in these early times. Jāḥiẓ own day, when poets had become largely mercenary and prose literature had developed in style, saw the reversal of the roles of poet and orator and produced the highly cultured court secretary, with his polished prose, who became a rival of both until still later when prose literature itself became too flowery and verbose. Formal treatises on rhetoric came in the wake of poetics, both being more or less under Greek influence (see e.g. Qudānah, Intro. pp. 36-44; Ibn Sīnā, Al-khitābah [Al-ṣīrih; Al-mantiq VI] ed. Muhammad Salim Salim [Cairo, 1373/1954].

83 Qudānah, Intro, pp. 36-44; Ibn Sīnā, Al-khitābah [Al-ṣīrih; Al-mantiq VI] ed. Muhammad Salim Salim [Cairo, 1373/1954].


85 Jāḥiẓ, Bayān I 55-66, gives representative lists of pre-Islamic and early Islamic orators and points out that poets outnumbered orators and that those who combined both talents were few, the best among them being Kumait, Ba‘īth, and Tirmīmh (cf. Ibid. III 372 f.).

86 Jāḥiẓ, Bayān I 131-35.

87 Muhammad's speech and style received special attention in the works of these and later scholars (see e.g. Qudānah, pp. 18 f.).

88 Jāḥiẓ, Bayān I 208.

89 Jāḥiẓ, Bayān I 68 f. For Sahl ibn Ḥārūn see Fihrist, p. 120, and Irshād IV 338 f.

90 Jāḥiẓ, Bayān I 312-20, 332-38.

91 'Ugūs II 251-56; Iqāl 54-154, where pp. 54-96 take us through Umayyad times.
by their frequent appearance in subsequent literature.\textsuperscript{93} We do know that Khālid al-Qasrī (d. 126/744), governor of Basrah and later of Mecca and finally Hishām’s governor of both Başrah and Kūfah (105–20/723–38), who was himself an orator, as were his son and grandson, reported that his father had made him memorize a thousand speeches as a very effective part of his liberal education and that he himself had a large collection, including speeches made at weddings,\textsuperscript{94} and we know also that he sought historical and genealogical manuscripts from Zuhār.\textsuperscript{95}

The Umayyad family produced no master orator, and the only ones mentioned as having some oratorical talent are Mu‘awiyyah’s brother ‘Utbaḥ, his half-brother Ziyād, and ‘Abd al-Malik, who believed the responsibility of the Friday sermons in the mosque turned his hair gray.\textsuperscript{96} The Quraish as a whole, though proud of their Arabic as the language spoken by Muḥammad and chosen for the Qur’ānic revelations, produced comparatively few master orators. Though ‘Alī and ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubair were considered as such by their partisans,\textsuperscript{97} their speeches do not measure up in ideas and style to those of such men as Ziyād ibn Abī Sufyān, Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf,\textsuperscript{98} or Khālid al-Qasrī.\textsuperscript{99}

The three leading personalities of our papyrus text, ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ, presumably Mu‘awiyyah, and Aḥnaf ibn Qais, represent a larger group of orators of lower rank. Aḥnaf was much more renowned for his pithy sayings and pearls of wisdom than for his few short speeches that are recorded.\textsuperscript{100} Mu‘awiyyah, too, seems to have been more effective in private or small-group discourse than in public oratory if we are to judge by the style and effect of his speeches as compared to those of ‘Amr during their long period of association.\textsuperscript{101} ‘Amr seems to have had the advantage over Mu‘awiyyah in his readiness to address large gatherings, in his effective delivery, and in his rapport with his audiences, qualities which Mu‘awiyyah recognized and put to use. When Mu‘awiyyah first heard of ‘Alī’s speech urging his followers on the march to give him battle, he was disturbed and called on ‘Amr for advice. The practical ‘Amr, more of a soldier than Mu‘awiyyah, advised speedy preparation of the Syrian forces and speeches to rouse in them burning desire to avenge the blood of ‘Uthmān. ‘Amr’s own speech played on the weakness, both political and military, of ‘Alī’s army, which had not yet fully recovered from the Battle of the Camel.\textsuperscript{102} Mu‘awiyyah’s speeches then and at other times placed more stress on ‘Alī’s role in the death of ‘Uthmān and his own right to avenge him.\textsuperscript{103} In the course of the battle, which lasted for several days, Mu‘awiyyah scolded his followers for lack of enthusiasm in word and deed and pointed out that ‘Amr alone could lay claim to both,
but he only angered several of the leaders. Again, after the discouraging results of the fifth day of the battle, Muʿawiyah counseled with 'Amr, who first pointed out 'Ali's familial and political advantages and then cautioned Muʿawiyah against personal laxity but urged him to lose no time in easing discipline and austerity among the Syrians and leading them to greater exertion by raising their hopes for future comforts and rewards. Muʿawiyah prepared and delivered a short speech with these points in mind and was reinforced by a similar speech from 'Amr. Both men are said to have delivered somewhat longer speeches before the last day of the battle.

A few other speeches of 'Amr have survived and are scattered in a wide variety of sources, but the occasions that called them forth are seldom specified. A few datable exceptions are of special interest. The first is a speech made in Syria in the year 17/638, known as the “year of the plague.” Unlike most of his leading contemporaries, who looked on the plague as willed by God and therefore not to be deliberately avoided, the hard-headed 'Amr urged the people to flee to the hills to avoid the plague, which, once started, spread like wildfire. Two of Amr’s Friday sermons in the mosque, delivered during his first governorship of Egypt, seem patterned for content more or less after those of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar I, particularly the latter, whose traditions from Muhammad 'Amr quoted in regard to religious duties, family, social behavior, and considerate treatment of the Copts. 'Amr’s facility with words and his smooth delivery were appreciated by ʿUmar I, who whenever he heard a speaker grope for words or stammer would marvel at how the same God created both such a speaker and the fluent 'Amr. 'Umar’s admiration for ‘Amr’s vivid description of Egypt is well known, as is his appreciative remark on reading it. Not so well known is ‘Amr’s terrifying description of the sea written in reply to Hjmar’s request and said to have influenced Caliph’s refusal of Muʿawiyah’s request for an aggressive naval policy.

Several of Muʿawiyah’s speeches during his caliphate have come down to us. They are more labored in style, and their tone progresses from an effort at conciliation in the first year of his caliphate, to a threatening assertion of his authority, particularly in reference to the succession of Yazid as his heir (see pp. 55 f.), to reflection on his long reign and its effects on the people, to his readiness to depart this world in the hope of a favorable reception by Allāh.

Of the three leading personalities of our papyrus text, the sources report ʿAbd Allāh’s familiarity with classical poetry but cite hardly any verses of his own. Muʿawiyah was reader with quotations from the
poets and is credited with a number of impromptu verses of his own. There are reports of several instances when these two discussed some poets or verse. We find that 'Amr was as ready with citations as Mu'awiyah and more productive of original verse, both as to number and length of poems. 'Amr is mentioned among the pagan Quraishite poets who satirized Mu'hammad and the Ansar.118

We have no direct evidence that 'Amr himself made a point of committing his verses to writing except those which he included in his correspondence with Mu'awiyah and others. The practice of including poetic citations and original verses in personal and political correspondence was already much in evidence among 'Amr's leading associates and contemporaries. There is, for instance, the earlier episode of 'Umar I and Naṣr ibn al-Ḥajjāj ibn 'Īlāṭ, when both Naṣr and the mother of Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf sent 'Umar written verses avowing their innocence. A little later, 'Umar received anonymously written verses complaining of the rule of 'Amr in Egypt. 'Amr is, furthermore, credited with knowledge of the dialects of the Qurʿān and with transmitting traditions from Muḥammad. There is some evidence that, if neither 'Amr nor his secretary Wardān kept copies of 'Amr's correspondence and his other literary output, then his son 'Abd Allāh and the latter's grandson Shu'āb ibn Muḥammad did so, at least for some of 'Amr's traditions and poetry.126

II

Turning now to the immediate background of the second section of our papyrus text, in which Ḥanāf ibn Qa'is of Baṣrah and his companions express their views on the ideal maiden, we note that these men, whatever their individual distinction or interest as wisemen, statesmen, politicians, or poets, were all South Arabs and also warriors of one rank or another who were already active in the reign of 'Umar I. Though all, including eventually Naṣr ibn al-Ḥajjāj, had either Baṣrah or Kufrāh as their headquarters, their political and military careers ran their course in 'Irāq and points to the east and in the Hijāz and Syria. From the literary sources on hand we have already ascertained that except for Naṣr these men all participated in the First Civil War. Furthermore, they are not otherwise associated in the sources. Therefore, our papyrus text, which shows them all together, including Naṣr, must indicate that this war was the background of their conversation. This fits well with the most logical background for 'Amr's speech, namely the period following the Battle of Siffin (see p. 50), which in turn suggests that in all probability

115 For Mu'awiyah's interest in classical poetry see Vol. I 14 f. in connection with his constant demand for poetry from 'Ubayd ibn Sharyah. For samples of poetry credited to Mu'awiyah see e.g. Waq'at Siffin, pp. 726-39, which cites him 14 times; 'Uyun al-Siyasah II 169, III 159, and IV 55; Mas'ūdī V 31 f., 55; Ibn 'Asakir VII 326. Mu'awiyah's patronage of poets and his use of them for political propaganda is well illustrated in the role played by Miskin al-Darmī in the succession of Yazīd (see e.g. Shīr, p. 347; Aphrāṭ XVIII 69 f.).


117 See e.g. Waq'at Siffin, pp. 726-39, which cites him 16 times; Ya'qūbī II 218 f.; 'Ītār I 3257; Mas'ūdī V 28, 30 f., 55, 60 f.; 'Iqd IV 15, 344 f.; Ibn 'Asakir VI 295 f.

118 E.g. Sīrah I 272, 621, 623; Ya'qūbī II 145; Aphrāṭ IV 4.

119 E.g. Waq'at Siffin, pp. 396, 467-69, 630; Ya'qūbī II 214-16; 'Iqd IV 344 f.

120 E.g. Waq'at Siffin, pp. 57, 59, 176-78, 470 f., 473 f.; Futūḥ, pp. 147 f.; Jāhib, Mahāsin, pp. 288, 341 f., 204; Aphrāṭ XVII 57 and 59, XXI 23 f. and 37; Irshād VII 67 f. One must keep in mind, however, the question of the authenticity of such poetry.

121 See e.g. Khamsah II 106-12 and other references cited on pp. 45 f. above.

122 'Umar I prohibited the Muslims from taking the initiative in satirical verse against the Ansār and the still pagan Quraish but permitted the Muslims, should they be so attacked, to retaliate by composing and committing such verse to writing. The Ansār had a written collection of such verse (Aphrāṭ III 5 f.). Furthermore, in 21/642 'Umar wrote his governor of Kufrāh to send him written copies of the poetry of contemporary poets in his province (Yazīd, p. 109) and also instructed Abū Mūsā al-Ash'ārī to order those who were with him to study poetry because it leads to high morality, good judgment, and knowledge of genealogy ('Umdah I 10).

123 Ibn al-Jazari I 601.

124 Nuwairī, p. 479, credits him with 37 traditions.


126 Ibn Ḥanbal, Al-musnad II 158; Jarīr II 1, pp. 351 f.; Aphrāṭ IX 58; 'Iqd IV 43; Ibn 'Asakir VI 324.
the conversation of Aḥnaf and his companions took place during the truce period. Relieved of actual fighting and awaiting the outcome of the pending arbitration, these warriors, it would seem, passed their evenings in light conversation as their thoughts turned to home and maidens, as soldiers' thoughts are wont to do—a setting similar to that which started the Persian Hazār Afsāna on its way as the forerunner of the Arabian Nights.127

For the literary background of this section of our papyrus text we must keep in mind the racial origin as well as the tribal and socio-cultural status of our speakers and must consider further the stage of development of Arabic literary prose in the first half of the first century of Islam. The speakers, being all Arabs from either shortly before the advent of Islam or soon thereafter, reflect in part long-established pre-Islamic concepts of the ideal maiden and in part the recently imposed Islamic ideal. The combination of the two concepts is reflected in Aḥnaf’s opening statement (recto 9–10), which stipulates humility before Allāh as his first requirement and a homebody as his second, but the “home” is no more than a tribal leader’s tent. We may safely assume that Aḥnaf’s companions tacitly accepted his first, if not his second, stipulation as basic, since humility before Allāh is required of Muslim men as well. This raises the question of the significance of the particle bal in this context in respect not only to Aḥnaf’s statement but also to each successive statement, that is, whether it is still being used in its less common copulative conjunctival sense or in its more common restrictive or adversative adverbial sense.128 In other words, does each speaker negate the preceding statement in favor of his own specifications or does he add his specifications to those already mentioned? There are no inherent contradictions in the successive statements, and hence it is possible that they were meant to be cumulative so that they would cover physical, mental, and personality characteristics. The ideal maiden, in that case, would have to be a paragon of sorts. The alternative would be to consider the particle bal as put to use first as a conjunction, where each speaker supplements Aḥnaf’s statement, and second as an inceptive particle of digression, where each speaker, irrespective of what has already been said, stresses his own basic desire in a maiden and displays at the same time his own eloquence. A case can be argued for either of these two alternatives in so far as the pertinent content of the literary sources is concerned.

The earliest recorded and best known description of the ideal maiden is that which traces back to the Kūfān and to Ḥammād al-Rāwiyah, Abī ‘Ubaidah, and Hishām ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Sā’ib al-Kalbī, whose accounts are sometimes combined.129 Briefly, the story behind the description is as follows. A Lakhmid king of Ḥira, Mundhir IV (A.D. 576–80),130 is said to have sent a gift of an Arab maiden along with a written description of her to Khusrau Anūshirwān (A.D. 531–79), who was delighted with the maiden and so impressed with the description that he ordered it filed in his state bureau. Later, when Khusrau II (A.D. 590–628), looking for a wife for his heir, was studying the same description, he was assured by Zaid ibn ‘Adī, his Christian Arab secretary,131 that the family of the Ḥira king Nu’mān ibn al-Mundhir (A.D. 580–602) had a score or more of young girls who answered that description. Khusrau sent Zaid to Nu’mān with a request for the hand of one of these girls for the Persian prince, which was indignantly refused. The angered Khusrau later imprisoned Nu’mān and brought about his death. The episode is said to have set the background for the Battle of Dhu Kār, which was fought in Muḥammad’s time but is dated variously from A.D. 604 to 620. The description of the maiden covers almost a page of Ṭabari’s printed text, and about half of it is devoted to the maiden’s physical charms, item by item and

127 See Abbott in JNES VIII 129–44.
128 See e.g. Wright, Grammar II 334; Lane, pp. 243 f.
129 See e.g. Ṭabari I 1016, 1025–29; Ṭahānī II 29–31; Ṭahānī (1927—) II 120–27.
130 See OIP L 6–8 and 17–19 for the Lakhmid kingdom of Ḥira, whose rulers were vassals of the Persian empire, and its use of Arabic in pre-Islamic diplomatic correspondence.
131 For the role of Zaid’s father, ‘Adī ibn Zaid (d. ca A.D. 590), and his family in pre-Islamic poetry see e.g. Jāhīr, Ḥujwīra IV 197–99, 203, 376 f., and Khizanah I 184–86.
feature by feature, from head to toe. The rest of the description stresses mostly mental and personality traits. The language involves rare words and unfamiliar terms that call for explanatory comments. Rhymed prose is freely used along with an occasional figure of speech. Some sources, early and late, mention the episode but do not give the text of the description as such.

Ibn 'Abd Rabbihi (246–328/860–940), citing only his contemporary Abū Muḥammad al-Farāghāni, general and historian, pupil of Ṭabarī, reports a second pre-Islamic Arab description of the ideal woman, this time given to Khūsraw II and credited to Ḥārīth ibn Kaladah al-Thaqafi. Ḥārīth was known as a “physician of the Arabs,” who had acquired some of his medical knowledge in Persia and about whom several medical anecdotes are available. Khūsraw begins his interview with Ḥārīth by belittling the Arabs as uncultured. Ḥārīth’s defense of and pride in his Arab heritage soon convince Khūsraw that Ḥārīth himself is a cultured man. Khūsraw proceeds next to test Ḥārīth’s medical competence and plies him with questions about disease, medicine, diet, and sex. Ḥārīth’s prescription for good health, in brief, involves the concept that prevention is better than cure and calls for moderation in food and sex. Khūsraw finally asks for a description of the woman most pleasing to eye and heart. Ḥārīth’s answer, devoted entirely to a physical description, is in rhymed prose. It starts with simple two-word phrases and ends with a series of longer phrases in which the girl is said to be softer than butter, sweeter than sugar, more fragrant than jasmine and rose, and more pleasing even than paradise. The only other comparable account of the conversation between Khūsraw and Ḥārīth is provided by Ibn Abī Uṣaibī ‘ah, who cites no initial single or composite authority for it but reports several additional anecdotes of Ḥārīth, some of which are traced to early transmitters readily found in Ibn Sa’d and Ṭabarī, such as the Companion ‘Amr ibn ‘Awf. 'Abd al-Malik ibn ‘Umar al-Lakhmī (ca. 33–136/653–753), and Abū ‘Awānāh al-Waḍdāḥ ibn Khilādī (d. 170/786 or 176/792). He supplies two details not found in Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihi’s account, namely that Ḥārīth informed Khūsraw that he had read some books of the ḥukama’ and that Khūsraw ordered Ḥārīth’s speech to be committed to writing, which Ibn Abī Uṣaibī‘ah assumes was done by Ḥārīth himself. We find Ibn Abī Uṣaibī‘ah’s account to have grown by about a fourth so far as the basically descriptive phrases are concerned but to have omitted two non-descriptive phrases. There is also an appropriate word substitution or correction of the earlier text, which could well have been called for by a scribe’s paleographic error. The order is the same in both texts. Considering the three centuries that separate Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihi and Ibn Abī Uṣaibī‘ah, we can understand the discrepancies in their versions. Their sources probably drew on variant manuscript copies which are now lost or still undis

132 See e.g. Ṭabarī I 1025 ff.; Aḥānī II 29 ff. Aḥānī (1927—) II 122–24 gives the pointed text with the editor’s lexical commentary and a few emendations and minor textual variations, which text and the author’s comments thereon form the basis of the account in Nuwairī XV 326–28, where further references are given.
133 E.g. Jāḥiṣ, Ḣayawān IV 375–77; Maʿṣūrī, p. 319; Maʿṣūdī III 205–8; Khīṣānī I 185.
135 See e.g. ‘Uqayl II 65 ff., III 218 and 272, IV 131–33; ‘Iqd IV 263 and V 4 ff.; Ibn Abī Uṣāibī‘ah, Kitāb ‘uyūn an-ʾanbā’, ed. August Mueller, I (Cairo, 1882) 113. Ḥārīth and his family, especially his son Naḍr, physician, musician, and storyteller, were among those who persisted in their opposition to Muḥammad. Naḍr was executed after the Battle of Badr, and his sister’s (or daughter’s) elegy is said to have touched Muḥammad. Ḥārīth is said to have lived until the time of Muʿāwiyyah; for samples of his knowledge and skill see e.g. Sīrah I 187–91, 235, 262, 400, 457 ff., 539, 974; Muʿṣirī ibn ‘Amr al-Ṣadūṣī, Kitāb ḫadīf min nasab Quraish, pp. 48, 49; Jāḥiṣ, Bayān III 330; Ṭabarī I 1230, 1904, 1335; Maʿṣūdī IV 184; ‘Adhān-al-Shāhī, p. 257 and references cited; Ibn Abī Uṣāibī‘ah, Kitāb ‘uyūn an-ʾanbā’ I 109–16.
136 Ḥāʾijī ibn Yaṣaṣī asked his personal physician Bādḥūn for health rules and received much the same advice, some of it in phrases very similar to those used by Ḥārīth (‘Iqd VI 306).
137 ‘Iqd VI 373–76.
139 Ibn Sa’d IV 2, p. 79.
140 Ibid. VI 220 ff.
141 See ʿīd, VII 2, p. 43 ff., and p. 65 below. See also Ṭabarī for all three men.
142 Ibn Abī Uṣāibī‘ah, Kitāb ‘uyūn an-ʾanbā’ I 112, line 12, and 113, lines 18–19.
covered. It should be further noted that portions of varying lengths of the conversation between Khusrau and Harith appear scattered in earlier literary and in other medical works (see n. 135 above).

Tha'alibi\textsuperscript{143} recorded another demand by Khusrau II for a description of the most desirable maiden. The demand was met this time not by an Arab but by a most knowledgeable young Persian administrator of the dihqān class in Khusrau's service. The maiden's description again concludes a lengthy conversation, preceded, however, not by a medical theme but by a discussion of the best of all kinds of luxuries. It is reasonable to assume that the entire conversation was in Persian and that what we have is but an Arabic version of it. The description is physical except for the stipulation that the maiden be few of words and very modest. Khusrau, we are told, considered it perfect. Its literary style is less harmonious and flowing than that of the two descriptions already covered. Rhymed phrases are less frequent, and all but one of the phrases sustain the two-word measure, which soon grows monotonous in such a lengthy description. Similes are more freely used but are not unusual in character. The maiden must be almond-eyed, pearl-toothed, apple-breasted, wasp-waisted, and so forth.

In sampling this type of Arabic prose literature in its pre-Islamic Arab setting we have to rely on the samples that were committed to writing later. Concern with the relationship of the sexes was much in evidence in pre-Islamic and early Islamic times and was not limited to the erotic or romantic. It covered, in addition to general attitudes, numerous specific relationships of fathers and daughters, of mothers and sons, of brothers and sisters, of husbands and wives, and of youths and maidens. We need not go into all these relationships nor be limited to men's statements in order to gain an idea of the content and style of this type of prose, particularly in reference to the appearance and qualities of a prospective wife or husband. Advice given to prospective brides by fathers and mothers or by elderly women of the immediate family reflected the general attitude as tested and either accepted or modified by their personal experience or by the experience of a larger unit of the tribe. Nor need we limit ourselves to either desert or city dwellers since the basic social mores in a mobile society that as yet knew not the veil and segregation of the sexes was much the same in the desert and the town through the greater part of the Umayyad period.

Almost all of the pre-Islamic descriptions of young girls are comparatively brief and consist for the most part of a series of one-word or two-word phrases in rhymed prose. Many of these start and end with physical descriptions. Many others, though they list primarily physical characteristics, include some personality trait or moral quality. Still others, though not so many, further stipulate some intellectual qualities. The affinity of such descriptions with those in our papyrus text is obvious. There is on the whole a set of physical requirements that serves as a common denominator for all types of descriptions. The maiden must be good-looking and healthy, physically strong and well knit in form yet soft and yielding, not too tall nor too short, not too thin nor too fat. As to specific features, those most frequently desired are a fair complexion, heavy black hair, large black eyes, pearly teeth, slender neck, firm round breasts, small wrists, small waist and feet, and large hips.\textsuperscript{144} There is still considerable leeway for description not only of the remaining parts of the body but for further delineation of the features specified. The fair complexion, for instance, is further defined as white or creamy white or eggshell white or white and rosy or light yellow touched with red—specifications which bring to mind complexions compared to cream and roses and to cream and peaches. The common denominator for personal and ethical traits involves little more than obedience, patience, responsiveness, and fidelity. Lists of individual specifications, on the other hand, though seldom longer, cover a wider range. For, while one prospective husband looks for a cheerful and playful maid, another specifies a dignified household manager who would husband the family resources. Or, while one desires a maiden of proud bearing and descent, another wishes for a self-


\textsuperscript{144} For a recent study of feminine beauty as conceived in pre-Islamic and early Islamic times see Ahmad Muhammad al-Ḥāfi, \textit{Al-ghanāl fi al-ṣpr al-jāhilī} (Cairo, 1381/1961).
effacing girl of humbler background. Varying combinations of traits reflect further the wide variety of individual taste and status. For the less often stipulated intellectual requirements, the list is even shorter and the statements are more general and less varied. The qualities most frequently sought are eloquence (faṣāḥah), intelligence or wisdom (‘aql), and perfection (kamāl). They are graduated in degree and called for either singly or in combination.

Most of the well known transmitters and authors of the third and fourth centuries of Islam, such as Jāhiz, Ibn Qutaibah, Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihi, and Abū ‘Alī al-Qālī, frequently cite Bedouins on the ideal maid or wife. More frequently than not they omit context and isnād. Where an isnād is given, it usually traces back to such well known authors as Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alā’, Haitham ibn ‘Adi, HASHIM ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Sa’īb al-Kalbī and his father, Abū ‘Ubaid, Abū ‘Ubaidah, Aṣma’i, Abū Zaid al-Anṣārī, Madā’inī, and Ibn al-A’rābī. Only in cases where Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alā’ (d. 154/771) is the ultimate source can we safely assume the possibility that the Bedouin in a contextless statement reflects late pre-Islamic attitudes since the long-lived Abū ‘Amr is said to have drawn, in his earlier days, on Bedouins contemporary with the younger generation of Companions. For the rest, Bedouin concepts of the ideal maid and wife were not much affected by the advent of Islam, even during the early Umayyad period. Furthermore, there are few instances where the context indicates the speaker, Bedouin or not, to be of either the pre-Islamic or the early Islamic period.

There is, to begin with, Hind bint al-Khuss, the earliest of this group, who is herself described as eloquent, wise, shrewd, and ever ready with marvelous answers to questions put to her. She seems to have been asked about every phase of life, including the various relationships of the sexes. Her answers came in crisp, short, rhymed phrases no matter what the subject. Her opinions characterizing the best and the second-best of all types of men and the best and the second-best of all types of women are followed by her characterization of the worst types of men and women. Ibn Abī Ṭāhir Ṭa‘īfūr (204-80/819-93) reports on the authority of Ibn al-A’rābī the longest account of a contest held in Suq ‘Ukkāz between Hind and her sister. The contest ended in a tie and showed both girls to be ready with extempore verses. Hind describes herself as a young girl, states her own basic requirements in a husband, and answers a prospective husband’s request for advice as to what type of girl he should marry, in each case in a few short rhymed phrases.

Abū ‘Alī al-Qālī provides us with an account very similar in its scheme and literary style to that of the contest between Hind and her sister. The contest this time is between two Ḥimyarite princes, ‘Amr and Rabī‘ah, who are being tested by their aged father (not named). Qālī’s impressive isnād starts with Ibn Duraid and traces back to Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alā’. Comparison of the two accounts shows that the two sisters’ answers to questions in reference to good and bad men and women dwelt less on the physical and stressed more the practical qualities desirable in either a wife or a husband, while the cultured princes’ answers, though much concerned with physical appearance, stressed moral and intellectual qualities for both men and women. But when describing the worst types of women, both accounts stress undesirable personality and character traits more than either physical defects or intellectual shortcomings, as do

143 Abū Zaid al-Anṣārī, Kāliḥ al-nawādir fi al-lughāt, ed. Sa‘īd ibn Khārīl (Beirūt, 1894) p. 251; Jāhiz, Bayān I 300 and II 166; Tha‘alībi, Ḥayawān V 94, 105, 459. See also Maqāṣid Tha’lab I 343. Jāhiz and Abū ‘Alī al-Qālī provide some lexical comments, and in Muzhir II 540-46 is brought together much of what the earlier authors have on Hind and considerable attention is given to their isnād’s.

144 Amāl III 108 f., 120; Ibn Abī Ṭāhir Ṭa‘īfūr, pp. 55-57; Muzhir II 541.

145 Ibn Abī Ṭāhir Ṭa‘īfūr, pp. 53-58; Jāhiz, Bayān III 34; ‘Uyun II 214. Most of Hind’s answers to the many questions put to both girls are found widely scattered in later sources.

146 Jāhiz, Ḥayawān V 94; Tha‘alībi, Thimar, p. 460.

147 ‘Uyun IV 11.

148 Amāl II 269 f.

most sources that give considerable attention to women of any period.\textsuperscript{152} We do, indeed, find an early if instinctive appreciation of the "golden mean" which later came to be more formally stated and defended, perhaps under Aristotelian influence. Most men felt that the extremely beautiful and highly intelligent and literate woman was to be avoided because they believed that as a wife she would all but inevitably be independent in social and moral matters.\textsuperscript{153} This brings to mind the high-placed, beautiful, and literate women who addressed Naṣr ibn al-Ḥājjāj of our papyrus text (see verso 4–5 and comments on pp. 46 ff.).

There is, furthermore, some evidence of expected reciprocity of unselfish devotion between husband and wife. This is best illustrated by the instructions given to Umm Iyās (fl. ca. A.D. 550), daughter of the Shaibänid chief 'Afw ibn Muhallim, on the eve of her marriage to the Kindite king 'Amar ibn Hujr or his son Ḥārith, ancestors of the poet Imru’ al-Qais: "Be to him a bondswoman and he will be to you a slave and," added the mother, "observe ten points of conduct which will lay up for you with him a treasure store." The ten points, grouped in five pairs of instructions in rhymed prose, may be summarized as follows. Be content in his company and ever ready to obey him; be always personally tidy and sweet smelling when with him; watch out for the proper time of his food and be quiet while he sleeps; husband his resources carefully without, however, stinting his family or retainers;\textsuperscript{154} and do not ever oppose him or reveal his secrets; and—as an afterthought—always match your mood to his.\textsuperscript{155} These instructions soon became proverbial, and fathers, including some of the Companions, used them for the benefit of their daughters.\textsuperscript{156} Again content and style are compatible with our text. Not so is an added description of Umm Iyās credited to 'Īṣām, a South Arab female agent of the Kindite king. So far as I have been able to discover from the sources available to me at present, the story, including the long and detailed description of Umm Iyās, was recorded in varying degrees of fullness by three writers. The first is the third-century Mufadḍal ibn Salamah, who mentions the Baṣraṇ Abū ‘Awānah al-Waḍḍāḥ ibn Khālid (d. 170/786 or 176/792)\textsuperscript{157} as his source. Later, Ibn 'Abbās Rabbīhi split the story into two parts, citing ‘Abbās ibn Khālid al-Sahmi\textsuperscript{158} as his source for the first part and presumably also for the second or descriptive section. The third version is by the fifth-century Maidānī, who gives Mufadḍal ibn Salamah as his source\textsuperscript{159} but does not mention Abū ‘Awānah. The three accounts, apart from the outline of the story and the basic content of its two units—instructions and description—are far from identical. Mufadḍal’s account is the shortest. Ibn ‘Abbās Rabbīhi’s account has single-word variations, mostly acceptable synonyms but occasionally a word with a different meaning such as "be humble" for "be content." It also omits some items but has more short additions interspersed in the text and longer ones at the end.

\textsuperscript{152} Such as Jāhiz’ several rasūl’il on women, Ibn Abī Ṭāhir Ṭafīr’s Balāghāt al-nisā’, Ibn Al-Sādi’s Nisāʾ al-khulajā,\textsuperscript{153} and the sizable sections devoted to women in such works as Ibn Qutaibah’s ‘Uyun, the Aghdāl of Abū al-Faraj al-Isfahānī, the ‘Iqd of Ibn ‘Abbās Rabbīhi, and in works intended for secretaries such as Ibn Qutaibah’s Adab al-kabīr.

\textsuperscript{154} Jāhiz is credited with stating the extreme point of view in this respect. See Jāhiz Maḥāsin, p. 223, where he reports a wise man of Medina as saying: "Eidāt al-fadl al-zalām al-ta’lāmā." See also ‘Iqd VI 84 ff.; ‘Uyun IV 77.

of each of the two units. Maidanī’s account has some minor variations, a few deletions, and some additions. The additions are mainly in reference to the origin of the proverb which he himself accepts as having originated with the story of Umm Iyās. He states further that Abū ‘Ubayd reported the proverb as having been first addressed to a man, namely by Nābighah al-Dhubyānī to ‘Īsām ibn Shahbar, chamberlain of the Hīrān king Nu‘mān ibn al-Mundhir, as reported also in the Fākhīr of Mufaḍḍal ibn Salamah but without mention of Abū ‘Ubayd.162 Neither the proverb nor the story of Umm Iyās is in the Amthāl of the still earlier Mufaḍḍal ibn Muḥammad al-Dabbī161 of Mufaḍḍalīyāt fame or in Bakhir’s fifth-century commentary on Abū ‘Ubayd’s collection of proverbs.162 We have dealt at length with the story of Umm Iyās because the style of its prose has some bearing on the dating of our papyrus (see pp. 75–78). Close analysis of the three versions as to content and style points to the final stabilization of the story in the second half of the second/eighth century at the earliest. In particular, the section describing Umm Iyās has marked affinities with the more labored prose of that half century and after and with the style of the secretarial class. This style is reflected in its longer phrases and its profuse use of similes, including such scribe-oriented comparisons as “eyebrows as though drawn with a pen, belly wrinkle like rolled papyrus, legs like the stems of the papyrus plant.” For, while any one of these similes could have been used alone in earlier prose or poetry,163 their simultaneous use in close succession points to scribal circles. Furthermore, with all due recognition of the contribution to Arabic literary prose and the secretarial arts by such early and gifted secretaries as Sālim ibn ‘Abd Allāh, his pupil ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd ibn Yahyā, and Ibn al-Muqaffa’, it was not until the time of the Barmakids and the Banū Sahl under Ḥārūn al-Rashīd and Ma’mūn that the secretarial class as such attained any literary distinction, and that of a type peculiarly its own. At that time linguistic and literary studies, like other intellectual activities, took a long leap forward into the golden age of Islām, the period in which the pupils and younger contemporaries of Sibawayh and Khalīl ibn Ahmad explored and exploited all phases of linguistic and literary studies, including classified vocabularies and the collection of proverbs. Works in both of these categories were produced more often than not by the same person, for instance Naḍr ibn Shumail’s Kitāb al-ṣifāt and his Amthāl, Abū ‘Ubaydah’s Kiṭāb al-khāli and his Amthāl, Abū Zaid al-Anṣārī’s Naṣīḥ and his Amthāl, ʿAsmaʿī’s Kiṭāb al-ṣifāt, his Ḥalq al-ḥasnān, and his Amthāl. All of these were available to if not used by Abū ‘Ubayd in his ghariḥ works and in his Amthāl.164 The ṣifāh, or descriptive vocabulary relating to humans, comprised two somewhat overlapping types, an objective list of words and expressions covering anatomical terms and a vocabulary intended primarily for aesthetic, moral, and intellectual characterization,165 such as the descriptive terms of our papyrus text.

162 See Mufaḍḍal ibn Salamah, Al-fākhīr (1380/1900) p. 187; Maidanī, Al-majmūʿ al-amthāl II 216 f.
161 See Mufaḍḍal ibn al-Ḍabbūl, Amthāl al-ʿArab (Constantinople, 1300/1883).
164 See Bakhri, Fasl al-maqālim fi sharḥ kiṭāb al-amthāl II Abī ‘Ubayd, ed. ‘Abd al-Majīd ʿAbdīn and Ḥasan ‘Abbās (Khurtum, 1958) p. 129. This work, according to the editors (p. 306), omits or overlooks many proverbs of Abū ‘Ubayd’s original collection, which is not available to me.

163 For example the expression كِمَا كَنَّى سَرَحَهَا َلِلنَّارْ was used in verse during the caliphate of Ālīs in (Yazīdī, pp. 151 f.). For an even more scribe-oriented description of a maid who was herself a secretary see e.g. ‘Umda II 35. In other contexts, figures of speech involving the pen and writing were used in pre-Islamic times, frequently in the Qur’ān, and by Umayyad secretaries and poets, though nowhere to the same extent as later under the ‘Abbāsid (see e.g. Sāliḥ, Adab al-kutūb, pp. 21–28, 41, 45–53, 61–68, 78 f., et passim; Muṣhir II 351 f.).
165 See e.g. Marāṭib, pp. 92 f.; Khatib XII 404; Ibrahīm VI 162 f. For a comprehensive survey of the early development of the amthāl literature, see Rudolph Sellheim, Die klassisch-arabischen Sprichwörtersammlungen insbesondere die des Abī ‘Ubayd (Gravenhage, 1954) esp. Chapters I–III.

163 Early descriptive vocabularies were cast and recast by each successive generation of scholars, who augmented and organized them into chapters or sections or separate monographs under such headings as صَبْحَةٌ شَيْخَةٌ, حَلَقَةٌ الأَناَثَانِ, and a . These vocabularies were put to use in sections of books or separate works devoted to the description and characterization of women—a category of literature which in its turn paralleled the growth and evolution of the linguistic and abkābd literature, as the numerous sources on women cited in the present study readily attest, not to mention many other similar works that have not survived (see pp. 75–78).
Moving into Islamic times, we find Muhammad himself citing the story of the Yemenite Umm Zar' and her husband Abū Zar' as a model for his own relationship with 'A'ishah. The story is one of several usually grouped under such headings as "women’s descriptions of their husbands" or "women who praised their husbands" as against women who found fault with their husbands. In the story of Umm Zar', eleven women agreed to give frank descriptions of their husbands. Five of them were critical of their husbands, but in varying degrees, and five others praised their husbands in varying degrees. The eleventh, Umm Zar', could not praise Abū Zar' enough even though he had divorced her to marry another and she herself had since married a good man. Muhammad, in relating the story to 'A'ishah, prefaced it with "I am to you as Abū Zar' is to Umm Zar,'" and some sources add that he closed the story with: "Furthermore, I will not divorce you." 'A'ishah is said to have answered: "Truly, you treat me better than Abū Zar' treated Umm Zar'". The story serves to dramatize certain qualities of desirable husbands as well as the full appreciation by wives of the good qualities of their husbands. Because of its association with Muhammad and 'A'ishah, the story is often repeated in early and late sources, with or without an isnād, but, where an isnād is given, it traces through various chains back to 'A'ishah, though the earliest extant written form known to us is that in the Gharib al-hadīth of Abū 'Ubaid (d. 223/838). As in the case of the story of Umm Iyās, the outline of the tale and most of the vocabulary are stable but no two versions are identical. The fullness of the women's statements varies, as does the order except that Umm Zar' is always the last speaker. Furthermore, and again because of its association with Muhammad and 'A'ishah, the story is reported by both Muslim and Bukhārī among other leading traditionists and, where found in either religious or secular sources, it is more apt than not to be accompanied by an extensive lexical commentary.

The story of Umm Zar' is of interest for several reasons apart from its association with Muhammad and 'A'ishah. Umm Zar' eulogizes not only her husband but also other members of the family, including a marriageable daughter, whose description has bearing on our papyrus text. The girl emerges as a dutiful and obedient daughter, beautiful of face and figure to the point of being the envy of her neighbors, generous, chaste, intelligent, and cultured—in short, perfect, as some commentators assure us. Our further interest in the story is the character of its prose. All versions, whether stemming from a single source or a composite account, include a large number of strange words that call for explanation. To what extent, if any, the strange words can be attributed to the fact that all of the eleven women involved were Yemenites is hard to tell. Their statements are in short series of one-word rhymed phrases or in rhymed phrases of two or three words each except the statement of the tenth woman, who uses longer rhymed phrases or sentences. On the whole the style is straightforward, the few similes and metaphors being familiar ones associated with desert life and animals. That is, apart from the strange vocabulary, the style of the piece in respect to brevity (ṣūfā), rhyme (ṣaj’), and figures of speech (tashbīhāt) is in harmony with that of our papyrus text.

166 See e.g. Ibn Abī Tahir Taifūr, pp. 76–123. Other frequent groupings include women who remained faithful to their husbands even after divorce or death, girls who described and praised their fathers, girls who described desirable prospective husbands, parents' advice to their children on choice of a mate and family life (see e.g. Jāhiz, Muḥāsir, pp. 223 f.; Ibn Abī Tahir Taifūr, pp. 88 f., 93, 114; Majālis Tha’lab 145; Mufaddal ibn Salamah, Al fakhir [1380/1960] pp. 109 f., 171 f., 253; Anālī I 17, 89 f. and II 222 f.).

167 See Ibn Abī Tahir Taifūr, pp. 76–86; Concordance V 541.

168 See Ibn Abī Tahir Taifūr, pp. 76–86; Concordance V 541.

169 For manuscript copies see pp. 10–11, with nn. 92 and 102.

170 See Muslim XV 212–22, with Nawawī’s lengthy commentary; Bukhārī III 441 f.; Concordance V 541.

171 See e.g. Ibn Abī Tahir Taifūr, pp. 76–86; Muzhir II 532–36.

172 E.g. Muslim XV 219. Nawawī’s terms are حدثنا وأمهدنا وعفنتنا وأدتما ; حسبنا وكمامنا ; حسبنا وكننا ; حسبنا وكننا ; حسبنا وكننا ; حسبنا وكننا ; حسبنا وكننا ; حسبنا وكننا ; حسبنا وكننا ; حسبنا وكننا ; حسبنا وكننا ; حسبنا وكننا .
The Qur’ān expressly states that Muslim men are to marry Muslim women only and that a Muslim concubine is to be preferred to a polytheist even though the latter may be more pleasing. Tradition credits him with the following brief formula for selection of a wife, be she maid, divorcée, or widow: “Marry a woman for her wealth, her beauty, and especially for her faith.” Other traditions expand this formula to include noble or respectable descent. Khadijah was singled out as meeting all four requirements, while ‘A’ishah and Umm Salamah lacked only wealth. But for most of Muhammad’s contemporaries and successors the combination most sought after in a wife, presumably apart from her faith, was beauty and suitable descent. Rich women continued to find husbands, but a poor man or one with modest means was cautioned against marrying a rich woman. For it was assumed or feared that her wealth would give her the upper hand in family and social affairs, all the more so if she was also beautiful and well-born, as was indeed illustrated by the conduct of “the two pearls of the Quraish,” ‘A’ishah’s niece and namesake ‘A’ishah bint Ta’llah and Sukainah the granddaughter of ‘Ali. Both these women were married to the rich, handsome, and well-born Mu’s’ab ibn al-Zubair, and they had successive well-born husbands during the lifetime of several of the leading characters of our papyrus text. Therefore, descriptive prose by or about these several women and their contemporaries should be of interest in connection with both the content and the style of our papyrus text.

There seem to be no statements by Khadijah pertinent to our theme in contrast to the many that are available about her, beginning with Muhammad’s eulogistic characterization of her. Umm Salamah and ‘A’ishah, Muhammad’s two most prominent wives after Khadijah, were both described as beautiful, graceful, and independent. Umm Salamah was well known for faithfulness, innate intelligence, and mature wisdom, while the young ‘A’ishah was more often described as playful, witty, eloquent, ambitious, and, later, as a woman of great knowledge with a memory well stocked with poetry. However, no one early source gives a complete formal description of either Umm Salamah or ‘A’ishah. The earliest formal description of ‘A’ishah bint Ta’llah ibn ‘Ubaid Allāh, who strongly resembled her Aunt ‘A’ishah, is that recorded by Abū al-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī with the following insādū: “Ḥusain ibn Yaḥyā informed me on the authority of Ḥammād on that of his father on the authority of Śāliḥ ibn Ḥassān al-Baṣrī.” What follows tells how Muṣ’ab ibn al-Zubair, ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Bakr al-Ṣaddīq, and Sa’d ibn al-‘As, having asked for the hands of ‘A’ishah bint Ta’llah, Umm al-Qāsim the granddaughter of Ta’llah, and ‘A’ishah the daughter of the caliph ‘Uthmān respectively, wanted detailed descriptions of the three women. They sent ‘Azzat al-Mailā’, a woman of Medina said to be knowledgeable about women, to inspect the ladies. ‘Azzat al-Mailā’ visited the three women and returned to give an enthusiastic...
item-by-item description of 'A'ishah bint Talhah, whose only defects, she said, were large ears and big feet. She found no defects in the other two women, whom she briefly described in general terms except for the comment that 'A'ishah bint 'Uthmān was too aloof. The story ends with three marriages. The handsome Muṣ'ab was ever proud of his 'A'ishah’s beauty and talents, as he was of the beauty of his other wife, Sukainah (see references in n. 181). It is noteworthy that the descriptions of all of these women are cast in more or less the same literary style, that is, a comparatively simple vocabulary grouped mostly in two-word rhymed phrases with now and again a few one-word or three-word rhymed phrases. Figures of speech are rarely used. It is interesting also to note here that 'A'ishah’s phrases describing the character of Muḥammad and that of her father, the caliph Abū Bakr, are cast in short measured sentences but not necessarily always in simple vocabulary or rhymed phrases and with few, if any, figures of speech.194

The role of the independent and gifted woman, royal or otherwise, of the Umayyad period has been detailed elsewhere.197 Mu‘awiyyah’s often very cordial reception of leading tribal women and gifted poetesses188 reflects his more or less balanced outlook on and approach to the opposite sex from his youth onward as expressed in his own words.199 Ša'ṣa'ah ibn Šuhān, a staunch supporter of ‘Ali, was taken prisoner by Mu‘awiyyah, who appreciated his vast knowledge, eloquence, and wit. Ša'ṣa'ah was politically less powerful than Aḥnaf ibn Qais of our text but far more outspoken, alike in his defense of the Shi’ah and his personal conversation with Mu‘awiyyah.200 Mu‘awiyyah once asked Ša'ṣa'ah what type of woman he desired most and what type least, to which he answered tersely: “She who does what pleases you and she who does not.” “This is a hasty criticism,” said Mu‘awiyyah. “But a just one,” countered Ša'ṣa'ah.201 At another time Ša'ṣa'ah was bold enough to ask Mu‘awiyyah: “O Commander of the Faithful, how can we consider you wise when but half a human being has the mastery over you?” He was referring to Mu‘awiyyah’s wife Fakhitah bint Qarzah, and Mu‘awiyyah answered: “Women surpass men in nobility and are surpassed in ignobility.”202

A curious tale203 involving the proverbially romantic Banū 'Udhrah, Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam as governor of Medina (41–49/661–69 and again briefly in a.h. 56–57), and Mu‘awiyyah runs as follows. When a loving 'Udhrite couple fell on hard times, the father-in-law, who was the uncle of the husband (neither one named), took his daughter, Su'da, back home even though the husband had refused to divorce her. The unhappy man appealed to Marwān, before whom the girl and her father were brought for questioning. Marwān lost his heart on first sight to this girl of surprising beauty. He bribed the father for the promise of her hand, imprisoned and flogged the unfortunate husband until, despairing of his very life, he divorced Su'dā, whom Marwān then married. The distraught 'Udhrite appealed next to Mu‘awiyyah, who ordered Marwān to divorce Su'dā and send her north. When the girl appeared before Mu‘awiyyah, he in turn lost his heart and mind to the delicate and perfectly beautiful young woman with an eloquent tongue.204

---

194 See e.g. Khatib VI 158 f.; Nuwairi VII 230 f. For some of her other public speeches see Abbott, Aisah, pp. 131, 146, 157, with references there cited.
197 See Abbott in JNES I 341–68.
188 See e.g. Ιqḍ II 102–21.
199 See e.g. ibid. IV 363: 一点都不像一个美丽的女人。A poisoned wound received at the Battle of Sīffīn necessitated an emergency operation that rendered Mu‘awiyyah sterile but not impotent (Ṭabarī I 3464). See Wāq‘at Sīffīn, pp. 416 f., for his comprehension of a woman’s lasting memory of her first love and of the murder of her first-born, to which he compares his own lasting anger against the murderers of ‘Uthmān.
200 See e.g. Masʿūdī V 91–93, 98–112.
201 'Ιqḍ VI 106: قال مارون هذه النكتة الفحشة فقال صمعها بالجلد والماء. For Fākhirī see e.g. Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī II 204, 'Ιqḍ VI 18, Masʿūdī VIII 148, and Ibn Qayyim al-Jauzīyah, pp. 93 f.
202 'Ιqḍ VI 106: أهل يغتلوا الكرم ويطعنوا الشام. For Fākhirī see e.g. Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī II 204, 'Ιqḍ VI 18, Masʿūdī VIII 148, and Ibn Qayyim al-Jauzīyah, pp. 93 f.
203 Ibn Qayyim al-Jauzīyah, Kūtub al-akhlāṣ al-nisā’ pp. 4–8 (for uncertainty as to the author of this work see n. 67 on p. 55 above).
204 Ibid. pp. 6 f.
In exchange for her, he offered the 'Udhrite three young girls and much wealth and pensions for all. But the 'Udhrite vowed that not for all of Mu'āwiyyah's kingdom would he exchange Su'dā and cited verses of Majnūn Lailā to express his devotion to her. Mu'āwiyyah then reminded the 'Udhrite that he had already divorced Su'dā, yet Mu'āwiyyah offered to give her the choice between himself and her former husband. Su'dā declared her choice of her husband in verse reinforced by prose reminiscent in part of the Christian marriage vow: "I am not, O Commander of the Faithful, about to forsake him because of the accidents of fortune. For I have had a good life with him and I, above all, ought to bear with him patiently in happiness and misfortune, in poverty and wealth, in sickness and health as Allāh has ordained for me with him." Mu'āwiyyah and his court marveled at her good sense, perfection, and humanity. Mu'āwiyyah not only honored her choice but presented her with 10,000 dirhems and placed her on public welfare. Touched up or not by a late and gossipy author, our only source, the story is nevertheless consistent in its general description of Su'dā's qualities and its literary style of one and two-word rhymed phrases. Furthermore, the open appreciation of Su'dā's moral qualities reminds one of the pagan Shanfārā (d. ca. A.D. 510) and his verses in appreciation of noble womanhood.

During the reign of 'Abd al-Malik (65-86/685-705) the moral tone sought by 'Umar I and Ziyād ibn Abī Su'fyan receded in an indulgent society exposed increasingly to slave girls of many races and varied endowments. The women of prominent tribes and families long known for the beauty and spirit of their women continued to be in demand at court and among men of position and wealth. This is well illustrated in the case of the Ansār, the Banū Taim and descendants of the caliph Abū Bakr, the family of 'Aqīl ibn 'Ullaṣah, who would even reject 'Abd al-Malik's son because he was born of a non-Arab mother, and the Banū Makhzūm, particularly the family of 'Abd al-Rahmān ibn al-Ḥārīth ibn Hishām al-Makhzūmī, whose daughter Zainab rejected even 'Abd al-Malik himself. 'Abd al-Malik and his son and successor Walīd I (86-96/705-15) frowned on public mention, let alone detailed descriptions, in verse or prose, of the members of their large harems. And, though the female marriage agent (dallālah) still enjoyed a lucrative profession, her descriptions of marriageable Arab girls or women seem to have been no longer as frequently recorded. Furthermore, she now met competition from male marriage brokers who mixed freely with the rising class of songstresses and courtesans and were considered more knowledgeable than women as to what qualities in a woman, other than the primarily physical, appealed most to men. She faced competition also from the expert slave dealer who picked, trained, described, and displayed his...
choicest articles of trade—beautiful and gifted young girls and handsome youths—to meet the increasing demands of court and society. Since these brokers and slave dealers and their patrons are frequently named, it is possible to date roughly their statements. The interest in women of a particular family and tribe, not always with happy results, was presently expanded to interest in foreign women, who soon came to be classified by preference and function. Greek girls, for instance, were frowned on by 'Abd al-Malik for their moral laxity but were favored by his son Yazid II (101-5/720-24). 'Abd al-Malik noted the patience of Indian women and recommended Berber girls for pleasure, Persian girls for fine offspring, and Russian girls for service. A description of the women of Tabaristan is traced back to Abu 'Amr ibn al-'Alā'. The Bedouins also were a source of descriptions of desirable women. They either described specific women or volunteered their opinions of the ideal maiden. But more often than not these Bedouins are nameless since second- and third-century transmitters and authors cite them simply with the expression qa la a rābī and the particular Bedouin may or may not have been contemporary with the transmitter or author. Thus, even rough dating of Bedouin statements is risky. Nevertheless the liberal supply of their statements in almost any work or section devoted to women enables us to observe that, though their statements present various views, they share a common style, namely brief descriptions in either ordinary or rather strange but generally rhymed prose with here and there a simile or a metaphor.

'Abd al-Malik himself was not only knowledgeable about women but also passionately devoted to them until old age overtook him. He had in all at least ten wives, not to mention unnumbered concubines. He asked for the opinion of his confidant Rauh ibn Zinba' on one of his royal wives, the mother of his heir Walid, and received a frank though uncomplimentary answer with which he himself readily agreed. He ordered Hajjaj ibn Yusuf, his governor of Iraq, to secure three lovely slave girls for him. Hajjaj did so, and in his brief rhymed description of one of these girls the only simile used compares her coloring to that of gold and silver. 'Abd al-Malik was interested in the opinions of poets on women, particularly that of his court poet 'Adi ibn al-Riqa', whose ideal woman, described in two verses, combined the best physical characteristics of the women of the tribes of Quḍā'ah, Kindah, Khuṣā'ah, and Taṣy with the wisdom of Luqmn, the beauty of the biblical Joseph, the diction of David, and the chastity of the Virgin Mary. 'Adi is credited with being the first poet to compare a groom and his bride to the moon and the sun respectively, the occasion being a royal wedding at the court of 'Abd al-Malik. 'Abd al-Malik once ordered a man of the North Arab Banū Ghatafan to describe for him the most beautiful of women. The description given was limited to physical traits and started, for a change, with the feet and moved upward. It covers seven lines of printed text and is cast in smoothly flowing rhymed prose of two-word phrases.

See e.g. Abbott in JNES I 331 f.; Ṣam'ā'ī V 344-47, 394-96; Aẓhānī VI 133 (= Aẓhānī [1927- ] VII 67).

See JNES I 346; Aẓhānī XIV 141; Iqd VI 98 f., 104 f., 114 f.; Āmālī III 47.

Khālīl Mardam, Diwān al-Walīd ibn Yāsīd (Damascus, 1355/1937) p. 21; cf. 'Uyun IV 8 f.

E.g. Iqd VI 103, 120; Iṣbāḥī II 203.

Tha'ālibī, Bārā' al-akbd (in Khams rasaḤl [Constantinople, 1301/1883]) p. 121.

E.g. 'Uyun IV 5 f.; Iqd VI 107, 112 f.; Āmālī II 81, 200; 'Abd Za'd al-Anna'ī, Kitāb al-nawādir fi al-lughāt, p. 170.

Aẓhānī XXI 9; Ibn 'Aṣākir VII 311 f.

See Abbott in JNES I 348-51.

See Iqd VI 114, where she is compared by both men to a rough and prickly object. Rauh could barely hold his own with a high-born Arab wife (ibid. VI 114 f.).

Iṣbāḥī II 148 f.

Ibid. II 205:

See Ibn Abī Tāhir Taṣfīn, pp. 72-75, for a female genealogist’s characterization of the various tribes in the time of Maṣ'ūdiyyah.

'Uyun III 69; Tha'ālibī, Thimdr, p. 229. For 'Adi’s figurative reference to the “pen and ink” see e.g. Shi'r, Aẓhānī al-kutūb, pp. 78 f., and for other such comparisons see p. 96 above. See e.g. Shi'r, pp. 391-94, and Aẓhānī VIII 179-84 for 'Adi’s biographical entries.
without a single simile or metaphor. The specifications are so exacting that 'Abd al-Malik is said to have exclaimed: “Woe to you! And where is she to be found?” “You find her,” came the unhesitating answer, “among the pure-blooded Arabs and the pure-blooded Persians.”

A decade earlier, his favorite wife, the glorious 'Atikah, granddaughter of Mu‘awiyah, had sought in vain to dissuade him from taking to the field against Mus‘ab ibn al-Zubair. As she and her attendants burst into tears at his parting, 'Abd al-Malik recalled a verse of Kuthaiyir which aptly fitted the situation. Thus, unlike some others before and after him, his passion for women was not allowed to interfere with his caliphal duties, and when, like other passions, it subsided in old age, his one remaining pleasure, he said, was conversation with his friends on a moonlit night in the desert—conversation interspersed no doubt with citations from the poets.

'Abd al-Malik’s and Walid’s major-domo Hajjaj ibn Yusuf (d. 95/714) was by contrast not much of a lady’s man. His marriages were made with an eye to politics and improvement of his social status but frequently boomeranged, for he was ordered to divorce a high-born wife and driven to divorce another such wife because of her persistent disregard of or open aversion to him. He nevertheless believed in always having the full quota of four wives and advised others to do the same. One group of four wives presented Hajjaj with an enviable variety. One was playful, another regal, the third a Bedouin versed in Bedouin speech and poetry, and the fourth a scholar versed in law. He called on Ibn al-Qirrlyah (d. 84/703), whose literary style and judgment about women impressed him, to act as marriage agent and ask for the hand of Hind bint Asma in no more than three sentences. Later, when he wished to divorce Hind, who had no use for him, he sent Ibn al-Qirrlyah to inform her in no more than two words that he had divorced her.

At another time he wrote Ibn al-Qirrlyah to find his son a wife with the following specifications: “beautiful (of form and coloring) from afar, pleasing (in face and feature) when near, from

---

214 Iqd VI 108; cf. Khālidīyān Kitāb al-ṭubāb wa al-hadāyāt, ed. Sāmī al-Dāhān (L’Institut français d’archéologie orientale du Caire, “Textes et traductions d’auteurs orientaux” XII [Cairo, 1956]) pp. 101-4; Ibshihi II 204. The Persians rejected mixed breeds and considered children of ordinary concubines as slaves, as Asma‘ī learned in conversation with Yahyā al-Barmakī (Iqd VI 129; Zubādī, pp. 187 f.).

215 Jābis, Tāj, p. 175; Junnah, p. 459; Mas‘ūdī VI 64 f.; Iqd IV 407. Akhtal’s verse reads

بُني فلَأَمْ تُبْنَى مَعَاهُ بَكَّتُ بِهِ مَسَافَتِهِ تَطُنَّا


216 Ibn ‘Uyūn, Al-tawbīlī, Risālah fl al-sadhqah wa al-nadīq, p. 32. For thumbnail characterizations of the youthful ‘Abd al-Malik by Mu‘āwiyyah and ‘Amr ibn al-‘Ās and later by ‘Abd al-Malik himself see e.g. Jābis, Bayān II 35, 248 and Muwāshshahāb, p. 32.

217 See e.g. Abbott in JNES I 347, 349, 353 f.; ‘Uyūn II 209; Iqd IV 130; Ibshihi I 60 f. Hajjaj was not above rewarding a staunch supporter by securing his social superiors into giving him their daughters in marriage (Mas‘ūdī V 331-33).

218 ‘Uyūn III 48.

219 Iqd VI 104 f., 122.

220 ‘Uyūn III 60 gives the three sentences: بَعَتْنِهِمْ مِنْ عَنْدِ مَعَالِمَ وَالاأمِرْ يَطَّبِعُكَ طَارِقُكَ مَا تَعْمَلُونَ أَسْتَحْكَمُونَ إِمْ تَرَوُونَ (cf. Jābis, Mahābāb, pp. 239 f.).

221 ‘Uyūn II 209; Iqd VI 107. The two words were خطبت ‘and Hind answered كَانَا حَدَاهَا رَبًا ثَمْنًا and rewarded Ibn al-Qirriyah with 10,000 dirhems for bringing her the good news. Muḥarrad, pp. 291 f., gives a supposed reason for this divorce.
a noble family, humble in spirit and obedient to her husband.” Ibn al-Qirriyah’s response to Ḥajjaj’s inquiry as to what he thought of married life was to describe the type of woman with whom one could live a serene and happy life. In the description, which covers seven lines of printed text, physical charms are subordinated to religious, ethical, and personality traits. The simple rhymed prose consists for the most part of series of one-word, two-word, or longer units but includes also a series of four similes. He used the same style in a two-line description of a woman who would render life miserable for all around her and who is compared to a heavy load being dragged by a weak old man. In a weak moment Ibn al-Qirriyah supported the ill-fated rebellion of Ibn al-Ash‘ath against Ḥajjaj. He was later captured, bound, and brought before Ḥajjaj. He begged to be allowed to plead his case “in just three sentences,” and his plea was granted. One word led to another until finally Ḥajjaj ordered his head struck off but soon regretted that he had thus deprived himself of Ibn al-Qirriyah’s company and conversation.

A youthful contemporary of Ibn al-Qirriyah and Alḥnafl ibn Qais of our papyrus text was the latter’s fellow tribeeman Khalid ibn Ṣafwān al-Tanunī of Baṣrah (d. 135/752), who early won a reputation as an orator with a style distinguished for its clarity and eloquence. He, like Alḥnafl, was known to exalt the excellence of Baṣrah and of Ḥiraq. Like Alḥnafl, Khalid ibn Ṣafwān had the ability to win the confidence of those in power. In his home province of Ḥiraq he was in favor with the governor Khalid al-Qasrī and his successor Yūsuf ibn ʿUmar ibn Shubrumah (120–26/738–44). The latter included Khalid ibn Ṣafwān in a delegation to the court of Hishām, whom he found at a desert resort. He regaled the caliph with stories of the Khūraus and stressed the transience of wealth and power and of his life itself. His theme and eloquence so touched Hishām that he broke camp and returned with his retinue to his palace. When an opportunity presented itself, he ventured to plead with Hishām on behalf of the fallen Khalid al-Qasrī, only to be told that the treatment meted out to the latter was no worse than he actually deserved. Hishām as prince once called for the opinions of some of his companions on the relative merits of Farāzdaq, Akhtal, and Jarir and was dissatisfied with the views expressed. He then asked Khalid ibn Ṣafwān to give his opinion of the three poets and was quite satisfied with the answer.

Khalid ibn Ṣafwān lived a simple life, perhaps because of a streak of piety though most of his contemporaries credited it to extreme miserliness. He advocated small families as a safeguard for one’s peace of mind and freedom from financial pressures. Proposing to a woman, he felt it only fair that she should know his temperament before giving her answer and proceeded to describe himself as one whose wife would weary him coming and afflict him going and would have no access to his money. He added that there were times when he felt so afflicted that were his own head in his hand, he would fling it away.  

117. *ʿAqd* VI 107: لَجِنَة مِنْ بِعْدِ مِلْحِيَةٍ مِنْ قَرْبِ شَرِيفَةٍ فِي قَوْمِ ذَا لَا يَلْبَسُهَا فِي نُسْمَةٍ مُوَاثِيقَةَ لِبِلَاهَا. The implied distinction of جِلْحِيَة and مِلْحِيَة is that offered by Khalid ibn Ṣafwān (see *ʿAqd* VI 23 and cf. *ʿAqd* VI 117). Ishbili II 204 f. has confused Ḥajjaj’s son ʿAbd al-Malik with the caliph ʿAbd al-Malik.

118. *Jāḥiṣ*, *Mabāḥīḥ*, p. 239; the good woman is described as كَالَّا مَجَانَةَ وَسَلِيْلَةَ فَيْ يَدْنِحُها وَكَالَّا مَسِكَةَ الَّتِي لَمْ تَنْقِفْ وَالَّمِسْكَةَ الَّتِي لَمْ تَنْقِفْ. For other specimens of Ibn al-Qirriyah’s prose see e.g. ibid., pp. 9 f., 263–67; *Māʾūdī* V 323 f.; and references in n. 110 on p. 59 above.


120. *Maʿārif*, p. 296; *Ṭabarī* II 1127–29; *Māʾūdī* V 323.

121. *Jāḥiṣ*, *Bayān* II 90; Ṣaʿīd I 97, 649 f.

122. See *Aḡbāʾī* II 35–37 and XVIII 130 and *Irshād* IV 161–64 for this and similar instances of his preachments.

123. *Aḡbāʾī* XIX 67. For the fall of Khalid al-Qasrī and his family see e.g. *Ṭabarī* I 1641–58.

124. *Aḡbāʾī* VII 73; *Irshād* IV 100 f. See also p. 141 below.

125. He was one night, he said, contemplating the world’s riches until in his imagination he saw the green sea covered with red gold but realized that all he really needed was two loaves, two jugs, and two old garments, to which another version adds the worship of the merciful (Allāh); see *Jāḥiṣ*, *Bayān* III 147; *Jāḥiṣ*, *Mabāḥīḥ*, p. 221: رَفِيقُانِ وَكَوزُانِ وَطَبِيرُانِ وَبَعْدَةٌ أَرْحَمِ.  

126. He came to be considered one of the four most miserly Arabs (*Aḡbāʾī* II 40; *Irshād* IV 164).

The woman answered that she would not consider him acceptable even for the daughters of Iblis and dismissed him with Allah's blessings. He commissioned agents to find him a wife, but his specifications were so exacting that the agents could do no more than assure him he would find her in heaven. He must have eventually sweetened his proposals with a promise of due consideration and a legacy, for wives he did have and also at least one son and a daughter. But home was not always peaceful, for we find him declaring that the best night of his life was that in which he divorced his two wives. When among a group of men the conversation centered on women—a frequent pastime—Khālid listened attentively to each speaker, city dweller or Bedouin. He was an admirer of Bedouin verse and prose and particularly of Bedouin oratory.

Khālid's attitude toward women and even some of the phrases he used in describing them seem to have remained more or less constant to judge by a comparison of his earlier with two of his later, if not indeed his last, statements, which were made to the first 'Abbāsid caliph, Abū al-'Abbās al-Saffāh (132-38/750-54), who enjoyed Khālid's company. The caliph, commenting on the growth of people's harems, asked Khālid what type of woman he preferred most. Khālid answered that his preference was for one not too young nor too old, of impressive beauty of form from afar and still attractive when near, slender from (the waist) up and full from (the waist) down, one who had experienced both wealth and poverty. This description all but duplicates earlier instructions given a marriage agent. On a second, and probably later occasion, Khālid suggested to the caliph, who in being monogamous provided the proverbial exception to the rule, that he should enlarge his harem. He proceeded to tantalize the caliph's imagination by referring to the many types of women, slave or freeborn, that were available in his vast empire. Among those mentioned were Berber girls and other girls of foreign extraction but born and bred in Medina and trained to amuse and please, free women whose conversation was delightful, and girls of all descriptions who were born and bred in Baṣrah and Kūfah.

Once again, in analyzing Khālid's descriptions of women, we find that the physical attractions predominate, with here and there a reference to personality and training but hardly any emphasis on intellectuality. As for Khālid's style, some choice of vocabulary apart, it is very similar to that of his predecessor Ibn al-Qirrīyah. Rhymed prose is the rule, with one-word or two-word phrases predominating. Khālid's descriptions tend to be somewhat shorter and even less given to the use of figures of speech. Once again we find marked similarity of content and style between the text of our papyrus and comparable texts that later literary sources have preserved from the Umayyad period.

It is both interesting and instructive to conclude our sampling of this type of literature by drawing attention to yet another description of a paragon of a woman. It comes from early 'Abbāsid times, when descriptions of beautiful and gifted slave girls were more readily available than those of high-born free

---

234 "Uṣūn IV 14. See ibid. IV 23, where he describes himself as short, dark, and bald.
235 'Iqd VI 107; Jābīz, Mohāsīn, pp. 220 f.
236 See "Uṣūn IV 8, where his specification ends with إنا عشتو أكنبتها وانستموتنيا. The effeminate male agent he employed had a reputation for success ("Iqd VI 103).
237 "Uṣūn IV 127. One distressed wife sent him his bedding, and the other sent his daughter with a basket of food. The sequel is not reported.
238 See e.g. "Iqd VI 107 and Amālī III 34 f., where a Bedouin describes in verse the desirability of women according to their ages and Khālid replies لاقت أبتى على ما في نفوسكم. كيف ناسبهم وأما. جرى على ما سبق آيتا من أثرائهم.
239 Jābīz, Bayān I 184. When a barefooted Bedouin surpassed Khālid in eloquence, the latter exclaimed: أبتى على ما في نفوسكم.
240 See e.g. Jābīz, Bayān I 324 f.; Ya'qūbī II 433. Abū al-'Abbās al-Saffāh preferred to spend most of his evening leisure time in the company of men and could not understand why some men left such company for that of women, where they hear nonsense and see shortcomings (Mas'ūlī VI 118, 137).
241 "Iqd VI 107, lines 10–13, as compared with lines 16–17, and both passages as compared with "Uṣūn IV 23, lines 1–4.
242 Mas'ūlī VI 110–18. For more background, details, and the sequel see Abbott, Two Queens of Baghdad, pp. 13 f.
women. Muḥammad ibn Mansūr ibn Ziyād, an influential Barmakid secretary in the reign of Ḥarūn al-Rashīd, was widely known for his generosity. This prompted an (unnamed) admirer to write him requesting the gift of a slave girl whose qualifications he specified at length with interspersed comments giving his reasons for a particular physical or personality specification. The requirements are exhaustive, and the style is mixed. Short and longer rhymed phrases intertwine with a series of similes and a verse of poetry. The sophisticated Barmakid secretary replied that he too was looking for such a maid but did not think she was to be found even in the next world. Nevertheless he inclosed a gift of 1,000 dinars and directed his correspondent to employ a professional agent to look for the desired girl, whose full price he promised to pay should she indeed be found.

### DATING OF THE DOCUMENT

A summary of the results of our research as detailed above is called for so that we may appraise its significance for the dating of the papyrus. We found that the two types of prose literature represented by the two sections of our text—a speech and descriptions of the ideal maiden—were well developed in pre-Islamic times and continued to be popular thereafter. The ideas and the prose styles of both oratory and descriptive compositions through the Umayyad period were closer to those of pre-Islamic times than to those of the new literary style (badī‘) that was emerging in early ‘Abbāsid times. The simpler idiom and the briefer phraseology of the pre-‘Abbāsid prose stylists contrasted with the more florid idiom and the lengthier phrases of their successors. Pre-‘Abbāsid eloquence with its characteristic desert idiom was first infiltrated and then all but supplanted by the labored eloquence of the city dweller as molded largely by the influential secretarial class, whose idiom and figures of speech in both prose and poetry reflected progressively life in the heterogeneous metropolis. The characteristic rhymed phrases, retained by ‘Abbāsid stylists, grew longer for the most part and hence complicated the elements of weight and balance. True, this process, which began roughly in the mid-second/mid-eighth century, had as yet far to go to reach completion. Nevertheless, its growth, analysis, and critical appraisal are reflected in the works of such leading authors from the second/eighth century onward as Jumahī (d. 231/846), Jāḥiẓ, Ibn al-Mu‘tāzī, Ibn Abī ‘Āwn, Qudāmah ibn Ja‘far, and Ibn Rashīq (d. 463/1071). Still later, Diyā‘ al-Dīn Naṣr Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ṯābirī (558–637/1163–1239), surveying the long history of literary prose, which by his time had reached its verbose and florid peak, summed up the argument that literary prose, being the medium of the Qur‘ān, was not only superior to poetry but demanded greater effort and skill on the part of the stylist. Few would question the rigor of late ‘Abbāsid prose, but none can fail to see that it is far removed from the brief and simple yet eloquent prose of our papyrus text.

The third-century authors who figure most significantly in our study of the historical and literary backgrounds of our document are Jāḥiẓ, Ibn Qutaybah, Ibn Abī Tahir Taifūr, Yaʿqūbī, Dīnawarī, and Ṭabarī. Their sources, in reverse chronological order, are Ibn al-Ṯabārī (d. 231/846 at age 81), ‘Uṭbī, Madā‘īnī, Abū ‘Ubadah, Aṣmā‘ī, Abū ‘Ubadah, the Shi‘īte Naṣr ibn Muẓāḥīm, Naṣr ibn Slumail, the

---

243 Ṭabarī III 688; Aghānī XV 141.
244 Ḥanīlīyīn, Kūṯūh al-taḥf wa al-kadāyā, pp. 101–4. Muḥammad ibn Mansūr himself owned an accomplished slave girl named Fauz, with whom the romantic court poet ‘Abdāb ibn al-‘Ashraf became enamored and for whom he wrote verses (see Aghānī XV 141 f.; see also Dā‘ūd al-‘Abbās ibn al-‘Ashraf, ed. ‘Atīkāh al-Khasrājī [Cairo, 1373/1954]). Fihrist, pp. 306–8, gives a long list of popular tales, some of which were authored by Ḥishām ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Sābī al-Kalbī and Ḥaitham ibn ‘Abd, including a Kūṯūh ‘Abbās wa Fauz whose author is not named. Contemporary poets praised Muḥammad ibn Mansūr for his generosity but more during his lifetime than in their elegies (e.g. Ibn al-Mu‘tāzī, Tabaqāt, pp. 253, 293 f., 296, 437; ‘Iqd III 291–93 and V 327).
Khārijite Haitham ibn ‘Adi, and Hishām ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Sā‘īb al-Kalbī (d. 204/819 or 206/821). Their isnād’s trace back in turn to Abū ‘Awānah al-Wajdāh ibn Khālid (d. 170/786 or 176/792), Muʿāḍḍal ibn Muḥammad al-Dabībī, Ḥammād al-Rawīyāh, Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alā’, Muḥammad ibn al-Sā‘īb al-Kalbī, ‘Awānah ibn al-Ḥakam, and Ibn al-Muqaffa’ (d. ca. 139/757 or 142/759). Two significant observations about all of these authors are, first, that they used manuscripts with or without accompanying oral transmission and, second, that all of them, though some more than others, drew on the more knowledgeable and eloquent Bedouins, both those in their midst and others whom they sought out in the desert—men and women whom they cited for the most part anonymously. Furthermore, these several groups of authors reflect the early literary interests as they developed in the Ḥijāz and Syria and the subsequent dominance of ‘Irāq in the linguistic and literary fields. They reflect also the early participation of both North and South Arab scholars, orthodox or otherwise, who were soon joined by non-Arab colleagues mainly from the eastern provinces. Moreover, early ‘Abbāsid sources provide some evidence that secular prose literature was already in circulation in Umayyad times, particularly literature of the anṣāb, ḥākībār, and amthāl categories and a wide variety of nasāʾīr for the most part from the history and folklore of the Persians and the Arabs. This should surprise no one, considering the rapid increase in literacy and the absence of injunctions against or hesitancy about committing such literature to writing. Even more significant is the realization that such early objections as had existed to committing sacred literature to writing, other than the Qur’ān itself, had been overcome by the time of Zuhri (d. 124/741) and his pupils, as already detailed in our Volume II. And Zuhri was contemporary with the Meccan schoolteacher and scholar ‘Ataʾ ibn Abī Rabāḥ and his son Yaʾqūb of our papyrus text (see recto 7 and comment on p. 44), as also with Ibn al-Qirriyyah, Shaʾbī, Khālid ibn Ṣafwān,252 Abīd al-Malik ibn ‘Umar (d. 136/753 at age 103),253 and Ibn al-Muqaffa’, all of whom have roles in our understanding of the literary background of our papyrus text.

Still another factor that must be taken into consideration is the wide range of interest of the Umayyad and early ‘Abbāsid scholars no matter what their particular fields of specialization. Stirring speeches and
lively anecdotes held a certain fascination for all. The subject of women intrigued poet, scholar, and layman alike. Under the Marwānid branch of the Umayyads, the rulers and courtiers indulged in such quick turnover of wives and concubines that Walid I is said to have married and divorced sixty-three wives during his reign. Sulaimān was so openly preoccupied with his bountiful table and his women that the members of his court and his wealthiest subjects, taking their cue from him, “became excessively preoccupied with conversation and exchange of opinion about the marrying of free women and the enjoyment of slave girls.” This trend, despite an attempted reversal during the brief reign of ‘Umar II, continued on its widening course in the plural society of the golden age of the early ‘Abbasid empire (see p. 74) though not without a few remarkable exceptions, particularly among dedicated scholars.

Finally, we need to keep in mind that literate families such as those of ‘Umar I, ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ, ‘Ali ibn Abī Ṭalīb, ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abbās, ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubair, and both branches of the Umayyads each included at least one person, of the blood or a client, who was primarily concerned with the history and deeds of the family. We read, for instance, that Sa’d (or Sa’īd) al-Qasīr, a client of Mu’āwiyah’s full brother ‘Utbah ibn Abī Sufyān, transmitted Umayyad family history. Sa’d himself fell at Mecca in the Second Civil War of ‘Isām but his materials were transmitted and the family history continued by other members of the family and put to good use by the family poet, historian, and scholar ‘Uthbi (d. 228/842), who transmitted from his scholarly father, ‘Ubayd Allāh al-‘Uthbi, among others. ’Uthbi was no narrow or formal political-military historian. His interests included genealogy, anecdotes, poetry, and ethics—ansāb, manāqib, ash‘ār, and akhlāq—as reflected in the titles credited to him: Kitāb al-akhlāq, Kitāb al-a‘ārīb, and a collection of the poetry of women whose love turned to hate.259 Both Ibn Sa’d and Abū Ḥātim al-Sijistānī transmitted from him, and the latter reported the use of ’Uthbi’s books after his death. Furthermore, inasmuch as poetry continued to be a source of political and social history there were those, poets or not, who collected and transmitted contemporary or nearly contemporary poetry. We read, for instance, that Walid II collected the records of the Arabs covering their poetry, history, genealogy, and dialects and made use of the manuscript collections of Ḥamād al-Rāwiyah and Janmād. We find, moreover, that not much later a grandson of ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abbās, namely ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Ali, who witnessed the fall of the Umayyads, collected the diwān’s of the Marwānids and declared that of Hishām the most accurate and the best for subject and ruler alike.261 The poetry in such diwān’s, even if incomplete, could...
hardly have been intrusted to memory alone. That poets of the Umayyad period committed to writing at least some of their own poetry, apart from such few verses as they included in their correspondence or sent as love messages,\(^{262}\) is indicated by the controversy over whether such compositions should begin with the *basmalah* formula. Sha'bi was against the use of the formula, but Sa'id ibn Jubair (d. 95/714) insisted on it and as a public as a rule followed his example, though there was a choice in the matter.\(^{263}\) The judge and poet Muhārib ibn Dīthār, hearing of the death of 'Umar II and wishing to compose an elegy for the occasion, summoned his secretary to write down his verses. The secretary automatically wrote the *basmalah* formula but was ordered to erase it “for it is not to be used with poetry.”\(^{264}\)

We have learned that prose literature of the type represented by the two sections of our papyrus text, in both content and literary style, was popular in Umayyad times and that some of it was available in writing to a number of second/eighth-century 'Abbāsid scholars who were known to have committed their own works to writing. On the basis of its script and of the name Ya‘qūb ibn ‘Aṭā in recto 7 we can place our document about the middle of this century. Ya‘qūb may or may not have long survived his aged scholarly father, ‘Aṭā ibn Abī Rabāḥ, who died in 114/732. Nevertheless, the papyrus could as well be from Ya‘qūb’s hand as from that of a younger second-century transmitter. The omission of *iṣnād*’s was common for this type of *akhbār* literature, as hadith critics later saw fit to point out. And Jāḥiz was probably not alone in appreciating the political and literary accomplishments of the Umayyads and in realizing that the greater part of their secular literature was lost, neglected, or corrupted by the time of such leading 'Abbāsid scholars as Abū ‘Ubaidah, Madā‘īnī, Hishām ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Sā‘īb al-Kalbī, and Haitham ibn ‘Adī.\(^{265}\) We have here an actual literary specimen from the Umayyad period.

---

\(^{262}\) See Ibn Abī Tahir Taifūr, p. 151; *Akhbār al-quwat* I 182, 192 f. See also n. 122 on p. 60 above and pp. 115 f. and 170 below.


\(^{265}\) Jāḥiz, *Bayān* III 297: "فَمَا يَذْكُرُوا إِلَّا قَلِيلًا مِّنْ كَثِيرٍ وَتَزِيدُوا مِّنْ خَالِصٍ".
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ANECDOTES FROM AŞMA‘Ī

Oriental Institute No. 17639. First half of third/ninth century.

Coarse papyrus, 25 × 16 cm. The piece has several lacunae, almost no vertical margins, and horizontal margins of 2 cm. (Pl. 5). The verso is blank except for a brief undated entry of an unspecified amount of rent still due from Jahl al-Jazzār(?) for the five months from Dhu al-Hijjah to Rabr II.

Script.—Nondescript, common, cursive hand, closely written and carelessly executed both as to the letter forms and the placing of some of the diacritical points. The latter are used freely especially in the verses cited. Vowels and the hamzah are not used. The circle with a dot indicates the end of a verse of poetry. The script of the notation on the verso is similar but more carefully written.

TEXT

1 بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
قال الأصمعي
2
مررت بقوم فأنا بعراقي خفا خيام قام عنها
3 فقلت له يا عراقي ما اوقفك ها هنا في هذه الناحية
4 قال عشقي جارية في هذا الحي قلت وما يملأك عنها
5 قال الكسل قال فهل قلت في كسل شيه
6 قال نعم فانشأ يقول سألت الله يائتي بسم الله الله يفعل
7 ما ليشأ قرأها فيطرحها بارضي قدها
8 وينكشف الكساء وبخذيه فيطرحني عليها ويرفعنا
9 وقد قضى القضاء وتأتي دمها فنحن سجاما [فغنا]
10 وقد ذهب العنان يا طبي ما يكون بعض عيش بلاصيف
11 ولا شئنا قال
12
امرأة الخجاج بن يسيف بخطب العراب من واسط قال فاتاه عرابي
13 قال له ائت الله بن الامير ليمت بخطب عرابي من عملك قال لاشك
14 لا تقرأ القرآن قال بلا والله أنى قد اقرأ قال فاقرأ
15 قال فا تريد ان اقرأ لك قال اقرأ لي اذا جاء نصر اللهم
16 قال فاتشاع الأعرابي بقول

Comments.—The text consists of two anecdotes reported by Aşma‘ī, in the first of which (lines 2–12) he himself is a participant. The second (lines 12–17) is an incomplete anecdote associated with Hajjaj ibn Yūsuf, who, as governor of Ṭiraq, ordered the undesirable classes of the population expelled from his newly founded provincial capital of Wāṣīt. The common link is the language or behavior of an undesirable person referred to as غرابي (see comment on lines 3–4). The individual so characterized, however, is not the same person in the two anecdotes.
**Lines 3-4.** The unvoweled word غرابي is clearly pointed in line 3 but unpointed in lines 4 and 13 and also in the plural form الغراب in line 13. The noun ghurāb (plural ghurāb, from which a double plural ghurāb is possible) is defined as the sharp edge of something or the sharpness of anything, including sharpness of the tongue and thence meaning sharpness of temper or the like, passionateness, irritability or vehemence of a man or a youth or a horse (see Lane, p. 2241). Furthermore, ghurāb and the possible plural ghurāb, said of a person or of language, means strange or far from being intelligible or difficult to understand or obscure or the state of being a stranger or a foreigner (see Lane, pp. 2240 and 2242). The last meaning could apply to the furtive stranger in the Bedouin camp of lines 3-4 and to the strangers or foreigners of line 13 who were expelled from Wāṣit.

Again, assuming that the dot over the ghain in line 3 is an accidental speck and reading غرابي and also stretching a point of grammar and lexicography by virtue of analogy, gīyās (a device still somewhat fluid in both sciences in young Ašmaʾi’s day), one could associate this assumed reading with رجل غرابية, a brisk, lively, or sprightly man, or with غرابية, foul or obscene speech or talk (see Lane, pp. 1991 and 1995). All of these meanings, depending on one’s idea as to what constitutes sprightliness or vulgarity, could be applied to the men and the language of both parts of the papyrus text because of their partly parallel and closely related anecdotes that are reported in the sources. Amended readings غرابي and the possible plural غرابية are not admissible, especially in line 13, on either paleographic or historical grounds. For all our sources are agreed that Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf’s edict of expulsion of some people from Wāṣit was not aimed primarily at the vulgar boors or clowns among the Bedouins, let alone at all of the Bedouins. An amended reading غرابي in line 3 has a bare paleographic possibility since dots are not always carefully placed with the letters to which they belong, as for example in قيد of line 11. Associated with a bachelor or a solitary distant herder (see Lane, p. 2033), the term might apply to the main character in lines 3-4 of our first anecdote but would not apply to line 13 for the same historical reason that is given above against the reading غرابي.

The desert setting in which we find Ašmaʾi reporting a personal anecdote is readily explained by his well known frequent visits and some lengthy sojourns with the Bedouins in search of knowledge of classical Arabic and its poetry. Not so well known is his marriage to a Bedouin woman. The gaum of line 3 could refer to any Bedouin group he was staying with at the time or to the people of his Bedouin wife (see pp. 104 f.).

**Lines 5-6.** The familiar theme of an amorous swain seeking his beloved’s camp or tent needs no comment. Lazy people disinclined to timely action or physical exertion were to be found in all walks of life, as reflected in several proverbs on this and related themes (see e.g. Bakri, Faṣl al-maqāl fi sharḥ kitāb al-amthāl li Abī ‘Ubaid, p. 276; Tāshkuprīzādah, Kitāb miftāḥ al-sū‘ādah I 15-17, 31; Ra‘d al-akhyār, pp. 250-53).

**Lines 7-12.** The lazy lover who claimed these five verses would seem to be a plagiarist if we accept the identification of verses 1, 3, and 4 as those of Walīd II (125–26/743–44) as reported by Ibn ʿAbd Rabbīhī (Iqd IV 454), the only identification provided so far in the available sources. The Iqd text reads as follows:

لعل الله يجمعني بسمه
أبيض الله يعال ما يشاء
فوقضني قد قضى الفضاء
وبيرسل دينه من بعد هذا
فغعلنا وليس بنا عنا

For يجمعني of the first verse, some of the Iqd manuscripts have إن يأني, which could be a slight variant if
not an error for لَا يَا بَنِي يَسْقُطُ فِي نَارٍ. The remaining variants are self-explanatory. See Gabrieli, p. 34, No. 1, for the fully pointed text of Walid’s three verses.

The phrase لَا يَا بَنِي يَسْقُطُ فِي نَارٍ of our line 9 alternates in comparable situations with لَا يَا بَنِي يَسْقُطُ فِي نَارٍ (‘Iqd VI 451 f.; Mas‘ūdī V 433). The prevalence of this type of amatory verse and Walid’s use of it is discussed below (pp. 92 ff.). Note that the last verse of our poem calls for a kasrah as its final vowel as against the dammah of the preceding four verses—a fault technically known as iqqād (see Shi‘r, pp. 29 f., for several examples).

Lines 12–17. The script of this second anecdote becomes increasingly cursive, with fewer diacritical points and more careless execution of individual letters. The final رَأَى and رَأَيْن of لَا يَا بَنِي يَسْقُطُ فِي نَارٍ in line 14 look more like final نَآئم. Note also the misformed medial صَلَط of سَلَط في نَآئم in line 16, citing Sūrah 110:1. For further comment on the background of the text see pp. 83 ff.

†HAJJAJ IBN YŪSUF

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

I

Mu‘awiya (41–60/661–80) and his governors of ʿIrāq were able, for the most part, to keep that turbulent province under control by a combination of force and painstaking diplomacy. The subsequent inter-dynastic rivalry that ended with the victory of the Marwānid branch of the Umayyads, the ‘Alīd tragedy at Karbalā‘, and the counter-caliphate of ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Zubair (61–73/681–92) roused the several dissident groups, particularly those in ʿIrāq, to intensify their open opposition. Even after the failure of the Shi‘īte movement of Ibn al-Ḥanafiyyah, the revolt of the Khārijite Muhštār, and the fall of ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Zubair, ʿAbd al-Malik (65–86/685–705) realized that he had still to reckon with the Shi‘ītes and the Khārijites and to contend with the tribal ambitions of the predominantly South Arab settlers of ʿIrāq, whose wholehearted loyalty to his North Arab dynasty entrenched in Syria could not always be taken for granted. It is, therefore, not surprising that, except for Ḥajjaj ibn Yūsuf, ʿAbd al-Malik found no ready and unconditional takers for the governorship of ʿIrāq.¹

Force rather than diplomacy, in peace and war, characterized Ḥajjaj’s long rule (75–95/694–714) of that restless key province and its eastern dependencies. ʿAbd al-Malik, convinced of Ḥajjaj’s loyalty and for the most part also of his indispensability, condoned Ḥajjaj’s policy of force though he did, on occasion, warn him against or rebuke him for causing excessive bloodshed.² Ḥajjaj’s first speech when he took office in Kūfah let the Kūfans know in no uncertain terms that he intended to rule with an iron hand and would assuredly cause rebels to shed blood.³ Open rebellion by the Khārijites, especially that of Shabīb ibn Yazīd al-Shaibānī (d. 77/696 or 78/697) in ʿIrāq proper and the halfhearted support of Ḥajjaj’s ʿIrāqī forces sent against Shabīb, soon gave Ḥajjaj occasion to match his threatening words with gory deeds. Thwarted by Shabīb’s guerrilla tactics and suspicious of his own ʿIrāqī forces, Ḥajjaj sent urgent appeals to ʿAbd al-Malik for Syrian troops, which were quickly dispatched.⁴ The trusted Syrians fought well,

¹ Masʿūdī V 291 f.; (Abd al-Malik) ʿIrāq; Only after having asked the same question twice more with the same result did ʿAbd al-Malik finally appoint Ḥajjaj.
² See e.g. Ṭabarī II 1133 f.; Masʿūdī V 308–12, 389; Śārī, ʿAdab al-kutub, p. 236; Ibn ʿAsakir IV 66–68.
³ Jāḥiz, Bayān I 309 f. and II 142; Yaqtābī I 326; Masʿūdī V 293 f.; Ṭabarī II 863–65; Muḥarrad, pp. 215 f. See ‘Iqd IV 115–24 for Ḥajjaj’s speeches. See also Pérès, pp. 70–73.
⁴ E.g. Ṭabarī II 943 f.; Masʿūdī V 331 f. See also Pérès, pp. 134–36.
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turned the tide of the war, and eventually put Shabib’s forces to flight, in the course of which Shabib himself was drowned. 5

In the meantime, despite advice for leniency, Ḥajjaj had continued to taunt the ‘Iraqis in general and the Kufans in particular, 6 thus further aggravating the discontent of the South Arab population and the resentment of the province’s military and religious leaders. Discontent and resentment continued to intensify as Ḥajjaj relied more and more on the largely North Arab Syrians, whom he repeatedly characterized as trustworthy, loyal, and of unquestioning obedience, 7 thus adding fuel to the ever smouldering fires of tribal rivalries and animosities. All these factors were, in part at least, responsible for the poor morale of the ‘Iraqi forces and their non-heroic flights before the enemy, particularly in the case of the general ‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn Mu‘āammad al-Kindī, better known as Ibn al-Asbâth, and his largely South Arab troops who fled before Shabib. 8 Ḥajjaj’s mistrust of and accusations against the ‘Iraqis lasted throughout his rule 9 and in part contributed to the growing animosity between him and Ibn al-Asbâth, 10 whose rebellion (80-85/699-704) raised the shadow of a counter-caliphate that all but dislodged Ḥajjaj from his powerful position in ‘Iraq. 11 The tide was first turned against Ibn al-Asbâth in part by the Syrian forces whom the greatly alarmed ‘Abd al-Malik dispatched posthaste 12 and in part by growing dissension in the rebel’s camp. Seeking new allies, Ibn al-Asbâth fled to Khurāsān, where he was finally betrayed in 85/704, and his head was sent to Ḥajjaj in return for tax remission over a period of seven years. 13

II

It was during the last phase of the rebellion of Ibn al-Asbâth that Ḥajjaj first gave thought, in 83/702, to a seat of provincial government other than that of Kufah or Basrah. The immediate reason is sometimes given as an incident involving a drunken Syrian soldier who offended a Kufan bride and was killed by her soldier-groom. The latter was nevertheless set free by Ḥajjaj, who expressed disapproval of the Syrian soldier’s conduct and furthermore ordered the Syrian troops, then quartered and moving freely among the population, to move to a new encampment on the outskirts of Kaskar. 14 The incident is reported by Ṭabarī without an isnad and without identification of the chief characters. Yet, under the circumstances incidents of this type would not be improbable. Be that as it may, separate encampments for the Syrian troops did offer a solution to such problems. But Ḥajjaj had other and more compelling reasons, political and personal, for the founding of Wāṣīt as a government seat. As governor not only of ‘Iraq proper but of its fast-growing yet turbulent eastern dependencies and since he was even contemplating an invasion of

5 Ṭabarī II 975 f.; Mas‘ūdī V 322; Ḥumābī, p. 163; Pèrèr, pp. 131-47. But see Jābih, Bayān I 285 and 384 and Mas‘ūdī V 454 for the rebelling South Arab Yazīd ibn al-Muhallab’s low opinion of the Syrians as composed of artisans and people of the lower classes.
6 See e.g. Ṭabarī II 444-46, 954 f., 997. Later he turned a deaf ear to Jābih al-Muhārī’s advice on winning the support of the ‘Iraqīs and their troops by milder measures, saying that the sword will bring them to obedience. Jābih’s courageous answer so angered Ḥajjaj that Jābih felt it necessary to flee to Syria (Jābih, Bayān II 140 f.; Ṯabūḏ II 179 f. and IV 114). See p. 59 above for a comparable situation when Mu‘āwiya readily accepted and acted upon the advice of ‘Amr ibn al-As. 7 As with Mu‘āwiya and ‘Amr ibn al-As (see pp. 51 f.), Ḥajjaj’s favorite term for the Syrians was اهل السم واطأطاءي which was also used at times as a battle cry (see Ṭabarī II 950 f.). For the subsequent use of this and other terms by Ḥajjaj in praise of the Syrians, coupled at times with condemnation of the ‘Iraqīs see e.g. Ṭabarī II 1090, 1134.
8 Ṭabarī II 930-33, 37-39; see also Pèrèr, pp. 129-33.
9 E.g. Ṭabarī II 1254, 1268; Mas‘ūdī V 306-7, 328-30, 336.
10 Ṭabarī II 1042-46.
12 Ṭabarī II 1059 f. . . .
13 Ṭabarī II 1059 f. . . .
14 Ṭabarī II 1102-4, 1122-26; Mas‘ūdī V 305-7; Pèrèr, pp. 224-26.
the Chinese border, Hajjaj saw the political and military advantage of a provincial capital that was more centrally situated than either Kufah or Basrah. His distrust of the 'Iraqi forces and of many leading non-military personalities who were critical of his policy of force or who supported Ibn al-Ash'ath impelled Hajjaj to seek a secure capital to be peopled by his own loyal supporters. Ibn al-Ash'ath fled to Sijistan, pursued by the Syrians and others, including Hajjaj's son Muhammud, sometime during the winter of 83–84/702–3. His flight left Hajjaj and 'Iraq free from active warfare though the end of the rebellion of Ibn al-Ash'ath could by no means have been taken for granted. Hajjaj, as I see it, must have begun building Wasiṭ in this very winter, which would adequately explain why some sources report it as first built in 83/702 and others in 84/703. Wasiṭ as completed in 86/705 was a twin city on the shores of the Tigris, the two parts linked by a pontoon bridge. On the western shore was the new Wasiṭ with its government and public buildings and accommodations for the Syrian troops. The older Kaskar, on the eastern shore, was incorporated into the new capital. Its largely Persian population was later augmented mainly by Turks from the Transoxus and by an earlier colony of Bukharians whom 'Ubaid Allah ibn Ziyād had settled in Basrah. Both the plan and the settlements of the twin city reflected Hajjaj's vigilant eye on the eastern dependencies, his aversion to the 'Iraqis, and his reliance on Syrian troops who, like him, were committed to the cause of the Umayyads in general and to that of 'Abd al-Malik and Walid I in particular.

SOCIAL AND LITERARY BACKGROUNDS

Born at Taʾīf in 41/661 to a humble family of schoolteachers, a profession then largely in the hands of the ma'āwalī and of Christians and Jews, the ambitious young Hajjaj ibn Yūsuf left the schoolroom to seek his fortune in public administration in the Hijāz itself. Presently he made his way north to the imperial capital of Damascus, where he served under Rauḥ ibn Zinbā, chief of police for 'Abd al-Malik. Hajjaj was among Rauḥ’s men in 'Abd al-Malik’s campaign against Mus’ab ibn al-Zubair and his 'Iraqi supporters (70–72/689–91) when he first came to the attention of 'Abd al-Malik as a strong and resourceful military disciplinarian. With Mus’ab out of the way, 'Abd al-Malik next gave the eager Hajjaj the task of reducing his brother 'Abd Allah ibn al-Zubair, counter-caliph in the Hijāz. This Hajjaj speedily accomplished the next year (73/692), to become himself the governor of Mecca and then of Medina (73–75/692–94) and presently the strong-handed governor (75–95/694–714) of the more strategic and turbulent province of 'Iraq and its eastern dependencies.

Hajjaj’s rapid rise to high office and political power was soon followed by an ambitious climb up the social ladder, primarily through marriage alliances (see pp. 72 f.). In the meantime, he sought a reputation as orator, linguist, and finally as patron of learning and culture, for his rivals, enemies, and at times...
even his patrons taunted him with his humble origin and background. The combination of great power, high social and cultural ambitions, and the nagging reminders, if not his own resentment, of his humble origin played a role in his high-handed treatment and disposal of those who criticized or dared to defy him, as it did also in his choice of the population for his new capital of Wāṣīṭ. The incident reported in lines 13–17 of our papyrus is but one of many symptoms of these several socio-cultural causes at work. Ḥajjaj’s concern with correct speech, and particularly with the correct reading and transcribing of the Qurʾān, must have dated back to his schoolteaching days. In addition to his sensitivity to errors in the reciting of the Qurʾān, from which not even he was free, the political and religious overtones of persistent variant readings, particularly those of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Masʿūd (d. 32/653), so alarmed him that he took steps to safeguard the correct reading and transcription of the ‘Uthmānic edition of the Qurʾān. It was perhaps no accident that the same year (86/705) saw the completion of Wāṣīṭ and of Ḥajjaj’s revision of the ‘Uthmānic Qurʾān, copies of which he sent to Damascus and the provincial capitals.

According to some sources it would seem that Ḥajjaj excluded from Wāṣīṭ from its very beginning all undesirables, commonly described collectively as the nabāṭ or as the nabiṭ and the anbāṭ. Other sources report that he expelled them when he himself first took up residence in his new capital. Still others report that the expulsion took place when the city was completed. Our papyrus text (line 13) indicates expulsion at some unspecified time rather than initial expulsion or exclusion. The stern Ḥajjaj would hardly have allowed an initial order of exclusion to be ignored. There is also the possibility that some so-called undesirables may have been used as construction workers in the building of Wāṣīṭ. We do know that he employed Ḥaṣān al-Nabāṭī to drain and reclaim the marshes. We read further that, having expelled the nabāṭ from Wāṣīṭ on taking up his residence in that city, Ḥajjaj wrote his kinsman Ḥakam ibn Ayyūb, deputy governor of Baṣra, to expel immediately all the nabāṭ from Baṣra also, for they corrupt religion and the (whole) world. When Ḥakam reported that he had expelled all the nabāṭ except those who read the Qurʾān and were knowledgeable in religion and world affairs, he received an angry reply for not expelling all of them and was all but accused of being part nabāṭī himself.

Whether or not the Nabataeans of the Nabataean kingdom of pre-Islāmic times were originally an ethnic group, Aramaic or Arab, need not detain us here. Yet, mention should be made in passing of their

---

24 E.g. ‘Iqd V 20–25; see also ibid., p. 38, where ‘Abd al-Malik upbraids him for his conduct and taunts him with his background, and pp. 41 f. for Princèe Sulaimān’s abusive and threatening letter to Ḥajjaj. See Masʿūdī V 364–67 for the upbraiding he received from Umm al-Banin, wife of Walīd I.
25 E.g. Mubarrad, p. 290; see also Perier, pp. 3–7.
26 When Yalūya ibn Yaʿmar pointed out, at Ḥajjaj’s own insistence, an error in the latter’s reading of Surah 8:24, Ḥajjaj gave him three days to get out of ʿIrāq and exiled him to Khurāsān, where he served as secretary to its governor, Yazīd ibn al-Muhallab (82–89 A.H.); Jumābī, p. 13; Nuzhā, pp. 11 f. See ‘Iqd V 39 and 38 for other incidents.
27 When Yalūya ibn Yaʿmar pointed out, at Ḥajjaj’s own insistence, an error in the latter’s reading of Surah 9:24, Ḥajjaj gave him three days to get out of ʿIrāq and exiled him to Khurāsān, where he served as secretary to its governor, Yazīd ibn al-Muhallab (82–89 A.H.); Jumābī, p. 13; Nuzhā, pp. 11 f. See ‘Iqd V 39 and 38 for other incidents.
28 E.g. Mubarrad, p. 290; see also Perier, pp. 255–57, esp. n. 3 on p. 256.
29 E.g. Jābis, Bayān I 270 and III 318: قُلِ الْحَاجُّ اِمْكَنْ بِيْ مَدِيْةٍ وَاسِعَةً فِي بَيْاتِ الْبَيْنَةَ فَمَّا قَالَ فَمَا يَدْخُلُ فِي مَاتٍ دَعْفَى أَلْيَا مِنْ قَرْبِهِ. For the generally poor opinion of the anbāṭ see ibid. II 106 and III 47.
30 E.g. Muhādarāt I 220: وَلَا فَرَغُ الْحَاجُّ مِنْ بَيْنِي وَاسِعَا أَمَراً بِمَعِسَةٍ كَلِّ بَيْتٍ يَا تَوَلَّ اماَّ مَهَيْنِ مَالَ مَثَأَتِ فَلِيْاً مَثَأَتِ. See e.g. Perier, p. 290.
31 Mubarrad, p. 296; Lo Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 42. Ḥaṣān al-Nabāṭī outlived Ḥajjaj to intrigue later against Khālid al-Qārī (Tabari II 1779 f.).
32 According to some sources it would seem that Ḥajjaj excluded from Wāṣīṭ from its very beginning all undesirables, commonly described collectively as the nabāṭ or as the nabiṭ and the anbāṭ. Other sources report that he expelled them when he himself first took up residence in his new capital. Still others report that the expulsion took place when the city was completed. Our papyrus text (line 13) indicates expulsion at some unspecified time rather than initial expulsion or exclusion. The stern Ḥajjaj would hardly have allowed an initial order of exclusion to be ignored. There is also the possibility that some so-called undesirables may have been used as construction workers in the building of Wāṣīṭ. We do know that he employed Ḥaṣān al-Nabāṭī to drain and reclaim the marshes. We read further that, having expelled the nabāṭ from Wāṣīṭ on taking up his residence in that city, Ḥajjaj wrote his kinsman Ḥakam ibn Ayyūb, deputy governor of Baṣra, to expel immediately all the nabāṭ from Baṣra also, for they corrupt religion and the (whole) world. When Ḥakam reported that he had expelled all the nabāṭ except those who read the Qurʾān and were knowledgeable in religion and world affairs, he received an angry reply for not expelling all of them and was all but accused of being part nabāṭī himself.
33 Whether or not the Nabataeans of the Nabataean kingdom of pre-Islāmic times were originally an ethnic group, Aramaic or Arab, need not detain us here. Yet, mention should be made in passing of their
political and literary contributions to the pre-Islamic Arab world and particularly to their role in the evolution of the Arabic script. Early in the Islamic period the villagers and agricultural inhabitants of Syria and 'Iraq were referred to somewhat contemptuously as anbāṭ, and they continued to be looked down upon whether or not they converted to Islam. Soon the derisive term came to be applied, regardless of race or religion, to all sorts of people who were considered undesirable. These included indigenous populations such as the inhabitants of the marshlands (bāṭā'īd) of 'Iraq, peoples of mixed blood, and “the lowest or basest or meanest sort, the refuse of men and the vulgar sort thereof.” All of these types Ḥajjāj would have considered unfit to live in his city of Wāṣiṭ. It should be noted further that the undesirable person involved in each of the two anecdotes of our papyrus text could readily represent any one of these types, whether the descriptive term used in the papyrus is derived from gharaḍa or 'araḍa or 'ażaba (comment on lines 3-4).

The question arises, on the one hand, why the papyrus text does not in this particular context use the words commonly found in the sources, namely nabāṭi and its plurals, and, on the other hand, why the papyrus term does not appear in the sources, not even where supplemental terms are appended to nabāṭ or to anbāṭ. One answer could be that our papyrus represents a text from a still youthful yet recondite Aṣma‘ī (b. ca. 123/741), who was fascinated with rare words and expressions in both prose and verse and who achieved the enviable reputation of being the ranking expert at elucidating the several meanings of a word and its derivatives. The papyrus term in all probability had a limited short-term currency before yielding to the readily understood and more widely used nabāṭi and its several plurals.

According to our papyrus text, Ḥajjāj considered inability to recite the Qurʾān sufficient reason for expulsion. Whenever such ability was claimed, it had to be put to the test, in this particular case by the recitation of Sūrah 110, which consists of three short verses. As our text breaks at this point, we do not know whether or not the test was passed. We do know, however, of instances well after the beginning of the first century when such claims failed the test either because of incorrect Qurʾānic citation or because of recitation of poetry mistakenly assumed to be Qurʾānic text. Walīd I (86-96/705-15), who was more influenced by Ḥajjāj than was ‘Abd al-Malik, refused to pay petitioners’ debts unless they could recite passages from the Qurʾān. Ḥajjāj must have changed his mind about allowing Qurʾān-reading nabāṭi to remain in Wāṣiṭ since he soon ordered all the nabāṭi, including those who read the Qurʾān and were knowledgeable in religion and world affairs, expelled even from the older Basra. The Bedouins (a‘rāb), however, were not so categorically disliked and excluded. Aṣma‘ī reports the case of an ill-mannered and vulgar a‘rābī who was imprisoned in Wāṣiṭ until, after Ḥajjāj’s death, he and many other prisoners were set free. Ḥajjāj, like many rulers and scholars, had a keen appreciation of the innate intelligence and ready wit found among the Bedouins, literate or otherwise. Several anecdotes are reported, frequently by Aṣma‘ī, in which Ḥajjāj overlooked insolence or even defiance of his orders by an outspoken
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85 See OIP L.
86 See Lane, pp. 2759 f., and references in n. 34 above.
87 Jumahi, p. 502.
88 Fihrist, p. 91; Iqd III 479.
89 E.g., ‘Uyun II 120 cites Muhammad without an isnad as follows: روى في الأخر أن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال: إني تابيت إلا أنهما أصبو في الجاهلية، إنما بنى أبا طلحة وهو كنيل. For Walīd’s even stronger appreciation of Ḥajjāj as expressed on the latter’s death see n. 85 on p. 90 below.
90 Walīd made one such supplicant recite 10 verses each from Sūrah 8 and 9 (Tabari II 1271).
91 Muhaddithīt I 220 cites Muhammad without an isnad as follows: روى في الأخر أن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال: إني تابيت إلا أنهما أصبو في الجاهلية، إنما بنى أبا طلحة وهو كنيل. This passage is followed by sayings of such leading Companions as ‘Umar I and Ibn ‘Abbās in condemnation of the nabāṭi.
92 Iqd III 481 and V 46.
93 Ibid. III 424, 444, 477 f. See ibid. III 418-98 for the character and behavior of Bedouins and their witty sayings and anecdotes about them (pp. 477-83 citing Aṣma‘ī as often as not) and p. 10 for Abū Tamām’s contrast of the intelligence, prudence, or sagacity of the Bedouins with the tyranny, cruelty, and lack of manners of the abī al-Jaṣīra.
but quick-witted Bedouin, including cases that involved severe criticism of the rule of Ḥajjāj himself and that of his brother Muḥammad as governor of the Yemen. Ḥajjāj appreciated the sagacity of his illiterate Bedouin cousin whom he appointed, sometime during the reign of Walīd I, as governor of Isfahān, where taxes were in arrears. The taxpayers thought they could outwit this ignorant Bedouin only to find themselves caught in his trap. Furthermore, Ḥajjāj himself married a Bedouin woman versed in Bedouin speech and poetry to round out the talents of his full quota of four wives (see p. 72).

There were a few who dared to point out to Ḥajjāj that the site of Wāsīt offered no personal advantage to him or his family, and a few others, including Ibn al-Qirriyyah, echoed the opinion. There were also those who considered his policy of excluding the indigenous nabāt from Wāsīt foolish and doomed to ultimate failure, since the city was in their territory (see n. 29 above). Events proved them right, for soon after the death of Ḥajjāj the nabāt moved into the forbidden city. Thereafter, as Ḥajjāj had feared, the quality of Wāsīt’s population deteriorated rapidly, so that the city and its people became the butt of the cutting satire of Bashshār ibn Burd and other poets.

However, in the dozen years or so that Ḥajjāj lived and ruled in Wāsīt, he strove to give the city an air of artistic and cultural distinction. The bridge of boats joining the two parts of the city, the two congregational mosques, the government buildings, and especially his own palace with its green cupola (qubbat al-khaḍrā‘), which he proudly displayed, were show places that profited in part from materials stripped from buildings in other cities. He chose his administrative staff, his personal secretaries, and his few close associates as much for their loyalty as for their intelligence and culture. He recommended Muḥammad ibn Yāzīd al-Anṣārī to ‘Abd al-Malik as the perfect private secretary, because he was trustworthy, virtuous, wise, even tempered, and a keeper of secrets. Ḥajjāj was so keenly aware of literary style that he rightly suspected gifted ghost writers to be the drafters of some letters from his officials in Khūrāsān. He was greatly annoyed if he was caught in any grammatical error whatever and distressed if he failed to grasp the meaning of a literary or historical allusion, especially when it came in a curt letter from ‘Abd al-Malik. His own conversation and correspondence were generally brief, clear cut, and apt, while his public speeches, threatening or otherwise (see p. 81, n. 3), frequently give the impression of a veritable literary tour de force.

But Ḥajjāj was ever suspicious of groups of scholars, orthodox or otherwise, who exerted politico-religious influence, the ‘ulama‘ and fuqahā‘, that is, Qur’anic-readers, judges and jurists, and traditionists. He pointedly humiliated a great number of rebel fuqahā‘ and mawlā‘ī in these professions by grouping them, despite their learning and culture, among the villagers and the anbā‘ī and thus no doubt helped to drive

---

41 Mas‘ūdī V 390–93; Périer, pp. 285 f. Aṣma‘ī reports a sequel in which this Bedouin, named Zaid, is approached by a brotherly Bedouin who seeks his favor in verse but in vain (Raba‘ī, pp. 38 f).
42 Ḥajjāj, Bayān II 140; ‘Īṣa‘ī II 179 f. and IV 114 f.:

One word led to another and Jā‘mī‘ al-Muhārīl turned against Ḥajjāj and fled to Syria (see n. 6 on p. 82 above).

43 Futḥ al-buldān, p. 390; Mas‘ūdī V 341 f.; ‘Īṣa‘ī VI 223.
44 See e.g. ‘Uyūn II 47; Ṭabarī III 390; Yaḥṣūb IV 886 f. Yaḥṣūb himself had some kind words for the Wāsīt of still later days (Yaḥṣūb IV 886–88). Deterioration of some elements of city population was not limited to Wāsīt (see e.g. Mubarrad, pp. 285 f.; Claude Cahen. Mouvements populaires et autonomisme arabe dans l’Asie musulmane du moyen-âge [Leiden, 1989]).
45 Yaḥṣūb IV 882–85; Périer, pp. 205–8 and references there cited; see also Le Strange, The Lands of the Eastern Caliphate, p. 39.
46 Iṣbā‘ī I 1168.
47 E.g. Šāhī, Adb al-kutūb, p. 235; Jumāhī, p. 13; Nuzhah, p. 12.
48 Pāṭūl, p. 51; Mas‘ūdī V 277 f.; 344 f., 357 f.
49 Mubarrad, p. 286; Yaḥṣūb (al-maḥa‘ja‘) an zillim ‘alā mu‘jam aṣṣama‘ wa-al-a‘dāb wa-adhālamu‘mā bād al-qarn wa-al-an‘ām ahl al-qarn ‘alā al-an‘ām al-‘alā‘ī al-ma‘ad al-‘alā‘ī. Ḥajjāj drew a distinction between Arab and non-Arab mawlā‘ī and permitted the former but not the latter to lead in prayers (‘Īṣa‘ī II 233). Later we find Marwān II preferring the mawāmitid mawlā‘ī to the allied one (see Ṭabarī II 1832: مولأ حنطة أفضل من موئل تباعة). See our Vol. I 28 f. for the role of learned mawlā‘ī.
several of them into the arms of such colorful rebels as Shabib ibn Yazid al-Shaibani and especially Ibn al-Ash'ath. But Hajjaj did not hesitate to harass and persecute the most prominent scholars of these groups, mawdli or not, if they opposed his views and threatened the success of his policy of iron rule. Some of them, for instance Anas ibn Malik, 'Abd Allah ibn Umar ibn al-Khattab, and Hasan al-Basri, were rescued from his wrath by 'Abd al-Malik. Hajjaj's vengeful wrath was vented on the 'ulama' who had joined Ibn al-Ash'ath and had the misfortune to be sent as prisoners to Wasi. Except for the few who managed to escape, such as Ibrahim ibn Yazid al-Nakha'i, they were either left to die in prison, as was Ibrahim ibn Yazid al-Taimi, or were summarily executed. Sa'id ibn Juhair managed to elude Hajjaj for many years of hiding but was captured in 94/713 and brought before Hajjaj, who upbraided him for his disloyalty and finding him still firm and defiant ordered his immediate execution. But not even repentance and humility had been enough to save the life of his former friend Ibn al-Qirrlyah (see p. 73). The encyclopedic Sha'bi, on the other hand, who had alerted the haughty Ibn al-Ash'ath to Hajjaj's murderous hate and then joined him, escaped execution and even punishment because of the friendly advice of both the secretary and the son of Hajjaj himself and by a combination of studied prudence and sustained humility. Soon thereafter Hajjaj sent Sha'bi to the aging and surfeited 'Abd al-Malik, who wished for a well rounded and entertaining scholar to inform and amuse him with lively conversation and ready citations from the poets. After an initial disciplinary coolness the caliph was more than pleased with the scholar, whom he appointed as tutor to his sons (see p. 136, n. 165) and took for a favorite companion. Sha'bi amused 'Abd al-Malik for some two years and comforted him with reassuring verse on his deathbed.

On his arrival as governor of 'Iraq, Hajjaj was not inclined to encourage the poets with prizes until 'Abd al-Malik ordered him to do so. Yet, the poets as a class were more acceptable to Hajjaj than were the 'ulama' as a group. Several factors contributed to this attitude. There was the time-honored role of the poet as the voice of his tribe to broadcast its heroic achievements and defend its honor, and there was also the role of the poet as propagandist or critic for or against Muhammad and his cause. Several poets of Muhammed's time outlived him and, along with a few others, continued the role of propagandist despite a Qur'anic condemnation of poets, which was interpreted for a brief span by the ultra-pious as con-

53 Tabari II 1076 f., 1085 f., 1100 gives lists of leading Qur'anic-readers and traditionists who took to the field with Ibn al-Ash'ath at Dir al-Jamajim and Maqan, where their several speeches were aimed at keeping up the soldiers' morale. Several of them fell in battle, and others fled with Ibn al-Ash'ath to Kirmak. In order to prevent further united support of Ibn al-Ash'ath on the part of the mawdli, Hajjaj dispersed the latter to their villages of origin and impressed on the hand of each the name of his village (see e.g. 'Iqd III 410 f.).

54 Jâlib, Bab'ân I 362; Tabari II 854 f. and III 2400 f.; Mas'udi V 295, 323, 389; 'Iqd V 35, 36-39, 53-55; Mawardi, Adab al-dunya wa al-din, pp. 42 f. See also Périer, pp. 89-91, and our Vols. I 16 and II 21, 148, 172, 249.

55 Mas'udi V 393 f. See also our Vol. II 21.

56 Tabari II 1261-66 gives details of several versions of Sa'id's wanderings, capture, and execution and of the subsequent death of Hajjaj himself. See also Mas'udi V 376 f.; 'Iqd V 55; our Vol. II 21.

57 Tabari II 1043. The sentiment was returned by Ibn al-Ash'ath, who considered Hajjaj below him socially.

58 Sha'bi was among those of Ibn al-Ash'ath's partisans whom Hajjaj had promised amnesty if they joined the forces of Qutaibah ibn Muslim in Kharisân (Tabari II 1111-13; Mas'udi 334 f.; 'Iqd V 32, 54 f.).

59 Aghâni IX 168 f.; 'Iqd II 77; Irshad I 30; Périer, p. 304.

60 Abû Hâtim al-Sijistânî, Kitâb al-mu'ammarîn (Ignaz Goldziher, Abhandlungen zur arabischen Philologie II [Leiden, 1899]) pp. 68-70; Majalis al-'ulama', pp. 206 f.; Aghâni IX 169-71, XIV 100, and XVI 165; 'Iqd II 77 f. See also our Vols. I 17, 44 and II 228. Mas'udi V 368-71 details another deathbed scene, in which 'Abd al-Malik surrounded by his family gives his sons his final instructions (tawâsiyâ') including the advice to regard Hajjaj well, since it was he who had facilitated this affair (i.e., the succession) for them: 'akiyma l-jâhâd wahâdan nîl wa waleem l-kâm al-adîm' (cf. n. 39 on p. 85 above).

61 Muhabbarât I 46.

Some poets attached themselves to the cause of 'Ali, others to the cause of Mu'awiyah. Subsequently, the Shi'ites, the Kharijites, the Zubairids, and the two branches of the Umayyads themselves all needed the poet to flatter and amuse in time of peace and as a mouthpiece and propagandist in time of war. Yet the poet was not, as a rule, a steady retainer or formal appointee. His flattering praise and scathing satire had at least to appear as self-initiated if not spontaneous. Fortunate was the ruler who could attract and hold a first-class poet, and rare was the poet who did not expect a rich reward in recognition of his service and superior talent. He had always to mind his tongue and on occasion to swallow his pride. If out of conviction or in a moment of pique he antagonized his patron, he would seek safety in the desert or take refuge with some new but powerful patron not necessarily of the same religious or political persuasion. If an offending poet on being captured stood his ground, he then risked his life for his convictions. Though fewer poets than 'ulamā' were prepared to take such a course, a poet in such circumstances was on occasion likely to be summarily executed. On the other hand, a first-class poet who was loyal to his patron and effective against the enemy, spirited yet discreet, though at times reproved for a passing minor offense, was on the whole more likely to be frequently humored and richly rewarded.

It is in the light of such established and accepted practices that one must view Ḥajjāj's relationship with the poets. 'Irāq was already on the way to leadership in the fields of language and literature. The large Ta'mīmite population no doubt took pride in the two leading poets of the day, Jarir44 from the Najdian Yamāmah and Baṣrah-born Farazdaq, who looked horns in turbulent 'Irāq. Jarīr was early identified with Baṣrah, where he met frequently with Muhammad ibn Sīrīn, while Farazdaq preferred Ḥasan al-BAṣrī.45 The two poets staged poetry tournaments for empire-wide acclaim, each against the other46 and both of them against most other poets, including for Jarīr a third famed poet, the Tāhilībīd and Christian Akhtal, favored poet of 'Abd al-Malik (see p. 111). In restless and rebellious 'Irāq we find Jarīr favoring the rebel governor Muṣṭāb ibn al-Zubair67 while Farazdaq leaned at first to the Alīds. Yet, being secular poets and not religious 'ulamā', they both readily served the next Umayyad governor, the pleasure-loving Prince Bishr ibn Marwān (71-74/690-93),68 who was given to stirring up jealous rivalries among the poets, especially those who waited on him.69 In view of the rapidly changing attitudes of these leading poets, it is understandable that Ḥajjāj on taking office as governor of 'Irāq in 75/694 did not wish to encourage the poets as a group. But the force of tradition, the poets' persistence in waiting at his door,70 the order from 'Abd al-Malik to receive and reward them, and Ḥajjāj's own love of poetry, at which both he and 'Abd al-Malik took a turn from time to time,71 all combined to cast him eventually in the role
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63 The literature on this theme is considerable and varied, being related to Sūrah (26:221-26 and 36:89) that Muhammad was a prophet and not a poet with demonic inspiration. Tradition distinguishes between the truthful and the lying poet, whether he is panegyrist or satirist, and recommends the latter (see e.g. Concordsion III 135 f. for Marsh. III 139 f. esp. for bism un-ayyāl Allāh f. n. 91 and VII 68 69 and VII 69 f. and VIII 181 f. and VII 68 f. For discussions of this theme see e.g. Buhārī IV 146-48; Muslim XV 11-15 with Nawawi's commentary; Māzūrī II 468-72, which draws heavily on Ibn Fāris and Ibn Bashīq, see also Sīraḥ I 13; Jāhiz, Baṣrī I 281 and III 333-36; Fādil, pp. 13 f.; Sīraḥ, p. 73; 'Umdah I 9 f. and II 138; Muḥādāt I 46 f.; Muṣṭafā Ṭālīq al-Rāḍī, 'Ṭārīkh adab al-'Arab (Cairo, 1953) II 223-31; Yahyā al-Jabbūrī, Shi'ir al-mukhadramūn (Baghdād, 1383/1964) pp. 40-49. For a survey of treatment of the theme by Western scholars and a fresh approach to the relationship of Muhammad and the poets see Irshād Shahīd, "A contribution to Koranic exegetics," Arabic and Islamic Studies in Honor of Hamilton A. H. Gibb, ed. George Makdisi (Cambridge, Mass., 1965) pp. 563-80.
64 He satirized the North Arab Banū Quānis, as did Akhtal (Jumāh, pp. 429, 443 f.).
65 Fādil, pp. 110-12; Ṭiq V 335; Pèrier, p. 288.
66 Their respective merits were current topics of conversation even in the opposing military camps (Aghānī VII 55; see also Nicholson, A Literary History of the Arabs, p. 239).
67 Jumāh, p. 357.
68 See Zambaur, pp. 39 and 41, for his governorship of Kufah, to which the governorship of Baṣrah was added in 73 A.H.
70 E.g. Amālī II 260 f.
71 For samples of Ḥajjāj's verse see e.g. Tabari II 1058 and Maṣūdī V 311 f.; for that of 'Abd al-Malik see Tabari II 1054-57 and Maṣūdī V 369 f., 368 f., 380; for both see Ibn 'Asākir IV 66-68 and Pèrier, pp. 287 and 330.
of patron of poets,\(^72\) from a personal and political as from a literary point of view. He is known, for instance, to have written to Qutaibah ibn Muslim, who was reputed to be a transmitter of poetry (\(r\ddot{a}wiyyat li al-sh\'\i\'r\)) and whom Hajjaj had appointed in 83/702 as governor of Rayy,\(^73\) asking him to name the ranking poets of the j\ddot{a}hiliyah and of his own day. Qutaibah named Imru’ al-Qais and Tarafah ibn al-‘Abd for the pre-Islamic period and Farazdaq, Jarir, and Akhtal as the ranking tribal poet or self-eulogist, satirist, and descriptive poet respectively.\(^74\) And while all these poets humored and praised Hajjaj, Jarir on the whole proved to be Hajjaj’s most effective and preferred panegyrist,\(^75\) even though he had at one time satirized him and composed romantic verses in reference to his wife Hind bint Asmā’ and had come close to being executed by Hajjaj for his offenses.\(^76\) Other poets who had either satirized Hajjaj or composed romantic verses to a woman of his family, such as ‘Udail ibn al-Farkh and Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Numair respectively, sought refuge in flight.\(^77\) A’shā Hamdān, who supported the caliphal ambition of Ibn al-Aš-‘ath and had satirized Hajjaj, had the misfortune to be captured and brought before the latter, who ordered his immediate execution.\(^78\) On the other hand, A’shā Bāni Rabi’ah offended Hajjaj with an elegy on the rebel Mundhir ibn al-Jārūd but later repented and eulogized Hajjaj and was forgiven.\(^79\) Still other poets he sent on political missions to and for ‘Abd al-Malik.\(^80\)

Of all the poets, Jarir became most closely associated in literature as in life with Ḥajjaj as his favorite panegyrist. His verses were so moving in both sentiment and style that they aroused the envy of even ‘Abd al-Malik, which may or may not have induced Hajjaj to present Jarir to that caliph. Just when and by whom Jarir was presented at the Damascene court is somewhat controversial. Jumahi\(^81\) reports Jarir as accompanying Hajjaj on his only visit to Damascus, and Mas’ūdī informs us that this visit took place soon after the victory at Dair al-Jamājim (83/702) but does not mention Jarir among those who accompanied Ḥajjaj.\(^82\) Somewhat later sources, with a family isnād tracing back to Jarir himself, report that Ḥajjaj sent ‘Abd al-Malik a delegation headed by his son Muḥammad accompanied by Jarir, thus affording the latter a greater opportunity for richer rewards.\(^83\) Inasmuch as Jarir was with Ḥajjaj in Wāsiṭ, his meeting and service with ‘Abd al-Malik fell within the last two or three years (84–86 A.H.) of that caliph’s reign. ‘Abd al-Malik’s initial coolness toward Jarir because of his earlier support of Muṣ‘ab ibn al-Zubair and his extravagant praise of Hajjaj, that undaunted poet’s challenging encounters with the Damascene court poets, especially Akhtal and ‘Adī ibn al-Riqā’, and the caliph’s final wholehearted approval of the “Baṣrān” poet will be considered in connection with Document 5.

Ḥajjaj’s more cordial relationships with the poets as contrasted with his harshness of the ‘udamā’

\(^72\) Périer, pp. 287–304, covers Ḥajjaj’s personal relationship with several poets in more detail than is called for here.
\(^73\) Their first meeting was in 77 A.H. (Tabari II 605 f., 1683, 1119). Jāḥīṣ, Ḥaḍrāt I 333, explains how a transmitter’s function was comparable with that of a camel as a carrier and why Qutaibah came to be called a ṭūṣīyāt. ṣarā’ī: الازوقة هو لجنة تلى وهو جمال المزايدة وقد أسلَّل إلى مسح المازداة والختام، كما أن تكون غيرها (cf. Lane, p. 1196, col. 2).
\(^74\) ‘Uṣūlu‘a’l-‘ulūma’, VIII 162; Périer, p. 299.
\(^75\) ‘Abd al-Malik’s initial coolness toward Jarir because of his earlier support of Muṣ‘ab ibn al-Zubair, and his extravagant praise of Ḥajjaj, that undaunted poet’s challenging encounters with the Damascene court poets, especially Akhtal and ‘Adī ibn al-Riqā’, and the caliph’s final wholehearted approval of the “Baṣrān” poet will be considered in connection with Document 5.
\(^76\) Their first meeting was in 77 A.H. (Tabari II 605 f., 1683, 1119). Jāḥīṣ, Ḥaḍrāt I 333, explains how a transmitter’s function was comparable with that of a camel as a carrier and why Qutaibah came to be called a ṭūṣīyāt. ṣarā’ī: الازوقة هو لجنة تلى وهو جمال المزايدة وقد أسلَّل إلى مسح المازداة والختام، كما أن تكون غيرها (cf. Lane, p. 1196, col. 2).
\(^77\) Jumahi, p. 357.
\(^78\) Mas’ūdī V 348 f. Aghānī VII 66, 181; Iqd II 82–84; Amālī III 43–46; Périer, p. 295.
\(^79\) See Périer, pp. 287 f., 295–97, and references there cited.
\(^80\) Jumahi, p. 429; Mas’ūdī V 351–56; Périer, p. 292. The chronology of these events is not too clear. Most probably Jarir’s offenses dated back to the time of his support of Muṣ‘ab ibn al-Zubair, and the threatening interview with Ḥajjaj and Hind was probably Jarir’s first meeting with Ḥajjaj as governor of Irāq. The date of the interview is not stated, and the occasion for it is controversial. Jumahi, p. 346, and Aghānī VII 70 f. point to their first meeting in Basra; others place it in Wāsiṭ, which I am not inclined to accept since it is not likely that Jarir and Ḥajjaj would have ignored each other for the first several years of Ḥajjaj’s governorship (see Périer, p. 288, and also pp. 114–16 below). Furthermore, according to Aghānī VII 70 f., Ḥajjaj took Jarir to task only for entering Wāsiṭ without permission but otherwise received him cordially.
\(^81\) See Périer, pp. 297 f. and 278 respectively, and references there cited; see also Yāqūt I 239 f.
\(^82\) ‘Abd al-Malik’s initial coolness toward Jarir because of his earlier support of Muṣ‘ab ibn al-Zubair, and his extravagant praise of Ḥajjaj, that undaunted poet’s challenging encounters with the Damascene court poets, especially Akhtal and ‘Adī ibn al-Riqā’, and the caliph’s final wholehearted approval of the “Baṣrān” poet will be considered in connection with Document 5.
\(^83\) See Périer, pp. 287 f., 295–97, and references there cited; see also Yāqūt I 239 f.
\(^84\) ‘Abd al-Malik’s initial coolness toward Jarir because of his earlier support of Muṣ‘ab ibn al-Zubair, and the threatening interview with Ḥajjaj and Hind was probably Jarir’s first meeting with Ḥajjaj as governor of Irāq. The date of the interview is not stated, and the occasion for it is controversial. Jumahi, p. 346, and Aghānī VII 70 f. point to their first meeting in Basra; others place it in Wāsiṭ, which I am not inclined to accept since it is not likely that Jarir and Ḥajjaj would have ignored each other for the first several years of Ḥajjaj’s governorship (see Périer, p. 288, and also pp. 114–16 below). Furthermore, according to Aghānī VII 70 f., Ḥajjaj took Jarir to task only for entering Wāsiṭ without permission but otherwise received him cordially.
\(^85\) See Périer, pp. 297 f. and 278 respectively, and references there cited; see also Yāqūt I 239 f.
\(^86\) ‘Abd al-Malik’s initial coolness toward Jarir because of his earlier support of Muṣ‘ab ibn al-Zubair, and his extravagant praise of Ḥajjaj, that undaunted poet’s challenging encounters with the Damascene court poets, especially Akhtal and ‘Adī ibn al-Riqā’, and the caliph’s final wholehearted approval of the “Baṣrān” poet will be considered in connection with Document 5.
is reflected in the reactions to his death. We find, to begin with, Ya'la ibn Makhlad rebuking the dying Ḥajjaj as he enumerates his political sins while Farazdaq comforted him with verses. Among the scholars who felt a great sense of relief or joy at the news of Ḥajjaj's death were Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, Abū ‘Amr ibn al-ʿAlā', and Prince ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. Among those who praised and mourned him were Walid I, the orator-governor Khālid al-Qaṣrī, and Jarir and Farazdaq, though Farazdaq did so under pressure from Walid I and in more restrained terms than those in which he eulogized the living Ḥajjaj. And later he satirized the dead Ḥajjaj to please the caliph Sulaimān.

WALID II
PRINCE AND CALIPH

The brief golden era of the Umayyads was all but over with the death of Walid I in 96/715. The divisive tribal rivalries and religio-political parties had undermined its political strength. The new conquests during the reigns of ʿAbd al-Malik and Walid I had brought an influx of foreign elements as mawālī of all degrees of culture and especially as slaves of both sexes. They had brought also an increasing flow of general and state income through expanded trade and commerce and imperial taxation. These social and economic influences resulted in an affluent and hedonistic society at court and among the upper classes which overshadowed the warnings of a new generation of religious scholars who lacked both the authority and the courage of their predecessors among the Companions and the Successors, whose ranks were so depleted by death by 96/715 that the year itself became known as the year of the passing of the ʾulamāʾ and fuqahāʾ. The poets continued to flourish at court though more and more in competition with singers and musicians of both sexes. Yazid II (101-5/720-24), who had married Ḥajjaj ibn Yūsuf's niece, the mother of Yazid's son Walid, reversed the cautious tribal policy of ʿUmar II (99-101/717-17) who, though he had imprisoned the South Arab Yazid ibn al-Muhallab, drew the line at torture and assassination. Yazid II now placed the Muhallabids at the mercy of their North Arab enemies, including his Thaqafite relatives by marriage who had previously suffered at the hands of the Muhallabids. In 102/721 he appointed as his heirs his brother Hishām to be succeeded by his son Walid, then eleven years old—a move that he later regretted, as did Walid still later. Yazid II won the unenviable reputation of being the least capable of the Umayyad caliphs and the first of that dynasty to degrade the dignity of the court and of the upper class by openly flaunting a life of wine, women, and song. He died of grief a few days after the death of his favorite songstress, Ḥababah. Hishām (105-25/724-43), the practical merchant-caliph, slowed down the several forces of disintegration at work in the empire but could not halt, let alone reverse, their course. His own life was circumspect, and the tone of his court was com-

84 Amālī III 175; Ibn Khallikān I 156 f. (═ trans. I 362 f.). See Périer, pp. 328-35, and ʾIqd V 46 for details of the illness and death of Ḥajjaj and the general reaction to these events. Jāḥiṣ, Bayān III 180, gives the reaction of an old woman of Ḥajjaj's household.
85 Ṣabāʾ al-Waqāʾ 35 f. See Mubarrad, p. 294, and Aṣḥāb VII 73, 181, for Prince ʿUmar's adverse opinion of the living Ḥajjaj. For Walid's reaction to his death see Asmaʾī, Khālīd al-ḥusnān, ed. A. Haffner (Leipsig, 1905) p. 174: خَرَجَ ʿُلَيْلٌ وَهُوَ يَبْقَىُ هَذَا ʾاَلْحَيَا ُنِبِيِّ رَقَبَةُ يُبَيِّنِ يَا ُنِبِيْرِي وَهُوَ يِفْتَحُ عَلَىْهَا. 86 Ṣabāʾ al-Waqāʾ 35 f.
87 wallā bi-l states, ʿAmrī al-ʿAlāʾ ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, and Prince ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. See also the reports in ʿAbd al-Malik’s caliphate.
88 Ṣabāʾ al-Waqāʾ 35 f.
paratively somber. Walid, on the other hand, had inherited his father's love of ease and pleasure. The personal incompatibility of uncle and nephew was further aggravated when Hisham sought to set aside Walid's succession in favor of his own son Maslamah or failing that to have Maslamah appointed as Walid's heir, but Walid refused to consider either proposition. Thereafter, the relationship between caliph and heir deteriorated to the point of open animosity, and Walid's hostility could not be overcome even after the death of Hisham.

Walid left Damascus to hold princely court at his Blue Palace beside the spring of Aqhdaf in the Jordanian desert, where he gathered around him congenial poets, singers, and musicians for whom he was not only a patron but a fellow professional. Hisham, in the meantime, lost no opportunity to discredit Walid's friends and partisans and to publicize Walid's excesses. Walid, in turn, denounced Hisham and satirized him in verses that anticipated and eventually celebrated his uncle's death. Walid as caliph (125-26/743-44), already a victim of his passions of pleasure and hate and now drunk with both wine and power and further corrupted by the possession of Hisham's immense treasury, lived faster, spent more freely, and directed his vengeance against Hisham's family. Heedless of dynastic and imperial consequences he soon alienated his other Umayyad cousins by appointing his two minor sons, born of concubines, as heirs. He committed an even worse blunder by antagonizing the powerful South Arab Yemenites, the military backbone of the Syrian army, by selling their fallen representative Khalid al-Qasri to his enemies, who tortured him to death and persecuted his family. To make matters still worse, he indulged in outbursts of sacrilegious words and deeds that alarmed the religious groups and thus fastened their co-operation with the Yemenites and his rival cousins. It was his cousin Yazid, son of Walid I, who first thought of making a bid for the throne, even against the advice of his brother, 'Abbas, by calling for Walid's abdication and then raising a hue and cry against him and demanding his deposition. Again, it was Yazid rather than the religious leaders who persistently accused Walid, both before and after his assassination, of heresy and moral delinquency. Even with allowance for some exaggera-

95 Asma'i transmits an incident which gives some insight into Hisham's personality (Raba'i, p. 27, No. 52).
96 Mubarrad, p. 386; Shi't, pp. 427, 485; Tabari II 1741, 1775; Mas'udi VI 4, 13 f. Francesco Gabrieli gives a detailed account of the life and reign of Walid II (Gabrieli, pp. 1-33) and appends a collection of 102 fragments of his poetry (Ibid., pp. 34-64).
97 Khalil Mardam, Dlan al-Walid ibn Yazid (Damascus, 1355/1937), reproduced Gabrieli's collection of these fragments, omitting the first and thus creating a discrepancy of one in the otherwise parallel numbering of the poems. In his introduction Khalil Mardam gives a lively picture of the life of Walid but without documentation except general references mostly to Tabari's Ta'rakh, the Aghani of Abú al-Faraj al-Ishahsí, and Ibn 'Anki's Ta'rakh al-kubir.
98 Tabari II 1742, 1745; Gabrieli, pp. 4 f. and 46, No. XLIV.
99 E.g. Tabari II 1731; Aghani VI 103 f. Maslamah sought to soften Hisham's attitude toward Prince Walid, who therefore spared Maslamah on his accession and eventually mourned his death.
100 Ṭabarai II 1795; Mubarrad, p. 386; Khalil Mardam, Dlan al-Walid ibn Yazid, Intro., pp. 17-24.
101 E.g. Ṭabarai II 1744 f.
102 Ibid. II 1731 f.; Mas'udi VI 5; Aghani VI 106, 1098; Gabrieli, pp. 9 f., 26, and 41, No. XXVIII, 47, No. XLVIII, 49, No. LV, 51, No. LX, 56 f., Nos. LXX and LXXVI, 62, No. XCVI. (Gabrieli's numbers should be decreased by one for Khalil Mardam's Dlan al-Walid ibn Yazid.) Walid would not allow treasury funds for Hisham's burial (Ya'qubi II 394).
103 Ṭabarai II 1751 f., 1754, 1791 f.
104 Ibid. II 1768, 1776.
105 Ibid. II 1775 f.; Ya'qubi II 397.
106 Ṭabarai II 1778, 1783 f., 1809, 1936 f.; Ya'qubi II 398 f., 400; Dinawari, pp. 347-49, 363, 397. For Khalid's long governorship of Iraq under Hisham and his subsequent removal and imprisonment see e.g. Ṭabarai II 1812-22. See Jumahl, p. 298, for the role of the Yemenites as arch rebels.
107 Ṭabarai II 1784 f., 1787, 1791; Aghani VI 130 f. See also Ṭabarai II 1785 and 1791 and n. 109 below. 'Abbas ibn al-Walid remained loyal to Walid II, fought on his side, was taken prisoner and persecuted along with his family (Ṭabarai II 1800, 1809, 1820).
108 Ṭabarai II 1777.
tion on the part of Yazid and his closest supporters, it is generally agreed, that the defiant Walid supplied his enemies with plenty of fuel for their fire up to a few days before his murder. Yet, when he realized all was lost, he implied a belated if not last-minute repentance by some of his verses and by taking hold of the Qur’an in imitation of the about-to-be-murdered 'Uthmân and to make amends for having made the Book a target for his arrows. Following the assassination, which was quick but savage, Yazid piously, some say hypocritically, took credit for ridding the Muslims of Allah's enemy (see references in n. 106), and Yemenite poets celebrated their avenging of Khâlid al-Qâsri. The murder, far from solving any of the major problems of the empire, served only to intensify the interdynastic civil war and afford further opportunities for Yemenite revolts and thus to pave the way for the 'Abbâsid victory of 132/750, which put an end to Umayyad rule in the Muslim east.

POET AND LOVER

We return to Asma'i's first anecdote of our papyrus text. Erotic poetry cast in a similar vein is readily found in Arabic poetry from pre-Islamic days to the time of Asma'i and after, and much of it is less restrained than our text. Satirists and amorous poets were often too blunt and vivid in their statements regardless of whether or not their verses, in reference to others or to themselves, were backed with facts and deeds.

The deterioration of the moral tone of the Umayyad court and of the upper classes becomes apparent when we recall that 'Umar I exiled Naṣr ibn al-Ḥajjâj ibn 'Īlāf for being too attractive to the ladies of Medina (see p. 46), that 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-Azîz, as governor of that city, ordered the aged Jarîr publicly punished for his scathing satire, and that Hajjâj ibn Yusuf would not tolerate vulgarity in his new

108 See ibid. II 1799–1801, where the cornered Walid protests the exaggeration of his sins and misdeeds: قالت الويلف فلمسيرة الله: انتكرت وأرفعت وأنا فيها أصلُ نعمة عما ذكرت... أما والله لا يُمكنُني تَتَ설ل ولا يَطمع كَليّمك. See ibid. II 1744 and Gabrieli, p. 45, No. XXXIX, for a similar defense of his tutor and intimate companion ‘Abd al-Ṣamad al-Shaibânî.

109 See Ta'barî II 1854 and 1844, where Yazid as caliph refers to the dead Walîd as فان يعده الله لم يكن引き من شراع الإسلام عليه، والهداشة ضاقت عليه، والله كان ذلك منه شائعة شائعة عريان لم يجلب الله فيه وفاة ولا لأحد فيه شقاً. See ibid. II 1741 and 1775 for brief references to Walîd’s unorthodox views and statements. Mas‘ûdî VII 11 says more specifically ذكر المجزه أن الؤلؤ الله في شعر له ذكر فيه إلى سلام وأن الوحي لم يأت من ربه وكتب بالخلافة المأمونية... أدينهه أن كتب أدينهه في كتاب... يطلب اللهو حتى يلبيه، ولله لا ي عليك عماري on the authority of Mubarrad, but these verses have not been found in the latter’s works, and Mas‘ûdî’s translator suggests they have been suppressed for religious reasons. See Gabrieli, p. 35, No. VI, where a third verse has been added on the authority of Sibt ibn al-Jauzî.

110 See Gabrieli, p. 44, No. XXXVIII; Mas‘ûdî VI 10 f.; Aghâmî VI 125.

111 See e.g. Ta’barî II 1777, 1791, 1874, where Walîd is accused of being a Qâdirî. See ibid. II 1780 f., 1801, and 1806 f. for details of the murder and disposal of the severed head and body (cf. Ya’qûbî II 400; Aghâmî VI 139 f.).

112 Mubarrad, p. 736: فان تقولنا مثابة قولي فاننا بائنا فلوده ان قوي وبدرنا تقولنا عن وقدها كانت إنطلسنا المصدرين.

The Yazid of the last verse is Yazid ibn al-Muḥallab. See also Ta’barî II 1809, 1817, 1822–24, 1935. The fall of the Umayyads did not put an end to the deadly rivalry between the North and South Arabs. In two other verses the South Arabs expressed pride in the defeat and death of the ‘Abbâsid caliph Amin and stated that it was their religious duty to dispose of all offending caliphs.

113 One need only mention the diwâîn’s of, for example, Ibu’r al-Quis, Farazdaq, ‘Umar ibn Abî Babî’ah, Bashshâr ibn Burd, and Abû Nawâs. See e.g. Ahmad Muhammad al-Ḥâfi, Al-fażal fî al-‘âr al-jâhîlî, pp. 218–55, for the influence of this type of pre-Islamic poetry on Islamic poets. See also Jabbiir’s ‘Umar ibn Abî Babî’ah.

114 Aghâmî VII 75 f. Mas‘ûdî V 428–30 relates a dramatic episode in which ‘Umar, having first removed a judge of Medina from office for possessing a singing girl, was nevertheless so affected by her performance that he restored her master to his judgeship. Aghâmî VIII 6 f. reports a case of successful resistance to the songstress Sallâmah’s temptation.
capital of Wāsit. In the second half of the first century the flourishing schools of music in ʿIrāq and the Hijāz were well stocked with local and foreign professional singers of comparatively loose morals.\footnote{114} The sober-minded scholar ʿUrwah ibn al-Zubair (d. 93/712) no longer felt at home in Medina because of the conduct of its people, nor did his son ʿAbd Allāh\footnote{115} and, not much later, Zuhār.\footnote{116} In contrast, we find Farazdaq boasting of his sexual powers in terms that shocked the pleasure-loving Sulaimān into quoting Sūrah 24:2: “The fornicatress and the fornicators, scourge each one of them a hundred stripes . . . .” The poet countered with Sūrah 26:226, “the poets . . . they say that which they do not,” and departed with a reward.\footnote{117} ʿUmar ibn Abī Rabīʿah, who also sought refuge in this Qurʿānic verse, improvised romantic poetry addressed to high-born ladies on their way to a pilgrimage and even during the circuit of the Kaʿbah, which once led an angry Prince Sulaimān to order the poet away to Ṭaʿīf for the duration of the Ḥajj ceremonies.\footnote{118} Khālid al-Qāṣrī, Hishām’s governor of ʿIrāq, met with the jurists of Kufah and during the meeting asked them for a romantic tale but found it necessary to caution them against lewdness and vulgarity.\footnote{119} Hishām tolerated the blunt verses of the libertine ʿIrāqī poet ʿAmmār dhī Kīnāz, whom he rewarded and even protected against the regularly stipulated flogging for drunkenness.\footnote{120} There were, of course, men and women in all walks of life who, out of piety and innate decency, shunned objectionable word and deed, in private and in public. Jāhiz recorded and documented the swift decline of the moral standards of the court and the upper classes following the reign of Yazīd II (101-5/720-24),\footnote{121} and he is reinforced by the numerous off-color anecdotes that run through the literary sources and involve both the lower and the upper classes.\footnote{122} Such deterioration of the moral fiber did not go without some protest and condemnation,\footnote{123} which nevertheless made due allowance for the scientific and medical description and study of sex and its problems.\footnote{124}

We turn next to Walid’s romantic life and poetry and their bearing on the first anecdote of our papyrus. While yet prince and heir, Walid had married the ʿUthmānīd Suʿdah (vars.: Suʿadh, Suʿad) bint Sād and had later fallen in love with her sister Salmā (vars.: Sulaim, Sulaimah, Sulam).\footnote{125} He divorced Suʿdah so that he could marry Salmā, but the proud and indignant father of the two girls would not permit such a marriage. Later, Walid regretted having divorced Suʿdah and attempted a second courtship, but Suʿdah

\footnote{114} Jabbur I 44-71; see also Abbott in NES I 351 f.\footnote{115} Abī Ḥāyyān al-Yawḥī, Risālah fi al-ṣadīq wa al-ṣadīq, pp. 97, 393.\footnote{116} See Vol. II 35.\footnote{117} ‘Uyun IV 107; Ibn Khallikān II 264 (= trans. III 620). Jumāḥ, pp. 30-39, compares Jarīc favorably to Farazdaq in such matters; see also Ṭabʿīlibī, Thīmār, p. 511 f.\footnote{118} Mushawshab, p. 203; Jabbur II 85.\footnote{119} Amālī III 205; Ḥādhāt al-ʿayn, pp. 158-60, 222-25; Jāhiz, Ḥayawan I 258 f. and II 105; ‘Uyun I, pp. L, 72, 74. Obscenity in national literature is not limited to that of the Arabs, nor has its presence and the problems it presents escaped the attention and study, on both a national and a comparative basis, of past and present scholars of the East and the West.\footnote{120} The variants of the girls’ names are used to accommodate the meter of each poem. Concurrent marriage to sisters is forbidden, but adultery with a sister-in-law does not nullify her sister’s marriage.}
emphatically rejected him. In the meantime Walid satirized the girls' father and continued to address amorous verses to Salma, implying in some that she returned his love. There is ample evidence, however, that she shunned his attentions and avoided meeting him, so that once he even disguised himself as an oil-seller in order to get to see her. Furthermore, he scandalized all in still other verses that all but deified her. Once he became caliph, Walid tacitly forced her father's hand and married Salma, perhaps against her will since she died shortly after. Walid mourned her deeply in a number of his poems, she having been perhaps his only true love. Fully a third of the 102 of his poems collected by Francesco Gabrieli are either about her or addressed to her, using the several variants of her name. Hammād al-Rāwiyah, who recited about a thousand odes to Walid, noted his marked preference for the lighter and more risqué verses of 'Umar ibn Abī Rabi'ah and Bashshār ibn Burd. Walid ordered his musicians to set his verses to music, especially those on Salma, and took pride in their widespread popularity in the desert and in the cities and himself joined in singing them. The poets among Walid's intimate companions mentioned Salma in their verses, some of which were also set to music. Yazīd ibn Ḍabbāh's ode of fifty verses started with two of Walid's own verses in which Salma was mentioned. The poem so delighted Walid that he ordered the verses to be counted and rewarded the poet with 1,000 dirhems for each verse, thus setting a record for later caliphs to follow. The story of Walid and Salma could hardly have escaped the attention of the popular storytellers of his day and after. It must have formed the central theme of Kitāb Salma tīa Su'ād as listed by Nadim among a dozen such anonymous romantic tales.

127 See Aghānī I 50 ff., where Salma is confused with her sister Su'da, and VI 113–15, 117 ff., 122, 141; 'Iqd IV 425–34 and VI 123; Jabbūr I 78 ff. See Paul Schwarz, Der Dienst der 'Umar ibn Abī Rabi'a II (Leipzig, 1902) No. 211, for the full ode, which begins with 'asal al-ilām wa tāsāl al-ṭarb and from which the verses that caught Walid's fancy are cited.

128 Aghānī VI 117 ff., 122; Gabrieli, pp. 34 ff., No. III.

129 Aghānī VI 122; Gabrieli, p. 43, No. XXXIV.

130 Aghānī VI 114 ff.; Gabrieli, p. 40, No. XXIII.

131 Gabrieli, pp. 35, No. V, and 46, No. XII.

132 Aghānī VI 116, 122. No cause is given for her death, which is said to have taken place seven or forty days after their marriage; both numbers I suspect to be approximations.

133 Gabrieli, pp. 42, Nos. XXXIX–XXX, and 90, No. LVI.

134 See ibid. pp. 42, No. XXXIII, and 60 ff., Nos. XC and XCIV.

135 Aghānī I 51, 56, 69 ff. and III 29, 43.

136 'Iqd IV 453 f.; Gabrieli, p. 46, No. XLII:

شاع شری فی سلی وانثر ورطه النان باد وحسنف وشیسته الفاری بنیه ونتین به حی انتیر
فلت قیرا فی سلی جمیبا مثل ما فقیال جیل وعر

The 'Iqd version has شاع شری فی سلی وانثر instead of شاع الفاری بنیه in verse 2. The poets referred to in verse 3 are the Bedouin Jamīl ibn Ma'mar al-'Udhri and the city dweller 'Umar ibn Abī Rabi'ah al-Makhzami, who were considered by some to be respectively the most and the least truthful of their contemporaries as to romantic verse (Muwashshaf, p. 205; see also Aghānī I 133 f. and VII 102–4). For some two dozen of Walid's verses on Salma and others on wine and the hunt that were set to music see Aghānī VI 110–22, 139 f., 139, 141, 143.

137 See Aghānī VI 146 and 147 f. for parts of the ode, which starts with

سلبی تلک فی الیب فقیس الاک او سری

(cf. Mubarrad, p. 12, and Gabrieli, p. 39, No. XVIII, for variants of expression and echoes of meaning). The tendency to exaggerate the amount of a poet's reward is frequently met with in later reports.

138 Fihrist, p. 307; this list is followed by a list of 27 entries of romances between humans and genii. The tendency to fictionalize the lives of the more romantic caliphs still prevails, as seen in Jurji Zaidan's numerous such tales and more recently in the story of Walid II by 'Ali al-Jārim, Marah al-Walīd (Cairo, 1948).
We turn finally to the specific content and moral tone of the five verses in the first anecdote of our papyrus text. Of these, verses 1, 3, and 4 are credited to Walid II by Ibn 'Abd Rabbihi (see p. 80). The second verse (lines 8–9) could be assigned to either Walid or the lazy lover of Asma‘i’s anecdote, but the fifth verse (lines 11–12) I would assign to the lazy lover. Neither as prince nor as caliph did the energetic Walid have need to wish for a life of ease in an equable climate, for such a life was in fact at his command, and he made every effort to enjoy it. The fifth verse is much more in keeping with the circumstances and character of the furtive and slothful lover of the papyrus text, who obviously appropriated some of Walid’s widely known and sung verses and later recited them to Asma‘i with some variations. The moral tone of the piece reflects the accepted practices of the time. In its implicit meaning, as in its language, it is more restrained than some products of several of Walid’s and later of Asma‘i’s contemporaries who were seemingly oblivious to the numerous Qur’anic injunctions against vulgarity and obscenity of thought, word, and deed.139 Anecdotes and poems of a wishful or an actual lover dwelling on a nightlong rendezvous with the beloved are readily found.140 Walid himself bragged of his verses to Salmā in the style of Jamil ibn Ma‘mar al-‘Udhri and of ‘Umar ibn Abi Rabī‘ah al-Makhzumī (see n. 136 above). The Quraish were exceedingly proud of ‘Umar as their poet and tolerated in him that which they condemned in other poets, asserting that in his objectionable verse he, being a poet, says what he does not do.141 Yet the Umayyad caliphs and their governors found it necessary on several occasions to threaten and restrain him from addressing his romantic verses to the women of their families, especially those on their way to and from a pilgrimage or those performing the Ḥajj ceremonies.142 Ḥammād al-Rāwiyyah reported that Walid’s favorite poets were ‘Aḍī ibn Zaid and ‘Umar ibn Abi Rabī‘ah, famed for their verses on wine and women respectively, but added that Walid was not much impressed with even the best product of the poets, including that of the Quraishi ‘Umar ibn Abi Rabī‘ah. Most of Walid’s verses to or about Salmā are tender and touching enough to recall the poetry of Jamil ibn Ma‘mar al-‘Udhri and some of the poetry of ‘Umar ibn Abi Rabī‘ah al-Makhzumī.143 But neither the ḍiwan of ‘Umar nor that of Walid is free from verses that are blunt in their expression or in their intended meaning, some of which are akin to those of our papyrus text. When questioned about or reprimanded for such poetry ‘Umar and his friends, especially the Quraish, relegated the offending verses to fiction and, like Farazdaq, claimed Surah 26:226 as their defense (see p. 93). But, when old and repentant, ‘Umar himself is said to have acknowledged the verses as being autobiographical.144 If the wine-loving Walid was more blunt at times than the usually sober ‘Umar,145 the reason may well have been Walid’s addiction to wine, women,
and song, the combination of which he himself declared leads to immoral conduct. Walid's observation was confirmed by the more sober of his older contemporaries, even when wine was not explicitly specified, as illustrated by the request of the leading Quraish and Ansâr of Medîna to their newly arrived governor 'Uthmân ibn Hâyân (93-96/711-15) to give first priority to the forbidding of singing and fornication. The governor's readily given promise to act on the request favorably within three days was foiled by the wiles of still another Quraishite of that city, Ibn Abî 'Atîq, patron of the famed songstress Sallâmah and intimate companion of 'Umar ibn Abî Rabî'ah. Ibn Abî 'Atîq contrived a meeting between the governor and the songstress, who confessed her past sins, declared her repentance, and chanted verses from the Qur'ân. Touched by her performance, 'Uthmân yielded to Ibn Abî 'Atîq's suggestion that he should hear her as a professional singer. So charmed was the governor with her dulcet voice that he permitted her to continue to sing and then felt obliged to permit the other songstresses to continue.

The fact that Walid II was interested in the manuscript collections of Ḥammâd al-Râwiyyah and Jannâd suggests that he probably committed most if not all of his own poetry to writing. Though we have no evidence that he did so regularly and systematically, we do know that he included some of his poetry in his correspondence with Hishâm, with the Medînans on his accession, and with Naṣr ibn Sâyîr. The inclusion in letters of citations from the poets or of one's own verses dated back to the time of Muhammad and the Companions, as illustrated by the correspondence of 'Umar I and his Irâqi governor, of 'Abî and Mû'âwiyyah, and of 'Abd al-Malik and Ḥâjjâj ibn Yûsuf. This practice was not limited to rulers and their officials but was fast becoming widespread among the lettered upper classes. Still another growing practice was the exchange of original verses between the sexes, such as the verses written by an absent husband seeking to rouse his wife's jealousy but receiving in answer seven verses which so roused his jealousy that he hastened back home, or the verses of a needy and outraged wife upbraiding her absent husband for failing to provide bread for her while he himself lived in luxury and grew fat at Ḥâjjâj ibn Yûsuf's court. Men seeking reconciliation with an estranged songstress, concubine, or wife did so in written verse. Others sought to win back even a divorced wife with written verses, as did Farazdaq, Walid himself (vainly), and still later even Asma'î, who, though a ranking critic...
of poetry, knew that he was no poet.\(^{158}\) The delivery of written verses by messenger in the time of 'Abd al-Malik is instanced in a four-verse proposal of marriage by a warrior poet who was turned down because he portrayed himself as a lion while the object of his attentions saw herself as a gazelle seeking her kind.\(^{159}\)

'Umar ibn Abī Rabi'ah sent written verses to some of the ladies.\(^{160}\) Abū 'Amr ibn al-'Alāʾ's large collection of manuscripts\(^{161}\) contained some contemporary poetry along with that of pre-Islamic poets. Some of his older contemporaries lent an ear to a youth reading poetry from a daftar.\(^{162}\) Bashshār ibn Burd, whose blindness did not prevent his appointment to a government bureau,\(^{163}\) had secretaries and several transmitters to whom he dictated official business and his poetry respectively.\(^{164}\) Twice a week he dictated his poetry to an assembly of women.\(^{165}\)

A number of poets of the Umayyad period committed at least some of their verses, not necessarily romantic ones, to writing. These include, in more or less chronological order, Yázīd ibn Rabī'ah ibn Mufarrag al-Ḥīmyari (d. 69/689),\(^{166}\) Jābir ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Anṣārī,\(^{167}\) the Khārījite poets Sumairah ibn al-Ja'd and Qaṣārī ibn al-Fajā'īt (d. 77/696 or 697),\(^{168}\) Abū Kaladah,\(^{169}\) the three leading poets of the period, namely Akḥṭal, Jarīr, and Farazdaq.\(^{170}\) A copy of Abū Tālib's ode in praise of Mūḥammad which was made in this period later came into the hands of Jumahi (see n. 205 below). The schoolteacher-poet Dḥū al-Rummah could hold his own with Ḥammād al-Rāwiyyah in the poetry and accounts of the battle days of the Arabs.\(^{171}\) The schoolteacher-poet Kumait ibn Zaid and his companion Ṭirimmah both wrote down materials from Ru'bāh ibn al-'Ajājj which they worked into their own verses.\(^{172}\) Dḥū al-Rummah appreciated accurate letter forms, corrected careless execution in the manuscripts of Shu'bāh ibn al-Ḥajjāj ibn Ward al-Azdī and Ḫās ibn 'Umar\(^{173}\) and Ḥammād al-Rāwiyyah, whose plagiarism of pre-

\(^{158}\) For some of the rare samples of Asmā'i's verse see e.g. Marāthī, p. 83, and *Iqd* I 175 and VI 58.

Khālil despaired of Asmā'i's understanding of meters, and both scholars knew their own limitations in composing poetry; see e.g. *Iqd* V 308; Kaladah, p. 171 f., 177 f., 192.

\(^{159}\) See e.g. *Iqd* I 361 f.; Ibn al-Muqaftī and Asmā'i, taking the hint, refrained from bringing up the subject again with Khalil (Khāṣā'īs I 361 f.). Ibn al-Muqaffa' and Mufaddal ibn Muhammad al-Ḍabī also are said to have known better than to compose verses (Umdah I 75).

In contrast to these four scholars, their contemporaries Ḥammād al-Rāwiyyah and Khalaf al-'Alamī were known as expert versifiers who did not hesitate to attribute their own compositions to some of the classical poets or to plagiarize the latter. They were exceptions to the rule that poets were poor critics and critics poor poets (Askari, *Musnān*, pp. 5 f.; Shi'r, pp. 19 f., 490; Marāthī I 14, 18-20). The credibility of both these Kūfī transmitters, particularly that of Ḥammād, was damaged by the accusations of rivals, questioned by most Basran scholars, and has remained controversial despite some staunch defenders, both past and present (see e.g. Jāhīṣī, Bayān I 143; Aghānī V 164 f.; Marāthī, pp. 72 f.; Shāhīd IV 140; Mufāḍḍalīyāt II, Intro. pp. 16-21; Marāthī, pp. 368-72 and 438-40).

\(^{160}\) Ibn Abī Tāhir Taifūr, p. 151; see also Blachère, *Histoire de la littérature arabe des origines à la fin du XVIe siècle de J.-C.* I 96-98.

\(^{161}\) See Vol. I 23 and p. 27 above.

\(^{162}\) Jāhīṣī, Bayān I 61.

\(^{163}\) Umdah I 6.

\(^{164}\) Aḥṣā'ī III 32 f., 43, 44 f., 62 f.

\(^{165}\) *Iqd* III 34, 50, 52, 67; see Dīwān Bashshār ibn Burd, ed. Muhammad al-Tūhīr ibn 'Āshūr, I (Cairo, 1369/1950) 30-35 for the poet and the women.

\(^{166}\) Aḥṣā'ī XVII 57-59; Khāṣā'īh II 216.

\(^{167}\) Marāthī V 206.

\(^{168}\) *Iqd* V 312-17; Khāṣā'īh II 438 f.

\(^{169}\) Aḥṣā'ī X 114.

\(^{170}\) These three poets and their writing-down of poetry are discussed below in connection with Document 5.

\(^{171}\) Shīr, p. 368; Aḥṣā'ī V 219-24; Mawāshah, pp. 172, 191 f.

\(^{172}\) Sāhi, *Idab al-kuttāb*, p. 62; *Iqd* IV 194; Mawāshah, pp. 170-72, 208; *Umdah* II 194; Mufāḍḍalīyāt II 349 f.

\(^{173}\) Mawāshah, pp. 171 f., 177 f., 192.
Islamic poetry he claimed he could detect. Four poets at the court of Yazid II brought their written verses to him for appraisal, and Yazid expressed himself in verse jotted down on the back of each poet's composition. In Walid's own court there were the poet-musician and author Yūnus al-Kātib, who was also a bureau secretary credited with a Kitāb al-aghdānī, and Ṭārāšt (or Ṭurāšt) ibn Ismā'īl, who referred in his verses to Walid's written poetry and to his own care in composing his eulogy on Walid himself. The ode of Yazid ibn Dabbah so pleased Walid that he ordered its verses counted, which implies a manuscript on hand, before he rewarded the poet lavishly, 1,000 dirhems for each of its fifty verses. Bashshār ibn Burd dictated his materials to scholars who sought him out for the purpose. His poem in praise of Abū 'Amr ibn al-'Alā' was sent to the latter by the hand of Bashshār's pupil Salm al-Khāṣir, who as a youth bought poetry manuscripts (daffātir al-shūr) and as a full-fledged poet wrote elegies on papyrus in anticipation of the death of certain notables, including his benefactress Queen Zubaydah. The poetry book of Salm's contemporary Abū al-Shamaqmaq was written on Kufān parchment in a wonderful script and bound in fine leather of Ṭā'if. Bashshār's cutting satire and blunt verse drew protests from Ḥasan al-Bāṣrī and Malik ibn Dīnār. Mahdī eventually forbade him the recitation of romantic verse, and powerful enemies whom he had satirized finally brought about his downfall on the charge of heresy, though an examination of his manuscripts after his death failed to substantiate the charge. Among the younger intellectuals who served the early 'Abbāsids in 'Iraq were poets and secretaries who took manuscripts in book form for granted, as witnessed in Sayyid al-Hīmār's collection of Ṣālīḥ wa Dīnnah and other originally Persian books.

Assuming that Walid II likewise wrote down his poetry, we can point to several factors, some generally and others specifically related to his life and poetry, that worked against the survival of his output in its entirety. Among these were the confusion and civil war that followed his death and his own reputation for a fast and sacrilegious life, which provided the opportunity and the motive for the destruction or suppression of his offending verses in reference to religion or morality or racial prejudice. Since he had no brothers interested enough to defend him and no adult sons to cherish his memory and since he had alienated his first cousins, the preservation of his poetry depended on the efforts of poets and musicians who had been his intimate companions and who had abetted him in his way of life. Most of these, fearing for their own lives of this close association, lay low after Walid's death. Some of them, however, and most other poets of the Umayyad period emerged later to court favor with the newly established 'Abbāsids. Under such circumstances, most of Walid's verses that had been set to music and were already widely and orally popular in his lifetime, whether credited to him or not, had a better chance of survival than his...
more serious and more offensive poems. This factor may in part account for the small number of his surviving poems, as for their predominant themes and the fragmentary nature of most of them. The survival of these poems and of anecdotes associated with them, like much of the information that has come down to us on the Umayyads, must be credited to the efforts of such early genealogist-historians as 'Abd al-Malik ibn 'Umair (see p. 76), to anthologists who collected akhbār and speeches, such as Khālid al-Qaṣrī, and to collectors of poetry such as Ḥammād al-Rāwiyah and Mufadḍal ibn Muḥammad al-Dabbī. Their successors, the emerging "encyclopedists" of the second century, included private collectors, family historians, and representatives of the various racial, religious, and political groups. Among these may be mentioned Haitham ibn 'Adī, who was known as a pupil and transmitter of Ḥammād al-Rāwiyah, Abū 'Ubayd, Abū 'Ubaydah, and Asma'I. Their numerous works covering a wide variety of subjects were fully exploited by the succeeding generations of scholars and historians.

The source materials for Umayyad history and culture were the manuscript collections of prominent families, such as the poetry and hadith collections of Ḥassān ibn Thābit and other Anṣār which were known and sought after. The papers and correspondence of 'Umar I and 'Amr ibn al-'Āṣ were passed on, in part at least, to their sons and grandchildren, as detailed in Volume II of these studies. So also were those of 'Aṭā and his family. Ḥusayn ibn 'Āli carried two saddles of correspondence with the Kūfīs and other 'Irāqīs which he displayed as evidence of their promise to help him in his fight for the caliphate. There was also Mu‘āwiyyah’s brother ‘Utbah ibn ‘Abī Sufyān, whose offspring included a succession of family historians and poets. Their materials were passed on by their distinguished member ‘Utbān. Some of the first-century collectors of akhbār had access to government archives which often if not always included the correspondence and the literary collections of the caliph, as in the case of the state bureaus (diwān’s) of Mu‘āwiyyah, ‘Abd al-Malik, Walīd I, and Hishām. Governors who had a literary bent and who were patrons of poets and scholars, such as Bishr ibn Marwān, Ḥājjāj ibn Yūsuf, and Khālid al-Qaṣrī, had literary manuscripts kept either in their state bureaus or in their personal libraries. As we have already seen above, a grandson of ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abbās, namely ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Āli, collected the diwān’s of the Marwānids. Even court records occasionally included some poetry, for we read that Ḥammād al-Rāwiyah, the last Umayyad judge of Medina, ordered his court secretary to write some edifying verses that took his fancy at the bottom of a legal document for the benefit of future readers. We may note in passing that ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abbās, Zuhrī, Ibn Ishaq, and Shafi‘ī were all preoccupied with poetry and that they all used and produced manuscripts, some of which included poetry.

There was, furthermore, steady supplementation of manuscript sources through oral information.

---

187 See Junahl, p. 204; see also our Vol. I 4, 22, 29.
188 Ḥabīb I 164; Ṭabari IV 140. For Haitham ibn ‘Adī see GAL I 140 and II 77, 213.
190 Ṭabari II 298 f.: . . . فَأَخْرَجَ خُوْرَيْنِ مَتَّؤِنَينَ صَغَّصٌ فَقَنْشَوْا بِهِمْ إِنَّهُمْ.
191 See p. 77 and Bahāqānī, p. 12.
192 See Vols. I 16, 18, 23 and II 181 f. and p. 13 above.
193 Junahl’s family was well rooted in the art of poetry and written composition (see e.g. Ḥabīb XIX 54: ‘آرَاقُهُمُ في الشعر’). Khālid and his father were both private secretaries, and Khālid as governor commissioned Zuhrī to compose a genealogical work and a biography of Muhammad; only the first of these projects was begun, and it was not finished (ibid. XIX 57, 59).
195 Ḥabīb al-qudah I 185. The judge was confirmed in his office by the ‘Abbaṣids. In Māmune’s reign we find him ordering his secretary to write down some amusing verses that Asma‘ī was reciting, and he added that the nobles were zealous for witticisms (ibid. I 187: جَعَلاً الإِشرافِ هُمْتُ السَّمَاحَة). Judges and jurists, like caliphs, occasionally indulged in composing verses of their own (e.g. ‘Umdah I 12-19).
196 See e.g. Vols. I, Document 6, and II 54-56, 98, 100; Ḥabīb IV 49; Yusuf ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Harūn Ḥayyūn al-‘ilīn wa fadlīhi I 77: قَلِّتُ الْزَّهْريِّ أَخْرَجَتْ أَلِيْ كَبِبْ فِيْ شَجْرَة; Sam‘ānī, Adab al-imlā’ wa al-isāmā’, p. 70.
received from knowledgeable city dwellers and Bedouins, much of which was first committed to writing by enterprising second-century scholars. Foremost among those who drew heavily on the memory, knowledge, and experience of the Bedouins were Abu ‘Amr ibn al-‘Ala’ and his devoted pupil and loyal transmitter Ašma‘i, to whom we owe a Bedouin’s version of Walîl’s three verses that appear in our papyrus text.

There is some evidence of early traffic in poetry manuscripts among poets and scholars. The demand was met through copies made, for a fee, from oral dictation or from other manuscripts or even through purchase of a poem itself. An ode written by a Bāḥili in praise of Marwān II was sold after the caliph’s death for 300 dirhems to Marwān ibn Abī Ḥafṣah, who, by making changes in the first two verses, turned it into a eulogy of Ma‘n ibn Zā‘īdah (d. 152/769). That a considerable market existed for manuscripts of poetry and music (daftār al-shi‘r wa al-qinā‘) is indicated by the fact that the sale of such manuscripts became a point of controversy between Mālik ibn Anas and his pupils. Mālik, whose linguistic and literary interests were less pronounced than those of either Abū Ḥanīfah or Shāhī, disapproved of the sale of such manuscripts even more emphatically than he disapproved of the sale of religious knowledge.

First-century Muslim scholars struggled with specific criteria for evolving a system of literary criticism though they were concerned at first primarily with pre-Islamic poetry and poets, including poets who lived into Islamic times. First-century poets appraised their fellow poets. The approach of both poet and scholar was more or less subjective and in some respects traditional, being somewhat reminiscent of the pre-Islamic poetry contests staged at Sāq ‘Ukkāsh. However, some first-century poets’ appreciative critiques of some verses of their fellow poets contain as much substance as the authoritative judgment of Nābīghah al-Dhubyānī at Sāq ‘Ukkāsh. Of the scholars, it was Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Ala’ who first approached the problem of standards of criticism on the more inclusive basis of both the quantity and the quality of a poet’s total product, rather than quick and changing judgments based on a verse or two or even an entire poem. Some of his views have survived mainly in Ašma‘i’s Fuhulat al-shu‘ārā’, where he is frequently cited and approved by the author, who was his admiring and faithful pupil. Torrey, editor and translator of the Fuhulat, has shown effectively that Ašma‘i himself fell short of evolving an organized system of literary criticism. Yet Ašma‘i does put emphasis on a poet’s need to know the poetry, history, and genealogy of the Arabs and on the less tangible qualities of originality, literary style, and a measure of natural poetic talent, as also on the quantity of a poet’s output. Ašma‘i’s contemporary Abū ‘Ubaydah also emphasized quantity. But even the standard of quantity is fluid, as it ranges from five or six to twenty or more odes for qualifying among the first-rank poets, the fuḥul, a title reserved almost exclusively in Ašma‘i’s day for the pre-Islamic poets, including those who lived into Islamic times.

197 Aḥbār IX 42; Muwashshah, pp. 252 f.
198 Sahnūn ibn Sa‘īd al-Tanūkhi, Al-mudawwana al-kubra (Cairo, 1324/1906) III 396 f. The controversy extended at the same time to the loaning of books, including poetry manuscripts, for a fee (Muḥaddith, 171; 73). It should be noted that the activities of the bookdealer (warraq) were as extensive in the fields of language and literature as in those of Qur’ānic commentary and hadīth (see our Vols. I 22 and 24 f. and II, esp. pp. 16, 46–49, 228 f.; see also pp. 15 f. and 35 above and 149 below).
199 See e.g. Shi‘r, pp. 78, 197 f.; Aḥbār I 51 f., VIII 194 f., and IX 163; Muwashshah, pp. 59 f., 47, 60, 205; ‘Askarī, M Fitz, pp. 3 f.; ‘Īṣā’i V 397. Some of these poets developed a more tangible critical ability, which is dealt with in detail below (see pp. 122–43 and 187–95).
200 See Fuhulat, pp. 488 f.
201 ‘Umdah I 132 f.
202 See ‘Īṣā’i, p. 141.
203 See Fuhulat, pp. 495, 497, 498; Muwashshah, pp. 80 f.; ‘Umdah I 132 f.
204 For Islamic poets Ašma‘i expresses his opinion negatively by stating that a given poet, for example Dhu al-Rummah, does not rank among the fuḥul, or, influenced by his earlier training, he resorts to terms used in hadīth criticism such as ṣinā‘ (see pp. 103 and 192, n. 158), or he refrains from giving a clear-cut opinion (see Fuhulat, pp. 496–96; Marāṭīb, p. 75; ‘Umdah I 138).
However, the more systematic and inclusive ʻTabaqat fuhūl al-shuʿaraʼ of Asmaʻī’s younger contemporary Jumahī (d. 231/845) gives about equal attention to the pre-Islamic and the Islamic poets.205

We have no specific reference to Walīd’s total output of poetry, and the quantity which has survived would not qualify him for high rank among the Islamic poets. As for the quality of his poetry, his intimate companions and court poets declared, on occasion, that as a poet he surpassed them, though allowance should be made for flattery and the hope of sizable rewards. In the early years of the “Blessed Dynasty” few poets or scholars would risk their own fortunes by bringing up the subject of the Umayyads, let alone mentioning Walīd II, who was considered a heretic, unless to denounce him. The first unfavorable reference to Walīd was made by Bāshshār ibn Burd in a pro-ʻAlīd poem with racial overtones. The poem was originally intended as a satire on Mansūr but was altered, after the failure of the ʻAlīd cause, to a satire on Abū Mus‘ūm al-Khurāsānī, who had played a major role in the establishment of the ʻAbbāsid dynasty. The poet reminds the new rulers of the fates of such crowned tyrants as Khusrau II, Marwān II, and Walīd II, points out that they are following the same course, and suggests the course they should follow.206

Other derogatory references to Walīd originated with some of the early ʻAbbāsid rulers themselves. The first such reference was made by Ja‘far ibn Sulaimān, governor of Medina (146–50/763–67), to the poet Rummāh ibn Yazīd ibn Maiyādah, a favorite of Walīd, whom he had rewarded richly and who had eulogized Walīd in glowing terms at the time of his death.207 Ja‘far took the poet to task for praising him in less glowing terms than he had used for Walīd the libertine (fāṣiq). The poet retorted that he did not say Walīd was a libertine and, besides, the measure of praise is in proportion to the liberality of the praised—an answer that pleased the governor as to the poet’s loyalty and induced him to match Walīd’s liberality.208

When the question of Walīd’s heresy was later raised at Mahdī’s court, the judge and jurist Ibn ‘Ullātih refuted it on the theory that Allāh would not have permitted him to be caliph had he in truth been a heretic—an argument that put Allāh’s mark of approval on the ʻAbbāsid dynasty as well.209 The first forthright defense of Walīd as a ruler and appreciation of him as a poet came at the request of Harūn al-Rashīd from the pro-Marwānid poet Marwān ibn Abī Ḥafṣah210 after Harūn had assured him that nothing he said would be held against him. The poet then described Walīd as one of the most elegant and vigorous of men and also as one of the best poets and one of the most liberal of men.211 Harūn al-Rashīd next asked Marwān to cite some of Walīd’s verses, and the poet recited Walīd’s verse on the dead Hishām, which Harūn ordered a secretary to write down.212 Harūn is further reported as having cursed Walīd’s assassins.213 Poets of the ʻAbbāsid period appropriated many of Walīd’s verses on romance and especially on wine. Abū Nuwās was considered the ablest adapter of Walīd’s poetry, in its style as in its basic

205 See Jumahī, pp. 21 f., 42, and Intro. pp. 15, 34–36. The assumed permanent superiority of the ʻancientsʼ over the “moderns” was successfully challenged thereafter as literary criticism developed further and new poets asserted their claim to superiority. This is readily seen in Ibn Qutaibah’s introduction to his Al-shi‘r wa al-shi‘r ‘arḍ’ and in Ibn al-Mu’tazz’s Kūh al-ḥadd al-badī‘ as forerunners in this phase of literary criticism.

206 ʻAghānī III 28 f.; ʻAskari, Maṣūm, pp. 102 f.

207 ʻShi‘r, p. 485; ʻAghānī II 92, 106–9.

208 Ibn al-Mu‘tazz, ʻTabaqāt, pp. 106 f. This source reports Ja‘far as governor of Basrah, which is an error (see Zambaur, pp. 24, 40). Ja‘far’s second governorship of Medina (181–82/797–98) was later than this episode since Rummāh ibn Yazīd ibn Maiyādah died early in the reign of Mansūr (ʻAghānī II 120).

209 See ʻAghānī VI 140 f., where two different accounts are given for Ibn ‘Ullātih; see also e.g. ʻTabārī III 402 and ʻAbdār al-quḍāt III 231 f.


211 ʻAghānī VI 109 and IX 14: ʻAlī al-nas wa ashghum rasūlim wa jadhim; Kan man Francesco Gabrieli, p. 35, No. V.

212 See preceding note and ʻAbdār al-quḍāt III 231 f.

213 ʻAghānī VI 140.
meaning. The sources on hand yield no second-century critical estimate of Walid as a poet, perhaps because of neglect by the Yemenite Abū `Amr ibn al-`Alā’ and the politic Ašma`i, neither of whom would have been particularly interested in the fallen anti-Yemenite Walid of disrepute. They did, however, express opinions on several Islamic poets, including a goodly number of Walid’s contemporaries, such as Umar ibn Abī Rabī‘ah, ‘Adī ibn al-Riqa‘, and Dhū al-Rummah. Jumāḥi, Ibn Qutaibah, and Mubarrad likewise seem to have refrained from expressing critical opinions of Walid, as far as their extant works indicate. He does not seem to have fared any better at the hands of the early anthologists, for only Buhturi cites him, and once only. It was not until after the `Abbāsids themselves had lost both political power and literary luster following the assassination of Mutawakkil in 247/861 that historians and literary scholars, predominantly non-Arabs, searched seriously into the life, reign, and poetry of Walid II. Ţabarî, Mas‘ūdī, Abū al-Faraj al-Isfahānī, Ibn ‘Abd Rabī‘ih, and possibly Ahmad ibn Ibrahīm ibn al-Jazzār have, among them, preserved practically all that is extant of Walid’s poetry. Later authors who do pick up Walid’s history and story have little except a few fragments of his verse to add to the picture given by these third- and fourth-century authors. Lesser known or still unpublished works of third/ninth-century scholars are more promising as sources of additional fragments, though I have so far discovered but one such fragment, namely two verses cited by Muḥammad ibn al-‘Abbās al-Yazīdī (d. 310/922), who drew on oral and written sources that trace back to Ḥammad al-Rāwiyah, Ḥammad ‘Ajrud, Haitham ibn ‘Adī, ‘Utbī and his father, Madā‘īnī, Abū Ubaidah, Jahīz, and other second-century collectors and authors to whom sufficient attention has already been drawn above. Because the collection of Walid’s poetry was at first neglected it is remarkable that we have as much of it as we do. Though his personal reputation and his corrupt rule, followed by the fall of the Umayyads, contributed to the early neglect of his poetry, his royal birth and colorful yet tragic life helped to keep alive a certain amount of interest in the man and his poetry. Nevertheless, the serious study and appraisal of his surviving poetry had to await modern times and scholarship.

Carl Brockelmann listed Walid II among Umayyad poets of second rank. Some quarter of a century later Ṭāhā Ḥusayn touched briefly on the tragic life of Walid and the literary quality of his poetry. Francesco Gabrieli collected and edited his poetry, related much of it to the events of his life, and ventured an opinion as to its literary quality. Gabrieli was followed by Khalil Mardam, who saw fit, as already pointed out (p. 91, n. 96), to omit the first poem of Gabrieli’s edition, on which he otherwise relied

214 Ibid. VI 109 f.: ḥafṣa al-ma‘nawīyya ta‘līma ‘as ḥafṣa al-ma‘nawīyya. See Diya’ al-Dīn Nasr Allāh Ibn Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥalīm, Al-mathal al-sāhīr fi adab al-katib wa al-shāhīr (Cairo, 1282/1865) p. 460, on the three degrees of poetry theft ranging from outright theft of a poem lifted from a book (muṣāk) to rewording a verse but retaining some of its basic sense (al-khāb) to scoffing at or vilifying a verse or poem (maṣākh). There is also allusion to the sense of a verse, either to expand on it or to reverse its meaning.

215 See Buhturi Al-hamūsah, ed. L. Cheikho (Beirut, 1910) p. 160, No. 854, which consists of only two lines.


218 See Gabrieli, pp. 30, Nos. IV-V, and 42, No. XXXII.

219 Yazīdī, p. 117:


221 It is to be noted that Walid is not included in a list of five leading Quraishite poets of the Umayyad period (Aqḍāḥī III 101). It is conceivable, however, that Ahmad ibn Muḥammad al-Murthādī (d. 286/899) may have included him in his Shu'‘ārā’ Quraish (see GAL III 219 and Irshād II 57 f.).

222 GAL I 69 and 109 I 96.

223 Hadith al-arba’d’ I 174-70.
heavily both for the texts of the poems and for his introduction.\textsuperscript{224} Taha Husain, Gabrieli, and Khalil Mardam are agreed that Walīd favored lighter themes and the shorter meters that usually go with them—such as the \textit{waṭṭir} meter of our papyrus text—over weightier topics and the longer and more difficult meters that they call for. Again, all three are rightly agreed that his verses lack a measure of artistic refinement and that final touch of literary polish expected of first-rank poets. Being blessed with natural poetic talent, he was content to use it, usually in extemporaneous verse when he was under the influence of wine or under emotional stress. That is, Walīd lacked the professional poet's incentive to achieve high literary polish as he competed with his peers for professional recognition and financial rewards. Nevertheless, Walīd's poetry is appreciated for its easy flow, its spontaneity, and its forthrightness. Incomplete as the extant collection is, it still yields enough firsthand information to provide an insight into his character and motivation. Though some of his verses are shocking enough to tempt one to suppress them even in our permissive twentieth century, more of his poems arouse sympathy for this high-spirited poet and caliph who fell victim to the fatal combination of his own strong-headedness and unfortunate family and political circumstances.

**DATING OF THE DOCUMENT**

Several questions arise to which the sources on hand give no definite answer. When did Aṣma'i encounter the Bedouin lover? Did he then recognize the verses of our text as Walīd II's poem with some variation? My considered guess is that the encounter with the Bedouin occurred early in Aṣma'i's literary career, and it seems possible that he did not at that time associate the verses with Walīd II.

Aṣma'i's first subjects of serious study were the Qur'ān and hadīth. His interest in the Qur'ān was probably stimulated by family tradition since his grandfather was employed by Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf to record and recite the corrections ordered by Ḥajjāj to be made in the 'Uthmānic edition of the Qur'ān.\textsuperscript{225} Aṣma'i transmitted some information (\textit{akhbār}) on Umayyad times and personalities, including several of the early Marwānīds and also Ḥajjāj, on the authority of his father on that of his grandfather,\textsuperscript{226} but he used the family \textit{isnād} rarely in contrast to his extensive use of other sources of information for his numerous interests. From the study of the Qur'ān to that of Tradition and law was the usual path for young aspirants to scholarship in the religious sciences. Most of the leading traditionists who were still active until about the mid-second century of Islām are listed among the young Aṣma'i's teachers. They included Ḥammād ibn Salamah ibn Dīnār, Mis'ar ibn Kidām, and Shu'bah ibn al-Ḥajjāj ibn Ward al-Azdi,\textsuperscript{227} all of whom committed their hadīth collections to writing.\textsuperscript{228} Such traditionists grounded him in their method of parallel oral and written transmission, and it was to their terminology that he resorted in expressing critical opinions on Islāmic poets (see p. 100, n. 204). Just when Aṣma'i decided that his professional career lay not in the religious sciences is hard to say. His decision to specialize in the secular field of language and literature was undoubtedly influenced by Abū 'Amr ibn al-'Alī, the leading Qur'ānic-


\textsuperscript{225} \textit{Marātib}, p. 65; \textit{Sirāfī}, p. 69. For the nature of the changes ordered by Ḥajjāj see p. 84 above. Little is known of Aṣma'i's family besides the names of his grandfather and father, a paternal uncle, and a maternal uncle who seems to have been remembered only for his parsimony, a characteristic associated with Aṣma'i himself. Stranger still is the lack of information on any literary activity of his brother 'All and his own son Sa'īd. What we know of his nephew 'Abd al-Rahmān ibn 'Alī (d. 231/846) as the only member of the family who transmitted Aṣma'i's books does not indicate a close personal relationship between the two.

\textsuperscript{226} See e.g. \textit{Majālis Tha'lab} II 615 f. and Ibn 'Asākir IV 62, 82.

\textsuperscript{227} See e.g. \textit{Sirāfī}, p. 60 and Khatīb X 410.

\textsuperscript{228} See \textit{Inbāh} II 197 f.; see also our Vol. II 45, 50, 52-84, 67-68, and pages listed in index under their separate names. See, further, Raba'i, Intro. pp. 2 f., citing Ibn 'Asākir on the authority of Mubarrad, for Aṣma'ai's own reference to the numerous scholars, jurists, traditionists, and long list of poets and eloquent men from whom he learned, memorized, and transmitted and to whom collectively he gave the credit for his own accurate knowledge, which in turn brought a delegation of Khurāsānī scholars seeking him as the ranking Basrān scholar.
reader of his day and the foremost authority on language and literature. It is also possible that Aṣmaʾi’s serious interest in poetry may have been first aroused by Shu’bah ibn al-Ḥajjāj, who was interested mainly in poetry before he specialized in ḥadīth.229 much as Zuhri and Shafiʿi just before and after him were interested in poetry before they decided to specialize in ḥadīth and fiqh. Furthermore, it was probably the aging Abū ’Amr ibn al-ʿAlāʾ who first directed the younger scholar to seek out the knowledgeable among the Bedouins, on whom he himself had relied so heavily for his knowledge of correct Arabic and pre-Islamic poetry. That as it may, we do know that Aṣmaʾi soon formed a lifelong habit of periodic visits to the desert. In his earlier days he lived and moved freely enough among the Bedouins to marry one of their women and to be rejected by another.230 His insatiable curiosity covered every phase of Bedouin life, private and public. His informants, both men and women, came from every level of Bedouin society.231 His reputation among them was so well known and widespread that a Bedouin woman who met him as a stranger could guess his identity from his lively conversation or from a display of his memory, which was matched at least once by a Bedouin woman.232 Bedouins who could not supply the information he sought would readily direct him to those among them who could.233 Prying into all sorts of Bedouin experiences, he was apt to ask, as in line 6 of our papyrus text: “Have you said anything (of poetry) about that?” And the Bedouin being questioned would be just as apt to recite verses that he considered his own.234 The character of the anecdotes he reported about Bedouin men and women and about his personal experiences among them ranged from innocuous235 to highly edifying236 to extremely shocking,237 and the papyrus episode comes close to this last. It should be added here that in moral tone Aṣmaʾi was no better and no worse than many of his contemporaries of high or low degree.

It is at the time of the youthful Aṣmaʾi’s intensive contacts with the Bedouins that I would place his encounter with the Bedouin lover of our papyrus text. This was not too far removed from the time of Walīd II, whose verses on Salmā, whether credited to him or not, would still have been popular in the desert, where dynastic change and political power lay not so heavy as they did on the city dwellers. It was also the time when Aṣmaʾi was collecting and storing up information and experiences in his extraordinary memory, which apparently was both auditory and photographic238 but which he nevertheless aided by much writing while he was still among the Bedouins.239 Back among the city dwellers, he would sort,
augment, and classify his materials that were in time to take the form of monographs on a surprisingly wide range of subjects.\textsuperscript{240} Meanwhile his Bedouin anecdotes, artfully presented in conversation, attracted attention and enhanced his reputation for serious scholarship and an entertaining personality.\textsuperscript{241} Reports of his fame soon reached Mahdi and Hārūn al-Rashīd. The latter summoned Asma‘i to the court, marveled at his extensive knowledge of Arabic and poetry\textsuperscript{242} and his store of information on the Umayyads,\textsuperscript{243} and greatly enjoyed his company and stories, especially those relating to the Bedouins. To keep up his stock of entertaining material with which to amuse Hārūn and others, Ašma‘i would make occasional trips to the desert on the city’s outskirts in search of Bedouin anecdotes, some of which no doubt quickly gained oral currency before they were included in his \textit{Nawādir al-a‘rāb}.\textsuperscript{244} It is regrettable that his serious students who became his editor-transmitters overdid the editing of at least some of his books and that others drew freely on his materials but failed to safeguard the identity of his works as separate units. One famous pupil, Ābū ‘Ubayd (d. 223/838), who served as a private tutor and became a prolific author patronized by the Tāhirid family of generals and governors, organized Ašma‘i’s works into chapters and supplemented them with materials from Ābū Zaid al-Ānsarī and from Kūfān sources, using only manuscripts for the most part.\textsuperscript{245} Still another gifted pupil, Ābū Naṣr Ṭāhir ibn Ḥātim al-Bāhili (d. 231/846), was preferred by Asma‘i above all others,\textsuperscript{246} and is said to have transmitted all of Ašma‘i’s works. He expanded Ašma‘i’s \textit{Nawādir} (not to be confused with his \textit{Nawādir al-a‘rāb}) by something like a third, which Ašma‘i himself deleted before he permitted others to copy Ābū Naṣr’s manuscript.\textsuperscript{247} A third pupil, ‘Āli ibn al-Ḥughrah al-Ṭāhir (d. 222/847), who became a professional transmitter and bookseller,\textsuperscript{248} was in demand for his accurate manuscripts and was credited with transmitting all of Ašma‘i’s works as well as those of Ābū ‘Ubaydah. Ašma‘i’s nephew ‘Ābd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Āli, a less congenial pupil, is said to have possessed some of his uncle’s original manuscripts, from which he transmitted presumably after Ašma‘i’s death.\textsuperscript{249} Many other pupils transmitted Ašma‘i’s materials less exhaustively.\textsuperscript{250} Ašma‘i’s works that have survived as units give evidence of variation and supplementation by their transmitters.

\textsuperscript{240} E.g. \textit{Fihrist}, p. 55; \textit{Irshād} II 202 f. Asma‘i considered five steps essential to genuine scholarship: quietness, attentive listening, retention, composition, and publication (\textit{Iqd} II 215). He acquired a sizable library, borrowed manuscripts, composed and dictated his works, and permitted pupils to copy and transmit them (see \textit{Fihrist}, p. 500; Jāḥīṣ, \textit{Buḥra} II 97; \textit{Jummāḥī}, p. 204; Karl Vilhelm Zetterstēen, “\textit{Aus dem Tahdib al-lūgā al-Azhari’s},” \textit{Le monde oriental} XIV [1920] 14 f.; \textit{Muzhir} I 160).

\textsuperscript{241} Ābū Nuwās, among others, compared Ašma‘i to a nightingale because he charmed his listeners into giving him the victory in conversation or debate with his better informed but less amusing competitors (\textit{Ṣūrah}, pp. 61 f.; Khatīb X 414, 417; \textit{Irshād} II 201; Ibn Khallikān I 362 [= trans. II 154]; \textit{Buḥra}, pp. 395, 400). For a less flattering comment on Ašma‘i’s materials, style, and delivery see \textit{Nuzhāḥ}, p. 68, and Ibn Khallikān I 390 (= trans. III 390), which expands the passage, the gist of which is that Ašma‘i’s style made the worst appear good while Ābū ‘Ubaydah expressed himself badly but furnished much useful knowledge.

\textsuperscript{242} \textit{Mardīb}, pp. 54 f., 56 f.; Zubaidī, p. 186; Khatīb X 417; Ibn Fīrīs, \textit{Ṣūrah}, p. 44; \textit{Nuzhāḥ}, p. 60.

\textsuperscript{243} \textit{Mas‘ūdī} V 401 f.; Ibn Khallikān I 364; see our Vol. II 47 and 54 and p. 99 above for sources on the Umayyads that were available in Ašma‘i’s lifetime. Ašma‘i’s knowledge of the life and times of Ḥāfiz ibn Yūsuf and Kahlād al-Ṣaqqārī is amply illustrated by Ibn ‘Asākir’s entries on both governors. The accounts cover their interest in and encounters with Bedouins as reported repeatedly by Ašma‘i (see e.g. Ibn ‘Asākir IV 52, 62, 72, 82 and V 70, 74–77, 78). Furthermore, Ašma‘i’s interest in history was such that he has been credited, rightly or not, with a \textit{Iqd} II 200 f. See Abbott, \textit{Two Queens of Baghdad}, pp. 147–49, 171, 174, 180, 187, for Ašma‘i as Hārūn’s courtier-companion. Not much later, Sa‘īd ibn Salm al-Bāhili was to relate a truly amusing story of a Bedouin who would not...

\textsuperscript{244} \textit{Mardīb}, pp. 54 f., 56 f.; Zubaidī, p. 186; Khatīb X 417; Ibn Fīrīs, \textit{Ṣūrah}, p. 44; \textit{Nuzhāḥ}, p. 60.

\textsuperscript{245} \textit{Mas‘ūdī} V 401 f.; Ibn Khallikān I 364; see our Vol. II 47 and 54 and p. 99 above for sources on the Umayyads that were available in Ašma‘i’s lifetime. Ašma‘i’s knowledge of the life and times of Ḥāfiz ibn Yūsuf and Kahlād al-Ṣaqqārī is amply illustrated by Ibn ‘Asākir’s entries on both governors. The accounts cover their interest in and encounters with Bedouins as reported repeatedly by Ašma‘i (see e.g. Ibn ‘Asākir IV 52, 62, 72, 82 and V 70, 74–77, 78). Furthermore, Ašma‘i’s interest in history was such that he has been credited, rightly or not, with a \textit{Iqd} II 200 f. See Abbott, \textit{Two Queens of Baghdad}, pp. 147–49, 171, 174, 180, 187, for Ašma‘i as Hārūn’s courtier-companion. Not much later, Sa‘īd ibn Salm al-Bāhili was to relate a truly amusing story of a Bedouin who would not have anything to do with a Bāhili, not for love of life or money (Khatīb IX 74).

\textsuperscript{246} \textit{Mardīb}, pp. 93.

\textsuperscript{247} \textit{Mardīb}, pp. 88 f.; Zubaidī, p. 198; Khatīb IV 114; \textit{Irshād} I 406; \textit{Irshād} II 36 f.; \textit{Muzhir} II 408.

\textsuperscript{248} See Zetterstēen in \textit{Le monde oriental} XIV 14 f.

\textsuperscript{249} \textit{Mardīb}, p. 56; Khatīb XII 197 f.; \textit{Irshād} V 421 f. and VII 304.

\textsuperscript{250} \textit{Mardīb}, pp. 54 f., 56 f.; \textit{Ṣūrah}, pp. 62 f.; \textit{Fīhrīs}, p. 56; \textit{Muzhir} II 408.

\textsuperscript{251} See e.g. Zubaidī, p. 104; \textit{Buḥra}, p. 400.
Though his *Nawādir al-ʿarab* has not survived as a unit in any contemporary or subsequent transmission, its contents are nevertheless repeatedly met with in practically every work on Arabic language and literature, along with Bedouin anecdotes attributed to one or another of ʿAṣmaʾi’s contemporaries, none of whom is credited specifically with a *nawādir al-ʿarab*, though several of them collected and published *nawādir* of a number of different categories.

The first anecdote of our papyrus text clearly belongs with the *nawādir al-ʿarab*, and the second anecdote is associated with the first by virtue of the boorishness of the chief character in each of them. The papyrus fragment is probably a student’s notation made from ʿAṣmaʾi’s dictation or copied from his manuscripts. Again, it could be a notation made from the dictation of any one of the above-mentioned chief transmitters of ʿAṣmaʾi’s works or from manuscripts of others of ʿAṣmaʾi’s many pupils. I am inclined to believe that it was made by indirect transmission through a pupil, rather than by direct transmission from ʿAṣmaʾi himself, on the basis of the script, which resembles available specimens of the early third century more than it does those from the second century of Islam.

The fact that our papyrus comes from Egypt presents, as I see it, no problems. For even in ʿAṣmaʾi’s lifetime his fame and at least some of his works had reached Khurāsān in the east and Spain in the west. Visitors from Khurāsān sought him out, and shortly after his death Abū Naṣr Ṭāhim ibn Ḥāṭim traveled to Isfahān carrying with him copies of ʿAṣmaʾi’s works, including the collections of the poetry of pre-Islāmic and Islamīc poets. Before leaving on a pilgrimage, Abū Naṣr intrusted his manuscripts to a friend who made them available for copying during Abū Naṣr’s absence. On his return, Abū Naṣr’s anger for the loss of his expected gain from the transmission of ʿAṣmaʾi’s works was appeased by the gift of a large sum of money from the citizens and their leader. Though Khurāsān of the second and third centuries surpassed Egypt in linguistic studies, Egypt and the west were not too far behind. The nature and extent of Egypt’s progress has been detailed above (pp. 33–40), particularly her role from about the mid-second century onward as a half-way center for North African and Spanish scholars seeking knowledge in the eastern provinces, first in the Hijāz and then in ʿIrāq. Thus, at least some of the works of such prominent scholars as the Kūfī Kīsāʾi and the Baṣrī ʿAṣmaʾi were introduced into Egypt and the west during their authors’ lifetime and continued to be sought after, like Sibawayh’s *Kitāb*, by succeeding generations of traveling scholars and to be studied, taught, and circulated by native Egyptians and by new settlers in Egypt.

Considering the combined factors of Walīd II’s reputation, the popularity of his verses and of Bedouin anecdotes, ʿAṣmaʾi’s career and his numerous transmitters, and, finally, the script of our papyrus, it seems safe enough to conclude that the text dates probably from about the mid-second century but that the papyrus itself is more probably from the early third century of Islam. The third century was richly productive in practically every phase of history, literature, and other cultural fields—a period when Jāḥiẓ, Ibn Qutūbih, Mubarrad, Yaʿqūbī, Ṭabarī, and Masʿūdī were studying the lives and co-ordinating and expounding upon the works of their predecessors. The many second-century and the more numerous third-century sources were freely used by Abū al-Ḥarār al-ʿIṣfahānī and Abū ʿAlī al-Qāfī, who spiced their

---

251 For example, Kīsāʾi likewise spent much time among the Bedouins and wrote down all sorts of linguistic information that was incorporated in his series of three *nawādir* works, which may have included incidental Bedouin anecdotes (see *Fihrist*, pp. 65 f.; Khatib XI 404; *Ibnh* II 238, 273 f.). Ḥātham ibn ʿAṭī related some of his experiences among the Bedouins at the request of Mahdī, who was already intrigued with the variety of the Bedouin tales; see *Fihrist* III 365–67: 

252 Rabaʾi, Intro. pp. 2 f., and n. 228 on p. 103 above. 


254 Khatib XIV 222 f.
works with numerous Bedouin anecdotes, as the Aghānī of the former and the Amāli of the latter so readily attest. By their time any political reason for ignoring Umayyad cultural achievements had long been dissipated and all but forgotten. It is not suprising that the Aghānī has yielded more of Walīd's surviving poetry than any other single source. Nor is it surprising that the encyclopedic Spanish scholar Ibn 'Abd Rabbihi (246-328/860-940), who lived in the golden age of the Umayyads of Spain, alone identified three of the five verses that we find in our papyrus poem as those of Walīd II (see pp. 80 and 95). His failure to identify the transmitter was in keeping with his stated policy of omitting the isnād's of well known and well attested materials in the interest of brevity. It has remained for our papyrus fragment to identify Aṣmaʾi as a transmitter of this particular poem of Walīd's, which, through the accident that its end rhyme is the first letter of the alphabet, comes first in Gabrieli's collection of what has survived of Walīd's poetry. The papyrus fragment likewise gives us Aṣmaʾi's illustration of Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf's well known policy of excluding the boorish and the vulgar from his new capital of Wāṣīt.

256 Ḥīrd I 3 f. 3. 1

وحتفظ الأسائد من أكثر الأخبار للاستخفاف والإيجاز وهربا من التنقيل والتطويل لابا بأي شكل متخريف وحكم ونوازير لا ينتمى الأسائد بالأصل ولا يقتصر ما حذف منها (see also p. 78 above).
DOCUMENT 5

A BEDOUIN'S OPINION OF JARĪR'S POETRY AS EXPRESSED TO THE CALIPH HISHĀM

PERF No. 636. First half of third/ninth century.

Papyrus fragment, 18.5 × 3.5 cm. (Pl. 6). The text is on the back of an earlier document of accounts in Greek figures and traces of text in a small cursive script commonly used in the third century.

Script.—Small cursive script written with well formed letters in a steady hand that is readily legible. Diacritical points are used sparingly, mostly for ba’ and its sister letters nun and qa’ and occasionally for khā’ and zā’. The hamzah is omitted. The circle indicates the end of a verse of poetry.

TEXT

1 زعموا ان اعرايبي دخل على هشام وعند الفرخذ وجرير فقال ه[شام يا اعرايبي هل تعرف]
2 من الشعر شخت قال ما سقط عنى الا ازد له قال فهل تعمل من هذا احدا قال لا قال فاخرد ميمح بيت قبل
3 قال جبرير يا امير المومنين فيكم الم قال السمو خير من ركب الطاقي واندى العلمين بطل راح
4 قال فاخرد فيهجا المر شخت قال جبرير يا امير المومنين فغض الطرف الك من تمير فلا كعب بلغت ولا
5 كلابا أما يهجو

Comments.—No literal parallels are available in the sources on hand, although several comparable texts and occasions are recorded and are discussed below.

Line 1. The reconstruction of the last two words is based on consideration of space and suggested by the same phrase in line 2. Alternative phrases in the sources are أتروى هل تروى or simply أتروى.

Lines 3-4. The two verses of Jarir’s poetry quoted here are frequently cited in most of the sources. Their history and long-sustained popularity are discussed below.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

I

A full and firm chronology of the lives and poetry of even the three ranking poets of the Umayyad period, Akhtal, Jarir, and Farazdaq, is not available from the sources. More often than not we have little more to guide us in dating than the reign of a caliph or the duration of the rule of a governor. When a reign or governorship covers some two decades, as in the case of ‘Abd al-Malik and Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf, other clues must be sought for dating a specific event of their time. Briefer reigns or governorships, though they narrow the period, fail to fix the date of a specific personal or literary event. The period widens again when the same person serves more than once as governor of a given province. It widens still further when an Umayyad personage is named without indication of his status at the time—governor, prince, or caliph—as happens quite frequently in reference to the four sons of ‘Abd al-Malik who succeeded him and to a lesser extent in reference to ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, who served as governor and caliph.

The scholars most indifferent to a poet’s chronology were the grammarians and the lexicographers, who
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cited verses out of context to serve their specific fields. Even the literary critics of the Umayyad and ’Abbasid periods were more concerned with hair-splitting arguments pertinent to their respective literary tastes and theories than with an integrated view of the life and work of a poet whose odes and verses they literally dissected. Some of the more historically minded commentators were more apt to furnish information significant for the dating of an ode. Internal evidence from a poet’s ḍīwān cannot always be trusted for fixing a specific date for a given ode since some verses may have been added or eliminated by the poet himself or by his ṭawīyah or by subsequent transmitters and commentators, each for a reason of his own (see e.g. p. 190). More fruitful are the major annalists, Tabari in particular. For, though Tabari had to contend with contradictory birth dates even for some of the Umayyad caliphs, he did ascertain and record more dates of caliphs, governors, judges, and leaders of pilgrimages, not to mention rebellions, wars, and battles, than are to be found in the available historical works of his predecessors. He lived in the same century as did such poets as Abū Tammām, Buḥṭurī, and Ibn al-Mu’tazz, philologists, such as Mubarrad and Tha’lab, littérateurs such as Ibn Qutaibah and Muhāmmad ibn al-Qāsim ibn al-Anbārī, and such commentators as Ibn al-Sīkīṭ and Sukkārī, all of whom were preoccupied, each group in its own way, with their rich heritage of pre-Islamic and Islamic poetry. Gifted with a powerful intellect and a man of encyclopedic knowledge and prodigious industry, Tabari made good use of most of the leading Islamic poets to judge from his frequent citations of their verses in his Ta’rīkh. Ibn Iṣḥāq before him and Masʿūdī among others after him did much the same, but Tabari and those after him stood on firmer ground and were more discriminating in their choice of citations than Ibn Iṣḥāq. However, inasmuch as Tabari and Masʿūdī cite poetry primarily in relation to historical and political events or in reference to a given poet’s direct relationship to those in power, they too are of not much help for establishing a full chronology of a poet’s life and work. All in all, even after we correlate pertinent statements from the above-mentioned varied sources, the net result is apt to be no more than a few specifically dated events, some probable date limits for a few others, and a rough relative chronology for a few more. Chronological problems will confront us as we seek to follow the historical and literary backgrounds of the texts of Documents 5 and 6, both of which revolve around the three ranking poets of the Umayyad period, Akhtal, Jarir, and Farazdaq.

II

Though the anecdote of Document 5 dates from the reign of Hishām, the two verses of poetry cited in lines 3 and 4 are from two separate odes which Jarir (d. 110/728 at age of over 80) actually composed in the reign of ’Abd al-Malik. The verse in line 3 is from the first ode that Jarir composed in praise of ’Abd al-Malik. We have previously covered (p. 89) the relationship between Jarir and Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf, who sent the poet, highly recommended, to the court of ’Abd al-Malik sometime during the last two or three years of that caliph’s reign. There are several versions of Jarir’s reception at the Damascus court. The most complete and detailed account comes with a family ḍīwān that traces back to Jarir himself.1 There are no meaningful discrepancies between this account and the shorter and partial accounts that are scattered in several earlier and some later sources.

’Abd al-Malik showed no eagerness to receive Jarir since he had favored the Zubairids.2 When ’Abd al-Malik finally did receive the poet, he addressed him as Ḥajjāj’s poet and permitted him to recite only his odes in praise of Ḥajjāj. Angered at a verse that referred to Ḥajjāj as valiantly stemming the tide of rebellion against the Umayyads, ’Abd al-Malik informed Jarir that Allāh did not give him victory through Ḥajjāj but made victorious His faith and His representative. He dismissed the poet abruptly.

1 Amālī III 43–46.
2 Jumāḥī, p. 357; Aḥānī VII 66.
and without a reward.\(^3\) Jarir was determined that he would not leave Damascus until he had won the caliph’s favor and a reward, without which both his reputation and his fortune would be ruined. When, on the intercession of Muhammad ibn al-Ḥajjāj, Jarir was finally permitted to recite an ode in praise of ʿAbd al-Malik the poet began with an unfortunate verse referring to himself, which the superstitious ʿAbd al-Malik considered an ill omen.\(^4\) As the caliph listened peevishly, the alarmed Jarir, concerned with the future of his fame and fortune, improvised, as he himself reported,\(^4\) the verse cited in line 3 of our papyrus. ʿAbd al-Malik was so delighted with this high praise of his opened-handed generosity that he kept asking the poet to repeat the verse and awarded him the royal gift of one hundred of the best camels. Jarir, taking advantage of the caliph’s mood, then boldly asked for equipment and camel drivers, among other requests, for the journey back to ʿIraq.\(^4\) ʿAbd al-Malik was so pleased with ʿAbd al-Malik’s acceptance of Jarir and the latter’s poetic brilliance that, had he not feared offending the caliph, he would have matched the royal reward instead of actually awarding the poet but half that gift.\(^7\)

During a ten-day visit as a member of the Širāqī delegation to ʿAbd al-Malik, Jarir met the older and well established court poet Akhtal. The latter had at first considered Jarir a better poet than Farazdaq but had been induced under pressure from the governor of ʿIraq Bishr ibn Marwān and his agents and against his own better judgment to reverse himself in favor of Farazdaq.\(^8\) Though Akhtal regretted his involvement, yet he rejected friendly advice to desist from further antagonizing Jarir.\(^9\) Thereafter the personal and professional pride of both poets goaded them to the exchange of satire until the death of the

\(^3\) Aghānī VII 66 gives the verse

\[
من سد مطاع النفاث عليكم
أو يصلى كلام الحجاج
(ان الله لم ينصر بالحجاج وأنا نصر دين وعلتئه (cf. ibid. VII 181).\(^a\)

\(^4\) The inauspicious verse reads

\[
اتصهر أم فنادك صالح
عليه هم حميك بالزوال
\]

(see Jāhiṣ, Tājī, pp. 123; Aghānī VII 66 f.; Amālī III 45). For the complete ode of 22 verses see Dīwān Jarir, ed. Karam al-Bustānī (Beirut, 1960), pp. 76-78, and Sharh dīwān Jarir, pp. 96-99. For another instance of verses considered ominous by ʿAbd al-Malik see Ibn Ṭūḥat, p. 123; Ibn al-Jawzi, Akhbar al-kamāq wa al-mugāffālān, ed. Khāzīm al-Muṣaffar (Najaf, 1966/1967) pp. 57-60, records this and other instances when ʿAbd al-Malik and Hishām found verses ominous though not so intended by the poets involved. ʿAbd al-Malik once dreamt that he was physically overpowered by ʿAbdAllāh ibn al-Zubayr and nailed to the ground with four pegs. He sent a messenger to Muhammad ibn Sirin in Baṣrah for an interpretation of the dream and was told to expect victory over his enemy and the succession of four of his sons (see Tanūkhī’s Niṣḥār al-maḥḍārān as translated from an unpublished manuscript by D. S. Margoliouth, “The table-talk of a Mesopotamian judge,” Part II, Islamic Culture VI [1932] 195). This episode brings to mind the report that Jarir’s mother dreamt that she gave birth to a black rope that wound itself around the necks of many and choked them and she was told she would give birth to a son and a poet “full of acrimony and violence, who would be an affliction to men.” And, therefore, when her seven-month son was born she named him Jarir, which means “halter” (Aghānī VII 58 f.; Ibn Khallikān I 128 (= trans. I 296)). Both dreams may well have been fabricated after the actual events (see Aghānī VII 59, 72). Superstitions of all sorts had a strong hold on most Arabs of pre-Islamic and Islamic times. Men and women in all walks of life, including rulers and scholars, saw good and bad omens in a variety of happenings. Diviners and dream interpreters had a large following. Augury, especially from the call or flight of birds, was widespread. Even a slip of the tongue could suggest an omen to one with a lively imagination. All were not equally affected, and some frowned on such practices. Poets and their critics were familiar with this phenomenon and would-be poets were cautioned against verses that might be considered as bad omens. For a sampling of instances of and attitudes toward such practices, drawn for our purposes largely from the first two centuries of Islam, see e.g. Jāhiṣ, Baghdād I 105 and II 212; Uṣūl I 144-53; Tabaqāt II 1163; Aghānī X 122; Māwarid, Adab al-dunyā wa al-dīn, pp. 285-88; Iqd II 300-303; Ibn Ṭūḥat, pp. 122-24; Bāhāqī, pp. 343-50, 303, 617; Khaṭīb X 49 f., 54, 60. See our Vol. II 169 for Muhammad ibn Sirīn and the interpretation of dreams and Concordance IV 70 f.

\(^5\) Amālī III 45, lines 8-10.


\(^7\) Amālī III 45 f.

\(^8\) Jumāḥ, pp. 386 f., 408 f.; Bevan I 494 f.; S̄ālimānī, Naqīl al-jārī wa al-akḥāl, pp. 148, 197, 207; Aghānī VII 44, X 2 f., and XX 170.

\(^9\) Bevan I 496; Aghānī VII 173.
older Akhtal. It is, therefore, not surprising that when the two met at the court of 'Abd al-Malik they quickly exchanged insults.10 'Abd al-Malik amused himself at the expense of first one and then the other. He dismissed both poets from his presence to fight it out in the courtyard, knowing that if they came to blows Jarir would win over the older Akhtal; but the latter, knowing his disadvantage, remained at a distance out of sight of the younger poet.11 At another time 'Abd al-Malik threatened to have Akhtal mount on the back of Jarir in order to humiliate the latter, but he refrained from carrying out his threat when several of those present, including Jarir himself, protested that it would not be fitting for a Christian to so humiliate a Muslim.12 Nevertheless, Jarir's short visit to the imperial court helped, though indirectly, to bring about the greatest public honor Akhtal achieved under the Umayyads. For, having seen and heard 'Abd al-Malik's ultimate pleasure in and rich reward for Jarir's panegyric, Akhtal had reason for concern for his own status. He therefore pointed out to 'Abd al-Malik that Jarir claimed he had composed his ode in three days while he himself had spent a whole year composing an ode to satisfy all of the caliph's wishes, and Akhtal was promptly ordered to recite this new ode.13 The poet stepped out to fortify himself with drink and returned to recite what was soon to become his most famous ode. As the recitation proceeded, 'Abd al-Malik's pleasure mounted and reached a peak at the forty-first verse.

الشمس العدوانة حتى يستقل هم وأعظم الناس أحلامًا إذا فدرو

stressing the Umayyads' determined opposition to the enemy until the latter surrenders and accepts their rule, which the poet says is most compassionate. The rest of this ode of eighty-four verses, recounting the services of Akhtal and the Banū Taghlib to the Umayyads and satirizing their enemies and also Jarir and his tribe, so pleased the caliph that he exclaimed: "This is (indeed) sweet (to the ear)! Were it, by Allah, to be placed on a piece of iron it would melt it down." Akhtal was rewarded with money and was all but smothered with gifts of rich clothing as 'Abd al-Malik declared him the poet of the Umayyads and according to one account had him paraded in public with a crier proclaiming: "This is the poet of the Commander of the Faithful. This is the best poet of the Arabs."14 For his year's effort on this his most famous ode Akhtal, as the poet of the Umayyads, reveled thereafter in all the professional and financial rewards that that honor entailed.15

Jarir was at the court of 'Abd al-Malik on at least one more occasion, when he found himself in competition with 'Adī ibn al-Riqa/ al-'Amili, the favorite court poet of Prince Walid. Nevertheless, Jarir proved to be a match for 'Adī in the presence of 'Abd al-Malik when of all the poets at the gate only he and 'Adī were admitted to celebrate the wedding of Walid's son 'Abd al-'Azīz to Umm Ḥākim. 'Adī won much praise for his three verses that referred to the bride and the groom as the sun and the moon in constant association in which he wished them lifelong happiness.16 Jarir followed with six verses, two each

10 Jumahi, pp. 409 f.; Aghānī VII 181; Tπd V 296 f.
11 Aghānī VII 64 f. and 69: قال عبد الملك قائل اللهو جيريما ما انخلدم دائما وقفت وعكر الفصيح من زر انته كلذ.
12 Amāli III 44; but see 'Umdaya I 21 f. and Khizānah I 221, where 'Abd al-Malik is said to have carried out his threat.
14 Aghānī VII 172 f., 175 f.; ibid 181: هذه المرأة بالله والله وساهمت على زر الخدي لأتيتاه. For the entire ode see Akhtal, Encomium Omayadarum, ed. M. Th. Houtsma (Lugd. Batavorum, 1878); Ṣāḥīhān, Shi'ir al-Akhtal, pp. 98–112; Ṣāḥīhān, Naqūt Jarīr wa al-Akhtal, pp. 79–85.
15 Aghānī VII 172 f., 181.
16 Aghānī XV 49 f.:
in praise of the bride and the groom and the last two expressing congratulations and sincere good wishes.  

Later Jarir found himself again in competition with 'Adi ibn al-Riqâ', this time at the court of Walid I, probably at his accession, when we know that Jarir warned Ru'bâh ibn al-'Ajja'â and his father not to take sides against him and that Walid rebuked Jarir for his biting satires. Like 'Abd al-Malik, Walid showed his displeasure with Jarir and other poets who had supported the Zubairids by refusing to receive them at his private sessions with the poets. But Jarir and the others had access to the caliph at his public audiences, and Jarir seized one such occasion to make a dramatic entry and boldly requested Walid's permission to challenge 'Adi as a poet. The surprised Walid answered: "May Allâh not inflict the people with many of the likes of you." And the unabashed Jarir replied: "O Commander of the Faithful, I alone have kindled the community! Were there to be many like me, they would devour the people completely." A broad smile spread over Walid's face in amused astonishment at Jarir's ready retort and his great self-confidence, and then Walid seated him among the court poets. When Jarir finally came face to face with 'Adi, he either did not or more likely pretended not to recognize him. When Walid named 'Adi ibn al-Riqâ' al-'Amili, Jarir played on the words rigaa', 'ragged clothes,' and 'amilah, "laboring," and in connection with the latter cited Surah 88:3-4, which refers to those laboring in hell-fire, and concluded with a vituperative verse. 'Adi answered with a verse in kind and then took refuge at Walid's feet. Walid angrily rebuked Jarir for his misuse of the Qur'ân and threatened to humiliate him and degrade him among his fellow poets by having a foreign client (ghulâm) saddle and mount him. Like 'Abd al-Malik before him, Walid was dissuaded from carrying out this threat because some who were present pointed out the inappropriateness of a foreign client so humbling a ranking Muslim Arab poet. Jarir was then dismissed with the warning that should he dare to satirize 'Adi he would have to face severe consequences at the hands of Walid himself. Jarir did nevertheless satirize 'Adi but did not explicitly name him and thus escaped any consequences. But on another occasion, during the pilgrimage of the year 91/709, the satires of Jarir and 'Umar ibn Laja' so angered Walid that he ordered his governor of Medina, Abu Bakr ibn Mu'hammad ibn 'Amr ibn Ḥazm al-'Anṣârî, to have both poets flogged.  

Upon 'Umar II's accession several persistent poets hastened to congratulate him but were kept waiting for a long time before they managed to gain an audience either alone or in groups. Among them we find Jarir, Farazdaq, Kuthaiyir, Mu'saib, and Dukin. Though all were disappointed in their expectation of rich rewards such as they had become accustomed to, yet 'Umar's motives and his desire to conserve

37 Aghânî XV 50. See Tha'alibi, Thimîr, p. 230, for a second version, according to which Jarir recited his verses first; this version gives several textual variants for the verses of both poets and does not mention the equal rewards they received from 'Abd al-Malik but adds that Walid preferred 'Adi's fewer verses and rewarded him with double the reward he gave Jarir: "فَتَقَالَ لَهُ وَلَدِي لَهُ لَتَقُلُ قُلْ فَقُلْ إِنْ أَمَرَ رَكَابُهُ فَيَقُولُ إِنِّي أَمَرُ رَكَابِي." The marriage was unhappy and ended in divorce.

38 Aghânî XVIII 123 f. and XXI 88; see also Ibn 'Asâkir V 394 f.

39 Aghânî VII 73; Muwashshah, pp. 129 f. See 'Iqd V 296 f. for Jarir's non-recognition of Akhtal and for Kuthaiyir's and Akhtal's non-recognition of each other, both instances being in the presence of 'Abd al-Malik.

40 Aghânî VII 73; Muwashshah, pp. 129 f. See 'Iqd V 296 f. for Jarir's non-recognition of Akhtal and for Kuthaiyir's and Akhtal's non-recognition of each other, both instances being in the presence of 'Abd al-Malik.

41 Jumâhî, pp. 324 f.; Aghânî VII 73 and VIII 179 f.; Muwashshah, pp. 129 f.

42 Jumâhî, p. 369; Aghânî VII 69.

43 For Jarir's interview while Farazdaq and others waited outside see Aghânî VII 67 f. Shi'r', pp. 317-21, and Aghânî VIII 152-54 give the fullest accounts, with simâl's that trace back to Ḥammâd al-Râwiyah on the direct authority of Kuthaiyir (see also 'Iqd II 86-96).

44 See preceding note and 'Iqd V 292.

45 Shi'r, pp. 387 f.; cf. 'Iqd II 84-86.
community funds for the purposes for which they were intended were appreciated by both Jarir26 and
Kuthayyir.27
The verse cited in line 4 of our papyrus text is from the only ode in which Jarir satirized yet another
poet and his tribe, namely 'Ubad ibn Ḥuṣain al-Numairi (d. 90/709),28 better known as Rā'i, “camel-
herder,” for his excellent descriptions of camels. Jumāḥi chided him with Jarir, Farazdaq, and Akḥṭal
though he among others considered him somewhat inferior to the other three.29 The older Rā'i, like
Akḥṭal, was drawn into taking sides in the rivalry between Jarir and Farazdaq and expressed himself in
verse in favor of the latter.30 Jarir convinced him that it would be to his best interest to desist and to take
a neutral position and Rā'i promised to do so. But under pressure from his tribe and powerful friends, and
some add under the influence of drink, Rā'i broke his promise. Warned once more by Jarir, Rā'i was about
to apologize and renew his promise of neutrality. At this moment Rā'i’s hot-headed son Jandal rushed in
to prevent Rā'i from doing so. He struck his father’s mount while reciting a verse satirizing Jarir. The
mule brushed past Jarir and knocked off his headgear. Rā'i drove off without returning to make amends
for his foolish son’s conduct, and Jarir tells us that had Rā'i done so he would not have satirized him.31
With mounting anger as he picked up his headgear, Jarir answered Jandal’s verse with an obscene one of
his own, using the same meter and rhyme. Rā'i soon regretted the incident, rebuked his son, and warned
him of worse satire yet to come from Jarir, who would not spare the honor of their women. And so it was.
For Jarir hurried home and, accompanied by a secretary-transmitter and fortified with food and drink,
sat up all night drafting an ode of eighty verses in the same meter and rhyme as the verses already ex-
changed between Jandal and himself.32 The verse that pleased Jarir most is the one cited in line 4 of our
papyrus, which in Nicholson’s apt translation reads: “Cast down thine eyes for shame! for thou art of
Numayr—no peer of Ka‘b nor yet Kilāb.”33 The next day Jarir, well groomed24 and mounted on a

26 Aḥḍāṭ VII 68: قَالَ جَارِرٌ لِعَمْشَا وَقَبِيمَ الْفَرِيقِ خَرِجْتُ مِنْ عِنْدِ رَجِلٍ يَبْصِرُ الْفَتْقَةَ وَيَبْشَرُ ابْنَاءَهنَا إِنَّمَا أَيْضَهُمَا
Mentioned in Al-Sha‘r al-‘Ilm al-Mabdi‘ wa al-Mu‘addib (Damascus, 1964) pp. 7 f.
28 Jumāḥi, pp. 372 f.; Aḥḍāṭ VII and 49 f., XX 160 f.; Bevan I 428. All of these sources indicate that
is the verse that caused trouble for Rā‘i.
29 Aḥḍāṭ XX 169.
30 Jumāḥi, pp. 273 f.; Aḥḍāṭ VII 49 and XX 160. The account of this whole episode as found in these two sources is repeated in
parts and supplemented, in both its details and content, in Bevan I 427–51, the ode itself (No. 53) having grown to 112 verses with
a composite commentary. See also Jumāḥi, pp. 68–68 and Sharḥ dhā‘ya Jarrir, pp. 64–88. Jarir seems regularly to have
had on hand a secretary to whom he dictated his poetry (see ‘Ijād III 186).
31 Nicholson, A Literary History of the Arabs, p. 246; see ibid. pp. 245 f. for a lively translation of Aḥḍāṭ VII 49 f.
32 See Bevan I 320 and II 624 and 650 for dress and grooming and see Khidrāja IV 172 for a satirist’s costume and grooming,
including that of Labid, in pre-Islamic times.
See Bevan II 546–76 (No. 61) and Aḥḍāṭ XIX 38 f. for an episode involving Farazdaq that in several respects parallels the
episode of Jarir and Jandal. This time the foolish son of the highly placed and highly respected Abī Bākra ibn Mu‘āwīya ibn
‘Amr ibn Ḥazm al-Anṣāri challenged Farazdaq’s claim that he was the poet of the Arabs and demanded that he prove his claim
by producing an ode to match one of Ḥasan ibn Thābit which he, the son, recited. That night Farazdaq roamed hill and dale
until inspiration came and enabled him to compose a long ode of 115 verses (Bevan II, No. 61) and, having first groomed himself,
recited it the next day.
stallion, presented himself at the circle of Ra'i and Farazdaq in the Mirbad of Ba'srah and recited his long ode to the dismay and shame of both poets. The aging Ra'i, we are told, never recovered from the shock, professionally or otherwise, and the shame was to haunt his family and his tribe, the Banu Numair, long after his death despite the fact that Ra'i himself made a brief answer to Jarir and Farazdaq defended Ra'i and his tribe in a satire composed in answer to Jarir.35

Though the affair of Jarir and Ra'i became widely known in considerable detail, none of the sources actually date it. Little is heard of Ra'i after his humiliation. Some say he died of grief on the spot, but others report that he and his people left Ba'srah in great haste and departed to their tribal settlement only to find that the news of Ra'i's humiliation had preceded him and that he died soon after.36 His son Jandal reports that his father, in order to discipline him, had vowed he would not answer Jarir for a year but that he died before the year was out.37 If we accept 90/709 as Ra'i's death date (see p. 113, n. 28) then it must follow that his clash with Jarir took place no earlier than 89 A.H. But this conclusion is contradicted by reports that the verse cited in line 4 of our papyrus and another verse from the same ode were cited to 'Abd al-Malik (d. 86/705) by a Bedouin as the best verse of satire and the best heroic verse of the Arabs (see pp. 117-19). Knowing that the sources show discrepancies of as much as four years for the death dates of Ra'i's more successful and better known contemporaries Akhtal, Jarir, and Farazdaq, I am more inclined to suspect Ra'i's death date as given by modern editors or else to reject the statement that he died within a year after his bitter experience with Jarir than I am inclined to suspect the report that verses from this specific ode of Jarir's were recited to 'Abd al-Malik. Several other bits of evidence reinforce my position. For most of some seven years before Hajjaj ibn Yusuf took office as governor of 'Iraq, Jarir had been away from Ba'srah with his people in their settlement of Marrût, while back in Ba'srah Farazdaq intensified his attacks on Jarir and the Banu Kulaib. Soon after Hajjaj's arrival in 'Iraq, Jarir, at the insistence of his people, returned to Ba'srah in order to be in a better position to counterattack Farazdaq.38 Jarir, while trying to persuade Ra'i to be neutral in respect to his rivalry with Farazdaq, pointed out to Ra'i that he, Jarir, had been seven years in the province parrying satirical attacks against his people.39 Inasmuch as Jarir had been an acknowledged poet and dreaded satirist for some three decades before Hajjaj's appointment as governor of 'Iraq, Jarir must have been here referring to seven years spent in Ba'srah after his return to the city early in Hajjaj's governorship. Furthermore, we learn from a composite and much abbreviated account that Hajjaj one night summoned Jarir to the governor's palace, but there is no mention of the time or of the city in which this summons took place. What Hajjaj wished was to know why Jarir abused the people with his satires. Jarir's reply was that he did so only in retaliation for their having satirized him first—an explanation that he once gave to Abu Amr ibn al-'Ala in answer to the same question.40 Jarir then added: "What have I to do with Ibn Umm Ghassan or with Ba'ith or with Farazdaq or Akhtal or Ibn Laja?" And he continued to name poets he had satirized. Said Hajjaj: "I know not what you have to do with these; you tell me." Jarir gave some details of why and how each of the twenty poets named had satirized him first and of how he had answered in each case, beginning with the above-named five poets and in that order, which is known to be generally chronological. As Jarir

35 Jumahi, pp. 373 f., 435; Jähiz, Bayân III 334 f.; Aghâni VII 50 and XX 171. For Farazdaq's ode see Bevan I 451-78 (No. 54). Khânimâh I 35 gives Ra'i's 3-verse answer to the verse cited in line 4 of our papyrus text (cf. Aghâni VII 46 and XX 170). Similarly, members of Akhtal's tribe, the Banu Taghlib, experienced a deep sense of humiliation at some of the verses of Jarir's satire of Akhtal (see e.g. Jähiz, Bayân III 371 f.; Shahr dîwân Jarîr, pp. 448-53, from which the fourth verse of the Bayân text is missing).

36 Jumahi, p. 374; Aghâni XX 171.

37 Jumahi, p. 374; Aghâni XX 172. See also Nâsir al-Ḥâfi, Shi'r al-Ra'i, pp. 64 and 119, but on p. 53 this author is misled by a misreading of the words ِع and ِف into accepting the statement that Ra'i outlived Jandal.

38 Shi'r, pp. 290 f.; Amârî III 43.

39 Bevan I 431.

40 Aghâni VII 43; 'Iqd V 296.
finished with each poet, Hajjaj asked *thumma man*, "then who?" Thus, we have clear indication of a chronological sequence for this list of poets, a list that was cut short only by the break of day. Ra‘i is eighth in this list, which, it should be noted, does not include ‘Adi ibn al-Riq‘ (d. 95/713 or 714), whom Jarir first met late in the reign of ‘Abd al-Malik.

If we assume that the conversation between Jarir and Hajjaj took place at the latter’s palace in Basrah, then we must assume that it occurred shortly before Hajjaj moved to his new capital of Wāsiṭ in the winter of 83/84 a.h. (see pp. 82 f.) in order to allow for the seven years Jarir claimed to have been in Basrah at the time of his conversation with Ra‘i and for some lapse of time between that event and his conversation with Hajjaj. If, on the other hand, the conversation with Hajjaj took place later in Wāsiṭ, it would have to be placed before the competition between Jarir and ‘Adi which began late in ‘Abd al-Malik’s reign (65-86/685-705) and climaxed early in the caliphate of Walid I (86-96/705-15), probably soon after Walid’s succession, when it was customary for the poets to wait on the monarch in order to congratulate and praise him in the hope of receiving his patronage. In either case, Jarir’s abusive satire of Ra‘i had ample time and opportunity to reach the ear if not, indeed, the hand of ‘Abd al-Malik and of his heir and successor, Walid I. For we know that news of such events traveled fast by direct word of mouth, by special messenger, or even by imperial post as in the case of an ode of Akhtal’s. We know that Jarir had several literate transmitters to whom he dictated his poems, especially the longer ones such as his satire of Ra‘i, and that Farazdaq also had secretary-transmitters. Their poetry had ready and

41 *Aghānī* VII 43-49 and XX 170. There is no convincing reason to assume, as does Ahmad al-Shāyib, *Ta‘rikh al-naqād fi al-shi‘r al-arabi* [Cairo, 1946] pp. 209-13, that this interview between Hajjaj and Jarir is a fabrication of Abū al-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī. One has to keep in mind constantly the uncertain relative chronology of some of the events and that Abū al-Faraj’s account is a condensation of two earlier lengthy accounts. Jarir claimed at various times in his long career to have overcome 43, 50, and 80 poets (*Aghānī* VII 40 and 59).

42 Hajjaj did once order both Jarir and Farazdaq to appear, dressed in their pre-Islamic tribal costumes, at the governor’s palace in Basrah, but here again the event is not dated (Jumahi, pp. 346, 368; *Aghānī* VII 71).

43 Mahmūd Ghināwī al-Zuhairī in his *Naqād‘ al-Jārīr va al-Farazdaq* (Baghdād, 1954), pp. 62-121, makes a commendable contribution to the chronology of the *naqād‘*. He has, however, been misled into dating Jarir’s satire of Ra‘i, for whom he gives no death date, after the year 96 a.h. (see *ibid.* pp. 105 f. and 112) because of a marginal note that has crept into the Bevan edition of the *naqād‘*, where it appears in parentheses and reads: "وتُولِقُ لحين كُلِّ رَجُلٍ كَبِيرٍ بِنِّ مَسْلَى قَبْطَةٍ وَمِنْ ثَقَلِي نُبُوَّة،" which refers to the fall and death in 96 a.h. of Muslim ibn Qutaybah al-Bāhī, governor of Khurāṣān (see *Ṭabarī* II 1283; Bevan I 427 f., 432).

44 Bishr ibn Marwān as governor of ‘Irāq (71-74/690-93) sent by messenger a copy of Suna‘ah al-Bārī’s satire of Jarir and demanded an immediate written answer to it (Jumahi, pp. 377-90; *Aghānī* VII 44, 61). He even conducted family affairs and correspondence with his wife Nawr in written verse (see e.g. Majūṣ al-ulūm‘, pp. 294 f.; *Aghānī* XIX 23 f.; *Iqīd* VI 95, 124 f.; Ibn Khalilikān II 266 f. [= *trans.* III 024 f.]). He also sometimes forced scholar-transmitters to write down his *naqād‘* and memorize and transmit them (see n. 137 on p. 131 below). Farazdaq himself claimed an instant and tenacious memory (*Aghānī* XIX 34).

45 ‘Abd al-Malik ordered Akhtal to write an ode in praise of Hajjaj, and it was forwarded by post to Hajjaj in ‘Irāq (*Aghānī* VII 174). For the ode see *Ṣiḥḥān*, Shīr‘ al-Abkār*, pp. 73-76 and 92, note d.

46 The names of at least five of Jarir’s transmitters, in addition to several of his sons, have come down to us: Ḥusayn al-Kātib, Ash‘āb the musician and singer, Jarir’s grandsons Mishal and Ayyūb (sons of Kusayr by Jarir’s daughter Zaidīt* [Bevan III 122]), and Marba‘ (see e.g. Jumahi, p. 349; Bevan I 430 and II 975; Shīr‘, p. 307; *Aghānī* VII 42; *Fihrist*, p. 159; *Umdah* I 138).


At least some of Kuthayr’s poetry was committed to writing possibly by a transmitter son-in-law whose manuscripts were passed on to his family (*Aghānī* VIII 30: ...}
widespread circulation, and some of their lighter and easily quotable verses were put to music and sung by ranking musicians and singing girls.48

Furthermore, Jarîr, the poet and the man, was more favored than Farazdaq by the Bedouins and the Quraish and their clients, both Arabs and foreigners.49 Moreover, 'Abd al-Malik had a lifelong interest in poets and poetry and developed a keen critical sense for the latter (see p. 136, n. 165). In his last years he found his most relaxing pleasure in conversation with scholars and littérateurs of the caliber of Sha‘bî and with Bedouins knowledgeable in poetry. There is therefore no valid reason to question Mada‘înî’s report, tracing back through a double isnad to 'Abd al-Malik ibn 'Umair and to 'Awânah ibn al-Ḥakam (see below), that a Bedouin in answer to questions put to him by 'Abd al-Malik as to the best poetry recited some of the most famous verses of Jarîr,50 including the one cited in line 4 of our papyrus from an ode satirizing both Râ‘î and Farazdaq.

Each of the two verses of our papyrus text is frequently cited, in early and later sources, either alone or in combination with comparable verses of Jarîr or other poets. The panegyrists dwelt on the qualities most admired by the Arabs and particularly flattering to their rulers, such as noble descent, generosity, forebearance, and courage. The following illustrative citations are verses from the four contemporary and comparable poets with whom we are primarily concerned—Jarîr, Farazdaq, Akhtal, and Râ‘î. Jarîr’s

is more apt than not to be found in association with Akhtal’s equally famous

since the two verses were addressed in close succession to ‘Abd al-Malik.51 The qualities directly opposed to those lauded in panegyric were most apt to be attacked by the satirists, who seldom overlooked low or base descent, miserliness, vindictiveness, and cowardice among other personal or tribal shortcomings. Jarîr’s

is the verse cited in line 4 of our papyrus, belittling the descent of Râ‘î and his tribe, and echoed in part by Râ‘î’s

in his satire of 'Adî ibn al-Riqâ‘.52 Jarîr’s above-cited verse was in some competition as his most effective satire with another of his verses, in which he attacked Farazdaq’s character

and which Farazdaq himself confessed was the verse that disquieted him most.53 Akhtal more than matched this with the verse which is considered the most vulgar in Arabic poetry

48 For the active role of the transmitter of poetry see e.g. Shi‘r, p. 307; Aghânî I 116 f., VII 42, and XVII 98; 'Iqd VI 24, 46 f.; Bevan II 1048. The role of a poet’s personal transmitter as secretary-editor in the 1st century of Islam is significantly illustrated by the individual and group activities of several direct transmitters from Jarîr and Farazdaq (see Aghânî IV 53 f.; Muwashshah, pp. 116 f.; cf. Jumâbî, p. 305, n. 1).
49 See e.g. Jumâbî, pp. 319 f., 347 f.; Muwashshah, p. 115; Aghânî VII 6 f., 65.48
50 Aghânî VII 54 f.; Qurashi, pp. 38 f.
51 E.g. Jumâbî, p. 420; Şâlihî, Shi‘r al-Akhtal, pp. 90–112; Shi‘r, p. 311. See also pp. 111 f. above.
53 Jumâbî, p. 353; Bevan I 251, 397; Aghânî XIX 30; Mas‘ûdî VI 155; ‘Askari, Maṣûn, p. 20; Ibn Khallikan II 291 (= trans. III 616).
accusing Jarir and his people of extreme miserliness and inhospitality. Jarir himself pointed out the four-barbed thrust of Akhtal’s verse and its elaboration in the next two verses as being the most damaging to him and his people. Also associated with one or the other of the verses already cited is a famous verse of Akhtal which cuts across praise and blame as its first half lauds the Quraish for their clemency and generosity and its second half satirizes the Anṣār as wholly base—no small literary feat. One version reads

and a second version is translated by Nicholson as follows:

“The Quraish have borne all honour and glory, And baseness alone is beneath the turbans of the Anṣār.”

The two words that survive at the end of line 6 of our document give no clue as to the content of that line but do indicate that still another line followed it. The search for parallels for Jarir’s two verses cited in lines 3 and 4 soon convinced me that the papyrus text is part of a unit account expressing a speaker’s choice of the best verse in each of at least three of the four major categories of Arabic poetry, namely panegyric (madīḥ), satire (hiṣaʾ), erotica (nasīḥa), and heroic (fākhra). To these should be added elegiac (rithāʾ) and description (ṣiyāḥa), the latter cutting across all the other categories. Continued search revealed, first, that all the poets of the Umayyad period only Jarir is credited with verses of supreme quality in at least four of these categories and, second, that in three of the four such accounts available the opinion is expressed by a Bedouin to ‘Abd al-Malik, instead of to the caliph Hishām as in the papyrus text, while in the fourth account it is expressed directly to Jumahī (d. 231/845) by a Bedouin of the Banū Usayyid who claimed that Jarir excelled Farazdaq in heroic, panegyric, satiric, and romantic poetry.

In the Jumahī account four of Jarir’s verses are cited by the Bedouin in support of his opinion. The first verse

is from Jarir’s ode satirizing Rawāt and his tribe, in which he expressed also his own pride in the overpowering effect of the influence of the Banū Tamīm, to which both Jarir and Farazdaq belonged. Farazdaq himself confirmed the excellence of the verse and wished he had been its author. The next two verses cited by the Bedouin to Jumahī are those of lines 3 and 4 of our papyrus, and in the same order, both of which have been dealt with above. The fourth is the romantic verse

and is frequently cited in later sources.

44 Jumahī, p. 428; Sālībī, Naqūʿ al-Jarir wa al-Akhtal, p. 134; ‘Uyun II 195; Muwassakah, pp. 140 f. In ‘Askarī, Maṣūn, p. 21, the first half of the verse reads: قُومْ أَذَّنْ بِحُرُومِ الْإِسْبَاطِ لَوْمَامَ.

45 See Bevan II 1053 f. for these verses and for Jarir’s verses that Farazdaq considered most damaging to him personally. Akhtal was fully aware of the effect of his verses on Jarir (Muwassakah, p. 140). See Shīr, p. 312, and ‘Idq V 298 for two verses of Ba’ith that hurt Jarir as severely.

46 See Jumahī, p. 397; Sālībī, Shīr al-Akhtal, p. 314; Sālībī, Naqūʿ al-Jarir wa al-Akhtal, p. 158; Jāhiz, Bayān I 79; Shīr, p. 302; Mabarrad, p. 101; Aghānī XIII 148 (fādkah) and XIV 122 (madiḥ); ‘Idq V 221; Ibn al-Shajari, Kitāb al-maṣūmāt, ed. Fritz Krenkow (Haidarābad, 1345/1926) pp. 108 f. Despite the several textual variants in these sources, the character of the verse and its basic concepts are clear in all. For Nicholson’s translation see A Literary History of the Arabs, p. 241. The religious, political, and personal motivation for the verse has been touched on elsewhere in these studies (see our Vol. II 260 and p. 139 below).


Two later and separate accounts trace back to two authorities earlier than Jumahī. The first of these accounts is found in Qurashi’s *Jamharat ash‘ār al-'Arab* on the authority of ‘Awānah ibn al-Ḥakam (d. 158/775), a fourth-generation member of a scholarly family, whose son or brother ‘Iyāḍ carried on the family’s scholarly tradition.60 The second account is found in Abū al-Faraj al-Isfahānī’s *Aghānī* as reported by Madā’inī on the direct authority of ‘Awānah alone and, through a second *ısmād*, as transmitted directly to Madā’inī by Abū ‘Imrān on the authority of his father, ‘Abd al-Malik ibn ‘Umar (d. 136/753 at age 103), who had access to early sources, including the library of Mu‘āwiyyah (see p. 76, n. 253). Though both accounts are abridgements of earlier reports, they are, so far as we are here concerned, point by point identical in sequence and content except for a few minor variants.61 The occasion was a large public banquet at the court of ‘Abd al-Malik. Among those present were Jarir and a knowledgeable Bedouin of the Banū ‘Udhrah. ‘Abd al-Malik, impressed with the Bedouin’s conversation, asked him if he was versed in poetry and was told to ask anything about poetry that he wished. Then began the familiar question-and-answer method of eliciting a critical literary opinion. What ‘Abd al-Malik wished to know was the best verse in each of the four major categories of Arabic poetry, and he received in answer the same four verses that are cited in Jumahī’s account but with the order of verses one and two reversed. However, the two accounts continue with a fifth question by ‘Abd al-Malik. He wished to know the verse of Arabic poetry with the best simile, and the Bedouin recited a fifth verse of Jarir’s:

سرى هم ليل كان تجومه  
قدؤلل فين الذبال الممتل

Still other details are provided in both accounts. Jarir’s attention was caught when the Bedouin recited the first of his verses, and his pleasure became increasingly evident as the Bedouin recited each successive verse. His delight was so great that he turned over his own regular reward of 400 dirhems62 and some gift cloth to the Bedouin, which prize ‘Abd al-Malik then matched.

The fourth account of this episode is reported on the authority of ‘Awānah ibn al-Ḥakam and Hishām ibn Muhammad ibn al-Sa‘īb al-Kalbi.63 ‘Abd al-Malik addressed the same five questions to the Bedouin of the Banū ‘Udhrah and received the same answers as in the preceding two accounts. But there are some differences too. Akhtal and Farazdaq also were present at the banquet. After the Bedouin had cited the five verses of Jarir ‘Abd al-Malik asked him if he knew Jarir and the Bedouin said that he did not but that he longed to meet him. ‘Abd al-Malik then pointed out the three poets to the Bedouin, who responded with two verses praising Jarir and satirizing the other two, whereupon first Farazdaq and then Akhtal angrily accused the Bedouin, in verse, of falsehood, ignorance, and low degree. Angered, Jarir then came to the defense, also in verse, of the Bedouin, leaped to place a kiss on his head, and relinquished his reward of 500 dirhems, which ‘Abd al-Malik matched.

That Farazdaq was ever present at the court during the reign of ‘Abd al-Malik or, indeed, prior to the reign of Sulaimān seems to have been erroneously questioned by Marzubānī.64 We know that Jarir was at the court late in ‘Abd al-Malik’s reign on more than one occasion. It is not likely that Farazdaq, with Akhtal already a friend at the court of ‘Abd al-Malik, would not compete with Jarir for that liberal monarch’s favor, even though Hajjāj ibn Yūsuf did not see fit to recommend him. Hajjāj’s attitude may have given Jarir the notion that Farazdaq would not visit Damascus while he, Jarir, was there.65 But Farazdaq did just that, though here again the time is not stated. The last account cited above would

---

60 Zubaidi, p. 246; see also p. 55 above.
61 See Qurashi, pp. 36 f.; *Aghānī* VII 54, line 18, to p. 55, line 12; *Sharh dīdūs Jarīr*, p. 456; cf. *Aghānī* XIX 39 f.
62 Jarir still expected to receive this amount as his regular reward even from ‘Umar II (see pp. 112 f.).
63 *Dīwān Jarīr* (Cairo, 1313/1806) II 189–91.
64 *Mawālīshāh*, pp. 164–66; but see Ibn ‘Asakir VII 52 f. and Blachère in *El II* (2nd ed.) 788 f.
indicate that Farazdaq's visit and the episode itself took place sometime in the last two or three years of 'Abd al-Malik's reign.

There seems to have been no parallel attempt to claim for either Farazdaq or Akhtal supremacy in all of the above-specified five categories. Akhtal did claim supremacy for himself in erotica, satire, and panegyric. But his claim was quickly refuted when he was accused of even confusing satire with panegyric.

Of younger contemporary poets, Bashshar ibn Burd was credited by Abu 'Amr ibn al-'AlÎ with supreme excellence in panegyric and satire and in the new style (badî') of poetry. But Asuma'î, though he considered Bashshar the last of the classical poets, reserved high praise for the verses of Jarîr and Akhtal. For when in the usual question-and-answer literary dialogue Harûn al-Rashîd asked him for the best verse each in heroic, panegyric, and satire Asuma'î cited Jarîr's

\[
\text{اذا غضبت عليك بنو مميس حسب الناس كلهم غضباناا}
\]

and his

\[
\text{السم خير من ركب المطاء وانذى العمالين بطن راح}
\]

and Akhtal's

\[
\text{قوم اذا استنجب الآبىء كلهم قالوا لاهم بيلى على النار}
\]

respectively. Harûn al-Rashîd promptly countered in each instance with verses from Bashshar which he considered even better.

Bedouin partiality for Jarîr cannot be explained entirely by the fact that his outlook and verse, rather than the outlook and poetry of such city dwellers as Akhtal and 'Adî ibn al-Riqa (typified their poetry, for Farazdaq's poetry reflected much of the same Bedouin approach. Farazdaq's overbearing personality in contrast to that of the more congenial Jarîr may have accounted in part for the latter's popularity among contemporary Bedouins.

With the passing of time and the rise of a new generation of poets, some knowledgeable Bedouins still proclaimed Jarîr superior to all the Arab poets while others were considering the possibility that Sayyid al-‘Imyari had surpassed him. On the whole, however, even non-Bedouin literary scholars and critics of the second century and after were remarkably loyal to and appreciative of the poetry of Jarîr, Farazdaq, and Akhtal, whom they ranked in the order it would seem, though only an exhaustively programmed computer could yield a final answer to the question of the relative merit of Jarîr and Farazdaq. Nevertheless, the order assumed above is repeatedly indicated if we judge by the number and the frequency of citations of their respective verses as representative of the best in the major categories of Arabic poetry and in a growing list of other themes that lent themselves to poetic expression. Celebrated verses of ranking poets were usually grouped together under such headings as muqalladdt ahshtfara* or qaldHd al-shu’ard’. and were further characterized as apt, or readily quotable, or proverbial, or unmatchable.

---

66 See Aghdni VII 177, where he cites verses in each category to support his claim.
68 Aghdni III 28. See Diya’ al-Din Nasr Allah ibn Muhammad ibn al-‘Alîr, Al-mathal al-wâ’ir fi adab al-bâith wa al-shâ’ir, p. 469, for Bashshar’s exalted opinion of his own poetic talent; for his opinion of our three poets, which places Jarîr first and Akhtal last, see e.g. Jumahi, pp. 315 and 319 f., Aghdni VII 40, Muwashshah, pp. 115 f., and 138, Ibn ‘Asakir V 426.
70 The statement is credited to Abu Mahdyjah (or Abu Malûd), a Bedouin philologist of Basrah, who is also credited with praying that Allah would forgive Jarîr for his satire of the Banû Qais (Aghdni VII 69 f.; Ma’ârij, p. 271). For Abu Mahdyjah see e.g. Marîtib, p. 40, Zobaidi, pp. 38 f. and 175, Fihrist, p. 46.
71 Aghdni VII 6 f.
72 See e.g. Ibn Abi ‘Awn, Kitab al-tushbihât, pp. 415–19, for a list of 99 topics which is not even exhaustive; see also ‘Askari, Mushân, pp. 14–51 et passim.
73 For representative groupings of such celebrated verses see e.g. Jumahi, pp. 305–12, 349–55, and 425–33, for Farazdaq, Jarîr, and Akhtal respectively; Shi’r, pp. 7–9, for all three poets; ‘Uqân II 191–97, esp. pp. 193 f. for Jarîr and Akhtal; Ibn Tabâtaba, pp. 24–31, 48, 58 f.; Muwashshah, pp. 115–32, for the three poets; Mu’jam al-shu’ar’â, pp. 486 f.; Tha’alibi, Íjâr, pp. 41–43; ‘Umdah II 138 f.; Irsâd VII 250 f.
The Christian Akhtal, so definitely associated with the Umayyads, came to be neglected under the ‘Abbāsids. Farazdaq’s verses, on the other hand, were more likely than not to be apt, but they were just as likely to be so obscene or vituperative that, for reasons of decency, they were practically unquotable.

No parallel has yet come to light for the conversation between the caliph Hishām and a Bedouin that is reported in our papyrus text—a conversation which has, so far as it goes, much in common with that of ‘Abd al-Malik and the Bedouin of the Banū ‘Udhrah (as seen above). In all probability, the account represented by our papyrus text included at least two more citations from Jarir, that is, the heroic verse and the erotic verse cited by the Bedouin to ‘Abd al-Malik. Prince Hishām, who was fourteen years old when ‘Abd al-Malik died in 86/705, may or may not have been present at the public banquet which was the occasion for the conversation between that caliph and the Bedouin. In any case, Akhtal praised the young prince and received the disappointing reward of only 500 dirhems, which he distributed to some youths. We first hear of Hishām’s personal association with Akhtal, Jarfr, and Farazdaq when he was nineteen years old, that is, in 91/710 and therefore in the reign of his brother Walid I. Hishām confronted the three poets with a she-camel and the first hemistich of a verse which he asked each poet to complete—a common literary pastime. The camel was to be the reward for the best second half of the verse. Akhtal won, yet the prince begrudged him the promised prize. We learn on the authority of Utbi, whose manuscripts were available after his death (see p. 77), that Hishām was again with our three poets, still in the reign of Walid I since Akhtal died before that caliph, when his interest in their poetry was on a much higher level. Having first scolded them for their unending rivalries and the disturbing effects on their families and tribes, the prince asked for opinions on the three poets first from a kinsman of Farazdaq, whose answers merely echoed a current opinion on the comparative merits of the three. Present on this occasion was Khalīd ibn Shafwān, on whom the prince now called for more meaningful opinions. Khalīd’s lengthy statement is illustrative of his perception, prudence, and rhymed-prose style. Four lines of printed text are devoted to Farazdaq, one and a half to Jarir, and only one line to Akhtal, yet Khalīd managed to please not only Hishām and his half-brother Maslamah, who likewise expressed his appreciation in rhymed prose, but also each of the three poets. Hishām’s interest in poetry, especially in the pre-Islamic heritage, grew as he reached maturity. His personal interest in the contemporary poets was less marked and hardly comparable to that of his father, ‘Abd al-Malik, or his brothers Walid I and Yazīd II. The renowned poets of his early days, including Akhtal and Kuthayir, had passed on before his caliphate began, and the careers of Jarir and Farazdaq were soon to end in death. Hishām was overly sensitive to personal

\[\text{\footnotesize{14 Anecdotes involving Hishām and Bedouins seem to be scarce. Hishām, being a recluse by nature, was not likely to have had much use for the Bedouins, and thus our papyrus text is rather exceptional in this respect. Siḥ, Adāb al-kullāb, p. 65, reports a chance encounter, on the pilgrimage road, of Hishām and an illiterate Bedouin whose graphic description of each of the letters of the word خسة on a milestone told Hishām that he had 5 miles still to go.}}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize{75 Hishām must have been born in 72/691 or 692 though his age at death is variously given as 52, 54, and 55 (Tabari II 1729; Ibn al-Athir, Al-kāmil fi al-ta’rikh IV 617 and V 122).}}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize{76 Aghānī VII 1731, lines 13-14: Amā jārīr fi frīgīm min hār wāwa al-tu‘āzībī fījīhāt min hār wāwa al-‘amalūn fījīhīs al-nisār. (see p. 141 below for the full text). There is some confusion as to the name and identity of this speaker, who was either Farazdaq’s paternal cousin and brother-in-law Shabbah (or Sabbath) ibn ‘Aqqāl (or ‘Iqāl) or the latter’s son ‘Aqqāl ibn Shabbah (see Tabari II 1731; Junmāh, pp. 387, n. 5, and 391; cf. ‘Uyun IV 70). Dīnahalī, Al-mashtabā‘, fi al-rījāl, ed. ‘All Muhammad al-Bajwī (Cairo, 1962) II 405, specifies ‘Aqqāl ibn Shababb as the correct form of the name.}}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize{77 Aghānī VII 73, lines 15-21: ‘Abd al-Malik IV 160 f; Ruhā‘iq, pp. 458 f. Khālid came from a family of orators (Shīr, p. 402); for further samples of his prose see p. 141 below. Prince Maslamah (d. 122/740) was better known as a general and a governor who took interest in archeology (see our Vol. I 55).}}\]
A BEDOUIN'S OPINION OF JARIR'S POETRY

remarks and less tolerant than 'Abd al-Malik of a poet's religious and political allegiances. His increasing aloofness and miserliness did not encourage the poets to persist in seeking him when a warmer welcome and richer rewards could be had first at the court of Yazid II and then at that of Hishām's alienated nephew and heir Prince Walid ibn Yazid (see pp. 91–93), not to mention the patronage of rival governors and generals. Yet, Hishām could be touched by a poet's sincere verses, as in the case of the Medinan Urwah ibn Uthaimah, who, when accused by Hishām of economic motives only, left before the rewards were distributed. Convinced that he had misjudged the poet, Hishām sent him double the reward that the others had received. He was annoyed at Nuṣaib's delay in coming to congratulate him on his accession, but on learning that illness had been the cause of the delay Hishām rewarded Nuṣaib well. Even his rage against the Shi'i schoolteacher-poet Kumait ibn Zaid for his bold Ḥāshimiyyāt was dispelled by that poet's touching elegy on Hishām's recently deceased son Mu'āwiyyah, which brought tears to the caliph's eyes and a pardon and rich reward for the pro-'Alid poet. He could relent enough in his antagonism to replace earlier threats with cordiality and patronage, as in the case of Ḥammād al-Rāwiyyah. Hishām as prince had threatened Ḥammād for partiality to his brother Yazid II, but as caliph he summoned Ḥammād from 'Iraq to the court in Damascus so that he could be informed and entertained with Ḥammād's vast knowledge of Arabic poetry, history, and especially the characteristics of the pre-Islamic period.

The quarter-century following Hishām's reign saw the transition from Umayyad to 'Abbāsid rule and climaxed in the literary career of Abū 'Amr ibn al-'Alī, whose influence left a pervasive and lasting effect on the entire field of Arabic language and literature. His own somewhat belated conviction that Islamic poetry such as that of Dhi al-Rummah, whom he considered the last of the classical poets, and that of Akhtal, Jarīr, and Farazdaq merited study and inclusion in his teaching program did not go far enough for either Abū 'Amr or his pupil and transmitter Asma'ī to place Islamic poets on a par with those of pre-Islamic times. Though in his old age Abū 'Amr saw fit to destroy his large private library, his theories and personal views were nevertheless quickly propagated by his earlier pupils such as Ḥsā ibn 'Umār and Yūnus ibn Ḥabīb and his still younger pupils Abū 'Ubaydah, Asma'ī, and Abū Zayd al-Anṣārī. They

---

81 For example, he was angered at Abū al-Najm al-'Ijī for referring to him as squint-eyed, which he was (Shīr, pp. 382 f.; Aghānī IX 79 f.).

82 For instance, he imprisoned Farazdaq for his praise of Ḥasan ibn 'All, better known as Zain al-'Abidīn, during the pilgrimage of the year 90/709 (Aghānī XIX 40 f.; Ibn Kathīrī X 394 f. [trans. III 621 f.]). He resented the allegiance of both Ḥammād al-Rāwiyyah and Nābiyī al-Šaibānī to his brother Yazid (see e.g. Aghānī V 166 and VI 152 respectively).

83 See e.g. Shīr, pp. 367 f.; Aghānī XXI 165; Ḥdskimiyat I 183–85.

84 Aghānī I 148. See also p. 112 above.

85 Autograph copies must have been available since the caliph ordered the poet's tongue and hand cut off, but the order could not be executed because the poet escaped from prison and went into hiding (Aghānī XV 114 f.; Ḥumāb, pp. 268 f.).

86 Aghānī XV 116 f., 121; Ḥdskimiyat II 183; Zubādī, p. 278.

87 Aghānī V 166 f. and XX 174 f.; Ibn Kathīrī X 206 f. (= trans. I 471 f.).

88 Jāḥiṣ, Buγān I 372 f.; Aghānī XVI 113; Qurnāshī, p. 35; 'Umdah I 56.

89 Jāḥiṣ, Buγān I 308: 'Umdah I 66 f., which uses the term 'āṣrāh (cf. Shīr, p. 5 and 'Umdah I 66 f., which uses the term 'āṣrāh and gives Ibn Rabiḥ's comment on its literary significance). Abū 'Amr's earlier attitude was quite different, as indicated by Asma'ī's report that he had studied for ten years under Abū 'Amr without having heard him cite a single Islamic verse as bijjah, i.e. authoritative (Jāḥiṣ, Buγān I 308). Furthermore, Abū 'Amr's earlier opinion, as expressed to Abū 'Ubaydah, was that the contemporary poets were at best no more than imitators and at worst originators of abominable poetry: (Aghānī XVI 113). See Ibn Kathīrī I 513 (= trans. II 451) for a different version which reads

90 For instance, he imprisoned Farazdaq for his praise of Ḥasan ibn 'All, better known as Zain al-'Abidīn, during the pilgrimage of the year 90/709 (Aghānī XIX 40 f.; Ibn Kathīrī X 394 f. [trans. III 621 f.]). He resented the allegiance of both Ḥammād al-Rāwiyyah and Nābiyī al-Šaibānī to his brother Yazid (see e.g. Aghānī V 166 and VI 152 respectively).

91 Marāṭib, pp. 21–23, 39 f.
became increasingly interested in Islamic poetry, and their personal views of the respective merits of the poets of the Umayyad period, particularly Akhtal, Jarir, and Farazdaq, formed the basis of a comparatively more objective view of Islamic poetry as a whole and of its relation to the pre-Islamic product. We find, for instance, the linguist and poet Ibn Munadhîr, an admirer of 'Adî ibn Zaid al-Ibadi, whom he took for a model, cautioning Abû Ūbahdah to judge his poetry and that of 'Adî not by its period but on its merit. A new turn to the controversy over the relative merits of the "ancients" and the "moderns" developed as Islamic poetry presently found advocates in such critics as Jumâhi, Jahiz, and Ibn Qutaibah. Furthermore, the activities of Ḥammâd al-Râwiyah and Muṣafâd al-Muḥammad al-Dâbî in collecting and preserving some at least of the earlier poetry, reinforced by the collections of the Kūfîn Abû 'Amr al-Shaibânî and his followers, supplied much of the material for a nascent scheme but hardly yet for a theory of literary criticism. Nevertheless, these scholars and their contemporaries provided much of the source material for the increasingly complex and comprehensive commentaries of the third century and after for the diwâns of both pre-Islamic and Islamic poets.

MODES OF EARLY LITERARY CRITICISM

I

We had occasion in connection with Document 3 to discuss at some length the basic characteristics of Arabic secular prose as illustrated in the categories of public speaking and descriptive composition from the eve of Islam to about the mid-second/mid-eighth century (see pp. 56-78). The linguistic and stylistic qualities which were generally accepted throughout that period were precision, clarity, economy of words, and a sense of rhythm. That these same qualities were demanded in other types of prose literature can be readily seen from a liberal sampling of the speeches and aphorisms of the Christian Quss ibn Sâ' idah of Najrân, whom Muḥammad and Abû Bakr were said to have heard in Suq 'Ukkâz, and from the sermons and sayings on many phases of life that were accepted as his and came to be admired in early Islamic times. Though he was confused with an earlier legendary figure, Quss's aphorisms and literary style were referred to in proverbially superlative terms. From the samplings of prose literature, other than

92 Aghâni XVII 12: "الله وحكم بين شعري وشعر عدي بن زيد ولا تقول ذاك جاهلي وهذا محدث فحكم بين المصريين ولكن حكم بين الشعرين وحكم المصريين实用性. See ibid. XVII 15 and 27 f. for further relationship between Ibn Munadhîr and Abû 'Ubâdhah. Ibn Munadhîr was rebuffed by Khalâf al-Ahmad for comparing himself to the ranking classical poets (ibid. XVII 11 f.). For Asma'il's opinion of this 'Adî ibn Zaid see Puhâtât al-shâ'ârâ', p. 494. For the life and times of 'Adî see OIP L 5 f., 13.

93 See Jumâhi, Intro. pp. 15 f. and 21 f.

94 Jahiz, as usual, saw the two sides of the controversy. He gave due recognition to the "ancients" but denied the concept that they could not be surpassed or even equaled: "كُلُّ الْجَاحِزَةِ مَا عَلَى آنِسِي أَشَرٍ مَّعْ قَرْنٍ مَا تَرَكْ الأَوْلِيَاءِ" (Khâfî's I 190 f.);

95 Shi'r, pp. 5 f.; see also n. 205 on p. 101 above and Abû Ḥātim al-Sijistânî, Kitâb al-mu'ammârin (Goldziher, Abhandlungen zur arabischen Philologie II) pp. 122-74, esp. pp. 143-74.

96 Aghâni XVII 27 f.; see also n. 205 on p. 101 above and Abû Ḥātim al-Sijistânî, Kitâb al-mu'ammârin, pp. 276; Baihaqi, pp. 351-56, 426; 'Iqd II 254 and IV 128; Aghâni XIV 41-43; Anwâr II 39 f.; Tha'âlibî, Thimîrî, pp. 94 f., 99, 185; 'Askari, Maṣāfîn, p. 179; Ibn 'Askirî, Ihkât al-Sharî'ah 197. Fikrist, p. 63, mentions Ibn Durustawâli's Shrâr Quss ibn Sâ' idah, which has survived in four folios; see Arthur J. Arberry (ed.), The Chester Beatty Library: A Handbook of the Arabic Manuscripts VII (Dublin, 1964) 181, No. 8498 (8).

97 See e.g. Abû al-Râbî'în ibn 'Iâd al-Ḥanâdhanî, Kitâb al-alâfiz al-khitâbîyih, ed. Louis Cheikho (Beirût, 1913) p. 298: "كَتَبَ الْجَبَّارُ مَا عَلَى آنِسِي أَشَرٍ مَّعْ قَرْنٍ مَا تَرَكْ الأَوْلِيَاءِ" (see also Abû Ḥâtim al-Sijistânî, Kitâb al-mu'ammârin, p. 76); Musâ'âdî, I 133 f.; ٌ"كُلُّ الْجَاحِزَةِ مَا عَلَى آنِسِي أَشَرٍ مَّعْ قَرْنٍ مَا تَرَكْ الأَوْلِيَاءِ". Tha'âlibî, Thimîrî, pp. 94 f., repeat these two proverbs and adds three more beginning with 'أَعْلَى أَطْلَقَ" and اَثْبَتَ" respectively. Mailânî, Al-majmû'a al-anwârî I 117 has "أَعْلَى أَطْلَقَ" (see also Diyâ' al-Dîn Nâṣîr Allâh ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ṭâhir, Al-jami' al-kabîr, pp. 73 f.)
A BEDOUIN’S OPINION OF JARIR’S POETRY

descriptions of maidens and women, of such stylists as ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ, Ṣa‘ṣa‘ah ibn Ṣāḥib, Aḥnaf ibn Qais, Ibn al-Qirriyāh, and Khālid ibn Ṣafwān—all cited in connection with Document 3—it is clear that the basic literary qualities that were admired by the first generation of Muslims continued to be admired into early ‘Abbāsid times. For apart from the leading Umayyad secretarial essayists, namely the Arab ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd ibn Yāḥyā and the Persian Ibn al-Muqaffa’, whose essays reflected Persian influence in practice and style, none made an effort to develop a formal system of literary critique of prose during this period. Their contemporaries were, for the most part, content to follow the taste and example of the eloquent among the Bedouins, as Khālid ibn Ṣafwān expressly affirmed.98

Turning our attention now to pre-‘Abbāsid Islamic poetry, we again find no system of formal literary critique in the period under consideration. Nevertheless, there are some patterns that indicate a reaching-out for forms of criticism and a number of individual statements by scholars and poets that were meaningful enough to form collectively a tentative base for a later theory of literary criticism. This development was to be expected in view of the longer history of Arabic poetry and the fact that there was much greater preoccupation with poetry than with prose, alike on the part of rulers and rebels, linguists and literary scholars, and the cultured and affluent upper classes. There was, therefore, greater incentive for the poets of the period to produce and to compete for the power, prestige, and economic rewards that the imperial and provincial courts and high society held out to them, especially to the forerunners among them. The role of the early Islāmic linguists as literary critics has received considerable attention from modern scholars while that of the professional poets has been comparatively neglected, no doubt, in part at least because of the belief that literary critics made poor poets and poets made poor literary critics. Despite the several grains of truth in this concept, there are exceptions, more perhaps in the case of poets than in the case of scholar-critics.99 Furthermore, except for Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alā’, the period under consideration produced no philologists who were deeply involved with the literary criticism of poetry. But it did produce many master poets, some of whom were vocal critics of their fellow professionals and at times ventured or were prodded into self-criticism. The subjective element in their criticism could hardly have been avoided in a society marked by tribal, political, and religious rivalry, from which the poets’ patrons and the scholar-critics also were not exempt. Therefore, in order to examine the role of poets in early literary criticism, we present the texts of representative statements from several leading poets of the Umayyad period, selected to give a closer view of both the continuity with the past and the emergence of new approaches to and modes of poetry criticism. Analysis of these and similar statements in the light of the earliest extant work on the subject, namely Aṣma’ī’s Fuḥūlat al-shu’arā’, should enable us to relate to models and theories of Arabic literary criticism of the third/ninth century and after.

Oral literary criticism of Arabic poetry dates back to pre-Islāmic times and antedates that of prose. For our purpose we need to go no farther back than the eve of Islām. Accounts of poets’ contests held in Ṣaq ‘Ukkāz name the winner but tell us little or nothing of the bases on which the contests were judged. The judge was usually a sage or a poet, or he combined the two functions as in the case of Hind bint al-Khuss, who was tested in both prose and poetry (see p. 64). More fruitful is the account of a contest presided over by the poet Nābighah al-Dhubyanī, who ranked A’shā Maimūn and the poetess Khansa’ ahead of the still heathen Hassan ibn Thābit. Hassan challenged the verdict and demanded to know the basis on which it was made. Nābighah’s answer is reported in two accounts, one that traces back through Aṣma’ī to Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alā’ and a somewhat fuller one whose isnād goes no farther back than Ibn Qutaibah and

98 Jāḥīz, Bayānī 1 184 (see also n. 239 on p. 74 above); Adab al-Shāfi‘ī, pp. 316 f. Jāḥīz, Bayānī 1 102 gives a number of definitions for balāghah.
99 Khalaf al-Ḥumayr, for example, was considered a good scholar-critic and poet while his famous contemporaries Khalil ibn Ahmad and Aṣma’ī were credited with little or no poetic ability (see p. 97, n. 158).
includes Khansa’s protest against Nabighah for allowing sex discrimination to influence his decision. Ibn Qutaibah’s account as reported in the Aghani of Abu al-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī reads as follows:

An nabiyya bint Dīban kānā qasīr bi-qa’id min aḥad bi-sūq a ṣawāq jisṣa bihā fī al-ḥassān bīn Naṭīb. Wādha bi-al-aḍwār wa-adhā khuṣūrū wa-al-ḥassān iṣḥādū ḍa’id bihiyyu a’lam bi-sūq a ṣawāq ḍa’id bihiyyu a’lam bi-sūq a ṣawāq. 

Wādha bi-al-aḍwār wa-adhā khuṣūrū wa-al-ḥassān iṣḥādū ḍa’id bihiyyu a’lam bi-sūq a ṣawāq ḍa’id bihiyyu a’lam bi-sūq a ṣawāq. 

Wādha bi-al-aḍwār wa-adhā khuṣūrū wa-al-ḥassān iṣḥādū ḍa’id bihiyyu a’lam bi-sūq a ṣawāq ḍa’id bihiyyu a’lam bi-sūq a ṣawāq.

Hassan was envious of Nabighah’s poetry and the rich rewards it brought him from Nu’man ibn al-Mundhir (see e.g. Qurashi, pp. 27 f.). For a more recent appreciation of Nabighah, see Abd Allah Abd al-Jabbar and Muhammad ‘Abd al-Mun’im Khafaja, Qismat al-adab fi al-Hijaz (Cairo, 1377/1958) pp. 392-406, 637-74.

The manuscript collection of Mr. H. P. Kraus of New York contains a 2nd/8th-century papyrus fragment (No. P129) written in small but fine Kufic script and consisting of a 7-versed ode of Khansa in praise and mourning for her brother Sakhr. This short ode with some variation is found in the sources but sometimes with a verse or two missing or a verse added.

Note in particular Nabighah’s specific and factual criticism, point by point, of Hassan’s poor choice of words, his lack of emphasis on pride of ancestry, and his failure to use sufficiently strong hyperbole in heroic poetry.

Our next specimen comes from the time of ‘Abdah ibn al-Tabib, who, along with Zuhair ibn Abi Sulmā, was favored by ‘Umar I. ‘Umar was himself a knowledgeable and respected critic of contemporary poetry though both he and Abū Bakr, among other leading Companions, favored and cited only such verses as were compatible with Islam. Before their conversion to Islam, ‘Abdah and several of his fellow Tamīmite poets would gather for a festive outing with wine flowing freely. After all had recited some of their poetry, they would call for an exchange of candid opinions or seek a verdict on the respective merits of their verses from any knowledgeable person present. Their opinions, particularly that of ‘Abdah, are of interest, despite their subjectivity, for their frankness, for their positive as well as their negative approach, and for the literary quality of their brief yet succinct prose with its household and desert similes. These characteristics emerge despite the lapse of time and the different versions available. Some versions are

100 For the account that traces back to Abu ‘Amir see Muwashshah, pp. 60 f., and see also Aghānī IX 103; for Ibn Qutaibah’s account see Shi’r, pp. 197 f., and Aghānī VIII 194 f. See also Amālī III 118 and Khisānī III 432. Muwashshah, p. 60, records Sīlī’s admiration of Nabighah’s critical acumen:
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100 For the account that traces back to Abu ‘Amir see Muwashshah, pp. 60 f., and see also Aghānī IX 103; for Ibn Qutaibah’s account see Shi’r, pp. 197 f., and Aghānī VIII 194 f. See also Amālī III 118 and Khisānī III 432. Muwashshah, p. 60, records Sīlī’s admiration of Nabighah’s critical acumen:

101 Jahiz, Baydāʾ I 243 f.; Aghānī IX 162; Thuʿālibī, Ḥijāz, p. 41. See Maseidīr, pp. 204-14, for the lively interest of ‘Umar I and his contemporaries in poetry.
condensed, others are composite accounts, while still others include transmitter's or author's comments, mostly glosses, and most are well fortified with multiple isnađ's. Abū al-Farāj al-Iṣfahānī's account, which traces back to Asmā' ibn Ḥabīb, Muḥammad ibn al-ʿAbbās and other members of the Yazīdi family, reads as follows:

And Marzubānī's account, with other isnađ's, reads:

And Ḥuṣairah (d. 30 or 59 or 69 AH.), because of his roving life, sharp tongue, and unsociable personality, was not disposed to lengthy discourses on poetry or any other subject. He displayed considerable originality and spent much time polishing his odes to achieve the high degree of uniform

\[102\] For these two accounts see Aḥānī XII 44 (= Aḥānī [1927–] XIII 107 f.) and Muwaṣšah, pp. 75 f., respectively. See also Is̱bāh III 199 f. For some of 'Abdah's poems see e.g. Shi'r, pp. 456 f., and Muṣaffāt al-Īdārāt I 268-304 and 575, II 92-104. For 2nd-century evaluation of 'Abdah as a poet see e.g. Jaljīz, Bayān II 362 f., and Aḥānī XVIII 163 f.

proficiency on account of which he and several other poets were characterized as the “slaves of poetry” and their poetry was faulted by Asma'ī and others for its monotony of labored excellence. Hūtā'ah, despite his mercenary motives, was so wholly involved with his art that he is credited with statements in verse and prose that reflect his thoughts on the temperament and effort needed to produce and preserve effective and accurate poetry. He expressed his fourfold classification of poets in verse:

الشعراء فاعل من أربعة فأطاره لرتبة فنهم
واطور البكاء وسطًا فيهم واسع جريء ولا يفر منهم
وشاعر ينشد بأمره يحيه فيده

We have a dramatic account from Abū 'Ubaidah of Hūtā'ah's deathbed scene, when, despite the urgings of those around him to express his last wishes and prepare to meet his God, he persisted in reciting verses from some of the best poets and concluded with his own verses

الشعر صعب وطول سلمه
والشعر لا ي يتمه من ضلته
إذا أثرتي فيه الذي لا يظلمه
يريد أن يعرفه في بعجمه

and added:

We turn next to Ba'ith, who ranked high among his contemporaries and among later critics as both orator and poet. His bold but well founded and point-by-point criticisms of older and well established poets, including Akhtal, Jarir, and Farazdaq, won the admiration of Walid I and his half-brother Maslamah. For the young but stout-hearted poet referred to his professional elders desirously. He called Farazdaq a fool and Jarir a dog, playing on the latter's tribal affiliation. He spoke desirously of the Christian Akhtal's faith and called Ibn Eumailah a betrayer of his own brother. He displayed precise knowledge of weaknesses in their verses that not only missed their aim but boomeranged on points of literary or moral defect in each instance. Walid I was both surprised and pleased and rewarded Ba‘ith well. We read as follows:

وكتب إلى أحمد بن عبد العزيز أخبرنا عمر أن شيخ قال بقال انه اجتمع على باب الوليد بن عبد الملك الفزدق وجريء والانطخل والبيث والاشبة بن زميلة فدخل عليه داخل فقال يا أمير المؤمنين لقد اجتمع على بابك شراءما لمتهم على باب الملك قبل ثم ساهم فأفرزق فأطاشه واحفة ثم أمر بالياين فأدخلوا وأخر البيت فتقبل له في البيث فقال ليس كهؤلاء فقبل ما هو بدوين فأمر به فأدخل ثم استطاع فقال يا أمير المؤمنين من أن حضرك نظرا أنت انا قد مضم في أملاUSTERED AND JUDEAIZED AND THEN ADDED

104 Jāhiz, Bayān I 210 f. and II 8–13; Muzhir II 498. See also Goldziher in ZDMG XLVI 42 and Goldziher, Abhandlungen zur arabischen Philologie I (Leiden, 1896) 129–34.
105 See Jāhiz, Bayān II 2, editor's note. For other contemporary and later fourfold classifications of poets see e.g., Jāhiz, Bayān II 8 f., 'Umdah I 72–74, and Muzhir II 489–91.
106 Aghānī II 59; 'Umdah I 74; Muzhir II 490.
107 Jāhiz, Bayān I 210 f. and III 372 f.; Shi‘r, p. 313; 'Umdah I 67 f.
The literary-minded Prince Maslamah once asked Ba’ith to name the best poets of the Arabs. Ba’ith replied in bold and far from complimentary terms naming Jarir and Farazdaq and the two sons of Kumailah, Ashhab and Zabab, as the best poets of the time but again pointed out specific weaknesses in some of their verses that he himself would not have been glad to have said, not even for love of a fortune in camels. We read:

The next poet to draw our attention in respect to modes of early literary criticism is the part-Negro slave Nuṣaib, who first came into public view when his owner’s family in the Hijaz, on discovering his talent for poetry, decided to sell him. For they feared that he would address erotic verses to their women or satirize their men and so bring shame and dishonor to all of them. The young Nuṣaib wished to have
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Abd al-'Aziz ibn Marwan, then governor of Egypt, for his owner and patron. He therefore made his way to that governor's palace and recited verses in his praise but refrained from accepting the prize of 1,000 dinars, pointing out that he as a slave was not entitled to prizes. There followed a dramatic slave-market scene in which Nuṣaib was being auctioned. From an initial bid of 50 (or 30) dinars for the man as a laborer, his price rose steadily as his specific abilities for taking good care of weapons and of camels were enumerated and finally reached 1,000 dinars, bid by 'Abd al-'Aziz' agent as Nuṣaib's ability to compose poetry in perfect form was mentioned. Thus began a mutually rewarding relationship between royal patron and emancipated poet. Nevertheless, the patronage of 'Abd al-'Aziz and of several other members of the royal family after him did not suffice to remove the stigma of Nuṣaib's black color, particularly among contemporary poets competing for the same royal patronage. The first such poet to belittle Nuṣaib because of his color was Aiman ibn Khuraim, early in the eighth decade of Islam and in the presence of 'Abd al-'Aziz himself. Asked by the governor what he thought of the poetry of Nuṣaib, Aiman replied pointedly that Nuṣaib was the best poet of all of the color of his skin. Enraged by this remark, 'Abd al-'Aziz retorted "by Allah he is a better poet than you are." Aiman, resentful of Nuṣaib and realizing that he himself was no longer welcome, requested that he be allowed to join the governor's brother Bishr ibn Marwan, then governor of Ḥiraq (71-74/690-93), and the request was granted. This episode did not deter other poets, including Jarlr and Farazdaq, from expressing the same opinion later, but it did encourage Nuṣaib to resort to 'Abd al-'Aziz' reply to Aiman and, further, to claim superiority over all. This color prejudice once caused Prince Sulaimān, to whom 'Abd al-'Aziz had commended Nuṣaib for protection, to dismiss Farazdaq without reward at the same time that Nuṣaib received a handsome prize, which in turn led the indignant Farazdaq to improvise the verse

\[ \text{ورش الشعر ما قال العييد} \]

as he departed. Kuthaiyir, himself physically unprepossessing, composed the verses

\[ \text{وان كان مظلوما له و جهل ظالما} \]

\[ \text{وان ابن الحجاء في الناس جائزا} \]

\[ \text{ولا تراه على ما لا حечен من سواده} \]

to express his reaction to Nuṣaib's color and features. Nuṣaib himself, when he was among well-wishers, was not reluctant to refer to his color and low origin. When 'Abd al-'Aziz wished to include him in his inner circle of companions, the poet drew attention to these in terms that outdid Kuthaiyir's two verses:

\[ \text{فان رأيته ان لا تفرق بينها فاعقل} \]

111 Jumahi, pp. 546 f.: \text{هل} \text{هل
When 'Abd al-Malik took Nusaib to task for his infrequent visits he replied that he, a black slave, was not fit company for kings and when he was offered some drink (nabūdīḥ) he refused it saying that he would not have his intellect, through which he had attained to the caliph's company, destroyed by drink. He concluded with some verses on color as against ability and character.

Nusaib was intelligent enough to understand the racial and class prejudices of the Arab society of his day. He considered it the better part of wisdom not to protest loudly against these prejudices nor yet to challenge them, preferring instead to conduct himself with dignity and make the best of his situation. His attitude and conduct fit well the sober man’s idea of the intelligent and wise man. For he refrained from satire, wishing, as he said, neither to dishonor the noble nor to blackmail the mean and hence be himself more deserving of satire. Again, except when pointedly goaded, he refrained from claiming superiority over all other poets, as many of his contemporaries were quick to do, though he did hold a high opinion of himself. He did have preferences for and opinions of some of these poets. For instance, he preferred Jarir to Farazdaq. When asked to give an opinion on his fellow Hijazian poets in comparison to himself, he did so briefly: “Jamil is our imām (in poetry), and 'Umar ibn Abī Rabī'ah is our best descriptive poet of the mistresses of the curtained canopies, and Kuthaiyir is quickest to move one to tears about beautiful but lowly women and is our best in the praise of kings. And as for me, I say what you have heard.”

Unlike Nusaib, Kuthaiyir, despite his own physical handicaps, was bolder and more vocal in his criticism of his fellow Hijazian poets, most of whom conceded his poetic superiority, as did also 'Abd al-Malik and even at one time Wālid I and still later several literary critics. We have some quite lengthy accounts that tell of Kuthaiyir's self-confidence, professional pride, and critical competence. In an encounter with 'Umar ibn Abī Rabī'ah, Aḥwās, and Nusaib, Kuthaiyir displayed intimate knowledge of the poetry of all three as he quoted first some of each poet's commendable verses and then verses illustrating each poet's weaknesses. He thus humiliated and silenced each poet in turn as he criticized both the form and the content of verses on the very themes in which each poet was supposed to excel. The several versions of this episode, some of them composite accounts, are too lengthy to reproduce here. But Kuthaiyir's bases and methods of literary criticism are equally well-illustrated in a comparatively brief account of his encounter with the Syrian poet 'Adī ibn al-Riqā' at the court of Wālid I. 'Adī recited his ode in praise of Wālid in which he referred also to his own labored method of composition and asserted that because of his professional self-sufficiency he had no need to seek further knowledge from

\[\text{\textsuperscript{117} Amāli III 128:} \text{أنا أسود البشر في الحب المنطدة وأنا وصلت إلي جلالة أمير المومنين يعني فان رأى أمير المومنين أن لا يدخل عليه ما يجلبه تمناه فإنه يذهب عليه وصوله (Iqd II 247). That a man is not to be judged by his color is implied by a saying of the Prophet: كرم الرجل دينه وروأه عليه وحسن خلقه.} \]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{118} Iqd II 240:} \text{أدع أمجاء علمني كلما أجوم كريما فأستم والهناء ليما طلب ما عندن فإني أمت الذي أمت الطيبين إلى الاسم (see Aghānī I 137 and 142 for somewhat different versions).} \]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{119} Jumāhī, p. 545:} \text{ادع أمجاء علمني كلما أجوم كريما فأستم والهناء ليما طلب ما عندن فإني أمت الذي أمت الطيبين إلى الاسم (see Aghānī I 137 and 142 for somewhat different versions).} \]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{120} Jumāhī, p. 348.} \]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{121} Aghānī VII 63.} \]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{122} Aghānī I 142 (= Aghānī[1927—]]) I 355):} \text{مَثِيلُ أمانة ومرتين أبي ربيه إوفدنا لربت الجان وكيتير إيتكنا على الدين ودنا يباولا. But Muwashshāhah, p. 205, has cùng إتَّمسَكَنا،} \text{اجتمعنا طوال وابن أبي ربيه إلتكنا واناقة. We have some quite lengthy accounts that tell of Kuthaiyir's self-confidence, professional pride, and critical competence.} \]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{123} See e.g. Mubarrad, pp. 320-22, and Muwashshāhah, pp. 162-64; Iqd V 372 f. gives a shorter version. See Tha'labī, Ijāz, pp. 44 f., for some of the best representative verses of the three poets.} \]
others. Kuthaiyir challenged and silenced ‘Adî on these points. Abû al-Faraj al-Îsfahânî’s account reads as follows:

Verses from the above-mentioned ode of ‘Adî are frequently cited, particularly the three that Kuthaiyir criticized but usually without reference to the latter’s criticisms. Nevertheless, the technical terms in these verses and Kuthaiyir’s reaction to them have significant bearing on the use and interpretation of these and related technical terms in the formative stages of Arabic literary criticism.

‘Abd al-Malik was much impressed with the sensitive and magical qualities of Kuthaiyir’s poetry, which he frequently recited and of which he had a copy that was used for the instruction of the princes. ‘Abd al-Malik sent Kuthaiyir to ‘Iraq during the governorship of Bishr ibn Marwân to recite some of his tribal and politically oriented poems in the congregational mosques of Başrah and Kufah. The poet was given a cool reception by the Iraqi scholars and poets, who considered all Hijazi poetry inferior to the ‘Iraqi product. But Kuthaiyir was wary enough, then and later under Yazid II, to resist satirical entanglement with any of the ‘Iraqî poets, let alone with either Jarlr or Farazdaq, both of whom were his contemporaries.

125 See also Marzûqî I 4 f., 9 and 12 f. on the two types of poets.
126 See e.g. ibid, p. 248 f.) ‘Adî would be classified as a ‘mutakallim’ rather than a ‘matbu’, i.e., as a slavish craftsman rather than a natural-born poet (see e.g. Shi’r, p. 17). See also Marzûqî I 4 f., 9 and 12 f. on the two types of poets.
127 For the whole ode of 38 verses see Nuwairî IV 246–50. On the basis of verses 10, 18, and 21 (ibid. pp. 248 f.) ‘Adî would have been classified as a ‘mutakallim’ rather than a ‘matbu’, i.e., as a slavish craftsman rather than a natural-born poet (see e.g. Shi’r, p. 17). See also Marzûqî I 4 f., 9 and 12 f. on the two types of poets.
128 See e.g. Qudamah, Intro, pp. 20 f., 34 f., 43 f. and text pp. 109–11; Qudamah (1963) pp. 209–12. See also n. 111 on p. 128 above.
129 As did the poet’s family (Aghânî VIII 30).
130 Ibid. VIII 36. See also n. 156 on p. 156 below.
131 See also n. 111 on p. 128 above.
133 As did the poet’s family (Aghânî VIII 30).
134 Ibid. VIII 36. See also n. 156 on p. 156 below.
135 Ibid. VIII 30 f.; Jumâbî, p. 377.
137 See e.g. ibid., p. 542.
A BEDOUIN’S OPINION OF JARİR’S POETRY

whom had at one time or another commented on the weakness of Hijazi poetry. The same criticism was used against Kuthaiyir’s poetry by Alkhtal and ‘Adi.

Most of the leading poets of the Umayyad period proclaimed their own superiority over their contemporary fellow poets. The claim was based more often than not on one or two of a given poet’s own verses—a basis used also, as seen above, by contemporary and later literary critics. More interesting are claims of superiority based on specific qualities or characteristics of a poet’s whole output, whether stated matter-of-factly or figuratively. Ra‘i, for instance, claimed general superiority over his uncle in the following terms: انك تقول البيت وابن اخي وقول البيت وابن عم

Ibn Qutaibah explained “a verse and its paternal cousin” as

Ru‘bah ibn al-‘Ajjaj asserted his superiority over his son ‘Ubqah because the latter’s poetry had no companion, in explanation of which Ibn Qutaibah added

Still later we find Mubarrad preferring the poetry of Farazdaq to that of Jarîr because “Farazdaq produces a verse and its brother, while Jarîr produces a verse and its paternal uncle.” Thus, while both the syntactical and the conceptual independence of each verse of Arabic poetry as complete in itself has long been widely recognized, the early emphasis on the various degrees of the conceptual interrelationship of consecutive verses has been for the most part overlooked by students of the early history of Arabic literary criticism.

Such interrelationship did not imply that a given verse should depend on the next verse for the completion of its basic meaning. The distinction is illustrated in Majnûn Lailâ’s verses

that were recited by Abû ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alâ to Jarîr on his return from Syria. These two verses so affected Jarîr in ‘Irâq that he exclaimed that were it not unseemly for an old man like himself to shout for joy he would let out a scream that would be heard by Hishân on his throne in Syria. Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihi commented that these verses would be considered among the most subtle and elegant of poetry were it not for the tadmm, that is, the dependence of the first verse on the second for completion of its meaning, and then he cited the single verse of ‘Abbâs ibn al-Aljmâf

131 See e.g. Aghânî I 71 f. and Muwashshab, pp. 202 f., for Jarîr’s comment on the poetry of ‘Umâr ibn Abî Râbi‘ah:

132 See Fuhulat al-shu‘arâ, pp. 502 f., and Mubarrad, p. 322, for similar statements and explanations in somewhat different terms.

133 See Aghânî VIII 183. From all of the comments cited it is clear that the ‘Irâqis and the Syrians considered Hijazi poetry inferior because, as they claimed, its thinness of substance and its insipidity rendered it dull and unappealing.

134 See Qudânah, Intro. pp. 10 f. and text pp. 73-75 (= Qudânah [1963] pp. 154-56), under the somewhat related terms حمّة الفصيحة and حمّة الفعيلة (see also ’Uwdâh II 28-31 and Marzûq I 18).
as conveying the full meaning of the two verses of Majnūn Lailā. Ibn Qutaibah’s account adds a second verse of ‘Ābās ibn al-‘Aḥnaf

Ibn Qutaibah’s account adds a second verse of ‘Ābās ibn al-‘Aḥnaf and his two verses could be considered as illustrative of consecutive verses that are as closely related as are a person and his brother, nephew, or paternal cousin. The closer the relationship of two consecutive verses, the better is the poetry.

II

That Umayyad and later literary critics agreed that Akhtal, Jarir, and Farazdaq were the leading poets of the Umayyad period but could not arrive at a generally acceptable relative ranking for them is a fact too well known to detain us here. And we need not dwell on the numerous occasions when each of the three poets claimed superiority over one or both of the other two on the basis of only one or a few of their verses. What does interest us at this point is the self-appraisal and mutual criticism of these three poets among others on the basis of the over-all characterization of their poetry, particularly as to meaningful content and forceful effectiveness. We read, for instance, that Akhtal on being asked by Prince ‘Umar, son of Walīd I, who was the best of poets answered “who when he praises exalts and when he satirizes debases” and on being ordered to name three such poets named A’shā Maimūn, Ṭārafaḥ ibn al-‘Abd, and himself in that order. Akhtal’s statement reflects his admiration of the two earlier classical poets and his own pride in the effectiveness of his praise of the Umayyads and his satires first of the Ansār and later of Jarir and the Banū Kulaib among others. Jarir and his admirers used the same criterion, claiming that Jarir’s praise of his lowly father raised him up while his satires of Rā’ī and others debased them. Farazdaq considered himself no less forceful in his panegyrics and more than a match for any other in his satires. He claimed that he and Jarir had the same demon but that this demon spoke more wickedly through his tongue than through Jarir’s. And, inasmuch as such wickedness was usually expressed in extremely vulgar and vituperative verse, it rendered Farazdaq on the whole more feared rather than more appreciated than Jarir and Akhtal. Soon after Akhtal and Farazdaq had joined forces against Jarir, they

142 See *Iqd* V 378 for the entire episode, including Ibn ‘Abd Rabbīhi’s comment:

وَهَا مِن أَرْقَمَ الْشَّعرَ كُلَّهُ وَلَمْ يَهْزَمْهُ أَيُّهَا الْأَشْهَرُ الَّذِي نَفْسِنَا إِنْ كَيْنَتْ الْلِّبْوَى مَعَالَفَةً بَالْيِتْنَانِ لَا يُضَامَنَّهُ أَيُّهَا الْمَالَمُ، أَيُّوَا مَعَهُ الْبَيْتِ

See *Umdah* II 68-72 for discussion and illustrations of *tajmīn*.

143 See *Uyun* III 78, which cites all four verses with some variants but with no comments. See also *ibid.* IV 139; *Shi’r*, pp. 363, 525; *Aghānī* VIII 21; Ibn al-Mu’tazz, *Ṭabaqṭ* p. 255.

144 See e.g. *Aghānī* VII 177, where Akhtal claims superiority in panegyric, satire, and erotica on the basis of two and three verses in each category. See Qurashi, p. 36, where Akhtal and Farazdaq claim over-all superiority, yet each concedes he could not match some few verses of some other poet. See *Muwashshah*, p. 136, where Akhtal is faced by his critics with four serious errors, and *ibid.* p. 131, where Jarir is reported to have acknowledged the superiority of Akhtal’s one verse answer to a verse of his own but then recited a second verse that he considered superior to the one verse of Akhtal; see our Document 6, comment on recto 8-13, for Jarir’s second verse.

145 See *Aghānī* VII 175: *الَّذِي أَذَا مَلَحَ رَأَى وَأَذَا حَمِيَّهُ رَضُوُّ* See Qurashi, p. 35, for Abū ‘Uṣayyish’s application of this critical approach to Akhtal, Jarir, and Farazdaq, and see Sāliḥīn, *Shi’r al-Akhtal*, pp. 345-48, for Akhtal’s opinion of himself.

146 *Aghānī* VII 88 f.

147 Thalālib, *Thimar*, p. 57: قال الفرزيق شهان جهير هو شهانه أَيُّهَا الآَنِ مِنِّي أَحْبَبْتُ (cf. *Aghānī* VII 15; Ḫibhīl I 59 f.). Abū al-Najm al-Ijzī considered his demon to be masculine and that of ‘Ajlājī to be feminine (*Aghānī* IX 79).

148 *Aghānī* VII 178 draws attention to Akhtal’s greater meanness couched, however, in less offensive terms.
expressed admiration for each other not only in their 
naqā‘īd but in their personal relationships.\footnote{Aghdānī VII 178 reports that Akhtal, on first recognizing Farazdaq, knelt in admiration and Farazdaq followed suit (see also Sāḥibānī, Shīr al-Akhtal, p. 354, and references and comment in n. 150 below). Aghdānī XIV 98 states that Farazdaq knelt on hearing a verse of Labīd recited in a mosque and when questioned on this said: أَتَّمْتُ تَعْمَرَ سَيْغَةً عِنْدَ أَبِيَ وَلَا يُنَبِّئُنِي لَهُ بَعْضُ الْقُرآنِ وَأَنَا عُرِفْتُ الْقُرآنِ بِالْكُلُّ الْبَاَيِم. But see *Fusūl al-ash'arā‘*, p. 498, for Asma‘s doubts about the quality of Labīd’s poetry, an opinion that must be reflected in the change in Labīd’s poetry and in the elegies of Ḥassān ibn Thābit after their conversion to Islām (*Mawṣū‘ah*, 62: المُسْتَقْلِيُّ اِلَّيْهِ الْفُلُوكَةُ مَعَهُ يَحْنَبُهُ بَلْ يَنْفِنُ لَهُ اِلَّيْهِ اِلِّيْهِ وَلَا يَنْفِنُهُ بَلْ يَتَحَلَّلُهُ صِفَا مِنْهَا وَلَا يَتَحَلَّلُهُ صِفَا مِنْهَا.)}

Though they continued to proclaim their own superiority over Jarīr, they agreed, in a moment of truth and mollified by drink and recitation of their own poetry, that Jarīr excelled them in the ready and smooth flow of his verses, which were apt and gained quick and widespread appeal among high and low society. Akhtal pointed out further that his own satire, which he considered superior to that of Jarīr and others, was transmitted by only the few who were wise in the art of poetry. The complete account which follows\footnote{Aghdānī VII 186 f. (*= Aghdānī [1927———] VII 317 f.) gives the most detailed account of this episode, on the authority of Abī Muḥammad al-Yaqqūl, and it is condensed in *Mawṣū‘ah*, pp. 131 and 140. *Umdah* II 146 f. gives a fragmented account with no ṭanīd, in which direct reference to Farazdaq is missing but which ends with the words: فَلَمْ يَقُولُوا وَأَنَا عُرِفْتُ الْقُرآنِ لِيَحْنَبُهُ بَلْ يَتَحَلَّلُهُ صِفَا مِنْهَا وَلَا يَتَحَلَّلُهُ صِفَا مِنْهَا. Sec also Sāli‘, *Akbār Abī Tamū‘ān*, ed. Khalīl Maḥmūd ‘Asākir al-‘al. (*Cairo, 1356/1937*) pp. 219 f., where Jarīr renews his widespread popularity with the public (cf. pp. 116 and 119 above).} reveals the full extent of the admiration of Akhtal and Farazdaq for each other.

The conversation between Akhtal and Farazdaq as recorded above amounts to an admission that Jarīr was more of a natural poet (*maṯbū‘*) than either of them and hence also more self-sufficient. And, in fact, their poetry though more polished is also more labored (*muṭakallaf*).\footnote{Kuthalīyī pointed out to ‘Adī ibn al-Rūqī that a natural-born poet would not have committed the errors that ‘Adī had in his verses (see Aghdānī VIII 184 and p. 129 above).} We have seen (p. 111) how Akhtal was annoyed when ‘Abd al-Malik was so greatly pleased with an ode which Jarīr had composed in a few days, while he himself had been working for a whole year on an ode in praise of that same caliph. Moreover, Akhtal received help from several poets in the composition of at least some of his satires against Jarīr. Furthermore, he is reported as saying: “We the poets are greater thieves than even the goldsmiths.”\footnote{*Mawṣū‘ah*, pp. 138 f., 141.} As for Farazdaq, he was reported as saying that there were times when it was harder for him
to compose a single verse than to have a tooth extracted. But he was adroit at lifting ideas from several ancient and contemporary poets and actually appropriated verses of several of his contemporaries. In fact, 'Asma'i considered that nine-tenths of Farazdaq's poetry was stolen as against only one half-verse stolen by Jarir, a statement to be suspected with respect to both poets. For though direct plagiarism was frowned on by all, the less obvious stealing of ideas (sirqat al-ma'ānī) to be expressed in one's own words in prose or verse was so ancient and widespread a practice that hardly an orator or a poet was not guilty of it. Controversial at first, the practice became tolerated among the "moderns" and even admired when a new expression of an old idea adorned with a new style in richer and more modern metaphorical speech was considered more effective. This type of plagiarism looms large in Arabic literary criticism and dovetails into the concept of literary originality, especially in respect to the bādi' poetry that had a good start with Bashshār ibn Burd and found its most effective champion in Ibn al-Mu'tazz and his Kitāb al-bādi'.

The statement most often cited on the respective merits of Jarir and Farazdaq is said to be Akhtal's comment, "Jarir draws from the sea and Farazdaq carves from stone." This comment has recently given rise to a controversy as to when, by whom, and where it was first used. One set of statements credits its first use not to Akhtal himself but to his son Mālik. Briefly, this view is based on a report that Akhtal in Syria, having heard of the reputation and rivalry of Jarir and Farazdaq in 'Iraq, sent his son to 'Iraq to listen to and appraise their poetry. On his return, the son's report (or perhaps only what has survived of it) consisted solely of the figurative statement cited above, on the basis of which Akhtal declared Jarir to be the better of the two poets. He then reinforced his verdict with his own two verses declaring his impartiality on the basis of what he had heard and elaborating on his verdict in other forceful figures of speech.
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153 Jāhiz, Bayān I 216; Aghānī XIX 36; 'Iqd V 327; 'Abdī Murūd, pp. 13; Mawṣelahāb, pp. 111 f.
154 Aghānī XIX 22; See also Mawṣelahāb, pp. 106-12, esp. p. 108.
155 In addition to Farazdaq's reputation for vituperative verse his very physique and appearance roused fear in his victims and opponents; see n. 205 on p. 142 below for a physical comparison of Jarir and Farazdaq.
156 Fuhūl al-shu'arā', p. 502. Marāḏī, p. 40, and Mawṣelahāb, pp. 105 f., take exception to this opinion as an impossible exaggeration for both poets. For definitions, distinctions, and examples of the technical terms ikhtird wa iḥtirdū, originality of idea and expression, and of akhdh, borrowing and improving on an idea, as against sirqah, outright theft of idea and expression, see e.g. 'Umdah I 175-78 and II 215-26. See p. 144 below for 'Adi's improvement on a simile of Jarir's.
157 'Abd al-Rahmān ibn 'Īsā al-Hamadhānī, Kitāb al-kitābīlatī al-kitābīyān, p. ix (man 'ādī rumūzī 'a l-nūrī 'a l-nūrī); 'Iqd V 338-40; Jurjānī, Al-ussājīb, ed. Muhammad Abū al-Fadl Ibrāhīm and 'All Muḥammad al-Bājāwī (Cairo, 1364/1945) pp. 183-90 et passim; 'Abdī Mawṣelahāb, pp. 124-25 (من أدركك) al-ḥādīth (man 'ādī rumūzī 'a l-nūrī 'a l-nūrī), extravagance for both poets. For though direct plagiarism was frowned on by all, the less obvious stealing of ideas (sirqat al-ma'ānī) to be expressed in one's own words in prose or verse was so ancient and widespread a practice that hardly an orator or a poet was not guilty of it. But he was adroit at lifting ideas from several ancient and contemporary poets and actually appropriated verses of several of his contemporaries. In fact, 'Asma'i considered that nine-tenths of Farazdaq's poetry was stolen as against only one half-verse stolen by Jarir, a statement to be suspected with respect to both poets. For though direct plagiarism was frowned on by all, the less obvious stealing of ideas (sirqat al-ma'ānī) to be expressed in one's own words in prose or verse was so ancient and widespread a practice that hardly an orator or a poet was not guilty of it. Controversial at first, the practice became tolerated among the "moderns" and even admired when a new expression of an old idea adorned with a new style in richer and more modern metaphorical speech was considered more effective. This type of plagiarism looms large in Arabic literary criticism and dovetails into the concept of literary originality, especially in respect to the bādi' poetry that had a good start with Bashshār ibn Burd and found its most effective champion in Ibn al-Mu'tazz and his Kitāb al-bādi'.
In a second set of statements Akhtal himself subsequently and for the first time in ‘Iraq expresses the “sea-and-stone” verdict under persistent pressure from the governor, Bishr ibn Marwân, and some of his intimate associates. Careful analysis of two accounts of Akhtal’s statement to Bishr led me to suspect some error or tampering in both accounts. The first reads: "الفرزدق يغفر من بحر فلم يرّه بذلك جري ohio, and, in view of the context, should have pleased Jarir and displeased Bishr. The other account reads: "فلما خلّت الاختلاف ساله (بشر) عن الفرزدق جري فقأ قال له الاختلاف أصلح الله الأمير أما الفرزدق فاعثر العرب" and is clearly incomplete since the use of "أما" and "فأشع" calls for a preceding comparative statement on both poets. In view of Jumâhî’s account it seems reasonable to suspect that Akhtal, reluctant to change his opinion but anxious not to offend the governor, hedged with a statement that must have read in full: "أن لا يجوز حكمة النشوانان فدعوا الحكمة أن من ملكها في بني حيّان" refuting their verdict. Bishr and Muhammad coerced and tempted other poets to declare Farazdaq superior to Jarir but prevailed on only Surâqâh al-Bâriqî, whose verses to that effect: "الغ تَبَيّن غَبْنِي وَسَيِّبَنَا" ان الفرزدق برزت حلباته "هذا قضاء الباري وانسه" were part of an ode which Bishr sent to Jarir by a messenger who was ordered to bring back Jarir’s answer in writing. Jarir’s reply consisted of a lengthy ode which contained the significant verses: "يا صاحبتي هل السباح منير يا بشر انك لم تزل في نعمة يه غضبنا لنا وانت أمير قد كان حلقك ان نقول لأبارك يا آن بارق فيها سب جري" and which he worked the night long to produce.

159 Jumâhî, pp. 408, lines 5–6.
160 Bevan II 880.
161 See Aghdrî VII 52 f., according to which Bishr once called on both Jarir and Farazdaq for impromptu heroic verse (fakhr), a category in which the social standing of Farazdaq’s family gave him the edge over Jarir. After three rounds of one verse each, Bishr declared Jarir the winner and rewarded both poets. For other instances when either Jarir or Farazdaq is declared the winner or claims the victory see e.g. Jumâhî, pp. 329 f., and Aghdrî I 71 f.
164 See these and the three verses of Surâqâh al-Bâriqî see Jumâhî, pp. 377–60; Aghdrî VII 67 f. For the entire ode see Sharh diwan Jarîr, pp. 300–303. The relative timing of Bishr’s pressure on Akhtal and that on his own court poets is not too clear, but the order in which the episodes are described above seems the more likely. See Bevan II 966 f. and 1014 f. for Jarir’s verses satirizing Surâqâh in odes Nos. 101 and 106, which satirize other poets as well.
Another example of the figurative use of the sea and stone to indicate literary virtuosity is provided by 'Abd al-Malik in a report that traces back through Abū 'Ubaidah to Sha'bī. 'Abd al-Malik was a great admirer of Aḥṣā Bakr, whose poetry he ordered included in his sons’ curriculum as he instructed the royal tutor in the following terms:  

أدبهم يربوه شعر الأعثوي فإن كلامه عذوبة قاتله لله ما كان أذيب بحره

وأصلب ضحية فن زعم أن احدا من الشعراء أشعر من الأعثوي ليس يعرف الشعر.  

Jarīr, Farazdaq, and many of their critics readily appropriated the sea metaphor in reference to their poetry, while the stone one was seldom used even by Farazdaq himself—a fact which could be interpreted as tacit recognition of Jarīr’s superiority. Both Jarīr and Farazdaq elaborated on the basic sea metaphor, each in his own interest. Farazdaq is reported as saying: 

أبي وأبا أعزف من لم أتحكم فذكره عند تعلم من اللبلبل تعلم البحر، implying conceptual thinness in Jarīr’s lengthy odes.\(^{165}\) Jarīr was given to short odes of praise and long ones of satire, though his reason is not convincing since brevity was more desirable in both categories for quick memorizing and ready recall:  

قال يا بني إذا مدخت فلا تطيلوا المدح، فانه يَبَيني افوا: 

ولمعفظ أخرى فذالك هجوهم فخافوا.  

That Jarīr made the most frequent use of the sea metaphor, in public and in private,\(^{168}\) is readily understandable as is his lengthy elaboration of the significance of the term itself and of terms closely related to it in their literal or derived meanings.\(^{169}\)

---

165 Qurashi, pp. 29 ff. *Mushir* II 309 ff. reports 'Abd al-Malik’s instructions to Sha'bī to teach the princes poetry and to watch their diet, behavior, and associations;  

قالاً طعموا الشعر يَمَهروه ونبنِدواً وواصلوا أشعارهم فكما فكما فرحوه وجرف شعرهم كثب شرعهم، فكانوا يَنْبِعون في فَنّ، بهم عليه الراجح بإتقانهم الكلام. Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān and 'Umar b. al-Khattāb before him had also stressed the moral and social benefits of knowing poetry ('*Umdah* I 10).  

'Abd al-Malik and his brothers, especially Bishr, and to a lesser extent 'Abd al-‘Azīz, were well versed in pre-Islamic and contemporary poetry. 'Abd al-Malik was a lifelong student of poetry, much of which he memorized and manuscripts of which he stocked in his library (see pp. 72, 88, 130). He took care to see that his sons were well instructed in the subject by their tutors, including Sha'bī. He himself developed a keen sense of literary criticism as attested by several poets and scholars. Occasionally in an informal family setting, in the presence of their tutors, he gave the young princes an object lesson in the art of literary criticism. His four heir-designates—Walīd, Sulaimān, Yazīd, and Hishām—and their half-brother Mūsalmān often attended the caliph’s numerous sessions with scholars and poets. As each heir in turn became caliph, his brother-heirs and his sons were more apt than not to attend his literary sessions and to contribute to the discussion when called upon. While this practice created for future scholars problems of chronology as to whether those royal personages made certain literary statements as princes or as caliphs, it did on the other hand render them not only political patrons of poets but also students of poetry. While their role as students, which involved the use of the postal service for obtaining literary information from leading 'Irāqī scholars, has not been completely overlooked (see e.g. Jumāhī, pp. 51 ff., and cf. Jabbār I 151–55), its full extent has not been appreciated, particularly in respect to the leading role of 'Abd al-Malik. The political motivation of 'Abd al-Malik’s patronage of scholars and poets is fairly well known, but not so well known is his great desire to impress these same groups, particularly those from 'Irāq, that 'Irāq had no monopoly on literary knowledge and its dissemination. For though he had ordered Ḥājjāj ibn Yūnūs to send him the 'Irāqī Sha'bī he kept that scholar waiting for an audience and gave him a cool reception. He then baited him with literary questions and tested his knowledge of poetry and, having first refuted his answers, he addressed him thus:  

أرسلت له ما لم يلقاه في نداه هو أن أهل العراق يتقرون أهل النبأ يتفوقون أن كأنهُ على القلعة إذ يلقى عليه المأمون وآخرون أهل النبأ يَلْقُونهُ (Aghānī IX 171). See p. 87 above for the continued relationship of scholar and caliph.  

'Abd al-Malik as a scholar and literary critic is an intriguing subject, and the pertinent source materials are copious enough to yield a rewarding study.  

166 Jumāhī, p. 318; Bevan II 1047; Aghānī VII 40. Farazdaq preferred shorter odes (Aghānī XIX 33).  

167 'Umdah II 103, where Farazdaq also accented of too lengthy poems. See also Jāhiz, Bayān I 213, 'Uyun II 184, 'Iqīd II 269, and 'Umdah II 103–14, where the argument is against odes of great length and in favor of shorter but more compact ones rich in striking verses that are readily memorized and recalled, these being more desired by a poet’s powerful patrons and more dreaded by his enemies. A comparison of the *naghth* of our three poets confirms that Jarīr indulged in longer odes than the other two and reveals that Aḥkāl was the most restrained in this respect; thus illustrating the latter’s practice of pruning and condensing his odes to about a third of the original draft (see e.g. Jumāhī, pp. 420 ff.; Aghānī VII 171).  

168 Expressed at first mostly at the court of 'Abd al-Malik or of Prince Walīd and later in response to questions from one or another of 'Abd al-Malik’s several sons (see Aghānī VII 51; Jumāhī, pp. 53 f.; 'Umdah I 61; nn. 190 and 194 on p. 139 below.  

169 Variants and related terms used by Jarīr are: بحرف (حر) الشعر أخ، أخ فّي، أخ فّي، أخ فّي (أحَر) الشعر أخ، أخ فّي، أخ فّي (أحَر) الشعر أخ، أخ فّي, meaning briefly that he had delved deeply into the subject of poetry and acquired a vast knowledge and expertise in the field (see Lane, *Ibr* and *Ibr*). Later, he who attempted to master the *Kūlāb* of Sibawayh was said to ride the sea or ocean (see e.g. Straff, p. 60).
We learn from accounts that trace back to Jarir himself through the family isnād of 'Umārah on the authority of his father 'Aqil on the authority of his father Bilāl on the authority of the family Jarir that when Jarir was asked by one of the caliphs, either 'Abd al-Malik or Wālid I (the former more likely), to explain some of these terms he had a ready and expansive answer. Short versions of such accounts are given by Abū 'Ubadah and Abū al-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī with some variations. The fullest account is that of Abū 'Ali al-Qāli on the authority of Abū Bakr ibn al-Anbārī on the authority of Abū Ḥātim al-Sījistānī on the authority of the above-mentioned family isnād. Jarir, according to all three versions, was asked first for his opinion on several ranking earlier and contemporary poets, including Akhtal and Farazdaq, for each of whom he had some high praise. The caliph in question then remarked that Jarir had reserved no praise for himself only to discover that Jarir ranked himself above all the others. The full account reads:

The next item in this speech that calls for comment is Jarir's opinion of Dhū al-Rummah, which is cited in other sources also and which stresses his excellent similes. More often than not another comment of Jarir, whether coupled with the first or not, stresses the paucity of Dhū al-Rummah’s themes and hence the monotony of his verses, which soon begin to pall. Since this comment, with slight variations and with or without an accompanying gloss, is credited to Farazdaq and Abū 'Amr ibn al-'Alī also, it is difficult to tell with certainty who was the first to use it. It or a different version of it may have been used first by Farazdaq and said directly to Dhū al-Rummah himself, but it is

---

172 Bevan II 1047 f. See p. 147 below for ‘Umārah.
173 Aghānī VII 60. See also ibid. VII 130, where the conversation is said to have taken place with “one of the Umayyad rulers.”
174 Amuli II 181 f. The two short versions (Bevan II 1047 f. and Aghānī VII 60) have the following variations.

---

The phrases ضروره الشعر and ضرور الفأثر in relation to Jarir’s proficiency as claimed by himself and conceded by other poets (see pp. 133 above and 139 below) could be extended to include the wider and reader use of meters and rhymes by a natural-born poet.

175 See e.g. Jumahi, pp. 46, 465; Aghānī VII 60 and 130, XVI 113 f.
176 Muwashshah, pp. 170–72; see also p. 191 below.
177 Muwashshah, p. 171. Cf. ibid. pp. 64 f., where Farazdaq characterizes Nābighah al-Ja’di and his poetry as a clothier who stocks both good and poor materials, which opinion was cited approvingly by Asma’i.
more probable that the expression and its gloss originated with Abū 'Amr and was then given currency first by both Jarir and Farazdaq and later by others, including ʿAsmaʿī and his contemporaries.174

Farazdaq was an even greater admirer of the earlier poets than was Jarir. He considered them his models and looked upon himself and some of his contemporaries as their professional heirs. He expressed his admiration in both prose and poetry. He compared poetry itself to a dismembered camel whose best parts had been appropriated by earlier poets, who left nothing worthwhile but the forelimbs and the contents of the abdomen to be distributed among the poets of his own generation.177 In one of his odes178 Farazdaq named a score of earlier leading poets who served as his models179 and claimed that he inherited their poetry, which was shared by only a few others, including Akhtal and Rāʾī but not Jarir.180 Jarir and his family are satirized outrageously in the rest of this lengthy ode.181

Jarir’s opinion as expressed in Abū ‘Ali al-Qalī’s account (given above) in admiration of Akhtal’s inexhaustible productivity until his death is cited in other sources, where the Christian Akhtal is referred to as “the son of the Christian woman.”182 More frequently cited is Jarir’s more candid opinion expressed initially in private to his son Nūḥ, who saw no reason to suppress it despite the fact that it amounted to all but an outright acknowledgment of the older Akhtal’s superiority—a superiority conceded by several scholars.183 After Akhtal’s death Nūḥ asked his father which of the two was the better poet, that is, Jarir or Akhtal. The question disturbed Jarir, who nevertheless answered thus: “My son, I reached Akhtal when he had but one canine tooth; had he had one other, he would have devoured me. Two factors gave me the advantage over him, his advanced age and his corrupt faith.”184 Jarir on various occasions expressed other favorable opinions of Akhtal, acknowledging especially his excellence in praising royalty and in the description and praise of wine.185

Akhtal was fully aware of the religious bias against him but refused to be deterred by it. Sure of his

174 Bevan II 1048; Jumahi, p. 467; Ṣūʾr, pp. 23, 333; Ḍhūḥānī XVI 115; Ṭawṣūkhshab, pp. 171 f., 362; Ibn Khalilīkān I 513; Khizānah I 52.

177 Qurashi, p. 24; Ṭawṣūkhshab, p. 320. For Jāḥiṣ’ opposite view see p. 122, n. 94. See n. 140 on p. 133 above for Farazdaq’s high opinion of a verse of Labīd, and see the Arabic passage quoted on p. 125 for an earlier use of the camel metaphor.

178 Bevan I 181-211, No. 39.

179 Ibid. I 200 f., verses 51-60. Verse 57 reads

180 Ibid. I 201 f., verses 61-64. Verse 61 reads

181 Ibid. I 202-11, verses 65-104.

182 Salībānī, Ṭakmilah, p. 15; Bevan II 1048; Ḍhūḥānī VII 60. The phrase ʿān al-ṣūrānīna was applied in a discriminatory sense to Christians and Muslims whose mothers were Christians, as in the case of Khālid al-Qasrī, and even to Muslims whose grandmothers or more distant forebears were Christians, as in the case of Farazdaq’s Bedouin wife (see e.g. Bevan II 705, verse 45, and 807, verse 4).

183 Both Abū ‘Amr ibn al-ʿAlī and Yūnus ibn Ḥabīb and ʿAsmaʿī after them ranked Akhtal first among the Islamic poets ( Ṣūʾr al-shaʿārāʾ, p. 496; Ḍhūḥānī VII 174; see also pp. 140 and 146 below).

184 Bevan I 496: ʿAbd al-Malik in reference to Jarir and by Jarir himself, see pp. 111, n. 11, and 112 above. Jarir frequently referred in his verses to Akhtal’s Christian faith and used the diminutive form of the poet’s name, Ukhaital (see e.g. Bevan I 496 and 506, verses 44-47 and II 936, verses 9-13, and 1041, verse 5, which refers to Akhtal’s daughters mourning for their father). Also Ṣurūʾ ʿayn Jarir (1905) p. 13, lines 5-10.

185 Jumahi, p. 420; Ḍhūḥānī VII 69; Ṭawṣūkhshab, p. 171; ‘Umdah I 61.
own great gift of poetry and of its appreciation among the most powerful and the most learned\(^{186}\) and secure in the avowed protection of Mu‘awiyyah and ‘Abd al-Malik, he flaunted his talent and his faith in the face of opposition with impunity\(^{187}\) but not without a few narrow escapes such as he experienced when he satirized the Ansār and Jāhīf ibn Ḥukaim.\(^{188}\)

Jarir's opinion of Farazdaq as holding firmly in his hand the spring-source of poetry is frequently cited.\(^{189}\) Once, for the benefit of his son 'Ikrimah, Jarir ranked Zuhair ibn Abī Sulma and Farazdaq first among pre-Islamic and Islamic poets respectively.\(^{190}\) Such high praise for his two leading rivals again brought the remark "but you have left nothing for yourself," to which Jarir had one of two answers, though sometimes the two were combined. One answer used the sea metaphor (see pp. 134–36), and the other answer was "I am the city (i.e., citadel) of poetry," used generally without comment\(^{191}\) but elaborated upon on at least one occasion by Jarir himself and later by others. Jarir's initial expansion of the phrase seems to have been "I am the city of poetry from which it emerges and to which it returns."\(^{192}\) This appears in Abū ‘Ali al-Qallî's text presented in full above with Jarir's further elaboration and elucidation of his thought, and it appears also in the short versions of Abū 'Ubaidah and Abū al-Faraj al-Iṣfahānî (see p. 137). In the full account Jarir claims excellence in all of the major categories and forms of poetry, including the rajaz forms,\(^{193}\) and in abundant quantities—an accomplishment, he concluded, that no other had matched.\(^{194}\) Except for his claim to excellence in the rajaz meter, this self-assessment was heartily confirmed by knowledgeable Bedouins as detailed above in connection with the discussion of Jarir's verses that are cited in lines 3 and 4 of our papyrus text. Another forceful phrase applied to Jarir and Farazdaq is "Farazdaq constructs and Jarir demolishes." Its origin is not clear, but Maslama ibn ‘Abd al-Malik, who favored Farazdaq, used the phrase only to reject it with the added comment "and nothing arises from ruins,"\(^{195}\) which twist was ignored by Jarir.

\(^{186}\) Cautioned by a friend to desist from further satirizing Jarir, Akhtal declared himself equal to taking on Jarir and the Banū Kulaib and added...\(^{187}\) Cautioned by a friend to desist from further satirizing Jarir, Akhtal declared himself equal to taking on Jarir and the Banū Kulaib and added...

\(^{188}\) See e.g. Bevan I 401 f.; Jumâhî, pp. 411–15; Murbarâd, pp. 286 f.; Aghâni VII 173, 177. See Sâlih, Aḥbâr Abî Tammûnî, ed. Khâlid Mâhîîd 'Assîkîr et al. p. 174, for the opinions of Muhammad al-Râwiyyah and Sâlih on this view.

\(^{189}\) See e.g. Bevan I 401 f.; Jumâhî, pp. 411–15; Murbarâd, pp. 286 f.; Aghâni VII 173, 177. See Sâlih, Aḥbâr Abî Tammûnî, ed. Khâlid Mâhîîd 'Assîkîr et al. p. 174, for the opinions of Muhammad al-Râwiyyah and Sâlih on this view.

\(^{190}\) See e.g. Bevan I 401 f.; Jumâhî, pp. 411–15; Murbarâd, pp. 286 f.; Aghâni VII 173, 177. See Sâlih, Aḥbâr Abî Tammûnî, ed. Khâlid Mâhîîd 'Assîkîr et al. p. 174, for the opinions of Muhammad al-Râwiyyah and Sâlih on this view.

\(^{191}\) See e.g. Jumâhî, pp. 251; Bevan II 1048 f.; Qurashî, pp. 35; Aghâni VII 69; 'Udâdah I 23 f. and Khânûnûh I 220 f. sum up some of these and other situations. See also Nicholson, pp. 221, 240–42.

\(^{192}\) For still other candid statements of Jarir on his two leading rivals namely Akhtal and Farazdaq, see e.g. Aghâni VIII 27: Kan qâdir. Gaulâîa li al-tashîm... Wâl dâr râfî al-mulûm yuqâîna fi yâqûma lâ yâmuqâna lî fârîshâma fi al-tashîm wa fî yâmuqâna fi al-tashîm... Wâl dâr râfî al-mulûm yuqâîna fi yâqûma lâ yâmuqâna lî fârîshâma fi al-tashîm wa fî yâmuqâna fi al-tashîm... Wâl dâr râfî al-mulûm yuqâîna fi yâqûma lâ yâmuqâna lî fârîshâma fi al-tashîm wa fî yâmuqâna fi al-tashîm...

\(^{193}\) See e.g. Jumâhî, pp. 251; Bevan II 1048 f.; Qurashî, pp. 35; Aghâni VII 69; 'Udâdah I 23 f. and Khânûnûh I 220 f. sum up some of these and other situations. See also Nicholson, pp. 221, 240–42.

\(^{194}\) See e.g. Jumâhî, pp. 251; Bevan II 1048 f.; Qurashî, pp. 35; Aghâni VII 69; 'Udâdah I 23 f. and Khânûnûh I 220 f. sum up some of these and other situations. See also Nicholson, pp. 221, 240–42.

\(^{195}\) See e.g. Jumâhî, pp. 251; Bevan II 1048 f.; Qurashî, pp. 35; Aghâni VII 69; 'Udâdah I 23 f. and Khânûnûh I 220 f. sum up some of these and other situations. See also Nicholson, pp. 221, 240–42.
and his admirers. For Jarir's sons were proudly aware of the demolishing effect of his satirical counter-thrusts against those who had attacked him. They therefore wished to know why he had restrained himself, comparatively speaking, in his counterattacks against 'Umar ibn Lajā' al-Taimī. Jarir's answer, in its briefest form, is reported as "I did not find among them nobility to humiliate nor a structure to demolish." Other statements add that the Banū Taim were shepherds and that the poets among them would each compose a few verses which 'Umar would appropriate and use in answer to Jarir's satires. Contemporary women who were knowledgeable in poetry and its criticism, and there were quite a number of them, generally preferred Jarir, the poet and the man, to Farazdaq because of the latter's obscenities. Some of these women did not hesitate to point out to Farazdaq himself that Jarir had indeed demolished what he, Farazdaq, had built, as they compared verses of the two poets.

Finally, we find Akhtal, Jarir, and Farazdaq described as or compared to three horses in a race. The metaphor or simile may have been suggested by Farazdaq's heroic verses about his family's horsemen, swift and victorious in battle, and Jarir's verses demolishing that image in terms in part similar to those used by the critics. The first to use the simile seems to have been Maslamah ibn 'Abd al-Malik, who claimed to know the three poets better than anyone else and placed Akhtal always first, Farazdaq now first and now second, and Jarir first, second, or third—a scheme which allows multiple ties. The simile was used also by a group waiting at the gate of the same Maslamah, which placed Akhtal consistently first, Farazdaq consistently second, and Jarir either first or third. The use of the simile was reported later to Jumaḥī, whose explanatory comment conveys the idea of a longlasting contest with many races in different fields and with no decision reached as to an over-all winner.

The critics did use similes of their own that were in part reminiscent of those used in hadith criticism. They compared themselves to artists such as musicians and singers, to such artisans as jewelers, clothiers, and carpenters, and to money changers, horse traders, and slave traders, whose judgments were based on professional knowledge and practical experience (see e.g. Jumahi, pp. 6-8; Qudamih, p. 5; Muwashshah, pp. 64 f.; 'Umada I 75-77). See also our Vol. II 74.

196 Aḥḥānī VII 72; Muwashshah, p. 129. After 'Umar ibn Lajā' and his tribe made their peace with Jarir, he continued to satirize "the mean lot" but claimed the verses were composed during the period of their feud (Jumahi, p. 371).
197 Aḥḥānī VII 72; Muwashshah, p. 129. After 'Umar ibn Lajā' and his tribe made their peace with Jarir, he continued to satirize "the mean lot" but claimed the verses were composed during the period of their feud (Jumahi, p. 371).
198 The literary role of Muslim women in early Islam has been noted occasionally but for the most part briefly. Women of all ages and classes, Bedouins or city dwellers, high-born members of society or low-born but well trained songstresses, displayed on numerous occasions memories well stocked with pre-Islamic and contemporary poetry. Several of the leading poets of the Umayyad period had sisters or daughters who gave evidence of poetic talent which they seldom fully developed owing in part to a sense of loyalty to fathers or brothers and in part to social discouragement. Where such talent could not be smothered, it found acceptable outlet mainly in elegies, in which the gentler sentiments and the more refined phrases prevailed (see p. 143, n. 213). Nevertheless, the ranking poetesses of the period and such high-born patroesses of culture as Sukainah bint al-Husain ibn 'Ali did not hesitate to face the poets, including Jarir and Farazdaq, with the technical shortcomings of their verses, or the vulgarity of their expressions, or the falsity of their egotistical professional claims. Sukainah's perceptive literary criticism, fully documented with liberal citations from the ranking poets, so impressed the poets themselves that they sought her judgment in their own contests and seldom questioned her verdict. She, too, as a rule preferred Jarir's verses to those of Farazdaq, despite the latter's Shi'ite leanings (see e.g. Aḥḥānī VII 53 f., XIV 173-75 and 177, XIX 40 f.; Muwashshah, pp. 159 f., 166-69; Ibshihi I 38). When a young poet of Akhtal's own people dared to satirize him, the poet threatened her family in verse with sharp reprisals. The threat silenced the girl and induced her family to placate the poet (Salihani, Shi'r al-Akhtal, p. 362).
199 See e.g. Bevan II 566, No. 61:67-70, and Jarir's answer on p. 590, No. 62:27, which reads

198 See e.g. Bevan II 566, No. 61:67-70, and Jarir's answer on p. 590, No. 62:27, which reads

199 See e.g. Bevan II 566, No. 61:67-70, and Jarir's answer on p. 590, No. 62:27, which reads

200 See e.g. Bevan II 566, No. 61:67-70, and Jarir's answer on p. 590, No. 62:27, which reads

201 See e.g. Bevan II 566, No. 61:67-70, and Jarir's answer on p. 590, No. 62:27, which reads

202 See e.g. Bevan II 566, No. 61:67-70, and Jarir's answer on p. 590, No. 62:27, which reads

203 See e.g. Bevan II 566, No. 61:67-70, and Jarir's answer on p. 590, No. 62:27, which reads

204 See e.g. Bevan II 566, No. 61:67-70, and Jarir's answer on p. 590, No. 62:27, which reads

205 See e.g. Bevan II 566, No. 61:67-70, and Jarir's answer on p. 590, No. 62:27, which reads

206 See e.g. Bevan II 566, No. 61:67-70, and Jarir's answer on p. 590, No. 62:27, which reads

207 See e.g. Bevan II 566, No. 61:67-70, and Jarir's answer on p. 590, No. 62:27, which reads

208 See e.g. Bevan II 566, No. 61:67-70, and Jarir's answer on p. 590, No. 62:27, which reads

209 See e.g. Bevan II 566, No. 61:67-70, and Jarir's answer on p. 590, No. 62:27, which reads

210 See e.g. Bevan II 566, No. 61:67-70, and Jarir's answer on p. 590, No. 62:27, which reads

211 See e.g. Bevan II 566, No. 61:67-70, and Jarir's answer on p. 590, No. 62:27, which reads
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213 See e.g. Bevan II 566, No. 61:67-70, and Jarir's answer on p. 590, No. 62:27, which reads

214 See e.g. Bevan II 566, No. 61:67-70, and Jarir's answer on p. 590, No. 62:27, which reads

215 See e.g. Bevan II 566, No. 61:67-70, and Jarir's answer on p. 590, No. 62:27, which reads

216 See e.g. Bevan II 566, No. 61:67-70, and Jarir's answer on p. 590, No. 62:27, which reads

217 See e.g. Bevan II 566, No. 61:67-70, and Jarir's answer on p. 590, No. 62:27, which reads

218 See e.g. Bevan II 566, No. 61:67-70, and Jarir's answer on p. 590, No. 62:27, which reads

219 See e.g. Bevan II 566, No. 61:67-70, and Jarir's answer on p. 590, No. 62:27, which reads

220 See e.g. Bevan II 566, No. 61:67-70, and Jarir's answer on p. 590, No. 62:27, which reads
Self-appraisal and mutual criticism among poets contemporary with Akhtal, Jarir, and Farazdaq were neither as vocal nor as colorful as the opinions of this trio and, with the exception of those of Kuthaiyir and Ba'ith, seem to have made a less forceful impression on the scholar-critics of their day and after. The extent to which the opinions of our three poets engaged the attention of their contemporaries and successors is attested by the frequent citation of these opinions in both early and later sources, as our footnote documentation readily reveals. Furthermore, most of their opinions, expressed in their own words or in somewhat modified phraseology, were incorporated by their contemporaries into the emerging apparatus of criticism by which the three poets themselves and others were judged then and later.

Instructive evidence of this process is seen in statements made in the presence of the three poets and therefore before the death of Akhtal late in the reign of Walid I. Opinions on the three poets were solicited by Prince Hisham and his half-brother Maslamah, and the speakers were a kinsman of Farazdaq and the orator-scholar Khalid ibn Safwan. The princes concurred heartily in Khalid’s judgment, which Hisham considered impartial enough to satisfy all three poets and thus to escape their satire. The account as recorded by Abū al-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī, which should be read carefully with a view to both the ideas and the phraseology of the three poets as detailed above, reads as follows:

قال هشام بن عبد الملك لشبه بن عماتان ينفرد بطرفي وطرففار فيصل إلمتين في علائم الذين قد مزجوا أعراضهم وهم كلاهم فقاً متفقاً واعظم من عشائرامهم في غيزة واليام فيهم أنهم عاطر يا جريه، فأشر قال حشام إياهم فخرب من بحر وما أمردور فيمنسح من صدر وما انشكل فيحمل المخ وفكس قال هشام ما فسست لنا شيتاً خصمان فأنا خرجت عما كنت قال (هشام) خالد بن صوان صفه لنا أين الأهم قال ما اطمسه فخرب وأظهرك واحسنهم عذراً وأسرهم مثلاً وأظهم غزلاً واحلاهم علالةً إذا زار وسافى إذا نظر، قال فإن جرخ سال فصيحة الأسان الطويل العبانة علاивает وإنا أضرهم بما أمرهم شروفاً ونكِ ويكيلهم علائم الوتر الأغبر الأبلق الذي إن طلب لم يسبق وإن طلب لم يُحَف فجربو كله ذكر الفواد رفع العباد واري الزند، قال له مسحة بن عبد الملك ما سمعنا بهما إياهما في الأوان والإرياني الأخيرين. وأشهد أنم أحستهم وصفاً وتبهم عظماً وإطمسهم مملاً وأكرمهم فعالاً قال خالد أتم الله عليك نعمة، وإنجل لذك قال يهيميمن وانس بكم واتر وترس بصم الكرونة، وإن الله ما علمته إياهما الإمبراطور كريم الغرام عالم بالباس جراد في الجل بدأ عند الدجل حليم عند الطيّش في ذرة فرض واسب عبد شمس وبدر ينير من حزم فضحك هشام وقال مارتب كتخصصه بأمن صوان في مدفع هلاوء ووصفه حتى أرضيهم جميعاً وسمت

Shabbah’s routine repetition of Akhtal’s often-quoted appraisals speaks for itself and need not detain us. Khalid’s well informed and shrewdly diplomatic appraisal of the three poets is understandable enough considering his own literary talents and the company present on the occasion.

204 Aghañī VII 73 (= Aghañī [1927—] VIII 81) cf. Ḥusri, Zahr al-adab wa thamar al- ḥabib, Al-ṣiq al-farād (1293/1876) 1 252 f. Balhāq, pp. 458 f., gives an iiad-less account of Khalid’s speech in which Hisham is not mentioned. The speech itself differs considerably from that of the Aghañī account in the order of its main parts, in the transfer of some of its descriptive phrases from one poet to another, and in a few additional phrases. Most of the changes favor Farazdaq. The following discrepancies between the Aghañī account and that of Ḥusri may be noted.

Lines 1–4: Ḥusri omits Shabbah (see n. 79 on p. 120 above for confusion as to name and identity) and his speech and refers to Hisham as caliph, which is an error since Akhtal died before Hisham became caliph.

Line 5: Ḥusri has āzār instead of āzār āzār.

Lines 7–8: Ḥusri supplies وامهم شروفاً وأكرمهم فعالاً and omits وامهم شروفاً وأكرمهم فعالاً.

Line 11: Ḥusri omits واتم على وكلاً إكلرونا.

Line 12: Ḥusri has من أشاف عبد شمس.
Khalid’s comparatively lengthy characterization of Farazdaq actually does no more than stress that poet’s addiction to heroic verse and saber-sharp satire. The rest is but word embroidery stemming on the one hand from Khalid’s own predilection for rhymed prose and intended on the other hand to avoid rousing the quickly angered, sharp-tongued, and powerfully built Farazdaq.  

Khalid’s opinion of Akhtal must have been indeed gratifying to that poet, who was not only the panegyrist of the Umayyads but who originated the very phrase used by Khalid (see p. 132). Furthermore, Akhtal had characterized himself and the other two in much the same terms as did Khalid.  

Finally, Khalid’s appraisal of Jarir reinforces some of the very factors on which Jarir himself based his claim to superiority, namely his use of many meters and greater coverage of themes, his easily flowing and more refined verse, readily conceded by his rivals also, and his ability to defeat and humiliate numerous rivals. Furthermore, in placing Jarir, in the racing metaphor, as either the sole winner or sharing that honor in a tie with another, Khalid not only added to Jarir’s pleasure but avoided offending the other two poets and further gratified Maslamah, who placed Akhtal always as the winner.  

Clearly, Khalid’s appraisal, though relatively more comprehensive in its totality, contains no basic point of criticism that was not already current among poets and scholars yet along with a few points that were missed by Khalid. Furthermore, these points, in their concepts as in their phraseology, continued to be repeated faithfully, if not indeed slavishly, among generations yet to come as one can readily see from the numerous parallel citations presented in this study. For instance, Bashshàr ibn Burd, a younger contemporary of both Jarir and Khalid, was disappointed because Jarir had not considered him important enough to satirize.  

Later, in a conversation with Jumalih, he declared Jarir superior to both Akhtal and Farazdaq on the basis of Jarir’s own claim of proficiency in more categories of poetry than either of his rivals.  

Still later, prior to and during the reign of the ‘Abbásid Mahdi, Marwàn ibn Abi Ḥaṣṣah was asked about the three poets. He expressed his opinion in mediocre verse, for ready citation, and recalled it later, in the reign of Amín, for the benefit of Jumalih and others. Of interest at this point is that the second hemistich of the first verse was current in the poet’s lifetime and was first said to Farazdaq himself by his wife Nawâr, who considered Jarir superior as man and poet.  

Marzubâni
rejected Nawar's opinion on account of her stormy life with Farazdaq. For Nawar had been tricked out of her choice of a suitor by Farazdaq, who then persuaded her to marry him. But the good and religious Nawar soon found Farazdaq's way of life distasteful and scolded him constantly about it. We, in turn, should discount Marzubani's opinion fully for the "sweet" part of the phrase and to a lesser degree for the "bitter." For Farazdaq himself, among others, confirmed Jarir's claim to superiority in delicate romantic and other categories of touching verse. Furthermore, Farazdaq envied Jarir his famous heroic verse

اذا غضبت عليك بنو ثيم حسب الناس كلهم غضبانا

whereby Jarir stole a double march on Farazdaq in praise of their common tribe, the Banu Tamim, in the very category of poetry in which Farazdaq claimed and was generally accorded superiority.

III

The naga'id of our trio of poets display not only their literary virtuosity but also their most egotistical and competitive characteristics. In the heat of literary combat, decency and truth were sacrificed in the interest of victory and its promise of fame. When Farazdaq greatly magnified the comparatively low social status of the family of Jarir, the latter did not hesitate to cast doubt on Farazdaq's Arab descent. Neither of these two poets spared the reputation of the women of the other's family or of any other rival's family. Yet they were but following the widely accepted idea in literary circles that "the best of poetry is that which lies most." However, the sources do give us glimpses of other facets of the personality and character of the poets of the time. Here again, what is revealed concerning our three poets is based largely

111 Muwashshahab, p. 106.

211 For the dramatic and stormy married life of Farazdaq and Nawar, which finally ended in divorce but during which Nawar appealed to Jarir against Farazdaq's verses satirizing her and praising a Bedouin co-wife, see e.g. Bevan I 166 f. and II 803-8, Janabi, pp. 267 f. and 280-83, Aqban VIII 187-82 and XIX 6-12, and Richard Boucher, *Divan de Farazdak* (Paris, 1870) text pp. 2-5 and translation pp. 4-8. Farazdaq regretted the divorce and was a repentant mourner at Nawar's funeral ceremonies performed by Hasan al-Hasani (Janabi, pp. 267 f., 283; Aqban VIII 47).

212 Janabi, in a conversation with Muwayiyah ibn Abi 'Amr ibn al-'Ala', compared Jarir's *simm* with that of the great epic poets of his time (cf. Aqban XIX 9). For the dramatic and stormy married life of Farazdaq and Nawar, which finally ended in divorce but during which Nawar appealed to Jarir against Farazdaq's verses satirizing her and praising a Bedouin co-wife, see e.g. Bevan I 106 f. and II 803-8, Janabi, pp. 267 f. and 280-83, Aqban VIII 187-82 and XIX 6-12, and Richard Boucher, *Divan de Farazdak* (Paris, 1870) text pp. 2-5 and translation pp. 4-8. Farazdaq regretted the divorce and was a repentant mourner at Nawar's funeral ceremonies performed by Hasan al-Hasani (Janabi, pp. 267 f., 283; Aqban VIII 47).

213 Bevan II 1048: قال الفرزيق قاتل الله ابن المرارة ما أصوحة مع عنتها إلى جازة شعرى وما أحسنته تفاصيل من شرها: Shıir, p. 29, gives a somewhat different version: كان المرقة يقينة ما أصوحة مع عنتها إلى صلة شعرى وما أحسنته تفاصيل من شرها ما تروي: Jarir, in a conversation with Muwayiyah ibn Abi 'Amr ibn Al-'Ala', compared Jarir's *simm* with that of the great epic poets of his time (cf. Aqban XIX 9). For the dramatic and stormy married life of Farazdaq and Nawar, which finally ended in divorce but during which Nawar appealed to Jarir against Farazdaq's verses satirizing her and praising a Bedouin co-wife, see e.g. Bevan I 106 f. and II 803-8, Janabi, pp. 267 f. and 280-83, Aqban VIII 187-82 and XIX 6-12, and Richard Boucher, *Divan de Farazdak* (Paris, 1870) text pp. 2-5 and translation pp. 4-8. Farazdaq regretted the divorce and was a repentant mourner at Nawar's funeral ceremonies performed by Hasan al-Hasani (Janabi, pp. 267 f., 283; Aqban VIII 47).

214 Janabi, in a conversation with Muwayiyah ibn Abi 'Amr ibn al-'Ala', compared Jarir's *simm* with that of the great epic poets of his time (cf. Aqban XIX 9). For the dramatic and stormy married life of Farazdaq and Nawar, which finally ended in divorce but during which Nawar appealed to Jarir against Farazdaq's verses satirizing her and praising a Bedouin co-wife, see e.g. Bevan I 106 f. and II 803-8, Janabi, pp. 267 f. and 280-83, Aqban VIII 187-82 and XIX 6-12, and Richard Boucher, *Divan de Farazdak* (Paris, 1870) text pp. 2-5 and translation pp. 4-8. Farazdaq regretted the divorce and was a repentant mourner at Nawar's funeral ceremonies performed by Hasan al-Hasani (Janabi, pp. 267 f., 283; Aqban VIII 47).

215 For the dramatic and stormy married life of Farazdaq and Nawar, which finally ended in divorce but during which Nawar appealed to Jarir against Farazdaq's verses satirizing her and praising a Bedouin co-wife, see e.g. Bevan I 106 f. and II 803-8, Janabi, pp. 267 f. and 280-83, Aqban VIII 187-82 and XIX 6-12, and Richard Boucher, *Divan de Farazdak* (Paris, 1870) text pp. 2-5 and translation pp. 4-8. Farazdaq regretted the divorce and was a repentant mourner at Nawar's funeral ceremonies performed by Hasan al-Hasani (Janabi, pp. 267 f., 283; Aqban VIII 47).

216 Farazdaq regretted the divorce and was a repentant mourner at Nawar's funeral ceremonies performed by Hasan al-Hasani (Janabi, pp. 267 f., 283; Aqban VIII 47).

217 However, the sources do give us glimpses of other facets of the personality and character of the poets of the time. Here again, what is revealed concerning our three poets is based largely...
on their own statements. Their extreme egotism is forgotten in moments of truth when one acknowledges the effectiveness of another’s barbs even though pointed at himself or when they envy verses of other poets regardless of the nature or target. Akhtal, for instance, proclaimed his love of wine and his aversion to outrageous indecencies in poetry and claimed that his own satires were such that not even a virgin would hesitate to recite them to her father.\(^{215}\) Once Akhtal had satirized a person, he refused later to praise him or, having first praised a person, refused thereafter to satirize him. The same was true of Jarir but for the rare cases when he praised Ḥajjāj and Farazdaq after having satirized them (pp. 89 and 145).

In contrast, Farazdaq did not hesitate to praise and later satirize or to satirize and later praise a person—practices which both Akhtal and Jarir held against him.\(^{217}\) Jarir explained that his lampoons on women were counterthrusts made in self-defense against an aggressor or rival who spared not the women of his own family and tribe.\(^{218}\) Not only Farazdaq’s wife Nawār but also Farazdaq himself confirmed on more than one occasion the truth of Jarir’s statement.\(^{219}\) Farazdaq went a step farther and condemned others for baiting Jarir only to find him more than their match in the battle of words.\(^{220}\) Farazdaq and Akhtal each envied some of the verses of the other.\(^{221}\) Jarir was even more forthright in expressing pity as ‘Adi ibn al-Riqāʾ recited the first half of a verse. But this changed to admiration as ‘Adi recited the second hemistich, and Jarir felt pity for himself, which soon turned into a strong sense of envy, for ‘Adi, in describing the horns of a gazelle, had actually improved on one of Jarir’s own similes.\(^{222}\)

‘Abd al-Malik once asked Akhtal and Jarir if they wished they had authored some verses of other poets.

Their negative answers were followed in each case with a strong expression of admiration for some verses of an as yet little known poet in whom they had detected talent. Akhtal’s choice was his fellow tribesman Qutāmī,\(^{223}\) and Jarir’s choice was Muzāḥim al-ʿUqālī.\(^{224}\)

Akhtal had the honesty to admit his regret for having taken sides in the verbal duels of Jarir and Farazdaq.\(^{225}\) Jarir spoke with feeling of the one time he regretted having satirized the Banū Numair.\(^{226}\)

\(^{216}\) Aghānī VII 178: قَالُ الْخُطَّابُ: ما هَوَى أَحَدًا قَدْ قَدَّمَتْ مَنْ تَمَّدُّ أَبَاهُ (see also Sāliḥānī, Shiʿr al-Akhtal, p. 344).

\(^{217}\) Bevan II 1048 f. But see Fragmentsa historicae Arabicae I 83 and 88, where ‘Umar ibn Hubairah admired Farazdaq for satirizing him as governor and praising him later as a prisoner. See also Taḥārī II 1433.

\(^{218}\) Jāḥīṣ, Baytā 1140 f.; see also p. 114 above.

\(^{219}\) Jāḥīṣ, Baytā 114 f.; قَالَ: خِلَاقُ مَا رَأَيْتُ إِلَّا أَنَّهُ قَالَ: أَنَا أُحِبُّ كُلَّ مَا قُلْتُ وَكِلَّمَا قُلْتَ لَنَقْلُ مَا قُلْتَ وَلَنَا تَقُلُّ وَنَقْلُ مَا تَقُلُ. See Jumahi, p. 319 f.; Also Ibn Rashīq cites and comments on the two verses involved.

\(^{220}\) Aghānī IX 7, where the caliph in question is identified as Yazīd I.

\(^{221}\) Aghānī VII 41: ڐزَرَوْنَ يَوْمَيْنَ عَنْ الرِّماحِ ٖلَا يَأْتَيهُمَا قَارَاءٌ تَأْمُرُونَها قَارَاءٌ وَقَالُوا بَلْ لا إِذَا نَبَتَنَّا فَإِنَّا نَحْنُ فِي اِثْنَيْنَ ظَهَّرَتْ عَلَيْهَا دُمَّرَةٌ ثُمَّ اِنفَتَحَ عَلَيْهَا ڐزَرََوْنَ (see also p. 117 above for the verse envied by Farazdaq). See also Umdah II 60, where Jarir is considered among the best of all poets when angered.

\(^{222}\) Qurashi, p. 36.

\(^{223}\) Mubarrad, p. 514; Aghānī VIII 182; Muʿjam al-shuʿārāʾ, p. 253. See also Umdah I 176 f., where Ibn Rashīq cites and comments on the two verses involved:

ونَحْنُ نَلَاكُونَ وَلَّيْنَا سُنُتُّ النُّكَلَمَاءِ كَانَ آئِثَةٌ اَلْطَّرَائِفِ ٖلَّهُمْ أَنَّهُ كَانَ اِيَتُّ نَوْقُهُ ٖقَلَّ اَلْإِصْابُ مِنْ الْدِّوَالِ مَسَادِهَا

‘Adī’s verse is frequently cited for its more apt and novel similo (see e.g. Jumahi, p. 558; Shiʿr, p. 392; ʿIṣr V 313; Sāli, Adab al-kuttāb, pp. 78 f.; Thāʿlībī, Thāmir, p. 239).

\(^{224}\) See e.g. Aghānī XX 118 f. and 130 f.; see also n. 185 on p. 191 below for differing opinions of Akhtal and Shaʿbī as to the best verses of this as yet little known poet. For Qutāmī see e.g. Jumahi, pp. 422-57, Shiʿr, pp. 463-56 and Aghānī XX 118-31.

\(^{225}\) See e.g. Aghānī XVII 162; Jumahi, p. 583, where Muzāḥim’s poetry is characterized in terms similar in part to those used for Jarir’s; ‘Askari, Muṣannān, pp. 25, 173. See also Henri Lammens, “Le chantier des Ouniades,” Journal asiatique, série viii, Vol. IV (1904) 405-4 and references there cited for other occasions when ‘Abd al-Malik pried his courtiers, poets, and scholars with evaluative questions, and n. 165 on p. 136 above for ‘Abd al-Malik as a student and critic of poetry.

\(^{226}\) Bevan II 496.

\(^{227}\) Aghānī VII 74: فَانفَتَحَتْ: وَأَنَا إِنِّمَا النَّاسُ عَلَى مَا حَلَفْنَّ مِنْ أَلْفِ قُوَّةٍ (see Bevan I 432-51, No. 53).
Farazdaq, having first sharply criticized Kumait ibn Zaid’s Ḥishmīyāt in praise of the ‘Alīds, encouraged the younger poet with the highest praise, assuring him he was the best of all. In their old age Jarir and Farazdaq dwelt more on their affinities than on their differences. When Khālid al-Qaṣrī, Hishām’s governor of ‘Irāq, imprisoned Farazdaq, Jarir to the surprise and admiration of the caliph pleaded for his release. In his statement, as reported by Abū ‘Ubaidah, Jarir regretted and negated the false vanities of their nāqī’īd in terms that are worth quoting in full:

قال هشام يا جرير أن الله قد أُذنّب الفاسق قال أي الفاسق يا أمير المونين قال الفرطدق ثم قال يا أمير المونين ان اردت أن تتمزيق بعد عن حاضرة مَضْرُوبةً بديئًا فأطلقت هم شاعروهم وسِهِم وابن سبيله وقال هشام يا جرير ما يسرك ان يخرج الفرطدق قال لا والله يا أمير المونين إلا أن يخرج بلساني قال فاين ما تقبل له و يقول لك قال ما أقول ولا يقبل إلا الباطل فلما انصرف جرير اعتم هشام بصرة وقال وليته اسمى هو عند حسه.

When the news of Farazdaq’s death in Baṣrah reached Jarir in the Najdian Yamamah, he expressed a premonition of his own soon-to-follow demise, though he was a decade or so younger than Farazdaq. As tears filled his eyes to the amazement of those present, he explained that he was mourning for himself as well. For he felt that seldom do two kinmen or two friends or a husband and wife whose lives have been so intertwined as had his and Farazdaq’s outlive for long one the other. He died some six months later but not before he had left the Arab literary world several touching elegies on his erstwhile rival Farazdaq.

IV

The leading philologists and grammarians of the late Umayyad period were primarily professional Qur’ānic-readers, as were also the majority of their pupils. As such they pursued their linguistic studies as a means to the understanding and interpretation of the Qur’ān. There were a few exceptions, the most notable being Abū ‘Amr ibn al-ʿAlā’, who included the collection and study of pre-Islāmic poetry among his objectives. It was with the Arab Khalīl ibn Almād’s Kitāb ʿal-ʿarūḍ and his Kitāb al-ʿa’in, even if he only began it, and the Kitāb of the Persian Sībawayh that specialized linguistic studies first achieved professional recognition in their own right. From among the contemporaries and pupils of Khalīl and Sībawayh came the first littérateurs of Islām—the collectors, transmitters, commentators, and finally the emerging critics of Arabic literary prose and poetry, but mostly the latter, both pre-Islāmic and Islāmic. This was the period of Ḥammād al-Rawiyah and Mufaddal ibn Muhammad al-ṭabbī, who have crossed our path so often that they need not detain us here. It was also the period of Muḥammad ibn al-Ṣā’īb al-Kalbī (d. 146/763), genealogist and Qur’ānic commentator, who transmitted from choice a hundred odes of Jarir and was intimidated by Farazdaq into transmitting an equal number of his nāqī’īd, having first read them out to Farazdaq himself—an indication of possession of nāqī’īd manuscripts by one or both of these men. A similar episode involved the Kūfī Khālid ibn Kulkhām

Masʿūdī VI 36-39: وَاتَّلَّى أَمِينُ الْأَمْوَةَ مِنْ نِعْمَةِ الْأَشْهَرِ مَنْ أَشْهَرَ مَنْ يَقِ.  
Bevan II 984 f.  
Ibid. II 1045 f.; Apḫāštī XIX 45.  
Bevan II 1046 f.; Apḫāštī XIX 45 f. These elegies are in contrast to his verse in anticipation of Farazdaq’s death and to his first single verse of impulse when he heard of his rival’s death (see Thā’tūlīlī, Thīnār, p. 107).  
Ibid. II 1046 f.; Apḫāštī XIX 45 f. These elegies are in contrast to his verse in anticipation of Farazdaq’s death and to his first single verse of impulse when he heard of his rival’s death (see Thā’tūlīlī, Thīnār, p. 107).  
See Apḫāštī VII 52 for a conversation between Ḥammād and Farazdaq on the respective merits of the latter and Jarir.  
Maʿārif, pp. 260 f.  
قَالَ فِي (الفرطدق) أَرْوَى شَيْاً مِنْ شَيْعَةِ قَلِيلٍ لَا وَلَلَّيْنِ أَروِي غَيْرُ مَعْنَى قَدْ صَى فَأَرْوَى لَانَ دِينَةُ أَمْرِهِ وَاللهُ يَا هَلْفَيْنَ كَلِبِي مَنْ أَرْوَى لَا كَيْماً فَأَرْوَى لَا كَيْمَاءِ لَمْ يُرْتَبْ جَرِيرَ نَجَّمَتْ اخْتِلَافًا وَأَذى عَلَى النَّقَائِضِ صَحَرُهُ مَا وَلَيْنِ فِي شَيْءِ نَحْضِيَةً. For Muhammad ibn al-Ṣā’īb al-Kalbī’s works and manuscripts and the patronage of booksellers by himself and his son Hishām see our Vols. I, 25, 45, 48, and II 47, 99, 104-6.

Farazdaq was quick to satirize scholars who criticized his grammar or preferred Jarir to himself (see e.g. Zubaidī, p. 24). For his encounters with ‘Anbasat al-ʿIlī see Sīrāfī, pp. 23 f., and Maʿārif, pp. 100 f., 104 f. See also p. 26 above.
al-Kalbî (n.d.), who had collected and written down the poetry of several tribes and some of the naqāʾīd of Jarir and Farazdaq but memorized and recited only those of Jarir. Farazdaq threatened to satirize the Banu Kalb unless Khalid wrote down, memorized, and recited Farazdaq’s responses to Jarir’s odes. Khalid concludes his account thus: فدلل افعل قلت شرب حتى حفظت تلك القافضت وأنذرت حرفها من شرو

The period of these first litterateurs was overlapped by that of Akhfash al-Akbar, Khalaf al-Ahlmar, Yūnus ibn Ḥabbīb, Abū Zaid al-Anṣārī, Abū ʿUbaidah, and Asmaʾi, all of whom displayed insight into various phases of literary criticism. Inasmuch as satire was the most widely used weapon against literary rivals or political and personal foes, the scholars for the most part tended to judge the poets by their effectiveness in that category. Though opinion was unanimous that our three poets were the most effective of the pre-ʿAbbāsid Islamic poets, individual critics presented plausible reasons for their preference of one of the three over the other two. Their reasons reflected their own fields of intellectual interest as well as aesthetic and moral values and involved such aspects as range of vocabulary, variety of satirical themes, degree of obscenity and of truthfulness. Yūnus ibn Ḥabbīb, who preferred Farazdaq to Jarir, is reported as saying that were it not for Farazdaq’s poetry one-third of the Arabic language would have been lost. Akhfash al-Akbar and, after him, Abū ʿUbaidah pointed out the paucity and falsity of Jarir’s satirical themes aimed at Farazdaq as against some hundred such themes used against Jarir by Farazdaq. Yūnus ibn Ḥabbīb favored Akhtal over the other two for his greater number of long odes, his greater accuracy, and his aversion to obscenity. Abū ʿUbaidah admired all three poets but criticized Farazdaq for lack of intellectual honesty as did also Asmaʾi, who admired Jarir’s originality and on the whole preferred Akhtal to both Farazdaq and Jarir in confirmation of the opinion of Abū ‘Amr ibn al-ʿAlāʾ.

Abū al-Faraj al-Ifshahī recorded repeatedly the divergent opinions of the “ancestors” and the “moderns” on the ranking of our three poets. His statement that all of the “ancestors” ranked Akhtal third is certainly misleading but may reflect at least in part the general opinion of the “transmitters” of his day on Akhtal’s rank (see pp. 119 f.). He himself, to judge by his initial oration, favored Farazdaq. Nevertheless, he summed up rather well, barring some exceptions, the subjective factors that influenced a critic’s over-all preference by classifying the critics themselves in two groups. Those who incline to strong language and haughty poetry that takes firm hold of them rank Farazdaq first; those who incline to the poetry of born poets and to gentle, easily flowing, gallant verse rank Jarir first. Nevertheless, he summed up rather well, barring some exceptions, the subjective factors that influenced a critic’s over-all preference by classifying the critics themselves in two groups. Those who incline to strong language and haughty poetry that takes firm hold of them rank Farazdaq first; those who incline to the poetry of born poets and to gentle, easily flowing, gallant verse rank Jarir first. Abū al-Faraj, it should be noted, omits any reference to moral factors. Therefore, it is readily understood why such born poets as Bashshār ibn Burd and Ibn Munadhir (d. 199/815) were great admirers of Jarir (see p. 119, n. 68). Ibn Munadhir’s answer to the familiar question as to who was the best poet may be here summarized in the words “he who is playful and serious at will” and “he who is beyond reach both in his sportive mood and

---

238 Aghānī XIX 11 f. For Khalīl’s activities see Fihrist, pp. 66 and 167, Inbā I 352, and Bugshah, p. 241. Jarir’s poetry is compiled in a great deal of his own and others’ poetry and preferred short to longer odes (Aghānī XIX 33 f.; see also p. 136 above).

239 Aghānī XIX 48: قال بن عبيدأ سمعت يونس يقول لو أراه الفردي وله لث لغة العرب. Yūnus was generally partial to Farazdaq (ibid. p. 6: قال جرب كذب من قال: ولكن يونس فرديًا as in fact was Jarir, excepting always himself (see Qurašī, p. 35: قال أنا مدينة الشعر). Hence the preference of the “ancients”.

240 Mannahahah, pp. 121-24.

241 Aghānī VII 174 and Yaṣāʿ, p. 80; cf. Sāliḥi, Shiʿr al-Akhtal, pp. 343 f. Yūnus cited in support of his preference five early grammarians, including Ibn Abī ʾIbāšiq and Abū ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAlāʾ, all five of whom he described as having beaten a path for progress in speech in contrast to others’ cited authorities who were neither Beduins nor grammarians: ولا نتكلم عنهم لا بنون ولا تومهين. However, this may be misleading because it is not clear whether Ibn Abī ʾIbāšiq and Abū ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAlāʾ were the same or different people.

242 Aghānī XIX 48: هم في ذلك مطياتن وما من كان يليل إلى جزئة الشعر وفخامة وثديثة أورده فيقدم الفردق وما من كان يليل إلى أشعار الطويلين والكلام السح السهل الخلق فيقدم جريحا. See pp. 125 f. and 130, n. 125, above for the natural-born as against the laboring poet.

243 See Aghānī III 25 for Asmaʾi’s preference for Bashshār, a born poet, as against Marwān ibn ʿAbī Ḥafshah and his laborered poetry.
in his lofty thoughts." He then named Jarir as the supreme example and reinforced his opinion with citations from Jarir's poetry.240 Bulturî, on the other hand, reports that his father, a contemporary of Ibn Munâdhir, was similar in temperament to Jarir yet such an extreme admirer of Farazdaq's poetry that he did not even wish to speak to anyone who preferred Jarir to Farazdaq, nor would he count such a one among those knowledgeable in poetry.241

It seems fitting at this point to refer to Jarir's great-grandson 'Umârah ibn 'Aqîl ibn Bilâl ibn Jarir, a poet and a scholar in his own right242 who surpassed the several other poets of Jarir's family. To him and his line back to Jarir himself we owe much of our information on Jarir the man and on his relationships with some of his contemporaries (see p. 115, n. 45, and p. 137). 'Umârah was court poet to several of the early 'Abbâsid caliphs, including Ma'mûn.243 He was much sought after by scholars of 'Irâq, beginning with Abû 'Ubaidâh and including his own younger contemporaries Mubarrad and Tha'lab,244 to whom he dictated not only his own poetry but also that of other members of his family, particularly that of Jarir.245 It is interesting to note both the conformity and the divergence in literary criticism as reflected in remarks of Salam, great-grandson of Abû 'Amr ibn al-'Alî, who recalled the latter's statement that poetry had ended with Dhû al-Rummah but added that he wished Abû 'Amr could see how much more advanced was 'Umârah.246 Salam also remarked that 'Umârah's poetry was more uniformly good and faultless than Jarir's, to which 'Umârah himself added that the greater part of Jarir's poetry cannot be matched by anyone. And there were some who agreed with both statements, especially Mubarrad, who is quoted as saying that "the eloquence of the modern poets ended with 'Umârah ibn 'Aqîl."247

The information in this section has been brought together at the risk of some repetition for the purpose of stressing the general character and level of literary criticism during the second/eighth century as indicated by the scholars' criticism of our trio of poets. For I have gathered from numerous references to many other poets, particularly Dhû al-Rummah (see Document 7), that the same type of literary criticism was applied to the contemporaries and predecessors of our three, though to a much lesser extent to the pre-Islamic poets, who as a group were accepted and extolled as models of excellence. Much of the scholars' criticism, apart from a flexible quantitative element, was centered on the mechanics of grammar and prosody, with some attention paid to permissible poetic license.248 So far as criticism was focused on the niceties of style and on aesthetics, the scholars of the second half of the second century contributed

239 Aghânî III 154 f. and VII 63; see also Ibn Khallikân I 128 f. (= trans. I 296 f.), which combines the two Aghânî accounts and gives a literal translation.
240 Muwashshah, p. 124.
242 Aghânî XX 183 f., 186; Mu'jam al-shu'arâ', p. 247. See also Ṭabarî III 1699.
243 Bevan III 117; Diwan Salamah ibn Jandal, ed. Louis Cheikho (Beirut, 1910), p. 22; Fâdîl, p. 62.
244 E.g. Aghânî XV 101 and XX 183 f., 185 f.; Ṭabarî V 368; Khatib XII 282 f. 'Umârah himself had written down his teacher's materials and had dictated all of his own diwân to his râṣûlîk Ibrâhîm ibn Sa'dân ibn al-Mubarak, who later refused to let the aged 'Umârah use his manuscripts unless he promised to share his reward with him (Aghânî XX 187; Ṣirîfî, pp. 80, 85 f.; Marâtib, p. 39). See pp. 14 and 30 above for other members of Ibrâhîm's family of scholars.
245 For Zuhair ibn Abî Sulmâ's and Jarir's remarkable families of poets in both the ascending and descending lines see e.g. Fâdîl, p. 150, and 'Umdah II 226.
246 Aghânî XX 183.
247 Gâlid: فَأَلَّا الْمَرْحُوِّدَ خَتَمَتُ الفِصَاحَةُ فِي شَرَائِعِ الأَفْلَامِ بِعِيَاهَةٍ بِنْ عُقِّيْلْ. 'Umârah seems to have been the last ranking poet of Jarir's remarkable family. He was, so he said, ugly but sagacious. He married a beautiful but foolish woman in the hope that his offspring would inherit her beauty and his sagacity, but they inherited her foolishness and his books (Khatib XII 282 f.; Nuṣāḥ, p. 108). His own diwân, however, continued to circulate. Among those who memorized some of his poetry was a woman client of the descendants of Ḥājjîj ibn Yâsûf. She memorized poetry and taught it to the daughters of the house (Amâlî II 62).

Farazdaq's sons died young except Labaṭâh, who supplied some personal information about his father (see n. 47 on p. 115 above). Farazdaq himself claimed that he inherited his poetic talent from his maternal uncles (Aghânî XIX 49; cf. Jumâlî, p. 152).
248 See e.g. Shi'r, pp. 6, 29-35; Jumâlî, pp. 181-88, 299 f., 362; 'Umdah II 208-15; Muzhir II 471 f.
little that was basically different in character from what had already been displayed by the scholars of the first half of the century and by the leading Umayyad poets themselves in their mutual criticism and self-appraisal and by a few of their poetically inclined patrons. Literary criticism on this level remained for the most part a matter of passing impulse for some and of intuitive knowledge for others and was for all more or less subjective.

Aṣmaʾī’s natural inclination to be an entertaining raconteur and his ambition to be a favored courtier may or may not have hindered him, despite his prodigious talent and vast knowledge, from undertaking a more formal and analytical approach to literary criticism than one finds in his Fuhūlat al-shuʿarāʾ. Nevertheless, anyone who delves deeply into the sea of Arabic literature, as Jarir would say, soon realizes that Aṣmaʾī and his outstanding contemporaries do reflect the level of literary criticism reached in the age of Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alāʾ and that in so doing they have reduced for us the effects of the loss of that great scholar’s large library and the loss of the manuscript collections of that age. They spent much time and energy in collecting, digesting, and preserving their literary heritage. Their pupils had at their disposal the record of this heritage, which was clarified and augmented through their personal contact with these masters. The scholars of the next generation were exposed to new cultural and literary influences from within and without their society. They were, therefore, in better position, as either traditionists or eclectics, to begin producing the more formal and increasingly analytical works of literary criticism, for both prose and poetry, that so greatly enriched the literature of the third/ninth century and left their mark on Islamic culture for several centuries thereafter.
DOCUMENT 6

PARTS OF TWO ODES OF AKHTAL

Oriental Institute No. 17642. Late third/late ninth century.

Paper book folio, 28.2 x 19.2 cm. (Pls. 7-8). The paper, of fine quality and medium thickness, is of
the type that became increasingly common for literary purposes in 'Iraq from the beginning of the third/
ninth century onward. It came into use much earlier in the provinces farther to the east, where it con­tinued to be the main writing material. The bitter and lengthy complaint which Jāhiz addressed to
Muhammad ibn 'Abd al-Malik al-Zayyāt (d. 233/847), who for his own ulterior motives had persuaded
Jāhiz to use leather and parchment for the manuscripts in his large library instead of Chinese or
Khurasanian paper, is indicative enough of the rapidly increasing use of paper in the first half of the
third/ninth century. Jāhiz, furthermore, pointed out the advantages of rag paper (waraq qutni
and
dafatir al-qutrii) as writing material because of its smoothness and light weight, especially for use by
book copyists and booksellers and by traveling scholars, as against the rough and heavier leather or
parchment. Attention has been drawn above to several extant literary works written on paper and
dated in the second half of the third/ninth century (see p. 11). Their scripts are comparable in several
respects with that of our Document 6, which is well preserved except for a minor break at the bottom.
Note the basmalah and part of the hamdalah scribbled later in the two lines on the lower half of the left
margin of the recto.

Script.—Naskhī book hand of medium quality. It lacks consistency, especially for the several forms
of the separate alif, other than the straight perpendicular, as in recto 6 and 9 and verso 1-2. The script
shows a few irregular Kufic features such as the forms of the initial and final kāf, as in recto 5 and 8, the
ḥāʾ or khāʾ with a beam, as in recto 14, and the large semi-angular tāʾ, as in verso 2. Diacritical points are
freely used. The letters dāl and rāʾ each have a dot below to distinguish them from dhāl and zāy, and
sīn has three dots in a row below (as in verso 5 and 7) to distinguish it from shāh with three dots above.
A small letter corresponding in each case to the letter itself is placed under hāʾ (as in recto 19), ṣād (recto
14 and 20), tāʾ (recto 14), and 'ain (recto 14 and 17). Final yāʾ and the alif maqṣūrah interchange. Vowels
are used freely but not fully. The hamsah is used in recto 5 and verso 7, 11, 17, and 20, more often than

1 See Jāhiz, Rasin', ed. 'Abd al-Sālim Muhammad Hārūn (Cairo, 1384/1964-65) I 252-54, for the following excerpt from
which I have omitted Jāhiz' refutation of the supposed advantages of leather:

ما عليك أن تكون كيمي كله من الورق الصنعي من الكاغف الخرافيق كل له ولم رأيت النسج في الجلد.. وخطي.. وقعت
على بذك لون وسع لا يخلط فيها جلداً.. وقلت في لم لبدرː التلف المسبح على اليد .. وثبت أن
التكريب في الكاغف الشعراً.. فذكرت بس المفرها في التفاوت الجلد والانشاد بالكاغف وكتب بملعه في تحويل التفاوت الحذرات
في الهل الاصحا في تنقل الإياب وظلم الصدور وظلم الظهور وظلم الإيام

Therefore, Jāhiz and his secretary-copyist no doubt used paper for his own compositions and bought paper manuscripts for
his library from booksellers, some of whom were known specifically as his bookseller (warraq al-Jāhiz), for example Zakariyya
ibn Yahlīk (Fihrist, p. 220; Jāhiz, Ḥaṣbunāt I, Intro. pp. 12 f.; Amalī I 248; Iṣbā'il VI 70) and 'Abd al-Wahhāb ibn 'Isā (Khatīb
XI 28 f., 130). We find Jāhiz also in the company of the poet-bookseller Muhmūd al-Warrāq, who recites some of his verses to
him (Jāhiz, Rasul'ī [1964-65] II 36). For instances of close association between second/eighth-century booksellers and scholars
and poets—not to mention such powerful patrons as the caliphs and the Barmakids and some eager bibliophiles (jamāʿat
al-lil-kutub)—see e.g. our Vols. I 3 f., 24, 91, n. 3, and II 46 f., 127. To these we can add the association of Muḥad dal ibn Muḥammad
al-Dabbī with Ḥabīb ibn Bustām al-Warrāq (Iṣbā'il III 300). That so few early manuscripts on paper or other writing materials
have survived is due in large part to the nature of the soil of the eastern provinces of Islam.
not in conjunction with ya\(^3\). The *shaddah* is used in recto 14 and 17–18 and verso 12. The *sukm\(\text{\aa}\) is not indicated. The circle is used, though not regularly, to mark a break in the verse text and occasionally at the end of a comment, as in recto 6 and 16. No space or other device marks off the hemistichs. That the same shade of ink, heavier in some parts than in others, is used for the consonantal text and the orthographic devices indicates that the latter are original and not, as in many cases, later additions. The orthographic system is that devised by Khalil ibn Al\(\text{\mda}\)mad for use especially in poetry (see pp. 7–9).

**TEXT**

**Recto**

\[\begin{align*}
\text{والحُفْرَة} & \text{ لها ويفعل بالخزَّين ما يفعل بالنافاعَاء} \\
\text{وتراب الخزَّين} & \text{ بما النافَقاء} \\
\text{فلا تنفخ بيوت بيلب ولا تقرب لهم إبدا رحالا} \\
\text{ترى} & \text{ شاب عرف يزِّن بالheaders الرجالا} \\
\text{قصبات الحَلْطَة} & \text{ عن كل خير الى السؤال مسحمة رعالا}
\end{align*}\]

8

\[\text{ووال 살ام}
\]

9

\[\text{إراد الاستفهام} وكدبتك}

10

\[\text{فاقتلك الالك} وكدبت الام غمس الظلام}

11

\[\text{بمس الظلام} مث الظلام وقد يكون}

12

\[\text{ذلك في أول الليل} واحره}

13

\[\text{وتعزت لك بالابالخ} بعد ما قطعت بابرخ خلَّة ووصلاء}

14

\[\text{البرق الجبل الحَلْطَة} بالرمل وكي البرقة}

15

\[\text{والحلة الصادقة}
\]

16

\[\text{وتعزَّت لتَرونَا جينين} والغَابنات يرتبك الأهوالا}

17

\[\text{التغول الالك} والغابنات الجرياري}

18

\[\text{وأحدتن [غام]ي ولا الهال الاخوانا}

19

\[\text{يهدَّدن من هفواتن الى السبا سببا يصدن به الغوا طوالة}

20

**Verso**

\[\begin{align*}
\text{افخْفَة} & \text{ الجليل} قال هنأ يبَوا فامة وييىها}
\end{align*}\]

1

\[\text{والطول} ودلبنا نحمى قال}

2

\[\text{صيا صيا صيا صيا}

3

\[\text{وما رأيت كمكرون اذا جرى} فينا ولا كباحن حيانا}

4

\[\text{المهدين نن هوين مسحة ومحسنات من قلنين مقالا}

5

\[\text{يقال قلني افباهه قالا وقالان} قلبه قلبه قلبه قلبه
PARTS OF TWO ODES OF AKHTAL

Comments.—The two odes represented in our document are to be found in published collections of Akhtal’s poetry (see Salihi, Shi’ir al-Akhtal, pp. 41–51, 163–65; Salihi, Takmilah, p. 7, Nos. 10 and 13; Salihi, Naqshi’i’d Jarir wa al-Akhtal, pp. 70–73, 189–91; Griffini, pp. 49 ff.), but the commentary differs markedly from those in these sources, which in turn differ among themselves. The order of verses also differs, and three verses of the published editions are missing in our fragment though they may have been included in the manuscript it represents. However, the familiar phenomenon of different manuscripts of the same ode varying not only in verse order but in number of verses is correctly understood to have stemmed, to begin with, from the very nature of Arabic poetry, which demands syntactic independence for each verse. This in turn facilitated changes in verse order and the deletion or addition of verses in revisions made by the poet himself or by his secretary (kattib) or by his personal transmitter (raswiyah), who functioned at times as secretary, editor, and critic. Again, but perhaps to a lesser extent, additions and deletions of verses may have been the work of persons who because of failure of memory or for other reasons of their own tampered with certain poems.

The original commentaries in the above-cited editions of Akhtal’s poetry are supplemented by comments of their modern editors. These two sets of comments provide mainly linguistic aids so far as our text is concerned and, along with the historical and literary background of the naqshi’i’d of Akhtal, Jarir, and Farazdaq as already presented in connection with our Documents 4 and 5, eliminate the need for detailed line-by-line comments here. Attention is drawn mainly to scribal errors, to the order or omission of verses, to uncommon textual variants, to any marked differences in the original commentaries of the several editions, and to some rather interesting citations of these verses.

Recto 1–6. From an ode of nine verses satirizing Jarir and the women of his tribe. The comments in lines 1–2 refer to the last verse on the page which preceded our folio. This verse in the printed text reads

but is cited by Mubarrad, p. 153, with the variant علیک, which changes the verbs following to the second
person singular. The verse is cited in explanation of عيَ أهل العراق as used by Ḥajjaj ibn Yūsuf in addressing a severe rebuke to the people of ِIraq (see p. 81 above and see also Ṣāliḥānī, Shiʿr al-ʾAkḥṭal, pp. 163–65, and Ṣāliḥānī, Naqāʿīd Jarīr wa al-ʾAkḥṭal, pp. 190 f.).

Recto 3–6. The dot below the ʿayn of the last word of line 3 is either omitted in the printed editions or placed under the following ḫaʾ, thus giving the incorrect reading رجلاً. The two verses of lines 4–5 are cited with the variation ʿayn ُفان َلا for the first and second words of line 4 by Ibn Qutaibah, who credited the two verses to Farazdaq and related them to the lustful eye (see ʿUyūn IV 84 and n. 124 on p. 93 above). See Ṣāliḥānī, Naqāʿīd, pp. 190 f. for lexical comments on these two verses and pp. 191–97 for Jarīr’s 42-verse answer to the ode from which they are drawn.

Recto 7–verso 21. Recto 7 introduces an ode of Ṣāliḥānī in answer to a satire of him by Jarīr. For the twelve verses of our folio see Ṣāliḥānī, Shiʿr, pp. 41–43, Ṣāliḥānī, Takmilah, p. 7, No. 10, Ṣāliḥānī, Naqāʿīd, pp. 70–73, and Griffini, pp. 49 f. Ṣāliḥānī realized that it is not always possible to tell with certainty which of Jarīr’s naqāʿīd were in direct answer to which ones of Ṣāliḥānī, and vice versa, since the two poets usually used the same meter and rhyme and at times the same themes in answering one another; however, he cites a number of Jarīr’s poems that were in direct answer to specific ones of Ṣāliḥānī (Ṣāliḥānī, Naqāʿīd, pp. iii–v, ix–xi). He also points out that some of Farazdaq’s verses were credited to Ṣāliḥānī for the same reasons (ibid. p. 219). See Ṣāliḥānī, Takmilah, p. 5, for a verse of Ṣāliḥānī that was credited to Zaid ibn Bishr.

In these twelve verses Ṣāliḥānī, like other poets (see p. 131), dwells on the wiles of women.

Recto 8–13. Note the poetic license in the omission of the alif of interrogation in line 8, as explained in the commentary (see also Abū ʿUbaidah, Majāz al-Qurʿān, ed. M. Fund Sezgin, I [Cairo, 1374/1954] 56 and references there cited). The ʿWasit of line 8 is not to be confused with Ḥajjaj’s new provincial capital of ِIraq, for it is ʿWasit al-Jazīrah in the tribal grounds of the Banū Taghlib (see Ṣāliḥānī, Shiʿr, p. 41, and Yāqūt IV 882, where the verse itself is cited, and Yāqūt IV 888). Some comments in Griffini’s Yemenite manuscript come very close to those of our folio, as in the present instance, but are not wholly identical with the latter. The differences are mainly brief additions or omissions and suggest the possibility that the Yemenite manuscript drew on our text or that both manuscripts drew on a common source; see Griffini, Preface pp. 5 f., for his discussion of the possible sources of the Yemenite manuscript.

Jarīr acknowledged the superlative quality of this satire against him but declared that there was no match for his own verse

والغالي إذا تتحوى للقري حك استه وكذل الامتثال

(see ʿIqd V 273, Muwāshshah, p. 131, and n. 144 on p. 132 above). For the whole ode see ʿSharḥ dīwān Jarīr, pp. 448–53, but note esp. line 1 on p. 451.

Recto 14–16. In Ṣāliḥānī, Naqāʿīd, p. 70, line 14 starts with the verse corresponding to our ʿayn تَحْيَت. Ṣāliḥānī, Shiʿr, p. 41, cites this as a questionable variant for ʿayn ُبُلَاء. The Yemenite commentary uses phrases identical with those of our text and adds َتَعْرَضَتْ يَعْنَى الربُّ يَعْرَضَتَ لَكَ فِي النَّاَمِ (Griffini, p. 49). For a fuller commentary and illustrative citations from Jamīl ibn Maʿmar al-ʿUdhri and an unnamed poet see Ṣāliḥānī, Naqāʿīd, pp. 70 f.

Recto 17–19. In Ṣāliḥānī, Naqāʿīd, p. 70, the verse corresponding to our line 17 starts with َتَعْرَضَت instead of ِتَعْرَضَت. The published commentaries among them cover our text; that of Ṣāliḥānī, Shiʿr, is briefer and that of the Yemenite text is fuller, but both are lexical glosses.

Recto 20–verso 3. The commentary of our folio up to this point is largely a gloss devoted to possible variants mostly in the nature of synonyms. Here and in several of the comments that follow there is
emphasis on the parts of the verb, perhaps chiefly because these verbs are either weak or doubled. Such emphasis is not found in the other commentaries on this section (see Sālihānī, Shīr, p. 42; Sālihānī, Naqū‘īd, p. 71; Griffini, pp. 49 f., where the word َلا لَبَأْ تَفََّلَأ was overlooked by the copyist).

Verso 4. A uniform variant for ِمَا إِنَّ ِقُلُّ إِلَّا ِقُلُّ is in all the parallel sources.

Verso 5-6. Note the form ِجَأْنَ أَذَا أَيْضَهُ ِقُلُّ أَلَّا. The marginal comment اَذَا أَيْضَهُ أَذَا أَيْضَهُ is a later addition.

Verso 7-10. The commentary of lines 8-9 appears in the Yemenite text with minor variation, but the verbal forms of line 10 are omitted (see Griffini, p. 50). The brief commentary in Sālihānī, Shīr, p. 42, cites an illustrative verse of Rāʾī, and the much fuller comment in Sālihānī, Naqū‘īd, pp. 71 f., cites no less than five poets.

Verso 11. This verse is preceded in Sālihānī, Shīr, p. 43 by

ان الغزوة إن رَبِّتْك طَوْيِسا بُسَدُ الشَّجَاب طَوْيِسا عَنْكُ وَصَالَا وَبِطُود اِدْرِيْس الشَّجَاب لَذِه بَن وَرَدْنِ من لِبِسِ الشَّجَاب خِيَالًا (Griffini, p. 50).

Verso 12-14. One comment on the verse of line 12 adds that Zuhayr ibn Abī Sulmā was the first to express its sense, thus:

وَقَالَ الْغُزَيْرِ يَا أَنتَ عَمَّا َوَكَانَ الشَّجَاب كَالْخَلِيطِ تُرَايْيِلُهُ (see Sālihānī, Naqū‘īd). Shīr, p. 312, cites our verse and compares it favorably with two verses of Quṭānī which convey the same meaning. ʿUyūn IV 121 cites the four verses of our verso 5, 7, 11, and 12 in a section dealing with the wiles of women. The last of these is followed in Sālihānī, Naqū‘īd, by a verse

وَأَذَا دَعَوْنَكَ يَا أَخِي فَأَنْسَـهُ أنَّا إِلَّا َمَوْعِدَةٌ وَصَالَا (Griffini, p. 50).

which is missing in our folio. For these two verses see also Nuwairī III 77 and Ibn Khallikān II 11 f. (= trans. III 136), where they are cited by the Spanish Ibn Zuhr.

Verso 15. This verse in Sālihānī, Naqū‘īd, follows our recto 20.

Verso 16. The Yemenite text has a brief comment and breaks off at this point (Griffini, p. 50). A brief comment in Sālihānī, Naqū‘īd, provides the variant قَطَاب قَطَاب for قَطَب.

The verse was admired by critics for its compactness (see Jumāḥī, pp. 420 f., and Aphānī VII 172).

Versos 17-21. Sālihānī, Shīr, and Sālihānī, Naqū‘īd, each present a commentary somewhat similar to that of our text, but the latter cites two illustrative verses. Sālihānī’s own comments in both of these works are rich in the elucidation of the poetry and in the references provided.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF LITERARY COMMENTARY IN EARLY ISLĀM

The commentary of our document, as indicated above, is not identifiable with any of the other available commentaries on the poetry of Akḥtał. We shall, therefore, consider briefly the general field of the development of literary commentaries in early Islām in search of clues that may lead at least to an informed guess as to a probable date or author of our commentary.

The first step in the development in early Islām of secular commentaries is linked to that in the development of Qur’ānic commentaries. For the citation of a classical verse to explain a word or phrase of the Qur’ānic text constituted a sort of reverse comment on the verse itself. This was but one phase of the intensive linguistic studies that centered from the start and continued to evolve around both the wording (اَفَز) and the intrinsic or hidden meaning (مَعْنَا) of the Qur’ānic text as explained through tafsīr.
We have pointed out above (p. 145) that the leading early philologists and grammarians were primarily Qur'anic-readers and that some continued to concentrate on the Qur'an while others expanded their linguistic efforts into the secular field, in which poetry was at first the major literary component. The first interesting clue to catch my attention for the present purpose was the use of the term *tafsîr* for both sacred and secular commentaries through the third/ninth century. The Qur'anic *tafsîr* of Ibn 'Abbâs (d. 68/688), known as the father of all such works, was primarily linguistic and mostly lexical to judge by what little of the original work has come down to us through his pupils, especially his secretary-transmitter 'Ikrimah. Differentiation in the Qur'anic sciences (*ulûm al-Qur'an*) to include four types of commentaries, namely lexical (*qin'ûd*), grammatical (*i'tâb*), interpretative (*ma'âni*), and historical, that is, the occasion for the revelation of a given passage (*tâsîl*), was already recognized by 'Umar I, who encouraged Ibn 'Abbâs in his *tafsîr* activity. The interest of both these leaders in poetry probably led them to use the term *tafsîr* for their comments on poetry as well. The term was so used throughout the second/eighth century by such outstanding scholars as Zuhri, Mufâdhal ibn Muhammad al-Ḍabbî (see n. 18 on p. 156), Akhfaš al-Akbar, Şâhi'ti, Abû 'Amr-Shahîbânî, and Aṣma'i, who, unlike his rival Abû Ubâïdah, refrained from *tafsîr* of the Qur'an and from *tafsîr* of satirical poetry. Again Aṣma'i and his younger rival Ibn al-A'rabî claimed to be and were recognized as experts at elucidating the meaning of poetry (*ma'âni al-shi'r*) and its correct grammar (*i'tâb al-shi'r*) respectively. Each of these authors wrote a work titled *Ma'âni al-shi'r,* though Ibn al-A'rabî was more knowledgeable as to the meaning of the strange or rarely used words occurring in poetry: Dowâ'în al-shûrâ va tafsîr al-Gurûp. It should be noted that the Aṣma'iqâ/il met with a cool reception among scholars because of the comparative obscurity, or perhaps brevity, of its selections and the paucity of its unusual elements. As the term *ilm al-tafsîr* came to connote Qur'anic interpretation and was expanded to include commentaries on other religious subjects, the term *tafsîr* was less readily applied to secular literary fields but at the same time came into general use by translators and commentators of the "foreign sciences." Just when the term *sharîh* came to be used, sometimes as an alternative to *tafsîr,* is hard to say. One notes, however, that Qudâmah ibn Ja'far uses *tafsîr* for the intra-verse interpretation

\[ \text{فَلَهُ بِلا حَرَّانٍ:} \text{فَلَمْ بِلا حَرَّانٍ} \]

with the second hemistich said to be the *tafsîr* of the first and gives examples of a whole verse as the

---

1 See Vol. II 99.
2 See Vol. II 110 and note that some written *tafsîr* accompanied the Qur'an as early as the reign of 'Umar I.
3 See e.g. Vol. I 17.
4 See Bevan II 1026, where Akhfaš expresses his conviction that the average Bedouin is not knowledgeable enough to explain or interpret poetry: 'Ama'ah 'Allul al-mâ'âmi, la dhâhûn al-tafsîr.
5 See *Umdah* I 18: 'Ama'ah 'Allul al-mâ'âmi, la dhâhûn al-tafsîr.
6 See also Khatib II 63; *Irshad VI* 369 f., 380, 383; Muzhir I 160: 'Ama'ah 'Allul al-mâ'âmi, la dhâhûn al-tafsîr.
7 Either Abû 'Amr-Shahîbânî or a contemporary asked 'Umar ibn 'Aqîl, "What is the meaning?" And for *tafsîr* of a verse (see *Divân Salâmah ibn Jandal,* ed. Louis Cheikho, p. 7, and for 'Umarâh, pp. 13 and 22. See *Marâ'îth,* p. 19, for Tafsîr Ibn 'Abbâs al-Hasân.)
8 *Marâ'îth,* pp. 41 and 48: 'Ama'ah 'Allul al-mâ'âmi, la dhâhûn al-tafsîr.
9 See e.g. *Isâbâh IV* 129, 133 f. For Aṣma'i see also Sîrî, p. 62, *Majalis al-‘ulum,* pp. 33 f., and Ibn Paris, *Sîrî,* p. 44.
10 See e.g. *Isâbâh II* 203 and III 131 respectively. Zajjâjî, *Al-bâb fi’lhal al-nabû,* p. 92, defines *sharîh* as al-Gurûp wa liyâd in *tafsîr* of the *qur’ân* and then gives several illustrations.
11 See e.g. *Fihrist,* p. 56; *Isâbâh II* 203; *Maytâdîr,* p. 571 f. Aṣma'i was, on the other hand, strong in dialectics, as can be readily seen from his several surviving works (see *Marâ’îth* II 205 and cf. *Gâl I* 104 f. and *Gâl S III* 163–65).
12 See e.g. *Hâji Khâlid* II 328–32 and Carra de Vaux in *EI* IV 603. This development is reflected also in Brockelmann's long list of *tafsîr* works (*Gâl S III* 1108 f.).
tafsir of an immediately preceding one and that he introduces the subsection with
نَمَ اَنْوَاعَ الْمَعْنَى صَحِيْهَهُ
the swim.

But about a half-century later Ibn Jinni titled his commentary on the Ḥaṃāsah of Abū Tammām
الْتَنْبِيْحُ ْالْدَّارِيْش ْمَشْكِيْلَتَ ْالْحَمَّاسَة.
It should be noted further that even thereafter tafsir and
shark were occasionally used interchangeably for both Qur'anic and literary commentaries.

One notes that in his long list of the more prolific second- and third-century poetry editors and
commentators, Nadim uses neither tafsir nor shark, or their verbal forms, but uses regularly the more general
and less specifically descriptive verbs 'amila, "he did, made, or wrought," and gan'a'a, "he made or
wrought skillfully." Since he interchanges the two verbs at times, it is not always possible to ascertain
from the Ḟihrist text alone just what a given poet, transmitter, or commentator actually did with the
poetry in question. We read for instance that Dhū al-Rummah himself did ('amila) his own ode, that
Mufaddal ibn Muḥammad al-Ḍabbi 'amila al-askär for the caliph Mahdi, that Abū 'Ubaidah did ('amila)
the naqā'id of Jarir and Farazdaq, that Asma'i's transmission (riwa'yah) of the same naqā'id was inferior
to that of Abū 'Ubaidah, and that Sukkari did ('amila) the poetry of Akḥṭal and the naqā'id of Jarir and
Farazdaq and improved them. The verb gan'a'a, too, at times implies more than composition or more than
collection and simple transmission. For we read that the poetry manuscript of Ibrāhīm ibn Harmah
consisted of some two hundred folios but was expanded into a manuscript of some five hundred folios in
Sukkari's version. No doubt the expansion was due, at least in part, to Sukkari's commentary. That is,
while rawd is simple transmission with perhaps some minor editing, 'amila and gan'a'a imply a greater degree
of literary contribution, including authorship of the poetry or collection and transmission of it with or
without a commentary. On the whole the Ḟihrist terminology conveys the impression that Nadim was
concerned more with the survival and the quantity of the poetry itself than with the types of commentaries
which, as we know from other extant sources, frequently accompanied poetry editions. More explicit and
significant for the increasing volume of literature, in both the composition and the study of
poetry, is Nadim's use of the verb sannafa, which definitely indicates written composition of organized
literary works of both prose and poetry.

The several branches of ilm al-tafsir in the Qur'anic and related fields began to emerge shortly before
the appearance of formal commentaries on poetry and were well advanced in the first half of the second
century. This is readily seen from a comparison of the meager linguistic comments in what has survived
of the Tafsir of Ibn 'Abbās with the several tafsir works of Muqātil ibn Sulaimān. The latter varied in
both type and content from the brief and strictly linguistic comments of the Wujūh wa al-naqā'id to the
Tafsir al-Kabīr with its expanded and varied commentary, a feature that characterized also the Tafsir
al-Qur'ān of Muqātil's contemporary Muḥammad ibn al-Sā'ib al-Kalbī (d. 146/763).

The philologists and grammarians of the first half of the second century commented freely on individual
verses which they cited as a conclusive illustration (ṣāhīḥ) in proof of some point raised in their
discussions. Abū 'Amr ibn al-'Alī's comments of this type were frequently cited by his pupils. But there seems
to be no clear evidence that he undertook a sustained commentary on any poet's diwān or on any anthol-
dogy of poetry. The same observation holds for Ḥammād al-Rāwiya. The Kūfān Mufaddal ibn

15 Ḟihrist, p. 169; Ibrahīm ibn Ḥamīd, Sharīh as-ṣan'ā'īr wa ḥaṣb al-ṣan'ā'īr al-ḥamāsah.
16 See ibid., pp. 157-59, with the heading أَسِيَاءٌ مَا صِنَّفَهُ مِنَ الْكِتَابِ وَخَطَّى عَلَى الْشَّعْرَاءِ، وَفَقَادَرَ ما خَرَجَ مِنَ الْشَّعْرَاءِ
and such typical terms as عَمِلَ فَقَرَ، or فَقَرَ، and عَمِلَ فَزَادَ فِيهِ. صِنَّفَهُ مِنَ الْرُّوَابِيَاتِ. For more on the niceties of these basic
terms see Lane, Arabic-English Dictionary, s.v. صَنَّفَ and عَمِلَ.
Muḥammad al-Ḍabbī deliberately refrained from commenting on the poems he collected and transmitted, being aware of his weakness in language rareties, grammatical points, and the interpretation of poetry. The second half of the second century—the era of Sibawaih, Khalil, Kisa‘t, Abū ‘Ubaydah, and Asma‘i—saw a heightened interest in pre-Islamic poetry as a discipline in its own right. This interest more than matched the interest in that poetry for its use as a linguistic tool and was expanded to include the output of the poets of Islamic times. Thus, in turn, collectors, transmitter-editors, and scholar-commentators were induced to broaden their activities to include some aspects of the biographical, social, and historical backgrounds of poets and their poetry. This half-century could well have been the time when the term šarḥ became more closely associated with poetry and secular fields, as taḥṣīl had earlier become associated with Qur‘ānic and other religious subjects. It might be of interest that though basically the verbs fasara and sharaha both mean “to explain,” “to interpret,” or “to disclose” only the second term includes among its several meanings “to expand,” in which sense it is used in Sūrah 94:1. Certainly, in the further development of šurūḥ literature, not only did the field expand in that more dīwān commentaries were produced, but many of the ranking commentators of the third century and after offered increasingly complex and voluminous commentaries. However, the earlier type of brief and primarily linguistic commentary was not neglected in either the Qur‘ānic or the poetic field. We have traced in the linguistic field itself the simultaneous production of elementary and advanced grammars, frequently both types by the same ranking scholar. A somewhat similar situation seems to have prevailed in connection with poetry commentators to meet the needs of the young scholar and also the demands of the aspiring professional and the cultured layman. Any of the numerous linguist-educators from the second half of the second century onward who for one reason or another produced an elementary grammar (see pp. 29–31) could have found it necessary to produce also an elementary gloss and scholia as bare essentials for the understanding of the poetry he collected or taught. Whether the emphasis was on lexical or grammatical points would depend on whether the particular scholar’s field of specialization was lughah or nahw. It is both interesting and instructive to note here that Qudāmah ibn Ja‘far, writing for fellow scholars and cultured laymen, complained of the excessive emphasis laid by his predecessors on the lexical and grammatical elements in their study of poetry to the comparative neglect of a comprehensive system of critical analysis, which deficiency his Naqd al-shīr wa’r was meant to remedy.

At about the same time his contemporary Şūfī (d. 335/946), who shared several of Qudāmah’s professional and literary interests, produced a commentary on the Dīwān Ābī Tammām that was all but void of lexicography and grammar but rich in information about and in defense of Ābī Tammām as a competent poet, especially as compared to Buhturi, a theme that Şūfī expanded in his Akhbār Ābī Tammām. A commentator’s intellectual bent and his professional status and duties inclined him to study or produce one type of commentary rather than another or even to compose several types, each to serve a different purpose. The effects of such personal factors are reflected in Jahīz’s comment that he found Asma‘i knowledgeable in only the strange elements

---

19 Zubaidi, who stresses this distinction, lists only three scholars as specialists in both of these fields, namely the Basrans Abū ‘Amr ibn al-A‘lā and ‘Isa ibn Umar (Zubaidi, pp. 28–34 and 176) and the Kufan Muhammad ibn Ḥabīb (ibid. pp. 153 f. and 216).
in poetry and Akhfash al-Awsat in only its grammar and Abū 'Ubaidah in only what touches it of historical
background and genealogical information. From the second half of the second century onward there
must have been a steady demand for all types of commentaries on the numerous poetry diwān's and
anthologies, classical and contemporary alike, that were being compiled or composed. These would range
from single-purpose commentaries stressing the lexical aspect (lugāh), grammar (iʿrāb), strange or
foreign words and phrases (gharīb), the basic significance (maʿānī) of verses or poems, or pertinent bits of
information (akhbār) to commentaries involving various combinations of these elements or even eventually
including all of them as did, for instance, a work by Tabrizī (d. 502/1109), who wrote three different
commentaries (shurūḥ) on the Hamāsah of Abū Tammām, varying from a brief one to an exhaustive
one. Whether or not poetry was taught in the elementary mosque schools probably depended on the
equipment and inclination of the teacher (muʿallīm). More mature students attending public sessions of
linguists and grammarians in mosque circles (see p. 25) or elsewhere were constantly exposed to some
phase of poetry study and discussion. Poetry was included in the curriculum of the palace school and in
that of the children of the nobility and the wealthy who were taught by private tutors. Brief primarily
lexical and grammatical commentaries, similar to that of our folio text, served the needs of young scholars
of these three groups. Lengthier and more complex shurūḥ, such as flowed from the pen of Abū 'Ubaidah
and increased steadily to climax in such exhaustive commentaries as most of those by Tabrizī, were
intended for cultured laymen (uḍabāʾ) and linguistic and literary professionals (uṣulāʾ) whose wide
intellectual interests generally overlapped.

The production of formal scholarly commentaries on the output of a given poet or tribe could hardly
have started very long before the later part of the life of Abū 'Amr ibn al-'Alāʾ (d. 154/771). Mufaddal
ibn Muhammad al-Ḍabbī's specific statement that his collection of poetry was void of any comment
implies that the collections of some of his contemporaries did include some sort of commentary. Foremost
among his younger contemporaries who were most likely to have provided their collections with com-
mentaries is the Kūfī Abū 'Amr al-Shaibānī, scholar, tutor, and tireless collector of tribal anthologies,
whose life all but spanned the second century. He is certainly cited more frequently than is the Baṣrī
Abū 'Amr ibn al-'Alāʾ in many of the commentaries of the third century and after, no doubt in part
because several of the leading commentators of the third century had been his pupils and in part because
several of his sons and grandsons transmitted his works. That a number of Abū 'Amr al-Shaibānī's
Baṣrī contemporaries provided some sort of commentary for their poetry collections is indicated by the
statement that Akhfash al-Awsat was the first to dictate his comments on gharīb al-shīʾr after the verses
which called for them instead of dictating all comments at the end of an ode according to the earlier prac-

\[\text{\textsuperscript{22}}\text{ Ṣūrūḥ II 84:}\]

نادمנות حسان ابن وبحا في مصنفه من عمل شعره إلى أنเลข أمي فوفجه نابع عدلا نفخى فتى فوفجه لا يتبين إلا أسبابه مفصولا على أبى
عثرة وفدها لا يقلن إلا ما اتصل بالأخبار ومن أجلاب الأملاس فلم أظن ما أدرته أعداء الكتابة كأحاس لود وبعض بن

\[\text{\textsuperscript{23}}\text{ See Marzūqi I, Intro, p. 12 and references there cited.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{24}}\text{ See e.g. Jāhiz, Bayān I 68 f.; Majālsī Thaʿlab I 82 f.; Ṣūrūḥ II 101 f.; Fihrist, p. 6. See also our Vol. I 17 and p. 136
above. See our Vol. II 13 f. for city mosques as centers for religious education and civic life and culture.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{25}}\text{ See e.g. Marzūqi, pp. 91 f.; Fihrist, p. 68; Ḥiṣbū Allūh II 234; Ḥiṣbū Allūh II 211-30, esp. pp. 227-29.}\]
Akhfash’s method gained acceptance and prevailed thereafter as being more conducive to the listener’s and the reader’s understanding of any verse that called for a comment. Because of his vast knowledge of the Arabic language, its grammar, and its poetry Akhfash was classed among the leading second-century transmitters in these fields. His audiences were large enough to require a dictation master, in which capacity he employed, in Baghdad, the younger Kufan scholar ‘Ali ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Ṭusi. It should be noted that Akhfash stressed the collation of manuscripts at every stage of copying in order to preserve their accuracy. Nevertheless, it is known that Akhfash deliberately refrained from providing full and clear presentation of his materials so that there would be need for his lucrative personal services (see p. 28).

PROBABLE AUTHOR AND DATE OF THE DOCUMENT COMMENTARY

We have already indicated above that our commentary is not identifiable with that in any known extant edition of the poetry of Akhtal. Inspection of some two dozen third- and fourth-century commentaries by such leading commentators as Abū ‘Ubaidah, Ibn al-A’rābī, Ibn al-Sikkit, Muḥammad ibn Ḫabīb, Sukkārī, Tha‘lab, and Muḥammad ibn al-Qāsim ibn al-Anbārī on the dīwān’s of mostly pre-'Abbasid poets served only to dramatize the wide difference between them and our folio commentary. For these commentaries are generally longer and grow progressively more complex and composite as each successive commentator draws on the commentaries and related works of his predecessors, frequently citing verses of other poets to explain those in the particular dīwān that is the object of his commentary. It seemed reasonable, therefore, to look for a probable author of our text among the scholars who functioned also as teachers or tutors of the young, especially as we recall that Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alā’ finally approved the poetry of Akhtal, Jarir, and Farazdaq for the instruction of the young (see p. 121). Our commentary, if we assume that it is typical of the entire manuscript which it represents, readily suggests Akhfash al-Awsat, who was tutor to the sons of Kisa‘I, as a probable author by reason of its brevity, its lexical and grammatical nature, and its placement after the verses involved. The sources, however, do not associate Akhfash with the transmission (riwāyah), with or without a commentary, of the poetry of either Jarir or Akhtal. Yet, in his capacity as tutor he might have produced such a work for his pupils or for the lucrative book market.

Among Akhfash’s outstanding contemporaries Aṣma‘i comes readily to mind because he is credited with editing and transmitting the poetry of some two dozen poets from pre-Islamic times through the Umayyad period. Unfortunately, none of his editions has survived in its original form. The list includes a Naqd ʿiḍ Jarir wa al-Farazdaq and a Shiʿr Jarir, to both of which Aṣma‘i’s contribution is fully reflected in the composite commentaries of the Bevan edition of the naqd ʿiḍ of Jarir and Farazdaq. The fact that Aṣma‘i seems to be nowhere credited with editing and transmitting the collected poetry of Akhtal could account for his being either bypassed or cited very rarely in the available recensions of Shiʿr al-Akhtal...
and in the incomplete version of *Naqā'il Jarīr wa al-Akhtal* believed to be the edition of Abū Tamammān. It does, nevertheless, seem strange that Ašma'i, who held such a high opinion of Akhtal's poetry (see p. 119 above), should have neglected it at the same time that he was involved with the poetry of both Jarīr and Farazdaq. Recently 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Maimāni al-Rajktī questioned Abū Tamammān's authorship of *Naqā'il Jarīr wa al-Akhtal* and suggested either Asma'i or, in his opinion, more likely Sukkari as the probable editor-commentator, on the basis primarily of internal commentary citations from an Abū Sa'id, which is the patronymu (*kunyah*) of both of those scholars.\(^{31}\)

In any case, our commentary, if it is typical of the entire manuscript which it represents, could hardly have come from the hand of Ašma'i, to judge from liberal samplings of his readily available comments.\(^{32}\) The samplings revealed a pattern, if not a style, for Ašma'i's comments, whether they are in works stemming directly from him, such as *Divān shīr' Ṭufail* as transmitted by Abū Ḥātim al-Sijistānī directly from Ašma'i, or in surviving works stemming from his contemporaries, such as his Baṣrān rival Abū 'Ubaidah or the Kūfī scholars Abū 'Ammar al-Shaibānī and Ibn al-A'rābī, as transmitted by their pupils. It is interesting to note that Ašma'i is quoted frequently and sometimes at great length in the *divān* recensions of these other scholars, especially if he and one or more of them are credited with an edition of the same *divān*, as in *Divān Labīd* as transmitted, with added commentary, by the Kūfī scholar 'Ali ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Ṭūsī from Abū 'Ammar al-Shaibānī and Ibn al-A'rābī\(^{33}\) and in the Bevan edition of the *naqā'il* of Jarīr and Farazdaq, which is based largely on the recension of Abū 'Ubaidah. Other commentaries tested for more light on Ašma'i's comments include those on the poetry of 'Urwh ibn al-Ward,\(^{34}\) 'Ajjaj,\(^{35}\) and Dhu'l-Rummah.\(^{36}\) On the whole, Ašma'i's *divān* comments substantiate the literary historians' and critics' appraisals of the type and scope of his linguistic and literary gifts (see p. 154) and the extent of his dependence on Bedouin sources. For his comments center first on explanation of the literal as well as the intrinsic meaning of a phrase or verse (*ma'ānī al-shīr'ī*), next on dialects and strange words (*lughāt* and *gharīb*), and to a lesser extent on pertinent bits of information (*khabar*) relating to geography, genealogy or background, and least of all on simple lexical and grammatical points, including broken plurals and weak or irregular verbs such as are found in our folio text. Furthermore, our sampling of commentaries revealed that the Kūfī transmitters were more apt than the Baṣrān transmitters to stress such grammatical points as those mentioned above and that the pattern in this respect was emphasized by the Kūfī tutor, philologist, and poetry commentator Ibn al-A'rābī and sustained by his leading pupils and transmitters, especially 'Ali ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Ṭūsī and Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb.\(^{37}\)

---

31 Abū Tamammān, *Kūb al-wahshiyāt*, ed. 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Maimāni al-Rajktī (Cairo, 1963) Intro, p. 5. I find an Abū Sa'id cited only four times for lexical comments (*ibid., pp. 3, 28 f., 62 f., and 153*) and only once for pertinent information, i.e., *khabar* (pp. 13 f.), all of which are inconclusive in one way or another as to Abū Tamammān's authorship. It should be noted, however, that if Abū Tamammān is indeed the editor-commentator, he would have to be citing Ašma'i and not his own much younger contemporary Sukkari. On the other hand, Ašma'i was seldom cited simply as Abū Sa'id, while Sukkari was frequently so cited. Scholars have continued to credit *Naqā'il Jarīr wa al-Akhtal* to Abū Tamammān (see e.g. *Divān Abī Tamammān bi sharh al-Khatīb al-Tabrīzī*, ed. Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh al-Ṭūsī, Intro, p. 13; see also H. Ritter in *EI I* [1960] 154).

32 Where no more than about two dozen references to Ašma'i were indicated in a given source, all were checked and his comments analyzed; and at least that many references were checked and analyzed where the indexes indicated three or more dozen references to Ašma'i.\(^{38}\)

33 See *Sharh divān Labīd ibn Rabī'ah*, ed. Ḥabīb 'Abdās (Kuwait, 1962).


36 See pp. 198-200 for references to Ašma'i's comments in Macartney.

37 For Ibn al-A'rābī's lengthy *divān* comments and his stress on singulars and plurals see e.g. Sayhān, *Shīr al-Akhtal* (1905) pp. 2, 4, 6, 10, 14, 17, 22, 26, *et passim*; for his emphasis on verba and the multiple significance of given verbs see *ibid.* pp. 3, 4-6, 8, 13, 19, 30, 32, 34, 35, 38, *et passim*. For Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb's usually briefer comments on such points of grammar see e.g. Yazdī, *Divān*, pp. 22, 39, 53, 66, 68, 69, 70, 74. Some of the stress on grammatical points in the commentaries on the *naqā'il* of Jarīr and Farazdaq may have been passed on by Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb, though it is not possible to ascertain that from the Bevan edition (see e.g. Bevan I 1, 7, 8, 12, 13, 28, 36, and 37, line 12: *qall Allāh Ĥabīb min Ḥamātī ro'ī al-māfšil*).
Among the contemporaries of Akhfash al-Awsat and Aṣmaʾi, Yaḥyā ibn al-Mubārak al-Yazidi (d. 202/817), scholar and tutor of Prince Maʾmaʾn, poet and transmitter of poetry, comes to mind as a possible author of our text. Also possible are several of his sons, particularly Ismāʿīl ibn Yaḥyā (d. 275/888). He was a valued teacher of Abu al-Faraj al-Isfahani, who praised him highly and transmitted much material from him directly; see Aḥsan al-Maʿṣar, pp. 72-74 for more of Yaḥyā’s poetry and that of some of his sons and grandsons.

The itnād spans the third/ninth century and draws on both Basran and Kūfīan sources as was becoming a common practice among scholars of the third-century mixed school of Baghdād. The commentary of our folio text is different from that of Muhammad ibn al-ʿAbbās al-Yazidi but is close to it in a few instances. The similarities suggest the possibility that our text represents that of any one of his three great-grandsons Muhammad ibn al-ʿAbbās al-Yazidi (d. 310/922) preserved this famed family’s literary heritage (see p. 29) and composed the Akhṭar al-Yazidiyin. He too was a royal tutor and a poet, and that he was a transmitter-commentator of Shīr al-Akhṭal is revealed by the St. Petersburg manuscript copy which has been so painstakingly edited by Şāhīnān and which has for its title and itnād

قَالَ ابْنُ عَمَّ عَلَى الْمَعْلُوْمِ إِبْنُ الْمُعْلُوْمِ يَزْدِي أَبِي سَعِيدُ السَّكْرِيَّ عِنْمُحَمَّدٍ بْنِ حِبْطِيْ عَنْ أَبِينَا الأَعْرَابِيَّ

شَعْرُ الْحَتْلُ

رواية أبي عبد الله محمد بن الابن الابن الابن عين أبي سعيد السكري عن محمد بن حيب عن ابن الأعرابي.

39 See e.g. Ibn al-Muʿazzza, Ṭabaqat, pp. 273-75; Sirāfi, pp. 40-47; Zubādi, pp. 66-64, 142; Khatīb III 412 f.; Naṣailah, pp. 15, 51 f. See Aḥsan al-Maʿṣar, XVIII 72-94 for more of Yaḥyā’s poetry and that of some of his sons and grandsons.

40 Ibn al-Jarrāḥ, Al-waṣaṣṣah, pp. 4 f., 81; Ṭabaqat al-shuʿārāʾ, pp. 54-55. He was a valued teacher of Abu al-Faraj al-Isfahani, who praised him highly and transmitted much material from him directly; see Aḥsan al-Maʿṣar, pp. 72-74 for more of Yaḥyā’s poetry and that of some of his sons and grandsons.

41 Zubādi, p. 65: ʿAbū Ibrahīm ʿAbdullāh ibn al-ʿAbbās al-Yazidi, who transmitted these nāqāṭ id from Abū ʿUbaidah, presumably with the latter’s commentary, to his son Ibrāhīm (see p. 147, n. 244), who in turn transmitted them to Sukkāri. ʿAbū Ibrāhīm is frequently cited in the sources.

42 See below for Muhammad ibn ʿAbbās and their transmitters. For Sukkāri, see Bevan I xi and 11, 1054; see also Fihrist, p. 158.

43 Fihrist, p. 158. See Salīlān, Shīr al-Akhṭal, Intro, pp. 3 f.

44 Bevan I xi; see also the listings under Sukkāri (ibid. III 127).

45 See Aḥsan, filūgh al-[qusṭar], pp. 105 ff.; Bevan I xi; see also the listings under Sukkāri (ibid. III 127).

46 Fihrist, pp. 71, 70; Izhād I 59 f.; Ibrāhīm I 155 and II 55.
in the Bevan edition of these *naqā'īd*, much oftener than Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb, who is cited twice as often as Sukkārī, as a glance at their index entries readily reveals. Saʿdān's son Ṣaʿdūn had a personal copy of the *Naqd al-Jārīr wa al-Farazdaq*, and he and his copy are cited several times in the Bevan edition, in which his brother Ibrāhīm is not mentioned at all. Analysis of the citations from the transmissions of Saʿdān and Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb readily revealed, first, that brief lexical glosses predominate in both while there are only a few points of grammar and, second, that lengthy immediate background information or more remote historical accounts are much more favored in Saʿdān's transmission, which in this respect stays closer on the whole to Abū ʿUbaydah's initial and basic commentary.

A third work of Muḥammad ibn al-ʿAbbās al-Yazīdī, the *Amālī,* remained unknown until Fritz Krenkow discovered the Constantinople manuscript, the only known extant copy, which traces back to the years 368/978–978. Analysis of the *Amālī*’s several major *iṣnād*’s, family or otherwise, and of the commentary on poetry citations of various lengths revealed that Muḥammad ibn al-ʿAbbās al-Yazīdī leaned heavily on both the transmission and the comments of Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb49 and that the commentary throughout is on the whole brief, a characteristic also of his commentary on Shiʿr al-Akhṭal as revealed by the St. Petersburg manuscript copy published by Şāhībānī. As to the nature of the *Amālī* comments, apart from a few informative notes (*akhbār*)50 and brief elucidating comments (*maḍān*),51 they are linguistic and mainly lexical. More significantly, there is some emphasis on rarely used and broken plurals and comments on the parts of verbs similar to those found in our folio text (see p. 152). Though it is not always clear whether such comments stem from the author himself or from one of his sources, yet Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb is more frequently specified than any other as the direct source.52 This is not surprising in view of the fact that Abū ʿAmr ibn al-ʿĀlāʾ and Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb are two of the only three language scholars whom Zubaydī included in both his list of philologists and his list of grammarians (see p. 156, n. 19) and the fact that Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb was, to begin with, a teacher and a private tutor, functions which, however, he apparently did not particularly like.53 We read also that Sukkārī took a great deal of material from him.54 The *Fihrist* entry which concentrates on Sukkārī’s transmission of and commentary on specified poetry *dīwān*’s, *naqāʿīd,* and anthologies does not reveal the great extent of Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb’s earlier and parallel literary activity, which is, however, clearly revealed in the main entry on Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb himself.55 Among the long list of books credited to him are *Akhbār al-shuʿārāʾ wa tābakāṭihim, Al-shuʿārāʾ wa ansābihim, Kunā al-shuʿārāʾ, Alqāb al-qabhāʾil,* and *Kitāb al-qabhāʾil,* the last being an autograph copy written on Khurāsānī Ṭalḥī paper for Mutawakkil’s bibliophile wazir Fath ibn Khaqān. These titles indicate continued interest in genealogy and tribal and literary history for their own sake as well as for their bearing on Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb’s several collections of the poetry of specific tribes and individual poets. He is credited with the transmission of the poetry of

---

49 See e.g. ibid. pp. 21, 20, 31, 38, 44–79.
50 See e.g. ibid. pp. 17, 44, 47 f., 68, 60, 81, from several of Muḥammad ibn al-ʿAbbās al-Yazīdī’s major sources, which include two of his uncles, Ishaq ibn Ibrahim al-Mausālī, and Abū al-ʿAbbās Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Abwāl.
52 See ibid. pp. 4, 39, 53, 59, 66, 68, and 118 for plurals and pp. 22, 60, 70, and 74 for verbs, the first from Ibn al-Aʿrābī and the rest from Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb, who is frequently cited as Abū Jaʿfar.
53 *Fihrist,* p. 106; *Irshād VI* 473. *Ishāb* III 121 records this attitude in his verses:

\[ ان العلم لا زال مسيءا \\
\text{ ولم كان عالم الإحسانا } \\
\text{من علم الصبيان أسواء أفعاله } \\
\text{حتى بني الحلفاء، وأخلفه } \\
\text{أكثراً إخاءاً إبو سعيد الصكَّر.}
\]

This source cites Marzubānī, who accuses Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb of plagiarism (cf. *Ishāb* III 121).
54 See *Fihrist,* pp. 157 f. for Sukkārī and p. 106 for Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb.
55 See *Ishāb,* p. 277; *Ishāb* III 119.
at least the Banū Hudhail and the Banū Shaiban. His transmission of the collected poetry of individual poets, probably all with some of his own commentary includes that of no less than eleven specified poets, beginning with Imru’ al-Qais and ending with Jarir and Farazdaq, but overlooks that of Akhtal. His transmission of Akhtal’s poetry, however, is indicated in the full isnād of the St. Petersburg manuscript copy of Shi’r al-Akhtal, published by Şahîhânî, and brings the list of Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb’s diwan’s to a full dozen, which I suspect is still incomplete. His Naqā‘īd Jarir wa ‘Umar ibn Lajjâ, Naqā‘īd Jarir wa al-Farazdaq, and Ayyâm Jarir al-latif hâkrahâ fi ši’irihi would seem to indicate that he had a greater interest in the poetry of Jarir than in that of either Farazdaq or Akhtal and possibly a greater interest in naqā‘īd than in other categories of poetry. This, too, I begin to suspect since we do have the Shi’r al-Akhtal, which includes most of Akhtal’s naqā‘īd.

Starting with Muḥammad ibn al-‘Abbâs al-Yazidi, fourth-generation member of a famous family of scholars, poets, and royal tutors, we have come in a roundabout way to Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb, himself a royal tutor, a multitalented linguistic scholar, and a leading poetry transmitter-commentator, as a possible author of the manuscript represented by our folio. Furthermore, as we look again at the above-cited isnād of Shi’r al-Akhtal and integrate each successive transmitter with pertinent bits of information already gathered about him this possibility is repeatedly reinforced. For we know now that the Kufan transmitters Ibn al-A‘rābi and his pupils ‘Ali ibn ‘Abd Allâh al-Ţūsî and Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb were more likely than others to stress grammatical points in their commentaries, that Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb was both a philologist and a grammarian, that he transmitted from both Ibn al-A‘rābi and Abû ‘Ubâdah to Sukkarî, who is classified primarily as a transmitter of the poetry texts of specified diwan’s, naqā‘īd, and anthologies as well as the commentaries on them. We know also that Sukkarî transmitted from Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb to Muḥammad ibn al-‘Abbâs al-Yazidi and that the latter, though known to have made a personal contribution to scholarship, was even better known and appreciated as the preserver and transmitter of his scholarly family’s literary heritage along with some materials from others. His personal contribution is confirmed by his numerous comments in the Bevan edition of the naqā‘īd of Jarir and Farazdaq but is not so clearly defined in the St. Petersburg manuscript copy of Shi’r al-Akhtal. For, apart from the isnād of this work, the contribution of each transmitter is only rarely indicated, as Şahîhânî realized and as his index of scholars mentioned in the manuscript copy indicates. On the other hand, Muḥammad ibn al-‘Abbâs al-Yazidi’s dependence on the contributions of his family members and others is readily apparent in his Amâlî. In both the Bevan edition of the naqā‘īd of Jarir and Farazdaq and the Amâlî we find that Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb is cited specifically more often than Sukkarî. Moreover, Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb is more apt to indicate broken plurals and even the singulares of such words and to give the parts of weak and irregular verbs. Nevertheless, despite all the points in favor of Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb, I am still not inclined to consider him as the probable author of the manuscript represented by our folio on the strength of this single folio alone. For there is ample evidence in the diwan’s cited that the nature, frequency, and length of poetry comments vary repeatedly within a given commentary. Hence, it would be futile to pursue this line of thought in respect to Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb’s contemporaries, especially since none of them seems to have been associated significantly with the transmission of the poetry of Akhtal. But as a result of our limited survey of poetry commentaries it seems safe enough to indicate the probability that comments of the type found in our folio were prevalent from at least as early as the time of Abû ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alâ until that of Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb, when linguistic studies, particularly those devoted to grammar, were still fluid, if not controversial, enough to demand the attention of the mature

56 Masâdir, pp. 546, 556, 565.
58 See Şahîhânî, Shi’r al-Akhtal, pp. 373, 565 ff.
PARTS OF TWO ODES OF AKHŢAL

scholar, the cultured reader, and the young learner. That such comments are found more frequently in commentaries that trace back to Kūfans than in those that derive from Başran scholars of this early period is due in part to the fact that the Kūfans began earlier to collect and transmit both classical and contemporary poetry. One has but to recall the rich careers in this respect of such Kūfans as Ḥammād al-Rāwiyyah and Muḥammad al-Ḍabbā and their younger contemporaries and literary heirs, especially Abū Amr al-Shaibānī and Ibn al-Aʿrābī, to realize why the last two mentioned are cited freely and frequently in poetry collections and commentaries that stem in the main from Başran scholars of their day and after. In the mid-third century, as the cultured and more sophisticated intelligentsia of Baghdad leaned toward formal literary criticism, the earlier poetry commentators were subject to criticism for overemphasis on lexical and grammatical elements, as demonstrated in Qudāmah ibn Jaʿfar's literary criticism and Şūlī's commentary on the Dīwān Abī Tammām (see p. 156). But it was not to be expected that such linguistic elements would be generally neglected thereafter. They are indeed to be found in the lengthier and more varied and complex commentaries of the fourth century and after as illustrated by those of Marzūqī and Tabrizī.
DOCUMENT 7
VERSES FROM AN ODE OF DHŪ AL-RUMMAH


Two joined book folios of fine light-colored papyrus, 28 × 21.5 cm., with 13 lines to the page (Pls. 9–10). This type of format was preferred for Qur’ānic codices and other prized manuscripts. The unusually wide outer margins vary between 6 and 8 cm., and the inner margins range from 4 to 7 cm. The text is well preserved except for the lower part of each folio, where large lacunae and several small breaks occur. The upper part of the outer margin of the first page has, at its edge, what seems to be a single illegible word and a vertical notation which could be read [J] or more likely { ^ * ] { ^ ~ ^ ( ^ J ^ . The latter would indicate that the papyrus had been used, at least in part, for an earlier but washed-out text, which would in turn explain a few dots that are not accounted for in the script, though most such dots that appear in our reproductions are but very small breaks in the papyrus itself.

Script.—Best described as a fair sample of large book naskhī with irregular use of a few Kūfic letter forms. Kūfic forms are  and  with a beam (as on pages 1:4, 2:7, 3:4, 4:4), the angular initial kāf (as on pages 1:4, 2:5, 3:5, 4:2), ṣād and ḏād (as on pages 1:2 and 2:8, 2:2–3 and 8, 3:2 and 11, 4:7),  and  (as on pages 1:7, 3:4, 4:2), and the open medial ‘ain and ghain (as on pages 2:2, 8, and 10, 3:8 and 12, 4:5). Diacritical points are freely but not fully used. The position of the dots varies according to the space available from three dots in a horizontal row for shin to three dots in a vertical row for thāʾ (as on page 2:6). The two dots of tāʾ, qaf, and yāʾ are usually placed vertically or slanted slightly (as e.g. on page 1:1–3). The letters dāl and dhāl are not carefully differentiated, though occasionally dāl has a dot below it and dhāl a dot above it (as on page 2:2 and 9 respectively). Small letters are placed below  (as on pages 2:6, 3:3, 4:2 and 6) and ‘ain (as on pages 3:2 and 4:5), but there is a muhmalah over the hāʾ of  on page 2:4, the hāʾ of  on page 3:12, and the ‘ain of  on page 4:1. Sin has three dots in a horizontal row below it (as on page 1:5 and 13) and sometimes a  above it (as on pages 2:2 and 5 and 3:5). The simple alif alternates with the hooked form (as e.g. on page 1:1–4). The ligatured alif and lām, regardless of their position in a word, were written downward and thus called for much lifting of the pen, which resulted frequently in a lower extension with a slight turn, mostly to the left, of the final alif (as e.g. on page 1:1–4). The reversed yāʾ alternates with the more regular form (as e.g. on pages 1:7, 2:2, 3:1–2). Medial hāʾ and its sister letters are sometimes placed partially or fully below a preceding letter (as on pages 1:3 and 10, 2:3, 3:3, 5, and 8, 4:3 and 8). Final alif alternates with alif maqṣūrah. Letter extensions are used unevenly and only at the ends of lines. A peculiarity of the scribe was to place a letter over a preceding extension as in the open ghain of  on page 2:10 and  on page 4:5 and the  of  on page 4:6. These could be later insertions of omitted letters. Omission of a word and a letter are indicated on pages 1:2 and 2:2. Another careless scribal practice was the insertion of a long dash between non-extendable letters in an attempt, not always successful, to even out the lines (as on pages 2:1 and 4 and 3:11). A misplaced extension is on page 1:8, where the final tāʾ of  instead of the hāʾ of  is extended. The widening of the written area beginning on page 1:7 was probably done to avoid overcrowding of the text, and the indentation of lines 9–13 resulted in a better balance between

¹ See Vol. II 91.
Verses from an Ode of Dhū al-Rummah

The inner and outer margins. The unevenness of the written area on page 2 is another indication of the scribe's carelessness.

The orthographic system used here and in Document 6 is that of Khalil ibn Ahmad, which, it will be recalled, he devised with poetry particularly in mind but which spread rapidly to other fields of secular literature (see pp. 7-10). Freely used are the three basic vowels, fathah, kasrah, and dammah, and the doubled forms of the fathah and kasrah for the tanwin. The sukun is indicated by the old sign >, which is carelessly written. The only other orthographic devices used are the small truncated shin and ‘ain for the shaddah and hamzah respectively. The placing of the hamzah is of particular interest in that it reflects the influence of the earlier Qur'ānic orthography, in which position and color were used to distinguish the dot or point indicating the hamzah from the dots used for the three basic vowels.

The hamzah in its initial, medial, and final positions is used rather freely, usually without its accompanying vowel, which is nevertheless frequently indicated by the placing of the hamzah itself. Thus ١, ١, and ١ generally indicate the later stabilized ١, ١, and ١. Note, however, that ١ indicates the ١ of ١ on page 1:2. Medial hamzah alternates with yat as on pages 1:9 and 3:4 and 7; see also p. 24). Note the use of both the hamzah and the two dots of the yat in غَرَابُ of page 4:5. The independent final hamzah is written on the line with its accompanying vowel indicated as in ١١١١١١ of page 2:11. The hamzat al-wasal and the maddah have no specific symbols. However, the maddah is not entirely neglected. Medial ١١١١ is written with two alif's as in مَلَأ١١١١ of page 4:13. Final ١١١١ is indicated as ١١١١ as in ١١١١١١١١١١ of page 1:3 and appears as ١١١١ as in ١١١١ of page 1:11. Note also that ١١١١ is indicated as ١١١١ as in ١١١١ of page 2:3 or as ١١١١ as in ١١١١١١١ of page 3:9.

No punctuation or collation signs are used and, as in Document 6, no space or other device marks off the hemistichs.

The more liberal use of more of Khalil's orthographic symbols in this early poetry manuscript than in early prose works is not surprising since the system was designed to meet the needs of written poetry more adequately than could the cumbersome orthographic system used for Qur'ānic manuscripts, as we have indicated more fully above in the discussion of orthography and scripts, where attention is drawn to the influence of the new system on even Qur'ānic manuscripts. Our papyrus is of interest in that it illustrates the reverse, that is, the influence of the Qur'ānic system on the newer one in non-Qur'ānic manuscripts, especially as to the position of the hamzah, in a period of overlapping use of the two systems in both Qur'ānic and non-Qur'ānic manuscripts. The copy of Abū 'Ubaid's Ḳhārīb al-hadīth dated 252/866 provides an instructive illustration of this process (see p. 11) as does the paper manuscript of the Divān al-Mutanabbi dated 398/1008 (see p. 12). Indispensable for our understanding of the complexity of the placing of orthographic signs in early Qur'ānic manuscripts, including the various regional practices, and of the progressive transfer of these signs into the more manageable system of Khalil, with some later modifications, is Dānī's Muḥkam, with its copious illustrations of the placing of the vowels and especially of the hamzah.

TEXT

Page 1

1 فَكَذَّبَتُ امْوَيَّا مِن حَزْنِ عَلِيمٍ وَلَمْ أُرَارُ الْأَلَامَ بَالَّا

2 فَأَشْفَقْتُ النَّزَالَةُ رَاسَ حَوْضٍ أَرَاقُهُمْ وَما أَفْقَا قِبَالًا

* For other illustrations of this process during this period of overlapping see e.g. Moritz, Arabic Palaeography, Pp. 19-21, and Namādī, Pp. 16 and 64; see also Le djami 'Ibn Wash, ed. David-Weill, I iv-vii and 84-106. For additional examples of the use and placement of orthographic signs in both systems see GIP L 39 t., 44, 93 and our Vols. I 1-3 and II 87-91; see also pp. 5-11 above and references there cited.
كةَنَّهُ جَلَّهُمُ مَّمِيَّزَاهُمُ مَعَ جَزَآئِهِمُ، فَكَيْلَهُمْ فَخَافُواٖ، وَلَبِّهِمْ عَفُوا.  
وَقَدْ جَعَلَهُمْ عَبَرَةً عَنِ الْمَيْتِ.  
وَلَا إِلَّا أَنَّ اللَّهَ يَلْقَوْنَ بَيْنَ حَرُوْرِيَّةِ  
فَقالَتْ-lلَّهُمَّ ٱلشَّمَسُ فَاغْدِرِ عَظَلَةٌ  
تَكَرَّرَتْ إِلَى ٱلْمِلْلَهِمَا، فَأَنْضَجَ حَتَّى  
كَانَ ٱلْأَلْلَهُ يَرْفَعُ بَيْنَ حَرُوْرِيَّةِ  
فِي ٱلْإِلَٰهَمَانِ شَيْءًا مِّنْهَا، فَرَفَعَ  
جَوَّـٰرُ ٱلْكَلَّامِ مَبِينًا، تَحْيَا  
جَمِيعُ مُلْلَهَا وَمَعْلَمٌ عَنْقٌ.  

مَعْلَمٌ عَنْقٌ،  
وَعَدَّهَا ذَهَبًا  
سَوَّادَ القَبْلِ فَاقْتَنَبْنَا  
جَوَّـٰرُ وَجَوَّـٰرَ ٱلْجَوَّـٰرِ  
كَفَّرُنَا ٱلشَّمَسُ ٱقْتَنَبْنَا  
كَلَا وَأَنْتِكَ ٱلْأَقْتَنَبْنَا  
تَمُسْنَا ِحَيْثُ ٱلْإِلَٰهَمُانَ  
رَأِيَتْبَا هَذِهِ وَجُهَّهَا  
كَانَ رَضِيَانِهِ مِنْ مَّأَةِ كِرْمٍ  
يَشْجَبُ مَعَ سَافَرِهِ  
وَسَلَاطَةٌ وَحَسَّسَتْهُ قَذَالَا  
وَلَا عَمَّا جَلَّهُمُ مَّمِيَّزَاهُمُ،  
وَبَيْنَ مَا نَظَرُّ وَعَشِينَا  
هِيُّ ٱلْإِلَٰهَمِ، لَتَنَادَىٰ مَّنْ  
ذِلَّلَيْنَ،  
فَعَمَّا عَنْصَبُهُ عَلَيْكَ شَمَشًا.  

فَبَنَّ اَسْرَى صَعْبَ الْهَمِّ حَتَّى  
أَلَّا إِلَّا ٱلْإِلَٰهَمُ، إِلَّا بُنِيَّةً  
قُطِّعَتْ بِعَفْعِ صَبْعَةٍ وَلَا  
غَدَّةً رَجِلَهُ، وَلَا  
طَوَلَ السَّمَكِ مَفَضِّعَةً بِهِ  
وَلَا  
كَانَ ٱلْإِلَٰهَمُ، وَلَا  
نَجَبُ مِنْ نَجَبٍ بِبَيْنَ غَرِيْبِر  
مَضْرَعَةٌ، كَانَ صَفَا ٌۡبِ ـٰلِلِّ  
مِنْهُ  
ذَلِكَ ٱلْإِلَٰهَمُ،  
فَعَمَّا عَنْصَبُهُ عَلَيْكَ شَمَشًا.
Comment.—The papyrus text parallels ode No. 57:6-58 in Macartney’s edition of Dīwān Dī al-Rummah and in Muḥammad Babbili’s edition, which retains the Macartney order of odes and verses. The order of verses in our text is the same, but verse 27 of the printed texts is missing. There are a number of lexical and grammatical variants for our text, most of which are indicated by Macartney either in the commentaries (shurūḥ) accompanying the text or in his numerous footnotes citing lexical and literary sources in connection with individual verses. The shurūḥ most cited for this particular ode are those of the manuscripts of Dīwān Dī al-Rummah that are in the Khedivial Library in Cairo and the India Office Library, which Macartney refers to as “C” and “D” respectively. The shurūḥ of these two manuscripts, being for the most part identical or very similar, are cited together in all but seventeen of the hundred verses of the ode, while alone C is cited five times (verses 8, 15-16, 81-82) and D only twice (verses 10 and 58). Supplementary comments, mostly from British Museum and Constantinople manuscripts, are cited in the editor’s footnotes. Muḥammad Babbili’s more recent edition is based largely on the Macartney text but has all the cited comments, variants, and literary references indicated in the footnotes along with some added editorial comments. It is not likely that the several extant manuscripts of Dīwān Dī al-Rummah that are not used in either of these two rich editions contain other variants which are significant for our text. In the Landberg Collection of the Yale University Library is one such manuscript, a recent and incomplete copy, a microfilm of which was kindly provided me. Folios 19-21 contain the ode from which our

See Macartney, p. v.


papyrus text is drawn, but, apart from scribal errors and the familiar discrepancies of verse count and verse order, there is hardly a variant that is not already covered in the Macartney and Muti' Babbili editions. On the other hand, some of the known but still unstudied manuscripts with early commentaries could prove significant for additional odes, for background information on individual odes, and possibly also for some biographical items. Such a manuscript, not available to me, is one from San'ā', judged from its script alone to be probably from the third/ninth century.⁶


Page 1:2. The scribe overlooked رأس but inserted it later between the lines.

Page 1:4. Macartney and Muti' Babbili have الإجلال

Page 1:5-6. The order of these verses is reversed in the Yale manuscript.

Page 1:8. Note the repetition of تفرعت and the letter extensions.

Page 1:10. Macartney and Muti' Babbili have الأخداد for الأخداد, the latter along with الأخداد being indicated in the footnotes of both editions.

Page 1:12. Note the variant in the margin, which reads ويروى ظنات الكلام نعامتاه and is written in a smaller and more cursive script.

Page 1:13. Our reproduction (Pl. 9) shows at this point many small breaks which can be mistaken for diacritical points. Macartney and Muti' Babbili have فخامة ملاحة instead of فخامة ملاحة, the latter being indicated in the commentary and the footnotes. The وعِنتِ is missing in both of the printed editions and in the Yale manuscript.

Page 2:1. Note the peculiar placing, on the line, of the two short diagonal strokes after the ُتَلَ of موَهَاتَ. Early Qur'ānic usage called for placing two such strokes over the “head” or the initial vertical stroke of the ُتَ to indicate its diacritical “points,” as it called for the placing of two dots, one over the other on the line, to indicate the dammah with the tanwin. We have here either compounded confusion of the Qur'ānic and non-Qur'ānic systems of orthography or, more likely, scribal carelessness. Since this is the only instance where our text calls for the double dammah, the scribe's practice in this respect cannot be checked.

Page 2:2. Note the omission of the medial ُزَرَ of الطعامان and the use of ُطَأَ instead of حامش.

Page 2:4. Macartney parallels this verse; Muti' Babbili prefers مِنْ حَيْنَ for مِنْ حَيْنِ.

Page 2:5. The last word of the line was first written اعلاً اعلاً and then changed to انغلاء انغلاء اعلاً with the added نين ligatured to the initial 'ain without the latter being changed to the medial form. The second half of the line reads in the Yale manuscript انًا اناناً وانغل جانيه انغلاء انغلاء, a variant which is indicated in Macartney's notes.

Page 2:6. Macartney and Muti' Babbili have من بين مِنْ بين, but Muti' Babbili prefers تَبَتْهُ to the definitely indicated ِتِنْضِئُهُ of the papyrus and the Macartney text.

⁶ Fu'ad Sayyid, "Makhtutat al-Yemen," Majallat su'l-ka'ba al-wakhblatiyyah (Cairo, 1955) 197; see also Dar al-kutub al-mi'iriyyah, Fihrist al-makhtutat, cd. Fu'ad Sayyid, II (Cairo, 1962) 31. It is not clear to me what the relationship of this San'ā’ manuscript is to the San'ā’ manuscript which Griffini turned over to the Ambrosian Library in Milan and which was freely used by Macartney, who refers to it as “Ambr.” and indicates that it does not contain ode No. 57, the ode of our papyrus text (see Macartney, pp. vi f. and xxxix).
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Page 2:8. Verse 27 of Macartney and Muḥṭī Babbili reads

\[\text{واسمح كالاسود مسكرًا على المنين مسللا جفلاً} \]

but is missing between lines 8 and 9 of our text.

Page 2:9. Macartney and Muḥṭī Babbili have \(\text{وجها حداً} \) for \(\text{وجها خداً} \); Muḥṭī Babbili has \(\text{واحسههم} \).

Page 2:10. See n. 120 on p. 184.

Page 2:12. The last word of the line, \(\text{احتالاً} \), is reconstructed from the Macartney text, where the variants \(\text{احتالاً} \) and \(\text{احتالاً} \) are also given.

Page 2:13. Scribal confusion is indicated in the first half of the verse, where \(\text{ما} \) and an illegible word following it should be deleted. Macartney, Muḥṭī Babbili, and the Yale manuscript have \(\text{هما} \) for \(\text{شياً} \).

Variants for \(\text{احتالاً} \) are \(\text{احتالاً} \) and \(\text{احتالاً} \), and the latter is preferred by Muḥṭī Babbili.


Page 3:2. Note the raised \(\text{alif} \) of ہ. Some early manuscripts omit this \(\text{alif} \), as, for example, in the case of ہہ (see Vol. II 166). The marginal note reads ہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہہلا
Page 4:7. The full line parallels the Macartney text, but the footnotes yield لَمَّا for لَمَّا and the variant reading وَلَسْتَ بِمَادِحِ أَبا لِيْبَى بِشَرِّيْ. The variant reading is preferred by مُتُّبِّ بابلي, as is also the variant اصاب. Note that lines 7–13 of our text and the rest of this long ode are devoted to the poet’s justification of his praise of بَيْلِلَهِ بْنَ أَبِي بَرْدَاهُ and his family and to the panegyric itself (see pp. 173 f. below).

Page 4:9. Macartney and مُتُّبِّ بابلي have كُرْمَمْ and كُرْمَمْ فَغَالِكَ.

Page 4:12–13. The reconstruction of the damaged text follows in part the Macartney and مُتُّبِّ بابلي editions. The definite article of الأُخُوَّة is missing in both editions. Before the last word of line 12 there seems to be an illegible word which disturbs the meter. The confused text could be due in part to the several breaks in the papyrus and in part to scribal carelessness, perhaps resulting from a belated effort to align the extensions at the ends of the two lines. The plural الأخوَّة of line 13 can refer to brothers and close kin as well as close friends. دُحُّ الرِّمْمَة could, therefore, be referring to some of his relatives, especially to his brother حِشَام (see pp. 174 f. below), but hardly to his earlier failure to win a reward from ‘أَبِ الدَّالِيْك. The second hemistich of line 13 deviates markedly from both the Macartney and مُتُّبِّ بابلي texts, which are the same as the Yale manuscript, and which read: واَكُرْمُهُمْ وَأَنْ كُرْمَمْ وَفَغَالِكَ. Inasmuch as neither Macartney nor مُتُّبِّ بابلي indicates the version found in our text as a variant in any of the manuscripts or the copious literary sources they cite, it could well be that our text is دُحُّ الرِّمْمَة’s original version, which was later edited either by the poet himself or by one of his leading transmitters.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

I

Dُحُّ الرِّمْمَة’s comparatively short life spanned the last part of the reign of ‘أَبِ الدَّالِيْك through most of the reign of حِشَام and thus coincided in part with the lives of جَرْر and فارِدِت. The major political and literary background of this period has been considered above at some length in connection with Documents 4–6. We note, to begin with, that inclination and circumstances seem to have turned Dُحُّ الرِّمْمَة away from playing an active political role comparable to that of جَرْر and فارِدِت among other poets. Reading through his ذيْمَن, one has to conclude that his first and lasting passion was for nature in its desert setting. Little of the desert’s hardships, its dunes and water sources, its flora and fauna escaped his sharp eye and receptive mind. But, like most poets of his day, he was drawn to the flourishing cities of بَسْرَة and كَفاَح (see p. 201, n. 255), alternating between them and the desert. He learned the rudiments of reading and writing from an itinerant city dweller and later taught school in the desert (بَدِيْيَة). He preferred to have his poetry written down,7 as did other poets of his day whose literary activities have been covered above.8

A number of Dُحُّ الرِّمْمَة’s verses reveal his familiarity with formal manuscripts, old and contemporary, and with the act of writing itself, as in the following verses from Macartney, the last verse being from an ode that the poet recited to ‘أَبِ الدَّالِيْك.

No. 1:4: من ذِمَّة نَسْفَتْ عَنْهَا الصَّبَغْ سَفَعاً كَانَ دِيَارُ الحَيَّ بِالْرَّقْ خَلَقْهُمْ
No. 18:1: من الأرضِ آمَ مُكْنَوَّةٍ بَدْرُدٌ كَانَ دِيَارُ الحَيِّ بِأَرْقَ خَلَقْهُمْ.

7 Jahiz, Hayawān I 41 (see p. 197 below); Aphārī XVI 121; Sāli, Adab al-kutūb, p. 62; Muwashshah, pp. 172, 178, 192; Khaṣṣal III 296; Muḥarrī II 340 f. See also p. 155 above.
8 Particularly instructive are references, direct or indirect, to manuscripts of Aḥḵṭal, جَرْر, and فارِدِت and the court poets of the poet-caliph وَلَد II (see e.g. pp. 97 f., 113, 116 f., 145 f.).
VERSES FROM AN ODE OF DHŪ AL-RUMMAH

No. 38:1: 
No. 51:1: 
No. 66:4: 
No. 71:3: 
No. 73:2: 
No. 81:6: 

Furthermore, most of the early sources on hand report that he dictated his poetry and at times corrected the resulting manuscript.

Teaching school in a desert settlement could have involved little more than reading, writing, and the recitation of the Qur’ān. Dhū al-Rummah makes frequent allusions to Qur’ānic phrases and terms, at times in justification of his own views and conduct. Nevertheless, he did not play an active role in the religious controversies of his day, though some sources refer to him as a Qādirite and a Mu’tazilite. He seems to have been preoccupied primarily with his poetry, which, despite his natural talent, he sought constantly to polish and perfect (see p. 190). But, like most poets of his day, he aspired to fame and fortune and hoped to achieve both through royal patronage. We find him very early in his career reciting a long ode to 'Abd al-Malik supposedly in praise of that royal patron of poets, but the ode turned out to be mostly in praise of the poet’s she-camel Ṣāda’. Displeased and disappointed, ‘Abd al-Malik told the young poet to seek his reward from his mount and dismissed him empty handed. Thereafter the poet apparently was disinclined to seek royal favor and was content instead with the patronage of local officials and provincial governors, with whom he fared more favorably. Among these were Muhāzir ibn ‘Abd Allāh, governor of the Najdian Yamamah, ‘Umar ibn Hubairah, governor of ‘Iraq (103–5/721–23), and particularly Bilāl ibn Abi Burdah. Bilāl started as chief of police in Baṣrah and rose to be judge, to which office was soon added the deputy-governorship of Baṣrah under Khālid al-Qaṣrī, Hishām’s governor of ‘Iraq (105–20/723–38).

It is possible that Dhū al-Rummah sought and received the patronage of ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Bishr ibn Marwān, deputy-governor of Baṣrah during the governorship of Maslamah ibn ‘Abd al-Malik, who was removed from that office along with his appointees, including ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Bishr, by Yazīd II in 103/721. Dhū al-Rummah does mention an Ibn Bishr, whom Macartney correctly suspected was this ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Bishr, for he is referred to as Ibn Bishr by Farazdaq and in the sources also. In the poet’s only other reference to a Marwānid he could well mean either Maslamah or this Ibn Bishr.

8 See e.g. Jāhiz, Ḥayawān I 41, 63, 65 (this entire section up to p. 104 being instructive for its numerous references to early writing and to books); ‘Iṣbah I 194; Muwassakhsah, pp. 177 f.; ‘Umdah II 194.

9 Maqāla ‘ulamā’, p. 74, but see Aghānī XVI 122. It should be recalled that Walīd II also was considered a Qādirite (see n. 111 on p. 92 above).

10 Poets considered it beneath their dignity and a disgrace to accept rewards from other than heads of state and their chief administrators, i.e., primarily caliphs, governors, and wazirs (see e.g. ‘Iṣbah I 275; ‘Umdah I 52–54; n. 49 on p. 175 below).

11 Aghānī XIX 168. See Macartney, No. 81, for this ode of 48 verses, the first 17 of which are devoted to Mayya, verses 18, 22–23, and 25 to the caliph, and the rest to the camel.

12 See e.g. Macartney, Nos. 31, 33, 62.

13 See e.g. ibid. No. 26.

14 See e.g. ibid. No. 25.

15 See e.g. Jumáhī, p. 14; Tabāris II 1508, 1523, 1939. Another patron of Dhū al-Rummah, mentioned in passing, was Ibrāhīm ibn Hishām al-Makhzūmī (see Macartney, No. 78:1, 19–22, 25–27).

16 Jumáhī, pp. 287 f.; Mubarrād, pp. 288, 479; Tabāris II 1417, 1433 f., 1436; Aghānī XIX 16 f.


18 See Macartney, No. 5:67.
There is, furthermore, a curious account with no isnad that reports Dhū al-Rummah as congratulating the caliph Marwān II (127–32/744–50) on his accession. The poet is described as decrepit and bent low with age. Marwān made a pointed comment to the effect that he did not expect the poet to be able to produce any verse in his praise after all the praise he had lavished on Mayya (or Mayyah) and his she-camel ẓaida. Dhū al-Rummah assured him he could indeed and recited

\[
\text{فَقَلَتْ لَنَا سَيْرَى إِمامَكَ سَيْدَينَ تَفْرَعُ مِن مَّرْوَانَ وَمِن مَّحْمَدِ}
\]

which again included his she-camel. And the poet then recited

\[
\text{طَوِّبَتُ غَدَائِرَهَا بِبَنِيَّ يُنُبِّيَ وَمَا الْرَّبُّ مَحَاسِنَ الْخَلْدِ}
\]

in response to Marwān’s wish to know what Mayya was doing. Marwān was impressed with the matched rhyme of these two verses and ordered the poet to be rewarded with 1,000 dinars for each of his ancestors whom the poet had named in the first verse. Said Dhū al-Rummah: “Had I known this, I would have mentioned your forebears back to ‘Abd Shams.”

This episode is improbable since there is general agreement that Dhū al-Rummah died no later than 117/735. On the other hand, the poet could have visited Prince Marwān on his appointment in 114/732 to the governorship of Maušil along with that of Armenia and Adhrabijān. The description of the poet as being decrepit and bent low with age gains some support from other reports of his physical appearance (see pp. 181–83). But his description of Mayya, who was probably not much older than he, as a gray-haired old woman with no trace of beauty left in her face needs further support.

Mayya, beloved of Dhū al-Rummah, and Bīlāl ibn Abī Burdah are the objects of praise in our papyrus text. We turn our attention first to the latter. Bīlāl’s character and reputation as a public official left much to be desired. To gain consideration for high office he relied in part on the reputation of his grandfather Abū Mūsā al-Ashʿarī, conqueror of much of ʿIrāq, judge and governor of Baṣrah and Kūfah during most of the reigns of ʿUmar I, ʿUthmān, and ʿAlī. He relied more on his own guile and strong hand to win and hold such office. We find him congratulating ʿUmar II on his accession and striving through lengthy public prayers to impress the pious ʿUmar with his own piety while secretly offering a year’s salary for help in securing the appointment as governor of ʿIrāq. The attempt boomeranged, for ʿUmar himself had set his confidant to test Bīlāl’s display of piety. And when the bribery was revealed to ʿUmar, he instructed the then governor of ʿIrāq not to employ Bīlāl in any official capacity.

Bīlāl’s big opportunity came during Khālid al-Qaṣrī’s governorship of ʿIrāq, when as deputy-governor of Baṣrah he acquired direct and full control of most of its civic offices, including the police department, the judgship, and the leadership of public worship. There seems to be general agreement that Bīlāl’s strong hand grew progressively oppressive and his temper extremely intolerant of criticism, so that complaints against his avarice, injustice, and autocratic rule went directly to Hishām, who then ordered

\[\text{مَثَلُ حَمَّامِ الْوَلَادَةِ وَأَحَداَكَانِ وَيَقَابُكَانِ وَالسَّلَامُ إِبْكَامًا.} \]

\[\text{(cf. Akhbār al-quḍūt II 21.)} \]

\[\text{Akbār al-quḍūt II 21; Ibn ʿAṣakir III 319 f.} \]
Khālid to remove Bilāl from office and hold him as house prisoner. Khālid did so rather reluctantly in 118/736, some two years before his own downfall and the death of Bilāl in 120/738.27

Bilāl, like most others of his class and position, was well versed in poetry28 and was also a patron and a tolerable critic of poets. Both Jarir and Farazdaq were too old to be actively seeking court favor except that Khālid al-Qasrī was still a desirable subject for poets of their caliber and fame. Farazdaq is known to have called on Bilāl, who in turn visited the poet during his last illness.29 Jandal ibn al-Rā’i sought Bilāl’s favor and met with mediocre success.30 On the whole Bilāl seems to have preferred the company of wanton poets such as the Kūfī Ḥamzah ibn Būj, whose friendship with Bilāl dated back to their youth.31 Ḥammad al-Rāwiyah also sought Bilāl’s favor, and he received it even though Dhu al-Rummah pointed out Ḥammad’s attempt to pass off some pre-Islamic verses in praise of Bilāl as his own (see pp. 97 f.). The incident led to Ḥammad’s acknowledgment of Dhu al-Rummah’s expert knowledge of the difference between pre-Islamic and Islamic idiom.32 Ḥammad supplemented this opinion with complimentary statements on Dhu al-Rummah’s wide knowledge and eloquence and compared him to Imru’ al-Qais in his masterful use of simile.33 Dhu al-Rummah’s rival Ru’bah ibn al-‘Ajjaj, who accused him of plagiarizing his verse,34 was on familiar enough terms with Bilāl to ask him why he still rewarded Dhu al-Rummah despite the accusation. Bilāl’s answer implies a preference for the personality of our poet, regardless of his compositions.35 Nevertheless, it was not Ru’bah but the more serious and sober Dhu al-Rummah who came to be recognized as the panegyrist of Bilāl, who outlived Dhu al-Rummah by some three years. Patron and poet proved congenial enough despite their marked difference in personality and character.

Bilāl was in a position to take advantage of the poet, whom he declared to be not a good panegyrist. Like ‘Abd al-Malik, Bilāl was annoyed at Dhu al-Rummah’s preoccupation with his she-camel Sāida in odes that were intended to praise him. When the poet recited

قِيَ اَللَّهِ ْنَاسًا يَتَيَتَّنُونَ غَيْبًا

Bilāl exclaimed: “So no one seeks me except Sāida!” He then ordered one of his men to give Dhu al-Rummah feed for his camel and thus shamed the poet.36 Bilāl sometimes criticized Dhu al-Rummah’s verses unjustly when not even Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alā’, fearful of Bilāl’s anger and vengeance, dared to declare Dhu al-Rummah in the right.37 For fearful indeed was Bilāl’s vengeance, as exemplified by his

27 Taḥṣar II 1657 f., 1779 f.; Ibn ‘Asākir III 319 f. For Ḥassān al-Nabāṭ, who was involved in Khālid’s downfall, see p. 84 above.
28 See e.g. Jumāḥī, p. 473; Aḥānī XVI 122; Aḥhār al-qulūb II 30.
29 Aḥānī XIX 32 f., 44.
30 Ibid. XX 172.
31 Ibid. XV 15, 25 f.
32 Aḥhār al-qulūb II 34; Aḥānī V 172, 174; Jumāḥī, p. 41, where Bilāl, himself an expert in the poetry of Ḥuṭa‘ah, detects Ḥammad’s plagiarism of Ḥuṭa‘ah’s verses in praise of Abū Mūsā al-Asbāḥ’s (see e.g. Aḥānī II 506 and XI 29). Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Asad defends Ḥammad and presents evidence of his general reliability as transmitter of pre-Islamic poetry (Uṣūl al-ḥisab, pp. 440-50).
33 Aḥānī XVI 113: “لَمْ أُقْسِمَ وَلَا أَعْمَلْ بِمَثْبِرٍ مِنْهَا، كَانَ أَحْسَنُ الْجَامِعِيَّةِ تَشْيَبُهَا أَمْرُ الْقَبْسِ وَذَوْرُ الْرُّؤْمَةِ أَحْسَنُ أَهْلِ الْإِسْلَامِ” (cf. Jāḥiṣ, Bayān I 144).
34 Shi‘r, pp. 336-40, stresses Ḥuṭa‘ah’s borrowing or elaborating of other poets’ ideas (as against outright theft (ṣīrqa‘ah), of which Ru’bah accused him (Aḥānī XVI 121): “لَمْ رَوْبَهَا كَلِمَةً قَالَهَا شَخْصُ أُذُنَّهُ فَاوْلَادُهُ” (Isaiah 1:121).”
35 Aḥānī XVI 123: “قَالَ رُوْبَهَا لِلَّيْلَانِ بْنِ أَبِي بُرَدةِ عِلْمَ تَعَفَّى ذَلِّيْلَةِ ذَلِّيْلَةٌ فَوَالَّدُهُ اَلْإِنْفُضُّ الأَلْوَرُ” (Isaiah 1:123).”
37 See Aḥānī XVI 121 f. and Aḥhār al-qulūb II 25 and 37 f. for accounts that trace back to ‘Aṣmā‘; see also Jumāḥī, pp. 483 f., and Ibn ‘Asākir III 320. For Abū ‘Amr’s general attitude toward those in power see p. 26 above.
treatment of the poet-scholar Khalid ibn Safwan, who had dared to protest his oppressive rule. It is therefore not surprising that Dhu al-Rummah was questioned as to why he praised Bilal above all others. His reported answer ignores completely Bilal’s reputation and stresses his own code of conduct. “Because,” said he, “he (i.e., Bilal) has smoothed my couch, regarded my company, and rewarded me handsomely, I find it only right, because of his great favor, that he should fully command my gratitude.” As it happens, both question and answer and the sentiments they convey are reinforced in Dhu al-Rummah’s poetry, particularly in the ode which is represented in our papyrus text and from which the following verses are drawn:


In the rest of this long ode Dhu al-Rummah continues to lavish high praise on Bilal and his ancestors, as he does in several other long odes. Careful reading of this material in the light of this family’s historical record leads me to conclude even after allowing for poetic hyperbole and even if the poet, as he claims, is not lying that he is at best telling but part of the truth—a practice followed by a goodly number of his profession.

II

Little is known of the personal history of Dhu al-Rummah and his immediate family, particularly his parents. He was raised by his oldest brother, Hisham ibn Uqbah, and he had two other brothers, the younger of whom preceded him in death while the older, Mas‘ud, outlived the others. All four brothers were poetically gifted, but Dhu al-Rummah surpassed the other three in output and reputation. He is, nevertheless, accused of exploiting some of their ideas and appropriating some of their verses, which because of his established reputation were then attributed to him. However, there seems to have been no diwa‘n of the poetry of either Hisham or Mas‘ud, both of whom are mentioned in the sources primarily in connection with Dhu al-Rummah himself.

The family fortunes apparently declined on more than one occasion. The Muhallabids are said to have defrauded and ill-treated the family. Dhu al-Rummah is referred to, perhaps as a youth, as a tufaili, that is, a parasitic adventurer who was habitually an intruder at festive parties or at mealtime. Again, we find

28 Akhbar al-qudat II 25, 37 f. When Bilal was deposed and imprisoned, Khalid was then set free and pleaded for the freedom of Bilal (ibid. II 38 f.). For Khalid’s literary style and personality see e.g. pp. 73-75 above.
29 Akhbar al-qudat II 34; Balhaqi, p. 131: قيل له لما خصصت بلاد بن أبي بردة يدحك فقال فيها وطاء مستهجوي وأكرم خليفي وأحمص صاحب فقح كبير مرهون عنه في ينطى على شكري (cf. Ibn ‘Asakir III 320).
30 Macartney, No. 67:52-54 (= page 4:7-9 of our text) and 59-60.
31 See Macartney, Nos. 32, 33, 59, 87.
32 E.g. Mubarrad, p. 145.
33 The name of this brother is given as جواسى. جواسى or جواسى is also spelled جواسى, which latter is believed to be confused with a cousin’s name (see Aghani XVI 111; Juma‘i, pp. 480 f.).
34 Aghani XVI 114; Macartney, p. 157.
35 Aghani XVI 111;
36 Aghani V 165; cf. Macartney, No. 81:1
37 Aghani XVI 112.
him accusing his brother Hishām of being jealous of him and keeping him at a distance when Dhū al-Rummah’s own fortunes were low. He seems to have been closer to his brother Mas‘ud despite the latter’s pointed criticism of his tearful verses (see p. 186). Perhaps Bilāl, who was reckoned a miser, did not always reward the poet handsomely. But the poet himself was in truth a spendthrift, as his daughter realized (see below). For shortly before his death and after taking counsel with his brother Mas‘ud, he started reluctantly on a trip to seek the caliph Hishām’s favor. He rode his aged she-camel and met with a fatal accident, probably on the way out though one account places it on the return trip and describes the poet as wearing a robe of honor supposedly received from the caliph. His chief mourners were his brothers Hishām and Mas‘ud, especially the latter to judge by his several dirges ending in different rhymes.

Of Dhū al-Rummah’s private life next to nothing is known. He does not seem to have married, and no specific concubine is romantically associated with him unless there was a one-sided sentiment on the part of Kathīrah (see p. 179). He was proud of his kunyah, Abū al-Ḥārith, which may have been just a nickname since there is no specific mention of a son named Ḥārith. Some credit the poet with a son named ‘All, who is said to have been in love with Salmā, a daughter of Mayya, but others question this. He did have a daughter, Lailā, who was so identified by his brother Mas‘ud as sharing his grief, though she had deplored her father’s free spending. There is mention of a niece, Tumāḍir, the daughter of Mas‘ud, but no reference to nephews. It would seem therefore that the survival of Dhū al-Rummah’s poetry was due in the first place to his own efforts in having it written down, secondly to the efforts of his several transmitters, and eventually to generations of scholars and musicians who were fascinated with his similes and his romantic odes.

DHŪ AL-RUMMAH AND MAYYA

I

Though the sources on hand contain many references to Dhū al-Rummah’s romances, the information they provide is for the most part spotty, often inconsistent, and at times quite contradictory. The poet early became the object of literary and anecdotal monographs titled Aḥbār Dhū al-Rummah by such second- and third-century litterateurs as Ishaq ibn Ibrahim al-Mausali and his son Hammad and Harūn ibn Muhammad ibn al-Zayyāt. These works are frequently cited in literary sources, especially in Abū...
al-Faraj al-Isfahani's Aghani, where a particular khabar is often introduced with a full isnad tracing back to the author or with the statement "I copied from the book of So-and-So," one of the above-mentioned authors among others being named. Furthermore, Dhū al-Rummah's romance with Mayya caught the imagination of some writer(s) of historical tales along with the famous romances of Janîl and Buthainah, Kuthayîr and 'Azzah, Majnûn and Lailâ, Yazîd and Ḥabîbah, and many others. The great majority of romantic tales were anonymous, and all seem to have been popular with the general public. Some were written by second-century scholars who were reasonably reputable in other fields, such as 'Isa ibn Dâb (d. 171/787 or 788) of Medina, schoolteacher and poet knowledgeable in genealogy and general information (ansâb wa akhbar), who composed historical tales and fictional stories and found favor with the caliphs Mahdi and Hâdi. The Fihrist list of authors of such fictionized historical romances includes 'Isa and the still better known second-century Hishâm ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Sā'id al-Kalbi and Haitham ibn 'Adî. Significant for us is the fact that the historical and literary accounts as well as the fictionized romances circulated in the second century and that both types are reflected in the subsequent literature on hand beginning with the works of Jumâhî and Jâhiz and including the works of a good number of their successors for centuries thereafter. While this accounts for some of the inconsistencies and contradictions noted in the sources, it provides no sure means for detecting the thin line between historical fact and literary fiction. Such being the case, the Dhūn of Dhū al-Rummah, though incomplete, must be our first guide to his romances and particularly to his romance with Mayya, to whom the first part of our papyrus text is devoted.

II

Among the facts that emerge from the heterogeneous sources on hand is that there were at most four women who at one time or another caught and held, for varying periods of time, the poet's fancy. Furthermore, all four women were Bedouins whose home grounds were in the Najdian Dahnâ', the home district of the poet himself. One gathers from his Dhūn that the poet's family headquarters were not far from those of the women, which in turn were not far each from the other. The locality in which three of the women and, for the most part, the poet himself lived and moved was the town of Ḥuwâ and its environs—a comparatively firm and fertile region nesting in a valley of the seven-hilled dunes of the Dahnâ'. It is in Ḥuwâ and occasionally a few other places in this general locality that the poet places the fourth woman. Furthermore, the scenic beauty of the Dahnâ' dunes so affected Dhū al-Rummah that he is said to have chosen its highest hilltop, near Ḥuwâ, for his burial place.

It is not possible to determine with certainty who was Dhū al-Rummah's first love nor yet to what extent his love affairs overlapped. The Dhūn mentions a certain Ṣâidâ' in one ode only, with no reference to another woman as a possible rival, which suggests an early passing infatuation. It mentions Umâmah, known also as Umm Sâlim, less frequently than the other two. The affair with her may have

59 E.g. Aghani XVI 110-14, 117-19, 122, 125-27; see also Muwašshah, pp. 108, 178, 194.
60 Fihrist, p. 306.
61 See e.g. Jâhiz, Bayân I 68, II 62, III 250 and 262; Jâhiz, Tâj, p. 116. See also Marûbîh, pp. 99 f., where Aṣma'i accuses 'Isâ of forging poetry and akhbâr and of false attribution of linguistic information to the Bedouins, which opinion is repeated in Isâhab VI 104-11 and Mu'âhir II 414. Such false attribution reflects the Bedouins' reputation for linguistic knowledge.
62 Fihrist, p. 306; see ibid. pp. 30, 95 f., and 99 f. for these authors' main entries and list of their works.
63 Yaqût II 61, 262 f., 635 f., III 610 and 830, IV 43. See also Macartney, e.g. Nos. 30:9, 39:11, 60:5, 60:1, 10-11, 13, 17, and 21 (all referring to both Mayya and Kharqâ'). See also Aghani XVI 129 f.
64 Yaqût II 635 f. and III 885; Macartney, No. 75:16. See also Aghani XVI 129 f.
65 Macartney, No. 11:1, 11-12, 16, 21-22, 26. A variant for Ḥuwâ, which suggests the possibility that Ḡud was a pseudonym for Mayya during the poets' early secret infatuation.
66 Ibid. Nos. 15:1 and 3, 50:5, 79:10 and 44, 84:2-6; in Nos. 23:5-6 and 72:1-4 both she and Mayya are mentioned, and in No. 48:1-15 an actual meeting of the poet and Umm Sâlim is mentioned. See also Uyun IV 142.
preceded the poet’s public declaration of his love for Mayya, as can be deduced from the following verses:\(^{67}\)

The ode continues with more verses on Mayya. And in the only other ode in which the two are named, again only passing reference is made to Umm Sālim while the rest of this short ode of eight verses is devoted to Mayya.\(^{68}\) Otherwise, Umm Sālim fades out of the picture so far as both the sources and the Diwān are concerned.

Of the several accounts of Dhu al-Rummah’s first meeting with Mayya, the most reliable seems to be that given by the poet himself as he recalled it some twenty years later. Thirsty in the desert, Dhu al-Rummah along with an older brother and a cousin sight a large encampment. Dhu al-Rummah, then only a boy, is sent to ask for a skinful of water. An elderly woman calls on Mayya to fill his container. The boy loses his heart to Mayya on first sight and is so affected that he neglects to hold steady the container and the water spills to the left and the right of it. Mayya comments on the thoughtlessness of taking such a young boy on a desert trip. Her comment inspires him to recite his very first five verses—in the rajaz meter—to which he added later. “Thereafter,” concluded the reminiscing poet, “I have remained desperately in love with her for these twenty years.”\(^{69}\)

A number of unusually clear-cut statements in several of the poet’s verses tell us that he was but a boy of ten when he first saw and fell in love with Mayya and that he kept his feelings secret, even from his immediate family, for ten years. Thereafter, he could no longer suppress or hide his love for her.\(^{70}\)

Supplementary accounts, with or without an ḫisnād, of this first meeting add some details which seem far-fetched indeed and others which could be authentic. Among the latter, we note that the boy asked Mayya to mend his waterskin. She said she could not do so because she was a ḳhārqā’, that is, a cherished young maiden who does no menial labor. But, on her mother’s order, she did give him a drink of water. Thereafter, Dhu al-Rummah named her “Kharqā’” and often so referred to her.\(^{71}\) The ḳhārqā’ detail is particularly important because it has led to the confusion of Mayya, who was of the Banū Mīnqar, with a woman who came later into the poet’s life and whose given name was Kharqā’. She was of the Banū al-Bākka’ Ḯbn ‘Āmir and is therefore referred to as the Bakkā’iyah and the ‘Āmiriyah. Corroboration of these bits of information about the poet’s first meeting with Mayya is found in his verse

that refers to their chance meeting while both were young and in his verse

that indicates that it was thirst and the need for water that had brought him to her people’s place.\(^{72}\)

\(^{67}\) Macartney, No. 22:5–6.

\(^{68}\) Ibid. No. 72. For other reference to Umm Sālim see ibid. comments on No. 48:1–15, which deal with linguistics rather than with information about her.

\(^{69}\) Aghānī XVI 114; cf. Macartney, No. 22, esp. verses 21–25.

\(^{70}\) See Macartney, No. 35:1–4 and 12–16.

\(^{71}\) Aghānī XVI 110. The often-repeated statement that it was she who first hailed him as “Dhu al-Rummah,” must be disregarded. More reliable are the statements of scholars who link the name to his verse

(see Macartney, No. 22:7; Jumāh, pp. 483 f.; Shīr, p. 334; Aghānī XVI 110 f.; Ibn Khallikān I 448 [= trans. II 45]; Yāqūt II 822; Muzāhir II 440; Khīzānāh I 61 f.).

As I see it, the second meeting between Mayya and the poet must have taken place several years later, when the boy was no longer readily recognizable in the grown young man. In the meantime, Dhū al-Rummah’s reputation as a poet had been established and his verses on Mayya had become well known. The salient points in the account of this meeting are as follows. A group of travelers, including Dhū al-Rummah, alighted at the encampment of Mayya’s father. The guests were refreshed with a drink of milk, but Dhū al-Rummah was for some reason overlooked, whereupon Mayya herself gave him a drink of fresh milk. When the company left, her father revealed Dhū al-Rummah’s identity as “the man who has been saying all those things about you.” The embarrassed girl exclaimed: “Oh how awful! Oh how wicked!” She then went into her tent, and her father did not see her for three days. In this context Mayya’s exclamations could not possibly refer to Dhū al-Rummah’s appearance. They must refer, therefore, to the entire situation, that is, to the poet’s numerous romantic verses about her, to his visit to her father, and to her waiting on him without recognizing him.

Another meeting with Mayya, if it indeed took place, must have occurred after this incident. This time, Dhū al-Rummah comes upon Kharqa (= Mayya74) and a company of her young women at a watering place. He orders them to unveil, and all but Kharqa oblige. “He then said to me,” reports Kharqa, “if you do not unveil, I will scandalize you. So I unveiled. He did not cease to recite and recite (his poetry) until he foamed at the mouth. I did not see him thereafter.”

There is an account of still another meeting between Mayya and Dhū al-Rummah. This meeting, if it took place at all, must be placed considerably later than their second meeting at her father’s place. For Mayya is now no longer a sensitive girl in her father’s household but a young woman of independent action and, if the tale is to be believed, of immodest behavior. The story is that Mayya, not having seen Dhū al-Rummah for some time, yet having heard his verses recited, vowed to sacrifice an animal on the day she sees him. When she does see him, he is ugly, short, and swarthy while she herself is among the most beautiful of women. Disappointed in his appearance, she exclaims: “Oh how ugly! Oh how horrid! My sacrifice is indeed wasted!” Angered, Dhū al-Rummah recites the verses

\[
\text{علي وجهي مسحة من ملاحية}
\]
\[
\text{لم تر ان الماء ينبغي طعمه}
\]
\[
\text{وان كان لون الماء ابيض صافيما}
\]

to the effect that she is deceptive and that her clothing hides her physical defects. To these verses she responds, so the story goes, by disrobing and taunting him further with her faultless body. The two part in anger. This episode has the earmark of fiction.

Mayya’s desire to see Dhū al-Rummah, her vow, their meeting, and her disappointment in his physical appearance are possible enough, though, from the several other available descriptions of both of them, theirs was no case of “beauty and the beast” except in the imagination of some fictionist. The remaining details of the account are negated by several factors. First, Dhū al-Rummah denied vehemently that he

---

73 Aghānī XVI 124: 
قال لما أبيها الطرود الرجل الذي سمعته صباهك قالت لا والله قال هو هو النايم القائل فيه الأواديل فرضم.

74 ابتهاج الودنة ولامحية.

75 يبدها على رأسها وؤاظها وإبطها ودخلت فيها فأها أبيها فيئا.

76 الصلة، وكذا يبدها.

77 كتبها على تجذيف Excel. وتجمدت، وعندك، وعندك، وعندك، وعندك، وعندك، وعندك، وعندك.

78 Khatībah I 513 (as trans. in 444 f.; Khatībah I 52).

---

Note that the exclamations can be translated in more than one way, depending on the contexts in which they occur, as here and in n. 77 below.

14 From what is known of Kharqa’s Amiriyah, such an episode could not possibly have involved her.

15 Aghānī XVI 124: 
قال لما أبتها الودنة تجمدت عليه الأقدام فرضم.

16 Al-Harīrī ibn Muhammad ibn al-Zayyāt (mentioned above) on the authority of Ibn al-Sikkit on the authority of his father. See also n. 103 below.

17 Variants are the same, and in the same order, as above. See, further, nn. 77 and 80 below and references there cited.
had ever uttered the verses\textsuperscript{78} that supposedly induced Mayya to disrobe. Second, Kathīrah, a jealous cousin or slave girl of Mayya’s family, eventually acknowledged that she had composed the verses and attributed them to Dhū al-Rummah.\textsuperscript{79} Again, the verses in question are out of tune not only with the great amount of poetry that Dhū al-Rummah devoted to Mayya but also with the poetry he devoted to other women. For one can readily gather from his Diwān that he was much more apt to address women, to chide or to flatter, in language that was more chaste and circumspect than bold and audacious (see p. 187). It should be noted further that the two verses in question, though often cited in the sources,\textsuperscript{80} do not appear in the available copies of his Diwān.

Lovers’ quarrels Dhū al-Rummah and Mayya no doubt had, if not before, then certainly after, her marriage to her paternal cousin ‘Aṣīm. On one occasion Dhū al-Rummah and a company of riders stopped to greet Mayya, who in return greeted all except, pointedly, Dhū al-Rummah. The poet, angered at being so humiliated publicly, departed as he recited two verses of his own to the effect that Mayya had broken for good the tie that was between them and ended with

\[\text{عَلَىَٰٓ(مَهْرَةٍٓ}}\text{ وَفَنَّىُٔ فَلَمّا بَدَّلَتْ}\]

which is the second of Kathīrah’s verses with a slight variation.\textsuperscript{81} The Diwān corroborates a meeting when Mayya did not return Dhū al-Rummah’s greeting, though without the other details. The poet pleads with his companions to go out of their way with him to Mayya’s abode. They arrive and greet her. She returns their greetings but does not answer that of the speaker, that is, Dhū al-Rummah himself.\textsuperscript{82}

Mayya’s marriage greatly distressed the poet, who could not bear the thought of her being married to a stingy man. He expressed his feelings in four verses,\textsuperscript{83} the second of which does play on the idea of Mayya disrobed.

\[\text{لَنُّزِجَتْ مِمَّا خَسِسَتْ لِطَاوِلُ مَآَ} \]

In other verses he implies that the marriage was a family arrangement rather than one of love on Mayya’s part and describes her husband as insecure and jealous and the least worthy of her.\textsuperscript{84} Furthermore, as a distressed and jealous lover himself, Dhū al-Rummah vented his feelings in verses that expressly wished for ‘Aṣīm’s death.\textsuperscript{85}

\textsuperscript{78} Aghānī XVI 119: 119f.
\textsuperscript{79} Jumāhī, pp. 475 f.; Aghānī XVI 119, 121. Macartney, No. 81:16 reads

\textsuperscript{80} See Macartney, pp. 675 f., Addendum 99, which is an ode of 8 verses including the two verses specifically denied by Dhū al-Rummah, three more verses in elaboration of the theme, and two verses of regrets that he wasted so much poetry on Mayya (cf. Aghānī XVI 120; Ibn Khallikan 1 511 [= trans. II 448]).

\textsuperscript{81} Aghānī XVI 119. See also Macartney, p. 675, Addendum 99:3.

\textsuperscript{82} See Macartney, No. 7:1 and 5. The poet often made such a request of his traveling companions (see ibid. e.g. Nos. 58:1, 71:1, 66:1, 83:1, and p. 672, Addendum 82).

\textsuperscript{83} Ibid. No. 86:15–18.

\textsuperscript{84} Ibid. No. 10:30–34.

\textsuperscript{85} Jumāhī, p. 349; Macartney, No. 8, esp. verses 13–14.
The lovelorn poet was drawn to Mayya’s dwelling by his desire to see and talk with her. One dark night he contrived to fall in step with her husband in the hope that he would not be recognized and would be invited in as a house guest. The ruse failed, for Āshīm did recognize him and offered him some food but left him in the outer inclosure. Mayya, too, recognized him. At midnight the poet sang out loud


with a reference to their previous meetings⁸⁶ which so enraged the jealous husband that he ordered Mayya to abuse the poet and deny his statement.⁸⁷ She strove in vain to calm her husband by reminding him of his duty as a host and of the fact that a poet says what he wishes and not what he actually does (see pp. 93 and 95). Under threat of death Mayya did as her husband ordered, whereupon the incensed Dhu al-Rummah rode away determined to transfer his affection to another.⁸⁸

It is at this point that Khārqa' al-Bakkā'iyah, who was better known as Khārqa' al-ʿĀmiriyah, enters Dhu al-Rummah’s life to become repeatedly and at times hopelessly confused in most of the sources on hand with Mayya, who was, we know, also frequently referred to as Khārqa’. But after much sorting and sifting of the sources, including Dhu al-Rummah’s Diwan, a plausible picture of Khārqa’ al-ʿĀmiriyah and her distinct personality begins to appear. Her first meeting with the poet was not long before his death. The object of his first visit was not romance but treatment of his sore eye, for she was known as an oculist (kahhālah). She was advanced enough in age to be concerned about her diminishing beauty. Rather than accept a fee of some sort for treating Dhu al-Rummah’s eye, she asked that he compose ten romantic verses about her and the remaining evidence of her beauty so that people would continue to seek her out for herself as well as for her trade. The poet obliged,⁹⁰ for he saw an opportunity to rouse Mayya’s jealousy. However, he composed but two or three romantic odes about Khārqa’ al-ʿĀmiriyah before death overtook him.⁹⁰ This bit of information also is substantiated by the Diwan of Dhu al-Rummah, which contains only three sustained references to her⁹¹ and some half-dozen passing mentions of her name, some of them in competition with Mayya’s.

Khārqa’’s vanity sustained her concern for the loss of her beauty, for some time later she requested her fellow tribesman Quhaif al-ʿUqaili to compose some romantic verses about her. He responded with


and thus gallantly assured her of increasing beauty though she were to live to be as old as Noah.⁹²

Khārqa’ continued to ply her trade at Faljah, a stop on the pilgrimage road from Bāṣra through the Najdian Hujr,⁹³ where people alighted presumably for eye treatment as well as for her entertaining

---

⁸⁶ See Aghānī XVI 114 with variants and Macartney, No. 47:4; see also Macartney Nos. 43:5, 46:5, and 60:5-6, which express similar nostalgic sentiments of recalling the past.
⁸⁷ The Divān has numerous references to their meetings by day or by night (see e.g. Macartney, Nos. 46:9–10, 47:4, 49:3–5, 51:7, 67:37, 68:15, 78:10, 83:9, 87:8 and 13). See p. 95 above for references to night meetings with the beloved.
⁸⁸ Aghānī XVI 114: فالعرف عنها بقصيرة ما يصرف عن موهبها أل غيرها.
⁸⁹ Aghānī XVI 123: شه ذى الرمية خرفها الماعوية غير حريما وما كانت كمائلة فذات عينه من رد كان له زواب فقال لها: ما تكون نفقات عشرة آلاف دينار بسي أرغب الناس في أذا سمعوا أن في بغية الشبيب فقيل (see Aghānī XVI 123 but see also ibid. p. 114 and Shī‘ī, pp. 335 f.).
⁹⁰ Jumābī, pp. 479 f.; Aghānī XVI 124. See also Aghānī XX 140 f. and Khīṣīsah IV 250. Mubarrad, p. 342, identifies Quhaif as an ʿĀmirī. The name ʿAmīrī is misread in some sources as ʿAbī. Jumābī places Quhaif last in his last of ten groups of four poets each (see Jumābī, pp. 583, 592–99). See Aghānī XX 140–43 for the main entry on Quhaif. Noah is said to have lived 950 years (Surah 29:13).
⁹¹ Yāqūt I 81 and III 911.
conversation, for she was knowledgeable in genealogy and ready with poetry citations. Among those who visited her on the way to or from a pilgrimage was Mufaddal ibn Muhammad al-Ḍabbī, who described her as tall and still beautiful and active despite her age. She berated him for not having visited her on earlier pilgrimages and cited a verse attributed to Dhū al-Rummah: 

\[ \text{طعام الحج ان تفط المطاوما على خرقاء وعامة الفضام} \]

She recited this same verse and the second of the two above-cited verses of Quḥāfīf al-ʿUqailī to Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥajjaj al-Usayyīdī,98 who had stopped to visit her when she was eighty years old.97 She then recalled Dhū al-Rummah, gave a touching description of him (see below), called Allāh's blessing on his soul, recited five verses of her own composition in praise of him, and finally expressed her gratitude to him for making her name famous—the last a sentiment she is said to have expressed in prose also.98

III

The greater number of source references to Mayya's beauty and Dhū al-Rummah's physical unattractiveness lack specific details and were intended, it would seem, to heighten the contrast. The several more or less detailed descriptions of Mayya and Dhū al-Rummah at various periods of their lives narrow this contrast and enable us to gain at least a sketch of their basic physical endowments and yield in addition some clues as to their personalities. That the poet's general appearance left something to be desired is indicated by his mother's reaction to a description of him, probably as a youth, as being small, short, ugly, and humpbacked. "Listen to his poetry," said she, "and look not at his face."99 He could not have improved with the years of exposure to desert life and the hot sun. For when Mayya is supposed to have seen him as a man, she was repelled, as this highly romanticized tale goes, as much by his color as by his general physique. Still another unflattering description of Dhū al-Rummah, based largely on Bedouin hearsay and referring probably to a still later period in his life, presents a picture of a "diseased yet fleshy man, square built and short, with a nose that was not beautiful."100

There are, however, other descriptions of the poet that seem to deserve as much if not, indeed, more credit than the preceding accounts. These trace back, as a rule, through more reliable snādī's to persons who knew the poet more intimately and for long periods. They are of especial interest in that they mention several attractive features of his person and comment on some traits of his personality.

There is a description of the poet as Kharqa' al-ʿAmiriyah recalled him when she was well advanced in age. "He was," reminisced Kharqa*, "of a clear complexion and spoke sweetly, was compactly built, excellent at description, and chaste of eye,"101 A fuller and more balanced description of the poet and

---

94 Aghānī XVI 124 f.; Khātānah I 52.
95 Shiʿr, p. 336; Aghānī XVI 124; Ibn Khallikān I 512 (= trans. II 448 f.); Khātānah I 52. For the verse see Macartney, p. 673, Addendum 87.
96 Aghānī XVI 125 and 127 have ṣīḥīʿī as tribal identifications, but p. 119 has ṣīḥīʿī. The wording of the quantitative is provided in Maʿārif, p. 37, and Dhahabi, Al-mashtabah fi al-ṣirāj I 26.
97 Aghānī XVI 124 f. See Jāhiz, Mahāsin, pp. 204 f., for other occasions on which she cited these verses. She retained her good looks in her old age, but she could not have been 80 years old when Dhū al-Rummah first saw her.
98 Aghānī XVI 125. See p. 184 below for a similar sentiment expressed by Mayya.
99 Aghānī XVI 126 f. See p. 184 below for a similar sentiment expressed by Mayya.
100 The nature of the deformity of the poet's back may have been a degree of curvature rather than a pronounced hump that would have made him readily recognizable at all times. The only other related term associated with him is “his back bent low with age” (ṣāʿī biṣrī “highly lustful eye).
some traits of his personality is transmitted by Abu al-Faraj al-Isfahānī from three of his contemporaries on the authority of Ibn Shabbah on the authority of Ishāq ibn Ibrahim al-Ma’ṣūlī on the authority of Mas’ūd ibn Qand, who heard it from ‘Ismah ibn Malik, a leading direct transmitter of Dhū al-Rummah’s poetry who once accompanied the poet on a visit to Mayya’s home grounds. They come upon Mayya and the women when the men are away. ‘Ismah recites one of Dhū al-Rummah’s longer odes, the first twenty-seven verses of which relate to Mayya, and is interrupted by comments now by one of the women and now by Mayya herself. ‘Ismah and the women retire a short distance while Mayya and Dhū al-Rummah converse, and she accuses the poet of false sentiments. When ‘Ismah sights the dust raised by the mounts of the returning men, he alerts the poet and they depart, as they had come, both riding on ‘Ismah’s pedigreed she-camel used especially for the occasion since the men could detect the footprints of Dhū al-Rummah’s own mount.102 There is no way of knowing how much of this tale is fact and how much fiction. It is of interest because ‘Ismah and not the poet himself is said to have recited the ode, and ‘Ismah’s description of Dhū al-Rummah indicates the reason: “He has nice eyes and a good melodious voice; when he speaks, you sense no impediment in his speech, but when he recites poetry he sputters and his voice grows hoarse.”103 On a later and last visit of the two men to the then deserted site of Mayya’s abode, ‘Ismah, sensing the poet’s deep emotion, comments that he never saw anyone gain such mastery over his passion, and the poet adds “I am indeed (a man) of great endurance and patience.”104 Dhū al-Rummah himself refers frequently to his physical and health handicaps in his verses, but it is not possible to time such references. One may assume, however, that physical symptoms of lovesickness belonged more to his mature days than to his early youth. A few citations will suffice. Such verses as

 recalling in part Mayya’s reaction to his appearance and in part his own awareness of his generally deteriorating health.105

Apart from the general statement that Mayya was a woman of great beauty, the sources provide comparatively few details as to her features and figure. Our one description of her as a young woman

102 Aghānī XVI 129; Ḥaṭīṣ, Maḥāzin, pp. 204 ff., and Amālī III 125 ff add more details, such as Mayya giving the poet a jar of ointment and a string of beads for his mount. See also Macartney, No. 5.1-27, esp. verses 20-22.

104 Aghānī XVI 129: كَانَ كَحْلَ الْمُنْحَمْ حَسَنًا النَّمَةَ أَنَّهُ لمْ تَسْأَمَّ حَيْثَ وَأَنَا أَشْكَلُ بِهَا وَجْلَتْ صَبْحَهَا. Amālī III 124 adds that he was thin-bearded, had bright teeth, a broad forehead, and was of good speech: خَفِيفٌ المَارِخِينْ رِاقٌ دُناَا وَأَضْحَ الْخِيْمَ حِسْنٌ الحَثلِ. The hadith.


106 Macartney, Nos. 1.27, 22:17-20, 64.36-37, 78:14, and 81:3 respectively. Such verses, along with the prose descriptions already cited, may explain why the poet, although he was not yet forty years old, could have been described as decrepit and bent low with age.
comes from 'Ismah ibn Malik, who recalled her appearance when he accompanied Dhū al-Rummah on a visit to her. According to 'Ismah, she was then a tawny-colored, delicately built young woman with long hair, pretty and witty though not, in this context, as pretty and witty as some of the women who were with her.\footnote{Amãlî III 126: لَانَّهَا لَهَا فَتْنَدُ حَيْبَاءُ وَإِبْرَاهِيمُ وَسَرَتُ مَسْتَرُ.}

Mayya as a mother of young sons was described to Jumâhî by Abû Sawwâr al-Ghanawi as smooth complexioned, long of face and cheeks, with aquiline nose, and still with traces of beauty.\footnote{Jumâhî, p. 476: لَسْتَ مَا تَسْتَفَيقُ وَدَوْنِهَا.}\footnote{Ask by Jumâhî if she had recited to him any of Dhū al-Rummah’s verses, Abû Sawwâr answered: “Yes, by Allâh! She gives long sustained recitations the likes of which no one has seen.”\footnote{Jumâhî, p. 476: لَسْتَ مَا تَسْتَفَيقُ وَدَوْنِهَا.}}

A third account comes from Abû al-Muhâlîl, who had gone to considerable trouble to find Dhū al-Rummah’s famed Mayya. Disappointed on seeing her, practically a toothless old woman (see p. 172, with n. 20), he wondered aloud why Dhū al-Rummah had been so deeply enamored of her. “Wonder not,” she is reported as saying, “I will show you his convincing reason.” She then summoned her young daughter and ordered her to unveil. Dazzled by the young girl’s beauty and perfection, the man exclaimed: “May Allâh accept his (i.e., Dhū al-Rummah’s) reason and have mercy upon him!” Mayya then informed him that Dhū al-Rummah was first attracted to her when she was of the girl’s age (and presumably as beautiful). And, in answer to her visitor’s request, Mayya dictated some of Dhū al-Rummah’s poetry to him.\footnote{Ulûn IV 40: قَالَتُ عَلَى يَوْمَ ائْتِيَتِهَا كَانَتْ عَلَى يَوْمِ نَافَعَتُهَا قَالَتُ عَلَى يَوْمِ وَقَعَتُهَا قَالَتُ عَلَى يَوْمِ قَتَلَتُهَا. Cf. ‘Iqã VI 423, which concludes with قَانَتُ عَلَى يَوْمِ كَانَتْ عَلَى يَوْمِ وَقَعَتُهَا قَانَتُ عَلَى يَوْمِ قَتَلَتُهَا.} In a somewhat similar but more detailed interview Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥâjjâj al-Usâyyîdî, on seeing the aged Mayya, said to her: “O, Mayya, I can’t help but see that Dhū al-Rummah has wasted his two verses on you”:\footnote{Uyun IV 40: قَالَتُ عَلَى يَوْمَ ائْتِيَتِهَا كَانَتْ عَلَى يَوْمِ نَافَعَتُهَا قَالَتُ عَلَى يَوْمِ وَقَعَتُهَا قَالَتُ عَلَى يَوْمِ قَتَلَتُهَا. Cf. ‘Iqã VI 423, which concludes with قَانَتُ عَلَى يَوْمِ كَانَتْ عَلَى يَوْمِ وَقَعَتُهَا قَانَتُ عَلَى يَوْمِ قَتَلَتُهَا.}  

Mayya laughed as she pointed out that he sees her now that her beauty has vanished and added: “May Allâh have mercy on Ghâlân! He said these verses about me when I was more beautiful than a glowing fire on a cold night to the eyes of a man suffering from the cold.” Then she summoned her daughter, who is here named Asmâ’. The gist of the rest of the interview is about the same as that with Abû al-Muhâlîl except that there is no mention of Mayya reciting any of Dhū al-Rummah’s poetry.\footnote{Ulûn IV 40: قَالَتُ عَلَى يَوْمَ ائْتِيَتِهَا كَانَتْ عَلَى يَوْمِ نَافَعَتُهَا قَالَتُ عَلَى يَوْمِ وَقَعَتُهَا قَالَتُ عَلَى يَوْمِ قَتَلَتُهَا. Cf. ‘Iqã VI 423, which concludes with قَانَتُ عَلَى يَوْمِ كَانَتْ عَلَى يَوْمِ وَقَعَتُهَا قَانَتُ عَلَى يَوْمِ قَتَلَتُهَا.} Women also were curious about Dhū al-Rummah’s Mayya. One woman who had long wanted to see her \footnote{Jâhiç, Mahâsîn, p. 205.}
did not think much of her when she finally met her until she heard Mayya speak and express her appreciation of the fame that the poet had brought her. Impressed with Mayya’s eloquence, the woman realized that Dhū al-Rummah had not done her full justice,112 an indication that this woman knew some at least of Dhū al-Rummah’s poetry on Mayya. Be that as it may, there is evidence that Mayya herself had memorized much of his poetry and transmitted it to others, for both Abū Sawwār and Abū al-Muhaulhil bore witness to her good memory and ready transmission.

Dhū al-Rummah’s physical descriptions of Mayya as found in his Diwān confirm and surpass those of the sources, which is not surprising since he was a poet-lover. He nowhere gives a complete picture of Mayya at any one period of her life. Yet, no detail of her features and figure seems to have escaped him, though some features are more frequently mentioned than others in the numerous and at times repetitious verbal sketches of her that are scattered in more than fifty of some eighty odes published by Macartney. Though Mayya’s physical attractions loom large in most of these references, articles associated with her such as her attire, jewelry, and perfume113 as well as the furnishings of her dwelling and the litters in which she and her women traveled also receive the poet’s attention.114 And her women companions are not overlooked.115 Dhū al-Rummah’s visits to Mayya and his nostalgic recollections of them, as well as his generally tearful return to the deserted sites, take up many of the traditionally romantic verses (nasib) of the introductions to most of his odes.

Little is to be gained from a list of all the references to each item of Mayya’s physical attractions and traits of personality, though I have noted and analyzed all of them in order to gain a sufficiently representative sketch of Mayya as Dhū al-Rummah actually saw her or as he more often pictured her in a lover’s fantasy. A goodly number of his odes, including the verses in the first part of our papyrus text, give comparatively full descriptions which should be consulted by readers curious about the actual texts. The descriptions are as a rule rich in the metaphors and particularly the similes on which Dhū al-Rummah’s literary reputation as a poet largely rests. Nevertheless, their profuse use in rapid succession tends at times to distract attention from rather than illuminate the subject.116

From the copious Diwān materials on hand we gather that young Mayya was tall and slender, yet small boned and well rounded.117 She had an oval face with a silken-smooth unblemished complexion comparable to the yellow-red glow of the rising sun.118 She had large bright brown eyes rimmed with long black lashes, a color combination expressed in a verse

that is one of the poet’s verses most often cited for its literary quality.119 Her eyes were, moreover, comparable to the eyes of gazelles for their beauty and magic appeal.120 The poet dwells on the sensitive

112 Fadil, p. 115 (see p. 181 above for Kharqāl al-‘Amiriyah’s expression of gratitude to Dhū al-Rummah).
113 See e.g. ibid., Nos. 1:4 and 17, 10:16, 19, and 22, 30:10–22, 35:22–33, 64:11 and 17.
115 See e.g. ibid., Nos. 5:8 and 16–17, 51:8–9, 57:9–20 and 31–32 (= pages 1:1–2:2 and 2:12–13 of our papyrus text), 64:14–19.
118 Ibid. No. 52:16; see, further, Nos. 1:15, 10:20, 24:11, 29:24, 35:30, 57:22–23 and 28 (= page 2:4–5 and 9 of our text).
119 Ibid. No. 1:20; note the many variants of this verse, some of which perhaps originated with the poet himself. For more verses on the eyes see e.g. ibid., Nos. 24:12, 29:23, 30:16–17, 64:16, and p. 668, Addenda 49:2 and 82.
120 Ibid. No. 52:17 (see p. 187 below for citation of this verse and two other such verses). Dhū al-Rummah was opposed to comparing any feature of a woman with that of a cow, as was commonly done, especially in respect to large passive eyes (see e.g. ibid., No. 25:14). He much preferred to compare women to gazelles and at times reversed the simile and compared gazelles to one or the other of his lady loves; see e.g. ibid., Nos. 1:10, 5:19, 10:11–15, 24:10, 52:16–17, 57:14, 16 and 29 (= pages 1:9, 1:11, and 2:10 of our text, where the poet’s sentiment is that not even a gazelle can be compared to Mayya), 66:17. See also Aghānī V 63 and 126 f., X 163, XVI 119; Ḍhorarā, pp. 420, 509; Muwashshah, p. 169; Yṣqūt III 198; Khizānah IV 597.
mouth,\textsuperscript{121} the highly colored lips,\textsuperscript{122} and the even and bright white teeth.\textsuperscript{123} She had a firm chin and long slender neck.\textsuperscript{124} Her braided, heavy, long black hair covered parts of her back and chest.\textsuperscript{125} She had small wrists and slender hands and feet.\textsuperscript{126} Her walk, when she was a heavier mature woman, was slow and swaying.\textsuperscript{127} The poet is enamored of her captivating smile\textsuperscript{128} and enchanted with her soft, sweet, sensible, and elegant speech—speech that he longed to hear whether or not it cured his lovesickness\textsuperscript{129} and even when she questioned his sentiments,\textsuperscript{130}

\begin{quote}
وفد حلقت بالله مية ما الذي احدها الا الذي اكاذاده
لي شكوك الحب كبي تتبين بدي فقات أما انت مسرح
\end{quote}

On the other hand, he speaks of her as being generally patient and understanding,\textsuperscript{132} but he also implies that she was too sparing of her attention so far as he was concerned, so that he was delighted even if she disagreed with him:\textsuperscript{133}

\begin{quote}
اذَا نازعتك القبل مية اودا لك وجه منها او نضا الدرع سالبه
\end{quote}

The poet’s superlatives are lavished on her whom he sees as a true free-born Arab lady—a paragon such as is not to be found among Arabs or non-Arabs:\textsuperscript{134}

\begin{quote}
ذار مية اذا م تساءفنا ولا يرى مثلها عجم و阐عرب
\end{quote}

All in all, as we are told in the following verse, Dhū al-Rummah would have us believe that were even Luqman the Sage to cast an eye upon the unveiled Mayya, he would be dazed and utterly bewildered.\textsuperscript{135}

\begin{quote}
لوا أن لقان الحكم تعرضت لعينه ما سافر كاد يتردق
\end{quote}

IV

Was Dhū al-Rummah sincere in his avowed love for Mayya or was he merely using her name as a literary motif to enhance his reputation?\textsuperscript{137} We note that some of his romantic verses addressed to the three other women in his life, beginning with Sā‘dah, convey at times sentiments similar to those expressed about Mayya. But we note also that thoughts of Mayya intrude even in the odes that start with praise of Ummaymah, or Umm Sālim, and Kharqa. The over-all implications of the Ḏawān so far as Mayya is concerned indicate that she had an ever increasing hold on the poet’s mind and heart during some thirty of the forty years of his life. If his interest in Mayya started as a youthful venture, it persisted through his

\textsuperscript{111} Macartney, Nos. 1:19, 25:16, 57:22 (= page 2:4 of our text).
\textsuperscript{112} Ibid. Nos. 25:16 and 64:14.
\textsuperscript{115} Ibid. Nos. 35:20, 52:15, 64:12-13.
\textsuperscript{116} Ibid. Nos. 30:20, 52:16.
\textsuperscript{117} Ibid. No. 30:21-22.
\textsuperscript{120} See e.g. ibid. Nos. 73:3 and 82:8, where her conversation only aggravated his condition, and p. 676, Addendum 101.
\textsuperscript{121} Ibid. Nos. 5:29 and 10:36.
\textsuperscript{122} Macartney, No. 1:24.
\textsuperscript{123} Ibid. No. 5:22; cf. Aghānī XVI 130 and Amālī III 125, 129.
\textsuperscript{124} Macartney, No. 14:14; see also No. 68:5, where she is referred to as \\
\textsuperscript{125} ibid. No. 1:10; cf. Mubarrad, p. 452, and Kāisīnāh I 378.
\textsuperscript{126} Macartney, No. 52:12.
\textsuperscript{127} Ibid. No. 1:18 reads
\textsuperscript{128} ‘Umduh I 137 f., for example, touches on this controversial point.
maturity despite the remonstrances of friends and family, including his brother Mas'ūd, as indicated by the following two pairs of verses:  

\[\text{Verse 138:}\]

Expressions of his deep and abiding though hopeless love occur time and again in his Divān, and it is possible to trace through some of the verses the likely course of his affection from his first youthful attraction on and on.  

\[\text{Verse 139:}\]

His love was never a case of out-of-sight, out-of-mind, for absence makes his pierced heart grow fonder, and his love could grow no further:  

\[\text{Verse 140:}\]

He loves even the ground on which she treads. Breezes blowing from her people’s quarters agitate his heart with a passion that brings tears to his eyes, but everyone loves the place where his loved one dwells, and, finally, Allah knows that he loves her with a strong and enduring affection:  

\[\text{Verse 141:}\]

\[\text{Verse 142:}\]

\[\text{Verse 143:}\]

\[\text{Verse 144:}\]

\[\text{Verse 145:}\]

\[\text{Verse 146:}\]

\[\text{Verse 147:}\]

\[\text{Verse 148:}\]

\[\text{Verse 149:}\]

\[\text{Verse 150:}\]

\[\text{Verse 151:}\]

\[\text{Verse 152:}\]

\[\text{Verse 153:}\]

\[\text{Verse 154:}\]

\[\text{Verse 155:}\]

\[\text{Verse 156:}\]

Macartney, Nos. 32:3-4 (cf. No. 62:6 ff.) and 58:6-7 (cf. Ibn Khalikān I 512 f. [= trans. II 450]) respectively.

Ibid. No. 57:20 (= page 2:2 of our text).

Ibid. No. 62:12 (cf. p. 661, Addendum 5) and 10:8-9 respectively.

Ibid. No. 10:10 (cf. Nos. 17:28, 25:4-5, 40:8, 41:6-7; Aghānī XVI 122 f.).

Macartney, No. 23:8.

Ibid. No. 8:8-9 (cf. Aghānī XVI 130 and Ibn Khalikān I 611 [= trans. II 448]).

Macartney, No. 53:14.
Thoughts of Mayya haunt him in his dreams as in his waking hours. They intrude even on his prayers—and he was a reasonably religious man—to confuse and confound him to the point that he knows not what he is doing, even to losing count of his forenoon prayers:

Perhaps yet another indication of his sincerity is the generally chaste language he employs throughout in reference to Mayya even when he is angered or frustrated, as in the following verses:

This characteristic of all his romantic odes and sundry verses led Asma’i to consider Dhu al-Rummah the most decent and serious minded of all the lovers he knew. All things considered, it would seem that Dhu al-Rummah while yet a precocious boy of ten was first struck with the young Mayya’s sweet charms and touched by her concern for his tender age as she supplied him with water. He then and there adopted her as his secret talisman for his budding genius. He came later to use her name as a literary device much as a gallant young medieval knight used his exploits to praise and pay homage to his lady fair. But he was soon bewitched, only to endure the pangs of unrequited love:

and finally realized that he was indeed genuinely and deeply in love with her and with her only. But, the sources being what they are, it seems fitting to conclude this line of thought with the familiar “and only Allâh knows best.”

DHÚ AL-RUMMAH THE POET

Dhú al-Rummah, like many another poet, began his career as a transmitter of poetry. And, like many a nephew, he was first directly influenced by an uncle, ‘Ubaid ibn Ḥūsain al-Numairi, better known as Râ’î, “camel-herder” (see pp. 113-16), whose poetry he transmitted. Râ’î had a tangible effect on the

145 See e.g. ibid. Nos. 7:30, 30:14, 57:51 (= page 4:6 of our text), and Addenda 47 and 63 on pp. 667 and 670 respectively. See also Aghâni XVI 128: “If a man says ‘I am the father of the child, the daughter of the child, the son of the child, and (on the authority of ‘Isâ ibn ‘Umar as reported by Asma’i) ‘I am the child of Allâh’ and the like of it, he is a liar.”
146 See also Aghâni XVI 128: “If a man says ‘I am the father of the child, the daughter of the child, the son of the child, and (on the authority of ‘Isâ ibn ‘Umar as reported by Asma’i) ‘I am the child of Allâh’ and the like of it, he is a liar.”
147 Macartney, Nos. 35:34, 52:17, 87:26. It should be noted that Kuthaiyir’s affection for ‘Azzah paralleled that of Dhú al-Rummah for Mayya in that eventually both romances progressed from a professional to an emotional phase (see e.g. Shi’r pp. 321 f.).
young poet’s style and theme orientation, particularly in the description of camels, but not to the point of stifling the younger poet’s inclination or originality.

Dhū al-Rummah’s first attempts at versification centered on the rajaz, a comparatively primitive meter that was all but pre-empted at the time by ‘Ajjāj and his son Ru’bah. The latter, a rival of Dhū al-Rummah, accused him of plagiarizing some of his verses (see p. 173), as he accused Tirimmah and Kumait (see p. 97) of plagiarizing his language materials and even his father of stealing some of his verses. It should be recalled that Dhū al-Rummah was accused of appropriating some of his brothers’ ideas and verses. However, Dhū al-Rummah himself early realized that he could not compete with such rajaz experts as Ru’bah and his father, and thereafter he concentrated on a limited number of other meters that were more suitable for regular odes and used mostly the ṭauwīl, básīf, wāfīr and mutaqqārib varieties.

Just as Dhū al-Rummah knew his limitations as to the rajaz meter, he knew also when to refrain from satire. He refused to satirize the Banū Ḥabtar, who had found fault with some of his verses, because he knew them to be transmitters of poetry and knowledgeable in that art. He must have sensed his weakness in this major category of Arabic poetry, which he nevertheless attempted occasionally though, by the accepted standard of the time, not very successfully. He countered criticism of his ineffective satire by claiming that he did not wish to damage the reputations of believing women, who were as a rule the satirist’s most vulnerable target in attacks on family and tribal honor. But his excuse was no more acceptable to the critics than were similar excuses of ‘Ajjāj and others who were weak in satire (see p. 139, n. 195).

Dhū al-Rummah could hold his own even in satire against lesser poets but not against such master satirists as Jarīr and Farazdaq. This is neatly illustrated in his involvement with Hīshām al-Mara‘ī, whose poetry was mostly in the rajaz meter and hence not conducive to effective satire. Dhū al-Rummah attacked Hīshām and his people for their lack of hospitality and his verses hit their mark. Jarīr, suspecting

---

154 When critics preferred Bā‘ī’s descriptions of camels to those of Dhū al-Rummah, the latter pointed out that Bā‘ī described royal mounts while he himself was more concerned with working camels of the desert and the market place (see Junmāh, pp. 408 f.; Muwaslihah, pp. 174–76).

155 For a definition of this meter see Lane, pp. 1036 f. For its origin and development see e.g. Sibawayh I 147 and 155 and ‘Umdat I 121–24, 126; see also Goldzihier, Abhandlungen zur arabischen Philologie I 76–83 and 120, and for early leading poets who used it see CALS I 90–92. For its later development and for its humble use by Arabs and its exalted use by Persians see EI Supplement, pp. 178–81, and A. J. Arberry (ed.), The Legacy of Persia (Oxford, 1953) pp. 211 f.

156 Numerous bits of personal and literary information and rare anecdotes (ubahhar and naceased) are told of ‘Ajjāj, Ru’bah, and Abū al-Najm al-‘Ijli, whose rivalries were almost as marked as those of Akhtal, Jarīr, and Farazdaq. An anecdote about Ru’bah and some of his verses are included in the text of PERF No. 864, which Karabacek dated to the 3rd/9th century—a date likely enough for the text itself but hardly for the papyrus copy. The latter I would place in the first half of the 4th century, largely on the basis of its script and the fact that it is written on a fragment of a palimpsest which retains remnants of an earlier, 3rd-century script. For parallels, with variants, of the Ru’bah anecdote and some of the verses see e.g. Junmāh, p. 581, and Aghṣān XVIII 125 and XXI 91.

157 Aghṣān X 156; Muwasshahah, p. 299. Ru’bah’s Bedouin diction, as well as that of Farazdaq, was held in very high esteem by Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Al’i (see Khāṣaṣāh I 102: ‘قثال أبو عروء بن الأعدة لم أر بدءا أباب في الحضر إلا فساد غروو فيه وفره’). Ru’bah’s eloquent speech became almost proverbial, while that of Ḥasan al-Baṣrī and that of Ḥabraḥ al-Sīndī were compared to it (Ibn Sa‘d VII 1, p. 121; Jāhiz, Bayāf I 321 f.; see also Khaṣṣāṣāh III 305). For Ru’bah’s accusation against his father see Sirāfī, pp. 91 f., and Ibn ‘Asākir VI 305.

158 Muwasshahah, p. 174. This report traces back to Tha‘lub on the authority of Abū ‘Ubaidah on the authority of Muntajī ibn Ṣaḥānh al-A‘rabī, one of Dhū al-Rummah’s leading transmitters. See also p. 290 below.

159 As readily confirmed by the meters of his Dīwān, which includes also his earlier rajaz pieces, some of them of considerable length (e.g. Macartney, Nos. 12–14 and Addenda 11, 21, 26, 51, 61, 60, 93 on pp. 662 f.).

160 Muwasshahah, pp. 180 f.: ‘سنحه من خذ أيدي موسى الخصمس قبل لئلا ألم أرى حبر قتل إلا لأنهم قوم ردوا بعدهما أي: 180’ (see Aghṣān VII 78 f. for Abū Ḥabtar and Kuthayyir).

161 See Macartney, No. 57:61 (= page 4:6 of our text), which reads
that Dhu al-Rummah favored Farazdaq, injected himself into the quarrel by aiding Hishām with verses in Dhu al-Rummah’s meter and rhyme in answer to Dhu al-Rummah’s attack. But Dhu al-Rummah detected the verses as those of Jarir and took him to task for it, explaining that he did not favor Farazdaq against Jarir. He himself then accepted help from Jarir against Hishām. This was so effective that Hishām and his people eventually prevailed on Jarir to help them again with satirical verses. Jarir’s aid resulted in victory for Hishām shortly before the death of Dhu al-Rummah.

Dhu al-Rummah seems to have been generally more tolerant of criticism from his fellow poets than from scholars, as is well illustrated by his relationships with Jarir and Farazdaq, whose opinions he deliberately sought, in contrast to his resentful attitude toward Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alā’, whose opinions were unsolicited. Abū ‘Amr even though he initiated the statement that “poetry began with Imru’ al-Qais and ended with Dhu al-Rummah” (see pp. 121 and 147) did on occasion find fault with specific verses of Dhu al-Rummah on points of grammar and meaning—a type of criticism with which Farazdaq at times agreed and other poets paralleled though not always justifiably.

Dhu al-Rummah’s desire to impress and win the approval and praise of his fellow poets is indicated also by the fact that he sought the opinions of Kumait and Tirimmah, to whom he recited some verses that he considered among his best. The more amiable and generous Kumait exclaimed that what they had heard was indeed “brocade” rather than the “muslin” of their own verses. The less impressionable and more critical Tirimmah would not go that far but conceded that what they had heard was good enough. Then Dhu al-Rummah recited two of his verses and asked if Tirimmah could produce anything to match them. Tirimmah recognized them as verses from the ode which had displeased ‘Abd al-Malik, who had refused to reward Dhu al-Rummah for it (see p. 171). Kumait urged Tirimmah to give Dhu al-Rummah his due, and in the end Tirimmah apologized and conceded that the reins of poetry were in the palm of Dhu al-Rummah’s hand.

That Dhu al-Rummah protected himself from what he recognized as his weakness is in itself a point of strength. It is instructive to note his own appraisal of what he considered his several strong points as a poet. His pronouncement that Dhu al-Rummah’s descriptions, unlike his own, were made from personal observation (see Aghdānī X 139 reports Kumait’s silent acceptance of what they had heard is indeed “brocade” rather than the “muslin” of their own verses. The less impressionable and more critical Tirimmah would not go that far but conceded that what they had heard was good enough. Then Dhu al-Rummah recited two of his verses and asked if Tirimmah could produce anything to match them. Tirimmah recognized them as verses from the ode which had displeased ‘Abd al-Malik, who had refused to reward Dhu al-Rummah for it (see p. 171). Kumait urged Tirimmah to give Dhu al-Rummah his due, and in the end Tirimmah apologized and conceded that the reins of poetry were in the palm of Dhu al-Rummah’s hand.

That Dhu al-Rummah protected himself from what he recognized as his weakness is in itself a point of strength. It is instructive to note his own appraisal of what he considered his several strong points as a poet. His pronouncement that Dhu al-Rummah’s descriptions, unlike his own, were made from personal observation (see Aghdānī X 139 reports Kumait’s silent acceptance of this type of criticism by various poets and scholars of specific verses of Dhu al-Rummah. See e.g. Aghdānī X 113, where both Jarir and Farazdaq mention Dhu al-Rummah favorably, and ibid. XVI 119, where Farazdaq alone does so.

Aghdānī XVI 117 f. gives a vivid description of Hishām’s reaction to this point. He beat on his head and wailed that Dhu al-Rummah and Hishām could not bypass their respective sub-tribes, the Banū ‘Adī and the Banū Imrī al-Qaṣīs. These latter were characterized as unwarlike agriculturalists and inhospitable eaters of pork and drinkers of wine (see Macartney, No. 29:44–55, esp. verses 47–48, and references under Imru’ al-Qaṣīs on p. xiii). For a sample of Dhu al-Rummah’s restrained allusion to their women, even in satire, see ibid. No. 29:56–60.

See Jumāh, pp. 471–75; Aghdānī VII 61–63 and XVI 116–18. Macartney, Nos. 27:17–19, and 68:78–84, incorporate most of Jarir’s verses in aid of Dhu al-Rummah. The claim that had Dhu al-Rummah lived longer he would have wrested the victory from Hishām should be discounted since the real victor was not Hishām but Jarir, for whom Dhu al-Rummah was no more a match than Rā’ī had been (see pp. 113 f. above) and a similar claim had been made for Ra’ī. See, further, Aghdānī VII 61 and ‘Umdah II 219 f. Khīdānah I 61 f. reports that Dhu al-Rummah refused an invitation from Jarir to exchange satire because he did not wish to attack women.

161 Majālis al-‘ulāmā’, p. 337. See also Macartney, No. 29:3, and ‘Umdah I 181.

162 Muwashshah, pp. 178–85, is devoted largely to this type of criticism by various poets and scholars of specific verses of Dhu al-Rummah. See e.g. Aghdānī XVI 122 f. for a criticism that was itself challenged. Criticism pointing out the errors of poets (اذاعة الأعراب) was a type which hardly any poet or transmitter escaped (see e.g. ‘Umdah II 191–96; Muzhir II 497–505).

163 He not only readily conceded Dhu al-Rummah’s superiority at description but volunteered the reason for it, namely that Dhu al-Rummah’s descriptions, unlike his own, were made from personal observation (see Aghdānī X 157 and XVI 125: إن الله تبارك عليه أن تصف شيئا وأيده بعيب وكان صنيف شيا وصف في وليس المعاني كلامه. Aghdānī I 139 reports Kumait’s silent acceptance of repeated criticism of his verses by Nusaib who preferred in each instance a verse of Dhu al-Rummah (cf. Muzhir II 499 f.).

poet. To begin with, as some of his verses reveal, he considered himself a good and careful technician in his art and extraordinarily effective in his use of uncommon words and phrases that then became ever so widely known:168

He worked hard on revisions, including the addition of new verses, which led one of his several transmitters to protest the confusion caused thereby in his own transmission.169 Dhu al-Rummah acknowledged his debt to Râ'î, his first direct mentor, but claimed that he had surpassed him by far.170 He was perfectly aware of his facility with excellent similes.171 He realized from experience that poetic inspiration was not always at one high level. He classified his odes in three categories, giving an example for each group: those in the composition of which he experienced an easy flow and play of words, those in which he had to exert himself more energetically, and those during the composition of which he was as one completely possessed.172 He illustrated his third category with his famed ode which begins with the verse:

ما بال عنك منا الماء ينكب كأنه من كل مفرة سرب

and which is the one ode that Jarîr envied Dhu al-Rummah for and wished that he himself had composed.173 And Jarîr is reported as saying that had Dhu al-Rummah become dumb after this one ode he would have been the greatest poet among men.174 Dhu al-Rummah was asked: “What would you do should poetry be locked away from you?” He answered: “How can it be locked away from me when I have its keys?”175

168 Macartney, No. 57:48–50 (= page 4:3–5 of our text). See also Jâhîj, Bayân I 153 f. and Khaṣṣâ‘î’s I 325; cf. n. 111 on p. 128 above.

169 Aghâni XVI 118 and Muwassahâh, p. 184: قال بعض رواه إلى الزهّة يتقدم على شعرك وذلك أن ذا الزهّة كان إذا اضطاح خلف ممكان. Such confusion probably accounts for some of the more numerous variants for some of his verses, such as Macartney, p. 5, draws attention to in respect to No. 1:20. For the role of the transmitter as editor, whether he was right or wrong, see e.g. Jumâhî, pp. 20, 40 f.; Jâhîj, Bayân I 269; Íbn Ṭâhâtâbî, p. 124; see also p. 151 above.

170 Aghâni XVI 113. Ibn Shubrumah reported that he heard Dhu al-Rummah say if àJU <JL L- aU ^k 0.\l 121: 15>ا_ا. He once criticized a verse of Dhu al-Rummah and caused the latter to change a word in it only to have Âbû al-Ḥakâm ibn al-Bakhtârî fault first Ibn Shubrumah and then the poet for making the change (ibid. XVI 122 f.; Muwassahâh, p. 180). Ibn Shubrumah was a minor poet and critic who later served as judge in Basrah and for the Sawâd of Kufah and was known as a good and wise judge (see e.g. Majâlis Thâlîb I 269; Ibn Tabataba, p. 151 above.

171 Ib-n Shubrumah reported that he heard Dhu al-Rummah say if âJU <JL U^ k 0.\l 121: 15>ا_ا. He once criticized a verse of Dhu al-Rummah and caused the latter to change a word in it only to have Âbû al-Ḥakâm ibn al-Bakhtârî fault first Ibn Shubrumah and then the poet for making the change (ibid. XVI 122 f.; Muwassahâh, p. 180). Ibn Shubrumah was a minor poet and critic who later served as judge in Basrah and for the Sawâd of Kufah and was known as a good and wise judge (see e.g. Majâlis Thâlîb I 269; Ibn Tabataba, p. 151 above.

172 Aghâni XVI 118; Khizâ‘îs I 376. For the odes with which Dhu al-Rummah illustrated his first and second categories see Macartney, Nos. 66 and 38 respectively.

173 Aghâni XVI 118. For the entire ode with commentaries see e.g. Macartney, No. 1, and Qurashî, pp. 177–87. Aghâni XVI 123 reports that Dhu al-Rummah, dressed in expensive clothing and with tears streaming down his bearded face, stood and recited this long ode in the Mirbad of Basrah, the meeting place of poets and orators. See, further, e.g. Íbn Ṭâhâtâbî, p. 19, for glowing praise of the similes in this ode, and pp. 27, 56 f., 109 f., for more praise of some of Dhu al-Rummah’s verses (cf. Jurjâni, Al-sâsâ‘îdâ [1364/1945] p. 190).

Dhu al-Rummah’s demonic inspiration is indicated in his expression ما بال عنك منا الماء ينكب كأنه من كل مفرة سرب and in Jarîr’s reason for his envy: “What would you do should poetry be locked away from you?” He answered: “How can it be locked away from me when I have its keys?”175
DHŪ AL-RUMMAH

Dhū al-Rummah, however, was either unwilling or more probably unable to accept and hence to profit from the major criticism against his poetry such as was voiced by Jarir and Farazdaq, whose status and approval he coveted. For though both of these ranking poets appreciated Dhū al-Rummah's several strong points to the extent that Jarir envied Dhū al-Rummah for his famous ode mentioned above and Farazdaq appropriated some of his verses, neither hesitated to point out his several weaknesses. Both pointed to the paucity of his meters and his weakness in several categories of poetry, to the monotony of his themes and his preoccupation with camels and cattle, and to the doleful and lachrymose features of his poetry, all of which, they explained, disqualified him for first rank. They expressed the totality of their criticism, favorable or otherwise, in the phrase nuqat 'arīs wa abār ghizlān, which, along with its gloss, probably originated with Abū 'Amr ibn al-'Alā' (see pp. 137 f.). De Slane's translation reads thus: "Dhū al-Rummah's verses are like sugar-plums scattered at a marriage feast; they disappear quickly; or they are like the dung of gazelles; at first, it has an odour, but it soon becomes mere dung." This combination of admiration mixed with a greater part of severe criticism of Dhū al-Rummah led Šāliḥ ibn Sulaimān, one of his several transmitters, to accuse both Jarir and Farazdaq of jealousy. Dhū al-Rummah had other admirers among the poets, but they were neither so outspoken nor yet such powerful opinion makers as either Jarir or Farazdaq. They included Kumait and Tirimmah, whose favorable opinions have been discussed above, and the Negro slave poet Nuṣaib, who preferred a series of Dhū al-Rummah's verses over a comparable number of the verses of the 'Alīd Kumait.

That Dhū al-Rummah was even less willing to accept criticism from scholars is indicated by his reaction to the suggestions of Abū 'Amr ibn al-'Alā' for improvement of a verse in praise of Bilāl which had displeased the latter (see p. 173, n. 36) much as similar verses had earlier displeased 'Abd al-Malik. "O Abū 'Amr," said Dhū al-Rummah, "you are unique in your knowledge, and I, in my knowledge and poetry, am the same."

Dhū al-Rummah sustained both his faith and his high self-esteem to the last. For when he realized that death was near he expressed the concept that "man proposes, God disposes," and asked that he be buried not in some pit in the lowlands but on the highest hilltop of his beloved dunes. His wish was granted, and

176 Aghānī VII 60 and 130, XVI 113 f.; but see p. 137 above for Jarir's high praise of Dhū al-Rummah's similes.

177 Jumābī, pp. 470 f.; Aghānī XVI 116 and XIX 23. See also Macartney, No. 19:1-5. Farazdaq was given to such thefts, and Asma‘ī, it should be recalled, considered nine-tenths of Farazdaq's poetry as stolen (see pp. 133 f. above). Farazdaq was often accompanied by one of his secretaries (see p. 115, n. 47) who was ordered to take down the verses that particularly impressed him.

178 See e.g. Jumābī, pp. 468 f.; Shi‘r, p. 333; Aghānī VII 62 and XVI 115, 117, 129; Muwashshāh, pp. 172 f.; Ibn Khallikān I 511 (= trans. II 447). It should be noted that Ibn Khallikān himself considered Dhū al-Rummah of first rank (Khizānah I 52).

179 Ibn Khallikān trans. II 451 f.

180 Aghānī XVI 115: قَالَ سَلَامُ بِن سُلِيْمَانُ كَانَ الْفَرْزِيُّ وَحَرُّبَ عَسَدَتُهُ وَأَهْلُ الْبَادِيِّ يَعْجِبُ شُعْبِهِ: Jarir and Farazdaq had early recognized the talents of the youthful and still little-known Dhū al-Rummah, whom each considered second only to himself when recommending him to 'Abd al-Malik, who then sent for Dhū al-Rummah (see Muwashshah, p. 239).

181 Aghānī I 138 f.; Muzkir II 409 f. For Nuṣaib as a critic of poetry see pp. 127-29 above.

182 Muwashshah, p. 179. Earlier, Akhtāl had rebuffed Sha‘bī in the presence of 'Abd al-Malik in somewhat the same manner in respect to the relative quality of some of the verses of Qutāmī and poetry in general; see Aghānī IX 170 f. for the account as told by Sha‘bī himself: قَالَ لِالْأَحَذِّرِ يَا شَبْبِيُّ إِلَّا فِي الْإِحْدَادِ وَأَنَا لَا نَأْفَكُنَّ فَإِنَّنَا لَا نُقَطُّنَّ عَلَىٰ اِلْكَثَّابِ. Note Sha‘bī's ready apology despite his high estimate of his own great knowledge of poetry, much of which he claimed he could recall in month-long recitation without repeating a single verse; see Igd V 275. قال الشعبي ما أنا لبني من اللحم أقول إلى رواية الشعر ولو شئت أن أنشد شعرا شهرا لا أريد قلنا لل坻.
the record, which traces back through Abu ‘Ubaidah to Muntaji‘ ibn Nabhan, adds that his tomb can be seen from a distance of three days’ journey.\footnote{183}{Aghānī XVI 127: قال أذنًا شيئاً واراد الله شيئاً ... لما أختص نور الوجه قال إنني لست من يدقن في الغموض والبعد ... فلنان:\footnote{184}{Ibid. XVI 114: قال ذو الرمة حجة لأنه بدوه ولكن ليس يشبه شعر العرب ثم قال إلا واحدة هي تشبه العرب وهي هي تقول فيها والباب دون أيدي فنان سدل}}

\section*{II}

We turn our attention now to the post-contemporary critics of Dhū al-Rummah’s poetry, the foremost of whom seems to have been Aṣma‘i, some of whose opinions have already been covered. As these are recalled and related to some of his other statements, it soon becomes clear that Aṣma‘i was in fact little more than a transmitter of the body of criticism, favorable or otherwise, that was already current in Dhū al-Rummah’s lifetime—opinions expressed by Jarīr and Farazdaq among others which were sustained beyond the poet’s short life primarily by Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alā‘ and Ḥammād al-Rāwiyyah. The latter believed that the poet was neglected partly because of his youth and partly because of jealousy.\footnote{185}{Aghānī XVI 113: وقال إن أداه في النظم القصير وما رأى من شعر الفارزان وما رأى من الفارزان . . . اسماعيل بن مقتضى بن تيمان . . . قال ما أذكر القول ذكره إلا أحاديثه عن بعض من حسامه} To begin with, Aṣma‘i, like the earlier critics, did not consider Dhū al-Rummah among the poets of first rank (al-fūḥāl) nor yet noteworthy (muḥtaj) except for his similes,\footnote{186}{Aghānī XVI 115: وقال ذو الرمة حجة لأنه بدوه ولكن ليس يشبه شعر العرب ثم قال إلا واحدة هي تشبه العرب وهي هي تقول فيها والباب دون أيدي فنان سدل} though he did consider him on the whole linguistically authoritative (hijjah) because he was a Bedouin.\footnote{187}{Ibid. XVI 114: وقال ذو الرمة حجة لأنه بدوه ولكن ليس يشبه شعر العرب ثم قال إلا واحدة هي تشبه العرب وهي هي تقول فيها والباب دون أيدي فنان سدل} On one occasion Aṣma‘i placed Dhū al-Rummah among the best poets for his ability to convey the meaning of a verse before its rhyme word and then to make meaningful use of this word itself. He readily cited two verses in illustration and commented on them.\footnote{188}{Ibid. XVI 115: وقال ذو الرمة حجة لأنه بدوه ولكن ليس يشبه شعر العرب ثم قال إلا واحدة هي تشبه العرب وهي هي تقول فيها والباب دون أيدي فنان سدل} He held Dhū al-Rummah superior to Kumait\footnote{189}{Aghānī XVI 116: وقال ذو الرمة حجة لأنه بدوه ولكن ليس يشبه شعر العرب ثم قال إلا واحدة هي تشبه العرب وهي هي تقول فيها والباب دون أيدي فنان سدل} but reiterated the opinion that Dhū al-Rummah was not good in either panegyric or satire.\footnote{190}{Ibid. XVI 116: وقال ذو الرمة حجة لأنه بدوه ولكن ليس يشبه شعر العرب ثم قال إلا واحدة هي تشبه العرب وهي هي تقول فيها والباب دون أيدي فنان سدل} He echoed Jarīr’s opinion that most of Dhū al-Rummah’s poetry had better remained unsaid\footnote{191}{Aghānī XVI 116: وقال ذو الرمة حجة لأنه بدوه ولكن ليس يشبه شعر العرب ثم قال إلا واحدة هي تشبه العرب وهي هي تقول فيها والباب دون أيدي فنان سدل} and approved and transmitted the “sugar-plum” metaphor.\footnote{192}{Aghānī XVI 116: وقال ذو الرمة حجة لأنه بدوه ولكن ليس يشبه شعر العرب ثم قال إلا واحدة هي تشبه العرب وهي هي تقول فيها والباب دون أيدي فنان سدل} One does run across other criticisms by Aṣma‘i of words, phrases, or verses of Dhū al-Rummah and other poets which are not all accepted, in their narrow sense and implication, by later critics.\footnote{193}{Aghānī XVI 116: وقال ذو الرمة حجة لأنه بدوه ولكن ليس يشبه شعر العرب ثم قال إلا واحدة هي تشبه العرب وهي هي تقول فيها والباب دون أيدي فنان سدل} Thus, Aṣma‘i’s contribution was mainly one of collecting and transmitting not only the poetry of Dhū al-Rummah but also all the previous major criticism (naqd) of his poetry. The contribution of Abū ‘Ubaidah, on the other hand, was one of recording the background and the setting (akhbār) of some of the poetry and of most of this criticism. Furthermore, such few opinions as he did express convey...
an air of personal conviction rather than of mere transmission. His best praise is for the elegance and refinement of Dhus al-Rumma’s romantic verses, an opinion shared by Asma’i (see p. 187). In this category Abu ‘Ubaidah considered Dhus al-Rummah the equal of Jarir, despite some objections by others. Poets and critics who were contemporaries of these two outstanding scholars had little to add on Dhus al-Rumma’s and his poetry. We do read, however, that Abu Bakr ibn ‘Ayyash al-Khlayyât (d. 193/809) and some of his contemporaries found solace in weeping after hearing a Bedouin recite some of Dhus al-Rumma’s tearful verse. We read further that Salam, great-grandson of Abu ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alâ‘i, took exception to the latter’s categoric statement that poetry ended with Dhus al-Rumma. But it was left for the Syrian Bu’tain ibn Umayyah al-‘Himṣî, himself a minor poet of limited output, to summarize hastily most of the previous criticisms of Dhus al-Rumma. He compared him unfavorably with Jarir, Farazdaq, and Akhtal and summarily dismissed him as being but one-fourth of a poet since he fell short in panegyric, satire, and heroic verse and excelled only in his use of similes—the main categories of poetry according to Bu’tain.

Thus we have here an equally instructive parallel to the evolution of literary criticism in respect to Jarir, Farazdaq, and Akhtal (see pp. 147 f.). For third-century poets down to Ibn al-Mu’tazz, who greatly admired Dhus al-Rumma particularly for his excellent metaphors and similes such as those used in his description of the last stage of a sunset, add nothing that had not already been expressed in the second century. Nor, in fact, do the linguists, grammarians, and critics, including Jâhiž, Ibn Qutaibah, Mubarrad, and Tha’lab, show any originality in this respect though most of them dwell, some at considerable length, on Dhus al-Rumma’s apt use or his misuse of words, on points of grammar, and occasionally on a misplaced simile. On the whole these scholars and critics and their successors of the fourth century and after give this poet due credit for his excellent figures of speech, especially his similes, by citing them in great numbers and in illustration of practically every category of his poetry.

While second- and third-century scholars dissected Dhus al-Rumma’s poetry, splitting hairs over its diction and grammar or admiring its linguistic rarities and elegance and its superb similes, the Bedouins recited and sang his verses, as they did Jarir’s, in appreciation of their apt desert themes and romantic

193 This is well illustrated by the collection of intermixed naqîd and akhbar in Aghâni XVI 113 f. and especially in Muwashshah, pp. 169, 173–76, 178–79, 183.

194 See e.g. Muwashshah, p. 176: قال نساب قال أبو عبيدة كان ذو الرية إذا ذا أخف في النسيب ولما ظهر مثل جبر وليس وأنا ذات: قال أبو عبيدة كان ذو الرية إذا ذا أخف في النسيب ولما ظهر مثل جبر وليس وأنا ذات. Furthermore, Abu ‘Ubaidah admired Dhus al-Rumma himself for his sincerity, conciliatory attitude, and refined speech; see Aghâni XVI 113, lines 11–12: قال أبو عبيدة كان ذو الرية إذا ذا أخف في النسيب ولما ظهر مثل جبر وليس وأنا ذات: قال أبو عبيدة كان ذو الرية إذا ذا أخف في النسيب ولما ظهر مثل جبر وليس وأنا ذات.

195 See Mubarrad, p. 52; Aghâni V 97; Irshad II 374, 377; Macartney, No. 66:1–2. See also pp. 194–97 below. The ode in question is the one Dhus al-Rumma cited as an example of his quick and ready compositions as against his odes that required greater degrees of effort (see p. 190 above).

196 See Fihrist, p. 163. Tabari III 1090 f. reports that Bu’tain was handsomely rewarded for his ode in praise of ‘Abd Allâh ibn Tâhir, whom he accompanied to Egypt in 210/825, and that he died in Alexandria soon thereafter.


198 Umdah I 185: كان أبو عبيدة كان ذو الرية إذا ذا أخف في النسيب ولما ظهر مثل جبر وليس وأنا ذات: (cf. Macartney, No. 48:36).

199 His similes are readily cited by such leading authors from the early 3rd to the 11th century as Junabi, Ibn Qutaibah, Mubarrad, Tha’lab, Qudâmah, Ibn Tabâthâbâ, Jurjânî in his Wastaş, Marzûbânî, Ibn Rashîq, Ibn Munjid in his Al-kadî fi naqî al-shîr, Ibn Khallîkân, and ‘Abd al-Qadîr ibn ‘Umar al-Baghîlî in his Khâṣnîh.
sentiments. There was, therefore, no break in either the availability or the circulation of Dhū al-Rummah’s poetry. Still a third group, the musicians and singers of the second half of the second century, paid tribute to this poet and his verse. The setting was mainly the early ‘Abbāsid court and the palaces of the Barmakids. First among the musicians to discover the lyrical qualities of Dhū al-Rummah’s verse was the adventurous, sophisticated, and highly gifted Ibrāhīm al-Mausālī (125–88/742–804),200 companion and court musician to Mahdī, Ḥādī, and Ḥārūn al-Rashīd.201 Ḥārūn, we learn, was already enamored of Dhū al-Rummah’s verse. Ja’far al-Barmakī pointed out to Ibrāhīm how he could capitalize on Ḥārūn’s admiration of Dhū al-Rummah’s poetry to enhance his own prestige and win himself a fortune by requesting a monopoly on the singing of Dhū al-Rummah’s verses at court.202 Ibrāhīm followed Ja’far’s advice, and the monopoly was readily granted, bringing in its wake a veritable fortune to this enterprising musician, who composed over a hundred melodies for the poet’s verses.202 Ibrāhīm’s even more gifted and famous son Ishaq (150–235/767–849), who was his successor at the court,204 reported that his father composed some nine hundred melodies which he, Ishaq, classified neatly into three groups of three hundred each as comparable in value and quality to the gold, silver, and copper currency of the realm. Ishaq eliminated from circulation the three hundred “copper” melodies because they were no more than passing pleasures but retained the “silver” ones, which were good though their quality was shared by others, and cherished the “golden” ones, which he considered matchless.205 Since Dhū al-Rummah’s verses do not readily lend themselves to levity, we may concede that two-thirds of Ibrāhīm’s musical scores for the poet’s verses were indeed among his “silver” and “golden” compositions. To these Ishaq added some melodies of his own. But even the best songs sometimes fade in popularity and are forgotten, and such was eventually the fate of most of the melodies composed by father and son for Dhū al-Rummah’s verses. For our fullest source, the Aghānī, specifies only six such melodies—considerably fewer than the number of melodies composed by the Mausalsīs for their own poetry.206 And we should not overlook other poets whose verses attracted these cosmopolitan musicians.207

200 See G A L S I 223 f. for Ibrāhīm al-Mausālī and his son Ishaq.
201 Aghānī V 2–49, VIII 102–65, and XVI 128 f. yield the fullest of the early accounts of the life, character, and artistic endowments of Ibrāhīm, and ibid. V 53–131 is fuller in these respects for his son Ishaq. Abū al-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī relies mainly on the several abkāhī monographs authored by Ishaq, who drew on Abū ‘Ubaidah and Aṣma’ī among others. The monographs were supplemented and transmitted by his comparatively lackluster son Ḥanamūd to several 3rd-century authors interested in Dhū al-Rummah (see pp. 175 f. above) and directly or indirectly to Abū al-Faraj’s older contemporaries such as Qudāmah and Wākī.

Ibrāhīm is reported as saying that he was first alerted to the lyrical qualities of Dhū al-Rummah’s verse in a dream, after which he acquainted himself with the life and verse of the poet as he composed his melodies (Aghānī V 38 f.).

202 Ibid. V 39: قال جعفر بن حرب ال بركي إن أمير المؤمنين يحظى شعر ذي الرمة حظوظ الصبا ويعجبه ويرثؤه فإذا سمع فيه أغطه أطره أكثر ما يمزج عليه غيره ما لا يحظى شعره ... فقل له تحلب شعر ذي الرمة أغني فيه ما اختلف وما يخاف في قال احبح شعره وأحكمه.

203 Ibid. V 40 f. يغنين مائة صوت وزيادة عليها في شعر ذي الرمة ... فانتحا إقاله يلفن ألف ألف دينار والد ألف دينار وهم.

204 Ibid. V 48 reports that Harūn consoled Ishaq on his father’s death, transferred Ibrāhīm’s pay to his children, and doubled Ishaq’s remuneration as his father’s successor at the court. This happy relationship between courtier-musician and caliph was threatened only once, when Ishaq, in answer to the caliph’s question as to current public talk, informed him that the people were expecting him to order the downfall of the Barmakids (Ibid. V 113).

205 Ibid. V 17: قال حسان قال في أبي صنع جدك تعني صوت منها دينار وبينه وضعة قلنا يا أبي أكثر ما صنعته فانثنا لنا ولما فانه تقدم الناس جمعا فيها وأثنين كتبليه فشتركهم فيها وأثنين الفنابة تلبس فطره قال ثم أتست أبا التنانين الآخرة بعد ذلك من غانه أي فكان إذا أثنا مثل صنعته يقتلي مك فكان هو تنانينة صوت. See ibid. VI 61 f. and 70 f. for Ishaq’s aversion to levity and careless performance. Father and son played significant roles, at the request of Harūn al-Rashīd and Wāhīq respectively, in the selection of the best 100 tunes current in their day (Ibid. I 5 f.).

206 Ibid. V 6, 23, 52, 56, 81 for Ibrāhīm and ibid. V 40, 74, 75, 82, 87, 103, 104, 106, 107, 114 for Ishaq.

207 The list of such poets is long. Occasioned mention are some of Dhū al-Rummah’s contemporaries, such as Jarīr, Akhtal, Rā’l, Wādī Il, and Bishahib ibn Burd, and poets contemporary with the musicians themselves, such as Marwān ibn Abī Ḥaṣāf, ‘Abbās ibn al-ʿĀlīf, and Abū al-ʿAtīḥīyah (Ibid. V 20, 40, 56, 82 f., 90 f., and passim).
There was yet another, though indirect, tie between Dhu al-Rummah and Ishaq, namely the latter’s interest in the Bedouins and their diction. For the multitalented Ishaq, so highly praised in the sources and so well understood and appreciated by Henry George Farmer for his musical genius and contributions to the theory and practice of Arabian music, was also a lexicographer. Ishaq, like many a leading scholar of his day, including the courtier Aṣma’ī, with whom both he and his father clashed at times, and Ibn al-A’rabī (see pp. 75 f.), whom he subsidized with a liberal pension, sought out Bedouin men and women and wrote down their diction and poetry. Ishaq composed melodies for some of their verses and was accused of attributing some of his own verses to them. He was even admired for his ability to imitate the verses of Dhu al-Rummah, and an instance is given in which his imitation of four verses was so perfect that none could detect it except one who had acquired and transmitted all of Dhu al-Rummah’s poetry.

It is interesting, though not surprising, to note that all of Dhu al-Rummah’s verses that the Aghānī reports as having been set to music are drawn from his romantic odes or romantic introductions to odes of other categories. They are verses of intense longing for the beloved and of weeping over her deserted dwelling, that is, verses of the very type that Dhu al-Rummah’s foremost fellow poets and critics believed helped to disqualify him for inclusion among the poets of first rank. Again, it is interesting to note that not only did Ibrāhīm and Ishaq at times shed tears freely but that Hārūn al-Rashīd also was quickly moved to tears by a sad verse or a pious preachment.

The main Aghānī entries on Ibrāhīm al-Mausullī have yielded four selections of Dhu al-Rummah’s verses that were set to music by this musician. Ibrāhīm informs us that the first verses of Dhu al-Rummah which he set to music and sang before Hārūn al-Rashīd were the following two:

\[
\text{ألا يرسلني يا دار عُلى على الظل،}
\text{لا زال ميلًا يجريه القدر،}
\text{فَلَنَّم لم تكون غير شاء بقيرة}
\text{بِجُرَّبِها الأذنل صافية كدرُ.}
\]

209 See e.g. Henry George Farmer, Historical Facts for the Arabian Musical Influence (London, 1930) pp. 27 f., 241–44, 247–55. Farmer covers the contributions of both Ibrāhīm and Ishaq to Arabian music in several of his numerous works on the subject. His own sustained effort to understand and interpret Arabian music to the West is particularly noteworthy.
210 See e.g. Aghānī V 55; cf. Marātib, pp. 59 f.
212 See e.g. Aghānī V 44, 56, 83, 100, 120.
213 Ibid. V 77.
214 Ibid. V 109 f.
215 See e.g. Aghānī V 15, 17, 22, 93; p. 106 cites two verses on old age and adds; p. 82 cites two verses of Ishaq’s own poetry and melody and adds.
216 See e.g. Ibn Qutaibah, Al-imdmah wa al-siydsah (Cairo, n.d.) p. 126; Abū Naʿaim, Ḥiljat al-awlīyā’ wa tabaqāt al-aṣfāyū’ VIII 105; Khatib V 372 and XIV 8; Ibn Khalikān I 625 (= trans. II 278 f.). See also Thaʿalibī, Khāṣṣ al-khāṣṣ (Beirūt, 1968) pp. 83 f., which cites many of Dhu al-Rummah’s lachrymose verses as among his very best poetry.
217 Aghānī V 38 f. and XVI 128; note the dream element in both versions. See also Macartney, No. 29:1–2. For criticisms of the first verse see e.g. Muwashshah, p. 185. The Aghānī text is not so reliable as that of Macartney, which is therefore used here for all the citations involved. Macartney gives, as a rule, numerous references to the cited verses in both lexicographical and literary works and draws attention to significant textual variants.
The next *Aghānī* selection, cited in two versions, each with a separate melody,\(^{218}\) consists of four verses from a single ode:

\[
\text{AMLMTI MIYEH SLM ALIKUMA},
\]

\[
\text{WIL YRJU TSLM WJKN SMMC},
\]

\[
\text{WLL BIL ALH HLMXJJ},
\]

\[
\text{WMIYEH YMN FQALT LSHBJJ}
\]

These, like Ibrāhīm’s other melodies for Dhu al-Rummah’s verses, were first composed and sung by him and by him alone at the court of Hārūn al-Rashīd. The third *Aghānī* selection consists of three verses from the same ode:\(^{219}\)

\[
\text{QF UMSE YN TST NTR FF DIBHYA}
\]

\[
\text{FHL DLK M DN ALH ALSHB SNNF}
\]

\[
\text{MNT AMFN YN TST MNSN}
\]

\[
\text{QFAL RAB} 4 \text{FN TRS MDAFF}
\]

\[
\text{KBTY BHYA O OT TRS MDAFF}
\]

It was after Dhu al-Rummaḥ had finished reciting this very ode of 44 verses that Farazdaq pointed out to him that his doleful verses kept him from achieving first rank as a poet.\(^{220}\) The fourth of Ibrāhīm’s melodies indicated in the *Aghānī*\(^{221}\) was composed for the following two verses:

\[
\text{AHA HBTH ALAROY MNB XJBG} BHE HLF}
\]

\[
\text{HRY TDRQ ALHBT MNH ANMS}
\]

The *Aghānī* specifies only two selections of Dhu al-Rummaḥ’s verses as having been set to music by Išāq. The first was composed for five verses

\[
\text{ZKRTMLK} 4M MLRT BNA AMM SHZDN}
\]

\[
\text{AMM ALHBFY NNTRFB YTNSH}
\]

\[
\text{MN ALHMP ATML AMHDX HRR}
\]

\[
\text{WMTA} 4BM FD MND PNM YTNTPH
\]

\[
\text{HKH SHH AMTFA WJHD WMFPH}
\]

\[
\text{KAN YBR DLH LGJ TBGHT MMTXN}
\]

\[
\text{HL HRX HB SML ABTHUJ}
\]

\[
\text{TBDRT N MN FF LHMRT ORH}
\]

and sung by Išāq and others for Ma’mūn.\(^{222}\)

Though Išāq was in high favor with the caliphs from Hārūn al-Rashīd to Mutawakkil,\(^{223}\) it was with Wāthīq (227–32/842–47) alone that he had an amicable professional rivalry, which was in marked contrast to his better known professional rivalry with Prince Ibrāhīm ibn al-Mahdī. For Wāthīq, as prince and caliph, composed numerous melodies which were committed to writing and some of which he submitted to Išāq for criticism and correction. He enjoyed Išāq’s masterly performances,\(^{224}\) especially those


"\(^{219}\) *Aghānī* XVI 129; Macartney, No. 45:7–9.

"\(^{220}\) Jumahi, p. 468. See, further, p. 191 above and other references cited in n. 178.

"\(^{221}\) *Aghānī* XVI 120; Macartney, No. 8:8–9.

"\(^{222}\) See *Aghānī* V 63, which reports that Išāq first heard these verses recited to one man by another who introduced the set with still another verse, which has to be an earlier version of Macartney, No. 10:34. The above five verses are drawn from the same ode (Macartney, No. 10:11, 12, 15, 17, 38). See also *Aghānī* V 126 f.

"\(^{223}\) Išāq’s relationship with Mu’taṣim became strained because he began his ode in celebration of the completion of Mu’taṣim’s palace with verses bewailing the ruins of a habitation and these verses were considered ominous by the caliph and those assembled; see *Muwashshah*, pp. 301 f.: فقطير المعتصم وقلمه الناس وجبذ كبير ذهب هذا على أحساك فحية وحالة وطن وطن خدمته ديني وعصر أبدا يسجد عليه الملك ... ورغم المعتصم إلى سر من رأي وغرب القصر (cf. n. 4 on p. 110 above).

"\(^{224}\) Išāq’s one professional weakness was the poor quality of his voice (see *Aghānī* V 104: لا يمكن في أحساك شيء يعبأ إلا حقه: و يكن يغلب الناس جميعا يطمعه وغدوة). \}
occasioned by contests among leading composers and singers of his day, several of whom Wāthiq himself instigated to the competition, as other caliphs had done before him. He made great demands on Ishaq’s energy and time, took him on his travels, and kept him for long periods at his court. On one occasion Ishaq, lonesome for home and family, recalled two verses of Dhu al-Rummah

which he had heard recited by a Bedouin and for which first he and then Wāthiq had composed melodies, though that of the caliph was for the second verse only.\(^{225}\)

Still other verses of Dhu al-Rummah set to music by Ibrāhīm al-Mausali and his son Ishaq and by other musicians of their day are likely to be met with in the sources, and such verses are just as likely to be of the same category as those cited above. Be that as it may, we have learned that Bedouins, poets, scholars, musicians, and caliphs helped to keep Dhu al-Rummah’s poetry, both oral and written, in circulation throughout the second/eighth century. Thus, in turn, it was possible for third/ninth-century compilers and commentators such as Abū al-‘Abbās Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-ʿAḥwal and Sukkari to pay tribute to Dhu al-Rummah by preserving his poetry for posterity.

EARMY EDITIONS OF DHŪ AL-RUMMAH’S POETRY

The numerous references to poetry manuscripts possessed or generated by Umayyad scholars, poets, and caliphs already cited in the present volume came as no surprise to me. Particularly instructive are the several dramatic episodes in which Akhtal, Jarir, and Farazdaq are reported as writing down or dictating some of their longer odes, such as Akhtal’s ode, written on the order of ‘Abd al-Malik, in praise of Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf and Jarir’s writing and dictating of his satire on Rā’i and the contemporary manuscripts of the naqāḍīl of Jarir and of Farazdaq. Thus, irrespective of Dhū al-Rummah’s own writing ability, I see no reason to question his desire, a desire common to these his older contemporaries and associates, to preserve his own poetry accurately and in writing. And, indeed, this desire is indicated in a passage\(^{226}\) which reports his explicit instructions to ʿĪsā ibn ʿUmar:

\[\text{One of Dhu al-Rummah’s younger contemporaries, the anthologist Muḥammad ibn Ṭabīb, gave evidence of the increasing production and availability of poetry manuscripts from which one could select what he considered best for study and for memorizing,\(^{227}\) as he himself did in his famed \textit{Mufaddalīyāt}. One would expect that the family, admirers, and professional direct transmitters of Dhū al-Rummah attempted to keep his poetry in circulation by word of mouth or in writing or by a combination of both methods. His brother Masʿūd probably did so in one or another of these ways, and after Dhū al-Rummah’s death Mayya, who had memorized his numerous odes or parts of odes on his love for

\(^{225}\) See e.g. \textit{Aḥnāfī} V 57 ff., 60, 63 ff., 83 ff., 91–97 and VIII 162–65 for Ishaq and Wāthiq; for the verses see \textit{Aḥnāfī} V 96 ff. and \textit{Macartney}, No. 66:1–2. Cf. p. 193 above, with n. 195.

\(^{226}\) \textit{Jāḥiẓ}, \textit{Hāyawan} I 41. \textit{Umdat} II 194 omits any reference to Jāḥiẓ but repeats this passage and attributes it erroneously to a Muṣāf ibn ‘Amr. See pp. 170 ff. above for Dhū al-Rummah as one among other literate poets.

\(^{227}\) \textit{Muṣāfīsūrī}, p. 358: ‘Abūna Muḥammad ibn al-Husayn ‘Abd al-Malik. Note the direct unbroken strong \textit{isnād} which traces back through Ibn Duraid to Abū ʿAbd Allāh (al-Sijistani) to Abū Zayd (al-Anṣārī), who heard the statement from Muḥammad himself.

\(^{1}\) \textit{Uyun} II 120 reports Yākyū ibn Khālid al-Barmaki as saying: ‘Abu al-‘Abbās Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-ʿAḥwal, who heard the statement from Muḥammad himself.

\(^{2}\) \textit{Aḥnāfī} V 57 ff., 60, 63 ff., 83 ff., 91–97 and VIII 162–65 for Ishaq and Wāthiq; for the verses see \textit{Aḥnāfī} V 96 ff. and \textit{Macartney}, No. 66:1–2. Cf. p. 193 above, with n. 195.)
her, dictated many of them at length to Abū al-Muhalhil (see p. 183). But credit for the first-known formal edition of Dhu al-Rummah’s poetry belongs to one of his direct transmitters, the eloquent Muntaji ibn Nabbān, who was also a source of linguistic and biographical materials transmitted to the ever receptive Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alā’, Āṣma‘ī, and Abū ‘Ubaidah.228 A second direct transmitter, Aswād ibn Ḍūbān (or Ḍuḥān), transmitted Dhu al-Rummah’s verses to Ibrāhīm ibn Mundhir,229 who seems at one time to have been secretary to Ibn Mūnādhīr, poet, critic, and defender of early and contemporary Islamic poetry (see pp. 122 and 147). We know of at least two other direct transmitters of Dhu al-Rummah’s poetry, the faithful Ḥimāmah ibn Mālik and Ṣāliḥ ibn Sulāmān.230 To the collections, written or oral, of these several direct transmitters should be added that of Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alā’, the foremost admirer of Dhu al-Rummah. The collecting and editing of the output of individual poets, with or without commentary, progressed rapidly in the second half of the second/eighth century, as amply illustrated by the activities of Abū ‘Amr al-Shaihānī, Abū ‘Ubaidah, and Āṣma‘ī. I have so far found no clear-cut statement in the sources to the effect that Āṣma‘ī collected, edited, transmitted, or commented on the poetry of Dhu al-Rummah.231 But indirect evidence strongly implies that he did all of these at one time or another for the greater part if not for the whole of the poet’s output. He was, to begin with, fully aware of Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alā’s high esteem for Dhu al-Rummah’s poetry, and though he himself did not rank that poet among the fulūhū he did nevertheless consider him, as a true Bedouin, to be authoritative in his knowledge and use of the language. Again, Āṣma‘ī’s statement that had he met Dhu al-Rummah he would have advised him to destroy most of his poetry implies that he had the whole diwan on which to base his judgment.232 Furthermore, Āṣma‘ī’s interest in and comments on the poet’s diwan are reflected in the Macartney edition in citations credited to Āṣma‘ī directly233 or through his most trusted pupil and transmitter, Abū Naṣr Aḥmad ibn Ḥātim al-Bāhili (see pp. 105 f. above), who in turn provided some of his own comments.234 While most of these citations are introduced with the familiar qāla and ra‘ad, the comment on one verse235 reads wa fi riva‘iyat al-Āṣma‘ī and is supplemented with wa qāla Abū ‘Amr, which in this instance has to refer to the Basran Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alā’, Āṣma‘ī’s avowed and revered mentor, rather than the Kūfān Abū ‘Amr al-Shaihānī as Macartney assumed for this and all other references to an Abū ‘Amr who is not further identified. On the strength of this assumption Macartney wrote: “In fact, I think we may conclude that the original text was that of al-Āṣma‘ī and that the glosses were largely based upon the commentary of asli-Shaihānī, and finally, that the account given in the colophon of Const. of the provenance of the text is substantially worthy of belief.”236 I am in agreement with Macartney’s view of

228 ‘Idā V 233; Muḥammah, p. 174; Bevann I 487; Muṣḥūfat al-‘Iṣbālī I 327.
229 See Ḥaṭṭārī XVII 24 and Macartney, pp. vii and xii, and note the variant spelling of the name Ṣāliḥ ibn al-‘Alā. Still another transmitter of Dhu al-Rummah about whose name there is some confusion is mentioned in Macartney, No. 27:83-84.
229 Ḥaṭṭārī XVI 112 and 124. See p. 190 above for the role of one of Dhu al-Rummah’s transmitters.
230 See ibid. XVI 112 and 124. See p. 190 above for the role of one of Dhu al-Rummah’s transmitters.
231 The Fihrist references to both Dhu al-Rummah and Āṣma‘ī do not mention the latter in respect to such activities. Jāḥiṣ II 202 f. lists the works of Āṣma‘ī but is silent on this point, as is the editor’s considerable supplementation of the already long list of Āṣma‘ī’s works.
232 See pp. 192 f. for Āṣma‘ī as a critic of Dhu al-Rummah’s poetry.
233 Macartney does not index either Āṣma‘ī or Abū ‘Amr al-Shaihānī in full. The following references for Āṣma‘ī’s comments concentrate on ode No. 67, to which our papyrus text belongs, with supplementary references for the other odes: Macartney, No. 67:20, 21, 24, 44, 73, 91, and 93, and Nos. 1:6, 78, and 97, 10:27 and 54, 17:26, 21:3, 5, and 23, 29:23, 30:45, 75:81, 78:4 and 35, 81:43.
234 See ibid. Nos. 35:32 and 57:31, 40, 67. Macartney, following some sources, accepted Abū Naṣr as the nephew and son-in-law of Āṣma‘ī and a transmitter from Abū ‘Amr al-Shaihānī and thence was misled to accept the comments as those of Abū ‘Amr al-Shaihānī (ibid. pp. vii, xii). That this Abū Naṣr was Āṣma‘ī’s nephew is emphatically denied by other sources; see e.g. Marāṭib, p. 82, which is reproduced in Muḥbir II 408:

235 See ibid. p. vii, where Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alā’ is not even mentioned.
the very informative colophon of the Constantinople manuscript with its multiple īṣād’s but not with his statement that the glosses were largely based on Shaibānī’s commentary. It is known that when Basrans cited simply Abū ‘Amr with no further identification they invariably meant the Basran Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alā’ but when they referred to the Kufan Abū ‘Amr they identified him as Abū ‘Amr al-Shaibānī.237 I therefore scanned Macartney’s edition of the Dīwān for all references to Abū ‘Amr and found first that only one reference specifies Abū ‘Amr al-Shaibānī. It is drawn from the Şan‘ā’ manuscript of the Ambrosian Library and from its wording could well be not the main comment but a confirmatory one.238 The second and only other reference that Macartney indexed specifically under Abū ‘Amr al-Shaibānī turned out to be simply Abū ‘Amr239 and from its context in two other verses of the same ode points rather to Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alā’, since the comment on each quotes Aṣma240 and the second in its wording clearly indicates that the initial comment was that of Aṣma’i. All the other references to Abū ‘Amr occur likewise in odes in which Aṣma’i also is mentioned.241 But the ode from which our papyrus text is drawn is even more illuminating since the comments on it draw repeatedly on Abū ‘Amr242 Aṣma’i,243 and Abū Naṣr Ahmad ibn Ḥāṭım,244 all introduced with either gāla or rawā, and in one instance simply on the Basrans.245 In other words, the comments on this particular ode can be said to be drawn mainly from Basran sources best represented by these three leading and closely associated scholar-transmitters.

Our papyrus, to judge by its script and orthography, dates from the third/ninth century. There is, however, no way of knowing whether the text itself represents a third- or a second-century version, perhaps stemming initially from Abū ‘Amr ibn al-‘Alā’, who had direct and close contact with Dhu al-Rummah himself (see p. 191). Unfortunately, neither Abū ‘Amr nor Aṣma’i specifies any direct transmitter as his source. But there is indirect evidence that either or both of these scholars could have received the text of Dhu al-Rummah’s poetry from one of his leading direct transmitters, namely Muntaji ibn Nahbān, who is cited by both Abū ‘Amr244 and Aṣma245 as eloquent and knowledgeable.

We are on firmer ground in respect to Muntaji’s close relationship with Abū ‘Ubaidah, Aṣma’i’s leading Basran rival for professional recognition and court patronage. Nadīm, in a section that reports Sukkarī’s numerous editions of pre-Islamic and early Islāmic poetry,246 mentions Abū ‘Ubaidah in connection with Muntaji’s edition of Dhu al-Rummah’s poetry in the following brief statement: (عَمْلَة) وَالَّتِي يَنْتَجُ بِنِي نَهَان رُوَى عَنْهُ أَبُو عَبْدِه.247 Read out of context the second sentence could be misinterpreted to mean that Abū ‘Ubaidah transmitted, for the most part, only general information from Muntaji. But the statement must be read in the light of Nadīm’s specific purpose and terminology and of his

237 This early manner of distinguishing between the two Abū ‘Amr’s soon gained general currency among scholars, as repeatedly illustrated in the Fīhrist (pp. 157 f.) list of transmitters and editors of poetry.
238 See Macartney, No. 52:29, footnote: كَذَٰلِكَ يَقُولُ أَبُو عُمْرو الْشَيْبَانَ.
239 See ibid. No. 10:16.
240 See ibid. No. 10:27 and 54, footnotes.
241 See ibid. No. 1, which cites both Abū ‘Amr and Aṣma’i, and No. 29, which cites Abū ‘Amr alone in verses 6, 17, 25, and 29 and Aṣma’i in verse 23.
242 Ibid. No. 57:21, 35, 50, 64.
243 Ibid. No. 57:20, 21, 24, 44, 73, 91, 93.
244 Ibid. No. 57:31, 40, 97.
245 Ibid. No. 57:39: رَأَيْلَ الْبَصَرَةُ يَقلُونَ.
246 Majālis al-ulamā’, pp. 2–4, 7; Zubaidī, pp. 38 f.; Amālī III 40; Inbāh III 323; Mushīr II 278.
247 Shi‘r, p. 428; ‘Iqd II 289; Zubaidī, p. 175; Mufaddalīyya I 391.
248 Fīhrist, pp. 157 f.
249 Ibid. p. 158, lines 21–22.
overly abbreviated style for the entire section. Nadim specifies a dual purpose, namely “to list the names of poets whose poetry Sukkarī “did” (tamīl) and at the same time to mention also others who “did” the same poetry.” However, in the main body of this section he mentions also those who transmitted (raivd) a given poet’s output. Again his reference to Dhū al-Rummah’s poetry starts briefly with دو الرمة عمه جامع وروه. He mentions the progressively exhaustive editions of Abū ‘Abbās Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-ʿAlwāl and Sukkarī ahead of the edition of the earlier Muntajī. I therefore conclude that the term raivd in the first passage quoted above is either a scribal or a typographical error and that the second sentence of the statement should read اوروا عنله ابوبعيدة. For it would seem strange indeed if a scholar of the caliber and reputation of Abū ‘Ubaidah, whose house was said to contain دبعن ال-ʿArab, who had done (tamīl) the naqdīd of Jarīr and Farazdaq (see p. 160), and who was an avowed admirer of Dhū al-Rummah and his poetry (see pp. 192 f.), had overlooked the edition of that poet’s best known direct transmitter.

Copies of Muntajī’s edition could have reached Hārūn al-Rashīd and his court musicians Ibrāhīm al-Mausālī and his son ʿIshāq, all three well known as great admirers of Dhū al-Rummah’s poetry, through either ʿAṣma’ī or Abū ‘Ubaidah or through both of these Baṣrān scholars. We know that Ibrāhīm and ʿIshāq were interested in the life of Dhū al-Rummah and that ʿIshāq and his ʿIjamād each wrote a monograph titled Abkhabār Dhī al-Rummāh (see pp. 175 f.). Furthermore, we know that ʿIshāq was himself a poet, that he could and did imitate Dhū al-Rummah’s poetry expertly (see p. 195) and that though he drew for literary materials on both ʿAṣma’ī and Abū ‘Ubaidah (see p. 194, n. 201) he preferred the company of the latter. We read further that it was ʿIshāq who was instrumental in bringing the Baṣrān Abū ‘Ubaidah to the court at Baghdaḍ. Angered at ʿAṣma’ī’s arrogance and his miserliness with his literary materials, ʿIshāq convinced the wazir Faḍl ibn al-Rabī’ of the undesirability of these qualities and at the same time praised Abū ‘Ubaidah’s extensive and profound knowledge of all the sources of the Arabs and his generosity with his materials. ʿIshāq’s enthusiastic recommendation induced Faḍl ibn al-Rabī’ to invite Abū ‘Ubaidah, in 188/804, to Baghdaḍ and the court of Hārūn al-Rashīd. In view of the considerable evidence of a close relationship between Abū ‘Ubaidah and ʿIshāq, both prolific authors with sizable libraries and both great admirers of Dhū al-Rummah’s poetry, it seems highly probable that ʿIshāq sought and received a copy of Abū ‘Ubaidah’s transmission of Muntajī’s edition of Dhū al-Rummah’s poetry.

The several second/eighth-century collections and transmissions of Dhū al-Rummah’s poetry must have been available for the most part to the third/ninth-century editor Abū al-ʿAbbās Muḥammad ibn

250 Ibid. p. 157:  251 See ibid. p. 158, lines 20-23, for the full entry.  252 Zubaidi, p. 105:  253 Aghānī V 107 f. and Irshād VII 106 give full accounts of these events with an isnād that traces back to ʿIshāq ibn Ibrāhīm al-Mausālī. For brief references to some of these events see e.g. Jāḥiṣ, Bayān I 331; Ḳaṣīṭh XIII 253 f.; Irshād III 277 f.  254 For the libraries of ʿAṣma’ī and ʿIshāq see e.g. Fihrist, pp. 53 f. and 141 f., and Kūrīs Awwād, Ḳaṣīṭh in al-kutub al-qadīmah fi al-ʿIraq, pp. 194-96; for that of Abū ‘Ubaidah see Fihrist, pp. 53 f., and Zubaidi, p. 105. For libraries of other scholars of the Umayyad and early ʿAbbāsid period see Kūrīs Awwād, op. cit. pp. 191-96.
al-Hasan al-Ahwal, whose edition drew on the previous transmissions.255 Abu al-'Abbās al-Ahwal, a language scholar and also a professional copyist, flourished in the mid-third/mid-ninth century.256 One of his younger transmitters, the scholar and poet Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad, better known as Nīfāwāh (d. 323/935), reported that Abu al-'Abbās al-Ahwal collected (jama') the poetry of 120 poets and that he, Nīfāwāh, did ('umil) the poetry of fifty poets,258 including the nāqa'īd of Jarīr and Farazdaq and the poetry of Dhu al-Rummah, all of which he memorized.259

The most exhaustive edition of Dhu al-Rummah's poetry reported by Nadīm is that of Sukkari, the outstanding transmitter and editor of literary works and especially of poetry.260 Though listed among the Basran philologists and considered the foremost transmitter from Basran scholars,261 he did not neglect the Kufans, especially those whose transmission derived initially from Basran scholars. His transmission of the nāqa'īd of Jarīr and Farazdaq traces back to the Basran Abī 'Ubaidah, in one version through the Kufan Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb and in another version through the Kufan Sa'dān ibn al-Mubārak (see p. 160). Sukkari's main contribution, like that of Abī Juhmah and his younger contemporaries, was to the poetry of many poets and the output of many poets,262 much of which survived in his accurate handwriting to Nadīm's day.263

The text of our third/ninth-century papyrus could represent the transmission or an edition of any one of the scholars considered above. It is probably from either a copy of Abī 'Ubaidah's transmission or the edition of either Abī al-'Abbās al-Ahwal or Sukkari. In any case, the sources give evidence of continuous written transmission of Dhu al-Rummah's poetry from his own time onward, as was the case with the poetry of his ranking contemporaries Akhṭal, Jarīr, and Farazdaq and several of their contemporaries whose poetry was transmitted by Abū 'Amr ibn al-'Alā',264

255 See Fīhrist, pp. 72 and 108; Ṣubkāt II 185; Ḥarād IV 482 f.; Ḥarād III 191 f.; Baḥgah, p. 33.

256 For his biographical entries see e.g. Khaṭṭīb II 185; Ḥarād VI 185 f.; Ḥarād III 191 f.; Baḥgah, p. 33.


258 See Fīhrist, p. 158, lines 21-23, mentions ahead of the edition of Muntajī one of Ḥālīl ibn Ṭahālīs, who is not further identified in our sources. There is, however, a bare possibility that he is Ḥālīl al-Qubālī, a contemporary of Jarīr (see Ḥaḥīr VII 65). The Fīhrist passage concludes with four transmitters: al-Wāḥi bī ṣawā开端 bī Mutāwakkīl ibn 'Abī Allāh al-Laithī, who eulogized the caliph Muḥammad ibn 'Abī Ṭālib and in another version through the Kufan Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb and in another version through the Kufan Sa'dān ibn al-Mubārak (see p. 160). Sukkari's main contribution, like that of 'Abī Juhmah and his younger contemporaries, was to the poetry of many poets and the output of many poets,262 much of which survived in his accurate handwriting to Nadīm's day.263

259 See Fīhrist, pp. 72 and 108; Ṣubkāt II 185; Ḥarād IV 482 f.; Ḥarād III 191 f.; Baḥgah, p. 33.

260 For his biographical entries see e.g. Khaṭṭīb II 185; Ḥarād VI 185 f.; Ḥarād III 191 f.; Baḥgah, p. 33.


262 See Fīhrist, p. 158, lines 21-23, mentions ahead of the edition of Muntajī one of Ḥālīl ibn Ṭahālīs, who is not further identified in our sources. There is, however, a bare possibility that he is Ḥālīl al-Qubālī, a contemporary of Jarīr (see Ḥaḥīr VII 65). The Fīhrist passage concludes with four transmitters: al-Wāḥi bī ṣawā开端 bī Mutāwakkīl ibn 'Abī Allāh al-Laithī, who eulogized the caliph Muḥammad ibn 'Abī Ṭālib and in another version through the Kufan Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb and in another version through the Kufan Sa'dān ibn al-Mubārak (see p. 160). Sukkari's main contribution, like that of 'Abī Juhmah and his younger contemporaries, was to the poetry of many poets and the output of many poets,262 much of which survived in his accurate handwriting to Nadīm's day.263

263 For his biographical entries see e.g. Khaṭṭīb II 185; Ḥarād VI 185 f.; Ḥarād III 191 f.; Baḥgah, p. 33.
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266 For biographical entries see e.g. Khaṭṭīb II 185; Ḥarād VI 185 f.; Ḥarād III 191 f.; Baḥgah, p. 33.
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269 For biographical entries see e.g. Zubāidī, p. 200; Fīhrist, pp. 78, 157 f.; Khaṭṭīb VII 296 f.; Ḥarād III 62-64; Ḥarād I 291-94.

270 Khaṭṭīb VII 296 f.; Ḥarād III 62-64; Ḥarād I 291-94.

271 For biographical entries see e.g. Zubāidī, p. 200; Fīhrist, pp. 78, 157 f.; Khaṭṭīb VII 296 f.; Ḥarād III 62-64; Ḥarād I 291-94.

272 For biographical entries see e.g. Zubāidī, p. 200; Fīhrist, pp. 78, 157 f.; Khaṭṭīb VII 296 f.; Ḥarād III 62-64; Ḥarād I 291-94.

273 For biographical entries see e.g. Zubāidī, p. 200; Fīhrist, pp. 78, 157 f.; Khaṭṭīb VII 296 f.; Ḥarād III 62-64; Ḥarād I 291-94.

274 For biographical entries see e.g. Zubāidī, p. 200; Fīhrist, pp. 78, 157 f.; Khaṭṭīb VII 296 f.; Ḥarād III 62-64; Ḥarād I 291-94.

275 See Fīhrist, pp. 55, 69, 78, 100, 106, 145, 157, 159, 160. See also Ḥarād I 292.
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After what has been learned from the studies presented in Volumes I and II of the widespread use of writing in early Islam from about the mid-first century onward in the steadily developing fields of Qur'anic studies, Tradition, and history and also of the emergence and rapid growth of the book market and of court and private libraries, it is not at all surprising to find the same accelerated developments in the fields of language and literature. For lexicography and grammar were basic to both the religious and the secular fields. Literature proper, whether prose or poetry, served also to inform and entertain, particularly poetry since it was still considered by scholar and ruler alike as the diwan al-'Arab. Furthermore, the objectives, attitudes, and interactions of rival Umayyad poets, outstanding linguistic scholars, and demanding but generous royal and other powerful patrons combined to yield genuinely early Arab modes of literary criticism. Poets and critics alike placed uneven emphasis on linguistic elements, rhetoric, and aesthetics, features that were incorporated later, under the 'Abbāsids, into a more heterogeneous, analytical, and formal theory of poetics.
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PLATE 7

recto
الموارد الموت المعمولة في الفن والفنون. وَالآنسات الحكيم في العصر، في عصر الأدوار.

يركز الفقرة ماجاراما على مبادئ وأنماط للفنون الإسلامية، ونحوه من الأعمال، وتشير إلى أهمية الفنون في الثقافة الإسلامية.

ورد في نصف النص، ملاحظة على الأثر الأثري لمثل هذه الأعمال، وانعكاسه على المجتمعات الإسلامية.

وقد عرفت هذه الأعمال الفنية في الأندلس، نظراً لتأثيراتها على الفنون الإسلامية، وتساهم في تطور الفنون الإسلامية.

VERSO
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