The manuscripts fall into three broad families. They are:

- Those which contain the twenty-seven-poem diwan associated with al-Aṣmaʿī.
- Those which contain the forty-poem diwan used by al-Baṭalyawsī.
- Those which contain the selection made by Ibn Maymūn for his Muntahā l-ṭalab.

These three families can be further divided into eight groups.

The first family, the twenty-seven-poem tradition, is that which is most extensively represented in the corpus as it has survived (16 MSS). It can be further arranged into five groups:

- Group I: manuscripts of the twenty-seven-poem tradition in al-Aṣmaʿī’s redaction with commentaries independent of al-Shantamarī (MSS 1–2).
- Group II: manuscripts containing al-Shantamarī’s full commentary on al-Aṣmaʿī’s redaction of the Six Poets (MSS 3–9).
- Group III: manuscripts containing al-Shantamarī’s commentary on selected poets (MSS 10–11).
- Group IV: manuscripts containing prefaces and excerpts from al-Shantamarī’s commentary on the Six Poets (MSS 12–15).
- Group V: anomalous manuscript (MS 16).

Four manuscripts of the second family, al-Baṭalyawsī’s recension of the forty-poem tradition, survive in two groups:

- Group VI: manuscript containing al-Baṭalyawsī’s commentary on the Six Poets (MS 17).
- Group VII: manuscripts containing al-Baṭalyawsī’s commentary on selected poets (MSS 18–20).

Finally, the third family constitutes one group:

- Group VIII: manuscripts containing Ibn Maymūn’s Muntahā l-ṭalab (MS 21).
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Group I

Manuscripts of the Twenty-Seven-Poem Tradition in al-ʿAsmaʿī's Redaction with Commentaries Independent of al-Shantamārī

1. Paris Bibliothèque Nationale de France Arabe 3273

Siglum: «۳»

This is our oldest manuscript and it furnished the basis for the edition of al-ʿAsmaʿī's redaction printed in War Songs (JEM Poems 1–27), as it did for the edition of Ahlwardt some one hundred and forty years ago. The 105 folios were completed in the first third of Rajab 571 [early January 1176] (see folio 105a), copied in clear Maghribi hand by a certain Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Qaḥṭabah al-Khazrajī. The copyist makes very few mistakes, though there is an occasional tendency to write  sinful as  saal. According to a statement written in dark ink within a rectangle drawn on the frontispiece, the work was reviewed and annotated by Ibn Jamāʿāh, whom Mawlawī identifies as Muḥammad ibn Ibrāḥīm al-Kattānī al-Ḥamawī al-Shāfiʿī (639–733/1240–1333). In his collation, it appears that he was correcting the readings of the MS on the basis of a copy of the diwan and  sharḥ in the al-Shantamārī tradition.

The MS includes what appear to be two sets of supralinear comments added in different hands, one in (red?) ink that is now quite faded and in many places impossible to read in the electronic copy I have of the MS. The other set of comments include sporadic annotations, vocalization of the verses, and indications of when to elide and when to pronounce certain consonants. They are written in dark ink and in close proximity to the verses of poetry.

Mawlawī presumes that both sets of comments are the work of Ibn Jamāʿāh, but if we examine the handwriting, there seem to be two different hands at work. It is not clear which of these sets of annotations is the work of the otherwise unknown scribe Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf al-Khazrajī and which is the work of Ibn Jamaʿāh. It is of course quite possible that one of the other owners of the manuscript recorded on the now badly damaged frontispiece also intervened in the text. The principle of Occam’s razor, however, dictates that the dark ink, used for the poetry, is the work of the copyist al-Khazrajī, and the lighter ink the work of Ibn Jamaʿāh some century and a quarter after the completion of the MS.

This MS, our oldest extant one, constitutes an anomaly within the wider corpus of manuscripts that preserve the diwan of ‘Antarah ibn Shaddād.
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It contains one verse (verse 20 of JEM Poem 1) and a number of readings found in no other recension of the diwan of ʿAntarah. Many of these readings are corrected by Ibn Jamāʿah, apparently on the basis of a manuscript that belonged to the version of the twenty-seven-poem tradition relied upon by al-Shantamarī—the emendations have much in common with the poetry as it is preserved in al-Shantamarī’s recension. There is almost no supplementary material (in the way of prefatory narratives, for example) provided for the poetry of ʿAntarah.

In sum, we can conclude that the readings prior to collation and the additional verse contained in this MS do not belong to the tradition of the diwan upon which al-Shantamarī based his commentary, and that this MS was later collated with, and corrected on the basis of, a version of the diwan that belonged to the tradition of the diwan upon which al-Shantamarī based his commentary. In short, the evidence encourages us to conclude that the poems of ʿAntarah recorded in this MS stem from a tradition of the al-Aṣmaʿī redaction of the twenty-seven-poem tradition that was not the same as that used by al-Shantamarī.

MS Paris BNF Arabe 3273 is thus not only the oldest extant copy of the diwan, it is our oldest testament to a version of the work prior to its codification in the commentary of al-Shantamarī. It is for this reason that the edition of the MS contained in this study prioritizes the readings in dark ink in the manuscript over the corrections made in red ink in the margins by Ibn Jamāʿah, in the hope that the oldest extant layer of the tradition might thereby be uncovered.


Order of poets in MS: Imruʿ al-Qays folios 1b–27a; al-Nābighah 27b–49a; ʿAlqamah 49b–56a; Zuhayr 56b–76a; Ṭarafah 76b–91a; ʿAntarah 91b–105a.

2. Istanbul Süleymaniye Nuruosmaniye 3849

Siglum: «ع».

This manuscript of 196 folios was completed at the end of Dhu l-Qaʿdah 589 [third week of November 1193] (see folio 196a), written in a crystal-clear naskh hand by Šālīḥ ibn Ṣārim al-Anṣārī. The poetry is vocalized and carefully pointed, with supralinear and marginal explanations of difficult words, in the hand of the copyist, and alternative vocalizations are scrupulously noted. The copyist occasionally lists variant readings. The copyist’s succinct and informative comments...
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belong to an eastern tradition of glossing independent of al-Shantamārī’s commentary. The manuscript is further independent of al-Shantamārī’s tradition in terms of the order of the diwans in the collection, with ‘ʿAntarah preceding Ṭarafah.26

Description of MS: Mawlawī in ʿAntarah, Dīwān, 167–68, 175.

Order of poets in MS: Imruʾ al-Qays folios 1b–60b; ‘Alqamah 61a–77a; al-Nābighah 78b–115a; Zuhayr 116b–46b; ‘ʿAntarah 147b–70a; Ṭarafah 171b–96a.

Al-Shantamārī’s Recension and Commentary Based on the Twenty-Seven-Poem Tradition in al-ʿAsmaʾī’s Redaction

Al-Shantamārī was born in Shantamariyyat al-Gharb (modern-day Faro in Portugal) in 410/1019 and died in Seville in 476/1083. He studied Arabic language, lexicography, grammar, and classical poetry in Cordoba, and wrote extensively on grammar and lexicography. He so excelled in these subjects that he was given the honorific “the Grammarian.” His commentary, therefore, is largely confined to lexical and grammatical problems, and only on rare occasions offers any variant readings or discussion of alternative transmissions.

He notes in the Introduction to his magnum opus, his recension of, and commentary on, the six pre-Islamic poets, that his transmission of this text goes back through the scholars of his native al-Andalus to al-Sijistānī (d. 255/869) and ultimately to al-ʿAsmaʾī: The isnād for the riwāyah is: al-ʿAsmaʾī → al-Sijistānī → Ibn Durayd → Abū ’Alī l-Qāli → Ibn Abī l-Ḥabbāb → Ibn Faḍālah → al-Ṭuṭāliqī → Abū Sahl al-Ḥarrānī → al-Shantamārī.27

It is not, however, clear whether al-ʿAsmaʾī, at the beginning of the chain, or al-Shantamārī, at the end, or any of the seven links in the chain, was responsible for the actual bringing together into one compendium of the recensions of the diwans of these six poets.

In his preface, al-Shantamārī lists the Six Poets in the following order: Imruʾ al-Qays, al-Nābighah, Zuhayr, ‘Alqamah, Ṭarafah, and ‘ʿAntarah. He also states that he has relied on al-ʿAsmaʾī as his principal authority and supplemented this recension with qasidas chosen from other transmitters. Thus, at the end of Imruʾ al-Qays’s poems, it is noted that this signals the end of Abū Ḥātim al-Sijistānī’s
transmission from al-ʿAṣmaʿī and of the qasidas chosen from other (unspecified) recensions. Al-Nābighah’s poetry is a selection of qasidas chosen from al-Ṭūsī (on the authority of his sheikhs). Three recensions were used for Zuhayr: those of al-ʿAṣmaʿī, Abū ʿAmr ibn al-ʿAlāʾ, and al-Mufaḍdal. No information is provided for the collection of ʿAlqamah, whereas for ʿAntarah the authorities used are “al-ʿAṣmaʿī and others,” though these “others” are unspecified. For Ṭarafah, the following information is provided:

This marks the end of al-ʿAṣmaʿī’s recension. The following poems are recorded by Ibn al-Sikkīt on the basis of other authorities, from the transmissions of Abū ʿAmr [i.e., ibn al-ʿAlāʾ] and al-Shaybānī.28

In all likelihood, the bringing together in one collection of the disparate recensions of these six poets is the work of his pupil Abū Ḥātim al-Sijistānī, an assumption we are encouraged to make by the inclusion of compositions in the diwan of ʿAntarah that are not sanctioned by al-ʿAṣmaʿī. Al-Sijistānī, an expert on Arabic poetry and its lore, prosody, and vocabulary, was a pupil of both Abū ʿUbaydah and al-ʿAṣmaʿī, and the teacher of Ibn Durayd (the third link in al-Shantamārī’s chain). This identification of the role of al-Sijistānī, however, as the pupil who brought together al-ʿAṣmaʿī’s redactions of the Six Poets into an identifiable collection remains simply a hypothesis, albeit one that best accounts for the evidence available. Presumably al-Shantamārī in turn relied on scholars who had reworked the redactions, and it is not inconceivable that he may have even supplemented them with additional poems.

While it is unclear whether prior to al-Shantamārī the twenty-seven-poem tradition was accompanied by a (full or partial) commentary, be it by al-ʿAṣmaʿī or al-Sijistānī or another scholar, what is clear is that al-ʿAṣmaʿī was a rigorist when it came to assessing the attributions of poems to poets, prone to err on the side of caution and with a distinct preference (in the case of ʿAntarah) for poems composed in the classical meters, to the exclusion of very short pieces and those composed in the more improvisatory meter of rajaz.

Five MSS of al-Shantamārī’s full commentary on all six poets survive. I have been able to collate them and have based my edition of al-Shantamārī’s recension on the oldest of these, MS 3 Rabat Khizānah Ḥasaniyyah 2126, hitherto unedited.
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Group II

Manuscripts Containing al-Shantamārī’s Full Commentary on al-Aṣma’ī’s Redaction of the Six Poets

3. Rabat Khizānah Ḥasaniyyah 2126

Siglum: ﹜غ ﹜.

This manuscript, given the title of Sharḥ dīwān ashʿār al-sittah (see folio 292b), comprises 292 folios. It is written in a careful, legible, and generous Maghribī hand by a certain ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥasan (?) Ibrāhīm al-Y-gh-f-li ( ?). It has, on average, twenty-two lines per folio. The manuscript has obviously suffered some water damage and exhibits signs of considerable bookworm activity. The verses are written in groups of two, sometimes three, in red and black ink, with the accompanying commentary of al-Shantamārī written in neat sections of text after the relevant block of two or three verses. It is fully vocalized, sometimes in black and sometimes red ink, though its vocalization is not always accurate. A few verses are left completely unvocalized, e.g., verses 1–2 and 6–7 of JEM Poem 11 (folios 281a–281b) and verses 3–4 of JEM Poem 12 (folio 282a). In the case of ‘Antarah’s diwan, there are occasionally gaps in the commentary (see, e.g., folio 282a), apparently intentional, when the scribe was perhaps unable to make out the text of his copy, but very rarely in the body of the poetry itself.

While the manuscript seems to be written in the same hand throughout, it contains two colophons which give divergent dates. The smudged colophon at the end of the manuscript (folio 292b) notes that the copying was completed on Wednesday, Jumada al-Thani 19, 989 [Monday, July 20, 1581]. However, on folio 161a, after the diwan of ‘Alqamah and before the start of the diwan of Zuhayr, there is another colophon which provides a later date: Monday, Dhu l-Hijjah 19, 1002 [Sunday, September 4, 1594]. The two sections were apparently written separately with the copying of the poetry of Zuhayr, Ṭarafah, and ‘Antarah preceding the copying of Imru’ al-Qays, al-Nābighah, and ‘Alqamah. The grouping of the poets into two sets of three is interesting. It suggests an affinity with those MSS in Group III that contain the poetry of Zuhayr, ‘Antarah, and Ṭarafah, or of ‘Antarah and Ṭarafah, to the exclusion of the other three poets.

Order of poets in MS: Imru’ al-Qays folios 1b–70b; al-Nābighah 72b–146a; ‘Alqamah 147b–60b; Zuhayr 161b–216b; Ṭarafah 217b–57a; ‘Antarah 258a–92b.
4. Rabat Bibliothèque Nationale de Maroc Q223

*Siglum:* «ح».

This is a generous MS of 420 pages, with an average of twenty-seven lines per page.\(^{31}\) It was copied by Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿUmar al-Y-m-h-li (?) on Saturday, Dhu l-Qa dah 17, 1078 [April 28, 1668].\(^{32}\) The pages appear at some stage to have been taped together.

The verses and almost all of the commentary are fully vocalized, with impressive accuracy. The verses of poetry are written in a larger hand and darker ink than that used for the commentary; the verses of other poets quoted in the commentary are also written in a large hand in dark ink. There are marginal corrections (see, e.g., pages 369 and 373) in a hand that is not the hand of the copyist, suggesting that the manuscript was subsequently collated against its exemplar and/or a different manuscript, and this later hand may be responsible for the addition of the vowels and orthographic signs to the text. There are bismillahs at the onset of each new diwan, on pages 104, 197, 225, 307, and 368.

**Order of poets in MS:** Imruʿ al-Qays pages 2–103; al-Nābighah 104–97; ʿAlqamah 197–224; Zuhayr 225–306; Ṭarafah 307–68; ʿAntarah 368–420.

5. Cairo Dār al-Kutub Shiʿr Taymūr 450

*Siglum:* «خ».

This manuscript, written in a somewhat cramped Maghribi hand, is scantily vocalized and contains many cases of *tasḥīf* (the misplacing or miswriting of the diacritical points in a word). It has an average of thirty lines of text to a page and the poetry is written in ink of a different color than the one used for the commentary. The ink used for the verses seems to be badly faded in many cases and many passages are as good as illegible in my electronic copy (which, admittedly, is not of the highest quality). According to the colophon on page 320, the completion of the work is dated to a Monday evening during the month of Rabiʿ al-Thani 1262 [April 1846], but there is no indication of any *riwāyah* or *samāʿ*, no chain of authorities or authentication, and the scribe’s name is not noted.\(^{33}\)

In terms of readings, this MS contains a number of similarities with MS 15 Istanbul Süleymaniye Laleli 1748 (see, e.g., the reading درفت in JEM Poem 6, verse 4), but seems closest to MS 6 Paris BNF Arabe 3274 in that they share a
significant number of errors, e.g., in JEM Poem 24. Of these three MSS, however, only MS 5 contains verses 69 and 70 of JEM Poem 1, which suggests their propinquity but not their dependence.


6. Paris Bibliothèque Nationale de France Arabe 3274

*Siglum:* «公社».

Slane and Ahlwardt date this manuscript to the eleventh century [seventeenth to eighteenth centuries], on the basis of their assessment of its handwriting.34 The colophon on folio 227a gives no indication of either the copyist’s name or the date the work was completed. It is written in Maghribī script, 25 lines of text to a page, with minimal vocalization and sporadic orthographic signs, often an occasional shaddah or sukūn. The poetry is written in a different-colored ink from the commentary, with the commentary usually written after every two lines of verse. It is not unusual for a new line of verse to begin on the same line as the last line of the preceding lemma. The MS displays evidence of the haste of its copyist, in the frequency of cases of taṣḥīf.

The readings of Paris BNF Arabe 3274 are, in the majority of cases, close to those offered by MS 5 Cairo Dār al-Kutub Shiʿr Taymūr 450 and MS 15 Istanbul Süleymaniye Laleli 1748, though they both contain some readings that Paris BNF Arabe 3274 does not. It is clear though that all three MSS share a common ancestor, though it is difficult to determine how far removed this ancestor is from them or what the stemmatic relationships between them are.


7. Paris Bibliothèque Nationale de France Arabe 5620

_Siglum:_ «شن».  

This MS of 218 folios, in a Maghribī hand, was copied, according to the colophon on folio 218a, by a certain al-Bayḍāwī ibn ’Abd al-Qādir ibn Aḥmād ibn Ḥammād Kuru (?), and its completion is dated to Thursday, Shaban 20, though no year is mentioned.35  

The verses of poetry are generally written in a light-colored ink, with al-Shantamārī’s commentary in a dark-colored ink and the prefatory headings (such as قالت عتيرة) also written in a dark-colored ink. As with other commentaries in the al-Shantamārī tradition, two, occasionally three, blocks of verse are followed by the _sharḥ_ formatted in paragraphs. The poetry is vocalized (in a light-colored ink that is very faint in my electronic copy), though there are a good number of errors. There is evidence of collation with its exemplar post completion (e.g., folio 196a).  

The MS contains five extra verses not found in most of the other MSS of al-Shantamārī’s _sharḥ_ but they are not accompanied by any commentary:  

- One extra verse after verse 50 of JEM Poem 1 (the same verse is found after verse 51 in MS 12 Cairo Dār al-Kutub 11626 zā’ and after verse 52 in MS 16 Paris BNF Arabe 5702).  
- One extra verse after verse 78 of JEM Poem 1 (the same verse is found after verse 77 of MS 16 Paris BNF Arabe 5702).  
- One extra verse at the end of JEM Poem 3 (the same verse is found in the margin at the end of JEM Poem 3 in MS 13 Cairo Dār al-Kutub 7727 adab and MS 16 Paris BNF Arabe 5702).  
- One extra verse at the end of JEM Poem 10; one extra verse between verses 9 and 10 of JEM Poem 23.  

_Order of poets in MS:_ Imru’ al-Qays folios 30a–77b; al-Nābighah 78b–120b; ’Alqamah 121a–33a; Zuhayr 134a–67b; Ṭarafah 168a–94a; ’Antarah 195a–218a. 

8. Paris Bibliothèque Nationale de France Arabe 5322

_Siglum:_ «صن».  

This miscellany of works of poetry and kalām is written in various Maghribī hands. It contains, on seventy-four of its 323 folios, a damaged (and thus
presumably unintentionally incomplete) version of al-Shantamarī's recension and commentary on the Six Poets.\textsuperscript{36} The diwans of ʿAlqamah, Zuhayr, and Ṭarafah have survived intact, whereas the diwan of ʿAntarah is incomplete.

JEM Poem 1, verses 1–6 and 22–85 and JEM Poem 2, verses 1–10 are extant, with al-Shantamarī's commentary. Apparently, the folios containing verses 7 to 21 of JEM Poem 1 have been lost between folios 251b and 252a. Folio 251b ends with the commentary to verse 6: َقَشَٰيْبَ مَحسَانْهَا, with َقَشَٰبَ َتَتنِبَتْ مَحسَانْهَا (cf. Mawlawī in ʿAntarah, ʿAntarah, 184) written at the bottom left hand side of the folio indicating the first word of the next folio. The extant folio (currently 252a) begins with the phrase َوَتَتَفَصِّلُ َتَفَصِّلُ, i.e., the sharḥ to verse 19. The MS comes to its lacunose end with the phrase َماَسِقْ مَنْهَا, written at the bottom left hand of the folio indicating the first word of the new folio (cf. Mawlawī in ʿAntarah, ʿAntarah, 277), i.e., midway through the commentary on verse 10 of JEM Poem 2.

The text is sparsely vocalized and includes some orthographic signs, especially tashdīd. The poetry is mostly written in a lighter ink than that used for the commentary.

There is no colophon with an indication of scribe or date of completion because the manuscript is missing the remainder of the diwan of ʿAntarah. On folio 193b, in the context of the diwan of ʿAlqamah, the name of the scribe is given, but unfortunately it is largely illegible: I can make out Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Bāqī Aḥmad, but the rest is unclear.

A number of the variants resemble the readings contained in MS 21, Ibn Maymūn’s Muntahā al-ṭalab and al-Ṭalawy’s recension (e.g., JEM Poem 1, verse 79, َکِرْبِيَ َكِرْبِيَ for َلِسُكْرِيَ), others the tradition of MS 3 Rabat Khizānah Ḥasaniyyah 2126 (e.g., JEM Poem 1, verse 33, َوَُرْضْعِيَ, َوَُرْضْعِيَ).

\textit{Description of MS:} Seligsohn in Ṭarafah ibn al-ʿAbd, ʿAntarah, xii–xiv.

\textit{Order of poets in MS:} ʿAlqamah folios 183a–93b; Zuhayr 194a–228a; Ṭarafah 228b–51a; ʿAntarah 251b–56b.

9. \textit{Cairo Dār al-Kutub} 81 adab shīn

\textit{Siglum:} «|».

I have not, as yet, been able to consult this MS but according to Mawlawī in ʿAntarah, ʿAntarah, 174–75, it consists of 164 folios, and the poetry of ʿAntarah is
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contained on folios 145b–64b. The MS is lacunose, as its incipit advertises, and it contains 211 verses compared with the usual 335 verses of most versions of the twenty-seven-poem tradition in the redaction of al-Aṣmaʿī and the recension of al-Shantamari.

There is some disagreement about the commentary this MS contains. According to Mawlawī, the commentary is by al-Shantamari, whereas Sezgin, _Geschichte_, 110 identifies this as an anonymous commentary written for a son of the Abbadid al-Muʿtaḍid ʿAbbād ibn Muḥammad (433/1041–1068). Mawlawī transcribes the incipit and the colophon, where completion is dated to Jumada al-Thani 1282 [October-November 1865]. He gives this MS the siglum _alif_ and it also furnished the basis for Khafājī’s edition of the commentary: see al-Shantamari, _Sharḥ dawāwīn al-shuʿarāʾ al-sittah al-jāhiliyyīn_. According to Khafājī, the MS was written by al-Shinqīṭī, the Mauritanian scholar who was also responsible for MS 19 Cairo Dār al-Kutub 1837 adab.

Group III  
_Manuscripts Containing al-Shantamari’s Commentary on Selected Poets_

10. Rabat Khizānah Ḥasaniyyah 1065  
_Siglum: «ح»._  

This manuscript of between seventeen to twenty lines per folio, written in a Maghribi hand, contains the diwans of Zuhayr, Ṭarafah, and ʿAntarah, with the commentary of al-Shantamari. The lines of poetry are written in a large hand in dark ink, in groups of two or sometimes three verses. The commentary follows each doublet or tercet of verse. The poetry is rarely provided with any orthographic signs and is only very sparsely vocalized. The pages are often damaged at the edges, where the paper has become friable and started to crumble. The manuscript contains neither title nor colophon and so cannot be dated. To the best of my knowledge, this manuscript has not previously been used in an edition of the diwan of ʿAntarah.

_Order of poets in MS:_ Zuhayr folios 1b–66a; Ṭarafah 67a–106b; ʿAntarah 107a–37b.
11. London British Library OR 3155

*Siglum:* «ش».

This is a late manuscript of 144 folios, copied in a clear eastern hand in 1295/1878, and given to Baron von Kremer as a gift by Sheikh ‘Ali l-Laythī, who owned the original, which Rieu describes as “an old MS.” The manuscript in its extant form is in considerable disarray, as Rieu, *Supplement*, 645–46 (§1026) notes. The diwans of both Ṭarafah and Zuhayr are incomplete and the diwan of ‘Antarah, also incomplete, is referred to on folio 77a as the diwan of Ṭarafah, despite the repeated references to ‘Antarah at the introduction of each poem.

The diwan of ‘Antarah begins on folio 51a with verses 9 and 10 of JEM Poem 3, after two verses of Ṭarafah (Ahlwardt, *The Divans*, §3, a ḏāliyyah). Of the remainder of al-Shantamarī’s recension and commentary, JEM Poem 21 is missing. The commentary contained in this MS is predominantly an abbreviation of al-Shantamarī’s *sharḥ*.

The poetry is sparsely vocalized and contains the occasional use of orthographic signs, especially *tashdid*. The verses of poetry and the majority of the introductory phrases are written in red ink, and there are corrections in the margins written in black ink. The vocalization is written in red ink in the hand of the copyist, but there are also many additions to the vocalization in black ink: they appear to be the work of the collator who added the marginalia. Interestingly, the same hand, in black ink, regularly corrects the work of the copyist, and on occasion corrects a reading adopted by the copyist or his exemplar to a reading associated with other MSS: e.g., in JEM Poem 14, verse 4, ناءَبَّا is corrected to نَاءَبَاتَ.


*Order of poets in MS:* Ṭarafah folios 1b–51a; ‘Antarah 51a–77a; Zuhayr 79a–144.

_Siglum:_ «٢».

This manuscript of 148 folios (with an average of nine verses of poetry per folio) is written in a Maghribī hand and contains supralinear notes and marginal comments in a different hand. The poetry is fully vocalized, with a high degree of accuracy. The manuscript, folio 2a of which contains a number of erased ownership statements, was completed (according to the colophon on folio 148b) during the first days (awāʾil) of Dhu l-Hijjah 1086 [early February 1676]. Folios 145b and 146a have been slightly damaged (in the right margin and top left corner respectively), and a significant proportion of the reproduced image of 147a in my electronic copy is illegible.

Al-Shantamāri’s prefaces are reproduced: the preface to JEM Poem 1 is abbreviated; the prefaces for JEM Poems 2–5, 8–20, 22–24, and 26–27 are given in full.38 There are signs that some of the notes added in the margin are based on al-Shantamāri’s commentary, though often in an abbreviated form. Thus, the marginal notes to verses 1, 2, 19, 30, and 35 of JEM Poem 1 are abbreviations of al-Shantamāri’s commentary, as is the supralinear commentary to verse 33 of this poem, whereas the commentary to verses 11 and 12 does not seem to derive from al-Shantamāri, at least insofar as his commentary has survived in other MSS. Other examples are the commentary to verses 9 and 12 of JEM Poem 6, and verse 3 of JEM Poem 11.

The readings of this MS are very similar, though not identical, to MS 15 Istanbul Süleymaniye Laleli 1748, and share further points in common with MS 3 Rabat Khizānah Ḥasaniyyah 2126 and MS 10 Rabat Khizānah Ḥasaniyyah 1065. However, the order of the poets in this MS is not the same as in these other MSS.

_Order of poets in MS:_ Imruʾ al-Qays folios 2b–36b; ‘Alqamah 37a–47a; Zuhayr 47a–74a; al-Nābighah 74a–105b; Ṭarafah 105b–27b; ‘Antarah 127b–48b.
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_Siglum: «د»._

This MS of 140 folios, with an average of ten lines to a folio, written in a Maghribī hand, was completed in the last days (awākhīr) of Dhu l-Hijjah 1112 [late May to early June 1701]. (The 28th of Dhu l-Hijjah that year corresponds with the 4th of June.) It is vocalized with great care (there are very few mistakes), and much attention is paid to recording, whenever relevant, the various alternative vocalizations possible. The copyist clearly had access to some version of al-Shanṭamari’s work (based on the evidence furnished by the ways in which he reproduces al-Shanṭamari’s prefaces), though when he proffers his infrequent supralinear explanations of individual words, he does not take them from al-Shanṭamari’s _shārḥ_: see, e.g., folio 128a (Poem 7, verses 5 and 6). The copyist is also very sparing with marginalia. There is a fully-fledged comment in the margin of folio 132b (JEM Poem 18, verse 1) intended to explicate the different meanings of two variant readings, and JEM Poem 23 is quite heavily explicated, but these are exceptions.

The copyist (or the exemplar he was copying) has a tendency to abbreviate the prefaces furnished by al-Shanṭamari in his _shārḥ_, as is the case for JEM Poems 1, 8, 10, 11, 13, 16, 20, and 27. Sometimes he both abbreviates and paraphrases, as in JEM Poems 2, 9, and 15. Occasionally the first phrase of al-Shanṭamari’s preface is given, as in JEM Poems 5, 6, and 12, sometimes the original preface is reproduced, as in JEM Poems 17, 18, 22, and 26. The prefaces to JEM Poems 14, 23, and 24 are not those given by al-Shanṭamari, and when there is no preface given by al-Shanṭamari, the copyist does not supply one from another source.

_Order of poets in MS:_ Imru’ al-Qays folios 1b–35a; al-Nābighah 35b–64a; ‘Alqamah 64b–73a; Zuhayr 73b–99a; Ṭarafah 99b–119a; ‘Antarah 119b–38a.

14. Gotha MS Orient-A-02191

_Siglum: «ژ»._

A manuscript of ninety-two folios, in Maghribī hand, without commentary, of al-Shanṭamari’s redaction of the Six Poets, completed according to the text on Dhu l-Qa’dah 21, 1131 [October 4, 1719]. Black ink is used for the lines of poetry, red for the supralinear comments, and red and brown ink for marginalia.
The comments and marginalia are written in a very small Maghribī hand. There is evidence that the copy was collated and corrected, with vowels and corrections added at a later stage, and extra care is taken to note alternative vocalizations where appropriate, with great precision evident in the accuracy and quality of the vocalization of the verses. The MS also contains additional marginalia in a hand that is not the hand of the copyist.

The copyist included al-Shantamarī’s prefaces to the poems written in red ink, though in the case of JEM Poem 1, the preface is truncated at the phrase لِيُنَزَّلَ قَالَ (cf. Mawlawī in ‘Antarah, Dīwān, 182). The copyist also relied on al-Shantamarī’s sharḥ for a number of his supralinear and marginal comments: thus, e.g., JEM Poem 1, verse 9 (on ﷺٌِّطَشَت), JEM Poem 1, verse 16 (on ﷺِّْتَبَّتَنَّ), JEM Poem 6, verse 12 (whole verse). Other comments, e.g., the marginalium to JEM Poem 1, verse 30 (on ﷺِّْطَصَّفَتْ), rely on other sources.

**Description of MS:** Pertsch, *Die arabischen Handschriften*, 209–13; Ahlwardt, *The Divans*, xviii.

**Order of poets in MS:** Imruʾ al-Qays folios 12b–31b; al-Nābighah 31b–47b; ‘Alqamah 47b–53a; Zuhayr 53a–67b; Ṭarafah 67b–78b; ‘Antarah 78b–88b.

15. Istanbul Süleymaniye Laleli 1748

**Siglum:** «س».

This manuscript of 101 folios (with fourteen lines of poetry to a folio) is written in a Maghribī hand, with supralinear and marginal notes in a small hand, written in red ink. The poetry is fully vocalized and carefully pointed. It has been corrected, with the corrections noted sometimes in supralinear, sometimes in marginal, notes. A copy of the diwan of al-Mutannabī begins on folio 101a.

There is no indication of when the manuscript was completed or of the identity of the copyist. Mawlawī proposes that the copy dates from the eleventh century [late seventeenth to late eighteenth century]. An ownership note on folio 1a records that the work was purchased after the death of its previous owner, “ʿAbbās al-Jazāʾiri.” There is an indication that the work was included as part of a waqf bequest in 1217/1801–2.

The copyist had access to the sharḥ of al-Shantamarī: the narrative prefaces given by al-Shantamarī are provided in red ink in the margins. Note however that the prefatory remark to JEM Poem 21 recorded on folio 97b does not stem
from al-Shantamārī’s *sharḥ*. I have been unable as yet to identify its provenance. I presume it originates with the copyist. Verse 3 of JEM Poem 25 is written twice: on the last line of folio 99a and the first line of folio 99b.

Mawlawī suggests that this manuscript is copied from MS 2 Istanbul Sülleymaniye Nuruosmaniye 3849. While many places suggest a close connection (e.g., the readings of JEM Poems 15, verse 2; 18, verse 1; 24, verse 18; 25, verse 14; and 27, verse 5), it would be odd for there to be a discrepancy in the name *سهمة* (JEM Poems 10, verse 1 and 12, verse 8) if this manuscript were copied from MS 2 Istanbul Sülleymaniye Nuruosmaniye 3849. The picture is complicated, however, by JEM Poem 24, verse 3, where both this MS and MS 2 Istanbul Sülleymaniye Nuruosmaniye 3849 give the form of the name as *سهمة*. As Mawlawī himself notes, the copyist of MS 15 Istanbul Sülleymaniye Laleli 1748 had access to al-Shantamārī’s *sharḥ*, which the copyist of MS 2 Istanbul Sülleymaniye Nuruosmaniye 3849 seems not to have had.

*Description of MS:* Mawlawī in *ʿAntarah, Diwān*, 168–69, 175.

*Order of poets in MS:* Imruʾ al-Qays folios 1b–25b; al-Nābighah 25b–46a; ʿAlqamah 46a–52b; Zuhayr 53a–71b; Ṭarafah 71b–87b; ʿAntarah 87b–100b.

**Group V**

*Anomalous Manuscript*

16. Paris BNF Arabe 5702

*Siglum:* «ق».

This lightly vocalized manuscript is part of a miscellany that contains on folios 266a–75a a copy of the diwan of ʿAntarah. Written in a clear Maghribi hand, it was finished on Wednesday, Shawwal 5, though no year is specified. It is furnished with occasional vowels and infrequent *tashdīd*, as well as sporadic marginalia (e.g., the reference to al-Suyūṭī on folio 266a). The poetry is written in two columns though the caesura is quite often misplaced (e.g., folio 266b, JEM Poem 1, verse 32; folio 267b, JEM Poem 1, verse 63), and the copyist sometimes gives two possible vocalizations for certain words (e.g., folio 269b, JEM Poem 6, verse 6). There are some infralinear explications (e.g., *باصل* on folio 267a, JEM Poem 1, verse 42) but supralinear explication (while infrequent) is the preferred
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method: e.g., folio 266b, JEM Poem 1, verse 23 (ْمَرَّة) and JEM Poem 1, verse 34 (ۡوَلِفَٰٓا).

The version of the diwan of ‘Antarah contained in this MS represents an anomaly. It is essentially a copy of al-Shantamari’s recension of the twenty-seven-poem tradition in al-Aṣmaʻi’s redaction of ‘Antarah’s poetry without al-Shantamari’s sharḥ. However, it also contains a number of additional verses, including on folio 272b one entire, short poem only found in the forty-poem tradition as extant in al-Baṭalyawsi’s commentary (this is JEM Poem 33 in War Songs, the fifteenth poem in al-Baṭalyawsi’s recension). However, the additional verses contained in this manuscript are not found in al-Baṭalyawsi’s recension, though three are included in MS 7 Paris BNF Arabe 5620.

Al-Baṭalyawsi’s Commentary and Recension of the Forty-Poem Tradition

Al-Baṭalyawsi (d. 494/1101) was an official from Baṭalyaw (Badajoz) working in the law courts of the Berber dynasty of the Aftasids (r. 413–487/1022–1095). While his collection of the Six Poets contains the diwans of the same six poets to which al-Shantamari devoted his commentary, in the case of ‘Antarah the range of poems is more extensive than that reproduced by his predecessor: in addition to the twenty-seven poems commented on by al-Shantamari, it includes thirteen additional short pieces, a number of them composed in rajaz.

Al-Baṭalyawsi is careful to note variant readings and identifies, wherever possible, his source for an item of information or a reading. His favorite source for variants is Abū ʿUbaydah, but he also mentions Abū ʿUbayd al-Qāsim ibn Sallām (d. 224/838), al-Mufaḍdal (d. 90/784), Ibn al-Sikkīt (d. 213/838), and Ibn Qutaybah (d. 276/888). Thus, in the sharḥ to the final verse of the seventh poem in his recension, i.e., JEM Poem 3, al-Baṭalyawsi notes that the verse was included by Abū ʿUbaydah in his riwāyah but omitted by Ibn al-Sikkīt. It is possible that al-Baṭalyawsi was relying on a redaction of sources that included Abū ʿUbaydah’s recension with a commentary by Ibn al-Sikkīt; see the commentary to verse 1 of the eighth poem, i.e., JEM 5, and the preface to the twenty-fifth poem, i.e., JEM Poem 6, where both Ibn al-Sikkīt and Abū ʿUbaydah are mentioned.

Did al-Baṭalyawsi intend his version of the Six Poets to supplement or supplant the version made famous by al-Shantamari? This might imply that
al-Baṭalyawsī himself compiled the collection out of various redactions of the poetry of the Six Poets. We might be tempted to find corroboration for al-Baṭalyawsī as the compiler of this version of the collection in the meticulous (and perhaps unusual) consistency with which he indicates his source materials, but this is outright conjecture. Only one of our four MSS, MS 17 Istanbul Süleymaniye Feyzullah Efendi 1640, contains al-Baṭalyawsī’s commentary on all the Six Poets. Two MSS contain the diwans of ʿAntarah and Ṭarafah (MS 20 Vienna ÖN Codex Mixtus 781 and MS 19 Cairo Dār al-Kutub 1837 adab), whereas MS 18 Istanbul Süleymaniye Beyazit B5385 contains Zuhayr, ʿAntarah, and Ṭarafah. So we have only one extant testimony to his commentary on all the Six Poets.

My tentative hypothesis is that the forty poems recorded by al-Baṭalyawsī reproduce the range of poems that were originally available to al-Aṣmaʿī, who omitted the poems that his rigorism found problematic or deemed suspect. This hypothesis can also be extended to propose that the forty-poem tradition preserved by al-Baṭalyawsī was derived ultimately via Ibn al-Sikkīt who was redacting one of the works of Abū ʿUbaydah. I base this hypothesis on the observation that al-Baṭalyawsī’s redaction contains an excerpt quoted in the Kitāb al-Shiʿr wa-l-shuʿārāʾ (Book of Poetry and Poets) by Ibn Qutaybah, in his entry on ʿAntarah (this is the fortieth poem in his recension, i.e., JEM Poem 43/B40). The poem is not included in the twenty-seven-poem tradition connected with al-Aṣmaʿī and used by al-Shantamarī.

Key Differences between the Recensions of al-Baṭalyawsī and al-Shantamarī

Al-Baṭalyawsī’s recension differs from al-Shantamarī’s in several key respects:

- His selection of the Six Poets places ʿAntarah’s poetry before that of Ṭarafah (the order is the reverse in al-Shantamarī’s sharḥ).
- His commentary is entirely independent of al-Shantamarī’s commentary.
- He shows greater attention to the recording of variant readings than al-Shantamarī does.
- His recension includes more poems than the Shantamarī recension does (i.e., he bases his commentary on the forty-poem as opposed to the twenty-seven-poem tradition).
- The sequence of poems in the diwan is, for the most part, different.
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- In six poems the verse order he reproduces is different from the verse order recorded for the twenty-seven-poem tradition: JEM 1/B1, 2/6, 3/7, 6/25, 7/26, and 9/9.  

The sequence of poems in the Baṭalyawsī recension of the diwan is as follows:

JEM Poems 1, 4, 30, 31, 32/8, 2, 3, 5, 9, 10, 12, 11, 13, 14, 33, 15, 34, 18, 21, 19, 20, 17, 35, 16, 6, 7, 23, 36, 22, 24, 25, 26, 37, 27, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43.

Using the numbers of the verses of the poems as reproduced in War Songs, the alternate versions of six poems in al-Baṭlayawsī’s recension are numbered as follows:

JEM Poem 2/B6: 1–7, 9–10, 8, 12, 11.
JEM Poem 3/B7: 1, 3, 2, 6, 4–5, 8–10, 7, 10′.
JEM Poem 6/B25: 1, 8, 12, 9, 13, 21, 14–15, 10–11, 16–20, 22.
JEM Poem 7/B26: 1–30 (verse 31 is absent).

Group VI

Manuscript Containing al-Baṭalyawsī’s Commentary on the Six Poets

19. Istanbul Süleymaniye Feyzullah Efendi 1640

Siglum: «ف».

This work of 150 folios was written in Constantinople by a certain ʿAbd al-Karīm ibn Muḥammad al-Ghūr al-Qarafaryavi,  completed, according to the colophon on folio 150a, on Saturday, Shawwal 9, 1046 [Friday, March 6, 1637]. This is the second oldest extant testimony to al-Baṭlayawsī’s commentary. The verses are written in red ink, distinct from the surrounding commentary, with which it is continuous (i.e., the verses are not written on lines separate from the commentary), and lightly vocalized (though the vocalization is frequently inaccurate). The copyist is especially prone to taṣḥīf and regularly mangles the verses that he clearly did not understand.
Both this manuscript and MS 20 share a number of features, especially the omission of six verses of JEM Poem 25/B31, an omission that suggests they were both copied from the same exemplar.


**Order of poets in MS:** Imru’ al-Qays folios 1b–40a; al-Nābighah 40b–66b; ‘Alqamah 66b–78b; Zuhayr 81b–106b; ‘Antarah 107a–30b; Ṭarafah 131a–50a.

**Group VII**

*Manuscripts Containing al-Baṭalyawsī’s Commentary on Selected Poets*

18. İstanbul Süleymaniye Beyazit B5385

**Siglum:** «ج».

This MS, written in an Ottoman hand, is our oldest extant copy of al-Baṭalyawsī’s commentary on Zuhayr, ‘Antarah, and Ṭarafah. It is the work of Sulaymān ibn Walī l-Dīn al-Ghūr (?) al-Qarafaryavi, completed in Istanbul, according to the colophon on folio 158b, on the night of Rajab 20, 1038 [Wednesday, March 14, 1629]. Although the manuscript is amply supplied with vowels and orthographic signs, the copyist was sloppy and added so many erroneous vowels that it is unusual for him to vocalize a word correctly. Towards the end of the MS, i.e., after JEM Poem 16/B24, the vocalization becomes more sporadic and even less consistent than in the poems prior to it. Despite its many mistakes, it is the basis for the present edition because it is the oldest MS in this group.

A comparison of the mistaken readings proves that this MS and MS 17 İstanbul Süleymaniye Feyzullah 1640, also copied in Istanbul, were copied from a manuscript in the same family. Both MSS, for example, retain the strikethrough in verse 2 of JEM Poem 1 (٣). Comparison of the marginalia in black ink with the readings and commentary of MS 19 Cairo Dār al-Kutub 1837 adab suggest that MS 18 Istanbul Süleymaniye Beyazit B5385 was read and corrected by al-Shinqīṭī, the copyist of, and commentator on, MS 19. For example, the marginalium to verse 5 of JEM Poem 9 corrects سَلَامٌ (‘the Sulām among them’) to سَلَامَاتٌ (‘the Salāmān among them), the reading of MS 19.

---

46

47

48
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The situation with the reading of JEM Poem 1, verse 36, preserved by MS 18 Istanbul Süleymaniye Beyazit B5385, MS 20 Vienna ÖN Codex Mixtus 781, and MS 17 Istanbul Süleymaniye Feyzullah Effendi 1640, reveals an earlier layer of confusion. In his sharḥ, al-Baṭalyawsī glosses the verse as if the reading of the main text was theود, and notes as a variant reading that al-Aṣmaʿī read الوُقُود. In MS 19 al-Shinqīṭī reads الوُقُود.

The title page of the manuscript indicates that the collection contained the following works:

- Sharḥ al-dawāwīn al-ʿArab
- Ibn Naḥḥās, al-Qaṣāʿid al-muʿallaqāt
- Sharḥ shiʿr Zuhayr, Sharḥ shiʿr ʿAntarah, Sharḥ shiʿr Ţarafah
- Sharḥ shiʿr Imriʿ al-Qays, Sharḥ shiʿr Labīd, Sharḥ shiʿr ʿAmr ibn Kulthūm
- Sharḥ shiʿr al-Hārith, Sharḥ shiʿr Zuhayr, Ţuraffi sharḥ al-Durriyyah
- Qaṣīdatān fī qaṣīdah li-bn Durayd
- Sharḥ al-Durriyyah

There is some confusion of the folios at folio 93b, where the commentary to JEM Poem 25/B31, verse 11, abruptly terminates, with folio 94a beginning with verse 11 of Ţarafah’s Muʿallaqah. The commentary on Ţarafah’s Muʿallaqah continues until verse 20 (folio 95b), and on folio 96a the commentary to JEM Poem 25/B31 recommences with verse 12. Interestingly this is the very poem that is lacunose in MS 17 Istanbul Süleymaniye Feyzullah Effendi 1640 and MS 20 Vienna ÖN Codex Mixtus 781.49

Order of poets in MS: Zuhayr folios 1b–46a; ʿAntarah 46b–100b; Ţarafah 102b–58b.

19. Cairo Dār al-Kutub 1837 adab

Siglum: «ث».

This MS, containing the diwans of ʿAntarah and Ţarafah, has twenty-seven folios, is undated, and, as noted by Mawlawī, was written by the Mauritanian scholar Muhammad ibn Maḥmūd al-Shinqīṭī (1245–1322/1829–1904). It is written in a clear Maghribī script, accurate vocalization is provided, and there are many marginal and interlinear remarks, especially alternative readings, and lexical glosses, a testimony to al-Shinqīṭī’s breadth of learning and knowledge
of the tradition. It is not clear whether he was relying on the commentary of al-Shantamari, though we can tell from marginalia to MS 18 Istanbul Süleymaniye Beyazit B5385 that he worked closely on this manuscript and corrected many of its misreadings, often by writing over an incorrect consonant, but tending to leave the usually erroneous vocalization without emendation. A number of poems in the MS are provided with brief contextual narratives or items of information intended to furnish necessary background.

In the case of the Mu'allaqah al-Shinqīṭī was evidently collating the recension of al-Baṭalyawsī with other available recensions, and in the case of Poem 25, he relied upon MS 18 Istanbul Süleymaniye Beyazit B5385. Mawlawī consulted but decided not to incorporate into his edition of 'Antarah's diwan the results of his examination of al-Shinqīṭī's copy of the recension. I have found this MS useful for confirming or suggesting the correct versions of a number of misreadings encountered in the three other MSS in this group.

Description of MS: Mawlawī in 'Antarah, Dīwān, 170–71.

Order of poets in MS: 'Antarah folios 1b–13a; Ṭarafah 14a–28b.

20. Vienna Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Codex Mixtus 781

Siglum: «ت».

This volume of 253 folios is a composite manuscript that consists of two separate works from distinct decades and in two different hands. The first part of the MS, Vienna ÖN 446 (folios 1b–186b), contains, among others, the poetry of Imru’ al-Qays, al-Nābighah, 'Alqamah, and Zuhayr, with the commentary of al-Shantamari. 50 It is written in a clear Maghribi hand, is vocalized, and the commentary is written after the verse of poetry. The poetry is written in darker ink and in a larger hand. Flügel, Handschriften, 431–32, dates the work to Sunday evening, Rabī’ al-Thani, 1043 [October, 1633].

The second half of the MS (folios 189b–248b) contains the commentary of al-Baṭalyawsī on the poetry of 'Antarah and Ṭarafah. It is impossible to tell whether the manuscript from which it was copied contained only these two diwans, or whether the selection of 'Antarah and Ṭarafah was made to supplement the four poets included in MS 446. It is written in an eastern hand, has almost no vocalization, and very little pointing of consonants. The commentary is written continuously with the poetry (i.e., the verses and comments are not
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written on separate lines), and in most folios is penned in a lighter, and now very faded, ink. The brief colophon on folio 248b, which does not mention the name of the scribe or the provenance, states that the work was completed at the end of Rabi’ al-Awwal 1099 [January 1688].

Vienna ÖN Codex Mixtus 781 appears to belong to same branch of the tradition as MS 17 Istanbul Süleymaniye Feyzullah 1640, even though the latter contains the poetry of all six poets and the former only contains the poetry of ‘Antarah and Ṭarafah. Both MSS share many of the same misreadings, though impressionistically MS 20 Vienna ÖN Codex Mixtus 781 is, on a number of occasions, more accurate than MS 17 Istanbul Süleymaniye Feyzullah 1640. Both manuscripts reveal that at a prior stage in the tradition, a number of misreadings of the verses became fixed, and that, interestingly, these misreadings are not replicated in the accompanying commentary. For example, in this MS, verse 17 of JEM Poem 25/B31 reads ُتَرْفَفُتُتْ, whereas the commentary preserves the reading of the other MSS.


Stemma

A comparison of the four manuscripts that contain the commentary on ‘Antarah’s diwan by al-Baṭalyawsī suggests the following relationships:

- MS 17 Istanbul Süleymaniye Feyzullah Efendi 1640 and MS 18 Istanbul Süleymaniye Beyazit B5385 are very similar, and often display identical cases of scribal misreading including  taḥrīf (by which I mean misreading and/or miscopying of the ductus, the skeleton, of words, whether deliberate or not).
- Were it not for the discrepancy between their respective versions of JEM Poem 25/B31, we might conclude that MS 17 Istanbul Süleymaniye Feyzullah Efendi 1640 was copied from MS 18 Istanbul Süleymaniye Beyazit B5385.
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- The marginalia to MS 18 Istanbul Süleymaniye Beyazit B5385 are written in the same hand as that of MS 19 Cairo Dār al-Kutub 1837 adab, so al-Shinqīṭī evidently worked closely on MS 18 and is presumably responsible for most of the corrections made to its misreadings.52
- These misreadings were not due to the copyist of MS 18 Istanbul Süleymaniye Beyazit B5385. When we compare them with similar misreadings in MS 17 Istanbul Süleymaniye Feyzullah Efendi 1640, we can conclude that the copyist appears to have been copying his source faithfully, i.e., the misreadings are part of the copyist’s exemplar.
- Al-Shinqīṭī had access to other sources for ʿAntarah’s diwan (or at least for some of the poems in the diwan).
- MS 20 Vienna ÖN Codex Mixtus 781 was presumably copied from the manuscript that furnished the exemplar for MS 17 Istanbul Süleymaniye Feyzullah Efendi 1640: they have a number of errors in common, especially the lacuna in JEM Poem 25/B31, and this suggests a close relationship between MSS 17 and 20, but not close enough to imply direct dependency.

We might represent this as follows:

Group VIII

Manuscripts containing Ibn Maymūn’s Muntahā l-ṭalab min ʿār al-ʿArab

Abū Ghālib Muḥammad ibn al-Mubārak ibn Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Maymūn al-Baghdādī was born in the year 523/1129 and died in 597/1200–1201. From 588 to 589/1192 to 1193, he completed his Ultimate Poetry Collection of the Early Arabs, an anthology that is reckoned to have contained 1080 pieces by 264
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poets, i.e., circa 39,990 verses. Three of Ibn Maymūn’s original 10 volumes—Volumes 1, 3, and 5—appear to have survived.

21. Istanbul Süleymaniye Laleli 1941

*Siglum: «١».*

This MS consists of 164 folios (328 pages in the published facsimile). According to Sezgin, this is an autograph dated to 595/1199 (Wednesday, March 10, to be precise). The colophon, however, gives the date of completion as “the eleventh of Jumada I in the year 995” [Saturday, April 18, 1587].

Two other MSS are known, and both are kept in Cairo’s Dār al-Kutub. The first, Cairo Dār al-Kutub 53 adab shīn, is similar to MS 21 Istanbul Süleymaniye Laleli 1941, according to Husain. Husain notes that the second Cairene MS “contains only a single fasciculus of the entire work.”

Five poems attributed to ʿAntarah are contained in Volume One of the *Muntahā l-ṭalab*, on pages 104–12 of Sezgin’s facsimile. Of these five poems, the first, second, and fifth are included in the twenty-seven-poem tradition, i.e., JEM Poems 1, 6, and 25 (respectively). Ibn Maymūn’s third poem is an extended version of the fifth poem in the twenty-seven-poem tradition, edited and translated in *War Songs* as JEM Poem 29. One poem, the fourth in Ibn Maymūn’s sequence, JEM Poem 28, is contained in neither the twenty-seven-poem nor the forty-poem tradition.

There is considerable discrepancy between the versions of the poems as found in the twenty-seven-poem tradition and Ibn Maymūn’s anthology. The latter displays numerous verse additions and omissions, and the verse sequences in the anthology differ from the sequences contained in the twenty-seven-poem tradition.

If we compare the versions, we find that in the case of Ibn Maymūn’s first poem, i.e., JEM Poem 1, MS 21 Istanbul Süleymaniye Laleli 1941 records the following sequence (using the numeration of the poem according to the version contained in JEM Poem 1): 1, 4, 6–16, 18–19, 21–35, 37–53, 61, 54, 56, 58–59, 62, 57, 63, 60, 64–73, 75, 76, 74, 78, 77, 79, 83–85.

From the evidence provided in the excellent apparatus for the *Muʿallaqah* (JEM Poem 1) prepared by Mawlawī in ʿAntarah, *Dīwān*, 185–222, it is evident that the Cairo MS he consulted contains twenty-six extra verses not included in the twenty-seven-poem tradition. These are: one verse after line 1; one verse
after line 7; three verses after line 16; three verses after line 19; one verse after line 38; one verse after line 49; one verse after line 56; three verses after line 71; three verses after line 73; three verses after line 74; one verse after line 81; four verses after line 82; one verse after line 84.

Mawlawī in ‘Antarah, Dīwān, 342 notes that the version of JEM Poem 1 contained in the Cairo MS contains seventy-five verses, but he does not specify which verses of the poem in the twenty-seven-poem tradition are missing. I have not included these extra Cairene verses in my edition, because I have not yet been able to consult the MS.

In the case of Ibn Maymūn’s second poem, i.e., JEM Poem 6, the sequence is: 1, 2, 4, 6–9, 13–15, 10–12, 17–21; i.e., verses 3, 5, 16, and 22 in the twenty-seven-poem tradition are absent. Based on Mawlawī’s notes in ‘Antarah, Dīwān, 348, the Cairene version is apparently identical to that of MS 21.

The sequence of Ibn Maymūn’s third poem, JEM Poem 29, an extended version of the fifth poem in the twenty-seven-poem tradition, is: 1–5, 5’, 6–8, 8’, 8”, 8’’, 8’’’, 8’’’’, 9, 9’, 10–12, 12’, 12’’, 12’’’. Thus, Ibn Maymūn’s version is thirteen verses longer, as it contains all of the verses included in the version in the twenty-seven-poem tradition.

The sequence of Ibn Maymūn’s fifth poem, JEM Poem 25, is: 0 (a verse not contained in al-Aṣma’ī’s redaction), 1, 2, 3, 4, 8–21. So, verse 5 of the twenty-seven-poem tradition is absent and an extra verse is added at the beginning of the poem.56

Ibn Maymūn’s fourth poem, i.e., JEM Poem 28, is contained in neither al-Baṭalyawsī’s recension of the forty-poem tradition nor al-Shantamarī’s recension of the twenty-seven-poem tradition. Its topography, on the banks of the Euphrates, suggests that it is a product of the Sīrat ‘Antar. We should note however that its lines 8 and 9 are very old, as they are quoted, with a slight variation, by Ibn Qutaybah in his Book of Poetry and Poets.

In contrast with these discrepancies in verse inclusion, absence, and sequence, the actual readings of Ibn Maymūn’s versions do not differ greatly from those contained in either al-Shantamarī or al-Baṭalyawsī. Taken in general and impressionistically, they suggest a greater contiguity with the variant readings of al-Baṭalyawsī than with those preferred by al-Shantamarī.