Notes

1. I do not include in this study any consideration of the verses contained in the popular epic, *Sūrat Antar*.

2. I was lucky during my studies to be able to use the copy of Ahlwardt’s book in the library of the Oriental Institute, in which D. S. Margoliouth, Laudian Professor of Arabic at Oxford from 1889–1937, had inscribed his marginalia.

3. This part of the study is numbered using Eastern Arabic numerals.


5. See *The Divans*, xxvii.

6. “They are the first fruits which the soil of Arabian literature has produced, or, at any rate, has preserved for posterity: and their study is the more attractive because they from the first appear in a degree of perfection” (*The Divans*, i).

7. As far as I can determine, Ahlwardt rarely employs its corollary of *emendatio ope ingenii*, emendation based on conjecture, though its presence can be discerned in comments such as, “I do not scruple to reject a reading that is not reconcilable with my appreciation of the sense, and to select another—or even to invent one” (*The Divans*, viii). On p. xvi, he intimates that the edition contains certain conjectures “due to a conception of the text” he had repudiated, conjectures whose presence “is very annoying.” The words he supplied on four occasions to fill in lacunae in the text, as explained on p. xiii, are conjectures based on context, not on rejection of existing readings. Interestingly, he does not supply a list of these emendations based on conjecture. The other piece of scholarly apparatus that Ahlwardt does not supply is a stemma of the manuscripts.

8. On the Table of Contents on p. 149, this third section (*faṣl*) is not mentioned. The duplicate pagination (there are two distinct sections, both of which are numbered pages 173–76) suggests that the third section was added to the book at a later stage.

Notes

10 The abbreviation JEM indicates the edition of the poems contained in ‘Antarah ibn Shaddād, *War Songs*.


12 Gacek’s “Taxonomy” is a treasure trove of information.


14 Another vehicle of hybridization is “restoration” or restitution of a text via emendation, be it by copyists or scholars.

15 I decided not to entertain any consideration of the authenticity of the poetry attributed to ‘Antarah. For a recent statement, see al-Jūzū, *Shi’r ‘Antarah*.

16 See Gacek, *Arabic Manuscripts*, 333–38 for guidance and instructions on how properly to describe manuscripts.

17 Another lesson I take from my work as an editor is that to try to establish the text on the basis of what I might take ‘Antarah’s authorial intention to be is the stuff of fantasy. This contrasts with the practice of translation, for in order to attempt to translate ‘Antarah’s poetry in any meaningful sense (at least according to what I understand translation to be), I had to discover ‘Antarah’s voice and inhabit the intentions of the poems.

18 In this regard, my literary-historical approach shares much with the approach to editing Shakespearean and Elizabethan plays known as “New Textualism”: see the 1993 edition of the A-text and B-text of Christopher Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus* by David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen and Jill Levenson’s 2000 edition of the 1597 (Q1) and 1599 (Q2) versions of Shakespeare’s *Romeo and Juliet*. This is what is elsewhere referred to as “versioning”: Tarrant, *Texts*, 3. Bevington and Rasmussen in Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus*, 77, warn “editors and critics alike” “to be wary of claims based on a conflated text,” because, they argue, “both texts of *Doctor Faustus* continue to deserve our divided attention.”

19 This is the manuscript that furnished the basis of the edition of JEM Poems 1–27 published in *War Songs* (2018).

20 This is the manuscript that furnished the basis of the edition of JEM Poems 30–43 published in *War Songs* (2018).

21 This is the manuscript that furnished the basis of the edition of JEM Poems 28–29 published in *War Songs* (2018).

22 This MS contains the twenty-seven-poem tradition supplemented with one poem from the forty-poem tradition.
Notes

23 In preparing the current edition I have only been able, so far, to consult one of the three extant manuscripts of Ibn Maymūn’s *Muntahā l-ṭalab*.


25 The collection of the poetry contained in this MS is a composite, as is the case with the other extant versions of the Six Poets. Thus, e.g., upon completion of al-ʿAṣmaʾīʾs transmission of Imruʾ al-Qays as handed down by Abū Ḥātim al-Sijistānī (see folio 20b) and his transmission of Ṭarafah as handed down by Ibn al-Sikkīt (see folio 89a), the manuscript includes poems from the collections of other scholars. These collections include the transmissions of Abū ‘Amr al-Shaybānī and al-Mufaḍḍal for Imruʾ al-Qays (folio 20b); of al-Ṭūsī for al-Nābighah (folio 49a); of Ibn al-Aʿrābī and al-Ṭūsī as handed down by Abū ‘Ali Ismāʾīl ibn al-Qāsim al-Baghdādī for Ṭarafah (folio 55a); of al-Shaybānī and al-Mufaḍḍal for Zuhayr (folio 76a); and of al-Shaybānī for Ṭarafah (folio 89a).

26 I have provided an edition of this MS and collated it with its oldest extant neighbor, Paris BNF Arabe 3273, in view of its independence of this neighbor and of the MSS that belong to the al-Shantamarī recension.


28 See MS 3 Rabat Khizānah Ḥasaniyyah 2126 folio 251b.

29 The name is difficult to read and seems to contain no trace of a teknonym of any sort.

30 Three and a half lines are illegible because of water damage of some sort. I would like to thank Dr. Ignacio Sanchez of Warwick for his help with these colophs.

31 The MS has been numbered at some stage as pages rather than as folios and so I will refer to pages, and not folios.

32 I would like to thank Professor Amira Bennison for her help with the scribe’s *nisbah*.

33 Rabiʿ al-Thani 10, 17, 24, and 31, 1262 were Mondays, equivalent to April 6, 13, 20, and 27, 1846.


35 The first twenty-eight folios of the manuscript contain a collection of poetry in praise of the Prophet, i.e., they are unrelated to either the Six Poets or al-Shantamarī’s *sharḥ*.

36 I assume that the copy of al-Shantamarī’s commentary on Imruʾ al-Qays and al-Nābighah had originally formed part of the work, before it was damaged and included in this miscellany. If that assumption is unjustified, then the work belongs in Group III: MSS Containing al-Shantamarī’s Commentary on Selected Poets.

37 I have only consulted those pages of the manuscript that contain the diwan of ‘Antarah.

38 There are no prefaces given by al-Shantamarī for JEM Poems 6, 7, 21, and 25.
The first twelve folios, 1b–12a, written in a naskhi hand, constitute a separate work and contain the Mu‘allaqāt of Labīd, al-Ḥārith ibn Ḥillizah, and ‘Amr ibn Kulthūm.

The copyist states that 21 Dhu l-Qa‘dah was a Saturday morning, but 21 Dhu l-Qa‘dah was a Wednesday. If we presume that Saturday is correct, and that the scribe's dating is dependent on the sighting of the moon, the date may be either Dhu l-Qa‘dah 17 or 24 [either September 30 or October 7]. I would like to thank Professor Qutbuddin for pointing this out to me.

The confusion over whether her name was Sumayyah or Suhayyah is an old one, as al-Iṣbahānī’s remarks on the subject show: see ‘Antarah ibn Shaddād, War Songs, 339–40 (Appendix §2.5).

“This is a verse that Abū ‘Ubaydah included, but not mentioned by Yāqūb” (i.e., Ibn al-Sikkīt).

Al-Baṭalyawṣī, Sharḥ al-ashʿār, 2:272 and 318 respectively.

In JEM Poem 25/B31, the version contained in two of the manuscripts (MS 17 Istanbul Süleymaniye Feyzullah Efendi 1640 and MS 20 Vienna ÖN Codex Mixtus 78t) is missing six of the verses contained in the version copied in MS 18 Istanbul Süleymaniye Beyazit B3385 and MS 19 Cairo Dăr al-Kutub 1837 adah. The version in MSS 17 and 20 is presumably lacunose, whereas the version in MSS 18 and 19 is identical to that reproduced within the twenty-seven-poem tradition.

Karaferya is also the town of origin of the copyist of MS 18 Istanbul Süleymaniye Beyazit B3385.

That is, he is from Karaferya. The Arabic أَلْغَرْ خُلْيَةٍ is presumably either Algör or Ilgör. I would like to thank Prof. Devin Stewart for his help with this name.

The MS contains the following mini-colophon on folio 46a: “Here ends the poetry of Zuhayr, praise be to God, Lord of the Cosmos. The poetry of ‘Anatarah ibn Mu‘āwiyah ibn Shaddād next follows. Completed, through the grace of God, in the evening, 1038.”

Sulāmī is explained as a member of a kin group that belonged to Ṭayyi’, whereas Salāmān would be a member of Salāmān, a group within Dhubyān. See ‘Antarah ibn Shaddād, War Songs, 329 (Glossary).

There is also some confusion with the pencilled numeration written on the folios. The folio that should be 70a is unnumbered, while the next folio (i.e., folio 71a) is given the number of 70(a), thus throwing the folios out of numeration. At folio 79(a) the correct numeration resumes.

On folio 94b, the end of al-ʿAṣma‘ī’s recension of al-Nābighah is noted and on 109b, the end of al-Ṭūsī’s riwāyah from Sibawayh (?) is signaled.

See al-Tūmî in al-Baṭalyawṣī, Sharḥ al-ashʿār, 2:536.
Curiously, al-Shinqīṭī’s text omits verses 11-21 of B30/JEM 24, verses extant in the other versions of the poem in both the twenty-seven-poem and forty-poem traditions, and extant in Istanbul Süleymaniye Beyazit B5385, folios 91a-92b, the MS he corrected.


The manuscripts of Volumes Three and Five are located at Yale University in the Beinecke Library.

See Husain, “Notice,” 434. Even if we read the number of the year backwards as 599, we arrive at the date of Saturday, January 25, 1203, two years after Ibn Maymūn’s presumed death date. For a generally critical assessment of Sezgin’s facsimile project, see Witkam, “Arabic Manuscripts in Distress.”

I have not yet been able to consult either of these MSS. They would become MSS 22 and 23 in the current list.

See ‘Antarah ibn Shaddād, War Songs, 272 (Appendix §1.13) and 316 (n. 126).

The MSS of al-Shantamarī’s recension and commentary represent what textual critics call an “open’ tradition,” whereas the MSS of al-Baṭalyawsī’s recension and commentary represent a “closed’ tradition”: see Tarrant, Texts, 54.

Tarrant, Texts, xi–xii. Carter’s challenge (“Arabic Literature,” 570), that “potential editors . . . produce an edition annotated in such a way that a careful user could accurately reconstruct the original manuscripts from the critical apparatus alone” is decidedly Borgesian, even if meant to be ironic. In textual criticism terms, I think I’d prefer to be Housman’s “editor of no judgment” who “cannot but feel in every fiber of his being that he is a donkey between two bundles of hay” (quoted from Tarrant, Texts, 21).