

THE DIVANS OF THE SIX ANCIENT ARABIC POETS



THE DIVANS OF THE SIX ANCIENT ARABIC POETS

W. AHIWARDT



GORGAS PRESS
2008

First Gorgias Press Edition, 2008

The special contents of this edition are copyright © 2008 by
Gorgias Press LLC

All rights reserved under International and Pan-American Copyright Conventions. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning or otherwise without the prior written permission of Gorgias Press LLC.

Published in the United States of America by Gorgias Press LLC, New Jersey

This edition is a facsimile reprint of the
original edition published by the Biblio Verlag, Osnabruck, 1972

ISBN 978-1-59333-998-2



GORGAS PRESS
180 Centennial Ave., Piscataway, NJ 08854 USA
www.gorgiaspress.com

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the
American National Standards.

Printed in the United States of America

P r e f a c e.

Works of poetry occupy a prominent place, both with respect to their number and value, in the extensive literature of the Arabians; and, among them, it is just the oldest compositions whose importance is most indisputable, and which excite the liveliest interest. They are the earliest documents of the Arabic language, and from time immemorial have been considered the chief authority for the correct understanding of its vocabulary; they are testimonies of an historical antiquity around which Legend has woven its mysterious veils; they exhibit to us the social relations of olden times with the most vivid freshness, and fetter us by the simplicity and truth of feeling and observation, no less than by the manly and self-conscious — even if unamiable — character which manifests itself in them, and which expresses itself in the sinewy strength of the diction. Moreover, 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 which, according to the judgment of most native scholars and critics, has never been attained by the compositions of subsequent times.

Time has spared no small portion of those works in which the indefatigable industry of Arabian philologists, from the middle of the second century of the Hīgira onwards, has collected the poetical compositions of the earliest period. Most of them confine themselves to collecting the poems of individuals, as those of Laqith,

of Elkhansā; others bring together those which are ascribed to a special tribe, as those of the Benu Hodseil — and the greater part of these are unfortunately unknown to us as yet; lastly, others comprise the poems of several persons, as the Elmofaddhalijjāt, or arrange single poems or fragments of poems in certain groups, as the Elhamāsa of Abū Temmām.

The collection which contains the Dīvāns of the six pre-islamic poets, Imru'ulqais, Ennābiga, 'Alqama, Zuhair, Tharafa, and 'Antara, is a work of the first kind, but on a grander scale. These very poets have, ever since they appeared, been considered the most eminent poets of the Arabians; they overshadowed a multitude of earlier poets of repute, and they exercised a regulative and permanent influence on the literature of the succeeding centuries. Even though they found a certain form, so to speak, a certain fashion of composition already in vogue, yet they enriched it by elevation and splendour of diction, by variety and novelty of thoughts and images, and in part by the art of transition from one subject of description to another, and thus as it were re-constituted it a model of style. Their language, moving on a genuinely national soil, is considered absolutely pure and free from foreign admixture, and the signification of the words is to be learnt from their verses. The compass of their compositions may be called large, in comparison with that of their contemporaries, and this, in addition to their other merits, has contributed no little to their high appreciation. While the collected poems of the elder Elmoraqqish, for instance, contain 147, and those of the younger 71 verses, these contain on an average more than 400 verses a-piece. Moreover, their life was not so much implicated with petty local incidents as that of many of the earlier poets, but with memorable events and eminent historical personages, and therefore lent a higher interest to their poetry. So many an ancient poet has fallen into oblivion, or has never passed beyond a narrow circle, but their glory shines through the centuries in unfading colours; no learned criticism has

ventured to detract from their authority, no later poet has been bold enough to place himself on their level.

Ever since these poems were collected, before the middle of the second century of the Hīra, they have continually been the subject of zealous study or learned discussion in all lands whither Arabic language and learning extended, and have found numerous editors. The assertion that the study of them really only thrived in the West, chiefly only in Spain, is wholly erroneous. It is based on certain MSS. of these poets which are written in Magrebine character (Codd. Paris. Suppl. 1424. 1425. Cod. Goth. 547. Cod. Escur. 299), whereas others (Cod. Lugd. Dozy 530. Cod. Oxon. Uri I. 1223) are written in Neskhī, and it overlooks the facts that several commentaries on them have been written in the East, and that single verses out of all these poems are cited in countless works of the East. This is itself a proof how much these poets were read. It may be asserted with perfect truth that there are not many poets, even of the most famous ones of subsequent times, who are so frequently cited as they, whereas citations of the verses of other ancient poets — from the *Elmofaddhalijjāt*, for instance — are surprisingly rare.

The collection of ancient poems of which we speak, was formed by the learned philologist *Ela'lam* [يوسف بن سليمان بن عيسى الشنتمري] [أبو الحاج الأعلم] (b. 410. d. 476), about the middle of the fifth century, who at the same time furnished it with a complete commentary. As he says in his Preface and in divers passages of his work, he has admitted into his collection those poems which *Elaçma'î* [عبد الملك بن قُريب بن عبد الملك بن علي بن أصبع بن مطهر البصري] [أبو سعيد] (d. 210 or 215), declared genuine, according to his recension, and has, in the case of each poet, appended to them certain poems which other philologists likewise thought genuine. That *Elaçma'î* knew these poems also, may be shewn from remarks on single verses in *Ela'lam's* commentary, and by other arguments.

he has nevertheless omitted them as doubtful or spurious, and, as I believe, with perfect justice. But it is quite possible that he not only explained the other poems in his lectures, but also furnished them with a perpetual commentary. It favours this supposition, that Ela'lam in his work repeatedly appeals to him with the words, „Elaçma'î does not admit this verse“, or „he explains this word so or so“, and the like. Moreover, we may gather it from the fact that a work is ascribed to him, the title of which appears to have been كتاب قصائد الستة (and not كتاب القصائد الستة). It may, however, be objected to this view, that Ela'lam appeals, for the poems of Imruulqais which Elaçma'î has accepted as genuine, to Abū ḥatim [سَهْلُ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ بْنِ عِثْمَانَ بْنِ الْقَاسِمِ السَّجِسْتَانِي] who died 250 (248. 254. 255). As he, as a pupil of Elaçma'î, fixed the poems of Imruulqais according to his master's text and commentary, the same thing may probably have occurred with the dīṣāns of the five other poets also, whether he himself or some other pupil wrote down Elaçma'î's recensions.

There were special editions of single poets of this series. Thus that of Zuhair by Tsa'lab [أَحْمَدُ بْنُ يَحْيَى بْنِ سَيَّارِ الشَّيْبَانِي] [أبو بكر] born in 200, died in 291, who is often mentioned in the Elmogni of Essojuthi; and by Ibn elanbārī [أَبُو بَكْرٍ] [أَبُو بَكْرٍ] who died in 328, a commentary to Ennābiga and Zuhair. Essukkari [أَلْحَسَنُ بْنُ الْحُسَيْنِ بْنِ عُبَيْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ عَبْدِ الرَّحْمَنِ] born 212, died 275 (290) edited several of them, namely Imruulqais, Ennābiga, Zuhair¹⁾, but not, as far as we know, all the six. It does not appear that Ela'lam made special use of these predecessors, at any rate I do not think I have discovered any reference to them in his commentary; although he may, in a certain respect, be indebted to Essukkari, as we shall see further on.

1) Cod. Paris. Suppl. 683, article الحسن بن الحسين.

With regard to the poems of questionable genuineness, Ela'lam appears to have admitted them according to different recensions. In the case of Ennābiga he mentions Etthūst [علي بن عبد الله بن Etthūst, سنن النيمى الطوسى], who died about 250. Further, for Zuhair, Tharafa and Imruulqais, he names Abū 'amr, and for Zuhair and Imruulqais he cites Elmofaddhal; by the first he means أبو عمرو, أسحق بن مرار الشيباني الكوفي الأحمر, who died in 206 (205. 213), and by the second أبو طالب المفضل بن سلمة بن عاصم الضبي الكوفي, who died about 280. He also names for Tharafa يعقوب بن أسحق, who died in 244.

He admitted the doubtful poems of 'Alqama just as „Abū 'alī ismā'il ben elqāsim delivered them from his teachers, who received them from Etthūst and Ibn ela'rābi and others“²⁾. He did not derive them immediately as a pupil from this Ismā'il (that is, Elqālī), of whom we shall speak further on, but he took them from a work of his. Now this was not his justly celebrated work كتاب الامالى, in which nothing occurs about these poems of 'Alqama; but it must have been البارع فى اللغة, mentioned in Cod. Paris. Suppl. 1935, I, fol. 1^a, to which Hāgi Khalife II 1600 seems to assign the title of البارع فى غريب الحديث.

It was in the year 1855 that I first became acquainted with this collection and with the Paris MSS of it (Suppl. 1424. 1425), having previously known nothing of these poets — except the pieces that had been printed — but 'Alqama's second poem according to a Petersburg MS., through Kosegarten's intervention. The study of these ancient poets then occupied me for a long period, and, if I could have found a publisher, I would have edited the text of them (with the exception of Imruulqais) with a translation and a brief commentary, in 1858 or 1859. I was not so fortunate, however, and I deferred my plan, in the hope of finding an oppor-

2) Cod. Paris. Suppl. 1425, 55^a.

tunity of executing it later on. Although I then, in the lapse of years, was engrossed in labours of a wholly different kind, and specially in the study of manuscripts which led me to very alien provinces of Arabic literature, yet, partly from a fondness for poetry, and specially for its earlier period, I have never lost sight of that collection of the six poets in my other studies, and have generally made a note of the passages that I have found cited of them.

This number increased more and more; after some time it afforded an almost statistical interest. But the number of verses which were ascribed to those poets, and which were not to be found in that collection, also increased; in time it even became considerable.

This surprised me. Were all those verses occurring in scattered citations spurious? Were they intentionally, or only mistakenly, ascribed to wrong authors? But the same verses repeatedly recurred under the same names, even in different writers, and it was impossible to ascribe this to deliberate imposture. The verses then belonged to poems which the author of our collection rejected as spurious, which he perhaps did not know at all, but which probably found a place in another recension.

This was clearly evinced in Imru'ulqais, the most celebrated poet of the six. The Leyden MS. of this *divān*, of which we shall speak further on, contains a very different text as to the number and order of the poems and verses, according to the recension of Essukkari. It is based, as it seems, on the text handed down by Abū 'obeida [أبو عبيدة معمر بن المثنى البصري] (d. 209), who probably received it from his teacher Abū 'amr ben al'alā, who died in 154 (159). That Ela'lam was not unacquainted with this edition, but that he had in a certain sense made use of it, I infer from the fact that the order of the last poems which he has declared spurious (40. 34. 14. 45. 36) is the same in both, save that Essukkari has interspersed some small poems between them.

Essukkarrī's recension of Ennābiga and Zuhair must have been of the same kind; he is not likely to have been too strict in admitting poems in their case either. I believe that, in the case of Zuhair, the same might be shewn of Tsa'lab's edition; but I cannot now enter into particulars. Further, there is a tradition that there was a collection of the oldest poems which contained eulogistic qaṣīdas on Enno'mān ben Elmundsir, the prince of Elhīra, and his adherents, and which passed over, either entire or mutilated, into the family of Merwān³); but I consider this a legendary report about that early period. There may, however, be some truth about it, namely, that, about the middle or end of the second century of the Hīgra, poems bearing reference to that princely house were put together. Among them were poems of 'Abd ben elabraṣ, Tharafa, and others; and, in that case, we must certainly assume, that poems of Ennābiga were there too. If this collection existed in Elaṣma's time, he most probably made use of it; but it is by no means impossible that it may have fallen into the hands of some one else, who has turned it to use. Moreover, it is evident that the citations of these poets by Ibn qutaiba, by the author of the Kitāb elagānī, and by Elgāuharī, and others, are not restricted to the poems which Ela'lam has admitted, and that, among later writers, especially Jāqūt and Essojuthī have used a different recension. The latter seems to have principally found the منتهى الطلب an abundant resource; a work whose loss I feel to be very great.

What I have collected from a multitude of writers, is fragments of this discrepant text; numerous, but seldom large enough to prevent our regretting the want of the verses of which these form part. Some of them are undeniably forged; in the case of others there may have been a confusion of poets having the same name. Thus in Elgāuharī (s. v. بجل) two verses are cited from Zuhair,

3) Elmoḥaddh. Berol. [Cod. Wetzst. I, 66], fol. 4^b. Elmuzhir I, 121. II, 237. (Būlāq edition).

which generally means our poet; but elsewhere (for instance, in the *Kitāb elagāni*, in Ibn qutaibā's *Thabaqāt*) they are ascribed to زهير بن جناب, for which reason I have not admitted them. On the other hand, *Ennābiga* Appendix 57 in *Cod. Paris. Suppl. 1935*, 3 is expressly ascribed to our *Ennābiga*, but in *Cod. Berol. Peterm.* 128, 1 to *Ennābiga elgā'di*. The same occurs in *Append. 54*, 2 and in other passages. Sometimes there is a mistake; *Ennābiga* *Append. 15* belongs beyond doubt to *Elhothaia*. In most cases, however, there is no doubt that the verses are actually ascribed to our poets.

At a time like the present, when an interest in the poetry of Arabian antiquity seems to receive a fresh impulse, my aim has been to contribute my aid also to supply this study an in part new material, by editing the text of all the poems and fragments of the six old poets, as far as I was able to obtain them; and I am glad that the ready cooperation of my Publisher has put it at length in my power to execute this scheme.

In this edition I have chiefly relied on some Mss. of the text, of which I will soon render an exact account, but I have not abstained from adopting readings which appeared to me more appropriate, from other sources. I think myself justified in claiming this privilege as a right. As I would not hesitate, when a verse has faults in the metre or lacks its proper feet, to correct it as far I am able to do so from the context, so likewise 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. I am not insensible to the hazard of the attempt; but I consider the text of all ancient poets too inadequately authenticated to preclude all doubt of its correctness: on the contrary, it is undeniable that we often have a multiplicity of readings, all of which may be traced back to ancient native authorities. I readily concede that the feeling of the language which the native Arabian philologists possessed, is in a great measure wanting in us; but

the authorities have different feelings in a given case, and Elaḡma'ī approves what Elmofaddhal rejects. Moreover, in linguistic matters, the feeling is less decisive than the knowledge of the signification and use of words, and, with all respect for the learning of those men, it must at any rate be admitted, that they had no immunity from narrow and onesided views. In many points we are able to judge more correctly, and to fathom the signification of words more profoundly, than they. The faculty which is especially concerned in these matters, however, is one which was wholly, or almost wholly, denied to them, but without which learning is nothing but a deaf nut, a knife without a blade — critical acumen. This deficiency of critical judgment prevents their correctly appreciating the composition of an entire poem, and discerning its deficiencies or its impossibilities. It often betrays itself in them, however, in individual instances, and, in my eyes at any rate, their choice of readings bears frequent witness to it; and on this ground, as I judge, we have a right to reject readings, even when they have been expressly sanctioned by them.

Do I hereby say that I estimate the knowledge of European scholars in the province of Arabic philology as highly — or, forsooth, more highly — than that of the native philologists? By no means! So far am I from this that I readily admit that we neither now nor ever can equal them in quantity of knowledge. I do not rate our knowledge high, but our power, our method of investigation, our critical treatment of a given subject.

I have, however, made but sparing use of the right of textual emendation of which I speak. I should have done so in quite a different style, if my present object had been to edit these poems in the form, in which they perhaps once appeared, which is at any rate more appropriate to them than that in which we find them. I had no such intention now. For, although I am not insensible to the seducing charm of the critical function of expunging and transposing passages, of detecting and supplying gaps, of

dissecting pieces and conjoining others, yet I am not blind to the unlucky results of those operations; the text that I would adjust to my own taste, is perhaps acceptable in my own eyes, but could claim no general assent, and, above all things, could not pretend to supplant the text that, in one form or other, has actually existed.

For the reason assigned, I have not made the experiment of incorporating the collected fragments into the text, in places where they seemed suitable; it would have been hazardous, even if their genuineness had been proved or provable.

For the same reason also, I at once relinquished the idea of disregarding the existing collection of these poems and of constructing the text wholly from the citations which I had brought together. It is undoubtedly true that, in many cases, and especially in the longest and most famous poems, the citations which I have gathered extend to all the verses, and I certainly might believe that I could build up a poem out of them in the correct sequence of verses. But it more frequently happens that single verses are not cited, or at any rate have not fallen in my way, or perhaps I have forgotten to take note of them. Now it is very possible that there should be no citation whatever of a number of the most genuine verses, either because no name of a place or of a person, or no extraordinary word or remarkable turn of expression or thought occurs in them, or for other reasons still; but I was as little able to consider them spurious on that account, because they are nowhere mentioned or have never fallen in my way, as I would be to accept the cited verses as genuine, merely because they are cited.

On the contrary, my present aim was to edit the existing and accredited text, and to furnish it with such apparatus as would enable an attentive reader to form an opinion of the condition of the text. In this end, I was not solicitous to collate a more or less considerable number of MSS. of single poems, and perhaps to collect a few more various readings; it would have been pos-

sible for me to have done this in the case of certain MSS., but not in that of others; and the result would in any case have proved insignificant. Nor could it be my object perpetually to discuss the variations in the text of the poems which have been already printed. I took it for granted that those texts were accessible to the reader, and that he would use them. I contented myself with producing the text with its various readings according to the MSS. which were at my disposal, and with thereby furnishing an auxiliary to its future settlement.

Without reference, then, to my judgement as to the genuineness of the poems or of single verses, I have first given the entire text of the five poets Ennābiga, 'Antara, Tharafa, Zuhair and 'Alqama on the whole just as the Paris and Gotha MSS. exhibit it; but then I could not prevail on myself to produce the poems of Imruulqais according to the same MSS., because their text of them has already been excellently edited by M. G. de Slane, and the recension of the Leyden MS. with its important variations was at my disposal. Without that MS. I should perhaps, as I first purposed, have omitted the *divān* of Imruulqais; although there are advantages in having all the six united in one volume, seeing that they all as it were belong to one class, and on the whole bear one stamp. In this reason, and because the text of the Leyden MS., contrasted with that of the Paris MSS. as exhibited by M. G. de Slane, distinctly shews the state of the case as to the parity, not to say genuineness of the text of these ancient poets, I thought it useful, nay, desirable to publish Imruulqais here in this form. This is also the reason why he here follows the other poets, whereas he elsewhere precedes them. The other five assume this order in the Paris and Gotha MSS.: Ennābiga, 'Alqama, Zuhair, Tharafa, Antara. That I have somewhat changed their order, which had anyhow been disturbed by placing Imruulqais last, depended less on internal than external reasons; but the circumstance that 'Alqama has many resemblances and allusions

to Imruulqais determined me to place him close beside him; and this arrangement may also find some excuse in the fact that the Escorial MS., of which we will speak hereafter, presents another order, which is almost the same as mine.

As for the order of the poems, as presented in the MSS., I considered that I had a right to depart from it and have changed it on principles of appropriateness. In the Gotha and Paris MSS. — and the same may be said of the Leyden one — those which are generally acknowledged to be genuine, and they are by far the larger portion, are placed first; then follow others which are regarded as less genuine. Now the first are not arranged chronologically; but the principle of arrangement appears to be that the bestknown and the longest are placed first, the less celebrated and shorter ones come next, and the fragments follow. Perhaps too we are to regard this arrangement as shewing the order in which the single poems were gradually collected; although this does not reveal itself, at least to me. Now as no intrinsic ground has determined the order of the poems in the MSS., I thought it best, for the sake of easy reference, to arrange them alphabetically according to the rhyme-letters; nevertheless, to secure a better insight and the easier finding of citations made from those MSS., I have appended to this preface a comparative table of the order of sequence.

In the Paris and Gotha MSS., and in the Leyden one also, the greater portion of the poems has short (seldom long) superscriptions indicating the occasion in consequence of which a poem was uttered. These superscriptions, most of which belong to *Elaçma'î*, refer to historical incidents, which are rarely indicated in detail, but generally very briefly, in the poems; in the Paris and Gotha MSS. no less than in the Leyden one, they are on the whole based on the same tradition, which certainly may be in part correct, in part adapted to the existing poems whose origin and reference was not known. However this may be, the superscriptions

have a certain value, and I have therefore retained them, but have placed them after the poems and fragments, in order to preserve to the poems their independent interpretation. I was unwilling that the reader should be prejudiced by the superscription in his judgment of the position of a poem; I wished that the poem itself should lead him to form an opinion of its purport and reference.

As for the order of the verses, I have preserved it as I found it in the MSS., and, in the first five poets, as it is in the Paris and Gotha MSS., in Imruulqais, as it is in the Leyden one. Especially in the longer poems, the latter differs considerably from the other three; whether it is to be preferred may be questioned, but at least proves that it is possible. The number of the verses is generally greater in the Leyden MS.

In a few passages the verses are incomplete; this cannot be original, but depends on lacunae there occurring in the older MSS. from which our copies, old as they are, were transcribed. There is an evident proof of this in Imruulqais 46, 7, where a word is wanting in the first hemistich after قبابه; I have supplied خيبي according to the context, but subsequently found the entire verse cited by Elgauharrī s. v. بلق, and in Cod. Berol. Wetzst. I, 149, 1, fol. 66^a, so that بلقى should be supplied, which as to sense coincides with my conjecture. This is doubtless a proof that one may err in the choice of a word to be supplied, but that one may discern what its sense should be; and for this reason I have preferred to supply the few gaps of this sort that occur. They are, besides the one just adduced, 'Alqama 3, 1. Imruulqais 15, 2. 52. 54.

I have disposed the collected fragments likewise alphabetically according to the rhyme-letters and the metres, respectively after the main text of the poets. The Appendix p. 86—102 will indicate the sources from which the fragments are derived. I think I should state, to avoid mistakes, that economy of space alone prevented my arranging the separate fragments under special numbers. I have placed under the same number those verses whose

rhyme and metre were the same; not thereby asserting that the verses all belong to one and the same poem, although in individual cases that is quite possible. I have assigned No. 58 to the Appendix of Ennābiga, because it is ascribed to him, notwithstanding it is in prose as to form, although bordering on poetry, and interesting in itself. There is however, as little doubt as to the spuriousness of this piece, as there is about the poems No. 18 and 19 in the Appendix to Imruulqais.

I have completely vocalised all fragments, as I also have the main text, following the example of the Paris (Suppl. 1425) and the Gotha MSS. and that of the less vocalised Leyden one. I am sorry that, after the impression of the fragments was finished, I met with some passages which I had overlooked in my Collectanea or which I have since chanced on in MSS.; I will append them, however, in a Supplement.

I thought it advisable to indicate the metre of every poem and fragment, even in order to enable the reader to judge at a glance of the frequency or rareness of the measures employed by the early poets. With regard to the various readings and the citations of places in which the verses are quoted, their number is very great, and I fear I have adduced too many to please everyone, although I had it in my power to cite still more and to gather still more variants. On the average, I have never or only rarely cited those discrepant readings of a MS. which are merely due to the copyist's neglect; there is a very plentiful crop of these in the Cod. Paris. Suppl. 1424 and in the Berlin MS. of the *Gāmhara*, and a brief list of such mistakes may not be unsuitable here.

Ennābiga 7, 20 لثانه in the place of لثانه. 15, 16 تجرى = القائنات = القائنات. 19, 20 تجرى.

Antara 4, 3 خالف = خالف. 5, 2 تحرى = تحرى. 7, 8 صابح = تحت. 7, 12 حب = حب. 7, 9 المساح = المساح. 7, 17 جيبوا = صابح.

تلتقى 11, 2. جفيرا = حفيرا 10, 5. قيل = قبل 9, 5. جيبوا = صرع 11, 11. ثمان = يمان 11, 8. قبضت = قنصت 11, 3. نلتقى = فتجلى 20, 16. فاقى = فاني 19, 19. زحفت = رجفت 11, 13. صرع = 21, 13. بمرعر = بمرعر 21, 10. سابغ = سابغ 20, 28. فتخلى = وزوت جوانى = وذرت خوافى 21, 81. ريد = زيد 21, 59. زمت = ذمت = مرقشات 26, 8. حينا = جينا 24, 4. كالسمار = كالشمار 23, 4. مرقشات.

Tharafa 1, 9. يحرب = يحرب 3, 2. اولاجها = اولادها 4, 11. لسامعتى 4, 34. عندل = عندك 4, 25. بعوجاء مرقال = بهوجا من قال. الممات = الحياة 4, 61. اللأسمى = اللأحي 4, 54. كسامعتى = مزعف = مزعف 9, 6. العلات = العلات 8, 13. دالف = ذالف 5, 28. انى = انى 10, 13. تعير = لغير 10, 5. وانقذنها = وانقذتها 9, 10. خيلا = خيلا 13, 23. نابتا = ثابتا 12, 12.

Zuhair 3, 8. تزيدي = تزيدي 3, 10. صفري 4, 3. تهر = تهر 14, 16. شن = شل 11, 10. افناء = ابناء 6, 2. صفوى =

Alqama 1, 35. ملهب = ملهب 1, 41. المذاك = المذاك 1, 42. مدموم = مدموم 13, 5. بدت = بدت 2, 14. ارحلنا = ارجلنا 13, 28. اوار = اوان 13, 46. بزمار = بزمان 13, 28.

Imruulqais 3, 4. بطياخة = بطياخة 17, 14. فا = يا 34, 16. الجزارة = الجزارة 52, 44. وربة = وربة.

Other readings, also manifestly incorrect, seemed to deserve some notice from another point of view; in some places only have I remarked that they are erroneous. The greater part, however, have a full title to be mentioned. In most cases I have, even for the first five poets, followed the readings of Cod. Par. 1425, for Imruulqais those of the Leyden MS., but in many places, as already observed, I have felt obliged to prefer the readings of the Gotha or other MSS.

With regard to the citations of passages in which a verse is quoted, I have purposely done it, so far as the extent of my reading permitted, as often as any linguistic or real interest seemed

concerned; I have taken particular pains to adduce all the passages in which Elḡauharī quotes these poets. I have forborne to mention several passages in MSS. which are only briefly indicated in my *Collectanea*, because I no longer had the text at hand; thus Ennābiga is quoted in Cod. Berol. Sprenger. 1188, 53^a; 90^a; Cod. Wetzst. II, 253, 83. Zuhair in Cod. Spr. 1188, 81^a; 90^a; Cod. Wetzst. II, 253, 84. 'Antara in Cod. Spr. 1188, 54^b. Tharafa in Cod. Wetzst. II, 253, 95^b. In many other MSS. in which one would have looked for quotations of these poets or one of their verses, I have not found any; but this would not warrant our concluding that they were not known to the authors of these late works.

As for errors of the press, I am unfortunately not able to deny their existence; but even though a portion of them is owing to injury of the letters during the printing, or to the bad shape of letters hardly allowing a vowel under them (e. g. ح), yet the larger share are my fault, and, in spite of great care, I have not corrected several misprints whose existence is very annoying to me. Some of these are not indeed really misprints, but are due to a conception of the text which I now repudiate, and are in part conjectures. Thus I had vainly puzzled over Ennābiga 5, 22 according to the MSS. text; I therefore changed it into ولا سليمان and made this verse refer to v. 27, regarding v. 26 as immediately connected with v. 25^b. But I now entirely give this up. My corrections of the misprints are inserted among the various readings, and I hope I have omitted nothing essential.

Lastly, as for the title of the collection, it is, in the Paris MS. Suppl. 1424 ديوان الشعراء الستة, and in Hāḡī Khalīfa I. 797 اشعار الستة; no special title is given in Casiri, Catal. I. 299; nor is there in Uri, Catal. Bibl. Bodl. I. 1223 (where a later hand has instead assigned the erroneous title شرح المعلقات).

This MS., namely, contains a collection of the six ancient

poets, with the commentary of the abovenamed Ela'lam, and is therefore the same as Cod. Par. Suppl. 1424, but incomplete. According to my notes of it, it contains, first, Imruulqais, his Mo'al-laqa, and some poems, the first of which is the poem numbered 52 in my edition; then some poems of Eunnābiga; only one long and one short poem of 'Alqama; the Mo'allāqa of Zuhair; three poems of Tharafa; only the Mo'allāqa of 'Antara. The copy is of the year 736 of the H.; the character large, thick, richly vocalised. On the whole it has only 78 leaves, and is therefore only a partial copy, not an extract, of the genuine work of Ela'lam. — Whether the MS. mentioned in Casiri (l. 299) is likewise this work, is, on account of the want of description, there very questionable. The order in which the poets are there represented to occur, seems unfavorable to the idea, for the order is 'Alqama, Imruulqais, Eunnābiga, 'Antara, Tharafa Zuhair. If this is really so, it cannot be the work of Ela'lam. Another point unfavorable to it is, that it is not stated that the poems are accompanied by a commentary; if there were one, it would probably be mentioned, as it usually is in other cases.

Under these circumstances I took leave to assign a special title to the collection, and the rather as the work has maintained an independent type in the form given to it. And as the single poems — the complete ones, at any rate — may be considered as the pearls of a necklace, the title I have adopted, **العقد الثمين**, appeared to suit the whole; although this is a kind of title, doubtless, not occurring in the oldest period, but much in vogue since the 5th century of the Hīg̃ra.

The MSS. employed to edit the text, are

1. 2. the two Paris MSS. Suppl. 1424 and 1425, the latter of which, the excellent 1425, has been made the basis of this edition of the first five poets. This contains the text of the six poets, with short glosses superscribed, and, in many poems, concise indications of their occasion, and was copied in the

year 571 (= January 1176 A. D.). Cod. 1424 contains the text of the same, and the perpetual commentary of the above mentioned Jūsuf esshantamurī Ela'lam (died 476). This copy dates from about the 11th century of the Hīgrā. Mac Guckin de Slane gives a copious description of both these MSS. in his *Diwan d' Amro'lkaīs*, p. XI—XIV. — In spite of the numerous errors which occur in the text and commentary of the MS. 1424, it is yet generally possible to discover what was meant from the explanation given of a word, and I have therefore indicated the really discrepant readings.

3. The Gotha MS. 547 contains the text of the six with interlineary notes. The date of the copy is 1131 = 1719 A. D. Compare Kosegarten, *Amrui Moallaka* p. IV. It is very careful and reliable and frequently agrees with Cod. Par. Suppl. 1425 in the notes. I think that the Gotha MS. gives the occasions of the poems more frequently and in part with greater fulness.

These three MSS. are in Magrebine character; Cod. Par. 1425 wellwritten; Cod. Goth. not so well and rather small, especially the glosses; Cod. Par. 1424 large and distinct, but rather hurried.

4. Cod. Berol. Diez 4^{to} 135. The first portion fol. 1—17 contains the fifth poem of Ennābiga with the commentary of an anonymous author, who is nobody but Ibn ennahhās [أحمد بن محمد]

بن اسماعيل بن يونس المرادي المصري أبو جعفر ابن الخناس, who died in 338. This is concise and begins with the words: قوله يا دار مية نداء مضاف ومية معرفة فلذلك لم يصرفها قال الاصمعي العلبياء مكان مرتفع من الارض الخ

The copy dates from about the end of the last century, rather large, incorrect.

5. Cod. Berol. Wetzst. I, 56. In this excellent MS. of the year 1052 = 1674 A. D., the first portion fol. 1—68 contains, in addition to the seven Moa'llaqāt, the poem of Ela'shā [ودع هريرة]

and the fifth of Ennābiga, both of which are here reckoned among the Moa'llaqāt, fol. 68^b. All nine are furnished with the concise and in part abridged commentary of Ibn ennahhās, and besides, on the broad margin, also with extracts from that of Ezzauzanī [الحسين ابن أحمد التوزني أبو عبد الله] who died 488, and of others. The poems of this collection which I have used are those of Imru'ulqais fol. 1^b — 13. Tharafa 14 — 24^b, Zuhair 24^b — 30, Antara 40 — 47^a, Ennābiga 66^a — 68.

6. The copy of the second poem of 'Alqama from a Petersburg MS., which I cannot exactly indicate. After a brief notice of the poet's descent, and of the occasion of the poem, the poem itself is given, with a short commentary to almost every verse.

The commentary to v. 1 begins thus: طحا بك طمح بك ومدّ بك قال الاصمعي طحا بك اتسع بك وذهب بك كلّ مذهب، وقال العصر والدهم والحين واحد والزمن ايضاً. That of the last verse is جنابة بعد وغربة، وشاس اخو علقمة. After which the sequel of the poem is concisely given according to Abu 'obeida on the authority of Abū 'amr ben el'alā.

7. Cod. Berol. Sprenger 1215. The first portion of it contains in fol. 1 — 77^a the *جمهرة أشعار العرب* of Abu zeid mohammed ben 'ali elkhaththāb elqorashī. This collection of poems contains, in seven classes, one long poem of each of the seven poets who are most eminent in each class. The poems of the first class are called *السموط*, of the second *الجمهرات*, of the third *المنقبات*, of the fourth *المذهبات*, of the fifth *المراثي*, of the sixth *المشوبات*, of the seventh *المحلمات*. They embrace the period from about the middle of the century before Mohammed's rise down to the second century of the Hīgā. Nevertheless, Elmofaddhal designates the 49 poems as „the eyes i. e. the most shining, of the poems of the primitive Arabs“ [*عيون أشعار العرب في الجاهلية*]. And, in fact, they bear the same stamp as those of the early time.

To the first class belong Imruulqais fol. 15^a, Zuhair 17^a, Ennābiga 18^b, Ela'shā 20^a, Labīd 22^b, 'Amr ben Kultsum 25^a, Tharafa 27^b. 'Antara is reckoned to the second class fol. 31^b. Of these I have paid attention to the poems (Mo'allaqāt) of Imruulqais, Zuhair, Tharafa and 'Antara.

The same collection is found in the Bodleyan (Uri I. 1298, 3). The order of the poets of the first class varies a little. It is: Imruulqais, Tharafa, Labīd, Zuhair, Ennābiga, Ela'shā, 'Amr. The date of the copy is about the year 950 of the Hīg̃ra. The text of the Berlin MS., which was written in 1271 (= 1854 A. D.), has in many places lacunae in the verses, and seems to have been transcribed from a dilapidated copy. It is not good, and only to be used with discretion.

The Berlin MS. furnishes the basis for the poem given in the Appendix of Ennābiga No. 26; I have not exhibited the blunders of the copyist as variants of the text.

8. Cod. Berol. Wetzst. I, 66. This contains the Elmofaddhalijjāt with the full commentary of Elmarzūqī [أحمد بن محمد بن Elmarzūqī] [الحسن المزرقى أبو علي] (died 421). The end of the MS. is lost; it breaks off at the beginning of the 109th poem of الممزق العبدى and it is questionable how much of it has been lost. The commentary is full of instruction in philological and real matters, but certainly labours under great diffuseness of expression. The use of this MS. is somewhat difficult, in as much as the on the whole ugly and hurried writing frequently lacks the diacritical points, and always omits the vowels, except in the verses of the text, although even they have not all their vowels and diacritical points. The copy dates from about the eighth century. Of this I have used the text and commentary of the two poems of 'Alqama (2 and 13), fol. 541—557.
9. Cod. Vindobon. Mixt. 127 (Cat. Flügel I. 449). The complete collection of the Elmofaddhalijjāt and Elaḡma'ijjāt, with a con-

cise commentary. Copy dates about 1820 A. D. I have used it in

- a) Poem 2 and 13 of 'Alqama, fol. 133—139.
 - b) Imruulqais, poem 51, v. 6. 7. 9. 10, fol. 169^b.
 - c) ditto, poem 7, v. 1—3, fol. 170^a.
 - d) Tharafa, poem 10, v. 4. 5. 8. 9, fol. 173^b.
10. Cod. Lugd. Warn. 901 (Cat. Dozy. No. 530). This contains the poems of Imruulqais in the recension of the abovementioned Essukkari. Date of copy 545 (= 1150 A. D.). This excellent fully vocalised MS. only lacks the diacritical points in some places and has very few mistakes. Many poems have superscriptions. — On this MS. my edition of Imruulqais is based. That Dozy states the number of the poems at 67 and that 68 should appear in this edition, arises from the fact that he reckons No. 53 and Shihāb's answer to it, No. 54, as one number.

The MSS. which I have used for the Variants and the Fragments, besides those just enumerated, are:

1. Cod. Berol. Peterm. 666, Commentary of Essojuthi who died in 911, on the verses cited as grammatical illustrations in Ibn hishām's syntactical work entitled مغنى اللبيب, composed in the year 756 (= 1355 A. D.). This excellent work is a mine for the knowledge of the ancient poets, of whom it not only cites and explains numerous verses, but gives biographical notices of the authors. This MS. is somewhat misbound at the beginning; the leaves follow thus: 1—3. 7. 6. 4. 8, and two leaves are missing after fol. 84. I have copied these from the Oxford MS. (Cat. Uri I. 1139) and when necessary have denoted by fol. 84^A.

The copy, of the year 995 (= 1587 A. D.) is without vowels, not rarely without diacritical points, and can only be used with caution.

2. Cod. Paris. Suppl. 1935, 1. The title of this work is كتاب [إسماعيل بن القاسم Elqālī النواذر وفي الامالى] [ابن عبدون بن هارون بن عيسى القالى أبو على] born 288, died 356. This work, which was delivered and dictated in Cordova, contains a great multitude of ancient poems and extracts, proverbs and extraordinary expressions, with lexicographical explanations. It is an eminent work for Arabic lexicography. This good copy is of the date 1049 (= 1639 A. D.).
3. Cod. Paris. Suppl. 1935, 3. Contains the Poetics of Abū 'alī elmodhaffar [المظفر بن السعيد ابى القاسم الفضل بن ابى جعفر] (about the year 640) the title of which is نصرة الاغريض في نصرة القريض. It is divided into 5 parts (Cf. Flügel, Catal. I. 224). This good copy is of the date 1039 (= 1629 A. D.). In my transcript of the work I have not indicated the pages of the MS.; the pages noted in my citations from it refer to those of my transcript.
4. Codd. Berol. Sprenger. 1175. 1176. The great Kitāb elagāni of 'Alī ben elhosein eliḡbahānī. Date of copy 1142 (= 1729 A. D.). The text to be used with caution, especially in the verses.
5. Cod. Ber. Spreng. 1180. A supplement to the Kitāb elagāni; contains a not long article on 'Alqama. The conclusion of the work is, moreover, contained in it and forms about a tenth of the whole. An incorrect copy of the date 1266 (= 1850 A. D.).
6. Cod. Goth. 532. Alphabetical extract from the Kitāb elagānī, by Ibn elmokarram [محمد بن المكرم بن على بن احمد الانصارى] [الرويفعى المصرى جمال الدين] born 630, died 711. The copy is not very correct.
7. Cod. Berol. Wetzst. II, 134. A rhetorical work entitled كتاب [البديع في البديع] in 95 chapters, distinguished for conciseness of treatment and abundance of quotations from the best poets,

- often, indeed, without the names of the authors. The author is Abū 'lmodhaffar usāma [اسامة بن مرشد بن علي بن منقذ مجد] [اسامة بن مرشد بن علي بن منقذ مجد] born in 488, died in 584 (= 1095. 1188 A. D.). The names are given somewhat discrepantly in Cod. Sprenger 252, 72^b. Date of copy about 700.
8. Cod. Berol. Sprenger 1006. A Commentary on Ibn doreid's [d. 321 = 933 A. D.] panegyric on Ibn mikāl and his son, entitled المقصورة or also المَخْرَجَة, which was composed by Ibn khalawaih [الحسين بن خالويه أبو عبد الله] (died 370). An excellent work, remarkable for its citations of passages from poets, its synonymes and lexicological observations. Two leaves are wanting after fol. 5, and about five at the end. Date of the copy about 550. I have indicated, in my transcript, at the passages and verses concerned, the variations of the complete and excellent MS. Cod. Berol. Wetzst. I, 54, which was copied in 594 (= 1198 A. D.). My references, therefore, apply either to this or the preceding MS.
9. Cod. Berol. Wetzst. II. 274. Commentary on the verses quoted in the grammatical work كتاب الإيضاح في النحو of Abū 'alī elhasan ben ahmed elfārisī (died in 377). See the notice of it in the Zeitschrift d. D. M. Gesellschaft XXIII, 647.
10. Cod. Vindob. N. F. 391 (Cat. Flügel II. 1159). This professes to be the work of Ibn qoteiba, entitled طبقات الشعراء. The copy is not faultless; the date is 1254 (= 1838). I, however, believe that it is only an extract from that work. Compare Nöldeke's notice of it in his „Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Poesie der alten Araber“ p. 1 sqq.
11. Cod. Paris. Suppl. 1558. A work of Mohammed ben mohammed ibn nobāta (d. in 768), entitled مطلع الغوائد ومجمع الفرائد which treats of the delicacies of verbal expression and the explanation of difficult words and phrases, in three chapters, and adduces examples of them.

12. Cod. Paris. Suppl. 1935, 2. A remarkable anthology in verse and prose, entitled *السفينة الكبرى*, whose author is called *النصاحي* and probably lived in the 10th century of the Hīġra. Although I am at present unable to settle his real name, I think it possible that he may be *علي اللطف بن أبي الكريم بن عبد الكريم بن أبي اللطف بن علي*, who died in 940. Date of the copy 1038. The same work is in Cod. Vindob. Mixt. 132 (Cat. Flügel I. 420).
13. Cod. Berol. Spr. 1154. The excellent work of Ettse'ālibi, entitled *ثمار القلوب والمصاف والمنسوب*, mainly of lexicological interest. Date of copy about 1750 A. D.
14. Cod. Berol. Peterm. 196. Contains a collection of the poems that occur in the romance 'Antar, with the superscriptions belonging to them. The whole is entitled *عنتم نامه* and also *القلادة الانسية الجامعة لفرائد القصائد العبيسية*. The collection contains about 11000 verses. The Mo'allaqāt occur fol. 182 sqq. The poems which are found in the divan, apart from the Mo'al-laqa and some others, do not appear in it, and belong all to a much later time. Date of copy 1212 (= 1798 A. D.).
15. Cod. Lugd. Warn. 549 (Cat. Dozy 521). Commentary to the Divān of the Hodseilites, by Essukkari. In this last volume of the commentary there are scanty glosses and only rare citations of verses.
16. Cod. Berol. Spreng. 947. The Arabic Lexicon *الصحاح* of El-ġauhari. The MS. is not particularly good and I have preferred to cite the verses quoted in this distinguished work from the Bulāq edition of it, which is unfortunately without vowels.
17. Cod. Berol. Peterm. 184, 5 (fol. 120^b—167^b). Commentary on the Himjarite Qaṣīde of Nashwān [*نشان بن سعيد الحميري*]. It is very diffuse and not so intent on explanation of linguistic difficulties, as on adducing historical notices and a number of professedly old poems, all of which, however, are of late origin. It trims up old popular legends as historical facts, and sets them

in verses, for moral exhortation. From the same source as that of this commentary, has also sprung the work in Cod. Peterm. 626, entitled وصايا الملوك, the first half of which is devoted to the Himjarites and agrees verbatim with many poems of this commentary, although one or the other may occasionally give more verses, and the order of the poems is not always the same. — I altogether question whether the Himjarite Qaṣīde is really by the learned Lexicographer Nashwān, and is not rather fathered on him solely because he was a Himjarite. In his large dictionary, in which he cites many verses by others and by himself also, I have not found a single verse of this Qaṣīde. The text of the Himjarite Qaṣīde and of the ancient Arabic poems also, which v. Kremer published from the Vienna MS. N. F. 112 (Cat. Flügel I. 482), Leipzig 1865. 1867. is very incorrect, and therefore the conclusions drawn from them in the „Südarabische Sage“ (Leipz. 1866) are more than hazardous. — This faulty copy dates from 1081 (= 1670 A. D.).

18. Cod. Berol. Peterm. 184, 4 (fol. 13^b — 120^b). Contains the Holwān Qaṣīde, the title of which is القصيدة الحلوانية افتخار القحطانية, the author of which is محمد بن سعيد الكاتب أبو عبد الله. The purpose of the long poem is the exaltation of the descendants of Qahthān (that is, of the Jemenite tribes as contrasted with the Ismaelite ones), by indicating the historical — or even legendary — accounts that seem favorable to it. It is composed in stanzas of six verses [مستدسة] in Thawīl. The commentary to it by عادي بن يزيد is extraordinarily rich in philological and historical notices and verses. The copy, not remarkable for correctness, dates from 1081 (= 1670 A. D.).
19. Cod. Berol. Peterm. 184, 6 (fol. 167^b — 188^a). Contains القصيدة الفزارية with a commentary. The Qaṣīde addressed to the Chalif Elmanṣūr is full of allusions to ancient Arabic history, and is

said to have been composed by أبو القاسم الفزاري. The diffuse and mainly real commentary cites many verses. The copy, rather incorrect, is of the year 1081 (= 1670 A. D.).

20. Cod. Berol. Spreng. 1123, 1. Contains the text of the Qaṣīde of Imru'ulqais, which is printed in the Appendix 18. The copy is in Ta'liq and is quite modern (about 1840).

21. Cod. Berol. Spr. 1123, 4. The same Qaṣīde with perpetual commentary by عبد الحق بن عبد اللطيف الزبيدي القادري. This text is shorter, and very different on the whole. I know nothing of the author of the commentary; only he must belong to modern times. The work has no title, but begins: الحمد لله الذي جعل الشعر ديوان العرب . . . أما بعد فيقول العبد الضعيف الخ

Appendix 19 gives this recension. Quite modern Neskhī, date about 1840.

I see no need to say anymore about the other MSS. which I have used, as they afforded little assistance and are only rarely cited by me. I have not treated of the much used Cod. Paris. Suppl. 1316, 2, containing the Elmuzhir [المزهر] of Essojūth, because I am now able to refer to the edition of this thoroughly instructive work which has been printed at Bulāq.

My readers will, I trust, believe that the printed pieces of the poetry of the six ancient poets have not been unknown to me. If I have not recorded the variations of their text, with nearly exclusive exception of Arnold's edition of the Mo'allaqāt and de Sacy's edition of Ennābīga's fifth poem, it has arisen, as I have explained above, partly because I considered it superfluous, and partly because I wished to confine myself to the MSS. accessible to me; and for the same reason I abstain from the enumeration both of the numerous editions of the Mo'allaqāt of four of these poets, as also of the previously published single poems of the six poets. Socin's edition of 'Alqama's poems, Leipzig 1867, did

not seem to offer any aid to me; and I was not willing to admit his spurious 14th poem. The *divān* of Ennābiga which M. H. Dénobour has published in the *Journal Asiatique* for 1868, II. p. 268 sqq., has only just appeared when the poems of Ennābiga and 'Antara in my edition were printed off; but I have been able to make use of two verses cited in his introduction, for my Appendix.

Having thus given an adequate account of the aids of which I have availed myself in the publication of this work, I have yet one point to speak of, a point of unquestionable importance, and one for the discussion of which this collection offers an excellent opportunity — I mean the genuineness of the poems it contains. But the space at my disposal forbids my entering on it even briefly. I will discuss the question in a small work which will soon appear and here I can only state some results of my researches, which also embrace the *Elmofaddhalijāt* and other ancient poems.

The integrity of the ancient poems, both as to their compass and the order of their verses is *a priori* suspicious. Many lack the beginning, many lack the end, many lack both, many appear to have two and more beginnings. The order of their verses is, when we possess different recensions of them, utterly discrepant. Frequently they are assigned to different authors; the more celebrated name displaced the less famous; even in the first half of the second century of the *Hijra*, poems just written in the ancient style, were ascribed to old names of renown.

As to our collection in particular, few appear to me to be genuine and preserved entire; several have lacunae, lack beginning or end, or are altogether supposititious. I doubt whether we possess anything of Tharafa or 'Antara except their *Mo'allaqat*. Most of Zuhair's poems are comparatively genuine; much of Ennābiga is spurious, and even his fifth poem is at least open to doubt. Anyhow it is a remarkable fact that the elder *Elmofaddhal* declares the poem No. 26 in the Appendix in conjunction with No. 11 of the text, to be Ennābiga's most splendid poem, and places it in

one class with the Mo'allaga of Imruulqais; especially if we take into consideration that both poems have striking resemblances. The beginning of Append. 26, with the perpetual recurrence of the woman's name, is surely unusual and strange; although this deviation from the usual introduction may, I think, be explained. A great portion of the poems of Imruulqais which Essukkarî has given, is only fragments, the genuineness of which has little in his favour and is liable to many objections. Even among the larger poems, all of which are admitted in Elaçma'r's recension, the genuine ones, precisely because they were always in the mouths of men, have suffered much mutilation and variation; but, in my opinion, most of his poems are fragmentary and spurious; and this poet especially has had many a poem of another ascribed to him. Irrespective of poem 52 and others, the 4th poem especially demands close scrutiny and comparison with the first poem of 'Alqama. If the former be somewhat wider in compass, yet the course of both is the same, the points of coincidence so numerous and the identity of verses so frequent, that there can be no doubt that they are one and the same poem, the author of which is certainly 'Alqama.

It is very desirable, not to say necessary, that competent scholars should submit the poems singly to an independent examination. The poems would then have to be judged on their own merits, without regard to the position assigned to them by literary opinion, which, as a rule, is entirely uncritical. The result of this critical investigation, whether it were positive or negative, would be a gain to the history of Arabian poetry. But, even irrespective of the question of their genuineness, the poems of this collection belong in any case to the oldest, longest, most important, but also most difficult, which the entire Arabic literature has to shew. They deserve the most attentive study; and while I warmly bespeak it for them, I beg the reader to apply to the editor the verse with which the 224th page of the Arabic text concludes.

In conclusion, I avail myself of this occasion to return my best thanks to Dr. J. Nicholson, of Penrith, for his friendly service in translating this Preface into English, in a style which I trust cannot fail to commend itself to my readers.

Greifswald, Juli 4th, 1870.

W. Ahlwardt.

Table of Contents.

Preface	I
List of different Readings and Corrections of the Text ,	1
Appendix	86
Table of Abbreviations	103
View of the order of the poems in the MSS. of Paris, Gotha, and Leyden, with a statement of the number of their verses . . .	105
Statement of the discrepancies between the MSS. of Paris (and Gotha) and this edition, as to the order of the verses in the poems of Imruulqais	107
Table of the order of the verses in the Mo'allaqāt of 'Antara, Tharafa, Zuhair and Imruulqais, in the 5 th poem of Ennābiga and in the 2 ^d and 13 th poem of 'Alqama, according to some MSS and editions	108
View of the poems of the six poets, which are stated by Ela'lam to be spurious or doubtful, according to the judgement of Elaçma'i	111
Supplement to the Appendix of the Fragments	112
Text of the Poems	٢—١٩٢
Ennābiga ٢	'Antara ٣٣
Tharafa ٥٣	Zuhair ٧٥
'Alqama ١٣٣	Imruulqais ١١٥
Appendix of the Fragments	١٩٣—٢٠٧
Contents of the Poems	٢٠٨—٢٢٣

List

of different Readings and Corrections.

The Abbreviations I have employed are explained hereafter in a separate Table. Abbreviations in *Italics* indicate that a Ms. contains one or several Variants besides the Reading of the Text.

Ennābiga.

- I, 1. t 4. ki I. 620. II. 251. s وكل m 75. r 19. Q 233. —
تَقَاعَسَ حَتَّى G. كَلَيْبِي ha 120. 286. 2. c 302. m 75. —
الَّذِي يَنْتَلُو and الذى يَهْدَى الجَوم ki I. 620. 2^b. c 42. 424. —
h 494. 3. f 96. ki I. 620. c 422. r 104. 4. ki I. 620. fl 128.
5. j II. 183. — حُسْنٌ G. Pa. — ظَتَّى ki I. 620. 6. ki I. 620.
— قَبْرٌ (twice) G. Pa. — بَجَلْفٍ Pa. — اَلَّتِي j II. 183. 7. لَيْلِنَس.
G. قد غَدَتَّ 8. اَرْضَ الْحَارِبِ j II. 183. ki I. 620. —
اَشْب s قَبَائِلُ من — 9. دُنْيَا G. Pa. 10. w 381, 18.

- kh 830. 11. kh 830. 12. فِي مُسَوِّكَ الْأَرْبَابِ n 78. 13. kh 830.
 14. c 397. kh 830. 15. c 307. 510. ki I. 620. r 78. 16. ki
 I. 386. 620. 17. m 75. 19. k 32. 196. h 474. hv I. 102.
 ki I. 620. w 415. 589. m 75. Q 149. B I. 92. 202. 585. 634. II. 396.
 r 43. kh 427. 856. 20. يُخْبِرَنَّ مِنْ j II. 326. m 75. 150.
 — إِلَى آلَيْنِ قَدْ ad 186. — تُخْبِرَنَّ w 589, 10. p II. 611. —
 j II. 326. — قَدْ جَرَّبَنَّ w 589. ad 186. j II. 326. —
 21. تَجِدُّ السَّلَاقِي f 163. — حَبَب s وَيُوقِدَنَّ بِالصَّفَاح h 77. Q 211.
 p II. 611. j III. 125. 399. 22. وَطَعَنَّ كَأَيْزَاع G. 23. مِنَ النَّاسِ
 ki I. 620. m 75. 24. جَلَل s مَجَلَّتْهُمْ ذَات (in the text). q 66.
 Pa. m 75. — مَخَافَتُهُمْ ذَات m 75. 25. t 21. s سَبَب and حَبَز
 ki II. 252. hv I. 376. — جُيُوءَ G. — يَوْمَ السَّبَائِبِ W 80. 120. —
 25^a. no 15. 26. W 120. 27. W 120. — يَصُونُونَ أَجْسَامًا G
 (in the text). 28. s لَرَب m 75. r 64. Cod. Petermann. 198, fol. 181^b.
 29. f 82. — لَاحِقًا بِقَوْمٍ ki I. 620.
 Pa. يَنْصَحَنَّ 6. سنن s 3. سنن s نَبِيْتُ حَصْنَا 2. II,
 12. k 253. 13. لَمْ تَبَفَّ Pa. — أَلْقَدَ G.
 III, 1. m 49. 2. s قَشَب m 49. 3. t 19. ki I. 618. 621.
 gb 6. m 19. 49. 4. ki I. 621. — عَتَى وَشَايَةً gb 6. — فَمُبْلَغَكَ

- m 49. 5. gb 6. m 49. — مستراد وَمَطْلَبُ ki I. 623. 6. m 49.
 — مِنْ اَمْوَالِهِمْ اِذَا مَا مَدَّحْتُهُمْ gb 6. — اِذَا مَا لَقِيتُهُمْ —
 ki I. 623. 7. m 49. — ترهم في مَدَحِهِمْ لَكَ gb 6. — Read
 اَذْنُبُوا . 8. m 49. 9. s سور . r 74. — ملك حَوْلَهَا m 49.
 10. فَانَكَ n 71. m 49 (text). 11. ki I. 621. h 199. c 284. gb 6. 7.
 p I. 29. m 19. 49. mu II. 241. 12. m 49.

IV, 1. s طَنِ . — مَطِيَّةُ الْجَهْل Q 255. 4. Diwān of Hassān
 ben tābit, Cod. Par., fol. 3. — اِذَا مَا شَبَّهَتْ تَبَاهِي Mehren Rhetorik. Read
 5. فَاَنْ يَكُن Pb.

V, 1. ki I. 622. 359. j III. 167. m 17. — يا دَارُ Pa. —
 فِي اَلْعَلِيَاءِ S. Read قَالَسَنَدِ . — وَكَانَ عَلَيْهَا Pb. — 1^a. c 187.
 2. ki I. 622. c 96. — اَصِيْلًا f 25. s اصل y (reading) S. m 17. —
 اَصِيْلًا كَيَّ اَسَايَلَهَا y (text). N (text).
 طَوِيْلًا كَيَّ اَسَايَلَهَا N (reading). y (reading). —
 طَوِيْلًا كَيَّ اَسَايَلَهَا m 17. — اَعْيَبَتْ جَوَابًا f 25. 3. s جلد ki I. 622. c 96. r 37. —
 اَلَا اَوَارِي y (reading). — اَلَا اَوَارِي y (text). — اَلَا اَوَارِي N (reading). —
 اَلَا اَوَارِي Pa. — اَلَا اَوَارِي S. N (text). — اَلَا اَوَاخِي y (reading). —
 اَلَا اَوَاخِي S. Pa. 4. ki
 I. 622. c 97. — رَدَّتْ S. y (text). G. Pa. N. 5. f 157. s سَجَف

- and نصد ki I. 622. ha 307. — الشَّجَفَيْنِ Pa. 5^b. k 6. 6. أَضَحَّتْ
 وَأَضْحَى خلاء s and لبد ki I. 622. D II. 406. y. S. p I. 439. N. kh 735.
 — 6^b. p II. 26. 7. فَعَدَّ عَمَّا مَضَى S. 7^a. M I. 599. 8. n 75.
 hi 233. — صَرِيفُ الْقَوِ Pa. N. 9. ki I. 622. — بِدَى الْجَلِيلِ S.
 y. N. — عَلَى مُسْتَوْجِسٍ N. y. — وَحِدٍ S. 10. ki I. 622. n 69.
 — الْقُرْدُ and الْقُرْدُ N. — أَلْفَرْدُ G. y (text). S. N. 10^b. mu I. 123.
 11. ki I. 622. c 415. — سَرَتْ عَلَيْهِ y (text). S. N (text). — سَارِيَّةٌ
 y. S. — الشِّمَالُ y. 12. ki I. 622. — طَوْعُ G. Pa. N. y.
 13. ki I. 622. c 249. — بَرِيَّاتٍ y. S. — بَرِيَّاتٍ Pa. 14. ki I. 622.
 c 249. — فَهَابَ ضَمْرَانِ s وزع (only the first hemistich). y. S. N (text).
 ضَمْرَانُ y. Pa. — طَعْنُ y. S. Pa. N. — طَعْنُ الْمَسَارِقِ s ضم (mis-
 printed instead of الْمَعَارِكِ). — ضَرْبُ الْمَعَارِكِ y. — الْمَحْجَرِ G. —
 الْمَحْجَرِ النَّجْدِ y. — النَّجْدِ G. N. y (reading). 15. ki I. 622.
 — فَانْفَدَهَا y. — شَكَّ الْمَبِيطِ s and عضد and درى y. S.
 16. f 20. 17. k 219. 20. gb 6. — وَفَى الْبُعْدِ m 17. y. —
 20^b. وَفَى الْبُعْدِ وَالْبُعْدِ s في الْأَدْنَى N. 21. m 17. 78. — وَمَا أَرَى y. —
 وَمَا أَحَاشَى gb 6. y. S. 21^b. w 358, 3. 22. Read
 الْاَسْلِيمَانِ. ki I. 618. h 435. gb 6. g 85. j I. 829. m 17. 19. Q 29. —
 قَارَدَدَهَا عَنْ y (text). Q 29. m 17. 19. N (text). —