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Abstract

Controversy surrounding transmission methods of various kinds of material
for history and science which are considered to be originated from prior to and early
periods of Islam seems to go on, and the methods of transmission become point of
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departure for debates on their authenticity. Discrepancies and differences among the variants of similar texts have led many scholars to assume that the transmission was committed to the oral method; and the fact about the presence of fabrication makes the bulks of material are to be regarded partially or at whole as unhistorical.

On the contrary, the three manuscripts we analyzed, which are originated from the 17th and 18th centuries containing Bānāt Suʿād poetry of the Mukhadrām poet (a period in between the Jabālīyah and Islam) Kaʾb bin Zubair show that the copying process of the written text transmission does not always safe from any discrepancies. By collating the manuscripts, we found differences from one to the other, not only in terms of wording, but also the lack of some lines and their arrangements. Even though we should admit that oral transmission has less accuracy compared to that of the written method, this does not mean that the claim of authenticity can always be lied on the concordance and congruity of the similar texts.
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A. Transmission of Arabic Texts: In Oral or in Written?

Historical material of Arabo-Islamic sciences (ancient Arabic poetry, taṣfīr, hadīts, sirāh, ayyām al-ʿArab, and so on), as far as the way the transmission is concerned, from the very early period of Islam until these sources were codified in the second half of the second century, consisted of either oral or written method of transmission. The existence of chains of authority, the isnād, in every text transmitted clearly implies the use of oral transmission. Nevertheless, this does not restrict us to assume the use of written method, since it has been undisputable that the art of writing has already been known by the Arabs before the coming of Islam. On the other hand, the fact that some texts in our hands, i.e. hadīts (here more frequently regarded to as tradition), havedifferent variantswhich sometimes contradict with each other. This triggers questions of whether this material depended mainly on the written. Should we assume the opposite, to what extent had the written been used? It is hard to believe—if not implausible—that the Prophet really said as many as those variants. The most probable suspect lies on transmitters who were allegedly responsible for the emergence of the different variants of the same text. Thus, it is not surprising that the issue of the oral and the written
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text transmission is of significance to which the discourse of authorship is linked by some modern scholars. Every time a topic of authenticity is addressed, the way the material was transmitted will always be regarded accordingly.\(^2\)

Goldziher, amongst those who argue against the authenticity of hadīts material, provokes the debate by suggesting that the traditions were largely transmitted orally. Even though he admits that some Companions might preserve the traditions in written form, the shabīhāb, for him the material (of the tradition) found in the canonical hadīts collections do not refer to the earlier written sources; and technical terms in the isnāds donot imply written sources. He begins by citing with the Qur’ānic verse challenging the Arabs: “...or do you have a kitāb by which you learn?” (Qur’ān: 68:37). Here Goldziher takes the literal sense of the word “kitāb”: book,\(^3\) not the contextual meaning as mentioned in tafsīr literature.\(^4\) He also strengthens his argument with traditions on the prohibition from writing other than the Qur’ān. For him, Isnād, by which the authenticity of any traditionshas been examined by orthodox Muslims, does not serve as a guaranty of the authenticity of the traditions. He rather sees the isnād in the collectionas the safeguard for emergence of fabricated traditions.\(^5\)

In the opposite side, Abbott stands firmly on her position which regards the hadīts collections of Bukhārī and Muslim as a genuine core of what comes from the Prophet, his Companions, and his Successors. She argues that there was an early and continuous written traditionin Islam.\(^6\) She says, “Evidence of continuous written transmission of Tradition from the second quarter of the first century on war unavailable in early and late Islamic sources.”\(^7\) Isnād, which went through several stages of developments, as for her “indicates the methods of transmission: oral, written, or combination of both.”\(^8\) In the same line with Abbott goes Sezgin who has no doubt to the authenticity of isnād; also to the materialtherein. From the ascription in the isnād, he even claims that text can be reconstructed.\(^9\)

Following Abbott and Sezgin, 'Azāmi\(^10\) stresses that there was already intense literary activity during and after the life of the Prophet. By listing hundreds of Companions, Successors, and scholars who wrote traditions, he concludes that the traditions were mainly based on the written form in their transmission. The traditions found in the shabīhāb of Suhail bin Abī Shālih (138 AH/756 AD) he edited and published corroborate those found in later collections which are always attached with isnāds. This attests to not only the authenticity of the traditions, but also to the historicity of the isnād system. It seems
that Abbott, Sezgin and also ‘Azāmi are so convinced with the sources they have that Juynboll, one who goes Goldziher’s way, feels being compelled to address his critics to.  

Even though the debate does not seem to rest, but so far we have seen how the attitudes of scholars are linked to the method of transmission in early Islam. To some extent, we may say that those who hold merely the oral method mostly argue against the authenticity of the material; on the contrary, those who lay their conviction on the use of writing for transmission, in addition to the oral, perceive the bulks of material as genuine. Of course, it would be wrong to make such generalization, but this applies, at least, to scholars we mentioned. Only rarely do we find exeptions. Motzky, as far as that I am concerned, seems very likely to be one of the few modern scholars whose views on the authenticity are non-sceptical; and yet his scrutinized observation is on the basis of the isnad. This shows once again that the transmission methods have becomescholars’ points of departure.

Regardless of the aforementioned attitudes, one thing that should be kept in mind is that written text transmission does not always preclude texts from any discrepancy. According to Schoeler, who has tried to mitigate the strict distinction between the two diametrically opposite points of view, there are some conditions in which students had to do with writing immediately when they listened to syaikh’s presentation, or ignored writing but made notes at home, as Waqi’ ibn Jarrāh did. In some other cases, one might copy the material from his colleagues’ note. Schoeler then sums up that the occurrence of diverging texts or recensions could have been caused by variations in a syaikh’s presentation of material, variations in recording, and variations by his students. We may also add another factor which had some impacts on errors in addition to what Schoeler has said, i.e. the absence of standardized writing rule in early periods of Islam, as we can see from the diverging writing of early Qur’anic manuscripts. The absence of unified writing system even contributed to difficulties in reading unfamiliar texts. This is what, among which, we understand from the rise of Arabic grammar. Yusuf Khulaif says, “in order to read text of a qasidah correctly from a written form, one should have committed the text well in memory.” In such condition, the written serves as a mnemonic aid.

Eventhough the written does not always safe from discrepancies, it is also important to stress here what Abbott has pointed out, that “...oral transmission is indeed more conducive to fabrication than is literary fixity.” Yet, some traditionists relatively
tolerated the transmission of solely meaning of a tradition (riwayah bi al-ma‘nā, without the actual words of the Prophet), which gives the similar traditions more divergent wordings. To some scholars, this is slightly different from ancient Arabic poetry which, by employing wazn and qafiyah, is more difficult to alter its wordings even if the transmission was by the oral method.

In what follows, we will look up discrepancies among texts which may occur during the copying process on the basis of written transmission, i.e. the transmission of Qashidah Banat Su‘ād text of Ka‘b bin Zuhair who lived in the time between Jahiliyah and Islam. The qashidah is of historical values for it depicts the shift of styles of poetry making from the time of Jahiliyah to the coming of Islam. It would be rash to make a conclusion about the authenticity of the text we will study, therefore we neither intend that far nor make a new fixed edition since there are many published editions. By collating three manuscripts of the qashidah—and thus we need to make at least an edition miniature—, this study will rather see whether the differences can reveal something which may corroborate scholars’ view on the topic.

B. The Poet Ka‘b bin Zuhair (d. ± 630 AD) and His Qashidah “Banat Su‘ād”

There is no precise date about when Ka‘b bin Zuhair, the author Qashidah of Banat Su‘ād, lived. All the information we have is that he lived in two epochs, at the end of Jahiliyah and the beginning of Islam. The sources only tell us about things related to the fame of the poet.

Ka‘b bin Zuhair is very well-known not only for he was a member of poet family of Murzainah tribe, but also for his poem. Being a son of the great poet of Jahiliyah whose odd belonged to one of The Seven Odds, Ka‘b inherited his father’s expertise in composing poems. He, with his family, belonged to the school of shun‘āb in poetry. It is said that he was prohibited by his father to make poetry and recite it in front of people for being afraid of bad impact on his tribe’s reputation. His father imprisoned him, but he kept doing so. His father then examined his expertise and gave him permission at the end after recognizing it. For his expertise in composing poetry, al-Jumahī considers him in the second rank among the greatest poets of his time.

Poems of Ka‘b dispersed in many collections. There are three kinds of collections of poetry in which we find the works of ancient Arabic poets, including that of Ka‘b: a) a collection of the complete
known verses of one poet, called *diwān*; b) a collection of the poems of several poets (*diwān*) within the same tribe, or a collection of poems of several poets in the same main topic, like *diwān al-bamāsah*; c) a collection of the poems of different poets; regardless of personal concerns, which, considering subject or poem, were deemed to belong together. This type is often found in the master sources of Arabic literature, *ummahāt mashādir al-adab*.

Ka‘b had a *diwān* (personal collection of poems), transmitted widely by Abū al-‘Aswād al-‘Aḥwāl. Besides the *diwān*, some parts of his poems can also be found in *ummahāt* books. Among several poems of Ka‘b, the most popular one is *Qasīdah Banāt Su‘ād* (QBS).

The fame of the QBS is due to its historical value for early Muslims, also for Arabic literature. The major topic (in Arabic literature: *gardh/agradh al-Siyā‘*) of the poem is *madh* (praise) to the Prophet with which Ka‘b aimed to apologize for being angry at his brother, Buja‘r, due to his conversion to Islam. The poet had previously mocked his brother with different genre called *bi‘ja‘* (lampooning) for his “ridiculous” act after which Ka‘b turned to mock Islam, the Prophet, and his Companions. It is said that the Prophet would take revenge at those poets who had ever mocked him, Islam, or his Companions with their lampooning poems. It is even said that he ordered his Companions to kill the poets whenever they met them.23

The news about *fath Makkah* (630 AD) was spread out to most people there, and let Ka‘b know. Buja‘r well knew that his brother’s life was in danger, and warned him accordingly, advising (advised) him to renounce his errors, and come (came) repentantly to the Prophet, or to seek a safe asylum far away. Ka‘b found out that his life would really soon be taken, and set out secretly for Madinah.24 He decided to come to the Prophet for apologizes.

Thanks to Arbuthnot for providing a good English translation of the text we need to cite as follows:

He [Ka‘b] found an old friend, claimed his protection, and went with him next morning to the simple meeting-house where Muhammad and his chief followers performed their daily devotions.25 When the service was ended, Ka‘b approached Muhammad, and the two sat down together. Ka‘b placed his own right hand in that of the Prophet, whom he addressed in these words: ‘Apostle of God, were I to bring to you Ka‘b, the son of Zoheir, penitent and professing the faith of Islam, wouldst thou receive and
accept him? The Prophet answered, 'I would.' 'Then,' said the poet, 'I am he!'

Hearing this, the bystanders demanded permission to put him to death. Muhammad ordered his zealous followers to desist, and the poet then, on the spur of the moment, recited a poem improvised at the time, probably with more or less premeditation. It is said that when Ka‘b reached the fifty-first [in our edition: forty nine] verse: 'Verily the Apostle of God is a light from which illumination is sought—a drawn Indian blade, one of the swords of God,' Muhammad took from his own shoulders the mantle he wore, and threw it over the shoulders of the poet as an honour and as a mark of protection. Hence the name given to the effusion, 'The Poem of the Mantle.'

The story about Ka‘b and his qashidah is mentioned in Kitāb al-Aghānī by al-Ishābahānī and many other sources. From the sources we know that the qashidah might be the last work of the poet. There is nothing of his work mentioned in many references to be later than this qashidah. Another probability, the QBS was his most famous poem, thus historians did not feel any necessity to cite another poems of Ka‘b in their books. In addition, when Ka‘b dead is also not that clear (when did he die is not clear). Our sources do not tell us about his death, except that mentioned by the later scholar.

The name ‘Baṅat Su‘ād’ itself is taken from the foremost of the qashidah, as the Arabs used to name their poems this way. The other name of the poem is ‘Qashidah al-Burdah’ (The Poem of The Mantle) hence the mantel of the Prophet was given to Ka‘b. Later, the mantel was purchased from him by Mu‘āwiya with twenty thousand dirham.

C. Manuscripts of QBS

There are three kinds of manuscripts of QBS: 1) the sole text of QBS; 2) the commentary (Syarḥ) of QBS altogether with the text; 3) commentary on a group of five lines (takbmiṣ) of QBS. The text of the QBS has been translated into several languages and published many times. Among the publications are of Noeldeke, Freitag, Pekostawski, Krenkow, and Basset. The last two mentioned will be referred in the collation.

The commentaries of QBS get up to 35 or more. Some of these commentaries were shortened, and some others were commented and
glossed. There are as well, commentaries on the qashidah, known as Syarh, dispersed in many big libraries. The most well-known are:

1. Syarh by Abū al-Aswad Ahmad bin Yahyā Tsa'lab;
2. Syarh by Ibn Duraid;
3. Syarh by At-Tibrīzī. This one is edited and published by Fritz Krenkow;
4. Syarh by 'Īsa bin 'Abdul 'Azīz al-Gazālī;
5. Syarh by 'Abdullāh bin Yūsuf bin Ĥisyām. This one is edited and published in Lipzig by al-Juwaini in 1871. Besides, there is also a commentary on this commentary called al-hashiyah by Ibrāhīm al-Bājūrī in year 1273 H, and copied several years;
6. Syarh by Abū Bakr bin Hujaḥ (d. 837/1433)
7. Syarh by al-Ghaznawi (d. 848/1444), printed in Heiderabad in 1323/1905
8. Syarh by Jalāluddin al-Mahallī (d. 864/1459)
9. Syarh by as-Suyūthī(d. 911/1505) entitled Kunh al-murād min Syarh Banāt Su‘ad. The manuscripts, the copies of this commentary dispersed in big libraries either east or west part of the world;
10. Syarh by Syihābuddin Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Hajar al-Haitsamī (d. 911/1505)
11. Syarh by 'Ali bin Muhammad al-Qārī al-Ḥarawi (d. 1014/1606)
12. Syarh by 'Abdul 'Azīz az-Zamzami (d. 963/1556)
13. Syarh by Shāhīb bin Shiddīq al-Khajrajī (d. about 949/1542);
14. Syarh by Athā’ullāh bin Ahmad bin Athā’illāh al-Azharī(1170/1756);
15. Syarh by 'Abdul Bāqi bin Muhammad al-Warnāwī (d. 1187/1783);

In terms of the takhbīs, not less than 14 disperse in world’s big libraries.

Manuscripts in our hands are of Leiden University library collection. Based on Witkam’s catalogue, there are three manuscripts (MS) of QBS in Leiden University library: 1) Or. 11.064; 2) Or. 11.070; and 3) Or. 11.021. One out of three manuscripts, Or. 11.064, is the sole text of QBS, and the rest three manuscripts are commentaries of QBS.

From the colophon, we know that they were made very lately, during 17th and 18th century. There is a huge gap of time in between the time of the poet and those of the writers/copyists which makeit difficult for us to conduct thematic work on the basis of the limited manuscripts we have. Nevertheless, since the time of the
copyists was quite late by which we assume that writing system was already enhanced with the use of dots and particular characters (especially those employed to mark long vowels), a hypothesis can be proposed: "Errors and discrepancies found in later, younger manuscripts should be less than those in earlier time."

a & b) MS Or. 11.064 and MS Or. 11.070

MS Or. 11.064 (the sole text of QBS) and MS Or. 11.070 (the commentary of QBS) are bound togethers one in a collective volume. The size of the manuscript is 20 cm length and 15 cm width, made of rather thick paper, and covered with carton material. Overall, the condition of the manuscript is good and the script can be clearly read. Since the style of the script is the same, it can be assumed that the copyist is also the same person.

At the preface, the copyist uses the pronoun (ِّ: "I") to refer to himself. When he puts the pronoun after قدما (to intend), this becomes a clue that he himself is the author of the commentary. Nevertheless, he also tells that he just simplified the work of another commentator, Jamāluddīn bin 'Abdullāh bin Yūsuf bin Hisyām al-Anshārī (d. 761/1360), quoting some parts of the work into his own work. So the MS Or. 00.170 could be considered as a concise fragment of the commentary of the QBS (Ar: Muqtathaf Syarb QBS) or shortened version of the commentary.

The author of this muqtathaf says that his work was aimed to benefit beginners. For this purpose, the content of the commentary therein closely relates to grammatical aspects of every single word (i'rab). Unfortunately, there is no clue about who he, the copyist of QBS and the author of this muqtathaf, was.
The script is written on watermark papers in two colours, black and red. The different colour used reflects the desire of the copyist to stress some given elements of the text. Here, the use of red colour seems to be intended to mark the punctuations, also to highlight the text of the poem, i.e. to distinguish it from the commentary, and sometimes for ornamentation. There is also another case about the use of the red ink. It is used once for a letter ش in between the end of a line of the poem (syath) and the beginning of the commentary. This letter must be an abbreviation of قرحة, used to point out the commentary of the previous line. Besides the letter, there is also ص used twice at the end of the commentary of each line of the poem. This could either indicate "the end of the body text," as distinguished from the column (shull) or to indicate end words of the copyist (in this case the author of the shortened commentary: mushannif), distinguishing them from next words of the poem.

One of the characteristics of the script is the absence of حمزة (e), as we well know in resent writing Arabic rules in order to distinguish the جذب from the وصلح ones. Examples of this can be seen in some words such as إمام, ارشد, إلي, and many others. More about حمزة, sometimes it is omitted (الما, الماء) and sometimes replaced with ب. In the miniature edition that I will try to make, as in my footnote for some words underlined in regard with this manuscript's introduction, I added حمزة in order to make the text easier to read and understand.
c) MS Or. 11.021,1

The size is 23 x 17 cm, light brown coloured. The script is written on rather thick watermark papers. Two colours are employed: black, is used for most of the writing; and red, seen especially within the text of the poem. The exertion of these two colours shows that the use of red pen was to highlight the text of the poem as well as to mark punctuations, as in the manuscripts mentioned above. But the difference is, the red ink in MS Or 11.021 is not occupied in a good order, and sometimes it overwrites the black ink scripts. This supposedly tells us that the red ink was added by the other person after the copyist.

Title Page of MS Or. 11.021,1

The title of the text as mentioned in the manuscript above is: Kitāb al-Is‘ād Fi Syarb Banāt Su‘ād: the commentary of QBS. It clearly mentions the name of the author, Ibrāhīm bin Abī al-Qāsim Muthīr who must be ‘Ibrāhīm bin ‘Abī al-Qāsim bin ‘Umar bin Ahmad bin Ibrāhīm bin Muhammad bin ‘Isā, as previously mentioned by Brockelmann.43

Presumably, the copyist simplified the Kitāb al-Is‘ād Fi Syarb Banāt Su‘ād. The clue is a sentence in the introduction which indicates the text as “quotations” from some parts of al-Is‘ād. In addition, in the colophon the copyist says: “This is what can be compiled in brief from the commentary of QBS” (Hādżā mā tayassara jam‘uḥū min Syarb Banāt Su‘ād).
The colophon states that the copyist is Muhammad Ahmad ʿAbdurrahmān, and the copying was finished on Friday morning, 29 of Rajab, 1134 H. Something to say here is that the copyist who owned the manuscript would not give any praise for himself. Instead, he would show his inferiority like al-faqīr, adh-dhaʿf, and so on. And here, he uses words al-faqīr, rājī al-ʿafwa min al-Karim al-Mannīn. Meanwhile, when mentioning the name of the author of Kitāb al-İsād, as at the title page, he uses compliment words: al-faqīh, al-wajīh, al-ʿalīm al-ʿallāmāh, mufid al-thālibīn, burhānuddīn…and so forth.

D. The Basis of Editing

Consideration should be made to choose which of the manuscripts is to be a basis. In this regard, I chose manuscript Or. 11.064 as a basis for the edition. This is because the manuscript can be clearly read, and it contains the sole text of the poem. While Or. 11.064, the text is interspaced by the commentary that makes it rather more difficult to recognize ends of every line of the poem, and it gets worse without enough proficiency of ʿilm al-ʿArūd. The same case applies for manuscript Or. 11.021,1 even though the both contain the text of the poem altogether with the commentary.

In the edition miniature, MS Or. 11.064 is marked as A, Or. 11.070 is B, and Or. 11.021,1 is C. Meanwhile the critical edition made by Krenkow is marked as CE. For the comparison amongst the earlier sources, in which we will have a look into the oral transmission, I also refer to Ummahāt Mashādīr al-Adab. Even though these books
were originated from between the second and the fourth century and hence based on the written sources—as proposed by Schoeler—the transmission lines end up to the rauya’at (exclusive transmitters of ancient poetry) who received poems from the beduins orally. Even though these books contain only fragments or some lines of poem of a given poet (not a complete poem), they at least can tell us about the sequence of the fragments of the poem. Here, Thabāqat Fuhūl asy-Syn’arā‘, asy-Siy’rū wa asy-Syn’arā‘, al-‘Iqd al-Farīd, and al-Agānī, each of them is marked as TFS, SS, IF, and Ag respectively.

**The Edition Miniature**

1. Bantat Sadaqat Fiqhī al-yaa Mabool...
2. Wa Sadaqat Gadaat al-bayn Idh Ralwo...
3. Jimala’50 Uwaraat Dhi ‘Azam E3 A’msma...
4. Shajta Wadi Shimaan Min [Ma]‘ee Shuwaayna...
5. Tanfi al-Ra’iaat al-Qudu’utu’u’u’u, Aqra’u’u’u...
6. Akram ha’53 Khulaa Lo’u’u Afu’u Bida’u’u...
7. Lukkaa Khulaa QSid Min ‘Amaa Dama...
8. Fama 55 Tadaam Ulaa Kalma ‘u’u Maa...
9. Wa Ma ‘Almsab al-Ruwaat al-Dha Zuma...57

**Dhaw al-Mahara’ al-Garabila**

10. Fila Gherika Ma Mnta Wa Wada...
11. Kaanta Ma‘wa ‘Aruqotu’u’u Masa’mala...
12. Arjoo waaMalam An Tadaa Madaqa...
13. Asmaa Sadaqat ‘Aarz su66 ‘Ullaqha...
14. Wun ‘Ullaqha ‘Ala Gadaa Fu‘a61...
15. Min Kal ‘Azaaa al-Zagari E3a Garaq...
16. Tarami ‘Aruqotu’u’u Bi‘yinu Manfa’u’u Laca...
17. ‘Umm Xumalhaa Fu ‘Miqdaa...63

**ALQALAM**

Vol. 30 No. 1 (Janua’i-April) 2013
في دفها سعة قدامها مسيل
طلع بضاحية المتين مهرول
وعمها خالها قودا سمل
منها 65 لبان وأقراب زهال
مرفقها عن بانت الزور مغفل
من حظمتها ومن اللحين يرطيب
في عارض لم تتنوه الأحالف
عشق مبين في الحدين 66 تسهل
ذوابلنهم الأرض محمل
لم يقفهن رحظ<الأكم تغلب
وقد تلفع بالقور العصاقل
كان صاحبه بالشمس مملول
ورق الجانبد يركض الخانقين
قامت فجاجاء وما نك متكال
لما نعى بكرها الماعون معقول
مشوق عن ترابها رعابي
إنك بابن أبي سلمي لفقتل
لا أفيهك 67 إنك مشغول
فكل ما قدر 68 الرحمن معقول
بوما على آلة حدبة[اء] عمول
العفو عند رسول الله مامول
القرآن فيه موازيت وتفصل
اذنب وإن كنكرت في الأقويل

18- غلياء وحناء علقوم مذكر
19- وجدالها من أطوة ما يؤمنه 64
20- حرف أخوها أبوها من مهنة
21- يمشي القراد عليها ثم (ي) زلفه
22- غيرانة قدفته باللحم عن غرض
23- كأنا فات عينيها ومذبحةها
24- فمر مثل عسب النحل ذا خصل
25- قنوار في حرتها البصير بها
26- هدوى على بسرات وهي لاحقة
27- حمر الأبحات يتركون الخصارما
28- كان أوب ذراعيه إذا عرفت
29- بوما نظبة الحرية مصصدة
30- وقال للقوم حادتهم وقد جعلت
31- شد النهار <ذراعة عبيط نصف
32- نواحة رجوع الضعيعين لسيلها
33- تفرى اللبان بكفيفيها ومدرعها
34- تسعى الوشاة جنابي بها والفوم
35- وقال كل خليل كنت آمله
36- فقلت خلو سبلي لا أبالكم
37- كله ابن آنثى وإن طالت سلامته
38- أنبت 69 أن رسول الله أوعدي
39- مهلا هداك الذي أعطاك نافلة
40- لا تأخذي بأقوال الوهاء ولم
أرى وأسمع ما لو تسمع الفيل من الورث بإذن الله توويل # 41
ففي كف ذي نفقات فيله القيو # 71
وقيل إنك مسعود وممسول # 72
من بطن غير غيل دونه غيل
لم من القوم معثور خرادن
أن ترك القرن إلا وهو مفسل # 73
مطرح البر والدرسان مكول
وصارم من سيف الله مسول
بطنين مكة لما أسلموا زولوا # 74
عند السقة[ء] ولا ميل # 75
معازيل
من نسج دارود في هيجا[ء] سرابيل
كأفا حلق الففعاء[ء] جدود # 76
قوما وليسوا مجاريا إذا نسوا
ضرب إذا غرد السود التنايل # 77
وما لهم عن عياب الموت قليل # 81

E. Conclusions

After collating the three manuscripts of Qashidah Banat Su'ad (MS QBS) of Ka'b bin Zuhair (± 630AD), we come to the following conclusions:

1. There are differences amongst the MSs collated. The differences can be divided into two groups: 1) differences in terms of the scripts and the wordings; and 2) differences in terms of the number of lines and their arrangements.

When collating MS A (the basis) with MS B, in terms of the script, the difference is not significant at all. If any, it is only about the way how a word is written. Hamzah for example, in some words
sometimes it is scripted and sometimes is omitted. No difference in the wordings and the arrangement of lines. This is because the copyist was the same person.

The difference of wordings as well as the number of lines and their arrangement can be found between MS A/B and C. MS A/B is lacking four lines of MS C, and there are two lines in MS C that differ in their arrangement from that in MS C. Sometimes, there occur interchangeable of lines amongst manuscripts and the earlier sources (‘ummahāt mashhādīr al-‘adāb).

2. Even though it is not certain whether MS C was copied from MS A/B and vice versa, the differences can explain that the difference of person who copies a text potentially has an effect on the emergence of discrepancies amongst variants of the copied text.

3. In more general words, we could say that differences might result from either oral or written transmission. Interchangeable positions and/or the lack and the excess of lines allegedly result from the oral. It is obvious that differences in number of lines as well as differences in the arrangement of some lines also exist amongst the earlier sources. The lower level of discrepancies, i.e. the differences in wording and characters, are strongly alleged to result from the writing. Of these differences, the writing contributed less than the oral. This corroborates Abbott’s thesis.

4. The claim that the existence of ważn and qāfihā makes it hard to alter words of an Arabic poem with other words (thus makes it more difficult to forge in comparison to traditions) is not always justified. Even if an ancient Arabic poetry was transmitted literally, as the case which relatively applies to traditions, this does not allude the emergence of discrepancies.

5. It is, however, too early to say that the excess of some lines is the result of forgery. Such conclusion needs further scrutinized observations. Otherwise, it is at our best tentatively say that the excess of line(s) in the manuscript and the lack in the earlier sources (this also applies to vice versa) imply the mutually complementary between the oral and the written, as maintained by Schoeler.

Endnotes:

1 I have pointed elsewhere that the writing was quite common in early periods of Islam, but it served as preservation rather than transmission purposes. CF Lalu Turjiman Ahmad, System Isnād Hadits dari Awal Mula Penggunaannya dalam...

2 Controversies surrounding the authenticity, as well as whether the use of writing for recording the traditions during the lifetime of the Prophet was permitted or not, have fulfilled pages of Majallah al-Manar quite long time during the life of the editor, Rasyd Ridha. CF G. H. A. Juynboll, The Authenticity of the Tradition Literature. Discussions in Modern Egypt, (Leiden: Brill, 1969). Many books address this topic as the locus of controversy.


44 See for instance Thabari's Tarsir, in Maktabah Syamilah 2nd Edition, Vol. 23, p. 553. It is mentioned, the book refers to a holybook containing the actual words of God.


11 These scholars are considered naïve. Juynboll says, "Something that always structure me in the work of Sezgin, Azmi, and also in that of Abbott, is that they do not seem to realize that, even if a manuscript or a papyrus is unearthed with an allegedly ancient text, this text could easily have been forged by an authority who lived at a time later than the supposedly oldest authority given in its isnad.” G. H. A. Juynboll, Muslim Tradition: Studies in Chronology, Provenance, and Authorship of Early Hadith, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), p. 4.


13 Shoeler focuses on the transmission between the second and the forth century. He is right when he says that the oral and the written were more complementary than mutually exclusive. Nevertheless, transmission prior to the second century relatively is not that clear to some scholars.


17 Quoted by Herbert Berg, The Development of Exegesis, p. 20.
In many aspects poetry was disregarded by Islam. First, some themes of the ancient poetry, such as lampooning, self glorification, and lamentation, were contested with the spirits of Islam. The Qur'an also discredits the poets in an epistle bearing their title. And the Qur'an challenges them to create verses equal to it in terms of style and content. This is how we understand why the Prophet had never been before interested with listening to poetry.

Ibn Qutaibah says, "al-'Awām bin 'Uqbah bin Ka'b bin Zu'hair bin Abī Sulma, all of these persons were poets." Ibn Qutaibah, Al-Siy'ir wa al-Syu'ara', Maktabah Shāmilah CD Program 2nd Edition, vol. I, p. 21

20 There were two schools for ancient poets: thubâ' and shum'a'ab. The first was characterized with naturalistic, led by Umru' al-Qais. The second one concerned more on the meaning contained in the poetry. One poem might be revisited several times to make it better before it was recited in front of the public. Zu'hair was the best to represent this school. Cf Syauqi Dhaif, Al-Fann Wa Madzāhibihā Fī aṣy-Syi'r al-'Arabi, (Cairo: Dār al-Ma'ārif, 1960), ed. VII


22 Ignaz Goldziher, A Short History of Classical Arabic Literature, ed. p. 23


25 In other source, it is said that Ka'b met Abū Bakr al-Shiddīq for this purpose, and they went together to the mosque in which the Prophet was conducting Shubh prayer.

26 F.F. Arbuthnot, Arabic Authors, p. 19


29 See for example, Ibnu Khallikān, Wafayat al-A'yān, Maktabah Shāmilah CD program.

30 There is also another qasidah named al-Burda by al-Busyairī. This qasidah is often read during the commemoration of Manāhid (or Manāhid: birthday of the Prophet) in Indonesia, Thailand, Malaysia and the Filipine, more particularly among traditionalist Islam community. Both qasidahs contain, as their major topic, madhth(praise) to the Prophet.


34 Brockelmann, Tārikh, Vol. I, p. 156

35 Friedrich Krenkow, Le Diwan De Ka'b ibn Zubair, critical edition, (Krakow, 1950)

37 Sezgin lists 43 commentaries.


39 Sezgin mentions (Jamâ‘luddîn ?) ‘Abdulhâm bin Yûsuf bin Ḥisâyâm al-Anshâfî as one of several commentators of QBS. See Fuat Sezgin, *GAL*, vol. VI, p. 231

40 Here is the transcription:

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

الحمد لله رب العالمين، وسلاطنا وسلسله على سيدنا محمد وآله وصحبه وسلم، هذا وقصيدة

أرشذك الله تعالى إلى اقتطاف شيء من الزيد التي امتضها بديع زمننا. وحود، أوانه، شنيك الشيخ

الإمام حجة الأدب، ح genom the right one, based on biographical books is

من قصيدة صاحب سيدنا رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم كعب بن زهر أبي سالم

{the right one, based on biographical books is}

رضي الله عنه المروفة ببانت سعداء انشاءها لوصيها إلى المتبدقين، وحرفها إن كان سالمًا

مرتفعا عن هذا النمط من المنظمين، وكان ما يدل على أحسن الكلام من فشعة في ذلك متوحبا

الخليج والشبيه، فصحا مما أظهر من القلب الأدب والتشييص، مستجيا أن وجبت طاعه

واتن شراقة، مستعينا بالله سبحانه وهو خير مميين، قال كعب بن سعد فقتلي اليوم مثول

ثم أثرها لم يمدكول


44 Here is the transcription:

هذا ما تيسر جمعه من شرح بانت سعدة والحمد لله رب العالمين، فرع من رمزها من بودي يوم

الجمعة 29 في شهر رجب الحرام سنة 1134، وكان الفراغ من رمياها ضحى يوم الاثنين شهر ربيع

آخر سنة 1262 بخط موصله لنفعه وليام شاه الله من بره راجي العفو من الكرم المهن محمد أحمد عبد

الرحمن غفر الله له وجميع المسلمين وصلى الله على سيدنا محمد وآله.

45 In MS C: مثول

46 In Ag: عنددها

47 In CE and Ag: يفجر in TFS: لم يشف

48 In SS: عرضت

49 In MS C: محفوظ. In MS C and IF, in between this line and the next one, there is another line:

هيفا مقبلة عجّبة مدبرة # لا يشتكى قصر منها ولا صول
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The author of IF also omits lines of the second until the seventh. Presumably, he intends to make it short in order to come to the topic he speaks about.

50 In MS C: تحملا
51 In MS C: القنّى القنّى and القنّى have the same way to read.
52 In MS C: جنوب
53 In MS C: Stella A: ولّمْها يا وبحا; in IF: بلّمها
54 In MS C: Stella A: وسغدًا, CE A: مجدًا
55 In MS C: ما إن
56 In SS: وما تدوم على العهد الذي زعمت
57 In IF: وعدت
58 In MS C: مواعد
59 In MS C: line 11 and 12 precede line 10
60 In MS C: لا
61 In MS C: فرق
62 In MS C: العيون
63 In MS C: the word دفعم is put in the marginal space. Supposedly, the copyist forgot to include it in the line and was added by the later person.
64 In MS C: لا يؤسسه
65 In MS C: عنها
66 In MS C: وفي الخدين
67 In TFS: لا أتمنيك
68 In TFS: وعد
69 In TFS: تثبث

70 In the line, there is: والعفو عند خيار الناس مقبول. But then it is corrected with مقبول in the margin. In SS: الدموم replaced with مقبول

71 In MS C: in between line 42 and 43, there is another line:

إِنْ لَمْ يَكُنْ مِنِ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ مَنْ تَوَلَّى

72 In MS C: in between line 43 and 44, there is another line:

فَلَامَّ أَخْفَفَ عَنْ هُذَا إِذْ أَكَلَمَهُ

73 In MS C: in between line 47 and 48, there is another line:

قَبْلَ إِنَّ مِنْ سِبْعَةٍ مَسَّهُ مِسْتَغْلِبٌ

74 In MS C: لنتور
75 In MS C and Ag: مهند
76 In MS C: عصبة
77 In TFS: يوم
78 In Ag: خيبر

79 In MS C: There is another line after line 53 and before line 54:

لا يرجون إذا نالت بها حسهم

80 In TFS: وما وليسو مجاريعًا إذا نيل
81 In Ag: حياض
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