

KITĀB AL-MANĀM
(A STUDY OF A CRITICAL EDITION)

SUGIYANTO

Alumni Pascasarjana Leiden University Jurusan Islamic Studies
bekerja sebagai Konsultan Pendidikan di Jakarta
sugiyanto8410@yahoo.com

Abstract

This paper tries to study an edition of Ibn Abī Dunyā's work, entitled Kitāb al-Manām, edited by Leah Kinberg. This paper also aims to deal with the nature of Islamic classical texts and tries to examine the existing edited form of the text that can be scientifically accepted in recently scholarly circumstances.

Kitāb al-Manām is one of which has attracted many scholars due to its popular contents about dream. It is a collection of 350 narratives. Most of these narratives tell readers about information transmitted through dream. The nature of dream is very dominant in the whole of its content, nearly 327 narratives. Kinberg explains in the beginning of her edition that those dreams are mostly short and follow a set of basic patterns, which is common patterns in relating dreams: 'motifs and formulae'. Viewed from its main nature, Kitāb al-Manām, as a whole, is a compilation of traditions drawn from early sources prior to Ibn Abī Dunyā'. Somehow, this was an important work since that we hardly can find explanations about dreams prior to Ibn Abī Dunyā'. That's why, the popularity of Ibn Abī Dunyā' was later acknowledged by many scholars especially those concerned with the nature of dreams in Islamic eschatology.

Key Words: Kitāb al-Manām, Ibn Abī Dunyā', dreams, critical edition

Abstrak

Tulisan ini mencoba mengkaji tentang sebuah edisi karya Ibn Abī Dunyā' yang berjudul Kitāb al-Manām yang diedit oleh Leah Kinberg. Makalah ini juga mencoba menjelaskan sifat alamiah dari teks-teks Islam klasik dan mencoba meneliti bentuk edisi yang ada sekarang yang secara ilmiah bisa diterima dalam lingkungan para sarjana saat ini.

Kitāb al-Manām adalah salah satu teks yang menarik bagi para ilmuwan karena popularitas kandungannya mengenai mimpi. Kitab ini berisi 350 narasi. Sebagian besar narasi menjelaskan kepada pembaca mengenai informasi

yang dibawa atau dikirimkan melalui mimpi. Sifat dasar mimpi sangat dominan dalam keseluruhan isi karya ini yang hampir mencapai 327 narasi. Di permulaan karya edisinya, Kinberg menjelaskan bahwa mimpi-mimpi itu sebagian besar pendek dan mengikuti serangkaian pola-pola dasar yang sangat umum yang berkaitan dengan mimpi; yakni 'motif dan formula'. Dilihat dari sifat-sifat dasarnya, Kitāb al-Manām, secara keseluruhan merupakan sebuah kumpulan tradisi yang digambarkan dari sumber-sumber awal sebelum Ibn Abī Dunyā'. Namun bagaimanapun juga, kitab ini adalah karya penting karena kita hampir tidak bisa menemukan penjelasan-penjelasan mengenai mimpi sebelumnya. Oleh karena itulah kemudian popularitas Ibn Abī Dunyā' kemudian diakui oleh banyak sarjana khususnya yang concern dengan sifat dasar mimpi dalam bidang ilmu Eskatologi Islam.

Kata Kunci: *Kitāb al-Manām, Ibn Abī Dunyā', mimpi, edisi kritis*

Introduction

The reproduction of Islamic texts has been lasting in every phase of Islamic history. Recently modern circumstances, for instance, has given witnesses how people produce and reproduce bulks of knowledge in line with social changes. Thanks to the invention of highly valuable devices of modern technology, the process of knowledge reproduction seems easier which to some degree has made it possible for people to produce it in huge number of copies. Since the printing machine has been invented, we see multitude of text production along scientific activities. This also enables people to disseminate variously new kinds of knowledge and methodology. Once finishing writing scientific works, a huge number of copies can easily be produced due to the use of those modern devices.

However, such a way in the text reproduction was impossibly found in the classical time, including in the medieval era, for the only possible mean to reproduce texts was by manual way. In the classical time, people would never meet multitude copies of such scientific works. This appeared in the fact that, at that time, many texts were preserved only in the form of manuscript, in which the way to transmit was nearly complicated and not simple one. Consequently, once we want to know further about the nature of classical text, we

have to deal with available manuscripts then try to represent them in such a way that can be scientifically accepted in recently scholarly circumstances. This paper aims to deal with such a matter, especially with the nature of Islamic classical texts and tries to examine the existing edited form of the text.

Many attempts have been done by scholars to edit, represent, and reproduce the old texts in the form of new books in order to make it easy for nowadays people to read. This paper is an attempt to study an edition of Ibn Abī Dunyā's book, entitled *Kitāb al-Manām* (KM), edited by Leah Kinberg. Hence, the problem raised is to what extent the edition is done in a scientific and scholarly way?

The Author and His Works

Abū Bakr 'Abdullāh bin Muhammad bin 'Ubaid bin Sufyān al-Qurashi al-Bagdādi, or commonly known as Ibn Abī Dunyā', was a Muslim theologist and lawyer. He was born in 208 H/823 AD in Baghdad and died in 281 H/894 AD. He wrote many books, some of which were greatly known as great classical books for softening the heart. This can be seen in the abundance of his works directing pious and ascetic life. Patience, humility, penitence, trust to God, hospitality, vigils, silence, frugality, and such and such are amongst of which can be found in most part of his books. Besides, he condemned anger, drunkenness, the use of musical instruments, and the world in general.¹

However, not only was he concerned in such field, but he also engaged in extensive teaching activities for the most parts to the field of edifying literature. He treated also single themes such as the moral characteristic which a man should seek to attain, or joy after sorrow (*al-Faraj ba'da al-syidda*). He wrote over 100 works, twenty of which have survived. Sibṭ al-Jauzi even speaks of more than 130 were known to Ibn Abī Dunyā'. Indeed more than 100 titles can be traced partly from Ibn Nadhim's *fibrist* and Hajji Khalifa, partly from reading list (*Fahāris asy-syuyūkh*). His writings include as follows:

1. *Shifāt an-Nār*
2. *Al-Jū'*
3. *Kitāb al-Muhtadharin*
4. *ar-Riqqa wa al-Bukā'*
5. *Kitāb al-Gibah wa an-Namimah*

6. *Man Āsa ba'da al-Maut*
7. *al-Ikhlāsh wa an-Niyyah*
8. *al-Ṭarf fi Manāzil al-Asbrāf*
9. *Makārim al-Akhlāq*
10. *al-Tawādbu' wa al-Khumūl*
11. *Kitāb al-Warā'*
12. *al-Shamt wa-Ādāb al-Lisān*
13. *Kitāb al-Faraj ba'da al-Shidda*
14. *Mujābū al-Da'wah*
15. *Kitāb al-Shamt wa Ādāb al-Lisān*
16. *Kitāb Dhamm ad-Dunyā'*
17. *Kitāb al-Maut wa Kitāb al-Qubūr*
18. *Nazhra Jadīdah*
19. *Majmū'ah al-Rasā'il*
20. *Kitāb asy-Syukr*

Besides, he was also one of compilers of in term of anecdotes writing. Roger Allen writes that a theme that lent itself very well to the predilection of anecdote compilers from tales that would contain the maximum amount of incident and surprise was 'escape from hardship' (*al-Faraj ba'da ash-shidda*).² This book was actually a name for writing which belongs not only to one scholar. Many Muslim scholars wrote such a book as al-Mada'ini and at-Tanukhi.³ In addition, Ibn Abī Dunyā' was also known as a compiler of *Dalāil an-Nubuwwah*, a book which tells us about the sign of Muhammad's Prophecy.⁴ *Kitāb al-Manām* is one of which has attracted many scholar thanks to its popular contents about dream.

So far in his life, Ibn Abī Dunyā' was a freedman of the Umayyads. He had played important roles dealing with religious matters along Umayyad dynasties. What makes him unique among others was the fact that despite his role in Umayyad dynasties, he became a tutor of several Abbasid princes as well and in particular those who later became *caliphas*: al-Mu'tadid and al-Muktafi. Maesami and Starley explain about it that Ibn Abī Dunyā's family had been clients (*mawali*) of the Umayyad. In later life he enjoyed patronage of al-Muwaffaq, the politically and militarily powerful brother of one Abbasid Caliph who resided in Baghdad, while the seat of the caliphate remained at Samarra. Al-Muwaffaq employed him to tutor al-Mu'tadid and who succeeded to the caliphate in 279/892, and his grandson later al-Muktafi.⁵ Ibn Abī Dunyā' was a highly respected

learned Muslim scholar during his time, a learned teacher, highly respected for his exemplary way of life; he was counted as weak traditions only by Shi'is.⁶

The KM to which I will be concerned is a collection of 350 narratives, of which 327 are accounts of dreams. The book opens with sixteenth traditions that treat the relationship between dead and the living.

Much has been written about Ibn Abī Dunyā' and his literary heritage, but not study has been dedicated to his contribution to Islamic-popular-eschatology and his resource to this material for reasons for edification.⁷ This paper is aimed at looking more briefly at the critical edition of KM done by Leah Kinbergh. Many attempts have been done by scholars to edit, represent, and reproduce old Arabic texts in the form of new books in order to make easy for nowadays people to read.

Only small number of KM's dream can be traced in works prior to Ibn Abī Dunyā's time. Nevertheless, KM is a compilation of tradition drawn from early sources. This assumption is based on the fact that KM uses formulae that reflect an earlier literary development. This can be seen in the attached *isnād* used by Ibn Abī Dunyā' in performing KM. Another collection of his, such as *Makārim al-Akhlāq*, also shows similar form, which is a collection of *hadīths* and *akhbār*, the latter often containing verses, called by the author from a vast amount of material heard by Sheikh in the course of many years of professional activity in the field. Therefore, his main contribution is not in the presentation of new material, but rather in the compilation of material, its preservation and above all, in his distinctive treatment of dreams, and thereby the creation of unique work.⁸

The wide circulation of dreams of KM in later sources bears witnesses to the popularity of Ibn Abī Dunyā' and attests to the great prestige that dreams had in the classical period of Islam. This contradicts the fact that only one manuscript of this work has survived and the absence of other collections at the same kind. However, examination of possible attitudes towards dreams in Islam, while focusing on dreams of the kind adduced in KM, will lead to better understanding of the status of dreams within classical Islamic literature in general.

***Kitāb al-Manām*, its nature and composition**

Kitāb al-Manām by Ibn Abī Dunyā' is a collection of 350 narratives. Most of these narratives tell readers about information transmitted through dream. The nature of dream is very dominant in the whole of its content, nearly 327 narratives. Kinberg explains in the beginning of her edition that those dreams are mostly short and follow a set of basic patterns, which is common patterns in relating dreams: 'motifs and formulae'. The dreams are adduces in a sequence that seems to arbitrary. The book opens with sixteen traditions (one dream and fifteen non dream sayings) that treat the relationship between the dead and the living, and thus illuminate the general purpose of the work. The book will tell multitude of story which is addressed as a major means of interaction between the dead and the living. This edifies nature that supplies the inhabitants of the present world with moral advice originating in the other world.⁹

Viewed from its main nature, KM, as a whole, is a compilation of traditions drawn from early sources prior to Ibn Abī Dunyā'. This can clearly be seen on the *isnāds* attached in every single narrative which shows how the narratives are originally originated from the prophet companions and therefore *shabīh* in contents. Somehow, this was an important work since that we hardly can find explanations about dreams prior to Ibn Abī Dunyā'. That's why, the popularity of Ibn Abī Dunyā' was later acknowledged by many scholars especially those concerned with the nature of dreams in Islamic eschatology. Some Muslim scholars after Ibn Abī Dunyā' then used some important notes about dreams from his work. Here, we can see such scholars as Ibn Qayyīm aj-Jauziyah (d. 751/1350), Nu'aim al-Isfahani (d. 430/1038), Hatīb al-Bagdādī (d. 563/1070), Ibn Asakir (d. 571/1175), and Ibn aj-Jauzy (d. 597/1200). In Ibn Qayyim aj-Jauziyah's work, namely *Kitāb ar-Rūh*, we will see that the author does not specify the sources from which he derives the narratives about dreams in his work. This certainly differs from what has been done by Ibn Abī Dunyā', in which he put the *isnād* neatly. What done by Ibn Qayyim also differs from the rest of authors mentioned above, who mostly attached the *isnād* in their narratives. These include *Hilyah al-Auliā'* by Nu'aim al-Isfahani, *Tārīh Bagdād* by Hatīb al-Bagdādī, *Tārīh Madīnah Dimasq* by Ibn Asakir, and *Shifā as-Safwa* by Ibn aj-Jauzī.

After those scholars, the name of Ibn Abī Dunyā' was commonly mentioned when a scholar wants to refer about dreams in his work. We can see such scholars as Ibn Rajab in *Ahwāl al-Qubūr* (d.

795/1392), *Basr Kaib* and *Sarh Sudūr* by Jalāluddīn as-Suyūti (d. 911/1505), *Ithāf al-Sada al-Muttaqīn bi Syarh Ihwa 'Ulūm ad-Dīn* by Murtadhā az-Zabīdī (d. 1206/1791), and *Kasyf as-Subuhāt* by Mahmūd Hasan Rabi'. Kinberg said that tracing the witness of Ibn Abī Dunyā's works become of great importance due to the fact that many scholars have written about him and his literary heritages, but rarely or not study has been dedicated to his contribution to Islamic popular-eschatology.¹⁰

The wide circulation of the dreams of KM in later sources bears witnesses to the popularity of Ibn Abī Dunyā's work and attests to the great prestige that dreams had in the classical period of Islam. This contradicts the fact that only one manuscript of this work has survived, and more significantly, the absence of other extant collections of dreams of the same kind. In other words, if dreams were widespread in classical Islam, to such an extent, most genres of Islamic literature should contain dreams.¹¹

Organization of the material

Kinberg explains that among the dreams not collected under one heading, we seldom find one common topic or system that might explain the order in which they are presented. It has four chapter headings, but these do not cover all the dreams of the book. Some contents describing the topic are;

- Introduction, this consists of 16 sayings as an introduction remark of Ibn Abī Dunyā' on KM.
- 94 sayings on dreams which are composed randomly. This is a typical of KM which does not identify clearly the transition from one topic to another, instead we will find many of the contents are arranged in non-systematic order.
- 27 dreams, the third part of the book, treat an array of narratives telling us about the dreams when some people meet the Prophet in their dreams. However, many other topics about meeting with the Prophet are also described in other parts of the book.
- 9 dreams explaining the topic about those who learned an invoking during the sleep.
- 13 dreams explaining the chapter about poetry. This is an interesting part of the thesis. There we will see about the poetries transmitted and memorized by someone in sleep.

- 66 dreams located between above poetry transmitted in sleep and the same part about poetry as well after.
- 13 dreams preceded by the title, a chapter on poetry transmitted and memorized in sleep`.
- 109 dreams which are not arranged in systematic order. This large part of the book tells various different narratives scattering in all of parts of the book.
- 1 dream. This is the closing content for the book. This last dream is also different from others due to the absence of *isnāds* in its form.

the Edition of *Kitāb al-Manām*

After looking at the glimpse of the content of KM, we now deal with the critical edition of Leah Kinberg more closely. The problems raised here, therefore, are as follows:

- What manuscript (ms) form used by the editor in conducting her work?
- Has the editor chosen the right manuscript?
- What methods were used by the editor to deal with problems rising in his work?
- How is her critical edition supported by introduction and bibliographies?
- What is the historical background of the edited text?
- What is the overall assessment of the critical edition by the editor?

Actually, there are two other editions of KM, first is the Egyptian edition, which is edited by Majdi as-Sayyid Ibrāhīm in 1989, and the second one is the Lebanese Edition, which is edited by 'Abd al-Qadīr Ahmad Atha' in 1993. Kinberg said that when she was in the end stage of editing her work, the Egyptian edition came up in the public. Due to this, she initially thought to bury her work and not to publish it. Nevertheless, as the Egyptian edition was not so very accurate that she later decided to proceed her work. She believed that what she had done was of great importance of scientific work. Ironically, the Lebanese edition later was surprised her again. The tantamount nature of the Lebanon with Egyptian edition encouraged her to continue her work and then to publish it.

Certainly, it will be extremely worthy to look at Egyptian and Lebanese texts edited by Majdi as-Sayyid Ibrāhīm and 'Abd al-Qadīr Atha' to examine the Kinberg's notion. As mentioned above, Kinberg argues that what had been done by Majdi as-Sayyid Ibrāhīm and Atha' were less accurate in its nature so that Kinberg proceeded her work to publishing. Necessarily, it will not be enough to take this Kinberg's notion for granted without examining it through seeing directly the Egyptian and Lebanese edition. Therefore the only way to know and to compare these three kinds of editions is by looking at every edition (Egyptian, Lebanese, and Kinberg's) directly. This could be my first critical point for Kinberg's work. In the preface of her work, she mentions that what Majdi did with his Egyptian edition is not scholarly enough. She said:

“...in 1989, when my revision of the text was at its final stages, the very same text was published in Egypt, edited by Majdi al-Sayid Ibrahim. At first I thought of burying my work, but inaccuracies of the edited text and the popular nature of its introduction reinforced my belief in the use scholars could make of a scientific edition of the text...”¹²

The main point why it is important to find such books is that Kinberg does not give further information about the nature of Egyptian and Lebanon edition. She merely mentions that both editions are relatively inadequate without telling readers more about some points what she presumes as inadequate. Even when I look at the Bibliography of her edition, those Egyptian and Lebanon editions are not listed. I think this is the first weakness for Kinberg's work since she mentions in the introduction that those two previous editions were used in making such a close comparison.

...in case of illegibility or obscurity, variant readings, found in other sources, have been incorporated. Also, a close comparison has been made with the published texts of 1989 and 1993 editions (Egyptian and Lebanon edition)...¹³

I try to look at bibliography, *Fihras al-I'lām*, and *Tabrīj* (list of reference), but I could not find those Egyptian and Lebanon editions. Then I just assume that she forgot to put it in the reference list, but possibly she explains in the introduction, again, I read her introduction, and, as first time, I could not find more explanation about those two editions.

Furthermore, I consulted bibliographical references in the Leiden University Library; I could not find those two editions of Ibrahim and Atha'. Therefore, I just proceed this evaluation by looking what has been done by Kinberg without comparing it with two other editions (Egyptian and Lebanese).

The Manuscripts

This part deals with these two following questions:

- What manuscript (ms) form used by the editor in conducting her work?
- Has the editor chosen the right manuscript?

There are two main sources to find the work of Ibn Abī Dunyā', especially KM, these are a sole manuscript and a collection of his work or *majmū'ah*. The sources were found in the library of the *Madrasah Nūr Ahmadiyyah* in the Ahmad al-Gazzār Mosque in Acre.

Photocopies of this sole manuscript can be found in the following places:

- in the Jewish National and University Library in Jerusalem (#7984),
- in Ma'had al-Mahtūthāt (Tasawuf #424),
- and in Dār al-Kutub (majāmi' #781) in Egypt.

It is in this part why the book of Ibn Abī Dunyā' is extremely unique. Unlike generally available manuscript, which has many kinds of its form, KM is preserved only in sole manuscript. Witkam explains that in the case of Middle Eastern literatures, the term 'unique' has only a limited meaning. Numerous collections of manuscripts have still not been described, or are not known at all: thus one must be constantly prepared to have another MS of a text believed to be preserved in one manuscript only, be found.¹⁴ So far I consult the exiting manuscript of KM, indeed, it is only one which is available around the world. In GAS, it is mentioned some manuscripts of Ibn Abī Dunyā's work, but Brockelman mentions the manuscript of KM is only preserved in a sole manuscript.¹⁵ Nonetheless, in regard to 'unique manuscript', it opens the chance for editor to fully deploy his/her creativity.¹⁶

Therefore, for those who want to deal with the manuscript of KM, they will find a similar basic form. In this case, Kinberg uses the manuscript preserved in the Jewish National and University Library in Jerusalem (#7984). Regarding this matter, certainly, what has been done by Kinberg about the source of her edition is truly understood and acceptable. Therefore, the two questions above can already be answered; the question about what manuscript (MS) form used by the editor in conducting her work? And has the editor chosen the right manuscript? Due to the availability of the sole manuscript, the editor has free choice to choose one of the available photocopies of manuscript.

It is in this point that, as Witkam said, that the implementation of textual criticism method used in studying the manuscript of Greek and Latin antiquity does not apply for some Middle Eastern manuscripts. Textual criticism which requires some presuppositions is used mainly by scholars who struggle to reconstruct Hellenistic version of Greek and Latin antiquity, and then to go back further toward the nature of its author. For these scholars, they then construct what is called stemma, which is the back into history, the path along which the philologist tries to find his author, or expressed more carefully, to the archetype.¹⁷

KM was copied in 603/1206 by Husain bin Mūsa bin Husain al-Huwayyī in *Naskhi* script with almost no vocalization and very few diacritical pints. The text is basically accurate, with the exception of a few omission and some distortions.¹⁸ Kinberg explores more about it as follows:

- Although the script is legible, some parts are indecipherable, due to poor maintenance. A significant number of leaves were damaged by water and worms which mainly affected the margins and the upper lines.
- Like the rest of the *Majmū'ah*, *Kitāb al-Manām* has both pagination and foliation.
- The title page contains the name of the author and the title of the work.
- The last page, after the last dream has a colophon; then an additional dream (#350), in the same handwriting, not preceded by *isnāds*, then comes *sama'*, which mentions the copyist's name and copy date; finally, the stamp seal of the *waqf*, at the bottom of page.
- *Kitāb al-Manām* has 76 pages.

- 350 narratives are recorded

From the way how Kinberg describes manuscripts, he pays attention on detailed information in the manuscripts. He notes the year written in MSS, He also gives remarks on other information in manuscript, such as the copier and the type of the script used in writing the text. MSS dating is one of many ways very important in the editing process.¹⁹

The editing of the text

This part deals with following questions:

- What methods were used by the editor to deal with problems rising in his work?

Due to the availability of the manuscript, it is impossible to edit KM as commonly done by comparing one manuscript with another. As mentioned above, KM is preserved only in one manuscript. Therefore such alternative ways should be taken in order to get better editing.

Although we only can find one only manuscript of KM, but many witnesses of its derivation in later sources are easily be found. It is because the fact that Ibn Abī Dunyā‘ was compiler of earlier tradition in which he drew some narratives the composed it in such a book. However, later scholars were benefited by the work of Ibnu Abi Dunya when they want to discuss dreams in their works. Consequently, works of later scholars are of great importance when dealing with the variant readings within the sole manuscript of KM. We can mirror to later work of scholars to make such a comparison. In regard this matter, Witkam said that in such concern exist the matters of the numerous quotation in other works, which may provide parallel witnesses, and in the Arabic literature in particular, this is something to be reckoned with.²⁰

That is also what has been done by Kinberg in her edition. She said that the edition of KM is based on the one and only extant manuscript. In cases of illegibility or obscurity, variant readings, found in other sources, have been incorporated in the text.²¹ We, here, presumably assume that Kinberg has taken an excellent step in this edition dealing with variant readings. She renders the later work after Ibn Abī Dunyā‘ the mirror to deal with variant readings of KM.

In addition to this, the appearance of Egyptian and Lebanon edition benefited Kinberg in that it enabled her to draw such comparison. Majdi and Atha' conducted their editing through the same manuscript. Therefore, it can be assumed that Kinberg then looked at the result of these scholars carefully and made some important notions. What we can see later from Kinberg about it is her comment that the result of those two scholars are not adequate enough, but without trying to explain further. It seems better in this point when Kinberg explains further about what the weaknesses of both Egyptian and Lebanese edition are. This is my remark for Kinberg's critical edition.

In conducting her edition, Kinberg made some improvement by adjusting with the practice of today's writing. Vrolijk explains that the practice of most editors of Arabic texts to normalize their spelling according to the rules of Modern Standard Arabic. This is understandable, since little is known the development of Arabic spelling through the ages, and consequently many editors refrain from a reconstruction of a spelling without the backing of thorough research.

- She adds particular indication in dealing with diacritical points. Specific reference to missing diacritics has been made only when the context allows for different readings, or when a different diacritic was found in the published edition or in other sources.²²
- Vocalization has been specified in many cases when the correct reading of the text is not straightforward.
- Conjectural additions to the text are indicated by point brackets: < > square brackets: [] indicates conjectural readings where the text is illegible. Each anecdote is numbered for the reader's convenience.
- List of reference are provided after the tradition to indicate their distribution in other sources.
- Proper names that occur either in the *isnāds* or in the text of the anecdotes are listed in an annotated index, in the last part of the book.
- It is important to see that Kinberg gives a lot of information in the footnotes. By working with footnotes, she provides the reader with all the required information.

Anyhow, in this sense, Kinberg has made a great work when dealing with the editing process. It can be seen in her way how she

traces the existence of available materials in later sources in every narrative she adds. Once she edits one narrative of KM, she explains in the bottom of that narrative some extant work where readers can find the material in other sources. She uses a wide range of books to complement and edit the narratives. These books include following genres: Qur'ān commentaries (*tafsīr*), *hadīth* collection, *sirah* and history works, *adab* treatises, biographical dictionaries, *zuḥd* and *sūfī* sources, and some Syri books.²³ By employing such a way, Kinberg is able to trace about 75% of KM's traditions in other sources. The notion that such a wide portion of KM can be traced in other sources attests to the popularity of the book.

It means, in editing the narrative and content of KM's manuscript Kinberg uses those parallels to deal with some problems such as illegible script, correcting miswritten words, completing missing parts, and more generally in producing an exhaustive text out of manuscript. It is, again, we can see the excellent work. Kinberg writes in the bottom of its narrative about those sources and how she deals with it.

The introduction and the bibliography

- How is her critical edition supported by introduction and bibliographies?

Clearly, Kinberg divides this part in some different subs; the introduction, *fiḥras al-i'lām* (containing a list of names mentioned in the manuscript), *fiḥras al-marāji'* (bibliography), and *fiḥras al-marāji' al-hadīṣah* (the newer bibliography). Here, we see that Kinberg differentiates or separates between *fiḥras al-marāji'* and *fiḥras al-marāji' al-hadīṣah*. I just assume that it is aimed by Kinberg to make readers easy in classifying the new and old ones of bibliography. This is acceptable. However, I do not know how she makes different categories between new and old bibliography. Because, as can be seen, if it refers to the year of publishing, it will not be acceptable, because she mentions some publications in *fiḥras al-marāji'* which are sometimes newer than that in *fiḥras al-marāji' al-hadīṣah*. And vice versa, she mentions some publications in *fiḥras al-marāji' al-hadīṣah*, which is in fact older than that of *fiḥras al-marāji'*. For instance, she mentions the book of the year 1921, which certainly is quite old, in the *fiḥras al-marāji' al-hadīṣah*, while many of new books is put on *fiḥras al-*

marāji'. In spite of that differentiation notion, by constructing such a system, a reader will be easy to look up information inside the edition.

In the introduction, the editor provides information about the KM, its composing, and the background of it. Information about the edition can also be found here, such as the nature of manuscript, the orthographic features, orthographic deviation, list of references and apparatus, index nominum, and some sources consulted by editor. As can be seen, Kinberg has given abundance of information with which she deals. The methodology by which the KM is worked out is abundantly explained.

The great effort has been made by Kinberg in listing more than 2000 names in his index nominum or *fibras al-I'lām*. This is certainly of great invaluable information in the editing such manuscript. Since the narratives within the KM are attached by *isnāds*, so many names are mentioned from the time of *shahābah* and later on. That's why what is done by Kinberg in listing these 2000 names together with an explanation about the biography of names is extremely remarkable. We know there are some names in *shahābah* which are similar with one another. This is the strength of Kinberg's work, for she has excellently used biographical dictionary to trace one by one of the name.

So far I consult some bibliographical tools, indeed Kinberg has used the relevant books to deal with her edition. However, I found information in Index Islamicus about the work of Ibnu Abi Dunya which is not used by Kinberg. This is, *the Qana'ah (Genugsamkeit) in der arabischen literature anhand des Kitab al-qana'a wa-l-ta'affuf* von Ibn Abi ad-Dunya, By Weninger, S. Berlin, 1992. A (nawati) G.C, *Institute Dominicain d'etudes orientales du caire: Melanges*. MIDEO, 21 (1993) p. 640-641(F) Rodriguez Manaz, F. *al-Qantara: Revista de estudios Arabes*, 14 I (1993), pp. 251-252.²⁴

The only remark that I can add is that it will much better if Kinberg gives more description about Ibn Abi Dunyā's biography. Kinberg excellently deal with the existence of KM. However, due to the idiosyncratic nature of it, I just think that the reader wants to know more who the author actually was? This becomes of great importance since Kinberg only writes little about the background of Ibn Abi Dunyā'. Certainly, it will not balance with the great achievement and a huge number of books of Ibn Abi Dunyā'. Commonly, once someone knows much about someone's works, s/he will eagerly want to know further about the person behind the works.

The historical background

- What is the historical background of the edited text?

In the beginning of this paper, I have already briefly mentioned about the existing manuscript of KM. In this section, I shall deal with stemma and textual criticism. As mentioned above, due to the availability of the manuscript, Kinberg has free choice to use one of the exiting photocopies of manuscript. What should be noted here is that Kinberg give no information about the nature why is it only one manuscript available of KM.

Initially I was surprised by her remark in the beginning of her introduction about the situation around the manuscript of KM. There, she proposes such a question to readers; why is it only one manuscript available of KM. While reading this Kinberg's question I assume that she will give broader explanation within her work. In fact, so far I read and evaluate this edition, nothing about it did I found within. Even I still hope to get its answers when reading the conclusion. Nevertheless, no such description was found in the conclusion. This may be my next remark toward Kinberg's critical edition of KM.

It is different, for instance, when we look back at the Witkam explanation about the manuscript of *Tsauq al-Hamama* of Ibn Ḥazm al-Andalusī. In this sense, Witkam clearly explains how the only one manuscript comes down to us. To him, the manuscript of *Tsauq al-Hamama* was first collected by Lavinus Warner in 1650s or 1660s in Istambul. Witkam traces, in such scientific presumption about who hold, copied, translated, and transferred the contents of *Tsauq al-Hamama*.²⁵ This matter is absent in Kinberg's edition. She did nothing to do so, or at least she does not give any information of traces, how the manuscript of KM comes down to us.

Thus, the nature of the manuscript of KM, which is only single one, implicates the difficulty to trace and construct the stemma. It is generally possible to construct such stemma if we have huge number of manuscripts²⁶

For the use of extant reading, Kinberg clearly edits KM very well. She uses more than 200 extant sources. It highly enables her to deal with variant readings arising in the nature of the content of of KM's manuscript. In addition to that, the earlier publishing of Egyptian and Lebanese critical edition has benefited Kinberg in that she can make such comparison in spite of, as I have mentioned above,

the absence of Kinberg's further information upon those two earlier editions.

Coclussion

- What is the overall assessment of the critical edition by the editor?

Having reviewed and looked at the critical edition by Leah Kinberg more briefly and having discussed some questions raised in this study, now, it is a turn to draw such conclusion of Kinberg's work. Regarding all information, data, and ways within the Kinberg's critical edition, here, I have to say that she has done extremely excellent work. Kinberg has added an importance work for scholarly sources. It will enable the latter researchers in dealing with tantamount matters, especially with the work of Ibn Abī Dunyā'. Kinberg has done a fantastic job with which the academic community will be much benefited.

It can be seen since the initial part of her work in which she does a great effort toward KM. Her introduction will much attract us since it offers the way, the source, and the methodology in such attractive way.

Viewing it closely, I was surprised by the data she gives in the footnotes. Dealing with a lot of classical sources, she very well attracts us with the way how she present those classical sources in such a way that we will, finally, clearly deal as well. Nonetheless, some critical points that maybe addressed to this work, as mentioned broadly above, lies merely as follow:

- a. The absence of her explanation about two previous editions, which are from Egypt and Lebanon. Meanwhile she mentioned that she uses those two editions as a source of comparison. However, so far she does the work; she does not give further information about what actually the Egyptian and Lebanese are like? What the weaknesses are? And what the strengths are?
- b. Unfortunately, so far I consult bibliographical reference in the Leiden University Library; I could not find those two editions of Ibrāhīm and Atha'. The main point why it is important to find such books is that Kinberg does not give further information about the nature of Egyptian and Lebanon edition. She merely

mentions that both editions are relatively inadequate without telling readers more about what inadequate is

- c. The absence of her establishing such historical traces dealing with the unique nature of KM's manuscript. As mentioned above, initially she surprises by telling about the unique situation of the manuscript of KM. Her initial statement about why it is only one manuscript available of KM may attract readers, but while reading the rest of her introduction, there is no information about it found.

In spite of those three remarks, Kinberg's work is absolutely great. It seems bit impossible to review the text in this paper. As explained before, Kinberg has edited this work three times before she decided to publish. Firstly was when she conducted her own editing, the second was when she found the Egyptian critical edition of KM, and the last time was when she found the Lebanon edition of the same work. Hence, I assume that this work has been published after having several attentions in editing. Consequently, this is a work which is carefully done, greatly scientific.

I have only looked at scholarly requisites for my evaluation of this critical edition. Regarding what has been done by Kinberg, I just conclude that Kinberg has met these scholarly requisites, ranging from the use of basis manuscript of the edited text, all the available text witnesses/text are bearers used, methods were employed beautifully to deal with variant readings, a length and full information of content in introduction, complete index (even she divides some parts), adequate bibliography (as mentioned above, despite I found one information about the work of Ibn Abī Dunyā' which is not used by her).

Endnotes:

¹ *Encyclopedia of Islam*, New Edition Vol V, edited by C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel and W.P. Heinrichs and the late CH. Pellat (Leiden, New York: E.J. Brill, 1993).

² Roger Allen, *an Introduction to Arabic Literature*, (Cambridge University Press, 2000), p. 149.

³ See, Julia Ashtiany, T.M. Johnstone, J.D. Lathan, R.B. Serjeant, and Grex Smith (eds), *Abbasid Belles Lettres*, 1998, p. 426 and 429.

⁴ See, *Arabic Literature to the End of the Umayyad Period*, A.F.L. Beestone, T.M. Johnstone, R.B. Serjeant, and GR. Smith (eds), 1998, p.355.

⁵ Julia Scott and Paul Starley, *Encyclopedia of Arabic Literature*, (London and New York, Routledge, 1998), p. 304.

⁶ See *Encyclopedia of Islam*, especially in the chapter of Ibn Abī Dunyā' Biography.

⁷ Leah Kinberg mentions that information about Ibn Abī Dunyā' can be found in many books. Among others are the introduction of *al-Ahwāl, 'Aql wa Fadhlūhu* (1988, 1989, 1993), *al-Auliā'* (1987, 1993), *Dam al-bāgi, Dhamm ad-Dunyā'* (English Introduction), *Dam al-Gibā wa an-Namimah*, *Dam al-Malahi* (19987, 1993), *Dam al-Muskir, al-Farāg ba'da as-Sidā, al-Hawātif*, etc.

⁸ Leah Kinberg, p. 13.

⁹ Leah Kinberg, p. 11.

¹⁰ Leah Kinberg, p. 12.

¹¹ Leah Kinberg, p. 16.

¹² Leah Kinberg, p. 9.

¹³ Leah Kinberg, p. 51.

¹⁴ J.J. Witkam, *Establishing the Stemma, Fact or Fiction, Manuscript of the Middle East 3*, (1998), p. 90.

¹⁵ Carl Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Literature*, Supplement II, p. 247. Meanwhile so far I consult Fuat Sezgin's book, *Geschichte des Arabischen Schrifttums* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967), there many explanation about Ibn Abī Dunyā', but I could not find the information about the manuscript of KM.

¹⁶ J.J. Witkam, *Establishing the Stemma*, p. 90.

¹⁷ J.J. Witkam, *Establishing the Stemma*, p. 88.

¹⁸ J.J. Witkam, *Establishing the Stemma*, p. 49.

¹⁹ See Arnaud Vrolijk, *Bringing a Laugh to a Scowling Face* (Leiden, 1998), p. 87-114.

²⁰ Arnaud Vrolijk, *Bringing a Laugh to a Scowling Face*, p. 90.

²¹ Arnaud Vrolijk, *Bringing a Laugh to a Scowling Face*, p. 51

²² Arnaud Vrolijk, *Bringing a Laugh to a Scowling Face*, p. 51.

²³ It is in this way of elaboration that I am attracted very much in Kinberg's work. She brilliantly conducts her work in such a way that makes readers easy and comfortable to enjoy the content of narrative of KM.

²⁴ See *Index Islamicus, The quarterly Index Islamicus: current books, articles and papers on Islamic studies*, (London: Mansell Information Publishing, 1977-1993).

²⁵ See J.J. Witkam, *Establishing the Stemma*, p. 90.

²⁶ J.J. Witkam, *Establishing the Stemma*, p. 94.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Roger, *an Introduction to Arabic Literature*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Arnaud Vrolijk, *Bringing a Laugh to a Scowling Face*, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1998

-
- Ashtiany, Julia, *et.al.*, (eds), *Abbasid Belles Lettres*, London and New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Beestone, A.F.L., *et.al.*, (eds), *Arabic Literature to the End of the Umayyad Period*, London and New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Brockelmann, Carl, *Geschichte der Arabischen Literature*, and its Supplement
- Scott, Julia, and Paul Starley, *Encyclopedia of Arabic Literature*, London and New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Sezgin, Fuat, *Geschichte des Arabischen Schrifttums*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967.
- Witkam, J.J., *Establishing the Stemma, Fact or Fiction, Manuscript of the Middle East 3*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1998