

**IBN SHUHAYD
AND HIS *RISĀLAT AT-TAWĀBI' WA-Z-ZAWĀBI'* (*)**

Jaakko HÄMEEN-ANTTILA
University of Helsinki⁽¹⁾

BIBLID [1133-8571] 8-9 (2000-2001) 353-368

Resumen: Este trabajo estudia la *Risālat at-tawābi'* de Ibn Šuhayd y su relación con las *rasā'il* suyas, probablemente anteriores y escritas por separado. Una *risāla* del texto resulta ser una nueva versión de un texto anterior que también se había puesto por separado en circulación.

Palabras claves: Ibn Šuhayd. *Risāla. Maqāma*. Historia textual.

Abstract: This paper studies Ibn Shuhayd's *Risālat at-tawābi'* and its relation to his presumably earlier, separately written *rasā'il*. One *risāla* of the text turns out to be a new redaction of an earlier piece which was also circulated separately.

Key words: Ibn Shuhayd. *Risāla. Maqāma*. Textual history.

Ibn Shuhayd's *Risālat at-Tawābi' wa-z-zawābi'* (in the following: *Tawābi'*) has received considerable scholarly attention, mainly because of its connections with the works describing celestial and otherworldly voyages and especially the

(*) [Sistema de transcripción: ', b, t, th, j, h, kh, d, dh, r, z, s, sh, ṣ, ḍ, ṭ, z', gh, f, q, k, l, m, n, h, w, y]

(1) First published in: *Journal of Arabic and Islamic Studies* 1 (1996-1997) [recte 1998], pp. 65-80. [on-line journal in the address <http://www.UIB.NO/JAIS>]

Divina Commedia of Dante⁽²⁾ and the *Risālat al-ghufrān* of al-Ma'arrī. The work has been preserved in fragments in Ibn Bassām's (d. 1147) anthology of Andalusian literature, *adh-Dhakhīra fī maḥāsīn ahl al-Jazīra* (in the following: *Dhakhīra*) I: 245-278, 283-301, it has been edited from these fragments by al-Bustānī and translated into English⁽³⁾ by Monroe (1971) together with a lengthy introduction to the work⁽⁴⁾.

The questions of the genetic links between these works are of primary importance, but it seems that the study of *Tawābi* ' *per se* has been slightly neglected⁽⁵⁾. The aim of this paper is to shed some new light on the structure of the work and on how Ibn Shuhayd wrote it and to put it in context within 11th century narrative, especially the *Maqāmāt*.

The early eleventh century was a period of vivid experimentation in narrative prose, and *Tawābi* ' finds its place within this development. Just a few decades before Ibn Shuhayd (992-1035)⁽⁶⁾ wrote his work, Badī' az-Zamān al-Hamadhānī (d. 1008) had written his *Maqāmāt* on the other side of the Islamic world, and was to find many followers in the next decades⁽⁷⁾. In Syria, al-Ma'arrī was writing his *rasā'il*, and Ibn Buṭlān soon wrote his *Da'wat al-aṭibbā* ⁽⁸⁾, and in the Eastern parts of the Islamic world, close to al-Hamadhānī both in time and in space, al-

- (2) It would be tempting to try to find links between *Tawābi* ' , written in Spain, and the later *Viaje del Parnaso* literature in the same country (e.g. Cervantes) but it seems that *Viaje del Parnaso* was not autochthonous to Christian Spain but was received from Renaissance Italy. The literature concerning celestial and otherworldly visitations has been much in vogue since the Sumerians and the influences have criss-crossed all over the Mediterranean for five millennia.
- (3) There is also a translation by S. Barbera (*Ibn Xuhaid, Epistola de los genios o árbol del donaire*. Santander: Sur 1981).
- (4) When quoting from *Tawābi* ' , I use the following form: I: 00 / 00 / 00. Read: *Dhakhīra* I: 00 / ed. al-Bustānī, p. 00 / tr. Monroe, p. 00. When necessary, I abbreviate B for the edition of al-Bustānī and M for the translation by Monroe. The references to *Tawābi* ' are primarily to Ibn Bassām's *Dhakhīra*. The "edition" of al-Bustānī — which was also used as the basis for his translation by Monroe — is otherwise a faithful reproduction of the text, but it lacks the immediate context of the fragment, and the comments of Ibn Bassām who could inspect the whole text whereas we have only the fragments he selected. Thus his comments on his own selection are valuable and should not have been dropped from the edition.
- (5) Ibn Shuhayd's work is very important for the literary criticism it contains, but this subject lies outside the scope of this article.
- (6) The biography of Ibn Shuhayd is found in several major biographical dictionaries and the main points of it have been discussed by al-Bustānī (1980 [1951]) and, following him, Monroe (1971).
- (7) See Hämeen-Anttila (1997) and (1998).
- (8) For which, see Hämeen-Anttila (1998).

Azdī wrote his *Hikāyat Abī-l-Qāsim* and Ibn Nāqiyā was soon to follow with his *Maqāmāt*.

The exact relations of these works are not always easy to pinpoint, but the three works which concern us here are the *Maqāmāt* of al-Hamadhānī, *Risālat al-ghufrān* of al-Ma'arrī and *Tawābi'*.

Tawābi' and *Risālat al-ghufrān* resemble each other so closely that one has to presuppose a genetic link between the two. The consensus of scholars seems nowadays to be that it was al-Ma'arrī who was influenced by Ibn Shuhayd, not vice versa, although Pellat's (1969, p. 939a) very early date for *Tawābi'* has to be rejected. Monroe (1971, p. 16-17) dates the work to circa 1025-1027 (see also al-Bustānī 1980 [1951], p. 67-70). Although his evidence is not decisive, it does seem that the work was written some years before al-Ma'arrī wrote his in 1032⁽⁹⁾.

The influence of Ibn Shuhayd on al-Ma'arrī is quite possible, since we know that his prose and verse did arrive in Iran at about the same time; in the final version of his *Yatīmat ad-dahr*, ath-Tha'ālibī (d. 1038) is able to quote passages from Ibn Shuhayd⁽¹⁰⁾. Whether ath-Tha'ālibī knew his *Tawābi'* is a question which will be tentatively answered below.

The other genetic link which is of importance is that between the slightly earlier *Maqāmāt* of al-Hamadhānī and *Tawābi'* —if al-Ma'arrī got his impetus to write *Risālat al-ghufrān* from Ibn Shuhayd's work, there is no need to speculate on his relations with the *Maqāmāt* in the present context.

al-Hamadhānī's work seems to have been crucial for the development of Arabic narrative literature. All the *Maqāmāt* proper were written under his aegis⁽¹¹⁾ and many other works either acknowledge their debt to him or their analysis shows this without any doubt⁽¹²⁾. His work became widely known in the Arabic West very soon after having been written, so that Ibn Shuhayd must have known him, at least by reputation.

(9) See also J.M. Contente Ferrer, *Consideraciones en torno a las relaciones entre la Risālat al-Tawābi' de Ibn Šuhayd y la Risālat al-Gufrān de al-Ma'arrī*. Actas de las I Jornadas de Cultura Árabe e Islámica. Madrid: Instituto Hispano-Árabe de Cultura 1981, p. 125-134.

(10) See also al-Bustānī (1980 [1951]), p. 74-75.

(11) Note that not all works which later came to be called *Maqāmāt* were, on the other hand, imitations of al-Hamadhānī's *Maqāmāt*; there is, e.g., no reason to suggest any Hamadhanian influence on Ibn Buḫlān's *Da'wa*, see Hämeen-Anttila (1998).

(12) E.g. Ibn Sharaf's *Masā'il al-intiqād*; one should also not forget that al-Hamadhānī's work was anthologised already by al-Ḥuṣrī (d. 1022) in his *Zahr al-ādāb*.

Ibn Shuhayd mentions al-Hamadhānī in his work and is able to quote a passage by him on a description of water (I:276/128/79). The passage comes from al-Hamadhānī's *al-Maqāma al-Maḍīriyya* (p. 137)⁽¹³⁾ but it is also found almost in the same form in the anthology of al-Ḥuṣrī (*Zahr al-ādāb*, p. 235), though without being attributed to al-Hamadhānī.

As Ibn Shuhayd knew the *Maqāmāt*,⁽¹⁴⁾ it is very probable that he was influenced by them. Openly fictitious writing outside the genre of *maqāma* was rather infrequent in the early 11th century — though not totally lacking — and al-Hamadhānī may have provided the main impetus for Ibn Shuhayd to select a fictitious story as his medium. The main theme of the work, literary criticism, was also the subject of some *Maqāmāt*, both in the aesthetic *Maqāmāt*⁽¹⁵⁾ of al-Hamadhānī and those of many later authors, e.g. the compatriot of Ibn Shuhayd, Ibn al-Ashtarkūwī as-Saraqustī, though these are by no means the only works dealing with literary criticism: the genre had its heyday in the tenth and eleventh centuries. The setting of the scene in a fictitious journey through the country of the *mn* does remind one of the travel theme in the *Maqāmāt*. Similarly, his use of two main protagonists — the first person narrator and his Jinni guide — resembles the use of a hero and a narrator in the *Maqāmāt*, and the comic elements are similar in both. *Tawābi'* differs from the *Maqāmāt* mainly in its moderate use of *ṣaj'*, as well as the lack of any picaresque hero.

Reciprocally, it is probable that the narrative technique of Ibn Shuhayd influenced the later Spanish *maqāma* tradition, most notably so the slightly later Abū Ḥafṣ 'Umar ibn ash-Shahīd, whose *Maqāma* has been preserved in fragments in the anthology of Ibn Bassām (*Dhakhīra* I: 674-685)⁽¹⁶⁾. The speaking animals

(13) See also *Maqāmāt*, p. 100.

(14) It goes without saying that he did not necessarily know *all* the *Maqāmāt* of the present standard collection; it seems that a separate collection of twenty *Maqāmāt* circulated widely in North Africa. See Hämeen-Anttila (1998).

(15) On the subgenres of the Hamadhanian *Maqāma*, see Hämeen-Anttila (1997). Especially fragment §3 (I: 283-296 / 132-146 / 82-92) is very similar in tenor to the Hamadhanian aesthetic *Maqāma*.

(16) Ibn ash-Shahīd's work has received unduly little attention. The work, although preserved only in fragments, is a masterpiece and seems to have been very influential (on its influence on al-Ḥarīzī and his *Tahkemoni*, see de la Granja 1976, p. 92-94, referring to an article in Hebrew by S.M. Stern). The structural similarity of the work with Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* is striking, although it would be hasty to draw any genetic links between the two. The hero of the *Maqāma* seems to have been a *faqīh* — like the belching *faqīh* of Ibn Shuhayd, see below — called Ibn al-Ḥadīd, although his rôle in the story remains somewhat obscure due to the fragmentary condition of the text.

(animal Jinnis, that is) in *Tawābi'* (I: 296-301 / 147-152 / 93-96) seem to be missing from the earlier *Maqāmāt* but they come up in the *Maqāma* of Ibn ash-Shahīd; whether they found their way from Ibn Shuhayd's work to Spanish *Maqāmāt* (and to al-Ma'arrī, for that matter) is not certain but this is a reasonable guess. Similarly, the scene of Abū Nuwās with the monks in *Tawābi'* (I: 258-259 / 104-105 / 63-64) links the work of Ibn Shuhayd to the *Maqāma* of Ibn ash-Shahīd, although the scene itself would have been readily available from all literature where Abū Nuwās and his carousals were described.

Ibn Shuhayd's *Tawābi'* comes thus into the margin of *maqāma* literature. It may have been influenced by al-Hamadhānī's *Maqāmāt*, but the author obviously did not feel that he was writing within any fixed limits of a new genre. al-Hamadhānī had given good ideas — perhaps the whole structure of *Tawābi'* owes something to al-Hamadhānī — but the field was quite open, and there were many other works which may have influenced him; the beggar literature, anecdotes concerning men in rags with golden mouths, perhaps even *Hā'ik al-kalām*⁽¹⁷⁾ — Ibn Shuhayd uses the metaphor in I: 268 / 116 / 71, although as this is a frequent metaphor, it does not prove that he knew the Weaver of Words anecdote.

The original structure of *Tawābi'* is, of course, partly lost as the work has been preserved only in fragments, but thanks to Ibn Bassām's rather faithful reproduction of his materials, we are able to reconstruct it to a certain extent, especially with the help of ath-Tha'ālibī's *Yatīmat ad-dahr*, which has been strangely neglected in earlier studies.

Ibn Bassām selected four (or five) fragments from the text of *Tawābi'*, viz. §1 *Dhakhīra* I: 245-248; §2 I: 248-278; §3 I: 283-296; §4 I: 296-301; fragment §2 may be divisible into two parts, I: 248-275 and I: 275-278, (boundary in I: 275 l. -1 / 127 / 79)⁽¹⁸⁾.

The work contained a Preface; the first fragment is most easily thus understood, and Ibn Bassām (I: 245) does identify it as such, calling his selection *fuṣūl min risāla* and introducing the first fragment with *qāla fī ṣadri-hā* (missing from B and M). Ibn Shuhayd himself (I: 248 / 90 / 53) says that his work (*kitāb*) is but a selection of all that happened between him and his familiar spirit, Zuhayr

(17) See Hämeen-Anttila (1998).

(18) As al-Bustānī and Monroe do not give the crucially important (although consisting only of three words: *qāla Abū 'Āmir*) information of Ibn Bassām, the possible boundary remains invisible in B and M.

ibn Numayr, but that he gives us only some of these stories (*qiṣaṣ*) so that the book would not become too long —yet Ibn Bassām thought it did become disproportionately long (I: 278, missing from B and M).

Briefly stated, the work describes the travels of Ibn Shuhayd —who uses his *kunya* Abū ‘Amir when speaking of himself as a character⁽¹⁹⁾— in the land of the Jinnis with his own familiar spirit⁽²⁰⁾ as a guide, and tells of their encounters with the Jinnis there.

The longest fragment §2 (I: 248-278 / 91-131 / 54-81) —which obviously is the absolute beginning of the main text, as the theme of travelling to the land of the Jinnis is here brought forward for the first time— consists of encounters with these Jinnis. The encounters in this fragment have an invariable structure: the Jinnis recite some of the poetry with which they have inspired the ancient poets and Ibn Shuhayd impresses them by quoting his own verses, after which he receives their *ijāza*, the licence to transmit their poems.

The theme of *ijāza* seems to have played a certain rôle in Ibn Shuhayd's real life, too. He is here on the defensive, as if he had been accused of not being able to produce regular *ijāzas* for the poetry he quoted; his opponents in the field seem to have criticised him for not having learnt the craft through respectable channels. The work is flavoured by a certain polemic tone against this opposition (see al-Bustānī 1980 [1951], p. 28-37, 54-55, 70-71, and Monroe 1971, p. 18). Ibn Shuhayd seems to be making light of the opposition he had met with, by providing these fictitious *ijāzas*⁽²¹⁾. His openly hostile attitude may be seen in his encounter in I: 274 / 124 / 77-78 with Anf an-Nāqa, the familiar spirit of the learned commentator of al-Mutanabbī, al-Ifḫīlī. When Anf an-Nāqa tries to dismiss him by calling him: *fatan lam a‘rif ‘alā man qara‘a*, Ibn Shuhayd rather sharply

(19) Most *maqāma* heroes are best known by their *kunya*, e.g. Abū-l-Faḥḥ, Abū Zayd, Abū Ḥabīb (Ibn al-Ashtarkūwī's hero) etc. Using the *kunya* is a form of familiarity in Mediaeval Arabic.

(20) According to an old belief — though at least in later sources the question is of a topos, not of an actual belief — the poet was inspired by a familiar spirit. The idea goes back to pre-Islamic times and possibly to the prehistory of Arabic poetry, when poets (*shā‘ir*) and *kāhins* were still men in contact with the supernatural.

(21) A similar but more serious phenomenon was also usual in the sphere of mysticism and esoteric Islam, where many charismatic figures have claimed that they have learnt their wisdom from *imām al-ghayb* (Persian *ustād-i ghayb*) and received their religious authority from him. Thus, e.g., the late 18th century leader of the Shaykhiyya movement, shaykh al-Aḥṣā‘ī claimed to have received the *ijāzas* of the Imams and the Prophet in dreams.

reciprocates by asking who were the teachers of Anf an-Nāqa. For Ibn Shuhayd, poetry was a natural gift which did not ask for any learned channels of transmission.

The second fragment is very long and seems to be of one piece, although there might be a break in I: 275; in any case the bulk of the fragment is of one piece, although there naturally always remains the possibility of very subtle omissions, but this is not very probable, especially in the light of the evidence provided by *Yatīma*, see below. Thus we may take the passage, at least until I: 275, as one fragment⁽²²⁾.

Within this fragment, the narration is continuous and the episodes are carefully linked together to make an illusion of evenly flowing narrative. I: 251-252 / 95-96 / 57 provides an example of these links: *fa-ṣāḥa 'Antar* [the familiar spirit of Ṭarafa]: "... " *wa-ghāba 'annā. thumma milnā 'an-hu fa-qāla lī Zuhayr* [Abū 'Āmir's familiar spirit]: "*ilā man tatuqu nafsu-ka ba'du min al-jāhiliyyīn?*" *Qultu*: "... ". This shows clearly that the episodes were not independent—as in the *Maqāmāt* of al-Hamadhānī—but that they were melted together to form one continuous narrative, as was later done in the *Maqāmāt* of Ibn ash-Shahīd and others.

The size of the original work is not very easy to estimate. The Jāhilī poets are discussed only on a few pages: I: 252 / 95 / 57 explicitly marks the end of the passage starting in I: 248 / 91 / 54. There are no obvious fragment boundaries in between, and the passage seems to be unabbreviated. Similarly, I: 267 / 114 / 70 marks the end of the passage on the older poets in general, and Ibn Shuhayd and his Jinni head for the orators; later, there comes a passage (fragment §3) on aesthetic questions and another on contemporary poets and critics, the most satirical of all (§4), but the twenty pages allotted to *all* pre-Islamic and Eastern poets together seems to indicate that we still have a major part of the original work at our disposal and that *Tawābi'* was thus considerably shorter than al-Ma'arrī's *Risālat al-ghufrān*.

In the longest fragment (§2), the theme of travelling is very prominent. In the beginning the two protagonists go to the land of the Jinnīs (I: 248), and later they

(22) One should, though, be careful in deducing anything from the omissions of the text. Monroe (1971), p. 19, may well be right, though, in assuming that the omission of the great Umayyad poets Jarīr, al-Farazdaq, al-Akḥṭal and Dhū r-Rumma are not fortuitous but indicate Ibn Shuhayd's aesthetic preferences.

move on after each encounter, with careful links tying the episodes together and containing references to travelling.

The exact nature of fragments §3 and §4 and their place within the whole work is more problematic. These fragments start rather abruptly: §3 (I: 283 / 132 / 82) starts with: *qāla Abū 'Āmir* (either part of the text or an addition by Ibn Bassām): *wa-ḥaḍartu aydan ana wa-Zuhayr majlisan min majālis al-Jinn...*, making no effort to link this with what may have preceded it. Similarly §4 starts (I: 296 / 147 / 93): *qāla Abū 'Āmir: wa-mashaytu yawman ana wa-Zuhayr bi-ard al-Jinn aydan...* They may also have ended without links with the next episode; e.g. I: 301 / 152 / 96 ends with: *fa-nṣarafat wa-nṣarafnā*, which sounds rather final.

Thus at least this part of *Tawābi'*—obviously the latter part; this is implied both by the subject matter (pre-Islamic and Eastern poets must have preceded contemporary and Western poets) and by the general tendency of Ibn Bassām to excerpt larger works retaining the order of material in them—seems to have been more loose than the first part, and the episodes seem to have been more independent towards the end of the book. Even in these fragments, though, Ibn Shuhayd is carefully inserting sentences which stress the continuous character of the narration. Thus, e.g., in I: 286 / 134 / 84 Ibn Shuhayd asks Zuhayr concerning a certain Jinni: *"fa-ḥallā 'arrafta-nī sha'na-hū mundhu ḥīn?"*

Ibn Shuhayd is very careful in keeping the illusion of narrative reality. In I: 269 / 117 / 73, Abū 'Āmir is able to use the *kunya* of a Jinni who has only just been introduced to him, without his *kunya* having been mentioned. Here Ibn Shuhayd adds, as if in brackets: *wa-qad kāna Zuhayr 'arafa-nī bi-kunyati-hī*, thus making a narrow escape from making his character Abū 'Āmir an omniscient narrator.

The general resemblance of *Tawābi'* with the *Maqāmāt* has already been mentioned. There are also features which are similar to though not identical with those of the *Maqāmāt*. The early recognition scene between Abū 'Āmir (Ibn Shuhayd) and the mysterious character who turns out to be Zuhayr (who knows the narrator although Abū 'Āmir does not know him, cf. the anagnorisis in the *Maqāmāt*) in the beginning (I: 247 / 89 / 52) reminds one of the *Maqāmāt*, as does the anagnorisis in the last fragment; in I: 298 / 149 / 94 the mule, which had been

speaking to the two protagonists, removes its veil (*lithām*)⁽²³⁾ and Abū 'Āmir, the Narrator, exclaims: "*fa-idhā hiya baghlat Abī 'Īsā*", just like 'Īsā ibn Hishām had exclaimed: *fa-idhā huwa*...

Ibn Shuhayd knew al-Hamadhānī. In I: 276 / 127-128 / 79 he meets the familiar spirit of al-Hamadhānī, called *Zubdat al-ḥiqab*⁽²⁴⁾ and the Jinni has to admit the superiority of Ibn Shuhayd —throughout the work Ibn Shuhayd does make it clear that his prose and verse is, to say the least, not inferior to that of the Easterners, not to mention his compatriots and contemporaries.⁽²⁵⁾

Within the work, Ibn Shuhayd quotes not only from his own poetry but also from his own *rasā'il*. One of these quotations is of special interest, viz. the *risāla* on the description of sweets, *ḥalwā'*, (I: 270-272 / 119-122 / 74-76). This has many similarities with the *Maqāmāt*, as was already noted by al-Bustānī (1980 [1951]), p. 52, and, following him, Monroe (1971), p. 28⁽²⁶⁾. The description of food was a favourite topic of al-Hamadhānī, especially in the *Maqāmāt*. The theme is naturally well known from elsewhere, too, but Ibn Shuhayd also uses a comic character, a *faqīh* who is unusually fond of sweets and eats too many of them until he belches and the company is dissolved —*fa-lam najtami' ba'da-hā wa-s-salām*. This might well belong to the same comic tradition as the *Maqāmāt*.

This *risāla* is very important. It is found with some other *risālas* in ath-Tha'ālibī, *Yatīma* II: 46-49, and the possibility of comparing the versions of Ibn

(23) Monroe translates "bridle", obviously misreading *lijām*.

(24) Monroe (1971, p. 79, note 41) takes the name to be a parody of Badī' az-zamān and writes that al-Hamadhānī's "name means 'the wonder of the age', while *Zubdat al-ḥiqab* 'the butter of the years' is a humorous parody". Monroe's translation is humorous, that goes without saying, but *zubda* as "choicest part; quintessence" is used in quite serious contexts. Many a Mediaeval work — e.g. the epitome of an history of Aleppo, *Zubdat al-ḥalab min ta'rīkh Ḥalab* — has *zubda* in its title with not the slightest shade of parody implied.

(25) Ibn Shuhayd becomes a paragon of the West, whose work is shown to be on a par with that of the Easterners. Whether he represents the whole West (e.g. I: 276 / 128 / 79 he is called *fatā l-Maghrib* "champion [Monroe: youth] of the West"), is not quite clear. His personal superiority does not necessitate reading any patriotic overtones into the text, although these are quite possible.

(26) Monroe also comments on the possible influence of al-Hamadhānī's *al-Maqāma al-Iblīsiyya* on *Tawābī'*. It is somewhat disturbing that neither al-Bustānī nor Monroe deem it necessary to consult the text of the same *risāla* in ath-Tha'ālibī, *Yatīmat ad-dahr* (II:47-49); the former does mention ath-Tha'ālibī but does not give any further attention to the variant version, the latter does not even refer to him nor is *Yatīma* given in his bibliography.

Bassām and ath-Tha‘ālibī with each other allows us to see how Ibn Shuhayd moulded his *risālas* when inserting them into *Tawābī‘*.

In *Yatīma* II: 46-49, ath-Tha‘ālibī quotes five⁽²⁷⁾ *risālas* on the description of different objects by Ibn Shuhayd, viz. a flea, a gnat, a fox, water, and sweets, in this order. Four of these five are also found in *Dhakhīra* (i.e. *Tawābī‘*), viz. sweets, flea, fox, and water, in this order (I: 270-276 / 119-128 / 74-79).

The nearly identical selection and its order is interesting. The three short *risālas* (flea, fox, water) are also almost identical in wording⁽²⁸⁾ —for the fourth, see below.

The possibility of either using the other’s work is naturally excluded: Ibn Bassām wrote a century after ath-Tha‘ālibī, and ath-Tha‘ālibī gives only the short descriptive *risālas* (and the poems), not the text of *Tawābī‘* itself. Thus, both offer material taken directly from the works of Ibn Shuhayd himself which makes *Yatīma* of special value in evaluating the selection of Ibn Bassām and in studying Ibn Shuhayd’s technique in compiling *Tawābī‘* from his earlier materials.

There are some questions which may now be answered when we study both sources in comparison. First of all: did ath-Tha‘ālibī quote from *Tawābī‘*? At the first look, this would seem to be so, but the question is more complicated. In *Tawābī‘*, Ibn Shuhayd is quoting himself: all the poetry and the descriptions were definitively not written for *Tawābī‘*, nor does Ibn Shuhayd claim they were: the character Abū ‘Āmir is recalling his, i.e. Ibn Shuhayd’s, earlier poetry and prose.

The identical order of the three short *risālas* in *Yatīma* and *Dhakhīra* would speak for ath-Tha‘ālibī having taken them from *Tawābī‘*, but the fourth makes the situation complicated —it should also be noted that ath-Tha‘ālibī does not mention *Tawābī‘* which, one would think, would have merited a mention if he knew of its existence.

The fourth *risāla*, on sweets, is intriguing. ath-Tha‘ālibī obviously quotes from a recension other than that used by Ibn Bassām. The differences between the two are considerable, both in wording and in selection of material, and not explicable as scribal omissions, nor as selections made by the respective anthologists, Ibn Bassām and ath-Tha‘ālibī, who otherwise, e.g. in the three other

(27) These five *risālas* are preceded by two other *risālas* (II:44-46).

(28) The edition of *Yatīma* is, though, not impeccable, but most of the variants can easily be attributed either to a careless copyist or a careless editor. There are no major differences which could not be explained as simple scribal (editorial?) errors.

risālas, reproduce their source verbatim, as their comparison with each other shows.

Ath-Tha'ālibī's version of the fourth *risāla* is a full grown narrative: the scene is first set, the characters are introduced, the incident with the sweets is related, and the dispersal of the company is mentioned—and the result is a piece very similar to the *Maqāmāt*. Ibn Bassām's version concentrates on the descriptions and lacks the introduction.

It seems clear that Ibn Shuhayd himself has here revised his work, and the two texts represent different redactions. As the author himself indicates that he is quoting his older works in *Tawābi'* and the analysis confirms the existence of two different redactions, there does not seem to be reason to doubt this: the text of the fourth *risāla* in *Dhakhīra* (i.e. *Tawābi'*) is a later redaction of an earlier *risāla*⁽²⁹⁾.

Ibn Bassām's version is, then, from *Tawābi'*, while that of ath-Tha'ālibī is not from it, but from another source, obviously the same original collection which Ibn Shuhayd used as his source when writing his *Tawābi'*, which would also explain the nearly identical order of materials in the two sources. The case of the fourth *risāla* makes it probable that the other three plus one *risālas* (flea, gnat, fox, and water) in *Yatīma* are also taken from this original source, not from *Tawābi'*, but the poetic quotations in *Dhakhīra / Tawābi'* and *Yatīma* (II: 35-44 + 49-50) have to be taken into consideration before answering the question. The last two fragments of verses quoted in *Yatīma* (II: 49-50) obviously come from a source other than *Tawābi'* or its original source—note that they are separated from the other poetic quotations by the 2 + 5 *risālas* (II: 44-49)—and can be left outside the discussion here.

In the main part of the article on Ibn Shuhayd in *Yatīma* (II: 35-44) ath-Tha'ālibī quotes fragments from 12 poems by Ibn Shuhayd. Eleven of these are also found in *Dhakhīra / Tawābi'* and in the same order as in *Yatīma* (which is not according to the rhyme). In addition, there are 16 poems in *Dhakhīra / Tawābi'* which are not found in *Yatīma*. A comparison⁽³⁰⁾ of the poems in *Yatīma* and *Dhakhīra / Tawābi'* shows that despite the identical order of these 11 poems, the selection of verses differs in the two sources.

(29) Al-Hamadhānī himself had incorporated into his collection pieces that had originally been *risālas*, see Hämeen-Anttila (1998).

(30) See Appendix.

The selection in *Yatīma* was, of course, done by ath-Tha‘ālibī himself—he is an anthologist who selects the best verses and freely omits others—but the question is, is Ibn Bassām responsible for the selection of verses in *Dhakhīra*? First of all, it is obvious that Ibn Shuhayd quoted his own poems only partially, i.e. he made the initial selection. The abbreviations are indicated in the first person (e.g. I: 255 / 100 / 60: *ilā an intahaytu fī-hā ilā qawlī*) which hardly comes from Ibn Bassām; the editorial policy of Mediaeval anthologists does not favour tampering with the exact wording of their sources to the extent that the anthologist would add words in the first person referring to the author.

Whether Ibn Bassām made yet another selection of the material already once selected by the author himself, is a more difficult question, but I believe that the answer has to be negative; the structure of *Tawābi‘* does not favour very long poetic quotations—in its present form the longest quotation, I: 265-267 / 112-114 / 68-70, consists of 24 verses—but the variance between *Dhakhīra* / *Tawābi‘* and *Yatīma* is so marked that their common source must have contained very long quotations from Ibn Shuhayd's poetry; the poem in *Yatīma* II: 41-42, consisting of two fragments (5 + 9 verses) has only five verses⁽³¹⁾ in common with the 24-verse fragment in *Tawābi‘* and the distribution of the common verses implies a much longer source for both.

All considered, it seems that the verses in *Yatīma* do not come from *Tawābi‘* despite the identical order of the poems, but there have been two independent selections: Ibn Shuhayd⁽³²⁾ selected verses from his own poetry for *Tawābi‘* and ath-Tha‘ālibī excerpted the same original source, not *Tawābi‘*. This original source may well have been a rather short⁽³³⁾ collection of poems from the youthful production of Ibn Shuhayd, as was suggested by Pellat.⁽³⁴⁾ The similar selection of

(31) All from the second fragment of *Yatīma*. The verses are (the verse number of *Yatīma* / the verse number of *Tawābi‘*): 6/3, 7/4, 8/11, 9/20 and 13/23.

(32) There is one incidence where either Ibn Bassām has cut a whole fragment off or, more probably, this has been done inadvertently by the copyist, viz. I: 267 / 114 / 70 where the main part of the poem is missing.

(33) Otherwise one cannot explain how the selections of both *Yatīma* and *Tawābi‘* came so close to each other.

(34) Pellat (1969), p. 939a. Pellat's dating of the whole work to before 1011 is, however, hardly acceptable, but he is certainly right in suggesting later additions to an earlier core, and ath-Tha‘ālibī's evidence seems to confirm this.

poetry by both anthologists also confirms that the second fragment of *Tawābi'* (§2) has been preserved intact.

The fourth *risāla*, on sweets, shows us how Ibn Shuhayd worked in inserting his earlier prose into *Tawābi'*. The original *Risālat al-ḥalwā'* (i.e. the version of *Yatīma*) was revised and modified by him to fit it into the new context of *Tawābi'*. The narrative parts of the *risāla* were minimized; in the new context he was only concerned with descriptions. That Ibn Shuhayd did keep the end, is a compromise; without it the descriptions would have been somewhat loose in the context. In the older version presented in *Yatīma* there is a kind of double introduction, typical of many *Maqāmāt* (general introduction and the introduction of the main episode). First, Ibn Shuhayd describes the prayer and then continues with the scene that leads to the description of the sweets.

The version of *Yatīma* is closer to *Maqāmāt*, though it may have been written without any influence by al-Hamadhānī. If *Tawābi'* was written about 1025-27 and the *risāla* was then incorporated, it cannot much postdate, say, 1020. In that case, its date comes annoyingly close to that of the *Maqāmāt*. Technically, Ibn Shuhayd may well have already known the *Maqāmāt* at that time, but that would be one of the earliest cases of *Maqāma* influence anywhere⁽³⁵⁾. It may be more probable that Ibn Shuhayd came to compose *Risālat al-ḥalwā'* as Ibn Buṭlān came to compose *Da'wat al-aṭibbā'*; independently from al-Hamadhānī but influenced by the same sources which had influenced al-Hamadhānī. —That Ibn Shuhayd knew the *Maqāmāt* when writing the final version of *Tawābi'* is more probable.

Against this background, it is intriguing to note that the original version of the fourth *risāla* is much closer to the *Maqāmāt* than the version in *Tawābi'* whose resemblance to *Maqāmāt* has been noted by earlier scholars. The similarity with al-Hamadhānī's work is clear but the *risāla* resembles even more the *Maqāmāt* of the slightly later Ibn Nāqiyā. Both have an unpleasant hero; Ibn Nāqiyā's al-Yashkurī might well be the cousin of the belching *faqīh* of Ibn Shuhayd. The obvious admiration of al-Ḥarīrī for his hero Abū Zayd, is definitely missing in the cases of al-Yashkurī and the belching *faqīh*. They are unpleasant and off-putting, in keeping with the tone of the beggar literature in general. The eloquence of the protagonists is here perfectly mixed with their unpleasant

(35) al-Ḥuṣrī's *Zahr al-ādāb* could have been available to him, but *al-Maqāma al-Maḍṭriyya* is not quoted in it. If Ibn Shuhayd wrote the *risāla* under the influence of al-Hamadhānī, his reaction to the *Maqāmāt* must have been instantaneous, provoking him into writing a *risāla* in the same style.

behaviour, thus making them real heroes of *maqāmāt al-kudya*; al-Hamadhānī's hero Abū l-Faṭḥ is never overtly unpleasant, al-Ḥarīrī's even less so, and even Ibn al-Ashtarkūwī's hero Abū Ḥabīb who sometimes comes close to al-Yashkurī, always finally overcomes all his unpleasant, external features (yellow teeth etc.) by his wit. Al-Yashkurī and the belching *faqīh* are disgusting, though eloquent, comic heroes whom we can laugh at.

The first section of the *risāla* (*Yatīma* II: 47, seven lines) which has been left out by Ibn Shuhayd from his *Tawābi'* was not superfluous in the original, although Ibn Shuhayd managed to do without it in *Tawābi'*. The first section creates a marked contrast between the sublime ecstasy of Ibn Shuhayd in prayer and the down-to-earth ecstasy of the *faqīh* with the sweets. Much of the dialogue between the narrator and the *faqīh* has been dropped (*Yatīma* a II: 47-48), whereas two descriptive passages have been added in *Tawābi'* (I: 270-271 / 120-121 / 74-75, on *qubayṭā'* and *thamar an-nashā*). In these cases, though, we cannot be sure whether the passages are additions in the later redaction of the *risāla* by Ibn Shuhayd himself or whether Ibn Bassām has abbreviated the *risāla* or, finally, whether the copyists (or editor) inadvertantly dropped these passages. Ibn Shuhayd's own editorial work remains, though, the most unforced suggestion. As for cutting out the narrative parts, Ibn Shuhayd does admit that what he gives in *Tawābi'* is but a selection of the original *risāla* (I: 270 / 119 / 74: *min risālatī fī l-ḥalwā'*).

The comparison between *Dhakhīra* and *Yatīma* also shows how faithful Ibn Bassām was to his source. The three short *risālas* are almost identical in the two books —disregarding the copyists' errors— and the fourth is so completely rewritten that the redaction cannot have originated with Ibn Bassām, but must date back to the author himself.

APPENDIX:

Poems of Ibn Shuhayd quoted in *Yatīma* and *Tawābi'* (36)

Rhyme	<i>Yatīma</i> verses	<i>Tawābi'</i> verses
R	35-36 3+8	92-93/137 5/6 ⁽³⁷⁾
L	36-37 9	94-95 1+13
'	37-38 17+4	97 1+10 ⁽³⁸⁾
Q	38-39 1+8+4	98-99 1+4 ⁽³⁹⁾
M	39 8 ⁽⁴⁰⁾	100-101 5+5
B	39-40 16	103-104 1+10+2 ⁽⁴¹⁾
D	40-41 17	107-109 15 ⁽⁴²⁾
L	41-42 5+9 ⁽⁴³⁾	112-114 24
N	42-43 1+15	114 1
T	43 10	129-130 8 ⁽⁴⁴⁾
S	43 2	130 5
M	44 7	— — ⁽⁴⁵⁾

(36) To make the Table simple, I have given references only to the edition of al-Bustānī. The references to *Yatīma* are to vol. II. When either of the sources quotes several fragments, the verses are counted separately (e.g. 2 + 2). When only one hemistich of the first verse is given, this is counted as one verse. If not otherwise stated, the smaller number of verses is included within the larger.

The following 16 fragments, quoted in *Tawābi'*, are without parallel in *Yatīma*: p. 89, R 1+1+1; p. 90, ā 3; p. 99-100, D 9+2; p. 106, R 5; p. 109, H 1+2; p. 110, D 1+4; p. 110-111, ' 6; p. 123, R 6; p. 136, S 5 (see Monroc 1971, p. 85 note 12); p. 138, B 4; p. 140, R 7; p. 141, Q 4; p. 141, B 4; p. 141-143, R 15; p. 143-144, M 13; and p. 146, R 2.

(37) The second fragment, p. 137, contains the same verses as the first with one additional verse. All verses are from the second fragment of *Yatīma*.

(38) The last six verses are without parallel in *Yatīma*.

(39) One verse is without parallel in *Yatīma*.

(40) Last four verses are without parallel in *Tawābi'*.

(41) 1+2+2 verses are without parallel in *Yatīma*.

(42) Seven verses are without parallel in *Yatīma*.

(43) 5+4 verses are without parallel in *Tawābi'*.

(44) Three verses are without parallel in *Yatīma*.

(45) The verses come from a long poem partly (1+76 verses) quoted in *Dhakhīra* I: 199-203, but two of the seven verses of *Tawābi'* are without parallel in *Dhakhīra*

SOURCES

- AL-HAMADHĀNĪ, *Maqāmāt* = Muḥammad Muḥyī d-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd, *Sharḥ maqāmāt Badī‘ az-Zamān al-Hamadhānī*. Bayrūt s.a.
- AL-HAMADHĀNĪ, *Rasā‘il* = Ibrāhīm al-Aḥḍab, *Kashf al-ma‘ānī wa-l-bayān ‘an Rasā‘il Badī‘ az-Zamān*. Bayrūt 1890.
- AL-ḤUṢRĪ, *Zahr al-ādāb wa-thamar al-albāb*. Ed. Z. Mubārak and M. Muḥyī d-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd. Bayrūt 1972⁴.
- IBN BASSĀM, *adh-Dhakhīra fī maḥāsīn ahl al-Jazīra*. I-IV. Ed. I. ‘Abbās. Ad-Dār al-‘arabiyya li-l-kitāb, Lībiyā—Tūnis 1399/1979.
- IBN SHUHAYD, *Risālat at-tawābī‘ wa-z-zawābī‘*. Ed. K. al-Bustānī. Dār Ṣādir, Bayrūt 1400/1980 [repr. of the 1951 edition].
- ATH-THA‘ĀLIBĪ, *Yatīmat ad-dahr*. I-IV. Dār al-kutub al-‘ilmiyya 1399/1979.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AL-BUSTĀNĪ, Buṭrus (1980 [1951]), *Ibn Shuhayd al-Andalusī. Ḥayātu-hu, adabuhū, Risālat at-tawābī‘ wa-z-zawābī‘*. [preface to Ibn Shuhayd, *Risālat at-Tawābī‘*, see SOURCES].
- DE LA GRANJA, Fernando (1976), *Maqāmas y risālas andaluzas*. Madrid.
- HÄMEEN-ANTTILA, Jaakko (1997), “The Early *Maqāma*: Towards defining a genre”. *Asiatische Studien* 51, p. 577-599.
- HÄMEEN-ANTTILA, Jaakko (1998), “al-Hamadānī and the Early History of the *Maqāma*”. in: U. Vermeulen — D. de Smet (eds.), *Philosophy and Arts in the Islamic World. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 87, pp. 83-96.
- MONROE, James T. (1971), *Risālat at-Tawābī‘ wa-z-zawābī‘. The Treatise of Familiar Spirits and Demons by Abū ‘Amir ibn Shuhayd al-Ashja‘ī, al-Andalusī*. University of California Publications. Near Eastern Studies 15.
- PELLAT, Charles (1969), article “Ibn Shuhayd”. in: *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*. 2nd edition. Vol. III [1971], p. 938-940.