

**Studies upon the Relationship of the
Poems ascribed to Umayya b. Abî'l-Şalt
with the Qur'ân.**

A translation of Israel Frank-Kamenetzky's *Untersuchungen über das Verhältnis der dem Umajja b.*

Abi ş Şalt zugeschrieben Gedichte zum Qorān,

and of Theodor Nöldeke's review "Umajja b. Abi'şŞalt".

Translated with foreword by David Reid Ross.

November 2013.

Translator's Forward.

Umayya b. Abî'l-Şalt was, they say, a non-Muslim poet of the Arabs. Nonetheless many Arabic poems have come down to us that are both ascribed to Umayya and which parallel the Qur'ân. Recent scholarship has revived this question of authenticity – of both the poems and of the Book – and that has occasioned a dive back to the classic articles upon that topic. Ibn Warraq has republished, and sometimes even had translated, several of these articles;¹ but he left a few for others. We are concerned here with the essays by Israel Frank-Kamenetzky and Theodor Nöldeke.

As background, in 1911 Friedrich Schulthess had published a corpus of then-known Umayya poems and fragments, in *Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft* VIII, 3 under the auspices of Friedrich Delitzsch and Paul Haupt. Concerning these poems' relationship with the Qur'ân, Schulthess's student Israel Frank-Kamenetzky (1880-1937) delivered his doctoral dissertation at the east Prussian port Königsberg (now the Russian enclave Kaliningrad).² In that very year 1911 this dissertation was published in Vilnius in (then) Russia under the title *Untersuchungen über das Verhältnis der dem Umajja b. Abi ş Şalt zugeschrieben Gedichte zum Qorān* – still in German.

Theodor Nöldeke is by far the more famous; by 1911 the Orientalists already revered him as the author of *The History of the Qur'ân*.³ The venerable professor was near-blind by then,⁴ but his powers of observation had not dulled a bit. His comments were completed in December; to appear in published form 1913 in the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete*, 27.

Although Schulthess's edition and the two derivative essays are all currently available online, they remain less accessible than they should be; not least to non-Germans. Frank-Kamenetzky's

¹ Ibn Warraq, *Koranic Allusions* (Amherst: Prometheus, 2013), first part, essays 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9 of 9.

² Cf. his "Life-Sketch" translated below.

Martin David Kamen, *Radiant Science, Dark Politics: A Memoir of the Nuclear Age* (University of California Press, 1985), 14, offers additional family reminiscences; that Frank-Kamenetzky went on to teach in a Vilnian "gymnasium", that is a German-standard grammar-school. But Kamen appears not to have fully understood this text as a whole.

³ WH Behn has (very recently) translated this classic into English (Leiden: Brill, 2013).

⁴ Nöldeke *ibidem*, preface, vii-viii tr. Behn xvii. Also Behn's own preface, xiii.

Untersuchungen especially has slipped into obscurity.¹ To translate and disseminate such work outside academia is the task embarked upon here.²

I have transliterated the Arabic to a modern standard, and corrected the verse references to the modern canon. It was not always clear which Qur'ân Frank-Kamenetzky was using; the verses do not always match even with the Flügel edition. Where I could not track down the verse from the enumeration, I have left as-is; in the hope that this is, at least, the *area* which the author intended.

This translation is a first draught. There were some tasks I decided were too much trouble for this phase – all in Frank-Kamenetzky's essay, and mostly involving transcribing Arabic. Where I found Qur'an-quotes, I generally transcribed them by copy-pasting the MSA's online transliteration. I have considered whether or not to convert these to proper diacritics; currently, the quotes do allow for easier searching in online text. I also omitted the full-verse quotations from Umayya's poetry; *both* essays assume Schulthess's collection for the context, so those quotes seemed redundant. I also omitted Frank-Kamenetzky's list of "Foreign Words"; for that omission, I don't have as strong an excuse, beyond that Nöldeke didn't appreciate the list himself. This much might re-enter future editions.

I should also like here to direct readers to more modern work. Frank-Kamenetzky and Nöldeke were writing at the turn of the twentieth century, and their works were published in 1911-12. Much has been written since then: Edmond Power's "Additions" being the best such (Ibn Warraq's #6), and outside Ibn Warraq's collection I also recommend Nicolai Sinai's recent work.³ Frank-Kamenetzky additionally belonged "to the Mosaic confession" and so was unfamiliar with Christian literature; this particular gap in his knowledge affected, for instance, his reading of Schulthess XXXV. To Frank-Kamenetzky's work, Schulthess had offered his notes; I shall follow his example, and where needed offer my own.

¹ <http://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.b4022488;view=1up;seq=1> ; retrieved over October 2013. My translation is based on this.

The watermarks show that the scanner to PDF was Google, but this scan is currently not posted to Google Books. Interestingly that copy of the book now in PDF form is *also* from University of California. It is probably the same copy which Kamen had described.

² As for Schulthess's full Diwân, I do not see a need to re-publish this into English. What is needed instead is a *second edition*, using his edition as base.

³ Especially Sinai, "Religious poetry from the Quranic milieu", *BSAOS* (2011).

Introduction.

That the collection edited by Prof. Schulthess of the poems handed down in Umayya's name¹ fulfills a much-appreciated task for literary-history studies, the editor himself has highlighted and justified in his *Einleitung*² to the edition and even earlier in his monograph in the "Oriental. Studien" (Nöldeke-Festschr. 1906), pp. 71-89 (1-19).³ At the forefront stands the question of the relationship between these poems to the Qur'ân; and whereas everything else would require an in-depth undertaking with the remnants of the Ḥanîf-poetry using new hand-written material, to compile a comparison of the poems with the Qur'ân would be an also well-feasible, vital and promising task; which should lead to much more secure results than, say, the weighing of evidences for the transmission.⁴

For orientation, the following remarks may serve.⁵

The historicity of Umayya b Abî'l-Şalt stands not upon as firm a footing as stand the other pious men, who are named as his contemporaries by the Tradition; and who are likewise described as "seekers" of religion and religious poets. Because, whereas the biographical notices pass over those men in the same frame: most likely he lost common-feeling with the Prophet, to whom he smoothed the path, and precisely with this uniformity in value; so for Umayya we have genuinely historical personal-accounts only in the elegies for the Qurayshites and Asadites fallen at Badr in Ibn Ishâq 531ff,⁶ and a historical witness for

¹ In the "Beiträge zur Assyriologie" [edited] by Delitzsch and Haupt, in 1911. Prof. Schulthess has sent me the Arabic text and the proofs in printable condition for these studies (for which is pronounced my heartfelt thanks at this point); so that the reckoning of the fragments and verses can coincide with that publication, and so in certain details reference can be made to it.

² That is, the book's introduction. Since that book has not yet been translated to English, this project preserves the German abbreviation "Einl." in the references here. – Ross.

³ From here onward, where our author says "Or. Stud." he means Schulthess's article. This much is now in English, anonymously translated "Umayya b. abî-Şalt [*sic*]", in Ibn Warraq, 1.4.77-98. – Ross.

⁴ Our author here specifies that he intends the isnads for these poems, not the general question of Ḥadîth-authenticity (he prefers to call the Ḥadîth, *der Tradition*). I do however detect here a pointed agnosticism against that subject as well. – Ross.

⁵ More by Schulthess *op cit.* O.

⁶ Per Ibn Hishâm's *sîra*, ed. F. Wüstenfeld as *Leben*, Göttingen: 1858-62 per Ibn Warraq, 92 n. 19. – Ross.

him in his nomination as a historical informant in the report of the battle of Khaybar: Ibn Ishâq 768.2.¹ Equally well attested and incontestable are the verses in which, as sung by another poet and occurring in Ḥadîth, he praised locally-famed Meccaner °Abd Allâh b. Jud°ân for his generosity, or mourned Ḥarb b. Umayya who had perished on a journey (Nr. XXI). A generation or two later the governor al-Ḥajjâj, known as a native Ṭâifite like Umayya, came to speak of him in a *khuṭba* (Aghani III.187 ult cf. “Or. Stud.” 6.11);² from the not quite clear sermon, whose context has been lost, it seems to emerge that Umayya’s poems were already off-course in Ḥajjâj’s time and required special interpretation.³ Since this currently could not be readily said of any work of contemporary and older poetry: for most of those poems which went under Umayya’s name we may see in this statement an indirect testimony that their transmission is not at fault, but that certain of his poems declaim peculiar themes. “He spoke of Abraham, Ishmael, of the Ḥanîfs, of the Afterlife” is an old statement.⁴ He professed to monotheism,⁵ taught the Resurrection,⁶ belonged to the “seekers” of religion, forbade the enjoyment of wine, rejected the idols and fasted.⁷ He read in the Jâhiliya the Torah and the Gospel,⁸ come by from the Jews and Christians in their *schuls* (*dâris al-naṣâra*).⁹

After such concurring information from various sources, we are not surprised that in the poem-fragments the biblical tales occupy an important space.

A second characteristic, Umayya’s fondness for animal stories,¹⁰ the tradition also testifies to us. However, they twisted the facts for the superstitious. The poet is said to have acquired through arcane

¹ Schulthess, Einl. p 7f.

² It has proven very helpful to this translator that our author has delivered to us the line-number as well. “Or. Stud.” 6.11 may be read, as translated in Ibn Warraq: 80-1. – Ross.

³ tr. in Ibn Warraq: “at [al-Ḥ’s] time the real connoisseurs of U.’s poems had already passed on, and with them their authentic interpretation”. – Ross.

⁴ “Or. Stud.” 11.26f. [tr. in Ibn Warraq, 85. – Ross] – In our fragments nothing more happens to be obtained of Ishmael.

⁵ “Or. Stud.” 11.30. [tr. in Ibn Warraq, 85 as “he reinforced” monotheism. – Ross.]

⁶ Damiri II.210. [Frank-Kamenetzky as Sch.’s commentator assumes Sch.’s bibliography (1911), 9-14; here, *Ḥayât al-ḥayawân*, Bûlâq 1284h. – Ross.]

⁷ Agh. III.187. [Cairo: 1868 per Ibn Warraq, 92 n. 16. – Ross.]

⁸ Damiri II.211 (Ibn °Abbâs).

⁹ Ibn Durayd 184.

per Sch. p. 11, “I. Duraid” is *K. al-ishtiqaq* (Genealogic Handbook) ed. F. Wüstenfeld 1854. Incidentally this must be Sch.’s source for the parallel note in 1906 as well; Ibn Warraq didn’t track this down: 91 n.12. – Ross.

¹⁰ see Schulthess, Einl. p 5.

ways an understanding of bird-speak (Ibn al-Raḡiq, °Umda 87v):¹ there are practical cases cited of his life;² and his own death, as he caroused at Castle Ghaylân, was announced by a raven.³ These naive tales are of course nothing more than illustrations of verses, in which the poet (in authentic poetic fashion) listened to [God’s] creatures as he did to the teachings of the great and noteworthy events of the past. Verses like Fragm. 2.3⁴ the philologists have just not understood.

But this couplet [Fragm. 2.3] seems to belong to Nr. XXV, which thereby in turn obtains a buttress. The pericopes attributed unanimously to our Umayya and often very well-supported, which the editor has brought together in this publication, are typical of the poet’s whole art. The legend of the hoopoe before the world-creation, the cosmogony in all its stages, the description of the throne of God and of the Angelic Host, the description of the pushy moon and the lazy sun: these set distinctly pagan and Christian-Jewish ideas together in a style that we find at every turn and in other longer fragments (eg XXX, XXXII.24-51, XXXIV) and which we may easily accept for Umayya.⁵ The poet loves also to embellish biblical stories in his whimsy; see, for example, XXXIV, where the animals of creation are enumerated in great detail, but also (v. 13) the cock is not mentioned without reference to his opponent, the raven, – which story he recounts elsewhere (XXX.12, XXXII var. to v. 36). If one wonders about the curious juxtapositions and amalgamations of the most varied Arab and foreign themes by Umayya and would try to ascertain, assuming interpolations, or, where relevant, to separate the different portions attributed to different authors from one another: so this Number is an important hint of the true circumstances. Here lies, as one can clearly see, portions from a longer poem, wherein was told extensively the story from creation, over Moses, nearly to the present, constructing the conclusion with

¹ *Wa-kâna nazr fi’l-kutub wa-°alim °ilma al-awâ’id hattâ adda°a ma°rifat kalâm al-ṭayri.* – Sch.

² Agh III.188 / Sprenger I.117 [tr. Hans-Jörg Döhla in Ibn Warraq, 44-5. – Ross], Ibn Kathîr 288v.

³ Agh III.192 / Sprenger I.118 [tr. 45-6. – Ross], Ibn Kathîr 288v. [In Sprenger it is “°Aylân”. Frank-Kamenetzky really depends on Schulthess again: “Or. Stud.” 5 n. 5; as tr. in Ibn Warraq 93 n. 32.]

⁴ Jâhîz, Ḥayawân VII.17, 6 v.u. [Cairo: 1325h. – Ross.]

Nöldeke judges otherwise: Neue Beiträge, 1910, p. 161. – Sch. [Nöldeke had said of this fragment: “the verses ascribed to Umayya ... are almost always to hold suspect, inasmuch as one could get out of *lughâtuhâ*, ‘their [the animals’] language’, in one such”. After Schulthess’s edition and (especially) this very essay, Nöldeke would implicitly change his mind. See the appended review. – Ross.]

⁵ See eg Nr. XXVI, where the old-Arab. formula “I give myself in return for thee” is readily used with reference to God. The poet attributes the same formula to Abraham XXIX.11.

the Arabic Thamûd-legend. Meanwhile the verses from the rain-spell are likewise of genuine Arabic origin and certainly a part of the poem. These verses may have belonged as easily in an earlier as in a later section.

In this use of the Arab-pagan materials lies also a contrast against those poems which we, albeit in far fewer remnants, know from other so-called Ḥanîfs.¹ The relevant poems by Christians, e.g. those by °Adî b. Zayd, lean as far as we can see closely to the biblical text,² which applies nowhere in our poems.

From the foregoing also follows the improbability of the hypothesis, that the majority of the previous poems in Umayya's name (I-XXII) be inauthentic and come from the ranks of the Medinese pious. What these people have achieved in poetry is wholly obscure to us; that they adopted into their Muslim poetry such extensive remains of heathen concepts, is simply best excluded.

Thanks to the fact that the editor of the now-present collection has taken all of any achievable verse-material, we can now also state, that the poem fragments are in part quite diverse, both in terms of thought-substance, as of the language and expression. And in consideration, as these differences could offer a handhold on the critique of authenticity, we have tried to handle the relationship with the Qur'ân as a criterion: and to put together the material in the first section, then in the second to extract the results. An appendix deals with the foreign words used in the poems.

¹ All variants given by Cheikho in "Al-Machriq" 7 (1905), pp. 530ff.

² Cf. the fragm. on the Sin-fall in Jâhiz, Ḥayaw. IV.66 (Machriq op cit. 536).

First Part.

Correlation between the Poems and the Qur'ân.

Introduction.

A distinction between the literal “citations” and mere paraphrases and references is not recommended, because this would break apart individual pieces. Instead we will summarize the different types afterwards.

Nr. VIII, 4b.

Q. 3:145 *wama kana linafsin an tamoota illa bi-ithni Allahi¹ kitaban mu-ajjalan.*

Nr. XV, 1a.

Q. 13:34 *wama lahum mina Allahi min waqin.* The citation is only an outlier and apparent.² Umayya means: “beside God thou hast no protector”.³

Nr. XXIII.

v. 1.

See places like Q. 34:1: *alhamdu lillahi ... wahuwa alhakeemu ...* . Maleekin Q. 54:55 (elsewhere *malik*), in our verses is required by the meter. *hakaman* 6:114; elsewhere *hakim* or *khayru al-hakimina*

¹ For the sense of this term cf. Nöldeke op cit. G. 35. – Sch.

² Also Q. 42:31, *ma lakum min duni Allahi min waliyyin walâ nasîrin.* See also Q. 2:107 / 9:116, 29:22. – Ross.

³ Per Sch.

7:87 etc.,¹ **ahkamu alhakimeena** 11:45 etc.

v. 2.

Verse a is a metric paraphrase of Q. 15:99 **waoAbud rabbaka hatta ya/tyaka alyaqeenu**. V. b is a paraphrase of 6:150: **wala tattabiAA ahwaa allatheena kaththaboo bi-ayatina**. (See also Q. 2:120, 145; 5:48-9; 6:56; 13:37; 45:18).

v. 3.

For v. a see Q. 61:9: **huwa allathee arsala rasoolahu bialhuda**. (=48:28, 9:33), for v. b see 93:8 **wawajadaka AAa-ilan faaghna**.

vv. 8, 9.

See Q. 24:56: **waateeAAoo alrrasoola laAAallakum turhamoona** (similarly 3:132) then 61:10: **hal adullukum AAala tijaratin tunjeekum min AAathabin aleemin**. The call for obedience to the Prophet is found also 4:59, 5:92 et al.

v. 12.

Refer back to Q. 33:40, where Muḥammad *khâtamu al-nabiyyîna* is meant (see also Goldziher, Muḥ. Stud. 2.278).²

v. 13.

Refers to Muḥammads' mortality (doubted by some of the pious), as is related in Q. 15:99 (annotated to v. 2 of this poem) and 21:34: **afa-in mitta fahumu alkhaldooona**.

v. 15.

Q. 96:4: **allathee AAallama bialqalami**.

¹ Q. 10:109, 12:80. – Ross.

² Tr. Stern as *Muslim Studies*, 2.256. – Ross.

v. 16.

Q. 17:93: hatta tunazzila AAalayna kitaban naqraohu.

v. 18.

See Q. 4:10: inna allatheena ya/kuloona ... alyatama thulman.

Nr. XXIV.

Elaboration of the thought of Q. 21:16 (/44:38): wama khalaqna alssamaa waal-arda wama baynahuma laAAibeena, similarly 38:27, and cf. 44:39 (/15:85): ma khalaqnahuma illa bialhaqqi – the term *al-muhaymin*¹ is found 59:23, *al-qayyûm* 2:255, 3:2, 20:111.

Nr. XXV.

v. 3.

On the “treasuries” from which God supplies the Creation cf. Q. 15:21, etc.² The keys to them are in God’s hands: Q. 42:12 (from which 39:63 is explained).

v. 15.

To the seven Heavens cf. Q. 65:12: Allahu allathee khalaqa sabAAa samawatin and 23:86: rabbu alssamawati alssabAAi. On the “levels”, Q. 67:3 (/71:15) khalaqa sabAAa samawatin tibagan.

¹ Schulthess, “Or. Stud.” 18 [tr. in Ibn Warraq, 90 – Ross] considers it מהימן. Nöldeke, Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft 27 for מהימן.

² Power, “Additions”, 148 sees this as a reference to God’s knowledge, drawing the parallels instead from Q. 11:31 (wala aqoolu lakum AAindee khaza-inu Allahi wala aAlamu alghayba) and 6:59 (waAAindahu mafatihū alghaybi). Power admits that Frank-Kamenetzky’s larger point stands, since either “sense is also Koranical”. – Ross.

vv. 27, 28.

That the Satans are bombarded with stars¹ and so kept away from Heaven is described in divers Suras. See Q. 15:17: waḥafīḥnāḥa min kulli shayṭānin rajeemīn, 67:5 wajaAAalnāḥa rujooman lilshshayṭeeni; alongside 37:6,7,10.

v. 29.

Is identical with LIV,2, cf. below.

v. 33.

Concerning the angel-messengers is the phrase Q. 35:1: jaAAili almala-ikati rusulan. As to the angels' role in making lightning, this is related in the stylistically clumsy pericope Q. 13:13.²

v. 39.

See Q. 2:189: Yas-aloonaka AAani al-ahillati qul hiya mawaqeeṭu lilnnaṣi waalhajji; otherwise it means both by the sun as by the moon, that these are used for time-calculation: 10:5, 17:12 see 6:96.

Nr. XXVII.

v. 1.

The term ilah al-âlamîn is found in Qur'ân not as such but as allah rabb al-âlamîn (1:1, 7:54 *et al.*) or just rabb al-âlamîn (7:61, 67 *et al.*). It is probably needed again merely because of meter. – To the “anchored mountains” v. b cf. 13:3: madda al-arḍa wajaAAala feehā rawaṣiya further 15:19, 16:15 etc.

v. 2

On v. a cf. Q. 78:12: wabanaynā fawqakum sabAAan shidaḍān to v. b Q. 13:2 (/31:10): rafaAAa

¹ On rajîm, cf. recently Nöldeke op cit. p. 47.

² Is meant here no doubt, that both thunder as lightning are intended as defence by the angels. – By contrast, in Q. 25:25 is a different concept.

alssamawati bighayri AAamadin tarawnaha (the seven Heavens: cf. to XXV, 15).

vv. 3, 4.

See Q. 10:5 jaAAala alshshamsa diyaan waalqamara nooran; otherwise the creation of the celestial spheres is mentioned more often, eg 71:16, 25:45. Zayyan with respect to the same: 15:16f, 37:6f, 41:12 etc – V. 4 is clearly to be recognized as a parallel to Q. 72:8, on the one hand by the concept, on the other hand specifically by the terms *shuhub* and *ashaddu*; it states: waanna lamasna alssama fawajadnaha muli-at harasan shadeedan washuhuban.

vv. 5, 6.

For the expression in v. 5a cf. Q. 7:160: fainbajasat minhu ithnata AAashrata AAaynan for thoughts 79:30f: waal-arḍa baAAda thalika dahaha / akhrajā minha maaha wamarAAaha. To v. 6 cf. Q. 41:10: wabaraka feeha waqaddara feeha aqwataha. The ending *harth wa-mâl* appears in Q. 2:205 alhartha waalInnasla “fields and children”, especially when *nasl* relates to the cattle (= *mâl*). Here *zulâli* at the former verse will have prompted the change of expression; the *nasli* would have rhymed more unpleasantly.¹

vv. 7, 8.

Q. 55:26-7: kullu man AAalayha fanin / wayabqa wajhu rabbika thoo aljalali waal-ikrami. The two predicates of Allah v. 8b are also Qur’anic: Dhû’l-Jalâli is found Q. 55:78, and as for *al-quddûs* the poet certainly due to the metrical reasons has replaced the passive participle, 59:23, 62:1.

v. 9.

That the sinners come to Hell naked is a Qur’anic idea, as is clear from Q. 18:48: laqad ji/tumoonā kama khalaqnākum awwala marratin in comparison with 6:94. For v. b see Q. 22:21: walahum maqamiAAu min hadeedin.

¹ Cf. Nöldeke’s followup, 169 n. 1: “not ‘*unschön*’ ...; rather, *not at all*”. – Ross.

v. 10.

See Q. 37:20 waqaloo ya waylana hatha yawmu **alddeenī** (likewise 36:52). The chains (*salâsil*): 40:71 etc.

v. 11.

Q. 14:17: waya/teeḥi almawtu min kulli maḳanin wama huwa bimayyitin; further 35:36 lahum ṅaru jahannama la yuqda AAalayhim fayamootoo and 87:13 (/20:74) thumma la yamootu feeḥa wala yahya.¹

vv. 12-13.

From Q. 16:30, 31: walaniAAama ḍaru almuttaqeena... lahum feeḥa ma yashaona; 77:41: inna almuttaqeena fee thilālin waAAuyoonin; 13:35: mathalu aljannati allatee wuAAaida almuttaqoona... and composed from similar parts (36:56, 4:57, 52:22 etc).

Nr. XXVIII.

v. 10.

The expression *sakhkhara* is found in this context, albeit without reference to the Flood story, eg, Q. 45:12 sakhkhara lakumu albaḥra litajriya alfulku feeḥi bi-amrihi, elsewhere 14:33.

v. 11.

Q. 11:42 wahiya tajree bihim fee mawjin kaaljibali.

v. 12.

The term *mashḥûn* is borne Q. 26:119, 36:41, 37:140.

¹ A parallel here is found in the rabbinic literature, cf. Beth ha-Midrash (Jellinek, 1853-78), II p 50f. Rabbi Josua b Levi saw in Hell the following: "Angels stand close by and with their staves drive them back into the fire and burn them ... They bring out afterwards the sinners from the fire just as if they had not been burnt and the fire had never touched them; and they burn them again. This they repeat seven times, three times at day and four times at night." [English by M. Gaster, "Hebrew Visions of Hell and Paradise", *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1893), 571f; 596, III.21. I have omitted Jellinek's Hebrew. – Ross.]

v. 13.

For v. a cf. 11:44, where Jûdî is referred to as the Ark's landfall: waistawat AAalā aljoodiyyi.

Nr. XXIX.

v. 3.

Q. 11:40: qulna ihmil feeha min kullin zawjayni ithnayni.

v. 23.

Q. 34:10-11: waalanna lahu alhadeeda (scil. David) / ani iAamal sabighatin waqaddir fee alssardi.

Nr. XXXI.

v. 1.

The name Sadûm is not in the Qur'ân, rather it is *qawmu Lûtin*; instead Lot with respect to the Sodomites is styled *akhûhum* eg 26:161f. About Lot's exhortations to same cf. 7:80-1, 27:54-5, 26:165.

v. 2.

For v. a cf. Q. 54:37 walaqad rawadoohu AAan dayfihi; otherwise is only indicated the intention of the Sodomites (11:82, 15:67-69). For verse b cf. Q. 27:56 qaloo akhrijoo ala lootin min qaryatikum... elsewhere 7:80, 26:167.

v. 4.

See Q. 11:79, qaloo laqad AAalimta ma lana fee banatika min haqqin wa-innaka lataAAalamu ma nureedu

v. 6.

Q. 11:82, falamma jaa amruna jAAalna AAaliyaha safilaha also 15:73f

v. 7.

In the same context hâsiban: 54:34; hijaratan min teenin / musawwamatan: 51:33-4; hijaratan min sijjeelin mandoodin: 11:82. Otherwise cf. further 7:84, 26:173, 27:58 etc.

v. 9.

Q. 11:40 and 23:27 wafara alttannooru.¹

v. 10.

Q. 11:41 waqla irkaboo feeha bismi Allhi majraha wamursaha... “It almost seems as if the poet had not fit the Qur’ânic *mursâhâ* to it metrically, so substituted the like-sounding but quite critically different *surâhâ*”.²

v. 11.

cf. Q. 11:48 qeela ya noohu ihbiti bisalamin minna... and for *mursâhâ* refer to the previously quoted verse 10.

Nr. XXXII.

v. 1.

Q. 28:88 kullu shay-in halikun illa wajhahu (for ideas see also 55:26-7, pointing to XXVII.7) - to v. b

¹ Cf. G. Weil, *Bibl. Legenden* 44 [Tisdall, *The original sources of the Qur’ân* p 125; Ps-Jonathan Gen 7:10, Tanchuma ed Buber p. 10, Power p 211f and n.5. – Sch.]

By “Power” Sch. means, and Frank-Kamenetzky will mean: “Umayya ibn Abi-s Salt”, *Mélanges de la Faculté Orientale* I, 197-222, Power’s first foray into the topic. The extracted article is available in full (Beyrouth: Imprimerie Catholique, 1906) via Google Books. Power, “Additions”, 172 n. 42 disputes this as a direct parallel to the Qur’an. – Ross.

² Sch. [Apparently verbally. But cf. Power, *ibidem*. – Ross.]

cf. Q. 15:23, “it is We who give life and death wanahnu alwarithoona”, cf. also 28:58.

v. 8.

Q. 30:27: walahu almathalu al-aAAla fee alssamawati waal-ardi; otherwise 87:1, 92:20.

v. 9.

Q. 69:18: la takhfa minkum khafiyatun, 40:16: la yakhfa AAla Allhi minhum shay-on.

v. 10.

The first half of the verse is a direct quote from Q. 17:22 (17:39, 51:51) with only adjustment for the meter. – *sabil al-rushdi* is 7:146.

v. 11.

cf. Q. 6:100, 34:41, where protesting against worship of the Jinn.

v. 14.

Paraphrase of Q. 20:43 ithhaba ila firAAawna innahu tagha cf. 20:24, 26:9f, 79:17.

v. 16.

cf. Q. 13:2 (/31:10) Allhu allathee rafaAAa alssamawati bighayri AAamadin. The second strain of *rafa* and *balâ* are selected for the sake of the meter.

vv. 19-20.

cf. Q. 20:53, 54 where Moses speaks to Pharaoh: waanzala mina alssama-i maan faakhrajna bihi azwajan min nabatin shatta... inna fee thalika laayatin li-olee alnnuha.

v. 21.

cf. Q. 37:142-44 failtaqamahu alhootu... falawla ... lalabitha fee batnihi. Further cf. 68:48.

v. 30.

cf. Q. 22:52 yuḥkimu Allahu ayatihi, 11:1. kitābun oḥkimat ayatuhu.

Nr. XXXIII.

Q. 28:11 waqalat li-okhtih qussehi fabagurat bihi AAan junubin.

Nr. XXXIV.

v. 15.

Here is ascribed to Pharaoh literally what in Q. 23:88 is Allah's privilege: wahuwa yujeeru walā yujaru AAalayhi.

vv. 18, 19.

cf. Q. 10:90ff: ..."And We took the Children of Israel across the sea, and Pharaoh and his host pursued them in violence and enmity until the Sea overwhelmed him. So he said, 'I believe that there is no god except in whom the Children of Israel believe, and wish to subject myself to God.' / Yes, now; but then you were reluctant and was a spoiler / So today We will save you in body," litakoona liman khalfaka ayatan "that thou mayest be a sign for your successor". For the final words fiṣāra mushīran, refer to Schulthess.¹

v. 23.

cf. Q. 54:23: kaṭṭhabat thamoodu bialnnuḥuri; 7:77: faAAaqaroo alnnaqata waAAataw AAan amri

¹ Shame, that the fragment here breaks off abruptly. Pharaoh's rescue was, as v. 19 shows, not told here; but the poet did know Jewish versions of the tale: see "Or. Stud." 13 n.1 [tr. in Ibn Warraq, 98 n. 83 – Ross], Beth ha-Midrash II, p. 11: i.e. "And the children of Israel went through the sea on dry (floor), and followed them did Pharaoh and all his army, and they were drowned in the sea, so that none of them was left except Pharaoh the Egyptian king; so he knew Him to be the living God, and believed in him." Another proof-point can be found in Geiger, Was hat Muhammad etc p. 164, of which also Q. 10:90 f has been translated with respect to this effect. [Geiger tr. Young, *Judaism and Islam* (1896), 2.2.127-9; here the translation is my own. – Ross.]

rabbihim.

v. 24.

cf. Q. 26:155: qala hathihi naqatun lahā shirbun walakum shirbu yawmin maAAaloomin; cf. 54:27,28:
Elsewhere, the camel is told in 7:71, 11:67, 17:59, 91:13.

vv. 25, 26.

Ahmar's name does not occur in the Qur'ānic narratives, but it is only called ṣāhibihum Q. 54:29 or ashqâhâ 91:12.

vv. 27ff.

In these verses is told, that the camel-calf stood upon a rock and sent a curse-cry upon the Thamûd into heaven, after which that [tribe] was destroyed. Of this is found in the Qur'ân but a hint in Q. 54:31: "We sent against them a single cry" (sayhatan wahidatan). Elsewhere dealing with the demise of the Thamûd, 11:70, 41:17, 51:44. – Quite foreign to the Qur'ân is the trek of the fugitives, v. 30 of the poem.

Nr. XXXV.

v. 1.

Q. 30:17 fasubhana Allahi heena tumsoona waheena tusbihoona; to variants such as 3:36, 6:52, 13:16, 24:36 etc.

v. 11.

Q. 51:12: yas-aloona ayyana yawmu alddeeni; similarly 7:187, 79:42, 75:6, 10:49 and such. – The term al-saa =judgementday: 30:12,14,55; 45:27 etc.

vv. 15-7.

Verse 17 cannot feel otherwise than that it be related to the Joseph story (cf. Q. 12:25), but is not an actual quote. If v. 15, as one would fain assume, belongs to the same home of poetry; so it stands to reason that the second half of the verse refers to Genesis 39:12, although the words themselves be understood figuratively. If so then the poet has used not the Qur'ân, but another source.¹

Nr. XXXVII, 1, 2.

(To the other recension: var. in the ed. for St.)

Q. 18:85-6: faatbaAAa sababan / hatta itha balagha maghriba alshshamsi wajadahā taghrubu fee AAaynin hami-atin.²

Nr. XXXVIII.

v. 3.

Q. 66:12=21:91: wamaryama ... allatee ahsanat farjaha.

v. 4.

Q. 19:16,17: ithi intabathat min ahliha makanan sharqiyan / Faittakhathat min doonihim hijaban.

v. 6.

Q. 19:17: faarsalna ilayha roohana fatamaththala laha basharan sawiyan. The “Spirit” is by the poet afterward, v. 12, implicitly revisited; as the Conception occurs by a “breath”.

¹ And in fact an unknown. Schapiro, Die haggad. Elemente etc. 1907, leads to no equivalent. [Power, “Additions” (ed. Ibn Warraq, 153) points to Saint Mark 14:52 instead. It has naught to do with Potiphar’s wife. – Ross.]

² Dhû Ḥummî in the other recension.

v. 8.

Q. 19:19: innama ana rasoolu rabbiki li-ahaba laki ghulaman.

v. 9.

Q. 19:20 qalat anna yakoonu lee ghulamun walam yamsasnee basharun walam aku baghiyyan elsewhere 3:40.

v. 10.

Q. 19:18 qalat innee aAoothu bialrrahmani minka in kunta taqiyyan from the familiar verse, differs only because of meter.

v. 12.

Is taken from Q. 19:21: wakana amran maqdiyyan.

v. 13.

The expression waḍa^c is Qur'ānic: Q. 3:31.

v. 14.

Q. 19:27: faatat bihi qawmahā tahmiluhu qaloo ya maryamu laqad ji/ti shay-an fariyyan.

vv. 15, 16.

Q. 19:30: qala innee AAabdu Allahi ataniya alkitaba wajaAAalane nabiyyan at the same time 19:21 walinajAAalahu ayatan lilnāsi. - it seems likely, that the absolute mukallam is a slavish following of kayfa nukallimu man... 19:30. However mutakallam would have not fit into the meter.¹

v. 17.

Q. 19:38 walam yajAAalnee jabbaran shaqiyyan. In the second half of the verse *ob^cath* looks like an

¹ per Sch.

takeover from 19:33, where it still has a very different meaning.

Nr. XXXIX.

v. 1.

cf. Q. 36:66 walaw nashao la \bar{t} amasna AAala aAAyunihim ... faanna yubsiroona.

v. 2.

The expressions *ifk* and *zûr* are Qur'ânic and are both albeit in a different context Q. 25:4.

Nr. XL.¹

v. 3.

Q. 18:29: inna aAAatadna lilthhalimeena naran ahata bihim suradiquha; 92:14: naran talaththha.

v. 4.

Q. 82:13 inna al-abrrara lafee naAAeemin; 25:15: jannatu alkhuldi allatee wuAAida almuttaqoona; 88:15: Wanamriqu masfoofatn.

v. 5.

Q. 59:20 la yastawee as-habu alnnari waas-habu aljannati; 32:18 afaman kana mu/minan kaman kana fasiqan la yastawoona.

vv. 6, 7.

Q. 30:12 wayawma taqoomu alssaAAatu yublisu almujrimoona... for hadâ'iq cf. 78:32; wasaat murtafaqan 18:29.

¹ Power, "Additions", 166 points out that Frank-Kamenetzky finds these parallels in just one recension of Nr. XL. The other recension lacks them. Power concludes that some pious editor has inserted these references. – Ross.

v. 13b.

Q. 3:185=21:35=29:57 kullu nafsīn thā-iqatu almawti.

Nr. XLI.

v. 1.

Rajīm (indeterminate such as eg Q. 15:34) = “satan”, according to the prevailing assumption by Muḥammad borrowed from the Ethiopic (see “Foreign Words”). But maybe it has appellative meaning in our verse, “one accursed”.

v. 10.

Q. 47:15: feeha ... waanharun min labanin ... waanharun min khamrin ... waanharun min AAAsalin.¹

vv. 11, 12.

Q. 55:68 feehimā fakihatun wanakhlun warummanun. To var. *al-qinwân* cf. 6:99: wamina alnnakhli min talAAiha qinwanun.

v. 13.

Q. 56:21 walhmi tayrin mimma yashtahoona likewise 52:22. Incidentally cf. Nr. LV.

v. 14.

The *hûr* come from d. Qur’ân (55:72, etc).

¹ A similar description of the paradise we find Beth ha-Midrash II p 52 (ident. with Ialq. Shim. Gen. Par. 20), which is to be compared in particular with verses 10, 17, and 18 of our poem: said Josua ben Levi: “Paradise has two gates of carbuncle... When the just man approaches them they divest him of the clothes in which he had been buried and clothe him with eight clothes, woven out of clouds of glory, and place upon his head two crowns, one of precious stones and pearls and the other of gold <from Parwayim>.... And they lead him to a place full of rivers ... Each one has a canopy according to his merits... And through it flow four rivers, one of oil <or milk>, the other of balsam, the third of wine, and the fourth of honey.” [English again by M. Gaster, 596-7, IV.1-2. I have restored in angle-brackets what Gaster has removed from Jellinek. – Ross.]

v. 15.

Arâ'ik in the same context Q. 18:31, 36:56, 83:35; qâşirât seems to be abbreviation of qasiratu alttarfi 37:48, 38:52, 55:56, at the expense of the meaning, or at least of clarity (cf. p 47).

v. 16a.

Q. 37:44(/56:15), that is AAala sururin ... mutaqabileena with reference to the inhabitants of Paradise.¹

vv. 17, 18.

Q. 76:21 AAaliyahum thiyabu sundusin ... wahullo asawira min fiddatin, 18:31 yuhallawna feeḥa min asawira min thahabin wayalbasoona thiyaban khudran min sundusin and likewise 22:23, 35:33, 44:53.

For namâriq v. 17a (var) see above for XL.4.

v. 19.

Q. 52:23 la laghwun feeḥa walā ta/theemun further 56:25 La yasmaAAoona feeḥa laghwan walā ta/theeman... likewise 19:62, 78:55, 88:11 – 37:47: la feeḥa ghawlun.

v. 20.

Q. 56:18-19 waka/sin min maAAeenin / la yuḡaddaAAoona AAanha; 37:45f bika/sin / la~~th~~thatin lilshsharibeena.

v. 21.

Q. 43:71, yutafu AAalayhim bisihafin min thahabin.

¹ So perhaps not Q. 15:47.

Nr. XLII.

Q. 78:32-33 hada-iqa waaAAanaban / WakawaAAiba atraban. 56:28 fee sidrin makhdoodin.

Nr. XLIV.

The first verse-half cf. above XXVII.10 and there-results parallel; to the second, 14:50: sarabeeluhum min qatranin.

Nr. XLV.

To yûqafu cf. mawqufûn 34:30 in the same context; to the second verse-half, cf. 11:105: faminhum shaqiyyun wasaAAeedin.

Nr. XLVI.¹

v. 1.

The first verse-half cf. 69:17-18 wayahmilu AAarsha rabbika ... / yawma-ithin tuAAaradoona ; thoo alAAarshi is found 17:42, 40:15 etc. On the second verse-half cf. 87:7 innahu yaAAalamu aljahra wama yakhfa.

v. 2.

The second verse-half² is found verbatim Q. 19:61.

¹ = al-Ḥadīthī 104. This poem, Gert Borg, “The Divine in the Works of Umayya B. Abī al-Ṣalt” in *Representations of the Divine in Arabic Poetry* (Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi, 2001), 9f; 15-16, has translated to English from Ḥadīthī (also Ibn Warraq, 1.9.221-35). As for Borg’s *analysis*, I will evaluate that in the next section. – Ross.

² cf. glossary on Ṭabari 103.

v. 3a.¹

Quote from Q. 19:95, wakulluhum ateehi yawma alqiyamati fardan (cf. 6:94, 19:83).

v. 7.

Q. 19:71, wa-in minkum illa wariduha kana AAala rabbika hatman maqdiyyan.

v. 8.

For jannatu alkhuldi cf. Q. 25:15; for ra'ûfan 2:138 etc, for hafiyy 19:47 (7:187).

Nr. XLVII.

Var.

Q. 73:17 in kafartum yawman yajAAalu alwildana sheeban.

Nr. XLVIII.

cf. Q. 15:23 wa-inna lanahnu nuhyee wanumeetu wanahnu alwarithoona.

Nr. XLIX.

v. 1.

cf. Q. 16:80 (with reference to the house-pets): wamin aswafiha waawbariha and 16:5 feeha dif-on.

¹ Power mused in "Additions", 171 n. 29 that there may be a less-Koronical version of Nr. XLVI; and therefore Islamic tampering with same. He had this from Tha'labî's *Kashf*, which he knew only from Ibn Hajar's quotes from (in order) vv. 2, 6, and 5. We now have this part of *Kashf* (on Q. 7:175). Tha'labî had in fact quoted vv. 1-6, including the "Koronical" parts; albeit in variant and disordered form, with (as predicted) v. 6 before v. 5. – Ross.

v. 5.

Q. 54:46 bali al^{ss}AAatu mawAAiduhum. Further 39:71 waseeqa allat^heena kafaroo il^a jahannama zumaran. The last words of the verse have no literal Qur'ân parallel; rather is meant 20:109 (34:22): Yawma-ithin l^a tanfaAAu alshshafaAAatu. – yawm al-taghâbun Q. 64:9.

v. 6.

Is paraphrase of Q. 54:7f. yakhrujoona mina al-ajd^hathi kaannahum jar^adun muntashir^{un} / MuhtⁱAAeena il^a aldd^aAAi.

vv. 7-9.

A similar description of the primaeval events (apart from the balance in v. 7), we find Q. 69:17 ff.: wayah^mil^u AAarsha rabbika .../ yawma-ithin tuAAar^adoona... / faamma man ootiya kit^abahu biyameenihi fayaqoolu haomu iqraoo kit^abiyah / innee thanantu annee mulaqin ^his^abiyah / fahuwa fee AAeeshatin radⁱyatin / ... waamma man ootiya kit^abahu bishim^lihi fayaqoolu ya laytanee lam oota kit^abiyah / walam adri ma ^his^abiyah; elsewhere still more is told concerning the books on the earliest days (with no mention of the throne): 17:14,15,73; 18:47; 21:104; 45:27; 81:10; 84:7-12; the term al-zubur for these: 54:52. – For the balance in the Last Judgement cf. 21:47: wana^aAAu almaw^azeena alqista liyawmi alqiy^amati; further 101:6-9: faamma man thaqulat maw^azeenuhu / fahuwa fee AAeeshatin radⁱyatin / waamma man khaffat maw^azeenuhu / faommuhu ha^wiyat^{un}, likewise 7:7-8, 23:104-5. – The term saAAeedan juruz^{an} (v. 7) is found again in Q. 18:8.

v. 10-11.

cf. 39:71 waq^ala lahum khazanatu^ha alam ya/tikum rusulun minkum ... wayunthiroonakum ... q^aloo bala; then 67:8,9 saalahum khazanatu^ha alam ya/tikum nat^heer^{un} / q^aloo bala, elsewhere 40:53. For v. 11 cf. 33:67 waq^aloo rabbana inna a^taAAana sadatana wakubara^ana and 7:51 wagharrat-humu al^hayatu alddunya (cf. 35:5, 45:35 etc).

v. 12.

cf. 76:4 *inna aAAatadna lilkafireena salasila waaghlaan wasaAAeeran*. That the damned are in chains, is found also 13:6, 34:32, 40:73.

v. 14.

cf. 7:46 *waAAala al-aAAarafi rijalun ...lam yadkhulooha wahum yatmaAAoona...* on the paradisaal rummân ... cf. Q. 55:68, to khadir 6:99.

v. 16.

mustatiru: Apparently active form of Q. 54:53's turn of thought, where *mustatarun* = *maktûb* (Ṭabari Tafsir XXVII:60). But the var. *muqtadiru* is the original reading, as compare Q. 54:55.¹

Nr. L.

cf. Q. 55:14: *khalafa al-insana min salsalin kaalfakhkhari*; *min salsâlin* is still 15:26, 28, 33, otherwise *min teenin*: 6:2 etc.

Nr. LI.

v. 1.

cf. Q. 27:59 *alhamdu lillahi ... Allahu khayrun amma yushrikoona*. The term *la sharika lahu* is Q. 6:163 (also others). *thalama nafsahu* 2:231, 4:110, 28:16 etc.

v. 2.

About the *sayl al-^carimi* of the men of Saba', this tale is Q. 34:15-17.

¹ That the two words in this Qur'an-pericope are so close together, speaks clearly enough for the Qur'anic basis of our verse.

Nr. LII.

v. 1.

cf. Q. 23:86-7 *qul man rabbu alssamāwāti alssabAAi ... / sayaqooloona lillāhi*;¹ likewise 13:17, 29:61, 31:24, 18:13.

Nr. LIII.

v. 1.

The first clause up to *waladan* is literally = Q. 17:111; further cf. 25:1-2: *tabaraka allathee... / ... lam yattakhith waladan ... wakhalaqa kulla shay-in faqaddarahu taqdeeran*. Other places where the prophet protests against the idea that God has begotten children are e.g. 6:100f, 18:3, 21:26, 39:16.

Nr. LV.²

v. 1.

cf. Q. 64:1 *arḍi lahu almulku walahu alḥamdu*. About God's sovereign dignity 6:73, etc. see also verse 20 of this poem. – Majîd with respect to God Q. 11:73.

v. 2.

For the beginning of the verse cf. XXIII.1 and XLVI.1 and the arguments indicated here. – *muhaymin* is found 59:23 (cf. XXIV.3) – for v. b, cf. 20:111 *waAAanati alwujoohu lilḥayyi alqayyoomi*.

¹ cf. Nöldeke, *Neue Beitr.* p. 12 n4. – Sch.

² English translation: Borg, 13-14 here as “poem 21” based on al-Ḥadithî. – Ross.

v. 5.¹

For the angels who carry the Throne: Q. 40:7, 69:17.

v. 7.

cf. Q. 78:38 yawma yaqoomu alrrooh waalmala-ikatu saffan la yatakallamoona illa man athina lahu alrrahmanu. With it, 89:23.

v. 9.

The watchers (ḥaras) of heaven are mentioned Q. 72:8.²

v. 10a.

Q. 21:26,27: AAibadun mukramoona/... wahum bi-amrihi yaAAamaloona.

v. 11.

Q. 21:19,20: waman AAindahu la yastakbiroona AAan AAibadatihi .../ yusabbihoona ... la yafturoona.

v. 20a.³

cf. lillahi mulku alssamawati waal-ardi Q. 3:189, 24:42, 25:2 etc.

v. 24.

For the first verse-half cf. XXVII.7-8 and the arguments presented on these parallels; that God gives life and death, found very frequently, as Q. 2:260, 3:150, 6:95, 7:158, 9:117, 10:57 etc.

v. 25.

cf. Q. 24:41 alam tara anna Allaha yusabbihu lahu man fee alssamawati waal-ardi waalttayru saffatin

¹ This and the next seem offset by one. V. 5 here is v. 6 Borg; v. 7 here, v. 8 Borg. – Ross.

² V. b. speaks about the key to Heaven (Mt 16:19 cf. Wellhausen, Die Evangel. Matthaei z. St.); so a very different concept than in Poem XXV.3 (cf. above). – Sch.

³ V. 20 here seems to be v. 21 Borg. –Ross.

kullun qad AAalima salatahu watasbeehahu with it, still, cf. 38:17,18 (34:10).

v. 26.

That the thunder for fear praises God, is found Q. 13:13: wayusabbihu alrrAAadu bihamdihi ... min kheefatihi; the same from the trees and animals Q. 22:18 anna Allaha yasjudu lahu ... waalshshajaru waalddawabbu.

Nr. LVI.

Q. 5:96 ohilla lakum saydu albahri wataAAamuhu ... wahurrima AAalaykum saydu albarri ma duntum huruman...

Fragm. 1 v. 2

The term *bi-idh Allâhi* is found in Q. 5:110, 97:4 etc.

Fragm. 2 v. 1.

cf. Q. 79:30. waal-arda baAAada thalika dahaha.¹

Fragm. 4 v. 3.

cf. ababeela Q. 105:3, rabbiyyoon Q. 3:140.

Fragm. 5 v. 2.

V. b refers conceptually to Q. 28:38, where Pharaoh is trying to build a tower, to ascend to heaven to

¹ cf. Ibn Hishâm 148.7 (Zayd b. °Amr b. Nufayl).

God.

v. 3.

Q. 16:52 walahu ma fee alssama_wati waal-ardi walahu alddeenu wasiban... further cf. 64:1 lahu almulku walahu alhamdu and the parallel to LV.1.

Fragm. 6 v. 3.

A clarification of the term in Q. 2:187. cf. Geiger p 90 above,¹ Power 211 n 2.²

Fragm. 7 v. 2a.

Q. 37:146... waanbatna AAalayhi shajaratan min yaqteenin.

Fragm. 8 v. 2.

Q. 18:9, 18 am hasibta anna as-haba alkahfi waalrraqeemi... / wahum ruqoodun... wkalbuhum basitun thiraAAayhi bialwaseedi.

Fragm. 12.

cf. Q. 2:68ff. baqaratun la fari_dun.../..._safr_o faqiAAun lawnuha.

¹ Tr. Young, 1.2.69. – Ross.

² Again, the earlier article “Umayya ibn Abi-s Salt”. – Ross.

Second Part.

Results.

The foregoing material shows, at first glance, that the relationships between our poem-fragments and the Qur'ân are both very diverse - sometimes close, sometimes otherwise - and indeed very abundant; but by no means is it possible to prove such in all the poems. It is thus required initially to distinguish between the Qur'ânised poems and the others, and then to investigate among the former: as to which correlations of the Qur'ân are ranked closer, and whether the testimony is less favorable to one than to the other.

1. Hints of the Qur'ân or direct contact with it are, as far as we can see, absent in Schulthess Numbers I - XXII, i.e. the poems which relate to profane and private topics (odes to the tribe, hymns to the Bountiful, etc.). Only Nr. VIII – which al-Tabrîzî, contrary to [his text in] Abû Tammâm and others, shifted to a Muslim era – refers in a figure of speech to the Qur'ân; but this must be considered as without a direct dependence.¹ And in Nr. XV, v.1a the echo² of the Qur'ân is, as we have seen, purely an outlier. Besides it remains an open question, whether this pedestrian verse belongs to the same poem as v. 2.

The same is true of the following Numbers:

XXVI. A single-verse in which is told God's mastery of the world and his work in the Sin-flood: topics that recur often in Umayya. But that which here happens without Qur'ânic terms, could be coincidental; and the whole, elsewhere lost, segment anyway could have included those terms.

Apart from having the Sin-flood theme itself, also in Nr. XXX.1ff we can find no direct dependence upon the Qur'ân; and such a claim for the corresponding fragment 1, v. 2 should hardly be accepted just on account of the expression *bi-idhni Allâhi* (see above). But then the whole poem is thereby more likely to hold true [as Umayya's work], as in verses 9, 12 it touches on a theme wholly alien to the mindset of

¹ *Mu'ajjad, ajdun* are more often found in early poems.

² "Anklang". Frank-Kamenetzky uses this term for "parallel", and does not mean to imply that it literally reflects the voice of the Qur'an. – Ross.

the Qur'ân.

Nr. XXXVI, another stray verse and as such with little force of evidence.¹

Nr. LIV should derive, according to some, from Umayya; according to others, from a Gentile or from Muh. (see Sch. for German translation).

Toward the end [of Sch's diwân], some single-verses:

Nr. LVII. The Judi could well be the one occurring once before in Qur'ân, not however the Jumud.

Nr. LVIII, most likely derived from a legend.

Nr. LIX from the legend [of the sheep in David's kingdom] indicated in Q. 21:78.

Nr. LX, LXI, LXII, all without apparent relation [to the Qur'ân].

2. All other poems and fragments exhibit more or less numerous and significant bases on the Qur'ân. If we refrain now from VIII.4 and XV.1, of which we spoke above, then the following types can be distinguished:

a) Echoes of Qur'ân-parts that might just as well be based on the frames of older tradition. – Here belong XXIX.3, 23. Many others, as in XXV.3, 27; XXXI.1; XXXII.11b, 30; XXXIX.1; XL.13b, Fragn 2 v.1, Fragn 5 v. 2, are obtained in a context that excludes their acceptance entirely.

b) Literal agreement of whole sentences with the Qur'ân, sometimes slightly altered for the sake of the rhyme or meter, as we have noted above in the following locations:

1) Nr. XXIII.2 and 3a. This is the ode to the Prophet, which is composed from beginning to end of Qur'ânic material and indeed from divers suras.

2) Nr. XXVII.2. Furthermore, these 13 verses – concerning God as the Creator of the world, the transience of mankind and their lot in the hereafter – show additional literal parallels with the Qur'ân.

3) Nr. XXXI.2a and 9ba. The two verses belong to two segments, likely elements of one and the same poem. The one concerns Lot and Sodom, the other the voyage of Noah. But both segments are Qur'ânised

¹ Not *here*. But cf. Power, "Additions", 154: Q. 18:49. – Ross.

elsewhere: cf. to the former, the verses 4, 6b, 7; to the latter, verses 10, 11.

4) Nr. XXXII, composed of three segments (vv. 1-6, 7-23, 24-51) but bundled here probably only on account of the rhyme on *ijâ*, shows literal agreement with the Qur'ân in verses 1a, 9b, 10a, 16a, 16ba, elsewhere in verses 1b, 7, 10b, 14, 19, 20, 21.

5) Nr. XXXIII v. a, a single-verse concerning the Moses story.

6) Nr. XXXVIII, about Mary and the birth of Jesus, in v. 10 and maybe 15 (see above). In the remainder, this poem is a direct paraphrase of sura 19.

7) Nr. XL, a memento mori, at the end of verse 4. In verses 3-7 (of paradise and hell) this reflects the Qur'ân thoroughly.

8) Nr. XLI.19, 20a; from v. 10 on, this constantly reminiscences off of Q. 55:56 and others. Cf. through to rajîm in v.1 if one would ascribe the adoption of this word from the Ethiopic to the Prophet.

9) Nr. XLVI: prospect for the fate of the soul in the hereafter (vv. 1-6) and final prayer for personal salvation (vv. 7-8). Direct quotations in verses 1b, 2b, 3a¹ and 7;² elsewhere Qur'ânic in verses 1 and 8. Especially according to Sura 19.

10) Nr. XLIX (about the Last Judgement) v. 6, 10, 11, 12, 14a. Others in verses 1, 5, 16,

11) Nr. LIII.1a and 1b.

12) Nr. LV about God's Majesty in heaven and on earth (vv. 1-27), succeeded thereafter by a forceful self-admonition about death (vv. 28-38), in v. 26 it clearly quotes the Qur'ân, and it is entirely composed of Qur'ânic elements in the preceding verses.

¹ As pertaining to vv. 1-6: first asserted in Sch., "Or. Stud." 8.14-16 (m); tr. Ibn Warraq, 82. This will be accepted in Nöldeke, "Umaiya", 164. – Ross.

² Sch., after "Or. Stud.", had found two more verses of the same meter, rhyme and general topic in the Jamhara, which Jamhara attributed to Umayya; Sch. in his main edition appended these to this prayer as vv. 7-8, and noted the Q. 19:71 parallel. This is why Frank-Kamenetzky has here assumed v. 7 as a quote too.

If I may offer what I feel is a stronger argument: the way v. 7 parallels Q. 19:71, is to assert "everyone to descend to the fire of hell" as having been destined in an imposed book [tr. Gert Borg]. As far as I know, sura 19 is the first text to promote this doctrine in any Abrahamic *Divine canon*.

In my footnote to Nr. XLVI above I had promised an aside on Borg's analysis of what he inherited as "poem 104". Briefly: Borg paid no attention whatever to Schulthess, Frank-Kamenetzky, Nöldeke, or Power here. See especially Power, "Additions", 165-6 (on v. 3): if Umayya is not a Muslim, then any verse's acceptance of sura 19 excludes Umayya as that verse's composer. And if one assumes sura 19's dependence upon the Dome of the Rock, Nr. XLVI in its Sch. form cannot belong to *any* poet prior to the Banû Umayya caliphs. – Ross.

13) Fragm. 5, v. 3a, which may well belong to the two scattered verses Nr. XXIX, is similarly Qur'ânised.

14) Fragm. 7, v. 2, will belong to Nr. XXXII (see above).

c) Paraphrases, or complete Qur'ânic sentences, interspersed with verbatim quotations:

- XXIV (teleological thought).
- XXV.15, 33, 39 (cosmology).
- XXXIV.15, 19 (Pharaoh's downfall in the Red Sea), 23, 24 (Thamûd).
- XXXV.1 and 11 (yearning for death).
- XXXVII.1, 2 (Alexander's trek).
- XLII (description of Paradise).
- XLIV (Hell).
- XLV (Judgement).
- XLVII, supplemental verse (and after).
- XLVIII (God as Raiser of the Dead).
- L (mankind as a clay pot by God's Hand).
- LI.1 (monotheistic confession), 2 (dam of Ma'rib).
- LVI. Fragm. 6 v. 3 (the white and black thread), belonging to Nr. XXVIII;
- Fragm. 8 v 2 (dormouse), belonging to Nr. LV.
- Fragm. 12 (the Red Heifer), belonging to XXVIII (see above)?

d) Isolated Qur'ân-terms found, finally, XXVIII.10 - 12, Fragm. 4 v. 3.

We see therefore, that if we wanted to see the presence of Qur'ânic elements in these poems as evidence to their falsity, almost nothing of the whole mass would be left.¹ In this case the Muslim

¹ See Nöldeke's skeptical judgment in "Neue Beiträge", 1910, pp. 30, 161. – Sch. [The former: "the oft-cited verse of Umayya, the *al-hanîfa* as the only true religion as quoted Agh. 3.187.25 etc, is as suspect as the most part of the verses ascribed to this poet". Schulthess would agree and dump this one to his "U[necht] 3". But on Fr. 2.3's *lughâtuhâ*, Nöldeke himself seems to have retracted his rejection; as noted above. Nöldeke by then was converted over to a less blanketly skeptical position, as the appended review proves. – Ross.]

tradition from the beginning must have been entirely ill-informed – and Umayya’s personality, as it confronts us already in the Sira, has left behind no trace. But some early poet still must have written these verses: because they fit, precisely because of this curious relationship with the Qur’ân, only in the very first era of Islam. As later imitations of the Qur’ân appear, so this example exhibits; which Tisdall¹ was able to indicate.

But perhaps a closer look and distinction of the contents of the most prominent Numbers might guide a bit closer to the goal.

Nr. XXIII, poorly-attested, is, even if it be not wholly homogeneous in content, a unified conscious paraphrase of Qur’ânic passages. It behaves similarly with Nr. XXVII, which, like the former, is handed down from only a single and uncontrollable source; and with Nr. XXXVIII (see above), where only the freely-invented name of the wilderness (v. 4) is foreign to the Qur’ân.

Nr. XXIV (see above) (teleology) fits wholly into teleological ideals, as are brought in the likely authentic parts of the piece.

The long poem Nr. XXV, in which the verses 15, 29, 33, 39 in part hint verbatim to the Qur’ân, is tangential with it elsewhere in its concepts, so not only in vv. 27, 28, but also in v. 3: God as the “Key-Master” of the earthly provision-chambers, as in the Qur’ân (see above, z. St.). But the poet sees through this idea in its true poetic context, at the middle of the mysterious primitive portrayal of Creation. The poem – well preserved almost completely, and in all its individual components unanimously attested for Umayya – is above all instructive for the poet’s mindset. He knows to unite Qur’ânic piety with old-Arabic tradition² and overall scholarly knowledge³. Thus he speaks for example in vv. 29, 30 in the same breath of God’s majesty in Muḥammad’s manner, and of the burial of newborn girls as a custom, which he draws for comparison without polemic; or vv. 39ff. the new moon as a means to determine time

¹ Sch., Einl. 8 n 4.

² Cf. above p 4 n 1.

³ Frank-Kamenetzky means *rabbinic* knowledge. I have converted the mammoth footnote here, concerning Nr. XXV, XXXIV, and XXXII, into a new appendix: “On Jewish Concepts”. – Ross.

not in the dry nature of the Qur'ân, but in extensive scientific / mythological execution. The sun must be whipped every morning, that it fulfill its duty uncurtailed, etc. But at the end it turns to a quite unexpected reflection (v. 49) and a plea for forgiveness of his sins, which source lies in wine and dice-gambling (v. 50).

Nr. XXVIII vv. 9-13 (cf. Fragm 6) is handed down in its second Qur'ânised part only by Baghdâdi; but the first part is, despite its strangeness, in obvious connection with that, provided in verse 6 it is assumed that God had deprived the serpent of its feet as a result of the Sin-fall (cf. "Or. Stud." 13 and n. 6).¹ The original poem has thus dealt with Creation and prehistory (Noah) and the poet has launched the Sin-fall with a poetic portrayal of the doom-serpent.

Nr. XXIX, where the verses 3 and 23 have Qur'ânic parallels, fits straightaway to Umayya's signature – if we add between vv. 20 and 21 the verses supplied by Dasuqi: it would then draw from the narration of Isaac's sacrifice the moral that man in need should not let himself drift, since in the end it oft goes quite differently than as he had thought.

Nr. XXXI: The two fragments that make up this number are perhaps the smallest part of the original poem: but they treat topics that are told in Sura 11, and being a paraphrase – using other suras – take out [the whole poem from consideration] (cf. esp. vv. 2 and 9).

Nr. XXXII again shows the characteristic combination of Biblical legends of prehistory with old-Arabic material. The verses 24-51, Jâhîz has found in one and the same poem; from his commentary (Ḥayaw. II.119) on *thumma ʿÂd ayḍan fî dhikri 'l-dayk faqâl*, that between verses 36 and 37 he misses a section or assumes a lacuna, is not even to infer with security – the poet could have shifted abruptly from one subject to another, from Noah and the dove-story to the legend of the raven and cock. The Qur'ânising parts vv. 1-6 and 7-23 are less well attested. For vv. 7-23 Zayd b. ʿAmr comes into consideration, for v. 5 Waraqa b. Nawfal. But if v. 1 is composed from literal reminiscences of the Qur'ân, so this group of verses (1-6) reminds one again conspicuously of Umayya's worldly-wisdom (see

¹ tr. in Ibn Warraq, 86 and 96 n. 88. – Ross.

especially vv. 3 and 5). If, by the way, one assumes that Fragment 7 belongs with this poem's v. 2 (Jonah story); one may infer therefrom that in this poem, like in others, the whole biblical story has been treated throughout.

Nr. XXXIV. The Qur'ânising extends over most of the group of verses 15-32, mostly got from pseudo-Balkhi and concerning the downfall of Pharaoh and the Thamûd. But the three verses 20-22 transmitted by Ṭabari, Tafsir refer apparently to the Israelites' wilderness-wandering and will not stand far out from the verses 14-19. They also possess that penchant for poetic depiction of nature: as Umayya expressed in 5ff. by his description of the animal world, and then again in the pericope vv. 33ff about the rain-spell. Finally vv. 1-4 are, as prefatory doxology, much in Umayya's mindset.

In Nr. XXXV the verses 11, 15, 17 in (resp.) 11-13, 15-16, 17 stand out from the pericope 1-10 and the single-verse 14ab. Whereas no link at all to the latter may be conceived; the formers' reflection upon the impermanence and purpose of human life recurs in many other poems. Notice in v. 9 the allusion to the pilgrimage, as in Nr. XVI. In the doxology v. 1 requires ultimately no actual Qur'ân-passage to be assumed, if it does not derive directly from two prayer-times.

Of Nr. XXXVII at most only the stray v. 3 can be genuine; the remainder is poorly attested.

Nr. XL exists in two recensions and is weakly attested. See also below for Nr. XLVII.

Nr. XLI¹ contains in its first part vv. 1-23, heterogeneous components; since verses 1-9² in their Hell-description differ markedly from the following Qur'ânised verses, and especially by the image of the milk-camel (vv. 7 ff.) – in fact in Umayya's realistic descriptions, more is remembered than in the Qur'ân. There is thus posed the counter-possibility: that this poem has been composed in two parts of various origin, and that the four verses communicated in the variant [poem] make up the introduction to the real piece. Also the verses 22, 23, reminiscent of "oathcontracts" per the *mutalmid* and *munathil*

¹ The following observations upon this Number, I owe to Prof. Schulthess.

² *rahîm* v.1 is no secure criterion, see ob. z. St.

Power (*Mélanges*, 217) had already noted vv. 14-21 as inauthentic. In "Additions", 166 he will argue for vv. 10-13 as authentic, but generally declare this first stance confirmed ("Additions", 167); against the blanket dismissal in "Or. Stud." and then in R. Geyer's review (*WZKM* 21, 1907), 387f; 395. But "Additions" missed the *sâhira* v. 13: see the "Foreign Words" section here, and Nöldeke's review further on. – Ross.

XXV.31, may belong to this pericope; they would even fit directly after v. 9. Certainly the group vv. 24-6 also returns to the sense of Umayya's unQur'anic poems: the pious allusion to the stars compared to the race-horses.¹

Nr. XLVI. In this highly Qur'anised fragment, the personal touch is laid upon vv. 4-6, 8.

Nr. XLVII, a memento mori, like Nr. XL linked with a vision of death (see "Or. Stud." 6 (76) and n. 1),² is however significantly better attested than *that* one (eg by Ibn Qutayba). The supplemental-verse via Tha'labi and Mas'ûdi is perhaps not crucial; assuming that "graying of children" by a terrible event be a proverbial saying, and also could be regarded as such in the Qur'an.³

Nr. XLIX. Verses 5-13, 14-15 (from Ps-Balkhi) and v. 16 are substantially different from vv. 1, 2, 4;⁴ the former are composed of Qur'an-phrases; while the [three verses] contain genuine poetry, and in the concept of the earth as "our mother" they agree with XXV.11. The echo of v. 1 with the Qur'an (et al z. St.) is therefore purely coincidental; it is worth noting that this verse seems to be secondary.⁵

Nr. LV limits its parallels with the Qur'an to pericopes 1-26 and 27. But the following vv. 28-38 stands in content unconnected (unless very loosely) with what precedes it – the starting-point would be God's eternity as opposed to earthly transience (vv. 22-24) – but evinces generally a very different poetic colour; and represents the death-calamity, and the process of dying itself, in images and expressions that match the pre-Islamic poetry perfectly. It seems, therefore, as if this pericope would have had nothing to do with that of its container. – That the verses 1-27 by the way are little more than a reworking of a fragment, as some of the verses are preserved in Nr. XXV vv. 32-37, is stated already "Or St" 78 (8).6-8.⁶

It follows that of those poems and/or fragments which might relate in any manner to the Qur'an, they may be set into two separate groups:

¹ Cf. Power, "Additions", 159. – Ross.

² Tr. in Ibn Warraq, 80 and 93 n. 35. – Ross.

³ See Schulthess, Transl. XLVII n. 1.

⁴ v. 3 does not belong in this context, see Sch. Transl.

⁵ See Sch. Transl. z. St.

⁶ That is, (i). Translated Ibn Warraq, 82. – Ross.

1 Adaptations of the Qur'ân, specifically:

a) those which build on a particular Qur'ânic topic and thereby are based upon one or more suras: namely XXIII; XXVII; XXXI; XXXII.1-23; XXXV.11-13, 15-16; XXXVIII; XLI.10-21; XLIX.5-16; LV.1-27 and many individual verses. Some of them show all manner of unskillfulness and caprice, such as Nr. XXXVIII.2, 10 (*su'a*) – see the comments on the German translation. – cf. also the notes on the metric alterations above *passim*. Thus, the frequent Qur'ânic *'ibra* “Examples” in XLIX.8 are replaced with *mu'tabar* for the meter's sake, which elsewhere has occurred¹ and for which the Qur'ân at least has the imperative *i'tabrû* 59:2. Similarly in the same poem v. 12 *al-sa'ir* (Q. 76:4, etc) by *al-su'ur*, which the Qur'ân does not know. – XLIV.2 *qa'rân* is mutilated into *qtr* (see Anm. z. Uebers.) About *qâsirât* XLI.15 cf. above p 25.

b) Free improvisation in Qur'ânic style and in Qur'ânic expressions are XXIV, XL, XLVI.

2. Those in which the scattered Qur'ân-echoes are found to be close to those notions which, according to all transmissions, agree with those of Umayya:² namely Nr. XXV, XXVIII.9-13, XXIX, XXXIV.15-32.

Those parts mentioned under 1a, it seems to us, fall so far off the frame of the remnant, that we can calmly reject them for Umayya.

On the other hand what verses stand under 1b and 2 depend more closely among themselves than it seems at first glance. Their relationships with the Qur'ân are, namely, either limited to conceptual echoes or explicable by means of common older sources. That is true of Nr. XXIV – the Aramaic expressions *muhaymin* and *qayyûm* can well indeed have belonged to the Ḥanif-poesie – and Nr. XXV. The Noah-and-Flood story Nr. XXVIII.9ff, XXIX.1ff, the story of Pharaoh's downfall XXXIV.14-19 undoubtedly come from a tradition that is older than the Qur'ân and has not first drawn from Muḥammad.

¹ Nöldeke, Zur Grammatik des klass. Arabisch p. 19. – Sch.

² That is, the “unsuspect poems”: Tilman Seidensticker, ed. J. R. Smart, *Tradition and Modernity in Arabic Language and Literature* (Curzon, 1996), 87-101; 90. Also ed. Ibn Warraq, 1.8.203-20. – Ross.

Obviously, that which is finally in the verses 23-32 of XXXIV is but the genuinely Arabic legend of the Thamûd, and the Prophet could not possibly revert to a different sense than that of the exemplification thereof. We would only give away [from 1b, and to oblivion] Nr. XL, due to its poor witness, and therefore Nr. XLVI: because they, despite the personal touch therein expressed, essentially belong to Group 1a.¹

So following overview provides our modest result in mind, which, by the nature of things, is individually most highly uncertain but at least can represent a first step toward the criticism of this interesting material. Naturally, such poems as Nr. I-XXII in [Sch.'s] earlier article might be partially rejected as phony on other grounds;² from all possible points of argument, we have busied ourselves only with the Qur'ân-parallels, probably without a full background in Arabic poetry. But one should not trust a dissertation for an exhaustive judgment about the authenticity-question.

Based on this standpoint, these are expected to be authentic:

Nr. I-VII; IX-XIV; XV.2; XVI-XXII (with the aforementioned constraints imposed); XXIV; XXV; XXVI; XXVIII; XXIX; XXX; XXXII.24-51; XXXIV; XXXV.1-10, 14; XXXVI; XXXIX.1; XLI.1-9, 22-23, 24-26; XLVII; XLIX.1-4; LI; LV.28-38; LVII; LVIII; LX; LXI; LXII.

For inauthentic:

Nr. XXIII; XXVII; XXXI; XXXII.1-23; XXXIII; XXXV.11-13, 15-17; XXXVII; XXXVIII; XL; XLI.10-21; XLII; XLIV; XLV; XLVI; XLIX.5-16; L; LIII; LV.1-27; LVI.

Inconclusive is the decision at:

Nr. VIII; XV.1; XXXIX; XLVIII; LII; LIV; LIX.

Allowing that direct use of the Qur'ân by Umayya has not been demonstrated based on this investigation, it is certain that he has stood extremely close to the religion of Muḥammad. So it would be

¹ I simply have not been able to translate this complex and idiomatic sentence any other way. Tilman Seidensticker, in "Authenticity II" (2011), 43, interprets that Frank-Kamentzky "rules out one (40 Schulthess) because of the uncertain ascription again; another piece (46 Schulthess) he ruled out, because it then seems more likely to belong to his group 1a". But Seidensticker understands Frank-Kamentzky's language much more fluently than I do. – Ross.

² See Sch. Einl. p. 4 n.3.

well-conceivable that he, in his own way, has made propaganda like that for the young religion; if, as already Schulthess¹ has shown, some indications for his Muslim-esque confession exist, he might be remembered as a Ḥanif like °Abd Allâh b. Jaḥsh, who eventually was converted to Islam;² or like Warāqa b. Nawfal, as unanimously testified in the Tradition.

¹ Einl. p. 8 above.

But see Power, “Additions”: “Was Umayya a Mussulman?”. – Ross.

² Ibn Hishâm 143 ult.

Appendices.

Occurrences of Foreign Words in the Poems.

The fact highlighted by Prof. Schulthess (Einl p. 4), that Umayya's poems show a certain preference for foreign words, has made a detailed examination desirable; partly to investigate their proportion to the not uncommon [foreign words] in the Qur'ân,¹ partly to find out whether the individual poems are distinct in this respect and yield thereby a new criterion. If the Arabic philologists ascribed to the poet such a preference, and it might almost be seen as an obstacle for the other traditions:² they could hardly have meant the two dirges at Ibn Hishâm 531 ff,³ but rather others that were truly foreign to them.

A criterion in the aforementioned sense is however not currently delivered, as it turned out, from foreign words. Nevertheless, the list may claim some interest: partly for the sake of documentation; partly because it does contain some rare words, including some whose foreign origin has not been identified, or at least was not stated publicly and Prof. Schulthess has marked as such only in his translation or to me privately.

It need hardly be remarked that the lack of foreign words in some poems or Fragments, especially those profane in content (Nr. II to X, XIV, XVI, XVII, XXII, XXXIII, XXXVI, XLVII, XLVIII, LI to LIV, LIX to LXII) proves as little, as prove the repeated occurrences of long-naturalized words in many others.

Those that occur in the Qur'ân, I will provide with an asterisk.

The more alien the substance, the more numerous the foreign words. The Nr. XXV teaches about the

¹ A number of such words exist only in the Qur'an and in our poems, and are in Q. as *hapax legomena*. Cf. concerning this, Suyûfî's Itqân 285 ff and the introduction to the Jamhara, where these by the verses should be regarded as high-Arabic. – Sch.

The Itqân is in process of translation to English: so far, the chapters up to 35 are available in *The Perfect Guide to the Sciences of the Qur'ân* (Garnet, 2011). Unfortunately for our purpose, the chapters we want are ch. 36-38 (*Guide*, xxx), which would belong to the *second* volume. – Ross.

² Agh. III.187.

³ Here are found alone *marzabân*, *baṭrîq*, *raṭl*, *qisṭâs* and the already oft-observed for Arabic *muhannada*.

world-creation with about 15 foreign words in 50 verses, or the likely semi-spurious Poem XLI about Paradise and Hell with 18 to 20 passages in 26 verses, or the also likely only half-authentic LV about the heavenly majesty with their 11 in 38 verses.

That certain unusual foreign words recur in different poems, could so far imply one and the same author (and namely just Umayya), as this one certainly liked often to vary the same theme (see, eg, the Sin-flood story XXVIII.10ff, XXIX.1ff, XXX.1ff, the legend of the cock and raven XXX.12, XXXII.37ff). Occasional allusions to his dirges can be found, namely elsewhere in these poems. eg. recall the comparison *shayzâ mithla al-jawâbî* XVIII.1 to *jaffân ka'l-manâdiḥ* Ibn Hishâm 531 ult; the verse I.5 is in content related to Ibn Hishâm 533.17 and the words *idha quḥiṭa al-qatru* are repeated here; to *al-qâ'ilîn wa-fâ'ilîn* XX.1 see *al-qâ'ilîn wa-fâ'ilîn* Ibn Hishâm 531.14.¹ In contrast, we can find *mubattal* XXV.3 of the same foreign form² of the verb *tabattala* only in spurious poem XXXVIII.2; also *muhaymin* as a predicate of God arises not only XXIV.3, XXV.29 but also in the spurious verse LV.2; and his own notion as to the inexhaustibility of the treasures in God's creation XXXV.2 (see XXV.3) returns again in inauthentic verses (LV.22). The *sâhira* otherwise known from a single source is found only at two spurious points (XLI.13 and XVI), likewise *al-yaqîn* (XIII.2 and XL.2). According to some of these cases it would be possible, by the way, that certain [formerly uncertain] verses are directly tied to the authentic pericopes; as we have already found for Nr. LV.1-27 on a larger scale.

¹ It would be hard to locate stylistic markers (cf. Sch. Einl. 6. n.1).

Perhaps, due to the enhancing *thumma* (cf. Reckendorf, Synt. Verhältnissätze 472) should be noted: *li'l-ḍayf thumma 'l-ḍayf* in Ibn Hishâm 532.2, *bizhâ' alif thumma alif* Z. 15, *sajjânuh thumma sajjânuh* LVII; but also in the spurious poem XXXI.7: *bi-ḥâsib thumma ṭayn*. – Sch.

² Foreign is *tabattala* in Christian-ascetic sense (deriving from *batûl* [Aramaic]; authentic Arabic is the root tr. = “separated”). The Form II would be used for the meter instead of Form V, as *tabîlan* Q. 73:8 for *tabattulan*. – Sch.

Some Jewish Concepts in the Poems.

To explain how far this [scholarly-knowledge in the poems] is imported from abroad, would require a special investigation. For the Jewish concepts, which Schulthess has already recognized and was occasionally noted above, here is brought to attention more as follows:

The idea that the earth begets by the rainwater (XXV.10; cf. Fragm. 6 v. 2, where the vegetation appears as the result of copulation) is found again in Taanith 6b (same as jer. Berachoth 14a); it is here the explanation of the fact that the word רביע, which otherwise means “sexual intercourse” is used as a designation for “April-showers”.¹ The [relevant] piece is: (Der Babyl. Talm.,² III, 240) ie “said rabbi Abbâhû: why is it (this rain) denoted “rabî” – (Because it) is something that begat the earth, according to the interpretation of Jehuda, the Rab Jehuda said: ‘The rain is the husband of the earth, as it is written³ (Isaiah 55:10): For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, ...’⁴ – That the earth is impregnated by rainwater is also *Pirkê de Rabbi Eliezer*, 5:33 ff here;⁵ it means either that the rain comes from the clouds, or directly from the Heaven; in the second case the vegetation is made richer; this is now expressed as follows:

The clouds draw water from the depths, ... and in every place where the King commands them, there they cause rain (to fall), and forthwith the earth becomes <pregnant> ... But when the Holy One, blessed be He, desires to bless the produce of the earth, and to give provision to the creatures, He opens the good treasures in heaven and sends rain upon the earth, namely, the <male> rain, and forthwith the earth becomes <pregnant> like a bride who conceives from her first husband and produces offspring of blessing.⁶

To the notion of the inertia of the sun (XXV, 47) cf. Nedarim 39b; here, with reference to Ḥabaq. 3:11 (“the sun and moon stood in Zebul”)⁷ the question was asked, why were the sun and moon in Zebul,

¹ “Frühregen”, likely with reference to Martin Luther’s Jeremiah 3:3. – Ross.

² Ed. Goldschmidt (Berlin, 1899).

³ cf. now S. Krauss, *Talmudische Archäologie* II, 150 above and 532 n. 13 – Sch.

⁴ Translation from the Orthodox Jewish Bible, Yeshayah 55:10. – Ross.

⁵ Warsaw: 1852.

I refer to Gerald Friedlander (1871-1923), *Pirkê de Rabbi Eliezer (the chapters of Rabbi Eliezer the Great) according to the text of the manuscript belonging to Abraham Epstein of Vienna* (New York: Bloch, 1916). – Ross.

⁶ This translation is mainly Friedlander, 30; almost certainly bowdlerised. But I have restored Frank-Kamenetzky’s intention in the angle-brackets. – Ross.

⁷ King James translated it “in their habitation”. – Ross.

since they are affixed to Raqîc; this response was supplied:¹

The sun and moon ascended to Zebul and said: Lord of the universe! if Thou wilt do justice (against Korah) to the son of °Amram, we shall emit light; and if not, we shall cease to shine. At once He darted at them arrows and spears, and said: Every day you receive worship from idolaters, and yet you continue to shine; you are not zealous for My honour, but you are zealous for the honour of flesh and blood.

It is well to assume that this narration is based on a general idea of the incitement of the sun and the moon; this assumption is also confirmed by addition to the aforementioned point where, in contrast to the same narration is meant: “and every day they are shot with arrows and spears, and shine”. – God’s answer is remarkable, as it appears as an aside to an Arab tradition, in which the sun refuses therefore to work, because it does not wish to shine for its worshipers.² – Further XXV.43 the moon – or is it the sun? – is described as a crowned prince. Hitherto cf. P. r. El. 6:17 ff, “the sun rides in a chariot and rises, crowned as a bridegroom”.³ Also Hullin 60b are the sun and moon reckoned as princes, bickering for precedence; specifically, they were originally of the same size and the moon protested in the following manner: “the moon spoke before God: Lord of the World! Is it right for two kings to share one (and the same) crown? – so He said to it: go and diminish *thysel!*”.

As to the idea that God on the throne is surrounded by fire (XXV.25) see Weber, System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie,⁴ p 160; then Pirke r. Eliez. 4:28 ... ie “and flaming fire rings around his throne”; and Beth ha-Midr III p 162: “how many mountains and hills of fire and flames are before the glorious throne”. – For God’s invisibility (XXXIV.4) cf. Weber, Syst, p 160; even the angels do not see him (p. 161); so too P. r. El. 4:47 “the Chajjoth stand next to the throne of His glory and they do not know the place of His glory”.⁵

Finally it should be noted, that the speech which in XXXII.13-20 Moses and Aaron declaim before Pharaoh finds its analogue in a similar speech by Moses before Pharaoh in Exod. rab. Par. 5.

¹ Quoted in Amsterdam: 1647. [tr. Paul Isaac Hershon and Henry Donald Maurice Spence-Jones, *The Pentateuch According to the Talmud: Genesis, pt. 1* (S. Bagster and sons, 1883), 10, #9. – Ross.]

² Sch, “Or. Stud.” p. 16 n 2; Sprenger, *Muhamm. I* p. 112 [tr. in Ibn Warraq, 97 n. 105; 39. – Ross.]

³ Friedlander, 40. – Ross.

⁴ Or, “The Theological System of the Ancient Palestinian Synagogue” (Leipzig: Doerffling & Franke, 1880). – Ross.

⁵ Friedlander, 25. – Ross.

Life-Sketch.

I, Israel Frank-Kamenetzky, of the Mosaic confession, was born 13 February 1880 in Wilna (Russia). I received my education in the Realschule at Wilna in the years 1890-1898. In autumn 1902 I was matriculated at the University of Leipzig, where I spent two semesters. In autumn 1903 I transferred to the University of Berlin, where I spent five semesters, through Easter 1906. After a three-year hiatus – meanwhile I had passed the supplemental-examination in Latin and Greek to the extent of the classical Gymnasia in the examination-committee of the Vilna education-district – I was matriculated in Göttingen, where I spent two semesters, and Easter 1910 I came to Königsberg.

My teachers were: Herr Professor Goedeckemeyer, Heinze, Husserl, Ed. Meyer, Peiser, Pfeiderer, Rahlfs, Rost, Schulthess, Sethe, Simmel, Smemd, Stumpf, Volkelt, Wellhausen, Winkler, Wreszinski, Wundt and others.

To all these men is here expressed my most heartfelt gratitude.

Special thanks I owe to Herr Professor Schulthess, who recommended this theme to supplement his output and who has supported me from the beginning with valuable advice and hints.

Nöldeke.

Review of Schulthess's "Umayya".

Umayya b. Abî'l-Şalt¹ is one of the so-called Ḥanîfs: that is, the men of whom it is said that they proclaimed monotheism and other fundamental doctrines of Islâm in Arabia before Muḥammad's appearance. To serve as witness to that are a number of greater and smaller poem-fragments, at least some of which cannot well be agreed upon. We are therefore on behalf of the history of religion very grateful already to Schulthess, who has dealt with this poet for a long time;² that he now provides us everything which should originate from Umayya – translated and explicated, which he has compiled with astonishing erudition from collected and unpublished sources of verses. In his case Rud. Geyer's comprehensive scholarship was particularly helpful. His collection will allow hardly any significant increase.³ I have encountered only one verse attributed to Umayya, and even that one certainly wrongly, that Schulthess has overlooked: Ṭab. i, 1122.4.⁴ For every verse he gathers all places known to him where it occurs.⁵

Schulthess orders the fragments according to content, but the whole thing breaks down into three sections: having the bulk of "texts" first, "fragments that cannot be classified in the texts" and then

¹ Umayya ibn Abî'l-Şalt. *Die unter seinem Namen überlieferten Gedichtfragmente gesammelt und übersetzt* by Friedrich Schulthess. Leipzig and Baltimore, 1911 (136 pp. in g-8⁰). (*Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft* VIII, 3. Herausgeg. ed. Friedrich Delitzsch and Paul Haupt.) – J. Frank-Kamenetzky, *Untersuchungen über das Verhältnis der dem Umajja b. Abi ş Şalt zugeschrieben Gedichte zum Qorân*. Inaugural-Dissertation ... of the ... Philos. Faculty ... of the ... Univ. of Königsberg filed by Kirchhain N.-L. 1911 (59 pp. in 8⁰). [tr. above. – Ross.] – I was just about to submit my article, on the publication of Umayya's poems, to the editors; when Schulthess told me that I would soon be receiving a dissertation relating to this from one of his students. Therefore, I left my task for the time being. Soon afterward, through the kindness of Mr. Frank-Kamenetzky, I obtained his manuscript; compelling in its diligence and prudence. This has led me to some few additions and other alterations.

² See [Sch.'s] treatise in the *Orient. Studien* dedicated to me 71ff. [tr. in Ibn Warraq. – Ross.]

³ It is admittedly not wholly excluded, that Umayya's full Diwân with its ancient commentary might return to light, as have the writers in the *Chizâna*. ["Treasury": he probably means °Abd al-Qâdir al-Baghdâdî, *Khizânat al-adab*, Bûlâq, 1299h. See Ibn Warraq, 91 n. 7. It turned out that Edmond Power would shortly turn up several more poems: "Additions", 127-45. – Ross.]

⁴ The first word of this verse is to be read without violent modification *°imrâ*. So without *alif* also Ibn Hishâm. 44, 11; 660, 2. [Power styles this "LXVII" in "Additions", 127, tr. 135. – Ross.]

⁵ This quote-hunt can easily be driven too far. What good is it, for example, for one to cite a verse given as locus probans by Sibawayh or some other grammarian/s, who has removed it thence and could easily multiply their number from – thank God – more unpublished works? At most, they confirm the name of the poet, who was perhaps not even noted in Sibawayh's source. Another thing it is, also, when secondary citations serve to secure the text of individual verses.

“inauthentic” left for last. This classification is hard to see as useful. In the first class, he assembles the pieces of the same meters and rhymes, as belonging to the same poems or contrariwise may be included, without direct connection and without argument, that his chosen arrangement was at least relative to the original, that he might loosely connect the individual verses of the second section also in the same way as those pieces to which their art-form agrees. And since the main section contains miscellany whose inauthenticity is apparent, his title for the third section of a select few poem-pieces must be out of place. Admittedly that chapter contains almost only those fragments for which, in Arabic sources, other poets are named as authors. But first, this distinction does not apply to the first long poem (U. 1); which, secure as its falsity is, happens to be attributed to no other poet in the sources.¹ Furthermore, Schulthess would need also to include the poem known to be addressed to Sayf b. Dhî Yazan in this section: which some affirmed to Umayya, but others with more justice to his father.² Finally he should also have set the piece listed in the second division as XXXVII, into the third; because it belongs to a very common fabric, which is attached to the [Ĥimyarite king] Tubba° Tab. I, 908.³ And since many poets are given for LIV, and since Yaqût 3, 495 for the first half of IV denoted Abû Ṭalib as author; we can freely place no weight on these.⁴

The editor would have done well in my opinion, to reprint again and translate Umayya’s two poems on those fallen at Badr;⁵ as for no poem bearing his name is the authenticity so secure as for these. These, or at least the larger one, which Ibn Hishâm had unfortunately mutilated on the basis of its religious

¹ The poem, for which, as Schulthess recognises, the Mo°allaqa of °Amr has served as the model, was probably also intended for the Thaḳîf in defence against the attacks which arose from the odium of the greatest of them, Ḥajjâj. The author may have posed himself as a great poet of the tribe. It is particularly interesting that per v. 27 the Thaḳîf have slain Abû Righâl. This [*kunya*] applies to he who guided the Abyssinian [scil. Abraha’s army – Ross] to Mecca’s shrine [before Islam]; one whose grave is to be stoned is often denoted with scorn exactly as this forebear of the Thaḳîf (as already of Ḥassân). “That is not true”, says now our poet; “our ancestors *killed* these evil people!” About Abû Righâl, I could now assemble far more than what I have given in my *Ṭabari*, p. 208.

² He means Agh. XVI.75; not in Sch. See Or. Stud., as tr. Ibn Warraq, 78. – Ross.

³ As tr. CE Bosworth, v. 5, *The History of Al-Ṭabari: The Sasanids, the Lakhmids and Yemen* (SUNY, 1999), 174. Also cf. Ibn Hishâm tr. Guillaume, 7-12. – Ross.

⁴ The assignment to Umayya is naturally the identification of Ṭâ’if advanced in the verses with *al-Ṭâ’if*; but I am unsure if it is not a simple appellative.

⁵ Maybe some text-improvements may yet come out on the basis of all available manuscripts of Ibn Hishâm. The translation is not easy especially because of the many synonyms; the superficial notice of Abû Dharr helps as much as anything.

dubiousness, shows us accurately Umayya's more rhetorical than poetic method – his penchant for wordplay and esoteric expressions – which have given the philologists some right not to recognize him as *hujja* [evidence]. With these poems Umayya's poetry and life are complete for us. It is significant that although his teachings are very consistent with Muḥammad's, he was not recognized as a prophet with him; and he even paid high tribute to those who had fallen in the struggle against him. Also no suspicion should accrue to the verses in which he celebrates the then-prominent Meccaner,¹ the rich merchant ʿAbd Allāh b. Gudʿân, who paid off his debts and with whom he caroused, before [Umayya], as it is claimed, completely renounced the wine.² Nr. XIII I would also like, as Geyer and Schulthess, to see as an elegy on the death of this patron; excluding the little salutation in v. 9. For this relationship to Ibn Gudʿân and from the disappearance of his name soon after the Battle of Badr, we may well incidentally conclude that he belongs to a slightly older generation than the Prophet; and this is confirmed by the Tradition. – The majority of the other pieces given at the start of the first section, the so-called purely “secular” pieces, we will also maintain for authentic until proven otherwise; although it is easy to be assigned a wrong author accidentally especially for individual verses. Truly interesting is VIII; the complaint about the lack of piety of a son, or of a son held as foster-child. But the oft-quoted verse VII would have to be omitted; for it belongs to *al-ʿArjî*, a renowned later poet, Agh. 1, 165; 2, 166; 20, 15; 21, 2; Gauh. *SDD*;³ Hariri, *Durra* 106 and Chafâjî 151.

With XXIII begin those poems which we *a potiori* may call “religious” or “pious”. At a glance, one is inclined to regard them all as Muslim forgeries. But in some of them, a more thorough study reveals so many strange or even odd traits that we cannot help ascribing them to a poet original in his own way, and as several of them resemble each other, there is reason enough to ascribe them to Umayya.⁴ However, one number cannot be regarded as authentic. At XXIII, the ode to Muḥammad (and after his death, v. 13): the obvious inauthenticity is as clear as it is rare; here can hardly be interpolation of the tale, except by a

¹ He was *shaykh Quraysh* Agh. 16, 70, 7.

² Agh. III.187 per Frank-Kamenetzky, 2. – Ross.

³ *Lisân* has for this verse impractical *anshad* for *qâl*.

⁴ Translation here taken from English tr. of Seidensticker's quote therefrom, 90. – Ross.

mere error. There are besides linguistic grounds for skepticism.¹ Where in XXVII, 7; XL, 9;² LV, 30, 38 (with fragment 8, where Q. 18:17 is used) indeterminate *dunyâ* occurs, here is a sign of later origin. This is because *al-dunyâ*, shortened from *al-ḥayâtu 'l-dunyâ*,³ only later on became a pure noun, so that an indeterminate form *dunyâ* “a world” could be used. This has made the grammarians also need the reason they may not have appreciated, that in *al-dunyâ* a bona fide feminine to *adnay* exists and it works as *dunyan* to a *fu^clalun* [form], cf. *Lisân* 18, 299, 7. In XLI, 13 and LVI we find the expression *sâhira*, by which Q. 79:14 intends “surface”, in the certainly incorrect meaning “earth, land” in direct contrast to the sea *bahr*; so misuse of the Qur’ân. This is consistent, that there occurs in XLI additionally a number of Qur’ânic expressions. Even clearer in XVIII,1 (which, however, is not among the “pious”) *fûm* stands in the meaning “wheat” or “wheat-flour”; this is falsely attributed to that word, which in Q. 2:61 means “garlic”⁴ – even conceding how little I understand the craving for garlic! This verse is probably only been fabricated precisely in order to prove the wrong meaning.⁵ And the (albeit popular) false explanation of Q. 2:187’s white and black thread occurring in Fr 6, 3 has even clearer postQur’ânic origin. XLVI, 3 all but quotes Q. 19:83 or 95 (*mithla mâ qâla*). Use of Qur’ân I find also in XXIV, XXXI, XXXVIII (with Fragm. 12, where *fâriḍ* from Q. 2:68), XLIX, XLII, XLIV, L, LI, LIII, where Q. 17:111 is repeated verbatim and Q. 25:2 is used, as XXXIII uses Q. 28:10.⁶ Also XXVIII, 9-13 are hardly independent of the Qur’ân; to the mountain *al-Jûdî*, which [itself] renders XXXII, 28 and LVII suspect, further comes [the “laden ark”] *mashḥûna*, cf. Q. 26:119, 36:41. The very peculiar verses XXVIII, 1-8, however, could belong to another poem [independent of vv. 9f.] and be genuine. To be noted: in the doubtful poems is

¹ This applies also of *tunajjawna* for *tunajjû* XXIII, 8; if it were not, as we just saw, already quite obvious otherwise that the poem is not from Umayya.

² Read *al-ilahu* [as subject of the subordinate clause]: “a world that God destroyed”. Even *‘âlimu ‘llâhi* would be extremely alien; *dunyâ ‘llâhi* “the earthly world of God” is impossible.

³ About *al-dunyâ* “the Earth” cf. my remark on the Mo^oallaqa of ‘Amr v. 103.

⁴ This bit is known to rely upon Num. 11:5.

⁵ A plural *fawmân* is however in the meaning “garlic” truly present in XLIII. This is [incidentally] to be translated: “wherein were chives, garlic and onions”. [As for “chives”:] *al-farârîs* is a plural form, corresponding to *ῥῆσῶν πρᾶσον*. For the misunderstood word, the unsuitable *al-farâdîs* was set here by a scribe. This verse with the three types of *allium* has nothing to do with the heavenly bliss.

⁶ I had overlooked that Schulthess in his translation had already noted the Qur’anic parallel to this verse XXXIII. Only through Frank-Kamenetzky (p. 17) am I made aware that it lies at the base, so [the verse] is inauthentic. Similarly it went for me with the verses XLII, XLIV, XLV.

especial over-coincidence with the Qur’ân, in complete sentences or in multiple individual figures of speech. This is also probable of XXXIX, 2, where in addition to *orkisû* (Q. 4:91) is also *ifk* and *zûr*, as in Q. 25:4. However, *ifk wa-zûr* could have been a common phrase, as we find *kadhiban wa-zûran* °Urwa 1,11 and *zûran wa-bâtilan* Labîd (Huber) XL,70. – The authors of such things, occasionally looking to reinforce the impression of authenticity, could well have attached homemade words like *al-salîtaṭ* or *al-salaṭilîṭ* XLIX, 16 and the corresponding Fr. 3, 1 *al-qasâqisa* (as Pl. from *qassîs* or *qass*) precisely because such were peculiar to Umayya’s art.¹

But not everything in these poems which more or less agrees with the Qur’ân must one take away from Umayya. He could have heard much from Jews or Christians, which Muḥammad had also received from such. However I must, in opposition to Schulthess (who was earlier somewhat too skeptical about the authenticity-question and is now somewhat too little), consider as good as certain that here the two mens’ data cannot derive from common *written* sources. That Muḥammad had ever read books is highly unlikely. His opponents accused him, as he himself reported, that his wisdom was left to him orally-recited just beforehand Q. 25:5 (*tumlâ*); his teachers are non-Arabs Q. 16:105. And even for Umayya any book-learning is not to be presupposed. Both men could just as easily have obtained their material through oral instruction. Now in [Umayya’s] verses some material is presented more expansively than in the Qur’ân. So the question is, whether we have to see therein mere expansions of Qur’ânic pericopes, or the more precise reproduction of [common] teachings.² I want to keep eg XXXIV with Fr. 4 as genuine; this and that internal-feature may also derive from later alteration. Likewise, XXIX and XXX with Fr. 1. Almost certain to me is the authenticity of XXV with all its oddities. Note especially the

¹ Frank-Kamenetzky has paid particular attention to the foreign-words occurring in these poems. But the appendix of his thesis, which is to present them all, is misguided. Apart from the fact that he brings several words whose foreign origin is unlikely; it also makes no real sense to enumerate such foreign-words together, given the long citizenship they had acquired in Arabic; and these simply make up by far the vast majority of his list. It is as if one wanted to shift weight off an English poet, that he used the words “wall, table, empire” of which only few know that they are of foreign origin, or even such as “nation, govern” about which every educated person knows. [I have swapped German for English – Ross.] Incidentally there would already be reason for this appendix better to have stayed away, because the author here is not even based from his own research.

² Deserving of thanks is the bulk of Frank-Kamenetzky’s writing, comparing points of the Umayya’ish poems with parallels of Qur’an. He has observed here Q. 21:78 to LIX. – To the distinction of suspected or probable authentic and inauthentic, we both agree in fairly large extent. Only mine is a little more skeptical than his.

ending, begging forgiveness of God for the happy life which the poet has led beforehand and of which we do have knowledge. Admittedly small Muslim variations or even interpolations are also not ruled out in this as in other poems. XLVII also gives the impression of authenticity. Of XXXII we can ascribe the noteworthy story of the cock and raven (the start of vv. 37 f unfortunately quite unclear) without concern to Umayya, while other components of this Number will be later. But vv. 7-23 will contrariwise be resolved by Ibn Hishâm 118 f to Zayd b. °Amr b. Nufayl, and v. 5 to Waraqa by Ibn Hishâm 149, 11; to whom the Agh. 3, 16, 10 also assigns v. 11 (both in connexion with another context).¹ Of course it is often impossible, especially for fragments consisting of only one verse, to form an opinion on their origin from Umayya or others.

The text of our fragments as to their understanding is often of unsure grasp. At several points I would not even know how to read them and how they are to be understood. For example points 27, 15b; 33, 2 and 3; 35, 15;² 39, 25;³ 40, 4b; 45, 1 and 2; 55, 17b. But for other points I think, with more or less surety, to be able to suggest improvements: of which some also result in changes in the translation. I restrict myself, for the most part, closely to the traditional manuscripts.

Page 17, [line] 3 [VIII.3] *idhâ* is a misprint for *innâ*.

- 17, 19 would establish the verse-form, when one swaps *mâlissinna* = *mina al-sinni* in place of [Sch.'s] *min sinnin*; and the indeterminate form is here itself also⁴ dubious.

- 19, 24 *ya^ctill* (misprint).

- 19, 26 probably *taba^cun* for [Sch.'s] *tabajun*.

- 21, 18 Ibn Qutayba's reading *bi'l-khirsâni* seems better to me [re: XIV.2]; this rare word was probably replaced by the known *bi'l-fursâni*.

- 24, 6 [XXIII. 7] *qabli* [not Sch. *qubli*].

- 24, 15 [v. 16] *taqrâ* is to be written without ' [*ḥamza*].

¹ The easy rhyme *-â / -ijâ* plays also a role in fabric-verses, that accompany the Majnûn.

² The rather violent improvement of the editor does not satisfy and also does not suit the meter.

³ I have tried every conceivable punctuation of ~~XXXX~~ without success.

⁴ Nöldeke is alluding to Power in *Mélanges*, 209 n. 1 *apud* Sch. – Ross.

- 25, 41 [XXV. 1] better *mulhidu* “sinner”.
- 26, 2 [v. 3] I would restore the traditional *tanfidu* [against Sch. *tuqlidu*]. A *qalada* or *aqlada* “nearby” is (from *iqld*) to my experience not known.
- 26, 7 [v. 8] l. with the traditional *min ummati fajarî bi-şâlihi hamlihâ waladan wa-kallafa zahratu mâ tafqidu*. So that even the metric is all in order.
- 27, 15 [v. 16] prefer *wa'l-malâ'iku* [as subject, not Sch. accusative object]
- 28, 2 [v. 24] *fa-aşkhan* (cf. 58, 25).
- 28, 8 [v. 27] I would retain [*Hayawân*'s] *maşâ'iban* “unruly” [against Sch. *mađâ'iban*].
- 28, 20 [v. 35] better *istanjidû*.
- 29, 5 [v. 38] the meter requires *ka-zâdi ghâdin* “like the stock for a future day” (ο αρτος ο επιουσιος Matt. 6:11?).
- 29, 8 [v. 41] meter and sense require *fa-yuhajjadu* “is awakened”.
- 29, 17 [v. 48, agreeing with Sch.] should not hurt the meter by deleting the *b* in *bi-an*, when *istađâ* with *b* is also not common. Then [at the end of the verse] probably *wa-tasharradu*.
- 30, 7 [XXVI] is with *Lisân* to be read *badâhu*, as [Sch.] *badâhun* is additionally against the meter. However, the proper reading of the verse remains unclear.
- 31, 14 the point of rhyme tolerates only *‘ashamu*, not *‘ashmu*.
- 33, 1 [XXIX.4] *wa'l-ifđâli*.
- 33, 12 [v. 11] l. because of meter *bunayyi*.
- 33, 15 [v. 14] *an ahîda* “(to avoid) that I back out”.
- 33, 16 I want to take *âlamu* as verbal form and to free up *al-maḥazza* [from Sch.’s genitive].
- 33, 17 probably *ḥaniyyatan* “crooked.”
- 34, 25 [Dasûqî v. b] *ḥîlata*.
- 37, 30 [XXXII.6] probably *yughâlî* “he goes too far.”
- 39, 25 [v. 29] *ghaymin* (*‘tf* to *jûnin*).

- 41, 17 ff *walâ gharwa illâ al-dîlu mudminu khamratin*. The construction of *lâ gharwa illâ* with following nominative also Ṭarafa 10, 5; *Ham.* 603, 1; *Lisân*, 19, 358, 3 v.u. (Ḥadîth).

- 43, 29 [XXXIV.14] *yusâqa*. In verses *yushâqu* is not allowed with its overlong *âqq*.

- 44, 2 [v. 17] *salaba*. The verse is a variation of 43, 23.

- 44, 9 [v. 20] *bi-muḍay^cin*.

- 44, 25 [v. 27] probably *aqâm* for [Sch.'s] *faqâm* as rain from *ṣa^cqatan*.

- 45, 11 [v. 34] *yusaffûn*.

- 48, 10 cannot belong to XXXVII, because the rhyme is different; as little as belong XXXIX.2 to XXXIX.1 and Fr. 6, 3 to Fr. 6, 1 and 2.¹

- 50, 7 [XL.7] [Sch.] would, by the improvement of the editor [*scil.* by inserting *fî*], not attain the metric accuracy one might produce by *qad odkhilati al-nâra*. But how to achieve the [verse]-measure in 50, 10, I do not see. The error in *al-ṣabr* remains.

- 50, 13 I would rather read *li'l-mawti*.

- 51, 23 [XLI.2] *shubbat*.

- 51, 30 [v. 9] surely instead *wa-li-kulli 'irqin* “every vein”. Beforehand *fa-yaharama*.

- 52, 12 [v. 22] would have been better explicitly vocalized *ujrû*, since one will be tempted to utter *ujrawâ*.

- 56, 12 [XLIX.3] *fî'l-a^cdhâ'i nâfidhatun* (Pl. of *'idhâ*), and [at the verse's end] *al-suburu*.

- 56, 20 [v. 8] *lam* for *mâ*.

- 56, 25 [v. 13] *al-muqâmi* “stay” for *al-maqâmi* “location”. The editor's improvement *ṣajjû* is incontestable.

- 59, 24 [LV.36] *taladdadu*. The language requires the 2nd-Person.

- 61, 8 [LX] maybe *ma^cattiban* (intensive for *'âtiban*) “it has satisfied no critics” “no admonisher is followed”.

¹ *nasli* rhymes with *zulâli* etc. not “unpleasantly”, as Frank-Kamenetzky p. 11 says; but rather, not at all.

- 61, 21 [LXIII] the (*Munsariḥ*, not *Khafīf*) meter requires for the rhyme-word, *li'l-zakawât*.

- 61, 25 [LXIV] has entered Umayya's verses accidentally. Lisân 1 c. says: "it occurs in Ḥadīth that he (the Prophet) was presented with poems of Umayya b. Abī'l-Ṣalt; because he (the Prophet) in those verses says 'ih' ie 'on!, ride away!'".

- 63, 18 [F. 2.3.2] *wa'l-ʿilmu* [subject, not Sch. object].

- 65, 14 [F. 6.3] *al-khaytu al-abyadu* and *al-khaytu al-âswadu*.

- 67, 4 [F. 11.2.2] probably *taqazzaz* (with *K. Bukhalâ*'), but what *qrn* here means, I do not know.

One could imagine *qarimun* "lusting (for flesh)", but *qrn* seems to have good attestation.

- 71, 5 [U. 1.27] *al-waḍînâ* will be correct.

- 73, 21 [U. 5.3] *amami*.

- 74, 17 [U. 7] *fa-yaman* is required for the meter throughout; and both in Labîd-text as in Ḥayawân 5, 73, one would like to hold the existent *fiyam* as a printing error.

Out of several of these proposals arise, as I said, changes in the translation; in some cases I have referred to those, too. I would now like to highlight some other places where I think I can improve the translation. Note, however, that I have not systematically and consistently compared text and translation. Also I repeat that I cannot translate some pieces.

XIII, 8. Why not simply "the sons of Fihr"? In the Quraysh there was no special class of people called *al-Abnâ*, as in Yemen.

- XXIII, 6 "God had removed one of the woes" (literally "has split"); see *rabbu buhmatin kashaftu* Amrlq. 63, 4; *inda al-rû'î wa'l-buhmi* Agh. 10, 78, 17. *buhma* is originally "darkness".

- XXV, 23 "stubborn stubble"? In so whimsical a piece, such an oddity is to be allowed.

- XXV, 25 *dûn* is certainly not "under", but, as so often, the preposition of defense and prevention: the flame denied access to the throne of God.

- XXV, 27, perhaps “and their cleverness consists in endurance when they are driven away.”
- XXVIII, 9 *dhû qadamin* is simply “one with a foot” ie “a man” and *amîr al-saw’i* “the wicked rulers”. Or is this to be read *amîr al-sû’i* and to be translated “he who gives bad advice”?
- XXIX, 20 “so they hurried away with the glory of noble deeds”. Or maybe *târâ* is here figuratively “whom they raised high”.
- XXXI, 2 “we forbid thee, that thou wilt insist on Hospitality¹ for them”; *qarâhâ* cannot be “their guest”.
- XXXII, 33 “I fear their barbs², that they -” etc. This is not a difficulty.
- XXXIV. 23, assuming that the interpretation of the [Arabic] text be right, one can just translate: “who transgressed against the Religion by force”; but maybe more serious is not just the transitive use of *tafattak* (instead of with *b*), but also to the joining of *umm saqabin* to the abstract *al-dîn*. But *tafannadat* is, in my view, impossible.³
- XXXIV, 25 “as the arrowshot”. The “godless” puts too much into the diminutive; the form sounds at most something contemptible.
- XXXVIII, 13 *âway* is to be = *away*: “He (the boy Jesus) regretted it.”
- XL, 10 “a servant, who is himself called and admonished, knows -”. The completely indeterminate *‘abd* without *şaffa* cannot serve well as *mubtadâ’*.
- Fr. 1, 5 (p. 120). I think, “whose end constitutes the handle”.
- Fr. 3, 2 (p. 121). *mukhtalaq* is hardly easy = *makhtalûq*; with that, the second half of the verse would not really make sense. I take it as a “product of human whimsy” contrasted with the enduring creations of God. *illâ* “but not”.⁴
- Fr. 4, 2 (p. 122). “The core of the night-raid came upon them, by its onslaught without a warner to

¹ Nöldeke, *Gastfreundschaft*. There was in the Arab-poetic ideal a memory of the *Biblical* ideal, also parallel to the Homeric and Teutonic ideals. – Ross.

² The Apollonian arrows of satire. – Ross.

³ In Sinai’s translation of that verse, the *Thamoudaioi* were those “who arrogantly slew religion and the hamstrung mother of the camel colt”. – Ross.

⁴ The nominative for the accusative expected here as in the cases *Zur Grammatik* p 42. – *al-kafar* is here presumably the Nabataean כפרא “grave-cave” but in the meaning of שאל. The underworld fits heaven and earth.

notice it beforehand”.¹

- Fr. 11, 4 (p. 126) I translate the second half of the verse “as this time was still new (youthful) and brave”;² but to me the meaning of *ḥasûm* is not secure. Even with the first half, I am not quite at peace.

- U. 1, 4 *al-ḥamâ'im* is “the pigeons”, with which are also compared the three *athâfin* in an otherwise deserted dwelling. The birds will have had gray or brown colour.

I feel myself entitled to conclude in the name of all Arabists: to say once more explicitly thanks to the editor, already earned many times over for his hard work.

Strassburg in Elsass,³ d. 11 Dec. 1911.

¹ But also cf. Power, “Additions”, 159. – Ross.

² See *Mufaḍḍ.* 17.7. “This time” is not the approximate present, instead the time is meant as an eternal continuum.

³ After 1919 this would become “Alsace” in France. – Ross.