

## ARABICA

SAVAGE SMITH, E. — A New Catalogue of Arabic Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, University of Oxford - Volume I: Medicine. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2011. (25 cm, XXXVI, 896). ISBN 978-0-19-951358-1. £ 150.00.

Emilie Savage-Smith's contributions to Arabic codicology include a *catalogue raisonnée* of the Islamic medical manuscripts at the U.S. National Library of Medicine, Bethesda ([http://www.nlm.nih.gov/hmd/arabic/catalog\\_tb.html](http://www.nlm.nih.gov/hmd/arabic/catalog_tb.html) [accessed 11 May 2014]), as well as a descriptive catalogue of oriental manuscripts preserved in St. John's college, Oxford (*idem*, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Oriental Manuscripts at St. John's College* (Oxford, 2005)). Savage-Smith is a leading figure in the work on the *Book of Curiosities* (*Kitāb Gharā'ib al-Funūn wa-Mulaḥ al-Uyūn*) (MS. Arab. c. 90), which the Bodleian purchased in 2002. *A New Catalogue of Arabic Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, University of Oxford — Volume 1: Medicine* (=MMB) is a work of enormous erudition, culminating 20 years of work with the Arabic medical manuscripts at the Bodleian and elsewhere.

As Colin Wakefield notes in his informative introduction, Oxford's Bodleian library possesses some 2,500 Arabic volumes containing an estimated 5,000 individual treatises (MMB, xxviii). MMB is the first instalment in a projected series of descriptive catalogues of all the Arabic manuscripts at the Bodleian, for which Wakefield will serve as the series editor. Before MMB, only two incomplete and rudimentary catalogues of the Arabic manuscripts at the Bodleian were compiled in Latin, the most recent of which was published in the middle of the nineteenth-century. Savage-Smith's MMB is proof that the Bodleian's rich collection has been underutilized in modern editions of Arabic medical manuscripts due to the collection's inaccessibility, and to the many lacunae in earlier catalogues. Savage-Smith's latest contribution thus goes a long way to making "this valuable resource more fully accessible to the scholarly community (MMB, xxxvi)".

MMB is a descriptive catalogue of 229 codices, which contain 243 different medical treatises. Factoring in multiple copies of a single treatise brings the total "medical items" catalogued in MMB to 378. Each of the 243 medical treatises is assigned a unique Entry number in the catalogue, under

which other copies of the same treatise appear. Entries are grouped under the following major headings: 1. Translations of Earlier Sources (Entries 1-34 and 34\*); 2. General Medical Manuals (Entries 35-88); 3. Medical Poetry (Entries 89-98); 4. Medical Monographs (Entries 99-118); 5. Therapeutics (Entries 119-157); 6. Dietetics and Regimen (Entries 158-169); 7. Pharmaceutics (Entries 170-214); 8. Prophetic Medicine (Entries 215-22); 9. Plague Tracts (Entries 223-226); 10. Magical-Astrological Medicine (Entries 227-240); 11. Modern Palimpsests (Entries 241-242). The catalogue is then followed by three Appendices (I. Concordance of Manuscripts; II. Concordance by Author; III. Concordance of Dated Manuscripts), and five Indices (Index of Titles, Index of Copyists, Index of Previous Owners, Donors, and Vendors, Index of Persons and Treatises Cited, and a General Index). There are forty-five stunning, high-quality glossy photograph plate inserts with portraits of historical figures (Plate II, Dioscorides), illuminated roundels (Plate I), anatomical illustrations (Plate XLIV), illuminated title-pages with ownership statements (Plate XXXII), colophons and *explicits* (Plate XXX), decorated front cover bindings (Plate XXIV), illustrations of medical instruments (Plate XV), samples of Judeo-Arabic medical manuscripts (Plate X), illustrations of plants with medicinal uses (Plate IV), etc.

The descriptions of the manuscripts in each Entry are prefaced by a wealth of meticulously documented information about the treatise, alternative titles, its author (if known), contents, the year and circumstances of its composition, patrons to whom it was dedicated, and previous editions and studies. The list of studies is not intended to be exhaustive (though, surprisingly, Savage-Smith does not cite G. Bos, "Ibn Al-Jazzār on Medicine for the Poor and Destitute", *JAOS* 118/3: 365-75 in Entry 140 on Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Zakarīya al-Rāzī's (d. 925) "self-help" manual for people who cannot afford a physician or complex drugs). Its main purpose is to direct the non-specialist to European language studies. This material is followed by minute descriptions of the physical conditions of the manuscripts in which the treatise is contained. The manuscript's shelf-number and position in the codex is followed by data about the length of the manuscript, the page and text dimensions, colour of the paper and ink, the script, the presence (or absence) of rubrications, catchwords, watermarks, chain lines, marginalia, and the conditions of the codex's binding. There are also long transcriptions of *incipits* and *explicits*, as well as copy dates, scribe names, the year the manuscript came to the Bodleian library, details about the codex's donor, and references to the manuscript in Uri's *Bibliothecae Bodleianae Codicum Manuscriptorum Orientalium*, and Nicoll's and Pusey's *Addenda*. Savage-Smith includes invaluable details that will prove indispensable to the scholar inexperienced in Arabic codicology. She notes whether a copy is a complete version of the treatise, highlights instances in which folia have been bound improperly (e.g. Entry 100, MS. Pococke 66), provides Arabic chapter and section headings for the entire treatise, often with English translations (e.g. *ibid.*), and compares modern editions of the treatise with the Bodleian manuscript (e.g. Entry 6). For treatises on *materia medica*, Savage-Smith provides the English translation for Arabic, Latin and Greek names of simple or compound drugs (e.g. Entry 14).

One of the most helpful features of MMB is its assessment of the quality of modern editions. For example, Entry 100 is

a fascinating text on “medical philosophy” entitled *Kitāb Khalq al-Insān*, which Savage-Smith translates as *Treatise on the Nature of Man*, written by Abū al-Ḥusayn (or Abū al-Ḥasan) Saʿīd Hibat Allāh (d. 1101). The author was a Nestorian Christian court physician who served the Abbāsīd caliphs al-Muqtadī (r. 1075-94) and al-Mustazhir (r. 1094-118) (*MMB*, p. 406), and worked in the ‘Aḍudī hospital in Baghdad (*MMB*, p. 407). Savage-Smith observes that the text divides into 50 chapters, of which the first twenty-nine were the subject of a critical edition and English translation in a Cambridge Ph.D. by Colin Francis Baker (C. Baker, *Abū al-Ḥasan Saʿīd’s Maqālah fī khalq al-insān*, Ph.D. thesis (Cambridge, 1990)). Baker and Browne (and Nicholson) (E. Browne, R. Nicholson, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Oriental MSS. belonging to the Late E.G. Browne* (Cambridge, 1932, pp. 165-7) date the Cambridge manuscript used in Baker’s edition to the author’s lifetime, A.H. 498 (1095 A.D.). However, Savage-Smith notes that the date on the manuscript gives evidence that the copy was made before A.H. 989 (A.D. 1581), and that “neither the script nor the paper are consistent with a date of the fifth/eleventh century (*MMB*, p. 406)” as Browne and Baker mistakenly thought. Savage-Smith also notes the existence of a more recent edition of *Nature of Man* by Yaḥyā Murād (Abū al-Ḥasan Saʿīd Hibat Allāh, *Khalq al-insān*, ed. Y. Murād (Beirut, 2003)), published by the well-known Lebanese publisher Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmiyya. Of this edition, Savage-Smith’s understated observation that the editor does not say “what manuscripts were employed, and no variant readings have been provided for the text (*MMB*, p. 406)” is to the point: Murād’s edition is practically useless to the historian of medicine.

Entry 100 highlights a challenge that confronts anyone who aims to classify ancient bodies of knowledge according to contemporary standards. I find Savage-Smith’s classification of treatises helpful because it reveals the variety and richness of the Bodleian collection (though it perhaps lacks some of the analytical tidiness of a catalogue organized by codex, e.g. N. Serikoff, *Arabic Medical Manuscripts of the Wellcome Library: A Descriptive Catalogue of the Haddād Collection* (Leiden, 2005)). Nonetheless, I should highlight Savage-Smith’s admission that the criteria for inclusion or omission of a manuscript from *MMB* was “somewhat arbitrary (*MMB*, xxiv)”. Saʿīd Hibat Allāh’s *Nature of Man* is a case in point. Savage-Smith gives a folio-by-folio list of all the chapter headings in the Ms. Pococke 66 manuscript in which *Nature of Man* is contained. The treatise roughly divides into six distinct topically-related sections. The first (folios 4a to 9a) deals with reproductive physiology. In it Hibat Allāh discusses male and female sex organs, (biological) gender differentiation, and a physiological exposition on the nature of the womb. Folios 9a-25b resemble an excursus drawn from the popular “sexual performance [*bāh*]” literature (P. Pormann, “Al-Rāzī on the Benefits of Sex: a Clinician Caught between Philosophy and Medicine”, in *Islamic Medical and Scientific Tradition*, vol. 2, ed. P. Pormann (London, New York, 2011), pp. 134-45; M. Ullmann, *Medizin im Islam* (Köln/Leiden, 1970, pp. 193-9); *MMB*, Entries 103-112; P. Franke, “Before *scientia sexualis* in Islamic Culture: ‘ilm al-bāh between Erotology, Medicine and Pornography”, *Social Identities* 18/2 (2012), pp. 161-73). This section discusses the benefits and harmful effects of sex, optimal times for it in the day and year, foodstuffs

that increase sexual potency and pleasure, aphrodisiacs, “therapy for untimely erections [*mudāwāt al-in-‘āz*]”, etc. The third section (folios 25b-37b) deals with embryology. The fourth section (folios 37b-54a) prescribes regimens for before, during, and after childbirth. The fifth section (folios 54a-68b) offers advice on combatting childhood diseases, and on early education. The last fifteen chapters (folios 68b-90b, §§35-50) are the only ones that treat what Savage-Smith calls “medical philosophy”. In these chapters Hibat Allāh discusses the nature of man, the soul, the intellect, and the survival of the soul after death, and ancients’ (*al-qudamā*) opinions on metempsychosis (*tanāsukh*).

Savage-Smith faced two challenges in categorizing this work. The treatise represents a synthesis of different but closely related medical and philosophical genres. The work is “medical”, but it could be placed with equal justification in a volume on the biological or the philosophical manuscripts in the Bodleian library. Hasty scholars of Islamic intellectual history are unlikely to consult *MMB* for treatises affording new insights into eleventh-century Muslim views of the soul (and metempsychosis). Yet, this is just the sort of treatise that such scholarship needs to consult. The second challenge facing Savage-Smith lay in placing *Nature of Man* in the *MMB* itself, since it could, with equal propriety, be placed in the section on “Sexual Matters (Entries §§103-111)”, “Pharmaceutics (§§170-214)”, or “Diet and Regimen (§§158-169).” In the end, Savage-Smith chose to place it in the section entitled “Medical Monographs”, a division further subdivided into a wide variety of topics and genres: “Aphorisms”, “Medical Geography”, “Ophthalmology”, “Diagnosis”, “Sexual Matters”, “Phlebotomy”, “Medical Dictionaries”, and “History of Medicine”. Such arbitrariness is unavoidable; certainly, Savage-Smith is blameless. However, liminal texts such as Hibat Allāh’s deserve close attention from students of Islamic intellectual history.

The organization of *MMB* might be faulted for not drawing attention to the large number of Arabic medical commentaries at the Bodleian. These include commentaries (or super-commentaries) on (1) the *Aphorisms* of Hippocrates, (2) Avicenna’s *Canon*, (3) Ibn Nafīs’ (d. 1288) epitome of the *Canon* entitled the *Summary* (*al-Mūjiz*), (4) Hippocrates’ *Prognostics*, (5) Avicenna’s *Didactic Poem on Medicine* (*Urjūza fī al-Ṭibb*), (6) Hunayn b. Ishāq’s (d. 873 or 877) *Questions on Medicine* (*Masā’il fī al-Ṭibb*), (7) Maḥmūd b. ‘Umar al-Jaghmīnī’s (d. 1344) *Little Canon on Medicine* (*Qānūnchah*), (8) and Najīb al-Samarqandī’s (d. 1222) *Book of Causes and Symptoms* (*Kitāb al-Asbāb wa-al-‘Ālāmāt*). All told, of the 378 medical items catalogued in *MMB*, 52 are commentaries or super-commentaries. Until recently the fact that commentaries were a popular medium for engaging in scientific debate in post-classical Arabic medicine was taken as a sign of stagnation and decline (N. Fancy, “Medical Commentaries: a Preliminary Investigation of Ibn Nafīs’ *Shurūh*, the *Mūjaz*, and Subsequent Commentaries on the *Mūjaz*”, *Oriens* 41 (2013), pp. 525-45). According to Savage-Smith and P. Pormann, conventional wisdom has it that Avicenna’s *Canon* had an “aura of authority that was to prove stultifying rather than invigorating (E. Savage-Smith, P. Pormann, *Medieval Islamic Medicine* (Washington D.C., 2007, p. 70)” to the development of post-classical Arabic medicine. An ever-expanding body of evidence contradicts the conventional characterization of post-classical commentaries. Asad Ahmed has recently argued that historians of

Islamic intellectual history are better served when they understand commentaries as sites of philosophical “conflict and dispute” (A. Ahmed, “Post-Classical Philosophical Commentaries/Glosses: Innovation in the Margins”, *Oriens* 41 (2013), p. 317).

The Bodleian library possesses several commentaries on the *Canon*, or just Book 1 of the *Canon* (typically called the “Book of Generalities [*Kulliyāt*]”), among them commentaries by Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 1210) (Entry 56) and Quṭb al-Dīn al-Shirāzī (d. 1311) (Entry 60). In his engrossing introduction to the descriptive catalogue of the Wellcome Historical Medical Library (A. Iskander, *A Catalogue of Arabic Manuscripts on Medicine and Science in the Wellcome Historical Medical Library* (London, 1967), pp. 33-64; *MMB*, p. 258), Iskander leads us through Quṭb al-Dīn al-Shirāzī’s introduction to his commentary on the *Canon*. Shīrāzī describes in intimate detail the difficulties he met interpreting the *Canon*, the extraordinary lengths he went to to obtain commentaries on it, and the intense scientific debates the book provoked across the Islamic world (Iskander, *Wellcome*, pp. 44f; Pormann, Savage-Smith, *Medieval Islamic Medicine*, pp. 70f). Shīrāzī praises Rāzī’s commentary as the best, but he also mentions commentaries by Afḍal al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Nawmar al-Khunajī (d. 1248), ‘Alī Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Kīshī (d. c. 692/1293), Ibn Nafīs, and many others. Quṭb al-Dīn al-Shirāzī calls the *Canon* “the most difficult book written on medicine (Iskander, *Wellcome*, p. 44)”, and it is an extraordinary fact that these giants of post-classical Islamic intellectual history, all of whom were often deeply critical of Avicenna, wrote medical commentaries on the *Canon* or on the *Generalities*. Post-classical medical commentaries preserved in the Bodleian represent an enormous and largely unexplored source of texts that would allow the student of the history of science and philosophy in the Medieval Islamic world to reassess the nature and extent of Avicenna’s authority on post-classical Arabic medicine.

A more complex narrative about the history of Arabic medicine is also emerging from an ERC-funded research project that studies post-classical Arabic commentaries on the *Aphorisms* of Hippocrates at the University of Manchester (principal investigator: Peter E. Pormann; see P. Pormann, P. Joosse, “Commentaries on the Hippocratic *Aphorisms* in the Arabic Tradition: the Example of Melancholy”, in *Epidemics in Context: Greek Commentaries on Hippocrates in the Arabic Tradition*, ed. P. Pormann (Berlin/Boston, 2012), pp. 211-50). Famous post-classical commentators on the Hippocratic *Aphorisms* such as Ibn Nafīs (Entry 6), Avempace (d. 1138 or 9), ‘Abd al-Laṭīf al-Baghdādī (d. 1231), and Maimonides (d. 1204) (Entry 5), as well as lesser-known figures such as Abū al-Qāsim b. Abī Sādiq (d. after 1068) (Entry 3), ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Mūsā al-Siwāsī (*fl.* 1316) (Entry 7), Ṭāhir b. Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir al-Sinjārī (d. 1106) (Entry 4), Abū Sahl Sa‘īd al-Nīlī (d. 1029) (Entry 2), and Abū al-Faraj b. Ya‘qūb b. Ishāq al-Masīhī Ibn al-Quff (d. 1286) navigate between Galen’s (d. ca. A.D. 216) medical authority, the textual authority of his commentary on the *Aphorisms*, Islamic medical authorities such as Avicenna and Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Zakarīya al-Rāzī, and their own clinical experience as practicing physicians. Ahmed’s characterization of post-classical philosophical commentaries as sites of conflict and dispute holds equally well for post-classical commentaries on the Hippocratic *Aphorisms*. In gen-

eral, commentators adopt remarkably different attitudes toward Galenic and Avicennian medical authority. The challenge for interpreting this enormous body of textual evidence will be in tracing how and why commentators were compelled to make the hermeneutic moves they did. Savage-Smith’s superb catalogue of the Arabic medical manuscripts at the Bodleian library will be an indispensable research tool for generations of scholars interested in the history of Medieval Arabic medicine and philosophy.

University of Manchester,  
May 2014

Kamran I. KARIMULLAH

\*  
\* \*

HALFLANTS, B. — *Le Conte du Portefaix et des Trois Jeunes Femmes dans le manuscrit de Galland (XIVe-XVe siècles)*. (Publications de l’Institut Orientaliste de Louvain, 55). Editions Peeters, Leuven, 2007. (26,5 cm, 490). ISBN 978-90-429-1874-0. ISSN 0076-1265. € 75,-.

One of the significant problems in the field of *Thousand and one night* studies is the difficulty to harmonize its various sub-disciplines. Some say, for instance, that it is useless to study narratological aspects of the collection, or of separate stories, as long as so much remains unknown about the historical evolution of the texts and the philological status of the various manuscripts. Others argue that separate stories can be analysed, or compared to each other, without necessarily considering their historical embedding in the *Thousand and one nights* tradition. It could even be argued that this kind of research is helpful for the reconstruction of the manuscript history because patterns may be discovered in the narrative structures of the stories, such as narrative strategies, topoi, similes and other literary elements. Moreover generic types may be identified which combined with historical references may shed light on the place of stories within the broader framework of literary history. Ideally, of course, scholars working in these fields could combine their efforts and find ways to connect their findings.

One of the sub-disciplines which have received relatively little attention, with regard to the *Thousand and one nights*, is the study of the linguistic characteristics of the various texts. Of course, a thorough study of linguistic features may result in a more secure chronological and geographical anchoring of the texts as they may be typical for specific periods or regions. Vice versa, the texts may be a rich source for historical linguistics, especially since they without exception do not strictly conform to the standards of ‘classical’ Arabic and contain many colloquial elements. They belong to the corpus of entertainment literature which is usually not considered to be part of the literary canon and is written, or at least recorded, in what is called ‘middle Arabic’, or a combination of classical and colloquial languages. It is in this hybridity that the historical/regional specificities lie and therefore the linguistic study of *Thousand and one nights* texts can be profitable for linguists as well as for philologists or narratologists.

In his *Le conte du portefaix et des trois jeunes femmes dans le manuscrit de Galland (XIVe-XVe siècles)*, Bruno Halflants has chosen a specific story of the *Thousand and*



*one nights* as an object for linguistic research, especially focusing on the usage of middle Arabic. The result is a re-edition of the text following the Mahdi-edition (Brill, Leiden 1984), which is based on the manuscript used by Antoine Galland for his famous French translation (published 1705-1717). It is now commonly assumed that this text dates back to the first half of the 15th century, although Halflants still retains the possibility of Mahdi's opinion, who preferred the 14th century. The edition of the text is accompanied by a translation and an elaborate inventory and analysis of the middle Arabic elements. Halflants legitimates the use of the Mahdi text by saying that it is the only critical edition that we have, but he compares the text with an extensive number of other manuscripts and edited versions of the story.

The linguistic analysis in the book is admirably detailed and elaborate. For some it may be somewhat disappointing that Halflants does not try to connect his research with the wider field of *Thousand and one nights* studies. His approach to the texts is cautious and he clearly wants to avoid speculations or philosophizing about the consequences of his research for our knowledge of the different texts. This notwithstanding, the author has made valuable use of the *Thousand and one nights* material to add a 'fragment' to the historical development of Arabic.

University of Amsterdam,  
March 24, 2014

Richard VAN LEEUWEN

\*  
\* \*

DEYOUNG, T. and M. St. GERMAIN (eds) — *Essays in Arabic Literary Biography I: 925-1350*. (Mizân. Studien zur Literatur in der islamischen Welt, Band 17,1). Verlag Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 2011. (24,5 cm, VII, 371). ISBN 978-3-447-06598-6. ISSN 0938-9024. € 68,-.

LOWRY, J.E., and D.J. STEWART (eds) — *Essays in Arabic Literary Biography II: 1350-1850*. (Mizân. Studien zur Literatur in der islamischen Welt, Band 17,2). Verlag Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 2009. (24,5 cm, VII, 431). ISBN 978-3-447-05933-6. ISSN 0938-9024. € 68,-.

ALLEN, R. (ed.) — *Essays in Arabic Literary Biography III: 1850-1950*. (Mizân. Studien zur Literatur in der islamischen Welt, Band 17,3). Verlag Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 2010. (24,5 cm, VII, 392). ISBN 978-3-447-06141-4. ISSN 0938-9024. € 68,-.

Reference works are a useful supplement to scholarly histories of literature, both for scholars and the general reader. Whereas a literary history is first of all concerned with a coherent representation of the development of literary forms and trends, possibly sacrificing detailed information for the sake of balance and coherence, a reference work can focus on specific works and authors, giving all the information available and only lightly hampered by the necessity to embed an author in a broader narrative. Both approaches are useful and necessary; they complement rather than replace each other. But the advantages of both

have their prerequisites: a literary history should present a balanced and coherent overview, while a reference work should strive for completeness and inner logic, especially with regard to the selection of the entries and the kinds of information it offers. In order to be useful, it should be clear about its purpose and demarcations.

The edition of *Essays in Arabic literary biography* is an ambitious project aimed to provide detailed biographical information about some 120 well-known Arabic literati from different periods of Arabic literary history. The work, supervised by Roger Allen, is divided into three volumes, covering the periods 925-1350, 1350-1850 and 1850-1950, each realized by different editors. Each volume counts about 400 pages and contains a treasure of information about the life and work of the selected authors, accompanied by a list of works, both in Arabic and in English translation, besides a list of references. Some entries contain quotations from the work of the author; all are written by well-known specialists in the field.

In spite of these valuable contributions to scholarship, the three-volume edition remains somewhat unsatisfactory, mainly because it is not clarified what the actual purpose of the book is. Each volume is provided with an introduction in which the literary history of the period in question is summarized, to give some background and to situate the authors in a more chronological context. There is hardly any indication, however, about the procedure of the editing and the concept and purpose of the series. It remains unclear, for instance, why the series begins in 925; in the introduction to the third volume it is mysteriously suggested both that this is the 'third (and last)' volume and that it is a 'fourth' volume in the series. Very little is said about the format of the entries and the kind of information included. The third volume contains an entry-index, the second volume a 'Glossary of selected terms', and the first volume no index of any kind. The arrangement of the authors is alphabetical, but some authors are inserted by their first names, others by other parts of their names. All these omissions and inconsistencies give a rather unsystematic impression.

One of the main deficiencies is that no criteria or arguments are given for the choice of the literati who are included. Sometimes they seem to be representing specific literary genres and different geographical regions, but it is not clear how the selection is justified or actually carried out. It is rather strange, for instance, to see an essay dedicated to Ilyās al-Mawsilī, who wrote only a small account of his journey to America in the 1680s. His account is curious, of course, and some readers may be pleased to find information about it here, but should he really be included while writers such as al-Nāblusī, al-Jabartī, al-Maqrīzī, and Ibn Khaldūn are lacking? Of course, it was clearly beyond the intention of the editors to produce a 'complete' biographical encyclopedia of Arabic literati. But the result of their considerable effort is a rather amorphous publication. It is informative and useful, but it looks rather haphazard.

University of Amsterdam,  
March 28, 2014

Richard VAN LEEUWEN

\*  
\* \*

DIEM, W. — Studien zu Überlieferung und Intertextualität der altarabischen Dichtung. Das Mantelgedicht Ka'b ibn Zuhayr. Verlag Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 2010. (24,5 cm, Band I, Studien: XIII, 455, Band II, Texte (Arabic): 224). ISBN 978-3-447-06179-7. € 168,-.

The present study is about transmission and intertextuality of ancient Arabic poetry, pre-Islamic as well as early Islamic poetry, until the end of the first century of the Hijra (in this review, from now on, indicated with H). The most famous ancient Arabic poem, namely “the Garment Poem” (*Qaṣīdat al-Burdah*) is the poem by the *mukhaḍram* poet Ka'b b. Zuhayr, which starts with the words *Bānat Su'ādu*, “*Su'ād* has departed, has separated herself”.

In normal indigenous critical editions of Arabic poetry one has a critical apparatus to explain the variants, however, Diem's procedure and aim was different, namely the examination of the total transmitted materials of the written sources from the end of the second century H on the basis of the conserved versions of the text of the *Dīwān* of Ka'b ibn Zuhayr, in special comments on the *Burdah* as well as in literary testimonies. All together Diem has evaluated more than 270 sources, from which not a few sources contain the whole or nearly the whole poem, when other sources contain parts of the poem or quote isolated verses.

The first volume (Band I) starts with an introduction about the *Burdah* poem, with the mention of the existence of other earlier translations in European languages such as German, Polish, French, English and Italian. From p. 3 we find the *Burdah* poem in Arabic, with a translation into German, 55 verses *in toto*. The author goes deeply into the circumstances under which the poem came into being: the author discusses contents and structure, the different linguistic levels and the allegoric meaning of the poem (p. 11-28). The name *Su'ād* is just to be considered as an improvised proper name without special meaning.

The large chapter about transmission (pp. 29-128) deals with the sources which we will see in chronological arrangement in the second volume (in Arabic letters). The different comments, some 16, are treated on p. 34, such as the one of al-Sukkarī, al-Tibrīzī and al-Aḥwal.

Werner Diem lists some criteria for authenticity: sometimes the uniformity of the material speaks for its authenticity. Also important is ‘the most famous version (*al-riwāyah al-mashhūrah*)’. Other criteria are chronology (earlier attested is probably more authentic), and well-known ‘transmitters’ are generally more authentic, because philologists are more careful and less negligent in transmissions of poetry. Moreover, correctness in handling poetic comparisons and metaphors, and correct metrical forms plead more for authenticity.

In the next pages Werner Diem goes deeper into the notions variants, version, and recension in the light of authenticity. (p. 38-40). A stemma of transmitters is impossible in a text like this, or in the words of the author: ‘It is so much incoherent, that it is not possible to establish a correct transmission scheme for the poem as a whole’ [my translation into English, A.S.]. Then a comment and analysis is made of the single transmitted verses of the poem, all the variants are amply discussed (pp. 46-123).

The next chapter is called ‘Intertextuality’, divided into Part 1 (pp. 129-157; Notions and Problems) and 2 (p. 158-401; verses and results). The relation between the *Burdah*

text and other texts is manifested in, for example, quotations: ‘Koranic quotations’ and ‘functional quotations’, and other things about quotations. The author gives also attention to aspects such as formulas, stereotype formulas, and ‘plagiarisms’ as a part of intertextuality. Already in the second half of the first century H there are lots of early quotations from the *Burdah* which speak for its authenticity (pp. 130-143). The author also goes into the well-known later *mu'araḍah* works of the *Burdah*, by respectively al-Būṣīrī (d. 694 H) and ibn al-Nubātah (d. 768 H).

A little chapter is also devoted to the status quo of the research of the *Burdah*: not only ancient Arabic authors, but also modern Arabic authors and even some Arabists are mentioned: in the last category Régis Blachère, Thomas Bauer, etc. (pp. 147-149). Diem also discusses contemporaries of Ka'b ibn Zuhayr and their *lāmiyyāt*: such as 'Abdah ibn al-Ṭabīb, al-Shammākh and Ka'b ibn Malik of which he includes a list of parallels (pp. 150-155).

In Part 2 of the chapter Intertextuality, he discusses the intertextuality of the 55 verses of the *Burdah*, one for one. To start with the introductory formula ‘*bānat Su'ādu*’ (p. 158), there are twelve identical beginnings from contemporary poets. There is also influence of some of the verses upon later poetry.

The research of the poem has demonstrated that the ‘Garment Poem’ is much related with early and later poetry. The poem not only is quoted by numerous early poets, but it is often quoted in later poets. With respect to the everywhere numerous quotations in the *Burdah*, comes up the question, whether this is a typical characteristic of the *Burdah*, and whether it is authentic. This research has given as results that in the *Burdah* numerous quotations, also more extensive ones, are incorporated. Diem says: “When occupying myself during a longer period with this theme, one gets the impression, that the poetry in the then existing time is interwoven to an even higher extent with quotations than one has assumed hitherto. [...] The multitude of quotations in the *Burdah* is nothing unusual, but represents more or less the normal situation of the then existing poetry, which one has to think as the poetry of the greatest, in majority professional poets, since I could establish only quotations from their works, when this in occasional poems of a multitude of unimportant poets was not the case.”

Gustav von Grunebaum<sup>1</sup>) had already described this reference network in the following words: “It may sometimes appear to us that everybody copied everybody and that literary theft was universally practiced and condoned”.

The conclusion from this has to be that the multitude of quotations of the *Burdah* does not speak against their authenticity. On the other hand, the multitude of quotations in the *Burdah* certainly does not prove also the authenticity of the poem. The intertextual connection possibly appeared already in *mukhaḍram* poets such as Ka'b ibn Zuhayr, since these poets stood in a poetic tradition, which started long before them and at the same time is well documented.

The quotations from the *Burdah* are not less numerous than the quotations in her, but plays in the judgement of the authenticity of the *Burdah* a fundamentally different role.

<sup>1</sup>) Gustav von Grunebaum, ‘The concept of plagiarism in Arabic theory’, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 3 (1944), pp. 234.

Quotations from this work namely witness that this work existed at the moment in which they quoted it. Quotations from the *Burdah* already in the poetry of the second half of the first century H were so dense and frequent, that one can only conclude with a wide dissemination of the poem at that time.

The earliest quotations from the *Burdah* originate therefore from already the first half of the first century H. Especially important are the quotation from al-Ḥutay'ah vers 36-38 in a wish poem directed to 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb (reg. 13-23 H), for which the year 23 H as being his death year presents the *terminus ante quem* (p. 334ff.).

Also very early are the quotations in the *Lāmiyyah* by 'Abdah b. al-Tabīb, whose name was mentioned in the battle of al-Qādisiyyah (16 H). These chronological evidences are compatible with the date 9 H transmitted in the *Burdah* or do not refute this date. Other subchapters are devoted to 'variants in early quotations', authenticity, intertextuality and schools of poets; and lists of quotations in and from the *Burdah* according to poets (pp. 382-393). The explanation of the difficult expression 'ālah ḥadbā' (a 'bier' according to some; 'a difficult situation' according to others) in vers 35 is discussed on the basis of the different *Burdah* comments and their explanations. Diem himself is favourable to the interpretation 'difficult unhappy situation' (pp. 394-401).

A special chapter is devoted to Ibn Ḥijjah's comment entitled *Bulūgh al-marām* (pp. 402-436). The context of the comment is amply dealt with also with mention of quotations from the comments by al-Tibrīzī and Ibn Hishām as well as the discrepancy between Ibn Ḥijjah's verse text and his verse comment (pp. 433-436; see for the texts in Arabic: Volume 2). Volume 1 ends with the usual indices (pp. 437-445).

The second volume (Band II) of the book contains the Arabic texts. First there are remarks (now in Arabic) about the *riwāyah* (transmission) of the *Qaṣīdat al-Burdah*, followed by an introduction (*tamhīd*, pp. 1-3). The sources of the *Burdah* in historical arrangement according to the death data of the authors are then enumerated (pp. 4-20). Among the authors are the *Kitāb al-'Ayn* by al-Khalīl and the *Ḥamāsah* by al-Buḥturī as well as the *Zahrah* by Ibn Da'ūd, with the more than 270 sources mentioned on the even pages, and the mentioned verses of the *Burdah* on the uneven pages. The so-called *riwāyah* (transmitted text) is to be found from pp. 22-147, consisting of the 55 verses of the *Burdah*. Then follow from pp. 148-169 some 490 *hawāmish* (notes) by the editor. Then follows the text of the *sharḥ* by Ibn Ḥijjah al-Ḥamawī (pp. 171-187, with notes pp. 182-187), and finally an index (*fihrist*) of the sources of the *Burdah* (with a misprint in the headings of the page!) and other sources (pp. 189-224).

Diem's book is a clear contribution to scholarship: he has come to the foreground with relatively less investigated and sometimes neglected problems of philology, textuality and intertextuality and has brought a body of fascinating poetic and philological material again to our attention, and has provided extensive translations and explanations of parts of this material which gives us an excellent view of what exists in the Arabic poetic and philological tradition, helping us determine how to move forward in our understanding of how the transmission of a canonical Arabic poetic text took place during several centuries. Diem's work suggests new approaches to the history of neglected occurrences and circumstances in Arabic poetry and philology. Finally, the monograph gives compelling evidence for the impact of Arabic philological

literature which we often did not realize, and which continues from the Middle Ages to this day with fascinating ramifications. In all these ways Diem's work is a service to the scholarly community and a product of the best German philological tradition.

Amsterdam,  
April 2014

Arie SCHIPPERS

\*  
\* \*

ULLMANN, M. — Beiträge zur arabischen Grammatik. Verlag Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 2013. (25 cm, 361). ISBN 978-3-447-06942-7. € 112,-.

In accordance with its title, this new book by Manfred Ullmann contains a number of contributions to the grammar of Arabic, but in fact, its importance transcends this scope. It does offer new insights into the linguistic usage of the Arabs from before Islam until the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> / 9<sup>th</sup> century, but the unique manner in which the research has been carried out and presented leaves us with food for meditations on methods of investigation, on the merits of the indigenous traditions in the fields of grammar, lexicon and Koran-interpretation, on the relation between the study of the Arabic language in the West and the native tradition, and on the translation of ancient Arabic texts (in particular some difficult passages in the Koran).

The book is in five parts. The first part (about the morpheme *fā'ilatun*) is the longest: with 268 pages, it covers three quarters of the entire book. The other parts concern such words and expressions as 'awlā, nāhika, balha, da' šay'an and na'am, which are not, of course, marked by a particularly high frequency of occurrence, but anyone who comes across any of these in their reading could arguably take great advantage of the study of the 177 text citations provided by Ullmann within the context of a clear and learned exposé of all the intricacies of the subject.

The morpheme *fā'ilatun*, by contrast, is very common. It is of course the female singular form of the active participle of the basic stem (I) of the Arabic tri-radical verb. But it is not this function that Ullmann discusses here. As he explains, this morpheme also occurs as a *maṣdar*, or, as he prefers to call it, nomen actionis (elsewhere in the literature referred to as "infinitive", or "verbal substantive"). References to this usage are scarce; it is completely neglected in most Arabic grammars and if dealt with at all, then only cursorily.

As an example, the word *kādibatun* may be cited. Normally, it will refer to a female liar or, as an adjective, describe the deceptive character of the person alluded to, translating therefore as "lying" or "deceitful". But as a nomen actionis it would be "the act of lying or deceiving" or "deception" or "lies" (as in: "I hate lies"), and it is Ullmann's assumption that the nomen actionis *kādibatun*, not the concrete noun nor the adjective, is used in the Qur'an 56:1-2: 'idā waqa 'at-i l-wāqi'atu \* laysa li-waq'atihā kādibatun. Therefore, rather than following Bell ("When the Event happens, At whose happening there is no false speaker") or Arberry ("When the Terror descends and none denies its descending") he translates "Wenn das Ereignis eintritt — darüber, dass es sich ereignet, gibt es keine Täuschung" (When the event occurs — about its happening there is no deception).



Are there many examples of this phenomenon? In § 331 of his *Mufaṣṣal*, az-Zamaḥṣarī (ed. J.P. Broch, Christiania 1879) enumerates the 32 patterns given by Sībawayh of the *maṣdar* of stem I, but *fā'ilatun* is missing from the list. A little further on, in § 333, he states that the *maṣdar* can sometimes have the form of the active or passive participle. As examples of the *fā'ilatun*-type he mentions *fāḍilatun*, *'āfiyatun*, *kādibatun*, and *dāllatun*. Heinrich Fleischer (*Kleinere Schriften*, Bd. 1, Leipzig 1885, reprint Osnabrück 1968, 196-202) discusses the passage in question together with its commentary by Ibn Yaṣīṣ (ed. G. Jahn, Leipzig 1882-6) who adds the additional examples of *'āqibatun* and *bāqiyatun*, but Fleischer does not interpret the items given as examples of a *maṣdar* and prefers to consider them as substantivized neuter adjectives derived from the participle.

In the third edition of William Wright's *Grammar of the Arabic language* (Vol. I, § 196, Cambridge 1933) 48 first stem *maṣdar* types are given (16 more than in Sībawayh's list), but again *fā'ilatun* is missing.

Jakob Barth in his *Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen* (Leipzig 1894, pp. 149-151), mentions 15 Arabic examples of infinitives of the *fā'ilatun*-pattern, 11 provided with references to texts, the other 4 without any reference. He calls it "eine noch wenig beachtete Infinitivform" (an infinitive-form to which so far little attention has been given), rejects in a footnote Fleischer's attempt at reinterpreting its meaning on the basis of the supposedly original meaning of the participle, has observations on phonetics, but otherwise does not elaborate on the subject.

Carl Brockelmann discusses the use of *fā'ilatun* as an infinitive abstractum in his *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen I*, 342-343 and gives 7 examples (6 from Barth's list plus the lexeme *fā'idatun*), but he fails to mention the phenomenon in his Arabic grammar.

Therefore, it would seem that we are dealing here with a marginal phenomenon. In fact, however, Ullmann comes up with the astounding number of 1126 text citations, each of them having an example of a *maṣdar* dressed up as the female active participle of the basic verb stem. Apart from three examples in a one-page appendix at the end of the book, they are all in the 244-paged inventory. This has 157 sections numbered with roman numerals and arranged in alphabetical order according to the trilateral root of the corresponding lexeme, from *'bd* for *'ābidatun* to *whn* for *wāhinatun*. There are 36 lexemes with just one text quotation; the others have nine text quotations on average, with a maximum of 39 references for *nāfilatun*. The examples are taken from lines of poetry, verses from the Qur'ān (28 different lexemes), and prose texts, showing the actual Arabic linguistic usage of early times (up to the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup>/9<sup>th</sup> century). The book has been printed from sheets in the hand of the author with all Arabic texts in fully vocalized script. Quotations from Arabic translations from Greek are provided with the corresponding Greek text, original Arabic texts are provided with a translation by the author (in German) or by other Orientalists (in German, English or French). References to sources are in the style of the *Wörterbuch der Klassischen Arabischen Sprache*.

In his introduction to his discussion of the morpheme *fā'ilatun* as nomen actionis Ullmann mentions a total of 1057 text citations (p. 21). The difference with the number 1126 mentioned above is caused by various inserted examples (e.g. 505a and 505b between 505 and 506). There is

also an extra lexeme (*ṣāfiyatun*, with number LXXa) in the appendix.

On the other hand, some examples occur more than once. This happens when the text in question contains two or more different lexemes, so that, for example, the proverb *al-wāqiyatu ḥayrun min-a r-rāqiyati* ("taking precautions is better than having recourse to incantations") is found at root LVI (*rqy*) as well as root CLVI (*wqy*).

Ullmann's method is essentially simple. It is practice before theory. Practice not in the sense of taking a few examples or carrying out a random sample survey, but rather a full and systematic exploration of all the preserved linguistic evidence, all examples that can be found and humanly managed. Once the details are methodically arranged, the linguistic regularities, incidental deviations, and evolutions over time will emerge with little need for improbable conjectures. Understandably, such a project cannot be accomplished overnight. Determination and perseverance are needed. These are qualities that Ullmann is certainly not without. In the introduction we learn that he has been collecting the material on which he bases his study for no less than 55 years.

The grammatical tradition of the Arabs is regularly brought in, however not as the point of departure, but instead as just a corpus of viewpoints and interpretations that cannot take precedence over a study of the original source material. Application of these principles has the effect that *Beiträge zur arabischen Grammatik* is full of new insights along with many old views that are summarily dismissed. The old views are those of ancient Arab grammarians as well as those of Western authors. According to Ullmann, inadequate Arabic grammar in the West is often due to the unwarranted assumption that the old Arab grammarians had given a complete and correct description of their language. In his preface, Ullmann uses a quotation from 1883 to hint at what he apparently considers as a token of exaggerated esteem for the native tradition, a kind of behaviour that may compromise the required scholarly attitude:

This Grammar is designed in conformity with the Prophet's injunction *ista'inū fi ṣ-ṣinā'āt bi-'ahlihā* (Seek help in arts from their masters), which, as applied to the study of Arabic grammar, may be interpreted to mean that the learner should have recourse to the teaching of the native Grammarians, and eschew the unauthorized conjectures of foreign scholars. (M.S. Howell, *Grammar of the classical Arabic language*).

With foreign scholars acting as deferential associates of native grammarians it can be explained why certain grammatical topics that are neglected in the East are just as much absent in the West, resulting in a gap in our knowledge that has galvanized Ullmann into producing yet another book to put things right. In the Introduction, he specifies 48 passages of his inventory where translators failed to take account of the nomen actionis function of *fā'ilatun*.

More than half of these concern passages from the Qur'ān. Modern translators of the Qur'ān have largely adopted the interpretations of the medieval Arab exegetes, who, more often than not, would stick to the conventional meaning of a word in isolation thereby missing the exact sense that can be found by starting from the original meaning of the root. As Ullmann puts it: The explanations of the Arab exegetes and lexicographers have laid themselves like mildew over the real meanings and thereby hindered the correct understanding of the Qur'ān throughout the ages until the present day (p. 275).

Only some examples of the many interesting results can be given here:

Q 79:10 *yaqūlūna 'a-'innā la-mardūdūna fī l-ḥāfirati*: “Sind wir, die wir in der Grabung (d.h. in der Grube) waren, wirklich zurückgebracht worden?” (= Have we who were in the digging really been brought back?). Cf. Bell: “Are we verily brought back as we were before?”; Arberry: “Are we being restored as we were before?” (Part of the difficulty of this verse has to do with the position of *fī l-ḥāfirati* at the end of the sentence in rhyme position.)

Q 79:14 *fa-'idā hum bi-s-sāhirati*: “Da sind sie plötzlich im Wachsein”. (= And all of a sudden they are in waking state). The majority of exegetes and translators interpret *as-sāhiratu* as “the earth”. (In this item Ullmann could have referred to Friedrun Müller’s *Untersuchungen zur Reimprosa im Koran*, Tübingen 1969 as he does elsewhere in the book. She arrives at the same result, but interestingly by a different route, viz. by comparing this verse with the five other Qur’anic passages that have *fa-'idā hum*.)

Q 69:5 *fa-'ammā tamūdu fa-'uhlikū bi-ṭ-ṭāḡiyati*: “Die Tamūd nun wurden aufgrund (ihrer) Widersetzlichkeit vernichtet.” (= destroyed on account of their rebelliousness). Cf. Bell: “... they were destroyed by the Outburst (lit. that which passes its limits; the reference would naturally be to a flood)”.

Q 12:107 *'a-fa-'aminū 'an ta'tiyahum ḡāṣiyatun min 'adābi llāhi*: “Sind sie denn sicher, dass sie nicht eine Heim-suchung als Strafe Gottes treffen wird ...?” (= Are they then confident that no visitation will come upon them as divine punishment?) The verb *ḡāṣiya* has two dissimilar meanings: 1) “to cover s.o. or s.th.”; 2) “to visit”, and in negative contexts “to descend upon, overtake”. Ullmann argues in favour of the second meaning for this and the other two Qur’anic verses; many translators have “covering” or “coverers”.

Two verses concerning the word *nāfilatun*:

1) Q 21:72 *wa-wahabnā lahū 'ishāqa wa-ya'qūba nāfilatan wa-kullan ḡa'alnā ṣāliḥīna*: “Und wir haben ihm (d.h. dem Abraham) Isaak und Jakob geschenkt als Gnadengabe, und wir haben gemacht, dass alle fromm wurden”. (= We gave to him Isaac and Jacob as a divine gift ...).

2) Q 17:79 *wa-min-a l-layli fa-tahaḡḡad bihī nāfilatan laka 'asā 'an yab'atāka rabbuka maqāman maḡmūdan*: “Und in der Nacht, da bleibe in ihr (betend) wach, als eine Gnadengabe für dich; vielleicht wird dich dein Herr in einen gelobten Stand erheben”. (= And at night, stay awake in it (in prayer), as a divine gift for you ...). Here the “divine gift” is to be taken as meaning that the devotional watch can be a gladdening spiritual experience.

In both cases Ullmann opts for “(divine) gift” in translating *nāfila*, thereby turning away from the interpretations of all modern translators who will have something like “in addition” in sūra 21 and “a voluntary action” or “a work of supererogation” in sūra 17. In what is the longest of the 157 *fā'ilatun*-sections (more than 10 pages) he adduces strong evidence for his stance, in particular a great number of early text examples that show the contemporary use of the word with its collocations and, perhaps surprisingly, celebrates the support he finds for his interpretation in the work of the early philologist Abū 'Ubayda (d. ± 825), who, incidentally, alsode-fines the interpretation of *bi-ṭ-ṭāḡiyati* suggested by Ullmann.

Other problematic Qur’anic passages concern Judgment Day. Words such as *al-'azīfatu* (Q 40:18 and 53:57), *aṣ-ṣāḡḡhatu*, (Q 80:33), *al-qāri'atu* (Q 101:1-3), *al-wāqi'atu* (Q 69:15) have often been taken as concrete nouns, or else as adjectives in an elliptical construction where *as-sā'atu* “the Hour of Resurrection” would have to be supplied. For *al-ḡāqqatu* (Q 69:1-3) we find “That which is due!” in Bell, “Celle qui doit (venir)” in Blachère, “The Indubitable” in Arberry and “(Die Stunde) in der es wahr wird” in Paret. Starting from the basic meaning of the verb *ḡaqqā* as “to be true”, “to become true”, “to come true” and comparing other uses of the word in the Qur’anic (e.g. Q 32: 13 *wa-lākin ḡaqqā l-qawlu minnī* “but my word has become true”) Ullmann adopts “das Werden der Wahrheit, das Wahrwerden” (= “the coming into being of the truth” or “the becoming true”) as the meaning of the nomen actionis *ḡāqqatun*. In his version the Qur’anic *al-ḡāqqatu* \* *mā l-ḡāqqatu* \* *wa-mā 'adrāka mā l-ḡāqqatu* becomes “Der Anbruch der Wahrheit. Was ist der Anbruch der Wahrheit? Woher weißt du, was der Anbruch der Wahrheit bedeutet?”. (= The dawning of the truth ...). With this translation there might remain some theological haziness, but it would seem that the linguistic truth is setting in. (May I add in passing that the appendix of *A Concise Dictionary of Koranic Arabic* compiled by Arne A. Ambros with Stephan Procházka contains a complete list of the eight of the 28 Qur’anic *fā'ilatun* lexemes used to refer to the Qur’anic Doomsday. On page 275 Ullmann wrongly calls this list totally incomplete, but the 20 lexemes that he considers missing do not refer to Judgment Day.)

Another problem is posed by the use of a nomen actionis together with a verb of the same root. H. Reckendorf surveys the phenomenon in his *Über Paronomasie in den semitischen Sprachen* (Giessen 1909). In § 19.2 he mentions examples with an infinitive or other non-concrete noun as subject and a cognate predicate, such as *ḡadda ḡidduhum* “their striving strove” (= they strove well and truly) and *ḡalla ḡalāluhū* “his majesty is majestic” (= he is majestic). Expressions such as *'azifat-i l-'azīfatu* (Q 40:18) and *fa-yawma 'idin waqa'at-i l-wāqi'atu* (Q 69:15) are built according to this pattern. Out of context they could translate as “it is near” and “that day it will happen”.

A final example from the Qur’anic, one with implications for the scope of Muḡammad’s mission, is the use of the word *kāffatan* in Q 34:28. Here it is not the usual Arabic for “all”, but the *maṣdar* or nomen actionis of the verb *kaffa yakuffu* “to hold back, to restrain”. Ullmann’s translation of *wa-mā 'arsalnāka 'illā kāffatan li-n-nāsi baṣīran wa-naḡīran* reads: “Wir haben dich als Freudenboten und Warner gesandt, nur um den Menschen Einhalt zu gebieten” (wörtlich: „als eine Hinderung, Beschwichtigung für die Menschen“) (= we sent you as bearer of glad tidings and warner only in order to halt the people ...). In his article “Fasste Muḡammad seine Verkündigung als eine universelle, auch für Nichtaraber bestimmte Religion auf?” *Islamica* II (1926) 135-149, the Danish scholar Frants Buhl (1850-1932) discusses the question whether Muḡammad considered his mission as one for the entire humanity or whether he had just his own land and people in mind. In a footnote he doubts that the interpretation “altogether” for *kāffatan* is correct and comes up with the suggestion that it is the “Verbalabstraktum” of *kaffa*. With all clarifications provided by Ullmann it is now easy to see that Buhl’s suggestion was right (in contrast with August



Fischer's observation in his *Chrestomathie aus Prosaschriftstellern* that for the sake of emphasis *kāffatan* "altogether" has, against the rules, been put in front of the relevant concept).

The importance of this book for students of the Qur'an will be clear. But it is also a treasure trove to the Arabist who wants to study and translate ancient poetry. The book's more than 1300 quotations with their straightforward and transparent translation constitute as many examples from which to learn the trade. And, of course, there is also much detail on Arabic lexicography. The root *ḡw* in section LXXVI has only one text quotation for the nomen actionis according to *fā'ilatun*, but as the root and its derivations are not mentioned in Lane, Ullmann takes the opportunity of supplying 27 references to texts with this root (12 examples for stem I, 2 for the nomen actionis *ḡā'*, 2 for the nomen vicis *ḡawatun*, 1 for stem IV, 8 for stem VI, 1 for *fa'ālun* and the one *fā'ilatun* example). Other passages of special lexicographic interest can be found in sections CIII (*ḡfṣ*) and CXV (*qdh*).

Ullmann's book should be studied by all students of Arabic. The spectacular results should find their way into new grammars, dictionaries, studies of Arabic poetry, Qur'an studies, and Qur'an translations.

Leiden, April 2014

Willem STOETZER