Concepts of Authorship
in Pre-Modern Arabic Texts

Lale Behzadi, Jaakko Hämeen-Anttila (eds.)

7 Bamberger Orientstudien

Bamberger Orientstudien

hg. von Lale Behzadi, Patrick Franke, Geoffrey Haig,
Christoph Herzog, Birgitt Hoffmann, Lorenz Korn und
Susanne Talabardon

Band 7

Concepts of Authorship
in Pre-Modern Arabic Texts

Lale Behzadi und Jaakko Hämeen-Anttila (eds.)

Table of Contents

Preface

The history of Arabic literature presents itself characteristically as a history of names which implicates that the prevalence of authors themselves shapes our perception of literary history.[1] By contrast, however, authors can be very hard to track, often dissolving and hiding amidst other voices, as we will see in this volume. Asking about the author invariably means asking about the preconditions of our research. It also means that concepts of authorship always point to something beyond the author. At the same time we inevitably stumble over the author in a sense every time we try to understand a text.

The questions on authorship that could be asked of pre-modern Arabic texts are manifold and cover a wide range of approaches. As a result of a collaboration between the Universities of Bamberg and Helsinki we discussed some of these questions at an international workshop in Bamberg in 2012, roughly grouping them into the following sections:

(1) the different forms of self-preservation and the staging of authorship, respectively; (2) the various functions an author can adopt, i.e. editor, narrator, commentator, compiler, etc.; (3) the relationship between author and text, i.e. his presence, influence, and intention; (4) the importance of biography with regard to social relations, economic context, patronage, personal situation, etc.; (5) the problem of intellectual property and copyright; (6) the different and often contradicting perspectives an author can provide and the reader can adopt, i.e. the author as an authority, as an individual, as a character, etc.[2]

---

1   This goes along with a reduction in complexity we should be aware of. Jannidis et al., "Rede über den Autor an die Gebildeten unter seinen Verächtern," 32 (for bibliographical details, see "introduction").

2   It is rather difficult to produce a comprehensive list of all possible authorial functions. It is also true that there are many different terms and definitions, such as "precursory authorship", "executive authorship", "collaborative authorship", "revisionary authorship" etc., depending on the academic perspective and zeitgeist. Love, *Attributing Authorship*, 32-50 (for bibliographical details, see "introduction").

The contributions in this book show authorial functions in the most varied ways; they provide inspiration and suggestions for new readings and interpretations. This volume therefore constitutes an initial step on the road towards a more profound understanding of authorial concepts in pre-modern Arabic literature and will hopefully encourage further research in this field.

We would like to express our sincere appreciation to our colleagues who have contributed to this volume. They have been willing to participate in this very inspiring and never-ending scholarly endeavor of critical reading and re-reading of various Arabic textual genres. We wish to thank the Editorial Board of the Bamberger Orientstudien and the Bamberg University Press for accepting this volume in their series. We also thank the Fritz Thyssen Foundation which made this workshop possible. Our special thanks go to our editorial assistant Felix Wiedemann for his strong commitment and valuable support.

Lale Behzadi   Jaakko Hämeen-Anttila

Bamberg and Helsinki, November 18, 2015

Assembling an Author:

On The Making of al-Hamadhānī's *Maqāmāt*

Bilal W. Orfali and Maurice A. Pomerantz

Modern readers encounter a book assuming that the author has played a central role in its creation. They anticipate (rightly or wrongly) that the name prominently displayed on the cover has been involved in the making of the book: i.e., drafting the text; dividing the work into sections; and arranging the contents. In some cases, they might imagine that this author selected the pictures, decided on the captions, and has chosen such material features such as the typeface and paper. While readers know that editors and publishers often shape the final form of modern books in important ways, few would hesitate to affirm that the role of the author is central to the modern book's production.

Authors in the medieval Arabic world were also involved in many aspects of the production of their own books. For instance, the author may have selected the individual poems, letters, stories, or speeches. He may have considered their arrangement. He may have even made an autograph copy on particular paper and using particular ink. Alternatively, the author may have dictated the work aloud to multiple scribes, and authorized them to teach the work through the granting of an *ijāza*. The particular features of authorial control in an age before mechanical reproduction are certainly of vital concern to the student of classical Arabic literature in general and deserve greater awareness on the part of their modern students.

In this article, we address such problems of authorship and authorial control through a particular example: the collection of the *Maqāmāt* of Badīʿ al-Zamān al-Hamadhānī. One of the central works of Classical Arabic literature, the *Maqāmāt* of al-Hamadhānī has long been known mainly through Muḥammad ʿAbduh's standard edition of 1889.

Most modern readers have been content to read the *maqāmāt* in ʿAbduh's edition without reference to the earlier manuscript tradition, be-

lieving that the noted Muslim scholar had altered the text in various places only for the sake of moral propriety.[1] Yet as D. S. Richards pointed out in an article of 1991, many of the hypotheses of modern critics about the text of Hamadhānī would not withstand scrutiny because the basic features of the text that were assumed to be the work of the author such as the titles of *maqāmāt* and their order, were clearly the product of later redaction and not the work of the author.[2]

Recent studies of the *Maqāmāt* of Hamadhānī suggest further difficulties in offering basic interpretations of the text of the *maqāmāt* in the absence of a critical edition based on a thorough study of the work's manuscript tradition.[3] In an article entitled, "Badīʿ al-Zamān al-Hamadhānī's *Maqāma* of Bishr b. ʿAwāna," Ibrahim Geries demonstrates how a text that falls outside of the canon of Hamadhānī's *maqāmāt* in the standard editions, *Bishriyya*, is numbered as a *maqāma* in two manuscripts. Moreover, Geries demonstrates how modern scholars' reliance upon the late recension of ʿAbduh has led them to base their analyses on terms and expressions that are late interpolations in the text.[4]

In the recent article, entitled "A Lost Maqāma of Badīʿ al-Zamān al-Hama<u>dh</u>ānī?" we identify a hitherto unknown *maqāma* on medicine in

---

1   Monroe, *The Art of Badīʿ Az-Zamān*, 112, "Serious problems exist concerning the textual transmission of the *Maqāmāt* by Hamadhānī yet many of these cannot be solved without the existence of a critical edition explaining the number and ordering of the maqāmas as they appear in different recensions," or more positively on p. 14, "It is my hope that the eventual appearance of Professor Pierre A. Mackay's criticial edition of Hamadhānī's *Maqāmāt* will provide future scholars with the means to correct any shortcomings attributable to faulty readings." Unfortunately, Mackay's edition has never appeared. Most modern readers unfortunately have not even used the uncensored editions. Of these versions, ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd's edition is on the whole superior. It includes the *Bishriyya* as a *maqāma* and does at times "correct" ʿAbduh in certain places.

2   Richards, "The 'Maqāmāt'."

3   Geries, "Maqāma of Bishr b. ʿawāna," 125-126, "The absence of a reliable critical edition of the *maqāma*s has had an adverse effect on a number of studies that have dealt with them, singly or as a whole, especially with respect to their nature, their sequence, their unity, their number, their poetics and the interpretation of some of them."

4   Ibid.

the second oldest extant manuscript of the *Maqāmāt* of Hamadhānī, Yale University MS, Salisbury collection 63.[5] We discuss in the article its possible authenticity, noting that because of its early preservation in the corpus, *al-Maqāma al-Ṭibbiyya* is better attested than one-fifth of the *maqāmāt* included in the *textus receptus* and urge a re-evaluation of the textual history of Hamadhānī's *Maqāmāt*.

In the present article, we focus primarily on the collection of Hamadhānī's *Maqāmāt* in an effort to understand how the *Maqāmāt* in the absence of the author's direct participation came to be assembled into an independent literary work. The first section of the paper surveys the earliest evidence for the circulation of Hamadhānī's work prior to the appearance of manuscripts. The next section considers the growth of Hamadhānī's collection from the 6th-10th/12th-16th centuries. The article then provides a list of the extant manuscripts of Hamadhānī's *Maqāmāt* and divides them into three main families. The last section discusses how the manuscripts of Hamadhānī were influenced by the later tradition of authoring *maqāmāt* in collections.

1 The Circulation of Hamadhānī's *Maqāmāt* prior to MS Fatih 4097

The *maqāmāt* of Hamadhānī are works that can be read independently of one another. Nevertheless, certain features suggest that the collection ought to be read together. The recurrence of characters, the narrative device of recognition (*anagnorisis*), and the variation of the locales of action point to an author conscious of the creation of a collection, or at the least a group of works intended to be read serially. Hamadhānī himself refers to the *maqāmāt* of Abū l-Fatḥ in the plural, as if the individual *maqāma*s acquired meaning from being a part of a presumed totality.

In all probability, Hamadhānī never compiled his own *maqāmāt* in a definitive written collection. Hamadhānī's *maqāmāt*, nevertheless, circulated and became known to his contemporaries as works of elegant prose. Abū Manṣūr al-Thaʿālibī (d. 429/1038) who had met and known Hamadhānī, quotes from the *maqāmāt* in both his *Thimār al-qulūb* and

---

5   Orfali and Pomerantz, "A Lost Maqāma of Badīʿ al-Zamān al-Hamaḏānī?"

in his *Yatīmat al-dahr*. He does so, however, treating the *maqāmāt* as elegant *exempla* of prose stylistics. If he was aware of the *maqāma* as a distinctive literary form, he does not discuss this.[6]

Abū Isḥāq al-Ḥuṣrī (d. 413/1021), also includes *maqāmāt* in his compilation *Zahr al-ādāb*. His quotations are far more substantial than those of al-Thaʿālibī. He relates twenty *maqāmāt* in total throughout the volume. Al-Ḥuṣrī is conscious of the literary form of the *maqāma*s—which might explain his attempts to suggest their kinship to a work of Ibn Durayd. Indeed, al-Ḥuṣrī identifies Hamadhānī's *maqāmāt* as featuring the two characters who are named by the author: ʿĪsā b. Hishām and Abū l-Fatḥ al-Iskandarī.[7] When al-Ḥuṣrī quotes from the *Maqāmāt* he consistently refers to them as from "the composition of Badīʿ al-Zamān from the Maqāmāt of Abū l-Fatḥ" (*min inshāʾ Badīʿ al-Zamān fī maqāmāt Abī l-Fatḥ*). At one point, al-Ḥuṣrī states that the text which he is relating is "from the Maqāmāt of al-Iskandarī on beggary which he composed and dictated in 385/995" (*min maqāmāt al-Iskandarī fī l-kudya mimmā anshaʾahu Badīʿ al-Zamān wa-amlāhu fī shuhūr sanat khams wa-thamānīn wa-thalāthimiʾa*).

Al-Ḥuṣrī relates Hamadhānī's *maqāmāt* in the *Zahr al-Ādāb* much as he does in other works of poetry and prose—classifying them according to the subjects which they describe. Thus he relates the *Azādhiyya* in a section on the "description of food" (*waṣf al-ṭaʿām*).[8] Similarly, in the course of a discussion of al-Jāḥiẓ, al-Ḥuṣrī supplies a "*maqāma* that is related to the mention of al-Jāḥiẓ."[9] Some of these groupings by al-Ḥuṣrī match modern generic classifications, such as a section of the work on "the abasement of the beggar" (*dhull al-suʾāl*) which prompts him to relate the text of the *Makfūfiyya*.[10] In all of the above cases, al-Ḥuṣrī considers the individual *maqāmāt* examples of the prose composition of Hamadhānī

---

6 See al-Thaʿālibī, *Thimār al-qulūb*, 203. For the quotations to *Yatīmat al-dahr*, see Geries, "On Jaakko Hämeen-Anttila," esp. 188.

7 Al-Ḥuṣrī, *Zahr al-ādāb wa-thimār al-albāb*, 305.

8 Al-Ḥuṣrī, *Zahr al-ādāb*, 2:343.

9 Al-Ḥuṣrī, *Zahr al-ādāb*, 2:543.

10 Al-Ḥuṣrī, *Zahr al-ādāb*, 4:1132.

on various topics, and not as components of a particular written collection.

In his *Maqama: a history of a genre* Jaakko Hämeen-Anttila posits the existence of an earlier, smaller collection of twenty to thirty of Hamadhānī's *maqāmāt*, circulating in North Africa. The evidence that Hämeen-Anttila adduces for this smaller collection of *maqāmāt* comes from a variety of sources: Richards' examination of the manuscripts (noted above); the statement of Ibn Sharaf al-Qayrawānī (d. 460/1067) in his *Masā'il al-intiqād* that Hamadhānī's collection contains 20 *maqāma*s; and citations from twenty of the *maqāmāt* in al-Ḥuṣrī's *Zahr al-ādāb* noted above. Given the early date and provenance of these witnesses to the *Maqāmāt*, Hämeen-Anttila suggests that they point to the existence of an early manuscript tradition containing twenty *maqāmāt* of Hamadhānī, with most of the *maqāmāt* included in this early collection coming from the beginning of Hamadhānī's *Maqāmāt* (according to the order of the standard edition of Muḥammad 'Abduh).[11]

2 The Growth of Hamadhānī's Corpus of *Maqāmāt* from the 6ᵗʰ-10ᵗʰ/12ᵗʰ-16ᵗʰ century

MS Fatih 4097: The First Extant *Maqāma* Collection

MS Fatih 4097 dating to 520/1126 is a particularly important manuscript for the study of the early history of the *maqāma* genre. First, it is the oldest extant collection of Hamadhānī's *Maqāmāt*. Second, it is bound with the collection of ten *maqāmāt* of Ibn Nāqiyā (d. 485/1092). The latter collection is distinctive because it is the first *maqāma* collection we know of to have a written introduction which identifies its author, and to have a uniform hero that appears in all of the *maqāmāt*.

Although identified on the title page (f. 2a) as the *Maqāmāt* of al-Hamadhānī, the *Maqāmāt* in MS Fatīḥ 4097 lacks an introduction. The *Maqāmāt* of Hamadhānī begin on f. 2b with the *basmala* followed imme-

---

11 Hämeen-Anttila, *Maqama*, 118-119.

diately by the phrase "*ḥaddathanā ʿĪsā b. Hishām*." Subsequent *maqāmāt* are identified by numeric titles.

The most significant feature of the *maqāmāt* of Hamadhānī in MS Fatih 4097 is that there are forty *maqāma*s in the collection. The number forty as many previous scholars have stated is suggestive of a link to *ḥadīth* collections.[12] Individual *maqāma*s can be understood as "reports" related by one individual about the sayings and actions of another. In this way, the *maqāma* collection might be considered akin to a *musnad* that contains the reports of a particular companion of the Prophet, arranged according to narration.[13]

MS Fatih 4097 presents the *maqāmāt* in an order which differs considerably from the *Maqāmāt* in the standard edition. The two subsequent dated manuscripts of the *Maqāmāt*, MS School of Oriental and African Studies 47280 which is a nineteenth-century copy of a manuscript copied in the year 562/1166-1167 and MS Yale University, Salisbury collection 63 copied in 603/1206 also follow the order of MS Fatih. The fact that both manuscripts include the same core of the same forty *maqāmāt* in roughly the same order as MS Fatih suggests their filiation to MS Fatih and to one another.[14]

The Appearance of Two Collections of Fifty *Maqāmāt* post-dating al-Ḥarīrī

Maqāmāt MS SOAS and MS Yale are also interesting in that they both contain fifty *maqāmāt*.[15] Their "growth" appears to be a response to the rise in prominence of the collection of fifty *maqāmāt* authored by

---

12   Brown, *Hadith: Muhammad's Legacy*, 53-4.

13   Schoeler, *The Genesis of Literature in Islam*, 79.

14   In some cases, the MSS Yale and SOAS provide materials that are missing from MS Fatih, such as the ending of the *Sijistāniyya* which is preserved in both of these MSS but not in MS Fatih (and the standard edition). This suggests that these two manuscripts may rely on a manuscript tradition independent from MS Fatih. For a reproduction of this ending, see Orfali and Pomerantz, "*Maqāmāt Badīʿ al-Zamān al-Hamadhānī*".

15   MS SOAS 47280 is a 19th-century copy of a manuscript dated to 562/1166-7.

al-Ḥarīrī (d. 516/1122) completed in 504/1111-2. Ḥarīrī praised Hama-dhānī in the introduction to his *Maqāmāt*. This sparked interest in the text of Hamadhānī as the author of the first *maqāma* collection.

The additional ten *maqāmāt* found in both the SOAS and Yale manuscripts come from two main sources: the so-called "amusing tales" (*mulaḥ*) of Hamadhānī and additional *maqāmāt*.

1 Mulaḥ

The *mulaḥ* are a "miscellany of texts transmitted on the authority of Hamadhānī outside his main collections (*Maqāmāt* and *Rasāʾil*) and put together by an anonymous collector," as Hämeen-Anttila has described them.[16] The *mulaḥ* do not mention the characters of either the narrator or trickster. As Ibrahim Geries notes, however, the *mulaḥ* are not distin-guished from *maqāmāt* in MS Aya Sofya 4283 (692/1225). Subjecting these *mulāḥ* to further analysis and comparing them with similar stories found in other sources, Ibrahim Geries concludes that they are mainly pre-existing literary anecdotes which were related by Hamadhānī. They were included in some manuscripts of Hamadhānī by compilers who considered these anecdotes to be *maqāmāt*.[17] In our further research on the topic, we note that both MS SOAS and MS Yale include seven *mulaḥ* as *maqāmāt*. In both cases, the *mulāḥ* appear toward the end of the col-lection, positions 37-43 in the case of MS Yale, and positions 43-50 in MS SOAS.

2 Additional *Maqāmāt*

Both MS SOAS and MS Yale include three additional *maqāmāt*. In MS Yale the three additional *maqāmāt* are: a letter that is described as a *mulḥa* in the Istanbul edition; the *Maṭlabiyya*; and the newly-discovered *Ṭibbiyya*.[18] MS SOAS also contains three additional *maqāmāt* (nos. 48-50)

---

16 Hämeen-Anttila, *Maqama*, 77.
17 Geries, "Maqāma of Bishr b. ʿAwāna," 136.
18 See Orfali and Pomerantz, "A Lost *Maqāma* of Badīʿ al-Zamān al-Hamadānī?," esp. 248.

which we have named: *Hamadhāniyya*, *Sharīfiyya* [which is a *maqāma* and *risāla*], and *Khātamiyya*.[19]

3 Additions to the Manuscripts of the 10th/16th century

A large group of *maqāmāt* were added to the corpus in the tenth/sixteenth century [*Mighzaliyya*, *Nājimiyya*, *Khalafiyya*, *Nīsābūriyya*, *ʿIlmiyya*, *Mulūkiyya*, *Ṣufriyya*, *Sāriyya*, *Tamīmiyya*, *Khamriyya*]. This group includes all of the so-called "panegyric" *maqāmāt* of Hamadhānī that he purportedly composed in 383/993 in celebration of the ruler, Khalaf b. Aḥmad.

The Three Families: The Extant Manuscripts of Hamadhānī's *Maqāmāt*

We identify three main families in our work on the manuscript tradition of Hamadhānī, which we term **A**, **A**[1], and **B**. We base our findings on the order and contents of the manuscripts and not on their specific readings. A stemma based on a comparison of readings will be a focus of future research.

1 Family **A**

The first family, **A** is the most heterogeneous. It includes the five oldest manuscripts: MS Fatih 4097, MS SOAS 47280, MS Yale 63, MS Aya Sofya 4283, and MS Paris 3923. These manuscripts vary greatly from one another. However, it is likely that both MS SOAS and MS Yale are related to MS Fatih 4097, or share a common ancestor, because of the common order of *maqāmāt*. MS Aya Sofya and MS Paris appear at times to foreshadow the later order of family **B**. The final folio of MS Aya Sofya is from the *Shiʿriyya*, which suggests that the manuscript may have contained other *maqāmāt* that are no longer extant.

Manuscripts belonging to Family **A**:

1. Istanbul Fatih 4097 (520/1126)

2. London SOAS 47280 (13th/19th c.)

---

19 See Pomerantz and Orfali, "Three *Maqāmāt* Attributed to al-Hamadhānī."

3. Yale University 63 (603/1206)

4. Istanbul Aya Sofya 4283 (692/1225)

5. Paris BN 3923 (8th/14th c.)

2 Family A^1

The second family A^1 includes twenty manuscripts which date from the 17th century until the 19th. These manuscripts all retain the order of MS Fatih 4097. The three supplementary *maqāmāt* discussed by Orfali and Pomerantz in "Three *Maqāmāt* Attributed to al-Hamadhānī"[20] appear in half of the manuscripts belonging to A^1.

Manuscripts belonging to Family A^1:

1. Edinburgh MS Or. 49 (11th/17th c.)

2. Tehran Ilāhiyyāt 3/441 (11th/17th)

3. Mashhad Riẓavī 4984 (1140/1727)

4. Tehran Millī Shūravī 20 (1110/1698)

5. Tehran Adabīyāt 3/74 (12th/18th)

6. Istanbul University A1227 (?)

7. Damascus Asad Library 218 (1243/1827)

8. Tehran *Kitābkhānah wa Markaz-i Asnād Majlis Shūrā-yi Islāmī* 303 (1270/1853)

9. Tehran Majlis 2/5764 (1278/1861)

10. Istanbul University A234 (1296/1878)

11. King Saud University (1307/1889)

12. Tehran Majlis 621 (12th-13th/18th-19th)

---

20 Pomerantz and Orfali, "Three *Maqāmāt* Attributed to al-Hamadhānī."

	Baṣriyya	Fazāriyya	Qazwīniyya	Balkhiyya	Kūfiyya	Qirdiyya	Qaysiyya	Maṣīliyya	Asadiyya	Ḥirriziyya	Māʿziyya	Wakhfiyya	Makhfūziyya	Jibāriyya	Budhāriyya	Azhādiyya	Asrājiyya	Sujāsiyya	Jahāniyya	Sirjāniyya	Iṣfahāniyya	Ḥahaniyya	Ahāzniyya	Baghdādiyya	Ghulāyiyya	Ruṣāfiyya	Waṣṣāfiyya	Dīnāriyya	Ḥulwāniyya
FAMILY A																													
Istanbul Fatih 4097 (520/1126)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
London SOAS 47280 (13th/19th)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
Yale University 63 (603/1206)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	24	25	44	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	11	34	26	27	28
Istanbul Aya Sofya 4283 (692/1225)	22	24	25	26	1		20	19		3	4			15	18	17	10	13	12	11		2	14		16	23	21	6	7
Paris BN 3923 (8th/14th)	2	3	7		11	13	8		14	15	16			5	4	6		17	9		10	18	12	19	1				20
FAMILY A¹																													
Edinburgh MS Or. 49 (11th/17th)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
Istanbul University A1227 (no date)	1		2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Istanbul University A234 (1296/1878)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
Tehran Majlis Shūrā-yi Islāmī 303 (1270/1853)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
Damascus Asad Library 218 (1243/1827)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
Tehran Majlis 631 (13th/19th)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
Tehran Majlis 2/5764 (1278/1861)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
Tehran Kitābkhānah-i Millī 8046 (no date)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
Tehran Lithograph (1296/1878)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
King Saud University 814 (1307/1889)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26			
Princeton MS 2007	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29
FAMILY B																													
Cambridge University Library 1096/7 (964/1557)	13	14	18	3	5	1	20	21	6	23	24	27	16	15	17	8	2	19	9	4	10	30	11	12	7	31	42	44	34
Istanbul Nurosmaniyye 4270 (1064/1654)	13	14	18	3	5	1	20	21	6	23	24	27	16	15	17	8	2	19	9	4	10	30	11	12	7	31	42	44	34
Istanbul Fatih 4098 (1116/1704)	13	14	15	3	5	1	20	21	6	23	24	27	16	15	17	16	18	8	2	19	9	4	10	30	11	12	7	31	42
Cairo Dār al-Kutub mīm 112	13	14		3	5	1			6							8	2		9	4	10		11	12	7				
Cairo Dār al-Kutub 1853 (1280/1863)	13	14	18	3	5	1	20	21	6	23	24	27	*	15	16	8	2	19	9	4	10	30	11	12	7	31	42	44	34
Cairo Al-Azhar 271	13	14	18	3	5	1	20		6				16	15	17	8	2	19	9	4	10		11	12	7				
Cambridge MS Add. 1060 (1822)	2	3	7		11	13	8		14	15	16			5	4	6		17	9		10	18	12	19	1				20
Markaz Malik Faisal 5930 (1282/1865)	13	14	18	3	5	1	20	21	6	23	24	27	16	15	17	8	2	19	9	4	10	30	11	12	7	31		44	34
EARLY PRINT EDITIONS																													
Istanbul Dār al-Jawāʾib (1298/1880)	13	14	18	3	5	1	20	21	6	23	24	27	16	15	17	8	2	19	9	4	10	30	11	12	7	31	42	44	34
Beirut ʿAbduh (1889)	13	14	18	3	5	1	20	21	6	23	24	26	16	15	17	8	2	19	9	4	10	29	11	12	7	30	41	43	33
Cawnpore Kanfūr (1904)				3	5	1							10				7	2		8	4	9			6				

Bishrīyya	Mahjāʿiyya	Shāmīriyya	Mardāmiyya	Aṣamiliyya	Ibsadriyya	Aʿwrāziyya	Nahṭīriyya	Shīrlbiya	Mṭabyā	Tlbiya	Mulha 1	Mulha 2	Mulha 3	Mulha 4	Mulha 5	Mulha 6	Mulha 7	Risāla	Misghaliyya	Nāgjmairiyya	Khaslfūriya	Nilmʿiriyya	Shufūriyya	Mukrilyya	Ṣafriya	Tahmriyya	Khamārdīhāniyya	Himsātlhā	Ribsādliha	Khātimiyya	
																															FAMILY A
30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40																					**Istanbul Fatih 4097** (520/1126)
30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	44	45	46	47	48	49	50											41	42	43	London SOAS 47280 (13th/19th)
29	31	32	10	33	30	45	46	47	35	36	49	48	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	50											Yale University 63 (603/1206)
8		5		9	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	37	35	36			33					38								Istanbul Aya Sofya 4283 (692/1225)
																															Paris BN 3923 (8th/14th)
																															FAMILY A¹
30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40																		41			Edinburgh MS Or. 49 (11th/17th)
29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39																		40	41	42	Istanbul University A1227 (no date)
30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38																							Istanbul University A234 (1296/1878)
30	32	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	44	45	46	47	48	49	50											41	42	43	Tehran Majlis Shūrā-yi Islāmī 303 (1270/1853)
30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	44	45	46	47	48	49	50											41	42	43	Damascus Asad Library 218 (1243/1827)
30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	44	45	46	47	48	49	50											41	42	43	Tehran Majlis 631 (13th/19th)
30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	44	45	46	47	48	49	50											41	42	43	Tehran Majlis 2/5764 (1278/1861)
30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	44	45	46	47	48	49	50											41	42	43	Tehran Kitābkhānah-i Millī 8046 (no date)
30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40																					Tehran Lithograph (1296/1878)
																															King Saud University 814 (1307/1889)
30	32	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	44	45	46	47	48	49	50											41	42	43	Princeton MS 2007
																															FAMILY B
25	26	22	37	43	36	28	29	35	33										32	38	39	40	41	45	46	47	48	49	50		Cambridge University Library 1096/7 (964/1557)
25	26	22	37	43	36	28	29	35	33										32	38	39	40	41	45	46	47	48	49	50		Istanbul Nurosmaniyye 4270 (1064/1654)
25	26	22	37	43	36	28	29	35	33										32	38	39	40	41	45	46	47	48	49	50		Istanbul Fatih 4098 (1116/1704)
																															Cairo Dār al-Kutub *mīm* 112
25	26	22	37	43	36	28	29	35											32	38	39	40	41	45	46	47	48	49	50		Cairo Dār al-Kutub 1853 (1280/1863)
																															Cairo Al-Azhar 271
																															Cambridge MS Add. 1060 (1822)
25	26	22	37	43	36	28	29			33									32	38	39	40	41	45	46	47	48	49	50		Markaz Malik Faisal 5930 (1282/1865)
																															EARLY PRINT EDITIONS Istanbul Dār al-Jawā'ib (1298/1880)
25	26	22	37	43	36	28	29	35	33										32	38	39	40	41	45	46	47	48	49	50		Istanbul Dār al-Jawā'ib (1298/1880)
51	25		22	36	42	35	27	28	34	32	50								31	37	38	39	40	44	45	46	47	48	49		Beirut ʿAbduh (1889)
																															Cawnpore Kanfūr (1904)

13. Tehran Majlis 631 (13th/19th)

14. Qom Gulpaygānī 4/4181-101/21 (13th/19th)

15. Tehran Ṣipāhsālār 7006 (13th/19th)

16. Mashhad Ilāhiyyāt 619 (13th/19th)

17. Tehran Malik 4/2357 (13th/19th)

18. Tehran Majlis 2/4113 (13th/19th)

19. Princeton University 2007

20. Tehran Kitābkhānah-i Millī Jumhūrī-yi Islāmī-yi Irān 8046

3 Family **B**

The third family **B** includes fifteen manuscripts dating from the 10th/16th to the 13th/19th century. The manuscripts in this family follow the order commonly known from the ʿAbduh edition. The family includes eleven additional *maqāmāt* [*Mighzaliyya, Nājimiyya, Khalafiyya, Nīsābūriyya, ʿIlmiyya, Shiʿriyya, Mulūkiyya, Ṣufriyya, Sāriyya, Tamīmiyya, Khamriyya*] as a group at the end of the collections. Only one of this group, the *Shiʿriyya* is found in a manuscript prior the 10th/16th century.

Manuscripts belonging to family **B**:

1. Cambridge University Library 1096/7 (Qq. 118) (964/1557)

2. London BM Or. 5635 (10th/16th)

3. Istanbul Nurosmaniyye 4270 (1064/1654)

4. Istanbul Fatih 4098 (1116/1704)

5. Istanbul Reisulkuttab 912 (1130/ 1717-8)

6. Istanbul Hamidiye 1197 (1174/1760-1)

7. Cairo Dār al-Kutub *mīm* 112 (undated)

8. Cairo Dār al-Kutub 1853 (1280/1863)

9.   Cairo al-Azhar ms. (undated)

10. Cambridge MS Add. 1060 (1822)

11. Riyāḍ King Faisal Center 5930 (1282/1865)

12. Copenhagen, Cod. Arab. 224

13. Istanbul Bayezit 2640

14. Tehran Majlis 303 (1270/1853)

15. Tehran Majlis 5/8951 (9 Muḥarram 1250/18 May 1834)

3 Becoming a *Maqāma* Collection: Introductions, Characters, Closure

With the rise to prominence of al-Ḥarīrī's collection of fifty *maqāmāt* during the 6th/12th century, readers began to consider Hamadhānī's *Maqāmāt* as a collection. *Maqāma* collections such as those of Ḥarīrī and Ibn Nāqiyā (d. 485/1092), possessed introductions, identities of main characters, and occasionally, some notion of closure. In the following section we consider ways in which Hamadhānī's manuscripts begin to conform to expectations about *maqāma* collections.

Introductions (*muqaddimāt*)

Introductions were common to prose works in the fourth/tenth century. Thus if Hamadhānī had in fact collected his own work, it would have been natural for him to begin with an introduction.[21] From Ibn Nāqiyā onward, it was common for the author of a *maqāma* collection to indicate his own role in the composition of the collection in the introduction in the first person. While extant introductions to Hamadhānī's manuscripts identify him as the author or transmitter of the *maqāmāt*, the fact that he is not the author of their introductions, distinguishes Hamadhānī's work from subsequent *maqāma* collections.

---

21 Orfali "The Art of the *Muqaddima*." In *The Oral and Written in Early Islam*, 46, Schoeler draws attention to the Greek distinction between *hypomnēma*, "notes for private use", and *syngramma*, literary works that are "redacted according to common rules."

Of the manuscripts of Hamadhānī's *Maqāmāt* copied prior to the tenth/sixteenth century, [MS Fatih 4097 (520/1126), MS SOAS 47280 (562/1166-7), MS Yale Salisbury 63 (603/1206), MS Aya Sofya 4283 (692/1225) Paris BN 3923 (8th/14th c.)] two preface the collection with introductions. The introduction in the SOAS manuscript is as follows, "This is what the esteemed teacher Abū l-Faḍl Badīʿ al-Zamān Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn Hamadhānī related from ʿĪsā b. Hishām of the *maqāmāt* of Abū al-Fatḥ l-Iskandarī" (*hādhā mimmā amlāhu al-ustādh al-imām al-fāḍil Abū l-Faḍl Badīʿ al-Zamān Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Hamadhānī riwāyat*[an] *ʿan ʿĪsā b. Hishām min maqāmāt Abī l-Fatḥ*).[22] MS Aya Sofya 4283 begins with the following introduction, "These *maqāmāt* were dictated by the teacher Abū l-Faḍl Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Hamadhānī in Nīshāpūr and he mentioned that he had composed them to be uttered in the voice of Abū l-Fatḥ al-Iskandarī and to have been related by ʿĪsā b. Hishām, whereas others have mentioned that they were composed by Abū l-Ḥusayn b. Fāris and the report concerning this has become widely known". (*hādhihi al-maqāmāt amlāhā al-ustādh Abū l-Faḍl Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Hamadhānī bi-Nīsābūr wa-dhakara annahu anshaʾahā ʿalā lisān Abī l-Fatḥ al-Iskandarī wa-rawāhā ʿan ʿĪsā b. Hishām wa-dhakara ghayruhu annahā min inshāʾ Abī l-Ḥusayn Aḥmad b. Fāris wa-tawātara al-khabar bi-dhālik*).[23] The fifth-oldest ms. MS Paris 3923 (the only one of the five early manuscripts to include the letters (*rasāʾil*) of Hamadhānī) introduces Hamadhānī's *maqāmāt* not as a separate work, but rather as "*maqāmāt* which he made and placed on the tongues of beggars" (*wa-min al-maqāmāt allatī ʿamilahā ʿalā alsinat al-mukaddīn*),[24] suggesting that the compiler still did not perhaps envision the work of Hamadhānī to be more than a sum of individual *maqāma*s.

Later manuscripts of Hamadhānī such as MS Nurosmaniyya 4270 copied in 1064/1654, MS Veliyuddin Efendi 2640 (1126/1714) and MS

---

22 MS SOAS, fol. 2a.

23 MS Aya Sofya 4283, folio 1b. The manuscript begins on fol. 1a with a prominent title page, referring to the work's title as *al-Maqāmāt al-Badīʿiyya*, which were related by (*min imlāʾ*) the *ustādh* Abū l-Faḍl Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Hamadhānī.

24 MS Paris 3293 f. 3a.

Reisulkuttab 912 copied in 1130/1718, as Geries notes, begin with an introduction which appears to draw upon the language of al-Ḥuṣrī's *Zahr al-ādāb* and Ibn Sharaf al-Qayrawānī's *Masā'il al-intiqād*, which states that "Badīʿ al-Zamān forged (?) (*zawwara*) *maqāma*s which he composed extemporaneously (*badīhat^{an}*) at the close of his literary sessions attributing them to a storyteller he called ʿĪsā b. Hishām, who had heard them from an eloquent man named Abū l-Fatḥ al-Iskandarī."[25] This introduction, it should be noted, is found only in one late family of manuscripts from the tenth/sixteenth century onwards, and is not in any of the early manuscripts.

Main Characters

The second feature typical of the *maqāma* collection is the uniformity of the narrator and the hero. In the case of the *Maqāmāt* of Hamadhānī it is usually assumed that the *maqāmāt* are related by ʿĪsā b. Hishām and that the main protagonist is Abū l-Fatḥ al-Iskandarī. The notion that a *maqāma* collection must possess a consistent narrator and protagonist, however, must have taken some time to evolve as the first readers of Hamadhānī interpreted the form of the *maqāma* in different ways.

For instance, Ibn Nāqiyā's collection of ten *maqāmāt* is uniform in their protagonist, but differs with respect to narrators. His collection of *maqāmāt* is held together by a unity of place, Baghdad, which is very different from the Hamadhānian prototype based on the travel of the narrator.[26] Al-Ḥarīrī's choice of a single narrator and protagonist for his collection, al-Ḥārith b. Hammām and Abū Zayd al-Sarūjī was influential for the remainder of the tradition of *maqāma* writing.

The earliest collection of Hamadhānī's *Maqāmāt*, MS Fatih 4097, includes several instances of *maqāmāt* which are not related on the authority of ʿĪsā b. Hishām. The *Bishriyya* in MS Fatiḥ 4097, as noted by

---

25 Al-Sharīshī (d. 620/1222) in his *Sharḥ Maqāmāt al-Ḥarīrī*, 1:15 states that Hamadhānī would compose *maqāmāt* extemporaneously (*irtijāl$_{an}$*) at the end of his *majālis* according to the suggestions of his audience.

26 Hämeen-Anttila, *Maqama*, 133-140.

Ibrahim Geries, is related on the authority of al-Ḥasan or al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad al-Fārisīnī.[27] At the time of authoring this article, Geries was unable to identify this person. In the opening letter of MS Paris 3239, Hamadhānī relates a poem of the poet Barkawayh al-Zinjānī, from a certain Abū ʿAbdallāh al-Fārisīnī who may indeed be identical to the narrator of the *Bishriyya*. The *Ṣaymariyya*, similarly, is prefaced by the statement, "Muḥammad b. Isḥāq, known as Abū l-ʿAnbas al-Ṣaymarī said." As has been noted by previous scholarship, Abū l-ʿAnbas was a historical personage who died in 275/888.[28]

If the identity of the narrator was not a common feature of the *maqāmāt*, perhaps the identity of the trickster character was important for the unity of the collection? However, the hero, as well, varies throughout the *maqāmāt* of al-Hamadhānī. While Abū l-Fatḥ appears in the majority of the *maqāmāt*, there are other figures in the so-called panegyric *maqāmāt*, who play the role of the trickster.[29]

Indeed, in this regard, it is significant to note the modes by which Hamadhānī referred to the *maqāmāt*. In one instance, referring to criticisms made by his rival Abū Bakr al-Khʷārizmī, Hamadhānī wrote, "he prepared a slander against us for that which we have related of the *Maqāmāt* of Abī l-Fatḥ" (*tajhīz qadḥ{in} ʿalaynā fī mā rawaynā min maqāmāt al-Iskandarī*), which suggests that the *maqāmāt* belong to Abū l-Fatḥ.[30] The *Asadiyya maqāma* opens with the narrator ʿĪsā b. Hishām stating, "From what was related to me of the *maqāmāt* of Iskandarī and his statements [there were statements and actions] that would make gazelles listen and the sparrow flutter."[31]

---

27   Geries, "Maqāma of Bishr b. ʿAwāna," 130, discusses the problem of al-Fārisīnī.

28   Hāmeen-Anttila, *Maqama*, 44.

29   Hāmeen-Anttila, *Maqama*, 60.

30   Hamadhānī, *Kashf al-maʿānī*, 389-390; MS Paris 3239, f. 2a.

31   In Muḥammad ʿAbduh's edition, the line is rendered, "what was reported to me of the *maqāmāt* of al-Iskandarī and his speech was what a beast who takes flight would listen to and to what a sparrow would flutter in response." (*kāna yablughunī min maqāmāt al-Iskandarī wa-maqālātihi mā yuṣghī ilayhi al-nafūr wa-yantafiḍ lahu al-ʿuṣfūr*) However, the earliest manuscripts MS Fatiḥ 4097, MS SOAS 47280, MS Yale 63 read *mā yuṣghī ilayhi al-fūr*. As Lane, *Lexicon,* 6:241 notes, *fūr* is a term for gazelles. This rare word

It is worth noting, too, that both of these passages demonstrate that Hamadhānī distanced himself from the immediate authorship of the collection. In the passage from his letters, Hamadhānī defends himself from the criticisms of his rival al-Khʷārizmī, describing himself as simply the relator of the *Maqāmāt* of Abū l-Fatḥ. Meanwhile in the *Asadiyya*, Hamadhānī describes the *maqāmāt* as the exploits of Iskandarī as opposed to his speech (*maqālāt*).

Closure of Hamadhānī's Corpus of *Maqāmāt*

The collection of forty *maqāmāt* found in MS Fatih 4097 is the oldest form in which we know the *maqāmāt* of Hamadhānī. And in some sense the number forty, because of its associations in collections of *ḥadīth* seem to be a plausible sum total for a *maqāma* collection.[32] However because of Hamadhānī's famed boast that he had authored more than 400 *maqāmāt* made in the course of his famed literary contest with Abū Bakr al-Khʷārizmī (d. 383/993), medieval and modern scholars believed that the corpus of Hamadhānī's *Maqāmāt* was "open". That is, there was no one definitive collection of Hamadhānī's *Maqāmāt* and the majority of his *maqāmāt* had not reached later readers.

The title page (f. 2a) of MS Fatih 4097 preserves a marginal note which is of great importance to the history of the corpus. The scribe who wrote this note is not the copyist of the main text of the manuscript, but provides alternate titles and numbering in the margins of the manuscript suggesting that he is working from another, now-lost, manuscript of Hamadhānī's *Maqāmāt*. Having read the contents of MS Fatih 4097, the scribe identifies the *Khamriyya* and *Ṭibbiyya* as two *maqāmāt* that are not found among the forty *maqāmāt*:

---

appears to have been replaced by *nafūr*, however, *fūr* is a case of *lectio difficilior*. The motif of a poet in dialogue with gazelles, is found in the *Dīwān Majnūn Laylā* edited by Y. Farḥāt (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-ʿArabī, 1992), 149.

32 ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Kīlīṭū, *Mafhūm al-muʾallif*, 20 suggests this. One might go further and describe the significance of the number forty more broadly in Judaism and Islam.

رأيت له مقامتين ليستا هنا إحداهما خمرية وأوّلها اتفق لي في عنفوان الشبيبة والأخرى طبّية
أوّلها عنّ لي الاجتياز بلاد الأهواز وعدّة المقامات أربعمائة قاله مصنّفها والثعالبي

I have seen two other *maqāmāt* belonging to him [viz., Hamadhānī]. The first is the *Khamriyya* which begins with 'it happened to me in the flush of youth,' and the second is the *Ṭibbiyya*, which begins, with 'I happened to pass through the lands of al-Ahwāz.' There are four hundred *maqāmāt* as both their author and al-Thaʿālibī assert.[33]

As we have shown in our recent article, the *Ṭibbiyya* is found in MS Yale 63, while the *Khamriyya* does not appear until MS Cambridge 1096/7 dating to the 964/1557.

Attempts to close Hamadhānī's text do not seem to have been definitive. In the 6th/12th century, the corpus of Hamadhānī's *Maqāmāt* as MSS Yale and SOAS attest seems to have grown to include fifty *maqāmāt* in the 6th/12th century. Following Richard's suggestion, it seems that Hamadhānī's collections grew in size to fifty *maqāma*s mainly in response to the existence of Ḥarīrī's collection of fifty *maqāmāt*.[34]

4 Conclusion: The Closure of the Corpus

Thus we can see that the *Maqāmāt* of Ḥarīrī fundamentally differs from the *Maqāmāt* of Hamadhānī in that it was authored as a collection. In the introduction to the work, Ḥarīrī states his claim to his authorship of the entire work.[35] He publicly affirmed his authorship of the work through the first public audition of the work in Baghdad upon his com-

---

33 The terms *al-Khamriyya* and *al-Ṭibbiyya* may also simply describe the contents of the two *maqāma*s (i.e. a *maqāma* concerning wine, and a *maqāma* concerning medicine) and may not be the titles by which they were known.

34 Richards, "The 'Maqāmāt'," 98, "Here one might entertain the idea that, rather than Ḥarīrī imitating the size of Hamadhānī's output, as has been suggested but is nowhere expressed by Ḥarīrī himself, the sum of fifty *maqāma*s found in the Ottoman Mss. is the result of efforts to effect the reverse, to bring Hamadhānī's *œuvre* up to the size of Ḥarīrī's."

35 Kīlīṭū, *Mafhūm al-muʾallif*, 13. The controversies surrounding Ḥarīrī's authorship of the work, underscored throughout Kīlīṭū's study, were perhaps reactions on the part of later critics to Ḥarīrī's strident claims of originality throughout the work.

pletion of the 50 *maqāmāt* in 504/1111-12.[36] Moreover, the text of Ḥarīrī itself provides a sort of narrative closure. Ḥarīrī's fiftieth *maqāma*, *Baṣriyya,* discusses the repentance (*tawba*) of the hero Abū Zayd al-Sarūjī providing a definitive conclusion. The hero finished his career in the home city of the author and the collection came to an end.[37]

By contrast, Hamadhānī's *Maqāmāt* remained "open" for many centuries. In the MS SOAS we find the expression, "this is the end of what we have found of the Maqāmāt" (*hādha ākhir mā wajadnāhu min al-maqāmāt*) as if the scribe were cognizant of the fact that more could be found.[38] For an author who had purportedly composed four hundred *maqāmāt,* the possibility seemingly remained for further additions of new *maqāma*s.

Later additions to the corpus seem to aim at defining certain features of his authorship and may possibly represent attempts at the closure of the corpus. Two of the three additional *maqāmāt* which we have recently published in MS SOAS (and ten other manuscripts in family **B**) discuss the return of Abū al-Fatḥ to Hamadhān (the home city of al-Hamadhānī) which seems to echo the return of Abū Zayd al-Sarūjī to Baṣra (the home city of Ḥarīrī). It should be noted, that there is no suggestion in these *maqāma*s that Abū l-Fatḥ repents of his roguery.

The latest additions to the corpus of Hamadhānī first attested in the tenth/sixteenth century, include the six panegyric *maqāmāt* that Hamadhānī allegedly wrote in celebration for the ruler Khalaf b. Aḥmad who reigned in Sīstān until 393/1003.[39] When taken as a group, these *maqāmāt* include several different heroes in addition to Abū l-Fatḥ, which is somewhat anomalous.[40] However, they are uniform in providing what was until the date of their addition to the corpus a missing feature: the context of authorship.

36 Mackay, "Certificates of Transmission."

37 Kīlīṭū, *Mafhūm al-muʾallif,* 7.

38 E.g. MS SOAS, f. 127b and MS Yale end with this formula. MS Fatih 4097, by contrast, states, "This is the end of the *maqāmāt.*"

39 C.E. Bosworth, K̲alaf b. Aḥmad, *EIr,* 15:362-3.

40 Hämeen-Anttila, *Maqama,* 60.

Hamadhānī has gone down in history as the creator of the *maqāma* genre. Yet he does not appear to have been the inventor of the *maqāma* collection. As this article has suggested, ideas about *maqāma* collections that emerged after Hamadhānī's lifetime shaped his literary legacy in significant ways.

Bibliography

al-Hamadhānī, Badīʿ al-Zamān. *Kashf al-maʿānī*. Edited by Ibrāhīm al-Ṭarābulsī. Beirut: Dār al-Turāth, 1890.

al-Ḥuṣrī, *Zahr al-ādāb wa-thimār al-albāb*. Edited by Zakī Mubārak and Muḥammad Muḥyī al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd. Beirut: Dār al-Jīl, 1972.

al-Sharīshī, *Sharḥ Maqāmāt al-Ḥarīrī*. Beirut: al-Maktaba al-Thaqāfiyya, 1952.

al-Thaʿālibī, *Thimār al-qulūb*. Edited by Muḥammad Abū l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm. Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, 1985.

Brown, Jonathan A. C. *Hadith: Muhammad's Legacy in the Medieval and Modern World*. Oxford: Oneworld, 2009.

Geries, Ibrahim. "On Jaakko Hämeen-Anttila, Maqama: A History of a Genre," *Middle Eastern Literatures* 8 (2005): 187-195.

—."Badīʿ Al-Zamān Al-Hamadhānī's *Maqāma* of Bishr b. ʿAwāna (al-Bishriyya)." *Middle Eastern Literatures* 14 (2011): 121–53.

Hämeen-Anttila, Jaakko. *Maqama: A History of a Genre*. Wiesbaden: Harassowitz, 2002.

Kilīṭū, ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ. *Mafhūm al-muʾallif fī al-turāth al-ʿArabī*. Beirut: American University of Beirut, 2011.

Mackay, Pierre. "Certificates of Transmission on a Manuscript of the *Maqāmāt* of Ḥarīrī (MS. Cairo, Adab 105)." *Journal of the American Philosophical Society* 61 (1971):1-81.

Monroe, James T. *The Art of Badīʿ Az-Zamān Al Hamadhānī as Picaresque Narrative*. Beirut: American University of Beirut, 1983.

Orfali, Bilal W., and Maurice A. Pomerantz. "A Lost Maqāma of Badīʿ Al-Zamān Al-Hamadānī?" *Arabica* 60 (2013): 245–71.

—. "Maqāmāt Badīʿ al-Zamān al-Hamadhānī: al-Naṣṣ wa-l-Makhṭūṭāt wa-l-Tārīkh." *Ostour* 1 (2015): 38-55.

Orfali, Bilal W. "The Art of the *Muqaddima* in the Works of Abū Manṣūr al-Thaʿālibī (d. 429/1039)." In *The Weaving of Words: Approaches to Classical Arabic Prose,* edited by Lale Behzadi and Vahid Behmardi. Vol. 112 of *Beiruter Texte und Studien*. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag, 2009, 181-202.

Pomerantz, Maurice A. and Bilal W. Orfali, "Three *Maqāmāt* Attributed to al-Hamadhānī." *Journal of Abbasid Studies* 2 (2015): 38-60.

Richards, D. S. "The Maqāmāt of Al-Hamadhānī: General Remarks and a Consideration of the Manuscripts." *Journal of Arabic Literature* 22 (1991): 89–99.

Schoeler, Gregor. *The Genesis of Literature in Islam: from the aural to the read*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009.

—. *The Oral and the Written in Early Islam*. Edited by James E. Montgomery. Routledge: Oxford, 2006.