

The manuscripts and editions of Ibn Dāwūd's *Kitāb al-Zahra*¹ by Wim Raven

The author and his work

Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Dāwūd al-Iṣbahānī (254-296/7 = 868-908/9) was primarily a legal scholar. At a young age he succeeded his father Dāwūd ibn 'Alī as the leader of the Zāhirite school of law, of which the latter had been the founder. Virtually nothing is known with certainty about his life. It must have been interesting enough, however, to inspire story-tellers to circulate a number of most entertaining anecdotes about him. It can be demonstrated that these are not only unhistorical, but also based on certain passages in his own *Kitāb al-Zahra*. Niṭawayh, a contemporary, seems to have been the inventor of the anecdote about Ibn Dāwūd's death-bed: it is said that he died from unfulfilled desire towards a male friend, to whom he dedicated his book. From the *Zahra* we only learn that he suffered from an unfaithful friend, who had walked out on him. One can hardly blame the fellow, for Ibn Dāwūd had a gloomy nature and was quite a whiner at times.

Most works by Ibn Dāwūd had a legal subject-matter. However, his only work which is extant, albeit incomplete, is of a literary nature.

The *Kitāb al-Zahra*, as it is called, is one of the older anthologies of poetry arranged according to genres, themes and motifs. The first fifty chapters deal with love poetry. Chs. 51-53 are dedicated to what I call Islamic *madīh*, i.e. poetry of a laudatory nature in which the dedicatees are God, the Prophet and the House of the Prophet. Chs. 54-57 contain elegies, 58-60 wisdom and *ādāb*. The chapters 51-60 thus are dedicated to ethically flawless poetry, in contrast to chs. 61-77, which treat some more traditional genres: (conventional) *madīh*, *hidjā'* and *fakhr*, all neatly arranged according to *addād*. Chs. 78-81 offer descriptive poetry (*ṣifāt*), 82-85 friendship poetry (*ikhwāniyyāt*). The rest of the book is padded with disparate material: extemporised verse, riddles, jokes, questions of plagiarism, faults in poetry, poetry by women and by jinns, and, finally, *radjaz*.

The *Zahra* also contains critical comments by the author on fragments of poetry and enlarges our knowledge of early Arabic poetics. It is a source for the works of certain poets and for a number of Graeco-Arabic texts, and it offers a theory of love. However,

love theory in the *Zahra* is subordinate to its literary purposes. Literature, in its turn, serves a further goal, which is no less ethical than aesthetical. Ultimately, the book aims at making the reader a better Muslim.

Last but not least, the book contains a surprisingly personal Introduction, in which Ibn Dāwūd addresses his unfaithful friend, as well as poetry by the author's own hand, which he concealed behind the ascription to a contemporary. I will quote here one instance of what I think is a poem by Ibn Dāwūd himself. It is from the chapter about giving presents to friends and, together with the answer which follows, it is illustrative of his difficult relationship with his friend, whom he presents with himself:²

*An advice on the day of mihradjān is a gift, my lord,
which the likes of me owes to the likes of you.*

*When I give [you] my soul, I give you what you
already possess; when I give my possessions — well,
they have been yours since long.*

*You gave me impertinence, to show yourself that you
are tough. I offer the restoration of our intimacy.*

*God knows that I did not betray [my] bond with you,
neither in earnest nor in jest.*

*Then let your opinion on this gift be rightly guided, so
that you bring my heart to life, unless you deem it
lawful to kill me.*

The troublesome gift was returned without much consideration by the friend:

*Your reminder on mihradjān is a gift indeed; so I
give you the breach of bond, and rightly so!*

*Don't give [me] a soul, for I don't want it; your
intimacy is hereby returned, and don't ask me for mine!*

*Do break the bond whenever you like! When I say it
in verse, it may sink in at last.*

*This is my answer to what you said; [at least] in
answering your letter I do not deceive you.*

Because the calendar reform of 282 A.H. by al-Mu'taḍid is mentioned in the *Zahra*, the book can hardly be older than 283 or 284³. The author was then about thirty years of age. There are some indications, however, that the first fifty chapters were written considerably earlier than the last fifty.

The reception of the Zahra

The *Zahra* had a modest renown in the Arab world,

mostly in circles of writers and story-tellers on love. Shortly after its inception it became a source of inspiration in the milieu of the Elegants (*Zurafā*), for whom Ibn Dāwūd was a sort of cult figure, notably on account of his alleged extreme chastity. Al-Ḥuṣrī quotes large parts from the *Zahra* in his *Kitāb al-Maṣūn*,⁴ as do later authors on love, such as Maḥmūd ibn Salmān al-Ḥalabī in his *Manāzil al-aḥbāb*,⁵ and Muḡhulṭāy in *al-Wāḍiḥ al-mubīn*⁶.

The *Zahra* was discovered for the West by Louis Massignon, who encountered Ibn Dāwūd because the latter issued a *fatwā* in which he declared the execution of the mystic al-Ḥallādj lawful. To Massignon Ibn Dāwūd remained mainly a frail theoretician of profane love, whose life, as gleaned from the anecdotes that were taken at face value, was characterised by a *demi-virginité ambiguë*⁷. This image of Ibn Dāwūd maintained itself in the West for over half a century and was considerably enhanced by J.-C. Vadet⁸. L.A. Giffen tried to counterbalance Massignon's portrayal⁹.

Although half of the *Zahra* was published as early as 1932, and the other half became known from two manuscripts about the same time, the scholarly world hardly bothered to discover that the book was not about love, but about love poetry, and indeed about the other genres of poetry as well. The *Zahra* is a book on literature. No doubt it has been neglected by literature students on account of the poor state of its text and the difficulty of following the winding roads of Ibn Dāwūd's thought and occasionally muddled style. It must be admitted that the author often spoils his own point, but it is worthwhile to penetrate the mind of a highly original and early literary critic.

The manuscripts

Five manuscripts of the *Zahra* are known to exist or to have existed:

C — Ms. Cairo, Dār al-kutub no. 45 *mīm*; 366 pages, as numbered by its editors Nykl and Ṭūqān. Dated 718 AH. Contains a virtually complete text of chs. 1-50.

Due to the present inaccessibility of the Cairo library, I have not been able to see either the manuscript or a microfilm of it. I know it only from the reproduction of six pages and the title page in S and from the readings mentioned in the 'Notes and Corrections' in NT 382-406. Descriptions of the ms. are given in the catalogues of Dār al-kutub¹⁰, in NT's Foreword, and in S 21-23.

— Copy of C, once owned by Massignon ('ma copie (528 pp.) du ms du Caire')¹¹. Not seen; whereabouts unknown.

— Ms. Cairo, Dār al-kutub no. 3548. Copy of C made in 1338 AH [= 1919-20]¹². Not seen.

T — Ms. Torino, Biblioteca Reale no. Or. 68. 227 pages. Dated 11 Ṣafar 901 (first half), 15 Rabīʿ al-

awwal 901 (second half). A microfilm is available in Leiden University Library under no. A 151. It contains the whole *Zahra*, but most of it in an abridged text. The ms. was copied from at least three different sources:

a) Fols. 2b-17b (= ed. NT 1-22:13): complete text, written in a younger hand than the rest of the ms.

b) Fols. 18a-152b: an abridged text which corresponds with ed. NT 22:14-SQ 94:7, and after that some loose fragments from later chapters.

c) Fols. 152b-225b (= ed. SQ 100:13-end). Abridged text. The parts which it has in common with b) have a different text. In several places the text is in disorder.

The first mention of this manuscript is by Vicenzo Promis, who described in brief the collection of oriental mss. that were collected about the middle of the nineteenth century by Baron Romualdo Tecco, Sardinian consul in Istanbul, by order of King Charles Albert. The list appeared in an obscure journal and was hardly noticed¹³. Only when the first half of the *Zahra* had been edited, from C only, was Nallino alarmed and drew attention in a review to the existence of T¹⁴. Nykl, the editor of the first half, hastened to Torino and gave a description of the manuscript in an article in which he also revealed the existence of a third ms. in Baghdād¹⁵. Descriptions of T also occur in S 21-23 and SQ 16-17. An exhaustive and most recommendable description was made by Michele Vallaro¹⁶.

B — Ms. Baghdād, al-Mathaf al-ʿIrāqī no. 1345. 247 pages. Dated 729 AH. This is a costly, fully vocalised ms., written for the library of the Ayyūbid prince Abū al-Fidā Ismāʿīl (672-732 AH). It contains a more extensive text than T, but covers only chs. 67-89. Originally it comprised four volumes and probably contained the whole *Zahra*. It was stolen from its proprietor, Father Anastās al-Karmilī, at the fall of Baghdād in 1917. In 1933, Father Anastās could recover only the third volume. As soon as he got wind of the existence of the edition, he wrote a letter to Nykl, who made the story public.

The folios of the ms. are now lying loose in apparent disorder. I did not see the ms. itself; fortunately, there is a microfilm available in Leiden University Library under no. A 467. The ms. is described by Nykl¹⁷, ʿAwwād¹⁸ and by the editors in SQ 13-16 (reprinted S 18-20), where also an attempt was made to restore the order of the folios.

The editions of the first half

The two halves of the *Kitāb al-Zahra* have been edited separately. For practical purposes I maintain the bipartition in this article, but it should be kept in mind that the *Zahra* is one book.

Massignon was the first to edit some fragments from the Introduction and chs. 1, 2, 8 and 50¹⁹. He used his copy of ms. C, which he collated with a

Baghdād ms. of Ibn Faḍl Allāh, *Masālik al-abṣār*²⁰. The value of these fragments for the establishment of the text is virtually nil.

NT: The first half of the *Zahra* was edited by A.R. Nykl and Ibrāhīm Ṭūqān in 1932 from ms. C only, since T became known to them only in 1933 by Nallino's review.

In another review of this edition, Ignazio Guidi²¹ suggested in 1935 a few emendations, not all of which can be maintained after the discovery of the second manuscript.

Because ms. C has been inaccessible to me, it has always intrigued me just how accurate NT is. In S 30-36 six pages of C are reproduced. Collation of these few pages leads me to the conclusion that NT is essentially a solid and accurate piece of work. Its weak spots are mainly due to the fact that it was made from a single ms. Occasional misunderstandings of a correctly transmitted text occur; such things can always happen and they do not really call for alarm: the text is difficult and it may take one or two generations before all *crucis* have been solved²². There are several vocalisation errors, about which one should not mutter. Apart from the Koran, there is probably no fully vocalised Arabic book without errors. All in all, NT is not a perfect edition, but quite respectable. Its only handicap is that the second ms. was not yet available when it was prepared.

In 1984, Ibrāhīm al-Sāmarrāī dedicated an article²³ to the edition by Nykl and Ṭūqān, in which he neglected Ṭūqān's contribution completely in order to debunk Nykl the more heartily. Indeed al-Sāmarrāī pointed out a number of faults in NT, some of them serious, others merely printing or vocalisation errors. Unfortunately, he did so in that unpleasant tone which some scholars in Arab countries reserve for the pernicious species of 'orientalists'. Apparently al-Sāmarrāī was not aware that the late Nykl had been primarily an 'occidental' — a student of Provençal and Spanish, who, in order to deepen his insight into the literatures in those languages, had bothered to learn Arabic as well, for which he should be praised instead of being posthumously bullied.

S: Al-Sāmarrāī's tone is the more embarrassing since he himself published in 1985 an edition of the whole *Zahra* in which he heaped blunder upon blunder. The first volume of it is essentially the text by Nykl and Ṭūqān, with their full vocalisation, to which he added most of the corrections²⁴ he proposed in his just mentioned article and inevitably some fresh composing errors. He paid no attention at all to Nykl and Ṭūqān's Notes and Corrections (NT 382-406)! What is worse, and what makes this edition, in spite of its attractive layout and cover, a piece of trash is that for the first volume ms. T is neglected completely. Al-Sāmarrāī was perfectly familiar with it, because he used it for his own edition of the second half. However, in 1985 he was suddenly of the opinion that T

begins at p. 116²⁵, although in 1975 he knew that it has 222 folios and contains the whole *Zahra*²⁶.

Alas, this new 'edition' of the first half is a sad failure, and the scholarly world would have been better served, for lack of something really new, with a photographic reprint of NT, with its Notes and Corrections and its familiar pagination, and enriched with emendations.

In the meantime, Biesterfeldt and Gutas had published a new edition of NT p. 17, not with the help of any ms., but by carefully studying that Graeco-Arabic piece in correlation with the text types found in other sources²⁷.

The editions of the second half

SQ: The 1975 edition of chs. 51-100 by Ibrāhīm al-Sāmarrāī and Nūrī al-Qaysī from mss. T and B cannot be called a critical edition. Apart from a certain overall sloppiness and defective indices, the most conspicuous fault is that some pages were completely overlooked, notably T fol. 161b (should be placed between SQ 120:3 and 120:4), and B fols. 8b ult.-10a,6 (to be placed after SQ 155, line 2).

Furthermore, al-Sāmarrāī and al-Qaysī found themselves confronted with the disorder in the texts of mss. B and T. They partly re-arranged the materials of chs. 51-100 in a rough way (cf. SQ 13-16 = S 18-20), but they forgot large parts. To mention the most important example: SQ 224:13-231:16 should not be printed with ch. 77; it belongs to ch. 88.

S: Al-Sāmarrāī's 1985 edition of the second half is essentially a reprint of SQ. His co-editor Nūrī al-Qaysī disappeared from the title-page. A number of errors were corrected, but the greatest faults were left unchanged.

Fragments from chs. 51 and 58 (= V 13-28, 34/SQ 23-33, 37-38, and SQ 83) were edited by Vallaro in his article on Umayyah ibn abī al-Ṣalt in ms. T²⁸.

V: Chs. 51-55 were edited from ms. T and provided with a philological commentary in 1985 by Michele Vallaro, who intends to deal with the remaining chapters as well. This is a serious edition, which cannot be impaired by a serious review. To begin with, I have the following suggestions for emendations:

V 20n: read فقارب هذا المعنى.

21w: read لاستحيوا.

28n: read with T ذاك.

49M1: read كأس النيكل.

49M2: read معدوم القشل.

67ll: read with al-Mubarrad²⁹ يابن ملحن أمه.

73A6: T وقد كان فوت الموت read وقد كان فوت الموت.

77g: footnote is misplaced.

77G7: read with *Dīwān* [الحي] فتى.

78j: read with T أبي معاينتها من فرغته.

78l: read فدرتتها for قد رزنتها.

79r: read وإثاره للصبر.

79t and 81ff: read [لأبي تمام] طاهر, cf. 76e.

My main remark about this edition is that it is at times over-zealous. It is of no avail to try to wrest a meaning from a sentence where apparently one or more words are lacking in a unique manuscript, as Vallaro did in V 50p (with lengthy comment V 55-56). The phrase *الذي أوجبه* etc. does not refer to the Christian poets mentioned before; therefore we must conclude that some text is lacking before it. At any rate, *الذي أوج عليه لهم* may be a better reading. SQ perhaps rightly deleted *خساسة*, which might be a personal comment by a copyist.

A minor remark is that Vallaro's system of numbering sections and lines is unnecessarily complicated. For the rest, this edition is excellent, and it is to be hoped that the next installments will soon be published.

Witnesses relevant to the establishment of the text

In the above section about the reception of the *Zahra*, several authors who have quoted from it were mentioned. All of these have a certain, albeit modest significance as witnesses of the text of the *Zahra*, with the exception of Mughulṭāy, whose text is too meagre. Two sources which do not quote Ibn Dāwūd are worth mentioning: Hunayn ibn Ishāq, *Ādāb al-falāsifa*, which was an indirect source of the *Zahra* and is of importance in the reconstituting of some Graeco-Arabic passages³⁰. Al-Washshā', a contemporary and acquaintance of Ibn Dāwūd, copied in his *al-Muwashshā'*³¹ a considerable quantity of materials which also occur in the *Zahra*. In some, but certainly not in all instances, it can be demonstrated that he plagiarised the *Zahra*.

The quantity of the text

Ibn Dāwūd states in his introduction (NT 4) that he intended to write one hundred chapters, each containing one hundred lines of poetry. In the first fifty chapters he more or less achieved this aim. Nykl, in his Foreword to N 6, counted 4928 lines instead of 5000. After taking into account the new materials, the revised total comes to 4970. Some lines may have been lost during the process of transmission; others may have been added by copyists. Besides, one should not blame the author for a certain inaccuracy.

Chs. 51-100 are incomplete. For most of these chapters we have only T, which in the later chapters is strongly abridged. Chs. 67-89 are covered by ms. T as well as B. In several places, Ibn Dāwūd shows concern about his promise to place one hundred lines into each chapter. The blame for the incompleteness of many chapters therefore probably lies with the manuscripts, particularly with T. On the other hand, in view of the oddity of the subject-matter in the last chapters, we cannot exclude the possibility that the author towards the end of the book failed to fulfil his promise.

Towards a new edition

The *Zahra* as a whole deserves a new edition: the first half, because ms. T and some textual witnesses have become available since; the second half, because the 1975 and 1985 editions leave much to be desired. Fortunately the critical edition begun by Michele Vallaro is an asset. It is to be hoped that he will continue his efforts.

Pending the completion of that new edition, I edited in my *Ibn Dāwūd al-Iṣbahānī and his Kitāb al-Zahra* a number of Graeco-Arabic texts and made a limited apparatus criticus, which contains the edition of the parts hitherto left unpublished, indications for further re-arrangement of the text, and emendations in the prose texts.

ABBREVIATIONS

- B = Ms. 1345. al-Maṭḥaf al-'Irāqī, Baghdād.
 C = Ms. no. 45 *mīm*. Dār al-Kutub, Cairo.
 NT = *Kitāb al-Zahra* (*The Book of the Flower*) *The first half*, composed by Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn abī Sulaimān (sic!, WR) Dāwūd al-Iṣfahānī (d. AH 297 AD 909). Edited from the unique manuscript at the Egyptian Library by A.R. Nykl, in collaboration with Ibrāhīm Ṭūqān, Chicago 1932 (The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, no. 6).
 S = *Al-Zahra*, li-abī Bakr Muḥammad ibn Dāwūd^m (sic!, WR) al-Iṣbahānī, ḥaḥqaqahu wa-qaddama lahu wa-'allaqa 'alayhi Ibrāhīm al-Sāmarrā'ī, al-Zarqā' 1406/1985.
 SQ = *Al-niṣf al-thānī min Kitāb al-Zahra*, li-abī Bakr Muḥammad ibn Dāwūd al-Iṣfahānī, taḥqīq Ibrāhīm al-Sāmarrā'ī [wa-] Nūrī al-Qaysī, Baghdād 1975 (Min manshūrāt Wizārat al-'Ilām fī al-Djumhūriyya al-'Irāqiyya, Silsilat kutub al-turāth, 37).
 T = Ms. Or. 68, Biblioteca Reale, Torino.
 V = Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Dāwūd al-Iṣfahānī *az-Zāhirī*, *Kitāb az-Zahra. Parte seconda*. Edizione critica a cura di Michele Vallaro (Capitoli LI-LV), Napoli 1985 (Supplemento n. 45 agli Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale).

NOTES

¹ This article is also a review of two recent editions of that work, by Michele Vallaro and Ibrāhīm al-Sāmarrā'ī.

For whatever remains undiscussed in this article, the reader is referred to my Leiden thesis: *Ibn Dāwūd al-Iṣbahānī and his Kitāb al-Zahra* (1989).

² SQ 281-282 = S 752

³ SQ 281 = S 751; cf. al-Ṭabarī, *Annales* III, 2143.

⁴ Ms. Leiden Or. 2593. The edition Cairo 1987 was not available to me.

⁵ Ms. Leiden Or. 798 and 1069.

⁶ O. Spies, *Mughulṭai's Biographical Dictionary of the Martyrs of Love*. Edited from the two extant manuscripts in

Istanbul. Vol. 1. Stuttgart 1936. (Bonner Orientalistische Studien, 18).

⁷ Louis Massignon, *La passion d'al-Hallāj*, Paris 1914-1921, 160-182.

⁸ J.-C. Vadet, *L'Esprit courtois en Orient dans les cinq premiers siècles de l'Hégire*. Paris 1968, 267-316. His article 'Ibn Dāwūd' in *EI*² is less fanciful.

⁹ L.A. Giffen, *Theory of Profane Love Among the Arabs: The Development of the Genre*. New York 1971, 71, n. 8.

¹⁰ *Fihrist al-kutub al-'arabiyya al-mahfūza bi-al-kutub-khāna al-khidīwiyya*, Cairo 1307, vol 4, 260.

Aḥmad al-Mihri wa-Muḥammad al-Bābalāwī, *Fihris al-kutub al-'arabiyya al-mawdjuda bi-al-dār li-ghāyat ākhir māyū sanat 1926*. Cairo 1927/1345, vol. 3, 180.

¹¹ Mentioned in Louis Massignon, *Recueil de textes inédits concernant l'histoire de la mystique en pays d'Islam*, Paris 1929, 233.

¹² Mentioned in Aḥmad al-Mihri, *op. cit.*, 179.

¹³ V[icenzo] P[romis], 'I manoscritti orientali della Biblioteca del Re a Torino'. *Bolletino Italiano degli studi orientali* I (1876), 86-92.

¹⁴ C.A. Nallino, [review of NT, no title], *Oriente Moderno* 12 (1933), 490.

¹⁵ A.R. Nykl, 'Nuevos datos sobre el <Kitāb al-Zahra>', *Al-Andalus* 4 (1936), 147-154.

¹⁶ Michele Vallaro, 'Il manoscritto Or. 68 della Biblioteca Reale di Torino: l'unico testo completo del *Kitāb az-zahra* di Ibn Dāwūd al-Iṣfahānī'. *Annali dell'Istituto Orientale di Napoli*, N.S. 26 (1976), 69-84.

¹⁷ A.R. Nykl, 'Nuevos datos ...', 147-48.

¹⁸ Kūrkiš 'Awwād, 'Al-makhṭūṭāt al-'arabiyya fi maktabat al-Mathaf al-'Irāqī bi-Baghdād. Al-qism al-thānī: al-makhṭūṭāt al-adabiyya'. *Sumer* 14 (1958), 127-179, esp. 154.

¹⁹ Louis Massignon, *Recueil*, 233-239.

²⁰ Ms. mentioned by Massignon in *Recueil*, 234, n. 1,

and in other places as quoted by Vallaro, 'Il manoscritto Or. 68 ...', 70-71. It is said to contain a considerable part of the *Zahra*.

²¹ M. Guidi, [review of NT, no title], *Rivista degli Studi Orientali*, 15 (1935), 112.

²² Or am I too much of an optimist? In 1914 Pétrof edited Ibn Ḥazm's *Ṭawq al-ḥamāma* from a single ms. Several editions have appeared since, but the state of the text seems to grow only worse and worse, as has been demonstrated by Jan Just Witkam, 'Establishing the Stemma: Fact or Fiction?', *MME* 3 (1988), 88-101, esp. 90ff.

²³ Ibrāhīm al-Sāmarrā'ī, 'Fī naqd al-turāth. Ma'a *Kitāb al-Zahra* li-abī Bakr Muḥammad ibn abi Sulaymān Dāwūd al-Iṣfahānī, i'tanā bi-nashrihi D. Lūwīs Nīkl al-Būhīmī bi-musā'adat Ibrāhīm Ṭūqān', *Madjallat ma'had al-makhṭūṭāt al-'arabiyya*, N.S. 28 (1405/1984), 623-651.

²⁴ He revoked some of his corrections.

²⁵ S 21.

²⁶ SQ 16.

²⁷ Hans Hinrich Biesterfeldt and Dimitri Gutas, 'The Malady of Love'. *JAOS* 104 (1984), 21-55.

²⁸ Michele Vallaro, 'Umayyah ibn Abī ṣ-Ṣalt nella seconda parte del <Kitāb az-Zahra> di Ibn Dāwūd al-Iṣfahānī (manoscritto di Torino)'. *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*. Memorie. Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche. Serie 8, Vol. 22, Roma 1978, 423-480.

²⁹ *Kitāb al-Ta'āzī wa-al-marāthī* li-Muḥammad ibn Yazīd al-Mubarrad, ed. Muḥammad al-Dībādī, Damascus 1396 1976, 143.

³⁰ Hunayn ibn Ishāq, *Ādāb al-falāsifa, ikhtaṣarahu Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Anṣārī*. ed. 'Abd al-Raḥmān Badawī. Kuwait 1406/1985.

³¹ Al-Washshā'. Abū al-Tayyib Muḥammad ibn Ishāq, *Kitāb al-Muwashshā*. ed. R.E. Brünnow, Leiden 1886.