THE GENRES OF CLASSICAL ARABIC POETRY
CLASSIFICATIONS OF POETIC THEMES AND POEMS BY PRE-MODERN CRITICS AND REDACTORS OF DĪWĀNS[1]

GREGOR SCHOELER

(UNIVERSITY OF BASEL)

❧ ❧ ❧

Introduction
Classifications of Poetry in the Pre-Systematic Phase of Literary Theory
Classifications of Poetry by the Critics and Theorists of Literature
Classifications of Poems by the Redactors of the *Dīwān*s
What is a *Qaṣīda*? Arab critics vs. Western Arabists

Introduction

Premodern Arabic poetry is generally considered to be short of genres. Whereas ancient Indian literature has all three genres of the traditional triad lyric[2], epic (narrative) and drama, and classical New-Persian literature had vigorously developed at least two of these (purportedly) most basic modes of literary art, namely, lyric and epic, Arabic literature is viewed as having developed only *one* of them, namely, lyric. This view roughly applies if understood by Arabic poetry is the poetry of the upper educated class, the elite, i.e., classical Arabic poetry. The latter does, however, evidence at least the rudiments of epic poetry, namely, in the didactic genre (e.g., Abān al-Lāḥiqī's [died 815 or 816] [3] and Ibn

---

1   This is a completely revised and updated English version of my article "Die Einteilung der Dichtung bei den Arabern" (1973), the very first publication in Arabic studies I ever submitted to an audience. My article, after A. Trabulsi's pioneering discussion on the traditional classifications of Arabic poetry in his book *La critique poétique des Arabes* (pp. 215-247), proved to be the second groundbreaking research on this issue which subsequent authoritative studies could build on. These include W. Heinrich's article "Literary Theory", G. van Gelder's book *Beyond the Line*, his article "Some Brave Attempts", Ali Husseins article "Approaches" and B. Gruendler's *Medieval Arabic Praise Poetry*. – I would like to thank Dr G. Bertram Thompson for his excellent English translation.

2   'Lyric' (or verse) is here understood pragmatically as a collective term for all short, non-epic and non-dramatic types of poetry.

3   Sezgin, *GAS,* vol. II, pp. 515-516; J. Scott Meisami, "Abān ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd al-Lāḥiqī", in *EAL,* vol. I, p. 1.

al-Ḥabbāriyya's [died 1110 or later] [4] versed renderings of *Kalīla wa-Dimna*). If, however, Arabic folk poetry is included, the assertion that Arabic poetry is short of genres does not apply at all. Arabic folk poetry is extremely rich in genres. Besides possessing a form- and content-rich lyric poetry (many stanzaic forms) it has a widely varied epic,[5] and there is also a dramatic art (in particular shadow-play).[6]

Whereas the folk poetry was deemed by indigenous critics inferior and not worth studying,[7] classical Arabic poetry was able to entice scholars to treat it systematically. They developed a sophisticated literary criticism and theory, a poetics and a rhetoric; they analyzed the systems of Arabic metre and rhyme.[8] Literary theory also includes a theory of poetic genres (i.e., a theory of the classification of poetry); this – as well as the procedure followed by the redactors of Dīwāns who arranged the collections according to genres (to a certain extent the practical counterpart to the elaboration of a theory of genres) comprises the object of the present study.

We distinguish between a pre-systematic and a systematic phase of literary criticism and theory[9], in our case, the theory of genres. Pronouncements in the pre-systematic phase on the categories of poetry comprise, for instance, traditions according to which some or another expert or poet said this or that about the capabilities of one or several poets. Noted in some of these pronouncements are the 'kinds' of poetry of which one poet is the better master, another the lesser. Such traditions are found, e. g., in the poet biographies of Abū l-Faraǧ's *K. al-Aġānī*, books on poetry like Ibn Qutayba's *K. al-Šiʿr* and al-Marzubānī's *K. al-Muwaššaḥ*, but also as quotes in later systematic works like Ibn Rašīq's *ʿUmda*. The first systematic pronouncement on genre theory originates from the philologist Ṯaʿlab (d. 904) in his poetics *Qawāʿid al-šiʿr*.

---

4   Brockelmann, *GAL*, vol. I, p. 293, suppl. I, pp. 446-447; C. Hillenbrand, "Ibn al-Ḥabbāriyya", in *EAL*, vol. I, p. 327.

5   G. Canova, "Epic poetry", in *EAL*, vol. I, pp. 209-10; id., "Sīra literature", in *EAL*, vol. II, pp. 726-27; id. (ed.), *Studies on Arabic Epics* (with a comprehensive bibliography, pp. ix-xxii); Reynolds, *Heroic Poets*, pp. 4-8; id., "Prosimetrum", pp. 285-290; Petraček, "Volkstümliche Literatur". A classification scheme for the epic genres of Arabic folk poetry has been attempted by Petraček, ibid., pp. 235-236.

6   S. Moreh, "Theatre and drama, medieval" in *EAL*, vol. II, p. 766-69; id., "Shadow-play", in *EAL* vol. II, p. 701-02; id., *Live Theatre and Dramatic Literature in the Medieval Arab World*, Edinburgh – New York, 1992.

7   An exception is, however, Ibn Ḫaldūn; see Sowayan, "The Hilālī Poetry".

8   Heinrichs "Rhetoric and Poetics", in *EAL*, vol. II, pp. 651-56; id., "Poetik, Rhetorik".

9   Cf. Bonebakker, "Poets", in particular pp. 109ff., and W. Heinrichs, "Poetik, Rhetorik", pp. 178ff.; "Literary Theory", pp. 37, 39

In the following we shall first of all treat some relevant texts from the pre-systematic phase, then the systematists' genre-relevant discussions and genre lists, and finally the arrangements of the Dīwāns by the redactors. As explained above, we cannot expect the indigenous experts and scholars to have subjected epic or even dramatic art to a systematic treatment and classification; such literature does not exist, or at any rate, not for them. The poetry they treated, classical Arabic, can hardly be called 'lyric'– a term coming from the European tradition, unless one understands 'lyric' pragmatically as a collective term for all short, non-epic and non-dramatic types of poetry.

Classical Arabic poetry is a poetry *sui generis*. Its main form of expression, and at the same time its claim to fame is the multipart (polythematic) *qaṣīda* or ode,[10] a long and complex poem mainly comprising several dozen verses in a quantitative metre with a consistent rhyme (monorhyme).[11] It originated in the pre-Islamic period. The most famous and exemplary *qaṣīda*s *per se* are the pre-Islamic *muʿallaqa*s.[12] In them, as well as in other long odes, the poets give form to a sequence of diverse themes. The polythematic *qaṣīda*s generally begin with amatory verses (*nasīb*). This prologue is often followed by a description of a camel; however, this section can also be absent. The closing of the ode is mostly formed by a section expressing a special aim of the poet.[13] In case of the so-called '*qaṣīda* containing a proclamation (or message)', it can comprise a normal proclamation, directed at another tribe or an individual, but also a threat, warning, reproach, lampoon, demand, and so forth. In a praise *qaṣīda*, the final section is formed by a glorification of a tribe, tribal head, or, later, a ruler (e.g. the caliph or a gouvernor). However, the closing of the ode can also be represented by a section in which the poet gives expression to his view of life or commemorates the past joys of youth (so-called remembrance *qaṣīda*s). While the '*qaṣīda* containing a message' still reached a culmination in the Umayyad period (namely, in the shape of the 'flyting'), it is primarily the praise *qaṣīda* that best survived the Abbasid 'revolution', albeit with considerable alterations ('tribal *qaṣīda*' >'court *qaṣīda*').[14]

A peculiarity of the *qaṣīda*, apart from its length, is that the introductory amatory verses and also the camel description never appear independent of it, i.e.,

---

10 For the *qaṣīda* see Jacobi, *Studien*; ead., "Qaṣīda", in *EAL*, vol. II, p. 630; Bauer, *Altarabische Dichtkunst*; Bloch, "Qaṣīda"; Schoeler, "Alfred Blochs Studie". – The most appropriate European concept to render the Arabic term *qaṣīda* is 'ode'.

11 On the issue of whether the *qaṣīda* is a genre, see below, pp. 39-42.

12 T. Bauer, "al-Muʿallaqāt", in *EAL*, vol. II, pp. 532f.

13 The following typology does not hearken back to indigenous experts, but was developed by Western scholars, though an attempt to describe one type of *qaṣīda* was undertaken by Ibn Qutayba; see below, p. 40.

14 See below, p. 27.

as poems in their own right; whereas the theme of the closing section (message, praise, commemoration of the youth, etc.) can also be the object of an independent, usually monothematic, short poem (*qiṭʿa* or *muqaṭṭaʿa*).[15]

Something else which is specific to the *qaṣīda* is that in all of its sections, comparisons are frequently spun quite far; we are dealing here with the so-called 'independent similes'[16] corresponding somewhat to the Homeric similes. This artistic device allows the poet to insert secondary themes into his poem, e.g., to liken, in the *nasīb,* his beloved to a green meadow because of her fragrance, or in the camel description, his she-camel to an onager due to its speed, and subsequently remain with the description of the newly inserted object over many verses.

The above description pertains primarily to verse of the pre- and early Islamic period ('Old Arabic poetry'); and it is basically 'Old Arabic poetry', including Umayyad poetry, which the early experts and critics had in mind in their discussions.

To facilitate an understanding of the following, a particular characteristic of the whole of classical Arabic poetry should be kept in mind: its so-called 'molecular structure',[17] i. e., each verse of a poem generally forms a syntactic and contentual unit; enjambment is rare, particularly in pre- and early Arabic poetry.

Classifications of Poetry in the Pre-Systematic Phase of Literary Theory

I shall now proceed to treat some statements on poetic genres (or, rather, poetic themes) in the pre-systematic phase. Ten characteristic traditions will be introduced.

1. (Caliph) ʿAbdalmalik b. Marwān asked Arṭāt b. Suhayya (d. c. 705)[18]: 'Will you be composing any poetry today?' He answered: 'By God! (How can I?) I'm not

---

15 Bloch, "Qaṣīda"; Schoeler, "Alfred Blochs Studie"; id., "Ḳiṭʿa", in *EI*[2], vol. XII, pp. 538-540.

16 Cf. Jacobi, *Studien*, pp. 157-167 ; Bloch, "Stilfiguren", pp. 185f.; Schoeler, "Alfred Blochs Studie", p. 755; Schoeler, *Arabische Naturdichtung*, pp. 16-25, Bauer, *Altarabische Dichtkunst*, vol. I, pp. 64ff.

17 Cf. Heinrichs, *Arabische Dichtung*, pp. 20-31; van Gelder, *Beyond the Line*, in particular pp. 14-22. -The term 'molecular structure' was coined by Th. Kowalski (cf. Heinrichs, l.c., p. 31).

18 d. c. 705; Sezgin, *GAS,* vol. II, pp. 387f.

excited[19], I'm not angry, I don't drink (wine), and I don't desire (anything). Poetry proceeds only from one of these (four states).'[20]

2. Al-Aṣmaʿī (d. c. 828)[21] related on the authority of Ibn Abī Ṭarafa (that he said): 'One actually needs no more than four poets: Zuhayr[22], when he desires (something), al-Nābiġa,[23] when he feels fear, al-Aʿšā[24], when he is excited, and ʿAntara[25], when he is furious.[26]' Others add: and Ǧarīr[27], when he is cross.'[28]

3. Someone asked al-Kuṯayyir[29] - or al-Nuṣayb[30] - : Who is the greatest poet of the Arabs? He answered: Imraʾ al-Qays[31], when he follows his passion[32], Zuhayr, when he desires (something), al-Nābiġa, when he senses fear, and al-Aʿšā, when he drinks (wine).'[33]

4. Abū ʿUbayda (d. 924 or 925)[34] reports: al-Aḫṭal[35] was asked in Kufa who was the best poet among them (sc. the three renowned Umayyad poets). He replied:

----

19 aṭrabu; or: 'moved with joy'.

20 Ibn Rašīq, ʿUmda, vol. I, p. 120; for slightly different versions cf. Ibn Ṭabāṭabāʾ, ʿIyār, p. 123; Ibn Qutayba, K. al-šiʿr, p. 332.

21 One of the most important early philologists; see M. C. Carter, "al-Aṣmaʿī", in EAL, vol. I, p. 110.

22 J. E. Montgomery. "Zuhayr ibn Abī Sulmā", in EAL, vol. I, p. 107.

23 R. Jacobi, "al-Nābiġa al-Dhubyānī", in EAL, vol. II, p. 570.

24 T. Bauer, "al-Aʿshā", in EAL, vol. I, p. 107.

25 T. Bauer, "ʿAntara", in EAL, vol. I, p.94.

26 Or: "when he is eager (for a thing)" (kaliba).

27 Ǧarīr (d. 729; for him see, G. J. H van Gelder, "Jarīr", in EAL, vol. I, p. 412) is one of three greatest Umayyad poets, the others being al-Aḫṭal (d. c. 710; G. J. H van Gelder, "al-Aḫṭal", in EAL, vol. I, pp. 67f.) and al-Farazdaq (d.c. 728; G. J. H. van Gelder, "al-Farazdaq", in EAL, vol. I, pp. 219f.).

28 Ibn Rašīq, al-ʿUmda, vol. I, p. 95.

29 An ʿUḏrī poet of the Umayyad period; d.726; see Ph. Kennedy, "Nuṣayb", in EAL, vol. II, p. 458.

30 A poet of the Umayyad period; d. 723; see T. Seidensticker, "Kuthayyir", in EAL, vol. II, p. 590.

31 R. Jacobi, "Imruʾ al-Qays", in EAL, vol. I, p. 394.

32 Following Heinrichs, I take rakiba to be short for rakiba hawāhu, lit. 'when he follows his own natural desire'; "Imraʾ al-Qays is famous for the erotic passages in his poems"; cf. Heinrichs, "Literary Theory", p. 38.

33 Ibn Rašīq, al-ʿUmda, vol. I, p. 95.

34 One of the most important early philologists; see G. H. J. van Gelder, "Abū ʿUbayda", in EAL, vol. I, p. 49.

35 See fn. 27.

'Ǧarīr is the greatest love poet among us (*aġzalunā wa-ansabunā*), al-Farazdaq[36] the greatest in self-praise (*afḫarunā*), yet I am the greatest in describing wine (*awṣaf lil-ḫamr*) and in praising the kings.'[37]

5. Ǧarīr said 'I have composed love poetry (*nasabtu*) and thereby extolled (the woman sung about); I have lampooned (*haǧawtu*) and thereby brought about the downfall of (the relevant person); I have praised (*madaḥtu*) and thereby enhanced (the one praised); I have poetized in *ramal* and done so brilliantly (?) (*aġzartu*), I have poetized in *raǧaz* and achieved therein perfection (*anǧaztu*); thus have I dealt with all types of poetry (*ḍurūb al-šiʿr*)'.[38]

6. He (al-Ḥuṭayʾa)[39] is among the great, first-rate poets of pure Arabic tongue. He mastered all of the poetic 'kinds' (*funūn*), namely, praise, invective (or lampoons), self-praise and love poetry, and was outstanding in all of them.'[40]

7. Al-Buṭayn (d. after 825)[41] was asked: 'Was Ḏū l-Rumma[42] a first class poet (*šāʿir mutaqaddim*)'? He answered: 'Experts of poetry are one in the opinion that poetry is founded on four 'bases' (or 'pillars') (*arkān*): elevating praise, or abasing invective, or striking simile or proud self-praise. All of this is united in Ǧarīr and al-Farazdaq and al-Aḫṭal; as on the other hand Ḏū l-Rumma was never good in praise, never good in invective and never achieved anything good in self-praise, he must be deemed inferior in those areas: he achieved brilliance only in simile, therefore he is only a quarter poet.'[43]

8. Abū ʿAlī al-Baṣīr (died after 866)[44] said: (True) poetry is either praise or invective. Abū Nuwās achieved nothing good in either; his best poetry is (rather) on wine and hunting; and the best of it is taken over and plagiarized.'[45]

9. I asked al-Usaydī, the companion of the Banū Salāma, about both of them (sc. Ǧarīr and al-Farazdaq). He replied: 'The 'houses' (*buyūt*) of poetry are four: self-praise, praise, love poetry and invective, and Ǧarīr prevailed in all of them.'[46]

---

36 See ibid.

37 *al-Naqāʾiḍ*, pp. 497, ll. 8ff.

38 *al-Naqāʾiḍ*, pp. 1048, 10ff.

39 Fl. 7th cent.; J. E. Montgomery, "al-Ḥuṭayʾa", in *EAL*, vol. I, p. 300.

40 Abū l-Faraǧ, *K. al-Aġānī*, vol. II, p. 157.

41 Or al-Baṭīn; an Abbasid poet; see Sezgin, *GAS,* vol. II, p. 477.

42 G. van Gelder, "Dhu al-Rummah", in Cooperson–Toorawa (eds.), *ALC*, pp. 108-13; J. E. Montgomery, "Dhū al-Rumma", in *EAL*, vol. I, p. 188.

43 al-Marzubānī, *al-Muwaššaḥ*, p. 273; cf. Bonebakker, "Poets", p. 97.

44 A poet of the Abbasid era; Sezgin, *GAS*, vol. II, p. 536.

45 al-Marzubānī, *al-Muwaššaḥ*, p. 434; cf. Bonebakker, "Poets", p. 97.

46 Ibn Sallām al-Ǧumaḥī, *Ṭabaqāt*, p. 87.

10. ʿAbd al-Ṣamad b. al-Muʿaddal (d. 854)[47] said: All Poetry is comprised in three words; not everyone masters all three equally. When one praises, one says: 'You are'; when one lampoons, one says: 'you are not'; and when one laments (i.e., composes a dirge), one says: 'you were'.[48]

In Traditions 1 to 3 no poetic categories were explicitly named; rather, specific states of mind and affects are mentioned, to some extent other drives as well which favour or elicit poetizing in the corresponding genres or themes. W. Heinrichs has called this approach a 'psycholiterary attempt'.[49] For those conversant with Arabic poetry, the signified genres or themes are easy to access: Passionate excitement elicits love poetry, anger invective poetry, desire praise poetry and fear apologetic poetry (poems asking for forgiveness); indulgence in wine favours descriptions of wine and binges.

The poets mentioned are particularly famous for the subjects associated with them, e.g., al-Nābiġa for his apology poems addressed to the Laḫmid ruler al-Nuʿmān III (580-602), and the Christians al-Aʿšā and al-Aḫṭal (s. no. 4) for their portrayals of wine and carousals.

Found in Traditions 2 to 3 is an aspect which is missing in 1: the relevant poets are qualified as being the greatest in the respective (unnamed) area favoured by the given states of mind. This shows that the experts have recognized and noted that poets often exhibit different talents, that one achieved more in this area, another in that. Quite explicitly in Traditions 3 to 4 – in 4 there is no longer any talk of emotional state – each of the greatest poets is mentioned along with his respective speciality. It goes without saying that the experts are often at odds regarding the respective candidates. In traditions 5 to 6 the speakers assert – in 5 more implicitly, in 6 more explicitly – that the respectively relevant poet has mastered the different genres or themes equally. In this regard the following categories are named in traditions 4 and 5: love poetry, invective poetry, praise poetry and self-praise poetry; in tradition 5, two more genres are added, which will need to be dealt with later.[50]

In Tradition 7 Ḏū l-Rumma, the 'last Bedouin poet' of the Umayyad period, is compared with the three greatest poets of this epoch. Of the latter it is said that they master all four of the 'bases' or 'pillars of poetry' equally, namely, praise, invective, self-praise and simile, whereas by contrast it is asserted that Ḏū l-Rumma excels in only one of the 'bases', simile. The point that for this reason he is only a

_____

47 Sezgin, *GAS*, vol. II, pp. 508; G. J. H. van Gelder, "Ibn al-Muʾadhdhal", in *EAL*, vol. I, p. 350.

48 Ibn Rašīq, *al-ʿUmda,* vol. I, p. 123.

49 "Literary Theory", p. 37.

50 See below, p. 17.

quarter poet shows that more was expected of great poets, in particular, mastery of the themes that are directed towards persons and connected to the society.

This is shown likewise by Tradition 8, whereby praise and invective are highlighted as the two most important themes a truly great poet needs to master. Criticism is directed this time against an Abbasid poet, Abū Nuwās.[51] The 'modern' genres primarily cultivated by him, wine and hunting, are not considered full-fledged poetry by the critic.

Tradition 9 (as compared to tradition 7) shows that no consensus exists as to the 'pillars' or 'houses' of poetry – both mean more or less basic themes. Although four categories are named in this tradition as well, love poetry (*nasīb*) takes the place of simile; the others are in accordance.

Tradition 10 contains a pronouncement on the 'deep structure' of Arabic poetry.[52] Here the nature of three prominent person-directed themes are placed in mutual interrelation: accordingly, invective is nothing other than negation or the opposite of praise; and the dirge, in turn, praise placed in the past.

It is conspicuous that dirge (*riṯāʾ*) has been omitted in most of these systems and statements.[53] Heinrichs considers this incompleteness a serious fault,[54] but the reason for the omission may also be a lesser appraisal of this category by the experts.[55]

A summary of the results of our observations up to now allows the following theses to be put forward.

1. The main concern of Poetry experts in the pre-systematic phase is with pre-Islamic and early Islamic poetry (including Umayyad poetry). Abbasid Poetry receives less attention.

2. Poets and Experts classified poetry according to either a) emotional states (affects, emotions; sometimes other motives come into play as well) which supposedly favour the genesis or calling forth of the relevant poetic themes, or they classified poetry according to b) themes. The 'psycholiterary' attempt will play only a minor role in the systematic genre theory,[56] whereas the second will continue to occupy us extensively.

_____

51 Sezgin, *GAS*, vol. II, pp. 543-550; E. Wagner, "Abū Nuwās", in *EI*[3;]; Ph. Kennedy, "Abū Nuwās", in Cooperson–Toorawa (eds.), *ALC*, pp. 21-32; G. Schoeler, "Abū Nuwās", in *EAL*, vol. I, pp. 41-43; Wagner, *Abū Nuwās*.

52 van Gelder, "Some Brave Attempts", p. 20.

53 It occurs only in Tradition 10.

54 Heinrichs, "Literary Theory", p. 38.

55 Perhaps because the dirges evolved initially from unliterary lamentations of women at the loss of a relative (cf. G. Borg, "Riṯāʾ", in *EAL*, vol. II, pp. 663f.) – Consider also the report cited by Ibn Qutayba, *K. al-šiʿr*, p. 18; id., *Introduction*, p. 18.

56 But see below, p. 17f.

3. The themes are called *funūn* or *ḍurūb*, 'kinds' or 'types'. Terms also employed are *arkān*, 'bases', 'pillars' and *buyūt*, 'houses' (the latter only once). Both of the last terms imply that not just any theme is meant, rather, fundamental themes are meant, themes which are ranked above others in the hierarchy or from which others are derived. Although there is no agreement as to which themes are the fundamental ones, some categories are found repeatedly.

4. It can be said quite generally that praise and invective are not absent in any list, and that mostly self-praise, occasionally also love poetry and simile appear in addition. This shows the great importance ascribed to poetry directed towards persons, especially praise and invective. He who has not mastered it is not considered a full-fledged poet.

5. That the matter of categories arrived at through classification (called 'kinds', 'bases', etc.) is less one of *genres* than of *poetic themes* is to be inferred from the fact that some of these categories, at least in pre- and early Islamic poetry (cf. above, 1.), are found not at all as poems in their own right but only contained within the framework of polythematic *qaṣīda*s. This is the case, e.g., for wine description and, above all, simile.

6. That simile, too, is occasionally named alongside and on the same par with poetic themes may seem unsystematic to us. The explanation may be that it, especially the extensively spun 'independent simile' spanning many verses, is in Arabic poetry less a stylistic device than a structural element of the poems[57] and therefore indeed something like a theme.

7. On no account did experts in the pre-systematic phase subject whole poems to classification, rather, always only single sections (constituting a thematic unit) of the poem.

8. In one case (Tradition 5), where the speaker wants to embrace poetry as a whole, named in an unsystematic way on the same par are *themes* on the one hand and *metres* (formal genres) on the other.

Classifications of Poetry by the Critics and Theorists of Literature

Ṯaʿlab

The first systematist to present a differentiated classification of poetry in the framework of a list is the Kufic grammarian and philologist Ṯaʿlab (d. 904).[58] In his opus on poetry *Qawāʿid al-šiʿr* ('Foundations of poetry')[59] he defines first of all

_____

57 Bloch, "Stilfiguren", p. 185. – Cf. fn. 16.

58 M. G. Carter, "Thaʿlab", in *EAL*, vol. II, pp. 765-766.

59 Ṯaʿlab, *Qawāʿid*, pp. 35-40.

as 'foundations' the four declarative forms: command, prohibition, predication and question.[60] These basic elements (or 'roots'; *uṣūl*) in turn ramify into praise (*al-madḥ*), invective (or lampoon; *al-hiǧāʾ*), dirges (*al-marāṯī*), apologetic verse (i.e., verse asking for forgiveness) (*al-iʿtiḏār*), love poetry (*al-tašbīb;* the term indicates the same as *nasīb*), simile (*al-tašbīh*) and report (or 'relating of events', 'telling stories') (*iqtiṣāṣ al-aḫbār*).

The categories developed by Ṯaʿlab concern the main themes of old Arabic poetry already familiar to us in great part from pre-systematic critique (praise, invective, etc.). He also includes an important category overlooked by most of the earlyer experts, dirge. Simile is found in his list as well; in addition a seemingly puzzling category, 'report', or 'the relating of events', which otherwise appears nowhere else. [61]

With Ṯaʿlab, too, no complete poems undergo classification – as evidenced by the emergence of the categories 'simile' and 'report', but also by the provided *šawāhid*[62]; rather, only single verses, or pairs of verses held together by a theme, are subjected to classification. The reason for this is on the one hand the 'molecular structure' of the whole of Old Arabic poetry - Ṯaʿlab shows himself to be an adherent of this idea and a decided critic of enjambment.[63] The other reason is the thematic diversity of the multipart *qaṣīda* at which the attention of literary critics and theorists – because it was the exemplary poem and claim to fame of Arabic poetry (cf. *muʿallaqa*s)! – was notably directed. These two features had to prevent the finding of a specific object, a characteristic theme as classification principle for the ode as a whole.

Qudāma b. Ǧaʿfar

Qudāma (died 922 or 948 or 945)[64], born Christian, converted later to Islam, was a philosophically educated scribe, a philologist and literary theorist. He is the author of a work on poetics entitled *Naqd al-šiʿr* ('The Assaying of Poetry'). The structure of the book, the ideas developed therein as well as the definitions and argumentations betray an author who was conversant with logic and who could

---

60 Cf. van Gelder, "Some Brave Attempts", pp. 17-18.

61 For this category cf. Heinrichs, "Literary Theory", p. 40, fn. 96, and van Gelder, "Some Brave Attempts", p. 18. – Regarding the exact meaning of the term, both authors are of the opinion that we have to resign ourselves to a *non liquet.*

62 *šawāhid*, (sg. *šāhida*), are verses supplied as evidence.

63 Heinrichs, *Arabische Dichtung*, p. 30; "Literary Theory", p. 39.

64 W. Heinrichs, "Qudāma ibn Jaʿfar", in *EAL*, vol. II, pp. 639-640; S. A. Bonebakker, Introduction to Qudāma, *Naqd,* pp. 1-73 (English).

think systematically. The first section of his book[65] already contains the definition which later became common knowledge: "Poetry is metred and rhymed utterance pointing to a meaning." In the section 'The characteristics of poetic thoughts (*maʿānī*)...' he holds forth about the classification of poetry thus:

> As the types (lit.: parts; *aqsām*) of poetic thoughts (*maʿānī*) [...] are innumerable and it would be impossible to enumerate them all and come to an end, I have deemed it appropriate in this regard to mention (only) that which is essential (*ṣadran*) [...]; (moreover I have found it expedient) to do this (only) for the most prominent 'aims' of the poets (*fī aʿlām min aġrāḍ al-šuʿarāʾ*) and for that which they mostly dealt with and what they cultivated for the longest time (*wa-mā hum lahū aktaru dawsan wa-ʿalayhi ašaddu dawman*) : These are praise (*al-madīḥ*), invective (*al-hiǧāʾ*), dirges (*al-marāṯī*), simile (*al-tašbīh*), description (*al-waṣf*) and love poetry (*al-nasīb*). [66]

Qudāma treats the individual 'aims' exhaustively in sections of his work specially dedicated to them. What is new with Qudāma is first of all the term 'aims', (or 'objectives', or 'targets') (*aġrāḍ*) for the categories he enumerates. The quote above implies that the 'aims' are 'poetic thoughts' (*maʿānī*) – in a wider sense; the latter term, however, is used by Qudāma also more specifically, something like in the sense of 'motifs' which constitute the 'aims'. The newly introduced term – probably by Qudāma – *ġaraḍ*, which from now on finds frequent usage in literary theory and critic, is quite fitting for the person-directed themes (praise, invective, etc.), because these do in fact arise from the 'objectives of the poet' with respect to the addressed persons. Qudāma could have drawn the term from the terminology of the Greek-Arab sciences with which he was conversant; [67] there it corresponds to the Greek *skopos*, the 'aim' or 'intention' of the author when composing a book. This assumption has a lot in its favour; for instance, *ġaraḍ/skopos*, in this sense, can also refer to the elaboration of a poetic description or simile (the poet can 'intend' the praise of a person, but likewise also the description of a thing).[68] However, if one accepts this view, one must assume,

---

65 Qudāma, *Naqd*, p. 2.

66 Qudāma, *Naqd*, p. 23.

67 As assumed by Heinrichs, "Literary Theory", p. 41, n. 100.

68 Cf. Heinrichs, "Literary Theory", pp. 40f., n. 100: "... it is evident that *waṣf* is not a *gharaḍ* in the strict sense since it is not directed to a specific person as are all the others. The same is true , of course, in the case of *tashbīh*. ... Qudāmah's use of he word shows that for him *gharaḍ* ... is simply the 'aim' of the poet in writing a line of poetry"; Hussein, "Approaches", p. 300: "Both *waṣf* and *tashbīh* should be considered *aghrāḍ* if the main aim of the poet in his verse/-s is o describe a certain object, or to make a comparison (perhaps an artful comparison) between it and other objects". Ibid., p. 305: "The targets (..) of old poetry can be either social (i.e. connected to the society) or literary." – The further development of Arabic genre theory, however, evidences the conspicuous tendency to

furthermore, that Qudāma adopted the term from an already existing terminological system from which he isolated it; because it mostly appears only in a certain context, i.e., in the framework of a scheme of eight preliminaries which the Greek and, in their wake, the Arab authors treat at the very beginning of their (mostly exegetical) works:[69] 1. aim (intention, objective) (*ġaraḍ*), 2. use(fulness) (*manfaʿa*), 3. title (*ʿunwān*), 4. division (in chapters) (*qisma*), 5. order (within the syllabus) (*martaba*), 6. authorship (*ṣiḥḥa*), 7. branch of science to which the book belongs (*min ayy ṣināʿa huwa*), 8. method of instruction (*naḥw al-taʿlīm*).

If we compare Qudāma's list with Ṭaʿlab's it is first of all noticeable that two categories are absent with the former – poetry of apology and 'relating of events'. As for the first one, it is probable that Qudāma eliminated it from the system because the theme can be meaningfully subsumed under 'praise' (as is incidentally also done in modern Western studies[70]). Although Qudāma does not say it explicitly, it can be inferred from a corresponding approach he follows elsewhere: At the beginning of some chapters concerning specific 'aims' he attempts to deduce them from other, principal (superordinated) 'aims'. Clearly following an approach – which we have already encountered in the pre-systematic phase (see Tradition 10, above) - and developing it, love poetry is for him praise of women[71] invective the inverse of praise[72] and dirge praise of the deceased.[73] Qudāma's tacit assumption thereby is, of course, that 'praise' - in the sense of 'panegyric poetry', 'eulogy' - is the principal category.

Noteworthy is Qudāma's distinction between *nasīb* and *ġazal*.[74] While elsewhere in pre-modern Arabic poetry and critical literature the two terms are mostly used as synonyms,[75] Qudāma suggests the following differentiation: *"Nasīb*

---

restrict the term *ġaraḍ* to person-directed themes: this tendency is already noticeable with al-Rummānī and Abū Hilāl, with both of whom only the description (*waṣf*) lies outside this framework; it is fully realized with Ibn Rašīq and Ḥāzim al-Qarṭāğannī who use the term solely for person-directed themes (s. below p. 19 and 22).

69 See Schoeler, "Der Verfasser der Augenheilkunde", pp. 89-94.

70 Jacobi has coined the term 'Entschuldigungs*madīḥ*' (apologising *madīḥ*) for al-Nābiġa's apologetic verse (*Studien*, pp. 65, 95, 97 etc.) .

71 Qudāma, *Naqd*, p. 28.

72 Ibid., pp. 44, 49.

73 Ibid., p. 49.

74 Ibid., p. 65. For the following see Schoeler, "Die Einteilung", p. 16; Jacobi, "Nasīb", in *EI²*, vol. VII, pp. 978-983; Bauer, *Liebe*, pp. 185-197.

75 See, e.g., p. 38. - Yet Ibn Rašīq is an exception: It is true that he explains the terms *taġazzul* (but not *ġazal!*), *tašbīb* and *nasīb* as synonyms; concerning *ġazal*, however, he refers explicitly to Qudāma's definition slightly rephrasing the latter's definition (*al-ʿUmda*, vol. II, p. 117; cf. Jacobi, "Nasīb", in *EI²*, vol. VII, pp. 978-983.)

is the expression (*ḏikr*) of the *ġazal*; *ġazal*, on the other hand, is the idea itself (*al-maʿnā nafsahū*); it is the passionate love and devotion to women." - The terminological determination *nasīb* = amatory prologue of the *qaṣīd*a, *ġazal* = independent love poem was introduced by Western Arabists; it is not to be found with indigenous poets, critics and redactors of Dīwāns.[76]

'Description' (*wasf*) is the new category introduced by Qudāma, perhaps in order to replace Ṯaʿlab's unfortunate and incomprehensible 'relating of events'. Appearing alongside simile, which according to Qudāma 'takes place between two things which share characteristic features', is description, which is a direct statement, a proposition devoid of any imagery, about a thing.[77]

Qudāma was the first literary theorist to recognize the category of *wasf*, 'description' in its significance and introduce it into the Arabic genre theory as a category in its own right. Naturally the term had long been in existence, and the way to Qudāma's innovation had been paved by 'pre-systematic' pronouncements like those of al-Aḫṭal (Tradition 4). Portrayals, just as similes, had always appeared as themes (or subthemes) in the framework of polythematic *qaṣīda*s (e.g., the camel description; but also binging and hunting scenes are primarely descriptive); and in Abbasid poetry, *wasf* appears as a genre in its own right.

Nonetheless, Qudāma did not consciously base his classification on complete poems. Like Ṯaʿlab, he was concerned with smaller or larger verse groups – this is evidenced by the *šawāhid* he provides, but also by the fact that he held onto such categories as love poetry (*nasīb*) and simile; the latter, in particular, never occurs as the exclusive theme of a poem. Thus, the term developed by him, *ġaraḍ*, is seen to refer primarily to themes[78], not genres.

Classifications in the follow-up to Qudāma

Qudāma's classification of poetry influenced other literary critics and theorists; above all, however, it was the term he introduced, *ġaraḍ,* ('aim', 'objective', 'target'), which was to reap the greatest success. Soon after Qudāma it finds use with al-

---

76 The term *ġazal* denoting an indipendent Arabic love poem (as used by Western Arabists) is a retroactive expansion of the Persian concept of *ġazal*. In Persian literature, *ġazal* means in fact an independent love poem; cf. fn. 236.

77 Qudāma, *Naqd*, p. 55 and p. 62.

78 Hussein rightly emphasizes (p. 305) that 'the term *gharaḍ* ... [is] not the same as the word 'theme' and 'genre' in English ...' and points to the fact that 'the old critics ... did not speak of them (sc. the *aghrāḍ*) as themes... Instead they preferred to focus on the targets of the poets in composing their verses'. On the other hand, Hussein has to admit that 'most [or rather: all?] of the *aghrāḍ* ... can be considered themes'.

Rummānī und Abū Hilāl al-ʿAskarī who are directly inspired by Qudāma's list. Baghdad grammarian and theologian ʿAlī b. ʿĪsā al-Rummānī (died 994)[79] says:

> The most prevalent 'aims' of poetry are five: love poetry (*nasīb*), praise (*madḥ*), invective, (*hiǧāʾ*), self-praise (*faḫr*) and description (*waṣf*); simile and metaphor fall under the category of description.[80]

Compared with Qudāma's list, the category 'dirge' is absent; al-Rummānī may have eliminated it because Qudāma had theoretically subsumed it under 'praise'; on the other hand, al-Rummānī reintroduces 'self-praise' which had been eliminated by Qudāma. In divergence from his predecessor, he allocates simile (and its associate, metaphor) to the category 'description'. This means that, for him, simile and metaphor are not 'aims', nor are they common modes of expression for all 'kinds' of poetry, but rather special forms of the one category, i.e., 'description'. On this point his system is more economical than Qudāma's; on the other hand, however, it is less economical due to his having reintroduced self-praise.

From Abū Hilāl al-ʿAskarī (died 1005),[81] philologist, poet, anthologist and critic, come two lists enumerating the 'aims' of poetry; one is found in his *K. al-Ṣināʿatayn al-kitāba wa-l-šiʿr* ('The Book of the Two Arts: Epistolography and Poetry'), the other in his *Dīwān al-maʿānī* ('The Register of Motifs'). The author introduces the first list with the following words:[82]

> As the aims (*aġrāḍ*) of the poets are many and their thoughts so ramified and manifold as to defy enumeration, it is expedient to mention only what is most prevalent and has been studied for the longest time, this being: praise (*madḥ*), invective (*hiǧāʾ*), description (*waṣf*), love poetry (*nasīb*), dirges (*marāṯī*) and self-praise (*faḫr*). [...] I left out dirges and self-praise because they both fall under the [heading of] praise. Indeed, self-praise is extolment of oneself with regard to purity, integrity, clemency, knowledge, noble parentage and the like. And the dirge is praise of the departed; the difference between both and praise is that (in the dirge) you say 'he was so and so', whereas in the praise you say 'he is so and so', and (in self-praise) 'you are so and so'.

The use of the term 'aim', the selection of the relevant 'aims' and even the explanations given by Abū Hilāl for his categorization (emphasis on the impossibility of treating all of the 'aims' and poetic thoughts, etc.) are proof of

---

79 Sezgin, *GAS*, vol. VIII, pp. 112-114, vol. IX, pp. 111-113; G. J. H. van Gelder, "al-Rummānī", in *EAL*, vol. II, pp. 666-667.

80 Apud Ibn Rašīq, *al-ʿUmda*, vol. I, p. 120.

81 W. Heinrichs, "Abū Hilāl al-ʿAskarī", in *EAL*, vol. I, pp. 35-36.

82 Abū Hilāl, *K. al-Ṣināʿatayn,* p. 137.

Qudāma's influence. In divergence from his predecessor, yet just like al-Rummānī, however (probably through his influence), he does away with simile as a category of its own and introduces self-praise as one. Admittedly, he at once reassigns the latter to praise, thereby proceeding as Qudāma did with the dirge. Again following Qudāma's procedure, yet in addition also quite obviously taking the pre-systematic explanation of ʿAbd al-Ṣamad (see Tradition 10 above) as a model, he shows that praise, dirge and self-praise have the same 'deep structure'.

The other list is found in the chapter of his *Dīwān al-maʿānī* in which he treats poetry of congratulation (*al-tahānī*).[83] There Abū Hilāl explicates that congratulation had not yet existed in the pre-Islamic period; because at that time there were only five categories (lit.: 'parts' (*aqsām*) of poetry: praise (*al-madīḥ*), invective (*al-hiǧāʾ*), description (*al-waṣf*), love poetry (*al-tašabbub*, and dirges (*al-marāṯī*), until an-Nābiġa added a sixth category, apologetic verse (*al-iʿtiḏār*).

This list differs from the other only in that it does not include self-praise and, instead, introduces apology and congratulation (as categories specific to later poetry). What is remarkable is that Abū Hilāl had become aware that in the course of the development of poetry new themes had emerged. This approach to a historical view of the genesis and development of themes had previously been completely absent, and it is not explained by him any further.

Finally, it should be noted that neither al-Rummānī nor Abū Hilāl al-ʿAskarī, no more than Qudāma, consciously based their classifications on complete poems. Neither love poetry nor description – and simile not at all – appear in pre-Islamic poetry as independent forms. This is why their categories, too, are themes, not genres.

Ibn Wahb

Ishāq b. Ibrāhīm b. Wahb al-Kātib (flourished in the middle of the 10th cent.)[84] was a contemporary of Qudāma. All that is known of him is that he was a scribe and composer of the *K. al-Burhān fī wuǧūh al-bayān* ('The Proof: on the Ways of Exposition'), a work written mainly for the use of secretaries, but containing much material on poetry and prose as well. In the chapter on 'the composition of (verbal) expression' (*taʾlīf al-ʿibāra*) it is said that:

> Poets have at their disposal many categories (*funūn*) which can ultimately be outlined in four main categories (lit. 'groups'; *aṣnāf*), namely, praise (*al-madīḥ*), invective (*al-hiǧāʾ*), gnomic poetry (lit.: wisdom) (*al-ḥikma*) and (poetry for)

---

83 Abū Hilāl, *Dīwān al-maʿānī,* vol. I, p. 91.

84 G. J. H. van Gelder, "Ibn Wahb", in *EAL*, vol. I, p. 381.

amusement (or: jocose, or light poetry)[85] (*al-lahw*). Subsequently branching off from each single main category (*ṣinf*) (in turn) are (sub)categories; belonging to praise are then: dirges (*al-marāṯī*), self-praise (*al-iftiḫār*), thanksgiving (al-*šukr*), polite request (*al-luṭf fī l-masʾala*) and the like which is similar to it and close to it in meaning. To invective belong: blame (*al-ḏamm*), reproach (*al-ʿatb*), deeming the addressee tardy (*al-istibṭāʾ*), rebuke (*al-taʾnīb*) and that which is similar and related. Belonging to gnomic poetry are: adages (*al-amṯāl*), summons to renunciation (*al-tazhīd*), admonitions (*al-mawāʿiz*) and that which is similar and related. Belonging to light poetry are: love poems (*al-ġazal*), hunting poems (*al-ṭard*), the description of wine (*ṣifat al-ḫamr*), licentious verse (*al-muǧūn*) and the like.[86]

This is again a classification according to themes. Like Qudāma and already the pre-systematic poetry experts, Ibn Wahb seeks to get back to the basic or main categories of poetry (he calls them *aṣnāf*) and introduces for this reason a hierarchical order into his system. As with his predecessors, 'praise' and 'invective' are main categories with him as well, however, he augments the number of subcategories with kinds of poetry neglected till then (e.g., 'thanksgiving' as a subcategory of praise; ‚reproach' as a subcategory of invective). An absolute innovation, however, is the introduction of two new main categories, 'wisdom poetry' and 'light poetry'. These, or more precisely their subcategories, make it possible to grant the 'modern' genres (that originated in the Umayyad period and were then fully developed in the Abbasid period)[87] – love, wine, hunting, renunciation poetry and licentious verse – a worthy place in the system. The fact of having created a system which covers thematic genres of 'modern' poetry and allows them to be dealt with equitably is an accomplishment of Ibn Wahb which has been recognized and valued in modern research from the start.[88]

Ibn Wahb only mentions themes that can also appear as independent poems. They can thus already be described as (thematic) 'poetic genres'. This does not mean, however, that he consciously based his classification on complete poems, because he always quotes only single verses as examples. In the case of love and hunting poems the verses cited come not from a *ḫamriyya* and a *ṭardiyya,* but from the *muʿallaqa* of Imraʾ al-Qays, i.e., a polythematic *qaṣīda* from the pre-Islamic period!

_____

85 In what follows I shall be using for *lahw* the free but apposite translation 'light poetry' ('poésie légère') suggested by Trabulsi, *La critique,* p. 217.

86 In Wahb, *al-Burhān,* p. 170f.

87 Cf. Wagner, *Grundzüge,* vol. II, pp. 31-87.

88 This has been already pointed out by Trabulsi in *La critique,* p. 217.

Ibn Rašīq, in one of the genre lists he adduces,[89] ascribes an identical system to a later literary theorist, ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Nahšalī (died 1014)[90] whose work he frequently quotes. If this ascription is correct, al-Nahšalī has taken over Ibn Wahb's system with or, more likely, without citing Ibn Wahb as its author. Otherwise, the system did not have any influence on subsequent literary theory. However, it did, in all probability, have an influence on a redactor of a collection of poems, Ḥamza al-Iṣfahānī, who arranged and edited the Dīwān of Abū Nuwās.[91]

It should be pointed out here in addition that, apart from the thematic, Ibn Wahb propounded yet another classification of poetry, one according to principles of 'outer form'.[92] We are dealing here with a categorization according to metre and rhyme, i.e., the two constituent elements of poetry. Ibn Wahb gives the following 'parts' (aqsām): qaṣīd (all metres except for raǧaz; monorhyme), raǧaz (the metre of this name, monorhyme),[93] musammaṭ (a stanzaic form of poetry; metre not prescribed; rhyme alternating following specific rules),[94] muzdawiǧ (metre mostly raǧaz, rhyming couplets).[95] This categorization, too, is expedient: it is completely in tune with the formal features of Arabic poetry, and for this reason is used in modern Western studies. The categories can be described as 'formal genres'.

Ibn Rašīq

Ibn Rašīq al-Qayrawānī (died 1063 or 1071),[96] North African poet and author of the poetic encyclopaedia al-ʿUmda ('The Support'), in the chapter, 'On the definitions of poetry and its structure', of his book,[97] assembled a full array of statements on the classification of poetry. Several appear in the framework of lists, some belonging to the pre-systematic phase,[98] others to the systematic. In a few cases, poetry is still categorized according to states of mind, more often, however, according to themes.

---

89 Ibn Rašīq, al-ʿUmda, vol. I, p. 121.

90 For him see Bouyahia, "Le livre de ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Nahšalī".

91 See below, p. 30.

92 Ibn Wahb, al-Burhān, pp. 160f.

93 For this genre see W. Stoetzer, "Rajaz", in EAL, vol. II, pp. 645-646; Ullmann, Untersuchungen.

94 See Schoeler, "Musammaṭ", in EI², vol. VII, pp. 660-662.

95 For this genre see W. Stoetzer, "Muzdawija", in EAL, vol. II, pp. 567-568.

96 G. J. H. van Gelder, "Ibn Rashīq al-Qayrawānī, in EAL, vol. I, p. 363.

97 Ibn Rašīq, al-ʿUmda, vol. I, pp. 119-123.

98 For three of these statements see above, Traditions 1, 2, 10.

In an anonymous list[99] whose author would better be attributed to later times owing to his systematic approach, four states of mind, or emotions (but no other drives), are systematically named as 'foundations' (bases) (*qawāʿid*) of poetry. Commensurate kinds of poetry are then derived from them: desire (*al-raġba*) would give rise to praise (*al-madḥ*) and thanksgiving (*al-šukr*), fear (*al-rahba*) to apology (*al-iʿtiḏār*) and plea for clemency (*al-istiʿṭāf*); arising from emotion (*al-ṭarab*) is yearning (poetry) (*al-šawq*) and tender love verse (*riqqat al-nasīb*); derived from anger would be invective (*al-hiǧāʾ*), threat (*al-tawaʿʿud*) and offensive reproach (*al-ʿitāb al-mūǧiʿ*). The emotions named correspond to those given in Tradition 2,[100] however, each emotion has been allocated more than one poetic kind of poetry.

There is another anonymous list ('a scholar said')[101] which could be understood as a systemization and improvement of an earlier attempt to expose the four 'houses' or 'pillars' on which poetry is supposed to be built (Tradition 7 and 9). In this list the term 'bases' (or 'pillars') (*arkān*) is used. Appearing here alongside the unavoidable categories of praise and invective are love poetry (*al-nasīb*) and dirge (*al-riṯāʾ*) – instead of simile and self-praise.

Yet another anonymous list[102] would recognize only two (basic) poetic 'kinds' (*nawʿān*): praise (*al-madḥ*) and invective (*al-hiǧāʾ*). The whole of poetry is split into these two categories; an intermediate status between the two opposites is ascribed only to reproach (*al-ʿitāb*) and incentive (*al-iġrāʾ*). That which belongs to praise is listed by name: the dirge (*al-riṯāʾ*), self-praise (*al-iftiḫār*), love poetry (*al-tašbīb*), the approved descriptions (*maḥmūd al-waṣf*) like the portrayal of deserted campsites and vestiges [sc. of the camp], beautiful similes (*al-tašbīhāt al-ḥisān*); (verse for) refinement of customs (*taḥsīn al-aḫlāq*) including adages (*al-amṯāl*), gnomic poetry (*al-ḥikam*), admonition (*al-mawāʿiẓ*), (poems of) renunciation (*al-zuhd fī l-dunyā*) and frugality (*al-qināʿa*). Belonging to invective would be 'everything contrary to this', namely, no category is named.

Where Qudāma already tried to derive certain poetic categories from others and was followed in this regard by Abū Hilāl, and where Ibn Wahb established four basic categories from which all others are derived, the author of this list carries the tendency to extremes: of them he acknowledges only two contradictory-antithetical basic categories, at most three, namely, one in addition which occupies a middle position between them. What becomes manifest in this list is the final consequence of a specific trend in genre treatment by the Arabs,

_____

99 Ibn Rašīq, *al-ʿUmda*, vol. I, p. 120.

100 See above, p. 5 .

101 Ibn Rašīq, *al-ʿUmda*, vol. I, p. 120.

102 Ibid., p. 121.

the tendency to want to get back to main categories, 'prototypical forms' of poetry.[103]

Ibn Rašīq doesn't grapple with any of these classifications. Instead, he treats in detail, in the second part of his opus, in chapters 72-81,[104] the following 'aims and categories of poetry' (aġrāḍ al-šiʿr wa-ṣunūfuhū): 1. love poetry (an-nasīb), 2. praise (al-madīḥ), 3. self-praise (al-faḫr), 4. dirge (al-riṯāʾ), 5. demand and plea to fulfil a promise (al-iqtiḍāʾ and al-istinǧāz), 6. reproach (al-ʿitāb), 7. threat and warning (al-waʿīd wa-l-inḏār), 8. invective (al-hiǧāʾ) and 9. apology (al-iʿtiḏār).

Ibn Rašīq was the first to use the term 'aim', 'target', strictly terminologically. For him, the only kinds of poetry that are 'aims' are those that 1. are person-directed and 2. pursue a real purpose. All of them are present in Old Arabic (pre- and early Islamic) verse; 'aims' 5-7 are typical themes of qiṭʿas (so-called 'poems containing a proclamation or message'); however, they very frequently also constitute the closing section of qaṣīdas ('qaṣīdas containing a message'). On the other hand, categories like 'description' and 'simile', i.e., categories which Qudāma and al-Rummānī still included under 'aims', have no place in this system. This is why the chapter in which he treats wasf (descriptive poetry) is not found with the 'aims' but at a completely different place in his opus. This applies as well for the 'modern' genres of wine, obscene verse, etc., which Ibn Rašīq likewise does not ignore, even though he doesn't give them their own chapter.

In the chapter, 'On the erudition (ādāb) of the poet',[105] he speaks initially of those kinds of poetry concerning which the 'objective of the speech' (maqāṣid al-qawl) and the 'aims of the addressee' (aġrāḍ al-muḫāṭab) needs to be known; they are the categories enumerated above (save no. 7 and no. 9). He then continues:

> One says: Each situation has a speech which is appropriate for it (li-kull maqām maqāl). Thus, any poetry composed by the poet for himself, concerning his own desire and matters pertaining to himself, e.g., jest (al-mazḥ), love poetry (al-ġazal), [poetic] correspondence (al-mukātaba), licentious verse (al-muǧūn), wine poetry (al-ḫamriyya) and the like, is something quite different from his poetry in the odes which he

---

103 According to Heinrichs ("Literary Theory", p. 42), a model for this system could also be found in statements like that of al-Baṣīr (see Tradition 8, above, p. 6): ("[True] poetry is either praise or invective"); but note that the bias is different in both pronouncements: the latter does not claim a dichtomy of poetry (it is not said that the whole of poetry is split into two categories, praise and invective), but points to the importance of the two genres under discussion. – Trabulsi's assumption (La critique, p. 218) that this system "is a result of the efforts displayed by certain logicians to adapt Arabic poetry to Aristotelian poetics" is implausible and refutable; cf. Schoeler, "Die Einteilung", pp. 24f.; Heinrichs, "Literary Theory", p. 42.

104 Ibn Rašīq, al-ʿUmda, vol. II, pp. 112-180.

105 Ibid., vol. I, p. 199 (27th chapter).

presents at festivals (*qaṣāʾid al-ḥafl*) and 'between the two rows' (*bayna l-simāṭayn*) (i.e., at state banquets)...

Ibn Rašīq therefore distinguishes two classes of poetry: official person-directed, on the one hand (the most important being the ritual praise *qaṣīda*) and private, on the other.[106] Only the first are 'aims'. He obviously valuates the official kinds of poetry (which have a social function) higher, for only they get their own chapter. Hence, already applicable for Ibn Rašīq's concept of the function of this kind of poetry is what van Gelder has ascertained for one of his successors, Ibn Aflaḥ:[107]

> It plays, first of all, a communicative role; it is a form of social intercourse between the poet and his equals, and, especially, his superiors, who may have to be praised, thanked, chided, urged, implored or reminded.[108]

Ibn Rašīq thereby connects up with a tendency already familiar to us from the pre-systematic phase.[109] The incorporation of the category *nasīb* (love poem) - which at least in pre-Islamic poetry never appears in independent forms – into the catalogue of his 'aims' shows that Ibn Rašīq, too, catagorized according to themes, not according to genres.

Ibn Aflaḥ

Ibn Aflaḥ (died 1141),[110] author of a *K. al-Badīʿ*, enumerates in the introduction to his work an array of kinds of poetry, all of them person-directed and 'aims'.[111] The individual categories have been arranged in pairs: praise (*al-madḥ*) and thanksgiving (*al-šukr*), invective (*al-haǧw*) and blame (*al-ḏamm*), justification (*al-tanaṣṣul*) and apology (*al-iʿtiḏār*) etc.; the author attempts to differentiate them from one another and gives examples, single verses or groups of verses, some short, others longer. The list contains some 'aims' which are otherwise not named, namely: 'explicitly mentioning dissatisfaction with someone's situation [*walaʿ*], and 'to condemn something by means of a veiled threat or innuendo' [*hamz*]. The catalogue is not complete; 'aims' as important as love poetry (*nasīb*), self-praise (*faḫr*) and dirge (*riṯāʾ*) are absent.[112] G. J. van

---

106 Cf. Schoeler, *Grundprobleme*, pp. 9f.

107 For him see below.

108 van Gelder, *Two Treatises*, p. 37.

109 See above, Traditions 7-8, p. 6.

110 For him see van Gelder, *Two Treatises*, pp. 10-14 (English); cf. Ibn Aflaḥ, *al-Badīʿ*, ed. Ibrāhīm Ṣāliḥ, Abu Dhabi, 1430/2009. For the sections on the "genres", see pp. 152-180.

111 Ibid., pp. 48-63 (Arabic).

112 van Gelder, ibid., p. 37f. (English).

Gelder, to whose study can be referred for everything else, explicates that Ibn Aflaḥ is of the opinion that, above all, poetry plays a communicative role.[113]

Ibn Abī l-Iṣbaʿ/al-Ibšīhī

The Egyptian, al-Ibšīhī (died c. 1446)[114], who wrote the anthology of Belles-Lettres *al-Mustaṭraf fī kull fann mustaẓraf* ('What is extreme in all branches of elegance'), deals in the section (*faṣl*) 'On poetry'[115] with its classifications. He first of all notes that some divide it into 10 'chapters' or 'categories *(abwāb)* following Abū Tammām's famous Anthology *al-Ḥamāsa* ('Bravery in warfare', named after the first chapter of the work)[116]. In obvious agreement he then cites a categorization of the poet and rhetorician Ibn Abī l-Iṣbaʿ (died c. 1256).[117] According to this categorization there are 18 'kinds' (*funūn*) of poetry: love poetry (*ġazal*), descriptive poetry (*waṣf*), self-praise (*faḫr*), praise (*madḥ*), invective (*hiǧāʾ*), reproach (*ʿitāb*), apologetic verse (*iʿtiḏār*), aphoristic poetry (*adab*), poems of renunciation (*zuhd*), wine poetry (*ḫamriyyāt*), dirges (*marāṯī*), [verse expressing] good news (*bišāra*), congratulations (*tahānī*), threat (*waʿīd*), warning (*taḥḏīr*), incentive (*taḥrīḍ*), facetious verse (*mulaḥ*) and 'a special chapter: question and answer' (*suʾāl wa-ǧawāb*).

What makes this list interesting is that Ibn Abī l-Iṣbaʿ (and in his wake al-Ibšīhī) are evidently out to produce an exhaustive catalogue of the thematic 'kinds' of Arabic poetry. (And this is exactly what other theorists did not want; they were rather out to indicate basic or main categories.) For this reason Ibn Abī l-Iṣbaʿ does not confine himself to listing only *aġrāḍ* (person-directed matters, 'aims') – and, significantly, the term *aġrāḍ* does not appear with him – rather, he offers a number of poetic 'kinds' (*funūn*) typical for 'modern' poetry. Completeness, however, wasn't achieved, because he left out such an important poetic genre as hunting poetry (*ṭardiyyāt*) (unless one assumes that he subsumed it in the descriptive poetry). This division was convenient for Ibn ʿAbdrabbihī because it encompassed all – or the greatest part – of the poetic themes appearing in his anthology.

---

113 Ibid.; see above.

114 For him see Brockelmann, *GAL*, vol. II, pp. 68-69, suppl. II, pp. 55-56; R. Irwin, "al-Ibshīhī", in *EAL*, vol. I, pp. 387-388;

115 al-Ibšīhī, *al-Mustaṭraf*, vol. II, p. 170.

116 M. Larkin, "Abū Tammām", in M. Cooperson – Toorawa (eds.), *ALC,* pp. 38-40.

117 For him see Brockelmann, *GAL*, vol. I, p. 373, suppl. I, p. 539; G. J. H. van Gelder, "Ibn Abī al-Iṣbaʿ", in *EAL*, vol. I. p. 305.

Ḥāzim al-Qarṭāǧannī

The Spanish-North African grammarian, poet, literary theorist and critic Ḥāzim al-Qarṭāǧannī (died 1285)[118] is the author of one of the most original works on Arabic literary theory, *Minhāǧ al-bulaġāʾ wa-sirāǧ al-udabāʾ* ('The Path of the Eloquent and the Light of the Lettered'). In it – as the first Arabic theorist – he built not only on the indigenous Arabic tradition of literary theory and critique, but likewise on the 'logical' poetics of the Arabic-Islamic Aristotelean philosophers al-Fārābī and Avicenna, and combined both traditions.[119]

Ḥāzim developed an idiosyncratic, purely theoretical (normative), highly casuistic system of *aġrāḍ*, 'aims' for poetry.[120] Like Ibn Rašīq and Ibn Aflaḥ, he is convinced that poetry above all plays a communicative role; however, he also includes the ethical aspect (see below). He accordingly takes the term 'aim' seriously and treats in detail only the purpose-oriented and person-directed kinds of poetry. These, however, he wants, unlike his predececessors whom he criticizes, to cover completely and systematically ('without any overlapping')[121]. It is striking that Ḥāzim has noted and explicitly ascertained that more than one 'aim' can be dealt with in a *qaṣīda*, e.g., *nasīb* (love) and *madīḥ* (praise). He speaks in this case of 'composite *qaṣīdas*' (*qaṣāʾid murakkaba*).[122] Hence the *ġaraḍ* is also for him a 'theme', not a 'genre'.

The highly complex system developed by Ḥāzim in this regard – shrewd it is for sure, but certainly not his best contribution – can only be given brief and incomplete attention here.[123] He derives it from the postulate that the actual intention of poetry would be 'to attract that which is useful and repell that which is harmful' through, as it were, an 'opening' or 'closing' of the souls.[124] (Both of these terms, as well as the related notion of the effect of poetry, were taken over by him from Avicenna's work on *Poetics*.)[125] What is 'useful' is foremost not of practical but of moral-ethical utility. Poetry has a lofty ethical goal: it keeps ideals

---

118 For him see W. Heinrichs, "Ḥāzim al-Qarṭājannī", in *EAL*, vol. I. pp. 280-281; id., *Arabische Dichtung*; Schoeler, *Einige Grundprobleme*.

119 Heinrichs, *Arabische Dichtung*, pp. 163-170.

120 al-Qarṭāǧannī, *Minhāǧ,* p.p 336-353; for a translation (in German) of the relevant chapter see Schoeler, *Einige Grundprobleme,* pp. 85-113.

121 al-Qarṭāǧannī, *Minhāǧ*, pp. 337f.; German transl. in Schoeler, *Einige Grundprobleme,* pp. 86f.

122 al-Qarṭāǧannī, *Minhāǧ,* pp. 303; cf. p. 351.

123 For a comprehensive discussion see Schoeler, *Einige Grundprobleme*, pp. 25-32.

124 al-Qarṭāǧannī, *Minhāǧ*, p. 337; cf. p. 111; transl. Schoeler, *Einige Grundprobleme*, p. 87; cf. Heinrichs, *Arabische Dichtung*, pp. 203f.

125 Cf. Schoeler, *Einige Grundprobleme*, pp. 15, 26f.

alive in the consciousness of people; as praise poetry it rewards good deeds, as (verse containing a) 'demand' it urges towards wholesome accomplishments, and, as (verse containing an) 'advice', it shows the right way to good, etc.

Ḥāzim highlights as basic or main categories four 'aims' forming two pairs of contradictory opposites: on the one hand praise and invective – they respond to that which is useful, or its opposite, arising through human conduct (praise rewards good deeds, invective castigates reprehensible deeds); and on the other hand congratulation and condolence – they respond to that which is useful, or its opposite, arising through fate.[126] As to his procedure for deriving the different sub-categories, only two examples are given here: the 'demand' is a praise whose justification is not yet actual but expected; and the 'advice' is a praise the way to whose realization must first be shown.

Let us again summarize, thesis-like, the most important results of the study.

1. Like the pre-systematists, neither did the systematic literary theorists and critics by any means use complete poems as the basis when establishing their classifications of poetry (according to theme). The categories they worked out relate to single verses (Ṯaʿlab) or to shorter or longer groups of verses of like content (Qudāma, Abū Hilāl, Ibn Wahb), i.e., they designate *themes*, not thematic genres. The reason for this 'deficiency' (as it might seem to us) is both the 'molecular structure' of Arabic poetry and the polythematic nature of the representative poems (all are long and multipart *qaṣīda*s, e.g., the *muʿallaqa*s). These two characteristic features of the poetry under discussion necessarily obstructed the theorists' view on larger units. In any case, this shortcoming is part of a major and conspicuous shortcoming of Arabic literary theorists: their scarce awareness of the existence of 'complex structures' (Heinrichs).

2. Appearing besides classification according to themes – although much more seldom – is also classification according to states of mind or affects. An anonymous critic names, more consistently than his predecessor in the pre-systematic era, four emotional states or affects as 'foundations' (*qawāʿid*) of poetry. He then deduces appropriate poetic themes from them.

3. Some critics express the intent of allowing economy to prevail in their classifications. Conscious of not being able to present or treat every kind of poetry, some want only to name the most important or most widespread kinds, others, in effect, only main or primary categories from which the other kinds can be deduced. Love poems and dirges are thus consigned to the main category of

---

126 al-Qarṭāǧannī, *Minhāǧ,* pp. 337 ff.; transl. in Schoeler, *Einige Grundprobleme,* pp. 87ff.; cf. p. 29.

praise (or panegyric), the former being praise of women, the latter praise of the deceased (Qudāma).

4. Not only economical systems are sought but 'logical' ones as well, in that one or more pairs of mutually opposing themes (most frequently: praise – invective) are pointed out. From these, then, all other themes will be derived or made subsidiary. This tendency is taken to extremes by an (anonymous) critic: he actually wants to recognize only two main categories, one positive (praise) the other negative (invective); if need be, however, he would accept a third occupying a middle position between the two (reproach, incentive).

5. Of the different termini used to describe the categories of poetry (e. g. *funūn, arkān, anwāʿ, qawāʿid, buyūt*), the most successful was *ġaraḍ*, pl *aġrāḍ*, 'aim', 'target'. Introduced by the man conversant with the Greek-Arab sciences, Qudāma b. Ǧaʿfar, the term might have been inspired by the Greek *skopos*. It fits best to the person-directed categories (praise, invective, etc.) in which the poet has a real concern, yet Qudāma and other early theorists and critics also employ it in a broader sense and relate it to other kinds. Later critics and theorists, however, Ibn Rašīq and in particular Ḥāzim al-Qarṭāǧannī, apply it only to person-directed categories. By contrast, *funūn* ('kinds', 'categories') is employed more unterminologically; it is certainly no accident that it is used by those critics who wish to enumerate as many as possible or even all categories of poetry (Ibn Wahb; Ibn Abī Iṣbaʿ/al-Ibšīhī).

6. As was the case already in the pre-systematic phase, the 'modern' genres originating in the Umayyad period and developed in full in the Abbasid period (wine, hunting poems, poetry of renunciation, etc.) receive less attention (and appreciation) from the systematists than was given the 'old' person-directed genres. The first critic to take them into consideration and grant them a place in his system was Ibn Wahb. He introduced two new main categories: 'light poetry' and 'wisdom poetry' under which he can subsume every new genre. Ibn Rašīq treats them only in brief; he characterizes the genres belonging to the first main category appropriately as 'private poetry' and contrasts them with official, person-directed poetry.

Classifications of Poems by the Redactors of the Dīwāns

Apart from the literary theorists and critics there was yet another group of Arabic scholars that occupied itself with classifying poetry and its genres[127]: the redactors of the Dīwāns (collections of poems of individual poets).[128]

---

127 The first Arabist to evaluate this other source of our knowledge of the autochtonous classifications of Arabic poetry was W. Ahlwardt, *Ueber Poesie,* pp. 30f.

The overwhelming majority of the Dīwāns is not arranged according to kinds of poetry, or (as we can now say) genres (ʿalā l-anwāʿ), but alphabetically according to the last rhyme consonants (rawiyy) of the poems (ʿalā l-ḥurūf). Another, rare, principle is the chronological arrangement according to epochs, whereby the successive chapters can be named after a territory in which the poet spent time, or also after a person, mostly a patron (mamdūḥ) with whom he had contact at the pertinent time. Hence the *Dīwān* of al-Mutanabbī[129] in the redaction (recension) of al-Wāḥidī is divided into *Šāmiyyāt* (poems originating in Syria), *Sayfiyyāt* (poems addressing Sayf al-Dawla), *Miṣriyyāt Kāfūriyyāt* (poems originating in Egypt addressing Kāfūr), *ʿAmīdiyyāt* (poems addressing Ibn al-ʿAmīd) and *ʿAḍudiyyāt* (poems addressing ʿAḍud al-Dawla).[130] Named after a territory are also the *ʿIrāqiyyāt* and the *Naǧdiyyāt* of al-Abīwardī (d. c. 1113).[131]

The Dīwān of Abū Nuwās

The chronologically first to be arranged according to genres, is the *Dīwān* of Abū Nuwās.[132] Within the individual genre chapters the ordering is mostly alphabetic according to rhyme letter. (This is likewise true of most of the later Dīwāns). The main reason for the emergence of this new method of arrangement is the generic diversification of the poetry of the most significant early *muḥdaṯ* ('modern' poet) that did not exist before him. Abū Nuwās cultivated, in addition to the 'old' genres, all of the 'new' genres that emerged in the Umayyad period (or even earlier).[133] With Abū Nuwās's Dīwān, it was for the first time worthwhile to arrange a collection of poems according to genres. The otherness of the poems of Abū Nuwās and the prominent place of the 'modern' genres with him was already noticed by an expert of the pre-systematic phase (Tradition 8); Ḥamza al-Iṣfahānī (d. 961, or 971),[134] one of the redactors of the Abū Nuwās Dīwān, expressed himself in this regard as follows in the introduction to his recension:[135]

---

128 The anthologies are excluded in principle from the following study. Anthologists even go a step further than poetry theorists in that their selection is based not only on themes (i.e., major parts of poems) but also motifs (i.e., very small units). – For the arrangement of a Dīwān from the Mamlūk period containing solely epigrams (*maqāṭīʿ*) cf. Bauer, "Was kann...", pp. 19-37.

129 For him see Sezgin, *GAS*, vol. II, pp. 484-497; R. Blachère, "al-Mutanabbī", in *EI²*, vol. VII, pp. 769-772; J. S. Meisami , "al-Mutanabbī", in *EAL*, vol. II, pp. 558-560.

130 al-Mutanabbī, *Dīwān,* Index, pp. 808-812.

131 C. Hillenbrand, "al-Abīwardī", in *EAL*, vol. I, p. 22.

132 See note 51.

133 Wagner, *Grundzüge,* vol. II, pp. 31-87.

134 Sezgin, *GAS*, vol. I, pp. 336-337.

135 Abū Nuwās, *Dīwān* vol. I, p. 8.

[...] Abū Nuwās practiced composing poetry in a different manner than the others (sc. poets)....; for [virtually] all of his poems concern amusement (*lahw*), flirtation (*ġazal*), licentiousness (*muǧūn*) as well as game and sport (*ʿabaṯ*), e.g., his poems on the hunt and wine as well as on the description of women and boys; the fewest of his poems are his praise poems. That is not the method of the poets that lived in his time and those who came after him [...] (named are Abū Tammām and al-Buḥturī).

In the times of Abū Nuwās and for a long time afterwards, poets didn't publish their collected poems themselves, they left this task to to their transmitters (*ruwāt*, sing. *rāwī*) and/or later scholars, philologists and men of letters.[136] Three redactions (recensions) of the Dīwān of Abū Nuwās are extant, all of them from the 10th century.[137] The most important are those of Ḥamza al-Iṣfahānī and Abū Bakr al-Ṣūlī (d. c. 946)[138]. The three extant redactions – and likewise two earlier ones which are no longer in existence[139] – are all arranged according to genre; the catalogues of genres concur for the most part in all of the collections. The explanation for this may be that all of the redactions hark back to a common archetype which already had this division, possibly even to a collection compiled by the poet himself and found in his inheritance. This presumption is supported by a remark made by al-Ṣūlī that Abū Nuwās himself had already divided his poems into 10 categories, whereby the *ġazal muʾannaṯ* (love poems addressed to women) and the *muǧūn* (licentious poems) are mentioned by name.[140]

Ḥamza's arrangement of the Abū Nuwās Dīwān is as follows:[141]

1. Introduction 2. 'Flytings' (or 'dispute poems') (*al-naqāʾiḏ*) 3. Praise poems (*al-madāʾiḥ*),) 4. Dirges (*al-marāṯī*) 5. Poems of reproach (*al-ʿitāb*) 6. Invective poetry (*al-hiǧāʾ*) 7. Poems of renunciation (or: ascetic verse) (*al-zuhdiyyāt*), 8. Hunting poems (*al-ṭarad*) 9. Wine poems (*al-ḫamriyyāt*) 10. Love poems addressed to women (*al-mūʾannaṯ*) 11. Love poems addressed to young men (*al-muḏakkar*), 12. Licentious verse (*al-muǧūn*).

Al-Ṣūlī has the same catalogue of genres, only the 'flytings' chapter is missing; but he puts the chapters in another order.[142]

---

136 Wagner, *Die Überlieferung*, p. 308; Schoeler, *The Genesis*, p. 115; Hämeen Anttila, "Abū Nuwās", pp. 92ff.

137 Wagner, *Die Überlieferung,* pp. 316-326.

138 Sezgin, *GAS,* vol. I, pp. 330-331; G. J. H. van Gelder, "al-Ṣūlī", in *EAL,* vol. II, p. 744.

139 Yaʿqūb b. al-Sikkīt (d. c. 867) and Yaḥyā b. al-Faḍl; see Wagner, *Die Überlieferung,* p. 311.

140 Abū Nuwās, *Dīwān*, vol. IV, p. 8; cf. Hämeen-Anttila, "Abū Nuwās", p. 93.

141 Wagner, *Die Überlieferung,* pp. 319-326*;* Abū Nuwās, *Dīwān*, vol. I-V (see tables of contents).

Leaving the 'flytings'[143] aside, we'll first of all take a look at the praise poems. The polythematic *qaṣīda* had survived the Abbasid 'modern' 'revolution', but two of the three types of *qaṣīda*s, the message and especially the remembrance type, had sharply declined.[144] What had survived, albeit with considerable alterations, was primarily the ritual praise *qaṣīda*, which in the court poetry of the Abbasids and later throughout Islam, in the Persian, Turkish and Indian courts, was to play a tremendous role. The 'praise poems' chapter in the Dīwān of Abū Nuwās thus includes many polythematic and otherwise long *qaṣīda*s. Most of them are found with Ḥamza in the first of the three sections into which he has divided the chapter ("contains his famous and excellent praise poems").[145] The two other sections, however, contain in addition short and often very short poems (*qiṭʿa's*).[146]

Whereas literary theorists and critics, when classifying poetry, by no means took whole poems into consideration but only themes, and proceeded likewise with polythematic *qaṣīda*s as well, the Dīwān redactors were forced as regards polythematic poems to decide – if they didn't want to dismember them – for a principle according to which they were to be classified and arranged. For the classification of polythematic *qaṣīda*s they proceeded exactly as did later, modern, Western researchers – without, by the way, having given it much reflection - and generally viewed the *closing* themes of the poems as dominant and determinant as to genre. The categories they developed correspond more so than the critics' 'aims' (*aġrāḍ*) and 'kinds' to what is understood in modern Western literature by 'genre'.

The *qaṣīda* containing a message was still granted a humble existence in invective and self-praise poetry; the chapter entitled 'Invective poems' in the Dīwān of Abū Nuwās[147] contains some *qaṣīda*s which begin with *nasīb* (love verse); the overwhelming majority of the invectives are presented, however, as short, single-part poems, *qiṭʿa*s.

---

142 Abū Nuwās, *Dīwān*, Index, vol. I, p. 11 (al-Ṣūlī's Introduction); Wagner, *Die Überlieferung*, p. 323.

143 The old tribal form of this genre comprises "poems in which tribal or personal insults are exchanged... The poems usually come in pairs, employing the same metre and rhyme... [With Abū Nuwās] the term... is employed for what is more properly called an... emulation." (G. J. H. van Gelder, "Naqāʾiḍ" in *EAL,* vol. II, p. 578). – For the *naqāʾiḍ* of Abū Nuwās see Wagner, *Abū Nuwās*, Index.

144 Cf. Schoeler, "Alfred Blochs Studie", p. 760.

145 Abū Nuwās, *Dīwān,* vol. I², pp. 106-268.

146 Ibid., pp. 269-291, 292- 341.

147 Abū Nuwās, *Dīwān,* vol. II, pp. 1-29.

Most of the new, independent genres originating in the Umayyad period (or even earlier) and attaining fruition under the Abbasids[148] are found in chapters 7 to 12. It is thanks to Abū Nuwās that some of them achieved literary status and were accepted into the canon; this is certainly true of the wine poems[149] – Abū Nuwās is the Arabic wine poet par excellence – however, it holds likewise for hunting poems,[150] love poems addressed to young men as well as for licentious poetry.[151] On the other hand, independent love poems (*ġazal*, or *ġazaliyyāt*) addressed to women, a genre which emerged in the time of the *muḫaḍramūn* (poets living in the pre-Islamic period and in the time of Islam),[152] had already proliferated in the Umayyad period, especially through the Ḥiǧāzi school and its master ʿUmar b. Abī Rabīʿa;[153] and Abū Nuwās' contemporary Abū l-ʿAtāhiya[154] was for ascetic verse[155] what Abū Nuwās was for wine poetry.

Another challenge for the redactors was the often hardly to be answered question as to the chapter in which this or that poem should be accommodated. This question cropped up mainly regarding 'light poetry' (*lahw*). The poems in these chapters – apart from the hunting poems – often exhibit stark thematic overlapping.[156] It quite often happens that Ḥamza places a love poem in the *muḏakkar* chapter and al-Ṣūlī the same poem in the *muʾannaṯ* chapter, and vice versa.[157] It even happens that the same redactor gives the same poem twice, placing it in the *muʾannaṯ* chapter and in the *muḏakkar* chapter as well.[158] Whether a poem is a *muǧūniyya* or a *muḏakkara* is also something about which

---

148 Cf. Wagner, *Grundzüge,* vol. II, pp. 31-87.

149 For this genre see J.E. Bencheikh, "Khamriyya", in *EI²*, vol. IV, pp. 998-1009; G. Schoeler, "Khamriyya", in *EAL*, vol. II, pp. 433-435.

150 T. Seidensticker, "Ṭardiyya", in *EI²*, vol. X, pp. 223-224; J.E. Montgomery, "Ṭardiyya", in *EAL,* vol. II, pp. 759-760.

151 E.K. Rowson, "Mujūn", in *EAL,* vol., II, pp. 546-548.

152 Jacobi, "Die Anfänge"; J. Meisami, "Ghazal", in *EAL,* vol. I, pp. 249-250.

153 Sezgin, *GAS*, vol. II, pp. 415-417; R. Jacobi, "ʿUmar ibn Abī Rabīʿa", in *EAL,* vol. II, pp. 791-792; F. Abdallah, "ʿUmar ibn Abi Rabiʿah", in Cooperson-Toorawa (eds.), *ALC,* pp. 344-350.

154 Sezgin, *GAS,* vol. II, pp. 534-535; P. F. Kennedy, "Abū al-ʿAtāhiya", in *EAL*, vol. I, pp. 27-28; E. K. Rowson, "Abū al-ʿAtāhiya", in Cooperson-Toorawa (ed.), *ALC,* pp. 12-20.

155 For this genre see P. F. Kennedy, "Zuhdiyya", in *EI²*, vol. XI, pp. 562-564; id. in *EAL*, vol. II, pp. 828-829.

156 For what follows cf. Hämeen Anttila, "Abū Nuwās", in particular pp. 94f., pp. 96ff.; van Gelder, "Dubious Genres".

157 See Abū Nuwās, *Dīwān* vol. IV, *passim* (divergent classifications of individual poems by the redactors are indicated by the editor). Cf. Hämeen Anttila, "Abū Nuwās", pp. 96f.

158 E. g., Abū Nuwās, *Dīwān*, vol. IV, pp. 17-19 (no. 23) and pp. 172-173 (no. 40); ibid., p. 65 (no. 84).

redactors often decided differently.[159] Moreover wine and love poems are sometimes difficult to distinguish and are classified differently because, in the former, descriptions of the (beloved) cupbearer - male or female – take up much space.[160] In one *faṣl* (section) of the *ḫamriyyāt* chapter Ḥamza assembles odes that are 'between wine poems and licentious verse as well as between wine poems and 'male' love poems.[161] In one case al-Ṣūlī deemed a poem classified as invective by Ḥamza a love poem and accordingly placed it in the corresponding chapter.[162]

A chapter containing 'descriptions' (*awṣāf*; sg. *waṣf*) is missing in the Dīwān of Abū Nuwās. Although he had indeed composed independent *awṣāf*, e.g., a few on animals (cock, pigeon, horse), Ḥamza appended them to the hunting poems[163] accomodating them in a special *faṣl* (section). Poems with portrayals of drinking utensils[164] and particularly flowers and gardens (which often form the backdrop of binges) are found, in Ḥamzas recension, dispersed among the wine poems.[165] Some poems with descriptions of ships in animal form which the caliph al-Amīn had built and sailed on the Tigris, appear in the praise poetry chapter where the portrayals are integrated in the glorification of the caliph al-Amīn.[166] – Owing to the rather small number of these pieces, the redactors evidently deemed any furnishing of a chapter for them uncalled for, and they accommodated them in other chapters. It is thus seen that even the *muǧūn* chapter, with Ḥamza in particular, contains a number of pieces that don't quite belong there, e.g., poems about chess (*šaṭranǧiyyāt*)[167] and poetic riddles. In fact Abū Nuwās has only a specific type of riddle (*al-muʿammā*), namely, riddles that are solved by combining the constituent letters of a word or a name to be found.[168]

The genre concept of the Dīwān redactors which emerged from their practical endeavors to classify poems differs starkly from that of the theorists. The term

---

159 E. g., Abū Nuwās, *Dīwān*, vol. V, p. 9 (no. 11), p. 13 (no. 15) p. 25 (no. 31), etc.

160 E. g., Abū Nuwās, *Dīwān*, vol. III, p. 121 (no. 94), p. 154f. (no. 118), pp. 174f. (no. 143); vol. IV, 232 (no. 122); cf. Wagner, *Abū Nuwās,* p. 301; Schoeler, *Arabische Naturdichtung*, pp. 75-78.

161 Abū Nuwās, *Dīwān*, vol. V, pp. 348-355.

162 Abū Nuwās, *Dīwān*, vol. II, pp. 25-27 = vol. IV, pp. 397-401 (no. 424); (*vice versa:*) vol. IV, p. 251 (no. 156). – Cf. van Gelder, "Dubious Genres".

163 Abū Nuwās, *Dīwān*, vol. II, pp. 319-324.

164 Abū Nuwās, *Dīwān*, vol. IIII, pp. 183-184 (no. 157); pp. 137f. (no. 105); Wagner, *Abū Nuwās,* pp. 303f.

165 Abū Nuwās, *Dīwān*, vol. III, pp. 271-273 (no. 233); pp. 289-290 (no. 249).

166 Abū Nuwās, *Dīwān*, vol. I^2, pp. 299f., 301.

167 Abū Nuwās, *Dīwān*, vol. V, pp. 510-521; cf. Wagner, *Abū Nuwās,* pp. 378f.

168 Abū Nuwās, *Dīwān*, vol. V, pp. 281-286; Wagner, *Abū Nuwās,* pp. 379-383; G. J. H. van Gelder, "Muʿammā", in *EAL*, vol. II, p. 534.

ġaraḍ ('aim') is hardly ever used; Ḥamza refers to the genres in the Abū Nuwās Dīwān as *abwāb* ('chapters', 'categories'), al-Ṣūlī as *funūn* ('kinds').[169] It is even more remarkable that Ḥamza nevertheless did not disavow the theory. At the beginning of his introduction (Chapter 1) he gave a reason for his arrangement of the individual genres:[170]

> I have praise poetry followed by dirges because they are praise of the dead; then (following that comes) reproach poetry[171] because it partakes of both praise and invective (lit.: is half praise and half invective); then I follow invective with (poems of) renunciation because it (sc. renunciation) is rebuke of the world just as invective is rebuke of honour (sc. of people); then I have separated the remaining chapters (*abwāb*) and grouped them together because they belong to the category (*ǧins*) of light poetry (*lahw*) and jest (*hazl*)...

In order to produce a systematic ordering, Ḥamza took the classifications of the theorists into account. His needs were accommodated sometimes by this system, at other times by another: Qudāma's derivation of the dirge from praise determined the succession praise – dirge; the placement of reproach as a cross between praise and invective by the anonymous theorist cited by Ibn Rašīq[172] determines its place in his Abū Nuwās Dīwān. There was only one model in question for the grouping of 'light' poetry: Ibn Wahb, who was indeed the only critic to take into account in his system this genre[173] which occupied the more significant place in the writings of Abū Nuwās. Ḥamza had also thus taken over Ibn Wahb's generic term *lahw,* ('light poetry') as well as his subdivisions.[174] What is new with Ḥamza is the relationship he establishes between invective and poetry of renunciation.

---

169 Abū Nuwās, *Dīwān*, Index, vol. I, p. 11 (al-Ṣūlī's Introduction).

170 Abū Nuwās, *Dīwān*, vol, I², p. 3.

171 For this genre see Wagner, *Abū Nuwās*, pp. 375-378.

172 See above, p. 18.

173 See above, p. 15f.

174 Heinrichs ("Literary Theory", p. 43) is of another opinion in this regard. He assumes that literary theory, in this case, i.e., Ibn Wahb, received an impulse from the redactors of the dīwāns of the *muḥdaṯ* poets, namely, from Ḥamza, and not the other way around. This is by no means impossible since both scholars were contemporaries. It nonetheless seems to me that the fact that Ḥamza's system not only has similarities to Ibn Wahb's, but that he even borrowed from other theorists and combined everything, rather suggests that he was the receiver, not the giver.

The Dīwān of Abū Tammām

The arrangement of the Dīwān of Abū Tammām (c. 805-845)[175] according to genres is said to have originated with Alī b. Ḥamza al-Iṣfahānī;[176] it has eight chapters:[177]

1. Praise poetry (al-madīḥ) 2. Dirges (al-marāṯī) 3. Love poetry (al-ġazal) 4. Invective poetry (al-hiǧāʾ) 5. Reproach poems (al-muʿātabāt) 6. Descriptive poems (al-awṣāf) 7. Self-praise (al-faḫr) 8. Poetry of renunciation (al-zuhd).

A fact not apparent in the titles should first of all be pointed out; it concerns the scope of the single chapters. It is noticed at a glance that the first chapter, praise poetry, occupies the most space by far; the other chapters give the impression of being merely an appendix to a main chapter, 'Praise'. That this is the case with Abū Tammām and even most of the Arabic poets, but not with Abū Nuwās, had already been recognized by Ḥamza al-Iṣfahānī.[178] However, Abū Tammām's chapter 'Love poetry', as regards the number of poems (but not verses), is in fact by no means as small as it seems. Th. Bauer, in a study in which he as the first one points out the importance of Abū Tammām's love poetry, explicates that when the number of poems are taken, the ratio of praise to love is 175 to 132 and that the apparent imbalance is explained by the brevity of most of the love poems; it is conspicuous that they often have four verses ('quatrains').[179] Furthermore, T. Seidensticker was able to furnish evidence that the trend to compose 'quatrains', already recognisable in the love poetry of Abū Nuwās, but more markedly perceivable in that of Abū Tammām and culminating in that of Ḫālid b. Yazīd al-Kātib (d. c. 883), could have influenced the emergence of the Persian rubāʿī.[180]

Unlike the Dīwān of Abū Nuwās where the love poems are distributed across two chapters, muḏakkar (poems addressed to young man) and muʾannaṯ (poems addressed to women), the Dīwān of Abū Tammām contains only a single ġazal chapter. This is explained by the stark decline in love poems addressed to women. Still at some 40 % with Abū Nuwās, they amount to only 10% with Abū

---

175 For him see Sezgin, *GAS,* vol. II, pp. 551-558; M. Larkin, "Abū Tammām", in M. Cooperson – Toorawa (eds.), *ALC,* pp. 33-52.

176 Sezgin, *GAS*, vol. II, p. 556.

177 Abū Tammām, *Dīwān* (see the table of contents, vol. IV, pp. 681-683); Ahlwardt, *Verzeichniss*, vol. VI, pp. 555-556 (no. 7536-7537).

178 See above, p. 26.

179 Bauer, "Abū Tammām's Contribution", p. 18.

180 Seidensticker, "An Arabic Origin". For Ḫālid see van Gelder, "Khālid ibn Yazīd al-Kātib", in *EAL,* vol. II, p. 430.

Tammām (often even 0 % with later poets).[181] For such a small group of poems it was not worthwhile to set up an own chapter.

Above and beyond the chapters of Abū Nuwās' Dīwān, the Dīwān of Abū Tammām contains two new chapters: self-praise and descriptive poems; missing in turn, save love poetry, are chapters with 'light' genres (*lahw*). The self-praise chapter is short (seven *qaṣīda*s, most long and beginning with *nasīb*). That the redactors set up no corresponding chapter in Abū Nuwās' Dīwān is explained by the poet's having dealt with the theme only within the framework of polythematic invective *qaṣīda*s. – The small chapter 'Descriptions' includes, among other things, the following themes: several rain descriptions, one or two wine and carousal descriptions, descriptions of the personal situation of the poet, the cold in Khorasan, a pilgrimage. - Descriptions of objects[182] which along with nature descriptions later comprise the greater part of *waṣf* (descriptive poetry) are still missing. *Waṣf*, as it appears since Ibn al-Rūmī[183] and Ibn al-Muʿtazz as a genre, was not yet fully developed in Abū Tammām's time.

The Dīwān of Ibn al-Muʿtazz

The most widely disseminated redaction of the Dīwān of the poet and caliph for a day, Ibn al-Muʿtazz (861-908)[184], is from his friend Abū Bakr al-Ṣūlī. It contains the following chapters: [185]

1. Self-praise (*al-faḫr*) 2. Love poetry (*al-ġazal*) 3. Praise and congratulation (*al-madḥ wa-l-tahānī*), 4. Invectives and poems of blame (*al-hiǧāʾ wa-l-ḏamm*) 5. Wine poems (*al-šarāb*) 6. Poems of reproach (*al-muʿātabāt*) 7. Hunting poems (*al-ṭardiyyāt*) 8. Descriptive, vituperative and facetious poems (*al-awṣāf wa-l-ḏamm wa-l-mulaḥ*) 9. Dirges and condolences (*al-marāṯī wa-l-taʿāzī*) 10. Poems of renunciation, wise sayings (or: aphoristic poetry), [descriptions of] old age (literally: 'white hair') and gnomic poetry (*al-zuhd wa-l-ādāb wa-l-šayb wa-l-ḥikma*).

---

181 Bauer, "Abū Tammām's Contribution', p. 21.

182 For this genre see Bürgel, *Die ekphrastischen Epigramme,* pp. 225-240; A. Arazi, "Waṣf", in *EI*², vol. XI, pp. 153-158; J. Saden, "Waṣf", in *EAL,* vol. II, pp. 806-807.

183 For him see Sezgin, *GAS*, vol. II, pp. 585-588; B. Gruendler, in Cooperson-Toorawa (eds.), *ALC*, pp. 184-192; for his descriptive poetry see Schoeler, *Arabische Naturdichtung,* pp. 167-234.

184 For him see Sezgin, *GAS,* vol. II, pp. 569-571; R. Jacobi, "Ibn al-Muʿtazz", in *EAL,* vol. I, pp. 354-355; W. Heinrichs, "Ibn al-Muʿtazz", in Cooperson-Toorawa (eds.), *ALC*, pp. 164-171.

185 Ahlwardt, *Verzeichniss*, vol. VI, p. 558 (no. 7542); Ibn al-Muʿtazz, *Dīwān* (Šarīf) (see table of contents).

In the *Dīwān* of Ibn al-Muʿtazz, unlike the situation with Abū Tammām, the 'modern' genres take up the most space. His model in this respect was Abū Nuwās, and the poet-caliph allowed himself otherwise to be keenly inspired in the form and thematic of his poetry by Abū Nuwās as well.[186]

That the love poems have been brought together in *one* chapter, and not two, is explained by the development of the genre we were already able to witness with Abū Tammām: There are always fewer love poems addressed to women; the terms *ġazal* and (*ġazal*) *muḏakkar* are about to become synonyms.

The chapter 'Praise and congratulation poems' turns out to be relatively thin,[187] particularly numerically; in scope as well, if one excludes the long, historical *muzdawiǧa* (pair-wise rhyming poem, composed in *raǧaz* metre) on the life and glorious deeds of the Abbasid caliph al-Muʿtaḍid,[188] a cousin of Ibn al-Muʿtazz. This 'epic' poem or, rather, poetic chronicle, differs considerably from the rest of his praise poetry in form and theme. – As with Abū Nuwās, with Ibn al-Muʿtazz there are besides the *qaṣīda*s many short praise and congratulation poems (*qiṭʿa*s); for the most part the short poems are comprised of two, three or (less frequently) four verses. On the other hand the poet-caliph makes liberal use of the polythematic *qaṣīda* form beginning with *nasīb* (love verse) in the *faḫr*, in the self-praise poems.[189]

Of particular interest is the chapter 'Descriptions'.[190] A comparison of the poems in the *wasf* chapters in the Dīwāns of both Abū Tammām and Ibn al-Muʿtazz documents the further development and structuring of the genre in the second half of the 9th cent. This development was substantially promoted by Ibn al-Muʿtazz himself, but probably more decisively still by his older contemporary Ibn al-Rūmī (836-896).[191]

Ibn al-Muʿtazz wrote a colourful quantity of *awṣāf* (independent descriptive poems). Found in the chapter of his Dīwān devoted thereto are descriptions of organic and inorganic nature: portrayals of gardens, flowers (roses, narcissi, violets etc.), fruits (a lemon) animals (a snake), but also atmospheric phenomena like rain, clouds, the moon, the night, snow in Bagdad, and lightening. Found furthermore are poems on things of daily use like wells, scoop wheels, beverages,

---

186 Wagner, *Abū Nuwās*, pp. 265-266, p. 288 (hunting poems); pp. 290, 292 (wine poems); pp. 234, 248 (*nasīb*); p. 355 (dirges).

187 Ibn al-Muʿtazz, *Dīwān* (Šarīf), vol. I, pp. 444-525 (92 poems); cf. chapter *al-ġazal*, vol. I, pp. 306-443 (420 poems); chapter *al-šarāb* (*al-ḫamriyyāt*) pp. 208-322 (244 poems).

188 Ibid., vol. II, pp. 5-29.

189 Ibid., vol. I, pp. 217-305.

190 Ibid., vol. II, pp. 150- 207 (156 poems); Ibn al-Muʿtazz, *Dīwān* (Lewin), vol. IV, pp. 45-124.

191 Schoeler, *Arabische Naturdichtung*, pp. 167-234.

quill holders, booklets, swords. People of particular notice are also described, preferably black women, singers and female flute players. The like was not yet current with Abū Tammām. The vituperative and facetious poems in this chapter are largely also descripitive; an example for the former is a portrayal of a neglected garden, for the latter a riddle concerning the penis. Many of these poems are very short; this is why they have been labelled by von Grunebaum as 'epigrammatical sketches' and 'poetical snapshots'.[192] The most important tool of Ibn al-Muʿtazz' *wasf* is, as is generally known, simile (*tašbīh*).

The chapter 'Poems of renunciation, etc.'[193] deserves a brief remark. Apart from actual ascetic poems and poems about grey hair (or old age), it contains pieces which can be termed 'reflective poetry'.[194] It is especially these that the redactor has his eye on when he inserts the concepts 'wise sayings' and 'gnomic poetry' in the title of the chapter. The subjects of these mostly short poems (2-7 verses) are, e.g.: fate, abstinence, forgiveness, the divulging of the secret, wealth and assets, patience and expected joy, etc. Prior to Ibn al-Muʿtazz, Ibn al-Rūmī on his part had already composed such 'reflective poetry'. His poems are substantially more copious than those of the poet-caliph, and exhibit considerable thematic variety and originality. Ibn al-Rūmī can be regarded as the founder of this genre.

The Dīwān of al-Mutanabbī

The most popular redaction (recension) of the Dīwān of al-Mutanabbī (915-965)[195] is al-Wāḥidī's (st. 1075)[196]; it is chronologically arranged as to epoch.[197] Other editions are arranged alphabetically. Yet there does exist a Mutanabbī Diwān – containing, however, only a selection of his poems – which, so it says in the title, is 'arranged according to (poetic) 'kinds' (*funūn*)'. The redactor is the historian and man of letters Ibn Fahd (died 1325);[198] it is arranged as follows:[199]

---

192   von Grunebaum, "Die Naturauffassung", pp. 45f.

193   Ibn al-Muʿtazz, *Dīwān* (Šarīf), vol. II, pp. 376-424 (130 poems); *Dīwān* (Lewin), vol. IV, pp. 182-238.

194   For this genre see Schoeler, "Ibn al-Rūmī's Reflective Poetry".

195   For him see Sezgin, *GAS*, vol. II, pp. 484-497; R. Blachère, "al-Mutanabbī", in *EI²*, vol. VII, pp. 769-772; S. Meisami, "al-Mutanabbī", in *EAL*, vol. II, pp. 558-560.

196   Sezgin, *GAS*, vol. II, p. 494.

197 Cf. above, p. 25.

198 Abū l-Ṯanāʾ Maḥmūd b. Salmān al-Kātib al-Ḥalabī; see Brockelmann, *GAL*, vol. II, p. 54, suppl. II, pp. 42-43.

199 Ahlwardt, *Verzeichniss,* vol. VI, p. 575 (no. 7575).

1. Gnomic verse, wise sayings and admonitions (*al-ḥikam wa-l-ādāb wa-l-mawāʿiẓ*) 2. Complaint about the times and their people, self praise (*šakwā al-zamān wa-ahlihī wa-l-faḫr*) 3. Love poetry (*al-nasīb*) 4. Praise (*al-madīḥ*) 5. Dirges (*al-marāṯī*) 6. Reproach (*al-ʿitāb*) 7. Apologetic verse (*al-iʿtiḏār*) 8. Plea for clemency (*al-istiʿṭāf*) 9. Calling in (sc. a promise) (*al-taqāḍī*) 10. Thanksgiving (*al-šukr*), congratulation, felicitations for holidays (*al-tahānī wa-l-ʿiyādāt*) 12. Condolations (*al-taʿāzī*) 13. Friendship poems (*al-iḫwāniyyāt*) 14. Invective (*al-hiǧāʾ*) 15. Miscellaneous (*ašyāʾ muḫtalifa*).

The redactors of the Dīwāns normally took complete poems into consideration in their classifications. Here the redactor proceeded in another manner: he dismembered the multipart *qaṣīda*s and put the individual parts together according to their theme. This is already evident in the catalogue of chapters: love poetry (*al-nasīb*) appears with al-Mutanabbī, e. g., never in independent forms, but only as the prologue to a *qaṣīda*. This generally holds true as well for gnomic and complaints about the times; these themes often form the introduction to his *qaṣīda*s appearing in them in the place of *nasīb*.

The procedure of Ibn Fahd most likely ties in with the methods of the anthologists, more precisely, those anthologists who arranged their collections thematically. The first anthology of this type is Abū Tammām's *al-Ḥamāsa* ('Bravery in warfare', named after the first chapter of the work).[200] In it the author compiled shorter poems, but also poetic excerpts of particular quality, according to themes and motifs, whereby he naturally had to destroy the unity of larger, polythematic poems. Ibn Fahd carried this procedure over to the Dīwān of one single poet. The poetry of al-Mutanabbī, with its many multipart, thematically quite variegated *qaṣīda*s must certainly have been a challenge for such a reworking.

A further challenge for the Dīwān redactors arose following the turn of the millennium (CE) after new *formal* genres emerged in Arabic poetry which were also cultivated ever more frequently by the poets. Of concern in this regard, e.g., is the *rubāʿī* or *dūbayt* (quatrain)[201] taken over from Persian, in particular, however, stanzaic poetic genres: the *musammaṭ* (and a special form thereof, the *muḫammas*),[202] the *mawāliyā*[203] and two genres originating in Spain, the *muwaššaḥ*[204] and *zaǧal*.[205]

—————
200 M. Larkin, "Abū Tammām", in Cooperson – Toorawa (eds.), *ALC,* pp. 38-40.
201 See W. Stoetzer, "Dūbayt", in *EAL,* vol. I, pp. 197-198.
202 See G. Schoeler, "Musammaṭ", in *EI²*, vol. VII, pp. 660-662.
203 See P. Cachia, "Mawāliyā", in *EAL,* vol. II, pp. 518-519.
204 See G. Schoeler, "Musammaṭ", in *EI²*, vol. VII, pp. 660-662.
205 See G. Schoeler "Muwashshaḥ", in *EI²*, vol. XI, pp. 373-376.

How should the Dīwān redactors proceed in response to this new situation? The new forms seemed distinctive enough for some of them to warrant devoting them their own chapters. Such a move, however, would disrupt the uniform thematic arrangement, or, more precisely, would restrict this arrangement to the non-stanzaic poetry. An example is

The Dīwān of Ibn Sanǧar al-Ḥāǧirī (died 1235).[206]

His chapters present themselves as follows:[207]

1. Love poems (*al-ġazal*) 2. What he poetised when he was a prisoner (*fīmā qāla wa-huwa masǧūn*) 3. *Muḫammasāt*[208] 4. Single verses (*mufradāt*) 5. Invective and blame (*al-hiǧāʾ wa-l-ḏamm*) 6. *Mawāliyā*[209] 7. *Dūbayt*.[210]

Here, thematic (1, 2, 5) and formal poetic genres (3, 4, 6, 7, 8) are mixed in an unsystematic manner.

The Dīwān of Ṣafī al-Dīn al-Ḥillī

The Dīwān of Ṣafī al-Dīn al-Ḥillī (died 1349)[211], the last one whose chapter arrangement we would like to consider, is particularly demonstrative. On the one hand because the poet cultivated practically every genre ever bred by classical Arabic poetry. Heinrichs has plausibly explained it in that this poet, who arrived on the scene late and wanted to achieve something new, was encumbered by the tradition of eight centuries of Arabic poetry. *One* way of dealing with this problem was to take an encyclopaedic approach to Tradition. He therefore occupied himself with cultivating every genre in existence or which had ever existed.[212] His Dīwān therefore conveys an outstanding overview of the inventory of genres in later Arabic poetry.

---

206 Ḥusām al-Dīn ʿĪsā b. Sanǧar al-Ḥāǧirī; s. Brockelmann, *GAL*, vol. I, p. 289, suppl. I, p. 443.

207 Ahlwardt, *Verzeichniss,* vol. VII, p. 23 (no. 7742/4).

208 For this sub-genre of the *musammaṭ* see Schoeler, "Musammaṭ", in *EI²*, vol. VII, pp. 660-662.

209 See P. Cachia, "Mawāliyā", in *EAL,* vol. II, pp. 518-519.

210 See W. Stoetzer, "Dūbayt", in *EAL,* vol. I, pp. 197-198.

211 For him see Brockelmann, *GAL*, vol. II, p. 205, suppl. II, pp. 199-200; W. Heinrichs, "Ṣafī al-Dīn [...] al-Ḥillī", in *EI²*, vol. VIII, pp. 801-805; id., "Der Teil und das Ganze".

212 Heinrichs, "Der Teil", pp. 678f.

On the other hand, the collection of poems also shows us a further possibility of how a Dīwān redactor could proceed towards accommodating the formal genres. We shall return to this later.

Al-Ḥillī's Dīwān which he collected himself at the suggestion of the Mamlūk sultan al-Nāṣir Muḥammad b. Qalāwūn (reg. 1294-95 and 1299-1309),[213] contains the following chapters:[214]

1. Self-glorification, bravery in warfare, incitation to assume leadership (*fī l-faḫr wa-l-ḥamāsa wa-l-taḥrīḍ ʿalā l-riʾāsa*), 2. Praise, thanksgiving and congratulation (*fī l-madīḥ wa-l-ṯanāʾ wa-l-šukr wa-l-hanāʾ* 3. Hunting poems and various descriptions (*fī l-ṭardiyyāt wa-anwāʿ al-ṣifāt*) 4. Friendship poems and correspondences (*fī l-iḫwāniyyāt wa-ṣudūr al-murāsalāt*) 5. Dirges and condolences (*fī marāṯī l-aʿyān wa-taʿāzī l-iḫwān*) 6. Flirtatious, elegiac and elegant love poems (*fī l-ġazal wa-l-nasīb wa-ẓarāʾif al-tašbīb*) 7. Wine poems and select flower poems (*fī l-ḫamriyyāt wa-l-nubaḏ al-zahriyyāt*) 8. Complaint, reproach, calling in a promise and the answer thereto (*fī l-šakwā wa-l-ʿitāb wa-taqāḍī l-waʿd wa-l-ǧawāb*) 9. Poems announcing presents, apologetic verse, plea for clemency (*fī l-hadāyā wa-l-iʿtiḏār wa-l-istiʿṭāf wa-l-istiġfār*) 10. Poems the meaning of which is difficult to be elicited, riddles and mnemonic verse (*fī l-ʿawīṣ wa-l-alġāz wa-l-taqyīd li-l-īǧāz*) 11. Facetious verse, invectives and obscene poems (*fī l-mulaḥ wa-l-ahāǧī wa-l-iḥmāḍ fī l-tanāǧī*) 12. Wise saying, poems of renunciation, remarkable odds and ends [strange sayings] (*fī l-ādāb wa-l-zuhdiyyāt wa-nawādir muḫtalifāt*).

The first part of the first section of Chapter 2 (containing the panegyrics) is made up of poems in praise of the Prophet (*nabawiyyāt*), his family and his companions. The first three poems, on the Prophet himself, are bipartite *qaṣīda*s wich open with a *nasīb* (amatory prologue); the rest are short poems (*qiṭʿa*s). The *nabawiyyāt*, a special category or sub-genre of laudatory poetry, enjoyed great popularity only from the 13th century onwards; by the time of al-Ḥillī they were considered a more or less indispensable part of poetry.[215] The second part of this section of Chapter 2 contains secular panegyrics: poems addressed to sultans (*sulṭāniyyāt*): the Mamluk al-Nāṣir Muḥammad b. Qalāwūn, the Artuqids Naǧm al-Dīn Ġāzī II [reg. 1294-1312] and Šams al-Dīn al-Ṣāliḥ [reg. 1312-1364], *et al.*

_____

213 Ṣafī al-Dīn al-Ḥillī, *Dīwān* (ed. Beirut), p. 7 (the poet's Introduction), pp. 549-552 (table of contents).

214Al-Ḥillī has composed the chapter headings in *saǧʿ* (rhyming prose); this entails that he had to utilize tautologies several times (*madḥ* and *ṯanāʾ*, e.g, are identical; both terms mean praise poetry). For this reason the English rendition of some tautological terms is omitted here. – For the English terms I rely largely on Heinrichs, "Ṣafī al-Dīn [...] al-Ḥillī", in *EI²*, vol. VIII, pp. 802-803.

215 Bauer, "Ibn Ḥajar", p. 37.

The second section is comprised of thanksgiving and congratulation poems (e.g. on the two great Islamic feasts). Most of them are addressed to rulers, as well.

Chapter 6 comprises al-Ḥillī's love poems. The first section titled "*ġazal, nasīb* and their (various sub-) kinds" contains both 'male' and 'female' love poems. While the difference between *ġazal* and *nasīb* here, as elsewhere,[216] is difficult to discern, *tašbīb*, on the other hand, refers with al-Ḥillī exclusively to poems addressed to young men (*muḏakkarāt*). Furthermore, all of his *tašbīb* poems are part of a tradition which had gradually made itself independent within the *ġazal* genre: we are dealing here with poems picking out a special peculiarity of the beloved as a central theme, in particular his name, extraction, religion, profession, or special physical characteristics (black complexion, long hair, or a physical infirmity).[217] The poems subsumed under the term *tašbīb* are assembled in the second section of Chapter 6. Found are here, i.a., poems on a young man who played chess with him, on another one whom he saw in the bath and whose hair was fair; several poems deal with boys or young men dancing or playing an instrument; one piece is devoted to someone whose molar teeth were extracted, and so forth. – The number of verses of al-Ḥillī's love poems is between 2 and 60 (!)

Deserving of special notice are the flower poems which are indeed cited for the first time in al-Ḥillī's Dīwān as an independent genre in the heading of a chapter. Al-Ḥillī separated them from the other descriptions (Chapter 3) and joined them with the wine poems in one chapter: In Chapter 7 he has the flower and springtime poems (*al-zahriyyāt wa-l-rabīʿiyyāt*) follow the wine poems. Al-Ḥillī did not do this without a reason: the motifs of wine and flower poetry very often merge seemlessly in that in the former a flower garden is frequently portrayed as the background of the carousal (as was already the case with Abū Nuwās) and in the latter an invitation to *carpe diem* and to 'drink and be merry' is often issued.[218] In the further course of development (since the second half of the 9th century), flower, garden and springtime poetry became more and more disassociated from *waṣf* and developed its own poetic conventions (restricting the *waṣf* to the descriptions of objects, e.g. things of everyday use, etc). The *zahriyyāt* and *rabīʿiyyāt* began to take on a life of its own with Ibn al-Rūmī and Ibn al-Muʿtazz; but it was first al-Ṣanawbarī (died 945)[219] who established flower and garden

---

216 See above, p. 12f.

217 Bauer, "Was kann", pp. 20f.; id., *Liebe*, pp. 462-493.

218 For this and the following see G. Schoeler, "Zahriyyāt" in *EI²*, vol. XI, pp. 399-402; id. "Nature, in classical poetry", in *EAL*, vol. II, pp. 582-584; id., *Arabische Naturdichtung.* – Cf. above, p. 29.

219 J. E. Montgomery, "al-Ṣanawbarī", in *EI²*, vol. IX, pp.8-9; G. Schoeler, "al-Ṣanawbarī", in *EAL*, vol. II, pp. 687f.; id., *Arabische Naturdichtung*, pp. 273-341.

poetry definitively as a separate genre. Thus, he is considered by the Arabs to be the flower and garden poet par excellence.

Al-Ḥillī combined the descriptions (in the narrow sense of the word; *al-awṣāf*) with the hunting poems – themselves descriptions as well by extension – in one chapter (3). For the ordering of the poems, he proceeds systematically: first of all come the actual hunting poems followed by descriptions of hunting animals like cranes, falcons, hawks dogs, horses. Then come the descriptions (in the narrow sense of the word). They concern things of everyday use like candles (particularly frequently), shields, books, doors; music instruments like the lute; in addition cities, wādīs, rivers, bridges; and, a few times, people as well, e.g., a female lute player and a female dancer. The similarity to Ibn al-Muʿtazz's descriptive poems is conspicuous.

Now as regards the arrangement of the stanzaic poems and the other, new, formal genres, al-Ḥillī did not set up special chapters for them in his Dīwān, rather, he mixed them with the 'old', non-stanzaic poems. This means that a thematic chapter might include the following formal genres: *qaṣīda, qiṭʿa, muwaššaḥ,*[220] *musammaṭ* (including its special form, the *muḫammas*),[221] *dūbayt.*[222] No dialect poems, like, e.g., *zaǧal*s, are found in the Dīwān; however, by no means did the poet skip over these genres; he collected poems of this sort - his own and those of others – in another opus, *K. al-ʿĀṭil al-ḫālī*, the first poetics of the post-classical formal poetic genres, and he explained therein the features of the relevant genres.

What is a Qaṣīda? Arab critics vs. Western Arabists

The term *qaṣīda* is used in indigenous Arabic literature theory and critique differently, namely, in a broader sense than in Arabic literature studies in the West.[223] Arab critics designate with *qaṣīda* (a) a *longer* poem, all lines of which have the same metre and the same rhyme (monorhyme) which (b) can be composed in all (*qarīḍ* or *qaṣīd*) meters[224], but, as a rule, not in *raǧaz*.[225] In the first case, *qaṣīda* is in opposition to *qiṭʿa* (or *muqaṭṭaʿa*; short poem)[226], in the

_____

220 For this genre see G. Schoeler, "Muwashshaḥ", in *EI²*, vol. VII, pp. 809-812.

221 See G. Schoeler, "Musammaṭ", in *EI²*, vol. VII, pp. 660-662.

222 See W. Stoetzer, "Dūbayt", in *EAL,* vol. I, pp. 197-198.

223 Cf. Wagner, G*rundzüge*, vol. I, pp. 61ff.; Jacobi, "Qaṣīda", in *EAL*, vol. II, p. 630.

224 The non-*raǧaz*-metres are called *qaṣīd-* (hence *qaṣīda*) or *qarīḍ*-metres; see Ullmann, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 1f.; Blachère, *Histoire,* p. 361.

225 A late and hybrid type is the *raǧaz qaṣīda*; see Ullmann, *Untersuchungen*, p. 26

226 See Ibn Rašīq, *al-ʿUmda*, vol. I, pp. 186ff.

second case, to *urǧūza* (poem in *raǧaz* meter).[227] How long a poem (in a *qarīḍ* meter) is allowed to be to be considered a *qaṣīda* was a matter of controverse among the indigenous scholars; indicated as bottom limit are ten or seven verses.[228] In practice, however, this problem hardly ever arose. Ḥamza al-Iṣfahānī, for most of the chapters in his Abū Nuwās Dīwan, indicates how many *qaṣīda*s and *muqaṭṭaʿa*s they contain[229] (for the hunting poems, (almost all of which are composed in *raǧaz*, he accordingly indicates the number of *urǧūza*s[230]). But he hardly says at all whether this or that poem is a *qaṣīda* or a *muqaṭṭaʿa*. – Hence, according to the native scholars, *qaṣīda* is something akin to a formal genre.

Western Arabists, in contrast, normally designate as *qaṣīda* only the polythematic long poem generally beginning with *nasīb* and having the same meter and rhyme; the most famous example for *qaṣīda*s (understood in this narrow sense) are the seven (or ten) *muʿallaqa*s. Hence in addition to the formal criteria, the definition of *qaṣīda* under Western Arabists has been supplemented by structural and content-related criteria. Perhaps they were influenced in this regard – apart from the recognition of the structure of the *muʿallaqa*s and Ibn Qutayba's famous description of a multipart *qaṣīda* (see below) – by the indigenous *Persian (Turkish, Urdu*, etc.) poetics according to which the *qaṣīda* is a not only a formal genre but one which is also thematic and determined by structural and contentual features.[231]

One should not, however, think that the indigenous theorists and critics failed to recognize the existence of polythematic *qaṣīda*s; to back this assertion, one need only recall Ḥāzim al-Qarṭaǧannī's insight into the existence of 'composite

_____

227 Cf. the evidence adduced in Ullmann, *Untersuchungen,* pp. 1f.

228 Ibn Rašīq, *al-ʿUmda*, vol. I, pp. 188f.

229 See, e.g., Abū Nuwās, *Dīwān*, vol. I, pp. 342, 382; vol. II, p. 158, etc.

230 Abū Nuwās, *Dīwān*, vol. II, pp. 179, 200.

231 Persian Dīwāns are generally arranged according to formal genres. The 'authentic' *Dīwān* of Ḥāfiẓ (ed. M. Qazwīnī – Q. Ġanī, Teheran, 1941), e.g., has the following chapter headings*: qaṣāʾid, ġazaliyyāt, maṯnawiyyāt* (poems in rhyming couplets)*, muqaṭṭaʿāt, rubāʿiyyāt* (quatrains). However, these formal genres, in part at least, have, in addition, contentual features: the *qaṣīda*, apart from being a long poem of equal metre and rhyme, is most frequently a polythematic poem, normally beginning with an exordium (*tašbīb*), (most frequently a description of spring; other themes are: *taġazzul* [love verse], a *munāẓara* [dispute about rank] etc.). The main section of the multipart Persian *qaṣīda* consists most frequently of praise; other themes are the description of the personal situation of the poet (*ḥasb ul-ḥāl*), philosophical and mystical thoughts, etc. - The *ġazal* has the same formal features as the *qaṣīda* but is much shorter; it normally consists of 5-12 lines. Its theme is most frequently love, but, in contradistinction to the Arabic *ġazal*, other themes do occur.

*qaṣīda*s'[232] and Ibn Qutayba's famous description of the three-part *qaṣīda*.[233] Nonetheless, this portrayal of a 'complex structure' is the exception rather than the rule;[234] above all, however, Ibn Qutayba was not out to present '*the qaṣīda*' or even the 'genre of *qaṣīda*'; he simply wanted to describe a specific type of *qaṣīda* which was widespread in his times.[235] It is remarkable that the type described by Ibn Qutayba was for a long time seen by Western Arabists as the standard type of *qaṣīda* and therefore determined the conception of the '*qaṣīda* as genre' in Western Arabists' studies.[236]

The recognition that the Old Arabic *qaṣīda* (in a narrow sense) indeed possesses genre-constituent features which justify its being termed a genre, the study of its place in the system of the other genres, and likewise its further development based now on detailed source studies, is due mainly to three scholars: A. Bloch,[237] R. Jacobi[238] and Th. Bauer.[239] Additional milestones along the way to studying the *qaṣīda*, in particular its structure and peculiarities, are J. E. Montgomery's *The Vagaries of the Qaṣīdah,* G. J. van Gelder's *Beyond the Line* and the two volume compilation published by St. Sperl and Ch. Shackle, *Qasida Poetry in Islamic Asia and Africa.*

In Arabic studies in the West the term *qaṣīda* is generally used today in the narrow sense. This holds for the leading researchers and can also be demonstrated on the relevant contributions in the work mentioned above, *Qasida Poetry in Islamic Asia and Africa.* Worthy of note, however, is the divergent terminology employed by R. Blachère:[240] For him the *qaṣīda* is a 'framework' (cadre) into which the diverse poetic 'themes' (thèmes) (praise, love, invective, etc.) are inserted. He thus uses the term 'themes' much like the indigenous critics use the terms *aġrāḍ, funūn, ḍurūb* etc. Today, too, one often encounters mixed terminology in that '*qaṣīda*' (understood in the 'Western' narrow sense) is used on a par with thematic genre designations used by the indigenous critics and Dīwān redactors. Hence it is seen in A. Hamori's classic study, *The Art of Medieval Arabic*

---

232 Cf. above, p. 22.

233 Ibn Qutayba, *Introduction*, pp. 13f.; id., *K. al-šiʿr*, pp. 14f.

234 Cf. Hussein, 'Classical and Modern Approaches', pp. 306-308.

235 Ibn Qutayba describes the praise *qaṣīda* of the Umayyad time, and not that of the pre-Islamic era; cf. Jacobi, "The Camel-Section", pp. 2, 22; van Gelder, *Beyond the Line*, p. 43.

236 Cf. Jacobi, *Studien*, pp. 3ff.

237 "Qaṣīda"; cf. Schoeler, "Alfred Blochs Studie".

238 *Studien;* cf. in particular pp. 204-212.

239 *Altarabische Dichtkunst.*

240 *Histoire,* pp. 376ff., 387ff.

Literature, that dealt with in succession are the *qaṣīda,* the *ġazal* (love poem), the *ḫamriyya* (wine poem) and the *waṣf* (descriptive poetry).[241]

In closing, we shall again provide a summary of the most important points yielded by our study of the Dīwān structuring and the concept of genre entertained by the Dīwān redactors.

1. Dīwāns (collections of poems of individual poets) arranged according to thematic genres (mostly called *anwāʿ* or *funūn* ['kinds']), are less common than those arranged according to the rhyme consonant of the poems. They do not arise until the emergence of Abbasid poetry with its relative wealth of genres. The first Dīwān arranged thus was that of Abū Nuwās. Appearing for the first time in the catalogue of his chapters are the 'modern' genres (poems on love, wine, hunting, renunciation, etc.) most of them originating in the Umayyad period.

2. In their practical work, the Dīwān redactors, contrary to the theorists and critics, had to grapple with complete poems. This explains why the Dīwāns arranged by them according to the content of the poems exhibit categories which correspond much more to today's concept of (thematic) poetic genres than to the categories developed by the theorists.

3. Among the challenges the redactors saw themselves confronted with was, for one, the question of in which chapters poems dealing with more than one theme should be accommodated. For polythematic *qaṣīda*s the closing theme (mostly praise) was considered genre-determinant. By way of exception, a redactor also once dismembered the polythematic *qaṣīda*s of a poet, al-Mutanabbī, and rearranged the individual parts according to their themes. This method probably ties in with the activities of the anthologists who, however, drew from the poems of a plurality of authors. -– Often difficult to solve was the other problem, i.e., in which chapters to accommodate poems of the 'light' genres (love, wine, licentious poetry) whose subject matter is frequently tightly intertwined. In this regard different redactors often made different decisions.

4. A further challenge was posed by the emergence of the stanzaic and other, new, formal genres. Both logical possibilities were put into practice here: Sometimes special chapters were set up to accommodate these genres in the collections of poems; however, the otherwise uniform thematic arrangement of the Dīwāns was thereby destroyed, or, more precisely, reduced to the poems with monorhyme. The other possibility was to arrange the stanzaic and other genres according to theme in appropriate thematic chapters. Although the uniform thematic

241 Hamori, *The Art,* pp. 3ff., 31ff., 78ff.

arrangement of the Dīwān was thereby maintained, the chapters now contained a jumble of poems with monorhyme and other formal genres.

5. The term *qaṣīda* is used in indigenous Arabic literature theory and critique differently than in Arabic literature studies in the West. While according to the native scholars, *qaṣīda* is any long poem of equal metre and rhyme (provided that it is composed in a *qarīḍ* meter, not in *raǧaz*), Western Arabists, in contrast, designate as *qaṣīda* only the long (mostly) polythematic poem of equal metre and rhyme generally beginning with *nasīb*. Hence in addition to the formal criteria, the definition of *qaṣīda* under Western Arabists has been supplemented by structural and content-related criteria; for them, the *qaṣīda* is not only a formal genre, but a thematic one as well.

SUMMARY

Experts of poetry and poets in the presystematic phase of literary criticism classified poetry according to *themes* or according to *emotional states* (which supposedly favour the genesis of corresponding poetic themes). Primarily the former method was adopted by the 'Systematics' (theorists and critics). Neither Presystematics nor Systematics subjected whole poems to classification, rather, always only single verses or sections constituting a thematic unit. Thus, the categories the theorists worked out designate *themes*, not *genres*. The reason for their incapability to describe larger units is both the 'molecular structure' of Arabic poetry and the polythematic nature of the representative poems (*qaṣīdas*). Invariably, the greatest importance is ascribed by the critics and theorists to poetry directed towards persons (in particular praise and invective); the 'modern' descriptive genres (wine, hunting poems, etc.) receive less attention.

In their practical work, the *Dīwān* redactors, contrary to the theorists and critics, had to grapple with complete poems. This explains why the *Dīwān*s arranged by them according to theme exhibit categories which correspond to a large extent to the Western concept of genres. Suchlike *Dīwān*s do not arise until the emergence of Abbasid poetry with its relative wealth of genres.

While a *qaṣīda* according to the native scholars is any long poem of equal metre and rhyme, the definition of *qaṣīda* under Western Arabists has been supplemented by structural and content-related criteria.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources

ABŪ L-FARAǦ AL-IṢFAHĀNĪ, ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn
    K. al-Aġānī, vol. I-XXIV, Cairo, 1928-1974.

ABŪ HILĀL AL-ʿASKARĪ, al-Ḥasan b. ʿAbd Allāh
    Dīwān al-maʿānī, Cairo 1352 H. (= 1933), 2 vols.
—   *K. al-Ṣināʿatayn, al-kitāba wa-l-šiʿr,* ed. ʿA. M. al-Baǧāwī, M. Abū l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm,
    Cairo, 2ⁿᵈ ed., 1952.

ABŪ NUWĀS, al-Ḥasan b. Hāniʾ
    Dīwān, ed. E. Wagner (vol. IV: ed. G. Schoeler), Wiesbaden, Cairo, Beirut, Berlin,
    1958-2006, 5 vols. + Index, 2 vols. (vol. I: 2ⁿᵈ ed. Beirut – Berlin, 2001).

ABŪ TAMMĀM, Ḥabīb b. Aws al-Ṭāʾī
    Dīwān, comm. al-Tibrīzī, ed. M. ʿA. ʿAzzām, Cairo, 1957-65, 4 vols.

ḤĀZIM B. MUḤAMMAD AL-QARṬĀǦANNĪ, Abū l-Ḥasan
    Minḥāǧ al-bulaġā wa-sirāǧ al-udabāʾ, ed. M. Ḥ. Belkhodja, Tunis, 1966.

AL-ḤILLĪ, Ṣafī al-Dīn Abū l-Maḥāsin Abd al-ʿAzīz b. Sarāyā
    Dīwān, ed. M. Ḥuwwar, Beirut, 2000, 3 vols.
—   *Dīwān,* [no editor] Beirut, 2005.
—   *K. al-ʿĀṭil al-ḥālī wal-muraḫḫaṣ al-ġālī* = W. Hoenerbach, *Die vulgärarabische Poetik
    al-Kitāb al-ʿĀṭil al-ḥālī* [...] *des Ṣafīyaddīn Ḥillī,* Wiesbaden, 1956.

IBN AL-MUʿTAZZ, Abū l-ʿAbbās ʿAbd Allāh
    Dīwān, ed. B. Lewin, Istanbul, 1945-50, 2 vols (vol. 3-4).
—   *Dīwān ašʿār al-Amīr … Ibn al-Muʿtazz,* ed. M. B. Šarīf, Cairo, 1977-78, 2 vols.

IBN QUTAYBA, Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh b. Muslim
—   [Ibn Qotaiba,] [*K. al-šiʿr wa-l-šuʿarāʾ*] *Liber poesis et poetarum,* ed. M. de Goje,
    Leiden, 1904.
—   [Ibn Qotaiba], *Introduction au livre de la poésie et des poètes. Muqaddimatu kitābi š-
    šiʿri wa š-šuʿarāʾ.* Texte arabe [...] avec introduction, traduction et commentaire par
    Gaudefroy-Demombynes, Paris, 1947.

IBN RAŠĪQ, Abū ʿAlī al-Ḥasan
    al-ʿUmda fī maḥāsin al-šiʿr wa-ādābihī wa-naqdihī, ed. M. M. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd, 2ⁿᵈ
    ed., Cairo, 1955, 2 vols.

IBN SALLĀM AL-ǦUMAḤĪ, Muḥammad
    Ṭabaqāt al-šuʿarāʾ. Die Klassen der Dichtung, ed. J. Hell, Leiden, 1916.
—   *Ṭabaqāt fuḥūl al-šuʿarāʾ,* ed. M. M. Šākir, Cairo, 1952.

IBN ṬABĀṬABĀ, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad
    ʿIyār al-šiʿr, ed. Ṭ. al-Ḥāǧirī – M. Z. Salām, Cairo, 1956.

IBN WAHB AL-KĀTIB, Isḥāq b. Ibrāhīm
    al-Burhān fī wuǧūh al-bayān, ed. A. Maṭlūb - Ḫ. al-Ḥadīṯī, Bagdad, 1967.

AL-IBŠĪHĪ, Šihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad

> *K. al-Mustaṭraf fī kull fann mustaẓraf*, 2nd ed., Cairo 1935, Leiden, 1982, 2 vols.

AL-MARZUBĀNĪ, Abū ʿUbayd Allāh Muḥammad b. ʿImrān

> *al-Muwaššaḥ,* ed. ʿA. M. al-Baǧāwī, Cairo, 1965.

AL-MUTANABBĪ, Abū l-Ṭayyib, *Dīwān*, comm. al-Wāḥidi, ed. F. Dieterici, Berlin, 1861.

[*al-Naqāʾiḍ*] *The Nakāʾiḍ of Jarīr and al-Farazdak*, ed. A. A. Bevan, Leiden. 1905-12, 3 vols.

QUDĀMA B. ǦAʿFAR AL-KĀTIB

> *K. Naqd al-šiʿr*, ed. S. A. Bonebakker, Leiden, 1956.

ṢAFĪ AL-DĪN, see AL-ḤILLĪ.

ṬAʿLAB, Abū l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā

> *Qawāʿid al-šiʿr*, ed. R. ʿAbd al-Ṭawāb, Cairo, 1966.

Studies, Encyclopedias, etc.

ʿABBĀS, I.

> *Taʾrīḫ al-naqd al-ʿarabī ʿinda l-ʿArab. Naqd al-šiʿr min al-qarn al-ṯānī ḥattā al-qarn al-ṯāmin al-hiǧrī,* Beirut, 1971.

AHLWARDT, W.

> *Ueber Poesie und Poetik der Araber*, Gotha, 1856.

— *Verzeichniss der arabischen Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, Berlin, 1887-99, 10 vols.

BAUER, Th.

> "Abū Tammām's Contribution to ʿAbbāsid *Ġazal* Poetry", *Journal of Arabic Literature*, 27 (1996), pp. 13-21.

— *Altarabische Dichtkunst. Eine Untersuchung ihrer Struktur und Entwicklung am Beispiel der Onagerepisode*, Wiesbaden, 1992, 2 vols.

— *Liebe und Liebesdichtung in der arabischen Welt des 9. und 10. Jahrhunderts,* Wiesbaden, 1998.

— " 'Was kann aus dem Jungen noch werden!' Das poetische Erstlingswerk des Historikers Ibn Ḥabīb im Spiegel seiner Zeitgeossen", in *Studien zur Semitistik und Arabistik. Festschrift für H. Bobzin zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. O. Jastrow, Sh. Talay et al., Wiesbaden, 2008, pp. 15-56.

BLACHÈRE, R.

> *Histoire de la littérature arabe. Des origines à la fin du XV siècle de J./C.* Paris, 1952-1966, 3 vols.

BLOCH, A.

> "Qaṣīda", *Asiatische Studien, 2* (1948), pp. 106-132.

— "Stilfiguren in der altarabischen Dichtung", *Asiatische Studien* 45 (1991), pp. 181-209.

— *see also* G. Schoeler, "Alfred Blochs Studie".

BONEBAKKER, S. A.

   "Poets and Critics in the Third Century A. H.", in *Logic in Classical Islamic Culture*, ed. G. E. von Grunebaum, Wiesbaden, 1970.

BOUYAHIA, Ch.

   "Le livre de ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Nahšalī ‚retrouvé'", *Arabica*, 10 (1963), pp. 237-252.

BROCKELMANN, C.

   Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur [=*GAL*]*,* 2nd ed., Leiden, 1943-49, 2 vols.; Suppl. [=*GAL S*],, Leiden 1937-42, 3 vols.

BÜRGEL, Ch.

   Die ekphrastischen Epigramme des Abū Ṭālib al-Maʾmūnī. Literaturkundliche Studie über einen arabischen Conceptisten, Göttingen, 1965.

CANOVA, G. (ed.)

   Studies on Arabic Epics = Oriente Moderno, XXII (LXXXIII), 2 (2003).

—   (ed.), *Studies on Islamic Legends = Oriente Moderno,* N.S. LXXXIX, 2 (2009).

COOPERSON , M. – Sh. M. TOORAWA (eds.)

   Arabic Literary Culture, 500-925. [=*ALC*]. (R. Allen [ed.], Arabic Literature Series = Dictionary of Literary Biography, vol. 311). Detroit, New York, San Francisco, etc., 2005.

EAL, see J. SCOTT MEISAMI – P. STARKEY (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Arabic Literature.*

EI² = *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Ed., Leiden, 1960-2004, 12 vols.

EI³ = *Encyclopaedia of Islam Three*, Leiden, 2007-, fasc. 1-

GÄTJE, H. (ed.)

   Grundriss der arabischen Philologie, vol. 2, *Literaturwissenschaft*, Wiesbaden, 1987.

VAN GELDER, G. J.

   Beyond the Line. Classical Arabic Literary Critics on the Coherence and Unity of the Poem. Leiden, 1982.

—   "Dubious Genres: On Some Poems by Abū Nuwās", *Arabica* 44 (1997), pp. 268-283.

—   "Some Brave Attempts at Generic Classification in Premodern Arabic Literature", in B. Roest and H. Vanstiphout (eds.), *Aspects of Genre and Type in Pre-Modern Literary Culture*, Groningen, 1999, pp. 15-31.

—   *Two Arabic Treatises on Stylisics: al-Marghīnānī's al-Maḥāsin fī ʿl-naẓm waʾl-nathr, and Ibn Aflaḥ's Muqaddima...*, Istanbul, 1987 (Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut).

GRUENDLER, B.

   Medieval Arabic Praise Poetry. Ibn al-Rūmī and the Patron's Redemption, London, New York, 2003 (Routledge-Curzon Studies in Arabic and Middle-Eastern Literatures).

VON GRUNEBAUM, G.

   "Die Naturauffassung der arabischen Dichtung", in id., *Kritik und Dichtkunst*, Wiesbaden, 1955, pp. 28-51.

HÄMEEN-ANTTILA, J.

"Abū Nuwās and Ghazal as a Genre", in Th. Bauer – A. Neuwirth (eds.): *Ghazal as World Literature I. Transformations of a Literary Genre*. Beirut and Würzburg, 2005, pp. 87-106 (Beiruter Texte und Studien, vol. 89).

HEINRICHS, W.

Arabische Dichtung und griechische Poetik. Ḥāzim al-Qarṭāǧannīs Grundlegung der Poetik mit Hilfe aristotelischer Begriffe, Beirut, 1969 (Beiruter Texte und Studien, vol. 8).

— "Ibn al-Muʿtazz", in Cooperson - Toorawa (eds.), *ALC,* pp. 164-171.

— "Literary Theory. The Problem of Its Efficiency", in G. E. von Grunebaum (ed.), *Arabic Poetry. Theory and Development*, Wiesbaden, 1973, pp. 16-69.

— "Der Teil und das Ganze: die Auto-Anthologie Ṣafī al-Dīn al-Ḥillīs", *Asiatische Studien* 59 (2005), pp. 675-696.

JACOBI, R.

"Die Anfänge der arabischen Ġazalpoesie: Abū Ḏuʾaib al-Huḏalī, *Der Islam* 61 (1984), pp. 218-250.

— "The Camel-Section of the Panegyrical Ode", *Journal of Arabic Literature* 13 (1982), pp. 1-22.

— *Studien zur Poetik der altarabischen Qaṣide*, Wiesbaden, 1971.

MEISAMI, J. Scott – P. STARKEY (eds.)

Encyclopedia of Arabic Literature [=*EAL*], London – New York, 1998, 2 vols.

MEISAMI, J. Scott

Structure and Meaning in Medieval Arabic and Persian Poetry London and New York, 2003 (Culture and Civilization in the Middle East).

MOREH, S.

Live Theatre and Dramatic Literature in the Medieval Arab World, Edinburgh – New York, 1992.

PETRAČEK, K.

"Volkstümiche Literatur", in H. Gätje (ed.), *Grundriss der arabischen Philologie*, vol. 2: *Literaturwissenschaft*, Wiesbaden, 1987, pp. 228-41.

REYNOLDS, D. F.

Heroic Poets, Poetic Heroes. The Ethnography of Performance in an Arabic Oral Epic Tradition, Ithaca – London, 1995.

— "Prosimetrum in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Arabic Literature", in *Prosimetrum. Crosscultural Perspectives on Narrative in Prose and Verse,* ed. J. Harris – K. Reichl, Cambridge, 1997.

SCHOELER, G.

"Alfred Blochs Studie über die Gattungen der arabischen Dichtung", *Asiatische Studien* 56 (2002), pp. 737-768.

— *Arabische Naturdichtung. Die zahrīyāt, rauḍīyāt und rabīʿīyāt von den Anfängen bis aṣ-Ṣanaubarī. Eine gattungs-, motiv- und stilgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, Beirut, 1974 (Beiruter Texte und Studien, vol. 15).

— *Einige Grundprobleme der autochthonen und der aristotelischen arabischen Literaturtheorie. Ḫāzim al-Qarṭāǧannīs Kapitel über die Zielsetzungen der Dichtung und die Vorgeschichte der in ihm dargelegten Gedanken,* Wiesbaden, 1975.

— "Die Einteilung der Dichtung bei den Arabern", *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 123 (1973), pp. 9-55.

— "On Ibn al-Rūmī's Reflective Poetry: His Poem about Poetry", *Journal of Arabic Literature* 27 (1996), pp. 22-36.

— "Der Verfasser der Augenheilkunde *K. Nūr al-ʿuyūn* und das Schema der 8 Präliminarien im 1. Kapitel des Werkes", *Der Islam* 64 (1987), pp. 87-97.

Seidensticker, T.

"An Arabic Origin of the Persian Rubāʿī?", *Middle Eastern Literatures* 14 (2011), pp. 905-936.

Sezgin, F.

Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums [=*GAS*], Leiden, vol. I-IX.

Sowayan, S.

"The *Hilālī Poetry* in *al-Muqaddimah*: Its Links to Nabati Poetry", in G. Canova (ed.), *Studies on Arabic Epics* (*q.v.*), pp. 277-306.

Trabulsi, A.

La Critique poétique des Arabes jusqu'au Ve siècle de l'Hégire (XI siècle de J.C.), Damascus, 1956.

Wagner, E.

Abū Nuwās. Eine Studie zur arabischen Literatur der frühen ʿAbbāsidenzeit, Wiesbaden, 1965.

— *Grundzüge der klassischen arabischen Dichtung,* Darmstadt, 1987- 88, 2 vols.

— *Die Überlieferung des Abū Nuwās-Dīwān und seine Handschriften,* Mainz, 1958.