

Syriac origin in the *Fiṣal* by Ibn Ḥazm", *Journal of Middle Eastern and North African Intellectual and Cultural Studies*, V/1 (2002), pp. 127—46; *idem*, "Anecdota muqtabisiana: sobre un hapax legomenon contenido en el *Muqtabis V* de Ibn Ḥayyān", *Al-Qanṭara*, XXIII/2 (2002), pp. 335—41.

70. D. Cook, "Tamīm al-Dār", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, LXI (1998), p. 20.

71. See Campbell, "It must be the end of time", pp. 179—80; cf. M. G. Morony, "Apocalyptic expressions in the early Islamic world", *Medieval Encounters*, IV (1998), pp. 176—7.

72. For a typological definition of the "Apocalyptic", see J. J. Collins, "Introduction: towards the morphology of a genre", *Semeia*, XIV (1970), pp. 1—20; cf. in the Syriac literary production the tentative by Sako, "Les genres littéraire syriaques". Concerning the Pseudo-Methodius, see Martínez, "The Apocalyptic genre in Syriac".

73. Cf. W. Witakowski, "The idea of *Septimana Mundi* and the millenarian typology of the creation week in Syriac tradition", *V Symposium Syriacum 1988*. (*Katholieke Universiteit, Leuven, 29—31 août 1988*), ed. by R. Lavenant (Rome, 1990), pp. 93—109. About the number seven in St. John's Apocalypse, see A. Y. Collins, *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism* (Leiden—Boston—Köln, [1998]), pp. 122—7.

74. Cf. H. D. Betz, "The problem of Apocalyptic genre in Greek and Hellenistic literature: the case of the Oracle of Trophonius", *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*, p. 577.

75. Cf. for instance the case of the *Malḥamat Dāniyāl*, A. Fodor, "Malḥamat Daniyal", *The Muslim East Studies in Honour of Julius Germanus* (Budapest, 1974), pp. 85—133, and facsimile of the 'irāqī edition; also J. den Heijer, "Malḥamat Dāniyāl and Christian Arabic literature", *Actes du Premier Congrès International d'Études Arabes Chrétiennes*, p. 230.

76. Cf. *The Seventh Century in the West-Syrian Chronicles*, introd., transl. and annot. by A. Palmer including two seventh-century Syriac apocalyptic texts introd., transl. and annot. by S. Brock with added annot. and a historical introd. by R. Hoyland (Liverpool, 1993), p. 253. This argumentative weapon will be re-adapted by the Arab speaking Christians of the former centuries, see Monferrer-Sala, "Literatura apocalíptica cristiana en árabe. Con un avance de edición del Apocalipsis árabe copto del Pseudo Atanasio", *Miscelánea de Estudios Árabes y Hebraicos*, XLVIII (1999), pp. 231—54.

77. Cf. V. L. Erhart, "The church of the East during the period of the four rightly-guided caliphs", *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, LXXVIII/3 (1996), p. 56.

78. See for instance Alexander, "The medieval legend of the last Roman emperor and its mesianic origin", *Journal of the Warburg and Courthauld Instituts*, LI (1978), pp. 1—15; cf. by the other side Suermann, "Der byzantinische Endkaiser bei Pseudo-Methodius", *Oriens Christianus*, LXXI (1987), pp. 140—55.

79. Cf. Alexander, "Byzantium and the migration of literary works and motifs. The legend of the last Roman emperor", *Medievalia et Humanistica*, II (1971), p. 55.

80. Cf. Martínez, "The Apocalyptic genre in Syriac", p. 340.

81. See in this respect, for instance, J. van Lent, "An unedited Copto-Arabic Apocalypse of Shenute from the fourteenth century: prophecy and history", *Akten des 6. Internationalen Koptologenkongresses, Münster, 20.—26. Juli 1996*, ed. by St. Emmel, M Krause, S. G. Richter and S. Schaten (Wiesbaden, 1999), ii, pp. 155—68.

82. See Reinink, "The beginnings of Syriac Apologetic literature", p. 183.

83. See Griffith, "Muḥammad and the monk Baḥīrā"; cf. Swanson, "Beyond proof-texting", p. 303. See also Monferrer-Sala, "Un texto base polemista: la versión árabe andalusí de la 'leyenda del monje Baḥīrā' incluida en el *l'ām* del Imām al-Qurṭubī", *Qurṭuba*, IV (1999), pp. 133—48.

TEXT AND ITS CULTURAL INTERPRETATION

A. Kudelin

ARABIC LITERATURE: POETICS AND STYLISTICS. III: EARLY ARABIC POETRY: AN ATTEMPT OF HISTORICAL-FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS

The problem of authenticity of pre-Islamic poetry has a long tradition in the history of classical Arabic literature studies. The approaches to the problem were developed as early as since the Middle Ages, and the modern research has been started in the middle of the 19th c. Medieval philologists did not manage to solve this problem: their criteria of selection of authentic pre-Islamic poems turned out to be too vague and subjective. Little more successful were the attempts of modern researchers. As a result there is no unanimous opinion about the authenticity of early Arabic poetry and thus contradictory ideas about the most important works of pre-Islamic classics are expressed.

Let us give one characteristic example. It is known that

"of special popularity in the East since the 8th c. and in the scholar Europe since the 18th c. have been the so-called *mu'allaqas* ('suspended', 'beaded', 'selected'): they form a collection of seven (in other editions of nine and ten) large works of the same type" [1].

But a competent French researcher R. Blachère shares neither the delight of the medieval philologists about this collection, nor the praise of European critics under their influence. His attitude towards *mu'allaqas* the researcher justifies by the fact that they, in his opinion, are not reliable enough examples of archaic poetry. Thus, in a *mu'allāqa* by 'Amr b. Kulthūm the elegiac prologue must have been added to give the whole the form of a "usual" *qaṣīda*-poem. The harmony of the parts of Zuhayr's *mu'allāqa* must have suffered sufficiently in the period of verbal existence of this poem. *Mu'allāqa* by al-Ḥārith b. Ḥilliza, according to R. Blachère, is a work by an imitator inclined to rare terms. 'Antara's *mu'allāqa* reveals a mystifier: its length itself is suspicious as well as the connection of non-related themes. In Imru' al-Qays's and Ṭarafa's *mu'allāqas* a skilful imitator gets too carried away with the rare terms and beduinisms. Besides, in the latter's *mu'allāqa* the description of sailing along Tigers and Euphrates or the Persian Gulf must be considered an obvious interpolation of Iranian origin [2].

Blachère's quoted opinion can not be called too harsh. The harshest conclusions about this problem belong to an

Englishman D. S. Margoliouth and an Egyptian Ṭāhā Ḥusayn. The latter, for example, wrote:

"The majority of what we call *jāhiliyyan* literature has nothing to do with *jāhiliyya* and is forged after the appearance of Islam; this literature is Muslim, it reflects the life of Muslims, their inclinations and interests more than the life in the epoch of *jāhiliyya*" [3].

Ṭāhā Ḥusayn claims that

"the poetry ascribed to Imru' al-Qays or al-A'shā or other *jāhiliyya* poets cannot have been written by them neither from the linguistic, nor from the artistic point of view; this poetry cannot have been written and spread before the appearance of Qur'ān" [4].

D. S. Margoliouth stated that the Arabs did not have poetry at all before the appearance of Islam and thus considered the earliest examples of Arabic poetry later forgeries [5].

Most contemporary researchers do not agree with D. S. Margoliouth or Ṭāhā Ḥusayn. At the same time, it is hard to find a specialist in medieval Arabic literature who would deny the existence of a sufficient number of late forgeries among the preserved works of early Arabic poetry. We can refer to the trustworthy opinion of I. Iu. Krachkovskii:

"Hardly any research today doubts that **part of the works** of the so-called pre-Islamic poetry is fake. But it is far from admitting that **all** pre-Islamic poetry is a late falsification, and hardly any researcher would agree with such an extreme idea" (bolded by Krachkovskii — A. K.) [6].

From Krachkovskii's words we should conclude that the study of pre-Islamic poetry should be preceded by the process of distinguishing authentic early Arabic works. Many speak about the complexity of this process, for example an Arabic scholar S. Khālīṣ:

"Pre-Islamic literature is a reality which one cannot ignore. We know about its trends, themes, motives and language from the indisputable date of the 6th—7th c. literature. However, the conditions of collecting these poetic works were such that in it leaked the alien, even bigger in its amount, and many works fell into oblivion. This puts many obstacles before a researcher which require from him the fundamental study of sources, ways of distribution and fixation" [7].

A Jordanian scholar N. al-Asad agrees with the ideas put forward by the philologists of the 9th—10th c. According to them, the criteria for selecting authentic poetic works could be: (i) poetic taste which would allow to distinguish between an original work and an imitation; (ii) a unanimous opinion of the *rāwīs* concerning the authenticity of certain works; (iii) the presence of a work in a trustworthy list of a poet's *dīwān* or in a selection of poems collected by an authoritative scholar-*rāwī* [8].

The suggested method, despite its complexity and laboriousness, is not really reliable as it is based on subjective judgments of medieval philologists. Anyway, it has not been applied in practice yet. However, a method based on common sense is applied. It was well formulated by I. Iu. Krachkovskii before the sensational works by D. S. Margoliouth and Ṭāhā Ḥusayn. When considering a *qaṣīda* by a pre-Islamic poet Al-Shanfarā (6th c.) in connection with his doubts about its authenticity, the scholar writes:

"Even if it were proved that this was an imitation, it would not have changed our attitude to this literary monument. We must agree with the paradoxical, as it seems, opinion that even an imitation must be considered as an early monument: it is made by a person who is so filled with the spirit of Arabic antiquity, that it contains not a single detail that is contradictory to historical or psychological truth" [9].

Later this approach to the study of the problem in consideration was fundamentally reasoned by R. Blachère:

"L'essentiel est de savoir si tel ou tel poème considéré ne contredit pas l'idée que nous sommes admis à nous faire de la poésie archaïque en général. L'apocryphe d'un Ḥammād ou d'un Khalaf (famous philologists, collectors of ancient poetry — A. K.) nous devient un précieux auxiliaire. Rapprochés des oeuvres composées en la seconde moitié du Ier/VIIe siècle, comme celle de Jarīr ou d'al-Farazdaq, les pastiches nous paraissent de fidèles produits de la tradition poétique avant l'Islam. Qu'ils accentuent certaines tendances, qu'ils marquent une prédilection pour quelques thèmes et quelques clichés, nous n'en doutons pas. Mais dans l'ensemble, ils ne faussent ni l'allure de leurs modèles, ni les sentiments que célèbrent les vieux poètes. Les savants iraqiens ne s'y sont pas trompés, eux qui se reconnaissent impuissants à dénoncer les forgeries d'un Ḥammād ou d'un Khalaf. Après un millénaire, serait-il sage à nous d'avoir plus d'exigences?" [10].

Such approach, despite its sufficient advantages, also has a number of serious drawbacks: it does not solve all questions put by D. S. Margoliouth and Ṭāhā Ḥusayn. Distinguishing authentic examples and defining the circle of "reliable" imitations (i. e. such examples and imitations which do not contradict to our idea about early Arabic poetry) is still based on subjective taste of researchers. We

remember that R. Blachère rejects, for example, a generally recognized masterpiece of early Arabic poetry — *mu'allāqa*.

A fundamentally new approach to the study of early Arabic poetry and, in particular, the problem of its authenticity, was suggested by an American researcher J. T. Monroe. For the first time in the history of Arabic studies he put the question about the unique creation method of early Arabic poets determined by the verbal character of the pre-Islamic poetry existence. Basing on the theory of Parry-Lord [11], J. T. Monroe calculates the repeated elements in the early pre-Islamic and later Arabic poetry. The comparison of the results leads the researcher to the conclusion that the early poets created their works basing on the oral-formula technique, that the early and the later Arabic poetic traditions are based on two antipode and opposed to each other methods: oral-formula and written-literary ones [12].

In this connection the researcher draws important conclusions about the early Arabic poetry. Its works cannot have had as distinct individual-author's character as the works of written poetry. In the process of verbal transmission from generation to generation these works must have inevitably been altered as the keepers of the verbal tradition did not know them by heart, and during each performance re-created them with the help of the oral-formula technique.

These conclusions allowed Monroe to suggest a new solution to the problem of the authenticity of early Arabic poetry. As the formula style can not have been imitated by the poets of the written poetry epoch, he suggests that all pre-Islamic poetry must be considered authentic. Researchers must not be confused with the present of a sufficient number of variations of one work, the presence in it of realities of the Muslim time, etc. as it is obvious that the preserved part of the early Arabic poetry is not an exact record of lines once pronounced by a great poet, but their more or less close version distorted by mistakes made during an oral transmission in which 'memorization' and 'depaganization' took place, and complicated by the tradition of written correction [13].

In our opinion, J. T. Monroe started a new prospective trend in the study of classical Arabic poetry [14]. The developed by him way of defining the authenticity of these or that works basing on the study of their style seems more reliable than all techniques suggested before [15]. However, this way immediately raises other problems which, in their turn, require serious consideration. If early Arabic poems were altered in the process of their verbal circulation, the question rises what determined these alterations, to what extent they were reflected in the original framework of a poem, how long was the process of alteration of early Arabic poetry and why the question of the authenticity of early Arabic examples rose in medieval science, etc. All these questions, as it seems could find solution within the frames of the historical-functional analysis of literature. The peculiarity of this method when applied to early Arabic poetry lies in the necessity to take into account doubtless fact that historical changes in the perception of its works were fixed not only in various sources of historical or literary-critical character, but also in the texts themselves. It was in the texts themselves that reconsiderations and new interpretations of early Arabic poetic texts were reflected and summed up. In this respects they became similar to a monument of early architecture which lost its original im-

age due to later rebuilding and alterations. A complex analysis of philologists' and critics' opinions as well as inter-textual alterations must, in our opinion, allow defining the main stages of early Arabic poetry circulation.

It is reasonable, as it seems, to begin the analysis of early Arabic poetry functioning from some general observations about the character of its circulation from the ancient times.

According to the data that we possess, most of the works of early Arabic poetry were created by oral authors and for a long time circulated in verbal form [16]. This, as J. T. Monroe established, is a principally important fact for understanding the specifics of this poetry's circulation on the early stage of its history. Evidences on some distribution of written language on the Arabian Peninsula in the pre-Islamic time [17] in this case are of no big importance.

In fact, even the Qur'ān, due to the imperfections of Arabic written language on the early stage (the absence of diacritical points, short and long vowels, etc. could only be read by people, who knew it by heart [18]). Even to a larger extent this is true about early Arabic poetry. Apart from certain inconveniences and the lack of reliability of written fixation of poetic works (only if the authors felt the necessity of it) in the so-to-say technical respect, there must have also been a factor of contemptuous attitude towards written language and literacy among Bedouins as towards features of settled culture [19]. Anyway, a historian of early Arabic literature finds few evidences of recording poetry in the pre-Islamic epoch [20].

Thus, during a long time — from the moment of its creation in the 5th—6th c. and, as we will later see, approximately until the 9th c., early Arabic poetry circulated verbally. In the process of keeping of literary works, the key role was played by a *rāwī*, who in scientific literature is often referred to as a transmitter (*transmetteur*) [21].

Quite a lot is written about the role of *rāwīs* in early Arabic literature [22], however the question is not clear yet. The reason for that, as we see it, lies in the fact that the *rāwīs'* functions did not stay the same. Let us turn in this connection to a detailed analysis of this question in N. al-Asad's monograph.

The researcher distinguishes several types of *rāwīs*. The first is *rāwī*-poets. In this type there are two sub-types — *rāwīs* who, according to N. al-Asad, learned the works of a certain author by heart and who stayed with poets as apprentices and *rāwīs* who transmitted the poems of different poets (their contemporaries or predecessors). After some time full-fledged poems are formed from representatives of both groups.

Examples of the first sub-type can be found in the "school" founded by Aws b. Ḥajar. A famous poet Zuhayr b. Abī Sulmā was Aws's *rāwī* and apprentice, then Zuhayr became teacher of his son Ka'b and al-Ḥuṭay'a. Then Hudba b. *Khashsham* learned from al-Ḥuṭay'a and was his *rāwī* and Hudba b. *Khashsham* taught Jamīl b. Ma'mar, and Jamīl's apprentice and *rāwī* was the last representative of this "school" *Kuthayyir*.

Many apprentices were connected with their teachers not only by literary, but also with family ties. Thus, there is data that Aws was married to Zuhayr's mother, and Ka'b was the latter's son. There are also other examples: al-Muraqqish Senior was al-Muraqqish Junior's uncle, and he was, in his turn Imru' al-Qays's uncle [23].

To the first sub-type Asad ascribes *rāwīs* of the 7th—beginning of the 8th c., who "transmitted" pre-Islamic poetry and learned from it. Moreover, the *rāwīs* of this type assessed the early works and compared pre-Islamic poets with each other. *Rāwī*-scholars of the 8th—beginning of the 9th c., who we will look at later, based on the opinions of *rāwī*-poets and appreciated the poetry preserved by them. Thus, the *rāwīs* of the second sub-type were a connecting link between the pre-Islamic poets and the scholars who played the part of systematic collectors of the early poetry. Among the representatives of this sub-type we should first of all mention al-Ṭirimmāh, Ru'ba b. al-'Ajāj who gave explanations about pre-Islamic poets to many *rāwī*-scholars, *Dhū* al-Rumma [24]. In the same context one should consider the figures of Jarīr and al-Farazdaq [25].

The next type is tribal *rāwīs* who played an important part in the Bedouin society [26]. N. al-Asad closely looks at the activities of these *rāwīs* in the period beginning from Muḥammad's times until the beginning of the 9th c. They greatly assisted *rāwī*-scholars who collected the poetry of the 8th c. tribes [27].

There was also a type of poets' *rāwīs*. They worked with poets (one of several *rāwīs* with one poet) and memorized their poems and performed them in public. Al-Farazdaq, Jarīr, *Kuthayyir*, al-Kumayt, al-Aḥwaṣ, *Dhū* al-Rumma, Nuṣayb, Jamīl (all of them were poets of the Umayyad epoch) — all had such *rāwīs*. According to al-Asad such type of *rāwīs* was known and popular as early as in the pre-Islamic epoch, but the scholar admits that no sources give any evidence of this, except for al-A'shā [28].

The next type is *rāwī*-"correctors". There were no *rāwīs* who specially devoted themselves to error correction in the Arabic poetry; this was done by *rāwī*-poets, tribal *rāwīs*, poets' *rāwīs* and *rāwī*-scholars who sometimes performed the role of "correctors". Here we mean the *rāwīs* of the 7th—beginning of the 8th c. who made corrections to the works of certain Umayyad authors (for example, al-Farazdaq, Jarīr, *Dhū* al-Rumma). The data about error corrections in the poetry of early authors by their contemporary *rāwīs* are less reliable [29].

The fifth type is *rāwī*-mystifiers. These *rāwīs*, who lived in the early Muslim epoch, dealt with forgeries of early poetry for different reasons. Sometimes these were poems about distant times which were performed at caliph's feasts. In other cases these *rāwīs* created poems which justified the claims of this or that person or tribe for noble origin. There were also forgeries whose aim was to present certain historical events, which determined the life of a tribe or certain persons, in a different light [30].

The last type is *rāwī*-scholars. Their main function was critical selection and fixation of early poetry. These were, according to a medieval term "people of science" [31]. *Rāwī*-scholars must have appeared not earlier than the second quarter of the 8th c. Among the first *rāwī*-scholars N. al-Asad mentions Abū 'Amr b. al-'Alā' and Ḥammād al-Rāwīya from whom the tradition of verbal transmission of poetry was inherited by such famous *rāwīs* as *Khalaf* al-Aḥmar, al-Mufaḍḍal, al-Aṣma'ī, Abū 'Ubayda, Abū 'Amr al-Shaybānī. From the latter learned Ibn al-'Arabī, Muḥammad b. Ḥabīb, Abū Ḥātim al-Sijistānī, Muḥammad b. Sallām al-Jumāhī; from them, in their turn the access to the literary tradition was gained by al-Sukkarī, Ṭha'lab and others. *Rāwī*-scholars belonged to different philological schools [32], which explains, according to

N. al-Asad the presence of antagonisms between them and mutual accusations of forgeries [33].

Basing on the analysis of *rāwī* types, N. al-Asad distinguishes to stages in the verbal transmission (*riwāya*) of the early Arabic poetry. On the first stage (which lasted approximately until the end of the first quarter — the middle of the 8th c.), the *riwāya*, according to the researcher, lied in memorizing (fixation), transmission to other *rāwīs* (preservation) and performing in public of poetic works without any amendments, corrections, etc. of the performed poems. On the second stage, as N. al-Asad believes, *riwāya* was added to with the elements of critical selection developed on the material of legends about prophet Muḥammad, which required a varied approach. Apart from the tasks of the previous period, the *rāwīs* of the second stage verified, commented on and corrected early Arabic works. Then there appeared scientific and educational clubs which were, as a rule, headed by authoritative philologists [34].

According to N. al-Asad the second stage of transmission of early Arabic poetry was on a higher level — this was a scientific *riwāya* which owed its technique to the successes of the *ḥadīth* studies. The level of *riwāya* level also rose sufficiently due to the appearance and gradual distribution of written fixation of early Arabic works.

In the light of J. T. Monroe's work one can see more sufficient differences between the two stages of *riwāya*. Let us turn back to the classification of *rāwī* types. Even at a fleeting glance it becomes clear that one cannot give a distinct definition of functions of *rāwīs* of different types. The differences between them are not limited to the fact that some belong to a lower and some to a higher level of *riwāya*. The differences, as we see it, are more fundamental and typological. It seems reasonable, for example, to ascribe the first and the second *rāwī* types to the Aedic type of verbal tradition keepers as they not only memorized, but also performed and re-created the works preserved until their time. The third and the fourth types must have been close to the rhapsodes as they tended to fix verbally early Arabic works at the same time eliminating certain faults.

Despite certain stipulations, the material on *rāwī* types refers mostly to the early Muslim time. According to J. T. Monroe's analysis, Arabic poetry was then still formed with the verbal-formula method. The review of *rāwīs* activities of the third and fourth types allows to define this notion more accurately: this must have been the end of the old verbal-formula poetics giving way to the individual author's features.

The sixth type marks the end of fixation of early Arabic works by philologists-collectors. However, their activities (and to a larger extent the activity of *rāwī*-mystifiers) was combined, despite their orientation on strict critical selection of "original", "trustworthy" works, with characteristic "recurrences" of aedic art.

Thus, in the six *rāwī* types defined by N. al-Asad there can be distinguished three types fundamentally different from each other. Their appearance was determined by key changes in the circulation of the early Arabic poetry. We can preliminarily define them as: (i) aedic *rāwīs*; (ii) rhapsode *rāwīs*; (iii) *rāwīs* who fixed poetry [35].

Basing on such understanding of functions of different *rāwī* types, we can assume that on the first stage of *riwāya* early Arabic works did not have a strictly fixed form, they were unstable and fluctuating, and about their true fixation and stabilization one can only speak referring to the second

stage. It was not accidental that the first stage, as N. al-Asad points out, did not give a so-called *isnād* to early Arabic poems. This term came to literary criticism from *ḥadīth* studies where only those *ḥadīth* were considered authentic which had a chain of trustworthy transmitters [36]. Early Arabic poetry mostly does not have a proven chain of transmitters from the author until a written fixation of a certain work. The earliest *isnād* we possess dates to the end of the 8th c. and belongs to the first generation of *rāwī*-scholars, while most works get *isnād* with the second, sometimes the third generation of *rāwī*-scholars (the first quarter of the 9th—beginning of the 10th c.) [37]. If we base on this fact, then, according to *ḥadīth* studies most part of early Arabic poetry must be considered unreliable.

However, medieval philologists did not pay much attention to this. N. al-Asad, who has a clear understanding of the situation, draws a different conclusion. He believes that the absence of *isnād* among the most reliable poems which belong to the most famous poets of *jāhiliyya* can be explained by the imperfections of *rāwīs*' work. Most of them supposedly did not pay due attention to *isnād* during oral perception of poems from their predecessors. In most cases they had *isnāds* for works of early Arabic poetry, but they must have not thought it necessary to mention *isnād* each time and limited themselves to mentioning the cases of its absence [38].

However, another explanation of the *isnād* absence in most works of early Arabic poetry, transmitted by *rāwī*-scholars of the first generation, is possible. It is strengthened by J. T. Monroe's research: pre-Islamic poems did not have *isnād* as these scientists must have fixed early Arabic works for the first time. Inheriting them from anonymous verbal tradition, they could compile quasi-critical texts basing on variants received from Bedouin informants. Fluctuating, unstable works of their distant predecessors got from these scholars certain stability as a certain text ascribed to a certain author. *Rāwī*-scholars, who did not understand the specific nature of early works, could not correspondingly give adequate interpretation of the presence of several variations of one poem. They strived to fix the "correct" variant and put aside all other ones [39].

Rāwī-scholars of the first generation, like rhapsodes fixed poetic works in the conditions of their verbal circulation. Verbal fixation, of course, could not be a final one for all works, but it was not excluded as early Arabic poems were, as a rule, quite small (up to 100 lines).

Somehow or other, but beginning with the first generation of *rāwī*-scholars it is possible to trace the history of a sufficient part of early Arabic poetic texts (*isnād* for the latter became compulsory in the 9th—10th c. [40]). It is necessary to point out to the fact that medieval tradition suggested one quite unexpected way of filling the missing links in the *riwāya* of early Arabic poetry which found its followers as well as critics in the Middle Ages as well as in our time.

N. al-Asad sets himself a task to "reconstruct" the lost link of the chain of transmitters from *jāhiliyya* authors until the first generation of *rāwī*-scholars. The researcher succeeds in finding several reports according to which separate poems and information about early Arabic poets traced back to the pre-Islamic figures. Special attention he dedicates to a report about the head of *rāwīs* Abū 'Amr b. al-'Alā' fixed by al-Jāhiz: "Most of his information he received from Bedouins who lived in the *jāhiliyya*

times" [41]. If we take into account the fact that Abū 'Amr b. al-'Alā' was born in 689 (?), which is approximately 70 years after the beginning of the Muslim epoch, the informants of this philologists must have been quite old. In this connection N. al-Asad raises the question of longevity of Bedouin informants. Referring to the sources, the scholar mentions among the informants some long-livers who were born and grew up in the pre-Islamic epoch and who lived until the end of the 1st—beginning of the 2nd AH (i. e. about a hundred years after the appearance of Islam). Among them, according to N. al-Asad could be the informants of Abū 'Amr b. al-'Alā' who started to study early Arabic poetry approximately in 699, or a little later (i. e. as early as a ten-year-old boy!). In this time, as the scholar believes, there could still live Bedouin informants who had lived in the pre-Islamic epoch from 10 to 70 years. Thus, their age at the moment when Abū 'Amr b. al-'Alā' addressed them was between 90 and 150 (?) years [42].

Such argumentation, as many contemporary researchers have mentioned [43] does not stand up to criticism. Medieval researchers were also often sceptical about the reports about the longevity of pre-Islamic Bedouin informants [44]. It seems that Abū 'Amr b. al-'Alā' at best could have dealt with the Bedouins who had known Bedouins who had lived in the *jāhiliyya* epoch. "Lengthening" of the informants' age brought the *riwāya* of the scholars-transmitters to the time of creation of the pre-Islamic works. It seemed that the first *rāwī*-scholars communicated directly with the bearers of the pre-Islamic poetic tradition leaving out the connecting links which could distort or forge the early examples [45]. Thus, the information about the long-livers could have been a deliberate or more likely non-deliberate fabrication of the early *rāwīs* aimed for substitution or fortification of *isnād* of the early Arabic poems. This resulted in the illusion of higher reliability of *riwāya* of pre-Islamic poetry, the illusion of the authenticity, fixity and stability of works which were in fact in the "fluctuating" state.

While fixing the works of the early Arabic poetry *rāwī*-scholars unconsciously extended their ideas about the poetic art on the pre-Islamic epoch, which in many cases led to difficulties in the recreation of the "original" text and the attribution of this or that poem to a certain author.

Thus, *rāwī*-scholars put a lot of effort into finding reliable informants who the least of all "distorted" the authentic text [46]. However, they often could not define the acknowledged normative texts basing on the nature of the early Arabic poetry itself. It often turned out that certain works or their separate lines were based in later transmission on the authority of one single scholar, but, regardless of the requirements to the definition of their authenticity (see above) were accepted by the tradition. For example, the first *bayt* of 'Antara's *mu'allaqa* which, by the way, has a special semantic importance in this poem, was acknowledged authentic by few *rāwī*-scholars [47], and one of the *bayts* of Zuhayr b. Abī Sulmā's *mu'allaqa* preserved to us in the transmission of one *rāwī*-scholar [48]. In both cases we speak about poems which belonged to the best and the most famous ones in the early Arabic poetry.

Even more difficult was the situation with the attribution of texts. Here, apart from the possibility of a late "forgery" of the early Arabic poetry, the *rāwī*-scholars came across numerous vague attributions of texts which undoubtedly belonged to the pre-Islamic authors [49]. *Rāwī*-scholars, who in their activities based on the princi-

ples of individual author's art, tried to establish their exact attribution, but often faced numerous contradictory facts to which they often attached peculiar interpretations. Thus, one description of rain Yūnus b. Ḥabīb ascribed to 'Abīd b. al-Abras, and philologist al-Mufaḍḍal believed that its author was Aws b. Ḥajar [50]. In a number of cases *rāwī*-scholars, who did not know the author of an early work, claimed its author to be a pre-Islamic poet at their own discretion. Ḥammād, for example, ascribed to Ṭarafa a *qaṣīda* which was performed to him by a Bedouin informant [51].

When finding repetitions of the same *bayts* in the works which were attributed to different early authors, the scholars, following the early *rāwīs*, must have ascribed to the pre-Islamic poets special motives which impelled them to appropriate the fruits of somebody else's work. A philologist Abū 'Ubayda stated, in particular, that one of the poets of the Ḥaṭafān tribe Qurād b. Ḥanash created wonderful poems, while other poets from the same tribe (among them supposedly was Zuhayr b. Abī Sulmā) pretended they belonged to them [52].

The later philological studies required great resourcefulness to reason the cause of coincidences in many lines in the works ascribed to different Arabic authors. When developing the theory of "poetic borrowings" a famous philologist al-Ḥātimī (d. 998) introduced into his classification of "borrowings" several categories for the interpretation of such phenomena [53]. The explanations concerning these categories often seem at least strange in the light of the notions of the individual author's features. Thus, *muwārada* (lit. "appearance together with somebody") consists, according to the researcher, in the fact that two poets write coinciding lines in their poems, despite the fact that they never heard each other's works. *Murāfada* (lit. "help") is explained by the fact that a certain poet refuses from some of his lines and gives them to another poet so that the latter could defeat his rival in the genre of mockery. *Istirāf* (lit. "using") consists in the fact that a poet uses another poet's lines in his *qaṣīda* because they suit it well [54].

Al-Ḥātimī tends to explain many coincidences in the poems of the early poets. In accordance with the ideas of his time about individual art he interprets these coincidences as accidental or as a dependence of one author on another. However, he does not mention what strange (for his time) ties connect different poems in his classification [55].

Al-Ḥātimī, obviously, followed the information on the pre-Islamic poets in the tradition of the early transmitters. The latter must have tried to comprehend early Arabic poetry as individual author's, i. e. poetry which must have fixed texts and attributions to authors. This must have completely excluded the possibility of collective creation, which forced them to come up with explanations and at the same time fabricate such statements.

We have considered some of the external, with respect to early Arabic poetry, evidences of its re-comprehension. Let us now turn to the review of certain aspects of historical changes in the perception of pre-Islamic works which reflected in the poetic texts themselves.

The largest level of late interpolations must be connected with the dramatic change in the lives of the tribes which inhabited the Arabian Peninsula — the appearance of Islam. Anachronisms of such kind were pointed out not

only by contemporary, but also by medieval authors. Let us look at some examples.

In the *dīwāns* of the pre-Islamic authors we can often find oaths on the name of Allah, to which the following line by 'Abīd b. al-Abraṣ [56] can serve as an example:

A swore on the name of Allah: indeed is Allah merciful to those he wishes to, the forgiving...

In another *bayt* by the same author it says [57]:

The one who asks from people is rejected, but the one asking from Allah will not fail.

Pre-Islamic poets fear sins which could enrage Allah. Imru' al-Qays wrote [58]:

So drink wine today, not sinning in front of Allah and not caring about anything.

In al-Hārith b. Ḥilliza's *bayt* Allah is described as a bearer of a "decreed thing" [59]:

And the case of Allah is performed, and the wicked suffer from it.

All these examples are pointed to by N. al-Asad [60]. Some interesting examples are also mentioned by R. Blachère. In Zuhayr b. Abī Sulmā's *mu'allaqa* the scholar distinguishes the following two *bayts* [61]:

Do not conceal from Allah what is in your souls so that it is hidden: whatever you hide from Allah, He knows it,

Postpones to another day, records in the book, puts off until the Judgment Day or immediately punishes.

R. Blachère, following his predecessors, writes that everything in these two *bayts* reminds of Qurān: the idea, the style, even the vocabulary. To justify this opinion, let us cite a verse from Qurān: "Surely He knows what is spoken aloud, and He knows what you hide" [62].

An interpolation of Muslim character can also be found in a work by a pre-Islamic poet Dhū al-Iṣb' al-'Adwānī, who spoke about Allah with a paraphrase from Qurān: "The One who grasps and outspreads the world" [63].

The next three *bayts* from al-Nābigha al-Dhubaynī's *dīwān* also evoked doubts among some researchers [64]:

I can not see among people a creator who would be similar to Him (and I do not make any exceptions for any nations),

Apart from Sulaymān to whom Allah said: "Rise among human creatures and prevent them from mistakes,

And subdue genies, I let them build Tadmur (Palmyra — A. K.) from stones and columns".

In another work by al-Nābigha al-Dhubaynī Noah's fidelity is mentioned [65] — a quality ascribed to Noah by the Qurān [66]. This interpolation is of special interest as in the Qurān it is said that neither Muḥammad nor his people had heard of Noah before the grant of the revelation [67]. Al-Nābigha's line, thus, is contradictory to the Qurān, but the pious censors of Arabic poetry did not notice this.

Apart from a sufficient number of reminiscences from the Qurān, medieval and contemporary researcher have found in the pre-Islamic poetry the terms which could not

be explained in any other way but the influence of the Holy Book of the Muslims. In this connection D. S. Margoliouth, for example, states that 'Antara knew the Qurān revelation and Muslim terms [68]. Indeed, in *dīwān* 'Antara we find a mention of hellish fire [69] — "Every time I felt the coolness of her lips, she seemed hellish fire", as well as the resurrection day [70] — "I came back from You and the purpose of [my visit to You] had been to obtain a memory that I will keep until the resurrection day" — and other terms. In the same way D. S. Margoliouth analyses the term *dunyā* to which pre-Islamic poets 'Abīd b. al-Abraṣ and Dhū al-Iṣb' attached Qurān meaning: "this world", near world" [71].

In the process of oral circulation of Arabic poetry in the early Muslim epoch, the pagan realities must have been gradually removed from it. We can assume how it happened if we turn to the following example. In the "Book of Songs" by Al-Iṣfahānī there is a *bayt* which is ascribed to al-A' shā, which contains oath on the pagan deities, which occurs quite rarely in the early Arabic poetry examples we possess [72]: "I swore on salt, ashes, al-'Uzzā and al-Lāt...". These two pagan deities which refer to the most important ones in the pantheon of the pre-Islamic Arabia were replaced in the variant fixed in the dictionary called "The Language of the Arabs" by Ibn Manẓūr (d. 1311) without the mention of the author [73]: "I swore on salt, ashes, fire and Allah..." [74].

Such anachronisms in the poetry of the ancient Arabs were fixed not only by the contemporary but also by the medieval researchers [75]. Thus, a famous philologist Ibn Qutayba (828—889) paid attention to the Qurān sounding of one of Labīd's *bayts* and made in this connection an interesting statement: either this *bayt* was written after the appearance of Islam, or Labīd has come to believe in resurrection and Judgement Day prior to his adoption of Islam, or this *bayt* was forged [76]. The second idea in this statement deserves special attention: the tendency to explain the presence of anachronistic elements in the early Arabic poetry by the faith in the Muslim doctrine before the appearance of Islam or before its adoption. The idea about the possibility of anticipation of Islam was widely spread. A pre-Islamic Umayya b. Abī al-Salt, according to medieval researchers, strived to become a prophet, as he had "read in the books that the Prophet will be sent from among the Arabs" [77]. This idea obviously appeared under the influence of religious propaganda after the appearance of Islam and was inspired by the Qurān which says that the prophetic mission of Muḥammad had been predicted by 'Īsā [78], as well as the most important elements of the new dogma had been proposed by the predecessors of Muḥammad who became "the Seal of the Prophets" [79]. It allows understanding why pro-Muslim poems introduced after the appearance of Islam (but still in the time of "aedic" art) into early Arabic works meeting the new ideological requirements, later did not cause confusion by their discrepancy with the pagan spirit of the epoch when these works were created [80].

There was also another solution to the problem of anachronisms in the early Arabic poetry. When considering the question of *rāwīs* we have already mentioned the tendency to exaggerate their age with the purpose of making their transmission of works look more reliable by reduction of the number of transmitters. In the biographies of the pre-Islamic poets we again face this tendency, but this time aimed at justification of Muslim realities in the early poetry.

A pre-Islamic poet spent the last years of his long life in the time of Islam and managed to "edit" his works in the appropriate spirit. Here we can refer to the information about the meeting of one-hundred-year old Zuhayr b. Abī Sulmā with Muḥammad, to remind of the data according to which Labīd supposedly lived for more than 120 years, and al-Hārith b. Ḥilliza and 'Amr b. Kulthūm reached the age of 150 [81].

In the conditions of verbal-formula art, the introduction of new Muslim motives in the early Arabic works must have required no explanations, as each work was sort of re-created by the performer for his audience. That is why we can assume that the ideas about the anticipation of Muslim beliefs and the longevity of early Arabic poets were required later. In them, in our opinion, was reflected the wish to comprehend in retrospective the early Arabic works in the terms of individual author's poetics of a stable author's text and the author's attribution.

However, it would be wrong to limit the matter to certain randomness in the interpretation of the poetic of the early Arabic works. The thing is that in the depths of the early Arabic poetry itself individual author's features must have gradually developed, which led to the corresponding re-comprehension of the early pre-Islamic poetic heritage. And this later tendency the rhapsod *rāwīs* could have extended on the whole of Arabic literature in their concern. Let us explain, which features we mean here.

In the early Arabic poetry we can find examples which are evidence of a higher level of development of individual author's consciousness than one could expect from this or that pre-Islamic author. The most characteristic example in this respect is a semi-verse which opens 'Antara's *mu'allaqa* (5th c.) [82]: "Have the poets left what needs fixing?" We have given the literal translation of this semi-verse. However, usually it is translated freely to avoid long comments and references to medieval interpreters: "Have the poets not praised any ruin?", "Have the poets not praised anything old?" [83]; "Have the poet left anything new?" [84], etc. But it is these interpretations which are of special interest to us. Let us look at some of them.

Ibn Qutayba wrote in his comment to this semi-verse:

"And this is like your words: 'Has the first one left anything to the last?', i. e. have the poets left anything which could be considered and which they had not considered before" [85].

A famous interpreter of al-Zawzanī's (d. 1093) *mu'allaqa*s interprets this semi-verse in the following way:

"Have the poets left a spot which needs mending without mending and correcting it? This question implies a negative answer as the poets have left nothing about which poems could be written. The meaning: the first one left nothing to the last one, i. e. I (al-Zawzanī comments the *bayt* on behalf of the poet — A. K.) was determined by many poets who left no place for me which needs mending, which I would mend, and which needs correcting, which I would make. Another understanding is possible: they have left something, only by singing their songs, by writing and performing poems with a brilliant description of it" [86].

Ibn Rashīq (b. 995—1000, d. 1063/4 or 1071) interprets this semi-verse in the following way:

"And 'Antara's words 'Have the poets left anything which needs mending?' prove to the fact that he considered himself a new one, who came to poetry when people had completed it and left nothing to him. And he wrote in this *qaṣīda* something in which none of his predecessors outstripped him and in which any later one could not compete with him" [87].

Of all these comments is typical a notion that an early *jāhiliyya* poet possessed a sharp feeling of individual-author's originality, and that he compared his creations with the works of the others, and viewed himself and his achievements on the background of other poets' achievements, and felt himself limited by the art of his predecessors as a number of limitations and restrictions.

It is hardly possible that 'Antara had this feeling in such sharp form. It must be no accidental that famous medieval philologists expressed their doubts that this semi-verse belonged to 'Antara. In the "Book of Songs" we find:

"Have the poets left anything which needs mending?" — a *bayt* which most *rāwīs*, including al-Aṣma'ī and Ibn al-A'rābī, do not ascribe to 'Antara... Abū 'Amr al-Shaybānī mentioned that he had not transmitted this *bayt* until he heard it in the transmission of Abū Ḥizām al-'Uklī" [88].

It is unlikely that the following lines, which are ascribed to Imru' al-Qays [89] belonged to a pre-Islamic poet:

I drive away the rhymes, just like a naughty boy drives away locust,

And when they become numerous and exhaust me, I will choose from them a dozen of brilliant ones,

I shall put aside small pearls and take the magnificent pearls.

Such attitude to creation is characteristic of developed author's consciousness; its feature appeared much later in Arabic poetic tradition [90]. In this connection a medieval comment to these lines, according to which this was the first poem by Imru' al-Qays, is of some interest. The ones who heard these lines understood that he would become a brilliant poet [91]. The poems and the comments to them (originally made by *rāwīs*) led to the creation of an image of a legendary genius poet. By the way, here we should say that these three *bayts*, as most poems ascribed to Imru' al-Qays, have doubtful attribution [92].

Aedic *rāwīs* could interpolate in the Arabic literature the lines which corresponded to their understanding of creative activity in which the individual author's feature were revealing more and more vividly. The late rhapsode *rāwīs* and even the later authoritative philologists accepted this new understanding of the principles of creative activity and attached to it a universal character. Without introducing into early Arabic works new lines, which reflected the growing individual author's initiative, they completed the same task in a different way: re-comprehending in the light of contemporary ideas about creation the lines of the early authors. Thus, al-Jurjānī (b. 903—d. 976 or 1001/2) ascribes to Labīd the tendency to renew the old motive of Arabic poetry — comparison of the traces of an abandoned site with faded inscriptions [93]. We can not be sure that this case proves the opinion of the medieval philologist [94].

An authoritative philologist Ibn Sallām al-Jumāḥī, who has already repeatedly been mentioned before, ascribes to caliph 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb the statement about the role of poetry in the *jāhiliyya* epoch: "Poetry was the knowledge of the people who did not have reliable knowledge" [95]. We can agree with his opinion, only adding that poetry preserved this role during quite a long period of time and after the appearance of Islam (in fact, until the end of the Umayyad epoch). We can see how close it is to the modern understanding of the question from the following consideration of a Russian historian P. A. Griaznevitch:

"verbal Bedouin poetry served as a universal means of fixation of information about contemporary events and those which took place before, and was a special type of social memory" [96].

Continuing this analogy, we can say that the early Arabic poetry was to a certain extent able, like memory, to forget, lose the unnecessary, and, on the contrary, to accumulate the new, the important, and in some cases to review the old under the influence of new impressions. Early Arabic poetry was indeed "reliable knowledge" and remained such at every moment of its lengthy verbal circulation in the Bedouin society, as it changed following the changes in the socio-cultural concepts of the society. Innovations were unconsciously introduced into the early poetry and, thus, were sanctified with the authority of the old. Each innovation turned out to be as old as antiquity itself and thus gained an unshakable status.

However, this could only have happened in a society in which such poetry performed the function of "reliable knowledge" within the chronological limits of the period when it was created and re-created by Aedic *rāwīs*. Early Arabic poetry stopped being a universal "reliable knowledge" as soon as it lost the ability to change, i. e. at the moment of its final fixation. Philologists-collectors of the 8th—9th c.

"perceived poetry only as a source, the feeling of its real spiritual organization was lost, as well as the understanding of the ideological and psychological aspects of poetry, as well as the functional difference of the types of information it contained, its elements and the ways of its representation. A truly vital and topical in its nature poetry of the Bedouin poets was for its collectors an "archive of the Arabs" [97].

The changing of the functions of the early Arabic poetry was determined by fundamental reorganization of its structural characteristics. While preserving the verbal form of circulation pre-Islamic poetic works went a long way from "fluctuating", variable from performance to performance and from transmitter to transmitter texts to a stable (or, at least, slightly variable) text which suited the new concepts of individual author's creation. At the same time pre-Islamic works also fixed the results of archaic collective creation, which evoked doubts concerning its authenticity among medieval and contemporary authors who viewed it in the light of individual author's poetics.

Notes

1. I. Iu. Krachkovskii, "Ash-Shanfarā. Pesn' pustyni" ("Song of the desert"), *Izbrannye sochineniia*, ii (Moscow—Leningrad, 1956), p. 238.
2. See R. Blachère, *Histoire de la littérature arabe des origines à la fin du XV siècle de J.-C.* (Paris, 1952—66), pp. 147, 184, 252, 273, 296—7, etc.
3. Ṭāhā Ḥusayn, *Fī al-adab al-jāhili* (On Pre-Islamic Literature) (Qāhira, 1927), p. 64.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 65.
5. D. Margoliouth, "The origins of the Arabic Poetry", *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (London, 1925), pp. 419—26.
6. Krachkovskii, "Takha Khusein o doislamskoī poēzii arabov i eč kritike" ("Ṭāhā Ḥusayn on the pre-Islamic Poetry of the Arabs and its critics"), *Izbrannye sochineniia*, ii, p. 197.
7. S. Khālīs, "O teorii apokrifichnosti drevnearabskoī poēzii" ("About the apocryphal theory of early Arabic poetry"), *Arabskaia filologija* (Moscow, 1968), p. 179.
8. Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Asad, *Maṣādir al-shi'r al-jāhili wa qaymatuhā al-tārīkhīyya* (The Sources of Pre-Islamic Poetry and its Historical Value) (Qāhira, 1962), pp. 468—9. A philologist Muḥammad b. Sallām al-Jumāḥī (757/8—ca. 846) gives the same recommendations: one should accept what is unanimously accepted by scholars; see Muḥammad b. Sallām al-Jumāḥī, *Ṭabaqāt fuḥūl al-shu'arā'* (Classes of the Master Poets) (Qāhira, 1974), pp. 5—6; Asad, *op. cit.*, p. 346.
9. Krachkovskii, "Ash-Shanfarā", p. 239.
10. Blachère, *op. cit.*, p. 186.
11. A detailed account of Parry-Lord's theory with some corrections can be found in P. A. Grintser's monograph: P. A. Grintser, *Drevneindiskii epos: genezis i tipologija* (Ancient Indian Epos: Genesis and Typology) (Moscow, 1974).
12. See: J. T. Monroe, "Oral composition in pre-Islamic poetry", *Journal of Arabic Literature*, III (Leiden, 1972), p. 15.
13. See: *ibid.*, p. 16.
14. Here we do not touch upon many disputable points of the American scholar's article or ones which require more detailed argumentation. About that see A. B. Kudelin, *Srednevekovaja arabskaia poētika (vtoraia polovina VIII—XI vek)* (Medieval Arabic Poetics (Second Half of 8th — 11th c.)) (Moscow, 1983), pp. 46—53.
15. J. T. Monroe recommends checking the authenticity of doubtful works by formula analysis, comparing their vocabulary with the general formulae vocabulary of pre-Islamic poetry and separate collections of formula repertoires of each early Arabic poet (these vocabularies must be developed later, according to the author). This method can be very flexible as it would be based on facts referred from a text itself. J. T. Monroe insists on the necessity to combine formula analysis with extra-textual information about each arguable poem fixed by the medieval philological tradition: Monroe, *op. cit.*, pp. 15—6.

16. J. T. Monroe view early Arabic works as products of verbal-formula art, almost identical to the works of folklore verbal-formula art of epic singers. However, many facts which give evidence of individual author's features reflection in the works of early Arabic poets, do not give grounds to such authentication. The American scholar, admitting that "when regarding pre-Islamic poetry, the theory of Parry-Lord must be slightly modified", only takes in consideration some of these facts and sufficiently simplifies a complicated picture: *ibid.*, pp. 15—6.

In our opinion, the contradiction between the high level of formula style and the presence of features of individual authors in early Arabic poetry can be solved if we view the latter as "verbal literature" (P. G. Bogatyrev, R. O. Iakobson, "Folklor kak osobaia forma tvorchestva" ("Folklore as a specific form of creativity"), *Voprosy teorii narodnogo iskusstva* (Moscow, 1971), pp. 382—3), as a transitional phenomenon from folklore to literature of events. Accordingly, the formula character of examples of early Arabic literature that we possess must be qualified as a transitional feature (in more detail see Kudelin, *op. cit.*, pp. 46—8).

17. These evidences can be found in Asad, *op. cit.*, pp. 107—84; references to the written language in the pre-Islamic poetry are found in Blachère, *op. cit.*, pp. 92—3.

18. *Koran*, transl. and comment. by I. Iu. Krachkovskii (Moscow, 1963), p. 674.

19. Khālīs, *op. cit.*, pp. 168—9. One grammarian supposedly asked a well-known and relatively late poet Dhū al-Rumma (d. 735 [?]) if he could write. The poet put his finger to his lips as if saying: keep this secret — the ability to write is considered to be a disgrace: Ibn Qutayba, *Al-Shi'r wa al-shu'arā'* (Poetry and Poets) (Bayrūt, 1969), ii, p. 438; Khālīs, *op. cit.*, p. 169.

20. Asad, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

21. We use this word as it is hard to find a term which would adequately interpret the meaning of the term *rāwī*.

22. Here we should first of all refer to an irrefragable section in Blachère's book: Blachère, *op. cit.*, pp. 85—117.

23. Asad, *op. cit.*, pp. 222—4.

24. *Ibid.*, pp. 225—6.

25. *Ibid.*, pp. 227—9.

26. This can be explained by the fact that "pre-Islamic Bedouin poetry appeared and existed first of all as realization of creative activities of separate independent clan groups (clan, tribe, tribal union)" (P. A. Griaznevitch, "Razvitie istoricheskogo soznaniia arabov (VI—VIII vv.)" ("The development of historical consciousness of Arabs (6th—8th c.)"), *Ocherki istorii arabskoī kultury V—XV vv.* (Moscow, 1982), p. 77).

27. Asad, *op. cit.*, pp. 231—7.

28. *Ibid.*, pp. 237—41.

29. *Ibid.*, pp. 241—4.

30. *Ibid.*, pp. 244—51.

31. Ibn Sallām al-Jumāḥī, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

32. N. al-Asad distinguishes four schools: Baṣrian, Kūfan, Medinian and that of Baghdād: *ibid.*, p. 252.

33. *Ibid.*, p. 251—4.

34. *Ibid.*, p. 189—90.

35. It is necessary to mention that quite often *rāwīs* combined different types, which must have reflected the transitional peculiarities of verbal early Arabic poetry.

36. A more detailed consideration of questions connected with a "special way of documenting accounts of facts and events" in the medieval Arabic-Muslim culture can be found in the work by A. B. Khalidov: A. B. Khalidov, "Knizhnaia kultura" ("Book culture"), *Ocherki istorii arabskoī kul'tury V—XV vv.* (Moscow, 1982), pp. 259—62.

37. Asad, *op. cit.*, p. 281.

38. *Ibid.*, p. 275.

39. Monroe, *op. cit.*, pp. 1—2 and voc.

40. However, even in the 9th—10th c. some scholars felt the burden of the necessity of *isnād* for early Arabic poetry, which was still not as mandatory as *isnād* in *ḥadīth* transmission: Asad, *op. cit.*, pp. 276, 279.

41. Al-Jāhiz, *Kitāb al-bayān wa al-tabyīn* (The Book of Eloquence and Exposition) (Qāhira, 1968), i, p. 321.

42. Asad, *op. cit.*, pp. 268—71, 274.

43. See Margoliouth, *op. cit.*, p. 443 and voc.; Monroe, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

44. Al-Jāhiz (d. 869) pointed out: "Indeed Bedouins have long life expectance, but they also lie a lot about that" (quoted from Asad, *op. cit.*, p. 274).

45. Together with these reports there is information about the long-livers who were the sons of the pre-Islamic poets and lived in the time of Islam. The son of Khaṭīm al-Ṭā'ī supposedly reached the age of 180 years (*ibid.*, pp. 234—5).

46. See Blachère, *op. cit.*, pp. 118—20; Monroe, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

47. Al-Iṣfahānī, *Kitāb al-aghānī* (The Book of Songs) (Qāhira, 1925—74), ix, p. 222; Asad, *op. cit.*, pp. 327—8.

48. See *Sharḥ al-qaṣā'id al-'ashr*, ta'līf al-Khaṭīb al-Tibrizī (Ten *Qaṣīdas* with Tibrizī's Comments) (Qāhira, 1964), pp. 237—8; Asad, *op. cit.*, pp. 536—7.

49. Accordingly in the medieval tradition there were two different terms defining what "forgeries — *manḥūl* ("ancient") and *mawḍū'* ("late") forgery of an old work: Asad, *op. cit.*, p. 632.

50. Ibn Sallām al-Jumāḥī, *op. cit.*, p. 92; Asad, *op. cit.*, p. 475.

51. *Ibid.*, p. 476.

52. Ibn Sallām al-Jumāḥī, *op. cit.*, p. 733; al-Marzūbānī, *al-Muwashshah* (Decorated) (Qāhira, 1965), p. 59; Asad, *op. cit.*, p. 323.

53. This can be stated with confidence as all illustrations given by al-Ḥātimī date to the pre-Islamic and early Muslim time (see Kudelin, *op. cit.*, pp. 114—5).

54. See I. 'Abbās, *Ta'rikh al-naqd al-adabī 'ind al-'arab* (The History of Arabic Literary Criticism) (Bayrūt, 1971), pp. 258—62.

55. In more detail see Kudelin, *op. cit.*, pp. 114—5.

56. *Dīwān 'Abīd b. al-Abras* (Bayrūt, 1964), p. 19.
 57. *Ibid.*, p. 26.
 58. *Dīwān Imru' al-Qays* (Qāhira, 1969), p. 258.
 59. Comp.: 19:21, 71; Asad, *op. cit.*, p. 362.
 60. *Ibid.*, pp. 361—2.
 61. Blachère *op. cit.*, p. 176; *Sharḥ Dīwān Zuhayr b. Abī Sulmā* (Commented *Dīwān* of Zuhayr b. Abī Sulmā) (Qāhira, 1964), p. 18; *Sharḥ al-qaṣā'id al-'ashr*, p. 220.
 62. 21:110. Translation by A. J. Arberry.
 63. Al-Iṣfahānī, *op. cit.*, iii, p. 105; comp.: 2:246.
 64. *Dīwān al-Nābigḥa al-Dhubayānī bi-tamāmih* (Full *Dīwān* of al-Nābigḥa al-Dhubayānī) (Bayrūt, 1968), p. 13; Blachère, *op. cit.*, pp. 176—7.
 65. *Dīwān al-Nābigḥa*, p. 265.
 66. 26:105—7.
 67. 11:50.
 68. Margoliouth, *op. cit.*, p. 437.
 69. *Dīwān 'Antara* (Bayrūt, [w. y.]), p. 209.
 70. *Ibid.*, p. 152.
 71. Margoliouth, *op. cit.*, p. 438.
 72. Al-Iṣfahānī, *op. cit.*, xxiv, p. 79.
 73. Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-'Arab* (The Language of Arabs) (Bayrūt, 1968), x, p. 62.
 74. It has already been mentioned before that al-Lāt in early texts could easily be replaced with the metrically equivalent to it Allah: Monroe, *op. cit.*, p. 3.
 75. Asad, *op. cit.*, p. 116.
 76. Ibn Qutayba, *Kitāb al-ma'ānī al-kabīr* (The Big Book of *ma'ānī*) (Ḥaydarābād, 1949 — reprint: Bayrūt, [w. y.]), i, pp. 199—200.
 77. Al-Iṣfahānī, *op. cit.*, iv, p. 122.
 78. 61:7.
 79. 33:41.
 80. Here it seems appropriate to mention that even in the 20th century some researchers tried to explain in the same way the presence of Muslim realities in the early Arabic poetry. From this point of view, for example, Ṭāhā Ḥusayn's views were criticized who believed all pro-Muslim poems in pre-Islamic works to be forged (in more detail about this see Asad, *op. cit.*, pp. 423—4, etc.).
 81. *Ibid.*, p. 273; Monroe, *op. cit.*, p. 3.
 82. *Dīwān 'Antara*, p. 15; *Sharḥ al-mu'allaqat al-sab'*, ta'līf al-Zawzanī (Seven *Mu'allaqas* with Zawzanī's Comments) (Qāhira, 1959), p. 146; *Sharḥ al-qaṣā'id al-'ashr*, pp. 317—8.
 83. A. E. Krymskiĭ, *Arabskaia literatura v ocherkakh i obraztsakh* (Arabic Literature in Reviews and Examples) (Moscow, 1911), pp. 154, 210.
 84. B. Ia. Shidfar, *Obraznaia sistema arabskoĭ klassicheskoi literatury (VI—XII vv.)* (Figurative System of Classical Arabic Literature (6th—12th c.)) (Moscow, 1974), p. 13.
 85. Ibn Qutayba, iii, pp. 1174—5.
 86. *Sharḥ al-mu'allaqat*, p. 146.
 87. Ibn Rashīq, *Al-'Umda fī maḥāsīn al-shi'r wa adabih wa naqdih* (The Support in the Beauties of Poetry, Its Sciences and Critics) (Bayrūt, 1972), i, p. 91.
 88. Al-Iṣfahānī, *op. cit.*, ix, p. 222; Asad, *op. cit.*, pp. 327—8.
 89. Al-Āmidī, *Al-Mu'talīf wa al-mukhtalīf* (Similar and Different) (Qāhira, 1961), p. 6; *Dīwān Imru' al-Qays*, p. 248; Asad, *op. cit.*, p. 119.
 90. About characteristic features of the development of individual author's consciousness in medieval Arabic poetry see Kudelin, *op. cit.*, pp. 50—2.
 91. *Dīwān Imru' al-Qays*, p. 248.
 92. *Ibid.*, p. 248. N. al-Asad views this and other examples (Asad, *op. cit.*, pp. 119—21) to prove that some pre-Islamic poets of the early period long and thoroughly perfected and refined their works, while this, according to the scholar, is impossible without their written fixation. If at least part of all pre-Islamic works was fixed in writing, we can confidently speak about their authenticity. This system of evidence, as we have seen, is built on a very unstable base.
 93. Al-Qādī al-Jurjānī, *Al-Wasāṭa bayn al-Mutanabbī wa kḥuṣūmih* (Mediation Between al-Mutanabbī and his Rivals) (Qāhira, [w. y.]), p. 150.
 94. In more detail see: Kudelin, *op. cit.*, pp. 118—9.
 95. Ibn Sallām al-Jumāhī, *op. cit.*, p. 22.
 96. Griažnevitch, *op. cit.*, p. 78.
 97. *Ibid.*, p. 79—80.

M. Reisner

THE LIFE OF THE TEXT AND THE FATE OF TRADITION. IV: ON THE CHARACTER OF LOVE SYMBOLISM IN THE POETIC WORKS OF 'ABD ALLĀH ANṢĀRĪ

The making of Ṣūfī love symbolism in the lyric poetry of 'Abd Allāh Anṣārī, one of the first representatives of mystic literature in the Persian language is analyzed in this article. The problem is raised in the poetological aspect, i. e. not the system of symbolic meanings of traditional images is studied here, but the character of their transformation on the way to poetic symbols. A stable set of love motives and images inherited by this Ṣūfī poet from the preceding refined court poetry and subjected by him to various changes, is in the centre of the research. Special attention is paid to the cases of incomplete symbolism of the text, when there is a possibility to examine the process of symbolism in dynamics.

The process of formation of the Ṣūfī symbols system in Persian classical poetry, with its most active phase within the period of the 11th—12th c., constituted one of sufficient factors of the poetic tradition development not only during the abovementioned period, but also afterwards. An allegoric interpretation of a text became an inseparable part of poetic canon and made a large impact on the figurative sounding of lyrical and epic poetry and the character of its perception.

A consecutive involvement of whole figurative layers of secular lyrics in the sphere of Ṣūfī symbolic system was performed due to efforts of authors of several generations. The appearance of the first original samples of mystical lyrics, which were closely connected with the requirements of ritual and sermon, was followed by constant attempts of the representatives of the new trend to review in poetry the experience of their predecessors who had worked at the courts of sovereigns, patrons of art. The tendency towards demarcation from court poetry and the aversion of its aesthetic grounds did not exclude, but determined the comprehension by the Ṣūfī poets of their work as another link in the chain of perfection of literary art.

Among the works by Russian and foreign specialists in Persian literature dedicated to mystical poetry the ones dominate in which the figurative Ṣūfī system is viewed as a stable layer of poetic terminology with stable semantics. The researchers have been primarily engaged with the task of revealing symbolic meanings from the main massive of poetic images and the study of structural ties between them (twoness of images — “face-lock”, “candle-moth”, etc., the presence of the so-called images-mediators — “wind”,

“dance”, “cup”, etc.) as well as the problems of interpretation of separate basic motives by different Ṣūfī authors [1].

What concerns the genesis of the system of Ṣūfī symbols in the purely poetological sense (the sources of motives, poetic means of their realization, etc.), its study has mostly had subsidiary character, serving as a peculiar tooling when considering the contents aspect of a Ṣūfī text.

Little interest in the artistic aspect of analysis of the early Ṣūfī lyrics must be connected with its relative, compared with the court poetry of that time, stylistic simplicity. However, this simplicity was not a complete absence of means of poetic expressiveness or lack of the form development; it is the consequence of a certain aesthetic principle. Ṣūfī poets inherited from the court poetic tradition, which they based upon, not only a rich repertoire of stereotypical images, motives and situations, but also a developed theory, i. e. a complex of concepts about poetic art. The changes introduced by the Ṣūfī authors into poetic practice and theory were, on one hand, of principal character; on the other hand they were regulated by them as they were realized within the limits of a canonical type of art. The analysis of the early stage of Ṣūfī symbolism formation can sufficiently broaden modern scientific ideas about the functioning of poetic canon as a dynamic system.

The present publication aims at studying the ways of realization of love motives in lyrical poems of 'Abd Allāh Anṣārī (1006—1088) by revealing their genetic ties with the corresponding motives of the traditional repertoire of secular *ghazal*. The material for research was selected basing on the following considerations: firstly, the analyzed texts have not caused doubts concerning their authenticity since the time of their appearance [2]; secondly, the small volume of the poetic heritage of the “Harāt elder” (about twenty poems which are insets into the rhythmical prose of the same author) makes it possible to review it within the limits of one small article; thirdly, Anṣārī's works are the closest to the origins of Ṣūfī lyrics in the Persian language and, thus, represents an almost ideal factual base for the study of the early stage of the process of symbolization of traditional poetic motives.

As is well known, the figurativeness of love lyrics, i. e. *ghazal*, lies at the basis of the Ṣūfī symbols system. Mystical-love poems dominate over works dedicated to other themes in most *dīwāns* of Ṣūfī poets. In Anṣārī's poems