

Der Gesprächsband von BOBZIN und KERMANI ist zweifellos für fachlich Interessierte, der von SCHÖNBORN für das allgemeine Publikum ergiebiger. Die drei Bücher weisen zahlreiche, zum Teil bis in einzelne Formulierungen gehende Übereinstimmungen auf und spiegeln so SCHIMMELS nur allzu gutes Gedächtnis. VON SCHÖNBORN und SCHIMMEL selbst bieten eine Kurzbibliographie. Auf eine Biobibliographie, die den Namen verdient, muss man also noch warten. Die Gesprächsbände sind sparsam illustriert, während SCHIMMEL für ihre Autobiographie einige historische Schwarzweiß-Aufnahmen zur Verfügung gestellt hat. Der Schutzumschlag dieses Werks zeigt ein schönes neues Portrait von ihr in der Pose einer altmodischen Diva mit Chiffonschal und Sonnenbrille, unter der sie, wie der zweite Blick enthüllt, eine zweite gewöhnliche Brille trägt – für mich ein wunderbares Bild für diese große Gestalt der deutschen Islamwissenschaft.

Hamburg

Karin Hörner

Philip F. KENNEDY: *The Wine Song in Classical Arabic Poetry: Abū Nuwās and the Literary Tradition*. Oxford 1997: Clarendon Press Oxford. xii, 304 pp. (Oxford Oriental Monographs).

The literary fame of Abū Nuwās al-Ḥasan b. Hānī' al-Ḥakamī (died between 813 and 815) is founded on his reputation as *poète maudit*, whose *diwān* contains brilliant examples of both the traditional poetic genres and their parodies. The poet was a contemporary – and an alleged boon companion – of Hārūn al-Rashīd (ruled 786–809). Both men became the subject of many legends, and popular stories about them are preserved through the *Arabian Nights* (Abū Nuwās (Ewald WAGNER), in: *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Leiden 21960, I, 143–144, 144b). These stories, in which the poet appears as an equal of the 'Abbāsīd caliph, document the social and political importance of poetry in the emerging Arabo-Islamic culture of the 'Abbāsīd court in Baghdad.

Philip F. KENNEDY's study is a revised version of his doctoral thesis: *The Development of the Khamriyya* (Oxford 1991). KENNEDY uses the example of Abū Nuwās' highly renowned wine poetry to discuss the changing relationship of *wasf al-khamr* to *ghazal*, *mujūn*, *hikma*, *hijā'* and *zuhdiyya* to construct the continuity of pre-Islamic traditions as well as their Islamic appropriations and parodies. He considers this process the "generic transformation" (pp. 149) of pre-Islamic tribal poetry into 'Abbāsīd court poetry. Since KENNEDY focuses on Abū Nuwās' wine poetry, he approaches *Jāhili* poetry as the prehistory of the Islamic corpus, even though he presents his poetic material in historical order so that the *Jāhili* examples always precede the Umayyad and 'Abbāsīd ones.

The study is organized in four chapters, framed by an introduction (pp. 1–18) and a conclusion (pp. 241–244). The first and the third chapters take as their starting point thematic conventions of *nasīb* and *hijā'* in the pre-Islamic *qaṣīda*: "*Khamr, Nasīb, and Ghazal*" (pp. 19–85) and "*Hijā'*, the Bacchic *Naqā'id*, and the Rhetorical

Wine Poem” (pp. 149–193). In contrast, the second and the fourth chapters are organized around the pre-Islamic concepts of fate (*al-dahr*), abstinence (*hilm*) and repentance (*tauba*): “Islam and *al-Dahr* in the *Khamriyya*” (pp. 86–148) and “*Hilm* and *Taubā*” (pp. 194–240). The study is supplemented with two appendices. In the first (pp. 245–261), KENNEDY provides “brief analytical synopses” (p. 245) of ten odes by the *mukhadram* poet al-A’shā (died ca. 629). The second (pp. 262–279) offers ten wine poems by Abū Nuwās, their Arabic text and an English translation. In addition, the Arabic text of seven other wine poems by Abū Nuwās is fully quoted within the study (pp. 49, 66, 116, 142–143, 178–179 and 222). The two appendices illustrate KENNEDY’s understanding of how *khamriyya* evolved as a separate poetic genre during a period of roughly two hundred years – from al-A’shā to Abū Nuwās. Although the book is published in a series of “specialist studies” (p. i.), KENNEDY included a “Glossary of Arabic Terms” (pp. 280–285) that will be very useful to the non-specialists because it provides straightforward translations of basic vocabulary – such as *dīn*, *hamm* or *ṭarab* – as well as short explanations of technical terms – such as *qaṣīda*, *wasf* or *ghazal*. The work concludes with a bibliography (pp. 286–294), an “Index of Authors of Secondary Literature” (pp. 294–295), and a “General Index” (pp. 297–304).

Abū Nuwās’ *dīwān* is available in an excellent critical edition: ABŪ NUWĀS: *Dīwān*, vols. 1–3 ed. by Ewald WAGNER and vol. 4 ed. by Gregor SCHOELER, Wiesbaden 1958–1988 (Bibliotheca Islamica, 20 a–d). But KENNEDY uses the 1953 Cairo edition by Aḥmad ‘Abd al-Majid AL-GHAZZĀLĪ, explaining “[o]nly after amassing the bulk of my references was the third volume of Ewald WAGNER’s edition of the *Dīwān* (containing the *khamriyyāt*) made available to me” (p. vii). KENNEDY documents discrepancies between the two editions in the footnotes, though he does not always give the reference to WAGNER’s edition. Moreover, he does not provide a concordance of the two editions, although WAGNER’s edition has no index based on first lines and *qāfiyāt*.

KENNEDY’s interpretation of Abū Nuwās’ poems is based on a biographical reading: The poet is the persona of the poem. KENNEDY uses phrases – such as, “it is possible to detect the voice of the poet himself” (p. 38); “in the following two lines he [*i. e.* Abū Nuwās] speaks of himself” (p. 84); or “It is only in the *zuhdiyya* of Abū Nuwās that the treatment of *tauba* may be deemed to be sincere”; (p. 240) – to answer the question of whose voice is heard in these poems. KENNEDY observes that Abū Nuwās’ “best poems are individual” (p. 84), implying that some of his individual poems can be taken as personal statements in the Romantic sense of lyrical poetry. He argues further that Abū Nuwās composed his poems with the expectation of “the audience’s” knowledge of his *dīwān* as a whole” (p. 77 note 157) to support his “interpretation based on accumulative knowledge of the poet’s bacchic narratives” (p. 77). These considerations indicate an implicit theory of how the poems and their codification in the *dīwān* are related to the poet’s biography. But KENNEDY does not make his implicit theory explicit, even though every scholar of Abū Nuwās’ poetry has to confront both historical evidence and mythical stories about the poet’s life. Abū Nuwās’ extraordinary fame influenced the posthumous compilations of his *dīwān*, and the legendary material about his life outweighs the

very scant external evidence (Ewald WAGNER: *Die Überlieferung des Abū Nuwās-Diwan und seine Handschriften*, Mainz 1958; compare idem: *Abū Nuwās: Eine Studie zur arabischen Literatur der frühen Abbāsidenzeit*, Wiesbaden 1965: p. 1–9).

One may admire KENNEDY for his unfazed approach to the nitty-gritty details of source criticism: “That Abū Nuwās emerged as the apogee and perfecter of the *khamriyya* is due not only to his talent but also to the fact that he produced far more than any other poet ... It is the combination of quality and quantity (over 300 *khamriyyāt*) that established his identification with the genre in the Arabic literary tradition” (p. 241). KENNEDY does not perceive the codification of the *dīwān* as a problem, and, consequently, does not discuss the authenticity of his examples. He first argues with aesthetic plausibility that “Wagner’s edition of the poem [*i. e.* a *rā’iyya* that opens: “Saqā Allāhu zabyan ...”] has *ḥurr*, which destroys this interpretation. *Ḥurr* is certainly the easier reading but I am inclined to resist it, if only for the sake of airing a plausible irony contained in the poem.” (p. 79 note 160). He then uses the poems’ aesthetic qualities as a shield against criticism because responding to poetry be a personal, almost intimate, process: “Since, however, one is speaking of poetry, much necessarily depends on a personal aesthetic response to the material” (p. 244). Although the observation of personal bias is as correct as it is troubling with regard to the methodological assumptions of literary criticism as an academic discipline, it is the closing statement of KENNEDY’s study of medieval Arabic poetry.

KENNEDY answers the question of how *khamriyya* evolved as a separate poetic genre by presenting a collage of single lines and short excerpts, as well as by line-by-line interpretations of whole poems by Abū Nuwās. He considers his interpretation the result of “essaying a rigorous method” (p. 244). But in his introduction, KENNEDY surveys modern scholarship on both *khamriyya* and Abū Nuwās without discussing the methodological assumptions of his predecessors, and he mentions only shortly that coherence is important in his own analysis (p. 16). Central to KENNEDY’s methodology is the distinction between two different forms of poems. He takes “composite ode[s]” (p. 94) with a “figurative link” (p. 83) between different sections as an expression of “a primarily descriptive art” (p. 41), while Abū Nuwās’ wine poems have a “specific narrative connection” (p. 65) because of their “narrative focal point” (p. 83). With regard to so-called classical Arabic poetry, the ruling paradigm still holds that poems are poetry and hence not narratives. KENNEDY’s use of the term *narrative* seems to constitute a breach with this paradigm, though, unfortunately, he does not address the issue, and neither the noun *coherence* nor the adjective *narrative* is listed in the “General Index” (p. 298 and 302).

One may consider the absence of any discussion of methodological problems a blessing because literary theory is not used to distract attention from the poetry itself. Yet, KENNEDY’s study appears terminologically confused because theoretical issues – such as narrative structures in poems, intertextuality (p. 56 *et passim*), audience expectations (p. 73) and post-structuralism (p. 102 note 48) – permeate the text without ever being put into perspective with regard to their applicability to medieval Arabic poetry. KENNEDY claims that he interprets wine poetry from “a more exhaustive literary perspective” (p. 39): The poems are not taken “as a social mirror” (p. 244), but “social issues ... are discussed where they serve to empha-

size literary features" (*ibid.*). KENNEDY remains equidistant from both contemporary and medieval societal attitudes toward all forms of indulgence, and arrives at an equanimous perspective on *muġūn* that aims at parodying "the decorum of formal love poetry" (p. 61) and thus becomes "eroticism/*muġūn*" (p. 241). For example, he characterizes Abū Nuwās' poem "rubba ghazālin ..." (ed. Wagner, III, 348–349 s. v. #305) as "a light-hearted piece which includes an amusing joke" (p. 75): The lyrical ego first admires a pretty boy, ponders that boys cannot get pregnant – "fa-mā / uġbila min waṣlinā" (line 4) – and then forces the boy to drink – "awjartu-hū al-qarqafa al-'uqāra" (line 9a) – so that the boy's cries conclude the poem: "ḥalifa ḥuznin muladhda'a al-kabidi" (*the familiar pain! the burning heart!* – line 12b). Unfortunately, KENNEDY does not explain for which audience such a poem is easy entertainment with a "bawdy ending" (p. 75), although there are at least three different 'Abbāsīd audiences: free men who are the caliph's boon companions, male and female slaves and servants at the caliph's court, or male literati without access to the caliph's banquets. This case illustrates how KENNEDY's hands-off attitude – charming though it may be – toward the theoretical foundations and historical assumptions of his own interpretations makes it difficult to follow his arguments, concerning his central question: How 'Abbāsīd wine poetry interacts with its social, religious and ethical discourses.

Bloomington, Indiana

Dagmar Riedel

Sayed M. Bagher TALGHARIZADEH: *Die Risāla fī l-hudūt* (Die Abhandlung über die Entstehung) von Ṣadr ad-Din Muḥammad Ibn Ibrāhīm aṣ-Širāzī (1572–1640). 2000 Berlin.

Existiert die Welt schon von der Urewigkeit an oder ist sie zeitlich von Gott erschaffen worden; dies war und ist seit jeher die zentrale Frage der islamischen Philosophie und Theologie um die Gott- und Weltbeziehung. Wenn die Welt ewig wäre, so stünden die Zeitlosigkeit und damit die Einheit Gottes in Frage und zugleich die Allmacht des Schöpfergottes; Gott und die Welt würden somit äquivalent und adäquat. Wäre das Gegenteil der Fall, dann müsste Gott für „eine Weile“ untätig gewesen sein bzw. würde seinem Wissen das Nichtsein oder Nichtwissen vorausgehen. Ṣadr ad-Dīn aṣ-Širāzī, bekannt als Mullā Ṣadrā, geht dieser komplexen Frage in allen seinen Werken leidenschaftlich, wie seine islamischen Vordenker al-Fārābī, Ibn Sīnā (Avicenna) und Ibn Ruṣd (Averroes), auf den metaphysischen Grund. Sein Verdienst ist nicht zu übersehen. Er lässt seinen Landsleuten Ehre zukommen, nicht nur, weil die Schule von Isfahan seinen Namen als Gründer trägt, sondern auch, weil durch ihn und seine Schule die islamische Philosophie nach Ibn Ruṣd im Osten wiederbelebt wurde. Ṣadrā hat für die Iraner eine Bedeutung wie Kant für die Deutschen, mit dem Unterschied, dass er im Gegensatz zu Kant keine kritische Metaphysik, sondern eine Erneuerung und Wiederbelebung einer islamischen Metaphysik betreibt.

Der Islam Bd. 80, S. 334–337

© Walter de Gruyter 2003

ISSN 0021-1818

Brought to you by | Columbia University Library The Burke Library

Authenticated | 128.59.161.30

Download Date | 8/29/12 6:25 PM