Return to top

CHAPTER 11

Musammaṭ, *muwashshaḥ* and *zajal*: questions of origins and interrelation

Gregor Schoeler [University of Basel] *

As regards the question of the origin of the two Andalusian Arabic genres of stanzaic poetry, *muwashshaḥ*[1] and *zajal*,[2] there is a large degree of consensus that they are further developments of the Eastern Arabian *musammaṭ*,[3] a simpler form of stanzaic poetry. This was first argued by Martin Hartmann (1851-1918) in *Das arabische Strophengedicht* (1897)[4] and has been shared of late by most Arabic-speaking researchers and most Arabists. An origin in Romance forms, advocated for the first time by Julián Ribera y Tarragó (1858-1934), is assumed at present only by a few. The objective of the first part of this article is to give substantial evidence for the validity of the "Arabic theory". I intend to show that a continuous line of development can be drawn from the *musammaṭ* to both of the Andalusian Arabic stanzaic genres. In the second part, I intend to discuss – and to refute – the arguments proffered in favour of the "Romance" (including the "Irish") and other hypotheses.

1. The *musammaṭ* with the rhyme pattern aaa ***a***, bbb ***a***, ccc ***a*** appears around the year CE 800, as witnessed in a wine poem by Abū Nuwās (d. c. 200/815).[5] However, the *musammaṭ* does not appear out of the blue. The recurrent rhyme which comes in the *musammaṭ* at the end of each stanza (common rhyme) is a characteristic feature of the *qaṣīda* where it occurs at the end of each verse; and the rhyme changing from one stanza to the next (separate rhyme) has its precursor in the rhetorical figure of *taṣrīʿ* (a special form of internal rhyme). This stylistic device is already encountered in Old Arabic poetry, with particular frequence in the dirges of al-Khansāʾ (d. after 644). For example:[6]

ḥammālu ***alwiyatin*** habbāṭu ***awdiyatin*** shahhādu ***andiyatin*** lil-jayshi jarrārū

In some poems, the figure appears in several verses successively;[7] for example, in the following passage from a dirge by Abū l-Muthallam (d. c. 600):[8]

law kāna lil-dahri mālun ʿinda mutlidihī la-kāna lil-dahri Ṣakhrun māla qunyānī
ābī l-***haḍīmati*** nābin bil-ʿ***aẓīmati*** *mit-* lāfu l-***karīmati*** lā siqṭun wa-lā wānī
ḥāmī l-***ḥaqīqati*** nassālu l-***wadīqati*** mi- ʿtāqu l-***wasīqati*** jaldun ghayru thunyānī
rabbāʾu ***marqabat***in mannāʿu ***maghlabatin*** rakkābu ***salhabatin*** qaṭṭāʿu aqrānī
habbāṭu ***awdiyatin*** ḥammālu ***alwiyatin*** shahhādu ***andiyatin*** sirḥānu fityānī

In all but the first of these verses we are almost presented with a *musammaṭ*. The further development into a proper *musammaṭ* consists in the regular employment of the internal rhyme (*taṣrīʿ*) in each of the poem's verses and its consistent purity. This is indeed the case in the very first *musammaṭ* that has come down to us, a wine poem by Abū Nuwās (d. c. 200/815) in the recension of Abū Bakr al-Ṣūlī (d. c. 335/946).[9]

sulāfu dannī	a
ka-shamsi dajnī	a
ka-māʾi muznī	a
ka-damʿi jafnī	***a***
ṭabīkhu shamsī	b
ka-lawni warsī	b
rabību fursī	b
ḥalīfu sijnī	***a***

This *musammaṭ* betrays its provenance from the *qaṣīda* in that it can at the same time "still" be perceived as a *qaṣīda*,[10] and written as such:

sulāfu dannin, ka-shamsi dajnī, ka-māʾi muznin, ka-damʿi jafnī
ṭabīkhu shamsin, ka-lawni warsin, rabību fursin, ḥalīfu sijnī

Another *qaṣīd-musammaṭ* is attributed to Ḥammād al-Rāwiya (d. c. 155/772).[11] Writing this poem as a *musammaṭ* yields the following scheme:

ʿafat dāra Salmā bi-mufḍā l-raghāmī	***a***
riyāḥun taʿāqabuhā kulla ʿāmī	***a***
khilāfa l-ḥulūlī	b
bi-tilka l-ṭulūlī	b
wa-saḥbi l-dhuyūlī	b
bi-dhāka l-maqāmī	***a***
wa-unsi l-diyārī	c
wa-qurbi l-jiwārī	c
wa-ṭībi l-mazārī	c
wa-raddi l-salāmī	***a***
wa-dahrin gharīrī	d
wa-ʿayshi l-surūrī	d
wa-naʾyi l-ghayūrī	d
wa-ḥusni al-kalāmī	***a***

In this poem, originating in the early 9th century or earlier,[12] we already have the exact rhyme pattern of the *zajal* before our eyes. The first regular "*qaṣīd*" verse corresponds to the two introductory lines of the *zajal*, namely the *maṭlaʿ* (prelude). And like with the *zajal*, the rhyme scheme of the final part of the stanza (common rhyme lines; Ar. *simṭ*; Span. *vuelta*) constitutes one-half of the rhyme scheme of the introductory lines (*maṭlaʿ*).

The same formal structure as the previously treated poem is exhibited by the wine poem of Abū Nuwās, quoted above, in the recension of Ḥamza al-Iṣfahānī (d. c. 360/971).[13] There, too, the first verse is preceded by a *maṭlaʿ*:

taḥāma dhikrā ḥiman bi-ḥaznī	a
wa-ʿmid li-dhikrā khumūri saknī	a
sulāfu dannī	a
ka-shamsi dajnī	a
ka-māʾi muznī	a
ka-damʿi jafnī	***a***
ṭabīkhu shamsī	b
ka-lawni warsī	b
rabību fursī	b
ḥalīfu sijnī	***a***

Although these two *musammaṭs* with a *maṭlaʿ* exhibit the exact rhyme pattern of the *zajal*, they do not yet have its precise formal structure, nor, of course, its vernacular language. This is because in the basic *zajal* form the *maṭlaʿ* lines, as a rule, are of equal length as the rest of the lines.

However, there is a very old *musammaṭ* corresponding not only in rhyme pattern but also in formal structure to the *zajal* "proper". It has been attributed – erroneously – to the pre-Islamic poet Imruʾ al-Qays ('Ps.-Imruʾ al-Qays I').[14, 15] The poem is old, however, and may have already originated in the 8th century.

tawahhamtu min Hindin maʿālima aṭlālī	***a***
ʿafāhunna ṭūlu l-dahri fī l-zamani l-khālī	***a***
marābiʿu min Hindin khalat wa-maṣāyifū	b
yaṣīḥu bi-maghnāhā ṣadan wa-ʿawāzifū	b
wa-ghayyarahā hūju l-riyāḥi l-ʿawāṣifu	b
wa-kullu musiffin thumma ākharu rādifū	b
bi-asḥama min nawʾi l-simākayni haṭṭālī	***a***
wa-mustaʾlimin [mustalʾimin] kashshaftu bil-ramḥi dhaylahū	c
aqamtu bi-ʿaḍbin dhī safāsiqa maylahū	c
fajaʿtu bihī fī multaqā l-ḥayyi khaylahū	c
taraktu ʿitāqa l-ṭayri taḥjulu ḥawlahū	c
ka-anna ʿalā athwābihī naḍḥa jiryālī	***a***

In a rhyme pattern and formal structure that is absolutely identical with this *musammaṭ* we have, for example, the following *zajal* by Ibn Quzmān (d. 555/1160) (no. 145):[16]

nirīd an nuqul lak khabar,	***a***
ḥalāwa fī hawlā l-sumar	***a***
Kuthayyir anā aw Jamīl?	b
futintu bi-lawnan nabīl	b
khilāsī aw akthar qalīl	b
bi-ḥāl an yirīd an yimīl	b
ilā l-ṣufra thumma khtaṣar	***a***

Samuel M. Stern, who was familiar with the first stanza of *musammaṭ* Ps. Imruʾ al-Qays I, had already briefly suggested that the *zajal* might be nothing but a *musammaṭ* with *maṭlaʿ* composed in the vernacular; but he had misgivings about drawing a definitive conclusion.[17] James T. Monroe on the other hand, one of the last followers of the Romance theory, denies any connection of the *musammat* with the *zajal*.

Another specimen, likewise attributed to Imruʾ al-Qays ('Ps.-Imruʾ al-Qays II'), is provided by Abū l-ʿAlāʾ al-Maʿarrī (d. 449/1057) in the *Risālat al-ghufrān*:[18]

yā ṣaḥbanā ʿarrijū	b
taqif bikum usujū	b
mahriyyatun dulujū	b
fī sayrihā muʿujū	b
ṭālat bihā l-riḥalū	***a***
fa-ʿarrajū kulluhum	c
wal-hammu yashghaluhum	c
wal-ʿīsu taḥmiluhum	c
laysat tuʿalliluhum	c
wa-ʿājati l-rumulu	***a***

We have before us here a *musammaṭ* without *maṭlaʿ*. *Zajal*s in this form do exist, although they are seldom (or never) found with Ibn Quzmān. On the other hand, they are frequently found with later Andalusian *zajjāl*s (e.g. al-Shushtarī, d. 668/1269),[19] as well as with non-Andalusian *zajjāls*.[20]

In order to explain the emergence of the most complicated type of Arabic stanzaic poetry, the *muwashshaḥ* – according to indigenous tradition around CE 900[21] – we must draw on both types of *musammaṭ*: the one with and the one without *maṭlaʿ*; for commensurate with these there are *muwashshaḥs* with *maṭlaʿ* – they are called "complete" (*tāmm*), and others without *maṭlaʿ*, designated as "bald" (*aqraʿ*). For explaining the structure of the *muwashshaḥ*, however, these two *musammaṭ* types alone are insufficient. In fact, we still need to deal with the other constitutive element of *muwashshah*: the *kharja*.[22] This is a

direct speech, often the quotation of a song put in the mouth of a (mostly female) singer, or of a saying (adage); in colloquial Arabic or Romance, or a mixture of both, more rarely also in Classical Arabic. The *kharja* always stands at the end of the poem; and there it makes up the last group of lines with common rhyme (*simṭ*; *vuelta*). An example of a "complete" *muwashshaḥ* with a (largely) Romance *kharja* is the following poem:[23]

wa-laylin ṭaraqnā dayra khammārī	***a***
fa-min bayni ḥurrāsin wa-summārī	***a***
fa-ātat lanā l-khamra bi-taʿjīlī	b
wa-qāmat bi-tarḥībin wa-tabjīlī	b
wa-qad aqsamat bi-mā fī l-injīlī:	b
mā labbastuhā thawban siwā l-qārī	***a***
wa-māʿ ʿuriḍat yawman ʿalā l-nārī	***a***
.....	
.....	
wa-rubba fatātin futinat fīhī	c
tuʿalliluhā bil-ṣaddi wal-tīhī	c
fa-qad anshadat wa-hya tughannīhī:	c
"amānu amānu yā l-malīḥ ghāri	***a***
bərqəy tū qarish bi-llāhi məttāri"	***a***

Here the *kharja* is made up of two lines. As with the *muwashshaḥs* in general, all groups of lines with common rhyme (*asmāṭ*), including the prelude (*maṭlaʿ*), have exactly the same formal structure and rhyme pattern as the *kharja*; this in contradistiction to the *musammaṭ* and the *zajal* where the last *simṭ*, and all other *asmāṭ* as well (mostly consisting of one line), reproduces only half of the elements of the prelude (mostly consisting of two lines).

We shall start by explaining the *kharja*. By placing the quotation (Arab. *taḍmīn*) at the end of the poem, the originator of the *muwashshaḥ* links up with a tradition existing in Arabic poetry long before his time. Ewald Wagner, in his *Abū Nuwās* monograph, was the first to indicate that this poet frequently had his wine poems, love poems and ribald poems end with a quotation *(taḍmīn*), and that he thereby uses the same stylistic device later employed by *muwashshaḥ* poets through their introduction of the *kharja*.[24] Abū Nuwās often quotes a song, sometimes also a saying; the quotation appears with him as well most often in the last verse or hemistich. Alan Jones has compiled and discussed these final *taḍmīns* in the work of Abū Nuwās with some comprehensiveness. Wagner had, however, already pointed out that the poet, in one instance, had had a poem (a *mujūniyya*) end with a phrase in a language other than Arabic, namely, Persian:[25]

yā ghāsila l-ṭarjahārī
lil-khandarīsi l-ʿuqārī
...
yā narjisī wa-bahārī:
bi-dih marā yak bārī

O you, who washes the flask (or: jug)
for the old wine!
...
O my narcissus and ox-eye daisy:
"Give me an audience!"

This stylistic device was described by the Romanist Heinrich Lausberg: the *kharja*s were intended by the poets as a "contentual climax comprising pathos and *agudeza*".[26] Lausberg follows in this regard the theorist of *muwashshaḥ* poetry, Ibn Sanāʾ al-Mulk, who claimed that the *kharja* should be "the pepper of the *muwashshaḥ*, its salt and sugar, its musk and ambergris", etc.[27] A corresponding effect was obviously intended by Abū Nuwās through the affixture of a final *taḍmīn* in so many of his poems.[28] What is novel

with the *muwashshaḥ* is that in its final part, both types of *taḍmīn* usually appear in combined form, namely, direct speech (quotation, for instance a song quote or an adage) and non-classical Arabic (vernacular) expression.

What made the originator of the *muwashshaḥ* decide to place his *taḍmīn*s at the end of a *musammaṭ* and not at the end of a *qaṣīda*? It was certainly because solely the structure of the *musammaṭ* offered the possibility to place lines of varied metric structure and complicated rhyme patterns at the end of the poem. He put these lines in the place of the last line of a *musammaṭ* with common rhyme (*simṭ*); this step, in turn, made it necessary for him to adapt the other common rhyme lines to this structure in order to maintain symmetry.

At the moment that a poet in al-Andalus – according to indigenous tradition around CE 900 (but see fn 21) – got the idea to close a stanzaic poem – and not, like Abū Nuwās, a *qaṣīda* – with a direct speech, song quotation or a text in Romance or colloquial Arabic, and to commensurately expand the structure of the poem, the *muwashshaḥ* was born. I would even like to go a step further and argue that the *muwashshaḥ* owes its existence to the intention of an Andalusian poet to be able to place yet longer and more complicated, and thereby even more effective, quotations at the end of the poem, something that for the Eastern poets was not possible in the *qaṣida*.

Never would it have been possible to place a *kharja* like the following [29] at the end of a *qaṣīda*:

(A. Jones)		(F. Corriente)[30]
mū (?; fən?) sīdi Ibrāhīm	a	Ven sidi abrahim,
yā nwāmmi (?) dalji	b	ya nwemne dolče
fānta mīb	c	vent a(d)mib
ḏī nuxti	d	de noxte.
in nūn ši-nūn kāriš	e	O non, ši non kereš
f-īrīmə tīb	c	virem a(d) tib:
gari mi ūb	c	garre(d)me ob
ləgar-ti	d	liqarte.

Come, Ibrāhīm, my master,
O sweet name (?),
come to me in the night!
O no! If it is not your wish,
then I shall go to you:
Tell me where
we shall meet.

Our thesis leaves it open whether the *kharja* was originally a previously existing text (colloquial Arabic, Romance or hybrid), or a concoction devised by the author himself or taken over from elsewhere, or – what to me seems most likely – whether *kharja*s of all of these types were in existence.

II

Those who argue for the Romance origin of Andalusian-Arabic stanzaic poetry can come up with no old Romance texts evidencing the model for *muwashshaḥ* and *zajal*. The earliest Galician-Portuguese *cantigas de amigo* that have a thematic similarity with the *kharja*s (or, rather, with a certain type of *kharja*) are from the end of the 12th century; thus they do not appear until long after the emergence of *muwashshaḥ* and *zajal*. Moreover, they also do not have a structure in which separate rhyme and common rhyme regularly alternate; much rather, they have authentic refrain lines:[31]

Foy-ss[e] o meu periurado	b
e non m'enuia mandado;	b
deseia-lo-ey	*A*
Ay madr' o que ben queria	c
foi-ss'ora d'aqui sa uya;	c
deseia-lo-ey.	*A*
..	
..	
deseia-lo-ey.	*A*

So although the formal structure of an individual stanza of such a *cantiga* could be brought into association with a certain type of *kharja*, this is not so for the overall *muwashshaḥ*. There is also no evidence at all that the *kharjas* are the leftovers from longer *muwashshaḥ*-like stanzaic poems in Romance.[32]

As far as I know, only one Arabist of distinction, James T. Monroe, supports at present the hypothesis of the Romance, or non-Arabic, origin of Andalusian-Arabic stanzaic poetry,[33] although he appears not fully convinced of correctness of his hypothesis.[34]

The first of Monroe's argument is this: "[1] The individual lines of the strophic *musammaṭ* never contain internal caesuras, [2] while its *maṭlaʿ* or initial refrain normally contains four times (aaaa, bbba, ccca, etc.) rather than twice the number of lines normally found in the *vuelta/simṭ* of the *zajal* (AA, bbb*a*, ccc*a*, etc."[35]

The claim in the first sentence [1] of this argument is strange, because Monroe quotes on the same page [36] the famous passage from Ibn Bassām's *al-Dhakhīra* [37] according to which the *muwashshaḥ* in several successive steps was developed progressively from simple forms without internal caesuras (akin to the *musammaṭ*) to complicated forms (*muwashshaḥ*s with caesuras in the *asmāṭ* and the *aghṣān*). On the other hand, there are – in later times as well – *muwashshaḥ*s having no internal caesuras and internal rhymes in the lines. As for the *zajal*, its basic type (aa bbba, ccca, etc.) which is the most widespread type of this genre in general, does not contain internal rhyme.

My objection to Monroe's point in the second sentence [2] is the following:

Nobody has suggested that the *muwashshaḥ* originates from the *musammaṭ* type aaaa, bbba, ccca etc. (e.g. Abū Nuwās' *musammaṭ*); rather, types like Ps.-Imruʾ al-Qays I and II, discussed above, are candidates as models for the *muwashshaḥ*. Moreover, Monroe's classification of the first four lines in the *musammaṭ* type aaaa, bbba, ccca, etc. is flawed; the first three *a* are not the *maṭlaʿ*, or part of a *maṭlaʿ*, rather they are the first *aghsān* here rhyming with the *asmāṭ* (the fourth and all other *a*) which is optional. In many other *musammaṭs* the first *aghṣān* do not rhyme with the first s*imṭ* (see e.g. Imruʾ al-Qays II).

Monroe's second argument for not seeing the *musammaṭ* as the model for *muwashshaḥ* and *zajal* is that "the *musammaṭ* is a very rare form ... , of which hardly a dozen examples are known".[38] According to him, only a good dozen of them are extant. This overlooks the fact that Ibn Rashīq, shortly after treating the *musammaṭ* cited above, and even another one without *maṭlaʿ*, remarks explicitly:[39] "I have noticed that there is a number (of poets) who compose *mukhammas's* and *musammaṭ*s, and they do so in great quantities (*wa-yukthirūna minhā*). But I have found none among the older, skilful poets who does anything of the like" (he then, however, names exceptions).

In fact, the *musammaṭs* that have come down to us are really not as rare as Monroe would suggest.[40] Major poets like Tamīm b. al-Muʿizz (d. 501/1108), Ibn Zaydūn (d. 463/1070), al-Ḥarīri (d. 516/1122) and Ṣafī al-Din al-Ḥillī (d. c. 750/1349) have composed *musammaṭs*, not to mention the numerous *takhmīs*'s (a special kind of *musammaṭ*)[41] which appear as of the 6th/12th century.

Monroe's third and last argument is that an Irish "*zajal*esque poem that is certainly of the same age, and very possibly older" than Abū Nuwās' *musammaṭ* would be a better candidate for having given rise to a model for the Andalusian stanzaic genres than the Arabic *musammaṭ*. This claim is briefly dealt with in Federico Corriente's paper in the present volume.

Seen by Monroe to be closely related to the problem of origin is the question "which came first, chronologically speaking, the *zajal* or the *muwaššaḥ*". He also refers here to an earlier essay in which he treated the problem in greater detail.[42] In his opinion, the colloquial *zajal* is the earlier emerging genre; the *muwashshaḥ* is held by him to be a learned derivative of the *zajal*, not vice versa.

Responding to the arguments of Monroe, my view [43] is that:

1. It is undisputed that the fully developed *zajal* as encountered in Ibn Quzmān is younger than the *muwashshaḥ* whose first extant testimonies are from the 11th century.

2. Poems with the rhyme pattern of the *zajal* (aa bbb a), however, are very much older than the first preserved *muwashshaḥ*s; they appear already around 800 as a variety of the *musammaṭ* (*musammaṭ* with *maṭlaʿ;* cf. above, Imruʾ al-Qays I). As of the 10th century there are also Hebrew poems with this rhyme pattern (e.g. Dūnash b. Labrāṭ, "who used the *musammaṭ* almost to the total exclusion of other forms".[44] All of these poems, however, are composed in classical Arabic or in Hebrew, not in the vernacular. Nonetheless, it is very well possible that, long before the emergence of the *muwashshaḥ,* this rhyme pattern was already also used for vernacular poems; such poems were thus nothing other than *zajal*s. In this case the *zajal* would be older than the *muwashshaḥ*. Nothing of this sort, however, has been preserved; hence the whole consideration must remain hypothetical.

3. There are reports from the 9th and 10th centuries in which the singing or reciting of *zajal*s is mentioned.[45] As these poems are not quoted or described in these reports, we do not know if these are fully developed "terminological" *zajal*s of the kind authored by Ibn Quzmān. This must be considered as most unlikely.

4. Although the verses cited in Ibn Ḥayyān's *K. al-Muqtabis* [46] and termed "proto-*zajal*" by some modern scholars were composed in the vernacular, they nonetheless do not yet have the *zajal* structure.[47]

Since as proof of his hypothesis that *muwashshaḥ* and *zajal* are "native Ibero-Romance forms adopted by the Arabs in Andalus" Monroe can provide no early Romance exemplars for this stanzaic form – for there are none – he directs attention to the late *zajal*esque poetic forms *virelai, cantiga, villancico dansa, laude*, etc., emerging at the start of the 13th century all over the Romance speaking countries. These genres do in fact exhibit precise structural parallels to the much earlier appearing Arabic genres (not only to the *zajal* but, though more rarely, to the *muwashshaḥ* as well) and for this reason are derived by the followers of the "Arabic theory" from these Arabic poetic genres.[48] Monroe sees it otherwise. He holds *virelai, cantiga*, etc. to be a continuation of a hypothetical old genuine-European *zajal*esque form, allegedly borrowed already at a much earlier date by Arabic-speaking minstrels from their Romance-speaking colleagues "when Ibero-Romance was still the dominant language on the Iberian peninsula". As evidence of the existence of this old European form Monroe proffers a poem from the Irish epic *Tain bo Qualnge* [49] that may – according to him – already have been committed to writing in the mid-7th century, or in the 9th century at the latest. I dismiss this "evidence" as without foundation – as does Federico Corriente in the paper published in this present volume [Chapter 3] .

The untenability of Monroe's hypothesis that the Andalusian stanzaic genres have nothing to do with the *musammaṭ* can also be illustrated from another side. Monroe asserts, following S. G. Armistead: "To confuse these two genres (scil. *musammaṭ* on the one hand, and *muwashshaḥ* [and *zaja*l] on the other) is tantamount to confusing speed with bacon."[50] He overlooks in this regard that there do exist poems which are something between *muwashshaḥ* and *musammaṭ*. This is true of one of Ibn Zaydūn's (d. 463/1070) *musammaṭ*s [51] for it exhibits a *kharja*:

Ibn Zaydūn

fa-qul li-zamānin qad tawallā naʿīmuhū	b
wa-raththat ʿalā marri l-layālī rusūmuhū	b
wa-kam raqqa fīhi bil-ʿashiyyi nasīmuhū	b
wa-lāḥat li-sārī l-layli fīhi nujūmuhū:	b
"ʿalayka mina l-ṣabbi l-mashūqi salāmū"	***a***

Say to a time whose bliss is gone,
whose traces were worn down with the passage of time,
whose breeze in the evening – O how often – blew gently ,
and whose stars shone for one travelling by night:
"Peace be upon you – from a yearning lover!"

And it holds also for the anonymous "bald" *muwashshaḥ ʿUddat al-jalīs* no. 164,[52] which, like the *musammaṭ*, has only *asmāṭ* consisting of one line (the last *simṭ*, the "*kharja",* exhibits only the name of the *mamdūḥ*, and is therefore markedly weak):

him bil-ṣabā wa-daʿī	b
maqāla dhī waraʿī	b
fa-innamā l-almaʿī	b
man bāta lam yasmaʿī	b
fī l-ḥubbi min ʿadhalī	***a***
kam dhā uqāsī l-gharām	c
fī ḥubbi badri l-tamām	c
wa-qad aliftu l-saqām	c
wa-rāḥati fī btisām	c
Muḥammadi bni ʿAlī	***a***

Fall in love as in the foolishness of youth and leave aside
pious talk,
clever is the one
who in love succeeds
to no longer hear reproof.

How much hot desire do I endure
in (the) love to a "full moon",
thus have I become familiar with suffering,
yet my consolation
lies in the smile of
Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī.

If its formal structure is taken as a criterion, then Ibn Zaydūn's poem is a *musammaṭ*; but likewise the anonymous poem *ʿUddat al-jalīs* Nr. 164, which Ibn Bishrī included in his *muwashshaḥ* collection; because all of its *asmāṭ*, and therefore the *kharja*, as well, have only *one* line. If, however, the presence of a *kharja* is taken as criterion for classification, then Ibn Zaydūn's poem is a *muwashshaḥ*, since it has a *kharja*, and indeed one which is more clearly marked (it contains a phrase in direct speech!) than the *kharja* of

muwashshaḥ No. 164 (which consists only of a name).

As a last point, it should be pointed out that *musammaṭ* Ps.-Imruʾ al-Qays II and *muwashshaḥ ʿUdda* no. 164 exhibit the same formal structure (no *maṭlaʿ*; 4 *aghṣān*) as well as the same metre (*rajaz*; catalectic dimeter); perhaps Ps.-Imruʾ al-Qays II was the formal prototype of *ʿUdda* No. 164:

yā ṣaḥbanā ʿarrijū	b	him bil-ṣabā wa-daʿī
taqif bikum usujū	b	maqāla dhī waraʿī
mahriyyatun dulujū	b	fa-innamā l-almaʿī
fī sayrihā muʿujū	b	man bāta lam yasmaʿī
ṭālat bihā r-riḥalū	***a***	***fī l-ḥubbi min ʿadhalī***

Given all the above considerations, I express full agreement with Corriente when he terms Monroe's attempt to prove *muwashshaḥ* and *zajal* to be "native Ibero-Romance forms adopted by the Arabs in Andalus" "a hopeless last stand for the hypothesis of a Romance origin of Andalusi poetry".[53]

III

Finally, I propose to deal with two further hypotheses concerning the origin of the Andalusian Arabic stanzaic poetry.

1. In Iḥsān ʿAbbās' view, it is "the people's need for singing" that is responsible for the origin of the *muwashaḥ* and the *zajal*.[54] It is indeed undisputed that song can have had an influence on the form of the stanzaic poem, and it is conceivable, e.g., that the splitting up of text lines and the introduction of internal caesuras and internal rhymes was prompted by the melodies. It is, however, hard to imagine that "the need for singing" – unmediatedly and without the precedence of an existing text tradition – took effect and gave rise to these forms. Moreover, not all *muwashshaḥs* and *zajals* were sung;[55] and although it can be assumed that both genres were made for singing, it can be ruled out that a melody was composed for all poems.

2. According to a hypothesis advanced by Jarir Abu-Haidar, it is the poet's objective to multiply the rhyme in the poem as a decorative motif that has generated the *muwashshaḥ*; "it was as part of this decorative motif that the 'alien' [foreign-language] *kharja* was introduced into the *muwashshaḥ*".[56] Abu-Haidar is furthermore of the opinion that the wealth of rhyme intrinsic to the *Maqāmāt* – a genre which is itself composed throughout in rhymed prose – induced an imitation of the same style in poetry: "the *muwashshaḥāt* were a natural and simple attempt to extend permutations of rhyme in Arabic prose to Arabic poetry".[57] For this he has to assume for the *muwashshaḥ* an emergence later than that asserted by native tradition (c. CE 900) (an assumption that is admittedly quite probable);[58] indeed, the creator of the *Maqāma*, Badīʿ al-Zamān al-Hamadhānī (968-1008), was not yet born at this point in time.

One readily agrees with Abu-Haidar, that standing behind the complicated *muwashshaḥ* forms with their many caesuras and rhymes was the same *Kunstwollen* (artistic will) that was behind the *Maqāmāt* with their wealth of prose rhymes. The development of the *muwashshaḥ* did indeed provide the possibility to multiply the rhymes, especially by introducing internal rhymes. Yet in my opinion, what was decisive was the intention to facilitate insertion of a longer citation at the end of the poem; the possibility to accommodate more rhyme in the poem will have been a welcome ancillary effect.

Furthermore, it should be borne in mind that according to native tradition, it was not complicated schemes with many caesuras and rhymes that stood at the beginning of the development, but *simple* rhyme schemes (cf. Ibn Bassām [59]). There are many simple *muwashshaḥ*s – still in later times as well – that have no internal rhyme; but there are practically no *muwashshaḥ*s that have no end-*taḍmīn*, i.e., no *kharja*.

But even if Abu-Haidar had been right, I insist that the intent of the poet to multiply the rhymes in the poem must have drawn upon an *existing text tradition*. Today, in my view, there can no longer be any doubt that this text tradition was that of the Eastern Arabian *musammaṭ*.

E-mail: gregor.schoeler@unibas.ch

*This is a summarised version of the author's principal arguments. An augmented version of the paper was published in *Oriens* 44 (2016), 69-93.

Bibliography

Sources

Abū l-ʿAlāʾ al-Maʿarrī, Aḥmad b. ʿAbd Allāh, *The Epistle of Forgiveness.* Ed. and trans. G. J. van Gelder and G. Schoeler. 2 vols. New York and London, 2013-14.

Abū l-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī, ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn: *K. al-Aghānī*[1] (=1st ed.). 20 vols. Būlāq, 1285 H.

---, *K. al-Aghānī*[3] (=3rd ed.). 24 vols. Cairo, 1927-74.

Abū Nuwās, al-Ḥasan b. Hāniʾ, *Dīwān.* Ed. E. Wagner (vol. IV: ed. G. Schoeler). 5 vols. + Index, 2 vols. Cairo, Wiesbaden, Beirut, Stuttgart, Berlin, 1958-2006.

al-Azharī, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, *Tahdhīb* a*l-lugha*. Ed. ʿA. M. Hārūn. 15 vols., Cairo 1964-67.

al-Hudhaliyyīn, *K. Sharḥ al-Hudhaliyyīn*. *Ṣanʿat al-Sukkarī.* Ed. ʿA. A. Farrāj and M.M. Shākir. 3 vol. Cairo, 1965.

Ibn Bassām al-Shantarīnī, Abū l-Ḥasan ʿAlī, *al-Dhakhīra fī maḥāsin ahl al-Jazīra.* Ed. I. ʿAbbās. 4 vols. Beirut, 1979.

Ibn Bishrī, ʿAlī, *ʿUddat al-jalīs*. *An Anthology of Andalusian Arabic* Muwashshaḥāt. Ed. A. Jones. Cambridge, 1992.

Ibn Ḥayyān, Abū Marwān, *K. al-Muqtabis* (V). Ed. P. Chalmeta, in coll. with F. Corriente, M. Ṣubḥ et al. Madrid, 1979.

Ibn Quzmān al-Qurṭubī, *Dīwān* (*Iṣābat al-aghrāḍ fī dhikr al-aʿrāḍ*). *Taḥqīq* F. Corriente. Rabat, 2013.

Ibn Rashīq al-Qayrawānī, al-Ḥasan, *al-ʿUmda fī maḥāsin al-shiʿr wa-ādābihī wa-naqdihī.* 4th ed. 2 vols. Ed. M. M. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd. Cairo 1972.

Ibn Sanāʾ al-Mulk*,* Hibat Allāh b. Jaʿfar*, Dār al-ṭirāz fī ʿamal al-muwashshaḥāt.* Ed. J. al-Rikābī. Damascus 1949.

Ibn Zaydūn, Aḥmad b. ʿAbd Allāh. *Dīwān ... wa-rasāʾiluhū.* Ed. ʿA. ʿAbd al-ʿAẓīm. Cairo 1957.

Imruʾ al-Qays, *Dīwān*. Ed. M. Abū l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm. 3rd ed. Cairo 1969.

al-Khansāʾ, [*Dīwān*] *Anīs al-julasāʾ fi Dīwān al-Khansāʾ*. [Ed. and transl.] Le P. de Coppier. Beirut, 1889.

al-Maʿarrī, see Abū l-ʿAlāʾ al-Maʿarrī.

K. Sharḥ ashʿār al-Hudhaliyyīn, see *al-Hudhaliyyīn*.

al-Shushtarī, *Dīwān*, see Corriente, *Poesía Estrófica.*

al-Zabīdī, Murtaḍā, *Tāj al-ʿarūs min jawāhir al-qāmūs.* 40 vols. Kuwayt, 1965-2001.

Secondary literature, encyclopaedias etc.

ʿAbbās, Iḥsān, *Tāʾrīkh al-adab al-Andalusī* (II): *ʿaṣr al-Ṭawāʾif wal-Murābiṭīn.* 5th ed. Beirut, 1978.

Abu-Haidar, Jarir A."The *muwashshaḥāt*: are they a mystery?" In *Al-Qanṭara* 13 (1992), pp. 63-81. [reprinted in id., *Hispano-Arabic Literature and the Early Provençal Lyrics*, Richmond: Curzon, 2001, pp. 126–38.

Corriente, Federico, "De nuevo en torno al protocejel de anõ 913". In *Sefarad*, pp. 69-73.

---, "On a Hopeless Last Stance for the Hypothesis of a Romance origin of Andalusi Stanzaic Poetry: Homosexuality and Prostitution in the *Kharja*s". In *Journal of Arabic Literature* 40 (2009), pp. 170-81.

---, *Poesía Dialectal Árabe y Romance en Alandalús* (*Cejeles y Xarajāt de Muwaššaḥāt*). Madrid, 1997.

---, *Poesía Estrófica* (*Cejeles y/o Muwaššaḥāt*) *atribuida al místico Granadino aš-Šuštarī (siglo XIII d. C.)*. Madrid, 1988, pp. 325-35.

EAL = Encyclopedia of Arabic Literature. J. Scott Meisami and P. Starkey (eds). 2 vols. London, New York, 1998.

EI² = The Encyclopaedia of Islam. New ed. 13 vols. Leiden, 1960-2009.

Emery, Ed, ed., *Muwashshah!* Proceedings of the International Conference on Arabic and Hebrew Strophic Poetry and its Romance Parallels. School of Oriental and African Studies. London, 8-10 October 2004. London, 2006.

Gelder, Geert Jan van, *Sound and Sense in Classical Arabic Poetry*. Wiesbaden, 2012.

Goldziher, Ignaz, "Bemerkungen zur arabischen Trauerpoesie". In *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 16 (1902), pp. 307-39

Hartmann, Martin, *Das arabische Strophengedicht.* 1. *Das Muwaššaḥ*. Weimar, 1897.

Heijkoop, Henk and Zwartjes, Otto, *Muwaššaḥ, Zajal, Kharja. Bibliography of strophic poetry and music from al-Andalus and their influence on East and West*. Leiden-Boston, 2004.

Jones, Alan, "*Eppur si muove".* In *La Corónica* 12 *(*1983-84), pp. 45-70.

---, "Final *Taḍmīn* in the Poems of Abū Nuwās". In *Arabicus Felix, Luminosus Britannicus. Essays in Honour of A.F.L. Beeston on his Eightieth Birthday.* Oxford, 1991, pp. 61-73.

---, *Romance Kharjas in Andalusian Arabic Muwaššaḥ poetry: A Palaeographic Analysis*. London, 1988.

Lausberg, Heinrich, "[Review of] P. Le Gentil, *Le Virelai et le villancico*". In *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen* 192 (1955), pp. 208-9.

Monroe, James T., "Literary Hybridization in the Zajal: Ibn Quzmān's *Zajal* 88 (The visit of Sir Gold)". In *Journal of Arabic Literature* 38 (2007), pp. 324-51.

---, "Which came first, the Zajal or the Muwaššaḥa?". In: *Oral Tradition* 4 (1989), pp. 38-64.

---, "Pedir peras al olmo? On Medieval Arabs and Modern Arabists". In *La Corónica* 10 (1981-82), pp. 121-47.

---, "*Zajal* and *Muwashshaḥa*: Hispano-Arabic Poetry and the Romance Tradition". In *The Legacy of Muslim Spain.* Ed. S. Kh. Jayyusi. Leiden, 1992, pp. 398–419.

Nunes, José Joaquim, *Crestomatia archaica: excertos da literatura portuguesa desde o que de mais antigo se conhese até ao século XVI.* 2nd ed. Lisbon, 1906.

Rhodokanakis, Nikolaus, *al-Ḫansāʾ und ihre Trauerlieder. Ein literar-historischer Essay mit textkritischen Exkursen*. In SB phil.-hist. Kl. der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften 147 (1904), pp. 1-128 Vienna. 1904. 4.

Rosen. Tova, "The Muwashshaḥ". In *The Literature of Al-Andalus*, ed. María R. Menocal *et al.* (The Cambridge History of Arabic Literature). Cambridge, 2000, pp. 165–89.

Schoeler, Gregor, "Abū Nuwās' Poem to the Zoroastrian Boy Bihrūz: An Arabic '*sawgand-nāma*' with a Persian 'kharja'". In *The Rude, the Bad and the Bawdy. Essays in Honour of Professor Geert Jan van Gelder*. Ed. Adam Talib, Marlé Hammond, and Arie Schippers. Warminster: "Gibb Memorial Trust", 2014, pp. 66- 79.

---, "Muwaššaḥ und Zaǧal. Einfluss auf die Troubadour-Dichtung?". In *Orientalisches Mittelalter*. Ed. W. Heinrichs (Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft, vol. 5). Wiesbaden 1990, pp. 440-64.

---, "The Origins of the Poetic Forms of the Troubadours: The Liturgical and Arabic Theories". In: *Poesía Estrófica.* Actas del primer Congreso Internacional sobre Poesía Estrófica Arabe y Hebrea y sus Paralelos Romances (Madrid 1989). Ed F. Corriente and A Saenz-Badillos. Madrid 1991.

---, "Über die Metrik andalusischer und nicht-andalusischer Zaǧals". In M. Forstner (ed.), *Festgabe für Hans-Rudolf Singer*. 2 parts. Frankfurt, Bern, etc., 1991. Part II: pp. 887-909.

Sezgin, Fuat*, Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums* [*GAS*]. 9 vols. Leiden 1967-1984. Vol. II, 1975.

al-Shushtarī, *Dīwān*, see Corriente, *Poesía Estrófica.*

Stern, Samuel M.*, Hispano-Arabic Strophic Poetry.* Selected and ed. by L. Harvey. Oxford, 1947.

Wagner, Ewald, *Abū Nuwās. Eine Studie zur arabischen Literatur der frühen ʿAbbāsidenzeit.* Wiesbaden 1964.

Zwartjes, Otto Jeroen, *The Andalusian* Xarja-*s: Poetry at the Crossroads of Two Systems*? Diss., Nijmegen, 1995.

---, *Love Songs from al-Andalus: history, structure, and meaning of the kharja*. Leiden, 1997 [revised version of the above-mentioned title].

Keywords
Arabic Stanzaic Poetry, *muwashhaḥ*, *zajal*, *musammaṭ*, the question of origin, "Arabic" theory, "Romance" theory.

NOTES

1. See *EI*^{2} VII, pp. 809-812 , s.v. "muwashshaḥ" (G. Schoeler); *EAL* II, pp. 563-66, s.v. "muwashshaḥ" (L. Alvarez); Monroe, "*Zajal* and *Muwashshaḥa*"; Rosen, The *Muwashshaḥ;* Heijkoop and Zwartjes, *Muwaššaḥ, Zajal, Kharja. Bibliography;* Zwartje*s, The Andalusian* Xarja-s, and id., *Love Songs.*

2. See *EI*^{2} IX, pp. 373-76 , s.v. "zajal" (G. Schoeler); *EAL* II, pp. 818-19, s.v. "zajal" (L. Alvarez).

3. See *EI*^{2} VII, pp. 660-62, s.v. "musammaṭ" (G. Schoeler); *EAL* II, p. 737, s.v. "strophic poetry" (W. Stoetzer).

4. pp. 111ff. and 214ff.

5. See below.

6. al-Khansāʾ, *Dīwān,* p. 27, l. 3; metre: *basīṭ*; cf. p. 84, l. 1; cf. also Rhodokanakis, *al-Ḫansāʾ,* p. 40.

7. al-Khansāʾ, *Dīwān,* p. 83, l. 9-p. 84, l. 1; p. 43, l. 2-4; cf. Goldziher, "Bemerkungen", p. 367 (313), fn. 2.

8. *K. Sharḥ ashʿār al-Hudhaliyyīn* I, p. 284-6, no. 14 = *K. al-Aghānī*[1], XX, p. 21; metre: *basīṭ*. For the poet see Sezgin, *GAS* II, p. 262.

9. Abū Nuwās, *Dīwān* III, p. 332, no. 287; metre: *basīṭ muḫallaʿ*. For this poem see Wagner, pp. 228-33.

10. Jones calls this kind of *musammaṭ 'qaṣīda musammaṭa'* and differentiates it from the *musammaṭ* proper ("*Eppur*", p. 55).

11. Abū l-Faraj, *K. al-Aghānī*[1] V, pp. 27f.; *K. al-Aghānī*[3],V, pp. 209-10: metre: *mutaqārib*.

12. There is no reason for doubting Abū l-Faraj's report that the poem was sung by Ibn Jāmiʿ, who lived in the days of of Hārūn al-Rashīd; so even if the lines are not by Ḥammād they date from the early 9th century at the latest.

13. See fn. 9.

14. *al-ʿUmda* I, 179; metre: *ṭawīl*.

15. Quoted apud al-Azharī, *Tahdhīb* XII, p. 348, and al-Zabīdī, *Tāj* V, p. 161 (s.v. s*imṭ)* = Imruʾ al-Qays, *Dīwān*, p. 474, no. 46 and p. 475, no. 47.

16. *Dīwān,* pp. 423-7; metre: *mutaqārib.*

17. *Hispano-Arabic Strophic Poetry*, p. 55.

18. *The Epistle of Forgiveness*. I, pp. 258-61 = Imruʾ al-Qays*, Dīwān*, 472, no. 39; metre: *rajaz*. – Al-Layth b. al-Muẓaffar (apud al-Azharī, *Tahdhīb* XII, p. 348, s.v. *simṭ*), too, mentions a second *musammaṭ* ascribed to Imruʾ al-Qays; this is, however, not the poem al-Maʿarrī quotes, for al-Layth explicitly says that it has at the beginning (*maṭlaʿ*) a verse consisting of two hemistichs (*miṣrāʿān*).

19. *Poesía Estrófica*, nos. 40, 42, 53; cf. Corriente's remarks, *ibid.*, pp. 14 and ff.

20. See Schoeler, *Über die Metrik*, pp. 903ff.

21. In all probability, this date is too early; cf. Abu-Haidar, "The *Muwashshaḥāt*: Are they a Mystery?", p. 63, fn. 1.

22. See fn. 1.

23. Ibn Bishrī, *ʿUddat al-jalīs*, pp. 156-7 (no. 102); Jones, *Romance Kharjas*, pp. 56-9 (Kharja 5); metre x –, x v – –, x v – –, – (non-Khalīlian; a *ramal* derivate: x – + two *ramal* feet).

24. Wagner, *Abū Nuwās*, pp. 229-33.

25. Ibid., p. 214. For this poem see Schoeler, "Abū Nuwās' Poem to the Zoroastrian Boy Bihrūz".

26. "Review of Legentil, *Le Virelai*", p. 209. Abu-Haidar is of the same opinion: "The *kharja* is a sally of *ẓarf* or *hazl* 'wit', 'witness' at the end of the *muwashshaḥ*. Woman's voice *kharjas* in Romance, whatever the purpose they served, if they existed prior to the *muwashshaḥāt,* were, like their Arabic counterparts, meant to provide the same *ẓarf* requirement at the end of the *muwashshaḥ."* "The *Muwashshaḥā*t and the *kharjas*", p. 98.

27. *Dār al-ṭirāz*, p. 32.

28. "Many of quotations end the poem in an ironic or witty fashion." Jones, "Final taḍmīn", p. 69.

29. Jones, *Romance Kharjas*, pp. 25-34; Ibn Bishrī, *ʿUddat al-jalīs*, no. 22 (pp. 33-5).

30. *Poesía Dialectal*, pp. 270-71 (A1).

31. Nunes, *Crestomatia,* p. 294, no. XXXI.

32. Cf. Stern, *Hispano-Arabic Strophic Poetry*, p. 62.

33. "Zajal and Muwashshaḥa", p. 415, fn. 48; recently in his article "Literary Hybridization", pp. 326f.

34. Ibid., p. 329.

35. Ibid., p. 326.

36. And once more on p. 327.

37. Vol. I, 1, pp. 469.

38. Monroe, "Literary Hybridization", p. 327; cf. also id., "Pedir peras", 125-6.

39. *al-ʿUmda* I, p. 179. Ibn Rashīq quotes two stanzas of this *musammaṭ*; al-Zabīdī cites this poem in his *Tāj al-ʿArūs* s.v. *simṭ*, as well and adduces three further stanzas.

40. Cf. also Jones, "Eppur", p. 56. who argues in the same vein. For further references to *musammaṭ*s that have survived see *EI*^{2} VII, pp. 660-2, s.v. "musammaṭ" (G. Schoeler).

41. See *EI*^{2} X, 123-5, s.v. "takhmīs" (Ph. Kennedy).

42. "Which came first…?"

43. See also Corriente, *Poesía Dialectal,* pp. 78f. Corriente distinguishes between "*zajal pre-estrófico*" and actual *zajal*.

44. Stern, *Hispano-Arabic Strophic Poetry*, p. 51; cf. 77; Monroe, "Which Came First…?", pp. 44-5.

45. Quoted and discussed by Monroe, ibid., pp. 43-53.

46. Quoted and discussed by Corriente, "De nuevo", p. 70; *Poesía dialectal*, pp. 79-80; and by Monroe, "Which came first…?", pp. 48-51.

47. *Pace* Monroe, ibid., p. 51, who by manipulating the transmitted text has attempted to establish something like a *zajal*-stanza.

48. Zwartje*s, The Andalusian Xarja-s,* pp. 85-7; Schoeler, "The Origins", pp. 332-3; id., "zajal" in *EI*^{2} XI, pp. 374-5; id. "Muwaššaḥ und Zağal", pp. 456-7.

49. For references to the edition and for two English translations see Monroe, ibid., pp. 330-2.

50. Monroe, "Pedir peras al olmo?", 125.

51. *Dīwān*, pp. 128-31: see 131; metre: *ṭawīl.*

52 Ibn Bishrī, *ʿUddat al-jalīs,* pp. 249-50; metre: *rajaz.* Cf. Jones, ibid., p. 2, who also refers to a Hebrew poem, of similar structure.

53 "On a Hopeless Last Stand", see Chapter 3 in the present volume.

54. *Taʾrīkh* II, pp. 225, 228 and 257.

55. "Various passages, both Western and Eastern, make it clear that *muwashshaḥāt* were recited as well as sung" (Jones, "*Eppur*", p. 62 with fn. 46).

56. "The *Muwashshaḥāt*", pp. 81; cf. also pp. 66ff.

57. Ibid., p. 81.

58. See fn 21.

59. *ad-Dhakīra* I, p. 469; cf. Schoeler, "Muwashshaḥ", in *EI*^{2} VII, pp. 811; Zwartjes, *The Andalusian* Xarja-*s,* pp. 44-6.