Al-Qantara, vol. 19, nº 2 (1998)

THE SCRIPT AND TEXT OF IBN QUZMĀN'S *DĪWĀN*: SOME GIVEAWAY SECRETS

J. A. ABU-HAIDAR
S.O.A.S., London

Whenever a true theory appears it will be its own evidence.
Emerson

It has been said, and quite rightly so, that «Had the 193 complete or fragmentary *zajals* attributed to Ibn Quzmān not survived, the genre would be little more than a hollow name» (Gorton, 1975:1). It is well known that the large majority of these *zajals*, 149 of them, appear in the unique manuscript of the *Dīwān* of Ibn Quzmān published in facsimile by David de Gunzburg in 1896.[1] The publication of the Facsimile by De Gunzburg could well have merited a celebration of its first centenary in 1996. It could perhaps be said that no other publication, or no other single *dīwān* has been as pivotal in the study of Hispano-Arabic literature during the past hundred years. There is no other poet who singly stands as a representative of a whole genre, and in such a forceful and winsome manner as Ibn Quzmān. To find him a peer among the Arab poets, one would have to classify his output as *mujūn*, and look at him as the counterpart of Abū Nuwās in the Arab East. The comparison would do credit to both poets. «In the opinion of those most competent to judge», says A. R. Nicholson, Abū Nuwās «takes rank above all his contemporaries and successors, including even Mutanabbī, and is not surpassed in poetical genius by any ancient bard» (Nicholson, 1956:292). This paper, as its title indicates, deals primarily with the script and text of the 1896 facsimile edition, and the problems arising from them. In the process of discussing these textual problems, however, it might well come out in evidence that Ibn Quzmān's knowledge of classical Arabic and its lore did not fall behind that of al-Mutanabbī or Abū Nuwās. His thorough familiarity with classical Arabic acquires a special significance when we remember that Ibn Quzmān, unlike his two illustrious predecessors in the Arab East, did not pass «a *wanderjahr* among the Arabs of the desert» (Nicholson, 1956: 293 and 304). Apart from references to Ibn Quzmān's mastery of Arabic, a few references to his poetical genius will also prove inevitable in the course of this paper.

The 1896 Facsimile is not only the unique manuscript of a poet's work. It constitutes at one and the same time the major corpus of popular literature

[1] D. de Gunzburg, *Le Divan d'Ibn Guzman, Le texte d'après le manuscrit unique du Musée Asiatique Impérial de St. Pétersbourg*, Berlin, 1896.

in al-Andalus known to us, and our chief treatise, so to speak, on the nature and physiognomy of this literature. As such the Facsimile imposes a severe discipline on us in reading and interpreting its texts. No alterations of any form with a view to improvement should be made in it unless such emendations are imposed or irrevocably dictated by the rationale of the text itself. As the title of this paper purports to show, both the script and the text of the Facsimile have some giveaway secrets which should be studied and ascertained with the utmost heed. What I refer to as 'secrets' are simply some features of the script and the text which, by their repeated or even consistent recurrence start to serve as guidelines to reading any faulty or uncertain script, and to deciphering and interpreting the diction used by the poet. I hasten to add, however, that what I mean by 'faulty' script will become apparent in the course of this paper, and that I do not refer thereby to the *scriptio defectiva* like ل for لـه or ه for هـو which, after all, is the hallmark of popular literature.

This paper will deal exclusively with the 149 *zajals* which appear in the St Petersburg manuscript. This is because the 1896 facsimile edition presents these *zajals* in the form in which they have come down to us, while the other *zajals* or fragments have been culled in recent times from edited texts like *Al-'Āṭil al-Ḥālī* of al-Ḥillī.[2]

Readers now have at their disposal two painstaking and competent complete editions and translations of the 193 *zajals* and fragments attributed to Ibn Quzmān. I refer to the edition by Emilio García Gómez (1972) in Latin characters, with translations on the facing pages, and the more recent edition by Federico Corriente (1995). Corriente had already published an edition of the *Dīwān* in Arabic, with transliterations on the facing pages (1980). He followed this 1980 edition with a translation of the *Dīwān* into Spanish, entitled *El Cancionero hispanoárabe*, 1984. Corriente's first translation of the 193 *zajals* and fragments appeared in 1989 under the title *Cancionero andalusí*, and has now been reprinted in a revised and updated edition (1996).

While I have referred above, and in the title to conclusions relating to the script and text of Ibn Quzmān, I have already given hints perhaps that a discussion of such conclusions cannot be meaningful without reference to both the copyist and the poet. These inferences or conclusions will be outlined below, and each of them followed by examples from the text to show

[2] The large majority of the *zajals* and fragments now published with the 149 *zajals* of the Facsimile derive from W. Hoenerbach's edition of al-Ḥillī's work, Wiesbaden, 1956.

how it was arrived at, or to substantiate its validity. While the examples will, by necessity, be restricted to a minimum, an adequate number has to be produced in each case, if the conclusions are to give confidence, or to be treated as axiomatic. As the numbering of the *zajals* in the Facsimile has been adhered to in all editions, the first number in all examples will denote the *zajal* number, and the second, separated by a comma, the number of the strophe.

I. THE UNIQUE MANUSCRIPT OF IBN QUZMĀN'S *DĪWĀN* (THE 1896 FACSIMILE EDITION) IS A DICTATED COPY (OR PASSIVELY COPIED FROM A DICTATED COPY).

There is no end of indications in the text of the *Dīwān* that it is a dictated copy, and that the copyist quite often took down what he heard phonetically without following the sense of the text, or its syntactic structure. Such lapses are not only numerous. They are often so glaringly obvious to portray the copyist as a brilliant calligrapher, but a 'dyslexic', finding difficulty in taking down correctly much of what he heard.

In *zajal* 41,5 the copyist writes ... قل تلو اذ دخل for what is obviously ... قلت لو اذ دخل 'I said to him as he came in...'.

In 45,4 he writes وكلما دفعتك الهناك for what is clearly وكلما دفعتك الى هناك ... 'Every time I urge you to go there'.

This bungled reading made García Gómez transliterate *wa-kullamā dafa'tak inhitāk* (1972, I: 238). In a similar context, in 137,9, the copyist writes: قم وزول لا هناك causing equal confusion by substituting, on the face of it, the negative particle لا for the preposition الى.

In *zajal* 49,2 the copyist writes كغيط عنكبوت for كخيط عنكبوت «like a spider-thread». In 139,13 he writes اس العين for العين السو «the evil eye», اس being a purely phonetic representation of what he hears. In 100,1, however, we read the more regular العين السو.[3]

In 141,6 the copyist writes يطرب المثل بكرم حاتم «Ḥātim's generosity is proverbial». This is in all likelihood the result of substituting ظ (left undotted) for ض in يضرب, a mistake still common in our own day in the Maghreb, and some parts of the Arab East.[4]

[3] This is insufficient evidence to argue for a different copyist in 101.

[4] That it was a common mistake in al-Andalus is clearly attested in 45,3 where ضفيرة and مضفور are written as ظفيرَ and مظفور respectively. Al-Lakhmī points out this mistake in *Al-Madkhal ilā Taqwīm al-Lisān*, e.g., vol. 2, p. 364, where *rabaẓ* is discussed as popular usage for *rabaḍ*.

The lapses on the part of the copyist discussed so far, might well be described as inconsequential. They are easy to detect and to rectify. Other lapses, however, have occasioned serious confusion.

In *zajal* 15,7 the copyist fails, it would seem, to hear the last radical in the common adverb حين and writes:

لا تغلط فابو بكر حي تطلب له شبيه
Make no mistake about Abū Bakr when you try to find his peer

García Gómez reads the defective adverb as *haiy*, and transliterates:

Lā yaglaṭ fī Bū Bakr ḥaiy yaṭlub la-hu [min] šabīh (García Gómez, 1972, I: 82).

In his 1980 edition Corriente, likewise, reads the term in question as *ḥayyan* (Corriente, 1980: 114-115). In the 1995 edition he reads the term as *ḥattā*.

In *zajal* 86,5 we read ...والنبال عدل الحصا «... and arrows as numerous as little stones, pebbles» for what is clearly والنبال عد الحصا. The copyist, it would seem, hearing the liaison of the geminate *dāl* in *'add* with the *lām* of the definite article, wrote the *lām* as part of the preceding word. As a result of this confusion, García Gómez transliterates: *wa-n-nabl 'adad al-ḥaṣā*, reading the added *lām* of the copyist as another *dāl,* (García Gómez, 1972, I: 432). Corriente in both of his editions reads: والنبال عدل الحصا (Corriente, 1980: 556-7, and 1995: 264).

It is significant to note in passing that the copyist writes الحصا and الخصا 'testicles', in the same strophe, instead of the more correct forms الحصى and الخصى respectively.

To give one or two more analogous examples, the copyist writes دوي for دوا or دواء in 15,1, وري for ورا or وراء in 17, 1 and in the same manner, مشا for مشى in 149,1.

With all these examples of the copyists' incompetence, and the multitude of others still to come, to speak of the copyist as «less than completely at home» in the Andalusian dialect, as Gorton does, is to minimize or completely obscure the textual problems of the Facsimile (Gorton, 1975: 1-2). The way Corriente keeps speaking of the «corrections» or classicizing emendations made by the copyist تصحيح الناسخ المشرقي seems to be equally misguided, (see e.g. Corriente, 1995: n.5, 23; n.1, 93; n.2, 98, etc.). Rather than attribute any

classicizing tendencies to the copyist, we should guard against standardizing any of his schoolboy howlers as either classical or Andalusian Arabic.

In *zajal* 9, 37 the copyist writes معن for what is clearly in the context ما عنا 'we have not got':

معن مولاي في الجزيرة سواك
We have not got, my Lord, in the Peninsula (anyone) other than you (to depend on).

Both García Gómez (1972, I: 52) and Corriente (1995: 53) read this as *ma'nā*, meaning 'we have'. To avoid the resulting anomaly in the sense i.e. 'we have (people) other than you (to depend on)', García Gómez introduces the negative particle *lā* at the beginning of the verse, and Corriente turns the poet's declamatory statement into a question:

معنا مولائي في الجزيرة سواك؟
¿Tenemos, señor, en la Península sino a ti? (1996: 75).

Ibn Quzmān does his poetical genius much credit by incorporating into his poetry numerous popular sayings. They enhance the familiar or intimate tone of his compositions. It is a cause for surprise that the copyist gives a most glaring example of his bungled work in the way he writes one of these sayings.

In the context of stressing the fact that little can be achieved without working for it, Ibn Quzmān in *zajal* 13, 13 uses the popular saying: من لم يسق قمح للسما عدولة «The harvest or produce (lit. the sacks[5]) of him who does not water his corn is dependent on the heavens, i. e. (the rain from) the sky». With the reference to 'the sky' this is reminiscent of the French saying *aide-toi, le ciel t'aidera.*

Presumably, not understanding what he heard, the copyist writes the first letter of the final word, ع, as part of the word preceding it. He thus writes the preceding verse with a word at the end which makes no sense at all:

من لم يسق قمح للسماع دولة

García Gómez drops the ع out of the text altogether and transliterates:

[5] See the articles, *'idl* and *ghirara* in Lane's *Arabic-English Lexicon*, and the diminutive *'udayyal* used by the poet in *zajal* 92, 4.

Man lam yasqi qamḥu li-s-samā dūla

Apparently associating *dūla* with the verb *dallā* 'to suspend, let hang', he translates:

Del cielo pende quien no riega el trigo (1972, I: 72-73).

Corriente introduces a few amendments and reads:

من لم يسوق قمحه لس ماع دوله

He translates:

quien no lleva trigo, no tiene turno
(1980: 102 and 1995: 65; and translations 1984: 72 and 1996: 84).

Needless to say that with the reading دوله instead of عدوله, any translation or interpretation is apt to be wide of the mark. Corriente points out in a footnote to his translation (1996: n.7, p. 84) that this saying was salvaged or restored (*rescatado*) by an observation of al-Ahwānī. Without rectifying the text of the saying, al-Ahwānī could only have made a wild conjecture about it. Corriente does not point out where al-Ahwānī makes the comments he refers to. In his work *Al-Zajal fī al-Andalus* (1957: 180) al-Ahwānī reads what the copyist has written:

من لم يسق قمح للسماع دولـه

When the poet uses recondite or simply unusual terms, the copyist seems to be utterly at a loss as to what to make of them. In *zajal* 146, 1 the poet refers to excessive longing inflaming the inner corners of the eyes, the آماق, presumably with tears. Hearing the word آماقك and not knowing what to make of it, the copyist writes instead the meaningless term التماقك:

شوقا كثير هيج التماقك

García Gómez changes the baffling term *iltimāq* into *iftirāq* (separation) and reads:

Šauqan kaṯīr haiyağ iftirāqak (1972 II: 722).

Corriente retains the manuscript reading, and explains in a footnote that *iltimāq* is of Romance origin and that «it means travelling shoes and is applied to wearing these shoes» (1995: n. 1, p. 417). Corriente, unlike García Gómez, does not supply the Romance terms or Romance origins he surmises, so that the reader can verify the validity of these terms. He translates, in keeping with the footnote mentioned above:

Gran nostalgia provocó tu partida (1996: 343).

This parallels the translation by García Gómez:

Pena sin igual movió tu ausencia (1972, II: 723).

Zajal 17 by Ibn Quzmān, a *zajal* of seven strophes, is arguably perhaps the most eloquent and readable poem of praise in Arabic literature, and there is no shortage, as we know, of such pompous and flatulent poetry in Arabic. In strophe 5 of *zajal* 17 the poet tells his Maecenas, whom in fact he does not mention by name, that much as the mention of his name is sweet to the tongue, the genial impression he leaves in people's hearts (souls) is even sweeter. The copyist, however, seemingly hearing a half-word, writes قعك في النفوس instead of وقعك في النفوس «the impression you leave in people's hearts»:

ترى قدر حلاوة ذكرك على اللسان
اشد هي حلاوة من قعك في النفوس

Both García Gómez (1972, I: 92) and Corriente (1995: 74) take the bungled spelling قعك to be a misspelling for كعك (a post-classical loan word from Persian)[6] which García Gómez transliterates as *ka'ak*, and Corriente explains as كعكة. Both translate the term into Spanish as '*pastel*'. There is no need to say, however, how much it trivializes the context to tell a Maecenas that the impression he leaves in people's souls is sweeter than a piece of cake. I have no hesitation in treating the preposition من in the verses quoted above as added bungling by the copyist, and in trusting the discretion of the poet to say:

[6] This is the view of Father R. Nakhla (1960: 243), although Persian lexicons trace the term ultimately to Aramaic.

ترى قدر حلاوة ذكرك على اللسان،
اشد هي حلاوة وقعك في النفوس

That the copyist had little familiarity perhaps with the term *waq'* is given further confirmation in *zajal* 46, 5 where he writes:

من ضرب الامثال وموقع وزمير
ذا الكلام اشجا ومن نقر الوتر

Ibn Quzmān shows an exceptional versatility in the use of rhetorical figures such as *jinās* 'paronomasia' and *ṭibāq* 'antithesis', etc. There is little reason to doubt that in the verses reproduced above, he would have retained the consecutive *mulā'ama* 'balance between phrases', and written what the copyist fails to hear clearly, or to undestand:

من ضرب الامثال ومن وقع الزمير
ذا الكلام اشجا ومن نقر الوتر

There is little doubt too that Ibn Quzmān would have written اشجى and not اشجا. García Gómez transliterates the second of the four versicles above as *wa-mauqi' az-zamīr* (1972, I: 244), while Corriente reads: وموقع وزمير (1995: 160).

II. THE COPYIST OF IBN QUZMĀN'S *DĪWĀN* HAD NO SOUND KNOWLEDGE OF ARABIC

The various parts of this discussion, it is hoped, will complement each other in providing a helpful approach to reading the *Dīwān* of Ibn Quzmān. But they unavoidably overlap inasmuch as examples given in one section could well serve to illustrate the purport of other sections.

Ibn Quzmān, as we know, states in strong terms in the introduction to his *Dīwān* that observing the rules of desinential inflection, *i'rāb*, in the *zajal* is, like death, an object of abhorrence. While using the *tanwīn* quite extensively in his *zajals*, more often than not he gives it the accusative case ending irrespective of grammatical requirements. It appears with the accusative case ending as the subject of a clause or sentence, as the predicate of a particle like ان, and quite often after prepositions, and in possessive constructions.

Examples of these will appear in the course of the discussion, but the way the copyist realizes the *tanwīn*, and the irregularity or lack of consistency with which he writes it, gives him away as a beginner or raw recruit in writing Arabic, and confirms still further the conclusion that the Facsimile of the *Dīwān* reads like a dictated copy. While in the majority of cases he realizes the *tanwīn* as doubled wowels at the ends of words, he has quite often confused his readers by writing the *tanwīn* as ان, or even, at times, by writing the double vowels and adding the *alif* and *nūn* after them. This irregularity could easily suggest two or more copyists instead of one, if it did not occur within the same *zajal*, and, on occasion, within the same strophe. Thus in 34, 7, for example, we read:

يوم ان نزورك انا في عيد
في كل ساعة سعدا جديد
«The day I visit you is a festive day
Every hour of it brings a new joy

The way the *tanwīn* is realized in the first verse above has proved to be one of the least problematic of cases, although García Gómez reads ان in the first verse as part of the *tanwīn*, and transliterates:

yauman nazūrak anā fī 'īd (1972, I: 178).

While Corriente retains the unlikely reading for a popular text:

يوم ان نزورك انا في عيد (1995: 123).

Other instances, however, of the copyist's uncertainties or gaucheries, have proved to be much more confusing and serious.

In *zajal* 1, 3 both García Gómez and Corriente have missed the copyist's bungling and both retain and read the ان he writes for the *tanwīn* in *ḥuṭāman* as a separate particle. The copyist writes:

قد ذبت ما بين راج ويائس
وصرت حطام ان سحت يابس
I waste away between hope and despair
I have become a wreck, a shrivelled body

García Gómez transliterates the second verse as follows:

wa-ṣirtu ḥuṭām in suḥit yābis (1972, I: 6).

Corriente, likewise, reads the second verse:

وصرت حطام ان سحت يابس (1995:23).

Despite the poet's predilection, so to speak, for the *tanwīn*, Corriente emends *rājin* in the first verse to read *rājī*, and attributes the manuscript reading with *tanwīn* to what he calls 'the classicizing tendencies of the Oriental copyist' (1995: n. 5, 23).

In *zajal* 20, strophe 14 the bungling of the copyist, seemingly taking down what is dictated to him, reaches one of those fairly common extreme cases of confusion where he writes:

انت وانا واحد لا اخرا ناجود

Here, he does not only realize the accusative *tanwīn* as ان, but being totally unaware of the meaning of what he writes, and guided primarily, perhaps, by what he hears phonetically, he joins the ن he hears at the end of the accusative *tanwīn* to the following word. The poet is clearly saying:

انت وانا واحد، لا اخرا اجود
You and I are on a par with each other, and there is no other better than us.

Corriente, apparently unaware of the use of the *tanwīn*, changes اخرا into احد and reads: لا احدنا اجود despite the stilted classical bent of such an emendation (1995: 85). García Gómez changes the ن of the *tanwīn* into ب and transliterates: *lā 'uẖrà bi-'aǧwad* (1972, I: 108). Needless to say that any translation, with such emendations, is apt to be wide of the mark.

A much greater confusion has, likewise, been caused in 43, 3 by the way the copyist realizes and writes the *tanwīn*. An element of shoddiness in placing the diacritical points, in this case, has not helped either. The copyist writes:

سوي يقال و نعما
ان كان فحان والله ما
جبت انا الله جاب

What has primarily confused readers in this case again, is that the copyist writes فخان for what is obviously فخا 'a trap'. The poet says about a loved one:

> He is straight and shapely, and excellent above all
> If he is a trap (a snare), by God I did not
> Bring him about; it is God who shaped him (lit. brought him about).

García Gómez transliterates:

> *Sawā nuqāl au na'ammā*
> *In kān fa-ḥāna, wa-llāh, mā*
> *ǧibtu 'anā: llāhu ǧābu* (1972, I: 224).

As a part of the endless arbitrary emendations Corriente introduces in his edition, he reads:

> سوا يقال او يعمى
> ان كان فجاني والله ما
> جبت انا الل جاب (1995: 151).

There is no apparent justification for changing سوي into سوا and نعما into يعمى. Equally difficult to explain or to justify, in the third verse, is the way Corriente changes الله into the enigmatic or simply unrecongnizable الل as he often does in the course of his edition.

As both García Gómez and Corriente miss the term فخا 'a trap; a snare' in the context, there is little point here in giving their respective translations, which could only amount to conjectures. The poet, incidentally, uses the term فخ 'trap' elsewhere in the *Dīwān*, as in 2, 6; 20, 15; and 69, 12.

In the light of what has preceded we may feel justified in emending the numerous cases of *tanwīn* realized with ان, or simply with ن as in 19, 4:

لم نفكر في الحر وقت نزال

where the ن of the *tanwīn* وقتا is seemingly written with the following verb زال. García Gómez transliterates:

Lam nufakkir fī 'aiyi waqt az-zawāl (1972, I: 98).

The reading وقتا زال is given further credibility by another analogous case in 13, 5:

كبرت انا يا اخي وقت ان رايت
I cried *Allahu akbar* the minute I saw him.

García Gómez eliminates the ان and transliterates «... *waqat ra'aitu*» (1972, 70). Corriente retains the ان and reads:

كبرت انا يا اخي وقت ان رايته (1995: 63).

Corriente reads يا آخي with a *ḥamzat waṣl* instead of ياخي, and adds the third person masculine pronoun to the rhyme word, and the preceding rhyme words, without indicating to the reader how all these are meant to be read in a popular context.

In *zajal* 9, 40 we have an instance of *tanwīn* with a genitive case ending, again written clumsily by the copyist:

فاذا جيت في امر ان نخشاه
Should I come (to you) concerning a matter I fear.

García Gómez transliterates:

...*fī 'amar, in naḫšāh* (1972, I: 52).

Corriente reads the ان of the *tanwīn* as انا:

فاذا جيت في امر انا نخشاه (1959: 53).

In the light of the preceding remarks also, we can go on to emend even less obvious cases of *tanwīn*. In 45, 8, for example, Ibn Quzmān says about a benefactor he is praising, that he is not happy with gold unless he sees it spent on others.

و لس يقر به عين الا
اذا راه على غير منفوق

Unlike the copyist, as we shall see, Ibn Quzmān knew his Arabic well. If he at all meant عين to be the subject of his first verse, he would have written تقر. Since the subject is his Maecenas (masculine) it becomes imperative to read:

ولس يقر به عينا الا

The copyist, besides, writes عين with a clear dagger *alif* above it. Was he at all unsure how to write the accusative *tanwīn* of a noun ending in *nūn*?

Indications have already been made in Part I above that the blundering of the copyist is not restricted to spelling mistakes in writing the *tanwīn*. A lot more goes to show the wide gap between the copyist's "quackish" Arabic and the poet's mastery of the language and its literary lore. The one charge, as already indicated above also, which cannot be made against the copyist is 'classicizing tendencies' on his part in copying Ibn Quzmān's *Dīwān*. Whenever the poet's language gets a little learned or abstruse, the copyist has left serious problems for his readers.

In *zajal* 9, 5 the poet seems to be using حبط in the sense of احباط 'making null and void, or of no avail':

والسرور مشترط لحبط الهم
Mirth is essential for foiling (doing away with) worry.

A slight uncertainty about the diacritical points in this case has made García Gómez read «*yanḫabiṭ*» for *ḥabṭ* (1972, I:44), and Corriente, likewise, reads لخبط instead of حبط (1995: 45).

In 9, 9, however, the copyist writes:

ان ازعق هو من زوال النعم

Hearing, it would seem, an uncommon term like الزعق, and missing the definite article with a sun letter, he sets down only the phonemes he hears. The poet is simply saying that timidity, or, in the context, fear of the peering *raqīb* does not allow for lasting bliss (in love):

ان الزعق هو من زوال النعم

Both García Gómez and Corriente read *az'aq*, and try to make sense, as best they can, of the bungled reading in their translations. The poet uses the cognate terms *az'aq* and *za'iq* in *zajals* 13, 2 and 18, 1 respectively.

As the following sections try to demonstrate, Ibn Quzmān, like al-Mutanabbī before him, could well claim a familiarity with the unusual and unfamiliar of classical Arabic diction —the *shawārid*. He could also claim equal familiarity with the language of the *Qur'ān*. In *zajal* 38, 3, and in a prologue of adulation, the copyist writes:

وذكا لس نفس عليه شيطان

It is as good as certain that we should read نفث 'to blow', as in *sūra* CXIII, 4. Although García Gómez retains the reading *nafas*, he appropriately translates:

En su inteligencia no sopla Satán (1972, I: 197).

Corriente reads *naffas* without any evidence to support his reading. He translates:

tiene un talento no inspirado por el diablo (1995: 132).

There is little doubt that the poet means to say that the talent, he is praising, is not *tainted* by evil or the breath of Satan. «A talent not inspired by Satan», as Corriente translates, does not amount to much praise in the context of a panegyric. Corriente's reading and translation, besides, do not at all take account of the preposition عليه which appears with the verb, and seems to be sufficient justification for reading لس نفث عليه شيطان «not blown on by the Devil».

This survey can be drawn much longer, if not endlessly. But one final example here should suffice to point out that much as the poet was widely versed in the classical Arabic literary lore, the copyist did not have, perhaps, even a hearsay knowledge of it.

In *zajal* 121, 1 the poet, using a metaphor in which he draws extensively on classical Arabic lore, tells a loved one who shows him the cold shoulder:

ان كان ه مطلك مقداد الكندي
فاكذا صبري عمرو بن معدي

> If your delay should turn out to be (a steadfast warrior like) Miqdād al-Kindī, my patience (much more steadfast) is 'Amr bin Ma'dī.

Not only does the copyist write 'al-Hindī' for 'al-Kindī' which Corriente has rectified (1996: n. 2, 302), but for any one able to consult the Facsimile, the copyist had, for all appearances it seems, started by writing مع دي as two words, and, seeing perhaps that they looked quite awkward for a proper name, went back over what he had written and joined up the two syllables.

One aspect of the *azjāl* of Ibn Quzmān which has never, perhaps, been studied and properly appreciated, is that the dropping or disregard of *i'rāb* by the poet, has not presented obstacles to a clear understanding of what he writes. In this light his work constitutes a strong argument that *i'rāb* is accidental and not essential to a language. What has presented difficulty, as we have seen, is the blundering copyist who, quite often it would seem, was unable to visualize clearly what he heard in order to be able to write it down clearly. Quite naturally, the wider the gap between poet and copyist in cognizance of Arabic vocabulary or Arabic classical allusions, the more likely it was that serious bungling would occur.

III. IBN QUZMĀN DISPLAYS AN UNRIVALLED MASTERY OF ARABIC

Just as the texts of Ibn Quzmān reveal his mastery of classical Arabic, our awareness of the poet's consummate mastery of the language can help us to set right some of the bungled readings in his text.

In *zajal* 85, 3 the poet addresses the sacrificial ram of the *'īd* with what amounts to a serenade, calling him *ḥabībī* 'my beloved'. While the verse containing this passionate address, the first in the strophe, presents no problem, the third verse has proved quite enigmatic:

حبيبي كبش العيد انا حريفك
لس تنطحني تنفر، ارحم ضعيفك
اش حال ه حبيبك اش حال صديقك
اش حال شوياتك، اش حال قديدك

Ḥarīfak 'your associate; your companion' which appears in the rhyme position in verse 1, is perhaps an uncommon term, but it is congruent with the tone of endearment in the rest of the verse.

García Gómez translated *anā ḥarīfak* '*soy tu amante*' (1972, I: 427), while Corriente, more accurately, translates '*soy tu cofrade*' (1996: 228). In the third verse, however, the poet, still addressing the much cherished ram, asks him about the state or quality of what can be read either as حبيبك 'your loved one', or جيبك, on the face of it, 'your pocket', neither of which makes much sense in the context. He asks him too about what is clearly written at the end of the verse as صديقك 'your friend'. Apart from badly violating the rhyme scheme, the latter term makes no sense in the context either. García Gómez transliterates verse 3 as follows:

Eš ḥāl hu ǧabīnak? Eš ḥāl ṣadīfak? (1972, I: 426).

This is practically the same as al-Ahwānī's reading:

اش حال جبينك اش حال صديفك (1957: 79).

Corriente reads:

اشحال هو حبيبك، اشحال صديقك؟ (1995 :262).

Corriente, as can be seen, retains the reading of the Facsimile صديقك at the end of the verse despite the fact, as already pointed out, that it violates the rhyme scheme of the strophe.

García Gómez translates verse 3 as follows:

¿Qué sesos tú tendrás, qué buena pringue?

As he reads *ǧabīnak* 'brow', the term, it seems, suggests to him 'brains' (Spanish *sesos*). صديف is not a lexical term in Arabic. García Gómez does not point that out, nor does he point out, as al-Ahwānī had done, that an element of phonetic corruption might have occurred in the term. He translates the term as *pringue* 'fat'.

Corriente translates:

¿Cómo están tus amados? ¿Cómo tus amigos?

He thus translates both *ḥabībak* and *ṣadīqak* as plurals (1996: 228).

If we remember, however, that Ibn Quzmān displays throughout his *Dīwān* a competent knowledge of classical Arabic and pre-Islamic lore, we would be as good as certain that he was aware that the term جيب refers to the 'heart' or the 'bosom'. He would have been equally aware that just as the term سديف refers to a camel's hump or the fat of the hump, it refers also to the hump cut into pieces, and he would have used it metaphorically to refer to juicy cuts of mutton. In the light of the poet's resourcefulness, there is little doubt that the enigmatic terms in verse 3 are جيبك and سديفك respectively:

اش حال هو جيبك، اش حال سديفك؟

As verse 4 goes on to say: اش حال شوياتك، اش حال قديدك؟ «How are your roasted cuts, and the dried strips?», the logical sequence is complete.

Until we get a more convincing reading, I have read لس تنطحني وتنفر «do not butt me with the head and shy off» in verse 2, in place of the suggested reading لس تصطحي تنفر «No te avergüenza huir?» as read by García Gómez and Corriente, and by al-Ahwānī before them. My reading is more in keeping with the text, and with the plea for mercy which follows in the verse.

Yanṭaḥ is attested in a *zajal* by Ibn Rāshid, an older contemporary of Ibn Quzmān, which was first published by S. M. Stern in *Al-Andalus* in 1951 (XVI, 379-425), and republished in 1974 (Stern, 1974: 192-5). Stern's reading and interpretation of the *zajal*, however, shows that there was much in it he could not make out, and both the meaning of the term *yanṭaḥ* and the significance of its use in the fifth and last strophe of Ibn Rāshid's *zajal* remained as a result unrecognizable in his work. Stern reads *sharraḥ*, in strophe 5, i. e. «cut meat into oblong slices» for the purposes of salting and preserving as *sarrah*, which he interprets as «to comb one's hair». Consequently, instead of understanding *mallaḥ*, which follows *sharraḥ* in the same verse, as meaning 'to salt', he translates it as 'beautifies himself'. Instead of what is clearly *'amal 'alā ḥablu mabzūr mumallaḥ*, i. e. «he put up on his rope spiced salted meat» he reads, apparently also with the sanction of H. A. R. Gibb, *'amal 'alā 'aylū mabzūr*. Taking the anomalous reading *'aylū* to be a cognate of *'ā'ila* 'family', he translates: «prepares for his family spiced and salted meat».

For our immediate purpose, however, it is enough to point out that Stern translates the term *kabsh* implying 'a hefty ram', as 'a lamb' and he tells his readers that «Many a *zajal* of Ibn Quzmān turns round the lamb and the flour of the *'Īd*...» (1974: 195). Perhaps because the meek lamb is not known to «butt with the head», Stern translates «*lays 'indī kabshun fa-yanṭaḥ*», as «I have no

lamb to kill» (1974: 195). In fact Stern reads *fa-yunṭaḥ* (passive), instead of *fa-yanṭaḥ*, which would make the verse in question literally mean «I have no ram which could be butted with the head», and hence the seemingly conjectural rendition «I have no lamb to kill».

'Alā ḥablu is patently clear in the MS text published with the transcription by Stern which H. A. R. Gibb read, and to which «he has contributed a few emendations...» (Stern, 1974: n. 45, 193). Even if *'ayl*, should prove to be a lexical item in popular Andalusian, meaning 'family', the preposition *'alā*, preceding it in the text, does not in any context mean 'for', to justify translating *'alā 'aylū* 'for his family'. The root *naṭaḥa*, likewise, does not semantically suggest either 'kill' or 'slaughter'. More often than not it applies to sheep, rams, bulls and cows acting, and not acted upon.

It is to be regretted, in the light of all this, that Stern's editor did not look carefully through these texts before republication in 1974.

That Ibn Quzmān was abreast of pre-Islamic lore is attested in *zajal* 12, in which festivities seem to be apace, with the poet enjoining the incumbents to make haste with all the preparations. In strophe 5 he urges them saying:

يسروا ناقتكم يسروا عبريكم

The text in this case is clear. Yet García Gómez finds it necessary to change عبريكم into *'airīkum* in his transliteration, and he translates:

!Lista la camella! ¡Preparad la burra! (1972, I: 67).

Corriente retains the facsimile reading, but he translates:

¡Preparad la camella, preparad al hebreo! (1996: 81).

He goes on to explain in various footnotes to his editions and translations that the '*hebreo*' or 'Hebrew' mentioned in the text seems to be a member of a 'troupe' enacting the story of Joseph in Egypt, while the Arabs and the she-camel also mentioned in the *zajal*, represent the merchants who bought Joseph.

Our awareness that Ibn Quzmān was well versed in his pre-Islamic lore, however, gives us the assurance that what he is referring to by عبريكم, as a counterpart to ناقتكم, is the عبر اسفار which referred to a sturdy camel innured to long travel, or, for that matter, to a she-camel just as well, if not better qualified. Of course the metre of the *zajal* does not allow for عبر

اسفاركم so the poet resorts to license and says عبريكم. Is not the *zajal*, after all, a genre which does not take too much heed of the fine points of syntax or philology?

The two antipodes, the resourcefulness of the poet, and the incompetence of the copyist, can help us to clarify problematic passages with a fair degree of certainty.

Zajal 27 starts with an encomium of a loved one of the poet, or, more accurately, of his fascinating looks, what his hair feels like, and what his chest and his mouth look like. The first two verses of 27, 1 read as follows in the Facsimile:

وانما ه معجب وشعر من نمس
وصدر من تعنق وفم من قبس

Both نمس in the first verse, and تعنق in the second have proved difficult to read and to interpret.

It is as good as certain, however, that with his versatile vocabulary the poet says that the hair of his loved one is, as it were, made of نمص that is «made of down» or is «as soft as down». The copyist, seemingly unfamiliar with a term like نمص, deemphasizes the last radical and writes نمس. Likewise, the bosom or chest of the beloved is described as white or, literally, made of يقق, implying that it is as white as «cotton» or «the core of a palm tuber». But the copyist, to all appearances, finding *yaqaq* unfamiliar and inscrutable, «makes a hash of it» and writes the term as تعنق. This made García Gómez transliterate *wa-ṣadru min ta'annuq*, which makes little sense and does not tally with his translation «*con pecho para abrazos*». García Gómez retains *namas* in the first verse, but translates *wa-sha'ru min namas* as *con pelo cual de hurón* which suggests that he takes *namas* to be a reference to the *nims* or 'ferret' (Spanish *hurón*) (1972, I: 146-7). Reading *nims*, however, would violate both the metre and the rhyme scheme.

Corriente introduces drastic changes in his reading of the problematic verses, without any attempt to justify these changes, or to apprise the reader of them. He changes all three substantives, preceded by the preposition *min* into verbs. As a result, he finds himself constrained to replace *min* in each case with the relative pronoun *man*. What was a problem of vague vocabulary becomes a serious one of halting syntax -*man*, as the subject of three separate phrases remains in each case without a predicate:[7]

[7] No question marks appear as in the 1980 edition.

وانما هو معجب وشعر من يمس
وصدر من يعنق وفم من يبس (1995: 105-6).

With the emendations outlined above, it is suggested that the two problematic verses should read:

وانما ه معجب وشعر من نمص
وصدر من يقق وفم من قبس

That the copyist had deemphasized *namaṣ*, and written *namas* instead is given added confirmation further on in *zajal* 27. Strophe 6 in the *zajal* [8] is one in which the poet is addressing his Maecenas, having finished, so to speak, with the love presagement. Verse 3 in strophe 6 reads as follows in the Facsimile:

فان وجد مثل سرف صرف ان قليل

García Gómez transliterates:

fa'an wuǧida miṯlu saraf, saraf qalīl (1972, I: 148).

Corriente reads:

فان وجد مثله سرف سرف قليل (1995: 107).

Both García Gómez and Corriente deemphasize صرف in the verse and read سرف twice, and both eliminate ان without giving any explanation for their emendations. Their elimination of the ان, however, is in all likelihood due to the fact that they missed reading the *tanwin* realized by the copyist as a separate ان (i.e. ان صرف for صرفا) as explained in some detail in the preceding section. It is my strong hunch also that the copyist had, unnecessarily again, deemphasized the ص in صرف preceding the absolute accusative صرفا and written سرف instead, just as he had written نمس in lieu of نمص in the opening strophe. Short of a more convincing reading and interpretation, we should read:

فان وجد مثل، صرف صرفا قليل

[8] This appears as strophe 5 in a rearrangement of the *zajal*, followed by both García Gómez and Corriente.

If one like him were to be found (at all), he would give (lit. spend) only scantily.

García Gómez complains with a sense of impatience about what he calls «... *las deformaciones en que puede incurrir este copista*» (1972, II: n. 9, 733). It is difficult to square this with Corriente's repeated references throughtout the length of his 1995 edition to the «corrections of the Eastern copyist» تصحيحات الناسخ المشرقي or his 'classicizing tendencies' تفصح الناسخ المشرقي (1995: n.1, 424 and n. 5, 23 respectively). The evidence studied so far shows that the copyist was not in a position to correct anything. His 'corrections' amount to what I have called 'schoolboy howlers', and what García Gómez calls '*deformaciones*', like writing التماقك for أماقك, صديقك for سديفك and نفس for نفث.

All this should not give the impression either that the wide gap between the poet's versatility and the copyist's incompetence is restricted to their grasp of Arabic vocabulary. The copyist, as one would expect, is equally at sea whenever the poet resorts to Arabic idiomatic usage, metaphorical usage or, still worse, to the use of figures of speech such as antithesis, paronomasia, etc.

In *zajal* 20, 4 we read:

ثم وبخني وعدد علي
استحيت من سقط من ادي
He reprimanded me, gave me a dressing down
I felt embarrassed before him, and was perplexed.

It is as good as certain that the poet, knowing his Arabic well, would have used the correct idiom in the second verse سقط في يدي- and resorted to the plural of يد for requirements of rhyme and metre. It is as good as certain too that the copyist replaced the preposition في of the classical idiom, unfamiliar to him, with the preposition من more familiar in common jargon. In the light of Ibn Quzmān's proven familiarity with the classical idiom, editors of his *Dīwān* can well reinstate the idiomatice في in the second verse above without compunction.

As already indicated, there is a clear testimony in the *Dīwān* that Ibn Quzmān, living three centuries after such a champion of *badī'* as Abū Tammām was quite comfortable with the use of the rhetorical figures of speech that Abū Tammām and other Abbasid poets had popularized, and particularly such figures as *ṭibāq* 'antithesis' and *jinās* 'paronomasia'. Addressing his

Maecenas in *zajal* 19, 14, Ibn Quzmān wishes that he should go on moving from happiness to a greater bliss and happiness, and that he should witness as well the delight of his friend, and the rage of his foe (lit. envious one):

وسرور الصديق وغيظ الحسود

The poet, having thus indulged his taste for the use of *ṭibāq* 'antithesis' —سرور and غيظ, صديق and حسود, he goes on to indulge it further, and says in the following verse:

و انت تسمن وهو بحال العود
Hope you will put on weight, while he (the envious one) remains as thin as a stick.

The copyist, having in all likelihood missed the niceties of the two cases of *ṭibāq* in the preceding verse, goes on to make a travesty of this figure of speech in the latter verse as well. He apparently hears *tasmā* instead of *tasman*, and he writes:

ات تسمى و هو بحال العود

García Gómez transliterates:

wa-'ett tusammà wa-hu bi-ḥāl al-'ūd (1972, I: 102).

Corriente likewise reads:

و ات تسمى وهو بحال العود (1995: 81).

The translations, in both cases are, quite naturally, wide of the mark.

The copyist does not fare better when metaphorical language is used. In *zajal* 141, 1 the poet makes a simple declamatory statement that the heavy burden of the penalty (the fine to be paid) falls on the one who loves:

وقر الغرامه لمن يعشق

By writing *waqr* instead of *wiqr*, and by an added uncertainty in the placing of the diacritical points, the copyist seems to have confused all his readers. Nykl reads:

Waffir al-ĝarāmah li-man ya'shaq (1933: 315).

But while reading الغرامه, Nykl seems to identify this term with الغرام 'passionate love' as can be seen from his translation:

Prodiga tu amor a quien te ama (1933: 436-7).

García Gómez transliterates likewise:

¡Waffir al-garama li-man ya'shaq!

and he translates much as Nykl had done:

Más amor has de dar al que te ama (1972, II: 700-701).

Corriente introduces a number of emendations into the whole strophe, and gives the rather far-fetched reading:

وفر الخزام لمن يعشق (1995: 405).

He translates:

Ahórrate nariguera con quien ama (1996: 334).

Ibn Quzmān's knowledge of Arabic seems to have been equally matched by his familiarity with the Qur'anic text. Here too, our awareness of what I have called the two antipodes, the poet's competence, and the copyist's uncertain grasp, can be of help in following the vagaries of the script, and in putting them right. In *zajal* 38, 3 we have already seen the copyist write نفس for نفث, a term acquired from *sūra* CXIII, 4. In *zajal* 93, 3 he writes اخو العلين for what is clearly in the context a reference to العالين 'the self-exalted and arrogant' of *sūra* XXXVIII, 75.

Such ineptitude, or such repeated 'clerical errors' can help us to anticipate and lay bare similar other errors. When the poet says to a beautiful, but uncompliant loved one in *zajal* 114,4 what seems to read وانت مقاع الغرور we can have little doubt that he is echoing *sūras* III, 185 and LVII, 20, and that we should read in place of the copyist's bungling وانت متاع الغرور, or, in other Qur'anic terms متاع الحياة الدنيا, the comfort and pleasure of illusion.

García Gómez emends the faulty term, and transliterates:

wa-anta mauqi' al-gurūr (1972, II: 586).

Corriente retains the Facsimile reading unchanged, but explains in a footnote that *maqā'* implies *mauqi'*, the way García Gómez had read the term (1995: n. 2, 352).

IV. OTHER TEXTUAL CORRECTIONS IN THE LIGHT OF THE PRECEDING GUIDELINES

What I refer to as guidelines are the two basic inferences drawn from reading the Facsimile of Ibn Quzmān's *Dīwān*, and illustrated in some detail in the preceding pages. They can be summed up in what I referred to as the two antipodes, a poet fully abreast of classical Arabic diction, idiom, metaphor and figures of speech, and a copyist who seems to be at sea with literary Arabic be it classical or popular. Apart from being a good hand at calligraphy, the copyist, it would seem, had little else to commend him for his task.

In the light of these conclusions we can be constantly on the lookout for the original and expressive literary language of the poet and the ersatz to which the clumsiness of the copyist can often reduce it.

What follows here are only a few examples to emphasize still further the remarks made in the earlier sections.

In *zajal* 14,9 and after some fairly fulsome praise of a Maecenas of his, Ibn Quzmān resorts to the traditional metaphor of the moist or dewy palm to describe his benefactor's generosity. He then goes on to compare him to the rain-bearing clouds. He says:

وكف اندي من الما
نحير بين اما واما
اما سحاب هو او كف

The confusion, or perhaps an element of absurdity in this case, appears in the last verse quoted. 'His palm', says the poet, 'is more moist than water, so that I am (we are) bewildered, whether he is a raincloud or a palm (of a hand). This is how both García Gómez and Corriente have read and translated the verse. García Gómez translates the last two verses:

Dudo entre una cosa y otra:
si una mano es o una nube (1972, I: 77).

Corriente, likewise, translates:

Perplejo entre dos estoy,
si es nube o es mano (1996: 86).

Remembering, however, that Ibn Quzmān knew his Arabic well, he would have been sure to associate rainclouds with *wakf* or 'shedding', 'dropping' their rain. He would have been more likely to wonder whether the Maecenas he is praising is a raincloud, or more copious with rain, so to speak, than rainclouds, in which case we should read:

اما سحاب او هو اوكف

In fact the Facsimile text has a seemingly otiose *alif* written after سحاب, which should have guided editors to the correct reading. It is the *alif* of او of which the copyist dropped the و. He could not visualize, perhaps, how او could appear on its own, and then as part of the following comparative اوكف.

Ibn Quzmān, knowing his Arabic all too well, would be aware that the verb *ḥajja*, apart from referring to making the pilgrimage, is extensively used as a transitive verb, and that among its primary meanings, is 'to visit repeatedly or frequently'. These seem to be the twin implications of the imperative حج in *zajal* 101, I:

وحج الكاس لو انك على عكاس [9]
Repair to or make your pilgrimage frequently to the cup,
even if you should be (bent double and) walking with a stick.

The text is patently clear, and I see no reason or justification for Corriente's surmise that حج 'is of Romance origin meaning 'suck' or 'suck at the breast' (1995: n. 7, 321). حج الكاس conveys the poet's characteristic irreverence for the injunction against drinking. Besides, the striking paradox of repeated visits being enjoined when one is no more able to walk is not conveyed by the suggested Romance reading. García Gómez reads the term as Arabic, although

[9] The poet, of course, would be aware of the *ikfā'* involved in rhyming عكاز with كاس , but as a *zajal* or *hazl* writer, he was not one to observe the fine points of prosody or grammar.

he introduces emendations which mar the forceful use of the imperative by the poet. He reads:

wa-ḥaǧǧ (sic) bi-l-kās law annak 'ala 'ukkās (1972, II: 524).

In the same zajal and the same strophe, 101, 1 the poet seemingly aware that بلج like انبلج, ابتلج, تبلج and ابلج refer to dawn, daybreak or the sun shining brightly, speaks of cheeks from which light emanates or shines brightly:

فمن خدين بلج الضيا فيه

Corriente reads بلج, which is sufficiently clear in the text, as يُلِجّ and comments in a footnote that this term too «is of Romance origin, meaning 'to light' or 'to shed light'» (1995: n. 1, 322). García Gómez reads *yaliǧ* instead of بلج, but, apparently surmising the sense of the text, gives a translation which tallies with بلج:

Gente con luz que les sale de la faz (1972, II: 524-5).

حج appears in *zajal* 20, 29, where it stands to reason that it is, in this case, the copyist's mistake for حاجة 'need':

ان كانت حج نمضي فيها راجل
حق لو كانت حاجتك ان تماري
If a need (of mine) should arise, I would go after in on foot,
It is only right if you have a need that you should be relentless (in seeking it).

Both the context, (seeking help from a benefactor), and the balanced phrases in the two verses leave little doubt that the copyist wrote حج, suggesting 'pilgrimage', for حاجة 'need', in the first verse. Corriente reads حج, and reads نماري for تماري, which is clearly written in the text, and which is more compatible with the 2nd person form of address in the second verse. He gives the reader no grounds for his emendation, or for reading as interrogative what seems to be a declamatory statement by the poet. Corriente translates:

Aunque peregrinar a pie me pidiera,
¿estaría bien discutirle lo que fuera? (1996: 102).

García Gómez reads *ḥāğa*, but he reads the imperfect subjuntive تماري, following appositely after ان, as a Romance term *tomar*. In order to sustain such a reading, however, he changes the text of the second verse out of recognition:

W-in kānat hāğa namḍī fī-hā rāğil
ḥaqqan lau kabar, dabbatak TOMARE

His translation, like that of Corriente, lacks directness and clarity:

Aunque a pie vine, por cuanto he venido
puedo si es mucho tu mula TOMARE (1972, I: 112-13).

V. THE ROMANCE ELEMENT IN THE *DĪWĀN* OF IBN QUZMĀN, AND CARITATIVE DIMINUTIVES

It is no secret, of course, that Ibn Quzmān peppers some of his *zajal* strophes with Romance terms and expressions, or what García Gómez aptly calls *Romancismos*. It is not the intention here nor the place to study these *Romancismos*. But, as in the preceding sections, the intention is to trace any giveaway secrets or guidelines for a better reading of the *Dīwān* of the poet. The *Romancismos* are too limited, or simply an insufficient indication as to whether Ibn Quzmān was at all bilingual. In fact, the *Romancismos* by themselves tell us little about Ibn Quzmān's knowledge of Romance, or what one may call his linguistic acculturation. Some features of the poet's Arabic diction, however, are more revealing about his familiarity with Romance than the isolated use of Romance vocabulary.

One such feature which has received little attention is the poet's use of the Arabic verb *arāda* (Form IV), as the equivalent of the Romance *querer*. While he often uses the verb to convey its familiar Arabic denotations 'to want', 'to want to have', 'to desire', etc., which are equally shared by *querer*, he quite frequently uses the Arabic *narīd, tarīd, yarīd* to convey the other primary meaning of *querer*, i.e. 'to love', 'to like'. In fact *narīd* is used in the very first verse of the *Diwan*, *zajal* 1,1 in a sense peculiar to *querer*:

نريد و لخوف النشبه نبكي
I love and for fear of infatuation (lit. getting hooked), I cry.

Such a usage of *narīd, tarīd,* etc., unfamiliar in Arabic, but which could well be taken for granted by the Spanish reader, appears in numerous other contexts in the *Dīwān*. Thus in 16, 4:

و تريد من جاك لسيتجدي و تعشق
You love whoever comes seeking your help, and become fond of him.

And in 28, 8:

كل من يراك يحبك كل من يراك يريدك
Whoever sees you falls in love with you,
Whoever sees you develops a desire for you.

This verse may be contrasted with the verse which immediately follows it, where *tarīd* simply implies you want:

كل من ترى غلامك ولّ من تريد و اعزل
All the people you see are your slaves, enthrone and dethrone whomever you please (lit. 'want').

نريد, used with a clear Romance reference, appears twice in the same verse in 43, 2:

نريد يا قوم نريد
I love him, gentlemen, I do.

The Romance signification is patently clear also in 48, 7:

لا تشك انت في ودي و ايقن اني نريدك
Do not you doubt my affection, and be sure that I love you.

And in 106, 1:

ابدا لس نقل بهم اذريت الذي نريد[10]
I never complain of any worries if I see the one I love.

[10] I have retained the Facsimile reading where اذا and رايت are written together.

García Gómez translates in the latter case:

> *Jamás hablé de mi pesar*
> *cuando al que quiero pude ver* (1972, II: 549).

This translation is more to the point than Corriente's who translates *narīd* as 'want' or '*lo que quiero*'. *Ra'ayt*, likewise, does not suggest *conseguir* as Corriente translates it:

> *Si consigo lo que quiero* (1996: 279).

Another feature of Ibn Quzmān's poetic diction which betrays Romance influence is his prolific use of the diminutive. It must be pointed out, however, at the outset, that the distinctive feature referred to here is the poet's use of the diminutive as a caritative form, or as a form of endearment. There is no suggestion made here that the diminutive form is not used by other Arab poets in Islamic Spain or outside it, or that the famous al-Mutanabbī, for example, did not use it perhaps as profusely as Ibn Quzmān did. But whereas al-Mutanabbī used the diminutive to scoff at his opponents, or as an expression of contempt, Ibn Quzmān invariably uses it to convey notions of affection, fondness and endearment, in the same way that it was used in contemporary Romance, or in the way it is attested in many of the surviving Romance *kharjas*. In this respect, Ibn Quzmān stands out as the sole representative among all the poets and writers in Arabic in Islamic Spain of the *tradicionalismo* which Ramón Menéndez Pidal chose to identify as a constant in cultural developments throughout the history of Spain. Ibn Quzmān's use of the caritative diminutive, in other words, is one of those perennial literary traits which seem to defy time in literary productions in Spain, or which survive, so to speak, with every ecological succession.

I have examined the diminutives in the *Dīwān* of Ibn Quzmān at some length in a study published back in 1989.[11] There is no need to repeat here the arguments produced in the 1989 study in support of likely Romance influences on the poet's predilection for the diminutive, and for coining, all too often, diminutive patterns of his own. One example should suffice to illustrate what one can call the Hispanic tone of many of his diminutives.

[11] *BSOAS*, vol. LII, part. 2, pp. 239-254.

The poet uses فميمه (feminine) as the diminutive of فم, at a time when both the Arabic term, and its classical Arabic diminutive فويه are masculine in gender. The feminine form فميمة is patently clear in the poet's text. Equally clear also, in the example given below, 62, 6 is the feminine epithet *fawwāḥa* qualifying *fumayma* and the feminine suffix pronoun referring to it, *bi-hā*:

جاني الحيب فميتو فواح كانه قد اكل بها تفاح
My beloved came to me with a fragrant mouth
as if he had just eaten an apple.

When the poet goes on to use فميمة consistently as a feminine diminutive, as in 10, 6 in 67, 2 and 141, 3 it stands to reason that *fumaymah* constituted a translation in the poet's mind, or perhaps a 'calque' of *boquita*, or *bokella* as attested in the Romance *kharjas* (García Gómez, 1965: e.g. 124, 144, 186, etc.).

But our primary purpose here is to see how far the poet's flair for the diminutive, and particularly for caritative diminutives, can be put to use as a guideline in reading his problematical or obscure texts.

Strophe 7 in *zajal* 54 has a caritative diminutive in each of its *aghṣān*, and a fourth in its *qufl*:

جات محاسن الايام جملة في صبي
سيكون تسع اعوام او يزيد شوي
السياده والاكرام منسبك حلي
ريت ما انبل فقديد يمنعني ان نميل
All the beauty of the world (lit. time) is gathered in one youth
He will be nine soon, or a little older
One who is noble and honourable, shapely of stature and charming
I have seen how noble he is, and his comely stature, prevents me from bending it.

Ṣubay, *shuway*, *ḥulay* are all caritative diminutives which give a clue or a fair expectation that *qudaydu* with an *u* vowel on its first radical is yet another diminutive. It is a caritative diminutive of *qadd* 'stature'. García Gómez misses the diminutive and reads *qadruhu* instead of *qudaydu*. He transliterates:

Fa-qadru-hu yamna'-nī an numaiyalu (1972, I: 276).

Corriente reads *qudaydu* and translates accordingly *'tallecito'* (1996: 168). But both García Gómez and Corriente miss the signification of *munsabak* in the third *ghuṣn* which anticipates the caritative *qudaydu* in the *quſl*. Both *munsabak* and the cognate *masbūk* imply 'shapely', 'well-shaped' or, literally 'well-cast' in a variety of Arabic dialects spoken today. *Masbūk sabk* likewise refers to a perfect form or stature, the implication being that it is without flaw or blemish as if it were cast *masbūk* by hand.

Apparently missing the implication of *munsabak*, García Gómez translates the third *ghusn* in the strophe quoted above:

Señorío y franqueza son dulce mezcla (1972, I: 277).

Corriente likewise translates:

Nobleza y señorío en dulce amalgama (1996: 168).

Keeping the caritative diminutive in sight can help us to to clarify an analogous difficulty in *zajal* 116,5 where the poet says:

اجر عجل لا تستدير
لحديده و قبل تربح الخيب و العنا

What has confused the editors of the *Dīwān* in this case is *ḥudaydah* which is a diminutive of *ḥadd* or *ḥaddu* meaning 'near' or 'near him' respectively. It is familiar in a wide range of present-day Arabic dialects in such statements like *baytu ḥadd baytī «his house is close to my house»* (Nakhlah, 1960: 121). The poet says:

Run quickly and do not look back
(Get) close to him and kiss him
And you will reap (nothing but) disappointment and distress.

García Gómez reads the diminutive as *li-ḥadīd* and translates:

Corre, aprisa, más no rondes,
que quien besa este cuchillo
saca sólo desengaños (1972, II: 595).

Corriente, likewise, reads the diminutive as لحديدي and translates:

> *Corre, pronto y sin volverte,*
> *a mi hierro, pues besarlo*
> *causa fatiga y desengaño* (1996: 296).

One other caritative diminutive which has confused all readers of Ibn Quzmān appears in *zajal* 10,4. It occurs in a verse in which the poet wishes that God had created his love as a little stem, or, one might say 'spriglet' of lavender:

لو جعلك الله خزيمه

O. J. Tuulio reads this diminutive as *khudayma* and translates: «Puisse Allah te transformer en une (pauvre) petite servante!» (1941: 4). A. R. Nykl transliterates this diminutive as *judhayma* and translates: «Si Dios te hubiera hecho manquillo». He adds in brackets after «*manquillo*» by way of explanation of his conjecture, «para no gastar!» (1922: 24 and 375). C. Brockelmann, quoted by C. Appel, translates the verse in question: «Möge Gott zu einem... (?) machen!». Brockelmann, it seems, refused to hazard a guess similar to the previous two, and supplied blanks for the diminutive in question.[12] García Gómez transliterates the verse in question:

¡lau ǧa'alak Allah ǧuḍaima!

He translates, omitting the reference to God: «*de volverte leprosilla*!» «that you should turn into a little leper!» García Gómez adds in a footnote that the strophe, in which this verse appears is difficult, and wonders whether the poet's use of 'little leper' was not due to the fact that "small pieces of money were thrown to lepers" (1972, I: 58-9). Corriente reads جذيمه, and adopts a similar explanation to those of Nykl and García Gómez. It is no doubt baffling that when the poet is clearly heaping terms of endearment on his love in *zajal* 10 (four caritative diminutives in as many verses in strophe 6), that so many scholars should give credence to the conjecture that he is wishing him or her to be a leper or a cripple lacking one or both hands or arms. In *zajal* 14, 6 the copyist has written تيه و جذلان which makes no sense, and

[12] C. Appel, in his review of A. R. Nykl's «El Cancionero de Aben Quzman», Madrid 1933, in *Zeitscrift für Romanische Philologie*, LV, 1935, 725-37.

which has consistently been read تيه و خذلان by the poet's editors. In the same way in *zajal* 10,4 we should read خزيمه and not جذيمه which, to say the least, seems far-fetched.

Having said this, however, one should not fail to point out here that scholars have puzzled over another diminutive in strophe 4 of *zajal* 10, *ḥujayrāt*, where the script presents no problems. *Ḥujayrāt* is used with *mathāqil*, gold dinars[13], or gold coins, in the same verse, and both terms seem to be used metaphorically in the context of a mounting crescendo of adulation and endearment of the beloved. In his 1980 edition (81-82) Corriente equates *ḥujayrāt* with حصى 'small stones', 'pebbles', indicating a diminutive of *ḥajar* 'stone'. In his first translation, however, (1984: 66) he clearly seems to view *ḥujayrāt* as the plural of *ḥujayrā*, diminutive of *ḥujra* 'room' or '*cámara*', and he translates the term as '*Algorfas*'. In his 1995 edition he points out that he now subscribes to the view that *ḥujayrāt* is the plural of the diminutive of *ḥijr*, meaning 'bosom' or more popularly 'lap', and he translates *ḥujayrāt* accordingly as "*Haldas*" in place of "*Algorfas*" (1995: n. 7, 55 and 1996: 77).

Since the context is one of lavish praise of the beloved, *ḥujayrāt* is more likely to be the plural of the diminutive of *ḥajar* 'stone', and since it is coupled with *mathāqil*, the poet is in all likelihood referring to حجارة كريمه or حجارة ثمينه, meaning 'precious stones' or 'gems', and not 'pebbles'. الحجر in classical Arabic referred also to 'gold' and 'silver', and together the two metals were called الحجران (Lane: art. *ḥajar*). It no doubt stands to reason that the poet in *zajal* 10,4 was not wishing his loved one to be a leper or a cripple, as has been claimed so far, so that those wishing to have a close look at her or his beauty would confer 'roomfuls' or 'lapfuls' of gifts on her or him. What the poet is saying is simply that his love is as precious as gems or gold.

VI. CONCLUSION

Future generations will one day come to realize that Ibn Quzmān is by far the most resourceful, talented and sensitive of all the poets who wrote in Arabic in al-Andalus. His *Dīwān* should be treated with great care, and no changes or emendations should be introduced on the single manuscript we have of it, unless

[13] See *zajal* 19, 2 and Corriente, 1995: n. 3, 86.

they are the kind of changes which, as Emerson says, constitute their own evidence.

With the help of scholars like Emilio García Gómez and Federico Corriente we are nearer to having a definitive edition of Ibn Quzmān's *Dīwān*. But the edition which is to transform the 1896 Facsimile into print is still a long way off. The definitive translation of the text it follows is still a long way off too, and we might perhaps have to accept the fact that it will always have a tentative aspect about it.

This article, as its title indicates, was meant to be restricted to the study of textual uncertainties in the *Dīwān* of the poet. Literary translations quite often, of course, reveal differences in interpretation. In the case of Ibn Quzmān's work such differences seem to be numerous and wide apart even where there are no textual uncertainties. One or two examples should suffice here to show that translating Ibn Quzmān needs as much deliberation and caution as reading his erratic or bungled texts.

An Arabic term which has the connotation in popular usage of «to be left without protection or support», or «to become exposed and vulnerable» is *inkashaf*. It is obviously in this sense that Ibn Quzmān uses the term. In strophe 14 of *zajal* 83, an elegy he wrote upon the death of his benefactor the *qāḍī* of Cordova, Abū'l-Qāsim Ibn Ḥamdīn, he addresses himself to the dead *qāḍī*, and says:

و انكشف بعدك اقواما كثيرة
كشفت البرغوث فيجبهة الاقرع[14]

Many people have become unshielded (unprotected) after your death,
Like fleas on a bald man's brow.

I am not commenting here on Ibn Quzmān's libertinism in seeming sardonic or even scurrilous in the context of a sombre elegy. But García Gómez, apparently missing the popular nuances of *inkashaf*, translates the term as '*sale*', 'to come out':

Ido tú, sale tropel de gentuza,
como en la frente del calvo las pulgas (1972, I: 417).

[14] Readers might note that the copyist misses writing كشفة with a *tā' marbūṭa*.

Corriente translates *inkashaf* as '*desbandar*' 'to run away, to flee in disorder' and gives a version close to that of García Gómez:

> *Tras ti se desbandan numerosas gentes,*
> *como las pulgas en la frente del calvo* (1996: 223).

In *zajal* 140, 5 the poet says with characteristic panache:

> و ان طبخ العشقَ احد
> انا ناكل العشق ني
> If anyone should (take his time and) cook love
> I eat love uncooked.

García Gómez appropriately translates:

> *Si amor suelen otros guisar*
> *yo crudo me como el amor* (1972, II: 699).

Corriente, however, seems to confuse the subject and object in the first verse, and translates as a result:

> *Si el amor cuece a algunos*
> *yo me lo como crudo* (1996: 333).

Side by side with the editions by García Gómez and Corriente, the *Dīwān* should continue for a long time to come to be published in Facsimile, until a consensus develops concerning the textual problems it presents whether in the Arabic which is difficult to surmise, or the equally enigmatic Romance which should fit into a convincing harmony both with the sense and the overall rhythm of the metre. Despite the numerous readings which Corriente has convincingly put right in his recent edition, the 1972 edition of García Gómez still has the advantage of having offered tentative readings and a detailed discussion of what is clearly Romance or supposed to be in Romance in the texts (1972, III: 323-513).

The rest of this conclusion is a further brief attempt to show how what I have described as 'giveaway secrets' in the text of the *Dīwān* can be put to use in helping us to arrive at a better reading and better interpretation of the Facsimile.

In *zajal* 83,5 we read what amounts to an injunction from the poet:

وكل الصار واستغن عن الناس
وان قال حد كيف ات قل لاباس
Eat *al-ṣār* [which makes no sense] and do without (the help of) other people,
and if anyone should ask how you are, (just) say «all is well».

Both García Gómez and Corriente have read the offending word as *aṣ-ṣārra* which makes no sense either. García Gómez translates the first verse:

Come lo justo, prescinde de todos (1972, I: 415).

And Corriente translates:

Come lo imprescindible, apártate de la gente (1996: 222).

Neither of the two translations tells us what it is the poet is enjoining us to eat, although the drift or tenor of what he is saying is fairly clear in both of them. Being aware, however, of the poet's resourcefulness, and the incompetence of the copyist, we can be as good as certain that the poet is referring to *al-ṣāb* tree, the equivalent of the bitter aloes الصبر which the copyist writes down as *al-ṣār*. «Sustain yourself on the bitter *ṣāb*», the poet tells us, «rather than seek the help of other people.» The poet tells us, after all, in an equally proud and dignified tone in *zajal* 9, 29:

فانا هو كما يقال فالمثل
عز روحك و لو نقلت الفحم
I am one who abides by the popular saying:
Keep your personal dignity, even though you should be carting charcoal.

Zajal 9, addressed to Abū'l-'Alā' Ibn Zuhr, a benefactor of the poet, is in 42 strophes. While many references have already been made to this *zajal*, it would be useful to quote one of its strophes, n.º 24, in its entirety here to illustrate the complex problems of reading and interpretation which the Facsimile still presents:

الذي كلما هجم من بعيد
و همز همزه و انكي بالحديد

فالذي اقبلوا الينا عبيد
والذي وُلّوا علينا خدم

What seems to be *ankā* in the second verse has proved to be problematic. The poet is praising the prowess of his Maecenas when he is accoutred for battle on horseback. He describes him when he charges from a distance, goading or spurring his horse for the charge - *hamaz hamza*. Prodding the horse with the spur seems to suggest to the versatile poet what might be called the 'logical sequent', thrusting at the enemy with the spear ونكي بالحديد or ونكا بالحديد, terms which have besides the wider implication of inflicting slaughter on the enemy with both sword and spear, or, collectively, بالحديد i.e. with steel (weaponry). The copyist, as far as one can see, unfamiliar with either نكي or نكا could well have introduced an element of metathesis and written انكى. García Gómez reads *wa-'ankà* (1972, I: 48). The copyist on the other hand could have written وانكى *wā-nakā*, for ونكى giving the conjunction a long vowel instead of its short one.

Corriente reads واتكا بالحديد justifying his emendation by metrical considerations (1995: n. 1, 50). اتكا , of course, requires a different preposition, which would create further metrical difficulties. While it is difficult to make out the sense of اتكا بالحديد in Arabic, the Spanish translation by Corriente «*embraza el hierro*» is not free from obscurity either.

The poet says in strophe 24:

> He who, whenever he charges from a distance
> Prods (his horse) and perpetrates slaughter on the enemy with his weapons (*al-ḥadīd*).
> (Then) those who fall upon us (in battle) are (turned into) slaves
> and those appointed to rule over us become (our) servants.

Corriente reads اقبلوا علينا in place of اقبلوا الينا although it is the preposition الى which denotes direction. He also reads ولولوا علينا «*los que albórbolas en nuestra contra hacían*» in place of the clearly vocalized passive وُلّوا علينا (1995: 50, and 1996: 73). His reading seems far-fetched. For one thing it is not the women encouraging the combatants that Ibn Zuhr is praised for enslaving, and for another, Corriente's reading misses the sharp case of antithesis, *ṭibāq*, in the poet's vaunt. «Those appointed to rule, or lord it over us, become (our) servants.»

Every caution, as can be seen, should be exercised before any emendations are introduced, especially where the text seems clear, and the copyist's bungling or incompetence is not suspected.

In *zajal* 20, 17 where the poet is describing one of his escapades with women, his friend, whom he has enticed to go home with him, seems to ask for something wherewithal to cover her nakedness. His ingenuity seems to rise to every occasion. He promises to write a note with his own hand through which a dress of a particular texture would summarily be provided:

قلت ذاب نكتب بطاق بخطي
ويجي فيها كساان يراري
I said I will directly write a note with my own hand
and a see-through dress will be dispatched (lit. will come) to us.

It is no doubt legitimate, if only for purposes of consistency and standardization to read كساء in place of the copyist's كساان. But both García Gómez and Corriente unnecessarily emend يراري i.e. 'transparent', 'see-through', and read instead *badārī*, which they translate as 'new'. يراري, meaning 'see-through', is still attested in a wide range of Arabic dialects in our own day, and it is, with little doubt, the appropriate term in the context.

The Romance terms and expressions in the *Dīwān* of Ibn Quzmān could not have fared better than the Arabic has done, at times, at the hand of the copyist. To say the least, they need to be read and ascertained with equal care and caution.

An attempt was made in the course of this study to show that Romance influence on Ibn Quzmān goes far deeper than the mere use of isolated items of vocabulary in his poetry. This is particularly apparent in what might well be described as his native use of the caritative diminutive. But it could well be said that the study of the poet's use of Romance terms and expressions has not gone much further than deciphering these terms or expressions, where the script is vague, or deciding their true identity with an element of certainty. Are the Romance terms used by the poet used solely for macaronic purposes, or is it possible to speak of any of these terms as loan words in popular Andalusian Arabic? These are the type of questions which the treatment or study of the *'Romancismos'* has not so far tried to raise or answer.

Strophe 10 in *zajal* 20 has an exquisite *'Romancismo'* used in it at the end of the *qufl*, or in the rhyme position. The poet says, expressing a seemingly universal failing:

من اراني عيني يطلب بلطاري
Whatever (lit. whoever) my eye sees, my palate (Sp. *'Paladar'*) would covet.

بلطار appears also in *zajal* 88, 3 but again in the rhyme position. The two terms appear in the rhyme position in the *aqfāl*. *Zajal* 20 has 29 strophes, and *zajal* 88 is not far behind with 27 strophes. Supplying 29 or 27 words rhyming in *ār* can tax the ingenuity even of a poet like Ibn Quzmān[15], and the use of one or two Romance terms prove unavoidable, if not simply handy. In the light of such considerations, *paladar* cannot be viewed as a likely loan term in Andalusian Arabic.

Only what seems to be the last two strophes of zajal 3 in the *Dīwān*, a *zajal* of praise, have survived, and they are clearly addressed to a member of the Banū Ḥamdīn family. Strophe 2 ends with the following verses:

ونشتم ايما كان معك عد
الق الله في راس ضربة شقور
I heap curses upon whoever is an enemy of yours
May God smite his head with a blow of a *"segur"*.

It is fairly clear from the context that *shuqūr*, at the end of what seems to be the final *qufl* is the Romance term *'segur'* 'axe', and both García Gómez and Corriente have read it as such. It accords in rhyme, or is perhaps made to have accordance of rhyme with *al-budūr*, the rhyme word in the *qufl* of the preceding strophe. The appearance of the term in the rhyme position, as already indicated, is no adequate basis for designating or thinking of it as a possible loan word in Andalusian Arabic. The poet, however, uses the term again in *zajal* 86, 5 where it is clearly the context, and not any exigencies of rhyme or metre, which prompts its use. The context this time is purely martial, and descriptive of battles and weaponry throughout the ten strophes of *zajal* 86. The poet says:

لس ترى ذاك النهار الا شقر او عصا
والري على الرمي، و النبال عد الحصا

[15] Ibn Quzmān makes practically the same vaunt about his unrivalled knowledge of Arabic, and quite rightly so, as al-Mutanabbī does. In *zajal* 9, 35 he says: والغرايب الى لساني تطوع i.e., «the most far-fetched terms are at the tips of my fingers».

You could hardly see that day anything other than axes and spears[16] (lit. sticks)
Shaft following upon shaft, and arrows as numerous as stones.

With شقر used in such a context, it becomes legitimate to ask whether the term was not a loan word from Romance in popular Andalusian Arabic. It becomes equally legitimate to ask whether the term was شقور as used in *zajal* 3, 2 where it has to accord with a particular rhyme scheme or more likely شقر as in *zajal* 86, 5. It is rather surprising, however, that neither García Gómez nor Corriente have identified the term in zajal 86. They both emend it to read شفره, and both translate '*acero*' or '*aceros*', 'steel' or perhaps 'swords' (García Gómez, 1972, I: 433, and Corriente, 1996: 230).

All this shows, however, that both the Arabic and the Romance elements in the *Dīwān* of Ibn Quzmān are still in need of much scrutiny.

REFERENCES

Abu-Haidar, J. A., «The diminutives in the *Dīwān* of Ibn Quzmān: A product of their Hispanic milieu?», *BSOAS*, vol. LII, part 3, 1989, 239-254.

Al-Ahwānī, 'Abd al-'Azīz, *Al-Zajal fī al-Andalus*, Cairo, 1957.

Corriente, Federico (ed.), *Dīwān Ibn Quzmān, Naṣṣan, wa-Lughatan wa-'Arūḍan*, Madrid, 1980.

—, *El Cancionero hispanoárabe, Introducción, traducción y notas*, Madrid, 1984.

— (ed.), *Dīwān Ibn Quzmān al-Qurtubī (d. 555 H./1160 A.D.)*, Cairo, 1995.

—, *Cancionero andalusí, Nueva edición, mejorada y puesta al día, Traducción, introducción y notas*, Madrid, 1996.

García Gómez, Emilio, *Todo Ben Quzmán*, 3 vols., Madrid, 1972.

—, *Las jarchas romances de la serie árabe en su marco*, Madrid, 1965.

Gorton, T. G., «The metre of Ibn Quzmān: A 'classical' approach", *Journal of Arabic Literature*, VI, 1975, 1-29.

Ibn Hishām al-Lakhmī, *Al-Madhkal ilā Taqwīn al-Lisān wa Ta'līm al-Bayān*, Edición crítica, estudio e índices por José Pérez Lázaro, Madrid, 1990.

Nakhla, R., *Gharā'ib al-Lugha al-'Arabiyya*, Beirut, 1960.

[16] It is Corriente who suggests (1996: n. 9, 264), that *'aṣā* in the context refers to 'spears', and he, accordingly, translates '*astas*'.

Nicholson, R. A., *A literary history of the Arabs*, Cambridge University Press, 1956.
Nykl, A. R., *El cancionero del Šeih, nobilísimo Visir maravilla del tiempo Abū Bakr ibn 'Abd al-Malik Aben Guzmán (Ibn Quzmān)*, Madrid, 1933.
Stern, S. M., «Studies on Ibn Quzman», *Al-Andalus*, 16, 1951, 379-425.
—, *Hispano-Arabic Strophic Poetry*, ed. L. P. Harvey, Oxford, 1974.
Tuulio, O. J., *Ibn Quzman, poète hispano-arabe bilingue*, Helsinki, 1941.

RESUMEN

Basado enteramente en pruebas internas, este estudio se propone mostrar que el manuscrito único del *Dīwān* de Ibn Quzmān, publicado en edición facsímil por David de Gunzburg en 1896, es una copia dictada. Se indica también que el copista, a quien con frecuencia se ha culpado de introducir en el texto popular andaluz correcciones o clasicismos, no estaba bien equipado para desempeñar tal papel. Si bien era un calígrafo de primera categoría, se aducen pruebas de que su conocimiento del árabe no estaba a la altura de la calidad de su caligrafía. El estudio muestra que él fue el responsable de una amplia gama de problemas textuales que ha dejado perplejos a sucesivos editores del *Dīwān*. En marcado contraste, se muestra que Ibn Quzmān poseía un dominio magistral de la lengua árabe y de las tradiciones árabes clásicas. Al parecer también había adquirido un alto grado de 'aculturación' en la lengua romance. Además de ofrecer las pruebas en que se basan estos asertos, el estudio constituye un ejemplo ilustrativo de cómo estas pruebas pueden ayudar a una mejor lectura e interpretación del *Dīwān* de Ibn Quzmān.

ABSTRACT

Depending wholly on internal evidence, this study sets out to show that the unique manuscript of Ibn Quzmān's *Dīwān*, published in facsimile by David de Gunzburg in 1896, is a dictated copy. It tries to show also that the copyist, who has often been blamed for corrections or classicizing emendations of the popular Andalusian text, was not qualified for such a "role". While he seems to have been a first class calligrapher, evidence is provided here that his knowledge of Arabic was not at all on a level with the standard of his calligraphy. He is shown to be responsible for the wide range of textual problems which have puzzled successive editors of the *Dīwān*.

In sharp contrast with all this, Ibn Quzmān is shown to be an unrivalled master of Arabic and classical Arabic lore. He also seems to have had a remarkable "acculturation" in the Romance language. Apart from citing the evidence for these findings, this paper amounts to an illustration of how they can help towards a better reading and understanding of Ibn Quzmān's *Dīwān*.