Aufsätze

Beatrice Gruendler
Ibn Rushd's Cultural Adaptation of Aristotle's ›Poetics‹

1. Context: The Arabic poetics in Ibn Rushd's ›Poetics‹

Ibn Rushd's (Latin: Averroes, d. 595/1198) so-called ›Middle Commentary‹ on Aristotle's ›Poetics‹[1] written in 570/1174 enjoyed a wide reception including translations into Latin by Hermannus Alemannus in Toledo in 1256 and Hebrew by Todros Todrosi in the Provence between Arles and Marseille in 1337, which was then twice retranslated into Latin by Abraham de Balmes, active in Venice and Padua, in 1523 and Jacob Mantino, active in Bologna, Venice, and Rome, in 1550/1552.[2]

The Arabic history of the ›Poetics‹ had begun with the founder of the philosophical school in Baghdad, Abū Bishr Mattā b. Yūnus al-Qunnāʾī (d. 328/940), who translated it from the Greek via a (lost) Syriac version.[3] But it took a century before the ›Poetics‹ received its first major commentary with Ibn Sīnā (Latin: Avicenna, d. 428/1037) — there had been none in the Greek and Byzantine traditions.[4] He aimed at understanding Aristotle on his own terms and succeeded to make sense of the problematic text of the Arabic version, an extremely literal and at times incomprehensible translation, replete with transliterations of Greek terms and names and with attempts at rendering the included citations from Greek literature into Arabic. The cultural context of Greek drama moreover had no correspondence in the Arabic-Islamic world (neither for a fact in the late antique Christianity of the Near East through which the ›Poetics‹ had been received), and Abū Bishr had chosen to culturally translate Greek

1 The following is a small excerpt from the full introduction to Ibn Rushd's ›Talkhīṣ‹ and the discussion of all his quotes to appear in Dimitri Gutas (ed.), The Complete Poetics: Multilingual Transformations of the Seminal Text in the Historical West (Bactria to the Atlantic) from Aristotle to the Renaissance, with contributions by Yury Arzhanov, Fabio Bulgarini, Vasiliki Chamourgiotaki, Torben Frey, Jan van Ginkel, Francesca Gorgoni, Beatrice Gruendler, Dimitri Gutas, Matthew Melvin-Koushki, Oliver Overwien, Ali Sakr, Hidemi Takahashi, and Marianna Zarantonello, Leiden (forthcoming). The research received funding from the Einstein Foundation (2016-2022) and the DFG-Project »Arabic Literature Cosmopolitan« (2020-2027) and was hosted at the Berlin Graduate School Muslim Cultures and Societies and the Institute of Arabic Studies, both Freie Universität Berlin.

2 Dag Nikolaus Hasse, Success and Suppression: Arabic Science and Philosophy in the Renaissance, Cambridge, Mass. 2016, pp. 73-74 and 341-43, 37, and 350.

3 It is preserved in a unique copy in MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Arab. 2346, and edited among others by Salīm Sālim, Talkhīṣ Kitāb Arisṭūṭālīs fī l-shiʿr, Cairo 1978. The Greek version has been reedited with recourse to the Arabic, whose manuscript antedates the oldest Greek manuscripts; for a comprehensive study, see Aristotle, Poetics: Editio Maior of the Greek Text with Historical Introductions and Philological Commentaries, ed. by Leonardo Tarán and Dimitri Gutas, Leiden 2012 (Mnemosyne Supplements 338), introduction by co-editor Dimitri Gutas to its Syriac and Arabic transmission, pp. 77-127.

4 See introduction of co-editor Leonardo Tarán, preface to Aristotle (fn. 3), pp. 3-76.

DOI https://doi.org/10.46500/83535895-001 | CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

tragedy into Arabic praise poetry (*madīḥ*) and Greek comedy into Arabic poetic satire (*hijāʾ*). This was a justifiable choice, since Arabic poetry, like Greek drama, was a publicly performed art, enjoyed prestige, and served social and political functions.[5]

Ibn Rushd, the second Arabic philosopher to comment on the ›Poetics‹, relies on Ibn Sīnā, but takes a different approach: he strives to make the ›Poetics‹ speak to the Arabic audience of his time. In his commentary, he replaces all remaining mentions and translations of Greek literature with examples selected from Arabic poetry and the Qurʾān, and he further infers Prophetic tales and wisdom literature, though without citations. The range of poets he cites covers the entire span from pre-Islamic times (sixth century CE) to the fifth/eleventh century (Abū Firās al-Ḥamdānī, d. 357/968 and Abū l-ʿAlāʾ al-Maʿarrī, d. 449/1058), and he even includes contemporary Andalusian dialectal poetry (*muwashshaḥ*), showing himself as a philosopher well acquainted with the Arabic poetic heritage. Verses by al-Mutanabbī (d. 354/965) outnumber by far any other poet (17 of 69 examples), with the pre-Islamic poet Imruʾulqays as a distant second. In the process, his familiarity with the Arabic poetic tradition further inspired Ibn Rushd to select citations from salient Arabic poetic *topoi* and rhetorical figures, and as a result he changed and expanded the ›Poetics‹' structure in a number of places, notably in chapters sixteen and twenty-two, which represent the densest assemblies of cited verses in the ›Talkhīṣ‹. Conversely, Ibn Rushd notes when Greek literary phenomena have no correspondence in Arabic.

2. The ›Poetics‹ as template: The tale (khurāfa/mythos)

Here I focus on the way Ibn Rushd reworked Abū Bishr's ninth century Arabic translation of Aristotle in terms of its primary sources. He opens his commentary, entitled in Arabic ›The Precise Exposition of the Book on Poetry‹ (›Talkhīs Kitāb al-Shiʿr‹) stating (emphasis mine):[6]

> My purpose in this account is to determine precisely what is [contained] in Aristotle's book on poetry about the *universal rules common to all nations, or most,* since much of what is in it is rules [which are] *not applicable to Arabic poetry and its conventions*.
>
> الغرضُ في هذا القول تلخيصُ ما في كتاب أرسطوطاليس في الشعر من القوانين الكلّيّة المشتركة لجميع الأمم أو للأكثر، إذ كثيرٌ ممّا فيه هي قوانينُ غير خاصّةٍ بأشعار العرب وعادتِهم فيها

Ibn Rushd then proceeds to excise all specifics pertaining to Greek poetry and substitute these with Arabic sources (of the 83 added quotes, 69 derive from poetry and 14 from the Qurān). He quite openly used the ›Poetics‹ as an universal template which

5 On praise poetry, see Beatrice Gruendler, Medieval Arabic Praise Poetry: Ibn al-Rūmī and the Patron's Redemption, London 2003, and on poetic satire, Geert Jan van Gelder, The Bad and the Ugly: Attitudes towards invective poetry (*Hijāʾ*) in classical Arabic literature, Leiden 1988.

6 All editions and translations from Greek and Arabic are by Dimitri Gutas (fn. 1), whom I thank for permitting me to use them here.

he filled in to make it an aid for understanding Arabic poetry and certain types of prose (Qur'ān, *qaṣaṣ shar'ī/kutub sharʿiyya, sunan*).[7] He divides his commentary into six larger sections (*fuṣūl*, sing. *faṣl*), which I indicate together with the new edition's subdivision into smaller passages.[8] In his fourth *Faṣl* (chap. 5.4-6.18) he lists the elements of the art of praise poetry: statements of fable (*al-aqāwīl al-khurāfiyya al-muḥākiya*) whose purpose is to imitate, meter, and melody are complemented by the indications of habit, those of belief, and looking;[9] the explanation of some elements requires him to adduce practices of story-tellers (*quṣṣāṣ*) and narrators (*muḥaddithūn,* chap. 6.6 and 6.12-17).

The »tale« (*khurāfa*,[10] chosen by Abū Bishr to render Greek *mythos,* chap. 6.5), according to Ibn Rushd, is the composition of things whose imitation storytellers and narrators intend. What is imitated can be real or a poetic convention, and in the latter case, poetic statements become tales. Ibn Rushd's use of poetry, in fact mostly praise poetry (*madīḥ*), to illustrate concepts that had once been developed on the basis of tragedy will have substantial repercussions.

By equating tales with poetic statements Ibn Rushd manages to make the latter his main subject in the ›Talkhīs.‹ Here (and in chap. 6.4) Ibn Rushd also solves the problem that Arabic poetry (his substitute for Greek tragedy) contains little narrative, usually limited to short episodes, and he adduces storytellers and narrators to import that dimension, even though they use prose. Towards the end (chap. 23), he identifies narrative poems (*ashʿār qaṣaṣiyya*) per se, but throughout the text, he mostly resorts to religious narratives (*qaṣaṣ sharʿī*, chap. 14.1a; *maktūbāt sharʿiyya*, chap. 14.2a), notably the Qurʾānic stories of Joseph (Arabic: Yūsuf, chap. 13.3a) and Abraham (Arabic: Ibrāhīm, chap. 14.5a).

The example of Yūsuf appears in Ibn Rushd's *Faṣl 6* (covering chap. 12.1-19.4; here chapt. 13) within discussion of the kinds of statements that inspire fear and sympathy and move souls. Here Ibn Rushd explains from which positions (*mawāḍiʿ*) the art of praise poetry (*ṣināʿat al-madīḥ*)[11] exerts it effect (*ʿamal*, chap. 13.1): it is generated

7 For the extant manuscripts of his commentary, especially his revised version see Gutas, The Complete Poetics, Part Three: Averroes (fn. 1).

8 The chapter division is the one used in the forthcoming new edition by Gutas, The Complete Poetics (fn. 1).

9 Ibn Rushd lists all elements first, then subdivides them into that which is compared (*mushabbah*) in a poetic statement (the latter three elements) and that by which it is compared (*mushabbah bihī*; the former three). In the second list, statements of fable are replaced by the overarching term of »imitation« (*muḥākāh*), but in the following detailed explanation (chap. 6.12) referred to again as »imitative speech with fables« (*al-qawl al-khurāfī al-muḥākī*).

10 The word *khurāfa* does not designate here a strange and marvelous tale, as common in Arabic literature, but simply means the narrated sequence of events. On the history and etymology of *khurāfa*, see Ulrich Marzolph, Phenomenology of the Middle Eastern Frame-Tale Collections, in: Framing Narratives in Premodern Literature: Arabic, Persian, Hebrew, ed. by Johannes Stephan und Beatrice Gruendler, themed issue of the Journal of Arabic and Islamic Studies 24, 2024, pp. 27-43, esp. pp. 33-34, https://doi.org/10.5617/jais.10120 (accessed October 30, 2025).

11 The term is shared with Abū Bishr vs. Ibn Sīnā who uses instead the Greek term in Arabic transliteration (*trāghūdhiyā*).

through a mixture of inference (*istidlāl*), reversal (*idāra*), and imitation (*muḥākah*) which arouses fear and sympathy and moves souls (chap. 13.2). Subject of imitation is excellent human qualities but also unmerited wretchedness, conducive to cause anguish (chap. 13.3.), that is, a transition must be made (*untuqila*) from the imitation of excellent qualities to unmerited wretchedness befalling excellent men. Ibn Rushd adds a passage saying that most imitation in religious statements (*aqāwīl sharʿiyya*) is of this sort and exemplifies this with the story of Joseph and his brothers (*ḥadīth Yūsuf wa-ikhwatihi*) and other stories (*aqāṣīṣ*), commonly called exhortations (*mawāʿiẓ*, chap. 13.3a, emphasis mine).[12] He explains:

> You will find that most of the imitation that occurs in religious statements is of this sort that has [just] been mentioned, since those are statements of praise that indicate action, like that which took place in the *story of Joseph* (peace be upon him) and his brothers, and in other narratives that are called exhortations.
>
> وأنت تجد أكثر المحاكاة الواقعة في الأقاويل الشرعيّة على هذا النحو الذي ذُكر إذ كانت تلك هي أقاويلَ مديحيّةً تدلّ على العمل مثل ما ورد من حديث يوسف صلّى الله عليه وإخوته وغير ذلك من الأقاصيص التي تُسمّى مواعظَ.

The story of Joseph appears in Sūra 12 of the Qurʾān. This Sūra gives the complete narrative, which is an exception in the Qurʾān. Most Abrahamic tales are only alluded to in the Qurʾān and their completion was part of early exegesis and then developed into an independent genre of tales of the prophets (*qiṣaṣ al-anbiyāʾ*). With the term »exhortations« (*mawāʿiẓ*), Ibn Rushd may refer to those of the Qurʾān itself or their narrative exegesis by professional storytellers (*quṣṣāṣ*) and preachers (*mudhakkirūn*). Those were sometimes even employed by mosques, but the practice was debated among theologians,[13] and a more scholarly type distinguished from a more popular one. Having given the Qurʾānic example, Ibn Rushd cuts the following section (chap. 13.5-6)[14] with examples from Greek tragedy, since these have now been replaced with what makes sense to an Arabic reader.

Ibn Rushd further elaborates that the tale (*khurāfa*) that causes fear and sadness must be visible and believable to perform its intended function (chap. 14.1). He reminds again that unmerited wretchedness and disasters befalling excellent people are rather found in religious writings (*maktūbāt sharʿiyya*) within the religious tradition (*sunan maktūba*), and that praise of excellent qualities is not found in Arab poems »in this age of ours« (chap. 14.2a). Wonder and pleasure at the evocation of excellent qualities (a new subtype he added based on Ibn Sīnā), along with imitation triggering compassion and fear, is felt only if the things transpiring are difficult (*ashyāʾ ṣaʿba*), not slight or insignificant, for instance, catastrophies and disasters that befall friends or loved ones from each other through their own will, such as brothers or fathers and sons killing each other (chap. 14.5). This Ibn Rushd exemplifies with the narrative of Abraham (*qaṣaṣ Ibrāhīm*, chap. 14.5a, emphasis mine).

12 Sections added by Ibn Rushd are marked with a lower case letter (a-c) following the chapter number.

13 See, e. g., Ibn al-Jawzī, Kitāb al-Quṣṣāṣ wa-l-mudhakkirīn, ed. and trans. by Merlin L. Schwartz, Beirut 1986.

14 Abū Bishr retains the Greek names and Ibn Sīnā paraphrases them.

The likes of these things are the disasters and catastrophes that befall friends from each other through [their] will, … and if pain accompanies that, it is nothing like the pain that accompanies the ill that befalls loved ones from each other, such as brothers killing each other, or fathers killing sons, or sons fathers (chap. 14.5). It is because of what he (sc. Aristotle) just mentioned that the narrative of *Abraham*, peace be upon him, relating to the command he was given regarding his son, is an account that compels the utmost sadness and fear (chap. 14.5a).

وأمثالُ هذه الأشياء هي ما ينزل بالأصدقاءِ بعضِهم من بعضٍ، من قِبل الإرادة، … وإن كان قد يلحق عن ذلك ألـمٌ فليس يلحق مثل الألم الذي يلحق من السوء الذي ينزل بالمحِبّين بعضِهم من بعضٍ، مثل قتل الإخوة بعضِهم بعضاً أو قتل الآباء الأبناءَ أو الأبناءِ الآباءَ. ولهذا الذي ذكره كان قَصصُ إبراهيم عليه السلام فيما أُمر ⟨به⟩ في ابنه في غاية الأقاويل الموجبة للحزن والخوف

The particular episode meant is Abraham's sacrifice of his son, Ismāʿīl or Isḥāq,[15] alluded to in the Qurʾān,[16]and fully told in the narrative exegesis of the Prophetic tales. It remains unclear whether Ibn Rushd means their Qurʾānic form or their elaboration in the tales of the prophets, because the tale of Abraham's sacrifice of his son in particular receives only brief mention in the Qurʾān but is lavishly dramatized for instance in the Prophetic tales of al-Kisāʾī.[17] Be that as it may, Qurʾānic tales replace for Ibn Rushd Greek tragedies in demonstrating how emotional impact is generated by the imitation of action.

3. Concepts reapplied: Reversal (idāra/peripeteia)

Another concern of Ibn Rushd is to apply the concepts of Aristotle's ›Poetics‹, as received through Abū Bishr's Arabic translation, to the givens of Arabic language and literature. Retaining Aristotle's universal thought, he strives to make sense of core concepts, such as »inference« (*istidlāl*) and »reversal« (*idāra*), in terms of their function within Arabic poetry. They first appear within a list of the elements of the tragedy (chap. 6.6) and are then made parts of the story-line (6.10, corresponding terms underlined).

Aristotle
ἔχουσα δὲ μῦθον καὶ σύστασιν πραγμάτων. Πρὸς δὲ τούτοις, τὰ μέγιστα οἷς ψυχαγωγεῖ ἡ τραγῳδία τοῦ μύθου μέρη ἐστίν, αἵ τε περιπέτειαι καὶ ἀναγνωρίσεις.

15 There is a debate in exegesis about which son was sacrificed. The passage does not identify him and both sons appear elsewhere in the Qurʾān.

16 Sūrat al-Ṣāffāt/37:99-111.

17 For a dramatic rendition enriched with fantastic elements, see al-Kisāʾī, Qiṣas al-anbiyāʾ, ed. by Saul Eisenberg, Leiden 1922, pp. 150-52, trans. by Wheeler Thackston, Tales of the Prophets (›Qiṣaṣ al-anbiyāʾ‹), Chicago, Ill., 1997, pp. 160-62. The more scholarly al-Thaʿlabī (ʿArāʾis al-majālis qiṣas al-anbiyāʾ, Cairo n. d., pp. 101-5, trans. by William M. Brinner, ›ʿArāʾis al-majālis qiṣaṣ al-anbiyāʾ‹ as recounted by Abu Isḥāq Aḥmad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Thaʿlabī, Leiden 2002, pp. 154-61) gives no continuous narrative but rather clusters Prophetic traditions (*aḥādīth*, sing. *ḥadīth*) on select aspects and ends with a poem by Umayya b. Abī Ṣalt (d. c. 8/630).

> [50a32-34] [A tragedy] has a story-line (*mythos*)—[i. e.,] a structure of incidents. In addition, the most important things with which a tragedy allures the soul are parts of the story-line: reversals (*peripateiai*) and recognitions (*anagnoriseis*).

Abū Bishr renders the three terms in Arabic respectively as *khurāfa* »fable,« *dawarān* »rotation,« and *istidlāl* »inference.« Ibn Rushd, due to his reapplication of the text to Arabic praise poetry, partially adapts these to »speech containing fables« (*al-qawl al-khurāfī*) »reversal« (*idāra*), and »inference« (*istidlāl*). I will focus on reversal here and return to inference further below.

According to Ibn Rushd, in the process of imitation, reversal is to begin with the opposite of him whose praise (*madḥ*) is intended and then to move to the one who is praised (*mamdūḥ*, chap. 11.1), whereas inference is imitation of the thing only (chap. 11.2). He deems the best inference to be the one mixed with reversal (chap. 11.3). Here he returns to a third function of imitation he had mentioned right at the beginning, namely imitation for the sake of mere wonder and pleasure, ergo as a goal in itself. Inference and reversal using inanimate things cannot be used to incite or prevent action but only serve for evocation, i. e., »correspondence« (*muṭābaqa*; chap. 11.4, see also 3.1). Ibn Rushd adds a passage to explain that this is common in Arab poetry (*ashʿār al-ʿarab*, chap. 11.4a) and illustrates this with an example by the poet al-Mutanabbī of the »highest degree of beauty.« He lets himself be guided by what is prevalent in Arabic poetry.

At this point in the ›Talkhīṣ‹, his substitution of the praise poem for Greek tragedy begins to structurally affect and reorient his commentary. Twists that affect the tragedy's entire plot need to be fitted to the episodic type of narrative within odes (whether real or imaginary action). Ibn Rushd accordingly demonstrates inference and reversal within the space of a mere two verses, scaling it down to a figure of speech. This refocusing takes account of the poetic artistry in Arabic odes (*qaṣāʾid,* sing. *qaṣīda*), whose unit is a verse group or the single verse. In classical Arabic poetics, the example verses are discussed under the heading of antithesis (*muṭābaqa*) and run as follows:

كم زَوْرَةٍ لك فِي الأَعْرابِ خافِيَةٍ أَدْهَى وقَدْ رَقَدوا مِنْ زَوْرَةِ الذيبِ
أَزورُهُمْ وسَوادُ اللَّيْلِ يَشْفَعُ لِي وأَنْثَنِي وبَياضُ الصُّبْحِ يُغْرِي بِي

> Many a visit did I make to you that was stealthy among the Bedouin,
> more crafty, after they had slept, than a visit by a wolf.
>
> I visit them as the blackness of night intercedes for me,
> and turn around as the white of morning incites against me (quote no. 7).

The couplet by al-Mutanabbī is from a *qaṣīda* in the meter *basīṭ* in 46 verses in praise of the Egyptian regent Kāfūr composed in 346/957 and describes the poet's secret nocturnal visit to his beloved in the *nasīb*-part.[18] In classical Arabic poetics it receives

18 Al-Mutanabbī, Dīwān Abī l-Ṭayyib al-Mutanabbī bi-sharḥ Abī l-Baqāʾ al-ʿUkbarī al-musammā bi-l-Tibyān fī sharḥ al-Dīwān, ed. by Muḥammad al-Saqqā, Ibrāhīm al-Abyārī and ʿAbdalḥafīẓ Shalabī, 4 pts. in 2 vols., Cairo 1971, i, p. 161, no. 34:6-7. For the poem's parts, see section 5.

mostly praise, though also some nit-picking. The ›Dīwān‹'s commentator Pseudo-al-ʿUkbarī (actually al-ʿUkbarī's student ʿAlī b. ʿAdlān al-Mawṣilī, d. 666/1268) cites regarding the second verse (no. 34:7) the anthology ›The Solitaire of the Age‹ (*Yatīmat al-dahr*) by al-Thaʿālibī (d. 429/1039): »This verse is the prince (*amīr*) of his (sc. al-Mutanabbī's) poetry; it contains a novel antithesis (*taṭbīq badīʿ*), beautiful wording, and a good novel motif, for this verse combines visit with turning around and departure, blackness with whiteness, night with morning, interceding with inciting (*iġhrāʾ*), and ›for me‹ with ›against me.‹ The meaning of antithesis (*muṭābaqa*) is that it combines two opposites in this way.«[19] The commentator follows this up with a list of circa one hundred outstanding verses (*nawādir*, sing. *nādira*) by al-Mutanabbī, which »boggle the minds« (*takhriqu l-ʿuqūl*).[20] Such collections of this poet's often-quoted verses, many of which became proverbial, were assembled by several scholars.[21] In the printed version of the ›Yatīma‹, the verse is cited as a borrowing whose model is hard to identify and again as an example for the poet's mastery of the ancient Arab style. The above praise is traced to Abū Bakr al-Khwarāzmī (d. 383/993-94).[22]

The poetic critic al-Qāḍī al-Jurjānī (d. 392/1001) cites the second verse (no. 34:7) within a long list of al-Mutanabbī's unique and innovative verses.[23] Another poetic critic, Ibn Sinān al-Khafājī (d. 466/1074), cites the verse in his ›Secret of Eloquence‹ (›Sirr al-faṣāḥa‹) within the chapter on combined words, the section on corresponding words (*tanāsub*).[24] There he distinguishes words that are opposite in meaning as antithesis (*muṭābaqa*) from others whose meaning matches as parallelism (*muqābala*). Citing the second verse (no. 34:7), Ibn Sinān finds it mannered (*takalluf*) but points

19 Ibid., i, p. 161, fn. 7. Classical Arabic poetics does not constitute a monolithic block, since authors varied in their terminology and it evolved over time. I use it as an umbrella term for salient works from the third/ninth century up to Ibn Rushd's time with which he shares poetic and Qurʾānic quotations (between 8 and 19 per work). Specific works are given hereafter in the notes.

20 Ibid., i, pp. 161-67, fn. 7. Some of these overlap with al-Thaʿālibī's list of proverbs al-Mutanabbī coined in hemistichs (idem, Yatīmat al-dahr, ed. by Muḥammad Muḥyī ʿAbdalḥamīd, 1 vol. in 2 pts., Beirut 1399/1979, i, pp. 198-202) and his verses paired with sayings attributed to Aristotle in Pseudo-al-Ḥātimī's ›Risāla al-ḤātiHmiyya‹; see Beatrice Gruendler, In Aristotle's Words … al-Ḥātimī's (?) Epistle on al-Mutanabbī and Aristotle, in: Islamic Philosophy, Science, Culture, and Religion: Studies in Honor of Dimitri Gutas, ed. by Felizitas Opwis and David Reismann, Leiden, New York 2012, pp. 98-129.

21 For some of these collections see Beatrice Gruendler with Colinda Lindermann and Ruslan Pavlyshyn (contributing autors), ›Dunkle Augen‹ – Die Wanderverse des al-Mutanabbī, in: Logbuch Wissensgeschichte, ed. by Mira Becker-Sawatzky et al., Wiesbaden 2024 (Episteme in Bewegung. Beiträge zu einer transdisziplinären Wissensgeschichte 36), pp. 638-58, DOI: 10.13173/9783447121804.I. and previous note.

22 Al-Thaʿālibī, Yatīma, i, (fn. 20) p. 137 and 177. For the attribution to al-Khwārazmī, see the edition by Muḥammad ʿAbdallāh Qāsim, 10 vols., Damascus 1445/2024., ii, p. 313 fn. 1.

23 Al-Qāḍī al-Jurjānī, al-Wasāṭa bayna al-Mutanabbī wa-khuṣūmihī, ed. by Abū l-Fadl Ibrāhīm and ʿAlī Muḥammad al-Bijāwī, Beirut 1427/2006, reprint of Cairo 1370/1951, p. 163; the full list covers pp. 162-77. Another verse from the section appears in Ibn Rushd, Talkhīṣ (in: The Complete Poetics, Part Three: Averroes (fn. 1), cited hereafter as Ibn Rushd, Talkhīṣ), chap. 21.6a, quote no. 48.

24 Ibn Sinān al-Khafājī, Sirr al-fasāḥa, ed. by ʿAbd al-Muʿtāl al-Ṣaʿīdī, Cairo 1953, p. 193; *tanāsub* is treated on pp. 191-95.

out that nearly each word in the first hemistich is matched by its opposite in the second, except for night and morning being no exact opposites.[25]

Ibn Rushd cites the couplet in order to exemplify the combination of inference in the first verse with reversal in the second (their mix being of the best imitation) when used purely for image evocation, devoid of any psychological function or causation of affect. For the »correspondence« (*muṭābaqa*) between two things compared, Ibn Rushd employs this term in a sense different from classical Arabic poetics. Throughout his commentary, he either coins his own terms or reuses those coined by Ibn Sīnā and occasionally juxtaposes them with their cognates on classical Arabic poetics. He writes as a philosopher speaking about poetry, not a poetician. Nonetheless his familiarity with classical poetics clearly shows in his selection of quotes. What matters here is that he changes the understanding of the Aristotelian reversal within an entire plot to an episode limited to a couplet, which contains a compound antithesis (*muṭābaqa*) in the sense of classical Arabic poetics. His understanding of inference (*istidlāl*), likewise adapted to Arabic poetry, forms the subject of chapter sixteen to which I will now turn.

There he discusses excellent inference and reversal as belonging to voluntary acts (16.8). Ibn Rushd finds this most frequent in the Qurʾān and gives an example for each, in which he shrinks the scope of both to one or a few verses (16.8a). Reversal is exemplified by an analogy for a good and a corrupt word; in classical Arabic poetics, this would qualify as antithesis (like the foregoing poetic example). He says:

> The most frequent occurrence of this kind of inference is in the Glorious Book, I mean in the praise of excellent acts and the censure of non-excellent acts. It is rare in the poems of the Arabs.[26] An example of reversal in praise is the statement of the Exalted: »God has struck a similitude; a good word« up to His statement, »having no stablishment.« (16.8a)[27]

> وأكثرُ ما يوجد هذا النوع من الاستدلال فى الكتاب العزيز، أعنى فى مدح الأفعال الفاضلة وذمّ الأفعال الغير الفاضلة؛ وهو قليلٌ فى أشعار العرب. ومثالُ الإدارة فى المدح قولُه تعالى ﴿ضرب الله مثلا كلمة طيبة﴾ إلى قوله ﴿ما لها من قرار﴾

The complete Qurʾānic citation, abbreviated by Ibn Rushd, is the following (core terms underlined):

> Hast thou not seen how God has struck a similitude? A good word is as a good tree—its roots are firm, and its branches are in heaven; it gives its produce every season by the leave of its Lord. So God strikes similitudes for men; haply they will remember. And the likeness of a corrupt word is as a corrupt tree—uprooted from the earth, having no establishment.

As in the poetic example, the reversal is scaled down to a trope, an analogy between speech and a tree whose good and bad nature do not follow upon each other in nar-

25 Ibn Rushd cites another verse contained in this passage in his Talkhīṣ (fn. 1), chap. 22.6b.

26 This is also stated earlier in Ibn Rushd, Talkhīṣ (fn. 1), chap. 14.12.

27 Sūrat Ibrāhīm/14:24-26.

rative order, as in the verses, but are given as a didactic statement of oppositions. This is even further away from Aristotle, as the reversal obtains on the level of the analogy, which has to be decoded to apply to reality. But in either case, Aristotle's concept of plot structure has come to operate at the level of micro-texts, be these poetic or Qurʾānic verses.

4. The Structure of poems: Connection vs. separation (takhalluṣ) of the poem's parts

Another aspect is that the ›Poetics‹ template, covering the structure of entire works, makes Ibn Rushd speak about macrostructure, discussing poems and their parts, which is rare in classical Arabic poetics. One issue is »tying« (*ribāṭ*) vs. »untying« (*ḥall*), i. e., the explicit linking of the first two thematic parts of the *qaṣīda* or articulating the break between them (chap. 18.1). Ibn Rushd uses generic words, but also designates the former, meaning the transition of the introductory part of an ode to the main part, as *istiṭrād,* literally »digression«. This contrasts with sense of *istiṭrād* in classical Arabic poetics,[28] there meaning either a digression from the main theme to a side aspect or an allusion. Conversely, the transition between the introductory and main part of the *qaṣīda* is designated in classical Arabic poetics as »transition« (*takhalluṣ*). Ibn Rushd rightly finds the linking to be frequent among the modern poets (*muḥdathūn*)[29] of the Abbasid period, citing Abū Tammām (d. c. 232/845) and al-Mutanabbī; the untying he deems in turn to be more frequent among [early] Arabs (18.1a). His quote of al-Mutanabbī is the following:

مَرَّتْ بِنا بَيْنَ تِرْبَيْها فقُلْتُ لها ... مِنْ أَيْنَ جانَسَ هذا الشَّادِنُ العَرَبا
فاسْتَضْحَكَتْ ثُمَّ قالَتْ كالمِغِيثِ يُرَى ... لَيْثَ الشَّرَى وَهْوَ مِنْ عِجْلٍ إِذا انتَسَبا

She passed by us between her two age mates, and I said to her:
How come this antelope is of Arab race?

She laughed and said: Just like al-Mughīth appears to be a lion of al-Sharā,
but is from ʿIjl when his ancestry is traced (quote no. 45).

The verse by al-Mutanabbī derives from a poem in the meter *basīṭ* in 39 verses in praise of al-Mughīth b. ʿAlī b. Bishr al-ʿIjlī, mentioned in the second verse, who received at least two praise poems by al-Mutanabbī.[30] The quote is the moment in which the poet ends the *nasīb*-part with an address of his beloved, using the trope of feigned wonder

28 As used for instance by the poet Abū Tammām (Abū Bakr al-Ṣūlī, The Life and Times of Abū Tammām by Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā al-Ṣūlī preceded by al-Ṣūlī's Epistle to Abū l-Layth Muzāḥim ibn Fātik, ed. and trans. by Beatrice Gruendler, New York, London 2015 (Library of Arabic Literature), § 40.1) and defined by Abū Hilāl al-ʿAskarī (al-Ṣināʿatayn, ed. by ʿAlī Muḥammad Bijāwī and Muḥammad Abū l-Faḍl Ibrāhīm, Cairo 1971, pp. 414-16, chapter 9, section 24).

29 On the modern poets of the Abbasid period, see Beatrice Gruendler, Pre-Modern Arabic Philologists: Poets' friends or foes? in: Geschichte der Germanistik 39/40, 2011, pp. 6-21.

30 Al-Mutanabbī, Dīwān (fn. 18), i, p. 112, no. 23:10-11.

(*tajāhul al-ʿārif*) and naturalizing the metaphor of an antelope for a woman (based on their shared long neck). With this composite figure, the poet inverts the image and pretends to see a real antelope and feigns wonder at her human descent. The response of the beloved establishes the link to the *qaṣīda*'s main part by applying the same trope to the praised one: she naturalizes the metaphor of a lion for a man (based on shared courage), pretending to see a lion, and then contrasts this with his true ancestry from the tribe of ʿIjl.[31]

The already mentioned al-Qāḍī al-Jurjānī, as also al-Thaʿālibī, cite the couplet in their sections on beautiful transitions (*ḥusn al-khurūj wa-l-takhalluṣ*).[32] In another section on the composition of odes, the former critic emphasizes that Abū Tammām and al-Mutanabbī paid great attention to their transitions (*takhalluṣ*), and that the latter in particular excelled in this. To exemplify the connective transition, Ibn Rushd thus selects a sophisticated case where this is effected by the repetition of a rhetorical figure that links both parts. With this example (as well as his other quote from Abū Tammām) of Ibn Rushd agrees with the judgment of classical Arabic poetics.

For the other option, marking the separation between both parts of the poem, Ibn Rushd quotes the pre-Islamic poet Zuhayr b. Abī Sulmā (d. c. 609 CE), who ends the *nasīb*-part of an ode as follows (I complete the verse of which Ibn Rushd cites the first hemistich):

دَعْ ذا وَعَدِّ القَوْلَ فِي هَرِمٍ خَيْرِ البُداةِ وسَيِّدِ الحَضَرِ

Leave this, and turn to speaking about Harim
best among desert and lord of the city dwellers (quote no. 46).

The verse derives from a poem in the meter *kāmil* in 21 verses and marks the moment in which the poet turns to his main concern, the praise of Harim.[33]

The poetic critic Ibn Rashīq (d. 456/1065 or 463/1071) distinguishes in his thirtieth chapter, on beginnings, transitions, and ends of poems, two types of transitions, connected ones (*takhalluṣ*) and unconnected ones (*khurūj*).[34] The second type he calls typical for the ancient Arabs, who abruptly ended the introductory topics with phrases such as »leave this« (*daʿ dhā*) or »turn from this« (*ʿaddi ...an dhā*). Both formulae of interruption which the critic mentions are combined in the quote selected

31 On the common metaphor of an antelope for a woman, see Ibn Rushd, Talkhīṣ (fn. 1), chap. 16.1a and 25.7.

32 Al-Qāḍī al-Jurjānī, Wasāṭa (fn. 23), p. 152 (the section on *takhalluṣ* covers pp. 152-54) and al-Thaʿālibī, Yatīma (fn. 20), i, pp. 175-76.

33 See Wilhelm Ahlwardt, The Divans of the Six Ancient Arabic Poets Ennābiga, ʿAntara, Tharafa, Zuhair, ʿAlqama und Imruulqais Chiefly according to the MSS of Paris, Gotha and Leyden and the Collection of Their Fragments, Greifswald 1869/1870, reprint Osnabrück 1972, p. 81, no. 4:4; see also al-Baṭalyawsī, Sharḥ al-ashʿār al-sitta al-jāhiliyya, ed. by Nāṣīsf Sulaymān ʿAwwād and Luṭfī al-Ṭūmī, 2 vols., Beirut and Berlin 1439/2018, ii, pp. 126-27, no. 10:4 in 20 verses; var. *khayri l-kuhūl*.

34 Ibn Rashīq al-Qayrawānī, al-ʿUmda fī maḥāsin al-shiʿr wa-ādābihī, ed. by Muḥammad Muḥyīddīn ʿAbdalḥamīd, 2 pts., Beirut 1401/1981, p. 239/ed. by Tawfīq al-Nīfar, Mukhtār al-ʿAbīdī and Jamāl Ḥamāda, 3 vols., Carthage, Tunisia 2009, i, p. 379.

by Ibn Rushd, aptly exemplifying the cut between the *qaṣīda*'s parts. Regarding his bipartition of the interconnection between an ode's first two parts, Ibn Rushd concurs with classical Arabic poetics but for his terminology. His citations serve the same topic therein. This was no coincidence, and his awareness of classical Arabic poetics will become more evident below. Such interconnection can be traced, because Arabic critics usually developed their discussions around specific verses, which are taken up including the surrounding comments in subsequent works. These micro texts carried with them specific debates, becoming something like ›traveling talking points‹. Here and elsewhere, Ibn Rushd picked such verses that had already generated discussions to bring his own points across. He sometimes agrees with the poeticians' evaluations and at others diverges from them.

5. More on the structure of poems: The qaṣīda's parts

Ibn Rushd turns now to art of praise poetry (*ṣināʿat al-madīḥ*)[35] in terms of quality. He cuts the list of elements of the Greek tragedy which Abū Bishr and Ibn Sīnā retain (chap. 12.1) and substitutes this with the parts of the Arabic *qaṣīda*, dividing it into three parts in analogy with an oration (chap. 12.1.a). In classical Arabic poetics, the structure of the poem is only rarely discussed; Ibn Ṭabāṭabā (d. 322/934) for instance compares poems to epistles and al-Ḥāṭimī (d. 388/998) to the human body, but both analogies focus on the connections between the parts.[36] The classical locus of a *qaṣīda* description by Ibn Qutayba (d. 276/889) shows a different arrangement, since it is based on the Umayyad praise *qaṣīda*, divided into amatory prelude (*nasīb*), camel section (*raḥīl*), and praise (*madīḥ*).[37] The *qaṣīda* model Ibn Rushd describes is the Abbasid *qaṣīda*, which often omits the camel section, Ibn Qutayba's second part, which had lost popularity in the urban culture of Abbasid times. Ibn Rushd writes (emphasis mine):

> What is found of them in the poems of the Arabs are three [parts]: [i] The *first* part that functions in them like the beginning of an oration, [ii] and this is the one in which they mention abodes and traces [of abandoned camps], and in which they compose love poetry. [iva] The *second* part contains the praise. The *third* part that functions like the conclusion in an oration; this part among them is mostly either a well-wishing for the one praised or about an exhibition of the merits of the poem which [the poet] composed (12.1a).

35 The term is shared with Abū Bishr vs. Ibn Sīnā: *ṭrāghūdhiyā*.

36 Ibn Ṭabāṭabāʾ, ʿIyār al-shiʿr, ed. by ʿAbdalʿazīz b. Nāṣir al-Mānīʿ, Riyadh 1985 [1405], p. 9, and Geert Jan van Gelder, Beyond the Line: Classical Arabic Literary Critics on the Coherence and Unity of the Poem, Leiden 1982, pp. 54-57 and 82-89.

37 See James E. Montgomery, Of Models and Amanuenses: The remarks on the *qaṣīda* in Ibn Qutayba's ›Kitāb al-Shiʿr wa-l-shuʿarāʾ‹, in: Islamic Reflections and Arabic Musings: Studies in Honour of Professor Alan Jones, ed. by Robert Hoyland and Philip F. Kennedy, Oxford 2004, pp. 1-47.

والذى يوجد منها فى أشعار العرب فهى ثلاثةٌ: الجزءُ الأوّل الذى يجرى عندهم مجرى الصدر فى الخُطْبة، وهو الذى فيه يذكرون الديار والآثار ويتغزّلون فيه؛ والجزءُ الثانى المدحُ؛ والجزء الثالثُ الذى يجرى مجرى الخاتمة فى الخطْبة، وهذا الجزءُ أكثرُ ما هو عندهم إمّا دُعاءٌ للممدوح وإمّا فى تقريض الشعر الذى قاله

Ibn Rushd defines as his first part poets' mention of abodes (*diyār*) and traces (*āthār*) and their composition of love poetry (*yataghazzalūn*). This corresponds in classical Arabic poetics to the *nasīb* and its framing motif of the deserted abodes (*aṭlāl*) going back to the Bedouin context of the ode's inception.[38] Ibn Rushd's second part is directly the praise (*madḥ*). As a third part he designates the closure with a prayer for the patron and a praise of the dedicated poem. Ibn Rushd is original in defining this as a separate part of the *qaṣīda*, for in classical Arabic poetics, the *qaṣīda*'s end is rather subsumed under the *madīḥ*. Invocation as closure is mentioned by Ibn Rashīq, but considered uninventive and poor. Better endings according to him are verses containing some general truth.[39] Abū Hilāl al-ʿAskarī (d. after 400/1010) prefers maxims too, or the last verse must summarize the idea of the poem as a whole.[40] Both poetic critics, however, have single verses in mind. In poetic practice, such endings can turn into distinct longer sections following the *qaṣīda*'s dedication formula. Ibn al-Rūmī (d. 283/896), in his praises and admonitions, prominently uses this part to extoll his own work, exactly as Ibn Rushd describes it, and develops it to a place for arguing his own rights and needs and his patron's duties.[41] Ibn Rushd here reflects poetry more than poetics.

6. Reshaping of the ›Poetics‹ and overlap with classical Arabic poetics

To measure Ibn Rushd's overall reshaping of the ›Poetics‹, it is helpful to give some numerical proportions. His ›Talkhīṣ‹ numbers twenty-five chapters with up to ten subsections. Twenty-six of these subsections, including the entirety of chapter twenty-six, present in the translation of Abū Bishr, are elided,[42] twelve are tersely summarized, and ten qualified as irrelevant for lacking any counterpart in Arabic. Nearly twice as often, Ibn Rushd adds new passages to fit his selections of Arabic verse into the work's structure: these make up forty-five added subsections, some of them lengthy; for instance, chap. 22.6a with eight quotes takes up two pages in print.

Many new passages, added around quotations, occur in chapter twenty-two on the agreement between »names« (i. e., nouns) used in combination, forming an equipoise (*muwāzana*) and mutual correspondence (*tanāsub)*. This requires that the nouns of a pair be similar. To demonstrate the proper matching of word pairs Ibn Rushd selects a negative case that has garnered consistent criticism and become a standard example

38 On the *nasīb*'s framing motifs, see Renate Jacobi, Studien zur Poetik der altarabischen Qaṣide, Wiesbaden 1971, pp. 13-22.

39 Ibn Rashīq, ʿUmda (fn. 34), ed. by ʿAbdalḥamīd, i, pp. 239-41/ed. by al-Nīfar et al., I, pp. 379-82.

40 Van Gelder, Beyond the Line (fn. 36), pp. 92-93 and 122.

41 See Gruendler, Medieval Arabic Praise Poetry (fn. 5), pp. 56-59 and 269-71, where this part is defined as metastrophe, and ibid., pp. 65-72 on the dedication speech act and Ibn al-Rūmī's descriptions of his own poems.

42 Some elisions are shared with Ibn Sīnā.

of how not to do this (chap. 22.6b). His choice agrees with the majority opinion in classical Arabic poetics. The verse by Kumayt b. Zayd al-Asadī (d. 128/744) runs as follows (I complete the verse of which Ibn Rushd cites second hemistich):

وقد رَأَيْنا بِها خَوْدِا مُنَعَّمَة بيضَاً تَكامَلَ فيها الدَّلُّ والشَّنَبُ

We saw in there a delicate, light-skinned young woman
whose coquetry and sharp teeth completed each other (quote no. 58).

The line in the meter *basīṭ,* from a couplet that is a fragment, describes a beautiful and flirtatious woman.[43] The original *dīwān* being lost, surviving single verses or passages have been assembled by the modern editor from classical sources. Poetic critics are unanimous in their blame of the cited verse, represented here by six of them between the fourth/tenth and seventh/thirteenth century. Al-Āmidī (d. c. 370/981) cites the verse for its erroneous »combination of two words that do not resemble each other,« in the context of faults blamed in innovative poets.[44] It figures among other poetic errors in a debate and is meant to excuse such missteps by Abū Tammām. Abū Hilāl al-ʿAskarī lists the second hemistich in his section on agreement (*muqābala*) in wording and/or meaning, among the bad examples without comment.[45]

Al-Marzubānī (d. 384/993) includes the verse (var. *ḥūran*) and a variant of it in his section on the poet Kumayt.[46] It features in three versions of a report (*khabar*), in which al-Kumayt recites his verses to another poet who counts up his mistakes, the present verse being the first. This kind of practical criticism antedates classical Arabic poetics proper and continues to exist alongside in Arabic literature. The transmitter of the second report, the grammarian al-Mubarrad (d. 285/898 or 286/899), calls the word pair of »coquetry« and »teeth« »very ugly.«[47] Ibn Rashīq lists the verse in chapter ninety-five on »complication« (*muʿāẓala*) and confused speech (*tathbīj*),» explaining »complication« variously as an enjambement (which was frowned upon), a bad metaphor, or a mismatched word combination; the verse serves to exemplify the last meaning.[48] Ibn Sinān al-Khafājī places the verse in his chapter on combined words, in the subsection on the correspondence (*tanāsub*) of word pairs in meaning, either by closeness or opposition, the later designated as antithetical (*muṭābaq*).[49] He cites the verse in al-Marzubānī's variant form, placed within one of the reports cited

43 Al-Kumayt b. Zayd al-Asadī, Diwān, ed. by Muḥammad Nabīl Ṭarīfī, Beirut 2000, p. 36, no. 27:2 in two verses; var. *ḥūran*.

44 Al-Āmidī, al-Muwāzana bayna shiʿr Abī Tammām wa-l-Buḥturī, ed. by Aḥmad Ṣaqr, 2 vols., Cairo, [1379/1960], i, p. 50/ed. by Muḥammad Muḥyīddīn ʿAbdalḥamīd, Cairo 1363/1944, p. 47; var. *khawdan.*

45 Al-ʿAskarī, Ṣināʿatayn (fn. 28), p. 349; var. *khawdun takāmala*.

46 Al-Marzubānī, al-Muwashshaḥ: maʾākhidh al-ʿulamāʾ ʿalā l-shuʿarāʾ fī ʿiddat anwāʿ min ṣināʿat al-shir, ed. by ʿAlī Muḥammad al-Bijāwī, Cairo n. d., pp. 249-51. The variant is: *am hal ẓaʿāʾinu bi-l-ʿalyāʾi rāfiʿatun* (var. *nāfiʿatun*) *wa-in takāmala fīhā l-dallu wa-l-shanabu*.

47 See also al-Iṣbahānī, al-Aghānī, 25 vols., various ed., Beirut: 1955 [1374], reprint 1981 [1401], i, pp. 327-28, for the first version of the *khabar* reuniting Kumayt with the fellow-poets Nuṣayb and Dhū l-Rumma.

48 Ibn Rashīq, ʿUmda (fn. 34), ed. by ʿAbdalḥamīd, ii, p. 265/ed. by al-Nīfar et. al., ii, p. 908; var. *ḥūran*.

49 Ibn Sinān al-Khafājī, Sirr al-faṣāḥa (fn. 24), p. 193; var. *am hal ẓaʿāʾinu bi-l-ʿalyāʾi rāfiʿatun;* the sub-

by him. Here the poet Nuṣayb (d. c. 108/726) comments that coquetry (*dall*) rather belongs to flirtation, whereas sharp teeth (*shanab*) belong to lips and the description of the mouth, so that the two terms are neither close nor opposite, and their combination is erroneous.

Ḍiyāʾ al-Dīn Ibn al-Athīr (d. 637/1239) finally cites the verse in his second discourse (*maqāla*), treating meanings, under type (*nawʿ*) twenty-four on correspondence (*tanāsub*).[50] This type is subdivided into antithesis (*muṭābaqa*) and matching (*muqābala*), and Ibn al-Athīr adds the brotherhood (*muʾākhāh*) between words as a further subtype, explaining that especially in descriptions, words should be combined with others close to them and not foreign, citing al-Kumayt's verse (in the variant of al-Marzubānī) as an error in this. He follows this with al-Iṣbahānī's version of the report (cited as the first of three by al-Marzubānī), reuniting Kumayt with his fellow poets Nuṣayb and Dhū l-Rumma (d. c. 117/735), and Nuṣayb voices the critique. The consistent blame heaped upon this verse in poetic treatises, with which Ibn Rushd concurs here, shows his choice to be informed by their *communis opinio*.

From paired words Ibn Rushd proceeds to larger elements, to wit, the balance of hemistichs within verses (chapt. 22.6b). His next selections provide an even more telling overlap with classical Arabic poetics, because he reproduces the combination of couplets by two poets far apart in time who are discussed jointly on the same issue. They are Imruʾulqays and al-Mutanabbī, the two poets he most often quotes. I begin with the supposed mismatch of hemistichs by the latter poet:

وَقَفْتَ وما فِي المَوْتِ شَكٌّ لواقِفٍ كأنّكَ فِي جَفْنِ الرَّدَى وَهْوَ نائِمُ
تَمُرُّ بِكَ الأَبْطالُ كَلْمَى هَزيمَةً وَوَجْهُكَ وَضَّاحٌ وَثَغْرُكَ باسِمُ

You stood, and for one standing there is no doubt about death,
as if you were the eyelid of perdition while it slept;

Heroes passed you, wounded, defeated,
while your face was shining and your mouth smiling (quote no. 60).

The couplet in the meter *ṭawīl* derives from al-Mutanabbī's famous ode on the battle of al-Ḥadath celebrating the victory of his patron Sawf al-Dawla, the ruler of Aleppo.[51] The couplet's combination of themes gave poetic critics food for thought.

Al-Qāḍī al-Jurjānī (cited in the ›Dīwān‹'s commentary) relates on the authority of another ›Dīwān‹ commentator, al-Wāḥidi (d. 468/1075-76), that at the moment of recitation, the poem's recipient Sayf al-Dawla criticized the poet for wrongly fitting (*taṭbīq*) the verses' hemistichs to each other and cites a couplet by the pre-Islamic

section on correspondence (*tanāsub*) covers pp. 191-95. Another verse from this passage is cited in Ibn Rushd, Talkhīṣ (fn. 1), chap. 11.4a.

50 Ḍiyāʾ al-Dīn Ibn al-Athīr, al-Mathal al-sāʾir fī adab al-kātib wa-l-shāʿir, ed. by Muḥammad Muḥyīddīn ʿAbdalḥamīd, Cairo 1939 [1358], ii, p. 292/ed. by Kāmil Muḥammad b. Muḥammad ʿArīḍa, 2 vols., Beirut 1998 [1419], ii, p. 252; var. *am hal ẓaʿāʾinu bi-l-ʿalyāʾi rāfiʿatun*. See also fn. 46 and 47.

51 Al-Mutanabbī, Dīwān (fn. 18), iii, pp. 386-87, no. 225:22-23. Other verses of this ode are cited in Ibn Rushd, Talkhīṣ (fn. 1), chap. 21.6a, quote no. 48 and 22.6a, quote no. 52.

poet Imruʾulqays as an example of the same fault, basing his opinion on experts in poetry (*ahl al-ʿilm bi-l-shiʿr*). Ibn Rushd had cited this very couplet by Imruʾulqays just before. It derives from a poem in the meter *ṭawīl* in 54 verses[52] and runs as follows:

كَأَنِّي لَمْ أَرْكَبْ جَواداً لِلَذَّة وَلَمْ أَتبَطَّنْ كاعِباً ذاتَ خُلْخالِ
وَلَمْ أَسْبَإِ الزِّقَّ الرَّوِيَّ وَلَمْ أَقُلْ لِخَيْلِيَ كُرِّي كَرَّةً بَعْدَ إِجْفالِ

As if I had not ridden a fine charger for pleasure,
or pressed a fully-breasted anklet-wearing girl to my chest

Nor bought a full wine-skin, nor said
to my horse »attack again« after it was startled (quote no. 59).

Al-Mutanabbī first concedes Imruʾulqays' and his own fault. Then however, he advances the analogy of a cloth merchant and a weaver for two different types of experts, the former on bulk and the latter on details as an argument to revisit the critique. Thereupon he explains Imruʾulqays' first verse as conveying the pleasures of love and hunting, whereas the second verse conveys generosity to friends and courage in fighting foes, unveiling both verses' underlying internal cohesion. This he applies to his own couplet: he joined in his first verse two occurrences of death (*mawt* and *radā*), and in the second, the defeated and crying foes together with the victorious Sayf al-Dawla's own smiling. The patron rewarded the explanation with five hundred *dīnār*s.[53] The anecdote is followed up with further commentary by Ibn Jinnī (d. 392/1002) and al-Wāḥidī, praising and corroborating the internal cohesion (*mulāʾama*) of either verse. Al-Qāḍī al-Jurjānī also cites the couplet with ten further verses of this ode among his selection of the poet's excellent passages that should outweigh his faults.[54]

Other poetic critics discuss the pair of quotes within their entries on the earlier poet, to which I turn now. Al-Marzubānī cites the couplet as being only attributed to Imruʾulqays and anticipates Abū Hilāl al-ʿAskarī's criticism and a transposed variant of the couplet.[55] Al-ʿAskarī cites the couplet in the first section of his third chapter on the composition (*naẓm*) of prose and poetry among other verses whose first and second hemistichs do not harmonize thematically.[56] He comments that if the first hemistichs of both lines were switched, it would be better and have »equipoise in the weft« (*istiwāʾ al-nasj*). He then cites a variant of the couplet with the hemistichs accordingly transposed and comments that riding fits better with attacking and wine better with fully-breasted women.

52 Imruʾulqays, Dīwān, p. 143, verses 37-38; var. verse 37 *khalkhāli*. See also Ahlwardt, Divans (fn. 33), p. 153, no. 52:42-43 in 59 verses; var. verse 37 *khalkhāli*; and al-Baṭalyawsī, Sharḥ al-Ashʿār al-sitta al-jāhiliyya (fn. 33), i, pp. 78-79, no. 3:36-37 in 53 verses, var. verse 37 *khalkhāli*. Further verses of this poem are quoted in Talkhīs (fn. 1), chap. 16.1a, quote no. 11 and 17.1a , quote no. 42.

53 The account also appears in al-Thaʿālibī, Yatīma (fn. 20), pp. 21-22, Ibn Rashīq (see fn. 57), and Ibn Abī l-Iṣbaʿ, Badīʿ al-Qurʾān, ed. by Ḥifnī Muḥammad Sharaf, Cairo [1957], pp. 138-140.

54 Al-Qāḍī al-Jurjānī, Wasāṭa (fn. 23), p. 115; the entire selection covers pp. 101-51.

55 Al-Marzubānī, al-Muwashshaḥ (fn. 46), pp. 31-32.

56 Abū Hilāl al-ʿAskarī, Ṣināʿatayn (fn. 28), p. 150.

Ibn Rashīq cites the couplet in his thirty-fourth chapter on composition (*naẓm*).[57] He sets the scene by relating an anecdote about a hypercritical man by the name of al-Muntakhab who blamed Imruʾulqays' verses in the presence of Sayf al-Dawla and reorganized the hemistichs as in the previous accounts. Then, another unidentified man counters him with a Qurʾānic quote,[58] which contains an analogical word combination, first hunger and nakedness are combined, then thirst and exposure to the sun, and he is rewarded by the ruler with a present. Ibn Rashīq then declares Imruʾulqays' original version superior, since the first verse recalls the poet's pleasure of hunting and youthful love, and the second verse combines two other topics, splendid hosting and chivalry. If reorganized as proposed, the second halves of each verse would be redundant (*ḥashw*). The second man's argumentation resembles that attributed to al-Mutanabbī in the report cited by al-Qāḍī al-Jurjānī.

Ibn Abī l-Iṣbaʿ cites the verse in his chapter on »prompting conjecture« (*tawhīm*), i. e., wording that looks like a solecism or seems to violate the rules of grammar but in reality does not.[59] Here too, Imruʾulqays' couplet is joined in a report with that of al-Mutanabbī. The critic is here Sayf al-Dawla and al-Mutanabbī defends himself with two Qurʾānic quotes.[60] Ibn Abī l-Iṣbaʿ then goes on to explain that in the latter Qurʾānic quote, the actual order is superior, because a rearrangement would lead to redundancy (the same argument Ibn Rashīq had made). Most critics recognize a superficial and a deeper layer of meaning in the verses and find consistency in the latter.

The fact that Ibn Rushd combined both poets' quotes in his discussion of the proper balance between verses' hemistichs shows that he was aware of their combination in classical Arabic poetics[61] and the diverging critical and positive appraisals; he introduces the criticism by »someone said« and »something similar was said« and then disagrees with it in his own final comment, stating that there is indeed some mutual correspondence in both couplets. He thus sides with the more sophisticated poetic critics, who look beyond the surface of single terms and discern the cohesion of the underlying meanings.

7. Inference (istidlāl/anagnorisis) enriched

Chapter twenty-two on types of nouns and their agreement had already displayed a substantial number of added quotes: fourteen from poetry and two from the Qurʾān. However, the largest cluster of substitutions and additions in the ›Talkhīṣ‹, with twenty-nine poetic and two Qurʾānic quotes, occurs in chapter sixteen on types of inference, here understood as metaphor. The types of inference of Abū Bishr's Arabic translation are partially adapted, reformulated, and expanded by Ibn Rushd.

57 Ibn Rashīq, ʿUmda (fn. 34), ed. by ʿAbdalḥamīd, i, p. 258/ed. by al-Nīfar et. al., i, pp. 410-11.

58 Sūrat Ṭāhā/20: 118-119.

59 Ibn Abī l-Iṣbaʿ, Badīʿ al-Qurʾān (fn. 53), pp. 138-140.

60 Sūrat Hūd/11: 24 and Sūrat Ṭāhā/20: 118-119. The report also appears in al-Thaʿālibī, Yatīma (fn. 20), pp. 21-22 without the Qurʾānic quotes.

61 Another pair of quotes taken from classical Arabic poetics appears in Ibn Rushd, Talkhīṣ (fn. 1), chap. 25.5, quotes no. 80 and no. 81.

In Aristotle's ›Poetics‹ this chapter classifies ways in which »recognition« (anagnorisis) materializes within a tragedy's plot (chap. 16.1-8). The term had been rendered into Arabic by Abū Bishr as »inference« (*istidlāl*)[62], which Ibn Rushd interprets as metaphor and adapts the entire chapter to elaborate on the Arabic metaphor in particular. He states that inferences are manifold and specifies that they require good imitation, »I mean imitation that best follows the [rules of poetic] art« (*aʿnī l-muḥākāta l-jāriyata majrā l-jawdati ʿalā l-ṭarīqi al-ṣināʿī*). This is the chapter Ibn Rushd treats most freely, and he considers metaphor as one of the distinguishing features of the poetic use of the Arabic language.[63]

Since the context for Ibn Rushd is no longer Greek tragedy but the Arabic praise *qaṣīda*, he readapts the classification to metaphors and other tropes occurring within it, adding poetic motifs and topoi (*aghrāḍ*, sing. *gharaḍ*). As elsewhere, he takes a normative stance, evaluating the verses exemplifying the types as praiseworthy or blameworthy. Already the very types he defines depart from the Arabic translation (and Ibn Sīnā's paraphrastic commentary), and the inserted Arabic verses showcase the altered descriptions of these types and his newly created (sub)types.[64] While Ibn Rushd fills the existing grid and alters the substance of this chapter, populating it with widespread Arabic poetic tropes, motifs, and topoi, he gives center stage to al-Mutanabbī and his individual style and lets this poet guide his interpretation. The following table juxtaposes the types of inferences (*istidlālāt*) in Abū Bishr's translation and Ibn Rushd's commentary; structural changes by the latter are shaded grey, and Arabic poetic tropes, motifs, and topoi he adds are placed within parentheses.

Abū Bishr, ›Kitāb al-Shiʿr‹	**Ibn Rushd, ›Talkhīṣ‹**
Type 1 Artless signs (e. g., birth-mark)	Type 1 Sensible things imitated with sensible things
Acquired signs (e. g., scar, necklace)	Type 2.1 Abstract concepts imitated with sensible things
Establishing proof or including reversal and turnover	Type 2.2 Producing assent to truth and persuasion
Type 2 Made up without art, close to error	[Merged into Type 2.2]
Type 3 Through memory	Type 3 Imitation through memory (dirge (*rithāʾ*), *aṭlāl*-motif, *khayāl*-motif)

62 Ibn Sīnā also uses this term. Julie Meisami renders istidlāl as »discovery,« see eadem, Structure and Meaning in Medieval Arabic and Persian Poetry: Orient Pearls, London 2003, p. 464, fn. 8.

63 Meisami (fn. 62), p. 326.

64 In enumerating the types, Ibn Rushed labels them either as istidlāl or uses the overarching term muḥākāh. The number of a type (nawʿ) is given only halfway through the list.

Type 4 Through one's thought	Type 4 Resemblance of a person to another
Type 5 Composite, taken from the sophistic syllogism	Type 5 False exaggeration (*al-ghuluww al-kadhib*)
-	Type 6 Speech attributed to inanimate things (*istinṭāq*)
[No number] Surpassing, through voluntary action	[No number] Outstanding inference and reversal

Table 1. Types of inferences in chapter sixteen

Ibn Rushd rewrites the first two types as concerning poetic figures that either imitate sensible things by other sensible things (type 1; chap. 16.1-1a) or figures that imitate abstract concepts by sensible things (type 2.1, chap. 16.2-2b). Both types develop Abū Bishr's type 1, and merge his type 2 into it. Ibn Rushd splits the second type into two parts, dealing with the second part separately (chap. 16.3).[65] As a result Ibn Rushd's **type 1** is sensible things (*maḥsūs*) imitated with sensible things; these instill doubt (*shakk*) and make the observer think both are identical. Here belong most comparisons of the Arabs (*tashbīhāt al-ʿarab*), indicated by particles of comparison (*ḥurūf al-tashbīh*; chap. 16.1a; introduced earlier in chap. 1.3.1a). Farfetched comparisons are to be rejected, exemplified by two quotes from Imruʾulqays.

(16.2) Ibn Rushd's **type 2.1**, imitations of abstract things (*maʿnawiyya*) with sensible things, make the viewer imagine their identity (*wahima annhā hiya*), exemplified with a quote by al-Mutanabbī on benevolence as a bond and another by Imruʾulqays on a swift horse being a shackle for hunted animals (chap. 16.2a). Inferences that are not analogous (*ghayr munāsib*) nor similar (*wa-lā shabīh*) are to be rejected. Ibn Rushd finds these frequent among the moderns, exemplified with two quotes from Abū Tammām including the »water of blame« and death coming as droplets of milk. The former was indeed among the poet's most criticized tropes in classical Arabic poetics. The same applies to far-fetched (*baʿīd*) inferences (chap 16.2b). Neither is the ignoble to be used for the honorable (*sharīf*) subject but rather excellent things (*fāḍila*); two negative examples are a quote by Abū Najm al-ʿIjlī (alive early second/eighth century) on the sinking sun as a squinter's eye and an anonymous couplet comparing Sayf al-Dawla and the Byzantines to cat and mouse.

Then Ibn Rushd reuses part of Abū Bishr's description of type 1 to create a new subtype, his **type 2.2**, geared toward gaining assent (*taṣdīq*) and persuading (*iqnāʿ*) and akin to rhetorical devices (*mithālāt khiṭābiyya;* chap. 16.3-4). He adds that »This kind of poetry that he (sc. Aristotle) mentioned is frequent in the poetry of Abū l-Ṭayyib [al-Mutanabbī]« (chap. 16.3a). He cites two of the poet's analogies, one between nat-

65 See previous note.

urally dark eyes and true prudence and another between the rising sun and the patron's presence, and a third analogy by Abū Firās al-Ḥamdānī between giving one's life in battle and paying high dowry for beauties. Then Ibn Rushd goes further by explaining the function of these analogies. To wit, they persuade through their rhetorical technique; indeed, the analogy with things perceptible to the senses makes abstract concepts palpable: dark eyes as opposed to painted eyes illustrate true wisdom, and the rising sun concretizes the praised patron's own glory in contrast with the fading light of nocturnal Saturn, who stands for the patron's ancestors. Not only does Ibn Rushd explain why these verses are effective, he also calls attention to the type, i. e., analogies that are not just enjoyable images but serve to persuade, and qualifies them to be a specialty of al-Mutanabbī. Indeed, in Arabic *adab* literature, the two verses by al-Mutanabbī figure among his most quoted ones; honored with the label of »wandering verses« (*abyāt sāʾira*) or »proverbs« (*amthāl*), they were assembled into various collections in which this type of persuasive analogy looms large.[66]

In Ibn Rushd's **type 3**, imitation[67] through memory (*tadhakkur*), for instance through handwriting of the deceased, Ibn Rushd includes a number of poetic *topoi* belonging to the genre of the dirge (*rithāʾ*), and two frame motifs of the *qaṣīda*'s opening theme of former love (*nasīb*), namely the mention of campsite traces (*aṭlāl*) and the specter of the beloved (*khayāl*; chap. 16.5). He calls this type frequent among the Arabs and cites four examples from lamentations (*rithāʾ*) and Udhrī love poetry (*ghazal*) which usually ended fatally for the lovers (chap. 16.5a). In a quote from al-Mutammim b. Nuwayra (alive first/seventh century), it is a random grave that renews his mourning for his brother; al-Khansāʾ (d. after 23/644) is reminded of her deceased brother by every sunrise and sunset; and a Hudhalī poet's grief is triggered by all phases of night and day. In the *ghazal*-verse, it is the name of another Laylā that stirs Majnūn's[68] yearning for his eponymous unreachable beloved.

Reiterating the frequency of this type (*nawʿ*), Ibn Rushd moves to another topos (*mawḍiʿ*) of remembrance, namely that of the lover looking at the abodes and ruins of his former beloved (*tadhakkur al-aḥibba bi-l-diyār wa-l-aṭlāl*), a framing motif of the *nasīb*,[69] and he exemplifies it with the most famous verse on this topos by Imruʾulqays, who is credited in classical Arabic poetics with its invention (16.5b). With his second example Ibn Rushd moves to another framing motif of the *nasīb*, the specter of the beloved appearing to the persona of the poet (*khayāl*), exemplified with another quote by al-Majnūn that combines two versions of the motif. This motif underwent a rich development between ancient and modern poetry,[70] and Ibn Rushd accurately

66 See Gruendler with Linderman and Pavlyshyn (fn. 21).

67 Here Ibn Rushd refers to inference with the overarching term of imitation (see also fn. 64).

68 Though he is the most famous representative of the ʿUdhrī love poetry in the Umayyad era (41/661-132/750) and a *dīwān* is attributed to him, his historicity is doubtful.

69 See fn. 38.

70 In classical Arabic poetics, Abū Hilāl al-ʿAskarī (Dīwān al-Maʿānī, no ed., Cairo [1833-34], pp. 276-79/ ed. by Muhammad Salīm Ghānim, 2 vols., Beirut 1424/2003, ii, pp. 539-44) demonstrates its wide spectrum, on which see Beatrice Gruendler, Motif vs. Genre: Reflections on the ›Dīwān al-maʿānī‹ of Abū

notes its diverse treatment within two different poetic genres, the amatory prelude of the *qaṣīḍa* (*nasīb*) and the lamentation (*rithāʾ*). He shows the full spectrum of the motif's variation, as a positive and desirable fiction (16.5b) and a negative and painful vision that intensifies the beloved's absence, the latter with a quote from al-Buḥturī (d. 284/897) from a *ghazal* about his page (chap. 16.5c).

Ibn Rushd's **type 4** (*nawʿ*) designates the resemblance (*shabīh, shabah*) of a person to another in physique or character, exemplified with a quote from Imruʾulqays about his half-brother Saʿd whose traits reminds him of their common father (chap.16.6).

His **type 5** Ibn Rushd rewrites as applying to false exaggeration (*al-guluww al-kadhib*), which he attributes to »sophist poets« (*al-sūfisṭāʾiyyūn*; chap. 16.7-16.7b). In classical Arabic poetics, this belongs to the larger theme of hyperbole (*mubālagha*), being its extreme form. Discussion of hyperbole focused on its position between lie and truth, and initial condemnations concerned mainly the extreme hyperbole. But gradually, an increasingly sophisticated imagery met with greater leniency and acceptance of its artful renditions and cosmic proportions (included among Ibn Rushd's examples). In this vein, Ibn Rushd distinguishes between blameworthy and praiseworthy extreme hyperboles.

He notes the frequency of this type among Arabs' poems including the moderns, and follows this with five quotes, the highest number for any type (chap. 16.7a). The illustrious selection, including some pre-Islamic greats, makes it improbable that Ibn Rushd would actually regard those poets as »sophists«. The first pair is by ancient poets, a quote by al-Nābigha al-Dhubyānī (alive sixth century CE) describes a sword cutting through armor, another by al-Muhalhil (alive fifth century CE) battle noise heard from a faraway place. As a second pair, he cites two verses by al-Mutanabbī, both cosmic images for a praised patron, the Egyptian regent Kāfūr: one threatens to blame sun and moon should they oppose Kāfūr, the other has the universe stop rotating should the patron dislike it. With the last quote, Ibn Rushd returns to the pre-Islamic poets with Imruʾulqays describing a woman's skin as so soft that a crawling insect would leave marks. He reiterates this type's frequency in Arab poems but clarifies its absence in the Qurʾān (chap. 16.7b). Despite his criticism of such poetry as sophist, he is obviously swayed by the gathered specimen and inveighs that some verses belonging to this category, composed by poets of talent, are praiseworthy and then cites two further verses by al-Mutanabbī. These contain fantastic etiologies (*ḥusn al-taʿlīl*),[71] i. e., imagined explanations for situations in which the hyperboles they contain are not themselves the focus but merely form the basis for a fantastic argument. One of the verses contains the already encountered figure of feigned wonder (*tajāhul al-ʿārif*; see section 4) at how a Byzantine emissary can find his way to the patron Sayf al-Dawla, when battle dust still obscures the land, and the wells are filled with the blood of their

Hilāl al-ʿAskarī, in: Ghazal as World Literature I: Transformations of a Literary Genre, ed. by Thomas Bauer and Angelika Neuwirth, Beirut, Stuttgart 2005, pp. 57-85, esp. pp. 66-67 and 84.

71 See Geert Jan van Gelder, A Good Cause: Fantastic Aetiology (*Ḥusn al-taʿlīl*) in Arabic Poetics, in: *Takhyīl*: The Imaginary in Classical Arabic Poetics, ed. by Marlé Hammond and Geert Jan van Gelder, Oxford 2008, pp. 221-37.

killed soldiers. The extreme hyperbole of lingering dust and blood magnifies the devastation caused by the patron's recent victory over the Byzantines. The other verse explains that beautiful women don brocade to hide their beauty and braid their hair to keep it orderly, not for embellishment. Both imagined explanations heighten by contrast the women's modesty and their natural beauty which dispenses with any ornament. Al-Mutanabbī's inventiveness thus prompts Ibn Rushd to qualify his general censure of extreme hyperbole and designate some if it meritorious.

He creates **type 6** from whole cloth for a further Arabic poetic convention, the attribution of speech to inanimate beings (*istinṭāq*), showing himself yet again guided by a prevalent Arabic poetic topos (chap 16.7c). This consists of turning inanimate beings (*jamādāt*) into articulate ones (*nāṭiqūn*) by the poet's addressing them (*mukhāṭabatuhum*), or creating situations that indicate speech (*aḥwāl tadullu ʿalā l-nuṭq*). His three examples cover a spectrum from objects actually speaking to conveying meaning through their silence: the poet al-Majnūn speaks to a mountain who metaphorically talks back; Dhū l-Rumma weeps over traces making the stones only nearly respond; ʿAntara (alive second half of the sixth century CE) questions a deserted abode in vain and understands its very silence to be the response. In classical Arabic poetics, this figure of gifting inanimates with speech is discussed in-depth by Ibn Wahb (alive mid-fourth/mid-tenth century).[72] The following table givens an overview Ibn Rushd's recast typology.

Aristotle	**Abū Bishr**	**Ibn Sīnā (shortens Aristotle and Abū Bishr to less than a page)**	**Ibn Rushd (seven pages)**
16. Types of recognition			Types of inference a, b, c = sections added by Ibn Rushd
16.1 Artless signs (birth-mark), 1 quote	16.1 Artless (spear head)	16.1. Inferences with non-existing things that produce assent by evoking images, not by truth.	16.1 Well-crafted imitations are of many kinds: (type 1) sensible imitated with sensible. 16.1a far-fetched ones, 2 quotes

72 Isḥāq b. Ibrāhīm Ibn Wahb al-Kātib, al-Burhān fī wujūh al-bayān, ed. by Ḥifnī Muḥammad Sharaf, Cairo [1389/1969], p. 57.

Aristotle	**Abū Bishr**	**Ibn Sīnā (shortens Aristotle and Abū Bishr to less than a page)**	**Ibn Rushd (seven pages)**
16.2 Acquired (scar, necklace)	16.2 Acquired (neck band, sword, pustule)	16.2 Of things belonging to bodies (neck band, sword)	16.2 (Type 2.1) Abstract imitated with sensible, 2 quotes (al-Mutanabbī, Imruʾulqays) 16.2a Rejects what is neither analogous (*ghayr munāsib*) nor similar (*wa-lā shabīh*), 2 quotes (Abū Tammām) 16.2b Rejects imitation by worthless things, 2 quotes
16.3 Establishing proof, or accidental 16.4 (Type 2) Made up by the poet	16.3 Artful, gaining assent, or including reversal 16.4 Made up without art, close to error	16.3 Artful, gaining assent, or beset [by misfortune] 16.4 Made up without art, close to error	16.3 (Type 2.2) »Another type« assent to truth 16.3a This type is frequent in al-Mutanabbī: 3 quotes (al-Mutanabbī, Abū Firās al-Ḥamdānī), added section mainly for al-Mutanabbī expands the classification [16.4 is cut]
16.5 (Type 3) Through memory	16.5 (Type 3) Through memory	16.5 (Type 3) Through memory	16.5 (Type 3) By memory; frequent among Arabs. 16.5a Dirge, 4 quotes 16.5b Abodes, ruins, 1 quote; specter, 1 quote with two *khayāls*

Aristotle	**Abū Bishr**	**Ibn Sīnā (shortens Aristotle and Abū Bishr to less than a page)**	**Ibn Rushd (seven pages)**
			16.5c Specter, modern: negative *khayāl,* 1 quote
16.6 (Type 4) Resulting from a syllogism	16.6 (Type 4) Through one's thought of a person	16.6 (Type 4) Through a likeness in one's thought	16.6 (Type 4) Resemblance of a person to another, 1 quote by Imruʾulqays
16.7 (Type 5) Paralogism	16.7 Composite, taken from the sophistic syllogism	16.7 False exaggeration	16.7 (Type 5) False exaggeration; extreme hyperbole is condemned 16.7a, 5 quotes (al-Mutanabbī, cosmic praise), critique of al-Mutanabbī 16.7b Praiseworthy; 2 quotes (al-Mutanabbī); al-Mutanabbī makes Ibn Rushd turn Aristotle's fault into merit. 16.7c (Type 6) Speech attributed to inanimate things, 3 quotes (end of the classification)
16.8 Best recognition by surprise	16.8 Surpassing, taken from voluntary action	16.8 Imitating action	16.8 Outstanding inference and reversal 16.8a Only in Qur'ān

Table 2. Ibn Rushd's types of inference and the tropes, motifs, and topoi exemplifying them

8. What to call the ›Talkhīṣ‹?

In applying or revising the theoretical layout of Aristotle (as received through Abū Bishr) Ibn Rushd operates on two levels. First, he omits phenomena that have no bearing on Arabic literature. Inversely he develops and alters the layout, for instance by adding types of tropes that existed in Arabic but not in Greek. For him the ›Poetics‹ was no untouchable classic but a living text that needed cultural adaptation to be meaningful. Second, his quotes prove his awareness of the longstanding discipline of classical Arabic poetics. However, he analyzed Arabic language and literature from a philosophical angle, giving it his own terminology (partly taken over from Abū Bishr or Ibn Sīnā). More importantly he covered aspects that had been blind spots in that discipline, such as the structure of entire poems. In evaluating verses, he uses his own judgement, concurring or disagreeing with poetic critics. What matters to him is the practice of poetry itself, which makes him revise negative evaluations found in the ›Poetics‹, such as of the extreme hyperbole (chap. 16.7b) and sundry poetic mistakes (chap. 25), which he finds instead to be familiar and common practice in Arabic poetry. In consideration of the invasive treatment Ibn Rushd gives the ›Poetics‹, one may reconsider what to call his ›Talkhīṣ‹. Its frequent designation as a »paraphrastic commentary« falls short of reflecting his in-depth interventions and his reorientation of the entire work towards Arabic language and literature.

(Prof. Dr. Dr. h. c. Beatrice Gründler, Freie Universität Berlin, Seminar für Semitistik und Arabistik, Fabeckstraße 23-25, 14195 Berlin: E-Mail: beatrice.gruendler@fu-berlin.de)