

# NĀBULUSĪ'S COMMENTARY ON IBN AL-FĀRĪD'S *KHAMRĪYAH*

SHIGERU KAMADA\*

## I. Introduction

Ibn al-Fāriḍ (d. 632/1235) is one of the most celebrated mystical poets in Islam and probably the best mystical poet in Arabic literature. On his literary style, R. A. Nicholson remarks: “(The odes of his *Dīwān*) exhibit a style of great delicacy and beauty and more or less copious use of rhetorical artifices.”<sup>(1)</sup> Among his odes two purely mystical poems: the *Khamrīyah* and the *Naẓm al-sulūk* (often called *al-Tā’īyah al-kubrā*) are especially well-recognized, and a number of commentaries have been written on them. On the *Dīwān* of Ibn al-Fāriḍ two commentaries of al-Ḥasan al-Būrīnī (d. 1024/1615) and ‘Abd al-Ghanī al-Nābulusī (d. 1143/1731) are well-known. Here in this paper I would like to discuss how Nābulusī interprets Ibn al-Fāriḍ’s poems, and therefore it is not my primary purpose to discuss Ibn al-Fāriḍ’s poems themselves.

To deal with the whole commentary<sup>(2)</sup> is beyond the scope of this paper, and I, choosing the *Khamrīyah*, would closely examine the way of Nābulusī’s interpretation of it. I use Rushayyid b. al-Daḥdāḥ’s abridged version of Nābulusī’s commentary as well as the French translation by É. Dermenghem, which is based on a manuscript of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris.<sup>(3)</sup> His translation seems not to be a complete one, either. However this is very helpful in order to make up for passages which are not found in Daḥdāḥ’s version.<sup>(4)</sup>

Before starting an examination of the text of the commentary, I would like to trace the background of Nābulusī’s life, work, and personality and to describe the general characteristics of his commentary.

Nābulusī whose full name is ‘Abd al-Ghanī b. Ismā‘īl b. Aḥmad b. Ibrāhīm al-Nābulusī<sup>(5)</sup> was born in Damascus in Dhū al-Ḥijjah 5,1050/March 19,1641.<sup>(6)</sup> His family had long been settled in Damascus and his great grand father was described by Muḥibbī as “*shaykh mashā’ikh al-Shām*.”<sup>(7)</sup> He belonged to the

---

\* Research Assistant, Faculty of Letters, University of Tokyo.

Hanafī rite, to which his father had changed from the Shāfi'ī rite. Since his father died in 1062AH, he grew up as an orphan.<sup>(8)</sup> He studied religion and its related sciences under several teachers. He studied jurisprudence (*fiqh*) and its fundamentals (*uṣūl*) under Aḥmad al-Qala'ī al-Hanafī; Arabic grammar (*naḥw*), rhetoric (*ma'ānī, tibyān*) and morphology (*ṣarf*) under a guest of Damascus (*nazīl Dimashq*) Maḥmūd al-Kurdi; *ḥadīth* and its technics under 'Abd al-Bāqī al-Ḥanbalī; *tafsīr* and grammar under Muḥammad al-Maḥāsini. He also attended his father's lectures on *tafsīr* at the Umayyad Mosque (*al-Jāmi' al-Umawī*) and got their general licenses (*'umūm ijāzah*). He studied with many other scholars.<sup>(9)</sup> As for his Sufism, he belonged to the two Sufi orders (*ṭariqah*), that is, the Qādiriyah to which he was initiated by al-Sayyid 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Ḥamawī al-Kilānī and the Naqshbandīyah to which he was initiated by Sa'īd al-Balkhī.<sup>(10)</sup>

When he was twenty years old, he started giving lectures and writing. He devoted himself to the study of Muḥyī al-Dīn Ibn al-'Arabī (d. 638/1240) and the works of Sufi *shaykhs* such as Ibn Sab'īn (d. 668 or 669/1269–71)<sup>(11)</sup> and al-'Afīf al-Tilimsānī (d. 690/1291).<sup>(12)</sup>

He traveled widely in Islamic countries. On 1075/1664 he made his first journey to Istanbul (*Dār al-khilāfah*), and in 1100/1688 he visited Biqā' and Lebanon, in 1101/1689 Jerusalem (*al-Quds*) and Hebron (*al-Khalīl*), in 1105/1693 Egypt and Ḥijāz, and in 1112/1700 Tripoli (*Ṭarābulus*). He left accounts of all these travels except the first. In 1114/1702 he came back to Damascus, where he moved from his ancestor's home to Ṣālīḥīyah in the beginning of 1119/1707 and then to their home where he died on Sha'bān 24, 1143/March 5, 1731.<sup>(13)</sup>

His works are many, and W. A. S. Khālidī counts from 200 to 250 (including short treatises).<sup>(14)</sup> Anṭūniyūs Shibli al-Lubnānī, whose counting is based on Murādī, lists 188 titles.<sup>(15)</sup> Nābulusī's works can be classified into three categories: Sufi literature, poetry, and narratives of travels.<sup>(16)</sup> His Sufi writings are mostly in the form of commentaries on the works of Ibn al-'Arabī, al-Jīlī, Ibn al-Fāriḍ and others. Abū al-'Alā 'Afīfī mentions Nābulusī's commentary on the *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam* as one of its most important commentaries.<sup>(17)</sup>

He composed many poems which comprised almost all fields of poetry such as mystical poems, eulogies of the Prophet, general eulogies and correspondence, and love poems. He had a great reputation as a poet during his lifetime and after.

In the accounts of his travels it was not Nābulusī's primary intention to present a description of topographical or architectural detail, though they provide us with a considerable amount of information of the religious and cultural life of the age. They are rather records of his own mystical experiences. In addition, he wrote works, some of them vast and encyclopaedic, on *tafsīr*, *ḥadīth*, *kalām*, *fiqh*, interpretation of dreams, agriculture, the lawfulness of tobacco and so on.<sup>(18)</sup>

As many Sufis did, Nābulusī showed some unconventional behaviours at which some people looked as antinomianism. Concerning this aspect of his life, Murādī relates as follows:<sup>(19)</sup>

At first strange and wonderful states occurred to him, and he confined himself in his house which was located near the Umayyad Mosque in the 'Anbarīn market, for seven years, and he did not go out; he let his hair hang down and did not cut his nails. He remained in a strange state, and melancholy sometimes seized him. Envious people came to speak of him with words which did not become him, talking that he did not perform the five canonical prayers and that he composed poems for the purpose of attacking people. But he (May God be pleased with him) was free from that.

Murādī reports another story concerning him.<sup>(20)</sup>

By receiving divine inspiration (*al-faṭḥ al-ladunī*) he composed a *Badī'iyah* in praise of the Prophet. But some people doubted his authorship. Then he had to comment on it. He made its beautiful commentary in one volume within a month and furthermore composed another *Badī'iyah* in which he imposed upon himself to mention the name of the kind (of technique in each verse).

Again he left a treatise in which he defended a controversial Sufi practice of meditation of God through beautiful faces of young men (*al-naẓar ilā al-wujūh al-ḥisān min al-ghilmān*).<sup>(21)</sup>

Ibn al-Fārid's mystical poems certainly contain subtle and deep meanings which come from his own mystical experience. They may be called his

‘thought’ in a wide sense. However his thought is not the same kind as that of philosophers. He is a poet first of all. I think that Ibn al-Fāriḍ himself had no intention to systematically expound his thought though his most celebrated long ode, the *Naẓm al-sulūk* or the *Tā’īyah al-kubrā* can be said to have some tendency of systematization. If we think that beauty of poetry consists in the harmony of its form and idea, it is not suitable as a means of conveying a consistent idea because emphasis on its idea often results in negligence of its formal beauty. On the other hand emphasis on form may result in lifeless word-playing. In Ibn al-Fāriḍ’s poems both elements, that is, form and idea claim their right of existence at their maximum. To put it in another way, the formal aspect of his poems is full of word play such as *jīnās*, *ḥibāq* and other technical embellishment to such a degree that we can hardly grasp what he wants to say even at the surface level, while the poet does not give up conveying a very subtle idea. This makes his poems very difficult to understand. If we think in this way, namely, that his poems contain profound and subtle ideas with complex forms, then we may understand why there are two commentators, Būrīnī and Nābulusī, whose commentaries have different characteristics from each other: the former’s work being grammatical and literal, the latter’s metaphysical and mystical.<sup>(22)</sup>

As I have mentioned above, Nābulusī himself was a Sufi. It is natural that his commentary deeply inclines to mystical interpretation. On the general characteristics of his commentaries, Khālīdī writes in the following manner:<sup>(23)</sup>

In these commentaries he does not merely paraphrase and epitomize, but develops the thought in the tradition of the great commentators by original, if sometimes farfetched, interpretation, which, as it is not exclusively mystical, is an important source for his religious and theological thought in general.

This characterization may be true of his commentary on Ibn al-Fāriḍ’s *Dīwān*. In Nābulusī’s commentary we rarely find a word which is interpreted in the literal sense which a dictionary gives to it. Almost every comment of his begins with a phrase “such-and-such a word alludes to such-and-such a matter” (*kināyah ‘an*). Probably this is the most salient characteristic of his way of interpretation. To judge whether this is right or not I will examine some of his comments in the following pages.

## II. His Interpretation (1)

Nābulusī interprets various words and phrases in the poem as having particular mystical significances. Here I would like to present some of his interpretations which may clarify his method of interpretation.

Verse 1,<sup>(24)</sup> "We drank upon the remembrance of the Beloved a wine wherewith we were drunken before ever the vine was created" does Nābulusī interpret in the following way. A number of mystics (*sālik*), by performing the *dhikr* (*dhikr bi-'l-lisān*) or contemplating the Beloved (*i. e.*, God) (*dhikr bi-'l-qalb*), drank wine or divine Love (*al-maḥabbah al-ilāhīyah*) which resulted from the contemplation of the traces of the beautiful Names of the high Presence. The wine inevitably leads them to intoxication and total annihilation from all the created things (*jamī' a'ḡyān al-wujūd*). The intoxication takes place in the presence of the divine Knowledge (*al-ḥaḍrah al-'ilmīyah*) even before appearance of all determined things (*ḡuhūr kull maqdūr*).

The commentator understands this verse in such a way that this means realization of mystics' union with God whose experience can be said to take place before creation because the experience transcends time and place in its nature.

Nābulusī connects the word *dhikr* in the verse to a Sufi practice of invocation. In the same place he mentions in the following way. It is a custom of sinful drinkers that they drink on listening (*samā'*) to and enjoying (*ṭarab*), a variety of music. But the *dhikr* here is not that of sinful drinkers but that of the Beloved, and this is one of the most efficient means of amusement for the poet. Because invocation of God, either by the tongue or in the heart, is the cause of his intoxication which he most enjoyed. Furthermore, he explains benefits of *dhikr* in his comment on verse 32.<sup>(25)</sup> Even a careless and veiled man will have pleasure, spiritual lightness (*khiffah*) and corporeal vivacity if he remembers it (*i. e.*, *mudāmah* or God) in such a way that he mentions it by his tongue, hears it from other's *dhikr*, or meditates (*tadhakkur*) in his heart.

He mentions another Sufi practice *samā'* (spiritual concert) in his comment on verse 38,<sup>(26)</sup> "Wine never dwelt with Care in any place, even as Sorrow never dwelt with Song." For this purpose, he states, each Sufi order has adopted a spiritual concert with melodies and musical instruments. However this same music is prohibited to thoughtless people because it increases only

their thoughtlessness concerning God. In this way he often interprets verses by reading ideas of Sufi practices in them.

In another place he mentions Sufi orders themselves in the context of verse 17,<sup>(27)</sup> “And had its name been inscribed above the banner of an army, surely that superscription would have intoxicated all beneath the banner.” The allusion of “the banner of an army” (*liwā’ al-jaysh*) is a Sufi order (*ṭarīqah*) which spreads under a shaykh and in which novices walk on the mystical way and fight their lower souls in order to reach the gnosis of their Lord. He mentions following examples: the banner of the Qādirīyah which Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Kilānī (d. 561/1166) raised for those who travel on his way (*ṭarīqah*) is humility (*dhull*) and mortification (*inkisār*); that of the Maḥbūbīyah which our Shaykh, al-Shaykh al-Akbar Muḥyī al-Dīn Ibn ‘Arabī (d. 638/1240) raised for those who travel on his way is beneficial knowledge (*al-‘ilm al-nāfi’*) and elevating practice (*al-‘amal al-rāfi’*); and that of the Shādhiliyah which al-‘Ārif al-Kāmil Abū al-Ḥasan al-Shādhilī (d. 656/1258) raised for those who travel on his way is abandonment of rational thinking (*tark al-tadbīr*). In this way every shaykh has his spiritual way whose banner is spread out and whose flag is well-known.

Although so far I have found no reference which shows his affiliation with the Shādhiliyah, this description might mean his affiliation with this order.<sup>(28)</sup>

This verse connotes that each novice, by attaching himself to a particular Sufi order, fights his soul according to the order of its characteristic way. Thus in various passages Nābulusī interprets verses in terms of Sufi orders and their practices.

On verse 3,<sup>(29)</sup> “But for its fragrance, I should not have found the way to its tavern; and but for its radiance, the imagination would not have pictured it,” the commentator interprets “fragrance” (*shadhā*) as the world of the supreme spirit (*‘ālam al-rūḥ al-a’zam*) which is by command of God; “tavern” (*ḥān*) as the Presences of the sublime Essence (*ḥadarāt al-dhāt al-‘aliyah*), or various exalted Names and Attributes; “radiance” (*sanā*) as the light of the human intellect (*nūr al-‘aql al-insānī*), or the light of the spiritual lightening which alludes to the spirit of the divine order (*al-rūḥ al-amrī*). The interpretation of the verse is as follows: But for the supreme spirit which is the fragrance of the divine Presences, I should not have been guided to the divine Presence. In

reality the fragrance has been spread, and all creatures have scented it except those who can neither have nor realize the marvellous knowledge. Again, but for the human intellect, the imagination would not have established an intelligible form of the wine which alludes to the universal Reality of the divine Being. Because the Reality in itself has no form. By taking into account his quotation of Ibn al-ʿArabī's words, "God has no form and He has all forms" appeared in Dermenghem's translation,<sup>(30)</sup> I guess that what he wants to say might be that God manifests Himself in such a form that man's intellect imagines Him as his personal God (his Lord (*rabb*), more precisely speaking in the context of Ibn al-ʿArabī's thought),<sup>(31)</sup> or that God always manifests Himself in whatever form the intellect imagines as God, though no one can know God in reality, or the Absolute Being (*al-wujūd al-muṭlaq*). In this way God has no form in Himself because of His transcendental quality but manifests Himself in such a form as man imagines Him as having a certain form.

The human intellect he discusses in his comments on other verses, too. The image of a "filter" (*rāwūq*) in verse 14<sup>(32)</sup> is interpreted by the commentator as intellect (*ʿaql*). According to him, human intellect in itself has no perceptive faculty, that is to say, man of intellect does not perceive through his own intellect, but he perceives through the light of his Lord and thereafter that which he perceives through the light of his Lord presents itself to his intellect. His intellect thus purifies that (*i. e.*, things perceived) from turbidity of the possibles and uncleanness of the perishable traces. Nābulusī understands the intellect, symbolized by the *rāwūq*, as purifying the human perception by receiving the divine Light.

He also understands a symbol "filter" (*fidām*) in verse 20<sup>(33)</sup> in the same manner. "It is the wine's veil by which the wine is concealed from human intellects (*al-ʿuqūl al-basharīyah*). Namely, the veil is human intellect (*al-ʿaql al-insānī*), and it is called a filter (*fidām*) in the state of not knowing the wine and a strainer (*miṣfāt*) in the state of knowing it." The intellect as such cannot understand the divine Essence. Only after man's receiving the light of his Lord, does his intellect grasp the divine Essence. Therefore, there are two modes of intellect; one is the mode of intellect before receiving the divine Light, which is symbolized by the word *fidām* in verse 20, and the other is that of intellect after receiving it, which is symbolized by the word *miṣfāt* in his comment on verse 20. The human intellect itself is nothing but a veil to grasp God, but it helps man to grasp Him on condition of its receiving the divine

Light.

In his comment on verse 6,<sup>(34)</sup> “From the very bowels of the jars it has mounted up, and nothing remains of it in truth but a name”, he discusses the significance of the divine Names. “It has mounted up” (*taṣāʿadat*) alludes to the divine Knowledge concealed in the breast of people which vanishes little by little by the dwindling of man’s spiritual energies in seeking it because of the heart’s desire for the world. He explains the second hemistich (*miṣrāʿ*) as follows:

The Reality of wine disappeared after its self-manifestation through its descent to the sensual and spiritual forms (*ṣuwar*) and for a sincere novice there remains nothing of it but a name of which he takes care because he is a locus of manifestation of the name (*majlā-hu*). God said: “God (*Allāh*) has the beautiful Names, call Him by them.”<sup>(35)</sup> He is not called nor sought except by His Names, because they (*i. e.*, the Names) control the worlds but not the sacred Essence (*i. e.*, God) who does not depend on the worlds by virtue of God’s saying, “God does not need the worlds.”<sup>(36)</sup>

Although it is not clear how his interpretation of the second hemistich is consistently combined with the first, his interpretation of the second hemistich is obviously based on Ibn al-ʿArabī’s discussion on the relationship between *Allāh* who integrates all the Names and the other divine Names.<sup>(37)</sup> From the context of the verse which describes the gradual fading of ecstasy from the heart of the mystic,<sup>(38)</sup> I would think that Nābulusī’s identification of the *ism* as a divine Name may be wrong in this context and rather that it should be understood as something empty losing its reality. Therefore I think that he started his speculation on divine Names without considering the context by finding a verse in which the poet mentioned the word *ism*.

Verse 8,<sup>(39)</sup> “And had the boon-companions beheld the sealing of its vessels, that sealing of its large vessel would have intoxicated them,” the commentator interprets as follows: If the mystical travellers realize in their hearts the divine self-manifestation specified to them in every state and in every time, its trace in human bodies makes them be absent from all but God. While Būrīnī, followed by Nicholson<sup>(40)</sup> and Arberry,<sup>(41)</sup> reads *min dūnī-hā* “without (their having tasted) the wine”, Nābulusī strangely reads *min danni-hā* “of its



large vessel" and interprets it as the human body (*al-jism al-insānī*). What he wants to say is not very clear, but I guess that he may have had in mind the mystical structure of man in such a way that man consists of body (*iism*), soul (*nafs*), heart (*qalb*) and others. Since a kind of psychology, a science of subtleties (*laṭā'if*) has been well developed in Sufism as a result of their quest for God through their own interior,<sup>(42)</sup> I suppose that he read *min-danni-hā* in order to convey a glimpse of the mystical structure of man. However as a comment on Ibn al-Fāriḍ's poem, I think that Būrīnī's reading is more appropriate to the context, though Nābulusī's interpretation is also interesting as far as we are interested in Nābulusī's own thought.

On "the Orient" (*al-sharq*) and "the Occident" (*al-gharb*) in verse 12,<sup>(43)</sup> he remarks as follows:

The Orient is the place from which the saints (*awliyā'*) of 'Irāq and the Pole (*qutb*) came out and to which people in this world turn from all places. By the Orient the heart of the Perfect Man may be meant, because it is the place of rising of the Sun of the divine Being (*al-wujūd al-Haqq*).

and concerning the Occident:

The Occident is the Occidental countries from which great saints came out and most of them emigrated to the Oriental countries, like the Shaykh al-Akbar (*i. e.*, Ibn al-'Arabī) and others.

He expresses the same kind of idea as this in his comment on verse 10.<sup>(44)</sup> That is to say, mystics travel from the side of the Occident of existents to the side of the Orient of the Sun of the Oneness at the rise of the Spirit of divine order (*al-rūḥ al-amrī al-rabbānī*). Nābulusī's idea that the Orient is the source of gnosis while the Occident is the world in darkness of existents and that mystics see their final goal in the Orient might be influenced by the thought of the Shaykh al-Ishrāq al-Suhrawardī (d. 587/1191)<sup>(45)</sup> though he does not mention him in these passages.

From a phrase, "the hand of one touching (a cup of wine)" (*kaff lāmis*) in verse 13,<sup>(46)</sup> he develops his speculation in the following manner. A sincere novice in the will of God puts his hand in that of the Perfect Man at the time

of the agreement (*mubāya'ah*) and the pact (*mu'āhadah*), just as the Prophet said in a *ḥadīth* concerning the sale of contact (*bay' al-mulāmasah*): "If I touch your cloth, or you touch my cloth, the sale is established between us." It is a sale of the soul to God who wears through His self-manifestation and influence the cloth of the form of the Perfect Man, and it is the form of the guide *shaykh*. If a sincerer novice puts his hand on that of the Perfect *shaykh* who guides him to God by way of mystical taste and passion, then the novice touches the cloth of God (*al-Murād*), and the sale is established. Then God buys the soul of the novice lawfully with no withdrawal from the sale.

From this we know that he interprets this phrase as a symbol implying that in a mystical state a novice makes an agreement (*i. e.*, the sale of his soul to God) with the Perfect Man in whom God manifests Himself totally. Briefly speaking, "touching" implies the novice's union with God through the Perfect Man.

Here I have presented his interpretations of various words and phrases in the *Khamriyah*. The more loyally I follow his interpretation, the farther I feel it from Ibn al-Fāriq's poem, probably because of his disorganized way of exposition and his commentary's nature itself as a mystical commentary. However at least it can be said that his discussions on various matters such as Sufi practices, human intellect, divine Names, the Orient and the Occident, and others, are farfetched to such a degree that his interpretation sometimes does not seem to be an interpretation of the *Khamriyah*.

### III. His Interpretation (2)

Nābulusī often speaks about the relationship between God as the Absolute Being and created things which are possible and perishable. Here I present his discussion which mainly deals with the relationship.

On verse 2,<sup>(47)</sup> "The full moon is a cup for it, itself being the sun which a crescent causes to circle. When it is mingled (with water), how many stars appear!", he discusses the spiritual meaning of wine (*mudāmah*) which forms the fundamental tone of the *Khamriyah*. According to him the wine is divine Love (*al-maḥabbah al-ilāhiyah*). It is the essence of eternal Love which appears in loci of manifestation of existent traces (*maẓāhīr al-āthār al-kawnīyah*). The commentator illustrates the relationship between God and man by making reference to a verse of the *Qur'ān* (5: 59). "He loves them and they love Him"

(*yuhibbu-hum wa yuhibbūna-hu*). When the sun shines on the moon, the moon reflects its light. The reflected light of the moon has originally come from the sun. Although the light of the sun and that of the moon seem to be different in phenomenal appearance, both are in reality one and the same sun light. If we take into account the above Qur'ānic verse, it is clear that human love and divine love are one and the same divine Love though there seem to be two kinds of love. That is to say, man's being is nothing but a form of God's Being. Divine Love permeates all creatures. It is that which Ibn al-Fāriḍ as far as Nābulusī understands, wants to convey by the word *mudāmah*. The commentator states as follows:

The exoteric (*i. e.*, apparent phenomena such as man's love to God) is the esoteric (*i. e.*, Divine Love) itself. It illumines all over the countries, and it is the wine (*khamr*) of God's Being and the sincere address. Every thing has drunken it, and its shadows and shades have appeared in every thing. It is Love which grows all grains and Wine which intoxicates Zayd and 'Amr (*i. e.*, everyone). It is Being which overflows a variety of generosity and magnanimity, and is the address of "*kun fa-yakūnu*" (*Qur'ān*, 2: 3, 36: 82) by which every movement and every stability appear. It is the essence which preserves all substances (*al-adawāt*). It is attributes and names for dresses of Sulaymā and Asmā (*i. e.*, everyone).

As this quotation shows, the wine or divine Love is the ontological basis which creates, sustains and permeates everything.

In other verses he also mentions a similar idea. Following are his comments on the phrase, "and the whole is one" (*wa al-kullu wāḥidun*) in verse 28.<sup>(48)</sup> He writes in the following way:

"The whole is one" refers to One Being living for Himself. He reveals eternally through His knowledge possible objects of His knowing which are not concrete existents, and articulates them in His eternal spiritual Speech. Thus that One Being exteriorizes, manifests, and reveals Himself. But He contemplates Himself through Himself while those unconcrete possible objects of His knowing have not existed.

As this comment shows, all existents in the world result from His self-contemplation and exteriorization. The visible existents are various manifested forms of the One Real Being without which nothing exists. The same kind of argument is also found in his comment on “in the tavern” (*fī al-ḥān*) in verse 37.<sup>(49)</sup>

This Wine symbolizing Being of God, the One, the Unique, exteriorizes, manifests and unveils Himself through determination (*taqdīr*) and formation (*taṣwīr*) of everything. Everything is an independent tavern (*i. e.*, a locus of manifestation of Wine, namely, of the Absolute Being), and everything vanishes except His face just as everyone who is on it (*i. e.*, earth) will perish.

The idea that phenomenal existents are nothing but forms of the divine self-manifestation and that all is essentially one, is the idea of *waḥdat al-wujūd* which Ibn al-ʿArabī and his followers advanced.

Here I will return to the discussion on verse 2. “The full moon” (*al-baḍr*), he tells, alludes to the Perfect Man (*al-insān al-kāmil*) who is filled with God by way of His self-manifestation and illumination. “The full moon or the Perfect Man urges the sun of Oneness to illumine darkness of the existents” and “is the perfect locus of manifestation of God” (*majlā al-Ḥaqq ʿalā al-tamām*).

“A cup” also alludes to the Perfect Man as the perfect locus of divine self-manifestation. He says as follows:

The Perfect Man is a cup of it (*i. e.*, Wine) inasmuch as it is the wine which intoxicates all who drink it so that their intellects may be absent from seeing the existents (*al-akwān*). The Perfect Man speaks the knowledge which he has in order for a sincere novice to realize it (*i. e.*, Wine, divine Love). Then the novice drinks it through him, and his how-much-ness (*kammīyah*) and how-ness (*kayfīyah*) disappear, and in him remains nothing except It (*i. e.*, divine Love).

The Perfect Man is conceived of as an intermediary between God and man by working as a transmitter of Divine Knowledge, by which a novice in the mystical way loses his own mode of being, inasmuch as it is different from the mode of divine Being which transcends all determination, and realizes union

with God. To drink wine in a cup alludes to the realization of union with God by the intermediary of the Perfect Man.

“Causes to circle it” (*yudīru-hā*) alludes to the spreading of the Names and the beautiful Attributes of the Wine or God. “A crescent” (*hilāl*) is a partly eclipsed moon. There is an interesting passage in É. Dermenghem’s translation<sup>(50)</sup> which Daḥdāḥ’s version lacks.

Si l’homme parfait est pleine lune, il n’y a pas en lui d’hétérogénéité et il ne peut pas s’exprimer; mais s’il est croissant, son moi l’éclipse un petit peu; il apparaît alors comme croissant et peut servir les convives (ainsi qu’un échanton).

The Perfect Man cannot express himself because his perfectness is too far from man to imagine. Taking a form of crescent, he comes nearer to man and leads man towards God by spreading one or some of the divine Names and Attributes. Therefore a crescent is a gnostic who manifests only a part of divine Light, not the whole.<sup>(51)</sup>

Concerning “when it is mingled” the commentator states only “mixing with other substances.” “When a crescent looks at others and moves on deviating from its route (to guide them), it becomes a star, and those who follow it are rightly guided.” From this we know that the stars are people’s guides who are closer to them than a crescent. Judging from his quoting a verse of the *Qur’ān* and a *ḥadīth*<sup>(52)</sup> he seems to identify the stars as the Companions of the Prophet (*aṣḥāb*).

Nābulusī seems to understand the symbols appeared in this verse such as *shams*, *badr*, *hilāl*, and *najm* in terms of the different levels of the self-manifestation of God, that is to say, from the divine Essence as the highest, the Perfect Man, gnostics who partially reflect the Perfect Man, and at last to the Companions of the Prophet. At the same time, all at the different levels are equally permeated by Wine (*mudāmāh*) of divine Love.

On verse 36,<sup>(53)</sup> “take it pure! but if you desire to mingle it, to turn away from the water of the Beloved’s teeth is wrong” the commentator states that pureness of this wine alludes to the extinction of all except Being of God and the contemplation of the pure Being of God through Itself not through ‘ego’ (*nafs*) as different from Him. Probably this is the most ideal way to reach God, but at the same time the most difficult way because this means that man

has to reach directly the real Being which transcends all. Therefore as the second best there is another way, the way of “mingling” (*mazj*). That is to say, man should seek the first emanation as the second best. The commentator writes as follows:

The Beloved (*al-ḥabīb*) is the one who is loved (*al-Maḥbūb*), namely, the Light of Muḥammad (*al-nūr al-Muḥammadi*) which is the first creation by His light in the sense that it is the first non-existent differentiation (*taqdīr ʿadamī*) and potential formation (*taṣwīr iqtidārī*). It is, so to speak, the water of mouth of the eternal Beloved, the moisture on the path between lips of the drinking friend. Because it is the traces of His beautiful Names and the manifestation of the presences of His most radiant Attributes.

He continues his argument in the comment on “it is wrong” (*huwa al-ẓulm*) as follows:

If it is inevitable to mingle Being of God with the forms of things potential and non-existent in themselves in such a manner that existents (*mawjūdah*) appear through this Being of God, the One, the Unique, then It (*i. e.*, Being of God) should be mingled with that which (firstly) comes from It (*i. e.*, Wine, Being of God), and everything comes from it.

As this quotation shows, the commentator thinks that between the Absolute Being and the corporeal existents there is an intermediate stage of being which is neither corporeal existents nor the Absolute Being. This stage of being is called the Light of Muḥammad here, which is the same as the Reality or Spirit of Muḥammad. Again this dimension is identified with the divine Names and Attributes. He interprets this verse according to a scheme which presupposes three modes of being, namely, the Absolute Being (implied by the word “pure”), corporeal existents, and the intermediate being (the Light of Muḥammad implied by “the water of the Beloved’s teeth”). This scheme obviously comes from Ibn al-ʿArabī’s thought.<sup>(54)</sup>

Of verse 5,<sup>(55)</sup> “If it be mentioned among the tribe, the tribesmen become intoxicated without incurring disgrace or committing sin”, his interpretation is as follows: If divine Love is mentioned among the tribe, the tribesmen (*ahlu-hu*)

or the qualified people who have preparedness (*isti'dād*) for receiving the divine emanation (*al-fayḍ al-rabbānī*) and the merciful grace (*al-madad al-rahmānī*) leave darkness of the night of carelessness (*ghuḥḥah*) and are illumined by the light of the divine self-manifestation on their hearts. Intoxicated by the unveiling they become absent from imagining possible things in realization of spiritualities of the secrets. As he refers to preparedness (*isti'dād*)<sup>(56)</sup> here, divine illumination is given only to those who are qualified to receive it.

He explains the principle of the divine self-manifestation (*tajallī*) in his comment on verse 21,<sup>(57)</sup> "Indeed, I have some knowledge of its (*i. e.*, Wine) attributes."

Attributes of the wine are insomuch as its manifestation to me, my knowledge and my desire for it (*i. e.*, Wine) by mystical taste and unveiling according to my preparedness (*isti'dād*) for receiving its emanation (*fayḍ*) and for accepting its help; not insomuch as it is in essence as it really is. Because it is not known except by holding a viewpoint (*ḥaythiyah*).

Man cannot know God in His entirety as the Absolute Being. Man knows only an aspect of the Absolute Being which is manifested to him according to his own capacity of comprehension of God. That is to say, God reveals Himself to man as far as man knows Him.

As I have shown, Nābulusī tries to understand in a framework of the divine self-manifestation the various images which Ibn al-Fāriḍ adopted in the poem. Every word and phrase is interpreted as having a symbolic meaning which shows a different aspect of the drama of God's manifestation.

Next I will examine how the commentator understands modes of union with God which are implied in verse 25,<sup>(58)</sup> "And my spirit was enamoured of it in such wise that they (my spirit and the wine) were mingled together and made one, not as a body pervades a body." Concerning this verse he explains how a mystic and God are one. He states under the interpretation of "in such wise that they were mingled" (*bi-ḥayth tamāzajā*) as follows:

One of the two is mixed with the other. The pronoun (*damīr*) of the dual form refers to the wine and his spirit. That is because the non-existent (*al-ma'dūm*) is mixed with the existent (*al-mawjūd*) like a date

(*nakhlah*) being mixed with a date pit (*nawāt*) before the former appears from the latter, that is, when it (a date) is non-existent in it (a date pit). It is not “mix” in the real sense, because the condition of “mix” is that two things should be existent. But this is impossible (in a case of God and creature) because nothing has an existence (comparable) with God. The existents exist through the existence of God in such a sense that they are the appearance of the existence of God.

Further he states as follows under the interpretation of “not as a body pervades a body” (*wa lā jirm<sup>u</sup> takhalla-hu jirm<sup>u</sup>*).

This “making one” (*ittiḥād*) is not a body’s pervading another like water’s pervading a sponge (*ṣūfah*) or rose water in rose petals in such a way that it comes out from them if it is pressed. It is like a particular tree which is invisible in its seed which is really existent. Every tree grows into a particular tree which is not in other seeds. This is not such doctrines of *ittiḥād* or *ḥulūl* as the veiled people slander people of the way of God, gnostics (*‘ārīfīn*), because of it. Since this comes from their lack of understanding of the ideas of their speech and that of knowledge of their terminology in their discussion on divine knowledge among them. Because the condition of the idea of *ittiḥād* and *ḥulūl* is that there must be an existent to be united with or to be dwelt in.

His interpretation here may be true to what Ibn al-Fāriḍ wants to say. From the last sentences which I have quoted above it becomes clear that the attitude of the commentator is very defensive or apologetic for Ibn al-Fāriḍ’s thought. As Ibn al-Fāriḍ implies in this verse, the commentator clearly interprets that his idea of unity with God is not the *ittiḥād* or *ḥulūl* in their antagonists’ understanding, which presupposes corporeal existents, but the union between God as the basis of existence which is not in itself physically existent and the created things which can be existent only through God. Since God, interpreted as the Absolute Being, stands at a level totally different from existent things in an ordinary sense, it is no reason to regard the poet’s idea as a heresy.

In the following verse 26,<sup>(59)</sup> Nābulusī further explains the relationship between the existence of God and the existents in terms of the wine (*khamr*) and the vine (*karm*). “The vine symbolizes the world of possibility, all created



things which are perishable and non-existent because of their fundamental nihility (*'adam*). The existence appearing in them is the existence of God." "Adam is the father of men, the first creation of this mankind." Therefore the first hemistich means that in the state that Adam is my father, wine is existent and not vine. "Adam's fatherness to me and my sonship to him are in the presence of the divine knowledge and speech."

In his commentary on the second hemistich, he states that if he attributes *wujūd* to the wine, namely, the real spiritual manifestation (*tajallī amrī wujūdi*), there is no existence to the vine which symbolizes the world of possibility, and that if he attributes it to the vine, there is no existence to the wine. Therefore the implication of this hemistich is that in the state that the mother of the wine is related to me, the vine is existent and the wine is not.

The commentator's statement is not very clear, but I guess that he intends to clarify the two aspects of *wujūd*;<sup>(60)</sup> the non-articulated aspect (pure-Being) which is symbolized by *khamr*<sup>(61)</sup> and the articulated aspect (the world of existents) which is symbolized by *karm*. As he mentions in the commentary on the second hemistich, two aspects of *wujūd* conceal each other, that is to say, man cannot see the articulated aspect of the created things if he regards the divine aspect (*i. e.*, the unarticulated aspect), and on the other hand, he cannot see the divine aspect if he regards the created things. Although he does not mention it here, the real mystic, or gnostic, should grasp both aspects at once. As the poet tells in his *Tā'īyah al-kubrā*, the supreme mystical state is neither to see God only (state of *jam'*) nor to see the existents (state of *tafriqah*), but the synthesis of both states, that is, the second separation (*al-farq al-thānī*).<sup>(62)</sup>

He interprets an enigmatic verse in terms of the relationship between the Absolute Being and the corporeal existents. Here is premised the notion that there is Being which synthesizes the aspect of God and that of the existents. On verse 30,<sup>(63)</sup> "Its grapes were pressed in the winepress ere Time began, and it was an orphan although the epoch of our father (Adam) came after it", the commentator writes as follows:

The attribution of orphanhood to wine alludes to extinction (*fanā'*) of the spirit with which wine was attired at its first appearance before its attirement with nature (*ṭabī'ah*) with which it (wine) was attired. As it were, the spirit is the father of wine and nature is its mother. When wine appeared in the world compounded of the spirit and nature, namely

the world of animals or that of men, and man started his endeavour to travel to it (wine), and its father who was the Spirit of order (*al-rūḥ al-amrī*) died from realization of extinction and annihilation (*fanā*, *idmiḥlāl*), then it was an orphan in the bosom of its mother nature.

The verse itself is very enigmatic, and the commentator's explanation is also unclear. This comment would be understood as follows.

The Absolute Being is known through both the spirit as representing the spiritual aspect of Being and nature as representing its corporeal aspect. The reason that the poet called the spirit and nature respectively the father and the mother of the wine (*mudāmah*) may be that the Being (*mudāmah*) is known to men only through the spirit and nature, without which Being cannot be known to men (*i. e.*, be born in the world). If man follows the way of mystics and attains the final goal, which is nothing but union of the spirit in man with the Absolute Being, the spirit (a symbol of the father of the Absolute Being) which is the essence of the Spirit of order as the first emanation annihilates itself in invisible Being, that is to say, the spirit symbolically "dies". Therefore as the result of "death of the Father", to the Absolute Being is left only the nature, its corporeal aspect. The Absolute Being loses its one aspect and becomes an "orphan".<sup>(64)</sup>

From the above presentation of Nābulusī's interpretations, it becomes clear that he explains away every word or phrase in the poem according to his Sufi thought which is based on Ibn al-ʿArabī's *waḥdat al-wujūd* doctrine.

#### IV. Conclusion

From my discussion in the foregoing pages I could draw some concluding remarks on the characteristics of Nābulusī's commentary.

First, he does not take Ibn al-Fāriḍ's expression in its literal sense. Throughout his commentary he makes a constant effort to show a hidden meaning behind a literal meaning. He takes every image in the poem as something symbolizing a mystical matter such as wine (*mudāmah*, *khamr*) as divine Love or Essence (v. 1), the full moon as the Perfect Man (*al-insān al-kāmil*) (v. 2), the Beloved as the Light of Muḥammad (*al-nūr al-Muḥammadī*) (v. 36), vine as the world of creature (v. 26), fragrance as the world of the supreme spirit (*ʿālam al-rūḥ al-aʿẓam*) (v. 3), a filter as human intellect (v. 14),

the Orient as the origin of Being (v. 12), and many others. The *Khamriyah* is something to be interpreted, and it has worth as far as it is a key to open a door of the treasure house of divine Knowledge. The formal aspect of the poem, therefore, is secondary for him.

When he interprets Ibn al-Fāriḍ's poem in this way, his interpretation almost exclusively follows a specific worldview, namely, Ibn al-'Arabī's. This is the second characteristic of Nābulusī's commentary. As I have mentioned in the first section, he studied Ibn al-'Arabī very well to such a degree that he left a commentary on his *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam*. In many passages in the commentary he mentions Ibn al-'Arabī's name, words and poems. He even describes Ibn al-'Arabī as Ibn al-Fāriḍ's teacher in another ode.<sup>(65)</sup> Based on the idea of *waḥdat al-wujūd* of Ibn al-'Arabī school, he interprets the *Khamriyah*. Through the divine self-manifestation (*tajallī*) God as the Absolute Being exteriorizes Himself in forms of the existent world. Every thing in the world is a manifested form of the Absolute Being. The most perfect manifested form is the Perfect Man (*al-insān al-kāmil*), and other individual existents partly reflect the Absolute Being in accordance with their preparedness. This basic scheme is the backbone of Nābulusī's interpretation of various images in the poem.

Thirdly his commentary shows apologetic tendencies. The idea of union with God in Sufi understanding easily incurs suspicion of polytheism (*shirk*) among uninitiated people. Nābulusī apologetically discusses the true meaning of union with God (*ittiḥād*) in Ibn al-Fāriḍ's poem as entirely different from the doctrines of *ittiḥād* and *ḥulūl* in a 'heretical' sense.

Nābulusī, affiliating himself with Naqshbandī and Qādirī orders, interprets some images in the poem in terms of Sufi orders (*ṭarīqah*) and their peculiar practices such as *dhikr* and *samā'*. This is the fourth characteristic of his commentary, which, I think, reflects his own Sufi life and experience.

The commentator interprets the *Khamriyah*, a poem, by bringing in Ibn al-'Arabī's mystical philosophy, a system of thought. Therefore discrepancy between his interpretation and Ibn al-Fāriḍ's actual wording is inevitable. One example is found in his comment on a "name" (*ism*) in verse 6. Farfetched interpretations such as "the banner of an army" (v. 17), "the Orient" (v. 12), "touching" (v. 13) are found throughout his comments on the poem. A reader of his commentary will be disappointed if he seeks in it a mystical meaning which is closely woven with its formal expression. His interpretation frequently

makes its own way regardless of the poet's wording. However, I do not think that his interpretation is totally wide off the mark. For instance, in his comments on verse 2 and discussion on union with God (v. 25) he suggests rather good interpretation though Ibn al-ʿArabī's influence is obvious. In this way "originality" or farfetchedness of interpretation may be its fifth characteristic. Nābulusī's commentary is thus one of the typical Sufi commentaries in which commentators freely develop their own ideas.

### Notes

- (1) R. A. Nicholson-(J. Pedersen), "Ibn al-Fāriḍ," *EI*<sup>2</sup>, III, 763.
- (2) The complete commentary has not been printed. An available text is Daḥdāḥ's *Sharḥ diwān Ibn al-Fāriḍ* (Marseilles, 1853) in which Nābulusī's abridged commentary is printed together with Būrīnī's. Nābulusī's commentary is entitled the *Kashf al-sirr al-ghāmīdh fī sharḥ diwān Ibn al-Fāriḍ* according to a manuscript of the Bibliothèque Nationale. C. Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur*, Leiden, 1943, I, 305 and É. Dermenghem, *L'Eloge du vin (Al Khamriya)*, Paris, 1931, 95.
- (3) É. Dermenghem, *op. cit.*, 95.
- (4) Verses 19, 35, and 38 in Daḥdāḥ's version lack Nābulusī's comments, while Dermenghem has their equivalent translations. On the other hand, 8 verses from 23 to 30 do not have Būrīnī's comments. See R. A. Nicholson, *Studies in Islamic Mysticism*, Cambridge, 1921, 186, note 2 and also A. J. Arberry, *The Mystical Poems of Ibn al-Fāriḍ*, Dublin, 1956, 88, note 23. They discuss the problem of the lack of verses 23-30 in Būrīnī's commentary.
- (5) Murādī, *Silk al-durar*, Būlāq, 1883/1301, III, 30 and Jabartī, *Ta'rikh 'ajā'ib al-āthār*, Bayrūt: Dār al-Fāris, n. d., I, 232. Also see Brockelmann, *op. cit.*, II, 454.
- (6) Murādī, *op. cit.*, III, 31.
- (7) W. A. S. Khālidi, "'Abd al-Ghanī", *EI*<sup>2</sup>, I, 60.
- (8) Murādī, *op. cit.*, III, 31.
- (9) Murādī lists the names of the scholars with whom Nābulusī studied. Murādī, *op. cit.*, III, 31.
- (10) *Idid.*, III, 31. According to J. S. Trimingham, *The Sufi Orders in Islam*, London, 1973, 70 and 95, his primary Way was the Naqshbandīyah though he was initiated into many lines.
- (11) Ibn Sab'īn is known as a peripatetic philosopher and Sufi. He was esteemed for his knowledge of medicine and alchemy but, on the other hand, was violently reproached for his doctrinal assertions, among others, that in which he defined God as being the sole reality of existing things. As the *isnād* of the *ṭarīqah Sab'īniyah* includes Plato, Aristotle, Alexander the Great, his Sufism is very much influenced by the Hellenistic culture. See A. Faure, "Ibn Sab'īn," *EI*<sup>2</sup>, III, 921-2.
- (12) 'Afīf al-Dīn al-Tilimsānī is a Syrian Sufi poet, and one of his teachers is Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī (d. 672/1273) who is a stepson and disciple of Ibn al-ʿArabī. Brockelmann, *op. cit.*, SI, 458 and H. Landolt, "Der Briefwechsel zwischen Kāṣānī und Simnānī über Waḥdat al-Wuḡūd," *Der Islam*, 50 (1973), 30.
- (13) Murādī, *op. cit.*, III, 22.
- (14) W. A. S. Khālidi, *op. cit.*, I, 60. Brockelmann lists 159 titles in *GAL*, II, 454-58; SII, 473-76.
- (15) In the introduction to Nābulusī's *al-Faṭḥ al-rabbānī wa'l-fayḍ al-raḥmānī*, Bayrūt, 1960, 34-42.
- (16) W. A. S. Khālidi, *op. cit.*, I, 60.

- (17) In his introduction to Ibn al-'Arabi's *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam*, Cairo, 1946/1365, I, 23.
- (18) W. A. S. Khālidi, *op. cit.*, I, 60.
- (19) Murādī, *op. cit.*, III, 32.
- (20) *Ibid.*, III, 31.
- (21) L. Massignon, *Recueil de textes inédits concernant l'histoire de la mystique en pays d'Islam*, Paris, 1929, 242-3.
- (22) É. Dermenghem, *op. cit.*, 96. However this distinction does not mean that Nābulusī's commentary contains no grammatical comments. His comments on verses 23-30 which are lacking in Būrīnī's more often give grammatical and syntactic explanations. Therefore I guess that his not yet printed original commentary may have more detailed comments on this aspect.
- (23) W. A. S. Khālidi, *op. cit.*, I, 60.
- (24) Daḥdāḥ, *Sharḥ diwān Ibn al-Fāriḍ*, 472. The pagination of the text of commentary which I mention in the following notes refers to the place where appears Ibn al-Fāriḍ's verse on which Nābulusī comments. Therefore, his actual comments on a verse do not always appear on the page which I mention.
- The Translation of the verses of the *Khamrīyah* in this paper is taken from that of R. A. Nicholson, *Studies in Islamic Mysticism*, 184-188, or of A. J. Arberry, *The Mystical Poems of Ibn al-Fāriḍ*, 81-84, sometimes with modifications in the direction of literality.
- (25) Daḥdāḥ, *op. cit.*, 491.
- (26) É. Dermenghem, *op. cit.*, 259. The Arabic text of the commentary on this verse is not available. See Daḥdāḥ, *op. cit.*, 496.
- (27) Daḥdāḥ, *op. cit.*, 482.
- (28) He joined the Naqshbandīyah, too. See p. 20 of this paper.
- (29) Daḥdāḥ, *op. cit.*, 474.
- (30) É. Dermenghem, *op. cit.*, 153.
- (31) In Ibn al-'Arabi's thought, God (*Allāh*) is the Name in which all divine Names are integrated and cannot be known to anybody except the Perfect Man. A mystic knows only a Name and has a personal Lord-servant (*rabb-marbūb*) relationship with it. See T. Izutsu, *The Key Philosophical Concepts in Sufism and Taoism*, Tokyo, 1966, I, 102-108.
- (32) Daḥdāḥ, *op. cit.*, 480.
- (33) *Ibid.*, 484.
- (34) *Ibid.*, 475.
- (35) *Qur'ān*, 7: 179.
- (36) *Qur'ān*, 24: 5.
- (37) See note 31.
- (38) R. A. Nicholson, *Studies in Islamic Mysticism*, 185.
- (39) Daḥdāḥ, *op. cit.*, 476.
- (40) R. A. Nicholson, *Studies in Islamic Mysticism*, 185.
- (41) A. J. Arberry, *op. cit.*, 82.
- (42) We can have a quick survey on this subject from such work as R. Gramlich, *Die schiitischen Derwischorden Persiens, Zweiter Teil: Glaube und Lehre*, Wiesbaden, 1976, 63-84.
- (43) Daḥdāḥ, *op. cit.*, 479.
- (44) *Ibid.*, 479.
- (45) H. Corbin, *L'Histoire de la philosophie islamique*, Paris, 1964, 284-304.
- (46) Daḥdāḥ, *op. cit.*, 479.
- (47) *Ibid.*, 473.
- (48) *Ibid.*, 489.
- (49) *Ibid.*, 495. Besides the verses which I have mentioned, the same interpretation is found in his comment on verse 24 (*Ibid.*, 487).
- (50) É. Dermenghem, *op. cit.*, 130-31.

- (51) See R. A. Nicholson, *Studies in Islamic Mysticism*, 184.
- (52) *Qur'ān*, 16: 16 and a *ḥadīth*, "My companions are like stars. Whomever you follow, you are rightly guided."
- (53) Daḥdāḥ, *op. cit.*, 494.
- (54) Ibn al-'Arabī mentions three categories of being; the Absolute Being (*al-wujūd al-muṭlaq*), the determined being (*al-wujūd al-muqayyad*), and the Reality of realities (*ḥaqīqat al-ḥaqā'iq*) or the comprehensive Universal (*al-kullī al-a'amm*). See H. S. Nyberg, *Kleinere Schriften des Ibn al-'Arabī*, Leiden, 1919, Einleitung, 32-38. Also H. Landolt, *op. cit.*, 42.
- (55) Daḥdāḥ, *op. cit.*, 475.
- (56) The term "preparedness" is one of the important concepts in Ibn al-'Arabī's thought. See T. Izutsu, *op. cit.*, I, 29 and 149.
- (57) Daḥdāḥ, *op. cit.*, 484.
- (58) *Ibid.*, 487.
- (59) *Ibid.*, 487.
- (60) R. A. Nicholson, *Studies in Islamic Mysticism*, 186-7 note 4.
- (61) Concerning a characteristic of *khamr*, divine Being, its transcendentality is mentioned in the comment on verse 29 (Daḥdāḥ, *op. cit.*, 489):
- What is alluded to in this verse is that the divine Presence is transcendent beyond entry in bonds of time (*al-dukhūl fī quyūd al-zamān*) as well as bonds of space. It has the absolute priority (*al-qabaliyah al-muṭlaqah*) of all things and the absolute posteriority (*al-ba'diyah al-muṭlaqah*) of all things. It is the Eternity (*azal*) which is the Presence continually comprehending all times in one. There is no past, no present, no future in eternity.
- (62) Verses 235 and 478 of the *Tā'īyah al-kubrā*. Also see R. A. Nicholson's commentary on verses 233-5, 326-7 and 478 of the *Tā'īyah* in his *Studies in Islamic Mysticism*, 221-2, 230-31, 243.
- (63) Daḥdāḥ, *op. cit.*, 490.
- (64) R. A. Nicholson, *Studies in Islamic Mysticism*, 187, note 3.
- (65) His comments on verses 5 and 103 of the *Yā'īyah* in Daḥdāḥ, *op. cit.*, 4, 1.13 ff. and 75, 1.1 ff. On the relationship between the two mystics, see Issa J. Boullata, "Toward a biography of Ibn al-Fāriḍ (576-632 A. H./1181-1235 A. D.)", *Arabica* 28 (1981), 55 and n. 69 of the same page.