This paper deals with a short narrative in Arabic which was quite well-known in a number of popular versions, documented in manuscripts of different origins (from Syria, Egypt and North Africa), beginning in the seventeenth century at the latest. It is a narrative describing how a little sparrow is trapped in a hunter’s snare, and how, through stratagems and wittiness, it manages to escape its awful fate.

While the narrative occurs relatively frequently in late circles of popular storytelling, many of its substantive elements in different stylistic features, can be traced in Arabic classical medieval writings of Islamic East and West origins, in most cases as two distinct separate fables. The history of this narrative thus moves between the medieval classical literature and the pre-modern popular one. It even touches on the margins of the fickle history of the Arabian Nights.

In a recently published paper,1 we examined a manuscript dated to the seventeenth century, which contains the same narrative in a colloquial Egyptian verse adaptation. This narrative can be traced back to a classical Arabic text which was well-known in the medieval period.
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that presents the entire plot as a colloquial Egyptian mawwāl with rhyme and meter. The present manuscript-based study is dedicated to an analysis of the narrative’s popular adaptation tradition into prose.
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The Hunter, the Snare and the Sparrow Narratives in Classical Arabic Literature

Two distinct and separate bird fables, which together form the frame of the complete narrative under discussion, have been preserved in medieval classical sources in Arabic. One of these two (henceforth A) relates how a snare (fakhkh) pretending to be a hermit manages to seduce and trap a hungry sparrow (ʿūsfūr) by seeds and words (and hence in part corresponds to the international tale type AaTh 245*: The Birds Discuss the Trap / AaThUth 68*: The Fox Jeers at the Fox Trap).

Here is A as preserved by the Andalusian writer and poet Ahmad b. Muḥammad Ibn ʿAbd Rabbihi (d. 940):

Yaḥyā b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz said: Nuʿaym told me in the name of Ismāʿīl, who quoted a descendant of Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq, may Allāh be pleased with him, in the name of Wahb b. Munabbih, who said: A man of the Children of Israel set a snare and a sparrow came and descended by it. The sparrow said: “Why do I see you stoop?” The snare said: “I stooped for having prayed a lot”. The sparrow said:
“And why do I see your bones exposed?” The snare said: “Because I fast so much”. The sparrow said: “Why do I see this wool on you?” The snare said: “Because of my asceticism in this world I wear wool”. The sparrow said: “What is this cane you have?” The snare said: “I lean on it and use it for my needs”. The sparrow said: “And what is this seed in your hand?” The snare said: “This is a sacrifice. If a poor creature will pass by I will give it to it”. The sparrow said: “I am a poor creature”. The snare said: “So take it”. The sparrow than approached, grasped the seed, and immediately the snare held it by the neck. The snare began to shriek “qaʿī qaʿī qaʿī”, which means “after you no hypocritical ascetic will ever seduce me again”.

The second fable (henceforth B) displays a conversation held between a lark (qubbara/qunbura; in other versions a qumriyya dove) and a hunter who had captured it, and the witty stratagem by which the bird manages to rescue itself. This fable corresponds to the international tale type AaTh 150: Advice of the Fox / AaThUth 150: The Three Teachings of the Bird.7

Here is B, also quoted from Ibn ʿAbd Rabbihi, independently of A:8

Dāwud b. Abī Hind [related] in the name of al-Shaʿbī: A man of the Children of Israel caught a lark [qubbara]. It asked: “What do you want to do with me?” He said: “I will slaughter you and eat”. It said: “By Allāh, I will not satisfy your desire for meat nor will I calm your hunger. However, I will teach you three wisdoms which will do you more good than eating me. I will teach you the first one while I’m still in your hand, the second when I’m on this tree and the third when


8 Al-ʿIqd al-Farīd, vol. 3, p. 68. See B also in later sources, such as Bilawhar wa-Būdāsī in Arabic (it is found also in the European literary complexity of the book), e.g., in Muhammad b. Ali Ibn Bābawayhi (d. 991) version found in his Ikmāl al-Dīn wa-Tamām al-Niʿma, p. 552 (see also Zotenberg, Notice sur le livre de Barlaam et Josaph, accompagnée d’extraits du texte grec et des versions arabe et éthiopienne, pp. 143-146; and Hommel, Die älteste arabisiche Barlaam-Version, p. 46); Mansūr b. al-Ḥusayn al-Ābī (d. 1031), Nāṭr al-Durr, vol. 7, pp. 193-194; Aḥmad b. ʿAbd Allāh Abū Nuʿaym al-Iṣbahānī (d. 1038), Hīyat al-Awliyāʾ wa-Ṭabaqāt al-Asfiyāʾ, vol. 4, p. 316; and Muhammad Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī (d. 1111), Iḥyāʾ ʿUlūm al-Dīn, vol. 3, p. 234. For more sources in Arabic, Persian, Syriac and Hebrew, see Lerner, “The Mawwāl”, pp. 156-157, n. 3. For versions in medieval Judeo-Arabic see below, n. 15.

I’m on this mountain”. He said: “Give me [the first]”. It said: “Do not regret what has slipped away from you”. He then freed it, and when it was on the tree he said: “Give the second one”. It said: “Do not believe that something that will not be, will be”. It then flew up on the mountain and said: “O poor man, had you slaughtered me you would have taken a pearl weighing twenty mithqāl from my craw”. He bit his lips in sorrow and then said: “Give the third one”. It said: “You have already forgotten the first two! How, then, shall I teach you the third? Did I not tell you not to regret what has slipped away from you? But you were filled with sorrow over me when I slipped away from you. I also told you not to believe that something that will not be, will be, but you did believe. Indeed, with my bones and feathers I will not weigh twenty mithqāl, so how could I have something in my craw that weighed that much?”

The classical tradition has preserved in most cases two distinct narratives of an Isrāʾīliyyāt type (stories about the Children of Israel). Yet, it seems that a less common tradition, in which both plots are intertwined (A+B), and the Jewish background is completely lacking, existed in medieval classical literature as well. The combined plot is presented in its complete form in an adab book titled Fiqar al-Ḥukamāʾ wa-Nawādir al-Qudamāʾ. This piece was composed by a thirteenth century CE anonymous author from Syria, a place which seems to have special significance for the evolution of the literary material discussed here, as well as in its popular context (see below). The following is a translation of the story, contained in the chapter on the famous Greek physician Hippocrates (Buqrāṭ):
Hypocrates said: It is told that one day a man set a snare to catch birds. A sparrow noticed the snare, approached it and said to it: “O you! Why do I see you far from the road?” The snare replied: “My desire is to keep people far from me, so I will not harm them and they will be protected from me”. The sparrow said: “And why do I see you residing in the soil?” The snare said: “I wanted to be humble”. The sparrow said to him: “Why do I see you exhausted?” The snare answered: “I am exhausted from worshipping the Creator”. The sparrow said to him: “And what is this rope on your shoulder?” The snare said: “It is the clothes of the ascetics”. The sparrow said: “And what is the stick inside it?” The snare replied: “I lean on it and use it to drive away anything that wishes to harm me”. The sparrow said to him: “And what is this wheat that I see by you?” The snare answered: “It is food of mine, which I keep for anyone who fasts and comes to me of a sudden, a traveler passing by or a hungry whom I’ll feed with it”. The sparrow said to him: “I am a traveler and hungry, and have just passed by you”. It said: “Take it, bless you”. The sparrow than approached it and wanted to take it with its beak, but the snare caught it by the neck. The sparrow said to it: “How evil of you to have chosen treachery and cheating, both of which are traits of the ignorant. For if all the ascetics were like you, there is no good in you nor in them and in all those who are led astray by you and your kind, or those who are deluded by the likes of you with their fancy phrases and false words”. The sparrow did not notice that the snare’s owner approached and caught it. The sparrow said to him: “Do with me as you wish, after you hear what I say to you and understand its meaning”. The hunter said to it: “Say what you have to say”. The sparrow said: “O you! As long as you live do not regret or feel sorrow for what was but is no longer”. After he heard its words he released it. It stood before him and said: “The second: As long as you live do not believe in anything that cannot be expected to be”. Then it flew up, far from him, and stood. The hunter said to it: “Say the third!” The sparrow said: “By Allāh the great, I have never seen anyone more miserable than you, o man”. The hunter said: “How is that?” It said: “For you have won wealth for yourself and your sons, but it is lost forever, fell out of you hand in the shortest time”. The hunter said: “What is it?” The sparrow said: “By Allāh, if you had slaughtered me you would have found two precious stones in my craw, each weighing fifty mithqāl, worth the tax of the largest city that men have”. Upon hearing this the hunter was beset by regret and sorrow. He bit his finger and said to it: “But you have misled me with your words”. The sparrow said to him: “Did I not tell you not to regret or feel sorrow for what was and is no more?” He said: “Yes”.

Al-Qanṭara XXXIX 2, 2018, pp. 321-351 ISSN 0211-3589 doi: https://doi.org/10.3989/alqantara.2018.010
sparrow said: “Did I not tell you not to believe in something that cannot be expected to be?” He said: “Yes”. The sparrow said: “You fool! Woe unto you! No wise man will doubt that had you taken me and weighed me, with my feathers, flesh, blood, bones and all that is within me, all this would not have weighed even ten mithqāl. How therefore will you find inside me two gemstones each of which weighs fifty mithqāl? Why did you believe this and regret and grieved for having released me? And how will your regret and sorrow help you, now that you have no way to get me?” After that it flew away.

From the preceding it may be concluded that at first the classical sources absorbed two distinct fables, each of which consisted of a paragraph of no more than a few lines, but later seem to have come together to form a single, somewhat more substantial and developed narrative. Evidence for this may be adduced from the fact that in medieval Europe B was absorbed independently of A (whose presence in Europe at the time is so far not attested) and appears in a considerable number of Christian collections intended mainly for preachers. First and foremost we mention B as it appears, perhaps also as an indication of the material’s oriental origins, in the *Disciplina Clericalis*, of Petrus Alfonsi (d. first half of the twelfth century). This converted Spanish Jew was acquainted with Arabic literature. He is also considered to have had a significant role in the introduction of ideas from the Muslim world into Europe. He acknowledges in his prologue: “I have compiled this small volume, taking it in part from the parables and counsels of the philosophers, in part from the parables and counsels of the Arabs, from tales and poems, and finally, from animal and bird fables”.

---


14 Ibid., p. 34.
The Plot as Occurs in Late Circles of Popular Storytelling

In addition to the classical literary configurations surveyed above, a more popular literary tradition of the complete narrative (A+B) is documented in manuscripts of Syrian, Egyptian and North African ḥikāyāt anthologies in Arabic from the seventeenth century onwards. Furthermore, an important late adab piece apparently preserves an evidence for the existence of such popular adaptations of the combined story: In his Kitāb Hazz al-Quḥūf bi-Sharḥ Qaṣīd Abī Shādīf the seventeenth century Egyptian author Yūsuf b. Muḥammad al-Shirbīnī ridicules “Kitāb al-Fakhkh wa-l-’Uṣfūr”, while presenting his scornful opinion in the question of literary materials that were in common use among lower social strata, in this case the Egyptian peasants.

The language of the classical versions of the two separate fables is a non-embellished standard fiṣḥā. The use of literary devices and artistic means in those texts is minimal. This is basically also true for the overall classical plot, yet here, as already noted, in addition to the amalgamation of the fables, the narrative and the dialogues are a little bit more substantial. In contrast to these all, and as will be demonstrated below, the popular versions are much more flexible in their structure and detailed in their content, and by far more vivid in their descriptions and dialogues. The Arabic in which those texts are written contains many colloquial characteristics and a number of corrupt linguistic forms, yet the authors have a clear tendency towards stylistic embellishment, and they occasionally integrate some rhymed prose and poetry into the prose sequence. In fact, the most prominent in this regard is probably the above mentioned colloquial Egyptian mawwāl, contained in the seventeenth century

---


BNF, ms. arabe, 3571, in which the narrative is found adapted into a sixty-one rhymed quatrains (see more details below).

Were we to distill the difference between the form of the plot as preserved in classical sources and that found in the manuscripts under discussion here, into a single metaphor, without of course detracting from the qualities of either, we would choose a raisin and a well-seasoned dish, both of which are tasty and worthy. And since we are on the subject of food, it is particularly interesting to note the storyteller’s creativity, especially where the hunter describes, in an amusing and intentionally exaggerated list, all the various dishes that could be prepared from the tiny bird he caught, in addition to the many utensils that could be made from its limbs. This list, by the way, is missing in the classical sources. The manuscripts indisputably share the same source, but the later creative stratum, in which every contributor used his own taste, knowledge and culinary lore, reflecting the unique material culture and realia, to which each of them had been exposed, is quite evident.

The manuscripts to be described below were created by various writers who dealt with ḥikāyāt, i.e., storytellers, compilers of tales,

18 Here we share a similar insight from a slightly different perspective, as suggested by Hämäeen-Anttila, “Oral vs. Written: Some Notes on the Arabian Nights”, pp. 184-192. Hämäeen-Anttila divides the literary materials in the Arabian Nights into three categories and focuses on the third category, which he defines as follows: “Stories the Classical forerunners of which are known, but which have been further developed in the Alf layla tradition”. Hämäeen-Anttila compares briefly between “The Barber’s Tale of His Second Brother” found in the “Hunchback’s Tale” of the Arabian Nights (See Marzolph and van Leeuwen, Encyclopedia, vol. 1, pp. 117-118) and an anecdote that appears in the above-mentioned early adab work, Ibn ʿAbd Rabbihi’s al-ʿlqd al-Farād. He suggests that through this kind of comparison it should be possible to analyze the literary tastes of those who shaped the literary materials before they entered the Arabian Nights and identify the literary devices which they used as they adapted these materials. In conclusion he states that (p. 191) “the classical version [of Ibn ʿAbd Rabbihi] is perhaps more refined with its subtle allusions and well balanced language, but the Alf Layla version gives a more vivid description of the poor victim’s exasperation and anticipation of the pleasures expected”. Hämäeen-Anttila’s approach fits in quite well with our own case, and could perhaps also be extended to the margins of the Arabian Nights and to the relationship between popular works and classical literature in general. See also, e.g., Gerhardt, The Art of Story-Telling: A Literary Study of the Thousand and One Nights, pp. 39-41; Pinault, Story-Telling Techniques in the Arabian Nights, Irwin, The Arabian Nights: A Companion, p. 113; Sadan, “Hārūn al-Rashīd and the Brewer: Preliminary Remarks on the Adab of the Elite versus Ḥikāyāt: The Continuation of Some of the Traditional Literary Models, from the ‘Classical’ Arabic Heritage, up to the Emergence of Modern Forms”, pp. 1-22.
and the like. Our examination of the manuscripts revealed quite clearly that those who created them drew from a common source, although probably only indirectly. It also became obvious that a characteristic trait of the evolution of the written versions of this material at the popular level was considerable freedom in its manipulation (beyond the various types of carelessness in transmission). In other words, writers of ḥikāyat felt free to modify and enrich the narrative, the dialogues and the lines of verse as well as to embellish and add stylistic ornamentations in accordance with their personal tastes, the environment in which they lived and worked, their beliefs, their languages and their talents. This is almost completely absent in the classical versions. With the possible exception of the Jewish context in which the material appears (a context that disappeared, or was made to disappear, in some of the classical sources), the writers here limited themselves to collecting and quoting two fables from classical works (whether written or oral, for example as heard in literary salons where literary materials were declaimed); in other words, what they did was to copy the material and place it inside their compositions to fit the literary topic of their choosing.

Because of the creative literary energy that characterizes some of the ḥikāyat writers in a considerable number of manuscripts (see immediately below) and their lack of commitment to the source to which they had been exposed, to the author or to the contents, it makes no sense to produce a critical edition in which the various manuscripts are compared in detail in an attempt to discover and reconstruct the supposedly original version. Such an endeavor would be neither useful nor efficacious. We shall instead publish the text of the earliest manuscript (BNF, ms. arabe, 3667. See below), with accompanying comparisons and quotes from the others, especially in cases where such additions can contribute to understanding unclear passages in the main manuscript or where the ḥikāyat writer’s additions can teach us more about the plot in general, their language,

19 Perhaps due to the fact that at a relatively early stage Muslim wisdom literature in Arabic became ever more reluctant to assimilate Isra’īlyāt traditions (see, e.g., Kister, “Haddithā ‘an Banī Isrā’īla wa-lā Ḥaraja: A Study of an Early Tradition”, pp. 226-227, 238), or simply since the Jewish background was added to begin with by some of the writers in order to give these fables a touch of the legendary.
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the material culture with which they were familiar, and their creative skills, as noted above.

Below is a detailed list of the manuscripts and other sources we used here:

BNF 3667 = BNF, ms. arabe, 3667 (supplément 1735), fols. 16a-19a. This manuscript is the basis for the present edition. It will be critically edited in full. It is dated 1089 AH, i.e., 1678 CE, and hence the oldest of the dated manuscripts. To judge by certain vocabulary items (see below) it was apparently written in Syria. The writing is quite clear, although not very careful. Letter size and spaces between the words are not uniform. Each folio contains about fifteen lines of varying length of between eight and twelve words. The words are partially vocalized. The opening sentence as well as some occurrences of qāla and its subject, some diacritics and comma-like signs that separate sentences, embellishments, etc., are in ink of a different color. The spelling of alif maqṣūra is not consistent: Sometimes it appears as word-final yāʾ, sometimes as alif and sometimes in the way it is written today. The scribe also shows no consistency in writing the two diacritics over tāʾ marbūṭa. When the first part of a possessive construction ends in tāʾ marbūta, it is occasionally spelled as word-final tāʾ.21 In addition to hypercorrections and evidence of non-standard language in general, there are plenty of indications of colloquial pronunciation in this manuscript, for example: In an emphatic environment the verbs are also clearly reflect the colloquial pronunciation in certain cases, for example in the first person singular past of the first form geminate verb: Shaddāt instead of Shaddāt; or when a verb in the imperative mood, such as taqaddam in the fifth form, is preceded by a prosthetic alif- itqaddam.

AŠ = Anṭūn Śalihānī, Ṭarāʾif Fukāhāt fī Arbaʾ Ḥikāyāt, Beirut, al-Maṭbaʿa l-Kāthūlikiyya, 1890, pp. 91-98. “Ḥikāyat al-ʿUsfūr wa-l-Fakkh wa-l-Ṣayyād” is the last of a total of four ḥikāyāt critically

---

20 See de Slane, Catalogue des manuscrits arabes de la Bibliothèque Nationale, p. 626.
21 Such inconsistencies in writing alif maqṣūra, tāʾ marbūta, etc., appear also in all of the other manuscripts. Our policy is to publish the texts without “correcting” them.
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edited and published by Şāliḥānī based on a manuscript found in the university library of St. Joseph in Beirut. According to Şāliḥānī it is a Christian manuscript from the city of Aleppo that was written a little bit prior to the year 1782.22 He reports that the title and the periods between sentences are written in red ink. The same hikāya was published by Şāliḥānī in the same year in an appendix (bearing the same title: “Tarā‘ if Fukūhāṭ fi Arba’ Ḥikāyāt”) to his (ed.) Alf Layla wa-Layla, Beirut, al-Maṭba‘a l-Kāthūliyya, 1888-1890, vol. 5, pp. 91-97. Şāliḥānī is known to have censored his edition of the Nights quite drastically.23 Indeed, some differences between the materials in his critical edition of the manuscript and the version in his edition of the Nights show quite clearly that he believed in “improving” its style and “raising the level” of the Arabic in it. Berlin 9066 = Berlin Staatsbibliothek, 9066 (pet. 110), fols. 49b-50b. The manuscript is not dated.24 The writing is quite clear, although the letters are not always very carefully executed. The spaces between the words and the length of the lines are quite uniform. Each page has about twenty-one lines and each line between thirteen and fifteen words. In a few places there are ink smears. No title is given. The manuscript is rarely vocalized. As far as content is concerned, this manuscript is nearly identical with the below detailed Berlin 9105. For instance, in both manuscripts the hunter is said to be a resident of the city of Basra and not Baghdad, as in the rest of the manuscripts and other sources; A does not contain a conversation between the sparrow and the snare, but instead the dialog is held between the sparrow and the hunter who seduces it to eat the grains placed around the snare; in the end, the sparrow has mercy on the hunter, and so leads him to a certain tree undewhich a jar full of gold is buried.

Berlin 9105 = Berlin Staatbibliothek, 9105 (pet. 259), fols. 109b-112b. The manuscript was written in the year 1260 AH, i.e., 1844 CE.25 As noted, it is nearly identical with Berlin 9066. It is quite clearly legible. The spaces between the words and the length of the lines are quite uniform, as are the sizes of the letters. Each page has

---

22 See Şāliḥānī’s preface, pp. 1-8.
25 Ibid., pp. 67-68.
about fourteen lines and each line between nine and eleven words. The title is in ink of a different color. The manuscript is rarely vocalized. The manuscript contains only few examples of colloquial pronunciation: 

Vocabulary of the colloquial Arabic appears here and there, for instance, the well-known شوي شوي, i.e., “slowly”, “gently”. As in BNF 3667, شديدت, appearing instead of شدت, reflecting the colloquial pronunciation.

BNF, ms. arabe, 3571, see Lerner, “The Mawwăl”.

BNF 3637 = BNF, ms. arabe, 3637 (supplément 1723), pp. 725-739. The manuscript was written in the year 1772 CE, presumably in Syria (see below, special vocabulary characteristic of Syria) by one ‘Abîd Rabbihi - a member of the Syrian community. This is the manuscript from which Richard Francis Burton (d. 1890) translated his “History of What Befel the Fowl-let with the Fowler”. In the 1780’s Dom Denis Chavis used this manuscript and other sources in fabricating in his handwriting his own Nights manuscript in Arabic (BNF, ms. arabe, 3616 [supplément 1716]). Some of the materials were used in his and Jacques Cazotte’s (executed in 1792) Continuation des Mille et une nuits, Genève, Barde, Manget & compagnie, 1788-1789. The story dealt with here was not included in Cazotte’s Continuation, nor in Caussin de Perceval’s Les Mille et une nuits, contes arabes, traduits en français par Galland: Continués, Paris, Le Normant, 1806, eighth and ninth volumes, that contain a translation into French of stories directly from the original Arabic of the current manuscript (viz. BNF 3637). The manuscript is quite clearly legible and partly vocalized. The spaces between the


27 See Mahdi, The Thousand and One Nights (Alf Layla wa-Layla) from the Earliest Known Sources, vol. 3, pp. 55-56. Indeed, according to Joseph Sadan, “Jacques Cazotte, His Hero Xaïloun, and Hamîda the Kaslân: A Unique Feature of Cazotte’s ‘Continuation’ of the Arabian Nights and a Newly Discovered Arabic Source That Inspired His Novel on Xaïloun”, p. 45, n. 8, this manuscript “could have been written by a non-Arab hand or by someone who did not know how to hold and use an oriental pen”.


words and the length of the lines are quite uniform, as are the sizes of
the letters. Each page has about fifteen lines and each line between
nine and twelve words.\textsuperscript{30} The manuscript contains only few examples
of colloquial pronunciation: \textit{سن} (بدلت، أخذت، مبدر، دربتك) \textit{ذ} in the
vicinity of \textit{رَأ} \textit{ص} (صغره). The scribe marks vowels only very
sporadically. He consistently uses brackets when writing \textit{قَالا}, \textit{ثَمَنَة}, \textit{شَيْر} and in similar cases.\textsuperscript{31}

BNF 3655 = BNF, ms. arabe, 3655 (supplément 1792), fols. 126b-131b. The manuscript is dated to the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{32} It is
clearly Muslim and judging by certain vocabulary, it originated in
Syria, perhaps Aleppo. The writing is clear, although not very
careful. Letter size and spaces between the words are quite uniform.
Each folio contains about nineteen lines of equal length, each line
consisting of between six and eight words. The opening sentence as
well as the words \textit{قَالا}, \textit{فَا-قَالا}, the embroidering between verses,
etc., are in ink of a different color. The manuscript contains only few
examples of colloquial pronunciation: (بدلت المجهوذ، يحتني) \textit{ذ}.

BNF 3664 = BNF, ms. arabe, 3664 (supplément 1741), fols. 1b-10b. The manuscript is dated to the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{33} This is the
manuscript from which René Basset translated his “Le fils du
marchand, le filet et le moineau”.\textsuperscript{34} It is quite clearly Muslim. The
script is stylized, although not always clear. Most of the words are
vocalized. The script is North African, for example, the diacritic
point of the letter \textit{جَ} is written under the letter, while the letter \textit{قَاف}
has one point above. When a letter has \textit{شاددة} and \textit{كسرة} both signs
appear below the letter. The scribe usually writes case and mood
endings, but occasionally errs. The letters and the spaces between
the words are of uniform size. Each folio contains about twelve lines of
uniform length, each with between five and eight words per line. The

\textsuperscript{30} For more, see Burton, \textit{Supplemental Nights}, vol. 6, pp. vi-vii.
\textsuperscript{31} As can be seen below, highlighting phrases (esp. \textit{قَال} or \textit{قَال} \textit{l-rāwī}) by means of
brackets, different ink color or larger letters, is common in most of the manuscripts that
are examined here. See, e.g., Pinault, \textit{Story-Telling Techniques}, p. 14, who hypothesizes
that it “served as a visual guide and marker alerting any reciter who glanced at the page
of an imminent change in the narrative voice”.
\textsuperscript{32} See de Slane, \textit{Catalogue}, p. 624.
\textsuperscript{33} Ibid., pp. 625-626.
\textsuperscript{34} \textit{Mille et un contes}, vol. 2, pp. 269-275. Basset briefly compared this manuscript
with the other BNF manuscripts. See his error-laden summation, ibid., pp. 276-277, n. 16.
opening sentence as well as the verbs qāla, fa-qāla, embellishments between verses, etc., are in ink of a different color. Relative to other versions this one makes more frequent use of rhymed prose, verses of poetry and quotes from Qur‘ān. A nearly identical version, also North African, can be found in al-Bāḥī al-Būnī (fl. during the nineteenth century), Mi‘at Layla wa-Layla wa-Hikāyāt Uktion, Shuraybiḥ Ahmad Shuraybiḥ (ed.), Algiers, al-Maktaba l-Waṭaniyya l-Jaza‘iriyya, 2005, pp. 37-41. This version is given here as part of the extra literary materials added by al-Būnī outside the framework of the Hundred and One Nights - a medieval composition of possibly North African origin. The very small and insignificant differences between this version and BNF 3664 can be attributed to scribal

BNF 5072 = BNF, ms. arabe, 5072, fols. 55b-58b. An eighteenth century Christian manuscript written in an Egyptian naskhī script. The writing is quite clear, although the letters are not always very carefully executed, and it contains errors of spelling and substance. In a few places there are erasures and ink smears. Each folio contains about fifteen unequal lines, each with between nine and thirteen words. The basmalla and the opening sentence are written in larger characters, as are the phrase qāla l-rāwī and the word shī‘r that introduces lines of poetry. Hamza without kursī following the letter alif is written as alif mamdūda (ʼ). The text contains numerous syntactic errors and hypercorrections. Among the characteristics of colloquial pronunciation are the following: س → ش (‘tajnī) د → ذ (instead of several times); ض → ض (‘lajnī) ص (‘lajnī). As in BNF 3667 and Berlin 9105, the scribe uses here the colloquial shēdīth, yet in this case it is hypercorrected when vowelized shūdīth. The adverb گ (‘very much”, “a lot”) appears in the colloquial use before the verb (و كثير احب القفرا...). Although from Blochet’s comments it may be concluded that the

---

35 Many thanks to Prof. Ulrich Marzolph for sending us a copy of this book.
36 On the question of origin see, e.g., Bruce Fudge (ed. and trans.), A Hundred and One Nights, pp. xxii-xxiii.
37 Thus, according to Blochet, Catalogue des manuscrits arabes des nouvelles acquisitions (1884-1924), p. 56. Note anyhow, that the story here begins in the Muslim basmala, what may lead one to the conclusion that the Christian scribe copied this section from a manuscript of a Muslim origin.
38 Ibid.
manuscript is Egyptian, as also supported by the presence of typically Egyptian forms such as انتفقر and a başka, yet, such forms with the relevant meanings are attested in the Syrian dialect as well. Furthermore, the manuscript contains words that exist in the Syrian and are (apparently) absent from dictionaries and other sources containing colloquial Egyptian, for example the Turkish-derived قيمة، a dish made from minced meat.

Cam. = Cambridge Add. 3491, fols. 9a-23b. The manuscript is not dated, but according to Mark Muehlhaeusler, it belongs to a group of manuscripts dated to the eighteenth century and brought most probably from Aleppo to Europe by Dr. Patrick Russell (d. 1805) in the year 1772. It was bought by Frank Chance in 1862, and bequeathed to Cambridge Library after his death (1897). The opening here is Christian - bi-ism al-Ab wa-l-Ibn wa-l-Rā h al-Qudus al-Ilā h al-wāhid. However, the text contains obviously Muslim elements, making it likely that the Christian compiler used a Muslim manuscript as his source. The manuscript is very clearly and carefully written. Each folio contains about ten lines, each with between six and eight words. On the top left-hand side of the recto the pages are numbered, from 1 to 16. In a number of places a later European hand (Patrick Russell? Frank Chance?) proposed corrections to the Arabic text, based on a comparison with another manuscript (to judge by the abbreviation “ms.” next to the correction). Many of the suggested emendations agree with the text in the undated Rylands Library of Manchester, Arabic 652 [137] (see below). In cases where not enough room is left for the next word, the scribe ends the line with the sign ل - a sort of horror vacui. The text is full of indications of colloquial pronunciation, for example ل (بديلة, ميوز، اتخاذ، دهك، البيع، دريبت، دوقي) ل ذ (مثلي، تيابه) (يفضان) ض ت (صفراءة، تصرص) ص ت (يفضان). The scribe adds vowels only sporadically.

40 “Oriental Tales in 18th-Century Manuscripts … and in English Translation”, esp. pp. 189-190, 194.
41 Or a year earlier, according to Mahdi, *The Thousand and One Nights*, vol. 3, p. 56.
Lerner, “The Mawwāl” = Amir Lerner, “The Mawwāl about the Snare and the Sparrow: A Late Medieval Colloquial Egyptian Verse Adaptation of Narrative(s) in Prose Rooted in Arabic Classical Literature”, Journal of Semitic Studies 63/1 (2018), pp. 155-181. A study and critical edition of a Colloquial Egyptian mawwāl, found in BNF, ms. arabe, 3571 (supplément 1918), fols. 1a-12b, dated to the seventeenth century CE. The piece is an adaptation of the narrative into sixty-one uniformly rhymed quatrains (aaaa) in the more or less al-basīṭ meter. It was written by ʿAbd al-Qādir b. Yūsuf al-Abbār, an unknown author whose name is given in the last quatrain. An almost identical text was published in phonetic transcription by Pierre Cachia.42 His source though, was an incomplete late nineteenth or twentieth century CE booklet.43

Ry. = Rylands Library of Manchester, Arabic 652 [137], fols. 131b-140b. The manuscript is not dated.44 The opening here is Christian - bi-ism al-Ab wa-l-Ibn wa-l-Rūḥ al-Qudus al-Ilāh al-wāḥīd. However, exactly as in Cam., the contents are Muslim. The manuscript is very clearly and carefully written. Each folio contains about fifteen lines, each with between six and eight words. The story heading and the opening sentence were later highlighted with red ink, which was also used for the diagonal line through erased words, periods between sentences and, occasionally, also words preceding a quote or a line of verse (e.g., shīʿr, qāla, etc.). In one case (fol. 137b) a later hand added a word. Vowel signs are added only very sporadically. As already noted above, this manuscript is very similar in all respects to Cam., down to the infrequent vocalization, inconsistency in writing word-final ḡāʾ, alif maṣūra and tāʾ marbūṭa. There is ample evidence for colloquial pronunciation in this manuscript too, also fully in line with Cam. Note that as Ry. is nearly identical with Cam. in every respect, the manuscript on which AŠ is based was also extremely close to these two. BNF 3637 is very similar to the three, but not identical. The four seem to be of Syrian origin.

42 Popular Narrative, pp. 121-138.
43 Ibid., 28, 121.
44 See Mingana, Catalogue of the Arabic Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library, Manchester, pp. 889-890.
"Al-Ṣayyād wa-l-Fakh wa-l-ʿUṣṣūr"

[BNF, ms. Arabe, 3667, 16a]

(by the permission of God, the Great/45) نبتدي بعون الله تعالى وحسن توفيقه بكتابة قصة الصياد والהבشي / BNF, ms. Arabe, 3667, 16a

الله علم، رجل صائد من أهل الصبر، وكان/46

شبهه برجل مدبب، وقيد صيده في الصحراء، وعند أنماطه / BNFS, fol. 126b; BNF 5072, fol. 55b; Cam., fol. 9b; Ry., fol. 131b; م: منال Aš, p. 92.

المذكور ونذر قلبه ينتج في الغف، ونذر كثير في ظهره وفيه / BNFS, fol. 1b: بحسن الرحمان الزمان / BNFS, p. 92; BNF 3637, p. 725; Cam., fols. 9a-10a; Ry., fols. 131b-132a. Berlin 9105, fol. 109b (similar to Berlin 9065, fol. 49b).

هذا هو، كله ينتج في الغف، ونذر كثير في ظهره وفيه / BNF, fol. 16a: بحسن الرحمان الزمان / BNFS, p. 92; BNF 3637, p. 725; Cam., fols. 9a-10a; Ry., fols. 131b-132a. Berlin 9105, fol. 109b (similar to Berlin 9065, fol. 49b).

وكان ذلك القلبه ينتج في الغف، ونذر كثير في ظهره وفيه / BNF, fol. 16a: بحسن الرحمان الزمان / BNFS, p. 92; BNF 3637, p. 725; Cam., fols. 9a-10a; Ry., fols. 131b-132a. Berlin 9105, fol. 109b (similar to Berlin 9065, fol. 49b).

وكان ذلك القلبه ينتج في الغف، ونذر كثير في ظهره وفيه / BNF, fol. 16a: بحسن الرحمان الزمان / BNFS, p. 92; BNF 3637, p. 725; Cam., fols. 9a-10a; Ry., fols. 131b-132a. Berlin 9105, fol. 109b (similar to Berlin 9065, fol. 49b).

وكان ذلك القلبه ينتج في الغف، ونذر كثير في ظهره وفيه / BNF, fol. 16a: بحسن الرحمان الزمان / BNFS, p. 92; BNF 3637, p. 725; Cam., fols. 9a-10a; Ry., fols. 131b-132a. Berlin 9105, fol. 109b (similar to Berlin 9065, fol. 49b).

وكان ذلك القلبه ينتج في الغف، ونذر كثير في ظهره وفيه / BNF, fol. 16a: بحسن الرحمان الزمان / BNFS, p. 92; BNF 3637, p. 725; Cam., fols. 9a-10a; Ry., fols. 131b-132a. Berlin 9105, fol. 109b (similar to Berlin 9065, fol. 49b).

كما أذاع الله ينير في الظلمش / BNF, fol. 16a: بحسن الرحمان الزمان / BNFS, p. 92; BNF 3637, p. 725; Cam., fols. 9a-10a; Ry., fols. 131b-132a. Berlin 9105, fol. 109b (similar to Berlin 9065, fol. 49b).

كما أذاع الله ينير في الظلمش / BNF, fol. 16a: بحسن الرحمان الزمان / BNFS, p. 92; BNF 3637, p. 725; Cam., fols. 9a-10a; Ry., fols. 131b-132a. Berlin 9105, fol. 109b (similar to Berlin 9065, fol. 49b).

كما أذاع الله ينير في الظلمش / BNF, fol. 16a: بحسن الرحمان الزمان / BNFS, p. 92; BNF 3637, p. 725; Cam., fols. 9a-10a; Ry., fols. 131b-132a. Berlin 9105, fol. 109b (similar to Berlin 9065, fol. 49b).

كما أذاع الله ينير في الظلمش / BNF, fol. 16a: بحسن الرحمان الزمان / BNFS, p. 92; BNF 3637, p. 725; Cam., fols. 9a-10a; Ry., fols. 131b-132a. Berlin 9105, fol. 109b (similar to Berlin 9065, fol. 49b).
The vocabulary of the colloquial Arabic of Egypt ("be in need") is typical of colloquial Egyptian (see Spiro, An Arabic-English Vocabulary of the Colloquial Arabic of Egypt, s.v.), and is common use also in Halab and Muṣūra, vol. 1, p. 170.

See similar verses in al-Ḥasan b. Masʿūd al-Yūsī (d. 1691), al-Muḥāḍarāt fi l-Adab wa-l-Lughā, vol. 1, p. 352. Cam. fol. 12a (as well as AŠ, p. 93; BNF 3637, p. 727; BNF 3664, fol. 4b; Ry., fol. 133a), has here an additional saying by the wise-fool Bahlul (Berlin 9066 and Berlin 9105 lack): "I have felt in the heart of the man the mufīr and some hidden from me the aleph and the aleph, and the face is ready for the face of " (al-Ḥasan b. Masʿūd al-Yūsī, al-Muḥāḍarāt fi l-Adab wa-l-Lughā, vol. 1, p. 352).

[Sic], meaning "my hair parting", as in BNF 3655, fol. 128a and BNF 5072, fol. 56b (BNF 3637, Cam. and Ry., lack). Berlin 9066, fol. 49b: "My aloes ("be in need") is typical of colloquial Egyptian (see Spiro, An Arabic-English Vocabulary of the Colloquial Arabic of Egypt, s.v.), and is common use also in Halab and Muṣūra, vol. 1, p. 170.

See similar verses in al-Ḥasan b. Masʿūd al-Yūsī (d. 1691), al-Muḥāḍarāt fi l-Adab wa-l-Lughā, vol. 1, p. 352. Cam. fol. 12a (as well as AŠ, p. 93; BNF 3637, p. 727; BNF 3664, fol. 4b; Ry., fol. 133a), has here an additional saying by the wise-fool Bahlul (Berlin 9066 and Berlin 9105 lack): "I have felt in the heart of the man the mufīr and some hidden from me the aleph and the aleph, and the face is ready for the face of " (al-Ḥasan b. Masʿūd al-Yūsī, al-Muḥāḍarāt fi l-Adab wa-l-Lughā, vol. 1, p. 352).

[Sic], meaning "my hair parting", as in BNF 3655, fol. 128a and BNF 5072, fol. 56b (BNF 3637, Cam. and Ry., lack). Berlin 9066, fol. 49b: "I have felt in the heart of the man the mufīr and some hidden from me the aleph and the aleph, and the face is ready for the face of " (al-Ḥasan b. Masʿūd al-Yūsī, al-Muḥāḍarāt fi l-Adab wa-l-Lughā, vol. 1, p. 352).

[Sic], as in BNF 3615, fol. 110a, reflecting colloquial pronunciation (shaddāt or shaddāyit, where fusha would have shaddāt. And indeed, BNF 5072, fol. 56b, has here the vowelized shaddāt. See, e.g., Vrolijk, Bringing a Laugh to a Scowling Face: A Study and Critical Edition of the Nūkhūt al-Nufūs wa-Mudhik al-ʿAbūs by ʿAlī Ibn Sūdān al-Baḥṣūgāwī (Cairo 810/1407-Damascus 868/1464), p. 145.
TWO AMALGAMATED ANCIENT BIRD FABLES IN CLASSICAL ARABIC LITERATURE
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70b: [Cam.] fol. 14b: 17b [BNF 3655, fol. 129a:]

The fable of the two amalgamated ancient bird fables in classical Arabic literature.

[8130x-12]

[8290x-28]
The quince is a dish composed of meat and sumac. Yet, as the following dishes are cooked with meat and a prominent product that resembles forms given by BNF 3637, p. 733:

65 Should be فصار في حلق طورق / الزرد / وأستيا هذا لمن قرق فصار العصفر أو غُنف / حرصي على مونتي وعندني الجهل وسوء الطعام 64 عند وذلك / أقبل أيضا الصبي وهو فرحان وخلص العصفر وصاح / إلى والد وقال له يا ولدي خذ هذا العصفر كله وأبيحه / وأسلخه 18/1 [و] أندفة 65 وشفع شفعت وأعمال لنا من الشقة الواحدة لحم / قديد 66 لأجل الشتا 67 وأعمال لنا من الشقة الأخرى نقوعي 68 ولبنية 69 وسِرفِجليه 70 وتفاقيه 71 وسمائه 72 وورمانية 73 وحنطية 74 وقرعية 75 وبورانية 76 وأعمال لنا من صرته 77 وإكاكه شرايح / والدغع.

66 BNF 3664, fol. 8a: [sic] Colloquial pronunciation of n.z.f.
67 Berlin 9105, fol. 111a (in resemblance to Berlin 9066, fol. 50a): "Nagia iyya is not found in dictionaries, nor in cookbooks or studies on Arabic cuisine. Yet, as the following dishes are cooked with meat and a prominent product that gives its name, one may expect it to be a dish of meat cooked with nagia. According to the Lebanon scholar Butrus al-Bustani (d. 1883), Kitab Muhit al-Muhit, Beirut, n.p., 1867-1870, s.v., naq is a dried apricot. See also Barthélemy, Dictionnaire, s.v., who adds that naq in Beirut denotes dried apricots. One may therefore assume that the meaning here is a dish of meat cooked with dried apricots, and that it was known is the region of Lebanon or Syria. Hence, one has here a possible indication about the manuscript’s origin. Nevertheless, one has also to take into consideration the resembling forms given by BNF 3637, p. 733: نقية (or نقية) and if so, is it derived from the classical نقية a, i.e., a meal on the return of a traveler? See, e.g., van Gelder, Of Dishes and Discourse: Classical Arabic Literary Representations of Food, p. 16; BNF 3655, fol. 129b and Cam., fol. 17b: نقية (below, n. 82); BNF 3664, 9a: نقية (ibid.).
69 Safarjaliyya is cooked with meat and quinces (سَفْرَجْل). Ibid., pp. 58, 344, 473.
70 Tuffahiyah is a dish of meat and (esp. sour) apples (تفاح). Ibid., pp. 44, 311, 352, 471.
71 Summaqiyah is cooked with (esp. fat) meat and sumac (سماء). Ibid., pp. 46, 312-313, 327, 473.
72 Rummaniyah is a meat dish cooked with sour pomegranates (رمان) and juice. Ibid., pp. 45, 307, 315-316, 472. BNF 3637, p. 734, has here also a recipe for pomegranate juice (this word is written very clearly, yet Burton, Supplemental Nights, vol. 6, p. 159, n. 3, for some reason reads “Kambursiyah”). A qanbarishlya is a dish of dried yoghurt (qanbaris and also qalbaris), meat and rice. See Rodinson, Arberry and Perry, Medieval Arab Cookery, p.
but a meatball dish cooked in a sauce of fat meat and melted tail fat. Ibid., pp. 59, 346. Because of the popularity it gained throughout the years (it is known also in Spain, the Balkans and in other places) it eventually came to denote a category of dishes prepared using a common technique. Thus, instead of eggplant, one may find for instance, gourd, cougette, spinach or mallow. See Marin, “Sobre Būrān y būrāniyya”, pp. 193-207; Rodinon, Arbrey and Perry, Medieval Arab Cookery, pp. 27 (n. 2), 60, 62-63, 137 (n. 1), 239-250, 350-351, 471.

Hiniyya is a fat meat dish cooked with shelled wheat (خبز). See Rodinon, Arbrey and Perry, Medieval Arab Cookery, pp. 54, 334-335.

Qar’iya is a meat dish cooked with gourds (فرغ). Ibid., p. 474.

The well-known būrāniyya dish was originally cooked with meat and eggplant. Because of the popularity it gained throughout the years (it is known also in Spain, the Balkans and in other places) it eventually came to denote a category of dishes prepared using a common technique. Thus, instead of eggplant, one may find for instance, gourd, cougette, spinach or mallow. See Marin, “Sobre Būrān y būrāniyya”, pp. 193-207; Rodinon, Arbrey and Perry, Medieval Arab Cookery, pp. 27 (n. 2), 60, 62-63, 137 (n. 1), 239-250, 350-351, 471.

Hiniyya is a fat meat dish cooked with shelled wheat (خبز). See Rodinon, Arbrey and Perry, Medieval Arab Cookery, pp. 54, 334-335.

Qar’iya is a meat dish cooked with gourds (فرغ). Ibid., p. 474.

The well-known būrāniyya dish was originally cooked with meat and eggplant. Because of the popularity it gained throughout the years (it is known also in Spain, the Balkans and in other places) it eventually came to denote a category of dishes prepared using a common technique. Thus, instead of eggplant, one may find for instance, gourd, cougette, spinach or mallow. See Marin, “Sobre Būrān y būrāniyya”, pp. 193-207; Rodinon, Arbrey and Perry, Medieval Arab Cookery, pp. 27 (n. 2), 60, 62-63, 137 (n. 1), 239-250, 350-351, 471.

Hiniyya is a fat meat dish cooked with shelled wheat (خبز). See Rodinon, Arbrey and Perry, Medieval Arab Cookery, pp. 54, 334-335.

Qar’iya is a meat dish cooked with gourds (فرغ). Ibid., p. 474.

The well-known būrāniyya dish was originally cooked with meat and eggplant. Because of the popularity it gained throughout the years (it is known also in Spain, the Balkans and in other places) it eventually came to denote a category of dishes prepared using a common technique. Thus, instead of eggplant, one may find for instance, gourd, cougette, spinach or mallow. See Marin, “Sobre Būrān y būrāniyya”, pp. 193-207; Rodinon, Arbrey and Perry, Medieval Arab Cookery, pp. 27 (n. 2), 60, 62-63, 137 (n. 1), 239-250, 350-351, 471.

Hiniyya is a fat meat dish cooked with shelled wheat (خبز). See Rodinon, Arbrey and Perry, Medieval Arab Cookery, pp. 54, 334-335.

Qar’iya is a meat dish cooked with gourds (فرغ). Ibid., p. 474.

The well-known būrāniyya dish was originally cooked with meat and eggplant. Because of the popularity it gained throughout the years (it is known also in Spain, the Balkans and in other places) it eventually came to denote a category of dishes prepared using a common technique. Thus, instead of eggplant, one may find for instance, gourd, cougette, spinach or mallow. See Marin, “Sobre Būrān y būrāniyya”, pp. 193-207; Rodinon, Arbrey and Perry, Medieval Arab Cookery, pp. 27 (n. 2), 60, 62-63, 137 (n. 1), 239-250, 350-351, 471.

Hiniyya is a fat meat dish cooked with shelled wheat (خبز). See Rodinon, Arbrey and Perry, Medieval Arab Cookery, pp. 54, 334-335.

Qar’iya is a meat dish cooked with gourds (فرغ). Ibid., p. 474.

The well-known būrāniyya dish was originally cooked with meat and eggplant. Because of the popularity it gained throughout the years (it is known also in Spain, the Balkans and in other places) it eventually came to denote a category of dishes prepared using a common technique. Thus, instead of eggplant, one may find for instance, gourd, cougette, spinach or mallow. See Marin, “Sobre Būrān y būrāniyya”, pp. 193-207; Rodinon, Arbrey and Perry, Medieval Arab Cookery, pp. 27 (n. 2), 60, 62-63, 137 (n. 1), 239-250, 350-351, 471.

Hiniyya is a fat meat dish cooked with shelled wheat (خبز). See Rodinon, Arbrey and Perry, Medieval Arab Cookery, pp. 54, 334-335.

Qar’iya is a meat dish cooked with gourds (فرغ). Ibid., p. 474.

Narjisiyya is a meat and rice dish coated with egg yolk and egg white, and hence probably resembling the Narcissus flower (برحي). Ibid., pp. 61-62, 137, 349. 

Qulaqisiyya is a dish of meat and taro (colocasia, قاس). Ibid., p. 474. 

Asfuriyya is a dish of boiled meat with rice and saffron. Ibid., p. 473. This dish is derived in this case (hapax legomenon) by Charles Perry from the aforementioned fifteen century Damascus Kitāb al-Ṭibākha. 

Māwardiyā is not found in cookery books or studies on Arabic cuisine. It is obvious from here that it is a dish of meat cooked with rose-water (ماء ورد). See Dozy, Supplément, s.v. It is mentioned without any description also by Ibn Sūdān (d. 1464) in his Nuzhat al-Nufūs wa-Mudhik al-ʿAbīs. See Vrolijk, Bringing a Laugh to a Scowling Face, p. 73. 

Kāfūriyya, if the intention here is mudaqqaga kāfūriyya, is a dish of chicken breasts and other ingredients, where camphor (كفور) here serves probably only as a proverbial image for whiteness. See Rodinson, Arberry and Perry, Medieval Arab Cookery, pp. 135, 359-360. Rūmiyya, if in the sense of labaniyya Rūmiyya (i.e., “Greek”, “Byzantine”), is a meat dish with yoghurt, rice and vegetables. Ibid., pp. 138, 153, and also above, n. 69. 

Fugāʿiyya (from فقاعة “bubble”) is a dish of meat and egg yolk. Ibid., p. 317. Fāriziya is written very clearly, yet impossible to identify. 

Laymūniyya is a dish of (esp.) chicken meat and lemon (ليمون) juice. Ibid., pp. 46-47, 174, 210, 316, 325-326, 362, 475. Hindiyaa, i.e., tamarhindiyaa, is a tamarind and meat dish known in medieval Cairo. See Lewicka, Food and Foodways of Medieval Cairenes: Aspects of Life in an Islamic Metropolis of the Eastern Mediterranean, p. 280. 

Muʿarraqiya, if in the sense of muʿarraq or muʿarraq Misrī, is a dish of chicken cooked with chickpeas, thus according to Rodinson, Arberry and Perry, Medieval Arab Cookery, pp. 134, 136. See also Dozy, Supplément, s.v. Yakhnī (or yakhnā, yakhnā, yakhna) here is a meat and vegetables ragout. Ibid., s.v. Zīrbāj is a stew of meat, chickpeas, almonds and vinegar. See Rodinson, Arberry and Perry, Medieval Arab Cookery, e.g., p. 43. Shushbarak or shishbarak is a dish of minced meat stuffed in dough in the shape of noodles served with yoghurt. Ibid. p. 473. 

Siyya, meaning shiwāʾ or shuwāʾ (“roast”)? See [Siyya], if it serves here as abbreviation of sitt al-nūba, is a dish of chicken and purslane, or sitt al-shanā (or al-shānī), a dish of meat and taro (colocasia). Ibid., pp. 134-135, 359, 364. 

Mamqūr means “soused in vinegar and salt”, one may assume, if indeed the reading is correct, that it is a dish of meat cooked with vinegar, resembling the mamqūriyya, and see ibid., pp. 47 (and n. 4), 317-318. 

Maʿṣūr [Siyya], meaning Maʿṣūr. According to al-Asadi, Mawsūʿ al-Halab, vol. 3, p. 65, in Aleppo the jaghl maghl (but cf. vol. 4, p. 5, in which the term is vowelized jaghal maghal) was a dish of tripes or stomach mixed with other parts of the animal. Note, that the dish was also current in Egypt, and according to a description given by al-Shirbīnī, Hazz al-Qubāf, vol. 1, p. 393, and vol. 2, p. 435, jaghl maghl (the transliteration is Humphrey Davies’s, the editor) is a dish cooked by Egyptian peasants from an animal’s tripes or stomach mixed with its offal. See also Dozy, Supplément, s.v. Sarsaba is not found in classical lexicography. In colloquial Arabic of Aleppo it denotes the spinal column. See al-Asadi, Mawsūʿ al-Halab, vol. 4, p. 341; Jumāna Ṣah, Mawsūʿ al-Amthāl al-Shaʾbiyya l-ʿArabiyya, Riyadh, al-Dār al-Wataniyya l-Jadīda, 1999, p. 565 (no. 2644); and also Muḥammad Ḥasan ʿAbd al-Muḥsin, al-Adab al-Shaʾbī fi Halab, p. 140. BNF 3664, fol. 8b: 

يا وادي حيد هذا [9a] العصفون: / واصل به إلى النبت كفاعة وأبخة وآبية واحمل منه: / مائية وم çalışية وغذائية ومزجية / ومذرية ونقاعية وبصيلية مقاربة وبامية / ومائية وم صالية ومائوية ومكرية ومرطبة / ومزجية وم صالية ومزجية ومكرية ومكرية ومرطبة وشراثى / واحمل لنا أيضا ماء مورودية وشرايقة / وحيدية ونافحة وتونية وتونية / ومصائية ومزجية ومزجية ومزجية وعائمة / من
Muscari  is not found in cookery books, nor is it a dictionary word. Should one consider here an error for summaqiyya (a dish of meat and sumac), mentioned in some of the other manuscripts? See above, n. 72. Marwaziyya is a dish of meat, prunes, jujubes, raisins, spices and wine vinegar. See Rodinson, Arberry and Perry, Medieval Arab Cookery, p. 326. Is nuqâ’iyya a dish of meat and some sort of fruit (e.g., raisins) soaked in water for the purpose of extraction (nuqâ’a)? See above, n. 68. Basaliyya magliyya is a fried dish of meat and a large quantity of onions (حصلي). See Rodinson, Arberry and Perry, Medieval Arab Cookery, esp. p. 348. Mulâkhiyya is a dish of meat and mallow (corchorus, ملخة). Ibid., pp. 361, 363, 475. Himisiyya or himmisiyya (etc.) in the current context is not found in cookery books, nor in dictionaries, but it is perhaps a dish of meat and chickpeas or one named after the Syrian city of Homs (إمهسا). Filîyya is a dish of meat and fava beans (قَلْف). Ibid., p. 474. Haytaliyya is a known pudding made of rice or wheat starch (amyllum), milk and honey. In the current context - a dish containing meat - is not found in dictionaries nor in cookery books. Sharâbiyya in the current context, is not found in cookery books, nor in dictionaries, yet from the semantics of the root sh.r.b, one may consider it to be a meat soup or a meat and fruit syrup stew or the like. Basset, Mille et un contes, vol. 2, p. 274, translates “sorbet”. Khawkhiyya is a dish of chicken and mûrâz / خوخ - apparently plums. See Rodinson, Arberry and Perry, Medieval Arab Cookery, p. 135, and n. 4. Basset, Mille et un contes, vol. 2, p. 274, translates “du sirop de pêches”. Tamriyya is a dish of meat and pitted dried dates (تمر). See Rodinson, Arberry and Perry, Medieval Arab Cookery, pp. 353, 365. Tiṭiya, in the current context, is not found in cookery books or in dictionaries. It may be a dish of meat and mulberries (فَرْقَة). Basset, Mille et un contes, vol. 2, p. 274, translates “de miures”. Rahmâniyya in the current context, is not found in cookery books or in dictionaries. Mutawakkiliyya - named after the tenth Abbasid Caliph al-Mutawakkil (r. 847-861) - is a dish of meat, tardo (colocasia) and caraway. See Rodinson, Arberry and Perry, Medieval Arab Cookery, pp. 137 and n. 3, 186-187, 280, 340. BNF 5072, fol. 57b: “والشاة الثانية تعمل لنا منها سطاقية ولبنية وفلفلية وسفرجية / وعمل منها سمكية وقريمة / وطاجية وعمل لنا منها كشككة / ومن راسة تهوية ومن ركبة ومن سطاقية سلم ومن جلدة / جراب ومن مفتارة مزج أحج لاجل التمور / ولعمل لنا منها جلاة حل الخنا / وعمل لنا منها جمعية مطبخاء لاجل المعيش. Sihkâjiyya is a dish of meat cooked with vinegar. Ibid., pp. 40, 71, 139, n. 5, 305-306, 328-329, 371, and also below (shikhâjiyya).” (فَمِسَانَا) *qa is not mentioned in classical lexicography or in cookery books. According to Barthélemy, Dictionnaire, s.v., and al-Asadî, Mawsâ’il at Halab, vol. 6, p. 285, ġîma or lahme ġîma is “minced meat”. They also note that it is derived from Turkish, where indeed ġîma means “minced”, “chopped up”, etc., and also specifically “minced meat”. See Redhouse, A Turkish and English Lexicon, s.v. *tūmājih here is a dish of fried meat and noodles made out of rolled out dough (the noodles without the fried meat are also named tûmâji). See Rodinson, Arberry and Perry, Medieval Arab Cookery, pp. 470, 473. See also below (tûmâjiyya). Kishkiyya, as obvious from here, is a dish of meat with kishkh - cracked wheat with yoghurt dried in the sun. See ibid., pp. 139, n. 2, 322-324. Tannuriyya is a dish of meat left overnight in the oven (طُنْوَر). Ibid., e.g., pp. 69, 368. Cam., fol. 17b (similar to AS, p. 95; BNF 3637, pp. 733-734; Ry., fol. 136b-137a): “يا ولدي خد هذا / العصروفر ومحمدي البيت والدح / وافخ لنا من كمحو وليل خير / فروعية وحمرية وطاجية / وطاجية وشترك / وشترك وتوقاء وشترك وشترك / فروعية وتوقاء وشترك وشترك / ولنن وعجيج وشراك ملية / وكباب ويدقية وما ايمن من / تلك الطاءنات / اوتار تحقي / ومنقرفية مزازيب للطاحو / وعامل من جلدة صفرة للطعام / وعامل / وحنين للمدخنات والميديان. Infašîyya is not
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found in dictionaries, nor in cookery books or studies about Arabic cuisine. It is probably a dish of meat cooked with plums or pears (ميشيش, Mishishiyah) or dry apricot juice, or a dish of meatballs resembling apricots. Ibid., pp. 58, 58, 318, 243-244, 356-357. *Tutmäjjiyya* is probably a dish of meat with *tumäj* noodles made out of rolled dough (see above in current note). *Shikbäjjiyya*, probably from sikkäj - a dish of meat cooked with vinegar. See above in current note. حَجْبِيْ (sic), and also in Ry., 137a; AŠ. BNF 3637, p. 734: حَجْبِيْ. In this sense not found in dictionaries. Is it *(u)j{i} or *u(j)ayj* a small *u{j}ja, i.e., an egg, meat and flour omelet? See also Burton, *Supplemental Nights*, vol. 6, p. 160, n. 6, who finds it so in the manuscript, and suspects "‘Ajñniajy = a dish of dough". *Bunduguyyiya* is a dish of meatballs in the size of hazel-nuts (بَنِدْجُ يْيَة) or with hazel-nuts. See Rodinson, Arbeyry, and Perry, *Medieval Arab Cookery*, pp. 66-67, 329, 354-355. As to the *Bunduguyyiya*, BNF 3637, p. 734, has here نَبَذَّة, which is the plur. of *khaddiyah* (pillow) known in Şāmī dialects of Arabic (!). See Barthélemy, *Dictionnaire*, s.v.; and also Dozy, *Supplément*, s.v. It is interesting though, to find this form in C. Schiaparelli, (ed.), *Vocabolista in Arabico pubblicato per la prima volta sopra un codice della Biblioteca Riccardiana di Firenze*, pp. 92, 263, which is a thirteenth century CE Arabic-Latin dictionary based probably on the dialect of the kingdom of Valencia (see, e.g., Colin, “Istabl: [ii] Spain and the Maghrib”, *EF*, s.v.) and attributed to the Catalan Dominican theologian Ramón Martí (d. 1287).

83 *Baqarat Banī Isrā’īl*: Corresponding with the account of the sacrifice of a cow by the children of Israel in Qur’ān 2: 67-73. *Kabsh Ismā’īl*: Corresponding with the story of the near-sacrifice of Abraham’s son in Islam. Al-‘Anqā’ is a legendary bird in Arab heritage. See Pellat, “Ankā”, *EF*, s.v. BNF 5072, fol. 57b: لو كنت البقاية بن داوود أو نافع: صاحب أو ابن إبراهيم الخليل أو بنو بني إسرائيل. Al-Rukhkh is also a very well-known fabulous bird in Arab folklore. See, e.g., Marzolph and van Leeuwen, *Encyclopedia*, vol. 2, p. 694; idem, “al-Rukkhk”, *EF*, s.v. Nāqat Šāliḥ: Based on Qur’ān 7: 73-79; 11:64-68; 17:59; 26:155-158; 54: 23-31; 91: 11-14, tradition tells that Šāliḥ was asked by the people of Thamūd to present proof for the righteousness of his prophecy, so he prayed to God and then an exquisite, good looking she-camel came out from a splitting rock. See, e.g., Tottoli, *Biblical Prophets in the Qur’an and Muslim Literature*, pp. 47-48. Note that BNF 5072 is a Christian manuscript, so it is not to be wondered that he used kabsh *Ibrāhīm al-Khalīl instead of kabsh Ismā’īl. Same goes to BNF 3637, p. 734, that has here *Ismā’īl*, which wribe, ’Abīd Rabbihi, was a non-Arab and a member of the Syrian community and hence a Christian. Cam., fol. 18b: لو كنت / الخلق نافع أو نافع: صاحب أو / بنو إسرائيل. Tradition tells, based on Qur’ān 20: 83-98, that al-Sāmirī instilled life in the golden calf (of the biblical story) by scattering dust taken by him from beneath the foot of Gabriel’s horse. See, e.g., Rubin, “Traditions in Transformation: The Ark of the Covenant and the Golden Calf in Biblical and Islamic Historiography”, pp. 202-203.

84 [sic], meaning حَجْيَة.

85 The word سليمان was written and crossed out.

86 [sic]
Berlin 9066 and BNF 5072, and see below, n. 91.
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