

*LAṬĀ'IF, PARAENETICA AND PROPHETS: RESTUDYING  
JUNTA MANUSCRIPT KITĀB LAṬĀ'IF AL-ANBIYĀ' WA-FĪHI  
QIṢAṢ AL-ANBIYĀ'*

***LAṬĀ'IF, PARÉNESIS Y PROFETAS: UNA REVISIÓN  
DEL MANUSCRITO DE LA JUNTA KITĀB LAṬĀ'IF  
AL-ANBIYĀ' WA-FĪHI QIṢAṢ AL-ANBIYĀ'***

SHOSH BEN-ARI  
University of Haifa

While examining the genre of “The Stories of the Prophets” (*Qīṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'*) as background to my dissertation about Abraham in Islamic literature, I received from Prof. J. Sadan a manuscript that he found in the British Library that is related to this genre. Later I found similar versions of the same composition, which led me to try to find how this compilation emerged. The composition is very close to the preaching literature (*wa'z*), which deals mainly with moral education, but it also includes stories. I wondered if this is a literary genre, standing by itself, which started out as an aid, auxiliary material for understanding the oral tradition and religious studies, and then became an independent genre, closer to edifying literature, known as Paraenetica, or to the genre of *Specula Regis* (Mirrors of kings). I describe the manuscript in order to try to reach a conclusion: is this a different literary genre? Is it an educational genre or only a simplified version of stories for a child or a non-Arab ruler whose education was in Arabic language? Or did the writer perhaps want an original name for his compilation, and as the name *Qīṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'* was already in use he chose a different name, using a word which also intimates the collection's small size?

**Key words:** *Qīṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'*; Preaching literature (*wa'z*); Edifying literature; Mirrors of kings; *Laṭā'if*.

Trabajando sobre el género de “Historias de los Profetas” (*Qīṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'*) en el proceso de elaboración de mi tesis sobre Abraham en la literatura islámica, el profesor J. Sadan me envió un manuscrito que había localizado en la British Library relacionado con este género. Posteriormente encontré versiones similares de la misma composición, lo que me animó a profundizar mi investigación sobre sus orígenes. La obra está próxima a la literatura de predicación (*wa'z*), que se ocupa principalmente de la educación moral, pero también incluye historias. Me planteé la posibilidad de que éste formase un género que hubiera surgido como una ayuda, un material auxiliar concebido para entender la tradición oral y los estudios religiosos para, posteriormente, convertirse en un género independiente, más cercano a la Parénesis o al *Specula Regis* (Espejos de príncipes). Describiré el manuscrito para intentar alcanzar una conclusión sobre ciertas cuestiones: ¿es éste un género literario diferente?, ¿se trata de un género educativo o solamente es una versión simplificada de historias para ilustrar a niños o principiantes de la lengua árabe?, ¿buscaría el autor un nombre original para su compilación, haciendo referencia al reducido tamaño de la colección y descartando el de *Qīṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'* por ser conocido?

**Palabras clave:** *Qīṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'*; Literatura de predicación (*wa'z*); Parénesis; Espejos de príncipes; *Laṭā'if*.

## Preface

MS or.12656 is a composition which was given to me by Professor J. Sadan, who found it in the British Library.<sup>1</sup> A similar but not identical manuscript version was found in the Junta collection of Madrid, and yet another in the National Library of Paris. A common custom was apparently to gather stories which until then had been transmitted orally, and to write them down. I have edited the manuscript and intend to publish it in the near future. I give one chapter as an example in Annex B to this paper.

## The meaning of the term *Laṭā'if*

Ibn Manẓūr in his dictionary *Lisān al-'Arab* gives two meanings to the adjective *Laṭā'if*, though only in the singular form, *laṭīf*: a. something small, delicate; b. an obscure or hidden meaning of a word.<sup>2</sup>

Many books bear the title *Laṭā'if* and they are usually collections of small pieces of information. Examples are the works of al-Tha'ālibī, a remarkable 10<sup>th</sup>-century scholar,<sup>3</sup> author of many books with *Laṭā'if* in the title such as *Laṭā'if al-ma'ārif*, *Laṭā'if al-luṭf*, *al-Laṭā'if wa-l-ẓarā'if*, and more; Ibn al-'Arabī, who wrote the book *Laṭā'if al-asrār*; al-Qaṣṣallānī, author of *Laṭā'if al-ishārāt*; and many others.

<sup>1</sup> I dealt with this manuscript at length as part of my dissertation, written under Professor Sadan's supervision. I would like to thank him for his helpful guidance and useful comments on a first draft of this article. I alone, of course, am responsible for its content.

<sup>2</sup> "Ammā laṭuḥa bi-l-ḍamm fa-ma'nāhu ṣagura wa-daqqā [...] wa-l-laṭīf min al-kalām mā lā khafā' fihī". Ibn Manẓūr, *Lisān al-'Arab*, Dār Ṣādir, Bayrūt, n.d., 9, 316-317. The same meanings appear in Firūzabādī, Muḥammad b. Ya'qūb, *al-Qāmūs al-Muḥīṭ*, 1979, 3, 189. He also writes the adjective, and says: "al-laṭīf al-'ālim bi-khafāyā al-umūr wa-daqqā'iqihā min al-kalām", i.e., the one who knows the hidden meanings behind the sayings.

<sup>3</sup> See Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt al-a'yān*, Slane, W.M.G. baron of (transl.), Paris, 1842-71, 129-130. The obscurity surrounding his life has led certain western orientlists like Caetani and Brockelmann to deny him attribution of some of his works, but this is a matter for a different study. An elaborate description of the man and his life is given by C.E. Bosworth in the introduction to his translation of the book *Laṭā'if al-ma'ārif*. See *The Book of Curious and Entertaining Information of al-Tha'ālibī*, Edinburgh, 1968, 1-7.

Al-Tha'ālibī's compositions with the title *Laṭā'if* contain works often written on a modest scale, with the needs of students, secretaries, officials, and the like in mind. A desideratum for the Muslim seeking a general education or specific training for official professions was knowledge of *adab*, the basic learning necessary to supply social or professional polish.

Muslim authors wrote on the *adab* required by such groups as rulers, viziers, soldiers, mystics, and contemplatives, and even court jesters and raconteurs. The scope of *adab* was very wide: it embraced all the traditional Islamic linguistic, religious, and legal sciences, together with the Islamic version of Human History. This breadth in part explains why a work from the *Laṭā'if* genre appears more like a collection of unrelated snippets of information.<sup>4</sup>

Even though these compilations were written with a didactic goal, many of them contain short anecdotes meant to entertain. Writers such as al-Tha'ālibī had in mind to hold their readers' interest, and they did so by inserting these amusing episodes into their material, placing odd items of information before the readers and abruptly changing the subject if they feared that dealing too long with a certain topic would become tedious.

Works meant to be useful for various classes and professions appear as early as the third century of Islam, for example, *Kitāb al-muḥabbar* of Ibn Ḥabīb (d. 245/859-860), who inserted into his compilation material which was later included in *Laṭā'if* books.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Bosworth translates the words *laṭā'if al-ma'ārif* as "curious and entertaining information". See also his discussion about this genre in *The Book of Curious*, 14-16. For general discussions on *adab* see Grunebaum, G.H. von, *Mediaeval Islam*, Chicago, 1946, 250-257 and Gabrieli, F., "Adab", *EP*.

<sup>5</sup> Around the same time as al-Tha'ālibī we find al-Fārābī's book *Iḥṣā' al-'Ulūm* (4<sup>th</sup>/10<sup>th</sup> century) and al-Khuwārizmī's *Mafātīḥ al-'Ulūm*. Both start a new tendency to classify systematically various branches of knowledge and to assemble lists of interpretations of technical terms of the sciences. But unlike the collections of *Laṭā'if*, they refrain from curious information or amusing stories. On these works see Bosworth, C.E., "A pioneer encyclopedia of the science: al-Khuwārizmī's Keys of the Sciences", *Isis*, 1 (1963), 99-101.

## The *Qışaş al-Anbiyā'* genre

Narratives and stories concerning the patriarchs and prophets were already collected during the prophet Muḥammad's lifetime, and they feature in all genres of Muslim literature: exegesis (*tafsīr*), historiography (*ta'rīkh*), and *ḥadīth* literature. Books dedicated to these stories appear as early as the end of the 1<sup>st</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>6</sup>

The first extant example of this genre dates to the 3/9 century: *Mubtada' al-dunyā wa-Qışaş al-Anbiyā'*.<sup>7</sup>

The major complete collections of *Qışaş al-Anbiyā'* are from the 5<sup>th</sup>/11<sup>th</sup> century, and they deal with traditions ranging from the Creation until the time of Jesus. These are the book by al-Tha'labī *'Arā'is al-Majālis*, the book by al-Kisā'ī, *Qışaş al-Anbiyā'*, and the book by al-Ṭarafī who lived in Cordoba, and was an expert in Qur'ānic readings.<sup>8</sup>

Does the manuscript of *Kitāb Laṭā'if al-Anbiyā' wa-fīhi Qışaş al-Anbiyā'* belong to this genre or is it a separate genre standing by itself? To answer this question I start with a description of the manuscript.

## The manuscript of *Kitāb Laṭā'if al-Anbiyā' wa-fīhi Qışaş al-Anbiyā'*

The manuscript numbered *OR12656* of the British Library (hereinafter: London manuscript) does not appear in any catalogue but only in books containing the lists of acquisitions; the year of its acquisition is 1961. It is a 142-page essay with no name of an author or any information about the time or place of writing. The handwriting is *naskhī*, 11 rows per page and 7-10 words per row. There are hardly any vowel signs in the middle or at the end of the words. The writing

<sup>6</sup> The first book we hear about was written by the Yemenite of Persian origin Wahb b. Munabbih. The book is not extant but much material attributed to him is quoted by later authors. For references to many studies on him see Tottoli, R., *Le Qışaş al-Anbiyā' di Ṭarafī*, Napoli, 1996, 45-49.

<sup>7</sup> This ms. is not complete but its more than 200 folios tell many prophets' stories. For more information on this ms. and its importance, see Tottoli, R., "The *Qışaş al-Anbiyā'* of Ibn Muṭarrif al-Ṭarafī", *Al-Qanṭara*, 19 (1998), 132-133.

<sup>8</sup> On this unpublished collection, see Tottoli, "The *Qışaş al-Anbiyā'* of Ibn Muṭarrif", 137-160.

itself is round and clear, and the spaces between the rows are wide. The book is titled *Laṭā'if Qiṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'* and is divided into 14 chapters dealing with *Laṭā'if*, which are embedded with moral lessons. The title of each chapter is the name of a prophet or a moral-religious matter: chapters 1 to 11 are named respectively Adam, Noah, Abraham, Ishmael, Jacob, Job, Jonah, Solomon, Moses, Jesus, and Muḥammad. Chapter 12 is dedicated to the names of God, chapter 13 to prayer, and chapter 14 to the titles of God. The first page, describing the contents, refers also to a chapter 15 but the manuscript ends with chapter 14. Each chapter is divided into subchapters, called *faṣl* (chapter) – a word written in large bold letters.

The anonymous author apparently intended to write a book to be read by young men. He defines his purpose at the beginning of the essay: “You have asked me to collect stories [literally anecdotes, which are not necessarily humorous] from *Laṭā'if Qiṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'* and to insert among them lessons which will be of great influence on the observer, and enlighten the thought of the reader, and I am answering you quickly.”<sup>9</sup> Clearly, the book was commissioned for didactic purposes. Recall, however, that sometimes an author pretends that his book was commissioned even though he wrote it at his own initiative, and only after he completed it did someone buy it from him.

I have found other two versions of this manuscript, in Madrid and in Paris.

# 1. *The manuscript of the Junta para Ampliación de Estudios* —CSIC—

Manuscript number 63 is from the collection known as “Manuscritos de la Junta”, preserved in the Tomás Navarro Tomás Library, at the Centro de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales —CCHS— of CSIC in Madrid (hereinafter: the Junta manuscript); it contains two literary works (see below).<sup>10</sup> Asín Palacios, in the catalogue of the Junta manuscript, would define it as two literary works, whereas Hermosilla Llisterra saw the two as one literary work; I shall return to this point later.

<sup>9</sup> Ms. London, page 3a.

<sup>10</sup> Ribera, J. y Asín, M., *Manuscritos árabes y aljamiados de la Biblioteca de la Junta*, Madrid, 1912, 228-232.

It is titled *Kitāb Laṭā'if al-Anbiyā' wa-fīhi Qiṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'*. It is stated at the beginning of the manuscript that it was copied by *al-Imām Abū l-Qāsim*, a biographer who wrote about the Muslims in Spain; its exact time of writing is given: the end of the year 803/1401. This manuscript was kept in a mosque near Zaragoza, a city under Christians rule with a Muslim minority.<sup>11</sup>

The Muslims living in Christian Spain were known as Mudejars, and they had a legal status which allowed them to maintain their religion. In many parts of the Peninsula they lost the written and even oral use of Arabic: they wrote in Spanish in Arabic script, what is known as "Aljamiado". They continued to do so after being converted to Catholicism in 1502 (Castille) and in 1526 (Aragon).

A medley of methods of writing was used by Muslims living in Christian Spain, such as Spanish in Arabic script and Arabic in Arabic and in Latin script.<sup>12</sup> In this style of writing (*Aljamiado*) we find *Qiṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'*, which might be a continuation of a *Laṭā'if* genre, and the manuscript leads to these stories. Perhaps the *Laṭā'if* are intermediate stages between the *Qiṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'* and Aljamiado stories, even though the evolution does not necessarily imply a direct connection.<sup>13</sup>

The manuscript contains 20 pages, 25 rows on each page, and 17-20 words in each row. The writing is very dense, the rows fill the width of the page, and occasionally they continue in the margins around the text. The manuscript is extremely difficult to read. It is divided into chapters like the London manuscript, but the further division into subchapters is hardly followed. Except in a few places, the header *faṣl* (chapter) is missing from the equivalent place in the London manuscript.

<sup>11</sup> Van Koningsveld claims that Abū l-Qāsim was the Imām of Santa María de Huevra, near the city of Saragossa; see "Christian Arabic Literature from Medieval Spain: an Attempt at Periodization", in S. Khalil and J.S. Nilsen (eds.), *Christian Arabic Apologetics during the Abbāsid Period*, Leiden, 1999, 86.

<sup>12</sup> Later, all activities involving Islamic culture were banned, and the use of Arabic, oral or written, was forbidden, along with singing Arabic songs, traditional dancing, etc. See Harvey, L.P., *Islamic Spain*, Chicago, 1990, 2-5, 85, 336-337.

<sup>13</sup> A good example is the texts collected by Corriente, similar to *Qiṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'*. They are written in Spanish in Arabic script (which he replaced in his book with Latin script) and include stories about Moses and David while all the rest are Muslims heroes ('Alī, Mālik b. Dinār, and others). The text defines the stories as ḥadīth ("al-hadiz" in the language of the text). See Corriente, F. (ed.), *Relatos píos y profanos del manuscrito aljamiado de Urrea de Jalón*, Zaragoza, 1990, prologue by M.J. Viguera.

The Junta manuscript is shorter than the London manuscript: it generally omits the quotations from the Qur'ān cited in the London manuscript, or at least some of them. However, the Junta manuscript consistently retains the phrases attached to the names of God (be praised *-ta 'ālā*), of Muḥammad (the prayer of God upon him and his peace *-ṣallā Allāhu 'alayhi wa-sallama*), of Abraham (rest in peace *-'alayhi al-salām*), etc.<sup>14</sup>

## 2. The Paris manuscript

Manuscript number *Arabe 1926* of the National Library in Paris (hereinafter: the Paris A manuscript) is very similar to the other two.<sup>15</sup> It contains 181 pages, 9 rows on each page, with 4-7 words per row. The writing is very clear and neat, and unlike the other two manuscripts it is fully voweled, both in the words and at their ends. It is divided to chapters and subchapters like the London manuscript and the Junta manuscript. At the bottom of each page the first word of the next page is written. In size it is closer to the London manuscript, but in proximity to proper Arabic (*fushḥā*)<sup>16</sup> it is more like the Junta manuscript. This manuscript leaves out some passages found in the other two, but its chapters contain a few parts that do not appear in

<sup>14</sup> This point is significant in examining the possibility that this manuscript was copied by Christians in Christian Spain, and the manner of the copying (probably in the 14<sup>th</sup> century): the Muslim character of the manuscript was in a way censored, but enough characteristics are preserved (formulas following names) to show that the copyist did not intend to totally erase the Muslim character. Van Koningsveld deals with Arab-Andalusian manuscripts in Christian Spain which were current among the three religions: "Andalusian Arabic Manuscripts from Christian Spain: A Comparative Intracultural Approach", *IOS*, XII (1992), 75-104; R. Boase, "The Morisco Expulsion and Diaspora", in D. Hook and B. Taylor (eds.), *Cultures in Contact in Medieval Islam*, London, 1990, 9-28.

<sup>15</sup> Vajda, G., *Index General des manuscrits arabes musulmans de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris*, Paris, 1953, 563; Slane, W.M.G. baron of, *Catalogue des manuscrits Arabes*, Paris, 1883-1895, 345.

<sup>16</sup> *Al-Fuṣḥā*: the normative correct pure language. On the development of the rules of the normative language see Fuck, J.W., "'Arabiyya", *EP*, 1, 561-569. I use the language as a tool to define the manuscripts and not as a goal in itself (a linguistic purpose). Therefore, describing differences from the normative Arabic as "deviations" is not a judgmental approach, as our goal is not linguistic, but a way to define manuscripts and their mutual relations. On the linguistics see Blau, J., *The Emergence and Linguistic Background of Judeo-Arabic*, London, 1965.

them. Also, chapter 13 deals with *Hikāyāt*, whereas in the other two manuscripts this chapter is dedicated to prayer. The last two chapters, respectively on prayer and the names of God, do not appear in it.

### **Relations between the manuscripts: a comparison**

The manuscripts' texts sometimes deviate from proper grammar. Some of the "mistakes" are quite common among copyists of *fuṣḥā*. These are minor changes, often allowed by the grammarians (such as a masculine verb before certain feminine nouns). However, the fact that the neat handwriting goes together with the proper form, whereas a sloppier manuscript contains variants (sometimes actual errors), testifies to carelessness in grammar.

#### *A. The scope of the essay*

The London manuscript is the longest and the most complete. The Junta manuscript and the Paris A manuscript lack parts (not the same in the two manuscripts) that are present in the London manuscript. However, in both the latter manuscripts, especially Paris A, passages appear that are absent from the London manuscript, but these additional parts are far fewer than the missing parts. Paris A has a few full pages that do not appear in the other two manuscripts.

#### *B. Technical differences*

1. The handwriting of the London and the Paris manuscripts is clear and highly legible. The rows are short and the spaces are wide. The Junta manuscript is cursive and was probably written quickly. It is dense and hard to read. The rows fill the entire width of the page and at times the writing continues into the margin of the page, around the text.

2. The Paris A manuscript is fully voweled, both in the words and at their ends, usually with correct grammar and syntax. The London manuscript has a few random vowel signs. The Junta manuscript has almost none, except on a few words.

3. The London and Paris A manuscripts are properly divided into chapters and subchapters, *fuṣūl*; the header of each subchapter, *faṣl*, is written in bold. The Junta manuscript has no consistent division into subchapters and the word *faṣl* is often omitted.

4. Only in a few cases is there a subchapter in the London manuscript that does not appear in the Paris A manuscript, and vice versa.

In medieval manuscripts the beginning of a chapter may be indicated by a new line + header + new line. However it was also customary to start a new chapter in the middle of the row, especially if the header is painted red ("rubric"), thus saving paper (or papyrus or parchment). This habit of the copyist of the Junta manuscript is therefore not surprising. The color, however, is not always seen well in the photocopies of manuscripts. The London manuscript appears to have its main headers painted gold. This too is a sign of the proximity of the book to the "mirrors of kings" genre, to educational books, and to the style of preaching (ethics), which tends to be delivered orally. (Preaching in the streets, in mosques, and in royal circles was a common sight, attested by the written preaching of Ibn al-Jawzī and his biography.)

5. Quotations from the Qur'ān are longer in Paris A manuscript. The London manuscript sometimes abbreviates with *al-āya* (etc.). The Junta manuscript omits citations in more cases.

6. In the London and the Paris A manuscripts the usual phrases are always added to the name of God (the praised *ta'ālā*), of each prophet (rest in peace *'alayhi al-salām*) and of Muḥammad (the prayer of God be upon him and his peace *ṣallā Allāhu 'alayhi wa-sallama*). The Junta manuscript often omits these formulas.

7. Various synonyms often appear in each of the manuscripts, i.e., different verbs or nouns express a similar idea. This common feature usually does not occur in the copying of works of philology or when religious adherence to the text is observed. Its presence in our case shows that the educational book was popular and perhaps not very strict as it was meant for simple readers, youngsters. Also, the copyists who wished to impart moral values to the stories might have lived in a population that no longer maintained proper Arabic. This question must be left to linguists.

### C. *Linguistic differences* <sup>17</sup>

1. The writing in the London manuscript is frequently flawed and the vowels are almost consistently omitted. The writing in the Junta and the Paris A manuscripts is almost always full, with strict attention to the rules of proper language.

2. The writing of the *hamza* in the Junta manuscript is often mistaken or omitted altogether. The London manuscript is more accurate in this matter, and the Paris A manuscript hardly ever deviates from the proper *hamza* rules.

3. In the London manuscript *alif maqṣūra* is often replaced with a silent *alif*, a feature apparent also in the other two manuscripts but not as much. In the Junta and the Paris A manuscripts *alif maqṣūra* is written almost everywhere as it should be according to the rules of proper orthography (the so-called *fuṣḥā*, whose rules were assembled by grammarians based on the authentic model of the Qur'ān).

### D. *Differences in the law of forms*

Certain deviations between manuscripts commonly arise with copyists of *fuṣḥā*. These are minor errors, which are sometimes permitted (e.g., a masculine verb before feminine forms of certain types). However, the fact that in the meticulous manuscripts the correct language form is present, whereas in a more careless manuscript variants appear (sometimes as real errors), shows sloppiness or lack of attention to the linguistic aspect.

1. Substitutions of the masculine demonstrative pronoun by the feminine, and the reverse, are common in the London manuscript and the Junta manuscripts. Such substitutions do not exist in the Paris A manuscript.

2. The use of the future tense is common in the London manuscript even with past actions. In the Junta and the Paris A manuscripts tenses are in strict agreement with the time of the event, except of rare cases.

3. The London and the Junta manuscripts evince a mixture of regular future tense and shortened future tense (*majzūm*) forms, not

<sup>17</sup> See tables in Annex A.

necessarily according to the rules of Classical Arabic. The Paris A manuscript adheres almost throughout to the rule.

4. The London manuscript has many instances of jumbled gender, referring to the masculine as feminine and vice versa, as well as a mixture of singular and plural. This feature appears in the Junta manuscript too, but less. In the Paris A manuscript it is negligible.

5. The plural instead of the dual is common in the London and the Junta manuscripts, and very rare in the Paris A manuscript.

6. Changes and deviations in the suffixes of the dual and plural forms, unconnected to the syntax, appear in the London and the Junta manuscripts, but hardly ever in the Paris A manuscript.

#### E. *Differences in syntax*

1. The London manuscript often uses the indefinite third person singular masculine form of the verb, whereas the Junta manuscript is more strict; the Paris A manuscript generally observes the rules required by the structure of the sentence.

2. Negation words are improperly used in a few cases in all three manuscripts.

3. Question sentences without question words appear in all three manuscripts, though less in the Paris A manuscript than in the other two.

4. The London manuscript shows no strict observance of the indefinite accusative form, whereas in the Junta manuscript it almost always keeps to the rule of syntax, often even when it is not needed. In the Paris A manuscript there are no deviations from the rule in this matter, and the form appears or is omitted accordingly.

5. The three manuscripts often use prepositions instead of the accusative.

6. In the Junta manuscript many other features common in Middle Arabic can be found, such as deviations and alterations in the use of the connecting particles *wa* and *fa*, the use of asyndetic locutions, redundancy, errors in the Five Names, and more. In the London and the Paris A manuscripts the traces of Middle Arabic are hardly discernable, and the language maintains its purity and its lack of errors or deviations from the rule.

## Parallel works

It is useful to refer to parallel compositions which may help to prove that the *Laṭā'if* was a genre in itself.

Here are two examples of parallel works.

**Example A** (of the *Laṭā'if* type but with a different emphasis) is Manuscript n.º 1924 of the National Library of Paris<sup>18</sup> titled *Kitāb Laṭā'if al-Anbiyā' wa-fīhi Qiṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'*. It contains 27 chapters dealing with the prophets, but it is entirely different from the three manuscripts mentioned above. The tendency of this author is more historiographic than educational; it presents many commentaries and controversies, even if it does not cite their speakers.

This manuscript, unlike the previous ones, addresses not the Qur'ān but the literature of the traditions (*ḥadīth*) and historiography. Therefore, many chains of traditionists (*isnād*) and many biographical details are set forth, and only very few moral lessons. However, it seems to belong to the same literary genre of *Laṭā'if* which is meant to educate, perhaps with a greater connection to *adab* as education and less to moral talks (paraenetica or edifying literature) than the other three manuscripts.

Here is a partial list of the chapter headings in this work:

Chapter A: the dynasty and age of Abraham (*fī nasabihi wa-mablagh 'umrihi ṣallā Allāhu 'alayhi wa-sallama*). The chapter deals with Abraham's age, a few calculations of the period of time that elapsed between Adam and Abraham, the interpretation of the name *Idrīs*, and some of his primary characteristics.

Chapter B: the birth of Abraham (*fī mawliidihi ṣallā Allāhu 'alayhi wa-sallama*). This chapter deals with the various versions of Abraham's birthplace.

Chapter C: Abraham's leaving the cave and his arguments and conflict with his people (*fī khurūjihi min al-sirb wa-muhājātihi qawmahu*). This chapter expands on his being thrown into the furnace, his arguments with Nimrod, the story of the insect that killed Nimrod, and the story of the Tower of Babel and the multiplicity of languages.

<sup>18</sup> Slane, *Catalogue des manuscrits Arabes*, 345.

Chapter D: Abraham's migration (*fī hijratihī 'alayhī al-salām*). This chapter deals with the versions of his journey to the Holy Land, the story of Sarah, and Pharaoh and Abraham's cattle.

Chapter E: The birth of Ishmael and his age (*fī dhikr mawlid Ismā'il wa-mablagh 'umrihi*). The chapter tells of the birth of Ishmael, his being preferred by Abraham over Isaac, the relations of Sarah and Hagar, the expulsion of Hagar, the building of the Ka'ba, and the story of the Binding, including the argument regarding the identity of the sacrificed son.

**Example B** (of the *Laṭā'if* type) is a manuscript of the Vatican Library numbered *Cod.Borg. Ar 164*, and described in the catalogue of Levi della Vida as an essay by one known as *al-Muṭṭawwi'ī al-Naysābūrī*. Its title is *Laṭā'if al-Albāb wa-l-ṭarīq ilā walī al-Asbāb*.<sup>19</sup> The work, described also by Van Koningsveld, is a mixture of theological matters and stories of prophets, and its author is a 14<sup>th</sup>-century man.<sup>20</sup> From the content of folio 31b it is apparent that the author summarized his remarks (observations?) from a source called *Laṭā'if al-Anbiyā'* which was ascribed to (*nusiba ilā*) 'Azīz al-Qāḍī. No other details about him are given in the catalogue, and Brockelmann and his like disregard him. However, a comparison of the text shows that it is not identical to our *Laṭā'if al-Anbiyā'*. As a few examples we can mention:

Chapters 1-5 include prefaces about stories of the prophets, about the Muslims, and about the Prophet Muḥammad.

Chapter 6 contains stories of "the prophet Adam, may he rest in peace" (*min laṭā'if nabī Allāh Ādam 'alayhī al-salām*). The chapter deals with the creation of man, and the attitude of the angels and Satan to his being created.

<sup>19</sup> Levi della Vida, G., *Elenco dei manuscritti Arabi Islamici della Biblioteca Vaticana*, Studi e Testi 67, Vatican, 1935, 263-264.

<sup>20</sup> Van Koningsveld, "Andalusian Arabic Manuscripts", 99. He states that the *Borg.ar 164* manuscript was written by al-Muṭṭawwī'ī, and *Borg.ar 165* by al-Naysābūrī - but both names refer to the same person! Van Koningsveld may have been mistaken, and his descriptions referring to *Borg.ar 164* match the *Borg.ar 165* manuscript, that is, *Qīṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'* written by al-Ṭarafī. See Khoury, R.G. (ed.), *Les légendes prophétiques dans l'Islam depuis le 1er jusqu'au III siècle de l'Hégire, d'après le manuscrit d'Abū Rifā'a 'Umāra b. Wathīma, Kitāb Bad' al-Ḥalq wa-Qīṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'*, Wiesbaden, 1978, 34.

Chapter 7 tells stories about Noah (*min laṭā'if Nūḥ alayhi al-salām*). The chapter gives different versions of commentaries on the Qur'ānic verses mentioning Noah.

Chapter 8 contains stories about Abraham (*min laṭā'if Ibrāhīm 'alayhi al-salām*). Different versions of commentaries on the Qur'ānic verses mentioning Abraham are presented.

Chapter 9 gives stories about Ishmael (*min laṭā'if Ismā'il*).

According to this, it may have been customary to summarize *Laṭā'if al-Anbiyā'* of this kind for purposes of preaching and education more than for the purpose of entertaining the listeners, as is the case with *Qīṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'* collections.

### **What can we deduce from the foregoing about the chains of the version?**

1. One writer most probably did not copy the manuscript of another; perhaps they all saw some older version, from which they all copied. The differences in the versions presumably arose also due to the liberty that writers allowed themselves with the written text, and also due to errors of copyists or unintentional omissions.

The London manuscript and the Paris A manuscript are in my opinion the closest to the older (or the oldest) version. At least judging by its length, I believe that the London manuscript, the longest, was not copied from the Junta manuscript or the Paris A manuscript.

2. The London manuscript and the Paris A manuscript are written in a manner that suggests their target readership: young men such as sons of kings who have to learn from these stories. But of course *Specula Regis* were meant also to educate rulers at the start of their way or even later, namely the purpose of the original essay itself as stated on the very first page. The Junta manuscript was probably copied for a different purpose, perhaps as a book for some scholar. It therefore does not have a strict external form, it is densely written, and not in large legible letters or in well defined rows.

3. The many features in the Junta manuscript typical of Middle Arabic hardly exist in the Paris A manuscript, and even less in the London manuscript. This might show us that the original manuscript from which the three were copied did not deviate from Classical Arabic. The tendencies of the copyist of the Junta manuscript and his

own language wrought changes in the spirit of the Middle Arabic language. However, we must not reject the possibility that the London manuscript, the longest of the three, is the source, and the copyists of the Junta manuscript and the Paris A manuscript corrected the mistakes based on grammatical rules that were clear to them.

More likely is the gradual commission of slight deviations that came naturally to the copyist (London and Paris manuscripts), and more numerous and excessive deviations (resulting from the influence of the Middle Arabic) (Junta), resulting from a normative text. Otherwise, the different “deviations” presumably came first, and the copyists corrected to the language to proper *fuṣḥā* with varying degrees of success. Clearly the first option is the logical one; it may serve to prove that the correct order is the one that places the Junta manuscript at the end of the chain.

4. If we logically assume that the basis for some of the above features, typical of Middle Arabic, was established by the author himself, especially regarding syntax matters, which usually suffer the copyist's foibles less than spelling, we may conclude that the book was written in common language which showed these features as early as the 2<sup>nd</sup> century after the *hijra*.

### **An idea as to the time of the literary work and its author's identity**

The foregoing depicts a picture of a popular genre that developed alongside the *mawā'iz* literature (preaching) and *Qiṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'*. It consisted of inserting stories of the prophet into moral educational literature, and it was called *Laṭā'if*. Jewish motifs may have exerted an influence on the shaping of the narrative and the deductive side. These were textbooks, on the borders of the *adab*, which also means education. Our manuscript is not really a book of ethics, as the lesson of the stories in it is not clear. It is more a literary work, both educational and narrative, with elements of preaching. There is obviously no pretension to cover all the *Qiṣaṣ* but rather to present some of them, and not only them (so what else?). If our work does indeed represent a stage in the development of the *adab*, we might be able to date it to the 13<sup>th</sup> or 14<sup>th</sup> century AD.

However, the work seems to be earlier; its source perhaps to be found in learning circles formed when the need to teach Islam to new converts arose. Its core was quotations from the Qur'ān and numerous comparisons among the prophets. The many repetitions of stories in the different chapters of the work may attest that they were first told orally and written down only later, by the first writer, from his memory and understanding. Therefore, when he had nothing more to write about the chapter's central personality, at least according to the title, he wrote about others.

### Refuting Hermosilla Llisterri's arguments as to the author's identity and the circumstances of the writing

Asín Palacios, who describes the manuscript, believes that *Laṭā'if al-Anbiyā'* is another literary work whose author is the so-called *al-Imām al-Ustād Abū l-Qāsim*.<sup>21</sup>

Hermosilla Llisterri describes the Junta manuscript in her article in *Al-Qanṭara* as Andalusian in origin.<sup>22</sup> According to her, the author of the work is a man named Abū al-Qāsim. Like Asín Palacios, she recognized two works in the manuscript, one entitled *Laṭā'if al-Anbiyā'* which ends on page 26r, and the other *Qīṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'*, which begins on page 27v. She claims that this work is parallel to one entitled *Bad' al-khalq wa-Qīṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'* ("The beginning of creation and the prophets' stories") which was published by Raif Khoury of Heidelberg.<sup>23</sup> She pays very little attention to the first composition, which is our main concern, and concentrates on the second, in what is indeed a profound and important study. Hermosilla maintains that the fact that the composition *Laṭā'if al-Anbiyā'*, was, in her opinion, written in a Morisco<sup>24</sup> handwriting is important, and the main character in its development was the above mentioned Abū al-Qāsim. She thinks that the book by Ibn Wathīma, *Kitāb bad' al-khalq wa-Qīṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'*, was probably given by Ibn al-Mufarrij (whom

<sup>21</sup> Ribera y Asín, *Manuscritos árabes y aljamiados*, 229.

<sup>22</sup> Hermosilla, M.J., "Una versión inédita del *Kitāb bad' al-jalq wa-Qīṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'* en el ms. LXIII de la Junta", *Al-Qanṭara*, 6 (1985), 43-78.

<sup>23</sup> Khoury, *Les Legendes prophétiques*.

<sup>24</sup> Hermosilla, "Una versión inédita", 43.

she tries to identify) to Abū al-Qāsim. Regarding the first part of the composition, which is parallel to our manuscript, she believes that Abū al-Qāsim was its writer and editor. Hermosilla apparently criticizes Khoury, the editor of the second composition, for disregarding the “Andalusian origin” of the work. But after comparing the different versions of the first composition we can comment on her criticism.

### Discussion of the conclusions arising

The comparison between the London, the Junta, and the Paris A manuscripts shows that the manuscript mentioned by Hermosilla is only one of the versions. A comparison of the variants shows, I believe, that originally the manuscripts were prepared in the *Mashriq* and they were copied in Spain. However, this cannot be verified.

Manuscripts that do not originate in Spain presumably exist, considering the way they are written (like the London and Paris manuscripts), which are closer to the assumed “origin” than the Junta manuscript. As a result, three conclusions can be reached, with a degree of criticism of the views of Hermosilla:

1. It is not necessarily an Andalusī literary work.
2. Judging by its character, the work belongs to a genre popular throughout the Muslim world, similar to the “Mirrors of kings”, preaching (*Mawā'iz*), compilations of moral stories, and wise proverbs (*ḥikam*). Some writers produce edifying literature (Paraenetica) of these types, such as advice for rulers and politicians, with wide line spacing, so that the prince (or the ruler) with limited mastery of the language will be able to read. This can be seen in both our *mashriqī* manuscripts and shows that they are the source. Examples of “Mirrors of kings” and manuscripts that are easy to read (calligraphically) are found in different libraries such as those of Ottoman rulers. All the data show that the *mashriqī* manuscripts (whose source is in the Middle Eastern Muslim countries) that are so attractive in form are the source, and not the aljamiado-morisco manuscript (as defined by Hermosilla), which seems slovenly to us. As can be seen by a comparison of the variants and from the tables in Annex A, there are more errors and omissions in the Spanish text than in the other two. This

still does not necessarily imply that one of the *mashriqī* versions is the source and the Spanish manuscript is a direct or indirect copy, but we can state that the *mashriqī* manuscript is closer to the source and generally reflects it; the Spanish manuscript is a “faulty” diversion. It is hard to imagine that the *mashriqī* manuscripts of the work (of which Hermosilla was not aware) are copies. The version with more mistakes and poor handwriting is most probably the copy.

3. Abū al-Qāsim was perhaps just a copyist who “connected” two works: ours and a very old one of Ibn Wathīma, as shown by Raif Khoury. Hermosilla Llisterra’s recognition of the Imām al-Ustādh Abū al-Qāsim as the writer of *Kitāb Laṭā’if al-Anbiyā’ wa-fihi Qiṣaṣ al-Anbiyā’* is thus not convincing. Even if we replace “writer” by “editor” it is still hardly convincing, in light of the comparison with the *mashriqī* manuscripts. Van Koningsveld is probably correct that this person should be identified as an Imām in a mosque, and nothing more.

Hermosilla could not overturn any of Khoury’s findings in his research on another literary work (namely that only the Junta manuscript is connected to our literary work). It is unfortunate that Khoury did not see, from Asín Palacios’ old catalogue, that there is a parallel manuscript (with certain *lacunae*) in Madrid. Still, this in no way diminishes the quality of his research.

Who may the author be? It could certainly be a man of the Eastern Muslim world whose essay ended up in the Iberian peninsula, be it directly or via North Africa. The two essays are unconnected in the sense of the character of the work.

## To sum up

Despite the unsystematic and selective nature of our compiler, many of his snippets of information can be combined with other material from contemporary *adab*, *Qiṣaṣ al-Anbiyā’*, *tafsīr*, and history books to give a picture of education in his day. His work may be useful for various classes and professions, from people concerned with educating their children to those simply wishing to add a veneer of *Qiṣaṣ al-Anbiyā’* to their own knowledge. It may be a non-Arab ruler whose language of instruction was Arabic. As this collection includes

stories about righteous men we may assume that it is a didactic book: for example, Anushirwan, who is mentioned in one of the chapters, was not a prophet but a descendant of the Persians, so perhaps the author wished to show that these were morally upright rulers. Or possibly he inserted Anushirwan, unconnected to the anecdotes before and after, simply to fill out his sparse material.

The writer could have been a preacher or simply a compiler who wished to give his own title to a book, and as *Qiṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'* was already in use he chose a title that would also hint that it was a lesser compilation.

Be that as it may, the compiler has left us an interesting book and has added another dimension to the study of education in general and *Qiṣaṣ al-Anbiyā'* in particular as part of the important knowledge for the educated man.

### Annex A: Examples of the manuscripts' deviations

Textual differences			
London ms.	Madrid ms.	Paris ms.	
المنتخبين وذريته المصطفين وصحبة المهتدين وعلى التابعين لهم بإحسان إلى يوم الدين [3a]	Omitted	Same as in London ms.	
فصل: لقد عهدنا إلى آدم من قبل..... ومن لطائف قصته [20 rows in folio 9a-10b]	Omitted	Omitted	
127b - a full page	Omitted	Omitted	

Differences in Qur'an quotations		
قالوا: أتجعل فيها من يفسد فيه ويسفك الدماء الآية [3b]	Omitted	قالوا: أتجعل فيها من يفسد فيه ويسفك الدماء ونحن نسبح بحمدك ونقدس لك [3a]
وقال: رب قد اتيتني من الملك وعلمتني من تاويل الأحاديث الآية [52a]	Omitted	وقال: رب قد اتيتني من الملك وعلمتني من تاويل الأحاديث الآية [45a]
إني رأيت أحد عشر كوكبا الآية [54a]	Omitted	إني رأيت أحد عشر كوكبا والشمس والقمر الآية [46a]

Inserting interpretations in the quotations		
هولاء بناتي أطهر لكم من اللواط ولكن اللواط طهرا [51b]	هولاء بناتي أطهر لكم من اللواط ولكن اللواط طهرا	هولاء بناتي أطهر لكم من اللواط ولكن اللواط طهرا
وأيوب إذ نادا ربه اني مسني الضر اي أضابني البلاء في جسدي وانت ارحم [73a]	Omitted	Omitted

Lexical differences		
مبدع كل شيء [3a]	مبتدع كل شيء [1a]	مبدع كل شيء [2a]
بلمع من الاشارة [3b]	بانواع من الاشارة [1a]	بلمع من الاشارة [2b]
الا باذن صاحبه [25b]	بغير إذن صاحبه [6a]	الا باذن صاحبه [17a]
فإن استعان بك فاعنه [30b]	فإن استغاث بك فأعنه [6a]	فإن استغاث بك فأعنه [22a]
أصابه ضرر [31b]	أصابته ضرورة [6a]	أصابه ضرر [23b]
اللحم المسموم [39a]	الشاه المسمومة [6b]	اللحم المسموم [32b]
يستريحوا [40b]	استرحنا [7a]	نستريح [34a]
امراته [91b]	زوجته [13b]	امراته [96b]
الجار ثم الدار [93b]	الجار قبل الدار [13b]	الجار ثم الدار [99b]
أرفع منزلة [95a]	أعظم درجة [15a]	أرفع منزلة [102a]

## Annex B: Chapter 4, Abraham

This chapter is edited according to the London manuscript, with point-by-point comparisons with the Junta and Paris manuscripts given only in the footnotes where م signifies the Madrid (Junta) ms. and ب the Paris ms. I have not corrected the mistakes, and the version suggested here does not select or conflate.

### الفصل الرابع<sup>25</sup> في لطائف قصة ابراهيم عليه السلام

[fol.26b] قوله تعالى<sup>26</sup>: "فما كان جواب قومه [fol.27a] الا ان قالوا: اقتلوه او حرقوه فانجاه الله من النار",<sup>27</sup> الآية<sup>28</sup> اعلم ان ابراهيم<sup>29</sup> كان رجلا محجاجا فلم يكن يجيب خصمه الا بالالزام بالحجة.<sup>30</sup> والى هذا المعنى ذهب في قوله: "هذا ربي".<sup>31</sup> وقيل ان ابراهيم علم انه من تصور<sup>32</sup> عند خصمه بصورة المخالف, لا يصغى<sup>33</sup> الى كلامه جدا, ولا يقبل منه نصحا. فصور نفسه عندهم بصورة الموافق لقوله:<sup>34</sup> "هذا ربي", يعني: بزعمكم.<sup>35</sup> فسكنوا اليه وصغوا<sup>36</sup> الى كلامه. ثم كشف لهم عن عيب<sup>37</sup> ما اتخذوه الهة, من الشمس وغيرها, فقال: "لا احب الاقلين",<sup>38</sup> ليكون اوقع في

<sup>25</sup> في م, ب: الثالث.

<sup>26</sup> في م: تعالى

<sup>27</sup> سورة العنكبوت (29), 24.

<sup>28</sup> في م محذوف: "فانجاه الله من النار... الآية".

<sup>29</sup> في م: ابراهيم عليه السلام؟

<sup>30</sup> في ب: الحجة.

<sup>31</sup> سورة الأنعام (6), 76-78.

<sup>32</sup> في ب: من تصعد.

<sup>33</sup> في ب: لا يصغى. وربما هو الصحيح.

<sup>34</sup> في م: الموافق لهم. في ب: فصغه بصورة الموافق.

<sup>35</sup> في م: بزعمهم.

<sup>36</sup> في م: فاضغوا.

<sup>37</sup> في ب: عن غيب.

<sup>38</sup> سورة الأنعام (6), 76.

قلوبهم وأقرب [fol.27b] للاجابة.<sup>39</sup> وكذلك قوله تعالى: "الم تر الى الذي حاج ابراهيم في ربه ان اتاه الله الملك",<sup>40</sup> الآية.<sup>41</sup> وذلك لما قال النمرود:<sup>42</sup> "انا احيي واميت"<sup>43</sup>. فلم يخاصمه, ولكن<sup>44</sup> حاجه في كلامه, فقال له: "ان الله<sup>45</sup> ياتى بالشمس من المشرق, فأنت<sup>46</sup> بها من المغرب. فبهت الذي كفر".<sup>47</sup> وكذلك قالوا عند كسره<sup>48</sup> الاصنام: من فعل<sup>49</sup> هذا بالهتنا<sup>50</sup>, يا ابراهيم؟ قال: "بل فعله كبيرهم هذا فاسألوهم ان كانوا ينطقون".<sup>51</sup> يعني: ان كان ينطق,<sup>52</sup> فهو الذي فعل ذلك. فلم يخبروا<sup>53</sup> وانقطعوا عن جوابه, وأرادوا الحجة عليه. فلم يقولوا سوى: "اقتلوه او حرقوه".<sup>54</sup> وهكذا<sup>55</sup> [fol.28a] فعل المعاند, ينكر العيان. ولهذا المعنى قال الله تعالى لنبيه عليه السلام: "خذ العفو وامر بالعرف وأعرض عن الجاهلین"<sup>56</sup> الذين لا يقبلون وينكرون العيان. فلما غلب على قلب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم الحزن لسبب<sup>57</sup> اذا قومه, واصرارهم على الاقتداء بابائهم وانكارهم للحق, اخبره الله

<sup>39</sup> في م: الى الاجابة. في ب: اقرب الاجابة.

<sup>40</sup> سورة البقرة (2), 258.

<sup>41</sup> في م: محذوف "ان اتاه الملك الآية".

<sup>42</sup> في ب: لنمرود.

<sup>43</sup> سورة البقرة (2), 259.

<sup>44</sup> في م: ولا كن.

<sup>45</sup> في ب: ان ياتى.

<sup>46</sup> في م: فاتى.

<sup>47</sup> سورة البقرة (2), 258.

<sup>48</sup> في ب: عند كسر.

<sup>49</sup> في م: أنت فعلت.

<sup>50</sup> في ب: أنت فعلت هذا بالهتنا, وهكذا في القرآن: سورة الانبياء (21), 62.

<sup>51</sup> سورة الانبياء (21), 62-63.

<sup>52</sup> في ب: ان كانوا ينطقون.

<sup>53</sup> في ب: الذي فعل ذلك يخبروا. في م محذوف من: "يعني ان... يخبروا".

<sup>54</sup> في م: وحرقوه. سورة العنكبوت (24), 29.

<sup>55</sup> هكذا وهكذا بنفس المعنى. وفي م: وهذا.

<sup>56</sup> سورة الاعراف (7), 199.

<sup>57</sup> في م وفي ب: بسبب.

تعالى بما جرى على ابراهيم وما قاسى حين لم يسمعوا كلامه وقالوا: "اقتلوه او حرقوه" فصبر<sup>58</sup> على ذلك حتى انجاه الله من النار. فاصبر انت، يا محمد، كما صبر اولو العزم من الرسل، ونحن نكفيك هذا [fol.28b] الشغل. وقال بعضهم: انما قال النمروذ: "اقتلوه او حرقوه"<sup>59</sup> لانه ناظر النمروذ في دعائه<sup>60</sup> الربوبية. والله تعالى اخبر ان قومه بانهم قالوا: "اقتلوه او حرقوه" من غير ان حصل منهم هذا القول، لانهم رضوا لما قال النمروذ من قوله: "اقتلوه او حرقوه". والتراضى بالشئ من الحكمة،<sup>61</sup> كالفاعل له. الا ترى الى قوله تعالى: "قل: فلم تقتلون أنبياء الله من قبل ان كنتم مومنين؟"<sup>62</sup> قيل: خاطب اليهود والذين كانوا في وقت النبي، صلى الله عليه وسلم، فلم يقتلوا احدا من الانبياء، ولكن مثل<sup>63</sup> اجدادهم من قبل. [fol.29a] فلما رضوا بفعل اسلافهم، فكانوا فعلوا ذلك، وباشروا قتل الانبياء بايديهم، واستحقوا هذا الخطاب. ولذلك<sup>64</sup> قوله تعالى: "لين رجعنا الى المدينة ليخرجن الاعز منها الاذل"<sup>65</sup>. والسبب في نزول هذه الآية ان النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم خرج الى غزاة، فنزل صاحبه على راس بير، فجاء<sup>66</sup> غلام عملر، رضي الله عنه، وغلاد عبد الله بن ابي السلول المنافق، لعنه الله، فتنازعا عند سقو<sup>67</sup> الماء. فشكا غلام عبد الله الى صاحبه ما غلام عمر<sup>68</sup>، رضي الله عنه، فاراد المنافق ان يطيب قلب صاحبه ويقوي [fol.29b] يده، فقال: لين رجعنا الى المدينة، منعناهم الطعام<sup>69</sup> واخرجناهم منها بالذل. فلما رجع عمر الى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، قال: يا رسول الله! اتانن لي ان اقتل هذا المنافق، فانه قال كذا وكذي؟<sup>70</sup> فدعا رسول الله

<sup>58</sup> في ب: محذوف: "فصبر على ذلك حتى انجاه الله من النار".

<sup>59</sup> The writer inserts here fragments of verses from the Qur'an in his words

<sup>60</sup> في ب: ادعائه. وبالفعل، ادعى ادعاء أكثر ملاءمة، ولكن دعاء ممكن بنفس المعنى.

<sup>61</sup> في م: الراضى. في ب: والراضى بالشئ من الحكم.

<sup>62</sup> سورة البقرة (2)، 91.

<sup>63</sup> في ب: قتل ويبدو انه الصحيح.

<sup>64</sup> في ب: وكذلك.

<sup>65</sup> سورة المنافقون (63)، 8.

<sup>66</sup> في ب: فحارب.

<sup>67</sup> في ب: عند سقى.

<sup>68</sup> في ب: ما لقي من غلام عمر.

<sup>69</sup> في ب: الطعام والشراب.

<sup>70</sup> في ب: كذا وكذا. وانظر: ملاحظة 31.

صلى الله عليه وسلم بالمنافق، فلامه، فانكر، فانزل الله تعالى هذه الآية تصديق<sup>71</sup> لقول عمر رضي الله عنه. وانما قال المنافق هذا القول<sup>72</sup> دون قومه. فاخبر الله تعالى عن قومه بانهم رضوا بقوله، فكانهم قالوا ذلك في الحكم. فصح الاخبار عنهم بذلك.

**ومن لطائف [fol.30a] هذه القصة** ما روي عن ابن عباس، انه قال لما رمي الخليل الى<sup>73</sup> النار: قالت الملائكة: هؤلاء هم يحرقوا خليلك بالنار. قال الله تعالى: يا جبريل! ان استعان بك فاعنه!<sup>74</sup> فجاءه<sup>75</sup> جبريل فقال له: الك حاجة؟ فقال: اما اليك - فلا. قال بعضهم: لم يقل: لي حاجة، لانه كان يكون نقص<sup>76</sup> في الخلّة. والمحبة من الخلّة من اجل المنائح. فاذا حصل الاجل، فلا يطلب بعده الاقل، ولم يقل: لا، لانه لو قال: لا، لكان نقص<sup>77</sup> في العبودية، لان العبد يحتاج دليل،<sup>78</sup> لكن قال له: اما اليك - فلا. حسبي من سؤالي علمه بحالي. ولذلك يجب [fol.30b] على العبد الا يرفع حاجته الى المخلوقين، ولا يظهر الاستغناء عن العبودية. وقد روى ان العبد، اذا صلى ولم يدع الله ولا يساله حاجة، يقول الله تعالى له: عبدي استغنى عني. وهذا ما قيل ان الله تعالى قال له: اسلم. قال: "اسلمت لرب العالمين".<sup>79</sup> فسلم النفس والولد والمال الى الكبير<sup>80</sup> المتعال. فلما القي في النار، جاءه<sup>81</sup> جبريل فقال له: الك حاجة؟ فقال: يا جبريل! كنت غايبا عني حتى<sup>82</sup> عقدت معه العقد. فقال: اسلم. فقلت: اسلمت. فالتار رسول من الجبار، يقول: سلمت مني لما بدلت له القول من عقد عقدا [fol.31a]. ثم امتنع من تسليم المعقود عليه فكانه قد نقض العهد. دعني، يا جبريل، فان الملك ملكه،

<sup>71</sup> في ب: تصديقاً.

<sup>72</sup> في ب: هذا الكلام.

<sup>73</sup> في م وب: في

<sup>74</sup> في م وفي ب: ان استغاث - فاعنه.

<sup>75</sup> في ب: فأتى.

<sup>76</sup> في م: كان نقصاناً. في ب: نقصاً.

<sup>77</sup> في ب: نقصاً. في م محذوف: لو قال لا لكان نقص.

<sup>78</sup> في م: محتاج دليل. في ب: محتاج.

<sup>79</sup> سورة البقرة (2)، 131.

<sup>80</sup> في م: الى الله.

<sup>81</sup> في ب: جاء.

<sup>82</sup> في م وب: حين.

ولو شاء اطلقه. فكان الله تعالى يقول: <sup>83</sup>يا خليلي، لما رفعت الواسطة بيني وبين النار <sup>84</sup> في النداء، وقلت: "يا نار! كوني بردا وسلاما على ابراهيم". <sup>85</sup>  
فكذلك العبد، باع نفسه وماله من الله تعالى، لقوله تعالى: "ان الله اشترى من المؤمنين انفسهم واموالهم". <sup>86</sup> فاذا اصابه <sup>87</sup> ضرر في نفسه او افة في ماله، فليس له وجه الا الصبر والرضى. فاذا جزع، فكانه ندم على البيع، ونقض العهد. فكذلك قال: <sup>88</sup> "ومن يسلم وجهه الى الله [fol.31b] وهو محسن"، <sup>89</sup> الآية.

**فصل** ومنها ان الخليل، لما قرب من النار، فمن بركته نالت النار النداء من ربها بغير واسطة: "يا نار! كوني بردا وسلاما على ابراهيم". لا تاكلي له لحما ولا تكسري له عظما، وكوني عليه بردا وسلاما. وكذلك العبد، اذا قرب من اولياء الله، فمن بركته مجاورتهم ينال الثنا والمحبة والجنة. فاذا كان الله قرب <sup>90</sup> من عبده لقوله: "فاني قريب مجيب" <sup>91</sup>، انظر ماذا تجد. واذا <sup>92</sup> كانت الرحمة قريبة من العبد، انظر كيف يكون العبد محله عند الله قوله: "ان [fol.32a] رحمة الله قريب من المحسنين". <sup>93</sup> ومنها قوله: "ملة ابيكم ابراهيم". <sup>94</sup>

**فصل** فان قيل: ما الحكمة في تسمية الخليل ابا دون ادم؟ الجواب: من عادة الملوك اذا خدمهم خادم وحصل <sup>95</sup> رضاه في حال حياته، فاذا مات، يكرم الملك ورثته وولده ويحفظهم في غيبته. واذا خالف الملك وعاداه <sup>96</sup> وخرج عليه، يخشى ان ينتقم من ولده. والله تعالى اخبر عصيان ادم لقوله تعالى:

<sup>83</sup> في م: وقال الله تعالى.

<sup>84</sup> في م: بيني وبينك. في ب: بيني وبينك وبين النار.

<sup>85</sup> سورة الانبياء (21)، 69.

<sup>86</sup> سورة التوبة (9)، 111.

<sup>87</sup> في م: اصابته ضرورة في ب: بان لهم الجنة فاذا اصابه الضرر.

<sup>88</sup> في ب: ولذلك قال الله تعالى: ومن.

<sup>89</sup> سورة البقرة (2)، 112.

<sup>90</sup> في م: كان الله قريبا. في ب: كان الله قريبا من عبد.

<sup>91</sup> سورة هود (11)، 61.

<sup>92</sup> في م: اذ. في ب: فاذا.

<sup>93</sup> سورة الاعراف (7)، 65.

<sup>94</sup> سورة الحج (22)، 78.

<sup>95</sup> في م: ويصل. في ب: محذوف.

<sup>96</sup> في م: وعادته.

"وعصى ادم ربه فغوى".<sup>97</sup> واخبر عن وفا ابراهيم لقوله: "وابراهيم الذي وفا".<sup>98</sup> وانما سمي ابراهيم ابا حتى لا ينهزم<sup>99</sup> العاصي، ولا يخشى العقوبة [fol.32b] على عصيان ادم. قال الله تعالى: "ولا تزرؤا زرة وزر اخرى".<sup>100</sup>

ومنها: سمي الله ابراهيم<sup>101</sup> ابا لان الميراث تخلف للاولاد.<sup>102</sup> ولم يقل: ادم ابوك العاصي، لتعلم انه لا يعاملك بما عامل به ادم<sup>103</sup>، عليه السلام، عند الذنب، لان ادم حين عصا، نزع عنه لباس الجنة، وانت اذا عصيت، لم ننزع عنك لباس المعرفة. وادم حين عصا، اخرجه<sup>104</sup> من محل القربة، وهو الجنة، وانت اذا<sup>105</sup> عصيت<sup>106</sup>، لم نمنعك من مكان القربة وهو المسجد. وادم حين عصا، شكاه منه الى الملكة والانبياء، وانت اذا عصيت، لم يشك منك الى احد من خلقه. وادم حين [fol.33a] عصى، فرق بينه وبين زوجته حوا، وانت اذا عصيت، لم يفرق بينك وبين اهلك. وادم، حين عصا، عاقبه باحزان الدنيا والوان المحن، وانت اذا عصيت، لم يعاقبك بحزن القطيعة وغم الفرقة، فلم تستحق الميراث منه في هذه المعاملة. وابراهيم<sup>107</sup> سماه لك ابا لانك تستحق الارث منه في معاملة الرب اياه، لانه احيا في يده الطيور المختلفة. وكذلك يحيي قلبك الغافل من ندامتك. وكذلك ظفر بالعدو وهو النمروذ، وانت كذلك تظفر بالشيطان اللعين. وكما انه رمي [fol.33b] في النار، فاحترقت النار قيوده ولم يصب الالم الى شعرة<sup>108</sup> من جسده، فكذلك اذا اوردت<sup>109</sup> النار يوم القيمة احترقت النار ذنوبك من غير ان يصيبك منها الم.

<sup>97</sup> سورة طه (20)، 121. في ب محذوف: "لقوله تعالى وعصى آدم ربه فغوى واخبر عن وفا ابراهيم".

<sup>98</sup> سورة النجم (53)، 37.

<sup>99</sup> في ب: حتى ينهزم وربما هو الأصح.

<sup>100</sup> سورة الأنعام (6)، 164. في ب: وازرة.

<sup>101</sup> في ب: سمي ابراهيم.

<sup>102</sup> في م: على الأولاد. في ب: يحلف للأولاد.

<sup>103</sup> في ب: كما عامل ابوك ادم.

<sup>104</sup> في ب: محذوف من: "اخرجه من محل.....عصا شكاه منه".

<sup>105</sup> في م: حين.

<sup>106</sup> في م: عاصيته.

<sup>107</sup> في ب محذوف "وابراهيم سماه.....معاملة الرب.

<sup>108</sup> في ب: ولم يصب الالم شعرة.

<sup>109</sup> في ب: وردت.

ومنها ما قيل: لم سمي ابراهيم ابا دون محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم، والنبي اولا<sup>110</sup> بامته؟ وقد جاء<sup>111</sup> في مصحف عائشة رضي الله عنها: "النبي اولى بالمؤمنين من انفسهم وازواجه امهاتهم"<sup>112</sup> وهو ابا لهم. الجواب لان النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم يحتاج في القيمة الى الشهادة لامته كما قال: "وجينا بك على هؤلاء شهيدا"<sup>113</sup> وفي موضع [fol.34a] قال: "جننا بك شهيدا على هؤلاء".<sup>114</sup> ولو سماه ابا لكان يستحي من ذنوبهم ويفر منهم، لان الاب يستحي من ذنوب الولد<sup>115</sup> ويفر منه، قوله<sup>116</sup> تعالى: "يوم يفر المرء من اخيه وابيه وامه".<sup>117</sup> ولو سماه ابا، لاعرض عن امته باظهار الذنوب كما قال: ان يعقوب اعرض عن اولاده عند اظهار الجفا منهم فسماه نبيا<sup>118</sup>، حتى يشفع لهم والله يغفر ذنوبهم.

ومنها ان ابراهيم سلم اسماعيل الى الله تعالى في واد غير ذي زرع، عند بيته المحرم. فتولى الله<sup>119</sup> تعالى الى حفظه وتربيته، ثم امر ابراهيم بذبحه، ثم قال له: انظر واجتهد وخذ.<sup>120</sup> هل تقدر على ذبح من توليت تربيته؟ وكذلك النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم سلم امته الى الله تعالى عند خروجه من الدنيا وقال: يا رب انت خلقتني عليهم.<sup>121</sup> واذا بلغ العبد القيمة، يرمى به الى النار ويقول: يا نار! خذي<sup>122</sup> واجتهدني، هل تقدرين على حرق من زينته بنور المعرفة؟ فتقول النار: جز، يا مومن،<sup>123</sup> فقد اطفأ نورك لهبي.

<sup>110</sup> في م وب : أولى.

<sup>111</sup> في ب: وجا.

<sup>112</sup> سورة الأحزاب (33)، 6.

<sup>113</sup> سورة النساء (4)، 41.

<sup>114</sup> سورة النساء (4)، 16.

<sup>115</sup> في م: من ذنوب ولده.

<sup>116</sup> في م: بدليل قوله.

<sup>117</sup> سورة عبس (80)، 34.

<sup>118</sup> في ب: فسماه أباً.

<sup>119</sup> في ب: فتولى الى الله سبحانه وتعالى حفظه.

<sup>120</sup> في ب: وجد.

<sup>121</sup> في م: خليفتي. في ب: أنت خليفتي عليهم.

<sup>122</sup> في ب: جدي.

<sup>123</sup> في ب: جز يا موسى.

**فصل** ومنها ما قيل انه لما القي ابراهيم في وسط النار<sup>124</sup> امر الله تعالى ان تكون<sup>125</sup> النار بردا وسلاما. فكانت للاشجار<sup>126</sup> غداء كالماء، فاثمرت [fol.35a] الاشجار بثمارها. فهذا<sup>127</sup> ثمرة<sup>128</sup> نداء الرب الى النار وبركته. وقد ناداك: يا هذا! في غير موضع<sup>129</sup> في كتابه<sup>130</sup>: "يا ايها الذين امنوا".<sup>131</sup> افلا يظهر عليك اثر<sup>132</sup> هذا النداء وبركته؟ بينس العبد انت لنعم الرب.

**فصل** وفي حديث بكا ابراهيم في النار، فلما لم يتوانا في امر الله تعالى، خاطبه الله تعالى بقوله: "وناديناه يا ابراهيم".<sup>133</sup> والنكتة فيه انه لما بكى على فوت الروح والنفس، ولما فاتته لطايف<sup>134</sup> النداء تأسف وبكا. وانت تتأسف<sup>135</sup> على فوت جزء من الدنيا، وقد فاتتك لطايف الغيب وفوايد المعرفة، [fol.35b] فلم تتأسف لحظة، ولم تبك دمة.

ومنها ما قيل انه لما نظر في النار، ظهر في خلالها رياض،<sup>136</sup> وحواليها نار<sup>137</sup> تنتقد. فمن ابتلى بنار النمرود،<sup>138</sup> كان حاله هكذا، فكيف من كان في قلبه نار المحبة، كيف يكون حاله؟ وسئل ابراهيم بعد خروجه من النار، بعد اقامته فيها اربعين يوما: اي ايامك كان اشهى اليك؟ قال: الاربعة<sup>139</sup>

<sup>124</sup> في م: في النار.

<sup>125</sup> في ب: ان يكون.

<sup>126</sup> في م وب: فكانت النار للاشجار.

<sup>127</sup> في م: فهذه. في ب: فهذا ثمر.

<sup>128</sup> في ب: ثمر.

<sup>129</sup> في ب: من غير موضع.

<sup>130</sup> في ب: من كتابه.

<sup>131</sup> سورة البقرة (2)، 104، 153، 172، 178، 183، 208، 254، 264، 267، 278 الخ.

<sup>132</sup> في م: فلا تظهر بركة. في ب: افلا يظهر عليك اثر.

<sup>133</sup> سورة الصافات (37)، 104. في م وب: "ان يا ابراهيم قد صدقت الرؤيا".

<sup>134</sup> في م وب: فاتته من لطايف.

<sup>135</sup> في م محذوف: تأسف وبكا وانت تتأسف.

<sup>136</sup> في ب: رياضنا.

<sup>137</sup> في ب: ناراً.

<sup>138</sup> في ب: فمن ابتلى بنار الجنة كيف يكون حاله.

<sup>139</sup> في ب: الاربعون.

يوماً. فقيل له في ذلك، فقال: لاني كنت عن الخلق غايياً، وبالحق مشغولاً. فراحة الأنبياء في الخلوة والعزلة، وراحتك في النعمة والشهوة.<sup>140</sup> بنس العبد انت! [fol.36a]

**فصل** ومنها ما قيل: قال الله تعالى: "ان ابراهيم لحليم اواه منيب".<sup>141</sup> كان كثير التاوه من النار، يريد بذلك تخويف اصحابه منها، فراه الله تعالى العجايب في النار، ليعلمه انه يجب عليه ان يخاف من رب النار، لا من النار.

ومنها: حين حمل الرمل الى اصحابه، فجعله<sup>142</sup> الله دقيقاً كي لا يغم<sup>143</sup> اصحابه واصدقاه. والنكتة فيه انه لم يرد بحزن قلوب اصحابه واصدقاه، فحول<sup>144</sup> الرمل دقيقاً. فاي عجب لا يحرق<sup>145</sup> اولياه بنار القطيعة، ويحول الجفاء وفاء لاجل النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم.<sup>146</sup> كذلك قال: "اوليك [fol.35b] الذين يبذل الله سيئاتهم حسنات".<sup>147</sup>

**فصل** وفي هذا المعنى ما روي ان الملك يكتب ديوان العبد في يومه، فيملاه معصية، فيعرج به، فيقابل اللوح المحفوظ، فيراها حسنات. فينظر الى ديوانه ثانية،<sup>148</sup> ويبقى من ذلك خجلاً، فيقول الله تعالى له: بلغت ندامة قلبي الى اسرع منك، فبدلت سيئاته حسنات.

ومنها ما قال ابراهيم عليه السلام: "واجعل لي لسان صدق في الآخرين".<sup>149</sup> قال الله تعالى: اجعل كلهم ذريتك لما علمت من صدق اضطرارك، فلو انت<sup>150</sup> دعوته بالاضطرار، لابدلك<sup>151</sup> درجات الاخير والابرار، ثم البسك لباس الخلّة. فذلك قوله: "واتخذ الله ابراهيم خليلاً".<sup>152</sup> والخليل يتحكم

<sup>140</sup> في ب: في الشهوة والشهوة.

<sup>141</sup> سورة التوبة (9)، 114.

<sup>142</sup> في م: فرده.

<sup>143</sup> في ب: كي لا يعلم.

<sup>144</sup> في ب: تحول.

<sup>145</sup> في م: فاي عجب ان لا يحرق.

<sup>146</sup> في م: المصطفى. في ب: النبي المصطفى.

<sup>147</sup> سورة الفرقان (25)، 70.

<sup>148</sup> في ب: ثانياً.

<sup>149</sup> سورة الشعراء (26)، 84.

<sup>150</sup> في ب: قلو أنك.

<sup>151</sup> في م: لا يد لك من درجات. في ب: لاتلك درجات.

<sup>152</sup> سورة النساء (4)، 125.

على خليله, وهو اظهر<sup>153</sup> العبودية, قوله: "والذي اطمع ان يغفر لي خطيئتي يوم الدين".<sup>154</sup> فاذا لم يتحكم الخليل مع خليله بالغفران, فكيف يتحكم<sup>155</sup> على ربك بهذا العصيان؟

**فصل** ومنها ما روى انه اذا كان يوم القيمة يجعل تارحا<sup>156</sup> تحت قدم ابراهيم, والسبب في ذلك ان امه لما حملت<sup>157</sup> به, قال: اشتهي ان يكون ما في بطنك ذكرا, حتى اذبحه تحت رجل النمرود, ابغني بذلك رضا. [fol.37b] فجازاه الله بذلك ان يذبحه تحت رجلي ولده. كذلك اهل مصر, تمنا كل واحد منهم ان يكون يوسف عبده, فعاقبهم الله بان جعلهم كلهم عبيده. والنكتة فيه كان الله تعالى يقول: عبيدي! انا اعاقب<sup>158</sup> على الضمير والنية, واسل بمشيئتي بغير الفعل. ولا اعاقبك بالنسيان. قوله عليه السلام: قال الله لي: رفع عن امتي الخطا والنسيان وعاملت تارحا على قوله, وعاقبت اهل مصر على ضميرهم. واذا كان نيتك ومرادك وعقد قلبك الا تعصى<sup>159</sup> ولا تخالف, ما اعاملك [fol.38a] انا الا على حسب نيتك وضميرك, اقول: عبيدي! كان نيتك الا تعصى واحسب<sup>160</sup> انا انك ما عصيت ولا اذنبت. ان قلت انت: انا اذنبت, اقل انا: عفوت وصفح.

**فصل** ومنها ما قيل ان الله تعالى قادر على اطفاء النار من قبل ان يرمى الخليل في النار.<sup>161</sup> لكنه فعل ذلك لبغي الطغي للعدو,<sup>162</sup> لقوله: لو وصل الى النار, لاحترق. فانزله الله وسط النار, ثم حول النار خضرة ونباتا, وانبت فيها من ثمرات الاحطاب ثمارها, ليكون<sup>163</sup> ابلغ في الكرامة والمعجزة, [fol.38b] وليعلم العدو ان المحرق النار بطبعها,<sup>164</sup> بل تحرق بامر جلاله. وكذلك قصة موسى عليه السلام: لو لم يتقدم في دخول البحر, لقالوا: لو دخل البر - لغرق. فادخله الله تعالى

<sup>153</sup> في ب: وهو اظهر.

<sup>154</sup> سورة الشعراء (26), 82.

<sup>155</sup> في م: نتحكم مع.

<sup>156</sup> في م: ازر.

<sup>157</sup> في م: احتملت.

<sup>158</sup> في م: اعاقبك.

<sup>159</sup> في م: الا يعصيني.

<sup>160</sup> في م: فاحسنت.

<sup>161</sup> في م: فيها, في ب: محذوف.

<sup>162</sup> في ب: لنفي الطعن للعدو.

<sup>163</sup> في ب: لتكون.

<sup>164</sup> في م: بطبيعته. في ب: بطبعه.

البحر، ثم اغرق العدو واخرج حبيبه،<sup>165</sup> ليكون ابلغ في المعجزة، وليعلم العالمون ان الغرق بالتسليط، لا بالطبع. وكذلك قصة النبي، صلى الله عليه وسلم: قدم اليه اللحم المسموم،<sup>166</sup> فانطقه الله تعالى بعد اكله. لو لم ياكل منه لظنت المرأة انه لو اكل منه لتلف. وانما انطقه الله تعالى بعد الاكل ليعلم [fol.39a] العالمون ان الاتلاف بالله، لا بالسم، وان الطبيعة لا يعمل الا بالتسليط. كذلك قصة العبد في القيامة، كان الله تعالى يقول: عبدي! لو ادخلتك الجنة قبل ورود النار، لظنت الكفار ان لو دخلتها - احرقتك كما احرقتهم. فاجبت<sup>167</sup> عليك الورود فيها، ثم وعدتك<sup>168</sup> بالنجاة منها ليعلم العالمون ان المعذب هو الله دون النار، وان النار لا تعمل بالطبع، وانما يعمل بالتسليط والامر، وان حقيقة الحرق يقع من الجبار دون الجحيم والنار، كما روى عن ابي هريرة، قال: [fol.39b] لما اقتحمت خيبر هديت<sup>169</sup> لرسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم شاة مسمومة، فقال: اجمعوا من كان ها هنا من اليهود. فجمعوا له، قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: اني سايلكم عن شي، فهل انتم صادقون لي؟ فقالوا: نعم. يا ابي القسم!<sup>170</sup> فقال رسول الله: انتم من اهل النار، كذلك في توراتكم؟ قالوا: نكون فيها يسيرا ثم نخلص. فقال لهم رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: ما للسلم تحسبوا، فوالله ما تخلصتم منها ابدا. ثم قال: هل انتم صادقون عن شي، ان سالنكم<sup>171</sup> عنه؟ قالوا: نعم. قال: ساحملكم<sup>172</sup> على ما فعلتم، ان اهديتموا<sup>173</sup> لي شاة مسمومة. قالوا: اردنا ان كنت كاذبا يستريحوا<sup>174</sup> منك، وان كنت نبيا صادقا، لا يضررك. فقال: ادنوها. فسمى الله ثم اكل. فكذاك المومن الموحد، لا تضره النار عند الورود، والكافر والكاذب تحرقه النار.

*Recibido:* 21/02/06

*Aceptado:* 29/06/06

<sup>165</sup> في م: موسى.

<sup>166</sup> في م: الشاة المسمومة.

<sup>167</sup> في ب: فاجب.

<sup>168</sup> في ب: وعد النجاة.

<sup>169</sup> في م: اهديت.

<sup>170</sup> في م وب: يا ابا القاسم.

<sup>171</sup> في ب: ان اسالنكم.

<sup>172</sup> في م: ما حملكم على.

<sup>173</sup> في م: اهديتموني.

<sup>174</sup> في م: استرحنا. في ب: نستريح.