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PART ONE

INTRODUCTION

Conversions often induced converts to produce literary outputs, such as autobiographies describing the motives that made them convert or refutations of their former religion. Both genres are to be found among the literary outputs of the convert to Islam Samaw'al al-Maghribi (d. 570/1175). Samaw'al, a Jew of North African origin, was a renowned mathematician and a successful

---

1 We take the opportunity to thank Wilferd Madelung, Camilla Adang, Bruno Chiesa, and Sarah Stroumsa who read the introduction and the edition and made helpful suggestions.


physician who had studied medicine with Abu I-Barakāt al-Baghdādi (d. after 560/1164-5), yet he is mostly known for his polemical treatise against Judaism, Iḥām al-yahād, that he wrote immediately following his conversion. Four years later, he composed an autobiography with details about his intellectual development and the motives for his conversion. From his pen we also have an undated reply to an anonymous accuser who had doubted the sincerity of his conversion. This correspondence presumably took place before Samaw'āl wrote his autobiography, i.e. between 558/1163 and 562/1167.

As a polemical tract, Iḥām had a significant impact on the later development of the genre. It was well known to ʿIzz al-Dawla Ibn Kamīṁa (d. 685/1284), who rejected numerous objections raised in this work against Judaism in his examination of the three faiths, i.e., Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Taqāṣīr al-abshaḥ li-l-millāl al-ḥayāt. The tract also served as a reference text for some later authors polemicizing against Judaism. Numerous excerpts are to be found in ʿAbd al-Sanāʿī al-Qarāfī’s (d. 684/1285) al-Ājībāt al-fākhrāt “an al-ṣawaḥil al-ṣafirān” and in some of Ibn Quyyim al-Jawziyya’s (d. 751/1350) writings, such as Ḥidāyat al-ḥayārat min al-Ḥayārat wa l-Nayār. Moreover, the treatise is one of the main sources for an anonymous polemical tract against Judaism, written between 694/1295 and 812/1409-10, entitled Iḥāh al-naḥbunna, and it is quoted extensively by ʿAṣīr Muḥammad ʿAlī Bihbahānī Kirmānshāhī (1141/1722-1216/1801) in his Rādī-i shahbāhū al-kaffār, composed in 1215/1800-1.

Possibly due to the conflict between Jews and Arabs in Palestine, there was renewed interest in the tract towards the end of the 13th century; at least two manuscript copies are known to have been written at the turn of the century. – At about the same time, Samaw’āl’s polemic was discovered by scholars. A copy of Iḥām al-yahād in Paris came to the attention of Salomon


9 Ms. Jaffa, copied in 1328/1909 and ms. Orient Ox. 2686 (Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin), copied in 1329/1911. For descriptions of these manuscripts, see infra.
Munk, and Moritz Stein Schneider gave a brief description of the tract, the earliest analysis of Iḥām al-yahūdī, containing a partial translation of the text, was published between 1868 to 1900 by Martin Schreiner, who had access to a manuscript of the tract from Cairo (ms. 255.18 kālīm 250), dated 731/1332. Throughout the 20th century, the tract was printed repeatedly in the Arab world, clearly for the purpose of political propaganda. In 1939, Muhammad Ḥamūd al-Fiqī published the text on the basis of a single manuscript dated 1328/899 from Jaffa, together with the incomplete autobiography contained in the same codex. The manuscript has a colophon stating that it contains the version that was compiled in 755 together with the author's additions made in 562. Around 1920, Muhammad Ahmad al-Shāmī [al-Yamani] published the tract in Cairo. A comparison with the print published in 1939 shows that al-Shāmī reproduced the same version of the text and quoted extensive portions of the incomplete autobiography in his introduction. The print of 1939 was also the single textual basis for the publication of Iḥām in 1939 in Damascus to which Abd al-Walīb ʿṬawīla added an extensive commentary (tāflīq). The first critical edition of Iḥām al-yahūdī, the correspondence and Samaw'āl's autobiography was published by Moshe Perlmann in 1964 on the basis of all manuscripts that were known at the time and within reach, namely Paris Bibliothèque Nationale 14566, ff. 92a-68b, containing İḥām al-

10 See infra n. 18.


14 Waḥīdī: ʿAṣṣāba wa jarīr wa-rūūrī, 4, 92a-68b, containing İḥām al-yahūdī, Ed. Muhammad Ḥamūd al-Fiqī. Paris Bibliothèque Nationale 1456, ff. 92a-68b


18 The manuscript was formerly in the possession of the Bibliothèque de Saint-Germain-des-Prés. For a description, see Georges Vajda and Yvette Sauvan: Catalogue des Manuscrits Arabes. Deuxième Partie: Manuscrits Musulmans. Paris 1985, pp. 321-323.

19 The manuscript (17 x 22 cm) is one of the more than 100,000 manuscripts held in the possession of the (nowadays) Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz since 1927 (Rec. Inv. 5296, 5355) and has so far not been catalogued. It was originally paginated (138 pp.) and was in 1926 foliated by the custodian of the collection (66 ff.) and has 11 lines to a page. Chapter headings, key words (lā-i qīla wa in wa-zama etc.), and transcriptions of Hebrew quotations from the Bible are written in red ink. Perlmann states that “the copist identifies the author as the pro-Islamic poet Samaw’āl b. ’Adiya.” See İḥām, ed. Perlmann, p. 27 n. 39. See, however, the title page where it is stated: hādi-qāhīyāt al-maṣūmūt fi nīṣād al-yaḥyāt lāl-maṣūmūt al-ṣāliḥiyya al-ṣāliḥiyya al-ṣāliḥiyya al-ṣāliḥiyya. It is stated that the marginal glosses throughout the text are by the hand of Bahrān al-Dīn Abu l-ʿHasan b. Umār al-Bāṣītī (d. 855/1450), a Damascus Shīʿī scholar (cf. GAL 2:140) who was in 861/1456-75 compiling Nāẓm al-durar fi tanāṣṣ al-dār wa-ṣawārīr. See ‘Abd al-Ḥasan al-Bāṣītī, [A.O.]: Fihrist li-Khulāṣāāy al-Maḥfīl li-Shāhīyya līlīyī l-22, Tehran 1350/1967-78, vol. 2, pp. 350-351. Cf. also Husayn Ali Maḥfīz: “Nafṣi al-makhlūṭ al-arabiyāa fi l-ʿIrān,” in: Makhtūtīyān al-makhlūṭ al-arabiyāa 3 (1957), p. 26.

20 Perlmann erroneously gives as shelfmark Ashīr 545. The manuscript consists of 51 ff., 13 x 18,3 cm. The codex consists of two parts that apparently did not constitute a single single code initially, the two parts of the codex (ff. 1-44 containing İḥām al-yahūdī and being incomplete in the end, ff. 45-51 containing İḥām al-yahūdī and being incomplete in the beginning) clearly differ in ink and paper. On the titlepage (f. 14), the following title is given: Ḥamūd al-yahūdī lār-i ruddu l-ḥarīf al-arabīyya wa-ṣawārīr. On the same page and on f. 2 (margin) it is stated that the marginal glosses throughout the text are by the hand of Bahrān al-Dīn Abu l-ʿHasan b. Umār al-Bāṣītī (d. 855/1450), a Damascus Shīʿī scholar (cf. GAL 2:140) who was in 861/1456-75 compiling Nāẓm al-durar fi tanāṣṣ al-dār wa-ṣawārīr. See ‘Abd al-Ḥasan al-Bāṣītī, [A.O.]: Fihrist li-Khulāṣāāy al-Maḥfīl li-Shāhīyya līlīyī l-22, Tehran 1350/1967-78, vol. 2, pp. 350-351. Cf. also Husayn Ali Maḥfīz: “Nafṣi al-makhlūṭ al-arabiyāa fi l-ʿIrān,” in: Makhtūtīyān al-makhlūṭ al-arabiyāa 3 (1957), p. 26.

21 Perlmann erroneously reads as shelfmark Ashīr 545. The manuscript consists of 51 ff., 13 x 18cm. The codex consists of two parts that apparently did not constitute a single single code initially, the two parts of the codex (ff. 1-44 containing İḥām al-yahūdī and being incomplete in the end, ff. 45-51 containing İḥām al-yahūdī and being incomplete in the beginning) clearly differ in ink and paper. On the titlepage (f. 14), the following title is given: Ḥamūd al-yahūdī lār-i ruddu l-ḥarīf al-arabīyya wa-ṣawārīr. On the same page and on f. 2 (margin) it is stated that the marginal glosses throughout the text are by the hand of Bahrān al-Dīn Abu l-ʿHasan b. Umār al-Bāṣītī (d. 855/1450), a Damascus Shīʿī scholar (cf. GAL 2:140) who was in 861/1456-75 compiling Nāẓm al-durar fi tanāṣṣ al-dār wa-ṣawārīr. See ‘Abd al-Ḥasan al-Bāṣītī, [A.O.]: Fihrist li-Khulāṣāāy al-Maḥfīl li-Shāhīyya līlīyī l-22, Tehran 1350/1967-78, vol. 2, pp. 350-351. Cf. also Husayn Ali Maḥfīz: “Nafṣi al-makhlūṭ al-arabiyāa fi l-ʿIrān,” in: Makhtūtīyān al-makhlūṭ al-arabiyāa 3 (1957), p. 26.
A second edition of all three texts was published in 1986 by Muhammad 'Abd Allâh al-Shaqwâl, who used two manuscripts: Istanbul Topkapî Sarayi 4832 R 506, ff. 115b-135, containing İhâm and the autobiography as the basis for his edition.30 According to the colophon at the end of the text of İhâm, the copy (dated 11 Safar 1112/2 July 1703) was made from an autograph compiled at 2 Safar 565/24 October 1169.26 Shaqwâl collated this copy with ms. Damascas Zâhiriyâ 5711, containing İhâm (incomplete) and the autobiography, and the edition of Perlmann. Close comparison between the two editions shows that Shaqwâl’s text hardly differs from Perlmann’s text; in a number of instances, Shaqwâl falsely attributes a wrong reading to Perlmann.7 When differences are mentioned, the intention is usually polemical;28 moreover, Shaqwâl consistently ignores Perlmann’s apparatus criticus.29


31 For a brief description of the manuscript, see Fehmi Edhem Karatay: Topkapi Sarayi Mecâvi Kitâbname Araqçâ Tarmular Katalosu, vol. 3, Istanbul 1996, p. 51.

32 The colophon as quoted in İhâm, ed. Shaqwâl, p. 184 n. 3, states:

33 See İhâm, ed. Shaqwâl, p. 85 n. alif, hâ; p. 89 n. dâl, p. 92 n. hâ; p. 132 n. hâ; p. 134 n. alif, p. 143 n. alif, dâl.

34 See İhâm, ed. Shaqwâl, p. 87 n. alif, p. 91 n. alif, p. 122 n. alif, p. 147 n. jîm, p. 149 n. alif, p. 152 n. alif, p. 154 n. alif, see also pp. 55-56.

35 See İhâm, ed. Shaqwâl, p. 93 n. alif, p. 99 n. hâ; p. 120 n. alif, p. 134 n. alif, p. 174 n. alif.

Since the publication of Perlmann’s critical edition, it is well known that Samawâl had written two versions of İhâm. In his autobiography he reports that he started composing the treatise on the Friday evening following his conversion to Islam on the previous day (Thursday, 9 Dhu l-Hijja 585/8 November 1163), that numerous copies were produced under his supervision, and that he later revised the work substantially: “The book became widely known, its fame was widespread, and numerous copies of it were made under my supervision in many places in the regions of Mosul, Diyarbakr, Iraq, and Persia. Later, I added to it many sections (fuqûl kathîrî) of polemics against the Jews on the basis of the Torah, so that it became an excellent work on polemics against the Jews, the like of which had never been produced in Islam.”31 The early version was presumably completed shortly after 9 Dhu l-Hijja 585/8 November 1163,31 and according to the colophon of the manuscript preserved in Jâlîa, the later version was completed four years later; in the colophon it is stated that the manuscript contains the version that was compiled in 585 together with the additions made by the author himself in 562.31 A different date is given in the colophon of the manuscript in Topkâpi Sarayi 4832 R 506, which was made from an autograph dated 2 Safar 565/24 October 1169;26 Safar 565 is also the date of an autograph indicated in a further copy of the text from Cairo that was used neither by Perlmann nor by Shaqwâl.31 Since we know from his autobiography that Samawâl completed the later version in 562 or perhaps even earlier, the later dates of these colophons suggest that the author himself copied (ed the text repeatedly.

Moshe Perlmann reasonably suggests that the Tehran copy (ms. Majlis 59/4, pp. 177-186) represents the earlier version of the text that was presu-
nably completed in 558. This is supported by the title page to the text. Moreover, many sections contained in other manuscripts he consulted are not included here. There are numerous other differences as to chapter titles, sequence of arguments and texts, wording etc. A further characteristic of this version is that it has the original Hebrew quotations (reproduced, though, in unintelligible form). Yet, Perlmann was mistaken in assuming that the Tehran copy is the earliest of the manuscript copies at his disposal and in concluding that the version of the text as it is preserved in this copy circulated less widely than the later enlarged version and was eventually replaced by it. The entire codex of which the text of Ḥām is part, is a copy, written in 1068/1650, of a codex that Qūṭ al-Dīn Shīrāzī (d. 710/1310) had completed on 30 Rabi’ II 685/24 June 1286 in Konya. The value of this copy is nonetheless considerable; according to the title page and colophon for Ḥām, both formulated by Qūṭ al-Dīn Shīrāzī, he had an autograph of the treatise at his disposal. Moreover, Perlmann was apparently not aware of the identity of Māḥmūd b. Māvūd al-Shīrāzī as being the famous astronomer and philosopher Qūṭ al-Dīn Shīrāzī, who is known to have been very well acquainted with Ibn Kammāna’s quara and who was also deeply influenced by the latter’s writings in philosophy. It is not unlikely that it was through Ibn Kammāna that Qūṭ al-Dīn Shīrāzī had access to Samawāl’s autograph.

Ms. Majlis 593 consists of 203 pp. [from p. 100 onwards, the codex is also foliated, p. 100 being f. 174a], 19 lines to a page, 24.5 x 15.5 cm; it contains the following items: (1) Fragment from an unidentified work, apparently dealing with legal methodology (p. 1); (2) Fragment from an unidentified philosophical work (p. 2); (3) Ibn Kammāna: al-Lum⌈a al-awṣayyiyya fi Ḥām al-ilmiyya wa l-amaliyya (pp. 3-40); (4) Majālis al-Shahrastānī (pp. 40-5-69); (5) Ibn Kammāna: Tanqīḥ al-abḥāḥ il-ilm al-shalālī (pp. 69-178); (6) Samawāl al-Maghribī: Ḥām al-yahyā (pp. 178-196); (7) Naskhī matlul al-wāridat ‘alā Samawāl al-min ba’d al-zanadīqa al-mutafalsihā (pp. 197-200); (8) Naskhī al-jawāh (li Samawāl al-Maghribī) (pp. 201-202); (9) Excerpt from an unidentified philosophical work (pp. 203-205). A microfilm of ms. Majlis 593 is preserved in the Central Library of Tehran University (no. 2230); see Muhammad Taqī Dānishpazhūh: Fihrist-i mikrātīmkhā-yi khāṭfi-yi khitāb-i hānā-yi maraqzī-yi dīnīhā-yī Tīrān 1-3. Tehran 1348-63/1969-84, vol. 1, p. 573.

Moreover, in the light of two other manuscripts of Ḥām that were not known to Perlmann, it appears that the earlier version continued to circulate during the following centuries. The Majlis Library in Tehran holds another copy of the tract and the exchange of letters between Samawāl and his anonymous critic which is part of a codex consisting of writings on philosophy and medicine mostly by Ibn Sīna and originally also by Hippocrates (Iṣwarī) (ms. Majlis 4547).

Ms. Majlis 4547 consists of 174 ff. 19 x 12 cm and contains the following writings: (1) Ibn Sīna: Fi l-ṣari‘a wa l-hujjat al-ṣaḥara (ff. 1b-14b); (2) Ibn Sīna: Risālat al-ṭayyib (ff. 14b-17b); (3) Abu l-Faraj ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Tayyib: Fi l-ṣari‘a wa l-hujjat (ff. 17b-23a); (4) Ibn Sīna: Fi l-radd ilā l-Shaykh Abī l-Faraj Ibn al-Tayyib (ff. 23a-26b); (5) Ibn Sīna: Dastūr tībī (ff. 27a-29a); (6) Ibn Sīna: Fi ‘is̄̄ūl al-ḥinābī l-ghayr al-masghūt l-ḥaṣā (ff. 29a-32b); (7) Ibn Sīna: al-Adwīya al-ṣahābiyya (ff. 33b-61b), dated Rabī’ II 1017/September-October 1602; (8) Ibn Sīna: Tadbīr al-fuṣūl fī l-tadbīr al-tībī (ff. 62a-86b), dated Dhu’l-Qa‘dah 1612; (9) Ibn Sīna: Iṣwarī al-jawī (ff. 86b-87b); (10) Ibn Sīna: Iṣwarī al-jawī (ff. 88b-92b); (11) Ibn Sīna: Fi l-ahlīlā (ff. 92b-97a); (12) Ibn Zayla: Iṣwarī Hāy Ibn Yaṣīn (ff. 97b-102a), dated Dhu‘l-Qa‘dah 1612; (13) Samawāl al-Maghribī: Ḥām al-yahyā (ff. 102b-117b); (14) Samawāl’s correspondence with an anonymous sucer in the same excerpt from an unidentified philosophical work that is also contained in ms. Majlis 593, pp. 202-204; (15) Ibn Sīna: al-Qadd wa l-qadar (ff. 120b-128b), dated 2978.
10
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1021/1610-11; (17) Ibn Siná: Makáhir al-ḥurar wa l-yawfi (f. 128b-136b); (18) Ibn Siná: al-Mahdá' wa l-máád (f. 137a-159a); (19) Ibn Siná: al-Qawá al-mašániyya (f. 159a-173), dated Sha'bán 1021/September-October 1612; (20) Ibn Siná: al-Nabh (f. 174a) [beginning and end missing]. The codex in its present form is evidently incomplete. According to the title pages, it contained originally 16 items, of which the following are lost: (21) Ithbát al-wáji'b [on the basis of a comparison with ms Dá'isíghá 1074 (see infra) it is safe to assume that here Khafir's Ithbát al-wáji'b is meant] (22) Faqúl Buqrát; (23) Tadhkimat al-máshá' (Buqrát) (24) al-Risála al-qabíra (Buqrát) (25) Fawé'd Maší' al-zähl al-misý; (26) F I al-adwa'íya al-mubíhá wa-kasyfíyya is'támi'ííthá (27) Naschát fáníyá'í yí marmiz. The title page has an ownership statement (['Abd Alláh b. Ibrahim Najájí] dated 1210/1601-12. See also al-Háfi z, Fihrist, vol. 12, pp. 219-231. A microfilm of ms. Majílís 4547 is preserved in the Central Library of Tehran University (no. 2794); see Dá'isíghá: Fihrist-i mihríjííí-yí khatá-yí, vol. 1, p. 730.

The on the basis of some colophons throughout the codex, the earliest being Rabi' II 1030/1622 (item no. 7) and the latest being Sha'bán 1021/September-October 1612 (item no. 18), it is safe to assume that it was copied during the early 11th/17th century. The copy of Ithbát and the correspondence contained therein thus predate the production of ms. Majílís 593. According to the colophons at the end of Ithbát and the correspondence, this copy was also taken from the original Shárá'í code. However, it is safe to assume that the Shárá'í code cannot have been the immediate source for the anonymous scribe of ms. Majílís 4547. The text of Ithbát is in complete disorder and the sequence of the text to be restored as follows: f. 102b-103a5, 104a6-105a16, 105a16-104a16, 107a8-110b1, 110b2-113b8, 110a1-112b2, 113b8-end. The frequent interruptions reflect the disorder of the copyist's own textural basis. If he had had the original Shárá'í code at his disposal, the same interruptions would have occurred in ms. Majílís 593, which was copied some 40 years later; yet here the sequence of this text, as well as of all other texts contained therein, is faultless.

At one instance, there is an addition in the margin of the text of Ithbát entitled āsháya li-l-Samaw' al-mangul min khatáfi (f. 105a) This addition is with slight differences identical with a passage of the late recension.

Introduction

Ms. Majílís 4547, f. 105a (hákhiyya)
لا يعلم المخطرات من أن يكون أثرها مفطرًا إذا أثرًا مفطرًا وإن كان مفطرًا في كل الأوقات لله تعالى.

Ms. Majílís 4547, f. 105a (ṣūfíyya)
لا تعلم المخطرات من أن يكون أثرها مفطرًا إذا أثرًا مفطرًا وإن كان مفطرًا في كل الأوقات لله تعالى.

ed. Perlmann, pp. 9:14-10:10
وأيضاً فلا تعلم المخطرات من أن يكون أثرها مفطرًا إذا أثرًا مفطرًا وإن كان مفطرًا في كل الأوقات لله تعالى.

See the following edition.

بدر محمد جمعة
The marginal addition is written by a different hand than the main text. This suggests that a later reader had reached those conclusions at this disposal or at least some of the additional material that is contained in the later recension. In addition, the same of a different later reader of the manuscript, certainly a Jew or a Jewish convert to Islam, wrote in the margins of the manuscript the respective Hebrew quotations from the Bible in immaculate Hebrew letters; the original scribe obviously did not know Hebrew and his attempts to reproduce the original Hebrew quotes are futile. Next to the marginal Hebrew additions there are fully vocalized phonetic transcriptions of the original Hebrew quotations (the transcriptions in the main text are often corrupt). The hand that added the transcriptions in the margins is the same that had written the addition (hishyia) on f. 1053a. This suggests that all marginal additions, Hebrew and Arabic, were inserted by the same hand.

The Central Library of Tehran University owns a ms. Dānishgāh 1074 that apparently originally contained all items contained in ms. Majlis 4547, including Samaw'al's ḳhām and the correspondence, though only partly in the same order. It was copied during the 1060s/1650s, i.e. some 50 years later than ms. Majlis 4547. This suggests that it was either copied from ms. Majlis 4547 or that both copies were transcribed from an earlier codex. Like ms. Majlis 4547, ms. Dānishgāh 1074 is incompletely preserved, and it contains only one page of Samaw'al's ḳhām. This copy of ḳhām is thus another testimony of the early recension of the text.

Ms. Dānishgāh 1074 consists of 332 ff., 18 lines to a page. 10 x 15.5 cm. and contains the following items: (1) Ibn Sinā: Fi l-saʿāda wa l-buḥay al-ʾaṣhara (ff. 1b-18a; see ‘Alī Naqī Munzawī and Muḥammad Taqī Dānishpazūh: Fihris-i nuskhahā-yi Khāṭfī-yi Kutubkhanā-yi Marzāvi wa Markaz-i az牝ād i Dānishgāh-i Tehran 1-, Tehran 1330/1951-, vol. 3, p. 225), dated Rābiʿa 1061/June-July 1651; (2) Ibn Sinā: al-Maḥbūs wa l-māʿālād (ff. 1b-4b; (3) Ibn Sinā: Fi l-kawāl al-najāfīn (ff. 1b-6a); (4) Ibn Sinā: al-Naqī (ff. 6a-b); (5) Khāṭfī: Bīḥār al-wājīb (ff. 7b-a); see ibid., vol. 3, pp. 126-27; (5a) Ṭabīʿi-min kalām al-fāṭīli al-Khāṭfī rahmat Allāh ‘alayhi (ff. 12b-12b; see ibid., vol. 3, p. 517); (6) Ibn Sinā: Risālat al-Taʿrīf (ff. 12a-12a; see ibid., vol. 3, p. 298-99); (7) Ibn al-Taṣyıbī: Fi l-kawāl al-taḥfīz (ff. 12b-133; see ibid., vol. 3, pp. 319-20); (8) Ibn Sinā: Fi l-radd ʿilā l-Shaykh Abī l-Faraj Ibn Tayyīb [Ṭabīʿi] (ff. 13a-13a; see ibid., vol. 3, pp. 72-73); (9) Ibn Sinā: Dastār ḥish (ff. 13b-14a; see ibid., vol. 4, pp. 753-54); (10) Ibn Sinā: Risāla fī istiʿāl al-hindībī al-qāhir al-mashgūd l-mal (ff. 14b-15b; see ibid., vol. 4, pp. 813-15); (11) Ibn Sinā: al-ʿAdīya al-qubālīyya (ff. 15a-b; see ibid., vol. 4, pp. 180-181), dated fi awākhir shahr Ramadān; (12) Ibn Sinā: Tadārak al-khāṭfī fī l-taḥdīr al-tībbī (ff. 18a-23b), dated fi shahr al-Shawwāl; (13) Ibn Sinā: Istiḥāda al-jaw (ff. 21b-21b; see ibid., vol. 3, pp. 142); (14) Ibn Sinā: Ḱayyib Ibn Yaqūq (ff. 21a-22b; see ibid., vol. 3, pp. 256-75); (16) Ibn Sinā: Risāla fī l-kawālī (ff. 22a-22b; see ibid., vol. 3, pp. 647-651); (17) Ibn Sinā: Taṣfīr Hāy Ibn Yaqūq (ff. 22a-23a; see ibid., vol. 3, p. 209); dated fi shahr Shawkāl; (18) Samawʾal al-Maghribī: ḳhām al-ulhād (fragment of one page) (ff. 23a-23b; see ibid., vol. 3, p. 757). According to the title page of the manuscript, there were seven more items in this codex which are lost, namely (19) Samawʾal’s correspondence with his anonymous accuser; (20) Ibn Sinā: al-Qaḍāʾ wa l-qadar; (21) Ibn Sinā: ḵayyīn būḥīt al-sawt; (22) ḵayyīn būḥīt al-sawt; (23) Fi l-ʿadīya al-mashīla wa ḵayyīn būḥīt istiʿāl al-mashīla (24) Nuskhā farangī-yi marmāz.

It is possible that the codex preserved in Istanbul, ms. Fahīt 3141, copied by Qub al-Dīn al-Shirāzī’s student Tāj al-Dīn al-Kirmānī, is another copy of the original Shirāzī codex, since it contains most of the writings that are also included in the copy of the codex from the 11th/17th century. Moreover, the similarity of the versions of this manuscript’s Tanqīf and al-ʿLaʾm al-ʾawwāmīyya preserved in ms. Majlis 593 and Fahīt 3141 further suggests that the copyist of this ms. Fahīt 3141, Qub al-Dīn al-Shirāzī’s student Tāj al-Dīn al-Kirmānī, had taken his copy of the Tanqīf from Qub al-Dīn Shirāzī. Unfortunately, the codex is incompletely preserved, and the sequence of the folios is in disorder. It contains the exchanges of letters between Samawʾal and his anonymous accuser, and it is likely that the codex originally also contained a copy of the early recension of ḳhām al-ulhād.

Fahīt 3141 (293 ff., 20 lines to a page, 8 x 16,5 cm.) contains the following items: (1) Ibn Kirmānī: Kāhiba (ff. 2b-158; see Ibrāhīm Maḥfūz al-Khāṭfī: Baghdad 1432/1951, pp. 451-548); (2) Ibn Kirmānī: Tanqīf (ff. 159-172; see ibid., pp. 533-536); (3) Ibn Kirmānī: Tanqīf (ff. 173-201; see ibid., pp. 536-536; incomplete in the end; (2) Ibn Kirmānī:


43 Ms. Fahīt 3115 (ff. 264-63), Carl Brockelmann (GAI. 1:431) erroneously states that those two leaves contain the reply by Ibn Kirmānī to a question why he converted to Islam.

42 This also holds true for a later reader of ms. Majlis 593. The introduction has some marginal corrections that correspond to the later recension.
Part One


That there must have been numerous copies of the earlier version of the tract is also indicated by Samaw'al al-Maghribi, who writes in his autobiography that numerous copies of it were made under his supervision in many places in the regions of Mosul, Diyārbakır, Iraq, and Persia.45

In addition to the manuscript evidence,46 the lasting impact of the early recension in the Eastern lands of Islam can be seen from later polemical writings for the composition of which the respective authors evidently made use of the early recension of Ifḥām. This is the case in an anonymous polemical tract against Judaism, written between 694/1295 and 812/1409-10, entitled ibḥābat al-nabawawwa,47 and in the comprehensive polemical work by Muhammad 'Ali Bihābahānī's Rūdūd al-shubahāt al-kaffār, composed in 1215/1800-1.48

On the basis of our knowledge of the extant manuscripts of Ifḥām and of the reception of the work in its two recensions, it is to be tentatively suggested that in the East the earlier version seems to have been more widespread whereas farther West (the manuscripts supporting this suggestion are located in or originate from Cairo, Damascus, and Jaffa) the longer version was apparently more popular – or may here have been the only version that was known at all.49

---

46 It appears that there is an additional copy of the early recension of Ifḥām al-yahdād preserved in a codex that originally belonged to the collection of Dr. Husayn 'Ali Majlisī in Kazīmiyya which is now part of Saddam Manuscripts Library in Baghdad and which was apparently copied in the 16th century from ms. Majlis 593. This is stated by Muhammad Karīm Zanjānī Aslī in the introduction to his forthcoming edition of Ibn Kamānīa's Tanqīḥ al-ḥabhāt.
47 See Pourjavady and Schmidke: “Kībat fi Ifḥābat al-Nabawawwā (ms. Hamidiyye no. 1447/3) (As n. 2).
48 See Pourjavady and Schmidke: “Muslim Polemics against Judaism and Christianity in 18th century Iran.” (As n. 8).
49 This is also supported by a fragment from the Firkovitch Collection (St. Petersburg) which contains portions of the late recension of the text in Hebrew letters and parts of a refutation of the text written apparently by a Rabbinite author of the 13th century. It is likely that the fragment (RNL II Firk. Yevr. Arab 1 3220) comes from the Ben Ezra Genizah in Cairo. We are grateful to Ibrahim Chiesa for having pointed out this manuscript to us.

---

The Manuscripts

The Manuscripts50

Most of the manuscripts that were available to Moshe Perlmann represent the later recension of the text. He therefore decided to edit this version and to mention the variants of the earlier version on the basis of ms. Majlis 593 in his apparatus criticus. Given that the early version is much more significant than Perlmann could have known on the basis of the material that was at his disposal and in view of the additional manuscripts of the early version that are described above, the text of the early version has been re-edited here on the basis of the following three manuscripts:

| | ms. Majlis 593, pp. 178-199:16 |
| | ms. Majlis 4547, ff. 102b-117b (sequence of text: ff. 102b-103a6, 104a15-107a16, 107a6-104a16, 107a16-110a1, 112b1-113a8, 110a11-112b2, 113b8-endl) |
| | ms. Dānishgāh 1074, f. 33b containing only the introduction of the text |

Following the tradition of the manuscripts that the early version is as a rule accompanied by the correspondence, the two letters also have been re-edited here. Of the manuscripts that were consulted for this purpose, the first two mentioned were already available to Moshe Perlmann:

| | ms. Majlis 593, pp. 100-102:16 |
| | ms. Fātīh 3141, ff. 264a-265b |
| | ms. Majlis 4547, ff. 118a-120a:6 |

---

50 Thanks are due to the Majlis-i Shāhārī Islāmī Library, Tehran, the owner of ms. Majlis 593 and 4547, and the Central Library of Tehran University, the owner of ms. Dānishgāh 1074, for having granted the permission to publish the editions on the basis of these manuscripts and to publish facsimiles of them.