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(Story of Adam)


(4)-(6) Abridged version from Tabari, Jami' al-bayān, I, 201-2, which shows Tārafi's use: he prefers to cut out sentences from a wider context and divides the material into approximate chapters. Regarding the kingdom of the jinn before man, here only hinted at, there are many traditions: cf. Ishāq b. Bishr, Muhitad'ī, 38b f.; Qiṣṣas al-anbiyā', Ms Berlin Or. quart. 1171, 137b: with the name of Iblīs' wife); Hayšam, Qiṣṣas, 12a: including the names of some prophets sent to the jinn; Maqdissi, al-Bad', II, 60; Ibn al-Wardi, Kharidat, 245; Ibn Hishām, Kitāb al-tājil, 11f.; Siyar al-anbiyā', 3b; and see also the discussion in Kister, "Ādam", 121. These traditions are closely related to the question of the nature of Iblīs, i.e. whether he was a jinnī or an angel. Tabari, in his Ta'rīkh, I, 78-86 (transl. Rosenthal, I, 249-257), mentions several reports. For other interesting reports, see Kisā'ī, Qiṣṣas, 22; Rāwandi, Qiṣṣas, 36-7; Ibn Kathir, al-Bidāya, I, 55, 71f.; Ps.-Mas'ūdī, Akhbar, 11f.; Ps.-Asma'ī, Qiṣṣas, 5b; and the comprehensive discussion in Kister, "Ādam", 119-23.

The creation of Adam on Friday is mentioned in hadith collections; cf. Schöck, Adam im Islam, 63-6. Some traditions enumerate the qualities (khisāl) of the day, including that it was the day of creation of Adam; see Ahmad b. Hanbal, Musnad, II, 537 no. 10307, V, 292-3 no. 15548: five khisāl; Nisābūri, al-Mustadrak, II, 593 no. 3999; Tabari, Ta'rīkh, I, 111-2 and other traditions on Friday in I, 20, 46-7, 54; Kisā'ī, Qiṣṣas, 16, 51; Siyar al-anbiyā', 11a-11b; 'Abd al-Malik b. Ḥabbīb, Kitāb al-ta'rīkh, 25 no. 38; Ibn al-Athir, al-Kāmil, I, 35; Bayhaqi, Kitāb fadā'īl, 462; Ibn al-Jawzi, al-Muntazam, I, 199-200; Ibn Kathir, al-Bidāya, I, 80; Bayhaqi, Ḥayat, 22-4. A tradition from Wahh in Ibn Iyās, Qiṣṣas, 10, maintains that Friday (jum'a) was given this name because on that day the clay for Adam's creation was gathered (jama'a).

The definition of Adam's creation 'alā 'ajal is an exegetical reading of Qur. 21:37: khuliga al-insān min 'ajal. Tārafi mentions here the interpretation given by Tabari, Jami' al-bayān, XVII, 27, and not the one in Ibn Qutayba quoted by the same Tārafi in his al-Qutayn, II, 20: khuligat al-'ajala fi al-insān. But this interpretation should not be attributed to Ibn Qutayba, since it goes back to Abū 'Ubayda, Majāz al-Qur'ān, II, 38-9, as Ibn Qutayba himself states in his Ta'wil mushkil al-Qur'an, Beirut 1981, 197-8. Cf. also the interpretations collected by Ibn 'Asākir, Ta'rīkh, II, 616, 618; 'Abdallāh b. Wahh, Tafsīr, 254; Ps.-
Masʿūdi, Akhbār, 5. Qurʾānic data regarding the creation of man and the exegetical explanations are discussed by Schöck, Adam im Islam, 74f.; Beck, “Iblis und Mensch”, 195-202; O’Shaughnessy, Creation and the Teaching of the Qurʾān, 12f.

(7) From Tabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, I, 203, 211, with some slight modifications. Regarding the presence of the jinn on earth before man, see above (§§ 4-6). The name of this tribe of angels is recorded in some traditions as al-ḥinn instead of al-jinn – a name already discussed by Kister, “Ādam”, 120f.; see also Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir̲āt, 125: al-ḥinn is the original name, but below, on the same page, another tradition states: first there was a group on earth called al-ḥinn, then another group ruled after them, called al-binn, and then, finally, al-jinn. Regarding these names cf. also the various traditions given by Ibn al-Dawādārī, Kanz, I, 230; Hāyṣam, Qīṣāṣ, 25b; Ibn Iyās, Qīṣāṣ, 35-6; Masʿūdi, Murūj, §1340; and cf. Ibn Abī Ḫudhayba, Qīṣāṣ, 2b; Hijrī, Qīṣāṣ, 25b. On the question see also Lo Jacono, “Di alcune peculiariità dei ḡinn”, 187.

(8)-(9) Almost completely from Tabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, I, 203, and cf. Id., Taʿrīkh, I, 87-88 (transl. Rosenthal, I, 258-9). All the sources mention three angels sent to the earth, but some others add a fourth angel, Isrāfīl, see Shāṭibi, Kitāb al-jumān, 5a; Diyārbakrī, Taʿrīkh, 36; Rāwandi, Qīṣāṣ, 42; Hāyṣam, Qīṣāṣ, 12b; Qīṣāṣ al-anbiyāʾ, Ms Berlin Or. quart. 1171, 138b; Ḥusaynī, Qīṣāṣ, 6a-6b; cf. also the comprehensive discussion in Kister, “Ādam”, 132-5. This report is also mentioned in the major ḥadīth collections, see Schöck, Adam im Islam, 67-8; and Schwarzbauern, “A Falasha creation myth”, 43-4. For further particulars and reports, see Qīṣāṣ al-anbiyāʾ, Ms Berlin Or. quart. 1171, 138a-138b; Kīshānī, Qīṣāṣ, 22-4; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 11a f.; and cf. Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʿrīkh, II, 615-6, including a report in which they were three, but not Gabriel; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, I, 85-6; Ps.-ʾAṣmaʾi, Qīṣāṣ, 6a. According to other sources, it could have been Iblīs that picked up the earth instead of the Angel of Death, see Ṭabarī, Taʿrīkh, I, 88; Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʿrīkh, II, 616; Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Tabsīra, 14. It is also said that when Iblīs discovered God’s intention to create man, he came down to earth and incited the earth to resist: see Mujīr al-Dīm, al-Uṣn, I, 16; and cf. Calasso, “L’intervento di Iblīs”, 71-90.

(10) Abridged from Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, I, 203 and 202, and cf. Id., Taʿrīkh, I, 90 and 92 (transl. Rosenthal, I, 262 and 264). Regarding the question of whether God created man with His hands, see Kister, “Ādam”, 135-137. There are differing versions about the period for which Adam’s body was abandoned; see Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʿrīkh, II, 618: forty days; Shāṭibi, Kitāb al-jumān, 5b: forty days plus another forty days. Almost all the sources state that this period was of forty years: Ṭabarī, Taʿrīkh, I, 89f.; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, I, 86; Ps.-ʾAṣmaʾi, Qīṣāṣ, 6b; Hāyṣam, Qīṣāṣ, 13a; Maqdisī, al-Badʾ, II, 86; Ibn Saʿd, Kitāb al-

(11) Abridged from Šabbarī, \textit{Jāmiʾ al-bayān}, I, 203 and 202, and cf. Id., \textit{Ṭarīkh}, I, 92 (transl. Rosenthal, I, 263). According to all the sources \textit{al-ḥamdul-llāh} were the first words pronounced by Adam. But see Ibn ʿAsākir, \textit{Ṭaʾarīkh}, II, 616, 618: it was the angels who suggested to Adam to say this.

(12) First part until the quotation of Qur. 2:30 from Šabbarī, \textit{Jāmiʾ al-bayān}, I, 202, and cf. Id., \textit{Ṭaʾarīkh}, I, 92-3 (transl. Rosenthal, I, 264-5); the rest is abridged from Šabbarī, \textit{Jāmiʾ al-bayān}, I, 204-5. In some commentaries and other sources, the devil's argument, i.e. that he was superior to Adam because he was created from fire, is considered the first case of qiyās; see in general Kūsā'ī, \textit{Qīṣās}, 27; and Kister, "Adam", 163. Cf. also Ibn Iyās, \textit{Qīṣās}, 39; Maqdisī, \textit{al-Badā'}, II, 88-9; Iṣḥāq b. Bishr, \textit{Mubtada'}, 40a, 42b-43a; Ibn ʿAsākir, \textit{Ṭaʾarīkh}, II, 625f., Ibn Kathīr, \textit{al-Bidāya}, I, 72; Hayṣam, \textit{Qīṣās}, 13b-14b; \textit{Qīṣās al-anbiyā'}, Ms Berlin Or. quart. 1171, 139b: God makes the angels prostrate themselves twice.

(13) All the exegetical questions are widely discussed by Šabbarī, \textit{Jāmiʾ al-bayān}, I, 204f.; about this subject cf. also Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, \textit{Mīrāt}, 187f. Ṭarāfi tries to justify the angels' objection which is strongly condemned by Shiʿis, see for instance Mašlīsī, \textit{Bihār}, XI, 124f.

(14) From Šabbarī, \textit{Jāmiʾ al-bayān}, I, 205.


(17)-(22) Abridged version, with some slight differences, from Šabbarī, \textit{Jāmiʾ al-bayān}, I, 224-6 (and cf. also the commentary to Qur. 18:50 at XV, 259f.), and cf. Id., \textit{Ṭaʾarīkh}, I, 83 (transl. Rosenthal, I, 83). The question of the nature of


(27) I was unable to locate the source of this passage. Something similar can be found in Ṭabarānī, *Jāmiʾ al-bayān*, IV, 224, and cf. Id., *Taʾrikh*, I, 103 (transl. Rosenthal, I, 274), commenting upon Qur. 4:1, in a report from Mujāhid included in his *Taḥsīr* (I, 143); cf. also Hūd b. Muḥakkam, *Taḥsīr*, I, 345; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Taḥsīr*, III, 853 no. 4719; Ibn Saʾd, *Kitāb al-ṭabaqāt*, V/1, 16; Suyūṭī,

(28) Ṭabarī mentions some of the most common interpretations about the tree. For further different identifications of the tree, see Thaʿlabī, Qīṣaṣ, 30; ʿIsḥāq b. Bīshr, Mubtadaʿ, 44a; Siyar an-nabīya, 14b; Qīṣaṣ al-anbiyāʾ, Ms Berlin Or. quart. 1171, 146a; Ḥayyam, Qīṣaṣ, 15a; ʿAḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Kitāb al-zuhd, 81: al-daʿaʾ, similar to wheat; ʿAbdallāh b. Wahb, Taṣfīr, 196: grapes; Sībī Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirrāt, 196; Kīsāʾi, Qīṣaṣ, 39-41: seven ears. Regarding this tree see also Kister, ʿAdam, 146-147; Schöck, Adam im Islam, 109.

(29)-(30) Abridged from Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, I, 231, 235; the second part is also in Taʾrīkh, I, 105-6 (transl. Rosenthal, I, 277). For more particulars see Kīsāʾi, Qīṣaṣ, 35f.; ʿIsḥāq b. Bīshr, Mubtadaʿ, 45a. Some reports mention the peacock along with the serpent and Iblīs, see, for ex., Thaʿlabī, Qīṣaṣ, 30-1; Qīṣaṣ al-anbiyāʾ, Ms Berlin Or. quart. 1171, 142a-142b; Nuwayrī, Nihāyat, XIII, 15-6; ʿUṣrī, Qīṣaṣ, 36b. The serpent, usually described as the most beautiful animal before the fall, is not mentioned in the Qurʾān. Ṭabarī hints briefly at the light of Adam and Eve in paradise. Some sources mention this and describe a shining dress of which human nails are a residue; see Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, I, 105 (transl. Rosenthal, 276 n. 677); ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ḥabīb, Kitāb al-taʾrīkh, 20 no. 24; Qīṣaṣ al-anbiyāʾ, Ms Berlin Or. quart. 1171, 144b, 143b; Ps.-Aḥṣamī, Nihāyat, 3b; ʿAḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Kitāb al-zuhd, 81; Thaʿlabī, Qīṣaṣ, 32; see also Yaʿqūbī, Taʾrīkh, I, 5; Sībī Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirrāt, 198; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, I, 78; Ps.-Masʿūdī, Akhbār, 48. See Castillo, "La creation de Adan"; Schöck, Adam im Islam, 111-114; Déclais, "La tenue d'Adam"; Ricks, "The garment of Adam"; and Rubin, "Pre-existence and light", 96-7, about the relevance for Shiʿis of these traditions.


(33) From Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, I, 237, 240; about the first part ascribed to (Saʿid) Ibn al-Musayyab, see also Id., Taʾrīkh, I, 109-10 (transl. Rosenthal, I, 281, and Newby, The Making of the Last Prophet, 37). The same report, with a complete isnād, is in Thaʿlabī, Qīṣaṣ, 31. See also the sources mentioned by Schöck, Adam im Islam, 108. Regarding their enmity, see Thaʿlabī, Qīṣaṣ, 33; ʿIsḥāq b. Bīshr, Mubtadaʿ, 51b-52a.

(34) From Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, I, 240. Some hadiths attributed to Abū Hurayra – with a similar wording to this one quoted by Ṭabarī – mention the duty of the true Muslim to kill the serpent: ʿAḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, III, 46 no. 7370,
427 no. 9594, 607 no. 10746, differing texts; Abü Dawūd, Sunan, IV, 365 no. 5248. See, on this topic, Canova, “Serpenti e scorpioni”, in part. 195f.

(35)-(36) From various exegetical traditions from Ṭabarî, Taʾrīkh, I, 132 (transl. Rosenthal, I, 302), and Id., Jāmiʿ al-bayān, 242-3, 244-5; the second part, from Mujāhid, of § 36, is also quoted in Ishāq b. Bishr, Mubtadaʾ, 54b. Many traditions discuss Qur. 2:37 and these kalīmāt, cf. Muqāṭil, Tafsīr, I, 99-100; Thaʿlabī, Qiṣaṣ, 35; Ibn Iyās, Qiṣaṣ, 44; Ishāq b. Bishr, Mubtadaʾ, 54a f.; Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʾrīkh, II, 643-5; Ibn Kathîr, al-Bidāya, I, 80-1. Some Shiʿī traditions maintain that the words uttered by God to Adam were the names of the members of Muḥammad’s family: the Prophet himself, ʿAlī, Fātimah, al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn, see Majlisi, Biḥār, XI, 175-7; Ṭibrīsī, Majmaʾ al-bayān, I, 112-3, who also mentions the tradition of Mujāhid. Contrasting reports are also quoted by Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 205-6; Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʾrīkh, II, 645; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Tafsīr, I, 90-1; Samarqandi, Tafsīr, I, 112; Qiṣaṣ al-anbiyāʾ, Ms Berlin Or. quart. 1171, 144a.

(37) This ḥadīth is not mentioned by Ṭabarî. Differing versions list the period of Adam’s affliction as 40 days, or 40, 100, 200 and 300 years, such as in the following tradition of al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī. Adam’s affliction consisted of weeping during a long prostration, see for ex. Kīsāʾi, Qiṣaṣ, 51, 53; Thaʿlabī, Qiṣaṣ, 35; Ṭabarî, Taʾrīkh, I, 133; Ishāq b. Bishr, Mubtadaʾ, 49b f.; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 17a-17b; Ibn Saʿd, Kitāb al-tabaqāt, I/1, 10; Rāwandī, Qiṣaṣ, 49; ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ḥabīb, Kitāb al-taʾrīkh, 34 no. 59; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, I, 141-2; Schöck, Adam im Islam, 124-5.

(38) The version of 300 years is included in Ibn Saʿd, Kitāb al-tabaqāt, I/1, 10; see also in al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, Tafsīr, I, 188, from the Durr of Suyūṭī; and see also in Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 17a and Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʾrīkh, II, 635. Regarding the expulsion of Adam from paradise see Ṭabarî, Taʾrīkh, I, 115f., and in part. 119: Adam left paradise between the noon and the afternoon prayers, from Ibn Saʿd. Traditions usually give many differing versions regarding the places where Adam, Eve, the snake and Iblīs came down from heaven. The most common places where Adam came down are India, Sarandīb (Ceylon), Daḥnāʾ, al-Dahnaj, al-Mandal, al-Rāḥūn or a wādī called Nūd(dh)/Nawd/Bawd; regarding the last name, various orthographical variants are attested, see Schöck, Adam im Islam, 117; Abbott, Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri, I, 42; Castillo, “Aportacion a la mitica historia de Adan y Eva”, part I, 52; Lidzbarski, De propheticis, 15. See Yāqūṭ, Muʾjam al-buldān, V, 358: Nawdh; Nuwayrī, Nihāyat, XIII, 22: Būdh; Şaṭîbī, Kitāb al-jumān, 7a: Būdā; Ibn al-Jawzī, Talbis Iblīs, 63; Qudāʾi, Taʾrīkh, 68: Bawdī. Regarding other versions similar to the name given by Ṭarāfī (Rāṣim), see the sources quoted in Tottoli, “Ibn Muṭarrif al-Ṭarafī”, 146; and Qudāʾi, Taʾrīkh, 68: Wāshīm. The place where Eve came


(41) The first part is from Ṭabarī, *Jāmiʿ al-bayān*, I, 547, with some slight differences (e.g. the attribution to ʿAbdallāh b. ʿAmr instead of Ibn ʿAbbās). Interesting versions about the matter can be found in Išāq b. Bishr, *Mubtada’*, 55b, 59b; see also Ibn ʿAsākir, *Taʾrīkh*, II, 637-43; Ḥayṣam, *Qīsas*, 17a; Nuwayrī, *Nihāyat*, XIII, 25-7; *Qīsas al-anbiyāʾ*, Ms Berlin Or. quart. 1171, 145b-146a. The story that the contact with impure people and menstruating women caused the stone to be blackened is attested in many traditions, see for ex. Ṭabarī, *Taʾrīkh*, I, 133.

(42) From Ṭabarī, *Jāmiʿ al-bayān*, I, 546, but with different mountain names. The most widespread list of names gives al-Ḥirāʾ, Mount of Olives, Sinai, Lebanon and al-Jūdī, see for ex. ʿAbd al-Razzāq, *al-Muṣannaf*, V, 92 no. 9092; Išāq b.
The list of names given by Ṭarāfī is attested in Azraqī, Akhbār Makka, I, 63 (transl. Tottoli, 25), with Jabal al-Ahmār instead of al-Ḥamr, and from here is taken by Suyūṭī, al-Durr, I, 316, together with the most common list of names. For further indications, cf. Azraqī, Akhbār Makka, transl. Tottoli, La Kaʿbah, 15 n. 20, and the differing versions collected by Majlisī, Biḥār, XI, 197.

(43) The first part from Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, I, 547, and also in Id., Taʿrīkh, I, 121-2 (transl. Rosenthal I, 293) and ʿAbd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, V, 91 no. 9090. Regarding this tradition, see Kister, “ʿAdam”, 139; Schöck, Adam im Islam, 115. The final part of this report is in Ṭabarī, Taʿrīkh, I, 123 (transl. Rosenthal, I, 294), and Ibn Saʿd, Kitāb al-ṭabaqāt, I/1, 13. Some traditions add that God reduced Adam’s original stature to sixty cubits, see in fact other versions of the story in Thaʿlabī, Qīṣaṣ, 34-5, 86; Ṭabarī, Taʿrīkh, I, 122f.; Ibn Iyās, Qīṣaṣ, 43; Maqdisī, al-Badʾ, II, 99. The particular of the sixty cubits, omitted by Ṭarāfī, is already attested in some ḥadīths; cf. the sources quoted in Schöck, Adam im Islam, 66f., and collected in Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʿrīkh, II, 628-9. A report in Majlisī, Biḥār, XI, 127, states that Adam was seventy cubits tall and Eve thirty five cubits.


(46)-(47) Only the final part is in Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, VI, 186-7, and Taʿrīkh, I, 143 (transl. Rosenthal, I, 313-4). A similar tradition is in Thaʿlabī, Qīṣaṣ, 44-45. The names of the wives of Abel and Cain given by Ṭarāfī are orthographical variations of the two most common versions: Iqlīmā and Labūdā. For a discussion of all the variants of their names and other related matters, such as the forty pregnancies of Eve and the other son called ʿAbd al-Ḥarīth (cf. for ex. Nisābūrī, al-Mustadrak, II, 594 no. 4003), see Tottoli, “ʿIbn Muṭarrīf al-Ṭarafī”, 147, and the sources quoted there. For parallels in Syriac literature, see
Stillman, “The Story of Cain and Abel”, 234; Decourdemanche, “La légende de Adam”, 378); and above all Borg-Qaysieh, *Kain und Abel*, 25-58, about the names: 34-35; and Zilio-Grandi, “La figure de Cain dans le Coran”.


Regarding the place where he was buried, it is usually considered Jerusalem, where Noah brought his mortal remains. See *Tabari*, *Ta‘rîkh*, 163; Tha‘labi, *Qisas*, 48; Ps.-Asma‘î, *Nihâyat*, 12a; 4lusaynî, *Qisas*, 18b: Mecca before Noah brought his remains to the Holy Land; Ibn ‘Asâkir, *Ta‘rîkh*, II, 655; Sibît Ibn al-Jawzî, *Mira‘at*, 222. Before the final destination, other places are mentioned:
India, Ceylon, Mt. Abū Qubays, or the mosque of al-Khayf, see Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 23a; Masʿūdī, Murāj, I, 41; Ibn Qutayba, al-Maʿārif, 19; Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntaẓam, 228; and cf. Kister, “Ādam”, 171-172.

(50) The sequence of the prophets he encountered in the heavens is that attested in the hadith from (Qatāda–) Anas b. Mālik (–Mālik b. Ṣaʿṣāʾa) : Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīh, IV, 413-15 no. 3207, IV, 628-30 no. 3887; Muslim, Ṣaḥīh, I, 145-7 no. 162, I, 1, 49-51 no. 164; Nasāʾī, Sunan, I, 178-82; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, IV, 297-8 no. 12507, VI, 249-53 no. 17850, 17852. See also Schön, Adam im Islam, 147-53.

(51) Only some particulars regarding the appearance of Adam are quoted in the sources. The most quoted and debated is that regarding whether he had his beard in paradise or if it grew as punishment after the fall, see Tottoli, “Ibn Mutarrif al-Ṭarafi”, 151 n. 100, the sources quoted there and Qaramānī, Akhbar al-duwal, 43. About the question, see also the considerations by Kister, “Ādam”, 139-40; and Castillo, “Aportacion a la mitica historia”, part II, 47-8.

(Story of Idrīs)

(52) Idrīs is only mentioned in Qur. 19:56 and 21:85. A long physical description of Idrīs is in Ps.-Ašmaʾ, Nihāyat, 8a; Rāwandi, Qīṣāṣ, 78. About his identification (Enoch, Andreas or Hermes) and the related problems, see Nöldeke, “Idrīs”; Casanova, “Idrīs et Ouzair”, 356, 358; Tottoli, Biblical Prophets, 43-4; and above all Alexander, “Jewish tradition in early Islam”; Castillo, “El profeta Idrīs”, 125-136; Erder, “The origin of the name Idrīs”, 340-341; Finkel, “Jewish, Christian, and Samaritan”, 154f.

(53) From Iṣḥāq b. Bishr, Mubtadaʾ, 86b-87a, with slight differences and a few omissions (for ex. Ibn ʿAbbas is the transmitter of the report in Iṣḥāq b. Bishr). For differing stories, see Thaʿlabī, Qīṣāṣ, 49; Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 228; Ḥijrī, Qīṣāṣ, 83a f. ʿTarafi mentions some of the most widespread awāʾil connected to the figure of Idrīs. The most interesting is that considering Idrīs as the first messenger or prophet (after Adam), see Iṣḥāq b. Bishr, Mubtadaʾ, 81a, 83a; and cf. Suyūṭī, al-Wasāʾil, 18; and Id., al-Durr, V, 524; Ibn Saʿd, Kitāb al-tabaqāt, I, 27. The question is connected to the prophecy of Adam, cf. Schöck, Adam im Islam, 133f. This tradition pointing to Idrīs as the first messenger is usually added that he was the first among Adam’s offspring, see for ex. Ibn Hishām, al-Sīra, I, 3; Maqdisī, al-Badʾ, III, 11; Nisābūrī, al-Mustadrak, II, 598 no. 4014; Qīṣāṣ al-anbiyāʾ, Ms Paris ar. 1924, 2a; Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 226; Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntaẓam, I, 233. According to Dīnawarī, Kīthāb al-akhbār, 3, Ibn Kathir, al-Bidāya, I, 99, and some other reports, Idrīs was the prophet following Adam and also Seth. About the question see also Tottoli, “A proposito di un
recente studio su Adamo”, 438. Regarding the awā’il of Idrīs see Kisāʿī, Qīṣāṣ, 81-2, and 69: but the first to write was Adam (cf. in fact Maqdisi, al-Badʾ, III, 11; Diyarbakrī, Taʾrīkh, I, 66; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 19b); Thaʿlabī, Qīṣāṣ, 49; Ibn Iyās, Qīṣāṣ, 51; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 24b-25a; Ibn al-Ḥarīrī, ʿUmdat, 45a; Masʿūdi, Murūj, I, 43; Nuwayrī, Nihāyat, XIII, 38; Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 226-7; Majlīsī, Biḥār, XI, 279-80; Shiblī, Maḥāsin, 129, 133; Quḍāʾī, Taʾrīkh, 74.

The thirty books/sheets (ṣaḥīfa) revealed to Idrīs are usually mentioned in a tradition which deals with the 104 books revealed to the prophets; see Ibn Qutayba, al-Maʿārif, 20-21; ʿUmāra b. Wathima, Kitāb ʿudl al-khalq, 11; Ḥijrī, Qīṣāṣ, 1b; Maqdisī, al-Badʾ, III, 2; Nuwayrī, Nihāyat, XIII, 38; Masʿūdi, Murūj, I, 43; Ibn Iyās, Qīṣāṣ, 192; books are 110; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 24b on the margin; Thaʿlabī, Qīṣāṣ, 100; Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, I, 350; and see the annotations on §§ 144-146. Only about the thirty books of Idrīs, see Ibn Iyās, Qīṣāṣ, 51; Diyarbakrī, Taʾrīkh, I, 66; Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 226; Ps.-Masʿūdi, Akhbār, 54; Hayṣam, Qīṣāṣ, 22b; Ps.-Aṣmaʾī, Qīṣāṣ, 9a; Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntazam, I, 234; Majlīsī, Biḥār, XI, 277, 279; Kisāʿī, Qīṣāṣ, 81; Thaʿlabī, Qīṣāṣ, 100; Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, I, 173, 174, 350.

Most of the sources specify that the name of Idrīs was Akhnūkh (Enoch), sometimes with orthographical variants such as Ḫanūkh/Ḫanūkh. Differing versions are also attested concerning the name of his father, Yarīd/Yarīdūr or Barīd, while Ṭarāfī has Yārād (see also in Noah’s genealogy). Regarding these names, see Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, I, 172; Ibn Saʿd, Kitāb al-ṭabaqāt, 1/1, 16; Thaʿlabī, Qīṣāṣ, 49; Mujīr al-Dīn, al-Uns, I, 19; Abū al-Fīdāʾ, Kitāb al-mukhtaṣar, I, 17; ʿAbd al-Bāṣīṭ, Taʾrīkh al-anbiyāʾ, 34; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, I, 59-60; Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntazam, I, 233; Abrégé des Merveilles, 95.


(55)-(56) I was unable to identify the source of this passage, but other sources include similar reports, see for ex. Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntazam, I, 234. Further interesting versions are in Iṣḥāq b. Bishr, Mubtadaʾ, 89b f.; Kisāʿī, Qīṣāṣ, 83f.; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, V, 519-22; Ḥijrī, Qīṣāṣ, 84a f.; Qīṣāṣ al-anbiyāʾ, Ms Berlin Or. quart. 1171, 153b-155b; Ps.-Aṣmaʾī, Nihāyat, 8a f.; Hayṣam, Qīṣāṣ, 23b f.

(57)-(59) From Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XVI, 96-7. Contrasting reports dispute whether Idrīs is in the fourth or sixth heaven and whether he is alive. See Muqāṭīl, Tafsīr, II, 631: the fourth heaven where he died; Ḥūd b. Muhākkam, Tafsīr, III, 18; Mujāhid, Tafsīr, I, 387: no indication of which heaven and he did not in fact die such as was the case of Jesus, but the indication of the fourth
heaven is nevertheless attributed to Mujāhid in later sources; see already in Sufyān al-Thawrī, Ṭafsīr, 186; cf. also Ṭabarī, Jāmi‘ al-bayān, XVI, 97; and the report in ‘Abdallāh b. Wahb, Ṭafsīr, 218. According to Ibn Hishām, Kitāb al-tijān, 29, Idrīs lived 365 years and was elevated to the seventh heaven. See the various versions collected by Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Ṭabsīra, 50; Ishāq b. Bishr, Mubtada’, 91a, 94b f.; Rāwandi, Qīṣaṣ, 77; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, V, 518-9, 524; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir‘āt, 227; Majlisi, Bihār, XI, 270, 277. A tradition states there are two prophets alive in heaven: Jesus and Idrīs, and there are two alive on earth: Elijah and al-Khiḍr; see Tha‘labī, Qīṣaṣ, 260; Siyar an-nabiyyā’, 26a, 126b; Diyarbakrī, Ta‘rīkh, I, 67; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir‘āt, 228; and see also the annotations on § 478.

(Story of Noah)

(60)-(61) Name of Noah and a part of § 60 from Ishāq b. Bishr, Mubtada’, 99b. The tradition ascribed to ‘Awn b. Abi Shaddād is taken from Ṭabarī, Jāmi‘ al-bayān, XX, 135, and Id., Ta‘rīkh, I, 185; cf. also Suyūṭī, al-Durr, VI, 456; Ibn al-Athir, al-Kāmil, I, 68; Diyarbakrī, Ta‘rīkh, I, 68; and Balādhurī, Anṣāh, I, 3-4. Upon Noah see above all Canova, “The Prophet Noah”. There are differing versions regarding his name. It was ‘Abd al-Ghaffār, according to Mujir al-Din, al-Uns, I, 19; Ibn Abi ‘Udhayba, Qīṣaṣ, 12b; Majlisi, Bihār, XI, 286; or Sukn/al-Sakan: Maqdisi, al-Bad‘?, III, 15; Diyarbakrī, Ta‘rīkh, I, 68; Ibn al-Ḥarīrī, ‘Umdat, 47a; Ibn ‘Asākir, Ta‘rīkh, XVII, 650; Majlisi, Bihār, XI, 286; Siyar al-nabiyyā’, 27b; and cf. Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir‘āt, 236; or other names, such as ‘Abd al-Malik, ‘Abd al-A‘lā, ‘Abd al-Jabbār, according to Majlisi, Bihār, XI, 286, 287, 326; Rāwandi, Qīṣaṣ, 84; Diyarbakrī, Ta‘rīkh, I, 68. The name was changed in Noah (Nūḥ) because of his lamentations; about the nature of these lamentations, see Tha‘labī, Qīṣaṣ, 60; Ibn ‘Asākir, Ta‘rīkh, XVII, 650; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir‘āt, 236.

Noah is considered by tradition as the prophet who lived longest, but there are contrasting reports about how long he lived, see for ex. Ibn Kathir, al-Bidāya, I, 101, in connection with the Qur‘ānic verse stating that Noah lived among his people for 950 years. Traditions listing his age as 950 are in Ibn Sa‘d, Kitāb al-tabaqāt, I/1, 16-7; Tha‘labī, Qīṣaṣ, 60; cf. Ibn Qutayba, al-Ma‘arif, 21; Ibn al-Kalbī, Aṣnām, 64; Ibn Kathir, al-Bidāya, I, 101; Mas‘ūdī, Murūj, I, 101; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir‘āt, 238; Quḍā‘î, Ta‘rīkh, 76. For other traditions 950 was the length of time that he spent summoning people, see Tabari, Ta‘rīkh, I, 186; Nisābūrī, al-Mustadrak, II, 595 no. 4005. Some traditions increase the number of years such as the versions in Ṭarafi, cf. Kīṣā‘, Qīṣaṣ, 99; Ibn Iyās, Qīṣaṣ, 67 from Wahb: he was sent as a prophet when 250 years old and stayed among his
people 950 years; other reports state that Noah lived 1000, 1300, 1450 or more years, see ʻAbd al-Malik b. Ḥabīb, Kitāb al-ta‘rīkh, 37 no. 70; Ibn Ḥabīb, al-Muḥābbar, 3; Majlīsī, Bihār, 285; Mujīr al-Dīn, al-Uns, I, 21; Maqdisī, al-Bad, III, 20; Qudā‘i, Ta‘rīkh, 77: 1300, 1480; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 236-7; Diyarbakrī, Ta‘rīkh, I, 68; Nuwayrī, Nihāyat, XIII, 50; Shāṭibī, Kitāb al-jumān, 9b; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 30a; ʻĀmilī, Jawāhir, 19: 2500. About the importance of the question of the muʾmmarūn for Shiʿīs, see Kohlberg, “Some Shiʿī Views”, 52f.

(63) From Iṣḥāq b. Bishr, Mubtada’, 99b, 100a-100b, with some slight alterations. Cf. the text from Iṣḥāq b. Bishr and, without alterations, in Suyūṭī, al-Durr, IV, 417. Many traditions describe the period and the particulars of Noah’s preaching among his people, see Kisaʾī, Qīṣās, 89; Thaʿlabī, Qīṣāṣ, 55; Ibn Iyās, Qīṣaṣ, 56; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, I, 106f.; and above all Ḥijrī, Qīṣāṣ, 97b f.; Qīṣāṣ al-anbiyāʾ, Ms Berlin Or. quart. 1171, 156a; Ḥayṣam, Qīṣāṣ, 26b-27a; Qīṣāṣ al-anbiyāʾ, Ms Damascus 3473, 31-3; Ibn ʻAsākir, Ta‘rīkh, XVII, 652; and see a Shiʿī version in ʻĀmilī, Jawāhir, 17.

(64) Abridged from Iṣḥāq b. Bishr, Mubtada’, 100b, 100b-101a. Cf. the versions in Suyūṭī, al-Durr, IV, 419-20; and Thaʿlabī, Qīṣaṣ, 55, where it is not attributed to Iṣḥāq b. Bishr. There are numerous traditions regarding the construction of the Ark, see for ex. Ṭabarī, Jāmī al-bayān, XII, 34-5; Id., Ta‘rīkh, I, 185-6; cf. Thaʿlabī, Qīṣaṣ, 55; Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntaẓam, I, 240; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 238; Diyarbakrī, Ta‘rīkh, I, 69; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, 69; Kisaʾī, Qīṣaṣ, 92-4; Ps.-Masʿūdi, Ḍakhkhār, 60; Ḥayṣam, Qīṣaṣ, 27a. Regarding the dimensions of the Ark there are also differing variants. Ṭabarī’s version is taken – with many variations – from Iṣḥāq b. Bishr who talks of these dimensions: 660-333-33; Thaʿlabī, Qīṣaṣ, 56 has a similar one: 660-330-33; cf. Diyarbakrī, Ta‘rīkh, I, 68-69; and see Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Ṭabsīra, 65: 600-330-330; Ibn al-Wardī, Khaṭādat, 231-2: 300-150-200. A widespread tradition, included by Ṭabarī in §§ 65-66, gives the dimensions as 1200 and 600 cubits. For other versions see Kisaʾī, Qīṣaṣ, 92-3; Nuwayrī, Nihāyat, XIII, 46; Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Ṭabsīra, 65; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 28a; ʻAbd al-Malik b. Ḥabīb, Kitāb al-ta‘rīkh, 40 no. 78. See also the versions collected by Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, I, 110; Rāwandi, Qīṣaṣ, 82; Majlīsī, Bihār, XI, 303, 311, 319, 325; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 239; Diyarbakrī, Ta‘rīkh, I, 70; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, I, 70; Ibn ʻAsākir, Ta‘rīkh, XVII, 654; and cf. Castillo, “El arca de Noé”, 72. Regarding the number of the people saved, see §§ 78-81.

(65) From Ṭabarī, Jāmī al-bayān, XII, 35, and in Id., Ta‘rīkh, I, 187 (transl. Rosenthal, I, 356), with the omission of the 50 cubits of width. This version of 300-50-30 cubits – attributed here to Qatāda – is quoted in Ibn Ḥabīb, al-Muḥābbar, 383; Ibn Qutayba, al-Maʾṣūrīf, 22: from Torah; Ibn Saʿd, Kitāb al-
From Ṭabarī, Jāmī al-bayān, XII, 35-6, and in Id., Ta’rīkh, I, 187-8. The only controversial particular is that referring to Noah’s son who is Ham in Ṭabarī and not Shem; cf. also Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, I, 116. Ms Vat. of Ṭaraff has Kā’b corrected on margin in Sām (f. 56b). Tha‘labī, Qīṣās, 59, in his version – which is identical to those of Ṭabarī and Ṭaraff – has Shem, as in Sīyār al-anbiyā’, 151a. See in fact Ibn Hishām, Kitāb al-tijān, 35-6, where Shem tells another story and cf. also Nuwayrī, Nihāyat, XIV, 229.

This description of the animals and the story of the raven and of the dove are mentioned in many sources; see in part. Kisā‘ī, Qīṣaṣ, 98; Ibn ‘Asākir, Ta’rīkh, XVII, 656-7, 663: also an unspecified third bird; Ibn Iyās, Qīṣaṣ, 65; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, I, 117; Diyarbarka, Ta’rīkh, I, 72; cf. also Hūd b. Muḥammad, Ta’fīṣ, II, 225; Castillo, “El arca de Noé”, 74.

The beginning of § 67 is from Ishāq b. Bishr, Mubtada’, 101a, and § 70 is from Ṭabarī, Jāmī al-bayān, XII, 39, and Id., Ta’rīkh, I, 193. Most of the exegetical explanations can be traced in Ṭabarī, Jāmī al-bayān, XII, 38f. About this oven, see traditions already in Muqāṭil, Ta’fīṣ, II, 282; Samarqandī, Ta’fīṣ, II, 126; Mujāhid, Ta’fīṣ, I, 303; al-Farrā’, Ma‘ānī al-Qur‘ān, II, 14; Hūd b. Muḥammad, Ta’fīṣ, II, 224-5; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Ta’fīṣ, VI, 2028-9; Māwardī, Ta’fīṣ, II, 472; etc. Upon ‘Ayn al-Wardah, see Yāqūt, Mu’jam al-buldān, IV, 203. Traditions point out that Noah inherited the oven from Adam, see Kisā‘ī, Qīṣaṣ, 93; Tha‘labī, Qīṣaṣ, 39, 56; Majlīsī, Bihār, XI, 334; Haysam, Qīṣaṣ, 27b; Ibn ‘Asākir, Ta’rīkh, XVII, 655; Diyarbarka, Ta’rīkh, I, 70; Ibn Abī ‘Udhayba, Qīṣaṣ, 10b-11a. According to Ibn Iyās, Qīṣaṣ, 62, the water overflowed from the oven in Shem’s house; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mir‘āt, 240, mentions also Baghdad. Regarding Kīfā and other stories connected to this episode, see Kohlberg, “Some Shī‘ī views”, 57-8; and Nuwayrī, Nihāyat, XIII, 47: Noah sees Adam’s coffin and asks angels to bring it to him.

The part on Canaan and the final part are from Ishāq b. Bishr, Mubtada’, 101b-102a. Cf. also Ishāq b. Bishr, Mubtada’, 101b: to prevent animals from quarrelling, God sent Gabriel. Regarding the names of Noah’s son and wife, see the annotations on §§ 82-84. Traditions are as usual in disagreement regarding the number of cubits of water which submerged the earth. Along with what Ṭaraff mentions, sources also include other measures; about the matter, see Tha‘labī, Qīṣaṣ, 58; Ibn Iyās, Qīṣaṣ, 74; Ibn Sa’d, Kitāb al-ṭabaqāt, I/1, 17; Majlīsī, Bihār, XI, 304: 15 or 30; Mujir al-Din, al-UNS, I, 20; Haysam, Qīṣaṣ,
28a: 30, 40 or 50. According to Ṭabarī, Taʿrīkh, I, 193, and Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, I, 112, in the Torah the measure is 15 cubits.

(72) From Isḥāq b. Bishr, Mubtadaʾ, 102a-102b, excluding the Qurʾānic quotation. All these particulars are repeated in all the sources: the donkey was the last to enter, and he brought with him Iblis, the Ark touched the earth on the mount al-Jūdī and performed the ʿawāf around the Kaʿba, see for ex. ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ḥabīb, Kitāb al-taʿrīkh, 38 no. 72; Ibn Saʿd, Kitāb al-ṭabaqāt, I/1, 17; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, I, 70; Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʿrīkh, XVII, 658-9; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 239; Hāyṣam, Qīṣaṣ, 27b; Diyārbakrī, Taʿrīkh, I, 70; Ps.-Masʿūdī, Akhbār, 91.

(73) From Isḥāq b. Bishr, Mubtadaʾ, 103a. All the sources state that Adam’s corpse was carried in the Ark; for further particulars see Ḥijrī, Qīṣaṣ, 103b; Isḥāq b. Bishr, Mubtadaʾ, 114a f. on the burying of Adam; Ibn Saʿd, Kitāb al-ṭabaqāt, I/1, 17; Majlīs, Bihār, XI, 330; Yaʿqūbī, Taʿrīkh, I, 14; Kīṣaʾī, Qīṣaṣ, 94; Thaʿlabī, Qīṣaṣ, 48: along with Eve, Adam was buried in Jerusalem; Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʿrīkh, XVII, 653; Hāyṣam, Qīṣaṣ, 27b; Ṭabarī, Taʿrīkh, 192; Ibn Iyās, Qīṣaṣ, 58-9: along with the body there were the Black Stone, Moses’ rod etc.; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, I, 98; cf. also Kohlberg, “Some Shiʿi views”, 58.

(74) From Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XII, 37, and Id., Taʿrīkh, I, 191 (transl. Rosenthal, I, 360). As stated above in § 72, the Ark set sail on the 10th of Rajab and landed on the 10th of Muḥarram for a total of six months, but there are differing versions (setting sail on the 13th of Ramaḍān or the 17th day of another month and for a total of 150 days or six months and ten days); about the question, see Aẓraẓī, Akhbār Makka, I, 52; Yaʿqūbī, Taʿrīkh, I, 14; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 239; Diyārbakrī, Taʿrīkh, I, 72; Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʿrīkh, XVII, 653, 659; Thaʿlabī, Qīṣaṣ, 59; Ṭabarī, Taʿrīkh, I, 192-7; Ps.-ʿAṣmaʾī, Qīṣaṣ, 12a; Ibn Iyās, Qīṣaṣ, 64; Ibn Ḥabīb, al-Muḥabbār, 382; Ps.-Masʿūdī, Akhbār, 61: according to one of the reports, the Ark remained in water for eleven months; Ibn Qutayba, al-Maʿārif, 22: on the 17th according to the Torah and on the 10th of Rajab according to Muslims; Majlīs, Bihār, 304, 318: the 1st of Rajab, 334; Mujīr al-Dīn, al-Ums, I, 21; Masʿūdī, Murūj, I, 43: differing datings for a total of five months, cf. Majlīs, Bihār, XI, 335.

Some traditions state that the fast of ʿĀshūrāʾ (the 10th of Muḥarram) was in honor of the day the Ark touched earth, see ʿAbd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, IV, 290 no. 7849; and cf. Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, III, 282 no. 8725; Ibn Saʿd, Kitāb al-ṭabaqāt, I/1, 17; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, I, 72; Diyārbakrī, Taʿrīkh, 72; Thaʿlabī, Qīṣaṣ, 59; Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XII, 47; Taʿrīkh, I, 192; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, I, 116-7; Hāyṣam, Qīṣaṣ, 27b; Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʿrīkh, XVII, 661.
(75) This is the only particular given by Tarafī about the ṭawāf of the Ark around the Ka‘ba; cf. the long report in ‘Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, V, 94 no. 9096; see also Kisā‘ī, Qiṣṣa, 96: before Mecca, the Ark visited Jerusalem; cf. also Ishāq b. Bishr, Mubtada‘, 103a. Almost all the sources state that the Ark circumnavigated the Ka‘ba for seven days, see Ibn Hīṣām, Kitāb al-tījān, 32; Ṭabarī, Ta‘rīkh, I, 193, 197-8; Dīyārbakrī, Ta‘rīkh, I, 72; Majlisī, Bihār, XI, 338, 340; Mujīr al-Dīn, al-Uns, I, 21; Azraqī, Akhbār Makka, 52: the Ark circumnavigated the Ka‘ba for 40 days; Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntażam, 242; Ibn Ḣiyās, Qiṣṣa, 58: also before the Flood, 63; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, I, 116; Ibn al-Murajjā, Fadā‘il, 171.

(76) From Ishāq b. Bishr, Mubtada‘, 103a-103b; see also in Ibn ‘Asākir, Ta‘rīkh, XVII, 661. Among the sources which mention this tradition, see ‘Abd al-Malik b. Ḥabīb, Kitāb al-ta‘rīkh, 40 no. 78; Ps.-Mas‘ūdī, Akhbār, 91; Hayyām, Qiṣṣa, 28a; Ps.-Aṣma‘ī, Nihāyat, 11a; Nuwayrī, Nihāyat, XIII, 48; Ibn Ḣiyās, Qiṣṣa, 58; and Kisā‘ī, Qiṣṣa, 96 (transl. Thackston, 102; cf. Newby, The Making of the Last Prophet, 25). Regarding the humility of al-Jūdī, see the suggestions in Muqūtabl, Tafsīr, II, 283; Ibn ‘Asākir, Ta‘rīkh, XVII, 659, 661; Mujāhid, Tafsīr, I, 304; Ḥūd b. Muḥakak, Tafsīr, II, 229; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Tafsīr, VI, 2037-8.

(77) The first part is abridged from Ishāq b. Bishr, Mubtada‘, 103b, 104b (cf. ‘Abd al-Malik b. Ḥabīb, Kitāb al-ta‘rīkh, 39, no. 75), and the final part from idem, 106b-107a. In the text the incomprehensible al-naz‘a has been corrected into al-nad‘a (I am indebted to M.J. Kister for this reading). For other variants, see the comprehensive discussion in Tottoli, “Ibn Muṭarrif al-Ṭarafī”, 143 n. 54 and above, p. 15 n. 43. The rainbow is the sign of the pact between God and Noah, see Ibn Qutayba, Ma‘arif, 23, and from here also in Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mīr‘āt, 244. The rainbow is the sign of the salvation from the Flood, see ‘Amīlī, al-Jawwāhir, 18-19; and also Ḥusaynī, Qiṣṣa, 31a. On the origin of the prohibition, see Suyūṭī, al-Durr, IV, 423: from Ibn Abī Ḥātim (see his Tafsīr, VI, 2030), Iblīs along with Noah and the angel; Majlisī, Bihār, XI, 292-3; Ibn ‘Asākir, Ta‘rīkh, XVII, 662; Ḥīrī, Qiṣṣa, 110a.

According to some reports, the name “Eighty” of the village is connected to the number of the survivors, see for ex. Mas‘ūdī, Mu‘ījī, I, 43; Ps.-Mas‘ūdī, Akhbār, 60; Ṭabarī, Qiṣṣa, 60; ‘Abd al-Malik b. Ḥabīb, Kitāb al-ta‘rīkh, 38 no. 73; cf. Ibn Qutayba, al-Ma‘arif, 24; Majlisī, Bihār, XI, 313; Ibn ‘Asākir, Ta‘rīkh, XVII, 653; Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntażam, I, 242-3. The names Tāqirda and Tārandā are mentioned in Ishāq b. Bishr but without diacritical dots; a discussion of the differing orthographical variants of these names is in Tottoli, “Ibn Muṭarrif al-Ṭarafī”, 147 n. 83; to the references quoted there, add Ḥūd b. Muḥakak, Tafsīr, II, 228 and in particular the variants in n. 4.
(78)-(81) Partially – §§ 79, 80, and the beginning of 81 – from Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-
bayān, XII, 42-3, and Id., Taʾrīkh, I, 194-6. All the sources deal with the
number of the survivors, with differing versions: they were 7, 8, 10, 70, 72, 78
or 80, see for ex. Sībī  Ibn al-Jawzī, Mīrātāt, 239-240; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bīḍāya, I,
111-2; Ḥayṣam, Qīṣas, 27a: 80 or 70. Beyond the explanation given here, see
also Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, I, 195-6; Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntazam, I, 241. The origin of
the black color of Ham’s offsprings is connected to the fact that Ham saw his
father’s genitals and laughed, see Ishāq b. Bishr, Mubtadaʿ, 108b; Ṭabarī,
Taʾrīkh, I, 212; Ibn Qutayba, al-Maʿṣūrī, 25; see also Sībī  Ibn al-Jawzī, Mīrātāt,
245; Nuwayrī, Nihāyat, XIII, 49; Dīyār Bakrī, Taʾrīkh, I, 76.
The origin of the tradition about the virtues of the names of Noah’s daughters-
in-law has been fully discussed by Levi Della Vida, “Una traccia del libro dei
Giubilei”. This report is not mentioned in the main collections of traditions
about the prophets. Regarding the various versions of their names, see also

(82)-(84) Probably collected from Ṭabarī, Tafsīr, XII, 49-53, XXVIII, 169-70 (but
the mention of tafsīr in § 84 is not in connection with Ṭabarī). The question of
the impious son and wife has been debated since the first exegetes, see for ex.
Muqātil, Tafsīr, II, 283-4; Samarqandi, Tafsīr, II, 127; ʿAbdallāh b. Wahb,
Tafsīr, 224; and above all ʿAbd al-Razzāq, Tafsīr, I, 306f.
The son is usually identified as Canaan, but some sources mention his name as
Yām, and thus it should be corrected the Sām in ʿTarāfi. For other variants, see
Kathīr, al-Bīḍāya, I,112, maintains that Canaan is the name according to the
Jews and Christians, and Yām according to Muslims. Cf. also Newby, “The
drowned son”, 24. About the names see also the reports in Ibn Qutayba, al-
Maʿṣūrī, 24: Yām; Kisāʿi, Qīṣās, 96-97; Thaʿlabī, Qīṣās, 58; Ibn ʿAsākir,
Taʾrīkh, XVII, 658: Canaan; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 29a; Ḥayṣam, Qīṣas, 27b: Yām
or Canaan; Majliš, Biḥār, XI, 317; Dinawrī, Kitāb al-akhbār, 4; Dīyār Bakrī,
Taʾrīkh, I, 76; and in general, about the drowned son, see the article by Newby
quoted above. All these contrasting interpretations are connected to the
embarassing Qurʾānic verse which explicitly mentions an impious son; see
Rāzī, ʿIṣmat, 45f.; Latāʾif al-anbiyāʾ, 9b f. For this theme in Shiʿi exegesis, see
Majliš, Biḥār, XI, 317f., and the comprehensive discussion in Kohlberg, “Some
Shiʿi views”, 60-2.
The same discussion is also connected to the wife of Noah, who is also referred
to as being an impious – along with the wife of Lot – in a Qurʾānic verse,
66:10. See traditions about the two wives in Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XXVIII,
169-70; Kisāʿi, Qīṣās, 97, 148; Majliš, Biḥār, XI, 308; Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʾrīkh,
XIV, 637, XVII, 656; Sībī  Ibn al-Jawzī, Mīrātāt, 243; ʿAbdallāh b. Wahb,
Tafsir, 224. Lot’s wife name, as given by Tabari in § 71, is an orthographical variant of the more common Wâ’ila/Wâ’lîa or Wâghila/Wâligha, and probably a mere mistake in the transcription (wa-Wâligha>wa-Âligha), see Tottoli, “Ibn Mutarrif al-Tabari”, 148 n. 84. See also the explanation given by Ibn Kathir, al-Bidâya, I, 112: his wife died before the Flood; cf. Kohlberg, “Some Shi’i, 59-60. The Qur’anic reading attributed to ‘Alî and Ubayy is not in Tabari. Cf. Zamakhshari, al-Kashshâf, II, 270, where it is traced back only to ‘Alî; see also Samarqandi, Tafsir, II, 127; Newby, “The drowned son”; and Kohlberg, “Some Shi’i views”, 61 and n. 5. The final part of § 84 about the origin of the seas is from Ibn Sa’d, Kitâb al-ṭabaqât, I/1, 17; cf. Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mir’ât, 243; and Ibn Abî ʿUdhayba, Qiṣâṣ, 11b.

(85) From Ishâq b. Bishr, Mubtada’, 103b; a similar version is in ‘Abd al-Malik b. Ḥabib, Kitâb al-ta’rikh, 39 no. 75; Ḥijrî, Qiṣâṣ, 108a.

(86)-(87) Abridged mainly from Tabari, Jâmi’ al-bayân, XII, 46f.

(Story of Abraham)

(88) Regarding Abraham there are two different genealogies, see Ibn Qutayba, al-Maʿārif, 30; Thaʿlabî, Qiṣâṣ, 72; Tabari, Ta’rikh, I, 252; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mir’ât, 267; Ibn al-Jawzi, al-Muntaẓam, I, 258; Ibn ʿAsâkir, Ta’rikh, II, 311-2; Nisâbûrî, al-Mustadrak, II, 600 no. 4020; Qudâʾi, Ta’rikh, 89-90; Dinawarî, Kitâb al-akhbâr, 9; cf. Hayṣam, Qiṣâṣ, 36b: Abraham b. ʿAzar b. Terah.

There are differing versions regarding Abraham’s age: 175, 195, 200 (but also 100, 117, 137, 190, 194), and the most attested is 175, while 200 is included in the reports mentioning his circumcision at the age of 120 years; see in particular the large collection of traditions in Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mir’ât, 306-7; and Mujir al-Dîn, al-Uns, I, 25; Ibn ʿAsâkir, Ta’rikh, II, 358; Thaʿlabî, Qiṣâṣ, 97, 98; Tabari, Ta’rikh, I, 273, 349; Hayṣam, Qiṣâṣ, 53a; Kisdâʾi, Qiṣâṣ, 145, 153; Ishâq b. Bishr, Mubtada’, 214a; Ibn Qutayba, al-Maʿârif, 33; Ibn al-Jawzi, al-Muntaẓam, I, 285; Qudâʾi, Ta’rikh, 92; etc. The sources list the age of Sarah as 127 years.

All the sources relate the particular of the circumcision with the pick-axe (al-qadîm), but according to some other versions it should be read al-Qaddûm, being thus the name of the place where Abraham was circumcised, cf. Ibn ʿAsâkir, Ta’rikh, II, 329; the particular is attested in fact in an utterance of the Prophet from Abû Hurayra, see Bukhârî, Šâhîh, IV, 458 no. 3356, VII, 6298 no. 6298; Muslim, Šâhîh, IV, 1839 no. 2370; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, III, 208 no. 8288, III, 397 no. 9412, IV, 432 no. 9628; Ibn Abî Shayba, al-Muṣannaf, VI, 233 (Adab, 179). Other sources give a total of 120 years instead of 80 for Abraham’s age, see Ishâq b. Bishr, Mubtada’, 187b; Ṭabarâní, Kitâb al-awâ’il,
(89)-(90) From Tabari, Jamiʿ al-bayān, III, 24, 25-6, and in Id., Taʾrikh, I, 319-20 (transl. Brinner, II, 106-7). About the unbelieving tyrant Nimrod see the comprehensive study of Schützinger, Ursprung und Entwicklung. See also the traditions in Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʾrikh, II, 319-20; and in Qīṣaṣ al-anbiyāʾ, Ms Berlin Or. quart. 1171, 171b f.; Qīṣaṣ al-anbiyāʾ, Ms Cambridge Add. 3258, 24b f. The name of Nimrod is mentioned in a tradition in which the four greatest rulers of the world are mentioned, two believers and two unbelievers including Nimrod; see Tabari, Taʾrikh, I, 254, 323; Mujāhid, Tafsīr, I, 380; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 4a; Majlisi, Bihār, XI, 87, XII, 36; ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ḥabīb, Kitāb al-taʾrikh, 49 no. 102; Ḥayyam, Qīṣaṣ, 37a; Maqdisi, al-Badʾ, III, 45-6; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mīrāʾāt, 270; Ibn Qutayba, al-Maʾārif, 32; Shāṭibī, Kitāb al-jumān, 15a; Ibn al-Jawzi, al-Muntazam, I, 159, 171, 259; etc. See also the description of his appearance in Ps.-Masʿūdī, Akhbār, 83. In some sources there seems to be confusion between the construction of the tower by Nimrod and the tower of Babel, see for ex. Ibn Iyās, Qīṣaṣ, 86f.; Ishāq b. Bishr, Mubtadaʾ, 158a; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 55a-55b. Further interesting particulars are in Majlisi, Bihār, XII, 34; Hījri, Qīṣaṣ, 148a f.

(91) From Tabari, Jamiʿ al-bayān, XIII, 244. Most of the sources talk about four and not two eagles, see for ex. Tabari, Taʾrikh, I, 321; Thaʿlabī, Qīṣaṣ, 96; Ishāq b. Bishr, Mubtadaʾ, 156b, 157a, and in part. 158a f.; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mīrāʾāt, 307-9; Qīṣaṣ anbiyāʾ, Ms Berlin Or. quart. 1171, 180a; Qīṣaṣ anbiyāʾ, Ms Damascus 3473, 84; Mujīr al-Dīn, al-UNS, I, 33; Ḥayyam, Qīṣaṣ, 42b; Ibn al-Jawzi, al-Muntazam, I, 281. According to some traditions, Nimrod is another name for al-Dahḥāk, or there were two Nimrods, see the discussion in Diyārbakrī, Taʾrikh, I, 78-9.

(94) From Tabari, Jamiʿ al-bayān, I, 547, 550; the first part also in Id., Taʾrikh, I, 276 (transl. Brinner, II, 71). All the sources relate these episodes regarding Abraham’s life, see for ex. Kisiʾī, Qīṣaṣ, 143f.; Tabari, Taʾrikh, I, 274f.; Thaʿlabī, Qīṣaṣ, 87-8; Ishāq b. Bishr, Mubtadaʾ, 203b f.; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 46b, 47a. About some of the contents of this tradition, see Azraʿī, Akhbār Makka,

(95) From Ţabarî, Ḫāmiṣ al-bayān, I, 551, XIII, 230, I, 551, XIII, 230, 228, partially in Id., Taʾrīkh, I, 275-6 (transl. Brinner, II, 70-1). This tradition contains the most widespread conception regarding the building of the Kaʿba. For an in-depth discussion of the themes and further bibliography, see Azraqî, Akhbâr Makka, I, 54f., transl. Tottoli, 19-38; Firestone, Journeys in Holy Lands, 80-93. The main sources include similar reports, see Ţabarî, Taʾrīkh, I, 274f.; Thaʿlabî, Qisas, 82f.; Ibn Iyās, Qisas, 82f.; Ishâq b. Bishr, Muḥtadāʾ, 199a f.; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 45a; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mirʿat, 281-3; Diyarbâkî, Taʾrīkh, 93f.; Mujîr al-Dîn, al-Uns, I, 37f.; Ibn Kathir, al-Bidâya, I, 154f. Further particulars are also mentioned in some hadîths, see Bukhârî, Sahîh, IV, 460-5 nos. 3364-5; ʿAbd al-Razzâq, al-Muṣannaf, V, 105-11 nos. 9107; Ahmad b. Ḫanbal, Musnad, I, 744 no. 3250. Regarding the well of Zamzam which, thanks to Hagar’s intervention, ceased to flow on the surface, see also Bukhârî, Sahîh, III, 110 no. 2368, IV, 460 no. 3362; ʿAbd al-Razzâq, al-Muṣannaf, V, 107 no. 9107; Ahmad b. Ḫanbal, Musnad, I, 546 no. 2285, etc.

(96)-(97) From Ţabarî, Ḫāmiṣ al-bayān, XIII, 229. The hadîth is from Muslim, Sahîh, I, 191 no. 202.

(98) From Ţabarî, Ḫāmiṣ al-bayān, XIII, 229, and cf. Id., Taʾrīkh, I, 280 (transl. Brinner, II, 74). The tradition about the dragging of Hagar’s dress is mentioned in Shibli, Mahâsin, 147; see also Suyûṭî, al-Wasâʾil, 104; Ibn Manzûr, Lisân al-ʿarab, VI, 4620c.

(99)-(100) From Ţabarî, Ḫāmiṣ al-bayān, I, 541, XIII, 233. This long exegetical part explains the favour accorded to the inhabitants of Mecca which is hinted at in Qur. 2:126. Regarding another tradition similar to that ascribed to Ibn Jubayr, but traced back to Mujâhid, see Ţabarî, Ḫāmiṣ al-bayān, XIII, 234; Samarqandî, Tafsîr, II, 209: including both the traditions; Mâwardî, Tafsîr, III, 139: both traced back to Ibn ʿAbbâs; cf. other versions in Suyûṭî, al-Durr, V, 47; and cf. instead the interpretations in Muqāṭîl, Tafsîr, II, 409; and Ibn Abî Ḥâtim, Tafsîr, II, 408-9.

(101) A similar hadîth – in a longer version – is in Ahmad b. Ḫanbal, Musnad, VI, 84 no. 17150, VI, 87 no. 17163; cf. the versions in Suyûṭî, al-Khaṣaʾis al-kubrâʾ, I, 9; Majlîsî, Bihâr, XII, 88.

(102)-(104) Abridged from Ţabarî, Ḫâmiṣ al-bayān, III, in order: 48, 49-52, 58, and 48, 49. The Qurʾân mentions four dismembered birds, put on 4, 7 or 10 mountains; see Majlîsî, Bihâr, XII, 58-9. These birds are usually identified as the four mentioned by Ţabarî, but Muqāṭîl, Tafsîr, I, 218, includes also a duck;
(105) From Tabari, Jamiʿ al-bayān, VII, 242-3. Abraham’s father was an idol-worshipper and a minister of Nimrod, and the Qurʾānic intercession on his behalf (Qur. 9:113-4). Qurʾānic exegesis tried to avoid these embarrassing particulars: Azar – mentioned in the Qurʾān – would not be his name, but an attribute or the name of an idol, or the name of his grandfather or uncle; see the explanations collected by Calder, “Tafsir from Tabari”, 102-4. About all these questions, see in particular Tabari, Taʾrikh, I, 253; Samarqandi, Tafsir, I, 495; Abū Ḥayyān, al-Bahr al-muḥīṭ, IV, 559: parents of the prophets cannot be unbelievers, see also Kulpin, al-Kāfi, II, 131; Ṭūsī, al-Tībiyān, IV, 175-6; Tibrisī, Majmaʿ al-bayān, IV, 401; and the long discussion in Majliṣī, Bihār, XII, 47-49; and cf. Qisas al-anbiyāʾ, Ms Damascus 3473, 67, 70-1, where instead there are many traditions on Terah’s idolatry. See also Thāʿlabī, Qisas, 72; Ibn Iyās, Qisas, 77; Ṣaḥb b. Bishr, Mubtadaʾ, 160a; Sīṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 267. On Shīʿ origin of these exegetical explanations, see Rubin, “Pre-existence and light”, 79, and upon the differing reading according to Ubayy b. Kaʿb, see Jeffery, Materials for the History, 130.

(106)-(108) From Tabari, Jamiʿ al-bayān, VII, 245, 246. In § 108 – which explains away Qur. 6:75 – Tarafī unifies two differing traditions. Relevant reports or explanations are in Hayṣam, Qisas, 44a-45a; Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʾrikh, II, 344-5; Samarqandi, Tafsir, I, 495; Hūd b. Muḥakkam, Tafsir, I, 538-9; and cf. Muqāṭil, Tafsir, I, 571, with a different tradition. More or less similar traditions about Abraham’s strictness are in Sīṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 271; ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ḥabīb, Kitāb al-taʿrikh, 48 no. 100; Majliṣī, Bihār, XII, 61; Laṭāʾif al-anbiyāʾ, 35b; ʿĀmili, al-Jawāhir, 22.


(110) Partially from Tabari, Jamiʿ al-bayān, VII, 248-9, and in Id., Taʾrikh, I, 254-5 (transl. Brinner, II, 50-1 and Newby, The Making of the Last Prophet, 67-8). Abraham’s birth is usually described this way: Nimrod has a premonition and gives order to kill all new-born infants, but Abraham’s mother is able to escape so that the prophet is born and grows with God’s help. Sources usually contain traditions including fantastic particulars, see for ex. Tabari, Taʾrikh, I, 257-8; Kiswaʾī, Qisas, 128-130: Nimrod kills 100,000 new-borns; Thaʿlabī, Qisas, 72f.; Diyarbakri, Taʾrikh, 79-80; Hayṣam, Qisas, 37a-38a, 41a: 7,000 children were killed; Muṣir al-Dīn, al-Uns, I, 24-5; Majliṣī, Bihār, XII, 29-30: Azar himself is astrologer; Ḥijrī, Qisas, 154b; Qisas al-anbiyāʾ, Ms Berlin Or. quart. 1171, 174a: the cave where Abraham and his mother take refuge has a name and had


(117)-(118) Only the final part of § 117 is from Ẓarafī, *Jāmiʿ al-bayān*, XVII, 40. Ẓarafī prefers exegetical reports to the most typical and particularised traditions of the *qiṣṣas al-anbiyā*’ collections. Regarding the refusal of the people to take him with no sure proof, cf. Ẓarafī, *Ta’rīkh*, I, 260; Thaʿlabī, *Qiṣṣas*, 76; *Siyar al-anbiyā*’, 41a; Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzi, *Mīrāt*, 274; Diyārbakrī, *Ta’rīkh*, I, 81.


(121)-(122) From Tabari, *Jami’ al-bayân*, XVII, 43-4, and in Id. *Ta’rikh*, I, 263-4 (transl. Brinner II, 59-60). There are various versions regarding the pyre where Abraham was thrown, specifying its height (20 or 30 cubits etc.), or how much time Abraham remained in it (3, 30 or 40 days or even years); cf. Tha’labi, *Qisas*, 77; and Mujir al-Din, *al-Uns*, I, 31: Abraham refused the help of the angels of winds and waters. God had caused a silver shirt to descend from heaven to protect Abraham, see Majlisi, *Bihār*, XII, 43. The Angel of Shade is said to have been similar to Abraham and some sources include a discussion between Abraham and Nimrod about him. Regarding all these particulars, see Tabari, *Ta’rikh*, I, 262f.; Tha’labi, *Qisas*, 77-8; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, *Mir’āt*, 275-7; Hayrām, *Qisas*, 41a: the pyre is 60 cubits height, 41b: Abraham stayed in the fire three or seven days; Diyarbakrī, *Ta’rikh*, I, 82-3; *Qisas al-anbiyāʾ*, Ms Berlin Or. quart 1171, 179a-180a; Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta’rikh*, II, 322-7; Majlisi, *Bihār*, XII, 33; Ḥijrī, *Qisas*, 159b f.; Ḥamad b. Ḥanbal, *Kitāb al-zuhd*, 127; Ibn al-Ṭahhr, al-‘Kāmil, I, 99-100; Ibn Iyās, *Qisas*, 79-80; Isḥāq b. Bishr, *Mubtada’*, 167b f., 168a: in a dream his mother saw Abraham saved from the fire by two angels; *Siyyar al-anbiyāʾ*, 42a-42b; Ps.-Aṣmaʾi, *Qisas*, 19a.


(125)-(127) The tradition § 126 is from Tabari, *Jami’ al-bayân*, XVII, 44; cf. idem, XVII, 44f., for other versions, one of which is in Id., *Ta’rikh*, I, 266 (transl. Brinner II, 61). A tradition similar to § 127 is in Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, *Mir’āt*, 276; Suyūṭī, *al-Durr*, V, 640: from Aḥmad, see in fact his *Kitāb al-zuhd*, 127; and see also ‘Abd al-Malik b. Ḥabīb, *Kitāb al-ta’rikh*, 49 no. 103; Ibn al-Jawzi, *al-Muntazam*, I, 261; Diyarbakrī, *Ta’rikh*, I, 82; Mujir al-Din, *al-Uns*, I, 31; and cf. Majlisi, *Bihār*, XII, 35: Gabriel got angry because Abraham was in the fire. The two traditions mentioning the refusal of the wazagh, a kind of gecko, to put out the fire of the pyre – traced back to Qatāda and al-Zuhrī – are from Tabari, *Jami’ al-bayân*, XVII, 45. An utterance of the Prophet Muhammad mentions its refusal and even its blowing upon the fire adding that he ordered the faithful to
kill the gecko because of this; see Bukhārī, Sahih, IV, 459 no. 3359; Ibn Māja, Sunan, II, 1076 no. 3131; Nasāʿī, Kitāb al-sunan al-kubrā, II, 373-4 no. 3814; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, IX, 366 no. 24588. etc. The particular at the end of the short tradition ascribed to al-Zuhri, i.e. that the gecko was called little wrong-doer, is another ḥadīth (in some versions with no order to kill it); see Bukhārī, Sahih, IV, 440 no. 3306; Muslim, Sahih, IV, 1758 nos. 2238-9; Nasāʿī, Kitāb al-sunan al-kubrā, II, 387 no. 3869; Ibn Māja, Sunan, II, 1076 no. 3230; Abū Dāwūd, Sunan, IV, 368 no. 5262; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, I, 373 no. 1523, etc. All the sources mention these traditions, and for further particulars upon the animals called to put out the fire, see Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 42a; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, I, 147; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, V, 638-9; Qiṣṣa al-anbiyāʾ, Paris ar. 1924, 4b; Mujīr al-Dīn, al-Uns, 31-2; Majlisi, Bihār, XII, 33, 36-7; Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʾrīkh, II, 324: many versions; and cf. Diyārbakrī, Taʾrīkh, I, 82-3, about the merits acquired by those killing geckos.

(128)-(129) Only the final parts of §§ 128 and 129 are from Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XVII, 41 and XXIII, 70. All the sources, with no particular variant, mention the age of Abraham, when he was thrown into the fire, and the age of Sarah when Isaac was born, see above all Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʿāt, 277; Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntażam, I, 261; Diyārbakrī, Taʾrīkh, I, 82-3.

In this passage Ṭabarī deals with the question of Abraham’s three lies, two of which are hinted at by the Qurʾān. Regarding the words connected to his illness, see Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XXIII, 71; Muqāṭil, Tafsīr, III, 611-2; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Tafsīr, X, 3219; Māwardī, Tafsīr, V, 56: seven different interpretations; Samarqandi, Tafsīr, III, 118; among the other sources, cf. the long discussion in Majlisi, Bihār, XII, 49-55, and in Rāzī, ʾIṣmat, 58f. There is a ḥadīth mentioning Abraham’s three lies, see Bukhārī, Sahih, IV, 458-9 nos. 3357-8; Muslim, Sahih, IV, 1840-1 no. 2371; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, III, 369-70 no. 9252; Tirmidhī, al-Jāmiʿ, V, 321 no. 3166; Abū Dāwūd, Sunan, II, 272 no. 2212. Also in the ḥadīth al-shafāʾa there is allusion to the three lies. Further remarkable particulars and reports are mentioned in Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, I, 268-9; Ishāq b. Bishr, Mubtadaʾ, 169b; Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʿā, 280; and Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʾrīkh, II, 320-1. About this question see Calder, “Tafsīr”, 106-110, and above all Gilliot, “Les trois mensonges d’Abraham”.

(130) Only the final exegetical part is from Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XXIII, 75, and cf. also Id., Taʾrīkh, I, 268. The story regarding Sarah and the king/tyrant, who gave her the slave Hagar as a present, is described in ḥadīth collections, see Bukhārī, Sahih, IV, 459 no. 3358, III, 53-4 no. 2217, cf. also the short version in VIII, 382-3 no. 6950; and another version in Muslim, Sahih, IV, 1840-1 no. 2371; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, III, 369-70 no. 9252; etc. All these ḥadīthis contain vague indications about the king or tyrant, while qiṣṣa al-anbiyāʾ works
identify him as a king of Jordan or a Pharaoh, see Kisârî, Qīṣâs, 142; Dîyarbakrî, Ta'rikh, I, 85-6; Joseph's beauty was only one third respect to Sarah's (sic); Mağlisî, Biḥār, XII, 46; Taḥbîrî, Ta'rikh, I, 267; Thahâlabî, Qīṣâs, 79; Mas'ûdî, Murûj, 200-1: a long report; Ibn Iyâs, Qīṣâs, 80: includes an original version; Ishâq b. Bishr, Muṣṭadārî, 169a f., gives also the name of the Pharaoh; see also on this point Abû al-Fidâ', Kitâb al-mukhtâsar, I, 23; Rawandî, Qīṣâs, 107; and, further, Maqdisî, al-Badî', III, 52; Hâyûsîn, Qīṣâs, 43a-43b; Ibn Kathîr, al-Biḍâya, I, 152; Sîbîl Ibn al-Jawzî, Mir'ât, 279-80; Qīṣâs al-anbiyâ', Ms Berlin Or. quart. 1171, 181a-181b; Ps.-Âsma'î, Niḥâyât, 43a. Further details about the topic in Firestone, Journeys in Holy Lands, 31-8. (131) From Taḥbîrî, Jâmi' al-bayân, XXIII, 76.

(132)-(133) Only § 132 is from Taḥbîrî, Jâmi' al-bayân, XXIII, 77, 77-8, 78, and in Id., Ta'ârikh, I, 302-3 (transl. Brinner, II, 91); see also Ibn al-Jawzî, al-Muntazam, I, 279. Regarding the meaning of sa'îy in Qur. 37:102, see Calder, "The Sa'îy and the Jabin". The identity of the son chosen for the sacrifice by Abraham is an issue debated in early Muslim traditions. While the Bible identifies him as Isaac, the Qur'ân does not mention him by name and exegetical reports have contrasting interpretations. According to Geiger, Judaism in Islam, 102f., and Goldziher, Die Richtungen, 79-80, in early Muslim tradition the son was Isaac and the version with Ishmael emerged only later. Some recent studies have discussed the question in various ways. According to Basheär, "Abraham's sacrifice", the name Ishmael emerged later in connection with the pilgrimage; to the same conclusion also leads Firestone, Journeys in Holy Lands, 105-151, Id., "Abraham's Son"; and Calder, "From Midrash to Scripture"; but see Rubin in his review to Firestone's book, in JSAl, 17 (1994), 245-9. The contrasting reports could instead be connected to the ethnic rivalries of early Islam; see for ex. a passage in Mas'ûdî, Murûj, I, 282 no. 572: the Persians maintained that the chosen son was Isaac since they descended from him. See also Firestone, "Comparative studies in Bible and Qur'ân".

Hadîth collections only contain a few hints at the question. Aḥmâd, Musnad, I, 657 no. 2795, and Id., Kitâb al-zuhd, 127 no. 416, mentions Isaac, such as Ibn Abî Shayba, al-Muṣannaf, III, 502 (Aymân, 68). No identification is offered by 'Abd al-Razzâq, where he mentions the sacrifice in his Muṣannaf, IV, 379-80 no. 8131. In early tafsîr the question is widely debated, usually with contrasting reports, see Muqâtil, Tafsîr, III, 614: the son was Isaac; Hûd b. Muhakkam, Tafsîr, III, 456-7; 'Abd al-Razzâq, Tafsîr, II, 150-2, contrasting reports; see also Muğâhid, Tafsîr, II, 543: Ishmael; Sufyân al-Thawrî, Tafsîr, 253: Ishmael; Samarqandî, Tafsîr, III, 119-22: contrasting reports. In major commentaries many pages are dedicated to the discussion of this question, see


(136)-(137) Partially from Tabari, *Jāmiʿ al-bayān*, XII, 68-71. The sources state that the messengers were the three angels mentioned by ʿTaraḥ, with a few exceptions, see Muqātil, *Tafsīr*, II, 290: Gabriel, Michael and the Angel of Death; Mujir al-Dīn, *al-Uns*, I, 35-6: two angels; Kisāʾī, *Qisas*, 146f. and

(138) From Ṭābārī, *Jāmiʿ al-bayān*, XII, 71, where it is ascribed to ʿAbd al-Razzāq, see in fact his *Tafsīr*, I, 305.


(143) The explanations of the meaning of *awwāḥ* are taken from Ṭabārī, *Jāmiʿ al-bayān*, XI, 47-51.

(144)-(146) From Ṭabārī, *Taʾrīkh*, I, 350 (transl. Brinner, I, 130-1). In Ṭabārī and in the other sources this report is included in a *ḥadīth* attributed to Abū Dharr about the hundred and four books revealed to the prophets, see Thaʿlabī, *Qiṣāṣ*, 100; *Siyar al-anbiyāʾ*, 48a-48b; Ibn al-Jawzī, *al-Muntazam*, I, 272-3; Majlisī, *Bīhār*, XII, 59, 71; ʿAmīlī, *al-Jawāhir*, 25; Ibn al-Wardi, *Kharidat*, 224; Sibṭ


(149) For a discussion of chronology, see § 513 and notes.

(150) Regarding Abraham’s appearance, see the discussion in Tottoli, “Ibn Muṭṭarīf al-Ṭarāfī”, 152-3.

(Story of Lot)

(151) The most common version of Lot’s name is Lūṭ b. Hārān, with the usual orthographical variants, see Kisāʾi, Qiṣaṣ, 145; Ṭabarî, Taʾrīkh, I, 325; Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʾrīkh, XIV, 630-1; Haysam, Qiṣaṣ, 46b; Ibn ʿĪyās, Qiṣaṣ, 90; Abū al-Fidaʾ, Kitāb al-mukhtasar, I, 25: b. Hārān; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 317; Maqdisi, al-Badʾ, III, 56; Majlisi, Bihār, XII, 143.

(152) From Ishāq b. Bishr, Mutbadaʾ, 189a. The Qurʾān mentions the muʿtafikāt – usually considered an allusion to Lot’s town – in two passages and exegetical literature usually numbers them as four towns, and sometimes gives their names; see Muqātil, Tafsīr, II, 181; Ishāq b. Bishr, Mutbadaʾ, 189a; Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʾrīkh, XIV, 632: with the names; Maqdisi, al-Badʾ, III, 57; Majlisi, Bihār, XII, 162-3; or there were five towns, see Ṭabarî, Jaʿmī al-bayān, XII, 98; Id., Taʾrīkh, I, 343; Kisāʾi, Qiṣaṣ, 145; Ibn Abī ʿUdhayba, Qiṣaṣ, 28a; Nisābūrī, al-Mustadrak, II, 613 no. 4057: with the names; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, I, 122; Qiṣaṣ al-anbiyāʾ, Ms Berlin Or. quart. 1171, 183a; Haysam, Qiṣaṣ, 46b; Diyarbakrī, Taʾrīkh, I, 86; Masʿūdi, Murūj, I, 50; Qiṣaṣ al-anbiyāʾ, Ms Paris ar. 1924, 39 b: Thaʿlabī, Qiṣaṣ, 105, 106: mentions four and five towns and gives the names of five; see also Samarqandi, Tafsīr, II, 138, who mentions two differing versions, see in fact Majlisi, Bihār, XII, 162-3. There are also further versions, see Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 317: ten or twelve towns; ‘Abd al-Bāsīṭ, Taʾrīkh al-anbiyāʾ, 64: ten; Ibn ʿĪyās, Qiṣaṣ, 91: seven towns; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 56a: twelve towns, 58a: five towns.

(153)-(154) From Ishāq b. Bishr, Mutbadaʾ, 192b and 193a. § 153 is not from Ṭabarî’s tafsīr. Regarding the origin of sodomy there are differing traditions, see for ex. Nisābūrī, al-Mustadrak, II, 613 no. 4058, quite similar to § 153 from Wahb; Ibn ʿĪyās, Qiṣaṣ, 90; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 56b f.; Ṭabarî, Taʾrīkh, I, 328f.; Thaʿlabī, Qiṣaṣ, 103; Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʾrīkh, XIV, 634; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 317; Haysam, Qiṣaṣ, 46b; Maqdisi, al-Badʾ, III, 59.

(155) From Ishāq b. Bishr, Mutbadaʾ, 194b. This hadīth is not in the major collections where the most quoted tradition regarding Lot states that Muḥammad was afraid his people committed what Lot’s people in fact committed, see Wensinck, A Handbook, s.v. Lot. About the question, see
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Tha‘labī, *Qiṣaṣ*, 106, adding that also women were guilty of the same; and cf. Majlisī, *Bihār*, XII, 151.

(156) From Isḥāq b. Bishr, *Mubtada‘*, 191a-193b; also in Suyūṭī, *al-Durr*, IV, 457-8, and cf. Ibn ‘Asākir, *Tā’rīkh*, XIV, 634. The passage hinting at the offered daughters is connected to the Qur‘ānic passage (15:71) mentioning this embarrassing and widely debated episode; see for ex. Sībt Ibn al-Jawzī, *Mīrāt*, 319; Majlisī, *Bihār*, XII, 161. About the names of Lot’s daughters, the most common versions are Rīthā and Ra‘rabā/Ra‘ubah, see Tottoli, “Ibn Muṭarrif al-Ṭaraft”, 149-50. Most of the sources maintain that the angels did not reveal their true identity to Lot until he had spoken three or four times against his people, see Kisā‘ī, *Qiṣaṣ*, 147-8; Tha‘labī, *Qiṣaṣ*, 104; *Siyar al-anbiyā‘*, 57b f.; Ps.-Aḥma‘ī, *Qiṣaṣ*, 21b f.; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, I, 120; and cf. *Qiṣaṣ al-anbiyā‘*, Ms Berlin Or. quart. 1171, 187a-188a, 187b: four angels, including a certain D.r.d.ʿyā’īl. That after Lot God only chose prophets from among the highest ranks of their own people is mentioned in a ḥadīth, see Tirmidhī, *al-Jāmi‘*, V, 293 no. 3116; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, III, 633-4 no. 10903.


(Story of Ṣāliḥ)

(161)-(162) Şâliḥ started his prophetic mission at the age of 40, as did Muḥammad. § 161 is probably from Ibn Qutayba, *al-Ma’ārif*, 29; and cf. the long discussion in Ishāq b. Bishr, *Mubtada‘*, 140a; Ps.-Aṣma‘ī, *Qiṣaṣ*, 15a; cf. also Kisa‘ī, *Qiṣaṣ*, 113-4: he slept in a hidden place for 40 years; Ibn Iyās, *Qiṣaṣ*, 73: he remained hidden for a hundred years in a cave.

(163) From Ṭabarī, *Jāmi‘ al-bayān*, VIII, 224, with some slight differences. The place where they lived, al-Ḥijr, gives the name to the entire sura 15 and, according to all the sources, it was between Hijāz and Syria. Further particulars are in Kisa‘ī, *Qiṣaṣ*, 110: Thamūd were ten tribes; cf. also Ps.-Aṣma‘ī, *Nihāyat*, 37a: twelve tribes and he gives their names; Ibn Iyās, *Qiṣaṣ*, 72; Ḥayṣam, *Qiṣaṣ*, 33a; and cf. Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, *Mīrāt*, 262. Upon Thamūd (b. Iram), Jadīs and a genealogical discussion, see Dinawarī, *Kitāb al-akhbār*, 5; cf. also the long report in Ibn Hishām, *Kitāb al-tijān*, 383f.


(165)-(166) From Ṭabarī, *Jāmi‘ al-bayān*, VIII, 224, and Id., *Ta‘rīkh*, I, 245 (transl. Brinner II, 41) and § 166 from XII, 64.


included in the major hadith collections, see Ibn Kathir, al-Bidāya, I, 137; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mirʿāt, 265; Ibn al-Athir, al-Kāmil, I, 93; Majlisi, Bihār, XI, 393; Hayṣam, Qīṣaṣ, 36a; Ibn Abī ‘Udhayba, Qīṣaṣ, 18b-19a. Sources give the name of the torturer of the she-camel as Qudār b. Ṣā‘īf, often adding a second name, Miṣdaʿ, with orthographical variants. Some reports state there were 4, 7, 8 or 9 men with him, including, according to some versions, two women; see in general Ishāq b. Bishr, Muhatta?, 146b f.; Ibn Hishām, Kitāb al-tijān, 392: gives other names, too; Ps.-Aṣmaʿi, Nihāyat, 38b: a long list of names; ‘Abd al-Malik b. Ḥabīb, Kitāb al-taʾrīkh, 45 no. 92; Nuwayri, Nihāyat, XIII, 83: the names of all nine; Maqdisi, al-Badʾ, III, 38; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mirʿāt, 264; Hayṣam, Qīṣaṣ, 35a; Ibn Qutayba, al-Maʿārif, 29; Qudāʿi, Taʾrīkh, 87: Qudhār, Qīṣaṣ al-anbiyāʾ, Ms Berlin Or. quart. 1171, 167b f.; Ibn al-Jawzi, al-Muntazam, I, 256; Ibn Abī ‘Udhayba, Qīṣaṣ, 18a; Majlisi, Bihār, XI, 374f.; Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, I, 248; Kīṣāʾ, Qīṣaṣ, 117-8; Thaʿlabi, Qīṣaṣ, 68: the killers had drunk wine before acting; Ibn Kathir, al-Bidāya, I, 135, 139; Ps.-Aṣmaʿi, Qīṣaṣ, 15b; Siyar an-anbiyāʾ, 37b; Masʿudi, Murīj, II, 159; Ps.-Aṣmaʿi, Qīṣaṣ, 15b: other names; there is also a hint in Bukhārī, Ṣāḥīḥ, IV, 469 no. 3377. Regarding the appearance of Qudār, a similar report is in Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mirʿāt, 264.

(Story of Shuʿayb)

(170)-(171) Apparently from Ibn Ḥabīb, al-Muḥabbar, 394, with some mistakes, for ex. the number of the sons. There are contrasting reports regarding Abraham’s sons, see for ex. Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, I, 345: mentioning the third wife, a woman from Canaan named Qāṭūra bint Yaqūtān, and the names of her six children, thus totalling, with the inclusion of Isaac and Ishmael, the number of eight children; cf. also Dīyārbakrī, Taʾrīkh, I, 130; Ibn Saʿd, Kitāb al-ṭabaqāt, I/1, 22; Yaʿqūbī, Taʾrīkh, I, 28; a similar list is in Thaʿlabī, Qīṣaṣ, 97: Abraham also married another woman named Ḥajūm bt. Aḥyāb and he had five children with her, for a total of 13 children. Two wives and 13 or even 14 children are mentioned, with the usual orthographical variations, by Ibn Kathir, al-Bidāya, I, 175; Kīṣāʾ, Qīṣaṣ, 152; Dīyārbakrī, Taʾrīkh, I, 130: his last wife’s name was Ḥajūr; Nisābūrī, al-Mustadrak, II, 611 no. 4051; Ibn Qutayba, al-Maʿārif, 33; Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntazam, I, 285; Maqdisi, al-Badʾ, III, 53. Upon the name Shuʿayb there are the usual orthographical variations: Shuʿayb b. Yūbāb/Shayʿūn/M.y.k.y.l/Shayfūn or the most common b. Nuwayb, or, in connection with Jethro, the version Yathrīn or Yatrīn. See, about all these versions, Ṭabarī, Jamʿī al-bayān, VIII, 237; Muqlatī, Tafsīr, II, 293; Ibn Ḥabīb, al-Muḥabbar, 389; Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, I, 365, 462; Thaʿlabī, Qīṣaṣ, 164; Siyar al-
Durr Iyas explained that Kitab accounts burns Kathlr cloud while dishonestly Tarafi are Qisas Maqdisi, al-Bad', III, 75: with his name in the Torah.

(172)-(173) A similar version to § 172 is in Suyūṭī, al-Durr, III, 501, where it is ascribed to Ishāq b. Bishr. Depending upon the contrasting and unclear Qurʾānic passages stating that he was sent to Madyan and to al-Ayka, some exegetical traditions maintain that Shuʿayb was sent to two different populaces, see Muqatil, Tafsīr, III, 278; Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, I, 368; Thaʿlabī, Qisas, 164f.; Maqdisī, al-Bad', III, 76; Majlisi, Bihār, XII, 376, 382-3; Ḥayṣam, Qisas, 85b; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, I, 189f.; Ps.-Aṣmaʿī, Qisas, 33a-34a; and cf. Kīsāʾī, Qisas, 191, and Ibn Iyās, Qisas, 113: in Madyan the people were idolaters while in al-Ayka the people were idolaters. Regarding the name Madyan there are contrasting views about whether it is the name of a people or of a place, see Māwardī, Tafsīr, II, 494-5; Samarqandi, Tafsīr, I, 555; ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ḥabīb, Kitāb al-taʾrīkh, 51 no. 112; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mirʾāt, 385-6; and cf. Bosworth, "The Qurʾānic prophet Shuʿayb", 425-7.

Ṭarafi mentions only the habit of the people of Madyan to steal and act dishonestly in the measuring of goods. More particulars, mainly about the punishment, are given in the other sources, see for ex. ʿAbd al-Razzāq, Tafsīr, II, 75-6; Muqatil, Tafsīr, III, 279: seven days of hot weather and then the cloud arrived; Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, I, 367; Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʾrīkh, VIII, 69-70; Nisābūrī, al-Mustadrak, II, 620 no. 4073; Mujir al-Dīn, al-Uns, I, 73; Ḥayṣam, Qisas, 85b-86a; Thaʿlabī, Qisas, 165: God made them perish with an earthquake or a cloud; Ibn Iyās, Qisas, 113-4: killed by a wind; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 93a f.; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, I, 185f.; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, VI, 318-20: a wind from Jahannam burns them and further interpretations; Maqdisī, al-Bad', III, 76-7: they thought that there was fresh water in the cloud; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mirʾāt, 387: mentions three differing punishments. Cf. also Ps.-Aṣmaʿī, Qisas, 33b, and the detailed accounts in Qur. 7:85-93, 11:84-95, 26:177-191.

(174)-(175) Passages in § 174 are taken from Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XIX, 107, IX, 4; § 175 is from Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XIX, 109, 111; see also Suyūṭī, al-Durr, VI, 320. Regarding the different reading of al-Ayka – in all the sources explained as a grove of palms – see Samarqandi, Tafsīr, II, 482, and Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mirʾāt, 387; it is attributed to Ibn Masʿūd: Jeffery, Materials, 68. Some sources also mention the kings of al-Ayka, see for ex. Kīsāʾī, Qisas, 191; Ibn Iyās, Qisas, 113. In Samarqandi, Tafsīr, I, 556, al-Ayka is the name of the grove where the people of Madyan sought refuge to escape the torrid heat.
(176) The tombs of Shu‘ayb and of his followers are around the Ka‘ba. We corrected “the door of Banū Sahl” given in the text to “the door of Banū Sahm” as in Suyūtī, al-Durr, III, 504, and Hayšâm, Qīṣās, 33b, but about Ād. Azraqī, Aḫbār Makkα, I, 74, gives the same indication but states that the tombs are between Dār al-Nadwa and Dār of Banū Ḥāshim. Other traditions state that Shu‘ayb’s tomb is in front of the Black Stone, see Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʿrīkh, VIII, 71; Suyūtī, al-Durr, III, 504; Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntazam, I, 326; Sībīʿ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 388; Mujir al-Dīn, al-UNS, I, 73: the tomb is in the village of Ḥīṭṭin.

(Story of Hūd)

(177)-(180) Partially taken from ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ḥabīb, Kitāb al-taʿrīkh, 41 no. 83 with Fāris instead of Bāris (§ 179); the final part is also in Iṣḥāq b. Bishr, Mubtada’, 116a; cf. also Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XXX, 175-6. For a detailed genealogy, see Dinawarth, Kitāb al-akhbār, 5-8; and above all Ibn Hīshām, Kitāb al-tiğān, 33f. That Hūd was the first to speak Arabic is a controversial subject, see Majlīsī, Bihār, XI, 346, 350; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, I, 120; Shāṭibī, Kitāb al-jumān, 11a; and in relation to Adam, see § 49.

The complexity of the explanation is related to the Qurʾānic data, mentioning Hūd as “brother” of the Ād and then Ād along with Iram. Regarding the name Hūd – here probably taken from Iṣḥāq b. Bishr, Mubtada’, 116b – there are as usual differing variants, see for ex. Thaʿlabī, Qīṣās, 62; Majlīsī, Bihār, 345-6; Ibn al-Athir, al-Kāmil, I, 85; Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntazam, I, 252; Ibn Qutayba, al-Maʿārif, 28; Diyarbakrī, Taʿrīkh, I, 78; Sīyar al-anbiyā’, 32b; Qurṭābī, Taʿrīkh, 84. Regarding Ād, some traditions state that it was the name of ten or thirteen tribes, see Iṣḥāq b. Bishr, Mubtada’, 135b; Maqdisī, al-Bad’, III, 31; Sībīʿ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 254; Ibn Qutayba, al-Maʿārif, 28; Shāṭibī, Kitāb al-jumān, 10b: 1000 tribes. Almost all the sources hint at two Āds, see for ex. Ṭabarī, Taʿrīkh, I, 200, 231; Thaʿlabī, Qīṣās, 61; Iṣḥāq b. Bishr, Mubtada’, 121b f.; Maqdisī, al-Bad’, III, 36-7; Ibn Saʿd, Kitāb al-.tabaqāt, I/1, 19; and cf. Hayšâm, Qīṣās, 33b, about the “other” ʿĀd.

The meaning of Iram is widely debated by exegetes and Ṭaraḥf includes neither those traditions identifying it as Baghdad or Alexandria – see for ex. ʿAbdallāh b. Wahb, Taʾfsīr, 190; Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XXX, 175; Māwardi, Taʾfsīr, VI, 267-8; Suyūtī, al-Durr, VIII, 505-6; Sīyar al-anbiyā’, 34a – nor those long reports describing a mythical town built by Shaddād b. ʿĀd, see Ibn Hīshām, Kitāb al-tiğān, 74f.; Thaʿlabī, Qīṣās, 143f.; Diyarbakrī, Taʿrīkh, I, 76; Ps.-Asmaʿī, Nihayat, 19b f.: a long description; Ibn Abī ʿUdhayba, Qīṣās, 15b f.; Ḥījri, Qīṣās, 120a f.; Ibn Iyās, Qīṣās, 70f.; Ibn al-Ḥarīrī, ʿUmdat, 49b; Ibn
Kathîr, *al-Bidâya*, I, 120, 125; and cf. Shâ‘îbî, *Kitâb al-jumân*, 10b: Iram was the name of the tribe who believed in Hud.


(185) Probably from Ishāq b. Bishr, Mubtada', 150b, where it is attributed to Muqātil. Kisāʾ, Qīṣāṣ, 104-5, gives the names of those who believed in him, cf. also Nuwayrī, Nihāyat, XIII, 53: the believer Junāda; Haysam, Qīṣāṣ, 30b f.

(186) Cf. Ishāq b. Bishr, Mubtada', 150b-151a, but this passage is probably taken from ‘Abd al-Malik b. Ḥabīb, Kitāb al-taʾrīkh, 42 no. 83. Upon these two mythical towns, see also Taḥār, Taʾrīkh, I, 68; Thaʿlabī, Qīṣāṣ, 20-1; Ishāq b. Bishr, Mubtada', 171a f.; Ibn Iyās, Qīṣāṣ, 163; and see Wheeler, Moses, 93-117. Regarding variants of their names, see Tottoli, “Ibn Muḥarrif al-Ṭarafi”, 149 n. 91; to the references there, add Muqātil, Tafsīr, IV, 476; Rāwandi, Qīṣāṣ, 37-8.

(Story of Jonah)

(187)-(188) The final part of § 188 is from Taḥār, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XVII, 76-7; cf. also in ‘Abd al-Razzāq, Tafsīr, I, 298, about God’s reproach when Jonah complains about the destruction of the pumpkin. All the sources add particulars to the Qurʾānic setting of the story, with variants as usual, but it is usually stated that Jonah lived in Niniveh. Upon all these matters and further, see Kisāʾ, Qīṣāṣ, 296-8, 299; Taḥār, Taʾrīkh, I, 782-6, 787, 788: the chastisement lasted three days; Hūd b. Muḥammad, Tafsīr, III, 87-9; Thaʿlabī, Qīṣāṣ, 406, 407; Ibn Iyās, Qīṣāṣ, 175: in Niniveh the king kills the believers, 176; ‘Umāra b. Wathīma, Kitāb ǧadʿ al-khalq, 225f.; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 162a: he is sent at the age of 30 and only two believe him; Samarqandi, Tafsīr, II, 111-2, 377; Mujāhid, Tafsīr, I, 415; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, IV, 391-2; VII, 132, with more traditions upon Qur. 37:147; cf. also the long description in Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 558f.: Mattā is the name of Jonah’s mother; see also Thaʿlabī, Qīṣāṣ, 406; Abū al-Fidāʾ, Kitāb al-mukhtaṣar, I, 45; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, I, 360; Muḥṣir al-Dīn, al-UNS, I, 156.

(189) The names of the two hills are attributed to Ishāq b. Bishr also by Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 562; cf. ‘Umāra b. Wathīma, Kitāb ǧadʿ al-khalq, 225; also Maqdisī, al-Badʾ, III, 110, mentions the hill of repentance. Regarding Pharaoh’s faith or conversion before drowning, see § 388. Reports similar to what is here attributed to Ishāq b. Bishr are attested in Muqātil, Tafsīr, II, 250; and see also Māwardi, Tafsīr, II, 451-2; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 562: why God accepted the repentance of the people of Jonah and not that of the Pharaoh.


(191) Similar reports about this topic are in Muqātil, Tafsīr, III, 90; Samarqandi, Tafsīr, II, 377; Māwardi, Tafsīr, III, 465-6; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, V, 665; and all the other commentaries. About Jonah’s anger see also Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 564. The entire question conflicts with the conception of the īṣma of the
prophets; about this question see and Rāzī, *Iṣmat*, 114-5; *Laṭā’if al-anbiyā‘*, 79a f.; Bachmann, “Das Skandalon des Propheten Yūnus”, 54-68.


(Story of David)

is not the most frequent, see in fact only Abū al-Fidā’, Kitāb al-mukhtasar, I, 37. Sources usually mention 100 years, see Tha‘labī, Qisas, 292; and cf. Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir‘āt, 492: along with that of the 100 years, he mentions two other versions, i.e. 77 years from the Torah and 140 from Tha‘labī; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, I, 228; Majlisī, Biḥār, XIV, 8, 15; see also Ya‘qūbī, Ta‘rīkh, I, 56: 120 years. Upon the tradition stating that Adam gave some years of his own life to David, see annotations on § 49.

(198)-(199) From Ṭabarī, Jāmi‘ al-bayān, II, 625-6; this report is attributed to Wahb b. Munabbih, see also Suyūṭī, al-Durr, I, 761-2, and cf. the translation in Déclais, David raconté par les musulmans, 19f. Some traditions describe Saul’s attempts at killing David; for further particulars, see Muqāṭīl, Tafsīr, I, 209-10: three stones becoming one; Kisā‘ī, Qisas, 253-4: Goliath was 18 cubits tall and David 10, see also Nuwayrī, Nihāyat, XIV, 49; Tha‘labī, Qisas, 270-1; Ibn Iyās, Qisas, 137-8; Mas‘ūdī, Murūj, I, 61: the stone thrown is made of three stones; see in fact Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, II, 9; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, I, 761: Saul promised David one third of his kingdom; Ibn Abī ‘Udhayba, Qisas, 85b-87b; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir‘at, 473, 474: 100 men are to be killed for the dowry; Māwardī, Tafsīr, I, 319-20; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Tafsīr, II, 478-9; Ṭabarī, Ta‘rīkh, I, 556-9: a long report; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, I, 220f.; Ibn ʿAsākir, Ta‘rīkh, V, 704-5: one stone hits Goliath, the two others his army; ʿUmār b. Wathīma, Kitāb badr al-khalq, 93-6; Qisas al-anbiyā‘, Ms Damascus 3473, 204-5; Khoury, Wahb b. Munabbih, 48-50, 58: Israelites maintain that David has more rights to rule than Saul, about this see also Tha‘labī, Qisas, 272-4: a long report; Ps.-Aṣma‘ī, Qisas, 51b; Muqāṭīl, Tafsīr, I, 210. The reports about David and Goliath are discussed by Déclais, David raconté par les musulmans, 127-142, and about Saul’s jealousy: 143-162.

(200) Partially from Ṭabarī, Jāmi‘ al-bayān, II, 626-7, 629, and cf. Id., Ta‘rīkh, I, 555-6 (transl. Brinner, III, 136-7), and Suyūṭī, al-Durr, I, 763. All the sources mention the three stones of Isaac, Jacob and Abraham, but see Tha‘labī, Qisas, 271: the stones spoke to David and claimed that they belonged to Moses, Aaron and David himself; see also, in general, Ps.-Aṣma‘ī, Qisas, 50b; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir‘at, 473; Ibn Abī ‘Udhayba, Qisas, 85b; Nuwayrī, Nihāyat, XIV, 47-9; a differing tradition is in ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ḥabīb, Kitāb al-Ta‘rīkh, 70 no. 169.

(201)-(202) From Ṭabarī, Jāmi‘ al-bayān, II, 629, and in Id., Ta‘rīkh, I, 534 (transl. Brinner, III, 135-6). The particular of the mountains glorifying God along with David and the birds around him are Qur‘ānic (38:18-19). About these points and the story of the lion, see Kisā‘ī, Qisas, 258-9; Ṭabarī, Ta‘rīkh, I, 554-5; Tha‘labī, Qisas, 270, 276; Nuwayrī, Nihāyat, XIV, 55-6; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir‘at, 472; Ibn Iyās, Qisas, 137f., in part. 140-1; Ps.-Aṣma‘ī, Qisas, 49b, 53a:
God gave him a beautiful voice; Ibn Kathîr, al-Bidâya, II, 11: animals enchanted by his beautiful voice; about his virtues, see Déclais, David raconté par les musulmans, 163-80.

Some sources start David's story with reports about his childhood. For ex. it is said he was the youngest of thirteen or seven brothers, see Ps.-Aṣmaʿi, Qīṣâṣ, 49b; Thaʿlabî, Qīṣâṣ, 270f.; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzî, Mîrʾāt, 472; ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ḥabîb, Kitâb al-taʾrîkh, 69; Ibn Qutayba, al-Maʿārif, 45. Some traditions mention four brothers, see ʿUmâra b. Wathîma, Kitâb badʾ al-khalq, 91; Khoury, Wahb b. Munabbih, 48.

(203) Cf. Tabari, Jâmiʿ al-bayān, XXIII, 136f. Similar explanations can be found in ʿAbd al-Razzāq, Tafsîr, II, 161; Muqātil, Tafsîr, III, 639; Samarqandi, Tafsîr, III, 131; Suyūṭî, al-Durr, VII, 148-9; cf. Mâwardi, Tafsîr, V, 83-4; Mujâhid, Tafsîr, II, 548. All the sources stress David's devotion. His way of fasting, on alternate days, is described in hadith literature, see Bukhârî, Sahîh, II, 608-11 nos. 1974-7, 1979-80, IV, 485-6 nos. 3418-19, etc.; Muslim, Sahîh, II, 812-9 nos. 1159, 1162; ʿAbd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, IV, 294-6 nos. 7862-3, 7865; Ibn Mâja, Sunan, I, 546 no. 1713; etc. in all the collections. Another hadith states that the most favoured manner of fasting to God is that of David, and also that David's manner of praying is God's favourite, see Bukhârî, Sahîh, IV, 486 no. 3420; ʿAbd al-Razzâq, al-Muṣannaf, IV, 295 no. 7864; Muslim, Sahîh, II, 816 no. 1159; Ibn Mâja, Sunan, I, 546 no. 1712; Nasâʿî, Kitâb al-sunan al-kubrâ, I, 419 no. 1327; II, 118 no. 2653; Abû Dâwûd, Sunan, II, 340 no. 2448; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, II, 554 no. 6501, II, 653 no. 6938. Other traditions insist upon the great devotion of David, see Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, V, 492 no. 16281; cf. Tirmidhi, al-Jâmiʿ, V, 522-3 no. 3490: Muḥammad defined David as the most devoted of human kind; one of his invocations is also quoted by Dârîmî, Sunan, I, 103 no. 342.

(204) Probably from Muqātil, Tafsîr, III, 639. See also in Samarqandi, Tafsîr, III, 131; Mâwardi, Tafsîr, V, 84: 32,000, from Qatâda; Tabari, Jâmiʿ al-bayān, XXIII, 138, mentions 4,000 men; Thaʿlabî, Qīṣâṣ, 278, mentions two versions, 33,000 according to Ibn ʿAbbâs, and 4,000 according to al-Suddî; see also Siyar al-anbiyâʾ, 128a; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzî, Mîrʾāt, 479: 33,000 min awlād al-anbiyâʾ. All the sources describe at length this mihrâb where David used to go to pray, see Kisaʿî, Qīṣâṣ, 259; Tabari, Taʾrîkh, I, 563f.; Thaʿlabî, Qīṣâṣ, 277f.; Ibn Iyâs Qīṣâṣ, 141 Ibn ʿAsâkir, Taʾrîkh, V, 710.

(205) From Tabari, Jâmiʿ al-bayān, XXIII, 138. About this dream, see also Thaʿlabî, Qīṣâṣ, 278; Samarqandi, Tafsîr, III, 132; Siyar al-anbiyâʾ, 128a; Ps.-Aṣmaʿi, Qīṣâṣ, 53b; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzî, Mîrʾāt, 478; see also the version translated by Lindsay, “ʿAlî Ibn ʿAsâkir”, 70.
(206) Exegetical part not taken from Ṭabarī. About the interpretation of the expression fasl al-khitāb, see above all Muqātil, Tafsīr, III, 639; and also Samarqandi, Tafsīr, III, 132; Tha‘labī, Qīṣās, 277; Hūd b. Muḥakḵam, Tafsīr, IV, 10; Māwardi, Tafsīr, V, 84; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, VII, 154. The explanation that David was the first to say ammā ba‘du is included in awā‘il collections, see Ṭabarānī, Kitāb al-awā‘il, 118 no. 40; Ibn Abī ‘Aṣīm, al-Awā‘il, 67 no. 191; Suyūṭī, al-Wasā‘il, 39; Shiblī, Maḥāsin al-wasā‘il, 151; Jarā‘ī, al-Awā‘il, 122; see also Ibn ‘Asākir, Ta‘rikh, V, 714. This tradition is rejected in Rāzī’s tafsīr, see Johns, “David and Bathsheba”, 250.

(207)-(208) Some parts from Ṭabarī, Ta‘rikh, I, 566 (transl. Brinner, III, 146), and the end of § 208 from Id., Jāmi‘ al-bayān, XXIII, 150. All the main sources relate this story in a similar manner, see for ex. Kisā‘ī, Qīṣās, 260f.: David had 99 wives and the two angels are Gabriel and Michael; Ṭabarī, Ta‘rikh, I, 567f.: the bird is a dove, as stated in most sources; Tha‘labī, Qīṣās, 279f.; Qīṣās al-anbiyā‘, Ms Damascus 18863, 102b-103, listing various explanations; Ibn Iyās, Qīṣās, 142f.; Mas‘udi, Murūj, I, 63; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, VII, 155-65; Nuwayrī, Nihāyat, XIV, 61f.; ‘Umāra b. Wathima, Kitāb bād al-khalq, 102-20; Qīṣās al-anbiyā‘, Ms Gotha A 1740, 51a f.; Ibn al-Ḥarīrī, ‘Umdat, 71a-72b; Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir‘āt, 482-3, including the text of a long invocation by David; cf. also the translated passages in Déclais, David raconté par les musulmans, 29-31, 39-41, and the discussion in pp. 181-211.

Most of these sources give the name of Uriah’s wife, with orthographical variants. The most attested versions are Sābih and the derivations from the Hebrew Bathsheba; see ‘Umāra b. Wathima, Kitāb bād al-khalq, 10, but with a confusing genealogy; Tha‘labī, Qīṣās, 279; Khoury, Wahb b. Munabbih, I, 76, where Khoury reads Batshābā‘, but from the facsimile – II, f. 17:17 – it could also be read Batshāyā‘, such as in Muqātil, Tafsīr, II, 300, and close to the Tashāya‘ given by Ibn Iyās, Qīṣās, 142; see also Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir‘āt, 480: Shayā‘ b. Shayā‘ (similar to the name given by Rappoport, Myth and Legend, 179: Saya). Other versions are mentioned by Kisā‘ī, Qīṣās, 262; Qīṣās al-anbiyā‘, Ms Gotha A 1740, 53a. The place al-Balqā‘ is mentioned by Tha‘labī, Qīṣās, 280; ‘Umāra b. Wathima, Kitāb bād al-khalq, 105; Khoury, Wahb b. Munabbih, 72; Mujīr al-Dīn, al-Uns, 108. According to some sources David went to Uriah’s tomb, see Tha‘labī, Qīṣās, 284; Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir‘āt, 484; Majlisi, Biḥār, XIV, 22; Mujīr al-Dīn, al-Uns, I, 110-1; Ya‘qūbī, Ta‘rikh, I, 52; Qīṣās al-anbiyā‘, Ms Damascus 18863, 104b-106a: various relevant reports. This explanation of the Qur’ānic passage is particularly embarrassing in terms of the concept of prophetic ‘isma, and some exegetes reject it, ascribing it to the qūṣās; see already in this regard Tha‘labī, Qīṣās, 279f.; cf. Johns, “David and Bathsheba”, 236; Busse, “The tower of David”, 147-50; and above all Rāzī,
Ismat, 100f. Ibn Kathir, al-Bidaya, II, 9f., omits this interpretation which in his Tafsir (IV, 47) is regarded as one of the isra‘i‘ilya‘at; about the question of the isra‘i‘ilya‘at, see Tottoli, “Origin and Use of the Term Isra‘i‘ilya‘at”, 193-210. See also the Shi‘i rejection by Majlisi, Bihâr, XIV, 19f.; Husayni, Qisas, 89b f.; Shâtibi, Kitâb al-jumân, 20b; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mirâ‘at, 484: prophets are not permitted to act this way; Râwandi, Qisas, 202: these are popular stories; Maqdisî, al-Bad‘, III, 100: the story is taken from the ahl al-kitâb. Ibn ‘Asâkir only hints at these traditions without including them, see the explanations given by Lindsay, “‘Ali Ibn Asâkir”, 75-80. But early tafsîrs include them, see Muqâtîl, Tafsîr, III, 639-41; ‘Abd al-Razzâq, Tafsîr, II, 162-3; Hûd b. Muhîakkam, Tafsîr, IV, 13-4; Mâwardî, Tafsîr, V, 85-6; Samarqandi, Tafsîr, III, 132-3; and cf. also Ibn Qutayba, al-Ma‘ârif, 46. For further information about the exegetical treatment of this story in the main tafsîrs, see the article by Johns mentioned above.

(209) The first part ascribed to Mujâhid is from Tabari, Jami‘ al-bayan, XXIII, 150, and in Id., Ta‘rîkh, I, 568-9 (transl. Brinner, III, 148). For similar traditions, see Ibn al-Athir, al-Kamil, I, 226-7; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mir‘at, 470; ‘Umâra b. Wathîma, Kitâb bad‘ al-khalq, 114-6; about David’s penitence, see the discussion in Declais, David, 213-237, and Idem, “Le péché et la pénitence de David”. The second part is from Tabari, Jami‘ al-bayan, XXIII, 149 (transl. Newby, The Making of the Last Prophet, 159 and Declais, David raconté par les musulmans, 29); and cf. Tha‘labi, Qisas, 275; ‘Umâra b. Wathîma, Kitâb bad‘ al-khalq, 99-102. David cried for a long time, in fact one tradition states that nobody ever cried as much as Adam, Joseph and David, see Ibn ‘Asâkir, Ta‘rîkh, II, 628, 633-4; Majlisi, Bihâr, XI, 213, but cf. some pages before, XI, 204: in a list of five names David is not included. Tarafî does not mention traditions regarding the appearance of David. Reports usually describe him as a little man, with blue eyes and a little hair, see Tha‘labi, Qisas, 275; ‘Umâra b. Wathîma, Kitâb bad‘ al-khalq, 91; Dinawari, Kitâb al-akhbâr, 22; Khoury, Wahb b. Munabbih, I, 50; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mir‘at, 476; ‘Abd al-Malik b. Ḥabîb, Kitâb al-ta‘rîkh, 69; Majlisi, Bihâr, XIII, 446, XIV, 14; Ibn al-Athir, al-Kamil, I, 223; Ibn al-Ḥarîrî, ‘Umdat, 70b; Ibn Abî ‘Udhayba, Qisas, 85a; Qisas al-anbiyâ‘, Ms Gotha A 1740, 36b; Qudâ‘î, Ta‘rîkh, 123.

(Story of Solomon)

(212)-(213) Partially from Tabari, Jami‘ al-bayan, XXIII, 157-8. Traditions state that Solomon was substituted for forty days because he had lost his ring. See already ‘Abd al-Razzâq, Tafsîr, II, 164-5; see also Suyûtî, al-Durr, VII, 180-1, 185. The name of the demon is given in almost all the sources as Şakhîr, see
Myth Nuwayri Another Kisa°I Siyar anbiya b. Tabari these XXIII anbiya Qisas Mujahid Diyarbakri Ta’rikh, I, 250, 251; ‘Abd al-Malik b. Ḥabib, Kitāb al-ta’rikh, 72 no. 180; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir‘āt, 526: various versions of the name; ‘Umāra b. Wathīma, Kitāb bad‘ al-khalq, 154-5; Majlīsī, Bihār, XIV, 105-8; Qisas al-anbiyā, Ms Gotha A 1743, 51a; Qisas al-anbiyā, Ms Gotha A 1740, 124a; Mujāhid, Tafsīr, II, 549-51; Ṭabarī, Ta’rikh, I, 590f.; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Tafsīr, X, 3241-4; Samarqandi, Tafsīr, III, 136; Muqtaṭīl, Tafsīr, III, 644; Ṣakhir or Asyad; Siyar al-anbiyā, 142b-143b; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, VII, 178-81, 185-6; Ps.-ʿAṣmaʾi, Qisas, 60a f. As in Ṭarafī, some sources state that the name of the demon was ʿĀsaf, or directly that ʿĀsaf b. Barakahīyā substituted Solomon, see Ṭabarī, Jāmi‘ al-bayān, XXIII, 157; Mujāhid, Tafsīr, II, 550; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, VII, 181; Kīsāʾi, Qisas, 293f.; Thaʿlabī, Qisas, 325; Ibn ʿAsākir, Ta’rikh, VII, 572-83. Another similar version about Solomon and Ṣakhir is translated by Rappoport, Myth and Legend, III, 190-1.

(214) Similar traditions include information that demons thought about killing Solomon’s son, as stated in Samarqandi, Tafsīr, III, 136; Thaʿlabī, Qisas, 326; Nuwayrī, Nihayat, XIV, 133; Māwārdī, Tafsīr, V, 96; see also Latā’īf al-anbiyā, 100b-101a, according to whom this son was the disfigured son born when Solomon did not say in shā’ Allāh.

(215)-(216) The concluding exegetical part is partially from Ṭabarī, Jāmi‘ al-bayān, XXIII, 161-4. Regarding the first part of § 215, most of the sources mention that Solomon married an idolatrous woman who used to prostrate herself before these images and invite people to do the same, see Muqtaṭīl, Tafsīr, III, 645; Ṭabarī, Ta’rikh, I, 587-8; Kīsāʾi, Qisas, 293; Māwārdī, Tafsīr, V, 95; Thaʿlabī, Qisas, 322f.; Siyar al-anbiyā, 143a; Ps.-ʿAṣmaʾi, Qisas, 61b. The name of this wife was Jarāda or Amina, or the second was the name of a servant, see Suyūṭī, al-Durr, VII, 178-9; Ṭabarī, Ta’rikh, I, 590, 592; Thaʿlabī, Qisas, 322; Ibn ʿAsākir, Ta’rikh, VII, 573-4; Ibn Iyās, Qisas, 152: his wife was of Greek descent; Māwārdī, Tafsīr, V, 97; Ibn al-ʿAṭārī, al-Kāmil, I, 238f.; ‘Umāra b. Wathīma, Kitāb bad‘ al-khalq, 154-5, 159, 166; Majlīsī, Bihār, XIV, 105; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir‘āt, 527, 529; Diyārbakrī, Ta’rikh, I, 250-1; Latāʾīf al-anbiyā, 101a f.; see also Rappoport, Myth and Legend, 203-4. Commenting on the verses quoted in the final part, tafsīrs do not usually include relevant reports, see for ex. Samarqandi, Tafsīr, III, 137; Mujāhid, Tafsīr, II, 551-2; Hūd b. Muḥakkam, Tafsīr, IV, 21; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, VII, 87-191; Māwārdī, Tafsīr, V, 98-101; Muqtaṭīl, Tafsīr, III, 646-7. Upon differing variants regarding the itinerary of the wind, see also ʿAbd al-Razzāq, Tafsīr, II, 127: Damascus-İstakhr-Kabul; Muqtaṭīl, Tafsīr, III, 526: Jerusalem-İstakhr-Dhū


also ‘Abd al-Razzāq, *Tafsīr*, II, 79: the reference to “the speech of the birds” (Qur. 29:17) which was known by Solomon would also have included the language of the ants; Māwardi, *Tafsīr*, IV, 199: in fact the ant had two wings and was one of the birds; about all this see also Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Tafsīr*, IX, 2855-6; Suyūṭī, *al-Durr*, VI, 347: ants at Solomon’s times were like flies; Majlisi, *Bihār*, XIV, 90-98. Regarding Solomon’s power over animals and birds, see above all *Qīṣāṣ al-anbiyāʾ*, Ms Damascus 3473, 228-30; and regarding the ant, see in part. *Qīṣāṣ al-anbiyāʾ*, Ms Damascus 4100, 200-4.

The note upon Solomon’s laughter must be read in connection with the tradition stating that Muhammad’s laughter was in reality a smile, see *Tirmidhī, al-Jāmiʿ*, V, 601 no. 2642. Upon this topic see also Ibn ‘Asākir, *Taʾrīkh*, VII, 595.


According to Tha‘labī, Qiṣṭ, 312, the name of the father is Ilīsharāh, or al-Had’hād, see the orthographical variants in Ṭabarī, Ta'rikh, I, 576. The various printed editions of the Qiṣṭ al-anbiyā' of Tha‘labī contain differing versions, see for ex. Qiṣṭ al-anbiyā', ed. al-Jumhūriyya, Cairo n.d., 174: al-Bashrakh instead of Ilīsharāh, and so also in Lassner, Demonizing the Queen of Sheba, 189. Due to the persistent inconsistencies in the transcription of this and other names, further research in the manuscripts of Tha‘labī's work would appear to be necessary; about the problems connected to the Jumhūriyya ed. see Tottoli, review to Newby, A History of the Jews of Arabia, in Annali di Ca' Foscari, s.o. 13, 1991, 383. In this case, the version of the term al-Bashrakh should be regarded as a corruption of the term Ilīsharāh. In fact the latter is found earlier in Ibn Ḥābīb, al-Muḥabbār, 367, and this is the most probable vocalization, close to the numerous variants attesting that the name was Bīlqīs bt. Abī/Dhi Sharḥ/al-Sharḥ, along with the differing versions al-Had’hād or al-Haddād.

About all these names see Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāyā, II, 21: one of the names of the father is al-Sayraḥ; Dīnawarī, Kitāb al-akhbār, 22: Dūhū Sharḥ is the laqab of al-Had’hād; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, VI, 351, 353; Ibn Iyās, Qiṣṭ, 148; Ibn Abī, 'Udhayba, Qiṣṭ, 102a; Majlisi, Bihār, XIV, 112; Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Miṣrāt, 515: various versions; Qiṣṭ al-anbiyā', Ms Gotha A 1740, 107a; Qiṣṭ al-anbiyā', Ms Gotha A 1743, 56b; Qaramānī, Akhbār al-duwal, 179. See also Kisā‘i, Qiṣṭ, 287: on her birth; Ṭabarī, Ta’rikh, 583; Watt, "The Queen of Sheba in Islamic tradition", 99, from Mas‘ūdī: Yeshrah or Anishurah.

Some sources also mention the name of her jinnīyya mother: Fāzima, according to Muqāṭil, Tafsīr, III, 301: bt. al-Ṣakhr; Māwardī, Tafsīr, IV, 81: Fārī‘a; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, VI, 351, 352: along with the name Balqama bt. Shaysān; Tha‘labī, Qiṣṭ, 313: Rayhāna bint al-Shukr; see also Mujīr al-Din, al-ʻUns, I, 129: bt. Ilīsakan; Dīyārbakrī, Ta’rikh, I, 244; 'Abd al-Malik b. Ḥābīb, Ta’rikh, 367: Rawāḥa bint al-Sukayn; Ibn Hishām, Kitāb al-tijān, 146: Rawāḥa bt. Sakn; Ibn al-Athīr, Kāmil, I, 231: Rawāḥa bt. al-Sakn or Yalqama; Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Miṣrāt, 515: bt. al-Sakn. Upon all these names, see Canova, "La leggenda della regina di Saba", 107-9, and upon the origin of the name Bilqīs, see Pennacchietti, "La reine de Saba", 7-12.

(230)-(231) Some passages from Ṭabarī, Jāmi‘ al-bayān, XIX, 152, 148. Regarding these arguments, see Māwardī, Tafsīr, IV, 205-6; Hūd b. Muḥakkam, Tafsīr, III, 251; Muqāṭil, Tafsīr, III, 301: a complete description of his throne; Kisā‘i, Qiṣṭ, 289f.; Ṭabarī, Ta’rikh, I, 578f.; Tha‘labī, Qiṣṭ, 314f.; Majlisi, Bihār,
XIV, 117; Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzi, Mirʾāt, 516; ‘Abd al-Malik b. Ḥabīb, Kitāb al-taʾrikh, 71 no. 175; Ibn Iyāṣ, Qīṣāṣ, 148; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 139a; Ibn Hishām, Kitāb al-tijān, 162f. According to a legend, Solomon’s hoopoe, called Yaʿfūr, met Bilqis’ hoopoe, called ‘Afnīr/ʿUfayr, see Canova, “La leggenda della regina di Saba”, 116; Lassner, Demonizing the Queen of Sheba, 188. See also Thaʿlabī, Qīṣāṣ, 311; Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzi, Mirʾāt, 512; ‘Umāra b. Wathima, Kitāb badʾ al-khaql, 135-6; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 138a; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, VI, 349: the name was ‘Anbar. Some sources mention the names as Yaʿfūr and ‘n.f.y.r (ʿAnfīr?), see Majlisi, Biḥār, XIV, 129: corrected by the editor in ‘Anqīr; Diyarbakrī, Taʾrikh, I, 243; Ibn Abī Ḫayyaḥ, Qīṣāṣ, 101b; Ḥusaynī, Qīṣāṣ, 139a: ‘Anqīr; Muḥjir al-Dīn, al-Uns, I, 127: Yanṣūr and ‘Unayfīr.

(232)-(233) Only § 232 is from Taḥārī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XIX, 151, the rest is abridged from XIX, 153, 155. Similar reports can be found in Suyūṭī, al-Durr, VI, 357-9. Regarding the letter sent by Solomon to the queen of Sheba, see Kīṣāʾī, Qīṣāṣ, 290; Thaʿlabī, Qīṣāṣ, 314f.; Ibn Iyāṣ, Qīṣāṣ, 148: Bilqīs became Muslim when the letter hit her head; Muqṭīl, Tafsīr, III, 302-3; Samarqandī, Tafsīr, II, 494-5; ‘Umāra b. Wathima, Kitāb badʾ al-khaql, 138-9; Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzi, Mirʾāt, 517-8; Majlisi, Biḥār, XIV, 117: Bilqīs sent for 312 tribes; Diyarbakrī, Taʾrikh, I, 246: Bilqīs convoked 12,000 commanders.

(234)-(235) Upon these tests, see the brief note by Venzlaff – König, “Salomo un das Rätself”. Similar reports about the delegation of boys and girls are in Thaʿlabī, Qīṣāṣ, 314-8, in part. 316, with various versions on the number of these young; Kīṣāʾī, Qīṣāṣ, 291; Taḥārī, Taʾrikh, I, 579f.; Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzi, Mirʾāt, 518-9; ‘Umāra b. Wathima, Kitāb badʾ al-khaql, 142-3; Muḥjir al-Dīn, al-Uns, I, 132-4; Nuwayrī, Niḥāyat, XIV, 118-9; Majlīsī, Biḥār, XIV, 119f.; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 140a-141b; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, VI, 358: the present consists in 200 horses; upon boys and girls, see also the versions collected by Lassner, Demonizing the Queen of Sheba, 229 n. 26; and Muqṭīl, Tafsīr, III, 304-5: the chief of the delegation was a man called al-Mundhir b. ʿAmr and it was Gabriel who told Solomon of the tests; see also Samarqandī, Tafsīr, II, 495-6; ʿAbd al-Razzāq, Tafsīr, II, 81: as present golden tables were sent; Ibn Abī Ḫatūm, Tafsīr, IX, 2877-81; cf. Māwārdī, Tafsīr, IV, 208-10: 80 or 160 boys and girls sent.

(236) Only partially abridged from Taḥārī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XIX, 162-3. Tafsīrs usually add further particulars about this “ṣifrat of the jinn” (Qur. 27:39) and “he who possessed knowledge of the the Book” (Qur. 27:40); see Taḥārī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XIX, 161: the first was called Kūzan/Kawzan, and idem, XIX, 162-3: the second B.l.ykhā or was his minister Āṣaf. See also Thaʿlabī, Qīṣāṣ, 318: K.w.dā or K.w.dḥān and the second was Gabriel, or an unnamed angel, or a man, or Āṣaf, or a man called Astūm or M.l.yḥā; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 141 a f.; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, II, 24: Āṣaf; Māwārdī, Tafsīr, IV, 213: various versions;
something. Ṭarafi does not include the commonly quoted traditions about Solomon’s death.

*(Story of Job)*

(245)-(246) Probably from Ḩishāq b. Bishr’s *Mubtada*, as it appears in Ibn ‘Asākir, *Taʾrīkh*, III, 254; this same tradition is also in Suyūṭī, *al-Durr*, V, 652-3. The Qurʾān (21:83-84, 38:41-44) praises Job’s patience and devotion. According to all the sources, Job was the most patient of his time, see for ex. Muṣṭā’il, *Tafsīr*, III, 89. Regarding all the questions connected to the figure of Job, and the material quoted here, see Déclais, *Les premiers musulmans*.


Abridged from Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XVII, 64-5 (transl. LeGrain, “Variations musulmanes”, 103; and Newby, The Making of the Last Prophet, 97-8; cf. also Macdonald, “Some external evidence”, 154-5). About the end of suffering, see the differing versions in Ṭabarī, Taʿrīkh, I, 364; Kīsāʾi, Qiṣṣaṣ, 183-9; Thaʿlabī, Qiṣṣaṣ, 160f.; Ibn Iyās, Qiṣṣaṣ, 111. The final part is abridged – with substantial modifications – from Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XXIII, 166-7. All the tafsīrs mention two springs, see for ex. Muqāṭil, Tafsīr, III, 646-7; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, VII, 193-4; Samarqandi, Tafsīr, III, 137: it was Gabriel who told him to stamp upon the ground; Māwardi, Tafsīr, V, 102.

Beginning from Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XVII, 69 (transl. LeGrain, “Variations musulmanes”, 109); the rest is from Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XXIII, 167. The ḥadīth is not included in the major collections, but is often quoted in tafsīrs, see Samarqandi, Tafsīr, II, 375-6; Ibn Ābī Ḥātim, Tafsīr, VIII, 2460; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, V, 659-60; cf. also Thaʿlabī, Qiṣṣaṣ, 160 (transl. Macdonald, “Some external evidence”, 156); Majlisi, Bihār, 367; Ibn Kathīr, al-Kāmil, I, 223. Sources mention several variants upon the years the affliction lasted: 3, 7 years, 7 years and some months, 8, something more than 10 years, see the differing versions in Samarqandi, Tafsīr, II, 375, III, 138; Ibn Ḥasan, Taʿrīkh, III, 251, III, 258: 18 years; III, 257: in many traditions his wife states “we have been happy for 70 years and afflicted for 7” or – according to other versions – 70 years; Nisābūrī, al-Mustadrak, II, 635 nos. 4114-15: 7 or 15; Ṭabarī, Taʿrīkh, I, 364; Māwardi, Tafsīr, III, 461; Ibn Ābī Ḥātim, Tafsīr, VIII, 2460; Majlisi, Bihār, XII, 347, 367-8; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, I, 221-2; Sībṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʿāt, 380-1; Kīsāʾi, Qiṣṣaṣ, 185; Thaʿlabī, Qiṣṣaṣ, 162. Another tradition states that he remained afflicted seven years, seven months, seven days and seven hours, see Muqāṭil, Tafsīr, III, 648; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 90b; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Kitāb al-zuhd, 73; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, I, 222; Sībṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʿāt, 380; Tawārikh wa-qiṣṣaṣ al-anbiyāʾ, Ms Damascus 8228, 19b; Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntaẓam, I, 323; Majlisi, Bihār, XII, 347.

Job’s wife was the only one to stand by him, her name was Raḥma, daughter of Ephraim, see Thaʿlabī, Qiṣṣaṣ, 156f.; Mujir al-Dīn, al-Uṣn, I, 72; Abū al-Fidāʾ, Kitāb al-mukhtaṣar, I, 27; Husaynī, Qiṣṣaṣ, 81a. Most of the sources, along with her name and other versions of it, also mention various genealogical lines; about all this, see Muqāṭil, Tafsīr, III, 648: another name, Dunyā; Samarqandi, Tafsīr, II, 375; another name is Māḥin, daughter of Mishā; Qudāʾi, Taʿrīkh, 104: Ayā bt. Yaʿqūb, 105: Raḥma; Majlisi, Bihār, XII, 353; Latāʾif al-anbiyāʾ, 70b; Māwardi, Tafsīr, III, 464: Mākhūrā; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, VII, 197; Nuwayrī, Nikāyat, XIII, 162; Tawārikh wa-qiṣṣaṣ al-anbiyāʾ, Ms Damascus 8228, 16b. Another frequent name is Liyā, daughter of Yaʿqūb, see Ṭabarī, Taʿrīkh, I, 361; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, I, 128; Ḥayṣam, Qiṣṣaṣ, 83a; Maqdisī, al-Badʾ, III, 72;


Nisābūrī, al-Mustadrak, II, 636 no. 4118; Ibn Kathîr, al-Bidâyâ, I, 225: 93 years but according to some other traditions longer than this; or 73 years, see Kisâ’î, Qiṣṣâs, 189; Ibn Iyâs, Qiṣṣâs, 112: 73 or 100 years; for other versions, see Sibt Ibn al-Jawzî, Miṣrî, 384; and Siyar al-anbiyâ’i, 92b: 73, 93, or 140; along with the most common versions, Ibn al-Jawzî, al-Muntaẓam, I, 232, also mentions 146 years, as stated in Majlisi, Bihâr, XII, 352, who explains: Job was afflicted when he was 73 years old and afterwards he lived for as long again. Some sources say that he lived for 70 years after the affliction, see Ps.-Asma’î, Qiṣṣâs, 33a; Haṣṣam, Qiṣṣâs, 85a; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzî, Miṣrî, 384; Ibn al-Athîr, al-Kâmîl, I, 131; Suyûtî, al-Durr, V, 661: he lived following the hanîfîyya 70 years among the Rûm. Regarding his appearance, see Tottoli, “Ibn Muṭṭârîf al-Ṭarâfî”, 153.

(Story of Joseph)

(258) A translation of this part is in Nagel, Die Qiṣṣâs al-anbiyâ’, 116-9. About the contents of this tradition and in particular the prostration of the faggots (cf. Gen., 37, 7), see Tottoli, “Ibn Muṭṭârîf al-Ṭarâfî”, 157 and other sources quoted there. See also Haṣṣam, Qiṣṣâs al-anbiyâ’, 57b, for another dream and further particulars. Sources usually add further particulars, for ex. about Joseph’s age when he had the dream: 7 or 12 years, but see Majlisi, Bihâr, XII, 275: thrown in the well at 9 years; Dîyârâbârî, Ta’rîkh, I, 132: 7, 12 or 17 years; or sources say that the dream was on a Friday; about all this see Tha’labî, Qiṣṣâs, 111f.; Ta’barî, Ta’rîkh, I, 373; Kisâ’î, Qiṣṣâs, 156f.; Siyar al-anbiyâ’, 65a; Ps.-Asma’î, Qiṣṣâs, 29a-29b; Ibn Kathîr, al-Bidâyâ, I, 200; Ibn al-Athîr, al-Kâmîl, I, 138: it was Jacob’s wife who told Joseph’s brothers of his dream. Some sources also mention the names of the stars, see Majlisi, Bihâr, XII, 263; Qiṣṣâs al-anbiyâ’, Ms Damascus 3473, 99-100; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzî, Miṣrî, 340-1; Dîyârâbârî, Ta’rîkh, I, 132. The exegetical explanation at the end of this report is connected to the fact that Joseph’s wife was already dead by the time his dream was fulfilled, see § 323.

(259) From Ta’barî, Jâmi’ al-bayân, XII, 155, 156; regarding the last tradition ascribed to Qatâda, cf. also ’Abd al-Razzâq, Tafsîr, I, 317; Ibn Abî Ḥâtim, Tafsîr, VII, 2106. Particularly interesting are the differing traditions about the brother who asked not to kill Joseph; along with Reuben, Ta’barî, Jâmi’ al-bayân, XII, 156, mentions also Simeon. These two names are mentioned also by Maqdîsî, al-Bad’î, III, 67; and Suyûtî, al-Durr, IV, 508-9, but there are further variants, see Sibt Ibn al-Jawzî, Miṣrî, 342: Reuben, Dan or Simeon wanted to kill him, but Judah stopped them; Samarqandi, Tafsîr, II, 152: Reuben or Judah, who was the most skillful; Baghâwî, Tafsîr, III, 265: Judah or Reuben, but the first is to be preferred. Most of the sources in fact prefer Judah, see Muqṭîil,
Tafsir, II, 320; Kisârî, Qîṣâs, 158; Tha‘labî, Qîṣâs, 111; Ibn al-Jawzi, al-Muntażam, I, 311; Siyâr al-anbiyâ, 65b; Hayyam, Qîṣâs, 58b; Ibn al-Athîr, al-Kâmîl, I, 138. Some Shî‘î versions instead state that this brother was Levi, see Majlisi, Bihâr, XII, 251-2; Ḥusayni, Qîṣâs, 69b. The three differing versions given by Ṭarafî between § 259 and § 260 are also enumerated in Mâwardî, Tafsir, III, 11; Ibn Kathîr, al-Bidâya, I, 200. See also the differing versions in Hämeen-Anttila “We will tell you”, 23-4.

(260) The brief mention of Simeon is from Ṭabarî, Jâmî‘ al-bayân, XII, 156. The version in Ṭarafî is quite relevant, since most of the sources usually depend on traditions traced back to al-Suddî upon this subject, see for ex. Suyûtî, al-Durr, IV, 500-8; see also Tha‘labî, Qîṣâs, 111-6; Latâ‘îf al-anbiyâ‘, 51a-51b: an interesting version upon the words of Gabriel; ‘Amîlî, al-Jawâhirî, 29: Gabriel taught him the invocation of God to be rescued. See also Sibt Ibn al-Jawzî, Mi‘rât, 343-5; Râwandi, Qîṣâs, 128; Kisârî, Qîṣâs, 158f.; Ṭabarî, Ta‘rîkh, I, 373f.; Mujîr al-Dîn, al-UNS, I, 67; Ibn al-Athîr, al-Kâmîl, I, 140-1; Majlisi, Bihâr, XII, 348-9: upon the shirt; Hayyam, Qîṣâs, 59a-60a: Gabriel took food from heaven for Joseph, 59b: Judah visited him; Ibn al-Murrajjâ, Fadâ‘îl, 352: about his shirt. A differing version of this story is in Diyarbakrî, Ta‘rîkh, I, 132-3.

The man who came to the well and took Joseph, Mâlik b. Du‘rî, was an Arab from Madyan, see Tha‘labî, Qîṣâs, 116; Kisârî, Qîṣâs, 160: M. b. D. al-Khuza‘î; Muqâtîl, Tafsîr, II, 325: along with the name of the second, ‘Awd b. ‘Amîr; cf. also Ṭabarî, Ta‘rîkh, I, 377; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzî, Mi‘rât, 345; Abû al-Baqâ‘î, Kitâb al-manâqib, 34-5: two differing genealogical trees but with M. b. Dhu‘rî; in fact Mâlik b. Dhu‘rî is a common orthographical variant, see the transl. of Thackston of the Qîṣâs of Kisârî: Stories, 171; and see all the differing versions in Ṭabarî, Jâmî‘ al-bayân, XII, 175; Ibn Ḥabîb, al-Muḥabbâr, 389; Samarqandî, Tafsîr, II, 154; Mâwardî, Tafsîr, III, 17; Khâzîn, Tafsîr, III, 270; Hayyam, Qîṣâs, 60b, Nuwayrî, Nihayat, XIII, 134: b. Du‘rî; Ibn Kathîr, al-Bidâya, I, 202; Suyûtî, al-Durr, IV, 517; Diyarbakrî, Ta‘rîkh, I, 133; Maqdîsî, al-Badî‘, III, 68: Mâlik b. al-Dhu‘rî; Majlisi, Bihâr, XII, 223: Mâlik b. Zu‘rî; but cf. Newby, The Making of the Last Prophet, 104: Mâlik b. Dhi‘rî.

About this topic, see the discussion in Monferrer Sala, “El episodio de la venta de José”, with a commented translation of Ṭabarî, Ta‘rîkh, I, 373-7.

The main tafsîrs abound in versions upon the amount of money gained by his brothers selling him: 8, 10, 19, 20, 22 or 40 dirhems, see ‘Abd al-Razzâq, Tafsîr, I, 320; Muqâtîl, Tafsîr, II, 326: but not more than 40; Hûd b. Muḥakkam, Tafsîr, II, 260-1; Ṭabarî, Jâmî‘ al-bayân, XII, 172-3; Samarqandî, Tafsîr, II, 155; Mâwardî, Tafsîr, III, 18; Fârâ‘î, Ma‘ānî al-Qur‘ân, II, 40; Mujîr al-Dîn, al-UNS, I, 67; Abû al-Fidâ‘î, Kitâb al-mukhtâsar, I, 28; Nuwayrî, Nihayat, XIII,
135: he was sold for money and some pieces of cloth; Majlisi, Biḥār, XII, 223, 300; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mīrāt, 346: dirhems and a pair of sandals; cf. also the long report in Hayṣam, Qīṣās, 60b-62b.

(261) From Ṭabarī, Jāmiʾ al-bayān, XII, 161. See also the similar explanations, commenting on Qur. 12:15, by ʿAbd al-Razzāq, Tafsīr, I, 318; Muqātil, Tafsīr, II, 321; Samarqandī, Tafsīr, II, 158; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, IV, 511.

(262) From Ṭabarī, Jāmiʾ al-bayān, XII, 162; cf. also the report in § 309.

(263) From Ṭabarī, Jāmiʾ al-bayān, XII, 162, 163, 165, 166. There are many legends regarding these episodes; one, in particular, states that Jacob talked with the wolf which denied that he had eaten Joseph, see § 330. About the confrontation between Jacob and his sons, see Kisāʾī, Qīṣās, 159-60; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mīrāt, 344; Diyarbakrī, Taʾrīkh, I, 133; Thaʿīlabī, Qīṣās, 114-6: Judah brought food to Joseph while he was in the well; Hayṣam, Qīṣās, 60a-60b; Ibn Iyās, Qīṣās, 94; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 67a, 83a: Jacob asked the wolf and the Angel of Death; Ṣiyām b. Ḥanbal, Kitāb al-zuhd, 126: he asked Gabriel. The final part ascribed to al-Thawrī, defining patience, is often quoted in Qurʾānic commentaries, see ʿAbd al-Razzāq, Tafsīr, I, 319; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, IV, 514; cf. Māwardī, Tafsīr, III, 16.

(264) From Ṭabarī, Jāmiʾ al-bayān, XII, 166; in Ṭabarī and in ʿAbd al-Razzāq, Tafsīr, I, 319, this tradition is ascribed to Sufyān al-Thawrī. The question of Jacob’s affliction is problematic to exegetes who emphasise this problem: Jacob did not put his trust in God though he knew Joseph’s dream. Joseph, for his part, is reputed to be guilty of not informing his father that he was alive; see Hämeen-Anttila, “We will tell you”, 22-3. A tradition in Laṭāʾif al-anbiyāʾ, 578-58a, states that God gave Jacob a proof that Joseph was still alive. According to Kisāʾī, Qīṣās, 162, Jacob knew the truth from the beginning; see also Hayṣam, Qīṣās, 65a.

(265) Only the final part from Ṭabarī, Jāmiʾ al-bayān, XII, 176. Ṭarafi mentions the two most often recurring versions of the name of Potiphars, see also in Ṭabarī, Jāmiʾ al-bayān, XII, 175; Id., Taʾrīkh, I, 378. About differing variants, see in particular Kisāʾī, Qīṣās, 161; and the list in Heller, “Recits et personnages”, 119. Regarding the names of Potiphars’s wife, along with that of Zulaykhā – which is already attested in Muqātil, Tafsīr, II, 327; Maqdisī, al-Badʾ, III, 68; and Hayṣam, Qīṣās, 64a – there are also Rāʾīl bint Raʾāʾil and Bakā (or Fakā) bt. Fayūsh; see Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Tafsīr, VII, 2117; Thaʿīlabī, Qīṣās, 118; Abū al-Baqāʾ, Kitāb al-manāqib, 35; Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, XII, 175; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mīrāt, 347: also the name Nabus; Maqdisī, al-Badʾ, III, 68; Majlisi, Biḥār, XII, 281-2; Diyarbakrī, Taʾrīkh, I, 134; Ibn Abī ʿUdhayba, Qīṣās, 34a; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, I, 202). Rāʾīl is also mentioned by Ṭarafi in § 294.
(266) Abridged from Ṭabarī, Jami‘ al-bayān, XII, 175; see also Māwardī, Tafsīr, III, 20; Ibn Kathir, al-Bidāya, I, 202; Thā‘labī, Qīṣāṣ, 118; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, IV, 517; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir‘āt, 347-8.

(267) The definition of the age of maturity as between 18 and 30 years is attributed to Ibn ‘Abbās in Ṭabarī, Jami‘ al-bayān, XII, 177. Other versions mention different ages: 33, 30 as well as others, 20, 25, 28, 40, see Ṭabarī, Jami‘ al-bayān, XII, 177; Hayūs, Qīṣāṣ, 65b, various ages between 18 and 40; Māwardī, Tafsīr, III, 21; Samarqandi, Tafsīr, II, 156; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir‘āt, 348: until 60 years.

(269) From Ṭabarī, Jami‘ al-bayān, XII, 183. A similar but incomplete report is in Tha‘labī, Qīṣāṣ, 119-20; and see also Suyūṭī, al-Durr, IV, 502. Qur. 12:24 says that Joseph saw a proof (burhān) that prevented him from touching the woman. The interpretations about the nature of this proof are various: it was a Qur’ānic verse appearing on the wall or the image of the father, see ‘Abd al-Razzāq, Tafsīr, I, 321; Ḥūd b. Muḥammad, Tafsīr, II, 262; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Tafsīr, VII, 2123-6; Muqātil, Tafsīr, II, 329. According to other traditions it was Gabriel, looking like Jacob, see Kīsā‘ī, Qīṣāṣ, 163f.; Tha‘labī, Qīṣāṣ, 118f.; Ṭabarī, Ta‘rīkh, I, 380f.; Ibn Iyās, Qīṣāṣ, 96; Siyar al-anbiyā’, 69a; ‘Abdallāh b. Wahb, Tafsīr, 174; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mir‘āt, 350-1; Majlisi, Biḥār, XII, 332f.; Maqdisī, al-Bad?, III, 70; Diyarbakrī, Ta‘rīkh, I, 134-5. See also the explanations collected by Tawārīkh wa-qīṣāṣ al-anbiyā’, Ms Damascus 8228, 2a-3a. In Ibn Abī ‘Udhayba, Qīṣāṣ, 34b, the particular that the devil touched both of them lightly is ascribed to Iṣḥāq b. Bishr. That Joseph could have yielded, though only for an instant, to the woman’s temptation, proved to be embarrassing to exegetes, see for ex. Rāzī, Iṣnāt, 74-80: eight differing interpretations; Māwardī, Tafsīr, III, 25; and above all the discussions in Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir‘āt, 349-51.

(270)-(271) The final parts of these two chapters are from Ṭabarī, Jami‘ al-bayān, XII, 186, 190. These traditions are often quoted in commentaries, see all the various versions given by Ṭabarī, Jami‘ al-bayān, XII, 183-91; ‘Abd al-Razzāq, Tafsīr, I, 321; Samarqandi, Tafsīr, I, 157; Māwardī, Tafsīr, III, 25; Tha‘labī, Qīṣāṣ, 119-20; Siyar al-anbiyā’, 70a f.; Ps.-Aṣma‘ī, Qīṣāṣ, 29b; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mir‘āt, 351; Majlisi, Biḥār, XII, 334.

(273) From Ṭabarī, Jami‘ al-bayān, XII, 192; see also Suyūṭī, al-Durr, IV, 502-3. Differing interpretations deal with this witness, some state that it was a simple man or a baby in the cradle that exculpated Joseph, see Ṭabarī, Jami‘ al-bayān, XII, 194; Id., Ta‘rīkh, I, 382-3; Māwardī, Tafsīr, II, 28; Samarqandi, Tafsīr, II, 158; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, IV, 525-6; Tha‘labī, Qīṣāṣ, 121; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mir‘āt, 351; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, I, 143; Ibn Iyās, Qīṣāṣ, 96; Ibn Kathir, al-Bidāya, I, 204; see also Muqātil, Tafsīr, II, 330. A ḥadīth mentions the four babies who
talked in their cradles, including the witness of Joseph: Āḥmad b. Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, I, 663-4 no. 2822.

(274) From Ṭabarî, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XII, 197.

(275)-(276) Abridged from Ṭabarî, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XII, 198, 201, 204. For further particulars, see Kisâʿi, *Qiṣāṣ*, 164f.; ʿAbd al-Ṣabīʿī, *Qiṣāṣ*, 121; Ps.-Masʿūdî, *Akhbār*, 231-2. A report states that seven or nine of the 40 women present at the scene died, see Ṭabarî, *Qiṣāṣ*, 122; Ḥayṣam, *Qiṣāṣ*, 67b: various versions upon their number.

(277) Only the first part attributed to the Prophet and defining Joseph’s beauty is from Ṭabarî, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XII, 207, even if the proportions are different: a third to Joseph and his mother and two thirds to the rest of human kind. A ḥadîth states that Joseph had half (ṣhaṭr) of the beauty of human kind; see Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, IV, 298 no. 12507, IV, 570 no. 14052; Muslim, *Ṣāhiḥ*, I, 146 no. 162; Ṯabarî, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XII, 207; Id., *Ṭabarī*, I, 371; Maqdîsî, *al-Bādʾ*, III, 67; *Qiṣāṣ al-anbiyāʾ*, Ms Paris ar. 1924, 34a; Ḥayṣam, *Qiṣāṣ*, 56b; Sībṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, *Mīrāt*, 339, 345; Qaramānī, *Akhbār al-duwal*, 80; Ṭabarî, *Qiṣāṣ al-anbiyāʾ*, 108; and cf. Ibn Kathîr, *al-Bidāya*, I, 205. Other traditions are more elaborate and state that beauty was divided in ten parts: three to Eve, three to Sarah, three to Joseph and one to the rest of human kind, see Suyūṭî, *al-Durr*, IV, 531-2: he gives the most extensive report with many variants; Ṯabarî, *Mustadrak*, II, 623-4 no. 4086-7; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Tafsîr*, VII, 2136; Ṭabarî, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XII, 207; Id., *Ṭabarī*, I, 371; Maqdîsî, *al-Bādʾ*, III, 67; *Qiṣāṣ al-anbiyāʾ*, Ms Paris ar. 1924, 34a; Ḥayṣam, *Qiṣāṣ*, 56b; Sībṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, *Mīrāt*, 339, 345; Qaramānī, *Akhbār al-duwal*, 80; Ṭabarî, *Qiṣāṣ al-anbiyāʾ*, 108; and cf. Ibn Kathîr, *al-Bidāya*, I, 205. Other traditions are more elaborate and state that beauty was divided in ten parts: three to Eve, three to Sarah, three to Joseph and one to the rest of human kind, see Suyūṭî, *al-Durr*, IV, 532; about Joseph’s beauty and his appearance see also *Qiṣāṣ al-anbiyāʾ*, Ms Damascus 3791, 97a-97b. Regarding Joseph’s appearance see the discussion and the references given in Tottoli, “Ibn Muṭṭarîf al-Ṭarāfī”, I, 153-4; see also Qaramānī, *Akhbār al-duwal*, 101.

(278)-(279) Regarding the appearance of Jacob and Isaac, see Tottoli, “Ibn Muṭṭarîf al-Ṭarāfī”, 154.

(280)-(282) § 280 and the first part of § 281 are from Ṭabarî, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XII, 209; the rest is abridged from Ṭabarî, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XII, 210-2.

(286)-(287) From Tabari, Jami' al-bayyan, XII, 217-21.
(288)-(289) The hadith in § 289 is not quoted in the major hadith collections, but in all the Qur'anic commentaries; see for ex. Tabari, Jami' al-bayyan, XII, 223; Hud b. Muhakkam, Tafsir, II, 270-1; Ibn Abi Hatim, Tafsir, VII, 2148; Suyuti, al-Durr, IV, 541. Sources state that five plus seven were the years that Joseph spent in prison, but there are as usual variants: 14 years or an amount between 3 and 9, see Mawardi, Tafsir, III, 40-1; 'Abd al-Razzag, Tafsir, I, 323; Muqatil, Tafsir, II, 335; Samarqandi, Tafsir, II, 163; Suyuti, al-Durr, IV, 542; Tabari, Jami' al-bayyan, XII, 224-5; about all the story cf. Id., Tarikh, I, 388f.; Tha'labi, Qisas, 124; Qisas al-anbiya', Ms Damascus 3473, 109-10; Ibn Kathir, al-Bidaya, I, 207; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mir'at, 356; Diyarbakri, Tarikh, I, 136.

(290) The first part is also in Ibn al-Murajja, Faḍā'il, 357 no. 592. All the sources mention Gabriel's visit to prison, see for ex. Kisa'ī, Qisas, 165-6; Tha'labi, Qisas, 125; Siyar al-anbiya', 83a; Haysam, Qisas, 70a.

(291) The final part from the quotation of Qur. 12:52 onwards is from Tabari, Jami' al-bayyan, XII, 238. For similar reports, see Kisa'ī, Qisas, 166; Tha'labi, Qisas, 125f.; Tabari, Tarikh, I, 389f.; Ibn Iyās, Qisas, 99-100; Ibn Kathir, al-Bidaya, I, 209; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mir'at, 356-7. As it is clear from the exegetical discussion, Joseph's refusal to leave prison sounded surprising to exegetes, see already Muqatil, Tafsir, II, 339. In a hadith from Abū Hurayra, Muḥammad states that if he had stayed in prison for as long as Joseph he would have answered affirmatively to the king's invitation to come out, see Bukhārī, Sahih, IV, 487 no. 3372; IV, 471 no. 3387, V, 264 no. 4694; Muslim, Sahih, I, 133 no. 151; Ibn Māja, Sunan, II, 1336 no. 4026; Ahmad b. Hanbal, Musnad, III, 228 no. 8400. For differing versions, see Tabari, Jami' al-bayyan, XII, 235; Suyuti, al-Durr, IV, 548; Haysam, Qisas, 71a; and the version in Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mir'at, 357-8.

(292) From Tabari, Jami' al-bayyan, XIII, 1, 4. When he left prison, Joseph was 30 years old, and according to other reports, when he was freed he left a message written on the door. Talking with the Pharaoh he showed his knowledge by speaking 70 different languages; about all this, see Tha'labi, Qisas, 126; Siyar al-anbiya', 76a; Majlisī, Bihār, XII, 294; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mir'at, 359; Ibn al-Athir, al-Kāmil, I, 146; Qisas al-anbiya', Ms Damascus 3791, 106a; Ibn Kathir, al-Bidaya, I, 210; Haysam, Qisas, 71b. The angel asking the question, mentioned by Ṭarafi as a generic angel, is in the other sources usually identified as Gabriel, see Muqatil, Tafsir, II, 340; Samarqandi, Tafsir, II, 166; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, IV, 550; Majlisī, Bihār, XII, 254; Haysam, Qisas, 71b.
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(293) From Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XIII, 4, 5; see also a differing version in Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʿāt, 359.

(294) From Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XIII, 5, 6. The name of the Pharaoh is given in almost all the sources as al-Rayyān b. al-Walīd who converted to Joseph's religion; but cf. the name given in Ps.-Masʿūdī, Akhbār, 230f., in part. 237. The final part about the meeting of Joseph and Zulaykhā (Rāʿīli) is also in Ṭabarī, Taʿrīkh, I, 392 (transl. Brinner, II, 166). Some traditions contain further particulars about the marriage of Joseph and Zulaykhā, see for ex. Ibn Iyās, Qiṣaṣ, 100-2; Thaʿlabī, Qiṣaṣ, 127-8; Hayṣam, Qiṣaṣ, 73a; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 76b-77a; Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntazam, I, 314, 315: Zulaykhā was old but God gave her youth and beauty. The name of the sons of Joseph and Zulaykhā are quoted with the usual orthographical variants, see Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XIII, 6; Id., Taʿrīkh, I, 392; Kiṣaʿī, Qiṣaṣ, 168; Thaʿlabī, Qiṣaṣ, 128; Ibn Qutayba, al-Maʿārif, 41; Dīyārbakrī, Taʿrīkh, I, 137; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, I, 156; Hayṣam, Qiṣaṣ, 73a; Ibn Abī ʿUdhayba, Qiṣaṣ, 39a; etc.

(296) From Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XIII, 7 (transl. Newby, The Making of the Last Prophet, 108-9), ascribed to Muhammad b. Iṣḥāq, and from idem, XIII, 7, and in Id., Taʿrīkh, I, 393 (transl. Brinner, II, 167-8), ascribed to al-Suddī. Sources add further particulars about their meeting, see for ex. Kiṣaʿī, Qiṣaṣ, 167-8; Thaʿlabī, Qiṣaṣ, 128f.; Ṭabarī, Taʿrīkh, I, 392f.; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 77b-78a; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, I, 211; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʿāt, 360-2: including many traditions; Hayṣam, Qiṣaṣ, 74a-74b; Dīyārbakrī, Taʿrīkh, I, 137; Nuwayrī, Nihāyat, XIII, 150-1; Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntazam, I, 316.

(297)-(298) Partially from Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XIII, 9, 10f. The question of whether Joseph's brothers were prophets is debated, see for ex. Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʿāt, 316, 342-3; that they were not prophets is maintained by Majlisī, Bihār, XII, 220, 283, 291, 322-3, who often touches the subject; Rāwandī, Qiṣaṣ, 129; also Kiṣaʿī, Qiṣaṣ, 169; Ṭabarī, Taʿrīkh, I, 395f.; Thaʿlabī, Qiṣaṣ, 130-1; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 79a; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʿāt, 362-3; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, I, 149.

(299) Partially abridged from Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XIII, 13, 14. There were four doors; see Thaʿlabī, Qiṣaṣ, 130-1; Kiṣaʿī, Qiṣaṣ, 170; Ṭabarī, Taʿrīkh, I, 396f.; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 79b; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʿāt, 363; Hayṣam, Qiṣaṣ, 74b-75a: about the pact imposed by Jacob upon his sons. Cf. also the passages about this argument translated by Köbert, "Zur Lehre des Tafsīr".

(300)-(302) Abridged from Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XIII, 15 (§ 300), and Id., Taʿrīkh, I, 379 (transl. Brinner, II, 170-1), XIII, 16 (§ 301), XIII, 18 (§ 302). Some sources add the story of the meeting of Joseph with Joseph himself, see Kiṣaʿī, Qiṣaṣ, 170-1; Thaʿlabī, Qiṣaṣ, 131-3; Majlisī, Bihār, XII, 287; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʿāt, 364; Dīyārbakrī, Taʿrīkh, I, 137; Husaynī, Qiṣaṣ, 74b:
Benjamin was angry with his brothers, 75a: it was a golden cup; Hayšam, *Qīṣās*, 75b: Benjamin has the shirt of Joseph and Joseph, upon smelling it, said that the blood on it was not human; Ṭabarī, *Ta’rīkh*, I, 397f.; *Siyyar al-anbiyā’*, 80a-81b. It was Ephraim, Joseph’s son, who shouted, see Samarqandi, *Tafsīr*, II, 170; Kīsāʾī, *Qīṣās*, 171.


(312) Abridged from Tabari, Jami' al-bayân, XIII, 32f., and cf. Id., Ta'rîkh, I, 403-4 (transl. Brinner, II, 176-7). Traditions usually state that the brother who talked was Simeon or Rawbil, but in Shi'i opinion it was Levi, see Majlisi, Bihâr, XII, 240; Husaynî, Qisas, 75b.

(313)-(315) Partially from Tabari, Jami' al-bayân, XIII, 37-8, 38, 41, 41f. Traditions and reports add particulars about Jacob's affliction, stating on some occasions that it was connected to an earlier sin, see in general Kisâ, Qisas, 173; Tha'labî, Qisas, 134-5; Tabari, Ta'rîkh, I, 404; Ibn al-Athîr, al-Kâmîl, I, 152; Ibn al-Murajjâ, Faḍâ'îl, 354 no. 586; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mirât, 368; Diyârâbârî, Ta'rîkh, 138-9; Hayyâm, Qisas, 76a: Jacob knew that Joseph was alive; on the affliction see 78a-79b; Siyar al-anbiyâ, 82b f.; Shi'i reports emphasise the motif of the affliction, see Majlisi, Bihâr, XII, 264f. Some reports emphasise that Joseph's progeny, being guilty of their father's affliction, lost the gift of prophecy, see Majlisi, Bihâr, XII, 280f.; Qisas al-anbiyâ, Ms Damascus 3473, 118-9; Husaynî, Qisas, 79a. According to other traditions, Jacob should have known that Joseph's dream was true. Some reports state that Joseph, when he met his father, told him that he should not have been afflicted so deeply, since they would surely have met on the day of Resurrection, see for ex. Tha'labî, Qisas, 138; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mirât, 372-3.

(316) The beginning is ascribed to Mujâhid from Tabari, Jami' al-bayân, XIII, 46-7; part of the rest abridged from idem, XIII, 47-9. According to some traditions it was God himself who promised Jacob to give Joseph back to him. Regarding this and other reports upon Jacob's attempts to find out Joseph's destiny, see Kisâ, Qisas, 173; Tha'labî, Qisas, 135-6, 139; Majlisi, Bihâr, XII, 244, 260: Jacob invokes the names Muhammad, 'Ali, Fâṭima, etc.; Tabari, Ta'rîkh, I, 404-5; Siyar al-anbiyâ, 82b; Husaynî, Qisas, 76b-77a; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mirât, 368-9. About the Angel of Death, see also Mawardi, Tafsîr, III, 72; Ibn Abî Hâtim, Tafsîr, VII, 2188-9; Samarqandî, Tafsîr, II, 174; Hayyâm, Qisas, 79b.

(317) Abridged from Tabari, Jami' al-bayân, XIII, 49-51. About the money, see also the interpretations given by Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mirât, 369.

(318)-(319) Abridged from Tabari, Jami' al-bayân, XIII, 51-7. About his shirt, see also § 260. Other sources mention further particulars about Joseph's recognition and his confrontation with his brothers, see Kisâ, Qisas, 174-5: Joseph sharply accused them; Tha'labî, Qisas, 137: Joseph disclosed his identity breaking into tears when he read a letter by Jacob; see also Suyûti, al-Durr, IV, 579; Tabari, Ta'rîkh, I, 406f. Letters were written between Jacob and Joseph, see Diyârâbârî, Ta'rîkh, I, 139-40; Ibn al-Athîr, al-Kâmîl, I, 153; Siyar al-anbiyâ, 84a; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mirât, 370; Majlisi, Bihâr, XII, 244-5; Hayyâm, Qisas, 80b-81a; Husaynî, Qisas, 77a-77b.
All the sources include traditions of this kind about Joseph’s shirt, see Samarqandi, *Tafsir*, II, 175-6; Māwardi, *Tafsir*, III, 76; Suyūṭī, *al-Durr*, IV, 580; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Tafsir*, VII, 2196, and the sources quoted above. The messenger sent to Jacob with the shirt is usually identified as Judah. The particular of Joseph’s scent reaching Jacob before the messenger is already in ʿAbd al-Razzāq, *Tafsir*, I, 329, and see also Majlisi, *Bihār*, XII, 236: 18 days of distance.


(322) Abridged from Ṭabarī, *Jāmiʾ al-bayān*, XIII, 62-5. The wording of this ḥadīth – not mentioned in the major collections – is different from the one included in Ṭabarī, *Jāmiʾ al-bayān*, XIII, 65. Sources include differing variants about how much time Jacob had to pray to obtain forgiveness from God for his sons, see the comprehensive treatment in Sībīʿ Ibn al-Jawāḥī, *Mīrāţ*, 372.


(324)-(325) Abridged from Ṭabarī, *Jāmiʾ al-bayān*, XIII, 67, 69, 71. Sources agree that this was a prostration of greeting. About it see the discussion and the materials quoted in Tottoli, “Muslim attitudes towards prostration. I”, 26-8.

III, 82-3; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Tafsīr, VII, 2202; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, IV, 589. Some variants relate to Joseph’s age: 110, 125, but 120 years is the most frequent version. Further, Joseph was buried by the Nile and his mortal remains were later brought to Palestine at the time of Moses. On these arguments, see Kisā’ī, Qīṣas, 177; Tha’labī, Qīṣas, 114, 142; Hayṣam, Qīṣas, 82b; Ibn Iyās, Qīṣas, 104: 70 years of being far away; Siyar al-anbiyā’, 87b; Mas‘ūdī, Murūj, I, 52-3; Majlisī, Bihār, XII, 221, 261, 297-8; Ibn al-Athir, al-Kāmil, I, 155; Maqdisī, al-Bad’, III, 69; Mujir al-Dīn, al-Uns, I, 68; Diyār bakrī, Ta’rīkh, I, 140-1; Sībṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir’at, 375; Mas‘ūdī, Akhbār, 237: 123 years; cf. also Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Kitāb al-zuhd, 128.

(328)-(329) From Ṭabarī, Jāmi’ al-bayān, XIII, 72. Sources usually number Joseph’s relatives who entered into Egypt at 72; about this question see Tha’labī, Qīṣas, 140; Siyar al-anbiyā’, 87b; Muqāṭīl, Tafsīr, II, 350; Samargandi, Tafsīr, II, 176: according to a version 73; Tawārīkh wa-qīṣas al-anbiyā’, Ms Damascus 8228, 13b: 93 or 72; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Tafsīr, VII, 2201; Maqdisī, al-Bad’, III, 69: 80; cf. also Hāyšam, Qīṣas, 82b. See also Nīṣābūrī, al-Mustadrak, II, 625 no. 4091: they were 390 men and then 670,000 left Egypt.

(330) I was not able to trace the source of this tradition; about it see Tottoli, “Ibn Mutarrif al-Ṭarafi”, 157-8. To the references quoted there add the parallel versions in Ibn Iyās, Qīṣas, 94; Siyar al-anbiyā’, 83a: Jacob asked both the wolf and the Angel of Death; Tawārīkh wa-qīṣas al-anbiyā’, Ms Damascus 8228, 11b; see in part. the long tradition in Qīṣas al-anbiyā’, Ms Damascus 3473, 102; a version quite similar to that in Ṭarafi is in Qīṣas al-anbiyā’, Ms Damascus 3791, 101a.

(331)-(333) About these names, cf. beginning of Ex., 1, 2-4. For differing versions see Ṭabarī, Jāmi’ al-bayān, I, 568, comm. to Qur. 2:136; and Maqdisī, al-Bad’, III, 66; Nīṣābūrī, al-Mustadrak, II, 622 no. 4080; Ya‘qūbī, Ta’rīkh, I, 31; Diyār bakrī, Ta’rīkh, I, 132; Majlisī, Bihār, XII, 219-20; Sībṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir’at, 316: a daughter called Dunyā. Regarding the total number of prophets and how many were Israelis there are many traditions and hadīths. From Abū Dharr, in Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, VIII, 130 no. 21602, VIII, 302 no. 22351: the nabīs were 124,000 and the rasūls were 315 or 310 and a few more; according to other versions the rasūls were 313 or 315, see Ibn Qutayba, al-Ma‘ārif, 56; Ṭabarī, Ta’rīkh, I, 152 (transl. Rosenthal, I, 323); Muqāṭīl, Tafsīr, III, 775-6: 315; Ibn Iyās, Qīṣas, 92; Ibn al-Wardī, Kharīdat, 223; Baghdādī, Ikhtisāṣ, 263; various versions; Nīṣābūrī, al-Mustadrak, II, 653 no. 4166, and see also no. 4167; Kisā’ī, Qīṣas, 94; Qīṣas al-anbiyā’, Ms Berlin Or. quart. 1171, 151b; Shāṭībī, Kitāb al-jumān, 16b; Ibn Saʿd, Kitāb al-tabaqāt, I/1, 10; Ibn Qutayba, al-Ma‘ārif, 56; Maqdisī, al-Bad’, III, 1; Sībṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir’at, 586, but the text is corrupted: 124,000 prophets and 13 rasūls (sic); Suyūṭī, al-
Durr, II, 746; Ibn Kathîr, al-Bidâya, I, 97. Samarqandî, Taṣfîr, I, 405, mentions traditions ascribed to Ka‘b al-Aḥbâr and Anas b. Mâlik about two million or more prophets; Hayṣam, Qiṣṣâ, 55a, states that amongst Jacob’s offspring there were 70,000 prophets. Cf. also how the question is dealt with in Schöck, Adam im Islam, 156-7; Wensinck, “Muhammed und die Propheten”, 168-71. The text of Ġaḫr about Israelite and non-Israelite prophets is problematic: non-Israelite prophets are 11 in § 331 while the number 20 in § 333 seems to be a corruption of the original rather than a variant version. About the question, see the comprehensive discussion in Tottoli, “Ibn Muṭṭarrif al-Ġaḫr”, 158-9; to the sources quoted there, add Ibn al-Dawâdārî, Kanz, II, 21: all were foreigners, except for the four Arab prophets.

(Story of Ishmael and Isaac)

(334)-(337) Only § 337 is from Ţabarî, Jâmi‘ al-bayân, XVI, 95. According to a differing tradition Ishmael started talking Arabic when he was 13 years old, when he was circumcised, and before that he talked Hebrew. About all these particulars, see Ibn Sa‘d, Kitâb al-tabaqât, I/1, 24; Sîḥ Ibn al-Jawzî, Mir‘ât, 310; Ibn ‘Asâkir, Ta’rîkh, II, 331: Isaac was circumcised at the age of 7 years; Ibn al-Jawzî, al-Muntazam, I, 105. §§ 334 and 335 are in Ibn Sa‘d, Kitâb al-tabaqât, I/1, 24, 25; cf. also Sîḥ Ibn al-Jawzî, Mir‘ât, 311; Ibn al-Jawzî, al-Muntazam, I, 105. In awá‘il collections the particular that Ishmael was the first to talk in Arabic is not frequent, see the comment of Shibî, Maḥâsin al-wasâ‘il, 143, upon the statement that he was the first to write in Arabic, cf. also Jirâ‘î, al-Awâ‘il, 92. Some sources state that the first to talk Arabic was Adam, see for ex. Ps.-Mas‘ûdî, Akhbâr, 49. Ra‘î is the name of Ishmael’s wife, the mother of his twelve sons; the first complete name is ascribed to Ibn Ishâq, see Ibn Hishâm, al-Sîra, I, 5, while the second name given by Ţabarî is ascribed to al-Kalbi in Ibn Sa‘d, Kitâb al-tabaqât, I/1, 25; and see also Sîḥ Ibn al-Jawzî, Mir‘ât, 311. Ţabarî, Ta’rîkh, I, 351, gives a different name of this second wife: al-Sâyyida bt. Muṣṭâd b. ‘Amr al-Jurhumî, see also Tha‘labî, Qiṣṣâ, 100; Ibn Kathîr, al-Bidâya, I, 192; Ibn al-Athîr, al-Kâmil, I, 125; Ishâq b. Bishr, Mubtada‘, 217a. These important data are also relevant to the questions of genealogy, see for ex. in Sîḥ Ibn al-Jawzî, Mir‘ât, I, 309-13.

(338) From Ibn Sa‘d, Kitâb al-tabaqât, I/1, 25; see also Ibn al-Jawzî, al-Muntazam, I, 306; Sîḥ Ibn al-Jawzî, Mir‘ât, 311. The major sources report the text with a slightly different wording. Most traditions place Ishmael and Hagar’s tombs in the Ḥijr near the Ka‘ba, see Ibn Hishâm, al-Sîra, I, 5; Ishâq b. Bishr, Mubtada‘, 217a; Tha‘labî, Qiṣṣâ, 100; Azraqî, Akhbâr Makka, I, 312 (transl. Tottoli, 93).
Many traditions deal with the tombs in the Ḥijr or close to the Ka‘ba, some of which mention 70 prophets buried, including also Ḥūd. About this topic, see Rubin, “The Ka‘ba”, 111; and Azraqi, Akhbār Makka, I, 68. All the sources agree that Ishmael died when he was 137 years old, see Ibn Iyās, Qīṣaṣ, 86; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 56a; Ps.-Aṣmaʾī, Qīṣaṣ, 26b; Maqdisi, al-Badʾ, III, 61.

(339) Abridged from Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, I, 358-9 (transl. Brinner, II, 137-8). For similar reports about this subject, see Kisāʾī, Qīṣaṣ, 153f.; Thaʿlabī, Qīṣaṣ, 101f.; Ibn Iyās, Qīṣaṣ, 89f.; Iṣḥāq b. Bishr, Mubtadaʾ, 215f.; Ps.-Aṣmaʾī, Qīṣaṣ, 27a; Yaʿqūbī, Taʾrīkh, I, 28-9; Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 314; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, I, 126-7; Hayṣam, Qīṣaṣ, 54b-55a; Diyarbakrī, Taʾrīkh, I, 130-1. The version of the name of Esau in Ṭabarī (ʿAysā) is an orthographical variant – and most probably a simple mistake in copying – of the most common ʿAyṣ or ʿAysū.

(340)-(341) Traditions usually add a fourth one, Levi, to the three sons of Leah. The name as given by Ṭabarī seems to be taken from Iṣḥāq b. Bishr, Mubtadaʾ, 216a. Isaac died when he was 160 years old, see Diyarbakrī, Taʾrīkh, I, 131, or 180 years old, see Qīṣaṣ al-anbiyāʾ, Ms Paris 1924, 26b; Hayṣam, Qīṣaṣ, 55a; and was buried close to Abraham. About their tombs, see Ibn al-Murajjā, Faḍāʾil, 333-4 no. 551, and cf. idem, 335 no. 553: Isaac died when 100 years old and Esau and Jacob 140 years old.

(Story of Elijah, Elisha and Dhu al-Kifl)

(342) The name – though taken from Iṣḥāq b. Bishr – is identical in Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XXIII, 91-2: Yāsīn instead of Yasīn; XXIII, 91: Elijah was in reality Idrīs; see also Muqātil, Tafsīr, III, 617: b. Finḥas; Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 459: Elijah b. Muṭar or b. Yāsīn or b. Nasīn, or he is Idrīs; Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntazam, 382-3: various versions; Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʾrīkh, III, 81-2; Maqdisi, al-Badʾ, III, 99: b. al-ʿĀdir or b. Yassā; Ibn al-Ḥarīrī, ʿUmdat, 78a-78b; Samarqandi, Tafsīr, III, 123; Ibn Qutayba, al-Maʿārif, 51; Majlisi, Bihār, XIII, 397; Māwardi, Tafsīr, V, 64; Kisāʾī, Qīṣaṣ, 244; Thaʿlabī, Qīṣaṣ, 252; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, I, 337: also Elijah b. al-ʿĀzir etc. About the traditions connecting Elijah to al-Khīḍr, see § 478.

(343)-(344) Partially taken from Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XXIII, 92-94; and cf. Suyūṭī, al-Durr, VII, 117-8. The identification of Elijah with Idrīs is from Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, VII, 261, who does not mention the variant Qurʾānic reading ascribed to Ibn Masʿūd where the name Idrīs is substituted to Elijah. The reading mentioned by Ṭabarī is in Nöldeke – Bergstraesser – Pretzl, Geschichte des Qorāns, III, 73; and Jeffery, Materials for the History, 80, 300: ascr. to al-Rabīʿ b. Khuthaym, 324: ascr. to al-Aʿmash, and cf. also the other
reading quoted at p. 160. It must be added that a tradition states that Elijah and al-Khîrî are the prophets still alive on earth, while Jesus and Idrîs are those alive in heaven; about this see § 478 and annotations. Regarding all the particulars of the story quoted by Târâfî, see a parallel version in Kisâ', Qîsâs, 244: he knew the Torah by heart when he was 7 years old; Ṭabarî, Ta'rikh, I, 540-4; Tha'labî, Qîsâs, 252-8; Nuwayrî, Nihâyat, XIV, 17f.; Ibn 'Asâkîr, Ta'rikh, III, 83f.; Ibn Iyâs, Qîsâs, 132; Siyar al-anbiyâ', 123b f.: a long report about the dispute with the king, and see in part. 126b-127a, about Elijah’s prodigious height, which was 300 cubits; Ps.-Asma’i, Qîsâs, 45a; Ibn Kathîr, al-Bidâya, I, 337: more than 10,000 men believed in him; Suyûtî, al-Durr, VII, 116-20; Ibn Abî ‘Udhayba, Qîsâs, 78b-80a; Maqdisî, al-Bad’, III, 99: his wife’s name is Azâbûl; Majlîsî, Bihâr, XIII, 392-9: ‘Umâra b. Wâthîma, Kitâb bad’ al-khalq, 64-71; Ibn Qutayba, al-Mâdarif, 51; Sîbî’ Ibn al-Jawzî, Mîrât, 459-65; 464: along with al-Khîrî; Hayyam, Qîsâs, 125b-127a; Ibn al-Jawzî, al-Muntazam, I, 383-4; Qîsâs al-anbiyâ’, Ms Gotha A 1742, 163a f.

(345) Cf. Tha’labî, Qîsâs, 259. Sources do not include other particulars about Elisha, always described together with Elijah, see for ex. Ṭabarî, Ta’rikh, I, 542; Tha’labî, Qîsâs, 259; Ibn Kathîr, al-Bidâya, II, 4; Majlîsî, Bihâr, XIII, 397; Maqdisî, al-Bad’, III, 99-100; ‘Umâra b. Wâthîma, Kitâb bad’ al-khalq, 71; Sîbî’ Ibn al-Jawzî, Mîrât, 466.

(346)-(347) The figure of Dhû al-Kifl is controversial and is usually identified with other characters, for ex. with Joshua, see ‘Umâra b. Wâthîma, Kitâb bad’ al-khalq, 71f.; Ibn al-Jawzî, al-Muntazam, I, 388: along with other identifications; Majlîsî, Bihâr, XIII, 406; Râzi, al-Tafsîr, XXII, 183: Zechariah, Joshua or Elijah; Ibn ‘Asâkîr, Ta’rikh, VI, 132: the real name was Shîbûr o Bîshr b. Ayyûb; Nuwayrî, Nihâyat, XIII, 164, 167: son of Job, Elijah or Zechariah; Qudâ’i, Ta’rikh, 105: he was Yashar, son of Job; ‘Abd al-Bâsi’t, Ta’rikh al-anbiyâ’, 68: Bishr b. Ayyûb; Abû Hayyân, al-Bahr, VII, 460-1. All the commentaries and the sources include differing interpretations, see for ex. Tha’labî, Qîsâs, 163-4: the real name was Bishr b. Ayyûb, 261-2: Elijah or Zechariah; Sîbî’ Ibn al-Jawzî, Mîrât, 466: Elisha is Dhû al-Kifl; Hayyam, Qîsâs, 127a: he is Elisha, 128a-128b; Ibn ‘Asâkîr, Ta’rikh, VI, 133; Ibn Kathîr, al-Bidâya, I, 225-6; Suyûtî, al-Durr, V, 661-4; Khâzin, Tafsîr, IV, 318: Elijah or Zechariah; Ibn Abî Ḥâtîm, Tafsîr, VIII, 2461-3; Ibn Qutayba, al-Madarif, 55.

(348)-(349) From Ṭabarî, Ḧaṃî’ al-bayân, XVII, 74, 75. Cf. also Tha’labî, Qîsâs, 262; Suyûtî, al-Durr, V, 661. The question whether Dhû al-Kifl was or was not a prophet is debated in the sources, see for ex. ‘Abd al-Razzâq, Tafsîr, II, 27; Mâwardî, Tafsîr, III, 464; Hayyam, Qîsâs, 127b-128a; ‘Umâra b. Wâthîma, Kitâb bad’ al-khalq, 71-2; Majlîsî, Bihâr, XIII, 405; Ibn al-Jawzî, al-

*(Story of Moses)*


(352) The beginning is from Ṭabarî, *Jāmi‘ al-bayān*, XX, 32; for the final tradition, cf. the similar versions in *idem*, XVI, 159. In all the sources the bow was found by the Pharaoh’s daughter, but also ᴬsîya has a central role. Relevant versions
are mentioned by Kisāʾi, Qīsās, 203: he stayed in the Nile 40 or 3 days or only one night; Hayṣam, Qīsas, 90a: his mother left him in the river when he was 3 months old, 91a: Pharaoh is not against the adoption; Ibn Iyās, Qīsās, 119; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 97a; Ps.-Askarī, Qīsās, 95a; Sībīʿ Ibn al-Jawzi, Mirʾāt, 393.

(353) Partially from Ṭabarī, Jāmīʿ al-bayān, XX, 36. His mother’s fear is embarrassing to exegetes since God had already told her to leave him in the waters, without being afraid because of his promise to her that he would have become a prophet (Qur. 28:7).

(354) Abridged from Ṭabarī, Jāmīʿ al-bayān, XX, 36, 39, 40-1. All the traditions follow the Qurʾānic data in these episodes, but see Samarqandi, Tafsīr, II, 511; Hāmān sent for Moses’ sister. Some sources also mention the name of his sister: Maryam, in accordance with the Biblical account, see Thaʿlabī, Qīsās, 170; Samarqandi, Tafsīr, II, 511; Muqāṭīl, Tafsīr, II, 338; Nisābūrī, al-Mustadrak, II, 628 no. 4097: but Maryam is the name of his mother’s sister; Majlisi, Bihār, XII, 55; Maqdisī, al-Badʾ, III, 81; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, I, 171; Ibn Qutayba, al-Maʾārif, 43; or Kulthūm, according to Suyūṭī, al-Durr, VI, 395; Mujir al-Dīn, al-Ums, I, 77. Other sources mention the existence of two sisters with these names, see Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntaẓam, I, 334; Sībīʿ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 394.

(355) The central part of this report is from Ṭabarī, Jāmīʿ al-bayān, XX, 43, and Id., Taʾrīkh, I, 450 (transl. Brinner, III, 36); the rest is abridged from various passages of Ṭabarī’s tafsīr. All the sources mention the pursuit in these terms and then quote the Qurʾānic verses relating to the killing of the Egyptian, see for ex. Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, I, 456f.; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, I, 174-5; Thaʿlabī, Qīsās, 172-3: the fighters are the Samaritans and an Egyptian called Fāṭim; Majlisi, Bihār, XIII, 57: the Samaritan and an Egyptian called Qāthān; Sībīʿ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 395: Fālimūn; see also Ibn Iyās, Qīsās, 120-1; Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʾrīkh, XVII, 309; Hayṣam, Qīsās, 92b-93b. Qurʾānic commentaries give variants upon the age of Moses’ maturity: 33, 40 or indefinite between 18 and 30, or between 33 and 40, see ʿAbd al-Razzāq, Tafsīr, II, 88; Mujāhid, Tafsīr, II, 482; Samarqandī, Tafsīr, II, 511; Muqāṭīl, Tafsīr, III, 338; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, VI, 397; Majlisi, Bihār, XIII, 17; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, Tafsīr, IX, 2951; Hūd b. Muḥakkam, Tafsīr, III, 273. That at this age Moses had ḥukm and ʿilm but not nubuwwa is to be read in connection with the killing of the Egyptian and the concept of ʾishma; regarding all these questions, see Rāzī, ʾIṣmat, 89-90; and also a tradition in Muslim, Ṣaḥīḥ, IV, 2229-30 no. 2905, where this sin is quoted.

(356)-(357) The beginning of § 356 is from Ṭabarī, Jāmīʿ al-bayān, XX, 45; for the rest, see idem, XX, 45-7.

(358) Partially from Ṭabarī, Jāmīʿ al-bayān, XX, 47-8.
(359) Abridged from Tabarî, Jâmî' al-bayân, XX, 49, 50, 53; for the final part see also in Id., Ta'rikh, I, 451 (transl. Brinner, III, 37). The name of the Egyptian believer is quoted in other sources, see for ex. Suyûti, al-Durr, VI, 401-2; Ibn Abî Ḥātim, Tafsîr, IX, 2959. The most common versions of his name are Khirbil or Hizqîl, see Muqâtil, Tafsîr, III, 340; Hayyâm, Qîsas, 93b: the two names along with Sham‘în; Kisâ‘î, Qîsas, 206; Tha‘labî, Qîsas, 173; Ibn al-Athîr, al-Kâmîl, I, 175; Ḥusaynî, Qîsas, 95a; Majlisi, Bihâr, XIII, 160-3; see also Samarqandî, Tafsîr, II, 513: Kh.z.y.li; Maqdisî, al-Badî‘, III, 84: Ḥ.z.s.l. All the main variants are mentioned by Ibn al-Jawzî, al-Muntazam, I, 346; Sibî‘ Ibn al-Jawzî, Mir‘ât, 411; Majlisi, Bihâr, XIII, 43.

(360)-(361) Partially from Tabarî, Jâmî' al-bayân, XX, 53, 54f.; regarding § 360, cf. also Id., Ta’rikh, I, 458 (transl. Brinner, III, 43). Eight nights of walking separated Moses from Madyan, such as the distance between Kûfa and Basâra, as stated in a tradition, see Tabarî, Ta’rikh, I, 458; Hayyâm, Qîsas, 93b; Tha‘labî, Qîsas, 174; Ibn Abî Ḥātim, Tafsîr, IX, 2962; Samarqandî, Tafsîr, II, 513: he travelled 10 days; Siyar al-anbiyâ‘, 98b: 8 days of distance but the travel took him 10 nights; Muqâtil, Tafsîr, III, 340: 10 days of journey; Nuwayrî, Nihâyât, XIII, 184: two lions indicated the way to Madyan to Moses.

(362) Similar particulars in Muqâtil, Tafsîr, III, 341; Mujâhid, Tafsîr, II, 483; Samarqandî, Tafsîr, II, 514; Tha‘labî, Qîsas, 174; Kisâ‘î, Qîsas, 207; Suyûti, al-Durr, VI, 404. Some passages are parallel to Tabarî, Jâmî' al-bayân, XX, 58, 59, 60, cf. Id., Ta’rikh, I, 458-60. Similar versions about these episodes are given by Tha‘labî, Qîsas, 174-5; Mujîr al-Dîn, al-UNS, I, 80; Siyar al-anbiyâ‘, 99a; Hayyâm, Qîsas, 94b.

(363)-(365) §§ 364 and 365 are from Tabarî, Jâmî' al-bayân, XX, 63. All the sources include similar traditions about Moses’ strength and honesty, see for ex. Mujâhid, Tafsîr, II, 483; Kisâ‘î, Qîsas, 207; Tabarî, Ta’rikh, I, 459-60; Tha‘labî, Qîsas, 174f.; Siyar al-anbiyâ‘, 99a f.; Suyûti, al-Durr, 404-5; Sibî‘ Ibn al-Jawzî, Mir‘ât, 397; Ibn al-Athîr, al-Kâmîl, I, 176-7; Majlisi, Bihâr, XIII, 29; Ibn ‘Asâkir, Ta’rikh, XVII, 313.

(366) Abridged from Tabarî, Jâmî' al-bayân, XX, 62; about Shu‘ayb/Jethro, see §§ 170-176. Most of the commentaries maintain that this man was Shu‘ayb, but the variant opinion stating that he was Shu‘ayb’s nephew is already attested in Ibn Ḥabîb, al-Muḥabbbar, 389; and cf. Samarqandî, Tafsîr, II, 514, with also a differing spelling for Jethro: Nayrûn. Cf. also the orthographical variants of his name in Suyûti, al-Durr, VI, 407-8; and see the discussion of the subject in Sibî‘ Ibn al-Jawzî, Mir‘ât, 396. Regarding the name mentioned by Ţarâfî, in Tabarî, Jâmî' al-bayân, XX, 62, and Id., Ta’rikh, I, 462, the name of his wife is Şâfûra/Şaffûra and related variants, while that of her sister is Liyâ. See also Ibn al-Jawzî, al-Muntazam, I,
336; Kisā’ī, Qiṣaṣ, 208; Tha’labī, Qiṣaṣ, 174; Abū al-Fidā’, Kitāb al-mukhtāṣar, I, 30; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, VI, 405, 408, and cf. VI, 408; Mujīr al-Dīn, al-Uns, I, 81. Other versions are in Muqātīl, Tafsīr, III, 341: Šabbūrā/Shabūrā, (also in Ḥabīb, Kitāb al-muḥabbār, 389) and ‘b.rā (‘Urbrā?, with a variant in the footnote: M.ḥ. brā); cf. the variants to these two names in Sībīʾ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir’āt, 397; Ibn Ṭabīḥ, Tafsīr, IX, 2969: Ṣaffūra and Sh.r.fā or Liyā; Mujāhid, Tafsīr, II, 484: Ṣafūriyā or Balāqīs; Majlisī, Bihār, XIII, 58: along with the two usual names, he gives an alternative name for Liyā: Ḥanūnā; on the name Shurfa, see Wheeler, Moses, 51. Regarding the contrasting opinions about Moses’ wife, i.e. if she was the older or the younger of the two sisters, see Samarqandi, Tafsīr, II, 515.

(367) Abridged from Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XX, 65-7, and upon the disputed rod: from Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XX, 67, and Id., Taʿrīkh, I, 460-1 (transl. Brinner, III, 45). Regarding the things Adam brought from heaven, including the rod, see further particulars in Thaʿlabī, Qiṣaṣ, 175-7 (transl. Tottoli, Vita di Mosè, 24-7); Kisāʾī, Qiṣaṣ, 208-9: with further particulars, such as the killing of a serpent by Moses; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, VI, 408-9; a tradition maintains that the rod was made with the first grown-up tree on earth, see Thaʿlabī, Qiṣaṣ, 176; Sībīʾ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 397-8; Ḥayṣam, Qiṣaṣ, 95a-95b: Shʿuʿayb had at home the rods of 70 prophets; ‘Abd al-Malik b. Ḥabīb, Kitāb al-taʿrīkh, 56, 58; Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʿrīkh, XVII, 316-7; Ibn Abī Ṭadhāba, Qiṣaṣ, 55b; Ḥusaynī, Qiṣaṣ, 88b-89a; Majlisī, Bihār, XIII, 22, 91; about the topic see Fodor, “The rod of Moses”.

(368) The hadith at the beginning is from Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XX, 68; the part after the Qurʾānic quotation is from Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XVI, 142. This hadith is from Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīḥ, III, 224 no. 2684; Ḥumaydī, Musnad, I, 246 no. 535; Abū Yaʿlā, Musnad, IV, 297 no. 2408; cf. also the mention of the two terms of 8 and 10 years in Ibn Māja, Sunan, II, 817 no. 2444. Exegetes maintain that Moses chose the longest term, see ‘Abd al-Razzāq, Tafsīr, II, 90; Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XX, 68-9: after the ten years he stayed 10 years more; Ḥayṣam, Qiṣaṣ, 95b; Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʿrīkh, XVII, 313-6; Muqātīl, Tafsīr, III, 343; Hūd b. Muḥākkaṭ, Tafsīr, III, 278; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, VI, 408-10; Samarqandi, Tafsīr, II, 515; Mujāhid, Tafsīr, II, 485; see also Sībīʾ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 398. Regarding Moses’ departure, other sources add some particulars, see Kisāʾī, Qiṣaṣ, 209; Thaʿlabī, Qiṣaṣ, 178; Ibn Iyās, Qiṣaṣ, 122; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 100b; Ps.-Asmaʾī, Qiṣaṣ, 38a.

(369)-(371) From Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XVI, 142, 143, 144; regarding § 370, see Id., Taʿrīkh, I, 465-6 (transl. Brinner, III, 50-1, and Newby, The Making of the Last Prophet, 125). For similar reports in the other sources, see for ex. Kisāʾī, Qiṣaṣ, 210 and Thaʿlabī, Qiṣaṣ, 178f. Regarding the tradition in § 371, see Tirmidhī, Sunan, IV, 224 no. 1734. For other traditions about the prophets
wearing woollen dresses and clothes, and, in general, the relevance of wearing wool, see Tottoli, “Sul vestire abiti di lana”. The particular that God ordered Moses to take off his boots because they were of donkey leather is often quoted, see Tirmidhî, Sunan, IV, 224 no. 1734; Muqâtîl, Tafsîr, III, 22; ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ḥabîb, Kitâb al-taʿrîkh, 56, no. 128; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mirʾât, 401; Hûd b. Muḥakkam, Tafsîr, III, 34; ʿAbd al-Razziq, Tafsîr, II, 15-6; Samarqandi, Tafsîr, II, 337; Thaʿlabî, Qīṣâs, 179; Ibn ʿAsâkir, Taʿrîkh, XVII, 320; Siyar al-anbiyâʾ, 101b; Ps.-Aṣmaʿī, Qīṣâs, 38b; Majlisi, Bīhār, XIII, 42, 64-6; Suyûṭî, al-Durr, V, 558-9: along with many other variants, a tradition mentions pig leather (!), ascribed to Mujâhid.

(372)-(373) Partially abridged from Ţabârî, Īmî ṣ al-bayān, XVI, 144, XIX, 133-135, XVI, 148, XIX, 134; the final part of § 372 and § 373 from idem, VI, 29-30. Regarding the portent of God’s words, see Thaʿlabî, Qīṣâṣ, 180: he told Moses 114.000 words; Ibn ʿAsâkir, Taʿrîkh, XVII, 323; cf. also ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ḥabîb, Kitâb al-taʿrîkh, 58 no. 136: the first language spoken by God was lišān al-barbar; see also Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mirʾât, 400; and Laṭâʾif al-anbiyâʾ, 114a-127b, upon the tree which God spoke from.

(374) Abridged from Ţabârî, Īmî ṣ al-bayān, XVI, 154, 156. Regarding other versions about the miracles of the rod and of the hand, see Kīsâʾi, Qīṣâṣ, 185; Thaʿlabî, Qīṣâṣ, 179; Siyar al-anbiyâʾ, 101b; Ibn al-Athîr, al-Kâmil, 1, 179; Ps.-Aṣmaʿī, Qīṣâṣ, 38b. I have dealt with the legends about this serpent in “Il bastone di Mosè mutato in serpente” and “Alcune considerazioni su ġānên”; to the references quoted there, add ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ḥabîb, Kitâb al-taʿrîkh, 54-56; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mirʾât, 401: Moses is afraid it is the snake which was with Adam in paradise; Mujîr al-Dîn, al-Uns, I, 85; Hayṣam, Qīṣâṣ, 96b-97a; Majlisi, Bīhār, XIII, 61-2, 145; Ps.-Masʿūdi, Akhbâr, 246-7; Âḥmad b. Ḥanbâl, Kitāb al-zuhd, 103-7. See also Tottoli, Vita di Mosè, 29-30.

(375) From Ţabârî, Īmî ṣ al-bayān, XIX, 136. About prophets’ fear, see Muqâtîl, Tafsîr, II, 297, mentioning the prophets who felt fear: Adam, Jonah, Solomon, Joseph’s brothers and Moses; Samarqandi, Tafsîr, II, 490; see also the considerations of Rāzî, ʿĪṣma, 89-90; and Laṭâʾif al-anbiyâʾ, 128a-128b, explaining why Abraham was not afraid of the fire and why Moses felt fear.

(376) Abridged from Ţabârî, Īmî ṣ al-bayān, XIX, 138, XVI, 157, 158, excluding the final part. The tawny color of Moses is attested in some hadîths describing also Jesus and Abraham. About Moses’ and Aaron’s appearance, see Tottoli, “Ibn Muṭarrif al-Ṭarafî”, 155.

(377) Partially abridged from Ţabârî, Īmî ṣ al-bayān, XVI, 159, 161, 168, 170, 173f. Regarding the explanation about the language to be used in front of the Pharaoh, see the same words in Muqâtîl, Tafsîr, III, 28; attributed to Muqâtîl in Tibrisî, Majmaʾ ṣ al-bayān, VII, 19. Ţarafî, alternating Qurʾānic quotations with

(378)-(381) Abridged from Ṭabarī, Jāmīʾ al-bayān, XVI, 179, and IX, 16, 18, 19. Ṭabarī omits completely the story of the believer opposing to Pharaoh’s proposal to kill Moses which is a story already attested in the Qurʾān (40:28-45). There are many traditions about the meeting between Moses and the sorcerers, with variants about the number of them, see Ṭabarī, Jāmīʾ al-bayān, IX, 19: along with the numbers in Ṭabarī, also 70 or 12,000; Samarqandi, Taḥfīẓ, I, 560: 1,500 along with other versions; Muqṭālī, Taḥfīẓ, II, 54: 72; Kīṣāʾī, Qīṣāṣ, 214: 70,000; Muẓīr al-Dīn, al-Usn, I, 86; Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, 473; Thaʿlābī, Qīṣāṣ, 185: 72 or 70,000 among whom Pharaoh chose 70; Ps.-Masʿūdī, Akhbār, 245: 140,000; Ibn Ḥabīb, al-Muḥabbar, 388: 72; see also Ḥayṣam, Qīṣāṣ, 100: various versions; Ḥusaynī, Qīṣāṣ, 91b; Ibn Iyās, Qīṣāṣ, 125; Sīyar al-anbiyāʾ, 104a; Sībṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʿāt, 406: along with other versions 400,000; Ps.-ʿAsmaʾī, Qīṣāṣ, 40b: 25,000 or 72; ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ḥabīb, Kīṭāb al-tawrīkh, 61, no. 142: there were 1000 sorcerers; Majlisi, Biḥār, XIII, 77, 147, 120: 1000; IbnʿAsākir, Taʾrīkh, XVII, 327, 329; Ibn al-Aṭḥīr, al-Kāmil, I, 182: 15,000 or 30,000; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāyā, I, 254; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, III, 513-4: 17,000 and numerous other versions; Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntazam, I, 344. Regarding their names, see Thaʿlābī, Qīṣāṣ, 185, the chief was named Shamʿūn or Yūḥannāʾ, 187: the names of five chiefs; Muqṭālī, Taḥfīẓ, II, 54, 55: Shamʿūn; Sībṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʿāt, 406: the names of seven chiefs; Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntazam, I, 343: four names; Id., Zād, III, 241: four names.

(382) I was not able to trace the source of this tradition: pigs and monkeys are however well attested in stories of transformation, see for ex. Cook, “Ibn Qutayba and the monkeys” and Rubin, Between Bible and Qurʾān, 213-32.

(383) Cf. Ṭabarī, Jāmīʾ al-bayān, IX, 20-1, partially used by Ṭabarī. About the beginning of the challenge, see Kīṣāʾī, Qīṣāṣ, 214; Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, I, 473f.; Thaʿlābī, Qīṣāṣ, 186; Sīyar al-anbiyāʾ, 104b.

(384) Almost completely from Ṭabarī, Jāmīʾ al-bayān, IX, 15, 14, 23, 24. Ṭabarī mentions here the tradition about the 25,000 dead men ascribed to Wahb which in other sources is usually connected to the transformation of the rod before the Pharaoh. A comprehensive discussion on this tradition is in Tottoli, “Il bastone di Mosè”, 388; to the references quoted add ʿAbd al-Malik b. Ḥabīb, Kīṭāb al-
ta‘rikh, 61-2; Hayyam, Qisas, 101a: 70,000 dead men; Ibn ‘Asakir, Ta‘rikh, XVII, 328: a long tradition ascribed to Wahb. A discussion of the modern exegesis dealing with these traditions is in Tottoli, “La moderna esegesi islamica”. For further particulars, above all about the challenge with the sorcerers, see in part. Tha‘labi, Qisas, 186f.; Siyar al-anbiya², 104b-105a; Hayyam, Qisas, 100a-101b; Ps.-Asma‘î, Qisas, 40a; Majlisî, Bihār, XIII, 147f.; Ps.-Mas‘ūdi, Akhbār, 245-6.

(385)-(386) Cf. Tabari, Jami‘ al-bayān, XVI, 189. Relevant is the omission in Ṭabarî of the stories of the building of the tower and above all of the plagues; about these episodes, along with the commentaries upon Qur. 7:130-5, see Kisā‘î, Qisas, 215f.; Tabari, Ta‘rikh, I, 474f.; Tha‘labi, Qisas, 189-196; Hayyam, Qisas, 103a f.; Siyar al-anbiya², 105b f.; Ps.-Asma‘î, Qisas, 41a; Majlisî, Bihār, XIII, 81f.; Ibn al-Jawzi, al-Muntaẓam, I, 344-5; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzî, Mir‘āt, 408-10; Ibn ‘Asakir, Ta‘rikh, XVII, 332-4.

(387) This part is not taken from Tabari, cf. Id., Jami‘ al-bayān, I, 275-9, XIX, 75-9, dealing with the same subjects. Sources usually state that the number of Israelites who left Egypt was around 600,000 and there were more than 5 million Egyptians. The episode of Joseph’s bones is described in many sources which sometimes add the name of the old woman who told Joseph and the Israelites where the bones were: Shāriḥ or Shārīkh, see Ya‘qūbî, Ta‘rikh, I, 35; ‘Abd al-Malik b. Ḥabīb, Kitāb al-ta‘rikh, 62; ‘Amīli, al-Jawāhir, 46; Dīyārbakrî, Ta‘rikh, I, 142: Maryam. According to some traditions, also Khiribil, along with Joshua, interrogated Moses before entering the sea; about the entire story, see Muqātil, Tafsîr, III, 266-7; Kisā‘î, Qisas, 218; ‘Abd al-Malik b. Ḥabīb, Kitāb al-ta‘rikh, 63; Tabari, Ta‘rikh, I, 482f.; Tha‘labi, Qisas, 196-8; Siyar al-anbiya², 108a-108b; Nuwayrî, Nihāyat, XIII, 207-9; Ps.-Mas‘ūdi, Akhbār, 250: there were more than 640,000 Israelites; Ibn ‘Asakir, Ta‘rikh, XVII, 335f.; Ibn Kathir, al-Bidāya, I, 270; Ya‘qūbî, Ta‘rikh, 35; Dīyārbakrî, Ta‘rikh, I, 142; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mir‘āt, 412-4; Majlisî, Bihār, XIII, 151-2; Abû al-Baqâ‘î, Kitāb al-manāqib, 38: 1,600,000 Egyptian were killed; Hayyam, Qisas, 104a-104b.

assertion of faith just before drowning, see Tottoli, “Il Faraone”, where many Muslim reports regarding the Pharaoh are discussed. The Israelites asked to see his corpse because they believed he was immortal, see `Abd al-Razzāq, Tafsīr, I, 297; Ṭabarî, Ḫāmiṣ al-bayān, XI, 165; Tha‘labî, Qīṣaṣ, 199-200; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 109b; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, IV, 388; Muṣîr al-Dīn, al-UNS, I, 89; Diyarbakrî, Taʿrīkh, I, 142; Majlîsî, Biḥār, XIII, 118.

(389) The beginning is almost identical to Muqāṭil, Tafsīr, II, 60; the final explanation that ten days were added because of the teeth cleaned with the piece of wood, is also in Samarqandi, Tafsīr, I, 567; Tha‘labî, Qīṣaṣ, 200; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, I, 189; Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzî, Mirzāt, 417. Pharaoh drowned on the day of `Ashūrā, see Muqāṭil, Tafsīr, III, 267: it was also the day God talked to Moses; Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzî, Mirzāt, 417. On the day of the meeting with God, see `Abd al-Razzāq, Tafsīr, I, 236; Ṭabarî, Ḫāmiṣ al-bayān, IX, 47-8; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, III, 534-5; Samarqandi, Tafsīr, I, 566, cf. also I, 117. Regarding the ten days more and the appointment of Aaron, see Ṭabarî, Ḫāmiṣ al-bayān, IX, 48-9; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, III, 535; Kisāʾī, Qīṣaṣ, 219-20; Tha‘labî, Qīṣaṣ, 200f.

(390)-(391) Almost completely from Ṭabarî, Ḫāmiṣ al-bayān, IX, 48, 49, 50. The most comprehensive collection of reports about this episode is in Suyūṭī, al-Durr, III, 536-547. All the sources include the tradition in which Moses stated that he would prefer to die but to see God; see, along with the commentaries, for ex. Kisāʾī, Qīṣaṣ, 220; Tha‘labî, Qīṣaṣ, 201; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 112a-112b; Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzî, Mirzāt, 420.

(392)-(396) From Ṭabarî, Ḫāmiṣ al-bayān, IX, 50-2 (transl. Newby, The Making of the Last Prophet, 135-8; Sirat, “Un midras juif”; and Tottoli, Vita di Mosè, 57-62). This version of the dialogue between God and Moses is the richest in details. See also, with no particular variant, Kisāʾī, Qīṣaṣ, 220f.; Tha‘labî, Qīṣaṣ, 202-3; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 112b; Muṣîr al-Dīn, al-UNS, 91; Nuwayrî, Niḥāyat, XIII, 213-4.

(397)-(398) The quotation in § 398 is from Ṭabarî, Ḫāmiṣ al-bayān, IX, 53.

(399) The final part is from Ṭabarî, Ḫāmiṣ al-bayān, XVI, 195. A much attested traditional dialogue with a discussion between Adam and Moses regarding questions of fate and destiny is quoted in the beginning. This hadith is widely attested, see Bukhārî, Sahīḥ, IV, 482 no. 3409; V, 289-90 no. 4736, 4738, VII, 274 no. 6614, VIII, 566 no. 7515; Muslim, Sahīḥ, IV, 2042-4 no. 2652; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, III, 49 no. 7391, 85 no. 7591, etc.; `Abd al-Razzāq, Musannaf, X, 112-3 nos. 20067-8; Mālik, Kitāb al-muwatṭaʾ, II, 898 (Qadar, 1); see also van Ess, Zwischen Hadith und Theologie, 161-75.

(400)-(401) Only § 401 is from Ṭabarî, Ḫāmiṣ al-bayān, I, 282, though the name mentioned by Ṭabarî is Musā b. Ḥuṭar, see idem, I, 283; in Id., Taʿrīkh, I, 492, he was a man from Bājarmā. These passages are also in Tha‘labî, Qīṣaṣ, 208;
402. All the sources state that the Samaritan himself built and gave form to the calf, see for ex. 'Abd al-Razzāq, Tafsīr, I, 236; Ṭabarî, Ḫāmiṣ al-bayān, I, 281; and Ṭab‘lābī, Qiṣaṣ, 209; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mīrzāt, 424-5; Ibn al-Aṭhūr, al-Kāmil, I, 189; Majlīṣī, Bihār, XIII, 227; Samarqandī, Tafsīr, I, 118-9; cf. also Muqāṭil, Tafsīr, II, 65, III, 37-8; Māwardī, Tafsīr, III, 419: the Samaritan gathers the jewels after 35 days of Moses’ absence on Mount Sinai talking with God and makes the calf in three days.

403. From Ṭabarî, Ḫāmiṣ al-bayān, I, 282. This is a widespread tradition, see Muqāṭil, Tafsīr, I, 104; Ṭab‘lābī, Qiṣaṣ, 210; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 114a; Samarqandī, Tafsīr, I, 571; Majlīṣī, Bihār, XIII, 210; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mīrzāt, 426; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, V, 591-2.

404. Mostly from Ṭabarî, Ḫāmiṣ al-bayān, IX, 62-3, I, 286; the long passage from the quotation of Qur. 2:55 to the last mention of the calf is from idem, I, 291, and in Id., Ta‘rīkh, I, 495-6 (transl. Brinner, III, 78-9; Newby, The Making of the Last Prophet, 134); and from idem, VI, 149, 181, 182; for the first, about Jericho, see Id., Ta‘rīkh, I, 498-9 (transl. Brinner, III, 80-1), and about the story of the manna, see idem, I, 296-7, and the final: I, 293. For further particulars about the calf and how its worshippers – 70,000 – were discovered, see Muqāṭil, Tafsīr, I, 105-7; Kisā‘ī, Qiṣaṣ, 222; Ṭabarî, Ta‘rīkh, I, 491f.; Mujrīr al-Dīn, al-UNS, I, 92; Ṭab‘lābī, Qiṣaṣ, 209, 211; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bīḍāya, I, 288-9; Majlīṣī, Bihār, XIII, 235: only 12,000 of 700,000 did not worship the calf, but cf. XIII, 246: 70,000 died; Hāyṣam, Qiṣaṣ, 115b-116b; Ḥusaynī, Qiṣaṣ, 201b; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mīrzāt, 425: only 10,000 did not worship the calf. The story of the seventy chosen by Moses, who were killed and then restored to life, is alluded to in Qur. 2:55-56, see in part. the comments by Samarqandī, Tafsīr, I, 120;
Mir maintain wilderness makes anbiya, Qisas, 223; Tha‘labī, Qisas, 212; Siyar al-anbiyā‘, 114b-115a; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mir‘āt, 427-8; Majlisī, Biḥār, XIII, 215f.

The episode of the giants – quoted in Qur. 5:22-26 – is only alluded to here. The chief of these giants was ‘Ūj b. ‘Unuq‘/’Anāq, a gigantic man who survived the Deluge and was then killed by Moses, see Muqāṭīl, Tafsīr, I, 465-6; P.-Mas‘ūdī, Akhbār, 92-3: ‘Anāq was daughter of Adam; Ṭabarī, Jāmi‘ al-bayān, I, 174, 185; Id., Ta‘rīkh, I, 498; Tha‘labī, Qisas, 241-3; Nuwayrī, Niḥāyat, XIII, 261-64; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mir‘āt, 428-30; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, I, 197; Haysam, Qisas, 106a-106b: A‘waj. The Holy Land mentioned in the Qur‘ān (5:21) is usually identified in Jericho or, in general, in Palestine and Syria (al-Shām), or in the territory around Mt. Sinai, see for ex. ‘Abd al-Razzāq, Tafsīr, I, 186; Mujāhid, Tafsīr, I, 191; Ṭabarī, Jāmi‘ al-bayān, VI, 172; Samarqandi, Tafsīr, I, 427: Jerusalem; Mujīr al-Dīn, al-UNS, I, 94-5; Ibn Abī ‘Udhayba, Qisas, 72a f.; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir‘āt, 428; Kisā‘i, Qisas, 226; Siyar al-anbiyā‘, 115a; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, I, 195-6.

Regarding manna and quails and the water which sprung from the rock, see the commentaries about Qur. 2:57-60, and in particular Muqāṭīl, Tafsīr, I, 108-9; and also Kisā‘i, Qisas, 225; Tha‘labī, Qisas, 244; Majlisī, Biḥār, XIII, 184: he makes the water spring forth and then invokes Muhammad, ‘Ali, etc.; Haysam, Qisas, 107a-107b; Ibn ‘Asākir, Ta‘rīkh, XVII, 349-50; see also the discussion in Samarqandi, Tafsīr, I, 428: Moses and Aaron did not wander in the wilderness since prophets are not submitted to punishments, but sources usually maintain that they died before entering the Holy Land, cf. Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir‘āt, 444.

(405)-(414) From Ṭabarī, Jāmi‘ al-bayān, IX, 64-66. About this dialogue between God and Moses, see ‘Abd al-Razzāq, Tafsīr, I, 236-7; Kisā‘i, Qisas, 221; Tha‘labī, Qisas, 205-6; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, I, 290; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, III, 552-8: various versions; al-Khasā‘iṣ al-kubrā, I, 11-2; Majlisī, Biḥār, XIII, 173 and 323-362; ‘Abd al-Malik b. Ḥabīb, Kitāb al-ta‘rīkh, 66-7 no. 159; Ibn ‘Asākir, Ta‘rīkh, XVII, 360-1. Some sources mention the Ten Commandments, see for ex. Samarqandi, Tafsīr, I, 569; Tha‘labī, Qisas, 203-4; Kisā‘i, Qisas, 219-20; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, III, 550-2; Ya‘qūbī, Ta‘rīkh, I, 37, 41-45.

(415)-(416) From Ṭabarī, Jāmi‘ al-bayān, IX, 66, and Id., Ta‘rīkh, I, 494. Emerald and ruby are the most often quoted substances, see Muqāṭīl, Tafsīr, II, 63, 65: there remained 4 of 9 tables; Samarqandi, Tafsīr, I, 569; Siyar al-anbiyā‘, 111b; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, III, 548-9; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir‘āt, 418, 425: only a fifth or a seventh of the Torah remained; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, I, 181: a seventh; Mujīr al-Dīn, al-UNS, I, 91.

(417)-(418) From Ṭabarī, Jāmi‘ al-bayān, I, 337, 337-8, 339; a translation of § 418 is in Tottoli, La vita di Mosè, 83-4, excluding the physical description of Moses


(Story of Jesus)


(426)-(431) Only the beginning from Ṭabarī, *Jāmiʿ al-bayān*, III, 252. This explanation of the name Yahyā is mentioned in all the commentaries. Though a *taṣfīr* is mentioned, this report is not in Ṭabarī’s *Jāmiʿ al-bayān* and I was not able to identify the source. John’s wisdom is mentioned in a Qurʾānic verse, 19:12, and is explained in a tradition where he – at the age of three – refuses to play with the other children. See Muqāṭil, *Taṣfīr*, II, 622; Māwārdī, *Taṣfīr*, III, 360; upon his refusal to play, see the traditions in *ʿAbd al-Razzāq, Taṣfīr*, II, 4; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, *Kitāb al-zuhd*, 122, 139; Samarqandī, *Taṣfīr*, II, 320; Nuwayrī, *Nhīyāt*, XIV, 201; Suyūṭī, *al-Durr*, V, 484-5: 3 or 6 years; and see also Thaʿlabī, *Qīṣas*, 375; Ps.-Ašmaʿī, *Qīṣas*, 77b; Ibn ʿAsākir, *Taʾrīkh*, XVIII, 87; Majīsī, *Bihār*, XIV, 185-6; Ḣusaynī, *Qīṣas*, 155b; ‘Umāra b. Wathima, *Kitāb badʿ al-khalq*, 310-1; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Kāmil*, I, 301; Ibn al-Murajjā, *Faḍāʾil*, 138; regarding other peculiarities of John the Baptist, see Ibn ʿAsākir, *Taʾrīkh*, XVIII, 83-4.

‘Asākir, Ta’rīkh, VI, 428f., XVIII, 100f.; Hayṣam, Qīṣās, 134b f.: about his death; Nuwayrī, Nihayat, XIV, 202-9; Majlīsī, Biḥār, XIV, 163f.; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, I, 302f.; Ibn Abī ‘Udhayba, Qīṣāṣ, 122b f.; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Kitāb al-zuhd, 128-9: about his food; Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntazam, I, 8-15: a long report about why he was killed and the punishment of the Israelites; Sibīt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir‘āt, 568; Siyar al-anbiyā’, 148a; Nīsābūrī, al-Mustadrak, II, 647 no. 4151. Sources usually state that John was six months older than Jesus, see for ex. Ṭabarī, Ta’rīkh, I, 711; Siyar al-anbiyā’, 147b; see also Muqātīl, Tafsīr, I, 274: two and half years; Kīsā‘ī, Qīṣāṣ, 303: the two mothers became pregnant on the same day; according to Hayṣam, Qīṣāṣ, 133a, and Ibn ‘Asākir, Ta’rīkh, VI, 428, there were three years of difference. About Jesus and John together, see Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, II, 51f.; Ps.-Aṣma‘ī, Qīṣāṣ, 78b.

(432)-(434) From Ṭabarī, Jāmī‘ al-bayān, III, 255, XVI, 50, 52, 53-4. For further particulars, mainly connected to Zechariah’s doubt about the possibility of having a son, see Muqātīl, Tafsīr, I, 275; Māwardī, Tafsīr, I, 391, III, 358; Suyūtī, al-Durr, II, 191-2; see also the significant report in ‘Umāra b. Wathīma, Kitāb bad‘ al-khalq, 307. The tradition attributed to Qatāda about his three days of silence as punishment is included in almost all the commentaries, see for ex. Muqātīl, Tafsīr, II, 622; ‘Abd al-Razzāq, Tafsīr, I, 120; Samarqandī, Tafsīr, I, 266; and also Nuwayrī, Nihayat, XIV, 199.

(435)-(437) From Ṭabarī, Jāmī‘ al-bayān, III, 262, 263. Also other commentaries include ḥadīths describing Mary as one of the best women, see for ex. ‘Abd al-Razzāq, Tafsīr, I, 121; Suyūtī, al-Durr, II, 193-4. These traditions mention the excellence of Mary and Āsiya in connection to Khadija or ‘Ā‘isha and must be read in relation to disputes about Muhammad’s favourite wife and the rivalries between ‘Ā‘isha and Fāṭima’s offspring (‘Alī and descendants). Mentioning Mary and ‘Ā‘isha, see Bukhārī, Sahīh, IV, 482-3 no. 3411, IV, 492 no. 3433, IV, 592 no. 3769, VI, 551 no. 5418; Muslim, Sahīh, IV, 1886-7 no. 2431; Abū Ya‘lā, Musnad, XIII, 219-20 no. 7245, XIII, 253 no. 7269; Ibn Māja, Sunan, II, 1091 no. 3280; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, VII, 130 no. 19540, VII, 159 no. 19688. The same ḥadīths included by Ṭabarrī, with Khadija, with or without Fāṭima, are mentioned in Bukhārī, Sahīh, IV, 491-2 no. 3432, IV, 605 no. 3815; Muslim, Sahīh, IV, 1886 no. 2430; Abū Ya‘lā, Musnad, I, 399 no. 522, I, 455 no. 612, V, 110 no. 2722; Tirmidhī, al-Jāmī‘, V, 702-3 nos. 3877-8; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, I, 182 no. 640, I, 246 no. 938, etc.; ‘Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, XI, 430 no. 20919; Nīsābūrī, al-Mustadrak, II, 650 no. 4160. A tradition mentions only Fāṭima along with Mary, see Abū Ya‘lā, Musnad, II, 395 no. 1169. A Shi‘ī author such as Sulaym b. Qays, Kitāb Sulaym, 183, states explicitly that at the time of Muḥammad Fāṭima was exactly like Mary at the time of Jesus. A similar tradition about Mary’s merits states that Qurashi.
women were the best at riding camels and add that Mary never rode a camel, see Bukhārī, Sahīh, IV, 492 no. 3434; Muslim, Sahīh, IV, 1959 no. 2527; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, III, 96 no. 7654, III, 107 no. 7713; ‘Abd al-Razzāq, al-Muṣannaf, XI, 303 no. 20603. About these arguments, see the differing versions in Ibn ‘Asākir, Taʾrīkh, XIX, 536-44.

(438) From Ṭabarî, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XVI, 59, 60. This tradition is translated by Robinson, “Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī”, 4-5.

(439) From Ṭabarî, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XVI, 61, 62. The story of the prostration of John to Jesus in the womb is repeated in all the sources and in the tafsīrs commenting Qur. 3.39. About this prostration see Tottoli, “Muslim attitudes towards prostration. II”, 416 and the sources quoted there.

(440) Only the central part is from Ṭabarî, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XVI, 65, and Id., Taʾrīkh, I, 725-6 (transl. Perlmann, IV, 113-4). These episodes are narrated in almost the same vein in the main sources. An interesting particular is the benevolence of Joseph who, according to other reports, reacted angrily when he knew Mary was pregnant. About these questions and the various reports describing them, see Kīšāʾī, Qīṣāṣ, 303-4; Thaʿlabī, Qīṣāṣ, 381-3; Ibn Iyās, Qīṣāṣ, 185: Mary was 15 years old at that time; Ps.-Aṣmaʾī, Qīṣāṣ, 80a; Ibn Qutayba, al-Maʿārif, 53; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, I, 308-9, 307: Mary got pregnant at 13 or 15; Nuwayrī, Nikâyat, XIV, 210: Mary pregnant at 13 or 15; Qīṣāṣ al-anbiyāʾ, Ms Gotha A 1740, 161b; Yaʿqūbī, Taʾrīkh, I, 74; Majlīsī, Bihār, XIV, 208f.; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mīrāt, 573; Hāyṣam, Qīṣāṣ, 135b; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, II, 64-5; Siyār al-anbiyāʾ, 149b-150a; Ibn al-Murajjā, Fadāʾil, 133-5 no. 166; Samarqandi, Tafsīr, II, 321: Mary was pregnant for 8 months, or one hour, and delivered her child in one hour.

(441) Partially abridged from Ṭabarî, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XVI, 77, 79. The discussion is connected to the strange appellation given to Mary: Aaron’s sister. Ṭarāfī mentions the main explanations, but see also Muqāṭil, Tafsīr, II, 625-6; ‘Abd al-Razzāq, Tafsīr, II, 7-8; Māwardī, Tafsīr, III, 368-9; Samarqandi, Tafsīr, II, 322-3; Hāyṣam, Qīṣāṣ, 137a; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mīrāt, 573; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, V, 507-8; Ibn ‘Asākir, Taʾrīkh, XIX, 533-4. Various traditions mention babies who talked in the cradles, see annotations on § 273 and Ibn Iyās, Qīṣāṣ, 184; Siyār al-anbiyāʾ, 149b: he talks from the cradle for one hour; Ps.-Aṣmaʾī, Qīṣāṣ, 81a; Nīsābūrī, al-Mustadrak, II, 650 no. 4161; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, I, 311; Thaʿlabī, Qīṣāṣ, 384; Hāyṣam, Qīṣāṣ, 137a; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, V, 510; Māwardī, Tafsīr, III, 370: he talked for 40 days; see also Ṭabarî, Taʾrīkh, I, 733-4; Thaʿlabī, Qīṣāṣ, 383f. About the miḥrāb, see Elad, Medieval Jerusalem, 119.

(442)-(443) Excluding the first mention of tafsīr at the beginning of § 442, the rest is from Ṭabarî, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, III, 238-9; see also in ‘Umāra b. Wathima,
Kitāb bad' al-khalq, 308. The contents of the first part are also in Muqātil, Tafsīr, I, 274; cf. Samarqandi, Tafsīr, I, 265; Hāysham, Qīṣās, 137a; Ibn ‘Asākir, Taʾrīkh, VI, 83.

Regarding the invocation of Mary’s mother, there are ḥadīths stating that Mary and also Jesus were the only creatures not to be touched by Satan, see Bukhārī, Saḥīḥ, IV, 491 no. 3431, V, 199 no. 4548; Muslim, Saḥīḥ, V, 1838 no. 2366; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, III, 203 no. 8261, III, 107 no. 7712, III, 137 no. 7884, III, 144 no. 7920. Mentioning only Jesus, see Bukhārī, Saḥīḥ, IV, 435 no. 3286; Dārīmī, Sunan, II, 847 no. 3014; Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, III, 612 no. 10777. Commentaries and other sources gather these traditions commenting on Qur. 3:36.

(444) From Ṭabarī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, III, 240. All the sources mention this episode, also with differing details, see Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, I, 727-8: a longer version, 734-5: when Jesus was born idols fell down on their faces; Thaʿlabī, Qīṣās, 384f.; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 150a; Majlisī, Bihār, XIV, 215; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, I, 312; ‘Umāra b. Wathīma, Kitāb bad’ al-khalq, 327: idols prostrate themselves; Sīt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 573; Ibn al-Murajjā, Faḍāʾil, 136 no. 168; Ibn ‘Asākir, Taʾrīkh, XIV, 31-2.

(445) A similar version – but more extended – is in ‘Umāra b. Wathīma, Kitāb bad’ al-khalq, 322-3. A hint at this tradition, from other sources, is in Barr, “Isa: the Islamic Christ”, 244.

(446) A similar version is in ‘Umāra b. Wathīma, Kitāb bad’ al-khalq, 324, 328. This is the only part dedicated by Ṭabarī to the prodigious acts and miracles of Jesus. All the other sources usually abound in details about the matter, see for ex. Kīsāʾī, Qīṣās, 304f.; Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, I, 730-1: he was prophet when 30 years old; Thaʿlabī, Qīṣās, 387ss, 390: prophet when 30 years old; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 151a f.; Ibn ‘Asākir, Taʾrīkh, XIV, 32, 45-6; Ps.-ʿAsmaʾī, Qīṣās, 85a-85b; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, II, 82, 84, about the miracles, 87; Majlisī, Bihār, XIV, 220: he had all his power when he was three days old, 270-1: with Iblīs; Hāysham, Qīṣās, 138a, 139a f.; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, I, 313-5; Nuwayrī, Nihāyat, XIV, 219-24, 228-36: a long passage on his miracles, 244-5: on the dialogue with Iblīs; Maqdisī, al-Badʾ, III, 122, 124: he received the prophetical inspiration when 13 years old; ‘Umāra b. Wathīma, Kitāb bad’ al-khalq, 326f.; Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntaẓam, I, 21-3; Sīt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 574f.

(447) Ṭabarī insists on Jesus’ premonition of Muḥammad’s coming, but does not give particulars on Jesus with the apostles. See instead Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, I, 735, 737-8: where the apostles are sent; Thaʿlabī, Qīṣās, 390f., including the names of the twelve; ‘Umāra b. Wathīma, Kitāb badʾ al-khalq, 333f.; Hāysham, Qīṣās, 138a; Majlisī, Bihār, XIV, 272-82; Sīt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʾāt, 577: with the names; Nuwayrī, Nihāyat, XIV, 226f.; Maqdisī, al-Badʾ, III, 127; Yaʿqūbī,
Ta’rikh, I, 69; Ibn Abî ‘Udhayba, Qiṣṣaṣ, 134a; Siyar al-anbiyā’, 151b, 152a; Ibn Kathîr, al-Bidāya, II, 92. Most of the sources discuss the origin of the term “apostles” (ḥawâriyyûn), and the most attested interpretation states that the name is connected to the white color of their dress, see – commenting on Qur. 3:52 – Ṭabarî, Tafsîr, III, 287; Mâwardî, Tafsîr, I, 395: three differing explanations; Mujâhid, Tafsîr, I, 128; Suyûtî, al-Durr, II, 223.

(448)-(449) Regarding his capture, see Ṭabarî, Ta’rikh, I, 736-9: the cock crows three times and Jesus is substituted by a certain Sergius, 741: about the substitute; Ibn Kathîr, al-Bidâya, II, 93; Haysâm, Qiṣṣaṣ, 145b: the name of the substitute is Ayshû’/Ishû’; Ibn al-Jawzi, al-Muntazam, I, 37: Yashû’; Ḥusaynî, Qiṣṣaṣ, 168b: Sarkhas. The judges accuse Jesus of being a magician, see Ṭabarî, Qiṣṣaṣ, 394, 400; Ps.-Aṣma’ī, Qiṣṣaṣ, 85b.

According to one widespread tradition, Jesus is one of the prophets alive in heaven, see annotations on § 478. This kind of tradition is also connected to the contrasting Qur’anic data regarding his presumed death, see about the question McAliffe, Qur’anic Christians, 130f.; Merad, “Le Christ selon le Coran”, 89-92; and above all Busse, “Der Tod Jesu”; and Id., “Jesu Errettung vom Kreuz”. Some sources contain confusing data about the return of Jesus, see Ṭabarî, Qiṣṣaṣ, 401-4; Kisas, 308; Ṭabarî, Qiṣṣaṣ, 403f.; Haysâm, Qiṣṣaṣ, 144b f.; Ibn al-Athîr, al-Kâmîl, I, 319: various opinions; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzi, Mirāt, 583-4; Nuwayrî, Nihâyat, XIV, 247-9, 271-7, 281-4; Mujîr al-Din, al-Unsî, I, 165f.; Ibn Iyâs, Qiṣṣaṣ, 189f.; Ṭabarî, Ta’rikh, I, 744: he ascended to heaven when was 32 years old; Nisâbûrî, al-Mustadrak, II, 651 no. 4164. The question of the return of Jesus – along with the killing of the Dajjâl – at the end of time is intractate. Qur. 43:61 is usually considered an allusion to it, see Ṭabarî, Jâmî’ al-bayân, XXV, 90-1; Ābd al-Razzâq, Tafsîr, II, 198; Muqâtîl, Tafsîr, III, 800; Mujâhid, Tafsîr, II, 583; Samarqandî, Tafsîr, III, 211; Mâwardî, Tafsîr, III, 235, along with other interpretations; Suyûtî, al-Durr, VII, 385. About the matter, see also Zwemer, The Moslem Christ, 79-110. There are many hadîths about this question, see for ex. Ābd al-Razzâq, al-Muṣânnaf, XI, 397-402 nos. 20834-46.

(450)-(451) The story of the table which descended from heaven is in Qur. 5:112-115. Commentaries and other sources relate that the table descended with every kind of food, excluding meat, see Suyûtî, al-Durr, III, 231-7; Mâwardî, Tafsîr, II, 85; Samarqandî, Tafsîr, I, 468; Muqâtîl, Tafsîr, I, 518: fish, bread and dates; Mujîr al-Din, al-Unsî, I, 162: Jesus and the apostles fell down prostrate; Ṭabarî, Qiṣṣaṣ, 397-8; Haysâm, Qiṣṣaṣ, 141a f.; Ibn Iyâs, Qiṣṣaṣ, 186-7; Ibn ʿAsâkîr, Ta’rikh, XIV, 51-4; Nuwayrî, Nihâyat, XIV, 236f.; Ibn Kathîr, al-Bidâya, II, 86-7.

100
Regarding the transformation into pigs, see the traditions mentioned by Muqātīl, Tafsīr, I, 519; Maqdisī, al-Bad2, III, 125; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, I, 316-7; Hayṣam, Qīṣas, 142a; Ibn al-Murajjā, Fadā'il, 197; see also Ṭabarī, Jámi' al-bayān, VII, 136: pigs and monkeys; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, III, 237; Māwardī, Tafsīr, II, 86: only monkeys; Tha‘labī, Qīṣas, 397-8; Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir'āt, XIV, 235; Husaynī, Qīṣas, 162a; Nuwayrī, Nīḥāyat, XIV, 239; Ibn ʿAsākir, Ta‘rīkh, XIV, 39, 52.

(452) This is the only direct quotation from Bukhārī. Regarding Jesus’ appearance and all the traditions upon it, see Tottoli, “Ibn Muṭarrīf al-Ṭaraftār”, 155-6.


(Story of Ezechiels, Simeon, Jeremiah and al-Khidr)

(455)-(456) From Ṭabarī, Jámi' al-bayān, II, 586; and in Id., Ta‘rīkh, I, 536 (transl. Brinner, III, 119). Qur. 2:243 is usually considered by exegetes as an allusion to Ezechiels, but there are also differing interpretations, see Muqātīl, Tafsīr, I, 202: it is Dhū al-Kifl; Māwardī, Tafsīr, I, 313: Simeon (Shamʿūn); Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir'āt, 455: various interpretations. Some sources also relate the name of the town: Dāwardān, see Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Muntaẓam, I, 381; Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir'āt, 455; or Dārvadān, see Māwardī, Tafsīr, I, 203; or Rāwardāra, see Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, I, 210. According to Ḥusaynī, Qīṣas, 115b, in the town there were 70,000 houses. The complete name of Ezechiels is given as Ḥizqīl b. Būzī, or see Hayṣam, Qīṣas, 124b: Ḥizqīl b. Būrā; Qudāʿī, Ta‘rīkh, 116: b. Būdhi. Sources contain variant versions upon the number of dead people: 4,000 or 12,000 or 80,000. The reports in the other sources are similar to that of Ṭaraft, see Samarqandi, Tafsīr, I, 215; Māwardī, Tafsīr, I, 312; Ṭabarī, Ta‘rīkh, I, 535: with also the variant Būdhi; Tha‘labī, Qīṣas, 250f.; Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mir'āt, 455; ‘Umāra b. Wathīma, Kitāb bad' al-khalq, 59-63; Majlisī, Bihār, XIII, 381-7; 383: he is Dhū al-Kifl; Ibn Abī ‘Udhayba, Qīṣas, 77b-78a; Siyar al-anbiyā', 122a: Dhū al-Kifl, but, later on, 122b: Ezechiels; Ps.-Aṣma‘ī, Qīṣas, 44a f.; Ibn Kathir, al-Bidāya, II, 3: b. Būdhi; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, I, 741f., II, 29: b. Būzā.

(457)-(460) From Ṭabarī, Jámi' al-bayān, II, 597, 596, 601; see also Suyūṭī, al-Durr, I, 749. The prophet alluded to in Qur. 2:246 is, according to all the sources, Simeon (Shamʿūn/Samʿūn) or Samuel (Ashmāwil/Shamawīl). According to Muqātīl, Tafsīr, I, 205, his name is Ashmāwil, which it is said should be Ismāʿīl in Arabic, and his mother’s name is Ḥanna; see also Tha‘labī, Qīṣas, 262f.; Samarqandi, Tafsīr, I, 218; Ibn Quṭayba, al-Ma‘ārif, 44: b. Halqānā. A name similar to that in Ṭaraft is in Ibn ʿAsākir, Ta‘rīkh, VI, 491.


(465)-(467) From Ṭabarî, Jāmīʾ al-bayān, II, 611, 612f.; § 467 is also in Id., Taʾrīkh, I, 550 (transl. Brinner, III, 131-2). Ṭabarî mentions the most important and widespread traditions regarding the sakina, also quoted in connection with the building of the Kaʿba, see § 94 and annotations. Cf. also ʿAbd al-Razzāq, Tafsīr, I, 100-1; Muqātil, Tafsīr, I, 206; Khoury, Wahb b. Munabbih, 44; Ṭabarî, Taʾrīkh, I, 544; Thaʿlābī, Qīṣāṣ, 267-8; Nuwayri, Nihāyat, XIV, 41; Ps.-Aṣmaʾī, Qīṣāṣ, 49a; Ibn Abī ʿUdhayba, Qīṣāṣ, 83b; Majlisi, Biḥār, XIII, 440-1; Haysam, Qīṣāṣ, 129b; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Kāmil, I, 219. See also the definition ascribed to al-Kalbī in Samarqandi, Tafsīr, I, 219; and Māwardi, Tafsīr, I, 315-6: six differing definitions; and cf. Suyūṭī, al-Durr, I, 757-8; Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirʿat, 470; ʿUmāra b. Wathīma, Kitāb badr ʿal-khalq, 89. Upon the angels bearing the Ark, the same tradition is in Thaʿlābī, Qīṣāṣ, 268-9; Ps.-Aṣmaʾī, Qīṣāṣ, 49a. The description ascribed to Mujāḥid is in his Tafsīr, I, 114; see also Maqdisi, al-Badr, III, 98.

(468) From Ṭabarî, Jāmīʾ al-bayān, II, 609-10, but where the prophet is Daniel; see in fact also ʿAbd al-Razzāq, Tafsīr, I, 99-100; Ibn al-Murajjā, Faḍāʾil, 165 no. 226: it is Daniel or another prophet.

(469)-(473) Abridged from Ṭabarî, Jāmīʾ al-bayān, II, 617-8, 620, 621, and see also Id., Taʾrīkh, I, 551, where the mention of 319 believers must be corrected. Sources contain the usual range of variants, see for ex. Muqātil, Tafsīr, I, 208: 100,000 soldiers; Samarqandi, Tafsīr, I, 219: 70,000, I, 220; Kīsāʾī, Qīṣāṣ, 252: 70,000; Ps.-Aṣmaʾī, Qīṣāṣ, 49a: 80,000 or 70,000 or 20,000; Haysam, Qīṣāṣ, 130b: various versions; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, I, 760: a version from Ishāq b. Bishr, according to which there were 303,313, and only 313 did not drink; ʿUmāra b. Wathīma, Kitāb badr ʿal-khalq, 90: 103,313 and only 313 did not drink; see also Khoury, Wahb b. Munabbih, 46; Majlisi, Biḥār, XIII, 437; Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, Mirʿat, 471-2. The tradition § 471 connecting Saul’s followers to those fighting at Badr is mentioned in the main ḥadīth collections, see Bukhārī, Sahih, V, 6 no. 3957; Ibn Māja, Sunan, II, 944 no. 2828; Āḥmad b. Hanbal, Musnad, VI, 418 no. 18579; Tirmidhī, al-Jāmīʾ, IV, 152 no. 1598: 313; see also ʿAbd al-Razzāq, Tafsīr, I, 101: two versions, a little more than 310 or 300; Muqātil, Tafsīr, I, 208; Samarqandi, Tafsīr, I, 219; Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʾrīkh, VI, 494; Māwardi, Tafsīr, I, 317-8; Thaʿlābī, Qīṣāṣ, 269; etc. This tradition is discussed by v. Mzik, “Die Gideon-Saul-Legende”.

(474)-(475) From Ṭabarî, Jāmīʾ al-bayān, III, 34, 34-5, 40. These traditions are connected to the interpretation of Qur. 2:259. The prevailing interpretation states that he was Ezra, see Muqātil, Tafsīr, I, 216: but the town is Sābūr; ʿAbd al-Razzāq, Tafsīr, I, 106; Samarqandi, Tafsīr, I, 226; Ibn al-Jawzī, al-

On the Arabic name of Jeremiah, see Ṭabarî, Jâmi‘ al-bayân, I, 28; Tha‘labî, Qîsâs, 343; Nuwayrî, Nîhâyat, XIV, 149, 164. Upon Jeremiah, see Schützinger, “Die arabischen Jeremia-Erzählung” and, above all, Schwarzbaum, Biblical and Extra-Biblical Legends, 76-116. The Persian king is usually identified in Cyrus, Arabic Kawrash or Kawshaq, Kûsh, Kayrash, see Ibn al-Jawzî, al-Muntazam, I, 410; Majlîsî, Bihîr, XIII, 366; Ibn Qutayba, al-Ma‘ârif, 48; Mujîr al-Dîn, al-Uns, 151; ‘Umâra b. Wathîma, Kitâb bad’ al-khalq, 283; Abû al-Fida’, Kitâb al-mukhtâsâr, I, 44. Some of these traditions contain a completely differing variant: Dârâ b. Bahman, see Abû al-Fida’, Kitâb al-mukhtâsâr, 44; Mujîr al-Dîn, al-Uns, I, 151; Diyârbakrî, Ta’rîkh, I, 145; see also Ayoub, “‘Uzayr in the Qur’an”, 7-8. None of the major sources contain differing particulars about Jeremiah, see for ex. Ṭabarî, Ta’rîkh, I, 659f.; Tha‘labî, Qîsâs, 333; Ibn Iyâs, Qîsâs, 155; Ps.-Aṣma‘î, Qîsâs, 71b; Ibn Kathîr, al-Bidâyâ, II, 34.


Ezra is explicitly mentioned in Qur. 9:30. His complete name, as attested in traditions, is ‘Uzayr b. Sharhiyâ, see Muqâtil, Tâfsîr, I, 216; Tha‘labî, Qîsâs, 343; Samarqandî, Tâfsîr, I, 226: Sharkhiyâ; Suyûtî, al-Durr, II, 26: Sarûkha. About Ezra bringing back the Torah to the Israelites, see also Ṭabarî, Ta’rîkh, I, 669-70; Tha‘labî, Qîsâs, 346-7: the same tradition, ascribed to al-Kalbî; Ibn al-Athîr, al-Kâmîl, I, 270-1; Ibn Abî ‘Udhayba, Qîsâs, 116b-117a; and cf. Ibn Qutayba, al-Ma‘ârif, 50; Ibn al-Jawzî, Fâdî’il al-Quds, 106; Nuwayrî, Nîhâyat, XIV, 166-8; Ps.-Aṣma‘î, Qîsâs, 75b-76b; Ibn ‘Asâkir, Ta’rîkh, XI.
601f.; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, II, 28-9: Ezra son of God, IV, 171-3; Muqātil, Tafsīr, II, 167; Maqdisī, al-Badā', III, 115; ‘Umāra b. Wathīma, Kitāb bad’ al-khalq, 285-98; see also the discussion in Schwarzbaum, Biblical and Extra-Biblical Legends, 100f.; Ayoub, “‘Uzayr in the Qur‘ān”; and Lazarus-Yafeh, Intertwined Worlds, 50-74; the origin of his name in Arabic is discussed by Küstlinger in Orientalistische Literaturzeitung, 35 (1932), 381-3.

(478) Al-Khīdhr’s identity is a controversial question. Along with the data given by Țarafī, it must be added that one of his names would be Bāliyā b. Malikān, see already Ibn Qutayba, al-Ma‘ārif, 42; and, upon this name, Friedlaender, Die Chadhirlegende, 256-7, who considers it a corruption of a most probable Ilīyā, but the common Arabic for Elijah is Ilyās. This variant is attested, see for ex. Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, I, 326: Ilīyā b. Malikān; Quḍā‘ī, Ta‘rīkh, 109: Yaliyā; Ibn al-Athīr, al-Ḳa‘mil, I, 160; Nuwayrī, Nihāyat, XIII, 243; Ibn ‘Asakir, Ta‘rīkh, V, 630; see also what is stated in Qīṣāṣ al-anbiyā’, Ms Gotha A 1742, 151a: al-Khīdhr is Ilyās, from the offspring of Noah. But the version Ilīyā is probably a corruption of the original Bāliyā, by far most attested; in fact there is another typical orthographical variant: Taiyā, in Majlisī, Biḥār, XIII, 286, 298. About this matter, see de Hond, Beiträge zur Erklärung der Elīḥīr-legende, 23.

Muslim traditions identify al-Khīdhr with other figures. Some of them connect him to Alexander/Dhū al-Qarnayn: he was his vizier, or to the Pharaoh: he would have been his son; some other reports specify a Byzantine or Persian origin of his parents. About all these particulars see the rich treatment in Ibn Ḥajar, al-Iṣāba, 115: ten different names and identities of al-Khīdhr; see also Iṣḥāq b. Bishr, Mubṭada', 178a: he was Alexander’s vizier; and Maqdisī, al-Badā', III, 78; Sībī Ḥb al-Jawzī, Mir‘āt, 457; cf. Friedlaender, Die Chadhirlegende, 264f.), 182b; Muqātil, Tafsīr, II, 592: he was son of ʿĀmil, 594: also about why Elisha was given this name; about the story of ʿĀmil see ‘Umāra b. Wathīma, Kitāb bad’ al-khalq, 7-10; cf. also Suyūṭī, al-Durr, V, 432. Moreover, see the various reports in Ṭabari, Ta‘rīkh, I, 415f.; Kisā‘i, Qīṣāṣ, 230; Ibn ʿAsakir, Ta‘rīkh, V, 630; Tha‘labī, Qīṣāṣ, 220f., and in part. 224: he was Dhū al-Qarnayn himself, 333, 358-9, 368; Ibn Abī ʿUdhayba, Qīṣāṣ, 67a; Maqdisī, al-Badā', III, 77; Dīyārbakrī, Ta‘rīkh, I, 106; Majlisī, Biḥār, XIII, 283f., 303: Khal‘ab, see in fact also in Ḥusaynī, Qīṣāṣ, 111b; Ibn Iyās, Qīṣāṣ, 134-5, 162; Sībūb Ḥb al-Jawzī, Mir‘āt, 456-7; Mas‘ūdī, Murūjī, I, 69; Sīyar al-anbiyā’, 122b; Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Taḥsīra, 235; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, I, 299, 326: al-Khīdhr b. Ādām, or al-Mu‘ammār b. Mālik. The connection between al-Khīdhr and the Pharaoh is also attested in a ḥadith about Muḥammad’s nocturnal journey, see Ibn Māja, Sunan, II, 1337 no. 4030. See also a version given by Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, I, 326-7. About the relation between al-Khīdhr and Ezra, dealt with below, see also Friedlaender, Die
Regarding the relation between Elijah and al-Khādīr, there are various and contrasting reports. For ex. Ţabarî, Ta’rīkh, I, 415, states that al-Khādīr was Persian while Elijah was Israelite, though they meet every year, see also in Tha’lābî, Qīṣāṣ, 224; Ibn al-Athîr, al-Kāmil, I, 160; Majlîsî, Biḥār, XIII, 319; Suyūṭî, al-Durr, V, 434; see also Ibn al-Jawzî, al-Muntazam, 361-2; Dīyārbaḵrī, Ta’rīḵh, I, 107; Nuwayrî, Nihāyat, XIV, 28-30; Ibn ‘Asākir, Ta’rīḵh, III, 82-5; V, 647-8: various versions. There are traditions containing contrasting details: they were brothers, as in Ibn ‘Asākir, Ta’rīḵh, V, 642; Ibn Kathîr, al-Bidāya, I, 326. The numerous traditions collected by Ibn Ḥajar, al-Iṣāba, II, 114-37, above all 118-27, point out the close relationship between the two. This relationship is further explained by a report attesting that they are the two prophets still alive on earth, while Idrîs and Jesus are the two prophets still alive in heaven, see annotations on §§ 57-59, and Tha’lābî, Qīṣāṣ, 260; Ibn Kathîr, al-Bidâya, I, 337; Ps.-Asma’î, Qīṣāṣ, 126b; Ibn Ḥajar, al-Iṣāba, II, 127; Qīṣāṣ al-anbiyā’, Ms Berlin Or. quart. 1171, 151b; Majlîsî, Biḥār, XIII, 299, 402; Nuwayrî, Nihāyat, XIV, 28-9; Dīyārbaḵrī, Ta’rīḵh, I, 107; Ibn al-Jawzî, al-Muntazam, I, 361: they are alive after drinking at the spring of Life, see in fact also Sibt Ibn al-Jawzî, Mir’āt, 458-9, 464; cf. Ibn al-Ḥarīrî, ‘Umduṭ, 81b. Along with quails, their favourite food is celery (karfās), see Ibn Ḥajar, al-Iṣāba, II, 125, 126; ‘Umāra b. Wathīma, Kitāb ḏaḏ al-khalq, 24; Ibn ‘Asākir, Ta’rīḵh, III, 85; Dīyārbaḵrī, Ta’rīḵh, I, 107; upon al-Khādīr’s food, consisting of celery and truffles, see also Ibn al-Murajjâ, Fadā’il, 140 no. 175. Upon Elijah and al-Khādīr see the comprehensive discussion in Franke, Begegnung mit Khīdîr, 80-161.

(479) The first part is a hadīth mentioned in Bukhārî, Sahīḥ, IV, 479 no. 3402; ʿAbd al-Jāmî, V, 313 no. 3151; ʿAbd al-Ḥanbal, Musnad, III, 186 no. 8119, III, 8235 no. 8235; see also Sibt Ibn al-Jawzî, Mir’āt, 457; Ibn ‘Asākir, Ta’rīḵh, V, 631-2: many versions; Dīyārbaḵrī, Ta’rīḵh, I, 106; Tha’lābî, Qīṣāṣ, 220; Nuwayrî, Nihāyat, XIII, 243-4; Maqdisî, al-Bad’, III, 78; for the final part, see Suyūṭî, al-Durr, V, 420; and also Friedlaender, Die Chadhirlegende, 109-11; Id., “Alexanders Zug nach dem Lebensquell”, 232-4.

(480) From Ţabarî, Jāmî, al-bayân, XV, 276, 277, 278; and in Id., Ta’rīḵh, I, 422-4 (transl. Brinner, III, 11-3). Similar traditions are in Ibn ‘Asākir, Ta’rīḵh, XVII,
369-71. In early hadith collections there are similar reports which follow the Qur’ānic passage, see Bukhārī, Sahih, IV, 477-9 nos. 3400-1, V, 279-85 nos. 4725-7; Muslim, Sahih, IV, 1847-53 no. 2380; Tirmidhī, al-Jāmī’, V, 309 no. 3149; Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, VIII, 11-2 no. 21167, VIII, 13-14 no. 21172, VIII, 15-20 nos. 21175-8, VIII, 21 no. 21189; see also the discussion in Friedlaender, Die Chadhirlegende, 61-107. In most of the traditions quoted above it is stated that the one who met al-Khīḍr was another man by the name of Moses, and not the patriarch himself, see Bukhārī, Sahih, I, 47-8 no. 122; and the complete explanation by Samarqandi, Tafsīr, II, 304: he is Moses b. Ibrāhīm (sic) or b. Mīshā. Since the name of this episode is not mentioned in the Qur’ān, some traditions aim at underlining, without room for doubt, that he was al-Khīḍr, as identified by extra-canonical reports; in addition to the sources quoted above, see Bukhārī, Sahih, I, 32-3 no. 74, I, 34 no. 78, VIII, 555-6 no. 7478. Other hadiths, apart from that quoted in § 479 and those quoted above, deal with al-Khīḍr, mainly in connection, with the murder of the young boy; see Muslim, Sahih, IV, 2050 no. 2661; Abū Dāwūd, Sunan, IV, 227 no. 4705; Tirmidhī, al-Jāmī’, V, 312 no. 3150; Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, VIII, 20 no. 21179-80; and cf. Abū Ya‘lā, Musnad, IV, 423-5 no. 2550: but with a generic al-ʿālim/shahīb Mūsā instead of al-Khīḍr. Upon the story of al-Khīḍr, see also Muqāṭīl, Tafsīr, II, 592: the confluence of the two seas is in Azerbaijan; ʿUmāra b. Wathīḥa, Kitāb ḏād al-khalq, 26: in Armenia; Ṭabarī, Taʾrīkh, I, 420f.; Kīsāʾī, Qiṣṣaṣ, 230-3; Thaʿlabī, Qiṣṣaṣ, 218-231; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 117a f.; Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, I, 295f.; Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʾrīkh, V, 632f.; Ibn Iyās, Qiṣṣaṣ, 129f.; Ibn al-Jawzī, al-Tabṣīra, 234: the confluence is in Ifriqiya or ʿTanja— the last name is also in Ṭabarī, Jāmīʾ al-bayān, XV, 271; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mīrʾāṭ, 437f.; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, V, 409-19; Mawardi, Tafsīr, III, 323: confluence in Armenia. Regarding the name of this king, see Tottoli, “Ibn Muṭṭarīf al-Ṭarafi”, 150.

(481) Abridged from Ṭabarī, Jāmīʾ al-bayān, XVI, 3, 4. The name of the young boy is given in some hadiths, see Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Musnad, VIII, 19 no. 21177; Thaʿlabī, Qiṣṣaṣ, 226, mentions three possibilities: Ḥasnūd, al-Ḥasan or al-Ḥusayn, together with the name of his parents, Mālāṣ and Ṭahmā; see also Muqāṭīl, Tafsīr, II, 596: al-Ḥusayn b. Kāzirī and the mother Sahlī; ʿUmāra b. Wathīḥa, Kitāb ḏād al-khalq, 30: al-Ḥasan b. Kādarīn and the mother Sahlība; Hāyṣam, Qiṣṣaṣ, 111b: Khashnūd b or al-Ḥusayn b. Kādirī; Mawardi, Tafsīr, III, 333: the son Jaysūr and his parents, quoting Muqāṭīl, Kāzirī and Sahlī; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, V, 412: Jaysūr; Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī, Mīrʾāṭ, 437: Jaysūr; Siyar al-anbiyāʾ, 118a; see the versions in Samarqandi, Tafsīr, II, 307: the name of the son was Khashnūd/Kharbath b. Khadhri, and cf. II, 309.
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(482)-(489) From Ṭabarāni, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XVI, 5-6. See also similar versions in Samarqandi, Tafsīr, II, 309; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, V, 421-2; and ʿAbd al-Razzāq, Tafsīr, I, 407: suhuf min ʿilm. Other traditions state that under the wall there were gold and silver, see Tirmidhī, al-Jāmiʿ, V, 313 no. 3152; Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirzāt, 439. Some sources mention the names of the two owners of the treasure, and the most frequently attested are Āṣām and Ṣarīm, see Muqāṭīl, Tafsīr, II, 599, along with the names of their parents: Kāshīḥ – also in Samarqandī, Tafsīr, II, 310; Thaʿlabī, Qiṣṣaṣ, 228, Haysam, Qiṣṣaṣ, 112a – and Dahnhā; Thaʿlabī, Qiṣṣaṣ, 228; Sibṭ Ibn al-Jawzī, Mirzāt, 439; Mujīr al-Dīn, al-UNS, I, 97; Māwardī, Tafsīr, III, 335: Ṣarm, Ṣarīm, Kāshīḥ and Rahnā; ʿUmrā b. Wathima, Qiṣṣaṣ, 32: Āṣām, Dūrayk, Kāshīḥ and Dahnā.

(490)-(498) §§ 490-492 are from Muqāṭīl, Tafsīr, III, 49-50, and §§; 492-496 from Ṭabarānī, Muʿjam al-awsat, VII, 79-80. Shorter traditions describing similar episodes – closer to § 491 – are reported in Thaʿlabī, Qiṣṣaṣ, 229-30; Ibn ʿAsākir, Taʾrīkh, V, 640-1; Samarqandī, Tafsīr, II, 310; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, V, 432: two versions of § 491, one from Ibn Ḥanbal’s Kitāb al-zuhd, and one from Ibn Abī al-Dunyā; Muqāṭīl, Tafsīr, III, 50-1; Ibn Hishām, Kitāb al-tijān, 102-4: a waṣiyya from al-Khīḍr to Alexander; and see the other sources quoted in Tottoli, “Ibn Muṭarrif al-Ṭarafi”, 159 n. 130.

(499)-(500) Abridged from Ṭabarānī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XXII, 155, 158-9, XXII, 158: Ḥabīb b. Mari. All the sources include wide reports about these messengers sent to Antioch, see for ex. Ṭabarānī, Taʾrīkh, I, 790-3, and Id., Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XXII, 156: their names are Śādiq, Maṣďuq and Salūm – Shalūm in Taʾrīkh, I, 790; see also Muqāṭīl, Tafsīr, III, 575: Tūmān, Yūnūs and Shamʿūn; Samarqandī, Tafsīr, III, 95: Tūmān, Ṭalūs and Shamʿūn; see also Thaʿlabī, Qiṣṣaṣ, 404: four series of differing names; Māwardī, Tafsīr, V, 10: differing names. According to one of the versions in Thaʿlabī, one of the three was Simeon, the chief of the apostles; see Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, I, 229: Shamʿūn, Yuḥannā and Būlus; such as in Suyūṭī, al-Durr, VII, 50, but Būlus; and Maqdisī, al-Badʾ, III, 130; on these names cf. Busse, H., “Antioch and its prophet Ḥabīb al-Najjār”, 164. Regarding the versions of the story of Ḥabīb, see Ps.-Asmaʾī, Qiṣṣaṣ, 88b f.; Suyūṭī, al-Durr, VII, 50: Ḥabīb b. Mari was a carpenter; Samarqandī, Tafsīr, III, 95-6: Ḥabīb b. Isrāʾīl; Muqāṭīl, Tafsīr, III, 576-7: Ḥabīb b. Ibriyā. An interesting tradition quoted by Muqāṭīl, Tafsīr, II, 578, states that Ḥabīb, quoted as sāḥib yāsīn, is already in paradise, along with the believer of the family of Pharaoh, Mary and Āsiya; see Busse, “Antioch and its prophet Ḥabīb al-Najjār”, 170f.; Schwarzbbaum, Biblical and Extra-Biblical Legends, 19, and 131 n. 135.

(501)-(506) From Ṭabarānī, Jāmiʿ al-bayān, XIX, 13-5. These traditions aim at explaining the unclear Qurʾānic hints (25:38, 50:12) at the mysterious asḥāb al-rass. As in Ṭaraft, also other sources identify al-Rass with the story of Antioch,

*(Conclusion)*

(507) In the introductory part Ṭarāfī states that in the following chapter he would have mentioned ages, chronology and appearances of the prophets. The preserved text could thus have been partially lost since he stops suddenly with the ages of the prophets. § 507 is almost identical to § 2.

(508) With some differing particulars, from Ṭabarī, *Ta‘rīkh*, I, 1072. More differences are also signaled in the version in Ibn Ḥabīb, *al-Muḥabbbar*, 1-2; for further sources about this tradition, see S. Leder, *Das Korpus al-Ḥayṭām*. Chronologies of this kind, though partial as in § 149, and with the usual variants, are attested in all the sources, see for ex. Maqdisī, *al-Bad‘*, II, 150-4: five different chronologies; Ḥamza al-Isfahānī, *Ta‘rīkh*, 76-82; Tha‘labi, *Qīṣaṣ*, 59, 73; Ṭabarī, *Ta‘rīkh*, I, 169, 170, 196, 200, 225; Ibn Iyās, *Qīṣaṣ*, 66: from the Flood to the Hijra there were 3774 years, 193; Iṣḥāq b. Bishr, *Mubtada‘*, 83a: between Adam and Noah there are ten centuries, 170a, 183a: between Jesus and Muḥammad 400 years; *Siyar al-anbiyā‘*, 32b-33a, 38b, 95a, 110a, 135b, 161b; Ps.-Aṣma‘ī, *Qīṣaṣ*, 30b-31a; Sībī‘ Ibn al-Jawzi, *Mīrā‘*, 44: from Adam to the Hijra 7000 years, 268, 415-6, 502, 586; ‘Abd al-Malik b. Ḥabīb, *Kitāb al-ta‘rīkh*, 73 no. 183; Ibn al-Wardī, *Kharīdat*, 246-7; Abū al-Fidā‘, *Kitāb al-
Regarding problems and questions of chronology, see Stern, “Abū 'Isā ibn al-Munajjim’s chronography”, in part. 440.

(509) Similar traditions are in Ibn `Asākir, Ta‘rīkh, II, 317 and XVII, 651: between Adam and Noah there were ten generations, ten between Noah and Abraham and seven between Abraham and Moses; cf. also Ibn Hishām, Kitāb al-tījān, 43.

(510) About the ages of the prophets see above, where for every prophet the question is dealt with. A long list, but different, is given in Ibn Ḥabīb, Kitāb al-muḥabbār, 2-5.