

**'The Coming of the Comforter:
When, Where, and to Whom?**

Orientalia Judaica Christiana

3

**Studies on the Rise of Islam and Various Other
Topics in Memory of John Wansbrough**

*Claude Gillick, « Mohammed's
exegetical activity in the
Meccan Arabic lectionary »,
pp. 371-398
G. 3. 144*

**Edited by
Carlos A. Segovia
Basil Lourié**

Orientalia Judaica Christiana, the Christian Orient and its Jewish Heritage, is dedicated, first of all, to the afterlife of the Jewish Second Temple traditions within the traditions of the Christian East. A second area of exploration is some priestly (non Talmudic) Jewish traditions that survived in the Christian environment.



gorgias press

2012

MOHAMMED'S EXEGETICAL ACTIVITY IN THE MECCAN ARABIC LECTIONARY

CLAUDE GILLIOT

AIX-EN-PROVENCE
Claude.Gilliot@univ-provence.fr

INTRODUCTION

The concept of *lingua sacra* in relation with the constitution of the Koran and with the exegetical literature is one of the main concerns of John Wansbrough in this Quranic studies. However we are not sure that the originally meaning of the expression *bādhā lisanun 'arabiyyun mubīnun* (Q 16: 103) was: “this is plain Arabic speech.” In order to try to clarify this issue, we should wish to begin with some remarks on what the Koran says on its own pre-history.

I. THE KORAN ON ITS “PREHISTORY”

With prehistory we do not mean here the Koranic words, passages or themes borrowed from Judaism, Christianity, Jewish-Christianity, Manicheism, gnosticism, etc.,¹ but Koranic words,

¹ *V. the status quaestionis* of Gilliot, “Rétrospectives et perspectives. De quelques sources possibles du Coran. I. (first part) “Les sources du Coran et les emprunts aux traditions religieuses antérieures dans la recherche (XIX^e et début du XX^e siècles),” to be published in *Mélanges Emilio Platti*, 2010, above all studies written in German, from Abraham Geiger (1810–1874), etc., to Tor Andrae (1885–1947) and Wilhelm Rudolph (1891–1987), etc. The second part of this study: II. “Le Coran, production

expressions or passages which seem to hint to a “text” or to an oral “source” on which the Koran could have been dependent.

We shall examine here what Günter Lüling² has called: “The Islamic scholarly terminology for the different layers of the Koran text.” Without necessarily accepting his general thesis on the Koran originating in pre-Islamic Arabic Christian hymns, and particularly his argument that the adversaries of Mohammed should have been Hellenistic Christians,³ we consider that his ideas on “The Islamic scholarly terminology for the different layers of the Koran text”⁴ has unrightly not been taken into consideration by the orientalis before Jan Van Reeth, as it will be seen below. Another stimulating point of departure for this study has been thesis of Ch. Luxenberg, according whom: “If *Koran*, however, really means *lectionary*, then one can assume that the Koran intended itself first of all to be understood as nothing more than a liturgical book with selected texts from the scriptures (The Old and New Testament, apocryphal literature and traditions, etc.) and not at all as a substi-

littéraire de l'antiquité tardive.” In *Mélanges à la mémoire d'Alfred-Louis de Prémare*, REMMM 129 (2011).

² Lüling, Günter. *Über den Ur-Qur'an. Ansätze zur Rekonstruktion vorislamischer christlicher Strophenlieder im Qur'an*. Erlangen, 1974 [review by Maxime Rodinson in *Der Islam* 54 (1977): 321–25] / (*Über den Urkoran...*, 1993²) / English translation and revised ed.: *A Challenge to Islam for reformation. The rediscovery and reliable reconstruction of a comprehensive pre-Islamic Christian hymnal hidden in the Koran under earliest Islamic reinterpretations*. Delhi, 2003.

³ Lüling, G. *Die Wiederentdeckung des Propheten Muhammad. Eine Kritik am "christlichen Abendland"*, 94–95. Erlangen, 1981 [review of Gilliot, Cl. “Deux études sur le Coran.” *Arabica* XXX (1983): 16–37 (1–37)]; cf. against this idea Van Reeth, Jan M. F. “Le Coran et les scribes.” In Cannuyer, C., ed. *Les scribes et la transmission du savoir*, 73 (66–81). Bruxelles, 2006.

⁴ Lüling, *Challenge*, 12–3, 69, 111 (*muhkam* vs. *mutashābih*, and *mufaṣṣal*) / *Ur-Qur'an*, 5, 62–3, 206–7, 209 (*muhkam* vs. *mutashābih*, (*mufaṣṣal*, *ibid.* and p. 111, 427) / *Urkoran*, same pagination (in both German editions less developed than in *Challenge*).

ture for the Scriptures themselves, i.e. an independant *Scripture*.”⁵ It should be clear for the reader that it is not necessary to follow Lüling (pre-Islamic Arabic Christian hymns), on the one hand, or Luxenberg (entire passages of the Meccan Koran being mere palimpsests of Syriac primitive text) in their systematic, sometimes probably too automatic ways of proceeding, if we consider that a part of their point of departure and some of their ideas have some *fundamentum in re*, or let us say a certain basis in the Koranic text itself, in the Islamic tradition, and in the cultural environment in which the Koran was born. Speaking of “cultural environment” means that we shall concentrate on the “Meccan Koran.”

1. This “lectionary” is in Arabic commenting a non-Arabic “lectionary”?

We shall begin with Q 16 (*Nahl*): 103: “And we know very well that they say: “Only a mortal is teaching him.” The speech (tongue) of him at whom they hint is barbarous; and this is speech (tongue) Arabic, manifest (*lisānu l-ladbi yulhidūna ilayhi a'ḡamiyyun wa bādḡā lisānun 'arabiyyun mubīn*)” (trans. Arberry modified by us). *Lisān* should be better translated in both cases by “tongue” than by “speech” (in Arberry's translation)

Most of the ancient Muslim scholars consider this sura a Meccan one (al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, 'Ikrima, etc.),⁶ with some Medinan in-

⁵ Luxenberg, Christoph. *Die Syro-aramäische Lesart des Koran. Ein Beitrag zur Entschlüsselung der Koransprache*. Berlin, 2000, p. 79 / ²2004, p. 111 / *The Syro-Aramaic Reading of the Koran. A Contribution to the decoding of the language of the Koran*, 104. Berlin, 2007. Cf. the three positive review articles of Nabielek, Rainer. “Weintrauben statt Jungfrauen: Zu einer neuen Lesart des Korans,” *INAMO* (Berlin) (Herbst/Winter 2000): 66–72; Gilliot, Cl. “Langue et Coran: une lecture syro-araméenne du Coran.” *Arabica* L (2003/3): 381–9; Van Reeth, J. M. F. “Le vignoble du paradis et le chemin qui y mène. La thèse de C. Luxenberg et les sources du Coran.” *Arabica* L.III/4 (2006): 511–24; the following negative reviews: Blois, François de, in *Journal of Quranic Studies* V/1 (2003): 92–7; Hopkins, Simon, in *JSAT* 28 (2003): 377–80.

⁶ Qurtubī, *Tafsīr = al-Jāmi' li-ahkām al-Qur'ān*, ed. A. 'Abd al-'Alīm al-Bardūnī et al. 20 vols. Cairo, 1952–67. X, p. 65.

terpolations, for instance Ibn ‘Abbās: verses 126–9 were revealed between Mecca and Medina when Mohammed returned from Uḥud.⁷ Or according to the same, verses 95–97 are Medinan.⁸ Some of them have said that this sura is Medinan from the beginning to verse 40 (*kun fa-yakūn*). The contrary is reported from Qatāda b. Di‘āma: it is Meccan from the beginning to verse 40, but Medinan for the rest.⁹ For the Mu‘tazilī Abū Bakr al-Aṣamm it is entirely Medinan.¹⁰ As for the chronological order, it is the 70th sura in the codex attributed to Ja‘far al-Šādiq¹¹ which has been taken up by the “Cairo’s edition” of the Koran. The orders in the chronological classifications proposed by the orientalist are the

⁷ Makkī b. a. Tālib al-Qaysī (d. 437/1045), *al-Hidāya ilā bulūgh al-nihāya* [*Tafsīr* Makkī b. a. Tālib], 13 vols., ed. under the direction of al-Shāhid al-Būshihī, Sharjah (al-Shāriqa), 1429/2008, 9112 p., VI, p. 3943; Qurtubī, *Tafsīr*, X, 201. Father Ludovico Marracci, o.m.d. (that is: Congregatio clericorum regulorum Matris Dei, 1612–1700), who have done an excellent work in his edition, translation and annotation of the Koran, already knew through *Tafsīr al-Jalalayn* that some people considered the three last verses of this sura Medinan; *Alkorani Textus Universus* [...], Patavii: ex typographia Seminarii, 1698, p. 399, *Notae*, col. 1.

⁸ Qurtubī, *Tafsīr*, X, 65.

⁹ Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *Tafsīr=Mafātīh al-ghayb*, ed. M. Muḥyī al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd, ‘A. I. al-Šawī *et al.* 32 vols. Cairo, 1933–62. XIX, p. 117. *Le Coran*, traduction selon un essai de reclassement, des sourates par Régis Blachère, I–III, Paris, G. P. Maisonneuve, 1947–51 [vol. I, 1947 being: *Introduction au Coran*], II, p. 396: the formulation of Blachère is ambiguous, because in writing: “v. Qatāda chez Rāzī,” he seems to suggest that Qatāda had the opposite position to the one given here. He writes also that this sura is considered Meccan unto verse 29 (*leg.* 39), with a reference to Abū al-Qāsim Ilibat Allāh Ibn Salāma al-Baghdādī (d. 410/1109), *al-Nāsikh wa al-mansūkh*, in the margin of al-Wāhidī, *Asbāb al-nuzūl*, Cairo, 1316/1895, p. 207, but Ibn Salāma writes: *nāzalāt min awalihā ilā ra’s arba’in āya bi-Makka*, which means to verse 39, and for the rest it is Medinan.

¹⁰ Rāzī, *ibid.*

¹¹ Jeffery, Arthur. *Materials for the history of the text of the Qur’ān*, 330–31. Leiden, 1937.

following:¹² Muir (88th, first Medinan period);¹³ Nöldeke (73th with some Medinan interpolations);¹⁴ Grimme (83th, last Meccan period, save verses 110–124 or 110–128, Medinan);¹⁵ Hirschfeld (Meccan of the 5th type: descriptive revelations, verse 1–114, *leg.* 113; 114–128 [with? of Hirschfeld], Medinan);¹⁶ Blachère (75th, verse 110, interpolation).¹⁷ We can conclude that according to the great majority of the Muslim and orientalist scholars the verse quoted above is classified in the last Meccan period.

This verse requires some remarks.

a. First of all it is within a group of verses (101–3), which constitutes “a passage packed with self-referentiality.”¹⁸

The word *lisān* is used in numerous other instances with the un-metaphorical sense of the vocal organ “tongue.” Some of these uses do not refer to the Arabic language, but rather, to the task of

¹² Watt, William Montgomery. *Bell’s Introduction to the Qur’an*, 207. Edinburgh, 1970. Watt has numbered himself the chronological classifications of Muir, Nöldeke and Grimme, in front of the “Egyptian,” i.e. Cairo’s edition; p. 110 he has listed Q 16 in the third Meccan period. Watt, W. M. *Companion to the Qur’an*, 130. London, 1967: “Seems to be partly Meccan, partly Medinan.”

¹³ Muir, Sir William. *The Coran. Its composition and teaching and the testimony it bears to the Holy Scriptures*, Londres, 1878³, reprint Kessinger Publishing’s, n.d. (ca. 2000), p. 44. When necessary the numeration of the verses in the Flügel edition of the Koran has been replaced by that of the Cairo’s edition.

¹⁴ *GdQ*, I, 145–9. Third Meccan period with some (possible) Medinan interpolations.

¹⁵ Grimme, Hubert. *Mohammed*, I, *Das Leben nach den Quellen*, II, *Einleitung in den Koran. System der koranischen Theologie*. Münster, 1892–95. II, p. 26, l. 8, p. 27, l. 14.

¹⁶ Hirschfeld, Hartwig. *New researches on the composition and exegesis of the Qur’an*, 144. London, 1902.

¹⁷ Blachère, *op. cit.*, II, p. XV.

¹⁸ Wild, Stefan. “An Arabic recitation. The meta-linguistics of Qur’anic recitation.” In Idem, ed. *Self-Referentiality in the Qur’an*, 148 (135–57). Wiesbaden, 2006.

prophetic communication¹⁹ (Q 28: 34; 19: 97; 44: 58, this last example has to be put into relation to 54: 17 and 22: 40). In Q 20: 27: where Moses says: "And loose a knot from my tongue" and also Q 28: 34: "My bother Aaron is more eloquent than me in speech (*afṣaḥu minnī lisānan*)," we find a reversal of Ex 4: 14–15: "Is not Aaron the Levite thy brother? I know that he can speak well [...]. And thou shalt speak unto him, and put words in his mouth."

Concerning the expression *lisān 'arabi* it occurs three times in the Koran (16: 103; 26: 195; 46: 12), all during the Meccan period, with the metaphorical sense of *lisān* (tongue), that is speech. As the Koran is a very self-referential text, it is "somewhat self-conscious with respect to its language."²⁰ It says non only that it is in Arabic or Arabic tongue/speech/language (*lisān*), but it seems also to declare that it is in a plain/clear (*mubīn*) tongue/speech/language: "We have revealed it, a lecture [or lectionary] (*qur'ānan*) in Arabic" (Q 12: 2; 20: 113); "We revealed it, a decisive utterance (*ḥukman*) in Arabic" (Q 13: 37); "a Lecture [or lectionary] in Arabic" (Q39: 28; 41: 3; 42: 7; 43: 3); "this is a confirming Scripture in the Arabic language (*lisānan 'arabiyyan*)" (Q46: 12); "in plain Arabic speech (*bi-lisānin 'arabiyyin mubīn*)" (Q 16: 103; 26: 195).²¹ The reasons why the Koran insists on the quality and value of its own language seem to be polemical and apologetic. The argument for its Arabic character, first of all, has to be put into relation to Q 14: 4: "We never sent a messenger save with the language/tongue of his folk (*bi-lisāni qawmihī*), that he might make [the message] clear for them." This declaration, by stressing the language of this messenger (Mohammed) and this folk (the Arabs) can be understood as a declaration of the ethnocentric nature of this prophetic mission, but also as a divine

¹⁹ Wansbrough, John. *Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation*, 99. Oxford, 1977; cf. Robinson, Neal. *Discovering the Qur'an. A contemporary approach to a veiled text*, 158–59. London, 1996.

²⁰ Jenssen, Herbjorn. "Arabic language." In *EQ*, vol. I, 132a, l. 5–6 (127–35).

²¹ Gilliot, Cl., and Pierre Larcher. "Language and style of the Qur'an." In *EQ*, vol. III, 113a (109–35).

proof of its universality,²² challenging another sacred language, Hebrew,²³ perhaps also Syriac, or more generally Aramaic.²⁴

But in stressing that it is in Arabic, the Koran answers also to accusations which were addressed to Mohammed during the Meccan period: "And we know very well that they say: "Only a mortal is teaching him." The speech (tongue) of him at whom they hint is barbarous; and this is speech (tongue) Arabic, manifest (*lisānu ḥadīḥi yulḥidūna ilayhi a'ḡamiyyun wa ḥadīḥā lisānun 'arabiyyun mubīn*)" (Q 16: 103). The commentators explain *yulḥidūna* (Kūfian reading: *yalḥadūna*)²⁵ by "to incline to, to become fond of," which is the meaning of Arabic *lahada*.²⁶ It is the reason why, following most of the commentators, Marracci had translated: "*Lingua ad quam inclinant (id est, qua loquuntur homines illi, a quibus dicunt Mahumetum doceri) est barbara.*"²⁷ George Sale (1697?–1736) who is often very dependent on Marracci has: "the tongue of the person unto whom they incline is a foreign tongue."²⁸ But this interpretation à *yulḥidūna* by "to incline to" seems not to be convincing. Indeed it has been shown else-

²² Wansbrough, *Quranic Studies*, 52–3, 98.

²³ *Ibid.*, 81.

²⁴ Gilliot, Cl. "Informants." In *EQ*, vol. II, 513 (p. 512–8); *Idem*. "Zur Herkunft der Gewährsmänner des Propheten." In Ohlig, Hans-Heinz, und Gerd-Rüdiger Puin, hrsg. *Die dunklen Anfänge. Neue Forschungen zur Entstehung und frühen Geschichte des Islam*, 151–56, 167–69 (148–69). Berlin, 2005.

²⁵ Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, ed. A. Sa'īd 'Alī, Muṣṭ. al-Saqqā *et al.* 30 vols. Cairo, 1954. XIV, p. 180; *Mu'jam al-Qirā'āt al-qur'āniyya*, collected by A. Mukhtār 'Umar and 'Abd al-'Āl Sālim Makram. 6 vols., vol. III, 34–5. Cairo, 1997 (8 vols., Kuwayt, 1402–5/1982–5); *Mu'jam al-Qirā'āt al-qur'āniyya*, collected by al-Khaṭīb ('Abd al-Laṭīf). 11 vols., vol. IV, 689–90. Damascus, 1422/2002.

²⁶ Muqāṭil b. Sulaymān, *Tafsīr*, ed. 'Al. Maḥmūd Shihāta. 6 vols., vol. II, 487. Cairo, 1980–9; Farrā', *Ma'āni l-Qur'an*, ed. M. 'Alī al-Najjār *et al.* 3 vols., vol. II, 113. Cairo, 1955–73.

²⁷ Marracci, *Alcorani Textus Universus*, 398.

²⁸ *The Koran*, commonly called the Alcoran of Mohammed [...] by George Sale, A new edition, in one vol., 207. London: Orlando Hodgson, n.d. (ca. 1840) (2 vols., 1734).

here that the linguistic and social context to which this verse refers could be a Syriac one: the Arabic root *l-h-d*, being probably an adaptation of the Syriac *l'ez*, “to speak enigmatically,” “to allude to,” like the Arabic root *l-gh-z*.²⁹

The contrast *‘ajami*, often understood as barbarous or outlandish, with *‘arabi*/Arabic, becomes very significant, if we consider Q 41 (*Fuṣṣilat*): 44: “And if we had appointed it a lecture in a foreign tongue (*qur’ānan ‘ajamiyyan*) they would assuredly have said: If only its verses were expounded (*fuṣṣilat*) [so that we might understand]? What! A foreign tongue and an Arab (*‘ajami wa ‘arabi*).” *Fuṣṣilat* was understood by an ancient exegete, al-Suddī (128/745), as “clarified” (*buṣṣinat*).³⁰ The exegete al-Tha’labī (d. 427/1035), not quoting al-Suddī, writes: “whose verses are clear; they reach us so that we understand it. We are a people of Arabs, we have nothing to do with non-Arabs (*‘ajamiyya*).”³¹ Long before him Muqātil b. Sulaymān (d. 150/767) commented: “Why are they (i.e. the verses) not expounded clearly in Arabic in order that we understand it (i.e. the Koran) and we know what Mohammed says? (*halla buṣṣinat bi-‘al-‘arabiyyati hattā naḥqaba wa na’lama mā yaqūlu Muḥammad*).”³²

According to these passages of the self-referential Meccan Koran, it seems that it is a kind of commentary or exegesis in Arabic of a non-Arabic book, or of non-Arabic collections of “texts” or *logia*, or of portions of a non-Arabic lectionary. The Koran does not deny that Mohammed could have information from informants, but it insists on the fact that what Mohammed delivers is in a language that Arabs can understand.

²⁹ Luxenberg, *Syro-aramäische Lesart*, 87–91/2004², 116–19 / *Syro-Aramaic reading*, 112–5; cf. Gilliot, Cl. “Le Coran, fruit d’un travail collectif?” In De Smet, Daniel, G. de Callatay et J. M. F. Van Reeth, eds. *al-Kitāb. La sacralité du texte dans le monde de l’Islam*, 190–91. Leuven/Louvain, 2004.

³⁰ Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, XXIV, 127.

³¹ Tha’labī, [*Tafsīr*] *al-Kaṣḥ wa l-hayān ‘an tafsīr al-Qur’ān*, ed. Abū M. ‘Alī ‘Āshūr. 10 vol., vol. VIII, 298. Beirut, 2002 (a bad edition!).

³² Muqātil, *Tafsīr*, III, 746.

b. Our second remark has to do with the expression “In plain/clear Arabic speech/tongue (*bi-lisānin ‘arabiyyin mubīn*) (Q 16: 103; 26: 195) which still needs more reflection, because the translation given here is—like most translations of the phrase—misleading from the point of view of morphology, and consequently of semantics. *Mubīn* is the active participle of the causative-factitive *abāna*, which can be understood as: “making [things] clear” (so understood by al-Suddī and others, as seen above). Such an understanding of that expression is suggested by Q 14: 4 which utilizes the causative factitive *bayyana*: “And we never sent a messenger save with the language/tongue of his folk, that he might make [the message] clear for them (*li-yubayyina labum*).”

But the adjectival opposition found in Q 16: 103 between *‘ajami* on the one hand, and *‘arabi* and *mubīn*, on the other hand, was understood by the exegetes as “barbarous,” i.e. non-Arabic (*‘ajami*) and indistinct (*‘ajami*) in contradistinction with clear/pure Arabic.³³ “Muḥammad’s quite conscious effort to create an Arabic holy book, a *Qur’ān*, corresponding to the Christian Syriac *Keryānā*” has been pointed out by G. Widengren (1907–96).³⁴

The consequence according to the theologians is that the Koran must be in a “smooth, soft, and plain/distinct speech (*sahl, layyin, wādih*): «In the Koran there is no unusual/obscure (*gharib*) sound-complex (*ḥarf*, or articulation, as the linguists now say) from the manner of speaking (*luḡha*) of Quraysh, save three, because the speech (*kalām*) of Quraysh is smooth, soft, and plain/distinct, and the speech of the [other] Arabs is uncivilized (*wahsh*) unusual/obscure.”³⁵ We shall not deal more here on the alleged supe-

³³ Wansbrough, *Quranic Studies*, 98–9; Larcher, Pierre. “Language, Concept of.” In *EQ*, vol. III, 108–9; Gilliot and Larcher, “Language and style,” 114–5.

³⁴ Widengren, Geo. *Muḥammad, the apostle of God, and his ascension*, 152. Uppsala, 1955.

³⁵ Abū al-‘Izz al-Wāsiṭī (d. 521/1127), *al-Irshād fi al-qirā’at al-‘ashr*, quoted by Suyūṭī, *Itqān*, chap. 37, *al-Itqān fi ‘ulūm al-Qur’ān*, ed. M. Abū al-Ḥaḍl Ibrāhīm, revised ed. 4 vols. in 2, vol. II, 124. Beirut, 1974–5 (Cairo, 1967); the three articulations quoted are: 17: 51 (*fa-sa-yunghidunā*), 4: 85 (*unquṭun*), and 8: 57 (*fa sharrad bi huu*).

riority of the Qurayshī manner of speaking and the so-called Qurayshī character of the language of the Koran, it has been done elsewhere.³⁶

The adjectival *mubīn* occurs also in another latter Meccan or early Medinian passage Q 12 (Yūsuf): 1–2 (chronology: 77th for Muir, Nöldeke; 85 for Grimme; 53th for Cairo's edition, save verses 1–3,7 Medinan):³⁷ “These are the signs of the manifest [or rather: making things clear] book (*tilka āyātu al-kitābi al-mubīn*). We have sent it down as an Arabic lectionary (*innā anzalnāhu qurʾānan ʿarabiyyan*); haply you will understand (*laʿallakum taqilūn*)” (trans. Arberry modified by us). Here again *mubīn* means “making things clear” in opposition to a lectionary in a foreign language, (perhaps) that this Arabic lectionary explains or comments in Arabic! For this verse, Ch. Luxenberg proposes the following translation according to the Syro-Aramaic understanding (but it could be also understood in this way without having recourse to Syriac): “These are the (*scriptural*) signs (i.e. the *letters* = the *written copy, script*) of the *elucidated*

³⁶ Gilliot and Larcher, “Language and style,” 115–21, *et passim*. V. the following seminal studies of Larcher, P. “Neuf traditions sur la langue coranique rapportées par al-Farrāʾ et alii.” In Michalak-Pikulska, B., and A. Pikulski, eds. *Authority, Privacy and Public Order in Islam 2004*, 469–84. OLA. Leuven, 2004; Idem. “D’Ibn Fāris à al-Farrāʾ. ou un retour aux sources sur la *luḡa al-fuṣḡā*.” *Asiatische Studien. Etudes Asiatiques* LIX/3 (2005): 797–804; Idem. “Un texte d’al-Fārābī sur la ‘langue arabe’ ré-écrit?” In Edzard, Lutz, and Janet Watson, eds. *Grammar as a Window onto Arabic Humanism. A Collection of Articles in Honour of Michael G. Carter*, 108–129. Wiesbaden, 2006; Idem. “Qu’est-ce que l’arabe du Coran? Réflexions d’un linguiste.” In Ayoub, Georgine, et Jérôme Lentin, eds. *Cahiers de linguistique de l’INALCO* 5 (2003–2005) [années de tomaisson], *Linguistique arabe*, 2008, p. 27–47.

³⁷ Watt, *Bell’s Introduction*, 207; [Aldeeb] *Le Coran*, texte arabe et traduction française par ordre chronologique selon l’Azhar avec renvoi aux variantes, aux abrogations et aux écrits juifs et chrétiens, par Sami Awad Aldeeb Abu-Sahlich (1949–), Vevey (Suisse), 2008, p. 15.

Scripture. We have sent them down as an Arabic *lectionary* (= koran) (or as an Arabic *reading*) *so that you may understand* (it).”³⁸

The idea that the Koran “translates”, or rather transposes (French: *transposer*; German: *übertragen*) into Arabic or comments passages from a foreign lectionary seems to be more clearly expressed in other passages.

2. What do *fuṣṣilat* and *mufaṣṣal* “really” mean?

a. Q 41: 44 and *fuṣṣilat*

In a certain way, the Meccan Arabic lectionary makes a distinction between a “lectionary in a foreign language” (*qurʾānan ʿajamiyyan*), and the commentary, explanation, translation or transposition (German: *Übertragung*), i.e. *al-mufaṣṣal*, which is delivered by Mohammed. The Koran itself seems to suggest that some of its passages are commentaries of a lectionary recited or read in a foreign language (Syriac or Aramaic? We shall examine this below): “If we had made it a barbarous lectionary (*qurʾānan ʿajamiyyan*), they would have say: ‘Why are its signs not distinguished (*law lā fuṣṣilat āyatuhu*)? What, barbarous and Arabic? (*ʿajamiyyun wa ʿarabiyyun*). Say: “To the believers it is a guidance, and a healing” (41, 44).³⁹

In the context, *fuṣṣilat* does not mean “to be distinguished or separated,” but “rendered clear,” that is to be explained, *buṣṣinat*, in the already seen interpretation of al-Suddī, and also in the choice of Ṭabarī himself,⁴⁰ who, of course do not mean, as we do, that Mohammed was explaining parts of previous non-Arabic Scriptures. In some languages till now to “interpret” means both to explain and to translate (Fr *interpréter, interprète*; German *übertragen*: to translate, to transpose, which is a form of explanation or free translation: Arabic *tarjama*: to translate, but *tarjumān/tarjumān* has the meaning of translator, but also of exegete. Ibn ʿAbbās is said to have been called by his cousin Mohammed *tarjumān/tarjumān al-Qurʾān*. *Tarjama* comme from the Syro-Aramaic *targem*: to interpret,

³⁸ Luxenberg, *Syro-Aramaic reading*, 105–6 / *Syro-aramäische Lesart*, 2000, 80–1 / 2004, 112; confirmed by Van Rcech, “Scribes,” 77.

³⁹ Van Rcech, “Le Coran et les scribes,” 77.

⁴⁰ Ṭabarī, *Tafsir*, XXIV, 90, ad Q 41: 1–2.

to explain). In the synagogues, the rabbis used to read *targum*-s in Aramaic after the reading Hebrew Torah, which uneducated people could not understand.⁴¹ So *faṣṣala* has the meaning of the Syro-Aramaic *prāsh/parresh*, to interpret, to explain, and it is a synonym of *bayyana*.⁴²

Fuṣṣilat is understood by the exegetes in contradistinction with *uhkimat*, in Q 11 (*Hūd*): 1: “A book whose verses are set clear, and then distinguished from One All-wise, All-aware (*kitābun uhkimat āyātuhu, thumma fuṣṣilat min ladun ḥakīmīn khabīr*)” (trans. Aberry), which J. Horovitz comments: “seine Verse sind fest zusammengefügt und dabei jeder einzelne wohl durchgearbeitet.”⁴³

b. ‘Ā’isha on al-mufaṣṣal and “the Prophet of the world’s end”

But this understanding of *uhkimat/muhkam* versus *fuṣṣilat/mufaṣṣal*, corresponding to the interpretation of the exegetes does not seem to fit with the context of the Meccan predication. According to a tradition transmitted by Yūsuf b. Māhak al-Fārisī al-Makkī (d. 103/721, 110, perhaps even 114)⁴⁴ from ‘Ā’isha (quoted by Tor Andrae,⁴⁵ then by Günther Lüling):⁴⁶ “The first [revelation] of it which

⁴¹ Van Reeth, “Scribes,” 76.

⁴² Luxenberg, *Syro-aramäische Lesart*, 85 / 2004, 117 / *Syro-Aramaic reading*, 110. See the excellent study of Stetkevych, Jaroslav. “Arabic hermeneutical terminology. Paradox and the production of meaning.” *JNES* 48 (1989): 81–96, on *fassara, faṣṣala, bayān, mubīn, tabayin*, etc. (88–91).

⁴³ Horovitz, Josef. *Koranische Untersuchungen*, Berlin and Leipzig, 92+6, p. 75, n. 2.

⁴⁴ Mizzī *Tabdhīb al-kamāl fī asmā’ al-rijāl*, eds. ‘Abīd, A. ‘A., and ‘Āghā, H. A., revised by S. Zakkār. 23 vols., vol. XX, pp. 501–3, no. 7744. Beirut, 1414/1994.

⁴⁵ Andrae, Tor. “Die Legenden von der Berufung Mohammeds.” *Le Monde Oriental* 6 (1912): 18 (5–18).

⁴⁶ Lüling, Günter. *Über den Ur-Qur’an. Ansätze zur Rekonstruktion vorislamischer christlicher Strophenlieder im Qur’an*, p. 62 and n. 56 (p. 427). Erlangen 1974 [c.r. Rodinson, Maxime, in *Der Islam* 54 (1977): 321–25] / (*Über den Urkoran...*, 21993) / English translation and revised ed.: *A Challenge to Islam for reformation. The rediscovery and reliable reconstruction of a comprehensive pre-Islamic Christian hymnal hidden in the Koran under earliest Islamic reinterpretation*.

descended was a sura of *al-mufaṣṣal* in which Paradise and Hell were mentioned (*innamā naẓala awwalu mā naẓala minhu suratun min al-mufaṣṣali fihā dhikru al-jannati wa al-nār*)⁴⁷ This tradition poses a problem to the commentators for whom the first revealed sura is sura 96 (*Alaq/Iqra’*), in which there is no mention of Paradise and Hell. It is the reason why Ibn Hajar proposes to understand *awwalu mā naẓala*: “Among the first...” and expresses the hypothesis that it could be Q 74 (*Muddathir*), in which Paradise and Hell are mentioned at the end, adding that this part of the sura was revealed “before the rest of sura *Iqra’* (Q 96, that is after verses 1–5 or more)”⁴⁸

Already in 1912 Tor Andrae had called attention upon the fact that the suras 96 and 74, with their scenes of prophetic call were not the first suras, but that the first revelations according to an old well-established tradition were commentaries of previous Scriptures or traditions.⁴⁹

The great divergences of the exegetes on what *al-mufaṣṣal* could refer to are well known.⁵⁰ But the tradition of ‘Ā’isha gives a hint to an interpretation of *al-mufaṣṣal* and *fuṣṣilat* which the exegetes could absolutely not have. It reminds first of all to the fact that the first predication of Mohammed dealt with the judgement and here-

tions, 69 and n. 69. Delhi, 2003; Gilliot, “Les traditions sur la composition/coordination du Coran,” 20–1.

⁴⁷ Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, 46, *Faḍā’il al-Qur’ān*, 6, ed. Krehl, III, p. 395 / Ibn Hajar, *Fath al-bārī bi-sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, 13 vols. + *Muqaddima*, ed. ‘A. ‘A. Bāz, numeration of the chapters and *ḥadīth*-s by M. Fu’ād ‘Abd al-Bāqī, under the direction of Muḥibb al-Dīn Khaṭīb. Cairo, 1390/1970 (reprint Beirut, n.d.), vol. IX, 38–9, n° 4993 / Trad. Houdas (cl-Bokhārī, *Les Traditions islamiques*. 4 vols., translation O. Houdas and W. Marçais. Paris, 1903–14), vol. III, 526.

⁴⁸ Ibn Hajar, *Fath*, IX, 40, l. 18–21.

⁴⁹ Andrae, “Die Legenden von der Berufung Mohammeds,” Lüling, *Wiederentdeckung*, 98.

⁵⁰ See our excursus, in Gilliot, “Collecte ou mémorisation,” 104–6, with bibliography.

after world.⁵¹ Paul Casanova (1861–1926) has shown that Mohammed considered himself at the beginning of his message (and probably also latter) as *nabī al-malḥama*⁵² (*rasūl al-malḥama*⁵³ or *nabī al-malāḥim*),⁵⁴ that is “the prophet of the world’s end.”⁵⁵ To these qualifications could be added the Gatherer (*al-ḥāshir*) with the explanation of Jubayr b. Muṭ‘im al-Nawfalī (d. 58/677)⁵⁶ given to ‘Abd al-Malik b. Marwān: Mohammed has been called *al-ḥāshir* “Because he was sent with the Hour, a warner to you (*nadbīrun lakum*) in front of a great torment (*bayna yaday ‘adhābin shadīd*).”⁵⁷ This thesis corresponds to the tradition attributed to ‘Ā’isha.

Passages of the “first Koran” seem to be commentaries of a previous Lectionary (in Syriac?). Mohammed (or/and others?) acts

⁵¹ Bell, Richard. *The Origin of Islam in its Christian environment*, 69–70. Edinburgh University, 1925; London, 1926, on the contrary, writes: “Too exclusive attention has of late been paid to his proclamation of the approaching judgement” (p. 69). He insists more “the idea of gratitude to God,” the power and bounty the Creator, in the first predications; p. 74 sqq.

⁵² Ibn Sa‘d, *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā*. 9 vols., vol. I, 105, l. 2–3. Beirut, 1957–1959, according to Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī; cf. Maqrīzī, *Imtā’, al-asmā’ bi-mā li-rasūl Allāh min al-abnā’ wa l-annwāl wa l-ḥafada wa l-matā’*, ed. M. ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Namīsi. 15 vols. Beirut, 1420/1999. Vol. II, p. 143 (from Jubayr b. Muṭ‘im), p. 143–44 (from Abū Mūsā). P. 144, al-Ḥākim al-Nīsāburī and others understand this name as a that of a prophet sent to kill the unbelievers; or the one sent with the sword; Ibn al-Athīr (Majd al-Dīn), *al-Nihāya fī gharīb al-ḥadīth*, ed. T. A. al-Zāwī and M. al-Ṭīnāhī. 5 vols., vol. IV, 240. Le Caire, 1963–66.

⁵³ Ibn Sa‘d, *Ṭabaqāt*, I, 105, l. 6, according to Mujāhid b. Jabr.

⁵⁴ Maqrīzī, *Imtā’*, I, 5, l. 4; II, 146, l. 5.

⁵⁵ *Mohammed et la fin du monde. Étude critique sur l’islam primitif I–II/1–2*, 46–53. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1911, 1913, 1924; cf. Van Reeth, “Le Coran et les scribes,” 71.

⁵⁶ Mizzī, *Tabdhīb*, III, 332–34, no. 888.

⁵⁷ Maqrīzī, *Imtā’*, II, 144, l. 1–8. It should be added that *al-ḥāshir* is also a collector of spoils. In a latter sense *al-ḥushshār* signify collectors of the tithes and poll-taxes (*ummāl al-‘usūr wa al-jizyā*); Zabīdī, *Tāj al-‘arūs*, ed. ‘Abd al-Sattār A. Farāj et al. 40 vols., vol. XI, 23b. Kuwait, 1385–1422/1965–2001; Lane, Edward William. *An Arabic-English lexicon*, 2 vols., vol. I, 575a. Cambridge, 1984 (London, 1877–93).

in the way of the Syriac *māpashqānā* (commentator, interpreter, translator); the equivalent of *mufaṣṣal* is the Syriac *mashlōmānūtā*.⁵⁸ *Faṣṣala* in this context, the *kitāb mubīn* (Q 5: 15; 41: 1) or the *qur’ān mubīn* (Q 15: 1) by which the Arabic lectionary is qualified is a book which *translates* and *explains*.⁵⁹

c. al-mufaṣṣal called “the Arabic”!

Again Islamic tradition seems to support this hypothesis (i.e. according which passages of the “first Koran” seem to be commentaries of a previous Lectionary), besides the narrative attributed to ‘Ā’isha quoted above. In a loose (*mursal*) tradition found only, till now, in the Koranic Commentary of Ṭabarī (d. 310/923) there is an important remark of one of the transmitters about *al-mufaṣṣal*.⁶⁰ Ya‘qūb b. Ibrāhīm⁶¹/Ibn ‘Ulayya⁶²/(*an*) Khālīd al-Ḥadhhdhā’ (d. 141/758)⁶³/(*an*) Abū Qilāba (d. 107/725 or 106):⁶⁴ The Apostle of God said: “I have been given the seven long (suras) in the place of the Torah, the duplicated in the place of the Psalms, the hundreds in the place of the Gospel, and I have been given preference with the discret⁶⁵ (suras or book).” Khālīd al-Ḥadhhdhā’ has made a short, but to us important, remark on *al-mufaṣṣal*: “They used to call

⁵⁸ Van Reeth, “Scribes,” 80.

⁵⁹ Van Reeth, “Le Coran et les scribes,” 80; cf. Lüling, *Challenge*, 13, 69, 111, already understood *mufaṣṣal* as a commentary or a gloss.

⁶⁰ Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, 16 vols. (unachieved), ed. Shākir, vol. I, 100, no. 127. Cairo, 1954–68 (1969², for some vols.).

⁶¹ Abū Yūsuf Ya‘qūb b. Ibrāhīm b. Kathīr al-‘Abdī al-Qaysī al-Dawraqī al-Baghdādī, d. 252/866; Gilliot, [Eh] *Exégèse, langue et théologie en islam. L’exégèse coranique de Tabari*, 28. Paris, 1990.

⁶² Abū Bishr Ismā‘īl b. Ibrāhīm b. Mīqṣam al-Asadī al-Baṣrī al-Kūfī, d. 193/809; Gilliot, *Eh*, *ibid*.

⁶³ Abū al-Munāzil (and not Abū al-Manāzil) Khālīd b. Mihrān al-Baṣrī al-Ḥadhhdhā’; Dhahabī, *Sīyar a‘lām al-nubalā’*, ed. Shu‘ayb al-‘Arna‘ūt, et al. 25 vols. Beirut, 1981–8. VI, 190–2; Id., *Mizān al-ittidāl fī naqd al-rijāl*, ed. ‘A. M. al-Bijawī. 4 vols., vol. I, 642–43, no. 2466. Cairo, 1963.

⁶⁴ Abū Qilāba ‘Abd Allāh b. Zayd al-Jarmī; Dhahabī, *Sīyar*, IV, 468–75.

⁶⁵ “Discret,” here in the mathematic, medical, and linguistic meaning: composed of separated elements.

al-mufaṣṣal: the Arabic. One of them has said: there is no prostration in the Arabic (*ka'nu yusammūna al-mufaṣṣala: al-'arabiyya. Qālā ba' dūbum: laysa fī al-'arabiyyi sajda*)." This tradition and the short commentary of Khālid al-Hadhdhā' on *al-mufaṣṣal* require some explanations:

(1) The seven long (suras), the duplicated, the hundreds, *al-mufaṣṣal* in the traditional Islamic understanding.⁶⁶

The seven long (suras) (*al-sab' al-tūwal*, or *al-tiwāl* in other traditions) are suras: 2 (*Baqara*), 3 (*Āl 'Imrān*), 4 (*Nisā*), 5 (*Ma'ida*), 6 (*An'ām*), 7 (*A'rāf*), 10 (*Yūnus*).⁶⁷ But in other versions, 10 is replaced by 9 (*Barā'a/Tawba*), because 'Uthmān has considered 8 (*Anfāl*) and 9 (*Barā'a*), being not separated by the basmala (they are called *al-qarīnatān*), a single sura.⁶⁸

The hundreds (*al-mi'ūn*) are the suras whose verses numbers are one hundred, more or less.⁶⁹ Or they are the suras which follow the seven long suras, and whose verses numbers are one hundred, more or less.⁷⁰

The "duplicated" (or "repeated," *al-mathānī*)⁷¹ sūras (or verses) are the ones which duplicate the hundreds and follow them: the hundreds have the first (formulations), and the duplicated have repetitions (of the previous). It has been said that they have been called so because they repeat the parables, statements and warnings

⁶⁶ For more references to sources, above all on *al-mufaṣṣal*, see the excursus of Gilliot, "Collecte ou mémorisation," 104–6.

⁶⁷ Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, ed. Shākir, I, 101–2, according to Sa'ib b. Jubayr; cf. Sakhāwī (Alam al-Dīn), *Jamāl al-qurrā' wa kamāl al-iqrā'*, ed. 'A. H. al-Bawwāb. 2 vols., vol. I, 34. Mecca, 1408/1987; cf. Suyūṭī, *Itqān*, cap. 18, I, 220.

⁶⁸ Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, ed. Shākir, I, 102, no. 131, according to Ibn 'Abbās. The qualification *al-qarīnatān* is taken up from Sakhāwī, *Jamāl al-qurrā'*, I, ibid.

⁶⁹ Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, ed. Shākir, I, 103; Sakhāwī, *Jamāl al-qurrā'*, I, 35.

⁷⁰ Suyūṭī, *Itqān*, I, 220.

⁷¹ On the meaning of *mathānī* is Q 15 (*Hijj*): 87, and applied to the first sura, v. *GdQ*, I, 114–6.

(*al-amthāl wa al-khabar wa al-'ibar*), etc.⁷² These whimsical explanations show only one thing: the exegetes did not know what the Koranic word *al-mathānī* means (probably a term borrowed from the Aramaic or Jewish-Aramaic language, as proposed by Nöldeke).⁷³ But we cannot enter here in details, our main interest being *al-mufaṣṣal*.

As for *al-mufaṣṣal*, considered as a part of the Koran, all the Muslim scholars agree that it finishes at the end of the Koran, but they disagree on its beginning, which can be: 1. *al-Ṣaffāt* (37); 2. *al-Jāthiyā* (45); 3. *al-Qitāl* (i.e. *Muhammad*, 47); 4. *al-Fath* (48); 5. *al-Hujurat* (49); 6. *Qāf* (50); 7. *al-Ṣaff* (61); 8. *Tabāraka* (i.e. *al-Mulk*, 67); 9. *Sabbih* (87);⁷⁴ 10. *al-Duhā* (93).⁷⁵ Ibn a. al-Ṣayf al-Yamanī⁷⁶ comes out in favour of 1, 7 and 8; al-Dizmārī,⁷⁷ in his commentary of (Abū Ishāq al-Shīrāzī's) *al-Tanbih*, for 1 and 8; al-Marwazī,⁷⁸ in his commentary, for no. 9; al-Khaṭṭābī (d. 388/998) and al-Māwardī

⁷² Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, ed. Shākir, I, 103; I'rūzābādī (Abū al-Ṭāhir Muḥyī al-Dīn M. b. Ya'qūb), *Baṣā'ir dhanī al-tamyīz fī laṭā'if al-Kitāb al-'arabiyyi*, ed. M. 'A. al-Najjār and 'Abd al-'Alīm al-Ṭahāwī. 6 vols., vol. II, 345–6. Cairo, 1963–73, gives a list of the suras allegedly pertaining to *al-mathānī*.

⁷³ V. also Jeffery, Arthur. *Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'an*, 257–58. Baroda, 1938.

⁷⁴ Which has the favour of Ibn al-Firkāh, according to Sakhāwī, *Jamāl al-qurrā'*, I, 195, l. 1. He is probably Burhān al-Dīn Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm b. 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Ibr. al-Fazārī al-Miṣrī al-Dimashqī, d. 7th Jumāda I 628/13th March 1231; Kaḥḥāla, *Mu'jam*, I, 43–4.

⁷⁵ Ibn Hajar, *Fath*, II, 249, l. 24–5 (on Bukhārī, 10, *Adhān*, 99, *ḥadīth* no. 765, p. 247 of Ibn Hajar, *Fath*; Bukhārī, ed. Krehl, I, 197, l. 6–8); cf. Suyūṭī, *Itqān*, I, 121.

⁷⁶ Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl al-Zabīdī al-Makkī, d. 609/1212; Kaḥḥāla, 'Umar Ridā. *Mu'jam al-mū'allifīn*, 15 vols., vol. IX, 57. Damascus, 1957–61.

⁷⁷ Kamāl al-Dīn Abū al-'Abbās Aḥmad b. Kashāsib b. 'Alī al-Dizmārī al-Shāfi'ī al-Ṣūfi, d. 17 rabī II 643 / 11th September 1245; Subkī, Tāj al-Dīn. *Tabaqāt al-shāfi'iyya al-kubrā*, ed. M. M. al-Ṭināhī and 'Abd al-Farrāh al-Hulw. 10 vols. Cairo, 1964–76. VIII, 30, n° 1054; Kaḥḥāla, *Mu'jam*, II, 53a.

⁷⁸ Perhaps Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm b. Aḥmad (d. 340/901), in his commentary al-Muzanī's *Mukhtasar*; Kaḥḥāla, *Mu'jam*, I, 3–4.

(d. 450/1058) for no. 10. Nawawī (d. 676/1277) gives only no. 3, 5 and 6. For Ibn Hajar, no. 5 (49, *Hujurat*) is the preferable (*al-rājiḥ*).⁷⁹ Some, like Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Ṭabarī (d. 694/1295), consider that *al-mufaṣṣal* is the whole Koran, an opinion which is anomalous (*shādhli*) to Ibn Hajar.

The explanations given on the meaning of *al-mufaṣṣal* are as fanciful as those on the sense of *al-mathbāni*: “It is so called because of the great numbers of sections (*fuṣūḥ*) into which its suras are divided by the *basmala* (*li-kathrati al-fuṣūḥi allatī bayna suwaribā bi-‘bi-smi Llāli l-Raḥmāni al-raḥīm*),”⁸⁰ or by the *takbīr*;⁸¹ or “Because of the shortness of its suras;”⁸² or “Because of the small numbers of verses contained in its suras (*li-qisari ‘ā dadi suwaribi min al-ayy*);”⁸³ or it has been so called: “Because of the small number of abrogated (verses) it contains, and it is the reason why it is (also) called “the one firmly established“ (*al-muḥkam*).”⁸⁴ To understand this equivalence between *mufaṣṣal* and *muḥkam* in relation with the abrogation, it should be reminded that *mufaṣṣal* can mean “to be made to measure,” so without abrogation or rather with few abrogations.

(2) The remark of Khālīd al-Ḥadhadhā: “They used to call *al-mufaṣṣal*: the Arabic. One of them has said: there is no prostration in the Arabic (*kānū yusammūna al-mufaṣṣala: al-‘arabiyya* (with no *fā marbū‘a*) *Qālā ba‘ ḍubum: laysa fī al-‘arabiyyi sajdā*.”

First of all, the Arabs, at the beginning of Islam, were already well acquainted with the prostration (*sujūd*). They knew this practice which was diffused in the regions surrounding Arabia, and among

⁷⁹ Ibn Hajar, *Fath*, II, 249 (on Bukhārī, 10, *Aḍbān*, 99, *ḥadīth* no. 765); cf. Zabīdī, *Tāj*, XXX, 167–68, for the whole, taken up from Ibn Hajar and Suyūṭī, with some additions.

⁸⁰ Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, ed. Shākīr, I, 101; cf. Suyūṭī, *Itqān*, I, 121.

⁸¹ Sakhāwī, *Jamāl al-qurrā*, I, 35.

⁸² Nawawī, *Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, 18 vols. in 9., vol. VI, 106–7. Cairo, 1349/1929, reprint Beirut, n.d.

⁸³ Zabīdī, *Tāj*, XXX, 168.

⁸⁴ Suyūṭī, *Itqān*, *ibid.*; Utrūzābādī, *Baṣā‘ir*, IV, 195, l. 1–2.

Christians and Jews.⁸⁵ When Islam came, of all the Muslim rites, it was the ritual prayer that met with the greatest opposition,⁸⁶ and the reason for this reluctance was the opposition to prostration itself, considered an alien practice and humiliating for their honour.⁸⁷

The number of ritual prostrations in the Koran ranges between four and fifteen in ḥadīth literature; these figures exclude all the prostrations from the *mufaṣṣal*. But there are also traditions prescribing prostration for verses from the *mufaṣṣal* (twelve or fourteen, or even sixteen prostrations).⁸⁸ An attempt to harmonize the different statements on prostration in the *mufaṣṣal* is found, among others, in the following tradition: [...] Abū Qilāba/‘an Maṭar al-Warrāq⁸⁹/‘Ikrima/Ibn ‘Abbās: “The Prophet never prostrated himself at the recitation of the *mufaṣṣal* since he moved to Medina (*lam yasjud fī shay‘in min al-mufaṣṣali mundhu taḥawwala ilā al-Madīna*).”⁹⁰ Those who consider this tradition reliable think that it abrogates

⁸⁵ Tottoli, Roberto. “Muslim attitudes towards prostration (*sujūd*). I. Arabs and prostration at the beginning of Islam and in the Qur’ān.” *Stud. Isl.* 88 (1998): 5–17 (5–34)

⁸⁶ Goldziher, Ignaz. *Muhammedanische Studien*, 2 vols. Halle, 1889–90. I, 33: “[...] unter allen Ceremonien und Riten des Dīn hat aber keine mehr Widerstand erfahren, vor keiner religiösen Uebung haben sie entschieden Widerwillen bekundet, als vor dem Ritus des Gebetes,” and p. 33–9.

⁸⁷ Tottoli, “Muslim attitudes towards prostration,” 17; Kister, Meir J. “Some reports concerning al-Ṭā‘if,” *JSAI* 1 (1979): 3–6 (1–18).

⁸⁸ Tottoli, Roberto. “Traditions and controversies concerning the *sujūd al-Qur’ān* in ḥadīth literature.” *ZDMG* 147 (1997): 376–78 (371–93).

⁸⁹ Maṭar b. Ṭahmān al-Warrāq Abū Rajā’ al-Khurāsānī al-Baṣrī, d. 129/ inc. 29 September 746; Mizzī, *Tabḍīb*, XVIII, 136–37, no. 6586; Ibn ‘Adī, *al-Kāmil li-l-ḍu‘afā*, ed. ‘Ā. A. ‘Abd al-Mawjūd and ‘A. M. Mu‘awwad. 9 vols., vol. VIII, 134, no. 1882. Beirut, 1418/1997.

⁹⁰ Ibn Shāhīn, a. Ḥafṣ ‘Umar b. Aḥmad (d. 385/995). *al-Nāsikh wa al-mansūkh fī al-ḥadīth*, ed. M. Ibr. al-Ḥifnāwī, 240, no. 238. Mansoura, 1416/1995; Ibn Khuzayma, Abū Bakr Muḥammad. *al-Ṣaḥīḥ*, ed. M. Muṣṭ. al-‘Azamī, 4 vols., vol. I, 280–81, no. 559–60. Beirut, 1390–9/1970–79; Nawawī, *Sharḥ*, V, 76–7; ad Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, 8 (*Masajīd*), 20 (*Sujūd al-filawā*), I, 405–7).

traditions in which Mohammed appears as prostrating himself at the recitation of a sura or of verses from the *mufaṣṣal*, like this one, according to Ibn Maṣ'ūd: "The first sura in which prostration (*sajda*) was sent down is *wa al-najm* (*Najm*, 53): the Prophet recited it in Mecca and he prostrated himself (*fa-sajada*)."⁹¹

We can say that the "One of them has said: there is no prostration in the Arabic" quoted by the Baṣrian Khālid al-Ḥadhdhā' followed the "Baṣrian" tradition of Ibn 'Abbās.

(3) We can return at last to the core of our subject, after these long but necessary explanations, with the commentary of Khālid al-Ḥadhdhā': "They used to call *al-mufaṣṣal*: the Arabic. One of them has said: there is no prostration in the Arabic (*kānū yusammūna al-mufaṣṣala: al-'arabiyya* (with no *tā marbūṭa*) *Qālā ba'dubum: laysa fi al-'arabiyyi sajda*)." In the Prophetic tradition transmitted by Abū Qilāba, the three previous Scriptures which figure in the Koran (*al-Tawrāt, al-Zabūr, al-Injīl*) are mentioned, but the great specificity of Muhammed, by which he has been favoured, is *al-mufaṣṣal*. This *mufaṣṣal* is qualified by Khālid al-Ḥadhdhā' of "the Arabic," so that it becomes a kind of "name," in the following declaration "there is no prostration in the Arabic"!

None of these three Scriptures were "Arabic." The Torah and the Psalms were in Hebrew, but explained/translated (*mufaṣṣar/mufaṣṣal*) in Amaraic in targums; the Gospel (in singular) was in Syriac (the *Diatessaron*) but Mohammed and those who have helped him translated/explained logia from these Scriptures, in Mecca, in his language (Arabic)

According to the Koran itself, it is not only comparable, but essentially similar to the previous Scriptures, confirming them: "This Koran could not have been forged apart from God; but it is a confirmation of (*taṣḍīqa alladhī*) what is before it, and a distinguishing of the Book (*tafṣīla al-kitābi*), wherein is no doubt, from the Lord of all Being" (Q 10: 37, trans. Arberry). *Tafṣīla al-kitābi* should be put in relation with *mufaṣṣal* (same root and same grammatical pattern, second form, as *tafṣīl*) and be translated by explana-

⁹¹ Ibn Shāhīn, *Nasikh*, 239, no. 236, or no. 237, according to Abū Hurayra.

tion (in Arabic) of a Book which is not in Arabic. It corresponds to *al-mufaṣṣal: al-'arabi* or *al-'arabi*, in the declaration of Khālid al-Ḥadhdhā'.

3. Collections and interpretation in Arabic

That the Koran himself refers to collections of texts or traditions being the basis of the early predications is not a new idea: "The frequent phrase 'this Qur'ān' must often mean not a single passage but a collection of passages, and thus seems to imply the existence of other Qur'āns. Similarly the phrase 'an Arabic Qur'ān' seems to imply that there may be Qur'āns in other languages. (The phrases occur in proximity in 39.27/8f.).⁹² When it is further remembered that the verb *qara'a* is probably not an original Arabic root, and that the noun *qur'ān* almost certainly came into Arabic to represent the Syriac *qeryānā*, meaning the scriptural reading or lesson in church, the way is opened to the solution of the problem. The purpose of an Arabic Qur'ān was to give the Arabs a body of lessons comparable to those of the Christians and Jews. It is known, too, not only from Tradition and continuing practice, but also from the Qur'ān itself that it was thus used liturgically [17.78/80; 73.20]^{93, 94}

That the Koran is a liturgical book is commonly accepted; this feature has been stressed especially for the Meccan suras in several

⁹² Q 39 (*Zumar*): 27–8: "Indeed we have struck for the people in this Koran (*fi bādhā al-qur'āni*) every manner of similitude (*min kulli mathalin*); haply they will remember; an Arabic Koran, wherein there is no crookedness (*qur'ānan 'arabiyyan ghayra dībī 'iwajin*); haply they will be goodfearing."

⁹³ Q 73 (*Muzammil*): 20: "Thy Lord knows that thou keepest vigil nearly two-thirds of the night (*annaka taqūmu adnā thuluthayī al-layl*), or a half of it, or a third of it, and a party of those with thee."

⁹⁴ Watt, William Montgomery. *Bell's Introduction to the Qur'ān*, completely revised and enlarged, 136–37. Edinburgh, 1970; cf. Bowman, John (1916–2006). "Holy Scriptures, lectionaries and the Qur'ān." In Johns, Anthony Hearle, ed. *International Congress for the study of the Qur'ān, Canberra, Australian National University, 8–13 May 1980*, 32–4 (29–37). Canberra: ANU, 1983.

studies of Angelika Neuwirth.⁹⁵ But besides that several scholars have called the attention upon a special form of its dependance from previous traditions and practices: “[...] this suggests that liturgy, specially liturgical poetry,⁹⁶ the Christian liturgy, which includes the Jewish has decisively stimulated and influenced Mohammed.”⁹⁷

That idea of compiling a lectionary from extracts of the previous Scriptures seems to appear in the following passage Q 75 (*Qiyāma*): 16–19: “Move not thy tongue with it to haste it; ours is to gather it, and to recite it. So, when we recite it, follow its recitation. Then ours is to explain it (*Inna ‘alaynā jam’abu wa qur’ānahu, fa-idā qarā nāhu fa-tbā’ qur’ānahu, tumma inna ‘alaynā bayānahu*).”

Bayānahu, like *mubīn*, *fusūlat*, *mufaṣṣal*, *buyyināt*, etc., may refer to the process of interpretation-translation-explanation of Mohammed and of those who helped him in his task of commentator. The logia or extracts from a liturgical lectionary, of from several lectionaries, are interpreted in Arabic.

This seems suggested also in Q 19: 97: “Now we have made it easy in thy tongue that thou mayest bear good tidings thereby to

⁹⁵ V. several articles or contributions of Angelika Neuwirth, e.g. recently: “Psalmen—im Koran neu gelesen (Ps 104 und 136).” In Hartwig, Dirk, et al., ed. *Im vollen Licht der Geschichte. Die Wissenschaft des Judentums und die Anfänge der Koranforschung*, 160–2 “liturgische Beleuchtung” (157–189). Würzburg, 2008. She considers that the word *sūra* (probably borrowed from Syriac *shūrāyā*, “beginning,” in the introduction to a psalm’s recitation) “a liturgical concept” (Der liturgische Begriff *sūra*), p. 160; Id., “Vom Rezitationstext über die Liturgie zum Kanon. Zu Entstehung und Wiederauflösung der Surenkomposition im Verlauf der Entwicklung eines islamischen Kultus.” In Wild, Stefan, ed. *The Qur’ān as Text*, Leiden. Brill, 1996, summary, p. 100–3 (69–105) / French trans. “Du texte de récitation au canon en passant par la liturgie. A propos de la genèse de la composition des sourates et de sa redissolution au cours du développement du culte islamique.” *Arabica* XLVII, 2 (2000): 224–7 (194–229).

⁹⁶ V. Lüling, *Ur-Qur’ān/Challenge*.

⁹⁷ Gräf, Erwin. “Zu den christlichen Einflüssen im Koran.” *ZDMG* 111 (1962): 396–9, reprint in Paret, Rudi, ed. *Der Koran*, 188 (188–91). Darmstadt, 1975.

the godfearing, and warn a people stubborn.” In Syro-Aramaic *pashsheq* means: to facilitate, to make easy, but also to explain, to annotate, and also to transfer, to translate⁹⁸. But it can be also understood without recourse of Syriac. Mohammed, the warner (*nabīr*) (of the last judgement) is the “interpreter” or selections of a foreign lectionary in his tongue/language, Arabic, to a people who understands only (or for some of them: almost only) Arabic.

In the context the ambiguous verb *jama’a* (to collect, to bring together, to know by heart, etc.) is put in relation with the lectionary (Syriac *qaryānā*) “which designates a church book with excerpts (readings) from the Scriptures for liturgical use.”⁹⁹ It corresponds to the Syro-Aramaic *kannesh* (to collect). “It has to do with the collecting of these excerpts from the Scriptures, and indeed specifically in the meaning of ‘*compilavit librum*’.”¹⁰⁰ It could be the basis of the above-mentioned verse (Q 16: 103);¹⁰¹ that it was a human who taught Mohammed. Already before Luxenberg, R. Bell had noticed upon Q 25: 4–5: “It is not certain whether the verse quoted above means that he had books¹⁰² transcribed for him, or whether there is any truth in the charge. He may have thus got copies of some Apocryphal books, but if so he was dependent on getting some one, who perhaps happened to be in Mecca, to read them and tell him what was in them.”¹⁰³

⁹⁸ Luxenberg, *Syro-Aramaic reading*, 123–24 / *Syro-aramäische Lesart*, 2000, p. 98–9 / 2004, p. 130–31.

⁹⁹ Luxenberg, *Syro-Aramaic reading*, 121 / *Syro-aramäische Lesart*, 2000, p. 97 / 2004, p. 129.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ V. Gilliot, Cl. “Les ‘informateurs’ juifs et chrétiens de Muḥammad. Reprise d’un problème traité par Aloys Sprenger et Theodor Nöldeke.” *JSAT* 22 (1998): 84–126; Id., “Informants”; Id., “Zur Herkunft der Gewährsmänner des Propheten.”

¹⁰² A. Sprenger’s point of view was that Mohammed had a book on *asātīr al-awwālīn* (fairy-tales of the ancients) which could mean also “books of the ancients,” from *saṭara*, to trace, to write. See our three articles on the informants mentioned above.

¹⁰³ Bell, *Origin*, 112.

II. READING OF SCRIPTURES IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCHES AND THEIR LECTIONARIES

The Christian Churches followed the Jewish custom of reading publicly the Scriptures, but they did it according to the lectionary principle.¹⁰⁴ So the whole of the Scripture, Old and New Testament, were never read to the congregation. Among the Syriac Churches what was usual was a lectionary (*kitaba d-qaryānā*) containing selections from the Law (*urāitha*), the Prophets and the Acts of the Apostles¹⁰⁵. Likewise the *Evangelion* consisting in selections from the four Gospels. “For the hearer this was the Gospel”¹⁰⁶ (*al-injil* in the Koran!). Another volume called the *Shliha* containedlections from the Pauline Epistles; then another volume with the *Davida* or the *Psalter*. A last volume called *Turguma* could contained metrical homilies (*mémrā*), read after the *qaryānā* and the *Shliha*.¹⁰⁷ For instance, the *mémrā* attributed to Jacob of Serug (d. 521) on the “Seven Sleepers” or “Youths (*tlāyê*) of Ephesus” in Syriac,¹⁰⁸ or his

¹⁰⁴ This principle exists till nowadays in both the Eastern and Western Churches (especially, but not only, in monasteries and convents), even if changings occurred through the time.

¹⁰⁵ Sometimes there were independant volumes for each of the Law, the Prophets, the Psalms; and the Gospels, Acts and Paul’s Epistle in still another volume. But very few Syriac churches possessed this.

¹⁰⁶ Bowman, “Holy Scriptures,” 31. Till now, we have in our personal library a book of our maternal aunt, Simone Lescieux, which she received at her “communion solennelle,” in the church of our village, Guemps, near to Calais in Northern France: *Le Saint Évangile*, Concordance et annotations par M. L’Abbé Vandenaebée, prêtre du diocèse de Lille, Limoges, Paul Meellitrée, Éditeur, 1928, 305 p., with illustrations. It follows the “chronological” life of Christ, through selections from the four Gospels! Our first personal knowledge of the gospels was through this book at the age of four years (one year before through the illustrations).

¹⁰⁷ Bowman, “Holy Scriptures,” 31–2.

¹⁰⁸ Jourdan, Fr. *La tradition des sept dormants*, 59–65. Paris, 1983, trans. of the short version; Griffith, S. H. “Christian lore and the Arabic Qur’an. The ‘Companions of the Cave’ in Surat al-kahf and the Syriac tradition.” In Reynolds, G. S., ed. *Qur’an in Its Historical Context*, 116–30 (109–37). London, 2007; Cf Q 18: 9–26.

discourse upon Alexander, the believing King, and upon the gate which he made against Gog and Magog,¹⁰⁹ were expected to be read in church, presumably as a *turgama*. J. Bowman has seen a very old manuscript of the Syriac New Testament belonging to the village of Khoyyi, on the coast of Lake Urmi. “The Gospels had in the margin sections marked off as *qeryane*, and subdivided into *Surata*.”¹¹⁰

Having said that, it is not easy to know which Gospel text Muhammad could have been familiar with. However, there are a few rare direct references in the Qur’an to the Gospels. Thus Q 48:29: “Such is their likeness in the Torah and their likeness in the Gospel—like as sown corn that sendeth forth its shoot and strengtheneth it and riseth firm upon its stalk, delighting the sowers—that He may enrage the disbelievers with (the sight of) them. God hath promised, unto such of them as believe and do good works, forgiveness and immense reward” This text combines two Gospel pericopes—Mark 4:26–7 and Matthew 12:23—the same amalgam that the *Diatessaron* makes, seen for example in the Middle-Dutch translation thereof, done in the thirteenth century from a lost Latin translation, and in the Arabic translation thereof.¹¹¹

Van Reeth applies the same treatment to the passages of the Qur’an which pertain to the infancy of Mary (Q 3:35–48), John (Q 19:3), and Jesus (Q 3:37; 19:22–6), showing again that “the Koran gives evidence (French: *témoigner de*) to the tradition of the *Diatessaron*.”¹¹² He does the same again with the Docetist version of

¹⁰⁹ *The History of Alexander the Great* (Pseudo-Callisthenes), trans. E. A. W. Budge, 1889, 182–4; Cf. Q 18: 83–98.

¹¹⁰ Bowman, “Holy Scriptures,” 31.

¹¹¹ De Bruin, C. C. *Diatessaron Leodiense*, 92, §93 sq. Leiden, 1970 (English trans., 93); Marmardji, A. S. *Diatessaron de Tatien, texte arabe...*, 159f. Beirut, 1935.

¹¹² Van Reeth, J. M. F. “L’Évangile du Prophète.” In De Smet *et al.*, *al-Kitāb*, 163 (155–74). On the possible influence of the *Diatessaron* and the Apocryphal Gospels on the Koran, v. Gnülka, J. *Die Nazarener und der Koran. Eine Spurensuche*, 96–104. Freiburg: Herder, 2007 / *Qui sont les chrétiens du Coran?*, trans. Ch. Ehlinger, 101–9. Paris, 2008; on the influence

the Crucifixion of Jesus (Q 4:157), but in this case he refers to Angel-Christology¹¹³ (cf. G. Lüling), notably that of the Elkesaites, declaring: "Rather than a likeness which God should have shaped and substituted to be crucified instead of him, it would have been originally the human form which God has made for Jesus at the time of the incarnation, and in which his transcendent and angelic person could go down."¹¹⁴ For this docetic view of Jesus and the denial of crucifixion, M. Gil refers to Basilides and his followers, and then to the Manichaeans, who are said to have believed that there was two Jesuses. The "false" is sometimes called "the devil," or the "son of the widow," used by God to replace him.¹¹⁵

Even if the *Diatessaron* does not explain all of the Qur'anic particularities on the life of Jesus (the Apocrypha also), van Reeth makes the following conclusion: "In referring to the *Diatessaron* as Mani had done it before him, the Prophet Muhammad could emphasize the unicity of the Gospel. Moreover he came within the scope of the posterity of Marcion, Tatian and Mani. All of them wanted to establish or re-establish the true Gospel, in order to size its original meaning. They thought themselves authorized to do this work of textual harmonization because they considered themselves the Paraclete that Jesus had announced."¹¹⁶ The followers of Mon-

of the *Diatessaron* on the Koran, see also Bowman, John. "The Debt of Islam to Monophysite Syrian Christianity," first published in *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 19 (1964–65): 177–201, then in MacLaurin, E. C. B., ed. *Essays in Honour of Griffiths Wheeler Thatcher (1863–1950)*, 191–216, passim. Sydney, 1967.

¹¹³ Lüling, *Challenge*, 21, speaks of the "ur-Christian angel-Christological doctrine... contained in the ground layer of the Koran"; Sfar, Mondher. *Le Coran, la Bible et l'Orient ancien*, 185–86, has shown that the prophet/Prophet has an "angelic status."

¹¹⁴ Van Reeth, "L'Évangile du Prophète," 166.

¹¹⁵ Gil, Moshe. "The creed of Abū 'Āmir." *IOS* 12 (1992): 41 (9–57), referring to Polotsky, H. J. "Manichäismus." In Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Suppl. VI, 269 (239–71)

¹¹⁶ Van Reeth, "L'Évangile du Prophète," 174; cf. Simon, Robert. "Mānī and Muḥammad." *JSAT* 21 (1997): 134 (118–41): "Both Manicheism and Islam assert the seriality of prophets"; Andrae, Tor Julius Efraim.

tanus (end IInd century) also believed to the coming of the Paraclete, inaugurated by the activity of Montan himself, and it's a short step from Montan to Tatian, whose *Diatessaron* was in vogue for the followers of Mani.¹¹⁷

The Gospel's pericopes in the Koran have their origin in the *Diatessaron* of the Syrian Tatian, the founder of the encratite movement in the IInd century.¹¹⁸ Tatian was born in Assyria of pagan parents. He travelled widely, and in Rome became a student of Justin Martyr, and a member of the Church. Tatian later broke away from the Roman church and returned to Mesopotamia, where he exerted considerable influence around Syria and Antioch.¹¹⁹ Muhammad probably belonged "to a sectarian community which was near to radical monophysitism and to manicheism, and which was waiting for the Parousia in an imminent future."¹²⁰

Les origines de l'islam et le christianisme, trad. J. Roche, 209. Paris, 1955 (German ed. 1926, and before in articles, 1923–5); Ahrens, Karl. *Muhammad als Religionsstifter*, 130–32. Leipzig, 1935. Mani's prophetic understanding of himself as an equal partner of the Paraclete, as promised by Jesus, even perhaps as the Paraclete himself (cf. Werner Sundermann, 1988, p. 102–3, with earlier bibliography), was also eschatological. Islamic authors ascribed to Mani the claim to be the Seal of the Prophets (Puech, Henri-Charles, *Le Manichéisme. Son fondateur, sa doctrine*, 146 n. 248. Paris, 1949; Tardieu, Michel. *Le Manichéisme*, 21. Paris, 1981). Ries, Julien. "Les Kephalaia. La catéchèse de l'Église de Mani." In De Smet et al., *al-Kitāb*, 143–48 (143–53).

¹¹⁷ Schepeleern, W. *Der Montanismus und die phrygischen Kulte. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, trans. from Danish by W. Baur, 28–30. Tübingen, 1929; Van Reeth, J. M. F. "La zandaqa et le prophète de l'Islam." In Cannuyer, Christian, and Jacques Grand'Henry, eds. *Incroyance et dissidences religieuses dans les civilisations orientales*, 73, 75, 79 (67–79). Bruxelles, 2007.

¹¹⁸ Van Reeth, "L'Évangile du Prophète," 162–66.

¹¹⁹ Head, P. M. "Tatian's christology and its influence on the composition of the *Diatessaron*." *Tyndale Bulletin* 43 (1992): 121–23 (121–37).

¹²⁰ Van Reeth, "Le Coran et les scribes," 73.

III. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this paper was not to enter into the details of the various influences which contributed to the constitution of the Koran,¹²¹ especially the Meccan Koran, nor to deal with the intertextuality,¹²² or with the “common traditions” in the Bible and the Koran.¹²³

Our own aim was to show that many passages of the Meccan self-referential Arabic lectionary (Koran) contain allusions to its “prehistory,” to “a Koran uphill” (i.e. a *qurʾān* before the Koran): its insistence on its Arabicity, on its explanatory character, its aspect of a book of pericopes (*Perikopenbuch*),¹²⁴ its liturgical feature which did not “descend from Heaven,” but testifies that Mohammed and his community around him, who helped him (Waraqā b. Nawfal and Khadija, Christian or Jewish-Christian slaves in Mecca, for instance) knew more on Jewish-Christianity, Manicheism, gnosticism, etc., than often accepted. They appear partly as interpreters of collections of logia, oral traditions, possibly taken up from liturgical lectionaries, directly or indirectly, and explained in Arabic during “liturgical assemblies.”

As seen the lectionary principle was a common practice in the Syriac churches. It is probable that Muhammad and his group have been influenced by such a practice.

THE SEARCH FOR ṬUWĀ: EXEGETICAL METHOD, PAST AND PRESENT¹

ANDREW RIPPIN

VICTORIA, CANADA
arippin@uvic.ca

AN EXEGETICAL PROBLEM

The word *ṭuwā* (or *ṭuwan* if understood to have *tanwīn* as it sometimes is, although it is never pronounced that way in recitation) is found only twice in the Qurʾān, in *sūrat Ṭāhā* (20), verse 12, and *sūrat al-nāẓiʿāt* (79), verse 16. Both instances occur in the context of Moses and the removal of his sandals in the holy valley. The first citation of the word *ṭuwā* (following the canonical ordering of the text) is in *sūra* 20.

20:9 Has the story of Moses come to you?

20:10 When he saw the fire, he said to his family, “Wait; indeed, I perceive a fire! Perhaps I will bring you a firebrand from it, or I may find guidance by the fire.”

20:11 And when he came to it, he was called to. “O Moses!

20:12 Indeed, I am your Lord! So take off thy sandals; indeed you are in the holy *wādī*, Ṭuwā.

¹²¹ V. *the status quaestionis* of Gilliot, “Rétrospectives et perspectives. De quelques sources possibles du Coran. I. (first part) “Les sources du Coran et les emprunts aux traditions religieuses antérieures dans la recherche (XIX^e et début du XX^e siècles).”

¹²² Reeves, John C., ed. *Bible and Qurʾān. Essays in Scriptural intertextuality*, Atlanta, 2003. See in this volume Reeves, “Some Explorations of the Intertwining of Bible and Qurʾān,” p. 43–60.

¹²³ V. the following very useful book: Thyen, Johan-Dietrich (d. 1994), *Bibel und Koran. Eine Synopse gemeinsamer Überlieferungen*, Cologne: Böhlau, 2005 (1993, 32000). See also: Gnülka, Joachim. *Bibel und Koran. Was sie verbindet, was sie trennt*, Freiburg, Herder, 2007 (2004); Tröger, Karl-Wolfgang. *Bibel und Koran. Was sie verbindet und unterscheidet. Mit einer Einführung in Mohammeds Wirken und in die Entstehung des Islam*. Überarbeitete Neuaufgabe. Stuttgart, 2008 (Berlin, 2004).

¹²⁴ Neuwirth, “Rezitationstext,” 102 / “Texte de récitation,” 227.

¹ Versions of this paper have been discussed at several gatherings (in Berlin, Copenhagen and Toronto) and I have benefitted greatly from that input.