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INTRODUCTION

The study of the interrelatedness of Islamic and Jewish intellectual endeavours relies fundamentally on the rich manuscript materials preserved in the various Genizah collections. It was during the second half of the nineteenth century that numerous genizot scattered throughout the Middle East were discovered, the largest and most important of which were located in Cairo. Their holdings were subsequently retrieved by antique dealers, booksellers, scholars, and travellers, including Solomon Wertheimer (1866–1935), Salomon Munk (1805–1867), Abraham Firkovitch (1786–1874), Moses Wilhelm Shapira (1830–1884), Solomon Schechter (1847–1915), and Elkan Nathan Adler (1861–1946), and these holdings are nowadays dispersed among numerous libraries in Europe, Russia, and North America.¹ The systematic scholarly exploration of the Genizah—here used as a generic term for storage space for timeworn manuscripts, mainly in Hebrew script—and the study of medieval Jewish societies in the wider Islamicate context evolved during the twentieth century and are still thriving today, with a dual focus on the documentary and the literary Genizah.² Yet, while the documentary Genizah was productively explored for panoramic investigations into Mediterranean and

¹ See the relevant entries in Richler (2014); and Sklare (2003).
² For the state of scholarship on the documentary Genizah, see the relevant contributions to Goldberg and Krakowski (2019). For the literary Genizah, see the contributions to Khan, Schmidtke, and Stroumsa (2020).
Near Eastern social history, especially Goitein’s monumental *A Mediterranean Society*, the material has yet to be analysed from a similarly large-scale perspective of intellectual history.

To date two major lacunae remain: Genizah scholars—representatives of Jewish studies for the most part—understandably tend to give precedence to Jewish authors and works, while less attention is paid to the substantial Islamic materials among the Genizah collections. At the same time, only a few Islamicists make use of the Genizah as a source for their scholarly endeavours, and this in spite of its crucial relevance. Another major desideratum in contemporary Genizah scholarship relates to the still largely untapped holdings of the Firkovitch collections of the National Library of Russia in Saint Petersburg, which was inaccessible to the majority of scholars from outside the Soviet Union for most of the twentieth century.

The vast majority of Firkovitch manuscripts were taken from the Genizah of the Karaite synagogue Dār Ibn Sumayḥ, in Ḥārat Zuwayla in New Cairo, the remnants of the synagogue’s former library. In some respects, the Firkovitch collections parallel the material retrieved from the Rabbanite Ben Ezra Geniza, but it also differs from it in several important respects. In contrast to the Ben Ezra corpus, the Firkovitch collections contain very little documentary material, such as letters, contracts, wills, charitable trust documents, etc., that would inform us about aspects of social, institutional, or economic history. Rather, its contents consist of fragments of works that cover virtually all disciplines of medieval learning, including

---

3 See, e.g., Ben-Shammai (2011).
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biblical exegesis, theology, philosophy and logic, law and legal theory, medicine, astronomy and other sciences, belles lettres, and so forth. Whereas the hundreds of thousands of literary fragments from the Cairo (Ben Ezra) Genizah are mostly small, containing between one and four folios of a work on average, many of the Firkovitch manuscripts are quite large, not infrequently comprising hundreds of leaves or so. Some of the manuscripts were originally part of the library of the Karaite community in Jerusalem and were brought to Cairo after the Crusaders’ conquest of Jerusalem in 1099, with the result that works from the so-called Golden Age of Karaism in Palestine (the tenth and eleventh centuries)—biblical exegesis for the most part—are well represented.

The Arabic manuscripts, the large majority of which are written in Hebrew characters, are extremely important. Most of the works they contain are completely or virtually unknown to modern scholarship. A considerable number are unique manuscripts, among them numerous works by Muslim authors. Even though many of the fragments are large in size, almost all are in poor condition, as is typical for Genizah material. They are fragmentary and jumbled, usually without a title page or colophon that would identify the text they contain. Moreover, the holdings of the Firkovich collections are acutely threatened due to poor conservation conditions and limited financial resources of the National Library of Russia.

Since the 1990s, microfilms of most sections of the collection have been available at the Institute of Microfilmed Hebrew Manuscripts (IMHM) at the National Library of Israel (NLI) in Jerusalem. Excluded from microfilming was the section of the
collection that consists of Arabic writings written in Arabic rather than Hebrew characters and that comprises close to seven-hundred miscellaneous fragments, which is rich in material pertinent to the rational sciences. In 2015, the NLR and the NLI signed an agreement that allows the NLI to provide open access to the digitised microfilm images, and, by now, nearly the entire body of microfilmed material is accessible through the KTIV site hosted on the NLI’s website⁴ and through the Friedberg Genizah Project.⁵ In the mid-1990s, the National Library of Russia began to restore a fair number of manuscripts from the Firkovitch collections. These procedures were often detrimental to the legibility of the material that underwent such treatment, and in many cases the microfilms preserve more of the original texts of the fragments than the physical objects after restoration (see figs. 7.4 and 7.5). Moreover, as part of their restoration, manuscripts were sometimes bound, such that traces of original binding and codicological divisions have been lost. However, given their fragmentary character and their jumbled arrangement, these are fundamental information for studying the material.

Today, more than twenty years after significant parts of the Firkovitch collections were made accessible, we are still far from possessing a catalogue raisonné of their contents. Since the

⁵ See https://fjms.genizah.org [accessed 4 April 2020].
early 1990s, several sample catalogs have been published, and since the beginning of the millennium, a number of collaborative research endeavours have specifically targeted works by Muslim and Jewish authors pertaining to Muʿtazilism as they are preserved in the Firkovitch collections. These include the ‘Muʿtazilite Manuscripts Project Group’, founded in 2003 and coordinated by David Sklare and Sabine Schmidtke; the Research Group ‘Muʿtazilism in Islam and Judaism’, hosted during 2005–2006 by the Israel Institute for Advanced Studies, Jerusalem, and coordinated by Wilferd Madelung and Sabine Schmidtke; and, between 2008 and 2013, the European Research Council-funded project ‘Rediscovering Theological Rationalism in the Medieval World of Islam’, hosted by Freie Universität Berlin (with Sabine Schmidtke as the Principal Investigator). These endeavours involved a large number of international scholars through various conferences and have resulted in numerous publications, editions of primary texts, as
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6 Fenton (1991); Sklare and Ben-Shammai (1997); Batat, Ben-Shammai, Butbul, Sklare, and Stroumsa (2000).

7 See https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/229460 [accessed 28 April 2020].
well as studies.\footnote{See, e.g., the relevant contributions to Abū l-Ḥusayn al-Ḵaṣirī (Taṣaffuh al-adilla); Madelung and Schmidtke (2006); Hamdan and Schmidtke (2006); Schwarb (2006); Adang, Schmidtke, and Sklare (2007); Hamdan and Schmidtke (2012); Schmidtke and Schwarb (2014); Ansari, Madelung, and Schmidtke (2015); Dāwūd al-Muqam- maṣ (Twenty Chapters = ‘Īṣrūn Maqāla); Madelung and Schmidtke (2017).} However, despite considerable progress, the research to date has only uncovered the tip of the iceberg.\footnote{Prior to his untimely demise, Bruno Chiesa had identified a significant number of Muʿtazili materials among the Firkovitch manuscripts. Among his most important discoveries was the K. al-Manʿ wa-l-tamānuʿ by ‘Abd al-Ḡabbār al-Hamaḏānī, two portions of which are preserved as Ms. YA I 1033 (46 folios), available online at https://web.nli.org.il/sites/NLIS/en/ManuScript/Pages/Item.aspx?ItemID=PNX_MANUSCRIPTS000153015 [accessed 30 April 2020] and Ms. Firk. Arab. 330 (4 folios), of which he had prepared a draft edition. For a brief description of both manuscripts, see Schmidtke (2007, 444–45). Another seminal work that is apparently exclusively preserved in the Genizah collections, is ‘Abd al-Ḡabbār’s original K. al-Muḥīṭ. A critical edition of the extant portions is in preparation by Omar Hamdan and Gregor Schwarb.}

Moreover, there is a lack of comparable systematic projects to study the equally rich materials pertaining to philosophy, logic, legal methodology, interreligious polemics/apologetics or the natural sciences (medicine, astronomy, mathematics). To illustrate the significance of the Firkovitch manuscripts for the study of philosophy, mention should be made, by way of example, of Alexander Treiger’s recent study on the long version
of the *Theologia Aristotelis*, significant portions of which are preserved among the Firkovitch manuscripts.¹⁰

The still ongoing, but largely unsystematic identification and study of new texts deriving from the collection continuously bring to light Jewish and Muslim works that were considered lost or were altogether unknown. Once the holdings of the Firkovitch Collection are fully explored, the history of Jewish thought and its historical ties to the relevant Islamic (and Christian) scholarly environments will have to be rewritten to a significant extent.

The present volume aims to further enrich the corpus of critically edited works that pertain to the intellectual history of Muslims and Jews and are exclusively preserved within the Genizah collections. Work on all seven texts included in the present publication began more than a decade ago, in most cases during the academic year 2005–2006, when four of the present editors worked together as members of the Research Group ‘Muʿtazilism in Islam and Judaism’ in Jerusalem. In all cases, consultation of the original manuscripts in St Petersburg was indispensable. This was done by some of us during repeated visits to Russia in 2008, 2010, and again in 2020. Thanks are due to the Gerda Henkel Foundation and the European Research Council for financially supporting the research trips to St Petersburg in 2008 (Gerda Henkel) and 2010 (European Research Council). The final trip, in March 2020, as well as the finalisation of this volume, were funded by a Ramón y Cajal grant of the Spanish Agencia Estatal de Investigación (RYC-2015-18346),
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¹⁰ Treiger (forthcoming).
and the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ. The editors also express their gratitude to the colleagues who supported the work on some of the material included in the present publication over the years and in different ways—namely Haggai Ben-Shammai, Aaron Hornkohl, Geoffrey Khan, Boris Sajkowski, Gregor Schwarb, David Sklare, Sarah Stroumsa, Alexander Treiger, María Mercedes Tuya, and Olga Vasilyeva. We also thank Geoffrey Khan, Aaron Hornkohl, and Esther-Miriam Wagner, the editors of *Cambridge Semitic Languages and Cultures*, for having accepted this volume for publication in their series.

With the exception of Texts III and VI, the works that are published here are preserved in manuscripts written in Hebrew characters. Since the majority of works were authored by Muslims and had been at some stage transcribed into Hebrew characters for the consumption of Jewish readers, we have retranscribed them into Arabic character. This is also the case for Text VII, which was authored by an anonymous Rabbanite scholar and is preserved in Hebrew characters only. The reason we chose to edit this text in Arabic rather than Hebrew characters is to make it accessible to scholars of both Jewish studies as well as of Arabic and Islamic studies.

The decision to publish the texts included in this volume has not been an easy one. None of the texts presented here is preserved in its entirety, and some of the fragments are heavily damaged, so that even some of the edited text remains unsatisfactory. The following considerations prompted us to gather these materials and make them available to the scholarly community. First, it is only by opening up the materials of the Firkovitch collection that other scholars may be attracted to
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engage with this important material, and it is hoped that future generations of scholars will be able to produce better and more complete editions of the texts included in this publication once additional witnesses have come to light. Secondly, having worked with some of the physical originals intermittently over more than a decade, we have sadly witnessed the deterioration of the Firkovitch material, and it is a matter of urgency to make available now what has already been studied carefully. Our hope is that the volume will entice more scholars to turn their attention to the material held in the Firkovitch collections. Thirdly, we also hope to engage more representatives of Islamic and Arabic studies in the scholarly exploration of the Muslim material among the Genizah in general and the Firkovitch collections specifically, even though the textual material we are presenting here is of only fragmentary nature.

With the exception of a small portion of Text I, for which we had two partly overlapping witnesses, all texts included in this volume are extant in one witness only. For this reason, and because of the deplorable state of virtually all the manuscripts consulted during the preparation of the editions included in this volume, we considered that diplomatic editions were the most appropriate approach to present the texts. As a rule, no attempt has been made to emend the texts, with the exception of correcting the most obvious errors. The orthography has been modernised throughout, and punctuation has been inserted to render the reading of the material more agreeable.
ʿAbd al-Ǧabbār al-Hamaḍānī commenting on Abū Hāšim al-Ǧubbāʾī

The two partially overlapping Mss. St Petersburg, National Library of Russia, YA II 2381 and YA II 3102 contain fragments of a commentary on a Bahšamite Muʿtazilite work. Passages from the basic text, which is divided into chapters (bāb) consisting of multiple quaestiones (masʿala) as it seems, are invariably introduced by qāla, followed by commentaries introduced by iʿlam anna. While the extant portion of the book contains no explicit indication as to the identity of the basic work, its author can safely be identified as Abū Hāšim al-Ǧubbāʾī (d. 321/933), the eponymous founder of the Bahšamiyya. On one occasion (Ms. YA II 2381, fol. 3r:14ff.), the author’s view as expressed in the basic work is compared by the commentator to the opinions he maintained in some of his other works, notably Naqḍ al-abwāb\(^\text{11}\) and al-Ǧāmiʿ,\(^\text{12}\) two well-known titles by Abū Hāšim.\(^\text{13}\)

The commentator can tentatively be identified as chief qāḍī ʿAbd al-Ǧabbār al-Hamaḍānī (d. 415/1025). This is suggested, for example, by the discussion revolving around the question whether God, whenever He effects an act via an intermediary cause (bi-sabar), is also capable of effecting the same act directly (bi-ḡayr sababʾ/ʿalā ǧihat al-ibtidāʾ/ibtidāʾan) (Ms. YA II 2381, fol. 3v:11–fol. 4r:8). The commentator first compares Abū Hāšim’s position in al-Ǧāmiʿ, where the latter affirmed that God

\(^{11}\) YA II 2381, fol. 3r: 17 (Naqḍ al-abwāb), fol. 3v: 13–14 (Baʿḍ al-abwāb, certainly being a misreading for Naqḍ al-abwāb).

\(^{12}\) YA II 2381, fol. 3v:1.

\(^{13}\) See Gimaret (1976, 298–304 no. 1); Gimaret (1984, 36 no. 1).
can effect the same act both through an intermediate cause and directly, with that of *Naqd al-abwāb*, where Abū Hāšim denied this possibility. The commentator concludes that Abū Hāšim’s view as expounded in *Naqd al-abwāb* is more convincing and subsequently proceeds to a discussion that runs largely parallel to the corresponding chapter in the *K. al-Muğnī*, where ʿAbd al-Ǧabbār also opted for Abū Hāšim’s position as maintained in his *Naqd al-abwāb*.14 While other followers of the Bahšamiyya, notably Ibn Mattawayh in his *K. al-Taḏkira*, discuss the issue along similar lines and likewise adopt Abū Hāšim’s view as expressed in his *Naqd al-abwāb*,15 another indication pointing to ʿAbd al-Ǧabbār as the commentator of the present work is that he is known to have commented on several works by Abū Hāšim, notably the latter’s *al-Ǧāmiʿ al-kabīr* and his *al-Ǧāmiʿ al-ṣaġīr*,16 and his *al-Baḍḍādiyyāt*.17 Our knowledge about the

---

literary output of ʿAbd al-Ǧabbār, which relies on the incomplete list of works provided by al-Ḥākim al-Ǧišumī in his Šarḥ ʿUyūn al-masāʾil complemented by self-references in ʿAbd al-Ǧabbār’s other writings, most prominently his K. al-Muḵnī, is sketchy, and it is certain that ʿAbd al-Ǧabbār wrote other works, among them possibly additional commentaries on some other writings by Abū Ḥāšim.

The first part of the preserved portion of the book consists of the final section of a chapter discussing questions of generated effects (tawlīd), while the second part contains the beginning of a chapter (bāb) on contiguity (mumāṣṣa), one of the five categories of akwān according to the Bahšamite system. Both parts are thus concerned with the accidents (aʿrāḍ) and their effects. Whether the book in its entirety was exclusively concerned with questions of natural philosophy or whether it also comprised chapters on doctrinal issues cannot be decided on the basis of the small portion that has been identified so far.

The edition is based on the following two manuscripts from the Firkovitch collection:

- Ms. YA II 3102 (א) consists of a quire of four leaves, ca. 10 cm × 14.5 cm, 16/18 lines per page, written in Hebrew characters. The text is interrupted following fol. 2, and comparison with Ms. YA II 2381 shows that one bifolio is missing between fols 2 and 3. Digital images of a microfilm of the fragment which was produced in June 1995 (National
Library of Israel, Film no. F. 61321) are accessible online. An entry on the fragment is also included in the Friedberg Genizah Project as FGP no. 3102503, though currently without digital images.

– Ms. YA II 2381 (ب) consists of a quire of six leaves, ca. 10 × 15 cm, 22 lines to a page, written in Hebrew characters. The fragment is heavily damaged throughout in the outer margins, and fols 1r and 6v are barely legible. Digital images of a microfilm of the fragment which was produced in April 1995 (National Library of Israel, Film no. F. 60610) are accessible online. An entry on the fragment is also included in the Friedberg Genizah Project as FGP no. 2381503, though currently without digital images.

The two manuscripts partly overlap—Ms. YA II 3102, fols 1–2 cover most of Ms. YA II 2381, fols 2v–3v, and Ms. YA II 3102, fols 3–4 cover most of Ms. YA II 2381, fol. 6, with some additional text that goes beyond what is preserved in Ms. YA II 2381. The fragments were retranscribed into Arabic characters, abbreviations such asضر for taʿālā have been written out in full, and recurring references to Abū Hāšim al-ʿUbbāʾī as ألب or ألب (as found in Ms. YA II 2381 ب) (as found in

---


Ms. YA II 3102 [[1]] have been replaced with his kunya, Abū Hāšim.

We thank the National Library of Russia for the opportunity to consult the original manuscripts in June 2008, May 2010, and again in March 2020 (S. Schmidtke; J. Thiele). Comparison of the microfilms with the original manuscripts shows that the fragments which underwent restoration after having been microfilmed have deteriorated since.

2 ʿAbd al-Ḡabbār al-Hamaḍānī commenting on al-Ṣāḥib b. ʿAbbād: Addenda

The writings of the Būyid vizier and patron of the Muʿtazila, al-Ṣāḥib b. ʿAbbād (d. 385/995), who was himself an adherent of the movement, apparently constitute the earliest Muslim Muʿtazili works of which copies can be traced in the various Genizah collections. After al-Ṣāḥib’s treatises, numerous works by ʿAbd al-Ḡabbār (see Text III in the present publication) and his disciples, including ʿAbd Allāh b. Saʿīd al-Labbād (see Text IV in the present publication), and Abū l-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī (d. 436/1044), as well as works by Imāmī scholars backing Muʿtazili theology, beginning with the Šarīf al-Murtaḍā (d. 436/1044), have been found in the Genizahs. The works of al-Ṣāḥib that are preserved in the Genizah collections include a summary of Abū Hāšim’s theological teaching, together with a commentary by ʿAbd al-Ḡabbār. Fragments of this work have been edited by W. Madelung and S. Schmidtke on the basis of two witnesses, namely Ms. Cambridge University Library, T-S Ar. 12.10 and Ms. St Peters burg, National Library of Russia,
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Arab. 264. The Firkovitch collections hold another fragment, which is most likely part of the same text by al-Ṣāḥib, again with a commentary by ʿAbd al-Ḡabbār: Ms. YA I 3114 (Hebrew script, consisting of 33 folios with 14/19 lines to a page). Each lemma (masʿala/faṣl/bāb) is introduced by ‘qāla’ (as against ‘qāla l-Ṣāḥib’ in Ms. T-S Ar. 12.10 and Ms. Firk. Arab. 264), while the commentary sections are again opened by ‘iʿlam’. Throughout the commentary, the latest authorities mentioned are Abū Ishāq b. ʿAyyāš (fol. 22r) and šayḥunā Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Baṣrī (d. 369/980) (fols 20v, 31v). As in the already published fragments, the commentator refers to the text he comments upon as ‘al-kitāb’ (fol. 8r). The fragment contains large portions of what appears to be a chapter on volition and aversion (possibly entitled bāb al-irāda wa-l-karāha), followed by the beginning of the next chapter on moistness and dryness, titled bāb al-ruṭūba wa-l-yubūsa. The lemmata from al-Ṣāḥib’s original text as preserved in the heavily damaged fragment read as follows:

مسألة قال ويجوز أن يريد الإنسان فعل غيره في حال وجوده كما يريد فعل نفسه في حال وجوده إلا أنه مما لا معلوله وذلك أن المريد إنما يريد من غيره شيئًا لكي يفعله فلا تجري إرادة لفعل غيره مجرى إرادته لفعل نفسه في أنه يجب أن يكون مجمعًا للمراد وإرادة القديم تعالى لافعال غيره متقدمة لها ولولا ذلك لم يكن العباد ...

(14) مسألة قال والإرادات إنما تكون حسنة إذا كان مرادها حسناً وليس سبيل الإرادات في هذا الباب سبيل سائر الأفعال والإرادة لا تحتاج إلى

Madelung and Schmidtke (2017).
إرادة بها تكون حكمة وإنما تكون حكمة بكون مرادها حكمةٌ إعلم (6ب)

مسألة قال وما يجوز أن يكون إرادة لزيد قد يجوز أن تكون إرادة لعمرو
بأن ينقل تعالى ذلك الجزء من قلب زيد فيجعله في قلب عمرو
ويحدث فيه الإرادة فأما ما صارت إرادة لزيد فليس يجوز أن تصير إرادة
لغيره لأنه لا يجوز عليها البقاء ولا الإعادة إعلم (10)

مسألة قال والإرادة لا توجب الأفعال إعلم (11ب)

مسألة قال ويجوز أن يفعل الإنسان في نفسه إرادة يكون بها مريدًا ولا
يجوز أن يفعل في غيره وليس يجوز أن تصير الإرادة مسيلة ولو اضطره
الله تعالى عن ذلك إلى إرادة فعل قبيح لم يكن ذلك معدودًا في فعل
القبيح متي أمكنه (13ب)

مسألة قال وكان أبو علي يجوز أن تراد الإرادة بإرادة أخرى ولم يكن
يجوز ذلك ويقول إنها إذا غمضت لم يجوز أن يريدها الإنسان من
نفسه وإن جاز أن يريده ما لم يغمض منها قال الثاني وليس ذلك عندها
بعيد وإن كان فيه ضرب من النظر إعلم (16)

فصل قال والإرادة غبر ... يصح إرادة شيء لا ... عن ... من أن
يكون متعلقًا بقدرة الرامي وبختياره وما هذا حاله لا يحسن أن يأمر به
لما لا يحسن أن يأمر بما يحذر عليه فعله وقد يصح أن يريد منه أن
يختره كما يصح أن يريد فعل الغبر (17ب)

فصل قال ولا يجوز أن يراد الإرادة بنفسها ولا يجوز أن يراد شيئان على
طريق التفصيل بإرادة واحدة وكذلك الكراهنة لا تكون كراهية لنفسها
وكذلك العلم لا يعلم نفسه إعلم (19ب)
فصل قال وليس يمتع حلول الإرادات في جزء واحد من القلب ولا حلول إرادات في أجزاء كثيرة منه والكراهية للشيء تنفي الإرادة له وإن كانت في غير الجزء الذي الإرادة فيه إذا ليسا من صفات ... وإنما تتعلقان على المريد الكاره ...

فصل قال وكان أبو علي يجيز أن يراد الشيء ويكره من وجهين مختلفين كالإنسان يريد من غيره أن يسجد مع القصد لعبادة ...

باب الرطوبة واليبوسة قال الرطوبة عرض تحل الجواهر والذي هو اليبس ولا تحتاج إلى بيئة فإذا صار في الجزء الواحد أجزاء من الرطوبة لم يجر أن يلترق بغيره ولو لم تكون فيه رطوبة البيئة ما جاز أن يلترق بغيره وإنما يلترق بغيره إذا كانت فيه رطوبة فليلة وكان الجسم الذي يتصل ببعضه بعض يابس وبعضه رطبًا ... بأن يخلق في الجوهر ...

وإن كان فإنما يصير ما بأكثر من جزء من الرطوبة فلا يتعرض التراق بعضه بعض ولا يحتاج إلى جزء يابس ليعتدل به وقد يجوز أن يخلق الله تعالى في كل جزء أجزاء كثيرة من الرطوبة اعلم ...

مسألة قال ويجوز على الرطوبات البقاء ولا يجوز عليها الرطوبة والرطوبة لا ينفيها اللون والخشونة واليبس عرض يضاد الرطوبة وله من الأحكام في أنه يبقى ولا يدرك ولا يحتاج إلى بيئة ويجوز [عليه] الإعادة ويحل في الجوهر من ...

The edition of Ms. YA I 3114 (33 folios, written in Hebrew characters) was prepared on the basis of a digital copy of a
microfilm of the fragment, which is by now available online. Additionally, we inspected the original manuscript during visits to St Petersburg in May 2010 and March 2020. Virtually every leaf is heavily damaged on the upper and lower margins. The manuscript underwent restoration measures in January 1995, and the physical characteristics of the original fragment cannot reliably be established. Occasionally, more text is visible on the microfilm, which was produced in June 1994, than in the original as it is preserved today. As far as can be established on the basis of the restored manuscript, the fragment consists of the following physical units: fols 1–7 (Q8) (fol. 1 [nearly entirely destroyed] is followed in the current foliation by 1’); fol. 8 (SF, now bound together with the preceding quire); fol. 9 (SF, now bound together with the following quire); fols 10–17 (Q8); fols 18–27 (Q10); fol. 28 (SF); fols 29–32 (apparently isolated leaves that were bound together during restoration; fol. 30 is upside down). On the basis of the better preserved folios, the number of lines seems to range between 18 lines (fol. 24r; fig. 2.1), 19 lines (fols 9r, 15r, 15v), and 21 lines (fols 9v, 16v), with several pages of 20 lines (fols 11r, 11v). Accordingly, it is also difficult to determine interruptions throughout the preserved text.


22 The following abbreviations are used: SF = single leaf; BF = bifolio; Q6, Q8, Q10, etc. = quire of six, eight, ten, etc., leaves.
3 Nukat al-Mugnî (vols 1–3), an anonymous abbreviated recension of ʿAbd al-Ǧabbār al-Hamaḍānī’s K. al-Mugnî

This section contains editions of fragments of the Karaite recension of ʿAbd al-Ǧabbār’s Kitāb al-Mugnī fī abwāb al-tawḥīd wa-l-ʿadl, contained in Ms. St Petersburg, National Library of Russia, Arab. 104. ʿAbd al-Ǧabbār’s Muğnî is the most extensive surviving compendium of Muʿtazili theology (and more precisely of the teachings of its Bahšamī strand). Fourteen of the original twenty volumes of the work were first discovered in Yemeni manuscript collections. Additional copies of the Muğnî were later identified in fragments of Karaite manuscripts, containing an abbreviated version of the recension known via the Yemeni copies. A portion of the Karaite copies have no equivalent in the manuscripts from Yemen, and are therefore invaluable additions to the materials that came to be available in the Cairo edition published in the 1960s.23

Ms. Arab. 104 contains the most extensive amount of material of a former codex. Its fragments are today scattered among three shelf marks of the National Library of Russia and

---

23 For a detailed account of the surviving manuscripts of ʿAbd al-Ǧabbār’s Muğnî (in the longer Yemeni and the shorter Karaite recension), and on the history of their exploration, see the introduction to Hamdan and Schmidtke (2012).
one manuscript at the British Library in London. The largest parts of Ms. Arab. 104 can be attributed to the specific thematic sections on acts that are effective via secondary causes (al-tawlīd), human capacity of action (al-istiṭāʿa), moral obligations (al-taklīf), and epistemology (al-nāzar wa-l-maʿārif). These parts were edited previously by Omar Hamdan and Sabine Schmidtke (2012). The same manuscript also contains eighteen fragments with textual materials that belonged to the missing volumes 1–3 of the recension preserved in Yemen, which correspond to the first volume (al-ḡuzʾ al-āwwal) of the Karaite recension. We provide here an edition of these eighteen fragments, covering the following parts of the manuscript: fragments I and II consist of one folio each, and they are contained within the same physical unit, the bifolio 57–58; fragment III, found on a single leaf (fol. 87); fragment IV, found on a single leaf (fol. 88); fragments V and VI consist of one folio each, and they are contained within the same physical unit, the bifolio 89–90; fragment VII, consisting of three physical units, namely ten leaves (fols 222–31), a single folio (fol. 232), and a quire of six leaves (fols 233–38); fragments VIII and IX are found within one physical unit, consisting of the first and the second half of a quire of four leaves (fols 241–44); fragment X, contained in a quire of eight leaves (fols 245–52); fragment XI, consisting of

---

24 These additional manuscripts include Ms. National Library of Russia, AY 381 (one leaf), Ms. Arab 105 (92 folios) and Ms. British Library OR 2569 (190 folios); for further details see Schmidtke (2007, 379–91); Hamdan and Schmidtke (2008); Schwab (2008); Hamdan and Schmidtke (2012).
the first folio of a bifolio (fol. 253); fragment XII, contained within two physical units, namely the second folio of a bifolio (fol. 254) and the bifolio 255–56; fragment XIII, consisting of a quire of six leaves (fols 257–62; fig. 3.3); fragment XIV, consisting of a quire of four leaves (fols 265–68); fragments XV and XVI are found in the same physical unit, consisting of the first and the second half of a quire of four leaves (fols 271–74); fragment XVII, found within a quire of six leaves (fols 275–80); and fragment XVIII, found on a single leaf (fol. 281).

These eighteen fragments contain only little information about their relative sequence. Fragment VII contains two quire signatures, each on the respective upper right hand corner of fols 222r (‘išrūn) and 232r (iḥdā wa-‘išrūn). Fragment XVII contains on fol. 277v a cross-reference to a foregoing discussion, which can be found in the chapter fi l-ṣifāt (fragment VII, fols 231v–235r; fig. 3.2), and fol. 281v contains a colophon, indicating the end of the first volume of Nukat al-Muğnī (fig. 3.1). For the rest of the fragments, we have no indication whatsoever as to their chronological sequence, nor do we possess a parallel text or other external evidence to reconstruct their original arrangement.25 We therefore present the eighteen fragments in the order of their appearance in the manuscript, which may not correspond to their original sequence.

---

25 In contrast, the chronological order of the surviving Karaite fragments of the section on tawlīd could be reconstructed even in the absence of parallel texts, thanks to a table of contents of the entire al-Kalām fi l-tawlīd preserved in Ms. Şan‘ā’, Maktabat al-awqāf, no. 543.
The fragments we have edited here all appear to be part of ʿAbd al-Ǧabbār’s discussion on attributes. They offer new textual material on his treatment of such fundamental Bahšamī doctrines as the so-called theory of ‘states’ (aḥwāl), as well as discussions of related ‘subtle topics’ (laṭāʿif or daqāʿiq), including causation. For most of the edited passages, chapter headings are missing. Therefore, we provide here a brief survey of their contents in order to provide the reader with a basic orientation:

**Fragment I**

This fragment of one folio contains the end of a chapter on divine knowledge, power, will, and life, followed by the beginning of a chapter on the denial that God knows, is powerful, and lives by virtue of created entities (bi-maʿānin muḥḍata).

**Fragment II**

This fragment of one folio includes the end of a chapter containing the proof that God is eternally knowing. The text then proceeds with a fragment of a chapter on the knowability of the existent and the non-existent.

**Fragment III**

This fragment contains a conceptual discussion on the notion of ḥukm (pl. aḥkām), that is, ‘characteristics’ that derive from

---

26 For the Bahšamī theory of ‘states’ see Frank (1978); for their reflections on causation see Thiele (2012) and Thiele (2013, 75–115).
attributes or ‘states’ and describe their reality (ḥaqīqa).\textsuperscript{27}
Concrete examples of aḥkām examined in this short passage include the potential of acting (which derives from the ‘state’ of being capable) or the atom’s potential of carrying accidents (which derives from its occupying space).

\textit{Fragments IV–VI}

These three fragments contain portions of texts from what may have been a single chapter. The gap between the fragments is apparently small. The fragments elaborate on the theory that the accident of life causes a ‘state’ of a composite (ǧumla), that is, of the entire living body, which must possess a ‘specific structure’ (binya maḥšūsa).

\textit{Fragment VII}

This fragment contains the longest continuous sequence of text that has been preserved from the section on God’s attributes. It begins within a chapter that argues that God cannot possibly be powerful and knowing by virtue of entitative power and knowledge that subsists in no substrate. It then continues with eight complete chapters on the following topics: God cannot possibly be knowing, powerful, and willing by virtue of co-eternal entities; all things are necessarily either similar to or distinct from other things; the meaning of our predicating that something is similar to or distinct from another thing; things are not similar or distinct by virtue of their being an entity; things are not similar or

\textsuperscript{27} For this conception of hukm see Frank (1978, 83 n. 18).
distinct by virtue of a distinct entity; things are not similar or distinct by virtue of their names; a chapter entitled ‘on attributes’, which proposes a typology of attributes in the framework of the Bahšamī theory of ‘states’; a chapter arguing that one thing cannot possibly annihilate two contrary things and vice versa. The fragment ends with the beginning of a chapter that denies that things cannot be similar to, or distinct from, other things by virtue of a ‘state’ that they possess by virtue of an accident (li-ḥāl yaḥtaṣṣu bihi li-maʿnā).

**Fragments VIII–IX**

These two fragments, which are part of the same physical unit, appear to be separated by a short gap only. They discuss the question of whether or not three types of effects depend on external conditions, including ‘characteristics’ caused by attributes (such as the potential of acting, which is caused by the ‘state’ of being capable), attributes caused by an accident (the accident is then denoted ‘illa), and accidents, whose coming into being is caused by other accidents (and are denoted sabab).

**Fragment X**

This quire of eight leaves contains a substantial fragment of an in-depth discussion on causes that are labeled sabab. Consequently, it could possibly be related to the discussion of the previous fragment. Specific examples discussed in this passage include ‘tranquility of the soul’ (sukūn al-nafs), that is, an inner conviction of certain knowledge which is caused by reflection (naẓar), accidents of ‘composition’ (taʿlīf) and
‘pressure’ (iʿtimād; this refers to accidents by virtue of which their substrates set other atoms in motion).

Fragment XI

The discussion found in this fragment is possibly a continuation of the preceding fragment. It focuses on a particularly stable form of ‘composition’—labeled ‘difficulty of decomposition’ (ṣuʿūbat al-tafkīk)—something which occurs whenever a composite is made up of moist and dry particles.

Fragment XII

This fragment is part of a discussion on properties that specify a composite in its entirety (ġumla), rather than only parts of it.

Fragment XIII

This fragment argues that one accident cannot exist in multiple substrates. The examples discussed include the following accidents: will (irāda), desire (šahwa), sounds (aṣwāt), colours (alwān), ‘pressure’ (iʿtimād), regret (nadam), and reflection (naẓar).

Fragment XIV

This fragment contains part of a discussion on the accident of life, and more particularly on how the ‘state’ of being alive (kawnuhu ḥayyan)—which is caused by the accident of life—relates to a composite body and the particles (aġzāʾ) of which the body is made up.
**Fragment XV**

This fragment contains further considerations on ‘characteristics’ (ḥkām; see above fragment III): whether or not the non-existent has characteristics; that the existent necessarily possesses characteristics, either by virtue of itself or by virtue of something else; and that these characteristics can depend on external conditions.

**Fragment XVI**

This fragment deals, like fragment XIV, with life—and so both fragments might be part of the same discussion—echoing again the question of how the ‘state’ of being alive relates to a composite body and the particles of which a body is composed.

**Fragment XVII**

The beginning of this fragment contains the end of a chapter on similarity and distinction of things, possibly devoted to the doctrine that things are said to be similar and distinct by virtue of their ‘essential attribute’ (ṣifat al-ḏāt). This is followed by a chapter on the doctrine that ‘the attribute by virtue of which a thing is distinguished from distinct things is the same as the one by virtue of which it resembles something, whenever they share this attribute’ (the attribute in question is again an entity’s ‘essential attribute’). The

---

fragment closes with an incomplete chapter on the question the kinds of attributes one thing can or cannot possess (for example, it cannot possibly possess contrary attributes).

Fragment XVIII

As shown by the colophon at the end of this fragment, this leaf contains the end of the first volume of *Nukat al-Muğni*, which concludes with a discussion of God’s ‘essential attribute’.

During the preparation of our edition, we consulted the original fragments in May 2010 and March 2020. We thank the National Library of Russia for granting us access to the manuscript.

4 ʿAbd Allāh b. Saʿīd al-Labbād on Natural Philosophy

The National Library of Russia and the British Library hold several fragments of a comprehensive work on natural philosophy by a Bahšami author. The fragments’ codicological features suggest that they all originated with the same codex. They are written in Hebrew characters, with 15/19 lines per page, 13 cm × 16 cm. Throughout the codex, the scribe uses common abbreviations, such as ṣa’alā for taʿālā, ṭaḥ for raḥimahu l-Lāh, qawlulu for qawlulu, and chapter headings are invariably centred. The bulk of the codex’s remnants is preserved in the following two manuscripts:

– St Petersburg, NLR, YA I 3093 [referred to as I in the edition], 75 folios, consisting of the following physical units:
fols 1 [SG], 2–7 [Q6], 8–10, 11–16 [Q6], 17–24 [Q8], 25–32 [Q8], 33 [SG], 34 [SG], 35–42 [Q8], 43–48 [Q6], 49–54 [Q6], 55 [SG], 56 [SG], 57–64 [Q8], 65 [SG], 66–75 [Q10]. A microfilm copy is available through the National Library of Israel (NLI Film no. F. 56559). Digital images of the microfilm are available through KTIV: Digitized Hebrew Manuscripts [system no. 000154905] and the Friedberg Genizah Project [FGP] 3093502;

- London, British Library, OR 2529, fols 89–95 [referred to as ب in the edition] (NLI Film no. F 6307; KTIV: Digitized Hebrew Manuscripts [system nos. 000122010, 000122011, 000122012, 000122013]; for a description of the codex as well as a digital copy see also http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/FullDisplay.aspx?ref=Or_2529).

Additional smaller portions of the work are preserved in the following fragments:29

- St Petersburg, NLR, YA I 880, fols 1–2, heavily damaged, particularly on the upper margin of fol. 2 and worm-eaten throughout [referred to as ژ in the edition]. (NLI Film no. F 54613, KTIV: Digitized Hebrew Manuscripts [system no. 000152937]; The Friedberg Genizah Project [FGP] 880502);

---

29 Mss. YA I 880, YA II 1060, YA II 1065, II 1082 were identified by Gregor Schwarb under the auspices of the Research Project funded by the European Research Council (2008–2013) ‘Rediscovering Theological Rationalism in the Medieval World of Islam’ and hosted by Freie Universität Berlin [https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/229460]. See Schwarb (2011, 278–79 n. 128).
– St Petersburg, NLR, YA II 1060, fol. 214, heavily damaged; the upper part of the leaf is torn off with only the last nine lines of each page being preserved [referred to as ‘ in the edition]. (NLI film no. F 59403; KTIV: Digitized Hebrew Manuscripts [system no. 000160314-1]; The Friedberg Genizah Project [FGP] 1060503);

– St Petersburg, NLR, YA II 1065, fols 1–2, heavily damaged on the upper and inner margins [referred to as ‘ in the edition] (NLI Film no. F 59418, KTIV: Digitized Hebrew Manuscripts [system no. 000160318]; The Friedberg Genizah Project [FGP] 1065503);

– St Petersburg, NLR, YA II 1082, fols 26–27, heavily damaged in the lower margins [referred to as ‘ in the edition] (NLI Film no. 59919; KTIV: Digitized Hebrew Manuscripts [system no. 000160332]; The Friedberg Genizah Project [FGP] 1082503).

Throughout the book, the chapters are numbered consecutively, and some of the quires have been marked in Hebrew characters on the upper right hand corner of the recto page of the first leaf. The original sequence of the extant portions of the work can be reliably reconstructed, with a few exceptions. Quires 19 and 20, which are preserved in their entirety (Fragment XVIII), suggest that the codex consisted of quinions. The earliest quire of which the first leaf is extant is numbered ‘dalet’ (τ), i.e., ‘four’ (Fragment V). Although the placement of Fragment V is tentative, it is possible that some thirty leaves are missing from the beginning of the text. The final preserved physical unit of the codex consists of the first three leaves of quire 21 (Fragment XIX). From the original 210 leaves of which the book consisted until
the end of this last, partially preserved quire, only 89 leaves are preserved. It is uncertain of how many chapters (after chapter 82) the book consisted and how much is missing from the end. It is hoped that future scholarship on the Genizah collections will bring to light additional fragments of the book. The physical structure of the preserved portions of the codex is as follows:

Fragment I*

YA I 3093:1 [F ??] <leaf heavily damaged, number and title of the faṣl that begins here are illegible>

Fragment II

YA II 1065: 1 [F 28]

Fragment III

YA I 3093: 2 3 4 ⊗ 5 [F 29] 6 7

Fragment IV

YA II 1065: 2 [F 30]

The following symbols have been used: ⊗ signifies the middle of a quire; chapter numberings [F] are indicated in [square brackets] following the number of leaf in question. Numbering of quires, whenever visible, is indicated in {curly brackets} following the number of the leaf on which they are found. The position of fragments marked with an asterisk (*) can only be approximately determined. Occasional comments are added in <angle> brackets.
Introduction

Fragment V*

YA I 3093: 8 9 {τ = 4} 10 <placement suggested by numbered quire as well as a cross-reference in YA I 3093, fol. 13, to an earlier discussion on YA I 3093, fol. 9>

Fragment VI*

YA I 3093: 10 <YA I 3093, fols 8–9 and 10 are still bound together, suggesting that fol. 10 follows soon after fol. 9>

Fragment VII


Fragment VIII

YA II 1082: 26 27 [F 33]

Fragment IX


Fragment X


Fragment XI

YA I 3093: 33 [F 50]
Fragment XII*

YA I 3093: 34 <As is the case with YA I 3093, fol. 33, this is a single leaf. The first line on both sides is heavily damaged, and the fragment’s precise placement is tentative>

Fragment XIII


Fragment XIV

YA II 1060: 214 [F 57]

Fragment XV

YA I 3093: 43 [F 58] 44 45 [F 59] ⊗ 46 [F 60] 47 48

Fragment XVI

YA I 3093: 49 [F 63] 50 [F 64] 51 [F 65] ⊗ 52 53 54 [F 66]

Fragment XVII

YA I 880: 1 2 [F 67]

Fragment XVIII

The book’s extant parts suggest that it was concerned with questions of natural philosophy. The chapters contain detailed discussions of atoms (ḡawāḥīr) or indivisible particles (aḡzāʾ, sg. ḡuz) of which bodies are composed (chs 28–35, 44–48, 50–52), as well as annihilation and restoration (al-fanāʾ wa-l-iʿāda) (chs 63–82). As such, the work complements other books on natural philosophy by Bahšamī authors, most importantly Ibn Mattawayh’s *K. al-Taḏkira*, or the *K. Masāʾil fi l-ḥilāf bayna l-Baṣriyyīn wa-l-Baγdādiyyīn* by Abū Rašīd al-Nisābūrī, among the generations of disciples of ʿAbd al-Ǧabbār, the *qism al-ʿāšir* of al-Ḥākim al-Ǧišumi’s (d. 494/1101) *Šarḥ ʿUyūn al-masāʾil*, and the writings of the Zaydī Yemeni author al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad al-Raṣṣāṣ (d. 584/1188) among later representatives of the Bahšamiyya.

The extant fragments contain no indication as to the book’s title and its author. Arguing primarily on the basis of Ms. British Library, OR 2529, Haggai Ben-Shammai suggested in 1974 that the fragment constituted a portion of a work by ʿAbd al-Ǧabbār al-Hamaγānī (d. 415/1025), most likely his *Šarḥ Kašf al-aʿrād*. Wilferd Madelung, who inspected a microfilm of Ms. YA I 3093 in 2005–2006 under the auspices of the research
group ‘Muʿtazilism in Islam and Judaism’, hosted by the Israel Institute for Advanced Studies in Jerusalem, tentatively identified ʿAbd al-Ḡabbār’s student qāḍī Labbād as the work’s author. One of the indications that led Madelung to an author other than, and evidently younger than, ʿAbd al-Ḡabbār is the repeated reference throughout the text to ʿAbd al-Ḡabbār’s K. al-Muġnī fī abwāb al-tawḥīd wa-l-ʿadl, which are invariably introduced in the passive.34 These contrast with the numerous internal cross-references throughout the book to earlier or later discussions that are all phrased in the first person.35

Among the students and companions of ʿAbd al-Ḡabbār, al-Ḥākim al-Ǧišumī lists Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allāh b. Saʿīd al-Labbād in second position right after Abū Raṣīd al-Nisābūrī, ʿAbd al-Ḡabbār’s successor as head of the Bahšamiyya school of the Muʿtazila. Al-Labbād, al-Ǧišumī reports, had studied with ʿAbd al-Ḡabbār, was one of his earliest companions, and acted as his teaching deputy (ḥalifatuḥu fī l-dars). Al-Ǧišumī adds that al-Labbād had numerous books to his credit, most prominent among them the K. al-Nukat.36 With the exception of a few references, the Muslim Muʿtazilite tradition has not preserved any of the works of al-Labbād. Occasional mentions of his views, possibly quotations from his K. al-Nukat, can be found in the K. al-Taḍkira fī aḥkām al-ḡawāhir wa-l-aʿrāḍ, by al-Labbād’s

34 Ms. YA I 3093, fols 46r, 73r, 89r.
35 Ms. YA I 3093, fols 15v, 16r, 18r, 21r, 32r, 36r, 36v, 37r, 38r, 38v, 39v, 40v, 41r, 41v, 42r, 44v, 49v, 50v, 53r, 54r, 54v, 56v, 59r, 61r, 63r, 68r, 72v, 74r; Ms. BL OR 2529, fol. 93v.
36 Al-Ḥākim al-Ǧišumī (Šarḥ ʿUyūn al-masāʿil, 395).
younger contemporary Ibn Mattawayh,\textsuperscript{37} and in Part Ten of al-\mbox{Ǧišumī’s} Š\textit{arḥ} ‘\textit{Uyūn al-masā’īl}.\textsuperscript{38} By contrast, al-Labbād was widely read among Jewish adherents of the Muʿtazila. The Karaite theologian Yūsuf al-Baṣīr (d. between 428/1037 and 430/1039) had commented on one of al-Labbād’s works (Š\textit{arḥ} \textit{Uṣūl al-Labbād}),\textsuperscript{39} and the transmission of al-Labbād’s book(s) is corroborated by references to it in some of the book lists that are preserved in the Cairo Geniza.\textsuperscript{40}

Madelung’s initial suggestion is supported by quotations from al-Labbād adduced by al-\mbox{Ǧišumī} in his Š\textit{arḥ} ‘\textit{Uyūn al-masā’īl} that show parallels in the fragments edited in the

\textsuperscript{37} Ibn Mattawayh (\textit{Taḍkira}, vol. 1:331, 12–16; vol. 2:507, 7–17).

\textsuperscript{38} This portion of al-\mbox{Ǧišumī’s} Š\textit{arḥ} ‘\textit{Uyūn al-masā’īl} is preserved in several manuscripts. For purposes of the present publication we have consulted Ms. Riyadh, King Saud University (KSU) Library 7783, which is incomplete at the end and undated. The codicological features suggest that it was transcribed during the seventh/thirteenth century. References to al-Labbād’s views are found ibid., fols 5v:15ff., 7v:4ff., 8v:14ff., 14v:14ff., 30v:7ff., 105r:5ff., 137v:15ff., 267v:5ff. For digital images of Ms. KSU 7783 and a brief description, see http://makhtota.ksu.edu.sa/makhtota/8453/1 [accessed 20 April 2020]. Another copy of Part Ten of al-\mbox{Ǧišumī’s} Š\textit{arḥ} ‘\textit{Uyūn al-masā’īl} is preserved as Ms. Ṣănʿā’, Maktabat al-awqāf, 707 (dated Muḥarram 608/June–July 1211).

\textsuperscript{39} See Sklare (1995, 256).

\textsuperscript{40} Allony (2006, 162:142, 166:237, 167:255).
present publication. While al-Ǧišumī’s quotations were most likely taken from al-Labbād’s *Nukat*, the identity of the present work is uncertain, as none of al-Ǧišumī’s quotations agrees verbatim with any of the text that is included in the preserved fragments. The *K. al-Uṣūl* that had been commented upon by Yūsuf al- Başīr is a possible candidate. An additional consideration supporting our identification of al-Labbād as the author is found in chapter 80 of this text. The chapter argues that atoms have possible existence and must therefore come into being by virtue of an arbitrarily choosing agent (*bi-ḥtiyār fāʿilihi*). Essentially, the author establishes here that if atoms were necessarily existent (*waḡaba wuḡūd al-ḏawhar*), they would exist by virtue of themselves and consequently be eternal. He then proceeds to argue that since we are certain of God’s necessary existence (*wuḡūb wuḡūdihi*), we would have to concede that necessarily existent bodies would resemble God’s very being. Yet, he concludes, it was shown that the atoms’ existence is not necessary, but rather contingent (*ḥadaṭa maʿa l-ḏawāz an lā yahdaṭu*), and that the atoms’ coming into existence must therefore depend on an agent. This is a noteworthy passage, because Bahšamī theologians tended to prove the temporal existence of atoms—and, in the next step, the existence of the eternal Creator-God—by the so-called proof from accidents, rather than by appealing to the notions of necessary and contingent existence.

---

41 Particularly relevant is Chapter 70 (*fī anna kawnahu bāqiyan lā yarğī bihi illā ilā istimrār wuḡādihi*) in the work that is edited. Al-Labbād’s view and his arguments run largely parallel to what al-Ǧišumī’s reports about him in his *Ṣarḥ ʿUyūn al-masāʾil*, fols 8v:14–9r:9.
as in the present case.\textsuperscript{42} In fact, the proof of God’s existence was reframed by Abū l-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī, who based his reasoning on the dependence of the contingent world on a necessarily existing Creator—a line of reasoning that later became famous with Ibn Sīnā.\textsuperscript{43} Abū l-Ḥusayn’s doctrine was harshly criticised by Bahšamī theologians, but he does not seem to have been the only student of ‘Abd al-Ǧabbār to adopt this argument: as Yūsuf al-Baṣīr reveals in a refutation of Abū l-Ḥusayn’s proof, it was actually also employed by al-Labbād.\textsuperscript{44} This is consistent with the evidence of our present text and would consequently support the hypothesis of al-Labbād’s authorship.

The work on the edition of the extant portions of the codex began in 2008 on the basis of microfilm copies of Ms. YA I 3093 and Ms. British Library, Or 2529. All Firkovitch fragments were inspected in May 2010 and again in March 2020 by S. Schmidtke in their original form, and thanks are due to the National Library of Russia for the opportunities to do so. The text has been retranscribed into Arabic characters, with modern spelling applied throughout. The division of the text into lines in the edition reflects the manuscript. Whenever a word spreads in the manuscript over two lines (the definite article ‘\textit{al-‘}, for example, is regularly placed at the end of the line with the noun following in the next line; another example is

\textsuperscript{42} For the proof from accidents see Davidson (1987, 134–43).
\textsuperscript{43} See Madelung (2006); to be sure, Ibn Sīnā’s proof relied on the distinction between necessary and contingent existence, but rather than speaking of the Creator, he referred to God as the First Cause.
\textsuperscript{44} Madelung and Schmidtke (2006, 6, 31, 42).
Ms. YA I 3093, fol. 13r:9–10 featuring ‘intiqā | lihi’, in the edition, the word appears in full in line 10 only), the word is rendered in full in the next line. Chapter headings and other dividers (e.g., ‘tariqa uhrā’, ‘tariq uhrā’, ‘aydan’, ‘waḥh āḥar’, ‘dalil āḥar’) have been rendered in bold, as have personal names and book titles. The division of the text into lines has been preserved. Abbreviations throughout the text (‘ta’ for ‘taʿalā’, ‘qaw’ for ‘qawluhu’/‘qawlihi’, ‘raḥ’ for ‘raḥimahu l-Lāh’) have been written out in full. Punctuation has been added to facilitate reading of the text. Damaged sections have been indicated by [square brackets], and our proposed reconstructions of the missing text in those locations are tentative throughout. Occasional emendations to the text are added in <angle brackets>.

5   **Al-Uṣūl al-muhaddabiyya**, by Sahl b. Faḍl al-Tustari

Ms. St Petersburg, National Library of Russia, YA I 3951 (14 folios, ca. 12.5 cm × 17.5 cm, 21 lines to a page) consists of two quires of four leaves (fols 1–4) and eight leaves (fols 5–12), respectively, with the thread indicating the middle of each quire still being visible between fols 2–3 and fols 8–9, followed by a bifolio (fols 13–14). **Al-Uṣūl al-muhaddabiyya**, the first text preserved in the fragment, stretches over fols 1–10. While the beginning of the text is preserved (fol. 1r; fig. 5.1), as is its end (fol. 10v), there is a lacuna between fols 4 and 5. Fols 11–12 constitute a fragment of a legal responsum on forbidden marriages, and fols 13–14 is a fragment of a doctrinal text. All three works are written in the same hand, and it is possible that
the three fragments originated in a multitext volume transcribed by a single scribe, containing three (or more) works. At the end of fol. 14v there is a colophon indicating the end of the unidentified doctrinal text. The colophon is dated to the month of Ṭevet, which concurs with Ḏū l-Ḥiḡḡa, in the year 4187 (fig. 5.2). The correct interpretation of the ambiguous date is uncertain. It has been suggested that fol. 13 constitutes another fragment that belongs to al-Uṣūl al-muhaddabiyya. This, however, can safely be ruled out on codicological grounds.

The preserved chapter headings of al-Uṣūl al-muhaddabiyya indicate that the lacuna between fols 4 and 5 is extensive. The first fragment contains, in addition to the title

45 For a discussion of the various possibilities, see Ben-Shammai (2020, 227). Ben-Shammai assumes this to be an abbreviation for 44187, the numerical value of which is 587, indicating the Islamic era. The date would thus have to be read, in his view, as Ḏū l-Ḥiḡḡa 587 AH = December 1191–January 1192 CE.

46 For the suggestion see Ben-Shammai (2020, 225 n. 5: ‘Fol. 13 may belong to the Uṣūl’). Since fols 13–14 constitute a bifolio, both leaves would thus have to be part of the work, which is impossible in view of the colophon on fol. 14v. There can be no doubt that the end of al-Uṣūl al-muhaddabiyya is preserved on fol. 10v of Ms. YA I 3951. Ben-Shammai worked from a paper copy of Ms. YA I 3951, on the basis of which he was unable to identify the individual physical units of the manuscript.
page\textsuperscript{47} and the author’s introduction, the beginning of \textit{bāb fī wuḡūb al-naẓar wa-l-istidlāl ʿalā maʿrifat Allāh subḥānahu} (fol. 2r), discussing epistemology. The second fragment begins in the middle of a discussion on reward and punishment, and it continues with chapters on repentance (\textit{bāb fī l-tawba al-musqiṭa li-l-ʿiqāb}; fol. 6r), prophecy (\textit{bāb fī l-nubuwwāt}; fol. 7r), the commandments of the revealed law (\textit{bāb fī l-ṣarāʾiʿ}; fol. 8r), the constitution of the rational person (\textit{bāb fīmā yanbaḡī an yakūna binyat al-ʿāqil}; fol. 8v), the afterlife (\textit{bāb fī l-maʿād}; fol. 9r), reckoning (\textit{bāb fī l-ḥisāb}; fol. 9v), and a final chapter on the commandments God imposed upon rulers (\textit{bāb fī taklifīhi uli l-amr}; fol. 10r). This indicates that in between the two preserved portions of the book the sections discussing divine attributes and divine justice are missing. On the basis of the extant portions, the Muʿtazilite character of the book is evident, and there are indications that the author was influenced by the doctrinal notions of Abū l-Ḥusayn al-Baṣrī, although the work’s non-denominational character is striking. The text is devoid of any scriptural material and other allusions specific to any religion. This is unsurprising, since the author relates in the course of his introduction that he composed the work at the

\textsuperscript{47} For a transcription of the title page in Hebrew characters, with English translation and discussion, see also Ben-Shammai (2020, 225–27). Ben-Shammai states that in an older photocopy at his disposal, the following number occurred after ָםוֹל ָשָכ. In a photocopy he received later on, this was missing. For the title page in its current state, see fig. 5.1.
request of al-qāḍī al-raʾis al-Muḥaddab (hence its title, al-Uṣūl al-
muḥaddabiyya), whose identity cannot be established.48

Unlike the colophon of fol. 14r, the colophon at the end of
al-Uṣūl al-muḥaddabiyya is undated. The work’s title page (fol.
1r; fig. 5.1), however, suggests the authoritative Karaite theolo-
gian, Sahl b. al-Faḍl (Yāšār b. Ḥesed) al-Tustarī who flourished
during the latter third of the eleventh century, as the work’s
author. Ben-Shammai, who has repeatedly discussed the work in
deepth, has convincingly argued for Sahl b. al-Faḍl al-Tustarī
being the author of the book.49

We began preparing a critical edition of the remains of al-
Uṣūl al-muḥaddabiyya, which was first brought to our attention
by David Sklare, in 2005–2006. While we initially worked on
the basis of a microfilm held by the Institute of Microfilmed
Hebrew Manuscripts (IMHM), National Library of Israel (F
60671), a digital copy of the microfilm is now available through
KTIV.50 Moreover, we inspected the original manuscript in May
2010 and again in March 2020 (S. Schmidtke), and we thank
the National Library of Russia for the opportunity to do so. It is
hoped that the edition will lead to the uncovering of additional
fragments of the codex and/or additional copies of al-Uṣūl al-
muḥaddabiyya.

---

48 See also Ben-Shammai (2020, 228–29). ‘Al-Muḥaddab’ is a common
laqab for the late Fāṭimid and early Ayyūbid periods in Egypt.
49 Ben-Shammai (2003; 2020).
50 See https://web.nli.org.il/sites/NLIS/en/ManuScript/Pages/Item.
asp?ItemID=PNX_MANUSCRIPTS000085404 [accessed 30 April 2020].
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**K. Laddāt al-dāt fī ʾitbāt waḥdat al-ṣifāt, by al-Faḍl b. Mufarrağ**

Firk. Arab. 652 (59 fols, 12.4 cm × 17 cm, 15 lines to a page, written in clear Arabic *nasḥ*) opens with a title page (fol. 1r; fig. 6.1) identifying the work contained in the fragment and its author: *K. Laddāt al-dāt fī ʾitbāt al-waḥda wa-l-ṣifāt*, by al-Faḍl b. Mufarrağ. Nothing is known about the author other than what can be gleaned from the present manuscript, which is fragmentarily preserved and heavily damaged towards the end (especially fols 52–59). The manuscript in its present form consists of the following physical units: fols 1–8 [Q8], 9–16 [Q8], 17–24 [Q8], 25–28 [Q4], 29 [SL], 30–39 [Q10], 40–49 [Q10], 50–51 [BF], 52 [SL], 53 [SL], 54–55 [BF], 56 [SL], 57 [SL], 58–59 [BF]. The quires are numbered throughout the codex, with numbers being added to the upper left hand corner of the recto page of the first leaf of each quire. In the fragment these are still visible on fols 30r (‘15’) (fig. 6.2), 40r (‘16’), 53r (‘14’), 56v (‘13’). The *K. Laddāt al-dāt* concludes on fol. 32v with the author’s announcement that he complemented the work with another tract devoted to questions of epistemology (*Risāla fī šināʿat al-istidlāl ʿalā ǧāl al-iḍmāl ...*). A substantial, consecutive portion of this second tract is preserved on fols 33–49 (fig. 6.3), though it is uncertain how much of the text is missing after it breaks off at the end of fol. 49v. Besides these two works, al-

---

51 The original binding of fols 30–49 was still visible in 2004.
52 The thread indicating that fols 50–51 constitute the middle of a quire was still preserved in 2004.
Faḍl b. Mufarraḡ refers towards the end of the chapter on generated effects (*bāb fi l-tawallud*) (fol. 17v) to another work of his, *K. al-Tahdīb*. The author also occasionally refers to some of the leading theologians among the Baṣrān Muʿtazilites, notably, Abū `Alī al-Ǧubbāʿī (fols 15v, 52v), Abū Hāšim al-Ǧubbāʿī (fol. 53v), and Abū `Abd Allāh al-Baṣrī (fol. 53v), and throughout the work, al-Faḍl b. Mufarraḡ endorses the positions of the Bahšamī school of the Muʿtazila.

The following fragments of the *K. Laḍḍāt al-dāt* are included in Ms. Firk. Arab. 652. While the position of fragments I and XII containing the work’s beginning and end are beyond doubt, the placement of the remaining fragments is tentative at best. The proposed arrangement of fragments II–VIII reflects the characteristic structure of Muʿtazili compositions on *uṣūl al-dīn* during the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The placement of fragment XI, in the course of which quire ‘14’ (fol. 53r) begins, before the final fragment XII (with quire ‘15’ starting on fol. 30r), is justified on codicological grounds. While the position of fragment IX (with quire ‘13’ beginning on fol. 56v) is also probable, the placement of fragment X is uncertain.

**Fragment I**

Fols 1–8 [Title page and opening section of *Laḍḍāt al-dāt*]

*Bāb fi wuḡāb iṭbāṭihi taʿālā* (fol. 2v)
*Bāb fi iṭbāṭ ḍāʾil tantahī ilayhi l-ḥawādiṭ* (fol. 5r)
Fragment II

Fol. 58

Bāb fi iṯbāthi taʿālā ḥayyan (fol. 58v)

Fragment III

Fol. 59

Bāb fi iṯbāthi taʿālā murīd wa-kārīh (fol. 59v)

Fragment IV

Fol. 25

[Rebuttal of Dualists]

Faṣl [fi l-Naṣārā]

Fragment V

Fol. 26

[Proof of mutual prevention (dalīl al-tamānuʿ)]

Fragment VI

Fol. 27

[God does not perceive through the senses]

Fragment VII

Fol. 28

[God is not driven by desire (šahwa)]

Bāb fi nafy l-ruʿya ʿanhu taʿālā

Fragment VIII

Fols 54 + 50–51 + 55

Bāb fi annahu taʿālā lā yuṣbih l-muḥḍaṭāt (fol. 54v)
Introduction

Bāb fi istihālat kawnīhi taʿālā maḥālan wa-ḥāllan fi ġilha (fol. 50r)
Bāb istihālat al-ḥāga ʿalayhi taʿālā (fol. 51v)

Fragment IX

Fol. 56 [Part of the discussion on scripture, it seems, possibly on the issue of abrogation, as it refers at the beginning to ‘expressions indicating eternal validity’ (alfāẓ al-taʿbid)]

Fragment X

Fol. 57 [Again part of the section on scripture, apparently on its function as an incentive (dāʿi)]

Fragment XI

Fols 9–16 + 52 + 53 Bāb fi l-naql wa-mā yatbaʿuhu (fol. 9r)
Bāb al-kalām fi l-kalām (fol. 12v)

Fragment XII

Fols 17–24 + 29–32 Bāb fi l-tawallud (fol. 17r)
Bāb al-kalām ʿalā l-munaḥḍimīn wa-man yağrı mağrāhum (fol. 17v)
Bāb fi l-qadāʾ wa-l-qadār (fol. 23v)
Bāb fi l-āğāl (fol. 24v)
Work on the edition began in 2004 when the National Library of Russia kindly provided us with a microfilm of Ms. Firk. Arab. 652. The original manuscript was inspected at various occasions. At the time of the first inspection (July 2004) the manuscript was still accessible in its original form, before it underwent restoration: the manuscript was unbound and its physical units could still be identified. Due to heavy damage of the last leaves of the manuscripts, fols 52–59 (some of which were still attached together at the time) were partly illegible. Additional inspections of the physical codex took place in May 2010 and in March 2020. The manuscript had in the meantime been restored, which significantly improved the legibility of fols 52–59. At the same time, the physical units of the manuscript could no longer be distinguished, as the codex had also been bound during restoration. Moreover, in some cases the microfilm of 2004 preserves more of the original text than the original manuscript in its current state (see, e.g., figs 6.4 and 6.5). A provisional attempt has been made to restore some of the textual portions that are missing due to damage to the manuscript. These are indicated by square brackets.

The spelling has been adapted to modern standard Arabic conventions and punctuation has been added to facilitate the

---

53 The digitised microfilm can be accessed via https://albert.ias.edu/bitstream/handle/20.500.12111/7899/Firk%20Arab%20652.pdf?sequence=18&isAllowed=y [accessed 14 June 2020].
reading of the text. The various features idiosyncratic to Middle Arabic have for the most part been retained in the edition. Only some minor corrections have been made to allow for greater readability of the text. As the manuscript is definitely not an autograph, it cannot be determined whether these features actually reflect the author’s language or were introduced by the scribe. Corrections include case endings, which are used in partial accordance to the norms of Classical Arabic, but sometimes omitted or overgeneralised; the addition of mood endings to distinguish between imperfect forms terminating in endings with or without \( n \), which are largely (though not consistently) absent in the manuscript; occasional corrections of gender (e.g., \( ḥāl \), which is invariably treated as masculine in the manuscript). All such emendations are mentioned in the apparatus.

7 Radd \textit{Ifḥām al-Yahūd}, by an anonymous Rabbanite author

Ms. St Petersburg, National Library of Russia, YA I 3020 (24 folios, 17 lines per page, written in semicursive oriental Hebrew script) contains fragments of \textit{Ifḥām al-Yahūd}, the renowned polemic against Judaism by the convert to Islam Samaw’al al-Mağribī (d. 570/1175), together with a refutation of this tract, both written in the same hand.\textsuperscript{54} An additional leaf containing

\textsuperscript{54} Samaw’al al-Mağribī’s \textit{Ifḥām al-Yahūd} has been published repeatedly, including three critical editions that reflect the state of scholarship of their time: Schreiner (1898; 1899) and Perlmann (1964) offered editions of the later recension of the \textit{Ifḥām}, and Marazka,
the final portion of the introduction to the refutation is preserved as Ms. YA II 470. Another fragment written in the same hand is preserved as Ms. YA I 1217, containing the beginning of a work.\textsuperscript{55} Since the fragment, which consists of a single page (fol. 1v, fol. 1r is left blank), contains only the \textit{hamdala} and breaks off before the text itself begins, it cannot be determined whether this fragment is indeed part of the refutation of \textit{Ifhām al-yahūd}. Therefore we did not include the text in the edition of the refutation, but rather included an image of Ms. YA I 1217, fol. 1v (fig. 7.6), together with a transcription of the text in the Appendix to the introduction.

The refutation was composed by a Rabbanite Jew. This is evident from the work’s introduction, in which the anonymous author evokes as authorities the writings of Rabbanite scholars such as the \textit{geonim} Samuel ben Ḥofni (d. 1034), Ḥai ben Šarīrā (d. 1038), and a certain Ibn al-Ḫašīš,\textsuperscript{56} and from the first-person plural wording ‘we, the majority of the Children of Israel, the Rabbanites and the religious scholars’ (\textit{li-annā maʿšar Bani Isrāʾīl al-Rabbāniyyūn wa-l-aḥbār}). Moreover, there is a lengthy note in the margin of Ms. YA II 470, fol. 1v (fig. 7.2), containing quotations from Saʿadya Gaon (d. 942), introduced as \textit{le-Rabbenu}


\textsuperscript{55} For a brief description and digital copy of the manuscript, see https://web.nli.org.il/sites/NLIS/en/ManuScript/Pages/Item.aspx?ItemID=PNX_MANUSCRIPTS000153156 [accessed 1 May 2020].

\textsuperscript{56} Possibly the eleventh-century Talmudist Ḥananel ben Ḥushiel, who served as head of the scholastic community of Qayrawān and corresponded with Ḥai Gaon.
Saʿadya, and on Ms. YA I 3020, fol. 8v (fig. 7.3), there is a long quotation in the margin from one of the writings of Daniel ben Moses al-Qumisī (flourished end of ninth, early tenth century), who is specifically identified as a Karaite. Noteworthy is also a note in Persian in the margin of Ms. YA II 470, fol. 1r (fig. 7.1), apparently added by a different hand in Arabic characters. Other than this, the extant fragments allow no conclusion as to when and by whom the refutation was written. Codicological comparison with other Genizah material suggests that the fragments are to be dated to the fourteenth century and were presumably written in Egypt.\footnote{A reference to Samawʿal's Ifḥām in the context of a discussion of the Muslim accusation that the Jews have distorted the Torah is included in Ms. YA I 888, fol. 9r:11. The entire manuscript, consisting of twelve folios, is apparently a collectanea of anti-Rabbanite polemics and Jewish apologetics against Islamic polemics. We are grateful to David Sklare for having pointed out this reference to us. For digital images of the manuscript, see https://web.nli.org.il/sites/NLIS/en/ManuScript/Pages/Item.aspx?ItemID=PNX_MANUSCRIPTS000152940 [accessed 1 May 2020].}

Neither the text of Ifḥām al-Yahūd nor the refutation are completely preserved; the leaves are in complete disorder, with numerous interruptions of text throughout.\footnote{For an edition of Samawʿal al-Maġribi’s Ifḥām al-Yahūd on the basis of Ms. YA I 3020, see Chiesa and Schmidtke (2006).} The following fragments of the refutation are preserved, and their probable sequence is as follows:

I: Ms. YA II 470, fol. 1
II: Ms. YA I 3020, fols 7, 8, 24
The extant fragments suggest that the refutation followed by and large the sequence of the *Ifḥām*. The individual sections open with brief allusions to the arguments adduced by the author of the *Ifḥām*, followed by detailed refutations. Occasionally, the anonymous author adduces more extensive quotations from the *Ifḥām*.59

Digital images of Ms. YA I 3020 that have been generated on the basis of a microfilm of the manuscript produced in 1995 are available through KTIV: Digitized Hebrew Manuscripts.60 The edition has been prepared on the basis of the microfilm copies held in the National Library of Israel. In 2006, Sabine

59 For an annotated English translation of the refutation, see Adang and Schmidtke (forthcoming).

60 Ms. YA I 3020 (NLI Film no. F 56412, accessible through https://web.nli.org.il/sites/NLIS/en/ManuScript/Pages/Item.aspx?ItemID=PNX_MANUSCRIPTS000154863), and Ms. YA II 470 (NLI Film no. F 58765, accessible through https://web.nli.org.il/sites/NLIS/en/ManuScript/Pages/Item.aspx?ItemID=PNX_MANUSCRIPTS000092559). The National Library of Russia kindly permitted us to publish facsimiles of those two manuscripts in their entirety. The facsimiles were made on the basis of the original manuscripts in their current form. Ms. YA II 470 is reproduced as figs 7.1 and 7.2. Ms. YA I 3020 in its entirety is available through https://albert.ias.edu/handle/20.500.12111/7899 [accessed 1 May 2020].
Introduction

Schmidtke consulted the original manuscripts in the National Library of Russia. By that time the manuscripts had undergone conservation measures, and portions of the text that had been visible on the microfilms were no longer visible. The National Library of Russia kindly provided us with digital images of the manuscripts in 2006, samples of which are included in the present publication.

The refutation is composed in Middle Arabic; deviations from classical Arabic have been left unchanged. These include the usage of Form VI (tawāʿud) for Form V (tawaʿʿud) in classical Arabic, or passive forms such as mafsūd rather than fāsid, according to classical Arabic, as well as the syntax of the text. Only obvious orthographic and lexicographical mistakes have been corrected, including relative pronouns (allaḏi, allatī, alladīna), which are sometimes used in congruence with classical Arabic, while this is not the case on other occasions. Abbreviations such asنس for ʿalayhi l-salām, و for qawlihi, and common usages such asلسما for lā siyyamā, have been transcribed in full.

Appendix: Transcription of Ms. YA I 1217, fol. 1v

بسم شوений تفلات مئاوي توات

الحمد لله على ما أنعم به من الحياة وكمال العقل واللد....

من شكره عز وجل الواجب عقلًا وشرعًا فسُبحان الله العظيم

شُرَقنا من سائر الأمم وأعطاناه نوراته المقدسة على يد

موسى عليه السلام سيِّد المرسلين الذي أتى بالآيات البيّنات والـ[....]

المُخرقة للعادات كقلب العصا حيّة وفطق البحر [....]
لمسى عليه السلام بالله كلمات وليني إسرائيل على طور سيد[بة ...]
كان فيه قدر ألفي ألف من الناس وشهدت به ونقلته لأولا[دها]
جبلًا بعد جبل على ممر الدهور في بلدها وفي أقطار الأرض
وليس في ذلك عددهما خلافًا البيت ولا في شريعتهم تُلف ولا
في كلمة فرد مع تشتت الأمة في العالم شرقًا وغربًا
الذي لا يجوز أن يتّم في ذلك ليس ولا حيلة ولا شعوذة ولا [سحرًا]
بوجوه من الوجه فحينئذ قويت حجّته عليه السلام ولزمنا فعل كل ما في
شريعته من التكليف بالأمر والنهي إذ كان ذلك يؤدي إلى عظيم
الثواب المقررون بالتبديل والتعظيم ويجوب على محاله العقاب
المقررون باللهوان والإسخاف ومن جملة ما في التكليف وجوب شـ
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