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General Introduction: From Jerome’s Latin Vulgate to the Mozarab Arabic Bible

In 382 CE, Pope Damasus I commissioned the acclaimed Latin Christian priest Jerome (d. 420) to translate the Bible into Latin. Jerome’s translation was preceded by a number of inconsistent and often unreliable Latin versions that had been in circulation in Africa and Europe since the second century CE. These older Latin translations were undertaken by a variety of known and unknown authors and they varied in their degrees of quality. Moreover, the Old Testament books of these early Latin texts were rendered into Latin via the Greek Septuagint, not directly from the Hebrew. Jerome’s first task was to revise the translations of the four Gospels on the basis of the most reliable Greek textual sources at his disposal. Then, from 390 to 405 CE, he undertook a new translation of the 39 books of the Hebrew Bible directly from the Hebrew Tanakh. Jerome’s masterful translation steadily gained recognition in the provinces of the Roman Catholic Church and was soon adopted as the definitive Latin translation of the Bible, superseding the older Latin versions. By the thirteenth century CE, Jerome’s translation came to be known simply as the versio vulgata, or the ‘commonly used version’.

Jerome’s translation was widely available among the indigenous Arabic-speaking Christians of al-Andalus, known as the Mozarabs (from musta‘rabūn, meaning ‘Arabicised’). As far as we can ascertain, Latin continued to be the primary liturgical language of the Mozarabic church, despite the fact that Mozarabs were thoroughly Arabicised by the fifth/eleventh century. Since the Latin Vulgate was not readily accessible to the average Mozarab, it is safe to assume that passages from the Bible, and in particular the Gospels, Pauline Epistles, and the Psalms, were being read out before Mozarab congregations in Arabic no later than the fifth/eleventh century.

The emergence of local Andalusī Arabic translations of the Bible had already begun by the late third/ninth century, and by the fourth/tenth century various segments of the Arabic Bible were probably available to the Jews, Christians, and Muslims of al-Andalus. It is apparently on the basis of Jerome’s Vulgata that the brilliant third/ninth-century Andalusī scholar Ḥafṣ b. Albar al-Qūṭī (d. 276/889) rendered
the Psalms into Arabic rajaz verse. This task, which he completed in 275/889, is often viewed as the watershed moment for the production of Christian-Arabic Mozarab literature in al-Andalus. Nonetheless, al-Qūṭī’s popular versified translation appears to have been preceded by earlier local renderings that we have no knowledge of, since the author expresses his disapproval of the hyperliteralism of a previous, and currently unknown, prose rendition of the Psalms in his introduction. Taking his lead from Ḥafṣ, Iṣḥāq b. Balashk al-Qurṭūbī translated the Gospels on the basis of Biblia Hispana or the pre-Jerome Vetus Latina in the mid fourth/tenth century. In addition to Ibn Balashk’s translation another independent translation seems to have existed, the dating and authorship of which are unknown, but which was based on the Hebrew-to-Latin translation of Heironym known as the Biblia Vulgata (Iuxta Hebraicam Veritatem). This anonymous translation had a smaller circulation in al-Andalus, although sometimes it was compared against passages of Ibn Balashk’s Arabic version for purposes of revision and correction.

Regrettably, our knowledge of the Andalusī Arabic Bible(s) is limited since the full translations of these works have not survived. The paucity of the surviving Mozarab literary sources is in contrast to the abundance of materials we have from the Christians of the Mashriq, and this disproportion mirrors the historical ups and downs of the Mozarab Christian community itself. This dearth of surviving Mozarab literature is not historically surprising given that the community as a whole was scattered, on account of either migrations to the northern Christian territories beginning in the fifth/eleventh century or forced deportation to North Africa in the sixth/twelfth century. Nor did it help that Catholic bishops of the northern kingdoms of Iberia deplored the Toledan Church for its Mozarabic liturgy and doctrine and for ‘submitting’ to Muslim rule. In fact, the very term ‘Mozarab’ (mustaʿrib) is an anachronistic label of opprobrium that harks back to fifth/eleventh-century Christian texts and was employed pejoratively against Toledan Christians. Ironically, therefore, the extinct Christian-Arabic tradition of Muslim Spain in general, and the Arabic Biblical texts in particular, is more likely to be excavated from indirect medieval Muslim and Jewish sources than from original Christian texts.

One such Muslim source that gives us a window into the Mozarab Arabic Biblical tradition is the written corpus of the Sevillan mystic and Qur’an commentator Ibn Barrajān (d. 536/1141). In sharp contrast to the general tendency of post-fourth/tenth-century Qur’anic exegetes in both the East and West (excepting in the modern period), this author seems to be the first Qur’anic exegete to seriously engage with the Bible non-polemically and through actual extended quotations. He freely incorporated Biblical materials into his works in order to explain the Qur’an and fill gaps in his understanding of Biblical figures and narratives. That is, Ibn
Barrajān probed into the Bible to further his understanding of the divine Word, whereas his medieval predecessors’ Biblical engagement was generally polemical and characterised by a desire (i) to claim that the Jews and Christians had corrupted their scriptures either textually or by way of errant interpretation; (ii) to find proof of Muḥammad’s prophecy in the Bible; and/or (iii) to correct Biblical narratives that did not align with Qur’anic ones. When pooled together, the Biblical passages in Ibn Barrajān’s extant works occupy approximately 20 full pages in modern print and are almost certainly taken from a Latin-to-Arabic Andalusī translation. Ibn Barrajān’s works are therefore of interest to scholars of both Qur’anic exegesis and Arabic Biblical literature.

This paper assesses Ibn Barrajān’s mode of engagement with the Bible in his extant body of writings. In it I demonstrate the different interpretive strategies marshalled by Ibn Barrajān to resolve perceived incongruities between narratives of the Qur’an and the Bible. I argue that the Bible enjoys the same degree of interpretive authority in his works as Prophetic reports (ḥadīth) and that there are instances where the Bible is not only allowed to complement but also challenge his understanding of the Qur’an. Ibn Barrajān’s openness to the Bible rests on his hermeneutical principle of ‘Qur’anic hegemony’; that is to say, his reasoning that the Qur’an, being God’s final and untampered divine revelation, enjoys epistemological supremacy and can serve as the ultimate litmus test by which all other scriptural passages, including the Bible, are to be judged and mined for wisdom. The Qur’an proclaims itself to be the conclusive revealed book of God which confirms, clarifies, safeguards, and, according to many, abrogates previous revelations. Taking these teachings to heart, Ibn Barrajān substantiates his approach to Biblical scholarship by means of the Qur’an. Pushing the premises of this principle as far as they will go, he argues that Biblical materials and ḥadīth reports are to be assessed solely on the basis of their alignment with the Qur’an. I propose that Ibn Barrajān’s far-reaching hermeneutical principle of Qur’anic hegemony may have been in part inspired by the scripturalist tendencies that are articulated in the writings of the Ṣāḥīḥī scholar Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1064).

This paper includes an exhaustive appendix and translation of the Latin-to-Arabic Biblical passages in Ibn Barrajān’s works. This compilation of scattered and heretofore unexamined Arabic Biblical materials demonstrates the parallels and occasional divergences between Ibn Barrajān’s Bible and its original Latin Vulgate equivalents, which confirm a Latin basis for the Arabic beyond reasonable doubt.

The Life and Works of Ibn Barrajān

ʿAbd al-Salām b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad b. Barrajān had already acquired the epithet ‘al-Ghazālī of al-Andalus’ during his own lifetime. Indeed, in the words of his biographer Ibn al-Zubayr (d. 708/1308), he was:10
One of the greatest men of the Maghrib, a leading scholar (imām) in theology, the Arabic language (lugha)\textsuperscript{11} and literature (adab);\textsuperscript{12} a knower (ārif) of both esoteric (ta'wil) and exoteric (tafsīr) interpretation of the Qur’an; a skilled, critical (naqqād), and outstanding grammarian; a leading scholar in everything he spoke of, and without peer. He was proficient in arithmetic (‘ilm al-ḥisāb), geometry (handasa), and so on. He possessed the greater part of every discipline (akhadha min kull ‘ilm bi-awfar ḥaẓẓ) and freely applied it to Ṣūfism and esoteric science (‘ilm al-bāṭin).

Born probably in Ifrīqiyya (present-day Tunisia) in the mid fifth/eleventh century, Ibn Barrajān’s family moved to Seville during a period of political instability in North Africa. He was one of the top pupils of the Sevillan ḥadīth scholar Ibn Manẓūr (d. 469/1077) with whom he studied the ḥadīth collection of al-Bukhārī. Ibn Barrajān went on to train a number of students in Seville and attract seekers of knowledge from around the Peninsula. He was a recluse who shunned fame and celebrity,\textsuperscript{13} and he chose to spend much of his adult life in a remote village west of Seville in al-Jarafe’s greater province (iqlīm al-Sharaf). Ibn Barrajān’s life ended in obscure and tragic circumstances. He was summoned along with two other prominent mystically inclined scholars (Ibn al-ʿArīf and Abū Bakr al-Mayūrqī) by the Almoravid emir to the capital of Marrakesh for a mock trial before an examining committee of jurists and died a few months thereafter in prison. One of his later biographers, al-Shaʿrānī (d. 973/1565), claims that he was arrested after scheming jurists falsely accused him of being imām, or political-spiritual leader, of 130 Andalusī villages. While al-Shaʿrānī’s claims are hard to verify, it is certain that Ibn Barrajān was perceived as a political threat. He was accused of unwarranted religious innovation (bidʿa) and his body was cast into the town’s garbage heap without due funeral rites. Owing to the intercession of Fez’s prominent Ghazālian Ṣūfī, ‘Alī b. Hirzihim (d. 557/1162), however, he was given a proper funeral, and his tomb in Marrakesh still stands.

Over the course of his long and prolific career Ibn Barrajān authored four sizeable works. The titles and sequence of these works are often confused in primary and secondary sources, but an accurate chronology of his corpus can be established on the basis of a close reading of his own internal references.\textsuperscript{14} His first work, al-Irshād ilā subul al-rashād (‘The Guidebook to the Pathways of Guidance’), is devoted to demonstrating that each Prophetic report found in the collection of Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj (Ṣaḥīh Muslim) is in total harmony with the Qur’an. He probably penned the Irshād between 480/1087 and 490/1096, that is, when he was in his thirties, having completed his ḥadīth studies under Ibn Manẓūr and while teaching ḥadīth in Seville. Although the Irshād is lost, it was quite influential among Qur’an exegetes, ḥadīth experts, and legal theorists (uṣūl al-fiqh), especially in the Mamlūk era, and key
passages from its introductory preface and first chapter have been preserved in the writings of the prolific Mamlûk scholar Badr al-Dīn al-Zarkashi’s (d. 794/1391) al-Burhān fī ‘ulûm al-Qur’ān (‘Demonstration of the Sciences of the Qur’an’). Ibn Barrajān’s second work is his celebrated Sharḥ asmā’ Allāh al-ḥusnā (‘Commentary on the Beautiful Names of God’), which is available in two recent critical editions that span approximately 700 pages. In the Sharḥ, he discusses the philological (istikhrāj lughawī), doctrinal (iʿtibār), and devotional (taʿabbud) significance of 137 divine names. As I argue elsewhere, the Sharḥ does not bear the mark of al-Ghazâlī’s works, and was therefore probably written prior to 495/1102, the year Abū Bakr b. al-ʿArabī introduced the works of al-Ghazâlī into al-Andalus.17

Ibn Barrajān then authored his major Qur’an commentary, which bears the lengthy title Tanbīh al-afhām ilā tadabbūr al-kitāb al-ḥakīm wa-ta’arruf al-āyāt wa-tanbīh al-ʿaẓīm (‘Alerting Intellects to Meditation on the Wise Book and Recognition of Symbols and the Tremendous Tiding [of Judgment Day]’). The Tanbīh has recently been made available in print in five volumes. The Tanbīh gained lasting fame primarily on account of a passage in which Ibn Barrajān accurately predicted the Muslim recapture of Jerusalem from the Crusaders in 583/1187—specifically the victory of the battle of Ḥaṭṭīn—based on an astrological analysis of the opening verses of Q. 30 (Sūrat al-Rūm). It was probably written between the years of 515/1121 and 525/1130, when he was 65 to 75 years of age, and the Īḍāḥ was presumably written thereafter. Shortly after finishing the Tanbīh, Ibn Barrajān authored his minor Qur’an commentary entitled Īḍāḥ al-ḥikma bi-ḥikmāt al-ʿibra (‘Deciphering Wisdom According to the Principles of the Cross-Over’). This work, which was a transcription of his lectures, is ‘minor’ in comparison with the slightly more lengthy Tanbīh. It spans approximately 600 manuscript folios, or 835 pages in the recent printed edition. Ibn Barrajān intended the Īḍāḥ as a supplement to the Tanbīh, and dictated his last work probably over the course of three or four years, that is, between 526/1131 and 530/1135, when he was between 76 and 80 years of age. It may be that the two tafsīrs were originally bound together and studied as one unit. The Biblical passages in this article are culled from his last three works, namely the Sharḥ, Tanbīh, and Īḍāḥ.

Ibn Barrajān and the Arabic Bible

To my knowledge, Ibn Barrajān is the earliest Qur’an exegete in Islamic history to employ the Bible extensively and for non-polemical purposes in his quest to understand the divine Word. His interest in the Bible can be detected already in his early commentary on the divine names. However, the influence of the Bible on his thought becomes progressively more pronounced in his major Qur’an commentary (Tanbīh al-afhām), and even more so in the later minor Qur’an commentary (Īḍāḥ al-ḥikma).
Ibn Barrajān was not the only exception to the medieval tendency to engage the Bible narrowly and polemically. The anonymous mystico-philosophical group of the fourth/tenth century, the ʿIkhwān al-Ṣafāʾ (‘Brethren of Purity’) quoted the Bible quite liberally in their Rasāʾil. During the same period, the Ismāʿīlī philosopher Ḥamīd al-Dīn al-Kirmānī (d. after 411/1020) made use of quotations from Jewish-Christian sources in his works. Since Ibn Barrajān was influenced by certain cosmological doctrines found in the Ikhwān’s Rasāʾil as well as Ismāʿīlī sources, he may have taken an interest in the Bible as prooftext for mystical teachings after reading these works.

The only other Qurʾān exegete of the sixth/twelfth-century to employ the Bible as an interpretive source of tafsīr was the near-contemporaneous eastern Šūfī author, Shams al-Dīn al-Daylamī (d. c. 593/1197), who cited passages from the Hebrew Bible in Arabic script. These Biblical citations seem to have been included in order to corroborate his interpretations of Qurʾānic passages such as Q. 42:11, Q. 2:30, and Q. 24:35. But Ibn Barrajān goes much further than al-Daylamī, both hermeneutically and quantitatively. Three centuries later the Mamlūk scholar of Egypt al-Biqāʿī (d. 885/1480) extensively employed Jewish and Christian scriptures for similar exegetical purposes. But while al-Biqāʿī’s sympathies with the Bible aroused controversy in Mamlūk Egypt, it is remarkable that Ibn Barrajān, who wrote during the height of the Crusades and the Reconquista, was not criticised by his scholarly peers for his inquiries into the Bible. This may be explained by the fact that he couched his works so thoroughly in the Qurʾān. Moreover, the late Almoravid rulers and their state-sponsored judges (qāḍīs) felt threatened not by Muslim Biblical studies but by the increasingly politicized epistemological claims of Šūfism, which posed a threat to the established political and religious structures of authority of the day. Curiously, the only hint of discomfort from a Muslim with Ibn Barrajān’s Biblical engagement appears on the cover of one manuscript of the Sharḥ, in which an anonymous scribe accuses him of being masīḥī (‘a Christian’).

This accusation is certainly false, but it does carry perhaps a suggestion of truth, for Ibn Barrajān’s third most important source of inspiration in his quest to understand of the divine Word is none other than the Bible—the first and second being respectively Qurʾān and hadīth reports. Ibn Barrajān freely incorporates Arabic Biblical material alongside hadīth to present his interpretations of Qurʾānic verses, which differ markedly from most mainline Sunnī exegetical interpretations.

**Ibn Barrajān’s Access to the Books of the Bible**

Ibn Barrajān quotes extensively from the Hebrew Bible, especially Genesis (chapters 1, 2, 3, 15, 18, 19, 22), and paraphrases a handful of passages from Exodus. Interestingly, the Torah (and especially Genesis) is cited more frequently than any other book of the Bible. In contrast to the Ikhwān who stress the Gospels
in their Rasāʾil, Ibn Barrajān never tires of reminding his reader that the Torah enjoys a special status among revealed scriptures mentioned in the Qur’an. He notes that the Torah is Qur’anically described as a discernment or ‘differentiation’ (tafṣīl) of all things: And We wrote for him [Moses] on the Tablets of everything an admonition, and a differentiation of all things (Q. 7:145). Ibn Barrajān takes this verse to mean that the Torah not only issues from God’s all-embracing knowledge, but also that it fleshes out or unpacks God’s undifferentiated (mujmal) knowledge as inscribed upon the Preserved Tablet (al-lawḥ al-maḥfūẓ). The Torah thus contains all knowledge of past, present, and future, and like the Qur’an it also contains predictions about what is to come. The Torah, in other words, is an important source of mystical inspiration and corresponds precisely to the ‘core’ of the Qur’anic revelation.

It is very likely that Ibn Barrajān came across commentaries upon the Torah in Arabic, specifically commentaries on Genesis and Exodus, since he claims to have consulted ‘commentaries upon some of the previously revealed Books’ in his discussion of Exodus (3:21–2). The extent to which these works were available in Arabic at the time does remain an open question. However, it is not unreasonable to assume that Ibn Barrajān had access to written or oral eastern commentaries authored by Jewish exegetes, like that of Saʿadiya Gaon (d. 331/942), or the ‘Irāqī Christian commentator Ibn al-Ṭayyib (d. 435/1043), or even local Biblical commentaries such as those produced by the contemporary, though younger, Jewish scholar Abraham Ibn Ezra (d. c. 563/1167).

Ibn Barrajān demonstrates a broad, albeit vague, familiarity with the Books of Prophets (kutub al-nubuwwāt), which he clearly distinguishes from the Torah. For instance, he points out that the kutub al-nubuwwāt frequently employ the metaphor of a ‘cup’ to denote good or evil. What is hermeneutically significant is that Ibn Barrajān accords the status of divine revelation (waḥy) to the kutub al-nubuwwāt, which are not explicitly listed as revelatory in the Qur’an. Furthermore, Ibn Barrajān cites the kutub al-nubuwwāt to deepen his knowledge of the Qur’an and, in at least one instance, to correct a conventional interpretation accorded to Q. 2:243 by Sunnī exegetes (see his discussion of Ezekiel 37:1–10 in appendix). In the following passage, Ibn Barrajān quotes Ezekiel 1:10 from memory, and possibly through a secondary Islamic source, to expound upon the angelic carriers of the divine throne:

The Qur’an commentators have related that according to the earliest books, the throne has four angels—peace be upon them—and they also mention that one of them resembles a human, the second an eagle, the third an ox, and the fourth a lion. This is what has been related in the prophecies of some of the prophets—peace be upon them all—describing their night journeys. Likewise, it has
been related that the carriers of the mighty throne are Mīkāʾīl, Isrāfīl, and two others whose names have slipped my mind. And God knows best.

Before we turn to the New Testament, it is curious to note that Ibn Barrajān only occasionally cites Isrāʾīliyyāt accounts to drive home a point in his tafsīr. These Isrāʾīliyyāt sometimes include hadīth literature in which Muhammad relates anecdotes about Jewish prophets. Isrāʾīliyyāt did not seem to have attracted much of his attention and therefore occur with much less frequency than Biblical citations. However, qurʾānically validated Isrāʾīliyyāt enjoy more or less the same level of authority in his writings as hadīth and Biblical material.

In terms of the New Testament, Ibn Barrajān quotes only from the Gospel of Matthew (chapters 4, 11, 13, 20, and 24). He does not evince any knowledge of the existence of Mark, Luke, and John (al-anājīl al-arbaʿ) and, similarly, there are no indications that he had access to an Arabic translation of the Diatessaron, such as Ibn al-Ṭayyib’s so-called Arabic Gospel Harmony. He equates the Gospel (injīl) with Matthew, and emphasises that the Qur’an acclaims it as a source of guidance, light, and admonition (And We sent, following in their footsteps, Jesus son of Mary, confirming the Torah before him and We gave to him the Gospel, wherein is guidance and light, and confirming the Torah before it, as a guidance and an admonition unto the godfearing. Q. 5:46), terms which the Qur’an ascribes to itself (Q. 10:57; Q. 4:174). The implication for Ibn Barrajān is evident: that one must seek the channels of guidance, light, and admonition in both the Qur’an and the Gospel. However, it is noteworthy that Ibn Barrajān does not accord the same status to the Gospels as he does to the Torah. While the Christian revelation is certainly a channel of guidance and light, it does not stand as a differentiation of the Preserved Tablet in the same way as the Qur’ānically affirmed status of the Torah. To some extent, therefore, the Torah enjoys more interpretive weight in his writings than the Gospels.

Three points are worth mentioning with regard to Ibn Barrajān’s interaction with the Gospel of Matthew. First, Ibn Barrajān sometimes describes the Gospels not as the word of God, as understood in the Qur’ānic context, but as a collection of statements made by Jesus. Second, he was well aware of the fact that certain hadīth reports had direct parallels in the Gospels. For instance, he quotes a famous hadīth qudsi, or statement attributed to God outside of the Qur’an, from Šāhīḥ Muslim, in which God addresses humanity: ‘Oh son of Adam, I was ill and you did not visit me; I was hungry and you did not feed me; I was thirsty and you did not give me to drink! The Son of Adam responds: Oh Lord, when were You hungry, so that you could be fed? Or naked, so that you can be clothed? God—may He be glorified—answers: had you done that for my servant, you would have done that for Me.” For Ibn Barrajān, such parallels confirm the veracity and ultimately divine origin of both statements.
Second, the Christian theological doctrine of original sin, which developed in the Latin theology of Augustine during the late fourth/early fifth century CE, left a faint trace in Ibn Barrajān’s thought and especially his narrative of the fall of man. For instance, in a report about Muḥammad’s nocturnal ascent to heaven narrated by al-Bukhārī and others, the father of mankind, Adam, is described as sitting among his descendants in the heavens. He looks at those who are to his right and smiles; and then looks at those who are to his left and cries. Ibn Barrajān explains that Adam cries on behalf of those who, like himself, were beguiled by Satan. Their being beguiled, he explains, ‘was in them [i.e., in their nature] like an inheritance’ (kānat fīhim kal-wirātha). Ibn Barrajān’s explanation of man’s ‘inherited sin,’ which is passed down trans-generationally, appears to be influenced by the Christian theological doctrine of original sin, which he may have received orally.

Further, original sin dovetails with Ibn Barrajān’s soteriological pessimism since, in his eyes, heaven and hell are decreed by God in pre-eternity.

Of all Biblical books, the Psalms, which Ibn Barrajān usually equates with the zabūr, inform his writings the least. It is not certain whether he had access to an Arabic translation of the Psalms or if he ever read them in their entirety. In any case, the Psalms do not deal with narrative Biblical material and supply few prooftexts for his purposes. Ibn Barrajān describes in several of his passages how the Psalms contain the oft-repeated refrain ‘Oh David, hear what I say, and the truth I say, be such and such; Oh David, heard what I say, and the truth I say, do not do such and such.’ However, this recurring refrain can be found in early Muslim sources, and so there is no proof that Ibn Barrajān used the Arabic rajaz rendering of the Vulgate Psalms by Ḥafṣ b. Albar al-Qūṭī. Our author’s understanding of the Psalms comes across in his statement:

God said [in the Qur’an]: For We have written in the Zabūr, after the Remembrance, ‘The earth shall be the inheritance of My righteous servants’ (Q. 21:205). The zabūr could mean all [divinely revealed] books, or it could mean [the Psalms], which were sent down to David; and this [latter meaning] is more probable.

The Epistemological Hegemony of the Qur’an

Ibn Barrajān affirms that the Qur’an is superior to previously revealed scriptures since it is the last of these scriptures and therefore both embraces and ‘guards’ (muhaymin) all preceding revelations from error. He counsels his reader:

Whenever you desire to read the Torah, the Gospel, the Scrolls of Abraham, Moses, Noah, Ṣāliḥ, or any prophet or messenger, then read the Qur’an [instead]. For it is God’s straight path to which all previously sent [messengers] were guided.
At the same time, Ibn Barrajān applies the oft-recurring polysemic Qur’anic word *al-kitāb* (e.g. Q. 5:48) to all revealed scriptures, including ‘the Torah, the Gospel, the Psalms, and all divinely revealed scriptures’. Moreover, the utility of previous scriptures lies in the fact that they elucidate or ‘differentiate’ (tafṣīl) God’s all-embracing knowledge inscribed in the Preserved Tablet, which he occasionally refers to as ‘the Mother of the Book’ (*umm al-kitāb*). In the following passage, Ibn Barrajān promotes an engagement with non-Qur’anic sources of revelation, including the Torah, Gospels, Psalms, and ‘all other scriptures’ as a means of guidance and of deepening one’s understanding of the contents of God’s essential, undifferentiated knowledge inscribed upon the Mother of the Book:

God says: And those [godfearing] who believe in what has been sent down to thee and what has been sent down before thee (Q. 2:4). Our Qur’an, and the previous Books including the Torah, Gospels, Psalms, and all other scriptures are together a guidance for those who have certainty, since they give report of God’s good pleasure, and on the whole they alert to what was inscribed upon the Mother of the Book.

In other passages, Ibn Barrajān clearly states that the Qur’an is the most reliable revealed source. He argues that it serves as a litmus test against which the veracity of previous revelations and especially Biblical material can be gauged. Standing on firm Qur’anic grounds, Ibn Barrajān advocates the usage of all revealed books without exception, books which he describes as ‘scrolls ennobled by the exalted revelation’ (*al-ṣuḥuf al-mukarrama bi’l-wahy al-ʿalî*). Notably, the tone of Ibn Barrajān’s justification for the use of the Bible is not defensive but matter of fact. He affirms that any Biblical passage should be accepted as authentic if it is confirmed by the Qur’an (*miṣdāquhu min al-Qurʾān*). His selection of Biblical material is thus dictated primarily by the Qur’an. That is, Ibn Barrajān assimilates biblical materials into his writings as long as (i) they accord with his understanding of the Qur’an text, and (ii) they complete and/or elaborate upon narratives that the Qur’an does not fully develop. It is notable, for instance, that he does not pick material from the story of Joseph, which is already sufficiently detailed for his purposes in the Qur’an. Similarly, biblical accounts about Moses receive little attention. In contrast, stories of the Seven Days of Creation, Adam, and Abraham, which belong to the early chapters of Genesis and are less developed in the Qur’an, play an important role in Ibn Barrajān’s exegetical writings. His recurring discussions of the Eleventh Hour in Matthew enrich his discussions of Q. 57:28 and a ḥadīth report from al-Bukhārī’s Ṣaḥīḥ collection (*Kitab al-Ijāra*, see below).

Ibn Barrajān takes his principle of Qur’anic hegemony a step further. He proclaims that the veracity of a Prophetic ḥadīth report is not to be assessed in light of the soundness of its chain of transmission (*isnād*) but rather in connection to its...
accordance with the Qur’an. Thus, even though Ibn Barrajān rhetorically distances himself from the content of the Bible by introducing each passage with the cautionary formula ‘it is said in the book that is said to be the Gospel/Torah’ (fī-kiṭāb alladhī yuḍhkaru annahu al-injil/al-tawrāh), in effect both the Bible and the ḥadīth enjoy equal weight in his writings since they are always weighed against and validated by the Qur’an. In fact, Ibn Barrajān frequently refers to passages from Genesis and elsewhere as ḥadīth (lit. ‘speech’) instead of āya (‘verse/sign’) or waḥy (‘revelation’) and, just as he inserts his own pious formulae following references to God and prophets in ḥadīth reports, he does the same when citing biblical materials.

Ibn Barrajān’s principle of Qur’anic hegemony is indicative of a literalist Zāhirī streak that runs through his writings, a streak that was strongly influenced by ḥadīth. It is not coincidental that biographers like Ibn al-Zubayr describe him as a scholar who ‘bound his opinions to the outward [meanings] of the Book and the Sunna’. Ibn Barrajān’s notion that Biblical passages and ḥadīth reports, regardless of their historicity, should be accepted or rejected expressly on the basis of their concordance with the Qur’an marks a radical departure of mainstream legal and theological thinking in Sunnī Islam. He endorses the idea that even a prophetic report that has a fabricated chain of transmission (mawḍūʿ) should be accepted as ‘true’ if it is in alignment with the message of the Qur’an. This powerful ‘principle of Qur’anic hegemony’ undermines the entire isnād approach to Sunnī ḥadīth. Ibn Barrajān’s drastic scripturalism, his opposition to the Sunnī scholarly consensus (ijmāʿ), his occasional criticism of taqlīd and the madhhabs, and his undercutting of the Sunnī tradition of assessing ḥadīth reports on the basis of chains of transmission seems to betray a Zāhirī leaning in his thought. After all, the writings of Ibn Ḥazm were accessible and widely known to the scholars of sixth/twelfth-century Muslim Spain, especially in Seville. Ibn Barrajān likely came into contact with the teachings of this school and may have taken inspiration from them to broaden, instead of restrict his engagement with the Bible.

The Supersession of Pre-Islamic Religions (naskh)

Ibn Barrajān took an interest in the devotional practices of other religions and in their symbolic meanings. For instance, he notes how Roman Catholics in al-Andalus perform baptismal ceremonies in which the new initiate is immersed in holy water (māʾ al-maʾūdiyya) to provide protection against evil and wash away sins. He remarks that this rite is typically carried out in the presence of a group, who ‘touch the newly baptised Christian, thereby emulating all of the created existents which, by virtue of having been ‘touched’ by God, also possess an intrinsic love and yearning [for their Creator].
But for all his openness to scriptures and his curious inquiry into the practices of other religions, it must be emphasised that Ibn Barrajān was a firm believer in the dogma of ‘supersessionism’ whereby Islam supersedes or abrogates Christianity, just as the latter is understood to have superseded Judaism. Salvation in the afterlife, therefore, is only possible within the framework of the Qur’anic message brought by Muhammad. All other religions are devoid of salvific efficacy. Ibn Barrajān plainly articulates this point of view in many of his writings and especially on his commentary on Q. 2:89, When there came to them a Book from God, confirming what was with them—and they aforetimes prayed for victory over the unbelievers—when there came to them what they recognised, they disbeliefed in it; and the curse of God is on the unbelievers.

What follows is a translation of Ibn Barrajān’s commentary on Q. 57:26-29 in which he outlines his pessimistic understanding of the history of Christianity and Judaism. The passage suggests that all the true followers of Christianity were killed off by their religio-political opponents and that the Torah and Gospels suffered from severe distortions either by way of false interpretation (taḥrif al-ma‘nā) or textual forgery (taḥrif al-naṣṣ) by the mainstream Christian community. He begins by stating that God revealed the Gospel (Injīl) upon Jesus as a confirmation of the Torah, which was sent upon the Children of Israel. Some believed in him and affirmed the Torah and the Gospels, while others refused him:

Until the day a king appeared who changed the Torah and the Gospels, and he was followed by the Byzantines and Greeks. Then bishops were summoned from various parts of the earth, and they assigned three hundred and a few dozen bishops to compile a canon (qānūn) which would be imposed upon the people of their dominions; and so they did. Then the followers of Jesus were killed and torn to pieces, save a few who were protected by the regime of the day. These [survivors] continued to recite the Torah and the Gospels, and to worship God until the day they were succeeded by a generation who complained about them to their king, and they said: ‘None has insulted us with such a grave insult as these [Christians] because they recite in the Torah “Whosoever does not judge according to what God sent down, they are the disbelievers,” and in the Gospels “Whosoever does not judge according to what God sent down, they are the unrighteous, and they are the digressers.” And in our own book [the Qur’an] we read So judge between them according to what God has sent down, and do not follow their caprices, to forsake the truth that has come to thee (Q. 5:48) and Had they performed the Torah and the Gospel, and what was sent down to them from their Lord, they would have eaten both what was above them, and what was beneath their
feet (Q. 5:66).’ And we have previously discussed how the earlier scriptures can be deduced from the Qur’an for those who seek to do so and are facilitated for the task.

Interpretive Solutions to Inter-Scriptural Incongruities

i) Historical Contextualisation

Having outlined Ibn Barrajān’s general understanding of and approach to the Bible, let us look at the interpretive strategies that he uses to explain perceived scriptural incongruities between Qur’anic narratives and Jewish and Christian sources. Contrary to expectations, Ibn Barrajān does not evoke the epistemological hegemony of the Qur’an to resolve perceived tensions between the Qur’an’s narratives and those of other scriptures. Instead, he resorts to what may be called ‘historical contextualization.’ He insists that each divine revelation was tailored by God for the community that was destined to receive it, and that perceived incongruities often result from cultural, geographic, and even climatic particularities of the community that God is addressing. For instance, much like the philosopher al-Farābī (d. 339/950), he notes that religions are divinely tailored for the ultimate purpose of salvation. Thus, hellfire is often Qur’anically described as hot, but in the New Testament it is said to be a place of freezing. This, he reasons, is because the Qur’an was revealed to Arabs for whom coolness is a blessing and heat a curse; whereas the New Testament was destined for northern European inhabitants of cold temperatures for whom heat is a blessing and coolness a curse. Thus, he reasons, Hell comprises a freezing quarter designated for sinful Christians and a hot quarter for sinful Muslims. For Ibn Barrajān, as for later exegetes such as Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328), God’s tailoring His message to different peoples is a manifestation of divine mercy, since God wants His servants to fear Hell and therefore describes it in a way that would most terrify listeners:

It is repeatedly mentioned in the book that is said to be the Gospel: Cast this wicked servant into the lower darkness; there shall be prolonged weeping and gnashing teeth. This expression denotes freezing [temperatures], because the region where the people to whom Jesus was sent is predominantly cold. They suffered in this life from the cold of that region. They used to fight it with heat, and would protect themselves with [heat] from the harm [of cold]. This is in contrast to the state of the [Arab] people of the [desert] region where the Qur’an descended. There is far-reaching wisdom behind this twofold division of God’s address [to humanity]: that [the message] may be a source of more awe in their souls, and that it may be a more stinging whip of fear
for their hearts, and more effective in inspiring fear and grief in them, and that it may prompt their inner souls to flee from the imminent threat [of Hell]. And herein the excellence of His mercy becomes apparent through His address. For He created Hellfire from the whip of His mercy, in order to impel His servants to flee from it to His heaven.

Or it may also be that God knew that the [Arab] disbelievers who live in the hot region of the earth would dwell in the region of Hellfire that is predominantly hot; whereas the disbelievers of the cold regions would inhabit the region [of Hell] which is predominantly cold. All this in order for His books and messengers to be affirmed, and in order for the punishment of this life to connect to the punishment of the hereafter, and in order that they be given the like thereof (Q. 2:25), and God is the Knowing, the Wise.'

ii) Allegorical Interpretation (ta‘wil)

The second tactic that Ibn Barrajān commonly resorts to in order to align Qur’anic narratives with Biblical ones is allegorical interpretation (ta‘wil). For instance, he uses ta‘wil to explain the allegorical significance of the Tree of Life and the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, which do not feature prominently in Islamic eschatological literature. In the Qur‘an, only one tree is featured and there is no explicit mention of the Tree of Life. Ibn Barrajān therefore puts forth three possible interpretations for the two trees. (i) These names were falsified by Jews (taḥrīf) and are not genuine revelations. This possibility is expressed but not emphasised by Ibn Barrajān. (ii) The trees were so named by Satan himself in order to lure Adam and Eve into disobeying God’s command in Genesis 3:4–5. (iii) The trees can be allegorically interpreted (ta‘wil) to denote respectively the divine command (amr), which, when heeded, gives way to blissful immortality in the hereafter, and prohibition (nahy), which, when transgressed, results in punishment in the hereafter. The Tree of Life, which symbolises God’s commands, is a door onto the hereafter whereas the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil is a door onto this world. Adam ate from the latter and was expelled to this world. Therefore, Ibn Barrajān reasons somewhat obliquely that had Adam eaten from the Tree of Life instead of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, he and his progeny would have lived eternally in Eden but would have never been raised to heavenly Paradise.70

Does the Bible Challenge the Qur’an?

A particularly fascinating aspect of Ibn Barrajān’s exegetical use of Biblical material is that on the rare occasion in which ḥadīth and Biblical material are aligned in meaning, they are accorded the same level of authority as a Qur’anic verse. Furthermore, when a ḥadīth report and a Biblical passage agree on a
meaning that stands at odds with the Qur’an, they may actually challenge the meaning of a particular Qur’anic passage. In such a case, Ibn Barrajān affirms the veracity of each source—the Qur’anic verse, the contradicting hadīth report, and the Biblical passage—even if he is unable to entertain a solution to the apparent contradiction. His acceptance of such scriptural paradoxes is suggestive of the Ash’ārī principle of ‘without how’ (bilā kayf), which he evokes occasionally in his writings.71

For instance, Ibn Barrajān notes that despite the Qur’an’s emphasis on God’s transcendence (tanzīh) vis-à-vis creation in verses such as there is nothing as His like (Q. 42:11), there are certain Biblical passages, as well as hadīth reports, which state explicitly that the human being was created in the image of God. Although the Qur’an is the most authoritative scriptural source for Ibn Barrajān, it cannot trump the combined authority of the Bible and hadīth. Ibn Barrajān therefore concedes that ‘both are true’ without being able to provide an explanation:72

Caveat: This previous [Biblical] passage mentions Let us make man in Our image, after Our likeness (Gn 1:26), and the Qur’an confirms and protects the books that came before it, and God states truthfully: there is nothing as His like (Q. 42:11), and He says and none is equal to Him (Q. 112:4). Yet, the Prophet said in an authentic report that ‘God created Adam upon His image’ and in another, ‘upon the image of the All-Merciful’, and both [the seemingly conflicting Qur’anic verses and the hadīth reports] are true, and God speaks the truth and guides to [His] way.

In sum, while both hadīth and Biblical material are equally weighed against the Qur’an, the interpretive weight accorded to each may vary according to context. Depending on which Biblical or hadīth passage is being cited, Ibn Barrajān may either accord the Bible as much weight as a complementary hadīth, or more weight than a hadīth, or the reverse.

Two extremes: Ibn Ḥazm’s versus Ibn Barrajān’s Biblical Engagement:

The sharp-tongued and controversial Cordoban polymath Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1064) is known for his articulation of one of the most polemical onslaughts against the Hebrew Bible and New Testament. He famously deplored the Bible as being historically unreliable, internally contradictory, rationally absurd, and morally decadent. Ibn Ḥazm’s Biblical sources remain unclear, though it is safe to assert that he relied mostly on Arabic translations that were at his disposal. It is almost certain that Ibn Ḥazm had more than one incomplete translation of the Torah at hand, since he occasionally compares his translations side by side. In all likelihood, his was not a complete translation of the Torah, but rather an abridgement that he compared against another written source or even against oral informants.73
Modern scholars are in disagreement as to whether Ibn Ḥazm had access to Saʿadya Gaon’s (d. 331/942) translation of the Torah, a local Latin-to-Arabic rendering, or even a Karaite source. Ibn Ḥazm definitely drew parts of his Biblical knowledge from earlier Muslim sources. One of these, which does not appear to have been used prominently by Ibn Barrajān, was Ibn Qutayba’s (d. 276/889) Aʿlām al-nubuwwa (‘Signs of Prophethood’). Ibn Ḥazm lifts lengthy excerpts of Biblical foretellings of Muḥammad from the Aʿlām in his Kitāb al-uṣūl wa’l-furūʿ (‘Book of Roots and Branches’).

It is certain that Ibn Barrajān did not extract his knowledge of the Bible from Ibn Ḥazm’s polemical work, Kitāb al-Faṣl fī’l-milal wa’l-ʿarāʾ wa’l-nihal (‘The Book of Discernment Between Religions, Doctrines, and Sects’). Rather he, like Ibn Ḥazm, probed into the Bible using translations that were at his disposal. As far as I can ascertain, the scattered Biblical quotations in Ibn Ḥazm’s Faṣl only overlap loosely in seven instances with Ibn Barrajān’s Biblical citations. Other than the Faṣl, I have not detected overlaps in Ibn Barrajān’s writings with Ibn Ḥazm’s earlier works. As the chart below indicates, these overlapping translations come from Genesis (2, 3, 15) and Matthew (11, 13, 24).

Broadly speaking, Ibn Ḥazm and Ibn Barrajān’s hermeneutical engagement with the Bible is almost antipodal. Ibn Ḥazm’s paramount concern is to show that the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament are replete with internal contradictions. Ibn Barrajān, on the other hand, had little interest in the supposed internal contradictions of the Bible and rather tried to incorporate Biblical material into his exegetical works to deepen his understanding of the Qur’an. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that, for the former, the de facto assumption is that the Bible was tampered with (mubaddal) and falsified (muḥarraf) unless proven otherwise; for the latter, the Bible is an authentically and divinely preserved revelation unless there is strong evidence to prove its inauthenticity. As we have seen, even in cases where the Bible is not in alignment with the Qur’an, it is still possible to resolve the incongruities in Ibn Barrajān’s eyes without resorting to the idea that Jewish and Christian communities distorted the meaning or wording of their scriptures.

In addition to differences in outlook, it should be noted that Ibn Ḥazm had a minimal knowledge of Hebrew, whereas Ibn Barrajān appears to have had none whatsoever. Moreover, Ibn Ḥazm had a broader knowledge of the Bible since he had access to the four gospels, whereas Ibn Barrajān equates the injīl only with Matthew. Sometimes Ibn Barrajān states that he is quoting from memory and cites different possible alternatives for a given word in Matthew. There is little evidence, however, that Ibn Barrajān had multiple translations of the Bible at his disposal. His focus on Matthew is no surprise, since the first Gospel occupied a central position in the Mozarab community of al-Andalus from the beginning.
Notably, the bulk of Ibn Ḥazm’s quotations are from Matthew as well, although a few are from Mark, Luke, and John. Nonetheless, it is not impossible that Ibn Barrajān had heard of the four Gospels but deliberately chose to omit anything about their existence in order to eschew polemics.

Two more conclusions can be drawn from a close comparison of the translations used in the works of Ibn Ḥazm and Ibn Barrajān. First, although the translations are not identical, the stylistic flow of the Arabic in the version of Genesis quoted by both Ibn Ḥazm and Ibn Barrajān is similar, and both renderings lack the idiosyncratic Hebraisms often found in medieval Jewish translations of the Hebrew Bible. Unlike Jewish Arabic versions of the Bible in the Mashriq, such as the famous one by Saʿadiya Gaon, which was possibly available in sixth/twelfth century-Muslim Spain, the Mozarab translations of the Bible into Arabic lack the distinctive features of translations influenced by Hebrew, Greek, Syriac, and Aramaic source languages. Second, some of the same stylistic observations can be made for passages in Matthew, whose phrases bear some similarity to Qur’anic language. On the whole, however, there seem to be less discrepancies between Ibn Ḥazm’s and Ibn Barrajān’s Matthew translations than in their versions of Genesis.

There is no evidence to categorically exclude the possibility that Ibn Barrajān’s sources came from the East. However, one may speculate based on stylistic considerations that Ibn Ḥazm and Ibn Barrajān drew from similar Latin-to-Arabic translation traditions in al-Andalus, which have yet to be fully mapped out. The few textual differences that can be detected in both authors’ versions do not necessarily imply that they used the Bibles of two different translators. Just as cherished classical Arabic qaṣīdas were ‘living’ texts that were modified by poets over time, Mozarab Arabic Biblical translations of the Hebrew Bible and the Gospel of Matthew evolved over the centuries as successive generations of Mozarab scholars tweaked and refined the Arabic recensions. Since the Arabic translation of the Vulgate never acquired the same canonical status as Jerome’s Latin translation, Mozarab scholars would have felt free to insert their personal stylistic modifications. If this is the case, then passages of Ibn Hazm’s Bible may represent earlier versions of the same Arabic Vulgate translation used by Ibn Barrajān one century later and/or represent the re-introduction of cherished pre-Jerome old Latin readings by North African and Andalusī copyists into the Mozarab Bible.
Appendix of Biblical Material in Ibn Barrajān’s Works

The following appendix contains the Biblical quotations used by Ibn Barrajān in his works, together with parallel English translations. The verses are laid out according to the chapter and verse sequence of the Latin Vulgate, which Ibn Barrajān does not refer to. The passages cited below are primarily from Genesis and Matthew. For reasons of space, an exhaustive collection of Ibn Barrajān’s commentary on the Bible is not included. The author’s exegetical opinions, however, are often voiced between the cited verses and provide a taste of his engagement with biblical material.

With regard to the Arabic translation of the Bible used by Ibn Barrajān, even the most cursory comparison of his passages reveal striking similarities with Jerome’s Vulgate translation. The minor points of divergence between his Arabic translation and the Latin Vulgate suggests that the translation used by Ibn Barrajān was probably collated against pre-Jerome Latin translations. Important differences and omissions are underlined in the main text and specified in the endnotes.

Hebrew Bible:

Genesis 1:1–31, 2:1–7. The Seven Days of Creation

The opening of Genesis is one of Ibn Barrajān’s favorite Biblical passages because it supplements and complements the Qur’anic narrative of creation. The following passage is part of his commentary on Q. 11:7, *And it is He who created the heavens and the earth in six days, and His Throne was upon the waters*:

In the first book of the alleged Torah, [God] says:

1. Truly, God created the heaven and the earth.
2. And it was barren and empty, and darkness [was] upon the abyss, and the spirit of God moved upon the waters.
3. And God—Mighty and Majestic—said: let there be light, and light came to be.
4. And God was pleased with the light, and He divided it from the darkness.
5. And He called the light day, and the darkness night, and the day and the night were a first day.
6. Then God—Mighty and Majestic—said: let there be a partition in the midst of the waters, that parts of the waters may be

 يوماً واحدًا
Then God created the partition, and He divided the waters that were under the partition from those that were above it.

And God called the heaven a firmament, and the night and the day were a second day.

Then God—glorious is His speech—said: let the waters that are under the heaven gather together unto one place so that the land may appear; and it was so.

And He called the land Earth; and the gathering together of the waters Sea: and God saw that His affair was good.

And He said: let the earth bring forth the green herb that produces its own seed, each according to its kind; and the fruit tree yielding fruit after its kind, whose offshoots come from it within the earth; and it was so.

And God produced the green herb, each according to its kind; and the earth produced trees yielding their fruit, each according to the measure of their kind. And God was pleased with that.

And the day and the night completed a third day.

And God—Mighty and Majestic—said: let there be lights in the heaven so that the day will become distinct from the night; and let them be as signs marking the seasons, days, and years.

And to illuminate the firmament and give light upon the earth. And it was so.

And God made two great lights; the greater one He made as light of day, and the lesser one as light of the night alongside the stars.

And He fixed them in the firmament to give light upon the earth,

And to preside over the day, and to divide the light and the darkness on its account; and God saw that it was good.

And the night and day completed the fourth day.

Then God—Mighty and Majestic—said: let the fish that hath life be created in the waters, and fowl that fly in the open.

Then God created great beasts, and every living creature that came into existence from the waters, after their kind, and God was pleased with it.

And He blessed them, saying: grow and multiply, and fill the waters of the sea; and...
He said to the fowl: multiply in the earth.

Then God—glorious is His speech—said: let there be created from the earth living creatures in their kind, and cattle, and creeping creature, and predatory beasts of the earth after their types; and it was done.

And God created the predatory beasts of the earth according to multiple kinds, and every creature that creeps upon the earth after their types: and God saw that His affair was beautiful.

And He said: let us create man in Our image and likeness, that he may rule over the fish of the sea, the fowl of the air, and all the cattle of the earth and every creeping creature.

Then God created man in His own image and likeness, male and female.

And God blessed both of them, and He said: multiply and fill the earth, and replenish it, and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and the fowl of the air, and over all living creatures that moveth upon the earth.

And God—Mighty and Majestic—said: Behold, I have made permissible for you every plant that is produced by the earth, namely its vegetables, herbs, and seed-produce, and every kind of fruit-bearing tree; that you may eat from them and be nourished thereof.

And that all living creatures may take nourishment from them, namely beasts of the earth, and fowl of the air, and every creature that creeps upon the earth, wherein there is life, that there may be food for them; and it was so.

And God completed all His creation, and all of it very good. And the day and the night completed a sixth day.

Thus God—Mighty and Majestic—completed the creation of the heavens and the earth in all their beauty.

And on the seventh day God completed what He had created; and He ceased on that [day] from [creating] what He had created.

And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because on that [day] He ceased from [creating] what He had created.

On the day that the Lord God created the heaven and earth,
And every tree of the earth before the earth brought it forth, and before it brought forth its herb; for the Lord God had not sent rain upon the earth, nor was there a man to inhabit it.

But it was watered by a spring which rose out of it.

Then the Lord God formed man of the slime of the earth, and He breathed into his face the breath of life; and he became a human with a living breath.

And all the trees of the earth before the earth brought forth its herb; for the Lord God had not sent rain upon the earth, nor was there a man to inhabit it.

But it was watered by a spring which rose out of it.

Then the Lord God formed man of the slime of the earth, and He breathed into his face the breath of life; and he became a human with a living breath.

Genesis 2:8–9 and 16–19; 3:1–7. The Tree of Life, and the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil

It is related in the book that is said to be the Torah [Genesis 2]:

8And the Lord God had planted a garden of pleasure in the beginning, and He placed therein man whom He had created.

9And the Lord God had planted in the earth all trees that are fair to behold and pleasant of fruit, and He planted in the midst of the garden the tree of life and the tree of knowledge of good and evil.

Then He said: eat of every tree of this garden,

But do not eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil; for when you eat thereof, you shall die.

This [death] means—and God knows best—that you shall assume the state of mortality. Perhaps this [death] symbolically denotes the death of his exalted status of being in dialogue with his Lord, as well as his life of abundance and his blessings, and his place of ease and distance from wretchedness, and that his [true] place of rest is in paradise. It is also related that He said to Adam [in Genesis 3]:

Because you have hearkened to the voice of your wife, and have eaten of the tree whereof I commanded you not to eat, cursed is the earth for your inhabitance; for you shall gain thereof only with labor.

Thorns and thistles shall it bring forth to you; and you shall eat the herbs of the earth

in the sweat of your hands, and you shall eat the bread until you return unto the ground; for out of it you were taken; for you are dust, and
unto dust shall you return.
Moreover, God says: O Adam, inhabit, you
and your wife, the Garden, and eat of where you
will, but come not nigh to this tree, lest you be of
the evildoers (Q. 7:19).
Also in the book that is said to be the Torah
[Genesis 3]:
1Now the serpent was more cunning than any
earthly beasts which the Lord God had created.
And he said unto the woman: why has God
forbidden you from eating every fruit of the
garden?
2And the woman said unto the serpent: we eat of
all the fruit of the garden,
3but not of the fruit which is in the
midst of the garden, for God has commanded us
that we should not eat therefore nor touch it, lest
we die.
4And the serpent said to her: you shall never die,
5For God knows that the moment you eat
thereof, your eyes will open, and you shall be
like God in knowing good and evil.
6And when the woman beheld the beauty of the
tree, and she liked it
s fairness, she took of its
fruit and ate from it, then she gave some of it to
her husband; and he ate therefore.
7And their eyes opened, and when they realised
that they were naked, they sewed together fig
leaves together, and made themselves aprons.
(Gn. 3:1–7)
Genesis 2:10–14. Descriptions of Paradise

10 And a river flowed from the place of pleasure, irrigating the garden. It is divided into four rivers:

11 The name of one of them is Phison, and it is the one that encompasses the land of Hevilath where gold grows,

12 and where one finds the jewel called bdellium and the onyx stone.

13 And the name of the second river is Gehon, and it is the one that encompasses the land of Ethiopia—the Nile.

14 And the name of the third river is Tigris, and it is the one that flows in the direction of the land of Persia. The name of the fourth river is the Euphrates.

Genesis 3:24. The Tree of Life

It is also related in the book that is said to be the Torah, that when Adam committed the sin and was driven out of the garden to this abode, God place in the hands of Israfel, or some other cherubim, [Genesis 3] a flaming spear to guard the tree of life (Gn. 3:24), So that none would have any access to it and thus become immortal.


In the following passage, Ibn Barrajān draws from passages from Genesis 15 and 22 concerning the covenant of Abraham as background to the story of Joseph, which fulfills the foretelling of Abraham's covenant with God. This passage, in which God promises to make of Abraham a great nation, is a classic polemic verse used by Muslims to prove that Ishmael is a forerunner of Muhammad's prophecy. Surprisingly, this polemic is not evoked by Ibn Barrajān. Instead, these verses demonstrate that the Torah is a ‘differentiation of everything’, which also means that it predicts the future.
It is related in the book that is said to be the Torah (Genesis 15), that God—Might and Majestic—

4 Revealed to Abraham—peace and blessings upon him—

And He brought him outside then said: look up to heaven and count the stars if you are able to; so shall your seed be.

5 And He said unto him: I am God, I saved you from the fire of the Yemenites, so as to give you this land to inherit and possess.

6 And He said unto Abraham: verily your seed shall be a stranger in a foreign land, and they shall be enslaved and abased for four hundred years,

7 But I will judge the nation that enslaves them, and after this they shall come out with plentiful abundance.

8 And you shall join to your ancestors in wellbeing and in good old age.

9 But their offspring shall return hither in the fourth generation.

10 God also told Abraham on the day he laid his son [upon the altar] to slay him, and God compensated him with a ram: Gn. 22:16

11 Since you have done this, and have not spared your only begotten son:

12 I will bless you and multiply your seed until they become as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand of the seashore, and you seed shall have dominion over the gates of their enemies;

13 And your seeds will bless all nations of the earth, because you have obeyed my command.

Genesis 19:20–1, 24–5, 27–8, and 30; 18:20 and 22–33. The People of Lot

Ibn Barrajān paraphrases and copies passages from Genesis here as complement to the story of Lot.

Said Lot to them: Surely you are a people unknown to me! They said, ‘Nay, but we have brought thee that concerning which they were doubting’ (Q. 15:62–3) i.e., with that concerning which you truthfully warned of what would befall them if they did not believe him. And we have come to thee with the truth, i.e., the
necessary truth from God, and assuredly we speak truly, So set forth, thou with thy family, in a watch of the night, and follow after the backs of them, and let not any one of you turn round; and depart unto the place you are commanded” (Q. 15:64–5).

It is said [in Genesis 19] that there were three cities, Sodom, Gomorrah, and Segor, and that Lot asked for Zoar to be spared on account of its smallness, then he entered [Segor] before the dawn, and the punishment befell them by sunrise, and that brimstone and fire were rained upon them before overturning them, and evil is the rain of them that are warned (Q. 26:173).

And He overturned those cities, and all the environs, and all the inhabitants of the cities, and the passersby on that night.

And Abraham—peace be upon him—looked toward the two cities Sodom and Gomorrah early in the morning, and toward all the land of the plain, and he saw the ashes rise up from the earth as the smoke of a furnace.

Then Lot—peace be upon him—left Segor with his two daughters and he did not dwell in it. This is copied from the book that is said to be the Torah, and it is affirmed by the Qur’an which confirms [the latter], and praise belongs to God, Lord of the worlds.

... And it is also related in the book that is said to be the Torah [Genesis 18]:

And when the men—that is the angels peace be upon them—departed from his place, they turned their gaze toward Sodom and Ghomarrah, and Abraham—peace be upon him—went with them accompanying them:

they said: the immodesty of the people of Sodom and Gomorrah has reached its full, their sins have multiplied and become exceedingly grievous. He said, and Abraham followed them constantly. This, and God knows best, is the meaning of God’s praise for [Abraham’s] penitence [in the Qur’an by:}

وَأَمَّنُواْ بِحَبْثُ يُؤْمَرُونَ (۱۵: ۶۴–۵۵).

قيل كانت ثلاث مدائن، سدوم وغمرة وصغورا، فاستأذن لوط عليه السلام أن يسلم له صغورة لصغرها، فاتحق بها قبل الفجر ونزل العقاب بأولئك حين طلوع الشمس، قيل إنهم أمطروا النار والكبريت بعد تأفيكهم، وأمطرنا عليهم مطرًا فساء مطر آل المنذررين (۲۶: ۳۷۱).

وُخسف بالقريتين وأجوارهما ومجموع من سكنهما ويمن كان يمر ليتنتد حولهما ونظر إبراهيم عليه السلام ضحوة ذلك اليوم إلى القريتين سدوم وغمرة وجميع ما جاورهما والشرير يخرج عنهما والدخان صاعد كدخان الفرن، ثم خرج لوط عليه السلام مع ابنتيه من صغورا ولم يبت فيها.

هذا منقول من الكتاب الذي يُذكر أنّه التوراة، صدّقه القرآن المهيمن والحمد الله ربّ العالمين.

وجاء في الكتاب الذي يُذكر أنّه التوراة، قال:

لمّا تحرّك من عنده الرجال، يعني الملائكة عليه السلام، حوّلوا نحو سدوم وغمرة أصابهم، وإبراهيم عليه السلام يذهب معهم يشيعهم قالوا: إن سرف أهل سدوم وغمرة قد كمل وذكرت ذويهم وتكاملت جدًا، وقال، وكان إبراهيم لا يعدو أن يتابعهم، وهذا والله أعلم معنى المدح بالإثارة.

قال: فقدانا وقال، أيهلك صالحًا مع طالح؟ قال: إن كان في المدينة خمسون صالحًا يهلكون معًا، ولا يرحم ذلك الموضع للمحسنين الصالحين.

فعاد من ذكر الفعل بأن يقتل صالحًا مع...
referring to him as munib in Q. 11:75].

"...He said, And Abraham drew near, and said: will the righteous be destroy with the wicked?

24 Should there be fifty righteous within the city, they will be destroyed as well, and no mercy shall come to that place on account of fifty righteous ones there.

25 Then [Abraham] restated the act that the righteous should be as the wicked, that be far from Your: You who judges all the earth, would not make this judgment.

26 Then the Lord said: If I find in Sodom fifty righteous within the city, then I will overlook all of their transgressions.

27 Then he said, If you find there forty and five, I will not destroy them for forty's sake.

28 Then he said: I beseech You my Lord, be not angry if I were to ask You again, what would happen if ten were found there? And He said, I will not destroy them for ten's sake.

29 Then the Lord ascended after communing with Abraham, and Abraham returned to his place.

Now God says [in the Qur’an]: And We have sent down to thee the book with the truth, confirming the book that was before it, and assuring it (Q. 5:48).

This passage [from Genesis 18] elucidates God’s Qur’anic statement: So, when the awe departed from Abraham and
the good tidings came to him, he was disputing with Us concerning the people of Lot; Abraham was clement, compassionate, penitent. (Q. 11:74–5) ... Adding to the aforementioned bargaining [between God and Abraham in Genesis], God also added ‘O Abraham, turn away from this; thy Lord’s command has surely come, and there is coming upon them a chastisement not to be turned back’ (Q. 11:76) ...

It is related in the book that is said to be the Torah [Genesis 19] that [Lot’s wife]:

*looked back from behind him, and she became a pillar of salt after she had left the city.*

---

Books of Prophecy:

**Ezekiel 37:1–10. Resuscitating the Children of Israel**

As demonstrated above, Ibn Barrajān evinces general knowledge of the Books of Prophecy (kutub al-nubuwāt) in his works. In the following passage, he cites verses from Ezekiel 37:1–10 in order to propose his own interpretation of the identity of those who fled their homes mentioned in Q. 2:243.

God says in the Qur’an, *Art thou not aware of those who left their homes in thousands for fear of death? God said to them, ‘Die!’ Then He gave them life* (Q. 2:243). The majority of exegetes hold that the people in question left their homes for fear of the plague, so God caused them to die, then He gave them bodily life. But it is related in certain passages from the Books of Prophets, that one of the prophets—peace be upon them all—said:

1As I was sitting among a group of the Children of Israelites, the hand of the God took me, and carried me out to the desert, and behold, there were many bones in a wide plain,

4And He said to me, Prophesy upon these bones, and say [unto them], O ye dry bones and bodies, or He said “withered flesh,” arise by the permission of God. Or He said something to that effect.

*And the bones came together,*

*the flesh came upon the bones until the bodies were perfected.*
Then He said unto me, Prophecy unto the spirits. Then comes a passage which I do not recall. He said, [the spirit] came from the four winds, and I heard a great commotion, and they stood up upon their feet, and they were like a great army, then He said unto me, such is the revival of the children of Israel after they die. God’s speech includes more [concerning this topic] and He knows best whether those [who left their homes in Q. 2:243] are these [Israelites mentioned in the Book of Prophets] or those [fleeing the plague of Egypt] mentioned by the exegetes, or both at once, or each in a distinct fashion. All things for God are easy. Most likely, Qur’anic verse 2:243 is [placed] in orderly accordance with the verse And say not of those slain in God’s way, ‘They are dead’; rather they are living, but you are not aware (Q. 2:154).

New Testament:

Matthew 4:34–5. Do not Swear

In the following passage (Matthew 4:35), Ibn Barrajān quotes a saying of Jesus in which the earth is described as God’s footstool, and heaven as His throne, in order to stress God’s omnipresence in the world. He follows up these passages by Qur’anic verses (Q. 2:55, Q. 20:5–6, and Q. 7:58) which describe God’s presence in the cosmos.

It is related in the book that is said to be the Gospels that the ancients were told not to swear, but if they did swear to fulfill their oaths. He said, Jesus Son of Mary says:

34But I say to you do not swear by heaven for it is the throne of God,
35Nor by the earth, for it is His footstool.

Mathew 11:2–8, 11, and 13–15. Messengers from John the Baptist

In the following passage, Ibn Barrajān inserts verses 2–8 and 13–15 from Matthew 11 to explain how Jesus is Qur’anically made to be an example to the Children of Israel. En route, he comments on Matthew 11, and gives his interpretation of the
meaning of wilderness and the reed shaken in the wind, in verse 7. Interestingly, this is one of the few instances where Ibn Barrajān omits the cautionary stock phrase ‘in the book that is said to be the Torah/Gospel’.

2And when John son of Zachariah—peace be upon him—caught news in prison of the works of the Messiah, he sent him two men from his disciples to say to him:
3Are you the one to come, or do we await someone else?
4Then Jesus—peace be upon him—responded to them: relate to John what you have heard and seen.
5For the blind see, the deaf hear, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the dead rise again, the poor are receive glad tidings,
6So blessed is he whose soul is not doubtful of me in this matter.
It is related in the book that is said to be the Gospels, following the previous verse, So blessed is he whose soul is not doubtful of me:
7Then he, peace and blessings upon him, began to address the multitudes concerning John son of Zachariah—peace be upon him—saying: what did you desire from your journey into the wilderness? By wilderness he means—God knows best— the worship of deities other than God—Mighty and Majestic—and disobeying His command. Did you think you would find scattered pebbles shaken with the winds?
This is a metaphor for John’s steadfastness in God. Then he said:
8Perhaps you went you out to see a man clothed in a soft garment?
9Amen I say to you, there hath not risen among the descendants of Adam anyone nobler than John: yet he who is the smallest in the kingdom of heaven is nobler than he,
10For the highest end of each [revealed] book has been brought to John
11And should you will receive it, he is like Elias that is to come.
12So He that has ears to hear, let him hear.
God says [in the Qur’an]: It is knowledge of the Hour; so doubt not concerning it (Q. 43:61) that is, he is its sign, so when he descends it will be a sign of the
Matthew 13:31–3 and 44–6. Parables of the Kingdom of Heaven

In the following passage (Matthew 13), Ibn Barrajān quotes a saying of Jesus from the Gospel of Matthew in order to highlight the ontological connection between the herebelow and the hereafter. He then interjects his own commentary, and Qur'an and hadīth citations, which are quoted with equal authority as are sayings of Jesus, to point out that they are descriptions of the same teaching.

It is mentioned in the book that is said to be the Gospel:

31 Jesus—peace be upon him—one day struck a parable for his companions, comparing the kingdom of heaven to a grain of mustard seed which someone sowed his field.

32 It is the least of seeds and the finest of grains. Yet when grew it became taller than all herbs and wheats, and it grew until the birds of the sky [began to] lodge on its branches, and dwell therein, and the beasts of the earth take cover under its shade.

His allusion—peace be upon him—was precisely to God’s—glorified and praised—[Qur’anic] statement: The day the earth shall be changed to other than the earth and the heavens (14:48). The Messenger of God [Muḥammad] explained this verse (14:48) by saying: “In the hereafter, this world shall be merely as a finger that you dip into a river; behold how much [water the finger] withdraws.”

33 He then struck another parable, saying: the kingdom of heaven is like yeast, which a woman buried in her dough, until it gained heat and was well leavened.

34 He then said: the kingdom of the heavens is like unto a treasure hidden in a field. Then someone, having discovered it, hid it in order to sell his belongings then to buy that field.

35 He also compares the kingdom of the heavens to someone who is a merchant seeking good pearls.

36 He had found one of the greatest pearls, sold all his belongings and bought it.

He exchanges the precious for the precious, and that is what is required on account of a valuable knowledge that is
inexhaustible. Do you not hear God when He says, And those are the parables—We strike them for men; haply they will reflect (Q. 59:21)?

إنّما يبدَّل النفي س في النفيس وهذا المطلوب لعلم له قدر ولا يبلغ كنهه، ألا تسمع قول الله جلّ ذكره ٱللَّهِ وَتِلْكَ ٱلأَمْثَالُ نَضْرِبُهَا لِلنَّاسِ لَعَلَّهُمْ يَتَفَكَّرُونَ (۵۹:۲۱). ۱۲۶

Mathew 19:30; 20:1–16. The Eleventh Hour.

In the passage below, Ibn Barrajān comments upon Q. 57:28, O believers, fear God, and believe in His Messenger, and He will give you a twofold portion of His mercy. He interprets the twofold portion of His mercy to mean that followers of Muḥammad shall receive twice the reward of Jews and Christians on the Day of Judgment, even though the latter worked harder and longer than the former. His engagement with Matthew 20 can arguably be categorised as ‘polemical’ in that he is showing that Islam was foretold by the Bible. But more importantly this passage is invoked to explain the meaning of a ḥadīth from al-Bukhārī. Remarkably, he does not speak about the Gospels as the word of God, but as a collection of statements by Jesus. What is also interesting to note is that as with his citations from the Qur’an and ḥadīth, Ibn Barrajān cuts his citations short by stating ‘to the end of the meaning.’ He seems to suppose, in other words, that his readers are well versed in Biblical literature.

In the book that is said to be the Gospels:

Matthew 19:30
And many that are first, shall be last; and the first shall be at the rear of the last.

And having agreed with the labourers for a penny a day, he brought them into his vineyard.

During the third hour, he saw others standing in the marketplace idle.

And he said: go you also into the vineyard, and I will give you your rightful dues.

And so they did, and again he repeated in like manner on the sixth hour, this corresponds to the first phase with Jesus and his followers, and the ninth hour, this refers to Muḥammad—peace and blessings be upon him.
And when the eleventh hour came, this refers to the end of the interim period between both [Muḥammad and the second return of Jesus], God willing, he found others standing, and he said to them: Why do you stand here all the day without work?

They responded: because no one has hired us. He said to them: go you as well and I will give you your rightful dues.

And when the day ended, the owner of the vineyard said to his steward: call the labourers and pay them their hire, and begin with the last and end with the first.

So he began with those that were brought in on the eleventh hour, and he gave every man a penny.

Then the first came forth, hoping for an increase, but they too received every man a penny.

So they reproached the owner of the vineyard, saying: have you made us equal to those who only worked but one hour of the day, [we who] have toiled all day long and borne the burden of its heat?

Then he answered one of them, saying: friend, I do you no wrong, did we agree on a penny?

So take what is yours and go your way, for I wish to give to the latecomer just as I have given you.

Is it unlawful for me to do so? Just as you are envious, so am I merciful.

It is on this account that the last shall be first, and the first shall be at the rear of the last. For many are called, but few chosen.
he comes forth with [an ability] to perform miracles [lit. break the habits] and display tremendous [signs], this he expressed by saying “he overpowers the ability,” while those who are described as “mountains” deem that they were counted liars, and in the end there shall be respite, and with hardship comes ease, and whosoever endures to the end is saved by God’s will.

22 And were it not that those days are short, no one would be saved.

It is related in the book that is said to be the Gospels (Matthew 24),

23 But those days will be shortened on account of the righteous.

24 There will arise during those days those who claim to be the Messiah son of Mary, and [who claim to be] prophets, and they shall bring forth great signs, until even those who are supposedly righteous will have doubt.

This is related in the Books of Prophecies.

It is also related in the book that is said to be the Gospel:

Mt. 24:21 For then shall be great tribulation, such as hath not been from the beginning of the world until now, neither shall be.

The Messenger of God [Muḥammad]—peace be upon him—said: “there is no affair,” and in another report “calamity”, “from the day God created Adam to the coming of the hour, is more tremendous than the antichrist.”

[Jesus] later said:

29 Immediately after the tribulation of those days, the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken:

30 and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the King coming in the clouds of heaven—this resembles the Qur’anic verse: What do they look for, but that God shall come to them in the cloud (Q. 2: 210)—with a great and mighty power.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chart: Comparison of the Closest Parallels between Ibn Ḥazm and Ibn Barrajān’s Biblical Passages:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ibn Barrajān</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genesis 2:8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genesis 2:10–14</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genesis 3:24</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genesis 15:13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matthew 11:11 and 13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matthew 13:31–2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
جاء في الكتاب الذي يذكر أنه الإنجيل أن عيسى صلوات الله وسلامه عليه قال يوما ممثلاً لأصحابه يشبه ملكوت السماء بحبة من خردل ألقاها إنسان في فدانه وهي أصغر الحبوب وأدق الزريعة، فإذا نبتت استعلت على جميع البقول والزراريع ونمت حتى ينزل طير السماء في أغصانها ويسكن إليه.

وفي الباب الثالث عشر من الإنجيل مثى أن المسيح قال: يشبه ملكوت السماء بحبة خردل ألقاها رجل في فدانه وهي أدق الزرايع فإذا نبتت استعلت على جميع البقول والزراريع حتى ينزل في أغصانها طير السماء ويسكن إليه.

Matthew 24:22 and 24

جاء في الكتاب الذي يذكر أن الإنجيل أن المسيح قال لهم: سيعود مسحاء الكذب وأنبياء الكذب ويطلعون العجائب العظيمة والآيات حتي يغلط من يظن بن الصلاح. جاء ذكر هذا في كتاب التثنية.

وفي الباب [الرابع والعشرين من إنجيل مثى] أن المسيح قال لهم: سيعود مسحاء الكذب وأنبياء الكذب ويطلعون العجائب العظيمة والآيات حتي يغلط من يظن بن الصلاح.
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33 The passage concerns the women of Israel who borrowed jewels of silver, gold, and raiment from their neighbours. God says to Moses in Exodus 3:21-22: And I will give this people favour in the sight of the Egyptians: and it shall come to pass, that, when ye go, ye shall not go empty: But every woman shall borrow of her neighbor, and of her that sojourneth in her house, jewels of silver, and jewels of gold, and raiment: and ye shall put [them] upon your sons, and upon your daughters; and ye shall spoil the Egyptians. Ibn Barrajān notes how this is confirmed by the Qur’ānic verse, we were loaded with fardels, even the ornaments of the people, and we cast them (Q. 20:87). In this discussion, Ibn Barrajān again cites from memory as he interlaces Qur’ānic verses with passages from Exodus. See Ṭanbih, vol. 2, pp. 366–7.

34 For a recension based on the Jewish translation of Saʿadiya Gaʿon, see Kahle, Bibelübersetzungen. For Saʿadiya’s commentary, see de Lagarde, Materialien; Eng. trans. by Linetsky, Rabbi Saadiah Gaon’s Commentary. See also Steiner, Biblical Translation.


38 Ṭanbih, vol. 5, p. 373. For a similar discussion, see Ṭanbih, vol. 4, pp. 369–70.

40 ʿAzrāʾīl and Jibrīl.

42 For instance, one hadith states that David was told by God to ‘Convey good news to sinners, and warn the truthful ones’ for ignorant sinners are held at a lower standard than those who are endowed with knowledge of God and the afterlife. See Sharḥ, vol. 1, p. 307.

43 The fact that Ibn Barrajān only possessed a translation of Matthew in Arabic is alluded to in the Sharḥ where he states: ‘It is repeatedly mentioned in the book that is said to be the Gospel: Cast this wicked servant into the lower darkness; there shall be prolonged weeping and gnashing teeth’ (Sharḥ, vol. 2, p. 83). The only Gospel of the New Testament where this verse appears repeatedly is Matthew (8:12, 13:42, 13:50, 22:13, 24:51, 25:30). In Luke it appears only once (13:28). Therefore Ibn Barrajān equates the Injīl with the Gospel of Matthew.


45 See appendix, section on Eleventh Hour.


47 The term used in the hadith is aswida for both those to Adam’s right and left. An aswad can mean a great serpent (see Lisān al-ʿArab, s-w-d).

48 Ḫāṣib, ¶381.

49 The scriptural foundations for this concept are seemingly to be found in Romans 5:12–21, 1 Corinthians 15:22, and Psalms 51:5.
Ibn Qasī also had a conception of ‘original sin’ which he discusses in much more elaborate and explicit terms. See Ebstein, ‘Was Ibn Qasī a Sufi?’.

Ibn Barrajān states: wa-ammā kitāb al-zabūr fa-yaqūl munazziluhu al-ʿalī al-kabīr jalla jalāluhu; ‘yā Dāwud isma’ minni wa-l-ḥaqq aqūl lā tafał kadhā wa-kadhā, wa-yyukthir min hādhā fa-ashbah’ (Īḍāḥ, ¶42). Parallels of this quotation are found in a statement attributed to the second/eighth-century Successor (tābiʿī) and narrator of Isrāʾīliyyāt, Wahb b. Munabbih, in Abū Nuʿaym al-ʿAṣbanānī’s Ḥilyat al-awliyāʾ, vol. 4, pp. 45–6. Given that Ibn Barrajān’s knowledge of the contents of the zabūr appears to originate in reports of Wahb, I suspect that he did not possess a copy of Ḥafs’ rajaz rendition. See Urvoy, Le psautier mozarabe.

For example, Tanbih, vol. 3, p. 15.

Ibn Barrajān drew on the authority of an isnād when it suited his purposes, even though he usually stressed his principle of Qur’anic hegemony and the corrective function of the Qur’an in confirming weak ḥadīth. Moreover, it is noteworthy that Ibn Barrajān only used his principle of Qur’anic hegemony to confirm weakly transmitted ḥadīth reports and Biblical passages, and never to challenge the authenticity of a soundly transmitted prophetic report on the basis of a contradicting Qur’anic verse. His principle of Qur’anic hegemony, in other words, was only employed with a view to broadening the scope of authoritative scriptural sources which Ibn Barrajān could make use of. See Īḍāḥ, ¶729-30.

For instance, we know that the Zāhirī Ibn Yarbūʿ (d. 522/1128) studied the ḥadīth collection of Bukhārī with Ibn Manẓūr, who was Ibn Barrajān’s ḥadīth teacher; and that Ibn Barrajān’s Mālikī student ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq al-İshbîlî transmitted Zāhirī works of Ibn Ḥazm. There are also connections to Ibn Barrajān through Abū Bakr al-Mayũrqi’s Zāhirī teacher Ibn Barrāl/Buriyāl, who was a student of Ibn Ḥazm and who came into contact with Ibn Barrajān’s associate Ibn al-ʿArîf. See Adang, ‘The Spread of Zāhirism’, p. 329.

For example, Ibn Barrajān does not entertain the possibility of pubescent non-Muslims being saved after the coming of Islam, or of hell ever subsiding for its denizens. He discusses the eschatological destiny of the children of unbelievers in the context of the following Qur’anic verse: Immortal youths will wait on them (Q, 56:17). ‘These are the youths that died prior to attaining the age where one is obligated to observe the legal precepts of religion (wujūb al-taklīf); that is, they died in a state of primordiality (fiṭra). I think, and God knows best, they are the children of the disbelievers, whom God entrusts to the service of the people of Paradise, just as they were their [child] slaves and servants in this world. As for the children of the believers, they will be with their parents. Their fate in Paradise, and God
knows best, will be different. I think that they will grow up and take wives; for this is implicit in the verse [And those who believed, and their seed followed them in belief,] We shall join their seed with them (Q. 52:21), thereby completing the happiness of their parents’ (Tanbih, vol. 5, p. 422).

66 For example, Tanbih, vol. 1, pp. 120–2 and p. 267.


70 ‘Īḍāḥ, ¶382–3.

71 For example, Ibn Barrajān contrasts Biblical and ḥādīth reports which state that man was created in God’s image against the Qur’anic statement that there is nothing like unto God (laysa ka-mithlihi shay’, Q. 42:11).

72 Tanbih, vol. 3, p. 15.

73 Adang, Muslim Writers, p. 137.

74 For a detailed discussion of the range of opinions regarding the authorship of Ibn Ḥazm’s Bible, see Adang, Muslim Writers, p. 136. Given the Andalusī context, a Christian Mozarab translation tradition seems to most likely to be the most important source for Ibn Ḥazm. Modern scholars have recently pointed out that Muslim authors were mostly exposed to earlier Arabic Christian renditions of the Bible in the East, and that on the whole Jewish ones including Sa’adya’s (or pre-Sa’adian Karaite translations) did not play a significant role for any Muslim author. For translations of the Pentateuch, see Vollandt, ‘Christian-Arabic Translations’. For the Gospels, see Kashouh, The Arabic Versions of the Gospels.

75 Adang, ‘Some Hitherto Neglected Material’.

76 For a discussion of Ibn Ḥazm’s polemic against Judaism and Christianity, see Behloul, ‘The Testimony of Reason’; and Urvoiy, ‘Le sens’.

77 Adang, Muslim Writers, p. 134.

78 Unlike Ibn Ḥazm, Ibn Barrajān does not cite the chapters of the Bible that he quotes from. He only refers once to the opening of Genesis as the sifr al-awwal (‘first book of the Torah’) whereas Ibn Ḥazm uses the conventional term bāb. This may or may not indicate the different translations used by both Muslim authors.

79 Adang, Muslim Writers, p. 136.


81 In ‘Īḍāḥ, ¶508, Ibn Barrajān has a slightly different version: fi’l-badʾ khalaqa Allāh al-samāʾ wa-l-ard.

82 Vulgate: et protulit terra herbam virentem (And the earth brought forth the green herb).

83 Mazīdī’s edition (vol. 3, p. 13) reads bi-anfusihā, which would translate as ‘by themselves’. However, the subsequent verses repeatedly refer to beasts that possess ‘nafās’, or ‘breath of life’. The plural of nafās is anfās, and therefore I assume here that there is a missing alif and that bi-anfāsihā should be translated as ‘[fish] that hath life’.

84 Vulgate: et omne volatile secundum genus suum (and every winged fowl according to its kind).

85 The order is inverted in the Vulgate: et factum est vesperae et mane dies quintus (And the evening and morning were the fifth day).
Vulgate adds: et bestiis universaeque terrae omnique reptili quod movetur in terra (and the beasts, and the whole earth, and every creeping creature that moveth upon the earth)

Vulgate adds: et creavit Deus hominem ad imaginem suam ad imaginem Dei creavit illum masculum et feminam creavit eos (And God created man to his own image: to the image of God he created him: male and female he created them).

Vulgate adds: et subicite eam (and subdue it).

Vulgate: et requievit die septimo ab universo opere quod patrarat (and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had done).

Vulgate: et benedixit diei septimo et sanctificavit illum quia in ipso cessaverat ab omni opere suo quod creavit Deus ut faceret (And he blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made).

Vulgate adds: istae generationes caeli et terrae quando creatae sunt in die quo fecit Dominus Deus caelum et terram (These are the generations of the heaven and the earth, when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the heaven and the earth).

Tanbīḥ, vol. 3, pp. 13–16. See also Īḍāḥ, ¶509, where Ibn Barrajān points out parallels between Qur’anic verses and Genesis 1:21–23, 26–31; 2:1–2. In Īḍāḥ, ¶505, he sets out to determine the exact time and cosmic day of Adam’s creation. To this end, he evaluates ḥadīth reports alongside descriptions from Genesis 2:1–5, and concludes that Adam was created on the seventh day.

Note that al-sayyīd Allāh is referred to inversely as Allāh al-sayyid throughout Genesis 1.

See Īḍāḥ, ¶90–1, for a discussion of the etymological significance of the first name Adam, in which Genesis 2:8 and 2:18 are quoted not only with equal, but more interpretive authority than similar ḥādīth reports.

Vulgate: in sudore vultus tui (In the sweat of thy face).

Vulgate adds: vidit igitur mulier quod bonum esset lignum ad vescendum et pulchrum oculis aspectuque delictabile et tulit de fructu illius et comedit deditque viro suo qui comedit (And the woman saw that the tree was good to eat, and fair to the eyes, and delightful to behold: and she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave to her husband who did eat).

This is how the text appears in both MSS A and B of Īḍāḥ (¶476). There is no mention of the Nile in Vulgate.

Vulgate: eiecitque Adam et conlocavit ante paradisum voluptatis cherubin et flammeum gladium atque versatilum ad custodiendum viam ligni vitae (And he cast out Adam; and placed before the paradise of pleasure Cherubims, and a flaming sword, turning every way, to keep the way of the tree of life).

Vulgate: statimque sermo Domini factus est ad eum dicens non erit hic heres tuus sed qui egredietur de utero tuo ipsum habebis heredem (And immediately the word of the Lord came to him, saying: He shall not be thy heir: but he that shall come out of thy bowels, him shalt thou have for thy heir).

Vulgate: dixitque ad eum ego Dominus qui eduxi te de Ur Chaldeorum (I am the Lord who brought thee out from Ur of the Chaldees).

There is this city here at hand, to which I may flee, it is a little one, and I shall be saved in it: is it not a little one, and my soul shall live? And he said to him: Behold also in this, I have heard thy prayers, not to destroy the city for which thou hast spoken. Make haste and be saved there, because I cannot do any thing till thou go in thither. Therefore the name of that city was called Segor. The sun was risen upon the earth, and Lot entered into Segor. And the Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrha brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven. And he destroyed these cities, and all the country about, all the inhabitants of the cities, and all things that spring from the earth.

And Abraham got up early in the morning, and in the place where he had stood before with the Lord: He looked towards Sodom and Gomorrha, and the whole land of that country: and he saw the ashes rise up from the earth as the smoke of a furnace.

And they turned themselves from thence, and went their way to Sodom: but Abraham as yet stood before the Lord.

And the Lord said: The cry of Sodom and Gomorrha is multiplied, and their sin is become exceedingly grievous.

And he said to me: Prophesy concerning these bones; and say to them: Ye dry bones, hear the word of the Lord. And I prophesied as he had commanded me: and as I prophesied there was a noise, and behold a commotion: and the bones came together, each one, its joint.

And I saw, and behold the sinews, and the flesh came up upon them: and the skin was stretched out over them, but there was no spirit in them.

And he said to me: Prophesy to the spirit, prophesy, O son of man, and say to the spirit: Thus saith the Lord God: Come, spirit, from the four winds, and blow upon these slain, and let them live again.

And when the son of Mary is cited as an example, behold, thy people turn away from it and say, 'What, are our gods better, or he?' They cite not him to thee, save to dispute; nay, but they are a people contentious. He is only a servant We blessed, and We made him to be an example to the Children of Israel. Had We willed, We would have appointed angels among
you to be successors in the earth. It is knowledge of the Hour; doubt not concerning it, and follow me. This is a straight path. Let not Satan bar you; he is for you a manifest foe. (Q. 43:57–62)

119 Vulgate: et beatus est qui non fuerit scandalizatus in me (And blessed is he that shall not be scandalised in me).

120 Vulgate: omnes enim prophetae et lex usque ad Iohannem prophetaverunt (For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John).

121 Tanbih, vol. 5, pp. 94–6. For a similar passage, see also Īḍāḥ, ¶589.


123 Vulgate: quod minimum quidem est omnibus seminibus cum autem creverit maius est omnibus holeribus et fit arbor ita ut volucres caeli veniant et habitent in ramis eius (Which is the least indeed of all seeds; but when it is grown up, it is greater than all herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come, and dwell in the branches thereof).

124 Vulgate: aliam parabolam locutus est eis simile est regnum caelorum thesauro abscondito in agro quem qui invenit homo abscondit et praedae avariae vestit et vendit universa quae habet et emit agrum illum (Another parable he spoke to them: The kingdom of heaven is like unto a treasure hidden in a field. Which a man having found, hid it, and for joy thereof goeth, and selleth all that he hath, and buyeth that field)

125 Tanbih, ¶589.

126 The ḥādīth in question is in Kitāb al-Ijāra in which it is narrated by the father of Sālim b. ‘Abd Allāh, who said: ‘I heard the Messenger of God say, “The period of your stay in relation to the previous nations is like the period between the late afternoon (ʿaṣr) prayer and sunset. The people of the Torah were given the Torah and they acted upon it till midday then they were exhausted and were each given one qirāṭ [of gold]. And then the people of the Gospel were given the Gospel, and they acted upon it till the late afternoon (ʿaṣr) then they were exhausted and were each given one qirāṭ [of gold]. And then we were given the Qur’ān and we acted upon it till sunset and we were each given two qirāṭ. On that the people of both the scriptures said, ‘O our Lord! Thou hast given them two qirāṭs and hast given us one qirāṭ, though we have worked more than they.’ God responded, ‘Have I compensated you unfairly in any way?’ They said, ‘No.’ God said: ‘That is my blessing I bestow upon whomsoever I wish.’”


128 Ibn Barrajān notes a parallel passage in the Books of Prophecies. I have been unable to locate this passage.

129 Vulgate: et nisi breviati fuissent dies illi non fieret salva omnis caro sed propter electos breviabuntur dies illi (And unless those days had been shortened, no flesh should be saved: but for the sake of the elect those days shall be shortened).

130 Vulgate: surgent enim pseudochristi et pseudoprophetae et dabunt signa magna et prodigia ita ut in errorem inducantur si fieret potest etiam electi (For there shall arise false Christs and false prophets and shall shew great signs and wonders, insomuch as to deceive (if possible) even the elect).

131 Vulgate: surgent enim pseudochristi et pseudoprophetae et dabunt signa magna et prodigia ita ut in errorem inducantur si fieret potest etiam electi (For there shall arise false Christs and false prophets and shall shew great signs and wonders, insomuch as to deceive (if possible) even the elect).

132 Vulgate: et tunc parabit signum Filii hominis in caelo et tunc plangent omnes tribus terrae et videbunt Filium hominis venientem in nubibus caeli cum virtute multa et maiestate (And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven. And then shall all tribes of the earth mourn: and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with much power and majesty).
Segments of the following passage are missing from the manuscripts that were at Mazīdī’s disposal. I therefore rely primarily on Reisulkuttab 30, fl. 362b–363a.

īḍāḥ, ¶91 and ¶278.


īḍāḥ, ¶476.


īḍāḥ, ¶387.


Tanbīh, vol. 5, pp. 94–6. For a similar passage, see also Īḍāḥ, ¶589.

Ibn Ḥazm’s version reads: ‘In Matthew twelve, the Messiah said to them …’ (cf. Faṣl, vol. 2, p. 69).

īḍāḥ, ¶589.


Tanbīh, vol. 3, pp. 248–9. Segments of the following passage are missing from the manuscripts that were at Mazīdī’s disposal. I therefore rely primarily on Reisulkuttab 30, fl. 362b–363a.

Ibn Ḥazm, Faṣl, vol. 2, p. 117. Ibn Ḥazm claims that this passage is from Matthew 15. The editor corrects this assumption, and identifies the passage as Matthew 24.