

IBN AL-^cARABĪ AND THE QABBALAH: A STUDY
OF THIRTEENTH
CENTURY IBERIAN MYSTICISM

Ronald Kiener

Islamic and Jewish mysticism are the separate experiences of differing spiritual personalities. From the standpoint of both the adherent and the historian of religion, Islamic and Jewish mysticism, with rare exception, are considered distinct fields, divergent in both their sources and their spirit. The origins of each are rooted in different geographical and temporal settings. Central to the difference between each movement is the simple fact that each is rooted in entirely different Scriptures, their respective source for mystical language and symbol.

On the other hand, a point-by-point comparison of Sufism and Jewish mysticism would uncover many similarities — structurally, conceptually and phenomenologically. Both Sufism and Jewish mysticism share the common amalgam of asceticism, Gnosticism, Hellenism, Neoplatonism and Iranian mystery religions, thus providing a basis for some parallel development. Yet each is demonstrably a separate expression of monotheistic mysticism, conveyed in different languages, linked to distinct cultural patterns.

Both sides had something to say about their counterparts. Occasionally, some Sufis professed that there is no real distinction between the religions of Moses, Jesus and Muhammad. An example of this attitude is found in the statement of Ḥasan ibn ^cAdud

al-Dawla ibn Hūd (1235/6-1297/8), who, when asked for guidance in the spiritual path, queried in response, “Upon which road? the Mosaic, the Christian, or the Mohammedan?”¹ The Persian Sufi Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī (d. 1273) asked, “What is to be done, O Muslims? for I myself do not know whether I am a Christian, a Jew, a Jabr or a Muslim.”²

It is a rare occurrence to find a Jewish mystic consciously and explicitly turning to another religion in his quest for spiritual attainment. In the pre-modern world³ only Abraham Maimuni (1186-1237), the son of Maimonides (1135-1204), called Jews to follow the ascetic practices of the Sufis. Maimuni thought that the Sufis preserved ascetic traditions of the Hebrew prophets, and therefore saw their practices as a model for Jewish pietism. As we shall see, some Jewish philosophical texts, written in an Islamic environment, show a strong Sufi influence. But nowhere does one find in Jewish mysticism, save the case of Maimuni, a positive predisposition towards, or even a recognition of, the essential monotheistic similarity of Islam.⁴

As this paper will attempt to show, the two systems suddenly and contemporaneously burst forth with a similar mystical doctrine. Both Sufism and Qabbalah, in the same general area and at the same time, produced a new cosmological figure, rooted in an earlier Gnostic and Neoplatonic microcosmic motif, in the structural symbol of the Perfect/Primordial Man. Moreover, the Perfect/Primordial Man seems so similar as to suggest the possibility of direct influence.

Such a thesis would be difficult to uphold. Historically, although we cannot rule out the possibility that the Qabbalah was influenced by Sufism (or vice versa), we must realize that such a suggestion is a tenuous hypothesis. The Qabbalah developed in Christian lands and Jewish mystics knew little about Islam or the mysticism which developed from it. From German pietists of the twelfth century to Qabbalists of thirteenth century Spain,

either ignorance or condemnation was the rule.⁵ It also should be pointed out that these European Qabbalists were illiterate in the languages of Islam, becoming familiar, and then only marginally so, with Islamic culture only after Muslim and Jewish-Arabic texts were translated into Hebrew. Thus, the possibility of Islamic influence on Judaism becomes even less likely.

I have been unable to establish an unquestionable link between a particular doctrine of Sufism with that of Qabbalah, due partly to limitations of the historical data presently available. We do not know if Sufis interacted with Qabbalists in Spain or anywhere else, nor do we have any proof that they lived co-temporally in the same location. Without any textual or narrative evidence, we can assume only two other possibilities: either the Perfect/Primordial Man teaching was transmitted orally, or the doctrine developed simultaneously and independently in both religions. All three possibilities carry no more weight than any other, and only because of the general proximity of time and place do I feel that the latter possibility should be ruled out.

If nothing more, this paper is a contribution to the study of a doctrine as it appeared in two monotheistic mystical movements on the Iberian peninsula during the thirteenth century, and thus is a statement as to the spiritual currents alive at that time and in that place. I hope that with this paper the field of Qabbalah-Sufi study may be tentatively and carefully opened, with judgment on the ultimate viability of this line of inquiry reserved until sufficient and conclusive evidence, is compiled.

Previously, scholarly research on the "external" influences of the Qabbalah has centered on mystical movements and heterodoxies within Christendom. S. Shaḥar has found some parallels between the *Sefer ha-Bahīr* (first appeared in the late twelfth century in Provence) and the literature of the Cathars.⁶ J. F. Baer has compared the later parts of the *Sefer ha-Zohar* (written late

thirteenth century in Leon) with the apocalyptic teachings found in a Joachimite text written in 1240.⁷ Through these studies much has been learned about the spiritual and sociological forces at work within Southern-European Jewry during this period. Although others have examined the possibility of a Sufi-Qabbalah connection, the studies are either without scholarly acumen,^{8a} or limited to matters of method and not doctrine.^{8b} The possibility has been recognized, but not pursued.

This paper will review the Sufi heritage in Jewish religious philosophy and Oriental Jewish life, then show how one specific doctrine of the Perfect/Primordial Man is shared by both Sufism and Qabbalah. The first section establishes a background, the second makes the specific comparison.

I

The fact that Islam and particularly Sufism had an important impact on the religious speculation and ritual modes of the medieval Jew in the East (and later in the West) is already well documented.⁹ In this section, I will limit the focus to the Sufi influences in Jewish philosophy, that speculative tradition of the Jews most closely interrelated to Jewish mysticism,¹⁰ and to the sociological realm.

The so-called "rational" Jewish theologians, either in their adoption or reaction to Sufi ideas, dealt with the mystical tradition of Islam. Baḥya' Ibn Paqūdah (2nd half of the 11th c.) and Abraham Maimuni are the two most obvious sources for our knowledge of the introduction of Sufi ideas into Jewish philosophy. Both Sa'adiah Gaon of Egypt (882-942) and Moses Maimonides may also reflect the impact of the Sufis, although it is less likely in the case of the former.

For example, according to I. Efros,¹¹ the last chapter of Sa'adiah's *Kitāb al-Amānāt w'al-Itiqādāt* (*The Book of Beliefs*

and Opinions), entitled "On Human Conduct,"¹² is partly devoted to a renunciation of abstinence (*zuhd*),¹³ which was a dominant theme in early Sufism. Since no Jewish sect that we know of committed itself to extreme abstinence during Sa^Cadiah's time, Efros concludes that it is the Sufis to whom Sa^Cadiah directs his scathing attack. Efros' conclusion is specious: the period of *zuhd* did not extend beyond the eighth century C.E., long before Sa^Cadiah's time.

After Sa^Cadiah, Jewish philosophy becomes rooted in Andalusia in the person of Ibn Paqūdah. Originally thought to have been influenced by the works of Abū Ḥamid al-Ghazālī (d. 1111), it has now been demonstrated by D. Baneth that one definite literary source of Ibn Paqūdah was that of the Muslim ascetic Abū ^CAbd Allāh al-Ḥarīṭ b. Asad (781-857), surnamed al-Muḥasibī.¹⁴ Ibn Paqūdah devoted a full chapter of his *al-Hidāya ilā Farā'id al-Qulūb* (*Guidance in the Duties of the Heart*) to the subject of *tawakkul*, "trust in God,"¹⁵ a fundamental aspect of the Sufi inner life,¹⁶ and the majority of the work is devoted to a mystical-psychological approach to the "duties of the heart" much akin to the Sufi ethical spirit.

Another Andalusian Jew, Maimonides, left Spain in his youth and settled in Egypt. In his monumental legal code, the *Mišneh Tōrah*, he displays Islamic influence, and also uses lexical terms and a conceptual framework which shows a Sufic stamp.¹⁷

Even more significantly, in the final four chapters of his *Dalālat al-Ḥā'irīn* (*Guide of the Perplexed*),¹⁸ written in the year 1200, Maimonides expounds on the perfection of man and his final cause. In the *Guide*, III: 54, Maimonides enumerates four perfections that man should seek to acquire: the perfection of possessions, the bodily constitutions, the moral virtues, and finally:¹⁹

The fourth species is the true human perfection; it consists in the

acquisition of the rational virtues. . . . This is in true reality the ultimate end; this is what gives the individual true perfection, a perfection belonging to him alone, and it gives him permanent perdurance (*al-baqā al-da'lm*); through it man is man (*wa-bihā al-insān al-insān*).

This description of the "perfect man" (*al-insān al-kāmil*) and the term itself is found throughout the *Guide*²⁰ and in Maimonides' *Commentary to the Mishnah*.²¹ This perfect man is consistently linked with two themes: *baqā*, a term first used in the Qur'an and employed by the Sufis to describe an ongoing existence of the Sufi in the Divine;²² and prophecy. (In many ways the Persian Sufi ^CAzīz al-Dīn Nasafī's [13th c.] doctrine of the perfection of the *sālik*, "the traveller," itself based on Ibn al-^CArabī's Perfect Man, corresponds to Maimonides criteria.)²³

It would not be sufficient to merely point out that Maimonides was wont to use Sufic terminology; surely this otherwise orthodox Aristotelian rationalist might be employing these terms and concepts in a non-mystical way.²⁴ However, there is corroborating evidence indicating that others, Jew and Muslim together, saw in his work a recourse to Sufism.

An Andalusian Sufi whom we have already mentioned, Abū ^CAlī Ibn Hūd al-Mursī (b. 1235/6 Murcia; d. 1297/8 Damascus) is reported by the historian al-Kutubī (d. 1363) to have taught the Jews of Damascus from the *Kitāb al-Dalālat* of "Ra'īs Mūsā," i.e., Maimonides.²⁵ Known as an authority on monistic Sufism, it is plausible that Ibn Hūd saw in the *Guide* ideas which correspond to *al-taṣawwuf ^Calā tariqat al-wahdat*.

But it is ultimately Maimonides only son, Abraham, who attests to the Sufic aspects in his father's works. Maimonides wrote the *Guide* when his son was only fourteen years old. Four years later, the brilliant philosopher, doctor and religious leader died and Abraham inherited the position of head of Egyptian Jewry.

Almost immediately, a vitriolic controversy erupted in the Jewish world over some of the doctrinal content of his father's work. Over a period of seven years, from 1224 to 1231, Abraham composed his *Kifāyat al-Ābidīn*, (*Complete [Guide] for the Pious*), partly as a defense of his father's works now under attack from many quarters, partly as a call to pietistic reform of Judaism along Sufi devotional patterns.²⁶ Abraham claimed that the Sufis were in practice the heirs of the Biblical prophets and regretted that his co-religionists did not follow in their footsteps:²⁷

We also see the Sufis of Islam (al-mutaṣawwifūn min al-islām) proceed in [this] war [against the self] to the combatting of sleep²⁸ . . . Observe then these wonderful traditions and sigh with regret over how they have been transferred from us and made their appearance among someone else than our nation.

Not only in the realm of ritual practice did Abraham Maimuni adopt from the Sufis, but also in his apologetic theology did he borrow from the mystics of Islam, Abraham wrote extensively of the *sulūk*, the "path", to God, which corresponds in the smallest details to the *tariqah* of the Sufis.²⁹ In many respects, Abraham Maimuni attempted to serve the same purpose in Judaism as al-Ghazālī did in Islam. Whereas al-Ghazālī succeeded in synthesizing the rational and mystical trends of Islam for future generations, Abraham Maimuni's grand reform failed to attract any Jews beyond his small circle, doomed to the relative oblivion of being a doctrinal oddity in scholarly research.

Still, Jewish-Sufi activity continued beyond Abraham Maimuni's age. A document written between 1355-1367 in Egypt, published by S. D. Goitein,³⁰ tells the story of a troubled Jewish wife whose husband often repaired to the "mountain" with a certain "al-Kūrānī," identified by Goitein as the Egyptian Sufi Yūsuf al-Ājamī al-Kūrānī (d. 1367), a renewer of the *tariqah* of

the Baghdadi Sufi al-Junayd (d. 910). In the letter, addressed to the head of Egyptian Jewry at that time, himself a great-great grandson of Abraham Maimuni, the wife implores:³¹

In Your name, You Merciful. . . The maidenservant the wife of Baṣīr the bellmaker kisses the ground and submits that she has on her neck three children because her husband was infatuated with (life on) the mountain with al-Kūrānī, in vain and to no purpose, a place where there is no Torah, no prayer and no mention of God's name in truth. . . It is her wish that our Master go after her husband and take the matter up with him according to His unfailing wisdom.

The Cairo Genizah contains other examples of Jewish-Sufi literature, including a Judeo-Arabic copy of a Sufi poem attributed to an "Abū Muḥammad," probably al-Ghazālī, copied no later than the thirteenth century.³² Even some poetry of the Sufi martyr Maṣṣūrah al-Ḥallaj (d. 922) is found in Judeo-Arabic script.³³

One of the most valuable finds discovered in the Genizah is an anonymous work entitled *Maqālat Derek ha-Hasīdūt*, "Guide to Piety," which is full of al-Suhrawardī's (d. 1191) illumination doctrine (*išraq*), and also displays knowledge of al-Sarrāj (d. 988) and al-Ghazālī.³⁴ The book, written between 1400 and 1600,³⁵ does not seem to have been produced in either Spain or the Maghrib, and testifies to the widespread dissemination of Sufi ideas in the Jewish world.

In the light of the documentation summarized above, it becomes evident that Sufism left its mark on both the dogma and practice of the elite in Oriental Jewry. As this cultural synthesis passed into the Jewish world of the Christian lands, the praxis was called into question, yet the speculative literature stood unblemished. For while Maimonides required the washing of the feet before morning prayers,³⁶ in imitation of the Islamic ritual of *wuḍū'*, R. Abraham b. David of Posquières (c. 1125-1198) in his

gloss on the *Mišneh Tōrah*, writes, "I do not know why feet (are washed),"³⁷ a question also raised by other scholars of Provence. While questioning such ritual innovations, the Jews of Provence were eager to begin studying the philosophical works of the Oriental community. It is the selfsame R. Abraham b. David who encouraged the recent *émigré* from Almohad Spain, Judah Ibn Tibbon, to translate Ibn Paqūdah's ethical treatise.³⁸ R. Abraham b. David is a symbol of his age and culture, in that he dabbled in both rational and mystical speculations, yet remained ignorant of the neighboring Islamic environment so crucial to both.³⁹ Whether cognizant of the fact or not, the Sufi legacy in the Jewish philosophers was now in the hands of Provençal Jewry. It is only natural that through their own unfamiliarity with Sufism the Jewish scholars of Provence remained ignorant of the Sufi elements in medieval Judeo-Arabic philosophy. In any event, the works of medieval Jewish *and* Islamic philosophy emigrated northward to both Provence and Christian Spain. Within a century, the major works of Averroes, al-Ghazālī and Avicenna were available in the Hebrew language, owing to the inclination of Provençal Jewry towards speculative theosophy. It is precisely within the context of this speculative inquisitiveness that Qabbalah flourished. The author of most of the *Zohar*, Moses de Leon (c. 1240-1305) can be described as a Maimonidean, having had prepared for himself a personal copy of the Hebrew translation of the *Guide*.⁴⁰ Furthermore, Abraham Abulafia of Barcelona (1271), wrote a number of mystical commentaries to the *Guide* which display ideas and symbols common with Sufism.⁴¹

II

It is against this context that I turn to an amazing figure of thirteenth century Andalusian Sufism, Ibn al-^cArabī (1165-1240). In the year of Ibn al-^cArabī's birth, the repressive Almoravid

dynasty was on the verge of collapse to the new wave of conquering Berbers led by Ibn Tumart. Until the age of 37, Ibn al-^cArabī remained in the Maghrib and al-Andalūs. He then went to Cairo, Jerusalem and Mecca, spending the latter part of his life in the Orient, and died in Damascus. While in Spain he met Averroes and studied the works of both philosophers and Sufis. By the time he left for the Ka^cbah, the Almohads were firmly in control of the greater Maghrib, including all of what was left of Muslim Spain, which due to the Christian reconquest was reduced to al-Andalūs. It was under Almohad rule, in fact, that the Maimūn family was obligated to leave Cordoba in 1148, roaming the Maghrib and arriving in Cairo in 1165. Ibn al-^cArabī stands at the apex of a long line of Anadalousian Sufis, beginning with Ibn Masarraḥ (883-931), who possibly influenced the thinking of Ibn al-^cArabī.⁴²

It would be impossible to produce here a full account of either Ibn al-^cArabī's encompassing speculative system, or the many attempts by Muslims and Orientalists to interpret his thought. It is characteristic of the relatively confused state of Ibn al-^cArabī studies that an argument still rages whether it is a "philosopher" or a "mystic" we confront in his writings. The most compelling treatment of the problem is by R. Landau, who portrays Ibn al-^cArabī as a mystic who expressed himself in the language of the philosophers.⁴³ Hence, in logical terms his philosophy, as such, has been characterized as unsystematic and eclectic.⁴⁴ It is clear that the mystical experience lies at the core of his system, couched whenever expressible in the terminology of Neoplatonism and orthodox Islamic theology. There was a new, potentially heretical gnosis in the truths of Ibn al-^cArabī, and either despite or because of this fact, he always resorted to the more orthodox terminology of Qur'ān, Ḥadīṡ, the Ash^carities and Neoplatonists. Conveniently, he could use these abovementioned institutions as a basis for his new ideas.

Yet there is another side to Ibn al-^cArabī. He did not hide

behind the medieval veil of pseudepigrapha, but proclaimed his system by way of prophetic revelation. His extensive *al-Futuhāt al-Makkīyah* (Meccan Revelations),^{44a} claims to be nothing less than intermediated divine relations. Ibn al-^CArabī claimed to be a “disciple of Kīḍr,” initiated as a *šayk* by the angelic, Elijah-like figure. Like Uways al-Qaranī and the *unwaysī*'s, Ibn al-^CArabī needed no earthly master to be educated in Sufism, but achieved recognition of the gnosis directly through divine grace. His last and most popular work, the *Fuṣūṣ al-Hikam* (*Bezels of Wisdom*) purports to be a book received directly from the hands of Muhammad, who appeared to Ibn al-^CArabī “in the flesh,” commanding him to “take [the *Fuṣūṣ*] and extract from it that which will benefit mankind.”⁴⁵ In all these ways Ibn al-^CArabī displays a boldness, a self-conscious originality, a spirituality which was widely and quickly accepted by the Sufis, especially in Persia.⁴⁶

Central to Ibn al-^CArabī's theosophy is what has been described as alternatively pantheism and monism, and portrayed by himself as *wahdat al-wujūd*, “the unity of being.” Existence is all that is Absolute Being; the phenomenal world is nothing more than manifestations thereof. Existence is a continuum between the Absolute Creator (*al-Haqq*) and relative creation (*al-kalq*), different sides of the same ontological coin. In representing the relationship and identity between the One and the many Ibn al-^CArabī used many symbols: creation as a mirror of the creator is a favorite.⁴⁷

Even more dear to Ibn al-^CArabī is the symbol of man as the microcosmic, manifested being in the macrocosmic universe. In this sense, he uses the terms *al-insān al-kabīr*, “the Great Man,” and *kawn al-jāmi*^C, “the microcosmic being,” terms employed expressly to establish the micro/macro motif. The *insān al-kabīr* describes the angelic aspect of existence, the externalized form of the Divine.

In utilizing man as a mystical, microcosmic symbol for the creation of the cosmos, Ibn al-^CArabī ties into various nascent

themes present in the Qur'ān. Although nowhere in the Qur'ān is it reported that man was created in the image of Allāh, it is said that when the first man was created, Allāh breathed into the clay mold from His Spirit (15:29: *wa-nafaḥtu fīhi min ruḥi*). Man in the Qur'ān is the object of creation; in this light, the universe is placed at the service of man:

And He has made subject to you (*wa-saḥḥara lakum*) the sun and the moon, both diligently pursuing their courses; and the night and the day He has also made subject to you (14:33).

Adam is created by Allāh as a vicegerent (*kalīfah*) on earth (2:30), a symbol, as we shall see, central to Ibn al-^CArabī's gnosis.

Adam, the primordial vicegerent of God in the manifested universe, is also referred to by Ibn al-^CArabī as *al-insān al-kāmil*, “the Perfect Man,” a term which not only encompasses the above-mentioned micro/macro motif, but also describes a Logos doctrine.⁴⁸ It is through Adam that the world is brought into an orderly nature; it is his attributes which determine the state of being.

In the first pages of the *Fuṣūṣ*, Ibn al-^C Arabī writes:⁴⁹

When God willed in respect of His attributes, which are beyond enumeration, that their essences — or, if you wish, you may say ‘His essence’ — should be seen, He caused them to be seen in a microcosmic being (*kawn jāmi*^C). . . through which the inmost consciousness (*sirr*) of God becomes manifest to Him.

The Logos doctrine is immediately apparent in this text. God's motivation for creation is simply self-knowledge, and the means by which He attains this knowledge is through the microcosm, described both as a mirror and the Perfect Man.⁵⁰ It is through this Logos that God actualizes the essences of the

attributes, so that He may know Himself.⁵¹ Thus, the Perfect Man is both the object of creation and the cause of the universe. He is “the spirit of the universe — its cause and spheres and states and movements.”⁵² The Perfect Man, the sum total of God’s names, attributes and essences, is the manifested Logos in the process of creation.

Many ideas, aside from the Qur’ānic, fed into Ibn al-^CArabi’s formulation of the Perfect Man doctrine. Neoplatonic and Gnostic traditions in the Ḥadīṭ which refer to a pre-existent Muhammadan light; Philonic, Hermetic, Persian and Mandeian influences — all have been argued at one time or another as the pivotal source for Ibn al-^CArabi’s Perfect Man. Precisely because so many speculative systems contain a conception of man as a microcosmic example of the universe do scholars find such diverse systems “influencing” Ibn al-^CArabi. Overshadowing all these relatively “external” traditions is the development of the idea of man within Sufi circles. Here we should turn to the great martyr/saint al-Ḥallāj, who along with Isma^Cīlī theologians, expanded on those Ḥadīṭ’s which deal with Muhammad’s pre-existence.⁵³ According to al-Ḥallāj, Muhammad preceded non-existence, substance and attributes, and all forms of relation. According to him, a light which shines forth from Muhammad is the undying source of knowledge from which all prophets derive their insight.⁵⁴

Affifi presents a balanced evaluation of the sources for Ibn al-^CArabi’s Perfect Man, in that he gives credence both to the Hellenistic (or Philonic) and Islamic aspects of the doctrine.⁵⁵ H. Schaeder goes one step further by identifying the Islamic elements of the Perfect Man doctrine with concepts found in Iranian cosmology.⁵⁶ Although these scholarly speculations are useful in that they answer questions posed by scholars, they show by their own multiformity the inability of achieving a final and absolute answer to the “influences” question. On the other hand, the phenomenological approach to this problem would properly

not address itself to the “influences” question: the mere existence of a quasi-Perfect Man doctrine in Iranian cosmology, in Gnosticism, in Lao Tzu for that matter, transcends the geographical and chronological barriers by which historical observations can be made.

Besides the cosmological symbol and philosophical Logos of the Perfect Man, there is a human and mystical side, rooted in the Aristotelian concept of human perfection as adopted by medieval theologians, including Maimonides, in the service of explaining the phenomenon of prophecy. For the question arises, how does one become a Perfect Man? According to Ibn al-^CArabi’s interpreter — both medieval and modern — Ibn al-^CArabi suggests a twofold perfection — in *being* and *knowledge*.⁵⁷ Potentially, insofar as all humanity is created in order to manifest God’s attributes, every man is perfect. Yet without perfection of the human intellectual faculties, man remains only potentially a Perfect Man. Only through complete self-knowledge can man realize his essential oneness with God, a perfect realization built on rational knowledge, but ultimately achievable only by means of mystical inspiration granted by God.⁵⁸ As God knows Himself through the Perfect Man, so the Perfect Man knows God through himself.

Only mystical saints and to a lesser extent prophets⁵⁹ achieve this knowledge and acquire all the names, attributes and finally the gnosis of the essence of God. Muhammad, being the most perfect of all God’s prophets, and who is reported in the ḥadīṭ as saying, “He who knows himself knows his Lord,” is also identified by Ibn al-^CArabi as the Perfect Man, the pole (*qutb*), or matrix, of the universe and of all other prophets. It is by virtue of the participation of others in Muhammad’s perfect nature that men become Perfect Men.

It is manifestly evident that Ibn al-^CArabi, who claimed for himself saintship and prophethood, saw himself as a Perfect Man, in fact, as the Seal of Saints (*katam al-awliya*):⁶⁰

I am the Seal of the saintship, no doubt, (the Seal) of the heritage of the Hashemite [i. e., Muhammad and the Messiah].

Ibn al-^cArabī claimed that the Seal of saintship could abrogate weak and even strong reports of Muhammad's *sunnah*, and innovate new legislation simply by the force of his perfection. Antinomian undercurrents abound in his writings, yet opposition to his claims failed to dislodge Ibn al-^cArabī from the rank of the "Great Master" (*al-sāyik al-akbar*) for future generations.⁶¹

It has always been assumed by Islamicists that Ibn al-^cArabī was the first to employ the term *al-insān al-kāmil* to describe the individual who is both microcosm and mystically illuminated philosopher, the cosmological and soteriological gnostic who achieves perfect union with God. As we have noted above, Maimonides used the same term in a somewhat similar manner more than a quarter of a century earlier. For Maimonides, *al-insān al-kāmil* is the man who has attained man's final cause: perfection of the intellect and the achievement of perdurance in God. For Maimonides the Jew, Moses represents the greatest prophet, the most perfect of men.⁶² According to Maimonides, man achieves this intellectual perfection by contemplation and by Divine Providence; his intellect unites with God's, and thus the prophetic state is acquired.

Now it cannot be presently established that Ibn al-^cArabī ever read or heard of Maimonides, and for this reason we refrain from drawing unwarranted conclusions. Yet the similarity is so striking in some ways between the two authors' concepts, the usage of the term *al-insān al-kāmil* is so uniquely limited during the first half of the thirteenth century, that we must entertain the possibility of direct, or more likely, of common influence. If Ibn al-^cArabī and Maimonides drew from some common source, it remains unknown. That Maimonides was known in Sufi circles in Damascus, Ibn al-^cArabī's residence during his final eleven years, bolsters the

contention that Ibn al-^cArabī may have adopted the term *al-insān al-kāmil* to describe his more mystical saint/prophet from Maimonides. Without further evidence, the point remains merely a speculative hypothesis.



Maimonides' Perfect Man is clearly a rational being, who, upon careful intellectual contemplation, is granted union with the Active Intellect. Nowhere is Maimonides' Perfect Man a microcosm or a cosmological Logos, or, for that matter, a mystic. However, when the Jewish Qabbalah expounds on the *adam qadmōn*, (Primordial Man) and the *adam šalem* (Hebrew translation of *al-insān al-kāmil*), we find many ideas first expressed in Ibn al-^cArabī cast in a Jewish mold.

Even in the Hebrew Bible a microcosmic apprehension of man is hinted at, in the sense that man is created in God's image (Gen. 1:26). God is also poetically likened to a man, as in Ex. 15:3, "God is a man of war."

By the Talmudic period, Gnostic elements become apparent,⁶³ and a more pronounced microcosmic motif appears: "Just as God fills the world, so the soul fills the body."⁶⁴ As early as the Tannaitic period we find the statement of R. Yose the Galilean:⁶⁵

Whatever the Holy One, blessed be He, created in the world, He created in man. . . He created forests in the world and He created forests in man: to wit, man's hair; He created evil beasts in the world. . . and in man: to wit, the vermin in man; He created channels in the world. . . and in man: to wit, man's ears; etc., etc. . . . Thus do you learn that whatever the Holy One, blessed be He, created in His world, He created in man.

This microcosmic tradition is preserved in the philosophical writings of Isaac Israeli, Joseph Ibn Šadiq, Ibn Paqūdah, Abraham

Studies in Mystical Literature

Bar Ḥiyya, Abraham Ibn Ezra, and others, as Altmann has documented.⁶⁶

The same idea is found in the mystical texts of Judaism. In the Gnostic throne texts⁶⁷ there appears the doctrine of the *Ši^Cūr Qōmah*, the "measurement of the Body of God" in which God is unabashedly described as a human body on immense proportions, based on Ezekiel 1:26, where the prophet sees "high above all, upon the throne, a figure similar to that of a man." It is this body of God that would later be associated with the *adam qadmōn* of the Qabbalah and it seems quite possible that the authors of these texts were influenced by the Persian Primal Man of Mani.⁶⁸ Scholem, interestingly enough, believes these speculations of the *Ši^Cūr Qōmah* found their way into the extreme anthropomorphic tendencies evident in Islamic theology.⁶⁹

No real expansion on the microcosmic motif is found in the *Bahīr*, save for the innovative utilization of sefirotic imagery. In section no. 55 (Margulies ed., no. 82), the seven limbs of man⁷⁰ are linked with the seven lower sefirot and the week of creation.⁷¹ Section no. 116 (Margulies ed., no. 171) repeats this theme:

I have already said to you that God has seven holy forms (*šūrōt qedōšōt*), and each of them correspond to man, for it is written, "For in the image of God was man created" (Gen. 9:6).

Another mystical expression of the microcosmic motif is evident in the *Bahīr*'s exposition of Exodus 15:3. In sections no. 18 and 84 (Margulies ed., no. 26 and 117) the word *īš*, "man [of war]," is treated according to the consonants ('-Y-Š) and is taken as a symbol of the divine pleroma. The *ʿ*, first letter of the Hebrew alphabet, signifies the head or alternatively the divine palace of God; the *Y*, which numerically equals ten, represents the ten divine utterances by which the world was created;⁷² the *Š* (written *sh*) symbolizes the world or the cosmic tree root.

Man is now seen as representing the divine powers, or sefirot. There is no reference to a Primordial or Perfect Man in the *Bahīr*,⁷³ nor any Logos doctrine.

The first occurrence of the term *adam qadmōn* is in a text from the Gerona school of mystics written in the early thirteenth century, displaying the influence of R. Azriel.⁷⁴ By this time, Maimonides' *Guide* had been translated into Hebrew and its influence was spreading from Provence to Gerona.

Turning finally to the *Zohar*, we find the traditional micro/macro/Delphic motif with a new turn. Terminologically, the *Zohar*, at least those portions written by Moses de Leon, uses the phrases *adam ʿila'ah*, the "Supernal Man," and *adam šalēm*, which I choose to translate the "Complete Man." The latter phrase, which for Maimonides represents the perfected intellectual/philosopher, is for the *Zohar* something quite different and unexpected: a man who has united with his wife and given birth to both a son and a daughter.⁷⁵ Here we should read *šalēm* not as "perfection," but "completion," in the sense of fulfilling the commandment of "be fruitful and multiply" (Gen. 1:28).⁷⁶

The former phrase encompasses the micro/macro motif as enhanced by the *Bahīr*. But while the *Bahīr*'s central focus is the Gnostic pleroma of the upper sefirotic world, the *Zohar* could be described as anthropocentric in focus.⁷⁷ In the *Zohar*, the entire sefirotic universe, all ten hypostases, all that can be known of God and the structure of the emanated this-world, is to be found in man's own mystical body and soul. This is not just an occasional doctrine which appears periodically in the text, but is one of the basic themes which permeates vast sections of the book.⁷⁸

Whereas Maimonides stresses the functional, human aspect of the Perfect Man, the *Zohar* emphasizes the mystical and cosmological nature of the Primordial Man (All three components, as we have seen, are evident in Ibn al-^CArabi.) The *adam ʿila'ah* and *adam qidma'ah* (Aramaic for *adam qadmōn*) of the *Zohar*

represent that aspect of God which is manifest in the world. It is from this Supernal Man that sublunar man is formed. In the *Greater Assembly* the Primordial Man is likened to an "image" (*diyūqan*), and worldly man is the essence of that image.⁷⁹ In many ways this "image" compares favorably to Philo's Logos⁸⁰ and Ibn al-^CArabi's essential Perfect Man, cause of the universe. The Primordial Man is not only the pattern for sublunar man, but is formed in the image of God:⁸¹

But when [God] had created the image [or form] of Supernal Man it was to Him as a chariot, and He descended on it, to be known by the image *YHVH*.

In these texts, man is primarily viewed as the form of both the supernal and sublunar world.⁸²

In the *Ra^Caya' Mehēmna'*, (*The Faithful Shepherd*), and *Tiqqūnīm* (*Additions*) the Logos theme surpasses the microcosm motif in regularity and centrality.⁸³ In these texts, each ascending sefirah is a Primordial Man for its antecedent.⁸⁴ If man attains knowledge of his essential unity with *adam qadmōn*, he will also perceive his unity with God. The *adam qadmōn* is the Logos by which man achieves gnosis and by which God creates the cosmos. Man is necessary for both the existence of this world, and for the order of the upper world.

Conclusions

It will be useful to review the doctrine of the Perfect/Primordial Man as it appears historically. It is also helpful to typologize the function of the doctrine in terms of: 1) human perfection as acquisition of gnosis and prophecy; 2) the microcosmic motifs and 3) a cosmological Logos, an image of the divine reality which makes God accessible to the gnostic and this world accessible to God.

Maimonides stresses 1) exclusively. Any man who has perfected the four perfections enumerated in the *Guide* becomes, with Providence, a prophet and achieves perdurance in God. A Perfect Man unites his intellect with God's Active Intellect.

The *Bahir* stresses 2), continuing a tradition rooted in earlier Rabbinic, and ultimately, Gnostic traditions. The *Bahir* adds an element based on a Neoplatonic apprehension of the universe: man is a microcosm of the created universe and God's revealed emanations.

In neither text is function 3) apparent.

In Ibn al-^CArabi, all three functions coincide. A perfect Man on the human level is a perfected rationalist, who, by perception of the microcosmic status of his being, is granted by God mystical intuition into the essential unity of man the many and God the One. At the same moment, the Perfect Man is a Logos, the collected, revealed Self by which God knows Himself and creates the world.

The *Zohar*, in the main, contains all three functions. A Perfect Man is one who has fulfilled worldly creation by bringing into corporeality male and female. The Primordial Man is both microcosm and Logos, the "image" by which man knows the revealed God and by which the hidden God creates the sublunar world. In the latter strands of the *Zohar*, function 3) becomes more of a concern than function 2).

We have no historical evidence in the form of documentary narrative that the Qabbalists who wrote the *Zohar* had an opportunity to read Ibn al-^CArabi. The similarities (especially of function 3) presented in this paper may be a coincidence of simultaneous inspiration or they may be the result of a conscious or unconscious adaptation of ideas current in the speculative cultural milieu of Islam. The similarity of terminology and common link of Maimonides to both Sufism and Qabbalah suggest more than a coincidence. I tentatively propose, on the basis of the above

comparison, that the authors of the *Zohar* were influenced by both the Maimonidean and theosophical Sufi teaching of the Perfect Man current in the literature and speculation of thirteenth-century Spain. Between the time of the composition of Ibn al-^CArabi's works and the appearance of the *Zohar* there is more than half a century for ideas to circulate and develop. From Maimonides came the idea of the human Perfect Man; from ancient Jewish mysticism came the Gnostic microcosm of the Primordial Man; but the *Zohar's* Logos doctrine can come from only two sources, if anywhere at all: either Philo or Ibn al-^CArabi (or his sources). Certainly Ibn al-^CArabi, of the same century and peninsula, is the far more likely candidate. Just as Sufi doctrines passed unknowingly into Jewish Philosophy in the West, so did they emerge in the Qabbalah.

ABBREVIATIONS

- AJSLL – *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature*
 HUCA – *Hebrew Union College Annual*
 IOS – *Israel Oriental Studies*
 JAOS – *Journal of the American Oriental Society*
 JJS – *Journal of Jewish Studies*
 JQR – *Jewish Quarterly/Review*, o.s. – old series; n.s. – new series.
 JRAS – *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*
 MW – *Moslem World*
 MTJM – G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, (New York, 1941)
 PAAJR – *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*
 REJ – *Revue des Études Juives*
 SI – *Studia Islamica*
 ZA – *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*
 ZDMG – *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*

NOTES

1. I. Goldziher, "Ibn Hūd, the Mohammedan Mystic, and the Jews of Damascus," *JQR* o. s., vol. 6 (1894): 220.
2. R. A. Nicholson, *Selected Poems from the Dīvān-i Shams-i Tabrīz*, (Cambridge, 1961²): 25.
3. In the mystical heresy of Sabbatianism, Shabbetai Sevi's forced apostasy to Islam is clothed in Qabbalistic colors, resulting in the doctrine of the necessary conversion of the Messiah to Islam. See G. Scholem, "The Crisis of Tradition in Jewish Messianism" and "The Crypto-Jewish Sect of the Dönme (Sabbatians) in Turkey" in his *The Messianic Idea in Judaism*, (New York, 1971).
4. Logically due to the fact that Qabbalah developed as we know it in the Christian world.
5. One of the few examples of Jewish mystical testimonies about Islam, written by a twelfth century German pietist, displays much ignorance. See Y. Dan, *Studies in Ashkenazi-Hasidic Literature* (Hebrew), (Ramat Gan, 1975): 26-33. For the Spanish view, see Scholem, *MTJM*: 146-147.
6. "Catharism and the Beginnings of the Kabbalah in Languedoc – Elements Common to the Catharic Scriptures and the Book Bahir" (Hebrew), *Tarbiz*, vol. 40 (1970-1): 483-705; English summary: viif. Scholem has expressed doubts as to the viability of Shaḥar's claims, but does not enumerate his objections. See his *Elements of the Kabbalah and its Symbolism* (Hebrew), (Jerusalem, 1976): 90, n. 3.
7. "The Historical Background of the 'Raya Mehemna'" (Hebrew), *Zion*, vol. 5 (1939-1940): 1-44; English summary: i-iii; and his *A History of the Jews in Christian Spain*, (Philadelphia, 1961): 270-77.
- 8a. See A. Bension, *The Zohar in Moslem and Christian Spain*, (London, 1932): 28-75.
- 8b. See Scholem, *On the Kabbalah and its Symbolism*, (New York, 1969): 51, where he suggests a connection between certain Ismā'īlī theologians and Qabbalistic methods of interpretation. It is unfortunate that Scholem did not mention the four-fold Sufi exegetical method so prevalent in Sufi *tafsīr* literature. Scholem has further noted that certain linguistic features of the *Bahir* reflect Arabisms. See his *Les origines de la Kabbale*, (Paris, 1966): 66, n. 12. See also *MTJM*, index, s. v. *Sufism*. In general, however, Scholem limits his history of Jewish

- mysticism in this period to the Christian world and largely ignores the development of a more Sufi-oriented Jewish mysticism in Andalusia and the rest of the Islamic world, a criticism already levelled by M.G.S. Hodgson in *The Venture of Islam*, (Chicago, 1974), vol. 2: 202, n. 1.
9. For example N. Wieder, *Islamic Influences on the Jewish Worship* (Hebrew), (Oxford, 1947).
 10. *MTJM*: 22-25.
 11. "Sa^cadia's General Ethical Theory and Its Relation to Sufism," *The Seventy-fifth Anniversary Volume of the JQR*, ed. A. Newman and S. Zeitlin, (Philadelphia, 1967): 172 ff.
 12. Ed. S. Landauer, (Leiden, 1880): 281-320.
 13. *Ibid*: 287, 11. 5 ff. See A. Schimmel, *Mystical Dimensions of Islam*, (Chapel Hill, 1975): 37, 110; and A. J. Arberry, *Sufism*, (New York, 1970): 31f.
 14. D. Baneth, "The Common Teleological Source of Bahye Ibn Pakuda and Ghazali" (Hebrew), in *Magnes Anniversary Book*, (Jerusalem, 1938): 23-30; and A. Lazaroff, "Bahya's Asceticism Against its Rabbinic and Islamic Background," *JJS*, vol. 21 (1970): 24f. Cf. Arberry, op. cit.: 46f; and G. Vajda, *REJ*, vol. 112 (1953): 21, n. 2.
 15. Ed. A. S. Yahuda, (Leiden, 1912): 175-224.
 16. Schimmel, op. cit. 117-120.
 17. Wieder, op. cit.: 7, 10-22.
 18. Ed. Joel, (Jerusalem, 1929): 454-471. Cf. *The Guide of the Perplexed*, trans. by S. Pines, (Chicago, 1963): 618-638.
 19. Ed. Joel: 469, 1. 4; Pines, op. cit.: 635. See also A. Altmann, "Maimonides 'Four Perfections' ", *IOS*, vol. 21 (1972): 15-24.
 20. Ed. Joel: 53, 1.23 (1:34); p. 102, 1.8 (1:61); p. 262, 1.24 (11:36).
 21. Ed. Y. Qafah, (Jerusalem, 1964), vol. 4: 199, 208. For the literature on Maimonides' *al-insān al-kāmil*, see D. Blumenthal, *The Commentary of R. Ḥōter ben Shelōmō to the Thirteen Principles of Maimonides*, (Leiden, 1974): 31, n. 1.
 22. Schimmel, op. cit.: 141f; and R. A. Nicholson, "The Goal of Muhammadan Mysticism," *JRAS*, (1913): 55-68.
 23. E. H. Palmer, *Oriental Mysticism*, (London, 1969): 11.
 24. Maimonides' adoption of Avicennian Neoplatonism on certain key doctrines is itself indicative of the Sufi aspects of his thought.
 25. Goldziher, op. cit.: 220.
 26. S. D. Goitein, "Abraham Maimonides and his Pietist Circle," in *Jewish*

- Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, ed. A. Altmann, (Cambridge, 1967): 145f; 148, 164. For a contrasting view, cf. G. Cohen, "The Soteriology of R. Abraham Maimuni," *PAAJR*, vol. 36 (1967): 75-89, and vol. 37 (1968): 33-56. For an analysis of some of the Sufi-like innovations instituted by Abraham, see Wieder, op. cit.: 31:46.
27. S. Rosenblatt, *The High Ways of Perfection of Abraham Maimonides*, (Baltimore, 1938), vol. 2: 323. This is one of the many examples; see Rosenblatt, vol. 1, (New York, 1927): 48ff.
 28. Schimmel, op. cit.: 114f.
 29. Rosenblatt, op. cit., vol. 1: 50f.
 30. "A Jewish Addict to Sufism," *JQR* n. s. vol. 44 (1953-54): 37-49.
 31. *Ibid*.: 46-49.
 32. H. Hirschfeld, "A Hebraeo-Sufic Poem," *JAOS*, vol. 49 (1929): 168-173 and A. R. Nykl, *AJSLL*, vol. 46 (1929-1930): 203-204.
 33. H. Hirschfeld, "The Arabic Portion of the Cairo Genizah at Cambridge," *JQR* o. s. vol. 15 (1902): 176-7; 180-1.
 34. F. Rosenthal, "A Judeo-Arabic Work Under Sufic Influence," *HUCA*, vol. 15 (1940): 441.
 35. *Ibid*.: 436f.
 36. Mišneh Tōrah, Hilḳōt Tefillah 4: 3.
 37. *Hassagōt ha-RaBad*, loc. cit.
 38. I. Twersky, *Rabad of Posquières*, (Cambridge, 1962): 260. For a description of the translation movement, see Twersky, "Aspects of the Social and Cultural History of Provencal Jewry," in *Jewish Society Through the Ages*, ed. H. H. Ben-Sasson and S. Ettinger, (New York, 1969): 196-202.
 39. Twersky, *Rabad*: 273-300.
 40. *MTJM*: 173, 194.
 41. *Ibid*.: 140f.
 42. First submitted by Asin Palacios and rejected by A. E. Affifi, *The Mystical Philosophy of Muhyid Din Ibnul Arabi*, (Lahore, 1964): 178-183. Ibn Masarrāh's system is also possibly reflected in Ibn Gabirol's *Fon Vitae*.
 43. "The Philosophy of Ibn ^cArabi," *MW*, vol. 47 (1957): 47.
 44. Affifi, op. cit.: xviiiif.
 - 44a. Now being critically edited by U. Yaḥya in Cairo.
 45. *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam*, ed. A. E. Affifi, (Cairo, 1365/1946): 47.
 46. Sayyed Hossein Nasr, *Sufi Essays*, (London, 1972): 97-103; and

- 50
- Studies in Mystical Literature
- Schimmel, op. cit.: 279-286.
47. *Fuṣūṣ*: 48f. See Affifi, op. cit.: 16f.
 48. As interpreted by Affifi, op. cit.: 77f.
 49. *Fuṣūṣ*: 48f.
 50. See R. A. Nicholson, *Studies in Islamic Mysticism*, (Cambridge, 1954-1957).
 51. Cf. with the Philonic Logos doctrine as portrayed by H. A. Wof *Philo*, (Cambridge, 1947), vol. 1: 231f.
 52. Quoted by Affifi, op. cit.: 79.
 53. See I. Goldziher, "Neuplatonische und Gnostische Elemente in H ZA, (1908): 317-344.
 54. Affifi, op. cit.: 86.
 55. *Ibid.*, p. 87.
 56. "Die Islamische Lehre von Vollkommenen Menschen, ihre H und ihre dichterische Gestaltung," *ZDMG*, vol. 79 (1925): 192-193.
 57. Affifi, op. cit.: 81.
 58. A. Altmann is to be credited with the elaboration of what is la Affifi. Affifi describes perfect knowledge as realization c essential unity with God. To this, Altmann, in his "The Delphi in Medieval Islam and Judaism," in *Studies in Religious Philosc Mysticism*, (Ithaca, 1969): 1-14, adds the element of self-kn a theme already present in al-Ḥallāj and al-Ghazālī. This self-kn has a clearly mystical typology, insofar as it is the result of illu See Nicholson, *Studies*: 85.
 59. As to the lower stature of the prophets, see *Fuṣūṣ*: 62f., a op. cit.: 92-101.
 60. *Al-Futūḥāt al-Makkīyah*, vol. 1:319. In other places, Ibn al-^cA at his Messiahship and, by mystical allusion, to his supe perfection as compared to Muhammad. See Affifi, op. cit.: 10.
 61. The relation between Islamic mysticism and heresy in the antinomianism is a subject that deserves much consideration. unique is the veneration of quasi-heretical figures by la orthodox mystics. How one age's heretic becomes another a martyr is the most distinguishable and perplexing aspe phenomenon.
 62. *Dalālat*, ed. Joel: 459, l. 11f.; trans. Pines: 623.
 63. Altmann, "The Gnostic Background of the Rabbinic Adam *JQR* n. s., vol. 35 (1944/45): 371-391.
 64. *Babylonian Talmud*, Berakōt 10a.
 65. *Abōt de-Rabbi Natan*, ed. S. Schechter, (Vienna, 1887), version A, ch. 31: 91-92; see also E. E. Urbach, *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs* (Hebrew), (Jerusalem, 1969): 206f; S. Horodetzky, "Primordial Man" (Hebrew), *Ha-Goren*, vol. 10 (1928): 101-104; and Altmann, "Delphic": 21.
 66. "Delphic": 23-28.
 67. See Scholem, *MTJM*, ch. 2, esp. pp. 63-67; and Horodetzky, op. cit.: 104-106.
 68. Hans Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion*, (Boston, 1963²): 216f. If Schaefer is correct in his hypothesis, then both Islam and Judaism shared Persian sources in their primordial man doctrines.
 69. *MTJM*: 66.
 70. Penis, two hands, head, torso and two legs.
 71. See Scholem, *Les origines*: 150-156.
 72. Reference to a crude Logos tradition from the Talmud. See *Pirqē Abōt*, 5: 1.
 73. The words 'is and *adam* both mean "man". Only 'is is treated in the *Bahūr*.
 74. The text, *Sōd Yedī^cat ha-Meṣi'ūt*, is extant in ms. form only (Munich 83: 165a and Schocken 6) and does not use the term in a mystical sense. The Munich ms. does not contain the term.
 75. *Zohar* III: 7a and 91b.
 76. The word "completion" had a sexual, procreative connotation in early Rabbinic literature. See *Sifra'*, sec. Beḥūqōtay, ch. 8, sec. 7 (to Lev. 26: 42): "Jacob's bed was not complete."
 77. I. Tishby, *The Wisdom of the Zohar* (Hebrew), (Jerusalem, 1975), vol. 2: 3.
 78. In de Leon's *Zohar*, the *Book of Concealment* (*Sifra' de-Šeni^cūta'*), the *Greater Assembly* (*Idra' Rabba'*) and the *Lesser Assembly* (*Idra' Zūṭa'*) are permeated with a detailed microcosmic scheme, influenced by the *Št^cūr Qōmah* literature. Other sections, while less exacting in detail, stress the divine aspect of the limbs, especially the phallus. The later sections of the *Zohar*, not written by de Leon, also stress continuously the mystical microcosmic motif, in addition to a cosmological Logos doctrine. On the sections of the *Zohar* and a literary analysis, see *MTJM*: 159-163, esp. secs. b), c), d), t) and u), and pp. 168-172.
 79. *Zohar* III: 141b.

80. Horodetzky, op. cit.: 112-115.
81. *Zohar* II: 42b.
82. *Zohar* II: 55a and I: 130b.
83. See Tishby, op. cit., vol. 1 (1971): 157-158.
84. *Zohar Ḥadaš, Tiqqūnīm*, 29a-b.
85. Altmann, "Delphic": 14-19.