SOME NOTES ON THE DREAM MANUAL OF AL-DĀRĪ

One of the best known medieval Islamic dream manuals is the so-called Muntakhab al-kulūm fi tarīb al-manāmī ascribed to Muhammad b. Sīrin (d. 1107/1208). This text has obtained its present fame in large measure because of its wide circulation in printed form. It would seem that the first printed edition of this text appeared in 1284/1287 from Bulaq. Subsequently, it was attached to the margin of the two-volume edition of Nīzārī’s Tārīb al-manāmī fi tarīb al-manāmī (Cairo, 1294/1877) and then again to the first volume of the same in the Cairo edition of 1302/1884. The text has been reprinted many times since the nineteenth century – copies are easily found today in bookstores in the Middle East. Contributing to its fame, it was this same text which formed the subject of one of the earliest academic studies of the Islamic tradition of dream divination. The purpose of this short note is to clarify the history of this work by restoring an important part of the text lacking in the printed edition, by clarifying its sources, and by providing a few clues as to its approximate date of composition.

Ibn Sīrin’s Muntakhab is preserved in a fairly extensive manuscript tradition. There are at least seven extant copies. The eldest of these is (1) Paris, ms ar. 2749.1, ff. 1-161, 819HE, ascribed to al-Ḥusayn b. Ḥasan b. ʿAbdallāh al-Khalīfī al-
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Dāri, bearing the title al-Mustadabī fi ṭarbī’ al-marjū. Other copies include: (2) Topkapi, A3174, f. 1b-289a, 9414, ascribed on fol. 1a (muraqqa‘) to Abū Siṣil al-Harawi but at the beginning of the text to Abū ‘All al-Husayn b. Hašān b. Isḥāq al-Mardūfī (a corruption of al-Marduwi). Bearing the title al-Mustadabī fi ṭarbī’ al-marjū, (3) Sur. Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suli, 307/1, f. 2b-5a, without date, ascribed to Abū ‘All al-Husayn b. Hašān b. Isḥāq al-Mardūfī, entitled al-Mustadabī fi ṭarbī’ al-marjū (f. 154b). (4) Dīr al-Kurub VI, 178, 3309, 2098f, 11351H, ascribed to Ibn Siṣil, entitled Munasik al-ḥabīb b. ṭarbī’ al-aḥlām. (5) Darnaczi, Zālīlayh, 5640, 391H, with the title Tarbi’ al-ḥabīb, ascribed by a second hand to al-Shāhī al-Faṣl al-Kanāl al-Mardūfī. Two other copies have been noted in the secondary literature: (6) Alexandria, Municipal Library fumīn mutt. 220, 880H, ascribed to Abū ‘All al-Husayn b. Hašān b. Isḥāq al-Mardūfī, entitled Dīr al-Kurub VI, 178, ascribed to Tarbi’ al-ḥabīb, authored by a second hand to al-Shāhī al-Faṣl al-Kanāl al-Mardūfī. This has also been suggested (wrongly) by Naskabi, al-Dīr al-Kurub VI, 178, ascribed to Ibn Siṣil, entitled Munasik al-ḥabīb b. ṭarbī’ al-aḥlām. Second, I have not elsewhere encountered Munasik al-ḥabīb b. ṭarbī’ al-aḥlām as a title for Khuzī’s dream manual. On the other hand, both manuscripts are said to contain sixty chapters; I know of no copies of Dīr al-Kurub VI, with the chapter titles, whether the majority of copies of Khuzī’s dream manual have sixty, though some combine chapters so that one occasionally finds versions containing fifty-eight or fifty-nine chapters.

This is the title as recorded on fol. 1a, whereas at the end of the text one finds al-Mustadabī fi ṭarbī’ al-marjū (fol. 989d).

I have not had access to a copy of the printed catalogue (Munāša‘) by Abū ‘All al-Ḥusayn b. Ḥašān b. Isḥāq al-Mardūfī, entitled Ḥanūf al-ḥabīb (fol. 381/2) and have been unable to verify Brockhaus’s data. Cf. S. Grod, G. S., 1910, who cites Alī b. Ḥakam, 1348 as containing a copy of this text.

"La distinction entre Études religieuses, métaphysiques et philosophiques par le nom de Vito (Vito) (Leiden, 1606), pp. 153-154. I was unable to gain access to this library in order to confirm Dīr al-Kurub VI, 178.

La distinction entre, p. 133, ref. p. 250, p. 290, and note 4. In fact, this manuscript bears the signature of a hitherto unknown dream manual. This text is of great interest and deserves further study. It appears to me to be a fascinating source for the study of Khuzī’s dream manual.

The manuscript is not dated, although it bears two markers on the title page, one being 1211/1, the other being 1225/1. It is written in a clear style and has been well preserved, although it stands in need of being rebound. The title page of the work bears the title Khuzī’s al-ḥabīb. This is also the name which the author himself gives to the work (f. 1b: šīr al-ḥabīb la ṭarbī’ al-aḥlām). The date on fol. 1a is 1211/1, which is written in the margin of the work. Two copies are noted in the catalogue of the Library, fol. 9. The manuscript contains 137 chapters. The first three chapters are as follows: 91 of al-ḥabīb la ṭarbī’ al-aḥlām, 26 al-ḥabīb la ṭarbī’ al-aḥlām, 13f 13f 13f. I have not been able to verify the contents of the chapters, but I am confident of their authenticity. Unfortunately, the beginning of the introduction in this manuscript has been lost.

In this text the author cites himself with the heading al-ḥabīb in this paper. The text was written at the time of the author’s death. I have not been able to verify the contents of the chapters. However, the name of the author appears on the title page, fol. 3. The manuscript contains 137 chapters.

The manuscript is entitled al-Ṭarbi’ al-ḥabīb, authored by a second hand to al-Shāhī al-Faṣl al-Kanāl al-Mardūfī. This has also been suggested (wrongly) by Naskabi, al-Mustadabī fi ṭarbī’ al-marjū. I have not been able to verify Brockhaus’s data. Cf. S. Grod, G. S., 1910, who cites Alī b. Ḥakam, 1348 as containing a copy of this text.

It is not clear whether the editors of the printed edition deliberately omitted their introduction materials in order to support the acceptance of the text to Ibn Siṣil or whether the example which they were following (Ibn Siṣil, f. 118, 3309) itself does not contain these materials.

As my note in this catalogue, I have examined the Topkapi, Soteriographic, and Parv manuscripts and determined that all three control the introductory materials printed here.

The manuscript cited above is based on two manuscripts, Topkapi 4154/1 and 4154/2, entitled Siṣil al-Suli, 307/1, and 307/2. Manuscript 4154/1 presents a text that is in a large and more concise form than the printed version of the manuscript. There are, however, two issues: one where the text lacks blank spaces, probably because the example was used elsewhere in the manuscript. The other issue is that the text on fol. 1a is not consistent with the printed version of the manuscript. I have not been able to verify the contents of the chapters. However, the name of the author appears on the title page, fol. 3. The manuscript contains 137 chapters.

The manuscript is entitled al-Ṭarbi’ al-ḥabīb, authored by a second hand to al-Shāhī al-Faṣl al-Kanāl al-Mardūfī. This has also been suggested (wrongly) by Naskabi, al-Mustadabī fi ṭarbī’ al-marjū.

the title al-Ṭarbi’ al-ḥabīb is not consistent with the text to a certain Abū ‘All al-Husayn b. Hašān b. Isḥāq al-Kanāl al-Mardūfī, as one can see, there are many sources which he used in his own comprehensive dream manual (Ṭarbi’ al-ḥabīb fi ṭarbī’ al-aḥlām) which are consistent with the text to a certain Abū ‘All al-Husayn b. Hašān b. Isḥāq al-Kanāl al-Mardūfī. The text is occasionally ascribed in the manuscripts to Ibn Siṣil, as mentioned in the previous note. It is not surprising. One could cite many other examples of a ḥadrī interpretation in the ascription of Islamic dream manuals. Unless an author "protects" his work by stating in his introduction his name, it is often common for manuscripts of his dream manual to come to be ascribed to Ibn Siṣil, the eponymous founder of the Islamic tradition of dream divination.

Upon what sources did Dīr draw for the compilation of his dream manual? According to the printed version of this text, the author nowhere specifies his sources. An examination of the manuscripts shows, however, that the beginning of Dīr al-Kurub’s dream manual is lacking in the printed version. The passage printed on the following page has been omitted. As can now be seen, Dīr al-Kurub’s original introduction had begun with a discussion of the nobility of the science of dream divination, a science recommended by the prophets and pursued by the adepts. The author then remarked how he had wanted a comprehensive work on the subject, but had found none to meet his needs. He continued by explaining how he then decided to summarize what was to be found on this subject in a number of earlier sources. He mentioned first those who were most reliable in the subject: (1) Ḥabīb b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Kanālī, (2) Ibn Siṣil, and (3) Aḥmad b. ‘All al-Husayn b. Hašān b. Isḥāq al-Mardūfī.
(2) Abu al-Hasan Ali b. Abu Talib al-Qarawyini⁶, and (3) Abu Muhammad 'Abd Allâh b. Muslim al-Qataybih⁷. He then mentioned certain more recent authors as well: (4) the writer of the Kitâb al-Qarîdâ⁸, and (5) Abu Sâ'îd al-Muwâ'îdî.⁹ He founded his work, he says, upon a comparison of all five of these sources. Darî was careful to add, that he was no blind compiler. He does not include materials simply because earlier authors are unanimous in their understanding of them. Rather, he has transmitted from these books only what is true and what he himself approves, whether or not his authorities agree upon it.

Excerpts from the dream manual of Kâmînî, all of these sources are still extant. Has Darî given an accurate account of his labors as a compiler? Empirically not! Darî's dream manual has two introductions. The first of these treats of such subjects as the different types of dreams, the adâb of the dreamer and the dream interpreter, and the different ways in which dreams can be interpreted. These materials are largely copied from Ibn Qataybih. The second of his introductions turns its attention to prophetic traditions relating to the interpretation of dreams. Dreams had by various prophets, and further treatment of the adâb of the dreamer and the dream interpreter. Almost all of this is derived directly from the dream manual of Khârîkhî. Following these introductory materials, Darî commences the actual interpretation of dream symbols. Like most texts from the formative period of this genre, he organizes his interpretations according to subject. There are fifty-nine chapters, each of which treats of a different category of dream objects. The first twenty chapters deal with religious subjects such as dreams of God, the prophets, the Qur’ân, heaven and hell, etc. The remaining chapters are concerned with more mundane subjects: dreams of bodily members, animals, the sun, moon and stars, food and drink, marriage and divorce, etc. A detailed examination of Darî's work shows that he was almost wholly dependent upon just

a single earlier authority for this part of his text – about 99 percent of it being nothing more than a summary of Kharkabi’s dream manual. Dārī is selective in what he includes and sometimes even rewrites parts of his source, especially where its Arabic is unclear. By and large, however, Dārī’s dream manual must be considered as nothing more than a *muṣbaʿa* of the work of Kharkabi.

Toufic Fahd (EP III, p. 948) has suggested that Dārī’s *Muṣbaʿa* was compiled toward the beginning of the 9th/15th century, referring his readers to earlier comments on this text in his *La distination antérieure* (p. 333, nos. 27). The latter work, however, does not attempt to date Dārī’s dream manual. It is not clear what evidence could be marshaled to support such a late date for this text. I can only think that Fahd was in fact referring to this text’s *terminus ante quem*, the earliest dated manuscript of this text being Paris ms. 2749,1, copied in the year 819H. An earlier date has been proposed by A. Abdel Daim*, basing himself on the authorities cited in the *Muṣbaʿa*. Abdel Daim argued that the composition of this text can probably be placed toward the beginning of the fifth Islamic century. Reliance upon the names of the authorities being cited is not as safe as it may at first seem. A collection of Dārī and Kharkabi shows that every single authority cited by Dārī – of which there are about thirty – was in fact originally an authority of Kharkabi. The same is true in Dārī’s dream manual (though no dates are given to its dates: they were simply lifted from his major sources).

All my efforts to identify Dārī on the basis of medieval biographical dictionaries and bibliographical works have proven vain. A *terminus a quo* for Dārī’s *Muṣbaʿa* can, however, be provided by the list of sources which has now been restored to his text. Qayrawānī, Dinawari, and Kharkabi all lived and wrote toward the end of the fourth century and the beginning of the fifth. Let us say, around 400H. As for this text’s *terminus ante quem*, as mentioned above, the earliest dated manuscript is Paris ms. 2749,1, copied in the year 819H. This date can be pushed back another two centuries, however, by the evidence of Topkapi A3174.1. This manuscript was copied in 974H, but the scribe specifies that the exemplar from which he copied was itself dated to 635H: *muḥāṣṣar al-muṣbaʿah al-nanārī mina taʾwīl hawā fi shahr 1... i was fī māshah 635 (colophon l. 297a)*. Dārī must therefore have been writing sometime between ca. 400H and 650H. I am more inclined to place this text’s date of compilation closer to the beginning than to the end of this period, for Dārī refers to both Kharkabi and Dinawari as *recent* authorities and he shows no awareness of the many dream manuals dating from the sixth or seventh centuries of the Islamic era.

**John C. Lamoreaux**

---

* L’astromonie arabe d’après les Sour. p. 17
* The name of the month in which the text was copied is unclear in the ms.